

KAMIL DWORNIK*

First Subcarpathian Episode of Ruthenian Alphabet War in 1873–1874¹

DWORNIK, K.: First Subcarpathian Episode of Ruthenian Alphabet War in 1873–1874. *Slavica Slovaca*, 55, 2020, No 2, pp. 198-210 (Bratislava).

In December 1873, the Hungarian Ministry of Religion and Education called the Greek Catholic bishops of Mukachevo and Prešov to view their opinion on the possibility of abolishment of the Cyrillic and adoption of Latin alphabet in Hungarian transcription for Ruthenian language. The bishop of Prešov decided to assign the task to canon Aleksandr Roikovyč whereas in Mukachevo eparchy a scientific commission prepared the document. The *Karpat* newspaper edited by Mykola Homichkov in Uzhhorod became a platform for the Greek Catholic priesthood to express their opposition to ministry's request and call for preservation of the old script. The following contribution aims to analyse the official responses from both eparchies in order to examine the symbolic meaning of Cyrillic alphabet for Ruthenian culture in Carpathian Ruthenia.

Script change, alphabet war, Cyrillic, Magyarization, Ruthenian, Ukrainian.

After the Compromise of 1867, the Kingdom of Hungary² was re-established as a separate entity of dual Austro-Hungary. Since then the national minority issues lay exclusively within the competence of each part of the Danubian monarchy. The Magyar elites imagined their country as centralized state on the pattern of France with a single political nation and a single official language.³ Building the unitary state for a multinational population was going to be a challenge. Nevertheless, the Magyars had a very favourable position in comparison with the other nations of the Royal Hungary. They formed the largest population in the country; however, they did not outnumber all national minorities. The dense settlement in the centre of Hungary was their important asset. Moreover, the Magyar social structure included powerful aristocracy and clergy that secured the economic advantage and represented national interests. Despite the initial hegemony the Magyar national leaders feared that someday the Slavonic, Romanian and German middle-class and intelligentsia might challenge their political supremacy in the Royal Hungary.⁴

The Nationalities Law of 1868 declared the whole population of the Lands of the Crown of Saint István a single indivisible Hungarian nation in the political sense. Despite the proclamation of equality of all citizens regardless of their ethnic origin, the liberal law became an instrument of chauvinistic

* Kamil Dwornik, MA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5231-3744>, University of Warsaw, Department of Central and East European Intercultural Studies, Szturmowa 4, 02-678 Warszawa, Poland.

¹ The present inquiry was implemented as a part of the project no. 0065/DIA/2012/41 „Alphabet as part of the ethno-national emancipation in the Habsburg Monarchy. The case of the Ukrainian national movement (1808–1914)” granted by Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

² Note on proper names and transliteration: the present-day names of town were used, e.g. „Mukachevo” instead of „Munkács”. The names of historic counties of the Kingdom of Hungary were preserved in original eg. „Sáros”. The first names were used in their national forms, e.g. István, Vasyľ, Aleksandr. The letter ⟨b⟩ was rendered in Latin alphabet as ⟨i⟩ and the soft sign ⟨ь⟩ as an apostrophe ('). The hard sign ⟨ѣ⟩ was omitted.

³ Maxwell, A.: *Choosing Slovakia: Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak language and accidental nationalism*. London – New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2009, p. 15.

⁴ Scotus V. [Seton-Watson, R.W.]: *Racial problems in Hungary*. London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1908, p. 147; Mésáros, J.: *Maďarizácia a asimilácia v Uhorsku od konca 18. storočia do roku 1918*. In: *Historický Časopis*. Bratislava: Historický ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1997, vol. 45, no. 2, p. 302.

tyranny. By giving the Hungarian language the sole official language status, it privileged its native speakers hence the ethnic Magyars. The separate national minorities (Jews, Germans, Romanians, Ruthenians, Serbs, Slovaks) were not recognized and thus not granted with any protection of collective rights and independent national institutions.⁵ The only concession to the non-Magyar population was a right to limited usage of minority language in courts or church administration.⁶ The rights of Croats in Croatia-Slavonia were regulated by a separate Croatian-Hungarian settlement.

According to British historian Robert W. Seton-Watson, almost all Magyar elites of that time shared the view that the suppression of minorities' aspirations and their cultural assimilation (Magyarization) will secure the existence of Royal Hungary and domination of Magyars. Though József Eötvös, Ferenc Deák, and Kálmán Tisza differed radically in their choice of methods. The first two preferred the policy of small concessions, financial incentives, and advancement opportunities within the Magyar society. On the other hand, K. Tisza represented generation of younger nationalists that expected the hard-line approach of administration terror: persecuting of minority leaders, subjecting them to fines, disbanding the cultural institutions and confiscating their possessions.⁷

In September 1872 Ágoston Trefort⁸ was appointed a minister of education and religion in József Szlávy's cabinet. Nearly half year later during a parliamentary debate over ministry's budget Trefort called for raising the public expenditure for education, science, and art.⁹ According to the new minister the public schooling should have been an investment in development of Hungarian economy rather than in the advancement of peoples of Royal Hungary. The utilitarian aims were soon realized in Trefort's decision to promote vocational education that gave more attention to practical skills useful in craft, industry, and commerce.¹⁰ In this context teaching liberal arts or minority languages was considered as wasting government's efforts to increase the national wealth.

Trefort's new educational strategy coincided with the gradual tightening in the Hungarian policy towards national minorities. The change affected among others the Ruthenians of Subcarpathian Rus. On 22nd December 1873, the ministry of religion and education sent a rescript no. 18894 to the Greek Catholic bishops of Mukachevo and Prešov. The religious leaders of Ruthenian community were asked to view their opinion on possibility of reform of the Ruthenian script. The ministry officials proposed to abandon the Cyrillic letters and adopt the Latin one based on the phonetic principle in new textbooks. The document was supplemented with a manuscript of primer that was translated from Hungarian to Ruthenian language ("уґро-руськое нарѣчје") by Josyf Chosyn.¹¹ The ministry was suggesting that the script change should begin with the children's reader, because the Hungarian government sponsors publishing of school textbooks exclusively in pure Ruthenian vernacular. Moreover, the ministry officials claimed that the Romanians, Serbs, and Bulgarians have already developed

⁵ Frank, T.: Hungary and the dual monarchy, 1867-1890. In: Hanák, P. – Sugar, P. – Frank, T. (eds.): A history of Hungary. Bloomington – Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994, p. 255.

⁶ Maxwell, A.: Choosing Slovakia: Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak language and accidental nationalism, op. cit., p. 26.

⁷ Scotus V. [Seton-Watson, R.W.]: Racial problems in Hungary, op. cit., p. 147.

⁸ Ágoston Trefort (1817-1888), Hungarian politician, scholar and publicist born in Humenné in Zemplén county. After graduating law from University of Pest he was a trainee in Sáros county board in Prešov. As a member of the Deák Party (later Liberal Party) he served as a minister of education and religion. Although, his reforms modernized Hungarian public education, they limited schooling in national minority languages. Cf. Fónagy Z.: Trefort, Ágoston (August), In: Santifaller, L. (ed.): Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015, vol. 14, p. 444.

