

**Октавія Фізеші,**

доктор педагогічних наук, професор, професор кафедри педагогіки дошкільної, початкової освіти та освітнього менеджменту,  
Мукачівський державний університет (м. Мукачєво, Україна)

**Oktaviia Fizeshi,**

Doctor of Pedagogic Sciences, Professor, Professor at the Department of Pedagogy of Preschool and Primary Education and educational management,  
Mukachevo State University (Mukachevo, Ukraine)  
*oktaviia.fizeshi@gmail.com*  
ORCID ID 0000-0003-0423-3154

УДК 373.3(477.87) «1919/1938»

## МОВНІ ДИСКУСІЇ ТА ЇХ УПЛИВ НА ОСВІТНЬО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ ПРОЦЕСИ ЗАКАРПАТТЯ В 20-30-ИХ РОКАХ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ

**Анотація.** Засвоєння державної мови представниками національних меншин України сприяє повноцінній реалізації їхніх конституційних прав, максимальної інтеграції в усі сфери суспільного буття, працевлаштування та конкурентоспроможності тощо. Досвід урегулювання мовних питань за умов полікультурності поступово формувалася у Закарпатті, особливо це помітним було у ХХ столітті, перша половина якого означена державно-територіальними змінами в підпорядкуванні закарпатських земель різним країнам, наслідком чого було впровадження освітньої та мовної політики, які визначали можливості місцевого населення щодо вивчення державної та національних мов. Стаття присвячена вивченню впливу мовних дискусій на освітньо-педагогічні процеси в Закарпатті в 20-30 роках ХХ століття.

Методи дослідження: контент-аналіз історичних, історико-педагогічних, архівних і довідникових джерел з досліджуваної проблеми; проблемно-хронологічний метод для вивчення динаміки впливу мовних дискусій на освітні процеси та забезпечення рідномовного навчання в закладах освіти Закарпаття. У статті досліджено вплив мовних дискусій на освітньо-педагогічні процеси в Закарпатті у 20-30-их роках ХХ століття, коли воно перебувало в складі Чехословацької республіки. Чехословацький уряд упроваджував демократичну освітню політику та закріпив право Підкарпатської Русі на самостійні законодавчі повноваження з питань мови та освіти. За цей період стрімко зросла кількість шкіл з русинською мовою навчання, що потребувало оновлення змісту освіти, створення нових підручників тощо. Проведено огляд процесу визначення варіанту літературної мови в контексті суперечок між представниками русинського, проукраїнського та проросійського напрямів. Визначено, що основне протистояння відбувалося між проукраїнським та проросійським напрямками, кожен із яких послуговувався своїми граматиками, створював педагогічні товариства та періодичні видання, на сторінках яких відстоював свої погляди щодо мови, освіти тощо. Особливу увагу звернено на мовний плебісцит 1937 р., який проводився за ініціатииви чехословацького уряду щодо вибору варіанту граматики, за якою потрібно було організувати процес навчання в закладах освіти краю. Крапку в мовній дискусії поставило визнання Автономним урядом Підкарпатської Русі 1938 р. української мови як державної мови, а також мовою освіти та навчання.

**Ключові слова:** рідномовне навчання, державна мова, літературна мова, мовні дискусії, Закарпаття.

## LANGUAGE DISCUSSIONS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE EDUCATIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL PROCESSES OF TRANSCARPATHTIA IN THE 20-30S OF THE XX-TH CENTURY

**Abstract.** Learning the state language by representatives of national minorities of Ukraine contributes to the full realization of their constitutional rights, maximum integration into all spheres of social life, employment and competitiveness, etc. The experience of settling linguistic issues in the conditions of multiculturalism was also gradually formed in Transcarpathia, this was especially noticeable in the XX-th century, the first half of which was marked by state-territorial changes in the subordination of Transcarpathian lands to various countries, which resulted in the introduction of educational and language policies that determined the capabilities of the local population regarding the study of state and national languages. This article is devoted to the study of the influence of language discussions on educational and pedagogical processes in Transcarpathia in the 20s and 30s of the XX-th century. The methods are content analysis of historical, historical-pedagogical, archival and reference sources on the researched problem; a problem-chronological method for studying the dynamics of the influence of language discussions on educational processes and ensuring mother-tongue education in Transcarpathian educational institutions.

