

CROSS-CULTURAL CONTACTS BETWEEN THE SERBS LIVED IN THE FORMER HUNGARIAN KINGDOM AND WEST-UKRAINIAN TERRITORIES – AS REFLECTED IN THE IMPORT OF THE LITURGICAL BOOKS¹

The matter of this problem. It was a false commonplace that the ideas of Enlightenment and national awakening in the 18th century came to the Slavic peoples of the Habsburg Empire as a result of the impact, made on the cultural life by the thinkers, artists and scientists in Vienna, whose activities were inspired and provided by the royal court, too. This statement is only partly true but not wholly. Though the West European cultural influences also political ideas came across Vienna, this was one of the ways of transmission but not the only one. In contrary, the role and importance of the contacts between the various Slavic peoples and those living in the Habsburg Empire could not be studied in the shadows of the overvaluation was given to the impacts of Vienna. Researches made by the Institute of Ukrainian Studies named Krypiakevich in Lviv in the last two-three decades, mainly the findings of Yaroslav Dmitrovich Isaievich, member of the Academy of Sciences, who had headed this institute for fourteen years, lead to new results in the history of the typographies and book-trade as the belles-lettres as well, therefore it became necessary to rethink the contacts between the Western territories of the recent Ukraine and the Slavic peoples of the Hungarian Kingdom. On the other hand, investigations made by the author of this paper and his predecessors and masters on the old printed liturgical books of the Byzantine rite, gave enough matter to come to the conclusions the book-trade was an important factor in the transmission of the impacts of early Enlightenment, those came from Poland across Ukraine to the Serbs were living in Hungary and on the Balkans, too. Finally, the Serbian Orthodox Church as a determining factor in the national awakening was not taken into consideration as a different from the other ones, that is, the Orthodoxy was wholly regarded but not distinguishing between the Greek and Serb churches, nor the Russian and Balkan Orthodoxy as well. Consequently, the aim of this paper is to demonstrate the contacts

* Tud. kutató, DE; mail: alexfoldvari@gmail.com

¹ Part-time lecturer at University of Debrecen, e.mail: alexfoldvari@gmail.com, URL: <http://unideb.academia.edu/SandorFoldvari>.

The research was supported by the "Wekerle Alapkezelő (Foundation)" No. PC-DN-11/2012/015.

between the Serbs and Ukrainian territories, to evidence the book-trade between these peoples and areas, and to give some new insides into the church and national relations on the Balkans.

Ways of acquiring the ideas of Enlightenment by the Slavic Peoples living in the Habsburg Empire. There is an axiom in the literature of the history of culture in the 18th century that the contemporary West European culture, the national awakening and the Enlightenment as well, the new thought of the “siècle de Lumière” came through Vienna. It is true partly but not entirely. Well, the capital of the Habsburg Empire was the main but not the only centre for transmitting the cultural development. As for Hungarians, the Hungarian Guards of Empress Maria Theresa was founded in 1760, and the Guardsmen-writers as György Bessenyei, the most prominent of them, also Ábrahám Barcsay, Sándor Báróczi, József Nalácz and others elaborated the programs of change the society to an enlightened one.² Similarly, the Slavic elite living in Vienna as Dositej Obradović for Serbs, Jernej Kopitar for Slovenes, Jozef Dobrovský for Czech and almost all Slavic people, spent periods of their lives, respectively, in Vienna.³ However, it is to be taken into consideration the “national awakening” (the very peculiar phenomenon for this epoch, the Czech “národní obrození”, German “nationale Wiedergeburt”) was not a part of the Enlightenment, but a process, was being different from that.⁴ While the West European nations faced the problems such as absolutism, clerical reaction, inequality in society, and famous members of the cultural elite completed the philosophical, political and sociological works, the Central and more the East European nations faced to the task of evolving the national elite. Therefore, the early Enlightenment in East-Central Europe (as Winter devoted a monograph to this epoch) was the time of the birth of nations, therefore, the shaping the national elite.⁵ Thus the late baroque though being a church-determined style and thought, was a great step toward the development of the national elite at the Slavic People. Since the late baroque came more lately to these peoples, due to the Turkish occupation, the study of the liturgical books and their provenance gives some contributions of great value to the early stage of unfolding the Slavic People as the Serbs. The most important way of bringing the Slavic liturgical books was the trade with the West Ukrainian territories, which were parts of then-Polish Kingdom that time. This way was another canal for the transmitting the West European culture, too, parallel to the role played by the Vienna-elite.

Differences between situations of the Serbian Church cultures in the Balkans and the Habsburg Empire. For clear understanding the problem, it is inevitable to highlight

2 For the guardsmen cf. Czirány 1986, 82–83; for the comparison with Czech Enlightenment and for further bibliography cf. Orosz 1983, 123–125.

3 For Obradović in Vienna cf. Markovich 2011; for Kopitar cf. Pogačnik 1977, and its corrected German version 1978; for Dobrovský and Kopitar's contacts Jagić 1885, 1897; for Dobrovský's activity in Vienna Brandl 1883; for literature on him Krbec-Laiske 1970.

