

## Subcarpathian Ruthenia in the Life and Work of Bishop Gorazd (Pavlík)\*

PAVEL MAREK

**ABSTRACT:** In the eastern territory of the Czechoslovak Republic, after its establishment and after the end of the Great War, the Orthodox Church, suppressed by the adoption of what was called the Union of Uzhhorod (1646), started to revive. The evolving Orthodox movement, characterized by a wave of conversion of the population from the Greek Catholic Church to Orthodoxy, and often connected with the forcible seizure of the churches, parishes, and property of the Uniates, was faced by both the authorities in Prague and locally with the aim of calming the situation and organizing the Orthodox Church. Bishop Gorazd (Pavlík) was also involved in this effort in the mid-1920s as the supreme representative of the Czech Orthodox eparchy. His involvement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia went through a development symbolized by terms as an observer, organizer, and beholder. This paper evokes his interventions in the development of those times and evaluates their quality. Bishop Gorazd came into contact with the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia in the early 1920s. The focus of his local involvement dates back to 1926 - 1931, when the Ministry of Education entrusted him with the role of an unofficial government representative for this territory in the affairs of the Orthodox Church. At the same time, he served as a supervisor of Serbian bishops, who served as delegates to the Serbian Orthodox Church. The bishop made a significant contribution to the establishment of the Orthodox Eparchy of Mukachevo and to ensuring its economic operation. The accession of Bishop Damaskin (Grdanički) to the position of the first official patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia ended Gorazd's official engagement, and he continued to have only friendly contacts with the local Orthodox community.

**Keywords:** Subcarpathian Ruthenia; Orthodox Church; Bishop Gorazd (Pavlík); Czechoslovak Republic 1928 - 1938; religious and church crisis

### *Introduction*

In the years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918 - 1938), Subcarpathian Ruthenia formed an integral part of this successor state. In the years of the post-war religious and church crisis (1918 - 1924) this territory was under focused attention of believers and the competent state establishment. This attention was comparable with the interest in the reform movement of the Catholic clergy in the Czech lands, which resulted in a schism and the establishment of the national Czechoslovak

---

\* The article was supported by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic granted by UP in Olomouc (IGA\_FF\_2021\_014), the Society in Historical Development VII. Cultural heritage and national identities in the past [Společnost v historickém vývoji VII. Kulturní dědictví a národní identity v minulosti].

(Hussite) Church (hereinafter CHC). While the Czech lands, traditionally mostly of a Catholic religion, were mired in a cultural struggle under the slogan “No Popery” – and many people longed for the establishment of a national and democratically organized church devoid of the “tutelage of the Pope” and the denomination which resulted from what was known as Austro-Catholicism – in Subcarpathian Ruthenia many people hated the Greek Catholic Church, also known as the Uniates. They accused it mainly of alienation of the nation and selfish behaviour on the part of the clergy, which, in the years of social distress, often insisted on the fulfilment of duties that were considered to be a relic of the past. In the years 1918 – 1919 (following the beginning of the years before the Great War), there was a relatively strong conversion movement of believers in a number of regions who, under the slogan “return to the Father’s Church”, left the Greek Catholic Church and headed for a renewed, “cheap”, and “non-discredited” Orthodox Church, repressed by what was called the Uzhhorod Union from 1646. The statistics of the number of believers claiming adherence to the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia convinces us that this was no trivial phenomenon. While in 1910 558 people allegedly claimed to be adherents of the Orthodox religion, the official results of the 1921 Census, shortly after the movement developed, showed that figure to be 60,997 believers, or 10 % of the country’s population, and further, the 1930 Census indicates 112,034 believers, i. e. 15,4 % of the population. These figures, however, provide only partial information regarding the development in the field of religious and ecclesiastical life, because the religious crisis had a number of negative accompanying features, which include, for example, clashes between the adherents of the two churches, both spiritual and physical, and thus the term “religious war” used by newspapers was not such an exaggeration. The restlessness and instability of the religious situation, with a number of excesses, was the last thing the state authorities of the Czechoslovak Republic wanted. After the establishment of a new state, it faced many other fundamental challenges of an internal political character and attempts at destabilization that even threatened the very existence of the Republic. Therefore, calming the situation in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, which included religious and church life, was one of the priorities of both the Prague government and politicians and public officials living in the east of the Republic. Everyone felt that it was an urgent task of the time to transform the elemental Orthodox movement into a standard church and to prevent anything that could hinder the satisfaction of the spiritual needs of the vast majority of people living in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Faith in God, attending religious services, prayers, and other religious practices were an integral part of the daily life of the population of the country.