The article examines the influence of language discussions on educational and pedagogical processes in Transcarpathia in the 20s and 30s of the XX-th century, when it was part of the Czechoslovak Republic. The Czechoslovak government implemented a democratic educational policy and established the right of Subcarpathian Rus to have independent legislative powers in matters of language and education. During this period, the number of schools with the Ruthenian language of



instruction increased rapidly, which required updating the content of education, creating new textbooks, etc. An overview of the process of determining the variant of the literary language in the context of disputes between representatives of the Ruthenian, pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian trends was carried out. It was determined that the main confrontation took place between pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian trends, each of which used its own grammars, created pedagogical societies and periodicals, on the pages of which it defended its views on language, education, etc. Special attention is paid to the language plebiscite of 1937, which was held at the initiative of the Czechoslovak government on the subject of choosing a variant of grammar, which should be used to organize the learning process in educational institutions of the region. The language debate was put to an end by the recognition by the Autonomous Government of Subcarpathian Rus in 1938 of the Ukrainian language as the state language, as well as the language of education and training.

**Keywords:** native language education, state language, literary language, language discussions, Transcarpathia.

## INTRODUCTION

**The problem formulation.** The relevance of the problem we are investigating is determined by the socio-historical processes of today, among which is the military aggression by the Russian state aimed at exterminating the Ukrainian people, culture, and history of the language. The issue of language in Ukrainian history had a difficult way of becoming a state language, but now no one has any doubts that language is an important sign of statehood. Educational institutions have a prominent place not only in the process of learning and acquiring the state language, but also in the formation of national consciousness and self-awareness of the younger generation. This is confirmed by the adoption of such documents as the Law of Ukraine "On Education" (2017) and the Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language" (2019), which determine that "the language of the educational process in educational institutions is the state language." Compliance with the norms of these laws is of particular importance in the conditions of a multicultural and multilingual environment, because learning the state language by representatives of national minorities of Ukraine contributes, first of all, to the full realization of their constitutional rights, maximum integration in all spheres of social life, employment and competitiveness, etc. It should be noted that the experience of settling language issues in conditions of multiculturalism was also gradually formed in Transcarpathia, this was especially noticeable in the 20th century, the first half of which was marked by state-territorial changes in the subordination of Transcarpathian lands to various countries, which resulted in the introduction of educational and language policies that determined opportunities for the local population to learn state and national languages. Let us dwell on the Czechoslovak period in the history of Transcarpathia, which lasted from 1919 till 1938, was characterized by democratic processes in the field of education and, at the same time, was full of language discussions that directly influenced the development of educational and pedagogical processes in the edge. A. Bondar, V. Homonnai, A. Ilnat, H. Lemko, M. Klyap, M. Kukhta, L. Malyar, Yo. Peshyna, H. Rozlutska, V. Rosul, F. Stoyan, M. Talapkanych, O. Fizeshi and others carried out historical and pedagogical studies on the development of education and schooling in Transcarpathia within the specified chronological period. The issue of the functioning of the state and national language in the educational sphere was the subject of scientific analysis by S. Melnyk, R. Ofishchynskyi, H. Rozlutska, Ch. Fedynets, O. Fizeshi, S. Chernychko, V. Shandor and others. Since language and educational issues are an integral part of the socio-political life of the region, scientific works of a general historical nature, which served to study the historical background of "language discussions", among which the investigations of M. Vegesh, S. Vidnyanskyi, V. Hanchyn, Ye. Zadorozhnyi, I. Likhtei, P.-R. Mahochyi, P. Petryshche and others.

**AIM AND TASKS OF THE RESEARCH** – this article is devoted to the study of the influence of language discussions on educational and pedagogical processes in Transcarpathia in the 20s and 30s of the XX-th century.

**RESEARCH METHODS:** content analysis of historical, historical-pedagogical, archival and reference sources on the researched problem; a problem-chronological method for studying the dynamics of the influence of language discussions on educational processes and ensuring mother-tongue education in Transcarpathian educational institutions.

## RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

The 20s and 30s of the XX-th century are considered by many researchers of the history of Transcarpathia to be the most favorable period in the formation and development of this edge. This period in scientific and historical writings became known as the "Czechoslovak period", which came in 1919 to replace the "Austro-Hungarian period". After all, after the events of World War I, the Transcarpathian lands became part of the Czechoslovak Republic. Such a state-territorial transformation was at that time "not the only possible, optimal and, moreover, far from the worst step. ... The conditions for Transcarpathia's inclusion in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic ... were, in general, quite attractive and democratic - to grant the widest autonomy, which is only compatible with the integrity of the Czecho-Slovak state." All this opened up new opportunities for the socio-economic and national-cultural development of this region, one of the most backward at the beginning of the XX-th century regions of Europe" (Vidnianskyi, 1994, p. 135). At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, the right to exercise "legislative powers in matters of language, schooling, religion and some others" was established for Subcarpathian Rus (here: under this name the Transcarpathian lands formed an administrative unit within the Czechoslovak Republic – O.F.) (Narysy istorii Zakarpattia. T. II (1918-1945): istoriia, 1995, p. 110-111). It is important to note that this was a significant achievement, because during the Austro-Hungarian period, the Transcarpathian edge did not have such powers and was completely guided by Hungarian normative documents on education and language.

The Czechoslovak government contributed to the creation of appropriate conditions for the activity of primary schools, so the Senate of the Czechoslovak Republic passed an order in 1921, obliging the local authorities of Subcarpathian Rus to make about 150 schools – state and parochial – suitable for teaching, so that "that cultural filth as much as possible rather eliminate [here: according to the ascertaining part of the order, in many villages, children who turned 7 years old



still did not attend school – O.F.]” (Rozporiadzhennia Ministerstva osvity Chekhoslovachchyny pro podil vchyteliv na okremi hrupy, pro vstanovlennia zarplaty vchyteliam ta spysky vchyteliv horozhanskykh shkil 1922-1925 rr., 1921-1925, sheets 13). Statistical data on the dynamics of the growth of folk’s primary schools are presented in the table 1, which eloquently testify to the democratic educational policy in the context of ensuring the educational needs of different nationalities in mother tongue education.

Table 1

**The Dynamics of the Development of Schooling in Subcarpathian Rus (from 1920 - till 1938)**

The language of learning	Folk’s Primary Schools		
	1920	1931	1938
Ruthenian	321	425	463
Czech	22	158	188
Hungarian	83	101	117
Others	49	43	35
In Total	475	727	803

Source: (Mahochii, 1994, p. 206).

As can be seen from the table 1, the largest number of folk primary schools were schools with the Ruthenian language of instruction. Actually, what do we mean by “Ruthenian language”?

In the 20s of the XX-th century, the society of Transcarpathia was divided into three parts: one of them considered themselves Ruthenians and spoke a Ruthenian dialect (in the 1930s, they switched to the grammar rules of I. Haraida); the second – Muscovophiles – considered Ruthenians part of the “Russian people” and used the Russian language; the third – considered themselves part of the Ukrainian people, were called Ukrainophiles and used the Ukrainian language (according to the grammar of I. Pankevych) (Mahochii, 1994, p. 82-85). It should be noted that the struggle between the Ukrainian and Russian trends took place in all spheres of social life, including education. Therefore, a commission was created at the Czech Academy of Sciences to establish the literary language of the Transcarpathian edge. Next, we present an excerpt from the conclusion of the commission: “1) it is primarily up to him to decide on the literary language of any nation; 2) artificially creating a new literary language for the inhabitants of Subcarpathian Rus would be not only very difficult, but also completely inappropriate from a scientific point of view, and undesirable from the point of view of Slavic politics; 3) in view of the fact that the local Ruthenian dialect referred to in the statute is, without a doubt, a Little Ukrainian dialect, therefore it is necessary to recognize for the local population the literary language of Little Russian, which is used by its neighbors and fellow tribesmen, that is, Galician Ukrainian...; 4) so that the population of Subcarpathian Rus’ does not lose consciousness that, as Ukrainians, they are also members of the great Russian nation, it is recommended to introduce mandatory teaching of the Russian language in secondary schools; 5) for scientific and political reasons, it is desirable that the previous literary attempts to create a separate literary language for the Carpathian Ruthenians, the example of which is, for example, Voloshyn’s grammar, were professionally followed up” (Shandor, 1992, p. 222-223). The researcher of the history of Transcarpathia, V. Sandor, noted that “Czech politics introduced and supported the Muscovite cultural movement in us, which caused many disasters. Only from the point of view of dizzy Czech Muscovitism could such an illogicality appear in point 4 that Ukrainians are also members of the great Russian nation” (Shandor, 1992, p. 223).

