

The territorial development of Mukachevo's eparchy in the Middle Ages and the early modern period

Vavrinec ŽEŇUCH*

Abstract

The history of each ecclesiastical territory unit affected its region. The origin of Mukachevo's eparchy is unique especially since it is the eparchy which was not governed by any ecclesiastical or state nobility. This matter shapes it into the distinctive model of the formation of an autonomous ecclesiastical unit. The forming of parochial and structure is related to Wallachian colonisation and following development of this region in modern times. The goal we established is an analysis of first events, which related to the formation of Mukachevo's eparchy title, later we follow the development of the title of the eparchy itself as long as its jurisdictional territory until the year 1771.

Keywords: Mukachevo's eparchy, Orthodox people, ecclesiastical administration, Greek Catholics, Hungary

Introduction

Current eparch of Mukachevo resides in Uzhgorod in Ukraine even though his residential historical city is Mukachevo. The Mukachevo eparchy is the mother eparchy of various eparchies in Slovakia (Prešov, Košice, Bratislava), Czech Republic (Prague), Hungary (Miskolc, Nyíregyháza, Hajdúdorog) or in the USA (Pittsburgh, Parma, Passaic Phoenix, Toronto). The most of those eparchies create their church structure Sui Iuris but historically they report to Mukachevo. The eparchy has a moved history. Since it was not a Catholic diocese, it was deprived of the benefits which belonged to other church institutions in the Hungary until the year 1771. From historical texts we can conclude that neither eparchy nor the eparch had property similar to the Catholic bishops, which would have served as the material security of the bishop as well as his mansion. The mansion itself or we can say the residency was the Basilian monastery, which was situated near Mukachevo. The local Vladika was usually a part of the monastery or he became one after he had been elected bishop. The first mentions about the eparchy or the eparch are from the later Middle Ages. They are

* Vavrinec ŽEŇUCH is PhD Student at University in Prešov, e-mail: vavrinec.zenuch@smail.unipo.sk.

rather torsional information. At the time of reformation and recatholization the amount of information increased. Today we know this eparchy and its inheritors as the Greek Catholics. The church unions or the change into Catholics had not begun until the 17th century, when the recatholisation was taking place in the region of the north-eastern Hungary. In that time at the instigation of the landowner Druget the first union dialogues started, and they resulted in the church union in Krásny Brod in the year 1612. The union was not accepted by the Mukachevo eparch but by the presbyters and folded into the hands of the Polish bishop. The Orthodox eparchy was further led by the eparch of Mukachevo but this situation was a stimulus to confessionalisation of the Orthodox in Hungary. The Mukachevo eparchs were still under the strong influence of the landowners of Mukachevo. After the Rákoci family became the landowners (1627), the influence of the reformed Church to the Orthodox intensified in this region. The whole situation escalated in the year 1646, when 82 presbyters joined the Church union in Uzhgorod. Afterwards, one of them became the bishop of Mukachevo, which caused a gradual change of the Orthodox presbyters to the Catholic priests. Since the Catholic church territorial organisation has different rules than the Orthodox one, this question caused big questions in the function of the Uniats. The bishop of Mukachevo as well as the presbyters were subordinated to the Latin bishop of Eger and the bishop of Mukachevo became the ceremonial vicar of the Latin language. This suspension caused numerous problems and a pressure between the bishop of Eger and his vicar. The Catholic church structures were careful towards the bishop from Mukachevo. The big problem was also the ambiguity of the canonical existence of the bishop of Mukachevo. The time after the year 1646 was full of significant changes, which led to the gradual catholicisation of the presbyters as well as the Orthodox. The changes had an impact also on the everyday life and helped to increase the education of the inhabitants and the Uniats presbyters transformed into the prominent Catholic theologians. In Mukachevo a seminary was established and later also a school for the teachers. These changes aimed to the emancipation of the presbyters as well as the bishop of Mukachevo, who wanted to break free from subordination to the bishop of Eger. The aspirations culminated in erigation of the diocese of Mukachevo in the year 1771.

There has been a polemic lead for a long time about Mukachevo Orthodox eparch and Mukachevo's eparchy in the historiography. In this relation we can conclude the results of the historiography into two primary questions: Did Muckachevo's eparchy exist before the year 1771? If so, who is the first eparch? The whole discussion has its origins and has continued for more than two hundred years. Most of the authors start with an existence of documents which were supposed to be published by Mukachevo eparch or they should have been addressed to him. In the historiography the eparchy is inextricably linked with the Monastery of St. Nicholas in Mukachevo, where this eparch

resided (The selective historiography, which opens this topic: Vasil', 2000, pp. 86-87, 89-92; Fenich, 2016, pp. 5-34; Coranič, 2014, pp. 32-35; Žeňuch and Vasil', 2003, pp. 250-251; Bazilovič, 2012, p. 19; Šturák, 1999, pp. 11-13; Lacko, 2012, pp. 29-32; Vegseő, 2011, pp. 13-16). The important question is “Who legally established it?” or “Was it even being legally established?” However, nobody answered our questions. The monastery was established in the 15th century next to a hill Chernec, which got its name due to monks (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 1-2; Bazilovič, 2012, pp. 30-31). The monastery did not origin as the first one in a territory of north-eastern Hungary nor did it possess a dominant position. To understand the first Orthodox ecclesiastical territorial-legal status in this territory of Hungary[‡] it is necessary to perceive the Byzantine-Slavic rite in a context of constant changes and effort to adapt flexibly to conditions and possibilities.

