

István Csernicskó – Csilla Fedinec

Language and Language Policy in Transcarpathia between the Two World Wars

The official names and titles in the whole or in certain parts of Transcarpathia seen as a historical-geographical region,¹ have often been adjusted to those used in Budapest, Prague or Kiev, which in itself tells us a lot about the nature of the different periods and systems. People who were living there always had to get integrated into the new system while each of the new regimes without exception incorporated or liquidated subsystems formed in the previous period. Language has always had a key role in the self-identification of nation states and individuals – as well as in the peculiar formations of regional and ethnical identity. Each regime has paid special attention to language policy, they have tried to arrange the relations between languages used in Transcarpathia in order to meet their own social, economic, cultural and political interests, so that they can have influence upon the national and linguistic identity and civic loyalty of the inhabitants. This is quite general practice. According to Will Kymlicka, in 20th century Europe none of the countries identifying themselves as nation states could be neutral and allow ethno-cultural and linguistic diversity. Modern states necessarily make several political decisions

¹ The region known as Transcarpathia took shape as a political entity only in the twentieth century, under names that varied over time and between languages. The geographical extent of the territory also changed several times. Prior to World War I it was part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. From December 25, 1918, to September 10, 1919, it was known as the “Ruska-Krajna Autonomous Area”, but the continuing warfare prevented the establishment of exact boundaries for this territory. After the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic (March 21 to August 6, 1919), this area took the name of “Podkarpatská Rus” and became part of Czechoslovakia under Introduction the terms of the Treaty of Saint-Germain. During the brief period of a federated Czecho-Slovakia (October 1938–March 1939), the region was designated on November 22, 1938, as an autonomous territory with the official name of “Carpatho-Ukraine”. This territory then became independent for a few hours on March 15, 1939. It was reoccupied by Hungary, and thereafter remained under Hungarian control for the duration of World War II and became a Hungarian administrative entity as the “Subcarpathian Governorship”. The territory then came under Soviet control in October 1944 as “Transcarpathian Ukraine”, and became formally incorporated into the Soviet Union on January 22, 1946. On August 24, 1991, the region became the “Transcarpathian county” of independent Ukraine. BÁRDI Nándor, FEDINEC Csilla, SZARKA László (eds.) *Minority Hungarian Communities in the Twentieth Century*. (Atlantic Studies on Society in Change, No. 138.) New York: Columbia University Press, 2011, pp. 8–9.

effecting linguistic relations, which – in a historical perspective – are decisive for the survival and dominance of a certain ethno-cultural or language group or for its decline due to the lack of support.²

We can state that – concerning the questions of language – modern European nation-states do not want to be neutral. The long term survival of linguistic, national or ethno-cultural communities depends on the decisions of the central or regional governments which determines the language used in education, public communication and by public servants. They determine the context and the extent of limitations on the linguistic and cultural integration of national, ethnic, or language minorities, autochthon or immigrant communities. The present paper focuses on the ethno-political and national-political aims of the Czechoslovak state concerning this issue between the two world wars and the impact of certain language use decisions on the relations of majority and minority communities to each other, as well as between the state and region of Transcarpathia.

Political background

During the peace talks in Paris following World War I it became clear that new answers to the questions of nationality was an unavoidable must. The Peace Treaties of Versailles forced the losing states to sign agreements which they could not influence. Peace treaties established new states and borderlines on the territory of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, ostensible using national self-determination as the main organizing principle. However, so many different – economic, strategic or purely territorial considerations were added, that the new configuration of states in the given region did not follow the national-ethnic principle even where ethnical-demographical conditions would have made it possible.³ From an ethnic point of view the arrangement was similarly not successful in the newly created Soviet Union, which had emerged from the ruins of the Empire of the Romanovs. On the territory of the former empire, to the west small nation-states were established, while in the new state – the Soviet Union – several nationally different areas were now taken absorbed in the whole. Among others, Ukrainian attempts at separation and establishment of independence were unsuccessful.

² „Ethno-cultural neutrality of a state is not only unrealizable but also undesirable” – Andrea Krizsán’s interview with Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka. In *Fundamentum* 2, 1997, p. 43–53.

³ ROMSICS Ignác: A nagyhatalmak és az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia felbomlása. In *Kisebbségkutatás* 2, 2000, p. 213.

In January 1919 the Czechoslovak and the Romanian armies appeared in the region. On 8 May 1919 it was decided in Paris that Transcarpathia would belong to Czechoslovakia. The decision was included in the Treaty of Saint-Germain on 10 September 1919. On 8 May 1919 the so-called Central Rusyn National Council declared their wish to join the newly formed Czechoslovak state. At the same time, in Transcarpathia there were inhabitants who wanted to remain inside Hungary while others – especially those in the Máramaros region – wanted to join the emerging Ukrainian state trying to break away from civil war burdened Russia.

The areas under Czechoslovak authority the introduction of Czechoslovak public administration began without delay. By September 1919, when the occupation was finalized by international legal acts, in a significant part of the region Czechoslovak public administration was already active. This became the basis of the Czechoslovak administration, which represented an alternative status compared to other Czechoslovak regions between the two world wars. New borders were drawn without the consideration of ethnic settlements (as the railway lines built in the dualistic period played the most significant role) either in case of the Hungarian or the Ruthenian communities. The region called Podkarpatská Rus did not include all regions with Ruthenian majority in Czechoslovakia. According to the Treaty of Saint-Germain the region and the town of Prešov were joined to Slovakia, while the Treaty of Trianon divided the region of Máramaros between Czechoslovakia and Romania along the line of the river Tisza.⁴

Vladimir Vernadsky, an Ukrainian philosopher and one of the founders and the first president of the Ukrainian academy of sciences wrote the following in his diary in December 1919: “Newspapers report that the Czech Republic has given autonomy to Carpathian Rus! I have always had a special interest in its fate but I would never have thought that what is happening now can happen at all. I can remember talking about the soil of Hungarian Rus with (Mykhailo) Drahomanov, who considered its protection his bounded duty. In Moscow I had long talks about the question with Mykhailo Hrush-evskyi. At that time both of them thought the situation was hopeless.”⁵

⁴ ВІДНЯНСЬКИЙ Степан. Поразка імперського мислення і утворення національних держав. In ВЕГЕШ Микола – ФЕДИНЕЦЬ Чілла (eds.) *Закарпаття 1919–2009 років: історія, політика, культура*. Ужгород: Видавництво «Ліра», 2010, pp. 54-55; ŠVORC Peter – DANILÁK Michal – NEPNER Harald (eds.): *Veľka politika a malé regióny (1918–1939)*. Prešov–Graz: Univerzum, 2002, pp. 34-44, 59–82.

