

ALIN CRISTIAN SCRIDON

FACULTY OF ORTHODOX THEOLOGY
WEST UNIVERSITY OF TIMIȘOARA
ROMANIA
alin.scridon@e-uvvt.ro

УДК:271.222(497.11)-722.52:929 Георгије, будимски епископ(093)
271.222(498)-9(439)"1920/1946"(093)

ПРИМЉЕНО: 17.3.2020.
ОДОБРЕНО: 28.3.2020.

GEORGIJE ZUBKOVIĆ, A NOBLE SOUL OF THE ROMANIAN ORTHODOX IN INTERWAR HUNGARY.

A Romanian Record under the Scrutiny of Historiography and Diplomatic and Ecclesiastical Documents

Abstract: Between 1920 (Trianon) and 1946 (the year of establishment of the Romanian vicariate in Gyula), 17 Romanian Orthodox parishes located in eastern Hungary lost their connection with the ecclesiastical structures in Romania. Until then, the parishes had been under the jurisdiction of the two dioceses of Arad and Oradea. For the History of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary, the interwar period is identified as a turbulent period, with most priests leaving for Romania. They left, although many of the parishes had a very good financial situation. Under the pressure exerted by the Hungarian authorities, the saviour-figure of Bishop Georgije Zubković emerged, who became the spiritual father of the disorganised Romanian Orthodox believers. ► *Keywords:* Georgije Zubković, Budapest, Hungary, Gyula, Romanian Orthodox Church.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Romania, we know biographical data about Georgije Zubković exclusively from Serbian historiography. Coincidentally or not, the one who immortalises him historiographically is someone also known to the Romanians (from Banat).

Сава Вуковић (Sava Vuković) — the administrator of the Diocese of Timișoara and Bishop of Șumadia — published the paper *Srpski jerarsi od devetog do dvadesetog veka*.¹ The thesis was published in 1996, when the diocese of Timișoara was handed over to the current Bishop-administrator, Lukijan Vojislav Pantelić.

In the matter of access to the higher hierarchy in the Hungarian space, a major advantage was without a doubt being born in Budapest. After 1920, Hungarian citizenship would become a major problem for the Hungarian Orthodox clergy.

¹ Sava Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi od devetog do dvadesetog veka* (Beograd: Evro; Podgorica: Unireks; Kra-
gujevac: Kalenić, 1996).

In light of the historical documents from the archives in Romania and Hungary, it is our intention to prove that Bishop Georgije Zubković was far from taking no further interest in the fate of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary. In fact, this is the message of Romanian historiography when browsing the profile bibliography. Outlining the idea — reiterated by the Romanian history books — that Georgije Zubković did nothing for the Romanian Orthodox community in Hungary is a lie. Grace to our historical discoveries we must clearly admit that we will present only a small part of Georgije Zubković's involvement in solving the problems of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary. In the future, the information discovered after consulting the Hungarian and Serbian archives remains to be added — in order to complete the image of Bishop Georgije Zubković in solving the problems faced by the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary.

2. GEORGIJE ZUBKOVIĆ. BIOGRAPHY

He was born on 23 April 1878 in Budapest in a family of (ethnic) Serbian believers, to Arsen (chairman of the parish committee of the Serbian Parish in Budapest) and Mileva Zubković. He graduated pre-university schools in the Hungarian capital, and then went to Chernivtsi to begin his theological studies (bachelor's and PhD. degree) at the only Faculty of Orthodox Theology in the Austro-Hungarian Empire — *Deutschsprachige Nationalitäten-Universität*.² The famous higher education institution *Alma mater Francisco-Josephina* was founded in 1875.³ The University provided academic programs in law, philosophy and theology for Central and Eastern Europeans, especially. Theology had its origins in Putna — due to the transfer of the Theological Institute from the Putna Monastery, the old school of Vartolomeu Măzăreanu.⁴

Within the faculty in Chernivtsi, he was taught by several Romanian professors: Vladimir Vasile de Repta, Emilian Voiutshi, Eusebiu Popovici, Vasile Mitrofanovici, Constantin-Clemente Popovici, Isidor de Onciul, and others.⁵

He was ordained as a monk at the Bezdin Monastery near Arad. He received the sacrament of the priesthood in the rank of deacon (1901) and priest (1905). Bishop Georgije of Timișoara ordained him, and hired him at the diocesan centre in the capital of Banat as a typist.⁶

On 10 December 1911, he was elected Bishop of Budapest, and was ordained on 29 December 1912 in Sremski Karlovci by the Serbian Patriarch Lukijan, Bishop Gavriilo of Vršac and Georgije of Timișoara.⁷

² Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

³ Ion Nistor, *Istoria Bucovinei* (București: Humanitas, 1991), 212–218.

