

Canonical Visitations as Special Travel Sources (Based on the Catholic Visitations of the Uh County in the Eighteenth Century)¹

Vavrínek Žeňuch²

Visitation protocols have a lot in common with travelogues. In Slovak context, one can think about Slovak national revivalists, who traveled along the county and documented their experiences in journals and literary works.³ However, this is different from the strict summarizing view which can be found in canonical visitations. The canonical visitation is a detailed summary of the visit – the visitor is usually being a bishop who visits a parish or a region. These visits took place in Hungary from the period of the Council of Trent, but because of the difficult geopolitical situation, mainly only the protocols from later times have been preserved (from the seventeenth century onwards).⁴

Complex information on the Uh County has been recorded starting from the eighteenth century. These are the oldest Catholic visitation protocols from the county's region, delimited into Satu Mare's Bishopric after the division of the Eger Bishopric (1804).⁵ The visitations were not performed only by Catholic structures but also by Protestants or

¹ The study is part of the project VEGA 1/0736/18 *Premeny hospodárskeho, spoločenského, konfesionálneho a kultúrneho vývinu zemepanských miest a mestečiek na území východného Slovenska v 17.-19. storočí*.

² Institute of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Prešov, Slovak Republic.

³ P. Markovič, "Cestopisné a memoárové texty Ludovíta Štúra ako ideologické výpovede [Travelogue and memoir texts of Ludovít Štúr as ideological statements]," in *19. storočie v zrkadle písomných prameňov* [19th century in the mirror of written sources], ed. Marcela Domenová (Prešov: Štátna vedecká knižnica v Prešove, 2016), 36-41. *Cestopisné denníky štúrovcov* [Travel notebooks of Štúr's community], ed. R. Modla (Martin: Matica slovenská, 2014).

⁴ A. Kónyová, P. Kónya, *Kalvínska reformácia a reformovaná cirkev v východnom Slovensku v 16. – 18. storočí* [Calvinist Reformation and Reformed Church in Eastern Slovakia in the 16th - 18th centuries] (Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej univerzity, 2010), 84-88.

⁵ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund Visitatio Canonica.

Orthodox Christians. The oldest visitation of the Uh county dates from 1618-1619, which was performed by the Reformed Church during the uprising of Gabriel Bethlen.⁶ This visitation is not geographically complete because it focuses solely on the Uh presbytery, which did not coincide with the perimeter of the county (which also included Zemplén and Szabolcs counties). Furthermore, later visitations performed on the impulse of insurgents (George I Rákóczi or Francis II Rákóczi) or Kings (Leopold I) did not only follow the territory of the Uh county, but they had a wider range.⁷ The visitations of the Orthodox bishops and later bishops who belonged to the Eastern Catholic Churches were stored from the eighteenth century onwards. Their actions in the seventeenth century are mentioned in relation to the issuing of passports for visiting particular territories, including the Uh County.

The visitators' protocols from the seventeenth century are rather reactionary, because they focus on the battles of re-Catholization or, more precisely, confessional tension, rather than documenting information about parishes. Probably the "richest" visitation in information is the first preserved visitation from the years 1618/1619. The summary of this visitation establishes that its writer did not have a clear structure of the information he was examining. The visitation reveals information about the existence of wine yards, local traditions (mostly connected to religious life), mills and their description (how many wheels they had), as well as the existence of schools, and other issues such as the number of glasses of wine which belong to the sexton in the belfry. There is no information about recent history, the parishes' problems, or the administrator.⁸

⁶ Tiszánineni Református Egyházi Levéltár Sárospatak [Archive of the Reformed Church in Sárospatak], fund Református Egyházlátogatások [Reformed Church Visitations], Uh.

⁷ Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO], fund 4 Наджупан Ужанської жупи, м.Ужгород [Count Uh county, Uzhgorod]/2, inventory number 561, p. 3-4. Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO], fund 4 Наджупан Ужанської жупи, м.Ужгород [Count Uh county, Uzhgorod]/17, inventory number 34, p. 3. K. Mészáros, *Ungvár története, a legrégebbi időkétől maig* [The history of Uzhgorod from the oldest times to the present] (Pesten: Ráth Mór könyvkereskedésében s bizottmányában, 1861), 76.

⁸ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund Visitatio Canonica, Uh 1746.

In the eighteenth century, each visitation is different. We cannot generalize any with regard to a particular region (counties in Hungary), confession, or the person who performed the visitation. The visitation was always comprised of certain questions, called “púntá” [points]. These points were preserved as part of the visitation protocol, as part of the preamble, or they were attached separately as questions. Their character was various, from containing basic historical information on the parishes and chapels of ease, through economical information about the incomes of the priest or the parish itself, to the believers’ language, their nationality, as well as the theological verification of the parish administrator.

