

Series II - « ANALECTA OSBM » - Sectio I
Серія II - « ЗАПИСКИ ЧСВВ » - Секція I

ALEXANDER DUCHNOVIČ

THE HISTORY
OF
THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠEV

Translated and supplemented with notes by
ATHANASIUS B. PEKAR, OSBM

Ed. 2

ROME 1971

PP. Basiliani - Via S. Giosafat, 8 (Aventino)

ANNALS OF THE ORDER OF SAINT BASIL
THE GREAT

SECTION I

Series II - «ANALECTA OSBM» - «ЗАПИСКИ ЧСВВ» - Серія II

Sectio -I- Section

OPERA-WORKS

vol. XXV

ALEXANDER DUCHNOVIČ

THE HISTORY OF THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠEV

ROMAE - ROME

Series II - « ANALECTA OSBM » - Sectio I
Серія II - « ЗАПИСКИ ЧСВВ » - Секція I

ALEXANDER DUCHNOVIČ

THE HISTORY
OF
THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠEV

Translated and supplemented with notes by
ATHANASIUS B. PEKAR, OSBM

Ed. 2

ROME 1971

PP. Basiliani - Via S. Giosafat, 8 (Aventino)

WITH ECCLESIASTICAL PERMISSION



CANON ALEXANDER DUCHNOVIČ
1803 - 1865

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	VII
<i>The Original Title of Manuscript</i>	IX
<i>The Dedication of the work</i>	1
Introduction	3
BOOK ONE - THE VICARIATE OF KOŠICE	7
1. General Remarks	9
2. Formation of the Košice Vicariate	12
3. Biography of Michael Bradač	27
BOOK TWO - THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠEV	31
1. Division of the Mukačevo Eparchy	33
2. Administration of Bishop G. Tarkovič	47
3. Bishop's Residence	56
4. Eparchial Library	60
5. The Cathedral Church	65
<i>Appendix to Book Two</i>	69
BOOK THREE - THE CHAPTER	73
1. General Information	75
2. First Members of the Chapter	76
3. Promotions Within the Chapter	86
BOOK FOUR - CATHEDRAL PARISH IN PRJAŠEV	93
1. Parish Priests	95
2. Clergy Assisting the Bishop	99
<i>Appendix</i>	102

FOREWORD

At the present time various attempts are being made to slovakize our people and our Church in Eastern Slovakia, generally known as — *Prjaševščina*. Since history is our best teacher, we decided to publish the original history of the Prjašev Eparchy, which was written by our great publicist, Canon Alexander Duchnovič. We hope that this excellent work, written “*with sincerity and truth*” in 1846, will help our people to some extent to maintain their religious and national identity.

A native of the Prjašev Eparchy, Alexander Duchnovič (1803-1865) was a great defender of the national and religious heritage of our people living south of the Carpathian Mountains. Though he was, first of all, a dedicated priest, he was also a great poet, accomplished writer and publicist, educator, organizer and our great civic leader. For his great merit our people gave him a name of distinction — “*Father of the People*”.

His complete works, comprehending four large volumes, at the present are being published by K.S.U.T. (our Cultural Organization) in Prjašev. So far the first two volumes of his works, “*Tvory*”, have been reprinted (1st vol. 775 pages; 2nd vol. 937 pages).

Canon Alexander Duchnovič began his literary work in the late thirties, first composing some poetry. In 1846, he completed his first scholarly book, entitled — “*The History of the Prjašev Eparchy*”.¹ It was only the first volume of his more extensive work, comprehending the historical events of the Prjašev Eparchy from the beginning until the death of its first Bishop, the famous Gregory Tarkovič (1818-1841). In the second volume Duchnovič intended to describe the period of Bishop Joseph Gaganec (1843-1875) who, however, survived the author by a good ten years, and thus frustrated his design.

In order to make his history available to the wide circles

¹ The original title — *Chronologica Historia almae Dioecesis Eperjessiensis, ab origine videlicet usque obitum primi Episcopi G. Tarkovics, deducta per Alexandrum Duchnovics, Magistrum Canonicum, anno 1846, Pars I.*

of intelligentsia, Duchnovič composed it in Latin language. Because of the political situation in Hungary at that time (Kossuth's revolution), he was unable to publish his work, but deposited the manuscript in the Archives of the Prjašev Chapter. Nevertheless, he succeeded to smuggle a copy of his manuscript to Russia, where it was later translated by Protopresbyter Constantine Kustodiev, and published in St. Petersburg, 1877.² In 1890, it was translated and published by Rev. Julius Drohobeckyj also in Hungarian.³

In 1943, Rev. Hlib Kinach, O.S.B.M., while working in the eparchial archives in Prjašev, made a copy of the Latin original, which later he brought with him to Rome. This copy was used by us in the preparation of the English translation of Duchnovič's work, in which we tried to follow as closely as possible the original text. In the translation, nevertheless, we omitted some insignificant parts of the text (e.g. complicated titles, numbers of the documents), while at the bottom of the page we added some explanatory notes.

We extend our sincere gratitude to the kind people, who graciously assisted us in the publication of this deserving work. We are especially indebted for ever to our generous Patron who, in his Christian humility, choose to remain anonymous. He made this offer in remembrance of his beloved Parents hailing from the Prjašev Eparchy. His great generosity made our publication possible.

Presenting this historical work of Canon Alexander Duchnovič to our present generation, whose roots reach down deep into the hallowed hills of our venerable Eparchy of Prjašev, we would like to remind them the words of Duchnovič's grandfather spoken to the youth, as he was leaving his home in the pursuit of knowledge: "My son, do not ever forget God and love your own people. By doing so you will not become a rich man, but certainly you will be always happy"⁴

Uniontown, Pa., March 30, 1971.

A. PEKAR, O.S.B.M.

² *Istoriја Prjaševskoj Eparchii*, sočinenije A.V. Duchnoviča, perevel s neizdannoј latinskoј rukopisi Prot. K. Kustodiev, S. Peterburg, 1877; reprinted in O. Duchnovič, *Tvory*, Prjašiv 1967, vol. II, p. 451-528.

³ Duchnovics S., *Az eperjesi egyháznak története*, Ungvár 1890.

⁴ Cfr. Duchnovič, *Tvory*, vol. II, p. 623.

516.

Chronologica Historia
Almae

Diocesis Greffessiensis

ab origine videlicet, usque obitum
primi Episcopi Gregorii Sarkovics,
deducta per

Alexandrum Duchovics.

Cathedralis Ecclesiae Greffessiensis
Magistrum Canonicum Anno 1846.

Pars I^{ma}

The Original Title of Manuscript

*“ Not to know what has happened before one’s
birth it means to remain an infant for ever ”*

Cicero

TO THE ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST
REVEREND MONSIGNOR

JOSEPH GAGANEC

BY THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE * THE SECOND BISHOP OF
PRJAŠEV,
PATRON OF LEARNING * MOST BENEVOLENT
PROTECTOR OF THE EPARCHY,
AND MY MOST GRACIOUS FATHER * AS A TOKEN
OF MY FILIAL DEVOTION AND OBEDIENCE * I HUMBLY
DEDICATE THIS BOOK

THE AUTHOR

My Beloved Native Eparchy:

For a long time I have carefully thought how I might show my gratitude for all the favors, which you have showered upon me. You have taken me under your kind protection since my tender years, when I was just deprived of my parents.¹ You have nourished me during my adolescence and in my youthful years you have preserved my life. When, finally, I became a man and was bound by natural instinct to give myself to the world, you lovingly called me to yourself, and received me to your motherly bosom, granting me the dignity (of priesthood) and adorning me, your undeserving son, with great honor.² Thus, indeed, I had to weigh anxiously how I could repay you for all these gifts.

Since my love is already dedicated to you and each passing day you witness my dedication, what more deserving tribute, according to my judgment, could I offer you, than making known your glorious deeds to future generations. Therefore, I have decided to collect and publish the sorrowful events of your destiny. In other words, I have planned to outline your life (history) from the very beginning in a chronological order.

It pains me that I could not render greater tribute to you, which you justly deserve, by using more sublime and eloquent language. Instead, I have limited myself to a simple description of bare facts in your progress, having to overcome so many difficulties. In this regard I have imitated Julius Caesar, who in this fashion has composed his *Commentaries*³ which, according to the testimony of Tullius Brutus,⁴ are simple, exact and concise, despoiled of any flowery speech as one would be without his

¹ Duchnovič's father died in 1816, when the boy was only 13 years old.

² In 1843, Duchnovič was elevated by Bishop J. Gaganec as the Canon of the Prjašev Chapter.

³ *Gaius Julius Caesar* (102 B.C. - 44 B.C.), great soldier, statesman and writer. His "*Commentaries*" on the Gallic War and unfinished three books on the Civil War are the memoirs of his campaigns, 58-52 B.C. and 49-48 respectively. They are the only extant works of Caesar, making him famous as the great classic writer.

⁴ *Tullius Brutus*, known better as — *Marcus Junius Brutus* (78? - 42 B.C.), Roman statesman and orator, member of conspiracy against Caesar. He wrote several philosophical and historical treatises, none of which survived. We still have part of his correspondence with M.T. Cicero, who dedicated to him his book on eminent orators, in 45 B.C., and called it "*Brutus*".

clothing. Caesar intended to give others available sources from which they could borrow when writing a history. According to the same Brutus, there is nothing more delightful than brevity in writing a simple and clear history but, at the same time, there is nothing more difficult to imitate.

Trying to be brief but, at the same time, truthful I, too, have gathered only such events which were registered partly in the official documents and partly in my memory, since some of them have happened in my days. Thus, I ventured to compile all the facts contained in these documents or perceived by my own observation. In this I have followed the advice of Atticus,⁵ who tried to persuade Cicero to write the history in honor of his own country, which he just saved.⁶

Nevertheless, I must admit that I did not respond fully to my design, since my compilation of the facts has neither the order nor the coherence of the events, which are required of every historian. I only wrote as my pen flowed and my memory suggested. I have written in this manner, imitating the first Roman historian, Caesar, by collecting and handing down the raw material which, in opportune time, could be elaborated by me or by somebody else into a methodical history. For this reason I have recorded the facts as they happened, in their chronological order, without trying to find some nexus among the events and without using any rhetorical figures of speech or elevated style. Neither did I intend to seek recognition as an orator, since my only desire in the exposition was to avoid untruth. In simple words, I intended to collect only the chronological annals, such as Anthony⁷ has requested from Tullius.⁸

⁵ *Titus Pomponius Atticus* (109-32 B.C.), an intimate friend of Cicero, received his surname of "*Atticus*" by his prolonged sojourn in Athens, capital of Attica. As a wealthy patron of literature, he published all the writings of Cicero. His own works, which did not survive, included a "*Liber Annalis*", an epitome of Roman history in one book. He also established the date of the founding of Rome, 753 B.C.

⁶ *Marcus Tullius Cicero* (106-43 B.C.), a great Roman orator and statesman, prolific writer and philosopher. During his consulship, 64-63 B.C., he exposed the anarchic conspiracy led by *Catilina* and, thus, saved his country. Some 57 of his speeches, among them four famous "*Catilinian Orations*", are still extant. Plutarch characterized him as, "An eloquent man and a lover of his country".

⁷ *Marcus Antonius* (c. 82-30 B.C.), personal friend of Caesar, dedicated

Accept, therefore, my beloved Mother,⁹ this my small gift as a token of my sincere devotion to you. Let all the things I have said here about you, in truth and good taste, turn to your praise. As for the things, which do not please you, ascribe them to my sincerity, for no one is without fault. Even you would not claim perfect sanctity for yourself.

And you Brethren, already resting in the Lord, forgive me if I have expressed myself somewhat unfavorably in regard to you. Rest assured that in your case I tried sincerely to apply the following principle: "*Concerning the dead, by all means, we should tell only the truth*"!

Written in Prjašev, May 1, 1846.

ALEXANDER DUCHNOVIČ,
*Canon-Lector of Prjašev Cathedral
Church*

soldier and emperor of the East. Popularized by Shakespeare's historical play "*Antony and Cleopatra*", as romantic lover.

⁸ *Marcus Tullius Cicero* — cfr. n. 6 above.

⁹ Meaning the Eparchy of Prjašev.

BOOK ONE

THE VICARIATE OF KOŠICE

THE EPISCOPAL VICARIATE OF KOŠICE

Greek Catholics living in the Kingdom of Hungary and called Carpathian Ruthenians, until the time of Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj,¹ i.e. until 1772, were under the jurisdiction of Eger² and, partly, under the Bishop of Spiš.³ Since these matters were sufficiently treated by Rev. Joannicius Basilovič in his learned book,⁴ we do not intend to discuss them here, but rather we will describe the beginning and subsequent destiny of the Eparchy of Prjašev.⁵ Omitting entirely the description of events concerning the general history of the Greek Catholic people in Hungary, we have decided to begin our composition with the history of the Vicariate of Košice.⁶

1. GENERAL REMARKS

Our faithful living in Hungary preferred to worship Almighty God according to the Rite of the Oriental Church. Originally, all Christians of Hungary belonged to our Rite and were ruled in spiritual matters by their own superiors, called “*Archijerej*”

¹ *Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj* ruled the Eparchy of Mukačevo 1773-1809.

² After the Union of Užhorod, in 1646, the Latin Rite Bishops of Eger claimed their jurisdiction also over the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukačevo. Finally, on September 19, 1771, the Eparchy of Mukačevo was canonically established and made independent from Eger. Cfr. B. Pekar, *De erectione canonica Eparchiae Mukačoviensis an. 1771*, Romae 1956.

³ In 1776, the Primate of Hungary without the consent of the Holy See placed 11 Greek Catholic parishes of Spiš District under the jurisdiction of the newly established Latin Rite Diocese of Spiš (Hung.: *Szepes*) — *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁴ Cfr. J. Basilovits, OSBM, *Brevis notitia foundationis Theodori Koriathovits*, Cassoviae, vol. I — 1799, vol. II — 1804.

⁵ Prjašev — in Slov.: *Prešov*, Hung.: *Eperjes*, Lat.: *Fragopolis*.

⁶ Košice — in Ruth.: *Košic'i*, Hung.: *Kassa*, Lat.: *Kassovia*.

or “*Vladyka*”, names equivalent to that of *Bishop*.⁷ They elected their own bishops from among the monks of the Order of St. Basil the Great, who were then confirmed in their office by the Prince of land.⁸ Canonically, these bishops were considered as *the Apostolic Vicars* and, as such, they were confirmed by the Roman Pontiffs.

In respect to the ecclesiastical policy, they were subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops of Eger and had to profess publicly their own submission to Eger, when making a *Profession of Faith*. When the bishops of Peremyšl ceased to exercise their authority in the Spiš District (Hungarian King Sigismund donated, in 1412, some villages of this District to the Poles as a pledge, but they were once again incorporated by the Gracious Maria Theresa into Hungary), then the Greek Catholic people and their clergy were placed under the jurisdiction of the local Latin Rite bishops,⁹ who also accepted and educated in their seminary young Greek Catholic candidates, among whom should be mentioned Michael Kaňuk, who later became the Canon of Prjašev Chapter.¹⁰

⁷ English term “*Bishop*” derives from Gr. “*Episkopos*”, meaning inspector, overseer. Ruthenians, besides “*Episkop*”, are using equivalent terms such as — “*Archijerej*” (from Gr. “*Archiereos*” — high-priest) or “*Vladyka*” (from Slav. verb “*vlad’iti*” — to rule, subst.: ruler).

⁸ After the battle of Mohács, 1526, the Hungary for almost two centuries was divided into three parts. The Habsburgs held the western fringe of Hungary, the Turks lorded it over the heart of the country, while the eastern part with Subcarpathia formed the Principality of Transylvania. Consequently, the Prince of Transylvania was confirming the Bishops of Mukačevo in their office by the “*ius patronatus*”. After the defeat of Prince Francis II Rákoczy, in 1711, this “*ius patronatus*” passed over to the Habsburgs as the Kings of Hungary.

⁹ In 1412, King Sigismund pawned the castle Lubovňa (Hung.: *Lubló*) with 16 villages of the Spiš District to King of Poland. Among those villages there were 5 Greek Catholic parishes, which were placed under the jurisdiction of the Greek Catholic Bishop of Peremyšl’. There were other 11 Greek Catholic parishes of the Spiš District incorporated into newly erected Latin Rite Diocese of Spiš, in 1776. Other 9 were incorporated into the newly erected Latin Rite Diocese of Rožnava. On the intervention of Bishop A. Bačinskýj all these Greek Catholic parishes of the Spiš District were finally, in 1787, placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Mukačevo and they formed nucleus of the Košice Vicariate, established in the same year. Cfr. o. A. Baran, *Episkop Andrej Bačinskýj*, Yorkton, Sask. 1963, p. 48-51.

¹⁰ Father M. Kaňuk (1762?-1832) — was instrumental in the reintegration of the Spiš Greek Catholic parishes into the Eparchy of Mukačevo — *Ibid.*, p. 49.

The bishops of Spiš governed Greek Catholic priests by the same laws as their Latin clergy, but they did not dare to make any changes in our ritual and ceremonies. In other words, they did not discriminate among the clergy of the two Rites. It should be ascribed to the good will and fatherly concern of the Spiš bishops that such parishes as Slovinka,¹¹ Porač¹² and Zavadka¹³ were provided with the royal tithes, similar to the Latin Rite parishes. These tithes were received "de facto" from their District until 1848, when the Diet has them abrogated.¹⁴

This form of administration of Greek Catholics remained until the death of Bishop Bradač, in 1772. The most gracious Empress Maria Theresa (her memory will remain in the hearts of the Ruthenian people blessed forever) appointed as his successor Andrew Bačinskyj, the pastor of Hajdudorog,¹⁵ from the ranks of the secular clergy, according to the desires of the clergy and the faithful. Bačinskyj was confirmed as bishop by the Roman Pontiff, Pope Clement XIV, and began independently govern the Eparchy of Mukačevo, which was extended throughout 13 districts of northern Hungary.¹⁶

Those acquainted with the duties of a zealous and vigilant bishop know very well the heavy burden placed on the shoulders of one person, considering the distance from the limits of Spiš or Maramoroš District to the Bishop's residence in Muka-

¹¹ Slov.: *Slovinky*, Hung.: *Szalánk*.

¹² Slov.: *Poráč*, Hung.: *Vereshegy*.

¹³ Slov.: *Závadka*, Hung.: *Görögfalu*.

¹⁴ Duchnovič mentions only three out of eleven Gr. Cath. parishes under the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite Bishop of Spiš. The other eight were: *Repaš*, *Helcmanovc'i*, *Hodermarka*, *Kojšov*, *Lipník*, *Oľšavica*, *Osturňa* and *Toriska*. Cfr. Baran, *o.c.*, p. 50.

¹⁵ Bishop John Bradač died July 4, 1772. A. Bačinskyj, as the Vicar General, closely co-operated with Bishop Bradač to canonize the Eparchy of Mukačevo, in 1771.

¹⁶ Administratively, Hungary was divided into the districts, called in Hung.: "megye", Ruth.: "župa", Lat.: "comitatus". The 13 northern districts with the Greek Catholic population were the following: 1. *Maramoroš* (Hung.: Maramoros), 2. *Uhoča* (Ugocsa), 3. *Bereh* (Bereg), 4. *Satmar* (Szatmár), 5. *Sabolč* (Szabolcs), 6. *Uh* (Ung), 7. *Zemplín* (Zemplén), 8. *Abovo-Novohrad* (Abaujvár), 9. *Boršod'* (Borsod), 10. *Turňa* (Torna), 11. Hemer (Gömör), 12. *Šariš* (Sáros), and 13. *Spiš* (Szepes).

čevo or later in Užhorod.¹⁷ It exceeds 25 miles.¹⁸ That so many faithful would not suffer a spiritual neglect, the successor of the memorable Maria Theresa,¹⁹ Emperor Joseph II in virtue of his *Royal Resolution*,²⁰ issued by the Supreme Royal Council²¹ on February 3, 1787, created the *Vicariate of Košice*, in addition to those of Maramoroš²² and Satmar.²³ This was the beginning of the Vicariate of Košice, which was transformed later into the Prjašev Eparchy.

2. FORMATION OF THE KOŠICE VICARIATE

The Vicariate of Košice was established in 1787. According to the decree, issued by the Supreme Royal Council on July 12, 1788, the Vicar of Košice would always be a Canon elected from

¹⁷ *Mukačevo* (Hung.: Munkács) was the see of the Bishop until 1780, when it was translated to *Užhorod* (Hung.: Ungvár), but the name of the Eparchy remained that of Mukačevo. Cfr. Pekar, *o.c.*, p. 118.

¹⁸ The Hungarian mile was undetermined distance made by a horse-rider in a half of day, ca. 18 statute miles. Thus 25 miles mentioned by Duchnovič would require at least 12 days of traveling at that time.

¹⁹ Since Empress Maria Theresa (1740-1780) lavished innumerable favors upon the Carpatho-Ruthenians, Duchnovič extolled her with extravagant titles, which he borrowed from the Imperial Rome, like "*Optima*", "*Diva*", here "*Immortalis*". In our translation we will simplify these lavish titles.

²⁰ "*Resolutio Regia*" — was a decree issued by the Supreme Royal Council of Hungary in the name of the King, who was also the Emperor of Austria, Joseph II (1780-1790).

²¹ *The Supreme Royal Council*, officially called "*Concilium Regium Locumtenentiale*", was the highest administrative body in Hungary, composed of 22 Councillors and presided by the Palatine. It was reorganized in 1723, with its headquarters in Bratislava (Hung.: *Pozsony*, Germ.: *Pressburg*). Its members were appointed by the Emperor from among the nobles, including some Prelates. Cfr. C.A. Macartney, *Hungary — A Short History*, Chicago, Ill., Aldine Publ. Co., 1962, p. 95.

²² It extended throughout the District of Maramoroš, with the Consistorial see in Maramoš Sihot (Hung.: *Máramoros Sziget*, Rum.: *Siget Maramuresului*). First established by Bishop George G. Bizancij, in 1723. Cfr. A. Baran, *Eparchia Maramorošiensis ejusque Unio*, Romae 1962, p. 77-80.

²³ Embracing Rumanian Greek Catholics in the districts of Satmar and Sabolč, with the see in Satmar (Hung.: *Szatmárnémeti*, Rum.: *Satu Mare*). In 1823, it was incorporated into the Rumanian Eparchy of Oradea Mare (Hung.: *Nagy Várad*, Ruth.: *Velikij Varadin*). Cfr. A. Baran, *Podil Mukačivskoji Jeparčiji*, art. in "*Analecta OSBM*", Romae 1963, vol. IV, p. 558-563.

the members of the Chapter of the Mukačevo Eparchy and presented for confirmation to His Sacred Majesty. In addition to his canonical benefice, the Vicar's salary was stipulated to amount to 1,200 florins in currency,²⁴ paid by the Religious Fund.²⁵

Because the city of Košice was assigned for the Vicar's residence, the City Council was asked to accommodate the said vicar to their best. Their proposal was to be submitted within eight days to the Supreme Royal Council for approval, but their answer is unknown to us. It is sufficient to note that, in force of the above mentioned order, the opinions of the Royal Chamber of Košice and the representative of the Diocesan Chapter of Eger were heard and it was generally agreed to assign the former monastery of the Dominican Fathers for the vicarial residence. Temporarily, until the execution of the plan, the Vicar was to reside in the abolished Franciscan monastery.