⁴ Sorin Șipoș, *Silviu Dragomir — istoric* (Oradea: Oradea University Press, 2009), 38–39.

⁵ Alin Cristian Scridon, *Școala nouetestamentară din Banatul istoric. 1867–1918. Mentalități. Repere exegetice bănățene. Interacțiuni istorice, socio-culturale și confesionale* (Szeged: Jate Press, 2017), 69–70.

⁶ Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

⁷ Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

Сава Вуковић (Sava Vuković) points out that, in the interwar period, the Hungarian authorities pressured Bishop Georgije Zubković to accept the position of head of the Hungarian Orthodox Church. He managed to face the threats, and left his descendants a diocese canonically dependent on the Serbian Patriarchate.⁸

He distinguished himself in the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church, which is why he was considered for the patriarchal seat in 1938 and 1950.⁹

He passed away on 11 April 1951 in Budapest. Initially, the Hungarian authorities refused to bury him in the Episcopal Cathedral. At first, he was interred in the cemetery in Budapest, and was laid to rest in the crypt of the Episcopal Cathedral after a few months.¹⁰

3. THE ORTHODOX FAITH — THE COMMON SPIRITUAL VEIN

The vast bibliography of the Romanian researchers in Hungary captures some images of the Romanian-Serbian relations in Hungary. Ethnological research faithfully notes the good coexistence of the two communities in the Hungarian space. The only connection between the two ethnic groups was their common membership in the Orthodox Church.

Romanian researcher Ana Borbély from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences disseminated interesting information related to the coexistence of the two ethnic groups. Thus, a component of the study “Aspecte istorice, sociale și identitare în alegerea prenumelor la românii din Ungaria”¹¹ analyses the evolution of the names given to Romanians in the mixed Romanian-Serbian localities.

Ana Borbély points out that, due to the common spiritual vein (the Orthodox faith) in Battonya and the Hungarian Cenad, Serbs and Romanians “intermarried. The Romanian-Serbian mixed marriages thus brought Serbian influences in Romanian culture, which can be also seen in terms of first names”.¹² In this sense, she brings evidence from the sociolinguistic interviews she conducted: many Romanians from the mentioned communes had the first name of Danița, Darinca, Ioța, etc.¹³

Ethnographer Emilia Martin — who led the Erkel Ferenc Museum in Gyula — in the paper “Sărbătorile calendaristice ale românilor din Ungaria”¹⁴ gives us another perspective. The researcher identifies (again) in Battonya a mixture between Romanian and Serbian traditions based on the “confessional intermarriage

⁸ Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

⁹ Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

¹⁰ Vuković, *Srpski jerarsi*, 122.

¹¹ Ana Borbély, “Aspecte istorice, sociale și identitare în alegerea prenumelor la românii din Ungaria”, in *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XXII-lea simpozion al comunității cercetătorilor români din Ungaria* (Békéscsaba, Giula: Nyomtatás Mozi Nyomda Bt., 2013), 141–155.

¹² Borbély, “Aspecte istorice, sociale și identitare în alegerea prenumelor la românii din Ungaria”, 146.

¹³ Borbély, “Aspecte istorice, sociale și identitare în alegerea prenumelor la românii din Ungaria”, 146.

¹⁴ See Emilia Martin, *Sărbătorile calendaristice ale românilor din Ungaria* (Gyula: Four Color Kft., 2003), 192.

between the two nationalities”.¹⁵ For example, on *Sânziene*, the tradition of weaving a wreath which was then placed on the façade of the house was considered a Serbian custom.¹⁶

4. GEORGIJE ZUBKOVIĆ IN ROMANIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY

Two Romanian researchers from Hungary provide some information particularly about Georgije Zubković: Elena Csobai and Teodor Misaroş.