The summary of the canonical visitation can be divided into various aspects according to content. Based on the nature of the visitation, it includes three fundamental aspects: economic, religious-managerial, and historically general information. Each of these aspects is based on travelogue-like information, particularly the information from Eger’s Bishop Francis Barkóczy de Szala, who travelled through the region.

Bishop Francis Barkóczy de Szala travelled through the Uh County twice in a short period of time (1746, 1749).⁹ His travels and preserved files include numerous information, especially connected to the way of performing the visitation. He did not delegate the Archdeacons or other persons with visitations, but he travelled through the region himself. He acted as a member of the privileged groups (the nobility, the clergy – Bishop) during his visitations. The bishops of Eger did not visit only Latin parishes, but they were the administrators of the Uniates, as well the Union of Uzhgorod. The territory of the Uh County was confessionally diverse. There were only eight Latin parishes, while the number of Greek rite parishes was multiple times higher (more than fifty parishes).¹⁰ The local wooden rectories were not suitable for the lodging of such a significant church prelate as the bishop. They consisted of one or two rooms where the parish administrator lived with servants. There

⁹ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund *Visitatio Canonica*, Uh 1746, Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO], fund 151 Правління Мукачівської греко-католицької єпархії, м. Ужгород [Board of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Diocese, Uzhgorod]/1 inventory number 1125, p. 1-17.

¹⁰ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund *Visitatio Canonica*, Uh 1746.

was also a place for farm animals. The bishop, with his entourage (a scribe, a priest, a porter, the cooks, and others), could not live in those constrained and thus unsuitable places. This is why Barkóczy usually informed the county's nobility in advance of his upcoming visitation so that he usually stayed with them. The bishop had his own estates in the Uh county (Pavlovce nad Uhom), where he stayed. Furthermore, he also slept in the parishes in Uzhgorod and Vinné.¹¹ The visitation of each parish (Latin and Greek) resulted from the church regulations. The procedure of the visitation was as following: the bishop first focused on gaining information about the administration, then he performed the Roman rite (he conferred the sacrament of confirmation and granted indulgences).

Barkóczy visited the Uh County twice. The first visitation was a full visitation and it took place in 1746. It followed each confession and settlement thus revealing complex information.¹² The second visitation took place in 1749 but it solely focused on the territories of the Eastern Rite, on the activities and the doctrinal level of the presbyters.¹³ Besides Barkóczy visitations, the visitations of Mukachevo's Eastern Rite vicars of the same time period (1741, 1747, 1748, 1752) were also preserved. These protocols map solely the territory of the Eastern Rite.¹⁴ Because of this, this study focuses solely on Barkóczy's visit of 1746, using other protocols to add information (especially the high occurrence of visitation protocols which show a travelogue-like character and development).

The visitation protocol from 1746 includes information on 195 sites visited during the summer. Three of them were sites from the Zemplén

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² *Ibidem*.

¹³ Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO], fund 151 Правління Мукачівської греко-католицької єпархії, м. Ужгород [Board of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Diocese, Uzhgorod]/1 inventory number 1125, p. 1-17.

¹⁴ T. Végheő et al. *Források a magyarországi görögkatolikus parókiák történetéhez. Az egri egyházmegye területén szolgálógörögkatolikus papok 1741. évi javadalom-összeírása* [Resources for the history of the Greek Catholic parishes in Hungary. 1741 census of Greek Catholic priests serving in the diocese of Eger] (*Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola*, 2014). T. Végheő et al. *Források a magyarországi görögkatolikus parókiák történetéhez Olsavszky Mihály Mánuel munkácsi püspök 1750-1752. évi egyházlátogatásainak iratai* [Resources For the History of the Greek Catholic Parishes in Hungary Mihály Olsavszky Mihály Bishop Munkács 1750-1752. records of his church visits] (*Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola*, 2015).