4 Pražál: 1983.

5 Niederhauser 1965, 1982.

the fact the Serbs of the Habsburg Empire could far better get Slavic-liturgical books and use their own language in the liturgy and church schools (that is, Church Slavonic in the mass and later Slaveno-Serb in the schools) than their brothers remained in the Balkans. As Temperley, who followed Jireček, pointed out it already in the first decades of the last century, the dominance of the Greek Phanariote elite in the Church was enough strong to oppress the Slavic national culture, the usage of Slavic languages in the schools and church, too. Consequently, the Serbian church was ruled by Greek priests and the low stratum remained for Serbian ones.⁶ Therefore, the memories of the great past, the tradition of the independent Serbian church in Middle Ages, became a determining factor in the Serbian thought. In a result, the Serbian Orthodox Church was not so God-centred but Nation-focused and it was logical. Sorry for the literature in the field, the Serbian Orthodox Church was criticized by such great authors, too, as Ladislav Hadrović and some of his followers, as the roman catholic Antal Molnár.⁷ Hadrović and those shared this one-track approach, stated the Serbian Church lost its former shine for the 17–18th centuries, in contrary to the flourishing in 12–15th centuries. The popes were undereducated, analphabetic, drinking and immoral people. The church was full of superstitions and without even elementary knowledge of the axial dogmas as the Saint Trinity, the Salvation, the sanctity of the marriage, the discipline in the church, even the service. For it was a terrene of the national pride but not the Christian devotion and so on. These statements were based mainly on the records by Franciscan monks who came from Rome and disesteemed the Balkan cultures not knowing the roots and circumstances of the Serbian people. Yes, the level of the church culture was not so high and the national spirit seemed to be more than it required, if one did not take into consideration the Greek oppress and the reaction for the Phanariote system. The Phanariotes were, as well, those who served in the administration of the Ottoman Empire but remained Christians, i.e. Orthodox, and were of Greek origin, to which the name referred: Phanar/iots < the district of Constantinople, inhabited by the Greek, was named 'Phanar' which meant 'lighthouse' in Greek. They get even high positions, as the dragoman of the Porte, who served as a secretary for foreign affairs, and the dragoman of the fleet, who administered the Greek costs and islands as inhabitants of these were obliged to provide the fleet by seamen.⁸ Therefore the diplomacy and the forces were managed by non-Muslims and non-Turkish people.⁹ In my opinion, it was not only a peculiarity of the Ottoman Empire as an Islam state but, and more, a specificity of every Turkish and nomadic empire, too, for they were conglomerate of miscellaneous tribes. It was not devoted enough attention to the fact, that the power concentrated in the hands of Non-Muslims in Ottoman Empire, it was a remnant of the non-Muslim

6 Temperley 1917, 123, 163–166; Jireček 1876, 466–467.

7 Hadrovics 1947; Molnár 2008.

8 Schevill 1991, 305.

9 For the structure of the Ottoman administration and phanariots' role in that cf. Gibb–Bowen 1957, I/ ii 207–261, and classical manual on the topic: Runciman 1968, 165–207.

epoch of the Ottomans. It was quite strange for the original Islam states, i.e. the Arab Caliphates. It was a structure of a strong state which required hard-handed rulers. Such as the Mongol Empire found by Genghis Khan (Temujin). While the Ottoman sultans were enough strong, as Suleiman the Great, or his father Selim, also Mehmed the Conqueror, the semi-Muslim also semi-Nomadic regime functioned well. As the sultans became more and more weaker in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Balkans turned into the field of struggles between Slavs and Greeks for their respective national power and culture, under the umbrella of the Ottoman Empire. Thus the Turkish yoke was the main danger in the 15–16th centuries but not in the 17–18th ones when the national awakening was beginning among the East European peoples. As the Greek had better chances due to the Phanariote system they gained more national power than the Serb, who had no position in the political administration also in the church one, which was the same since the Turkish Islam state regarded church leaders for the political representatives of the dhimmies (Christians and Jews), regardless the differences between Christian peoples. Therefore it was logical that the Greek Phanariotes destroyed everything and everyone on their way for developing the national Greek culture and Greek Orthodox Church-dominated culture. Though it was clear, the literature in the field was not going along with Temperley and Jireček for the mechanism and evolving the Phanariote system had not been enough investigated for a long time.¹⁰ The Orthodox Greek Phanariotes were in so closely bond to the Ottoman elite as they often stepped on the way of assimilation.¹¹

Thus the Western, mostly Roman Catholic authors often forgot the Orthodox Church lived in peaceful connections with the Ottomans while the great enemy for the peoples in the Balkans it was the Roman Catholic Church.¹² The Islam rule did not force to convert the Christians in whole, except for the assimilation of Phanariotes and the devshirme (collecting boys for janissaries), but these were not the way of destroying the Christians, as they served as a good soil for the benefits as taxes, the spahi-lands and alive-taxes. The Christians were able to keep and preserve their customs, way of life, as the Orthodoxy did not mean a mere religion but, and rather, the framework of the life entirely and the “Pax Ottomanica” provided the safety of the orthodox way of life far more than it would be destroyed by the Catholics.¹³ The Phanariotes were extremely well-educated (as extremely rich as well), as they sons studied at universities of Italy and Western Europe; partly thanks to the Greek communities had been living in numerous cities since they settled there in the Antiquity.¹⁴ Thus it was a real elite in contrary the “folk-cultured” Orthodoxy characterized the Serbs and Bulgarians. The schools of

10 For the phanariote rule in Bulgaria cf. Voillery 1986; for evolving the phanariotes in the Ottoman Empire Gibb–Bowen 1957, I/ii, 207–261 and the classical manual in the topic: Runciman 1968, 165–207.

11 Sloane 1908, 308.

12 Sherrard 1959, 96–107; Ware 1964.

13 Cvijić 1918, 281; Kitromilides 1999.

14 Jelavich 1983, 53–55.

Phanariotes in the Balkans were of higher level than those of Armenians even Jews. No wonder the Phanariotes replaced Jews in the trade, too.¹⁵

