

History of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy in Periodicals of 1918–1945¹

VIKTOR KICHERA

*Department of Modern History of Ukraine and Foreign Countries,
Faculty of History and International Relations,
Uzhhorod National University, Ukraine*

Abstract: In the proposed article, an attempt is made to critically study the history of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy (MGCE) on the basis of the press. First of all, attention is focused on the regional press. In general, both church and secular publications were used. The period was not chosen by chance, because it is the period of the interwar and wartime periods of the Czechoslovak Republic. The main task of the research is to study not only the subject matter of the publications, but also the views that were covered in each periodical. The fact is that depending on the edition and the publisher, the content of the publications was appropriate. If religious topics and protection of the Church prevailed in church periodicals, then in government or independent periodicals, in addition to general news, there were also critical articles about the Church. Particular attention is paid to historical topics in these periodicals on the history of the Mukachevo Eparchy. In general, information in journals and the press can significantly supplement historical knowledge not only of the history of the Church, but also of the history of state-church relations and the history of Czechoslovakia of the studied period.

Keywords: Church, the Czechoslovak Republic, Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy, periodicals, state-church relations.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24040/ahn.2023.26.01.31-57>

Introduction to the problem and methodological aspects

For objectivity and the presence of dissimilar views, it is necessary to refer to different periodicals, both from the point of view of the editorship and the publisher. After all, the press sometimes had a competitive, debatable rhetoric. Pro-government periodicals defended the opinion and policy of the government, church publications defended the position of the Church.

First of all, it is worth paying attention to the periodicals of the MGCE “Dushpastyr” and “Blagovisnyk”, which were aimed at covering eparchial topics and news. However, even they had their difference. If “Dushpastyr”

¹ This article was written thanks to a scholarship of the Visegrad Fund at the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica in 2022–2023.

was an official eparchy media channel, then “Blagovisnyk” had a more missionary orientation, both in name and in content.

In 1923, priest Yulii Grigashiy (during the reign of Bishop Antony Papp) headed the “Society of Catechists of the Mukachevo Eparchy” and became the first editor of the journal “Dushpastyr”, where he published the section “Catechism”. It was noted here that the society itself is the publisher, but Yulii Grigashiy, a professor at the Uzhhorod Theological Seminary, was appointed to be responsible for editing the periodical.²

Among the sections of the first issues of the monthly, it was possible to get acquainted with the publications of the “Unio” joint-stock company, which was an unofficial publishing house of the eparchy. The journal itself begins with the blessing of Bishop Anthony Papp and the words of the editor about the new journal. The next section was a catechism for children with a theme on God, and the section “Catechism” on the same topic for adults. The next section was filled with news, which had the character of regional, state-level and world news. All the news was united by the topic of the Catholic Church and religion in general. Large parts of the journal were dedicated to asceticism and different pastoral topics, mainly to the theological explanation of individual rites. There were also separate theological essays on baptism and marriage law.

The next part of the journal was the “Official part”, where the orders of the Eparchy government for priests and the implementation of these orders were published. The second part was compiled from state government orders, which also concerned the administration of Eparchy and individual parishes as well. So, this part was intended mainly for the Eparchyal board and the clergy who had to carry out/implement the orders of the Eparchyal board and the state government. This was very convenient, because there was no need to look for state orders separately in the official publications, and this kind of centralization of news allowed to respond more quickly and efficiently to changes proposed by the government of the Czechoslovak Republic and the Eparchyal government itself, promptly solving the urgent needs of the Church. The next two sections of the first issue are “Interlocutor” and “Sermon”. If the second focused on the sermon on Christmas and Sundays, then the first mentioned rubric was oriented rather for the formation of ideas and feedback communication between all interested

² Содержаніє. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1924, рочник I, январій, число 1, с. 1. As a seminary professor and teacher, he published “Textbook of Christian Moral Education” (1924) for secondary schools and “History of the Church of Christ” (1926) for public schools. See: ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Написи історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2. Рим-Львів : Вид. ОО Василян “Місіонер”, 1997, с. 177, 220.

parties in the Church – believers, clergy, Eparchyal administration, etc. The magazine ended with personal appointments of individuals and priests and a word of the editors. In total, the first issue of the journal was 38 pages long and was quite substantial and voluminous. This practice of the publication was preserved in the subsequent issues.³

In general, the need for a journal of this type has been brewing for a long time and was primarily related to the operational communication of the center of the Eparchy and the everyday life activities of individual parishes. Several issues were resolved regarding the communication of the Eparchyal board with the priests, as well as the government of the Czechoslovak Republic with the local clergy and believers. The missionary component and communication in the Church, in general, were also carried out.

From 1925, the editor of the journal “Dushpastyr” was Fr. Aleksandr Illytskyi, a member and secretary of the Eparchyal consistory, who remained its editor until the end of its publication on the eve of the Second World War in 1939. The topics of the journal’s sections in different years were approximately the same. In the end, the return column of the editorial office was added, and not only from the editorial office, which made it possible to see readers’ feedback and adjust the content of subsequent editions. The first two paired numbers totaled 72 pages, which also roughly corresponded to the volume and content of the previous year’s edition.⁴

For example, since 1926 there was a separate part of the “People’s Missions”, which was conducted by the clergy and the Basilian monks, Redemptorists, and even Jesuits. In 1926, two sections were added to the official part, where there were orders from the Mukachevo and Prešov Eparchys.⁵ And since 1928, “Dushpastyr” has turned into a printed press organ of the Mukachevo and Prešov eparchy. Orders and other components were printed here, which were also applied to the Prešov eparchy. The section “Defense of faith” was also added.⁶ Since 1934, the journal has turned into a governmental and spiritual organ of the Mukachevo Eparchy. At the same time, the Prešov Eparchy used other journals that published the official orders of the bishop and the consistory – in the 20s of the 20th century “Church and School” and in

³ Содержание. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1924, роч. I, януарій, ч. 1, с. 1.

⁴ Содержание. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1925, роч. II, январь-февраль, ч. 1–2, с. 1.

⁵ Содержание. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1926, роч. III, януарій, ч. 1, с. 1.

⁶ Содержание. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1928, роч. V, януарій, ч. 1, с. 1.

pre-war times – the newspaper “Russkoe slovo”, and later “Rasporazhenia Eparchyalnoho Pravitelstva v Prjasevi”. During the Second World War and after it was journal with the title “Uriadny visti”.⁷

The theme of the church periodic “Dushpastyr”

The historical theme of the journal depended on the current news and processes that were taking place at that time on the territory of Central-Eastern Europe in the Catholic Church and in Czechoslovakia itself. The event history on the pages of the studied religious periodicals referred to general events in the Eparchy or all Greek Catholic Churches and the Catholic Church in general. One of the first pieces of information is about the nomination and consecration of bishops in the United States of America. According to priest Yulii Grigashiy, the consecration of two bishops for the USA – Vasyl Takach and Kostiantyn Bogachevskiy – took place on June 15, 1924, in the church of St. Athanasius. Bishop of Kryzhevci and apostolic administrator of Prešov Dionysii Nariadii, Bishop of Przemyśl Josaphat Koncylovsky, and Giovanni Mele, Bishop of Lungro, an Italian-Greek from Calabria, gave the ordination.⁸ In “Blagovisnyk” for 1924 there is a short note about the appointment of Vasyl Takach.⁹ In this way, it is possible to receive the historical information related to individual Eparchys – and Mukachevo in particular – in the mentioned periodicals.

Some historical essays concerned individual societies that arose in the Eparchy. Thus, on February 23, 1928, under Bishop Peter, the Apostolate of St. Cyril and Methodius, the head of which was appointed Msgr. Viktor Shelkov; Emilian Bokshay and Aleksandr Ilnytsky became editors; its charter was published immediately. The founding meeting of the Apostolate was held on October 17, 1927, priest Teodor Kogutysh became its secretary, and Dr. Yulii Marina became its treasurer. The main success of this society is the introduction of the holiday of the Slavic Apostles on the territory of the Eparchy, although there was criticism of this Apostleship, mainly from the persons of the leaders.¹⁰ This is unique information from the

⁷ See for an example: *Урядны вѣсти Епархіального Правительства и Апостольской администратуры епархіи Мукачевской въ Прешове*. Годъ 1941, января, 8 с.; *Распоряженія епархіального правительства въ Пряшеві*. Годъ 1936, ч. III, с. 24–33.

