

ВИДАННЯ  
УКРАЇНСЬКОГО КАТОЛИЦЬКОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ  
ІМ. СВ. КЛИМЕНТІЯ ПАПИ

EDITIONES  
UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICAE UCRAINORUM  
S. CLEMENTIS PPAE

Праці Греко-Католицької Богословської Академії  
*Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*  
Том XXXII Vol.

# THE HISTORY OF PRJAŠIV EPARCHY

by  
JULIUS KUBINYI S. T. D.

РИМ 1970 ROMAЕ

ВИДАННЯ  
УКРАЇНСЬКОГО КАТОЛИЦЬКОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ  
ІМ. СВ. КЛИМЕНТІЯ ПАПИ

EDITIONES  
UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICAE UCRAINORUM  
S. CLEMENTIS PPAE

Праці Греко-Католицької Богословської Академії  
*Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*  
Том XXXII Vol.

# THE HISTORY OF PRJAŠIV EPARCHY

by  
JULIUS KUBINYI S. T. D.

РИМ 1970 ROMAЕ

JULIUS KUBINYI S. T. D.

# THE HISTORY OF PRJAŠIV EPARCHY

by  
JULIUS KUBINYI S. T. D.

ROMAE 1970

*За дозволом Церковної Влади*

## ІСТОРИЯ ПРЯШІВСЬКОЇ ЕПАРХІЇ



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i> . . . . .	5
<i>Bibliography</i> . . . . .	6
<i>Introduction</i> . . . . .	21
I. Prjašivščyna until eighteenth century . . . . .	27
II. The Ecclesiastical-religious situation before the Union with the Catholic Church . . . . .	44
III. The Union with the Catholic Church . . . . .	53
IV. Prjašivščyna as part of the Eparchy of Mukačevo . . . . .	56
V. The Erection of the Vicariate in Košice . . . . .	64
VI. The Vicariate in Prjašiv . . . . .	72
VII. The Erection of the Eparchy of Prjašiv . . . . .	79
VIII. The Organization of the Eparchy . . . . .	94
IX. Bishop Joseph Gaganec . . . . .	101
X. The period of Decline . . . . .	106
XI. The Eparchial Seminary . . . . .	110
XII. The Political Efforts of Adolph Dobrjanskyj . . . . .	114
XIII. The Denationalization of the Eparchy . . . . .	122
XIV. The Erection of the Hungarian Byzantine Catholic Eparchy of Hajdudorog . . . . .	126
XV. World War I (1914-1918): The Eparchy as Part of Czechoslovakia . . . . .	131
XVI. The Reaction to Magyarization: The Orthodox Movement . . . . .	137
XVII. The Eparchy without the Bishop (1918-1922) . . . . .	144
XVIII. Bishop Dionysius Nyaradij as Apostolic Administrator (1922-1926) . . . . .	148
XIX. The Spiritual Renewal under Bishop Gojdič . . . . .	152
XX. The Slovak Oppression . . . . .	158
XXI. The Eparchy After World War II . . . . .	165
XXII. The Liquidation of the Eparchy . . . . .	169
XXIII. Persecution of Seminararians, Clergy . . . . .	179
XXIV. Under State-controlled Orthodox Administration . . . . .	184
XXV. Prjašivščyna under Communist Administration . . . . .	188
Conclusion . . . . .	194
Index . . . . .	199





## PREFACE

*The year of 1968 was the hundred-fiftieth anniversary of the canonical erection of Prjašiv eparchy. There were no celebrations commemorating this event, because the eparchy was completely destroyed by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia. During those one-hundred-thirty-two years of existence, the eparchy produced many illustrious personalities. After the World War II, it was the only eparchy of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Czechoslovakia. The eparchy's last bishop-ordinary, Paul Gojdič, OSBM, died the death of a martyr for his faithfulness to His Catholic Church and to his flock. The auxiliary bishop, Basil Hopko, S.T.D., after sixteen years of Communist imprisonment was never "recognized as the ordinary of the eparchy" by the Holy See and thus "remained as auxiliary bishop without any administrative power" (1).*

*To both these bishops this book is dedicated. To those priests and laymen, who will find encouragement on these pages — to those faithful to God, to His Catholic Church and to the traditions of those great sons of eparchy — Duchnovyč and Pavlovyč — we would like to convey our prayers, because we believe that God, the Lord of human life and history, will rebuild His Church in full justice, splendor and glory, not only in Prjašivščyna, but in the entire world.*

---

(1) Cfr. the article of A. PEKAR, OSBM, *Apostolic Administrator - Very Rev. Rev. John Hirka*, in "Byzantine Catholic World," Sept. 7, 1969.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ARCHIVAL SOURCES

#### I. Archivium Secretum Vaticanum (ASV):

- 1) *Archivium Nuntiaturae Vindobonensis* (ANV), volumes: 75, 79, 86, 86, 87, 89, 90, 126, 155, 203, 206, 209, 216, 216B, 240, 243, 247, 252.  
*Processi Canonici*, fasc. 515, 683, 687, 706, 828, 956.
- 2) *Archivium Nuntiaturae Germaniae* (NG), volumes: 381, 382, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 390, 392, 393-4, 395, 654-5, 704, 723.
- 3) *Archivium S. Congregationis Consistorialis* (ACC), a. 1771, a. 1776, a. 1818, a. 1823, a. 1824, a. 1853.  
*Processus Consistorialis*, volumes: 161, 165, 212, 245.
- 4) *Secreteria Status* (SS), a. 1818, 1819, 1842-43.
- 5) *Secreteria Brevium*, v. 4557.
- 6) *Collectio Bullarum et Breviorum Apostolicorum*, v. 5.
- 7) *Abbreviationes in Curia*, t. XI.

#### II. Archivium S. Congregationis De Propaganda Fide (APF):

- 1) *Acta S. Congregationis*, volumes: 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 33, 35, 38, 54, 60, 63, 65, 67, 69, 72, 73, 74, 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 92, 96.
- 2) *Scritture riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali* (SR), volumes: 69, 83, 85, 310, 418, 516, 558, 570, 578, 587, 595, 597, 669, 681, 716.
- 3) *Scritture riferite nei Congressi*. Ungheria e Transilvania, a. 1622-95, v. 1; a. 1676-95, v. 2; Greci di Croazia, Dalmazia, Schiavonia, Transilvania e Ungheria, v. 1, a. 1642-1760, v. 2, a. 1761-1845. (Greci di Croazia...) Germania e Missioni Settentrionali, v. 1, a. 1622-80.
- 4) *Scritture riferite nei Congressi Greci*, volumes 2, 3.
- 5) *Miscellanea Valachorum Graeci Ritus*, Generalia, vol. 1.  
*Miscellanea Valachicorum Graeci Ritus* a. 1773, vol. 1.

#### III. Archivium Eparchiae (AE):

The copy of the Bull "Relata semper."

## PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Дулишковичъ, І., *Историческія Черты Угро-Русскихъ*, 3 тт., Ун-варъ 1974-1877.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Древнѣйшія грамоты по исторіи Карпаторусской Церк-кви и Иерархіи 1391-1498 гг.*, Прага 1930.
- ПЕТРУШЕВИЧЪ, А., *Сводная Галичско-Русская Лѣтопись съ 1600 по 1700 годъ*, Львовъ 1874.
- ПЕТРУШЕВИЧЪ, А., *Дополненія ко Сводной Галичско-Русской Лѣто-писи съ 1600 по 1700 годъ*, Львовъ 1891.
- ПЕТРУШЕВИЧЪ, А., *Сводная Галичско-Русская Лѣтопись съ 1700 по 1772 годъ*.
- ПЕТРУШЕВИЧЪ, А., *Дополненія ко Сводной Галичско-Русской Лѣто-писи съ 1700 по 1772 годъ*, Львовъ 1896.
- СВѢЦИЦКІЙ, І., *Матеріалы по исторіи возрожденія Карпатской Руси*, Львовъ 1906.
- BASILOVITS, J., *Brevis notitia fundationis Theodori Koriatovits*, 2 voll., Cassoviae 1799-1804.
- DUCHNOVICS, A., *Chronologica Historia almae dioecesis Eperjes-siensis*, Eperjes 1848, (manuscript).
- FEJÉR, G., *Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae*, 6 voll., Buda 1826-1866.
- FRANKÓI, V., *Oklevéltár a magyar királyi kegyuri jog történetéhez*, Budapest 1899.
- HODINKA, A., *A munkácsi gör. szert. püspökség okmánytára*, Ungvár 1911.
- KNAUZ, J., *Monumenta Ecclesiae Strigoniensis*, 2 voll., Strigonii 1874.
- LUKINICH, E., *Documenta historiam Valachorum in Hungaria illu-strantia usque ad annum 1400 p. Christum*, Budapestii 1941.
- MARCZALI, H., *Enchiridion fontium historiae Hungarorum*, Vindo-bonae 1902.
- MINISTERSTVO SPRAVODLNOSTI, *Process proti vlastizradnym Bisku-pom - Vojtaššakovi, Buzalkovi a Gojdičovi*, Bratislava 1951.
- NILLES, N., *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiae Orientalis in terris Coronae S. Stephani*, 2 voll., Oeniponte 1885.
- REDAKCONNYJ KOMITET, *J. E. Pavel Gojdič, ČSVV., jepiskop prjaševskij (1927-1947)*, Prjašev 1947.
- S. CONGREGAZIONE ORIENTALE, *Codificazione Canonica Orientale*, Fonti, f. VIII, "Studi Storici," Vaticano 1932.
- THEINER, A., *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae Gentiumque Finintimarum Historiam Illustrantia*, 3 voll., Romae 1863.

- THEINER, A., *Vetera Monumenta Historiam Hungariae Sacram Illustrantia*, 2 voll., Romae 1859-1860.
- WELYKYJ, A., *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia*, 2 voll., Romae 1953-1954.
- WELYKYJ, A., *Litterae S.C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantia*, 7 voll., Romae 1954-1957.
- WELYKYJ, A., *Acta S.C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantia*, 5 voll., Romae 1953-1955.
- WELYKYJ, A., *Congregationes Particulares Ecclesiae Catholicae Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantes*, 2 voll., Romae 1956-1957.

## LITERATURE

- Андрухович, А., *Віденське Барбареум*, Львів 1935.
- Бача - Рудловчак, *Хрестоматія нової закарпатської літератури*, Братислава 1964.
- Бачинський, Е., *Подкарпатская Русь за годы 1919-1936*, Ужгород 1936.
- Балудянскій, А., *Исторія церковная Нового Завѣта*, Въ Виѣннѣ 1851.
- БАРАН, О., *Епископ Андрей Бачинський і церковне відродження на Закарпатті*, Йорктон, Саск., 1963.
- БЕЛОУСОВ, С.М., *Исторія України*, Київ 1946.
- БІРЧАК, В., *На нових землях*, Львів 1938.
- БІРЧАК, В., *Літературні стремління Підкарпатської Русі*, Ужгород 1936.
- БОРЖАВА, Ю., *Від Угорської Русі до Карпатської України*, Філадельфія 1956.
- ВАЙДА, М., *Великий Пробудитель Закарпаття*, Філадельфія (с.а.).
- ВАВРИК, М., *По Василіянських Монастирях*, Торонто 1958.
- ВЕЛИКИЙ, А., *Большевицький церковний собор у Львові*, Нью Йорк 1952.
- ВІНТЕР, Е., *Візантія та Рим у боротьбі за Україну 955-1939*, Прага 1944.
- ВОЛОШИН, А., *Спомини*, Філадельфія 1959.
- ВОЛОШИН, А., *Оборона Кирилики*, Ужгород 1936.
- ГАДЖЕГА, В., *Додатки к исторіи русинов и руських церковей в Ужанській жупль*, Ужгород 1924.
- ГАДЖЕГА, В., *Додатки до исторіи русинов и руських церковей в быв. жупль Земплинської*, Ужгород 1931-1936.
- ГАДЖЕГА, В., *Додатки к исторіи русинов и руських церковей в Мараморошль*, Ужгород 1922.

- Гаджега, В., *Додатки к исторіи русинов и руських церковей в жупль Угоча*.
- Гаджега, Ю., *Исторія О-ва св. Василя Великаго*, Ужгородъ 1925.
- Гаджега, Ю., *Два историческихъ вопроса*, Ужгородъ 1928.
- Гнатюк, В., *Національне відродження австро-угорських українців*, Відень 1917.
- Голубинский, Е., *Исторія Русской Церкви*, 3 тт., Москва 1900, 1911.
- Грушевський, М., *Исторія Руси-України*, 10 тт., Нью Йорк 1954-1958.
- Зеркаль, С., *Національні і релігійні відносини на Закарпатті*, Новий Йорк 1956.
- Ісаїв, П., *Звідки Русь-Україна прийняла християнство*, Філадельфія 1952.
- *Історичні Постаті Галичини ХІХ ст.*, Нью Йорк-Париж-Сідней-Торонто 1961.
- *Исторія Української Культури*, Вінніпег 1964.
- Коломиец, И.Г., *Очерки по истории Закарпатья*, 2 тт., Томск 1953, 1959.
- Кондратович, І., *Исторія Подкарпатскої Руси*, Ужгород 1931.
- Кондрашов, Н.А., *Славянские языки*, Москва 1956.
- Купчатко, Г., *Угорска Русь и еи русски жители*, В'ідень 1897.
- Курінний, П., *Реймська Євангелія*, Регенсбург 1946.
- Лужницький, Г., *Українська Церква між Сходом і Заходом*, Філадельфія 1954.
- Мицюк, О., *Нариси з соціально-господарської історії Угорської, нині Підкарпатської Руси*, 2 тт., Ужгород 1936, Прага 1938.
- Мишанич, О.В., *Література Закарпаття ХVІІ-ХVІІІ ст.*, Київ 1964.
- Мольнар, М., *Словаки і Українці*, Братіслава-Пряшів 1965.
- Нагавський, І., *Кирило-Методієвське християнство в Русі-Україні*, Рим 1954.
- Недзелський, Е., *Очеркь карпаторусской литературы*, Ужгородъ 1932.
- Нидерле, Л., *Бытъ и культура древнихъ славянъ*, Прага 1924.
- Пачовський, В., *Исторія Підкарпатської Руси*, 2 тт., Ужгород 1920, 1922.
- Пачовський, В., *Исторія Закарпаття*, Мінхен 1946.
- Пастернак, Я., *Археологія України*, Торонто 1961.
- Пашуто, В.Т., *Очерки по истории Галицко-Волинской Руси*, Москва 1950.
- Пекар, А., *Нариси Історії Церкви Закарпаття*, Рим 1967.

- ПЕКАР, А., *Владика-Мученик Т.Ю. Ромжа (1911-1947)*, Нью Йорк 1962.
- ПЕКАР, А., *Василіянин-Ісповідник*, Нью Йорк 1961.
- ПЕРЕНИ, Й., *Из истории Закарпатских Украинцев*, Будапешт 1957.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Древнѣйшая на Карпаторусской территоріи шолтиска грамота 1329 г.*, Ужгородъ 1929.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Древнѣйшая церковно-славянская грамота 1404 г. о карпаторусской территоріи*, Ужгородъ 1927.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Каноническія визитаціи 1750-1767 гг. въ вармедяхъ Земплинь, Шаршиъ, Спишиъ, Абауй*, Ужгородъ 1924.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Отзвукы реформаціи в русскомъ Закарпатъи XVI в.*, Прага 1923.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *О подложности грамоты князя Теодора Коріятовича 1360 г.*, СПетербургъ 1906.
- ПЕТРУШЕВИЧЪ, А., *Краткое историческое извѣстіе о введеніи христіянства въ Прекарпатскихъ странахъ...*, Львовъ 1882.
- ПОТУШНЯК, Ф.М., *Археологічні знахідки бронзового та залізного віку на Закарпатті*, Ужгород 1958.
- САБОВЪ, Е., *Христоматія церковно-славянскихъ и угро-русскихъ литературныхъ памятниковъ*, Въ Унгварѣ 1893.
- СОВА, П., *Прошлое Ужгорода*, Ужгородъ 1937.
- СТРИПСКИЙ, Й., *Гдѣ документы старинной исторіи Подкарпатской Руси*, Ужгородъ 1924.
- ТОМАШВСЬКИЙ, С., *Угорщина і Польща на початку XVIII в.*, Львів 1909.
- ТРАЙНИН, И.П., *Национальные противоречия в Австро-Венгрии и ее распад*, Москва-Ленинград 1947.
- ФЕДОРЪ, П.С., *Краткій очеркъ дпьятельности А.И. Добрянскаго*, Ужгородъ 1926.
- ФЕЕРЧАКЪ, П., *Очеркъ литературнаго движенія угорскихъ русскихъ*, Одесса 1888.
- ФРАНЦЕВЪ, В.А., *Обзоръ важнѣйшихъ изученій Угорской Руси*, Варшава 1901.
- ЯВОРСКИЙ, Ю.А., *Два замечательныхъ карпато-русскихъ сборника*, Кіевъ 1909.
- ЯВОРСКИЙ, Ю.А., *Новыя рукописныя находки въ области старинной карпаторусской письменности XVI-XVIII вѣковъ*, Прага 1931.
- ЯВОРСКИЙ, Ю.А., *Матеріалы для исторіи старинной пльсенной литературы*, Прага 1934.
- ALFÖLDI, A., *Der Untergang der Römerherrschaft in Pannonien*, 2 voll., Berlin und Leipzig 1924, 1926.

- ANDĚL, J., *Evropa střední*, Praha 1936.
- ASZTALOS, M., *II. Rákóczi Ferenc és kora*, Budapest 1936.
- BALICS, L., *A kereszténység története hazánk mai területén a magyarok bejöveteléig*, Budapest 1901.
- BARAN, A., *Metropolita Kioviensis et Eparchia Mukačoviensis*, Romae 1960.
- BARTA, I., *Az egyház és állam viszonya Magyarországon a középkor végén*, Budapest 1935.
- BARTHA, M., *V zemi chazaru*, Mukačevo 1927.
- BERZEVICZY, A., *Az abszolutizmus kora Magyarországon*, Budapest 1937.
- BESKID, N.A., *Karpatorusszkaja pravda*, Homestead, Pa., 1933.
- BESZKID, M., *A szt. Péter és Szt. Pál Apostolokról Tapolcai Apátság története*, Ungvár 1913.
- BIDERMAN, H. I., *Die ungarischen Ruthenen*, Insbruck 1862.
- BOBAK, A., *De iure patronatus supremi quoad Ecclesiam Ruthenicam in Hungaria*, Romae 1943.
- BOBAK, J., *De coelibatu ecclesiastico deque impedimento Ordinis Sacri apud Orientales et praesertim apud Ruthenos*, Romae 1941.
- BOD, P., *Historia Hungarorum Ecclesiastica*, 3 voll., Lugduni-Batavorum 1888-1809.
- BOKEŠ, F., *Slovenský životný priestor v minulosti a dnes*, Bratislava 1943.
- BOKEŠ, F., *Dějiny Slovenska*, Bratislava 1946.
- BORZSAK, I. S., *Die Kenntnisse des Altertums über das Karpatenbecken*, Leipzig 1936.
- BOYSACK, B., *The Fate of the Holy Union in Carpatho-Ukraine*, Toronto-New York 1963.
- BOYSACK, B., *Ecumenism and Manuel Michael Olshavsky*, Montreal, Que., 1967.
- BÖHM, J., *Podkarpatská Rus v pravěku*, Užhorod 1933.
- BÖHM-JANKOVICH, *Skythové na Podkarpatské Rusi*, Praha 1936.
- CÍNEK, F., *K náboženské otázce v prvních letech naší samostatnosti 1918-1925*, Olomouc 1926.
- CSÁKY, E., *La question ruthene*, Paris-Budapest 1920.
- CZIPLE, S., *A máramorosi püspökség kérdése*, Budapest (s.a.).
- DAMPIER, M. G., *History of the Orthodox Church in Austria-Hungary*, London 1905.
- DE VRIES, G., *Oriente Cristiano ieri e oggi*, Roma (s.a.).
- DOMANOVSKY, S., *Magyar Mívelődéstörténet*, 5 voll., (s.l.; s.a.).
- DVORNIK, F., *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, London 1949.



- DVORNIK, F., *The Slavs, Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston (s.a.).
- EISNER, J., *Slovensko v pravěku*, Bratislava 1933.
- EISNER, J., *La Slovaquie et la Russie Subcarpatique à l'époque néolithique*, Paris 1926.
- FARKAS, L., *Egy nemzeti küzdelem története*, Budapest 1896.
- FRAKNÓI, V., *A magyar nemzet története*, 3 voll., Budapest 1873.
- FRAKNÓI, V., *A magyar királyi kegyuri jog Szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig*, Budapest 1895.
- FRAKNÓI, V., *Magyarországi egyházi és politikai összekötései a római szent székkal*, Budapest 1901.
- GABRIEL, F., *Poddanské poměry na užhorodském panství ke konci XVII století*, Užhorod 1934.
- GATTI-KOROLEVSKIJ, I *Riti e le Chiese Orinetali*, Genova 1942.
- GRIGASSY, Gy., *A magyar görög katolikusok legujjab története*, Ungvári 1913.
- GRIGORIČ, V., *Pravoslavná cirkev v Republice Československé*, Praha 1926.
- GRIVEC, F., *Žitja Konstantina in Metodija*, Ljubljana 1951.
- GRIVEC-TOMŠIČ, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses*, Zagreb 1960.
- HADŽEGA, V., *Přehled církevných dějín na Podkarpatské Rusi*, Bratislava 1936.
- HALAGA, J., *Slovanské osídlenia Potisia a vychodoslovenski gréckokatolíci*, Košice 1947.
- HANAK, W. K., *The Subcarpathian-Ruthenian Question 1918-1945*, Munhall, Pa. 1962.
- HARAKSIM, L., *K sociálnym a kulturnym dejinam Ukrajincov na Slovensku do r. 1867*, Bratislava 1961.
- HARASIEWICZ, M., *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*, Leopoli 1862.
- HEISLER-MELDON, *Under the Carpathians*, London 1946.
- HODINKA, A., *A munkácsi görög-katolikus püspökség története*, Budapest 1909.
- HODINKA, A., *Adalékok az ungvári vár és tartománya és Ungvár város történetéhez*, Ungvár 1917.
- HODINKA, A., *A kárpátaljai ruthének lakohelye, gazdagságuk és multjuk*, Budapest 1923.
- HÓMAN, B. M., *Magyar középkor*, Budapest 1938.
- HÓMAN-SZEKFÜ, *Magyar történet*, 5 voll., Budapest 1935-1936.
- HORTHY, M., *Emlékirataim*, Buenos Aires 1953.
- HOŠŤAN, J., *Československé dějiny*, Praga 1946.

- HRUBÝ, V., *Archivium Coronae Regni Bohemiae*, Praha 1935.
- HRUŠOVSKÝ, F., *Slovenské Dějiny*, Turč. Sv. Martin 1939.
- HUDEČEK, J., *Dějiny Velké Moravy*, Přešov 1935.
- HUGELMAN, J., *Das Nationalitätenrecht des alten Oesterreichs*, Wien 1934.
- JANKOVIČ, J., *Podkarpatská Rus v prehistorii*, Mukačevo 1931.
- JANKOVICH, J. M., *Mukačevský hrad*, Užhorod 1929.
- KADLEC, J., *Byzantské křesťanství u slovanských národů*, Praha 1934.
- KATONA, S., *Epitome chronologica rerum hungaricarum*, 3 voll., Budae 1796.
- KATONA, S., *Historia pragmatica Hungariae*, Budae 1782.
- KERTÉSZ, I., *A habsburgi irtódalom bibliográfiája 1218-1934*, Budapest 1934.
- KIRÁLY, P., *A keletiszlovák nyelvújárs nyomatott emlékei*, Budapest 1953.
- KROFTA, C., *Podkarpatská Rus a ČSR*, Praha 1935.
- KRPELEC, B., *Bardejov a jeho okolie dávno a dnes*, v Bardejove 1935.
- KVAČALA, J., *Dějiny reformácie na Slovensku*, Lipt. Sv. Mikuláš 1935.
- LACKO, M., *Unio Užhorodensis*, Roma 1955.
- LEHOCZKY, T., *Adatok a hazánk archeológiához*, 2 voll., Munkács 1892, 1912.
- LEHOCZKY, T., *A beregmegyei lelkészségek története a XIX század végéig*, Munkács 1904.
- Libellus Memorialis Hungarorum Graeci Ritus Catholicorum ad SS. Patrem Leonem XIII*, Budapestini 1900.
- LISCOVÁ, M., *The Religious Situation in Czechoslovakia*, Praha 1925.
- MACUREK, J., *Dějiny maďaru a uherského státu*, Praha 1934.
- *Dějepisectví evropského východu*, Praha 1946.
- MALÝ, P., *Život sv. Cyrila a Metoděje a jejich poměr k Římu a Cařihradě*, Hlinsko 1936.
- MARKUS, V., *L'incorporation de l'Ukraine Subcarpatique a l'Ukraine Sovietique 1944-1945*, Louvain 1956.
- MENCL, V., *Středověka města na Slovensku*, Bratislava 1938.
- MONDOK, J., *Brevis historica notitia dioecesis Munkacsiensis*, Ungvarini 1878.
- MORAVCSIK, Gy., *A magyar történet bizanci forrásai*, Budapest 1934.
- MOSOLYGÓ A *Keleti egyház Magyarországon*, Budapest 1941.
- MOUSSET, A., *Le monde Slave*, Paris 1945.
- MOUSSET, J., *Les villes de la Russie subcarpatique*, Paris 18938.
- NĚMEC, L., *Church and State in Czechoslovakia*, New York 1955.
- NĚMEC-MOUDRÝ, *The Soviet Seizure of Subcarpathian Ruthenia*, Toronto 1955.

- NIEDERLE, L., *Slovanské Starožitnosti*, Praha 1924.
- ONDROUCH, V., *Limes Romanus na Slovensku*, Bratislava 1938.
- PAPP, Gy., *A magyarországi és bizanci kereszténység kapcsolatának kezdetei*, Nyiregyháza 1938.
- PAPP, Gy., *Magyarország Primásának joghatósága és gör. kat. Egyház*, Miskolc 1943.
- PEKAR, B., *De erectione canonica eparchiae Mukačoviensis*, Romae 1956.
- PEKAR, A. B., *Bishop Paul P. Gojdich, OSBM*, Pittsburgh 1968.
- PELESZ, J., *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom*, 2 voll., Wien 1878-1881.
- Primi Incatenati...* Libro sulla persecuzione religiosa in Ucraina, Roma 1953.
- PUNYKO, A., *Bishop Theodore G. Romzha and Soviet Occupation (1944-1947)*, New York 1967.
- RAES, A., *Introductio in Liturgiam Orientalem*, Romae 1947.
- S. CONGR. PER LA CHIESA ORIENTALE, *Oriente Cattolico*, Città del Vaticano 1962.
- SKUTIL, J., *Plaoelitikum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi*, T. Sv. Martin 1938.
- ŠLEPECKIJ, A., *Stručný prehľad vývinu ukrajinskej literatury na Východnom Slovensku*, Prešov 1959.
- SZABÓ, J., *Ugocsa megye*, Budapest 1913.
- SZABÓ, O., *A magyar oroszokról*, Budapest 1913.
- SZENTPÉTERY, E., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, Budapest 1936.
- SZTRIPSZKY, H., *Emlékkönyv a görög szertartásu kath. magyarok római zarándoklatáról*, Budapest 1901.
- TICHÝ, F., *Podkarpatská postilla z r. 1640*, Berouna 1922.
- TICHÝ, F., *Vývoj současného spisovného jazyka na Podkarpatské Rusi*, v Praze 1938.
- TOMCSÁNYI, L., *A főkegyur szerepe a püspökök kinevezésénél*, Budapest 1922.
- TUPICKIJ, N. L., *Monumenta ad SS. Cyrilli et Methodii Successorum vitas resque gestas pertinentia*, Sergijev Posad 1918.
- URBAN, R., *Die slavisch-nationalkirchlichen Bestrebungen in der Tschechoslovakei*, Leipzig 1938.
- VARGHA, G., *Katholikus Egyháztörténelem*, Ungvár 1915.
- ŽATKOVIČ, K., *Jagerskoje vlijanije v istoriji Mukačevskoj Dioceziji*, Homestead s.a.
- ZELLER, A., *A magyar egyházpolitika*, Budapest 1894.
- ZUBEK, Th., *The Church of Silence in Slovakia*, Passaic 1956.

ZSATKOVICS, K. Gy., *A Máramorosi görög szertartásu orosz egyház és vicariátus történelme*, Ungvár 1909.

## ARTICLES

- АЛЕКСІЙ ІЕРОМОНАХЪ, *Православіе на Подкарпатской Руси*, в «Подкарпатская Русь за гг. 1919-1935», Ужгородъ 1936.
- БАРАН, О., *Питання укр. патріярхату в половині ХІХ ст.*, в «Логос», Йорктон, Саск., 1962, т. ХІІІ, ст. 26-36.
- БАРАН, О., *Синод у Відні 1773-го року*, в «Записки ЧСВВ», Рим 1960, т. ІІІ, ст. 394-403.
- БАРАН, О., *Поділ Мукачівської єпархії в ХІХ сторіччі*, в «Записки ЧСВВ», Рим 1963, т. ІV, ст. 534-569.
- БЕСКИДЪ, Н.А., *Пряшевская Епархія*, в «Календарь Соединенія на 1933 г.», Гомстедъ, Па., ст. 67-103.
- БУТРИНСЬКИЙ, Б., *Змагання до унії руської церкви з Римом*, в «Записки НТШ», Київ 1908, т. ІІІ, ст. 106-116.
- ВАЙДА, М., *Трагедія нашої Пряшівщини*, в «Америка», Філадельфія, Па., 11 липня 1950, ч. 6, р. ХХХІХ.
- ВАНЧИК, І., *Мадярська мова в церк. богослуженню і руське духовенство на Угорщині*, в «Нива», Львів 1907, ст. 227-230.
- ВЕДЕРНИКОВ, А., *Прекращение унии в Чехословакии*, в «Журнал Московской Патриархии», Москва 1950, ч. 7, ст. 40-52.
- ГЕРОВСКИЙ, Г., *Историческое прошлое Пряшевины*, в «Пряшевщина», Прага 1948, ст. 57-93.
- ГНАТЮК, В., *Угороруські духовні вірші*, в «Записки НТШ», Львів 1902, тт., ХЛVI, ХЛVII, ХЛІХ.
- ГОНЧАРЕНКО, А., *Пламенный борец против Ватикана и унии*, «В Сім'ї Єдиній», Ужгород 1954, ст. 213-218.
- КАРНАШЕВИЧ, П., *Автокефалія православної церкви ЧССР*, в «Ежегодник Православной Церкви в ЧССР», Прага 1962, ст. 38-52.
- КУШНИРЕНКО, М., *Побут села Ізи. Православіе і москофільство*, в «Збірник Укр. Наук. Інст. в Америці», Ст. Пол., Мінн., Прага 1939, ст. 175-184.
- *Ликвідація Кат. Церкви в ЧСР*, Інсбрук (манускрипт).
- МАРКУСЬ, В., *Нищення греко-катол. церкви в мукачівській єпархії в 1945-1950 рр.*, в «Записки НТШ», Париж-Сарсель 1962.
- НАЗАРГІВ, О., *Етнографічна територія угорських українців-русинів*, в «Записки НТШ», Львів 1911, т. СІІ, ст. 165-191.

- НЕСТОР ЕПИСКОП, *Из Закарпаття*, в «Журнал Московской Патриархии», Москва 1947, ч. 8, ст. 35-38.
- ПАНЬКЕВИЧ, І., *Ладомирське учительне Євангеліє*, в «Науковѣ Записки Т-ва Просвѣта», Ужгород 1923, т. III, ст. 93-107.
- ПЕКАР, А., *Чоловік Провидіння — Владика Д. Нярадій*, в «Світло», Торонто 1965, ст. 354-357.
- ПЕКАР, А., *Доля монахів і монахинь на Пряшівщині*, в «Світло», Торонто 1958, ст. 15-16.
- ПЕКАР, А., *Церковна політика мадярів на Закарпатті*, в «Світло», Торонто 1965, ст. 170-173.
- ПЕТРОВЪ, А., *Къ исторіи «русскихъ интригъ» въ Угріи въ XVIII в.* в «Карпаторусскій Сборникъ», Ужгородъ 1931, ст. 123-133.
- ПРОХОДА, В., *Національно-культурне життя українців на Пряшівщині*, в «Голос Лемківщини», Йонкерс, Н.Й., липень 1966, ч. 7, ст. 2.
- ПЬЕЦАК, І., *Из прошлаго наших школьных дел*, в «Календар УНРП на 1946 г.», Пряшев, ст. 50-55.
- Р.Н., *Голгота Уній в Карпатській Україні*, в «Життя і Слово», Інсбрук 1948-1949, ч. 3-4, ст. 327-246.
- РУСАКЪ, Ю.П., *Мукачевская епархія и ея борьба за права рускаго языка*, в «Карпаторусскій Сборникъ», Ужгородъ 1930, ст. 58-60.
- САВОЛ, С., *Мученицький шлях Преосв. П. Гойдича, ЧСВВ*, в «Світло», Торонто 1960, ст. 417-418.  
— *Ситуація Греко-Кат. Церкви в ЧСР*, Рим 1950 (манускрипт).
- ХАНАТ, М., *Закриття Пряшівського Епархіального Семинара*, Куфштайн 1950, (манускрипт).
- ШЛЕПЕЦКИЙ, А.С., *Пряшевцы в Америке*, в «Пряшевщина», Прага 1948, ст. 225-262.
- ШЛЕПЕЦКИЙ, А.С., *Карпатороссы въ Америкѣ*, в «Альманахъ ОКС Возрожденіе», Прага 1936, ст. 81-86.
- ШЛЕПЕЦКИЙ, І., *Стара віра і унія*, в «Дружно Вперед», Пряшів 1965, чч. 6, 7.
- ШЛЕПЕЦКИЙ, І.С., *Токаик — партизанское село*, в «Пряшевщина», Прага 1848, ст. 19-34.
- BARAN, A., *Quaedam ad biographian J. Vološynovskuj, eppi Mukachoviensis (1667)*, in "Analecta OSBM," Roma 1954, v. II, pp. 209-227.
- BARAN, A., *Progetto del Patriarcato Ucraino di Gregorio XVI*, in "Analecta OSBM," Roma 1960, v. III, pp. 454-475.

- BARAN, A., *Documenta inedita de confirmatione Parthenii Petrovyč, eppi Mukačoviensis*, in "Analecta OSBM," Roma 1960, v. III, pp. 440-448.
- BARAN, A., *Archiepiscopus Theophanus Maucocordato eiusque acti-  
vitas in eparchia Mukačoviensis*, in "Orientalia Chr. Periodica," Roma 1961, v. XXVIII, pp. 115-130.
- BARAN, A., *Archiepiscopus Raphael Havrilovič eiusque activitas in  
eparchia Mukačoviensis*, in "Orientalia Chr. Periodica," Roma  
1965, v. XXXI, pp. 119-134.
- BONKALO, A., *Die ungarländischen Ruthenen*, in "Ungarische  
Jahrbücher," Berlin 1925, v. I, pp. 215-232.
- CATOIRE, A., *L'evêche de Hajdudorog*, in "Echos d'Orient," Paris  
1913, v. XVI, p. 454 ss.
- DÉCSY, A., *A magyar oroszokról való igen rövid elmélkedés*, in "Ke-  
let," Kassa 1891, October 25.
- DUCHNOVICS-RUBY, *Brevi historia dioecesis Eperjesensis*, in "Sche-  
matismus Eperjesensis," a. 1898, a. 1903.
- DUDÁS, M., *Az egri püspökség és baziliták szerepe az ungvári unió  
történetében*, in "Keleti Egyház," Miskolc 1937, pp. 4-13.
- FIEDLER, J., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Union der Ruthenen...*, in  
"Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften," Ph-  
Hist. Cl., Band XXXIX, h. IV, Wien 1862, pp. 481-524.
- GULOVICH, S. C., *The Rusin Exarchate in the United States*, in "Ea-  
stern Churches Quarterly," 1946, v. VI, pp. 459-486.
- HODINKA, A., *Documenta Koriatoviciana*, in "Analecta OSBM,"  
Roma 1950, v. I, pp. 339-359; 1953, v. III, pp. 525-551; 1954,  
v. II, pp. 165-189.
- JANIN, R., *Diocese d'Hajdu-Dorogh*, in "Echos d'Orient," Paris  
1914-15, v. XVII, p. 499 ss.
- KONDRATOVIČ, I., *The Olšavsky Bishops and Their Activity*, in "Slo-  
vak Studies," Rome 1963, v. III, pp. 179-198.
- KRAJNYÁK, G., *A gör. kath. Egyház Magyarországon és szt. Unió*,  
in "Keleti Egyház," Miskolc 1937, pp. 135-146.
- LACKO, M., *The Churches of Eastern Rite in North America*, in "Uni-  
tas," 1964, v. XVI, n. 2, pp. 89-115.
- LACKO, M., *The Forced Liquidation of the Union of Užhorod*, in "Slo-  
vak Studies I," Rome 1961, pp. 145-185.
- LACKO, M., *A Brief Survey of the History of the Slovak Catholics of  
the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite*, in "Slovak Studies II," Romae  
1963, pp. 199-224.

- LACKO, M., *The Cyrilomethodian Mission and Slovakia*, in "Slovak Studies I," Rome 1961, pp. 23-49.
- LACKO, M., *New Documents about Michael Manuel Olšovský Bishop of Mukáčevo*, in "Orientalia Chr. Periodica," Roma 1959, v. XXV, pp. 54-90.
- LACKO, M., *The Pastoral Activity of Manuel Michael Olšovský Bishop of Mukáčevo*, in "Orientalia Chr. Periodica," Roma 1961, v. XXVII, pp. 1-12.
- LACKO, M., *Manižest greckokatolíckých duchovných a veriaticich prijaty na sobore dna 28. aprílija 1950 v Prešove*, (s.l.; s.a.).
- MOIOLI, G., *Giubileo in carcere*, in "Il Messaggero," Roma, April 4, 1952.
- MYCJUK, A., *Rok 1848 a uherští Rusini*, in "Časopis pro dějiny venkova," Praha 1936, č. XXV, pp. 133-142.
- N. N., *Jak sudly Prjaševskoho ep. P. Gojdiča*, in "Byzantine Catholic World," Pittsburgh, Pa., nn. 16-29.
- PAPP, Gy., *Az ungvári unió időpontja*, in "Keleti Egyház," Miskolc 1941, n. 7, pp. 162-167; n. 8, pp. 184-188.
- PAPP, Gy., *A munkácsi püspökség eredete*, in "Keleti Egyház," Miskolc 1940, n. 9, pp. 175-183; n. 10, pp. 204-212, n. 11, pp. 221-224.
- PEKAR, A., *Bishop Peter Gebey - Champion of the Holy Union (1864-1964)*, in "Analecta OSBM," Roma 1963, v. IV, pp. 293-326.
- PEKAR, A., *A Martyr of Our Time...* series in "Eastern Catholic Life," Passaic, N. J. March 6,-April 3, 1966.
- PEKAR, A., *Bishop Hopko is Hopeful*, in "Byzantine Catholic World," Pittsburgh, Pa., July 7, 1968.
- POTEMRA, L. A., *Ruthenians in Slovakia and the Greek Catholic Diocese of Prešov*, in "Slovak Studies I," Rome 1961, pp. 199-220.
- STANISLAV, J., *Slovenska Liturgia na Slovensku a sídlo Metodovo a Gorazdovo*, in "Historica Slovaca," Bratislava 1940-41, v. I-II, pp. 5-43.
- VEDERNIKOV, A., *Zrušenie unie v Československu*, in "Svetlo Pravoslávia," Praha 1951, nn. 2-3.
- VEDERNIKOV, A., *Vyhlasenie o Ukrajinskej národnej rade Prjaševščiniv*, in "Východoslevenské noviny," June 5, 1968.





## INTRODUCTION

The subject of this modest work is the Eastern territory of today's Czechoslovak Socialistic Republic. Until the official liquidation of the Holy Union by the Communist government on April 28, 1950, this Eastern part of Czechoslovakia was the territory of the Catholic eparchy of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite with the Episcopal See in Prjašiv. On April 28, 1950, this See became an Orthodox " Exarchate " under the jurisdiction of the " Orthodox " metropolitan of Czechoslovakia and, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow.

This eparchy extends on the North to the borders of Poland; to the East, there lies the Zakarpatsjka Oblašt of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic; to the South lies the Republic of Hungary. The western border is most simply described by geographical features of the countryside; from the border of Hungary on the South the river Hornad extends Northward to the river Poprad, from Poprad Northward to the Polish border.

This territory is called " Prjašivščyna," although the term is not strictly scientific; while it is very often the object of tendentious and unilateral polemics, it is a very vague administrative term. For simplicity, we shall use this term, because this is the name used by its inhabitants. This territory is also the region of the eparchy of Prjašiv. In fact, the names " Prjašivščyna " or " Prjašivsjska Rusj " can be found in the writings of those authors who tried to describe this land scientifically, or in a literary manner.

It is complicated and difficult to study and to analyze the past of that branch of the Ukrainians who dared to settle down on the Southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains. We can see from the past how complicated and difficult was the life of these people. The geographical situation already gives us a sufficient reason. The environment, where the fate of these Ukrainians was similar to the fate of slaves — a nation without liberty and state — was the most pathetic symptom of the past as well as in our days. The states to which they used to belong and to which they belong now and the neighbor nations became their worst enemies. Of course, it was easy to find reasons — political exigencies of times, ethnical, cultural,

national, economic developments, but the chief cause was religious intolerance. All these elements have been deeply engraved in the mentality of the people and probably they will remain there for a long time. This is the fate of a stateless nation.

You may quote the international law — but what kind of law defends the interests of stateless nations? You may perhaps mention the laws of human dignity, of human rights — however, if one studies the past of these people, one comes to a very sad conclusion. Briefly — this is the past; the dominant nationality of the state (they can be called occupants) in the past have always tried to erase from the face of the earth this branch of Ukrainians. Of course, they wrote and they will write “scientific” historical books just for one reason — to justify their unjust purposes and deeds. They only write and use the truth, if they can use it for their own gain. Otherwise, they ignore or they twist the truth, the facts and the past. Many times in the past the occupants tried “to teach” and “to re-educate” this “stateless horde”. However, it is their intention, that after a few decades there will be only mention of these Ukrainians on the pages of history. They have even tried to destroy every proof of the past, which could have an unfavorable effect upon their evaluation. They write and re-write their “history” and “statistics,” but all these are nothing else but exaggerations and falsifications of truth and of history.

When we unveil the past of the Ukrainian people, the fact immediately comes into view, that even if these Ukrainians did not discover new lands, spaces or seas; even if they did not develop world-renowned classics of literature, philosophy, music and art; even if they did not discover new weapons, missiles, rockets, nevertheless in history they remained, as they are now — century long fighters for what they have discovered, nourished and treasured in their souls — they are deeply dedicated to God, to their Faith and to their Church. This is what has remained as their centuries-old treasure and this is what gives life to the Ukrainian population in that corner of Europe. This is what has sheltered them during those long centuries of cruel, bloody wars and revolutions. Their faith gave them courage to counteract those tragic consequences of religious wars. It was their Faith, their Church and their Rite, that made them immune to the process of denationalization during long centuries of foreign occupation.

The terrain where these people have their abode has also contributed to their history. Most of the territory is covered by the

Carpathian Mountains. Here end the highest mountains of Czechoslovakia — the High Tatry. The chain of Beskid Mountains attracts many tourists with its beauty and with the exotic attire of the inhabitants. The region is rich in mineral wells. The northern part is unfit for farming, but the southern part, the plains, is rich in agriculture products. Here end the slopes of the Tokay Mountains (Hegyalja), which are world famous for the production and export of wine and in horticulture.

All the rivers — the Ondava, the Laborec, then from the Zakarpatsjka Oblasť — the Už and the Latoricja form the river Bodrog. In a like manner with the Hernad, near Tokaj (Hungary), the Bodrog meets the river Tisa. Only one — the Poprad river runs North, leaves the region and later, with the Dunajec river, merges into the river Wisla (Poland).

Generally, the climate here, as in the Mid-European countries, is pleasant and dry. The summer is warm, but the winter is bitter and cold. The chain of Beskids protects the whole region from the cold, northern winds, as the Alps protect it from the warm, humid Mediterranean weather changes. The meteorologists state that this is the reason why there are no tornadoes in these parts.

It is difficult to obtain additional statistics. Some, published by Communist authorities, are not trustworthy. The present authorities will not publish objective statistics, lest they reveal the weak points of the totalitarian state economy of the collective farms and enterprises and thus serve completely to destroy their own Communist propaganda.

In regard to the inhabitants, all we can say is that the majority are farmers. In the northern parts, where the farming is difficult, they raise cattle and the nearby forests give them an opportunity to be active in lumbering. After the "coup d'état" of 1948, the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna, as well as the inhabitants of Czechoslovakia, became enslaved by the Communist regime.

Ethnically, the majority of the inhabitants are Slavs. In the Southern part there are Hungarian-speaking villages and towns, but it would again be in the province of anthropology to determine the ultimate composition of these nations. Since Hungarians here, as in Hungary, are mixed with different Slavonic races, those Hungarian speaking Greek-Catholics cannot be considered as belonging to the Mongolian race. The dominant type is the Eastern Slavonic race, with little influence in the North of the Dynaric-Slavonic; however, among the inhabitants we can find the peculiarities of Baltic and

other types of Slavs. At the present time, there is an enormous difficulty of determining the nationality of this territory, because of political or other repercussions. Because of such difficulties, we must postpone for a more opportune time other necessary and detailed studies. For the present, we limit our research to those descriptions, which could have some importance.

Administratively, until the fall of Austro-Hungary, Prjašivščyna was divided into the districts (župa): Aba-Novohrad, Boršod, Gemer, Šariš, Spiš, Turňa and Zemplin. During the Czechoslovakia of (1919-1939) and during the Slovak Republic of Dr. Tiso (1939-1945), the territory was divided into 24 minor administrative counties, which probably exist at the present time.

As the symptom of the past, we can speak about Prjašivščyna as one ethnographical entity, as one nationality "from Poprad to Tisa." With present Zakarpatsjka Oblast, Prjašivščyna formerly faced the same difficulties and shared the same bright days. Even if both these regions belonged once to the Austro-Hungarian State, the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna had their share in the fight for their faith and national survival. What was the cause of their success?

During the past years of occupation by different regimes, many historical writings were published dealing directly or indirectly with Prjašivščyna. Besides scientific research, in these works we can find much non-historical material, which can be classified into the following groups:

a) *Authors of Russian tendencies.* These will a priori hate and condemn everything which is Ukrainian or, in their eyes, "separatist." If they are Orthodox, the hatred will be more intensive, for the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna are mainly Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite.

These authors try to put the greatest emphasis on scientific research in this area. If they cannot achieve their purpose, they will become suddenly specialists in philology, pointing out as philological "experts," that Ukrainians never existed here. These people were only a group of wandering shepherds, forced by political circumstances to settle on the southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains. They do not care who first occupied the land, but they denied and are denying the right to the Ukrainians.

b) *Authors of Hungarian tendencies.* Many Hungarian historians try to prove that the Hungarians first occupied this territory, and consequently, they have historical rights of possession of the region. There is a suspicion that, to prove their viewpoint, they

destroyed many proofs and documents, which ran counter to their line of argumentation. They also state that the natural borders of Austro-Hungary were God-given. These propagandists will tell about the thousand-year-old common past, and maintain that this past brought Ukrainians and Hungarians so close, that there is no other way of life for Ukrainians, but to live in the same state with the Hungarians. Of course, the Hungarians will again be the superiors, the dominant race, while the Ukrainians will continue to be that "gens fidelissima" which they were to Francis II Rákoczy, after the most faithful Hungarians left him alone in the fight for their freedom against the Hapsburgs. The Russian group and the group of authors with Hungarian tendencies base their arguments upon "historical documents" which they use as it suits their ideology. It is very easy to be influenced by these groups.

c) To the third group of historians we can ascribe *the truly objective scientists*. In an objective manner, they defend the past of these Ukrainians on the basis of historical documents. They also make mistakes. Their greatest fault consists in too stoutly defending the objective truth. Sometimes in their writings they go too far in the opposite direction. Rejecting the tendentious writings of the previously described authors, these scientists sometimes idealize the past of these people, by building their arguments on very unstable and questionable data which also becomes for them historical dogma.

The reader himself can understand to which category these authors belong. One does not have to be a real specialist in the history of the Carpatho-Ukrainians to ascertain who they are, or what their purpose is; but if these individuals wanted to twist the past, they made the mistake of not caring for objective truth. Rather, they cared for ideology or tendency for which purpose they wrote their books and articles.

d) It is too early to talk about a fourth and most recent group — *the Soviet historians*. However, the Soviet way of history writing is generally known. To characterize this school, an episode which happened during the Historical Congress in Stockholm, Sweden, may be brought to mind. After the official session of the Congress ended, one of the free world historians in an informal talk, objected to his Soviet colleague that in Soviet historical publications 70% of the writing is nothing else but Communist propaganda, and only 30% deals with real history. How realistic and tactical was the reply, "I know that, but I know also, that nobody reads that 70% of propaganda." How great and encouraging this statement is!

It would be a good lesson for all those who would like to twist historical facts for their own purposes. Will they learn from this great “magistra vitae”? If they will not, the final approval and disclosure of the objective, historical truth will be after the history itself.

## I. PRJAŠIVŠČYNA UNTIL EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The first symptoms of human life and activity of Prjašivščyna are found in the pre-historical times. Here we find the objects of the palaeolithic era (1). In the neolithic era, in the southern parts we notice the presence of people linked with the culture of the Sudetenland, known as the culture of the Buk Mountains (2). The excavations of this era are the richest of all Europe (3). The objects found here are classified as the objects of late neolithic era and they are also classified as the objects of the culture of Trypillja (4). From Spiš to the Eastern Carpathian Mountains there are many objects dating from this era (5). From them archaeologists conclude that the culture and the mentality of the people who lived here were the same as those of the people of Ukraine of the same age (6). In the Mid-Bronze Period the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna had the custom of cremating their dead, since urns with ashes were the types of graves found here (7). The end of the Bronze Period was influenced by the culture of Lužice, which culture we can notice in the beginning of the Period of Iron (8). At the end of this period, in the sixth century B.C., there was the invasion by the Scyths from the territory of Ukraine (9). In the fourth century B.C., the Celts came. In the exportation of salt they used Greek coins — tetradrachmas, as a means of exchange (10).

---

(1) J. SKUTIL, *Paleolitikum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi*, p. 127 ss.

(2) F. TOMPA, *Archaeologia Hungarica*, IV. 20.

(3) J. EISNER, *Slovensko v pravěku*, p. 353.

(4) J. PASTERNAK, *Archeolohija Ukrajiny*, p. 122 ss, and the bibliography.

(5) J. PASTERNAK, *o.c.*, p. 178.

(6) F. M. POTUŠŇAK, *Archeolohični znachidky*, p. 4.

(7) T. LEHOCZKY, *Adatok a hazánk archeológiájához*, p. 42; J. PASTERNAK, *o.c.*, p. 147. J. JANKOVIČ, *Podkarpatska Rus v p̄ehistorii*, p. 1-2., J. BÖHM-J. JANKOVIČ, *Skythové na Podkarpatské Rusi*, I., Mohylové pohřebište v Kušťanovicích, in "Carpatica," 1936.

(8) F. M. POTUŠŇAK, *o.c.*, p. 8.

(9) J. BÖHM-J. JANKOVIČ, *o.c.*, p. 8.

(10) J. EISNER, *Mince t.zv. barbarské na Slovensku a v Podkarpatské Rusi*, in "Numismatický Časopis Československý" 1927; T. LEHOCZKY, *Beregvármegeye leirésa*, p. 12.

In the works of Roman writers mention is made of land. We find it alluded to by Pliny the Elder (23-79 A.D.) in his *Historia naturalis* VI, 35; by Caesar (100-44 B.C.) in his *Commentarium de bello Gallico* VI, 35; and by Tacitus (55-117 A.D.) in his *De origine, situ, moribus ac populis Germaniae*. In the description of the borders of "Germania" Tacitus mentions that it extends to the rivers Poprad and Dunajec. On the East lived Sarmatians (Slavs) and Dacians (11). The descriptions of these authors were a great help not only to the Roman soldiers and different merchants, but they are of great value to modern sciences. The geographer can use them as the geographical descriptions of the Carpathian Mountains. The zoologist can study the described species of animals, etc. From these writings we can conclude, that Prjašivščyna was known in Roman circles and it was included in the sphere of Roman politics and future expansion.

Since pre-historical times, even as it is today, Prjašivščyna is known as a meeting place of two cultures. From time immemorial here can be noticed the influence of the Mediterranean and Asiatic cultures (12). Numerous objects were carried by the different merchants to many markets by various roads. One of these roads led through the territory of Prjašivščyna. The most important was the road which linked Halyčyna with Hungary. The other road, linking Zakarpatsjka Oblasť with Slovakia-East and West was also used, even if not so often. During the colonization period Romans transported salt on these roads from the salt-mines of Maramoroš (Zakarpatsjka Oblasť) to different parts of the Empire. Probably in those times they fortified the town called Zemplin, to protect the transport of salt (13). The route of transport was from the river Tisa to Portum Salis (Sajórév), then along the river Slana (Salty River) to the river Ipoľ at Sah-ut (Route of Salt); then, following the river Ipoľ to the Danube and the Salka colony. The other route of transport was on the river Tepla, on which Castrum Salis and the station Solnik (Town of Salt) were located (14).

Around 50 A.D. we notice evidence of the Jaziges, called also

---

(11) J. PASTERNAK, *o.c.*, p. 270; p. 503.

(12) F. M. POTUŠŇAK, *o.c.*, p. 5.

(13) J. ENDLICHER, *Rerum Hungaricarum Monumenta Arpadiana*, pp. 14-15.

(14) V. CHALOUPECKÝ, *Dvě studie k dějinám Podkarpatska*, in "Sbornik" filosofické fakulty Komenského, 1925, pp. 133-141.



Metanastes (15). Then came Roxolans (16). In 170 A.D. these regions were invaded by the Lakrings (Vandals), Kostoboks, Vico-gals (Goths), Bastards (Celts) and Alans (Sarmats) (17). After the last battle, in 248 A.D., the Carpsi became assimilated with the Dacians (18), and after the invasion of the Avars we find the presence of Getas. In year 551 A.D. we find in the area already Slav tribes, which then became more organized, more powerful (19). In the battles against the invaders, the autochthonous population always emerged as conqueror. We can see this in the history of the migration of the nomads. The Slav tribes were the autochthonous inhabitants of Prjašivščyna. They lived in this area from pre-historic times. They did not come from other places, since from the dawn of history we find them as the possessors of these lands (20).

According to the Greek historian Constantine Porphyrogenitus, during the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (610-641 A.D.) these parts were under the administration of White Croats (21); consequently, they were part of the great state of Ants. The center of this state was the tribe of Dulibs (today's territory of Volyň) and it extended to Silesia, thus incorporating the White Croats (22). With their language, customs and religion, the White Croats were very close to the Ants — Anthaibs (23). After the Bulgarians occupied Pannonia, around 820 A.D., they became rulers of the tribes of Slavs of Prjašivščyna (24). Other Slav tribes founded the Great Moravian State, which existed until the invasion of the Hungarians in 906 A.D. (25). Prjašivščyna did not belong to the Great Moravian State, but to Pannonia. This is the conclusion from the description of the borders of the diocese of Prague, which ended on the slopes of High Tatry (26). The fact, that the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna are of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, also affirms this argument,

---

(15) PLINIUS, *Historia naturalis*, l.c.

