

УДК [94(439.5=161.2):262.3ГКЦ(477.87)]"1860/1867"  
DOI: 10.33402/ukr.2022-36-37-49

**Fedir MOLNAR**

*PhD, Associate Professor*

*Department of History and Social Sciences*

*Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education*

*Postdoctoral researcher*

*Eötvös Loránd University*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9488-9207>*

*e-mail: [molnar.ferenc@kmf.org.ua](mailto:molnar.ferenc@kmf.org.ua)*

## **THE PROGRAMMES OF THE GREEK CATHOLIC CLERGY OF NORTHEASTERN HUNGARY (1860–1867)<sup>1</sup>**

The article addresses the problem of religious and political activity of the Greek Catholic clergy of Northeastern Hungary between 1860 and 1867. Considerable attention is paid to analyze the role of the local Rusyn leaders. Among the nationalities of the Hungarian Kingdom in the XIX century, the Rusyns were considered to be the poorest people, both materially and culturally. Their society was truncated, in other words, incompletely structured, consisting of the vast majority of peasants. The author highlights that in the absence of nobility and citizenry, their Greek Catholic clergy served as elites. Their ecclesiastical organization provided an appropriate framework and base for the development of their national culture and literature. The most significant ecclesiastical structure of the Rusyns in Northeastern Hungary was the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo, which had jurisdiction over seven Hungarian counties (Zemplén, Ung, Bereg, Ugocsa, Máramaros, Szabolcs and Szatmár). The current bishop of the diocese resided in Uzhhorod was the number one leader of the Rusyns.

It is alleged that the so-called October Diploma, enacted by Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph on October 20, 1860, proclaimed a return to constitutional principles. On the basis of analysis of the various programmes of the Greek Catholic priests of the Eparchy of Mukachevo, it is established that the October Diploma had a great impact on the Rusyns of Hungary. This time, Adolf Dobriansky, a councillor of Hungary's Lieutenant Council claims the federal transformation of Hungary, the establishment of an independent Rusyn congress and a Greek Catholic archbishopric. As noted, his ideas also influenced many Rusyn priests. The traditionally pro-Hungarian Bishop of Mukachevo, Vasyl Popovych and his followers rejected Dobriansky's ideas because of their «radical» nature. Instead, the Consistory of Uzhhorod wanted to accept nationality demands exclusively in cooperation with the Hungarian Parliament.

The author comes to the conclusion that after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, the pro-Hungarian Greek Catholic clergy of the Eparchy of Mukachevo was satisfied

---

<sup>1</sup> Supported by the ÚNKP-21-4 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.

with the rights enshrined in the Nationalities Law of 1868. In the end it is revealed that the clergy believed: the state subsidies of the Diocese of Mukachevo would have been at risk by claiming nationality rights. The article summarizes the new material on the topic under study, introduces it into scientific circulation.

**Keywords:** Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo, Rusyn clergy, Adolf Dobriansky, Northeastern Hungary, nationality question.

Although the significance of the nationality issue in the Habsburg Empire during the 1860s has been discussed in the literature, the political activity of the Rusyn priests of the Eparchy of Mukachevo can be mentioned among the less researched issues. This theme is little studied and requires further research. Therefore, the purpose of the article is to analyze the religious and political programmes of the Greek Catholic clergy of Northeastern Hungary between 1860 and 1867.

According to some historians, the above mention period of Habsburg Neoabsolutism can be described as the era of a Rusyn «golden age». From the 1950s, several scholars turned their attention to the 19th century history of the Rusyns of Northeastern Hungary. Among the Hungarian historians, the names of József Perényi and his student, Mária Mayer can be mentioned. Perényi's doctoral thesis<sup>2</sup> investigates the Rusyn socioeconomic developments while the publications of Mayer introduce the political activity of the Greek Catholic clergy and secular activists<sup>3</sup>. Ivan Žeguc, a historian of Transcarpathian origin gives a general overview of Rusyn aspirations of the second half of the 19th century<sup>4</sup>. The book of a noted American scholar, Paul Robert Magocsi was published by the Harvard University Press. It traces the historical, socioeconomic, religious, political and cultural developments, and the language question of the Transcarpathian Rusyns between 1848 and 1948<sup>5</sup>. Among the contemporary historians, we can highlight the publications of two Ukrainian scholars. Mariya Kashka's PhD thesis<sup>6</sup> focuses on the ethnic and political development of the Transcarpathian Rusyns-Ukrainians from the second half of 18th century to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. The scientific articles of Rostislav Mayor examine the national and political aspirations of the Greek Catholic clergy and the Adolf Dobriansky-led secular intelligentsia in the 1860s<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata 1800–1918. Kandidátusi értekezés. Budapest: MTA, 1954.

<sup>3</sup> Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai és társadalmi törekvések: 1860–1910. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977; A ruszinok (kárpátukránok) és az 1865. évi képviselőválasztás. *Századok*. 1974. 5–6. sz. P. 1142–1175.

<sup>4</sup> Žeguc I. Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen der Karpato-Ruthenen 1848–1914. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965.

<sup>5</sup> Magocsi P. R. The Shaping of a National Identity Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1978.

<sup>6</sup> Кашка М. Ю. Етнополітичний розвиток русинів-українців Закарпаття (середина XVIII ст. – 1867 р.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Ужгородський національний університет. Ужгород, 2008.