⁸ ГРИГАШІЙ, Юлій: Рукоположеніе двухъ Епископовъ Американскихъ в Римѣ, отбывшее дня 15-го юнія сего года. In: *Душпастыр. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1924, септембрій, роч. I, ч. 7, с. 343–346.

⁹ Новости. In: *Благовѣстник*, 15 марта 1924, № 6, с. 94.

¹⁰ ИЛНИЦКІЙ, Александр.: Организуемся въ обществѣ «Апостолство Кирила і Методія». In: *Душпастыр. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1927, апрѣль, роч. IV, ч. 4, с. 211–218. Also see: ПЕКАР, А.: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історіі церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 228–229.

official publication of the Eparchy, which is practically impossible to find in any other source of that time.

There were also events of cathedrals or episcopal conferences, which took place under the auspices of the Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytskyi. This meeting of higher hierarchs was called to jointly solve the pressing issues of all Greek Catholic Eparchys in Europe and North America. On August 17 – 18, 1928, a meeting of Greek Catholic bishops took place in Uzhhorod, where, except Mukachevo' Bishop Peter, Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytskyi, Bishop of Canada Mykyta Budka, and Bishops of Prešov and Kryzhevci – Pavlo Gojdič and Dionysii Naryadii, were present. At the meeting, it was decided to continue the discussion of last year's issues.¹¹ It is clear that the conferences were periodic and urgent issues of the entire Greek Catholic Church were resolved. On October 20, 1929, all the Greek Catholic bishops were present at the conference in Rome, except Vasyl Takach from the USA, and apparently Mykyta Budka from Canada, which is not mentioned in the report. And on October 29, all participants were at the audience with the Holy Pope Pius XI on the occasion of his 50-year ministry.¹² According to the protocol, there were several days of meetings of bishops during October 21 – 29, 1929. On the first day, a meeting was held with the participation of Cardinal Cinchero, where the formation of an intereparchyal seminary for Greek Catholics was discussed. This process had already begun with the purchase of land for the seminary. Subsequently, it was proposed to increase study in seminaries from four to five years and to use the study plan of Latin seminaries and not to accept seminarians in the seminary if they had already studied in other theological institutions. During the next days, issues of catechism, publication of new editions of "Trebnyk" and "Sluzhebnyk", edited by the metropolitan, were resolved. For the formation of a new "Sluzhebnyk" the text of the Lviv edition of 1927 was taken as a basis, and the Slavic language of the Liturgy. The text of Lviv edition was provided for editing. After that, the issues of editing the text of the "Code of Canons for the Eastern Church", as well as the issue of the tribunal, and the Orthodox movement were discussed. All decisions were taken unanimously.¹³ Despite the fact that archival documents exist – i.e. protocols of meetings, which offer the details of the discussion, general

¹¹ Епископски конференция. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, октябрь, роч. V, ч. 10, с. 231–232.

¹² Историческая авдиенция нашихъ епископовъ у Его Святѣйшества. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1929, декабрь, роч. VI, ч. 12, с. 311–312.

¹³ Archív gréckokatolíckeho arcibiskupstva v Prešove [Archive of the Greek Catholic Eparchy in Prešov], f. Prezidiálne spisy, id. nr. 64, sign. 52/1929. Document "Zápisnica z biskupskej konferencie gr. kat. episkopátu konanej v Ríme od 21. – 29. 10. 1929".

information about such councils and their participants can also be found in religious periodicals.

There were also historical notes of regional and Eparchyal significance. Undoubtedly, an important event was the fact that in 1935 priest Konstantyn Hrabar, the Greek Catholic parish priest of Dubrivka near Serechnie, was appointed the governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia. This became known after the ministerial meeting on February 2, 1935, in Prague.¹⁴ That is, the journal contained information about the activity of the clergy in the political life of the region, although it was not always favorable for the Church itself.

It is possible to get certain unique historical data from the pages of a religious periodical, which cannot be found even in archival funds. The fact is that the event described by the periodical was rather a project that was not implemented due to objective political changes. In 1937, the journal of the Mukachevo Eparchy "Dushpastyr" reported that soon two archbishoprics in Czechoslovakia should be organized – namely, the Czechoslovakian and Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Also a new Eparchy in Khust should be created, and a papal bull about these new administrative entities should be promulgated. The boundaries of the new administrative entities have not been clarified in detail, but the fact of them was explained as the near future and was delayed only by formal processes. Moreover, it is indicated that *modus vivendi* is only a temporary agreement. Its main positions: the complete autonomy of the local bishop within the framework of the state, as well as his loyalty to the state and the fact that the management of all estates should be within the state.¹⁵

On September 2, 1937, a papal bull *Ad ecclesiastici regiminis incrementum*, which changed the jurisdiction of Catholic and Greek Catholic Eparchys, was published in Rome. The subordination of the Mukachevo and Prešov Eparchies to the Esztergom archbishop was canceled and the direct subordination to the Apostolic Capital was established.¹⁶ The second reform on re-subordination of Eparchies directly to the Apostolic Capital was the first stage before such changes. But it remained unimplemented. However, thanks to above mentioned periodicals, we can obtain interesting historical data that changed the status of Greek

¹⁴ О. Костянтинъ Грабаръ губернаторомъ Подкарп. Руси. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1935, январь-февруарь, роч. XII, ч. 1–2, с. 30–31.

¹⁵ М., М., Б. *Modus vivendi*. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1937, роч. XV, нов.-децемберь, ч. 11–12, с. 245–249.

¹⁶ Новое установленіе границъ епархій в ЧСР. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1937, роч. XV, септ.-октоберь, ч. 9–10, с. 235–236.

Catholic Eparchys, making them independent from neighbouring structures of the single Catholic Church.

Opposition between Greek Catholics and Orthodox and state modernism of the Czechoslovak Republic

It is important that the periodicals not only could talk about the confrontation itself but also could give an assessment of the Eparchy vision among the members of clergy, of the reasons of the such activity of the Orthodox believers in the conditions of the Czechoslovak Republic. The editor of the journal Aleksandr Ilnytskyi provided information about the circumstances of the activity of the Orthodox movement in a separate appendix. He pointed out that the reasons were extensive and originated from the time of Austria-Hungary due to the implementation of the calendar reform by the Hungarian authorities as an attempt to interfere in the life of the Church.¹⁷ Another aspect of the activation of the Orthodox was the Galician and Russian emigration to the Czechoslovak Republic, which took advantage of the weak education of the people. Another reason, according to priest Aleksandr, was social manipulation, when the target was church and parish lands, which the agitators promised to divide among the population, as well as the payment of *koblyna* and fulfillment of annual work, which the state canceled, replacing them with compensation. Thus, the editors of the journal were well aware of the reasons for such activity and understood the circumstances, however, they could not change the situation, especially in the case of local elites contributing to such events. In total, the conflict covered about forty Greek Catholic parishes, which were partially or completely captured by the Orthodox. However, later it was the authorities of the Czechoslovak Republic, which encouraged these conflicts, that tried to resolve them in favour of the Greek Catholics. For example, Velyki Luchky was one of the biggest centers of conflict between churches, but only on November 26, 1927: the Orthodox handed over the rectory to the Greek Catholics, which ended in the return of all church property in Velyki Luchky, which became the center of the Orthodox movement – and of inter-confessional struggle as well – in the district.¹⁸ Priest Aleksandr Ilnytskyi took over the church from the Orthodox in Velyki Luchky who deserved such a

¹⁷ It is interesting that Athanasius Pekar clearly states that the attempt to introduce the Latin alphabet instead of the Cyrillic alphabet and to replace the Julian calendar came exclusively from the Hungarian authorities, and not from the bishop of Hungarian origin Antonius Papp or individual clergymen, i.e. the Church. See more: ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 322–323.

¹⁸ Передача фары въ Вел. Лучкахъ. Іп: *Душастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1927, май, роч. IV, ч. 5, с. 281–282.

symbolic act, because he made almost the most effort in the Eparchy to return seized and illegally transferred property. Later, in the 1930s, confrontations stopped and there were fewer messages on this topic.

