

**THE LIGHT OF
THY COUNTENANCE
GREEK CATHOLICS
IN HUNGARY**

METROPOLITAN
CHURCH
SUI IURIS OF
HUNGARY

DEBRECEN
2020

Cover images: wall-painting of the Pantocrator (by Zsolt Maklár) in the Nyíregyháza Seminary Chapel and a fragment of the icon *Christ the Great High Priest* from the iconostasis of Velyki Kom'yaty (*Magyarkomját*)

Edited by: Szilveszter Terdik (Greek Catholic Heritage Research Group under the Joint Programme *Lendület/Momentum* of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological College)

Associate editor: Irén Szabó

Assistant: Lilla Nagy

Specimen descriptions were written by: Péter Borbás (P. B.), András Dobos (A. D.), Xénia Golub (X. G.), Mátyás Gödölle (M. G.), Hedvig Harmati (H. H.), György Janka (Gy. J.), Etele Kiss (E. K.), Annamária Tóth-Kollár (A. T. K.), András Koltai (A. K.), Bertalan Lada (B. L.), Zsuzsanna Ujteleki-Majchrics (Zs. U. M.), Imri Ozsvári (I. O.), Márta Pallag (M. P.), Anikó Pataki (A. P.), Gábor Prodán (G. P.), Bernadett Puskás (B. P.), Gruber H. Reinhard (G. H. R.), Krisztina Sedlmayer (K. S.), Irén Szabó (I. Sz.) and Szilveszter Terdik (Sz. T.).

Editor of the English text: David Veljanovszki

Translators: David Veljanovszki (the main text with notes in all chapters, foreword and epilogue – except IV.2.2), Dénes Neumayer (Cat. II.01–II.33), Aliz Tóka (Cat. II.34–II.66; Cat. III.01–III.30; Cat. III.37–59), Romulus Varga (Cat. III.31–36) and Péter Veres (Cat. IV.1–63; Chapter IV.2.2; Glossary)

Scripture quotations have been taken from the *English Standard Version* (Crossway Bibles, 2001). Passages from the Divine Liturgy have been adopted from the English translation of the *Ruthenian Recension* (2015). Sections from the Divine Office are from *Horologion* (Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Brookline, MA, 2019). The source of quotations and phrases from the Akathist Hymn is a traditional anonymous English translation.

Index compiled by: Lilla Nagy

Designed by: Márton Borbás, Stalker Studio

Prepress: Endre Földi, Stalker Studio

Project manager: Erzsébet Rubóczki

Printed by: Keskeny és Társai 2001 Kft.

ISBN 978-615-5964-11-4

Published by: Metropolitan Church *sui iuris* of Hungary
The publisher is represented by: Fülöp Kocsis
© The Metropolitanate
© The authors, 2020

This publication was created in preparation for the 2020 International Eucharistic Congress.

II.1.2 The Liturgical Tradition of the Historic Eparchy of Mukacheve (Munkács)

András Dobos

The roots of the multi-ethnic Eparchy of Mukacheve

Even though Byzantine Christianity had been present in the Carpathian Basin prior to the arrival of the Hungarians,¹ and, even among the Hungarians, there were numerous individuals who were converted to the Christian faith by Byzantine missionaries,² written records of the liturgical practice of these centuries barely survive. The Mongol Invasion destroyed even the last traces of the Byzantine Rite and left but ruins of the formerly flourishing monasteries.³ Any continuity between the missionary activity begun by Cyril and Methodius or the Byzantine presence at the time of the Hungarian Conquest of the Carpathian Basin and affecting the medieval Hungarian nation, on the one hand, and the historic Eparchy of Mukacheve, on the other, is impossible to substantiate with data.⁴ The core of the latter ecclesiastical structure was constituted primarily by Vlach⁵ and East Slavic groups settled in the border lands of historic Hungary

following the Mongol Invasion. These ethnicities, out of which the Slavic ethnic group called Ruthenians or, more accurately, Rusyns⁶ would come to have a dominant role in the history of the Eparchy, were part of Orthodox Christendom. As, in post-Mongol Invasion Hungary, no Orthodox ecclesiastical organisation existed, a degree of loose authority in church affairs could be provided only by the hierarchies of the neighbouring countries.

The centres of liturgical or, in general, ecclesiastical life were the monastic communities, with the larger ones gradually taking the faithful rapidly growing in number under their jurisdiction. Two monasteries are evidenced, with their origins fading in the obscurity of history, though their existence may be verified by documents as of the 14th century: the Monasteries of Körtvélyes (*Hrusheve/Szentmihálykörtvélyes*)⁷ and Mukacheve.⁸ The rivalry of these two religious houses was concluded by the triumph of the latter, and its prior already bore the title bishop from the late 15th century at the latest. The clergy under the leadership of the Bishop of Mukacheve entered into

The paper was written with the support of the Research Group 'Greek Catholic Heritage' under the Joint Programme 'Lendület' (Momentum) of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological College.

