

Museum Affairs at the Territory of Subcarpathian Rus' in the Years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1919 – 1938)

Ihor Shnitser

Doc. PhDr. Ihor Shnitser, PhD.
Uzhhorod National University
Faculty of History and International Relations
Narodna Square, 3
88000 Uzhhorod
Ukraine
e-mail: ihor.shnitser@uzhnu.edu.ua

Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, 2019, 7:1:99-110

Museum Affairs at the Territory of Subcarpathian Rus' in the Years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1919 – 1938).

The article deals with the formation and specifics of the development of museums in Subcarpathian Rus' in 1919-1938. It defines the main centers of museum science, as well as the contribution of scientists, representatives of cultural and public societies, and the state to the collection and exhibition of natural monuments and monuments of material and spiritual culture of the region. In the article, a great attention is paid to the coverage of the history of the creation, development and functioning of the Museum of T. Legotsky in Mukachevo, the Museum of the Society 'Prosvita', the Rus' National Museum, and others. The author reaches the conclusion that the development of museum affairs in the territory of Subcarpathian Rus' in 1920s – 1930s was stimulated by the attention of the society and the support of the central and local authorities. Museum affairs were moved to the state level.

Key words: Subcarpathian Rus', museum affairs, museum society, museums, monuments, protective activity

After the ending of the World War I the territory of the Ukrainian Transcarpathia according to the Treaty of Saint-Germain since September 10, 1919 was included to the territories of the Czechoslovak Republic under historical name Subcarpathian Rus'. Since then, a new, rather controversial, yet important and positive stage of the development of this distinctive Ukrainian region has begun. The democratic principles of the young state created favorable opportunities and conditions for the emergence and functioning of political parties, public associations, cultural and educational societies and other institutions and elements of civil society. In addition, in Czechoslovakia, sufficiently good conditions were created for the revival of the indigenous culture of Subcarpathian Rus'. The transformation of culture called for a transformation of social and national consciousness. Formation of ethnocultural self-awareness of Rusyn-Ukrainians in Subcarpathian Rus' led to the manifestation of the public need for the creation of museums that could store and display real, pictorial and written testimonies of the history of the local population of the region. Historical and cultural heritage has become perceived as a necessary link, linking the past with modern, an important means of establishing the national consciousness of the population, the basis for an objective study of its history and culture.

The purpose of this article is, in the retrospective aspect, to highlight the preconditions of the formation and specificity of the development of museums in Subcarpathian Rus' in 1919-1938, to find out the main centers of museum science, as well as the contribution of scientists,

representatives of cultural and public societies and the state to the collection and exhibition of memorabilia of nature, material and spiritual culture of the region.

In recent years, Ukrainian historiography has accumulated considerable scientific potential in the study of the history of museum affairs in Subcarpathian Rus' between the two World Wars. The origins of museum studies in the province were studied by J. Kobal, Y. Kachiy, I. Striapko, V. Pankulych, V. Kusma, V. Palynchak and others. Their works comprehensively cover the circumstances of the birth of museum institutions in Subcarpathian Rus', their main achievements and the problems they encountered during the formation and exhibition of museum collections.

After the end of the World War I there was not a single museum in Subcarpathian Rus'. This is despite the fact that in 1907 the 'Mukachevo Museum Society named after Theodore Legotsky' was created, whose members planned to open a county museum. T. Legotsky was known in the land as a historian, ethnographer, archaeologist, ethnographer and lawyer. He closely linked his practical activities with research work. He traveled a lot through the territory of Transcarpathia, collected a rich historical, archaeological and ethnographic material - a huge collection of 7 thousand items. This collection was at one time the largest private collection in all of Austria-Hungary.¹

In 1909, the statute of the 'Mukachevo Museum Society' was approved and it began its activities. The head of the society was T. Legotsky, and the director of the future museum – a teacher of history of the Mukachevo Gymnasium Y. Yankovych. The Mukachevo City Council handed over to the Society three rooms on the second floor of a two-story building, in which a prominent Hungarian realist artist, Migal Munkachi, was born. The lack of proper state support and financial hardship did not allow the company to realize its main goal - to open a museum. As a result, T. Legotsky, before his death, ordered his collection to his family. After his death in 1915, the museum society ceased its activities.² Soon after, children of T. Legotsky decided to leave the Carpathian Rus' for Hungary and sell their father's collection to the seller-antiquarian Lazar Singer from Bratislava. A collection of coins and a five-volume diary of a new owner was exported to Bratislava, and a collection of archaeological finds planned to be brought to Budapest.³

Thus, the Czechoslovak authorities had to start practically from scratch to preserve the monuments of folk culture and antiquity in Subcarpathian Rus'. Already in 1919 the law was issued, which regulated the memorandum and, in particular, strictly forbade the export of monuments of antiquity from the state. By regulation of the Ministry of Internal Affairs No. 72.449 / 24-9 of February 12, 1925. The customs authorities were given new instructions regarding the preservation of the monuments of the past. In each of the administrative territories of Czechoslovakia, a specially created authorities for the protection of monuments operated. So, for the Czech Republic, such an authority was located in Prague, for Moravia-Silesia - in Brno, and for Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' - in Bratislava. The task of these

¹ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В. Тиводар Легоцький – закарпатський історик, етнограф і археолог. Ін: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2011, вип. 27, с. 293.