In the context of our research, the language debate that arose between representatives of different directions influenced, first of all, the activities of pedagogical societies, pedagogical periodicals, the process of creating school textbooks that used different grammars, etc.

Thus, the pro-Ukrainian direction was represented by the Pedagogical Society of Subcarpathian Rus, founded in 1924 by Augustyn Voloshyn. It included many members of the “Prosvita” society, which advocated the idea of Ruthenians belonging to the Ukrainian people and the need to use the Ukrainian literary language in all spheres, including education. The Department of Education of Subcarpathian Rus and the progressive pedagogical community of the region closely cooperated with the Pedagogical Society of Subcarpathian Rus. First of all, this cooperation concerned the issue of textbook creation, compilation of methodical literature, etc. In particular, the Lviv branch of “Prosvita” received orders regarding Ukrainian-language literature: “A request to send to the small library the books by M. Vovchok “Sister”, B. Grinchenko “Dyadyko Tymokha”, M. Kulish “Stories”, Yu. Fedjkovych “A Selection from Literary Works”, S. Rudanskyi “Singers”....” (Perelik literatury zamovlenoi u Lvovi dlia filialu tovarystva v m. Uzhhorodi, a takozh yoho zaiava po pytanni dalshoi peredplaty lvivskykh zhurnaliv «Zhyttia i znannia» ta inshykh, 1933-1938 rr., sheet. 2), as well as an order for a subscription to the magazine “Life and Knowledge”. There were also periodicals of a pro-Ukrainian orientation, founded by the Pedagogical Society of Subcarpathian Rus, in particular: “Subcarpathian Rus” (1926-1936), “Our Native Edge” (1922-1939), “Pchilka” (1922-1932), etc. In 1929, the “Teachers’ Community” began its activities – a pedagogical association that advocated the Ukrainization of education in Subcarpathian Rus and founded the pro-Ukrainian pedagogical magazines “Our School” and “Teacher’s Voice”. The pro-Russian trend was represented by the Teachers’ Society of Subcarpathian Rus, founded in 1921. It also included members of the Society named after Oleksandr Dukhnovych, who called themselves Ruthenians and suggested using the Ruthenian dialect in daily communication, but insisted on using the Russian language in education and cultural life, because at that time “the Russian literary language was codified, had great authority and high cultural value” (Zakarpattia 1919-2009 rokiv: istoriia, polityka, kultura, 2010, p. 657). The activities of the Teachers’



Association of Subcarpathian Rus were supported by the Czechoslovak government and representatives of the Russian emigration. For example, Pryashiv school inspector Ihor Husnai recommended the use of the Russian literary language in school, as he considered the local Ruthenian dialect to be a manifestation of provincialism, and the Ukrainian language to be an Austro-Polish invention (Husnai, 1921, p. 2-8).

