

ISSN 2411-345X (Print)
ISSN 2415-7198 (Online)

НАЦІОНАЛЬНА АКАДЕМІЯ НАУК УКРАЇНИ
ІНСТИТУТ ІСТОРІЇ УКРАЇНИ

**МІЖНАРОДНІ
ЗВ'ЯЗКИ УКРАЇНИ:
НАУКОВІ ПОШУКИ
І ЗНАХІДКИ**

МІЖВІДОМЧИЙ ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ

ЗАСНОВАНИЙ 1991 р.

Випуск 30

Київ – 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/mzu2021.30>
УДК 94(477):[327+001.891]

Міжнародні зв'язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки. Вип. 30: міжвідомчий збірник наукових праць. Відп. ред. С.В. Віднянський. Київ: Ін-т історії України НАН України, 2021. 540 с.

Збірник наукових праць присвячено 30-річчю відновлення незалежності України. У ньому акцентовано увагу на актуальних питаннях історії міжнародних відносин та зовнішньої політики, місці й ролі в них України, внеску національних меншин у розвиток міжнародних зв'язків на українських землях, важливих аспектах дипломатичної історії, проблемах і перспективах розвитку партнерських відносин України з державами-членами ЄС. Розглядаються також актуальні проблеми теорії та методології історії, а з нагоди 85-річчя Інституту історії України НАН України спеціальну рубрику присвячено його внеску в розвиток досліджень із всесвітньої історії, міжнародних відносин та зовнішньої політики України.

Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою Інституту історії України НАН України, протокол №8 від 30 вересня 2021 р.

Р е д а к ц і й н а к о л е г і я :

С.В. Віднянський, доктор історичних наук, професор, член-кореспондент НАН України, Інститут історії України НАН України (*відповідальний редактор*);

О.А. Іваненко, кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Інститут історії України НАН України (*відповідальний секретар*);

О.Г. Бажан, кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, доцент, Інститут історії України НАН України;

Є.В. Бевзюк, доктор історичних наук, доцент, ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»;

Г.В. Боряк, доктор історичних наук, професор, член-кореспондент НАН України, Інститут історії України НАН України;

М.М. Вегеш, доктор історичних наук, професор, ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»;

М.М. Волошук, доктор історичних наук, доцент, ДВНЗ «Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника»;

Любіца Гарбульова, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Пряшівський університет (Пряшів, Словачька Республіка);

Н.Д. Городня, доктор історичних наук, професор, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка;

А.В. Грубінко, доктор історичних наук, професор, Західноукраїнський національний університет;

С.П. Качараба, доктор історичних наук, професор, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка;

Станіслав Конечни, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Інститут суспільних наук Словацької академії наук (Кошице, Словачька Республіка);

А.І. Кудряченко, доктор історичних наук, професор, член-кореспондент НАН України, Державна установа «Інститут всесвітньої історії НАН України»;

О.Є. Лисенко, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут історії України НАН України;

А.Ю. Мартинов, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут історії України НАН України;

І.Б. Матяш, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут історії України НАН України;

Д.В. Миколенко, доктор історичних наук, доцент, Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна;

Дорота Міхалюк, доктор габілітований, професор, Університет Миколая Коперника (Торунь, Республіка Польща);

Ян Рихлік, доктор габілітований, професор, Карловий університет (Прага, Чеська Республіка);

В.Є. Снапковський, доктор історичних наук, професор, Білоруський державний університет (Мінськ, Республіка Білорусь);

Міхал Шмігель, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Університет Матея Бела (Банська Бистриця, Словацька Республіка).

Рецензенти: **О.О. Кураєв**, доктор історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства імені М.С. Грушевського НАН України;

О.С. Рубльов, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут історії України НАН України;

Г.В. Саган, доктор історичних наук, доцент, Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка.

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації: 04.02.2003 р., серія КВ № 6938.

Збірник включено до «Переліку наукових фахових видань України» (Наказ МОН України №1188 від 24.09.2020 р. «Історичні науки», категорія «Б»).

Реєстрація в міжнародних базах даних: Centrum Otwartej Nauki (CeON) (Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego, Polska Akademia Nauk i Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich); ERIH PLUS; Google Scholar; Slavic Humanities Index (Canada); The Central European Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (Polska Akademia Nauk, Akademie Věd České Republiky, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Slovenská Akadémia Vied); Ulrich's Periodicals Directory (USA).

Адреса редакції: вул. М. Грушевського, 4, офіс 500, Київ, Україна, 01001
тел. +38 044 279 8704, факс +38 044 279 6362, e-mail: vsesvit_vid@ukr.net

Веб-сайти видання: <http://mzu.history.org.ua/index.php/MZU>
<https://mzu44.webnode.com.ua>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/mzu2021.30>
UDC 94(477):[327+001.891]

International Relations of Ukraine: Scientific Searches and Findings. Issue 30: Interagency collected scientific papers. Ed. by S.V. Vidnyanskyj. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine, 2021. 540 p.

The collection of scientific papers is dedicated to the 30th anniversary of the regaining of Ukraine's independence. It highlights topical issues of the history of international relations and foreign policy and Ukraine's role in them, the contribution of national minorities to the development of international communications in Ukrainian lands, important aspects of diplomatic history, problems and prospects of Ukraine's partnership with the European Union member States. Current problems of historical theory and methodology are also considered. On the occasion of the 85th anniversary of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, a special section is devoted to its contribution to the development of studies on world history, international relations and foreign policy of Ukraine.

Recommended for publication by the Academic Senate of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Protocol No.8, September 30, 2021.

E d i t o r i a l b o a r d :

S.V. Vidnyanskyj, Doctor of History, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (*Executive Editor*);

O.A. Ivanenko, PhD in History, Senior Researcher, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (*Executive Secretary*);

O.H. Bazan, PhD in History, Senior Researcher, Associate Professor, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

E.V. Bevzyuk, Doctor of History, Associate Professor, Uzhhorod National University;

H.V. Boriak, Doctor of History, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

N.D. Gorodnia, Doctor of History, Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv;

Eubica Harbul'ová, PhD in History, Associate Professor, Prešov University (Prešov, the Slovak Republic);

A.V. Hrubinko, Doctor of History, Professor, West Ukrainian National University;

S.P. Kacharaba, Doctor of History, Professor, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv;

Stanislav Konečný, PhD in History, Associate Professor, Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (Košice, the Slovak Republic);

A.I. Kudryachenko, Doctor of History, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the State Institution "Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine";

O.E. Lysenko, Doctor of History, Professor, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

A.Yu. Martynov, Doctor of History, Professor, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

I.B. Matiash, Doctor of History, Professor, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

Dorota Michaluk, Doctor Habilitatus, Professor UMK, Nicolaus Copernicus University (Toruń, the Republic of Poland);

D.V. Mykolenko, Doctor of History, Associate Professor, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University;

Jan Rychlík, Doctor Habilitatus, Professor, Charles University (Prague, the Czech Republic);

Michal Šmigel', PhD in History, Associate Professor, Matej Bel University (Banska Bystrica, the Slovak Republic);

V.E. Snapkovsky, Doctor of History, Professor, Belarusian State University (Minsk, the Republic of Belarus);

M.M. Vehesh, Doctor of History, Professor, Uzhhorod National University;

M.M. Voloshchuk, Doctor of History, Associate Professor, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University.

R e v i e w e r s : **O.O. Kurayev**, Doctor of History, Senior Researcher, M.S. Hrushevskyi Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

O.S. Rubliov, Doctor of History, Professor, Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine;

H.V. Sahan, Doctor of History, Associate Professor, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University.

Certificate on the state registration for the printed media: 04.02.2003, "KV" No. 6938.

Inclusion in the List of the academic publications of Ukraine: the Order No.1188, dated from September 24, 2020, of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine ("History", Category "B").

Registration in the international databases: Centrum Otwartej Nauki (CeON) (Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego, Polska Akademia Nauk i Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich); ERIH PLUS; Google Scholar; Slavic Humanities Index (Canada); The Central European Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (Polska Akademia Nauk, Akademie Věd České Republiky, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Slovenská Akadémia Vied); Ulrich's Periodicals Directory (USA).