² КАЧІЙ, Ю. З історії музейної справи на Закарпатті. Ін: *Науковий збірник Закарпатського краєзнавчого музею*, 1995, вип. I, с. 10-11.

³ КУЗЬМА, В.В. Розвиток музейної справи на Підкарпатській Русі (20-30-ті роки XX ст.). Ін: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2011, вип. 27, с. 164.

bodies was to keep track of the monuments, as well as to inform the public about the state of affairs about the monuments of history, culture and art.⁴

As historian V. Pankulych rightly pointed out, the development of the museum affairs in Subcarpathian Rus' in the 1920's was stimulated by direct interest in it and by the control of it by the authorities (central and local) and (largely) by the public's attention and its institutions⁵. On October 22, 1920, the Civil Administration of Subcarpathian Rus' appointed the head of the Mukachevo court of V. Adamkovich as a curator of the 'T. Legotsky Museum Society. The director of the Mukachevo high school Y. Yankovych was elected its director.⁶ By the order of the Mukachevo Government Commissioner in 1921 the collection of T. Legotsky was transported and placed in the Mukachevo castle.

From 1922 to 1929, Y. Yankovych was engaged in ordering the collection of T. Legotsky and its description. At the same time, he conducted a collection of archaeological materials, bringing archaeological collections from Uzhhorod, Berehovo and Vinohradiv to Mukachevo.⁷ In 1924 a special room was purchased for museum collections. In the annual report of J. Yankovych about the work of the museum in 1927, it was noted that during the year an exhibition of the museum was held. The museum had large collections of archeology and historical monuments of the city of Mukachevo.⁸ However, the full-fledged work of the museum, in addition to the absence of staff and adequate funds, interfered with the trial with L. Zinger. The latter demanded recognition of his right to the property of the museum and the opportunity to dispose of it freely. After several years of legal proceedings, L. Zinger won the case. At the end of 1929 - early 1930s, the state was forced to reimburse him the money spent on the purchase of a collection from children of T. Legotsky. Since then, the museum had officially become the property of the state and was open to visitors.

After the museum of T. Legotsky has received the status of regional, its scientific and research work is expanding. Since the beginning, the museum has completed archaeological and historical monuments. The director of the museum, Y. Yankovych, developed a special questionnaire in three languages (Czech, Rus'sian and Hungarian), which contained more than 30 questions. The questionnaire was distributed around the settlements of Subcarpathian Rus' to discover ancient monuments, especially the archeological ones. As a result, the valuable material was collected about the monuments of the ancient region, which enriched the museum's collection.⁹ In 1931 J. Yankovych published the work 'Subcarpathian Rus' in prehistory' for the purpose of propaganda of historical and cultural monuments.

It is worth mentioning that certain assistance to the museum of T. Legotsky was provided by the State Archaeological Institute in Prague. In 1929, with the support of the institute, the museum began systematic archaeological excavations.¹⁰ In 1931, 13 ancient burial mounds of iron age (VI - III centuries BC) were explored in the village of Kushtanovytsia of the Mukachevo

⁴ КОБАЛЬ, Й. З історії пам'яток охоронної справи на Закарпатті у 20-30-ті роки ХХ століття (діяльність Йосипа Янківича). Іп: *Науковий збірник Закарпатського краєзнавчого музею*, 1998, вип. ІІІ, с. 34.

⁵ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В. Розвиток музейництва Ужгорода в 1920-1940-х роках. Іп: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2014, вип. 1 (32), с. 41.

⁶ КЛЧІЙ, Ю., ref. 2, с. 11.

⁷ КОБАЛЬ, Й., ref. 4, с. 35.

⁸ СКРИПНИК, Г.А. Етнографічні музеї України. *Становлення і розвиток* / ДН УРСР. Інститут мистецтвознавства, фольклору та етнографії ім. М.Т.Рильського. Київ : Наукова думка, 1989, с.182.

⁹ КОБАЛЬ, Й., ref. 4, с. 35.

¹⁰ ПАЛИНЧАК, В.В. Етапи розвитку музейної справи на Закарпатті у першій половині ХХ століття. Іп: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2014, вип. 1 (32), с. 21.

district. According to research materials, the article 'The Scythians in Subcarpathian Rus' was prepared, which was published in 1935 in Prague in the herald 'Carpatica'.

