

ISSN 2345-1785 (Print)
e-ISSN 2345-1793 (PDF)

Rusin Studies

An Abstracts Journal

2018, 1

Association "Rus"
Tomsk State University



Rusin Studies

An Abstracts Journal

Русинские исследования

Реферативный журнал

2018. Vol. 1

Association "Rus"

Tomsk State University

Editorial Board:

Editor-in-Chief

Sergey Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University (Russia),

Nikolai Babilunga

Taras Shevchenko State University of Transnistria
(Moldova, Transnistria)

Mykhaylo Chuchko

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (Ukraine)

Yuriy Danilets

Uzhhorod National University (Ukraine)

Mikhajlo Fejsa

University of Novy Sad (Serbia)

Dmitry Katunin

Tomsk State University (Russia)

Anna Plišková

University of Preshov (Slovakia)

Vasilij Zinoviev

Tomsk State University (Russia)

**Editor's address: Association "Rus".
P.O. box 1041, Kishinev, MD 2028, Moldova
Tel.: (+373 22) 28-75-59
E-mail: journalrusyn@rambler.ru**

© Association "Rus;" 2018

CONTENTS

<i>Editor's Page</i>	6
----------------------------	---

HISTORY

Ju. V. Danilets

New Documents on the Activities of Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenkov) in Subcarpathian Rus' in 1923 to 1924

Novi dokumenti pro diyal'nist' episkopa Veniamina (Fedchenkov) na Pidkarpats'kii Rusi u 1923–1924 rr.	7
--	---

Ju. V. Danilets

Prisoner of Dachau Hieromonk Feodosii (Rosokha)

V'yazen' Dakhau ieromonakh Feodosii (Rosokha)	9
---	---

Ju. V. Danilets

From the Personal Archive of Documents of Archimandrite Matthew (Vakarov)

Iz dokumentiv Osobistogo arkhivu arhimandrita Matfeya (Vakarova)	11
--	----

Ju. V. Danilets

Archbishop Alexy (Dekhterev): The Life and Career (1889 – 1959)

Arkiepiskop Oleksii (Dekhter'ov): zhitteviï ta tvorchii shlyakh (1889–1959)	14
---	----

Ju. V. Danilets

Religious Persecution of Rusins in Austria-Hungary Before World War I (The 100th Anniversary of the Second Marmarosh-Sighet Trial 1913 – 1914)

Peresliduvannya rusiniv za viru v Avstro-Ugorshchini naperedodni Pershoï svitovoï viini (do 100-richchya drugogo Maramorosh-Sigots'kogo protsesu 1913–1914 rr.).....	17
--	----

Ju. V. Danilets

Anti-Rusin Trial of 1913 – 1914 in Maramorosh-Sighet and its coverage in the columns of the Lvov newspapers “Delo” and “Delo and Novoye Slovo”

Antirusinskii sudebnyi protsess 1913–1914 gg. v Maramorosh-Sigote na stranitsakh l'vovskikh gazet “Delo” i “Delo i Novoe clovo”	20
---	----

Ju. V. Danilets

To the History of Orthodoxy in Ugrian Rus' on the Eve of the WWI (Based on the Materials of the American Newspaper “Svet”)

K istorii pravoslaviya v Ugorskoï Rusi nakanune Pervoï mirovoï voiny (po materialam amerikanskoï gazety “Svet”)	23
---	----

Ju. V. Danilets

Transformation in the Life of Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Region in 1939 – 1945

Transformatsii v zhizni pravoslavnoi tserkvi na Zakarpat'e v 1939–1945 gg.	26
---	----

S. G. Sulyak

Emperor Alexander I: The Incident in Chernovtsy

Imperatora oblayali v Chernovtsakh	29
--	----

S. G. Sulyak

Ethno-Demographic Processes in Bessarabia in the 19th – early 20th Centuries

Etnodemograficheskie protsessy v Bessarabii v XIX – nachale XX v.	32
--	----

<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
Moldavia and the Russian World: Is a Return Possible?	
Moldaviya i Russkii mir: vozmozhno li vozvrashchenie?	35
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
Multiethnic Moldavia (According to Toponymic and Anthroponymic Information)	
Polietnichnaya Moldaviya (po dannym toponimiki i antroponimiki)	37
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
Cossack Andrey Sulyak (The Participation of Native Moldavians in the Haidamak Movement of 1734 Revisited)	
Kazak Andrei Sulyak (k voprosu ob uchastii vykhodtsev iz Moldavii v gaidamatskom dvizhenii 1734 g.)	40
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
Ethnic Groups and Languages of Moldavia According to the Results of the Census of 2004 and the Statistics of the State Enterprise "Centre for State Information Resources 'Registru'"	
Etnosy i yazyki Moldavii po rezul'tatam perepisi 2004 g. i dannym GP «Tsentr gosudarstvennykh informatsionnykh resursov "Registru"»	44
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
Orthodoxy in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian Lands (On the Occasion of 200th Anniversary of the Kishinev Diocese and the Centenary of the Second Marmarosh-Sighet Trial)	
Pravoslavie v Karpato-Dnestrovskikh zemlyakh (K 200-letiyu osnovaniya Kishinevskoi eparkhii i 100-letiyu Vtorogo Marmarosh-Sigotskogo protsesssa)	47
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
"Who Are Tolkoviny": In Regard to the Economic Structure of the Old Russian Population in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian Lands	
«Yazhe sut' tolkoviny»: k probleme khozyaistvennogo uklada drevnerusskogo naseleniya Karpato-Dnestrovskikh zemel'	51
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
The Attitude of the Administration of Bessarabia Towards the Subjects of the Austro-Hungarian Empire Living in the Territory of Its Province During WWI	
Otnoshenie administratsii Bessarabii k prozhivavshim na territorii gubernii poddannym Avstro-Vengrii v gody Pervoi mirovoi voiny	55
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
The Ancestors of the Rusins and the Nomadic Tribes: Ethno-Cultural Interactions	
Predki rusinov i kochevniki: voprosy etnokul'turnogo vzaimodeistviya	58
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
The Rusins of Bessarabia in the 19th – Beginning of the 20th Centuries: The Question of Numbers	
Rusiny Bessarabii v XIX – nachale XX v.: k probleme chislennosti	62
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
The Rusin identity (A Case Study of Galicians' Participation in the Civil War)	
Rusinskaya identichnost' (na primere uchastiya galichan v grazhdanskoi voine)	67
<i>S. G. Sulyak</i>	
The Beginning of Christianization of Carpatho-Dniestrovian Rus'	
Nachalo khristianizatsii Karpato-Dnestrovskoi Rusi)	74

M. K. Iurasov

A. I. Dobriansky as a Historian

A. I. Dobryanskii kak istorik 78

M. K. Iurasov

An Anonymous Hungarian Account about “the Boundary of the Ruthenians” During the “Founding of the Magyar Homeland” in the Inner Danubian Lands

Vengerskii anonim o «porubezh'e rutenov» vo vremya «obreteniya rodiny» maďyarami v Srednem Podunav'e 80

ANTHROPOLOGY

V. V. Kotsan

The Interior Layout of Transcarpathian Ukrainians' Folk Dwellings in the 19th and the First Half of the 20th Centuries

Planuvannya inter'eru narodnogo zhitla ukraintsiv Zakarpattya XIX – pershoi polovini XX st. 82

T. Ya. Sologub-Kotsan

Ornamental Motifs of Hutsul Folk Embroidery in Transcarpathia (The Yasinian Center) at the End of the 19th to the Middle of the 20th Centuries

Ornamental'ni motivi gutsul's'koï narodnoi vishivki Zakarpattya (yasinians'kii osередok) kintsya XIX – pershoi polovini XX st. 84

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE

I. I. Babenko, O. V. Orlova

Language Construction of National Identity in the Internet Discourse: “Who are the Rusins and What Language Is Rusinian Like?”

Yazykovoe konstruirovaniye natsional'noi identichnosti v internet-diskurse: «Kto takie rusiny i na kakoi iz yazykov pokhozhd rusinskii yazyk?» 86

Z. I. Rezanova, K. S. Shilyaev

Ethnonyms “Rusin” and “Rusinian” in Russian Discourse: A Corpus Study

Etnonimy «rusin», «rusinskii» v russkoi rechi: korpusnoe issledovanie 88

G. N. Starikova

I. Kercha's Rusinian-Russian Dictionary and Supplements to It

O «Rusinsko-russkom slovare» I. Kerchi i dopolneniyakh k nemu 90

D. A. Katunin

The Ruthenian and Slovak Languages in the Current Laws of Croatia

Rusinskii i slovatskii yazyki v sovremennom zakonodatel'stve Khorvatii 92

D. A. Katunin

The Rusinian and Ukrainian Languages in the Current Laws of Serbia

Yazykovye prava rusinov, ukraintsev i drugih natsional'nykh men'shinstv v zakonodatel'stve Respubliki Serbiya 96

S. G. Sulyak

The Language of the Rusins of Bessarabia in the Works of the Pre-Revolutionary Ethnographers

Yazyk rusinov Bessarabii v trudakh dorevolutsionnykh etnografov 99

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/1

Dear Readers,

The Association "Rus" (Chişinău, Moldova) and Tomsk State University (Russia) launch a new journal called "Rusin Studies. An Abstracts Journal".

The publication of reviews of issued monographs, articles on the history, ethnology, culture and language of Rusins is the aim of the "Rusin Studies. An Abstracts Journal".

The journal will be published in English once a year.

The full-text versions of the published issues can be found on the journal's website: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin_studies.

Every article is indexed in CrossRef and provided with unique DOI.

The first issue of the journal contains the summaries/abstracts of a number of articles on Rusin topics published in the "Rusin" journal during the period from 2011 to 2015.

Abstracts of articles have been presented by their authors in the original language and translated by the editors.

Currently, the international historical journal "Rusin" is the world's only scientific periodical offering an insight into the history, culture, language, and ethnography of the Rusins (Rusnaks) who are the indigenous population of the Carpathian-Dniester lands.

In 2011 the "Rusin" journal got indexed in the world's largest abstract and citation database Scopus.

In 2015 it fell into the highest quartile Q1 in the category of history.

The Rusin presents the abstracts of the articles by such historians as Yuri V. Danilets, Mikhail K. Iurasov, Sergey G. Sulyak, ethnologists Vasilii V. Kotsan, Tatiana Ya. Sologub-Kotsan, linguists Inessa I. Babenko, Olga V. Orlova, Zoya I. Rezanova, Konstantin S. Shilyaev, Dmitry A. Katunin and Galina N. Starikova. The abstracts fall into the following categories: History, Anthropology, Linguistics and Language.

In our opinion, the issue of "Rusin Studies. An Abstracts Journal" will contribute to the strengthening of international cooperation and joint activities of specialists from different countries. This will lead to a more active study of the history, culture, language and customs of the Carpathian-Dniester indigenous population.

Sergey Sulyak,
Editor-in-Chief

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/2

New Documents on the Activities of Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenkov) in Subcarpathian Rus' in 1923 to 1924

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

***Нові документи про діяльність єпископа
Веніаміна (Федченков)
на Підкарпатській Русі у 1923–1924 рр.***

Ю. В. Данилець

Published in: Rusin. 2011. Vol. 24. Is. 2. pp. 52–69 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1222&article_id=20698

The reorganization of the Orthodox Church administrative structures began in the Subcarpathian Rus' after World War I. On March 4, 1923, Patriarch Meletios of Constantinople (Metaxakis) consecrated Archimandrite Sabbatius (Vrabec) as the Archbishop of Prague and All Czechoslovakia. The Tome (Tomos) confirming the above appointment was issued two days later, on March 6, 1923. Patriarch Meletios decreed that three dioceses, namely, Prague, Moravian and Subcarpathian were to be formed on the territory of Czechoslovakia. Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky's official letter informed about the issuance of the Tome. On June 1, 1923 the Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church acknowledged it. The Serbian Holy Synod made a vigorous protest against the Constantinople Patriarch's policy. To comply with the provisions of the Tome and spread the canonical influence on the territory of Subcarpathian Rus'/Ruthenia, Archbishop Sabbatius (Vrabec) invited Bishop Benjamin of Sevastopol (Fedchenkov) to become his assistant.

The appointment of the Russian Bishop called in support of the Transcarpathian local clergy. In a short time Bishop Benjamin managed

to attract many priests of the Serbian jurisdiction. Bishop Benjamin tried to stop religious struggle of Greek Catholics and Orthodox Christians over the churches and Church property. He worked on the preparation of theological training. At the meeting of clergy in Uzhgorod on November 1, 1923, a decision was made about the opening of the theological school. Theological courses were founded in the village of Bushtyno, Tyachiv district, under the leadership of Archpriest John Chernavin. Individuals of 17 years of age and over took several months-long course of study. The first course was held from February 18 to September 20, 1923.

Due to the Yugoslavian Government's pressure, the Czechs were forced to admit the Serbian Orthodox Church within their borders. The recognition of the Serbian Church jurisdiction by the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic evoked Bishop Benjamin's response. On March 20, 1924, he convened a meeting of the Orthodox clergy in Khust, where they discussed the issue of recognition of Serbian jurisdiction by the Czechs and the functioning of the Constantinople jurisdiction in a new environment. The government stopped funding Bishop Benjamin's activities in Subcarpathian Rus'. On April 18, 1924 in Mukachevo the Bishop was given the document according to which he had to go to Prague by order of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After this incident, the Bishop left the Republic and went to France.

Thus, while in Subcarpathian Rus', Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenkov) tried to organize the religious life of the Orthodox communities and to raise the educational level of the clergy. However, becoming a hostage of the complicated international situation, he was forced to leave the Republic.

Keywords

Benjamin (Fedchenkov), Bishop, the Orthodox Church, Greek Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Rusins, Subcarpathian Rus'.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/3

Prisoner of Dachau Hieromonk Feodosii (Rosokha)

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

В'язень Дахау ієромонах Феодосій (Росоха)

Ю. В. Данилець

Published in: Rusin. 2011. Vol. 24. Is. 2. pp. 87–103 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1222&article_id=20700

Hieromonk Theodosius was born on April 11, 1903, the son of Ivan and Anna Rosokha in the village of Nyzhniy Bystry in Khust district. In 1913 – 1914, the Hungarian government began to prepare a lawsuit against the Orthodox Transcarpathians. Toma Rosokha's family did not avoid persecution either. The boy's father and mother were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, his grandfather was killed by gendarmes.

During World War I Toma had to be a farm hand and since 1918 he worked in forestry in the villages of Gumennoye, Dragovo, Dolgoye, Svaliava and Nizhny Bystry. On April 26, 1924, he became a novice monk at St. Nicholas monastery in Iza village. On July 9, 1927, T. Rosokha took monastic vows under the name of Theodosius, in honor of the Venerable Theodosius, Father Superior of Kiev-Pechersk. On October 7, 1928, he was elevated to the rank of the Hierodeacon, and on March 2, 1929 to the priesthood (Hieromonk). The first parish which was served by Father Theodosius, was in v. Rebrin near Michalovce in Slovakia. In 1931 he was transferred to v. Volovets to serve the parish of v. Kanora. In Volovets he held two posts: of the parish priest and a teacher in the local school. He taught geography, history and mathematics in 5th and 6th grades, and his monthly salary was 650 Slovak korunas (krones).

In March 1939, Transcarpathia was occupied by Hungary. Magyars arrived in Volovets on March 15 in the evening. The priest was arrested

and then put under house imprisonment due to his refusal to greet the Hungarian troops.

In October 1939, Father Theodosius wrote a letter to the Commander of the Soviet border guards and offered his assistance. The priest was nicknamed Daniil. He had to pass intelligence information to the guerrillas on the 20th of every month. The underground group collected information on the movements of Hungarian troops and the location of their facilities.

On May 24, 1941 he was arrested and sent to Budapest to prison Morgitkerut. Then they transferred him to the town of Vác where he was court-martialed and sentenced to death. Later the death penalty was commuted to hard labour for life. In case of amnesty he was prohibited to live in borderland; besides, for ten years he lost the right to serve and was deprived of his political rights for good.

After that he was sent from Vác to the Dachau concentration camp. The food ration in the camp was very scanty: the morning portion consisted of 100 grams of bread with impurities and 200 grams of straw tea without sugar. Lunch consisted of half a litre of potato peel soup or pea soup.

Prisoners worked all the time, they used to weave rugs of 25 – 30 cm width.

On April 29, 1945, American soldiers entered the camp. All the atrocities committed in the camp by German soldiers and their collaborators are described in Theodosius' (Rosokha) memoirs.

After his release from the camp, Father Theodosius (Rosokha) left the monkhood. He held various offices, including the position of the head of the "Carpaty" spa resort.

Father Theodosius died in Uzhgorod on April 14, 1983.

Keywords

Subcarpathian Rus', hieromonk, prisoner, camp, Dachau.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/4

From the Personal Archive of Documents of Archimandrite Matthew (Vakarov)

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

Із документів Особистого архіву архімандрита Матфея (Вакарова)

Ю. В. Данилець

Published in: Rusin. 2012. Vol. 29. Is. 3. pp. 127–140 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1116&article_id=17499

Among the leaders of the Orthodox movement in the 1st half of the 20th century, Archimandrite Matthew (Vakarov) distinguished himself through his intense activities. Archimandrite Matthew (mudanely known as Vasily Stepanovich Vakarov) was born on January 23, 1888, into a peasant family. His father was arrested and sentenced to two years in prison and 300 korunas (krones) penalty for converting to Christianity during the Second Marmarosh-Sighet Trial.

He graduated from his village school in 1900. In 1911, he went to Yablochinsky monastery of Chelm, together with Vasily Kemin who lived in the same village. Here Vakarov was accepted to the brotherhood and appointed the psalm-reader at the pastoral school.

On July 21, 1912, Hegumenos (Abbot) Father Superior Archimandrite Seraphim (Ostroumov) tonsured him as a rassophore monk wearing a robe and a kamelaukion. On November 16, 1913, he was tonsured a monk wearing a pallium. The next day, November 17, in Chelm, he was ordained a Hierodeacon by Archbishop Evlogy. On March 29, 1914, the Metropolitan of Selefkia Germanos Strinopoulos, the Scholarch (Head) of the Holy Theological School of Halki, ordained Matthew a Hieromonk.

On April 27, 1914, the young missionaries arrived in the village of Iza from Halki via Italy (where they visited Rome and the Vatican city).

Six days after returning home, Father Matthew was arrested by Hungarian gendarmes for crossing the border illegally. From Iza Makarov was escorted to Marmarosh-Sighet. After 21 days of detention he was transferred to Košice. The garrison military tribunal sentenced the monk to three months in prison. After the outbreak of hostilities with Russia he was released from custody and sent as an ordinary soldier to an engineer regiment in the town of Komarovo. In the first half of August 1914 the regiment was sent to the Eastern front.

On October 28, 1914, Father Matthew was captured by Russians. He was in the POW camp at Novo-Nikolaevsk (then in Novosibirsk since 1925). By order of the Church authorities, he was sent to the parish in Galicia. However, with the onset of the Austro-German troops, he was transferred to the Russian Army for the position of a translator on the Romanian front. After hostilities Father Matthew lived for a while in the Giržavsky Ascension Monastery (The Giržava Ascension Monastery) in Bessarabia, and then in the Monastery in Feofania near Kiev. He held church services in the village of Khotov.

On March 28, 1919, he returned to his village. From March 30, 1919, to July 25, 1920, he held services in the parishes in the village of Horinchovo-Monastyrets of Khust district. He was rector of parishes in the villages of Nankovo and Nizhnee Selishe in the same district from July 25, 1920, to May 18, 1925. In 1919, St. Nicholas monastery was founded in the village of Iza. The monastic brotherhood was headed by hieromonk Alexy (Kabaliuk). Hieromonk Matthew, one of the brethren, took an active part in the development of the monastery. On April 18, 1925, the brotherhood of the monastery elected him as their Hegumenos. Due to the fact that the monastery was moved outside the village to Iza-Karputlash tract, the Hegumenos took up the construction of the church, residential, farm and maintenance buildings.

On May 17, 1925, Bishop Dositheus (Vasič) in Niš (Serbia) elevated Matthew to the rank of Hegumenos for services to the Orthodox Church. The next year (June 29) he was elevated to the rank of Archimandrite and appointed as assistant to Bishop Dositheus in Subcarpathian Rus'. In 1926 Father Matthew was awarded the hypogonation and epigonation (ecclesiastical vestments). From May 20, 1925, to December 20, 1929, he served in the Orthodox parishes in the villages of Boronyavo and Kriva in Khust district. From December 21, 1929, to February 28, 1933, Archimandrite Matthew held services in the village of Nankovo. In 1929 – 1944, he was a member of the Diocesan Council

and the Ecclesiastical Consistory.

From 1933 to 1944, Father Matthew inspected religious instruction in town and village schools in Mukachevo and Priashev Diocese. At the same time, (from March 1, 1933, to October 26, 1944) he was Hegumenos in Gorinchovo village.

In 1945 he was appointed rural Dean of the Iza Diocese. From 1946 until his death, Father Matthew served as Dean of the Orthodox monasteries of the Transcarpathia region. On December 10, 1947, Bishop Nestor (Sidoruk) confirmed the appointment of Archimandrite Matthew the Father Superior of the St.Nicholas monastery.

In autumn 1953, the Archimandrite got ill, on September 30, he took the Great Schema vows and he died on October 1. He was buried in the monastery graveyard in Iza.

Keywords

Bishop, Matthew (Vakarov), Orthodox Church, Eastern Orthodox, the Holy Synod.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/5

Archbishop Alexy (Dekhterev): The Life and Career (1889 – 1959)

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

***Архієпископ Олексій (Дехтерьов): життєвий та
творчий шлях (1889–1959)***

Ю. В. Данилець

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 32. Is. 2. pp. 131–150 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1112&article_id=35134

The personality of Archbishop Alexy (mundanely known as Alexander Petrovish Dekhterev) is not sufficiently studied in modern historiography. Present-day scholars somehow passed over his activities, despite the fact that he lived in Transcarpathia for a long time and was active in his missionary and publishing work.

Alexander Petrovich Dekhterev was born on April 19 (May 2), 1889 in Vilna. In 1908 Alexander finished the local Vilna Classical Gymnasium and in 1911 he graduated from the Libava Naval School majoring in deep sea navigation. He was Captain of the ocean-going merchantman “Birna” belonging to the Russian East Asian Steamship Company. In 1913 – 1914, he worked as a research associate in the Department of Statistics for subtropics flora survey of Transcaucasia.