⁵ МАЗУРОК Олег – ПЕНЯК Павло – ШЕВЕРА Мирослав. Володимир Вернадський про Угорську Русь. Ужгород: Ужгородський національний університет – Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича, 2003, p. 14.

According to Articles 10-13 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain⁶ the Czechoslovak Republic was obliged to organize the region called Podkarpatská Rus now under its authority as an autonomous unit having its own self-government, which was also to have legislative power concerning language use. The legal status of national minorities was defined in the Chapter of the Constitution of 1920⁷ based on the Treaty of Saint-Germain, whose Section VI – Protection of national, religious and racial minorities – declared by law the full equality of the citizens of the republic concerning language, religion and race. Language rights were regulated by the language law, which – based on § 129 – was considered a part of the Constitution. § 1 of the language law No 122. (29 February 1920)⁸ declared that the “Czechoslovak language” was the official language of the state and – according to § 4 – in Czech regions the Czech and in Slovak regions the Slovak is the adequate variety of the Czechoslovak language.

“The Czechoslovak Republic was established as a nation state – the state of the Czechoslovak nation – however, it was actually a multinational formation. One third of the citizens (34,3 % in 1921 and 32,7 % in 1931) belonged to one or other nationality.”⁹ As early as 1916 Edward Beneš stated in his paper originally published in French in Paris that “Czechoslovaks – or simply Czechs – consist of two elements: the 7 million Czechs living in the Czech Republic, Moravia and Silesia and the 3 million Slovaks living in the northern parts of Hungary, between the Morava – Danube meeting and the Upper Tisza region. (...) the two branches of the one and the same nation have the same culture, language and history: the Slovak dialect hardly differs from the Czech.”¹⁰ The first president of the Czechoslovak state, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk had a similar opinion, he declared in his often cited work published in several languages in 1923-24 that „Československo je obnovením bývalého českého (a

⁶ Malá Saint Germainská zmluva (Zmluva medzi čelnými mocnosťami spojenými i združenými a Česko-Slovenskom, podpísaná v Saint-Germain-en-Laye dňa 10. septembra 1919). VESELÝ Zdeněk. *Dejiny českého štátu v dokumentech*. Praha: Victoria Publishing, 1995, pp. 329–334.

⁷ Ústavní listina Československé republiky (121/1920 Sb. Zákon ze dne 29. února 1920, kterým se uvozuje Ústavní listina Československé republiky). http://www.psp.cz/docs/texts/constitution_1920.html

⁸ Zákon c.122/1920 Zb. z. a n., upravující jazykové pomery v Československu. VESELÝ Zdeněk. *Dejiny českého štátu v dokumentech*. Praha: Victoria Publishing, 1995, pp. 351–352.

⁹ POMICHAL Richárd. Csehszlovákia es Magyarország viszonya az 1920-as években. In *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle 2*, 2007, p. 64.

¹⁰ BENEŠ Edvard. *Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie! Le martyre des Tchéco-Slovaques à travers l'histoire*. Paris: Delagrave, 1916, pp. 5–6.

velkomoravského) státu [...] Češi a Slováci jsou jeden národ a mají jeden jazyk.” (Slované po válce, 1923).¹¹

The Czechoslovak language was a political construction, similar to Serbo-Croatian, the most numerous language of ex-Yugoslavia. Although the theory of a uniform Serbo-Croatian language can be backed up by historic tradition, since the break-up of Yugoslavia there have been two separate languages (Abstand): Serbian is the state language in independent Serbia, and Croatian in sovereign Croatia. However the same language is used in both countries – the language used in the uniform Southern Slav State.¹² Recently not only Serbian and the slightly different Croatian have been distinguished but also Bosnian – spoken in regions inhabited by Moslems –, which is very close to both of them, and the Montenegrin language has also been recognized as a separate language.

In this way the Czechoslovak nation and language consisted of two, theoretically coequal varieties, the Czech and the Slovak peoples and languages. In a political sense the Czechs dominated in the Czechoslovak Republic. This is evident from language use. If Slovak had been the equal eastern variety of the “Czechoslovak language”, this eastern variety should have appeared in administration and education on the area of Podkarpatská Rus. The more so as – from a linguistic point of view – the Slovak language is much closer to Rusyn than Czech. But in Podkarpatská Rus Czech was the language of administration and education. Titles and labels of state institutions and symbols also illustrate the dominance of the Czech language: where there was a choice between Czech and Slovak, Czech was usually preferred.¹³

The language law and other measures regulating language use – e.g. Government statute No 27, issued in 1924¹⁴ and the Enacting Clause of the language law in 1926¹⁵ – ensured relatively wide rights

¹¹ MASARYK Tomáš Garrigue. *Slovanské problémy*. Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1923, p. 13.

¹² NYOMÁRKAY István. A szerbhorvát nyelvkérdés. In *Magyar Nyelvőr* 2 (121), 1997, p. 204.

¹³ SZALAY Zoltán. Kisebbségi nyelvi jogok Szlovákiában az 1918–1968 közötti időszakban. In *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 3, 2011, p. 86.

¹⁴ 27/1924 Sb. Vládné nariadenie, ktorým sa upravuje užívanie jazykov pre župné zastupiteľstva, župné výbory a okresné výbory, sriadené podľa vládneho nariadenia zo dňa 26. októbra 1922, č. 310 Sb. z. a n. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1924/013-1924.pdf>

¹⁵ 17/1926 Sb. Vládní nařízení, jímž se provádí ústavní zákon jazykový pro obor ministerstva vnitra, spravedlnosti, financí, průmyslu, obchodu a živnosti, veřejných prací a veřejného zdravotnictví a tělesné výchovy, pro veřejné korporace, podléhajícím těmto ministerstvům v republice Československé, jakož i pro úřady místní samosprávy. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1926/009-1926.pdf>

to minority language speakers, both orally and in writing. The right to free language use was provided not only for private persons. In case the headquarters of a certain firm, company or church was in the area of a district court where the percentage of a given minority exceeded the legally regulated threshold (20%), they also could take advantage of the right of free language use. Here we should not forget that the state not only allowed but prescribed the use of the minority language in case in a district the percentage of minority citizens exceeded the legally regulated limit. In most parts of Transcarpathia bilingual (Czechoslovak – Rusyn) and in districts inhabited by Hungarians trilingual (Czechoslovak – Rusyn – Hungarian) inscriptions appeared on public institutions: the names of schools, associations, shops, streets and squares were displayed in two or three languages.