From the beginning, the attempts to resolve the religious and ecclesiastical situation in Subcarpathian Ruthenia encountered two main problems that the politicians and the less experienced officials of the state apparatus failed to overcome satisfactorily, despite a good intent.

Firstly, the adoption of the Reception Act, transposing the legislation of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy, was a sensible step in the situation of the time that ensured the functioning of the state, but on the other hand ran the risk of adopting standards that no longer corresponded to shifts in the opinions of the

population as a result of ongoing national emancipation and a cataclysmic war of a type that mankind had never experienced before. In the case of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, the situation was complicated by circumstances related to the constitutional position of the country within the Czechoslovak Republic. The practical consequence of these facts was the violation of laws and norms, and a way out of the situation consisting of the adoption of new legislation by the competent Subcarpathian Assembly was not possible to envisage for various reasons.

The second key problem was the absence of an organizational headquarters in a situation where the Orthodox movement had the character of a natural wave created by a popular movement from below inspired by activists from the secular environment and clergymen, mostly Russian emigrants leaving the country after Lenin's coup of 1917. These forces had neither the competencies nor the ability to play the role of a church organizer. The state apparatus had to solve a difficult dilemma. On the one hand, it reflected on the above-mentioned facts, but refused to have a direct involvement in taking the role of the main organizer on the grounds that it did not belong to the state, because it could not organize the church and the believers; it was their private affair and the state could only monitor the development or use its tools to regulate and control matters. At the same time, however, it realized that, in the interests of the security and integrity of the state, it was necessary to become involved in the ecclesial situation and streamline the existing chaotic conditions. We consider the offer of the Serbian Orthodox Church to assist in the constitution of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, which led to the sending of an Orthodox mission led by Dositej (Vasić), the bishop of Niš, to the country to be an expression of this belief. The Prague elites, headed by the Foreign Minister Edvard Beneš, guaranteed and supported the measure, and although, due to various circumstances, Dositej's mission did not achieve all that was expected of it, it became one of the important instruments in the organization of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. No less important a factor in the fundamental entry of the state into the ecclesiastical conditions in the country (and also in the territory of the whole republic) was the project of the constitution of a unified nationwide autocephalous Orthodox Church, which appeared in 1921 in connection with solving the role of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia. The political elites seemed to accept the offer of the Orthodox mission guaranteed by the Kingdom of Serbians, Croats, and Slovenians in a weak moment, but on the other hand they quite quickly realized the delicacy and complexity of this decision, and over time feelings of alertness and some fear increased. Although the Orthodox Serbs came from a country which was a Little Entente ally, they were also perceived as foreigners entering into matters within the sovereign decision-making sphere of the Czechoslovak Republic. The operation of foreigners in the country was perceived by the state administration as a risk factor and accordingly the administration also took appropriate measures by monitoring them using the security forces, or by restrictions or bans on residence and, in particular, a prohibition of activities in the country.

This exposition brings us to the definition of the meaning, importance, and goals of our paper, which is conceived as an evocation and one of the episodes in the

process of the establishment of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia in the years of the first Czechoslovak Republic. Bishop Gorazd (Pavlík), whose activities form the core of this paper, profiled himself during the first decade of the successor state's existence as a leading and then founding personality of the Orthodox Church in the Czech lands. After he had taken up the position of leader of the Czech Orthodox Religious Community in Prague in 1925/6, the State Administration of Cult Affairs, following the concept of a unified nationwide autocephalous Orthodox Church until the early 1930s, approached him as a person capable of making an impressive entrance onto the territory of Subcarpathian Ruthenia and pushing this concept ahead in terms of its practical fulfilment. Our aim is to capture and evaluate the bishop's intervention in this area and to consider the extent to which his activities were productive and what place he has in the history of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. In this context, the paper is also a probe into the work of the bishop in the period when he inclined to Orthodoxy. From a methodological point of view, we intend to fulfil these intentions by examining Gorazd's activities in three diachronic planes that are factually interconnected. In terms of resources, the study relies primarily on archival records stored in the Bishop's personal collection deposited in the archives of the Olomouc-Brno eparchy of the Orthodox Church in the Czech lands and Slovakia and in the collections of the National Archive in Prague.