⁹ Mann, M.: Ágoston Trefort, Gestalter ungarischer Kulturpolitik (1872-1888). In: Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981, vol. 27, no. 1/2, p. 149.

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 151.

¹¹ Josyf Chosyn (József Csaszin), Greek-Catholic priest and deputy school inspector of Zemplén County. Cf. Schematismus venerabilis cleri Graeci ritus catholicorum Dioecesis Munkacsiensis. Ungváriini: Typis Caroli Jäger & Alberti Répay, 1874, p. 17.

their vernaculars into national literary languages due to abolishment of „Old Slavonic but in principle Muscovite” spelling and adoption of Latin letters.¹²

The rescript was issued just three days before Roman Catholic Christmas. It is hard to judge if the ministry chose the time intentionally. Subcarpathian Rus’ was a religiously diverse region where people often celebrated Christmas also with their relatives and neighbours of different denomination. Minister Trefort who was born and brought up in Zemplén county must have been aware of local cultural niceties. Because of difference in Gregorian and Julian calendars, the Christmas time was there much longer than in predominantly Roman Catholic and Protestant parts of the Kingdom of Hungary. During that time due to higher attendance at the service, also the Greek Catholic clergy was much busier. Hence, it was harder to summon the meeting of the eparchial consistory and chapter. Nevertheless, the planned script change was considered as a matter requiring urgent attention.

Ivan Sil’vai in his contribution to Saint-Petersburg *Slavianskiy Sbornik* (Славянский Сборникъ) on the condition of Ruthenians in the Kingdom of Hungary was informing the Russian reading public that the Prešov eparchy rejected the idea of Latinization of the alphabet. The Ruthenian activist cherished hope that the similar response will soon be prepared in Mukachevo eparchy.¹³ Mykola Homichkov¹⁴ informed on 24th January that *Karpat* editorial team has received the response from the curia of Prešov eparchy and will publish it in following issue.¹⁵ Josyf Gaganets,¹⁶ the bishop of Prešov, decided to appoint a young canon Aleksandr Roikovych¹⁷ to prepare the official statement on his behalf.

In Uzhhorod, which was the official seat of Stefan Pankovych,¹⁸ bishop of Mukachevo, the issue was approached in a different manner. Sil’vai complained on frequent absences of bishop Pankovych who much of his time was spending on avoiding his duties and paying visits in Vienna and Pest.¹⁹ It is highly possible that when the Mukachevo curia received the rescript bishop Pankovych was out of

¹² „[...] не соотвѣтнѣе было бы ли [...] Читанки и вообще всѣ школьные учебники для народныхъ школь вмѣсто до сихъ поръ употребляемой Угро-рускими кириллицы латинскими буквами дати печатати? Тѣмъ болѣе, что Румыны и Сербы, какъ и Болгаре лишь отъ того времени въ состояніи на своемъ народномъ языкѣ чисто писати, отколи особенно два послѣдныя откинувъ мнимую (вѣлт) старославянскую но на дѣлѣ московскую правописи, и отверши кирилловскія буквы и замѣнивъ ихъ латинскими [...]”, *Карпаты*, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 1.

¹³ Ivan Sil’vai (1838–1904, p. Uriil Meteor) was Greek Catholic priest, cultural activist of Russophile orientation, author of poetry and ethnographic studies that were published in Subcarpathian Ruthenian newspapers and Russian Slavophilic journals. He was an opponent of the policy of Magyarization led by bishop Pankovych. The manuscript for *Slavianskiy Sbornik* was finished in January 1874. Cf. Метеоръ, У.: Положеніе угорскихъ русскихъ подъ управленіемъ Стефана Панковича, епископа Мукачевскаго. In: *Славянской Сборникъ*, 1875, vol. 1, p. 88; Magocsi, P. R. – Pop, I.: *Encyclopedia of Rusyn history and culture*. Toronto – Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2002, pp. 459–460.

¹⁴ Mykola Homichkov (1833–1886) was Greek Catholic priest, teacher of Ruthenian language in Uzhhorod gymnasium, Ruthenian national activists of Russophile orientation. Homichkov was founder and editor-in-chief of *Karpat* weekly, which was published in mix of Church Slavonic, local Ruthenian and Russian language (so-called „iazychie”). Cf. Бабота, Л.: *Закарпатська газета «Карпат» (1873–1886)*. In: Сополіга, М. (ed.): *Науковий збірник Музею української культури у Свиднику*. Пряшів, 1988, no. 1, p. 70.

¹⁵ *Карпаты*, vol. 2, no. 3 (24/12.01.1874), p. 4.

¹⁶ Josyf Gaganets (József Gaganecz, 1793–1875) was Greek Catholic priest, bishop of Prešov eparchy in 1843–1875, balanced between support of Aleksandr Dukhnovych’s literary and educational initiatives aimed at Ruthenian cultural revival and assimilatory demands of Hungarian government. Cf. Magocsi, P. R. – Pop, I.: *Encyclopedia of Rusyn history and culture*, op. cit., p. 127.

¹⁷ Aleksandr Roikovych (Sándor Rojkovics, 1835–1886) was Greek Catholic priest ordained in 1859, canon of Prešov chapter (1873), archdeacon of Szepes, teacher of religion in Prešov Catholic gymnasium. Cf. Листокъ, vol. II, no. 15 (1/13.08.1886), p. 335. Budapesti Közlöny, no. 29 (05.02.1873), p. 242; Nuber S. (ed.): *Az eperjesi kir. kath. főgymnasium 1875/6 tanévi értesítvénye*. Eperjes: Ipar- és Hitelbank könyvnyomdája, 1876, p. 29.

¹⁸ Stefan Pankovych (István Pankovics, 1820–1874) was Greek Catholic priest, bishop of Mukachevo eparchy in 1867–1874, pro-Hungarian loyalist at the time when the government began to introduce policy of Magyarization; hindered the cultural and publishing activity of the Society of Saint Vasyľ the Great. Cf. Magocsi, P. R. – Pop, I.: *Encyclopedia of Rusyn history and culture*, op. cit., p. 372.