County which were administratively connected to the church structures in the Uh County.¹⁵ Likewise, one community (Vrbovec) in the Uh County was visited as part of the Zemplén County. The bishop started his journey in the parish of Pavlovce nad Uhom, where he was also the founder of a local rectory. He visited the local administrator of the parish named Nicholas Beregovič (Nicolaus Beregovics), and recorded his age and income. His parish included a stone temple, newly painted in blue. The temple, dedicated to Saint Andrew, had its interior reconstructed by Barkóczy's family. The village also had a school and a midwife.¹⁶ Apart from this information, the bishop recorded details on the branches of the parish: he noted that the Bajany branch included only Calvinists; that in Vysoká nad Uhom, half of the village was Reformed and the other half consisted of Uniates and Roman Catholics; he further stated that another midwife lived in Tegerňa (nowdays, Pavlovce and Uhom); he then also mentioned Liesková, Krišov, and Mokča (nowdays, Krišovská Liesková). The information revealed that there was a deaf midwife in Krišov, a wooden Reformed oratory with a preacher's house in Mokča, and a school where the teacher was funded by the landowner Mokcsai. Furthermore, there was another wooden oratory in Vojany, which the bishop described as "ruins" and a school where a Reformed teacher taught. The local community probably made an impression on the bishop; it was composed of 128 Reformed believers, about 35 Roman Catholics, and 5 Lutherans. The person with whom the bishop communicated, Francis Solanci (Szolanci), interested him especially: he described him as an "apostate" from Catholicism to the Reformed Church. The bishop further noted the local language and the total number of each locality. In each community, except for Vysoká nad Uhom, the dominant language was Slovak, and the second prominent was Hungarian. Tegerňa and Krišov were also inhabited by Rusyns.¹⁷

Further on, the bishop travelled to the village of Ruská, located to the south-east of Pavlovce. The parish was managed by George Salkaj (Georgius Szalkaj) who was 32 years old and had been in the parish for three years. The bishop described the entire temple (it had three altars, the main one consecrated to the Holy Cross and the minor ones

¹⁵ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund *Visitatio Canonica*, Uh 1746.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.

consecrated to Our Lady of Sorrows and Saint Joseph). The building material of the temple was not mentioned; the bishop just wrote that the temple was not consecrated (blessed), so we assume that it was a new building. The locals in Ruská spoke Hungarian and Slovak. There was no school or cantor in the village, only an uneducated midwife. The sponsor of the parish was the Dobo family from Ruská. The bishop, during his travel, also passed the village of Malé Kapušany, the town of Veľké Kapušany and the village Čepel', all of which now form one town, Veľké Kapušany. These three settlements influenced each other due to their geographical closeness. Čepel' was a property of Mokcsai, who belonged to the Reformed Church.¹⁸ There was no sacral building in the town, only a school with a bell which did not have a clapper and could not ring. A reformed priest taught in the local school. The village of Malé Kapušany had a Catholic church in ruins. The landowner's (the Mokcsai family) oratory, a ten-year-old wooden building, was located in Čepel'. Even though the local reformed parish was in Čepel', the Reformed Church considered it part of Kapušany.¹⁹ The inhabitants of these three settlements spoke solely Hungarian. The Ruská parish also included Matovce,²⁰ where there was an old wooden temple, Palad' (today Palad'-Komarivtsi), and Palad'ské Komarovce (Palad'-Komarivtsi), which shared a wooden Reformed temple in Palad'. When the parish of Ruská was visited, the villages of Malé Slemence (Mali Selmentsi), with a Catholic wooden church, and Veľké Semence, with no church as the Reformed met in the house of a landowner, were mapped as well. These five villages were close to each other. It is interesting that the dominant language of this region was Rusyn and Hungarian was secondary.²¹

After mapping these settlements, the bishop's attention focused on the settlements of Čičarovce (with a thirty-year-old wooden Reformed temple and a Reformed school), Beša (with its wooden Reformed oratory and a school), and Ižkovce with its wooden oratory. The language spoken in this region was Hungarian and Rusyn.²² Kľašany, Ňarád, and Močár

¹⁸ Ibidem.

¹⁹ P. Kónya, "Reformovaný cirkevný zbro vo Veľkých Kapušanoch medzi reformáciou, rekatolizáciou a toleranciou" [Reformed church in Veľké Kapušany between Reformation, Recatholicization and Toleration], *Historia Ecclesiastica* 10:1 (2019): 45.

²⁰ Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare], fund Visitatio Canonica, Uh 1746.

²¹ Ibidem.

²² Ibidem.

are now centered under one village named Kapušianské Kľačany. In Kľačany, there was no sacral building. Močár and Nárád were joined at the time. Located in the center of the settlement, Nárád had a Reformed oratory headed by an administrator named Njaradi. In Močár, there was just a bell house with an unblest bell.²³ The villages of Veškovce, Ptruksa, and Pallo (Palo), all of which only had bell houses, also belonged to the Ruská parish. Also, Vajkovce had a ruin of a Roman Catholic church, Budince had a Catholic bell house and a reformed oratory in the landowner's house; Galoč (Haloch) had a wooden Uniate temple in good condition, as well as a wooden reformed oratory. The inhabitants of these villages spoke mainly Hungarian and Slovak.²⁴