As for Podkarpatská Rus, § 6 of the language law declared that the future regional assembly will have the right to pass its own laws on linguistic questions, however until the establishment of the regional assembly, the same language law was to be applied “with consideration to the specific language relations of the region”. The Enacting Act of the language law issued in 1926 repeats the text of the law – in addition it declares that petitions could be submitted in the Carpatho-Rusyn language at each court and office in the region. Besides the official Czechoslovak, the names of official buildings had to be displayed in Carpatho-Rusyn and official announcements had to be issued in both of the two languages.

The language law and the Enacting Act allowed the use of the Rusyn language in the whole region of Podkarpatská Rus. Hungarian language could be used at official places in settlements where the majority of inhabitants were Hungarian.

The right to education in the mother tongue was also assured by the language law. According to the Education Act No. 226/1922 passed on 13 July 1922¹⁶ it was required to teach the Czechoslovak language in minority schools; while the law No. 137/1923 passed on 8 July 1923¹⁷ definitely ordered the compulsory teaching of the state language in every school of the republic.

Although language measures were not hostile, minorities living in the Czechoslovak Republic raised several complaints concerning

¹⁶ 226/1922 Sb. Zákon, jímž se mění a doplňují zákony o školách obecných a občanských Pozn.: předpis neplatí na Podkarpatské Rusi. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1922/080-1922.pdf>

¹⁷ 137/1923 Sb. Zákon, kterým se upravuje vyučování jazyku státnímu a jazykům národních menšin na školách středních a ústavech učitelských. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1923/061-1923.pdf>

their language rights. One of the reasons was that the percentage of the given minority had to exceed the 20 % limit – granting the use of the language – on the area of the given district court. By means of administrative reforms the authorities often tried to change the borders of the district courts so that the percentage of minorities could not exceed the 20 % limit. Another reason was that only Czechoslovak citizens were taken into consideration – other citizens and stateless people were not counted when the percentage of a given minority was estimated. Czechoslovakia signed the Peace Treaties but later they did not accept the articles granting citizenship automatically to all people living in the country. The so called Domicile Act No 236/1920¹⁸ declared that only persons who had been domiciled before 1910 could get Czechoslovak citizenship. Those who moved to the regions concerned had to submit complicated petitions and face different examinations.

The so called Lex Dérer – Law No 152/1926 – passed on 1 July 1926¹⁹ regulated the problems of citizenship. Citizenship was of special importance as language rights were bound by Czechoslovak laws to the percentage of the minority present in a given district. Unsettled citizenship was characteristic of minority people on the first place. The Czechoslovak census in 1930 found sixteen thousand foreign or stateless persons in Transcarpathia, most of them were Hungarians or Rusyns. Transcarpathian inhabitants without Czechoslovak citizenship were not counted in the 20 percent limit and the elections, since only citizens of the Czechoslovak Republic had voting rights.

Demographic policy also served the political ends of language policy. There is a striking difference between the results of the two censuses in the region of the present Transcarpathia: in 1910 the Hungarian census found 184 thousand Hungarians, while the first Czechoslovak census recorded only 111 thousand. This was partly due to the change of the administration in the region – a great number of Hungarian civil servants, intellectuals, officers and gendarmes left for Hungary – inside the borders drawn at Trianon. At the same time the Hungarian census recorded the numbers by mother tongue, while the Czechoslovak records based it on nationality. This is why a great number of Hungarian-speaking Jews fell into another category. In the Czechoslovak period the Hungarian parties of Transcarpathia openly expressed their opinion that the reduction of the number of

¹⁸ 236/1920 Sb. Ústavní zákon, kterým se doplňují a mění dosavadní ustanovení o nabytí a pozbytí státního občanství a práva domovského v republice Československé. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1920/046-1920.pdf>

¹⁹ 152/1926 Sb. Ústavní zákon o udělení štátného občanstva československého některým osobám. <http://ftp.aspi.cz/opispdf/1926/070-1926.pdf>

Hungarian inhabitants was mainly due to counting the Jews separate from the Hungarians. On 5 May 1935 the daily paper “Kárpáti Magyar Hírlap” appealed to them as follows: “Fraternal words to Hungarians of Jewish religion in Transcarpathia! (...) Our Hungarian brothers and sisters of Jewish religion! The last hour has come! Return to the indigenous community, which is also a vital affiliation for you! Return to the basic principles of the policy of the Hungarian National Party!”²⁰

Czechoslovak authorities wanted to reduce the number of nationalities also by means of an agrarian reform: several so called Czech colonies were founded on the properties of previous large estates, mainly in the southern parts of Transcarpathia inhabited by Hungarians. Different benefits were given to Czech and Moravian and upland Rusyn people who settled in these villages. Although the majority of the inhabitants of the Czech colonies left when these regions were returned to Hungary after the First Vienna Award in 1938, later Rusyn/Ukrainian people were settled in their place by the Soviet authorities.²¹

The Rusyn autonomy promised in the constitution could have changed the linguistic situation of the region significantly, but it was realized just before the beginning of World War I. With reference to §8 of the Czechoslovak language law of 1920, on 25 November 1938 the Transcarpathian government of Avhustyn Voloshyn introduced Ukrainian as the state language of the autonomous region. §2 of the governmental regulation²² allowed Czech, Slovak and Russian inhabitants to submit their official applications in their own languages. At the same time §3²³ invalidated previous regulations concerning the use of languages. The Voloshyn-government clearly aimed to ukrainianize of social and public life, which is also reflected by changing the name of the region to Carpatho-Ukraine.

²⁰ Cit. FEDINEC Csilla. *Iratok a kárpátaljai magyarság történetéhez 1918–1944. Törvények, rendeletek, kisebbségi programok, nyilatkozatok*. Somorja–Dunaszerdahely: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Lilium Aurum Könyvkiadó, 2004, pp. 345–346.