¹ The impact of the activity of Cyril and Methodius in Pannonia is documented in a handful of written records, cf. Žeňuch, Peter. *Источники византийско-славянской традиции и культуры в Словакии – Monumenta byzantino-slavica et latina Slovaciae*, Roma – Bratislava – Košice, 2013, 18–31. The question whether anything from their missionary work could survive the vicissitudes of the ages or, in other words, if any continuity between the ecclesiastical structure created in the 9th century and current Christian presence may be demonstrated continues to be a subject of debate.

² The most extensive material on the medieval Hungarian connections of Byzantine Christianity was compiled by Gyula Moravcsik, cf. Moravcsik, 1953; Id. Honfoglalás előtti magyarság és kereszténység, in: Serédi, Juszinián (Ed.). *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, I, Budapest, 1938, 174–211, 388–422. Other general overviews: Ivánka, Endre. Griechische Kirche und griechisches Mönchtum im mittelalterlichen Ungarn, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VIII(1942), 183–194; Révész, Éva. *Régészeti és történeti adatok a kora Árpád-kori bizánci–bolgár–magyar egyházi kapcsolatokhoz*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Szeged, 2012. On a possible Byzantine-rite ecclesiastical organisation, cf. Baán, István. Turkia metropolíájáról egy negyedszázad múltán – Válaszadási kísérlet a felmerült problémákra, in: Id. – Görföl, Tibor (Eds.). *Bizáncon innen és túl: Tanulmányok*, Nyíregyháza, 2018, 207–231; Koszta, László. Byzantine Archbishop Ecclesiastical System in Hungary?, in: Olajos, Terézia (Ed.). *A Kárpát-medence, a magyarság és Bizánc – The Carpathian Basin, the Hungarians and Byzantium*, Szeged, 2014, 127–144.

³ Cf. Moravcsik, Gyula. Görög nyelvű monostorok Szent István idején, in: Serédi, Juszinián (Ed.). *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, I, Budapest, 1938, 387–422.

⁴ From the late 18th century, the view that the Eparchy of Mukacheve was one of the seven Pannonian bishoprics founded by Cyril and Methodius would persist for one century, a position regarded as completely unfounded by most historians in recent times, cf. Hodinka, 1909, 58–64, 182–186; Pekar, Basilius. *De erectione canonica eparchiae Mukačoviensis* (an. 1771), Romae, 1956², 18.

⁵ It is hypothesised by some that a Vlach colonisation could precede subsequent Slavic settlement in many places; cf. S. Benedek, 2003, 11–12.

⁶ The origin of the Rusyns continues to raise a number of questions even today. According to the prevalent view, diverse ethnic groups from areas north east of the Carpathian Mountains (Galicia, Volhynia and Podolia) became a unified people in the Carpathian region. The various dialects of the Rusyn language also corroborate this thesis. For the ethnogenesis and colonisation of the Rusyn nation cf. Magocsi, Robert Paul. *With Their Backs to the Mountains: A History of Carpathian Rus' and Carpatho-Rusyns*, Budapest–New York, 2015; S. Benedek, 2003; Bonkáló, Sándor. *A rutének*, Basel–Budapest, 1996²; Hodinka, Antal. *A kárpátaljai rutének lakóhelye, gazdaságuk és múltjuk*, Budapest, 1923; Петров, Алексей. *Об этнографической границе русского народа в Австро-Угрии: о сомнительной «венгерской» нации и о неделимости Угрии*, Петроград, 1915.

⁷ On the foundation of the Monastery of Körtvélyes destroyed in the 17th century cf. Baán, István. A körtvélyesi monostor, *Vigilia*, 10(1988), 1988, 749–754; as well as the author's paper published in the present volume. The significance of the Monastery in its day is illustrated by the fact that it obtained *stavropegic* status from Anthony IV, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 1391.

⁸ The hitherto most detailed description of the origins and history of the Monastery of Chernecha Hora (*Csernek-hegy*), situated in the vicinity of Mukacheve, is found in the large-scale historical work of Antal Hodinka: cf. Hodinka, 1909, 90–175. Notable additional points on the foundation are also supplied in: Петров, Алексей. *О подложности грамоты князя Федора Кориатовича 1360 г.: Материалы для истории угорской Руси*, III, Санктпетербург, 1906.