¹⁹ Метеоръ, У.: *Положеніе угорскихъ русскихъ подъ управленіемъ Стефана Панковича, епископа Мукачевскаго*, op. cit., p. 65.

town. *Karpat* informed that the hierarch was in fact planning to come back to Uzhhorod to celebrate Greek Catholic Christmas at home. Moreover, bishop Pankovych was well-known for his support for change of liturgic calendar and limitation in number of church holidays that would unify the Slavonic Byzantine rite with the Latin one used by the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church.²⁰ The priests of Mukachevo eparchy, unlike their Prešov counterparts, generally did not support their bishop. Ukrainian historian Rostyslav Mayor points out that the Mukachevo clergy was divided in two opposing camps: the Ruthenian national populists and Hungarian loyalists. Bishop Pankovych was a leader of the latter party.²¹ Moreover, the consistory must have acted in haste to prepare the response, because the delay caused by the Greek Catholic Christmas, might have been used by minister Trefort as an argument against the Julian calendar. On 27th December 1873, the preparation of official response was delegated to the eparchial scientific commission.²² Despite the fact that *Karpat* did not provide any information about composition of the commission, it is highly possible that, facing the limited amount of time, the consistory did not create any collective body *ad hoc* but chose the permanent commission for school affairs.²³ *Karpat* reported that the commission met and turned down ministry's proposal.²⁴ The newspaper announced that the document would be published as soon as the eparchial consistory will approve it.²⁵ On 31st January 1874 *Karpat* informed that the Mukachevo consistory approved the document and send it to bishop Pankovych to Pest for submission it to the ministry. Nevertheless, in the same issue the Homichkov's newspaper informed that the bishop in following days is leaving to Vienna.²⁶ That is why it is not clear if bishop Pankovych read the text of response, approved its content and submitted the document to the ministry. Two weeks later the *Karpat's* columnist K. commenting the already sent responses referred to the Ruthenian „patriotic voice” of bishop of Prešov and Mukachevo chapter not saying a word about local bishop Pankovych. On the other hand, the Budapest newspaper *Magyar Politika* informed that bishop Pankovych in order to support the social and educational development of Ruthenian people appealed for change of the script from Cyrillic to Latin, introduction of modern Gregorian calendar, and unification of the Ruthenian Society of Saint Vasyl' the Great and the Hungarian Society of Saint István. According to the newspaper the Russophiles and Pan-Slavs party does everything it can to destroy Pankovych's idea to abolish Cyrillic letters. Nevertheless, the Hungarian paper supported all his progressive novelties and wished him success.²⁷ Moreover, *Magyar Allam* complained that bishop Gaganets, rejected to change calendar from Julian do Gregorian and to limit

²⁰ Ibidem, pp. 86-87.

²¹ Майор, Р.: Русофільство на Закарпатті в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.: генеза, розвиток та ідеологія. Ін: Русин, 2017, no. 47 (1), p. 163.

²² Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 1 (3.01.1874/22.12.1873), p. 4.

²³ In 1874 the members of the commission for school affairs were: Andrii Churhovych (Uzhhorod gymnasium professor emeritus), Ioann Mondok (Uzhhorod gymnasium professor), Josyf Baludians'kyi (Banská Bystrica gymnasium), Mykola Homichkov (Uzhhorod gymnasium), Kyryl Sabov (Szeged gymnasium professor), Josyf Chosyn (Zemplén deputy school inspector), Emilian Talapkovych (Ung and Bereg counties school inspector), Mykola Dolynai (military chaplain in Budapest), Mykola Val'kovs'kyi (Oradea Realschule professor). Cf. Schematismus venerabilis cleri Graeci ritus catholicorum Dioecesis Munkacsiensis, op. cit., p. 17 and 264.

²⁴ The exact date of the proceedings is not clear. On 17 January 1874, *Karpat* informed that the scientific council would gather on 18th January. It seems that the alphabet matter was given the highest importance and the scientific commission gathered even earlier. On 24 January 1874, the *Karpat* reported that the meeting took place on 10th January, what suggests either a typo or simple miscalculation of days, common when two calendars are in the daily use. The date printed below the text of response is 15th January. It is possible that this is the date when the final version of the text was written. Moreover, on 17th January *Karpat* reported that the response of Prešov eparchy has been already sent to the ministry. Cf. Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 2 (17/05.01.1874), p. 3 and 4; Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 3 (24/12.01.1874), p. 4, and Прибавление къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 2. Ін: Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (07.02/26.01.1874).

²⁵ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 3 (24/12.01.1874), p. 4.

²⁶ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 4.

²⁷ A magyarországi ruthének... Ін: Magyar Politika, no. 34 (12.02.1874), p. 1; Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 7 (21/09.02.1874), p. 4.

the number of church holidays. The newspaper hoped that bishop Pankovych together with his Transylvanian counterparts Ioan Vancea, Ioan Olteanu, Mihail Pavel would decide in favour of reforms.²⁸

Karpat published for its readers the text of both documents. The response from Prešov was printed in Ruthenian as a two-part article.²⁹ The Mukachevo response took the form of a two-sided insert with the left column in Ruthenian and the right with translation in Hungarian language.³⁰

Aleksandr Roikovych begins the response of Prešov eparchy with clarifying the misinterpretations of ministry. He points out that the Serbs and Bulgarians did not adopt the Latin letters but began to use the modernized „civil typeface” (Russian: *grazhdanka*). The Mukachevo scientific commission confirms that the mentioned above nations, leaving either in the Kingdom of Hungary or outside its borders, did not abandon the Cyrillic letters.³¹ Roikovych argues that no Slavonic people of the Slavonic Byzantine rite churches has ever stopped using the Cyrillic letters in the church, school and daily life. Only the Western Slavs and some of South Slavs (Slovenes, Croats, and few Bulgarians) who accepted Latin rite Christianity uses Latin letters.³² The Mukachevo commission confirms that it was long and disorganized process of gradual adaptation of the Latin signs to Slavonic languages. It also stands on the position that the alphabet issue is inseparably connected with the rite, hence it is a religious matter.³³ American linguist Peter Unseth is of opinion that religion is one of the most important factors of spreading scripts. Almost every major denomination is associated with certain type of script, e.g. Latin and Cyrillic alphabets with Christianity, Arabic abjad with Islam, Devanagari with Hinduism, etc. The conversion between denominations that uses different scripts usually results in a script change. Unseth calls this relation „Alphabet follows religion”.³⁴ Moreover, British anthropologist Jack Goody points out that the religions of the book, e.g. Christianity, are usually much less tolerant for any cultural change, because their literate believers can always consult any novelties with the written canons of faith.³⁵

The second ministry’s misconception was the suggestion that the Ruthenians in Latinization of script should follow the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Romanians. Roikovych stresses that the Romanians are not Slavs but Romance people, hence they recently restored the letters that they used before in order to be recognized by the French, Spaniards, and Italians as a Romance people.³⁶ This view was

²⁸ Az ungvári „Kárpát”. In: Magyar Állam, No. 29 (4213), 6.02.1874, p. 1.; Карпать, vol. 2, no. 7 (21/09.02.1874), p. 4.

²⁹ Отвѣтъ пражевскаго епископа на предложёніе угорск. министра просвѣщенія касательно замѣненія кириллицы латинскими буквами, Карпать, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), pp. 1-3; Отвѣтъ пражевскаго епископа на предложёніе угорск. министра просвѣщенія касательно замѣненія кириллицы латинскими буквами (Окончаніе), Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), pp. 1-3.