Besides, Alexander published his poems in the North-West Voice newspaper. In 1906 he published “Eyas Wings”, a book of poems.

While being in merchant fleet, Dekhterev writes about sea voyages for the magazines “Vershiny” (“The Summits”, SPb.) and “Around The World” (Moscow). With the outbreak of World War I he served in the technical division of the 12th Army, then he was appointed head of the shipyard in Riga.

In 1917 Alexander landed within the boundaries of the region of the Don Army. He was a journalist and wrote for the newspapers “Priazovsky Krai” (The Priazov Region) and “Voronezhsky Telegraph” (The Voronezh Telegraph). He was also the editor of the literary and art magazine “Luchy Solntsa” (The Sunbeams). But he managed to produce just one issue of the magazine.

Under the rule of Ataman P. Krasnov, he organized the scout movement. He became Senior Scout in the Russian Scout Youth Organization and published the The Pedagogical Newspaper and The Don Scout Newspaper.

In 1920 Alexander Dekhterev arrived in Turkey together with the evacuated Russian Army. He was an educator in Baron P. Wrangel gymnasium in Gallipoli and a teacher in the Russian school in the Halki island. He was also a member of the Constantinople Committee of the Russian Scout Association.

Since 1923 A. Dekhterev lived in Bulgaria. There he worked as an employee of the Department of School Education for Children in Bulgaria (1924 – 1934) and a teacher in the gymnasium in Tirnovo (Tarnovo) and Shumen. He was the founder and head of My Little Russia boarding school. Working in the field of education, Alexander published a number of his articles in the Prague journals such as Russian School Abroad and the Bulletin of the Pedagogical Bureau for the Middle and Lower Schools Abroad.

While in exile, he corresponded with hieromonk Savva (Struve) who pursued his religious activities in the monastery of St. Job of Pochaevo in the Prešov Region (Rusin: Preshovska (Priashevka) Rus’). In 1934 he leaves Bulgaria for Czechoslovakia. At the monastery, he fulfilled various obediences: taught Russian and mathematics at the monastery school while teaching the Law of God to children in the surrounding villages, and edited the newspaper “Pravoslavnaya Rus” (The Orthodox Rus’). The Childhood and Youth supplement to “The Orthodox Rus” was published in 1934 on Dekhterev’s initiative.

In April 1935, he was tonsured into monasticism with the name Alexy. In April 1936, he moved to Mukachevo, where he became editor of “The Orthodox Carpatho-Russian Messenger”, the official publication of the Mukachevo-Priashev (Prešov) Orthodox Diocese. He continued working with young people and was among the organizers of the Union of Orthodox Youth Congress of Subcarpathian Rus’. The sessions of the Congress were held at the Lipchansky monastery in 1938. In December 1938, Alexy was ordained to the priesthood by the Bishop of Mukachevo-Priashev (Prešov) Vladimir (Rajić) and appointed rector of the Orthodox Memorial Church in Uzhgorod. In office of priest, he

carries out active missionary work and maintains contacts with the White Russian émigrés' community worldwide.

In December 1938, he left Uzhgorod for Belgrad. In 1941, he became rector of the Russian Church of St. Alexander Nevsky in Alexandria, Egypt. At that period, the parish fell within the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. During the visit to Egypt of the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia Alexy I (Simansky) on June 14, 1945, Alexy (Dekhterev) became subordinate to the Moscow Patriarchate.

On November 1, 1946, he was elevated to the rank of archimandrite. In 1947 he received Soviet citizenship.

In August 1949, Father Alexy was arrested by the local authorities on charges of pro-Communist propaganda. Till May 11, 1949, he was imprisoned in Fort de Kom-el-Dik, whereupon he was deported to the Soviet Union.

Upon returning to Moscow, he was appointed librarian of the Holy Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius (Troitse-Sergyeva Lavra). His articles were published in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. In December, 1949, Alexy was transferred to Czechoslovakia to be at the disposal of the Czechoslovakian Exarchate. On December 30, 1949 the Council of the Orthodox Church in Priashev (Prešov) elected him bishop. On February 3, 1959, the rite of the naming of bishop took place in Prague. It was very difficult to manage the Priashev (Prešov) Diocese because it consisted largely of former Greek Catholics. At the beginning of 1955, there were some cases of conversion Bishop Alexy's diocesans to Catholicism. Being concerned about the growing influence of the Catholic Church in Slovakia, the State Administration of Church Affairs of Czechoslovakia accused Bishop Alexy of inaction and took up the matter with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. They deemed it necessary to replace him by another bishop.

In the summer of 1955, Bishop Alexy left Priashev (Prešov) and moved to Moscow. On November 22, 1955, by order of the Synod he was appointed temporary administrator of the Vilnius Diocese. Then, on November 22, 1956, Alexy was appointed bishop of Vilnius and Lithuania. On July 25, 1957, the bishop was promoted to the rank of archbishop. He died on April 19, 1959, and was buried in the crypt of the Saint-Spirit (Sviato-Dukhov) Cathedral in Vilnius.

Keywords

Alexy/Alexis (Dekhterev), Archimandrite, monk, Orthodox Church, Orthodox, Subcarpathian Rus', Czechoslovakia.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/6

Persecution for the faith Ruthenians in Austria-Hungary Before World War (100th Anniversary of the Second Marmarosh-Sighet Trial 1913 – 1914)*

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

***Переслідування русинів за віру в Австро-Угорщині
напередодні Першої світової війни
(до 100-річчя другого Мараморш-Сиготського
процесу 1913–1914 рр.)***

Ю. В. Данилець

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 34. Is. 4. pp. 16–31 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1108&article_id=34122

The Orthodox movement among the Rusins in the Austro-Hungarian Empire began in the early 20th century. It was caused by a number of factors of socio-economic and political nature. Without the Orthodox clergy, the Orthodox Christians could not develop wide missionary activities. Initially, the movement was local, it was limited to a few settlements. A qualitatively new period in the history of the Orthodox movement was associated with the name of Alexander Kabaliuk. Despite being thoroughly controlled by the police and the Greek Catholic clergy, the Orthodox movement spread to several villages: Koshelevo, Berezovo, Lypcha, Nizhni Bystry, Horinchovo, Tereblia,

* The original title of this article has not been translated into English correctly, so the correct translation is as follows: **Religious Persecution of Rusins in Austria-Hungary Before World War I (The 100th Anniversary of the Second Marmarosh-Sighet Trial 1913 – 1914).**

Krivaya, Bedevlia, Belky, Osiy, Ilnitsa, Dulovo, Dolgoe, Zadneye and Oleshnik.

Kabaliuk was ordained to the priesthood with the name Alexis upon finishing the monastic theological classes at the Monastery of St. Onufry (Onufrius) of Chelm on August 15, 1910. After adopting Russian citizenship and receiving the relevant documents, Kabaliuk went to Mount Athos to exchange his Russian monastic documents for the Athos ones. It would enable him to return home with the Greek missionary documents without let or hindrance.

In 1911 Alexis (Kabaliuk) met with the Serbian Patriarch Lucian (Bogdanovich), who appointed him assistant to Greek Gabriel (Aurel) Motin, an Orthodox priest in Miskolc, who gave guidance to the Orthodox Christians in the villages of Veliky Luchky and Iza. On June 17, 1912, the police and border guards rummaged Alexis' (Kabaliuk) house in Yasinya village. They confiscated the chalice, the priest's vestments and books from the family chapel, and sealed up the door. After this incident, Hieromonk Alexis went to the U.S., where he conducted missionary work among the Rusin immigrants.

Failures in missionary work in the village of Iza forced the Hungarian government and the Greek Catholic Church to take on more radical methods. Additional units of gendarmes and soldiers were sent to the major centers of Orthodoxy to suppress the movement against the Union. The gendarmes demanded that each peasant was to have a certificate from the local priest to the effect that the peasant attended the Greek Catholic Church. If the peasant did not have such a document, he was subjected to torture and persecution. Besides, the Orthodox Christians experienced financial pressure. After useless efforts to stop the movement with the fines and illegal exaction, the Ministry of the Interior sent Adviser Horner to Maramorosh-Sighet, who was assigned to crush the Orthodox faith. Secret agents, provocateurs, investigators, funded by the government, began to operate on the territory of Ugorska Rus'. The police conducted several raids during which about 180 people were arrested.

Those arrested were kept in zhupanat and district prisons, where they were victimized and tortured with intent to beat false confessions out of them. On December 29, 1913, 94 people were on the dock in Maramorosh-Sighet, among them men and women within the age range from 17 to 64. The evidence by which the Prosecutor tried to prove anti-state activities by the defendants, included pictures, which portrayed the monasteries of Mount Athos and Kiev, icons, liturgical books published in Kiev, Odessa, Moscow, and periodicals published in Chernovtsy and Kiev.

The hearings were held in the Hungarian language, but only a few detainees could understand it. The defence lawyers drew attention to the fact that the court interpreters wrongly interpreted the statements of defendants and witnesses. Most of the prisoners rejected anti-state agitation allegations. They stated that it was of purely religious nature. The hearings of witnesses caused a real failure of the prosecution. The witnesses were Uniate priests, tavern keepers and officials. Not having enough evidence, on February 5, 1914, the prosecutor released from custody a significant number of detainees, clearing them of all charges. Despite all the efforts of legal defence and the protests of the international community, on March 3, 1914, Hungarian authorities issued a shameful verdict: 32 people were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment and had to pay large monetary fines. Hieromonk Alexis (Kabaliuk) got the longest prison term: (4 years and 6 months in prison and a fine of 100 kronas).

The Maramorosh-Sighet Trial in 1913 – 1914 showed to the international community that in Hungary the authorities used provocateurs and bribed witnesses, and that they did not adhere to the religion and belief legislation. Judicial defence showed that the Hungarian authorities, not being able to condemn Orthodox Christians for the secession from the Union, wrongly charged them with treason. The verdict demonstrated the defeat of the judicial system of the Empire and its crisis. Their methods of investigation shocked the general public and sparked interest of many European periodicals which objectively assessed the Orthodox movement.

Keywords

Orthodoxy, Orthodox, litigation, Transcarpathia, Maramoroch-Siget/ Maramorosh-Sighet, Alexis (Kabalyuk/Kabaliuk).

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/7

Newspapers “Delo” and “Delo and New Slovo” as a Source of History Trial in Marmarosh-Sigot Years 1913 – 1914*

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

Антирусинский судебный процесс 1913–1914 гг. в Мараморош-Сиготе на страницах львовских газет «Дело» и «Дело и Новое слово»

Ю. В. Данилец

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 36. Is. 2. pp. 249–269 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1103&article_id=34093

The Marmarosh-Sighet Trial of 1913 – 1914 became a high profile incident of that period. A lot of Ukrainian, Russian and foreign newspapers wrote about its causes, progress and consequences. Of course, depending on political preferences, the periodicals did not always give an objective account of the events they witnessed. However, the materials of the press published at beginning of the 20th century are an invaluable source for us, helping to fill gaps in historical knowledge. In this publication, the author analyzed the materials that had been published in the Lvov newspaper “Delo” (The Cause) and “Delo i Novoye Slovo” (The Cause and New Word), from December 1913 to March 1914. The “Delo” newspaper was founded in 1880 and

*The title of this article has not been translated into English correctly, so the correct translation is as follows: **Anti-Rusin Trial of 1913 – 1914 in Marmarosh-Sighet and its coverage in the columns of the Lvov newspapers “Delo” and “Delo and Novoye Slovo”**.

belonged to the Narodovetsky movement. It was last issued in 1939. The "Novoye Slovo" was published from 1912 to 1914. From December of 1913 till the beginning of February 1914, the two newspapers temporarily merged to be published under the title of "Delo i Novoye Slovo".

The newspaper articles shed light on the causes of persecution of Rusins, giving a detailed account of the indictment, the course of the investigation, the trial as it was, and its results. The reporters, who were present at the trial, referred in their reports to the important facts, to the names of the prosecutor, witnesses, lawyers and the accused. It became clear that the Hungarian authorities had used the services of paid agents and provocateurs for the preparation of materials of the process. The materials were characterized by criticism of the Orthodox movement; the newspaper regarded Orthodoxy to be a holdover from the Russophile propaganda.

The editors wrote a lot about the poor socio-economic situation of the Rusin population in Austria-Hungary. Criticism was primarily and justifiably aimed at the government which turned a blind eye to the impoverishment of peasants, and that, according to the editors, came useful for pro-Russian agitators. The newspaper articles reported that the head of the court held a meeting in the Hungarian language, but very few defendants could understand it. A lot of information was published about the contacts of Alexis Kabaliuk with the brothers Gerovski, Count V. Bobrinsky and the monasteries on Mount Athos in Greece.

The newspaper expressed compassion toward the defendants, reporting the terrible atrocities that had been committed by gendarmes and police officers during pre-trial investigation. Several peasants were certified as mentally ill and sent for compulsory treatment in the hospital. The newspaper also monitored the coverage of the trial by other periodicals. Its columns contain quotes and materials from the newspapers "Kievskaya Mysl'" (Kiev Thought), "Vera i Tserkov" (Faith and Church) and "Russkaia Pravda" (Russian Truth).

Besides the information on Alexis Kabaliuk, the newspaper paid much attention to Juri Vorobchuk, Mikhail Palkanints, Dmitry Petrovci and Ilia Pirschak. Yury Vorobchuk travelled to Russia, where he bought books and distributed them among Transcarpathians. D. Petrovci was a soldier in the Hungarian army. He was arrested on charges of propaganda against the Greek-Catholic clergy. He rejected that his words were politically charged, saying that their priest was a bad preacher and impoverished peasants.

Liturgical books, icons and church utensils were presented in court

as the evidence of guilt of the peasants. The examination of Greek Catholic priests, officials and Jewish traders showed the utter failure of the authorities. Most of those examined had a vested interest, and considered persecution of the Orthodox movement triggering their large financial losses.

On March 3, 1914, the newspaper printed information on the sentence. 32 defendants were convicted for incitement against the state and religion; 23 people were released. Alexis Cabaliuk was sentenced to the longest term of 4.5 years in prison, the other defendants got different terms from 6 months to 2.5 years in prison and all of them had to pay monetary fines; Kabaliuk's fine amounted to 100 kronas.

Keywords

Peasants, charged, Orthodox, propaganda, tribunal, witness, priest.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/8

**To the History of Orthodoxy in Ugrian Rus'
on the Eve of the WWI (Based on the Materials
of the American Newspaper "Svet")**

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

***К истории православия в Угорской Руси накануне
Первой мировой войны
(по материалам американской газеты «Свьтъ»)***

Ю. В. Данилец

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 37. Is. 3. pp. 9–21 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1099&article_id=34065

The "Svet" periodical was a newspaper for the Orthodox Rusins living in Brazil, Canada and the United States; later it became the official mouthpiece of the "Russian Orthodox Brotherhoods in America" (1900) and the Orthodox mutual aid societies in the United States (1901 – 1910). It was published in 1897 – 1914 in Old Forge, Bridgeport, Philadelphia, New York and other cities. During the period under discussion, the chief editor was Archpriest Benedict Turkevich.

The author studied the newspapers published within the period from January through to May 1914. Upon analyzing all the texts, the author found 17 reports, articles, proclamations and other materials, which in a greater or lesser extent related to the history of Orthodoxy in Ugrian Rus'. The editors used a large number of sources for publishing: the letters the newspaper received, the information of the Hungarian "Korrespondenz-Bureau", the articles from various European periodicals such as "Novoye Vremya" (New Times), "Russkoe Slovo" (Russian Word), "Neue Freie Presse", "Deutsch-Ungarische Korrespondenz", "Villag" etc.

The periodical followed the most important facts that were revealed during the hearing of witnesses. In the article titled "The Case of 94 Russ Ugrî in the Hungarian Court. The Three Gone Insane", the editors

exposed cruelty and abuse “under the guise of judicial investigation and trial”. Those atrocities led to the fact that “the three accused fell into religious madness right during the trial”.

Dmitry Petrovci, a soldier of the Hungarian 66th Infantry Regiment in Mukachevo gave extremely important testimony at the trial. Prosecution accused him of allegedly saying: “The Russian Tsar will conquer the whole region as far as the White Tisza River, so we all have to convert to Orthodoxy”. Petrovci rejected the charges and said that in prison he had been forced to sign the Magyar protocols, but he did not know what was written in them.

In the article of February 26, 1914, the editors rebuked some periodicals because they “supposedly had not seen this and had not heard that”, referring to the judicial process. The Hungarian Parliament also ignored that serious problem. According to the newspaper, only A. Beskid, a deputy of the Hungarian Parliament, representing Priashevskaya Rus’, submitted a request due to which the criminal proceedings against all the accused were suspended.

On March 5, 1914, the editors published the transcripts from a court hearing of the defendants who lived in Iza, the center of the Orthodox movement. Upon analyzing the statements of the accused, the author concluded that these statements had put the court in a very difficult position: the charges became irrelevant. Quoting the correspondent of the Hungarian newspaper “Villag”, the periodical published a conversation with one of the prisoners in the Maramorosh-Sighet prison. A farmer said that the priest Azarias threatened the Orthodox Christians as early as in 1912. At his request on January 4, 1913, a military unit came to Iza. Soldiers broke into the Orthodox Christians’ houses, whipped men and did not even spare women and children. A lot of people sought refuge in the woods where frostbites damaged their hands and feet. The reporter, citing the “Novoe Vremya”, published a curious document that the gendarmes beat up the Russ Ugri who had refused to attend the Uniate church; this was done by order of the Uniate priest.

The information in the issue published on March 26, 1914, is very important for a researcher. The issue presented excerpts from the speeches of the prosecutor and the lawyers. The prosecutor laid the blame for converting Rusins to Orthodoxy on Mikhail Pogodin, Adolf Dobriensky, Ivan Naumovich, the brothers Gerovsky and Vladimir Bobrinsky. The arrival of Count V. Bobrinsky in Maramorosh-Sighet had a significant impact on the process. According to “Svet”, the Slavic circles considered Count Bobrinsky’s mission as a national Slavic heroic deed in favor of the oppressed Russ Ugri.

On March 12, 1914, the newspaper announced the sentencing. The attitude of the editors towards this event was expressed in the title of the article: The Conviction of the Innocent. The journalist briefly outlined the verdict and paid quite a lot of attention to Father Alexis Kabaliuk. The main prisoner, Father Alexis, a Russian monk from Mount Athos, got four and a half years in prison. He was accused of carrying on propaganda under the guise of converting the Rusin peasantry to the Orthodox faith, but the idea allegedly was to separate them from the nationality of Austria-Hungary and drag them to Russia. On March 19, 1914, the newspaper published the names of everyone who was sentenced to prison.

Thus, the materials of the Rusin newspaper "Svet" of 1914, published in America, demonstrated in sufficient detail the causes, course and results of the proceedings instituted against the Orthodox Christians in Maramorosh-Sighet. The newspaper, using international periodicals, private sources and letters, revealed the policy of the Hungarian government towards the Rusin population.

Although the paper belonged to a Russophile trend and sympathized with the Orthodox movement, the editors were able to publish unbiased information. "Svet" is a valuable source for studying the history of Ugric Rus' (Transcarpathia) on the eve of World War I.

Keywords

Peasants, process, sentence, Orthodox, Rusins, article, Russ Ugri.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/9

Transformation in the Life of Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Region in 1939 – 1945

Ju. V. Danilets

Uzhgorod National University
3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

Трансформации в жизни православной церкви на Закарпатье в 1939–1945 гг.

Ю. В. Данилец

DOI 10.17223/18572685/40/5

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 40. Is. 2. pp. 61–79 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1265&article_id=22739

The Serbian Orthodox Church began pastoral work in 1921 after the revival of Orthodoxy among Rusins in Austria-Hungary. The Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Autonomous Church was established under the leadership of the Serbian bishops-delegates. In 1931 this Church formed the basis of the Mukachevo-Pryashevsky Orthodox Diocese.

The first permanent bishop of the new diocese was Damaskin (Grdanichki). Before 1938, when the bishop was transferred to Canada for the pastoral ministry, he had established a strong diocesan structure which included about 150 000 believers.

On June 23, 1938, Vladimir (Rajic), was elected to the vacant post of the Mukachevo-Priashev (Prešov) bishop. The consecration took place in Belgrade on October 30, 1938. On November 16, 1938, Bishop Vladimir arrived in Mukachevo, where his enthronement occurred on November 20. The representative of the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Bishop Seraphim took part in the celebrations. 130 parishes, including 12 parishes in the Priashev (Prešov) region, located in 6 deaneries, 5 monasteries and 13 hermitages with 417 inhabitants were under the direction of Bishop Vladimir. On November 26, Bishop Vladimir moved to Khust, due to the fact that on November 2, 1938, according to the above-mentioned Vienna arbitration, the Hungarians

seized Mukachevo. Bishop Vladimir reorganized the Ecclesiastical Consistory for the effective management of the diocese in the new situation.

After the seizure of Carpatho-Ukraine by the Hungarian army, the situation in the Orthodox Church began to rapidly change. In early 1939, in Budapest there arose the idea to establish the Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Hungary. Therefore, in Transcarpathia they began covert support of a small group of the clergy, which since 1923 had been subordinate to Archbishop of Prague Sabbatius (Vrabec). His supporters even worked in the diocesan office in Khust, where they spread the anti-Serbian propaganda. Bishop Vladimir knew about clandestine activities against the Serbian jurisdiction on the part of some priests, headed by Mikhail Popov, whom the Hungarian government considered as a candidate for the episcopal office in the new church.

Despite the difficult situation of the diocese due to the Hungarian occupation, the bishop was actively performing his functions. He visited parishes, ordained and consecrated the clergy and hallowed churches. On his orders, the boarding school for Orthodox gymnasium students re-opened in Khust in 1939. It was founded in the middle of the 1920s by Archimandrite Alexis (Kabaliuk). The situation in the Priashev (Prešov) part of the diocese was still very complicated. Bishop Vladimir was not able to carry on ecclesiastical guidance for the parishes in Eastern Slovakia to the full extent, after the proclamation of the independent Slovak state (14 March 1939) and full occupation of Subcarpathian Rus'. 12 parishes of the diocese, the monastery of the Rev. Job in Vladimirova and two church communities under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Evlogy (Georgievsky) operated at that time on the territory of Slovakia. (On February 24, 1939, the bishop officially recognized the typographical fraternity of the Rev. Job of Pochaevo to be the monastery under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Bishops of ROCOR).