II.1.2

union with the Catholic Church in the 17th century, and, as the first stage of the union process lasting over a century, part of the clergy signed the document on unification in 1646.⁹

The Eparchy of Mukacheve has been characterised by ethnic diversity from the beginnings. As has been pointed out, the earlier wave of Vlach settlement was followed by the immigration of Rusyns. Fleeing the Turks, numerous other ethnic elements also arrived here from the Balkans, referred to by the collective term 'Greek merchants' in the corresponding sources.¹⁰ The region received substantial numbers of people of Serbian descent ('Rascians'), such as the Hajduks, who settled in Hajdúdorog, resolutely adhering to the faith inherited from their forefathers, despite losing their ancestral language rather early.¹¹ Moreover, the union attracted members of other denominations in large numbers as well. At least, Bishop Mánuel Olsavszky (1743–1767) was pleased to report to the Holy See that the number of his faithful had considerably grown in one century, not least thanks to converts from Hungarian and Slovak Protestant communities, as well as from Jewish synagogues.¹²

Sources on the liturgical tradition of the historic Eparchy of Mukacheve

The Eparchy boasts relatively early specimens of liturgical heritage since the oldest items date from the 12th century. The most ancient and most well-known texts, such as the Mukacheve and Imstichovo (*Misztice*) fragments, the Koroleve (*Királyháza*) Gospel and the Mukacheve

Psalterium, reveal hardly anything from the local liturgical practice because, apart from the fact that these are predominantly replicas made not in the territory of the Eparchy, they contain mainly scriptural texts, thus carrying no clues about liturgical peculiarities. The only early example with some specific reflections of the local liturgical traditions would be the *Poluustav* of Uzhhorod (*Ungvár*) recorded in the early 14th century, which was unfortunately lost in 1971 though.¹³

All these sources are written in Old Slavic or, more accurately, Church Slavonic as the majority of the monasteries and parishes in the territory of the historic Eparchy of Mukacheve were Slavic or Romanian speaking – and, at that time, even the Romanians used the Slavic language during their worship.¹⁴

The first liturgical sources affording insight into local praxis are the hand-written *Euchologia*¹⁵ or, to use the Slavic term, *Sluzhebnyks* dating from the second half of the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century. Ten such specimens have been discovered in two collections,¹⁶ namely in the former Episcopal Library of Uzhhorod – today a section of the University Library – and in the National Széchényi Library, Budapest.

In view of the ethnic composition of the Eparchy, it would be reasonable to assume that the diversity referred to above could leave a mark on the liturgical tradition. This was also Antal Hodinka's stance on the matter, being the first to note the rich material in episcopal and monasterial libraries. He did not have the opportunity to conduct an in-depth analysis, but, even at

⁹ Cf. Gradoš, 2016, 303–314; Lacko, 1965.

¹⁰ Cf. Papp, Izabella. Görög kereskedők, in: *Magyar katolikus lexikon*, IV, Budapest, 1998, 180–182.

¹¹ It is precisely this parish of Serbian origins that would have the most important role in the century-long fight for the liturgical use of the Hungarian language later.

¹² Cf. the Bishop's 1759 report to the Congregation *De Propaganda Fide*: Lacko, Michael. Documenta spectantia regimen episcopi Mucačevensis Michaelis Manuelis Olšavsky (1743–1767), *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 25(1959), 81.

¹³ Любашенко, Вікторія. Церковні рукописи Галицько-Волинської Русі XII–XIV століть: спроба узагальнення (закінчення), in: Александрович, Володимир (ред.). *Княжа доба: історія і культура*, 5, Львів, 2011, 105. Strictly speaking, the *Poluustav* is not in fact a liturgical book but a collection comprising the everyday rules of monastic life and a few prayers. Its only description: Колесса, Олександр. *Ужгородський «Полуустав» у пергаментній рукописі XIV в.*, Львів, 1925.

¹⁴ The Slavic language was gradually supplanted by Romanian from the 16th century, while, by the late 18th century, the latter had completely replaced the former in services, cf. Rohály, Ferenc. Magyarországi keleti liturgiák, *Keleti Egyház*, 10(1943), 58–59.

¹⁵ In a broader and more ancient sense, the term *Euchologion* denotes the liturgical book that includes the Divine Liturgy, the invariable parts of the daily Divine Office relevant to the priest celebrating the liturgy, as well as other sacred acts or, to use the Western terminology, the order of the celebration of the Sacraments and sacramentals. Later the meaning of *Euchologion* was restricted to a book comprising the latter services, while the volume containing the text of the Divine Liturgy began to be called *Liturgikon*. In the Slavic languages, with reference to the more specific interpretation, *Euchologion* corresponds to *Trebnyk*, whereas *Liturgikon* corresponds to *Sluzhebnyk*; cf. Желтов, Михаил. Евхологий, in: *Православная энциклопедия*, 17, Москва, 2000, 699–700; Velkovska, Elena. Libri liturgici bizantini, in: Chupungco, Anscar (Ed.). *Scientia liturgica*, I, *Introduzione alla liturgia*, Casale Monferrato, 1998, 243–258.