<sup>7</sup> Майор Р. Парламентська діяльність А. Добрянського в угорському сеймі та його боротьба проти мадяризації національних меншин Угорщини в 1861–1868 рр. *Проблеми історії країн Центральної та Східної Європи*. 2012. Вип. 3. № 1. С. 120–139; Майор Р. Національно-політичні програми та вимоги українців Закарпаття у 1865–1868 рр. *Проблеми історії країн Центральної та Східної Європи*. 2015. Вип. 4. С. 141–154.

The Rusyn movement first took the stage of history during the Hungarian Revolution and the War of Independence in 1848–1849<sup>8</sup>. Around this time, Bishop Vasyl Popovych of Mukachevo and much of his clergy stood up for Hungarian liberal leaders advocating civic transformation, and from the spring of 1849, he supported Hungary's secession from the Habsburg Empire<sup>9</sup>. Only a few Rusyn leaders joined the counter-revolution led by the Habsburgs. At the beginning of 1849, Adolf Dobriansky, a mining engineer from the Greek Catholic family of priests, asked Emperor Franz Joseph I to unite the Rusyn-inhabited territories of Hungary to Galicia<sup>10</sup>. Although the independent Rusyn Crown Land, led from Vienna, was not established in the end, Dobriansky, who took on the role of civilian commissioner in addition to the tsarist troops occupying Hungary, was rewarded by Vienna after the defeat of the Hungarian War of Independence. In October 1849, the Rusyn leader was appointed civilian referent for the Uzhhorod Civil District, which comprises the Counties of Ung, Bereg, Ugocsa, and Máramaros. He held this post until the dissolution of an administrative unit also known as the «Rusyn District». That event took place at the end of March 1850<sup>11</sup>.

Dobriansky initial success also activated the Greek Catholic Church. Although Bishop Popovych remained under house arrest until October 1850, his eparchial vicar, Ioann Churhovych and the bishop of the Eparchy of Prešov, Iosyf Gaganets' were willing to cooperate with the referent<sup>12</sup>. The cooperation manifested itself on several levels: Dobriansky employed Greek Catholic seminarians in the local administration, and also advocated for the equality of the Rusyn language and nation<sup>13</sup>.

In the 1850s, during the period of so-called neo-absolutism, the state form of the Habsburg Empire was monarchial absolutism, where the will of Emperor Franz Joseph I prevailed in all areas. The Austrian authorities declared every person suspicious, who engaged in independent political activity. The change was brought about by the failure of the Imperial-Royal Troops on the Italian battlefield in 1859, which resulted in a serious loss of prestige for Vienna<sup>14</sup>. The Emperor was forced to make allowances: in the autumn of 1860, he issued the so-called October Diploma, which provided for the federal transformation of the Habsburg Empire. In the spirit of returning to constitutional principles, parliamentary elections were held in Hungary. As the Hungarian political elite

<sup>8</sup> Magocsi P. R. *The Shaping of a National Identity...* P. 42.

<sup>9</sup> Molnár F. *A Munkácsi Görögkatolikus Egyházmegye története 1848–1849-ben*. PhD dissertation. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 2018. P. 104–118.

<sup>10</sup> Майор Р. Національна програма А. Добрянського на Слов'янському з'їзді у Празі 1848 р. й прагнення українців об'єднати Закарпаття і Галичину в окремий «Руський коронний край». *Русин*. 2013. № 2. С. 72–83; Steier L. *A tót nemzetiségi kérdés 1848–49-ben. A kérdés története*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1937. 1. köt. P. 343, 477.

<sup>11</sup> Данилак М. Галицькі, буковинські, закарпатські українці в революції 1848–1849 рр. *Братіслава; Пряшів: СПВ–ВУЛ*, 1972. С. 183–184; Добош С. *Адольф Иванович Добрянский: Очерк жизни и деятельности*. Пряшев: SVKL, 1956. С. 42.

<sup>12</sup> Mayer M. *Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai...* P. 31–32.

<sup>13</sup> Кашка М. *Етнополітичний розвиток русинів...* С. 149.

<sup>14</sup> Deák Á. *From Habsburg Neo-Absolutism to the Compromise 1849–1867*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008. P. 42–43; Szabad Gy. *Hungarian Political Trends between the Revolution and the Compromise (1849–1867)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977. P. 71–75.

did not accept the ideas offered by the Emperor, Franz Joseph dissolved the Hungarian parliament on August 22, 1861, and reintroduced decree government<sup>15</sup>.

The legislature and the temporary restoration of the county administration also had a great impact on the Rusyn Greek Catholic clergy in Hungary. During 1861, many priests and intellectuals formulated their linguistic and national demands. These include the protection of the mother tongue, the employment of Rusyn officials, the establishment of Rusyn ridings, constituencies and the establishment of the Greek Catholic Archdiocese<sup>16</sup>.

Compared to other Rusyn leaders, the councillor of Hungary's Lieutenantcy Council and later court counselor, Adolf Dobriansky's programme was the most radical with the suggestion of the federal transformation of Hungary and the establishment of an autonomous Rusyn district<sup>17</sup>. He worked out his political program in cooperation with the Slovak leaders. As no Slovak representative entered the Hungarian parliament in the general elections held in the spring of 1861, Dobriansky was the only candidate to represent the Slavs in northern Hungary. Despite his victory in the Slovak-majority district of Zboro (Zemplén County), he was accused of spreading pan-Slavic propaganda, and the House of Representatives ultimately did not confirm his mandate<sup>18</sup>.