After the German attack on Yugoslavia, the situation changed drastically. Bishop Vladimir and all the priests of the Diocese were offered Hungarian citizenship. But the bishop refused point-blank. Then, on April 8, 1941, the bishop was arrested at the railway station of Mukachevo. The patriarch was sent to a concentration camp, and Bishop Vladimir was interned by the Hungarians in the country house of the Roman Catholic bishop in the city of Vác. In mid-October 1941, Bishop Vladimir (Rajic) was exiled to Yugoslavia.

After the arrest of Bishop Vladimir, the administrator Hegumenos Feofan (Sabov) took up managing the Orthodox parishes in

Transcarpathia. However, on April 12, 1941, the Regent of Hungary, Miklos Horthy, appointed the above-mentioned Mikhail Popov “the administrator of the Greek-Eastern Hungarian and Greek-Eastern Rusin Churches”. Popov coordinated these actions with Archbishop Sabbatius, who issued a decree as early as September 26, 1940, appointing Popov as his own administrator in Hungary.

When the attempts to establish the Autocephalous church in Hungary failed, and its establishment was prevented first and foremost by Germany, Popov reflected on changing jurisdiction. Besides, on May 30, 1942, the Gestapo arrested Archbishop Sabbatius (Vrabec), and Popov was left without a church patron. It is known that on January 11 and 20, 1943, he met with Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) with whom he discussed the situation of the Orthodox Church in Hungary. In June 1943, Popov was dismissed. Hegumenos Feofan (Sabov), a supporter of the Serbian jurisdiction was restored to the office of an administrator. He began to lay the groundwork for the return of Bishop Vladimir from Serbia. In October 1944, Transcarpathia was liberated by the Soviet Army.

1944 was a turning point in the history of Transcarpathia. The changes affected almost all the spheres of socio-political, socio-economic, cultural and religious life. It was a new stage in the life of the Orthodox Church too. Although the Orthodox clergy, unlike their Greco-Catholic counterparts, expressed their loyalty to the new government and took an active part in the reunion movement and in the activities of people’s committees, they were unable to avoid pressure.

On November 24, 1945, the Moscow Patriarch consecrated George Sidoruk as the bishop of Uman, vicar of the Kiev Metropolis, under the name of Nestor, at the same time appointing him administrator of the Orthodox Mukachevo-Priashev (Prešov) Diocese. On November 6, 1945, Bishop Vladimir arrived in Mukachevo together with Bishop Nestor. On November 9, the new Bishop took over the diocesan archive from his predecessor, and on November 11 his enthronement took place at the Mukachevo Cathedral.

Keywords

Bishop, Orthodox Church, Patriarch, Orthodox Synod.

Yurij V. Danilets, Uzhhorod National University (Ukraine).

E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/10

The Emperor Was Unjustly Called Down in Chernovtsy*

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University

7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Императора обляяли в Черновцах

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2011. Vol. 26. Is. 4. pp. 44–72 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1113&article_id=20570

At the end of March 1821, the Russian Army Major-General Count Alexander Ypsilantis together with a group of eterists crossed the Prut and called the Danubian Principalities population for an armed insurrection against the Turkish domination. The uprising broke out in Greece. Mass repressions against Christians began in the Ottoman Empire. In early April, janissaries plundered Greek colonies in the region of the Bosphorus. Patriarch Gregory V of Constantinople and three archbishops were hanged on Easter Sunday, April 10. Emperor Alexander I who disapproved of any rebellions, keeping in mind the repercussions of the French revolution, at the same time was ready to support Orthodox Christians. The question of opening hostilities against Turkey was under consideration. Great Britain and Austria, in fear of Russia's increasing influence, tried to prevent a new Russo-Turkish war. Austria played an active part in this process pursuing its own interests in the East. In August 1823, in his secret dispatch, Austrian Chancellor Clement von Metternich informed Count Lebzelttern, the Austrian Envoy to Russia, that in case of war between Russia and Turkey Austria would lend no support to Russia and would act according to its own interests. Meanwhile Austria was ready to act as a peace-broker in the settlement of the Russo-Turkish conflict. The

*The original of this article has not been translated into English correctly, so the correct translation is as follows: **Emperor Alexander I: The Incident in Chernovtsy.**

Austrian Royal Court initiated the summit of the Austrian and Russian emperors. It took place in autumn 1823 in Chernovtsy (Bukovina).

Alexander I was fond of strolling around Chernovtsy alone without any escort. On the third day after his arrival, Alexander walked to the village of Gorecha which was a half-hour walk away, to visit the local church (nowadays the Gorecha Nativity of the Most Holy Mother of God Monastery). As legend has it, the church was built by Archimandrite Artamon with the financial help of Russian Empress Catherine II when the Russian troops were quartered in Bukovina from 1770 to 1774. Catherine donated 30 chervonets pieces (300 gold roubles) for the construction of the church.

Right near the church, the emperor was attacked by the pack of dogs that escaped from Sexton's house. The tsar was standing at bay and hitting back with a stick he pulled out of the wicker fence until Sexton's wife came to his rescue and chased the dogs away. After that the tsar made for the church where he saw a priest who was praying aloud. The slyboots who, most probably, had never seen the tsar but guessed that it was some nobleman from Russia, was praying very ardently for the tsar's health and his and his escort's safe returning home.

– Why, – asked the tsar in amazement, – why aren't you praying for your king?

– We pray for him dayly, – said the clergyman, – but we should now pray to God for Alexander specially because he is a stranger just on a visit here and he needs God's Grace for the Congress”.

Alexander thanked the priest and asked him to lay the Gospel on his (Alexander's) head and bless him. Then Alexander kissed the priest's hand, gave him 50 ducats and walked back to Chernovtsy.

For a very long time the stick had been kept in the church as an honorary relic. According to some sources it was silver-bound and had a commemorative inscription on it.

Alexander stayed in Chernovtsy for seven days till September 30 (October 12). The uppermost subject discussed at the emperors' summit was the Greek rebellion. During the talks, the problem of re-establishing diplomatic relations between Russia and the Ottoman Porte was settled. The Turks withdrew their troops from the Danubian Principalities Valachia and Moldavia; the subsistence of troops was a heavy financial burden for the population of the principalities. Besides, they lifted restrictions on ships' journey through the Bosphorus. Russia expressed readiness to commence talks with Turkey on peaceful settlement of the Greek issue. Thus, Austria prevented Russia's armed interference.

Once Russian historian S.M. Soloviev divided Alexander's reign into two periods, calling the former the Age of Coalitions and the latter the Age of Congresses. A week in Chernovtsy brought the Age of Congresses to a close. A new war with Turkey broke out in 1828 during the reign of Nicholas I of Russia, tsar Alexander's brother. *Casus belli* for its outbreak was the closing of the Bosphorus Strait by the Turks, thus breaking the Akkerman Convention concluded between Russia and Turkey on September 25 (October 7), 1826, in Akkerman (now Belgorod-Dnestrovsky). However, in fact, the military conflict was triggered by the disagreement between the great powers in regard to the Greek War of Independence and the situation of the Orthodox Christian population in the Balkans.

Keywords

Emperor of Russia, Aleksander I, Franz I, Austria, Russia, Turkey, Chernovtsy, Bukovina, Meeting, Congress, Greek rebellion.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/11

Ethno-Demographic Processes in Bessarabia in the XIX – Beginning of the XX Ages*

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Этнодемографические процессы в Бессарабии в XIX – начале XX в.

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2012. Vol. 27. Is. 1. pp. 6–26 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1118&article_id=17514

The territory between the Prut and the Dniester rivers later called Bessarabia became part of the Russian Empire under the Treaty of Bucharest, as a result of the Russo-Turkish war of 1806 – 1812.

At that time, the Principality of Moldavia, the nominee owner of the Prut-Dniester interfluvium, was the Ottoman Empire vassal state. The Principality finally fell under the Turkish rule at the end of the 1530s. Some of Moldavian lands became rayas – the annexed territories governed by the Turkish military authorities. They were Belgorod (renamed as Akkerman by the Turks and governed by the Turkish authorities from 1484), Kilia (from 1484), Tighina (Bender from 1538), Ismail (from 1595) and Khotyn (from 1715). In 1569 steppe plains (called Budjak) located between the river mouths of the Dniester and the Danube were given to Nogais (later called Budjak Tatars; Mirza's Government House was in Kaushany). That is, 25,500 square km out of 45,800 square km of the territory later called Bessarabia were part of Turkish rayas and Tatar lands (55.7% of the interfluvium territory or

* The original of this article has not been correctly translated into English, so the correct translation is as follows: **“Ethno-Demographic Processes in Bessarabia in the 19th – Early 20th Centuries”**.

27.2% of the whole of the Moldavian Principality territory). The north of the principality being the area of Rusins' compact settlement Bukovina (now Chernovtsy Oblast of Ukraine and Suceava County in Romania) including Siret and Suceava, the first capitals of Moldavia, was occupied by the Austrian troops in July 1774 and annexed to the Austrian Empire on May 7, 1775, under agreement with Turkey. The territory of 10,438.8 square km with the population of 70,000 people was ceded to Austria (the said territory was about 15% of the Moldavian territory).

The rest of the Moldavian Principality ceased to exist after the unification with Walachia in 1859 in order to create the United Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia (called Romania in 1861) that became independent in 1877 in the course of the Russo-Turkish war.

The Prut-Dniester interfluvium annexed to Russia was a sparsely-populated region devastated by Turks and Tatars. According to the imperial period ethnographers' data, the population size here varied between 200,000 and 334,000 inhabitants.

On February 29, 1828, Bessarabia lost its status of an independent region and became part of the Novorossiisk Governorate General. Tsinuty were renamed as districts. In 1873 Bessarabia became a Governorate.

A number of research papers published after the transfer of the region to Russia under the treaty with the Turks pointed out that the Bessarabian population was polyethnic. Legislative measures could not but impact social and economic welfare of the region resulting in the increase of its population. The first household census was held in Bessarabia in 1817. According to it, 98,526 families or 491,685 people domiciled in Bessarabia.

The northern and central regions in Bessarabia were mainly inhabited by Moldavians; Rusnaks (Rusins) lived in the northwestern part of the Khotyn District and in the territories along the Dniester banks. The population of the southern part consisted of new settlers, such as Great Russians, cossacks, Nekrasov or Ignat Cossacks, Bulgarians, Moldavians, Vlachs, Serbs, Armenians, the Swiss, Germans et al. Towns and "shtetls" (small settlements) in both parts of Bessarabia were mainly inhabited by Jews.

1,935,412 people lived in Bessarabia in 1897, according to the census data.

Among them, the number of Moldavian native speakers amounted to 920,919 people (47.58%). Ethnicity was determined in the census by the person's native language. The total number of Russians was 537,943 people; they were spatially dispersed according to their native

languages as follows: Great Russian spoken by 155,774 people (8.05%), Little Russian spoken by 379,698 (19.62%), Byelorussian spoken by 2,471 (0.13%). In Bessarabia there also lived 11,696 (0.6%) Poles, 103,225 (5.33%) Bulgarians, 60,206 (3.11%) Germans, 8,636 (0.45%) Gypsies, 228,168 (11.79%) Jews, 55,790 (2.88%) Turkish speakers, 2,737 Greeks and 2,080 Armenians. Some Gagauzes named Bulgarian as their native language, the rest of the Gagauz population claimed Tatar Turkish (as well as Ottoman Turkish) as their native languages. 55,615 people (97.7% of men and 99.6% of women) among those who considered Ottoman Turkish as their mother tongue were Orthodox Christians. This again suggests that ethnicity is not always determined by the language one speaks.

Rusins were assigned to the Little Russian native speakers. At that time, their population in Bessarabia was not less than 250,000 people. However, only 64 people determined Rusin as their native language being different from the other Russian languages.

According to their religion, the population of Bessarabia consisted of 1,600,999 Orthodox Christians, 28,532 Old Believers, 2,265 Gregorian Armenians, 246 Armenian Catholics, 19,825 Roman Catholics, 54,258 Protestants, 228,528 Jews and 617 Muslims (or Mussulmans as they were called in the 19th century). Orthodox Christians made up 82.72% of the entire Bessarabian population.

The coexistence of various ethnic groups in Bessarabia, which was part of the Russian Empire, contributed not only to cross-fertilization of cultures but also led to the formation of a specific (supra-ethnic) multiethnos called the Bessarabians notable for their high passionarity, "imperial consciousness" and mentality which was different from that of Romanians, though Romanians share ethno-cultural affinity with Moldavians.

Keywords

Russia, Turkey, Moldavia, Bessarabia, Moldavians, Russians, Rusins, Ukrainians, Gagauz, Bulgarians, Romanians, Russian.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/12

Moldavia and the Russian World: Is a Return Possible?

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Молдавия и Русский мир: возможно ли возвращение?

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2012. Vol. 29. Is. 3. pp. 5–32 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1116&article_id=17492

The Carpatho-Danubian region is the area of Slavic ethnogenesis. In the first half of the 6th century A.D., the lands north-west of the Black Sea through to the Danube, were occupied by the Eastern Slavs (the Antae). In the 8th – 10th centuries, the Uliches, the Tivertsy and the White Croats, ancestors of contemporary Rusins, roamed this area. In the 10th century these tribal unions were taken into the Old Rus' state and at the end of the 11th century formed a separate Galician Princedom.

In the period of an acute struggle for the Galician-Volhynian dynasty in the lands which were formerly in the Galician Princedom, the Moldavian Princedom was formed (1359). Both Vlachs and Rusins participated in its formation. The Moldavian State was formed along the lines of the Old Russian. The language of Western Rus' was the official language up to the beginning of the 18th century. At the end of the 1530s Moldavia fell under Turkish domination.

The territory between the Prut and Dniester Rivers, later called Bessarabia, was taken into the Russian Empire in May 1812. When Bessarabia was united to Russia, it was a land devastated by the Turks and the Tatars. From 1812 to 1828, Bessarabia was a province of special position with local features in its administration. From 1823

to 1874, the province was governed by the Governor General of New Russia. They were called Vicars of Bessarabia until 1828; since 1828 they were called New-Russian and Bessarabian. In 1873 the province was re-named as a governorate.

The improvement of the social-economic situation in the province was reflected in an increase in population. According to the results of the census in 1897, the population of Bessarabia was 1,935,412 persons. The compatibility of the various ethnic groups of Bessarabia in the Russian Empire allowed for a mutual enrichment of cultures and the formation of a basic polyethnic commonality – the Bessarabians, who differed from the Romanians in their heightened activity, “imperial” consciousness and mentality even though Romanians are similar to Moldavians in an ethno-cultural sense. This commonality showed itself clearly during the years of the revolution, the civil war, the Rumanian occupation and WWII. During this time, the various ethnic groups were able to keep their ethno-cultural identity. It was here that the Turkish-speaking settlers from beyond the Danube could form into an independent ethnic group – the Gagauz.

In 1918 Bessarabia was occupied by Romania. In 1940 Northern Bukovina and Bessarabia entered into the structure of the USSR. On August 2, 1940, a law about the formation of Soviet Moldavia was passed. On August 27, 1991, the Moldavian parliament accepted the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Moldova. An unsuccessful attempt to quietly swallow up Moldavia during the early years of her independence, forced the leadership of Romania to re-work a long-standing plan. Its goal is the Romanianization of the Moldavian population by changing its mentality. The results of the census of 2004 show that only 2.2% of the population of Moldova consider themselves Romanian, while the majority, 75.8%, consider themselves Moldovan. Despite this fact, the Romanian leadership refuses the Moldovan majority its right of self-determination.

During these years, Romania has been able to carry out an effective ideological program of unification with Romania. This program has proven to be highly effective and could be used in the processes of integration in other lands of the former Soviet Union.

Keywords

Moldavia, Bessarabia, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, Moldavians, Rusins, Russians, Integration, USSR, Russian World, Orthodoxy, Russian Language, Russian Culture.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/13

Multiethnic Moldavia (According to Toponymic and Anthroponymic Information)

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Полиэтничная Молдавия (по данным топонимики и антропонимики)

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 31. Is. 1. pp. 95–105 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1114&article_id=34116

The Moldavian Principality being initially multiethnic was founded in the second half of the 14th century (in 1359) on the territory between the Eastern Carpathians, the Dniester and the Black Sea, the most part of which belonged to the Principality of Halych (Galych) before the Golden Horde invasion.

An old Moldavian legend contains some information on the main ethnic makeup in Eastern Transcarpathia. This story tells of the shepherds from Maramorosh (Maramuresh, the comitatus [jupa], a type of an administrative unit in the northeast of the Hungarian Kingdom) who, when hunting an aurochs, came across a Rusin beekeeper Yatsko (Etsko) in the vicinity of the present-day city Suceava. The tale also describes how both sides brought their countrymen to these lands that had been devastated by Tatars. A large Rusin population, besides Vlachs, lived in Maramorosh. Nowadays a larger part of this historic area is included into the Transcarpathian region of Ukraine and only 2/5 of the territory belongs to Romania. Rusins also resided in the territory of the future principality.

The Moldavian scribes of the 17th century mentioned a considerable size and compact settlement of the Rusin population in Moldavia.

Simeon Dascălul wrote that “the country was created on the basis of two ethnic groups: Romanians (meaning East Romanians) and Russians and up to the present day Russians made up half the country’s population and the other half consisted of Romanians”.

The Moldavian chronicler Miron Costin noted that Rusins “settled in Chernovtsy and Khotyn Counties, throughout the whole of the Dniester Region, Soroka and Orhei Counties, half of the Iași and half of the Suceava Counties along the Prut banks”.

Besides Rusins and Vlachs, some other spatially dispersed ethnic groups lived there. They included Southern Slavs (mostly Bulgarians) who kept moving to the southern part of the Carpatho-Dniestrovian lands not only in the 14th – 15th centuries but later too. (At the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries there actually was a mass migration). The above ethnic groups also included Tatars, Transylvanian Saxons aka Sași who were the German-speaking population of Transylvania), Gypsies, Hungarians and Jews. During the Phanariot Rule period (since 1711), Greeks migrated to Moldavia to take up permanent residence. Some of them became forefathers of the Boyar families (Nacco, Cantacuzino, Casso et al.).

Speaking of the toponymic area of Rusin placenames, Professor Margareta Ștefanescu from Iași, stated that they occurred mainly on the Moldavian territory (Trans-Prut Moldavia, Bukovina and Bessarabia). 312 Rusin placenames are nowadays found in Moldova between the Carpathians and the Prut (plus 24 Indo-European placenames); 70 ones have Rusin suffixes. 45 placenames occur in Bessarabia, 119 have Rusin suffixes. There are also Rusin names of towns and villages in Valachia, Dobruja and Transylvania.

The following placenames had been mentioned since the end of the 14th century. For instance, Cursacevtsy, Vladimirovtsy, Maryshevtsy, Dobrinovtsy were mentioned in the Moldavian Gospodar Roman Voivode’s Deed of Gift of March 30, 1392. By the second half of the 15th century the Old Russian suffix *-ovtsy* evolved into the Rusin suffix *-outsy*. Later this Rusin suffix will be modified in some names into its Moldavian derivative *-ăuți* (euts’).

There also were some ethnonyms in the medieval Moldavian toponymy. Such names as Rusy, Rushi, Ruscany, Roshiori, Roshcani (12 toponyms in all) clearly show the Rusin ethnic background of their inhabitants. So do such names as Sirby [Sîrbu – Rom.] pointing out the Southern Slavic, mostly Bulgarian ethnic origin (9 villages most of which were presumably Bulgarian), Shkeyeny, Shkeyee (skiu – plural: skei – derivative from *sclavus-slavu-Slav*, so Bulgarians were called), Bolgary and Bulgary.

Sasseny and Sashchory derived from “Sasses” (the German population of Transylvania); Tsiganeshty and Tsiganei are derivatives of “Tsigane” (Gypsies);

Gretskoye and Greky derived from the ethnonym “Greeks”; Tatory, Tatareshti, Tatarany originated from “Tatar” and so on.

Moldavian, Rusin, Hungarian, Tatar and other ethnonyms do not mean that those localities were inhabited only by the representatives of the respective ethnoses. Surnames ending in the suffixes *-uk/-yuk/-chuk*, *-ak/yak*, *-ey (ei)*, *-sky/-tsky* are spread across Moldavia. They belong to the southwestern group of East Slavic (Rusin) surnames.

A lot of Moldavian last names originated from Rusin and Little Rusian first names and surnames ending in *-yak*, *-ak*, *-yuk*, *-uk*, *-ei* and from nicknames. Moldavian last names Kazaku, Zaporozhan, Russu, Rusnak, Podolian, Guțu, Buț et al. came from East Slavic ethnonyms and appellatives.

The censuses conducted in 1772 – 1774 by the Russian military authorities by order of P.A. Rumiantsev, the Russian Army Commander-in-Chief, are of value for estimating the ethnic composition of the Moldavian Principality population. The household census covering all 24 tsinutys (counties) in Moldavia provided data either on an inhabitant’s name or whose son he was or his occupation or his last name or nickname or his ethnicity.

Quite a number of Moldavian residents’ names show the ethnic origin of people who have them, thus providing valuable material for the region’s ethnic studies.

As of 01.01.2012, the surname *Gutsu* [*Guțu* – Rom.] belonged to 11,489 people, *Russu* belonged to 7,259 people, *Rusu* was the surname of 23,162 inhabitants, 32 people had the name of *Rusin*, and the surname *Rusnak* [*Rusnac* – Rom.] belonged to 4,681 inhabitants.

Keywords

Moldavia, Moldavians, Russians, Rusins, Ukrainians, Gagauz, Bulgarians, Romanians, Russian.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/14

**The Cossack Andrey Sulyak
(Regarding the Part of Native Moldavians in the
Haidamak Movement of 1734)**

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

**Казак Андрей Суляк
(к вопросу об участии выходцев из Молдавии в
гайдамацком движении 1734 г.)**

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 32. Is. 2. pp. 42–61 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1112&article_id=35129

Immigrants from Moldavia (Rusins and Moldavians) called themselves Vlachs (Moldavians) by their state affiliation. They took an active part in social and political life in Ukraine since the time of Bogdan Khmelnytsky.

At the beginning of the Great Northern War, Russia in concert with Saxony waged hostilities on the Polish territory in accordance with the Treaty of Narva on the anti-Swedish alliance (1704) concluded between Rzeczpospolita Polska (Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth) and Russia.