The Phanariots kept in their hands the patriarch, too, supporting him by large sums of money, as the positions of church leaders, as bishops, archbishops and even the patriarch became subjects for sale by the turn of 17–18 centuries. As it was pointed out by Roucek, the Patriarchate fell into the power of the Phanariotes, the wealthy Greeks, who kept the Orthodox Church in their pocket.¹⁶ However, I cannot agree with Roucek when he falsely states out the Phanariots persuaded the Sultan to put the whole of the Balkan Church under the power of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. This was a different process and went earlier. The church had already organized the lands into dioceses and subdioceses when the Turks conquered the Balkans. Then the well-organised church system was accepted by the Ottoman conquerors as for their administrative and tax-collecting tool. The patriarch was appointed by the new rulers as the head of the Christian *millet*, he became the *millet-basi*, had right to use flag with two horsetails.¹⁷ Thus the church had full jurisdiction over Christians, relating to marriage, court and commercial cases, too. It was in a consequence of the role played by the church already in the Byzantine epoch and in the independent Serbian state. The conflict raised when the Greek patriarch had rule over the Slavs and when the Greek Phanariotes gained the rule over all the Christians even the patriarch as well. It was more than a century later the Balkan was conquered by the Turks. Then, as Roucek was already right, writing that “Slavs who wanted to become priests had to play traitors to their own blood and, if they displeased their masters, they were beaten, as the servants of the Greek clergy, during divine service before silent congregations of their own people. There was also a ruthless campaign against the speaking of the Serbian and Bulgarian languages, and an attempt was made to enforce the use of Greek over the whole of Macedonia, instead of the small southern district to which it had long been limited.”¹⁸

Since the Ottoman Sultan appointed the patriarch of Constantinople in Istanbul the head of all the Christians, and the Phanariots kept the secular and church power even the church leaders in their hands, the Greek clergy became the only Christian also secular establishment for the Bulgarian, Serbian and Macedonian peoples. This brought sad situation for the Serbs. The language of the church was Greek, the higher positions in the church were filled by the Greeks, and these were subject for sale, too. Serbian monasteries had to use the Greek language even the monks were Serbs, and the Slavic liturgical books in Serbian monasteries were destroyed. That is, fired by the Greeks, too, not only by the Muslim Turks. In a result, any monk had to learn to read and write in Greek and did not have any chance to acquire the elements of the Slavic church culture

15 For education of the Phanariotes abroad and the prominent ones of them cf. Strauss 1995, 191–194, with extremely rich bibliographical notes.

16 Roucek 1946, 370.

17 Jelavich 1983, 52–53.

18 Roucek 1946, 370; cf. Temperley 1917, 111–113, 123–124.

even the Cyrillic letters. For the lower stratum of the clergy remained Serbian, it was not a miracle the villains and popes in villages remained under-cultured in Christian dogmas but full of national pride. This poor church kept the Serbian national consciousness even being not so perfect in the beliefs. It must be taken into consideration as it was done by Temperley and a lot of other authors but forgotten by some later historians who wrote their works approaching the topic within too narrow thus false views. The Serbian Church for the Serbs was the only way and place for surviving while the Ottoman Empire gave all the rule to the Greek clergy above the Christians lived on the Balkans. The Serbian nation faced the double oppression, from the one hand by the Ottomans and from the other hand by the Greeks. Therefore those Serbs moved to the Hungarian Kingdom could rid of Greek oppression and had chances to use and develop their Slavic liturgy and Cyrillic letters.¹⁹

Serbian book-import into Hungary from the Ukrainian Typographies. In contrary to the sad situation on the Balkans, the Serb refugees moved into the Hungarian Kingdom (then part of the Habsburg Empire), had right for free usage their Serbian language, Cyrillic letters and Church Slavic liturgical books in their communities, in which the secular and church local authorities were the same. The constantly complaining Serbs in the Habsburg territories were right as they wrote they had no equal position with the Hungarians mainly the Catholics,²⁰ although they had far better circumstances as those remained to live on the Balkans.²¹ It was reflected by the provenance of the liturgical books, too. The Serbian parishes in Hungary bought books in the 17–18th centuries from the East Slavic territories, while they did it earlier from the Western typographies. Editions from 16 century are held in the Serbian collections up to nowadays as books from Parish, Tübingen and mostly Venice, but no record about buying books after beginning of the 17 century.²² Since the situation on the Balkans became unbearable for the Slavic book-trade. The larger part of books in Serbian parishes, edited in 17th and 18th centuries were printed in West-Ukrainian and Belorussian typographies and, according to the data of provenance, the marginalia, these were bought by Serbs here in Hungary in the 17–18th centuries. While the Serbs on the Balkans did not have much chance to get these books in the 17th century, their relatives in the Hungarian Kingdom did. Therefore, the books from East Slavic typographies determined the spiritual and cultural life of the Serbs in Hungary.

Let us take for example the little but important collection of liturgical books being now held in the Archbishopric Library of Veszprém (Centre of the West Hungary). It was not taken into attention of researchers until I went there and described them.²³ These books belonged to the Serbian parish in Sósút, next to Buda (then independ-

19 Temperley 1917, 111–113, 123–124.

20 Picot 1873.

21 Schwicker 1880; Palić 1995.

22 Földvári 2011.

23 Földvári 1994; Földvári–Ojtozi, 1995.

ent part of Budapest). Some books were printed in Venice but in the 15th century. The predominant parts of them were editions of West Ukrainian typographies (Lviv, Pochaev, Unev, Kyiv, etc.) According to the marginalia, those were printed in the West Ukraine were bought here by local Serbs. One of the marginal writings shows to Nikolas Milovanivić as a possessor²⁴ and another book of him (evidenced by marginalia) is held in the Serbian Orthodox Museum and Library in Szentendre.²⁵ The authors of studies on the Szentendre collection and its monograph are of the opinion the Serbs brought by his immigration all the books were printed in South Slav and Italian typographies and, on the other hand, they bought here, in Hungary, all those were printings of the West Ukrainian Typographies.²⁶ Therefore the data of possessors evidenced all those were said above that one had to distinguish between the situations of the Serbs in Hungary and the Balkans. What is yet important, Serbs settled in Hungary bought Cyrillic books from the West Ukrainian typographies but not from the Russian ones. Tsarist help as donations of books characterized the Serbian culture from the end (at least the third quarter) of the 18th century but not earlier.