In the 1930's, the collections of the school museum of Sevlyush (now the city of Vinohradiv) were attached to the museum of T. Legotsky. Since 1932, the museum's activities have been extended to the study of ethnography, folklore, nature and geography of Subcarpathian Rus'. Worthy of note is also the study of the museum of T. Legotsky in the Kholmtsi, Chervenevo, Kolodne and other settlements.¹¹

Before the entry of Transcarpathia into Czechoslovakia in the city of Uzhhorod there was not a single museum in operation. There was only a well-known private collection of birds of the biologist by education and gymnasium professor O.Grabar.¹² At the beginning of the twentieth century he created a unique collection of scabbards of day-old birds of prey and owls from the territory of Subcarpathian Rus' and Eastern Slovakia was collected and produced, which numbered more than 200 copies. This unique collection could become a treasure of any academic museum in the world. After the death of O. Grabar in 1959, the collection ended up at the zoological museum of Uzhhorod University.

A prominent contribution to the preservation and protection of monuments of folk culture and antiquity in Subcarpathian Rus' was made by the 'Prosvita' Society, which was founded in 1920. At its constituent meeting, on the proposal of M.Novakovsky the decision was made to create a Rus' National Museum and to elect a museum commission. These decisions were also fixed in the Charter of the Society, which, among the directions of work of 'Prosvita' has defined: the creation of libraries and museums and the care of already existing; giving a start to the foundation of the Central National Museum for the whole region of Subcarpathian Rus'.¹³

To accomplish this task, on May 20, 1920, the Society established a museum and library committee, which included Theophan Skyba, Mikhaylo Novakivsky, Petro Kutsyn, Ivan Pankevych, Andriy Alyskevych. The historian Vasyl Gadzega became known as the referent of the commission.¹⁴

On June 28, 1920, the first general meeting of the 'Rus' National Museum' was held, in which the articles of association of the new partnership were adopted and submitted for approval by the relevant authorities. According to the main department of 'Prosvita', *'the good development of the Rus' Museum requires a separate society and individuals who would devote themselves exclusively to this business'*.¹⁵

The first step in the attempt to organize the museum was the 'Memorial of the Museum and Library Commission of the 'Prosvita' Society in Uzhhorod for the Civil Administration of the Subcarpathian Rus' for the establishment of the National Museum', filed with the regional government on August 25, 1920. In the document, the following requests were made: 1) to provide financial assistance to the society for the organization of the museum and library in the amount of 60 thousand CZK and to allocate premises; 2) to support the 'Prosvita' initiative in identifying historical monuments in the museums of Vienna and Budapest, exported from Subcarpathian Rus', and to assist in returning them to their homeland; 3) to prohibit theft

¹¹ КОБАЛЬ, Й., ref. 4, с. 36.

¹² ТИВОДАР, М.П. Ужгород між двома світовими війнами. Ін: *Історія Ужгорода. Ужгород, 1993. Розділ IV, с. 148.*

¹³ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В., ref. 5, с. 41.

¹⁴ ЛІХТЕЙ, І. Музей товариства «Просвіта». Ін: *Календар «Просвіти» на 1995 рік, 1995, с. 66.*

¹⁵ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В., ref. 5, с. 41.

and export outside the boundaries of the exhibits of the museum named after T. Legotsky in Mukachevo.¹⁶

The Czechoslovak authorities were careful about the initiatives and problems raised by the 'Prosvita' in the years 1920-1923. As a rule, funds, legal aid, moral support or other types of assistance were provided. In response to the appeal of the Society, the head of the school authority of Subcarpathian Rus', J. Peshek provided museum and library commission 20 000 CZK for the work of in 1920.¹⁷

'Prosvita' Society plans to open the National Museum of Subcarpathian Rus' on the basis of the collection of T. Legotsky. Already in June 1920, before the Civil Administration, the Museum and Library Commission filed a petition forbidding the export of museum values and book property beyond the boundaries of Subcarpathian Rus'. First of all, it concerned the collection of T. Legotsky. Members of the Main Department of the 'Prosvita' Society on this occasion personally turned to the governor, vice governor and the school department. There were also 3 memorandums submitted to the authorities, which called for immediate measures to help preserve the collection of T. Legotsky.

Members of the Museum and Library Commission hoped that after the trial with L. Zinger, the museum exhibits will be transferred to the 'Prosvita' Society and will be based on the National Museum. The state refused to transfer the rescued exhibits to the management of the company, leaving them in the ownership of the city community of the city of Mukachevo.¹⁸