Russia was to withdraw its troops from the Polish territory as well as from the right-bank Ukraine under the Treaty of the Prut, (July 12(23), 1711) and the Treaty of Adrianople (June 13 (24), 1713). On September 23, 1711, Peter I decreed that the Cossacks should leave the Transdnieper Ukraine (right-bank Ukraine) and together with their regiments, their Military Government and Administration, with Cossacks' wives, children and their goods and chattels should move to Little Russia and join "the local regiments, at the Cossacks' discretion". Besides, "the inhabitants of all towns, villages and boroughs are to be transferred to Little Russia; the lands must always remain unpopulated and no people must be resettled to the aforesaid lands

by the Poles". The Tsar's Decree was forwarded to Bila Tserkva Colonel Anton Tansky (a native of Moldavia). The Decree was carried into effect. The resettlement had been completed by 1714.

After coming back, the Polish gentry had to attract the population from some other Polish regions (from Galichina, in particular), natives of Moldavia, Old Believers (Lipovane or Philippons [*Lipoveni* – Rom.]) et al. They were promised to be exempt from many of their duties (manual labour and dues) for a period lasting from 15 to 30 years.

The situation gradually became intolerable for "live stock": by the middle of the 18th century slave labour in the Podolia Province in terms of working days exceeded 100 days a year (sometimes 200 days and even more); the situation in Volhynia was even worse. The absence of economic rights was aggravated by religious persecution – the Articles of the Union of Brest were forced on people everywhere. It evoked resistance from the local population.

At the beginning of the 18th century, the Haidamak movement started primarily in Volhynia and Podolia to stand up against the order established by the ruling classes. At the same time, there was also a great deal of plunder in the region. Since 1713 Jewish merchants, gentry estates, towns, villages and "shtetls" had been frequently assaulted in Podolia and Brazlav Voivodeships. The term "haidamaks (haidamakas)" was coined in the Universal (decree) sent to the inhabitants of the region in 1717 by Ian Haletsky appointed as a military governor of the Ukrainian Voivodeships.

At first, robbers' gangs that appeared in the right-bank Ukraine at the beginning of the 18th century were called "haidamakas". Only by the first half of that century did people begin using the term in regard to peasant movements, when by-and-by runaways or discontented peasants gathered round the core groups formed by haidamak robbers. For the first time the nature of the Haidamak movement acquired the elements of a class struggle only in 1734.

The Haidamak uprising of 1734 was triggered by the feud in Rzeczpospolita Polska. At the beginning of 1733, August II, Prince-Elector of Saxony, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania passed away. While electing the new king, the Sejm split up into two factions: a bigger one which consisted of Stanislas Leshchinsky's (Leszczynski) supporters and a smaller one led by August III, Prince-Elector of Saxony, August II's son. Russia supported August's candidature (the French king was Leshchinsky's son-in-law), as it did not want strengthening France's role. The Russian troops entered the Polish territory. The majority of the Polish nobility in the south-western region took Leshchinsky's side, they formed confederations in the Volhynian, Podolian, Kievan and Brazlav counties. Moreover, a bigger part of magnates in those

voivodeships supported August III's candidature. A civil war broke between the gentry and rich landowners. Both parties to the conflict involved peasants into the struggle. The gentry incited peasants to start riots in the magnates' estates and their bands attacked the estates. Some of the gentry formed small gangs of peasants, cossacks and homeless gentry who got broke and engaged in plundering disguised as political struggle. Rich landlords used home reserves consisting of cossacks and Vlachs, against the gentry.

At the end of 1733, the Russian Corps under the command of Count Shakhovskoy entered the right-bank region "for the devastation of the territories of Stanislas Leshchinsky's supporters". A considerable part of troops went deeper into Poland. Some detachments consisting mostly of Little Russia's Cossacks stayed in the Volhynian, Podolian, Kievan and Brazlav voivodeships to counter Leshchinsky's supporters. The Russian troops' struggle against the Polish gentry made local population come to a conclusion that upon driving away the gentry the Russian troops would form Cossack regiments that were to become part of Little Russia's Hetmanate. It was rumoured that Russian commanders issued deeds on behalf of Empress Anna Ioannovna enabling deed holders to rob and exterminate noblemen and Jews and to make a vow in loyalty to her. The fact that Russian colonels took under their command the Cossacks from the estates of the Saxon Party supporters helped nail down those guesses.

After the Russian Colonel Polansky had occupied Uman, he sent out circular letters to the heads of militia detachments offering joint action against Leshchinsky's Party. This circular letter was somewhat misconstrued by militiamen and peasants. On receiving it Verlan (Vyrlan), a native of Moldavia, the head of estate Cossacks from Shargorod, Lubomirsky's estate, put his squadron on the alert, declared himself a colonel, called together militiamen from the neighbouring estates and recruited peasants, ladling out military ranks. He divided his militia into small platoons called "tens" (taking into account their coming from different villages); each platoon elected its leader. These "tens" were entered into the Cossack Army registers. Verlan announced that he received a personalized decree from a Russian colonel, allegedly ordering to exterminate people of different origin and creed, such as Poles and Jews; moreover, according to Verlan, after their extermination the region would belong to Russia. Verlan made his regiment swear allegiance to Empress Anna Ioannovna.

Estate Cossacks, inhabitants of Vlachian military settlements, haidamak groups, Zaporozhian Cossacks, peasants, impoverished gentry, church lectors and many others gathered in his camp. Verlan and his cohorts went through the Brazlav and Podoloian counties

exterminating gentry and Jews and making the local population swear allegiance. He occupied Brody and Zhwanets and sent his small military groups towards Kamenets and Lvov.

After the unconditional surrender of Danzig on June, 26 (July 7), 1734 Leshchinsky's cause was lost and he defected to Prussia.

The noblemen of the Ukrainian counties were the first to come to the Russian Headquarters and acknowledge guilt. They consented to August III to be elected and asked the Russian Military Authorities to suppress peasants' unrest. On July 1, the Russian commander-in-chief issued the Manifesto "To All Residents of Rzeczpospolita Polska, Who Recognized the Power of His Majesty King August III", in which the commander promised to take drastic measures against those "regular and irregular Russian volunteer detachments" causing offence to peaceful citizens.

Russian Army detachments were sent to suppress uprisings and catch fugitives.

Those suspected of committing crimes were escorted to Polish courts and sentenced to death or to different kinds of punishment. Punishment was often quite lenient because the gentry wanted to retain their serfs.

The rebellion being suppressed, peasants, in fear of reprisals, joined haidamak gangs. Commanders of Polish forces and landlords persuaded them to join territorial militia, formed several regiments and made them swear allegiance to Rzeczpospolita Polska.

Led by Verlan, instigators of the rebellion and their detachments consisting mostly of Moldavian natives retreated to Moldavia and took away their loot. Disregarding the requests for their extradition, the Moldavian Gospodar (King) returned only part of loot to Brazlavian and Podolian gentry. Other rebels including a lot of peasants escaped to Tatar and Zaporozhian steppes and formed numerous gangs there.

There are some interesting details in the judicial acts of the trials of haidamakas that show the structure of haidamak detachments. The case files of the trial of the insurgents A. Sulyak, G. Vorobets and P. Demianovich contain "The Register of His Honour Stephan Keefa and of His Squadron". Unfortunately, its number of the rebels is incomplete because, according to Verlan's special messenger A. Sulyak, he stopped entering names in the register when the number of the peasants joining the Squadron became too large.

Keywords

Cossack, Bukovina, Sulyak, Moldavia, Verlan, Haidamaks, Rusins, Vlachs, Moldovans.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/15

Ethnic Groups and Languages of Moldavia According to the Results of the Census of 2004 and the Statistics of the State Enterprise “Centre for State Information Resources ‘Registru’”

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Этносы и языки Молдавии по результатам переписи 2004 г. и данным ГП «Центр государственных информационных ресурсов “Registru”»

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 33. Is. 3. pp. 94–101 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1110&article_id=34233

The first national census of the population was held from October 5 to October 12, 2004. But do the census data, regarding nationality in particular, fully reflect the status quo?

Of certain interest for scientists is the comparison of 2004 census results, the population statistics of 2012 collected by the National Statistics Bureau of the Republic of Moldova and the information from the government establishment called “Centre for State Information Resources ‘Registru’” (“Registru”). Although the process of documenting the population is not finished yet and the information on citizens under 16 years of age is incomplete (their data are entered into the documentation of their parents or on the basis of the acts of civil status), the information on nationality and the native language is stated and double-checked by citizens when they fill in the forms for ID cards and the foreign passport. The data are quoted less on the population of Bendery and the Dniester left-bank regions (Transnistria).

As of October 12, 2004 (the time of holding the census), 2,570,170 people were registered in “Registru”. 2,362,540 of them were over

16 years of age (the census gave it as 2,673,438 citizens). According to people's own statements, this age group included 1,665,622 Moldavians, 2,579 Romanians, 147,014 Russians, 206,594 Ukrainians, 99,283 Gagauzes, 44,916 Bulgarians and 4,175 Jews.

339,481 people stated that Russian was their mother tongue (even though the data on people registered in "Registru" during the period in question lacked 813,162 people who were registered in the census database, and this information mainly concerns people aged over 16).

According to the information of the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova as of January, 1, 2012, 3,559,541 people lived in the Republic (2,935,531 people aged over 16 among them). As of the same date, the "Registru" database shows the population number as 3,559,605 inhabitants (2,972,657 people (83.5%)) aged over 16. Thus, the figures are almost identical while the information provided by "Registru" reflects a more realistic picture.

In accordance with the data of "Registru" as of January 1, 2012, 2,477,084 (69.6%) citizens indicated their national identity as Moldavian (2,212,800 of them were over 16 years of age (74.4% of this age group)). 3,087 people identified themselves as Romanians (0.09%), 2,881 of them aged over 16. The data show that people indicated their ethnicity as follows: 183,115 (5.14%) Russians, 252,835 (7.1%) Ukrainians, 128,683 (3.6%) Gagauz, 61,609 (1.7%) Bulgarians and 4,098 (0.12%) Jews. 1,930,103 (54.2%) people acknowledged Moldavian as their mother tongue, 207,840 (5.8%) people acknowledged Romanian as such and 524,885 (14.7%) people stated that their native language is Russian.

As regards people aged over 16 registered in "Registru" as of 01.01.2012, Russian is the mother tongue for 67,595 Moldavians, 225 Romanians, 159,168 Russians, 133,838 Ukrainians, 11,948 Gagauz, 16,557 Bulgarians and 3,107 Jews.

The large number of Ukrainians who acknowledged Russian as their native language can be explained by the fact that many of them are Rusins or their descendants. After the reunification of Bessarabia and the USSR, the attempted Ukrainization of Rusins in Moldavia in the 1950s was to no avail.

According to the 2004 census in Moldova (exclusive of information on Transnistria), 60% of citizens (2,029,847 out of 3,383,332 people) acknowledged Moldavian as their native language and 16.5% (558,508 people) called Romanian their mother tongue.

380,756 people (11.3%) out of 3,383,332 citizens of the republic stated that Russian was their native language. Russian was native for 195,573 Russians, 63,290 Moldavians, 89,853 Ukrainians, 9,134

Bulgarians, 8,618 Gagauzes, 3,500 Byelorussians, 2,795 Jews, 1,557 Poles, 1,163 Germans, and for 571 Romanians. Russian as the language for everyday communication was acknowledged by 540,990 (16%) people, among them 128,372 Moldavians, 141,206 Ukrainians, 40,445 Gagauzes, 1,537 Romanians, 23,259 Bulgarians and 18,610 representatives of the other ethnic groups. Fluent speakers of Russian were distributed as follows: 52.5% Moldavians (1,347,647 people out of 2,564,849, according to the 2004 census), 32.7% Ukrainians (92,248 people), 60.5% Romanians (44,350 people), 57.1% Bulgarians (37,497 people) and 62.5% Gagauzes (92,114 people).

The existence of a considerable number of citizens for whom Russian is their mother tongue and the language for everyday communication highlights the pressing issue of a steadfast compliance with the country's language laws including the Organic Law on functioning languages within the territory of the Republic of Moldova Nr. 3465–XI of September 1, 1989, which has priority over other statutory acts but its statutory requirements are not met by state agencies.

Keywords

Russian, Romanian, Moldavian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Gagauz, Bulgarian, Russian language, Romanian language, Moldavian language, Moldavia, Rusin.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/16

**Orthodoxy in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian Lands
(On the Occasion of 200th Anniversary of the Kishinev
Diocese and the Centenary of the Second Marmarosh-
Sighet Trial)**

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University

7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

***Православие в Карпато-Днестровских землях
(К 200-летию основания Кишиневской епархии и
100-летию Второго Мармарош-Сиготского
процесса)***

С.Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 34. Is. 4. pp. 8–15 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1108&article_id=34121

The Galician Diocese of the Archdiocese of Kiev played a key role in the dissemination and preservation of Orthodoxy in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian lands.

The Diocese came into being in the middle of the 12th century after Galych (Halych) had become the capital of the homonymous Principality in 1141. The first information of the Halych Archdiocese dates back to 1303 – 1304. It was short-lived and then refounded in 1371 upon Polish King Casimir III the Great's demand; King Casimir annexed Galychyna (Halychyna).

By the 13th century, Subcarpathian Rus' (Ugorskaja Rus') had become part of the Kingdom of Hungary. After the death of Daniel Galitsky (Daniel of Galicia), the last representative of the princely family, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Grand Duchy of Moscow and the Polish Kingdom had been in conflict throughout forty years for the Galych-Volhynia Principality. The strife resulted in Galicia becoming part of Poland.

During the intensification of struggle for the Galych-Volhynia Principality in the lands that previously had been its part, the Moldavian Orthodox Church was at first subordinate to the Galician Archdiocese due to colonization of Vlachs and Rusins, then to the Constantinople Patriarch and sporadically to the autonomous Archbishopric of Ohrid.

At the end of the 1530s, the Moldavian Principality came finally under the Turkish rule. However, its religious connection with Carpathian Rus' was not interrupted.

The population in Galichina and Subcarpathians being part of Catholic Poland and Hungary experienced ethnic and religious persecution. In 1569 there was the unification of Poland and the Great Duchy of Lithuania and Ruthenia, and they became a single state called Rzeczpospolita Polska (under the Union of Lublin). In 1596 the majority of Orthodox bishops from Western Rus' signed the Union of Brest. The Union of Uzhgorod was signed in 1646, the Union of Mukachevo was concluded in 1664 and the Union of Maramures was signed in 1713.

Populace still called their faith "ruska", most of the clergy and laymen stuck to the Eastern rite and opposed Latinization. Moldavian *Gospodars* (kings) and *boyars* provided great support to Orthodoxy in Carpathian Rus' donating considerable sums to churches and to the Dormition Stavropegial Brotherhood in Lvov. The Moldavian hierarchs appointed Orthodox bishops. The last Orthodox Bishops of Marmarosh Iosif Stoica and Dositei Teodorovici were ordained by the Metropolitan of Suceava and Moldavia.

The Dormition Stavropegial Brotherhood (1572 – 1788) helped to introduce printing in the Moldavian Principality and forwarded there the Orthodox literature printed in Lvov.

A great contribution to the preservation of Orthodoxy was made by the natives of Moldavia. On becoming head of the Western Russian Orthodox Church at dark hour, the Metropolitan of Kiev, Galych (Halych) and All Rus' Peter Mogila (Movilă) was able to recover possession and return to the Metropolitanate of many churches and monasteries which had previously been seized by the Uniats with the royal support. When Peter Mogila became the metropolitan, he transformed the Kiev Brotherhood School to the Mohyla Collegium later known as the Kiev Mohyla Academy which became a model for theological institutions in Russia. Then Peter Mogila founded the Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy in Vinnytsia, established a monastery of the Kiev Brotherhood and printing works subordinate to the Kiev Metropolitan.

In 1772 Galichina was annexed to Austria as a result of the first partition of Poland. In 1774 Austrians occupied Bukovina, the northern part of the Moldavian Principality; a year later they annexed it under

the treaty with Turks. Thus, at the end of the 18th century most of the Halych Principality lands became part of the Austrian (Austro-Hungarian since 1867) Empire. Despite the fact that Orthodoxy was one of the state's official religions spread in Bukovina, the Austrian authorities tried their hardest to stop the population's returning to their "old" faith.

The beginning of the 20th century saw the most tragic events in the struggle of Rusins for their ethnicity and Orthodoxy.

Mass conversions of the Rusins of Ugor (Subcarpathian) and Halych Rus' to Orthodoxy began in 1903. Orthodox priests Alexey Kabaliuk (Ugor Rus') and Maxim Sandovich (Halych Rus') became their spiritual leaders. In 1994 the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church canonized the Holy Martyr Maxim (Sandovich), then in 1996 he was canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. In 2001 the Carpatho-Russian Schiarchimandrite Alexis (Kabaliuk) was canonized by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.

At the beginning of 1904, the First Marmorosh-Sighet (Marmorosh-Sighet) trial took place in Ugor Rus' against the peasants from the Subcarpathian village of Isa in the Khust District of Transcarpathian Oblast (Region). More than 160 Orthodox monks and nuns hailed from that village at the beginning of the 20th century. They were accused of praying for the Russian tsar and of inciting people against the Uniate faith. Seven peasants were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment lasting from 9 days to 14 months and punished by large fines.

The Second Marmorosh-Sighet (Marmorosh-Sighet) trial was held from December, 29, 1913 to March, 3, 1914. Initially, 189 people were brought to trial, mostly peasants from villages Isa and Velikiye Luchki (NagyLucska, Vel'ký Lúčky) situated near Mukachevo.

During their arrest and imprisonment the peasants were abused and beaten by the Hungarian gendarmes. Later, the prosecutor reduced the number of the defendants to 94 people accusing them of incitement against the Magyar people, the Greek Catholic religion and the clergy as well as of violation of the laws. The defendants were sentenced to a total of 39.5 years in prison.

The Prut-Dniester Interfluve experienced a different fate. This territory later called Bessarabia became part of the Russian Empire under the Peace Treaty of Bucharest resulting from the Russo-Turkish War of 1806 - 1812.

In 1808, during the Russo-Turkish War, the former Metropolitan of Kiev Gavriil Bănulescu-Bodoni was appointed the Exarch of Moldo-Wallachia. Through the participation in 1811 - 1812 in the sessions of the Holy Synod and the Commission for the administrative arrangement

of the region included into the Russian Empire, he worked towards retaining the civil and ecclesiastical administrative scheme that had been introduced to Wallachia and Moldavia on a provisional basis.

The Eparchy of Chişinău and Khotyn headed by Bănulescu-Bodoni was established in Transnistria on August 21, 1813. Besides Bessarabia, the new Eparchy included the so-called Khan Ukraine (Ottoman Ukraine) or the Ochakov steppe with such cities and towns as Tiraspol, Ananiev, Odessa and their counties (before 1837), and the Khush Diocese (Zaprutskaya Moldova, Western Moldavia). As part of the diocese, there were 826 churches.

Nowadays, the Metropolis of Chişinău and All Moldova of the Russian Orthodox Church has 610 parishes, 24 monasteries and 5 religious retreats (sketes).

Keywords

Carpatho-Rus', Galician Principality, Moldavia, Bessarabia, Metropolia, Unia, Orthodoxy, Peter Moghila, Pamba Berynda, Gavriil Bănulescu-Bodoni.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/17

“Who Are Tolkoviny”: In Regard to the Economic Structure of the Old Russian Population in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian Lands

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University

7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

«Яже суть толковины»: к проблеме хозяйственного уклада древнерусского населения Карпато-Днестровских земель

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 36. Is. 2. pp. 55–75 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1103&article_id=34080

The descendants of Tivertsy, Ulichy and Croats founded the Principality of Halych and played an important part in creating the Old Russian statehood, in the formation of Old the Russian nation and the ethnogeny of the Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, Moldavian and Romanian peoples.

A number of Carpathian Rus' inhabitants living in the heterodox and foreign language environment managed to retain their ethnic and cultural identity and self-appellation of “Rusins (Rusyns)” up to this day.

One of the challenges facing contemporary historiography is the study of the evolution and continuity of the economic system set-up by East Slavic (Old Russian) population and their Rusin (Rusnak) descendants who inhabit the Carpathian-Dniester region.

In 907 AD Prince Igor embarked on a campaign against Greeks. Along with the other tribes participating in the campaign, the Tivertsy were mentioned as “those who are the Tolkovins”.

The word “Tolkovins” can be found in the description of Grand Duke Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich's dream from “The Tale of Igor's Campaign” (the 12th century).

The last time Tivertsy were mentioned in the Russian chronicle is

circa 944 AD, when they, together with the other tribes, took part in Prince Igor's campaign against Greeks. A little earlier, about 940 AD, Uliches were mentioned for the last time.

But the chronicler mentions the Russian population of the Carpatho-Dniester lands later too. In 1223, right before the beginning of the Battle of the Kalka River, the Russian Army was reinforced by the "Galician Vygottsy" who came just on time.

The debate over interpreting the notions of "Tolkovins" and "Vygottsy" mentioned in the chronicle, has not abated until now. It is based on a linguistic approach.

As to "Tolkovins", the majority of researchers adhere to two opinions: the word means either allies (or assistants) or interpreters/translators.

The supporters of these theories thoroughly analysed both their own and their opponents' theories, and the arguments they produced raised doubts about the validity of both theories.

In Prince Oleg's Army there were the Viatichy and the other tribes which, not being part of Rus at that time, were in fact Oleg's allies and helped the Kievan prince. Let us recall that, as the chronicle states, in 885 AD Prince Oleg waged war against the Tivertsy and probably conquered them. It is most doubtful that the whole tribe could have served as interpreters.

316 years later the "Galician Vygottsy" who lived in the Carpatho-Dniester lands were mentioned in the chronicle. One of the most common points of view is that this refers to the exiled boyars (nobles). Moreover, it is not known who and when was banished to Ponizie: boyars fled mainly to Hungary. Then after the death of Prince Roman Mstislavich they came back and supported various claimants to the Galician throne, were very influential and influenced Prince Mstislav the Bold too. The inhabitants in Ponizie were loyal to the prince (e.g. the coming of "Vygottsy" to participate in the Battle of the Kalka River and the departure of Prince Mstislav to reign in Ponizie).