On June 27, 1787, John Pastelyi alias John Kovač from Pastil²⁶ was appointed as the first Vicar Foraine of Košice. Canon Pastelyi "de facto" did not take possession of his post nor did he live in the place of his assigned residence, because there was no building available for him. As we previously mentioned, the abolished Franciscan monastery had been assigned as Vicar Pastelyi's residence, but at the time it was used as a Minor Seminary and storage for army supplies, and thus could not be relinquished to him. So, he continued to live in Užhorod. In the Vicarial

²⁴ *Florin* — a golden coin, weighing 54 grains, was called in German — "*Gulden*". It appeared in Austria during the 14th century and was divided into 60 *crosses*, each weighing 24 grains of silver (Germ.: "*Kreuzer*"). In the 18th century, due to the inflation, paper notes were issued, "*Scheingeld*" — *currency*. The golden pieces, called "*Konventionmünze*", on the Conventional Exchange were priced 150 crosses or 2½ paper florins each. Hence difference in the value of the florins (will be abbreviated — *fl.*). For paper florin we will use abbreviation — *i.c.* (in currency), for golden florin — *c.e.* (Conventional Exchange).

²⁵ Emperor Joseph II (1780-1790) established the so called "*Fundus Religionis*" (the Religious Fund) from the confiscated monastic and church properties, which was used by the Government to support the Church institutions and the clergy.

²⁶ *John Kovač-Pastelyi* (1741-1799) was one of the most learned priests in the Eparchy, for long time Professor of the Moral and Pastoral Theology. He was also a poet and writer. His biography cfr. O.V. Mišanyč, *Literatura Zakarpatta XVII-XVIII st.*, Kyjiv 1964, p. 80-82.

Registers there is no trace of any official act performed by Pastelyi, except his single visit to the parish in Zborov.²⁷

It can be definitely said that Pastelyi did not show a great enthusiasm for his office, perhaps because he accepted it against his own will. Soon he asked to be released from the office because of his ill health. His resignation was accepted and, by the Royal Decree of January 13, 1790, Canon Michael Bradač²⁸ was appointed as the Vicar Foraine of Košice. He displayed great zeal and efficiency in his new assignment.

Since nothing has been done to solve the problem of vicar's residence, Bradač was forced to live in his own home in Jakubjany²⁹ and Kamjonka.³⁰ The Royal Decree, in virtue of which the Vicariate of Košice was established, stipulated that three rooms in the former monastery of the Franciscan Fathers should be vacated for his living quarters. The City Council, in an attempt to restrain a Ruthenian Vicar from Košice, urgently requested the Government to reestablish the Franciscan Fathers in their city for the benefit of the Slovak faithful. This was the main reason why all the efforts of Vicar Bradač to take possession of the assigned to him residence were frustrated for over three years at the Royal Court, headed by Baron Nicholas Vécsey.

Destituted of his living quarters assigned to him by the highest authority, the poor Vicar resolved to establish his temporary residence in Kamjonka. He feared that by some manipulation of the interested party even the very office of vicar would be dissolved. Under these circumstances, Bradač then took necessary steps to secure for the vicar's residence the abolished monastery of the Minorite Fathers in Prjašev.

At the beginning, his efforts seemed to be unsuccessful, since the city of Prjašev flatly refused to grant the right of residence to a Greek Catholic Vicar. However, pressured by the government representatives, General Splényi, the Supreme Commissioner of Sabolč District and Baron Nicholas Vécsey, the Chief Justice of the Royal Court, Bradač was granted "temporary residence" at the mentioned monastery on August 29, 1792. Under the rescript of King Leopold II, the Supreme Ro-

²⁷ Hung.: *Zboró*, Šariš District.

²⁸ Michael Bradač's biography is given in art. 3.

²⁹ Hung.: *Jakabfalva*, Spiš District.

³⁰ Called also: *Kaminka*, Hung.: *Kövesfalva*, Spiš District.

yal Council issued a decree, dated December 20, 1792, by which the possession of the Minorite monastery was officially transferred to Reverend Michael Dudinskyj, pastor of Rus'ka Nova Vesj³¹ and Reverend Michael Šimoga, pastor of Kralovci,³² who acted as the commissioners for the Eparchy.

Nevertheless, envy continued to cloud some people's mind, who persisted to raise various obstacles against the gracious decision of the King. The establishment of a new Greek Catholic Vicariate hindered their shrewed plans to oppress or, even, to completely suppress the Ruthenian Greek Catholics, contrary to the intentions of the Royal Crown. Therefore, they used their influence to abolish the very institution of the Vicariate, claiming the need of the monastery for a Gymnasium,³³ supposedly to be staffed by the Piarist Fathers of Sabinovo.³⁴ Their proposal was particularly supported by Ladislaus Péchy, the Deputy Commissioner of Šariš District, who presented it to the Assembly of the District Representatives on September 24, 1793. But his scheme was defeated, because the Representatives, mostly the Evangelists, upheld the position of Vicar and rejected the plan for a new Gymnasium.

The City Council of Prjašev then found new and greater impediments. The local Colonel Michael Törney, influenced by the magistrate, persuaded General Splényi to petition the Royal Court for conversion of the monastery in question into the military barracks. The Royal Court, before giving a decision, asked the opinion of the Representatives of the District. The Assembly of the District, to which also Vicar Bradač was summoned, flatly rejected this new proposal. One of the Representatives, namely Alexander Keczer, who contributed 6,000 florins for the benefit of this monastery, was particularly opposed to the plan.

Under these unfavorable circumstances Vicar Bradač hastily took possession of his temporary residence in the Minorite monastery. He feared that any delay on his part would invite another

³¹ Hung.: *Sós-Ujfalú*, Šariš District.

³² Hung.: *Királynép*, Abauj District (Abovo-Novohrad).

³³ In Europe the secondary school is called "*Gymnasium*", including 4 years of grade school and the high-school of the American educational system, thus embracing 8 years of studies.

³⁴ Lat.: *Cibinium*, Hung.: *Szeben*, Šariš District.

attempt on the Vicariate as it previously occurred in Košice. Just before the Vicar was ready to occupy his apartment all the windows, doors, locks and other displaceable parts were removed from it. Therefore he insisted, that the District Tax Collector, John Dezsöffy, who was entrusted with the release of residence, turn over to him all the items listed in the inventory which he personally signed. But in vain.

Misfortune continued to plague Vicar Bradač. At that time, the monastery was filled with the arms and military provisions, while some rooms were occupied by the officers and entire detachment of soldiers. Hence a constant clattering of arms, shouting, abusive language, and loud commands of the military drills incessantly disturbed unfortunate Vicar, who so badly needed quiet.

Just below his apartment was living a Protestant printer named Eger, with most quarrelsome wife and five children, as well as a certain vagabond, who also had a large and disdainful family. The basement was also rented to a wine-dealer, Nicholas Foltinovicz, whose workers moving the barrels day and night were shouting and laughing, thus adding to the disturbance of peace.

But most of all the Vicar was annoyed by the sacristan Szkala, who despised the Greek Rite and, consequently, the Vicar and his assistant. Szkala was a great gossip and always ready to start some rumors. He used to entertain himself by slandering the Vicar, who was unable to replace him, since he was appointed by the Supreme Royal Council.

Surrounded by these annoying circumstances, Vicar Bradač made necessary steps to improve the situation, but his requests remained unheeded for a long time. Unfortunately, the situation did not improve even after the Royal Order was issued to the magistrate in August, 1792.

Responsible for the spiritual needs of the Greek Catholic faithful in Prjašev, the Vicar was forced to provide candles for the church and wages for the cantor and bell-ringer from his own salary. Since he did not enjoy the privilege of free postal services, he also had to cover the high postal expenses of Vicar's Office and pay the wages to his assistant and secretary.

As it has been mentioned, the windows, doors, locks, and stoves in his apartment were either destroyed or taken away, thus the Vicar was forced to replace them at his own expense.

Bradač was expected to cover all these expenditures from his meager salary of 1,200 florins yearly. Pressed by these needs, he often did not have enough money for bare necessities.

Encompassed by so many difficulties and abuses, this great man³⁵ showed heroic patience always reminding himself that only "by great sacrifices we attain higher things".³⁶ He tried to smooth out slowly these difficulties by his constant appeals and interventions. Thus, e.g. by the Royal Decree of December 4, 1794, the sum of 250 fl. and 46 cr.³⁷ was assigned to him for various repairs in his residence to be solved by the Religious Fund. On July 4, 1795, he presented a certified receipt for such amount to the Prefect of the Royal Chamber in Jasovo,³⁸ Alexis Ökolcsányi.

Having overcome these major obstacles, the Vicar hoped to enjoy a long awaited tranquility. However, he unexpectedly received an insolent letter, dated July 15, 1795, from the same Prefect of the Royal Chamber, requesting rent for his apartment in the Minorite monastery. One can only guess, how deeply was Vicar Bradač hurt by this new and unexpected insult. After his firm reply that the apartment was assigned to him by the same Royal Decree which conferred to him the office of Vicar, they did not bother him further with this problem.

The question of vicar's residence in the monastery was raised again in 1797, when someone suggested to turn this delapidated building into the Royal Bench Court of Tisa District³⁹ on the premise, that the Vicar would retain his apartment. On January 16, 1797, the Supreme Royal Council deputized Count Anthony Szirmay, the President of the Royal Bench Court and Paul T. Manyigay, the Prefect of the Royal Chamber in Jasovo, a bitter enemy of the clergy, especially the Ruthenian, to examine this new proposal. When the appointed Commission rejected the plan, Vicar Bradač tried to acquire the entire building under the condition it would be completely restored.

³⁵ i.e. Vicar Michael Bradač.

³⁶ Duchnovič had in mind a Latin proverb "*Per aspra ad astra*".

³⁷ One *florin* (fl.) had 60 *crosses* (Germ. "*Kreuzer*"). The silver coin was called "*cross*" on account of his design on its tail end.

³⁸ Lat.: *Jasovia*, Hung.: *Jászó*, Abauj District.

³⁹ *The Royal Bench Court* was the court of the second instance; *the Tisa District* — the district between Carpathian Mountains and the Tisa River, i.e. the territory of Subcarpathia.

The City Council of Prjašev, however, tried again to impede the Vicar's plan. They did not care any longer about the monastery, since it was completely delapidated. But they intended to grant the backyard and garden for the use of the adjoining City Hospital. Bradač discreetly was able to stop them in time and thus frustrate another of their sinister schemes. When in 1800, finally, Bradač secured for his residence the entire building, it was occupied by the enlisted recruits in preparation for the war with France.⁴⁰ Next year the whole monastery, including the corridors, was filled with the victuals and military equipment. In vain did Vicar protest. Even the cellar, which has been vacated by Foltinovicz, was once again rented to a city wine-dealer named Steinhübel, to whom Bradač was forced to pay rent for a small room, which he was using himself. Indeed, the Ruthenians were destined to undergo all kind of misery and misfortune.

In 1802, while the harassment continued, Bradač was elected by the Chapter of Mukačevo Eparchy as a representative to the Royal Diet in Bratislava.⁴¹ On this occasion he went to Vienna, where he personally presented to His Majesty a petition, requesting necessary provisions for the Eparchy of Mukačevo and the Vicariate of Košice. His Majesty did not refuse his request. On March 8, 1803, the Court Chancery demanded the blueprints of the necessary repairs and changes to the former monastery in Prjašev, converting it into a permanent residence of Vicar. In a short time, notwithstanding the protests of opposition to the progress of the Ruthenians, Bradač did present the required blueprints to the Court Chancery. In 1802, Vicar Michael Bradač was named titular Abbot of St. Andrew of Saár⁴² and in 1804, he became a correspondent-member of the Mineralogical Society of Jena.⁴³

⁴⁰ It was Napoleon's II Campaign against the Coalition, 1799-1801. Cfr. T. Neill - D. McGarry - C. Hohl, *A History of Western Civilization*, Milwaukee, Wisc., Bruce Publ. Co., 1962, p. 813-814.

⁴¹ The Diet of Hungary, until the revolution of 1848, convened in Bratislava (Hung.: *Pozsony*).

⁴² *Schematismus Dioecesis Munkácsensis A.D. 1908*, p. 41, has "Abbas S. Demetrii de Saár", situated in the Satmar District.

⁴³ Jena, Thuringia in Germany, famous for its University, founded in 1558. Among its renown professors were Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Schlegel, Schiller etc. Jena is famous as a center of the glass industry and optical instruments (Zeiss). *The Mineralogical Society of Jena* enjoys a world-wide reputation.

At this point nobody doubted Vicar's successful efforts and they ceased from placing any more obstacles in the execution of the conceived plan, since it was personally approved by His Majesty. But when the adversaries desisted in their plot, the friends and the neighbors began to agitate against the proposal. Just as the Psalmist said: " My friends and my companions stood against me! " (Ps. 37:12).

The two Greek Catholic Bishops, one of Oradea-Mare⁴⁴ and the other of Križevci,⁴⁵ conceived a new scheme how to divide the vast Eparchy of Mukačevo. According to their plans, presented to the Court Chancery, the districts of Satmar, Maramoroš and Sabolč were to be incorporated into the Eparchy of Oradea-Mare, and the lower districts⁴⁶ into the Eparchy of Križevci. Thus reduced Mukačevo Eparchy would no longer require the proposed Vicariate of Košice.

The idea pleased the Court Chancery, which immediately presented this new proposal to His Majesty for the approval. Before his final decision, the Emperor sent his personal councillor, Bishop Mitterpracher,⁴⁷ to Prjašev to survey the situation. Bishop Mitterpracher stayed in Prjašev for five days and, before his departure, he vowed his friendship and support to Vicar Brađač. As it can be ascertained from the official documents, this whole affair was subsequently placed aside and, according to the testimony of Bishop Bačinskyj, it was never put even on the agenda.

Instead, Paul Rozsos, the Deputy for the Ruthenian Affairs at the Hungarian Court Chancery, presented once again the proposal of Bishop Bačinskyj to establish the Vicariate of Košice. Due to the great influence of Bishop Mitterpracher in the Court, finally, by the Imperial Decree of September 2, 1806, the Vicariate of Košice was established with the residence in Prjašev.⁴⁸ The abolished monastery of the Minorite Fathers was assigned

⁴⁴ Bishop Ignatius Darabant (1788-1805), succeeded by Bishop Samuel Vulcan (1806-1839).

⁴⁵ Bishop Sylvester Bubanovič (1794-1810).

⁴⁶ i.e. the Districts of Spiš, Šariš, Boršod, Abauj-Turňa, and Hemer.

⁴⁷ In msc. "*Mitterpacher*".

⁴⁸ Although the Vicar's residence was transferred from Košice to Prjašev, the Vicariate continued to be called — *Vicariate of Košice*.

for the Vicar's residence, while the adjacent church was to be converted for the use of the Greek Rite.

By the same decree also the Vicarial Consistory, consisting of two assessors and a notary, was established. The Religious Fund was ordered to cover all the current expenses of the Vicar, the cost of extensive repairs of the residence, the necessary adaptation of the church building to the requirements of the Greek Rite, as well as the upkeep of the church and services. Only the salary of two assessors was to be taken from the subsidiary funds given to the Eparchy.

Following the suggestion of Count Joseph Erdödy, the Chancellor of the Hungarian Court Chancery, they agreed to donate all the vestments made ready for the mission in Dalmatia⁴⁹ to the vicarial church, stipulating in the decree of August 2, 1808, that all other equipment would be supplied by the Religious Fund. By another decree of May 17, 1808, the Religious Fund was ordered to solve every year the sum of 550 fl. for the following: a) 200 fl. for the assistant pastor, who was to take care of the services in the church; b) 200 fl. for the salary of the Consistorial Notary, and c) 150 fl. for the current Chancery expenses. Finally, by the decree of June 6, 1809, the sum of 2,674 fl. 45 cr. was assigned for the necessary church furnishing.

When, at last, on July 7, 1809, the Vicariate was established in Prjašev, the Chancery asked to present new blueprints and estimate for the restoration of the church and monastery, since the plans of Thomas Martináczy, presented in 1803, have been rejected. The official architect of the Royal Chamber in Solivar,⁵⁰ Joseph Bretterbauer, drafted new plans. On October 7, 1807, they were presented by Bishop Bačinskyj to the Supreme Royal Council for the approval or, if need be, for their referral to a higher department. The Supreme Royal Council by the decree of March 29, 1808, approved the presented plans and assigned the sum of 23,890 fl. 34 cr. for the repairs of the vicarial residence and roofless church, whose front wall was near collapse.

⁴⁹ During Maria Theresa's reign (1740-1780), there were plans to extend the Union with the Holy See to Dalmatia and neighbouring districts. But these plans were frustrated by *the Patent of Toleration*, issued in 1781, allowing all non-Catholics full freedom of worship and equality with the Catholics. Cfr. Macartney, *o.c.*, p. 122-123.

⁵⁰ Hung.: *Sósvár*, near Prjašev.

On April 30, 1808, the Vicar received an advance of 10,000 fl. for the intended repairs, sent to him by the Royal Treasury of the Political Foundation in Košice.

The Supreme Royal Council ordered to cover the front of the church roof with the copper-tin, while the remainder was to be covered with the wooden shingles. The rear section of the monastery building, adjacent to the sacristy, was to be reserved to the disposal of the Religious Fund. However, the Vicar reiterated his protest and demanded it for the accommodations of the Consistory and his two Assessors.

In the meantime, Count Joseph Erdödy, the Chancellor of Hungary, by the decree of March 11, 1808, promulgated the nomination of Vicar Michael Bradač as the titular Bishop of Doryllea⁵¹ and auxiliary of the Bishop of Mukačevo.⁵² He was consecrated on January 8, 1809, by Bishop Samuel Vulcan of Oradea-Mare.⁵³

But let us return to the restoration of the monastery in order to have a complete picture of the work done on the vicarial residence. On July 12, 1808, the Supreme Royal Council demanded a name of certain person, who was to assume the responsibility of supervising the restoration and handling the money. On the recommendation of Architect Florian Gharlach a District Surveyor of Solivar, Joseph Freudhoffer, was appointed. Since Freudhoffer was a busy man and most of his time he spent in Užhorod, attending to his own business affairs, the Vicar entrusted the inspection of the work and handling of money to his nephew Michael Bradač, the Consistorial Attorney and Notary.⁵⁴ By September 27, 1808, Architect Bretterbauer consumed all 10,000 fl., which have been advanced to the Vicar for the repairs.

By the letter of February 14, 1809, the Supreme Royal Council has imposed the responsibility of supervision and allocation of funds on the Vicar himself. It was only then that the Vicar discovered how unscrupulous Joseph Bretterbauer was, seeking

⁵¹ The title of Doryllea was conferred on Bradač by Pope Pius VII, September 30, 1808. Cfr. A. Welykyj, OSBM, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, Romae 1954, vol. II, p. 323.

⁵² i.e. the aging Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj, who was already sick.

⁵³ Bishop Samuel Vulcan administered the Oradea-Mare Eparchy between 1806-1839.

⁵⁴ As a layman, he was also attorney at the Court of Law, in Prjašev.

only his personal gain. He completely abandoned the original plans of restoration approved by the Supreme Royal Council and, instead of repairing the building, he was destroying it.

Where the blueprints called for a new door or window he retained the old one. While spending for the construction material only 800 fl., he charged for it 6,000 fl. Like an ordinary thief, he stole from the residence iron bars, metal plates, harrows and other usable parts, which he carried to his own home in Solivar. He was literally tearing the building apart. When the Vicar reminded him of his contract, Bretterbauer did not listen, but insolently laughed in his face.

Finally, on May 14, 1809, Vicar Bradač reported this shameless and greedy man to the Supreme Royal Council. By the letter of June 11, 1809, the Council ordered Surveyor J. Freudhoffer to investigate. Having found Vicar's allegations true, Freudhoffer immediately suspended Architect Bretterbauer, but he already has squandered 20,000 fl. Having been removed from the work, the malicious architect took the blueprints with him and refused to give them back. Bradač tried to retrieve the plans many times, but without any success, since Bretterbauer had influential friends and protectors. Thus the restoration of the vicarial residence was never finished. On March 9, 1813, Architect J. Bretterbauer was completely exonerated from the charges and the ballance of money was reserved for the future building fund.

The greatest Bishop of Mukačevo Eparchy, Andrew Bačinskyj, passed away on December 19, 1809.⁵⁵ According to the decision of the Council of Trent, sess. XXIV, chapter 16, the Chapter within eight days elected two Vicars General: Canon John Kutka for the Capitular Vicar and Auxiliary Bishop Michael Bradač for the Vicariate of Košice.⁵⁶ The full jurisdiction, according to the practice of the Archdiocese of Esztergom,⁵⁷ was given only to the Capitular Vicar. Thus Bradač, although

⁵⁵ In msc. "November".

⁵⁶ Canon John Kutka (1750-1814) — was Bishop Bačinskyj's Vicar General and his candidate for the Auxiliary Bishop. Cfr. his biography in E. Nedzelskij, *Očerki karpatorusskoj literatury*, Užhorod 1932, p. 92. As the Capitular Vicar, Canon Kutka administered the whole Mukačevo Eparchy, while Bishop M. Bradač had jurisdiction only over the Vicariate of Košice, the position he held since 1790.

⁵⁷ Since the Bishop of Mukačevo was subject to the Archbishop of Eszter-

he possessed the episcopal character, in virtue of his jurisdiction as the Vicar General was able to administer only his vicarial district, extending throughout Abauj, Boršod, Gemer, Šariš, Spiš, Turňa, and Northern Zemplin. In special cases he had to turn for the dispensation to Capitular Vicar Kutka, chosen by the Chapter.

On April 11, 1809, to the vicarial church in Prjašev were donated two bells, one weighing five and another three tons.⁵⁸ The former bells were lost in the fatal fire of the church soon after the abolition of the Minorite Order.⁵⁹ At the time it was serviced only by two small 30 and 22 pounds chimes, which were very resonant.

During the vacancy of the Mukačevo episcopal see, all the members of the Chapter of Canons had a great ambition to fill the see, thus creating a lack of mutual understanding. At the Consistorial meeting of 1810, they heatedly discussed the question of the division of the Mukačevo Eparchy. Their proposal was also supported by the Vicarial Consistory, meeting in Prjašev on May 16, 1810. It was unanimously agreed on the partition of the vast Eparchy of Mukačevo by erecting two additional eparchies, one in Prjašev and another in Baia Mare⁶⁰ or, better yet, in Sihot⁶¹ for the Rumanian parishes of the Maramoroš, Satmar, and Ugoča Districts.

The Supreme Royal Council promptly approved this proposal and was ready to forward it for its final ratification to His Majesty. But first they wanted to discuss the proposed designs with the representatives of the Eparchy and, therefore, they summoned to Buda Canons John Kutka, Michael Bradač, and Gregory Tarkovič.⁶² The Providence of God wanted, that at that time, on October 17, 1812, the Capitular Vicar John Kutka

gom as to his Metropolitan, also the Particular Laws of the Esztergom Metropolitan Province were binding the Eparchy of Mukačevo.

⁵⁸ Meaning "Metric Tons", 1 M.T. — a weight of 1,000 kilograms. Their price, paid by the Religious Fund, was — 3,125 fl.

⁵⁹ i.e. in 1788.

⁶⁰ Ruth.: *Velika Baňa*, Hung.: *Nagy Bánya*, now in Rumania.

⁶¹ Ruth.: *Maramoroš Sihot*, Hung.: *Máramoros Sziget*, Rum.: *Siget Maramuresului*, now also in Rumania. The Rumanian Eparchy of Maramures with the see in Baia Mare was erected on July 5, 1930. Cfr. S. Congr. per la Chiesa Orientale, *Oriente Cattolico*, Città del Vaticano 1962, p. 279.

⁶² Tarkovič was already in Buda, working there as the official censor of the Slavic books at the University Printing House.

ended his earthly life and, on October 24, 1812, the Chapter elected Michael Bradač to succeed him. On December 28, 1812, Bradač moved to Užhorod in order to assume the administration of the vacant Eparchy, thus leaving, once and for all, his beloved Vicariate and residence in Prjašev.

