



# Society. Document. Communication

Journal homepage: <https://sdc-journal.com.ua/en>  
*Society. Document. Communication*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 82-91

**Article's History:** Received: 21.11.2023 Revised: 29.01.2024 Accepted: 29.02.2024

UDC 94 (477.87):930.2(044)

DOI: 10.69587/sdc/1.2024.82

## Correspondence between Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Hiiador Strypskyi as a source of personal cooperation

Nelia Svitlyk\*

PhD in Historical Sciences  
Uzhhorod National University  
88000, 3 Narodna Sq., Uzhgorod, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6377-5813>

**Abstract.** The relevance of this publication lies in the recognition that private epistolary heritage is a crucial source for comprehensive historical research. It is an indispensable component for both a broader understanding of the historical context of events and for a deeper exploration of the biographical data of historical figures. This publication aimed to characterise 23 handwritten letters written by the Transcarpathian scholar H. Strypskyi to the Lviv ethnographer V. Hnatiuk, as well as to analyse the themes of the letters and the socio-cultural issues discussed therein. To achieve this goal, general historical and special methods of historical research were used, namely: critical and comprehensive methods of source analysis, historical-comparative, and biographical. In this publication, based on the processed letters, the ways of cultural unification of Ukrainians in the Austro-Hungarian Empire were analysed, in particular, book trade, joint cultural events, organisation in Transcarpathia reading rooms, concerts, and the collection of manuscript sources. The process of establishing personal contacts between scholars has been explored. Based on the analysis of the letters, the linguistic assimilation of Transcarpathian Ukrainians by the Hungarian authorities has been examined. The study also analyses the spread of Moscophile ideas and the concepts of political Ruthenianism in Transcarpathia, which hindered the rapprochement of the local population with Ukrainians across the Carpathians and ultimately led to the suppression of national revival in the region. The correspondence between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi, who maintained a warm and friendly relationship, is presented as a prime example, not only of personal ties but also as a source for studying the social atmosphere and cultural-educational situation of Ukrainians in the Habsburg monarchy. This research holds practical value as its materials can be utilised both in academic investigations and in the teaching of regional history at universities and schools

**Keywords:** epistolary heritage; cultural contacts; scholarly relations; national revival; linguistic identity; Ruthenians-Ukrainians; the intelligentsia

### Introduction

Personal and institutional interactions among the Ukrainian intelligentsia within the Austro-Hungarian Empire were a crucial component of the national revival process and cultural rapprochement, ultimately becoming one of the primary catalysts for the formation of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian identity. The position of Ukrainians

within the Habsburg Empire was fraught with numerous challenges, including constant opposition from Polonophilia and Magyarization, which hindered the development of national self-consciousness. A significant challenge to cultural life was also the emergence of Russophile (Moscophile) sentiments among a cohort

### Suggested Citation:

Svitlyk, N. (2024). Correspondence between Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Hiiador Strypskyi as a source of personal cooperation. *Society. Document. Communication*, 9(1), 82-91. doi: 10.69587/sdc/1.2024.82.



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

\*Corresponding author



of Ukrainian activists, which were dominant in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These ideas also gained considerable traction in Transcarpathia. Amid the conflicts between Polonophile, Rusophile, and Ukrainophile identities – and, in Transcarpathia, also against Magyarization – by the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, a popular Ukrainian identity ultimately prevailed. The process of cultural unification among Ukrainians within the Habsburg Empire played a significant role in this development. However, it is important to note that throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, cultural and national rapprochement among Ukrainians within the empire was primarily based on personal relationships between the scholarly circles of society. The events of the Spring of Nations provided the impetus for the establishment of such cooperation, and it was from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century onwards that more stable scholarly contacts could be observed. In the 1870s and 1880s, this cooperation was almost completely halted. Nevertheless, at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, following the establishment of Ukrainophile and populist-oriented institutions in Lviv – such as the Prosvita society and the Shevchenko Scientific Society – cultural contacts revived once more. A crucial component of the national revival was the dissemination of national ideas to all regions of Ukraine. This mission laid the foundation for a new phase of cultural rapprochement between Transcarpathia and Galicia.

Among the cohort of Galician intellectuals of this period who laboured towards the national unification of Ukrainians, a notable figure was the renowned ethnographer and member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Volodymyr Hnatiuk. The scholar played a decisive role not only in the study of Transcarpathia but also in the process of national awakening among the local population. Through his travels to Transcarpathia, Hnatiuk established personal contacts with many local figures, particularly with Yu. Zhatkovych, Yu. Stavrovskiy, and H. Strypskyi. The private correspondence between Hnatiuk and these individuals contains valuable information about the key aspects of their personal collaboration and its role in the process of national revival and cultural development of Ukrainian lands. This is particularly true of the epistolary heritage between Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Hiiador Strypskyi, which serves as an important source for studying the socio-cultural situation not only in Transcarpathia but throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The historiographical foundation of this publication primarily consists of materials dedicated to the biographies and scholarly work of V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi, respectively, as their private correspondence has not yet been the subject of a separate study. The ethnographer V. Hnatiuk stands out in terms of the number of published studies, with scholars beginning to study his academic contributions as early as the late 1920s. One of the first researchers to examine Hnatiuk's ethnographic work, particularly in the context of studying Transcarpathia, was V. Kaminskyi, a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, who highlighted the significance

of the ethnographer's work for the national consciousness of Carpathian Ukrainians. Several studies on the figure of the Lviv ethnographer were also published during the Soviet period. Importantly, these research contained valuable factual material, although their methods are now outdated (Payonk, 2021). The Shevchenko Scientific Society (ShSS), of which Hnatiuk was a long-standing member, also played a significant role in popularising his work. In honour of the 110<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth, a special volume of the ShSS Notes was published, featuring his selected works, many of which focused on Carpatho-Ukrainian studies. This comprehensive edition has not lost its relevance to this day. However, further study of Hnatiuk's figure, particularly his collaboration with the Transcarpathian intelligentsia, was delayed, and its renewed attention can only be noted after the declaration of Ukraine's independence.

