

New Europe College Yearbook  
*Gerda Henkel* Program  
2016-2020



---

AURELIA FELEA  
ARTEM KHARCHENKO  
SVITLANA POTAPENKO  
VIKTORIIA SERHIIENKO  
EVGENY TROITSKIY

---

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

*Gerda Henkel* Fellowship Program is supported by Gerda Henkel Stiftung, Düsseldorf.

### **EDITORIAL BOARD**

Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Andrei PLEȘU, President of the New Europe Foundation, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Bucharest; former Minister of Culture and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania

Dr. Valentina SANDU-DEDIU, Rector, Professor of Musicology, National University of Music, Bucharest

Dr. Anca OROVEANU, Academic Coordinator, Professor of Art History, National University of Arts, Bucharest

Dr. Katharina BIEGGER, Consultant, Eastern European Projects, Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin

Dr. Constantin ARDELEANU, NEC Long-term Fellow, Professor of Modern History, The “Lower Danube” University of Galați

Dr. Irina VAINOVSKI-MIHAI, Publications Coordinator, Professor of Arab Studies, “Dimitrie Cantemir” Christian University, Bucharest

Copyright – New Europe College, 2021  
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College  
Str. Plantelor 21  
023971 Bucharest  
Romania  
www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro  
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10



## **VIKTORIA SERHIENKO**

Born in 1988, in Ukraine

Ph.D., Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 2014

Thesis: *Formation and activity of the Orthodox Church brotherhoods of Left-Bank Ukraine (1864 – 1917)*

Researcher, Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies,  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Author of 20 research papers in Ukrainian, American, Polish, Russian,  
and Belarusian scholarly journals and collections of scientific works

Her research focuses on the religious and social history of Ukraine  
in the 19th – 20th centuries



# HRABSKÉ IN SEARCH OF “DIVINE AND HUMAN LAW”: THE HISTORY OF GREEK CATHOLIC – ORTHODOX CONFLICT IN ONE VILLAGE IN INTERWAR SLOVAKIA

## Abstract

The article examines how the Greek Catholics of Eastern Slovakia viewed the ambiguous role of Orthodoxy, one of the fundamental components of all-Russian ideologies, in discussions about religious and national belonging among local Ruthenians/Ukrainians. The unfolding polemics illustrate the process of the reinterpretation of the image of the self among local Greek Catholics, who understood that it had become impossible to adhere to the old “Orthodox” rhetoric and who were looking for new words and meanings to re-describe their role in the region. The case of Hrabské is typical, but at the same time particularly interesting, because it reflects the reaction of different levels within the structures of the Czechoslovak state to a quite ordinary conflict between the Orthodox and Greek Catholic inhabitants of one East Slovak mountain village.

**Keywords:** Russophiles, Ukrainophiles, the Greek Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, Eastern Slovakia.

## Orthodoxy in Eastern Slovakia: Austro-Hungarian and Czechoslovak History

Orthodoxy in the Ruthenian/Ukrainian<sup>1</sup> villages of Eastern Slovakia and in neighbouring Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia began to appear in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century in response to the “magyarization” of the Greek Catholic priesthood taking place at the time. The seeds of Orthodox agitation fell on the fertile and grateful soil of romantic Russophilism which had been spreading through the local intelligentsia since the time of the “awakeners” in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. One of the sources of this spread of Orthodoxy were former Greek Catholic priests and believers. After emigration to America, they had often converted to Orthodoxy in protest against the

attitude of the local Roman Catholic episcopate there who were insensitive to Byzantine liturgical issues and Greek Catholic church history. Orthodox ideas also came from another direction, from the Russian Empire, which supported these ideas within the framework of its foreign policy doctrine. The Hungarian authorities, who governed Slovakia and Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia after the Compromise of 1867, implemented a repressive policy in respect of Orthodox believers. (This policy took on especially harsh forms on the eve of the First World War with the search for alleged Russian spies among the Orthodox.) The darkest chapter in that story were the two Máramarosziget trials against some Subcarpathian/Zakarpattian villagers who wanted to convert to Orthodoxy.<sup>2</sup>

After the revolution and the rise of Czechoslovakia, the religious liberalism of the newly formed state, bound by many international obligations regarding national minorities, created new opportunities for the spread of the Orthodox movement.<sup>3</sup> Several considerations determined Czechoslovak government policy on Orthodoxy. Firstly, Prague tried to emphasize its difference from the pre-revolutionary Hungarian past. Secondly, the policy of non-interference put the authorities in the privileged position of arbitrator in inter-confessional conflicts. That is to say, if the Hungarian authorities, through their rigorous (even brutal) policies in confessional matters, had intensified anti-government sentiment, then Prague largely deflected aggression against the state. On the other hand, the role of observer often adopted by the Czechoslovak authorities tended to direct inter-confessional conflicts inwards – onto the religious communities involved. To this general picture was added the anti-clericalism typical among the Czech (but not Slovak) intelligentsia and the popular slogan of the time, “Away from Rome!”. In addition to these domestic political calculations the ongoing negotiations with the Vatican on the *Modus Vivendi* of 1928 should not be forgotten.<sup>4</sup> The spread of Orthodoxy and the capacity of the Czechoslovak authorities to regulate it also constituted a form of pressure on the Holy See. For some time, Prague even tried to maintain its own Orthodox project, officially registered as “The Orthodox Czech Religious Community” under the rule of Archimandrite Savvatij (secular name Antonín Jindřich Vrabec) (1880–1959), consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople Meletius (Metaxakis) as the Archbishop of Prague and All Czechoslovakia.<sup>5</sup>

Beside this, in order to contextualise the spread of the Orthodox movement in Eastern Slovakia, it is important to mention several key figures in the story. Among them was Jurko Lažo (1867–1929) – a public figure

and the only Ruthenian deputy in the Czechoslovak Parliament, where he actively, if somewhat hopelessly, defended the interests of his voters. Lažo was from a peasant family: he lived in predominantly Ruthenian/Ukrainian Svidník and his mentors were two Ruthenian “awakeners” – Alexander Duchnovič (1803–1865) and Alexander Pavlovič (1819–1900). Jurko Lažo was a supporter of Orthodoxy, seeing in it salvation from a largely “magyarized” Greek Catholic clergy.<sup>6</sup> The other important figure (supported by Jurko Lažo) was Vitalij Maksimenko (1873–1960), one of the leaders of the Black Hundred movement in the Russian Empire and the former Archimandrite of the Pochaïv Monastery in Volhynia. During the period in question Maksimenko was the head of the Orthodox movement in Eastern Slovakia.<sup>7</sup> From the Greek Catholic side of the story it is impossible not to mention the two bishops who governed the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov during the interwar period:<sup>8</sup> Dionýz Njarady (1874–1940), who came from a Ruthenian village in Serbia,<sup>9</sup> and his successor Pavel Peter Gojdič (1888–1960), born into an old local priestly family and subsequently recognized as one of the Righteous Among the Nations for helping and rescuing Jews during the Holocaust.<sup>10</sup>

### **Greek Catholics in Search of a Confessional Identity**

Among the priests of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov, even in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, it was common practice for them to call their parishioners “Orthodox Greek Catholics”. This testifies that their way of thinking went beyond a strict confessional division. However, with the arrival of representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the return from the United States of those Greek Catholics who had converted to Orthodoxy there, new issues arose. The biggest was the issue of rethinking their own confessional identity since the Orthodox claimed an exclusive right to represent the “faith of the forefathers” to the local Greek Catholic population. Interestingly, the Orthodox agitated among conservative-minded villagers to convert not to a new belief (in the confessional sense, at the time of the Union of Uzhhorod of 1646, Orthodoxy was only in the process of creation there), but by presenting it as a return to the “lost traditions of old”.