Later, the visitor moved on to the parish of Malé Ratovce (Mali Rativtsi, today known as Rativtsi), which was administered by Paul Krupnik. The administrator was thirty-six years old and was serving in the parish for the twelfth year. There was also an older parish temple dedicated to Saint Michael and an oratory in the landowner's house. The Catholic church even had an organ with an organist – Joseph Čučka (Csucskoi). In the parish village, people spoke Slovak or Rusyn with a small number speaking Hungarian. Describing this region, the bishop noted that the village of Homok (Kholmok) had a temple of Saint John the Baptist; Ketergeň (now Rozivka (Rozivka) had a bell house; Koritňany (Korytnyany) had a ruin of an old temple and also a Uniate wooden temple. The village of Baraňa (Baranyntsi) was divided into an upper and lower part, the upper one having an Uniate temple. Časlavice (Chaslivtsi) had a wooden temple which was visited by believers from the villages of Koritňany, Chlmec (Kholmets'), Veľké Hejovce (Velyki Heivtsi), Láz (Velyki Lazy), and Baraňa. In Malé Hejovce (Mali Heivtsi), there was a Reformed temple. In the village Sjurte (Sjurte), there was a Catholic temple. The village belonged to the wealthier localities (Sjurte) and the Church had a stronger position in that Sjurte. Settlements such as Čop (Chop), Solomonovce (Solomonovo), Ďuročke (Győrocske), Zahony, and Ašvň (Tisaashvan') were primarily Reformed. Wooden oratories were spotted in Zahony, Solomonovo, and Čop. Those southern parts of the county were predominantly inhabited by Calvinists who spoke Hungarian. Veľké, Malé Ratovce, and Časlovce were

²³ Ibidem.

²⁴ Ibidem.

primarily settled by Slovak speaking inhabitants, with some of them also speaking Rusyn.²⁵

From Ratovce Parish, the bishop travelled to the parish of Jor and Darma (today Storozhnytsja). Jor and Darma were not divided at the time, which is why the bishop did not distinguish the primary name of the parish's residency. The villages had two temples – the Roman Catholic and the Uniate temples. The Reformers gathered privately in their homes. The village had the tradition of making pilgrimages to surrounding temples and parishes. They were done on the feast of Saint John the Baptist to the village Homok and on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross to Ruská. The local Roman Catholic temple was dedicated to the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. The position of parish administrator was vacant. The Uniate parish was administrated by John Bolai, and the reformed preacher was Stefan Pataky. No school was mentioned in the village, only a note about the cantor whose name was Michal Silani (Szilanyi). This parish also included the villages of Božoš (now a part of Uzhgorod), Koncovo (Koncovo), Minaj (Minaj), Jenkovce, Tašula, Zahor, Pinkovce, Lekárovice, Vyšné Nemecké, Nižné Nemecké, Bežovce, Tarnovec (Tarnivtsi), Botfalva (Botfalva), Šišlovec (Shyshlivtsi), Batfa (Batfa), and Tekergeň (extinct village). In Božoš, there was only a bell house, but the bishop noted that it was situated near the mansion (*Castello dominalis*). In Koncovo, there was a brick chapel with a bell house. In Minaj, there was a Roman Catholic bell house and a wooden Reformed oratory which was visited by the inhabitants of Uzhgorods. A wooden reformed temple and a brick Roman Catholic temple with two bells were located in Jenkovce. In Tašula, there was a Catholic bell house, and the preacher from Jenkovce came to the Reformers who held ceremonies at the houses of the local Calvinists. In Záhör, there was a wooden oratory led by a preacher from Bežovce. There was also funding for a teacher and the school; however, the teacher's position was vacant. In Pinkovce, there was no bell or oratory. In nearby Lekárovice, the Reformers had their own bell house and the Uniates had their temple. In Nižné Nemecké, there was a Uniate parish and a wooden temple. Moreover, a brick Reformed oratory was situated there, where the preacher from Jenkovce went to preach. In Tarnovec, the Reformers met in the house of the landowner Horvát. There was also

²⁵ Ibidem.

a brick sacral building Tarnovec which was used by the Uniates and the Roman Catholics. In Šišlovec, only a bell house was spotted, but it is not clear to which confession it belonged. In Badfa, there was a one-hundred-year-old brick temple, administered by the Reformers, particularly by the preacher Stefan Makrandi. In the now-extinct Tekergeň, there were no sacral buildings, the only information given was that the local Reformees were ministered to by a preacher from Minaj and the Catholics by the parish administrator from Jor. In Bežovce, there was a Uniate temple and a wooden Reformed oratory. In Lekárovce, there was a wooden temple with a tower and two bells. These settlements were mainly inhabited by Slovak-speaking people.²⁶