Address of the editorial office: 4, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi Street, office 500, Kyiv, 01001, Ukraine

Tel. +38 044 279 87 04, fax +38 044 279 63 62, e-mail:vsesvit_vid@ukr.net

The publication websites: <http://mzu.history.org.ua/index.php/MZU>

<https://mzu44.webnode.com.ua>

ДО 30-РІЧЧЯ ВІДНОВЛЕННЯ НЕЗАЛЕЖНОСТІ УКРАЇНИ

З М І С Т

Україна на міжнародній арені

<i>Solomiya Kozak.</i> «И доконцавъ с нимъ миръ до своего живота»: on the Question of the Context of the Opava Meeting in 1289, its Participants and the “Eternal” Czech-Galician Union.	10
<i>Георгій Потульницький.</i> Спроби мазепинської еміграції залучити кримське питання до міжнародної політики Французької монархії у першій половині XVIII ст. . . .	26
<i>Юлія Вялова.</i> Леон Василевський на переговорах у Ризі: до сторіччя Ризького мирного договору 1921 р.	45
<i>Володимир Потульницький.</i> Проблема українсько-польського співіснування в українській консервативній політичній думці міжвоєнної доби: Липинський versus Томашівський у контексті епохи.	67
<i>Ірина Матяш.</i> Діяльність консульських установ соціалістичних країн у Києві (кінець 1940-х – 1980-ті рр.).	85
<i>Владимир Снапковский.</i> Сотрудничество СССР, Украинской ССР и Белорусской ССР в ООН в период советской перестройки.	113
<i>Рената Поладі.</i> 1991 рік: у джерел розбудови угорсько-українських міждержавних зв'язків.	141
<i>Степан Віднянський.</i> Розвиток та проблемні питання партнерських відносин України з сусідніми країнами-членами ЄС.	156

Проблеми теорії та методології історії

<i>Олег Горенко.</i> Людина в історії vs історія в людині – ч. 3: Ноосферна трансформація, емпатія і феномен когнітивної історії.	177
<i>Ярослава Верменич.</i> Глобалізація vs локалізація: діалектика взаємодії у сучасному світі.	207
<i>Андрій Мартинов.</i> Теоретичні засади й методологічні проблеми семіотики історії.	225

3 історії міжнародних відносин

<i>Yurii Chotari.</i> Written Heritage of Transylvanian Princes in the Archival Funds of Ukraine.	243
<i>Ігор Жалоба, Ігор Піддубний.</i> Внутрішньо- та зовнішньополітичне становище Румунії у першій половині 1921 року (за донесеннями австрійської дипломатичної місії у Бухаресті).	262
<i>Іван Боровець.</i> Словацьке питання в зовнішньополітичній візії владних кіл II Речі Посполитої (1938 – березень 1939 р.).	284

<i>Ákos Fóris.</i> “The Sacrificed Army” – the Hungarian 2nd Army Between Memory and History.	304
<i>Andrii Aftanas.</i> Wirtschaftspolitik der Deutschen Besatzungsbehörde im Bezirk Kolomyia (gemäss Zeitung “Volya Pokuttya” 1941–1944).	325
<i>Олена Антупова.</i> Відлуння Угорської революції 1956 року в Польщі.	342
<i>Oksana Cherevko.</i> Margaret Thatcher’s Vision on the Russian Factor in the International Relations System (Late Twentieth – Early Twenty-First Century).	363
<i>Олександр Горобець.</i> Арктична політика КНР: виклики регіональній безпеці (1990-ті – 2020-ті рр.).	377

Національні меншини в історії України

<i>Oksana Ivanenko.</i> Public Resistance in the National Liberation Movement of Poles in Right-Bank Ukraine in the First Half of the 1860s (From the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv).	389
<i>Анна Уманська.</i> Видавнича діяльність Культур-Ліги в Києві у 1918–1931 рр.: періоди та жанри.	405
<i>Владислава Піскіжова.</i> Проблематика історії грецької присутності на українських теренах у сучасній вітчизняній історіографії.	428

До 85-річчя Інституту історії України НАН України

<i>Степан Віднянський.</i> Дослідження з всесвітньої історії, міжнародних відносин і зовнішньої політики України в Інституті історії України НАН України: традиції та сучасний розвиток.	451
<i>Оксана Іваненко.</i> Проблеми всесвітньо-історичного процесу й участі в ньому України на сторінках збірника наукових праць «Міжнародні зв’язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки» (огляд змісту випусків 1-29 за 1991-2020 рр.).	477
<i>Показьчик</i> змісту випусків 1-29 за 1991-2020 рр. міжвідомчого збірника наукових праць «Міжнародні зв’язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки».	495

Наші ювіляри

<i>Андрій Мартинов.</i> До 70-річчя відповідального редактора збірника, члена-кореспондента НАН України Степана Васильовича Віднянського.	525
<i>Степан Віднянський.</i> До ювілею членкині редколегії збірника, докторки історичних наук, професорки Ірини Борисівни Матяш.	533

DEDICATED TO THE 30th ANNIVERSARY OF THE REGAINING OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

CONTENTS

Ukraine in the International Arena

<i>Solomiya Kozak.</i> «И доконцавъ с нимъ миръ до своего живота»: on the Question of the Context of the Opava Meeting in 1289, its Participants and the “Eternal” Czech-Galician Union.	10
<i>Heorhii Potulnyskyi.</i> The Attempts of the Mazepian Emigration to involve the Crimean Question into the International Policy of French Kingdom in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century.	26
<i>Iuliia Vialova.</i> Leon Wasilewski at the Treaty of Riga Negotiations: to the Centenary of the Peace of Riga (1921).	45
<i>Volodymyr Potulnyskyi.</i> The Problem of Ukrainian-Polish Coexistence in the Ukrainian Conservative Political Thought of the Interwar Period: Lypynskyi Versus Tomashivskyi in the Framework of Epoch.	67
<i>Iryna Matiash.</i> Activities of Consulates of Socialist Countries in Kyiv (Late 1940s – 1980s).	85
<i>Uladzimir Snapkouski.</i> Cooperation of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Belarusian SSR in the UN during the Perestroika Period.	113
<i>Renata Paladi.</i> 1991: at the Origin of Building Hungarian-Ukrainian Inter-State Relations.	141
<i>Stepan Vidnyanskyj.</i> Development and Problematic Issues of Ukraine’s Partnership with the Neighbouring EU Member States.	156

Issues of the Theory and Methodology of History

<i>Oleg Gorenko.</i> Human Being in History vs History in Human Being – Part 3: Noospheric Transformation, Empathy and Phenomenon of Cognitive History.	177
<i>Yaroslava Vermenych.</i> Globalization vs Localization: the Dialectics of Interaction in the Modern World.	207
<i>Andriy Martynov.</i> Theoretical Foundations and Methodological Problems of the Semiotics of History.	225

From the History of International Relations

<i>Yurii Chotari.</i> Written Heritage of Transylvanian Princes in the Archival Funds of Ukraine.	243
<i>Ihor Zhaloba, Ihor Pidubnyi.</i> Romania’s Domestic and International Political Situation in the First Half of 1921 (According to the Reports of the Austrian Diplomatic Mission in Bucharest).	262
<i>Ivan Borovets.</i> The Slovak Question in Foreign Policy Vision of the Second Rzeczpospolita Authorities (1938 – March 1939).	284

<i>Ákos Fóris.</i> “The Sacrificed Army” – the Hungarian 2nd Army Between Memory and History.	304
<i>Andrii Aftanas.</i> Economic Policy of the German Occupational Authority in the Kolomyia Region (According to the “Vollia Pokuttya” Newspaper 1941–1944).	325
<i>Olena Antypova.</i> The 1956 Hungarian Revolution Echoes in Poland.	342
<i>Oksana Cherevko.</i> Margaret Thatcher’s Vision on the Russian Factor in the International Relations System (Late Twentieth – Early Twenty-First Century).	363
<i>Oleksandr Horobets.</i> China’s Arctic Policy: Challenges to Regional Security (1990s – 2020s).	377

National Minorities in the History of Ukraine

<i>Oksana Ivanenko.</i> Public Resistance in the National Liberation Movement of Poles in Right-Bank Ukraine in the First Half of the 1860s (From the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv).	389
<i>Anna Umanska.</i> Publishing Activity of Kultur-Lige in Kyiv in 1918-1931: Phases and Genres.	405
<i>Vladyslava Piskizhova.</i> Issues of the History of the Greek Presence on Ukrainian Territory in Modern National Historiography.	428

For the 85th Anniversary of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine

<i>Stepan Vidnyanskyj.</i> Studies on World History, International Relations and Foreign Policy of Ukraine at the Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine: Traditions and Contemporary Development.	451
<i>Oksana Ivanenko.</i> Issues of World History and Ukraine’s Role in it on the Pages of “the International Relations of Ukraine: Scientific Searches and Findings” (a Content Review of Issues 1-29 from 1991 to 2020).	477
<i>The Content</i> Index of “the International Relations of Ukraine: Scientific Searches and Findings” (Issues 1-29 from 1991 to 2020).	495

Our jubilees

<i>Andriy Martynov.</i> For the Seventieth Anniversary of the Yearbook Executive Editor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Stepan Vidnyanskyj.	525
<i>Stepan Vidnyanskyj.</i> For the Anniversary of a Member of the Yearbook Editorial Board, Doctor of History, Professor Iryna Matiash.	533

З ІСТОРИЇ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН FROM THE HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/mzu2021.30.243>

UDC: 930.253(439.21)

Yurii Chotari

PhD in History, Associate Professor

Head of the Department

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian

College of Higher Education

6, Kossuth Square, Berehove, 90202, Ukraine

E-mail: csatary@kmf.org.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7265-1273>