²¹ SZAKÁL Imre. „... Nem tehetnek ők sem róla, hogy közénk kerültek.” Az első Csehszlovák Köztársaság kárpátaljai telepítéspolitikájának néhány aspektusa. In SZAMBOROVSKYNE NAGY Ibolya (ed.) *„Így maradtok meg hívóvőnek”. In memoriam Soós Kálmán*. Ungvár: PoliPrint, 2012, pp. 165–178.

²² Розпорядження правительства Підкарпатської Русі з дня 25 листопада 1938 року про запровадження на її території державної української (малоруської) мови. <http://izbornyk.org.ua/volosh/volosh41.htm>

²³ ЛЕВЕНЕЦЬ Юрій et al. (eds.) *Закарпаття в етнополітичному вимірі*. Київ: ІПНЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса, 2008, pp. 294–295.

While the troops of the Hungarian Army started to reoccupy Transcarpathia still belonging to Czechoslovakia, the autonomous parliament (the Sojm) declared the independence of Carpatho-Ukraine in Khust, on 14 March. The next day – while the Hungarian troops, overcome sporadic armed resistance, and marched towards Khust, the capital – the Sojm accepted the constitution²⁴ verifying the declaration of the sovereign state (§1), whose state language was Ukrainian (§4). However, there was no chance to set up an independent state since the Hungarian Army finished the military occupation of all of Transcarpathia by 18 March.

Language camps

In the Czechoslovak period on the territory of the present Transcarpathia authorities allowed the official use of the Rusyn language in the region where the absolute majority of the population was Rusyn – in spite of the fact that there was actually no real autonomy. From a language policy point of view the language of the Slav majority of the population could be used as an official language, equal to the state language (theoretically the Czechoslovak, but actually the Czech language). Hungarian, which used to be the previous state language, could be used officially only in the area of district courts where the percentage of the Hungarian inhabitants exceeded 20 %. Although neither Rusyns nor Hungarians were completely satisfied with the language situation, the main linguistic problem of the period was due to the questions of linguistic strategy. This was closely connected with language policy, which did not have a clear policy. This was mainly due to the fact that in the fields of culture, public life and education, three literary varieties were used of the so-called Rusyn language, the official language in the region.

One of the most significant language problems of the local Slav inhabitants was the lack of a standardized dialect. Since the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries several linguistic dialects existed among the Slovaks in Transcarpathia. There was no uniform linguistic approach in the period in question. This was also the case with the Rusyns. Three language camps could be differentiated: Russophile (Great Russian), Ukranophile (Little Russian) and Rusynophile. The three language camps wanted to arrange the linguistic status of the majority of inhabitants in the region in three contrasting ways.

²⁴ Конституційний Закон ч. 1 Карпатської України. Хуст, 15 березня 1939 р. <http://litopys.org.ua/volosh/volosh45.htm>

The local Slav intellectuals could not agree upon which language or language variety could function as the standard or literary language.

Before 1918 Hungarian authorities supported the Rusyn language. The supporters of this camp considered the Rusyn people independent and differentiated the Rusyn or Ruthenian language (the local Slav dialects) from the neighbouring Slav (Ukrainian, Slovak, Polish) languages. Especially the priests of the Greek Catholic episcopate in Mukacheve were Rusynophile. Their aim was to establish and codify their own literary language, based on local dialects and the Slav language used by the Church. The best-known representatives of this camp were Antal Hodinka and Hiiador Strypskyi, who – in the Czechoslovak period – lived in Hungary and not on the territory of Podkarpatská Rus and returned there for a short time only after the revision.

The theory of independent Rusyn people was backed by the fact that the Carpathian mountain range – a natural border – separated Slavs living in Hungary from Slavs living beyond this border. The supporters of the Rusynophile theory thought even after the region had been joined to Czechoslovakia that the literary language had to be near to the “language of the people”, the natural spoken language in everyday life. Their ambitions were hampered by the relatively significant differences between the local Slav dialects, so the question of the standard literary language could not be solved by choosing one of them. However, they did not have the time, the opportunity, financial backing or legitimacy to blend the local dialects and equal the norms. In the 1920's the Rusynophile camp became insignificant, partly because the Czechoslovak authorities thought that the supporters of the theory of the independent Rusyn people and language were “magyarón”, and represented Hungarian interests. Although in the first issue of the periodical „Недѣля (Sunday) published on 6 October 1935 the supporters of the theory of an independent Rusyn literary language – recognizing the cultural splendour of the Russian and the Ukrainian people – appealed to the supporters of the two other camps to join them in order to work out a literary language based on the language spoken by the local people. However, the language could not be standardized because of the deep divisions. The Rusyn camp got stronger again in the second half of the 1930's, especially when Transcarpathia was returned to Hungary.

There was a keen rivalry between the Russophile and Ukrano-ophile camps when the area was joined to Czechoslovakia. In the beginning the two opposite camps dividing the local Slav intellectuals were equally supported by the Government in Prague. The first camps wanted to use Great Russian as the literary language while the other aimed at the introduction and use of the Ukrainian standard.

A short work by Aleksei Gerovsky²⁵ can be considered a summary of the linguistic program of the Russophile line. He differentiated four linguistic varieties: a) Northern Great Russian /северно-великорусское наречие/, b) Southern Great Russian /южно-великорусское наречие/, c) Byelorussian /белорусское наречие/, d) Southern Russian or Carpatho-Rusyn /южно-русское или малорусское наречие/. In his opinion the dialects of Transcarpathian Slovaks belong to the Southern or Carpatho-Rusyn dialect. As the dialects spoken by local people also belong to the uniform Russian language, the use of literary Russian in writing is quite necessary. Gerovsky considered Ukrainian a dividing, artificially imported language.