(16) J. PASTERNAK, *o.c.*, p. 466.

(17) J. DICULESCU, *Wandalen und Gotten*, p. 7.

(18) P. KIRALY, *Dacia*, pp. 526-527.

(19) V. HADŽEĀA, *Dodatky... v župi Zemplynsjkij*, p. 20.

(20) This is the general opinion of Slav historians, archaeologists.

(21) C. PORPHYROGENITUS, *De administrando Imperio*, in PG, v. 102, col. 30-31.

(22) Cfr. F. DVORNIK, *The making of Central and Eastern Europe*.

(23) O. MYCJUK, *Narysy*, v. I, pp. 9-10.

(24) *Ibidem*.

(25) Cfr. documents and bibliography in works of quoted authors.

(26) COSMAS, *Chronicon*, II, p. 137 in "Mon. Germ. Historica. Scriptores."

since in the whole territory of the Great Moravian State the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was substituted by the Latin Rite (27). In the tenth and eleventh century Prjašivščyna as well as the whole territory of Zakarpattá belonged to the Kievan Rus (28). Nestor, the author of "Povist' Vremennyh Lit," points out that all Slav tribes constituted one entity, one language, one culture (29).

Although Prjašivščyna did not belong to the Great Moravian State, the spread and the influence of the Slav culture and of the Catholic Faith in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite found its deep roots in these lands. It is unfortunate, that there is no mention of the disciples of St. Methodius from Prjašivščyna, because among two-hundred disciples there had to be some from Prjašivščyna and Carpatho-Ukraine. After the expulsion of the disciples from the territory of Moravia (after March 6, 885), they returned home, where they converted their co-nationals to the faith of Christ. Missionaries, priests from these lands also took part in the conversion of Rus during the reign of Volodymyr the Great (30). In the eleventh century, after the monks of the Slavonic Rite were expelled from the monastery of Sazava (Bohemia), they came to Prjašivščyna and into the territory of today's Zakarpatsjka Oblast (31). One of these Saints, who worked in Rus was Moses, "the Hungarian," who was the priest of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite from the territory occupied by Hungarians — Prjašivščyna or Carpatho-Ukraine (32). The same fate befell the monks of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Poland. The insinuation was made, that they took part in political conspiracy against the king, therefore, Boleslaus II Chrobry (992-

---

(27) G. FEJER, *Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae*, III, 310: "...graecis latinis substituere..." From the letter of Pope Clemens VI to the bishop of Nitra concerning the monastery in Vyšegrad.

(28) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *Istorija Rusy-Ukrajiny*, II, 487; J. PASTERNAK, *Korotka archeologija zachidno-ukrajinsjkych zemelj*, in "Bohoslovija," 1932, p. 230.

(29) Cfr. the edition of Academy of Sciences of USSR, Moskva 1950, p. 21.

(30) E. GOLUBINSKIJ, *Istorija Russkoj Cerkvi*, I, 445.

(31) F. DVORNIK, *Slavs*, p. 104.

(32) Cfr. Life (Žitije) of Moses "the Hungarian," in G. ANONYMUS, *Chronicon*, I, l.c. In another "Žitije" of Moses "the Hungarian," written by the monk of the monastery of Caves (Perčersjka Lavra) near Kiev, Polycarp. According to Polycarp, Moses "the Hungarian," was evangelizing the regions of Poland and after being freed from prison, entered the monastery of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, but shortly, with all the monks of the same monastery, he was expelled from the territory of Poland. Cfr. A. BIEŁOWSKI, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, IV, p. 810.

1025) expelled them from the territory of his kingdom. They settled in the neighboring countries, probably also in the mountaineous territories of Prjašivščyna and of Carpatho-Ukraine (33).

About their activities and existence, a document from the year 974 mentions that before the invasion of Hungarians, on the territory of Moravia, there already existed seven episcopacies, three of which were situated on the territory occupied by the Hungarians (34). About these episcopacies we know only the name of the episcopacy in Nitra (35). Where, in what localities, the other two episcopacies existed, historians cannot prove. There is a group of historians who on the basis of local traditions as well as from indirect proofs and from logical deductions, conclude that one of the episcopacies of St. Methodius could be the episcopacy of Ukrainians in Zakarpattia (36).

In the territory of Prjašivščyna one of the events of the greatest importance is the arrival of and the missionary work of the Apostles of the Slavs — SS. Cyril and Methodius. Although the faith of Christ had been brought to the inhabitants of these regions by various missionaries of the Latin Rite, the work of SS. Cyril and Methodius marks the beginning of a new era in the life of almost all Slav nations. In fact, this is the greatest religious and cultural awakening of the inhabitants of Prjašivščyna (37).

In the age of migration of nations, when in a short period of time, many nations were completely absorbed into another, and completely new nations and states changed the political map of Europe, we notice the existence of two powerful empires of Rome

---

(33) The description of the incident refers A. BIELOWSKI, *Synowie Chrobrego*, St. Petersburg 1859.

(34) G. FEJÉR, *Codex Diplomaticus* I, pp. 261-262: ...“ quia et quodam Romanorum gepidarumque tempore proprios VII. antistites eadem orientalis Pannonia habuit... quorum etiam quattuor, usque dum Hungari regum Bawariorum inuasurunt, sicut presente cognitum est aetate, in Marauia manserunt.” Idem in S. TIMON, *Imago antiquae Hungariae*, p. 182.

(35) N. A. KONDRÁŠOV, *Slavjanskyje jazyky*, p.p 145-146 considers the opposite arguments of those tendentious historians and philologists who would like to move the beginning of present Slovakia during the period of great Moravian State. About see of Notra, see M. LACKO, *The Cyrilomethodian Mission and Slovakia*, in “Slovak Studies,” I, pp. 23-47.

(36) Dulyškovyč, Bazylovyč, Žatkovyč, Lučkaj, Pekar, etc.

(37) I. NAHAJEVSKYJ, *Kyrylo-Methodijvsjke Chrystijanstvo v Rusi-Ukrajini*, p. 132.

With all probability we can say, that the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite were under the influence of their own clergy and bishops who broke away from the unity with Rome in the years 1204-1234 (46).

In 1234 already the Hungarian King Bela IV (1234-1270) swore to force all Christians not united with Rome to embrace the Catholic religion in the Latin Rite. Those, who would not obey the orders of the king, would be expelled from the state and their possessions would be confiscated (47). Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241) did not agree with these orders of the king and in the same year, November 14, 1234, referred information to the king that in Hungary, in the territory of the episcopacy of Kunns there were many persons who rejected the teaching of the Catholic Church and who received the sacraments "from Greek pseudo-bishops." Once again the pope suggested that an episcopacy of the Byzantine Rite be erected for these non-Latin Rite faithful, but again it was without any result (48).

When the Hungarians settled in Pannonia, after the fall of the Moravian State, the inhabitants of these territories lived their independent lives. The borders of the Hungarian state did not include Prjašivščyna. In the year 981 the territory of Prjašivščyna was included into the state of Rus' by Grand Prince Volodymyr the Great (980-1015). This happened without any military operations or action (49). The borders between Poland, Hungary and Rus' and as well as Bohemia were on the southern part of Prjašivščyna (50).

After the fall of Rus' of Kiev, in the North, the cities of Červeň (today Halyčyna) were organized into the Halyč-Volyň State (Halycjko-Volynsjka Deržava). Because of the political situation and the marital relationship with the Rus', the Hungarian kings started to convert their interests and aspirations to this state. The closest way from Hungary to Halyčyna was through the territory of Prjašivščyna, which actually linked these two states. We shall not

---

(46) G. VARGHA, *Egyháztörténelem*, p. 97, refers that this happened in the second half of the thirteenth century.

(47) J. CZIPLE, *A máramorosi püspökség kérdése*, p. 4.

(48) E. LUKINICH, *Documenta historiam Valachorum in Hungaria illustrantia*, p. 18.

(49) I. NAHAJEVSJKYJ, *Kyrylo-metodijivsjske chrystijanstvo v Rusi-Ukrajini*, p. 107.

(50) M. HRUŠEVSJKYJ, *Istoriija Rusi-Ukrajiny*, II, p. 48; A. BIELOWSKI, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, I, p. 505.

describe the relationship, wars, commerce etc. of these two states, since many of them already have been published. However, it is interesting, that to this day, the study of these relationships on the part of Hungarian history is neglected. The political leaders, military personalities or many other important individuals, after they entered the Hungarian territory, became unknown or completely lost to any other historian. We shall not elaborate on this period of Prjašivščyna for the lack of documents. It will help, however, to mention some of those fractional episodes which had many influences on the history of these parts. Among all these we shall mention just the most important events. In Spiš (Prjašivščyna), in the year 1214 the Polish and Hungarian kings — Lesko and Kalman — made an agreement concerning the division of the territory of Halyčyna among themselves. Prjašivščyna for a period of time belonged to Halyčyna and to Hungary. Many pretenders for the throne of Halyčyna were the allies of the Hungarian kings (51). After their defeat, they escaped to Hungary. To have them completely isolated, Hungarian kings made them settle in the territory which was completely separated from Halyčyna or entirely under the control of the Hungarian kings. Prince Rostyslav, after he was defeated by the armies of Prince Danylo Romanovyč of Halyčyna, became the administrator (ban) of South-Western Hungary, of the territory occupied by the Croats and Slovenians, between the Danube, the Sava and the Drava rivers (52). His wife, Anna, owned the village Brid (district of Bereh, Zakarpatska Oblast). This village Brid was given to Fedir and Stefan, sons of Leo, the emigrant from Halyčyna (53).

The documents from the year 1254 mention that Prince Rostyslav received from the Hungarian King Bela IV, the castle Füzér, in the vicinity of Lesna and Čemerna. This document is of great importance, since it mentions for the first time in the Hungarian history the “Sepulchra Ruthenorum” near the river Laborec (54).

The relations between Hungary and Halyčyna were another revitalization of Prjašivščyna. It has already been said that this territory was the way of communication between these two states.

---

(51) V. T. PAŠUTO, *Očerki po istoriji Galicko-Volinskoj Rusi*, p. 200.

(52) *Ibidem*, p. 238.

(53) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, II, p. 507.

(54) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.* III, p. 204; A. HODINKA, *A karpátaljai ruthének lakohelye, gazdagságuk és múltjuk*, p. 14.

During the existence of Halyč-Volyň State, the relations became more active. Hungarian kings travelled through this area with their armies when they conducted military operations to annex Halyčyna to Hungary. The sympathizers of the Hungarian kings from among the nobles and military leaders of Halyčyna, in their critical moments, found here or in other parts of Hungary a safe haven against the repercussions of their rulers (55). During these times the population of Prjašivščyna became strengthened by a new continuous affluence of settlers of the same nationality. These settlers brought with them their priests and even bishops of their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. These ties, with all probability, began in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and, as we notice, the jurisdiction of the bishop of Peremyšl was established here, until the status and the jurisdiction of the bishop of Mukačevo was completely determined by the canonical erection of the eparchy of Mukačevo, to which the territory of Prjašivščyna belonged in the matters of religious administration (56).

To counteract these settlers, the Hungarian kings brought into these territories German settlers. The eleventh century Prjašivščyna became part of "Marchia Ruizorum" — a new administrative unit, conquered from Rus' (57), — terminology imported from German lands. During the reign of kings Gejza II (1141-1161) and Bela III (1173-1196) these German settlers opposed the increase of Slav population, their culture, faith and rite (58). The kings also founded monasteries for German monks. Among the first monasteries of the Latin Rite in Hungary, we notice the erection of that of Premonstratensian Orders' monks in 1215 in Leles by Bishop Benedict (59). In Szerencs was erected the monastery of Benedictine Fathers (60). In 1247 Bela IV described the borders of the possessions of the newly arrived from Halyčyna's Kopryvnycja Cistercian monks of Bardyjiv (61).

---

(55) V. T. PAŠUTO, *o.c.* describes many of these relationships.

(56) A. HODINKA, *Okmánytár*, p. 209.

(57) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, I. 7; N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, 199.

(58) J. BARDOSSY, *Supplementa terrae Scepus*, p. 223.

(59) J. WAGNER, *Annales Scepusii*, p. 389 relates the document, that king Andrew II in 1212 donated possessions of Zymnyj Potik to the Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre.

(60) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, II. 492.

(61) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, IV, vol. I, p. 468- "...de Koprivincza, Cisterciensis ordinis, apud ecclesiam s. Aegidii de Bartpha prope Sarus commorantes..."; B. KRPELEC, *Bardejov*, pp. 14-15.

In 1209, during the reign of King Andrew, "Castrum Ujvar, in finibus Polonorum" — Castrum Novum, Novohrad was built on the river Topľa, by the village Lipjany (62). The name of this town was given to the whole district — the Aba-Novohrad, which was organized in 1243 with its own administrator — župan. Until 1262 the capital of the district was Forro (from Castrum or Forum) in the Southern part (63). Castle Šariš was built in the twelfth century on the river Topľa also and to this castle belonged the territory between Prjašiv and Košice (64). The documents from 1209 until 1250 mention about 91 settlements of the Šariš district. We find it organized in 1247 with its capital of the same name and its administrator (župan) Count Tecus (65). German settlers found their new home in the Spiš district. The capital of Spiš is mentioned during the agreement between the Polish King Lesko and the Hungarian King Andrew in 1214. According to this agreement, Salomea, two-year-old daughter of Lesko had to be the wife of three-year-old Kalman, son of Andrew (66). King Andrew asked the Pope for the crown for his son and in his letters he promised Innocent III that all the people would unite with the Church of Rome (67). The problem was discussed at Lateran IV (Rome) Council in 1215, but in reality it remained only on paper since the king changed his mind. In 1240 the castle Makovycja-Zboriv was built near Bardyjiv (68), but this did not prevent the invasion of the Tartars in 1241. Prjašivščyna was destroyed during this invasion. To be prepared for the future, King Bela IV continued to build castles and for their maintenance, he restored villages and towns. As we already mentioned, during his reign Prjašivščyna was organized into districts. Further, in 1288 old Castrum Salis, which had been built under the Roman Empire, was rebuilt; it is now called Sónár-Solník, and was also known during the dynasty of the Arpads (69). Also fortified and modernized was the castle Zemplin, on the river Bodrog,

---

(62) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, II, p. 492.

(63) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, p. 65.

(64) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, I, pp. 36-37; M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, II, p. 493; G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, IV, vol. I, p. 61.

(65) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, VI, p. 376.

(66) V. T. PAŠUTO, *o.c.*, p. 201.

(67) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, III, p. 31.

(68) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, I, pp. 36-37.

(69) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, V, vol. 3, p. 296.

which had existed during the time of the Romans (70). The castle in Kapušany was built in 1310. Not far from it, castle Potik was erected. In the Northern parts, by Stropkiv, on the river Ondava, close to the border with Halyčyna, in 1245 another castle was built. Poroščan was constructed in 1284 with other castles following (71).

Perhaps the desire of union with Rome, mentioned in the documents of the Hungarian King Andrew at the time of the Lateran IV Council, or perhaps the attention given to this problem after the Council in Lyons (France) in the year 1245 bore fruit, because there is a mention that in the year 1252 part or all of the faithful of Prjašivščyna and of today's Zakarpatsjka Oblast' were reunited with the Catholic Church (72). We can conclude that King Bela IV was under the influence of the last council but it could be noted also as a particular circumstance that the king did not oppress the non-united faithful. We see them take part in the war against the Bohemian King Ottokar II, who in year 1260 defeated King Bela IV (73). What happened to these who were united with Rome? We can admit that some of them became Catholics of the Latin Rite, but the major part again became non-united.

The Hungarian kings many times intruded into the affairs of the kings of Halyčyna. They were also related through marriages. No wonder, that we see them as pretenders to the throne of Halyčyna, which they tried to annex to their Hungarian kingdom. The non-united inhabitants of Prjašivščyna were only tolerated by the kings of the Arpad dynasty. There were instances when they were persecuted. After the expulsion of the disciples of St. Methodius from Moravia, in the antagonism between Rome and Byzantium and after the end of the dynasty of the Arpads in year 1301, the non-united were destined to a slow death.

Thus in the same year 1301, when Charles Robert of Anjou became the king of Hungary, he had to confirm his authority and power with physical force, since various magnates did not accept him as their king. The palatines Kapoš, Mojš and Matthew Csák and in Prjašivščyna Peter Petrovyč (Peter son of Petheo) fought against Charles Robert of Anjou in 1315-1322. Being the admini-

---

(70) *Ibidem*, IV, vol. 2, p. 140. Called also "Castrum (regale) de Saturhyg" in "Codex Arpadianus," VIII, p. 6.

(71) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*

(72) ASCC of 1771, f. 75.

(73) E. LUKINICH, *Documenta historiam Valachorum in Hungaria illustrantia*, p. 26.



strator (župan) of the Zemplin district, Peter Petrovyč had the entire district under his jurisdiction and command. He tried to persuade the king of Halyčyna to take the throne of Hungary under his domination. With the Palatine Kapoš, Peter Petrovyč rebelled against Charles Robert of Anjou in 1315. In year 1321 Peter Petrovyč made a trip to Rus' to obtain military support, but unfortunately it was too late (74). The army of Csák, Kapoš and Peter Petrovyč was defeated in 1320 near the village Kapušany (Užhorod). Peter Petrovyč still resisted the king in his Northern possessions, where he was ultimately defeated in 1322 by the king's ally, Mačk, the administrator of Šariš (75). The possessions of Peter Petrovyč were confiscated because of his efforts to install "ducem Ruthenorum" on the Hungarian throne, and given to Mack, the administrator (župan) (76). The entire district of Šariš became the property of the noble family of Drugeth which already was in possession of Humenne and its vicinity, Prjašiv and then Užhorod.

The agreement between the Polish King Casimir and the Hungarian Ludwig I in 1339 was a repetition of the agreement of Spiš in 1214 — the alliance against Halyčyna (77). Even before the agreement, Ludwig I, on July 20, 1336 ordered the expulsion from the territory of his kingdom of all the non-united, with their priests, but without any other possessions (78). These non-united Ukrainians left their lands. Non-united Romanians, with their leader, Bohdan, settled in Moldavia where they established a new state.

In Northern Hungary the people rebelled against the Hungarian king's absolutism. In the year 1345 the king ordered the administrator (župan) of Šariš district, Ricolf, to suppress the rebellion (79).

After the death of the Hungarian King Albert in 1440, Hungary again was the scene of arduous contentions. The king's widow, Elizabeth, and her faction wanted to secure the throne of Hungary for her infant Ladislaus. The other faction of the Hungarian nobility wanted to see on the throne another Ladislaus, the king of Poland. Elizabeth, confiding the care of the royal infant to John Jiskra, asked him also for military help against the faction of the nobility who supported Polish Ladislaus. She knew of Jiskra because of

---

(74) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, VIII, 293.

(75) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, III, p. 119.

(76) G. FEJÉR, *o.c.*, VIII, vol. 2, p. 325.

(77) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, III, pp. 128-129.

(78) J. CZIPLE, *A máramorosi püspökség kérdése*, p. 4.

(79) TOTH, *Sáros megye monografiája*, III, p. 131.

his help to her deceased husband — the king against the Turks. For the time being, she gave him Zvoleň Castle (Western Slovakia), and then she made him the governor of the whole northern part of her kingdom, with residence in Košice. The coming of his army was welcomed by the Slav population of Prjašivščyna, but Jiskra did not govern these territories for long. After Matthew Hunyady became the king of Hungary, in 1462, in the battle of Vac, Jiskra surrendered to the king and for his service in the war against the Turks the king made him a knight (80).

On the occasion of the Council of Florence in 1439, Pope Eugene IV (1431-1447) invited all to return to the Catholic Church. The non-united of Zakarpattia, Halyčyna, Lithuania and Ukraine were not prepared for this important event. Even if they desired to unite with Rome, after the Act of Union was proclaimed, it seems that they did not take it into consideration. There were no mass conversions, but the Council itself brought encouraging effects.

Returning from the Council via Krakiv to Kiev and Moscow, the Metropolitan of Kiev, Isidor, at the suggestion of Pope Eugene IV, came to Buda, the capital of Hungary, on March 5, 1440. On the next day, he took part in the coronation of King Ladislaus I. During his ten-day stay in the capital, Isidor made a visit to the king. Among other matters, without doubt, they discussed the miserable situation of the non-united Ukrainians and their union with the Catholic Church (81). As a result of these talks, the king, with the encouragement of the Apostolic Delegate, Julian Cardinal Lambertini, on March 22, 1443 issued a royal decree, in which he proclaimed complete freedom and the equal privileges to the non-united citizens of his kingdom, the privileges which up to that time had been granted only to the Catholics of the Latin Rite. This decree seems to be the tacit revocation of the king's previous orders for the persecution of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite (82). In fact, after this document, the non-united bishop of Mukačevo started to demand the application of the orders of the king, especially when he protested against the unjust confiscation of the bishop's possessions. The bishop and his successors demanded the restitution of these possessions according to the concessions given to them by Prince Fedir Korja-

---

(80) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, pp. 16-17; B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 31.

(81) E. GOLUBINSKIJ, *Istorija Russskoj Cerkvi*, II, pp. 444-445.

(82) *Archiv Juzozapadnoj Rossiji*, I, vol. 1, p. 442 ss.

tovyč, who rebuilt the already existing monastery of Černeča Hora (Mukačevo) at the end of the fourteenth century (83).

We already know of the relationships between the kings of Hungary, Halyčyna and Poland in the twelfth-fourteenth centuries. As it was mentioned, many of the political emigrants found their haven and new home in the kingdom of Hungary, especially in the territory of Zakarpaťta. After the agreement of the Kings Casimir of Poland and Ludwig of Hungary, and after the annexation of Halyčyna to Hungary in 1393, Vitovt, the Prince of Lithuania, occupied the territory of Podilla. Its leader, Prince Fedir Korjatovyč, planned to resist, leaving in the mountains his fortified army, which was sent to him by King Sigmund of Hungary (84). With the hope of obtaining more help, Fedir Korjatovyč crossed the borders of Hungary, but Vitovt occupied all his towns and land. Korjatovyč thus became "dominus Munkacs" — the lord of the territory around the town of Mukačevo, given to him by the king about the year 1390 (85). He also owned possessions in Prjašivščyna, Krasnyj Brid, where he built the monastery. There was another monastery in Snyrna, built by him and restored in 1487 after his death (86).

The bishop of Mukačevo first tried to regain the possessions of the monastery of Mukačevo and then the others, but without success, since the orders of King Ladislaus were only on paper. In fact, the king died near Varna, on November 10, 1444, in the war against the Turks (87).

These were the first hopes for the free life of the non-united Ukrainians. The thunders of wars suffocated these hopes many times, but they never died; they again and again would rise until their final realization.

In 1514 another rebellion exploded in Hungary. This was the rebellion of the peasants under the command of George Doža. Prjašivščyna became again the terrain of many battles. The rebellion was crushed by John Zapolyi, with the help of Gabriel Perenyi and Stephen Verböczy. The towns of Prjašivščyna were fined monetary contributions, but all the inhabitants were blamed for the support

---

(83) B. BUTRYNSJKYJ, *Zmaňňa do uniji ruskoji cerkvi z Rymom*, in "ZNT im. Ševčenko," Kyjiv, 1908, III, p. 106.

(84) M. HRUŠEVSKYJ, *o.c.*, IV, p. 171.

(85) *Ibidem*; Cfr. A. HODINKA, *Documenta Koriatovicsiana*, in "Analecta OSBM," 1950, vol. 2-3, p. 4.

(86) M. VAVRYK, *Po vasylijanskych manastyryach*, pp. 249-250.

(87) E. GOLUBINSKIJ, *o.c.*

of the rebels. Doža was burned to death and with him were executed about 3,000 peasants from Prjašivščyna (88). The whole kingdom of Hungary did not have a chance to heal the wounds of rebellion, when another danger brought a complete disaster. In the battle of Mohács in 1526 the Hungarian army was completely destroyed and King Ludwig II was killed. In the history of Hungary this is known as the chapter of dissensions or struggle for power.

A law was made by the Hungarian noblemen in 1505, which reserved the throne of Hungary to a king born Hungarian. The majority of the noblemen were reluctant to see on the throne of Hungary a foreign-born king. They elected as their King John Zapolyi, who already had all the military power of the state. His enemies, under the leadership of John Bornemissza, the commander of the fortress of Buda, on December 15, 1526 elected Ferdinand I, the brother-in-law of the deceased King Ludwig II, and the brother of the Austrian Emperor Charles V. With Ferdinand I the Hungarian throne became the property of the powerful family of the Hapsburgs. These were very critical years for Ferdinand I. Only the Western part of Hungary, together with the territory of today's Slovakia, was under his crown. The Southern part was occupied by the Turks, whose armies continuously advanced into the territory of his kingdom. The Eastern part of Hungary became the principality of Transylvania. The borders of these powers were in the territory of Prjašivščyna! It is difficult to establish the exact location of these borders, since there were continuous military operations, which many times changed the map and jurisdiction of these territories. The inhabitants of Prjašivščyna lost practically everything in these wars. Whatever was left, even that little was taken from them as taxes or as provisions for the armies.

After the agreement of Vienna in 1606, the Turks remained in the territories occupied by them. In 1619 there was another rebellion against the king — the rebellion of Gabriel Bethlen. According to the peace treaty concluded in Nicholsburg (Vienna), on January 7, 1622, Bethlen possessed Zemplin, Aba-Novohrad and Boršod districts of Prjašivščyna.

In 1631 in the vicinity of Tokaj there was another rebellion, which spread also to Prjašivščyna. Its leader, Peter Cisar, fought against the brutal oppression of local landowners (89). It was put

---

(88) O. Мучук, *o.c.*, I, p. 103 ss.

(89) *Történelmi Tár*, 1899, pp. 495-496.

down, but arose again in 1632, when the peasants rebelled and fought for their "old privileges, for old freedom." (90) There was no other solution for the peasants. They did not expect any help or understanding from either the king or the prince of Transylvania. In their despair, they turned to the Turkish pasha, who at that time resided in Eger. After the rebellion was controlled by the army of king in 1633, the leader of rebellion, Peter Cisar was cut in four pieces and the rebels punished. Consider the paradox: the Christian inhabitants of these parts did not find help and understanding on the part of the Christian king as well as the prince of Transylvania, so they were forced to turn to a Mohammedan Turkish pasha!

---

(90) O. МУСЮК, *o.c.*, II, pp. 118-119.

## II. THE ECCLESIASTICAL-RELIGIOUS SITUATION BEFORE THE UNION WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Some historians study the history of Prjašivščyna from the point of view of the conflict between Rome and Byzantium for political and religious influences (1). To make such a general conclusion, will be only part of the truth, since these influences were only part of the life of these Ukrainians. We notice these influences during the existence of the Moravian State, in the activities of SS. Cyril and Methodius and their disciples. We have to admit that the fall of the Moravian State resulted in part from the manœuvres of the diplomacy of Byzantium. Could it be possible for Hungarians, without the help of Byzantium to destroy the Moravian State and once and forever to split the unity of Slav tribes in the basin of the Danube? (2). In Constantinople, they were afraid of continuous attacks by the Slavs on the Western borders of the Empire ; therefore it was necessary for the diplomats of the Emperor' court to persuade Hungarians to settle there. As it was said in a previous chapter, during the period of migration, many people wandered through these territories, but even if they conquered the local population, the inhabitants always were the ultimate victors. If the invaders were not defeated by another immigrating tribe or nation shortly after they had settled in these parts, they were absorbed by the local, dominant inhabitants in such a manner, that today only a few historical documents and topographical names of localities, rivers etc. mark their presence there.

After the Hungarian invasion in 907, the political circles in Constantinople were influenced by the faithfulness of their new allies and they were not mistaken. In fact, we notice the influence of Byzantium in the life of the Hungarian nation until the end of the royal dynasty of Arpad in 1301 (3). On the other hand, after the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders, April 13, 1204, (4),

---

(1) N. A. BESKID, *Karpatorusskaja pravda*, p. 128.

(2) *Ibidem*, p. 122.

(3) P. BOD, *Historia Hungariae Ecclesiastica*, p. 100 ss.

(4) F. CALLAËY, *Praelectiones Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, II, p. 131.

and especially during the period of confusion and schism, the Hungarian kings started to look toward a more powerful Rome. They expected more help and privileges from the Pope of Rome than from the Patriarch of Constantinople. In many cases the kings of Hungary, becoming Catholics of the Latin Rite, tried to be more faithful to the papal bull than the Pope himself meant. It would be more understandable if in some way they were to profit from them. However, the kings exaggerated and confused everything just to show the world that they were faithful to the instructions. These Kings considered themselves the protectors of the Catholic Church in Hungary, assuming the title of "the Apostolic King." This title as well as the royal crown, as some historians tried to prove, St. Stephen, the first Hungarian King, (997-1038), received from Pope Sylvester II (999-1003) for the founding of twelve episcopacies in Hungary (5). These "Apostolic" kings tried to convert all their subjects to the Catholic Church. For them, the Catholic Church was only the Latin Rite; and every other rite had to be destroyed. These "conversions" were forced and did not succeed.

Already, before the invasion of the Hungarians, there is mention in the documents of the towns of Prjašivščyna and Carpatho-Ukraine. Part of the disciples expelled from Moravia found in these parts of their co-nationals the terrain of future apostolic work. Even if in the documents is mentioned the existence of seven episcopacies, founded by St. Methodius, and even if three of these episcopacies were located in the territory occupied by Hungarians, the exact location of these episcopacies was not described by historians. According to these conclusions, one of the episcopacies had to be the episcopacy of the Ukrainians (6).

After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, we notice a strictly church-administrative, religious influence of Byzantine Rite church authorities in the life of these Ukrainians. The nobles tried to obtain privileges, honors, such as lands and castles. They tried to be on the side of the king and, until the Reformation, they tried also to profess the same faith and rite. The common people were left

---

(5) Thus the Hungarian king, the "kterikon" of the Byzantine Emperors changed into the "ius patronatus," claiming its origin from the non-existing bull of pope Sylvester II. This "ius patronatus" was never given to any Hungarian king by the Pope; it is never mentioned in any document. Therefore, the Hungarian kings had to appeal to their old "custom." B. PEKAR, *De erectione canonica dioecesis Mukačoviensis*, pp. 20-22.

(6) Basilovits, Dulyškovyč, Žatkovyč, etc.; ASCC, 1771, f. 74v.

without leaders. For the nobles, the common people were the subjects of exploitation; they had to pay taxes and perform every kind of labor, being continuously exposed to hatred, humiliation, and, if they were of different nationality, to persecution. This was the cause of many rebellions. Except for the leaders of the rebellions, nobody else cared to better the life, the working conditions, the standard of living of the masses, who were becoming very poor during these rebellions (7). It was easy to condemn them for their illiteracy and isolation, it could be that this isolation was one of the causes of preserving their faith and rite. At any rate, on this point, we cannot talk about the influences of Byzantium or Rome. The rite was imported from Byzantium, but in the times of SS. Cyril and Methodius it became their national heritage through which they conserved their national entity and existence during the long centuries.

In the fifteenth century, when the " Little Brothers " of Jiskra occupied Prjašivščyna, the pre-Reformation ideas were imported here, but the real movement of Reformation can be noticed in the cities, where the German settlers lived. Thus the town of Bardyjiv became the center of the Reformation for all the country of Hungary (8).

The greatest tragedy of every nationality is a religious war. In a political war, in the upraisal for economic betterment, in the struggle for national independence, even if the war is lost, the consequences are not so catastrophic, as are the consequences of the religious war which destroys the main source of the strength of the people — unity, which is the core and the moral force of every nation. During these wars of the period of Reformation, there was every attempt to insert these disintegrating ideas of hatred among the Ukrainians, but without any noticeable result. It is interesting to observe, that these ideas of Prototestantism were propagated among the nation which had a natural aversion toward Hungarians in the mentality and in the language of the oppressors Hungarians. The movements among the German settlers were in German and they were directed from Germany among the co-nationals of Luther. Thus the Reformation did not have any success among the Ukrai-

---

(7) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, I, p. 94.

(8) Cfr. the description of the " Confessio Quintopolitana " of the towns of Levoča, Prjašiv, Košice, Bardyjiv and Sabyniv from 1568 year, in, J. BREZNYJK, *A selmechanyai ágostoni hitvallásu evangélikus egyház és lyceum.*



nians, because it was considered an unnatural element, averse to the nation's tradition and customs. Viceversa, in their Slavonic Rite, the Ukrainians found their national resource. This was their own rite; it was not strange to them, as the Latin Rite was for the Germans and Hungarians. To introduce the Reformation among the Ukrainians meant to destroy what later Hungarian policy of denationalization tried to destroy: the traditions, the rite, the culture, the customs of these Ukrainians (9). This was the greatest danger for these Ukrainians, but in these critical moments, the Providence of God sent to the leaderless nation individuals, who took upon themselves the great task of fighting for the spiritual and religious conservation of the nation. These individuals understood the critical situation and fought until the final ecclesiastical independence. This was not an organized effort; it was a silent, a most strategic rebellion of every individual for the conservation of the nation's faith, rite and future.

By the royal decree of August 22, 1785, serfdom was abolished (10), but in the practical life until the Second World War the inhabitants of Hungary were divided in three groups: *a*) the privileged class of nobles, *b*) the clergy of the Latin Rite and in many cases Protestant ministers, and *c*) the serfs.

*a*) The nobles were the core of the state. They took part in the legislative and political activities; they defended the interests of the state and of the king; they organized armies. For their faithful services, or for political motives, the kings rewarded them with many privileges, titles, lands, castles; they became heads of administrative districts, ministers, counselors and state officials. Because of their desire to profit from some of these opportunities, we find among the nobles, many individuals of Slav origin who became Hungarians.

*b*) On the same level as the nobles were the clergymen of the Latin Rite. They were freed from military services, but many times in the history of Hungary they fought on the side of the king, or defended the country from the Turks. Later, the Latin Rite clergy became very faithful to the idea of Christianization of the whole Hungary in the spirit of St. Stephen, the first Hungarian

---

(9) E. PERFECKIJ, *Religioznoje dvyženije v XVI i nač. XVII v. v Ugorskoj Rusi*, in "Izviščeniya otd. Russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti," 1915, p. 41.

(10) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, II, p. 64.

king. This meant to place the church to a complete service of the state and of growing Hungarian nationalism.

c) The worst was the situation of the serfs. As in the Roman Empire, so in Hungary this "massa odiosa" was completely without rights and privileges. The serfs were the source of potential riches for the nobles. Even if taxes and forced labor were established by the legislative offices of the state, every noble, every land or castle owner, according to his own disposition and profit made his own laws; this was another burden for these serfs, and only as an exception sort of betterment. The serfs had to pay taxes to the king, to the landowner, and to the clergy.

This was the condition of the non-united of Prja:ivščyna. Their leaders were nobles of an alien nationality. As serfs, they were excluded from the political and public life of the state. The only thing left to them was their faith in God, their Church, their rite. But even in the field of religion they were considered the outcasts of the Hungarian society. Their Church was in a miserable condition, while their priests were not different from the serfs, having to work also for the landowners. These priests did not have the right to collect the usual tithes for their religious, church services from their faithful. As it has been mentioned, in the year 1443 King Ladislaus I for the first time gave to the non-united priests the same rights, which the Latin Rite clergy enjoyed. In 1481 and in 1495 the king decided finally that these non-united Ukrainian faithful should pay tithes to their own priests, and not to the priests of the Latin Rite (11). Yet, even if the king freed the non-united priests from the king's tithes, the local landowners forced them, as all other serfs, to pay them local taxes and to perform definite manual labors. How could these priests perform their ecclesiastical duties, when for the omission of those labors, scourging and jail were waiting for them? It was very easy for the Latin Rite clergy to condemn their ignorance in theological sciences and to make sarcastic remarks about their situation. Did they make at least an effort to better these conditions? To find the right solution of this critical problem, the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna, as the whole body of the non-united Church of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Zakarpattā, concluded the union with the Catholic Church. There was no other way to secure the future of their faith and Church. The nobles had to realize that it was time

---

(11) I. BATHYAN, *Leges Ecclesiasticae Regni Hungariae*, I, p. 516; O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, I, p. 102.

when they should treat the united clergy as the clergy of Latin Rite, according to the same laws and privileges.

During the occupation of the Central part of Hungary by the Turks, the Western part belonged to the Austrian Empire, the Eastern part, with Zakarpattá was under the Prince of Transylvania. The borders of these three powers were unstable. The continuous battles also made life unbearable. The border between the lands of the Emperor and the Prince of Transylvania was not too far from Prjašivščyna, near the town of Seredně. According to the Bishop of Cholm, Jacob Suša, Zakarpattá, from immemorial times, in ecclesiastical matters were subject to the Bishop of Peremyšl (12). Therefore, the Catholic owner of Humenne and Užhorod, George Drugeth, with the auspices and blessings of the Catholic Bishop of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Peremyšl, tried to reinforce the movement to unite these Ukrainians of his lands with the Catholic Church. This help from the part of lay authority brought a considerable betterment in the ecclesiastical life of the people. Meanwhile on the other side of the Carpathian Mountains, came great changes. At the Synod of Berest, in 1596, part of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite clergy and bishops became united with the Catholic Church. Being under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Peremyšl and having continuous relations with the clergy of Halyčyna, the priests of Prjašivščyna began also to act. There were many obstacles in their way, but the hope to unite with the Catholic Church found a solid foundation in their hearts.

Encouraged by the events of the union in Berest, the Bishop of Mukačevo, Volodyslav II (1565-1597), personally appeared in the palace of King Rudolph II (1576-1608) in Prague, to protest against the unjust oppression of the people and clergy on the part of the local landowners (13). The bishop intended first of all to free himself from the oppression of the owner of Mukačevo, Sigmund Rákoczy, then the other problems, he hoped, would be solved with less difficulties. The bishop protested at the time of the union in Berest, because then it became evident what the Holy Union could bring to the whole nation. The bishop and the clergy saw that this union would conserve their precious rite; the Slavonic liturgy would flourish again; the national traditions and culture would be reborn; even the rights of the people would be respected and kept. In the reli-

---

(12) *Okm.*, 209.

(13) *Okm.*, 31.

gious life, the union would bring an orderly constitution to their Church and hierarchy as well as the renewal of the spiritual life of the faithful and the clergy. It would open the window toward the rest of the world; to have their candidates for the priesthood educated in the seminaries and universities of Vienna, Prague, and even of Rome. As it did for their co-nationals on the other side of Carpathian Mountains, this union could mean equal rights with the clergy of the Latin Rite. Their bishop could become, as other bishops of Hungary, a member of parliament, where he could appeal for a just intervention of civil authority, or even the authority of the king. They would not be defenseless anymore, because if the king would not take care of their justice, they would appeal to the Supreme Pontiff in Rome. Their priests would be free from compulsory serf labors and from the unbearable taxes of landowners; they would be helped with the offerings from their own parishioners; they would have more opportunity to dedicate their time and efforts to the spiritual cares of the faithful; in one word — in the Holy Union, they foresaw a complete renewal of their church and rite, which could foster an independent, free life of their nation. But their troubles had just begun.

The Catholic owner of Prjašivščyna, Count George Drugeth, tried to bring the Ukrainian clergy of his lands to the union with the Catholic Church. The jurisdiction of the non-united bishop of Mukačevo was limited to the borders of the Principality of Transylvania. Therefore, Drugeth planned to have on his lands the bishop of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in the monastery of Krasnyj Brid. Thus, with the agreement of the Latin Rite Bishop of Peremyšl, Drugeth in September, 1613, summoned from Halyčyna the Bishop Athanasius Krupeckyj, already united with the Catholic Church (14). Immediately after his arrival, Bishop Krupeckyj made many personal contacts with the priests and monks of Mukačevo to unite all the clergy and faithful of Zakarpattá with the Catholic Church. There was no possibility to contact Bishop Sergius, because due to fear from Rákoczy or other motives, he was temporarily absent from Mukačevo (15). In a short time Bishop Krupeckyj had fifty priests inclined toward union (16). These priests wanted to see the bishop celebrate the Divine Liturgy, because for them one of the essential

---

(14) A. THEINER, *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae*, III, p. 357.

(15) A. BARAN, *Metropolita Kioviensis et eparchia Mukačoviensis*, p. 53.

(16) E. PETRUŠEVYČ, *Svodnaja Letopis 1600-1700*, pp. 420-421.

conditions was the conservation of their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. When they saw that the bishop did not change even one liturgical ceremony, these priests professed publicly the act of obedience to the bishop and to the Roman Pontiff. In his sermon Bishop Krupeckyj admonished the clergy not to seek a revenge for injustice, that he himself would try for the fulfillment of the law and the restitution of properties.

The church-building of the monastery of Krasnyj Brid during the rebellions and recent wars had been noticeably damaged. With the financial help of Count Drugeth it was restored as the future Cathedral Church. The remodeled and restored church supposed to be re-dedicated on the feast of Pentecost, 1614. There were 13,000 people present at this event and they came from distant villages, even from Halyčyna, with their priests and families. The bishop, supervising the finishing touches of internal decorations ordered the temporary closing of the church to correct one detail of the artist. This was a sufficient reason for the agitators and those priests who opposed the union to start a commotion. Telling the pilgrims, that the bishop intended to close the church permanently, thus turning this religious celebration into a rebellion. An angry mob of people broke into the church and almost killed the bishop, saved by the soldiers of Count Drugeth. Even if Bishop Krupeckyj did not succeed completely, the two years of his apostolic activity, his prayers and bloody sacrifice brought beneficial results (17).

After this tragic event, Bishop Krupeckyj left the territory of Prjašivščyna. After thirty years the situation changed completely, in connection with the activity of Bishop of Mukačevo, Basil Tarasovyč. After he was arrested, for becoming a Catholic, the Catholic noblemen and prelates made every effort to have him freed from jail. (18). What a colossal change! Until now nobody had cared about the non-united; from this moment every Catholic lay or church-leader, including the king, used all his influence to free Bishop Tarasovyč. In the union of Bishop Tarasovyč everybody saw the future union of the whole nation of Ukrainians on this side of the Carpathian Mountains. The seed planted by Bishop Krupeckyj started to grow. Prince Rákoczy was afraid that he would lose many properties and working hands. To free himself from embarrassment, he forced Bishop Tarasovyč to sign very unfavorable conditions,

---

(17) M. LACKO, *Unio Užhorodensis*, pp. 46-50.

(18) *Okm.*, p. 76 ss.

July 12, 1641 (19) and only on September 12, 1641 did he set the bishop free (20). Not losing time, Bishop Tarasovyč went to Vienna, where he made a Profession of the Catholic Faith in the Court's chapel (21). As a Catholic bishop, he could not return to the lands of Rákoczy. Following the invitation of Drugeth, Bishop Tarasovyč settled in Kallovo, Prjašivščyna, where the idea of union found a very solid ground in the hearts of zealous priests and faithful.

---

(19) *Okm.*, p. 105.

(20) APF, SR, v. 83, f. 44.

(21) APF, SR, v. 85, f. 182.

### III. THE UNION WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Bishop Tarasovyč knew that his flock would follow his example. Prjašivščyna was already on the way to union, but to influence the rest of his flock, it was necessary for him to return to Mukačevo. If he would return as the united Catholic bishop, he would be arrested again and from jail he would not be able to conduct the rest of his faithful to a union with the Catholic Church. Who would be able to continue this important undertaking? The worst difficulty for him was the nomination by Rákoczy of the non-united priests from Dorobratovo, John Yusko — a fiery enemy of union — as the Bishop of Mukačevo (1). Tarasovyč gave a great deal of thought to the final decision. This was the proper moment to act. To have further influence on the priests, to avoid arrest by Rákoczy, and also to perform the act of union, Tarasovyč declared before the civil authorities and before Rákoczy, that he did not consider himself united and Catholic, but a non-united bishop (2). He had to resign his state pension in Kallovo and only then Rákoczy re-nominated him the Bishop of Mukačevo, allowing him to use certain privileges (3).

Bishop Tarasovyč risked his soul for his faithful and for the purpose of union with the Catholic Church (4). Before he would close his eyes forever, on his death-bed, he obliged priests present to promise with an oath, that after his death they would elect as his successor Parthenius, one of his most reliable collaborators in this union (5). Into the hands of God Tarasovyč commended his soul and into the hands of Parthenius he commended the great task of union.

Keeping their oath, after the death of Tarasovyč, the priests elected Peter Parthenius the Bishop of Mukačevo (6). To avoid any other complication, Partenius took the first occasion to leave Mu-

---

(1) *Okm.*, p. 146.

(2) *ASV, SR*, v. 575, f. 525v.

(3) *Okm.*, p. 156.

(4) *Tört.*, p. 314.

(5) *Okm.* p. 158.

(6) *Okm.*, pp. 158-160.

kačevo and the dominion of Rákoczy. Living in Užhorod, on the territory of Drugeth, Parthenius applied all his effort to spread unity among Ukrainians. In Mukačevo, Rákoczy again reappointed John Yusko as non-united bishop. For Parthenius it was the most logical conclusion to start the work for the union on the lands of Drugeth, where a solid ground has been prepared by Bishop Tarasovyč. In fact, the widow of John Drugeth, Anna Jakušyč, used every opportunity to help Parthenius and his flock to embrace the Catholic Faith. For this purpose she donated to Parthenius a house in Užhorod, sending also a messenger to her brother, the Latin Rite Bishop of Eger, George Jakušyč, who came to confer with Parthenius (7). Parthenius then invited his sixty-three priests to the synod in Užhorod, where they declared, that with the help of the Holy Spirit and by their free decision, they would unite with the Catholic Church. The second part of the synod was held on the name-day of Bishop George Jakušyč, on the feast of St. George, April 24, 1646, in the chapel of the Drugeth's castle, in Užhorod. Parthenius celebrated solemn divine liturgy, with the concelebration and the assistance of priests present. After the liturgy all sixty-three priests made the Profession of Faith. These were the conditions of the Holy Union: 1) they would retain their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, 2) they would elect their own bishop, who would be confirmed by the Roman Pontiff, 3) they would enjoy the same rights and privileges, as did the Latin Rite clergy. The main protagonists of the union with the Catholic Church in Prjašivščyna and Zakarpatta were Bishops Krupeckyj, Tarasovyč and Parthenius. The territory included the districts of Užhorod and of Prjašivščyna, where the Ukrainians of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite lived. Those sixty-three priests were located in six arch-deaconates and four of these were in Prjašivščyna, namely: Father Alexius Lodomerskyj, the arch-deacon of Makovycja, Father Stephen Andrijkovyč, the arch-deacon of Spiš, Father George Hostovyckyj, the arch-deacon of Humenne, and Father Alexius Fylypovyč, the arch-deacon of Stropkiv (8).

There were many difficulties yet to overcome, the greatest of which were caused by Catholics of the Latin Rite. Even after Parthenius had made the profession of faith and recognized the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, even after he had been cleared of all irregularities, the Latin Rite clergy considered him and his

---

(7) *Ibidem*, p. 215.

(8) ASV, NV, v. 79, f. 53-54; ASV, SCC, a. 1771, f. 171-172.



priests as second-rate Catholics and his Byzantine-Slavonic Rite as inferior to the Latin Rite. Parthenius was not allowed to celebrate the divine liturgy, but had to receive holy communion in the Latin Rite in the Jesuits' chapel (9). The primate of Hungary, George Lippay, wrote to Rome, asking the Apostolic See to erect in this land an eparchy for the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, to unite to the Catholic Church the rest of the non-united and to absolve Parthenius of irregularity, since he was consecrated by the Orthodox metropolitan (10). Out of 769 priests of Zakarpaťa, 313 became Catholics. Non-united priests in the dominions of Rákoczy were willing to embrace union with the Catholic Church, but they had to overcome the last obstacle — Rákoczy, who was an enemy of the Hapsburgs and, consequently, of the Catholic Church.

In the territory of Prjašivščyna, during Bishop Parthenius' time existed the following: the proto-presbyterate of Spiš, temporarily vacant, with the parishes in Rejpaš, Olšavycja, Toryska, Porač, Zavadka, Slovinka, Hodermark, Osturňa, Lypnyk and two or three others.

The proto-presbyter of Šariš was Father Peter Bukoveckyj. There were parishes in Šambron, Bajirovci, Gromoš, Pustopole, Jastrabje, Kyjiv, Renčyšovo, Miklošovci, Pekľany, Šoma, Hanikovci, GERALTOVO, Hradisko, Rešiv, Liviv, Lukiv, Gerlachiv, Hrabske, Spakov, Gereš, Orliv, Legňava, Starina, Matisova, Kružľova.

The proto-presbyter of Makovycja, Father Zeleňak, pastor of Poľana, in the district of Zboriv, had thirty priests with parishes. The other proto-presbyter of Makovycja, Father Rovanskyj, was a superior over thirty parishes and priests.

The arch-deaconate of Stropkiv was divided into two proto-presbyterates, each with thirty parishes and priests.

The arch-deacon of Humenne, Father Blažovskij, had to take care of three proto-presbyterates with sixty parishes and priests.

The arch-presbyter of Nove Misto had sixty parishes and priests. Even if the bishop did sign his name as the Bishop of Spiš, eleven parishes of the Spiš district were under the administration of the Latin Rite chapter of the Bishop of Spiš (11).

---

(9) *Okm*, p. 168.

(10) *Okm*, p. 165.

(11) J. DULYŠKOVYČ, *Istoryčeskija Čerty*, II, p. 110.

#### IV. PRJAŠIVŠČYNA AS PART OF THE EPARCHY OF MUKAČEVO

Analyzing the past, we can now conclude how many sacrifices had to be made by the Ukrainian faithful of Zakarpattia just to preserve their faithfulness to the Apostolic See of Rome and their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The period between 1646 and 1771 from the Union of Užhorod until the canonical erection of the Eparchy of Mukachevo could be called the period of fight for an independent life. During these long hundred-twenty-five years much energy and time were wasted. If these had been used for something positive, the whole situation of the Catholic Church in Zakarpattia and even Hungary as a whole could have been better in many aspects.

The kings of Hungary were "de facto" protectors of the Catholic Church of the Latin Rite. Many times they did wonderful and noble gestures toward the Church. Being zealous Catholics, they tried to propagate the Catholic Church on the territory of their state, donating lands and financial help to the Church, to the bishops, to ecclesiastical institutions and monasteries. On the contrary, many times these kings abused their privileges, making impossible demands of Church authorities and interfering with the affairs of the Church, so that their zeal often brought more harm than good to the Church.

During the centuries, in the circles of the Hungarian nobility and clergy, an extreme trend of nationalistic pride started to develop. It was nothing else, but fanatic disrespect for everything, which did not bear the mark of Hungarian culture, language, or religion. All Christians, even Catholics, who were not Hungarians, were the object of their scorn and laughter, and considered as a second rate Christians. This is remarkable in the conduct of Hungarian church-dignitaries and clergy in the matters concerning the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The whole fight for the independence of the eparchy of Mukachevo in fact consisted in this. Today, to a fair-minded person, this would appear strange and unbelievable but the facts cannot be denied. The conduct of the Latin Rite Bishop of Eger and his priests will serve as an outstanding example. They tried everything to suffocate the independent ecclesiastical life of the faithful of Zakarpattia.

Both parties, the Hungarians — the Bishop of Eger and the Ukrainians — the Bishop of Mukačevo, knew that upon this fight depended the national survival of the Ukrainians under the Carpathian Mountains. This is why these contentions became so fiery and exaggerated. Hungarians used all, even dishonest means, in order to destroy any non-Hungarian minority. On the other hand, the Zakarpattians knew, that if they did not use honest and just means, they would lose their battle and with it their cause (1). They placed all their hope in God, because they were a stateless nation and had to fight against the persons and institutions who had the law in their own hands. They knew, that the defeat of their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, and the loss of their ecclesiastical independence could mean the suppression of their culture, their national traditions, and their language. If they could not have their own eparchy, their national existence would also be jeopardised. In those difficult times there was only one harbor of safety, where they could pray to God in their own language, that is their churches, and they prayed.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Hungarian kings forced non-Hungarian subjects to become Catholics of the Latin Rite. The same tactics were used by the Latin Rite clergy in XVII and XVIII centuries, after the union. What a bitter disappointment this was for united Ukrainians! It was not difficult for the Bishop of Eger to inform in his own interest the Papal Nuncio in Vienna about the progress of the union and of the situation of the Catholics in the eparchy of Mukačevo. Could the Nuncio have any doubt about the honesty and truthfulness of a bishop? Could he suspect any dishonest purpose? Could he even suspect that the Bishop of Eger would misinform him and twist Cannon Law to suit his own purposes? For the Ukrainians any defense became hopeless, because the personal contacts of the Bishop of Eger with the State Chancery and with the other high officials made it almost completely lost. All these sent their unfavorable informations about the Ukrainians to the Apostolic See. This was the reason why the process for the canonical erection of the eparchy of Mukačevo, the only eparchy of Ukrainians in Hungary, became a tedious affair. When the cause of the Ukrainians to have their own eparchy in Rome was frustrated by the Bishop of Eger, the Ukrainians attempted to push their affair through the empress Maria Theresa, but even she resigned from

---

(1) J. DULYŠKOVYČ, *o.c.*, III, p. 194 ss.

this enterprise during the pontificate of Clement XIII. Answering a new appeal of Ukrainians against injustice, Maria Theresa renewed the process of canonization of Mukačevo Eparchy under Pope Clement XIV. Now, the supreme dicasteries of the Apostolic See began the process of the erection of the eparchy. After a hundred-twenty-five years of legal procrastination, the Eparchy of Mukačevo was finally erected, under Pope Clement XIV in 1771, as independent of Eger and from any other Hungarian Latin Rite Bishop (2).

The newly erected eparchy included the northeastern territory of Hungary, where the Ukrainians lived. Bishop Andrew Bačynskyj (1773-1809), following the instructions of Maria Theresa, but without permission of the Apostolic See, in 1775 transferred the episcopal see from Mukačevo to Užhorod. The empress donated the monastery and the church of the abolished Jesuit Fathers to the eparchy, which edifices became the cathedral church and the residence of the Bishop of the eparchy of Mukačevo (3) until the total liquidation of the Catholics of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite by the Bolsheviks in the year 1947. The former castle of Drugeths' family became the theological seminary. In the entire eparchy there were made great reforms which brought tremendous results of a complete religious and cultural renewal.

There is enormous difference between the Union of the Ukrainians of Zakarpattia concluded in Užhorod, in year 1646 and the Union of Ukraine and Bjelarusj concluded in Berest, in year 1595. While the Ukrainian Bishops of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite dealt directly with the Apostolic See, sending a special delegation to Rome to conclude and to perform the requested formalities, the Bishop of Mukačevo dealt only with the Latin Rite Bishop of Eger. For this historical mistake the Ukrainians of Zakarpattia had to pay an enormous price.

It is not too difficult to analyze how the losers, the Bishop of Eger and his allies, felt after the erection of the Mukačevo eparchy. They did not stop the fight against the eparchy of Mukačevo, even after the latter was canonically erected by Rome and confirmed by the empress. The Hungarians wanted to destroy it completely. They did not pay attention to the bulls and official documents, to

---

(2) ASV, ACC, 1771; ASV, NV, v. 79; N. PEKAR, *De erectione canonica eparchiae Mukačoviensis*, historically and juridically analyzes the problems of the canonical erection.

(3) J. BASILOVITS, *o.c.*, v. 46 ss.

the Apostolic See and State Chancery of the empress. They continued to resist, but finally they had to admit their defeat (4). They gave up the fight, but they always took their revenge, when the opportunity presented itself.