Because of the election failure, he did not express his views in the parliament. Therefore, he published his political program in German in Vienna. In his brochure, he set out to create a Rusyn autonomous district consisting of the counties of Northeastern Hungary. According to his plans, a German-Hungarian, a Serbian, a Romanian and a Slovak district was to have been set up from the remaining territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. Referring to an «ancient custom», Dobriansky demanded that an annual Rusyn national assembly should be held to deal with religious and school affairs. The president of the Rusyn assembly would have been the bishop of Mukachevo, with a secular co-president appointed by the ruler. Dobriansky found it necessary to establish a Rusyn archdiocese with independent jurisdiction and to restore the former diocese of Máramaros with Khust as its centre<sup>19</sup>.

On August 22, 1861, the Emperor dissolved the Hungarian parliament and introduced a government by decree<sup>20</sup>. Under these circumstances, Dobriansky's brochure published in Vienna did not significantly impact political life. The Rusyn leader, therefore, appealed to a new tactic. He issued a circular letter at the end of October, which he distributed to Greek Catholic bishops and Rusyn secular leaders through his confidants. In his circular he asked for authorization to lead a delegation to Franz Joseph and submit their national needs to the ruler. Dobriansky's historical concept was based on the fact that the former bishops of Mukachevo could decide independently on the ecclesiastical affairs of their nation until the XVI century. Thus, according to the councillor, what the

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. P. 45, 484–490.

<sup>16</sup> Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 10.

<sup>17</sup> Deák Á. From Habsburg Neo-Absolutism... P. 488; Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 33.

<sup>18</sup> Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 31–35; Žeguc I. Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen... S. 53.

<sup>19</sup> Dobrzansky A. Rede des ungarischen Landtags-Abgeordneten Adolf Ritter von Dobrzansky in der Adress-Angelegenheit. Wien: Typogr. Lit.-Artistischen Anstalt, 1861. S. 108–111, 117–121; Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 185–187.

<sup>20</sup> Szabad Gy. Forradalom és kiegyezés választóján (1860–61). Budapest: Adakémiái Kiadó, 1967. P. 596–597; Deák Á. From Habsburg Neo-Absolutism... P. 490.

priesthood only has to do is to ask the ruler to restore the «ancient rights» of the Greek Catholic church. Dobriansky included among these rights the free election of bishops of the Greek Catholic clergy, the establishment of an archdiocese independent of the Hungarian Catholic Church, and the convening of its national assembly. As an example, he cited those national leaders who had already presented the needs of their people to the ruler. He mentioned among them the Slovak, Ján Francisci-Rimavský, the Serb, Đorđe Stojaković and the Romanian, Andrei Mocsonyi<sup>21</sup>.

The Greek Catholic clergy and the secular intellectuals who took office in the 1850s formed the national self-conscious Rusyn elite somewhat divided in several respects. Some of them were willing to support Dobriansky's pro-Habsburg policy. However, a group of primarily Greek Catholic priests who wanted to enforce moderate national demands became more and more active in cooperation with the Hungarian Parliament<sup>22</sup>.

Bishop Vasyl Popovych of Mukachevo proved to be important for Dobriansky and, gained the Consistory's support in Uzhhorod. Therefore, the Rusyn deputy councillor asked Bishop Popovych to authorize him to submit the nationality issue to Franz Joseph<sup>23</sup>. The precedent was given by the Slovaks. In December 1861, Bishop of Banská Bystrica, Štefan Moyzes, led the delegation that handed over the Slovak Memorandum to the ruler<sup>24</sup>.

Bishop Popovych discussed Dobriansky's request at the consistory meeting on December 24, 1861. Most Rusyn leaders did not support the councillor's petition movement and the plan to send a Rusyn delegation to Vienna. Instead, a resolution was adopted in which it was declared that the exclusive competence of the Hungarian Parliament to ensure national rights were recognized. Nevertheless, György Markos was asked to compile an inscription on behalf of the Eparchy of Mukachevo asking for the ruler's help to submit the nationality issue to the next Hungarian Parliament. According to Markos, the consistory of Uzhhorod made a decision that reassured the upset tempers<sup>25</sup>. The high clergy did not ask for the promotion of the Eparchy of Mukachevo to the rank of an archbishopric. That proposal of Dobriansky's circular, which wanted to create an archdiocese independent of the Hungarian Catholic Church, could not be considered for the consistory<sup>26</sup>.

The consistory motion by Markos dealt with Rusyn demands only in general terms. He asked for the Rusyns to be guaranteed only those rights which other non-Hungarian peoples enjoy and which do not violate Hungary's constitution and territorial integrity<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> Ruszoly, J. Mészáros Károly és a rutén nemzetiségi törekvések 1861-ben. *A Hajdúsági Múzeum Évkönyve V*. 1983. 5. évf. P. 151–152.

<sup>22</sup> Kováč D. Szlovákia története. 2. kiadás. Pozsony: Kalligram, 2011. P. 143; Molnár F. A kiegyezés hatása a ruszin mozgalomra. *Nemzetiségek és törvényhozás Magyarországon* / ed. Kovács Kálmán Árpád. Budapest: Országgház Könyvkiadó, 2019. P. 210–211.

<sup>23</sup> Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 33; Ruszoly J. Mészáros Károly... P. 141–142.

<sup>24</sup> Bokes F. Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias po oslobodenie. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied a umení, 1946. P. 167, 231–234; Maxwell A. Choosing Slovakia. Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak Language and Accidental Nationalism. London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009. P. 24.

<sup>25</sup> Kárpáti Hirnök. 1861. december 16. 40. sz. P. 142; Szabad Gy. Forradalom és kiegyezés... P. 606–607; Haraksim L. K sociálnym a kultúrnym dejinám Ukrajincov na Slovensku do roku 1867. 1. vyd. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1961. P. 188–189.