After visiting the parishes near the town of Uzhgorod, the bishop unexpectedly did not travel to the center of the county – Uzhgorod – but he instead went back to the parish of Senné, which was near Pavlovce nad Uhom. In Senné, there was a wooden Roman Catholic temple dedicated to the Virgin Mary adorned with depictions of the Holy Trinity, Saint John the Baptist, and Calvary, which were commissioned by the baron Vecsei. The locals only spoke Slovak. The local parish was administered by John Uhrík, while Martin Hanzík was mentioned as bellman. An unnamed midwife was also mentioned. Nor school or a cantor are mentioned in the village. Its territory included the village of Stretava, where there was a Catholic bell house and a Reformed wooden oratory (which was a former Catholic church). The village had a midwife and a Reformed cantor. Stretavka only had a bell house, as the village was located nearby Stretava. The locals visited Stretava's reformed oratory or the parish temple in Senné. In the village of Palín, the Catholics did not even have a bell. The Reformers had a wooden oratory with a bell house in the village and they were led by a preacher from Stretava. Based on the information about the villages of Rebrín and Krašok (today, Zemplínska Široká), it appears that they were considered as one single settlement. Already at that time (in 1746), the villages were joined. These two joined villages held a wooden temple dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. The temple was described as being in good condition and having one bell. In Ináčovce, there was a Uniate temple. There was a cantor in the village, but he did not teach. In Jastrabie, near Michalovce, there was no temple, only a well-preserved

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

bell house situated in the center of the village. The bell itself was not blessed. The village was visited by a Uniate priest. The inhabitants of this parish spoke mainly Slovak and Hungarian. In the settlements where the Uniate priest ministered, Rusyn language was also used since the priest preached only in the Rusyn.²⁷

Afterwards, the bishop continued in his journey through the county to the parish of Vinné. The present-day village of Vinné is composed of two localities, Vinné and Banka, and, as is stated in the protocol, these settlements were united even at that time. In Vinné, there were two temples. The first one was constructed in brick and described as large and beautiful (*Magna et Pulchra olim*). The second one was wooden and in good condition. Processions were held in Vinné on the Assumption of the Virgin Mary when people journeyed to Michalovce. There is no mention about any iconographical depictions of saints or altar images in the temples. This points to the times when the temples were used primarily by the Reformers. The Reformers did not have a temple in the village therefore they had to meet in the house of Daniel Kurimci (Kurimci). The reformed preacher commuted from Lúčky. The Latin parish was administered by Matthew Seko (Szeko), who was 35 years old. Vinné was the first parish where he worked. A midwife and a cantor who did not teach also lived in this village. In a village belonging to that parish, Trnava pri Laborci, there was a well-preserved Uniate temple. In Zbudza (a village in Zemplén county), there was a wooden Catholic church dedicated to Saint Lawrence. This church still stands today, but after the renovation in the year 1749, its dedication was changed to the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin Mary. In Malé Zalužice (now Zalužice), there was no sacral building. In the village Veľké Zalužice (also now Zalužice), there was a Catholic church in good condition. The Reformers met in a house where the believers from Čečehov and Vrbovec also gathered. They were given spiritual comfort by a preacher from Lúčky. In Hažín, there was an old but well-preserved wooden temple belonging to the Uniates. In Lúčky, there was a wooden temple which had been used for years by the Catholics, but in the year 1746 it started to be used by the Reformers. Hnojné did not have any church or oratory and there was only a bell house with one bell. The priest of Vinne administered *ex currendo* as well as the parish of Sobrance. Among the belongings of

²⁷ Ibidem.

Sobrance's parish was the village of Závadka with a bell house with one bell and Úbrež with a wooden church which belonged to the Uniates with a cantor. In Fekišovce, there was a brick church. In Blatné Revištia, there was no oratory or temple, only a bell house with one bell. In the vicinity of the settlements of Vyšné Revište (now Veľké Revištia), Bunkovce, Sobranecké Komárovice (now a part of Sobrance), Kristy, Svätuš, Kolibabovce, Porúbka, Čertež (an extinct village), Priekopa, Koňuš, Krčava and Blatné Remety, there was only one bell house. In Nižná Rybnica, Beňatina, Podhorod', Choňkovce, Hlivištia, Vyšná Rybnica, Klokočov, Vyšné Remety, Poruba pod Vihorlatom, Jovsa, Jasenov, Koromľa, and Porostov, there were rectories and temples belonging to the Uniates. Some villages had a cantor who did not teach in school or a midwife. In Ostrov, Ruskovce, and Kaluža, there was no bell house, only the houses of the inhabitants. In Sobrance, there was a half ruined large temple, which had served until recently as a reformed oratory. The building was a dominant part of the town but the landowners did not have resources for its reconstruction. In Tibava, there was a brick church in process of reconstruction. The reconstruction was paid by Emeric Sztárai, while spiritual comfort was partially provided by the Jesuits from Uzhgorod. In Vojnatina, there was a brick temple which was reconstructed in wood only after the uprising of Francis II Rákoci. Until the uprising, it served as a simple Reformed oratory. After the reconstruction, it was blessed and Catholic masses started to be held there. In Baškovce, there was also a ruined wooden temple of the Uniates. In Kusín, there was a new wooden temple of the Eastern Rite, which was visited by a presbyter from Jovsa. The locals only spoke Slovak, while the presbyter preached in Rusyn. In northern settlements such as Beňatina and Podhorod', people spoke Rusyn.²⁸