Although the previous literature in the field maintained the Cyrillic liturgical book were imported from the "Moscovia" i.e. the Tsarist Russia, it seemed to be false. Anton Hodinka was of the opinion that the Russian (in his terminology "Moscovian") book-sellers provided the Slavic peoples in the Habsburg Empire with liturgical books until 1772, when their activity was prohibited by Empress Maria Theresa.²⁷ It was criticized by Esther Ojtozi, the master of the study of old printed Cyrillic books held in recent church collections in Hungary.²⁸ Her follower Sándor Földvári found new data about the Serbs imported liturgical books from the West Ukraine, then part of the Polish Kingdom, according to the marginal data on possessors and provenance.²⁹ Moreover it was evidenced by the archival data on the Serbian community in Eger (North Hungary), held in the Archivum Vetus of the Archbishopric Library of Eger, newly found by Földvári, that even the Orthodox Serbs in Eger bought books from the West Ukrainian typographies though the Carpathian Greek Catholic Ruthenes as transmitters, though being in struggles with the Catholics in Eger, too.³⁰ Although Empress Maria Theresa established the typography of Joseph Kurzböck in Vienna, it did not print so many books as would required for the service, moreover, the Serbs were not likely to purchase these instead of the product of East Slavic typographies. The import of the books

24 Földvári-Ojtozi 1995, No.8, with the photocopy marginal handwriting of this possessor.

25 According to Sindik-Grozdanić-Pajić-Mano-Zisi 1991, No. 90. - On Nicolas Milovanović as a possessor cf. Grozdanić-Pajić 1982.

26 Sindik-Grozdanić-Pajić-Mano-Zisi 1991.

27 Hodinka 1890; Hodinka 1909; Hodinka 1925.

28 Ojtozi 1977; Ojtozi 1979; Ojtozi 1984.

29 Földvári 1995; Földvári 1996; Földvári 2001; Földvári-Ojtozi, 1995

30 Földvári 1996; Földvári 1997.

printed in West Ukrainian territories remained the main source.³¹ The printing Serbian books become important only by the end of 18th and mostly in the first half of the 19th centuries, when the Royal Typography in Buda provided Serbs also every Slavic people with books of secular content, thus the late Slavic national awakening centred in Buda but not the early one, which is the subject of this paper.³² However, it is worth to mention the Buda Typography played axial role in evolving of the Slavic national cultures as Peter Király devoted numerous papers and books, too, to this topic.³³ The flourishing period of the Serbian national awakening was the 18–19th centuries, thus in the 17th century it was quite enough to provide the liturgy by Slavic books which was entirely impossible on the Balkans.³⁴ It was not only possible but carried out far well, and these books were not only of liturgical items but even tools for transmitting the contemporary secular culture, too. Let us see how it was done.

The circumstances of the West Ukrainian and Belorussian book-printing in the 17–18th centuries. As we have seen the predominant part of the Cyrillic books used by the Serbs in the Hungarian Kingdom was of West Ukrainian origin, it is necessary to look through the situation of the book printing in those territories. It would be the best to follow the new investigations by Yaroslav Dmitrovich Isaevich, who just passed away and whose findings made to rethink all we knew about the topic.³⁵ As for the typographies in Ukraine, they were owned and managed by the civil societies, the so-called brotherhoods (confraternities) and it was the main difference between the Tsarist Pechatnyj dvor in Moscow and the Belorussian and Ukrainian ones.³⁶ These were more market-oriented and flexible, though having more risk, too, moreover, closer to the Polish territories and culture in both geographical and spiritual sense. The enormously large Tsarist typography served for the huge number of churches being as the only one in the empire, thus not depending on the demands of the market but the requests of the centralized administration of the emperor. Profit was guaranteed and big, according to the data sources remained in good condition. In a consequence, there was no need to change the shape and inner form of the service books or any will to do it.³⁷ Although the content of the liturgical books was strictly determined in the Byzantine rite, the prefaces and afterwards, even the illustrations were subjects to change and good tools for acquiring more costumers, at least to attract their attention. As for the illustrations, the 18th century baroque was undoubtedly acquainted for the illustrators of liturgical books issued in the Western Ukraine.³⁸ As for the prefaces, it was a remarkable way

31 Kostić 1912.

32 Gavrilović 1974.

33 Király 1973; Király 1980; Király 1983; Király 1985; Király 1993.

34 Adler 1979.

35 Kasinec 1974/1984.

36 Isaevich 1966.

37 Isaevych 1992; Isaevich 1996, 214–239.

38 Zapasko 1971; Stepovik 1982.

to use liturgical books for publishing text of a bit more secular character in Moscow, too. The ratio of the civil books was very small, almost zero before the time of reign of Peter the Great. The circles of readers of the civil books were far narrower than the number of users and listeners of the liturgical books. Far different was the situation in Western Ukraine and Belorussia, then-parts of the Polish Kingdom. The printings were published in Moscow in enormously large number as commercial products were issued with paying less attention to the requirements of the readers as their expectations were not too great. On contrary, the items printed in Ukrainian and Belarusian typographies were far smaller and more market-oriented. These worked for a bit more educated even enlightened audience than those printed for the believers were living on the large Russian steppe or in Siberia.³⁹ Therefore, prefaces and afterwards were added to the western printings far more than to those books issued in Moscow. If it was done, the products of the huge Moscow typography were accompanied by such commentary texts in order to give some explanations from or on the initiative of the Holy Synod but not with purposes of acquiring the interest of the audience. Since the audience was given and guaranteed in a large number of parishes along the huge empire, while the liturgical books were only printed in the Petsatnyj Dvor in Moscow. On contrary, the small but flexible western typographies had to gain costumers and printed far more accompanying text than the central typography in Moscow. Moreover, these texts were of higher level, and accompanied by texts as it was likely the Protestant commentaries on the Saint Scripture, therefore it was the way on which the humanism and baroque could influence the literary texts were written with purposes to enlighten the holy ones.⁴⁰ Last but not least, it was evidenced by records of the brotherhoods the Serbs gained and purchased their books in significant number.⁴¹ As for the Habsburg Empire, the Serbs did not accept with good will the books printed by Kurzböck in Vienna, moreover, they often refused to use them, and imported books from East Slav territories, mostly from West-Ukraine (then East Poland), through semi-legal or illegal ways. Even Greek merchants works for Serbs as booksellers in the Hungarian Kingdom, while the Greek establishment on the Balkans did not permit such activities.⁴² The further migration of the Serbs and the foundation of the "Nova Srbia" (New Serbia) at the heart of Ukraine in the middle of the 18th century provided the trade and cultural contacts even in the time when Empress Maria Theresa denied the activity of the Slavic booksellers.⁴³