<sup>26</sup> Pekar A. B. The History of the Church in Carpathian Rus'. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992. P. 59–60.

<sup>27</sup> Sürgöny. 1862. január 28. 22. sz.; Pesti Napló. 1862. január 30. 13. évf. 3590. sz.

However, several indications show that some Greek Catholic clergy were not satisfied. They were seriously influenced by Dobriansky's views.

In early April 1861, a two-part article was published, the author of which, under the pseudonym Ungifi «derived the need for ethnic equality from the historical separation provided by the Eastern Church»<sup>28</sup>. Unlike Dobransky, Ungifi did not ask to create an independent Rusyn province and would have been satisfied with establishing of Rusyn-majority ridings and constituencies. However, the author insisted on convening his own national assembly from time to time, which would decide on the ecclesiastical and educational issues of the Rusyns<sup>29</sup>. A similar view of Ungifi's writing was represented by the three priests from Maramures who published their petition in the Hungarian newspaper, *Kárpáti Hirnök* [Carpathian Herald]. The Subdeacon of Khust, János Pásztélyi, and two other priests, namely András Popovych and Ivan Rakovsky asked the bishop of Mukachevo to convene a Rusyn congress and to submit the national demands to the Parliament. In their motion, they called for the recognition of an independent nationality and the Greek Catholic Church<sup>30</sup>. In the same issue of the *Kárpáti Hirnök*, some Rusyn leaders in Ung County, presumably followers of Dobriansky, called for an autonomous voivodship and a national congress to be convened. However, Bishop Popovych did not support these efforts and urged the leaders of the movement to be patient<sup>31</sup>.

In Osij (Szajkófalva, Bereg County), 14 deans of Bereg and Ugocsa Counties organized a meeting, at which it was proposed to convene a Rusyn national assembly. The Osij program also required the establishment of ethnic counties and the proportional employment of Rusyn officials. As far as the church organization is concerned, it formed the right to promote the Eparchy of Mukachevo to the rank of an archbishopric. The creation of the Rusyn archdiocese was explained by the «ancestral bishopric» nature of the Eparchy of Mukachevo, as it once rounded out the territory of the Eparchy of Prešov. In addition, several parishes from the Eparchy of Mukachevo were annexed to the Romanian-speaking dioceses of Oradea and Gherla<sup>32</sup>. In August 1861, the program of Miklós Homicsko, a grammar school teacher in Uzhhorod, was published, which also required the regular operation of the national congress, the free election of bishops and the establishment of a Rusyn archdiocese<sup>33</sup>.

In 1861 the Greek Catholic clergy expressed demands for the organization of an independent Rusyn church several times. Although these programs were more moderate than Dobriansky's demands, the effect of the Rusyn councillor's views can be felt in their text. In 1861, Bishop Popovych who had good relations with the Hungarian elite and the government in Vienna, did not stand up clearly for the establishment of the Rusyn archdiocese. The bishop's modest position was reflected in the consistory resolution of July 2, 1861, in which he stated that he was content with granting the rights enjoyed by other nationalities in the country. The Consistory of Uzhhorod, led by Bishop Popovych, called on the Greek Catholic members of parliament to seek to achieve national

<sup>28</sup> Ruszoly J. Mészáros Károly... P. 137.

<sup>29</sup> Sürgöny. 1861. április 9. és 11. 81. sz. és 83. sz.

<sup>30</sup> *Kárpáti Hirnök*. 1861. július 18. 6. sz. P. 23.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Sürgöny. 1861. augusztus 15, 17–18. 187–189. sz.; Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 29.

<sup>33</sup> *Kárpáti Hirnök*. 1861. augusztus 29. 16. sz. P. 61–62.

aspirations within the constitutional framework and keep Hungary's territorial integrity always in mind<sup>34</sup>. As we have seen, the high clergy represented this principle even when Dobriansky asked Bishop Popovych for authorization to submit Rusyn claims to the ruler. Dobriansky's methods proved too risky for the bishop of Mukachevo and his followers. Bishop Popovych's fears were not unfounded, as the imperial authorities watched the national movements with increasing resentment after the dissolution of the parliament. For example, a formal procedure was initiated against Dobriansky because of an end of October circular letter addressed to deans and Rusyn secular leaders. As a result, the Hungary's Lieutenantcy Council gave him the strictest rebuke and significantly limited his powers<sup>35</sup>. In October 1862, the Hungarian governor Mór Pálffy also warned Bishop Popovych himself when the Rusyn priests in Ugocsa County protested that the language provisions attached to the October Diploma of 1860 had not been implemented. According to Pálffy, the organized action of the protesters could be considered «incitement»<sup>36</sup>.

As the previous examples have shown, the governance by decree (provisorium) applied during the interim period (1861–1865) did not favour national movements. The old and much ill Popovych, who had also been the Emperor's privy councillor since 1863, tried to balance between Vienna and the Hungarian political elite. On the other hand, he also had to take into account his Romanian and Hungarian believers, who repeatedly spoke out against the Rusyn dominance of the Eparchy of Mukachevo<sup>37</sup>. Vasyľ Popovych, who, although enlisted in the history of the Eparchy of Mukachevo as an eminent bishop, was unable to become an active participant in the turmoil of events because of his serious illness and his death in the autumn of 1864<sup>38</sup>.