Elena Csobai, in *Românii din Ungaria. Studii de istorie*¹⁷ mentions the turbulent period of the Romanian Orthodox Church in the interwar period, and the firm role assumed by Georgije Zubković in relations both with the Hungarian authorities and with the Romanian Orthodox community in Hungary.¹⁸

The visionary attitude of the Serbian Bishop of Budapest is captured by Teodor Misaroş in his well-known work.¹⁹ Misaroş mentions the efforts of the Metropolitan of Sibiu, Nicolae Bălan, who asked Georgije Zubković in a brotherly tone to take care of the Romanian believers in Hungary. Father Misaroş also notes that “the bishop was not willing to interfere in the affairs of the Romanian Orthodox here”.²⁰

Misaroş depicts Georgije Zubković as the only Orthodox in Hungary who, from his position, took a stance against Archbishop Savatie of Prague, who had ordained several priests and deacons for the Hungarian Orthodox Church. The Serbian hierarch, despite Savatie’s political support, complained that the Russian bishop “had no jurisdiction over Hungary”.²¹

The last deed of the Serbian hierarch — presented by Father Misaroş — was *the project to organise the Orthodox churches in Hungary*, initiated by the Hungarian authorities. The plan called for Serbian, Romanian, Greek and Hungarian parishes to be incorporated into a common diocese. Georgije Zubković was nominated to lead them, but he flatly refused to enter the Budapest political games.²²

The simplistic bibliography leads the reader to a clear conclusion: Georgije Zubković was firm in his relations with the Hungarian authorities in order to save his (Serbian) Church from disorganisation and Magyarisation. At the same time, we have seen him as distant to the *problems of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary*. Is this the historical truth?

¹⁵ Martin, *Sărbătorile calendaristice*, 162.

¹⁶ Martin, *Sărbătorile calendaristice*, 162.

¹⁷ Elena Csobai, *Românii din Ungaria. Studii de istorie* (Gyula: Dürer Nyomda Kft., 2013), 271.

¹⁸ Csobai, *Românii din Ungaria*, 214.

¹⁹ Teodor Misaroş, *Din istoria comunităţilor bisericeşti ortodoxe române din Ungaria* (Gyula, 2002), 242.

²⁰ Misaroş, *Din istoria comunităţilor*, 236.

²¹ Misaroş, *Din istoria comunităţilor*, 245–246.

²² Misaroş, *Din istoria comunităţilor*, 256–257.

5. ARCHIVAL PROOF

The historical *truth* in scientific research is *reinforced by evidence*. In this context, the natural question arises: will the *evidence* we have succeed in moving the level of research forward?

For the Romanian Orthodox clergy in Hungary, the activity carried out by the Serbian Church was an example. The shortcomings in education and proselytism were problems for both Serbs and Romanians. Simion Cornea wrote to Dimitrie Sabău about pursuing the *Serbian model* in the issue of filling vacancies in denominational schools²³ and in countering neo-Protestant and Greek-Catholic proselytism in Hungarian Orthodox parishes.²⁴

5.1. Georgije Zubković in the Romanian diplomacy

In this respect, the first *testimony* about Georgije Zubković is given to us by the Romanian diplomacy. Poet Octavian Goga — the Minister of Religious Affairs and Arts — wrote in the summer of 1921 to his colleague, Take Ionescu — the Minister of Foreign Affairs — about the disturbing situation of the Romanian Orthodox spirituality in Hungary due to the departure of most priests to Romania. Goga had this information from Metropolitan Nicolae Bălan, who had asked him to do something to stop the “Hungarian atrocities” and to “comfort the souls” of those who stayed.²⁵ Goga asked Ionescu to intervene with the Government in Budapest for the establishment of “a Romanian Orthodox vicariate, that would administer itself autonomously, and that, with respect to spiritual matters, would be subject to the Serbian Orthodox Bishop (of Buda), for as long as his station will exist”.²⁶

From this exchange of letters between the Romanian diplomats in Bucharest, we can clearly discern the fact that the Romanian Government trusted Georgije Zubković. However, at the same time, we note in Goga’s letter the wording “for as long as his station will exist”. Is it possible that he may have received information from Budapest about a possible dissolution of the Serbian diocese? We do not know.

²³ A.E.O.R.U. (Archives of the Romanian Orthodox Bishopric of Hungary), coll Gyula I, foll 1929, the letter of 5 July 1929.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, the letter of 14 December 1929.