It should be noted that in education and schooling, the language debate affected the language of instruction and textbooks, which were compiled according to different grammars, which brought considerable chaos to the learning process. Thus, representatives of the pro-Ukrainian direction preferred the grammar of I. Pankevych "Grammar of the Russian language for the younger classes of secondary and urban schools" (1922, 1927, 1930), and representatives of the pro-Russian direction preferred the grammar of E. Sabov "Grammar of the Russian language" (1924). However, none of these textbooks can be called exclusively Ukrainian or Russian grammar, because the authors "brought them closer to local dialects, that is, no grammar fully corresponded to the literary version of the given language" (Zakarpattia 1919-2009 rokiv: istoriia, polityka, kultura, 2010, p. 659). In order to stop the long-standing disputes surrounding this issue, the government initiated a referendum in 1937, the main task of which was to choose a grammar – pro-Ukrainian or pro-Russian. Even before the beginning of the referendum, the pedagogical magazine "Narodnaya Shkola", which was published by the pro-Russian Teachers' Society of Subcarpathian Rus, published an appeal by the Board of the Teachers' Society to all "Russian teachers and Russian parents", in which they warned teachers against participating in the plebiscite, since they had to choose the language of instruction only parents of students. Teachers could be subject to disciplinary punishment for campaign work. Addressing parents, members of the Teachers' Association of Subcarpathian Rus emphasized that the textbooks used in schools were written by non-Carpathian authors (V. Birchak, I. Pankevych, etc.) and served as an experiment for the introduction of Galician-Polish jargon, which they called "sometimes Russian, then Little Russian, then Ukrainian." Instead, parents were offered to choose textbooks written by local authors (I. Dobosh, M. Vasylenko, M. Mykyta, E. Sabov, etc.), who imitated O. Dukhnovych and other Awakeners of the second half of the XIX-th century: "We must follow in the footsteps of our ancestors and ensure the future of our children with our national culture, our native Russian language!" (Vnymaniiu vseho russkaho uchytelstva y russkykh rodytelei, 1937-1938, p. 4). Representatives of the Russophile trend tried in every way to justify the idea of the unity of the Carpathians with the great Russian people, and to recognize the Russian language as a single literary language. After such large-scale work, the result turned out to be quite expected: out of 427 schools that participated in the referendum, 73% of respondents preferred the Russophile grammar of Yevmenii Sabov (Fedor, 1937-1938, p. 2). The results of the language plebiscite of 1937 raised doubts among the Ukrainian-speaking intelligentsia. In particular, the resolution of the 8th Congress of the "Teachers' Community" held in Uzhhorod in 1938 states that the language plebiscite initiated by the Czechoslovak government in Subcarpathian Rus' is evidence of a hostile attitude not only to Ukrainian teachers, but also to the entire people: "The voting took place from corrections. There were cases when a vote was held two or three times in one school with the help and direct intervention of notaries and gendarmes... This vote was held in our country for purely party-political reasons... This plebiscite is a humiliation of our human and national dignity, does not correspond to the constitution and the language law ..." (Rezoliutsiia VIII zizdu «Uchytelskoi hromady» 2-4 lypnia 1938 r. v Uzhhorodi ta memorandum yii do hubernatora Pidkarpatskoi Rusi 1938 r., 1938, sheets 9), therefore "the Congress strongly protests against the attempts of Russophiles to change those foundations (here: educational programs – F.O.) in favor of the Great Russian language" (Rezoliutsiia VIII zizdu «Uchytelskoi hromady» 2-4 lypnia 1938 r. v Uzhhorodi ta memorandum yii do hubernatora Pidkarpatskoi Rusi 1938 r., 1938, sheets 4). Therefore, the referendum held in 1937 did not resolve the language debate, and in the end, all this led to a decrease in the quality of education, because instead of fully learning the content of education in their native language, schoolchildren were involved in language disputes.

But later, the language discussion was still stopped. This was preceded by the following events: on October 11th, 1938, the Czechoslovak government granted the long-awaited autonomy to Subcarpathian Rus, and on November 22nd, 1938, the Czechoslovak Parliament adopted the Constitutional Law on the Federal Organization of the State of Czechs, Slovaks, and Transcarpathian Ukrainians, following which preparations for the elections of the first Diet of Carpathian Ukraine began. One of the first tasks of the newly formed regional government, headed by Augustyn Voloshyn, was to regulate the language issue, for which an order was issued on November 15th, 1938, where in §1 it was determined that "The state language in the country of Subcarpathian Rus is Ukrainian (Little Russian)" (Ternystyi shliakh do Ukrainy: Zbirnyk arkhivnykh dokumentiv i materialiv «Zakarpattia v yevropeiskii politytsi 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946 rr.», 2007, p. 183). The Ministry of Culture, Schools and Public Education immediately issues its order concerning the language of instruction in educational institutions: "every student must be taught in his native language, since that language is used in the community concerned" (§1), "in schools founded for the language of instruction of Ukrainian (Russian, that is, Little Russian) children should be the Ukrainian language in its literary form" (§2) (Ternystyi shliakh do Ukrainy: Zbirnyk arkhivnykh dokumentiv i materialiv «Zakarpattia v yevropeiskii politytsi 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946 rr.», 2007, p. 184-185). In order to ensure the transition to the use of the Ukrainian literary language in all spheres of social life, on December 23rd, 1938, the government sent out a letter that "draws attention to auxiliary linguistic literature" (Ternystyi shliakh do Ukrainy: Zbirnyk arkhivnykh dokumentiv i materialiv «Zakarpattia v yevropeiskii politytsi 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946 rr.», 2007, p. 186-188). Also attached to the letter was a list of literature on general linguistic issues (textbooks by I. Ohiyenko), a list of Ukrainian language grammars (Y. Neverli, V. Simovych, A. Shtefan), general dictionaries (B. Grinchenko, S. Ivanytsky, etc.), special dictionaries (H. Woznyak, A. Krymskyi, K. Levitskyi, etc.), terminological articles (terminology office, sports, aviation, fire, etc.). As for Russian-language education, according to this Ordinance, it could be implemented provided there were requests from parents (guardians) of at least 40 schoolchildren, if the number of applications was less, then Russian-speaking classes were joined to Ukrainian-speaking classes. In his interview on January 4th, 1939, the Prime