Church vs. political modernism (liberalism, socialism, nazism, communism)

In March 1927, the episcopal message was a reaction on political disputes and growing hatred among peoples, as well as catastrophic social unrest and poverty. The social theme, the problems of state modernism and secularization, had a great importance in those days. In order to calm the situation the Church established a separate holiday of the Lord Jesus Christ the King. The main point of the newest holiday in the Catholic Churches was not to confuse political leaders with God, who in some societies replaced God Jesus Christ himself. With this holiday, the Church taught the faithful not to idealize political regimes and their leaders, because this kind of imagination led in the interwar period to dictatorial regimes and wars, which worsened the position of the people even more.¹⁹

Despite the introduction of the feast of Christ the King for believers, part of the clergy was organized to achieve political advantages. On January 10, 1928, the Clergy Club of the Christian People's Party was formed with the participation of about 30 priests. At its founding, in the presence of Bishop Peter Gebei, the introductory speech was delivered by Msgr. Augustyn Voloshyn, and later priests Vasyl Lar, Emilian Bokshay, Viktor Zheltvay and Mykhailo Shuba spoke.²⁰

According to these church journals, it is known that the local Church has been actively opposing communism as an ideology since the second half of the 1920s. According to the Eparchy, the "Central Office of the Defense of the Faith" (CODF) was active, in particular in the distribution of pamphlets against communism. Thus, the editors asked the clergy of the Maramureş region to submit the addresses of believers who did not receive booklets against dangerous ideology, in the villages where property and churches have not been returned – Bereznyky, Nyzhnii Bystryi, Horinchevo, Iza, Koshelovo, Krychovo, Lypcha, Nankovo, Nyzhnie Selyshche, Vuchkove, Chumalovo, Shandrovo (filial).²¹ The main board, which has been strengthened, also testifies to the success of the Central Committee: Aleksandr Ilnytskyi was the head of the office, priest Aleksandr Stoyka

¹⁹ Пастырское послание духовенству и вѣрникам мукачевской, пряшевской и крижевацкой епархи о Царствѣ Христовомъ. In: *Душпастырь. Официальный органъ Греко-Каволч. епархи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1927, мартъ, роч. IV, ч. 3, с. 115–121.

²⁰ Клубъ духовенства христ.-народной партіи. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, февруарій, роч. V, ч. 2, с. 45–46.

²¹ Прошение къ мараморошскому Духовенству. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, мартъ, роч. V, ч. 3, с. 73.

became the secretary, Emilian Bokshay hold position of the clerk; priest Yulii Maryna, professor of the theological seminary in Uzhhorod, became the treasurer; the central administration was composed from the priests Viktor Shelkov, Aleksandr Khira, Emilian Bokshay, Viktor Zheltvai, Yevhen Petryk and Alexii Ivanchov. In total, more than 100 priests belonged to the society, excluding the presidium, which testified to its activity in the parish structures of the Eparchy.²² That is, it is possible to receive specific personal data about clergymen who tried to practically explain the difference between the empty promises of ideology and true, real life and faith in eternal life. The subject of the teachings had a practical dimension. Thus, in the critical article on “Socialism”, the clergy understood Christian aid as helping an orphan or a beggar left on the street without help, because for a true Christian, such an orphan or beggar is abandoned Jesus.²³ That’s why the emphasis was placed on the fact that not some ideology or political movements can be kind and care for people, but every person, a Christian, has the duty to love, that is, to help his neighbour.

The separate publication items were the bishop's pastoral letters or joint pastoral letters openly criticizing the state. In November 1928, a pastoral message was published for the tenth anniversary of the existence of independent Czechoslovakia. It pointed out the fallacy that the state does not need God, with the assertion that its formation is connected with the social contract. The state, as indicated in the letter, is formed exactly like the Church, where people unite for a certain goal, and the very fact of the need for unity is divine, not earthly. The role of the secular government is to take care of a person's material life, safety, etc., not spiritual needs. The state cannot fully provide for spiritual needs, although there are attempts by atheism to convince of the ability of independent education, and therefore every state will not be able to do without the Church. Goodness, “virtue”, is defined in the message in a form of three important virtues – to love God, to serve Him, and to love one’s neighbour. Other “virtues” cannot exist, no matter how beautiful they are. The imperative is that every virtue is inseparable from God. First of all, one should be afraid of God’s laws, not only state laws. It is indicated by the bishops that the greater the deviation from Christian morality, the greater a number of sins. The Church helps the state to turn thousands of sinners into good and honest citizens. As it was indicated in the message, all problems in the state have arisen because people depart from

²² Именословъ председательства и членства ЦКОВ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, май, роч. V, ч. 5, с. 122–123.

²³ Соціалізмъ (I). In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1924, октябрь, роч. I, ч. 8, с. 413–421.

God.²⁴ So, there is not only a controversy about the role of the state and the Church in society but also the teachings of the Church, and the position of the state, regardless of the ideology it uses.

In the joint Czechoslovakian archbishops' and bishops' letter dated October 6, 1937, the issues of the Christian family, the family as the main component of the patriarchal society and the Church in general, are raised. The message is entirely dedicated to the following problems: family divorces, harm to contraception, violation of marital fidelity, extra-marital cohabitation, and education of young people. One of the slogans of the archbishops and bishops is "Whoever destroys the family, destroys the religion." These words are clearly explained in the letter: The Church needs priests who will be brought up in families with Christian values since there is a constant demand for good shepherds.²⁵ In general, the problem of the destruction of the Christian family is a constant relay of religious values in the 30s of the 20th century that took on a threatening character, judging by the archpastoral letters.

Social questions of the Church

The episcopal secretary, priest Aleksandr Stoyka, provided important information about state payments to the clergy, indicating that the clergy expected the law on congruity from June 25, 1926.²⁶ That is, socialists and communists who criticized the Church voted for the law on the financial support of the Catholic Church in the state. That is, the populism of the ideology was traced rather than the real position of the politicians.

There are also cases when priests of the Eparchy actively spread socialist ideas, but there was an appropriate reaction from the Eparchial authorities. Finally, in November 1931, an announcement appeared in the Eparchial publication "Dushpastyr" about the removal of Stefan Kiral with all the consequences – a ban on divine services and exclusion from the Eparchial clergy.²⁷ It is necessary to say that later his dispensation was removed, and the priest was transferred to other parishes,

²⁴ Отъ Епископа мукачевскаго и пряшевскаго. Архієпископы и Епископы Чсл. Республики посылають высокопреподобному Духовенству и всѣмъ вѣрникамъ миръ и архіерейское благословеніе! Дорогіе въ Христѣ! In: *Душпастыр. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, ноябрь, роч. V, ч. 11, с. 250–260.

²⁵ Обоще пастырское посланіе ахієпископовъ и епископов чсл. Республики. In: *Распоряженія епархіального правительства въ Пряшеві*, годъ 1937, 10 декабря, с. 9–14.

²⁶ СТОЙКА, Александр: Державное жалованіе Духовенства. In: *Душпастыр. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, январь, ч. 1, с. 5–9.

²⁷ Диспензія о Стефана Кіраля. In: *Душпастыр. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1931, новемберъ, роч. VIII, ч. 11, с. 261–262. Later, the dispensation was lifted, but this case became a good example for the clergy of both Eparchys.

but this preventive episode became a good example for the Eparchyal clergy of both Eparchys.

On the social role of the Church, there is a series of essays written by priest Vasyl Hopko, which were published in church periodicals for the Prešov and Mukachevo Eparchys. Since 1932, taking into account the catastrophic social problems, the essays were authored by the above-mentioned Fr. Vasyl Hopko. Already at the beginning of the first essay, Fr. Vasyl emphasized the need to talk about social justice. It is necessary to solve the problems of certain groups in society – workers, peasants, artisans, merchants, women, and others. Each essay thematically related to a certain social problem, with an in-depth explanation of the position of the Church.

So, in essay from January 28, 1932, published under the title “Social Charity of the Church”, the explanation of the encyclical *Quadragesima anno* is presented. The essay condemns the rapid development of technology because people have remained without work. Overproduction is also explained here; according to the author it caused the excessive individualism, liberalism, the desire to enrich the few, and pride. The consequence of overproduction is the current state of crisis and unemployment (that is, the economic crisis of 1929 – 1933; note by author). Already in the third essay, capitalism is condemned, although not private property as such, only its advanced version, i.e. primitive materialism. That is, the materialistic, unjust side of capitalism is condemned, as it rejects religion and love for one's neighbour. In the very first essay, it is indicated that the reason for the emergence of socialism is the defects of capitalism. Paradoxically, as early as the 1930s, the Church pointed to the basic problems of society, many of which exist even today.