As we can see, the Ponizie population that lived in close proximity to the Cumans (Polovtsi) had significant military forces (which could "drive out" anyone) and took an active part in all-Russian affairs. V.T. Pashuto estimated the numerical force of the "Black Sea Vygottsy's" army participating in the Battle of the Kalka River as much as 30,000 to 40,000 people. Even if the chronicler exaggerated the size of the army, it was still a fairly large military contingent whose commanders enjoyed prestige.

Thus, the version of the Galician Vygottsy being "exiles" was not confirmed.

V. D. Koroliuk had previously raised the issue of cattle and sheep

breeding by the Slavs. He highlighted as particularly notable the contact zone including contemporary Moldavia (the Prut-Dniester interfluve). Constant interaction of nomadic, agricultural and pastoral economies and cultures resulted here in ethnic and socio-economic synthesis and greatly influenced the formation of statehood and ethnic groups. Based on the evidence that Slavs had pastoral and agricultural economy, which had been noted in the works of ancient authors, the researcher believed that since ancient times the Slavs had had two types of economy: agriculture and cattle and sheep breeding. Agriculture was certainly the main economic activity.

Indeed, the word "toloka" (joint work) has another meaning in a number of Russian and Rusin dialects and in Ukrainian, which is a pasture or a cattle range; the word "common" is its synonym. Accordingly, their derivatives "talkoviny" and "vygontsy" might mean "herdsmen" and "stock-farmers".

Thus, we discuss the specific type of economic and cultural ways and customs of the population, the type that had evolved on the territory of Carpathian Rus' and was different from the types of economic and cultural life in the other regions of Rus'. Besides agriculture, the local population was actively engaged in stock-breeding and the chroniclers thought it appropriate to emphasize the fact. A lot of researchers noted that stock-breeding played a significant part in the life of the local population.

Volokhs (Vlachs) appeared in the territory between the Carpathians and the Dniester in the middle of the 12th century. The word "vlach" – "volokh" – "wallach" is of a Slavic origin. At that time it primarily meant an occupation (herdsmen and stockbreeders) and another meaning was "ethnos". Later this word which entered all major Slavic languages was applied to anyone who was engaged in cattle and sheep breeding.

The Rusins of the Carpatho-Dniestrovian region took an active part in the Vallachian "colonization". Migrants were often referred to as Valachi et Rutheni or Valachi seu Rutheni in the documents written in Latin and issued in the Hungarian Kingdom. Herdsmen of Rusin origin from the East Carpathians were called Ruthenians.

In the second half of the 14th century, the Vallachian-Ruthenian (Rusin) Moldavian United Principalities, officially called the United Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, were established in the Carpatho-Dniestrovian lands. The Moldavian ethnos originated from the Vallachian and Rusin ethno-cultural contacts.

In the Middle Ages, stock breeding was one of the main agricultural activities in Moldavia. Moldavian archeologist G. B. Fedorov deemed that if we compared the archeological map of East Slavic settlements

on both banks of the Prut river and the Prut-Dniester interfluvium in the 9th – 13th centuries, with the map of the borders of the medieval Moldavian Principality, those two maps would be basically the same.

Keywords

Eastern Slavs, Tivertsy, Uliches, Khorvats, Tolkoviny, Vygontsy, shepherds, Galician Principality, Galician Rus', Volokhs, Rusins, Vallachian colonization, Moldavian Principality, Moldavia, Carpathian Rus'.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/18

The Attitude of the Administration of Bessarabia Towards the Subjects of the Austro-Hungarian Empire Living in the Territory of Its Province During WWI

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Отношение администрации Бессарабии к проживавшим на территории губернии подданным Австро-Венгрии в годы Первой мировой войны

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 37. Is. 3. pp. 126–141 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1099&article_id=34073

Unlike the other Russian governorates, the territory between the Prut and the Dniester called Bessarabia which became part of Russia in 1812 was intensively settled (especially its South and North) by immigrants from the Balkans and the Moldavian Principality, including those from Bukovina annexed to Austria in 1774. After becoming permanent residents, many of the immigrants acquired Russian citizenship.

At the beginning of the 20th century, over, 250,000 Rusins lived in Bessarabia. Unfortunately, these are ballpark figures and they do not show the true number of migrants. Some researchers indicate that there was mass migration of Rusins from Austria-Hungary to Bessarabia before the Great War.

The situation of the Austro-Hungarian nationals in the territory of Bessarabia changed before and during the Great War when they automatically became citizens of the states being at war with Russia. This period is still one of the least studied pages in our history. Some useful light can be cast on the matter with the help of dossiers stored in such funds of the National Archives of the Republic of Moldova as

“The Office of Bessarabian Governor-General,” “The Bessarabian Police Administration” and “The Bessarabian Governorate Gendarme Police Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”.

1,459,000 German immigrants (35.1% of the total number of migrants) and 888,000 Austro-Hungarian subjects (21.4%) lived in Russia from 1828 to 1915. Galicians, migrants from Bukovina, Poles and Czechs were the largest group. From 1911 to 1915, 59,000 German citizens and 41,000 Austro-Hungarian citizens immigrated to Russia. A number of immigrants eventually acquired Russian citizenship.

The results of the 1897 census showed that 0.5% of people out of 158,100 German subjects lived in Bessarabia. There were 121,600 Austro-Hungarian subjects in Russia, 13.2% of whom settled in Bessarabia. According to the 1897 census, in the Bessarabian Governorate there were 23,157 foreigners, including 15,994 Austro-Hungarian subjects (mainly, Rusins) or 69.1% of their total number, 1,267 Turkish subjects or 5.5%, 473 Prussian subjects or 2%, 330 German subjects or 1.4%, and 400 Bulgarian subjects or 1.7%. 12,014 people out of 21,687 subjects of the Russian Empire who were foreign-born but lived in Bessarabia, were born in Austria-Hungary.

Although the lists of foreign nationals living in the Governorate were made regularly, it was hardly possible to consider them complete. A lot of migrants from Austrian Bukovina lived with their families for several scores of years in the villages of Bessarabia. Local landowners and tenants took a great interest in those people and welcomed them. Similar cases became known quite by chance, just as in the case called “Information on the Austrian Subjects Living in Bessarabia” which was initiated on January 18, 1913, and completed on September 23, 1914, after the war had broken out. The case concerned the petition of 25 Rusins who were Austrian subjects (living in the village of Slobozia of Beltsy District in the north of Bessarabia). The Rusins and the members of their families applied for Russian citizenship. The investigation and proceedings revealed that some of the applicants had lived in Bessarabia for over thirty continuous years without any passports, residence permit or licences. Their children were born in Bessarabia. But all of them were deemed to be the citizens of Austria-Hungary.

The forcible resettlement of the Austro-Hungarian and German draft age citizens to the interior provinces began shortly before the declaration of war. Those whose loyalty was beyond doubt were permitted to stay on under police surveillance after signing the pledge not to leave their localities. To initiate mass deportations, the Ministry of Internal Affairs opened a number of centers in major cities throughout the Empire. Prisons, guarded barrack-type buildings or

hastily built temporary relocation camps were used as such centres. Groups of deportees were relocated under guard in sealed freight cars to the provinces pre-determined as their points of destination. In July 1914, Viatka, Vologda and Orenburg provinces were assigned as the places of exile. Since 1915 reservists and their families had been relocated to Saratov, Ufa and Kazan provinces and then to Perm and Yenisey governorates.

Despite the fact that all exiled Austro-Hungarian and German citizens were under police surveillance, they enjoyed freedom and were not subject to forced labour.

Though the State had undertaken providing sustenance for “civilian captives” and had been paying their rent, the allocated funds were not sufficient enough.

Austria-Hungary and Germany took similar measures in regard of the Russian citizens. At that time draft age men were seen as potential enemy soldiers who, in case of repatriation, were called up for military service in their native country. Such men made up the majority of the internees during the First World War. In the Russian Empire, the Slavs who were subjects of the hostile States were often not subject to deportation. On August 14, 1914, the Ministry of Internal Affairs took a resolution which allowed to exclude draft age men of the Serbian, Czech and Rusin origin from the deportation lists.

On August 25, the Bessarabian Governor-General issued a similar decree, Order Nr. 2640. According to this document, the German and Austro-Hungarian subjects aged from 18 to 45, though bound to military service, were exempt from it as being of Czech, Galician and of other Slavic origin, after signing a special written promise not to leave their places of residence. Those unfit or ineligible for military service as well as the Armenian Gregorians and the Armenian Catholics were also exempt from military service.

Quite often the civil administrative bodies approached the county military authorities and solicited for non-deportment of the persons who applied for the Russian citizenship (including Rusins who were Austro-Hungarian citizens). If such persons had been deported before obtaining the Russian citizenship, the query was sent about their current location for the delivery of the appropriate order.

At the same time, the Rusins (including those who were Russian subjects) suspected of espionage were exiled outside the governorate.

Keywords

Austro-Hungary, Rusins, Bessarabia, Slavs, WWI, deportation, foreign subjects.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/19

The Ancestors of the Rusins and the Nomadic Tribes: Ethno-Cultural Interactions

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Предки русинов и кочевники: вопросы этнокультурного взаимодействия

С. Г. Суляк

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 38. Is. 4. pp. 152–176 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1131&article_id=34044

The assumption that Iranian-speaking tribes of the Greater Black Sea area played a significant role in the ethnogenesis of the Eastern Slavs was made by M. Lomonosov, E. Klassen, Y. Venelin, I. Zabelin, N. Zagoskin, D. Samokvaskov, D. Ilovaisky, A. Lappo-Danilevsky, M. Liubavsky, L. Niederle, P. Tretyakov, B. Rybakov, V. Sedov, G. Vernadsky, A. Udaltsov et al.

A number of researchers point out the ethno-cultural link between the Iranians and the Indo-Aryans (the two largest Indo-Iranian sub-branch representatives of the Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family). O. N. Trubachev noted that one of the Scythians' names was "para" which meant "younger" or "descendants" (the Indo-Aryans were "old Aryans"). The largest confederation of Northern Iranian tribes of Sarmatia, which became the heir of Scythia, were the Alans. Their name comes from the adjective *aryana (arian; plural – aryānām), one of the varieties of the ancient Iranian form of ārya (Aryan) through the interchange of consonants l-r, "aria – ariana – alan".

In the Indo-Iranian habitat, ancient Indians and Iranians used the name *ārya* to designate their affiliation with the free people, separating themselves from slaves.

Herodotus, describing the Scythians, pointed out that the Hellenes gave them this name. From his description, we can conclude that the

unified nation of Scythians had never existed. There existed Scythian nomads and Scythian farmers. Scythian nomads lived in the steppe and raised cattle. Next to horses, sheep were the major livestock.

Scythian plowmen (Scythian farmers, Scythian Borisphenites; their self-name was Skolots) lived in the forest-steppe belt and were engaged in agriculture and sedentary cattle-breeding. The agricultural region of the Proto-Slavic tribes was the Middle Dnieper and the left bank areas with a mixed population (Gelons, Boudins and partially resettled Borisfenites). The formation of the Old Russian State took place in this region in the Middle Ages. Scythians proper dwelt in the regions of the Lower Dnieper and the Sea of Azov. Anthropological studies confirm that those whom Herodotus called Scythians-farmers were Proto-Slavs. Contacts of the Eastern Slavs' ancestors and the Scythian-Sarmatian population in the lands of the middle and lower reaches of the Dnieper and its tributaries, in the basin of the Southern Bug left their mark in the genesis of the anthropological features of the East Slavic peoples. Agricultural tribes were greatly influenced by Scythian culture, which made them similar to the Scythians in appearance. According to Boris Rybakov, the residence of the Eastern Slavs' ancestors in Scythia conditional caused the long absence of Slavic unity.

According to O. Trubachev and F. Filin, the intensification of Slavic-Iranian contacts dates back to the middle of the 1st millennium BC. This applies mainly to religious and social spheres. Mythology and the pagan religion of the Slavs developed under the Iranian influence.

A considerable Iranian influence can be found in toponymics. Such hydronyms as Prut (Porata), Tiras (*tūra* – fast, strong), Don, Donets, Dnieper, Dniester (*dān* – water, river), etc are of the Iranian origin.

In the 3rd – 2nd centuries BC, Sarmatians pushed out Scythians from the northern part of the Greater Black Sea area; after this the ancient authors called it Sarmatia. The Western Sarmatians (Alans, Roxolani, Yazyges) settled along the lower reaches of the Dniester and the Danube no later than the AD era.

At the beginning of the 1st century AD, the ancient authors first mentioned Wends (Slavs) in the Carpatho_Dniester region.

In the 6th century, a new, purely Slavic culture (called the Penkovsky or the Antes culture) replaced the Chernyakhov culture and spread throughout the territories of Moldavia and Ukraine.

According to V. V. Sedov, 'antes' is a tribal name of the Slavic group which had its own ethnographic features; its formation was greatly influenced by the active participation of the Iranian (Sarmatian) ethnic component. This view is shared by M. Gimbutas, who believed that

in the Prut-Dniester region the Sarmatians merged with the local population. By this time, they changed their nomadic existence for a sedentary way of life and took up farming. The ethnonym 'ant' probably dates back to ancient Indian 'antas' – end, edge; antyas – located at the edge, and to Ossetian 'attiya' – back, behind. Thus, the word 'antes' in the Russian translation means "those living in the border lands" or "borderers", "ukrainians". This name could be borrowed by the Greeks from the Alans living in the southern Russian steppes.

In the 7th – 9th centuries, the Penkovsky (Antes) culture of the Prut-Dniester interfluvial region was replaced by the Luka Raikovetska culture prevailing in the northern and central regions. Researchers have no hesitation in recognising the East Slavic origin of the Luka Raikovetska culture.

At that time, the territory of the Carpathian-Dniester lands was inhabited by the tribes of Croats, Tivertsy and Uliches. The Croats were one of the Antes tribes.

The ethnonym dates back to the period of the Slavicization of the Iranian-speaking population against the background of Cherniakhov culture. Tivertsy is an ethnonym derived from Tiras, the ancient name of the Dniester, their ancestors were one of the Antes tribes. Uliches lived to the south of Kiev. After conquering Peresechino in 940 AD, they migrated to the Southern Bug and the Dniester interfluvial region. The Croatian ethnonym most probably derived from the ancient Iranian words 'shepherd, cattleman'. Croats allegedly got their ethnonym during the existence of the Antes Union through assimilation of the Iranian population by the Slavs.

B. A. Rybakov suggested that Uliches' ancestors (Urgy-Urugundy) belonged to the Sarmato-Alanian tribes "involved into the process of the Slavic ethnogenesis". In the 3rd – 4th centuries, in T. Sulimirski's opinion, most of the Sarmatian tribes settled in the northern part of Bessarabia and in the adjoining districts of Moldova along both banks of the Prut river. Considering the fact that the ancient authors of that period called these lands "Alania" and the Prut was mentioned as the Alan river (Alarms fluvius) by them, it can be concluded that the Sarmatians subdued the local population. A lot of toponyms with the root "Yas", including the city of Iași, lead to the assumption that it was the Eastern branch of the Alans – Aorsy, Yasy or the Ptolemaic Asayas. The scholar identified them as the Antes present in this region from the 4th through to the 6th centuries whereupon they were assimilated by the Slavs.

It is in the southeastern borderlands of the Slavic world that the word Ru appeared, which, as V. V. Sedov considered, came from the

Iranian-based **rauka-* **ruk-* meaning “light, white, and to shine”.

The data obtained by archeologists, linguists, historians, and anthropologists on the Slavic-Iranian symbiosis have received confirmation from geneticists. Several research teams conducted a genomic study of the Russian population. The study revealed that Y-chromosome (Y-DNA) haplogroup R1a was common in Russians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians. This haplogroup emerged thousands of years ago and was very common among Indo-Aryans and the Iranians of the northern Black Sea.

Currently, in the higher castes of India (Brahmins), irrespective of their geographical and linguistic affiliation, the indicator R1a reaches 72.22%.

The article published in *The American Journal of Human Genetics* in 2008 mentions the R1a being an average indicator among Russians and reaching 55.4%. According to the authors of the monograph “Russian Gene Pool of the Russian Plain”, this haplogroup, most common for the East Slavs, also exceeds 50%, declining to 40% in the north-east of Russia. This study confirmed the similarity of the gene pools of Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians.

The research carried out in the Belgorod region among the indigenous Russian and Ukrainian populations showed an even higher percentage of carriers of haplogroup R1a which amounted to 55.82%.

In the author’s opinion, studying the gene pool of the indigenous East Slavic population in the Carpathian-Dniester region, considering their long-standing ethno-cultural contacts with the Scythian-Sarmatian world will reveal a higher percentage of carriers of haplogroup R1a.

Keywords

Rusins, Slavs, Antes, Tivertsy, Uliches, Croatians, Scythians, Sarmatians.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/20

The Rusins of Bessarabia in the 19th – Beginning of the 20th Centuries: The Question of Numbers

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

***Русины Бессарабии в XIX – начале XX в.:
к проблеме численности***

С. Г. Суляк

DOI 10.17223/18572685/39/7

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 39. Is. 1. pp. 95–115 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1109&article_id=23031

Studying the ethnic groups of Bessarabia, including Rusins (Rusnaks), began since the inclusion of the territory between the Prut and the Dniester rivers into the Russian Empire. Researchers of the Russian imperial era and Romanian historians of Bessarabian descent studied this ethnic group, the history of its emergence and localization in this territory, and the population size. The comparison of their data is of great scientific interest. For the most part, the authors of the works written in the first years after the inclusion of the territory, into Russia do not mention Rusins separately, identifying them as either Russians or Ukrainians, due to insufficient knowledge of the issue.

In the “List of Population Aggregates in the Bessarabian Region” published by the Statistical Committee (The Bessarabian Region. The List of Communities/Populated Areas according to the 1859 Data. Published by the Central Statistical Committee of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, St.Petersburg, 1861) “Galicians (Galichane) or proper Rusnaks either Rusins often called either Little Russians (though the name is incorrect) or Raylians, or even more specifically, Rayans” were mentioned among the ethnic groups that inhabited Bessarabia. They were called “the oldest, if not the original, settlers in these lands according to the time of of their settlement”. It was mentioned that

Rusnaks lived mainly in the Khotyn County, where they amounted to more than 3/5 of the population (and to 1/8 of the entire population of Bessarabia).

A. I. Zashuk (Zashuk A. I. Materials for Geography and Statistics of Russia Collected by the Officers of the General Headquarters. The Bessarabian Region. Compiled by General Headquarters Captain A. Zashuk, St. Petersburg, 1862) lists “the tribes inhabiting Bessarabia at present”: “Moldavians (Romanians), Rusins or a Southern Russian tribe, Bulgarians, Armenians, Greeks, German settlers, the Swiss as well as Jews and Roma people dispersed everywhere; besides, immigrants from various regions, the Great Russians and Little Russians assigned at different periods to the cities and villages mostly in the central and southern parts of Bessarabia and the Poles in the Khotyn County were also part of the Bessarabian population as well as Serbs and Arnauts (hellenized Albanians) residing in the Bulgarian settlements”. He pointed out that “the second largest tribe inhabiting Bessarabia are Rusins/Rusnaks speaking the Southern Russian dialect which is somewhat different from Little Russian”; “this tribe also inhabited Red Rus (Red Ruthenia) and the Principality of Halych”. They inhabit “almost all the villages in the Khotyn County and some villages around the Prut in the Yași County, mostly in its northern part”. The number of Rusins in the entire region was estimated by him at approximately 120,000 people. Zashuk divided Rusins into three groups: indigenous people, those displaced by Moldavian Gospodar Gheorghe Duca whom the Turks had appointed the hetman of Ukraine in 1681 – 1684, and those who moved to Moldavia during the period of the Union at the end of 16th – early 17th centuries.

A. S. Afanasyev-Chuzhbinsky (Afanasyev-Chuzhbinsky A. S. Travel to the Southern Russia. St. Petersburg, 1863, Part 2) wrote that “Little Russians, (“Rusnaks are a subethnic group of Little Russians”) Moldavians, Jews, Armenians, Serbs, Romani, and Great Russian Old Believers (dissenters) referred to as Lipovans in Russia, lived on both banks of the Dniester from the Austrian border as far as the Black Sea. He also noted that the Bessarabian Rusnaks and the Galicians were two kindred ethnic groups indigenous to these lands.

In the monograph “Bessarabia. Historical Description. The Posthumous Release of P. N. Batyushkov’s Historical Publications” (St. Petersburg, 1892) Rusins were called “Old Croatians’ descendants”, “indigenous inhabitants of the Khotyn and the neighbouring counties”, part of the Russian people who had lived there before the arrival of Vlachs, and were different from the Little Russians (Rusins, Little Russians, Great Russians – S.S.). In 1861 – 1862, the Bessarabian population totalled

to 1,003,035 people, among them 515,927 Moldavians and Vlachs, 283,793 Rusins, Little Russians and Great Russians.

In the review "Bessarabia. Geographical, Historical, Statistical, Economic, Ethnographic, and Literary Reference Book" (Moscow, 1903), edited by P. A. Krushevan it was emphasised that "Rusins, or Rusnaks, speaking the language which was a little different from the Little Russian language" were the indigenous population of the region, living in the upper lands of Bessarabia before the arrival of "Dragos, the first founder of Moldova". "Rusins inhabit almost all the villages in the Khotyn County and some villages around the Prut in the Beltsy County, mostly in its northern part. Their total number in the governorate is not less than 250,000, that is, 1/8 of the entire population".

The works carried out under the guidance of P. P. Semenov-Tyan-Shansky also provide information about the Rusin population of Bessarabia. The first volume of the "Geographical and Statistical Dictionary of Russian Empire" published in 1863 informs in the Bessarabian Region Section that "Rusnaks or Galicians and Rayans who form a raya (a province) of the Turkish possessions, amounting up to 130,000 people, both males and females, live mostly in Khotyn, Soroka, Iași and Orhei (Orgeev) counties. The Little Russians began to settle here in the 17th century, now their number amounts to 70,000 people both males and females".