²⁵ A.M.A.E. (Archives of the Ministry of Romanian Foreign Affairs, Bucharest), coll Problema 15 — Școli și biserici românești din străinătate (1877–1949), foll — Situația Bisericii Ortodoxe din Ungaria, 1921–1942, 174.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

5.2. Georgije Zubković in Romanian church archival documents

On the other side, in the Hungarian space, the first archival information appears a decade later. The document was written on **5 March 1930** and signed by a certain Cristea R., who wrote from Budapest, among others, to a Romanian clergyman: “In the matter of Kétegyháza, I wanted a Deputy to issue an Interpellation, but I think it would be somewhat unpleasant, I did not mention this Letter to Mr. Bogojeviciu as I was unable to show it, what rests on Dr. Alexics, I think that you are also convinced about his szalma láng, it is a very sad thing, but it would be wrong not to say about **the Serbian Bishop that His Holiness is very interested in the Romanians matters in Hungary (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)**, but only Mr. Bogojeviciu can resolve this matter, seeing that he also was received in audience by His Holiness.”²⁷

In the context of the times, we find the epistolary activity between Georgije Zubković and the clergy of the Romanian Orthodox Church interesting. First of all, because it took place in Hungarian...

In letter № 102 of 23 March/**5 April 1930**, Bishop Georgije Zubković wrote to the official representative of the Romanian Orthodox in Hungary, Father Gheorghe Bogoevici, about the divisive activities of the defrocked priest Németh István. The subject, then topical, is raised with the wording “to ensure the preservation of the canonical unity, I want **to inform you confidentially (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)** on (...)”²⁸

After communicating the secret subject, honestly, properly, lucidly for the times, he clearly expressed his view on the issue of the Romanian Church: “In fact, **I believe that in order to solve the issues of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Hungary, according to canon law, the Hungarian Government should appeal to the only competent authority, namely the Synod of Romanian Orthodox Bishops (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)**”²⁹

By letter № 14/16 April 1930, Ghenadie Bogoevici sent to Father Simion Cornea a copy of letter № 102 of 23 March/5 April 1930. Thus, the Romanian parishes in eastern Hungary were notified of the stance of the Bishop in Budapest.

On **9 June 1930**, Simion Cornea suggested to Petru Mișcuția to write to Bishop Georgije Zubković a letter requesting the cessation of Németh István’s proselytising actions in Békés. This could be achieved if the Serbian Bishop would intervene with the Hungarian government³⁰.

On **14 June 1930**, Father Petru Mișcuția from Békés confessed in writing to Father Simion Cornea that, related to the *Németh István problem*, he had corresponded with Bishop Georgije Zubković.³¹

²⁷ A.E.O.R.U., coll Gyula I, foll 1930, the letter of 5 march 1930.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, № 102 din 23 march/5 april 1930.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, № 17/9 june 1930.

³¹ *Ibid.*, the letter of 14 june 1930.

Two days later, on **16 June 1930**, Simion Cornea replied to Father Mișcuția, confirming that he also wrote to Bishop in Buda on 7 June 1930. Cornea mentions the convening of the Budapest Synod by the Serbian Bishop on 19 June 1930, “where they will also deal with this matter (A/N, the Németh István problem). And **maybe even with the organisation of our church (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)**”³²

The priest from Gyula I, Dimitrie Sabău, in the letter of 18 June 1930, probably addressed to Simion Cornea, proposed to the Romanian priests from Hungary a subject to which the Romanian clergy from Hungary was not connected, namely to ask the Romanian hierarchy (the Metropolitan of Sibiu and the Bishops of Arad and Oradea) “to somehow give, for a limited time, a canonical dispensation to the Bishop of Buda, and free us from their jurisdiction for some time, so that we may organise ourselves, and thus shatter the hostile actions initiated against us by incompetent but dangerous people”³³

In the same letter, Dimitrie Sabău mentions two other important aspects. On the one hand, the fact that Bishop **Georgije Zubković managed to persuade the Hungarian authorities to put an end to the proselytising actions planned by Németh István in Békés**, and, on the other hand, in the matter of the organisation of the church, he proposed to request the support of Mr. V. Grigorcea from the legation (embassy) in Budapest.³⁴

By letter № 20/18 June 1930, written in Hungarian by Simion Cornea and addressed to the Bishop of Buda, the Priest from Battonya reminded the Bishop of the meeting of 8 May 1930. Cornea emphasised that “**to our great satisfaction, you have showed altruistic goodwill towards the problems of our church**” (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)³⁵

Simion Cornea, confidently goes on in the letter: “encouraged by this attitude, I come again before Your Holiness. (...) We ask you: to take measures, **according to the promise made, and to take steps so that our activity is finally recognised**” (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)³⁶