While the vicarial see in Prjašev was empty, the City Council decided to eliminate the Ruthenians from their town and confiscate the residence and vicarial church, which served the spiritual needs of the Greek Catholics. They claimed that those buildings were needed for a Government storehouse. But they were not able to execute their scheme, since they did not have higher authorization. Rev. Andrew Kampo, who was the Greek Catholic pastor of Prjašev at that time, publicly denounced these malicious attempts against the Ruthenians and refused to surrender the keys to the magistrate. Thus the city's ordinance was once again frustrated and from that time on nobody disturbed the Ruthenians in use of their church.

The Pope confirmed the election of Michael Bradač as the Capitular Vicar on December 1, 1812, while the approval of Supreme Royal Council was granted on January 26, 1813. In order to receive a double salary, Bradač intended to hold both vicarial offices, planning to administer the vacant Mukačevo Eparchy as its Vicar Capitular and the Vicariate of Košice as its Vicar General. For this reason he asked to be confirmed in both offices, but his request was denied. Thus Canon Gregory Tarkovič, censor of the Slavic books at the Royal Printing House in Pest,⁶³ was appointed as the new Vicar of Košice.

Canon Gregory Tarkovič was to receive his vicarial salary from the time of his appointment, i.e. as of July 30, 1813. However, for a while he was kept busy by his duties as censor of books, while Bradač did not hasten to move his personal belongings from his former residence in Prjašev. It was only on December 18, 1813, that Canon Tarkovič assumed his vicarial duties. As it was generally known, the two Vicars were not the best friends and they heatedly argued over 480 fl. in salary during the period of transition, which was claimed equally by both.

Tarkovič demanded the salary from the day of his appoint-

⁶³ The cities of *Pest* and *Buda*, located on the opposite banks of the Danube River, were incorporated under the name of *Budapest* only in 1872. The Printing House was in Buda.

ment, while Bradač was claiming it for himself, since in fact he has substituted Tarkovič in the vicarial office. Unable to reach an agreement, they appealed to higher authority for a settlement. However, Michael Bradač died⁶⁴ before a decision was made. He willed all his possessions to his nephew, Michael Bradač Jr., who was the notary of the Vicarial Consistory in Prjašev. As the only heir of his uncle, he took the case against Tarkovič to court. On August 29, 1821, the court ruled that Tarkovič should reimburse 480 fl. in question to Michael Bradač Jr., since he was late Vicar's heir. Tarkovič then, not wanting to give the money directly to the plaintiff, promptly deposited the sum into the hands of the judge.

As was already mentioned, Gregory Tarkovič assumed his office as the Vicar of Košice on December 18, 1813. He did not keep any diary and, therefore, we do not know much about his activities. He lived only in one room supplied to him by the Franciscan Fathers and continuously quarreled with Father Andrew Kampo, who was taking spiritual care of the Greek Catholic parish in Prjašev and was dean of that district. There is not registered a single official act of Tarkovič, since he failed even to attend the Assembly of the Šariš District. Besides the Franciscan Fathers, who provided him with room and board, not many people in Prjašev had known him. Thus the vicarial period of Tarkovič can be considered as inactive.⁶⁵

After the death of Michael Bradač,⁶⁶ Tarkovič was elected the Capitular Vicar of the Mukačevo Eparchy, December 22, 1815, and had to leave his residence in Prjašev of which he was never fond. His successor at the Vicariate of Košice became Canon John Olšavskyj, formerly the pastor of the Greek Catholic parish of St. Barbara in Vienna. He was highly educated, most eloquent and very active man.⁶⁷

Although Canon Olšavskyj was appointed as Vicar on December 22, 1815, he did not take possession of his office until

⁶⁴ Bradač died December 20, 1815.

⁶⁵ Tarkovič was still engaged by the Government as the censor of the Slavic books and spent great deal of his time at the Printing House in Buda.

⁶⁶ Cfr. n. 64. His death was sudden.

⁶⁷ *John Olšavskyj* — studied in Vienna and after his ordination became the Assistant Pastor of the Gr. Cath. parish of St. Barbara in Vienna. In 1811 he was promoted pastor of the same parish and, in 1813, he was elevated to the Canon of the Mukačevo Eparchy. Between 1815-1821 he held office

November 8, 1816. Thus again, between him and Tarkovič an argument arose concerning the salary during this interval of time. On May 6, 1817, Olšavskyj was ordered to reimburse the sum of 1,030 fl. to the Religious Fund, which in turn paid it to Tarkovič, since he during said period performed also the duties of the Vicar of Košice.

John Olšavskyj remained in his vicarial office until the establishment of the Eparchy of Prjašev or, rather, until the appointment of Gregory Tarkovič as the first Bishop of Prjašev, March 22, 1816. But in fact he administered the newly erected eparchy until June 17, 1821, when Tarkovič finally became consecrated as the Bishop. Olšavskyj was an outstanding man, but his activity will also remain unknown to posterity, since he did not leave any records or diary, too.

It should be noted, that he was very hot-tempered man and in anger he was ready to fight. Thus he often would strike his servants. He was unable to control his temper even during the Liturgical Services and would strike his server, John Petrik, either with the cross or the censor. On one occasion he struck him even with the Gospel-Book. He was a passionate card player and spent many nights without a sleep playing at home or in his friends' place. After his death in 1829, Olšavskyj bequeathed half of his voluminous library to the Eparchy of Prjašev.

It should be noted, that in 1812, considerable inflation was experienced throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire. On that occasion all coined money (silver and gold) was replaced by the paper certificates, called "*Anlegung Schein*".⁶⁸ Previously, the Vicar's salary was equal to that of the Auxiliary Bishop, yearly 4,000 pieces of gold (florins). Then it was exchanged to meager 800 florins in bills. Later the Royal Chancery raised the Vicar's salary to 1,600 fl. yearly.

Further should be mentioned, that on account of the war with France⁶⁹ the State reserves of gold and silver were completely exhausted, and the Government was forced to request from

of the Vicar of Košice, then returned to his canonical benefice in Užhorod. He died in 1829.

⁶⁸ i.e. "*Investment Certificate*", equivalent to the *Federal Reserve Notes* now circulating in USA.

⁶⁹ Napoleonic Wars 1799-1815, completely drained the Austrian treasury.

the private citizens the precious articles, including the church vessels. On that occasion Vicar Michael Bradač donated to the Government for the war efforts 6 marks and 1½ ounces of melted silver,⁷⁰ while the clergy of his Vicariate collected 1,723 fl. 17 cr. in coins, and a large supply of grain.

3. BIOGRAPHY OF MICHAEL BRADAČ

Michael Bradač was born in the village of Kamjonka or Kaminka, Spiš District,⁷¹ in 1749. His father was a parish priest, who owned a little land⁷² with a house and orchard. His "*scultetia*" was called "*Borodačka*", since the first inhabitants who settled in Kaminka were members of the Borodač family.

Michael Bradač received his secondary education at the Piarist Fathers Gymnasium in Podolinec.⁷³ He studied philosophy in Košice and theology in Trnava. After his ordination he was appointed as the Professor of Dogma at *the Theological School* in Mukačevo,⁷⁴ while temporarily administering also the Mukačevo parish. When the see of the Mukačevo Eparchy was transferred to Užhorod,⁷⁵ Bradač also went there and, eventually, became a Canon. As has been already mentioned, in 1790 he was appointed the Vicar General of Košice.

In 1803, Bradač was honored with the title of the Abbot of St. Andrew of Saár and, in 1808, he was named titular Bishop of Doryllea and the Auxiliary of Mukačevo. He was consecrated by Bishop Samuel Vulcan of Oradea Mare, in 1809. When the Capitular Vicar, John Kutka, died in 1812, Bishop Bradač succeeded him in that office. The office of the Capitular Vicar he exercised with great zeal until December 20, 1815, when his labo-

⁷⁰ 1 mark — weight for gold and silver, equal to about 8 oz. 1 mark of silver at that time was priced 20 fl. Thus Bradač's donation amounted to about 125 fl. in silver.

⁷¹ Cfr. above n. 30.

⁷² Duchnovič calls it "*scultetiales possessiones*", meaning that Bradač belonged to the lower class of aristocracy.

⁷³ Hung.: *Podolin*, town in the Spiš District.

⁷⁴ *The Theological School* of Mukačevo was founded by Bishop M. Olšavskyj, in 1744. It developed eventually into the Eparchial Seminary. In 1778, it was transferred by Bishop A. Bačinskyj to Užhorod, which became a new see of the Bishop. Cfr. B. Shereghy - B. Pekar, *The Training of Carpatho-Ruthenian Clergy*, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1951, p. 91-94.

⁷⁵ In 1780. Cfr. above n. 17.

rious and very fruitful life ended. He was buried in the crypt of the cathedral church in Užhorod.

His large estate, which he inherited and expanded by good management, Bradač willed to his nephew, Michael Bradač Jr., an attorney at the Court of Law in Prjašev. The nephew in a short time squandered all his inheritance and in his old age had to be supported by the charitable institutions. He died in 1848, in home of his son, who was the pastor of the parish in Rudľovo.⁷⁶

About the character of Vicar Michael Bradač everybody can find sufficient information in his records, which he kept conscientiously from 1790-1812. From the said records we can conclude, that he was very devoted to God and loyal beyond any suspicion to the King; he strongly loved his people, always and readily obeyed his own Bishop, and was extremely efficient in any task committed to him. In all his labors and misfortunes he displayed a heroic degree of patience.

Although the Greek Catholic priests were generally hated and despised in Hungary, especially in the Diocese of Eger,⁷⁷ this simple man during his vicarial office was able to gain many outstanding men for his cause. He was always welcomed in the home of one of the most influential magnates in Northern Hungary, Baron Horváth of Plavč.⁷⁸ Already at his first visit the Baron presented Bradač with an expensive golden snuff-box. He was also cordially received by General Splényi, the Supreme Commissioner of the Sabolč District, Baron Vécsey as well as Commissioners Szirmay and Csáky.

Bradač always sought the company of the nobles, taking every opportunity to pay them his personal respects. He would not miss the feast-day of any of the landlords, especially in the districts of Šariš and Spiš, without expressing his felicitations in person or, at least, in writing. He enjoyed to attend the christenings, weddings or funerals of the aristocracy. In turn, he gladly extended his hospitality and maintained friendly relations with many high-ranking officials. For his sincere rather than diplomatic behavior he was held in public esteem. When he

⁷⁶ Slov.: *Rudľov*, Hung.: *Erzfalva*, Zemplin District.

⁷⁷ In retaliation for the fight of the Greek Catholic faithful and clergy to free themselves from the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite Bishops.

⁷⁸ Hung.: *Palócsa*, Šariš District.

arrived for the first time to Prjašev to attend the Assembly of the Representatives of the Šariš District, in 1791, an honor guard of 50 horsemen met him at the city gate.

As is known to the writer of these lines, Michael Bradač was very humble man. He was rather of robust stature and grew a grayish well trimmed beard. Being man of unassuming manners, he always dressed with modesty. He was most amiable and everybody enjoyed his company. Even his subordinate clergy liked him, since he was ready to make any sacrifice on their behalf.

During his canonical visitations, which Bradač performed with a paternal solicitude, he inspired confidence in his clergy and the faithful. Fostering the Gods worship, he encouraged the church committees to build new churches or open new parishes. He was constantly in touch with his people through his *Pastoral Letters*, which always were written in the Ruthenian language. All these facts can be found in his registers.

Michael Bradač should be remembered for his great merits in improving the conditions of the Prjašev Eparchy.⁷⁹ Due to his solicitude, the Ruthenians were finally released from the obligation to pay taxes⁸⁰ to the Bishop of Eger and, in the District of Spiš, they were delivered from the jurisdiction of the Latin Rite Bishops as well as their domineering clergy.⁸¹ The Ruthenian clergy received also a representation in the Assembly of Nobles and many landlords have taken the Greek Catholic churches under their patronage⁸². In a word, through the efforts of Michael Bradač the unfortunate Ruthenian people were given chance for survival.

Let us keep the memory of Bradač blessed forever.

⁷⁹ The Vicariate of Košice was erected only in 1818, into the Eparchy of Prjašev, but Vicar Bradač paved the road.

⁸⁰ The various taxes, like "*decimae*", "*octavae*", and "*quartae*", mentioned by Duchnovič, were unjustly collected by the Rom. Cath. clergy from the Greek Catholics. Cfr. Pekar, *o.c.*, p. 85-87.

⁸¹ Cfr. n. 9 above.

⁸² By taking "*ius patronatus*" over the Greek Catholic parishes, the landlords were obliged to build or to restore the church and the parish house. In turn, they had a voice in the appointment of the pastor and the administration of the parish. Cfr. J. Papp-Szilágyi, *Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiae Orientalis Catholicae*, Magno-Varadini 1880, p. 209-211.

BOOK TWO

THE EPARCHY OF PRJAŠEV

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRJAŠEV EPARCHY

After the death of Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj of blessed memory,¹ the Vicarial Consistories of Mukačevo and Prjašev conceived the plan to partition the vast Mukačevo Eparchy into several, since it extended throughout 13 districts. It included 711 parishes of which only a few remained without their own pastors. The administration of such huge eparchy surpasses the strength even of a most zealous and vigilant Hierarch on account of a great distance and number of subjects.

For these reasons the Chapter of Mukačevo, supported by their own clergy and that of Prjašev, in 1810, presented the necessity of dismembration or, better stated, of proper provision of the Mukačevo Eparchy to His Majesty Francis I, the King of Hungary.²

1. DIVISION OF THE MUKAČEVO EPARCHY

The gracious King Francis I did not reject such reasonable request of the Chapter, but ordered a preliminary study of diplomatic and systematic³ solution of the involved problems, especially the feelings of the representatives of the eparchy in question. After making necessary arrangements with the Supreme Royal Council, the King has ordered to summon several delegates of the eparchy to Buda at public expense. Those who were

¹ *Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj* died on December 19, 1809.

² The last Holy Roman Emperor as — *Francis II* (1792-1806); the King of Hungary as — *Francis I* (1792-1835). In 1804 he was crowned as the Emperor of Austria.

³ *Diplomatic* — the opinion of the Hungarian higher circles, especially that of Primate and Palatine; *systematic* — concerning the “*systematization*”, i.e. the division and provision of a new eparchy.

summoned to Buda were: *Canon John Kutka*, the Capitular Vicar of Mukačevo, *Auxiliary Bishop Michael Bradač*, the Vicar General of Košice, and *Canon Gregory Tarkovič*, the official Censor of Books at the Royal Printing House in Buda.⁴ In addition to these three members of the Chapter, to Buda were also summoned a secretary and notary, but their names cannot be identified from the acts. They all participated in the deliberations of the Committee for the Ecclesiastical Affairs, appointed by the Supreme Royal Council. The delegates, by describing the impossible task of administering the huge Eparchy of Mukačevo by one man, convinced the Committee to recommend proposed partition of the eparchy.⁵

On the recommendation of the Supreme Royal Council, wishing to secure proper spiritual administration of the Greek Catholic faithful, His Majesty decided, on November 3, 1815, to divide the Eparchy of Mukačevo and erect a new Eparchy of Prjašev with its own Chapter of Canons. The King also ordered that the preparatory steps be taken immediately and the names of qualified individuals to fill the Mukačevo and Prjašev sees be submitted to him. The Hungarian Court Chancery informed the Supreme Royal Council about the King's decision concerning this matter.

Illustrious Palatin, Archduke Joseph, was asked to seek information about the candidates, capable of filling these episcopal sees from the neighboring Latin Rite bishops, namely the Archbishop of Eger and the Bishops of Košice and Satu Mare. The advice of the Greek Catholic Bishops of Oradea Mare and Križevci as well as the Capitular Vicar of Mukačevo, were also requested concerning the candidates, worthy of the episcopal dignity and ready to protect the interests of both Countries.⁶

The Illustrious Archduke complied with the orders and

⁴ Cfr. Book I, note 63, where Duchnovič mistakenly places the Printing House in Pest, while it was in Buda.

⁵ Duchnovič suggests that the idea of division came from our own circles, what is wrong. The idea to divide our people and make them more responsive to the magyarization came from the Hungarian circles. The question was raised in the Hungarian Parliament by the Primate, in 1807. Bishop Bačinskyj was strongly opposed to the idea and, therefore, they decided to wait until his death. Cfr. J. Kubinyi, *The History of Prjašiv Eparchy*, Rome, ed. by St. Clement's University, 1970, p. 80-83.

⁶ i.e. of Austria and Hungary.

gathered necessary information from the above mentioned Bishops. After mature reflection upon the life and qualifications of the proposed candidates, he recommended or, rather, respectfully proposed Canon Alexis Pocsy, a member of the Greek Catholic Chapter of Oradea Mare for the Mukačevo Eparchy⁷ and Canon Gregory Tarkovič, the Capitular Vicar and a member of the Mukačevo Chapter for the Prjašev Eparchy.⁸ This proposal and recommendation was accepted and approved by the Hungarian Court Chancery at its meeting of January 26, 1816, which was presided by the Chancellor, Count Erdödy. At the meeting were present also the following: Vice-Chancellor, Prince von Koháry, and the Councillors: Baron Püchler, Petkovič, Count Eszterházy, Névery and Count Cziráky, to whom this whole matter was presented by Bishop Rudnyay and Councillor Barthodeiszky.

They forwarded the following resolution to His Majesty: "This obsequious Chancery is of opinion that both these men, recommended by the Supreme Royal Council, possess the merits and qualifications necessary for the episcopal dignity. It can be expected that they will efficiently fulfil the duties of their sublime office in a such way, that our State will profit both spiritually and politically. We earnestly hope that by salutary admonition given to them there can be once again established a deeply rooted peace, mutual understanding, and true unity between the Greek and the Latin Rite Catholics which, since Bishop Bačinskyj's death, were gravely impaired by Vicars Kutka and Bradač, who now are both deceased".

In order to offer a better selection, the Chancery added the names of two other candidates, Canon Simeon Bran of Oradea Mare for the Eparchy of Mukačevo, and Canon John Olšavskyj of Mukačevo for the Eparchy of Prjašev. On these recommendations His Majesty made the official nomination by the decree, dated in Desenzano,⁹ March 19, 1816:

⁷ *Alexis Pocsy* — of Rumanian descent, was born in Kakád, 1753. He absolved his theological studies in Vienna. After his ordination he was, for a long time, a military chaplain and, in 1800, became Canon and rector of the cathedral in Oradea Mare. In 1816, he was consecrated Bishop of Mukačevo, died in 1831.

⁸ Duchnovič gives us the biography of Tarkovič in chapter 2 of this Book.

⁹ *Desenzano* — a vacation place on the Lake Garda, Venezia District, which at that time belonged to Austria. Now it belongs to Italy.

“ We nominate Canon Alexis Pocsy of Oradea Mare for the Bishop of Mukačevo, and Canon Gregory Tarkovič, the Capitular Vicar of Mukačevo, for the Bishop of Prjašev ”.

The Supreme Royal Council was immediately informed about the decision of His Majesty by the Hungarian Court Chancery. In compliance with the Chancery's order of November 3, 1815, they prepared a conspectus of the parishes, which was thoroughly examined at the meeting of the Committee of the Ecclesiastical Affairs, held on February 3, 1816, under chairmanship of the Archbishop of Eger, Baron Fischer. At the meeting were present Bishop Magovich, Bishop Vurum — who made a report, Councillor Almássy, and Count Emeric Battyányi, while Kancz and Máté acted as the secretaries, and Director Erczály as the official registrar.

It was decided that the funds intended for the support and education of the clergy would remain with the Eparchy of Mukačevo, while the Eparchy of Prjašev and Oradea Mare, into which 72 parishes from the Mukačevo Eparchy would be incorporated, were to receive a proportionate supplement to their dotation. The Royal Decree of March 1, 1816, ordered to take necessary steps for the proposed division of the Mukačevo Eparchy, with the exception of the Felső-Szopor parish, which was to be incorporated into the Eparchy of Fagaras.¹⁰

The above-mentioned conspectus of the Supreme Royal Council was changed by the new Decree of November 13, 1819, according to which the Bishop of Prjašev was to receive a proportionate amount of money from all the funds of the Mukačevo Eparchy,¹¹ including the Widows Endowment of 25,167 fl. and 15 cr.

While the Hungarian Court Chancery was working on the details of proposed dismembration, Prince Francis von Koháry, the Vice-Chancellor, informed Canon Gregory Tarkovič of his appointment as the Bishop of Prjašev in virtue of the Royal Decree of March 22, 1816. Although Tarkovič highly desired the episcopal dignity, nevertheless, alarmed by the fact that in

¹⁰ The Rumanian Greek Catholic Eparchy of Fagaras was created in 1721, elevated to the Metropolitan See in 1854. Its residence is in Blaj.

¹¹ Thus, the Mukačevo Eparchy, being already poorly provided, was to become poorer yet. The Canon of Eger Diocese was better provided than the Bishop of Mukačevo.

Prjašev there was no residence for the bishop, and the cathedral church required complete restoration and refurnishing, he declined this honorable offer by his letter of May 11, 1816, under pretext of his advanced age.¹² He humbly asked a permission to retain the benefice of a simple Canon of the Mukačevo Chapter.

On October 29, 1816, the Supreme Royal Council once again asked Tarkovič to give his definite answer, since in case of his refusal the Council was ordered to propose a new candidate for the Eparchy of Prjašev. This time Tarkovič promptly informed the Supreme Royal Council that at the time of his nomination by His Majesty he was seriously ill and contemplating rather the salvation of his soul than the episcopacy and, therefore, he had declined the high honor bestowed upon him. But now he was ready to comply with the desires of His Royal Majesty, although his advanced age prompted him to abide by his previous decision.

Upon receiving Tarkovič's answer, the Hungarian Court Chancery held another consultation, the Chancellor, Count Erdödy, presiding. At the meeting were present the Vice-Chancellor, Prince von Koháry, the Royal Councillors Lányi, Baron Püchler, Petkovič, Count Eszterházy, Névery, Count Cziráki, and Barthodeiszky, while Bishop Alagovich has made a report. The following recommendations were made to His Majesty:

1) The same Minorite monastery, which was given to the Vicar for the residence before the division of the Eparchy, should be also assigned for the residence to the Bishop of Prjašev. Two years before a specific amount of money has been granted to the Vicar for the complete restoration of mentioned monastery. Therefore, that money was to be placed to the disposal of Bishop-Elect Tarkovič as soon as he will take the oath of his office. The responsibility of complete restoration of the residence should be also committed to him.

2) The sum of 6,000 fl., which the Bishop of Mukačevo is returning from his benefice to the Religious Fund, should be assigned to the Bishop-Elect until his installation in Prjašev. The same Religious Fund should advance to him about 5,000 fl. for the purchase of the episcopal robes.

3) Further, according to the opinion of the Chancery,

¹² In 1816 Tarkovič was only 62 years old.

the meager dotation of the Bishop in sum of 6,000 fl. could provide only for his barest necessities and was not sufficient for an honorable livelihood on a par with the episcopal dignity, even in more favorable times. Pressed by constant needs, worries, and solicitude for his own subsistence, the Bishop could not face the enormous expenses of his canonical visitations and extensive journeys within the Eparchy. He would be unable to extend his hospitality to the subordinate clergy, when they come to discuss with him their pastoral problems. He could not support the poor, the widows, and the orphans, what is expected of the bishop not only in virtue of the natural law, but also, in many cases, by the salvation of the souls. It is impossible to be charitable with such inadequate income.

4) To spare this newly established eparchy from the future financial difficulties, the Chancery recommended to change the episcopal dotation into some immoveable property, which would be managed by the Religious Fund and would secure at least 8,000 fl. of yearly income for the bishop. Until making a definite provision, the Religious Fund should supply bishop's income from some other vacant benefices.