During the first division of Poland, in 1773, Halyčyna was incorporated into Austria. The State Secretary, Baron Püchler, already on March 3, 1774, conferred with the Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna, informing him, that the empress Maria Theresa intended to create for the Ukrainians of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Austro-Hungary an independent church-administrative province, with the metropolitan see and the first metropolitan would be the Bishop of Mukačevo eparchy, Andrew Bačynskyj. With joy the Nuncio forwarded this news to Rome, making a statement that this plan was identical to the plan of the Cardinal Secretary of the State, and the Pope (5). But the Hungarian State Chancery had completely different plan, pushing forward their political pretensions regarding Halyčyna. They alleged these reasons: for their interest, the emperor of Austro-Hungary, as the king of Hungary, had also the title of king of the Halyč-Volyň State; therefore, they claimed that Halyčyna should be annexed not to Austria, but to Hungary. The Hungarian State Chancery wanted the Bishop of Mukačevo, elevated as the metropolitan, to retain his see of Užhorod as a metropolitan see, and all the bishops, even the Bishops of Halyčyna, be placed under his jurisdiction as suffragans (6). In Vienna, it was decided that after the incorporation of Halyčyna to Austria, Halyčyna would no more belong to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kiev. This was the reason they wanted to create an independent metropolitan see for the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Lviv. The metropolitan of this province would have also the jurisdiction over the Bishop of Mukačevo. The plans of the Austrian officials seemed to be better than those of Hungarian Chancery; therefore, the clergy of Halyčyna, under the leadership of Father John Gudz, persuaded Vienna to reach a definite decision for the erection of a metropolitan see in Lviv (7). Now the Hungarian government began to isolate the Ukrainians of Zakarpattá from every contact with Halyčyna in order to denationalize them completely.

---

(4) ASV, NV, v. 232, f. 210; ASV, NG, v. 704, December 20, 1806.

(5) ASV, NG, v. 393-4, f. 328.

(6) I. HARASIEWICZ, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*, p. 579.

(7) A. S. PETRUŠEVYČ, *Svodnaja Galycko-Russkaja Letopysj rr. 1772-1800*, p. 125.

The problem of union with the Catholic Church was of great interest to the Bishops of Eger. They wanted this union, in their own way — in order to destroy the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. They did everything that could serve this purpose. When they helped some candidate to the priesthood, they made all efforts to educate Ukrainian seminarians in a complete contempt of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and nationality. During the time of the Bishop of Mukačevo, Manuel Olšavskyj, (1743-1767), there were made attempts by the Bishop of Eger to educate our young men in this kind of spirit. They did not realize, that a natural, human reaction would bring the opposite results — the definite consciousness of their own nationality. The type of priestly training can be recognized from the fact that all those seminarians educated in Eger withdrew from the Latin Rite seminary (8).

When during Bishop Bačynskyj's time, in 1778, an eparchial seminary was being erected in Užhorod, the Bishop of Eger could not see the progress of the eparchy of the Ukrainians and tried to stop it. Now he had to change his tactics, and suddenly he became a great protector of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. In his letters to the Apostolic See he always mentioned the faithfulness and zeal of the Ukrainian clergy not so much for the Catholic Church but most of all for the Latin Rite. The Bishop of Eger conceived an idea, that the seminarians from Zakarpattá should be educated in foreign countries, and not in their native land of Zakarpattá, in their own traditions and customs. In a letter to the Secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, dated October 15, 1772, the Bishop of Eger, Charles Eszterházy, wrote that in his estimation it would be best for the seminarians of Eger, studying at the Propaganda Fide, to have an instructor of the Eastern Rites who would not only fight the abuses, but correct the errors which had been caused by the priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite (9). This was nothing else but a slow process of latinization of Eastern Rite. There was no logic in the statement of the bishop. At this time, there was only a small percentage of non-united in Zakarpattá and the errors and abuses had to be eradicated not by the clergy of the Latin but of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. What sort of errors and abuses were spread among the faithful? The Bishop of Eger considered as abuse the long fight for the independence of the Mukačevo eparchy and,

---

(8) HODINKA, *Tört.*, p. 770; J. DULYŠKOVYČ, *o.c.*, III, p. 220 ss.

(9) APF, SR, *Greci di Croazia...*, 1761-1845, v. 2, f. 442.

in a few cases, its deplorable religious situation. But who created this situation? Bishop of Eger was now ready to act and to help for his own benefit, but he had to forsake his intent, because in 1775 a seminary of St. Barbara in Vienna was erected for the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite seminarians of the Austro-Hungarian lands (10).

These lines might seem to appear perhaps as long, continuous accusations of the past politics of Hungarian nationalism. In this case we would like to suggest the study of the original documents. These documents will tell about the past of the Ukrainians of Zakarpattia, which was nothing else but a continuous fight against the aggressiveness of Hungarian nationalistic politics. It would be unjust to assign all these failures to the sophisticated nationalistic politics of Hungarians.

In the letter to the Apostolic Nuncio, dated September 1, 1777, the Bishop of Eger again sent his false information: "I shall not miss to inform Your Excellency, what is happening among the Ukrainians, omitting certain facts. Through Your Excellency's great wisdom is known the kind of discretion and suspicion we must contend with the united" (11). According to these flattering words, only God knew what those Ukrainians were devising, and even if it should seem publicly that they are good Catholics, faithful to the Apostolic See, nobody could confide in them, because at any moment they were capable of breaking their promise and leaving the Catholic Church. Isn't this statement a complete detraction, or an effort to destroy the Ukrainians' reputation before the Holy See?

Thank God, Vienna completely ignored this attempt of revenge. From the short existence of the eparchy of Mukačevo, the civil authorities came to the conclusion that it was necessary to erect more independent eparchies for minorities of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, who belonged to the Catholic Church. The non-united Christians of Hungary had many bishops, under the supervision of a metropolitan. It was the decision of the Court of Vienna to erect two new independent eparchies of the Byzantine Rite, the eparchy of Kryževci and that of Gran Varadin (Oradea Mare). From the case of the Ukrainians they hoped that this would be the right way to induce the non-united to embrace the Catholic Church. Such was the answer to those "informations" of the Bishop of Eger, which proved that

---

(10) A. ANDRUCHOVÝČ, *Vidensjke Barbareum*, p. 59; ASV, NG, v. 395, f. 81.

(11) ASV, NV, v. 126, f. 17.

his accusations of Ukrainians to the Holy See were completely unfounded.

The erection of the independent eparchies of the Byzantine Rite and the exemption of these bishops from the jurisdiction of the local Latin Rite Bishop, was the only way to confirm the loyalty of the united with Rome, and to induce the non-united to join the Catholic Church. The civil authorities also brought the facts that in those districts where Catholics of both rites live, the faithful and the clergy of the Byzantine Rite, due to experiences of the past, will never trust those who cheated them. They will never be persuaded to come under the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite bishop. On the contrary, if they keep their rite, if they have an independent ecclesiastical-administrative life, then even those non-united of the same rite, in the near future will embrace the Catholic Church. The united as well as the non-united faithful of the non-Hungarian minorities in their rite considered the conservation of their national traditions and culture; to force them to be under the Hungarian priests and bishops of the Latin Rite meant to force them to pray and to worship God in the Hungarian language and Hungarian Latin Rite. The result was a complete rebellion against this unnatural procedure. What the Hungarians were doing — was against the natural law. Rome had to take all these into consideration; they had to forget about the suggestion of the Bishop of Eger, especially in the nomination and confirmation of the bishops of the Byzantine Rite. To prove this point, the officials of Vienna set forth some reasons for the local circumstances. Hungary — the document continues — is the state where the Catholic religion is dominating, where the kings were and are Catholics. Therefore, following supernatural, spiritual motives, the kings also in the future would try to spread the teaching of the Catholic Church among their subjects. These subjects, disregarding the differences of rites, will not have the right to elect their bishops. This right will be reserved to the king himself, who from now on will nominate the bishops for both rites. From now on, the king will also provide that the election and nomination of the bishops of the state will be according to the ecclesiastical and political constitution (12). In the future, according to the state's constitution, those priests will be elected and nominated as bishops whose loyalty and faithfulness are generally known. The canons and the archimandrites will be also nominated by the king and not elected by the

---

(12) ASV, ACC, 1776, f. 227v and ss.



faithful or monks. All the bishops of the Byzantine Rite will be subject to the Archbishop of Esztergom as to the metropolitan, who is the Primate of Hungary. It will be his duty and task to take care of the welfare and growth of the union with the Catholic Church, and he had to do it in such a manner that it will not cause mistrust from national motives and hostility between the rites. The archbishop of Esztergom in opportune time has to detect and to suffocate those eventual misunderstandings, provocations, and prejudices detrimental to the union. To satisfy and to silence the Bishop of Eger, it was provided that the candidates to the priesthood of the Byzantine Rite would be, at least temporarily, educated in the seminaries of the Latin Rite and in this way they planned to solve the hostility and ritual prejudices. Finally, if even these reasons were insufficient, then the obligation of all the Bishops of Hungary to make the profession of the faith yearly to the Primate must remove any cause of mistrust and of suspicion (13).

---

(13) ASV, NV, v. 155, f. 88.

## V. THE ERECTION OF THE VICARIATE IN KOŠICE

In the western part of Prjašivščyna, on the southeastern slopes of High Tatry, on the territory called the district of Spiš, from memorable times lived Ukrainians. They settled here, when the Slav tribes occupied these territories. Here ended the borders of the Great Moravian State. After the Hungarian invasion of Pannonia, the district of Spiš and its inhabitants during a thousand years shared their life with the rest of Ukrainians of Zakarpattia. The part of Spiš belonged to the kingdom of Poland, and the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Peremyšl. During the reign of the Hungarian King, Zigmund, in year 1412, Spiš was incorporated into Hungary (1). During the rebellion of Transylvania against Austria, Prjašivščyna was owned by the powerful family of Drugeth. As good Catholic, count Drugeth fostered progress of religious life of his subjects. Since the episcopal see in Mukačevo was in the territory of the rebels, to promote religious-ecclesiastical life, Drugeth asked the Latin Rite Bishop of Peremyšl to send to his lands of Prjašivščyna a Bishop of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The petition was granted and in 1613-1614 the territory of Prjašivščyna became the terrain of the apostolic, unionistic activities of the Ukrainian Bishop Anthanasius Krupekyj, who established his provisional see in Krasnyj Brid.

During the episcopacy of Parthenius, Prjašivščyna was divided into ecclesiastical-administrative districts, such as arch-deaconates and proto-presbyterates. Bishop Parthenius, in 1662, was forced to leave eleven parishes of Spiš district to be governed by the Latin Rite chapter of the diocese of Spiš (2). During the period of rebellion, chaos and bitter fight for the canonical independence of the eparchy of Mukačevo, the question of these eleven parishes became less important. The Latin Rite bishop and clergy did not mistreat

---

(1) A. DUCHNOVICS, *Chronologica Historia*, p. 3.

(2) It was approved on the session of Hungarian State Chancery, July 26, 1776. Cfr. APF, SR, Greci di Croazia... a. 1761-1845, v. II, f. 538. The document of the incorporation in ASV, ACC, 177, f. 224.

the faithful of these eleven parishes, but they did all that was possible to be again incorporated to the eparchy of the same rite. After the erection of the diocese of Rožňava, part of these parishes came under this diocese's jurisdiction, while other parts belonged to the archdiocese of Esztergom.

When there came the question of erecting the eparchy of Gran-Varadin of the Byzantine Rite, the criterion of the juridical belonging of the parishes was the nationality of parishioners. A very thorough study was made and according to it, the Romanian parishes had to belong to the eparchy of Gran-Varadin; Ukrainian parishes — to that of Mukačevo. Using the same criterion, Bishop Bačynskyj now appealed to the State Chancery, that those parishes, which during the time of Bishop Parthenius had become subject to the Latin Rite chapter of Spiš, and those four parishes of the diocese of Rožňava, should be again incorporated into his eparchy. The State Chancery officially annexed these parishes to the eparchy of Mukačevo, April 8, 1777 (2), but even then the realization of this decision took a long time and a great deal of energy.

In the same year a new Latin Rite diocese of Spiš was erected. The diocese included the northern parts of the archdiocese of Esztergom and of the diocese of Rožňava. The bishop of the newly erected diocese of Spiš, Charles Salbek, did not even want to listen to the dismembration of these parishes. The decisions of the State Chancery and of the emperor did not help a bit! The pride of the bishop was hurt. Now the disobedience to the emperor's order became a matter of patriotism of the Hungarians. As the bishop, he had to be the father to all his faithful, and not discriminate against the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. He began mercilessly to oppress them forcing them to accept the Latin Rite. The pontifical bulls and the decisions of the Congregation of the Propaganda about the faithful of the Byzantine Rite did not help. The stubborn bishop intended by all means to achieve his unjust goal. The priests and faithful started to defend their rite as they could. On July 25, 1780 a meeting was called in the village of Slovinka, where the priests discussed the plan of the defense of their rite. In 1781 from these plans a memorandum was made, in which the toleration of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and the propagation of the union with the Catholic Church in Hungary was discussed. There is no need to say, how much these initiatives irritated the proud bishop. He ignored all the petitions of the priests, and deprived the Pastor of Slovinka, Father Basil Jamborskyj, of all priestly functions, and sent him for

penitential spiritual exercises to the convent of the Minorite Fathers in Prjašiv (3).

For the final decision in this matter, it was necessary to appeal to Rome through the Papal Nuncio in Vienna, as well as to the emperor, through the newly erected Deans' Council of Hungary, which was under the influence of the Bishop of Eger, known for his contentions against the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite eparchy of Mukačevo. But even then the faithful of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Spiš did not give up their rights.

Returning from Lviv to Vienna, on August 11, 1786, the emperor Joseph II arrived at Prjašiv. After the official reception, during the private audience, the assistant pastor of Hodermark, Father Michael Kaňuk, (later the canon of the eparchy of Prjašiv) in the name of these eleven parishes forwarded a petition for the annexation of these parishes to the eparchy of Mukačevo. This was granted and the Deans' Council the same year ordered Bishop Bačynskyj to accept personally these eleven parishes and to incorporate them into his eparchy as soon as possible, for the faithful already were losing their patience with the imprudent conduct of the Latin Rite Bishop, Charles Salbek. About this matter the Council informed the Vicar General of the diocese of Spiš, Jastremsky, when on August 31, 1786 Bishop Bačynskyj asked for the explanation of the emperor's decree, the Council answered, that the will of the emperor was "to return their own to their own" (4).

The Latin Rite Bishop of Spiš finally saw his mistake. To satisfy the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and to keep them under his own jurisdiction in the future, the bishop appointed as his Vicar General, the "rebel" priest of Slovinka, Father Basil Jam-borskyj. But this diplomatic change came too late.

In a letter of September, 1786 Bishop Bačynskyj notified the Bishop of Spiš, that to accomplish the decision of the emperor on October 8 and 9 he would arrive to Spiš. But the Council by the letter of September 26, 1786 advised Bishop Bačynskyj to wait with the annexation of these parishes (5).

In 1776, during the canonical erection of the eparchies of Gran-Varadin and of Krýževci (6), in the circles of the Latin Rite hierarchy

---

(3) The article *Pamjat' Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 8, 1868.

(4) *Ibidem*: A. BARAN, *Epyskop Andrej Bačynskyj*, p. 48.

(5) *Ibidem*.

(6) ASV, ACC, 1776, f. 351 ss.

the idea to divide the eparchy of Mukačevo was brought up. These were behind the scene revenges of the Bishop of Eger. Knowing that he was now powerless against the bulls of the Pope and the decrees of the emperor, he changed his tactics to divide the eparchy. Since a direct fight became meaningless he, therefore, conceived this idea just to obstruct the progress of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Zakarpattá. He also used all his influence that more important offices in the eparchy fell into the hands of those individuals, who were sympathetic to the Hungarian national policy.

Pretending to be objective, the Deans' Council asked for the information of the Latin Rite clergy of the diocese of Spiš. The Latin Rite Pastor of Levoča, Count Michael Brigido, simply denied the unjust treatment of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite faithful (7), but he strongly recommended that the best solution for the faithful of both rites would be if those eleven parishes would belong to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Mukačevo. Even though he contradicted himself, nevertheless, he tried to find a compromising solution.

In Vienna already there was the project of Bishop Bačynskyj of September 14, 1786, suggesting that all parishes of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Western districts belong to their own bishop and to provide for the spiritual needs of these faithful, it would be an excellent idea to erect a Vicariate in Košice or in Prjašiv. In any case, if this would appear impossible, then from these parishes at least an arch-diaconate should be erected, which would be under the jurisdiction of Mukačevo bishop.

Finally, after eleven years of procrastination, overcoming "all difficulties," on February 3, 1787, the Deans' Council annexed all eleven Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes into the eparchy of Mukačevo. With the decree of April 23, 1787 the following eleven parishes were dismembered from the Latin Rite diocese of Spiš: Nyžnyj Repaš, Helcmanovci, Hodermark, Kojsiv, Lypnyk, Olšavicja, Osturňa, Porač, Slovinka, Torysky and Zavadka. From the eparchy of Peremyšl: Kamjanka, Jakubova, Litmanova, Jarembyna and Sulyn (8). The Bishop of Rožňava did not want to agree on the separation of these parishes, unless he would have the confirmation from Rome. This was very difficult to obtain because of the political situation in Europe, but, finally, on May 7, 1787, he consented to release from

---

(7) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynkaho*, in "Svit," June 8, 1868.

(8) *Ibidem*.

his jurisdiction these nine parishes: Holnyci, Remeta, Svedler, Wagendrüssel, Žakovci, Pragendorf, Tegel, Mardetovo and Folkmar (9). Bishop Bačynskij had planned to create one, but, actually, he created two arch-deaconates. With Bishop Bačynskij's consent, the Deans' Council proposed to the emperor to erect three vicariates on the territory of the Mukačevo eparchy: in Satu Mare (Satu Mare), Maramorošskij Syhit (Maramures Sighet) and Košice. This plan was approved by Emperor Joseph II on February 3, 1787. Thus in Košice the Vicariate for Prjašivščyna was erected, from which originated the eparchy of Prjašiv (10).

Usually, in the matters of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite faithful, the Deans' Council of Hungary was very slow and procrastinating. The Chancery of Vienna and the Deans' Council in Budapest were careful to appoint to various ecclesiastical offices such persons who would be faithful to their political aspirations. Of course, many times they were disappointed, because the nominated person was really the best for the task and he rendered valuable services not to the imperial Court or Hungarian policy, but to his own people. It was regrettable, that the first vicar of Prjašivščyna had to disappoint everybody. Born in the Ukrainian village of Pastil (county of Velike Berezne), Rev. John Pastelij was not magyarized. It is uncertain why he was indifferent toward religious and national aspiration of his people, and why he resigned from the office of the vicar of Prjašiv (11).

His decree of nomination by the Deans' Council Bishop Bačynskij received on April 7, 1787, he immediately notified Pastelij (12). In his letter to the bishop, Pastelij mentioned that in the nomination there is not a word about vicar's residence (13). For this reason Bishop Bačynskij had to have continuous contacts with the State Chancery in Vienna, since Pastelij was not interested in his new office. The bishop did not have confidence in Pastelij since he was the candidate of Deans' Council. Thus Bačynskij continued to intercede with the offices of the Council, this time to designate the building of the suppressed Dominican Order in Košice for the use

---

(9) *Ibidem*.

(10) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 5.

(11) O. V. MYŠANYČ, *Literatura Zakarpatta*, p. 80.

(12) J. BASILOVITS, *o.c.*, V. 61.

(13) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 8, 1868.

of the Vicariate. If this would not be possible, then Bačynskyj asked for any other suppressed convent or the church of the suppressed Jesuits with its annex (14). The Council did not answer the bishop's petition and it isn't known what answer was given by the city council of Košice.

On June 27, 1787, the canon, John Pastelij received from the Council directly the nomination for the office of the vicar of Košice, but the efforts for a complete erection of the vicariate were fostered by Bishop Bačynskyj (15).

By the letter of March 1, 1788, the bishop asked the administrator of the State Chamber, Count Michael Vécsey, what steps were taken concerning the transfer of the vicariate's buildings. In his reply of March 21, the administrator exposed the whole series of problems, stating that he was unable to solve them (16).

Count Vécsey had already proposed to the Deans' Council that the residence of the vicariate could be in one of the suppressed convents, but the district school inspector, Count Terek, insisted that the vicariate should take residence in the buildings of the suppressed Dominican monks. The Council again asked for an explanation, as to what Vécsey did on March 18, but Budapest did not hurry with the solution of the vicariate. Therefore, Bishop Bačynskyj wrote on April 21 to the Council again. Confirming the emperor's decree, the Council, on July 12, 1788, finally decreed the official erection of the vicariate in Košice ordering that the vicar had to be appointed one of the canons of the Mukačevo eparchy, that yearly the sum of 1200 florens would be assigned to him as salary from the Religious Fund of the State, and that he would reside in Košice. The city's council was also notified to communicate within eight days to the Deans' Council its proposal for the vicar's residence. The vicariate had to be located in one of the convents of the suppressed Franciscan Fathers. According to the suggestion of the bishop of Eger his Minor Seminary was located here (17). Now, to solve the problem of the vicar's residence, a special commission was formed. Of course, one of its members had to be the representative of the Bishop of Eger, the Latin Rite Pastor of Košice, Father Adam Orosz.

---

(14) *Ibidem*.

(15) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 7.

(16) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 8, 1868.

(17) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 8.

Other members were the representatives of the Košice city council: Michael Bányai, Stephen Sechovics and Joseph Wagner. From the Mukačevo eparchy were canons Andrew Žetkej and Michael Bradač as petitioners (18).

The Deans' Council, the supreme office in the matters of ecclesiastical administration, did not solve the problem of the vicar's residence, but transferred it to this commission. When the commission made a decision to place the vicar's residence in the building of the former Dominican monastery, the Council did not confirm this decision! To save face before the emperor, the Council, on October 5, 1788, recommended to the commission the project of a complete remodeling of the Benedictine monastery. Immediately Count Vécsey asked that Bishop Bačynskyj send someone to cooperate in this project. Bačynskyj sent Pastelij, the Vicar, and his nephew, Father Theodore Bačynskyj to Košice (19). These two, after a few days, studied the project and sent it to the Deans' Council, but the solution of the problem was stymied. The Deans' Council now started to work on another project — to divide the eparchy of the Ukrainians. It would be easier to fight with divided opposition. Applying the Latin proverb "Divide et impera," they made moves in this direction. This was a risky initiative, for they did not foresee the future consequences. From the past of the Mukačevo eparchy it was evident what tremendous results came from the independence of the eparchy. This had to end. There was no other way to do it, but to divide the eparchy. Thus at the end, everything was changed.

The Deans' Council decided, that for the use of the vicariate the building of the Franciscans would be released, but Vicar Pastelij could not take over the building. Neglecting his vicarial duties he continued to live in Užhorod. His only activity on the territory of his vicariate consisted of one official visitation in the Zboriv parish (20). The procrastination and intrigues and the intervention of many official institutions also disappointed Pastelij. On June 27, 1788, he asked Bishop Bačynskyj to be relieved from the duty of vicar, claiming as a main cause his poor health (21). The resigna-

---

(18) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 8, 1868.

(19) *Ibidem*.

(20) A. DUCHONVICS, *o.c.*, p. 8.

(21) J. BASILOVITS, *o.c.*, V. 61.



tion was accepted. Bishop Bačynskyj then proposed the canon, Michael Bradač, to be the new vicar of Košice. Confirming his candidacy, the Deans' Council, on January 13, 1790 issued the document of Bradač's nomination (22).

---

(22) *Ibidem*, V. 62.

## VI. THE VICARIATE IN PRJAŠIV

The newly appointed vicar, Michael Bradač (1), threw himself into the whirl of work for a complete realization of the plans of the erection of the vicariate. In contrast to his predecessor, he did not leave the solution of the vicariate's problems to anybody else; rather he faced them himself. First, his decision was to have a constant residence in the territory of his vicariate. He did not obtain any of those proposed buildings, where he could establish his offices. To have a building was a very important issue. From there he could administer to the faithful under his spiritual care; there he would have his offices. Now nobody could object to some kind of irregularity, alluding that he did not even live in the territory of his vicariate and, therefore, his orders would not oblige within the territory of the vicariate. He expected these difficulties, having experienced them from the past. The situation was peculiar, for there were many influential individuals both against and for the division of the Mukačevo eparchy. Temporarily he lived in his family's possessions in Jakubjany and Kamjanka, waiting for the time and opportunity to move to the vicariate see. In fact, the emperor had already issued a decree that three rooms in the former monastery of the Franciscan Fathers in Košice would be assigned to him. Until now, the Hungarians caused many difficulties in order not to let the vicar of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite come to Košice. Now, they publicly admitted, that all those difficulties, procrastinations and intrigues, served only for one purpose: they would never tolerate Košice being the see of the vicar of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, for the newly appointed Vicar, Michael Bradač, was not dedicated to the idea of the growing Hungarian nationalism. Thus, all interventions and solicitations became useless.

Now Bradač had to fight Hungarian fanaticism in Košice, which in those times was an impossible task. The vicar did not resign, even if all the doors in Košice were closed to him. He went to Prjašiv

---

(1) The decree of emperor's nomination dated January 13, 1790 published in Basilovits, *o.c.*, VI, p. 62.

and in this town he again started to work and to fight to obtain a building for a residence. Even if the vacant building of the suppressed Minorite Fathers was assigned to him by the emperor, on January 13, 1790, the city council of Prjašiv, in the same manner as in Košice, did not want to let a non-Hungarian vicar to reside in their city. Bradač turned to the Governor of Szabolcs district, Count Szelényi, and to the often mentioned administrator of the State Chamber, Count Vécsey, and, to the great surprise of everyone, on August 19, 1792, he obtained the building of the Minorite Fathers! Having learned from past experience, Bradač took care immediately, that the assignment of the building be confirmed by competent offices. It was confirmed by Emperor Leopold II, on December 20, 1792 (2). The vicar then sent his representatives, Father Michael Dudynskyj and Father Michael Simoga, who officially took the possession of the building. This was not the end of troubles! Although everything was officially confirmed and approved, the Hungarians started a campaign against the vicar of the Slavonic Rite. To achieve their goal, they attempted to locate in the assigned building to Bradač the state gymnasium in care of the Brothers of Christian Schools from Great Sibin (today's Romania). This decision was confirmed during the meeting of the district's administrative council in Bolotnyj Potik (Sárospatak) and by the vice-superintendent of the district, Count László Pécsy. There was only one fraction, the non-Catholics, Evangelical representatives of the Šariš district, who took part of the vicariate. Now again, history repeated itself.

If the Ukrainians had to overcome one difficulty after another since the time of their union in 1646, they remained always faithful to the Successor of St. Peter. This was the fight against the sympathizers of Hungarian nationalism, for whom Hungary meant more than anything else. If this nationalism would not use religion for its own purpose, if it would not restrict the limits of justice and of natural law of other minorities, then perhaps it would not have much of the violently opposite reaction of the non-Hungarian element. Today it is difficult to understand these symptoms, but we have to take them into consideration, for this was the basis of the thinking and of the acting of those times, and it would be difficult to understand not only the situation of the vicar Bradač, but also the situa-

---

(2) A. DUCHNOVICS, *Chronologica Historia*, pp. 10-11.

tion in Hungary in the past century. This was the main cause for many great barriers being placed on the road of national progress of the minorities of Hungary.

In fabricating the difficulties, Prjašiv far surpassed Košice! Instigated by the city's council and obtaining the permission of the same superior of Szabolcs district, Count General Szelényi, the commander of the local military garrison, Colonel Michael Ternyei, planned to locate his soldiers in the building, which officially had been assigned to the vicar! Naturally, Bradač protested on account of the emperor's decree, but the officials of the Šariš district pretended they did not know about the plan of the building's occupancy by the soldiers! Instead the district council forwarded to the vicar the claim of a certain Alexander Keczer, who asked for 6,000 florins to be paid to him as an unpaid mortgage on the building of the former convent (3).

The joy of Bradač was now destroyed. Now he knew the reason why these gentlemen did not hesitate to release to him this building. Could he pay this enormous sum of money and for what? He did not live in the building and this dilapidated structure was not worth such a great amount of money. Where could he obtain the loan? To avoid any further complications, he permitted the building to be used temporarily for the residence of the general executor (tax collector) of Šariš district, John Desevfy, with the commitment that a complete inventory of the building would be made. He asked the tax collector to make restitution for the stolen doors, windows and locks. The building, without his permission, now was used as a warehouse for wheat and for arms for the army. The vicar had to live here also. He could not sleep because of the noise of arms and of the indecent language of the commanders. The first floor was also occupied by the printing shop worker, one Eger, a Protestant. His loud wife and the noise of the five children disturbed the vicar continuously. The basement was rented to a certain Foltinovyč as a wine cellar. The workers did not care whether they disturbed anyone, especially, during nights when they had to load or unload wine barrels. The peak of troubles for the vicar were caused by the janitor-sacristan of the church of the former convent, a man by the name of Skala. Bradač could not get rid of him, for he was appointed and confirmed for the job by the Deans' Council of the State, simply to aggravate the vicar to the point that he would leave the build-

---

(3) *Ibidem*, p. 13.

ing and the town. With a great pleasure this individual laughed and scorned the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and anything pertaining to the Ukrainians. How many personal offenses, outrages, scornings, etc. had the vicar to suffer — we cannot imagine (4). This was an impossible situation!

The vicar did not give up! He fought again and again for his rights. In one person, he was also the pastor of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite's faithful of Prjašiv. Therefore, as the pastor, he asked the city's administrative council for a decent residence, for the financing of the parish utilities and of the janitor of the parish's church, which was also the vicariate's church. From his yearly salary of 1,200 florins, the vicar paid the secretary, the clerk and the postal expenses of the vicariate's chancery. Besides, on his personal expense, he started to remodel the building — to install doors, windows, locks. To avoid bad reputation, the officials of the Religious Funds of the state, on December 9, 1794 assigned to him for the reparation of the building the sum of 250.46 florins, with an order to report to the prefect of the Emperor's Chamber in Jesenov, Alexius Okolicsányi. This, in fact, the vicar did on August 4, 1795 (5).

Of all these difficulties the most malicious and the most ironical was the letter of prefect Okolicsányi. On July 15, 1795, the prefect arrogantly demanded that the vicar pay rent for the use of those three rooms of this dilapidated Minorites' convent. What could he answer to these orders? The greatest blow for the vicar was the fact that — who knows on what basis and on whose orders — the semi-destroyed building of the vicariate became the residence of the Court of the Trans-Tissan District. In 1797 court sessions were already held there. The vicar was notified, if he wished, that he could also live in the building. To get rid of the vicar, to use the building in the future for purposes of the court of justice on January 1, 1797, a special delegation was sent to the emperor, composed of: the court-judge, Count Anthony Szirmay, and the prefect of the emperor's Chamber, Paul Tádday Manyihay. The last one was a fanatical atheist. He fought bitterly against the Catholic Church, Catholic clergy and institutions, but now they used this atheist to fight against the Ukrainian clergy. When this delegation and the

---

(4) *Ibidem*, p. 15.

(5) *Ibidem*, p. 16.

emperor's court checked the building, and after realizing the condition of the vicar's residence, they resigned from the building and officially assigned it to the vicar (6). How many difficulties had to be overcome just to obtain one miserable, dilapidated building!

By now the structure had been almost completely destroyed. Nobody claimed its ownership, nobody wanted it, it was "*res nullius*." But the opposition now instigated the city hospital administration to take from the vicar at least the nearby orchard. Suddenly these lots became necessary for an additional structure for the benefit of the citizens. The proper intervention of vicar Bradač made an end of this unjust intention (7).

There were no elections in Hungary in the eighteenth century. Until the abolition of the corvee, people did not elect their representatives and deputies, but the emperor appointed them from nobility, loyal and faithful to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. These decided all the problems of the state. When a priest became a bishop, he was also appointed a member of the parliament. Bishop Bačynskyj in 1789 was appointed a member of the state's parliament until his death. We don't know the reason why Bishop Bačynskyj delegated the vicar Bradač for the parliament's session, held in Bratislava in 1802. Perhaps he wanted Bradač to make personal contacts with influential persons of the monarchy and felt that in this way it would be more possible to obtain what Bradač was fighting for. To function as a nobleman, Bradač was made the abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew in Šar. Bradač, now with the title but without anything else, after the parliament's session in Bratislava, left for the capital Vienna. In a private audience, he asked the emperor to put an end to all the intrigues and procrastinations and finally to erect the vicariate in Prjašiv. This was done, because the emperor, on March 8, 1809, gave an order to make plans for the renovation of these buildings. He also appointed the vicar a corresponding member of the Mineralogical Society of the city of Jenna (8).

There was a hesitation about the division of the Mukačevo eparchy. In the beginning, the Hungarians had wanted to divide it; now they were against it, being afraid of unfavorable consequences. They started to persuade the emperor's offices that the erection of

---

(6) *Ibidem*, p. 18.

(7) *Ibidem*, p. 19.

(8) *Ibidem*, p. 20.

the vicariate in Prjašiv now was useless and unnecessary, because, after the erection of the eparchies of Kryževci and of Gran-Varadin, the faithful of Prjašivščyna would be administered perfectly well. The Bishop of Kryževci demanded also the annexation of vicariate's parishes to his jurisdiction. The emperor sent his councilor, Bishop Mitterpracher, who, after five days in Prjašiv, promised Bradač help and co-operation and left for Vienna. Here, due to the head of the Hungarian State Chancery, Paul Rozzos, a good friend of the Ukrainians, the emperor finally, on September 2, 1806, decreed an official erection of the Vicariate of Košice, with its residence in Prjašiv (9.)

This is the most important document in the history of the Vicariate of Prjašiv, because it was made by the supreme authority of the state, the emperor, and because it contains the most necessary details: The Vicariate would be located in the monastery of the suppressed Minorite Fathers, and the former monastery church would have to be remodeled and adapted to be the church of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite vicar. The consistory of the vicar was to consist of two assessors (notary and secretary), selected from the clergy of the vicariate. The salaries of these church officials and all the expenses for the building and church remodeling would be paid from the 30,000 florins, assigned to the eparchy of Mukačevo from the Religious Funds of the state. The state secretary, Count Joseph Erdödy, on September 18, 1807, assigned some funds to procure liturgical vestments as well as the church appurtenances for the Vicar, from the Missionary Funds of Dalmatia. Another order of May 17, 1808, decreed that from the Religious Funds of the state yearly 550 florins, as a salary, would be assigned to the pastor — vicar; another 100 florins to the procurator; 100 florins to the secretary, and 150 florins for the chancery and postal expenses. On June 6, 1809, the vicar was assigned 2,647.45 florins for the new liturgical vestments. Previously, Bradač had obtained the church remodeling plans, made by the State Chamber architect in Solivar, Joseph Bretterbauer, and confirmed March 29, 1808. During this remodeling it became evident in what miserable conditions this building was. On April 29, 1808, for the material and labor of the remodeling the sum of 23,890.34 florins was assigned. Bretterbauer was a master in swindle and theft. He did the remodeling, but actually the building was in worse shape, than before he started.

---

(9) *Ibidem*, p. 22.

He pocketed the money and the material; even what was left of the dilapidated building, he took and hid in his residence in Solivar. The vicar again appealed to the emperor, and on December 27, 1810, Bretterbauer was replaced by Joseph Freudhoffer. Bretterbauer caused a damage of 20,000 florins, but there was no official investigation demanded. Clever as he was in theft, he showed the same cleverness in avoiding any criminal procedure in the court (10). The vicar protested to various offices about fifty times, but the money and the stolen material were never returned.

---

(10) *Ibidem*, p. 25.



## VII. THE ERECTION OF THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠIV

While authorities and influential persons were making these gigantic difficulties for the vicar of Prjašivščyna, the bishop of Eger relaxed. It seemed that the erection of the vicariate would never be realized. Who could even think, that the vicar could overcome all the difficulties?

When all the difficulties seemed to be solved and all seemed to be in order, then the bishop of Eger started to fight the Ukrainians. The vicariate of Prjašivščyna was part of Mukačevo eparchy, therefore, to fight against the vicar meant to fight against the eparchy. Bishop Bacynškyj was old; perhaps now the prelate of Eger hoped to obtain a complete victory — the destruction of the Mukačevo eparchy. After this, it would be very easy to fight the vicar of Prjašivščyna. It was easy for the Bishop of Eger to find an occasion, it was easy for Bishop of Eger. This time it was one of the mission-parishes of the Mukačevo eparchy. The Bishop of Eger stubbornly demanded that this mission-parish “according to Canon Law” be under his jurisdiction (1). According to his argumentation, even after the canonical erection of the eparchy, after the Bulls of the Pope and official confirmation of the empress, the eparchy of Mukačevo had not existed and did not exist at this time. Again, according to the Bishop of Eger, the Bishop of Mukačevo was the Bishop who took care of spiritual problems and needs of the faithful, but without a diocese, territory and without administrative jurisdiction — “episcopus in spiritualibus,” as it was in the case of the titular Bishop of Nicopolis in Bucarest (Romania). Who would not react to this unfounded statement? It meant not only a complete negation of the existence of the eparchy, but also a total negation of the existence of the Ukrainians South of the Carpathian Mountains, as well as it was against the Bulls of the erection of the eparchy by the pope and and the empress. This was a violation of the natural law of existence! To counteract this

---

(1) This was the case of village of Malcov. It was solved by the Deans' Council October 4, 1814. APF, SR nei Congressi, Greci..., a. 1737-1844, v. 3, f. 375 ss.

attitude of the Bishop of Eger, a delegation went to Vienna protesting before the Apostolic Nuntio that the Latin Rite bishop's statement incited the faithful against the Catholic Church. The Nuntio knew very well the past and present situation of the Mukačevo eparchy. On December 20, 1803, he once more informed the Hungarian state chancery, that the eparchy of Mukačevo was erected according to all the exigencies of Canon Law, that in papal documents were given the borders, titles, foundations, financial provisions, dotations and other particulars of the eparchy. The Nuntio sent a similar letter also to the Bishop of Eger (2).

The Deans' Council of Hungary, on the request of the Bishop of Gran Varadin and Kryževci, in 1802, had intended to divide the Mukačevo eparchy, but this did not happen because of the opportune intervention of Bishop Bačynskyj. Now, the situation changed. They were just waiting for Bishop Bačynskyj's death. Meanwhile, they started to act. In Rome, it was not known who was the initiator of the division of the Mukačevo eparchy. They knew this would happen after Bačynskyj's burial. For this reason the Nuntio in Vienna, Gabriel Severoli, wrote to the Cardinal of the Propaganda Congregation, Michael di Pietro, for more informations concerning this division, until in Vienna they would have more detailed news (3). Not being informed about this division, the cardinal informed the Nuntio that in case of such division, the new bishop had to make the profession of faith of Pope Urban VIII prescribed for the bishops of this rite's eparchies. He asked the Nuntio that all letters concerning the division of Mukačevo eparchy be sent directly to the Consistorial Congregation (4). The profession of the faith was not practiced anymore and, consequently, the archbishop of Esztergom, the Primate of Hungary, in his reports did not include information concerning the Mukačevo eparchy (5).

The introduction of Josephinism in Austro-Hungary led to the point that not only the problems of the administrative character of the dioceses were handled by the emperor and his offices, but many times they interfered with the matters reserved only to the Apostolic See. Such was the case in the history of the Prjašiv eparchy.

The Hungarian parliament, in 1807, decided that the erection

---

(2) ASV, ANV, v. 232, f. 210; ASV, NG, v. 704, Dec. 20, 1806.

(3) ASV, ANV, v. 216B, f. 87.

(4) ASV, ANV, v. 209, f. e9.

(5) *Ibidem*, v' 216, f. 110.

of the dioceses and the nomination of the bishops of the monarchy, which until now took place after the confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff, from now on would be handled by the episcopal commission of Monarchy (6). Primate of Hungary, Charles Ambrus, then proposed, that the eparchy of Mukačevo be divided and the new eparchy of Prjašiv be erected (7). Hungarian civic and ecclesiastical circles have profited from the tense situation between Pope Pius VII and Napoleon. From now on it was certain that all the episcopal sees would be occupied by Hungarian patriots.

Bishop Bačynskij knew the situation of his eparchy and was aware of the dangers of growing Hungarian nationalism. While he lived, he was able to overcome all the difficulties, because the emperor and many state officials were on his side. But now he was 76 years old and losing his sight (8). It was necessary to provide a capable auxiliary bishop, who, in case of his death, would defend the rights of the eparchy and the people. Even though the vicar of Prjašiv successfully overcame all the difficulties, but he was far from the center of the eparchy. The future of the vicariate for Bačynskij became a primary concern, therefore, he appointed Canon John Kutka as the vicar general of the Mukačevo eparchy. Without any doubt, this appointment was the best, because Canon Kutka was one of the most talented priests of the eparchy. Bishop Bačynskij, appealing for the appointment of an auxiliary bishop, proposed two candidates: Kutka, and Bradač. Bačynskij intended personally to take care of this matter, but because of his poor health, his doctor forbade him to leave his residence in Užhorod. The nomination of an auxiliary, Bishop Bačynskij then confided to the rector of St. Barbara's Church, in Vienna, Father John Olšavskij, a priest of Mukačevo eparchy. Olšavskij favored the nomination of his cousin Bradač, then on March 11, 1808, the emperor nominated Bradač the auxiliary bishop and asked Rome for his confirmation (9). The State Secretary, Cardinal Pacca, informed Nuntio Severoli, that Pope Pius VII consented to make the process of nomination. When Bishop Bačynskij was informed of the fact, on August 16, 1808, he gave his consent. The canonical process was made by the Nuntio in Vienna, on September 1, 1808, with the help of two

---

(6) ASV, NG, v. 216, sf, June 30, 1807. «

(7) ASV, NG, v. 704, f. 208, Sept. 17, 1808.

(8) ASV, ANV, v. 232, p. 60.

(9) ASV, ANV, *Processi Canonici*, fasc. 687.

witnesses, Father John Olšavskij and John Sidor, the notary of the State Chancery. Thus, on September 30, 1808, Pius VII appointed Michael Bradač the titular bishop of Dorylea (10). In the document of nomination there was no mention of the right of succession or of his duties in the eparchy. There was not even a word of the division of the Mukačevo eparchy. According to the document, Bradač was only an ordaining bishop, without any right of succession. He was consecrated on the feastday of the Synaxis of the Blessed Virgin (according to the Julian calendar), January 8, 1809, in Gran Varadin by the Bishop Samuel Vulkan (11). This was a prophetic decision of Bishop Bačynskij, because eight months later on November 19, 1809, he departed for his eternal reward (12).

According to the decisions of the Tridentine Council, the eparchy's chapter had to elect a capitular vicar in the period of eight days. Thus, Canon John Kutka was elected the capitular vicar of Mukačevo, while auxiliary Bishop, Michael Bradač, remained the vicar of Prjašivščyna, with a condition that in the important cases he had to ask Kutka's permission. Under the vicar of Prjašivščyna were the priests and parishes of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Abanovohrad, Boršod, Gemer, Šariš, Spiš, Turňa and of the northern part of Zemplin district (13). Both vicars, Bradač and Kutka, were deeply spiritual men, but from this time on they were unable to come to a mutual understanding. It seems that the passions of antagonism and fraternal jealousy infected their minds, which, of course, re-echoed in the future events of the eparchy.

On Napoleon's order, Pope Pius VII was taken out of Rome and from August 16, 1809 until June 9, 1812, he lived in isolation in Savona (Northern Italy); from June 19, 1812 until January 23, 1814 in Fontainebleau (near Paris, France). Since the Pope was absent from Rome, it was impossible to obtain the nomination of a new bishop for the Mukačevo eparchy. This time again the enemies of the eparchy, of the rite and of the Ukrainians used this splendid opportunity.

The Deans' Council of Hungary, on March 27, 1810, requested the vicar Kutka for a precise, detailed report on the eparchy's situation, because now — they wrote clearly — they wanted to divide

---

(10) *Secr. Brevium*, 4557, 113; ASV, ANV, *Processi Canonici*, 683.

(11) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 27.

(12) *Ibidem*, p. 30.

(13) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 16, 1898.

the Mukačevo eparchy. It was just too bad, that Bačynskij died, because Kutka was unable to oppose the plans for division. Kutka defended the unity of the eparchy with the same arguments, which Bishop Bačynskij used, but it was in vain. In May 1810, Kutka called the meeting of the eparchial consistory, where the detrimental effects of Hungarian nationalism were felt. After returning to Prjašiv, Bradač, on May 16, 1810 had also a meeting with his consistory, which had to approve the plans of the erection of a new eparchy (14). Receiving the results of this meeting, Vicar Kutka, on June 12, 1810, sent to the Deans' Council his consent for division of Mukačevo eparchy. Thus, according to the decisions of the Deans' Council and of the vicar in the territory of Prjašivščyna, a new eparchy was to be erected, which would contain 17 deaneries, 189 parishes (15) with 145,730 faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. A special commission was formed in Budapest with the members: Bishop Bradač, Vicar Kutka and Canon Gregory Tarkovyč, who from 1803 lived in Budapest as the representative of the Ukrainians in the parliament and the censor of the Slavonic books at the state university's printery (16). These three members did not have any choice but approve the Deans' Council plan, which was immediately sent to the emperor for a final approval.

On October 17, 1812, Vicar John Kutka died. In his place the chapter elected Bradač, on October 24. As the vicar general of the Mukačevo eparchy, the auxiliary bishop, Michael Bradač, on December 28, 1812, left for Užhorod, leaving to Divine Providence the vacant post of vicar in Prjašiv and the buildings, for which he had fought (17). After his departure, there was made a last attempt to confiscate vicar's residence. Someone instigated the city's administration council, that a warehouse of wheat be made from the building and in this way they would get rid of the vicar and of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Of course, they found the official documents also, but if there had not been stubborn resistance by the parish priest, Andrew Kampo, then this would have been the end of the vicariate (18).

In 1812 came the inflation of money and with it a change of

---

(14) *Pamjat Andreja Bačynskaho*, in "Svit," June 16, 1898.

(15) In ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 237 there were 188 parishes.

(16) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 33.

(17) *Ibidem*, p. 34.

(18) *Ibidem*, *l.c.*

monetary system. Instead of 4,000 florins, the vicar of Prjašiv was to receive 800 new florins but after some protests, there had been assigned 1,600 florins to him. Financially, the vicariate became very poor. The treasury department of the state appealed to all citizens for voluntary contributions of gold, silver and bronze for military aid. Some churches of the vicariate even offered their church vessels. A certain amount of silver was collected, and, loyal priests, besides great quantity of oats for the cavalry, made a voluntary contribution of 1,723.17 florins to the state (19).

After Bishop Bradač left Prjašiv, the post of its vicar became vacant. On July 30, 1813, Canon Gregory Tarkovyč was elected as a new vicar, but after the bishop Bradač's death, (1815), he was elected the capitular vicar of Mukačevo eparchy (20).

On May 24, 1814, Pope Pius VII triumphantly returned to the Eternal City, but the emperor, without the consent of Pope, on his own initiative, on November 3, 1815, divided the eparchy of Mukačevo and erected a new eparchy of Prjašiv (21). Of course, the emperor acted under the influence of the Deans' Council and the Council under the influence of the bishop of Eger and the Primate. For the solution of the problems connected with the election, the Council, under authorization from the Emperor, created a special commission, which included: Latin Rite Bishops of Eger, Košice and Satmar; of the Byzantine-Rite's Romanian bishops of Gran Varadin and of Kryževci; of vicar Tarkovyč, the commission's president, the archduke palatine, Joseph declared that the Mukačevo eparchy had to be divided (22). On January 16, 1816, the same commission discussed the erection of Prjašiv's eparchy. Its government had to consist of a Bishop, appointed in the near future, and five canons — the archpresbyter, lector, cantor, ecclesiarch and scholastic. Its territory would include seven districts: Aba-Novohrad, Šariš, Spiš, Boršod, Turňa, Gemer and the northern part of Zemplin. All together there were 192 parishes, with 148,987 faithful (23). At the meeting of January 26, 1816, the commission passed a motion to propose to the emperor for the confirmation of the canon of Gran-Varadin eparchy, Alexius Počij, as the bishop of Mukačevo

---

(19) *Ibidem*, p. 41.

(20) *Ibidem*, p. 36.

(21) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 164; *Ibidem*, p. 51.

(22) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 53.

(23) ASV, ACC 1818, r. 247, fasc. 1, foglio 79.

and of vicar Gregory Tarkovyč, as the bishop of Prjašiv. They gave the following motives: "Peace and unity between the faithful of the Latin and Greek Rites which were damaged during Bačynskyj's time by the vicars Kutka and Bradač and not without public scandal," It was necessary that Hungarians, according to "the constitutional decrees," would create a lasting peace between the faithful of both Rites (24). Only Tarkovyč could say a word of protest, but he did not dare to irritate the Council. Perhaps because of his silence he was made a bishop.

Without any doubt, peace, harmony and unity between the faithful of both rites were broken. This happened not only during the episcopacy of Bačynskyj, but also in previous years. The history also will point out that peace, harmony and unity was always perturbed by the Hungarians.

After Bačynskyj's death, the eparchy of Mukačevo was vacant. The Hungarians needed time, for they were looking for a candidate, who at least would create no obstacle to the erecting the eparchy of Prjašiv or to the separation of 72 parishes from Mukačevo eparchy in favor of the eparchy of Gran Varadin. There were many good and zealous priests among the Ukrainian clergy, but to realize their plans, they appointed the canon of the eparchy of Gran Varadin, Alexius Počij, as the bishop of Mukačevo eparchy. In the letter of February 6, 1816, the Deans' Council notified the chapter of Mukačevo, that for the greater spiritual benefit, the emperor divided the eparchy of Mukačevo, erected the eparchy of Prjašiv and 72 parishes annexed to the eparchy of Gran Varadin (25).

The emperor, in a letter of March 1, 1816 notified Pope Pius VII of this division and erection (26), after he received the commission's resolution passed at their meeting on February 3, 1816 he asked for their confirmation (27). The said meeting of the special commission was held under the presidency of the bishop of Eger, Count Fisher. Not even one representative of the faithful of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was there present. Not waiting for an answer from Rome, on March 22, 1816, the emperor appointed Alexius Počij the bishop of Mukačevo, and Gregory Tarkovyč the bishop of Prjašiv eparchy (28). In the document of nomination there is no mention

---

(24) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 55.

(25) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 237 ss.

(26) ASV, ANV, v. 206, f. 108; ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 164 ss.

(27) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 59-61.

(28) A. WELYKYJ, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, II, pp. 337-339.

of the residence and the financial provisions for the bishop, as was usually done. On May 11, 1816, considering his old age (62 years old) and the poor financial situation of the eparchy, Tarkovyč asked to be provided as the canon of Mukačevo eparchy. From the tone of the letter, the state chancery officials understood that Tarkovyč declined the episcopal dignity and on October 29, 1816 they asked for an explanation (29). With the explanation, Tarkovyč requested that: 1) The church and the building of the former monastery of Minorites be remodelled and given to the disposition of the bishop; 2) From the yearly salary of 6,000 florins, assigned from the Religious Funds, the sum of 5,000 florins be released immediately for the purchase of the episcopal vestments; 3) The bishop be given some funds for charitable purposes; and 4) Some immobile possessions with yearly income of 8,000 florins instead of salary, be assigned to him (30). The emperor's representative, archduke Ranieri, assigned to Tarkovyč only 3,000 florins from the bishop's income to start the day of his profession.

In his letter to Rome, the emperor did not mention the decision of the Hungarian Parliament of 1807, that in the future, the Conference of the Bishops of Hungary, without the consent of the Apostolic See, would erect new dioceses and appoint new bishops. It seems that the emperor also ignored this decision, and if it were known in Rome, nobody has mentioned it. This could be why the confirmation of the emperor's plan was not coming from Rome.

According to the privilege of patronate ("jus patronatus"), the emperor Francis I (1804-1835), on July 11, 1817, nominated Gregory Tarkovyč the first bishop of Prjašiv eparchy, with the yearly salary of 6,000 florins payable from the Religious Funds, and asked Pius VII for confirmation (31).

In the meantime, it was decided to repair the building and the church of the Minorites and that Bishop Tarkovyč would make his profession of faith to the commission of which the bishop of Eger was president. The Deans' Council on September 30, 1817, decided, that from 30,000 florins, assigned for the Mukačevo eparchy, the bishop of Prjašiv would obtain a proportionate amount for the education of his seminarians (32).

---

(29) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 62.

(30) *Ibidem*, p. 63.

(31) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 193 ss.; ASV, ANV, v. 23, n. 19975.

(32) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 73.



There was no answer from Rome. From Vienna came only promises, but the financial problems of the bishop and the eparchy were not solved. The generous gesture of the patriotic clergy of Prjašivščyna was forgotten. There was only one solution, to go personally to Vienna and not to leave until the final provisions for the eparchy were made. Tarkovyč did just that, living humbly for three years at the parish house of St. Barbara, in Vienna. Having no other means, he ate military bread, which affected his health. He appealed to the chapter of the Mukačevo for necessary documents. On the chapter's meeting, October 16, 1817, "*Litterae testimoniales*" were prepared and sent to him in Vienna (33).

After the audience with the emperor, Tarkovyč went to the Nuncio. On February 14, 1818, the nuncio contacted the Pontiff's State Secretary, Cardinal Consalvi, reminding him that the emperor on March 1, 1816, asked Pius VII to erect the eparchy of Prjašiv and to confirm Tarkovyč as its bishop (34). Tarkovyč, according to this letter, declined the episcopal nomination three times. But now all the necessary documents for his confirmation were in the office of the nuntiature. Further, the nuncio asked for papal permission to start the canonical process of Bishop Tarkovyč. The nuncio also asked that Rome reduce the taxes connected with the erection of the eparchy and of the nomination of the Bishop Tarkovyč.

This time the emperor kept his word. On August 17, 1818, from the Religious Funds was assigned to Tarkovyč the income of the estate of the suppressed Red Monastery of the Camedule Fathers, near the village of Lechnyci (Špiš district), which on paper supposedly had an income of 11,692.42 florins. From this sum 6,000 florins were supposed to cover bishop's and the chancery staff's salary; 5,000 the canon's and the remaining of 692.42 florins had to be deposited in the treasury of the cathedral church (35).

In the meantime, the bishop-elect of the Mukačevo eparchy, Alexius Počij, on April 28, 1818, sent his written permission for dismemberment, but all this information was not sufficient in Rome (36)

---

(33) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 234.

(34) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 164 ss.; ASV, SS, 1818, rubr. 247, fasc. 1, foglio 79; ASV, ANV, v. 206, f. 108.

(35) A. PEKAR, *Narysy istoriji Cerkvy Zakarpatta*, p. 92; A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 79.

(36) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 274 ss.; SAV, ANV, v. 243, f. 19975; ASV, ANV, v. 240, n. 424.

On May 6, 1818, the substitute of the Consistorial Congregation, Toesca, asked the nuncio how many eparchies had to be erected — two or three? When and how the Minorites had been suppressed in Prjašiv? Who is the patron-saint of the cathedral church in Prjašiv? What were the financial provisions of the bishop? Why in the documents was not made mention of the eparchial seminary? Was the consent of the Mukačevo bishop obtained? Will the bishop of Prjašiv be the suffragan of the archbishop of Esztergom, as the bishops of Mukačevo and of Gran Varadin were? How extensive is the territory of the eparchy? How many parishes and faithful? (37).

After receiving the necessary faculties, on May 23, 1818, the nuncio, Paul Leardi, began the process. The Consistorial Congregation sent nuncio an 18 point questionnaire, and 12 of them were included in the decree and bull of erection (38).

The requested material was sent to Rome on May 25, 1818. Among others, the nuncio mentioned that Tarkovyč visited him and presented the emperor's decree of nomination and the copy of the emperor's letter to Pius VII, dated July 11, 1817, and how the nuncio was submitting also the consent of the Mukačevo bishop.