1. Genesis of Eparchy

The arrival of the Byzantine-Slavic rite to a territory of Subcarpathia relates to the arrival of inhabitants after the invasion of the Tatars in the years 1241-1242, where inhabitants from Ukraine and Romania came to a sparsely populated area of the northern Hungary (Kónya, 2014, p. 54).

The incoming residents had their own cultural and rite identity. The first Orthodox presbyters in the Slovak territory is possible to document only after the year 1437 in a village Koromľa (Uličný, 1995, p. 311). The first administrative and legal centre of the Orthodox was established in the followed territory on the 13th of August in 1391 in Hrushovo (Грушово, UA) (ANRS/C/G Nr. 1, f. 1-3; ŠAZO/151/25, 11 f. 3-4; Mihályi, 1900, pp. 109-111). In Hrushovo there was an Orthodox monastery, which was established in the 14th century and its patron was St. Michael Archangel. In the mentioned year, the Patriarch Anton of Constantinople granted it special rights and privileges, which had an administrative character. The monastery became a spiritual and cultural centre of Subcarpathia region. An archimandrite administers counties Szatmár, Bereg, Ugocsa, Bihar and Máramaros (ANRS/C/G Nr. 1, f. 1-3; ŠAZO/151/25, 11 f. 3-4; Mihályi, 1900, pp. 109-111). This territory is often defined by properties of genus Sas. For instance, M. Lučkaj quantified the territory into thirty-four municipalities (Vasil', 2000, p. 35). This number cannot be perceived as binding. From later realia we assume that an administrative outreach was far more extensive since the territory cannot be defined only by a relevant genus. The archimandrite disposed also of episcopal ordination and that is the reason why he became the closest auxiliary bishop of the Greek rite in this territory (Žeňuch *et al.*, 2018, pp. LXXV 15 – LXXVI 25). The bishop had a right not only to sanctify the

[‡] or the territory from a source of the river Tisza to river Uh, from northern borders to the flow of the river Tisza.

presbyters but also to verify a document (a form of a credible place). The bishop should have dressed appropriately, kept a distance from women's surroundings and had an obligation to confirm the presbyters in new localities. Moreover, he was supposed to pray for the local church entrusted to him and respect an organisational hierarchy (Žeňuch *et al.*, 2018, pp. 47-48).

In Hungary each bishopric had to be subordinated to the Bishop of Esztergom, who was *Primas Hungariae* (Cherrier, 1839, pp. 234-238). As it was the monastery with a special privilege where a post of archimandrite was connected to a title of bishop, we cannot state that the eparchy in Hrushovo was duly established. The title of bishop was granted to the archimandrite *ad personam*. Naturally, the eparch used the title according to his residency but the local was an archimandrite in the first place, so he used the title that located him to the monastery even though he could sign as an eparch. From the preserved period writing we can assume that the monastery as well as the eparchy were incorporated into the former Hungarian ecclesiastical administration. The benefits are tied to the monastery, it gained a dominant position in the region. The monastery in Hrushovo was multiple times endowed with a king and in its surroundings the Orthodox presbyters were exempt from paying taxes already in the year 1479 (MNL-OL/Q316, 13687; MNL-OL/Q316, 13688; ŠAZO/151/25, 10 f. 1-16; ŠAZO/151/25, 12 f. 1-4). The King's gifts were properties which brought a regular profit. These privileges helped to make a local centre of the Orthodox ecclesiastical administration from Hrushovo, but it was not the only monastery in the mentioned territory.

2. Transition to Mukachevo

As we have already mentioned, Mukachevo's monastery was established in the 15th century. In the year 1458 the rights for presbyter Luke, who resided in *Monastier* near Mukachevo, were confirmed by a royal decree. The King Matthew approved him benefits from villages *Bobovishte* ((Бобовище, UA) and *Lauka* (Лавки, UA). The whole thing should have been supervised by premonstrates from Leles convention (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 1-2; Bazilovič, 2012, pp. 30-31). The document can be viewed as the first fund for Mukachevo's monastery, which was just being established at those times. This suggests also the Luke's title as a presbyter and *Monastier* as a parish residency. The document from the year 1488 informs us about a monastery and it also mentions past presbyter Luke who is titled in it as a monk (ŠAZO/151/25, 14 f. 1). The content of the document states property disagreements, which later had a significant importance for a context of the first bishop in Mukachevo. The paper from the year 1491 states a position of the monastery in Mukachevo. A lot of authors have interpreted the paper as the first mention of the Mukachevo's bishop, therefore

bishopric (Vasil', 2000, p. 86-87, 89-92; Fenich, 2016, pp. 5-34; Coranič, 2014, pp. 32-35; Žeňuch and Vasil', 2003, pp. 250-251; Bazilovič, 2012, p. 19; Šturák, 1999, pp. 11-13; Lacko, 2012, pp. 29-32; Vegseő, 2011, pp. 13-16). This misinterpretation originated by an uncritical interpretation of the archival documents and taking conclusions from older historiography. The monastery in Mukachevo had its territory; however, as it follows from the content of the document, the monastery was subordinated to an archimandrite with an episcopal ordination, who resided in Hrushovo (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 5-6; Bazilovič, 2012, pp. 32-35).