A significant contribution to the study of Volodymyr Hnatiuk as a researcher of Transcarpathia belongs to the Slovak historian M. Mushynka (1975), who dedicated many years to examining the scholarly work of the Lviv academic and published a bibliography of the ethnographer's works. Due to censorship in Soviet Ukraine, the researcher primarily published his materials abroad, notably in Paris in 1975 with the work "Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Transcarpathia" which for the first time comprehensively illuminated Hnatiuk's Transcarpathian studies. One of Mushynka's most recent works on Volodymyr Hnatiuk, titled "Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Life and his Activities in the Field of Folkloristics, Literary Studies and Linguistics", was published in 2012. In this work, the researcher not only provides biographical data but also analyses the main achievements of the Galician scholar in various scientific fields. The work is based on a thorough source base, including, as the author noted, materials from over 700 volumes of the publications of the ShSS (Mushynka, 2012). Importantly, Mushynka was also one of the first to begin researching the collaboration between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi, publishing his study of the Transcarpathian scholar titled "Bright spirit of Hungarian Ruthenia", which remains relevant today (Mushynka, 1995).

Among the most recent studies dedicated to various aspects of V. Hnatiuk's scholarly work, it is worth mentioning the publication of historian M. Hlushko (2018), who emphasises Hnatiuk's role in the formation of Ukrainian studies as a science. The monograph by historians I. Zulyak & H. Zulyak (2018) is one of the most recent publications of Hnatiuk's epistolary heritage. I. Priymak (2019) also delves into the epistolary sources of the Ukrainian ethnographer's work, publishing several archival materials. However, these publications scarcely address the correspondence sent to V. Hnatiuk from Transcarpathia. This layer of archival sources still requires research.

Comparatively fewer scholarly works have been dedicated to various aspects of the Transcarpathian linguist H. Strypskyi's activities in comparison to Volodymyr Hnatiuk. The first objective and unbiased assessment

of the scholar's life and creative path was given by historian M. Lelekach (1943). Several scholarly works dedicated to Strypskyi have been published since independence, among which it is worth mentioning the works of I. Khlanta (2007) and A. Galas (2013; 2019). However, these authors consider Strypskyi's work only in the context of his linguistic studies, bypassing the scholar's contribution to the process of cultural unification between Ukrainian lands. The Hungarian researcher I. Udvari (2007) has published several works and archival materials related to the Transcarpathian scholar.

In recent years, the figure of the Transcarpathian linguist has received little scholarly attention. The same applies to the correspondence between H. Strypskyi and V. Hnatiuk, which remains largely unexplored. Although Hnatiuk's extensive epistolary heritage is occasionally published, there are few publications of letters from his correspondence with scholars from Transcarpathia. An exception is the correspondence between Hnatiuk and Yu. Zhatkovych, which was published by the Uzhhorod historian O. Mazurok in the 1990s (1995). As for the correspondence between Hnatiuk and Strypskyi, it is only mentioned sporadically in individual publications by N. Svitlyk (2010) but has not yet become the subject of a separate study.

This publication aims to investigate and analyse the private correspondence between the Galician ethnographer Volodymyr Hnatiuk and the Transcarpathian cultural and educational figure Hiiador Strypskyi. It also seeks to summarise the issues raised by the authors in their personal correspondence to better understand the socio-cultural and political situation of Ukrainians in the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. To achieve this goal, both general historical and specific methods of historical research have been employed. In presenting the material of this publication, classical principles of historical knowledge and contemporary general scientific methods have been applied, as these are deemed the most significant and appropriate for a comprehensive and multifaceted examination of the issues at hand. The primary methods employed in this research include critical and comprehensive source analysis, as referenced in Kaminskiy (1929). This enabled a thorough evaluation of the entire dataset about the subject matter and the establishment of objective connections between individual sources comprising the research's source base. Furthermore, the application of these methods in working with the sources facilitated the identification of reliable and essential information. The biographical method was also crucial for this study, as its use is indispensable when examining historical figures. Additionally, the research utilised classic historical research methods such as historical-comparative, historical-genetic, and descriptive-narrative approaches. The application of these methods allowed for a more comprehensive and sequential exploration of the research problem.

### ■ Establishment of personal cooperation between Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Hiiador Strypskyi

Volodymyr Mykhailovych Hnatiuk (1871-1926) was a renowned Ukrainian ethnographer, linguist, and folklore researcher, and an esteemed member of the ShSS, known for his scientific research in various fields. At the same time, the scholar is rightfully considered an authoritative researcher on the issues of Carpatho-Ukrainian studies. Hnatiuk is the author of a substantial scholarly legacy. Hnatiuk's extensive scholarly legacy has been published numerous times, with one such publication being a bibliographic index of his works released by a collective of authors in 2007 (Hnatiuk, 2007). The most recent publications of Hnatiuk's scholarly works on Carpatho-Ukrainian studies are the publications of his materials in scholarly collections. For example, Hnatiuk's articles on the national revival of Ukrainians in Austria-Hungary were published as a separate volume, collecting the scholar's publications devoted to the formation of Ukrainian national identity among the Ruthenians of the Habsburg monarchy. Hnatiuk's greatest contribution to the study of Transcarpathia is the publication of several volumes of "Ethnographic Materials from Hungarian Ruthenia", where he published materials collected during his scientific expeditions. This work has been republished several times, with the latest reprint published in 2019 (Hnatiuk, 2019). A significant amount of material on Transcarpathia is also contained in the collection of Hnatiuk's articles entitled "Selected Articles On Folk Art", republished in 2020 (Hnatiuk, 2020).