¹⁶ Precious liturgical manuscripts are also held in other collections, including the Libraries of the St Athanasius Greek Catholic Theological College of Nyíregyháza and of the Theological Faculty of the Greek Catholic Theological College of Prešov (*Eperjes*), as well as the Stefanyk National Science Library, Lviv. At the same time, there is not a single *Euchologion* among these manuscripts that would be of local provenance and would pre-date the 17th century. Therefore, they are immaterial to research on this subject.

first sight, it occurred to him that the manuscripts showed substantial linguistic variance.¹⁷

Although differences between the manuscripts are indeed salient philologically, some appearing to be particularly interesting, some others containing unknown liturgical peculiarities, in terms of their content, a surprisingly uniform praxis materialises.¹⁸ All *Euchologia* were written under the influence of the first version of the *diataxis* of Philotheos Kokkinos, Patriarch of Constantinople (1353–1354; 1364–1376). In liturgical terminology, *diataxis* means a detailed system of rules governing the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, structured as a collection of rubrics.¹⁹ Philotheos wrote the first variant of his *diataxis*²⁰ still in the years when he was a monk on Mount Athos; he would subsequently revise it. The second draft developing thus, along with the Slavic translations made from it, spread in most Byzantine-rite Churches or at least made some impact on them. The oldest hand-written *Euchologia* of the Eparchy of Mukacheve are, however, in close connection with the Slavic translation according to the so-called Athonian recension, derived from the first version.²¹ This variant presumably developed in Athonian Serbian circles would become widespread primarily in the Balkans (in the Serbian and Bulgarian Churches). Thus, the Mukacheve tradition – at least in its oldest form reconstructed as part of the present inquiry – may be traced to Balkan roots. This body of tradition had been brought by the first Vlach settlers via Moldavia, and thus it became common in the Byzantine-rite monasteries in the north-eastern region of the Carpathian Basin, over time dispersing from there to

individual parishes as well. Nearly the same liturgical tradition came from a different direction, through mediation by the Serbs.

The effect of the Union of Uzhhorod on liturgical life

At the time of entering into union with Rome, a relatively uniform liturgical practice was dominant in the monasteries and parishes of the historic Eparchy of Mukacheve, at least as much as this may be inferred from the extant documents. In fact, the liturgical texts are indicative of a degree of uniformity, which may obviously be attributed to the role of the monasteries as liturgical centres. The fact that, in this period – but even in the one hundred years following the union – there was neither a seminary nor any theological school here, and no episcopal office, either, should not be overlooked. It seems legitimate to ask whether union with Rome brought any changes in the sacramental practice of the hitherto Orthodox faithful, and, if it did, of what character these changes were.

Surprising though it may sound, from the first decades of unity, there are no data suggesting that the altered situation in ecclesiastical policy would represent a turning point in this regard. The Catholic senior clergy cared precious little about questions of rite, for they did not see the rite-specific peculiarities of the united Eastern communities as a dangerous anomaly at that time yet. More conspicuous is a change attributable to an entirely different factor though. As of the 17th century, printed liturgical books would also reach Byzantine-rite communities in the north-eastern portions of the Kingdom of Hungary in ever larger quantities. Whereas

¹⁷ Cf. Hodinka, 1909, 787–791.

¹⁸ This assertion is based on an examination of the ten oldest known hand-written *Euchologia*. Seven of the manuscripts may be found in the former Episcopal Library in Uzhhorod, constituting part of the University Library nowadays. Their shelf marks are: 30 D (570), 31 D (497), 32 D (403), 33 D (80), 34 D (90), 37 D (335), 38 D (68) – cf. Štrempel, 2012. The National Széchényi Library, Budapest, holds an additional three manuscripts, which found their way to this public collection thanks to Antal Hodinka: *Quart. Eccl. Slav.*, 11; *Quart. Eccl. Slav.*, 12; *Quart. Eccl. Slav.*, 13 – cf. Cleminson, 2006, 78–90. The analysis performed for the purposes of the present study was mostly confined to the text of the *Liturgy* of Saint John Chrysostom. Further investigations involving all of the *Euchologia* might enrich liturgical scholarship not only in Hungary but also internationally with additional valuable insights.

¹⁹ On the genre of the *diataxis* in general, cf. Taft, Robert. *Diataxis*, in: Kazhdan, Alexander P. (Ed.). *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 1, New York – Oxford, 1991, 619.