In his answers, the nuncio have the following information: The Prjašiv eparchy was to include the districts: Aba-Novohrad, Turňa, Boršod, Gemer, Šariš, Spiš and five proto-presbyteries of Zemplin (Humenne, Hostovyci, Laborec, Stropkiv and Voroniv). According to the 1816 yearbook, the eparchy would have 193 parishes and 1,109 mission parishes with 148,987 faithful. Its territory was to be 30 × 20 Hungarian miles. The Minorite Fathers in Prjašiv had been suppressed about thirty years ago. The church now was in the stage of remodelling. Its patron saint was St. John the Evangelist. Concerning finances, to the bishop were assigned yearly 6,000 florins; to the canons — 5,000, namely: to the archpriest and to the archdeacon 900, to the primicerius 800, to the ecclesiarch 700 and to the scholastic 600 florins. The bishop was to be the suffragan of the Primate, archbishop of Esztergom. Concerning the seminary, the seminarians would be temporarily educated in the seminaries of Vienna, Trnava, Budapest and Užhorod, until the bishop would erect the eparchial seminary (39).

The financial situation of Bishop Tarkovyč was very poor. Even

---

(37) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 198 ss.

(38) Cfr. ASV, ACC, 1818, pars I.

(39) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 202.

if there were assigned to him 6,000 florins, this was not enough. In Hungary a simple canon of any diocese was in a better financial situation than the bishop of Prjašiv, who had to pay from his salary the expenses of the chancery and its officials. True, Tarkovyč received land possessions, but they brought only 4,000 florins of income, which was less than the assigned salary. Therefore, Tarkovyč tried hard to arrange better financial provisions for the eparchy (40). The nuncio asked for permission to start the process. On August 7, 1818, he received sworn testimony of two witnesses: Father John Fogarašij, the assistant pastor of St. Barbara in Vienna, and John Evangelist Sidor, the notary of the Hungarian state chancery (41). In the presence of two witnesses, Fathers Anthony Enoli and Aloisius Malaguti, into the hands of the Nuncio, Tarkovyč also made the profession of faith (42), although the permission of the Apostolic See came only on August 15 (43). On September 9, 1818, the Consistorial Congregation issued the decree of the erection of Prjašiv eparchy (44). The Congregation of Propaganda, on September 16, 1818, presented some reservations which were answered immediately (45). At the audience with the Holy Father, on October 19, 1818, the following changes in the Bull had to be made: 1) Instead of "Graeci Catholici" use the term "Rutheni omnes Graeci ritus uniti, aliique qui eosdem Ritus et unionem sequuntur." 2) Omit the mention of the erection of the prebend and the seminary — since this obliged only the faithful of Latin Rite. 3) To inform the archbishop-metropolitan in Esztergom and to notify also the nuncio to get rid of the "heretical" books and reinforce the rescription of Pope Benedict XIV's bull "Etsi Pastoralis" (46). The nuncio

---

(40) The received real estate "were too far from Prjasiv and the soil was stony as well as the greatest part was a forest. Therefore, Tarkovyč tried to purchase the estate of suppressed Jesuits in Mysli, in Aba-Novohrad district... Not even one Latin Rite bishop wanted to accept the estate of Red Monastery... Hungarian chancery gave the estate of Mysli to the seminary of Esztergom, since the "Primate wanted it." Thus, beside the estate of Red Monastery Tarkovyč received smaller possessions near Voroniv and Krajna... The bishop had to divide this income in thirteen parts..."; A. PEKAR, *Narysy istoriji Cerkvy Zakarpattia*. p. 92.

(41) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 244.

(42) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 229v.

(43) *Ibidem*, f. 209 ss.

(44) *Ibidem*, f. 248.

(45) *Ibidem*, f. 263 ss.

(46) *Ibidem*, l.c.

was also informed, that the decree of the Consistorial Congregation, by which the eparchy was erected, was ready. The nuncio's petition concerning the reduction of taxes the Pro-Datarius would take into consideration, but they had to wait for the publication of the bull. On September 19, 1818, the secretary of the Consistorial Congregation, Rafael Monius, presented the *Munkacsiensis Ritus Graeci Catholici uniti Dismembrationis et novi Episcopatus de Eperies Erectioonis SUMMA GRATIAE* (47). On September 22, 1818, *Propositiones* were made of the erection of the Prjašiv eparchy and Tarkovyč's nomination as bishop, which had to be confirmed by Pius VII (48). The taxes were 548.28 florins (49). The bull of the canonical erection of the Prjašiv eparchy *Relata semper* was dated September 1, 1818, and after revision of Cardinal Litta, it was promulgated on September 22, 1818, and finally confirmed at the consistory of October 2, 1818, by Pius VII (50).

According to the bull, because of the vast territory of Mukačevo eparchy, there was a necessity for a better administration of the faithful, and the Western part be dimembered and erected in a new eparchy of Prjašiv. After the emperor's petition and the consent of Mukačevo eparchy's bishop, Pius VII canonically erected the eparchy of Prjašiv. The bishop of the newly erected eparchy had a complete jurisdiction over the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, living in five archdeaconates and seventeen vicedeaconates. In the government of eparchy, the bishop was to be assisted by the chapter, consisting of five canons. Their obligation was to recite the office daily in the cathedral church. For the dotation of the bishop the emperor would temporarily provide 6,000 florins as salary; until such a sum would be met by immobile possessions. The church and the buildings of Minorite Fathers in Prjašiv had to be remodelled and adapted to the use of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. The bishop would be the legal owner of these buildings forever.

In the territory of his eparchy the bishop enjoyed a full jurisdiction over the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite; he had to govern his flock without prejudices toward the bishop of Eger, observing the

---

(47) *Ibidem*, 152 ss.

(48) ASV, ANV, v. 247, f. 202.

(49) *Ibidem*, f. 117v, ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 290; f. 309.

(50) ASV, *Collezione Bolle e Brevi Apostolici*, v. 5, num. 13; We possess a copy of the bull, transcribed from the Eparchial Archive of Prjasiv on January 15, 1935. The bull was first published by A. WELYKYJ, *Documenta Pontificum*, II, pp. 327-333.

prescriptions of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide concerning the Byzantine Rite faithful, living in the same territory with the faithful of the Latin Rite. The right of the bishop's nomination Pius VII again conceded to the emperor, but his nomination had to be confirmed by the Roman Pontiff. The bishop of Prjašiv was to be suffragan of the archbishop of Esztergom or, in the case of *sede vacante*, of his chapter. The bishop had to make the profession of faith prescribed by Pope Gregory XIII for the Byzantine Rite bishops, in the presence of two witnesses-priests of the eparchy or members of the chapter as witnesses, which was to be sent through the Nuncio to the Congregation of Propaganda (51).

Tarkovyč was nominated bishop. Although the bull expressed all the necessary points, another document was made, in which the bishop was ordered to make a profession of faith to be sent to Rome. He was also ordered to purchase liturgical vestments, to remodel the church, the residence, to erect a seminary and an institute of charity (52).

The expedition of the bull was delayed. In Rome they intended not to send the document, until the expenses and taxes were paid. The Consistorial Congregation's secretary, on November 15, 1818, notified the ambassador of Austro-Hungary, Count Kaunitz, that the Holy Father dispensed Bishop Tarkovyč from all expenses and taxes, but that the sum of 1,055 florins, as the "tax of exercise" for the erection had to be paid if they did not wish to delay the expediting of the bull (53). Tarkovyč did not know what to do. Not having the necessary money, on February 5, 1819, he informed the Nuncio about his resignation from the episcopacy (54). Usually all the expenses of Holy See connected with the erection of a new eparchy — the taxes, the clerks and other expenses — were paid by the government. This was the practice also of the Austro-Hungarian government (55). Without any scruples, the practice of paying the expenses by the government suddenly was revoked, just to embarrass the Ukrainians and their bishop. The following day, the embassy clerk, according to the emperor's instruction, informed the Consistorial Congregation, that the embassy would pay all the expenses. The congregation through the Nuncio contacted the state chancellor

---

(51) *Ibidem*.

(52) Cfr. *Processus Inquisitionis* in ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 208 ss.

(53) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 304.

(54) *Ibidem*, f. 307.

(55) ASV, ANV, v. 252, sf.

Metternich, who, on April 4, 1819, confirmed that all the expenses would be paid by the Hungarian chancery (56).

Without any difficulty the Deans' Council donated to the bishop Tarkovyč the estate of the Red Monastery of suppressed Camedule Fathers near the village of Lechnyci. It was very distant from Prjašiv, in the Spiš district and the stony soil could never produce the stipulated income of 6,000 florins. On February 26, 1819, he personally asked for the estate of suppressed Jesuits near the village of Vyšňa Mysľa, in Aba-Novohrad district, and for the maintenance of the cathedral church the estate near the village of Brestiv, in Šariš district. Of course, the Deans's Council declined the petition, because the estate of Vyšňa Mysľa was given to the Latin Rite seminary of Esztergom, since the Primate wanted it (57). It was another slap in the face of Bishop Tarkovyč. This time he did not resign from the episcopacy, but he asked the Nuncio to delay the consecration until the spring of next year, when he hoped to obtain a satisfactory provision from the emperor (58). On July 7, 1820, Tarkovyč asked for the estate of Voroniv and a part of the meadow near the village of Krajna. He obtained these on July 16, 1820. Furthermore, to purchase the liturgical books and vestments, he received 3,000 and again 6,000 florins, as well as 50% of the bishops' income from the Religious Funds (59). If somebody would like to characterize the erection of the eparchy of Prjašiv, he could term this a continuous begging and humiliation.

Living in Vienna, Tarkovyč appointed the first chapter of the eparchy, the first five canons, who were confirmed by the emperor on August 6, 1820 (60). The pastor of Vienna, St. Barbara Church, John Olšavskyj, on his own request, was incardinated into the eparchy of Mukačevo. The archpriest John Mehaj became Vicar General. The other members were: the archdeacon Michael Kaňuk, the known leader of the eleven parishes of Spiš annexed to the eparchy; the canon-primicerius Basil Hodobaj; the ecclesiarch Andrew Chyra and the canon-scholastic John Habyna. In Prjašiv, in the absence of the bishop, on August 6, 1820, the church of the former vicariate

---

(56) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 308.

(57) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 92.

(58) ASV, ANV, v. 243, Sept. 29, 1818.

(59) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, pp. 87-89.

(60) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 92.

was elevated to a cathedral. The erection of the Prjašiv eparchy was officially proclaimed and newly appointed canons installed (61).

In Vienna, Tarkovyč informed the Nuncio that 3,000 florins were insufficient for the purchase of the episcopal vestments (62). The audience of September 10, 1820 was for the bishop the occasion of finally leaving Vienna, for the problems of the eparchy were solved in the satisfactory manner. Traveling by ship on the Danube, the bishop lacked expense money for food. Exposed to hunger, he had to stop in Esztergom, in the house of his brother, Judge Basil Tarkovyč, where he was forced to spend two weeks to gain energy for the rest of his trip. The bishop also had an audience with the Primate of Hungary and from here he continued to Budapest, where he stayed for two weeks. Whether he settled all the matters concerning the erection of the eparchy in the office of the Deans' Council, we do not know. In Budapest his quarters was a cell in the Capuchin Monastery, and again, broke, he ate the same dry, army bread. Leaving Budapest he had enough energy to come to Miskolc. He was sick and physically exhausted. Such was "the triumphant entrance" of the bishop to take over the see of his eparchy! Finally, he was brought half dead to Prjašiv, on November 17, 1820. The doctors found the condition of his health completely hopeless, prognosticating the day of his imminent death, but Divine Providence decided differently. The bishop-elect with the help and care of his faithful servant Fyšynskyj regained his health (63).

After his convalescence, the bishop-elect began to make necessary preparations for his consecration. It was the spring of 1821, the time to which he had asked to delay his consecration. Avoiding sumptuous solemnities, Tarkovyč asked the newly consecrated bishop of Mukačevo, Alexius Počij, to be the only consecrator. On Sunday of all the saints, according to the Byzantine Calendar, on July 17, 1821, in the church of the Basilian Fathers in Krasnyj Brid, Gregory Tarkovyč was consecrated the first bishop of the eparchy of Prjašiv. Accepting the government of the eparchy from his vicar general, John Mehaj, Tarkovyč returned to Prjašiv, and took possession of the residential buildings. Thus he began to govern the eparchy as the first bishop of Prjašiv with full episcopal powers and jurisdiction.

---

(61) *Ibidem*, p. 90.

(62) ASV, ANV, v. 247, n. 499.

(63) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 104.

## VIII. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EPARCHY

After the episcopal consecration and formal installation, Tarkovyč began to govern his eparchy. An enormous task waited for him. He had everything on paper, but to apply all these decisions and orders into real life, to move all the wheels of the eparchy's administrative apparatus, required superhuman effort and complete self-sacrifice.

Usually, the newly installed bishop-ordinary, at the beginning of his pastoral and administrative activities, meets his priests in a specially convoked eparchial synod. Here he outlines the program and his policies for the future, asking the clergy's full co-operation and encouraging them to be faithful to their priestly ideals. This synod was called to Prjašiv, on November 18, 1821. It was opened by the bishop's prayer. All five canons were present, as well as the chancery staff. Every deanery and two Basilian monasteries were represented by two priests. From Bishop Bacynškyj's death until the erection of the eparchy a slight decline of ecclesiastical discipline was noticeable. Although it was not an alarming symptom, still the bishop and the clergy had to counteract it from spreading further. For three years the bishop lived in Vienna to accelerate the erection of the eparchy. Consequently, there was need for a synod, at least to solve those problems, which priests could not solve without the permission and faculties of a bishop. In this synod were discussed also the preparative plans for the future Hungarian Inter-Dioecsan Synod, to be held in Bratislava, in 1822, under the leadership of the Cardinal-Primate, Alexander Rudnyai (1).

For his three-years stay in Vienna, Bishop Tarkovyč had to pay with his health. He never regained it. To travel to Bratislava, to this synod, was for him a great difficulty and danger to his life. Thus, unable to attend, the bishop sent to this assembly the decisions of the eparchial synod in Prjašiv. Nobody knows what happened to these documents. Probably they contained the defense of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite unfavorable for the Hungarian hierarchy.

---

(1) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 122.



Bishop Tarkovyč had an uncompromising thirst for justice. When he knew that justice was on his side, he did not resign, but fought for it with all his energy. Yet, in governing the eparchy, he became meticulous. Even if he were the head of the eparchy, in every important case he called on the emperor. The state chancery in Vienna was issuing orders to be carried on by the clergy of the eparchy.

Thus, the bishop authorized canon Basil Hodobaj, that according to the emperor' order of October 24, 1820 the census of the parishes and clergy should be made (2). Canons Hobobaj and Peter Pidhajeckyj were sent to Užhorod, to obtain from the Mukačevo eparchy's archives all the documents concerning the eparchy of Prjašiv. As a result, the eparchial archives were founded.

In December, 1820, the president of the State Camera, Michael Koronay, assigned to the bishop the income of the estate near the village of Lechnyci, and in February, 1821, the lands near Voroniv with the field in Krajna. Thus, the emperor again on December 10, 1823, reaffirmed the material provision of the eparchy. These grants had to be divided into thirteen parts: six for the bishop, five for the chapter and two for the cathedral church (3).

According to the decision of the Council of Trent, every bishop had to provide for the education of the future clergy, and if possible, to erect on the territory of his jurisdiction a theological seminary. This was mentioned previously in bull of erection. But according to the suggestions of the Congregation of Propaganda, November 16, 1818, this was changed (4), since the decisions of the Council of Trent obliged only Catholics of the Latin Rite and did not refer to the bishop of Prjašiv. In the eparchies of the Byzantine Rite seminaries did not exist. The young candidates to the priesthood studied theological sciences and practiced the principles of spiritual life in the monasteries, which were also the residences of the bishops. Usually married priest's sons became priests. They received the fundamental theological and liturgical education at home. After they learned all the ceremonies and liturgical services, they had to spend the prescribed time in the monasteries and after the completion of higher theological studies, they received the sacrament of priesthood (5). Therefore, the Congregation of Propaganda

---

(2) *Ibidem*, p. 123.

(3) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 92.

(4) ASV, ACC, 1818 f. 265 ss.

(5) J. KUBINYI, *De cleri educatione in Ucraina Carpathica*, p. 32 (manuscript).

did not force the Byzantine Rite bishops to introduce the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, thus forcing them to be Latinized. To confirm this point, the encyclical *Allatae sunt* of Pope Benedict XIV of July 26, 1765, was quoted. Again, Pope Benedict XII in his *breve* confirmed the decisions of the Provincial Council in Zamostja in 1720, which dealt with the problems of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite faithful. Therefore, if these were acknowledged by the supreme authority of the Pope, why then did these faithful have to be forced to obey the decisions of the Council of Trent, which dealt with the Latin Rite faithful? This would mean many bitter remarks and criticism of the Catholic Church. These decisions had to be modified, because it would seem that the Apostolic See did not care to conserve Byzantine Rite and traditions. The Popes many times protested in similar cases and affirmed that the faithful of the Byzantine Rite would not be forced to obey those prescriptions and laws, directed to the faithful of the Latin Rite (6).

According to the decisions of the Deans' Council of January 14, 1823, from the funds of the Mukačevo eparchy of 5,881.04 florins the eparchy of Prjašiv received 1,517.43 florins and the yearly interests of the vineyards' income — 40.55 florins for the education of seminarians. Thus: 1) Temporarily two seminarians were studying in Budapest at the expense of the seminary; three seminarians were in Vienna on the state designated funds of bishops' assistance; 27 seminarians, who studied in Užhorod, received their education financed from the same and from the interests of the vineyards' income and from Religious Funds. 2) For charitable purposes the amount of 1,203.41 plus interest was assigned to the eparchy. They were not paid for six years. Now, with interest, 1,800.00 florins were paid to the eparchy. 3) The financial assistance and salaries of the priests had to be 7,930.49, but the eparchy received 7,725.49 florins. 4) For the Orphans and Widows' Fund was assigned to the eparchy 15,387.53 (7).

At this time, the town of Prjašiv had only around 6,000 inhabitants (8). Minorite Fathers came to Prjašiv in 1673. The church and the building of the hospital was donated to them, but in the Thökölyi's rebellion Minorites left the town and in 1633 the church was used by the Lutheran congregation, until December 28, 1685,

---

(6) ASV, ACC, 1818, f. 265-267.

(7) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, pp. 129-132.

(8) O. МУСЮК, *Narysy*, II, p. 342.

when again, according to the emperor's order, it became the property of the Minorites. After repairs and after the re-possession of the church, the vice-regent of the Šariš district, Alexander Keczer, donated to the Minorites his house with the adjacent property and he also remodeled the chapel of St. Anthony. His brother, bishop of Gran Varadin, Stephen Keczer, financed the remodeling of the church's sanctuary, altar and provided all the liturgical vestments. On August 31, 1787, the Minorites were suppressed. Some of them lived in the building until 1788, when the church was destroyed by fire. Suspicion fell on these Minorites. Thus in 1791 it became the property of the vicar of Prjašiv (9).

With a low note of enthusiasm Bishop Tarkovyč began the repair of the inherited buildings. This was a real scandal, that the bishop had to live in this half-destroyed structure (10). He intended to rebuild first the church and adapt it for the use of the Byzantine Rite. For this purpose he received, in 1818, from the emperor 4,000 florins, but he did not even touch them, since the money was found after his death as it was received from the emperor. In 1823 the bishop ordered 50 maple boards for the painting of icons for the iconostas. He paid 61.05 florins for them, but in 1825 they were lost in the vicinity of Kapišovo (11).

Finally, for the buildings' repairs, he received 23,947.57 florins. On July 8, 1824 the bishop contracted an agreement with the architect Michael Eishel to make blueprints for the repairs (12). The case again began to be confused, since the Deans' Council on September 5, 1825 made other blueprints through the architect Michael Willecz (13). On October 28, 1826 the Council changed these plans and this time decided that the expenses for the repairs should not exceed the sum of 23,947.57 florins, otherwise, the excess was to be paid by the bishop. The bishop was unable to pay. On June 5, 1827 he asked the Council and the emperor's chancery. On the basis of Vienna's order, the Council again changed everything (14). The buildings were in such bad condition, that the Council on October

---

(9) L. LYZAK, *Istorija Prjašivsjskoji parafiji*, in "Zapovit sv. Kyryla i Mefodija," n. 8, 1963, p. 188; A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, pp. 137-138.

(10) Duchnovics calls this "political" scandal. *Ibidem.*, p. 140.

(11) L. LYZAK, *Istorija Prjašivsjskoji parafiji*, in "Zapovit sv. Kyryla i Mefodija," n. 9, 1963, p. 207.

(12) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 142.

(13) *Ibidem.*, p. 143.

(14) *Ibidem.*, p. 146 ss.

15, 1830 ordered that they be demolished which after much delay and pleading, did occur in 1888 (15). The bishop with the chancery staff had to live in a little shanty left for this purpose, until he would be able to move into the new residence.

Tarkovyč was a real intellectual. He did not care for social life; if he could, he tried to avoid people. • The greatest part of his life he dedicated to the studies of the Fathers of the Church. During the years of his priesthood he developed a deep spiritual and ascetical life. Because of his meticulous character and his personal disappointments many of his beautiful plans were never realized.

After he became the bishop of Prjašiv, he intended to erect scientific institutions in his eparchy, where his clergy and some of his faithful could obtain a higher education. However, after the bitter experience of begging for the eparchy, to dream of such a thing as higher education, was completely out of order. But the Good Lord had mercy on this humble servant. On May 1, 1819, another humble priest of the diocese of Eger, John Evangelist Kovács, donated his sumptuous library of the eparchy (16). From the donation of the generous benefactor and from the emperor, in 1816 the library had at its disposition 26,000.00 florins. Out of gratitude, all priests of the eparchy, August 25, 1830, offered a divine liturgy for the generous benefactor (17). After his death, on his grave near Vienna, the bishop ordered to be erected a marble tombstone, and on April 12 and on June 24 of each year as long as the eparchy will exist, the requiem divine liturgy would be offered for his soul. There was another Latin Rite priest of the Košice diocese, Matthew Benyo, who donated his books to the eparchial library in 1829, as did the other vicar, then the Mukačevo eparchy's canon, John Olšavskyj, who ordered his books to be transferred to this library. Thus in Prjašiv was founded the Eparchial Library, which was named after its main benefactor *Bibliotheca Kovacsiana* (18).

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the history of Europe are known as the centuries of great revolutions. In almost every nation the citizens rebelled against the absolutist regime of their native lands. The various manuals of history tell us about the development of these revolutions, the fights, the loss of lives and their consequences. The most horrible was the French Revolution.

---

(15) *Ibidem*, pp. 148-149.

(16) *Ibidem*, p. 154.

(17) *Ibidem*, pp. 164-165.

(18) *Ibidem*, pp. 152-172.

The Austro-Hungarian monarchy was also governed by the absolutist regime of the emperor. No wonder, that during the course of history of this monarchy there were many rebellions. They were of political, economical, national and many times also of a religious character. The most complicated internal problem of the state was the problem of nationalities. The central government of Vienna was not prepared and did not know how to cope with this complicated reality. The fact was, that the nationalities of the monarchy, especially in those centuries, reactivated their struggle for a completely free life. The situation was known to the government, but they were not able to solve the problem. They applied the politics of division and of oppression of nationality by nationality. The domineering Austrians were oppressing Hungarians; when Hungarians became dangerous, then the government instigated other nationalities to counteract their struggle. To have these dangerous symptoms under complete control, the government tried to apply the politics of division and mistrust. We notice this in the case of the Czechs and Slovaks.

From Sudeteland to the territory of Prjašivščyna, the Northern part of the monarchy was inhabited by Western Slavs. They were one people, one nationality. The territory of Bohemia and Moravia were under the Austrian administration and Slovakia — under the Hungarian administration. In the eighteenth century we notice the division between these two nationalities and from this century we can consider the rise of a new Slavonic nation — Slovaks (19).

Even if they were divided by administrative borders, the Ukrainians on the Northern and Southern parts of the Carpathian Mountains are considered one nation. To perpetuate "Great Hungary of St. Stephen," the Hungarians tried to conquer the Ukrainians of Zakarpattia for their purposes. First of all, they tried to isolate completely these Ukrainians and then they began a strong propaganda to magyarize and to destroy every symptom of Ukrainian national life. They had to start to magyarize the education because they knew, that without the intelligentsia, a nation soon would become a horde of ignorant people without leaders and without any reasonable means of defense.

---

(19) In the same century the experiment was made to create the Slovak literary language on the basis of Western Slovak dialect. Cfr. N. A. KONDRASOV, *Slavjanskije jazyky*, pp. 145-146.

The situation in Prjašivščyna and in the Carpatho-Ukraine was critical. The Hungarians considered "this people as an arrow, ready to shoot, which will have to take the natural direction of freedom and which, even on the slightest instigation of some merciless Catilina, will explode with all its forces" (20).

The rebellion erupted in 1828. It was an unorganized fight of peasants against landowners and government officials. In 1831 the rebellion spread to the districts of Spiš, Šariš and Zemplin. In that year cholera broke out. The inhabitants of the villages were dying in great numbers. The germs of pestilence were spread by water, through the village wells, whence people took water for domestic uses. Because not even one of the government officials, nor landowners became a victim of this pestilence, the Ukrainians accused them of poisoning the wells. Many of them were murdered (21). The most bloody revenge of the masses occurred in Trebišov, Voroniv, Čakliv, Zamutiv and Mernik. The Hungarian State Chancery, of course, accused only the Ukrainians, even though many non-Ukrainians took part in the rebellion. The central government of Vienna now recalled how important and what great authority the bishop of the Ukrainians enjoyed. If the emperor would send against the rebels an army of 10,000 soldiers, they would fight them, but not their own bishop. Therefore, the emperor sent Bishop Tarkovyč to calm the rebellion. With heavy hearts the Ukrainians in their villages met their only authority and listened to their spiritual leader. To obey the orders of the emperor and not antagonize him, Tarkovyč visited many villages and shortly after his visitation the rebellion ended. Again, the fatherly, loving words of the bishop proved to be more effective than all the orders of the emperor and his military expedition (22).

The other occasion of Bishop Tarkovyč's visit, when he was seen among his faithful, was the consecration of the church in Komloš, near Zboriv. Perhaps he was afraid of the unstable situation of future revolution and thus he left all the plans concerning the eparchial buildings in writing. After having received the last sacraments of the Church, he died on January 16, 1841, at 87 years of age (23).

---

(20) O. MYCJUK, *Narysy*, II, p. 140.

(21) *Ibidem*, II, p. 166.

(22) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 122.

(23) ASV, *Processus Consistorialis*, v. 245, f. 171; A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, p. 242.

## IX. BISHOP JOSEPH GAGANEC

To put the eparchy on its feet, to introduce all those issued orders and permissions, to realize all the plans, was the task of the second bishop of Prjašiv, Joseph Gaganec, a worthy successor of Bishop Tarkovyč. The eparchy was vacant only a year, because on August 2, 1842, Pope Gregory XVI confirmed as Bishop of the Prjašiv eparchy, the 49 year old vicar general nominated by Emperor Ferdinand I (1).

The episcopal consecration was arranged to take place right after the session of the Hungarian parliament in Bratislava, since both bishops of Prjašiv and of Mukačevo were members of the Hungarian parliament. The episcopal consecration took place in the emperor's private chapel, in Vienna, on June 25, 1843. In the presence of the emperor and his family, Bishop Popovyč of the Mukačevo eparchy consecrated the new bishop of Prjašiv (2).

Being the vicar, during the eparchy's vacancy, Gaganec already started to introduce many beautiful things into the life of the eparchy. He reproached the negligence of some pastors in the spiritual care of the faithful and the observance of the rite. He reinforced the

---

(1) Bishop Joseph Gaganec was born on April 10, 1793, according to the certificate of baptism (in ASV, *Processus Canonici*, v. 245, f. 179) in the village of Velykyj Vyslock, Halyčyna. His father, John Gagan, cantor of the parish church and mother, Mary Lupkovyč, with ten children moved to Tvarožec, Šaris district. After elementary education, he studied in 1801-1804 Bardyjiv, then gymnasium in 1804-1809 in Nove Misto and Levoča, philosophy in Gran Varadin. As a seminarian of the Mukačevo eparchy, he was sent for theological studies to Trnava seminary, which he finished maxima cum laude. In 1816, after he married Anna Kovalyckyj, Gaganec was ordained priest, March 8, 1817, in Gran Varadin, by Bishop Samuel Vulkan. Until 1820 he was the pastor of Rusjki Peklany; from 1820-1828 pastor in Vysliv and from 1828 until 1836 he was the pastor of Mezökereztur. Becoming a widower in 1835, he was appointed a canon of the Prjašiv eparchy and in 1839 he became the eparchy's financial administrator until January 17, 1841, when "sede vacante" he became the eparchy's vicar capitular, Cfr. B. SASS, *Biographia secundi episcopi Eperjessiensis*, in A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, s.p.

(2) Cfr. his nomination by Ferdinand I, in ASV, *Processus Canonici*, v. 245, f. 182.

law of appointment, stating that without explicit orders of the eparchial authority, priests couldn't exchange their parishes. He ordered the vice-archdeans to visit the parishes in their districts at least once a year. He imposed a just order in the faithful's offerings for the sacramentals. He ordered the erection of parish schools in the places where they did not exist and encouraged priests not only to supervise these schools, but to instruct the pupils also. He also tried to acquire another building for the parish house of Prjašiv congregation. For the eparchy he tried to acquire buildings for the future seminary and teachers' college, but was unsuccessful (3).

In his first pastoral letter, issued on August 28, 1843, he asked his clergy to work for the spiritual welfare of their people, and the people to remain faithful to Christ and to the Church, especially in those unstable times of rebellions, indicating the dangerous work of enemies of the people and of the Church. There were many poor parishes and poor priests in the eparchy. To assist them, he ordered that from every parish treasury one percent of the yearly income should be deposited for this purpose in the eparchy's fund (4).

It seems that he foresaw future events, therefore, he did not hesitate with his plans. In 1844 he rebuilt the bishop's residence. For the financing of eparchial projects, he organized the eparchial administrative council. To build up the treasury for the said purpose, the council loaned money for 6% interest. Against constant magyarization, on August 19, 1844, in a circular letter directed to his priests, he imposed the fostering of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and of the Ukrainian language.

In 1845 Bishop Gaganec reorganized the administration of the eparchial funds, defined the obligations of the pastor toward his mission-church, explained lenten regulations, regulated the upkeep of the parish-house and the instructions of the faithful. To prevent a rebellion, similar to that of 1831, he also ordered his priests to take initiative in social work. To avert the instigations, he asked the opinion of the vice-archdeans in the appointment of pastors, and so forth (5).

In 1846 Bishop Gaganec established the "congrua," the steady income for the priests. This was a great help for the clergy in those

---

(3) B. SASS, *Biographia secundi episcopi Eperjessiensis*, in A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, s.p.

(4) *Ibidem.*

(5) *Ibidem.*



times of a poverty stricken eparchy. He knew, that his clergy would give more time to the spiritual welfare of the faithful, if they would have fewer material and financial problems. He wrote to every influential person, asking and begging, until his project was approved by the emperor on December 18, 1845. The state chancery of Hungary on February 24, 1846 prepared a concrete project, according to which each of 167 priests would receive 27.50 florins yearly support from the general clergy fund (6).

The bishop remodelled the cathedral church. He contracted George Roman to carve and Albert Tikos to paint the ikonostas, for a total of 5,200 florins (7).

For the ordinandi he prescribed obligatory exams in moral theology and in canon law. From those candidates who were planning to be ordained as married priests, he required informations about their future wives.

In the year 1846 there was a great drought, followed by a terrible famine and contagious cholera. Consequently almost one third of the eparchy's inhabitants died or moved to other places. The courageous bishop did not leave his flock in these difficult times, but made every effort to alleviate their misfortune. In a paternal solicitude, he asked his priests to help these poor, hungry and sick faithful (8).

The eparchy of Prjašiv was born among many difficulties. When it finally began to function, the clouds of another horrible storm almost destroyed it completely. This was the Revolution of 1848. The fights in Prague, Venice, Budapest, Lviv and other cities were as the prophetic omen of the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In the neighboring Halyčyna the Ukrainians obtained their constitutional rights. The situation was different under the Hungarian administration, since in Zakarpatta the Ukrainians rebelled against the oppression of the Hungarians, and not of the Austrians. When in Hungary Lajos Kossuth organized the armed insurrection, the Ukrainians were embarrassed to fight with them, for they attributed many of their achievements as favors of the Austrian Emperors.

During the revolution of 1848-49 the eparchial buildings were considerably damaged. They served as the headquarters of general

---

(6) *Ibidem.*

(7) *Ibidem.*

(8) *Ibidem.*

Görgey, commander of the Hungarian rebels. After the Russians occupied the town on June 22, 1849, the bishop's residence became a military hospital. The situation did not discourage the bishop, and he continued the reparations, since he was afraid that the regular Hungarian government would cause more difficulties. Without any hesitation, he contracted the architects, remodelled the buildings and paid for the expenses from the eparchial treasury 2,994 florins. The tower to the cathedral church was added later in 1865 (9).

Bishop Gaganec was in favor of the fight for freedom of his people. The political leader of this fight, Adolph Dobrjanskyj, was the son of one of the eparchy's priest. The other Dobrjanskyj, Victor, was the bishop's secretary since 1841. When the revolutionaries came, Rev. Victor Dobrjanskyj left Prjašiv with his brother and fled to Halyčyna. Both brothers came back with the victorious Russian army, in 1849. Foreseeing Hungarian reprisals, Bishop Gaganec did not reappoint Rev. Victor Dobrjanskyj to his previous office, so he went to Užhorod, where he became a temporary eparchial school inspector. In 1852 he was elevated to canon of the Prjašiv eparchy, and was appointed the pastor of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parish in Košice (10).

The Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna were on the emperor's side. In these restless times everybody took part in revolution. In many towns the local population rebelled against municipal authorities and against the Jews in the administrative councils (11). There were also Ukrainians, who fought with the rebels of Kossuth expecting Kossuth to win. Thus they hoped to secure for all people at least their natural rights of existence. The whole territory of Hungary was under the control of the revolutionaries. It was a great scandal for the eparchy, when canon Michael Jakovyč's son, Joseph Jakovyč, the famous attorney at law in Budapest, became an organizer of the revolution in Northern Hungary. When revolutionaries occupied the district of Šariš, he became its governor. After Kossuth's defeat, he was condemned to a life imprisonment in Josephstadt jail. His embarrassed father disinherited him (12).

The critical times for the bishop and his flock were just coming. The precarious situation of the eparchy was discussed during the eparchial synod held on June 15, 1848. With 23 deans representing

---

(9) *Ibidem.*

(10) Dobrjanskyj's biography in A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, s.p.

(11) O. MYCJUK, *o.c.*, II, p. 325.

(12) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, Additamenta.

clergy and people, the bishop discussed the situation and plans for the future. All the Catholic bishops of Hungary planned to have the National Synod in Budapest. To every bishop were sent 26 questions concerning the regulations of fasts and ecclesiastical holidays, the erection of new institutions and organizations, the promotion of the religious spirit and the excess of revolution, which, of course, meant to combat anti-Hungarian feelings. The answers of the bishop to all these questions were very diplomatic and evasive. Some disappointed Hungarian bishops during the National Synod accused the clergy of the eparchy's Makovicja district of aversion to the Catholic Church, to the Union with Rome and of sympathy with Russian Orthodoxy (13). From the past of the mother-eparchy of Mukačevo, Bishop Gaganec knew, that there were always some individuals, who tried to destroy the good reputation of Ukrainians. These false accusers, the Hungarians, as in the past, even now, with an old prejudice, were spreading rumors about the relations with Russia and the dissident Orthodox Church. According to these accusations the Ukrainians had an aversion to the Catholic Church, to the Union with Rome, to the clergy of the Latin Rite, being considered unpatriotic and disloyal to the state. To be a Ukrainian meant to be accused of numerous fabricated "crimes." There were also individuals, who tried to remove both bishops of the Ukrainians from their episcopal sees, reporting them to Vienna (14). Minister Bach, through the Cardinal-Primate, Scitovszky, forwarded an official rebuke to both bishops. Thus, Bishop Gaganec was forced to limit his activities only to the administration of his eparchy, but in 1849 with Dobrjanskyj's influence, he was re-installed in the emperor's favor. This incident encouraged the bishop to promote capable Ukrainians to high official positions. These individuals were not only grateful to the bishop, but they also helped their connationals to fight misery and injustice.

For his merits, Bishop Gaganec was decorated with the Order of Franz Joseph I. The emperor also appointed him a consultor to the court in 1868. Pope Pius IX elevated him to the assistant of the Papal Throne and a Roman Count. In his active life, Bishop Gaganec consecrated two bishops of the Mukačevo eparchy and ordained 237 priests. In December, 1875, he contracted a virus and, a week later, on December 22, 1875, after receiving the last rites, he died (15).

---

(13) *Ibidem.*

(14) A. DUCHNOVICS refers the incident in *o.c.*

(15) A. DUCHNOVICS, *o.c.*, cfr. *Biographia*.

## X. THE PERIOD OF DECLINE

During the Crimean War (1854-56), Russia and Austria dissolved their mutual friendship and alliance. The emperor of France, Napoleon III, who in his youth belonged to the secret society of "Carbonari," in 1855 was in favor of the nationally minded Italian leader, Camillo Benso di Cavour, to set up Italian united monarchy. Thus, Italy and France declared war on Austria and in a peace treaty in Villafranca, on July 8, 1859, Austria agreed to cede Lombardy to the king of Piedmont. Again in 1866, the Austrian army was defeated by the Prussian and Italian military power. Austria had to evacuate the Venetian region in favor of the Italians. These two defeats completely ruined the ambitious dreams of young Franz Joseph I (1848-1916). Inside the monarchy there was a new threat caused by the Hungarians. They were ready to rebel again under the leadership of general George Klapka. The emperor was forced to give in to the Hungarian pressures and the Law XII of 1867, *the Compromise — the Ausgleich* was sanctioned by both parties. According to said law in the dominions of the Habsburgs a dualist government was formed of Austria and Hungary with two separate parliaments. This was the end of Austrian sovereignty in Hungary (1).

In the Hungarian kingdom this brought about the Dark Era of oppression of non-Hungarian minorities. The newly formed Hungarian government headed by Count Julius Andrassy, as prime minister, did not accept all the clauses of the *Ausgleich* and by continuous political machinations tried to alienate all Hungarians from Habsburgs, aspiring for a completely separate state (2).

When the Hungarians in the tenth century came through the passes of the Carpathian Mountains, they found the Ukrainians living on their present territory in an organized state. Even if these territories of the Ukrainian population belonged to the Hungarian administration, Hungarians could not claim them, since Hungarians never lived here as a dominant nationality and were only officials of the administrative apparatus of the state. In the years of growing

---

(1) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, pp. 259-262.

(2) *Ibidem*, p. 260.

Hungarian nationalism, when they were building the *Great Hungary of St. Stephen*, every inch of land, belonging to the Hungarian kingdom, had to be Hungarian. The dream of this little Hungarian nation to be a great power became a creed of every Hungarian. To achieve their purpose, Hungarians used even dishonest methods and force to make their impossible dreams a reality.

During the Josephinian reforms a great amount of ecclesiastical property was confiscated by the state. From it the Religious Fund was organized, which granted equal financial support to each religious denomination of Hungary. To obtain it, every religious denomination had to be organized into an autonomous body, whose by-laws were to be approved by the government. Only after this procedure a certain religious denomination became eligible for financial support and was permitted to exercise its religious and national rights. The Latin Rite Catholics did not have any difficulties, since they were Hungarians; so, too, were Protestants. The Orthodox Church was recognized by the government also. When it came to approve of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic Church of the Ukrainians, the matter became of a completely different nature. These Ukrainians were the primary target of complete extermination. Hungarians knew from experience, if they would conquer the last fortress of Ukrainians — their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church, only then was there a possibility of complete victory.

The freedom of religion and ecclesiastical autonomy for all the religious denominations was proclaimed by the leader of the revolution, Lajos Kossuth, in 1848 by XX Constitutional Law. It was recognized and confirmed by the parliament of Budapest and by the emperor of Vienna. Thus, theoretically also, the eparchy of Prjašiv was recognized and financial support from the Religious Fund was to be assigned for the eparchial purposes. This was only on paper.

It was not according to Canon Law that a bishop would be subject to the metropolitan of another rite, but since in Hungary there was no metropolitan of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, in the bull of the erection of the eparchy the bishop of Prjašiv became subject to the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite archbishop of Esztergom, as his metropolitan, who was also the primate of Hungary. Both Ukrainian bishops of Prjašiv and of Mukačevo, were thus subject to the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite primate. This innocent clause became a matter of great ecclesiastical-jurisdictional importance with enormous consequences in every phase of Ukrainian life. The Hungarians bitterly opposed the subjection of the Ukrainian bishops

to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Lviv, as well as the project of Pope Gregory XVI to erect a patriarchate for the Ukrainians (3). They stubbornly insisted that all the Ukrainian bishops in Hungary had to be under the jurisdiction of the Hungarian prelate. Their innocent clause covered the intention of destroying the last fortress of these Ukrainians — their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite.

After the *Ausgiech*, the Hungarian government accused the priests of the Laborec district that on the feast of Pentecost in 1867, during the pilgrimage at the Basilian Fathers' monastery in Krasnyj Brid, at the dinner they were toasting the Russian Czar. When the bishop sent as the official investigator canon Victor Ladomerskyj, it became evident how false and exaggerated these accusations were. They caused much hatred among the Hungarians and Ukrainians. Thus the Ukrainians became very suspicious of everything that was Hungarian (4).

Considering the Ukrainians of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite as his subjects, the Latin Rite primate of Hungary claimed to be the only authority in ecclesiastical matters even for the Ukrainians. In reality, this meant a continuous intrusion of Hungarians in the cultural, religious and national life of the Ukrainians. The primate took care that in the Prjašiv and Mukačevo eparchies only those individuals would be appointed as bishops or other church dignitaries, who were pro-Hungarian and who supported the Hungarian national policy. Unfortunately they had success. No need to say, that these pro-Hungarian church dignitaries introduced in their offices and in the parish schools Hungarian as the official language. Ukrainian pupils had to learn even their prayers and religion in Hungarian. These denationalized clergymen supported only those societies, which were in favor of co-operation with Hungarians, while making all efforts to cripple the activity of their own organizations and societies.

Another attack against the Ukrainians was made on the occasion of the Catholic Congress of 1870, in Budapest. In 1868 the preparatory committee had to work out the project for the autonomy of the Catholic Church in Hungary. The eparchy of Prjašiv was represented by J. Farkaš, M. Molčanij, A. Rubij and the president

---

(3) A. BARAN, *Progetto del Patriarcato Ucraino di Gregorio XVI*, in " *Analecta OSBM*," 1960, v. III, pp. 454-475.

(4) " *Csar* " in Ukrainian meant the head of the state. The incident is described in A. DUCHNOVIC; *o.c.*, s.p.

of delegation, A. Dobrjanskyj (5). The pro-Hungarian bishop of Mukačevo, Stephen Pankovyč (1867-1874), against the opinion of delegates and the persuasion of his own faithful, consented that the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church of Ukrainians be included in the general autonomy plan for the whole Catholic Church in Hungary. This meant the increasing decline of the ecclesiastical life of Ukrainians. Dobrjanskyj opposed this idea in his famous speech *The Autonomy of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Church* (6), which was bitterly denounced by the Hungarian press. The delegation of Prjašiv and Mukačevo eparchies worked out a separate project of ecclesiastical autonomy for the Ukrainians, but it was outvoted by the Hungarian majority of delegates, approving only the general autonomy plan for the Catholics of both rites. Of course, one clause was added to the general plan, that all ecclesiastical life, including the cultural and educational activities of Ukrainians, had to be in the hands of the Central Office, which followed the policy of the Hungarian government. The general plan of Autonomy for the Catholics of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Ukrainians of Hungary, as well as the budget for financial support of their church-affiliated organizations, was presented for approval on July 12, 1871, but it was never signed by the emperor (7).

---

(5) J. HADŽEGA, *Istorija o-va Vasylija Velykaho*, p. 22.

(6) Dobrjanskyj speech was published in Budapest's *Autonomia*, 1869, n. 147.

(7) It was published in Budapest in Hungarian language: *Ertesítés a Magyarországi Kath. Egyházi Automidját szervező gyűlés II. ülésszakának folyamáról a Magyarországi gör. kath. általában és különösen az Oroszokat illetőleg*, Buda, 1871.

## XI. THE EPARCHIAL SEMINARY

Until the canonical erection in 1818, the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna had a common fate with the Ukrainians of the eparchy of Mukačevo. The clergy of Prjašivščyna was educated with those of Mukačevo's eparchy in the seminaries of Trnava, Eger, Vienna and Esztergom. After the establishment of the eparchial seminary in Užhorod, the majority of the candidates for priestly orders were educated there (1).

The foundation of the seminary in Prjašiv was mentioned already at the time of erection of the eparchy. When the emperor Francis I (1806-1835) asked the Holy See to confirm his initiative in the erection of the eparchy, the Consistorial Congregation asked the Nuncio in Vienna, why the emperor did not mention the matter of the seminary in his letter (2). The Nuncio answered Cardinal Conslavi that the only obstacle was the poor economic situation, and thus the future priests of Prjašiv's eparchy, as they were until that time, would be educated in the seminaries of Užhorod, Trnava, Vienna and Budapest (3). Ailing Bishop Tarkovyč had many difficulties with the provision of the eparchy, thus the establishment of the seminary had to be postponed. Because of the revolution of 1848, Bishop Gaganec also was forced to leave this plan to be realized by his successor. After his death, when Rome asked for a new candidate for the bishopric of Prjašiv, the cardinal-primate and the government of Hungary, without any hesitation, proposed the alumnus of Central Seminary of Budapest, Rev. Nicholas Tovt (1876-1882) (4). Born in Mukačevo, Bishop Tovt was one of the most learned bishops of these times. When he was the spiritual

---

(1) From the yearbooks (schematismus) of the Mukačevo eparchy results, that in the seminary of Užhorod, in 1826, 16 seminarians were from the Prjašiv eparchy. In 1835 - 19; in 1837 - 21; in 1839 - 15; in 1845 - 24; in 1847 - 6; in 1856 - 17; in 1868 - 11; in 1872 - 13; in 1878 - 18. J. KUBINYI, *De cleri educatione in Ucraina Carpathica*, p. 218.

(2) ASV, ANV, v. 243, n. 19975.

(3) *Ibidem*, v. 246, n. 142.

(4) Cfr. his *Processus Inquisitionis*, March 6, 1876, in ASV, ANV, *Processi Canonici*, dasc. 966.



director of the Užhorod seminary, the government introduced the Hungarian language into the seminary, in 1880, with his full cooperation. But after becoming the bishop, he admitted, that he was the bishop of the Ukrainian faithful. Considering him a Hungarian, the government and Hungarian ecclesiastical authorities did not cause any obstacles in founding the eparchial seminary. From the Religious Fund of Hungary he received 2,300 florins for the purchase of a building, which he remodeled. The Eparchial Seminary was dedicated by the bishop, on September 12, 1880. This eparchial institution started its activity with the opening of the school year of 1880-81 with the seminarians of III and IV years of theology, transferred there from Užhorod. To those the students of the VII and VIII year of Prjašiv's high school were added (5). The seminary from its beginning was dominated by pro-Hungarian elements. The bishop was against the introduction of the Hungarian language into the liturgical services, while he insisted that the Ukrainian language had to be taught in the parochial schools. The clergy also resented him, since he was from another eparchy. When he ordered the priests to shave their beards, they opposed it, considering it as another step toward the Latinization of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. To show their patriotism and faithfulness to their rite, the priests signed the general protest. Concerning the subject, Dobrjanskyj, in 1881, wrote *An Answer to the Bishop of Prjašiv's Eparchy from the Ukrainian Clergy of Hungary* (6). When the bishop sent intimidating letters to various priests and laymen, Dobrjanskyj wrote to Pope Leo XIII *An Appeal to His Holiness from the Hungarian-Ukrainian Clergy of Prjašiv's Eparchy Concerning the Wearing of Beards by the Uniate Clergy*. This *Appeal* was a petition asking that the Holy See would compel the bishop to keep the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and not to submit the whole eparchy to the influence of Hungarian national politics (7).

The building of the eparchial seminary was expanded in 1886 during the episcopacy of John Vályi. In the beginning of his administration, Bishop Vályi invested his private funds to support this

---

(5) A. DUCHNOVICS-I. RUBY, *Chronologica Historia almae dioecesis Eperjesiensis*, II, p. 35.

- (6) *Otvit uhro-ruskoho duchovenstva Prjaševskoj eparchiiy svojemu epyskopu*. E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 143.

(7) *Appellacija k papi ot imeni uhro-russkaho duchovenstva Prjaševskoj eparchiji po voprosu o nošenij uniatskymy svjaščennykamy borody*. *Ibidem*, *l.c.*

eparchial institution as well as many talented young Ukrainians, candidates for the priesthood or other vocations. This remodelled seminary building was able to accommodate 24 seminarians with three superiors-professors (8). The number of seminarians continuously grew. In 1903 there was need to make another addition, because the seminary had already 40 seminarians and four superiors-professors. The costs for the construction as well as the seminary's expenses were paid from the Religious Funds.

The first seminary rector, Rev. Michael Kotradov (1880-1899), is known not only in the history of this institution, but also in the Ukrainian literature of Prjašivščyna, as well as in the field of education. From his personal funds he helped many talented Ukrainian students. Following his death, a sum of money was found in his room which was destined to foster 40 needy students with scholarships (9).

Kotradov's successor was Rev. Andrew Hodobaj (1900-1902), who later became an Apostolic Visitor of the Ukrainians who emigrated from Hungary into the United States, succeeding Rev. Augustine Bačynskij (1902-07), as rector of the seminary, was the secretary of Bishop Vályi, Rev. Zeno Kovalyckij. The first spiritual director of the seminary was Rev. Bartholomew Janyckij (1880-1897), who left the post, becoming a monk of the Basilian Order in Halyčyna. His successors were: Rev. Joseph Myžyčko (1897-1902), Rev. Nicholas Rusnak (1902-1907), Rev. Adalbert Ďulaj and others. The vice-rectors were: Rev. Michael Romoňak (1880-1891), Rev. John Bezegij (1891-1899), Rev. Eugene Repak (1899-1903), Rev. Volodymyr Bereckij and others (10).

The rules and the by-laws of the seminary were made according to the rules of Užhorod seminary, identical with other such institutions of Hungary. From the very beginning, the classes were taught in Hungarian, except the pastoral theology, which was in Ukrainian. During the rectorship of Rev. M. Kotradov, the seminarians founded the *St. Anthanasius Association*, obliging themselves to have scientific discussions and theological conferences in their native Ukrainian language. During the administration of Bishop Vályi, the library, donated by Rev. John Kovács, was incorporated into the eparchial seminary. The activity of the *St. Anthanasius*

---

(8) A. DUCHNOVICS-I. RUBY, *o.c.*, II, p. 37.

(9) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 194.

(10) N. BESKID, *Istorija Prjaševskej Eparchiji*, p. 74 ss.

*Association* was paralyzed by the order of the Hungarian government in 1902, but it was reorganized under the direction of Rev. George Hodobaj, who also organized the seminary choir and orchestra (11).

The seminary functioned according to the requirements of the Hungarian government. Thus, making certain that almost all who studied in this seminary, as the future priests, would not only dedicate themselves to the spiritual care of their faithful, but also they would co-operate in the growth of Hungarian nationalism and thus cause a slow death of their own people.

---

(11) *De bibliotheca Kovacsiano-dioecisana*, in "Schematismus" (yearbook) of the eparchy of 1903, pp. 19-23.

## XII. THE POLITICAL EFFORTS OF ADOLPH DOBRJANSKYJ

The Empress Maria Theresa, to show her gratefulness for support in the fight for the throne of the Habsburgs, gave the Hungarians many privileges and favors. Her successor to the throne, Joseph II (1780-1790), with his illuministic ideas of absolutism, tried to centralize not only the state's institutions, but the nationalities as well. During his regime there were plans to Germanize every individual of the state. When the emperor reached for the Hungarian constitution, the Hungarians bitterly protested, threatening a general rebellion. The unsuccessful war with Turkey made the emperor change his internal policy as well as further plans concerning the Hungarians. His liberal successor, Leopold II (1790-1792), considered the Hungarians as a solid, compact nationality, and re-installed all Hungarian institutions and societies. The Hungarians made every effort to have supremacy in the political field as well as in the cultural, national and educational areas over all the minorities of Hungary, especially over the smallest of them all, the Ukrainians. The emperor Francis I (1792-1835), was engaged in the war with Napoleon. On a politically weak government the Hungarians made pressures to introduce Hungarian as the official language in Hungary's schools and offices without any consideration for the rights of minorities. The despotic methods of Metternich already had to deal with the strong, united forces of Hungarian nationalism (1).

The first spark of revolution was ignited in Milan, where Italians rebelled against the domination of the Habsburgs in the beginning of January, 1848. The revolution spread to Vienna, and on March 13, 1848, the rebels in street fights made an attempt to end the regime of the emperor of Austria and proclaim a republic. On March 15, 1848, a new constitution was proclaimed, giving birth to the Hungarian state and their independence (2).

On the other hand, all non-Hungarian minorities were ready to rebel against the Hungarians. Therefore, when the Hungarians

---

(1) J. MACUREK, *Dějiny Maďaru a Uherského Statu*, pp. 234-240.

(2) M. HOLUBEC, *Istoriija Ukrajinu*, p. 576.

started to fight the government of Vienna, they were disappointed, because they did not have the support of all non-Austrian minorities. These minorities began the fight for their own freedom and national liberty. What greatly helped the central government of Vienna was the fierce attack of the Hungarians by the Croats under the leadership of ban Elačič (3). Encouraged the emperor had to favor Slav minorities, forming the administrative national units of Slovenia, Croatia, Banat, Transylvania, Serbia and Bačka.

In Prjašivščyna and in Carpatho-Ukraine, when the Revolution of 1848 broke out, "peasants" counteracted all the Hungarian assaults. The handful of Ukrainians began to fight the powerful Hungarian government and their strong propaganda. The leader of the Hungarian revolutionaries, Lajos Kossuth, planned to destroy all Slav minorities. Hungarians were fighting not only for their national freedom, but also for a complete extermination of minorities in Hungary. "*Hungary — for Hungarians*" and "*The sword will decide*" — became the slogans of this merciless extermination (4). The Hungarian language, forcibly introduced in all schools, was intended to Magyarize every individual in Hungary. In fact, at the time of the revolution, the Ukrainian teachers and professors, in these Magyarized schools, were very scarce. Those persons who wanted to have a job or career, had to give up their nationality or leave the country. Ukrainians had no other choice but to appeal to the imperial court against the Hungarian oppression. Except in some sporadic cases (5), the Ukrainians were grateful to the imperial court for the help in the erection of their eparchies of Mukačevo and of Prjašiv. To fight on the side of Hungarians was considered by the Ukrainians a scandal, ingratitude, even national treason. In these critical times the Ukrainian peasant had to fight for his existence completely alone, since his leaders became completely denationalized, ashamed of the uneducated villager, whose only sin was to remain faithful to his national ideals. Without newspaper, without schools, the only leader was his parish priest and only in the case when the priest was not yet denationalized.

In these hopeless circumstances on the political scene appeared an individual, to whom the Ukrainians of Hungary are grateful for

---

(3) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 241.

(4) *Ibidem*, p. 239.