In this time the king issued two decrees. The first one was dedicated to a monastery in Mukachevo, where eparch John was not titled by any title. In the second one a residency of the previously mentioned eparch in Hrushovo is mentioned (ŠAZO/151/25, 11 f. 1-2; ŠAZO/151/25, 15 f. 1-2; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 5-6; Bazilovič, 2012, p. 32-34). As it follows from the preserved archives, this eparch moved to Mukachevo. The eparch did this according to common belief, which states that an overthrown eparch should not act intrigue, but he should retire to a monastery (Žeňuch *et al.*, 2018, pp. XCIV 7-20). The change in eparch's attitude started due to property. Already in the year 1493 the bishop moved to Mukachevo and afterwards he started an argument about properties, which was held from the year 1488. As the argument had started before a transport, the eparch had to meanwhile reside maybe somewhere else or he stayed in Hrushovo.

Paradoxically, until the year 1493 we can date also the first mentions about Koriatovych's donation, which was claimed to be a forgery by a modern historical writing. In relation to Koriatovych's donation eparch John addressed a new landowner of Mukachevo – John from Hunadso he could confirm him privileges which confirmed a right of the monastery to benefits from villages Lauka, Bobovishte and Oroshveg (Mukachevo -Rosvigovo, UA). The eparch acted in this was because a Latin priest Dionysus was against a fact that his -Catholic- believers, who lived in the mentioned villages, should have paid taxes to Orthodox eparch's. The landowner perceived the document handed by the bishop as a forgery and after a comparison with various documents of Teodor Koriatovych he proclaimed it to be the forgery. Moreover, the bishop asked for more than the original fund of King Matthew – benefits from a village Oroshveg. The landowner finally declared a compromise to the document and the village Oroshveg became a part of the fund even though the choice of tithing was limited to the believers of the Eastern rite (Bazilovič, 2012, pp. 94-96; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 7-9).

In years 1493-1494 there was a dispute between a bishop John who moved from Hrushovo to Mukachevo and a new archimandrite of the monastery in Hrushovo. The king Władysław III of Poland issued a binding regulation and determined that an eparch title belongs to John from

Mukachevo and a post archimandrite to Hilár (ŠAZO/151/25, 11 pag 4; ŠAZO/151/25, 18 f. 1-2). The new archimandrite did not have an ordination, which is a reason why he did not sign or be named as an eparch. The eparch from Mukachevo began to demand subsequently all benefits, which had belonged to him as a former Hrushovo's archimandrite and eparch.

Due to his behaviour the eparch in Mukachevo got into an argument, which was resolved by king Władysław III of Poland. The king proclaimed that the eparch John had misunderstood his previous letter and appropriated not only the eparch rights but also the pensions of the monastery. According to king's decision he had to stop acting like this (ŠAZO/151/25, 19 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 9-10). In the year 1498 the title eparch in Mukachevo as Mukachevo's Bishop (*eppus de Monkach*) appeared, but this title was not used in the following centuries (Hodinka, 1911, p. 10; ŠAZO/151/25, 20 f. 1-2). From the documents we can state that the eparchy was not established. The title Bishop from Mukachevo as *Mukachevo's* is an advanced localization of his settlement. After all, he was an emigrate from Hrushovo to Mukachevo and neither the monastery in Hrushovo nor the one in Mukachevo were the residency of the eparch. A situation was *modus vivendi* for the eparch as well as for an archimandrite since it was necessary to do an act of ordination (an ordination of presbyters) and secure an administrative document. The archimandrite still had a high status. Monasteries were also spiritual centres, especially in Hrushovo a lot of manuscript books originated, which implicates that the Orthodox monasteries fulfilled the role of scriptoriums and educational institution as well. The preserved manuscript records reflect a resilience of the local administration as well as an educational activity in the monasteries.

2.1 Naming the Eparchy in 16th century

In the 16th century a toponymal designation of a bishop, which declares his residency, disappeared from the documents. In this context we cannot talk about residential eparchs or eparchy. During the century we can follow various descriptions of the eparch from Mukachevo. In *urbariums* benefits are being transferred in the 16th century to the *Ruthenian bishop from monastery* (*Episcopi Ruthenici ab monasterij*) or he is titled as the *Ruthenian Bishop* (*Episcopo Ruthenorum*) (MNL-OL/E156, fasc. 097/No. 029 f. 33-35). Also decrees issued by monarch Ferdinand referred him as a *Greek Bishop from the temple of St. Nicholas* (*eppus Græcæ religionis præfatae b. Nicolai*) as well as a *Bishop from Ruthenian's in the monastery of St. Nicholas* (*eppus Ruthenorum in clastro b. Nicolai*) or simply as *the Bishop in the monastery of St. Nicholas* (*eppum in clastro b. Nicolai*) (ŠAZO/64/1, 4 f. 13; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 12-14; Bazilovič, 2012, pp. 35-37). At the same time next