²⁰ For the two versions of the text of Philotheos's *diataxis*, as well as for the Slavic translations made from them, cf. Zheltov, 2010, 346–348; Афанасьева, Татьяна. К вопросу о редакциях славянского перевода Диатакиса Божественной литургии патриарха Филофея Коккина и об авторстве его древнерусской версии, *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка*, 2013, 67–85.

²¹ The proposed affinity of the respective *Euchologia* with the first variant of Philotheos's *diataxis* is predicated on the following observations: 1. The prayers accompanying the donning of the priestly vestments are omitted; the text furnishes only the formulae intended for the deacon. 2. The row of commemorations on the third *prosphoro* (sacrificial bread) opens with John the Baptist in current Slavic praxis and in the second, revised variant of the *diataxis*. In the first version of the *diataxis* and, consequently, in the translation according to the Athonian recension, the commemorations on the third *prosphoro* commence with the commemoration of the Life-Giving Holy Cross, followed by commemorations of the Bodiless Powers of Heaven and of the Baptist. 3. The deacon may place commemorative particles (for both the living and the dead) on the *diskos*, on his own behalf. On the distinctive features of individual Slavic translations, cf. Zheltov, 2010, 351.

II.1.2

typography would normally result in a sense of uniformity in the area of liturgy,²² it set in motion the opposite process in the Eparchy of Mukacheve. Book import compensating for the absence of a local printing press gave rise to a kind of liturgical medley. Nonetheless, first and foremost thanks to the rapidly developing infrastructure of the Eparchy established in 1771 even canonically, gradually a uniform local tradition did evolve, affirmed by institutions such as the Cathedral of Uzhhorod²³ or the Seminary. These would assume the role previously played by monasteries in cherishing the liturgy.

The core of the gradually developing local tradition was formed less in conjunction with concrete liturgical components. Instead, it tended to be rooted in a profound conviction characteristic of the mentality of the clergy and the faithful alike for a long time, namely the notion that they had impeccably preserved the tradition inherited from their forefathers, and thus the rite remained devoid of any external influences, primarily coming from the Roman Church. The latter influences are conventionally referred to as Latinisation. The Greek Catholics living in the north-east of Hungary were particularly proud of the fact that they had not allowed alien liturgical customs to infiltrate their ancient services, thereby preventing the rite from being 'compromised' – a feat many uniate Churches could not lay claim to.

Naturally, this conviction was only partly true. Alien elements such as Eucharistic Adoration, organ music or the use of unleavened bread, i.e. wafers or hosts, in fact eluded praxis in this region. In the Eparchy of Mukacheve, adherence in terms of constructing iconostases was evident well up to the 20th century – a practice that was gradually abandoned in Galician churches already from the 17th century or lived on in a drastically simplified form wherever

iconostases were still erected.²⁴ Even the Divine Liturgy would be celebrated intact, in its form established by the 14th century, for a long time. The concept of private Masses²⁵ was unknown, similarly to the Feast of Corpus Christi or the Immaculate Conception.

At the same time, the policies of the Catholic Church affecting Uniate communities significantly changed nearly half a century following the union. Latin-rite senior clergymen felt it necessary to act as guardians of the Uniates, who – they argued – had not yet sufficiently internalised Catholic teaching, defined primarily as the Scholastic doctrines endorsed at the Council of Trent.²⁶ Around the mid-1700s, they implemented dramatic mutations in the services and, only to mention a few of the most blatant ones, terminated the communion of infants and the rite of the *zeon*.²⁷

The implementation of these measures was modelled upon the decrees of the 1720 Synod of Zamość of the Ukrainian Uniate Church. At this provincial synod, a number of resolutions were made with an impact on the sacramental order of the Church. As the Latinisation tendency had been dominant among the bishops of the Metropolitanate of Kiev for decades, the synodal fathers sought to harmonise liturgical praxis with the sacramentology of the Council of Trent. Issued by a local synod, the decisions of the Synod of Zamość were not binding for the Eparchy of Mukacheve, yet they affected its fate. At this time, the Bishop of Mukacheve, along with his priests, was subordinated to the Bishop of Eger. The Holy See was for long reluctant to give official recognition to the Eparchy of Mukacheve as in no way could its foundation be ascertained. In case an Eastern Church intended to unite with Rome, ordinarily it would be placed directly under the jurisdiction of the Holy See. With Mukacheve, the

²² Cf. Taft, Robert. *A bizánci liturgia* (Bizánc világa, X), Budapest, 2005, 123–124.