On February 19, 1932, another essay was published, condemning communism as populism. One of the main dangers of communism, the promise of a quick solution to social problems, which could not help but be liked in conditions of crisis, hunger, and unemployment, are covered here in sufficient detail. For the majority, such slogans became a kind of dream, a utopia, and therefore such clarifications remained extremely relevant and necessary. It is interesting that the fourth essay condemns collectivism, and solidarity in the form of class struggle – the Christian Church, on the contrary, builds social justice on love. In fact, communism led people to confrontation, the so-called “class struggle”, so that the poor would fight against the rich. Instead, the Church pointed to the primary need for mutual aid, mercy, and helping one's neighbour. As for communism, it was the greatest danger for the youth, because whoever owns the youth owns the future, and therefore it is necessary to fight against the penetration of such ideas among young

people. In this way, the position and direction of the Church on these issues are indicated.²⁸

In the Hungarian period (1939 – 1944), some priests also cooperated with the Hungarian authorities, which was again not in favour of the Church. Among them, Stefan Fentsyk was restored to the rank of priest, and priests Yulii Maryna and Aleksandr Illytskyi, whose activities alienated the faithful from the clergy, compromising it, although, in reality, such phenomena were rather exceptions than the rule. Thus, on June 30, 1939, Aleksandr Illytskyi was appointed a life member of the Upper House of the Hungarian Parliament, priest Yuliy Maryna became an adviser to the Minister of Culture and Public Education, as well as head of the department of culture and school education in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, and priest Ioan Bokshay became a member of the Hungarian Parliament. These data speak of the confrontation on the one hand of the Church against modernism and various political ideologies, which were not for the benefit of society. From the same periodicals it is possible to learn about the participation of the clergy in political processes, which made it possible to obtain certain benefits for the Church, as in the case of congruity, which was provided by the state. These political activities compromised the Church, whose task, above all of the clergy, is to save the souls of believers, and not to participate in politics.

The so-called “Easter Action” was an important and not so instructive practical event of the Mukachevo Eparchy. Since April 1932, the thesis of the Ordinariate of the Mukachevo Eparchy under the authorship of priest Aleksandr Illytskyi has been spreading: every Ruthenian should celebrate the Easter holiday, that is, the “Easter Campaign” began.²⁹ According to it, the more affluent were supposed to bake Easter cakes or send

²⁸ ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанская Харита. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1932, январь-февраль, роч. IX, ч. 1–2, с. 15–20.; ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанская Харита. In: *Русское слово. Еженѣдельная народная газета*. Год изд. IX, 28 сiчня 1932 р., ч. 4 (354), с. 2–3.; ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанская Харита. In: *Русское слово. Еженѣдельная народная газета*. Год изд. IX, 5 лютого 1932 р., ч. 5 (355), с. 2–3.; ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанская Харита. In: *Русское слово. Еженѣдельная народная газета*. Год изд. IX, 19 лютого 1932 р., ч. 7 (357), с. 4.; ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанская Харита. In: *Русское слово. Еженѣдельная народная газета*. Год изд. IX, 26 лютого 1932 р., ч. 8 (358), с. 4.; ГОПКО, Василь: Соціальны вопросы Христiанска Харита. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1932, мартъ, роч. IX, ч. 3, с. 47–53.

²⁹ More see: На Великдень каждый русинъ маеть мати пасху! In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1932, априлій, роч. IX, ч. 4, с. 101–102. See: ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 1. Рим : Вид. ОО Василян, 1967, с. 142; ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 303; КИЧЕРА, Віктор: *Греко-Католицька Церква в Чехословаччині як соціальна інституція (1918–1939)*. Пряшiв : Видавництво «Шарк», 2016, с. 82–87.

cash check or bring a cash gift for the poor ones. Every Christian can give natural gifts of flour, corned beef, and other products. Afterwards, priest Aleksandr Ilnytskyi reports on the positive results of the event.³⁰ Thus, the faithful and the clergy took an active part in helping the poor, carrying out active social pastoral care in practice, in contrast to the ideologies of populism and opposition at the time.

Successful aid was also provided in 1933, but already at the parish level – wealthier parishes shared with poorer ones, priests were given intentions in their intentions, etc.³¹ In fact, the Eparchyal administration in Uzhhorod tried to implement the Easter promotion at the local (parish) level for the second year, improving and expanding a successful social event.

Missionary movement on the pages of religious periodicals

Of great importance were the missions and missionary work mainly of monks on the territory of the Mukachevo Eparchy, which, however, was carried out with certain difficulties. Despite the successful missions against communism and the Orthodox movement, on December 9, 1926, the Polish embassy in Prague asked for an explanation of the question, why the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic forbade priest Stepan Reshetylo, a Basilian monk from Galicia who was noted for his distinctly pro-Ukrainian views, to stay in the Czechoslovak Republic.³² In general, the journal very positively evaluates the missionary activity of the monk from Galicia. Already in the April issue of the journal “Dushpastyr” (1927) it was reported about the return of priest Stepan Reshetylo to Uzhhorod, while about 140 priests and thousands of believers from the Mukachevo Eparchy expressed their support for him.³³ However, after the return of priest Stepan, attacks began against him on the pages of the journals “Russkaya Zemlya”, “Russkii Vestnyk”

³⁰ ИЛНИЦКІЙ, Александр: Пасхальна акція въ podporу бѣдныхъ русиновъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1932, май, роч. IX, ч. 5, с. 121–122. Almost identical information about the Easter campaign of 1932 is provided in the *Svoboda* newspaper. See: Пасхальна акція для бідних Підкарпаття. In: *Свобода*, 28 апріля 1932, ч. 17–18, с. 2.

³¹ На Великдень каждый русинъ маеть мати пасху! In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1933, мартъ-апрѣль, роч. X, ч. 3–4, с. 104–106; На Великдень кожний Русин мае мати пасху! In: *Свобода*, 2 березня 1933, ч. 5, с. 1.

³² Archiv Ministerstva zahraničních věcí České republiky, sekce II, kart. 64, č. 184.379/1926. Církev řeckokatolická. Mužský Řád sv. Basila Velkého. Štefán Rešetylo.; РЕШЕТИЛО, Степан: ЧСВВ выповѣженъ изъ републики. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1927, январій, роч. IV, ч. 1, с. 51–52.

³³ РЕШЕТИЛО, С. ЧСВВ, дома! In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1927 апрѣль, роч. IV, ч. 4, с. 228–229.

and the government newspaper “Podkarpatské Hlasy, where it was stated that priest Reshetylo, with the support of the “Voloshinovites”, has ambitions to become the episcopal secretary. However, this is denied, because the bishop was satisfied with the work of both: Aleksandr Stoyka as a secretary and Stepan Reshetylo as a missionary – about which he informed Archabbot Polikarp Bulyk.³⁴ That is, in this case, the journal stood in defense of the missionary, due to his successful activity in the territory of the Eparchy.

In general, the success of the Basilian missions, moreover, not without the help of the Galician Basilians, turned out to be significant. In 1928, about 50,000 believers came to Mukachevo for the Assumption holiday, of which 15,000 received communion. In addition to Bishop Peter Gebei, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, as well as Bishops Dionysii Naryadii of Kryzhevci and Nikita Budka of Canada participated.³⁵ For example, it is also reported that the Basilian priests conducted 49 missions in Subcarpathian Ruthenia until 1928 (majority of them since 1924), largely due to the arrival of priest Stepan Reshetylo in Subcarpathian Ruthenia at that time.³⁶ Therefore, the events of missionary work were actively described.

Since the end of 1929, the Redemptorist priests have been carrying out extensive missionary work in the Mukachevo Eparchy. In total, as of 1928, the Redemptorist priests conducted five missions and two mission renewals (preachers were priests Dominic Trchka and Vasyl Nekula);³⁷ 1929 was spent in Korolevo;³⁸ and in 1930, the mission in Rakoshyno.³⁹ The result of the successful activity of the Redemptorists in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia (in particular, the missionary activity) was a consecration of the cathedral in Michalovce by bishops Aleksandr Stoyka and Mykola Charnetskyi, Volyn bishop. The architect of the temple,

³⁴ Пресовы напады на оо. Василяновъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1927, юній, роч. IV, ч. 6, с. 323–325.