The supporters of the Russian camp conceived of a linguistic situation similar to the one characteristic of the German-speaking region in Switzerland. The situation called (Ferguson) diglossia²⁶ in linguistic literature means that Swiss Germans use the local dialect (Schweizerdeutsch) in everyday communication (at home, with friends, private correspondence, etc.) and literary German (Hochdeutsch or Schriftsprache) in formal, public situations (church, work, school, media, etc.). Russophiles suggested local dialects in everyday oral communication but urged the introduction of Russian (Great Russian) in education and cultural life. This way Russian was to be considered “sophisticated” while local dialects were “popular”. German, French and Italian linguistic situations were shown as models for the local people. They stressed that Bavarians, Saxons and the Tyrolese use their own dialects in the family, and change to uniform literary German in cultural life, education, science and literature. “We recognize the common literary Russian language and urge its introduction in education and administration but do not want to throw out the popular language. At the same time we want to gradually rid this dialect of magyarisms, we want to make it richer and wider but not with pure fabrications and other provincialisms, which does not make sense here. We want to arrange the linguistic situation similar to the model used by West-European civilized people. Literary French does not damage Provencals, and literary Russian will not hurt us either.” – writes Ihor Husnai.²⁷

²⁵ ГЕРОВСКИЙ Алексей. *Борьба чешского правительства с русским языком (1938)*. <http://oboguev.narod.ru/images/cr3.htm>

²⁶ FERGUSON Charles A. Diglossia. In *Word XV*, 1959, pp. 325-340; TRUDGILL Peter. *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003; WARDHAUGH Ronald. *Sociolinguistics*. 5th ed. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

²⁷ ГУСЬНАЙ Игорь. *Языковый вопрос в Подкарпатской Руси*. Пряшевъ: Книгопечатня „Св. Николая”, 1921, pp. 19, 27.

The theoretical background of Ukranophiles was the fact that the dialects used by Transcarpathian Slavs were similar to the Ukrainian dialects spoken on the other side of the Carpathian mountain range, so they did not have an independent language. The similarity of the dialects used on the Eastern and Western sides of the Carpathian mountain range were derived mainly from texts written before the 18th century. The majority of local intellectuals also supported the Ukrainian camp. One of them was the poet, author and editor Vasył Grendzha-Donskyi. He wrote in the 21st issue of the journal “Українське слово” (Ukrainian word) published on 13 April 1938: “Actually there is no need for a separate literary language in Carpathian Ruthenia (...), the appearance of a somewhat new language would be a dangerous support for dividing efforts, which have been present among our people for a long time. There is no doubt that the local Rusyn dialect of Carpathian Ruthenia is a dialect of the Ukrainian language, so local citizens should also accept the Ukrainian used by their neighbours and relatives as their own literary language, too.” And he goes on: “Here in Transcarpathia we speak a beautiful Ukrainian language, a language spoken by our sisters and brothers in Galicia, Bukovina or Great-Ukraine.”²⁸

The Russophile camp started with the advantage that Russian was a codified, prestigious language carrying high cultural value – as against the Ukrainian language, which had several more or less different literary norms and spellings in the first third of the 20th century. This way not only the Rusyn but also the Ukranophile camp had to face certain problems of codification. “We should not forget that the “Ukrainian – Carpatho-Rusyn” language and spelling have not yet become solid and uniform. (...) Separatists have at least three different ways of spelling, ie. Rusyn – Ukrainian in Podkarpatská Rus, Galician – Ukrainian in Galicia and Carpatho-Rusyn – Ukrainian in Southern Russia. The separatists themselves cannot even decide which of the three is the best. We know that (Ivan) Kotlyarevsky, (Mykola) Kulish, (Ivan) Franko and (Vladimir) Vinnichenko wrote in different ways” – Husnai writes.²⁹

The establishment of a uniform Ukrainian standard was hindered by the division of the Ukrainian language areas up to the end of World War II, politically belonging to the territory of several states.³⁰

²⁸ Cit. ФЕРЕНЦ Надія. В. Гренджа-Донський про мову Закарпатців. In *Українська мова на Закарпатті у минулому і сьогодні*. Ужгород: Патент, 1993, pp. 314–320.

²⁹ ГУСЬНАЙ Игорь. *Языковый вопрос в Подкарпатской Руси*. Пряшев: Книгопечатня „Св. Николая”, 1921, p. 30.

³⁰ KOCSIS Károly – RUDENKO Leonid – SCHWEITZER Ferenc (eds.) *Ukraine in Maps*. Kyiv–Budapest: Institute of Geography National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine – Geographical Research Institute Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 2008, pp. 19–24.

There were different opportunities to standardize, codify and unify spelling in Galicia and Bukovina, which were parts of the Habsburg Empire up to 1918 and then belonged to Poland. The area of the present Transcarpathia, on the other hands up to the end of World War I belonged to Hungary then to Czechoslovakia, or to Central- and Eastern-Ukrainian regions, which were first under the supremacy of tsarist Russia then of the Soviet Union.

The above problems of the Ukrainian orientation in reflected by the fact that in the given period more than one way of spelling was used in the region, and different etymological and phonetic orthographies prevailed. The linguistic uniformity of Ukrainians living in Transcarpathia and beyond the Carpathian mountain range had to be obvious also in spelling – at least the supporters of the Ukrainian camp thought it very important. The is stated in „Мова і правопис” (Language and spelling) an article signed by a certain K. Chehovich published in the Ukranophile paper „УЧИТЕЛЬ” (Teacher) in 1931: „If the members of a nation do not use the same letters to indicate the same sounds of their literary language, the feeling of their national unity will fade and at the same time it will be difficult to transfer thoughts and cultural values connected to language.”³¹

When local authorities had to answer the question of which language or language version was to be used in education and public administration in Podkarpatská Rus, on 15 November 1919 they wrote a letter (registered No 934 in Prague) to the academy of sciences in Prague asking for their opinion. The letter was answered from the ministry of education by Gustav Habrman, his letter was registered 62.756/19. 902. n.o. on 20 December 1919. The introduction of the letter (re: „Spisovný jazyk pro Karpatskou Rus”) states that a committee of linguists and other experts were sitting on 4 December, which had to make a commitment concerning the literary language of the region and the version of the language used in education. The experts unanimously accepted a common attitude of five items which was delivered to the state leaders in Transcarpathia in a letter signed by the minister himself.