As a result, the museum and library commission had nothing else to do, how to continue the process of forming its own historical, archaeological, ethnographic and numismatic collections, a collection of manuscripts and early printed books, begun in the early 1920s. With this aim, the commission members developed a special questionnaire for the collection of museum and library values, which was sent to all schools of the region. The Commission has repeatedly appealed to the public to assist in the collection of museum and library materials. In particular, in April 1921, the commission made the following appeal through the press: 'To all Rus' citizens' with the request to send materials for the album on life and life of Subcarpathian Rus' (drawings, photographs), as well as embroidery, pysanky, clothes, carved things, etc. The members of the Museum and Library Commission of the 'Prosvita' Society, in particular, Mykhailo Novakivsky, regularly addressed the public, drawing attention to the problem of creating the museum and the task of the Museum of Subcarpathian Rus'.¹⁹ The members of the 'Prosvita' planned to give the museum's future a cultural-historical character and a national status.²⁰ For this purpose, the following departments were created in the museum: natural, prehistoric, history of the region, the culture of cities, village culture and occupations of inhabitants of Subcarpathian Rus'.²¹

It is also noteworthy that the Conservative Institute was created on the initiative of Prosvita, which took account of architectural monuments and prevented them from being destroyed. In

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Протокол изъ засідання головного Выдїла тов. „Просвіта” дня 8.VI.1920. Ін: *Науковий збірник товариства „Просвіта” в Ужгороді. Річник V–VII (XIX – XXI) / [Під. ред. П. Федаки]. – Ужгород : „Два кольори”, 2003, с. 79.*

¹⁸ СТЯПКО, І.О. *Товариство «Просвіта» в громадсько-політичному та культурному житті Закарпаття (1920 – 1939)*. Ужгород : Інформаційно-видавничий центр ЗІППО, 2012, с. 222.

¹⁹ Ibid, с. 221.

²⁰ П.: Єще о нашом національном музею. Ін: *Подкарпатска Русь*, рочник V, число 6. Ужгород: Юній, 1928, с. 130.

²¹ Ibid.

1922 in the 'scientific herald' of the Society was published an article by V. Zalozetsky 'Tasks of conservative labor for the protection of monuments of art in Subcarpathian Rus'. It raised the issue of the protection of monuments of antiquity. First of all, attention was paid to the wooden church of the region, which remained about 20.²² The oldest of them were built in the second half of the XVII century. Each church had its own individual style. Some have survived the unique iconostasis of the Byzantine pattern. However, due to the inability to treat them, the wooden churches of the region gradually collapsed. V. Zalozetsky wrote that the best way to protect the monuments of antiquity is to transfer them to the museum.²³ He advocated the creation of the 'Prosvita' Society of Subcarpathian National Museum in which the 'artistic objects of the whole region' would be kept.²⁴ At the same time V. Zalozetsky noted that 'the organization of the museum should not be carried out at the expense of stripping artistic decorations of churches'.²⁵ Among the main tasks of the museum, he highlighted the preservation of monuments of antiquity and familiarity with them to the public of the region.

By September 1922 'Prosvita' had the following things: 13 manuscripts, a collection of ancient printed matter, 3 paintings by Y. Bokshay, a baroque iconostasis, an old main gun, a trembita and milk devices in kolyba.²⁶ As of 1924, 57 manuscripts, 113 ancient printed books, over 400 photographs from the history of the province, 18 ceramic monuments, 38 church subjects, and iconostasis of the 18th century were collected. In the power of the Baroque, coins, 10 models of farms in Subcarpathian Rus', 8 households of shepherds, two sets of clothing from Hutsulshchyna and the outskirts of Khust, 155 species of minerals.²⁷ The rich collection of embroidery collected by lush men was successfully exhibited in 1924 in Prague at the exhibition 'Life and Art of Subcarpathian Rus'.²⁸

To find out the real value of the collection of 'Prosvita Society', a special commission was created. According to the results of her work in November 1926 a special certificate was sent to the school authority. In it, the museum collections of the 'Prosvita' Society were characterized as 'mostly of an ethnographic and ecclesiastical material of little value'.²⁹ Commissioner Y. Yankovych stated that these monuments were going accidentally, without a certain system, and a reminder of 'unsystematic confusion'.³⁰ In the conclusion it was noted that the objects of the collection were partially donated, partially purchased, they are disorderly packed in boxes. Thus, the museum materials of 'Prosvita' were recognized as an unsystematic mix.³¹

The commission report revealed a number of shortcomings in the work of the museum and library commission. In particular, the lack of a person who would have a professional education and organize the work of collecting museum materials in a proper manner. At the

²² ЗАЛОЗЕЦКИЙ, В. *Задачи консерваторского труда для охраны памятков мистецтва на Подкарпатской Руси*. Ужгород : Друкарня акційного товариства „УНІО”, 1922, с. 6.

²³ Ibid, с. 10.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ НОВАКОВСКИЙ, М. Народный домъ въ Ужгород. In: *Наука*, 1920, число 42, с. 1-2.

²⁷ КУЗЬМА, В.В. Тенденції та особливості розвитку музейної справи в Підкарпатській Русі (20-30-ті роки ХХ ст.). In: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2017, вип. 1 (36), с. 29.

²⁸ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В. Історія музейної справи на Закарпатті. In: *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія»*, 2009, вип. 22, с. 160.

²⁹ СКРИПНИК, Г.А., ref. 8, с. 181.