³⁵ Мукачевскій успенскій отпустъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, октябрь, роч. V, ч. 10, с. 229–231; ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 363. See: ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 3. Монаше життя. Ужгород : КП «Ужгородська міська друкарня», 2014, 220 с., с. 126–132.

³⁶ Отцы Редемптористи. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, декабрь, роч. V, ч. 12, с. 310.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, с. 310.

³⁸ Подпоруйме Чинъ оо. Редемптористовъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1930, январь, роч. VII, ч. 1, с. 19–20. Also see: Народна миссія въ Краловъ н. Тисою. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1930, февраль, роч. VII, ч. 2, с. 55–56.

³⁹ Народна миссія въ Ракошинъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1930, юній-юлій, роч. VII, ч. 6–7, с. 185–186.

Volodymyr Sichynskiy, designed the five-tower church on September 29, 1935.⁴⁰ In 1936, in Michalovce, priest Methodius Dominic Trchka was elected abbot instead of priest Kyril Zakopal, who built the church and monastery in Michalovce.⁴¹

Education and upbringing in the Eparchy

A great number of educational activities were performed by the nuns and the Basilian priests. According to the official journal of the Eparchy, the nuns began working in the 1924/1925 academic year, taking over the boarding school for priestly girl orphans, and under the leadership of Abbess Magdalena Humenyuk. There were 4 more nuns who took care of 72 orphans.⁴² Since May 1930, there was an announcement by the Basilian nuns in Uzhhorod about enrollment in the first grade of the girls' grammar school from September 1, 1930.⁴³ Further success of the nuns in Subcarpathian Ruthenia was education at the secondary school level. Considerable support in the education of young people was given to orphanages in Uzhhorod and Khust, which were looked after by the Basilian nuns, as well as in Michalovce, which was maintained by the servant nuns. The relevant pieces of information on this topic could be found in the annual collection of funds for this noble cause.⁴⁴ A boarding school and a school in Uzhhorod were also maintained by the Basilian priests.

There were also unpleasant cases of restrictions on education in the Eparchy by the state. The government's decision to pay state teachers by parish communities was an attempt to limit Greek Catholic school education. Accordingly, the vice-governor asked to stop and cancel such decisions of the authorities on payment.⁴⁵ According to an information from Stefan Petrus to the Land government, by order of the Ordinariate dated August 22, 1935, the boarding school "Alumneum" was legally

⁴⁰ Нова церковь Редемптористовъ въ Михайловцахъ поблагословенна. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1935, августъ-октябрь, роч. XII, ч. 8–10, с. 179–180.

⁴¹ Новый игумень въ михальовскомъ монастырѣ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1936, юній-августъ, роч. XIII, ч. 6–8, с. 173–174.

⁴² Сестры Василиянки въ Ужгородѣ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1924, новембрій, роч. I, ч. 9, с. 474.

⁴³ Конкурсъ до дѣвической реальной гимназіи СС. Василиянокъ въ Ужгородѣ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1930, май, роч. VII, ч. 5, с. 141–142.

⁴⁴ Подпорование епарх. Сиротинцевъ. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской*, 1937, новемберъ-дец., роч. XIV, ч. 11–12, с. 286.

⁴⁵ Прѣдседателямъ школ. радъ на Подк. Руси. In: *Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1928, февруарій, роч. V, ч. 2, с. 32–33.

transformed into the “Alumneum and Konvikt” boarding school, with one head, Stefan Petrus.⁴⁶

“Blagovisnyk” and other church periodicals

The Eparchy’s periodicals and newspapers played an important role in the educational tasks, in particular the newspaper “Nauka”, which was headed by priest Augustyn Voloshyn since 1922, later renaming it to “Svoboda”, in which priest Viktor Zheltvay appears as the editor-in-chief. In 1921, the newspaper “Blagovisnyk” began to be published, the editor of which was priest Emilian Bokshay, and from 1930 – the Basilian priests, in particular Teofan Skiba. In 1935, on the initiative of Bishop Aleksandr Stoyka, the newspaper “Nedilya” began to be published, the editor of which was priest Emilian Bokshay, whose owner and publisher priest Yevhenii Petryk was mentioned as the head of the foundation fund.⁴⁷ At the same time, Atanasii Pekar did not mention at all the journal “Dushpastyr”, the editor of which was priest Aleksandr Ilnytskyi for a long time (despite the fact that priest Atanasii claimed himself as the most influential person in the publication of this periodical during the 20s and 30s).

The journal “Blagovisnyk” was also connected with the Mukachevo Eparchy, in particular, its publication was started and edited by the Greek Catholic priest and long-term director of the Uzhhorod Greek Catholic seminary, priest Augustyn Voloshyn. The publication of the journal began in 1921. The structure began with advertisements for the “Pidkarpatskyi Bank”, then the following sections contain information from the editors about the role of the journal in spreading the Good News. The next column was about faith, a separate column with essays was about hagiography (that is, the lives of saints, mainly of early Christians who were persecuted in Rome). A separate section was dedicated to the rites of the Church, f. e. in the first issue of the journal there was a text about the types of crosses used by Christian Churches. The next part of the journal was composed of different news, and the first issue ended with advertisements and Christian publications of the unofficial publishing house of the Eparchy “Unio”.⁴⁸ In 1924, the catechetical-missionary theme of the journal continued: the first part was about the Nativity of Christ, and the theme of science and faith continued. Next, there was a text focused on the younger believers of school age telling the story of the Holy Evening on Christmas Day. In part, the issue of inter-church

⁴⁶ Отворение епарх. «Конвикта» въ Ужгородѣ. *Ип: Душпастырѣ. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархи Мукачевской и Пряшевской*, 1935, май-юлій, роч. XII, ч. 5–7, с. 106–107.

⁴⁷ ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 280–281.

⁴⁸ *Благовѣстник*, 1921, децембер, № 1, с. 1–12.

conflicts between Greek Catholics and Orthodox was raised in the issues, and the publication ends with the several news.⁴⁹

In general, it should be emphasized that the subject matter of the “Blagovisnyk” journal included fewer historical topics, and the basis remained rather missionary oriented. However, this is not the first time that the successful struggle for the return of the Greek Catholic church, captured by the Orthodox in Neresnytsia, has been highlighted. Therefore, the church from Neresnytsia was returned to the Greek Catholics only under the leadership of the school department, headed by Josef Pešek, on March 8, 1922. At the same time, the faithful were present, the priest Kornelii Hira and his son, the young priest Aleksandr Hira, who preached a sermon about the need to forgive one another despite all the damage caused.⁵⁰ That is, as a missionary journal, these events, as an exception, were covered quite often, because they were connected with the missionary component. Separately, there is also a short note about the above-mentioned episcopal conference in Lviv, where it is reported that it is to be held under the chairmanship of Metropolitan Sheptytskyi with the participation of all Greek Catholic bishops, including Mukachevo, Prešov, and bishops from United States of America. The main subject of the meetings, as stated in the publication, will be the fight against new heretics.⁵¹ That is, conflicts with the Orthodox were meant.

There are also other events mentioned, although they are rather fragmentary. In 1928, Petro Gebei visited Maramureş Verkhovyna by car together with priest-vicar Augustyn Voloshyn, priest-dean Heori Leshchyshyn from Serednie, and priest-secretary Aleksandr Stoyka.⁵² It is interesting that on June 21–29, 1928, Xavier Ritter, the apostolic nuncio in Prague, traveled through Maramureş. Priest Stefan Reshetylo accompanied the representative of the Vatican in all his travels.⁵³ The peculiarity of this journal was that it was unofficially a publication of the Order of St. Basil the Great of the province of St. Nikolas with the center in Uzhhorod. Starting from the 1930s, the Basilian monks edited the “Balgovisnyk”, which had little practical need, because it was the Basilians who carried out the most missions and had their own printing press, which prevented the spontaneous conversion of Greek Catholics to the Orthodox faith.

⁴⁹ *Благовѣстник*, 1924, январь, № 1, с. 1–22.

⁵⁰ *Новости*. Нересницькѣ греко-католики побѣдили схизматиковѣ. In: *Благовѣстник*, 1922, май, №5, с. 11–12.

⁵¹ *Епископска конференція*. In: *Благовѣстник*, 1927, новемберъ, ч. XI, с. 175.

⁵² *Апостольска подорож епископа Петра на Верховинѣ*. In: *Благовѣстник*, 1928, юлій, № 7, с. 109–112.