The first item declares that it is the users of the given language who are competent to decide the literary language of a nation not an academic committee. The second item clearly states that the Slav inhabitants of the region were not likely to welcome the development of a new literary language, which was considered unnecessary and contradictory to the aims of Czechoslovak nationality policy as it could lead to strengthen the supporters of divisiveness. The

³¹ *Учитель* 7-8 (XII), 1931, pp. 137–139.

third item undoubtedly calls the language varieties of the region “maloruské” – dialects of the Ukrainian language. Subsequently the language used by the nearest neighbours belonging to the same ethnical group, Galician Ukrainian („haličskou ukrajinštinu”) should be recognized as the literary language of Transcarpathia. In addition the statement suggests that in Transcarpathia the spelling of the Galician literary language should be etymological rather than phonetic.³² According to the experts in Prague the introduction of the Ukrainian literary language in local education would be useful for schools in Transcarpathia and it would be possible to use Galician textbooks and to employ Galician teachers. The fears that this would lead to Ukrainian irredentism would appear in Podkarpatská Rus are wrong – the minister’s letter states. The chance would be greater – the letter states – if Transcarpathian Slavs would be cut off from their natural national roots.

With consideration of the above, the fourth item is even more interesting. The academic body suggests that in secondary school classes Russian should be also compulsory in addition to the state language, so that the Slav – as well as the Ukrainian – inhabitants of the region would not lose the feeling of belonging to the great Russian nation.³³

The fifth issue – the final suggestion of the academic body – declares that it would be advisable, both professionally and politically, to study earlier attempts – e.g. Voloshyn’s grammar – aimed at the development of the local literary language.³⁴

In the Transcarpathian region one of the first public confrontations between the Russian and Ukrainian orientations took place in 1921. Ihor Husnai, a school inspector in Prešov expresses his opinion in his above cited paper „Языковый вопросъ въ Подкарпатской Руси” (The language question in Podkarpatská Rus) published in 1921, according to which Czech authorities do not know what to think of a “dialect”, this is why he suggested the introduction of the Russian

³² Шевельов Юрий. *Українська мова в першій половині двадцятого століття (1900–1941). Стан і статус*. Київ: Сучасність, 1987, p. 249.

³³ Tichý František. *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka na Podkarpatské Rusi*. Praha: Orbis, 1938, p. 112.

³⁴ The original attitude of the academy (in Czech language) is cited by Мозер Міхаель. Шляхи „українізації: Підкарпаття за міжвоєнної доби – перші граматики української мови. In ZOLTÁN András (ed.) *In memoriam István Udvari (1950–2005)*. Nyíregyháza: Nyíregyházi Főiskola Ukrán és Ruszin Filológiai Tanszéke, 2011, p. 248. A copy of the original document is published in: Черничко Степан – ФЕДИНЕЦЬ Чілла. *Наш місцевий Вавилон. Історія мовної політики на території Закарпаття у першій половині ХХ століття (до 1944 року)*. Ужгород: Поліграфцентр «Ліра», 2014, pp. 105–106.

language in Transcarpathia. He refused to use the Ukrainian literary language, calling Ukrainian a pure Austrian-Polish fabrication, considering the Ukrainian camp separatist. In his opinion the Rusynophile camp was a manifestation of narrow territorial interests, provincialism and intellectual backwardness as well as Russophobia.³⁵ “There are as many as three different Carpatho-Rusyn dialects, in addition to several smaller dialects. In Podkarpatská Rus itself three or four dialects can be differentiated. How far would we get if – behind the slogan of “mother tongue” – each dialect wanted to be officially recognized?”³⁶ – Ihor Husnai asks the question, refusing both the Ukrainian and the Rusyn camps.

Avhustyn Voloshyn reacted to Husnai’s question in his answer „О письменном язиць Подкарпатських русинов” (On the literary language of Transcarpathian Rusyns).³⁷ He clearly defined the Ukrainian language as the literary language of the local Slav inhabitants and refused the theory according to which Carpatho-Rusyn (малоруський) was only a dialect of Great Russian (великорусский). In Voloshyn’s opinion the Russian orientation, which had had a strong influence from the second half of the 19th century, was an anachronistic mistake, and contradictory to national consolidation.³⁸ Voloshyn thought that behind the pro-Russian argument there were divisive political aims. “Some fanatic janissaries had infiltrated us from tsarist and Bolshevik Russia and began their dangerous fratricidal work. Single-minded people were convinced by their mean demagoguery, fluffy-minded believers were converted to “krivoslavia” here and there, and intellectuals were divided by the language question” he states in his polemical essay.³⁹ He refuses the charge of separatism and defends the independence of the Ukrainian (Carpatho-Rusyn)

³⁵ ПЛІШКОВА Анна. *Русинський язык на Словенску (Короткий нарис історії і сучасності)*. Пряшів: Світовий конгрес Русинів, 2008, pp. 39–40.

³⁶ ГУСНАЙ Игорь. *Языковый вопрос въ Подкарпатской Руси*. Пряшевъ: Книгопечатня „Св. Николая”, 1921, p. 30.

³⁷ ВОЛОШИН Августин. *О письменном язиць Підкарпатських русинов*. Ужгород: „Уніо”, 1921. <http://litopys.org.ua/volosh/volosh30.htm>

³⁸ ПЛІШКОВА Анна. *Русинський язык на Словенску (Короткий нарис історії і сучасності)*. Пряшів: Світовий конгрес Русинів, 2008, p. 40.

³⁹ By means of this play on words the Greek Catholic Volosyn wanted to parallel between pravoslavia (православіє) and krivaslavia (кривославіє) referring to the schismatic movement, which made several Greek Catholic believers to converse to the Greek Orthodox (Pravoslav) Church. The word „Pravoslav” means (also) follower of the true faith, while the prefix „krivo” means here false, wrong and distorted.

language with reference to the attitude of the Academy of Sciences in Petersburg which had been issued in 1905.⁴⁰

Referring to the all-Russian uniform language and the German analogy of his debating partners, Avhustyn Voloshyn cites a work of Vatroslav Jagić (1908) and stresses that in addition to German there are several other Germanic languages e.g. Flemish, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. “If we examine the reasons why these languages have differentiated from the all-German language, we will face their historic disintegration.” – the author states. “As impossible as it is to transform a square into a circle, so difficult it is to blend people divided by history on the basis of language” – Voloshyn writes with reference to the Russian and the Ukrainian people and languages. He states that “each Slav folk has created their own language and literature”. Voloshyn stresses that the literary language should be near to the language of the people. In the author’s opinion writers and poets of the Hungarian reform period – Mihály Csokonai Vitéz, Sándor Petőfi and János Arany – renewed Hungarian literature by raising the language of single-minded people onto the level of literature. Voloshyn clearly opposes local, regional literary traditions to the Great Russian linguistic line. In his opinion regional linguistic traditions consider the popular language a base but they do not separate from the language varieties used beyond the Carpathian mountain range.