In 1865, the political life of Hungary took a favourable turn. By December, the Emperor reconvened the Hungarian parliament, which in 1867 approved the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. As a result, the Hungarian Kingdom gained extensive self-government in the Habsburg Empire, and the Hungarian nobility regained its leading role within the country<sup>39</sup>.

Another revival of the Rusyn movement can be attributed to the Parliament sitting from December 1865 to December 1868. As a result, new programs have been launched to address the demands for national and ecclesiastical self-determination in drafting the forthcoming Nationalities Law. On November 12, 1867, on behalf of the 80,000 Greek Catholic followers of the Archdeacon of Bereg, János Deskó applied to the Lord Lieutenant of Bereg County to appoint a Rusyn speaking deputy-lieutenant. The Archdeacon argued that the Rusyn population, which makes up most of the county, does not speak the Hungarian language, so they would suffer a disadvantage in litigation. The General

<sup>34</sup> Ruszoly J. Mészáros Károly... P. 143.

<sup>35</sup> Haraksim E. K sociálnym a kultúrnyim dejinám Ukrajincoy. P. 190–191; Toth A. Parteien und Reichstagswahlen in Ungarn: 1848–1892. München: Oldenbourg, 1973. P. 240.

<sup>36</sup> Deák Á. Soknemzetiségű nemzetállam és soknemzetiségű irodalom. *Századvég*. Új folyam 50. sz., P. 64.

<sup>37</sup> Pirigyí I. A magyarországi görög katolikusok története. Nyíregyháza: Görög Katolikus Hittudományi Főiskola, 1990. 2. kötet. P. 64; Molnár F. The Life and Work of Stefan Pankovych, the Bishop of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo. *Rusin*. 2021. Vol. 64. No 4. P. 54.

<sup>38</sup> Pirigyí I. A magyarországi görög katolikusok története... P. 64.

<sup>39</sup> Deák Á. From Habsburg Neo-Absolutism... P. 556–577.

Assembly of Bereg County rejected the request of Archdeacon Deskó because language skills could not be a condition for the sub-election process<sup>40</sup>.

On August 15, 1867, the Rusyns of Maramures convened a meeting in Tyachiv, where a 15-member committee was commissioned to work out the Rusyn needs of Maramures. At the meeting, György Illyásevics, Dean of Tyachiv, was elected the oldest member<sup>41</sup>. The program of the Maramures Committee was presented to the general public at the general meeting in Tyachiv on 17 September<sup>42</sup>. István Markos was elected chairman of the meeting. The Dean of Bychkiv, Sándor Seregélyi, was asked to lead the session, and he gladly accepted the task. According to the Tyachiv program, the forthcoming nationality law should consider the needs of Rusyns and other nationalities in county settlement, church administration and education. Concerning ecclesiastical matters, it was mainly the request to ensure the autonomy of the Greek Catholic Church by involving secular persons. The authors of the petition considered the main guarantee of ecclesiastical self-determination in raising the Eparchy of Mukachevo to the rank of an archbishopric. In addition, a separate diocese was asked for the followers of Bihar, Szabolcs, Szatmár, Borsod Counties and the Hajdú District, and they demanded the restoration of the former Eparchy of Maramures. As for educational matters, the position was expressed that folk education should be entrusted to the Greek Catholic Church with self-government. However, the payment of the salaries of the folk teachers was expected from the Hungarian state<sup>43</sup>. Subsequently, the decision was made to send the minutes of the meeting to the Hungarian government<sup>44</sup>, the bishops of Mukachevo and Prešov, the neighbouring counties and the bishops. The consistory of the Eparchy of Mukachevo accepted the decisions of the Rusyn assembly in Maramures and took a waiting position<sup>45</sup>.

By sending the minutes of the meeting in Tyachiv, the Rusyns of Maramures wanted to prove that they wanted to fight for their rights only within the legal framework, in contrast to Dobriansky's autumn circular of 1861, which was distributed in secret without the knowledge of the authorities. Members of the Maramures Committee rejected the view emphasized by Dobriansky that it wished to justify the self-determination of the Rusyn Church from the supposed former existence of a Rusyn autonomous duchy<sup>46</sup>.

A program resembling the Maramures submission was adopted by the Rusyns of Ugocsa (November 25, 1867). The programs in Maramures and Ugocsa included the provision of language and education rights, the raising of the Eparchy of Mukachevo to the rank of an archbishopric, the establishment of the Hungarian diocese in Hajdúdorog and the Rusyn diocese in Maramures, the use of the yellow-blue flag and the recognition of the Rusyn political nation<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> DAZO [State Archives of Transcarpathian Oblast]. Fund 151, Archival List 12, Storage Unit 1703. P. 1–2.

<sup>41</sup> *Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez Magyarországon a dualizmus korában (1867–1892)*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1952. I. Kötet / ed. G. G. Kemény. P. 53–54.

<sup>42</sup> DAZO. Fund 151, Archival List 12, Storage Unit 1702. P. 3–4.

<sup>43</sup> Mayer M. *A ruszinok (kárpátukránok)...* P. 1164–1167.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Máramaros. 1867. október 30. 31. sz.

<sup>45</sup> DAZO. Fund 151, Archival List 12, Storage Unit 1702. P. 1–2.

<sup>46</sup> Máramaros. 1867. október 9. 28. sz.

<sup>47</sup> Máramaros. 1867. december 18. 38. sz.; Mayer M. *A ruszinok (kárpátukránok)...* P. 1170–1171.