V. Hnatiuk was a prominent member of the so-called "Hungaro-Ruthen Committee", established by Galician intellectuals specifically to organise research in Transcarpathia. Between 1895 and 1896, he organised and conducted three ethnographic expeditions to the region. During these expeditions, Hnatiuk visited Máramaros, Bereg, and Ung counties, as well as parts of Ugocea and Zemplén counties. In essence, he travelled throughout almost all of present-day Transcarpathia. Based on the materials collected during these expeditions, the scholar conducted a thorough ethnographic study of Transcarpathia, processing a significant body of literary and folklore material. Alongside his research, Hnatiuk established collaborations with local intellectuals, aiming to involve them in the shared processes of national revival. The idea of cultural and national rapprochement between Ukrainians in Transcarpathia and Galicia had already taken root among Galician scholars and had acquired new significance during a period of increasing politicisation and radicalisation within Ukrainian society. At the initiative of Transdniprian's civic activists, particularly M. Drahomanov, the centre of the Ukrainian national movement was to be transferred to the Galician "Piedmont", from where the ideas of nation-building would spread to other parts of Ukraine. The path to fostering national sentiment among the population of Transcarpathia was chosen to be



cultural and educational uplift, involving them in shared national processes in which the Galician intelligentsia would play a significant role. Given the opposition of the Hungarian authorities, this path seemed the most optimal.

V. Hnatiuk played a significant role in establishing closer personal relationships with Transcarpathian intellectuals. According to the scholar's vision, this was to contribute not only to the cultural advancement of Transcarpathia but also to become a primary factor in the region's national consciousness. The educated local intelligentsia was seen as the future backbone for promoting national ideas. However, establishing a high-quality academic collaboration proved to be quite challenging. The impressions of Hnatiuk and other Galician intellectuals who had visited Transcarpathia were overwhelmingly negative regarding the region's socio-economic and cultural situation. Under the pressure of Hungarian assimilation and entrenched Moscovophile views in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, national sentiment had almost vanished in Transcarpathia. This posed a new challenge for the Ukrainian intelligentsia. In the process of shaping the national idea in Galicia and striving to spread it to all corners of Ukraine, domestic intellectuals endeavoured to activate cultural rapprochement among all Ukrainians within the Habsburg Empire.

A significant role in promoting Ukrainophile national ideas in Transcarpathia was played by members of the ShSS, particularly by Hnatiuk. The scholar purposefully involved Transcarpathian intellectuals in educational activities. During his expeditions, Hnatiuk established personal contacts with the Transcarpathian cultural and educational elite. The Galician ethnographer maintained private correspondence with certain individuals throughout his life. This epistolary heritage currently serves as an important resource for investigating personal collaboration between scholars. Notably, Hnatiuk had private correspondence with Transcarpathian scholars such as Yu. Zhatkovych, H. Strypskyi, and Yu. Stavrovskiy. The publication and detailed study of this correspondence will shed light on new aspects of cultural and scientific cooperation on either side of the Carpathians.

The correspondence between the aforementioned individuals, although primarily focused on establishing the main avenues of cultural collaboration, is quite varied in nature. The primary difference lies in the quality of the relationships between the authors of the letters. The correspondence between Hiiador Strypskyi and Volodymyr Hnatiuk is distinct in that it lacks formality, as the scholars shared a rather warm and friendly relationship. The indicated correspondents not only discussed work-related matters, but their correspondence contained a great deal of personal information. This nature of the epistolary heritage allows researchers to delve more deeply into the issues of collaboration between scholars.

Hiiador Strypskyi (1875-1946) was a renowned Transcarpathian scholar, literary critic, and researcher of language and Transcarpathian folklore. His long-standing

friendship with Volodymyr Hnatiuk is evidenced by their private correspondence. It is believed that the two scholars first met in 1897 thanks to the Transcarpathian priest Yu. Zhatkovych, who was actively collaborating with Hnatiuk at that time. This meeting significantly influenced Strypskyi's future career and, more importantly, his national identity. It was through Hnatiuk's influence that Strypskyi was able to study in Lviv. Specifically, he enrolled in the Faculty of Philosophy at Lviv University, where he became part of a circle of Ukrainian intellectuals, attending lectures by prominent figures such as M. Hrushevskiy and O. Kolessa. He also became acquainted with members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, including O. Rozdolskyi, I. Verkhratskyi, and S. Tomashivskiy, through whom he engaged in educational and scientific work within the society.

The young H. Strypskyi was deeply impressed by the level of cultural development, scholarly activity, and civic engagement in Galicia. Such a level was clearly lacking in Transcarpathia at that time. He was particularly captivated by the activities of the "Prosvita" society. Under the patronage of V. Hnatiuk, Strypskyi conceived the idea of establishing similar institutions in Transcarpathia. One of the first steps in this direction was the founding of a reading room in the Transcarpathian Skotarske. The Galician cultural elite also aspired to this goal, and members of "Prosvita" actively supported the establishment of the reading room, providing it with literature and encouraging local residents to participate in educational activities. Thus, again with Hnatiuk's assistance, on November 29, 1897, the Lviv "Prosvita" sent a large collection of Ukrainian literature to the reading room founded by Strypskyi in Transcarpathia. Along with the books, a letter was sent to Strypskyi expressing the wish for him to "...live many more years and continue to work in the field of education and economics." At the same time, Strypskyi was urged to "...encourage everyone, where hears the echo of Ruthenian song, to join the "Prosvita" society" (Mushynka, 1995).

### ■ The main aspects of personal cooperation between scientists

The personal collaboration between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi was multifaceted and encompassed various aspects of interregional relations. During this period, cultural contacts on both sides of the Carpathians intensified, exhibiting a distinctly Ukrainophile character. A striking example of this revitalisation was the organisation of reciprocal visits by groups of students, pupils, and choirs, in which both scholars played an active role. In assessing H. Strypskyi's Ukrainophile orientation, V. Hnatiuk referred to him as the "bright spirit of Hungarian Ruthenia", suggesting that, in contrast to local figures who predominantly favoured Magyarophile or Moscovophile sentiments, Strypskyi could actively promote the Ukrainian idea in Transcarpathia. In particular, Hnatiuk wrote: "As for the literary language, he was for a long time almost the only one among the Hungarian

Ukrainians who adhered to a pure Ukrainian orientation" (Hnatiuk, 1897). Thus, it is evident that the Galician scholar valued Strypskyi for maintaining his Ukrainian identity in the face of Magyarization pressure and for his willingness and ability to disseminate this identity among his compatriots.