⁵³ *Апостольска нунціятура и Подкарпатська Русь*. In: *Благовѣстник*, 1928, августъ, № 8, с. 126–127.

During the division of the Eparchy under the Vienna Arbitration in November 1938, part of the Mukachevo Eparchy ended up in Uzhhorod, together with Bishop Aleksandr Stoyka. Most of the Eparchy's parishes ended up in the autonomous Carpathian Ukraine, with the center in Khust, where the Vatican appointed Bishop Dionysiy Naryadii of Kryzhev as apostolic administrator. At that time "Bulletin of the Mukachevo Eparchy in the Czechoslovak Republic" was published. In addition, the Basilian nuns and Basilian priests were active. Basilian priest Sevastiyan Sabol published the journal "Blagovisnyk – Sacred Heart of Christ".⁵⁴ There was more event information in this journal. Thus, on December 4, 1938, as written in the "Blagovisnyk" newspaper, Khust became the Eparchyal capital city, the installation of a new bishop took place, and the parish church was elevated to the episcopal chair. And the priest Dmytro Popovych symbolically handed over the keys to the church to the bishop and apostolic administrator Dionysii Naryadii.⁵⁵ So, the concrete steps of the formation of the Apostolic Administration in Khust were revealed.

With the new borders, the situation also changed for the Basilian priests and monks, who lost the monastery in Uzhhorod, the boarding school, and the printing house. However, the grammar school was moved to Velykyi Bychkiv, where nine monks settled. At the same time, they opened a boarding school and took over the parish; by the way, the grammar school had 300 students in those times. In addition, the Basilians reformed and took over the monastery in Boronyavo, as well as the "Alumneum" boarding school in Khust, which was headed by an active priest Dmytro Popovych, who took care of the youth in Maramureş.⁵⁶ The position of the Basilian nuns also changed: after losing their monastery in Uzhhorod, they moved to Khust, and with the efforts of Bishop Dionysiy Naryadii, they opened a monastery in Sevlyush (now Vynohradiv), took over the management of a school and a girls' boarding school, and with it a handicraft circles (a group where girls were taught handicrafts (e.g. sewing, different house works, and manners). The same were opened in Rakhiv and Velykyi Bychkiv. Also, the nuns took over the running of the school in Humenné, and in general, the Basilian nuns in the Czechoslovak Republic numbered seven houses.⁵⁷ Most of the historical information is about the Basilian priests and monks, from whom the editor of the journal came.

⁵⁴ ПЕКАР, Атанасій: ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 1, с. 146.

⁵⁵ МИТРОВИЧ, Д.: Історичне торжество в Хусті. Іп: *Благовісник – Пресвятого Серця Христового*, 1939, січень-лютий, № 1–2, с. 11–12.

⁵⁶ Нова праця отців василіан. Іп: *Благовісник – Пресвятого Серця Христового*, 1939, січень-лютий, № 1–2, с. 20–21.

⁵⁷ Василіянські монахині на нових стаціях. Іп: *Благовісник – Пресвятого Серця Христового*, 1939, січень-лютий, № 1–2, с. 21.

The periodical associated with the Eparchy was the newspaper “Nova Nedilya”, published as political but non-partisan, and its editor was priest Aleksandr Ilnytskyi, whose editorial talent the Hungarian authorities tried to use. Teodor Ortutai and Dr. Alekseder Nemet were employees of the newspaper. The newspaper was published every Sunday and contained pro-Hungarian political topics. For example, on March 15, 1939, the front page presented Admiral Miklós Horthy describing the next anniversary of the Hungarian state, while in Khust on the same day a Diet was held on the proclamation of Carpathian Ukraine and the attack of Hungarian troops on the newly proclaimed state. However, there were also essays of biographical content, for example, priest Alexander Bachynskyi published an essay for the 50th anniversary of Alexander Ilnytskyi, where it is pointed out his great work for the Ruthenians of the region.⁵⁸ The topics also included news from the Christian world, such as the election of Pope Pius XII, spiritual readings, and catechism. For example, there is an article written by Štefan Gojdič about the eternity of the Church and criticism of the Hitler regime as anti-Christian.⁵⁹ In 1940, the newspaper was renamed to “Carpathian Week” and was published as an organ of the Hungarian-Russian brotherhood. The subject matter of the periodical became mainly political, and at the same time, it expanded from four to six pages. There was a small number of church topics and most of them related to the history of the Mukachevo Eparchy. For example, a note that the seminarians could, due to communication problems, come to study at the Uzhhorod Seminary a week later, that is, on February 26.⁶⁰

In 1941, there was a message from Bishop Alexander published, in which he called for the unity of Christians, both in general and in the region, where many have left the Greek Catholics to other faiths, and therefore everyone should strive for the unity of the original pre-1054 year and the Florentine union of 1439.⁶¹

“Podkarpatské hlasy” and other journals

Another group, even the opposite, is made up of publications with pro-government content, which contained the official position of government circles of the Czechoslovak bureaucracy. The most famous periodical,

⁵⁸ О. Александер Ильницький 50 льтний. In: *Нова Недѣля*, 1939, год выд. V, число 5, 5 феб., с. 3.

⁵⁹ ГОЙДИЧ, Стефан: Церков Христова вѣчна. In: *Нова Недѣля*, 1939, год выд. V, число 9, 26 март, с. 4.

⁶⁰ Продовжили вакаціѣ гр. кат. Богословов на оден тыждень. In: *Карпатска Недѣля*, 1940, рок выд. VI, ч. 7, 18 фебруаря, с.3.

⁶¹ Епископ Александр у великопостном пастьырском листь закликуюе своих вѣрников до роботы за едностъ христіанской церкви. In: *Карпатска Недѣля*, 1941, рок выд. VII, ч. 10, 9 марта, с. 3.

which polemicized around the Greek Catholics, was “Podkarpatské hlasy”, the regional government newspaper of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, which presented the position of Prague in the region. The publishers themselves officially positioned the periodical as an independent edition that represented the interests of the entire Czechoslovak people in the Subcarpathian Ruthenia and Eastern Slovakia. In 1925, Rudolph Záhřada is mentioned as the editors, and the address was in Uzhhorod at 9 Malomostná Street (opposite the Berchény cafe). It is obvious that the newspaper was expanding, as it was published several times a week, and in 1927, the administration and editorial office worked in Mukachevo and Uzhhorod. Since 1928, Vilem Taryan is mentioned as the editor in Mukachevo, and the editorial offices also worked in Khust, Berehovo and Rakhiv.

If the church periodicals described an impact of the historical events to the lives of the Greek Catholics and presented their official position. The regional government press had an almost opposite critical position towards the Greek Catholics. Such situation was caused by the criticism of the Catholic Church from the time of the Hussite Rebellion of the Jan Hus era and the perception of the Greek Catholics of the region almost as Roman Catholics. But, of course, the Greek Catholics were not definitely part of the Catholic Church at that time. Therefore, such an accent of the Prague authorities is not accidental.

A rather interesting concept regarding the “modernization” of the region is presented by Stanislav Holubec. In particular, Prague’s vision of the modernization of Subcarpathian Ruthenia which, according to the author, took place without taking in account the traditions and peculiarities of the region, including religious ones.⁶² It should be said that the authorities of the Czechoslovak Republic did not hide their intentions and still tried to “elevate” cultural development, disclosing in the regional press their plan of action regarding the Mukachevo Eparchy. For example, ordinary people do not know what nationality is, and often tie it to faith, feeling it with their heart, but spiritual leaders are playing an unpleasant game, leading Ruthenians⁶³ not to Czechoslovakia, but to the Hungarian

⁶² HOLUBEC, Stanislav: “We bring order, discipline, Western European democracy, and culture to this land of former oriental chaos and disorder”. In: *Mastery and Lost illusions, Space and Time in the Modernization of Eastern and Central Europe*. Eds. Włodzimierz Borodziej, Stanislav Holubec, Joachim von Puttkamer. Oldenburg, Wissenschaftsverlag, Munchen: Publication of the Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena, 2014, vol. 5, p. 246.