(5) MELNYKOVA, *Zakarpatskaja Ukraina v revoluciji 1848 goda*, in "Voprosy Istoriji," 1948, vol. VIII, p. 75, quotes some names of seminarians.

his great efforts and sacrifices in the fight for their freedom, Adolph Dobrjanskyj (1817-1901).

During his sojourn in Banská Štiavnica, 1836-1840, Dobrjanskyj became active in the literary circle of the Slovaks, which gave him the opportunity to meet Slovak leaders and to become interested in the national aspiration of his own people. The Slovaks elected him their representative, but the government of Budapest declined his nomination. Therefore, Dobrjanskyj became active in his native Prjašivščyna, organizing military units to fight the rebels of Kossuth (6). After the evacuation of the Austrian General Schlick, the territory of Prjašivščyna remained in the hands of Kossuth's rebels. The Ukrainian population, avoiding the forcible mobilization of the rebels, went under cover, escaping into the mountains, where they fought a partisan war against the Hungarians. For his political ideas, Dobrjanskyj had to escape to Lviv, where from by a formal appeal of *Ukrainian National Council*, he tried to instill into the hearts of his co-nationals the true patriotism in fight against dangerous Hungarian nationalism. In fact, at the first meeting of Ukrainian National Council in Lviv, May 2, 1848, the national leaders of Halyčyna appealed to all Ukrainians to remain faithful to the Catholic Church and their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, working wholeheartedly for the progress of the Ukrainian people (7). At Dobrjanskyj's suggestion, a similar appeal was issued by the Slovak National Council to the Ukrainians of Hungary. On May 31, 1848 convened in Prague the Congress of Slav nationalities. Among the 340 delegates, for political reasons, there was no representation of the Ukrainians of Hungary, but their demands were forwarded to the government by the Slovak delegation (8).

The whole Austro-Hungarian empire was in a turmoil. After the rebellion in Vienna, the government evacuated to Kroměříž, Moravia. In the territory of Prjašivščyna, an army of Hungarian rebels, under General Lázár, was stationed. Another, General Dembinszky, with 18,000 soldiers came to defend the Northern borders of Hungary, the peaks of the Carpathian Mountains. In December, 1848, the Austrian army, under the command of generals Fiedler and Schlick, was fighting the rebels, while the Austrian government, knowing Dobrjanskyj's anti-Hungarian feelings, appointed

---

(6) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 133.

(7) M. HOLUBEC, *o.c.*, p. 677.

(8) M. MOLNAR, *o.c.*, p. 61.

him a special commissioner with the mission to contact the member of the Sacred Alliance, Russia, and ask the Czar for a military intervention to suffocate the Hungarian rebels. Czar Nicholas I (1825-1855), was afraid that the revolution might spread into Russia. Therefore, he gave orders to the army to fight the revolution of Hungarians and to cross the Carpathian Mountains. On June 15, 1848, near the village Dukla the Russian Czar, Nicolas I, after the religious services, inspected his army of 194,000 soldiers and 587 heavy artillery guns, confiding the command to General Ivan Paškevyč. The Czar returned to Warsaw, but the army of 50,000 soldiers entered the territory of Hungary. The poorly armed Hungarian rebels, under the command of General Görgey, numbered 17,000 soldiers. On June 18, 1849, the Russians occupied Zboriv; on June 19 they took Bardyjiv, and on June 22 they were in Prjašiv (9).

The bishop of Prjašiv, Joseph Gaganec, recommended to the bishop of Mukačevo to support Adolph Dobrjanskyj and Michael Vysanyk and to approve *The Memorial of the Ukrainians of Hungary* and presented to the imperial court by a special delegation. The following were their demands: 1) The erection of an autonomous entity of Ukrainians in Austro-Hungary (Halyčyna, Bukovyna and Zakarpattá) as a separate administrative unit, with the same rights, as other nationalities of the empire. 2) It would be described by the ethnographical borders of Ukrainians. Its legislative body would be the Ukrainian parliament to defend the rights of Ukrainians. 3) The erection of Ukrainian schools, a Ukrainian University in Lviv and a Faculty of Law in Užhorod. 4) The official language would be Ukrainian. The Ukrainians would pay taxes in the capital city of their province and they should benefit from their own institutions and cities. 5) All nationalities in Austro-Hungary should be equal enjoying the same rights. The Ukrainians would have their own publications and a Ukrainian press. 6) A general amnesty would be given to all political prisoners. If an individual would consider himself Ukrainian, he would not be treated as a traitor or an enemy of the state. 7) The erection and foundation of such societies and institutions, which would promote the Ukrainian national life. The Byzantine-Slavonic Rite chaplains would be admitted into the armed forces (10).

---

(9) B. KRPELEC, *Bardejov*, p. 358.

(10) M. MOLNAR, *o.c.*, p. 236.

The Hungarians claimed, that they were always faithful to the throne of the Habsburgs, but Dobrjanskyj was the eyewitness to their treason. After the defeat at Világos, on August 13, 1849, the deputation of three Hungarian nobles, headed by Count Kálmán Tisza (later the prime-minister and the minister of internal affairs of Hungary) appeared at the headquarters of Russian General Ivan Paškevyč in Gran Varadin. Offering the Hungarian crown of St. Stephen to the Russian Czar Nicholas I, Count Tisza proposed to make the Hungarian kingdom a Russian protectorate, offering the Hungarian throne to the governor of the Western Territories, Great Prince Constantine Pavlovič. Being a member of the Sacred Alliance, Russian General Paškevyč, in the name of the Czar declined the proposal. The whole incident became the matter of bitter accusations during the court case, in 1882, when Count Tisza accused Dobrjanskyj of state treason (11).

The Austrian emperor was grateful to the Ukrainians and to Dobrjanskyj for their loyalty and support during the revolution. The whole territory of Hungary was divided into five administrative provinces. One of them, the province of Kosiče, included Ukrainian population, as the territories of four former districts, with Dobrjanskyj as its first governor. The Ukrainian language was re-introduced in schools and offices and was considered again the official language in both Ukrainian eparchies.

Ukrainians did not enjoy their freedom for long. Austria joined the Sacred Alliance just to crush the rebellion of Hungarians, but when Russia expected Austrian military support against the Turks, Austria disregarded the pact of Sacred Alliance and withdrew its membership. Thus, Russia was left to fight the Turks alone, in the Crimean War (1854-56). In fact, propaganda against Russia in Austria started immediately after the revolution of 1848-49, since the central government of Vienna was afraid of a complete alienation of the Slav minorities aspiring to join a neighboring Russia. Therefore, the court of Vienna gave the Hungarians a free hand to handle their own internal, domestic affairs (12). The Hungarians again became the leading nation, reducing all the promises of the emperor to the Ukrainians to naught. The attempts to offer Hungary to the Russian Czar were well known in Vienna. The Hungarians succeeded to turn all the hostility against the Ukrainians, who in their

---

(11) P. C. FEDOR, *Kratkij očerk dejatelnosti A. I. Dobrjanskago*, pp. 6-7.

(12) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 253.



eyes became traitors, disloyal and unworthy of any trust. The Austrian government tried again to introduce German as the official language. The Hungarians simply replaced public officials and leading clergy in their territory with pro-Hungarian ones. To show their gratitude to the government, these individuals sold the aspiration of their people for a good job or career, subserving the state to destroy everything that was non-Hungarian. The government tried to bribe Dobjanskyj, in order to silence him. The minister of the interior, Count Tisza, offered Dobrjanskyj the post of minister of agriculture. For Dobrjanskyj this meant co-operation with Hungarians, therefore, he declined the offer (13). Dobrjanskyj was disappointed with the Austrian utilitarian politics. Realizing, that the promises and guarantees of the emperor would remain only on paper, the leader of Prjašivščyna began to seek a support for his people in Russia. The court of the Czar was not interested in the Slavophile and pro-Russian sympathies of Dobrjanskyj, nor in the anti-Hungarian movement of the Ukrainians. Dobrjanskyj as well as all Ukrainians in Hungary, were now accused of the Russophile sympathies and destined to a complete extermination by the Hungarians. In 1861, Dobrjanskyj was elected to represent the district of Šariš in the Hungarian parliament. When he entered the hall of representatives to deliver his address in defense of the autonomy for Ukrainians, he was booed, heckled and jeered by Hungarian representatives. The election and his mandate were proclaimed invalid and the autonomy of the Ukrainians was declared illegal. He was not allowed even to deliver his speech in parliament. Later he was able to publish in Vienna his 130 page defense of the historical rights of non-Hungarian minorities and particularly of the Ukrainians (14).

After the Ausgleich (1867), the newly formed government of Hungary did not keep all the clauses of agreement and, with their customary intrigues, they tried to alienate all Hungarians from the Habsburgs, aspiring for a completely separate state. To neutralize the "danger" of Slav minorities, the Austrian government began to oppress Ukrainians in Halyčyna, introducing a strict censorship of the Ukrainian press, which was an evident violation of Ukrainian

---

(13) P. S. FEDOR, *o.c.*, p. 14.

(14) *Rede des ungarischen Landtags-Abgerodneten Adolf Ritter von Dobransky in der Adress-Angelegenheit*, Wien 1861. A short analysis of "Rede", in E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 137.

constitutional law. To camouflage their maneuvers, Vienna instigated a nationally strong Polish element to fight the revival of Ukrainians in Halyčyna. In Hungary, the count used the Hungarians.

Disappointed, Dobrjanskyj resigned from his political activity, dedicating his time to writing political, sociological and juridical articles, books and pamphlets in defense of his people, living on his estate in Čertežne (15). The agents of the Hungarian government were always on his heels. In 1871, after the meeting of the Society of St. Basil in Užhorod, the Hungarian soldiers made an attempt on his life, wounding only his son Myroslav in his right arm (16).

In the estate of Čertežne, Dobrjanskyj wrote *The Political Project of Austrian Ukraine*, proving a necessity to transform dualistic Austro-Hungarian monarchy into a federation of nationalities. Because of their majority, the Slav nations of Austro-Hungary had to have equal rights. For the Ukrainians of Halyčyna, Zakarpattia and Bukovyna, Dobrjanskyj demanded a formation of an autonomous, separate province, the constitution and a political program which was to be elaborated by the Ukrainian National Council in Lviv (17).

In 1875, Dobrjanskyj made a trip to Russia, where he met many prominent political leaders, but he came home empty-handed. After being exposed to continuous persecution and calumnies, in the autumn of 1881 he moved to Lviv, where the agents of Count Tisza, then prime-minister of Hungary, with the consent of the Austrian government, arrested him. In 1882 the court proceedings were arranged intentionally at a time when the only witness, the Russian General Ivan Paškevyč, was dead. During the trial, Dobrjanskyj revealed the personal political machinations of Count Tisza, as well as his attempt to bribe Dobrjanskyj by offering him the ministry of agriculture of Hungary (18). In his speech *I don't feel guilty*, Dobrjanskyj proved ... proved that he and his group were innocent, ... pointing out again that the Ukrainians had constitutional rights to their own autonomy (19). Freed by the court, Dobrjanskyj was ordered to move to Vienna and later to Insbruck, Austria, where he lived in reclusion until his death, 1901 (20).

---

(15) P. S. FEDOR, *o.c.*, p. 14.

(16) *Ibidem*, p. 15.

(17) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 138.

(18) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 136.

(19) *Ja ne znaju za soboj nikakoj vyny*, partly published in *Prjaševščyna*, pp. 179-180.

(20) P. S. FEDOR, *o.c.*, p. 18.

Among his publications, the memorandum, printed in Moscow in 1875 entitled *The Present Religious and Political Situation of Austro-Hungarian Ukraine* underlined the oppression of Ukrainians and Slovaks alike. The Ukrainians were faithful to their Catholic Church and to the government of Vienna, and still they were continuously accused of treason and rebellion. On the other hand, the continuously rebelling Hungarians obtained all the privileges and favors. Dobrjanskyj made a conclusion from the past and insisted that Ukrainians had to rely only on their own strength. Because religion has always played an important part among Ukrainians, Dobrjanskyj demanded to form a special ecclesiastical commission, which would work out the outlines of the proposed ecclesiastical autonomy and protect Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, according to the decisions of the Council of Florence (21).

His main co-operator, his brother, Rev. Victor Dobrjanskyj, the canon and pastor of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parish in Košice, under continuous pressure and persecution of the Hungarian government, suffered neurotic depressions and committed suicide (22).

The other co-operator, Rev. John Mondok, was forced to leave the country and to emigrate to Russia, followed by the author of many school manuals, Rev. John Kymak and the secretary of the bishop, Rev. Michael Molčanič (23). The others were forced to move into the Hungarian mainland and they were isolated from every phase of Ukrainian national life. Ukrainian newspapers were forced to cease their publication; the activity of the Society of St. Basil was completely paralyzed. The laws of 1868, 1879 and 1883 imposed the Hungarian language in all schools, including the kindergarten. In the high schools of Užhorod and Prjašiv the Ukrainian language became only an extra-curricular subject. It was frequented by a small group of students and later, because of "the lack of students," it was completely discontinued (24).

Thus the stars of the Ukrainian national hopes were extinguished one after another and with them was dimmed the outlook for a brighter future for the Ukrainians on the Southern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains.

---

(21) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 139.

(22) A. DUCHNOVICŠ *o.c.*, in "Biographia."

(23) A. MRÁZ, *Volanie Podkarpatskej Rusi*, in M. MOLNAR, *o.c.*, p. 366; E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 186.

(24) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 263, 266-267; E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 240.

### XIII. THE DENATIONALIZATION OF THE EPARCHY

After Bishop Nicholas Tovt's death, May 21, 1882, another pro-Hungarian, John Vályi, was appointed the bishop of Prjašiv. It is not too difficult to learn the reasons for his candidacy, since the Hungarian government looked for a priest who would dedicate his services to their nationalistic purposes. Thus the government of Budapest proposed to the Holy See a candidate, involved with a woman, who bore him an illegitimate son. This was the case of Bishop John Vályi (1883-1911). Even if he was born in Óvencselő, Szabolcs district, of Hungarian nationality, Bishop Vályi began to administer the eparchy with sincerity and piety, dedicating himself to his flock, and studying the language, mentality, customs and culture of his faithful. The officials of the government did not forget their reasons for favoring his candidacy, promising to cover up the issue in Rome, if he would fully co-operate with the government in their policy of denationalization. Otherwise, they threatened to expose the bishop in Rome. Thus, blackmailed, Bishop Vályi became a puppet in the hands of the Hungarian government and a tool of the Hungarian nationalism (1).

The eparchial seminary was under the complete control of the Hungarian spirit. The priests, except for a few, became denationalized, forgetting completely the ideals of Rev. Alexander Duchnovyč and his patriotic circle. The government also planned to Magyarize the school for lay teachers, the Teachers Institute of Prjašiv. From its erection in 1895, all the subjects of the Teachers Institute were taught in Hungarian, except religion. The students were allowed to study their own Ukrainian language in their school but only two hours weekly and as extra curricular subject. Most of its graduates, lay teachers, to avoid the government's reprisals and to secure for themselves a state job and career, became tools of the denationalization of their own people.

For the Ukrainians, their last fortress of defense was their

---

(1) B. PEKAR, *Narysy Istorij Cerkvi Zakarpatia*, p. 99; A. VOLOŠYN, *Spomyny*, pp. 23-24.

Church and their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. To conquer them, the Hungarians had to change the strategy used in past. They had learned a lesson, that through the denationalized priests and bishops, they would be able to reach the Ukrainian Church itself. Now, that Bishop Vályi was on their side, and schools were performing an excellent job of denationalization, there was nobody who would oppose the policy of the government.

On May 22, 1863, a convention was held in Hajdudorog, Szabolcs district, under the leadership of an officer of the Hungarian army, Lajos Farkas. They forwarded to the bishops of Prjašiv and Mukachevo *The Memorandum*, demanding an introduction of the Hungarian language into all liturgical services. To make such a change was up to the Holy See, but both bishops allowed Hungarian to be used during the divine liturgy: the reading of the gospel, the sermon and the prayer before Holy Communion. Hungarian hymns could be sung after the liturgy (2). On May 3, 1866, the Hungarian group, in addition to their former requirements, petitioned the emperor to erect a separate eparchy for the Hungarians of the Byzantine Rite. The same petition was forwarded also to Hungarian political leaders and to the parliament. Thus the church issue became a political matter and was publicly discussed in parliament. Inspired by the government, the Hungarian faction branded all those who were not in favor of this movement as fomenters of schism, unloyal citizens, enemies of the state and agents of Russia. The whole controversial matter was sent to Rome, to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, which forwarded it to the Holy Office. On September 26, 1896, the Holy Office finally forbade the use of the Hungarian language in the liturgy, but the Hungarians did not obey the decision of the Holy See (3). Delegations were formed to intervene in various offices until they would obtain their goal. They were encouraged by the ministers Julius Andrásy and Francis Deák. The latter advised not to request, for the time being, an erection of a new eparchy. The issue was discussed in Rome, Vienna and Budapest, by the Cardinal-Primate and both Byzantine-Slavonic Rite bishops of the Ukrainians, who were in favor of the whole movement. On Sep-

---

(2) L. FARKAS, *Egy nemzeti küzdelem története*, Budapest 1896, among other things, falsely argued that Hungarians used their vernacular in liturgy in eleventh century. His exaggerations were refuted by Gy. GRIGASSY, *A Magyar Görög-Katolikusok legújabb története, Ungvár 1913*.

(3) A. RAES, *Introduction in Liturgiam Orientalem*, p. 214.

tember 20, 1873, the Ministry of Education and Cults ordered the erection in Hajdudorog of a vicariate for the Byzantine-Hungarian faithful. This vicariate included 33 parishes with 49,922 faithful, administered by the first vicar, the canon, John Danylovýč. The Hungarian prayer book *Liturgy of St. John Chrystom* for the people printed in Užhorod in 1795, was a non-liturgical translation of liturgy. Its second edition and the *Gospels and Epistles for Sundays and Holydays* were printed in Debrecen, in 1882, and *The Liturgy of S. Basil the Great* was printed there, in 1889 (4).

On the occasion of the millenium of the Hungarian settlement in their land, in 1896, the government sponsored great celebrations in Hungary. These served to foment Hungarian nationalism and to accelerate the denationalization of other minorities in Hungary. The group, which wished to introduce Hungarian into the liturgy, with the help of other Hungarian ultra-patriots, made a public demonstration on the streets of Budapest and presented another *Memorandum* to the prime-minister and to the primate. The pastor of Hajdudorog, Rev. Andrew Ujhelyi, against the decisions of the Holy Office celebrated the divine liturgy in the Hungarian language in the University Chapel. The Holy See once again repeated the decisions of the Holy Office, forbidding the use of Hungarian in liturgical functions, stating that Hungarian liturgical books had never been approved by Rome (5). This caused great indignation among Hungarians. On June 20, 1898 a *National Convention* was held in Budapest, where the *National Committee for the Hungarians of Byzantine Rite* was formed. The Committee added to their previous demands the change of the Julian calendar in relation to the celebration of ecclesiastical holydays (6). Again on September 30, 1899 all their demands were refused by the Congregation of Propaganda Fide. In 1900, on the occasion of the Holy Year, the Committee made "a pilgrimage" to Rome, where the puppet of the Hungarian government, the bishop of Prjašiv, John Vályi, as

---

(4) A. RAES, *l.c.* Most of the Hungarian liturgical books were translated from Church-Slavonic by Rev. John Danylovýč. Cfr. E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 193. First Hungarian prayerbook for Byzantine Rite faithful was compiled by Rev. IGNATIUS ROŠKOVYČ, *O-hitü imádságos és énekeskönyv*, Debrecen 1762 (The prayerbook and hymnal of the old faith). The comment in I. HRVŇOCH, *Sobor, jakyj dla nas ne vidbusvja* (The Council, which was not celebrated for us), Munchen 1967, p. 35.

(5) Gy. GRIGASSY, *o.c.*, pp. 65-66.

(6) *Ibidem*, pp. 71-74, and also *Libellus Memorialis*, p. 99 ss.

the head of pilgrimage presented Pope Leo XIII with *Libellus* — the demands of the Hungarians (7).

For his pro-Hungarian efforts, Bishop Vályi was praised by the Hungarian press. The government awarded him with the Iron Cross of First Class, as well as on its suggestion, Bishop Vályi was also given the title of the assistant of the Papal Throne and Count of Rome.

In 1871, yet in 353 parochial schools of both eparchies all subjects were taught in Ukrainian; while in 265 schools they were taught in Ukrainian and Hungarian or only in Hungarian (8). The peak of a forcible denationalization of parochial schools was reached by XXVI and XXVII laws of Apponyi, approved by the Hungarian parliament in 1907. According to these laws, in all private and public schools, all the subjects had to be taught in Hungarian (9). The parochial school teachers automatically became the officials of government, independent from the ecclesiastical administration. The government praised Bishop Vályi for introducing these laws into the eparchial schools.

The bishop did not live to see one of those achievements of the Hungarian nationalism, the erection of the Hungarian Byzantine Catholic eparchy of Hajdudorog, because a year before its erection, in 1911, he died.

---

(7) *Libellus Memorialis Hungarorum gr. rit. Catholicorum ad SS. Patrem Leonem XIII*, Budapestini 1900, translated in German *Denkschrift der Griechisch-Katholischen Ungarn an Seine Heiligkeit Papst Leo XII*, Budapest 1900, and in Hungarian *Emlekkönyv a Görög Szertartásu Katholikusok Magyarok Római Zarándoklatáról*, Budapest 1901.

(8) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 250.

(9) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 279.

#### XIV. THE ERECTION OF THE HUNGARIAN BYZANTINE CATHOLIC EPARCHY OF HAJDUDOROG

Encouraged by the Hungarian government and press, the magyarized priests were introducing the Hungarian language into the Byzantine Rite liturgical services against all the protests of the Ukrainian faithful. The Holy See was reassuring the bishops of Prjašiv and Mukačevo, that the use of the Hungarian language in the liturgy is forbidden and that the Holy See would insist that these orders be observed. The cardinal primate nevertheless, encouraged Hungarians to fight for the use of Hungarian in the Byzantine liturgy. The Ukrainian faithful as well as few Ukrainian priests protested, also asking the Holy See for intercession. From Rome a reconfirmation of previous decisions came in 1909 (1), but the Hungarian patriots changed their tactics. It seemed more realistic for them to ask for the erection of Hungarian Byzantine Rite eparchy and to magyarize later all the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Ukrainians. The petition was sent to Rome from *the Central Committee* on September 12, 1911, for the erection for Hungarians of a Byzantine Rite eparchy with Greek as the liturgical language. The Holy See sought the advice of Hungarian bishops who unanimously were in favor of this erection. The Hungarian government made the guarantee of using the Greek liturgical language, but they did not intend to keep these promises. The two-faced Hungarian diplomacy was exposed to Pope Pius X by the Rumanian Bishop Hosszu, in March, 1912, but it was too late (2). On June 8, 1912, by the bull *Christifideles Graeci Ritus*, Pope Pius X canonically erected the eparchy of Hajdudorog for Hungarian faithful of the Byzantine Rite. The motives were: 1) The "great increase" of Hungarians of the Byzantine Rite, 2) The "re-establishment of peace" among the same rite's faithful of different nationalities, 3) The better co-operation between the Holy See and Hungary, and 4) The faithful observance of the orders of the Holy See to fight the condemned use of the Hun-

---

(1) C. KOROLEVSKY, *Living Languages in Catholic Worship*, p. 33.

(2) *Ibidem*, p. 37.



garian language in the liturgical functions (3). The territory of the new eparchy included 160 parishes with 215,498 faithful (4). The bishop and his chapter had to reside in Hajdudorog, but after the attempt on the bishop's life in 1913, the city of Nyiregyháza became the bishop's residence (5). The erection of the Hajdudorog eparchy was another milestone in the process of denationalization of non-Hungarian minorities with the help of ecclesiastical hierarchy (6). The favorite candidate of Hungarian government, Stephen Miklóssy, was appointed on June 23, 1913 as the first bishop. He was consecrated and installed on October 5, 1913 (7).

If the priests would not use the previous Church-Slavonic, the Holy See prescribed for the eparchy of Hajdudorog the use of the Greek language. The vernacular Hungarian was prohibited and it could not be used only at the extra liturgical functions. To the priests the Holy See gave the period of three years to introduce Greek instead of Slavonic language (8). The prohibition of the Holy See was not observed, since the Nuncio of Vienna informed the Holy See they would not insist on a strict observance of these orders (9).

Since the opinion of the cardinal primate and Hungarian government in the election of the new bishop was considered by the Holy See as the most convincing recommendation, the Hungarian faction had a free hand to select a candidate for the bishop of Prjašiv, who was completely dedicated to the cause of Hungarian nationalism.

After the death of Bishop John Vályi and the canonical erection of the Hajdudorog eparchy, the government and the cardinal primate proposed to Rome as their candidate, Stephen Novak, who became the Bishop of Prjašiv, in 1913. Born in the village of Ubla, Zemplin district and educated in the primatial seminary of Esztergom,

---

(3) AAS, 1912, v. IV, pp. 430-435. The comment in G. DE VRIES, *Oriente Cristiano ieri e oggi*, p. 248, 250.

(4) *Schematismus dioecesis Hajdudoregensis*, 1918, p. 13 ss. 8 parishes from Prjašiv's eparchy; 68 from Mukačevo eparchy; from 83 parishes of Romanian eparchies, 77 returned to their previous eparchies after the World War I. G. DE VRIES, *o.c.*, p. 248.

(5) B. KRPELEC, *Bardejov*, p. 153.

(6) C. KOROLEVSKY, *o.c.*, p. 38.

(7) B. KRPELEC, *l.c.*

(8) AAS, 1912, v. IV, pp. 430-435. A. RAES, *Introduction in Liturgian Orientalen*, p. 214.

(9) I. VANČYK, *Maďarsjka mova v cerk. bohosluzěvu a rusjke duhovenstvo na Uhoršyjni*, in "Nyva," 1907, pp. 227-230.

Novak was ordained priest on January 9, 1905. After two years as an assistant-professor and prefect at the eparchial seminary in Užhorod, Stephen Novak for five years (1908-1913) was the tutor of Count Michael Pálffy's children. It was this Count Pálffy, who pushed this pro-Hungarian minded priest to the episcopal see of Prjašiv. Confirmed by the Holy See on November 20, 1913, Stephen Novak was consecrated the bishop of Prjašiv eparchy on November 1, 1914 (10). Immediately after his consecration, Bishop Novak began to destroy the last remains of the weakened Ukrainian national life of his own faithful. He did not have to worry about the eparchial clergy, since they were already completely controlled by the government. The oppressed people, identified only as "Greek Catholics," had to abandon all their hopes for their brighter future (11).

Bishops Novak, Papp and Miklóssy became co-charimen of the government sponsored *Central Committee of the Byzantine Catholic Eparchies* under the presidency of primate, the archbishop of Esztergom. The vice-chairman of the Committee was the secretary of the ministry of education. He was also the acting president at the meetings. The Subcommittee included four delegates of each eparchy, approved by the chairman-primate. The by-laws, prepared by the mentioned ministry, included these provisions for the agenda: 1) The change of the calendar, 2) The reform of the theological studies, 3) The reform of the Basilian Order, and 4) The change of the Ukrainian into the Hungarian alphabet (12).

The government issued already in 1911 an order to introduce in both eparchies the Gregorian calendar. To captivate priests for their project, an increase of congrua to the clergy was granted by the government. The people rebelled against this forcible reform of the calendar. The priests, afraid of massive desertion of the Catholic Church, did not insist on the application of calendar reform. The government had to wait until World War I, when, on June 24, 1916, the Gregorian calendar was imposed again with the radical methods, enforced by police. On Easter Sunday, 1917, according to the "new" calendar, the Ukrainians of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite were dragged by Hungarian gendarmes to have their Easter-

---

(10) *Dušpastyr*, 1932, p. 280.

(11) E. NEDZELSKIJ, *o.c.*, p. 272. See the poem of STAVROVSKYJ-POPRADOV, *Lasciate ogni speranza*, in J. BAČA, *Chrestomatija*, p. 265.

(12) A. VOLOŠYN, *Oborona Kyrylyky*, in "Naukovyj Zbirnyk t-va Prosvita," 1936, v. XII, pp. 85-117.

food blessed in their churches. Bishop Novak did not protest against the brutality of the gendarmes. He remained deaf to the desperate plea of his oppressed people (13).

Two years after the celebration of the Hungarian Millennium in 1898, Hungary's prime minister, Desiderius Bánffy, ordered all state clerks and officials to magyarize their family names (14). To both bishops he ordered to introduce in the eparchial parochial schools the Hungarian alphabet. The bishops obeyed the order, otherwise the government threatened to abolish the financial support for the clergy. The liturgical books also had to be printed in Hungarian spelling, according to the orders of the ministry of education, of February 23, 1905. In reprinted liturgical books, many saints of Slavonic origin were omitted and new, Hungarian saints, with corresponding feastdays, were introduced into the liturgical calendar of the Ukrainians of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite (15).

The Central Committee on June 1, 1915, agreed to the plan of the ministry to change the alphabet and to "correct" the liturgical books. The pro-Hungarian bishops did not even discuss the possibility of opposing the government's plan. Only the members of the Subcommittee from the Mukačevo eparchy dared to defend the position of the Ukrainian faithful in their memorandum of June 22, 1915 (16). During the only meeting of the Central Committee, held in Budapest on August 9, 1915, the Cardinal Primate Csernok, in his patriotic speech, demanded a strict co-operation of all Catholics for the final victory in the war. The clergy of the Ukrainians had to avoid any suspicion of Russophile schism. All the Ukrainians had to sacrifice their alphabet, their old Julian calendar and their liturgical books. All the members of the Committee had to agree to all these "reforms" of the Hungarian government, because otherwise, they would expose themselves and all the Ukrainians to the reprisals of the government (17).

In further discussion, Bishop Novak was in favor of government inspired reforms. The canons of Prjašiv's eparchy, the members of the Subcommittee: J. Kyzak, N. Rusnak, S. Smandraj and S. Seman had nothing to do but to agree with their bishop. Thus,

---

(13) A. BIRČAK, *Na Novych Zemplach*, Lviv 1938, pp. 154-155.

(14) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 272.

(15) A. VOLOŠYN, *Spomyny*, p. 46.

(16) *Ibidem*, p. 50; A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 110.

(17) A. VOLOŠYN, *o.c.*, p. 48.

in September, 1915, Bishop Novak introduced the Hungarian alphabet in all parochial schools of the Prjašiv eparchy (18).

He did not stop there. In his patriotism, the bishop not only sacrificed everything for the victory of the Hungarian army, but also invested all the eparchial funds as a state loan to the Hungarian government. In 1918, the prediction of Adolph Dobrjanskyj became an unexpected reality: Austro-Hungary was completely destroyed. After the territory of Prjašiv eparchy was incorporated to the Czechoslovak republic, Bishop Stephen Novak, without permission of the Holy See, renounced the administration of the eparchy and emigrated to Budapest, where he remained until his death, September 16, 1932 (19). The bankrupt eparchy remained without shepherd, but the Divine Providence watched over the Ukrainian faithful even during these critical times.

---

(18) A. VOLOŠYN, *Oborona Kyrylyky, l.c.*, p. 97; B. BOYSAK, *The Fate of the Holy Union in Carpatho-Ukraine*, pp. 158-159.

(19) *Dušpastyr*, 1932, p. 280.

## XV. WORLD WAR I (1914-1918). THE EPARCHY AS PART OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Many broadminded statesmen, realizing the consequences of Hungarian nationalism, were inclined to transform the Austro-Hungarian monarchy into a federation of nations (1). This was also the opinion of the heir to the throne, Archprince Franz Ferdinand, but he was killed in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914. This conflict between Austro-Hungary and Serbia was the beginning of World War I (2).

On September 7, 1915, the Austrian Prime-Minister Stirk revealed, that at the monarchy's council meeting, it was decided to form from Halyčyna, the Ukrainian territory of Hungary, and the occupied territories of Volyň, an independent Ukrainian province, on the basis of federation with Austro-Hungary, with a guarantee for the rights of national minorities (3). The monarchy was becoming weaker. The death of Franz Joseph I and the regime of his successor-cousin Charles (November 21, 1916), was another step toward the complete disintegration of monarchy (4). In Russia, in October, 1917, the Bolshevik Revolution broke out. Weakened war enemies met at the Peace Conference in Berest, and on February 9, 1918 it was decided to form an autonomous province of Halyčyna, Bukovyna and Zakarpattia, but this clause was annuled by the Hungarian Prime-Minister Burian (5). To obtain the rights and freedom for their people, the Ukrainian diplomats in mutual understanding with the Czech and Slovenian representatives proposed to Emperor Charles the plan of transforming the monarchy into a federation of national states (6).

Czech political leaders, Masaryk and Beneš, until the war, were

---

(1) J. MACUREK, *o.c.*, p. 287.

(2) M. HOLUBEC, *Istoriya Ukrajinny, p. 748. V. A. ŽEBOKRYCKYJ, Istoriya Pivdennykh i Zachidnykh Slovjan, p. 227.*

(3) M. HOLUBEC, *o.c.*, p. 750.

(4) *Ibidem*, p. 751.

(5) *Ibidem*, p. 778. V. A. ŽEBOKRYCKYJ, *o.c.*, p. 163.

(6) *Istorični Postati XIX-XX st.*, p. 164.

completely against the separation from Austria (7). It was planned to proclaim in the national capital cities the erection of national states, but the emperor was hesitating. Thus, the minorities political leaders began to look for help abroad. On October 16, 1918, the emperor issued a decree of reorganization of the monarchy into a federation with National Councils of minorities. On October 18, 1918, in Lviv, the Ukrainian Constituent Council proclaimed the erection of Halyčyna, Bukovyna and Zakarpattia in an independent Ukrainian State, postponing the problem to what state or federation it had to belong. Its representatives were to be sent to the Peace Conference in Paris (8). The Hungarian Prime-Minister, Vekerle, on the basis of the Emperor's proclamation of federation on October 15, 1918 transferred Hungarian armies from the Eastern front to defend the Hungarian borders and tried to improve the relations with victorious allies (9). According to the 14 points of Wilson's proclamation of self-determination of nationalities, the Austro-Hungarian government agreed to take part in the Peace Conference. Reaffirming the rights of self-determination, the State Secretary of the United States, Lansing, on October 21, 1918, added that Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are in a state of war with Austro-Hungary and that they will decide themselves about their future (10). The final downfall of Austro-Hungary became a matter of weeks. The leader of Czechoslovakia, Masaryk, promised to support the demands of Ukrainians in the Peace Conference in Paris. For the time being, an agreement was made between Ukrainian political leaders and the Hungarian Prime-Minister, Count Károlyi, that the same Peace Conference would decide the future of Ukrainians in Hungary (11).

The Czechoslovak politics concentrated in the hands of Masaryk. The *Czechoslovak Jednota* was organized from among the ex-prisoners of the Austro-Hungarian army as was the *Czechoslovak Legion* formed in the various prisoner camps. In their hatred toward Austro-Hungary, Czechs and Slovaks became Russian orientated. Slovaks, in their first meeting of *The Association in Memory of Štur*, on August 20, 1915, elected their first president Savjolov, a Russian, later

---

(7) *Ibidem*, l.c.

(8) M. HOLUBEC, o.c., pp. 790-791. *Istoryčni Postati*, pp. 171-172.

(9) *Istoryčni Postati*, p. 175.

(10) J. MACUREK, o.c., p. 288. *Istoryčni Postati*, p. 175.

(11) *Istoryčni Postati*, p. 178.

the governor of Cholm province, with nine Slovaks and nine Russians as members of the board. Savjolov was bitterly opposed to the union or federation of Slovaks and Czechs (12).

In the USA, the Slovak League in 1916 sent its delegate Košík to Russia to work for the liberation of Slovakia under the Russian protectorate. When the Slovaks were persuaded to co-operate with the Czechs, they disassociated themselves from the delegate Košík (13). The next step of Masaryk was to persuade the Ukrainians of Hungary. At the meeting of their organizations on July 23, 1918, Ukrainian emigrants in the USA were discussing the situation of their homeland. They decided that their territory, together with Halyčyna, should form a new state. On October 25, 1918, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Masaryk and the president of the Ukrainian Council in USA, Gregory Žatkovyč, agreed to annex the Ukrainian territory of Hungary to the new Czechoslovak Republic (14). As the juridical entity, on the basis of federation, the districts of Spiš, Šariš, Aba-Novohrad, Gemer, Zemplin, Boršod, Už, Ugoča, Bereh and Maramoroš would form part of the new state. This was confirmed at the meeting in Scranton, Pennsylvania, on November 12, 1918, where 67% of the emigrants were for the federation with the Czechoslovak republic, 28% for federation with Ukraine, only 2% were for an independent state, 1% for the union with Russia, and 1% for federation with Hungary (15). Later all the points agreed to by Masaryk and the representatives of Ukrainian emigrants of USA were ratified by the Paris Peace Conference, on September 10, 1919 (16).

In the territory of Prjašivščyna, on November 8, 1918, Rev. I. Nevyckyj, in Stara Lubovňa, organized *the National Council* which was for federation with the Ukraine (17). The same thing was decided at the meeting of the National Council in Prjašiv, on November 18, 1918. Nevertheless, when they realized, that the federation with Ukraine was impossible, the Councils of Stara Lubovňa

---

(12) N. A. BESKID, *Karpatorusskaja Pravda*, p. 21.

(13) *Ibidem*.

(14) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, pp. 17-19.

(15) V. MARKUS, *L'incorporation de l'Ukraine Subcarpathique a l'Ukraine Sovietique*, p. 14. J. BORŽAVA, *Vid Uhorskoji Rusy do Karpatskoji Ukrajiny*, p. 26.

(16) Cfr. the document in V. MARKUS, *o.c.*, pp. 109-110.

(17) B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 99.

and Prjašiv, on January 7, 1919, decided to become part of the Czechoslovak Republic (18). Discussing the new Republic's name, during the dinner in honor of the Ukrainian delegation, given in Prague, May 23, 1919, the Minister of Justice, Francis Soukup, toasted to the "Czechoslovak-Ukrainian Republic" (19). On May 7, 1919, the Councils of Prjašiv, Chust and Užhorod, founded one *Central National Council* in Užhorod and decided to join the Republic of Czechs and Slovaks (20).

The Hungarians used all their diplomacy to save at least what was possible (21). Thus on December 24, 1918, the republican government of Károlyi proclaimed the autonomy of the Ukrainians, under the name of "Rusjka Krajina" with its administration, education, religion, cultural and juridical apparatus. The provincial Parliament had to pass its laws and the commissioner of the autonomous province was to be included in the government of Budapest (22). But it was too late. On March 21, 1919, the Communist revolution of Béla Kun broke out in all Hungary. Almost all the territory of Prjašivščyna was occupied by the Communist revolutionaries for a brief time (23), but in the summer of 1919, the Czechoslovak legionaries occupied Prjašivščyna which became the part of the newly created Republic of Czechoslovakia.

The 14 points of President Wilson in reality were a bitter awakening and a bargain between the stronger and weaker partner. Ironic also was the statement of the Prime-Minister of England, Asquith, November 9, 1914, because exactly the contrary happened in the political life of the Ukrainians. Until this time, the ethnographical border of the Ukrainians was on the river Poprad, but the Slovaks included all these territories to the river Už into the Slovakia. This happened, after Slovak leaders found out about the decision of the Ukrainians in the USA to become part of the federative Republic (24). This was an injustice. It happened without any consent or diplomatic ratification on the Ukrainian part. Lieutenant-Colonel Vix, in the name of the Czechoslovak government sent a note to Buda-

---

(18) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 24.

(19) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, p. 20.

(20) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 25.

(21) V. MARKUS, *o.c.*, p. 15. A. MRAZ, *Volanie Podkarpatskej Rusi* in M. MOLNAR, *Slovaky i Ukrajinci*, p. 368 n.

(22) V. MARKUS, *o.c.*, p. 13. N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, pp. 18-23.

(23) V. A. ŽEBOKRYCKYJ, *o.c.*, p. 277.

(24) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, p. 23.



pest, December 24, 1918, stating again, that the border with Slovakia will be on the river Už (25), thus the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna would belong to the Slovak administration. It was also stated, that the definite borders would be approved in the Peace Conference by the Allies, which never happened (26). Against this decision, the Ukrainian National Council of Užhorod made a formal protest and on September 12, 1919, appealed to the Peace Conference in Paris.

In the cities, towns and villages of Prjašivščyna, during these political and military changes, the population avoided bloodshed. This was the result of the work and influence of parish priests. In many instances, in these chaotic times, people confided only in them, electing them to order their social and national lives (27). It was a pity, that they were also pro-Hungarians, dedicated to the interests of the monarchy. Their political orientation caused bitter consequences not only in their own lives, but also in the life of the whole eparchy.

On October 28, 1918, in Prague, the Czechoslovak Republic was proclaimed with its first president, Thomas Garique Masaryk. On October 30, 1918, the proclamation was promulgated throughout the territory of Slovakia (28). The Czechoslovak soldiers occupied the territory of the new republic, but Prjašivščyna did not wake up to this reality. There were councils and meetings in its villages and towns, most of them conducted in Hungarian and in the spirit of loyalty to Hungary. The teachers were instructed not to take an oath of loyalty to the Czechoslovak regime. The priests followed their example. It was generally assumed, that it was only a temporary situation and that the Hungarians would return and everything would return to its pre-war order (29). On January 9, 1919, the Governor of the Zemplin district, Fabry, dissolved the old Hungarian administrative offices and in the district's new capital, Prjašiv, he accepted only those officials, who took the oath of loyalty to the new state (30).

Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, was

---

(25) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, pp. 14-15.

(26) Father Biharij was elected the city's council president in Bardyjiv. Cfr. B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, pp. 126-127.

(27) V. A. ŽEBOKRYCKYJ, *o.c.*, p. 274.

(28) B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 125.

(29) *Ibidem*, p. 127.

(30) L. NEMEC, *Church and State in Czechoslovakia*, pp. 124-130.

not only anti-Austrian, but also anti-Catholic. During his first years of presidency, Bohemia and Moravia were affected by atheism, anti-Catholicism and anti-clericalism, supported by socialists and masons. A form of religious iconoclasm broke out. More than three hundred churches changed ownership, about five hundred shrines were desecrated. The priests were expelled from public schools and offices, calumniated and attacked. Traditional Czech Hussitism was reestablished. The Association of Catholic Clergy was created, with 400 priests as members (31), but because of their modernistic and liberal viewpoints, the Holy See, on January 15, 1920, condemned it (32). Sixty-six priests did not obey the Holy See's orders and broke away from the Catholic Church, establishing a new religion with forty-one parishes and 150,000 members, the Czechoslovak Church. In 1923 it counted 1,388,000 members, but in 1930 their number dropped to 793,000 and it was continuously decreasing. The Catholic Church having her rights guaranteed by the constitution shortly recuperated from her initial shock and proved once again that it was still the dominant religion in the new republic (33).

Leaving his eparchy, in 1918, Bishop Novak promised he would not return to Prjašiv until the last Czechoslovak soldier would be expelled from the country. His wish was not fulfilled. The priests eventually also realized, that they had to acknowledge the new regime. Many of them were suspicious, because in receiving Czech brothers, they received also new political divisions, schism, atheism and chaos. In protest against the new government, the clergy of the eparchy refused to take part in the public life of the new state. The government sent into the Ukrainian territories Russian emigrants, the ex-soldiers of the White Army of General Denikin or other Russian Orthodox emigrants just to have these Ukrainians completely disintegrated (33). This was the situation, when on October 1, 1918 the Very Reverend Nicholas Rusnak became a temporary administrator of the eparchy.

---

(31) AAS, 1920, XII, p. 37.

(32) F. CINEK, *K náboženské otázky v prvních letech naší samostatnosti*, p. 27 ss.  
M. LISCOVA, *The Religious Situation in Czechoslovakia*, p. 36 ss.

(33) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, pp. 28-29.

## XVI. THE REACTION TO MAGYARIZATION: THE ORTHODOX MOVEMENT

Hungarians applied all methods to exterminate non-Hungarian nationalities, especially Ukrainians. They gave opportunities to economic exploiters to reduce the Ukrainians to economic and financial misery, to transform the rest of these villagers into beggars, and thus have a complete control of their lives. In the villages appeared the merciless extortionists, the tavern owners. The number of alcoholics grew from day to day in catastrophic proportions. The estate of this poor people, their livestock and all their earthly possessions became the property of the exploiters (1).

Dobrjanskyj fought against this social plague, applying his efforts to better the economic life of his people, but he was powerless against these malefactors. Therefore, Dobrjanskyj, in 1880, encouraged many of his people to emigrate to the United States and to Canada in order to better their economic conditions. To find out the details about the working conditions, Dobrjanskyj sent one of his men to the United States and demanded from the government of Budapest the right to emigrate to foreign lands (2).

In their new home, in the United States, the emigrants from Prjašivščyna settled in the hard coal region of Pennsylvania, in Shenandoah, where together with the Ukrainian emigrants from Halyčyna founded in 1882 their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Church of St. Michael, first in the United States. The first priest of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite was Rev. John Voľanskyj, from the eparchy of Lviv, Halyčyna (3). In following years the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite parishes were organized in Pittsburgh, Pa., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., St. Clair, Pa., Duquesne, Pa., Bridgeport, Conn., Minneapolis, Minn., and others (4). In 1907 there were 148 secular and 6 religious priests

---

(1) The description of these miserable conditions in M. BARTHA, *V zemi Chazaru*.

(2) G. GEROVSKIJ, *Istoričeskoje prošloje Prjaševščyny*, in "Prjaševščyna," p. 90.

(3) S. C. GULOVICH, *The Rusin Exarchate in the United States*, in "Eastern Churches Quarterly," 1946, V. VI, pp. 459-486.

(4) A. S. ŠLEPECKIJ, *Prjaševcy v Amerike*, in "Prjaševščyna," p. 258.

from Prjašiv, Mukačevo and eparchies of Halyčyna in charge of the spiritual care of 152 parishes and 43 missions (5).

The Hungarian government screened carefully every eventual emigrant and only those Ukrainians could leave Hungary, who promised to be faithful to the Hungarian national aspirations. In the free land of Washington, being of the same rite and language as the Ukrainians from Halyčyna, the eventual unity of the Ukrainians could create a new menace to Hungarian policy abroad. Through a strict surveillance by the officials and secret agents, Hungarians controlled their activities. From the Hungarian consulates and embassies in the United States and Canada pro-Hungarian ideology was directed, causing bitter antagonism between the Ukrainians of Zakarpattá and Halyčyna (6). The whole net of this underground work was in hands of the head of the secret police for Ukrainian territories, Arnold Dulyškovyč, who was poisoned on his return trip to Hungary by Czechoslovak counter-espionage agents (7).

These Ukrainian immigrants came to the New World to escape national, political, religious and economic oppression of the Hungarians. As the exodus from their lands was spontaneous and unorganized, so were their lives in the New World: confused and divided. Without leaders they crossed the ocean, penniless, without knowledge of English and in many cases completely illiterate. These first Ukrainian immigrants were abused by local English speaking individuals (8). These and similar incidents caused them to found their own organizations and associations (9). Politically confused and nationally dis-orientated, they had a inferiority complex about their own nationality. Under the cover of friendship or false pretexts, agents of different ideologies used them for various political and national goals. The bishops of Prjašiv and Mukačevo sent priests to take spiritual care of the immigrants, but the government saw to it that these priests would be Hungarian patriots. This pro-Hungarian and aristocratic attitude of the clergy caused many Ukrainian immigrants from Prjašivščyna to leave the Catholic Church and to organize non-Catholic communities (10).

---

(5) M. LACKO, *The Churches of Eastern Rite in North America*, in "Unitas," 1964, v. XVI, p. 103.

(6) Cfr. published documents, in "Hungary Unmasked," Cleveland 1907.

(7) N. A. BESKID, *o.c.*, pp. 287-288.

(8) S. C. GULOVICH, *o.c.*

(9) A. S. ŠLEPECKIJ, *l.c.*

(10) S. C. GULOVICH, *l.c.*

In 1867 Russia sold the territory of Alaska to the United States. The money was destined for Russian propaganda, mostly by the Orthodox priests to "convert" these nationally unstable immigrants.

On November 27, 1889 Rev. Alexis Toth, sent to the United States by the bishop of Prjašiv, John Vályi, became the pastor of the newly organized Catholic parish of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Minneapolis, Minnesota. During the audience on December 18, 1889, he was told by the local Latin Rite Bishop of St. Paul, John Ireland, that only Latin Rite priests would be accepted in his diocese. The bishop refused to grant jurisdiction to Rev. Toth. When he and other priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite protested, the bishop suspended him. Rev. J. Pocholski, a Polish priest of the Latin Rite, was ordered to read the suspension in his church in the presence of many Ukrainians of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. As a suspended priest, with orders from his former bishop of Prjašiv, Rev. Toth served his parishioners almost a year (11), appealing to the Holy See, but received no answer. The Holy See ordered Bishop Vályi to call him back to Prjašiv, but Rev. Toth disobeyed the orders (12). For him these were sufficient proofs that the Latin Rite Catholic hierarchy in the United States would not recognize him as a Catholic priest, nor his parishioners as Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Unfortunately, he made contacts with the Russian Orthodox Bishop Vladimir of Alaska, residing in San Francisco, California (13). Thus the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite congregation in Minneapolis, on March 25, 1891, broke away from the Holy See and became subject to the Russian Orthodox Bishop Vladimir, as *The Carpatho-Russian Greek-Catholic Orthodox Church*. The acceptance of Minneapolis congregation under Russian Orthodox jurisdiction was confirmed by the Holy Synod of Moscow on July 14, 1892 (14). Moved to Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Rev. Toth persuaded fifteen of his former colleagues-priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite to embrace Orthodoxy. Thus in 1895, seventeen parishes with over 20,000 faithful were organized into a new ecclesiastical unit, the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox eparchy, under his own jurisdiction (15).

---

(11) *Kalendar Russkago Pravoslavnago o-va Vzaimopomošči na 1938 g.*, pp. 141-143.

(12) B. BOYSAK, *o.c.*, pp. 168-169.

(13) *Ibidem*, in "Kalendar."

(14) *The decree*, in "Kalendar," pp. 152-153.

(15) M. LACKO, *l.c.*

This split brought further division, hatred and confusion among the Ukrainians. Polemics, discussions, fights, court-cases were on the daily program. In those parishes, where there were dedicated priests, unity and peace were preserved, but in parishes where the priest was imprudent, the parishioners broke away from Rome. Pro-Hungarian priests advised these parishioners in many instances to join the Orthodox parish rather than belong to the Ukrainian from Halyčyna. In many instances, these pro-Hungarian priests celebrated divine liturgies in nearby Latin Rite churches to create a division among the Ukrainians of Zakarpattá and Halyčyna. In some instances, these divisions went completely out of their control, because these newly "organized" parishioners became disappointed in pro-Hungarian policies and in the aristocratic manners of priest and, therefore, broke away from Rome.

In Nanticoke, Pa., the parishioners became tired of waiting for a priest every Sunday as long as two hours until he could come on the street-car from Wilkes-Barre, Pa. and many times they could not collect the required \$ 25.00 for his services. Thus, one Sunday an Orthodox priest came to the town and told the parishioners they would not have to wait nor to pay a priest anymore. Almost the whole congregation broke away from the Catholic Church, organizing a new Orthodox parish. At the present time, there are three churches in Nanticoke of Byzantine Rite: 1) St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church, under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Philadelphia, 2) St. Mary's Church of Ukrainians of former Hungary, under the jurisdiction of the exarch of Passaic, and 3) the Russian Greek-Catholic Orthodox Church, under the jurisdiction of the autocephalous bishop of New York. There are many other similar cases in the past of these parishes.

When Rev. Alexius Toth, *the Father of Orthodox Church in the United States* died on May 9, 1909, 225,000 former Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite had already joined his "Carpatho-Russian Greek-Catholic Orthodox Church" (16).

In 1905 these "converts" collected \$ 600.00 and sent it to Becheriv, Prjašivščyna, to build there a new Orthodox church, but the Hungarian government returned the money to the senders (17).

In Prjašivščyna, after it was annexed to the newly formed Czechoslovak Republic, another political-religious ferment was in

---

(16) M. LACKO, *l.c.*

(17) B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 177.

progress. President Masaryk and the central government of Prague accused the clergy of disloyalty to their pro-Hungarian feelings. To belong to the Catholic Church, they said, meant to belong to the faith of Hungarians. The Ukrainians had to break away from Rome, from their pro-Hungarian priests and form a new Russian Orthodox Church. The Czechoslovak government sponsored Russian immigrants to become professors, teachers, publicists, scientists, intellectuals and journalists. Many of them, after a short course of religion, became Orthodox priests. Prague was interested in creating more chaos and divisions among the Ukrainians, since they tried to convince the international public opinion, that the Ukrainians were politically and nationally divided, and, consequently, incapable of the promised autonomy. Therefore, they misled the local Ukrainians and instead of fighting for their autonomy, the Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia began to fight among themselves (18).

The government intended to pay the parish priests — teachers of religion as the state employees, but they required the oath of loyalty. Many priests refused. The government did not want to acknowledge officially the eparchies of Prjašiv and of Mukačevo. After many discussions and interventions, when finally the ecclesiastical and religious affairs of Ukrainians were acknowledged by the parliament of Prague, one of the opposing deputies fainted.

Even if the government acknowledged the eparchy, in their pro-Russian politics, they favored the Orthodox Church. Therefore, when in 1920, the first Orthodox priest, Rev. George Varchol, came to Becheriv from the USA, the government gave him all necessary help. In 1922, from 120 families of the village, 84 came to the meeting and having elected six trustees, they decided to break away from the Catholic Church. With the financial help from the USA and co-operation of parishioners, Rev. Varchol built in Becheriv a new Orthodox church for 96,000 Czechoslovak Kronas. Later 11 families returned to their Catholic Church, thus the Orthodox parish in Becheriv in 1935, had 78 families; in Komloš 8; in Štebnik 4; in Varadka 1 and in Nyžňa Polanka 1; altogether there were 92 families. The pastor of Becheriv in 1929 was assigned 1,000 Czechoslovak Kronas monthly salary as a teacher of the Orthodox religion (19).

The center of Orthodoxy in Prjašivščyna was the village of Ladomirova, where the Orthodox movement was initiated by a

---

(18) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 36.

(19) B. KRPELEC, *l.c.*; A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 122.

farmer of Vyšnyj Svydnyk, George Lažo. Having become a building contractor, Lažo constructed a parochial school in 1914, in Vyšnyj Svydnyk but the eparchial school superintendent, Rev. Nicholas Danko, could not pay the expenses, since Bishop Novak invested all eparchial funds into the state loan for war. Instead of a compromise, both parties appealed to the Hungarian state chancery. When the eparchy was ordered to pay the building expenses, Rev. Danko accused contractor Lažo of state treason. After having served the sentence of four months in jail in Prjašiv, Lažo waited for an opportunity to avenge himself. When Prjašivščyna became incorporated into the Czechoslovak Republic, in 1918, Lažo openly started a campaign against the priests of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and the Catholic Church. In 1920, he became a senator of Prague Parliament. In 1922, at his own expense, now Senator Lažo, invited from Prague to Prjašivščyna an immigrant Archimandrite, Vitalij Maximenko, of Počajiv Orthodox monastery, who was a fanatical enemy of the Catholic Church. The parish in Ladomirova was vacant for two years, since the Apostolic Administrator had no priest at his disposition. With the help of Senator Lažo, a printery was constructed in Ladomirova for the religious Orthodox propaganda. In a little building the Archmandrite opened the theological seminary, where about 20 seminarians, besides their studies, had to work in the printery. Thus the village of Ladomirova became the center of the Orthodox movement in Prjašivščyna (20).