Paradoxically, however, the Greek Catholics were caught in a trap they had unintentionally made for themselves. The parishioners remembered that they had been taught by their priests to call themselves “Orthodox”.

Not only did the Orthodox agitators take advantage of this habit, it also caused misunderstandings with representatives of the Czechoslovak state. The Ladomirová newspaper "Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus" described a case where local Greek Catholics at the time of the general census of 1930 had said that they were Orthodox and the census-taker had fined them for providing false information. As reported, the priest Teodor Rojkovič<sup>11</sup> (1877–1963) (he was the editor-in-chief of the Greek Catholic newspaper "Russkoe Slovo" at the time the article appeared) had taught his parishioners that they were "Orthodox" over the preceding twenty-five years. In an article in response, Rojkovič commented that "the rascals had gulped their words in front of the clerk-advisor and that father R. (Rojkovič meant himself – V.S.) had always added [to the term "Orthodox"] the words "of the Christian Greek Catholic faith"". He explained himself by saying that he had always taught his pupils at school to use this form of words and he had made a separate announcement about it again before the census.<sup>12</sup> But it was hard to sort out completely the sense of what had been said to the peasants by the priest.

In addition, it was necessary to reconcile the adherents of the so-called "Ruthenian faith" ("Ruska vira"), who called only their Roman Catholic neighbours "Catholics", with a sense of their own Catholicism. So the Greek Catholic journalists of the newspaper "Russkoe Slovo" attempted to explain that "Orthodox" and "Catholic" are synonymous in signifying the "universality" and "unity" of the Church as the mystical body of Christ. That is to say, by using the arguments of the 17<sup>th</sup> century:

However, if you open the Orthodox catechism issued in Vyšnij Svidník, you will read: "I am an Orthodox Christian of the Orthodox Catholic faith." You see, the word Catholic is not so terrible as you might think. I have one Orthodox prayer book from the year 1600, where in the Liturgy of St. Basil the Great there is one prayer for the Catholic Church and for the Patriarch of All Russia all at once.<sup>13</sup>

Of course, this kind of argument was inappropriate in a world divided into confessions and could function only at a certain moment in a relatively isolated mountain region like the one where the Ruthenian/Ukrainian villages of Eastern Slovakia were situated. Until recently, the local Greek Catholics had needed to separate themselves on a confessional spectrum from Roman Catholics but not from the Orthodox, who had been almost non-existent there.



Nonetheless, Greek Catholics began to realize the need for the standardization of terminology and its usage in the confessional sense. In the Greek Catholic press, it was common to call opponents *schismatics* and “*the Orthodox*” (in quotes). In this way they would replace the name of the confession with an implied question about its (non)orthodoxy. In the end, arguments went full circle, culminating in statements like this with references to church history:

The fact is that they call themselves “Orthodox” and our official circles call them “Orthodox” as well, but this is incorrect. The correct name for them is “Greek-Eastern”, which was defined a long time ago in German, Magyar and other languages, ‘griechisch orientalisches’, ‘görög-keleti’ ...

Only the faithful of the Eastern or Western rite, who in unity, in the union with Rome, recognize the Roman Pope as the head of the universal Christ[ian] Cat[holic] Church, can properly be called Orthodox ...<sup>14</sup>

The Orthodox brought with them questions not only about the name of their confession. They also accused local priests of the Latinization of the rite in the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov, in particular the shortening of church services; the replacement of the Julian calendar with the Gregorian one; and the likeness of appearance of the local priests to their Roman Catholic counterparts. At the time, questions like these were a typical subject of discussion in various Greek Catholic dioceses,<sup>15</sup> and because of their public visibility they were an effective way of campaigning for believers.

In general, it seemed that the Greek Catholics were not ready for polemics with the Orthodox, because they were disorganised and defensive in their approach. They also lacked theological training. The talented journalist Alexei Iljkovič (1910–1944),<sup>16</sup> who came from the family of a local Greek-Catholic priest, explained the situation as follows:

[...] our priests were brought up in the spirit of Latin seminars, so they knew the particular issues of the Eastern Church only very superficially. As a result their defence was very cumbersome and often not very convincing. Indeed, one might say that if the arguments of the Orthodox were demagogic, the arguments of the “Uniates” were not even demagoguery. The level of their defence has declined so much that often its subject is only the greasy cassocks, the ungroomed beards, and the general unkempt appearance of the Orthodox priests.<sup>17</sup>

In these disputes, the Orthodox also instrumentalized the phenomenon of “*Ruska vira*”. Since religious affiliation was the only identity for Ruthenian/Ukrainian peasants which extended beyond the boundaries of their own village, the Orthodox coming from the former Russian Empire attempted to politicize it. First, I will refer to the entourage of the above-mentioned Vitalij (Maksimenko), one of the leaders of the Black Hundreds and an active opponent of the Ukrainian movement. I mention this question only in passing because it will form the subject of my next piece of research.