²³ The church once owned by the Jesuits was donated by Maria Theresa to the Greek Catholics after the dissolution of the Order. In the building, modifications required by the regulations of the Byzantine Rite for a liturgical space were executed in line with the ideas of Bishop András Bacsinszky. The converted church functioning as a cathedral, similarly to the pilgrimage church of Máriapócs completed a few decades earlier, served as a model for the interior furnishing of a constantly growing number of stone churches in the Eparchy. On the history of the two churches mentioned, cf. Terdik, 2014a, 76–120.

²⁴ Cf. Takala-Roszczenko, Maria. *The 'Latin' within the 'Greek': The Feast of the Holy Eucharist in the Context of Ruthenian Eastern Rite Liturgical Evolution in the 16th–18th Centuries*, Joensuu, 2013, 141–142.

²⁵ This assertion does not apply to religious houses, undergoing a series of substantial reforms as early as the 18th century and introducing a range of previously unfamiliar customs modelled on foreign examples.

²⁶ Cf. Véghseő, Tamás. *Az 1750–1752 között lezajlott vizitáció történeti háttere*, in: Véghseő–Terdik–Simon–Majchrics–Földvári–Lágler, 2015, 7–11.

²⁷ *Zeon* is the hot water poured into the chalice before communion, symbolising the enlivening presence of the Holy Spirit. On its development, cf. Taft, Robert F. *The Precommunion Rites: A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, V (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 261), Rome, 2000, 441–472.

situation appeared to be more complex from the outset. In fact, the Bishops of Mukacheve owed obedience to the Bishops of Eger as of the early 18th century, with the latter regarding them as their Greek-rite Vicars. The Latin senior clergymen took advantage of the unfavourable status of the Uniates and left no stone unturned to ensure that Rome would not establish an independent diocese for them.

The new liturgical regulations also fitted such a political programme of the Bishops of Eger. It is remarkable that, whereas the aforementioned liturgical changes were effected by internal reforms in the Ukrainian Church, the clergy and the faithful of the Eparchy of Mukacheve experienced them as the result of external coercion.

After a decade of uncertainty and tension, Maria Theresa founded the Eparchy of Mukacheve in 1771, to be canonised by Pope Clement XIV in his Bull *Eximia Regalium*. This ushered in an era in which the liturgy was able to develop freely. The creation of the institutional structure of the Eparchy fell to Bishop András Bacsinszky, who was particularly vigilant to ensure that services were conducted in a dignified manner.²⁸ When in 1773, Maria Theresa summoned the Uniate bishops of the Kingdom of Hungary to council,²⁹ Bacsinszky excelled among the Serbian and Romanian bishops with his conservatism and made a statement in support of the preservation of ancient liturgical forms.³⁰

With the canonical establishment of the Eparchy, the old wish of the clergy also seemed to come to fulfilment: They attained a legal and social status that the Latin-rite Catholic clergy had enjoyed for a long time. One of the major – if not the most important – motivating factors for uniting with Rome from the perspective of priests was liberation from the duties of serfdom. Interpreting it as mere selfish interest would be an oversimplification of reality. As long as the clergy did not enjoy some type of immunity, church life was

restricted in its entirety since an officiating priest – just as the cantor – could at any time be dragged from the altar by his landowner to the fields.³¹ Such cases were by no means uncommon, on the one hand, because the Byzantine calendar enumerated numerous feasts that were unknown in the Latin Rite and, on the other hand, because the Orthodox used the Julian Calendar, while, in Hungarian territories, the Catholics and the Calvinists had adopted the Gregorian version almost everywhere from late 16th century.

However, the emancipatory process of the Byzantine-rite community entailed some unexpected consequences. Much as the free practice of religion had by now become wholly uninhibited and the clergy had been granted the desired social status, it would seem that the outcome benefited only them. Even in the time of Bishop Bacsinszky, ecclesiastics began to display signs of languishing devotion and reduced liturgical activity. Many of them stepped on the road of secularisation and were neglectful of services and fasts, and frequently even abandoned their Slavic native tongue, opening a chasm as it were between them and the people.³² It may be imputed to this secularisation that, by the mid-1800s, the Divine Office was hardly ever prayed in many parishes, and less common services, such as the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts or the Penitential Canon of Saint Andrew of Crete, completely disappeared.³³

Rite as a force of identity formation

Despite the processes discussed above, the consciousness of the faithful and the clergy was characterised by a conservative attitude to questions of rite. They continued to celebrate services in fidelity to the traditions of their forefathers. Pride over liturgical heritage intensified from the middle of the 19th century, a phenomenon which may in the main be linked to two causes. The first one is the encounter with Russian

²⁸ As one of his acts, for instance, he sent graduate monks to the Cave Monasteries of Kiev with a view to studying the services, cf. Недзельский, 1932, 87.