⁶³ According to the official Czechoslovak statistics, the Ruthenian people predominated in the region, so we use this term in the context of the available sources. A similar situation occurred on the territory of the then Galicia. The team of authors of the Ukrainian Catholic University, presenting the Polish statistics of Galicia in 1931 in the interpretation of Volodymyr Kubiiovych, reduce all to the Ukrainian segment, although they indicate that Ukrainians individually made up more than 1.5 million people, and Ruthenians – more than

state.⁶⁴ That is, the government journals tried to politicize religious life by treating Greek Catholics *a priori* with prejudice. Moreover, little was taken in account that, in addition to Ruthenians, Greek Catholics also included Hungarians, Slovaks, and Romanians, that is, the members of other minorities. The authorities tried to separate the Ruthenians as Slavs from the Hungarians, which violated the traditional organicity and unity of the Eparchy. This division in the government press, as it has turned out, was a peculiar national-church policy of Czechoslovak government in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Such prejudices were also described in the press regarding emigrants from Subcarpathian Ruthenia to the United States. Despite the good state of affairs among the American Greek Catholics under the leadership of Bishop Vasyl Takach, the official state press of the Czechoslovak Republic saw in the Greek Catholic intelligentsia in the USA a lack of any interest in preserving cultural and national characteristics, accusing the intelligentsia and clergy of Magyarism and defending their interests.⁶⁵ So, it was a calculated policy towards the Church and the population of the region with the benefit, as it seemed, for the government. Defending “Slavism” against Austro-Hungarian Magyarization, the authorities saw the greatest danger in the leadership of the Eparchy, which had a great influence on the society of Subcarpathian Ruthenia. The Czechoslovak bureaucracy was not going to put up with this.

The official periodical post-facto intervened in the history of the Uzhhorod Union, presenting its version of events. Like, when the Orthodox voluntarily signed it – and the property, about which there was a dispute for years during the days of the Czechoslovak Republic, was transferred to the Union Church. The Uzhhorod Union of 1646, which is a real historical act of the union of Churches, was viewed by the Czechoslovak authorities in unison with the Orthodox as a voluntary act, as a result of which all property was transferred to the Uniates, and therefore the authorities only “restore” historical justice.⁶⁶ According to government periodicals, the authorities supported the position of the Orthodox and did not try to maintain law and order, but on the contrary – to benefit from the confrontation, which was far from equality, justice, and democracy.

1 million of the population of Galicia. More see: ЗАЙЦЕВ, Олександр – БЕГЕН, Олег – СТЕФАНІВ, Василь: *Націоналізм і релігія: Греко-Католицька Церква та український націоналістичний рух у Галичині (1920–1930-ті роки)*. За заг. ред. О. Зайцева; Український Католицький Університет; Центр досліджень визвольного руху. Львів: Вид. Українського Католицького Університету, 2011, с. 105.

⁶⁴ Uniatství a lid. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, vol. I., 1925, 17. ledna, nr. 3, p. 2.

⁶⁵ BESKID, Kostantin: Americká emigrace. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 1926, 21. ledna, nr. 8, p. 1.

⁶⁶ Pravoslavná a uniatská církev na P. Rusi. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, vol. IV., 1928, nr. 293, 29. prosince, p. 1.

Particularly sharp criticism was directed to Mukachevo bishop Anthony Papp. Even two years before the transfer of the bishop to another position, the government press already predicted the transfer of Bishop Anthony Papp according to one of the versions – to Prešov.⁶⁷ It looked like bullying, in today's terms – bullying back then. Even after the replacement of Antony Papp in 1925, the authorities mentioned him as "...an unfortunate Magyar over the quiet Slavs".⁶⁸ That is, the emphasis of the press was on the origin, not the activity. The government newspaper openly wrote that the entire diplomatic service of the state was used to remove Bishop Anthony Papp, despite this, he continued to be, according to journalists, in the episcopal residence, and the new bishop Peter Gebei was forced to live in the canon's house, which he occupied before his nomination.⁶⁹ That is, a journalistic technique was used: formally defending the successor, but at the same time criticizing the predecessor. We have a knowledge from the local government newspaper from August 22, about Papp's departure, even despite the protest of the bishop himself regarding the non-recognition of his citizenship of the Czechoslovak Republic. He could not take the oath to the state because of the estates of the Eparchy in Hungary, in which he was perceived as a hero and martyr, journalists wrote with sarcasm.⁷⁰ The instigation of this process took place with the participation of the Czechoslovak official press, although for the sake of justice, it is worth examining in the future also the Hungarian periodicals regarding these events.

In the context of Anthony Papp, it was also mentioned solving the property situation of the clergy, which the authorities did not solve before his removal from office. We learn about the reaction of the state press to the government's decision to begin restitution of the donations of two types: 1.) approximately 60 kilograms of food peasant should give to church (in Ukrainian "kobylyna") and 2.) one day a year the peasants had to work for the church (in Ukrainian "rokovyna") from an interview on April 26, 1925, with ex-bishop Antony Papp, who, as the journalist emphasized, was still in residence in Uzhhorod, although Peter Gebei was officially appointed bishop. Antony Papp told a newspaper reporter about the extremely good news about government compensation. He was convinced that donations harmed the clergy itself, because both the rich and the poor paid the same, and he tried for a long time to seek monetary compensation from the Hungarian authorities, and later from the

⁶⁷ Kdo bude biskupem v Prešově? In: *Lidové noviny*, 21. září 1922, p. 2.

⁶⁸ Uniatství a lid. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 17 ledna 1925, nr. 3, p. 2; Po odchodu Pappově. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 7. února 1925, nr. 6, p. 1.

⁶⁹ Po odchodu Pappově. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 7. února 1925, nr. 6, p. 1.

⁷⁰ Biskup Papp před odchodem? In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 22. srpna 1925, nr. 78, p. 2.

Czechoslovak Republic, for the canceled in-kind payments and overtime since the Greek families of Catholic priests are large and in some places, it reached the point that they could not send their children to school, and therefore the decision to pay monetary compensation is good news.⁷¹ It is not excluded that the issue of material financing of the clergy was resolved at a very high level, and the removal of the bishop was supposed to contribute to this, and Anthony Papp did not have the merit in this. The issue of religious confrontation between Greek Catholics and Orthodox was partly touched upon by “government” journalists. In July 1926, there was information about the transfer of churches in Chervenovo, Goronda, and Russke, and plans to do the same in Velyki Luchky.⁷² That is, the authorities that “incited” the confrontation were eventually forced to intervene in the resolution of disputes in favour of the Greek Catholics, which could also be resolved at the highest level of the state and the Apostolic Capital and was connected with the transfer of Bishop Anthony Papp to another position.

Meanwhile, the authorities did not stop trying to use the division of Greek Catholics by national origin. The division between Russophiles and Ukrainophiles existed not only among the higher clergy – but individual parishes were also divided in this way, in which the representatives of the respective directions ruled. For example, in the parish of Verkhni Vorota, the long-time pro-Ukrainian priest Vasyl Lar (participant of the meeting) built a house for the village “Prosvita” on the territory of the Greek Catholic estate, but the other part of the Greek Catholics who adhered to the local Ruthenian cultural trend and belonged to the “A. Dukhnovych’s Society”, did not approve of this.⁷³ Although the article talks about the protection of church property, the authorities do not hide their bias towards the Ukrainian movement, stressing that the Greek Catholic Church should support the home direction – Ruthenian. This is despite the fact that in the early 1920s, the school department supported the Ukrainian movement in opposition to the local Ruthenians. However, after the intensification of the Ukrainian movement, including within the Greek Catholic faith, it became unprofitable for the Czechoslovak government, which can be traced in subsequent press publications.

Separate issues on the pages of the regional press were also related to education. The excessive freedom that swept the European continent did not escape the Uzhhorod Seminary either, as the government newspaper wrote on April 10, 1926, indicating the spread of unnecessary free-

⁷¹ Rokovina a koblina před zrušením. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 28. dubna 1925, nr. 29, p. 2.

⁷² Uklidnění v otázce kostelů na P. Rusy. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 17. července 1926, nr. 81, p. 1.

⁷³ Jak se chrání majetek řecko-katolické církve. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 12. dubna 1931, nr. 82, pp. 1–2.

thinking in general. Thus, after the expulsion of a seminarian from the seminary for disciplinary offenses and the continuation of disciplinary investigations, eleven seminarians left the seminary in protest, but later went to the bishop and the case ended with their return to studies. Oddly enough, the authorities of the Czechoslovak stood by the side of the bishop, who was trying to restore order in the Eparchy, and did not approve of any free-thinking and disobedience to their authorities, because it could lead to anarchy.⁷⁴ That is, there were publications that clearly supported the Eparchyal government.