The collaboration between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi was further strengthened by the latter's direct involvement in the activities of the ShSS and his increased publications in Galician periodicals. Strypskyi authored numerous works that were published both in Transcarpathia and Galicia. His collaboration with the ShSS was particularly fruitful. The Transcarpathian scholar collected materials for Hnatiuk and sent his own research for publication. Even during his student years, Strypskyi had been working on collecting Transcarpathian folklore. As his personal correspondence reveals, during summer vacations he travelled through the Carpathian counties and recorded 50 fairy tales and nearly 1000 songs in Bereg, Ugocsa, and Máramaros counties, which he subsequently sent to Hnatiuk and Ivan Franko for publication. Significantly, in his folklore research, Strypskyi was the first Transcarpathian collector to use a phonograph. Strypskyi was also the first Transcarpathian to become a full member of the ShSS. On March 4, 1914, he was unanimously elected a full member of the historical-philological section of the ShSS.

H. Strypskyi's journalism further stimulated cultural cooperation. He frequently published his works under the pseudonym Ya. Bilenkyi in Galician periodicals. For example, in 1907, under this pseudonym, he wrote his most extensive study "Older Ruthenian Writing in Hungary" for the Transcarpathian newspaper "Nauka". This article is a clear testament to Strypskyi's nationalist stance and his sincere admiration for the Galician elite. As the scholar wrote: "At that time, our closest brothers, the Galician Ruthenians or Ukrainians, turned their attention to our Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Among them were Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Ivan Verkhratskyi, Ivan Franko, Stepan Tomashivskyi, and Ilarion Svetsitskyi... Through their works, they attracted the attention of the entire world at a time when our people, under Magyars pressure, were forced to remain silent, and when the Magyars celebrated the millennium of their domination over other nations, it was only the Galician Ukrainians who protested on our behalf before the whole of Europe" (Strypskyi, 1918).

By publishing this article, H. Strypskyi emphasised the role of Galician scholars in opposing Magyarization in Transcarpathia. He referred to the manifesto "We Are Also in Europe", which was signed by the Galician elite and published in the newspaper "Zhytie i Slovo" as a protest against the grand celebrations in Hungary marking the millennium of the state's founding. Members of the ShSS welcomed the Transcarpathian scholar's stance. For example, reviewing Strypskyi's aforementioned article, one of the foremost experts on Transcarpathia, historian S. Tomashivskyi, rightly remarked: "If the

Transcarpathian Ukrainians heed their own wise voice, we will witness a new era in the history of Hungary Ruthenian" (Mushynka, 1995).

### ▀ The content of the epistolary heritage

It should be noted that the correspondence between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi has not been fully preserved. In the Manuscript Department of the V. Stefanyk Lviv National Scientific Library, within the V. Hnatiuk collection (No. 34), 23 letters from H. Strypskyi to V. Hnatiuk are kept, comprising 37 pages. The first letter was written in 1897, and the last in 1918. Only a few of these have been published sporadically. By the late 1990s, five letters had been printed in the work "Volodymyr Hnatiuk. Documents and Materials" (Dashkevich *et al.*, 1998). Most of the letters have survived in satisfactory condition, although two are missing their conclusions, and one lacks both the beginning and the end. A considerable number of the letters are also undated by the author.

The correspondence between the two scholars is characterised by a light, informal tone, indicative of a close friendship between the correspondents. Each letter begins with a warm greeting such as "Dear friend" or "Dear Volodymyr". The subjects of the letters are varied. Aside from personal matters and everyday affairs, the letters contain valuable information on issues related to fostering cultural cooperation, including book exchanges, the collection of manuscripts, the organisation of cultural events in Transcarpathia, the establishment of periodical publications, the founding of reading rooms, and the creation of museums.

The first letter, that survives, from Hiiador Strypskyi to V. Hnatiuk is dated April 28, 1897. This is a lengthy and quite interesting letter in which Strypskyi analyses his collaboration with the Hungarian newspaper "Keles", where he published articles opposing Moscophilia in Transcarpathia. From the content of the letter, it is evident that Strypskyi openly mocks the Transcarpathian Moscophiles. In particular, he writes to Hnatiuk: "...my article was published in issue No. 16 of Keles, with the second half to appear in issue No. 17. Our moskals will be twisting their moustaches" (Strypskyi, 1897-1918). The reference here is to Strypskyi's article "A Few Words About Our Ethnography", published under the pseudonym Ruskotsi in several issues of the Hungarian publication Keles. In addition to comments on this publication, the letter also discusses the distribution in Transcarpathia of Hnatiuk's articles "Bright Spirits in Hungary" and "Dark Spirits in Hungary", which were published in the publication "Bukovyna" and also addressed the issue of the spread of Moscophilia ideas in Transcarpathia. Strypskyi notes that he was inspired to publish his own materials by Hnatiuk's stance on Moscophilia in Transcarpathia.

The next letter to V. Hnatiuk, written in the autumn of 1897, in addition to a range of personal details about the challenges of student life, provides valuable information about H. Strypskyi's collaboration with Stepan

Tomashivskiy, a full member of the ShSS. In particular, the letter mentions that Strypskyi spent some time translating documents from books sent to him by Tomashivskiy into Hungarian. Tomashivskiy collected these for the publication of his historical studies on Transcarpathia. This letter also references Strypskyi's collaboration with ShSS. He notes that he received the books he had ordered from the society and sent his own materials for publication in ShSS journals.