At the end of his polemical essay Voloshyn sums up the results of his work. He declares that the independent existence of the Carpatho-Rusyn (Ukrainian) language is a fact. The fight against it is due to religious, political and economic reasons. He stresses that the Carpatho-Rusyn language must not be linked to separatism as it does not hinder Slav solidarity. He announces that Great Russian spelling cannot be applied to Carpatho-Rusyn. He asserts that the polonisms of the Galician language varieties, the Moskowite and Polish elements or the Hungarian occurrences in the Transcarpathian language varieties have not changed the popular character of the Carpatho-Rusyn language. In his opinion the Great Russian line is anachronistic and prevents cultural development, encumbers ecclesiastic work and spiritual life, and obstructs economic growth and blocks political consolidation.

Prague wanted to arrange language relations in the region by means of a referendum in 1937, which was to decide which grammar the local schools should teach as the basis of the Rusyn language.

⁴⁰ *Об отмене стеснений малорусского печатного слова*. Санкт-Петербург, 1905. http://histans.com/LiberUA/OtmStMalPechSl_1905/OtmStMalPechSl_1905.pdf

However, the results of the referendum were contradictory, 73 percent of the 427 schools voted for Evmenii Sabov's Russophile grammar and 27 percent for Ivan Penkevich's Ukrainian grammar. The interpretation of the results suggested that the majority voted for the existence of the independent Rusyn people and the use of the Russian language. Ukrainian intellectuals did not accept the result as authentic – stressing among others that it did not cover the whole territory of Podkarpatská Rus.⁴¹

The major institutional background of the Ukranophiles was the Prosvita Society (Товариство Просвіта) founded by a Galician pattern in 1920, and the periodical „Науковий збірник” (Scientific Review). “We will let the whole world know that we, Transcarpathian Rusyns belong to the great Ukrainian nation, our language and culture have always been, are and will be the same – i.e. the language and literature of our brothers and sisters living beyond the Carpathian mountain range, and we will fight with all our might against all attempts to russionize us or make a separate tribe out of us, and thereby this way break us away from our maternal tribe.” – can be read in the program of the Prosvita Society.⁴² Its counterpart was the Russophile Alexander Dukhnovych Society (Русское культурно-просвѣтительное общество имени А. В. Духновича, in short Общество имени А. Духновича) and the periodicals „Карпатський край” (Carpathian Region, published in 1923-24) and „Карпатський світ” (Carpathian World, published in 1928-1933). Both of the two companies wanted to influence local cultural life, and by means of their periodicals they tried to establish Ukrainian or Russian as the literary language in the region. Most members of the Prosvita declared themselves to be Ukrainian, while members of the Dukhnovych Society avowed themselves mainly Rusyns. Several supporters of the Ukrainian camp came from Galicia, while there were some immigrant (Great) Russian intellectuals in the Rusyn society.

In his memoirs the contemporary Julius Marina⁴³ estimated a 40-42 % percent majority for the Great Russian Dukhnovych Society

⁴¹ MAGOCSI Paul Robert. *The Shaping of a National Identity: Developments in Subcarpathian Rus' 1848-1948*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978, p. 226; SHEVELOV George Y. The Language Question in the Ukraine in the Twentieth Century (1900-1941). *Harvard Ukrainian Studies XI*, 1987, p. 205; ЛЕВЕНЕЦЬ Юрій et al. (eds.) *Закарпаття в етнополітичному вимірі*. Київ: ІПЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса, 2008, p. 271.

⁴² Cit. BONKÁLÓ Sándor. *A kárpátaljai rutén irodalom és művelődés*. Pécs: Pécsi Egyetemi Könyvkiadó és Nyomda, 1935, pp. 63-64.

⁴³ MARINA Gyula. *Ruténsors – Kárpátalja végzete*. Nagyszőlős: Kárpátaljai Magyar Kulturális Szövetség, 1977/1999, pp. 102, 111.

led by Evmenii Sabov and Shtefan Fentsyk in the early 1930's while the Ukranophile Prosvita Society led by Voloshyn had 28-30 percent. In Marina's opinion the popular-oriented "narodovci"s (i.e. Rusynophiles) led by the Greek Catholic bishop Alexander Stojka would have rather joined the Russian camp.

Although the Czech authorities declared the equality of the Russian and Ukrainian languages in Podkarpatská Rus on 15 July 1937,⁴⁴ at the end of the period the Ukrainian linguistic camp – parallel to the strengthening of the positions of the Ukrainian-oriented political elite – also strengthened significantly. At the congress of the Prosvita Society in Uzhgorod on 16-17 October 1937, a proclamation was issued, signed by the leaders of 24 parties, social and cultural organizations, which was spread by means of posters all over the region. The authors of the proclamation contended that Moscow forced the Russian and Budapest the Rusyn on the local inhabitants, who were actually Ukrainian and spoke Ukrainian. "We must not allow – the proclamation says – the enemies of the republic and the people to create a Carpatho-Russian people that never existed. There are neither Russians (москалі), nor Carpatho Russians (карпатгоросси), there is only one nation, the Ukrainian (український нарід), which has one unified language, culture and spelling." The authors also demanded that Ukrainian should be the language of education in the schools of the region.⁴⁵

Both of the two orientations had strong influence upon education. Most Ukranophile teachers gathered in the Teachers' Association (Учительська Громада) existing between 1929 and 1939, while Russophile teachers joined the Teachers' Assembly (Учительское Товарищество) existing from 1921 to 1938. The first issued the periodical (Учительський Голос) (Teachers' Voice, 1930-1939) and the second the „Народна Школа” (Popular School, 1921–1938).

The government in Prague urged the extension of the network of Czecho(slovak) schools and the state language as the language of education, but at the same time it allowed education in the mother tongue. The rate of pupils studying in Czech or Slovak was much higher than the number of those of Czech or Slovak national identity. However, in Podkarpatská Rus pupils belonging to several other

⁴⁴ SHEVELOV George Y. The Language Question in the Ukraine in the Twentieth Century (1900–1941). In *Harvard Ukrainian Studies XI*, 1987, p. 204.