Speaking from the standpoint of the so-called “*triune Russian people*” and using Uvarov’s formula of “*Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality*”, these people spread their ideas to Eastern Slovakia via the aforementioned newspaper “*Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus’*.”<sup>18</sup> In their articles, they took away from the Greek Catholics the right to call their faith “*Ruska vira*”, explaining that while it had been one thing during the Austro-Hungarian Empire, when Uniatism had been a kind of “*compromise*” in the face of the threat of Catholicization and Magyarization, now, however, they further proclaimed, peremptorily:

Not the “*Union*” but Orthodoxy is the Russian faith! The “*Union*” is a dark legacy of the mournful past of our long-suffering people, and the sooner we get rid of it, the better it will be for us.<sup>19</sup>

In this way the local Greek Catholic intelligentsia, among whom since the time of the “*awakeners*” had been rooted a tradition of romantic Russophilism (and the further west across the region of Ruthenian settlement, the more Russophile they were), found themselves in an uncomfortable and incomprehensible situation. They considered themselves genuine “*Rusians*”, but their language (non-standardized local dialects and a superficial knowledge of literary Russian among the local intelligentsia) and faith were not worthy of pious “*reverence*” in the eyes of the foreigners:

Russianness without Orthodoxy? Is this even possible? Was it not a selfless devotion to the lofty precepts of the holy Orthodox faith which created those attractive traits of the Russian soul that the best foreigners hold in awe?<sup>20</sup>

Of course statements like the one above provoked an abrupt rejection in response:

So we Greek Catholics are not ‘*Rusians*? Or what? ...’ – “*Russkoe Slovo*” wrote with indignation. – “Is not the “*Nar[odnaia] Gazeta*”<sup>21</sup> spreading Ukrainianness<sup>22</sup> with writing like this, at least indirectly?<sup>23</sup>”

The Greek Catholic newspaper was mistaken, because none of these people was going to spread “Ukrainianness”. The idea was that folk religion needed to be associated in the minds of the local Ruthenians/Ukrainians not with Greek Catholicism, but exclusively with Orthodoxy.

And here the Greek Catholic journalists took one very rash step:

You, our dear intellectuals, who in your extreme enthusiasm think you will only protect and save Russianness if we all become “Orthodox”, are much mistaken, because faith has nothing in common with nationality (originally *narodnost`* – V.S.): there is no such thing as the “Slavic” or the “Latin” faith – there exists only the faith of Christ.<sup>24</sup>

This quotation manifested the whole essence of the way of thinking of a Greek Catholic believer, for whom religious identity was the main thing. But statements like this opened the way to opportunities for Slovak national activists from the “Slovak League.” Because the most important slogan of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov during the time of Pavel Peter Gajdič, “Whoever is Greek Catholic is Ruthenian” (“*Čo gréckokatolík, to Rusín*”), had now been undermined.

### **Believers of the “*Ruska Vira*” between the Greek Catholic and the Orthodox Choice**

The majority of the villagers, however, who largely remained illiterate, were not interested in the abovementioned polemics in the newspapers about theological and identity issues (let us now leave this level of argument to one side). The truth was that the spread of Orthodoxy in Eastern Slovakia was not connected with arguments of a dogmatic nature. As explained by the editor-in-chief of the “*Narodnaia Gazeta*” Ivan Zhidovský (1897–1982):

Since 1914, the common man has been through many troubles here, even mortal ones, and without the presence of a priest, who accompanied him neither in war nor in captivity. [...] We only rarely see a priest here even now, as a cultural or economic worker among the people. [...] The result is complete alienation, helped along by the fact that almost every parish priest and his family have not drawn closer to the people even in the language they speak. They scoff in Hungarian no worse than the descendants of Attila, although we have now been living in a Slavic country for twelve years already. [...] Today the situation is that the Gr[ee]k Cat[holic] priests, brought up to be “lords and masters,”<sup>25</sup> who have got themselves families which need supporting and children who need educating, are now for their impoverished people a “luxury” – and the people prefer the less demanding Orthodox clergy.<sup>26</sup>

The author of the sentences quoted above had in mind the “natural obligations” of the villagers towards their priests (the so-called “koblina” and “rokovina”), of which the villagers highly disapproved. Living in a poor mountainous area, which had suffered during the First World War, it was difficult for these villagers to feed not only the priests but even their own families. Because of this the Czechoslovak authorities in 1920, on the eve of the elections, had taken a very popular decision allowing the redemption of these obligations. The villagers, however, who had grown accustomed during the war to not fulfilling these obligations, now refused to acknowledge any material obligation in respect of the priests, who were in fact economically dependent on their parishioners. This worsened the already not very friendly relationship between the Greek Catholic laity and their clerics.<sup>27</sup> Orthodox priests from the former Russian Empire, who in their émigré poverty were content to receive a minimal recompense (often only food and housing), would take advantage of these conflicts.

Equally important for understanding the religious conversions of peasants in Eastern Slovakia is their aforementioned imprecise understanding of their denominational belonging. The so-called “Ruthenian faith” (“*Ruska vira*”) implied the possibility of being both Greek Catholic and Orthodox. After all, the components of this folk religion were the Byzantine liturgy (with certain local modifications), worship in the Church Slavonic language (with the haphazard inclusion of local words) and sermons “in our language,” that is, in one of the Ruthenian/Ukrainian dialects. The peasants were far from fully understanding Catholic dogmas or the essence of the meaning of the form of worship. As one local priest noted:

If a cantor had dressed in priestly vestments and “done” a good church service, many of our people would have praised him: “He did that nice and loudly!” Indeed, in one village our country folk said: “Why can’t we be done with church services? We could sing as priests ourselves.”<sup>28</sup>

These words are characteristic both of the so-called “darkness” (uneducatedness) of the villagers and the unscrupulous ministry of the priests, who often treated their parish like a more or less profitable family business.

However, these preconditions might not apply if the villagers were satisfied with their priest. And vice versa: often the direct cause of conversion to Orthodoxy was the personal conflicts between a church community and a pastor. The absence of a permanent Greek Catholic priest would also provoke Orthodox activism. In order to fill the vacancies, consecrations of Orthodox priests would take place after a few months of training for those who only yesterday had been ordinary villagers or cantors.

### **The Case of the Village of Hrabské**

The case of Hrabské is typical, but at the same time an interesting one, because the local Orthodox community, in looking for the decision they required, went through every possible decision-making body, including in Prague. Thus one can see the reaction from every different level of authority to this quite ordinary conflict between the Orthodox and the Greek Catholics of one East Slovak mountain village.

It is important to note that the village of Hrabské (in the county of Košice) was situated in the northeastern part of Slovakia. This was a Ruthenian/Ukrainian village<sup>29</sup> on the border with Poland which had cross-border contacts with Lemko villages where Orthodoxy was spreading at the time. Incidentally, Czechoslovak border guards had been deployed there during the period in question, in fact on the church lands, to prevent smuggling in the village. Until recently, the village had officially been counted as almost entirely Greek Catholic.<sup>30</sup> However in 1920 Michal Čisárik (1841–1920), who had been the Greek Catholic priest of Hrabské, died. The archdeacon (vicar general) Mikuláš Rusnák (1878–1954) did not appoint anyone to the vacant position (due to a lack of priests): instead the administrative functions of the parish were carried out by priests from