³⁰ Мукачевской епархіи учебной комисіи въ высокопреподобной консисторіи тойже епархіи Представленное изъясненіе мнѣнія о томъ, можно ли бы въ учебныхъ книгахъ, издаватися имущихъ на частѣ угорскихъ народныхъ училищъ, вмѣсто досель употреблявшихся кириллическихъ буквъ – по проектированію, сдѣланному съ высшаго мѣста, латинскіе буквальные знаки употреблять?, Прибавленіе къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 1-2. In: Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (07.02/26.01.1874).

³¹ Прибавленіе къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 2. In: Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (07.02/26.01.1874).

³² Карпать, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 1.

³³ Прибавленіе къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 2. In: Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (07.02/26.01.1874).

³⁴ Unseth, P.: Sociolinguistic parallels between choosing scripts and languages. In: *Written Language & Literacy*, 2005, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 35.

³⁵ Goody, J.: Introduction. In: Goody, J. (ed.): *Literacy in traditional societies*. Cambridge – London – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1975, p. 2.

³⁶ Карпать, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 1.; The Romanian script change from Cyrillic to Latin alphabet was proposed at the turn of 18th and 19th centuries by the Transylvanian School (Ioan Budai-Deleanu, Samuil Micu-Klein, and Gheorghe Șincai), a circle of Greek Catholic national revivalists. Both alphabets were in use till half of 19th century. Moreover, between 20s and 40s of 19th century the transitional alphabet (Romanian: alfabetul de tranziție) was in use. It comprised of a mixed set of Cyrillic and Latin letters and was aimed to popularize Latinization. Eventually, Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Prince of Danubian Principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia), enforced the Latin alphabet for secular purposes in 1862. Cf. Mitu, S.: *National identity of Romanians in Transylvania*. Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2001, pp. 236-243.

also shared by the Mukachevo priests, who argues that the Latin alphabet has been used by the forefathers of the Romanians before the Cyrillic was adopted. Hence, this is not the case of modernization but rather revival of the authentic cultural roots and bears no relation to the Ruthenian alphabet.³⁷

The third ministry's allegation concerning the script change was the accusation that the Ruthenian letters resemble the Muscovite ones. The Mukachevo commission pointed out that the officials drew a false conclusion that the Subcarpathian Ruthenians must have borrowed the Cyrillic alphabet from Russia. They argued that the Pannonian Slavs thanks to mission of Saints Cyril and Methodius generally accepted the Slavonic Byzantine Christianity and Cyrillic alphabet before the Hungarian tribes came to Pannonia to „conquer their homeland” (Hungarian: *honfoglalás*). Moreover, it was also before, as the commission claims, the Rurik dynasty founded the Muscovy and around 989 (sic!) accepted the Christian faith. Hence, it was the Muscovites who borrowed the Cyrillic letters together with church books from the Pannonian Slavs, who the Mukachevo clergy recognizes as the ancestors of Subcarpathian Ruthenians.³⁸ This declaration reveals that the Mukachevo scientific commission members had, in fact, little knowledge of Kievan Rus' history and considered Moscow (founded in 12th century) as a main Eastern Slavonic power centre during the 10th century Christianization. The Mukachevo clergy declared also that the Russian philologists, who borrowed lots elements that eventually enriched the Russian language and literature, have studied the languages of Bulgarians, Serbians and „Little Ruthenians” (“малоруссовъ”, Ukrainians).³⁹ Jack Goody and Ian Watt call spreading the alphabetic script the supreme example of cultural diffusion.⁴⁰ In view of the Mukachevo commission as well as Roikovyč, the Cyrillic alphabet was indeed a product of cultural borrowing. Nevertheless, their arguments were aimed to prove that the direction of cultural diffusion was other way round. Hence, the use of Cyrillic alphabet for Ruthenian language in Subcarpathian Rus' has never been a result of Russian intervention in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Hungary.

In comparison with his Mukachevo counterparts, Roikovyč was much better informed about the current situation of his compatriots in Central and Eastern Europe. He claimed that the Subcarpathian Ruthenians by their Slavonic Byzantine rite and language belong to people of 15 million that lives in Royal Hungary, Austrian Galicia, Bukovina, and Southwestern governorates of Russian Empire under names of Ruthenians (“Рутень”) or Little Russians (“Мало-Русские”). It is important to notice, that Roikovyč did not include the population of Russians and Belarusians, hence in his view they did not form one nation with the Ruthenians. Similar view was shared by Ivan Dulyshkovyč, the Ruthenian historian of that time.⁴¹ The Prešov canon declared that despite cultural bonds the Subcarpathian Ruthenians nether in the past nor in the present did not contact with their compatriots in abroad and they shared life together with the Hungarian nation throughout centuries. Nonetheless, Roikovyč admitted that after the Union of Uzhhorod, when the new Greek Catholic church was established, the Subcarpathian Ruthenians did turned to the Galician Ruthenians for help. They needed new liturgical books approved by the Holy See; however, there was no single printing shop in the Kingdom of

³⁷ Прибавленіє къ 5. числу «Карпата», р. 2. In: Карпаты, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

³⁸ „[...] первѣйшіє вѣрники того, чтобы первымъ своимъ потребностямъ вспомочи, какъ кирилицею написанное священное писаніє, такъ и прочія обрядовыя книги, отъ польскихъ и чешскихъ и отъ бывшихъ паннонійскихъ славяновъ, собственно отъ предковъ подкарпатскихъ русиновъ переняли”. Прибавленіє къ 5. числу «Карпата», р. 2. In: Карпаты, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

³⁹ Прибавленіє къ 5. числу «Карпата», р. 2. In: Карпаты, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

⁴⁰ Goody, J. – Watt, I.: The Consequences of Literacy. In: Goody, J. (ed.): Literacy in traditional societies. Cambridge – London – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1975, p. 39.

⁴¹ Ivan Dulyshkovyč (1815–1883) – Greek Catholic priest, historian of Subcarpathian Rus', his most important work is a four volume Historical characteristic of Hungarian Ruthenians (Историческія черты Угро-Русскихъ, 1874–1877) published in Uzhhorod. Cf. Magocsi, P. R. – Pop, I.: Encyclopedia of Rusyn history and culture, op. cit., p. 106; Майор, P.: Народовський рух на Закарпатті в 1860-х–1918 рр.: генеза, розвиток та ідеологічні засади. In: Rusyn, 2015, no. 39 (1), p. 134.