WRITTEN HERITAGE OF TRANSYLVANIAN PRINCES IN THE ARCHIVAL FUNDS OF UKRAINE

The written legacy of the Transylvanian princes preserved in Ukrainian archival funds is a less researched area. The aim of the article is to shed light on the documentary heritage of two Transylvanian princes preserved by the archival funds of Ukraine. The methodology of the research is based on the description of the sources, with the help of which new data is introduced into the scientific stream. Archival-descriptive methods were applied that can be used to exploit the historical data in the records. The scientific novelty of the article is about exploring sources that have not been published so far or have already been mentioned in the foreign literature, but are less known in the historical literature of Ukraine. Conclusions: The present study covers the documentary legacy of two princes, György Rákóczi I (1593-1648) and his great-grandson Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676-1735), examining the letters in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region, which were signed by them. Although the Transylvanian princes were not independent rulers, they left a significant mark in European history in the administrative, military and political spheres. Their military-political careers had an impact on the peoples of the region, the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, the Poles and the Germans alike. Of all the princes of the Rákóczi dynasty, the documentary legacy of the princes mentioned above is the richest in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region. The princes in question were suffering in the European space between the two great powers of the time, the Habsburgs

and the Turkish Empire, and could succeed only with great effort. Letters, decrees, and other orders written or issued in the princely chancelleries, the description of which appears in this article, are essentially the result of the present research. These expand the image of the relationship between the peoples living in the principality and the Rákóczi, who often acted in political coercion. A detailed examination of the princes' letters of donation, the treaties with the rulers, or the relations with the poor peasantry may be of interest for further research.

Keywords: Transylvanian princes, archives, Rákóczi, Mukachevo, documentary legacy, war of independence, the Kurucs, bishopric, union.

Юрій Чотарі

канд. іст. наук, доц., зав. каф.

Закарпатський угорський інститут

ім. Ференца Ракоці II

90202, Україна, Берегово, площа Кошута, 6

E-mail: csatary@kmf.org.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7265-1273>

ПИСЕМНА СПАДЩИНА ТРАНСІЛЬВАНСЬКИХ КНЯЗІВ У АРХІВНИХ ФОНДАХ УКРАЇНИ

Писемна спадщина трансільванських князів, яка зберігається в Україні, на сьогодні є малодослідженою. Метою нашої публікації є висвітлити документи, авторство яких належать двом трансільванським князям, і які зберігаються в українських архівних фондах. Методика дослідження ґрунтується на описі джерел, завдяки чому в науковий обіг введено нові факти та дані. Наукова новизна публікації полягає в тому, що в ній вперше публікуються та аналізуються джерела, які зарубіжними науковцями вже згадувалися, але у вітчизняній історичній науковій літературі залишалися невідомими. Висновки: У статті розглянуто документальну спадщину двох князів – Дердя I Ракоці (1593-1648) та його правнука Ференца II Ракоці (1676-1735), вивчено ті листи, що зберігаються в Державному архіві Закарпатської області й підписані ними власноруч. Хоча трансільванські князі не були незалежними правителями, але в адміністративній, військовій та політичній сферах залишили по собі в європейській історії значний слід. Їхня військово-політична діяльність мала вплив на більшість народів регіону – українців, угорців, поляків, німців та ін.

З-поміж представників династії Ракоці саме стосовно двох згаданих осіб у Державному архіві Закарпатської області маємо найбільшу кількість писемних пам'яток. Цим князям доводилося лавірувати між двома могутніми державами того часу – Габсбурзькою та Османською імперіями, тож

успіхів вони досягли ціною надзвичайних зусиль. Опис листів, указів та інших розпоряджень, що виходили з князівських канцелярій, є по суті результатом нашої дослідницької роботи, представленої у публікації. Завдяки цьому ми отримуємо ширшу картину відносин між народами, що проживали в князівстві, та родом Ракоці, представники якого змушені були діяти, виходячи з тогочасних політичних обставин. У подальшому дослідження можна продовжити, детальніше вивчаючи княжі дарчі листи, угоди, укладені з правителями, або відносини з селянством.

Ключові слова: трансільванські князі, архів, Ракоці, Мукачево, писемна спадщина, визвольна боротьба, куруци, єпископство, унія.

The diverse history of the peoples of Europe, together with the history of the currently functioning states, can be best understood by studying the former provinces, limited state formations and regions. Such a state formation was Transylvania, which belongs to the territory of today's Romania, and whose past may be of interest to several European nations. The province under Turkish rule was recognized by King Miksa of Habsburg on 6 August 1570 in Speyer. With the permission of the Turkish sultan, they were able to elect a prince who was given a letter of credence to rule¹. Despite its dependence on foreign policy and finance, Transylvania had many features of independent statehood. In the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, out of the Transylvanian princes, the Rákóczi gained significant political and economic influence.

The topic that has been formulated is less known in the Ukrainian literature, therefore it currently contains new data on the written heritage of the Rákóczi family. Exploring the sources, including analysing them and making them public, is the key to the development of our historiography. The research done so far only touches, but does not discuss in detail, the resources we have described that are available in Ukraine².

The aim of our study is to present the activities of two Transylvanian princes, György Rákóczi I³ (1593-1648) and his great-grandson Ferenc Rákóczi II⁴ (1676-1735) with the help of their rich documentary legacy preserved in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region. György Rákóczi I's written legacy is primarily connected to today's Transcarpathian region, especially to the area of Mukachevo, and is associated with the castle and the city. This time, the events and consequences of the Thirty Years' Great European War (1618-1648) are revived with the help of county and prince decrees. The legacy of the documents was researched according to the funds (or collections) and their analysis was carried out on this basis, including these sources in the Ukrainian scientific circulation.

The State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region concentrate the surviving documents of the offices of the regions and counties that once belonged to Transylvania, which also preserved the decrees, circulars, letters and other records of

the princes of Transylvania. The collections (funds) examined in this article contain the largest number of valuable sources about the two princes, most of which have not been published so far. One is György Rákóczi I, the other is Ferenc Rákóczi II. The documentary legacy of these two significant historical personalities is the most richly documented, from which we can learn about the social relations of the time. There is no separate collection of these persons in the archives, but in the document funds of Uzh, Bereg⁵, and Uhocha counties⁶, the five crown towns of Maramures, as well as the funds of the Greek Catholic bishopric of Mukachevo, the chief judge⁷ of Mukachevo, there are several documents signed by the princes personally. Historiography disproportionately remembers the two princes: György Rákóczi I, an economically precise lord who was considered a school and church builder, is recorded less by posterity than Ferenc Rákóczi II, whose name is entwined with the longest war of independence against the Habsburgs (1703-1711). It can also be seen that the conscious, humble builder is valued less than the freedom fighter⁸.

It should be noted about György Rákóczi I that his father, Zsigmond Rákóczi, the creator of the dynasty, left him a huge fortune. He was Upper Hungary's richest landowner and possessor. At the age of twenty-two, he was appointed lord-sheriff of Borsod County. He married the Protestant Zsuzsanna Lorántffy, who was famous for her successful church and cultural patronage⁹. In 1630, György Rákóczi I was elected prince of Transylvania with the help of the Turkish sultan. The prince was always strict with his soldiers and court judges. However, he was very sensitive to requests from the peasantry, and when he became aware of military or other abuses, he always took orderly measures¹⁰. Undoubtedly, György Rákóczi I did the most for the creation of the status of the Transylvanian ruler, which manifested itself in the dynastic marriage policy, in the representation of the rulers, and in the establishment of the European federal system. He was characterized by fear of God and parental respect, which accompanied him throughout his career as a politician and prince as a fundamental principle of his life. Even as a Calvinist, he sincerely believed in the Rákóczi family's political mission, to be a firm member of the European nations, which he partly achieved in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648¹¹.

The Habsburg ruler was busy with the 30-year war and the sultan with the Janissary rebellions, which is why the prince's eighteen years of rule provided peaceful development for Transylvania. He still considered the land to be the basis of princely power, although financial management was already characteristic of his age¹². The Protestant prince made contact with the Swedish and French diplomatic circles against the Habsburgs. In his proclamation of February 1644, he stressed that he was going to war to restore the freedom of the country¹³. However, the Catholic aristocracy withdrew its support, as did the Sultan, so he ended his campaign without success¹⁴. Thanks to Rákóczi's policy, Transylvania strengthened and planned to secede from the Turkish Porta. Increasing his fam-

ily's wealth, however, he ultimately gained relief for his subjects with his great wealth: as his family estates grew, he gradually freed his subjects' trade. He first allowed the retail distribution of honey and wax, then that of the other export items, which had a very positive effect¹⁵.