²⁹ For the antecedents and progress of the so-called Synod of Vienna, see: Lacko, 1975.

³⁰ A case in point would be the situation when other bishops demanded the removal of saints who had lived after the Great Schism (such as the miracle-working Muscovite hierarchs) from the church calendar, Bacsinszky emphasised that these were saints revered by the people, whose veneration even the Holy See did not object to, cf. Lacko, 1975, 14–15, 43–44, 76, 245–248.

³¹ Cf. The report of Archbishop György Lippay to the Holy See from the year 1654: Hodinka, 1911, nr. 126, 169. Lippay was among the first to note the miserable situation of the Rusyn people.

³² In his circulars, András Bacsinszky already reproaches his priests for all this. Cf. Udvari, István. The Circulars of András Bacsinszky, Bishop of Munkács (1732–1772–1809) Belonging to the Period of Maria Therese, *Studia Slavica Hungarica*, 48(2003), 287–289.

³³ Bishop Bazil Popovics (1837–1864) levels a long list of accusations at the clergy on account of their service-related neglect, cf. 892. sz. körlevél, 1840. március 19., Sárospataki protokollum; 1219. sz. körlevél, 1834. december 5, Tokaji protokollum, Archives of the Eparchy of Miskolc, GKPL, III–2–b.

II.1.2

culture enabled after 1849 by the sojourn of Russian troops in Hungary.³⁴ The second factor is associated with the first one: the national awakening of the Rusyn people and its search for identity. Amazing as it may sound, rite had a crucial part to play in all this. When – virtually as last of all of Hungary's nationalities – the Rysin community embarked on its process of awakening, the minor intelligentsia in its ranks realised that a people could hardly survive without a literary language. Initially, this national revival did not assume any political colouring. Although representatives of the Ukrainian people, also in a state of agitation at the time, sought to connect with their Rusyn 'brethren', their approach would usually be met with cold indifference on the part of the latter. To them, Russian language and culture represented a sense of standard, which is no doubt incomprehensible given that, in both their language and customs, Hungary's Rusyns were by far closer to the Ukrainians. The Russophilic emotions of the Rusyn intelligentsia may be explained by historical and aesthetic reasons, as well as with reference to the linguistic justification that they felt a sense aversion to the Ukrainian language abounding in Polonisms. To the Rusyn ear, Russian sounded more appealing and more archaic, chiefly because it was perceived to be closer to Church Slavonic, which had had a lasting influence on the Rusyn vernacular.³⁵ Nevertheless, the choice in question appeared to be defined by a wholly different factor. The Rusyns looked upon the liturgical tradition of the Russian Church with admiration, recognising their own tradition in it, but viewed the Latinising practice of the Ukrainians with contempt, saying that 'they had compromised the Rite'.³⁶ The mid-1800s saw the start of a real liturgical mini-renaissance, as attested by liturgical commentaries and catechisms in Russian.³⁷

A break in tradition

Notwithstanding the sense of pride felt over the ancestors' liturgical tradition in the Eparchy of

Mukacheve, they were unable to eschew foreign influence completely. From the 19th century, services were less shaped by any external coercive force, but internal influences came to the fore instead. Even though the training of priests happened predominantly in Uzhhorod, there were always individuals who were educated at Latin seminaries, where their mentality would be formed by Scholastic sacramentology even inadvertently. In many instances, the leading elite of the eparchies came precisely from the ranks of such seminarians, studying in Pest or abroad. Several 19th-century bishops, commonly remembered as figures knowledgeable and passionate about the liturgy, left a mark through their controversial activities on liturgical life. Bishop Bazil Popovics (1837–1864) was regarded as somebody who genuinely cared about the cause of the divines services. He was the last to wear a *klobuk*³⁸ and to use the *zeon* and *ripidions* during his hierarchal services. The Imperial Secret Police constantly kept him under surveillance due to his putatively suspicious Russian relations. At the same time, he was also the first bishop not to wear a beard and he obliged his priests to celebrate the Divine Liturgy daily, a practice that was completely foreign to Byzantine spirituality and would later entail severe consequences for the spirituality of the clergy and the liturgical view of the people.

In spite of all the changes, the spirituality of the Eparchy continued to be defined by liturgical conservatism. Over the centuries, the aforementioned Latinisms either left their marks as a result of external influence or entered unnoticed, for example via priest training or dictated merely by fashion, without the clergy's cognisance. At any rate, it may be concluded that, in the Eparchy of Mukacheve, as well as in the Eparchy of Prešov created out of it in 1818,³⁹ the rite was retained in a comparatively purer form than in many other united Churches. This is supported by the protocol of the eparchy-wide canonical visitations of Miklós Tóth,

³⁴ Cf. Недзельский, 1932, 125–132.