After the visitation of the parish of Vinné and the territory of the parish of Sobrance, the bishop travelled on to the village of Onokovce (Onokivtsi). The temple in Onokovce was made of wood and was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Inside the temple, there was only a wooden altar with a depiction of the Virgin Mary. The Way of the Cross was also depicted in the church. There were no sacral buildings belonging to other confessions in Onokovce. The administrator of the local parish was Sebastian Augustini, who was 38 years old and had been residing in

²⁸ Ibidem.

Onokovce for 11 years. The village also had a midwife and a sexton. In Domanice (today Uzhgorod), Orechovica (Orikhovytsya), Jarok (Yarok), and Nevické (Nevyts'ke), there were rectories and churches belonging to the Eastern Rite. In Husák, there was only a bell house. In Kamenica (Kam'yanytsya), Stará Huta, Nová Huta (now joined as one village under the name Huta) there was no bell house – only the houses of the locals. In Petrovce, there was a chapel-like building, where the believers from the wider area (Husák) met in a prayer. The locals spoke Slovak even in localities where the parishes belonged to the Eastern Rite.²⁹

From the parish of Onokovce, the bishop travelled to the parish of Uzhgorod. The city was the center of the county. The dominant part in the city was its castle complex. The wide city center was surrounded from both sides by the river Uh. The city had numerous sacral buildings including a collegium which was under the Jesuits' ministry. The complex of the Jesuits was located near the castle and it consisted of a convent with a library, a school, and a large temple. The commissioner of the building was the Druget family. The bishop was not interested in concrete information on the lives of the Jesuits or the inside of their church. The city also held a church dedicated to Saint George, which was built in the Salt Street, over an old Reformed temple. The church consisted of five altars – the main one dedicated to Saint George, a smaller one dedicated to the Holy Cross, and side altars dedicated to Saint Lawrence, Our Lady of Sorrows, and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Uzhgorod also had chapels dedicated to Saint Stephen I of Hungary and Saint John of Nepomuk. The administrator of the parish was John Eniczkei, who was 54 years old and had been living in Uh County for a long period. There was also a new church in the city belonging to the Eastern Rite, which was administered by a local presbyter. The Calvinists in the city did not have a sacral building but they visited oratories in the nearby area. In Radvánka (now part of Uzhgorod), there was a Roman Catholic chapel, a wooden temple belonging to the Eastern Rite as well as a reformed oratory. In Horiany (now part of Uzhgorod), there was a brick temple dedicated to Saint Ann and a temple of the Eastern Rite. In Dravce (now part of Uzhgorod), there was an old temple not used by any confession because it was in bad condition, but which previously served as a Reformed oratory. Temples

²⁹ Ibidem.