The lengthy letter to V. Hnatiuk, dated 31 December 1897, reveals that at the time, H. Strypskyi was in Lviv and was preparing to return to Transcarpathia. This letter addresses several significant issues relevant to this study. Firstly, Strypskyi discusses the comprehensive publication of Hnatiuk's "Ethnographic Collection" and its potential impact on readers in Transcarpathia. The Transcarpathian scholar remarks sceptically: *"On 29 December, I sent the "Ethnographic Collection" to Uzhhorod, and when I am in Ungvár (6 January), I will already be in a position to gather some responses from our patriots"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918).

Secondly, in this letter, the author touches upon the language issue in Transcarpathia, a subject of considerable contention between Galician and Transcarpathian scholars. The reluctance of some Transcarpathian intelligentsia to write in the vernacular, and their preference for the Moscovite "lazychie", posed a significant obstacle to national unity. Strypskyi expresses a negative view of the Transcarpathian intelligentsia's attitude towards the language question in the region. To support his arguments, the scholar quotes a passage from an article by an unknown author published in the Transcarpathian newspaper "Lystok" edited by Ye. Fentsik: *"An interesting proclamation can be read in "Lystok". An uncle writes about national enlightenment, stating that it can only be achieved through education in the vernacular, yet simultaneously declares: "We want to develop our literary language based on Church Slavonic". Is not that foolishness?"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918). This refers to the unwillingness of a portion of the Transcarpathian intelligentsia to develop a living vernacular language, and instead to introduce anachronisms of Old Church Slavonic, Rusisms, and lazychie into literature, which only contributed to Magyarization in the region.

At the end of the aforementioned letter, Strypskyi provides interesting details about how the Galician intellectuals perceived the journal "Visnyk", whose publication was revived in Lviv in the 1890s. In particular, in this letter the following is read: *"It was truly remarkable, to be honest, when Franko, Pavlyk, Shchurat, Lavrovskiy, and other gentlemen gathered at Schneider's, and after a long wait, Makovey arrived with a whole stack of "Visnyk" under his arm. We quickly grabbed them and solemnly began reading with such reverence, like the early Christians in the catacombs reading the Gospels"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918). This message is evidence of another fact that is important for this study. The point is that H. Strypskyi,

in addition to his connections with V. Hnatiuk and S. Tomashivskiy, was also well-acquainted with and even moved within the close circle of prominent Galician figures, including I. Franko and M. Pavlyk.

A particularly interesting and valuable letter from Strypskyi to Lviv, dated 30 July 1898, concerns the attempt to organise choral concerts in Transcarpathia – a project in which both figures were actively involved. The letter reveals that such events were held with the support of Galicians, aiming to revitalise Ukrainian cultural life in the region. However, the efforts to organise these events were frequently hindered by the opposition of the Hungarian authorities and bureaucratic obstacles. According to the letter, Strypskyi was tasked with overcoming these challenges as much as possible. Specifically, the Transcarpathian scholar was responsible for the organisational aspects of the concerts, establishing contacts with the necessary individuals, and obtaining the required permits. In this letter, Strypskyi outlines the necessary documents for organising the concert and highlights the key people to approach, including the capitular lawyer Silard Smolijovych and the Uzhhorod canon Kapradov (Stripskyi, 1897-1918).

The letter continues by detailing the necessary steps for organising the concert, including the required documents and permits. Strypskyi methodically outlines the demands for holding such events. The Transcarpathian scholar emphasises the importance of providing all necessary information in Hungarian, as *"no other language will be accepted"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918). This highlights the extent of Magyarization in the region, where even citizens' petitions were only accepted in Hungarian. The letter goes on to address other organisational aspects, including funding, invitations, and the income from the concert, which *"...must be handed over to the magistrate"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918).

In this letter, Strypskyi also draws attention to certain conventions and the "whims" of the Transcarpathian audience, who might potentially attend the organised concerts. In particular, the scholar writes that the local *"audience is spoiled by such formalities as the Poles or ordinary Magyars, who might not even attend a concert if they saw posters hastily scrawled in pencil"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918). Consequently, he believes it would be prudent to print new invitations and posters, as well as to raise ticket prices, because *"it should be at least 1 zloty, not just 1 koruna"* (Stripskyi, 1897-1918). This observation appears somewhat peculiar against the backdrop of the general decline of cultural life in Transcarpathia at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The likely reason is that the ordinary populace of Transcarpathia, who were both creators and admirers of Ukrainian culture, probably had little opportunity to attend such events (Pankevich, 1910–1926). The audience Strypskyi refers to comprises a small group of wealthier townsfolk, who were largely Magyarized and could easily exhibit such spoiltness due to their banal reluctance to engage with "folk culture" events.

Unfortunately, there is no information available regarding whether the aforementioned concerts actually took place and what impressions they left behind. The recipients also did not mention this, as there was a noticeable gap in communication between H. Strypskyi and V. Hnatiuk following the letter referenced above. The next letter sent to Lviv is dated 15 January 1906. The reason for this prolonged hiatus in their correspondence remains unknown. Some researchers suggest that certain contradictions may have arisen between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi on linguistic grounds. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Strypskyi changed his national loyalty, increasingly expressing sympathy for the idea of "Carpatho-Ruthenism" and the formation of a "regional" language, subsequently refusing to promote Ukrainophile ideas in the region. However, it is also possible that some letters were lost, which could explain this gap in their correspondence.

The letter dated 15 January 1906 is quite lengthy and emotionally charged in its content. In it, Strypskyi addresses several issues. Initially, he states that he has received the books sent to him, but he does not know who they are from – whether they are from Hnatiuk or the ShSS – because no accompanying letter was included. This fact greatly outrages Strypskyi: *"But how is it possible to send something in such a Ruthenian manner, without a single line of correspondence, without any information? After all, this is such a noble favour to a poor Hungarian-Ruthenian: here are your books, and now silence yourself!"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918).