Georgije Zubković replied to Father Simion Cornea through an employee of the diocese. By act № 20/23 June 1930, the Romanian priests received the following information: “The Bishop instructed me to inform you that he has received your letter, and he will answer you personally as soon as he returns from his official mission, in 10–12 days. **He also asks that Your Holiness and the Orthodox priests (Romanian, A/N A.C.S.) be convinced that he will do everything possible to solve the problems of the church legally and in accordance with the canonical norms**” (emphasis mine, A.C.S.)³⁷

³² *Ibid.*, the letter of 16 June 1930.

³³ *Ibid.*, the letter of 18 June 1930.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*, № 20/18 June 1930.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*, № 20/23 June 1930.

Another issue brought to the attention of the Serbian Bishop was the dissatisfaction with the election of the priest in Kétegyháza. On 19 January 1930, Petru Mișcuția, who was a priest in Békés, ran and was elected priest in Kétegyháza. Those who did not vote for him filed an appeal, but instead of addressing it to the church authorities, they sent it to the Hungarian authorities. Cornea wrote to the supreme head of the county in Békésgyula that church problems are solved by church authorities, and not secular ones. He thus asks the appeal and annexes to be sent to him so that the petition can be resolved by the competent church authorities.³⁸

Kétegyháza parish had had two priests since the 18th century. In 1927/1928, the parish was served by Vasile Beleș and Ioan Borza. In 1928, Vasile Beleș passed away, and the community wanted to fill this gap in the pastoral activity.³⁹

Although statutorily elected by a majority of votes, the Hungarian authorities did not allow Petru Mișcuția to take up his position. Disappointed, Mișcuția complained to the Serbian Bishop. Georgije Zubković, by **act № 193/18 July 1930**, got involved in resolving the problem, and took the first step by asking Simion Cornea for additional information: “I ask your opinion about the request made by the Romanian Orthodox priest Miscutia Péter from Békés regarding the priest election in Kétegyháza. Please let me know if I can make a decision *in dogmaticis et pure spiritualibus* according to the current statutes of the Romanian Orthodox Church”.⁴⁰

Simion Cornea replied to the Bishop by letter **№ 26/21 July 1930**. He referred to paragraph 36 of the Statute of Organisation of the Church which provided that “after the expiration of the 14 days allowed for appeals, the records shall be sent within 8 days to the Archpriest’s seat for verification. From here, the record will be forwarded to the Diocesan seat”. Cornea mentioned that the Romanian parishes in Hungary had neither archpriest nor episcopal authority, and thus the elections held in Kétegyháza could not be contested.⁴¹

In the letter, the Priest from Battonya also explained the two reasons evoked by the appellants. On the one hand, *unauthorised votes* were mentioned, votes that have been *consecutively* annulled by *the synod*. On the other hand, the issue of seniority in priesthood was raised. The laws provided that a priest had to have been serving for at least 3 years in order to be able to move to another parish. Father Petru Mișcuția was missing a few months... However, Cornea shows the Bishop that this paragraph mentioning seniority “applies only to priests with canonical investiture and invested as district archpriest (paragraph 38). The priest in question was not invested, therefore he was not a «parish priest», only a spiritual administrator, who can leave the parish whenever he wants”.⁴²

³⁸ *Ibid.*, № 10/27 march 1930.

³⁹ Misaroș, *Din istoria comunităților*, 114.

⁴⁰ A.E.O.R.U., coll Gyula I, foll 1930, № 193/18 July 1930.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, № 26/21 July 1930.

⁴² *Ibid.*

To solve the case, Simion Cornea mentioned the empowerment of the Serbian Bishop given by the Romanian hierarchs with respect to the archpastorate of Romanian believers in Hungary: “Your Excellency, you have received an empowerment from the Romanian Orthodox Metropolitan Synod in Sibiu that gives you the right to take action regarding our problems. It is true that we have learned about this from Your Excellency personally, but if there is a document attesting to this fact, a request must be made with regards to its issuance by the Government in order for you to be able to exercise this right. Please send us a copy of the above empowerment so that we can make a decision”.⁴³

By **act № 27/21 July 1930**, again written by Father Simion Cornea from Battonya and intended for the bishop of Budapest, we know that the Hungarian government refused to issue the governmental empowerment to Bishop Georgije Zubković. Cornea pointed out that “the Government has taken a stance on this, of which I have been informed, and a copy of which I have herewith attached”.⁴⁴