Since it pleased His Majesty to establish the income of the Prjašev Bishop at only 6,000 fl., payable yearly from the Religious Fund, the sympathizing Hungarian Court Chancery appealed to His Majesty's kind generosity and asked to increase the dotation. His Majesty then communicated the following decision through Archduke Rainer:

“Taking into consideration the declaration of the Bishop-Elect Tarkovič, We approve the first and the fourth paragraphs of the recommendations, presented to Us by the Court Chancery. Concerning the paragraphs two and three of the same recommendations, We order that the Religious Fund release a sum of 3,000 fl. to the Bishop-Elect for the purchase of his episcopal vestments.

“Making a temporary provision for the Bishop's suitable living, the same Religious Fund will pay the Bishop-Elect 50% of his established income from the day of his oath as it is customary with the other Government officials.

“The Chancery, as soon as possible, will kindly send Us a concrete proposal of how the Eparchy of Prjašev could be provided with the benefice, consisting in a real property.

Given in Vienna, on July 8, 1817. By the highest order of His Majesty — *Rainer, m.p.* ”.

In virtue of this royal resolution and one, given previously on July 29, 1816, the Hungarian Court Chancery issued a *Decree of Execution*,¹³ dated September 16, 1817, in which it stipulated:

“ As it was resolved by His Majesty, the funds needed for a complete restoration of the former Minorite monastery, which according to the former decision were first assigned to the Vicar, now will be supplied to Bishop-Elect Tarkovič and, following an oath of loyalty, the Bishop will assume entire responsibility for its completion.

“ Further, the Bishop-Elect will receive a grant of 3,000 fl. from the Religious Fund for the necessary episcopal vestments and liturgical equipment. In addition to the temporarily fixed dotation of 6,000 fl., he will also receive 50% of temporary subsidy for his proper subsistence, starting with the day of his oath. Thus, presently, the episcopal benefice of the Prjašev Bishop is established.”

According to the Royal Decree of November 3, 1815, the division of the Mukačevo Eparchy was decided as follows: “ The Bishop of Mukačevo will be left with 464 parishes, the Bishop of Prjašev will received 188 parishes, while the Bishop of Oradea Mare will obtain additional 72.” According to the communication issued on September 30, 1817, the subsidy of 30,000 fl. and other funds paid until present time to the Eparchy of Mukačevo were also to be divided. The respective bishops are given the opportunity to present, as soon as possible, their recommendations in the agreement with the disposition, issued on March 1, 1816.

In order to execute the Royal Decree of July 8, 1817, the Supreme Royal Council in its communiqué, released on April 27, 1818, has informed the competent Departments that, “ until a new disposition concerning episcopal benefice, Bishop-Elect Tarkovič will receive yearly 6,000 fl. plus a subsidy of 50% from the Religious Fund for his charitable enterprises effective from the day of his nomination. It was understood that Vicar’s salary, which was already included in that of the Bishop, will automatically discontinue ”.

¹³ *Decree of Execution* — i.e. putting into effect.

Thus the poor Bishop-Elect Tarkovič, who has been living in extreme poverty in Vienna for two long years at his own expense, finally was provided with a suitable livelihood, which was eventually paid to him in one sum, but much later. In the meantime, Tarkovič was unable either to leave Vienna or to cover from his meager income the expenses for himself, his secretary, and his servant as well as for the mail, transportation and other expenditures. He was living in the rectory of St. Barbara¹⁴ through the hospitality extended to him by the assistant pastor, Rev. John Fogarašij,¹⁵ who later became the pastor of the same parish. As related to us personally, the Bishop-Elect had to live very sparingly and be satisfied with hard military bread, which caused him to loose the last of his teeth.

Although finding himself in a grave situation, Bishop-Elect Tarkovič did not intend to leave Vienna until he would secure an appropriate endowment for the Eparchy and the Chapter of Prjašev. He summoned to Vienna also his Vicarial Secretary, Reverend Andrew Chira and, with his successful assistance, he took necessary steps to secure a real property for the benefice, as it was suggested to him at the Hungarian Court Chancery. His efforts were not vusted since the well disposed Monarch has instructed the said Chancery to make concrete proposal of how to properly provide the Eparchy of Prjašev.

The Chancellor, Count Erdödy, personally informed the Bishop-Elect of this fact by his letter, dated July 11, 1817. In accordance with this Royal Ordinance the Vice-Chancellor, Prince von Koháry, on April 17, 1818, held with Bishop-Elect Tarkovič an inquiry as to whether he was willing to accept the possession of Lechnicja, Spiš District¹⁶ as the benefice, under the following conditions:

From the stipulated income of 11,692 fl. and 42 cr., proceeding from the said possession every year, the Bishop was to

¹⁴ The Greek Catholic parish of St. Barbara in Vienna was established by Empress Maria Theresa, in 1774.

¹⁵ Rev. John Fogarašij — assistant pastor of St. Barbara, 1814-1818; then pastor, 1818-1834. Writer and linguist, he dedicated his *Grammar* of the Ruthenian language, printed in Vienna, 1833, to the benefactor of the Prjašev Eparchy, John Kovács. Cfr. dedication in E. Sabov, *Christomatija*, Ungvár 1893, p. 72-73.

¹⁶ Slov.: *Lechnica*, Hung. & Germ.: *Lechnitz*.

apply 6,000 fl. for his own dotation, 5,000 fl. for the dotation of the Chapter, while the remaining 692 fl. and 42 cr. was to be deposited into the cathedral church treasury for its maintenance. The individual Canons were to receive a proportionate amount of the Chapter's cumulative benefice periodically plus 50% of their income in cost-subsidy, as it was customary to give to all Government officials.

Bishop-Elect Tarkovič accepted the gracious gesture of His Majesty with due respect and submitted his reply to the inquest to the Hungarian Court Chancery on February 26, 1819. He was ready to accept any possession, which would be kindly assigned by His Majesty as revenue for the Bishop, Chapter, and cathedral and would administer it according to the conditions stipulated by the Chancery. But, before giving his final decision, Tarkovič wanted to survey the assigned property and reach an agreement with his Chapter, which later would be submitted to the Chancery for its ratification. As dotation for the Bishop and cathedral he asked possession of Myšľa¹⁷ instead of Lechnicja, and for the Chapter possession of Berestovo.¹⁸ Tarkovič supported his petition with the following reasons:

1) The possession of Lechnicja, which was offered to him by Vice-Chancellor Koháry, was distant 16 miles from the episcopal residence¹⁹ and, therefore, the Bishop would be able to administer it only with an extreme difficulty. The property was situated on the barren slopes of the Carpathian Mountains bordering Galicia and was not fertile enough to grow grapes, wheat, fruits and vegetables, even for the use of the workers. Thus Bishop would be forced to buy all the food needed by himself and his official family and, in addition, he would have to pay a proportionate amount of money to his Chapter and toward the maintenance of the cathedral church.

On the other hand, the possession of Myšľa was not far from Prjašev and in the middle of a fertile valley, thus its administration was not only much easier, but also more profitable. This arrangement would satisfy the needs of the Bishop and his cathedral and would, also, better comply with the gracious intention of His Majesty to secure the foundation of new Eparchy.

¹⁷ Hung.: *Mislye*, Abauj District.

¹⁸ Slov.: *Brestov*, Hung.: *Boroszló*, Šariš District.

¹⁹ Almost 280 American miles.

2) The property of Berestovo was distant from the city only two miles²⁰ and had an estimated yearly income of 4,472 fl. It could more adequately provide the benefice for the Chapter according to the opinion of Tarkovič. In this way would be prevented also the possible misunderstandings, which could arise from a joint benefice between the Bishop and his Chapter.

3) Since the estimated income from the Myšľa possession was somewhat higher than the assigned income for the Bishop and his cathedral, the difference could be easily applied toward the other needs of the Eparchy, such as building of a parish house, a reformatory school for the boys, a library etc.

On account of these reasons Bishop-Elect Tarkovič graciously asked to assign the above-mentioned properties to proposed Eparchy. The Hungarian Court Chancery took his request into consideration and, by the letter of November 27, 1818, asked the Supreme Royal Council to weigh the facts advanced by Bishop-Elect Tarkovič and to give its own opinion in this matter. The Chancery suggested that in case the possessions of Myšľa and Berestovo, for some grave reason, could not be assigned for the benefice of the Prjašev Eparchy and its Chapter then, perhaps, the Council could recommend some other suitable property for such purpose.

The Supreme Royal Council insisted on its original proposal to assign the possession of Lechnicja for the joint benefice of the Bishop, Chapter, and cathedral. Since the yearly income from that property was insufficient for all three dotations, estimated at 13,000 fl., the Council suggested to add smaller properties in Vranovo²¹ and Krajňa.²²

His Majesty accepted this modified proposal of the Council and, on July 7, 1820, issued a decree by which the above-mentioned properties were assigned for the benefice of the newly erected Eparchy. The responsibility of their administration was placed on the Bishop. The decree also allotted 4,000 fl. to be paid from the Vacant Dioceses Fund to the cathedral church for the purchase of necessary sacred vestments and vessels. In addition to 3,000 fl., which the Religious Fund was ordered to

²⁰ About 35 statute miles.

²¹ Slov.: *Vranov*, Hung.: *Varannó*, Zemplin District.

²² Hung.: *Krajnya*, Šariš District.

release to the Bishop according to the directive of September 16, 1817, another 3,000 fl. were to be appropriated for the furnishing the Bishop's private chapel.

The above-mentioned Royal Decree, imposing on the Bishop the responsibility of administration of the assigned properties, did not stipulate the proportionate distribution of the income. This question was raised by Count Ignatius Almásy and Bishop Alexander Alagovich at the consultation of the Hungarian Court Chancery, held on July 14, 1820. The Chancery decided to recommend to His Majesty to divide the whole benefice into 13 or 14 parts, of which the Bishop, the Chapter and the cathedral would receive their own share.

The King approved this proposal and by his communiqué of December 21, 1820, he instructed the Supreme Royal Council to transfer the administration of the assigned possessions with the necessary documents to Bishop-Elect Gregory Tarkovič, effective as of July 16, 1820. From that day on the payment of 6,000 fl. plus 50% of subsidy, formerly assigned to Tarkovič from the Religious Fund, was to cease.

Having established the benefice of the Prjašev Eparchy, His Majesty then proceeded with the formation of the Eparchial Chapter, which was to consist of five canons, namely: 1) *The Dean of Chapter* or *Praepositus Major* — with 1,000 fl. of yearly salary; 2) *Lector* — receiving 900 fl.; 3) *Cantor* — 800 fl.; 4) *Custodian* — 700 fl.; and 5) *Scholasticus* — 600 fl. yearly. Each canon was also to receive an additional 200 fl. as yearly subsidy for an apartment, which amounted to another 1,000 fl. Thus the cumulative dotation of the Chapter was established in the amount of 5,000 florins. This Royal resolution was promulgated on May 16, 1820.

The members of the newly erected Chapter were appointed as follows: *Canon John Mehaj* — as *Praepositus Major*; *Canon Michael Kaňuk* — as *Lector*; *Canon Basil Hodobaj* — as *Cantor*; *Canon Andrew Chira* — as *Custodian*; and *Canon John Habina* — as *Scholasticus*. They were formally installed in the former vicarial church, which by that time was elevated to the cathedral, on August 6, 1820. On that memorable day, after the reading of the Papal Bulls and Royal Decrees, the Eparchy of Prjašev was canonically established and the Chapter formed.

Upon notification of the Chapter's installation, the Supreme Royal Council has ordered the resignation of the assigned pos-

sessions to the Eparchy by its decree of August 16, 1820. However, because of the opposition of Administrator Michael Koronay, the actual transfer of the benefice occurred only on November 7, 1820. Thus the Chapter was deprived of its income for a longer period of time.

On October 17, 1820, Tarkovič petitioned the Supreme Royal Council to assign 5,000 fl. payable from the State's Treasury to the Chapter, since it had begun to fulfill its high obligation of the Canonical Office on August 6, 1820. The requested sum of 5,000 fl. was to be paid until such time when the benefice would be actually transferred to the Eparchy. The petition was not entirely rejected and the Religious Fund was ordered to pay the Chapter a sum of 1,250 fl. for the three months in question. However, the amount was paid in currency and not according to the conventional exchange.²³ The Chapter protested, claiming that their benefice was calculated according to the conventional exchange.

On October 24, 1820, the Supreme Royal Council gave the following answer: "The Hungarian Court Chancery established the benefice of the Chapter and its yearly subsidy at the amount of 5,000 fl. However, the conventional exchange is never mentioned in all the official decrees. Thus also the Bishop's dotation in sum of 6,000 fl. yearly should be understood 'in currency'".

But let us return to the question of the benefice. As was mentioned, the Hungarian Court Chancery's proposal to divide the income into 13 equal parts was approved. To this effect, on December 10, 1820, the Supreme Royal Council issued a decree, whereby all the income of Lechnicja, Vranovo and Krajňa was to be divided into 13 shares, six of which were assigned to the Bishop, five to the Chapter, and two to the cathedral. Thus the question of the benefice was officially considered as concluded.

The money assigned for the restoration of the former Minorite monastery and its adaptation for the residence was not accepted by the Bishop-Elect, because he considered the allotted sum as insufficient to cover expenses. As was described in *Book One*, the building was further destroyed by the Contractor Joseph

²³ Between Viennese market (in currency, *Scheingeld*) and Conventional Exchange (*Konventionmünze*) there was great difference. Cfr. Book I, note 24.

Bretterbauer and, since 1812, it has been completely neglected and desolated. Because of a leaking roof the entire edifice simply fell apart. However, a deplorable condition of the building can be only partly ascribed to the insatiable greed of the contractor. The most of responsibility still remains with the Vicars, who neglected to inspect the progress of the work during the restoration. In 1813, Tarkovič himself squandered a large sum of money on altering five rooms for himself without making them habitable.

Bishop-Elect Tarkovič realized that his living quarters were unsuitable for the episcopal residence and that the building, even if provided with the sufficient funds, could not be properly restored. Therefore, he petitioned His Majesty to assign him the former house of Count Klobusiczky, which was temporarily occupied by the army, for the bishop's residence. The building was situated close to the cathedral church and was very appropriate for such purpose. At the same time, Tarkovič intended to retain the old monastery building for the eparchial needs, such as the residence for Canons, the rector of cathedral and his assistants, the guest rooms for the priests, a Preparatory School²⁴ and correctional center for boys. However, this petition was immediately rejected without processing it through the proper channels.

With God's help the Bishop-Elect finally was able to conclude the whole affair of putting a solid foundation for the newly erected Eparchy of Prjašev. On August 6, 1820, the Chapter of Canons was solemnly installed in the newly designated cathedral church, when the Papal Bull of the canonical erection of the Prjašev Eparchy was also promulgated. The Bishop of Prjašev received under his jurisdiction 194 parishes, six more than originally planned. They all were divided into five *Arch-Diaconates*²⁵ and seventeen *Deaneries*. Thus a new Prjašev Eparchy was established completely independent from that of Mukačevo, and described by its own boundaries.

On October 24, 1820, the Supreme Royal Council issued an

²⁴ From Latin it was called "*Praeparandía*", modern *Teachers College*. Eventually it was established by Bishop John Valyi, in 1895.

²⁵ It is medieval division of the diocese into larger districts, headed by the Archdean, called *Arch-Diaconates*, which were subdivided into *Vice-Arch-Diaconates* or *Deaneries*, headed by Dean.

order to the Bishops of Mukačevo and Prjašev that in their mutual understanding they should proportionately divide between their two eparchies the various funds and foundations, including the 30,000 fl. subsidy granted for their clergy. Also the documents and archives related to the newly erected Eparchy were to be transferred to Prjašev.

Having successfully finished all transactions concerning the newly established Eparchy, Bishop-Elect Gregory Tarkovič, finally, bade farewell to Vienna, where he spent three years living in extreme poverty. On his return to Prjašev he made a stop in Buda, and then payed a visit to the Metropolitan of Esztergom.²⁶ On November 17, 1820, at last he arrived to Prjašev, where he was joyously greeted by the members of the Chapter and the clergy. They accompanied him to the former Minorite monastery, where he had lived as the Vicar and which now became the bishop's residence. The building was in a such sad condition that it was suited better for the owls and bats than for the people. And here, in these deplorable quarters, Bishop Tarkovič had lived to the very last day of his life, constantly exercising himself in heroic patience and religious poverty.

Exhausted by a strenuous and long journey, the Bishop-Elect became ill in Miskolc, arriving to Prjašev almost dead.²⁷ Unable to find a real cause of his illness, the doctors didn't know how to treat him and gave up hope for his recovery. Then his valet, John Fišinskyj, using his home medicine, made him well again.

Having regained his health, Tarkovič turned his thoughts to his consecration. He realized that an elaborate and solemn ceremony in the cathedral would involve a great expense. He also tried to curtail expenses of the consecrating Bishop Alexis Pocsy, who just recently was consecrated Bishop of Mukačevo and was still paying his debts.²⁸ For these reasons Tarkovič decided on a private and simple ceremony at the monastery in Krasnyj Brod.²⁹

²⁶ The Eparchy of Prjašev, similarly as that of Mukačevo, was subject to the Archbishop of Esztergom as to its Metropolitan.

²⁷ Duchnovič explains that Tarkovič, lacking funds for the traveling expenses, could not stop over night at the inn and was living on bread and wather only.

²⁸ Bishop Alexis Pocsy was consecrated in 1817.

²⁹ The monastery of the Basilian Fathers in Krasnyj Brod, near Mežila-

Dispensing with all pomp, Tarkovič was consecrated Bishop in the presence of the members of his Chapter and the clergy, on All Saints Sunday, June 17, 1821. Returning to his episcopal see in Prjašev on the same day he was privately installed in the cathedral with the Canons of his Chapter present. Thus, finally, Tarkovič assumed the administration of his Eparchy, which until that day was governed by the Dean of the Chapter, Canon John Mehaj.³⁰

The Government's representative, Administrator Michael Koronay, officially transferred the management of the possession in Lechnicja to the Bishop and his Chapter only in December, 1820. The properties in Vranovo and Krajňa were ceded to them in February of the following year. At last, Bishop Gregory Tarkovič became the Ordinary of his own right.

Such were the beginnings of the Prjašev Eparchy, which we tried to describe to you as faithfully as possible. Although there were arduous and great obstacles to overcome, nevertheless, everything came to a happy ending.

2. ADMINISTRATION OF BISHOP G. TARKOVIČ

Before continuing the description of the relevant events, which took place during the administration of the first Bishop of Prjašev, it seems to us most feasible to briefly recount his biography.

Gregory Tarkovič saw the light for the first time on November 8, 1754 (according to the Julian calendar), in the small village Pasika, Bereh District,³¹ which eventually became a filial

borcji, was founded probably in XIV c. At the beginning of XVII c. the monastery and church were completely reconstructed by Count Drugeth. In 1914, during the war operation, both monastery and church were completely destroyed. Prof. K. Zaklinskyj describes the history of Krasnyj Brod Monastery in "*Naukovyj Zbivnyk Muzeju u Svidnyku*", Bratislava-Prjašiv 1965, vol. I, p. 43-58.

³⁰ Vicar John Olšavskyj administered the Prjašev Eparchy until August 6, 1820, when the newly created Chapter of Prjašev was installed. On that occasion he handed the administration of the Eparchy to the Capitular Vicar, Canon John Mehaj. Thus, Canon Mehaj administered the Eparchy of Prjašev from August 6, 1820 to June 17, 1821.

³¹ Hung.: *Kishidvég*, Svaljava County.

church of Suskovo.³² His father was Andrew Tarkovič, the cantor in Pasika, his mother Anastasia nee Hankovskij. He was baptized by his grandfather, Reverend Simeon Tarkovič, who at that time was the pastor of Pasika. Reverend Simeon Chomitskyj, the pastor of Suskovo, and Catherine Kamiňaš were his Godparents.

Tarkovič learned how to read and write in his native tongue from his father and his grandfather to such a degree that, before going into the Latin Schools,³³ according to his own confession, he new by heart the entire *Book of Psalms* and *Horologion*.³⁴ The grammar and humanities he studied at the Gymnasium of the Jesuit Fathers in Užhorod³⁵ with such a great success, that his name was always the first on the Honor List. He was also an exemplary member of *the Sodality of Mary* not only because of his scholastic success, but also on account of his sincere piety, which he manifested from his infancy. At the completion of his secondary education, as he admitted himself, he applied and was promptly accepted by the Society of Jesus.

At that time he considered himself a most fortunate man, since he often used to repeat: "When I was accepted by the Jesuit Order, I regarded myself the happiest man, because in my own estimation a Jesuit surpassed every other ecclesiastical dignity". Unfortunately, his happiness was not long lived. Just as he was ready to depart for the Jesuit Novitiate in Vác, the famous and never enough bemoaned Order has been suppressed.³⁶ Thus, the most desired wish of Tarkovič was frustrated. All his life he retained such a high opinion of the Jesuit Order, that every time someone has mentioned the name of the Society or some of its members, he would shed abundant tears.

After his dreams were frustrated, Tarkovič headed to Ora-

³² Hung.: *Bányafalva* or *Bányafalu*.

³³ i.e. *Gymnasium*, where he began to study Latin.

³⁴ O. Sl.: *Časoslov*, priestly prayerbook, containing all the liturgical services and liturgical calendar. In those days, because of lack of our Ruthenian books, the children were compelled to study our language from the Old Slavonic liturgical books.

³⁵ The Gymnasium was founded by Count Drugeth in Humenne, 1613. In 1646, it was transferred to Užhorod and was under the administration of the Jesuit Fathers until 1773, when the Jesuit Order was suppressed.

³⁶ By Pope Clement XIV, in 1773. Jesuits were restored by Pope Pius VII, in 1814.

dea-Mare for his philosophical studies. There he finished a two-year course under the famous professors of former Jesuit Order and was accepted by Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj among the junior clergy of the Mukačevo Eparchy. Bačinskyj immediately sent him to the newly established St. Barbara Seminary in Vienna, founded only for the Greek Catholic seminarians. He completed the first year of theology with great success and received his first tonsure as a *Reader*³⁷ from the hands of the Bishop of Križevci,³⁸ in 1775. His theological studies he completed again with high honors and immediately returned to his native eparchy. Bishop Bačinskyj ordained him in his cathedral³⁹ as a *Subdeacon* on November 6, 1778, then again on November 20 of the same year as a *Deacon*. Finally, on January 1, 1779, Tarkovič received the holy order of the priesthood in the monastery church on Černeča Hora,⁴⁰ near Mukačevo.

After his ordination, Tarkovič immediately was appointed as a Professor of Theology in Mukačevo,⁴¹ which post he held with success until 1793. According to the testimony of his former students, Tarkovič, trying to be clear, by the excessive repetitions most of the time became very obscure. This unfortunate man, not being gifted with the art of presentation of the subject, in his teaching did not achieve proportionate success compared to his diligence.

Because John Kopčaj, the pastor of Hajdudorog,⁴² was not

³⁷ It is also called from the Latin term — *Lector*.

³⁸ At that time the Bishop of Križevci was Basil Božičkovič (1759-1785).

³⁹ It was still in Mukačevo, since the see of Mukačevo Eparchy was transferred to Užhorod only in 1780.

⁴⁰ Basilian Monastery on Černeča Hora, near Mukačevo, was the traditional seat of the Mukačevo Bishop until 1751, when Bishop Michael M. Olšavskyj transferred it to the city. On Černeča Hora there was also a large church for the sake of the pilgrims, in which Tarkovič was ordained a priest.

⁴¹ The Theological School in Mukačevo was founded by Bishop M. Olšavskyj, in 1744. In 1776, it was established into the Eparchial Seminary and, in 1778, was transferred to Užhorod, where it remained until recent times. Duchnovič made mistake, since at the time of Tarkovič's ordination the Seminary was already in Užhorod, not in Mukačevo.