³⁰ СТЯПКО, І.О., ref. 18, с. 227.

³¹ КЕРЕЦМАН, Н., КЕРЕЦМАН, В. Крaсзнавчa діяльність «Просвіти» на Закарпатті. In: *Науковий збірник Товариства «Просвіта» в Ужгороді*, 1996, річник I (XV), с. 54-55.

same time, according to historian I. Strypka, the value of the exhibits collected by the `Prosvita` was deliberately underestimated so that `Prosvita` did not receive financial assistance from the government and could not implement its project to create the National Museum.³² In the end, the negative conclusions of the commission caused the cessation of any assistance from the state museum and library commission.

A major problem for the museum-library committee of the `Prosvita` Society was the lack of premises for the museum. Repeatedly the leadership turned to the Czechoslovak³³ government for help, but the premises were never received. Therefore, it was decided to place the `Prosvita` collection on the second floor of the People's House - a cultural and enlightenment center of the Ukrainian community of Subcarpathian Rus'. The construction of the People's House was carried out on the donations of individuals, organizations and institutions. It is significant that 100 thousand CZK for its construction was presented by the President of the Czechoslovak Republic T.G.Masaryk.³⁴

On October 7, 1928, the solemn opening of the People's House took place. Almost the whole second floor (frontal high hall 17 x 8.5 m, as well as two lateral smaller rooms) was allocated to the museum. It was composed of the following departments: ethnographic (clothing, model, embroidery, material culture); church (icons, carvings, clothes, sacrarium); archeological excavation (bronze excavation); numismatic (collection of coins); ceramic (ceramics old and new); photos of wooden architecture; manuscripts (parchments and papers from the sixteenth century); natural (minerals of Subcarpathian Rus', collected by professor Rudnytsky).

In general, the `Prosvita` collection comprised over 2,000 exhibits: manuscripts collections, archival materials, photographs, embroidery, iconography, carvings, models of houses and churches, ceramics, folk clothes, shepherd's accessories, archaeological objects, numismatic collection, gallery of modern paintings and a collection of minerals.³⁵ However, these and other exhibits were placed in a spacious hall on the second floor of the People's House only temporarily.³⁶

In spite of all the efforts of the `Prosvita` Society, it was not possible to open a museum for the entire Subcarpathian Rus', accessible to the general public. Therefore, the question of the creation of such a museum again becomes relevant in the early 1930's. Already on June 28, 1930, the `Rus' National Museum` was founded on the initiative of the Museum and Library Commission of `Prosvita`. His creation was an attempt by the `Prosvita` to preserve the existing exhibits and still create a National Museum. They hoped that the new museum association would no longer be the property of the `Prosvita` Society, and would therefore unite those who are not indifferent to the fate of the museum, and would hope for help from the state. The good intentions of the `Prosvita` witnessed the fact that they decided to transfer all their collections to a new society.³⁷ His presidium consisted of the head Vasyl Gadzega, the deputy head Margarita Brashchayko, the secretary Ivan Pankevych.

³² СТЯПКО, І.О., ref. 18, с. 227.

³³ Протокол XXIII Засідання Головного Відділу дня 20 квітня 1921. Ін: *Науковий збірник товариства «Прогрес» в Ужгороді*, 2003, річник V – VII (XIX – XXI), с. 124.

³⁴ КУЗЬМА, В.В., ref. 27, с. 29.

³⁵ ПАНЬКЕВИЧ, І. Єще о нашом національном музею. Ін: *Подкарпатска Русь*, 1928, р. V, ч. 6, с. 129-130.

³⁶ МАЛИШ, А. Musejnictví na Podkarpatské Rusi. Ін: *Podkarpatská Rus*. Bratislava : Klub přátel Podkarpatské Rusi, 1936, s. 33.

³⁷ Гадзєга В. Вступайте в члены «Руського Національного Музею». Ін: *Подкарпатска Русь*, 1930, р. VII, ч. 7-8, с. 175.

The statute of the newly formed society was approved by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, on June 17, 1931, under the number 40 323 / 1931-2, but formally presented this approval only in February 1935. Therefore, from June 1930 to February 1935 the Society 'Rus' National Museum', as much as possible, collected material, but did not carry out active work. But even under such conditions, the community managed to replenish the collection of the museum with more than 100 valuable items. Among them were manuscripts, ethnographic materials, old books, valuable golden Scythian decorations found in Bushtyno on the eve of the First World War, ceramics from Khust, mimicry on the glass with Trebushany and ancient icons.³⁸

A new step in the development of the museum business in Subcarpathian Rus' was the creation on February 22, 1929, on the basis of Uzhhorod Aquarium Union of the 'Regional Museum Community'. As noted in the circular of the Presidium of the Regional Directorate of Subcarpathian Rus', the company was founded with the aim of creating a regional museum. His most important task, besides the creation of a regional museum, was to combine the collections of ethnographic and natural monuments existing in the region, as well as pieces of art.³⁹ For the location of the collections, several rooms of the former zhupanat were allocated to the company.