Conclusions: the double way of the Serbian national awakening. It was the subject of great debates, proceeded in 80-ies of the last century at the Hungarian Academy of

39 Isaevich 1978.

40 For prefaces and afterwords cf. Demin 1981; for the texts Titov 1924, especially 57, etc. for the western influence.

41 Isaevich 2006, 200–236.

42 Kostić 1923.

43 For this micro-state of Serbs in Ukrainian territories of Russia cf. the monograph and its further notes: Kostić 2001; first published 1923.

Sciences if the nations were already formed in the 17th century or not. Emil Niederhauser was of the opinion that yes, at least in embryonic forms.⁴⁴ If so, the Serbian national consciousness was provided by the books were imported from the West-Ukrainian territories in the 17–18th centuries. It was great to support the Serbian Orthodox culture which had to be regarded not only as a church but a whole atmosphere of preserving the national spirit and heritage.⁴⁵ Though the Greek-oriented authors often forget the Serbs were oppressed by the Greek elite from the time the system of Phanariots evolved. Although it seemed good for Christians the Patriarch became not only the religious but even the secular leader of them, as a head of the *millet*,⁴⁶ later the unified *millet* for both Slavic and Greek Christians became a terrene of Greek national awakening and oppressing Serbian and Bulgarian cultures. The Rumanian history is not the subject of this paper, however, the Phanariot system was there very strong and ambiguous, too. The Serbs moved into Hungarian Kingdom by few waves during the 15–17th centuries. They often complained for hurting their rights although their position was far better than that in the Balkans, however, not equal with that of the Hungarians. They can use the Cyrillic letters and imported books from the East Slav territories, even their popes and teachers were educated there. According to the new investigations in the field, the book-import and personal cultural relations were far stronger with places in then-Polish territories, Western Ukraine, than with Russia. The Russian influence got stronger from the end of the 18th century and mostly in the 19th century but it is not the subject of this paper. Therefore the early Serbian cultural awakening was provided by books and contacts from Western Ukraine. These books were although of liturgical character, contained numerous text commenting the holy liturgy and these commentaries reflected the influences of late renaissance and early baroque, too. The same is true for the illustrations, which took more influence for the users of books. This was the way the Polish culture as transmitter of the Western ideas and styles, influenced the West-Ukrainian books and cultural centres, and through them, the Serbs settled in Hungary, too. Consequently, the way of West-European ideas and culture went not only through Vienna, but curving to Poland, Ukraine and from there to the Slavic people of the Habsburg Empire, as well. This was not so well-seen and remained understudied although this scrambling way of the western culture was more important to the Serbs than the role of Vienna, regarding the early phase of their national awakening. New contributions to this question were made by the author with investigations on the book-collections, and further steps on this way, together with Ukrainian colleagues, seem to be prolific works to evidence the Serbian–Ukrainian contacts as well.

44 Niederhauser 1982.

45 Mylonas 2003, mainly the Chapter 2, "Orthodoxy and Serbian National Identity" 35–72.

46 Ursinus 1989.

REFERENCES:

Adler 1979 = Ph. ADLER, Nation and Nationalism among the Serbs of Hungary 1790–1870. *East European Quarterly* 13/3 (1979) 271–285.

Brandl 1883 = V. BRANDL, *Život Josefa Dobrovského*. Brno 1883.

Braude 1982 = B. BRAUDE, Foundation myths of the millet system. In: *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*. Vol. I. Ed. by B. BRAUDE – B. LEWIS. New York – London 1982, 70–75.

Cvijić 1918 = J. CVIJIĆ, *La Péninsule balkanique. Géographie humaine*. Paris 1918.

—Czigány-1986²= L. CZIGÁNY, *The Oxford-History-of-the-Hungarian-Literature*. Oxford 1986².

Demin 1981 = A. С. Демин, *Тематика и стилистика предисловий и послесловий*. Москва 1981.

Földvári 1992 = FÖLDVÁRI S., *Az Egri Főegyházmegyei Könyvtár cirill és glagolita nyomtatványai*. (The catalogue with Ester Ojtozi's contribution). Debrecen 1992.

Földvári 1994 = FÖLDVÁRI S., Adalékok a Veszprémi Érseki Könyvtár cirill könyveinek provenienciakérdéséhez. *Magyar Könyvszemle* 110/3 (1994) 307–314.

Földvári 1995 = Ш. Фёльдвари, Старопечатные книги кирилловского и глаголического шрифтов Эгерской архиепископской библиотеки. *Slavica. Annales Instituti Philologiae Slavicae Universitatis Debreceniensis De Ludovico Kossuth Nominatae* 27 (1995) 83–96.

Földvári 1996 = Ш. Фёльдвари, Стародруки кириллического шрифта в римокатолических библиотеках Угорщины. In: *Третій Міжнародний Конгрес Україністів 26–29 серпня, 1996 р. Літературознавство, Бібліографія, Інформатика; Доповіді та повідомлення*. Ред.: О. Мишанич. Харків 1996, 188–192.