To analyse the cultural and national situation in Transcarpathia at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it is important to note that in this letter, H. Strypskyi characterises the well-known Uzhhorod newspaper "Nauka", which began publishing in the region in 1897, as the printed organ of the Society of St. Basil the Great, and from 1902, the "Unio" society. The newspaper was intended to become a new centre for progressive ideas, publishing in the vernacular; however, it once again became embroiled in the language issue. The opposition between the Moscophiles and Magyarophiles in Transcarpathia did not allow Ukrainian culture to progress. In characterising this publication and its then-editor, Pr. Yuliiian Chuchka, H. Strypskyi returns to the problem of Moscophilia among the Transcarpathian intelligentsia. He informs V. Hnatiuk of the futility of the latter's efforts to establish national ideas in Transcarpathia. After discussing with the editor of "Nauka", Yu. Chuchka, Strypskyi remarks that *"...it is a pity about the books you send him"* (Strypskyi, 1906). He also observes that no one reads the books sent to the editorial office, stating that *"...if only he would read at least one of them and if at least one thought gleaned from the Ukrainian books would resonate in his soul, it would have been fine"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918). However, *"...all the Ukrainian books he has are not torn apart without use"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918). Furthermore, H. Strypskyi notes that the work of the Uzhhorod editor is significantly influenced by

Galician publications with a pronounced Russophile orientation, mentioning the newspaper "Halychanyn", edited by the Russophile B. Didytskyi, and the journal "Pravoslavna Bukovyna". From the work of I. Svetsitskyi, "The Revival of Carpathian Ruthenia", the editor *"...sets out the goals of admission to "Nauka"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918).

Overall, the content of this letter reveals how strong the positions of Moscophilia were in Transcarpathia even at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, the letter also highlights another fact: the gradual strengthening of the Ukrainian vernacular idea in Transcarpathia. The aforementioned newspaper "Nauka" played a significant role in this process, especially when A. Voloshyn, the creator of the Ukrainian national idea in Transcarpathia and the future president of Carpathian Ukraine, became its editor. In the same letter, H. Strypskyi introduces V. Hnatiuk to the figure of A. Voloshyn. In particular, Strypskyi writes about him: *"Voloshyn is a fairly good material, but unrefined, he has good intentions, so he tried to write in the vernacular in "Nauka", but he does not have his own developed principles..."* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918).

Regarding the subsequent correspondence between the correspondents, it should be noted that it becomes increasingly formal, losing the ease of communication that was characteristic of the previous correspondence. In the next few letters, H. Strypskyi mainly describes the process of collecting old prints and folklore materials for V. Hnatiuk. Thus, in a letter dated October 24, 1908, H. Strypskyi informs V. Hnatiuk that the editorial board of the Hungarian publication "Szazadok" has tasked him with making brief excerpts from all volumes of the ShSS Notes for a Hungarian bibliography, and therefore he asks Volodymyr Mykhailovych to send him 19 volumes of the Notes that he lacks.

The next letter, written to Lviv on January 24, 1914, followed another break in their mutual communication. Hiiador Strypskyi once again raises the issue of the intensification of Magyarization in Transcarpathia, which, on the eve of the World War, had taken on an even more reactionary character. In particular, responding to V. Hnatiuk's call to intensify mutual cooperation between the Galician and Transcarpathian intelligentsia to counter the new measures of Magyarization, the scholar writes that it is in vain for him to hope for help from the Transcarpathian intelligentsia in spreading the vernacular, and this especially applies to teachers, as they can only contribute to Magyarization. In particular, to confirm this, H. Strypskyi mentions the main features of school education in Transcarpathia and the role of teachers in strengthening Magyarization. He also notes that V. Hnatiuk is in vain waiting for help from the Transcarpathian intelligentsia, as *"...since the time of the Ap-patiievnyi School Law, every teacher must take an additional oath, apart from the governmental one, that they will not engage with foreign people"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918). It should be noted that "foreign people" also included Galicians, and therefore Transcarpathian teachers were



officially forbidden to cooperate with them and were only allowed to work for widespread Magyarization. This ban existed for a reason. According to the Hungarian authorities, it was intended to stop the spread of the Ukrainian national idea in Transcarpathia.

In the next letter, dated March 4, 1914, information about H. Strypskyi's election as a full member of the ShSS in Lviv, for which he expresses his gratitude to V. Hnatiuk and S. Tomashivskyi can be found. The author of the letter also reports that a sociological society was founded in Budapest at that time, whose members could be representatives of all nationalities. H. Strypskyi wrote that he also became a member of this society on behalf of the Transcarpathian Ruthenians and shared his impressions of the first meeting with V. Hnatiuk. The Transcarpathian scholar noted that at the very first meeting of the society, the problems of nationalities and national policy in Austria-Hungary were discussed. Hiiador Strypskyi recalled that he spoke on this occasion, taking the opportunity to openly declare the problem of the assimilation of Ukrainians in Hungary. In particular, in the letter he writes about it as follows: *"I spoke out openly against the government's national policy, against the fools of the Vrablev family, lazzychie, the current education system, and discussed the economic and cultural situation of the Ruthenians"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918). H. Strypskyi also notes that *"...the audience was particularly interested in lectures on the historical background, the establishment of Orthodoxy among us, and Moscovophilic tendencies"* (Strypskyi, 1897-1918).

Interestingly, in this letter, H. Strypskyi first shares with Hnatiuk the idea of forming a new "regional Hungarian-Rusyn language" in Transcarpathia, as he considers it impossible under the existing circumstances to promote Ukrainian phonetics here, which he calls overly Polished. Strypskyi also encourages the Galician scholar to help establish a corresponding cultural society in Uzhhorod and introduce the new language into literature. This information indicates a gradual departure of H. Strypskyi from Ukrainian nationalism and joining the new trend of Carpatho-Ruthenism, which distinguished the Transcarpathian population as a separate people from other Ukrainians. V. Hnatiuk, who remained a steadfast Ukrainophile until his death, was displeased by this shift in the views of his former friend, resulting in a deterioration of personal relations between the two scholars.