to the eparch in Mukachevo acted the eparch in Hrushovo. In Mukachevo in the 50s of the 16th century the eparch Ladislav operated. In this time (a year 1556) the eparch Hilár acted in Hrushovo who was referred in the documents as the *Ruthenian Bishop from the monastery of St. Michael* (*eppum Ruthenum, ut claustrum s. Michaelis*) (Hodinka, 1911, p. 16). The eparch Hilár operated in Hrushovo until the year 1558, when he transferred to Mukachevo (ŠAZO/151/25, 25 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 16-17). From the preserved documents we can assume that the labelling which had been used in the 90s of the 15th century was not used anymore. None of the bishops was a resident bishop only a member of a monastery. Isabelle – a wife of John Zápolya- referred Hilár as *Episcopi ex caeterorum Fratrum Monachorum in Claustro Ruthenorum Divo Nicolao*, so as *the Bishop from brothers monks of Ruthenian monastery of Divo Nicolao*, thus she did not referred to him as a resident bishop in Mukachevo (ŠAZO/151/25, 25 f. 1).

This state points to a persistence of the privilege which was granted by the Patriarch of Constantinople to a monastery in Hrushovo. Wilfulness by which the bishops moved to Mukachevo, where they brought and applied a mentioned privilege, points to a peripheral influence of the Patriarch of Constantinople as well as other patriarchs, for example in Kiev. According to the Patriarch Anton of Constantinople´ privileges from the year 1391 the status of a prior of monastery in Hrushovo was connected to the episcopal ordination (ANRS/C/G Nr. 1, f. 1-3; ŠAZO/151/25, 11 f. 3-4; Mihályi, 1900, pp. 109-111). The documented reports show that archimandrites in Hrushovo continued to receive the ordination and they did it also in Mukachevo. In the year 1498 the eparch John proceeded autonomously in relation to the prior of the monastery in Hrushovo (ŠAZO/151/25, 19 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 9-10). The explanation of the basilian monks and their choice of the bishop among themselves points to this autonomy. Since the year 1569 monks have written about a method of the choice of eparch while his successor is picked by the old eparch (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 21-23). The following development in the 17th century changed this principle and an eparch started to be picked by a landowner of the castle in Mukachevo (Žeňuch and Vasiľ, 2003, p. 252).

2.2 Situation in 17th century

The 17th century brought significant changes in the lives of the Orthodox, who were under the authority of the bishops from Mukachevo and Hrushovo. A rioting that surrounds a whole 17th century also affected the monastery in Hrushovo. The monastery was reconstructed in the year 1607 and the bishop who lived there was not named by an aristocratic predicate from Hrushovo. The eparch from Hrushovo was titled as *Eppo Valachico*, thus the *Wallachian bishop* (ŠAZO/151/25, 36 f. 1;

ŠAZO/151/25, 37 f. 1; ŠAZO/61/5, 16 f. 11 =“*olàh pòspökòk*”). The eparch from Mukachevo was at the beginning of the century referred as *eppum Rutenorum ritus Græci in monasterio prope Munkacz*, thus as the *Ruthenian Bishop of the Greek rite in the monastery near Mukachevo* (Hodinka, 1911, p. 43). All the mentioned expressions can be found in a file and after the century a phrase *Mukachevo's bishop* (*eppus Munkachientis*) appears again. The reasons behind this arrival relate to a continuous administrative development in the Orthodox church (Hodinka, 1911, p. 44). In the year 1623 the territory of the Greek union (a territorial association) was established and it included presbyters from a territory of counties Bereg, Ung, Sabolcs, Zemplén, Máramaros and Sáros (Hodinka, 1911, p. 53; ŠAZO/64/1, 4 f. 2-3). Its definition points to a process of establishing a territorial division according to the example of the Catholic church. However, it was not a definition of the territory of eparchy but autonomous part, since after two hundred years of autonomous development and intensifying of reformation pressure, the territory needed to be strictly defined. A territorial community was internally divided into districts. It is suggested by a mandate issued from the year 1624 by Paul Rákóczi in which he granted freedom to presbyters from Makovica. It was later a separate district (ŠAZO/151/25, 45 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 56-57).

Since the year 1627 the Greek union has not been mentioned subsequently with a sole mention of eparch in Mukachevo and Máramaros. These titles were connected. The new eparch was marked in the documents as a Bishop of Mukachevo and Máramaros (*eppo Munkacsiensi et Maramorosiensi*) (ŠAZO/151/25, 52 f. 1-3; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 57-59). The bishop was named by a landowner of Mukachevo, Gabriel Bethlen, who chose him as the right person for this position. Administratively he named him as the eparch of Mukachevo and Máramaros, which again defined its jurisdiction differently. It is clear from this that a post of the bishop in Máramaros was not filled. The eparch John Gregorovič had his jurisdiction determined in the territory of Greek union from the year 1623 to which a county Szatmár was connected to. The right to a free movement in the territory, which was defined by counties Bereg, Ung, Sabolcs, Zemplén, Szatmár and Máramaros, was granted to him as well (ŠAZO/151/25, 57 f. 1). The canonical organisation of the Diocese of Eger, where the Orthodox and previously mentioned eparchs resided, also affected the administrative and legal definition. The territory which was entrusted to him extended from the northern and eastern borders of Hungary to a western boarder of Eger diocese. The southern boarder can be defined by boarders of counties Máramaros, Szatmár, Sabolcs and Zemplén. The territory of these counties cannot be perceived in the whole since it can be only a part of the territory where the Orthodox parishes resided in its jurisdiction. From the content of appointment decree, we can assume that the Orthodox eparchs were under the authoritative influence of reformative seniors. By this change we can look at a convergence

of these two religions especially at an administrative level (ŠAZO/151/25, 52 f. 1-3; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 57-59).