The opening of the regional museum in Uzhhorod was the reason for the discontent of the museum workers from Mukachevo. On this occasion, the Uzhhorod weekly newspaper 'Rus'skaya Zemlya' wrote the following: *«Very often Uzhhorod and Mukachevo argue with each other. Uzhhorod became the main city, winning a dispute, but misunderstandings are occurring more and more often. Already reported about the organization and construction of the County Museum in Mukachevo. But because of the habit, people wanted to argue further and they began to demand that the museum was not in Mukachevo, but in Uzhhorod. The 'Bulletin of the Czechoslovak Agricultural Museum' reports the following: 'Our association for the foundation of a museum in Subcarpathian Rus' faced this work with the old Legotsky Museum Society in Mukachevo. The number of competency disputes has thus increased. As experience shows, here and there the decision will not be in favor of the case itself, because no city will transfer to other things from its museum'. It's our life as it is: disputes instead of work. The two are arguing, and the third is accused of their failures'.*⁴⁰

In 1932, Mukachevo and Uzhhorod Museum societies were united into the 'Subcarpathian Regional Museum Society'.⁴¹ In 1933, in temporary use, the company transferred the dry and bright rooms of the district court, which was located in the structure of the zhupanat.⁴² Since then, the Uzhhorod County Museum has started to function as the central museum of the region with a branch in Mukachevo (T. Legotsky Museum). The museum was officially opened on October 28, 1934. The first honorable visitor to him was the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia K. Krofta.⁴³ As the historian V.Pankulych correctly notes, the activity of the County Museum in Uzhhorod added new bright pages to the history of the memorial area of the region.⁴⁴ Although it remained in the shadow of the museum of T. Legotsky, it

³⁸ Нова культурна інституція «Руський Національний музей» в Ужгороді. Ін: *Українське слово*, 1935, 28 березня (III), рік видання IV, ч.12 (105), с. 2.

³⁹ ПАЛИНЧАК, В.В., ref. 10, с. 22.

⁴⁰ ФІАПОВ, О. *Історія Мукачевево чехословацької доби. Збірник документальних нарисів*. Ужгород : Ліра, 2012, с. 56.

⁴¹ КАЧІЙ, Ю., ref. 2, с. 13.

⁴² ТИВОДАР, М.П., ref. 12, с. 149.

⁴³ ПАНКУЛИЧ, В.В., ref. 5, с. 43.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

played a significant role in the dissemination of museum practices, propaganda among the wider population.

The main activity of Uzhhorod County Museum remained ethnographic. That is why, as noted by researcher V. Kuzma, in profile orientation he was defined as an ethnographic.⁴⁵ The following departments were opened in the museum: ethnography and village culture; ethnographic relations; nature (paleontology, geology, geography, mineralogy, botany, zoology); use of natural resources (agriculture, industry, trade); schooling; Art Gallery; Uzhhorod City Department; additional scientific collections.⁴⁶

Uzhhorod City Department of the museum exhibited the works of the handicrafts, in particular, the products of Uzhhorod ceramics (vases, pots, painted plates), which were original and were a true work of folk art. At the same time, an earthen furnace was exhibited in which ceramic products were baked. The exposition of the Uzhhorod History Department transmitted photos and drawings not only of city's past, but also showed the construction of new neighborhoods, new public buildings and the settlement.⁴⁷

In 1934, the Ethnographic Society of Subcarpathian Rus' was founded in Mukachevo. Among its founders were: the branch of the 'Prosvita' Society in Mukachevo, and the Teachers' Community, Y. Okhrymovych, Y. Komarynskyi, A. Voloshyn, the Klympush brothers. For its purpose, the society has put training, conducting research and education in the Mukachevo Regional Ethnographic Museum.⁴⁸ For some time the company was headed by A. Voloshyn.⁴⁹

Members of the Ethnographic Society believed that the creation of separate exhibition departments should be preceded by deep ethnographic studios and the collection of monuments in their subject matter or drawings. In other words, they planned to put the organization of the museum on a truly scientific basis. The society focused on the study of material culture. The plans were to publish an ethnographic card of the national clothes of Subcarpathian Rus'. To this end, a special instruction was developed 'A questionnaire for the compilation of descriptions of national clothing of Subcarpathian Rus''. It provided for the identification of clothing-related socio-economic aspects of life of the population.⁵⁰ Also, the company prepared special programs-questionnaires for a general description of the village, to collect materials about the construction of huts in Subcarpathian Rus', to study folk spiritual culture, folk art.