The cause of the break with the Catholic Church in the nearby village of Vyšnyj Orlyk was imprudent antagonism between the pastor and his parishioners, concerning the stole. The Apostolic Administration did not satisfy the delegation of parishioners, refusing to remove the local pastor. Therefore, on March 15, 1924, the whole village, except 11 families, broke away from the Catholic Church. With help from the USA, they built a wooden Orthodox church and hall. The chancery office realized its mistake and removed the priest, but in was too late (21).

Another case of religious antagonism happened in the village of Hrabske, near Bardyjiv. After the death of the pastor, Rev. Michael Čisarik, in 1918, only two years later Rev. Stephen Burik was appointed to this parish. Shortly he was moved again to the village of Sňakiv. When the parishioners asked the Apostolic

---

(20) Cfr. *Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar*, 1926, pp. 1-27.

(21) B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 180.



Administrator for another pastor, they were told to repair first the church and the rectory building and then ask for a priest. The second delegation categorically affirmed that in the case of refusal, they would invite an Orthodox priest. This did not scare the Apostolic Administrator, since he intended to make a mission church their parish of Malciv. Disappointed parishioners, except for four families, invited an Orthodox priest from Chust, former officer of the Russian army (22). After the illegal Orthodox takeover of the church and church property, the pastor of Malciv through the court required that the parish property in Hrabske be returned to the Catholic eparchy of Prjašiv. The gendarmes then locked the church and the rectory until the court sentence. Somebody broke into the church and the chalice and the vestments were removed and the gongs from the bells were thrown into the well. The Orthodox were forced to hold their religious services in a private home. Having won the court case, the pastor of Malciv planned to re-dedicate the church with religious festivities. When the procession of 1,200 people, protected by 18 gendarmes, entered Hrabske, the Orthodox villagers threw rocks at them thus chasing them from the village. After this incident, the Orthodox began to build their own church, thus creating even more confusion. At the end, 17 families remained without any religious denomination; 43 families became Orthodox, while 29 families adhered to their Catholic parish (23).

In 1926, Orthodox parishes were also organized in Mežylaborci, Krasnyj Brid, Olšinkovo, Vilahy, Stakčyn, Telepovci and Jalova. Thus, by 1935 the Orthodox had 17 parishes, with 18 churches and 21 church organizations, out of which 8 were recognized by the state (24). According to the statistics of 1930, in Prjašivščyna were 9,076 Orthodox (25).

---

(22) B. KRPELEC, *l.c.*

(23) B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, pp. 180-181.

(24) *Ibidem.*

(25) G. DE VRIES, *Oriente Cristiano ieri e oggi*, p. 246.

## XVII. THE EPARCHY WITHOUT THE BISHOP (1918-1922)

After the downfall of Austro-Hungary, the Ukrainians started to build their new life with a new hope and enthusiasm. The long and bitter oppression of the Hungarians left its mark on the souls of people. They were not ready for a sudden change, to start their new life in the Czechoslovak Republic. Their only leaders, the priests, following the example of their bishop, served Hungarian national interests, against those of their own people. Nevertheless, there were a number of priests, who in these critical times served their faithful with great dedication. Having changed their political orientation, these priests were again disappointed with the policy of the Czechoslovak government. Instead of bringing to the people of Prjašivščyna peace, autonomy and democracy, they brought nothing else but confusion and chaos. The new regime started where the Hungarians stopped, only the methods were different.

In his bitter opposition to the government of Habsburgs, President Masaryk started to build the new republic under the slogan "*Away from Rome*" (1), giving a free hand to all those religious and political movements which supported his program. He considered building a new state on a strong national basis, rooted in the renewed anti-Catholic Hussitist movement. He considered the Orthodox movement among Ukrainians similar to that of Hussites, and decided to support it with all other anti-Catholic movements. This anti-Catholic stand of the government brought great disillusionment not only to the clergy, but also to many sincere Ukrainians. In some instances, it only strengthened their sympathies toward the old Catholic regime of Hungary. Consequently, the great part of the clergy refused to take the oath of loyalty to the new government, since it did not respect their Catholic Church and brought another division to their faithful.

To save their faithful from chaos and bloodshed, many of the clergy became active in politics and social life. They organized the National Councils, which became most effective in the formation of

---

(1) T. G. MASARYK, *Los von Rom*, Boston 1902.

the national life of Prjašivščyna. Thus, the National Council of Stara Lubovňa, organized on November 8, 1919, by Rev. Irynej Nevyckyj, was for the annexation to the Ukraine (2). The National Council of Bardyjiv, under the leadership of Rev. E. Biharij, was inclined toward Hungarian administration, but, under the inspiration of the clergy and its new president, Dr. A. Beskyd, on January 7, 1919, it decided for the Czechoslovak Republic (3). Facing reality, pro-Hungarian priests and laymen changed their political orientation and began to work for their own people. Rev. E. Biharij became one of the leaders of Ukrainian national life in Prjašivščyna (4).

Many priests became completely apathetic. They neglected their pastoral duties and, disgusted, they cared only for their own families. When the Orthodox "missionaries" became active, these priests with a complete indifference, witnessed many unpleasant events in the parishes of their own eparchy. This indifference and the exaggerated interpretation of Dobrjanskyj's ideas, caused the spreading of the Orthodox movement.

In these circumstances, on October 1, 1918, Canon Nicholas Rusnak, S.T.D., as Vicar General took the administration of the eparchy. The lack of ecclesiastical discipline and the post-war chaos were almost insuperable, while the lethargy of priests and disintegration of national life dimmed any hope for a better future.

Educated in the Hungarian spirit, Rev. Nicholas Rusnak tried to administer the eparchy in the rigid, aristocratic manner, but many times he had to swallow his own pride because of the reaction of his own priests. The priest did not respect him, since he was not a bishop. From the Holy See he received only temporary administrative faculties, which he could apply only in cases of necessity. When he tried to move some priests and make necessary changes, many priests did not want to obey, presenting their own reasons and excuses. Thus, in many instances the parishes were left without a priest. Disgusted parishioners, in some instances, invited to their parish the Orthodox priests or the Orthodox priest invited himself to a vacant parish. Thus, the property and buildings of Catholic parishes of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite came into the hands of these Orthodox priests.

---

(2) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 24; B. KRPELEC, *o.c.*, p. 99.

(3) I. S. BUKOVSKIJ, *Verchovnaia organizacija Prjaševščyny*, in "Prjaševščyna," p. 263. J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 25.

(4) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 31.

There was still a handful of dedicated priests, who, with the co-operation of some laymen, started to build a new life. Thus, in Užhorod, in 1920, the organization *Prosvita* (The Enlightenment) was founded. The branch of it was extended by Rev. E. Biharij to Prjašiv. The Women's Auxiliary, *Sojuz Rusjkych Zenščyn* (The Association of Ukrainian Women), under the leadership of Mrs. Kriško, organized in Prjašiv a boarding school for girls, accomodated temporarily in the vacant bishop's residence. To take care of these girls, the Apostolic Administrator, on August 10, 1922, invited five Sisters of the Order of St. Basil the Great from Halyčyna with their first superior, Mother Magdalene Humeniuk (5).

The change in the state administration brought with itself also a change of state clerks. Instead of Hungarian clerks, in the public offices of Prjašivščyna Czechs and Slovaks appeared, introducing Czech and Slovak as official language in the offices and schools. The government did not open Ukrainian schools and when the parents desired that their children be taught in Ukrainian, they had to send them to the private schools. The government considered Prjašivščyna as an integral part of Slovakia, under the administration of Bratislava.

In 1918, the Hungarian government of Count Michael Károlyi invited a representative of Ukrainians, Dr. Anthony Beskyd, to Budapest in the hope of persuading the Ukrainians to remain in Hungary. Instead of Budapest, Dr. Beskyd arrived at Turčansky Sv. Martin, where he contacted Slovak political leaders and the representative of Eastern Slovakia, Rev. Ladislav Moyš, to confer about the future of Ukrainians. According to the testimony of Joseph Škultéty, Dr. Beskyd "united the fate and the future of his people with the fate of Slovaks and requested that the Carpatho-Ukrainians belong to the same federation with the Slovaks" (6).

Unofficially it was told, that Slovaks would administer Prjašivščyna only for 20 years, but, evidently, this was not part of the agreement. The Ukrainians protested against this annexation and did not desire to become divided or annexed to some other state against their own will (7). During the revolution of 1848, Ukrai-

---

(5) J. E. Pavel, *Gojdič*, p. 89.

(6) Slovak newspapers from November 26, 1918 reported that this was also the decision of National Council in Prjašiv, November 19, 1918. A. MRAZ, *Volanie Podkarpatskej Rusi*, in M. MOLNAR, *Slovaký i Ukrajinci*, p. 368 n.

(7) *Ibidem*.

nians and Slovaks fought together the common enemy, the Hungarians, but now, when Ukrainians needed the help from their Slovak neighbors, they committed a political fraud, including simply the territory of Prjašivščyna into Slovakia.

The first governor of then " Podkarpatsjka Rus' " protested and demanded to annex at least the territory of Zemplin and Makovycja to Carpatho-Ukraine, but he did not succeed. The territory of Prjašivščyna, according to the treaty of St. Germain, was to belong to the Ukrainian administration, but the Czechoslovak government, against all protests, did not honor this clause (8). The river Už and the capital of Carpatho-Ukraine, Užhorod, became the border line between Slovaks and Ukrainians. The first governor, Dr. Gregory Žatkovyč, realizing that the Czechoslovak government did not keep its promise concerning the autonomy, on March 17, 1821, resigned from his office and returned to the United States. The cental government then appointed inactive Dr. Beskyd as his successor, but Dr. Anthony Rozsypal, of Czech nationality, as vice-governor had all the administrative powers in Podkarpatska Rus (9).

---

(8) V. MARKUSJ, *L'incorporation de l'Ukraine Subcarpatique a l'Ukraine Sovietique*, pp. 109-112.

(9) J. BORŽAVA, *o.c.*, p. 27.

### XVIII. BISHOP DIONYSIUS NYARADIJ AS APOSTOLIC ADMINISTRATOR (1922-1926)

There is no need to say, that after the downfall of Austro-Hungary, all those orders of denationalization were forgotten. Therefore, when Prjašivščyna became part of Czechoslovakia, once again the people automatically prayed to God in their Slavonic liturgy, which had been forbidden by the Hungarians. They also returned to their liturgical Julian calendar. It was difficult to establish order and a normal way of life.

There was unrest and tension in many villages. The Orthodox propaganda, supported by the government and local politicians, was in a full progress. In many villages these Orthodox "converts" seized ecclesiastical buildings, causing confusion and antagonism among people. The Administrator, Canon Nicholas Rusnak, was helpless in bringing the eparchy to order. Thus, the Holy See, on October 1, 1922, appointed a bishop with full authority to administer the eparchy. When Bishop Dionysius Nyaradij received his appointment to be the Apostolic Administrator of Prjašiv eparchy, he had already been the bishop of the eparchy of Kryževci, Yugoslavia, from 1915. He had just brought to full progress his own eparchy and now he had to do it all over again in Prjašiv. He was not a stranger to the people, because his ancestors originally were from Prjašivščyna and they had emigrated to Bačka in the eighteenth century. The dedicated priests welcomed him with joy. Those clergymen, who were spreading the ideals of re-union, saw in him a champion of zeal and religious renewal. He came to Prjašiv with the ideals of St. Josaphat, martyr of Church unity, asking his priests for co-operation, prayers and sacrifices, even at the cost of their own life (1).

To the government, state officials, and false propagandists he had to prove, that to belong to the Catholic Church and to the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite did not mean to be Hungarian or to follow pro-Hungarian national policy, but rather that the Hungarians had

---

(1) A. PEKAR, *Čolovik Provydiúúá*, in "Svitlo," 1965, pp. 354-357.

been persecuting this rite and its faithful. It was unfortunate, that some of the clergy and people were not able to resist the pressure and served pro-Hungarian purposes. Bishop Nyaradij was seen almost every year at the Unionistic Congresses in Velehrad, Moravia, where he contacted many influential clergymen and lay leaders of many nations. In the spirit of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Bishop Nyaradij taught his people and priests to be faithful to God, to the Catholic Church, to their Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and to the Holy See. In his intensive pastoral activities, Bishop Nyaradij found the time to publish *The Life of SS. Cyril and Methodius* (2). To his priests he presented the activity of Rev. Alexander Duchnovyč, encouraging them to leave the indifference, lethargy and "long deep sleep" and to start to work for their people (3). The 120th anniversary of Duchnovyč's birthday, April 24, 1923, was proclaimed by the bishop as a religious-national holyday and he ordered it to be celebrated in every parish and in every eparchial institution. Because of his encouragement and co-operation, for the faithful of both eparchies, Rev. Emil Bokšaj, began to publish *Blahovistnyk* (The Good Messenger) and for the clergy Rev. Alexander Ilnyckyj started *Dušpastyr* (The Shepherd of Souls). In Prjašiv, the bishop founded the weekly *Ruskoje Slovo* (Ukrainian Word), which after his departure from Prjašiv became *Russkoje Slovo* (Russian Word), with a Russophile tendency, but always defending the interests of the bishop and of the eparchy (4). He personally helped those seminarians, who during the war could not finish their theological education. To those, who had to leave their homeland and their families, he was also of a great assistance. To those political immigrants, who were starving after the war, he gave new jobs, appointing some with teachers' qualifications to the parochial schools. For his love for his flock, he was viciously attacked in the press. The Russophile magazine *Karpatorusskij Vestnyk* (Carpatho-Russian Messenger) in its issue of February 2, 1925, no. 8, in the article of Dr. Anthony Beskyd, publicly insulted him, but the bishop was always ready to forgive these public offenses, even if the eparchial lawyer,

---

(2) Cfr. letter of Rev. E. Bokšaj from July 12, 1923, Ep. Archive, Kryževci.

(3) *Ibidem*. We are grateful to the Most Reverend Gabriel Bukatko, Archbishop of Belgrad for granting us his help: the letters of Bishop Nyaradij from the eparchial archives of Kryževci.

(4) Cfr. the article *Pro čužyncev* (About Foreigners) in "Russkoje Slovo," February 20, 1930.

Dr. Ivan Dolynskij offered his services in legal prosecution (5). He tried to introduce into the eparchy monks from different orders of the same rite, but the government and supporters of Russophile and Orthodox tendencies accused him of politicizing, of trying to bring foreigners into the eparchy (6). He tried to place the Redemptorist Fathers in the vacant monastery buildings of the Basilian Fathers on Bukova Hirka, near Stropkiv, which was later realized (7).

Bishop Nyaradij was an example of Christ's love for his priests, because, he not only preached, but practiced it by making peace with offended and politically disoriented priests. It was to his merit, that the priests were brought under disciplinary control, giving the bishop their co-operation and support. During the five years of his administration, he was able to send to the United States thirty priests for the spiritual needs of the immigrants from Prjašiv-ščyna (8). The bishop for the first time in the history of the eparchy procured some scholarships for his seminarians in the central seminary in Prague (9). For the first time, he accepted young levites from the United States into the eparchial seminary of Prjašiv (10). He patronized and helped all the eparchial institutions. From the Czechoslovak government he asked financial help for the historical and valuable library, but, of course, the anti-Catholic offices of president Masaryk refused his petition (11). When the bishop received a generous gift from the priests and emigrants from the United States through the Apostolic Administrator, Rev. Gabriel Martyak, he converted it toward the building of a girls' boarding house. From the Association of Ukrainian Women he also received 10,000 Czechoslovak Kronas for the same purpose (12).

---

(5) The eparchial lawyer, Dr. Ivan Dolynskij about the matter wrote two letters: March 10, 1925 and June 30, 1925.

(6) The letter of Rev. E. Boskaj of July 17, 1923.

(7) The letter of Protohegumen J. Choma of Basilian Fathers in Užhorod from March 8, 1923. Eparchial Archive, Kryževci.

(8) Cfr. the letter of the spiritual director of Užhorod seminary, Rev. Basil Takach, the future bishop of Pittsburgh, from November 22, 1922, in Ep. Archive, Kryževci.

(9) Cfr. letter of rector of Prague's seminary, Rev. John Řihánek, from September 10, 1923, *Ibidem*.

(10) From the Pittsburgh Byzantine Exarchate were: Demetrius Jackanich, Joseph Jackanich, Gregory Moneta, Andrew Stim, John Bovankovich, Cfr. the letter of Rev. E. Bokšaj, from July 17, 1923. *Ibidem*.

(11) The letter of the Ministry of Education from May 18, 1923. *Ibidem*.

(12) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, p. 89.



Personally, the bishop lived the life of a saint. He was strict with himself. Knowing, that he would not be able to perform the enormous tasks of a bishop in these difficult circumstances without God's help, he spent long hours in prayer. He tried to be present at all liturgical devotions in the cathedral church or in the seminary chapel. Practicing the virtue of evangelical poverty, many times he did not have food to eat, because he gave to the poor everything he had. For defense of and faithfulness to the Catholic Church, the bishop emphasized the virtues and martyrdom of St. Josaphat, martyr for the cause of unity. The bishop himself gave spiritual retreats, conferences to the clergy, encouraging, consoling and solving their problems. The eparchy was set on the way to further spiritual progress (13). The danger of Orthodox propaganda was isolated, the administration of the eparchy was put in order, the discipline of the clergy and people restored, the eparchy was starting a chapter of renewed spiritual life. Preparing the harvest for his successor, Bishop Nyaradij asked the Holy See to release him from the administration of the Prjašiv eparchy and to send him back to his eparchy of Kryževci (14). In fact, some Slovak nationalists in cooperation with the central government of Prague were working to get rid of "this foreigner" (15). His petition was favorably answered and the Holy See, on September 14, 1926, appointed as his successor the Apostolic Administrator of Prjašiv, Paul Gojdič, OSBM.

---

(13) A. PEKAR, *Čolovik Provydiňňa*, in "Svitlo," 1965, pp. 354-357.

(14) M. VAJDA, *Tragedija Prjašivščyny*, in "America," July 11, 1950.

(15) Bishop Nyaradij wrote to his friend, March 25, 1926: "Rome keeps me here, and the government works against me." Ep. Archive, Kryževci.

## XIX. THE SPIRITUAL RENEWAL UNDER BISHOP GOJDIČ

Bishop Nyaradij had continuous contacts with his former eparchy, because, according to the appointment of the Holy See, he had to return to his episcopal see of Kryževci. Administering the eparchy of Prjašiv as a temporary Apostolic Administrator, he was looking for a worthy candidate to continue his work. This was a difficult task, since he was aware of the political and personal intrigues among the clergy. Pressured by the government as a foreigner, Bishop Nyaradij inquired among the clergy of Prjašiv eparchy with a complete impartiality and objectiveness for a successor, who would bring the eparchy to a complete spiritual renewal. His prayers were answered, because the candidate chosen by him was the best bishop the eparchy ever had. Thus, after the episcopal installation, Bishop Nyaradij left Prjašiv, leaving the eparchy to his successor, Bishop Paul Gojdič, OSBM (1).

Rev. Peter Gojdič entered the Order of the Basilian Fathers in Mukačevo, July 22, 1922, assuming the monastic name of Paul. For two years he was the spiritual director of Basilian boarding home in Užhorod, when he was appointed the Apostolic Administrator of Prjašiv Eparchy on September 7, 1926 (2). When the bishop's secretary of Mukačevo eparchy, Msgr. Alexander Stojka, brought the document of nomination, he found him in the chapel praying

---

(1) Bishop Paul Gojdič, OSBM, was born in Rusjki Peklany, July 17, 1888, in the family of the parish priest, Rev. Stephen Gojdič. The family moved to the parish of Cigelka, where he finished his elementary education. Peter entered the gymnasium in Prjašiv, where he graduated in 1907 summa cum laude. Following his older brother, Peter entered the eparchial seminary in Prjašiv, but Bishop John Vályi sent him to the Central Seminary in Budapest, where he acquired deep spiritual and esecetical life from the seminary's spiritual director, Rev. Stephen Hanauer, S.T.D., later the bishop of Vác. Ordained by Bishop Vályi on August 27, 1911, Rev. Peter Gojdič, living with his father, took care of the parish in Pitrova. In 1912 he was appointed the prefect of *Alumneum*; in 1914 he became the secretary of chancery office; in 1917 the administrator of Sabyniv's mission church; in 1919 the chancellor of the eparchy. For more detailed biography see *J. E. Pavel Gojdič CSVV, Prjasiv 1947*.

(2) A. WELYKYJ, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, pp. 548-549.

and crying. Before his episcopal consecration, he had to make perpetual monastic vows, which he made with the permission of the Holy See earlier as prescribed, in the monastery of Krechiv, Halyčyna, on November 28, 1926 (3).

His episcopal policy was to serve God and his Byzantine-Slavonic Rite faithfully in the spirit of SS. Cyril and Methodius. In fact, the first of his activities was to proclaim the celebration of the 1100 jubilee year of St. Cyril, which was also signed by Bishops Nyaradij of Kryževci and Gebej of Mukačevo eparchy. The installation took place on February 20, 1927, in Prjašiv and on February 22, Pope Pius XI appointed him the titular bishop of Harpago (4). In the document of nomination, he was invited to be consecrated in Rome. The episcopal consecration took place in the Basilica of St. Clement, where this Saint Pope is buried with St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Cyril, the Apostle of Slavs. On March 25, 1927, on the feast of the Annunciation, during the 1100 anniversary year of the birth of St. Cyril, Paul Gojdič, OSBM, was consecrated bishop. The consecrators were: Bishops Dionysius Nyaradij of Kryževci (Yugoslavia), Constantine Bohačevskij from Philadelphia (United States), and Josaphat Kocylovskij of Peremyšl (Halyčyna). At the banquet in St. Josaphat Ukrainian Collegè on Gianicolo hill, among other guests, the Apostolic Nuncio of Czechoslovakia, F. Marmaggi, congratulated the new bishop (5). March 29, 1927, Pope Pius XI, during a private audience talked to both bishops Nyaradij and Gojdič, decorating them with golden medals of "The Good Shepherd." Honoring the newly consecrated Bishop Gojdič with a golden pectoral cross, the Pope said: "My son, this cross is only a symbol of those difficult crosses, which Our Lord will send you in your new assignment as a bishop" (6). These words found a deep echo in his first pastoral letter, in which Bishop Gojdič offered his love and sacrifice for spiritual welfare of his faithful, asking in return for the prayers and co-operation. In another letter he asked the deans to visit all parishes in their deaneries and to give a full report, concerning 1) activity of parish priests, 2) conditions of parish and mission church buildings, 3) conditions of eparchial schools, 4) relationships between the parish priests and their cantors. The deans

---

(3) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 21 ss.

(4) The document in *J. E. Pavel Gojdič CSVV*, pp. 34-35.

(5) *Ibidem*, p. 38.

(6) *Blahovistnyk*, Užhorod 1927, p. 91.

were also instructed to promote 1) the religious instructions of the school children by priests, 2) Sundays and holydays sermons during the divine liturgies, 3) the reaction to the Orthodox propaganda, and 4) certain and eventual changes of parish priests for the spiritual progress of the faithful (7). He emphasized to the priests daily spiritual meditations, conscientious recitation of the breviary, exemplary celebration of daily divine liturgies, frequent confessions, the reading of the authors on spiritual life and the theological sciences (8). In the cathedral church he introduced choral singing, which he promoted also during his visitations in parish churches. He was of the opinion, that if young people would learn this type of church singing, they would lead others in the congregational singing during various devotions (9). To discuss pastoral and moral problems, connected with the spiritual care of priests, during the deanery meeting, May 4, 1932, according to canon 131, it was unanimously decided to have every year at least four priestly conferences. For this purpose the eparchy was divided into four districts; Prjašiv, Bardyjiv, Stropkiv and Humenne. (Later the fifth Michalovce district was added to those previous districts). According to these districts, the priests had also to attend every third year spiritual exercises held in the seminary of Prjašiv, in the monasteries of Michalovce and Stropkiv, or in a private retreat house in Ružomberok (10). Where there was need for the bishop or his parishioners were in danger, or there was some problem, he came immediately to take care of it personally. His episcopal visitation was a real crusade. During the day he preached, confessed and at night he prayed. Even if the doors of his residence were open every time for everybody, he did not wait, but went out to take care of his lost sheep. With a deep understanding of human problems, with great love for souls, with his personal sanctity, Bishop Gojdič converted to God even those, who were considered hopeless sinners; he silenced the fanatic agitators, he encouraged to the degree of a heroic faith many weak persons (11).

To foster spiritual life, the bishop encouraged frequent Holy Communion, founding the Apostleship of Prayer. For the youth

---

(7) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, p. 40.

(8) A. PEKAR, o.c., pp. 29-30.

(9) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, l.c.

(10) *Ibidem*, pp. 41-42.

(11) *Ibidem*, p. 43. «

he organized the Marian Congregations (12), for the older faithful — the Rosary and Altar Society (13). Parish missions and spiritual exercises among the students were on the yearly program. Devotions to the Blessed Mother of God during the month of May, in honor of the Sacred Heart in the month of June, recitation of the Rosary in October, then the celebration of the Eucharistical Year 1943-44 (14) and of the Marian Year 1944-45 (15) — all these contributed to the considerable progress of spiritual life in the Prjašiv eparchy.

Amid work and prayer, he also found time for reading and study. He had to find time to write his pastoral letters, which were always inspired by his personal spirituality. The following are the most characteristic of his topics: The Spiritual Life (1928), The Holy Eucharist (1929), The Education of Youth (1930), Death (1931), The Liturgical Action (1938), The Love of Neighbor (1939), and so forth (16).

In his zeal and with hope in God, Bishop Gojdič founded many eparchial institutions. Nobody would believe that, starting from scratch, these humble beginnings would flourish in such a beautiful way.

Already in 1927 the bishop made an appeal for offerings for the orphanage, and on September 10, 1928, temporarily he accommodated five nuns of the Sisters Servants of the Immaculate Conception in the eparchial seminary, which temporarily served as the bishop's residence (17). The corner-stone of the convent and orphanage was laid on September 11, 1932. The generous offering of Pope Pius XI of 100,000 liras was followed by many gifts from various benefactors, especially of those from the United States. The Sisters were able to enter their new home on May 1, 1934, but it was not completely finished until in 1935. From this humble beginning, a whole province of the Sisters Servants grew in the eparchy. In 1948 the province had 70 Sisters living in six convents: Prjašiv, Michalovce, Lucina, Trebišov, and on the territory of Bohemia: in Uherské Hradiště and Libejovce. The motherhouse in Prjašiv was also the novitiate, where were twelve novices. The orphanage brought wonderful fruits. Sisters tried to give these orphans a Christian education and prepared them for different professions and

---

(12) *Ibidem*, p. 48.

(13) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 37.

(14) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, p. 137.

(15) *Ibidem*, p. 140.

(16) *Ibidem*, pp. 111-135. A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 38.

(17) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, p. 79.

jobs. The chapel of the orphanage served also as a parish church for those who lived in the neighborhood (18).

After the meeting of December 29, 1928, the bishop offered 70,000 Czechoslovakian Kronas for the National Home. Thus, the mortgage was paid and the institution performed incomparable work in the field of national and cultural progress (19). On September 1, 1927, the society "Petra" was organized. It was under the patronage of the bishop, helping priests in the construction and remodeling of parish churches. It printed Catholic books, prayerbooks and manuals; sold religious articles and church appurtenances. The society assigned yearly 3,000 kronas as scholarships for poor students (19). The bishop supported the weekly *Russkoje Slovo*, but he also encouraged *Da přijdeť carstvie Tvoje* (Thy Kingdom Come), and the priestly magazine *Dušpastyr*. Under his inspiration, the Redemptorist Fathers printed many pamphlets and magazines, *Naš Východ* (Our East) and *Missionar* (The Missionary). He founded the eparchial weekly *Blahovistnyk* (The Good Messenger) and the publication of *Knihy Blahovistnyka* (The Books of Good Messenger) with apologetic and religious subjects. The Redemptorists also published in Slovak the weekly *Sv. Cyril a Metod* (SS. Cyril and Methodius) (20).

Bishop Gojdič bought another building for the girls boarding house under the care of the Basilian Sisters, which they occupied on August 31, 1929. To the building he annexed the orchard, given to the eparchy by Msgr. Šaš. In 1932 to the building were added three rooms, and in 1937-38 was added a new floor, where the Sisters opened novitiate (21). Besides Prjašiv, the Basilian Sisters had their houses in Mežylaborci, Stropkiv, Svydnyk, Sečovce and Prague (22).

"The Society of St. John the Baptist," founded in 1850 by Bishop Gaganec, built the boarding house for boys, called "Alumneum." Bishop Gojdič appointed as a new rector of "Alumneum," Msgr. Michael Sabadoš, professor of religion, who completely remodeled the old building and added two new floors. This was a real joy to the bishop, because almost all his priests were educated there,

---

(18) *Ibidem*, pp. 78-82.

(19) *Ibidem*, p. 83.

(20) *Ibidem*, pp. 84-85.

(21) *Ibidem*, p. 89.

(22) *Ibidem*, p. 92.

and even now from 120 boys he expected that many would become priests (23). When the state took over this institution, the bishop tried to repossess it, but without success.

For religious and spiritual needs of the faithful, the bishop organized parishes in many cities and towns of the Czechoslovak Republic, since he had spiritual jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Thus, the parish of Prague was organized in 1931, for which the Archbishop of Prague, Kordač, donated the beautiful church of St. Clement. It was acknowledged by the state and from January 1, 1934 the parish had the right to keep baptismal, matrimonial and burial records (24). The parish of Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, was founded on October 6, 1939 (25). The permission of the Ministry of Education to found the parish in Brno, capital of Moravia, was granted December 5, 1945 (26).

Bishop Gojdič supported and helped also the monastic orders. In the beginning of his episcopacy, the Redemptorist Fathers were only in Stropkiv. The bishop helped them to build their houses and churches in Michalovce and Sabyniv, until they had a complete Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Province (27).

After the Hungarian occupation in 1939, the bishop made it possible for his confreres, the Basilian Fathers, to start their apostolic work in the eparchy. They were accommodated in the bishop's residence and took care of the parish in Mežylaborci. In 1942 they built a house-chapel on Bukova Hirka, which became a place of pilgrimage. In the summer of 1943 they were assigned as educators of the eparchial boarding house for students of the teachers' academy. In 1944 the bishop blessed the new Basilian monastery in Trebišov, and on November 30, 1945, the Basilian Fathers took spiritual care of the parish in Prague and of all the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in Bohemia (29). These monks not only gave the bishop their moral and spiritual support, but with their missions, retreats, conferences and private talks prepared priests and faithful against the advancing materialistic atheism, brought in with the Red Army.

---

(23) *Ibidem*, p. 98.

(24) *Ibidem*, pp. 62-68.

(25) *Ibidem*, p. 70.

(26) *Ibidem*, p. 72.

(27) *Ibidem*, p. 108.

(28) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, pp. 41-48.

## XX. THE SLOVAK OPPRESSION

The regime of Czechoslovak Republic for the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna was only a change in tactic and means in their struggle against the denationalization, for their most dangerous threat came from the closest neighbors — the Slovaks.

During the revolution of 1848-49 the Slovaks asked the Ukrainians for co-operation against the Hungarians, but now the Slovaks repayed them with an ungrateful oppression, since they took over, where the Hungarian nationalism left. During these twenty years of Slovak administration of Prjašivščyna, they harmed more the national life of Ukrainians, than the Hungarians during the thousand years of their occupation.

By a continuous magyarization and suppression of their Ukrainian, Cyrillic alphabet, many Ukrainians preferred to read books and newspapers with the Latin alphabet. This was the success of slovakization, which also became a solid base for the Orthodox propaganda, as Bishop Nyaradij had already affirmed (1).

After World War I, these 200,000 Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna did not have their Ukrainian schools. To fight the denationalization of his faithful, Bishop Gojdič on August 10, 1929 ordered that in every parish school the Ukrainian language and the Cyrillic alphabet should be taught at least three hours weekly (2).

When the central government of Prague announced the census of the citizens for 1930 year, the Slovak government of Bratislava started a fierce propaganda of slovakization. They intended to force all the Ukrainians to enlist as Slovaks, since, they tried to prove, that this was the territory of Slovakia. One statement perhaps would characterize the propaganda of slovakization. At the meeting of "The Slovak League" in Michalovce. on November 23, 1929, the chairman of the district, Baška, said: "Although the Ukrainians do not want to be considered Slovaks, during the census of 1930 this has to be taken into a consideration: conduct it in the way, that

---

(1) A. VOLOŠYN, *Spomyny*, p. 41; M. VAJDA, *Tragedija našoji Prjašivščyny*, in "Ameryka," July 11, 1950, b. 6.

(2) *Dušpastyr*, 1929, p. 98. J. E. Pavel Gojdič, p. 53.



the Ukrainian people will be registered as Slovaks, i.e., give them that kind of question, to which they will have to answer that they are Slovaks" (3).

To counteract the bishop's order, the Department of Education in Bratislava, on January 15, 1930 ordered that all the subjects in all schools of Prjašivščyna had to be taught in the Slovak language. Bishop Gojdič, on January 30, 1930, protested against this violation of natural law, appealing to the guarantee of the Peace Conference in Paris (4). To justify their order, the government of Bratislava appealed to the old Hungarian XXVI and XXVII law of Count Apponyi from the year 1907 (5). During the Hungarian oppression, Slovaks have been the first to protest against this law, but now they used exactly the same law to oppress the Ukrainians. The bishop did not cease either to defend his cause until the Department of the Education, on April 30, 1930, conceded, that the Ukrainian language should be taught three hours weekly until the final decision would be made on this matter (6). This decision of the government of Bratislava forced Bishop Gojdič to order, that in 80 Ukrainian parish schools the Slovak language be taught three hours weekly. In 1935 the provincial government of Bratislava nationalized all the parish schools, which was against the agreement of *Modus Vivendi* between the Czechoslovakia and the Holy See. Bishop Gojdič appealed to the central government in Prague. A compromise was made by the Ministry of Education in 1938, by returning to the eparchy only 65 parish schools with the Ukrainian language. The Slovaks officially gained 15 schools. The bishop received the permission in 1936 to open the eparchial Greek-Catholic Ukrainian Gymnasium. To his appeal of May 12, 1936, many prominent leaders answered with the promise of their co-operation and financial support. After the legal transfer of the real estate by the attorney Dr. Ivan Pješčak, the organizational committee was formed with Rev. Teheodore Rojkovyč as president. The generous offering by Msgr. Simeon Smandraj of 10,000 kronas and the efficient leadership of gymnasium's first rector, Dr. Nicholas Bobak, realized the dream of bishop and of many individuals who treasured the cultural progress of the Ukrai-

---

(3) Cfr. the article *Pered narodoščitanijem*, in "Russkoje Slovo," January 4, 1930, p. 5.

(4) *Russkoje Slovo*, January 30, 1930, pp. 2-3.

(5) J. MACUREK, *Dejiny Madaru a Uherského Statu*, p. 279.

(6) *Russkoje Slovo*, April 30, 1930, p. 2.

nians of Prjašivščyna. The gymnasium was opened already in September, 1936. The classes started with 48 pupils of the first grade in the building of the orphanage. Later they were moved into the boarding house "Alumneum," until finally the high school was located in its new building. The first graduation took place at the end of school year of 1942-43, when in all eight grades there were 330 students (7). After the Communist coup d'état in 1948, this institution became the government controlled school.

The year 1939 brought an end to the Czechoslovak Republic. On November 2, 1938, by the arbitration in Munich, the Sudetenland was annexed to Germany, while the Southern part of Slovakia was incorporated into Hungary. On March 15, 1939 the Hungarian army occupied the territory of the Carpatho-Ukraine, after Msgr. Joseph Tiso proclaimed the Slovak Republic. The eparchy of Prjašiv lost the city of Košice and the Southern parishes, but from Mukačevo eparchy 47 parishes and 90 mission churches were formed into the Apostolic Administration and subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Prjašiv (8).

In August of 1939, in the name of Slovak government, Dr. Tiso signed the agreement of military co-operation with Hitler (9). In the internal politics, concerning minorities of Czechs and Ukrainians, they adopted the policies of German nationalism, expressed in a propaganda song of the National Guard of Hlinka: "Slaughter and cut until the bloodshed, for this will be the first time the Slovak will be the master of Slovakia" (10).

There is no need to say, that with such a policy, the government of Monsignor Tiso considered Bishop Gojdič the enemy of state, disloyal, undesirable, unworthy of bishop's dignity and so forth. The bishop was accused of not wanting to ordain those seminarians, who claimed to be of Slovak nationality, and that the superiors of the Prjašiv seminary forbade them to speak in Slovak. The govern-

---

(7) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, pp. 92-97.

(8) Cfr. the yearbook, *Schematismus venerabilis cleri dioecesis Fragopolitanae* of 1948 year. M. LACKO, *The Forced Liquidation of the Union of Užhorod*, in "Slovak Studies," I, p. 146.

(9) J. A. MIKUŠ, *The Three Slovak Bishops*, p. 19, wrote: "That Slovakia... as an independent State was the result... of the political wisdom of the Bratislava Government." Was this "political wisdom" a complete co-operation with Germany?

(10) The original Slovak text: "Rež a rubaj do krve, at bude to poprve, dokial Slovak na Slovensku panom ne bude."

ment controlled newspapers and radio accused the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite clergy, the bishop's chancery and the bishop of disloyalty, but the bishop reacted to all these false accusations with energetic rebuttal (11).

The president, Dr. Tiso, in November of 1940, made an official visit to the city of Prjašiv. At the railroad station, among other military and civic leaders, the representatives of religious communities, namely: the Latin Rite Catholic Bishop Čarský, the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic Bishop Gojdič, the Lutheran Bishop and the 'Jewish Rabbi attended the welcoming ceremonies. Shaking hands with all, president Tiso ostentatiously ignored the welcoming hand of Bishop Gojdič. Of course, there was "no chair" for him on the honorary tribune and Bishop Gojdič was forced to stand during the entire ceremony. There were tears in his eyes. In the evening, when all the delegates of the various civic and religious groups of Prjašivščyna came to the president with their petitions, Bishop Gojdič protested against the renewed nationalization of Ukrainian parish schools. In the name of the president, Dr. Galan, publicly offended the bishop, calling him the traitor and the enemy of Slovak people, saying: "Bishop, for persons like you, we have a special place." The allusion was to the famous jail of Illava, where already several priests of the eparchy were arrested for "treason" against the Slovak state (12).

Writing for the American and other English-speaking readers, some Slovak super-patriots claim, that Bishop Gojdič was of the Slovak nationality (13). Some writers try to prove their statement according to the American way of thinking: If you are born in the United States, you are American, you are of American nationality. This criterion cannot be applied in Europe. To state that Bishop Gojdič was Slovak, is an ironical paradox. He was born in the territory, which was unjustly annexed to the Slovak administration, but this does not mean, that he was a Slovak. He was bishop for everybody, who belonged to his eparchy, even for those Slovaks, who attacked him unjustly, while he fought for the natural rights of his people. To his Slovak faithful, he preached and talked in the Slovak language, but it doesn't mean he was a Slovak.

---

(11) *J. E. Pavel Gojdič*, pp. 57-58. A. PEKAR, *Narysy Istoriji Zakarpatta*, p. 143.

(12) These are the descriptions of an eyewitness.

(13) J. A. MIKUŠ, *Tjree Slovak Bishops*.

The Slovak propaganda machinery worked continuously. The government planned another census in 1940, just to convince the world that there were no Ukrainians in the Slovak state. To defend the natural rights of his faithful, Bishop Gojdič, October 21, 1940, issued a pastoral letter, in which he asked the priests of the eparchy to instruct the parishioners to register their nationality according to their own conscience. The government considered this a great offense, threatening the bishop to withhold the financial support of the clergy (*congrua*) and confinement in jail of Illava (14). In consequence of the bishop's letter in 1940, the government census found in Prjašivščyna 80,000 registered Ukrainians. There is no need to say, how irritated was the Slovak government of Dr. Tiso. On December 18, 1940, the Ministry of Education ordered the bishop "to close the Greek-Catholic Ukrainian Teachers Academy in Prjašiv" (15), planning later to close also the Eparchial High school. The bishop resisted. He did not allow the closing of the Teachers Academy, even if the Academy was permitted to enroll new students only every second year and did not receive any state support. The professors had to be satisfied with humble salaries, since the school was maintained by the students and by the offerings of the faithful. In these critical times, the bishop turned again to the Holy See for moral and material help. Pope Pius XII answered with a generous offering, which made the government of Msgr. Tiso change their attitude and assign to the bishop a certain amount of Slovak Kronas "for the cultural purpose of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna" (16). The Teachers Academy existed until the liquidation of the eparchy by the Communists.

Bishop Gojdič took good care of his Slovak faithful. To foster their religious life, bishop approved "The Society of SS. Cyril and Methodius" (*Jednota Sv. Cyrila a Metoda*); with his blessing, Slovak books and magazines were printed (17), but the bishop was still a reproach in their eyes. They attacked him publicly, accusing, provoking and forcing him to resign from the administration of the eparchy. Being only the Apostolic Administrator, he could resign and, in fact, on November 12, 1939, he notified the Slovak government of his intended resignation and on November 22, 1939 he asked

---

(14) *J. E. Pavel Gojdič*, pp. 136-137.

(15) *Ibidem*, p. 52; A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 143.

(16) *Ibidem*, pp. 52-53.

(17) *Ibidem*, pp. 55-56.

Pope Pius XII that he be allowed to resign. At the meeting of January 26, 1940, the Slovak government very gladly accepted the bishop's resignation, assigning him an annual pension of 45,600 Slovak Kronas, but the bishop had to leave the territory of Slovak state (18). The Holy See asked further information from Slovak representative at Vatican, Dr. Charles Sidor. Having received his objective information, the Holy See did not accept the bishop's resignation, but by a decree of the Congregation for the Oriental Church on July 19, 1940, Pope appointed him the ordinary of the Prjašiv eparchy (19). The government of Msgr. Tiso had to respect the decision of the Holy See, but at bishop's installation, August 8, 1940, not even one government representative was present. Supporting the government's policy, all the Slovak bishops completely ignored Bishop Gojdič installation!

The government did not miss an occasion to persecute the bishop, his priests and faithful. Those priests, who read the bishop's pastoral letter, concerning the census of 1940, were arrested. Others, who in private conversations explained to their faithful the importance of the matter, were suspended from any financial support (*congrua*). The government did not dare to fight the bishop directly, because they had to consider the opinion of the Holy See. To cover their unjust reprisals, they invented the persecutions of Slovaks in Prjašivščyna by the Ukrainians. Thus, to "investigate" the issue and to support Slovak nationalistic propaganda, the famous Minister of Propaganda, Šaňo Mach, came to Prjašiv. After the previous rude treatment, Bishop Gojdič did not intend to take part in the official welcome, but the local administrative authorities of Prjašiv forced the bishop to be in the official reception, for his refusal could have had bad consequences for all the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. The reception was given in honor of the Minister of Propaganda in the local theatre. When Šaňo Mach saw the bishop, he insulted the prelate, calling him the traitor and the enemy of the Slovak state, unworthy of the dignity of bishop. Among the commotion and public scandal, without answering those uncivilized accusations of Minister Šaňo Mach, the bishop silently left the theater (20).

The greatest part of the Slovak writers tried to justify the government of Msgr. Tiso of co-operation with the Hitler Nazism,

---

(18) *Ibidem*, pp. 103-104.

(19) Cfr. the decree of the Holy See, *Ibidem*, p. 105.

(20) This is the report of an eyewitness.

but they cannot deny the facts. They also deny the persecution of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna and of the bishop. They make another step in Slovak propaganda, by trying to make a Slovak of bishop Gojdič after his death. During his lifetime, the Slovak government persecuted him, but after his death, it seems that they need the name of the Bishop Saint for their nationalistic purposes. When he was alive, the government of Msgr. Tiso was always at the bishop's heels, trying to force him to resign, but after they were unable to do so, due to the Holy See, they tried to force him at least to leave the city of Prjašiv and to make his residence in the small town of Mežylaborci, in the monastery of the Basilian Fathers. Thus, they intended to liquidate completely the religious and cultural center of Ukrainians in Prjašiv (21).

During World War II, the Ukrainians again were considered disloyal to the state and their bishop was labelled as an untrustworthy person. On the Soviet front the Slovak army did not excel, as the Slovak propaganda apparatus broadcasted and published in newspapers. On the home front, the situation in Slovakia was confused and panicky. In Slovak factories many Soviet prisoners were working for the German victory. Many of these former Red Army soldiers were born under the Soviet regime and had been educated in completely atheistic schools. These souls Bishop Gojdič wanted to bring to God, even if he knew what would be the reaction of the Slovak government. It was a courageous, but humble attempt to reach these prisoners through the simple distribution of religious pictures of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite icons, with printed prayers in the Russian language. For this humble religious activity among the prisoners, the angry Slovak government of Msgr. Tiso accused the bishop of political agitation against the state.

The events of war on the Eastern front during 1943-44 caused the government to change its policy. The Soviet army was advancing, while they were afraid of Ukrainian reprisals in Prjašivščyna. Therefore, the government of Bratislava changed their attitude toward the bishop, and the Ukrainian clergy of Prjašivščyna, they tried also co-operate with the civic Ukrainian organizations.

---

(21) The report of an eyewitness. I. PJEŠČAK, *Iz prošlago našych školnych del*, in "Kalendar Ukrainskoj Narodnoj Rady Prjaševščyny na 1946 god," pp. 50-55.

## XXI. THE EPARCHY AFTER WORLD WAR II

World War II brought new tragedies and sufferings to the faithful of the eparchy. Intending to surround a part of the German armies and those of their collaborators, Soviet military machinery from Ukraine was moving South, through the Danube basin into the heart of Hungary. This caused a lethal wound to the units defending the Carpathian Mountains. The other Soviet armies tried to break through the Dukla pass and through the territory of Prjašivščyna to close the surrounding ring, creating another Stalingrad. While in the territory of Carpatho-Ukraine there were not heavy military operations, around the Dukla pass German and Soviet forces fought for three months. According to eyewitnesses, the corpses of soldiers caused floods of the creeks and rivers and people called one of the valleys around Dukla pass *Mertva Dolyna* (The Valley of Dead). During the last years of the war, Prjašivščyna was also the territory of Czech, Slovak and Soviet partisan activities with the headquarters in Banská Bystrica. During the combats, the Northern districts of Prjašivščyna were completely devastated. Many civilians were shot by Germans for co-operation with partisans and their villages were burned (1).

God only knows what kind of life was destined for the eparchy during the Slovak republic. The end of the war and the end of the Slovak republic brought new hopes.

The neighboring Carpatho-Ukraine was annexed to the Soviet Union. "According to the free will of the people" it became the Trans-Carpathian Province (*Zakarpatska Oblast*) of the Soviet Republic of Ukraine (2). Prjašivščyna was again under the Slovak administration as part of the Czechoslovak Republic.

In the villages and towns of Prjašivščyna families rebuilt their homes, companies restored their scarce and badly needed industries. With the help of the government, the roads, the highways, the

---

(1) I. S. ŠLEPECKIJ, *Tokajik - Partizanskoje Selo*, in "Prjaševščyna," pp. 19-34.

(2) Cfr. the Manifesto, in V. MARKUS, *L'incorporation de l'Ukraine Subcarpatique a l'Ukraine Sovietique*, pp. 116-117.

railroads and all the means of communication were restored. The school buildings were repaired and opened for the students. Shortly, life began to take its normal peace time course. On the political scene new individuals took over. Under the protection of the Red Army, the Communist party was growing stronger, placing its members in the key positions of public and private life.

The Catholic Church was again exposed to bitter criticism and all the Slovak bishops of the Latin Rite were accused of co-operation with the nationalistic government of Msgr. Tiso. The only bishop, persecuted during the regime of the Slovak republic, was the bishop of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite eparchy of Prjašiv, Paul Gojdič. Thus, in the postwar Czechoslovak Republic the prestige of Bishop Gojdič grew, which meant a short pause in the reprisals against the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. For his attitude toward the government of Msgr. Tiso, he became popular in the political and government circles of Prague. On the first occasion Bishop Gojdič came to Prague to plead for mercy of his former persecutor, Msgr. Tiso. Escaping the Soviet Army, Msgr. Tiso was extradited by the American military authorities in Germany to the Czechoslovak government to be condemned for the war crimes (3). The Ministry of Justice of Czechoslovakia was already in Communist hands and thus the bishop's plea for mercy was unanswered. Msgr. Tiso, the president of the Slovak republic 1939-1945, was condemned to death by hanging. Expecting riots and demonstrations in the cities and towns, the central government of Prague ordered the closing of all public schools on the territory of Slovakia, except the Ukrainian schools of Prjašivščyna. The Ukrainian Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite regretted the day of March 17, 1947, when in the capital of Slovakia, Bratislava, Msgr. Tiso was hanged. They were not glad at the execution of a Catholic priest, even if he was their former persecutor.

When the Carpatho-Ukraine was annexed to the Soviet Ukraine on June 29, 1945, the eparchy of Prjašiv faced new problems. Many Ukrainians, escaping the Communist regime, emigrated to Czechoslovakia. The government, after expulsion of 2,000,000 Germans from Sudetenland, settled these Ukrainians in the empty *Pohraničí* (Borderland). There was need to erect for them new parishes, since

---

(3) At the same time the American military authorities gave permission to the former regent of Hungary, Nicholas Horthy, a Protestant, to emigrate to Portugal, where he lived until his death. M. HORTHY, *Emlékirataim*, pp. 300-301.



these Ukrainians were Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite and intended to become Czechoslovak citizens. The Byzantine-Slavonic parish of St. Clement in Prague (erected in 1931), after 1945 became the center of religious life of the Ukrainians living in Bohemia. Bishop Gojdič erected the parish of Bratislava (approved by the government of Msgr. Tiso, on October 6, 1939 and acknowledged by the Czechoslovak government on March 4, 1946), and in the capital, of Moravia, Brno (acknowledged by the government on April 12 1946) (4). Many missionary stations were erected for the spiritual care for those Ukrainians who settled in Czechoslovakia. In the territory of the Prjašivščyna the parishes in Levoča, Lubica Giraltovec, Gelnica, Sečovska Poľanka and Vysoka also were erected. The Southern territory with the city of Košice and Stakčín and nearby villages, annexed in 1939 to Hungary, were again incorporated into the eparchy (5). There was only one Byzantine-Slavonic Rite eparchy for all Ukrainian Catholics of Czechoslovakia. Forced by these circumstances, Bishop Gojdič asked for an auxiliary bishop. Thus, after nomination of the Holy See on January 1947, Msgr. Basil Hopko became the first auxiliary bishop in the history of the eparchy (6).

Even if the Soviet Red Army occupied the territory of Central Europe, Czechoslovakia became a sovereign state. However, many diplomats and experienced politicians, specialists in Soviet matters, were expecting the worst. In the ecclesiastical circles, with the advancing Communist occupation, from the experience of past, the worst was predicted for the Ukrainians of the Prjašiv eparchy. In fact, after the death of Metropolitan Andrew Šeptyckyj, the whole metropolitan province of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite of Ukrainians of Halyčyna was destroyed in 1946 (7). The eparchy of Mukačevo after the martyr-death of Bishop Theodore Romža, on November 1,

---

(4) J. E. Pavel Gojdič, pp. 62-72.

(5) 47 parishes and 90 mission churches of Mukačevo eparchy constituted the Apostolic Administrature. Another 27 parishes from Mukačevo and 4 parishes from Hajdudorog eparchy were incorporated into Prjašiv eparchy. *Ibidem*, pp. 59-60.

(6) The Breve of Pius XII in A. WELYKYJ, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, II, pp. 594-595. Bishop's Hopko appointment in "Blahovistnyk" (Prjašiv), January 25, 1947, pp. 1-4. His consecration in same "Blahovistnyk," May 25, 1947, pp. 1-5.

(7) *Primi incatenati*, pp. 29-46. A. W. Bolševyckyj *Cerkovnyj Sobor u Lvovi 1946 r.*

1947, was destroyed and annexed to the jurisdiction of Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow in 1949 (8). On February 12, 1948 in the coup d'état the Communists took over the government of Czechoslovakia. This meant the end of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic eparchy of Prjašiv. The auxiliary bishop Basil Hopko, as well as the ordinary bishop Paul Gojdič, had their hands full. They foresaw the imminent danger, therefore, they prepared their faithful for the future persecutions.

---

(8) R.N., *Holhota uniji v Karpatskij Ukraini*, in "Žytta i Slovo," 1948-1949, v. 3-4, pp. 327-346. V. MARKUSJ, *Nyščeňňa Hreko-Katolyckoji Cerkvi v Mukačivskij Eparchiji*, in "Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva Ševčenka," 1962, v. 169, p. 16 ss. A. PEKAR, *Narysy Istoriji Cerkvy Zakarpatta*, pp. 159-170.

## XXII. THE LIQUIDATION OF THE EPARCHY

After the annexation of Carpatho-Ukraine to the Soviet Ukraine, the government of Prague welcomed those Ukrainian emigrants, who preferred to live in the Czechoslovak Republic. The government of Prague settled the majority of these emigrants in the Sudetenland. Although their number was estimated about 150,000 only 68,000 Ukrainians registered in the newly erected parishes and mission churches. The bishop sent some of his priests to administer to their spiritual needs. From the Holy See Bishop Gojdič obtained the bi-ritual faculties for those Latin Rite priests, who were willing to help in the organization of new Byzantine-Slavonic parishes. In Czechoslovakia in 1948 there were registered 305,645 faithful of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite; 301 priests, 27 Basilian monks and 29 Redemptorists (1). There were also 72 Sisters Servants of Mary Immaucate and 28 Basilian Sisters (2). The only eparchial institution after the World War II remained the seminary with 30 seminarians (3).

Bishop Gojdič intended to provide for the spiritual care of the Ukrainian emigrants interceding at the government's offices in Prague in 1947 and 1948. The bishop's petitions were unanswered, since many departments of the government were already in the Communists' hands. However, the government gave permission to form 33 Orthodox parishes in Sudetenland and assign their Orthodox priests. After this first Orthodox "victory," the bishop knew what was waiting for his eparchy.

In 1946 the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia was transferred

---

(1) 27 Basilian Fathers had their monasteries in Prjašiv, Mežylaborci, Trebišov and Prague. The Redemptorist Fathers had three houses in Michalovce, Stropkiv and Sabyniv.

(2) The Sisters Servants had convents in Prjašiv, Trebišov, Michalovce, Lutina, Libejovce and Uherské Hradište. The Basilian Sisters, likewise, had convents in Prjašiv, Stropkiv, Mežylaborci, Sečovce, Svydnyk and Tepla.

(3) These and previous informations are from the eparchy's last yearbook. *Schematismus venerabilis cleri dioecesis Fragopolitanae seu Presovenssis*, Fragopolii 1948.

from the jurisdiction of the Serbian to the Russian Church (4). The Patriarch of Moscow, Alexis, established in 1947 an Orthodox Exarchate of Czechoslovakia and appointed as its first Exarch Eleutherius, with the title of Archbishop of Prague, for 20,000 Czechoslovak citizens and for 10,000 repatriated Czechs from Volyň, Soviet Ukraine (5).

The Communist propaganda began to work. According to them, it was the great Soviet Army, which defeated Germans and brought freedom to all nations of Europe and to Czechoslovakia. The Orthodox religion was now considered as the religion of a great, victorious Soviet Republics, while Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite were considered collaborators with the enemies of the working classes (6).

In the territory of Prjašivščyna there were about 10,000 Orthodox faithful, headed with the Archimandrite Vitalij Maksimenko in Ladomirova (7), but, being the ex-officers of Czarist army, these priests with their archimandrite in 1944 escaped to Germany and emigrated to the United States (8). The administrator of the Orthodox Church of Prjašivščyna became the Archimandrite Andrew Kolomackyj (9).