### *The Personality of Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd*

We consider it necessary to start our analysis of Gorazd's work in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and his relation to the Orthodox Church with some remarks concerning his personality. We are convinced that he has an important place in the national church and religious history of the first half of the 20th century and that his importance extends beyond the Czech borders. For a vast majority of the Czech public today, the name of Matěj Pavlík (born on 26 May 1879 in Hrubá Vrbka, Hodonín district, died on 4 September 1942 in Prague-Kobylisy),<sup>1</sup> Bishop Gorazd, in the Orthodox Church called St. Gorazd II., is connected with the assassination in Prague in 1942 of the Reich Deputy Protector Reinhard Heydrich (1904 - 1942),<sup>2</sup> when the bishop protected his co-workers hiding the paratroopers after the action in the crypt of the Orthodox Cathedral of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Resslova Street in Prague and paid for it with his life. However, it would be wrong if we wanted to reduce the importance of this personality to only this event in modern Czech history, however

<sup>1</sup> On Gorazd's personality cf. e.g.: ŠUVARSKÝ, Jaroslav. *Biskup Gorazd*. Praha : Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1979; JEDLINSKI, Radomir. *Gorazd, episkop českomoravski (1879 - 1942)*. Kragujevac : Kalenić, 1991; ALEŠ, Pavel. *Pastýř a martýr*. Olomouc : Pravoslavná církev, 1992 - 1995; ALEŠ, Pavel. *Směřování*. Olomouc : Pravoslavná církev, 2002; MAREK, Pavel. *Biskup Gorazd (Pavlík). Životní příběh hledání ideální církve pro 20. století*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> BERWID-BUQUOY, Jan. Das Attentat auf den Stellvertretenden Reichsprotector von Böhmen und Mähren, Reinhard Heydrich. Offene Fragen in den Publikationen tschechischer Autoren. In *Bohemia*, 1981, Bd. 22, pp. 413 - 423; ČVANČARA, Jaroslav. *Heydrich*. Praha : Gallery, 2011; VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. Pravoslavná církev v protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1938 - 1945. In *Theologická revue Církve československé*, 2003, Vol. 74, no. 3 - 4, pp. 435 - 444; JINDRA, Martin. *Česká pravoslavná církev od Mnichova po obnovu v roce 1945*. Praha : Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů, 2015.

important it may be. Matěj Pavlík is one of the most important figures among Czech proselytes who, at the beginning of the 20th century, went through three churches – Catholic, Czechoslovak, and Orthodox. To say that he left a significant mark on each of them is not much of an exaggeration. As an originally exemplary Catholic priest after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic, he joined the Reform Movement of Catholic clergy striving for changes in the Church in the spirit of its nationalization and democratization.<sup>3</sup> After the scant success of the negotiations of the delegation of the Prague Unity of the Catholic Clergy in the Vatican on proposals for changes, he inclined towards a radical faction of clergy that, led by the Pilsen catechist Karel Farský (1880 – 1927),<sup>4</sup> prepared the foundation of the national Czechoslovak Church.<sup>5</sup> But soon, in opposition to supporters of the theological modernism of Karel Farský, he became a supporter of the Orthodox conception of the catechism. In 1924, when he did not receive sufficient support for his ideas from the Church's members, he left the Czechoslovak Church<sup>6</sup> and joined a group of Orthodox clerics associated in the Czech Orthodox Religious Community (hereinafter referred to as CORC) around Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec, 1880 – 1959),<sup>7</sup> which had started, not long before that, to build an Orthodox Archbishopric of Prague within the territorial area of the Czech lands with the support of the Patriarchate of the Constantinople Orthodox Church. He also had great interest in the organization of believers in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Gorazd's almost annual activities in the Prague religious community, marked by efforts to enforce the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia and eliminating the influence of the Constantinople Patriarchate on the Orthodox movement in the country, resulted in an internal coup within the religious community and the suspension of Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec), so that at the turn of 1925 and 1926, Bishop Gorazd became a leading figure in the Orthodox movement in the Czech lands. From this time until his tragic death on the shooting range in Kobylysy in 1942, his efforts were devoted to the Orthodox Church, with the aim of establishing a Czech variant of Orthodoxy in the Czech environment under the auspices of the Serbian Orthodox

<sup>3</sup> MAREK, Pavel. *České schizma. Příspěvek k dějinám reformního hnutí katolického duchovenstva v letech 1917 – 1924*. Rosice u Brna : Gloria, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> POKORNÝ, František (ed.). *Sborník Dra Karla Farského. Kniha vzpomínek, dojmů a úryvků z díla a života zakladatele církve československé*. Praha : Nakladatelské družstvo Církve československé 1928; KADEŘÁVEK, Václav – TRTÍK, Zdeněk. *Život a víra ThDr. Karla Farského*. Praha : Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1982; CHADIMA, Karel. *Dr. Karel Farský. 1. patriarcha Církve československé (husitské)*. Hradec Králové : Královéhradecká diecéze Církve československé husitské, 2019.

<sup>5</sup> URBAN, Rudolf. *Die Tschechoslowakische Hussitische Kirche*. Marburg / Lahn : J. G. Herder-Institut, 1973.