of the Eastern Rite could also be found in: Lazy (Velyki Lazy), Ruské Komárovce (Rus'ki Komarivtsi), Andrašovce (Andriivka), Linec (Lints), Lachovce (Lyakhivtsi), Kibliari (Kyblyary), Antalovce (Antalovtsi), Horľovo (Khudlevo), Orľová (Irlyava), Dubrovka (Dubrivka), Čertiž (Chertezh), Turja Remety (Tur' ji Remety), Poroškovce (Poroshkovo), Turja Polena (Tur' ja Poljana), Turja Bistrá (Tur' ja-Bystra), Turičky (Turychky), Rakovo (Rakovo), Turja Pasika (Tur' ja Pasika), Viľšinky (Viľshynky), Smreková (Smrekovo), Bukovec (Bukiv'ovo), Turica (Turytsja), Simerky (Simerky), Zaričov (Zarichovo), Malé Berezné (Malyj Bereznyj), Veľké Berezné (Velykyj Bereznyj), Soľ (Sil'), Domašina (Somashyn), Stričava (Strychava), Kňahyňa (Knjahynja), Nová Stružica (today Stuzhycja), Zboj, Nová Sedlica, Stará Stuzica (now belonging to Nová Stružica), Kostrina (Kostryna), Vyškovo (Vyshka), Bystrá Verchovina (Verkhovyna-Bystra), Zavosina (Zavosyna), Ruský Hrabovec, Stavné (Stavne), Volosianka (Volosjanka), Užok (Uzhok), Husná (Husnyi), Suchá (Sukhyj), Tichá (Tikhyj), Ľutá (Ljuta), Behendetská Pastiľa (Behendjats'ka Pastil'), Roztocká Pasiľa (Roztots'ka Pastil'), Kosteva Pastiľ (Kosteva Pastil'), Mirča (Myrcha), Simerky (Simerky), Čornoholov (Chornoholova), Dubrič (Dubrynichi), Pastiľky (Pastilky), Perečín (Perechyn), Simer (Simer), Voročovo (Vorochovo), Novoselica (Novoselytsja) and Nižná Slatina (Nyzhnje Solotvyno). In Chlmec (Kholmec'), there was a Reformed temple. In Seredné (Serednje), there was a fortress holding a Catholic chapel prepared for mass. There was also a Reformed oratory in the city. Even though there was no church belonging to the Eastern Rite in the city, their presbyter commissioned a teacher, thus establishing a school where a cantor from Lachovce taught. A priest in Turičky also commissioned the local cantor as a teacher. There were no churches or bell houses in: Slatinka (Verkhnja Solotvyna), Cigánovce (Tsyhanivtsi), Lipovec (Lypovets'), Ľubňa (Lubnya), Luh (Luh), Ruský Močiar (Rus'kyi Mochar), Mokrá (Mokra). The village Zahorb (Zahorb) had a church belonging to the Eastern Rite which was in a very bad condition, almost a ruin. Midwives and cantors lived in most of these villages. In Uzhgorod, people spoke Slovak, German, Rusyn, and Hungarian. Tradesmen spoke German. In Seredné, people spoke Hungarian, Slovak, and Rusyn. In most of the above-

mentioned localities of the Uh County, people spoke Rusyn or Slovak and Hungarian. The local presbyters preached mainly in Rusyn.³⁰

The visitation is not complete since the information about the villages of Likicari (Likitsary), Lumšor (Lumshory), Svaľavka (Svalyavka), Čabanivka (Chabanivka), Gajdoš (Haidoš), and Vrbovec is missing. These settlements were situated on the hills or close to borders thus they were visited as a part of another county. Also, this protocol includes the information about certain villages of the Zemplén County (Zboj, Nová Sedlica, Zbudza, Ruský Hrabovec). Buildings such as fortresses are only mentioned in the cities of Seredné and Uzhgorod. The bishop was primarily focused on sacral architecture, predominantly on the Roman Catholic churches. Concerning churches that belonged to the Eastern Rite, the bishop sometimes commented on the building material or the condition of the temple. Villages at that time had a main focus point: the sacral building. If there was no temple in a village or a town, the focus was the bell house. Bells called people to prayer thus the bell house was located in the center of the settlement. The central position of these buildings is mentioned by the bishop. The bell house did not only have a spiritual importance, but also a social importance as the ringing of the bells could announce fires, floods, or the arrival of county officials. Along with the information on villages or the life of priests, the bishop also mentioned nearby forests. These reports were, however, laconic, being mainly a simple statement about wood availability. Any information on rivers is completely missing.

In the bishop's protocols, three other professions are mentioned apart from priests, preachers, and presbyters. These are cantors, teachers, and midwives. The number of Roman Catholic churches which functioned 1746 is low and it does not create a real functioning parish network. The priests from Vinné or Uzhgorod administered over 30 localities. The bishop also provided information on parishes or churches of other confessions. The office of teacher is mentioned sporadically, particularly with regard to towns (Uzhgorod, Seredné) and reformed parishes (Veľké Kapušany, Beša). Based on the visitations of the Eastern Rite churches, various information can be concluded. The testimonies in visitations show personal problems, mainly material ones (a house,

³⁰ Ibidem.

benefits, estates, adequate payments).³¹ If a presbyter did not require that a cantor would also teach, it was easy to occupy this post; however, material/financial problems were still an issue. The problem of midwives is particularly difficult. It appears that the northern mountainous areas had always had a midwife unlike the southern parts of county where the number of midwives was limited. Midwives were mentioned as related to indoctrination and the oath of midwives who were administered by the Church.³²

Using probing and analogy as methodology, the high potential of canonical visitations shown in this paper. There is no other model in Slovak historiography similar to the one we presented. The inner nature of the information can easily be considered travelogue information. The character of the data is bound to a certain date, in this case to the year 1746. Apart from architectural information, the bishop also followed an ethnographical aspect of the area: the language of the locals or the language of sermons. He even distinguishes between the dominant and secondary languages. The nature of the data points to the way of acquiring information: in practice, a draft was written first which was later re-written into the final protocol. The drafts were not preserved in this case, except for the one about the parish Jor-Darma (Storozhnytsa), which was glued to the final protocol due to the writer's mistake. The protocol includes the exact numbers of believers in certain settlements or the names of the presbyters, cantors, and landowners, which shows a precision of information acquisition. Furthermore, the property, benefits, or condition of churches were stated for each settlement. This study focused solely on the actual state of the past (of the year 1746), but it is a starting point for future research and possible analogies. The context of the travelogue brings new questions and hides, within the text, new answers for further research in canonical visitations.