The eparch Bazil Tarasovič became a bishop based on the will of the eparch John Gregorovič and the choice of the monks with a help of reformed seniors (Hodinka, 1911, p. 64; ŠAZO/151/25, 61 f. 1-3). It was done by a method (choice), which was written by monks in the document from the year 1569. The choice was significantly influenced by a recommendation of a previous eparch. The eparch from Alba Iulia gave an ordination to Tarasovič (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 63-66; ŠAZO/151/25, 62 f. 1-3). The jurisdiction of eparch Bazil was connected to counties Bereg, Ung, Sabolcs, Ugocsa, Szatmár and Máramaros. His jurisdictional territory was not defined in Rákóczi's certificate of appointment issue. However, he was granted a passport for previously mentioned territories, which allowed him a free movement for the purpose of visitations of parishes (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 66-67; ŠAZO/151/25, 64 f. 1.). From the preserved documents and seals follows that even the eparch himself was titled as *the Bishop of Mukachevo and Máramaros* (ŠAZO/151/25, 67 pag 1-4). The reason why Bazil Tarasovič used this double title is not known. In the Máramaros's territory the eparch Dozitej and later Demeter operated. The territory Máramaros was mentioned in the report written by Bazil after the synod from the year 1639 (Lacko, 2012, pp. 72-73). Paradoxically, the existence of other eparchs did not stop from using their titles or connecting of jurisdictional territories. It relates to a crisis, which affected a byzantine ceremony from Mediterranean to Carpathians (Lacko, 2012, p. 72; Baán, 2012, 320 pp.). The eparch Bazil decided to join the union with the Catholic church. The Congregation for the Spreading of the Faith did not know how to localise where the eparch had his residency, he was even mistaken to be a patriarch (*Ruthenorum Patriarchæ*) (Lacko, 2012, p. 198). Later he was localised in Moldova since about the existence of bishopric in Mukachevo they did not have any reports. It follows from the correspondence that a jurisdictional situation was known to the Congregation but the bishopric in Mukachevo or the one in Máramaros did not perceive it as existing (Lacko, 2012, pp. 85-87). It is confirmed by a reluctant confirmation of the bishop Peter Parténus as well.

3. After union in Uzhhorod

The first ceremonial vicar of the united Ruthenians, Peter Parténus, was confirmed after four years from his ordination. His title was a Bishop of the Ruthenian Nation of Mukachevo and the whole territory of Hungary (*eppiscopum Ruthenorum degentium Munchák, et in alijs locis Hungarie*) (ŠAZO/151/1, 23 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, p. 178). A lot of authors perceive this information as a formal

confirmation about the existence of Mukachevo's eparchy (Vasil', 2000, pp. 86-87, 89-92; Fenich, 2016, pp. 5-34; Coranič, 2014, pp. 32-35; Vegseő, 2011, pp. 13-16). The formulation of the papal throne was reluctant. It did not localise its residency but the nation who he administered. Only an emperor appointed him for a Bishop of Mukachevo, who exercised his apostolic right in Hungary and appointed Peter for the Bishop of Mukachevo (ŠAZO/151/1, 25 f. 1).

It is clear that the territory Máramaros did not belong to the administration of Peter Parténus. The ordainer of Peter, the eparch Stefan Simonovics, used a title of the eparch of Máramaros by himself (Hodinka, 1911, p. 158). Later (after the year 1665) in Máramaros an Orthodox bishop operated there and he was an opposite to the Bishop in Mukachevo (ŠAZO/151/1, 111 f. 1). During the uprising of Francis II. Rákóczi the monastery in Hrushovo disappeared and the Orthodox eparch operated in this locality until the year 1735 (Kónya *et al.*, 2010, p. 111; The end of the administrative merger is evidenced by the complete transposition of the administration of the Máramaros area in 1735. Compare ŠAZO/151/1, 534 f. 1-3; ŠAZO/151/1, 536 f. 1-2; ŠAZO/151/1, 537 f. 1-2; It states that the bishops of Marmaros were under the faithful influence of the Prince of Transylvania. ZSatkovics, 1909, pp. 14-15.).