⁴² *Hajdudorog*, Hajdu District, now in Hungary, was one of the largest parishes of the Mukačevo Eparchy. In 1875, it became seat of the *Vicariate of Hajdudorog* for the Hungarian Greek Catholics. In 1912, the Vicariate was erected into the *Hungarian Greek Catholic Eparchy of Hajdudorog*, with its seat in Nyiregyháza.

making his financial report for the last fifteen years and was convicted of defrauding his parish of 300 fl., in 1793, he was removed from the parish and in his place Reverend Gregory Tarkovič was appointed as the pastor of Hajdudorog. In his new place Tarkovič did not achieve desired success either, no matter how hard he tried, because he lacked a sufficient command of the Hungarian and, as was mentioned before, he had difficulty in delivering his homilies, although he wrote some most elaborate sermons.

Conscious of these shortcomings and being resented by the parishioners, in 1797, Tarkovič was transferred to the Užhorod parish⁴³ on his own accord. In his new place, preaching in Ruthenian, he pleased his parishioners and remained there until 1803, when he was appointed as the official *Censor of the Books* at the newly established *Royal Slavic Printing House* in Buda, generally known as "*the Illyric Printery*". In 1804, Tarkovič was elevated to the dignity of Canon of the Mukačevo Chapter, but remained in his post in Buda until 1813, when he was appointed Vicar General of Košice.

In 1815, Tarkovič returned to Užhorod in the capacity of the Capitular Vicar⁴⁴ and, the following year, he was graciously nominated as the first Bishop of Prjašev. His care and solicitude for the newly erected Eparchy are already known to us.

Gregory Tarkovič was a very well read man. Leading almost a solitary way of life, he studied every day late into the night, even to dawn. Thus he acquainted himself almost with all the books, which he was able to find in the enormous *Episcopal Library* in Užhorod.⁴⁵ Having a perfect command of the Greek language, he became very familiar with the Church Fathers and the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils.

⁴³ Besides the cathedral church in Užhorod (Hung.: *Ungvár*), there was another parochial church called "*Cehoľňa*", established in 1575. Tarkovič was pastor in Cehoľňa church.

⁴⁴ After the death of Bishop Bačinskyj, the Mukačevo see was vacant from 1809-1817. The Eparchy was administrated by one of the Canons, elected by the Chapter, who was called *the Capitular Vicar*. During this period there were three such Capitular Vicars, namely: *Canon John Kutka* (1809-1812), *Canon-Bishop Michael Bradač* (1812-1815), and *Canon Gregory Tarkovič* (1815-1816).

⁴⁵ The famous *Episcopal Library* in Užhorod was founded by Bishop A. Bačinskyj, in 1780. Already then it contained 9,000 volumes of rare books and manuscripts.

Man of remarkable talents and indefatigable diligence, in public life he had no or very little success since, on account of his timid nature, he avoided the company of the people. Trying to arouse his uncommon talents, the Mukačevo Canons elected him to represent them at the Diet in Bratislava,⁴⁶ successively, in 1803 and 1807. Nevertheless, it was impossible to stir up his courage. At the Diet he also preferred the solitude and tried to avoid even people's shadow.

During his assignment in Buda Tarkovič had his board and lodging at the monastery of the Capuchin Fathers, where he became friendly only with a certain Father Blaise, and spent all his free time on the exercises of piety. Having lived there for whole ten years, according to his own admission, he didn't know to indicate on which bank of the Danube River was situated Buda, and on which Pest.⁴⁷ He was completely unfamiliar with these two cities, besides some public Office Buildings, the monasteries, and the homes of his councillors.

Having occupied in Buda an office of distinction for ten years, upon the death of John Kutka,⁴⁸ he was recalled by the Chapter and was appointed the Vicar General of Košice. What he really did as the Vicar of Košice, as was mentioned before, is hard to determine on account of the lack of the records. It seems to us, that he has done very little or almost nothing, if we can trust the testimony of other vicarial officials of that time.

About his election for the Bishop of Prjašev it was already mentioned.

As the Bishop, he administered the Eparchy from 1821-1841, when, on account of his old age, he quietly and piously departed in the Lord on January 16. Bishop Basil Popovič of Mukačevo,⁴⁹ who was his former Secretary, solemnly buried him in the cathedral crypt in Prjašev, where he is resting in peace to this very day.

Gregory Tarkovič was of medium height and slender figure,

⁴⁶ Hung.: *Pozsony*, Germ.: *Pressburg*, today capital of Slovak SR.

⁴⁷ Twin cities on the opposite banks of Danube River, *Buda* and *Pest*, were incorporated into one city of *Budapest* only in 1872.

⁴⁸ *Canon John Kutka*, the Capitular Vicar, died October 17, 1812.

⁴⁹ *Basil Popovič* was: 1) Bishop Tarkovič's Secretary, 1822-1835; 2) Canon of Prjašev Chapter, 1835-1838; 3) Bishop of Mukačevo, 1838-1864.

his lean but lofty face was somewhat redish-pale, he had stern but most radiant eyes, and wore moderately long beard. Shortly, he possessed such impressive and majestic stature that, generally, he was considered as a descendant of some high nobility.

Even in his advanced years he was constantly absorbed by his studies and one could always find him with a book in his hands. Possessing a kind and tender conscience, but a very hot temper, he was often asking for forgiveness when realizing, that he hurt someone's feelings by his outburst, always trying to correct his own mistakes. He meticulously performed all the exercises of piety and was a zealous protector of our venerable Rite, which he knew thoroughly.

Toward the reigning dynasty he was most respectful and would refuse to send any petition to His Majesty for fear he might offend his royal dignity. He equally loved and hated money. With his domestic expenditures he was very tight, but in making donations he was generous. To everyone, who came to him for help, he gave liberally, without asking for an account. In one word, if one would disregard his highly suspicious character, constantly aroused by the intrigues of his adulators, one could see in him mirrored St. Nicholas, especially when he was vested in his episcopal robes and celebrating the Divine Liturgy.

The administration of Bishop Tarkovič was paternal, especially during the period, when Secretary Basil Popovič was at his side.⁵⁰ On November 18, 1821, he convoked the *Eparchial Synod* in which took part, besides the Canons and Chancery Officials, two pastors from each deanery and four religious of the Order of St. Basil the Great, representing its two monasteries.⁵¹ The acts of the synod were transmitted to the National Synod of the Catholic Church in Hungary, presided by the Primate-Archbishop Alexander Rudnyay. Bishop Tarkovič, on account of his illness, was not able to be present at the National Synod celebrated in Bratislava, 1822.

After taking over the administration of the Eparchy, Bishop Tarkovič delegated Canon Basil Hodobaj⁵² to take out from the

⁵⁰ i.e. between 1822-1835.

⁵¹ There were two Basilian monasteries within the boundaries of the Eparchy of Prjašev, namely in *Krasnyj Brod* and on *Bukova Hirka*. They both were destroyed during World War I.

⁵² *Basil Hodobaj*, Canon of the Prjašev Chapter, 1820-1840.

Mukačevo Eparchy's Archives all the documents concerning the newly established Eparchy, and deposit them in the Archives of Prjašev. According to the records of October 24, 1820, Canon Hodobaj did transfer these documents, but they were of little value with the exception of the parish registers. Thus *the Eparchial Archives* were established. The archivist was to be payed from the Bishop's Fund, graciously instituted by His Majesty in the sum of 2,000 fl., as suggested by Bishop Tarkovič.

On May 28, 1822, the Religious Fund was ordered by His Majesty to grant to the Bishop of Prjašev additional 2,000 fl. for *the Bishop's Fund* under the condition, that every Bishop would leave in trust of his successor as a principal 500 fl. "*in naturalibus*" and 1,500 fl. in cash. By the same order the Bishop received for his dining room a silver set for twelve, a total of 81 pieces of silver, weighing 230 oz. which, according to the Chapter's Register, was also to be passed to his successor.

The sharing of common benefice by the individual beneficiaries was constantly causing new and complicated problems. According to the official census of 1814, the benefice was estimated to yield 14,917 fl. and 23 cr. of net yearly income. But being located in the most sterile parts of Hungary⁵³ it was hardly yielding a half of that sum. In addition, the Bishop received these possessions without any supplementary funds for the repairs, but had to replace all delapidated farm buildings and purchase all new farming equipment, including the seed for sowing.

However, Bishop Tarkovič suffered the greatest loss in the wooded area of his benefice in Lechnicja. The Government officials forced him to pay an excessive price for timber already cut and he had to cover all the debt of the private creditors for the wood, previously sold to them in that area. For this single transaction the Religious Fund mortgaged him for a total of 12,249 fl. and 46 $\frac{9}{12}$ cr. Subtracting from this sum 2,000 fl., which it had to solve to the Bishop for the establishment of the Bishop's Fund, the Religious Fund, by the letter of May 28, 1822, had notified Bishop Tarkovič that he owed them a total of 10,249 fl. and 46 $\frac{9}{12}$ cr.

Bishop Tarkovič hoped that the debt would be condoned

⁵³ Until 1918, the territory of Prjašev Eparchy belonged to Hungary, after it was incorporated into modern Slovakia.

to him. But he was mistaken, because the Religious Fund was repeatedly reminding him of his debt. Trying to aggravate him more, on October 24, 1826, the Religious Fund requested from Tarkovič an account of money, granted to him yet in 1814, namely 925 fl. for the repairs of the vicarial residence and 3,000 fl. for the furnishing of the vicarial church.

But let us turn back to the administration of the Eparchy. Previously we already explained what was official opinion concerning the division of the Mukačevo Eparchial Funds as it was presented for its final approval to the Supreme Royal Council. On January 14, 1823, the Council issued its decision, according to which:

1) From *the Seminary or Educational Fund* — consisting of a total of 5,881 fl. and 4 cr., to the Eparchy of Prjašev was assigned 1,517 fl. and 43¼ cr. From the income of the Seminary vinyard a total of 40 fl. and 55¼ cr.,⁵⁴ and from the yearly interest on cash savings 189 fl. and 49¼ cr. There were 32 Seminararians of the Prjašev Eparchy to be educated as follows:

In the Central Seminary of Pest	2 Seminararians,
In the Primatial Seminary of Trnava	5 Seminararians,
In the Imperial Seminary of Vienna	3 Seminararians,
In the Eparchial Seminary of Užhorod	10 Seminararians,
In various Institutions	12 Seminarians,

Total	32 Seminarians.

Two Seminararians assigned to the Central Seminary in Pest and three to the Imperial Seminary in Vienna were to be provided for from the funds of the same Seminaries. The remaining twenty-seven Seminararians were to be provided for from the Prjašev Seminary Fund, to which the Religious Fund was ordered to add 3,838 fl. and 12½ cr.⁵⁵

Since the Supreme Royal Council had ordered, that the money assigned for the education of the Seminararians in Užhorod

⁵⁴ In this place Duchnovič made the following remark: "The Seminary of Užhorod owns a vineyard, bequeathed by Canon M. Gáll (d. 1822), which belongs to the public fund of the Seminary".

⁵⁵ With other words, *the Seminary Fund* of Prjašev Eparchy consisted of a total of 5,586 fl. and 39¼ cr.;

and Trnava be payed to the Bishop and he, in turn, had to dispose of it according to the orders, Bishop Tarkovič asked the Council to pay the money directly to the concerned Seminaries, because of difficulty in forwarding the money. It was granted for the Seminarians in Trnava, but not for those in Užhorod.

2) *Fund for Disabled* — consisted of deposits in sum of 4,541 fl. and 4 cr., yielding yearly 272 fl. and 30 $\frac{4}{8}$ cr. interest. From this fund the Eparchy of Prjašev shared 1,203 fl. and 41 $\frac{6}{8}$ cr., bringing in 72 fl. and 13 $\frac{3}{16}$ cr. of interest.

At that time in the Eparchy there were six disabled priests. Counting only 300 fl. yearly for their support, the total of 1,800 fl. was needed. Therefore, it was ordered to take sum of 1,727 fl. and 46 $\frac{3}{6}$ cr. from other funds and to add to the above mentioned income from the interest.

3) *The Subsidiary Fund for Clergy* — amounted to 30,000 fl., from which to Prjašev Eparchy a sum of 7,930 fl. and 49 $\frac{1}{4}$ cr. was allotted. After paying a grant from this sum to some parishes, the Subsidiary-Fund of Prjašev Eparchy consisted of a total of 7,725 fl. and 49 $\frac{1}{4}$ cr.

4) *The Widows and Orphans Fund* — consisting of a total of 58,061 fl. and 29 $\frac{2}{3}$ cr., made Prjašev's share 15,387 fl. and 53 cr.

After the establishment of proper Eparchial Funds the only thing left to be done was the adaptation of the cathedral church to the requirements of the Greek Rite and the restoration or, rather, the reconstruction of the Bishop's residence as well as the provision of the cathedral clergy.

The restoration of the cathedral during the episcopacy of Tarkovič remained only wishful thought. As was mentioned before, in 1823, Bishop Tarkovič received a sum of 4,000 fl. i.c. for the adaptation of the cathedral from the Religious Fund. Bishop immediately ordered 30 thinner and 20 thicker planks, for which he paid from his treasury 61 fl. and 5 cr. In 1825, other needed materials were bought from Kapišova,⁵⁶ but they were stolen before their delivery. The whole work was then held back until 1845, while the Bishop kept all that money by himself without any interest. It can only be explained by his

⁵⁶ Hung.: *Kapissó*, Šariš District.

passive attitude. The planks and other materials slowly decayed or were stolen. By 1846, there remained only two usable boards. Thus, having buried the treasure of 4,000 fl. in the earth, Bishop Tarkovič left this noble task together with the other affairs to his successor.

The reconstruction of the residence was also left undone. But for the sake of truth and benefit of posterity we intend to describe this whole matter in a separate chapter, which follows.

3. BISHOP'S RESIDENCE

For the vicarial residence, which later was assigned to the Bishop of Prjašev, an old monastery of the abolished Minorite Fathers was graciously designated. For its remodeling and restoration, as was mentioned above, the sum of 23,947 fl. and 57½ cr. was granted. But let us first describe a deplorable condition of this monastery when it was consigned to the Eparchy.

The monastery of the Minorite Fathers was constructed by the generosity of a certain Keczer Family on one of the Prjašev's main arteries, namely, on the southern end of the Košice Street. It was the last building on the main street leading to the south from the city. In 1788, following the abolition of the Minorite Fathers by the Emperor,⁵⁷ the monastery was destroyed by fire, which turned almost the entire city into the ashes. There is a certain rumor going around until this day that the fire was set by some of the members of the Minorite Order.

After the fire, when the entire city was being rebuilt, the monastery was also restored at the public expense for the Government's use, such as a storehouse for military supplies, army barracks etc. Finally, in 1791, it was granted to the Vicar of Košice for his residence, as it was already described.

On his return from Vienna, in 1820, Bishop Tarkovič took possession of this monastery, but it was in a such deplorable condition that everyone considered it only as a heap of rubble. The southern part of the building facing the back-yard, previously repaired and occupied by the vicars, was somewhat better

⁵⁷ Emperor Joseph II (1780-1790) abolished numerous monasteries of the various Religious Orders and turned their property into the so called — *Religious Fund*.

preserved and, at least for the time being, had to serve to the Bishop as his residence. The front part facing the street was completely uninhabitable. There were no windows and no doors in the whole building, with the exception of two lower rooms at the entrance. The window and door openings were either blocked up by logs or walled up with the boards. The roof was almost falling apart. Remaining a few rotten shingles, hanging from some two-by-fours, were threatening every day to collapse. Only the chimneys, opposing each other as two gallows, were protruding from the roof.

The place was full of filth, since everybody had access to the ruins and used them for a privy. Everyone who looked at these ruins knowing, that they were given to our Bishop for his residence, was seized by a great disgust, considering such gesture only as a political scandal. Here, then, the first Bishop of Prjašev had his living head-quarters, which served both as his residence and the Chancery Office.

The Bishop himself was occupying two former monastic cells in the back of the building. Another cell was used for the Chancery Office, where five persons were working at one desk all day long. It also served as a lodging for the secretary. One larger room, after taking out the dividing wall from between the two cells, had served as a meeting room for the Bishop's Consistory, as a dining room, and living quarters for the office personnel. Finally, another cell was converted into a library.

Some members of the staff were living in two dark cells in the basement. The author of this book⁵⁸ lived there, like in a prison, for four long years. As the eparchial registrar (Lat.: "*Actuarius*"), he was forced to live in one small room with other two clerks and a teen-aged stoker by the name of George Kriba. The Eparchial Archives and the official files were stocked on the corridor.

Bishop Tarkovič presented his petition concerning the reconstruction of this building during his stay in Vienna. On his return to Prjašev he waited patiently and hopefully until 1824, but in vain. Finally, he engaged Architect Michael Eischel to survey the entire building and present in writing a professional

⁵⁸ A. Duchnovič was working in the Chancery Office as "*actuarius*", 1827-1830. Unable to stand any longer deplorable conditions of work, he escaped to Užhorod.

evaluation of its condition. On July 8, 1824, he sent this articulate evidence to the Supreme Royal Council, insisting to commission some official inspector in order to make concrete plans for the restoration of the building.

In the reply of September 5, 1825, the Supreme Royal Council informed the Bishop to make repairs according to the specifications, approved yet on July 11, 1817, for which purpose a sum of 23,945 fl. and 57½ cr. was already assigned. Since this order was not executed, the Supreme Royal Council imposed on the Bishop an obligation to present new blue-prints with the estimates. They were prepared by the official architect, John Willecz, who was a member of the District Building Commission, and were presented to the Supreme Royal Council together with the Bishop's new petition, dated October 28, 1826.

On December 12, 1826, Bishop Tarkovič received unfavorable answer to his petition, being instructed to adapt the plans for restoration in a such way, that they might be executed for a total of 23,947 fl. and 57½ cr., which sum was previously allotted for this purpose. In case he needed more money, he had to supply it from his own treasury. Such reply did not bring any consolation to poor Bishop, but rather a new distress. Tarkovič was barely able to survive on his personal income, much less to build.

On June 5, 1827, Bishop Tarkovič reverently informed the Supreme Royal Council about his inability to meet the additional expenses for the restoration on account of a lack of means and declined to assume any responsibility in supervising the work. The Council sent back to the Bishop all the acts, blue-prints, and estimates, prepared for him by Architect Willecz, stipulating they had to be accommodated to the previously assigned sum of money, unless the Bishop was ready to give his written guarantee, that he himself will cover all the expenses, exceeding the allotted sum, from his own income.

Bishop Tarkovič insisted on his previous proposal and, therefore, on November 6, 1828, sent the plans of the above mentioned architect with his own observations and remarks to His Majesty. The same year the Hungarian Court Chancery rerouted them back to the Supreme Royal Council giving an explicit order to work out some new plans for the restoration of the residence. As the letters were sent back and forth, the roof over the southern part of the building collapsed, turning the residence into a complete

ruin. The Bishop informed the Supreme Royal Council of this misfortune on June 23, 1830.

In view of the Court Chancery's decision, the Supreme Royal Council, by its communication of October 15, 1830, disposed as follows:

"Since there were valid reasons suggesting the demolition of the whole monastery in question and the construction of a completely new and more compact building in the same place, the entire matter was committed to the Supreme Building Commission, where all the questions connected with the building were previously discussed. The Commission was to employ the services of the official architect, John Willecz of Košice, who was to make new plans with the proper estimates for a simple and compact building in the agreement with the Bishop, using all necessary means to keep the expenses down".

Architect John Willecz fulfilled his task well. In a short time, taking into consideration the thriftiness of State Treasury and needs of the Eparchy, he presented new, more suitable plans. But they were rejected again by the Supreme Royal Council, because they surpassed somewhat the suggested cost.

We would like to remark that every time the question of the bishop's residence was raised, new blue-prints and new estimates were requested. As the various Government Departments were deliberating on the matter, the roofless monastery building exposed to the wind and inclement weather deteriorated to such an extent that there was a danger of its collapse. The precarious condition of the building was reported by the Bishop and Magistrate to the proper authorities. Finally, in 1838, by the order of the Supreme Royal Council the whole building, with the exception of the rear part occupied by the Bishop and his assistants, was completely demolished.

Inspired with a new hope, Bishop Gregory Tarkovič continued to fight for a decent residence, but he was destined to end his life in these abominable lodgings, while sighing with the Prophet: "*My house is desolate*" (Agg. 1:9), and with the Sage: "*I have completed my outdoor task and arranged my work in the field, and afterwards I will build me a house*".⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Duchnovič mistakenly ascribed this quote to *the Ecclesiastes* (Coeleth), since it is adaptation of *the Proverbs*, 24:27.

4. EPARCHIAL LIBRARY

Among many other important matters, which Bishop Tarkovič was pursuing at the Imperial Court in Vienna before taking over the administration of the newly erected Eparchy, was the establishment of *the Eparchial Library*. Tarkovič was personally convinced of the importance and the necessity of such an institution in the eparchy, being inspired by a good example of other well established dioceses. Thus, this poor and needy Bishop, who from the first day of his appointment to the new see had to struggle in order to secure a suitable income for himself and provide for all the pressing needs of his Eparchy, did not forget to procure some additional funds for the Eparchial Library and buy a few books.

As he was set to raise some funds to purchase the books for the library, the imperscrutable Divine Providence, by some unique action, has moved the pious heart of a man, already known for his many charitable deeds in favor of various institutions as well as private persons, namely, a remarkable and generous John the Baptist Kovács of Eger. With uncommon and even unheard of generosity this man on that happy day, May 1, 1819, has presented to the newly erected Eparchy of Prjašev his large library containing several thousands of some very rare books and his famous collection of geographic maps and atlases. He even promised to provide sufficient funds for the purchase of some additional books in order to increase the volume of the library.

Kovács kept his promise and on September 29, 1819, he generously contributed for this purpose a sum of 1,000 fl., and on June 28, 1820, another sum of 500 fl. i.c. When his charitable deed was reported to the Imperial Court, His Sacred Majesty considered the Founder worthy of high recommendation and ordered that his unique gesture of generosity be highly publicized in the national press so as to reach the knowledge of the general public.

Nevertheless, the charity of the generous Founder was not exhausted there. He knew that the library which he presented to the Eparchy could not make any progress unless it was provided with some funds, from which a regular inflow of new books would be secured. Therefore, on August 15, 1820, he promised to give toward this purpose an annual sum of 200 fl. i.c. as long as he

lived. And he lived up to his promise. On July 16, 1822, for this purpose he deposited in bank 200 fl.; on July 29, 1823, again 416 fl. and 44 cr.; on December 17, 1825, another sum of 245 fl. and 6 cr. and, finally, on July 5, 1826, he deposited 208 fl. and 51 cr. i.c.

Kovács also knew, that his generous intention to provide for the future of the library cannot be realized only by a temporary arrangement, but that there was a need of some permanent foundation. Consequently, he decided to establish a perpetual library fund, consisting of 3,000 fl. i.c. Having become aware of the fact, that the library needed a custodian to care for the books, he changed his previous intention of depositing 3,000 fl. i.c. and, instead, deposited 5,000 fl. c.e. (equivalent to 12,500 fl. i.c.) as the principal of a perpetual *Library Fund*.

He confirmed his promise by a contract, which was solemnly notarized on August 15, 1826. The contract stipulated that from the sum of 300 fl. c.e., received yearly in interest on the principal, 120 fl. c.e. (300 fl. i.c.) was to be used for the purchase of new books, and 180 fl. c.e. (450 fl. i.c.) for the salary of a custodian. Between 1825-1830, in fact, the library and the custodian collected 3,375 fl. i.c. from the interest. Adding this sum to all the above mentioned donations of Kovács, the Eparchial Library, besides the perpetual foundation of 12,500 fl. i.c. and numerous books, has received an additional sum of 5,945 fl. and 41 cr. i.c. from its generous Founder, to whom the Eparchy will be indebted for ever.