neighbouring Snakov – Kornel Rokický (1879–1943) and Štefan Beskid (1892–1950). The residents of Hrabské felt dissatisfied with the lack of a permanent priest, as well as with the high fees they were paying for priestly services. Štefan Beskid was even transferred to another village for corruption by the episcopal administration after taking higher than usual fees for a funeral. A Slovak representative to the Czechoslovak Parliament, Igor Hrušovský, recounting the villagers' complaints, noted that the priests "would demand for a funeral, for example, 100 Czechoslovak crowns, a chicken, a piece of cloth, and a drink."<sup>31</sup> The two next priests (appointed after Štefan Beskid) also stayed only for a short time. One of them came "just to gather the harvest from the priest's arable land, to sell it and then to give the land back to the village to look after."<sup>32</sup> It seems that the poor state of the vicarage also influenced the longevity of the priests' stays in the village, because it meant they had to live in one of the rooms in the schoolteacher's house. So the coincidence of several factors (the lack of a permanent priest, the high prices charged by the visiting priests for their services, and the Lemko villages just over the border) caused most residents in the village to start calling themselves Orthodox. Evidently Orthodox activism was also a factor, begun in the outskirts in 1921 by Jurko Lažo, a Rusyn deputy to the Czechoslovak Parliament, and Father Baran, an Orthodox priest from America, originally a native of the village. Concerned about this agitation, the Prešov Greek-Catholic episcopal administration and Mikuláš Russnák in person sought the support of local officials and, in particular, wrote to inform the prefect of the county of Šariš, Pavel Fábry, on 23 March 1921 as follows:

I request and urge you to remove this Orthodox clergyman from Makovice and to control the [parliamentary] deputy Lažo and take him under your supervision. In spite of the fact that he is a senator, he is not authorised to act in a way which is harmful to the state.<sup>33</sup>

Events unfolded quickly, however, and according to official data from the census of 1921, among the 479 residents of the village of Hrabské there were 57 Greek Catholics and 399 were Orthodox.<sup>34</sup>

Residents of the village (now as Orthodox rather than Greek Catholic parishioners) continued to use the church, the school and the priest's estate. This relatively peaceful coexistence between the Orthodox and the Greek Catholics in the village lasted for some time. However in 1924 the Prešov Greek Catholic episcopal administration initiated a bureaucratic

procedure to allow it to make use of the church property again. The district government in Bardejov, in order to consider the case, requested an extract from the land register administered by the local land management service. According to the cadaster (land register) of 1888, the church and another legal object (probably the priest's estate) belonged to the Greek Catholic community of Hrabské. On the basis of this information, the head of the district government in Bardejov and then the head of the county of Košice, who confirmed the initial decision, concluded: "The Orthodox have occupied the church property of the Greek Catholics unlawfully and it is the duty of the authorities ... to return the property which has been seized to its legal owner."<sup>35</sup>

In both instances, it was a question of the self-same people who had first been Greek Catholics and then gone over to Orthodoxy. The fact is that despite the existence of liberal legislation establishing the general principles protecting freedom of conscience and the activities of religious organizations in Czechoslovakia, particular pre-revolutionary regulations had remained in place and were therefore not always appropriately up-to-date. In particular, the Hungarian Law XX of 1848 regulated changes of denomination and the legal procedure for the transfer of ownership of property in such cases. The law had been adopted by Hungarian liberals in earlier times who had aimed on the one hand to guarantee denominational equality and, on the other, to strengthen the power of the state at the expense of the Catholic Church. It was this law which had first proclaimed the equality of churches before the law: "Complete equality and reciprocity without any discrimination are hereby declared in respect of all legally-existing religious denominations of the fatherland."<sup>36</sup> However, according to the same law, it followed that when somebody converted to another confession, they lost the right to own a share of the property belonging to their original community. Thus on the one hand this Hungarian law in theory protected a community from abuse on the part of the church authorities but on the other it did not allow people to dispose of their share of the common property if they decided to change denomination. (There was only one exception to this rule: if the whole community changed denomination, down to its last member, then the property could be re-registered.) It should also be mentioned that the Orthodox Church had no legal personality in Eastern Slovakia at the time, so it was not able to own any property there even in theory.<sup>37</sup>

Another episode is also important in relation to this case. In 1922 some former villagers from Hrabské, who some time previously had left

for America for work, sent 16,900 Czechoslovak crowns to their fellow villagers in Hrabské to buy a church bell. Village residents added their own savings to this money and purchased a bell for 19,000 crowns. In the same year, at the community's expense, the church underwent a major renovation costing 85,000 crowns. In respect of this newly-acquired property there was also a dispute over ownership and an important argument in the resolution of the dispute was determining the point at which the majority of the community moved over to Orthodoxy. In other words, the question was this: to whom was this gift made and who exactly repaired the church – the Orthodox or the Greek Catholics? Interestingly, the head of the county of Košice, Ján Rumann (1876–1925), was on the side of the Greek Catholics and wrote in his decision that the Orthodox had appeared in Hrabské only in 1923. However, as we saw from the abovementioned official census data published in 1927, most villagers had already begun to consider themselves Orthodox in 1921. In other words, the head of the county of Košice not only chose an easy way out by avoiding asking the statistical office for the perhaps unofficial but at least reliable information essential for deciding the case but also arbitrarily took one side in the case without any supporting reasoning. At the same time Ján Rumann did not check with the American Ruthenians who had been the intended recipients of their donation. Only the evidence from the Greek Catholic side was taken into consideration, and it was on this basis that the decision was made. (For example, the former Greek Catholic priest Štefan Nemetz provided clarifications, but in the case file the position of the other party to the conflict was not to be found.) The case was only considered administratively, which is inherently not a format that allows for contestation. It means that solely administrative officials selected the information to be included in the case files, information which as a result became the primary facts on the basis of which the decision was taken.

In other words, all this testifies in favour of biased decision-making by the head of the district government in Bardejov and his superior in Košice. The possible cause of this bias might be explained, for example, by personal sympathies or by bribery. However, an interesting letter of 1924 drew my attention. In it Štefan Fabián, the head of the district government in mostly Ruthenian/Ukrainian Vyšný Svidník, wrote with some thoughts about the state of affairs in the district to the head of the county government in Košice, Jan Rumann. The functionary from Vyšný Svidník argued that because the territories where the Ruthenians lived had to be prevented from being separated from Eastern Slovakia and becoming



part of Subcarpathian Rus`, they, the officials of the administration, should for this reason support the Greek Catholics in local inter-confessional conflict. "Because we can always reach an arrangement with the Gr[reek] Cat[holic] priests, and in twenty years our schools will have done their job with the people, but with the Orthodox priests we could never make that work, and then if the region does not join Subcarpathian Rus`, they [the Orthodox priests] will fanatically set the people against the [Czechoslovak] state. [...] In a word, Orthodoxy means the loss of this land for Slovakia."<sup>38</sup>

While these bureaucratic decisions were being made, events in Hrabské itself were intensifying. The head of the district government in Bardejov wrote on 22 July 1925 to the county government in Košice:

The Orthodox priest Vasilij Horochovský has been continually inciting people to rebellion with the slogan "the church is yours," so that they do not give in, and telling them that they "do not need any government", so that they are going to take up sticks and stones and beat up anyone [government officials – V.S.] who comes to take back the church [...] so when the head of the district for the first time went to Hrabské to visit the church without any police assistance, it was only a lucky coincidence that he had met a resident of Hrabské on the road who told him that the villagers were waiting for him armed with sticks and stones, and consequently he had to turn back [...].<sup>39</sup>

There was evidently a conflict between the local authorities, who were on the side of the Greek Catholic eparchal administration, and the Orthodox community. Highly indicative in the quotation is the reference to the idea that villagers "do not need any government." It is also worth paying attention to the crystal-clear connection between religious conversion to Orthodoxy and the socio-economic dissatisfaction of the Ruthenian peasants, caused by the lack of concern shown to them by the state. It was no accident that there was an armed anti-government peasant uprising in the Ruthenian villages of Čertižné and Habura, recently converted to Orthodoxy, in Labyrshchyna in 1935.<sup>40</sup> Only when the situation had reached the verge of civil conflict did the government begin to understand what the local clerical and non-clerical intelligentsia had tried to convey through the democratic process over the last decade-and-a-half, telling them about the "Ruthenian question" in Eastern Slovakia. For example in 1924 the aforementioned Jurko Lažo wrote to the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Antonín Švehla, saying that the authorities

probably did not understand what was happening in Eastern Slovakia and explaining that:

Our population in Slovakia are almost entirely peasants, but they have so little land that families cannot feed themselves. This is the cause of emigration to America, which has now been made almost impossible. [...] The land reform has been approved, but is not being carried out at all. Also there are not enough schools. [...] The worst situation is in religious matters. The Ruthenian people have already had enough of the Union [with the Catholic Church], which came at a very high price, as they learned perfectly during Hungarian times, so they are returning en masse to the faith of their ancestors. Although freedom of religion is guaranteed in our country, in reality it does not exist.<sup>41</sup>

To return now to the village of Hrabské. In order to implement earlier administrative decisions the Greek Catholics, led by two priests, one of them Štefan Nemeč (1858–1930), who had been appointed in 1923 to Hrabské from neighbouring Malcov, intended to occupy the church, for which purpose they announced a religious procession from “Malcov and Livov to Hrabské to take their church back and to sanctify it.” For the preservation of order on the day the procession was to take place, the district government in Bardejov sent eight police officers to the village. But when the procession reached Hrabské, the Orthodox women began shouting and driving the Greek Catholics away and stripping the priests of their vestments. To avoid further complications the Greek Catholics temporarily went back on their plan. Interestingly, according to one informant, the police officers who were to ensure the peaceful transition of the church to the Greek Catholics not only were not barring the Orthodox from taking the abovementioned action but were supporting them with the words, “Hold on, because the church is yours.”<sup>42</sup> An internal investigation was conducted about this item of information but it failed to prove the guilt of the police officers. If this behaviour did indeed take place, it would have been difficult to bring the police officers to justice because they would have had no interest in reporting on their own actions.

Finally on 1 March 1925 a permanent Greek Catholic priest, Andrej Židišin (1900–1991?), was appointed to the village. Representatives of the local Orthodox community then took from the contested place of worship some items they needed for church services. In response, Židišin filed a statement with the district government in Bardejov about the theft.

The statement claimed that the stolen church items were to be found in the house of the Orthodox priest Vasilij Horochovský and in the building where the Orthodox, after their expulsion from the church, were holding services.<sup>43</sup> In response to the statement, the district government in Bardejov on 8 May 1925 made a search at the addresses indicated, resulting in the discovery of several missing church items. Horochovský, who held a passport issued by the Russian Empire, was arrested and his case was sent to the district court in Bardejov. However, a few days later, at the request of the prosecutor's office of the city of Prešov, the court released him.<sup>44</sup> Some of the villagers went back to Greek Catholicism out of fear of punishment. Although thereafter no court opened criminal proceedings about the incident, according to Hrushovský, "the political persecution of Orthodox citizens by the government [...] continued uninterrupted under the pretext of searching for hidden church articles."<sup>45</sup>

The arrest of Horochovský drew the attention of the Archbishop of Prague and All Czechoslovakia Savvatij (Vrabets), who used the opportunity to write to the Minister of Education about the Orthodox Church situation. In particular the Archbishop, in his submission dated 30 April 1925, argued that the local authorities in Slovakia "do not defend public order and the interests of the state, but represent the interests of one religion at the expense of another." He also emphasised that, because of the uncertain legal status of the Orthodox Church in Slovakia, its faithful found themselves in an inequitable situation, because they received no state assistance (for example, for building churches or supporting the activity of their priests etc.), unlike other confessions.<sup>46</sup>

Conflicts in the village did not die down and moved to the local national school, where learning stopped on 1 February 1926. First, there was a dispute between Orthodox parents and the Greek Catholic teacher, Ondrej Andrásy, who had worked there for several decades. The children of Orthodox parents began to boycott his lessons: he tried to restore order, but the parents did not want to put up with him any more and at the beginning of 1924 Andrásy had to leave the village. In the same way after just six months the Greek Catholic church teacher Aurelia Desjatníková was forced to leave the same job. The Orthodox children had been making fun of her, causing a short-term nervous disorder for which she was now seeing a psychiatrist. Two years earlier there had been a similar conflict in the village of Lodomirová, but in that case it was the Orthodox children who were victimised. The local Greek Catholic teacher Anna Sedlak made

her pupils kneel and beat them for walking out of school in protest at the arrival of the Greek Catholic priest Ivan Baitsura.<sup>47</sup>

In general, the religious conflict in Hrabské proceeded typically and it was by no means the worst. In an appeal to government officials, residents from the area of Makovica, signing themselves as “Greek Catholics: the true Orthodox clergy and faithful” complained about some Orthodox activity:

The villagers of Medvedže have been throwing stones at the current mayor of Šarbově while he was going about his job. [...] Last year in Ladomirová during a violent attempt to seize our church one of our men was beaten up so badly that he lay sick for a week [...] two of our priests were forcibly removed from the church building and one of them was pelted with rotten eggs! [...]