Minister of the Autonomous Government A. Voloshyn noted that "we, Ukrainians, are not against the Russians. We respect their literature and culture. But we want to live our own life, our Ukrainian culture, and, consistently and firmly defending our own, we do not shy away from honoring the spiritual wealth of others" (Ternystyi shliakh do Ukrainy: Zbirnyk arkhivnykh dokumentiv i materialiv «Zakarpattia v yevropeiskii politytsi 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946 rr.», 2007, p. 190-182). But everyone knows that the Soviet-Russian state, regardless of such tolerance, proceeded to eliminate Augustyn Voloshyn as a bourgeois element in the Lefortovo prison, and his name was erased from the textbooks of the history of pedagogy in the following decades.

It should be noted that with the establishment of the military administration of the Kingdom of Hungary in 1939, the Transcarpathian lands returned to its composition under the name "Subcarpathia". And the issue surrounding the language was renewed again, the Hungarian government, first of all, played on Ruthenian sentiments and tried to create an artificial Hungarian-Russian grammar.

### CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

Educational processes are a component and, at the same time, a reflection of state and socio-political processes, as evidenced by language discussions that arose in the 20s and 30s of the XX-th century in multilingual Transcarpathia. Given the fact that in the educational sphere the issue of the language of instruction was resolved democratically by the Czechoslovak government and the vast majority of schools in the region taught in the native language of the local population, a dispute arose regarding its literary version between representatives of the Ruthenian, pro-Russian and pro-Ukrainian trends. This could not but be reflected in the activities of schools, pedagogical societies, pedagogical periodicals, textbook creation, etc. The linguistic question was transferred to the political plane and reflected the political views of representatives of various directions. On the part of the Czechoslovak Republic, at the governmental level, recommendations were made regarding the use of the Ukrainian literary language, although with the caveat that it is necessary to study the Russian language in order to maintain unity with the Russian people. The complete transition of education and schooling in Transcarpathia to the use of the Ukrainian literary language took place at the end of 1938 with the assistance of the Autonomous Government of Subcarpathian Rus and personally Augustyn Voloshyn. Prospective directions for further research are: studying the experience of foreign countries in learning the state language in a multicultural environment, improving the method of training teachers to teach the state language in schools located in communities where representatives of several nationalities and indigenous peoples live compactly, etc.