According to P. A. Nestorovsky, the author of the first monograph on Bessarabian Rusins (Nestorovsky P. A. Bessarabian Rusins: Historical and Ethnographic Essay. Warsaw, 1905), "isolated long ago from the congeneric Rusins living across the border, the Bessarabian Rusins, during their isolated existence, had become an independent ethnographic entity with quite clear-marked individuality". He stated that "now they are no longer the Rusins of Bukovina or Galicia nor the Little Russians of Russia's southwestern provinces but an almost independent ethnic group, realising, of course, that the independence is relative". The Rusins, as the author points out, are "generally regarded as the Little Russian population of Galicia and Bukovina or the descendants of those early Slavs who are known in history as Chervona Rus' (Red Ruthenia) or Chervonorussy. The descendants of these Chervonorussy survived in Bessarabia too, namely, in the Khotyn County. Their separate settlements are occasionally found in the other counties, mainly in the Soroka and Beltsy counties". He thought the latter ones to have been subjected to considerable "Romanization" ("Moldavanization"). Nestorovski believed that the Rusin population "in the Khotyn district, and in Bessarabia on the whole was about 250,000 people at the beginning of the 20th century

According to V. N. Butovich (Butovich V. N. Materials for Ethnographic Map of Bessarabian Province. Kiev, 1916), the total number of the Rusins, whom he called “the local Little Russians, usually calling themselves Rusnaks or the Russians”, was not less than 270,000 people in the Khotyn, Soroka, Beltsy and Orhei counties in 1907.

L. S. Berg, whose works on the history of Bessarabia were published immediately after the revolution (Berg L. S. Bessarabia. Country – People – Economy. Petrograd, 1918; The Population of Bessarabia. Ethnographic Composition and Population Size. Petrograd, 1923), called Rusins “Little Russians-Ukrainians”. This “Little Russian indigenous population is concentrated in the north of the province, mainly in the Khotyn County”. “Our Little Russians call themselves “Rusnaks” or Russkie”. It was noted that earlier they were often called Rayikas or Raylians because they inhabited the Khotyn raya under the Turkish rule. In the Akkerman County there is the village of Raylianka called so due to being inhabited by the Little Russians who moved there from the Khotyn County. Big masses of Little Russians inhabit predominantly the northern part of the Khotyn County.

Little Russians amount to 53% of the population in this county including the town. Their separate settlements are occasionally found in the other counties, mainly in the Soroka and Beltsy counties. The entire indigenous Little Russian population (the so-called Rusins) amounts up to 250,000 people in the Northern Bessarabia.

Researchers noted that the Rusins living side by side with the Moldavians, were subjected to “Romanization” (“Moldavanization”).

Thus, the majority of the Russian ethnographers of the imperial period considered Bessarabian Rusins (Rusnaks) to be the indigenous population of the region related to the Rusins of the neighbouring Austrian Bukovina and Galicia. They identified the Rusyns as an ethnic group different from the Little Russians. Some researchers regarded them as an entirely separate ethnic group, they designated the northeast of Bessarabia (Khotyn, partly Beltsy, Soroka and Orhei counties) as the region of Rusins’ compact settlement. Besides, some ethnographers pointed out their non-compact settlement in the other districts, including Moldavian villages. This fact, considering the bilingualism of Rusins, made it difficult to determine their actual number. The number of the Rusins of Bessarabia was determined in the range from 100,000 to 130,000 in the second half of the 19th century; at the beginning of the 20th century, it ranged from 250,000 up to more than 270,000 people.

We can agree with V. N. Butovich that Rusins lived not only in the North of Bessarabia, but also throughout its entire territory (concentrated in

the south of the province and in one district of Chişinău, and dispersed in many of Moldavian towns, villages and “shtetls” of the region). This is confirmed by the fact that many citizens in present-day Moldova have a large number of surnames of the Rusin origin (including ethnic surnames).

According to 2012 data, there were in Moldova:

4,681 people whose surname was Rusnak [<i>Rusnac</i> – Rom.]	
6,017	Railean
1,604	Raileanu
265	Reilyan [<i>Răilean</i> – Rom.]
2,127	Reilyanu [<i>Răileanu</i> – Rom.]
11,489	Gutsu [<i>Guţu</i> – Rom.]
403	Gutsul [<i>Guţul</i> – Rom.]
7,259	Russu
23,162	Rusu

The surnames with such suffixes as *-uk/-yuk/-chuk*, *-ak/-yak*, *-ey*, *-sky/-tsky* are spread across the Prut-Dniester region. They belong to the southwestern group of East Slavic (mostly Rusin) names. According to the data as of the beginning of 2011, 7 surnames ending in *-uk/-yuk/-chuk* are among 300 most widespread surnames in Moldova (The total number of surnames in the republic is 141,570).

They are distributed as follows:

Vakarchuk [<i>Vacarciuc</i> – Rom.]	2,392 people
Gavrilyuk [<i>Gavriliuc</i> – Rom.]	1,983
Romanchuk [<i>Romanciuc</i> – Rom.]	1,844
Kovalchuk [<i>Covalciuc</i> – Rom.]	1,839
Savciuc (Savchuk) [<i>Savciuc</i> – Rom.]	1,828
Shevchuk [<i>Şevciuc</i> – Rom.].....	1,787
Tkachuk [<i>Tcaciuc</i> – Rom.].....	1,762

Thus, the real number of the Rusins of Bessarabia in the 19th and early 20th centuries, in the author’s opinion, considerably exceeded the figures provided by the researchers of the imperial period.

Keywords

Rusins, Bessarabia, Russian Empire, Russia, Moldavia, Bukovina, Russians.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/21

The Rusin Identity (A Case Study of Galicians' Participation in the Civil War)

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Русинская идентичность (на примере участия галичан в гражданской войне)

С. Г. Суляк

DOI: 10.17223/18572685/42/9

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 42. Is. 4. pp. 107–125 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1356&article_id=24979

In Polish historiography, there is a widespread, opinion according to which the Rusins, unlike the Poles, are “unhistorical” people, incapable of attaining their own statehood.

Having lost statehood in the 14th century, the population of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia or the Kingdom of Rus fought for its restoration throughout many centuries. After the “Spring of Nations” of 1848 – 1849 which caused the first Rusin revival, the Rusin public figures maintained a popular idea of creating an Autonomous Austrian Rus', thus uniting all Rusin lands of Austria: Galichina, Bukovina, and Subcarpathian (Ugorskaya (Hungarian)) Rus'.

Attempts were made to attain Rusins' own statehood after World War I.

The defeat of Austria-Hungary in WWI led to the collapse of the empire. In October 1918, the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later Yugoslavia), Polish and Czechoslovak Republics were established. Although Emperor Charles (Karl) issued a Manifesto on October 16, in which he announced the intention to transform the Habsburg monarchy into a federal state, it was too late. Earlier, in August 1917,

Charles decided to change the names of ethnic Ruthenians, Rusyns / Rusins (Ruthenen) to Ukrainians (Ukrainer).

The Russian (Rusin) movement at that time was weakened by Austro-Hungarian reprisals. At the outbreak of war, scores of thousands of Russian Galicians and Bukovinians were sent to Europe's first concentration camps established by Austro-Hungarians: Talerhof and Gnas in Styria, Terezin in Northern Czechia, Gmind in Upper Austria et al. Not less than 20,000 people were imprisoned in Talerhof alone, to say nothing of the other camps. According to some estimates, during WWI Austro-Hungarian authorities exterminated at least 60,000 Rusins including old people, men, women and children, who were subjects of Austri-Hungary.

Eastern Galicia was affected by the war more severely than any other regions of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. In 1914 – 1918, the population of Galicia was reduced by 300,000 people at the expense of excess of death rate over birth rate and the main decrease in the population occurred in its Eastern part. The decline in the birth rate was facilitated by the fact that in Austria-Hungary the proportion of mobilized men was 55.5%. The growth of epidemic diseases also contributed to the population decline. The 1918 influenza pandemic that struck Eastern Galicia killed more people than WWI. 422,000 people had to leave the region due to the military actions in this territory and reprisals by the Austro-Hungarian authorities. In Russia, according to some reports, about 200,000 Galicians became refugees during the war.

The Rusins in Eastern Galicia suffered the largest population loss. It led to a shift in the numerical balance among the ethnic groups in the region. By October, 1918, on the Italian, Serbian, and Albanian fronts, there were 30 regiments out of 34 regiments of the Austro-Hungarian Army, where the Rusins made up the majority; four regiments were in Little Russia. As the majority of the Rusins fought on the Italian front, more than 100,000 of them remained in captivity in Italy after the collapse of Austria-Hungary.

Nevertheless, the Galician Rusins made some attempts to attain their statehood.

In Western Galicia, Rusin villages established the Comanche Republic (known as the Eastern Lemko-Rusin Republic consisting of 30 villages) in the valley of the Oslava river near the town of Comanche in November, 1918 [Gmina Komancza (countryside district), Powiat Sanocki (Sanok County, Subcarpathian Voivodeship)]. The Lemko-Rusin Republic announced their decision to join the West Ukrainian People's Republic. The Lemko-Rusin Republic lasted two months and

fell to the onslaught of Polish troops at the end of January, 1919. In Florynka (nowadays a village in Poland in Gmina Grybów in the Nowy Sącz County, Małopolska Voivodeship) on December 5, 1918 500 delegates from 130 villages elected the Executive Committee of Lemkovyna which proclaimed the Ruthenian (Rusin) National Republic of Lemkos also known as the Western Lemko Republic. Its aim was unifying all the Rusins and creating one state – Carpathian Rus', followed by its subsequent becoming an integral part of Russia. Due to the impossibility of joining Russia, the alternative was to become an autonomous Rusin province in Chechoslovakia. In March 1920, the Lemko-Rusin Republic was occupied by the Polish troops.

On October 18 – 19, 1918, the Ukrainian National (People's) Rada was formed in Lvov by the Ukrainian deputies of two chambers of the Austrian Parliament, of the Galician and Bukovinian sejms, and by the representatives of several Ukrainian parties of Galichina and Bukovina such as the National Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Radical Party, the Ukrainian Social Democraric Party and the Peasant Radical Party; each party was represented by three members of the parties' leadership.

On November 1, 1918, the Polish Liquidation Committee created on October 28, 1918, with its seat in Krakow, was to arrive in Lvov. Its aim was to ensure the transfer of Eastern Galicia from the Austrian Governor to Poland. On November 1, the Ukrainian National Rada supported by the Sich Riflemen took power in Lvov, in a number of other cities and then throughout Eastern Galicia.

Realizing that it was impossible to rescue the city from the attack and seizure by the superior enemy forces, Galician military units left the city on the night of 21/22 November 1918, to avoid encirclement. Most members of the Ukrainian National Rada and the members of the Secretariat of State left the city with them. After the Poles had taken over the city they staged a three-day Jewish pogrom as revenge on the Jewish population for their taking a neutral stance.

Yaroslav passed into the hands of the Poles on November 1, Peremyszl changed hands on November 1.

The West Ukrainian People's Republic was proclaimed on November 13, 1918. Its armed forces, the Ukrainian Galician Army (UGA), were founded on the basis of several reserve battalions of the former Austrian Army.

The offensive of the regular Polish forces began in the north and west, Romanian troops were advancing in the South. The Romanian troops entered Chernovtsy on November 11 and occupied, against the will of the population, the entire Northern Bukovina region. On December 31, the Romanian King signed the Act of incorporation of

Bukovina into Romania. The occupation regime was established in the region.

The Government of the West Ukrainian People's Republic moved to Ternopol. In late December, the city of Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankovsk) became the new seat of the West Ukrainian People's Republic Government. It controlled 40 powiats (districts) in Eastern Galicia.

After the additional elections to the National Rada in late November, its size increased up to 150 people because of new delegates elected in powiats (districts) and towns. E. Petrushevich was elected president of the National Rada. On January 3, the Rada, counting on "Great Ukraine" to support them, approved a preliminary agreement on the unification with the Ukrainian People's Republic (Act Zluky). A preliminary agreement was signed in Fastov on December 1, 1918, by the representatives of the ZUNR (the West Ukrainian People's Republic or WUPR) and of the UNR Directorate (the Directorate of the Ukrainian People's Republic or UPR).

On 22 January 1919, the Directorate proclaimed the Unification Act on the Sofia Square in Kiev. According to it, ZUNR (WUPR) became an autonomous western region of the Ukrainian National Republic. However, it was agreed that before the elections to the Constituent Assembly of the unified republic, the Ukrainian National Rada should exercise the legislative power throughout the territory of the former West-Ukrainian Republic.

In November and December, mobilization was declared for the Rusin population within the age range of 18 to 35. Up to 100,000 people were drafted before the end of December. Only 40,000 of them were combat-ready. A number of commanders were Germans, former officers of the Austro-Hungarian Army. ZUNR(WUPR) also invited ex-Tsarist officers.

At the same time, in 1918 – 1919, about 15 million people lived in the territory of the Russian and Austrian parts of Poland (excluding the German possessions – the western part of Greater Poland (Wielkopolska) with Poznan). During WWI up to 3.4 million Poles served in the armies of different countries. Their combat losses amounted to 390,000 people. In August, Poland had an army of 500,000 soldiers (200,000 of them battle-ready). Poland was assisted by France and other Entente countries. France equipped General J. Haller's Army (three corps) that was 100,000 men strong and L. Zeligowski's Division which arrived in Poland via Bessarabia from Odessa occupied by the French.

Since April 1919, after the arrival of Haller's Army to Poland, General P. Henrys' Mission had been working there settling the issues of providing the Polish army with weapons and equipment.

On February 17, the Galician Army launched the Vovchuhi/Volchuki (a village in Lvov County) operation from where the main attack was directed with the objective of liberating Lvov.

Offensive fighting was going on along the front with the frontline of 300 km. On October 18, the army reached the railway lines, thus interrupting railway and telephone communications between Lvov and Peremyshl (now Przemyśl). The same day, France requested to let the train through. On board the train there was the Interallied Mission of the Entente, headed by the French General J. Barthélemy authorized by the Paris Peace Conference. On their train Barthélemy brought 14,000 rifles and ammunition through to Lvov. Many historians believe that the Poles enjoyed the General's attention and goodwill because his wife descended from the Polish szlachta nobility.

On February 22, the Mission categorically demanded an immediate ceasefire of the Galician Army Command. The requirement was fulfilled on February 25. The next day Polish-Galician peace talks began. The purpose of Barthélemy's Mission was the conclusion of the armistice (necessary for joining forces against Soviet Russia) and then the peace treaty between Poland and ZUNR (WUPR). On February 28, the Mission presented its truce draft. In accordance with the demarcation line (later called Barthélemy line), Lvov and the oil fields of Eastern Galicia (1/3 of the territory) were left to Poland.

On February 27, the UNR (Ukrainian Peoples' Republic) Army Commander S. Petliura took part in the negotiations. He was ready to accept the demands of Barthélemy's Mission in exchange for the recognition of the UNR and ZUNR (WUPR). He demanded the military assistance of the Galician Army to fight the Bolshevik troops; the assistance was denied.

By March 18, the Poles had managed to raise the blockade of Lvov after reconquering the railway line. The unsuccessful operation shattered the morale of the Galician Army while the Polish Army recaptured the initiative at the front.

The Entente feared that the Galician Army could enter into an alliance with the Red army which had broken through to the Zbruch river. That is why the Allies sent to Poland General J.Haller's Army formed in France. His army immediately joined the fight against the Galician troops notwithstanding the Entente representatives' statements that Haller's Army would not struggle against the Galicians and would only fight the Bolsheviks. The Polish government headed by J. Pilsudski was authorized by Paris for military occupation of entire Eastern Galicia, promising to provide "self-determination" in future.

On April 30, Haller's Army entered Lvov. It numbered 50,000 men,

200 cannons and 900 machine guns. 100,000 Poles fought at the Galician battlefield. The Galician Army numbered 37,000 men.

On May 14, the Polish Army broke the front. On May 24, the Romanian Army launched an offensive on Pokkutia and after capturing Kolomyia, approached Stanislav. On June 1, the Poles took control of Ternopol. After heavy fighting against overwhelming odds the Galician Army was flung back to the Zbruch river.

On June 7, the Galician Army went on the offensive. Despite the small size of the army (only 25,000 combat-ready soldiers) the Galician troops forced the enemy to retreat along the entire frontline. The success of the army rekindled the enthusiasm of the population. About 90,000 volunteers joined the army, but due to shortage of weapons just 15,000 men were enlisted. After Haller's Army had returned to the front, the Polish Army launched a counteroffensive on June 28, recaptured Ternopol and approached the Zbruch river.

On June 25, 1919, influenced by Poles, "the Council of Ten" recognized the Poland's right to the occupation of the entire Eastern Galicia under the slogan of fighting Bolshevism. "The Council of Ten" consisted of heads of governments and secretaries of state/foreign ministers of five major victorious countries: Great Britain, France, the USA, Italy and Japan. Poland was granted a provisional mandate to govern the territory provided that the rights of the population were ensured and sufficient autonomy guaranteed.

The movement of the UGA (Ukrainian Galician Army) and Dictator Petrushevskiy to the territory of Malorossiya (Little Russia) did not lead to a complete unification with the Ukrainian Directorate despite the fact that Greater Ukraine was proclaimed as early as in January 1919. Too great were the differences between the parties, as N. Polonska-Vasilenko believed. The ZUNR (WUPR) government was non-partisan and anti-socialist. It considered its immediate task to continue struggle with Poland and was ready for an alliance with Denikin.

The directorate was headed by Social Democrats, who were willing to come to an agreement with the Bolsheviks on the struggle against Denikin's Volunteer Army. Their relations influenced the situation very much too: Petliura and the entire leadership of the UPR (Ukrainian People's Republic) thought that E. Petrushevskiy had been elected dictator in an illegitimate and undemocratic manner. Petrushevskiy and all members of the ZUNR (WUPR) Government, in their turn, believed that appointing Petliura the commander-in-chief of the army would harm the cause.

After the negotiations of the Ukrainian People's Republic and Poland had started, the ZUNR (WUPR) official diplomatic delegation notified

the UPR Embassy and the Polish Government on December 4, 1919, of the denunciation of the Unification Act ("Act Zluky") by the ZUNR (WUPR) Government headed by E. Petrusевич. It was a protest against Petliura's secret negotiations with Poland.

On November 6, 1919, at the time when Denikin's Army suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Bolsheviks, the Commander of the Galician Army General M. Tarnavsky signed an agreement with Denikin. The army came under the command of the joint forces of South Russia, and the Galician Government was protected by the Russian Volunteer Army and transferred to Odessa. In accordance with the agreement, the Galician Army retained its posture and internal regulations and could not be used against Petliura's troops. According to A. I. Denikin's testimony, "It retained the discipline and absolute loyalty till the end. But they could not restore the combat capability within that short period of time allowed by the situation, the Army having lost its morale and fitness, being in want of everything, with up to ten thousand of people infected with typhoid fever".

The military history of the Galician Army showed that the majority of its officers and soldiers supported the idea of Russian irredentism. Despite the alliance with S. Petliura's Directorate, the Galician Army Command considered first Denikin and then Soviet regime officials as possible representatives of the legitimate Soviet authorities. This is confirmed by the withdrawal of troops from Kiev when the Volunteer Army regiments approached the city, the entry into the negotiations with the White Army Command and going over to its side, joining the Soviet troops after the defeat of the Volunteer Army, and the participation in the Soviet-Polish war.

Keywords

Rusins, Galicia, Austro-Hungary, Russia, Little Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Civil War, Soviet-Polish war.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/22

The Beginning of Christianization of Carpatho-Dniestrovian Rus'

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University
7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia
E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Начало христианизации Карпато-Днестровской Руси

С. Г. Суляк

DOI: 10.17223/18572685/42/19

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 42. Is. 4. pp. 267–307 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1356&article_id=24989

The question of the beginning of Christianization of Rus' (of Medieval Russia's population) is still problematic. The theme of the adoption of Christianity by the population of Carpathian-Dniester lands which had been the region of the Rusins/Ruthenians ethnogenesis before the official act of the baptism of Rus' is continuously raised, including discussions in the international historical journal "Rusin".

Christianity, or, rather, its "right doctrine" (Orthodoxy), has long been one of the main components of Russian ethnicity. Not incidentally, at the mention of christening Czech Count Borzivoi I by Archbishop Methodius of Vyshehrad it was stressed in the Chronicle of Dalimir: "Ten arcibiskup Rusín bieše, mšiu svú slovensky síúžieše" ("That Archbishop, being a Rusin, held the Divine Service in Slavonic"). The Chronicle of Dalimir was the first chronicle in the Czech language, written at the beginning of the 14th century. In that case holding the church service in the Czech language meant not ethnicity but the fact that he professed Christianity of the Eastern rite. At that time it was believed that only Rusins could be Orthodox in the Carpathian-Dniester lands. The ethnonym "Rusnak (Rusniak)" which emerged later was opposed to the ethnonym "Pole"; Rusniak is an Orthodox (or Uniat) vs Pole is a Catholic.

The process of adoption of Christianity by the ancestors of the Rusins/Ruthenians can be divided into three stages. The first stage

lasted from the 1st century through to the 8th century, when the Slavs, Antes, and later the tribes of the Ulichy and the Tivertsy contacted with the Ancient World in the north-west Black Sea coast. In that case, it might mean a small number of the baptized. The second stage was connected with missionary activities of Cyril and Methodius in Great Moravia (the second half of the 9th century), influencing the population of Carpatho-Dniestrovian Rus'.

And the final stage associated with the baptism of Rus by Prince Vladimir was a mass conversion to Christianity of the population in the Carpathian-Dniester lands which became part of the Old Russian State (Kievan Rus').

The Slavs came in contact with the Ancient World in the 1st century AD, appearing in the lower reaches of the Dniester and the Danube and coming to the borders of the Roman (later Eastern Roman) Empire.

Slavic tribes of the Antes (4th – 7th centuries) lived in the territory between the Prut and the Dniester. They appeared there later than the Slavs and were formed of several ethnic components including the Iranian (Sarmatian) component. The bulk of the Antes lived in the Dniester area. The north of the Prut-Dniester interfluvium and the valleys of adjacent Dniester left-bank tributaries (Seret, Zbruch) were most densely populated.

The Scythian Diocese was the first to appear in the lands inhabited by the ancestors of the Rusins. The city of Tomis/Tomyris (now Constanța, Romania) was the seat of the diocese administration. The diocese was located in so-called Scythia Minor and not only covered the Black Sea coast to the south of the Istra (Danube), but also extended beyond the northern arm of the Danube, as some researchers suggested. The Scythian Bishop Evangelicus was first mentioned in the last quarter of the 3rd century AD. Later, Gothic Bishop Wulfila who preached Arianism in the territory of Great Scythia, had had his chair until the persecution of Christians by the Goths started in 348 AD. Great Scythia was the region north of the Danube, which covered part of present-day Romania, Moldova and Ukraine.

Hermias Sozomenus (Ermias Sozomen) wrote in his Ecclesiastical History (circa 444 AD) that a number of the Antes had already adopted Christianity by the 5th century.