Hungary that used the Cyrillic typeface.⁴² The Prešov canon forgets to mention that the printing shop of Pázmány University at Trnava acquired the Cyrillic typeface at the turn of 17th and 18th centuries.⁴³ Moreover, in his response to the ministry Roikovych intentionally leaves unsaid the more recent contacts of Subcarpathian and Galician Ruthenians of Russophile orientation.⁴⁴

Roikovych believed that in order to dispel the ministry's prejudice towards Ruthenian language and its script, it is vital to explain its origin. According to him, Church Slavonic language was a liturgical as well as a literary language of Ruthenians for centuries. Nevertheless, in the Subcarpathian Rus' this language was being gradually influenced by the Ruthenian dialects. In the early 19th century, the use of vernacular words became more frequent. However, Roikovych argues that it was the national revolution of 1848 in Royal Hungary that gave impulse to develop the literary language. The Subcarpathian Ruthenians decided to preserve the Church Slavonic grammar and orthography but in terms of vocabulary, they shifted towards the vernacular. Roikovych claims that this language is used in Ruthenian primers, calendars, press and literature.⁴⁵

The ministry suggested that the new Latin alphabet should use the orthography based on the phonetic principle. According to Roikovych that was not possible from legal, linguistic, cultural, national, and religious point of view. The Prešov canon argues that every nation of Royal Hungary has right to cultivate its language and identity. Introduction of phonetic principle would be as forcing the allegedly related to Hungarians Csángós and Cumans (Polovtsians) to write only phonetically with Hungarian spelling rules. That would unveil how little they have in common with Hungarian language and nation. Moreover, Roikovych provides the example of Transylvanian Saxons who developed their literary language thanks to German translation of Bible. If they began to write their vernacular phonetically with Hungarian letters, no one would have recognized in it the language of Goethe and Schiller. Hence, the Saxons would not have been considered as a part of German nation. For Roikovych the acceptance of alphabet Latinization would mean to disavow his Ruthenian identity. He perceives the phonetic principle as government's measure to disintegrate and assimilate the national minorities of the Kingdom of Hungary.⁴⁶ Roikovych sees language as the most important marker of national identity. Moreover, in his view the Cyrillic alphabet is an inseparable component of the language. American anthropologist and linguist Susan Gal points out that this type of linguistic nationalism is typical for followers of Johann G. Herder who assumed that the character of each nation is formed by national language.⁴⁷

The Prešov canon claims that when the etymology loses its importance then what really remains is the pronunciation. The language of its neighbours very often influences the vernacular of small nations like the Subcarpathian Ruthenians. The language itself has dialects with different pronunciation. Hence, a consistent use of phonetic principle will never lead to a single literary standard, unless one dialect is approved to serve as a model for pronunciation.⁴⁸ Roikovych asks which of the four Ruthe-

⁴² Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 2.

⁴³ Magosci, P. R.: *With Their Backs to the Mountains*. Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2015, pp. 84-85.

⁴⁴ For example, Aleksandr Duchnovych, Aleksandr Pavlovych, Anatolii Kralytskyi were contributors of Bohdan Didytskyi's almanac *Сф. Дѣдичкій, Б.* (ed.): *Зоря галицкая яко альбум на год 1860*, Львов: Типом Института Ставропигійського, 1860, pp. 58-66, 528-540. The rich source of information about cultural bonds between Ruthenians in Subcarpathian Rus' and Austrian Galicia is the correspondence of the national activists studied by Nela Svitlyk. *Сф. Світлик, Н.: Епістолярна спадщина як джерело вивчення культурних контактів Закарпаття і Галичини (1848–1918)*. In: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Історія*, 2010, no. 24, pp. 198-207.

⁴⁵ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 2.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁷ Gal, S.: *Polyglot nationalism. Alternative perspectives on language in 19th century Hungary*. In: *Langage et société*, 2011, vol. 2, no. 136, p. 33.

⁴⁸ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 2.

nian dialects should be a base for the new literary language. The proximity of Slovaks, Hungarians, and Romanians made influence on Ruthenian vernacular, hence none of dialects can be perceived as pure. He points out that if the pronunciation of the Máramaros dialect would be chosen together with Ukrainian vocabulary and artificial *kulishivka* (Ukrainian: „кулішівка”) spelling of the *Journal for Popular Teachers* (“Газета для народных учителей”) then the speakers of Sáros-Zemplén and Sáros-Abatúj dialects will not recognize their mother tongue.⁴⁹ R. Mayor confirms that the lack of confidence in overcoming the dialectical diversity in Carpathian valleys together with clergy’s attempt to preserve the use of Church Slavonic was a serious obstacle in forming Ruthenian literary standard based on vernacular.⁵⁰

Roikovych argues that the real aim of the spelling rules is not only to correctly render the sounds but also to preserve etymology of words. Hence, the language codification should be comprised of both rules: „write as you speak” and „express in a script the root and etymology”.⁵¹

The Prešov canon mocked that the phonetic principle would bring more benefit to much more „learned” languages like English and French that has already used Latin script with complicated and prolix orthography.⁵² What is more, Roikovych claims that the Latin alphabet is not well adapted for the Romance languages as well as Hungarian, Czech, and Polish. Although all of them share the same script, they use much different orthography.

According to Roikovych, the Hungarian alphabet does not have enough letters to render all Ruthenian sounds, hence the ministry’s reform, which aims only to transcribe Ruthenian with Hungarian letters, will fail.⁵³ Moreover, the members of Mukachevo commission agree that Latin alphabet had to be adapted even for the West and South Slavonic languages. Each of the nation chose its own diacritics and spelling rules, hence the Western rite Christianity is the only thing that unites them. That is why Saints Cyril and Methodius designed new alphabet based on Greek with its unique letters. In view of the Mukachevo commission, it would be beneficial to have one spelling rules for all Slavonic languages, but it is doubtful, if the Latin alphabet will render all Slavonic sounds. The priests provide example of sound [i] that can be rendered in Ruthenian Cyrillic letters as ⟨i⟩, ⟨й⟩, ⟨і⟩, ⟨ѣ⟩, and ⟨ы⟩. On the other hand, the Latin alphabet has only ⟨i⟩ and ⟨y⟩.⁵⁴ Moreover, Roikovych asks which Hungarian letter ⟨ö⟩ or ⟨ü⟩, should be used for the Ruthenian sound [ы]. The Prešov canon is concerned that the reduction of letters and simplification of orthography will lead to creation of many new homonyms in Ruthenian language. He provides an example of four words: „миръ” (peace), „миръ” (world),

⁴⁹ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), p. 2; Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 3; Газета для народных учителей was a government-sponsored newspaper published in Budapest for popular teachers in Hungarian and the languages of national minorities of Royal Hungary. The Ruthenian version was printed in the Cyrillic alphabet but with the modern „civil typeface” (Russian: grazhdanka). Initially the paper was published in Russian language but later it switched to Ukrainian (“правопись украинскаго нарѣчія”). It used the orthography of Panteleimon Kulish (1819–1897) which was far from Church Slavonic and based on phonetic principle with pronunciation and vocabulary typical Ukrainian language in Austrian Galicia and Russian Dnieper Ukraine. Hence, the Subcarpathian Ruthenians considered this variety as foreign and incomprehensible that is why the teachers often ignored it. From 1874 all editions in the minority languages were replaced by a single edition in Hungarian language. Cf. more on this topic: Мереоръ, У.: Положеніе угорскихъ русскихъ подъ управленіемъ Стефана Панковича, епископа Мукачевскаго, op. cit., p. 87.; Zoltán, A.: Про мову «Газеты для народных учителей» (Пешть-Будинь, 1868–1872). In: Moser, M. – Zoltán, A. (eds.): Die Ukrainer (Ruthenen, Russinen) in Österreich-Ungarn und ihr Sprach- und Kulturleben im Blickfeld von Wien und Budapest. Wien: Lit Verlag, 2008, pp. 101-110; Панчук, М. – Войналович, В. – Галенко, О.: Закарпаття в етнополітичному вимірі. Київ: Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2008, p. 155.