Since the first librarian, John Lacko, personally appointed by the Founder, shortly left his post,⁶⁰ John Kovács directed that the custodian's salary be added to the principal until the time, when a new residence of the Bishop will be built with an adequate reading room. This way he intended to raise an additional fund for the library's janitor. Thus, *the Eparchial Library Fund*, taking into consideration the income from the interest as well as the expense for some new books, reached this year of 1846 a total sum of 21,000 fl.

⁶⁰ *John Lacko* (1795-1844?), an educator, linguist, and writer. He was patronized by John Kovács, to whom Lacko dedicated a Latin panegyric "*Pastorale*", in 1822. He was a librarian in Prjašev, 1820-1829; personal Secretary of Count Csáki, 1829-1843; archivist of Royal Education Department in Nagy Várad (Oradea Mare), 1843-1844. After 1844 his fate cannot be traced.

Having established the Eparchial Library and providing it with the sufficient funds, the generous Founder wanted to supply for the library, some decorations too. Thus, on February 18, 1825, he donated to the library an elegant portrait of His Majesty, Emperor Francis I, painted in the garments and insignia of the Golden Fleese Order, estimated to cost several hundreds of florins. To the library he also presented for an everlasting memory a painting of himself, skillfully executed by our Ruthenian artist, Joseph Miklossy.⁶¹

These numerous gestures of generosity could not escape the notice of His Majesty, who was always ready to extend his recognition and to regard his deserving subjects. Consequently, the Supreme Royal Council, by a citation of November 13, 1827, presented to John Kovács for his generous foundation of the library a golden medal, as a token of the King's pleasure.

In order to safeguard the valuable foundation against the sinister vicissitudes and political changes, the generous Benefactor asked His Majesty to ratify the Library Foundation with its endowment. His Majesty favorably resolved this request and ordered the Supreme Royal Council to issue, in way of a special favor, a *Decree of Confirmation*, as was communicated to the Founder on June 22, 1830.

The Eparchy and its clergy were most grateful to their generous Benefactor and, some way, they wanted to repay him for his virtue and generosity. Thus, on the occasion of the 66th birthday of their liberal Benefactor, August 25, 1830, they offered for his well-being Divine Liturgies in all the churches of the Eparchy (including the cathedral), in order that his exalted example of generosity may be known to all the faithful. To preserve his memory everlasting, the Bishop's Chancery had lithographically reproduced his picture and ordered, that the picture be framed and hanged on the wall of every parish office. It had to be entered into the inventory of the parish and passed by every pastor to his successor.

Great benefactor of the Eparchy, John the Baptist Kovács,

⁶¹ Painter *Joseph Zmij*, magyarized his name to *Miklossy* (1792-1841), was also patronized by John Kovács. His painting of Kovács is preserved at the National Hungarian Museum in Budapest. By Bishop Tarkovič he was appointed the official Eparchial Artist and his icons are still preserved in some of our churches.

ended his earthly life on April 12, 1834, and was buried at the cemetery of Währing Estate near Vienna. The eparchial clergy with their Bishop, as a token of their gratitude, placed on his grave a magnificent stone and entered his name into their diptychs.⁶² Bishop Tarkovič also ordered that the Divine Liturgy be celebrated for the repose of his soul twice a year, i.e. on April 12 and June 24, as long as the Eparchy will exist. This way he remembered piety by a piety, and one good work by another.

Besides this great Benefactor, the Eparchial Library had another one by the name of Rev. Matthew Beňo, a Latin Rite priest and famous professor of Church History and Canon Law in the Diocese of Košice. He was born in the village Litmanova,⁶³ Spiš District, as a son of common people working their farming land. His parents were Greek Catholics and, therefore, Father Beňo remained always a great admirer of his native Rite, although he became a priest of the Latin Rite. On solemn feast-days according to the Julian calendar he used to come to our church in Zdoba⁶⁴ and there, with a great delight, he celebrated in our Rite the Vespers and assisted our pastor in other liturgical services.

He was most friendly with our Greek Catholic clergy, especially with the members of the Chapter, to whom he constantly promised to bequeath his books after his death. On Pentecost of 1829, he was invited to spend his vacations in Prjašev by District Attorney Vincent Bujanovics, whose two sons, Guy and Julius, he successfully tutored through their higher education and helped them to achieve their degrees in Philosophy. On the evening of his arrival he was suddenly seized by apoplexy and, after making his last will, passed away and was buried in the public cemetery.

Father Beňo appointed his friend and colleague, Emery Kábányi, professor of Dogmatic Theology, as the executor of his last will. He willed a sum of 18,750 fl. i.c. to his relatives, i.e. to his seven brothers and sisters, under a condition that the money would be managed by the Chapter of Canons in Prjašev.

⁶² *Diptychs*, popularly known as "*Hramoty*", are the lists of the deceased commemorated in the church on five All-Souls Saturdays (*Zadušni Soboty*).

⁶³ Hung.: *Hársád*, Spiš District.

⁶⁴ Hung.: *Izdoba*, Abauj-Turňa District.

For the management the Chapter was entitled to 1/16 part of the yearly interest (i.e. 75 fl. i.c.), while the rest of the interest was to be distributed among the heirs. The Chapter, in fact, received this sum of money and faithfully managed it according to the last will of the departed.

The last will was made in haste and there was no mention made about the large collection of the books left by the deceased. Canon John Mehaj, the Dean of the Chapter, made a sworn statement to the effect, that during his life the deceased has promised his books to the Chapter and, therefore, he claimed Father Beňo's library. Bishop Stephen Cseh of Košice, with his Chapter, did not contest such a claim and, on October 27, 1829, all the books of the deceased were sent to the above mentioned Dean of Chapter, Canon John Mehaj, who temporarily stored them in the cathedral, namely in the side chapel of SS. Peter and Paul.

On account of these books Bishop Tarkovič started a long dispute with the Chapter, claiming them for the Eparchial Library. He was supported in his claim by his Secretary Basil Popovič. The Chapter, headed by Canon John Mehaj, refused to comply, claiming that the books were bequeathed and handed over to the Chapter as such. Bishop Tarkovič, greatly angered by this attitude of the Chapter, ordered to clear up the heavy boxes with the books from the cathedral, otherwise he threatened to throw them out on the street. Thus the Chapter was faced by a dilemma. Not having their own building, the Canons were unable to find a suitable place for the books.

This caused also a dissention among the members of the Chapter, because none of the Canons was willing to take those books into his own apartment. Finally, the Chapter spontaneously disclaimed the books and asked to include them into the Eparchial Library. Thus Father Beňo's books were added to the Eparchial Library and constitute its conspicuous part until the present time.

John Olšavskyj, the Canon of the Mukačevo Chapter,⁶⁵ became the third benefactor of the Eparchial Library. After his death in 1829, he bequeathed a half of his well selected collection

⁶⁵ *Canon John Olšavskyj* (1761-1829), was the Vicar of Košice and administered the newly erected Prjašev Eparchy, 1816-1820. His biography cfr. Dr. N. Beskid, *Iz minuvšaho odnoj krestanskoj semji*, Homestead, Pa., ed. by Sojedeninije, p. 79-84.

of the books to the Eparchial Library in Prjašev, which considerably increased its number.⁶⁶

These were the beginnings of *the Kovács Eparchial Library* in Prjašev. But, sad to say, neither its purpose nor the intention of its Founder were carried out to the present day. The purpose of this institution was a progress of learning and, therefore, the Founder conceived the idea to open the library to the public by providing the library with a suitable reading room. Since until now there is not even a proper place to store those books, naturally, neither the purpose of the library nor Founder's intention can be achieved.

On top of all this something worse had happened. Since there was a great number of these books, some of them were deposited in a small dark room, some under the tower, and the rest was placed in the choir-loft of the cathedral. Thus it happened, that the harsh weather, particularly a heavy rain, damaged a great number of these books. Since there was no one to take care of this dreadful accident, many books were covered with mold and became unuseable.

Some people try to put the blame for this disaster on us, the Ruthenians. But the blame should be placed on those Government officials, who obstinately opposed the construction of the (Bishop's) residence and, consequently, of a suitable library. The Ruthenians try to preserve this their treasure as much as they can, cherishing it, for they are in dire need of it.

5. THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH

Nobody knows when this church, known at the present time as our cathedral in Prjašev, was constructed from its foundations. It is an ancient church, what can be determined from the fact that it was built within the city walls.⁶⁷ Consequently, its construction must hail from the time of the city's beginnings. The design and dimensions of the original church must have been quite different from the present ones. It was more a chapel than a church in that it was attached to the hospital, which was

⁶⁶ According to Beskid he left to the library 291 books — *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁶⁷ So called "citadel", built in the first half of XV c. Cfr. *Dejiny Prešova*, Košice-Prešov 1965, vol. I, p. 90-93.

erected in the area extending from the present ambo to the side wall, where now two side-chapels are located. Originally it was called *the Hospital Church*. Its entrance was on the western side, where the present sanctuary is located.

In 1673, through the efforts of the praiseworthy Fr. John the Baptist Reggiano of St. Felix, in the city of Prjašev a monastery of the Franciscan Fathers "of strict observance"⁶⁸ was established. It was dedicated by the Illustrious and Most Reverend Francis Szegedy, the Bishop of Eger as the Ordinary of the place, in the presence of Count Otto Ferdinand von Wolkra, the President of the Administrative Commission of Spiš District, the nobles, civic officials and numerous citizens.

On that occasion the hospital church with the adjoining building, which presently forms a rear part of the Bishop's residence and where the Bishop is temporarily living, was conferred "*in perpetuum*" to Father Reggiano and, through him, to the Minorite Order by the favor of the Roman Emperor and the King of Hungary, Leopold I.

This whole complex was located at the lower gate of the city, as it can be learned from an authentic document extracted from the original sources by the above mentioned Count von Wolkra. The written testimony was then entered into the Old Register of the Minorite Province.⁶⁹ The buildings were resigned into the hands of Father John the Baptist Reggiano who, on that occasion, expressed his great gratitude and immediately installed there a Superior with the sufficient number of Friars to perform the Divine Services. The first guardian of the Minorite monastery was Reverend Thomas Artoi.

During the Tökölian rebellion the Minorite Fathers were forced to leave the city and their church was forcibly occupied by the Lutherans, in 1683. The Lutherans kept it in their possession until 1686, when the rebellion was finally subdued. By the gracious order of Emperor Leopold I, given in Vienna on December 28, 1685, the Lutherans were told to return the church to the Minorite Order. The release of the property was then

⁶⁸ *The Order of Friars Minor* (briefly — *Minorites*), according to the observance of the Rule was divided in — a) *Friars of Regular Observance*, and b) *Friars of Strict Observance*.

⁶⁹ Here Duchnovič refers to Michael Knaisz, *Historia Chronologico-Provincialis Ordinis FF. Minorum S. Francisci, Posonii 1803*.

officially transacted in the Prjašev court. Father John the Baptist Reggiano, who received back and reconciled the church, celebrated the first solemn Liturgy in it on February 10, 1686. After singing the Ambrosian hymn of thanksgiving, the Minorite Friars once again took possession of their monastery.

After this incident the church remained in peaceful possession of the Minorite Friars, although other rebellions and revolts followed.⁷⁰ During these unrestful years, especially during the uprising of Prince Rákoczy⁷¹ as well as during a ravaging pestilence that followed, the Minorite Friars performed all the parochial services in their church, since the parochial church was illegally detained by the Lutherans. They also administered the necessary Sacraments to the faithful.

The monastery building and adjoining church of St. John the Baptist under the administration of the Minorite Friars were magnificently reconstructed, due to the generous donations of many benefactors and patrons. In first place, the generosity and munificence of Honorable Lord Alexander Keczer of Lipocz,⁷² who for many years was a Vice-Count of the Šariš District, should be especially mentioned. Besides his house adjoining the hospital, which he restored according to the needs of the Friars, he also donated to the Minorites some lots which he purchased for them. To church he added a chapel of St. Anthony (presently of the Holy Cross), underneath of which he built a crypt for the members of his family.

The Illustrious and Most Reverend Stephen Keczer of Lipocz, the titular Bishop of Macriana and the Dean of the Latin Rite Chapter of the Oradea Mare, was another generous benefactor of the Minorites. He restored, at his own expense, the entire church and built a new sanctuary with the main altar and organ. The rededication of the church was performed by the Illustrious and Most Reverend Charles Zbisko, the titular Bishop of Timisa and the Dean of the Spiš Chapter, on the feast of St. John the Baptist, 1759. Bishop Keczer also provided the church with a complete set of the episcopal robes, including the crozier, mitre,

⁷⁰ The most dangerous of all was that of Francis II Rákoczy, 1703-1711.

⁷¹ i.e. Prince Francis II Rákoczy.

⁷² After village Hung.: *Keczer-Lipocz*, Ruth.: *Kečerovskij Lipovec*, Šariš District.

and silver basin with the scyphus,⁷³ for his everlasting memory.

Nevertheless, his memory did not last for ever, because every temporary thing must come to its end. All these exuberant expenditures for the improvement of the monastery were reduced to naught by a simple stroke of pen. On August 31, 1787, by his supreme order, Emperor Joseph II liquidated the Minorite monastery in Prjašev, the Franciscan monasteries in Košice and Humenne, the Capuchin monastery in Tokay, the Premonstratensian monastery in Leles, the Cistercian monastery in Eger, and the Franciscan monastery in St. Andrew.⁷⁴ The Emperor confiscated all these monasteries, sending the religious to some other communities of their Order, while some of them were assigned to do a pastoral work.

After the liquidation of the Minorite monastery in Prjašev, since the religious were engaged also in pastoral work, they stayed yet in their place for a while. In the meantime, the influential Catholic circles of the city tried to influence His Majesty on their behalf. But their efforts were in vain. The Royal Treasury seized all valuable and movable property of the monastery, the religious community was dissolved, and the Friars were assigned to the other communities of the Minorite Order.

Seeing that on account of the liquidation of the Minorite monastery the Catholic population of the central part of the city was deprived of their spiritual care, the Catholic circles appealed to His Majesty's clemency once again. They referred to the communication of the Supreme Royal Council, issued on April 14, 1787, which determined the spiritual care of the city's inhabitants and intreated His Majesty to assign one wing of the monastery for the residence of the pastor and four assistants, who would take care of the church and spiritual needs of the Catholic population in that part of the city. They suggested to provide for five priests in question from the Religious Fund and assign all the immoveable property of the monastery, such as farm buildings, pastures etc., as the benefice of the church.

Their request was most reasonable, nevertheless, it was turned down. The monastery was completely despoiled, all its property was sold at a public auction, and the empty building

⁷³ Sort of pitcher, to wash bishop's hands.

⁷⁴ Hung.: *Szent András*, Abauj-Turňa District.

was resigned to the disposal of the Government. Although the church was also entirely despoiled, sacred functions were not prohibited.

As we already mentioned, in 1788, the church was destroyed by the fire. Then it was covered with a new roof at the public expense, but the building itself was not assigned to any specific use. Only in 1791, it was given first temporarily, later permanently, to the disposition of the Greek Catholic Vicar of Košice, as was described in detail in the first part and at the beginning of the second part of this work.

What happened to the church later, i.e. after the death of Bishop Gregory Tarkovič, will be discussed in the second volume of this work.⁷⁵

APPENDIX TO BOOK TWO

It will not contradict the purpose of this work if we introduce at this point some important documents concerning the liquidation and resignation of the Minorite monastery in Prjašev. Omitting the communication in respect to said liquidation made to the Bishop of Eger, Count Charles Eszterházy, dated August 31, 1787, we transcribe only the following documents:

1) *The letter of the Provincial Superior of the Minorites to the Guardian in Prjašev.*

Very Reverend and Most Respected Father Guardian!

On Sunday of Mother of Dolores, September 3rd of this year, we have with a great sadness received a communication of the Supreme Royal Council, dated August 31, 1787, which reads as follows:

By the Imperial Court's decree, issued on July 12th of this year, it pleased His Majesty to dissolve the Minorite monastery in Prjašev and order that the concerned religious be kindly assigned to the other communities according to the regular procedure of an appointment. The liquidation of the mentioned monastery will be executed by the appointed Commission "ad hoc" with the understanding that the Provincial Superior will send

⁷⁵ Unfortunately, Duchnovič died before he could write the second volume of his work. The cathedral church was restored and dedicated by Bishop Joseph Gaganec, in 1846.

us, as soon as possible, the list of the appointments, namely, to what communities and in what capacity he will assign the individual religious of said monastery.

He will communicate the same also to the Bishop of Eger in order that he might use these individuals for the vacant positions in his diocese. It is also ordered that the Provincial, together with the list of the appointments, send us the inventory of all the articles, which each and every individual has taken with himself to the other monastery by way of furniture, utensils, and food provisions.

Issued by the Supreme Royal Council in Buda, on August 31, 1787.

Signed: *Christopher Miczky, m.p.*
Joseph von Lingen, m.p.

Lo, a sorrowful misfortune, which did not end as yet but slowly is making its way down deep into our heart. Certainly, in the near future we cannot expect anything better but only more of the same. Groaning together with our stigmatized Seraphic Father,⁷⁶ if we could just share with him also his spiritual joy as it is expressed in today's holy office: "*When cares abound within me, your comfort gladdens my soul*" (Ps. 93:19), and which recalls to our mind the words of Jesus Christ: "*If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you also*" (Jn. 15:20), and "*You will be hated by all*" (Mt. 10:22), and again: "*Everyone who kills you will think he is offering worship to God*" (Jn. 16:2).

Resigning completely to the will of God, we humbly beg all of our con-Friars not to cease to pray together with us to our Omnipotent and Great God. In this hope we eagerly recommend to bring this Communication to the attention of all concerned, and we remain as always,

Eger, the Feast of Sorrowful Blessed Mother, September 17, 1787.

Your truly sorrowing and agonizing Servant,

FR. HIACYNTH RAJTER, m.p.

2) *The supreme order given to Lord John Desseöffy in the name of His Sacred Majesty, by which it was decreed as follows:*

⁷⁶ i.e. *St. Francis of Assisi* (d. 1226), the Founder of the Franciscan Order.

His Sacred Majesty for the reasons well known to him has graciously decided to abolish the monastery of the Minorite Fathers, located in free royal city of Prjašev...

In virtue of this decree, issued in the name of His Majesty and by his highest order and by our authority, graciously delegated to us "in perpetuum" as to the Royal Deputy for the Košice District, without any delay we nominate and appoint Your Lordship as a Royal Deputy "ad hoc" for the execution of the above mentioned abolition.

We invest you, therefore with all the necessary power and faculties for the execution of imposed upon you duty according to the instructions given to our Central Office of the District, within whose boundaries both the free city of Prjašev and the Minorite monastery are located. For this purpose we delegate, convey, and decree, that everything be executed faithfully, promptly, and exactly according to the above mentioned instructions, a copy of which herewith we enclose.

Signed in Košice, September 28, 1787.

Francis Szent-Iványi, m.p., the Acting
Supreme Count and Royal Deputy.

Francis Stípszics, m.p., the Secretary of
the District Office in Košice.

3) The Minorite Friars were disturbed and driven away from their Prjašev monastery by the partisans of Tökölyi, in 1683. But on January 30, 1686, the church and the monastery were returned back to them.

4) In 1783, when the Minorite monastery in Prjašev was liquidated, the Guardian of the community was Father Daniel Hadbavni.

BOOK THREE

THE CHAPTER

THE CHAPTER OF CANONS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

The Chapter of the Cathedral Church in Prjašev, as mentioned in the Book Two of this work, was established by His Majesty, Francis I, the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, in 1820. After the nomination of the individual members, the Chapter was officially installed on August 6, 1820, and immediately began to function.

Since all the beginnings are difficult, the Chapter, too, had to overcome the initial hardships on account of lack of sufficient funds. Until this day the Canons are deprived of their own homes and are forced to live in private apartments. They lack an appropriate income suitable to their status and, on account of insufficient funds for the emergency, they are unable to extend any assistance to the needy, as it is befitting their dignity. From their meager income they have to make a constant sacrifices in order to be able to carry out their official correspondence, make some donations etc.

Their income, fixed to 5/13 parts of the common benefice in Lechnicja and Vranovo, seldom or never equals the established sum of 5,000 fl. c.e. For this reason every member of Chapter has died either in debt or without leaving any legacy.

According to the decree of erection the Chapter consists of five members: 1. Dean of the Chapter or Praepositus Major, 2. Lector or Reader, 3. Cantor, 4. Custodian, and 5. Scholasticus, who all are ascribed to the cathedral church in Prjašev. Their prebend (yearly income) was graciously determined in the following fashion: 1. for the Dean or Praepositus Major — 1,000 fl. annually; 2. for Lector or Reader — 900 fl., 3. for Cantor — 800 fl., 4. for Custodian — 700 fl., and 5. for Scholasticus — 600 fl. c.e. Besides his yearly prebend, every Canon should receive additional 200 fl. annually for the apartment, payable from the Eparchial Fund.

The prebend of the deceased Canon, as long as his stall remains vacant, goes to the Widows and Orphans Fund with the exception of 1/7 part of the total sum, which is shared by the members of the Chapter, because they have to perform all the duties of their departed colleague "in solidum". Although the Chapter's prebend is very meager, the Canons are unable to collect it in full for the simple reason, that the eparchial benefice is never yielding a sufficient income to reimburse to the Chapter their share of 5,000 fl. c.e. annually. But we will return to this question in the second volume of this work.¹

2. FIRST MEMBERS OF THE CHAPTER

1. As the first Dean or Praepositus Major of the Chapter was appointed *John Mehaj*, who was entitled to wear a pectoral cross.

John Mehaj was born in 1776, at the estate of Barakony, Turňa District,² where his father, Andrew Mehaj, was the pastor. After having finished the Gymnasium and Philosophy in Košice with high honors, he was accepted among the junior clergy³ of the Mukačevo Eparchy. He was assigned to the Central Seminary in Bratislava,⁴ where he absolved his theological studies with high honors. He received his sacred orders in celibacy from Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj of Mukačevo, who immediately appointed him to the parish in Orosz-Gadna, Turňa District.⁵ In addition to his pastoral work, he was appointed as a dean of the Čerhata Deanery and a member of the Vicarial Consistory in Prjašev, although he was very young.

Father Mehaj was a most amiable and very active man. He proved his ability during the census of the parishes in his deanery, which was ordered by His Majesty, in 1806. He took

¹ Unfortunately, Duchnovič did not write the second volume.

² Orig.: *Podbereh*, now in the Hajdudorog Eparchy.

³ The Seminarians are called by Duchnovič — *the Junior Clergy*.

⁴ *The Central Seminary* was originally established in Trnava, 1648. In 1777, Maria Theresa transferred it to Pest; in 1784, Joseph II moved it to Bratislava, and finally, Francis I transferred the Central Seminary back to Pest, in 1804. Cfr. V. Shereghy - V. Pekar, *The Training of Carpatho-Rutenian Clergy*, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1951, p. 114-115.

⁵ Now also in the Eparchy of Hajdudorog.

the census with great diligence and accuracy. He administered his deanery very successfully, showing himself rather as a promoter of common good and true brother of his fellow-priests than their superior.

When the threat of the war with France became imminent and Hungarian nobility spontaneously took arms, ready to defend their country, Father Mehaj was appointed as military chaplain for the Greek Catholic soldiers. He successfully spent two years in various military camps, being loved and trusted by all. In 1810, when the general mobilization came to its end, Father Mehaj returned to his former parish in Orosz-Gadna, where he continued his duties as a zealous pastor and diligent dean. In 1818, he was elevated to the dignity of a Junior Canon of the Mukačevo Chapter. He moved to Užhorod and stayed there until 1820, when he was appointed as a Praepositus Major of the newly established Chapter of Prjašev.

John Mehaj was a statuesque and gentle man, with a good disposition and delicate conscience. Sincerely affable, he was generally loved and respected, acclaimed by all as an ideal person. As an example of his amiability, we can recall his friendship with a widowed, Illustrious Lady of late John Berzeviczy, Baroness Anna Mesko, who donated a large and magnificent house in the city, not far from the (cathedral) church, to the Chapter. To this effect she also signed the necessary papers, releasing the house to the Chapter "in perpetuum".