As early as in the 3th – 4th centuries AD, Christians lived in the lower Danube territory and Christianity spread over to the left bank of the Lower Danube and the northern bank of the Danube.

In the 5th – 6th centuries, Byzantine historians wrote about prominent Byzantine military leaders of the Antes descent who, most probably, were Christians. In 425 AD Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III

issued an edict addressed to Amatus, the prefect of Gaul. According to the edict, Jews and pagans were forbidden to engage in judicial activities and to be in public office. Although the law had not been always respected, it concerned senior officials and army commanders-in-chief.

The presence of the Christian population in the Prut-Dniester interfluvium was confirmed by archeological data.

In the 7th to 9th centuries, Antes tribes of Croats, Ulichy and Tivertsy inhabited the Carpathian-Dniester lands. As 'The Tale of Bygone Years' describes it, "Ulichy and Tivertsy seated themselves along the Dniester banks and were in close proximity to the Danube".

The Tivertsy settled in the Prut-Dniester interfluvium as far as the Danube, and a large part of the Ulichy population moved to the Bug-Dniester interfluvium, probably, after the capture of their tribal centre Peresechen by Svengeld in 971 AD. The Croats who lived in Subcarpathia were the northern neighbours of the Ulichy and the Tivertsy.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus, describing the area of settlement of the Pechenegs in the middle of the 10th century, mentions the empty fortresses built "on this side of the Dniester River in the region facing Bulgaria" where "some remains of churches and the crosses carved into sandstone can be found".

At the end of the 9th century, the Pechenegs drove the Hungarians from the steppes in the northern part of the Greater Black Sea area to the Prut-Dniester interfluvium which was the location of the Tivertsy and Ulichy tribes with whom the Magyars developed good-neighbourly relations. Then, under the pressure from the Pechenegs, the Magyars were forced to migrate to the Carpathian Basin. A number of the "Ruthenians" relocated together with the Hungarians to Pannonia.

Despite the early missionary work of the Byzantine Church among the Hungarians, the early Christian terminology does not contain words of Greek origin. That is, the Hungarians had been Christianized to a certain degree when they arrived in Transylvania and the Danube region, moreover, they had been converted to Christianity by the Slavs. The Hungarian language preserved a large number of Slavic linguistic borrowings relating to the religious and ecclesiastical sphere. It means borrowing the Russian (Rusin) Christian terminology by the Hungarians. This is another evidence of Hungarian-Christian Rusin contacts that existed in the Prut-Dniester interfluvium as well as in Pannonia. Abundant information indicates the existence of Russian settlements in Hungary throughout its history.

The second phase of Christianization of the Carpathian-Dniester lands dates back to the second half of the 9th century AD. Researchers

in Tsarist Russia took a critical approach to Latin sources mentioning “Russians” living in the territory of Great Moravia, Czechia, Poland and Hungary. It could be explained by insufficient information on the history of Carpathian Rus’, available at that time.

Moravia Proper and adjoining Hungary, Bohemia, White and Red Croatia (Little Poland), Upper Silesia and Red Russia were part of Great Moravia where Cyril and Methodius introduced Christianity according to the Eastern rite.

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the boundary of the Moravian Archbishopric were extended to Lesser Poland and the Carpathian Mountains.

After the termination of missionary activities by Cyril and Methodius, Christianization of Rusins continued in Great Moravia and in the First Bulgarian Empire when both countries adopted Christianity as their official Christian religion in 864 AD. At the end of the 9th century, their missionaries vied with German Latin missions, Benedictines and Irish monks for influence. However, shortly after Methodius’ death (885) the new Pannonian Archbishop Wiching, a German native, and his supporters persuaded Pope Stephan V to forbid worship in the Slavic language.

After Great Moravia had been defeated by Hungarians, several lands inhabited by Croats became part of the Duchy of Bohemia (Prague), sometimes also referred to as the Czech Duchy.

21 years before the official Christianization of Rus’, Pope John XIII (965 – 972) issued a special papal bull in 967 by which, allowing the establishment of the Prague bishopric, he forbade to appoint any person to govern the Episcopal. See if the said person belonged to “the rite or a sect” of the Bulgarian and Russian nations, at the same time prohibiting to conduct a church service in the Slavic language.

The third period was the final Christianization of the Rusins’ lands that became part of the Old Russian State. Most of the territory inhabited by the ancestors of the Rusins finally joined the Old Russian State by the end of the 10th century and became subordinated to the Kiev Mitropolis in terms of religion. Later, at the end of the 11th century, these lands became a separate Galician Principality.

Keywords

Rusin, Rusnak, Rus’, Carpatho-Rus’, Christianity, Orthodoxy, Cyril, Methodius, Carpathian-Dniester Lands, Antes, Tivertsy, Uliches, Croatsians.

Sergey G. Suluak, St. Petersburg State University (Russia).

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/23

A. I. Dobriansky as a Historian

M. K. Iurasov

The Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences
19 Dmitriy Ul'yanov Str., Moscow, 117036, Russia
E-mail: mihail_yurasov@mail.ru

А. И. Добрянский как историк

М. К. Юрасов

Published in: Rusin. 2012. Vol. 29. Is. 3. pp. 78–90 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1116&article_id=17495

During the revolutionary events of 1848-1849, leaders residing in the dominions of the Habsburg Rusinian asked the government the question of unification of all the lands of the Austrian Empire, inhabited by the descendants of the Eastern Slavs, especially Galicia and Carpathian Rus', into a single autonomous region. This raised the question of the border between ethnic Hungarians, western and eastern Slavs in the Carpathian region, which was first raised in D. I. Zubritsky's pamphlet, Published in in 1849 in the Polish and German languages, and more extensively – by A. I. Dobriansky, who published an article entitled “On the Western Borders of Carpathian Ruthenia, since St. Vladimir's Time” in the “Journal of the Ministry of education” in 1880.

In this work, Dobriansky is not limited to the European and Russian chronicles, he also attracts Polish sources of the late 10th century, called Dagome iudex, and other numerous sources of evidence of the 11th – 18th centuries, up to the documents of the era of Maria Theresa, designed to reinforce her rights as the Hungarian queen, to all former possessions of Arpad. The historian present this information quite chaotically, without classification of sources and without source-criticism. The most qualified is Dobriansky's analysis of the medieval Hungarian charters' material, but it gives little to establish the limits of the settlement of the Eastern Slavs in the Carpathian region.

To justify the localization of the ethnic border between Western and Eastern Slavs in the Early Middle Ages, Dobriansky not only uses toponym data, but also refers to the modern picture of the Russian-speaking population settlement in the lands to the south and east of Krakow. This Dobriansky's argument that 90,000 people could not populate the area for many centuries is not convincing.

A serious error of the historian is his attempt to justify the extension of the authority of the Kievan princes up to the land of modern Eastern Slovakia (the region Spiš), based on vague information of the Wielkopolska Chronicle, as well as on a speculation that the named area was originally given as a dowry for the daughter of Polish Duke Boleslaw III from his Russian wife, who married a Hungarian prince, and then through the exchange was a part of the Hungarian kingdom. Dobriansky's argument was criticized by I. Linnichenko, who pointed out that the very procedure for the transfer of land holdings in ancient Russia as a dowry is unknown.

While the science of the textual chronicle was still at the initial stage of its development, Dobriansky can only be blamed for ignorance of the latest (for its time), research in this area, especially the works of K. N. Bestuzhev-Rumin. At the same time, the localization of the western limits of the settlement of the Eastern Slavs, proposed by Dobriansky, was supported by the most prominent pre-revolutionary Russian experts on the historical geography of ancient Rus' – N. P. Barsov and S. M. Seredonin.

Keywords

A. I. Dobriansky, Carpathian Rus', Rusins.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/24

An Anonymous Hungarian Account about “the Boundary of the Ruthenians” during the “Founding of the Magyar Homeland” in the Inner Danubian Lands

M. K. Iurasov

The Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences
19 Dmitriy Ul'yanov Str., Moscow, 117036, Russia
E-mail: mihail_yurasov@mail.ru

Венгерский аноним о «порубежье рутенов» во время «обретения родины» мадьярами в Среднем Подунавье

М. К. Юрасов

Published in: Rusin. 2013. Vol. 33. Is. 3. pp. 21–31 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1110&article_id=34230

In the historical essay “The Acts of the Hungarians”, written at the beginning of the 12th century by an anonymous notary of Hungarian King Bela III, “the boundary of Ruthenians” (confinium Ruthenorum) is mentioned to supposedly be located in the basin of the Upper Tisza. Here, according to the Hungarian anonymous, Bulgarian rulers settled part of the Balkan Slavs. Since the possession of Kievan Rus’ and the First Bulgarian Empire never extended that far, most likely, the anonymous author was referring to the south-western border of the area of settlement of the Eastern Slavs. This unknown “Magister P.” only once mentions the polytonym Ruthenia in his essay (the title of Chapter 8), but devotes several chapters to describe the relations of the ancient Hungarians with Rutheni people.

In historical maps, found in the works of foreign researchers, as well as in historical atlases, one can meet the designation of the territory as a part of ancient Russia, which is hardly true, because it was unrealistic in the 9th century for Kiev to control the land located 800 km away from it beyond the line of the Carpathian Mountains. Moreover, as established by Soviet researchers, “Russian land” in the 9th century did not extend

beyond the Gorina river in the west, i. e. was more than 200 km away from the Carpathian Mountains.

The determination of the “boundary of Ruthenians” does not comply with foreign realities of the 12th and 13th centuries, when “The Acts of the Hungarians” was written. While the Upper Tisza basin was already mastered by Hungarian rulers in administrative terms, in the lands of “marchia Ruthenorum”, once the north-eastern border of the Hungarian kingdom, there emerged a castle district. The Carpathian ranges had long been a natural Russian-Hungarian border, and the Second Bulgarian Empire, even during its heyday, territorially was noticeably inferior to the first.

In this regard, it can be assumed that the Hungarian anonymous was not referring to Rus', but the ancestors of the Carpathian and Moldavian Rusyns, who, according to the concept of A. V. Soloviev, could also consider themselves part of the Russian ethnos. The small number of East Slavic people who lived in the lands of the Carpathian Basin forced them to seek the protection of the neighboring early formations, especially of Great Moravia, Bulgaria and Russia. At the same time, none of these countries could effectively control the Upper Tisza basin at that time because of its remoteness from their political centers.

The emergence of the ancient Russian state and the desire of the Kievan princes to subdue all the ethnic communities of the Eastern Slavs, including the Ulichy and the Tivertsy, could encourage the Bulgarian rulers Boris (852 – 888) and Simeon (893 – 927) to create a barrier against the Russian on the northern borders of their possessions, but it is unlikely that Balkan immigrants lived so far away from the lower reaches of the Danube.

Keywords

Source study of Hungarian mediaeval literature, early history of the Ruthenians and Hungarians, Rusins.

Mikhail G. Yurasov, Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia).

E-mail: mihail_yurasov@mail.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/25

The Interior Plan of the Folk Abode in Transcarpathia of the 19th and First Half of the 20th Centuries*

V. V. Kotsan

Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life
Kapitul'na Str., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: vasilkotsan@ukr.net

***Планування інтер'єру народного житла українців
Закарпаття XIX – першої половини XX ст.***

В. В. Коцан

Published in: Rusin. 2011. Vol. 25. Is. 3. pp. 106–130 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1111&article_id=20656

Vernacular architecture of the Transcarpathian Ukrainians is an integral part of the Ukrainian people's tangible national cultural heritage. At the same time, it has a lot of local features. The internal layout of a traditional folk dwelling has been one of its ethnic identification characteristics.

A three-section house, which consisted of living quarters, a porch and a storehouse (komora), was the most common type of a peasant house in the Ukrainian Carpathian Mountains region in the late 19th – early 20th centuries. A two-section type of housing is found more rarely, such as house+“seny” (a kind of porch). A larger part of the family life was spent in heated living quarters (“hizha”) where they worked, cooked food, enjoyed their rest and welcomed guests. Such quarters could house quite a large family, including some domestic cattle in winter.

The living quarters were conventionally divided into the following

*The original of this article has not been correctly translated into English, so the correct translation is as follows: **The Interior Layout of Transcarpathian Ukrainians' Folk Dwellings in the 19th and the First Half of the 20th Centuries.**

parts: 1) a kitchen (a place for cooking) with a stove, a “misnik” or a cupboard (sometimes used for keeping foodstuffs), and a cutlery holder; 2) a table, benches, chairs and a wooden bin for grain storage. According to the functional use, everything in the house was divided into three large groups consisting of furniture, dishware, decorative objects and devotional articles. The first group included beds, tables, benches, a cradle, a chest, a clothes and towel rail, a “misnik” and a cutlery holder.

The second group comprised bowls and pans, pots, spoons, salt-cellars, piggins, mugs and tubs for soaking cheeses. The third group included icons, decorative bowls and plaques.

The internal layout, the interior and the use of the living space had much in common in the Ukrainian Transcarpathia, in the region of the Ukrainian Carpathians and in the whole of Ukraine. Some differences, particularly regarding the location of the stove and the direction of its mouth, were found in some areas of the province. A farmer always relied on the principle of rational and the most complete and convenient use of the interior space of his house, resulting in a clear and very strong tradition of its planning and usage. However, despite the traditional folk forms of dwelling and its design, it was continuously changing.

Keywords

Vernacular architecture, folk dwelling, interior, stove, bed, table, furniture, dishware.

Vasiliy V. Kotsan, The Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life, Uzhgorod National University (Ukraine).

E-mail: vasilkotsan@ukr.net

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/26

Ornamental Motifs of Hutsul Folk Embroidery in Transcarpathia (The Yasinian Center) at the End of the 19th to the Middle of the 20th Centuries

T. Ya. Sologub-Kotsan

Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life
Kapitul'na Str., Uzhgorod, 88000, Ukraine
E-mail: sologubt@rambler.ru

Орнаментальні мотиви гуцульської народної вишивки Закарпаття (ясинянський осередок) кінця ХІХ – першої половини ХХ ст.

Т. Я. Сологуб-Коцан

Published in: Rusin. 2011. Vol. 25. Is. 3. pp. 95–105 (In Ukrainian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1111&article_id=20655

The author provides complete information on the ornamental motifs, the art features and the symbolism of embroidery of Yasinian Hutsuls, who lived in the villages of Black Tysa, Yasyňa, Lazeshchyna, Stebny, Kvasy, Sitno, Trostianets and Bilin. In this research, the data have been aggregated on the basis of literature and various sources, the author's own observations and samples of Hutsul folk embroidery from the collection of Maria Gritsak (the stock collection of the Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life).

Samples of apparel embroidery are represented in the said collection. Among them, the most interesting are “ustavki”, (a square-cut and embroidered upper part of the sleeve), plastrons of men's shirts, cuffs (“doodiky”/ “doody”) and narrow collars (“dog collars”).

The Yasinian County embroideries are extremely expressive and picturesque and are notable for various colors. Ustavky of women's blouses in this county are wide, they are like bands consisting of two or three ribbons, one of which is wider than the other two. A rhombus and its various types are the main ornamental motif of the Yasinian

embroidery.

There were two main types of embroideries: cross-stitching and “nizinka”. Stalk stitches or narrow strips (“putky”) were used as a structural framework. The green, black, red (the 19th century), red-cherry and orange (first half of the 20th century) color scheme was dominant in that county.

The ornament, like all the other art forms, is a peculiar form of an imaginative reflection of reality. It undergoes changes depending on socio-economic and cultural development of the society. New socio-economic conditions and artistic conceptions naturally and inevitably give rise to new forms of ornaments and their new stylistic features. Each historical period is characterized by certain types of ornaments that have common stylistic features, regardless of what products they decorate. In this case apparel embroidery of Yasinian Hutsuls is no exception.

Keywords

Hutsuls, embroidery, ornamental motifs, colour scheme, shirt, ustavka, plastron, collar, cuff.

Tatyana Ya. Sologub-Kotsan, The Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life (Ukraine).

E-mail: sologubt@rambler.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/27

Language Construction of National Identity in the Internet Discourse: “Who Are the Rusins and What Language Is Rusinian Like?”

I. I. Babenko, O. V. Orlova

Tomsk State Pedagogical University
60 Kievskaya Str., Tomsk, 634041, Russia
E-mail: uchim.russkij@tspu.edu.ru

Языковое конструирование национальной идентичности в интернет-дискурсе: «Кто такие русины и на какой из языков похож русинский язык?»

И. И. Бабенко, О. В. Орлова

DOI 10.17223/18572685/41/6

Published in in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 41. Is. 3. pp. 79–89 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1271&article_id=23103

Modern scholars distinguish 3 historically established versions of national and linguistic self-determination of the Rusins: Russian, Ukrainian and Rusin. Competition for these versions has always escalated and the nationality question maximized during situations of social change, social mobilization, political, geopolitical crisis and transformations. The aggravation of Russian-Ukrainian relations, which occurred as a result of the events in 2014, stimulated a communicative network activity, the study of which could be a key to the current state of public opinion regarding the identification and self-identification of Rusins.

Socio-cultural and contextual analysis of the online discussion regarding the Rusin question allows us to reconstruct the actual current disposition of the 3 traditional (Russophile, Ukrainophile, Rusinophile) options of Rusin ethnic identity in the context of contemporary socio-political challenges.

The ethnonym Rusin in different contexts reflects a polar ethnic identity status. Rusins consider themselves as 1) an independent group, not of Ukrainian identity; 2) a part of Ukrainian identity; 3) a part of

Russian identity; 4) True Russian, but not identical to modern Russian, believing their language and culture to be more ancient, primordial. The complex and ambiguous meta-linguistic reflection is mainly focused on the issue of “detuning” from closely related language and cultures.

The subject of Rusin ethnic identity is discussed in the context of sharp Russian and Ukrainian polemics which is explicated in the leitmotifs of Ukrainian independence and the Russian World. Statements about ethnicity by Rusins are a means to demonstrate, in particular, a social and political position. Opposition to ethnic integration and globalization, desire to create a linguistic and cultural core of ethnicity, “detuning” from the power poles of Russian and Ukrainian are the focus of the formation of national consciousness.

The increase in the degree of conflict in Internet discussions about Rusin subjects leads to the general displacement of an axiological focus of the discourse from the positive to the negative. In determining the ethnic status of Rusins, the communicants demonstrate, in descending order of importance, Rusinophile, Russophile and Ukrainophile attitudes instead of the previously dominant Rusinophile, Russophobic and Ukrainophobic ones.

Keywords

Language construction, national identity, Rusins, internet discourse.

Innesa I. Babenko, Tomsk State Pedagogical University (Russia).

E-mail: uchim.russkij@tspu.edu.ru

Olga V. Orlova, Tomsk State Pedagogical University (Russia).

E-mail: uchim.russkij@tspu.edu.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/28

Ethnonyms “Rusin” and “Rusinian” in Russian Discourse: A Corpus Study

Z. I. Rezanova¹, K. S. Shilyaev²

Tomsk State University
36 Lenin Avenue, Tomsk, 634050, Russia

¹E-mail: rezanovazi@mail.ru

²E-mail: shilyaevc@gmail.com

Этнонимы «русин», «русинский» в русской речи: корпусное исследование

З. И. Резанова, К. С. Шиляев

DOI 10.17223/18572685/39/15

Published in in: *Rusin. 2015. Vol. 39. Is. 1. pp. 239–255 (In Russian).*

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1109&article_id=23040

The article focuses on the analysis of the different ways in which the ethnonyms “Rusin” and “Rusinian” are used in Russian discourse. The analysis, taken from the Russian National Corpus for the time span of the last 300 years, is used to discover typical contexts, discourses and genres in which these ethnonyms are found. The evidence is of correlated social and historical phenomena that concern the Rusins as an ethnic group.

The results have shown that Rusin ethnicity is represented in two ways: either as united with Russian ethnicity and its other neighbours or as opposed to the surrounding ethnicities. As a rule, this is manifested through an enumeration of ethnonyms that are either names of Slavic or non-Slavic ethnicities which are in territorial contact with the Rusins.

The heterogeneous character of the Rusin ethnicity is often highlighted in the context of self-determination relative to other ethnicities. At the same time, the contexts in the Russian National Corpus demonstrate the inner heterogeneity of the ethnicity and its division according to various social dimensions. This is manifested in the combination of “Rusin” with differentiating adjectival attributes.

Predicative semantics related to “Rusin”, “Rusinian” often contain

negative connotations which are made prominent in the contexts that are concerned with oppressing the Rusins or with their participation in inter-ethnic conflicts. The ethnonym “Rusin” is often found in opposition to an object of a verb with the semantics of harm. Predicates with neutral and positive connotations are but a third of the total.

In the temporal dynamics of the usage of the ethnonyms in question, an explosion of interest can be noticed in the first twenty years of the 20th century. Most of the newspaper contexts come from the epoch after which there follow almost 60 years in which Soviet newspaper discourse did not raise the Rusin topic. This is reflected in the fact that there are no contexts of usage of “Rusin”, “Rusinian” in the period from 1920 to 1960.

The general discourse-temporal dynamics shows a clear tendency to shift from the more transient discourses (the press) to literary and historical reflections. The decrease in the occurrences of “Rusin”, “Rusinian” dating from 1940 in all spheres of communication correlates with the actions of the Soviet government after annexing Galicia to the Ukrainian SSR – all Rusin organizations were closed and Rusins were refused ethnic sovereignty. Rusin topics became taboo since the 1950’s which is evidenced in gaps across all discourses and genres represented in the Russian National Corpus. However, a sharp increase in the number of contexts from 2,000 onward shows a growing interest with regard to Rusin issues in the Russian Internet. We believe it to be due, at least in part, to the growing scientific and literary activity of the Rusin diaspora.

Keywords

Ethnonym, Rusin, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, collective identity, Russian National Corpus.