### REFERENCES

- Fedor, P. (1937-1938). Plebysyt po voprosu yazyka prepodavaniia v karpatorusskykh shkolakh 1868-1937 [Plebiscite on the language of teaching in Carpatho-Russian schools 1868-1937]. Narodnaia Shkola, 3, 1-2. (in Ruthenian)
- Husnai, Y. (1921). Yazykovoii vopros v Podkarpatskoi Rusy [Language issue in Subcarpathian Rus]. Priashev: Knyhopechatnia «Sv. Nykolaia». (in Ruthenian)
- Mahochii, P.-R. (1994). Formuvannia natsionalnoi samosvidomosti: Pidkarpatska Rus 1848-1948. [Formation of national self-confidence: Subcarpathian Rus 1848-1948]. Uzhhorod: Polychka «Karpatskoho kraiu. (in Ukrainian)
- Narysy istorii Zakarpattia. T. II (1918-1945): istoriia [Essays on the history of Transcarpathia. Volume II (1918-1945): history] / Red. kol.: I. Hrachak, E. Balahuri, I. Hrytsak, V. Ilko, I. Pop. (1995). Uzhhorod: Zakarpattia. (in Ukrainian)
- Perelik literatury zamovlenoi u Lvovi dlia filialu tovarystva v m. Uzhhorodi, a takozh yoho zaiava po pytanni dalshoi peredplaty lvivskykh zhurnaliv «Zhyttia i znannia» ta inshykh, 1933-1938 rr. [List of literature ordered in Lviv for the branch of the society in Uzhhorod, as well as his statement on the issue of further subscription to the Lviv magazines "Life and Knowledge" and others, 1933-1938]. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorichnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Lviv, F. 348 (Tovarystvo «Prosvita m. Lviv»). Op. 1. Spr. 5741. Ark. 2. (in Ukrainian)
- Rezoliutsiia VIII zizdu «Uchytelskoi hromady» 2-4 Iynia 1938 r. v Uzhhorodi ta memorandum yii do hubernatora Pidkarpatskoi Rusi 1938 r. [Resolution of the Eighth Congress of the "Teachers' Community" on July 2-4, 1938 in Uzhhorod and its memorandum to the governor of Subcarpathian Rus, 1938]. DAZO, F. 28 (Referat osvity Pidkarpatskoi Rusi, m. Uzhhorod, 1938 r.). Op. 2. Spr. 3348. Ark. 4-9. (in Ukrainian)
- Rozporiadzhennia Ministerstva osvity Chekhoslovachchyn pro podil vchyteliv na okremi hrupy, pro vstanovlennia zarplaty vchyteliu ta spysky vchyteliv horozhanskykh shkil 1922-1925 rr. [Decree of the Ministry of Education of Czechoslovakia on the division of teachers into separate groups, on the establishment of teachers' salaries and lists of teachers of urban schools, 1922-1925.]. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Zakarpatskoi oblasti (DAZO), F. 28 (Referat osvity Pidkarpatskoi Rusi, m. Uzhhorod, 1921-1925 rr.). Op. 2. Spr. 117. Ark. 13 (in Ruthenian)
- Shandor, V. (1992). Zakarpattia. Istorychno pravnyi narys vid IX st. do 1920. [Transcarpathia. Historical legal essay from the IX-th century until 1920]. Carpathian Alliance, Inc., New York. (in Ukrainian)
- Ternystyi shliakh do Ukrainy: Zbirnyk arkhivnykh dokumentiv i materialiv «Zakarpattia v yevropeiskii politytsi 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946 rr.» [Thorny road to Ukraine: Collection of archival documents and materials "Transcarpathia in European politics 1918-1919, 1938-1939, 1944-1946"] / Uporiadkuvannia, peredmova ta pokazchych O.D. Dovhanychka ta O.M. Korsuna. (2007). Uzhhorod: VAT Vydavnytstvo «Zakarpattia». (in Ukrainian)
- Vidnianskyi, S. (1994). Zakarpattia u skladi Chekho-Slovatskoi respubliky: perelomnyi etap u natsionalno-kulturnomu y etnopolitychnomu rozvytku rusyniv-ukraintiv [Transcarpathia as part of the Czecho-Slovak Republic: a turning point in the national-cultural and ethno-political development of Ruthenians-Ukrainian] / Kultura Ukrainykh Karpat: tradytsii i suchasnist: Materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoii konferentsii (Uzhhorod, 1-4 veresnia 1993 roku). Uzhhorod: Hrazhda, 130-140. (in Ukrainian)
- Vnymaniiu vseho russkaho uchytelstva y russkykh rodytelei [To the attention of all Russian teachers and Russian parents]. (1937-1938). Narodnaia shkola, 2, 3-5. (in Ruthenian)
- Zakarpattia 1919-2009 rokiv: istoriia, polityka, kultura [Transcarpathia 1919-2009: history, politics, culture]. 2010. / Pid red. M. Vehesha, Ch. Fedynets. Uzhhorod: Polihraftsentr «Lira». (in Ukrainian)

Received  
Accepted

17.09.2022  
06.10.2022