One can find nineteen original letters written by György Rákóczi I and six copies of his letters in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region. These documents can be found in five collections, including the archives of the Chief Justice of the city of Mukachevo¹⁶. As prince of Transylvania, his life was connected to Mukachevo and today's Transcarpathian region in many ways. Katalin Brandenburg, who inherited the principality from her husband Gábor Bethlen, handed over Mukachevo Castle to Rákóczi in a letter dated 13 April 1631. This agreement was finally recognized by Emperor Ferdinand II in 1633, but he handed over the town and its villages to Rákóczi only in case he paid 200,000 forints. Since then, he was landowner of 140 villages around Mukachevo and 33 settlements of the Chynadiyev estate¹⁷. At that time, according to the 1645 census¹⁸, Mukachevo was inhabited by 59 serfs, 61 infantry, 41 widows, 60 city officers, 41 craftsmen, 21 peasants, two beggars, and a gypsy farmer. It also included 44 noble houses, 18 new houses and 10 sheer places¹⁹.

György Rákóczi I received French ambassadors in Mukachevo on April 23, 1645, with whom he discussed the anti-Habsburg campaign. The prince had the lower fortifications of Mukachevo Castle and the defensive walls with shooting openings built by two French engineers²⁰.

Four decrees of the prince in connection with the castle and town of Mukachevo are kept in Transcarpathia. These documents are part of a collection of documents compiled by László Váry, a notary in Mukachevo, in the 1820s. It is clear from these writings that the prince played a firm role in personal and litigation matters. In his instructions, he regulated the use of meadows around the castle for people of different ranks. According to the decree dated March 31, 1645 in Mukachevo Castle, the prince learned from the report of the town judges of Mukachevo that on the meadows around the castle the cattle was still grazing at Pentecost, though it should have been driven away already at St. George's Day. The prince ordered that from that day on whoever grazed a horse or cattle in the mentioned meadows, his goods should be ruthlessly collected and he himself fined. He specifically mentioned the nobles: if one may have trampled the sowing with his horse, only his horse can be taken away. However, if a peasant committed such a crime, he could be captured²¹. He took the patronage of the owners of the newly purchased houses, whose peace was the duty of the court judge. He forbade the nobles to buy farmhouses²². He made orders about protracted inheritance lawsuits, and made efforts to close court cases²³. In August 1648, he last ordered from Mukachevo Castle about the affairs of the town, which was also connected to justice, specifically the observance of the order of court proceedings, even under the penalty of punishment²⁴.

In addition to the correspondence and decrees, the Uzh County collection contains the treaty of Rákóczi with the Habsburg ruler, Ferdinand II, signed on April 3, 1631, where he ensured the recognition of the principality of Transylvania. The contract signed in Košice set out the positions of the two parties in 19 points. The prince committed himself to disarm his soldiers and receive an imperial guard into the Castle of Ónód (Northern Hungary)²⁵.

From the time of the campaign against Vienna in 1644²⁶, we can find additional letters addressed to Uzh County in which György Rákóczi made monetary and in-kind taxes obligatory. The fifteen original letters addressed to the county are valuable from the point of view of military supply. Despite the difficulties, the Uzh County leadership sent soldiers, carts, food and fodder to Rákóczi. It is characteristic of the letters that the same problem is raised in them several times due to incomplete fulfilment of claims. The costs of the campaign, which began in February 1644, were largely laid upon the counties, so the princely letters report about the difficulties of military supply²⁷. An important topic in the orders is military supply, as troops also had to be provided from the counties²⁸. August 11, 1644, he instructed Uzh County from Košice to equip and send 100 cavalry to Szendrő under the command of Mátyás Huszár²⁹. He also provided military forecasts about front lines³⁰. In addition, he issued decrees about the arrest of escaped soldiers³¹. The escaped soldier was a common phenomenon during the campaigns. The prince could not always prevent the excesses of his soldiers against the peasantry. The shortage of weapons was constant. Knowing the military equipment of the prince, it can be stated that György Rákóczi I always maneuvered luckily against a trained, well-equipped and mostly numerically superior enemy³². It can be stated that the counties of the Northeast contributed to the cost of the campaign, though not in the desired amount.

Last but not least, the prince's struggle was for the spread of the Reformed religion. In his decree issued in Szécsény on May 4, 1644, he acted decisively in the interests of the Reformed, ordering the return of the Reformed property confiscated by the Catholics³³. Furthermore, he defended the property rights of his faithful subjects³⁴.

At the beginning of the 17th century, simultaneously the Rákóczis got hold of the property of the Mukachevo manor and the Mukachevo monastery was given Reformed supervision. The neighbouring Uzhhorod manor was owned by the Homonnais who had returned to Catholicism. Typically, Catholic rivalry in the area extended to those of the Orthodox religion, too. The Catholic, led by Jesuit monks, also dealt with converting practitioners of the Byzantine rite to the Catholic religion³⁵. One of the important pillars of the prince's religious policy was having good relations with believers of other religions. In addition to the Reformed and Roman Catholic denominations in the area, the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Churches had a large number of believers. After the death of the Greek

Catholic bishop John Gregori in 1633, his nominatee Basil Tarasovich became the first candidate for the bishopric. The monks of the Mukachevo monastery respected the will of their predecessor, so he was nominated for the appointment to Prince György Rákóczi I. Related to this event is the decree of György Rákóczi I dated 5 January 1634 in Alba Iulia (Romania), in which he gave the vacant bishopric to Tarasovich. The document on this is kept in the form of a copy in the archives of the Greek Catholic Bishopric of Mukachevo³⁶. However, due to his union aspirations, the bishop dropped out of the graces of the Reformed Rákóczi and was arrested by János Balling³⁷, Captain of Mukachevo Castle, on the prince's order. Tarasovich was imprisoned for eight months, from where he could only be freed under pressure from the Catholic Church³⁸. His punishment was not caused by the Orthodox and pro-union opposition, but rather by the Protestant Catholic opposition and, of course, political interests. The appointment letter received from Rákóczi contained the same encouragements that were given when the previous bishops were appointed: visiting the parishes, examining the priests, correcting the mistakes, eliminating the abuses, restoring the old conditions, and so on³⁹. Rákóczi continued to support Tarasovich, as evidenced by his letter dated August 1, 1648, in Mukachevo, in which, at Tarasovich's request, he instructed his manorial officers to allow the bishop to fish over the Davydkovo dam and to cut wood in the forest with written permission⁴⁰.

György Rákóczi I's policy of donating rights and privileges was supported by the diploma issued to the population of Chynadijeve on February 6, 1648 in Nyzhi Vorota. Here the prince granted privileges to the inhabitants of the mentioned settlement for their participation in the campaigns he organized⁴¹. Chynadijeve became a settlement of the prince's loyal soldiers as an accessory of Mukachevo Castle, their privileges were the same as those of the Hajdús, which were so popular at the time.

Few letters remained from Bereg County where his princely estates were spread. Two letters can be found among the documents of Bereg County lord-sheriff. One of them is a response letter addressed to István Kegiosi, who in his letter to the prince on May 23, 1644, reclaimed his property, which had been unlawfully confiscated during the campaigns. Rákóczi replied much later, on June 23 in Sárospatak, where he ordered the reimbursement of claims⁴². The next letter was dated in Mukachevo on April 24, 1645. In this document, the prince took patronage of the potters of Mukachevo, protecting them from illegal orders. He regulated the taxation of town masters. The potters were only obliged to pay tax to the lord of Mukachevo Castle and the prince, while other noble people were obliged to pay for their work⁴³.

Uhocha County, located further from the Mukachevo manor, also obtained Rákóczi letters, but only one of these remained for posterity. The letter dated May 2, 1646 in Alba Iulia (Romania) notified the county of the appointment of

Transylvanian judges. The election of new judges was a significant event in the princely court, so letters of notification were sent regularly to the surrounding counties⁴⁴.

At the end of his life, Rákóczi focused on gaining the Polish throne. However, due to his death in 1648, this failed. The assessment of the domestic policy of Prince György Rákóczi I still provokes controversy due to his peculiar selfish economic policy and foreign policy ambitions⁴⁵. At the same time, the brief peaceful development he ensured made it possible to support education and the boom in book printing in Transylvania. In addition to the Hebrew and Greek letters, he had documents printed also in Cyrillic letters⁴⁶.

Our research continues because, in the absence of resources, we cannot give a reassuring answer about Ukrainian-Hungarian relations, especially in the last year of György Rákóczi I's life, when he established contact with the Ukrainian Cossacks, seeking allies to gain the Polish throne⁴⁷. However, his early death prevented the implementation of his plan in Poland.

Among the Transylvanian princes, the written legacy of Ferenc Rákóczi II is the richest in the archival funds of Ukraine. The prince entered European history as the leader of the longest European War of Independence (1703-1711). Typically, the plan for the anti-Habsburg movement itself was formulated in a Ukrainian town. Berezhany Castle (then part of Poland) gave refuge to Ferenc Rákóczi II, who fled the Viennese captivity, and Miklós Bercsényi, who had escaped the capture. They were patronized by the Polish great hetman Adam Sieniawska⁴⁸ and his wife Elisabeta, with their patronage they were able to stay incognito in Berezhany. The secret peasant delegations from the Hungarian county of Bereg arrived in this castle with the aim of winning the prince for the cause of the war of independence⁴⁹. The first document of the War of Independence, the Berezhany manifesto⁵⁰, was also formulated here on May 6, 1703, in which Ferenc Rákóczi II called the multinational population of Hungary into arms against the Habsburg monarchy. With a small number of escorts, the prince crossed the Polish-Hungarian border on June 16, 1703, where he was already received by the insurgents. In his memoirs, Rákóczi commemorates the Ukrainian / Ruthenian people surrounding him at this time, who supported him among the mountain ranges of the Carpathians⁵¹.