It follows from the documents that the territory administered by a vicar in Mukachevo was changing. It primarily related to an acceptance of the union and secondary with a king's reaction to the events in the north-eastern Hungary. The jurisdiction of the bishop Parténus was very specific, he was a ceremonial vicar at the territory of the diocese of Eger and also a visitator of Szepes in the territory of Esztergom diocese (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 159-160). It did not implicate an acceptance of the Orthodox believers or the clergy. The vicar managed pastoral travels and particular presbyters, or archimandrites professed his acceptance as their bishop. In the year 1664 also the archimandrite of Mukachevo's monastery Theofil accepted Peter Parténus and he informed of this fact the Bishop of Eger. Until this time the bishop resided in Uzhgorod. It follows from the documents that he administered the territory of counties Ung, Zemplén and Sáros, after the year 1664 also Bereg (ŠAZO/151/1, 39 f. 1; Hodinka, 1911, pp. 203-204). In the year 1654 the archbishop Lippaj subordinated the Serbs of Greek rite in the territory of Esztergom and Győr diocese under the jurisdiction of Peter Parténus (Hodinka, 1911, pp. 168-174). During the administration of Theofanis Mavrogorgatos in the year 1677 there was a territory of counties Bereg, Máramaros, Zemplén, Sáros, Szepes, Komarno[§], Szatmár and Ugocsa under his administration (Baán, 2012, pp. 260-261). In the year 1689 the territory of vicarage was defined in the bul of Alexander VIII. by counties Sáros (103

[§] M. Lacko assumed that the believers from Komárno were not mentioned in the report written by the Bishop in Mukachevo. Compare Lacko, 2012, p. 158.

parishes), Zemplén (130 parishes), Abaúj (15 parishes), Borsod (6 parishes), Sabolcs (31 parishes), Szatmár (92 parishes), Máramaros (135 parishes), Ugocsa (29 parishes), Bereg (77 parishes), Ung (57 parishes), Szepes (11 parishes), Gömör (1 parish) and Torna (3 parishes). The whole vicarage consisted of 690 parishes, 858 temples and 145 107 believers (ŠAZO/151/1, 1 f. 5; ŠAZO/151/1, 90 f. 1). In the year 1690 the territory under administration of the vicar included also Bihar, Borsod, Heves and Szolnok (Hodinka, 1911, p. 299). Szepes was a part of a vicar's report in Mukachevo until the year 1711, when political changes appeared in the monarchy that related to the ending of uprisings of the states in the country. The territory of the vicar was in the year 1699 expanded to a territory of Cluj county (ŠAZO/151/1, 139 f. 1). After the year 1711 the whole vicarage was reduced to the territory of Eger diocese.

The bishops continued to be titled by themselves. The bishop Parténius gave himself a title the Bishop of Mukachevo, Krásny Brod, Szepes and of all his territories (*Eppus Munkacsiensis, Krasnobrodensis, Scepusiensis et omnium Diotionum suæ*) (ÖSA/HHUSA/UA/SF274, fol. 9-10; Hodinka, 1911, p. 183). In two localities – Mukachevo and Krásny Brod there were the Orthodox monasteries, which points to an acceptance of the local structures. The Uniats' bishop Jozef Vološanský titled himself in the year 1674 as the Orthodox Bishop of Mukachevo, Krásny Brod, Makovica, Máramaros, Szepes and all the territories of Hungary (*Pravoslaenêj Ep÷ps Mukaèeaskñj, Krasno Brodckñj, Makoæeckñj, Mari&mori&skñj Spi&skðj n& vseì zemln& Ougrskñi*) (ŠAZO/151/1, 62 f. 1). In the year 1690 John Joseph De Camelis used the title Bishop of Sebaste, Mukachevo, also of Máramaros, Krásny Brod, Makovica, Szepes, Komárno, etc., the apostolic vicar of the inhabitants of the Greek rite of Hungary (*eppo Sebastensi, Munkács., nec non Marmar., Krasnobrod., Makovicz., Scepus., Komaranensi etc. Vikaro aptolico populorum r. gr. in tota Ungaria*) (Hodinka, 1911, p. 300). He used it so he could show his jurisdiction over various territories that he administered. Extracting exact locations points to a variability as well as an ambiguity of the vicariate's boundaries. After all, these are not the boundaries of one Latin diocese. Even the ecclesiastical administration on the basis of the Ninth Constitution of the Fourth Lateran Council did not allow one jurisdictional territory to have more bishops, the second should have always been a vicar (Zubko, 2016, p. 7).** The vicar was always bound to the particular diocese where he should have had his scope (locality, ethnicity, rite). The mentioned vicars belonged to the Greek rite, which

** Medieval or modern church practise did not recognise a status of an auxiliary bishop. It always has one territory, one resident bishop. The other bishops could be appointed as titular bishops, but it does not mean that they had to be ordained. In terms of mass a titular bishop, abbot / provost, or other church prelates (canonists) had the right to serve a pontifical service. In terms of administration only a resident bishop had jurisdiction over a diocese. A vicar had a limited jurisdiction on particular rite, language, ethnicity, territory even only to the diocese where he held his post.

is declared by the unifying element. The vicar would have to be appointed in each diocese. Such practices were not preserved.

Conclusions - was the eparchy erigated (before 1771) or not?

After the year 1711 a vicar in Mukachevo was titled by the royal office as the Bishop of Mukachevo. From the church point of view, it was a vicar of the Bishop of Eger and a titular bishop (ŠAZO/151/1, 227 f. 1; ŠAZO/151/1, 250 pag. 1-5). The whole situation was finished by a canonical erigation of the Mukachevo's diocese of the Greek rite, which was established in the year 1771 (ŠAZO/151/1, 2206 f. 1-7). The establishment of the diocese had a major impact on the historical development of the believers of the Byzantine rite. The diocese became a cultural and educational centre for Ruthenians in Hungary. The specific culture of Greek Catholics developed already in the territory of the vicariate and later in the diocese.