In 1947 Czechoslovakia and Poland signed the military pact against Ukrainian partisans, the Banderivci, who from Ukraine fought their way through the Carpathian Mountains and through the territory of Prjašivščyna tried to evacuate to Germany and Austria. The Communist propaganda used this occasion to label the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholics as the supporters of the enemy who had to be destroyed.

Two or three months after the Communist coup d'état of February, 1948, a secret meeting was held in Karlové Váry under the chairmanship of Soviet Minister Andrej Vyšynskij. Two Czechoslovak ministers, Vaclav Kopecký (propaganda) and Zdeněk Nejedlý

---

(4) The history of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia in G. DE VRIES, *Oriente Cristiano ieri e oggi*, pp. 237-246.

(5) The appointment of Eleutherius, in "Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarchii," 1946, n. 12, pp. 33-36.

(6) "Il Messaggero," April 4, 1952.

(7) Until the World War II there were 9,076 Orthodox in Slovakia. G. DE VRIES, *l.c.*, A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 170.

(8) M. LACKO, *The Forced Liquidation of the Union of Užhorod*, in "Slovak Studies I," p. 160.

(9) A. PEKAR, *l.c.*

(education) approved the Soviet proposal to destroy the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholics. For this purpose the Czechoslovak government erected the Department for the Ecclesiastical Affairs (SUC) with its chairman, the vice-president Zdeněk Fierlinger. The Communists of Moscow through their puppet Czechoslovak government intended: 1) To destroy unshakable Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests who formed the core of the clergy. The specially-assigned Communist agents observed these priests for two years, studying their habits and faults. The superiors of monasteries were arrested first. On February 22, 1949 the Basilian Fathers of Prjašiv monastery were arrested (10). During the night of April 13, 1950, the government closed all the monasteries and convents. The police in uniforms and in civilian clothes with machineguns surrounded the defenseless Redemptorist Fathers in Michalovce. In Trebišov smoke bombs were used by the police, while the Basilian Fathers were arrested (11). 2) The older priests and those without influence and authority were interned in the concentration camps, where the trained agents with force and persuasion tried to make them cooperate with the Communist government. In some of these priests succumbed to these "persuassons," they lost the confidence of the faithful, who refused to assist at any of their liturgical celebrations or to receive the sacraments. There was a division between these weak priests and the faithful. 3) Materialistically inclined priests were bought for money and given the better positions. The faithful opposed them by passive resistance, leaving their churches completely empty. To the parishes, from which these venal priests were moved, the Communists sent promptly ordained "priests." These knew only how to celebrate liturgical devotions and were completely ignorant in the theological sciences. Noticing their ignorance, after a very short time, many people did not attend even these devotions, which was exactly what the Communists wanted. After their report to the state department on the ecclesiastical affairs, these churches were closed. The communique in the press briefly mentioned that

---

(10) G. MOIOLI, *Giubileo in carcere*, in "Il Messaggero," April 4, 1952.

(11) These and further informations are based on the written reports of priests escaped from Prjašivščyna: *The Situation of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia*, written by a Basilian Father (quoted *The Situation*), *The Liquidation of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia*, typed by Rev. Michael Levenec, chancellor of the Apostolic Visitator for Ukrainians in Europe, on the testimony of three priests (quoted *The Liquidation*), and *The Closing of the Seminary of Prjašiv*, written by now deceased Rev. Nicholas Chanat (quoted *The Closing*).

these people became so "progressive" that they did not need any religion. The church buildings had to be converted to social and cultural activities. Those faithful, who practiced their religion privately, were publicly exposed and attacked in the press.

The police were "investigating" Bishop Gojdič. They blamed the bishop for receiving illegal funds from the Vatican, for helping Ukrainian Nationalists, the Banderivci, for giving shelter to many Ukrainian displaced priests and laymen, who, in the Communists' eyes, were the enemies of the people. In 1949 Moscow's Patriarch appointed as new Orthodox bishops for Olomouc (Moravia) a married ex-bank clerk, Čestmir Kračmar and for Prjašiv, an ex-army officer, Alexis Dechtereč. Bishop Dechtereč was assigned the task of liquidating the Byzantine-Slavonic eparchy of Prjašiv (12).

On February 3, 1950 a delegation of Moscow's Patriarch came to Czechoslovakia headed by Metropolitan of Kruticy, Nicholas, the secretary of the Patriarch and the representative of the Orthodox Church of the Soviet government. On February 12, 1950 Alexis Dechtereč was consecrated the Orthodox bishop of Prjašiv eparchy (13). In April 1950, a secret meeting was held in Vyšne Ružbachy (Podolinec), where under the influence of alcohol, discussions were held about the liquidation of the union with Rome. The initiators of this movement were five bribed Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests: D. Šudich, M. Knapp, E. Kačur, A. Havrilla and I. Pahij; as well as the laymen, P. Babej and V. Kapišovský of the Slovak National Council; A.M. Rudlovčák, of the Ukrainian National Council, and others. Two or three days later, all the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests (except those arrested) were invited by the department of ecclesiastical affairs for a "peace rally" in Prjašiv. The purpose of the rally was not revealed and those priests who knew about it, were forcibly brought to the city; many others came of mere curiosity. The group of five fallen priests grew to sixteen: canon V. Mihalič, chancellor J. Kokinčák, P. Vojtovyč (suspended for twenty years), N. Burik, Toth, P. Bobalik, A. Čabiňák, Jos. Molčan, B. Chlipavka, N. Kelly and M. Milly (14). The central government of Prague passed a new, unjust law: if a group of faithful transferred to the Orthodox religion, they had the right to possess the church and

---

(12) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 173; M. LACKO, *o.c.*, p. 161.

(13) G. MOIOLI, *l.c.*

(14) *The Situation; The Relation; Svitlo Pravoslaviija*, June 1, 1950, n. 1-2, p. 18 ss. *Holos Pravoslaviija*, 1955, v. IV, pp. 107-108.

all the parish properties even if they were in minority. In the following places the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite churches were confiscated: Stakčín, Stakčinská Roztoka, Olšynkiv, Nyžňa, Jedlova, Dubová, Jalova, Inovce, Čelovce, Nyžnij and Vyšnij Myrošiv, Nyžnyj Orlik, Osadne, Varadka, Nyžňa and Vyšňa Poľana, Lomne, Bžany and Palata. At Easter, 1950, the monthly *Svitlo Pravoslavia* (The Light of the Orthodoxy) published in Russian, Ukrainian, Czech and Slovak languages, contained bitter attacks on the Vatican and union with Rome.

On April 26, 1950, the priests' meeting was called at Košice. About 80 Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests thought this would be an open discussion with the Orthodox leaders and government representatives concerning the situation of the Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Those courageous priests came to the meeting and presented to the government the memorandum which they had worked out. The Communists did not have the intention of any discussion, but merely wished to find out the leaders of the opposition. The initiators of this group, twelve priests were arrested. The others returned home without any other choice, than to apostatize and thus secure their own and their families' future, or to remain faithful to the Catholic Church and wait for arrest and persecution. Special concentration camps were organized in Hlohovec, Bač, Trenčín and Podolinec, where the number of arrested Catholic monks of the Latin and Byzantine-Slavonic Rites already was 630 (15).

The rally was called in Prjašiv for April 28, 1950. The government agencies brought to the city many Communist agitators, militia, and other suspicious characters. They announced that this would be a rally for peace. In fact, the partakers were ordered to shout a slogan: "*Pravoslavna vira — zaporuka myra*" (The Orthodox faith is the guarantee of peace). The main hall of the Black Eagle Hotel was decorated with pictures of Moscow's Patriarch, Alexis, and of Prague's Orthodox Archbishop, Eleutherius, as well as the three-bar cross in the middle. There were also the portraits of Stalin and of Gottwald, president of Czechoslovakia. The synod started with the resurrectional hymn *Chrystos Voskrese* (Christ is Risen) at 10:00 a.m. It was presided over by Benicky, chairman of the Central Committee for the return of Orthodoxy and director of the department of schools, who welcomed those present. The Committee of priests, who returned to the Orthodox Church, was formed, as well

---

(15) *The Situation; The Liquidation.*

as was the Committee of laymen, which included the most active members of the Communist Party, state and local officials. In their speeches, the representatives of the clergy accused the Vatican of un-Christian and inhuman activities. Converted to the Orthodox Church, ex-priests of the eparchy: Knapp, Kačur, Bihun, Havrilla and Toth insisted on breaking away from the jurisdiction of Pope and joining the Russian Orthodox Church. The same was reaffirmed by the lay-speaker, Dribňak, a gymnasium teacher in Humenne. Finally, the commission of three was elected presided by Dr. Ilkiv-Rohaľ, to elaborate the synod's resolutions, which later were accepted by "unanimous" acclamation. The resolutions were: 1) The Union concluded in Užhorod in 1646 is to be abolished; 2) The jurisdiction of Rome should be terminated, and all should join the Russian Orthodox Church; 3) Petitions in their behalf are to be sent to Metropolitan by Eleutherius, to the Patriarch of Moscow, Alexis, to the President, Clement Gottwald and to the government of Czechoslovakia; to the President of Slovak National Council, Ch. Šmidke; to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, Z. Fierlinger, and the Commissioner of Slovakia, L. Holdoš. 4) The congratulatory telegrams to be sent to the above-mentioned leaders (16). The synod was closed at 12:00 noon by the Czech and Slovak national anthems. After the synod, the participants guarded by police went to the Cathedral of Prjašiv. Bishop Gojdič refused to relinquish the keys when asked to give them to the delegation. The Blessed Sacrament was removed by one of the priests. The Cathedral then was taken by force. Metropolitan Eleutherius, who by "coincidence" was in Prjašiv, celebrated the Services of Thanksgiving. Bishop Alexis Dechtereč recited the prayer of thanksgiving and the Metropolitan delivered the sermon. During this "religious" devotion, Bishop Gojdič was led by the police to the jail (17).

The Communist press mentioned that from among the 820 delegates of the synod of Prjašiv, 100 were supposed to be former Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests, but it referred to only eleven names and five speakers at the synod. The eyewitness related the presence of eighty priests who embraced the Orthodox Church. From the photography of the synod one can observe that the hall of the Black

---

(16) *The Situation; The Liquidation. Manifest greckokatolíckych duchovných a veriáček prijaty na sobore dna 28. apríla 1950 v Prešove.*

(17) *The Liquidation; Svitlo Pravoslávija*, 1950, n. 1-2, p. 21.



Eagle Hotel could only accommodate 500 persons, although the communique mentioned 4,000 attendents (18).

The telegram-answer of Patriarch Alexis was dated May 3, 1950. The letter of the Czechoslovak government, signed by z. Fieringer, Vice-President of the state and Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, was dated May 27, 1950. The Patriarch "received" the eparchy of Prjašiv into the bosom of Russian Orthodox Church, while the Minister handed over all the ecclesiastical properties to the Orthodox (19). Protected by police, the Communist agents toured all the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite rectories, forcing priests to sign the transfer to the Orthodox Church. Those who obeyed were left in the rectory; others were moved out with their families on the street or eventually arrested (20).

About two weeks after the synod, the government agents went to all the districts, enforcing on the people and the clergy the resolutions of the synod. Fourteen priests, who were against "the return to the Orthodox Church" were arrested in Bača (21). There were only a few who signed these proposed resolutions; others preferred to hide. Another group of courageous priests petitioned the government to nullify the synod of Prjašiv and call another, under the chairmanship of the eparchy's vicar general, who had already been arrested. The Communist government ignored this petition and forced all priests to make a personal profession of the faith before the Orthodox bishop. Only eleven priests obeyed, while the government arrested another ten priests. Many of those priests, who signed the synod's resolution, did not want to appear before the Orthodox bishop and thus five of these seven priests were arrested. At the time of the synod of Košice, held on April 26, 1951, only fifteen to twenty priests remained faithful to the Catholic Church (22). Most of these imprisoned 120 priests were kept in concentration camp in Hlohovec, while others were placed in different jails and concentration camps of Moravia and Bohemia. Thus, the Orthodox had a complete freedom to establish their congregations in the empty ecclesiastical buildings. Those arrested priests, who did not sign

---

(18) *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarchii*, 1950, n. 7, p. 50. *The Liquidation*.

(19) Cfr. the English translation of the telegram and of the letter, in M. LACKO, *o.c.*, pp. 174-175.

(20) *The Situation*.

(21) *The Liquidation*.

(22) The relators asked not do mention these priests names.

the document, after a year or more in the concentration camp, were released, but the government forbade them to reside in the territory of the former eparchy, and so they were forced to undertake other trades, even manual work, to provide for a living. Their situation was indeed horrible. At work, their foremen and coworkers ridiculed them, or ordered them to attend all the "peace rallies," but they were firm in their faith. As it is known, not even one of the religious clergy or sisters became Orthodox (23). In the colleges and high schools all the students were forced to sign the resolutions of Prjašiv synod, otherwise they were expelled from school or were not allowed to graduate. Many students found themselves faced by manual work for their whole lifetime. If the farmers refused to attend Orthodox devotions, they were condemned for long terms to the labor brigades, or forced to work on Sundays. As prior to their arrest, both Bishops, Gojdič and Hopko, were watched by police (24). Bishop Hopko was in Illava prison for ten years without any trial. In July 1960, on the list of 29,000 amnestied prisoners, there was only the name of Bishop Hopko, but he remained under the surveillance of police in Osek, Bohemia.

Bishop Gojdič was long before attacked by the Communist propaganda, and according to the Kremlin orders, he was supposed to have been arrested in the summer of 1947, but the National Slovak Council did not follow these orders (25). A Communist trial was held in the capital of Slovakia, Bratislava, January 11-15, 1951, where due to physical and psychological pressures, Bishop Gojdič, after "spontaneous confession," was given a life sentence. According to the Communist publication, the crimes of Bishop Gojdič were: 1) Sending priests for missionary work to Ukraine during the World War II; 2) Helping priests, "Nazi collaborators, enemies of people," who escaped from Ukraine and Poland; 3) Having contacts with the Vatican and with the Nunciature in Prague for espionage purposes; 4) Receiving financial help for controversial activities from the Holy See, Red Cross and Charitas of Prague; 5) Distributing illegally directives to his priests and receiving them also from arch-

---

(23) *The Situation.*

(24) *The Closing.*

(25) A. PEKAR, *o.c.*, p. 171: "The Slovak National Council was against this arrest, because it could create riots or ferments among the Catholics of Slovakia. Bishop Gojdič had a great authority, because he was the only bishop who politically was not involved during the Slovak Republic of Dr. Tiso."

bishop of Prague, Joseph Beran; 6) Forbidding in 1948 his priests to join the state sponsored "Catholic Action"; 7) Delegating special, episcopal faculties to five priests (26). In the beginning of the trial, the bishop was calm and energetically defended himself against all these pre-fabricated and false accusations. Suddenly, the Communists interrupted the radio-transmission. After it was resumed, the psychologically broken bishop admitted that he was guilty of all these fantastic "crimes." The sentence was the life-term in jail, the deprivation of all citizen's rights and the confiscation of all possessions (27). The Holy See condemned this "parody of justice" and "deceiving comedy" of Bratislava, stating, that Bishop Gojdič was arrested "for his faith" and gave an undeniable "testimony to the truth" (28). The bishop was transferred to the jail in Leopoldov, then to Illava. For a short time he was also in the jail in Košice, where there was a trial of another group of 70 Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests, December 1956, or January 1957. These priests were accused of "illegal propagation of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite" and one of the witnesses had to be Bishop Gojdič. The Communist agents put further pressure on the bishop to testify against his former priests and to persuade them to embrace the Orthodox Church, but the bishop did not accept this offer and preferred to spend his life in jail (29).

As during the years of his freedom, Bishop Gojdič in prison led a saintly life (30). When people found out his whereabouts, they came as to the pilgrimage to see the saint. On the occasion of his 70th birthday, on July 17, 1958, Pope Pius XII sent him an encouraging telegram to Illava prison. The other condemned bishops, Buzalka and Vojtaššak, were released from jail to a home for the aged under the police control in Džčin. Even as the bishop's name

---

(26) *Proces proti vlastizrádným biskupom Vojtaššakovi, Buzalkovi a Gojdičovi*, Bratislava 1951; M. LACKO, *o.c.*, p. 176; A. PEKAR, *The Mock Trial of Bishop Gojdich*, in "Eastern Catholic Life," March 20, 1966, p. 7.

(27) On the occasion of Bishop Gojdič episcopal consecration jubilee, Msg. G. MOIOLI wrote the article *Giubileo in carcere*, in "Il Messaggero," April 4, 1952.

(28) "L'Osservatore Romano," January 15-16, 1951. The Communist press cautioned: "The sentence of the bishop has to be a precaution for all those, who dare to follow the steps of justly punished dignitary, the traitor." *Prjašivščyna*, n. 5, 1951.

(29) *Ameryka*, (Ukrainian daily), March 15, 1957. *The Byzantine Catholic World*, January 13, 1957.

(30) A. B. PEKAR, *Bishop Paul P. Gojdich*, OSBM, p. 46 ss.

was on the list of the amnestied, he did not enjoy the freedom. According to the last visitors, he suffered lung-cancer but he performed his prison duties — repairing with bandaged hands the prison's torn burlap sacks until his death. When his close friends and relatives inquired about his release, they received the sad news, that he died in the prison of Leopoldov, on July 17, 1960 (31). There was no communique or radio report of his death. The Communist authorities did not release the body to the family for the burial, but buried him in the prison's cemetery. The official news release came from the Holy See: "The Most Reverend Peter Paul Gojdič, OSBM, 72 years old, Ukrainian Catholic bishop-ordinary of Prjašiv in Czechoslovakia, died in a Communist prison two months ago. The news about his death reached us only now. He died in July, but it is not known on what day" (32).

---

(31) A. PEKAR, *He Suffered for the Name of Christ*, in "Eastern Catholic Life," April 3, 1966, p. 8. Also private letters to various persons.

(32) "L'Osservatore Romano," September 17, 1960.

### XXIII. PERSECUTION OF THE SEMINARIANS, CLERGY

Since the Communist takeover of February, 1948, the eparchial seminary was guarded by the state police. Bishop Hopko, the seminary rector and the professor of moral theology, was watched around the clock by special agents. Life and the classes of the seminary continued normally until April 10, 1950 (1). That night the apostate priest Havrilla accompanied by Lata, professor from Humenne, and two police agents, came to the seminary. They wanted to talk to any of the superiors of the seminary. None of them was home. Then, they called the senior seminarians and in their presence they wanted to install the apostate Havrilla in the office of the rector. The seminarians categorically declined such action. When one of the superiors came to the scene, the police forced him to give them the keys of the rector's office. Thus, the seminarians faced their new rector, the apostate priest Havrilla, appointed by the Communist police. Officially the seminary was not yet proclaimed Orthodox. The new rector was not seen too often in the seminary, and the seminarians ignored him completely. There were no classes of theological subjects. The seminarians were without any superiors, only the spiritual director was there to take care of their spiritual needs. The new rector, Havrilla, was very careful, but professor Lata started his re-educational program. He called every seminarian to his office, trying to persuade him "to conform to the new requirements of the progressive age." Every seminarian left his office with a gift — a "progressive" anti-Catholic book. One day, when Lata stated that the seminary was already Orthodox, and that everybody was welcomed to stay, the seminarians packed their clothes, dressed in civilian clothes, and, unnoticed, left the seminary. All this happened on April 20, 1950. Lata became very angry, ran from one room to another finding only two seminarians, who were supposed to take a later train to Košice. These men he sent to the railroad station with orders to

---

(1) *The Situation.*

bring back all the seminarians, or he would send police after them. These two came back with a negative answer: the seminarians would never return to the Orthodox seminary. Lata called the police to seize the seminarians from among the passengers, but it was too late, since the train had just left the station. Those two seminarians, who did not have a chance to leave, were taken to the seminary building and guarded by police. With them the spiritual director and the employees were arrested. The agents had the intention of dragging to Prjašiv synod all thirty seminarians in cassocks and to force them to pose for the photograph, but not one of the seminarians was there and this propagandistic trick did not work (2).

The police did not give up. On May 20, 1950 they started a new "hunt" of the seminarians with the result of twenty seminarians being locked up in Prjašiv's jail. Again, many attempts were made to "re-educate" these seminarians. The new "rector" Havrilla lectured them for a whole month, as did the chief of the police, comrade Nžmčik. The seminarians were called personally and asked again to return "to the faith of their forefathers," but without any result (3). The apostate-rector promised the seminarians the government would pay for their education in the seminary of Prague, but to no avail. The seminarians were released from jail, but after two weeks they were again in the seminary-jail, and from here they were transferred by bus to the concentration camp-monastery in Hlohovec (4). Here the seminarians were welcomed by the group of arrested priests and Bishop Hopko. After two months, the seminarians and the younger priests were taken into the army as newly-formed Working Brigades. According to the Communist interpretation, the seminary became Orthodox on the basis of "the voluntary decisions of faithful."

During the first years of the Orthodox administration, into the seminary were often admitted individuals with only four years of grade school, who after six months of catechetical instruction were ordained "priests." The seminarians of the former eparchy of Prjašiv, according to the government plans, were to study in the

---

(2) *The Closing*.

(3) Three seminarians consented to their "persuasion," because they intended to leave the seminary and to choose another profession, *The Situation*.

(4) Some 120 priests were arrested in the concentration camp-monastery in Hlohovec. M. LACKO, *o.c.*, p. 175.

Latin Rite seminary of Prague and to be ordained as married Latin Rite priests. Such was the Communists intention to end the celibacy of the Latin Rite clergy in Czechoslovakia (5).

Life in the Working Brigades was hard. The seminarians and arrested priests had to work in stonepits, forests, airports, on the construction of new highways, railroads and different buildings, in rain or snow, 9-12 hours daily. The police-agents, armed with automatic rifles, brought these brigadiers to their camp, where, tired, worn out with physical labor, they had to take part in two-three hours long reeducational "social sciences of the Marx-Lenin theories of new society." Malnutrition, hard physical labor and obligatory courses ruined the health of many of these priests and seminarians. If any were caught sleeping, the guards threw any objects at them, or made them run around the building for punishment. They did not spare the seminarians from continuous remarks about their "stupidity" for not transferring to the theological faculty of Prague, "spying" for the Vatican and their "stubbornness" in the re-education in the new "democratic popular regime." The seminarians had to attend many motion pictures, lectures, propaganda courses, but the worst was the working and living with the prisoners of the opposite sex. Near Puchov the government was building a new dam on river Váh and for this purpose a concentration camp accommodating 250 Jesuits and 180 Salesians was established there. In the same barracks, separated only by wooden boards, the government placed arrested young women. This situation really required an exceptional willpower. When some of these prisoners succumbed to the temptation, this brought a great joy to the Communist "educators." The bad examples were emphasized in the press and brought to the consideration of all the seminarians, just to break their faith and faithfulness to the Catholic Church. The grace of God worked even here, because seeing the strategy of the Communists, these prisoners prayed and encouraged each other (6).

The Communist government tried by all means to realize their plans. In the summer of 1950 there was forcible recruiting to the state-controlled seminaries. Only thirty candidates enrolled in the Central Seminary of Prague and twenty-five to the seminary of Bratislava. From the former seminarians of Prjašiv eparchy only one

---

(5) *The Situation, The Closing.*

(6) *The Situation.*

secular and one religious went to Prague, but one of them left during the first semester (7).

In the Prjašiv seminary the Orthodox began their own "theological instructions." This was nothing else, but the brief catechetical courses. They needed priests, since the majority of the clergy of Prjašiv eparchy did not want to join the Orthodox and preferred to be arrested rather than to leave their Catholic Church. The empty parishes were now in the hands of the state controlled Orthodox. After the petition of Archbishop Eleutherius and with the permission of the government, the former eparchial seminary with Orthodox faculty was reopened on October 15, 1950 (8).

In Prjašiv, the faithful did not want to enter the forcibly-taken Cathedral Church. The government agents started another man-hunt for Orthodox priests to fill up the empty parishes. They contacted all retired teachers, professors, clerks and if these would not co-operate, the state would refuse them the pension. Many of these retired did not want to lose their pension, but there were cases of heroic courage. Thus, the government picked up from among these about sixty "new seminarians." In the seminary they learned only ritual and liturgical devotions. Some of them finished these instructions in three weeks; some of them graduated after three months. Those retired teachers, who knew how to read in Church-Slavonic as well as were versed in the liturgical celebrations — graduated earlier. Young men, after the fourth or fifth year of gymnasium, were forced to enter the Orthodox seminary, otherwise they would be expelled from state-controlled schools. After eight months these "seminarians" not only graduated from the gymnasium, but also were ordained "priests" (9).

The pressure to embrace the Orthodox religion was applied to all schools in the territory of Prjašivščyna. The children of arrested Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic priests were expelled from all schools, as well as all those who did not sign the transfer to Orthodox Church. If these had already finished eight years of the gymnasium, they were not allowed to graduate. If they did not want to give up their Catholic faith, the students were not given the permission to enter the state-controlled gymnasium or university, even

---

(7) *The Situation*.

(8) M. LACKO, *o.c.*, p. 179.

(9) *The Situation* mentions two names, two brothers, but for obvious reasons they will not be revealed.



if they had the best grades. At the exams, the Communist professors failed favoring only the students of Communist parents. Thus, the universities of Czechoslovakia were filled with these students. If they were of the Communist parents, they had to enroll in the university, whether they wanted or not; those, who did not cooperate with the Communists had to secure their livelihood with physical or manual labor (10).

---

(10) *The Situation.*

#### XXIV. UNDER STATE-CONTROLLED ORTHODOX ADMINISTRATION

The "spontaneous" Communist demonstrations are usually planned by a few leaders. In the Communist countries all the state employees, students, workers and soldiers — all the state controlled mass of people — have to take part in these demonstrations, otherwise they will be considered as the enemies of the social-democratic working class and, consequently, persecuted.

The Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna many times expressed their sincere loyalty to God, to their Church and to their bishops. They always came to welcome their spiritual father, Bishop Gojdič during his canonical visitations of the parishes. The pilgrimages, where he celebrated the pontifical divine liturgies, were an extraordinary manifestation of faith. With all sincerity it has to be said, that all the Communist or Orthodox manifestations cannot be compared to those, which expressed the faith in God and confidence of the faithful in their bishop (1).

The Communist authorities were aware of the loyalty of the Ukrainians to their Church and to God. To appeal to their patriotism, they staged peace rallies, the purposes of which were distorted and they resulted in nothing more than feeble attempts. An unsuccessful appeal was made to the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna to erect an Orthodox church-monument in Laborec in honor of Czechoslovak and Soviet soldiers, killed in the World War II, but at the construction, only one, Archimandrite Andrew, was working. In 1947, the students of the gymnasium in Humenne and the brigade of the Carpathian Association of Youth (Sojuz Molodeži Karpat) "voluntarily" helped at the construction (2).

After the "voluntary" synod in Prjašiv, the Communist authorities tried to instill their ideology through the demonstrations and rallies. The opportunity came when they sponsored a demonstration on the occasion of SS. Cyril and Methodius Day, July 9, 1950

---

(1) A. B. PEKAR, *Bishop Paul P. Gojdich*, p. 20.

(2) See the photographs in "Prjaševščyna", p. 41 ss.

in Michalovce. Both the Archbishop Eleutherius and Bishop Alexis Dechtereŭ took part in it. Since it was also a peace rally, there were also representatives of the government. This "peace rally" started with religious devotions in the front of the Church of the Descent of the Holy Spirit, confiscated from the Redemptorist Fathers. To the crowd of about 25,000 people Archbishop Eleutherius spoke in Russian, while the apostate priest, John Kokiňak, in the Zemplin dialect, praised the Orthodox religion. Again, "according to the will of the people" a new Orthodox eparchy of Michalovce was erected. The monastery of former Redemptorist Fathers now became the bishop's residence and the Church his Cathedral. This was discussed and "approved" at the eparchial meeting in Prjašiv on July 28. On the very next day, an eparchial synod in Michalovce was held and the former canon of Prjašiv eparchy, Victor Mihalič, 72 year old widower, was made the first Bishop of Michalovce eparchy. With tears of sadness, this old ex-canon consented to be the first Orthodox Bishop of Michalovce, while the mentioned John Kokiňak, was appointed the vicar general of the eparchy. The episcopal consecration took place in Michalovce, on October 8, 1950 (3).

In his first pastoral letter, Bishop Alexander (his assumed name) asked the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholics to follow his example, at least to save some kind of religion, even if it is Orthodox (4).

According to the commentary, the eparchy of Michalovce was needed a long time ago and it was not realized, because of "the obstinate, dictatorial centralizing attitude of Rome." Only now, in "the free, democratic, people's republic the possibility to serve the interests of people" became a reality (5).

The Orthodox eparchy of Michalovce included seven deaneries (protopresbyterates), 95 parishes and 359 filial churches, as follows: Michalovce 22, 42, Vraniv 12, 42, Velyki Kapušany 7, 24, Sobrance 14, 33, Košice 12, 138, Trebišov 18, 46, Sečovce 10, 34.

The Mother-eparchy of Prjašiv had the rest of the 160 parishes and 624 filial churches in fifteen deaneries (protopresbyterates): Prjašiv 9, 86, Sabyniv 15, 99, Stara Lubovňa 13, 40, Giraltoŭ 9, 37, Bardyjiv 1) 10, 38, Bardyjiv 2) 10, 16, Svydnyk 19, 35, Stropkiv 13, 42, Mežylaborci 1) 10, 21, Mežylaborci 2) 10, 8, Humenne, 9, 42,

---

(3) *Svitlo Pravoslaviija*, August 1, 1950, n. 5-6, pp. 49-76; M. LACKO, *o.c.*, p. 180; A. PEKAR, *Narysy Istoriji Cerkvi Zakarpatta*, p. 176.

(4) The part of his first pastoral letter in M. LACKO, *o.c.*, pp. 180-181.

(5) *Svitlo Pravoslaviija*, August 1, 1950, n. 5-6, p. 50.

Snyňa 1) 9, 9, Snyňa 2) 10, 12, Levoča 12, 122 and Bratislava 2, 16 (6). In 1954, in both eparchies of Prjašiv and Michalovce there were 255 parishes and 983 filial churches. The total number of the Orthodox faithful in Czechoslovakia was about 400,000 including even those who opposed or were contrary to the Orthodox religion (7).

“For great and fast progress,” the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia was proclaimed “autocephalous” during the liturgical celebrations in SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in Prague, December 8, 1951. In the presence of the delegates of Orthodox Churches of Soviet Union, Georgia, Antioch, as well as satellite countries of Albania, Bulgaria and Rumania, the Archbishop Eleutherius, December 9, 1951, “was elected” and installed its first Metropolitan (8). The Orthodox monthly *Svitlo Pravoslavija* (The Light of the Orthodoxy), published in four languages, in June of 1952 was changed into the *Holos Pravoslavija* (The Voice of the Orthodoxy) and later, since they tried to attract more subscribers, it was changed in *Zapovit Sv. Kyryla i Meřoda* (The Testament of SS. Cyril and Methodius).

In the eparchy of Michalovce, the apostate priest, also a widower, Michael Milly, who had assumed the name of Methodius, was consecrated on February 15, 1953, the auxiliary bishop to the aging Bishop Alexander Mihalič, with the title of the bishop of Trebišov (9). In the Orthodox eparchy of Olomouc-Brno, Moravia, Bishop Čestmir Kračmar, without any given reason or explanation, was removed and was never mentioned as Orthodox Bishop. In his place another ex-Catholic priest, Nicholas Kelly, on October 2, 195e, was consecrated as Bishop Clement for this eparchy (10). The spiritual director of the Orthodox seminary in Prjašiv, Russian-born Ivan Kuchtin, the Bishop of Žatec, on October 24, 1954 was consecrated as the auxiliary to the Metropolitan of Prague (11). Both protagonists of the forced liquidation of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite

---

(6) The name of the locality is also the name of the deanery; first-is the number of parishes; second-of filial churches.

(7) According to the *Pravoslavny Svornik s Kalendarem na Rok 1954*, pp. 47-49.

(8) *Ibidem*, p. 45; P. KARNAŠEVYČ, *Autokefaliija Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v ČSSR*, in “*Ježegodnik Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Čechoslovakiji*,” 1962, pp. 38-52.

(9) *Holos Pravoslavija*, 1959, n. 15, p. 213.

(10) *Pravoslavny Sbornik s Kalendarem na Rok 1954*, p. 47 does not give any reason why the eparchy of Olomouc-Brno did not have the bishop. *Ibidem*, l.c.

(11) *Ibidem*, l.c.

Catholic eparchy of Prjašiv were called to return to the Soviet Union, where Eleutherius was elevated to the Metropolitan of Leningrad, and Alexis was appointed the Archbishop of Wilno. They kept these offices until their deaths (12). The successor of Eleutherius as the Metropolitan of Prague and of all Czechoslovakia became Ivan Kuchtin. The successor to Alexis Dechtereov in the Prjašiv eparchy was consecrated in Moscow, Bishop Dorotheus Filip, while after the death of Bishop Alexander Mihalič, on November 25, 1954, Bishop Methodius Milly became the head of the Michalovce eparchy (13). In 1960 in Czechoslovakia there were three Orthodox bishops: the Metropolitan of Prague, Ivan, and Bishop of Prjašiv, Dorotheus, from Soviet Union and one ex-Catholic priest, the 76-year-old Slovak Bishop of Michalovce, Methodius (Michael) Milly (14). These facts tell us about the real "independence" of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church, about "the free will of people" concerning the administration of the ecclesiastical communities and who was behind the "free elections" of the ecclesiastical dignitaries in Czechoslovakia.

---

(12) Cfr. the visit of the delegation of the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia to the Moscow's Patriarch, Alexis, on July 14-17, 1956, in *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarchii*, October 1956, n. 10, pp. 19-22.

(13) As of Slovak nationality, Bishop Methodius was made the head of the Czechoslovak delegation to Moscow, July 14-17, 1956. *Ibidem*.

(14) According to the information the Orthodox eparchy of Michalovce was erected for the Slovak Orthodox, with the Slovak official language.

## XXV. PRJAŠIVŠČYNA UNDER COMMUNIST ADMINISTRATION

After World War II, in political circles and in the minds of many statesmen emerged a new idea: the Unified Europe. The first realization of it was the European Common Market. The idea of united Slav nations had already been discussed at the Congress of the Slav Nations in Prague in 1848. This time the strongest of the Slav states, Russia, wanted to have the total control of all Slav nations, but this utopian dream was against self-determination of interested nations. These Slavo-Russophil ideas were absorbed later into the totalistic ideology of the Communist Party. Even if the first Soviet government was composed of only 5% Russians, the party adopted Russian as the official language and Slavophil patriotism to spread the ideas of international Marxism-Leninism. In the party's program there was a task of eradicating nationalistic feelings, replacing it with the international, cosmopolitan Communism. In the Soviet Union this meant a strong, forcible denationalization of non-Russian nationalities and the building of a powerful Russian Communist state. Those, who did not co-operate, were simply exterminated or deported to Siberia. Thus in the Soviet Union the problem of nationalities does not exist, because all non-Russian nations had to sacrifice everything "to the older brother," Russian nation.

Outside the Soviet Union, the ideology of Communism is spread as a patriotic, national fight for the social justice or human rights.

If you were to hear or to read about the Czechoslovak nation today, you would say immediately that the author is completely ignorant on the subject, for there is no such Czechoslovak people or nation. There is a Czechoslovak or Czecho-Slovak Socialistic Republic, there are Czecho-Slovak citizens, but the Czechoslovak nation or nationality does not exist. There are Czechs and Slovaks and to the state of Czechs and Slovaks, to the Czechoslovak Republic Prjašivščyna also belongs. If you tell a Slovak that he is Czechoslovak, he will be insulted, but then is it not an insult, when Slovak writers call the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna Slovaks? They try to prove

that the territory is under the Slovak administration, therefore, it is Slovak.

During his life-time, Thomas G. Masaryk, the first president of Czechoslovakia, many times mentioned, that he never saw or never met anybody during his travels who would call himself a Slovak, being Greek-Catholic. These "Greek-Catholics" were Rusins or Ukrainians and it was their wish that their land "from Poprad to Tisa" would belong to the autonomous Ukrainian province, which was never realized by the Czechoslovak government.

Against their will, the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna were again incorporated into the Czechoslovak Republic and Prjašivščyna became the subject of political bargain. The President, Dr. Edward Beneš insisted that the borders of Czechoslovakia be the same as they were before 1939. After the Czechoslovak government was forced to sign the annexation of Carpatho-Ukraine to the Soviet Ukraine, in the territory of Prjašivščyna there was a movement to incorporate this piece of Ukrainian territory into the Soviet Ukraine also. The chairman of Czechoslovak Communist Party, Clement Gottwald, went to Moscow in 1945 to talk with the government of Stalin, but even if Gottwald affirmed that the Soviet Union was taking a negative attitude, President Beneš already started to solve the problem by expelling the Ukrainians from Prjašivščyna into the territory of Soviet Ukraine and of Sudetenland (1). On May 8, 1945, President Beneš said in Bratislava, that those national minorities, who did not return to their national states, would be subjected to the assimilation. Thus, the sentence of denationalization was passed and again these Ukrainians suffered great losses.

On March 1, 1945 the meeting was called in Prjašiv, where the representatives of the Ukrainians organized the Ukrainian National Council of Prjašivščyna (2). The Soviet Red Army of occupation was of the opinion, that the Russophil movement of Prjašivščyna was the work of czarist immigrants; therefore, political agents of General Moskalenko insisted that this territory was Ukrainian and its representative organization be called the Ukrainian Council (3).

---

(1) S. ZERKAL, *Ukrajinciv na Prjašivščyni čechizujut i slovakizujut*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," December, 1966, n. 12, p. 1.

(2) I. S. BUKOVSKIJ, *Verchovnaja organizacija Prjaševščyny*, in "Prjaševščyna," pp. 262-268. S. ZERKAL, *Čechizacija ukrajinciv Prjašivščyny*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," October, 1965, n. 10, p. 2.

(3) S. ZERKAL, *Čechizacija Ukrajinciv Prjašivščyny*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," December, 1965, n. 12, p. 2; and *Ibidem*, July, 1966, n. 7, p. 2.

The Slovak National Council in Bratislava did not acknowledge the existence of the Ukrainian Council, as long as the representatives of Democratic Party of the National Front would not be part of it. Thus, since the beginning, this Council was not the representative organization of the Ukrainians, but only a co-operating entity, assisting the government in the economical, political and social problems, concerning Ukrainians. The following officers were elected: V. Karaman - chairman, P. Žydovskij - vice-chairman, Jos. Zbihlej - treasurer, I. Levkanyč, P. Babej and V. Zavadskij - representatives in National Assembly in Prague: V. Kapyšovskij, A. Bohdanov, Dr. Iikiv-Rohaľ and J. Suchyj - the representatives at the Slovak National Council in Bratislava (4).

In March 18, 1945, under the redactorship of I. Pješčak, appeared the first issues of "*Prjaševščyna*," the weekly of the Ukrainian National Council, printed in Russian. The Ukrainian National Council published the memorandum, including these five points: 1) the erection of Ukrainian schools and cultural, educational institutions, 2) the nomination of representatives to the National Council in Bratislava, 3) and to the National Assembly in Prague, 4) the erection of the Ukrainian Department of Schools in Prjašiv, and 5) the appointment of representatives of agricultural and economic matters. The program, submitted to provincial Slovak government was approved on May 26, and was sent to the people. Since the Ukrainian National Council was for the territorial autonomy of Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna, the majority of the Communists rejected its policy, appealing to the international comradeship of Communists. According to the Communist critics of the central government of Prague, "these bourgeois" officers considered their problem not from socialistic, but strictly from the nationalistic viewpoint. The last issue of "*Prjaševščyna*" appeared on August 18, 1951 and the Ukrainian National Council of Prjašivščyna was suppressed. Instead in July, 1954 "*The Cultural Association of Ukrainian Workers of Czechoslovakia*" was organized with its monthly publication, printed in Ukrainian, "*Družno Vpered*" (Friendly Forward) and weekly "*Nove Žyttá*" (New Life) (5).

Already on June 18, 1945 the Ukrainian Department of Schools

---

(4) I. S. BUKOVSKYJ, *l.c.*

(5) *Kulturna Spilka Ukrajinських Trudaščych Česloslovaččyny*, abbreviated KSUT. S. ZERKAL, *l.c.*, in "*Holos Lemkivščyny*," December 1965, n. 12, p. 2, and *Holos Lemkivščyny*, July, 1966, n. 7, p. 2.



was erected in Prjašiv. The school inspector Dr. I. Pješčak, organized four school-districts: Laborec, Prjašiv, Sabyniv and Stropkiv (6). In the same year there were: 11 kindergardens with 948 pupils, 272 grade-schools with 16,905, 25 high-schools with 3,044 and 5 gymnasiums, teachers and professional colleges with 1,046 students (7). On June 30, 1960, Prjašivščyna had five school-districts, 243 grade schools, 8 gymnasiums and 4 teachers and professional colleges (8).

The government of Czechoslovakia did not acknowledge the autonomous rights of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. While there was the Communist Party of Czechs and Slovaks, there was never the Communist Party of Ukrainians; the representatives of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna had to be sent to Prague and to Bratislava. Ukrainians again were exposed as a dangerous "counter-revolutionary, nationalistic bourgeois element." The Communists from the central government of Prague gave the Slovak Communist Party free hand in the denationalization and slovakization of Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna (9).

While there was a satisfactory progress in Ukrainian schools in 1951-61, there began also numerous silent provocations and intrigues against these fortresses of education. According to the Communist propaganda, these schools were becoming the nests of Ukrainian nationalistic education, therefore, many villagers were told to make official complaints against Ukrainian schools and to petition the Communist authorities to substitute them for the Slovak ones (10). Thus, in the years 1960-63 the slovakization of Ukrainian schools in Prjašivščyna took place. There remained only 82 Ukrainian grade-schools, while 611 had been "lost" to Slovaks (11). In those "lost" schools the Ukrainian language was strictly forbidden. Teachers were not allowed to speak Ukrainian even after classes nor were they to explain any subject in Ukrainian, even if the pupils did not understand (12).

---

(6) V. KAPYŠOVSKYJ, *Školnoje delo na Prjaševščyne*, in "Prjaševščyna," pp. 273-282.

(7) V. KAPYŠOVSKYJ, *l.c.*

(8) S. ZERKAL, *o.c.*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," December, 1965, n. 12, p. 2.

(9) *Ibidem*, also *Holos Lemkivščyny*, July, n. 7, p. 2.

(10) V. PROCHODA, *Nacionalno-kulturne žyttja ukrajinciv na Prjašivščyni*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," September, 1965, n. 9, p. 2.

(11) S. ZERKAL, *o.c.*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," July, 1966, n. 7, p. 2.

(12) In the Soviet Ukraine there is a great fight for the Ukrainian schools

At the meeting of school-principals, on August 27, 1964, it was decided: 1) that the change of the language in school does not signify the change of the language of the village, therefore, all extra-curricular educational work should be allowed to be held in Ukrainian, 2) two hours weekly of obligatory Ukrainian language would be taught in the nine-grades school (*devjatylytka*), 3) to try to instill national pride into the minds of the pupils by understanding and putting emphasis of belonging to the Ukrainian nation, 4) in the musical education the teachers had to follow the prescriptions of correspondent manuals, 5) in the teaching of history and geography, the teachers had to use the regional descriptions and 6) in Ukrainian high-schools and in higher education all the subjects had to be taught in Ukrainian. For the same reason, the second point, instead of obligatory, had the word non-obligatory, which caused confusion (13). On August 1, 1964, the school-inspector of Prjašivščyna, Holenda "explained," that if the sufficient number of parents would demand, the Ukrainian language would be taught as a non-obligatory subject (14).

There were also other artificial "difficulties" presented by various pro-Slovak persons, as lack of class-rooms, the poor school-furnishing, the distance of teachers' quarters, the lack of Ukrainian school-manuals, the "superiority" of Slovak language and so forth. This amounted to the complete Slovakization of Ukrainian schools.

In spite of the Communist and Slovak oppression, there were many organizations of Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna with their headquarters in Prjašiv, such as: The Ukrainian National Council of Prjašivščyna (from 1954 The Cultural Association of Ukrainian Workers), The National Theater, The Ukrainian Broadcast Association, The Association of Pedagogical Publications, The Association of Ukrainian Writers, The Faculty of Philology and The Faculty of Pedagogy (both affiliated with the university in Bratislava), The Research Institute of Pedagogy, The Teachers' Institute, "The

---

and against forcible Russification. Almost on the same pattern is the Slovakization of Ukrainian schools of Prjašivščyna. For this reason we would like to recommend the book of JOHN KOLANSKY, *Education in Soviet Ukraine*, Peter Martin Ass.

(13) The decree of the Ministry of Education of Prague, August 21, 1963 in "Holos Lemkivščyny," July, 1966, n. 7, p. 2, as well as the other informations and comments.

(14) S. ZERKAL, *Čechizacija ukrajinciv Prjašivščyny*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," October, 1966, n. 10, p. 2.

Ukrainian Book" publishing company, The School of Economy, The School of Medicine, and newspapers and magazines: *Družno Vpered* (Friendly Forward), *Nove Žyttá* (New Life), *Žyttá i Škola* (Life and School), and *Dukla*. In 1965 Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna published more books, than the Ukrainians of the Soviet Ukraine. If there were only so few Ukrainians, as the Slovak "experts" affirm, the Ukrainian organizations and the Ukrainian publications would have no meaning at all, and the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna would become chimerical, artificial non-reality (15).

---

(15) S. ZERKAL, *Nacionalni i relyhijni vidnosyny na Zakarpatti*, p. 30.

## CONCLUSION

After World War II, there were ferments in all fields of life in the Soviet Union. During the regime of Chruščov was begun "the era of destalinization," when there were changes only in the methods, but not in the Communist ideology. These ferments for freedom of expression, of art, of music had their importance and repercussion in the life of nations of the Soviet Union. In many instances this was a new phase of their fight against Russification and rebuilding the oppressed national life, culture and freedom. Unfortunately, many of these efforts ended with secret court trials and with life sentences in the concentration camps of Siberia for those, who would dare to fight Communists and the Russian regime.

The era of destalinization in Czechoslovakia began in 1962. In Slovakia the "liberal" Communists revised and rewrote the Slovak history and the constitution during 1964-1967 (1). The Slovak Communists intended to make of Slovakia an independent, sovereign state, which would form with Czech lands and Moravia the federative Republic of Czechoslovakia. The only common affairs with Czechs were supposed to be the foreign representation and foreign diplomatic offices. In these affairs the Slovaks demanded an equal number of Slovak officials, disregarding the disproportion of ten millions of Czechs to four millions of Slovaks in Czechoslovakia (2).

Concerning German, Hungarian and Polish national minorities, the governments of Bonn, Budapest and of Warsaw officially intervened at offices of Prague and of Bratislava defending the minorities' rights of their co-nationals, but the government of Soviet Ukraine did not have interest of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. Supporting pro-Russian policies of the central committee of the Communist Party of Moscow, the government of Kiev left the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna to become again the target of denationalization (3).

---

(1) From the speech of Hon. P. Findley, III. in the House of Representatives, in "Congressional Record," May 8, 1968, v. 114, n. 78.

(2) *Ameryka*, (Philadelphia) July 17, 1968, n. 135.

(3) The article *Z žytta ukrajinciv Prjašivščyny*, in "Holos Lemkivščyny," July 1968, n. 7, p. 1.

The promises of a cultural-national autonomy were never carried into effect. The threats of expatriation to the Soviet Ukraine even today are the most potent weapons of Slovak nationalistic propaganda. The present situation could be characterized with an incident, which occurred at the meeting in Prjašiv honoring M. Štefanik, on April 4, 1968, when Slovak students and professors made a motion to expel all the Ukrainians from their native lands of Prjašivščyna into the Soviet Ukraine. The rally finished with singing an old song of Slovak fanatics " *Rež a rubaj do krve!*" (4).

In the ecclesiastical life, the Orthodox bishop of Prjašiv, Dorotheus Filip, in 1963 was elevated to the rank of arch-bishop and in 1964 to the metropolitan of Prague and of Czechoslovakia. Bishop Nicholas Kočvar, was placed in charge of the Orthodox eparchy of Prjašiv. In the Orthodox eparchy of Michalovce, Bishop Methodius Milly in 1962 received an auxiliary, Bishop Methodius Kančuha, with the title of "bishop of Trebišov." In 1965 he was brought to the United States by certain Slovak "ecumenist" to head the Carpatho-Russian Greek-Catholic Orthodox eparchy of Johnstown, Pennsylvania (5). This attempt did not work, since "the bishop of Trebišov" for personal reasons was asked to return to Czechoslovakia. During the destalinization period, in 1962, there were attempts made to re-establish the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic eparchy of Prjašiv by clergy, but the Czechoslovak government did not comply with the petitioners' request (6).

The Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholics were granted to re-establish their eparchy only during the period of liberalization of Alexander Dubček in 1968. After eighteen years of persecution and oppression, these Catholics emerged from the catacombs and on January 1, 1968, sent a Memorandum to the Czechoslovak government demanding the re-establishment of their parishes and institutions. According to the Czechoslovak Communist press, a meeting was held in Košice on April 29, 1968, where 135 Catholic priests of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite elected the temporary Executive Committee, asking immediately for the rights to correct the illegal and unjust decision of the liquidation of the eparchy on April 8, 1950 (7). Af-

---

(4) *Ibidem.*

(5) M. LACKO, *A Brief Survey of the History of the Slovak Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite*, in "Slovak Studies," III, pp. 199-224.

(6) *Ibidem.*

(7) *Byzantine Catholic World*, July 7, 1968, p. 9.

firming the legality and canonicity of the Prjašiv synod of the eparchy's liquidation, the Orthodox metropolitan of Czechoslovakia explained, that Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholics were deprived of all rights, because of their refusal to co-operate with the government. Thus, the confiscated property of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic parishes and institutions rightfully belonged to the Orthodox Church, which sufficiently satisfied the spiritual needs of inhabitants of Prjašivščyna. There was no need of rehabilitation of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic eparchy, for it could bring unrest and confusion among the people (8). These statements were ineffective, because the new Czechoslovak government admitted the illegality of Prjašiv's synod in violation of constitutional rights and illegality of the Orthodox Action. Bishop Hopko returned from his home arrest in Osek, Bohemia, to Prjašiv, where an agreement was made with the local Orthodox bishop concerning the freedom of conscience of Catholics and Orthodox, as well as preliminary steps for the return of the confiscated properties to the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic eparchy of Prjašiv. On May 6, 1968, Bishop Hopko addressed his first pastoral letter to the faithful, asking for their support and prayers in the rehabilitation of the eparchy. On May 18, the bishop again asked those of good will for patience and understanding in the re-establishment of parishes and of the appointment of priests (9). The systematic return of the ecclesiastical properties began with a supervision of the government. According to the signed petition of inhabitants, the government granted the permission to re-establish Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic parishes on the previously owned properties. There were cases where the government paid the retroactive salaries of illegally arrested priests-teachers in state schools (10).

During meeting of Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Catholic priests on April 29, 1968 in Košice, two Executive Committees were organized: one for Ukrainian, another for Slovak Byzantine-Slavonic Rite priests. The elected chairman of the Ukrainian priests' Committee, John L'avynec, the actual vicar general of the eparchy, acting upon his doctor's advice, went to a clinic in Prague, where he is under the care of a lung specialist. Unfortunately, he did not resign from his office, nor did he delegate his power to anyone else. Consequently, the Executive Committee of Ukrainian priests became paralyzed.

---

(8) *Zapovit Sv. Kyryla i Mefoda*, May 1968, n. 5, pp. 103-110.

(9) *Nove Žytta*, May 18, 1968.

(10) From private letters.

Intimidated with the expulsion to the Soviet Ukraine, the Ukrainian priests became inactive and ineffective in the matters of their parishes and eparchy.

The Executive Committee of Slovak priests elected as their chairman a nationalistic minded priest, John Murin, S.T.D. Relying on the government support, these Slovak priests, backed with Slovak super-patriotic laymen, launched an organized propaganda campaign to re-establish the eparchy of Prjašiv as the Slovak eparchy for Byzantine Rite Catholics of Slovak nationality, forcing the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna to a speedy process of denationalization. As the Hungarians before World War I, now Slovaks are using the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite to denationalize all the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. If any of those forced to accept Orthodox religion congregations wanted to return to the Catholic Church, they had to present their petition to the Slovak Executive Committee and they were accepted to the Catholic Church only under the condition, that they will become Slovak Byzantine Rite Catholics. Unfortunately in Rome, these nationalistic minded priests and laymen have continuous contacts with administrative officials of the Catholic Church, hoping to persuade the Holy See in behalf of their cause. The Slovak nationalistic minded priests used the short period of Dubček's democratization of Czechoslovakia to achieve their goal — to rebuild the eparchy of Prjašiv and to denationalize the rest of the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna. They intervened through Orthodox and Communist authorities to force Bishop Hopko to return to the place of his former house arrest in Osek, Bohemia. If he were dead, they would use his name for propaganda purposes, as they do with the name of Bishop-Martyr Paul Gojdič. But because he is not dead he is not of Slovak nationality, they try to get rid of him, demanding their own Bishop of Slovak nationality. Once again the Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna are denied their national and religious rights.