The next few letters from H. Strypskyi to V. Hnatiuk are written in Hungarian and are undated. These letters were likely written around the end of 1918. In these letters, H. Strypskyi wrote to V. Hnatiuk that he was forced to write in Hungarian to avoid persecution by the authorities, and asked if Hnatiuk could learn Hungarian so that he could write to him in Hungarian as well. As the content of the letters indicates, Magyarization measures were once again intensified in the country, even though Hungary would subsequently lose Transcarpathia, which in the interwar period became part of Czechoslovakia under the name of Subcarpathian Ruthenia.

By early 1919, the personal, friendly relations between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi had completely broken down. The main reason was the change in H. Strypskyi's views, as he gradually moved away from Ukrainophilia. His transition to Carpatho-Ruthenism, and his changing views on shared cultural unity, history, and language, led to the loss of their friendly communication. H. Strypskyi believed that the Galician intelligentsia was making futile attempts to return the Transcarpathian people to Ukrainophilia, while V. Hnatiuk, in turn, noted that he had never thought that H. Strypskyi *would "...ever abandon the branch of our nation for which he has worked for over two decades"*.

Logically, personal correspondence between the scholars ceased, and the loss of friendly relations between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi is evident in V. Hnatiuk's letters to the Galician linguist I. Pankevych, who worked in Transcarpathia in the interwar period, and was well acquainted with the socio-cultural situation in the region, and was also acquainted with H. Strypskyi. Thus, in one of his letters to I. Pankevych, written on July 13, 1924, there were reflections of V. Hnatiuk about the new views of H. Strypskyi. In particular, in this letter, the Galician scholar mentions H. Strypskyi's Hungarian-language article "Moscophilia, Ukrainianism, and domestic Rusnaks", which was published in Budapest in 1913 and in which he advocates for the formation of a regional Ruthenian language in Transcarpathia. Hnatiuk notes that the Transcarpathian linguist did not send him the article, which he believes was due to shame: *"...because it contradicts all his previous writings. He... supposedly defends the local language, which is neither Great Russian nor Ukrainian-Polish, but Little Russian. But this is just throwing sand in the eyes..."* (Hnatiuk, 2019).

This excerpt from the letter indicates the final transition of H. Strypskyi from Ukrainophilia positions to those of "Ruthenianism". It should be noted that the problem of the formation of a political Ruthenian movement in Transcarpathia became another stumbling block on the way to the formation of a national identity for the Transcarpathian Ukrainians, which played into the hands of the Hungarian authorities and only led to the intensification of Magyarization in the region. This also led to a weakening of Galician-Transcarpathian cultural ties. As a result, at the beginning of World War I, the Transcarpathian Ukrainians entered the war without a stable national identity. The situation improved in the interwar period when the region became part of Czechoslovakia. It should be emphasised that V. Hnatiuk, despite the loss of contact with H. Strypskyi, continued to care about Transcarpathia until the end of his life and strived for its unification with the common Ukrainian national root.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, the study of the epistolary heritage between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi has enabled an exploration of one aspect of the cultural life of Ukrainians

within the Habsburg Empire, which is crucial for a deeper understanding of the challenges and key elements in the development of personal collaboration between Galician and Transcarpathian scholars. This correspondence remains incomplete, as the return letters from V. Hnatiuk to H. Strypskyi have not survived; and they would have made it possible to depict a more complete picture of their friendly but at the same time complex relationship. Nevertheless, the letters analysed above serve as a valuable resource for examining the cultural and scientific contacts among the intelligentsia of Transcarpathia and Galicia during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

In summary, it is worth noting that the private correspondence between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi touched upon many important topics that reflected the nature, trends, and challenges in establishing cultural relations between the Transcarpathian and Galician intelligentsia. The analysed letters contained both personal information of a private nature and information of general cultural significance. In particular, they mentioned jointly organised and conducted cultural events, active book exchange, scientific trips, ethnographic expeditions, folklore collection, etc. The epistolary heritage of the scholars was rich not only in details of cultural life but also contained valuable information about the circles of communication of the addressees, their national and socio-political ideas, and the challenges they had to overcome on the path to national self-awareness. The letters indicated that H. Strypskyi, at the beginning of his academic career, was strongly influenced by the Galician

model of national revival and actively sought to transfer these ideas to the Transcarpathian context. However, these same letters also indicated that there were many obstacles in the way of cultural and, especially, national unity between Transcarpathia and Galicia, which ultimately destroyed even such friendly personal relationships as existed between V. Hnatiuk and H. Strypskyi.

At the same time, this epistolary heritage has become a valuable source for studying the socio-cultural situation in Transcarpathia, the problems of the spread of Moscovophilia and Magyarization, and once again demonstrated how difficult the path to affirming Ukrainian national identity was here. Among the multiple loyalties that Ukrainians faced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, only a few individuals, such as V. Hnatiuk, firmly stood on national positions. In contrast, H. Strypskyi became an example of a change in loyalty at the local, personal level, which was not uncommon at that time. Most importantly, this correspondence revealed that the idea of promoting the Ukrainian national idea in Transcarpathia had firmly taken root among the Galician intelligentsia. This stance among the scholarly community of the time ultimately played a decisive role in the triumph of Ukrainian national identity in Transcarpathia.

#### ■ Acknowledgements

None.

#### ■ Conflict of Interest

None.