The Hungarian Government relied on act № 1936/1920 issued by the Diocese of Oradea, a document confirmed by the Diocese of Arad, by which Ghenadie Bogoevici was appointed as responsible for the coordination of the Romanian Orthodox in Hungary.⁴⁵

Despite the government’s refusal, Cornea believed that Bishop Georgije Zubković must insist with the Government to be appointed as responsible for the Romanian Orthodox in Hungary: “We ask you to notify the Government on the empowerment from the Metropolitan Church of Sibiu, and at the same time to take the necessary measures, on which we ask you to notify us. Attached is the list of Orthodox parishes”.⁴⁶

Act № 36/24 July 1930 was written by Father Petru Mișcuția and intended for Father Simion Cornea. Father Mișcuția informed that on 16 July he sent a letter to Bishop Georgije Zubković, asking him to intervene at the Ministry of Religious Affairs in Budapest in order to resolve his election as a priest in Kétegyháza. At the same time, he pointed out that “the Prefect, by act 29/930 — from the parish office in Kétegyháza — forbade me to take up my position until the competent resolution of the case by the church forum”.⁴⁷

Petru Mișcuția concluded by asking Simion Cornea to help him and intervene with Bishop Georgije Zubković to solve the case.⁴⁸

Two days later, on **26 July 1930**, Father Simion Cornea informed his colleague Mișcuția that he had already had an exchange of letters with the Bishop of Budapest

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, № 27/21 July 1930.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, № 36/24 July 1930.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

(letters of 18 and 21 July), precisely in the matter of supporting the resolution of the issue of the position of priest in Kétegyháza.⁴⁹

In order to solve the problem, as the only solution, Cornea admitted that based on the empowerment given by the Metropolitan of Sibiu to Bishop Georgije Zubković, he should “ask the Government to deliberate on the «appeal». To complete the matter, that authorisation from Sibiu should be communicated to us as well”.⁵⁰

Serbian Archbishop Pandurovics Mihály, in his letter dated **15 September 1930** and addressed to Father Simion Cornea, shed light on the existence of the document empowering Georgije Zubković in the matter of (arch)pastorate of the Romanian Orthodox in Hungary. Thus, the Archpriest wrote: “After I found out that within the meaning of decision № 20/1924 of the Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Bishops of 18 October 1924 in Sibiu, His Excellency, the Bishop of Buda, takes care of the Romanian Orthodox parishes on the territory of Hungary in a strictly spiritual sense (in spiritualibus) (...)”.⁵¹

*Pandurovics Mihály approached Simion Cornea for a joint decision on the Németh István problem.*⁵²

In the *Minutes* drawn up on the occasion of the synod of the Serbian church commune in Battonya, which convened on (14) 27 July 1930, more information was recorded regarding the activity of the defrocked priest Németh István. The Synod adopted several decisions for the proper functioning of the Orthodox (Serbian) religious life in Battonya: “1. expresses its loyalty and attachment to His Excellency who was unjustly attacked; 2. calls on all Orthodox dioceses to express their protest against the illegal activity of Németh István; 3. calls on the Hungarian Royal Government to implement the suspension decision issued by the competent ecclesiastical authorities, as Németh István’s work violates the laws of the Church and is against all parishioners and the priesthood. Also, to come to the aid of the Bishop in the judgment of this case; 4. requests the Holy Synod — in its capacity as the highest authority of the Church, to inform the Patriarchate of Constantinople of the harmful activity of Németh István, and to rescind his title of «archpriest» of Szentes”.⁵³

The chronology of Father Mișcuția’s *Record* with respect to his appointment at Kétegyháza ends only in the spring of 1931, more than a year after he had won the election. In this sense, Father Dimitrie Sabău wrote to Father Simion Cornea: “I am very happy to inform you that the much dallied issue of filling the vacancy in Kétegyháza, delayed for more than a year, has been finally resolved. The Prefect of the county received in audience on Friday (20 l.c.) colleague Mișcuția and communicated to him, — present being the chairman and notary of the parish committee in

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, the letter of 26 July 1930.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, the letter of 15 September 1930.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, Meeting minutes № 22 din 14/27 July 1930.