Földvári 1997 = Ш. Фёльдвари, Памятники обучения закарпатских грекокатолических русинов в г. Эгер” In: *Slavica Quinqueecclesiensia III. A szláv nyelvek oktatásának elmélete és gyakorlata (III.) nemzetközi konferencia anyaga (Pécs, 1996, Április 26–27.)*. Szerk.: Lendvai E. – Hajzer L. Pécs 1997. 236–240.

Földvári 2001 = FÖLDVÁRI S., Cirill liturgikus könyvek provenienciális kérdései. Hodinka koncepciója az újabb kutatások tükrében. *Könyv és Könyvtár: A Debreceni Egyetem Egyetemi és Nemzeti Könyvtárának Évkönyv*. 22–23 (2000–2001) 193–209.

Földvári 2011 = FÖLDVÁRI S., A Magyar Királyság szláv etnikumú ortodox parókiáinak liturgikus-könyv importja – mint a keleti s nyugati kereszténység koraujkori kapcsolatainak tükrözője. In: *Magyarország és a Balkán vallási és társadalmi kapcsolatai. Обществени и религиозни връзки между Унгария и Балканите. (Tanulmánykötet Ohridi Szent Naum halálának 1100 évfordulója emlékére)*. Szerk.: Doncsev T. – H. Tóth I. – Menyhárt K. Budapest 2011, 192–207.

Földvári, 2014 = FÖLDVÁRI S., A kora újkori szerb ortodoxia és a nyugat-ukrán kultúrközpontok kapcsolatai a liturgikus-könyv-kereskedelem tükrében. *Belvedere Meridionale* 26/1 (2014) 23–47.

Földvári–Ojtozi 1995 = Ш. Фельдвари–Э. Ойтози, Кириллические книги Веспремской Архиепископской библиотеки и южнославянская миграция в селе Шошкют. *Studia Slavica Savariensia* 4/1–2 (1995) 143–157. (The catalogue with Ester Ojtozi's contribution)

Gavrilović 1974 = Н. Гавриловић, *Историја ћирилских штампарија у Хабзбуршкој монархији у XVIII веку*. Нови Сад 1974.

Gibb–Bowen 1957 = H.A.R. GIBB–H. BOWEN, *Islamic Society and the West*. Oxford 1957.

Grozdanović–Pajić 1982 = М. Гроздановић–Пајић, Ретки водени знаци у рукопису из Сентандрејских библиотеке. *Археографски прилози* 1982, 83–99.

Hadrovics 1947 = L. HADROVICS, *L'église serbe sous la domination turque*. Paris 1947.

Hodinka 1890 = HODINKA A., Erdélyben és Oláhországban megjelent ó-szláv nyomtatványok. *Magyar Könyvszemle* 15/1–2 (1890) 106–126.

Hodinka 1909 = HODINKA A., *A munkácsi görög-katholikus püspökség története*. Budapest 1909.

Hodinka 1925 = HODINKA A., Muszka könyvárusok hazánkban 1711–1771. In: *Emlékkönyv gróf Klebelsberg Kunó negyedszázados politikai működésének emlékére*. Szerk. Lukinich I. Budapest 1925, 427–436.

Isaevich 1966 = Я. Д. Исаевич, *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI–XVIII ст.* Київ 1966.

Isaevich 1978 = Я. Д. Исаевич, Круг читательских интересов городского населения Украины в XVI–XVIII вв. *Федоровские чтения*, 1976. Москва 1978, 71–73.

Isaevich 1987 = Я. Д. Исаевич, Послесловия мосеевских изданий Ивана Федорова как литературные памятники. *Федоровские чтения*, 1983. Москва 1987, 54–63.

Isaevych 1992 = I. ISAEVYCH, Early Modern Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine: Culture and Cultural Relations. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17/1–2 (1992) 17–28.

Isaevych 1993 = I. ISAEVYCH, Books and Book Printing in Ukraine in the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth Centuries. *Solanus* 7 (1993) 69–96.

Isaevych 1994 = I. ISAEVYCH, The book trade in Eastern Europe in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In: *Consumption and the World of Goods*. Ed. by J. Brener – R. Porter, London – New York 1994, 381–392.

Isaevich 1996 = Я. Д. Исаевич, *Україна давня і нова: Народ, релігія, культура. – Ukraine, Old and New: People, Religion, Culture*. Lviv 1996.

Isaevich 2002 = Я. Д. Исаевич, *Українське книговидання: витоки, розвиток, проблеми*. Львів 2002.

Isaevych 2005 = I. ISAEVYCH, Pan-Slavism in Ukraine and elsewhere: Past and Present. In: *Ukraine's Reintegration into Europe: a Historical, Historiographical and Politically Urgent Issue*. Ed. by G. B. Bercoff – G. Lami. Alessandria 2005, 23–37.

Isaevych 2006 = I. ISAEVYCH, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton 2006.

Jagić 1885 = V. JAGIĆ, *Briefwechsel zwischen Dobrowský und Kopitar (1808–1828)*. Sanktpeterburg 1885.

Jagić 1897 = V. JAGIĆ, *Neue Briefe von Dobrovký, Kopitar und anderen Süd- und Westslaven*. Berlin 1897.

Jelavich 1983 = B. JELAVICH, *History of the Balkans: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century*. Vol.1. Cambridge – New York 1983 [repr.1993].

Jireček 1876 = C. JIREČEK, *Geschichte der Bulgaren*. Prague 1876.

Karpat 1982 = K. H. KARPAT, *Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era*. In: *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*. Vol. I. Ed. by B. Braude – B. Lewis. New York – London 1982, 141–169.

Karpat 1997 = K. H. KARPAT, *The Balkan National States and Nationalism: Image and Reality*. *Islamic Studies* 36 (1997) 82–104.

Kasinec 1974/1984 = E. KASINEC, *Jaroslav Isajevych as Historian of the Ukrainian Book*. *Recenzija* 5/1 (1974) – reprinted in E. Kasinec, *Slavic Books and Bookmen. Papers and Essays*. New York 1984.