⁵⁰ Майор, Р.: Русофілство на Закарпатті в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.: генеза, розвиток та ідеологія, op. cit., p. 159.

⁵¹ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874), p. 2.

⁵² Ibidem.

⁵³ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), p. 1.

⁵⁴ Прибавленіє къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 1. In: Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

„мѣръ” (measure, *G. pl.*) and „мѣрь” (aim!), which after application of phonetic principle would be all written as „mir”.⁵⁵

The Mukachevo clergy was aware of leading role of the government in providing the public education in a minority language that is why the scientific commission thanks the ministry for making efforts to improve the condition of the Ruthenians. Nevertheless, the response from Mukachevo points out that the actual problem is not the Cyrillic alphabet itself, but low literacy rate among Ruthenians. The Mukachevo priests claim that the current state of education in Subcarpathian Rus' is a result of long-lasting underfunding, which led to severe shortage of textbooks and school buildings. That is why in their view it is highly unlikely that the Latin letters will make the Ruthenian people more civilized than the current ones.⁵⁶ The widespread illiteracy of Ruthenian population was indeed one of the factors that slowed down the modernization process and spread of national consciousness. According to American historian Paul Robert Magocsi the illiteracy rate at the turn of 19th and 20th century could reach even 90 percent.⁵⁷

Roikovych stresses the link between rising literacy rate and the development of literary language. He argues that at school pupils learn not only the ABC but also they broaden their knowledge. Only the educated Ruthenians will be able to expand their mother tongue register with contemporary terms. That is why, in Roikovych's view, it is pointless to form the vocabulary of modern Ruthenian on loanwords from a single dialect if there are commonly comprehensible words of Church Slavonic origin.⁵⁸ Moreover, Roikovych reminds that the Pope ordered to the Ruthenian priests that they must teach their congregation the liturgical language and its letters. The believers must not only understand Christian morals and liturgy, but they must also read the prayer books and songbooks. That is why in Roikovych's view the liturgical language together with Ruthenian vernacular written in the Cyrillic alphabet must be taught in school.⁵⁹

According to Roikovych, the Ruthenians are proud when they see that their sons can read aloud in Church Slavonic from the liturgical books in the church and that they can sing the religious songs from the songbooks. This prestige is the only motivation for parents for sending their children to schools. The script change will prevent the younger generation from understanding the religious and ceremonial matters. The illiterate Ruthenian peasants would consider the new Latin letters as foreign. Even for low-educated countryside teachers the new spelling and letter would be a problem. Hence, in case of forced Latinization the Ruthenians the effects will be contrary to what the ministry intended. The abolishment of Cyrillic alphabet will discourage the Ruthenians from building new schools and from education in general. Eventually, no one will buy the textbooks that are incomprehensible as no one buys the official state journal for teachers.⁶⁰

J. Goody claims that in traditional societies where religious instructions, prayers, and songs are written in form of relatively available texts, possessing the rolls or books is a matter of status. Moreover, both, the literate and illiterate believers can make use of the scripture. Goody cites Robert E. Ekvall who noticed that the illiterate Buddhists in Tibet hold books in their hands, raise it to their forehands, and intone the syllable *OHm* in order to take blessing. Contrary, the literate believers read and verbalize the text of prayer.⁶¹ In such societies, reading is considered as a prestigious skill because it allows participating more consciously in the church service.

⁵⁵ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), p. 2.

⁵⁶ Прибавление къ 5. числу «Карпата», p. 1. In: Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

⁵⁷ Magocsi, P. R.: With Their Backs to the Mountains. Budapest, op. cit., p. 419, n. 17.

⁵⁸ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), p. 3.

⁵⁹ Ibidem, p. 2.

⁶⁰ Ibidem, p. 3.

⁶¹ Goody, Introduction, p. 15.

The Slavonic Byzantine icons of the first tier of iconostasis or of the side altars very often hold inscriptions with the name of the represented person. The predominantly illiterate Ruthenian community used to recognize the representations due to characteristic attributes of saints and repetitiveness of motif. Moreover, the text in Cyrillic letters was important symbolic attribute that the Slavonic Byzantine congregation until these days associate with the icons of Christ Pantocrator (open book), Saints Cyril and Methodius (roll with alphabet), Saints Anthony and Theodosius of Kyiv (roll with prayer). That is why, the Cyrillic alphabet was sacralised as an inseparable part of the worshiped icons.⁶² At the same time, the literate Ruthenians could identify the less typical depictions thanks to the inscriptions.

The Mukachevo commission argues that the Slavonic Byzantine congregations, no matter if united with the Holy See or not, were founded as a popular church. Hence, in every country the liturgy and other ceremonies as well as praying are conducted in the mother tongue of the believers. That is why the language and Cyrillic letters are considered not only as a mean of communication, but also as sacrum of Slavonic Byzantine rite.⁶³

The Mukachevo commission declares that in case of forced script change in public school, the Greek Catholic Church will still use and support the Cyrillic alphabet. It will lead to conflict between church and secular public school. The priests argue that their stance is based on a thousand-year-old right of constant use of Cyrillic letters. In their opinion, the Subcarpathian Ruthenians would rather follow the imperatives of their ancient church; hence, the reform will give them another excuse to avoid education more often.⁶⁴ American anthropologist Margaret Mead noticed certain difference between the aims of education in primitive and modern societies. According to her, the former communities expect from the education to maintain the continuity between parents and children. That makes school the important tool of cultural reproduction. Nevertheless, modernization brought another model of education where school aims to „create discontinuities – to turn the child of the peasant into a clerk, of the farmer into a lawyer, of the Italian immigrant into an American, of the illiterate into the literate”.⁶⁵ The Ruthenian clergy sees in abolishment of the Cyrillic alphabet the danger of turning Ruthenian children into Hungarian citizens who might be equal to the Magyars but far less similar to their own parents. That is why the Mukachevo priests warned the ministry that if it will ignore the commission’s view and enforce its proposal, then many Ruthenians might consider it as unlawful interference of secular power into church and sacral matters.⁶⁶

The Mukachevo clergy tried to address directly to Hungarian government’s fear of strengthening of Slavonic national movements. In their view the script change would uncover the similarities between Ruthenian and Slovak languages. Hence, the Ruthenian reading public might find the neighbouring „subversive” modern Slovak literature accessible and more interesting than their own prayer-books, songbooks, and calendars. The Mukachevo priests warn minister Trefort that it would expose their people to the Slovak nationalists who claim that the Ruthenians are Greek Catholic Slovaks. The commission members evaded to assess „from patriotic and cultural point of view”, if that would be in the best interest of both the Subcarpathian Ruthenians and the Hungarian government.⁶⁷ Clearly, the Mukachevo commission tries to convince minister Trefort that the real danger is not the Russian infil-

⁶² „[...] языкъ и буквы въ узкой и нераздѣльной связи суть съ самою церковію и вѣрою [...] почитаются обрядовыми средствами на престолѣ освященными и внутреннею вѣрою соск[р]ѣпленными”. Прибавленіе къ 5. числу «Карпата», р. 1. In: Карпаты, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

⁶³ „[...] народъ [...] употребленіе кирил[л]ическихъ буквъ, которыя святыми знаками почитаетъ, не выпустить”, Ibidem, p. 2.