#### ■ References

- [1] Dashkevich, Ya., Kupchinskyi, O., Kravets, M., Pelts, D., & Sysetskyi, A. (1998). *Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Documents and materials (1871-1989)*. Lviv: Shevchenko Scientific Society.
- [2] Galas, A. (2013). *Linguistic parameters of H. Strypskyi's epistolary*. *Modern Problems of Linguistics and Literary Studies*, 18, 16-21.
- [3] Galas, A. (2019). Hiiador Strypskyi in the history of Ukrainian linguistics in Transcarpathia. *Scientific Bulletin of Uzhhorod University. Philology Series*, 2(42). doi: 10.24144/2663-6840.2019.2.(42).28-37.
- [4] Hlushko, M. (2018). *Volodymyr Hnatiuk – at the origins of the formation of Ukrainian studies*. *Ethnological Notebooks*, 6(144), 1366-1375.
- [5] Hnatiuk, V. (1897). A bright spirit in Hungarian Rus. *Bukovyna*, 87-88.
- [6] Hnatiuk, V. (2020). *Selected articles on folk art*. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature.
- [7] Hnatiuk, V. (2019). *Ethnographic materials from Hungarian Rus. Legends and novels*. Kharkiv: Folio.
- [8] Kaminskyi, V. (1929). Hungarian Ukraine in the ethnographic works of Academician V. Hnatiuk. In *Launch of the historical and philological department UAS* (pp. 149-174). Kyiv.
- [9] Khlanta, I. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Transcarpathia: Prominent Persons of the 20th Century*. Uzhhorod: Grazhda.
- [10] Lelekach, M. (1943). Subcarpathian literature at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Zorya-Goinal: Journal of the Podcarpathian Society of Sciences*, 229-257.
- [11] Mazurok, O. (1995). The letters of Yu. Yu. Zhatkovich to V. M. Hnatiuk as a source for the study of the cultural ties of Transcarpathia with other Ukrainian lands and Russia in XIX – at the beginning 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Karpatyka*, 3, 123-159.
- [12] Mushynka, M. (1975). *Volodymyr Hnatiuk and Transcarpathia*. Paris.
- [13] Mushynka, M. (1995). Bright spirit of Hungarian Rus. *Carpathian Region*, 1-4, 46-50.
- [14] Mushynka, M. (2012). *Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Life and his activities in the field of folkloristics, literary studies and linguistics*. Ternopil: Scientific book-Bohdan.
- [15] Pankevich, I. (1910-1926). *Letters to V. Hnatiuk. Manuscript*. Lviv: Department of Manuscripts of the Lviv Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine named after V. Stefanyka.

- [16] Payonk, M. (2021). [Volodymyr Hnatiuk: folklorist, ethnographer, literary critic \(1871-1926\)](#). Ternopil: "Textbooks and manuals" publishing house.
- [17] Priymak, I. (2019). [Epistolary discourse of V. Hnatiuk \(based on archival sources\)](#). *Actual Problems of Philology and Translation Studies: A Collection of Scientific Papers* 16, 163-166.
- [18] Stripskyi, G. (1897-1918). *Letters to Hnatiuk V.M. Manuscript*. Lviv: Department of Manuscripts of the Lviv Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine named after V. Stefanyka.
- [19] Stripskyi, H. (1874). *From the older literature of Hungarian Rus. Manuscript*. Lviv: Central State Historical Archive in Lviv.
- [20] Stripskyi, H. (1875). *My impressions in Lviv. Manuscript*. Lviv: Central State Historical Archive in Lviv.
- [21] Svitlyk, N. (2010). [Epistolary heritage as a source of study of cultural contacts of Transcarpathia and Halychyna \(1848-1918\)](#). *UzhNu Scientific Bulletin. History Series*, 24, 198-207.
- [22] Udvari, I. (2007). *A collection of sources about studies of Ruthenian writing. III. Giador Stripskyi, ethnographer, bibliographer, linguist, typist*. Niredgaz.
- [23] Zulyak, I., & Zulyak, H. (2018). [Volodymyr Hnatiuk. From the epistolary heritage](#). Ternopil: Yu.M. V. Osadtsa.

## Листування Володимира Гнатюка із Гіядором Стрипським як джерело особистої співпраці

Неля Світлик

Кандидат історичних наук

ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»

88000, Площа Народна, 3, м. Ужгород, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6377-5813>

**Анотація.** Актуальність тематики публікації виражена тим, що приватна епістолярна спадщина є важливим джерелом для ґрунтовних історичних досліджень. Вона необхідна складовою як для ширшого розуміння історичного контексту подій, так і для глибшого вивчення біографічних даних історичних постатей. Метою публікації було охарактеризувати 23 рукописні листи, написані закарпатським вченим Г. Стрипським до львівського етнографа В. Гнатюка, а також проаналізувати тематику листів, соціо-культурні проблеми, які обговорювалися в них. Для досягнення поставленої мети використано загальноісторичні та спеціальні методи історичного дослідження, а саме: критичний і комплексний методи аналізу джерел, історико-порівняльний, біографічний. В даній публікації, на основі опрацьованих листів, було проаналізовано шляхи культурного єднання українців Австро-Угорської імперії, зокрема книготоргівлю, спільні культурні заходи, організацію на Закарпатті читалень, концертів, збирання рукописних джерел. Досліджено процес становлення особистих контактів між вченими. На основі аналізу листів, розглянуто мовну асиміляцію закарпатських українців з боку угорської влади. Також було проаналізовано шляхи поширення на Закарпатті москвофільських ідей та ідей політичного русинства, що ставали на заваді зближення місцевого населення з українцями по той бік Карпат та врешті приводили до стримування національного відродження в краї. У статті було встановлено, що листування В. Гнатюка і Г. Стрипського, які мали доволі теплі, дружні відносини є яскравим прикладом не тільки приватних відносин, а й джерелом для вивчення суспільної атмосфери та культурно-освітнього становища українців в імперії Габсбургів. Дане дослідження має практичну цінність, оскільки його матеріали можуть бути використані як у наукових розвідках, так і при викладанні краєзнавчої історії у вузах та школах

**Ключові слова:** епістолярна спадщина; культурні контакти; наукові взаємини; національне відродження; мовна ідентичність; русини-українці; інтелігенція