In the following, the letters, decrees and circulars signed by Ferenc Rákóczi II himself, are going to be dealt with. They also include the documents whose copies only are left to us, although they occur in small numbers in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region. The period of examination was extended to the prince's pre-war letters, but much of the correspondence was, of course, written during the war of independence. The number of letters signed by Rákóczi according to the current state of the present research is 131 original documents and 16 copies. In the following, the princely writings will be studied according to the collections (funds) in the archives for easier reference.

Ferenc Rákóczi II returned to Hungary in 1694 after his upbringing in Austria and his appointment as lord-sheriff of Sáros County. Leopold I regulated the ownership⁵² of Rákóczi and his sister Julia in a royal decree, with which Rákóczi could secure his place among the nobility. From then on, he set about arranging and developing his estates, which is also reflected in his letters. In a decree written to Bereg County on October 1, 1695, he demanded the consolidation of public order⁵³, on January 9, 1697, he confirmed the privileges of the merchants of Mukachevo⁵⁴, a year later he donated nobility to his steward⁵⁵. He appointed his trustee for economic matters related to Bereg County⁵⁶. It is clear from Rákóczi's decrees issued during the War of Independence in 1703–1711, that he settled the petition of the inhabitants of the town of Berehove about their debt and the income of the priesthood⁵⁷. Rákóczi's circular on the preservation of the value of the copper coin, for example, reached Bereg County in 1708⁵⁸. In the last year of the war of independence, some documents of the negotiations between the Commander-in-Chief of the Prince, Sándor Károlyi, and the Commander-in-Chief of Austria, János Pálffy, and the documents concerning the amnesty of Ferenc Rákóczi II were sent to Bereg County⁵⁹.

The Rákóczi War of Independence is not considered a religious war, but the settlement of church relations was a central theme at the beginning of the establishment of Rákóczi's state. The prince had to deal with the Reformed vs. Roman Catholic conflicts, and he had to pay attention to meeting the demands of the Greek Catholic and Orthodox people⁶⁰. His letters to the Greek Catholics confirm his efforts in this direction.

In one of the letters left to us in the archives of the Greek Catholic Bishopric, Rákóczi ordered the Greek Catholic priests living on his estate to obey⁶¹ Bishop József De Camelis⁶². De Camelis was an apostolic vicar of Mukachevo by papal appointment, subordinated to the bishop of Eger by Emperor Leopold I⁶³. On April 9, 1705, Ferenc Rákóczi II issued a letter of protection for the defence of the property of the Greek Catholic priests of Mukachevo⁶⁴. Rákóczi received the parochus György Bizánczi from Kálló (Hungary), who had lodged a complaint against the harassment of the war⁶⁵. Emperor and King Joseph, on the other hand, countered this by issuing a decree on August 20, 1707, granting privileges to the Ukrainians / Ruthenians for their loyalty to him⁶⁶. It is known that these privileges were not redeemed by the emperor⁶⁷.

After De Camelis' death, in 1707, Ferenc Rákóczi II appointed Péter Kaminszki⁶⁸ as the bishop of the Greek Catholics in Mukachevo by virtue of his right as archbishop. He was the Kaminszki who Rákóczi also mentions in his Memoirs⁶⁹. By appointing Kaminszki and strengthening his economic power, he prevented the episcopal activities of Joseph Hodermarszki⁷⁰, who was recognized by King Joseph I⁷¹. Pope Clement XI did not confirm these bishops. Rather, with the notification of April 7, 1707, he entrusted György Vinniczky, Bishop of Przemisli,

with the management of the bishopric of Mukachevo, who made Polikarp Filipovich his deputy⁷².

During the Rákóczi War of Independence, three bishops “worked” at the same time, but due to the power triangle (emperor, pope, landlord) they could not perform significant activities. At the time of Rákóczi's reign, of course, the position of power was favourable to the prince's candidate, Kaminszki, who could actually hold an episcopal office until his death in September 1710.

Throughout the war of independence, Rákóczi sought to establish religious patience. However, the resolution of tensions between the denominations could have taken place only within the framework of an independent Hungarian state. He had realistic plans, as the legal background of inter-religious tolerance in Transylvania provided a strong basis for this transformation⁷³.

Ferenc Rákóczi II was in contact with the counties in parallel with the towns of special status, such as the five crown towns of Maramures (Tyachiv, Vyshkove, Khust, Campulung la Tisa and Sighetu Marmatiei), whose administrative centre was Tyachiv. Three of these towns today are in Transcarpathia and two in Romania. These towns already had privileges due to the extraction of salt in 1329. These towns acted in an organized manner during the War of Independence to protect their own privileges. Referring to the diplomas given by the 'old kings', the provision of compulsory food or military, which was considered illegal, was denied in many cases. During the war of independence, the prince managed to put the towns on his side and protect them, for example from the excesses of the captain of Khust Castle. The population of the crown towns turned to the prince several times to defend their prerogatives⁷⁴. The question of just bearing the burden and the grievances were present throughout the correspondence between the five crown towns and the prince⁷⁵. A similar question in the letters is the issue of providing soldiers. Due to the continuous recruitment of regiments of the war of independence, the prince could not make an exception with the towns concerning this issue⁷⁶. In his brief responses to the appeals of the towns, the prince always sought a compromise, taking into account the economic capacity of the towns. In the last years of the war of independence, the issue of refugees from Transylvania, who flooded the region due to the unfortunate battles, was also discussed in the dialogue between the crown towns and the prince⁷⁷. Last but not least, the correspondence shows the difficulties of transporting the salt produced and taken to the designated places by the five crown towns⁷⁸.

In the following, the archival funds of Uzh and Uhocha counties will be examined, in which the largest number of documents containing the signatures of Ferenc Rákóczi II are kept. History has left us the most sources about the Rákóczi era in Uhocha County. The description of the documents as a whole would require more space; therefore, the letters that enrich the universal and Ukrainian cultural history are only presented here along the main subject lines.

The decrees, letters and instructions of Ferenc Rákóczi II were freely distributed to today's Transcarpathia, for example, the Berezhany manifesto dated May 6, 1703 (though only one copy remained) for us⁷⁹. Letters delivered between the end of 1699 and August 1703, due to political circumstances, were not included in the archives of the offices examined within the frame of the present research. However, the surviving correspondence of the prince can be considered regular from August 1703 until 1711. The letters can be divided into four major groups according to their subject matter: political, economic, military and private donation-type letters. These sources are also related to the management of the estate and the war of independence.

The first document from the time of the War of Independence, which Rákóczi signed in person, was a donation letter granting the population of Cămărzana (now Romania) tax exemptions and protection rights⁸⁰, and then the prince extended the number of privileged settlements with ones such as Tarpa (now Hungary). The further letters are basically about the provision of soldiers and the feeding of the army, which clearly proves that the contemporary population of the present-day Transcarpathian territory took a large part in the organization and supply of the army⁸¹. The prince asked the county leaders and the military commanders to account for the supply of fodder and draught animals⁸², as well as for the restoration or even destruction of the castles⁸³. In addition to providing soldiers for the war, Rákóczi's primary military goal was to occupy the fortifications in the region – Khust, Mukachevo, Uzhhorod, Satu Mare (now Romania) –, which took many months⁸⁴. Much of the princely correspondence was aimed at settling the disintegrated regiments after the lost battles. The county authorities received the relevant regulations and instructions. Proceedings against soldiers were formulated in order for them to return to the army. Rákóczi wanted to strengthen military discipline at all costs. He sent special envoys to counties to curb disorder, violations and abuses⁸⁵. He regularly notified the counties on the international political situation, the success of his efforts at the European level, for example with the king of France or the Anglo-Dutch rulers, the House of Habsburgs. The prince usually asked the county to express an opinion on both the peace talks and the affairs of the country⁸⁶. With this Rákóczi also ensured the support of his decrees and built the confederate state he had envisioned according to the Polish model. A recurring theme in the princely letters is the information about the peace talks with the imperial commissioners, which began as early as 1704 and continued with more or less intensity for years⁸⁷.

The introduction of the copper coin minted by Rákóczi initially benefited the country, but as it began to become devalued around 1705, it became a burden on financial accounts and gave rise to a number of abuses. In addition to the copper coin, other means of payment, e.g. the Rhenish guilder, was also in circulation. The prince wanted his regulations to prevent devaluation, which became

impossible due to the economic recession. He moved the mint of Baia Mare to a safe place in Mukachevo. From January 1706, the mint was already operating in Mukachevo Castle⁸⁸. The prince imposed strict restrictions on foreign merchants who bought the valuable money in the country, thus weakening Rákóczi's economy⁸⁹.