⁶⁴ Ibidem.

⁶⁵ Mead, M.: Our Educational Emphases in Primitive Perspective. In: American Journal of Sociology, 1943, vol. 48, no. 6, p. 637.

⁶⁶ Прибавленіе къ 5. числу «Карпата» р. 2. In: Карпаты, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

⁶⁷ „[...] живущая русская народность можетъ загнаться в русло въ Угорщинѣ существующей литературы словацкаго языка и ввійдетъ въ духовную связь съ западною славянскую группою”. Ibidem, p. 1.

tration of Ruthenians and the expected unrest inspired from across the border but rather the growing Slovak nationalism. This attempt to shift any suspicions of Pan-Slavism to the Slovaks shows how the Ruthenian clergy desperately tried to demonstrate its loyalty to Hungarian state in order to stop the abolishment of Cyrillic alphabet.

The Mukachevo commission recalled the second episode of alphabet war in Austrian Galicia. In 1859 Polish aristocrat Agenor Gołuchowski, governor of Galicia convinced Leopold von Thun-Hohenstein, the Austrian minister of education and religion, to abolish the Ruthenian Cyrillic alphabet and impose the Latin letters. The project of new alphabet was worked out in secret by Czech Josef Jireček who applied the Czech diacritic. Governor Gołuchowski as well as minister Trefort used the threat of Russian intervention in Austrian Galicia to persecute Ruthenian national movement. The planned introduction of Latin alphabet was aimed to easier Polonization of Ruthenians by blurring the differences between Ruthenian and Polish languages. Gołuchowski called a scientific commission that consisted of his office clerks, school inspectors and Greek Catholic clergy. The Ruthenians were in majority and turned down the proposal.⁶⁸ The Mukachevo commission members interpreted the „language unification” in Austrian Galicia as an analogous attempt of forced assimilation of the Ruthenian nation. Moreover, Roikovych claims that the Poles not only failed to impose the new letters but also integrated the Ruthenians of much different cultural orientations in a single front to protect the Cyrillic alphabet. Hence, the whole action was counterproductive and strengthened the Ruthenian national movement in Austrian Galicia.⁶⁹ The editorial team of *Karpat* decided to provide more information about the successful campaign of Galician compatriots. In the article *On the Alphabet* (“Объ абцадлѣ”), the columnist K.⁷⁰ gives account of the course of events in neighbouring province. Despite misspelling the names of the most important figures, the general outline is correct. Moreover, he recalls that Aleksandr Dukhnovych waited impatiently and with anger for the final decision in the Galician case.⁷¹ M. Homichkov decided to reprint in *Karpat* the work *On inconvenience of Latin alphabet in Ruthenian literacy* (“О неудобности латинской азбуки в письменности русской”) written by Bohdan Didytskyi.⁷²

It is a kind of paradox that the content of response written by the Prešov canon is much more „scientific” in comparison with the response prepared by the scientific commission from Mukachevo eparchy. In his work Roikovych shows broaden knowledge on the contemporary status of Ruthenians in the

⁶⁸ Ibidem, p. 2. More on this: Miller, A. – Ostapchuk, O.: The Latin and Cyrillic Alphabets in Ukrainian National Discourse and in the Language Policy of Empires. In: Kasianov, G. – Ther, P. (eds.): A Laboratory of Transnational History. Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography. Budapest, New York: CEU Press, 2009, p. 173; Савчук, Б. П. – Билавич, Г. В.: Азбучные войны 30–50-х гг. XIX в. в Галиции в современном научном дискурсе. In: Русин, 2019, vol. 56, pp. 58-76.

⁶⁹ Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874), p. 3.

⁷⁰ Under the initial K. could concealed his identity Kyryl Sabov (1838–1914), teacher, publicist, the editor of *Svit* (Свѣтъ) who studied at the Central Theological Seminary in Vienna (1857–1860) and attended lectures on Slavic languages at the University of Vienna. It is very possible that he met in person Bohdan Didytskyi, then a student of Slavonic philology. On the other hand, the revelation of Aleksandr Dukhnovych’s personal interest in Galician alphabet war shows that it might be a person from his circle like Anatolii Kralyts’kyi (1835–1894), Basilian monk, pedagogue, historian, who was Dukhnovych’s student and successor. Magocsi, P. R. – Pop, I.: Encyclopedia of Rusyn history and culture, op. cit., pp. 255 and 445.

⁷¹ K.: Объ абцадлѣ, In: Карпатъ, vol. 2, no. 6 (14/02.02.1874), p. 1. In the title of article, the word „alphabet” was spelled as „абцадло”, which is a direct and intentional transliteration of Polish equivalent „abecadlo” with Cyrillic letters. Ibidem, p. 2.

⁷² Bohdan Didytskyi (1827–1909) was a Ruthenian journalist, writer, translator, historian, and publisher of Russophile orientation from Austrian Galicia. He opposed the policy of Polonization that was led by governor Agenor Gołuchowski. His article that condemned the attempt of adoption of Latin alphabet for Ruthenian language in Austrian Galicia was published in 1859 in Vienna. *Karpat* reprinted it in parts in vol. 2 (1874) no. 7-14 and 16. Смолий, В. А. et al. (eds.): Энциклопедія історії України, vol. 2: Г-Д, Київ: Наукова думка, 2004, p. 399.

Royal Hungary and abroad. He argues that the modernization of Ruthenian culture and advancement of Ruthenian community will be possible by combating the illiteracy. According to Roikovyč, the fact that the Cyrillic alphabet is used to write the liturgic Church Slavonic gives the script unique prestige that wins the Ruthenians' support for education. That is why the Cyrillic alphabet must be preserved for church as well as secular purposes. As a cultural Russophile Roikovyč, claims that the orthography based on phonetic principle will not help to codify the single Ruthenian literary language but simply disintegrate Ruthenian who speaks various dialects influence by the language of neighbours.

On the other hand, the Mukachevo scientific commission members remind the ministry of religion and education that the Ruthenians are indigenous people of Subcarpathian Rus', which have been always loyal to the Hungarian state. Although the priests of Mukachevo eparchy declare kinship with all Eastern Slavonic people and recognize Russia's leading rule in the Orthodox World, they claimed that the Cyrillic literacy developed in Subcarpathian Rus' earlier than in the Muscovy. Moreover, the commission members perceive the Cyrillic alphabet as an element of the Slavonic Byzantine liturgy which preservation was guaranteed by the Union of Uzhhorod. Hence, they consider the proposal of adoption of Latin alphabet as a violation of previous agreements and unlawful interference of secular power into church affairs.