They trample all over our property rights! They pour petrol down the wells of our faithful, they smash windows with stones, they damage rooves and orchards, they drive our children and our cattle with them off the common pastures, they ban people from our shops under threat of huge fines [...] they cut our corn while it is still green, they damage our church property and stop us from exercising our rights over parish and church belongings.<sup>48</sup>

Violence on the part of the Greek Catholics, however, was no less acute. The long-term consequences of the First World War, the bloody battles of which had swept through the Carpathian region, also in a sense overlapped with it. In 1926, in the village of Vyžní Apši in Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia, Ivan Popovič, an Orthodox priest, was killed because of a religious dispute. He was shot in his own house through a window from a military rifle which had been hidden from requisitioning. On suspicion of committing the crime, a church cantor from the local Greek Catholic church, Nikolaj Derda, and two half-brothers of the murdered man were arrested.<sup>49</sup>

When they found out that they had lost the church property, the Orthodox community of Hrabské judged the decision of the local authorities to be “wrong and not commensurate with either divine or human law.” Although the decision of the head of the county of Košice said that it was final and could not be appealed, the community applied to the Supreme Administrative Court in Prague.<sup>50</sup> On 11 May 1926 the court upheld the complaint, noting that only the Ministry of Education could make a final decision.<sup>51</sup>

Interestingly, taking the side of the Orthodox villagers was a Czechoslovak politician, a supporter of official Czechoslovakism and deputy to the National Assembly from the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party, the already-mentioned Igor Hrušovský. It is natural to assume that his colleague Jurko Lažo, who had defended the Ruthenian minority in Slovakia on various issues, had attracted the deputy's attention to the case. Using the right of a deputy to make an interpellation to a state institution, Hrušovský (together with 24 other deputies who added their names to the interpellation), even before the announcement of the court decision, in fact on 15 March 1926, sent an interpellation about the persecution of the Orthodox residents of the village to the Minister of Education.

In response, on 12 July 1926 the Ministry of Education in Bratislava and the Ministry of Slovak Affairs sent an urgent request to the county government in Košice to clarify the information set out in the interpellation. It turned out that the county government, whose resolution had been appealed against by the Orthodox community, was required to review its own decision and scrutinise it for misuse of power. The process had gone full circle. The new head of the county government in Košice, Juraj Slávik (1890–1969), delegated the Ministry's request downwards to the head of the district government in Bardejov, who, as might be expected, did not find any violations. On 7 September 1926 the county government in Košice made use of its powers to issue a final decision which was no different from the previous one.

In November 1934 the newly-built Orthodox church in the village of Hrabské was opened. People from the surrounding villages came to the consecration ceremony. The community had been making donations towards the church for some time and had built it with their own hands. Vitalij (Maksimenko), who somewhat earlier that same year had left his temporary shelter in the little Ruthenian/Ukrainian village of Lodomirová and accepted the post of Archbishop of All North America and Canada, also contributed a donation.<sup>52</sup>

\*\*\*

The spread of Orthodoxy in Eastern Slovakia in the 1920–30s was closely linked to similar processes in Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia. It was based on the same preconditions but was not as successful. As of 1930, the percentage of Orthodox and Greek Catholic worshippers in Slovakia and Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia was slightly more than 4% and 31% respectively.<sup>53</sup> Why so? This can be explained by the coincidence of many

factors. I will name just three of the most important in my opinion. Firstly, the loyal position taken by the official Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov during the times of Njaradi and Gojdič (the pro-Hungarian Bishop Štefan Novák had been removed in 1920). In Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia, on the other hand, until 1924 the diocese had been led by Bishop Antal Papp (1867–1945), who had not reconciled himself with the terms of the post-WWI Treaty of Trianon: his pro-Magyar attitude was felt as a threat by the Czechoslovak government and a portion of the faithful had felt an acute intolerance towards him since Hungarian times. The greater unanimity of the Greek Catholic priesthood in Eastern Slovakia is also important: they were not so much divided between the Ukrainophile and the Russophile movements as was the case in neighbouring Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia. At the same time, most of the small number of Orthodox priests whom the Czechoslovak state had allowed to stay in Slovakia (including the leader of the movement, Archimandrite Vitalij (Maksimenko)) were foreign citizens, so it was easier there to present the entire Orthodox movement as brought in from outside and as something alien.

What does the case of Hrabské add to our understanding of inter-confessional relations between Greek Catholicism and Orthodoxy in interwar Slovakia? Events around this conflict in the village of Hrabské (in the county of Košice) can be understood in a variety of ways. As an example of the limitations of the liberal Czechoslovak state during the interwar period. (The impossibility of achieving equal rights for Orthodox believers.) Or as different interpretations of what constitutes public interest and state security. (The positions of the district and county governments on the one hand and of the Prague authorities on the other.) The case of Hrabské is also an illustration of arbitrariness on the part of local officials and unselfish assistance on the part of some not-indifferent individuals (the Member of Parliament Jurko Lažo). Finally, this may be a story about self-organization by the members of a community who united their efforts in a common cause (the construction of a new church) when the institutions of government did not hand them down a fair decision.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Here I use the double name *Ruthenians/Ukrainians* because it reflects the complexity of identity of those inhabitants of Eastern Slovakia.
- <sup>2</sup> About Maramarossziget trials and the spread of Orthodoxy in Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia see: DANYLETS, Y., *Pravoslavná Tserkva na Zakarpatti u pershij polovyni XX stolittia*, Vydavnytstvo «Karpaty», Uzhhorod, 2009; DANYLETS, Y., “Peresliduvannia rusyniv za viru v Avstro-Uhorshchyni naperedodni Pershoi svitovoi vijny (do 100-richchia druhoho Maramorosh-Syhotskoho protsesu 1913–1914 rr.)” in *Rusyn*, No. 4, 2013, s. 16–31.
- <sup>3</sup> An interesting moment: despite the widespread perception of Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk as a straightforward anti-Catholic, the views of the first president of Czechoslovakia (1850–1937) on religious issues were, however, more complex. In his earlier years, Masaryk had been very interested in religious quests. He looked at these questions from a philosophical point of view, considering faith a basis for human existence. However, not connecting his future to religion, Masaryk became a professor of philosophy at Charles University. There, under the influence of the local intellectual atmosphere, he began to hope that “the scientific point of view was to be an inspiring substitute for the religion that failed to meet the spiritual needs of the modern man”. However, religious issues continued to occupy him: “It held for him an endless fascination; he said about the religious question: “It has always existed, and it will always exist ... All my life experience and study have confirmed me in this conviction again and again ...” (Quoted after: SZPORLUK, R., *Political thought of Thomas G Masaryk*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1981, p. 51.).
- <sup>4</sup> Negotiations between the Holy See and the Czechoslovak authorities in the 1920s focused on the right of appointment of bishops, the division of the bordered dioceses, and church property distribution, which Masaryk regarded as part of national sovereignty. Other issues, like limiting the teaching of religion in schools to the first classes and the change of some national holidays, like the commemoration of the day of the burning of Jan Hus, provoked active protests of the Vatican and caused complications in their relations. For more information see: KONÍČEK, J., *Modus vivendi v historii vztahů Svatého stolce a Československa: církevně-politický vývoj v letech 1918–1993*, Společnost pro dialog církve a státu, Olomouc, 2005; HELAN, P., “Československo a Svatý stolec na složité cestě k Modu vivendi”, in *Střed: Časopis pro mezioborová studia střední Evropy 19. a 20. Století*, Vol. 10, Issue 1, 2018, p. 9–29; HELAN, P., “Vztah Československa a Vatikánu z pohledu Kongregace pro mimořádné církevní záležitosti v letech 1919–1928”, in *Studia Historica Brunensia*, Vol. 61, Issue 2, 2014, p. 207–220; DEJMEK, J., “Československo-vatikánska jednání o modus vivendi 1927–1928”, in *Česky časopis historický*, Vol. 92, Issue 2, 1994, p. 268–285.