Kétegyháza –, that because the faithful vigorously support the election of the priest as valid, «he has nothing to object to» and allows him to occupy his parish. Couldn't he have done this last year, too?!”⁵⁴

The recognition of the Kétegyháza priest's election by the state was undoubtedly a positive deed. However, the Romanian priests were dumbfounded or at least this is the attitude we extract from Father Simion Cornea's reply to Dimitrie Sabău: “I read your lines about the business in Kétegyháza with great satisfaction. It can still be seen that the front of the organisation is beginning to clear up. Perhaps the Dignitary developed the activity to show the fruits of his superiority. Don't you think so?”⁵⁵

Dignitary — they were referring to Ghenadie Bogoevici, because that is how he was called in the epistolary exchange. Therefore, they had doubts about who still managed to intervene with the Government and solve the problem of the vacancy in Kétegyháza.

6. CONCLUSION

In the context of the diplomatic relations between Romania and Hungary after 1920, but also of the *weavings* of the church hierarchy in Constantinople, Moscow, Belgrade or Bucharest, Bishop Georgije Zubković remains a worthy historical figure who *made his way* with integrity and determination to fulfil the church organisation plan of the Romanian Orthodox.

Cited archival documents outline the image of a hierarch who we believe should imperatively be studied thoroughly not only by Serbian theologians or laymen, but also by those who love Romanian Orthodox ecclesiastical historiography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

БИБЛИОГРАФИЈА

- Archives of the Ministry of Romanian Foreign Affairs. Bucharest: coll Problema 15.
- Archives of the Romanian Orthodox Bishopric of Hungary. Gyula: coll Gyula I.
- Borbély, Ana. “Aspecte istorice, sociale și identitare în alegerea prenumelor la românii din Ungaria.” In *Simpozion. Comunicările celui de al XXII-lea simpozion al comunității cercetătorilor români din Ungaria*, 141–155. Békéscsaba, Giula: Nyomtatás Mozi Nyomda Bt., 2013.
- Csobai, Elena. *Românii din Ungaria. Studii de istorie*. Gyula: Dürer Nyomda Kft., 2013.
- Martin, Emilia. *Sărbătorile calendaristice ale românilor din Ungaria*. Gyula: Four Color Kft., 2003.
- Misaroș, Teodor. *Din istoria comunităților bisericești ortodoxe române din Ungaria*. Gyula, 2002.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, foll 1931, № 4/25 march 1931.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, № 5/30 march 1931.

- Nistor, Ion. *Istoria Bucovinei*. București: Humanitas, 1991.
- Scridon, Alin-Cristian. *Școala nouetestamentară din Banatul istoric. 1867–1918. Mentalități. Reperе exegetice bănățene. Interacțiuni istorice, socio-culturale și confesionale*. Szeged: Jate Press, 2017.
- Șipoș, Sorin. *Silviu Dragomir — istoric*. Oradea: Oradea University Press, 2009.
- Vuković, Sava. *Srpski jerarsi od devetog do dvadesetog veka*. Beograd: Evro; Podgorica: Unireks; Kragujevac: Kalenić, 1996.

Алин Кристијан Скридон
Православни богословски факултет
Западни универзитет у Темишвару
Румунија
alin.scridon@e-uvt.ro

ГЕОРГИЈЕ ЗУБКОВИЋ, ДОБРОТВОРАЦ РУМУНА ПРАВОСЛАВАЦА
У МЕЂУРАТНОЈ МАЂАРСКОЈ.

Румунски *госије* под лупом
историографије и дипломатских и црквених докумената

Резиме: После 4. јуна 1920. године седамнаест румунских православних парохија на подручју источне Мађарске губе своје везе са епархијама на територији Румуније којима су канонски припадале. Те парохије биле су до тада под јурисдикцијом двеју епархија — Арадске и Великоварадске. Међуратни период у историји Румунске Православне Цркве у Мађарској памти се као веома буран. У највећем делу румунско православно свештенство преселило се у Румунију, напустивши Мађарску, упркос томе што су многе парохије поседовале богато материјално стање. Под великим притиском мађарских власти, појављује се добротворни лик владике Георгија Зубковића, који притом постаје духовни отац неорганизованих румунских верника. Овај допринос доноси у научном кругу новије податке, пошто се у највећем делу темељи на архивској грађи истраживаној у Мађарској и у Румунији. ► *Кључне речи:* Георгије Зубковић, Будимпешта, Мађарска, Була, Румунска Православна Цркве.