Hungarian historian Maria Mayer argues that the campaign for protection of Cyrillic alphabet and Julian calendar helped the *Karpat's* editorial team to present the struggle for religious rights as for national rights.⁷³ This was the only way the Ruthenians could stop the abolishment of the Cyrillic alphabet facing lack of minority's legal recognition and censorship ban for discussing political issues. Another Hungarian scholar Zoltán Medve stresses that the position of Mukachevo and Prešov eparchy in dispute over Latinization of Ruthenian alphabet proves that the Subcarpathian Greek Catholic clergy actively resisted assimilatory attempts of Hungarian government and protected the Ruthenian national identity.⁷⁴ However, this comment does not concern the bishop Pankovyč and his circle of Magyarized priests who formed the wing of Hungarian loyalists in the Mukachevo eparchy.

Due to the Vienna stock market crash on 1st May 1873 (German: *Schwarzer Freitag*) József Szlávy's cabinet was struggling to balance the Hungarian state budget. The unpopular reforms might have led the Deák Party to the loss of majority in the Hungarian House of Representatives. Szlávy was trying to form a larger coalition with the Left Centre (Hungarian: *Balközép*), the biggest opposition party. The tightening of the national minority policy was one of concessions to Kálmán Tisza, the opposition leader. Nevertheless, the negotiations ended in a fiasco and Szlávy stepped down from office on his own request in March 1874.⁷⁵ The proposed script and calendar change became a failure not only because of cabinet's collapse but also by an unexpected death of bishop Pankovyč, who died in August 1874. Meanwhile, Ágoston Trefort remained in office in the three following cabinets and held the minister post till his death in 1888. After 1875 he became an executor of Kálmán Tisza's policy of brutal Magyarization in education.⁷⁶ He closed the Slovak secondary schools (*gymnasia*) and the *Matica slovenská* education institute. Soon all teachers in every school in the Royal Hungary were obligated to conduct classes in Hungarian language.⁷⁷

⁷³ Mayer, M.: *The Rusyns of Hungary: political and social developments, 1860–1910*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, p. 60.

⁷⁴ Медве, З.: От «dialectus ruthenica» до литературного языка (Роль языка и религии в развитии национального сознания подкарпатских русинов). In: Вегвари, В. – Волош, Р. – Поварниціна, М. (eds.): *Учёные записки кафедры славянской филологии Печского университета*. Печ, 2011, p. 101.

⁷⁵ Cf. Ress, I.: Szlávy von Érkenéz und Okány, József. In: Santifaller, L. (ed.): *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013, vol. 14, p. 163.

⁷⁶ Maxwell, A.: *Choosing Slovakia: Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak language and accidental nationalism*, op. cit., p. 26-27.

⁷⁷ Mann, M.: *Ágoston Trefort, Gestalter ungarischer Kulturpolitik (1872–1888)*, op. cit., p. 160.

Newspapers

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 1 (3.01.1874/22.12.1873).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 2 (17/05.01.1874).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 3 (24/12.01.1874).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 4 (31/19.01.1874).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (7.02/26.01.1874).

Прибавление къ 5. числу «Карпата» In: Карпать, vol. 2, no. 5 (07.02/26.01.1874).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 6 (14/02.02.1874).

Карпать, vol. 2, no. 7 (21/09.02.1874).

Листокъ, vol. II, no. 15 (1/13.08.1886).

Budapesti Közlöny, no. 29 (5.02.1873).

Magyar Állam, no. 29/4213 (6.02.1874).

Magyar Politika, no. 34 (12.02.1874).

Первый подкарпатский эпизод русинской азбучной войны в 1873–1874 гг.

Камил Дворник

В декабре 1873 года венгерское министерство просвещения и религий призвало рескриптом грекокатолических епископов Мукачева и Прешова высказать своё мнение о возможности смены алфавита языка подкарпатских русинов с кириллицы на латиницу в венгерской транскрипции. Попытка смены азбуки активизировала церковную интеллигенцию Подкарпатской Руси, которая начала кампанию против языковой реформы. Предложение министерства обсуждалось ими на страницах еженедельной газеты «Карпать», издаваемой Николаем Гомичковым в Ужгороде. В прешовской епархии владыка Иосиф Гаганец поручил подготовку ответа министерству молодому канонику Александру Ройковичу, учителю прешовской гимназии. В Ужгороде, который являлся столицей мукачевской епархии, в отсутствие владыки Стефана Панковича консистория передала азбучное дело в научную комиссию. Несмотря на то, что как прешовское, так и мукачевское духовенство отказалось от реформы письма, будапештская газета «Magyar Politika» информировала, что известный своими провенгерскими взглядами владыка С. Панкович поддержал введение латиницы вместе с григорианским календарём.

Оба ответа на министерский рескрипт опубликованы в газете «Карпать»: прешовский – в форме двухчастной статьи, а мукачевский – в форме вкладки. Надо заметить, что второй документ был напечатан на местном варианте русинского языка (т.н. языче) вместе с переводом на венгерский язык. Противники смены алфавита в своих ответах указали на ошибочность трёх аргументов, использованных будапештскими чиновниками для обоснования требования смены алфавита.

Как первый аргумент министерство приводило пример сербов и болгар. Прешовский каноник А. Ройкович не соглашался со взглядом министерства, что сербы и болгары отказались от кириллического алфавита. По его мнению, они лишь ввели модернизированные гражданские шрифты. Он подчёркивал, что ни один славянский народ славяно-византийского обряда никогда не отказался от кириллицы. Кроме того, А. Ройкович обращал внимание на неприменимость второго аргумента министерства: ситуация румынского языка не может стать примером латинизации алфавита для подкарпатских русинов, потому что румынский язык принадлежит к романской группе. По мнению мукачевской комиссии, румыны уже раньше пользовались латиницей, поэтому они лишь вернулись к письму своих предков. Духовенство мукачевской епархии не согласилось с третьим доводом министерства, состоящим в том, что подкарпатские русины взяли свой алфавит от Московского царства и доказало, что культурная диффузия имела противоположное направление. А. Ройкович был противником введения латинского алфавита, основанного на фонетическом принципе. Он считал, что это было бы возможно, если существовал бы один диалект, который мог бы стать эталоном верного произношения, но поскольку на все карпаторусинские диалекты повлияли языки соседей, выбор одного эталонного диалекта затруднён, и любой выбор сделал бы литературный язык непонятным для части народа. Кроме того, А. Ройкович заметил, что неграмотные крестьяне посылают своих детей в школу, потому что грамотность позволяет исполнять функции в церкви, которые считаются престижными. Смена алфавита приведёт к потере такой мотивации и подозрению, что школа стремится разорвать связь между родителями и детьми.

В статье освещена борьба подкарпатского грекокатолического духовенства против латинизации алфавита в 1873–1874 г., которая стала одним из успешных примеров противодействия ассимиляционной политике венгерского правительства.