But, as it often happens, the best intentions of good people become frustrated by others. That's what happened in our case. Just before the Chapter was able officially take possession of the said building, the grandchildren of the charitable Baroness, seeing their loss, with the assistance of the acting Vice-Count of Šariš District, Emeric Pécsy, persuaded their grandmother to revoke her donation or, rather, foundation. She signed to that effect a letter stating that she changed her mind, entrusting it to the Vice-Count.

With this letter in his hands, the Vice-Count approach the Chapter and tried to persuade its members to return all the papers of cession, since the house was not as yet officially resigned to the Chapter. Declaring that this was Baroness' desire, he promised in return to establish a perpetual foundation of 2,000 fl. i.c. for four Divine Liturgies with Panachida, to be celebrated annually in the cathedral by one of the Canons. Taking into

consideration that the pious foundation or legacy should be made with a proper intention, the Canons graciously gave back the requested papers to the insisting Vice-Count without demanding any compensation or pious foundation.

Nevertheless, the devoted Baroness desired to fulfill her promise, at least to some extent, and made a pious foundation in favor of the Chapter in sum of 800 fl. c.e. She deposited the money with her son-in-law, Balthasar Semsey, under a condition that he would pay the yearly interest from this amount to the Chapter. The Chapter gallantly agreed and gave up the much needed house, which was worth of, at least, 25,000 fl. according to a moderate estimate. Thus this whole matter was settled peacefully and the members of the Chapter proved that, although poor, they did not lack virtue.⁶

Further should be mentioned, that Canon Mehaj knew how to endure the wrong done to him. He suffered great deal from the Bishop who, probably misinformed, treated him very rudely. But Mehaj on every occasion showed himself magnanimous and respectful toward his Bishop.

After having received the Sacraments of dying with great devotion, he gave up his spirit to his Creator amidst the tears of many, on January 28, 1835. He was buried in the cathedral crypt. Let his memory remain always blessed in the generations to come.

2. Canon-Lector (Reader) of the first Chapter was *Michael Kaňuk*, whose family hailed from Osturňa, Spiš District, but he himself was born in village of Hodermarka,⁷ where his father was the pastor, in about 1762.

At that time the Greek Catholic clergy and faithful of the Spiš District still belonged to the jurisdiction of the Spiš Chapter.⁸ Thus, Michael Kaňuk, a most promising youth, was accepted by said Chapter among the junior clergy for the Greek Catholics and was sent to Vienna for his theological studies. Upon the completion of the Theology he married a daughter

⁶ Baroness Mesko, through her grandson Albert Semsey, revoked in 1850. even this foundation of 800 fl.,

⁷ Germ. settlement *Hundertmarkt*, Hung.: *Száztelek*, eventually became inhabited also by the Ruthenians.

⁸ The Greek Catholic parishes of Spiš District were placed under the jurisdiction of the Mukačevo Bishop only in 1787.

of an army officer in Thurma,⁹ Christine Fényessy, and was ordained to the holy priesthood by Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj in Vienna.

First he was assigned to the parish of Repaš,¹⁰ wherefrom he was moved, in 1788, after the death of Father Elias Adaškevič,¹¹ to the famous parish in Jarembina¹² and became dean of the Superior Spiš.¹³ In 1820, he was appointed as the Canon-Lector of the first Chapter of Prjašev. He remained in his canonical office until his departure from this life, i.e. November 22, 1832.

May he, living now in eternity, and the prudent men, who are still with us, allow us in our sincerity to outline the dispositions of this man, although they were not always at their best. We said — *in our sincerity*, because we do not intend to make him more attractive by covering up for his senility. The history must be true, therefore, we ask the reader's forbearance for what we have to say about Canon Kaňuk.

Michael Kaňuk was a man of boisterous, unreliable, and somewhat deceitful character, since he often availed himself of mental reservation. Even before, as a dean of the Superior Spiš, he caused so many dissensions among the people that, until this day, the people will not believe the most sincere man remembering, how many times they were deceived by their own dean.

Furthermore, he was most arrogant man and ambitious for honors. This he proved beyond any doubt after the death of Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj,¹⁴ when he sent out to the priests proclamation, entitled "*A Short Address to the Clergy of Mukačëvo Eparchy*", printed by him in Levoča.¹⁵ By his "*Address*"

⁹ Little border village in Austria, where the military garrison was stationed.

¹⁰ Hung.: *Alsó-Répaš*, Spiš District.

¹¹ *Schematismus A.D. 1944*, p. 79, — gives the following list of the pastors in Jarembina at that period: *Rev. Elias Adaškevič* (1772-1773), *Rev. Michael Jarembinskyj* (1773-1789), *Rev. Michael Kaňuk* (1789-1821).

¹² Slov.: *Jarabina*, Hung.: *Berkenyéd*, one of the oldest Ruthenian parishes, mentioned in 1329.

¹³ Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj divided the parishes in Spiš into two deaneries: 1) *Superior Spiš*, and 2) *Lower Spiš*, subjecting them to the Vicar of Košice. Cfr. A. Baran, *Jepiskop Andrej Bačinskyj*, p. 51.

¹⁴ Bishop Bačinskyj died on December 19, 1809.

¹⁵ Slov.: *Levoča*, Hung.: *Lőcse*, Germ.: *Leutche*, free royal city in Spiš District.

he incited our clergy to elect their own Bishop, without any intervention of the King.¹⁶ Of course, he considered himself as one to be elected, since at that time he was already a widower.

When the disturbing endeavors of Father Kaňuk came to the attention of official circles, the Most Serene Prince Joseph, the Archduke and Palatine of Hungary, proscribed the above mentioned "Address" by a personally signed proclamation, issued on April 20, 1810. By another letter of January 16, 1811, addressed to the Vicarial Office in Prjašev, the Palatin ordered that Michael Kaňuk be publicly censured and restrained in his turbulent activity. In compliance with the orders, Father Kaňuk was summoned by the Vicarial Consistory to Prjašev and was publicly rebuked and restrained. All the copies of the proclamation, which was secretly distributed by Rev. Andrew Stavrovskyj¹⁷ in order to persuade his fellow-priests to elect Michael Kaňuk as the candidate for the Bishop, were diligently collected and, according to higher disposition, indiscriminately burned up.

Father Kaňuk would not accept any submission to the others and after the death of Bishop Bačinskyj he refused to obey any of the Vicars.¹⁸ Even Bishop Bačinskyj had constantly to admonish him, but was unable to change his attitude. Finally, on September 27, 1809, he received a canonical rebuke in writing, in which the Bishop compared him with the unprofitable fig-tree which had to be cut off. But he never came to his senses.

Due to his own efforts, despite all his shortcomings, Kaňuk was recommended and became nominated member of the Eparchial Chapter. But even then he was restless. He did not cease to provoke the elderly Bishop, into whose graces he assiduously tried to endear himself, turning him against the rest of the Ca-

¹⁶ The Kings of Hungary, from the times of St. Stephen (1001-1038), claimed for themselves the "*Ius Patronatus Supremum*", giving them the right to nominate a candidate for the bishop, who was to be confirmed by the Holy See. Cfr. A. Bobák, *De iure patronatus supremi quoad Ecclesiam Ruthenicam in Hungaria*, Romae 1943.

¹⁷ Here Duchnovič calls Fr. Stavrovskyj "*the pastor of Repaš*", while the *Schematismus 1944* shows, that Rev. Andrew Stavrovskyj was the pastor of Krempach, 1806-1810; and Telhart, 1810-1839.

¹⁸ During the vacant see of Mukačevo, i.e. between 1809-1816, there were three Capitular Vicars succeeding themselves in the administration of the Eparchy: 1. John Kutka, 1809-1812; 2. Auxiliary Bishop M. Bradač, 1812-1815; 3. Gregory Tarkovič, 1815-1816.

nons and other clergy. On account of this he was generally hated by his fellow-priests. Even after his death he caused many troubles for the Chapter, one of which should be described for posterity in particular.

One of the Kaňuk's daughters, Christine, married to Čorňanskyj, the pastor of Florynky, Galicia, persuaded her father to buy for himself a house in Prjašev where he could live after his appointment as Canon. He then signed the contract with Attorney Samuel Kardos for a house, facing the main square near cathedral, sold to him for 8,200 fl. i.c. He was supposed to pay half of the amount agreed upon from his savings, and the rest was promised to be payed by his daughter. But at the time of payment his daughter, knowing well the unreliable character of her own father, changed her mind and did not want even to listen about buying the house.

Finding himself in a difficult financial situation, Kaňuk turned to the Chapter asking for a loan of 4,000 fl. i.c. He promised to pay on the loan a yearly interest during the rest of his life and leave the house, after his death, to the Chapter in payment of his debt. To this effect he personally signed an agreement, which was then on August 22, 1830, entered into the Register Book of Chapter. After having received on September 1, 1830, the sum of 4,000 fl., he presented to the Chapter a duly notarized note of obligation, in which he stated:

“ Herewith I certify that I have received from the Chapter a cash of 4,000 fl. i.c., for which sum I agree to pay a yearly interest of six percent for the rest of my life under the sanction of an optional repayment.¹⁹ To cancel my debt of 4,000 fl. i.c. I will resign the legal title to the above mentioned house to the Venerable Chapter, in commemoration of my earthly existence. I declare beforehand the resignation of my house to the Venerable Chapter with the express clause that, immediately after my departure from this life, the title and deed of its ownership be definitively given to said Chapter, because the Venerable Chapter rightly deserves it. My heirs or their successors have no right to claim this house under any pretext or title whatsoever, be it by the right of inheritance, restitution or any other allegation ”.

The said Canon, writing and signing this solemn and sacred

¹⁹ He permitted the Chapter to take the interest from his canonical benefice.

bill of obligation, had used a wide mental reservation. On the very day of agreement, after the members of the Chapter and witnesses of this solemn transaction had left, Kaňuk declared to the writer of these lines,²⁰ who happened to be present in his house for a toast: "My friend, it will not be so. The old man is not yet completely fool and the things will change!" And indeed, the prediction of his bad intention was fulfilled.

After Kaňuk's death, which occurred on November 21, 1832, his last will, safeguarded in the Archives of the Chapter, was officially opened, promulgated, and ratified by the Bishop. Since Bishop's Secretary Basil Popovič was appointed as the executor of the last will, he immediately started to take an inventory of all the possessions of the deceased. But there was another daughter of the deceased, Constance Kaňuk, twice widowed and a woman of ill repute, who simply moved into the above mentioned house, claiming her rights of inheritance.

On account of her physical resistance the Chapter was not able to take possession of the house and was forced to make a recourse to the Supreme Royal Council. The Council directed to seek the restitution of damage in the Court of Law. Thus, the necessary legal steps were taken in the local Court, which on December 13, 1836, pronounced the following sentence: "Since the house was resigned to the Chapter not as a foundation but only as a collateral for a loan of 4,000 fl., it will remain in the possession of the heir under a condition that she be willing to pay back 4,000 fl. with the yearly interest. Otherwise, the house will become a property of the Chapter".

Both parties appealed. On September 6, 1838, the Court (so called Royal Bench) adjudicated to the Chapter a refund of 4,000 fl. and not the house, since in the above mentioned transaction the legal formalities were not observed. The Appellate Court upheld the sentence of the first instance and imposed its execution. Senator Michael Beör, appointed by the Court as the executor of the sentence, demanded the contesting party to pay off the debt of 4,000 fl. Since the party did not have necessary money to pay off the debt, he resigned the mortgaged house to the Chapter as a security until such time, when the contesting party would pay the mortgage.

²⁰ i.e. to Alexander Duchnovič himself.

In all this affair deceased Michael Kaňuk and the present Bishop of Mukačevo Basil Popovič were deeply involved. At that time Popovič was Bishop's Secretary in Prjašev and Canon Kaňuk appointed him as the executor of his last will. When the Chapter members, in order to secure Kaňuk's foundation, collected and locked up in a separate chest all his personal effects and documents, they did it in the presence of the executor. Thus, taking the Chapter into the court, Constance Kaňuk filed her suit against the Dean of Canons, late John Mehaj, as the first party, Canons Chira and Hodobaj as the second, and Secretary Basil Popovič (presently the Bishop of Mukačevo) as the third party in the case. The sentences of the appellate court were passed, but Constance Kaňuk has taken the case into the Supreme Court, where it is pending to this day.

Deceased Michael Kaňuk was in care of the eparchial treasury, handling the bills for the current expenses and the assistance to the parish priests. After his death the treasury was found to be considerably deficient, therefore, the Ordinariate has taken his heirs into the court, but the case was not tried as yet.

This is brief biography of Michael Kaňuk. If in some way we have offended the good name of the deceased, we certainly did not do it with a bad intention, since we were his best friend. All these facts were mentioned only in the interest of the historical truth, which demands sincerity and objectivity. In our sincerity we described also the less pleasant events, following the rule: "*Even about the deceased the truth should be said!*"

3. Canon-Cantor of the first Chapter was *Basil Hodobaj*, born in the village Tvarošč, Šariš District.²¹ His father was a local pastor and his original name was *Chudoba*, the descendants of which family are living to this day in Tvarošč. It was his father, who started to call himself *Chodoba*, while his sons preferred to be called *Hodobaj*.

In 1793, after finishing his theological studies at the Central Seminary in Bratislava, he was ordained a priest and appointed as assistant pastor to Prjašev. Shortly after, he became a widower and was appointed as temporary administrator of the parish in Kraľovci.²² In 1796, he became the pastor of Zdoba.

²¹ Slov.: *Tvarožec*, Hung.: *Tarócz*.

²² Slov.: *Kráľovce*, Hung.: *Királynép*, Abauj-Turňa District, which Hodobaj administered, 1794-1796.

On October 23, 1798, he was appointed also the dean of Košice Deanery. In 1808, he became a Vice-Rector of the Seminary in Užhorod, but already the following year we see him as a pastor in Dubravka.²³ In 1820, finally, he was appointed as the Canon-Cantor of the Chapter in Prjašev, which post he honorably held until his death. He passed away on May 10, 1840.

Basil Hodobaj was kind, affable, and very studious man. Imbued with a vast knowledge of Geography, History (especially Statistics) and Rite, he also had a good command of the Greek language. Unfortunately, having a slight defect of speech, he preferred to keep all this knowledge to himself. After he became Canon, he was twice stricken by a partial paralysis, which considerably impaired his health.

On December 3, 1835, this kind man was promoted to the stall of the Canon-Lector. Although he enjoyed a long life, he didn't leave any literary legacy only, as widower, he left behind a daughter and most promising grandchildren. Let his soul rest in peace.

4. Canon-Custodian of the first Chapter was *Andrew Chira*, born in 1788, in Poľany, Zemplin District,²⁴ where his father, a highly educated and excellent priest, was the pastor and dean of the Bodrogköz Deanery.²⁵ His mother was Agatha Vaško, who was a most commendable lady.

Chira absolved his secondary education in Užhorod, Philosophy in Košice, and Theology in Trnava as an average student. In 1813, after his priestly ordination in a celibate state, he was immediately assigned to the Chancery Office in Užhorod, where he assisted the famous Secretary Anthony Bányai. In handling the office business he showed such great dexterity that, after the promotion of Bányai to the Hajdudorog parish, Chira succeeded him as Bishop's Secretary.

In 1817, he was summoned by Bishop-Elect Tarkovič to Vienna, where he played an important role in the establishment of the Prjašev Eparchy. In 1820, he was graciously appointed as Canon-Custodian of the newly-erected Chapter of Prjašev and,

²³ Hung.: *Dobrôka*, Zemplin District, where Hodobaj was pastor, 1809-1820.

²⁴ Hung.: *Bodrogmezô*, presently in the Eparchy of Hajdudorog.

²⁵ The most of the *Bodrogköz Deanery* was included into the Hajdudorog Eparchy.

on December 3, 1835, he was promoted to the dignity of Praepositus Major of the same Chapter. He passed away on May 17, 1840, in Červený Monastyř²⁶ and was layed to his rest in the crypt of cathedral church in Prjašev.

Andrew Chira was a highly educated man and cordially welcomed in all social circles. By his diligence and incessant work he improved his average intelligence to such an extent, that he was generally considered as a very talented man. The archives of the Eparchy of Mukačevo are most indebted to his diligence. The Prjašev Chapter will also remain grateful to him forever, because he compiled all the documents concerning the establishment of the Chapter, neatly and diligently copying them with his own hand. To him we should attribute also the composition of this work since, in its greater part, it was based on the documents collected by him.

Andrew Chira was a man of an elegant disposition, endowed with a delicate character and noble constitution. He was of medium height, with a strongly built body, picture-like face, with somewhat pale but rosy cheeks, his large eyes were brown and expressive of a generous soul, his slightly swollen lips were naturally red, his hair black but soft, which he used to curl with moderation. In one word, he was such a handsome man that, using Virgil's expression, he could be called — *a delight of the Lord*.

He was always ready for a conversation and enjoyed such a great charm of persuasion, that everyone was captivated by his speech. He liked to dress elegantly, preferred cultured company, and was gladly visited by the people of higher circles. We must admit that in the person of Andrew Chira all those qualities were put together which make a person delightful, noble, and sublime. His unique qualities endeared him to the people of the Šariš District to such an extent, that they repeatedly elected him as their speaker in the General Assembly. To great satisfaction of his constituency, he fulfilled his task most successfully. His elegant style and exquisite calligraphy, which always delighted him, should be also mentioned in his praise.

We ask his indulgence, but for the sake of truth we have to

²⁶ Slov.: *Červený Kláštor*, a Camaldulese Hermitage near Lechnicja, liquidated by Emperor Joseph II and given to the Bishop of Prjašev as the eparchial benefice. About the history of this hermitage cfr. *Slovak Studies*, Rome 1965, vol. V, p. 105-111.

mention that, to some extent, he was an ambitious man, always looking for honors. As a matter of fact, he constantly tried to get some important assignments or distinctions. Indeed, he deserved them, but it made him conceited. We ascribe this weakness not to his bad intention or moral defect but, rather, to human frailty and to the environment, in which he lived.

5. Canon-Scholasticus of the first Chapter was *John Habina*, born in village Čabov, Zemplin District,²⁷ where his father was the pastor. Having completed his theological studies the Central Seminary in Pest, he was immediately ordained as a celibate and appointed a Spiritual Director of the Eparchial Seminary in Užhorod. He was graciously nominated as Canon of the Chapter of Prjašev, in 1820.

Habina was a man of exceptional piety or, better to say, holiness. He was very humble, satisfied with poor food and little service, always trying to be “*all things to all*” (I Cor. 9:22). A very industrious man, he never offended anybody, but tried to be sincere and effable with everyone. He diligently dedicated himself to his daily exercises of piety until his death, December 1, 1823.

It wouldn't be superfluous to mention what has happened to him during his illness of 1823. One cold night, suffering from a high fever, in a coma he opened the window and jumped down from the second floor on the rocky, frozen ground, yet he did not hurt himself. In a trance, then he walked bear-footed and almost naked on the streets of the town for a longer period of time. Although the temperature was freezing, he did not suffer any harm. Some pious souls ascribe this incident to the intervention of Divine Providence, protecting the innocent people in time of any danger. And indeed, to fall down from an altitude of 21 feet, unharmed, seems to be an act of Providence.

May his saintly remains find rest until the day of resurrection of the Blessed.

3. PROMOTIONS WITHIN THE CHAPTER

From the original members of the first Chapter *Canon John Habina* was the first to die, as was mentioned, on December 1, 1823. His stall remained vacant until 1835, while the prebend

²⁷ Slov.: *Cabov*, Hung.: *Csábocz*.

was applied to the Fund of Widows and Orphans. On November 22, 1832, he was followed by *Canon Michael Kaňuk* and, on January 28, 1835, by the piously expired Dean of Canons, *John Mehaj*. Consequently, there remained only two of five original Canons, namely *Basil Hodobaj*, who was in his seventies and partially paralyzed, and *Andrew Chira*, who in fact represented the whole Chapter, because his colleague was paralyzed.

On December 3, 1835, the Chapter was once again completed at the proposal of Bishop Tarkovič in the following manner:

Canon Andrew Chira was promoted to the stall of Praepositus Major, and *Canon Basil Hodobaj* to the stall of Lector.

To the stall of Cantor was graciously appointed *Basil Popovič*. He was born in Veliki Komjaty, Ugoča District,²⁸ on the day of Deposition of the Venerable Belt of B.V.M., September 12, 1796 (according to the Julian calendar on August 31st.). His father was a Greek Catholic priest and his mother, Maria Lengyel, of noble descent. His primary and secondary education he received in Nagy Károly,²⁹ with the exception of second year of Gymnasium, which he studied in Užhorod. He completed his philosophical and theological studies in Pest, where he achieved a degree of Doctor in Philosophy and Arts.

Bishop Alexis Pocsy of Mukačevo conferred on him holy order of priesthood in a celibate state, and he took a competitive test for a vacant post of professor of rhetoric at the Gymnasium in Užhorod, but the post was given to another priest of the Mukačevo Eparchy, to Rev. George Durányi, who already acted as a substitute-professor of rhetoric. Therefore, Popovič was appointed as a temporary administrator of parish in Svaljava, Bereh District.³⁰ Shortly after this parish was given to Rev. John Lipeckyj, and Popovič had to return back to Užhorod.

In a short time Popovič was again assigned as an assistant pastor of Maramoroš Sihot, Maramoroš District and notary of the Vicarial Consistory. In his new assignment he fulfilled his duties and obligations with commendable efficiency, proving himself as a zealous priest and capable notary. He dedicated himself continuously, every day, to studies and pious exercises.

In 1822, Popovič was summoned by Bishop Gregory Tarko-

²⁸ Hung.: *Magyarkomját*, now in U.S.S.R.

²⁹ Modern *Carei* in Rumania.

³⁰ Hung.: *Solyva*, presently in U.S.S.R.

vič to Prjašev, where he was appointed his Secretary and Consistorial Notary. As of April 1, 1822, his yearly salary was established in a sum of 300 fl., with the additional 50 fl. of supplement payed to him from the Religious Fund. In the performance of his duties he was most efficient and, by his own hand, he wrote all the minutes and official letters. In order to reward him for his excellent work, on September 2, 1824, Bishop Tarkovič nominated him a Consistorial Assessor.³¹ On December 3, 1835, upon the recommendation of the Bishop, His Majesty elected Popovič for the stall of Canon-Cantor.

On March 16, 1837, Basil Popovič was graciously nominated the Bishop of Mukačevo. He was consecrated only on March 18, 1838, in Galicia, by Archbishop Michael Levyckyj of L'viv.³² At his consecration Popovič was accompanied by Canon Joseph Gaganec of Prjašev and Canon Theodore Čopej of Mukačevo, by Dean John Hadžega of Komjaty, Father Alexander Duchnovič, at that time pastor of Biloveža,³³ and Seminarian Basil Hadžega, who just absolved his theological studies. The newly consecrated Bishop, after his return from L'viv, remained in Prjašev until April 19, 1838, when he was solemnly installed in Užhorod as Bishop of the Mukačevo Eparchy.

At the same time *Joseph Gaganec*, the pastor of Hejő-Keresztur,³⁴ was graciously promoted to the stall of Canon-Custodian. Later he became second Bishop of Prjašev and, therefore, his biography will be given in the second volume of this work.³⁵

On the same occasion also the stall of Canon-Scholasticus was filled by the gracious nomination of *Michael Jakovič*, the

³¹ Equivalent to the *Diocesan Consultor*.

³² *Michael Levyckyj* — the Bishop of Peremyšl' (1813-1816), then the Metropolitan of L'viv (1816-1858). He was created the Cardinal, in 1856.

³³ A. Duchnovič served as pastor of Biloveža, Šariš District between 1834-1838, when he went to Užhorod.