Active public support for the idea of creating a Ukrainian museum allowed the collection of the necessary means to build its collection.⁵¹ Already in the first years of functioning of the Mukachevo cell, it collected more than 2,000 monuments, several tens of thousands of records of folk songs, translations, etc. Many monuments came from private individuals. Among them, there were the Klympush brothers from Yasinya, teachers I. Kelemen and G. Bodnar, etc.⁵² Also, the community was prepared to publish more than 50 printed worksheets of ethnographic materials.

⁴⁵ КУЗЬМА, В.В., ref. 3, с. 166.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ СКРИПНИК, Г.А., ref. 8, с. 183.

⁴⁹ СТЯПКО, І.О., ref. 18, с. 230.

⁵⁰ СКРИПНИК, Г.А., ref. 8, с. 184.

⁵¹ *Вісті Етнографічного товариства Підкарпатської Русі*, ч. 6-7. Мукачів, 1937, с. 1.

⁵² СКРИПНИК, Г.А., ref. 8, с. 191.

June 20, 1937 the grand opening of the Ethnographic Museum took place. Initially, the museum materials were stored in the premises of the Mukachevo 'Trade Academy', and later it was allocated two rooms in the premises of the craft school. According to the contemporaries, the opening of the museum, became a notable event in the life of Subcarpathian Rus'. According to local press, in only four days the museum was visited by 3000 visitors.⁵³ At the end of the 1930's, attempts were made to transfer the museum exhibits of the 'Prosvita' to the Ethnographic Society of Subcarpathian Rus', about which correspondences were conducted between these societies. However, this initiative has not been implemented.⁵⁴

On September 1, 1937, another museum - diocesan - was opened in Uzhhorod. It was to carry out a religious-educational and artistic-cultural mission. The idea of the opening of this museum belonged to Bishop Alexander Stoika. 7 rooms in the episcopal residence, which were also connected with a rich bishopric library were allocated for the museum. Exhibits of the museum, among which there were many written monuments, related to the history of Subcarpathian Rus' and diocese.⁵⁵

Considering the history of the museum affairs in Subcarpathian Rus', it is impossible to ignore the origin of the first rural and district ethnographic museums in the early 1930s. Their importance was that they fixed the national identity of the Subcarpathian Rus' population. One of such museums was the Rakhiv ethnographic museum, founded by the educational authorities on the funds allocated to extracurricular educational activities.⁵⁶

The decline of the First Czechoslovak Republic and the occupation of Subcarpathian Rus' by the Horthy Hungary negatively affected the state of the museum affairs in the province. The collection of Uzhhorod Museum in November 1938 was evacuated to the village of Kamyanytsia. At the end of March 1939, it was returned to Uzhhorod, but as a result of these transportations, many exhibits were lost. In Mukachevo and Uzhhorod formally, historic and ethnographic museums continued to function. They worked in difficult conditions and on a voluntary basis, at the expense of donations. From the state the museum from time to time received small financial assistance.⁵⁷

Thus, at the time of the first Czechoslovak Republic in the Carpathian Rus', the processes of the formation and development of memorial and museum affairs intensified. The study and preservation of the historical and cultural heritage were carried out mainly by scientists and representatives of cultural and public associations (primarily the 'Prosvita' Society). At the same time, the role of the state in collecting and exhibiting monuments of nature, material and spiritual culture of the region is growing. It may be stated that the museum affairs in Subcarpathian Rus' in the 1920s-1930s ceases to be exclusively enthusiastic and goes to the state level. This resulted in the opening of the museums and an active memorabilia work.

⁵³ Діло, 9. 07. 1937.

⁵⁴ СТЯГІКО, І.О., ref. 18, с. 231.

⁵⁵ ЛІТЕРАТІ, Т. *Втрачений Ужгород: музеї та цінності, які втратило місто*. URL: <http://karpatnews.in.ua/news/130464-vtracheniy-uzhhorod-muzei-ta-tsinnosti-yaki-vtratylo-misto.htm> [cit. 2018-04-27].

⁵⁶ СКРИПНИК, Г.А., ref. 8, с. 192.

⁵⁷ КУЗЬМА, В.В., ref. 27, с. 30.