The origin of the eparchy is generally debatable, but the geopolitical relations helped to preserve a ceremonial affiliation of the believers. We can clearly state that the eparchy was not erigated by anyone and it was established gradually on the basis of the transfer of forming archimandrite from Hrushovo to Mukachevo. Mainly the significance of Mukachevo as a dominion helped to preserve the eparchy even in exchange of its transport. After the first residences of bishops, that were aristocratic predicates not the signs for a functioning residence, the eparchy started to be established in the 17th century. It was not an eparchy defined on the basis of the territory, but the main element was religion. This phenomenon that the main element is not the border but the faith, makes from the eparchy/bishopric a unique jurisdictional case. The origins of ecclesiastical administration's formation are debatable but the heritage which it left behind testifies to the diversity of problems as well as an ability to adapt.

The erigation of the diocese had a bigger impact than the origin of a new Church territorial unit in Hungary. The Mukachevo diocese was established as Latin (Roman catholic) dioceses with a supplement that it belongs to a Greek rite. Its territory was not surrounded by Latin dioceses, but they overlapped. This caused violation against common paradigm of Latin church, which was based on conclusions of the fourth Lateran council from its ninth constitution. On its basis two dioceses were not allowed to overlap territorially since this fact was explained through a prism of a body (=diocese) and a head (=bishop). Each body should have only one head, thus each territory is allowed to have only one bishop. Precedence from the church development in a relation with Mukachevo diocese influenced various Catholic structures in the world.

Especially the consequences were palpable in a relation between the bishop of Eger and his former vicar. The bishop Esterházy, who was a residential bishop of Eger, asked his priests to be supportive towards presbyters of Greek rite, not to calumniate and receive doses from them (Kónya *et al.*, 2010, p. 210). A lot of them decided to ignore this regulation and this is the reason why numerous disputes between the presbyters and priests ended on capital courts. Often the disputes rose from the different liturgical calendar and holidays. In this relation Maria Theresa made a move when she pushed to the Greek Catholics in Hungary with the unification of the holidays by the Latin Church. The Pope, however, limited the effort of the Queen and established an abundance of holidays for Hungarian Greek Catholics identical with the Orthodox church. These disputes ended often similarly as the situation between the clergy, on the capital courts.

The origin of the bishopric had another important consequence which was related to a denial of the historical memory. As we mentioned above, the bishop operated in Mukachevo for more than three hundred years. Gradually he started to be titled as Mukachevo's eparch or a bishop. Although the erection of the bishopric meant a victory of vicars' efforts of independence from Eger Episcopal See, it caused a discontinuity in the historical memory. That is the reason why the question about the existence of Mukachevo's bishopric in the past was still present, the mythical existence of Koriatovych's donation, which the bishop Battyany proved wrong in the time of the erection of the bishopric (Bazilovič, 2012, p. 112). The historical memory was constantly culminated and multiple times misinterpreted. In the 19th century the Mukachevo diocese reports even in the official schematisms to the existence of Mukachevo orthodox eparchy and the mentions about the bishops are interpreted as the Episcopal period. Naturally, the bishops after the year 1771 are detached without clear interpretation. In this context, the memory eliminated all negative aspects and information which would not confirm this condition (the nonexistence of the Cathedral church, the nonexistence of bishop's properties, the ambiguous origin of the bishopric). It influenced the development of the Ruthinian national revival in many ways as well as their national story. From the documents it is clear that the territory of Mukachevo orthodox eparchy in the Medieval time was connected to today's territory of Romania. This connection was close even in the modern age, when the candidates for the bishop chirotony went to Alba Iulia. The relations towards the bishop in Hrushovo are still unexplored in many ways and he was even labelled as the Wallachian bishop and later his territory was incorporated into Mukachevo bishopric.

By referring to the roots of Mukachevo diocese as well as to the first mention from Hrushovo we detached a romanticizing historical memory from a demonstrable history again. Today's eparchy based in Uzhgorod has turbulent history; its roots are related to the Wallachian colonisation of

Hungary and its history (especially the year 1771) influenced the whole Catholic world. We believe that even this text will be a stimulus for further (critical) reassessment of history also in relation to the bishoprics in Romania and Moldova.

Acknowledgement: The study is part of the project VEGA 1/0736/18 The transformations of economic, social, confessional and cultural development of agricultural cities and towns in the territory of the Eastern Slovakia in the 17th - 19th. century.