- <sup>5</sup> For more information about Savvatij (Vrabetš) see: MAREK, P., BUREHA, V., Danilec, J., *Arcibiskup Sawatij (1880–1959). Nástin života a díla zakladatelské postavy pravoslavné církve v Československé republice*, Univerzita Palackého, Olomouc, 2009.
- <sup>6</sup> About Jurko Lažo see: ŠVORC, P., *Od pluhu do senátorského kresla. Jurko Lažo a jeho doba (1867–1929)*, Universum, Prešov, 2018.
- <sup>7</sup> For more information on Vitalij (Maximenko) and how the pro-monarchist Black Hundreds became unintentional allies of the Ukrainian movement see in: Fedevych, K. K., Fedevych K. I., *Za viru, tsaria i Kobzaria. Malorosijski monarchisty i ukräins`kyj natsional`nyj rukh (1905–1917)*, Krytyka, Kyïv, 2017.
- <sup>8</sup> Although in historiography the contrast between “Ukrainophile” Njarady and “Ruthenophile” Gojdič is widespread, they, apparently, would not understand such an opposition. In the archives of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov are kept the letters of Njarady to Gojdič, written in a friendly manner after the removal of the first one from the position of the apostolic administrator.
- <sup>9</sup> For more information on Dionýz Njarady see: CORANIČ, J., *Dejiny Gréckokatolíckej Cirkvi na Slovensku v rokoch 1918–1939*, Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Prešov, 2013.
- <sup>10</sup> For more information on Pavel Peter Gojdič see: ŠTURÁK, P., *Pavol Peter Gojdič OSBM – Prešovský Gréckokatolícky biskup (1926–1960)*, Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Prešov, 2013.
- <sup>11</sup> In 1950, when the Greek Catholic Church was banned in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Teodor Rojkovič was one of those priests who did not convert to Orthodoxy. For this consistent position, the court sentenced him to three years’ imprisonment. (BABJAK, J., *Zostali verní. Osudy gréckokatolíckych kňazov. II zväzok*, PERTA, Prešov, 2011, s. 94.)
- <sup>12</sup> o. R., “Ruku na serdse i hovoryty pravdu” in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 12 (318), 03 April, 1931, s. 4.
- <sup>13</sup> “Otvet na statiu “Narodnoj Gazety” ch. 6. “Zhalkij napriam verkhnostej gr.-kat. Tserkvi k zapadu” ” in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 13 (276), 10 April, 1930, s. 3–4.
- <sup>14</sup> O.V., “Pouchenie avtoru izv. sta`i Slov. Dennika”, in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 32 (338), 02 October, 1931, s. 3.
- <sup>15</sup> For more information see: MAGOCSI, P. R., “Prystosuvannia bez asymiliatsii: henial`nist` Mukachivs`koï hreko-katolyts`koï ieparkhii” in *Kovcheh*, No. 4, 2004, s. 162–169. Compare about so-called “latynnyky” and “vostochnyky” in the prewar Halychian context of the discussions between the Ukrainophiles and the Russophiles: WENDLAND, A. V., *Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Conservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland, 1848–1915. Studien zur Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie, vol. 27*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 2001.



- <sup>16</sup> Alexei Iljkovič wrote this analytical note in 1941, deprived of the opportunity to engage in journalistic activities and being under the stakeout, immediately after the release from a seven-month arrest committed by the Slovak authorities without indicating any accusation. All this happened in the context of the growing Slovak-Hungarian tension and spy hunting. The note was added to the police materials and sent to archive storage. In 1944, Iljkovič was arrested again by the secret police of the Third Reich. He tragically died on December 20 the same year during the aerial bombing of Prešov by the Soviet airforces, including the Gestapo house where he was imprisoned. (ILJKOVIČ V., ed., *Rusyns`kyj novynar*, Spolok rusyns`kykh pysateliv Slovenska, Prešov, 2014, s. 15, 17.)
- <sup>17</sup> Štátny archív v Prešove. Fond Odbočka Ústredne štátnej bezpečnosti pri Policajnom riaditeľstve v Prešove. Inv. č. 1477. Iljkovič A.I. Poznámky k problémom podkarpatoruským. 1941. Strojopis, s. 47.
- <sup>18</sup> It should be noted that Jurko Lažo (on whose name was registered the printing house, which published the newspaper “Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus”) had a different attitude on identity issues than the supported by him Vitalij (Maksimenko). The logic of Lažo’s conversion to Orthodoxy was the logic of negation. Like peasants, whose tribune he became in the Czechoslovak Parliament, Lažo turned away from Greek-Catholicism because it compromised itself during the Hungarian times.
- <sup>19</sup> “K chemu obiazyvaet prazdnovanie “Dnej Russkoj Kul`tury””, in *Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus*, No. 11 (193), 1 June, 1936 (Old Style), s. 6.
- <sup>20</sup> AVERKIJ, Ieromonakh (from Uzhhorod), “Russkost` i Pravoslavie”, in *Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus*, No. 5 (187), 10 March, 1936 (Old Style), s. 4.
- <sup>21</sup> The “Narodnaia Gazeta” – was published in Prešov at the expense of American Ruthenians and the “Russian People`s party”, which was the part of the National Democratic Party, guided by the first Czechoslovak Prime Minister Karel Kramář. The “Narodnaia Gazeta” shared all-Russian ideologies.
- <sup>22</sup> The exposure in an opponent`s camp of the ghost of “Ukrainianness” was used by both sides as discrediting tactics. Also, Greek Catholics in the press and their appeals to Czechoslovak officials often used the accusations of Orthodox fugitives from the former Russian Empire in supposedly Bolshevism and anarchism.