³⁴ *Hejő-Keresztur*, now belongs to the Hajdudorog Eparchy.

³⁵ *Joseph Gaganec (1793-1875)* — after the completion of his theological studies in Trnava, was ordained priest, in 1817. He was engaged in pastoral and educational work until the death of his wife, in 1835, when he became the Canon of Prjašev Chapter. In 1843, he was appointed and consecrated as the second Bishop of the Prjašev Eparchy, and became one of our greatest leaders. Cfr. A. Pekar, *Historic Background of the Eparchy of Prjašev*, Pittsburgh, Pa., Byzantine Seminary Press, 1968, p. 15-20.

pastor of Čabiny³⁶ and Dean of Laborec. He was born in 1782, in the village Dubove, Šariš District.³⁷ He received his primary and secondary education in Bardijev³⁸ and Sabinov.³⁹ He studied the Philosophy in Košice, and Theology in Trnava, always with honor colors. After working in the Chancery Office for almost a year, he received holy orders from the Auxiliary Bishop Michael Bradač, in 1808.

First, he was appointed as the assistant to his father-in-law, Rev. Basil Kutka, the pastor of Sabinov. Later he was transferred as the pastor to Izbuds'ka Bila, Zemplin District.⁴⁰ In 1822, he became the pastor of Sabinov and Dean of that District. As a dean he fulfilled his duties with great efficiency, what can be proved from the eparchial and deanery registers. In reward for his services, on December 3, 1835, he was graciously nominated Canon-Scholasticus, which office he discharged with a great zeal and dedication.⁴¹ On April 11, 1843, Canon Jakovič was promoted to the stall of Praepositus Major. After suffering an apoplectic stroke he passed away on November 26, 1854.

Michael Jakovič was of average structure, somewhat thin, although he had strong and big bones. By his character he was very gentle and timid, trying to avoid any encounter with the people, especially in public places. He left two sons, Joseph and Anthony, behind. Joseph at the time of his father's death, was serving his term in jail of Josephstadt.⁴² He was sentenced to six years of imprisonment for his political implication in the revolution of Kossuth.⁴³ For this reason he was left out of his father's will, and his share was inherited by the grandchild, who lived in Pest. The other son, Anthony, the pastor of Habura,⁴⁴

³⁶ Hung.: *Csebinye, Csebény*, Zemplin District, where M. Jakovič was pastor between 1822-1835.

³⁷ Known in Hung. as — *Cseves*.

³⁸ Slov.: *Bardějov*, Hung.: *Bárdița*, Germ.: *Bartfeld*, Šariš District.

³⁹ Lat.: *Cibinium*, Hung.: *K. Szeben*, Šariš District.

⁴⁰ Slov.: *Zbudská Bela*, Hung.: *Izbugy-Béla*.

⁴¹ From here to the end of the article the text was added by Duchnovič later, after 1854.

⁴² The famous prison of Josephstadt, Austria.

⁴³ Kossuth's Revolution, 1848-1849. In his *Diary 1863*, Duchnovič described the Joseph Jakovič's role in the revolution. Cfr. M. Ričalka, *O.V. Duchnovyč*, Prjašiv 1959, p. 342.

⁴⁴ Hung.: *Laborcfő*, Zemplin District, where Rev. Anthony Jakovič served as the pastor, 1849-1896.

inherited his share, which he received from the executor of will, Canon Alexander Duchnovič.

Michael Jakovič, already suffering from a stroke, had to sustain an additional misfortune on account of his son Joseph, who was an outstanding lawyer in Pest. During the revolution he became a strong supporter of Kossuth and became involved in the campaign as a Representative of Debrecen municipality. Kossuth's revolutionary Government appointed him as High-Commissioner of Šariš District, where he worked hard in the interest of revolution. When the revolution, with the assistance of the Russian troops, was suppressed, Joseph was imprisoned. This caused his father a great sorrow because he was his favored son. To the praise of the father should be said that he, finding himself in such predicament, was able to accept his sorrow with equanimity.

The Chapter, after its complete reconstruction in 1835, did not function normally for a long time. On March 16, 1837, Canon Basil Popovič was graciously nominated the Bishop of Mukačevo. On May 10, 1840, Canon Basil Hodobaj was called to his eternal rest, being followed shortly by Canon Andrew Chira, who died on May 17, 1840. Thus, once again, there remained only two members of the Chapter namely, Canon Joseph Gaganec and Canon Michael Jakovič, who had to carry the entire burden of the Chapter.

At this stage, the first Bishop of the Prjašev Eparchy, Gregory Tarkovič of blessed memory, well advanced in years, also expired in the Lord on January 16, 1841.

His Majesty then nominated Canon Joseph Gaganec as a new Bishop of the Eparchy on July 13, 1842. The newly consecrated Bishop immediately tried to reintegrate the Chapter. On his recommendation, His Majesty, Emperor Ferdinand V, had graciously appointed new members of the Chapter in the following order:

1. *Canon Michael Jakovič*, the only remaining member, was promoted to the stall of the Praepositus Major.

2. *Honorary Canon Michael Dudinskyj, Sr.*, the pastor of Nižňi Slovinki and dean of the Lower Spiš, became Canon-Lector.

3. *Father Michael Gerberij*, the pastor of Homrogd and dean of Cserhát Deanery, was nominated Canon-Cantor.

4. *Father Andrew Molnar, S.T.D.*, the assistant pastor of St. Barbara in Vienna, was appointed Canon-Custodian.

5. Finally, the stall of Canon-Scholasticus was extended to *Alexander Duchnovič*, the Consistorial Notary of the Mukačevo Eparchy.⁴⁵

They were personally installed in the cathedral of Prjašev by Bishop Joseph Gaganec, who solemnly introduced them to their new offices. This was already the third reorganization of the Eparchial Chapter.

* * *

Besides the actual Canons, His Majesty nominated also five *Honorary Canons* of the Cathedral Church (until that time there was only one, Michael Dudinskyj):

1. *Michael Zubrickyj* — the pastor of Zdoba and dean of Košice Deanery; 2. *George Mihalič* — the pastor of Jarembina and dean of Superior Spiš; 3. *Michael Dudinskyj, Jr.* — son of Canon Michael Dudinskyj, the pastor of Nižni Slovinki and dean of Lower Spiš; 4. *Michael Stefančik* — the pastor of Šoma and dean of Prjašev; 5. *Joseph Bovankovič* — the pastor of Mikóháza.⁴⁶

They all were graciously nominated by His Majesty on October 23, 1843, and installed on May 12, 1844, by Canon Michael Gerberij.

⁴⁵ A. Duchnovič was for second time in Užhorod, assisting Bishop Basil Popovič, 1838-1843.

⁴⁶ Presently in the Eparchy of Hajdudorog.

BOOK FOUR

CATHEDRAL PARISH IN PRJAŠEV

CATHEDRAL PARISH IN PRJAŠEV

We cannot find any evidence that in Prjašev existed a Greek Catholic parish before. Without any doubt, there were numerous Greek Catholics living in the city, because it is situated in the middle of several Greek Catholic settlements. Formerly, Prjašev was a filial of Rus'ka Nova Vesj,¹ whose pastor provided for the spiritual needs of the Greek Catholics also in the city.

When Prjašev became residence of the Greek Catholic Vicariate of Košice,² as was already mentioned in *Book One* of this work, the Vicar began to fulfill the duties of the local pastor, too. His Secretary, who was also a Consistorial Notary, acted as the assistant pastor of the parish. The Vicars, who acted as pastors of Prjašev, were the following three: 1. *Michael Bradač*, 2. *Gregory Tarkovič*, and 3. *John Olšavskyj*. Nevertheless, the pastoral work in the city was carried out mostly by the assistant pastors, who were primarily assigned for this task.

1. PARISH PRIESTS

The first assistant pastor, who took spiritual care of the faithful in Prjašev, was *Michael Dudinskyj, Jr.*, the son of the pastor in Rus'ka Nova Vesj. He was a secular priest and married to the sister of Vicar Michael Bradač. He stayed in Prjašev only one year, when his wife unexpectedly died, in 1793. He was then summoned to the Eparchial Seminary in Užhorod, where he became Professor of Dogmatic Theology.

Dudinskyj, Jr. was succeeded in Prjašev by *Rev. Basil Hodobaj*, who administered the parish until May, 1795. Since he

¹ Hung.: *Sos-Ujjalu*, Šariš District.

² Since the Vicariate was originally established in Košice, it retained its pristine name even after the see was transferred to Prjašev.

later became a Canon, we already described his biography in *Book Three*.

After Hodobaj came *Rev. John Žatkovskij*, who married another sister of Vicar Bradač. He administered Prjašev from September 14, 1796 - June 4, 1797, when he became the pastor of Jakubjany and dean of Superior Spiš.

From June 4, 1797 - August, 1799, the parish was administered by *Rev. John Tabakovič*, who then became the pastor of Zdoba and dean of the Košice Deanery. In 1816, he was appointed to the parish in Kraska,³ Mukačevo Eparchy, and from there to Perečín,⁴ where he acted also as a dean of the Turja Deanery. He died in 1843, being bereaved by all his parishioners. He was a learned priest and the curial clergy of the Mukačevo Eparchy is indebted to him for having received an additional financial assistance from the Government, called "*congrua*".

Rev. John Čiženko — served in Prjašev from August to December, 1799, when he was appointed the pastor of Osturňa. There he also died, in 1812.

After him came *Father Hilary Morelle*, who substituted until April, 1800. Father Morelle was a Greek monk from Asia Minor on his way to the Cholm Eparchy, Poland.⁵ Passing through Prjašev, he substituted for the assistant pastor only several months, when he continued his journey to Lithuania. After his departure, once again, a regular assistant pastor was appointed in person of *Rev. John Hodermarskyj*.

Rev. John Hodermarskyj — acted as the assistant pastor and notary from 1800 - November, 1805. He was recalled to the Seminary in Užhorod, where he became a Professor of Dogma. There he died, in 1832.

Rev. John Őrmezey — immediately succeeded Hodermarskyj and remained there until May, 1809. Subsequently, he was pastor of several parishes in the Ugoča District. During

³ Slov.: *Krašok*, Lower Zemplin District, where Tabakovič was pastor between 1817-1824.

⁴ Hung.: *Perecseny*, Uh District, now in U.S.S.R.

⁵ After the III Division of Poland, in 1795, the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Cholm was divided between Austria and Russia. At that time the Bishop of Cholm was *Porphyrius Wažynskij* (1790-1804), who met Fr. Morelle in Rome during his studies.

1817-1818 school year he performed duties of the Vice-Rector⁶ in the Eparchial Seminary of Užhorod.

In May, 1809, to Prjašev was assigned *Rev. John Gerberij*, one of the most promising priests in the Eparchy. But, taking care of the Russian reservists returning from the war against Napoleon, he became infected by typhus and died in December of the same year. He was buried in the crypt beneath cathedral.

Then, until July, 1810, a Basilian monk, *Father Joannicius Vileckyj* — substituted.

In July, 1810, *Rev. Andrew Kampo*, a secular priest of great talent was appointed. He was the first to receive the title of *the pastor of Prjašev* and, at the same time, he became also a dean of the Prjašev Deanery. He had a constant fights with Vicar Gregory Tarkovič, who vindicated to himself the rights of the pastor and tried to fulfill at least some accidental pastoral duties in the parish. Claiming that Father Kampo had sufficient income from the stola Tarkovič refused to provide for his board. Not able to sustain constant pressure on the part of the Vicar, in 1815, he finally left his post and headed straight to Užhorod. He was then appointed the pastor of Perečin and dean of the Turja Deanery. In Perečin he also ended his earthly journey.

His successor, *Rev. John Zomborij*, remained in Prjašev only until August, 1816, when he, also on his own, returned to Užhorod. He was appointed the pastor of Činadijevo,⁷ Bereh District, and later of Chust,⁸ Maramoroš District. Just recently⁹ he was nominated Canon of the Mukačevo Chapter.

In Prjašev he was immediately succeeded by *Rev. Peter Gorzo of Bilki*, who occupied this post until February, 1817. Then he was appointed as the assistant pastor and Vicarial Notary to Satmar.¹⁰ Later he became a pastor in Byčків,¹¹ where he also passed away, in 1842.

After him *Rev. Michael Molčanij* — was appointed as a

⁶ The duties of Vice-Rector in Užhorod Seminary were those of procurator.

⁷ Hung.: *Szentmiklós*, now in U.S.S.R.

⁸ Hung.: *Huszt*, now in U.S.S.R.

⁹ i.e. in 1843.

¹⁰ Modern *Satu-Mare*, in Rumania.

¹¹ Hung.: *Nagybocskó*, Maramoroš District, now in U.S.S.R.

temporary assistant. He remained in Prjašev until April, 1817, when he was transferred to the parish in Snakovo.¹²

Rev. John Andrejkovič — was also only a temporary assistant, serving the cathedral until May, 1818. Later, in 1822, he became pastor of Krompachi,¹³ Spiš District. There he died, in 1830.

His successor, *Rev. Michael Vislockyj*, performed his duties of the assistant pastor with great diligence between May, 1818 - December, 1822, when he was assigned as a temporary administrator to the parish of Jakubjany.

Bishop's Secretary, *Rev. Stephen Skorodinskyj*, substituted Father Vislockyj until 1823, when he returned back to Prjašev as the administrator of the cathedral. *Rev. Michael Vislockyj* discharged his office as the administrator with great efficiency until May, 1829, when he succumbed to a high fever and died. He was solemnly buried in the cathedral's crypt.

The second administrator of the cathedral was *Rev. Athanasius Jaromiš*, previously archivist at the Chancery Office. He administered the cathedral church until March, 1832, when he was appointed as a pastor of Lukov.¹⁴ Later he was transferred to Hrabovčik¹⁵ and, in 1846, to the parish of Velikij Lipnik.¹⁶ There he also passed away to eternity, in 1859.

Former Bishop's Secretary, *Rev. Anthony Pankovič*, served as the administrator of cathedral between 1832-1837. Then he became the pastor of Vyšňi Čabiny¹⁷ and dean of the same Deanery.

From 1837, the duties of the administrator of cathedral were commendably discharged by *Rev. Joseph Šoltis* — who, in 1853, was elevated to the dignity of Canon.¹⁸

Finally, in 1858, His Majesty graciously established the cathedral as the parochial church of Prjašev,¹⁹ whose pastor was

¹² Slov.: *Snakov*, Hung.: *Szánkó*, Šariš District.

¹³ Slov.: *Krempach*, Hung.: *Lublókarompa*, Spiš District.

¹⁴ Slov.: *Lokov nad Toplou*, Hung.: *Lukó*, Šariš District.

¹⁵ Hung.: *Gyertyánpatak*, Šariš District.

¹⁶ Slov.: *Veľky Lipník*, Hung.: *Nagyhársas*, Spiš District.

¹⁷ Slov.: *Vyšné Čabiny*, Hung.: *Felsőcebény*, Zemplin District.

¹⁸ *Schematismus 1944*, p. 17, indicates the year of his elevation — 1850. He died in 1879.

¹⁹ According to the *Schematismus A.D. 1898*, p. 39, the cathedral parish was established on July 24, 1857.

to be also the sixth Canon of the Prjašev Chapter. At the present time this office is occupied by *Canon Michael Stareckyj*.²⁰

2. CLERGY ASSISTING THE BISHOP

Besides the Canons, there were some other priests, who assisted the Bishop in his sacred functions and, at the same time, were working in the Chancery Office. Due to his limited headquarters and very meager income the Bishop was not able to maintain a full staff in the chancery and had to limit his personnel only to those strictly required by the Canon Law.

Besides the above mentioned assistant pastors and administrators of the cathedral, from among the secular clergy should be mentioned the following persons:

Rev. Alexis Lejčak — a secular priest, who was appointed as the Vicarial Notary, in 1818. After the establishment of the Prjašev Eparchy, he remained in the Chancery Office in capacity of a Consistorial Notary, until 1824. Anxious to replace him, Bishop Tarkovič appointed him as the pastor of the vacant parish in Humenne²¹ and dean of the same Deanery. In 1830, he was transferred to the parish of Velikij Lipnik, Spiš District.

At the Chancery Office Father Lejčak was succeeded by *Basil Popovič*, already mentioned above. He was a most efficient and diligent Secretary to the Bishop as well as the Consistorial Notary. By the exemplary order of the registers and official documents Popovič left in our Eparchy a lasting memorial of himself, which will survive in the hearts of his successors for many years to come. At the beginning he was working by himself, writing all the minutes and making clean copies of the official documents. Only later the Bishop agreed to hire other two clerks, who would make clean copies of various letters.

In 1823, upon the completion of his theological studies at the Primatial Seminary in Trnava, *Nicholas Brinskyj* was assigned

²⁰ M. Stareckyj became Canon in 1858, when he was also appointed the first pastor of the cathedral church in Prjašev. It seems, that Duchnovič was constantly working on his *History*, even after 1846.

²¹ Hung.: *Homonna*, Zemplin District. According to *Schematismus A.D. 1944*, p. 87, Fr. Lejčak was pastor of Humenne between 1822-1829.

ned to the disposition of the Secretary with the title of “*actuarius*”. He soon became not only the Secretary’s assistant, but also his trusted friend and admirer. In 1827, Brinskyj was assigned to the parish of Kaňa.²²

In Brinskyj’s place to the Chancery Office was appointed *Panteleimon Balaščak* — who, lacking any ambition, was to the Secretary of little help. The only thing it can be said about him is the fact that he was assigned to the Chancery Office. The same very year of 1827, he was sent to the parish of Niklova.²³

Balaščak was succeeded in the Chancery Office by *Athanasius Jaromiš* — previously mentioned among the assistant pastors of the cathedral, and *Alexander Duchnovič* — who just absolved his theological studies in Užhorod and was most welcomed by Secretary Popovič on account of his diligence. In 1830, Duchnovič resigned from his office,²⁴ but two years later he returned to the Chancery Office, where he continued his favored work. In 1833, Duchnovič was appointed to the parish in Komloš,²⁵ and a year later to Biloveža.²⁶ In 1838, when his friend, Basil Popovič, became the Bishop of Mukačevo, Duchnovič went with him to Užhorod, where he discharged the duties of the Consistorial Notary with great diligence.²⁷

In 1827, besides Duchnovič, to the Chancery Office was appointed *Seminarian Joseph Andrejčjo* — an outstanding young man on account of his honesty and diligence. Unfortunately, he was soon appointed to the parish of Stefanovcji,²⁸ where he prematurely passed away, in 1835. At the Chancery Office he carefully copied the minutes and compiled some indexes, by which he left a good memory of himself. May his soul rest in peace.

²² Hung.: *Kány*, Abauj-Turňa District.

²³ Hung.: *Miklósvölgye*, Šariš District.

²⁴ Working for two years without salary, Duchnovič decided to leave Prjašev and settled down in Užhorod, tutoring Count S. Petrovay’s children, 1830-1832. He hoped to be incardinated into the Eparchy of Mukačevo. Under the pressure of Bishop Tarkovič he had to return to Prjašev and was assigned to the pastoral work.

²⁵ Slov.: *Chmelova*, Hung.: *Komlóspatak*, Šariš District.

²⁶ Slov.: *Beloveža*, Hung.: *Bélavézza*, Šariš District.

²⁷ In 1843, Duchnovič had to return to Prjašev under the orders of new Bishop, Joseph Gaganec, who made him this time a Canon.

²⁸ Slov.: *Štefanovce*, Hung.: *Istvántelke* (Stefanócz), Zemplin District.

Rev. Anthony Pankovič — also mentioned above, was attached to the Chancery Office only for a short period of time, because soon he was appointed to take spiritual care of the faithful in the city of Prjašev.

In 1836, after the elevation of Basil Popovič to the dignity of Canon, *Rev. Michael Dudinskyj* — son and assistant of the most influential pastor of Nižni Slovinki,²⁹ was nominated as Bishop's Secretary and Consistorial Notary. But, to be truthful, he was not cut out for this work. Having succeeded Popovič, Dudinskyj will be remembered by the posterity in the same manner as was remembered *Ladislaus Dobrze* after the death of King Matthew Corvinus.³⁰

The work at the Chancery Office was really done by *Victor Dobrjans'kij* and *Basil Hučko*, who have just finished their theological studies at the Imperial Seminary in Vienna. Although only Seminarians,³¹ they both were very promising men,³² and will be mentioned in the second volume of this work.

There are some other priests, who should be mentioned in connection with the Bishop's Chancery, namely:

Rev. Andrew Samovolskyj, who was released from the Mukačevo Eparchy, in 1835. Since Bishop Tarkovič was his Godfather, he made him a "*praebendatus*" of the cathedral church.³³ In 1837, he was transferred to the parish of Horváthi,³⁴ and year later to Remeniny.³⁵

Stephen Hrabar — Bishop Tarkovič's nephew, a Seminarian from the Mukačevo Eparchy, already ordained as a Reader (Lec-

²⁹ Slov.: *Slovinky Nižné*, Hung.: *Alsószalánk*, Spiš District.

³⁰ Very progressive and dedicated king of Hungary, *Matthew Hunyadi* (1458-1490), surnamed after a raven in his crest "*Corvinus*" (Lat.: *corvus* — raven), was succeeded by Polish King Ladislas Jagello, known in Hungary as — *Ladislaus II* (1491-1516). He was very ineffective ruler and approved everything, what was proposed to him, always repeating — "*Dobrze*" (O.K.). Hence he was surnamed — "*Dobrze László*".

³¹ They finished the theology course, and were waiting for the ordination.

³² *Rev. Victor Dobrjanskyj* — spoke fluently 11 languages and left behind a large library of selected books. Later he became Canon (1850-1860). *Dr. Basil Hučko* — one of the most outstanding Canons of the Prjašev Chapter (1857-1872).

³³ "*Prebend*" — the benefice for the administrator of the cathedral church.

³⁴ At the present time in Hungary.

³⁵ Hung.: *Reménye*, Šariš District.

tor). Between 1831-1832, he worked as Bishop's Personal Secretary, but after he returned to his native Eparchy.

Another relative of the Bishop, *John Kuliman*, upon the completion of his theological studies at the Seminary in Užhorod, was released by Bishop Pocsy of Mukačevo and accepted by Bishop Tarkovič among the clergy of the Prjašev Eparchy. Like his cousin Hrabar, he was also employed as a Personal Secretary of the Bishop, but was later transferred to the parish of Sedliska.³⁶ Eventually, in 1839 he also returned to his native Eparchy.

Rev. John Gernat — a prebendary of the cathedral church, and *Anthony Kutka* — working at the Chancery Office as a clerk, should be at least mentioned by their name.

APPENDIX

The Greek Catholic clergy like to preserve the ancient ecclesiastic discipline. In the same manner they try to preserve their pristine and venerable customs concerning their exterior appearance, such as growing a beard. The custom of growing a beard by our clergy became so deeply rooted, that our people did not consider one a priest if he did not have a beard. At the time of Bishop Andrew Bačinskyj (1773-1809) this custom was still in general use and those, who on account of their youthful face or complexion were not able to grow a beard, were contemptuously called "*Bezborodko*", i.e. beardless. Consequently, many priests placed their pride in a long, bushy beard.

Later, when our Seminarians began to be educated in the Latin Rite Seminaries, this venerable custom began to fade away. Thus, Rev. Thomas Petrašovič, the only bearded secular priest in the Eparchy of Prjašev in 1830, was already considered by all an odd person. After his death, the only bearded person among the clergy of our Eparchy was Bishop Gregory Tarkovič. With Bishop's death (d. 1841) also the noble custom of wearing a beard by our clergy died out completely.

Our posterity should know, that the first Greek Catholic Bishop, who began to shave off his beard, was Bishop Basil Popovič, the Ordinary of the Mukačevo Eparchy (1837-1864).

³⁶ Hung.: *Szedliszke*, later: *Telekháza*, Zemplin District.