In the government newspaper, however, there was a series of anti-Catholic and anti-Hungarian publications about the Basilians, which exaggerated the Hungarian influence on them, falsely claimed that the library of the monastery in Mukachevo was 90 % filled with Hungarian literature. The article also emphasized the Hungarian origin of priests Teophan Skyba, Leontiy Dolgoi and the large estates of the basilians. It was also indicated, for example, the subordination of the order to the Jesuits, etc.⁷⁵ But to the credit of the editors – in one of the following issues, priest Polikarp Bulyk refused most of the theses about the “Magyarization” of the order and the fulfillment of some informative role of the Basilians. He emphasized that the reform itself began with the consent of the parties and that order is generally loyal to the authorities and has a Ukrainian basis. He concluded with a remark that such publications are trying only to sow division and unrest.⁷⁶ There was also Ivan Vyslotskyi’s criticism of the refutation of Polykarp Bulyk, who critically insisted on the Magyarization of the order, not understanding the existence of reformed monasteries, which were actually of the Ukrainian orientation, and non-reformed ones, where monks of the former Hungarian province lived. For example, priest Teophan Skyba, mentioned by the author, had a Hungarian origin, but he accepted the reform, that is, he was open to the Ukrainianness of the reformers, although he could not change his Hungarian origin. But the author, unfortunately, reproached him for this.⁷⁷ The epic about the Basilians ends with the idea that they took both an anti-Polish and an anti-Czech position, they also oppose the local population, Ukrainizing the local Ruthenians.⁷⁸ This opinion of the government newspaper was not accidental, because it was at this time that a

⁷⁴ Podkarpatoruská “svoboda” v kněžském semináři. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 10. dubna 1926, nr. 41, p. 4.

⁷⁵ Řád Basliánů na P. Rusy. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 17. července 1926, nr. 81, p. 1; Řád Basliánů na P. Rusy. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 20. července 1926, nr. 82, p. 1.

⁷⁶ Řád Basliánů na P. Rusy. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 10. srpna 1926, nr. 91, p. 1.

⁷⁷ VYSLOCKYJ, Ioan: Řád Basliánů na P. Rusy. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 17. srpna 1926, nr. 94, p. 1.

⁷⁸ Basliáni. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 19. srpna 1926, nr. 95, p. 1.

brochure was discovered in the Mukachevo monastery about the belonging of Subcarpathian Ruthenia to Ukraine. There was also an unpleasant incident in the Mukachevo monastery: the arrest of five Galician emigrants, among them the director of the Basilian printing house Vladimir Rozortsev (in the document “Dozortsev”) and the monk Matej Kunda, who, according to the government media, confessed to preparing leaflets against Poland and transporting them to Galicia.⁷⁹ The periodical’s claims were well-argued regarding the production of pamphlets and leaflets with nationalist content. The task of the printing house in the reform was to publish and distribute religious literature, conveying Christian values to local believers. Along with these unpleasant episodes, the government news described the excellence of the Basilian book collection in the Mukachevo monastery. Here, the journalist was able to get acquainted with the incunabula, presented in Gothic script and framed in white leather; old prints of the Renaissance period, etc. are also mentioned.⁸⁰ That is, we receive data on the history and opinion of government circles at the same time.

A separate third group consists of periodicals of the general political spectrum, both of the government and of individual political organizations, mainly from the Slovak Republic. Comparing the three groups of periodicals in this way, it will not be difficult to research the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy on the basis of its own periodicals as well as Czech and Slovak periodicals, which will allow to create a more objective view of the periodicals on the activity of the Mukachevo Eparchy.

Some of the government periodicals were found in the *Slovak National Library* in Martin (Slovak Republic). However, it was possible to find little information about MGCE. True, there are articles of general content that concern the Slovak state and the Catholic Church. An example can be the newspaper “Slovenský východ”, which was published in Košice, and from 1919 contained the supplement “Russkoje slovo”. One of the interesting publications is the attitude to Russia of the Ruthenian intelligentsia, where it is indicated that Russia and its culture were only a means to preserve the Ruthenian people, who did not impose themselves on anyone else as a guardian or friend.⁸¹ For example, this appendix describes the activities of the Hungarian provocateur Arnold Duliskovich during the Austro-Hungarian period. He was allegedly supported by Greek Catholic priests, who provoked the elite. Later there was an

⁷⁹ Senšiční zatčení Ukrajinců. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 21. srpna 1926, nr. 96, p. 1.

⁸⁰ BRADAČ, Ludvig: Knihovna kláštera svatého Vasilia v Mukačevě. In: *Podkarpatské hlasy*, 18. června 1936, nr. 136, pp. 2–3.

⁸¹ Россия была для всѣхъ только средствомъ. In: *Slovenský východ a Русское слово*, 20. novembra 1919, nr. 224, p. 3.

article on 26 ordinary Orthodox peasants of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, who were persecuted by the gendarmes for their religious beliefs.⁸² There is, in particular, an agreement on relations between the Apostolic Capital and the authorities of the Czechoslovak Republic. The publication was about establishing the borders of the Eparchy within the boundaries of Subcarpathian Ruthenia.⁸³ In the periodicals, there is also an accusation of the former dean Sabo of the Mukachevo Eparchy of ties with Hungary and attempts to return of its government.⁸⁴ The anti-Hungarian theme prevailed in the perception of the entire Greek Catholic clergy, although in reality, the clergy was very diverse both in terms of origin and views.

So, in this article under consideration, church and secular periodicals from 1918 to 1945 were studied. It must be said that those publications that were official publications of the Mukachevo Eparchy or were published by priests, had a lot in common. The exception to the official journals of the Eparchy were the decrees of the Eparchyal government that concerned priests and believers in parishes. The journals were unofficial, but related to Eparchyal structures or clergy, mainly contained missionary and informative topics from the history of the Church or current religious news. Journals of government circles contained controversial rhetoric of church-state relations, presented critical essays, as well as the news from the life of the Church. Therefore, the comparison of different views made it possible to compare the data of different journals and obtain more reliable and objective information.

Zhrnutie

Dejiny Mukačevskej gréckokatolíckej eparchie v periodikách z rokov 1918 – 1945

Vo svojej štúdií sa autor pokúša kriticky analyzovať dejiny Mukačevskej diecézy (eparchie) na základe dobových publikácií. V prvom rade sa pozornosť sústreďuje na regionálnu tlač. Vo všeobecnosti sa skúmali cirkevné aj svetské publikácie. Sledované obdobie výskumu umožňuje nielen porovnávať rôzne časopisy, ale aj skúmať protichodné názory, spôsoby rozvoja a hodnoty vo vzťahoch medzi cirkvou a štátom. Hlavnou úlohou výskumu bolo skúmať nielen pertraktované témy publikácií, ale

⁸² Дулишковичъ и попы мыдьяроны. In: *Slovenský východ a Русское слово*, 20. novembra 1919, nr. 225, p. 3.

⁸³ Úprava cirkevných pomerov v ČSR. In: *Slovenský východ*, 25. mája 1928, nr. 121, p. 1.

⁸⁴ Maďarskí iredentisti a mukačevský dekan Szabó. In: *Slovenský východ*, 12. februára 1928, nr. 36, p. 1.

aj názory, ktorým sa jednotlivé periodiká venovali. Obsah periodík závisel aj od vydavateľa a redaktora. Je zrejmé, že v cirkevných periodikách sa možno stretnúť s témami náboženského, misijného charakteru a dokonca aj s kritikou politických ideológií. Na druhej strane vládne periodiká publikovali aj kritické eseje o Cirkvi, ako aj samostatné názory na vzťahy medzi štátom a cirkvou. Kým v cirkevných periodikách prevládali náboženské témy a problémy ochrany cirkvi, tak vo vládných či nezávislých periodikách sa okrem všeobecných správ objavovali aj kritické články o cirkvi. Osobitná pozornosť bola venovaná historickým témam v týchto periodikách o dejinách Mukačevskej gréckokatolíckej eparchie (MGCE). Vo všeobecnosti informácie v časopisoch a tlači môžu výrazne doplniť historické poznatky nielen o dejinách gréckokatolíckej cirkvi, ale aj o podobe štátno-cirkevných vzťahov a o dejinách Československa a Podkarpatskej Rusi v sledovanom období.