Király 1973 = P. KIRÁLY, *Die slawische Mundarten in Ungarn und die ungarlandischen Druckwerke in slawischen Sprachen*. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 19/1–4 (1973) 148–164.

Király 1980 = P. KIRÁLY, *Die ersten Schulbücher der Ofner Universitätsdruckerei in sprachlicher und orthographischer Hinsicht*. *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 26/1–4 (1980) 307–324.

Király 1983 = P. KIRÁLY (ed.), *Typographia Universitatis Hungaricae Budae, 1777–1848*. Budapest 1983.

Király 1985 = P. KIRÁLY, *The Role of Buda University Press in Development of Orthography and Literary Languages*. In: *The Formation of Slavonic Literary Languages*. Ed. by G. Stone – D. Worth. Columbus (Ohio) 1985, 29–37.

Király 1993 = P. KIRÁLY, *National Endeavors in Central and Eastern Europe. As Reflected in the Publications of the University Press of Buda 1777–1848*. Budapest 1993.

Kitromilides 1999 = P.M. KITROMILIDES, *Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century*. *Oriente Moderno* Vol. 18 (1999) 131–145.

Kostić 1912 = M. КОСТИЋ, *Рускосрпска књижевна трговина Терезијанског доба*. Сремски Карловци 1912.

Kostić 1923 = M. КОСТИЋ, *Српска насеља у Русији – Нова Србија и Славеносрбија*. *Српски Етнографски Зборник* 26/1 (1923) 135–327.

Kostić 2001 = M. КОСТИЋ, *Нова Србија и Славеносрбија, Српско-Украјинско Друштво*. Нови Сад 2001 [1923].

Krbec-Laiske 1970 = M. KRБEC–M. LAISKE, *Bibliographie der Veröffentlichungen von Josef Dobrowský*. Prague 1970.

Markovich 2011 = S. G. MARKOVICH, Dositey Obradovich: The man who introduced modernity to the Serbs. *The South Slav Journal* 30/3-4 (2011) 5-27.

Mylonas 2003 = Ch. MYLONAS, *Serbian Orthodox Fundamentals: The Quest for an Eternal Identity*. Budapest – New York 2003.

Molnár 2008 = MOLNÁR A., A szerb orthodox egyház és az uniós kísérletek a 17. században. In: *Elfelejtett végvidék: tanulmányok a hódoltsági katolikus művelődés történetéből*. Szerk. Molnár A. Budapest 2008, 76-90.

Niederhauser 1965 = E. NIEDERHAUSER, The Problems of Bourgeois Transformation in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. In: *Nouvelles études historiques publiées à l'occasion du XIIe Congrès International des Sciences Historiques par la Commission Nationale des Historiens Hongrois*. Vol.2. Eds. Csatári D. – Katus L. – Rozsnyói Á. Budapest 1965, 565-580.

Niederhauser 1982 = E. NIEDERHAUSER, *The Rise of Nationality in Eastern Europe*. Budapest 1982.

Ojtozi 1984 = Э. Ойтози, Фонды книг кирилловской печати XV-XVIII вв. нескольких библиотек Венгерской Народной Республики. *Федоровские чтения* 1980. Москва 1984, 123-125.

Ojtozi 1977 = E. OJTOZI, Kirchenslawische Bücher aus der Klosterbibliothek zu Máriapócs I. *Könyv és könyvtár: könyvtártudományi és bibliográfiai tanulmányok és közlemények. A Debreceni Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Könyvtárának évkönyve* 11 (1977) 119-131.

Ojtozi 1979 = E. OJTOZI, Kirchenslawische Bücher aus der Klosterbibliothek zu Máriapócs II. *Könyv és könyvtár: könyvtártudományi és bibliográfiai tanulmányok és közlemények. A Debreceni Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Könyvtárának évkönyve* 12 (1979) 197-203.

Orosz 1982 = L. OROSZ, The Hungarian Enlightenment and the Classicist Movement. In: *A History of Hungarian Literature*. Ed. by T. Klaniczay. Budapest 1982, 117-165.

Palić 1995 = M. PALIĆ, *Srbi u Mađarskoj-Ugarskoj do 1918*. Novi Sad 1995.

Picot 1873 = E. PICOT, *Les Serbes de Hongrie*. Prague 1873.

Pogačnik 1978 = J. POGAČNIK, *Bartholomäus Kopitar, Leben und Werk*. München 1978.

Pogačnik 1977 = J. POGAČNIK, *Jernej Kopitar*. Ljubljana 1977.

Popović 1964 = M. POPOVIĆ, *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864)*. Beograd 1964.

Pražák 1983 = R. PRAŽÁK, Zur problematik der Aufklärung und der Anfänge der sogenannten nationalen Wiedergeburt in Mitteleuropa. In: *Sprache und Volk im 18. Jahrhundert. Symposium in Reinhausen bei Göttingen 3-6. Juli 1979*. Hrsg.: B. Hans-Hermann. Frankfurt am Main – Bern 1983, 125-138.

Roucek 1946 = J.S. ROUCEK, The Geopolitics of the Balkans. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 5/3 (1946) 365-377.

Runciman 1968 = S. RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*. Cambridge 1968.

Sayer 1996 = D. SAYER, The Language of Nationality and the Nationality of Language: Prague 1780-1920. *Past and Present* 153/1 (1996) 164-210.