During the war of independence, the smooth operation of connecting points, communications and postal traffic were important. In the questions of the connecting points and the courier service, the military commanders made decisions in addition to the prince himself⁹⁰.

The documents also point to Rákóczi's social policy, as he repeatedly defended the war widows, trying to help them with their financial difficulties⁹¹. In his decrees, he called for the fair sharing of the burdens of the war of independence not only by the peasants, but also by the nobility⁹². He issued separate decrees for the protection of the so-called Russian priests⁹³, and for the benefit of ecclesiastical personalities of other religions; he considered that the priesthood also belonged to the nobility⁹⁴.

Due to the prolonged state of war, it became difficult to provide the food supplies required of the military, which could also be explained by the lack of manpower due to the prolonged state of war. The supply stalled, which the prince and his generals repeatedly articulated in their decrees⁹⁵. Tax collection gradually stalled, and the economically and humanly exhausted settlements were no longer able to comply with orders demanding large amounts of supplies at the end of the war of independence⁹⁶.

One of the unsolvable problems of the Rákóczi War of Independence is the issue of refugees from Transylvania to the territory of today's Transcarpathia. They covered the territories conquered by Rákóczi from 1706, when the prince's army withdrew from the Transylvanian territories under the pressure of the enemy. The accommodation of people, peasants and nobles fleeing the enemy, leaving their homes, was the prince's responsibility. He provided them with accommodation, pasture, and animals relative to scarce facilities. Thousands of people were forced into what is now Transcarpathia, waiting for a favourable military situation⁹⁷.

There are also entries in the State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region concerning the linguistic tolerance of the prince. In the written heritage there is a decree in which Rákóczi called the head of Uzh County to publish the decrees in the language of the population⁹⁸. By arranging the documents in chronological order, we get an incomplete but realistic picture of the battlefield events and their consequences. From the addresses and dating, the locations of the prince and the movement of the Kuruc camp sites can be determined.

The State Archives of the Transcarpathian Region has a rich and less researched source base on the Transylvanian principality of the Rákóczi family.

It is intended to examine separately letters of donation, military lists, responses written to the requests of peasants, as well as diplomatic negotiations of the princes as future research perspectives. It is hoped that the results of these further investigations will be made available for researchers and those interested in the topic.

¹ Чухліб Т. Український гетьманат – Трансільванське князівство: міжнародне утвердження за допомогою політики полівасалітетності (XVII ст.). *Україна-Угорщина: спільне минуле та сьогодення*. Київ, 2006. С. 159–161.

² Balassa I. I. Rákóczi György gazdálkodásának néhány vonása. *Rákóczi évfordulók. Történelmi tanulmányok*. Sárospatak: Rákóczi Múzeum Baráti Köre, 1994. P. 67-72; Makkai L. I. Rákóczi György birtokainak gazdasági iratai, 1631-1648. Budapest, 1954; Csorba Cs. 'Számos dicsőségű első Rákóczi György' A nagy fejedelem. Szerencs, 1993.

³ Szilágyi S. Magyar történeti életrajzok. I. Rákóczi György 1593–1648. Budapest, 1893.

⁴ Köpeczi B., R. Várkonyi Á. II. Rákóczi Ferenc. Budapest, 1976.

⁵ Henzsel Á. Bereg vármegyei főispán iratai. 1342–1800. Nyíregyháza: OKTESZT Kiadó, 1998. P.12, 22–26.

⁶ Administrative units of the Hungarian Kingdom that correspond to today's region/oblast.

⁷ Csatáry Gy. A máramarosi öt koronaváros levéltára, 1326-1910. Ungvár-Beregszász: PoliPrint. P.19–20, 120.

⁸ Віднянський С.В. Ракоці Дердь І. *Енциклопедія історії України*. Київ, 2012. Т. 9. С. 130–131.

⁹ Komlósi S. Lorántffy Zsuzsanna iskolákat támogató tevékenysége. *Erdély és Patak fejedelemasszonya. Lórántffy Zsuzsanna*. Sárospatak: Sárospataki Rákóczi Múzeum, 2000. P. 145–160; Füle S. 350 év a művelt Magyarorszáért. Lorántffy Zsuzsanna, Comenius és a magyar pedagógusok szellemi öröksége. *Erdély és Patak fejedelemasszonya. Lórántffy Zsuzsanna*. Sárospatak: Sárospataki Rákóczi Múzeum, 2000. P.161-180.

¹⁰ Nagy L. A „bibliás őrálló” fejedelem. I. Rákóczi György a históriában. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1984. P. 140–141.

¹¹ Várkonyi G. Egy közép-európai dinasztia: Rákócziak Erdélyben. *Rákócziak öröksége*. Sárospatak: Kapitális Nyomdaipari Kft, 2018. P. 201, 203.

¹² Sebestyén M. Erdélyi fejedelmek. Marosvásárhely: Mentor Könyvkiadó, 1993. P. 40.

¹³ Balogh J., Dienes D., Szabadi I. Rákóczi-iratok a Sárospataki Református Kollégium Levéltárában 1607-1710. Sárospatak: Debreceni Református Kollégium Nyomdája, 1999. P. 41–45.

¹⁴ Cseh-Szombathy L. I. Rákóczy György 1644-es hadjárata. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*. 1956. No. 1-2. P.43-76.

¹⁵ Удвари І. Коротка історія Угорщини. Ньиредьгаза, 1997. С. 48–50.

¹⁶ Державний архів Закарпатської області (далі – ДАЗО). Ф.1589. Оп.1–3. Спр.1-4036.

¹⁷ Tabódy J. Munkács múltja és jelene Magyarország történetében. Pest, 1860. P. 39.

¹⁸ The data was collected by manorial officers Márton Vizaknai and Mihály Cseh.

- ¹⁹ Lehoczky T. Beregvármegye monographiája. I. kötet. Ungvár, 1881. C. 434.
- ²⁰ Tabódy J. Munkács múltja és jelene Magyarország történetében. Pest, 1860. C. 40
- ²¹ ДАЗО. Ф.1589. Оп.1. Спр.53. Арк.1-8.
- ²² ДАЗО. Ф.1589. Оп.1. Спр.54. Арк.1.
- ²³ ДАЗО. Ф.1589. Оп.1. Спр.55. Арк.1.
- ²⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.1589. Оп.1. Спр.56. Арк.1.
- ²⁵ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.484. Арк.1-6.
- ²⁶ György Rákóczi I goes to war against the emperor of Austria in February 1644, the attack was finally successful, as he occupied significant areas in Upper Hungary. Later, however, he lost a battle and the Swedish help also arrived late. On December 1, 1645, he concluded the Peace of Linz with Vienna. Cf. Czigány I. I. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem királyellenes hadjárata a harmincéves háborúban (1644–1645). *Acta Academiae Agriensis, Sectio Historiae*. XLIV, 2017. P.75–96.
- ²⁷ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.557. Арк.1–3.
- ²⁸ Там само. Арк.4, 5, 7, 9.
- ²⁹ Там само. Арк.11, 13, 15.
- ³⁰ Там само. Арк.17, 19.
- ³¹ Там само. Арк.21.
- ³² Nagy L. A „bibliás őrálló” fejedelem. I. Rákóczi György a históriában. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1984. P.157–158.
- ³³ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.561. Арк.1.
- ³⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.15. Спр.108. Арк.1.
- ³⁵ Gradosh Yu. Uzhhorods'ka unia z 24 kvitnia 1646 roku u svitli ii dokumentu. *Naukovi Zapysky Uzhhorods'koho Universytetu. Seria: istorychno-relihijni studii*. Uzhhorod, 2016. Vyp. 5. P. 16–25.
- ³⁶ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.25. Спр.61–62. Арк.1–3.
- ³⁷ Поп И. Энциклопедия Подкарпатской Руси. Ужгород, 2001. С. 318.
- ³⁸ Végheő T. Unió, integráció, modernizáció. A Rómával való egység háttere a munkácsi püspökségben (17. század közepe). URL: <https://www.byzantinohungarica.com/index.php/tortenelem-01/veghseo-tamas-unio-integracio-modernizacio-a-romaval-valo-egyseg-hattere-a-munkacsi-puspoksegben-17-szazad-kozepe>.
- ³⁹ Hodinka A. A Munkácsi gör. szert. püspökség okmánytára. Ungvár, 1911. C. 63–65.
- ⁴⁰ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.8. Арк.1–2.
- ⁴¹ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.6. Арк.1.
- ⁴² ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.104. Арк.1–4.
- ⁴³ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.105. Арк.1–2.
- ⁴⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.6. Спр.17. Арк.1–2.
- ⁴⁵ Nagy L. A „bibliás őrálló” fejedelem. I. Rákóczi György a históriában. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1984. P. 190–197.
- ⁴⁶ Dienes D. I. Rákóczi György és Lorantffy Zsuzsanna bibliás kegyessége. *A bibliás Rákócziak*. Budapest, 2006. P 97–102.