References

- MALICH, A. (1936). Musejnictvi na Podkarpatské Rusi. In: *Podkarpatská Rus*. Bratislava : Klub přátel Podkarpatské Rusi, s. 32-34.
- GADZHETA, V. (1930). Vstupajte v chleny «Rus'koho Natsional'noho Muzeju». In: *Podkarpatska Rus'*, r. VII, No. 7-8, pp. 177-176.
- ZALOZETSKIY, V. (1922). *Zadachi konservatorskoy pratsy dlia okhorony pamiatok mystetstva na Podkarpatskoy Rusi*. Uzhhorod : Drukarnia aktsiinoho tovarystva „UNIO“, 14 p.
- KACHIIY, Yu. (1995). Z Istorii muzeynoii spravy na Zakarpatti. In: *Naukovyi zbirnyk Zakarpats'koho krayeznavchobo muzeju*, vyp. I, pp. 10-11.
- KERETSMAN, N., KERETSMAN, V. (1996). Kraveznavcha diyalnist' «Prosvity» na Zakarpatti. In: *Naukovyi zbirnyk Tovarystva «Prosvita» v Uzhborodi*, richnyk I (XV), pp. 52-57.
- KOBAL', Y. (1998). Z istorii pamiatkookhoronnoii spravy na Zakarpatti u 20-30-ti roky XX stolittia (diyalnist' Yosypa Yankovycha). In: *Naukovyi zbirnyk Zakarpats'koho krayeznavchobo muzeju*, vyp. III, pp. 34-36.
- KUZ'MA, V.V. (2011). Rozvytok muzeynoii spravy na Pidkarpats'kiy Rusi (20-30-ti roky XX st.). In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, 2011, vyp. 27, pp. 163-168.
- KUZ'MA, V.V. (2017). Tendentsii ta osoblyvosti rozvytku muzeynoii spravy v Pidkarpats'kiy Rusi (20-30-ti roky XX st.). In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, vyp. 1 (36), pp. 28-32.
- LITERATI, T. *Vtracheniy Uzhborod: muzeii ta tsinnosti, yaki vtratylo misto*. URL: <http://karpatnews.in.ua/news/130464-vtracheniy-uzhborod-muzei-ta-tsinnosti-yaki-vtratylo-misto.htm> [cit. 2018-04-27].
- LICHTEY, I. (1995). Muzey tovarystva «Prosvita». In: *Kalendar «Prosvity» na 1995 rik*, 1995, pp. 66-67.
- Nova kul'turna instytutysiya «Rus'kyi Natsional'nyi muzey» v Uzhhorodi. In: *Ukrains'ke slovo*, 1935, 28 bereznia (III), rik vydannia IV, ch.12 (105), p. 2.
- NOVAKOVSKIY, M. (1920). Narodnyi dom v Uzhhorod. In: *Nauka*, No. 42, pp. 1-2.
- P. (1928). Eshche o nashom natsional'nom muzeju. In: *Podkarpatska Rus'*, rochnik V, No. 6. Uzhhorod: Yuniy, pp. 129-130.
- PALYNCHAK, V.V. (2014). Etapy rozvytku muzeynoii spravy na Zakarpatti u pershiy polovyni XX stolittia. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, vyp. 1 (32), pp. 18-25.
- PANKULYCH, V.V. (2009). Istoriya muzeynoii spravy na Zakarpatti. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, 2009, vyp. 22, pp. 159-161.
- PANKULYCH, V.V. (2011). Tyvodar Lehots'kyi - zakarpats'kyi istoryk, etnohraf i apkheoloh. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, vyp. 27, pp. 293-302.
- PANKULYCH, V.V. (2014). Rozvytok muzeynytstva Uzhhoroda v 1920-1940-kh rokakh. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhborods'koho universytetu, seriya «Istoriya»*, vyp. 1 (32), pp. 40-50.
- PAN'KEYVYCH, I. (1928). Eshche o nashom natsional'nom muzeju. In: *Podkarpatska Rus'*, r. V, No. 6, pp. 129-130.

- Protokol XXIII Zasadannia Holovnoho Vydilu dnia 20 kvitnia 1921. In: *Naukovyi zbirnyk Tovarystva «Prosvita» v Uzhhorodi*, 2003, richnyk V–VII (XIX – XXI), pp. 123-125.
- Protokol iz zasadannia holovnoho Vydila tov. „Prosvita” dnia 8.VI.1920. In: *Naukovyi zbirnyk Tovarystva «Prosvita» v Uzhhorodi*. Richnyk V–VII (XIX – XXI) / [Pid red. P. Fedaky]. – Uzhhorod : „Dva kol’ory”, 2003, pp. 79-81.
- SKRYPNYK, H.A. (1989). *Etnografichni muzeii Ukrainy. Stanovlennia i rozvytok* / AN URSS. Instytut mystetstvoznavstva, fol’kl’oru ta etnografii im. M.T. Ryl’s’koho. Kyev: Naukova dumka, 304 p.
- STRIAPKO, I.O. (2012). *Tovarystvo «Prosvita» v bromads’ko-politychnomu ta kul’turnomu zhytti Zakarpattia (1920 – 1939)*. Uzhhorod: Informatsiyno-vydavnychiy tsentr ZIPPO, 328 p.
- TYVODAR, M.P. (1993). Uzhhorod mizh dvoma svitovymi viynamy. In: *Istoriya Uzhhoroda*. Rozdil IV. Uzhhorod, pp. 102-159.
- FILIPOV, O. (2012). Istoriia Mukacheva chekhoslovats’koiu doby. *Zbirnyk dokumental’nykh narysiv*. Uzhhorod: Lipa, 136 p.
- Visti Etnografichnoho tovarystva Pidkarpats’koyi Rusi*, No. 6-7. Mukachiv, 1937, p. 1.