⁴⁵ *Маніфест до Українського народу Підкарпаття. 17-го жовтня (октобра) 1937.* <http://litopys.org.ua/volosh/volosh39.htm>; МИШАНИЧ Олекса. *Політичне русинство: історія і сучасність. Ідейні джерела закарпатського регіонального сепаратизму.* Київ: Обереги, 1999.

nationalities, were allowed to study in their own mother tongues during this period.⁴⁶

At the beginning the Greek Catholic Church supported the Rusyn camp, but later – mainly due to Voloshyn’s influence – the majority of Greek Catholic priests sided with the Ukranophile camp. The orthodox (pravoslav) church thought that Russian should be used as the literary language. In political life of the Rusyn camp was embodied by Andrej Bródy and the Ukrainian by Avhustyn Voloshyn. When Bródy became the head of the first autonomous government, the idea of the independent Rusyn people and the introduction of the Russian literary language was supported, notwithstanding the proclamation of the National Council of Rusyns, which was posted all over Transcarpathia in October 1938, and demanded that the “language of the people” should be the official language.⁴⁷ Bródy’s government was soon replaced by Voloshyn’s cabinet and Voloshyn considered the Ukrainian line the only right direction. During his governance he took significant steps toward independence from Prague and the strengthening of the Ukrainian language in the region. The peak of this striving for independence was the declaration of the independent state of Carpathian Ukraine in March 1939 and the introduction of Ukrainian as the official language.

When language standard is developed (i.e. the process of standardization and codification), four essential steps can be differentiated in the theory and practice of language planning: selection, codification, implementation and elaboration.⁴⁸ Selection means the decision of the language version which will be the basis of the standard. Then the given variety has to be codified, i.e. the standard norm should be laid down in grammar, dictionaries, handbooks and orthographical rules. Implementation is the phase when – through education in the first place – the codified norm will be introduced to the people,

⁴⁶ КЛИМА Виктор. Школьное дело и просвещение на Подкарпатской Руси. In Эдмунд Бачинский (ed.) *Подкарпатская Русь за годы 1919–1936*. Ужгород: Русский Народный Голос, 1936, p. 103; МАГОУЧІЙ Павло Роберт. *Історія України*. Київ: Критика, 2007, p. 518.

⁴⁷ Cit. FEDINEC Csilla. *A kárpátaljai magyarság történeti kronológiája 1918–1944*. Galánta–Dunaszerdahely: Fórum Intézet – Liliium Aurum Könyvkiadó, 2002, p. 291.

⁴⁸ FISHMAN A. Joshua. Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. In JOSHUA A. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton, Haugen, 1974, pp. 79-102; HAUGEN Einar. The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and Practice. In COBARRUBIAS Juan – FISHMAN A. Joshua (eds.) *Progress in language planning. International perspectives*. Berlin–New York–Amsterdam: Mouton, 1983, pp. 269–289.

the teachers and the press, etc. who are urged to use the standard. Elaboration means the continuous updating of the codified norm: the permanently changing language should be followed up, enlarged and differentiated stylistically, codifying tasks should be refined. Einar Haugen sums up these steps as standardization, as this is the way of transforming a dialect into a standard language.⁴⁹

In education the above mentioned linguistic camps were fighting with regard to three out of the four basic steps of language planning. For selection, the first voted for the Ukrainian version and the second for the Russian literary language, while the third wanted to codify a new standard variety. The codification of the role of grammars used at school was decisive, as it is the school, which forms the linguistic behaviour, habits, norm-consciousness and spelling of adults. The selection of the language of education will have a great influence on implementation.

Transcarpathian linguistic camps from a language planning point of view

	Rusynophile	Ukranophile	Russophile
Selection	New literary language on the basis of local dialects	Ukrainian	Russian
Codification	Gradual approach to a stable literary norm (standardization and codification) via literary and scientific works and publications	Introduction of the Ukrainian literary language by means of grammars (e.g. the grammar of Ivan Pankevich)	Acceptance of the already codified Russian literary language and Evmenii Sabov's grammar
Implementation	Education at school, ecclesiastical and cultural life, via papers and periodicals	Education at school, ecclesiastical and cultural life, political and public life	Education at school, ecclesiastical and cultural life
Elaboration	Lack of time	Lack of time	Lack of time

The linguistic polemics and the language planning steps of the different linguistic camps – seen in a theoretical framework of language policy and/or language planning – is presented in the following table.⁵⁰ For selection, the Rusyn camp aimed at the creation of a new literary language, arching over and blending the local

⁴⁹ SÁNDOR Klára. Nyelvertervezés, nyelvpolitika, nyelvművelés. In KIEFER Ferenc (ed.) *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2006, p. 961.

⁵⁰ HAUGEN Einar. The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and Practice. In COBARRUBIAS Juan – FISHMAN A. Joshua (eds.) *Progress in language planning. International perspectives*. Berlin–New York–Amsterdam: Mouton, 1983, pp. 269–289.

dialects. Ukranophiles voted for Ukrainian and Russophiles for Russian as the literary language. In education the Ukrainian and Russian linguistic movements used mainly school grammars, while Rusyns approached the elaboration of the literary language variety via literary and scientific works. They considered education the main means of implementation. However, none of them had real opportunities to elaborate, update and develop linguistic norms under the given historic and political circumstances.

In Podkarpatská Rus the most important question of nationality and linguistic politics was autonomy – allowing among others the inner regulation of language rights – promised in the Treaty of Saint-Germain and the Czechoslovak Constitution of 1920. However, Czechoslovakia postponed the introduction of autonomy up to 1938. In the given period the most important events of language policy were the change of the state language (from Hungarian to Czechoslovak) and the official status of the Rusyn language. It is not surprising that Hungarians viewed this as a negative and Rusyns as a positive change. Another important event of the period was the wider and wider appearance of the Ukrainian language in education, culture, the press and in official life. None of the representatives of the Rusyn, Ukrainian or Russian camps could definitely win the struggle. At the same time it cannot be doubted that the strong appearance of the Ukranophile stream in education, the organizational work of Ukrainian intellectuals coming from Galicia and the steps toward the independence of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state had decisive influence upon the identity of the Slavic inhabitants living in the region. It also had a decisive influence upon the development of their language and linguistic consciousness, and Ukrainian undoubtedly became the dominant stream.