⁴⁷ Гебеї Ш. Дипломатичні зносини між Трансільванським князівством та запорізьким військом у 1648 році. *Україна – Угорщина: спільне минуле та сьогодення. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції*. Київ, 2006. С. 106-107; Смолій В., Степанков В., Горобець В., Чухліб Т. Дипломатія на 'Межі світу'. *Міжнародні відносини та зовнішня політика Української держави (XVII ст. – 1750-ті рр.)*. Київ, 2016. С. 117–118.

⁴⁸ Gebei S. Rákóczi Ferenc és a Sieniawski-házaspár. *A hazáért és a szabadságért. (Tanulmányok II. Rákóczi Ferencről, koráról és emlékezetéről)*. Szeged, 2013. P. 147–162.

⁴⁹ R. Várkonyi Á. II. Rákóczi Ferenc 1676–1735. Vaja, 2004. P. 40.

⁵⁰ Esze T. II. Rákóczi Ferenc breznai kiáltványa. *Századok*. Budapest, 1954. Vyr. 88. P. 285–316.

⁵¹ II. Rákóczi Ferenc fejedelem emlékiratai a magyarországi háborúról, 1703-tól annak végéig. Budapest, 1979. P. 18–19.

⁵² ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.324. Арк.1.

⁵³ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.313. Арк.1–2.

⁵⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.1589. Оп.1. Спр.57. Арк.1.

⁵⁵ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.328. Арк.1–2.

⁵⁶ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.337. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.338. Арк.1–2.

⁵⁷ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.366. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.368. Арк.1–2; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.375. Арк.1–4.

⁵⁸ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.372. Арк.1–2.

⁵⁹ ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.380. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.381. Арк.1–2; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.382. Арк.1–12.

⁶⁰ Csatóry Gy. Katolikusok és protestánsok II. Rákóczi Ferenc államában. *Mercurius Veridicus Novus*. Vyr. 1. Berehove, 2015. P. 61–75.

⁶¹ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.182. Арк.1.

⁶² József De Camelis (b. 1641 – d. 1706), he was bishop from 1690. See the description of his life and activity: Udvari I. A ruszinok a 18. században. *Nyíregyháza*. 1994. P. 175–177; Жаткович Ю. Иоанн Йосиф де Камелис. *Месяцеслов*. Ужгород, 1893. Вып. 28. С. 111–119.

⁶³ Misóczki L. Vallás- és egyházügy a Rákóczi-szabadságharc idején. Gyöngyös, 2009. С. 143.

⁶⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.190. Арк.1.

⁶⁵ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.186. Арк.1.

⁶⁶ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.202. Арк.1.

⁶⁷ Hodinka A. II. Rákóczi Ferenc és a 'Gens fidelissima'. Pécs, 1937. P. 1–60.

⁶⁸ Péter Kaminszki (b. ? – d. September 1710) He was the superior of the Mukachevo monastery. Rákóczi entrusted him with diplomatic missions to Poland and Russia. He was appointed bishop by Rákóczi on February 28, 1707, but his appointment was not recognized by either the pope or the king. Regardless, he acted as bishop in the prince's state. The pope then appointed Bishop György Vinniczky from Przemysl, to the episcopal seat of Mukachevo as a counterweight to Kaminszki. In addition, according to Tivadar Lehoczky, the pope even appointed a bishop, Polikarp Filipovich. See: Lehoczky T. A beregmezei görögszertartású katolikus lelkészség története a XIX. század végéig. Munkács, 1904. P. 21.

⁶⁹ II. Rákóczi Ferenc fejedelem emlékiratai a magyarországi háborúról, 1703-tól annak végéig. Budapest, 1979. P. 18.

⁷⁰ József Hodermarszky (b. ? – d. 1716) was consecrated in 1701 after his training in Trnava, when he became a member of the Basilian order. The appointment of the bishop of Mukachevo in 1707 was not recognized by the bishop of Eger either, which led to many conflicts. He was officially replaced on December 15, 1715, but it was not until 1706 when he was already seriously ill that he resigned in favour of Bishop György Bizánczi (1637–1733).

⁷¹ Fabiny T. Rákóczi és az evangélikusok. *Rákóczi tanulmányok*. Budapest, 1980. P. 379.

⁷² Hodermarszky was appointed bishop by the emperor with the intention of inciting the Ruthenians against the Kurucs. See: Esze T. Rákóczi valláspolitikája. *Európa és a Rákóczi-szabadságharc*. Budapest, 1980. P. 291.

⁷³ Misóczki L. Vallás- és egyházügy a Rákóczi-szabadságharc idején. Gyöngyös, 2009. P. 103–119.

⁷⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.125. Арк.1–2.

⁷⁵ ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.126. Арк.1–4; ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.136. Арк.1–2; ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.131. Арк.1–2; ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.135. Арк.1–2.

⁷⁶ ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.128. Арк.1–2.

⁷⁷ ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.138. Арк.1–2.

⁷⁸ ДАЗО. Ф.61. Оп.1. Спр.140. Арк.1.

⁷⁹ Esze T. II. Rákóczi Ferenc breznai kiáltványa. *Századok*. Budapest, 1954. Vyp. 88. P. 285–316.

⁸⁰ ДАЗО. Ф.151. Оп.1. Спр.179. Арк.1.

⁸¹ *Csatáry Gy.* Ugocsa vármegye II. Rákóczi Ferenc államában. Ungvár-Beregszász, 2008. 276 c.

⁸² ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.408. Арк.9.

⁸³ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.13. Спр.135. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.459. Арк.1, 3; Там само. Арк.4–5; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.1527. Арк.11–12; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.122. Арк.1.

⁸⁴ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.417. Арк.5, 9; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.418. Арк.5.; Váradí Sternberg J. Az ungvári vár ostroma 1703–1704-ben. *Századok öröksége. Tanulmányok az orosz-magyar és ukrán-magyar kapcsolatokról*. Budapest-Uzhgorod, 1981. C. 129-138.

⁸⁵ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.408. Арк.3; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.1531. Арк.3; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.127. Арк.10.

⁸⁶ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.436. Арк.5-6, 14–15; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.416. Арк.1.

⁸⁷ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.1527. Арк.21; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.499. Арк.1–2; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.416. Арк.1.

⁸⁸ Lehoczky T. Munkács város új monografiája. Munkács, 1907. C. 288–293.

⁸⁹ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.127. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.10. Оп.1. Спр.372. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.167. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.463. Арк.1.

⁹⁰ ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.96. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.134. Арк.9.

⁹¹ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.13. Спр.135. Арк.1; ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.482. Арк.5.

⁹² ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.482. Арк.21.

⁹³ ДАЗО. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.531. Арк.1, 8.

⁹⁴ ДА30. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.101. Арк.7; See: Esze T. Rákóczi valláspolitikája. *Európa és a Rákóczi-szabadságharc*. Budapest, 1980. P. 285-296.

⁹⁵ ДА30. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.436. Арк.20.

⁹⁶ ДА30. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.101. Арк.9; Bánkúti I. A kuruc függetlenségi háború gazdasági problémái, 1703–1711. Budapest, 1991. P. 99–113.

⁹⁷ ДА30. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.530. Арк.3; ДА30. Ф.4. Оп.2. Спр.1527. Арк.23; ДА30. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.95. Арк.1; ДА30. Ф.674. Оп.8. Спр.505. Арк. 2.

⁹⁸ ДА30. Ф.4. Оп.16. Спр.128. Арк. 2.

REFERENCES

1. Balassa, I. (1994). I. Rákóczi György gazdálkodásának néhány vonása. In: E. Tamás (Ed.) *Rákóczi évfordulók. Történelmi tanulmányok* (pp. 67–72). Sárospatak: Rákóczi Múzeum Baráti Köre [in Hungarian].

2. Balogh, J., Dienes, D., & Szabadi, I. (1999). *Rákóczi-iratok a Sárospataki Református Kollégium Levéltárában 1607-1710*. Sárospatak: Debreceni Református Kollégium Nyomdája [in Hungarian].

3. Bánkúti, I. (1991). *A kuruc függetlenségi háború gazdasági problémái, 1703–1711*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].

4. Chukhlib, T. (2006). Ukrains'kyj het'manat - Transil'vans'ke kniazivstvo: mizhnarodne utverdzhennia za dopomohoiu polityky polivasalitetnosti (XVII st.). *Ukraina - Uhorschyna: spil'ne mynule ta s'ohodennia. Materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferentsii (Kyiv, 14–16 kvitnia 2005 r.)* (pp. 154–176). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

5. Czígány, I. (2017). I. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem királyellenes hadjárata a harmincéves háborúban (1644–1645). *Acta Academiae Agriensis, Sectio Historiae*, 44, 75–96. Retrieved from http://publikacio.uni-eszterhazy.hu/3639/1/Czigany_75-96.pdf [in Hungarian].

6. Csatóry, Gy. (2008). *Ugocsa vármegye II. Rákóczi Ferenc államában*. Ungvár-Beregszász: PoliPrint [in Hungarian].

7. Csatóry, Gy. (2015). Katolikusok és protestánsok II. Rákóczi Ferenc államában. *Mercurius Veridicus Novus*, 1, 61–75 [in Hungarian].