³⁵ Cf. Геровский, Георгий. *Язык Подкарпатской Руси*, Москва, 1995, 46–61.

³⁶ 'Rite compromising' established itself as a technical term in the 19th century. Cf. Sztripszky, Hador. Moskophilizmus, ukrainismus és a hazai rusznákok, *Budapesti Szemle*, 153(1913), 288–290.

³⁷ The most popular of these were Alexander Duhnovych's Catechism (*Літургическій Катихись, или изъясненіе с. літургіи и нькоторыхъ церковныхъ обрядовъ по Новой Скрижали*, Будинь, 1851) and Yevgeniy Fentsik's manual (*Литургика или объясненіе богослуженія святой, восточной, православно кафеолической церкви*, въ Будапештѣ, 1878).

³⁸ In Byzantine-rite Churches, it is the everyday headwear of monks and bishops, consisting of a hard, hat-like upper part and a long, usually black veil.

³⁹ For the story of the foundation of the Eparchy, cf. Duhnovič, Aleksander. *The History of the Eparchy of Prjašev* [translated by Basilius Pekar from the Latin manuscript] (*Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni*, ser. II, sec. I, vol. XXV), Romae, 1971².

II.1.2

Bishop of Prešov (1876–1882).⁴⁰ The Bishop detected a number of irregularities regarding the order of services, mostly consisting in the arbitrary abridgement of the Divine Liturgy and in the abandonment of a few obligatory services. In addition, it is also worth remarking that he discovered elements alien to the Eastern liturgical spirit only in a handful of parishes. He firmly prohibited Sacramental Adorations and processions with the Eucharist in places where these were in use, with the rationale that these piety practices were uncommon in both the Mother Diocese of Mukacheve and the Cathedral of Prešov, and did not constitute part of the ancient tradition. It must be noted that, even as a consequence of its location, the Eparchy of Prešov had always been more open to liturgical innovations, and, in the Bishopric of Mukacheve, there was a sense of aversion to whatever was not considered to be compatible with tradition.

The inter-war period resulted in a break in liturgical thinking. In consequence of the Treaty of Trianon, except for a few parishes, the Eparchies of Mukacheve and Prešov became part of the territory of Czechoslovakia, where the state preferred to support the consolidation of a national Orthodox Church, which would be easier to control.⁴¹ In such an atmosphere, rite became what it had never before been in the historic Eparchy of Mukacheve: a distinctive feature. Henceforth, primarily the clergy, but over time the faithful as well, expressly endeavoured to differentiate themselves from the Orthodox by means of ritual elements, gestures or previously unfamiliar services. Sacramental Adoration, the cult of the Sacred Heart and other devotional practices of Latin origin, which were seen as strengthening ties with the Catholic Church, spread quickly. The pioneers of the new spiritual movement were from the ranks of the reformed Basilian Order.⁴²

Under the altered political circumstances, this time, the leaders of the eparchies strove to establish connections with the Ukrainian Church. They adopted its liturgical books, which they would for long be reluctant to use. In 1942, however, the Holy See issued new liturgical texts cleansed from certain Latin elements, in part with a view to stemming the aforementioned processes that increased the distance

from the Orthodox even in the area of rite. The new books were compulsory for those eparchies where the decrees of the Synod of Zamość were in effect. Although the Eparchy of Mukacheve was not one of these, those in charge made a decision in favour of the new *Liturgikon*.⁴³ This step literally concluded the unique development of the Mukacheve liturgical tradition. The liquidation of the Eparchy of Mukacheve and of the Eparchy of Prešov by Communist state authorities in 1949 and 1950 respectively would have put an end to any internal liturgical development anyway. The Eparchies revived in the meantime are currently in search of their liturgical identity. Their heritage partly lives on in Daughter Churches such as the Hungarian Greek Catholic Church, the Byzantine Catholic Archeparchy of Pittsburgh, PA, or the Eparchy of Ruski Krstur (*Bácskeresztúr*), Serbia.

⁴⁰ Cf. Dobos, András. *Prassi e teologia circa l'Eucaristia nella storica eparchia di Mukačevo dall'unione di Užgorod fino alla metà del XX secolo*, Dissertazione di dottorato, Roma, 2019, 281–282.

⁴¹ Cf. Пекар, Атанасій В. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, I, Рим, 1967, 128–132.

⁴² Cf. Пекар, Атанасій В. *Василіянська провінція св. Миколая на Закарпатті* (Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni, II/IX, fasc. 1–4), Roma, 1982.

⁴³ Cf. Пекар, Атанасій В. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, II, Рим–Львів, 1997, 45–46.