The creation of a Greek Catholic archdiocese was also proposed by the Rusyns of Šariš (January 1868) and Spiš (January 11, 1868). However, the authors of the last two submissions did not request the organization of the Hungarian-speaking diocese of Hajdúdorog and the Rusyn-speaking diocese of Maramures. Like the authors of the program of Ugocsa, regarding their «ancient rights», they proposed allowing the free election of bishops and the marriage of priests. The priests of Bereg County made similar demands and also requested the establishment of the archdiocese of Mukachevo under the supervision of the archbishop of Esztergom<sup>48</sup>. The Bereg County petition was sent to the Ministry of Religion and Culture, where the document was not dealt with on the merits. The ministerial justification argued that it is necessary to wait for the adoption of the Nationalities Law<sup>49</sup>.

On January 27, 1868, the Rusyns of Zemplén proclaimed a meeting attended by 21 Greek Catholic priests, four cantors, and ten wealthy peasants. The motion adopted here demanded rights similar to those already mentioned: the recognition of Rusyns as a political nation, the establishment of a Greek Catholic archdiocese, and the right of the Greek Catholic clergy to elect bishops freely. However, the program of the Rusyns in Zemplén attracted the interest of the Hungarian Ministry of the Interior, and an official investigation was launched into this case. The investigation tried to prove that the clergy fraudulently squeezed out the village seals and the signatures of the peasants. The peasants testified that they were unaware of the content of the petition and did not support the Rusyn demands. The on-the-spot committee concluded that the priests involved in the case had been able to deceive the farmers by promising to abolish the allowances payable to the Greek Catholic Church for their signature<sup>50</sup>.

The same investigation was launched in the case of the national program of the Slovaks in Spiš. The Rusyn program in Zemplén and the Slovak program in Spiš were connected by the person of Dobriansky, who was re-elected to Parliament in 1865 in the Slovak majority district of Zboró. This time his mandate was confirmed and he was able to be a member of the Hungarian House of Representatives<sup>51</sup>. In February 1868, the magistrates of 21 Slovak villages applied to Dobriansky to submit a petition of Slovaks to the Parliament. The authors of the Rusyn petition in Zemplén and the Slovak petition in Šariš followed the method announced in Dobriansky's circular of October 1861 to have their petition signed by as many church and secular people as possible, thus emphasizing the social weight of their movement<sup>52</sup>. The role played by Dobriansky in drafting his motion in Zemplén seems to be proved by the fact that the wording of the document reveals proficiency in matters of nationality. Like the Zemplén program, the Hungarian House of Representatives did not discuss the Spiš program, so the committee dealing with the issue of nationality did not take it into account<sup>53</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Mayer M. A ruszinok (kárpátukránok)... P. 1172–1174.

<sup>49</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 216.

<sup>50</sup> Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez... P. 168–169; Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 212–215; Žeguc I. Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen... S. 68–71.

<sup>51</sup> Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez... P. 75–77; Майор П. Парламентська діяльність А. Добрянського... С. 130; Ábrahám B. A nemzetiségi törvény szlovák szemmel. *Erdélyi Jogélet*. 2020. 3. évf. 2. sz. P. 132.

<sup>52</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 215; Žeguc I. Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen... P. 69.

<sup>53</sup> Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez... P. 75, 168.

The demands of the Rusyn programs of 1867–1868 were not submitted to the Hungarian Parliament, so they did not affect the content of the Nationalities Law passed on December 8, 1868<sup>54</sup>. The contemporary sources testify that the adoption of the law on nationality did not have a marked effect on Rusyn clergy's aspirations, while other nationalities were primarily disappointed and politically passive<sup>55</sup>. After 1868, the intensity of the movement of the Greek Catholic clergy in Northeastern Hungary came to an end<sup>56</sup>. Rusyn leaders did not pay much attention to the law of nationality itself. Both the radical and the more moderate followers took note of the power relations. The law recognized only the Hungarian nation in political terms. Representatives of the radical trend led by Dobriansky were forced to give up efforts to create the Rusyn-majority ridings and constituencies. Dobriansky, who served as a councillor dignity in the 1860s, ran out of air in politics owing to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867<sup>57</sup>. His influence was further reduced by his failure to win a mandate in the next parliament<sup>58</sup>. As his immunity was waived, his room for maneuver was severely limited. For Dobriansky's supporters, the proceedings initiated in connection with the programs of the Rusyns of Zemplén and the Slovaks of Spiš served as a deterrent. In the current situation, Dobriansky tried to increase his influence only within the Greek Catholic Church and in Galicia.

The majority of Rusyn leaders were those who could easily adapt to the situation created by the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. There are several reasons behind this. On the one hand, a significant part of the Rusyn high clergy became Hungarian, and on the other hand, the priesthood hoped that the Andrassy Government would settle the financial situation of the Eparchy of Mukachevo. The Rusyn movement did not have comparable financial means to the Serbs or the Romanians<sup>59</sup>. Social strata consisting mainly of more moderate peasants or traders were missing. The Greek Catholic bishop at the time usually acted in accordance with the policy of the Hungarian government, and did not formulate any demands that went beyond the possibilities offered by the Nationalities Law of 1868<sup>60</sup>. It was mainly open to hold different offices who enjoyed the trust of the Hungarian government and the bishop of Mukachevo (Sándor Nehrebeczky, György Markos, János Pásztélyi, Péter Dolinay and others) considering building their careers a primary consideration. They did not dare to come up with claims that went beyond the Nationalities Law, as it would have jeopardized their public service office, which represented their existence. Instead, the possibilities offered by the law, such as the use of the mother tongue in different settings (e.g. middle and lower-level administration, church life, courts, schools), or scientific and cultural associations, societies, institutions, or even the right to establish non-Hungarian language of instruction schools. Thus, the Greek Catholic clergy, which had previously formulated a moderate nationality program,

<sup>54</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 210.