8. Csatóry, Gy. (Ed.) (2011). *A máramarosi öt koronaváros levéltára, 1326–1910*. Ungvár-Beregszász: PoliPrint [in Hungarian].

9. Cseh-Szombathy, L. (1956). I. Rákóczy György 1644-es hadjárata. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 4(1–2), 43–76. Retrieved from https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00018/00212/pdf/EPA00018_hadtortenelmi_1956_01_043-076.pdf [in Hungarian].

10. Csorba, Cs. (1993). "Számos dicsőségű első Rákóczi György". *A nagy fejedelem*. Szerencs: Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén Megyei Levéltár [in Hungarian].

11. Dienes, D. (2006). I. Rákóczi György és Lorantffy Zsuzsanna bibliás kegyessége. In: I. Monok, & J. Hapák (Eds.). *A bibliás Rákócziak* (pp. 97-102). Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó [in Hungarian].

12. Esze, T. (1954). II. Rákóczi Ferenc breznai kiáltványa. *Századok*, 88, 285–316 [in Hungarian].

13. Esze, T. (1980). Rákóczi valláspolitikája. In: K. Benda (Ed.). *Európa és a Rákóczi-szabadságharc* (pp. 285-296). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].

14. Fabiny, T. (1980). Rákóczi és az evangélikusok. In: B. Köpeczi, L. Hopp, & Á. R. Várkonyi (Eds.). *Rákóczi tanulmányok* (pp. 365-382). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].
15. Füle, S. (2000). 350 év a művelt Magyarországért. Lorántffy Zsuzsanna, Comenius és a magyar pedagógusok szellemi öröksége. In: E. Tamás (Ed.). *Erdély és Patak fejedelemasszonya. Lórántffy Zsuzsanna. I. kötet* (pp. 161-180). Sárospatak: Sárospataki Rákóczi Múzeum [in Hungarian].
16. Gebei, S. (2006). Dyplomatychni znosyny mizh Transil'vans'kym kniazivstvom ta zaporiz'kym vijs'kom u 1648 rotsi. *Ukraina - Uhorschyna: spil'ne mynule ta s'ohodennia. Materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferentsii (Kyiv, 14-16 kvitnia 2005 r.)* (pp. 104-119). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
17. Gebei, S. (2013). II. Rákóczi Ferenc és a Sieniawski-házaspár. In: P. Miklós (Ed.). *A hazáért és a szabadságért. (Tanulmányok II. Rákóczi Ferencről, koráról és emlékezetéről)* (pp. 147-162). Szeged: Belvedere Meridionale [in Hungarian].
18. Gradosh, Yu. (2016). Uzhhorods'ka uniiia z 24 kvitnia 1646 roku u svitli ii dokumentu. *Naukovi Zapysky Uzhhorods'koho Universytetu. Seria: istorychno-relihijni studii*, 5, 16-25. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/31442019/Scientific_notes_of_Uzhhorod_University_Series_historically_religious_studios_Issue_5_Logos_5_pdf [in Ukrainian].
19. Henzsel, Á. (Ed.). (1998). *Bereg vármegyei főispán iratai, 1342-1800*. Nyíregyháza: OKTESZT Kiadó [in Hungarian].
20. Hodinka, A. (1911). *A munkácsi. gör. szert. püspökség okmánytára. I. kötet. 1458-1715*. Ungvár: Unio Könyvnyomda R. T [in Hungarian].
21. Hodinka, A. (1937). *II. Rákóczi Ferenc és a "Gens fidelissima"*. Pécs: Dunántúl Pécsi Egyetemi Könyvkiadó és Nyomda Rt [in Hungarian].
22. *II. Rákóczi Ferenc fejedelem emlékiratai a magyarországi háborúról, 1703-tól annak végéig.* (1979). Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
23. Komlósi, S. (2000). Lorántffy Zsuzsanna iskolákat támogató tevékenysége. In: E. Tamás (Ed.). *Erdély és Patak fejedelemasszonya. Lórántffy Zsuzsanna. I. kötet* (pp. 145-160). Sárospatak: Sárospataki Rákóczi Múzeum [in Hungarian].
24. Köpeczi, B., & R. Várkonyi, Á. (1976). *II. Rákóczi Ferenc*. Budapest: Gondolat [in Hungarian].
25. Lehoczky, T. (1881). *Beregvármegye monographiája. I. kötet*. Ungvár: Pollacsek Miksa Könyvnyomdája [in Hungarian].
26. Lehoczky, T. (1904). *A beregvármegyei görögszertartású katolikus lelkészségek története a XIX. század végéig*. Munkács: Grünstein Mór Könyvnyomdája [in Hungarian].
27. Lehoczky, T. (1907). *Munkács város új monografiája*. Munkács: Grünstein Mór Könyvnyomdája [in Hungarian].
28. Makkai, L. (1954). *I. Rákóczi György birtokainak gazdasági iratai, 1631-1648*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].
29. Misóczki, L. (2009). *Vallás- és egyházügyi a Rákóczi-szabadságharc idején*. Gyöngyös: Konturs Nyomdaipari Kft [in Hungarian].
30. Nagy, L. (1984). *A „bibliás órálló” fejedelem. I. Rákóczi György a históriában*. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
31. Pop, I. (2001). *Entsiklopediia Podkarpatskoj Rusi*. Uzhgorod: Izdatel'stvo V. Padiaka [in Russian].

32. R. Várkonyi, Á. (2004). *II. Rákóczi Ferenc 1676-1735*. Vaja: Grafit R Nyomda Kft [in Hungarian].
33. Sebestyén, M. (1993). *Erdélyi fejedelmek*. Marosvásárhely: Mentor Könyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
34. Smolij, V., Stepankov, V., Horobets', V., & Chukhlib, T. (2016). *Dyplomatiia na "Mezhi svitu". Mizhnarodni vidnosyny ta zovnishnia polityka ukrains'koi derzhavy (XVII st. – 1750-ti rr.)*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo 'AMENHOTEP' [in Ukrainian].
35. Szilágyi, S. (1893). *Magyar történeti életrajzok. I. Rákóczi György 1593-1648*. Budapest: Franklin Társulat Könyvnyomdája. Retrieved from https://mandadb.hu/dokumentum/672896/I_raakoczi_gyoergy_1839.pdf [in Hungarian].
36. Tabódy, J. (1860). *Munkács múltja és jelene Magyarország történetében*. Pest: Herz János nyomdája [in Hungarian].
37. Udvari, I. (1994). *A ruszinok a 18. században*. Nyíregyháza: Gprint Iroda [in Hungarian].
38. Udvari, I. (1997). *Korotka istoriia Uhorschyny*. Uzhhorod: PoliPrint [in Ukrainian].
39. Váradi Sternberg, J. (1981). Az ungvári vár ostroma 1703–1704-ben. *Századok öröksége. Tanulmányok az orosz-magyar és ukrán-magyar kapcsolatokról* (pp. 129–138). Budapest-Uzsgorod: Gondolat – Kárpáti Könyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
40. Várkonyi, G. (2018). Egy közép-európai dinasztia: Rákócziak Erdélyben. In: E. Tamás (Ed.). *Rákócziak öröksége* (pp. 195–204). Sárospatak: Kapitális Nyomdaipari Kft [in Hungarian].
41. Véghseő, T. (n.d.). *Unió, integráció, modernizáció. A Rómával való egység háttere a munkácsi püspökségben (17. század közepe)*. Retrieved from <https://www.byzantinohungarica.com/index.php/tortenelem-01/veghseo-tamas-unio-integracio-modernizacio-a-romaval-valo-egység-hattere-a-munkacsi-puspoksegeben-17-század-kozepe> [in Hungarian].
42. Vidnyanskyj, S.V. (2012). Rakotsi Dierd' I. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy*. (Vol. 9). Kyiv: Naukova dumka' [in Ukrainian].
43. Zhatkovych, Yu. (1893). Ioann Josif de Kamelis. *Mesiatseslov*, 27, 111–119 [in Russian].

Наукове видання

**МІЖНАРОДНІ ЗВ'ЯЗКИ УКРАЇНИ:
НАУКОВІ ПОШУКИ І ЗНАХІДКИ**

МІЖВІДОМЧИЙ ЗБІРНИК НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ

Заснований 1991 р.

Випуск 30

Комп'ютерна верстка та оригінал-макет: *Леонід Мигаль*

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
КВ № 6938
від 04.02.2003 р., видане Державним комітетом інформаційної політики, телебачення
та радіомовлення України

Підписано до друку 1.11.2021 р. Формат 70x100/16.
Ум. друк. арк. 43,88. Обл. вид. арк. 45,00
Тираж 300. Зам. 32-2021.

Друкарня Ін-ту історії України НАН України
01001, Київ, вул. Михайла Грушевського, 4

Свідоцтво
про внесення суб'єкта видавничої справи до державного реєстру видавців,
виготовлювачів і розповсюджувачів видавничої продукції
Серія ДК № 5070 від 23.03.2016 р.