## INDEX

- Aba-Novohrad, district, 24, 37, 42,  
82, 88, 92, 133  
Alans, tribe, 29  
Alaska, state, 139  
Albania, state, 186  
Albert, H. king, 39  
Alexis Symanskij, patr. of Moscow,  
170, 173, 174, 175  
Alexis Hieromonk, author, 16  
Alföldi, A., author, 11  
Alps, mountains, 23  
Ambrus, Ch., H., Primate, 81  
Anděl, J., author, 12  
Andrassy, J., H. minister, 106, 123  
Andrew, H. king, 37, 38  
Andrew, archimandrite, 186  
Andrijkovyč, S., priest, 54  
Andruchovyč, A., author, 9, 61n  
Anna, princess, 35  
Ants (Antaibs), tribe, 29  
Apponyi law, 125, 159  
Arpad, H. dynasty, 37, 38, 44  
Asquith, Engl. prime-minister, 134  
Asztalos, M., author, 12  
Ausgleich, 106, 108, 119  
Austria, state, 59, 64, 106, 118, 132  
Austria's emperor 103, 114  
Austria's (Vienna) government, 61, 62,  
68, 87, 97, 99, 105, 115, 116, 119,  
120, 121, 123  
Austria's (Vienna) nuntio, 66, 80, 81,  
110, 127  
Authonomy, ecclesiastical, 107-109  
Avars, tribe, 29  
  
Baběj, P., official, 172, 190  
Bač, Bača, town, 173, 175  
Bača, J., author, 128n  
Bača - Rudlovčák, authors, 9  
Bach, A. minister, 105  
Bačka, district, 115  
  
Bačynskyj, A., bishop, 58-60, 65-71,  
76, 79, 83, 85, 94  
Bačynskyj, Aug., priest, 112  
Bačynskyj, Ty., priest, 70  
Bajirovci, village, 55  
Balation, lake, 33  
Balics, L., author, 12  
Baltic race, 23  
Baludánskyj, A., author, 9  
Banat, district, 115  
Banderivci, Uk. partizans, 170, 172  
Bánmfy, D., official, 129  
Banská Bystrica, city, 165  
Banská Štiavnica, city, 116  
Bányai, M., official, 70  
Baran, A., author, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18,  
50n, 66n, 108n  
Bárdossy, J., author, 36n  
Bardyjiv, city, 37, 46, 117, 142, 154,  
185  
Barta, I., author, 12  
Bartha, M., author, 12, 137n  
Basilian Fathers, order, 93, 94, 108,  
112, 128, 150, 152, 157, 164, 169, 171  
Basilian Sisters, order, 146, 156, 169  
Bastards (Celts), tribe, 29  
Battyán, I., author, 48n  
Becheriv, village, 140, 141  
Bela III, H. king, 36  
Bela IV, H. king, 34-38  
Belousov, S. M., author, 9  
Benedict, bishop, 36  
Benedict XIV, pope, 89, 96  
Benedictine Fathers, order, 36  
Beneš, E., president, 131, 189  
Benycky, official, 173  
Benyo, M., priest, 98  
Beran, J., cardinal, 177  
Bereckyj, J., priest, 112  
Bereh, district, 35, 133  
Berest, city, 131

- Berest Union, 49, 58  
 Berzeviczy, A., author, 12  
 Beskid, N. A., author, 12, 16, 32n,  
 36n, 37n, 40n, 44n, 112n, 133n,  
 134n, 135n, 138n  
 Beskyd, A., governor, 145, 146, 147,  
 149  
 Bethlen, G., rebels' leader, 42  
 Bezegij, V., priest, 112  
 Biderman, H. I., author, 12  
 Bielowski, A., author, 30n, 31n  
 Biharij, E., 145, 146  
 Bihun, P., priest, 174  
 Birčak, V., author, 9  
 Bjelarusj, state, 58  
 Black Eagle Hotel, 173, 175  
 Blahovistnyk, weekly, 149  
 Blažovskij, J., priest, 55  
 Babak, A., author, 12  
 Bobak, J., author, 12  
 Bobak, N., Educator, 159  
 Bobalik, P., official, 172  
 Bod, P., author, 12, 33n, 44n  
 Bodrog, river, 23, 37  
 Bohačevskij, C., metropolitan, 153  
 Bohdan, vojvoda, 39  
 Bohdanov, official, 190  
 Bohemia, state, 30, 99, 136, 157, 147,  
 167, 175, 194  
 Böhm - Jankovich, authors, 12, 27n  
 Bokeš, F., author, 12  
 Bokšaj, E., editor, 149  
 Boleslaus Chrobry, P. king, 30  
 Bolotnyj Potik, town, 73  
 Bonkalo, A., author, 18  
 Bonn, city, 194  
 Bornemissza, J., rebels' leaders, 42  
 Boršod, district, 24, 42, 82, 88, 133  
 Boržava, J., author, 9, 133n, 134n,  
 136n, 141n, 145n, 147n  
 Borzsak, I. S., author, 12  
 Bovankovich, J., seminarian, 150n  
 Boysak, B., author, 12, 130n, 139n  
 Bradač, M., bishop, 70-74, 76, 77,  
 81-85  
 Bratislava, city, 76, 94, 101, 146, 157,  
 159, 166, 167, 177, 189, 194  
 Brestiv, village, 92  
 Bretterbauer, J., bishop, 77, 178  
 Breznyik, J., author, 46n  
 Brid, village, 35  
 Bridgeport, Conn., city, 137  
 Brigido, M., priest, 67  
 Brno, city, 157, 167, 186  
 Bronze period, 27  
 Bucarest, city, 79  
 Buda, Budapest, city, 40, 42, 68, 69,  
 83, 88, 93, 96, 103, 104, 105, 108,  
 110, 116, 122, 123, 124, 129, 130,  
 134, 135, 137, 146, 194  
 Buk, mountains, 27  
 Bukatko, G., bishop, 149n  
 Bukova Hirska, village, 150, 157  
 Bukoveckyj, P., priest, 55  
 Bukovskij, I. S., author, 145, 189, 190  
 Bukovyna, territory, 117, 120, 131  
 Bulgarians, nation, 29, 33  
 Burian, H. prime-minister, 131  
 Burik, N., priest, 172  
 Burik, S., priest, 142  
 Butrynskyj, B., author, 16, 41n  
 Buzalka, J., bishop, 177  
 Byzantine Rite, 34, 45, 62, 63, 65  
 Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, 21, 29, 30,  
 32-34, 36, 40, 48, 49, 51, 55-60  
 Byzantine-Slavonic Rite Ukrainians,  
 61, 64-68, 72-73, 75, 77, 82, 83, 85,  
 90, 102, 104, 107, 109, 110, 117,  
 121, 123, 126  
 Byzantium, empire, 32, 33, 38, 44, 46  
 Bžany, village, 173  
 Čabinák, A., Com. official  
 Caesar, J., R. emperor, 28  
 Callaey F., author, 44n  
 Camedule Fathers, order, 87, 92  
 Canada, state, 137, 138  
 Capuchin monks, order, 93  
 Carbonari, It. secret society, 106  
 Carpathian Mountains, 21, 23, 27, 28,  
 49, 51, 57, 99, 106, 116, 117, 121  
 Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Or-  
 thodox Church, 139-140  
 Carpatho-Ukraine, territory, 30, 31,  
 45, 115, 147, 165, 166, 169, 189  
 Carpatho-Ukrainians 25, 146  
 Carpatho-Ukrainian Church, 109  
 Carps, tribe, 29

- Čarský, J. Sl. bishop, 161  
 Casimir, P. king, 39, 41  
 Catholic Action, Communist sponsored, 177  
 Catholic Church, 34, 38, 45, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 60, 62, 63, 65, 75, 105, 108, 121, 128  
 Catoire, A., author, 18  
 Cavour, C. B., It. leader, 106  
 Čelovce, village, 173  
 Celts, tribe, 27  
 Čemerňa, village, 35  
 Čertežne, village, 120  
 Cerularius, M., Byz. patriarch, 32, 33  
 Chaloupecký, V., author, 28n  
 Chanat, N., priest, 171n  
 Caritas of Prague, 176  
 Charles, Austro-Hung. emp., 131  
 Charles Robert, H., king, 38, 39  
 Charles V., Austr. emp., 42  
 Czechoslovak Association of Catholic Clergy, 136  
 Czechoslovak Church, 136  
 Czechoslovak Jednota, organization, 132  
 Czechoslovak Legion, organization, 132  
 Czechoslovak (Prague) government, 134, 135, 140, 141, 142, 144, 147, 158, 166, 171, 174, 175, 189, 190-191, 195-196  
 Czechoslovakia, state, 21, 23, 24, 131, 133, 134, 140, 142, 145, 148, 157, 159-160, 160-170, 172, 178, 181, 186-189, 194  
 Chechs, 99, 131, 132, 133, 146, 160, 170, 188  
 Chlipavka, B., priest, 172  
 Cholm, city, 132  
 Choma, J., priest, 150n  
 Christian School Brothers, congregation, 73  
 Chust, city, 134, 143  
 Chyra, A., priest, 92  
 Cínek, F., author, 12, 136n  
 Cisar, P., reb. leader, 42, 43  
 Čisarík, M., priest, 142  
 Cistercian monks, order, 36  
 Clement XII, pope, 58  
 Clement XIV, pope, 58  
 Communist agents, 175, 177  
   authorities, 23, 178, 184, 191, 197  
   coup d'état, 160, 170, 179  
   educators, 181, 183  
   government, 21, 172, 175  
   occupation, 167  
   oppression, 192  
   police, 173  
   press, 195  
   prison, 178  
   propaganda, 23, 25, 170  
   regime, 23, 166, 176  
   trial of Bratislava, 176  
 Communists Party, 162, 168, 171, 173, 177, 181, 190, 194  
 Congrua, 102-103  
 Consalvi, H., card., 87, 110  
 Consistorial Congregation, 80, 88, 89  
 Constantine Pavlovič, R. prince, 118  
 Constantinople, city, 33, 44, 45  
 Cosmas, author, 29n  
 Crimea, peninsula, 33  
 Crimea War, 118  
 Croatia, state, 35  
 Crusaders, 33, 44  
 Csak, M., H. palatine, 38, 39  
 Csáky, E., author, 12  
 Csernok, J., H. primate, 129  
 Cziple, S., author, 12, 34n, 39n  
  
 Dacians, tribe, 28, 29  
 Dampier, M. G., author, 12  
 Danko, N., priest, 141, 142  
 Danylo-Romanovyč, Uk. king, 35  
 Danylovyč, J., priest, 124  
 Danube, river, 28, 35, 44, 93, 165  
 Da pryjdet carstvije tvoje, rel. periodical, 156  
 Deák, F., H. minister, 123  
 Debrecen, city, 124  
 Dechtereč, A., Orth. bishop, 172, 174, 185, 187  
 Děčín, city, 177  
 Décsy, A., author, 18  
 Dembinszky, H. general, 116  
 Denikin, Russ. general, 136  
 Desevfy, J., H. official, 74

- De Vries, G., author, 12, 127n, 143n, 170n
- Di Pietro, M., card., 80
- Dobrjanskyj, A., Uk. leader, 104, 105, 108, 111, 114, 116-121, 130, 137, 145
- Dobrjanskyj, M., 120
- Dobrjanskyj, V., priest, 104, 121
- Dolynskyj, I., attorney, 150
- Domanovszky, S., author, 12
- Dominican Order, 68, 69, 70
- Dorobratovo, village, 53
- Dorylea, ep. title, 82
- Doža, G., reb. leader, 41, 142
- Dribňak, Com. official, 174
- Družno Vpered, Uk. monthly, 190, 193
- Dubček, A., Czsl. p. minister, 195, 197
- Dubova, village, 173
- Duchnovyč, A., priest, 5, 8, 64n, 68n, 70n, 73n, 82n-87n, 92n-94n, 96n, 97n, 101n, 104n, 105n, 108n, 121n, 122, 149
- Dudas, M., author, 18
- Dukľa, Uk. monthly, 193
- Dulyškovyč, A., H. agent, 138
- Dulyškovjč, J., 7, 31n, 45n, 55n, 59n, 60n
- Duquesne, Pa., city, 137
- Dušpastyr, monthly, 149, 156
- Dvornik, F., author, 12, 13, 29n, 30n, 33n
- Eastern Rites, 60
- Eger, bishop of —, 57, 58, 60, 63, 67, 69, 79, 80, 90
- Eger, city, 43
- Eishel, M., architect, 97
- Eisner, J., author, 13, 27n
- Elačić, Chr. ban, 115
- Eleutherius Vorontsov, Orth. bishop, 170, 173, 174, 182, 185-187
- Elizabeth, widow of Albert, H. king, 39
- Emeric, H. king, 33
- Endlicher, J., 28n
- Enoli, A., priest — nuntiatore official, 89
- Erdödy, Jos., G. state secretary, 77
- Esztergom, city, 63, 65, 80, 88, 89, 91-93, 110, 127-128
- Eszterházy, Ch., bishop, 60
- Etelköz, territory, 33
- Eugene IV, pope, 40
- Europe, continent, 31, 32, 33, 67, 167
- Evangelical, denomination, 73
- Fabbry, district superintendent, 135
- Farkas, G. J., priest, 108
- Farkas, L., H. army captain, 13, 123
- Fedir, Ukr. nobleman, 35
- Fedor, P. S., author, 11, 118n, 119n, 120n
- Fejér, G., author, 8, 30n, 31n, 33n, 35n, 36n, 37n, 39n
- Fejerčak, P., author, 11
- Ferdinand I., H. kknq, 42, 101
- Fiedler, Austr. general, 116
- Fiedler, J., author, 18
- Fierlinger, Z., Czsl. p. minister, 171, 174, 175
- Filip, D., Orth. bishop, 187, 195
- Findley, P., USA senator, 194n
- Fisher, Ch., bishop, 85
- Florence, Council of —, 40, 121
- Fogarašij, J., priest, 89
- Folkmar, village, 68
- Fontainebleu (Paris), 82
- Forro, castle, 35
- Fraknói, V., author, 8, 14
- France, state, 32, 82, 106
- Francev, V. A., author, 11
- Francis I., Austro-Hung. emperor, 86, 110, 114
- Franciscan Fathers, order, 69, 70, 72
- Franz Ferdinand, archprince, 131
- Franz Joseph I., Austro-Hung. emperor, 105, 106, 131
- French Revolution, 98
- Freudhoffer, J., contractor, 78
- Füzér, castle, 35
- Fylypovyč, A., priest, 54
- Fyšynskyj, servant, 93
- Gábríel, F., author, 13
- Gaganec, J., bishop, 101-105, 110, 117, 156
- Galan, Sl. officia, 161
- Gatti-Korolevskij, authors, 13
- Gebej, P., bishop, 153

- Gejza II, H. king, 36  
 Gelnica, village, 167  
 Gemer, district, 24, 82, 84, 88, 133  
 GERALTOV, village, 55, 185  
 Gereš, village, 55  
 Gerlachov, village, 55  
 Germania, Roman province, 28  
 German settlers, 46  
 Germany, state, 32, 46, 166, 170  
 Gerovskij, G., author, 16, 137n  
 Getas, tribe, 29  
 Gianicolo Hill, Rome, 153  
 Giraltovece, village, 167  
 Gojdič, P., bishop, 152-169, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 197  
 Golubinskij, E., author, 10, 30n, 40n, 41n  
 Görgey, H. general, 104, 117  
 Gottwald, Cl., president, 173, 174, 189  
 Gran Varadin, city, 61, 65, 66, 77, 82, 84, 85, 88, 97, 118  
 Great Sabin, city, 73  
 Greek, 27, 29, 34  
 Greek-Catholics, 23  
 Greek liturgical language, 126, 127  
 Greek monks, 33  
 Gregory IX, pope, 34  
 Gregory XVI, pope, 101, 108  
 Grigássy, Gy., author, 13, 123n, 124n  
 Grivec, F., author, 13  
 Grivec-Tomšič, authors, 13  
 Gregorič, V., author, 13  
 Gromoš, village, 55  
 Gudz, J., priest, 59  
 Gulovich, S. C., author  
 Gymnasium, school, 162
- Habsburgs, dynasty, 25, 42, 106, 114, 118, 119, 144  
 Habyna, J., priest, 92  
 Hadžega, J., 10, 109n  
 Hadžega, V., 9, 10, 13, 29n  
 Hajdudorog, eparchy, 123-127  
 Halaga, J., author, 13  
 Halyč-Volyň state, 34, 36, 59  
 Halyčyna, territory, 28, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 49, 59, 102, 116, 119, 120, 131, 133, 137, 138, 140, 146, 153, 167  
 Hanák, W. K., author, 13
- Hanikovci, village, 55  
 Haraksim, L., author, 13  
 Harasiewicz, M., author, 13, 59n  
 Harpago, ep. title, 153  
 Havrilla, Orth. rector, 172, 174, 179, 180  
 Heisler-Maldon, authors, 13  
 Helcmanovci, village, 67  
 Heraclius, Byz. emperor, 29  
 High Tatry, mountains, 23, 29, 64  
 Hitler, A., German dictator, 160  
 Hlinka Guard, Sl. nazi organization, 160  
 Hlohovec, con. camp, 173, 175, 180  
 Hnaťák, V., author, 10, 16  
 Hodermark, village, 55, 66, 67  
 Hodinka, A., author, 8, 13, 18, 35n, 41n, 60n  
 Hodobaj, A., priest, 112  
 Hodobaj, B., priest, 92, 95  
 Hodobaj, G., priest, 113  
 Holdoš, L., Sl. official, 174  
 Holnyci, village, 68  
 Holos Pravoslavija, Orth. monthly, 186  
 Holubec, M., author, 11n, 116n, 131n, 132n  
 Holy Land, territory, 33  
 Holy Office, Roman congregation, 123, 124  
 Holy Synod, Russia, 139  
 Homán, B. M., author, 13  
 Homán-Szekfü, authors, 13  
 Hončarenko, A., author, 16  
 Hopko, B., bishop, 167-169, 176, 179, 180, 196, 197  
 Hornad, river, 21, 23  
 Horthy, M. H. regent, 13, 166n  
 Hosszu, J., bishop, 126  
 Hošťán, J., author, 13  
 Hostovyckyj, G., priest, 54  
 Hostovyci, village, 88  
 Hrabske, village, 55, 142, 143  
 Hradisko, village, 55  
 Hrubý, V., author, 14  
 Hruševkyj, M., author, 10, 30n, 34n, 35n, 37n, 39n, 41n  
 Hrušovskij, F., author, 14  
 Hryňoch, I., author, 124n

- Hudeček, J., author, 14  
 Hugelmann, J., author, 14  
 Humeniuk, M., superior, 146  
 Humenne, city, 39, 49, 54, 88, 154, 179, 184, 185  
 Hungarian alphabet, 128-130  
 Hungarian bishops, 50, 62, 63, 86, 105, 126  
 Hungarian government, 59, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 115, 120, 121, 122, 126, 127, 129  
 Hungarian invasion, 31, 44, 64  
 Hungarian kings, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, 56, 57  
 Hungarian language, 108, 111, 112, 114, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127  
 Hungarian liturgical books, 124  
 Hungarian National Committee of Byzantine Rite, 124  
 Hungarian nationalism, 48, 61, 72, 73, 81, 83, 107, 113, 122, 124, 125, 127, 131  
 Hungarian nobility, 39, 42, 56  
 Hungarian parliament, 80, 86, 101, 119, 125  
 Hungarian revolutionaries, 104, 115, 116, 117  
 Hungarian State Chancery, 59, 77, 80, 82, 89, 92, 100  
 Hungarian territory, 35, 45, 104, 118  
 Hungarian tribes, 33  
 Hungarians, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 33, 44, 47, 58, 62, 72, 73, 76, 85, 99, 100, 105, 106, 107, 108, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 121, 123, 126, 134, 135  
 Hungary, kingdom, 21, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 73, 76, 89, 99, 103, 106, 107, 112, 114, 115, 117, 118, 120, 133, 134, 135, 138  
 Hungary, throne of —, 39, 42, 118  
 Hungary's Catholic Church, 45, 65  
 Hungary's Deans' Council, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 82, 84, 85, 92, 93, 97  
 Hungary's Primate, 63, 80, 84, 93, 107, 108  
 Hungary's Religious Fund, 69, 75, 77, 87, 92, 96, 107, 111, 112  
 Hussitism, rel. movement, 136, 144  
 Ilkiv-Rokaľ, Ukr. representative, 174, 190  
 Illava, jail, 161, 162, 176, 177  
 Innocent III, pope, 33, 37  
 Inovce, village, 173  
 Innsbruck, city, 120  
 Ipoľ, river, 28  
 Ireland, J., bishop, 139  
 Isajiv, P., author, 10  
 Isidor, metropolitan, 4  
 Islamic, religion, 32  
 Italy, Italian, 106, 114  
 Jackanich, D., seminarian, 150n  
 Jackanich, J., seminarian, 150n  
 Jakovyč, J., attorney, 104  
 Jakubjany, village, 72  
 Jakubova, village, 67  
 Jakušyč, A., noblewoman, 54  
 Jakyšyč, G., bishop, 54  
 Jalova, village, 143, 173  
 Jamborskýj, B., priest, 65, 66  
 Janin, R., author, 18  
 Jankovič, J., author, 14  
 Janyckyj, B., priest, 112  
 Jastrabje, village, 55  
 Javorskij, J. A., author, 11  
 Jaziges, tribe, 28  
 Jedlova, village, 173  
 Jenna, city, 76  
 Jesenov, village, 75  
 Jesuits, order, 55, 58, 69, 92, 181  
 Jews, religion, 104  
 Jiskra, J., rebels' leader, 39, 40, 46  
 Johnstown, Pa., city, 195  
 Joseph II, Austro-Hung. emperor, 66, 114  
 Joseph, H. palatine, 84  
 Josephinism, movement, 80; Josephinian reforms, 107  
 Josephstadt, city, 104  
 Kadlec, J., author, 14  
 Kallovo, town, 52, 53  
 Kalman, H. king, 35  
 Kalman, son of Andrew, H. king, 37  
 Kamjanka, village, 67, 72  
 Kampo, A., priest, 83  
 Kaňuk, M., priest, 66, 92

- Kapišovo, village, 97  
 Kapoš, palatine, 38, 39  
 Kapušany, village, 38, 39  
 Kapyšovskij, V., author, 191n  
 Karlové Váry, city, 170  
 Karnaševyč, P., author, 16, 186n  
 Károlyi, M., H. p. minister, 132, 134, 146  
 Karpatorusskij Vestnik, periodical, 149  
 Katona, S., author, 14, 33n  
 Kaunitz, Austro-Hung. chancellor, 91  
 Keczer, A., 74, 97  
 Keczer, S., bishop, 97  
 Kertész, I., author, 14  
 Kiev, city, 34, 40, 194  
 Kievan Rus, state, 34  
 Király, P., author, 14, 29n  
 Klapka, G., H. general, 106  
 Knapp, M., priest, 172, 174  
 Knauz, J., author, 8  
 Knyky Blahovistnyka, publications, 156  
 Kocylovskij, J., bishop, 153  
 Kojšiv, village, 67  
 Kolansky, J., author, 192n  
 Kolomackyj, A., archimandrite, 170  
 Kolomyjec, I. H., author, 10  
 Komloš, village, 100, 141  
 Kondrašov, N. A., author, 10, 31n, 99n  
 Kondratovyč, I., author, 10, 17  
 Kopecky, V., Czsl. minister, 170  
 Kopruncyja, village, 36  
 Kordač, archbishop, 157  
 Korjatovyč, F., prince, 40  
 Korolevskij, C., author, 126n, 127n  
 Koronay, M., H. official, 95  
 Košice, city, 37, 40, 64, 67-74, 77, 84, 104, 118, 121, 167, 173, 175, 177, 179, 195, 196  
 Košík, Sl. delegate, 133  
 Kossuth, L., H. revolutionary, 103, 104, 107, 115  
 Kostoboks, tribe, 29  
 Kotradov, M., rector, 112  
 Kovacs, J.E., priest, 98, 112  
 Kovalyckij, Z., priest, 112  
 Kračmar, C., Orth. bishop, 172, 186  
 Krajna, village, 92, 95  
 Krajnyák, G., author, 18  
 Krakiv, city, 40  
 Krasnyj Brid, village, 41, 50, 51, 64, 93, 108, 143  
 Krechiv, village, 153  
 Kriško, Mrs., organizatrix, 146  
 Krofta, C., author, 14  
 Kromeriž, city, 116  
 Krpelec, B., author, 14, 36n, 117n, 127n, 133n, 135n, 140n-143n, 145n  
 Krupeckyj, A., bishop, 50, 51, 54, 64  
 Kružlova, village, 55  
 Kryževci, city, eparchy, 61, 66, 77, 80, 84, 148, 151, 152, 153  
 Kubinyi, J., author, 95n, 110n  
 Kun, B., H. com. leader, 134  
 Kunns, tribe, 34  
 Kupčatko, H., author, 10  
 Kurinnyj, P., author, 10  
 Kušnirenko, M., author, 16  
 Kutka, J., priest, 81, 82, 83, 85  
 Kvačala, J., author, 14  
 Kyjiv, village, 55  
 Kymak, J., publicist, 121  
 Kyzak, J., priest, 129  
 Laborec, river, 35, 88, 108, 184  
 Lacko, M., author, 14, 18, 19, 31n, 51n, 138n-140n, 160n, 170n, 172n, 175n, 177n, 178n, 182n, 185n, 195n  
 Ladislaus, I., H. king, 40, 41, 48  
 Ladislaus, P. king, 39  
 Ladomerskyj, A., priest, 54  
 Ladomerskyj, V., priest, 108  
 Ladomirova, village, 141, 142, 170  
 Lakrings, tribe, 29  
 Lambertini, J., cardinal, 40  
 Lansing, U.S.A. state secretary, 132  
 Lata, gymn. teacher, 179, 180  
 Lateran Council IV, 37, 38  
 Latin Rite, 30-34, 36  
 Latin Rite bishops, 162  
 Latin Rite clergy 47, 50, 54  
 Latorycja, river, 23  
 Lavynec, J., priest, 196  
 Lazar, H. general, 116  
 Lažo, G. senator, 141, 142  
 Leardi, P., nuntio, 88

- Lebedia, territory, 33  
 Lechnyci, village, 87, 92, 95  
 Leghava, village, 55  
 Lehoczky, T., author, 14, 27n  
 Leles, village, 36  
 Leningrad, city, 187  
 Leo XIII, pope, 111, 125  
 Leopold II, Austro-Hung. emperor, 73, 114  
 Leopoldov, jail, 177, 178  
 Lesko, P. king, 35, 37  
 Lesna, village, 35  
 Levenec, M., priest, 171n  
 Levkanyč, I., official, 190  
 Levoča, city, 67, 167  
 Libejovce, city, 155  
 Life of SS Cyril and Methodius, publication, 149  
 Lipjany, village, 37  
 Lippay, G., archbishop, 55  
 Liscova, M., author, 14, 136n  
 Lithuania, state, 40  
 Litmanova, village, 67  
 Little Brothers, rel. movement, 46  
 Liviv, village, 55  
 Lomne, village, 173  
 Lubica, village, 167  
 Lucina, village, 155  
 Lučkaj, M., author, 31n  
 Ludwig, I., H. king, 39  
 Ludwig II, H. king  
 Lukinich, E., author, 8, 34n  
 Lukiv, village, 45  
 Luther, M., rel. leader, 46  
 Lutheran, denomination, 96  
 Lužice, culture, 27  
 Lužnyckyj, H., author, 10  
 Lviv, city, 59, 66, 103, 116, 117, 120  
 Lviv, eparchy, 137  
 Lyons Council, 38  
 Lypnyk, village, 55, 67  
 Lyzak, L., author, 97n  
  
 Mach, S., Sl. minister, 163  
 Mack, administrator, 39  
 Macúrek, J., author, 14, 106n, 111n, 112n, 118n, 121n, 125n, 129, 131n, 132n, 159n  
  
 Makovycja, district, 37n, 54, 55, 105, 147  
 Maksymenko, V., archimandrite, 142  
 Malaguti, A., priest, nuntiatore official, 89  
 Malciv, village, 143  
 Málý, P., author, 14  
 Maramoroškyj Syhit, city, 68  
 Maramoroš, district, 28, 133  
 Marchia Ruizorum, territory, 36  
 Marczali, H., author, 8  
 Mardetovo, village, 68  
 Maria Theresa, Austro-Hung. empress, 57, 58, 59, 114  
 Marian Congregations, rel. org., 155  
 Markusj, V., author, 14, 16, 133n, 134n, 147n, 165n, 168n  
 Marmaggi, F., nuntio, 153  
 Martyak, G., ap. administrator, 150  
 Marx-Lenin theory, 181  
 Masaryk, T.G., president, 131-133, 135, 140, 144, 150, 189  
 Matisova, village, 55  
 Mehaj, J., priest, 92, 93  
 Melnykova, author, 115n  
 Mencl, V., author, 14  
 Mernik, village, 100  
 Metternich, Austro-Hung. chancellor, 92, 114  
 Mežylaborci, city, 143, 156, 157, 164  
 Michalovce, 154, 155, 157, 158, 171, 185, 186  
 Mihalič, V., bishop, 172, 185, 186, 187  
 Miklossy, S., bishop, 127, 128  
 Miklošovci, village, 55  
 Mikuš, J.A., author, 160n, 161n  
 Milan, city, 114  
 Milly, M., bishop, 172, 186, 187, 195  
 Minneapolis, Min., city, 137, 139  
 Minorite Fathers, congregation, 66, 73, 75, 77, 86, 88, 90, 96, 97  
 Miškolc, city, 93  
 Mitterpracher, bishop, 77  
 Modus Vivendi, 159  
 Mohacs, battle, 42  
 Mohamedan, religion, 33, 43  
 Moiola, G., author, 19, 171n, 172n, 177n  
 Mojš, palatine, 38



- Molčan, J., priest, 172  
 Molčanij, M., priest, 108, 121  
 Molnar, M., author, 10, 116n, 117n, 121n, 146n  
 Mondok, J., priest, 121  
 Moneta, G., seminarian, 150n  
 Mongolian, race, 23  
 Monius, R., official, 90  
 Moravcsik, Gy., author, 14  
 Moravia (Great Moravian State), 29-32, 34, 38, 44, 45, 64  
 Moravia, territory, 149, 167, 175  
 Moscow, city, 21, 40, 121, 187, 189, 194  
 Moskalenko, Soviet general, 189  
 Mosolygó, Gy., author, 14  
 Mousset, A., author, 14  
 Mousset, J., author, 14  
 Moyš, L., Sl. leader, 146  
 Mozes "The Hungarian", saint, 30  
 Mraz, A., author, 121n  
 Mukačevo, bishop, 59, 101, 123, 126  
 Mukačevo, city, 41, 50, 54, 58, 110  
 Mukačevo, eparchy, 56-58, 60, 61  
 64-70, 76-86, 87-90, 105, 108, 109, 115, 129, 138, 141, 160, 167  
 Munich arbitrage, 160  
 Murin, J., priest, 197  
 Mycjuk, O., author, 10, 19, 29n, 36n, 37n, 38n, 42n, 43n, 46n, 47n, 48n, 96n, 100n  
 Myšanyč, O.V., author, 10, 68n  
 Myžycko, J., priest, 112  
  
 Nahajevskij, I., author, 10, 34n  
 Nanticoke, Pa., city, 140  
 Napoleon Bonaparte, emperor, 81, 114  
 Napoleon III, emperor, 106  
 Naš Východ, monthly, 156  
 Nazarijiv, O., author, 15  
 Nazi collaborators, 176  
 Nazism, 163  
 Nedzelskij, E., author, 10, 111n, 112n, 116n, 119n-121n, 125n, 128n  
 Nejedlý, Z., minister, 170  
 Němčík, official, 180  
 Němec, L., author, 14, 135n  
 Němec-Moudrý, authors, 14  
 Nestor, bishop, 17  
 Nestor, historian, 30 ;  
  
 Nevyckij, I., priest, 133, 145  
 Nicholas of Krutycki, bishop, 172  
 Nicholsburg (Vienna), 92  
 Nicopolis, episc. title, 79  
 Niederle, L., author, 10, 15  
 Nilles, N., author, 8  
 Nitra, city, 31  
 Nižňa Poľanka, village, 141  
 Novak, S., bishop, 127-130, 136  
 Nove Misto, city, 55  
 Nove Žytfa, weekly, 190, 193  
 Nyaradij, D., administrator, 148-153, 158  
 Nyiregyháza, city, 127  
 Nyžňa, village, 173  
 Nyžnyj Myrošiv, village, 173  
 Nyžnyj Orlik, 173  
 Nyžnyj Rejpaš, village, 67  
  
 Okolicsányi, A., official, 75  
 Olomouc, city, 172  
 Olšavycja, village, 55, 67  
 Olšavskij, J., priest, 81, 82, 92, 98  
 Olšavskij, M., bishop, 60  
 Olšinkovo, Olšynkiv, village, 143, 173  
 Ondava, river, 23, 24, 38  
 Ondrouch, V., author, 15  
 Orliv, village, 55  
 Orthodox, 24, 140, 143  
 Orthodox, bishop, 176, 186  
 Orthodox Church, 105, 139-141, 169-170, 172-175, 182, 185-187  
 Orthodox eparchy of Michalovce, 185-187, 195  
 Orthodox eparchy of Olomouc-Brno, 186  
 Orthodox eparchy of Prjašiv, 185-186, 195  
 Orthodox exarchate, 19, 170, 175, 176, 182, 197  
 Orthodox faithful, 170, 186  
 Orthodox movement, 141, 145  
 Orthodox priests, 169, 182  
 Orthodox propaganda, 142, 148, 151, 154, 170  
 Orthodox seminary, 179, 180, 182, 186  
 Osadne, village, 173  
 Osturňa, village, 55, 67  
 Osek, city, 176, 196, 197

- Ottokar II, Boh. king, 38  
 Ovencsellö, village, 122
- Pacca, cardinal, 81  
 Pačovskij, V., author, 10  
 Pahij, I., priest, 172  
 Palata, village, 173  
 Pálffy, M., nobleman, 128  
 Paňkevyč, J., author, 17  
 Pankovyč, S., bishop, 108  
 Pannonia, territory, 29, 34, 64  
 Papp, A., bishop, 128  
 Papp, Gy., author, 15, 19  
 Paris, city, 82  
 Paris Peace Conference, 132, 133, 135  
 Parthenius, P., bishop, 53, 54, 55, 64, 65  
 Paškevič, I., Russ. general, 117-118  
 Passaic, N.J., eparchy, 140  
 Pastelij, J., vicar, 68-70  
 Pasternak, J., author, 10, 27n, 28n, 29n, 30n, 32n  
 Pastil, village, 68  
 Pašuto, V.T., author, 10, 35n, 36n, 37n  
 Pavlovyč, A., priest, 6  
 Pécsy, L., official, 73  
 Pekar, A., author, 5, 10, 11, 15, 17, 31n, 45n, 58n, 87n, 89n, 95n, 122n, 129n, 141n, 148n, 151n, 153n, 154n, 155n, 161n, 162n, 168n, 170n, 172n, 176n, 177n, 178n, 184n, 185n  
 Pekľany, village, 55  
 Pelesz, J., author, 15  
 Peremyšl, city, 36n, 49, 64, 67, 153  
 Pereny, J., author, 11  
 Perényi, G., nobleman, 41  
 Perfeckij, E., author, 47n  
 Peter Petrovyč, palatine, 38-39  
 Petra, publ. society, 156  
 Petrov, A., author, 8, 11, 17  
 Petruševyč, E., author, 8, 11, 50n, 59n  
 Philadelphia, Pa., city, 133, 153  
 Photius, rel. leader, 32  
 Pidhajeckij, P., priest, 95  
 Piedmonte, province, 106  
 Pittsburgh, Pa., city, 137  
 Pius VII, pope, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 90, 91  
 Pius IX, pope, 105  
 Pius X, pope, 126  
 Pius XI, pope, 153, 155  
 Pius XII, pope, 162, 163, 177  
 Pješčak, I., attorney, 159, 190, 191  
 Pliny, the Elder, author, 28  
 Pocholski, J., vicar, 139  
 Počij, A., bishop, 84, 85, 87  
 Podkarpatska Rusj, province, 147  
 Podolinec, conc. camp, 172, 173  
 Polāna, village, 55  
 Poland, state, 23, 30, 41, 59, 64, 170  
 Polish border, 21, 35, 37  
 Popovyč, B., bishop, 101  
 Poprad, river, 21, 23, 24, 28, 134, 189  
 Porač, village, 55, 67  
 Porphyrogenitus, G., author, 29n, 32n  
 Potemra, L.A., author, 19  
 Potik (Patak), castle, 38  
 Potušňak, F.M., author, 11, 27n, 28n  
 Pragendorf, village, 68  
 Prague Central Seminary, 181  
 Prague, diocese, 29, 50  
 Prague Orthodox Metropolitan, 186, 187, 195, 196  
 Premonsranensian Order, 36  
 Prjaševščyna, monthly, 190  
 Prjašiv, city, 66, 67, 96, 104, 117, 121, 146, 161, 164, 190, 191  
 Prjašiv eparchial institutions: Library, 95; orphanage, 155; girls boarding home, 146, 149; Gymnasium, 159-160; Teachers' Institute, 162, 192  
 Prjašiv eparchial societies: St. John the Baptist Soc., 156; Alumneum 156, 160; St. Athanasius Ass'n., 112-113; Society of St. Basil, 121; Central Committee 128-129; Petra, 156; Jednota Sv. Cyrila a Metoda, 162  
 Prjašiv eparchial synod, 94, 104  
 Prjašiv eparchy, 21, 79-94, 95-101, 103, 108, 115, 130, 136, 138, 139, 141, 149, 151, 152, 160, 166, 187, 196, 197  
 Prjašiv National Council, 133-134  
 Prjašiv's bishop, 95, 107, 123, 126, 127

- Prjašiv's eparchial seminary, 110-113, 150, 154, 160, 179-183
- Prjašiv's Orthodox Synod, 172-174-176, 180, 184, 185, 196
- Prjašiv's vicariate, 68, 69, 72-79
- Prjašivščyna, territory, 21, 23, 24, 28-31, 35-38, 40-42, 44-47, 50-51, 53-56, 64, 77, 99, 100, 112, 115, 116, 119, 133-135, 137-138, 140, 142-148, 158-167, 170, 184, 188, 189, 195
- Prochoda, V., author, 17, 191n
- Propaganda Fide, congregation, 60, 65, 80, 89, 91, 95, 123, 124
- Prosvita, association, 146
- Protestants, 46, 74, 107
- Prussia, Prussian, 106
- Püchler, Austro-Hung. chancellor, 59
- Puchov, village, 181
- Punyko, A., author, 15
- Pustopole, village, 55
- Raes, A., author, 15, 123n, 124n, 127n
- Rákoczy, F., II, rebels' leader, 25
- Rákoczy, S., nobleman, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
- Ranieri, archduke, 86
- Red (Soviet) Army, 157, 164, 166, 167
- Red Cross, char. org., 176
- Redemptorist Fathers, congregation, 150, 156
- Reformation, 46, 47
- Rejpaš, village, 55
- Remeta, village, 68
- Renčyšovo, village, 55
- Repak, E., priest, 112
- Rešiv, village, 55
- Rřhanek, J., rector, 150n
- Rojkovyč, Th., priest, 159
- Roman, 28, 38
- Roman Empire, 48
- Roman, G., sculptor, 102
- Romania, state, 73, 186, Romanian 126
- Rome, Apostolic See, 55, 60, 62, 67, 80, 81, 85-89, 91, 110, 145, 151, 152, 162, 163, 167, 169, 174, 176, 177, 178, 185, 197
- Rome, city, 82, 84
- Rome, empire, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 44, 45, 48, 56
- Rome, pope of —, 45, 50, 51, 54, 86, 87, 88
- Rome, union with —, 38, 40
- Rome, Vatican, 163, 172, 181
- Romoňak, A., priest, 112
- Romža, Th., bishop, 167
- Rosary Societies, rel. org., 155
- Roškovyč, I., 124n
- Rostyslav, prince, 35
- Rovanskyj, priest, 55
- Rožňava, city, 65, 67
- Rozsypal, A., governor, 147
- Rozzos, P., official, 77
- Rubij, A., author, 108
- Rudlovčak, A.M., official, 172
- Rudolph II, Austr. emp., 49
- Rudnyai, A., primate, 94
- Rus (Prjašivsjka), territory, 21
- Rus, state, 30, 34, 36, 39
- Rusak, J., author, 16
- Rusjka Krajina, 134
- Rusnak, A., priest
- Rusnak, N., ap. administrator, 129-136, 145, 148
- Russia, state, 105, 106, 112, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 131, 133, 188
- Russian army, 104, 143
- Russian emigrants, 136
- Russian propaganda, 139
- Russkoje Slovo, weekly, 149, 156
- Ruthenians (Ukrainians), 35, 39
- Ružomberok, city, 154
- Sabadoš, M., priest, 156
- Sabol, S., author, 17
- Sabov, E., author, 11
- Sabyniv, town, 157, 185
- Sacred Alliance, pact, 116, 118
- Sáh-ut, town, 28
- St. Clair, Pa., city, 137
- St. Clement's Basilica (Rome), 153
- St. Germain (Paris) Treaty, 147
- St. Josaphat, martyr, 148 —, Col-lege, Rome, 151, 153
- St. Ignatius of Antioch, 153
- St. Methodius' disciples, 30, 32, 38
- St. Methodius' episcopacies, 31, 45

- St. Paul, Minn., city, 139  
 St. Stephen, H. king, 45, 99, 107, 118  
 SS. Cyril and Methodius, 31, 32, 44, 46, 149, 153  
 — Day, 184-185  
 — Church (Prague), 186  
 SS. Cyril and Methodius Society, 162  
 Sajorév, town, 28  
 Salbek, Ch., bishop, 65, 66  
 Salesian Fathers, congregation, 181  
 Salka, town, 28  
 Salomea, princess, 37  
 Šambron, village, 55  
 San Francisco, Cal., city, 139  
 Sarajevo, city, 131  
 Šaš, A., priest, 156  
 Sass, B., author, 101n  
 Satmar (Satu Mare), city, 68, 84  
 Sava, river, 35  
 Savona, province, 82  
 Sazava, town, 30  
 Schlick, general, 116  
 Scitovszky, J., primate, 105  
 Scranton, Pa., city, 133  
 Scyths, tribe, 27  
 Sechovics, St., official, 70  
 Sečovce, village, 156, 185  
 Sečovska Polánka, village, 167  
 Seman, S., priest, 129  
 Šeptickýj, A., metropolitan, 167  
 Serbia, province, 115, 131  
 Sergius, bishop, 50  
 Severoli, G., nuntio, 80  
 Shenandoah, Pa., town, 137  
 Siberia, territory, 194  
 Sidor, Ch., ambassador, 163  
 Sidor, J., Official, 81, 82, 89  
 Silesia, province, 29  
 Simoga, M., priest, 73  
 Sisters Servants of Imm. Conception, congregation, 155, 169  
 Skala, janitor, 74  
 Skultety, J., Sl. leader, 146  
 Skutil, J., 27n  
 Slana, river, 28  
 Slav language, 33; Slav, population, 40  
 Slavs, race, 23, 28, 32, 33; tribes, 29; nations, 31, 32, 188  
 Šlepeckýj, I., author, 16, 165n  
 Slovak Association on Memory of Štur, 132  
 Slovak bishops, 166  
 Slovak faithful, 162  
 Slovak government, 158, 160, 162-164, 190  
 Slovak language, 159-161, 192  
 Slovak League in U.S.A., 133  
 Slovak National Council, 116, 190  
 Slovak propaganda, 162-164, 195  
 Slovak State, 161-163, 165-166  
 Slovakization, 158, 191-192  
 Slovaks, 116, 132, 134, 146, 147, 158, 159, 161, 163, 188, 189, 191, 197  
 Slovenia, province, 115  
 Slovenian, 35, 131  
 Slovinka, village, 55, 65, 66, 67  
 Smandraj, S., priest, 129, 159  
 Šmidke, Ch., Sl. leader, 174  
 Sňakiv, village, 142  
 Snyrna, castle, town, 41  
 Sobrance, town, 185  
 Sojuz Molodeži Karpat, association, 184  
 Solivar, town, 77  
 Solnik, city, 28, 37  
 Šoma, village, 55  
 Soukup, F., Czsl. p. minister, 134  
 Sova, P., author, 11  
 Soviet government, 164  
 Soviet Union, state, 165, 170, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194  
 Špakov, village, 55  
 Stakčín, town, 143, 167, 173  
 Stakčinska Roztoka, village, 173  
 Stalin, J., dictator, 173  
 Stalingrad, city, 165  
 Stanislav, J., author, 19  
 Stara Lubovňa, village, 133, 145, 185  
 Staryna, village, 55  
 Stebnik, village, 141  
 Stefan, nobleman, 35  
 Stefanik, M., Sl. leader, 195  
 Stim, A., seminarian, 150n  
 Stirk, Austr. p. minister, 131  
 Stockholm, city, 25  
 Stojka, A., bishop, 152  
 Stropkiv, town, 38, 54, 55, 88, 150, 154, 156, 157, 185

- Strypskyj, H., author, 11, 14  
 Suchyj, J., official, 190  
 Sudetenland, territory, 99, 160, 169  
 Šudych, D., priest, 172  
 Sulyn, village, 67  
 Suša, J., bishop, 49  
 Svatopluk, prince, 32  
 Svedler, village, 68  
 Svencickij, I., author, 8  
 Svitlo Pravoslavija, monthly, 173, 186  
 Szabó, J., author, 15  
 Szabó, O., author, 15  
 Szabolcs, district, 73, 74, 122, 123  
 Szelényi, official, 73, 74  
 Szentpétery, author, 15  
 Szerencs, city, 36  
 Szirmay, A. official, 75
- Tacitus, author, 28  
 Táddy-Manýihay, P., official, 75  
 Takach, B., bishop, 150n  
 Tarasovyč, B., bishop, 51-54  
 Tarkovyč, B., judge, 93  
 Tarkovyč, G., bishop, 83-88, 91-95,  
 97-101, 110  
 Teachers' Academy, school, 162  
 Tecus, count, 37  
 Tegel, village, 68  
 Telepovci, village, 143  
 Tepla, river, 28, 37  
 Terek, nobleman, 69  
 Ternyei, M., official, 74  
 Theiner, A., author, 8, 9, 50n  
 Thökölyi, Rebels' leader, 96  
 Tichý, F., author, 15  
 Tikoš, A., painter, 102  
 Tisa, river, 23, 24, 28, 189  
 Tiso, J., president, 24, 160-164, 166  
 Tisza, K., H. p. minister, 118-120  
 Toesca, official, 88  
 Tokay, town, 23, 42  
 Tomašivskyj, S., author, 11  
 Tomcsányi, L., author, 15  
 Tompa, F., author, 27n  
 Toryska, village, 55, 67  
 Toth, A., Orth. leader, 139-140  
 Toth, J., priest, 172, 174  
 Tovt, N., bishop, 110, 122  
 Trajnin, I.P., author, 11
- Transylvania, territory, 42, 43, 49,  
 50, 64, 115  
 Trebišov, town, 100, 157, 171  
 Trenčín, city, 173  
 Trent Council, 82, 95, 96  
 Trnava, city, 88, 110  
 Trypillja, culture, 27  
 Tupickij, N.L., author, 15, 32n  
 Turčiansky Sv. Martin, city, 146  
 Turks, 40, 41, 42, 47, 49, 118  
 Turňa, district, 24, 82, 84
- Ublä, village, 127  
 Ugoča, district, 133  
 Uherské Hradiště, city, 155  
 Ujhelyi, A., priest, 124  
 Ujvár (Novohrad) castle, 37  
 Ukraine, 40, 133, 165, 170, 176  
 Ukraine, Austro-Hungarian, 27  
 Ukraine, Soviet Republic, 165, 166,  
 169, 189, 194, 195, 197  
 Ukrainian alphabet, 128  
 Ukrainian bishops, 58, 105, 107, 108,  
 123  
 Ukrainian clergy, 50, 60, 75, 85, 111,  
 164, 196, 197  
 Ukrainian Communist Party, 191  
 Ukrainian Constitutional Council, 132  
 Ukrainian emigrants, 133, 134, 137,  
 138  
 Ukrainian faithful, 56, 111, 126, 129,  
 130  
 Ukrainian institutions, 190-192  
 Ukrainian language, 102, 111-112,  
 117, 118, 121, 122, 125, 158, 159,  
 173, 191, 192  
 Ukrainian National Council, 144; Lviv,  
 116, 120; Prjašiv, 133, 134; Chust,  
 134; Stara Lubovna, 133, 145; Bar-  
 dyjiv, 145; Ukr. Nat. Council of  
 Prjašivščyna, 189, 190; Central Nat.  
 Council, Užhorod, 134, 135  
 Ukrainian national life, 128, 134, 145  
 Ukrainian parliament, 117, 134  
 Ukrainian patriarchate, 108  
 Ukrainian press, 117, 119, 121, 193  
 Ukrainian province, 131, 189  
 Ukrainian university, 117; schools,  
 117, 146, 159, 161, 166, 190-192

- Ukrainians, 21, 22, 24, 25, 45, 46,  
 47, 49, 54, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 73,  
 75, 79, 82, 91, 99, 100, 103, 110,  
 112, 114-122, 129, 132, 136-141,  
 144, 146-147, 159-160, 162-164,  
 169, 189, 190, 192  
 Ukrainians non-united with Rome,  
 39, 40, 41, 48  
 Ukrainians of Byzantine - Slavonic  
 Rite, 59, 128, 139  
 Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia, 141  
 Ukrainians of Halyčyna, 119, 120,  
 140, 167  
 Ukrainians of Hungary, 57, 115-117,  
 119, 132, 133  
 Ukrainians of Prjašiv eparchy, 167  
 Ukrainians of Prjašivščyna, 48, 104,  
 110, 135, 158, 160, 162-164, 189-  
 192, 194-195, 197  
 Ukrainians of Zakarpatta, 68, 59,  
 61, 64, 120, 138, 140  
 United States (U.S.A.), 112, 132, 133,  
 134, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 147,  
 150, 153, 155, 170  
 Urban VIII, pope, 80  
 Urban, R., author, 15  
 Už, district, 133  
 Už, river, 23, 134, 135, 147  
 Užhorod, city, 39, 49, 54, 56, 58,  
 59, 60, 70, 81, 83, 88, 95, 96, 104,  
 110, 111, 112, 117, 120, 121, 128,  
 134, 135, 146, 147, 152  
  
 Vac, city, 40  
 Vah, river, 181  
 Vajda, M., author, 9, 16, 151n, 158n  
 Vályi, J., bishop, 12, 112, 122-125,  
 127, 139  
 Vančik, I., 16, 127n  
 Varadka, village, 15, 173  
 Varchol, G., priest, 141  
 Vargha, G., author, 15, 34n  
 Varna, city, 41  
 Vavryk, M., author, 9, 41n  
 Vécsey, M., official, 69, 70, 73  
 Vedernikov, A., 16, 18  
 Vekerle, H., p. minister, 132  
 Velehrad, city, 149  
 Velyke Berezne, city, 68  
  
 Venice, city, 103  
 Verböczy, S., lawyer, 41  
 Vilagos, battle, 118  
 Vilahy, village, 143  
 Vitovt, prince, 41  
 Vix, colonel, 134  
 Vicogals, tribe, 29  
 Vojtovyč, P., priest, 172  
 Volánskyj, J., priest, 137  
 Volodymyr the Great, prince, 30  
 Volodyslav, bishop, 49  
 Voroniv, Vraniv, city, 88, 92, 95,  
 100, 185  
 Vološyn, A., author, 9, 122n, 128n,  
 129n, 130n, 158n  
 Volyň, territory, 29, 131, 170  
 Vulkan, S., bishop, 82  
 Vysanyk, M., Ukr. leader, 117  
 Vyšňa Myslá, village, 92  
 Vyšne Ružbachy, town, 172  
 Vyšnyj Myrošiv, village, 173  
 Vyšnyj Orlik, town, 142  
 Vyšnyj Svydnyk, town, 141  
 Vysoka, village, 167  
  
 Wagendrüssel, village, 68  
 Wagner, J., author, 36n  
 Wagner, J. official, 70  
 Warsaw, city, 117, 194  
 Welykyj, A., author, 9, 85n, 90n  
 152n, 167n  
 White Croats, nation, 29  
 Wilkes-Barre, Pa., city, 137, 139, 140  
 Willecz, M., architect, 97  
 Wilno, city, 187  
 Wilson Proclamation, 132, 134  
 Winter, E., author, 9  
 Wisla, river, 23  
 Working Brigades, 180, 181  
 Wyšynskyj, A., Soviet minister, 170  
  
 Zakarpatska Oblast, territory, 21, 24,  
 28, 30, 35, 38, 165  
 Zakarpatta, territory, 30, 40, 41, 48,  
 49, 50, 54-56, 58-61, 64, 67, 99,  
 102, 117, 120, 131, 138, 140  
 Žakovci, village, 68  
 Zamostja Council, 96  
 Zamutiv, village, 68

Zapolyi, J., Rebels' leader, 41, 42  
Zapovit sv. Kyryla i Metoda, monthly,  
186  
Žatec, city, 186  
Žatkovyč, G., governor, 133, 147  
Žatkovyč, K., author, 15, 16, 31n,  
45n  
Zavadka, village, 55, 67  
Zavadskyj, V., 190  
Zbihlej, J., official, 190  
Zboriv, town, 37, 55, 70, 100, 117  
Žebokryckyj, V.A., author, 131n, 134n

Zeleňak, B., priest, 55  
Zeller, A., author, 15  
Zemplin, district, 24, 28, 37, 39, 42,  
82, 84, 88, 100, 127, 133, 135, 147  
Zerkaľ, S., author, 10, 189n, 193n  
Žetkej, A., priest, 70  
Zigmund, H. king, 64  
Zubek, Th., author, 15  
Zvolen, city, 40  
Žydovskyj, P., official, 190  
Zyľta i Škola, monthly, 193

НАШІ ВИДАННЯ  
NOSTRAE EDITIONES

1. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. I. Romae 1964, p. XXIV+350. Doll. 8.
2. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. II. Romae 1965, p. XX+360. Doll. 8.
3. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. III. Romae 1966, p. XVI+400. Doll. 8.
4. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. IV. Romae 1967, p. XIX+380. Doll. 8.
5. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. V. Romae 1968, p. XX+434. Doll. 8.
6. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. VI. Romae 1968, p. XVI+392. Doll. 8.
7. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. VII. Romae 1969, p. XVI+388. Doll. 10.
8. MONUMENTA UCRAINAE HISTORICA, collegit Metropolitae Andreas Šeptyckyj, vol. VIII. Romae 1970, p. XV+284. Doll. 10.
9. Wasyl Lencyk, *The Eastern Catholic Church and Czar Nicholas I.* Romae-New York 1965, p. XIII+148. Doll. 3.
10. О. д-р Ісидор Нагаєвський, *Історія Римських Вселенських Архієпископів*, частина I. (*Historia Romanorum Catholicorum Pontificum, pars I*). Мюнхен 1964, стор. 363. Doll. 4.
11. Проф. Микола Чубатий, *Історія християнства на Русі-Україні*, том I. (*De historia christianitatis in antiqua Rus-Ucraina, vol. I*). Рим-Нью Йорк 1965, стор. XI+816. Doll. 10.
12. О. Михайло Кравчук, *Книга Псалмів.* (*Liber Psalmorum*). Рим, 1966, стор. 240. Doll. 4.
13. Проф. д-р Олекса Горбач, *Три Церковнослов'янські Літургійні рукописні Тексти Ватиканської Бібліотеки.* (*Tres Textus Liturgici Linguae Ecclesiasticae (Paleo) - Slavicae in Manuscriptis Vaticanis*). Рим 1966, стор. 160. Doll. 3.
14. О. д-р. Мирослав Марусив, *Чини Святительських Служб в Київському Євхології з початку XVI ст.* (*Ordinum Pontificalium in Euchologio Kioviensi saec. XVI expositio*). Рим 1966, стор. XVIII+210. Doll. 4.



15. *Український Католицький Університет ім. св. Климента Папи і його правна основа. (De Universitate Catholica Ucrainorum a S. Clemente Papa eiusque fundamento iuridico).* Рим 1967, стор. 32. Doll. 1.
16. «Обнова» *Організація Української Католицької Університетської молоді, Академічних товариств і її статуту. (De organizatione ucrainicae catholicae inventutis universitariae, academicarum societatum eorumque statutis expositione).* Рим 1967, стор. 35. Doll. 1.
17. Проф. д-р Олекса Горбач, *Перший рукописний українсько-латинський словник Арсенія Корецького-Сатановського та Єпіфанія Славинецького. (De manuscripto primi ucraino-latini vocabularii Arsenii Korec'kuj-Satanovs'kuj et Epirhanii Slavunec'kuj typis nunc mandato).* Рим 1968, стор. 335. Doll. 5.
18. О. проф. д-р Ісидор Нагавський, *Історія Римських Вселенських Архисре́т, частина II. (Historia Romanorum Catholicorum Pontificum, pars II).* Рим 1967, стор. 600. Doll. 8.
19. Кард. Йосиф, *Твори*, зібрали о. проф. д-р Іван Хома і о. Іван Яцків, том I. (Card. Josephus, Opera omnia, collegerunt Johannes Choma et Johannes Jackiw, vol. I). Рим, 1968, стор. 423. Doll. 10.
20. Кард. Йосиф, *Твори*, зібрали о. проф. д-р Іван Хома і о. Іван Яцків, том II. (Card. Josephus, Opera omnia, collegerunt Johannes Choma et Johannes Jackiw, vol. II). Рим, 1969, стор. 316. Doll. 10.
21. Кард. Йосиф, *Твори*, зібрали о. проф. д-р Іван Хома і о. д-р Юрій Федорів, том III-IV. (Card. Josephus, Opera omnia, collegerunt Johannes Choma et Georgius Fedoriw, vol. III-IV). Рим 1970, стор. 950. Doll. 20.
22. DR. EUGENIUS KAMINSKYJ, *De Potestate Metropolitanarum Kioviensium-Halicensium, (a. 1596-1805), Romae 1969, p. 180.* Doll. 3.