References

- Arhivele Naționale ale României – Sibiu (ANRS), Colecția de acte fasciculate (C), G. Probleme religioase (G), Nr. 1, f. 1-3.
- Державний архів закарпатської області [Derzhavnij archiv zakarpatskoji oblasti] (Next ŠAZO), 64 Мукачівський чернечий монасти ротців Василіан, м. Мукачеве (64)/ Опись [Opis] 1, Документ №. [Dokument No.] 4.
- ŠAZO/64/ Опись [Opis] 5, Документ №. [Dokument No.] 16
- ŠAZO/151 Правління Мукачівської греко-католицької єпархії, м. Ужгород [Pravlinnja Mukačivskoj greko-katolicheskoj eparchiji m. Uzhorod] (Next 151)/ Опись [Opis] 1, Документ №. [Dokument No.] 1, 23, 25, 37, 39, 62, 90, 111, 139, 227, 250, 534, 536, 537, 2206.
- ŠAZO/151/ Опись [Opis] 25, Документ №. [Dokument No.] 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 25, 36, 45, 52, 57, 61, 62, 64, 67.
- Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár (MNL-OL), Q 316, 13687.
- Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár (MNL-OL), Q316, 13688
- Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár (MNL-OL), E156, fasc. 097/No. 029
- Österreichisches Staats archiv (ÖSA), Haus-, Hof- und Staat archiv (HHUSA), Ungarische Akten (UA), Specialia Fasc.(SF) 274, fol 9-10
- Baán, I. (2012), *Theofánisz Mavrogordatosz (1626 – 1688) paronaxiai metropolita munkácsi adminisztrátor = Theophanes Mavrogordatos (1626 – 1688) Metropolitan of Paronaxia and Administrator of Munkács*. Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola.
- Bazilovič, J. (2012), *Dejiny Gréckokatolíckej cirkvi v Uhorsku* in: Bizoňová, M. and Coranič, J. (eds.), Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej university.

- Cherrier, N. J. (1839), *Enchiridion juris ecclesiastici, cum singulari ad alienas confessiones attentione*. I. Pestini : Adolph. Hartleben.
- Coranič, J. (2014), *Z dejín Gréckokatolíckej cirkvi na Slovensku*. České Budějovice: Sdružení sv. Jana Nepomuckého při Biskupství českobudějovickém.
- Hodinka, Antal. *A Munkácsi gör. szert. Püspökség Okmánytára*. Ungvár: Hodinka Antal, 1911
- Kónya, P. (2014), Valašské obyvatel'stvo východného Slovenska v procese reformácie a rekatolizácie. in: Syrný, M. and Mârza, E. (eds.), *Valašská kolonizácia na Slovensku a Slovenská kolonizácia v Rumunsku*. Banská Bystrica: Múzeum Slovenského národného povstania, pp. 54-65.
- Kónya, P. et al. (2010), *Konfesionalizácia na Slovensku v 16. – 18. storočí*. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove.
- Lacko, M. (2012), *Užhorodská únia Karpatských Rusínov s Katolíckou cirkvou*. Košice: Dobrá kniha.
- Mihályi, J. (1900), *Máramarosi diplomák a XIV. és XV. századból*. Máramaros-Sziget: Mayer és Berger.
- Šturák, P. (1999), *Dejiny Gréckokatolíckej cirkvi v Československu v rokoch 1945-1989*. Prešov: Petra, n. o.
- Uličný, F. (1995), *Dejiny osídlenia užskej župy*. Prešov: FF UPJŠ.
- Vasiľ, C. (2000), *Kánonické pramene byzantsko-slovanskej katolíckej cirkvi v Mukačevskej a Prešovskej eparcchii v porovnaní s Kódexom kánonov východných cirkví*. Trnava: Dobrá kniha.
- Véghseő, T. (2011), „... mint igaz egyházi ember...“ *A történelmi Munkácsi Egyházmegye görögkatolikus egyházának létrejötte és 17. századi fejlődése*. Nyíregyháza : Szent Atanáz Görög Katolikus Hittudományi Főiskola.
- Žeňuch, P. and Vasiľ, C. (2003), *Cyrillic Manuscripts from East Slovakia Slovak Greek Catholics: Defining Factors and Historical Milieu = Cyrilské rukopisy z východného Slovenska Slovenská gréckokatolíci, vzťahy a súvislosti*. Roma – Bratislava – Košice : Pontificio Istituto Orientale – Slavistický kabinet SAV – Centrum spirituality Východ – Západ Michala Lacka.
- Žeňuch, P. et al. (2018), *Užhorodský rukopisný Pseudozonar. In Užhorodský rukopisný Pseudozonar Pravidlá mníšskeho a svetského života z prelomu 16. – 17. storočia = Ужгородський рукописний Псевдозонар Правила монашеской и светской жизни рубежа XVI – XVII. В [Užgorodckij rukopisnij Psevdozonar Pravila monascheskoj i svetskoj zhizni rubezhca XVI. – XVII. vv] Bratislava – Moskva – Sofia – Košice: Veda – Slavistický ústav Jána Stanislava SAV – Институт российской истории РАН – Кирило-Методиевски научен център БАН – Slovenský komitét slavistov – Centrum spirituality Východ-Západ Michala Lacka Teologickej fakulty TU.*

- Zsatkovics, K. Gy. (1909), *A máramarosi görög szertartású orosz egyház ésvicariatus történelme*.
Ungvár: Jog Fentartva.
- Zubko, P. (2016), O dokumente Užhorodskej únie z 24. apríla 1646. In *Slavica Slovaca*, 51(1), pp. 3-9.
- Фенич[Fenich], В[V]. (2016), Міфи і стереотипи в історії греко-католиків Мукачівської єпархії
[Mifi i stereotipi v istoriji greko-katolikiv Mukačivskojj eparchiji], in: Coranič, J. (ed.),
Gréckokatolícka cirkev na Slovensku vo svetle výročí IV b. Prešov: Gréckokatolícka teologická
fakulta, pp. 5-34.