Interestingly, the Ukrainophiles of Eastern Slovakia clearly spoke on the side of the Greek Catholic Church. At the same time, Iryna Nevyts`ka (1886–1965), editor-in-chief of the only one Prešov newspaper of Ukrainophile direction “Slovo Naroda”, desperately wrote about false priorities of local discussions. She wrote: “The people in the mountains die of hunger – and our intelligentsia breaking their heads while discussing the “language issue”, schools are undergoing Czechization in a terrible way – and ours are

- debating on “Orthodoxy”, all the governments are occupying exclusively with Czech officials – and ours are choking on the joy of a successful day of culture in Khust. What a terrible reality. How gray is around and dark.” (NEVYT’S’KA, I., “Do vsikh narodovtsiv-natsionalistiv”, in *Slovo Naroda*, No. 13, 01 July, 1932, s. 2.)
- 23 “Sredi gazet”, in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 20 (237), 23 May, 1929, s. 3.
- 24 “Horyt’”, in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 15 (232), 12 April, 1929, s. 2.
- 25 The perception of the behavior of the Greek Catholic priesthood as being “lords”, that is, superiority regarding peasants, also indicates the absence of a significant cultural distance between two social groups. It was difficult for a peasant to respect someone who was not too different in style of his life, education, and breadth of interests, but represented in his eyes a more privileged category of the population.
- 26 Zhydovskiy, I., “Otchego shyritsia pravoslavie v Priashevskoy Rusi. (Perepechatano iz Ameryk. “Russ. Vestnyka”)”, in *Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus`*, No. 6, 15 March, 1931, s. 2–3.
- 27 In the archives of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Prešov, there are numerous complaints on non-fulfillment of “koblina” and “rokovina” by the parishioners, as well as the refusal of the priests from their functions for this reason. For more information see: Fond Bežna agenda. 1922. Inv.č. 438, Sign. 797. Odopieranie cirkevných funkcií farármi na vých. Slovensku pre naturálne nedoplatky; Fond Bežna agenda. 1923. Inv.č. 439, Sign. 2014. Zrušenie kobliny a rokoviny na Slovensku a Podkarpatskej Rusi a štátna záhoha za nedodané rokoviny.
- 28 ““Hollandia docet”. O.S.R. (Prodolzhenie)”, in *Russkoe slovo*, No. 6 (223), 08 February, 1929, s. 3–4.
- 29 According to the first Czechoslovak census of 1921, the village was inhabited by the following nationalities: 431 – “ruská národnost”, 16 – “československá”, 8 – “židovská”, 16 – “iná”, under which in this case meant Gypsies. (Statistický lexikon obcí v republice Československej. Úradný soznam miest podľa zákona zo dňa 14. Dubna 1920, čís. 266 sb. zák. a nar. Praha: Ministerstvo vnútra a Štátny úrad statistický na základe výsledkov sčítania ľudu z r. 1921, 1927, s. 122.)
- 30 At the same time, among the inhabitants of Hrabské was an understanding that in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century this village was Orthodox. This can be understood from the fact that later, during the competition for church property between the Greek Catholics and Orthodox communities, this idea arose as an argument in the dispute.
- 31 Štatny archív v Košiciach (hereafter: ŠA KE), Fond Košicka Župa (1923–1928) (hereafter: KŽ), č.š. 121, inv.č. 85, 1926 r. Údajné prenasledovanie pravoslavia, s. 689.
- 32 Ibid.

- 33 Quoted after: HORKAJ, Š., PRUŽINSKÝ, Š., *Pravoslávna Cirkev na Slovensku v 19. a 20. storočí. L'udia – udalosti – dokumenty*, Prešov University, Prešov, 1998, s. 101.
- 34 Statistický lexikon obcí v republike Československej. Úradný soznam miest podľa zákona zo dňa 14. dubna 1920, čís. 266 sb. zák. a nar. Praha: Ministerstvo vnútra a Štátny úrad statistický na základe výsledkov sčítania ľudu z r. 1921, 1927, s. 122.
- 35 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 121, inv.č. 85, 1926 r. Údajné prenasledovanie pravoslavia, s. 700.
- 36 Quoted after: KISH, G. A., *The Origins of the Baptist Movement Among the Hungarians: A History of the Baptists in the Kingdom of Hungary from 1846 to 1893*, Brill, Leiden, 2011, p. 189.
- 37 In the 1920s, the representatives of several Orthodox jurisdictions, such as the Serbian Patriarchate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Russian Orthodox Church abroad, which had no canonical status, operated in Eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia. From the point of view of Czechoslovak law, no proper legal procedures regulating the status of Orthodoxy in these territories were implemented during those years.
- 38 Quoted from: ŠVORC, P., *Od pluhu do senátorského kresla. Jurko Lažo a jeho doba (1867–1929)*, Universum, Prešov, 2018, s. 269.
- 39 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 84, inv. č. 84, 1925 r. Zatknutie pr. kňaza, s. 480 (back).
- 40 See more about the uprising in Čertižné and Habura: Dokumenty o malorol'nickej vzbure v Čertižnom a Habure roku 1935. Prešov: III Oddelenie KV KSS a odbor školstva a kultury rady KNV v Prešove, 1960; "Chertizhniansko-haburske selianske zavorushennia", in VANAT, I., *Narysy Novitnoi istorii ukrainsiv Skhidnoi Slovachchyny (1918–1938)*, Slovatske pedahohichne vydavnytstvo v Bratislavi, Viddil ukrainskoi literatury v Priashevi, Prešov, 1979, s. 238–247.
- 41 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 47, inv. č. 83, 1924 r. Pravoslávne hnutie, s. 392 (back).
- 42 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 121, inv.č. 85, 1926 r. Údajné prenasledovanie pravoslavia, s.736.
- 43 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 84, inv. č. 84, 1925 r. Zatknutie pr. kňaza, s.478.
- 44 *Ibid.*, s. 478 (back).
- 45 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 121, inv.č. 85, 1926 r. Údajné prenasledovanie pravoslavia, s. 698.
- 46 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 84, inv. č. 84, 1925 r. Zatknutie pr. kňaza, s. 486.
- 47 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1929), č.š. 38, inv.č. 83, 1924 r. Pravoslávne hnutie v obci Ladomirová. Vyšetovanie, s. 79.

- 48 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 52, inv.č. 83, 1924 r. Stážnosť obce Makovce, s. 103.
- 49 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 130, inv. č. 85, 1926 r. Zastrlenie pravoslávneho knaža, s. 676.
- 50 ŠA KE, KŽ (1923–1928), č.š. 121, inv.č. 85, 1926 r. Údajné prenasledovanie pravoslavia, s. 695 (back).
- 51 Ibid., s. 742.
- 52 “Nabliudatel’”, “Torzhestvo osviiashcheniia pravoslavnoj tserkvi v s. Hrabskoe, vozle Bardieva na Priashevskoj Rusi” in *Pravoslavnaia Karpatskaia Rus’*, No. 22, 15 November, 1934, s. 5.
- 53 Calculated based on the Czechoslovak census of 1930. The number of Orthodox in Slovakia – 9,076 people, in Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia – 112,034 people. The number of Greek Catholics (along with Armenian Catholics) in Slovakia – 213,725 people, in Subcarpathia/Zakarpattia – 359,167 people. (Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl I. Phara: Vydal státní úřad statistický – v komisi knihupectví Burskík & Kohout v Praze, Státní tiskárna v Praze, 1934, s. 105–106.)