- Schevill 1991 = F. SCHEVILL, *A history of the Balkans*. New York 1991.
- Schwicker 1880 = J.H. SCHWICKER, *Politische Geschichte der Serben in Ungarn*. Budapest 1880.
- Sherrard 1959 = Ph. SHERRARD, *The Greek East and the Latin West*. Oxford 1959.
- Sindik-Grozdanović-Pajić-Mano-Zisi 1991 = Н. Р. Синдик – М. Гроздановић-Пајић – К. Мано-Зиси, *Опис рукописа и старих штампаних књига Библиотеке Српске Православне епархије Будимске у Сентандреји*. Београд – Нови Сад 1991.
- Sloane 1908 = W.M. SLOANE, Turkey in Europe. *Political Science Quarterly* 23/2 (1908) 297–319.
- Stepovik 1982 = Д. СТЕПОВИК, *Українська графіка XVI–XVII століть: Еволюція образної системи*, Київ 1982.
- Strauss 1995 = J. STRAUSS, The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th–20th Centuries). *Die Welt des Islams* 35/2 (1995) 189–249.
- Temperley 1917 = H. W. TEMPERLEY, *History of Serbia*. London 1917 [reprinted New York 1969].
- Titov 1924 = Хв. Тітов, *Матеріали для історії книжної справи на Україні: Всього передмов до українських стародруків*. Київ 1924.
- Ursinus 1989 = M. URSINUS, Zur diskussion um 'millet' im Osmanischen Reich. *Südost-Forschungen* 48 (1989) 195–207.
- Voillery 1986 = P. VOILLERY, Entre Russie et Bulgarie: Contribution à l'histoire de la première église bulgare de Constantinople 1847–1859. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 27/3–4 (1986) 417–460.
- Ware 1964 = T. WARE, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule*. Oxford 1964.
- Zapasko 1971 = Я. Запаско, *Мистецтво книни на Україні XVI–XVII століть*. Львів 1971.

A MAGYAR KIRÁLYSÁG TERÜLETÉN ÉLŐ SZERBEK ÉS A NYUGAT-UKRÁN TERÜLETEK INTERKULTURÁLIS KAPCSOLATAI – A LITURGIKUS KÖNYVEK TÜKRÉBEN

Mára már elavult közhely, hogy a felvilágosodás és a nemzeti megújulás eszméit egyedül kizárólag Bécs közvetítette a Habsburg Birodalom szláv nemzetiségei fel. Jóllehet a bécsi szellemi élet valóban a legfontosabb ablak volt Nyugat-Európára, de nem az egyetlen. A magyar történészek vitát folytattak a nemzetek kialakulásáról a múlt század nyolcvanas-kilencvenes éveiben, és ebben a Niederhauser Emil képviselte álláspont került elfogadásra, mely szerint már a 17. században beszélhetünk nemzeté alakulásról. Ennek a szerbek esetében jelentős motorja volt a liturgikus könyvek importja keleti szláv, mai ukrán területekről. Először is azért, mert a balkáni szerbek egyáltalán nem használhatták nyelvüket és a cirill betűket kultúrájuk megőrzésére, miután a görög phanarióták váltak az Oszmán birodalom elitjévé. Mivel az egyháznak jól kiépített adminisztrációja volt, amikor a törökök meghódították a balkáni népeket, és mivel az iszlám gyakorlat a "könyv népeit" nem tiltotta el (csupán korlátozta) vallásuk gyakorlásában, ha megfelelő adót fizettek, mindkét félnek előnyös volt, hogy a keresztény millet fejévé a pátriárka vált. Ám a tizenhetedik században Isztambul Phanar (világítótorony) nevű városrészéről elnevezett gazdag és művelt görög nagypolgári réteg az oszmán uralom alatt lévő valamennyi keresztény felett magához ragadta mind a gazdasági, mind az adminisztratív hatalmat, sőt a pátriárkát korrumpálva még az egyházat is. Emiatt lehetetlenné vált a szláv ajkúak mégoly korlátozott művelődése is. A Habsburg Birodalomba menekülő szerbek (a Magyar Királyságba történt bevándorlás három fő hullámát különítettük el az idézett korábbi munkáinkban) jóllehet állandóan panaszkodtak hátrányos helyzetükre, ha magukat a magyarokhoz hasonlították, ám a balkáni testvéreiknél összehasonlíthatatlanul jobb helyzetbe kerültek. Vallási s világi önkormányzatuk az egyházi szláv liturgia s a cirill betűs könyvek szabad használatával párosult. A Szentendréni kutató szerb kollégák monográfiájában és az egyéb gyűjteményeket a jelen munka szerzője korábbi publikációiban leírt possessori margináliák egyértelműen bizonyítják, hogy a 17-18. sz. folyamán a Magyar Királyság területén élő szerbek alapvetően a mai ukrán, akkori kelet-lengyelországi területekről származó könyveket importáltak. Az ukrán és fehérorosz nyomdák ugyanakkor a lengyel hatások alatt álltak, és tulajdonosaik civil testvéretek (confraternitas) voltak, ezáltal rugalmasabb kiadói politikát és a nyugati kultúrának, a barokknak a hatásait jobban kitett nyomtatást folytattak. Bőséges elő- s utószavaik, a szent könyveket kísérő világi kommentárjaik, főként pedig a liturgikus tartalmakat illusztráló rézmetszeteik a nyugat-európai barokk hatásait lengyel közvetítéssel így a Magyar Korona szláv nemzetiségeihez is eljuttatták. A Lembergben nemrég elhunyt Iszajevics akadémikus kutatásai, s a vele kapcsolatban dolgozó jelen szerző munkái folytatásaként a kérdés nagymonográfiájában történő feldolgozása várható, mellyel további bizonyítékokat kapunk arra, hogy a késő barokk és a korai felvilágosodás korában a nemzeti öntudat ápolásában a szerbek a mai ukrán

területek városainak jótékony hatására tartották meg és fejlesztették nemzeti kultúrájukat. Az orosz gyámkodás majd a csak a 18. század végétől válik erőssé, amely kivezet a dolgozatunkban tárgyalt korszakból. Csak az 1768-1774 közti orosz-török háborút lezáró békekötés után, amelyen 1774. július 21-én Kücsük-Kajnardzsiban a török szultán kénytelen volt elismerni a cárt minden pravoszlávok patrónusának az oszmán birodalomban.