<sup>55</sup> Katus L. Nemzetiségi kérdés és Horvátország története. *Magyarország története 1848–1890*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979. 2. kötet. 6/2 / eds. E. Kovács, L. Katus. P. 1345.

<sup>56</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 219; Magocsi P. R. The Shaping of a National Identity... P. 54–55; Майор П. Національно-політичні програми... С. 151.

<sup>57</sup> Magocsi P. R. The Shaping of a National Identity... P. 52.

<sup>58</sup> Pesti Napló. 1869. március 12. 5673. sz. R. k.

<sup>59</sup> Katus L. Nemzetiségi kérdés... P. 1388.

<sup>60</sup> Magyar Törvénytár. 1836–1868. évi törvényczikkek / eds. D. Márkus. Budapest: Franklin, 1896. P. 494.

identified with the system of the Compromise and maintained a good relationship in the hope of social uplift<sup>61</sup>.

## REFERENCES

- Ábrahám, B. (2020). A nemzetiségi törvény szlovák szemmel. *Erdélyi Jogélet*, 3 (2), 124–138 [in Hungarian].
- Bokes, F. (1946). *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias po oslobodenie*. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied a umení [in Slovak].
- Danylak, M. (1972). *Halytski, bukovynski, zakarpatski ukraintsi v revoliutsii 1848–1849 rr.* Bratislava; Prešov: SPV–VUL [in Ukrainian].
- Deák, Á. (2008). *From Habsburg Neo-Absolutism to the Compromise 1849–1867*. New York: Columbia University Press [in English].
- Deák, Á. (2008). Soknemzetiségű nemzetállam és soknemzetiségű irodalom. *Századvég*, 50 (4), 51–77 [in Hungarian].
- Dobosh, S. (1956). *Adolf Ivanovich Dobrianskii: Ocherk zhyzni i deiatelnosti*. Prešov: SVKL [in Russian].
- Dobrzansky, A. (1861). *Rede des ungarischen Landtags-Abgeordneten Adolf Ritter von Dobrzansky in der Adress-Angelegenheit*. Vienna: Typogr. Lit.–Artistischen Anstalt [in German].
- Haraksim, L. (1961). *K sociálnym a kultúrnym dejinám Ukrajincov na Slovensku do roku 1867* (Vol. 1). Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied [in Slovak].
- Kárpáti Hirnök. (1861, Augustus 29), 16, 61–62 [in Hungarian].
- Kárpáti Hirnök. (1861, December 16), 40, 142 [in Hungarian].
- Kárpáti Hirnök. (1861, Július 18), 6, 23 [in Hungarian].
- Kashka, M. Yu. (2008). *Etnopolitychnyi rozvytok rusyniv-ukraintsiiv Zakarpattia (sередина XVIII st. – 1867 r.)*. [Ethno-political development of Ruthenians-Ukrainians of Transcarpathia (mid- XVIII century – 1867)]. (Candidate's thesis). Uzhhorod [in Ukrainian].
- Katus, L. (1979). Nemzetiségi kérdés és Horvátország története. In E. Kovács, L. Katus, *Magyarország története 1848–1890* (Vol. 2 (6/2), pp. 1333–1393). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].
- Kemény, G. Gábor. (Ed.). (1952). *Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez Magyarországon a dualizmus korában (1867–1892)* (Vol. 1). Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
- Kováč, D. (2011). *Szlovákia története* (2nd ed.). Pozsony: Kalligram [in Hungarian].
- Magocsi, P. R. (1978). *The Shaping of a National Identity Subcarpathian Rus', 1848–1948*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press [in English].
- Maior, R. (2012). Parlamentska diialnist A. Dobrianskoho v uhorskomu seimi ta yoho borotba proty madiaryzatsii natsionalnykh menshyn Uhorschchyny v 1861–1868 rr. *Problemy istorii krain Tsentralnoi ta Skhidnoi Yevropy*, 3 (1), 120–140 [in Ukrainian].
- Maior, R. (2013). Natsionalna prohrama A. Dobrianskoho na Slovianskomu zizdi u Prazi 1848 r. y prahnnennia ukraintsiiv obiednaty Zakarpattia i Halychynu v okremyi «Ruskyi koronnyi krai». *Rusyn*, 2, 72–83 [in Ukrainian].

<sup>61</sup> Perényi J. A ruszinok történetének vázlata... P. 217–219; Mayer M. Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai... P. 10–11, 39–48, 51–52.