³¹ T. Végheő et al., *Források a magyarországi görögkatolikus parókiák történetéhez. Az egri egyházmegye területén szolgálógörögkatolikus papok 1741. évi javadalom-összeírása* [Resources for the history of the Greek Catholic parishes in Hungary. 1741 census of Greek Catholic priests serving in the diocese of Eger] (*Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola*, 2014).

³² *Rituale Agriense, seu Formula agendorum in administratione sacramentorum, et caeteris ecclesiae publicis functionibus, jussu, et auctoritate Excellentissimi, Illustrissimi, ac Reverendissimi Domini Stephani e liberis baronibus Fischer de Nagy-Szalatnya [...] novis curis editum, emendatum, et auctum* (Budae: Typis Regiae Universitatis Pestanae, 1815), 587-588.

References

Archives

- Szatmári Püspöki és Káptalani Levéltár [Archives of the Bishops and Chapters of Satu Mare]. Fund Visitatio Canonica. Uh, 1746.
- Tiszánineni Református Egyházi Levéltár Sárospatak [Archive of Reformed Church in Sárospatak]. Fund Református Egyházlátogatások [Reformed Church Visitations], Uh.
- Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO]. Fund 4 Надзупан Ужанської жупи, м.Ужгород [Count Uh County, Uzhgorod]/2. Inventory number 561.
- Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO]. Fund 4 Надзупан Ужанської жупи, м.Ужгород [Count Uh County, Uzhgorod]/17. Inventory number 34.
- Державний архів Закарпатської області – ДАЗО [The State Archive of the Transcarpathian region – DAZO]. Fund 151 Правління Мукачівської греко-католицької єпархії, м. Ужгород [Board of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Diocese, Uzhgorod]/1. Inventory number 1125.

Primary sources

- Cestopisné denníky štúrovcov* [Travel notebooks of Štúr's community], ed. Rastislav Modla. Martin: Matica slovenská, 2014.
- Rituale Agriense, seu Formula agendorum in administratione sacramentorum, et caeteris ecclesiae publicis functionibus, jussu, et auctoritate Excellentissimi, Illustrissimi, ac Reverendissimi Domini Stephani e liberis baronibus Fischer de Nagy-Szalatnya [...] novis curis editum, emendatum, et auctum.* Budae: Typis Regiae Universitatis Pestanae, 1815.
- Véghseő, Tamas et al. *Források a magyarországi görögkatolikus parókiák történetéhez. Az egri egyházmegye területén szolgálógörögkatolikus papok 1741. évi javadalom-összeírása* [Resources for the history of the Greek Catholic parishes in Hungary. 1741 census of Greek Catholic priests serving in the diocese of Eger]. *Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola, 2014.*
- Véghseő, Tamas et al. *Források a magyarországi görögkatolikus parókiák történetéhez Olsavszky Mihály Mánuel munkácsi püspök 1750-1752. évi*

egyházlátogatásainak iratai [Resources For the History of the Greek Catholic Parishes in Hungary Mihály Olsavszky Mihály Bishop Munkács 1750-1752. records of his church visits]. *Nyíregyháza: Szent Atanáz Görögkatolikus Hittudományi Főiskola, 2015.*

Secondary literature

Kónyová, Annamária, and Peter Kónya. *Kalvínska reformácia a reformovaná cirkev na východnom Slovensku v 16. – 18. storočí* [Calvinist Reformation and Reformed Church in Eastern Slovakia in the 16th - 18th centuries]. Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej univerzity, 2010.

Kónya, Peter. “Reformovaný cirkevný zbro vo Veľkých Kapušanoch medzi reformáciou, rekatolizáciou a toleranciou” [Reformed church in Veľké Kapušany between Reformation, Recatholization and Toleration]. *Historia Ecclesiastica* 10:1 (2019): 40-50.

Markovič, Pavol. “Cestopisné a memoárové texty Ľudovíta Štúra ako ideologické výpovede” [Travelogue and memoir texts of Ľudovít Štúr as ideological statements]. In *19. storočie v zrkadle písomných prameňov* [19th century in the mirror of written sources], ed. Marcela Domenová, 36-41. Prešov: Štátna vedecká knižnica v Prešove, 2016.