Zoya I. Rezanova, Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: rezanovazi@mail.ru

Konstantin S. Shilyaev, Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: shilyaevc@gmail.com

I. Kercha's Rusinian-Russian Dictionary and Supplements to It

G. N. Starikova

Tomsk State University
36 Lenin Avenue, Tomsk, 634050, Russia
E-mail: gstarikova@yandex.ru

О «Русинско-русском словаре» И. Керчи и дополнениях к нему

Г. Н. Старикова

DOI 10.17223/18572685/41/2

Published in in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 41. Is. 3. pp. 25–38 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1271&article_id=23099

The Rusinian-Russian Dictionary by I. Kercha (Uzhgorod: Polyprint, 2007) analyzed in this article implements consolidated lexicographical work using diverse chronological, stylistic and areal terms as the sources. The analysis showed the basis was folk vocabulary which was the result of unremitting preparatory work. Stylistic differentiation of the vocabulary is the least recorded aspect of the dictionary as this classification is poorly supplied by the lexicographer. The body of the dictionary and its illustrations under review allow for the creation of an adequate representation about the lexicophraseological vocabulary of Rusin which includes Old Russian relic features and a significant number of loans from various periods providing a wide range of nominative variation. The rich synonymy and the large quantity of vocabulary allow to qualify the dictionary as a Rusin treasure reflecting the numerous regional versions of the language, helping to preserve the bases of it and providing permanent language development in polyethnic conditions. The publication of Rusin dictionaries which give well-organized extensive lexical material, continuing the tradition of former researchers, provide Comparative Slavistics with a base which can be used in new works. The most promising lexico-semantic groups

of words for comparative linguistic studies have been brought out by the author of the article. These include different aspects of human nominations (by relationship, by kinds of occupation, by speech habits, by special particularities of physical structure, etc.), names of folklore mythological characters (werewolves, domovoys, leshys, vodyanoys, etc.), plants, domestic and wild animals, etc. The sources of the material, new meanings and forms of already included words, which can add new lexical units to the dictionary, are also indicated in the article. Among them are lexicographical works, educational and scientific literature regarding the Rusin subject.

Keywords

Rusin Studies, Rusinian-Russian Dictionary, lexicographical Source

Galina N. Starikova, Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: g_starikova@yandex.ru

The Ruthenian and Slovak Languages in the Current Laws of Croatia

D. A. Katunin

Tomsk State University
36 Lenin Avenue, Tomsk, 634050, Russia
E-mail: katunin@mail.tsu.ru

Русинский и словацкий языки в современном законодательстве Хорватии

Д. А. Катунин

Published in: Rusin. 2014. Vol. 36. Is. 2. pp. 296–311 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1103&article_id=34096

The aim of the study is to determine the status of the Slovak and the Ruthenian (Rusin) languages in the laws of the Republic of Croatia of the state, regional and municipal levels from the proclamation of independence of the state from Yugoslavia to the present day: the Constitution laws on language and national minorities, international treaties, statutes of the provinces and municipalities densely populated by the largest part of the Rusin and the Slovak diasporas. The laws of the unrecognized Republic of Serbian Krajina (RSK) governing the use of languages and scripts in its territory during the existence of the self-proclaimed state are considered separately. Statistical data of the 1991, 2001 and 2011 censuses in Croatia on the absolute and relative number of Rusins and Slovaks, as well as on the number of those who had Rusin and Slovak as their mother tongue, are given.

Analysis of language rights of Croatian Rusins and Slovaks in one article is grounded by the common destiny of the diasporas: these peoples are close historically, culturally and linguistically; in addition, their migration from the north to the south of the Kingdom of Hungary (including the territory of modern Croatia) in the 18th – 19th centuries took place at the same time and largely for the same reasons: because of the lack of a sufficient number of allotments in the Carpathians and

their availability in the Middle Danube after the expulsion of Turks from there.

Totally, according to the 2011 census, Croatia has 4,753 Slovaks (0.11% of the total population) and 1,936 Rusins (0.05%). Comparison of the results of the three latest censuses shows a downward trend in their number (this is especially noticeable when specifying Slovak and Rusin as a mother tongue), due to both assimilation and emigration.

Despite this small size, Slovaks and Rusins are officially recognized national minorities, whose rights (including language ones) are recognized and protected by the state. Thus, according to the preamble of the Constitution, Croatia is declared a national state of the Croatian people and of autochthonous national minorities, Slovaks and Rusins among them. Thus, Croatia is the only country in the world that mentions the Rusin people in its Constitution. Also, the Basic Law of the country guarantees the members of all national minorities can freely use their languages and scripts.

In 1997, Croatia ratified the European Charter on Minority and Regional Languages of the Council of Europe and committed itself to the protection and development of seven such languages, including Slovak and Rusin.

In addition, Croatia has adopted a number of laws regulating the rights of national minorities to use their languages. The first of them is the 1992 Constitutional Law on Human Rights and Freedoms and Rights of National and Ethnic Communities or Minorities in the Republic of Croatia, which guarantees the freedom of use of languages and scripts of national minorities in the private and public spheres, and also allows the units of local government to grant an official status to these languages and scripts if a minority makes up the majority of the population of a municipality.

The issue in question is regulated in most detail by the special 2000 Law on the Use of the Language and Script of Ethnic Minorities in the Republic of Croatia, which fixes, among other things, the conditions for minority languages to obtain an official status and the spheres of their use. The following conditions are sufficient: predominance of representatives of national minorities in the population of a municipality, availability of appropriate obligations in international treaties signed by Croatia, fixation of the official status of a language in the fundamental laws (statutes) of a community, city or county (*županija*) at the time of the adoption of the law.

The 2002 Constitutional Law on the Rights of National Minorities supports the provisions of the above law regarding the official use of languages and scripts of ethnic minorities and states that this right is

guaranteed in the units of local government where the minority is at least one-third of the total population of the municipality.

Most Croatian Rusins live in the eastern region of Croatia, Vukovar-Srijem County, with 1,150 people (0.64% of the region's population) by the 2011 census, but Rusins do not constitute one third of the population necessary for the introduction of the Rusin language and script in official use in any municipality. However, despite this, the basic laws of two communities – Bogdanovci and Tompojevci – contain (or contained) mention of the Rusin language. Thus, the first 1994 Statute of the municipality of Bogdanovci indicated that the Serbs, Rusins and Ukrainians were entitled to use their languages officially. It should be noted that during this period the Croatian authorities did not control the territory of this newly formed community, because its settlements were part of the self-proclaimed Republic of Serbian Krajina. The Statute of the municipality of 2001 mentioned the Rusin language only, without providing it with any official status; the right to use it is claimed in one village – the village of Petrovci.

The 1994 Basic law of the community of Tompojevci (whose territory at that time was also part of the RSK) had no mention of the language, the 2001 Statute gave Rusins and Hungarians the right to use their languages in two villages, but in the 2009 and 2013 editions the mention of Rusin and Hungarian disappeared.

The majority of Croatian Slovaks live in Vukovar-Srijem County: 1,185 (0.66%) people and in Osijek-Baranja County: 2,293 (0.75%). Slovaks make up over a third of residents (666 (36.94%) people), which is necessary to declare their language official, in the municipality of Punitovci only. However, the statute of the community has no provisions on languages and scripts. In the reports on the implementation of its legislation on the language rights of national minorities, the Government of Croatia explains this fact by the lack of interest on the part of the Slovak minority in this matter.

The article draws conclusions about the unevenness and inconsistency of the Slovak and Rusin language rights reflection in modern Croatian legislation. On the one hand, despite the small number of Slovaks and Rusins in Croatia, their rights to preserve and develop their language and cultural identities are enshrined in Croatia's laws. This particularly applies to the Constitution of the state where they are listed as autochthonous national minorities that along with the Croats make up the Republic of Croatia. The Constitution also guarantees the free use of languages and scripts of all national minorities. In addition, the language rights of the Slovaks and the Rusins (as well as five other

peoples) are enshrined in much detail in the Law on the Ratification of the European Charter on Minority and Regional Languages.

On the other hand, the laws of the regions and municipalities densely populated by Slovak and Rusin minorities virtually do not reflect these rights. For example, the statutes of the two eastern counties contain only general provisions on the free use of their languages and scripts by representatives of unnamed national minorities. At the municipal level, such rights of Rusins are fixed in only one village of the Bogdanovci community. Similar provisions, previously part of the statute of the Tompojevci community, were deleted. The statute of the Punitovci community where Slovaks make up a third of the population has no mention of the Slovak language, the Croatian authorities explain this fact by the reluctance of the Slovaks themselves to give an official status to their language.

Keywords

Rusins, Rusinians, Ukrainians, Rusin language, Ukrainian language, national minorities, Slovak language, official language, Croatia, Serbian Krajina.

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/31

The Rusinian and Ukrainian languages in the Current Laws of Serbia

Dmitry A. Katunin

Tomsk State University
36 Lenin Avenue, Tomsk, 634050, Russia
E-mail: katunin@mail.tsu.ru

Языковые права русинов, украинцев и других национальных меньшинств в законодательстве Республики Сербия

Д. А. Катунин

DOI: 10.17223/18572685/39/15

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 39 Is. 1. pp. 229–238 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1109&article_id=23039

The aim of the research is to determine the language rights of the Rusin, Ukrainian and other national minorities as fixed in the laws of the Republic of Serbia.

Rusins and Ukrainians began to settle in the territory of modern Serbia from the middle of the 18th century, when the government of the Austrian Empire made a decision to populate the lands seized from the Ottoman Empire. At present, according to the 2011 Census, the number of Rusins and Ukrainians in Serbia is small: less than half a percent in total: 14,246 (0.20%) and 4,903 (0.07%) people respectively. Based on the 1981 – 2011 census results in Serbia, data are given on the negative dynamics of the absolute and relative number of Rusins and Ukrainians, as well as the number of those who have Rusinian (Rusin) as their mother tongue. Most of Serbian Rusins and Ukrainians live in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina: 13,928 and 4,202 respectively (2011).

Despite the fact that Rusins make up 0.2% of the population of Serbia, and Ukrainians even less than 0.1%, they were officially recognized as

national minorities, whose rights (including language) are recognized and protected by the state. The Constitution of the Republic of Serbia in the relevant section (Art. 75 and 79) provides for a broad implementation of the language rights of the national minorities in record management, education, place name labels and signs, media, etc. in autonomous provinces and units of local government where such minorities form a considerable part of the population.

In addition to the Constitution, implementation of the language rights of the national minorities is regulated by a number of republican laws. For example, in 1991 a law was passed "On the Official Use of Languages and Alphabets", which stated that minority languages can be introduced into official use in municipalities and provinces by basic laws (statutes) of the territorial-administrative units.

These rights are confirmed and specified in the law of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia "On the Protection of the Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities" (2002). According to this law, local governments are obliged to introduce into official use the language and alphabet of a national minority which makes up at least 15% of the total population according to the latest census. If a language has this status before the adoption of the law, the status is reserved for it, regardless of the number of people who speak it at the time of the latest census. The law also explains in detail what is meant by the "official use of minority languages": their use in court proceedings and in government, in communication with the authorities, in the publication of documents, in official records in ballots, etc. In addition, the names of the local government units, settlements, squares and streets, bodies exercising public functions, etc. are also given in the language of the national minority.

It should be noted that, although Rusins do not make up 15% of the population in any of Serbia's municipalities, six communities have the Rusinian language in official use in their municipalities.

The right of municipalities to approve the official use of minority languages and alphabets is also fixed in Serbian laws "On Local Self-Government" of 1999, 2002 and 2007.

In 2005, the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) of the Council of Europe, and committed itself to the protection and development of ten such languages in Serbia (including Rusinian and Ukrainian) and two in Montenegro (Albanian and Romani).

The Council of Europe adopted ECRML in 1992, and today 33 of the 47 states which are members of the Council of Europe signed and 25 ratified it. The Charter in its main part (Part III) consists of a set

of obligations in relation to regional or minority languages, of which the states that signed the document should select and ensure the implementation of no less than 35 paragraphs and subparagraphs of six articles in this Part (it contains seven articles in total).

According to the law on the ratification of the Charter, the Republic of Serbia has committed itself to ensure that the language rights of national minorities are observed in the following areas: education, court proceedings, administrative and public activities, media, culture, economic and social life and cross-border exchanges.

The article concludes that, although the national minorities in Serbia amount to about 12% of the population (and the number of people who did not give Serbian as a mother tongue is even smaller), the language rights of this category of the population are widely and fully reflected in modern Serbian legislation: in the Constitution of the state and in a number of special laws. The federal and international documents describe in detail the possibility of public functioning and development of the minority languages. However, it should be noted that Serbian legislation delegates a large part of these obligations to the units of regional and municipal levels: provinces and communities. Accordingly, to have a complete idea of the language rights of the Rusinian, Ukrainian and other national minorities of Serbia is possible only after considering the regional and local laws, which will be done in the following publications.

Keywords

Rusins, Ukrainians, Rusinian language, Ukrainian language, national minorities, Serbia.

Dmitry A. Katunin, Tomsk State University. (Russia).

E-mail: katunin@mail.tsu.ru

DOI: 10.17223/23451785/1/32

The Language of the Rusins of Bessarabia in the Works of the Pre-Revolutionary Ethnographers

S. G. Sulyak

St. Petersburg State University

7/9 Universitetskaya Embankment, Saint Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

***Язык русинов Бессарабии в трудах
дореволюционных этнографов***

С. Г. Суляк

DOI 10.17223/18572685/41/1

Published in: Rusin. 2015. Vol. 41. Is. 3. pp. 14–24 (In Russian).

URL: http://journals.tsu.ru/rusin/&journal_page=archive&id=1271&article_id=23098

The Rusinian language of the Carpathian-Dniester lands was the official language of the Moldavian Principality until the beginning of the 18th century. It had a considerable impact on the development of the Moldavian language. There are approximately 2,000 East Slavic adopted and loan-words in the basic wordstock of the modern Moldavian language. Bukovina, a region of compact settlement of the Rusins became the centerpiece of the principality founded along the lines of the Old Russian principalities in the second half of the 14th century. In 1774 a larger part of Bukovina was incorporated into Austria, and the territory between the Prut and the Dniester rivers named Bessarabia was included in the Russian Empire in 1812.

In one of my works I cited the information on the Rusins of Bessarabia, which had been gathered by researchers of the imperial period, concerning their distribution, size and the time of their arrival to the province. In my opinion, not less interesting are the descriptions of the local characteristics of Bessarabian Rusins' spoken language in the works of Russian researchers, published in the second half of 19th – early 20th centuries. Language, as we know, is not only an

integral part of the culture but also one of the most important factors determining ethnic identity.

In one of his letters from Bessarabia (Novoselitsa, November 29, 1848), I. S. Aksakov wrote: "But how delighted I was moving from Moldavians to Rusnaks. Here in this part of the Khotyn County, most of the population are Rusnaks, same as those who live in Bukovina and Galicia; they speak a lot more correct Russian than the Little Russians do".

By the way, the fact that "the Rusinian language is closer to the Great Russian language than all the Southern Russian dialects" was noted by V. I. Kelsiev during his travels across Bukovina and Galicia (The author called the Bukovina Rusins "Rusnaks").

A. I. Zashuk stated that the Rusins speak "Southern Russian, a little different from the Little Russian language". S. V. Potocky backed this opinion.

A. S. Afanasiev-Chuzhbynsky believed that the language of the Rusins of Bessarabia was "a specific dialect of Little Russian which adopted some Moldavian and Turkish (very few) words, but that dialectal form was very old and did not undergo further transformations". He also drew attention to the fact that "the postpositive is placed before the verb, but they do not use it now in Little Russia". "A Rusnak says, *-sia smiati* (to laugh), *sia khvaliti* (to praise oneself), *sia turbovati* (to worry). The postpositive is used in the same way in conjugations: *ya sia nasmiav* (I laughed), *vin sia pokhvaliv* (he praised himself)". This feature was also noted by P. P. Chubinsky and P. Y. Nestorovsky.

Some words were pronounced with rearranged letters. P. Nestorovsky also mentioned it).

The instrumental singular feminine often has the form *-ou* instead of the ending *-oyu*, for instance, *rukou*, *nogou*. P. Chubinsky and P. Nestorovsky mentioned it too. It should be noted that this form was preserved in some villages in the north of Moldavia until the 1960s.

A. Afanasiev-Chuzhbynsky noted that Rusins replaced purely Little Russian words with Rusin words in Little Russian songs. The researcher also wrote about the influence of the Moldavian language over Rusin.

P. Nestorovsky registered crisp, and sometimes firm, pronunciation of consonants and vowels in the dialect of Bessarabian Rusins, very different, in his opinion, from the "smooth and melodious Southern Russian".

The Rusin sound *u* often sounds just as firm as the Great Russian *ы*. The matching of the sounds *u* and *ы* that exists in the Little Russian language has not been observed in Rusin. The researcher points out that the *ы* is a completely separate, independent sound in Bessarabian

Rusins' dialect as well as in the Lemko dialect. *Мышь* (mouse), *сыр* (cheese), *рысью* (at a trot), *мы* (we), *ты* (you) and a number of other words are pronounced in the same way as in the Great Russian language.

The researcher also points out that the language of the Rusins of Bessarabia contains a lot of borrowed words from the other languages: Polish, Moldavian, Great Russian and, probably, some words of Turkic and of unknown origin.

During the First General Census of the Russian Empire in 1897, the language of the Rusins of Bessarabia was not separated from the Little Russian language. In the official statistics the Rusinian language was categorized as Little Russian due to a close similarity between the Rusin and "the real Little Russians' dialects". That was why Russian languages were subdivided into Great Russian, Little Russian and Byelorussian in the table "Distribution of Population by Mother Tongue" in the "Groups and Languages" column. In the "Little Russian" column there is a reference: "including those who indicated Rusin as their native language". There were 64 such people registered in towns and villages. This fact allowed the Ukrainian scholars in Moldavia to assert that "in the late nineteenth century Rusins in the Khotyn County were involved in the overall process of consolidation of the Ukrainian nation, due to which they lost the sense of belonging to an ethnic group and acquired an all-Ukrainian identity. According to the 1897 census, the Rusins were numbered among the Ukrainians, and only 64 people identified themselves as Rusins". These scholars ignored the fact that the census was conducted in respect of languages but not ethnicity, and the Ukrainian language was not mentioned in it. In my opinion, a small number of the Rusinian language native speakers specified in the census is likely to indicate the level of education of the census takers who, due to the low literacy of the population (the population identified themselves as the Russians/Rusins), filled in the census forms at their own discretion.

For example, I happened to see completed census questionnaires in the National Archives of the Republic of Moldova. It was registered in one of them that the Rusnak family (6 people) (v. Ataky, Soroka County, Bessarabia), M. A. Bela (an Austrian subject born in Chernovtsy, Bukovina) and a certain P. N. Statsiuk (born in Snigorovka, Barsukovsky District, Kremenetsky County, Volhynia Province) designated their native language with the "R." which just meant Russian. Thus, a number of Rusins could probably indicate Great Russian as their mother tongue.

It was noted in a lot of research papers that at the beginning of the 20th century, even at the most conservative estimate, more than

270,000 inhabitants of Bessarabia considered themselves to be Rusins.

Therefore, most of the imperial era researchers classified Bessarabian Rusins' language as belonging to one of the Little Russian branches. However, they noted its peculiarities and originality, some surviving old forms and its similarity with the Great Russian language. The researchers mentioned the fact that the language of the Rusins of Bessarabia was heavily influenced by the Moldavian, Polish and Russian languages.

Unfortunately, so far no research has been conducted on the dialects of the population (Rusins and their descendants) in the north of today's Moldova. This topic is only partially addressed in several research papers.

The process of globalization leads to major changes in culture, to its unification and the destruction of cultural identity and traditional values. Currently, the Rusin native speakers in Moldova are the older generation, living mainly in small villages. Their number is decreasing yearly.

Nowadays, the research into linguistic peculiarities of local dialects in the villages of the North of Moldova and publishing the Rusin dictionary become increasingly pressing.

Keywords

Bessarabia, Bukovina, Moldova, Rusins, Rusnaks, Rusinian language.

Sergey G. Suluak, St. Petersburg State University (Russia).

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Innesa I. Babenko, PhD in Philological sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Language Theory and Methods of Teaching Russian Language and Literature of Tomsk State Pedagogical University (Russia).

E-mail: uchim.russkij@tspu.edu.ru

Yurij V. Danilets, PhD in Historical sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine of Uzhhorod National University (Ukraine).

E-mail: jurijdanilec@rambler.ru

Dmitry A. Katunin, PhD of of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the General, Slavonic-Russian Linguistics and Classical Philology Department of Tomsk State University. (Russia).

E-mail: katunin@mail.tsu.ru

Vasilij V. Kotsan, PhD in Historical sciences, director of the Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life, Associate Professor of the History of Ukraine of the Uzhgorod National University (Ukraine).

E-mail: vasilkotsan@ukr.net

Olga V. Orlova, Grand PhD of Philological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Language Theory and Methods of Teaching Russian Language and Literature, of Tomsk State Pedagogical University (Russia).

E-mail: uchim.russkij@tspu.edu.ru

Zoya I. Rezanova, Grand PhD of of Philological Sciences, Chair of the Department of General, Slavonic-Russian Linguistics and Classical Philology of Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: rezanovazi@mail.ru

Konstantin S. Shilyaev, PhD of of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of General, Slavonic-Russian Linguistics and Classical Philology of Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: shilyaevc@gmail.com

Tatyana Ya. Sologub-Kotsan, Head of the Department of Scientific and Educational Work of the Transcarpathian Museum of Folk Architecture and Life (Ukraine).

E-mail: sologubt@rambler.ru

Galina N. Starikova, PhD of of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Language of Tomsk State University (Russia).

E-mail: g_starikova@yandex.ru

Sergey G. Sulyak, PhD in Historical sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of History of the peoples of the CIS countries of the Institute of History of St. Petersburg State University (Russia).

E-mail: sergei_suleak@rambler.ru

Mikhail G. Yurasov, PhD in Historical sciences, Senior Researcher of the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia).

E-mail: mihail_yurasov@mail.ru

Rusin Studies

An Abstracts Journal

Русинские исследования. Реферативный журнал
Rusinskiye issledovaniya. Referativnyi zhurnal

2018, Vol. 1

Association “Rus” (Moldova)
Tomsk State University (Russia)

– 104 pages

Website: http://journals.tsu.ru//rusin_studies

Founders and Publishers:
Association “Rus” (Moldova)
Tomsk State University (Russian Federation)

Editor's address: Association “Rus”
P.O. box 1041, Kishinev, MD 2028, Moldova
Tel.: (+373 22) 28-75-59.
E-mail: journalrusyn@rambler.ru

Release date 28.12.2018
Format 60x90 1/16.
PT Sans
Order № 135.
Circulation of 110 copies

All manuscripts are peer reviewed by experts in the respective field. Authors of the manuscripts bear responsibility for their content, credibility and reliability. Editorial board doesn't expect the manuscripts' authors to always agree with its opinion.