- Maier, R. (2015). Natsionalno-politychni prohramy ta vymohy ukrainsiv Zakarpattia u 1865–1868 rr. *Problemy istorii krain Tsentralnoi ta Skhidnoi Yevropy*, 4, 141–154 [in Ukrainian].
- Máramaros. (1867, December 18), 38 [in Hungarian].
- Máramaros. (1867, Október 30), 31 [in Hungarian].
- Máramaros. (1867, Október 9), 28 [in Hungarian].
- Márkus, D. (Ed.). (1896). *Magyar Törvénytár. 1836–1868. évi törvényczikkek*. Budapest: Franklin [in Hungarian].
- Maxwell, A. (2009). *Choosing Slovakia. Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak Language and Accidental Nationalism*. London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies [in English].
- Mayer, M. (1974). A ruszinok (kárpátukránok) és az 1865. évi képviselőválasztás. *Századok*, 5–6, 1142–1175 [in Hungarian].
- Mayer, M. (1977). *Kárpátukrán (ruszin) politikai és társadalmi törekvések: 1860–1910*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].
- Molnár, F. (2018). *A Munkácsi Görögkatolikus Egyházmegye története 1848–1849-ben*. (PhD thesis). Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University [in Hungarian].
- Molnár, F. (2019). A kiegyezés hatása a ruszin mozgalomra. In K. Á. Kovács (Ed.), *Nemzetiségek és törvényhozás Magyarországon* (pp. 199–222). Budapest: Országgház Könyvkiadó [in Hungarian].
- Molnár, F. (2021). The Life and Work of Stefan Pankovych, the Bishop of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo. *Rusin*, 64 (4), 52–73 [in English].
- Pekar, A. B. (1992). *The History of the Church in Carpathian Rus'*. New York: Columbia University Press [in English].
- Perényi, J. (1954). *A ruszinok történetének vázolata 1800–1918. Kandidátusi értekezés*. Budapest: MTA [in Hungarian].
- Pesti Napló. (1862, Január 30), 13, 3590 [in Hungarian].
- Pesti Napló. (1869, Március 12), 5673 [in Hungarian].
- Pirigyi, I. (1990). *A magyarországi görög katolikusok története* (Vol. 2). Nyíregyháza: Görög Katolikus Hittudományi Főiskola [in Hungarian].
- Ruszoly, J. (1983). Mészáros Károly és a rutén nemzetiségi törekvések 1861-ben. *A Hajdúsági Múzeum Évkönyve*, 5, 129–154 [in Hungarian].
- Steier, L. (1937). *A tót nemzetiségi kérdés 1848–49-ben. A kérdés története* (Vol. 1). Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat [in Hungarian].
- Sürgöny. (1861, Április 9), 11, 81, 83 [in Hungarian].
- Sürgöny. (1861, Augusztus 15), 17–18, 187–189 [in Hungarian].
- Sürgöny. (1862, Január 28), 22 [in Hungarian].
- Szabad, Gy. (1967). *Forradalom és kiegyezés választóján (1860–61)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].
- Szabad, Gy. (1977). *Hungarian Political Trends between the Revolution and the Compromise (1849–1867)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in English].
- Toth, A. (1973). *Parteien und Reichstagswahlen in Ungarn: 1848–1892*. Munich: Oldenbourg [in German].
- Žeguc, I. (1965). *Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen der Karpato-Ruthenen 1848–1914*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz [in German].

**Федір МОЛНАР***доктор філософії**доцент кафедри історії та суспільних дисциплін  
Закарпатського угорського інституту ім. Ференца Ракоці II**постдокторський дослідник**Наукового університету ім. Лоранда Етвеша**ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9488-9207>**e-mail: [molnar.ferenc@kmf.org.ua](mailto:molnar.ferenc@kmf.org.ua)*

## **ПРОГРАМИ ГРЕКО-КАТОЛИЦЬКОГО ДУХОВЕНСТВА ПІВНІЧНО-СХІДНОЇ УГОРЩИНИ (1860–1867)**

Розглянуто проблему релігійної та політичної діяльності греко-католицького духовенства Північно-Східної Угорщини в 1860–1867 рр. Значну увагу приділено аналізу ролі місцевих русинських лідерів. Зазначено, що у XIX ст. із-поміж народів Угорського королівства найбільш значущим етносом як у матеріальному плані, так і в контексті культурних здобутків вважали русинів; соціальна структура цієї спільноти була неповною, адже більшість становили неписьменні селяни. Стверджено, що за відсутності власного дворянства та буржуазії роль еліти відіграло греко-католицьке духовенство, а базою, зокрема фінансовою, для розвитку руської національної культури та літератури стали церковні структури. Встановлено, що найбільш значною церковною структурою русинів Північно-Східної Угорщини вважалася Мукачівська греко-католицька єпархія, чия влада поширювалася на сім угорських комітатів (Земплін, Унг, Берег, Угоча, Марамарош, Саболч і Сатмар), а єпископ, який керував єпархією з осідком в Ужгороді, – провідним лідером русинства.

Стверджено, що Жовтневий диплом, який проголосив австрійський імператор Франц Йосиф I 20 жовтня 1860 р., ознаменував повернення до конституційних принципів. На підставі аналізу різних програм греко-католицьких священників Мукачівської єпархії встановлено, що Жовтневий диплом мав великий вплив на угорських русинів; у цей період радник Придворної ради Угорщини Адольф Добрянський відстоював федералізацію Угорщини, створення самостійного руського конгресу та греко-католицької архієпархії. Зазначено, що його ідеї вплинули на багатьох руських священників. Констатовано, що проугорський мукачівський єпископ Василь Попович і його послідовники відхилили пропозиції Добрянського, оскільки вважали їх занадто радикальними, натомість ужгородська консисторія хотіла втілити національні потреби винятково у взаємодії з Державними зборами Угорщини.

Висновано, що після австрійсько-угорської угоди 1867 р. дружнє до угорців греко-католицьке духовенство Мукачівської єпархії задовольнилося тими правами, які забезпечував Закон про національність від 1868 р. На закінчення зазначено, що духовенство побоювалося, що вимога розширення національних прав призведе до зменшення державного фінансування (субсидії) Мукачівської єпархії.

**Ключові слова:** Мукачівська греко-католицька єпархія, руське духовенство, Адольф Добрянський, Північно-Східна Угорщина, національне питання.