<sup>6</sup> MAREK, Pavel. *Česká reformace 20. století? K zápasu Církve československé (husitské) o vizi moderního českého křesťanství v letech 1920 – 1924*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2016.

<sup>7</sup> MAREK, Pavel – BUREHA, Vladimír Viktorovič – DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. *Arcibiskup Sawatij (1880 – 1959). Nástin života a díla zakladatelské postavy pravoslavné církve v Československé republice*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2009.

Church<sup>8</sup> and preparing the establishment of an autocephalous church.<sup>9</sup> He worked with the intention of detaching the Czech nation from Catholicism and incorporating it into the family of Slavic nations connected by the idea of Eastern Christianity.

The involvement of Bishop Gorazd in Subcarpathian Ruthenia<sup>10</sup> represents a thematically and temporally distinct episode of his work in the Orthodox Church. It underwent three main transformations. 1) In the period of the first half of the 1920s (1921 - 1925), he was more or less only an observer and recorder of and commentator on events in the press in relation to the Subcarpathian Orthodox Movement, especially in his church weekly titled *Za pravdou* (For Truth), published in Olomouc. 2) In the second half of the 1920s his role changed and from 1926 to 1931 he acted as an organizer, intervening in local events. 3) The third change of role occurred after 1931, when the organizer became a mere spectator, with no possibility of influencing events directly and actively. This role persisted until the break-up of Czechoslovakia in 1938.

*Bishop Gorazd as an observer of the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia*

We have not yet been able to find out the exact date when Pavlík-Gorazd made closer contacts with the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. We believe that they commenced at some point around the period 1921 - 1922. At that time, the first broader information about the Subcarpathian Orthodox movement coming from his pen began to appear on the pages of the Olomouc weekly of the Czechoslovak Church *Za Pravdou*.<sup>11</sup> An analysis of these articles shows that he not only sympathized with this movement, but had a good overview of the problems it was facing. As a bishop, Gorazd appeared in Subcarpathian Ruthenia for the first time in April 1922, when he ordained the priest Dmitriy Beljakov (1895 - 1967) in Velké Lúčky.<sup>12</sup> This indicates that he must have been in contact with some activists of the Orthodox movement during that period. Although it was a short stay, it left a deep impression on his mind. He was particularly enthusiastic about the behaviour of the believers who had converted to Orthodoxy before the war. He felt a determination from them that was based on the attitudes of the heroes of the

<sup>8</sup> PULEC, Miloš Josef. Svatý novomučedník Gorazd a české bohoslužby. In *Pravoslávny teologický zborník*. Prešov : Pravoslávna teologická fakulta, 2013, Vol. 39 (24), pp. 148 - 159.

<sup>9</sup> The Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia only received autocephalous status from the Moscow Patriarchate in 1951. Cf. VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. O jurisdikcích pravoslavné církve, které působily na území Československa. In *Theologická revue Církve československé*, 2004, Vol. 75, no. 3 - 4, pp. 398 - 404; VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. *Pravoslavná církev v Československu v letech 1945 - 1951*. Brno : Nakladatelství 3K, 1998.

<sup>10</sup> For a first outline of the topic cf. MAREK, Pavel. Vladyka Gorazd (Pavlík) a Podkarpatská Rus. In *Naukovi zapiski Bogoslovsko-istoričnovo naukovo-doslidnovo centru imeni archimandrita Vasilija (Pronina)*. Ed. Jurij Vasilovič Danilec. Užgorod : Nauka, 2015, No. 4, pp. 300 - 327.

<sup>11</sup> PAVLÍK, Matěj. Církevní poměry v Podkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1921, Vol. 1, No. 4, p. 14; Náboženské poměry na Podkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, Vol. 2, No. 6, p. 42; Pravoslavní na Přikarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, Vol. 2, No. 34, pp. 210 - 211; No. 35, p. 216; Archimandrit Alexij Kabaljuk. In *Za pravdou*, 1926, Vol. 6, No. 17, p. 67.

<sup>12</sup> DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. Protojerej Dimitrij Beljakov (27 October 1895 - 25 August 1967). In *Spovidniki ta podvižniki Pravoslavnoj cerkvi na Zakarpatje v 20 st.* Užgorod : Mukačivska Pravoslavna eparchija, 2011, pp. 320 - 325.

Maramaros-Sziget trial,<sup>13</sup> who had come from this village. According to him, the piousness and joy of the people was shining from their eyes.<sup>14</sup> Gorazd officiated at a service for them and his enthusiastic statement contained in the report describing the trip speaks volumes about his experience: “*I found myself in my spirit in my hometown in Moravian Slovakia, where people, before worshipping, sing their songs, old ones, which you would not find in a hymn book and in which the same Slavic soul resounds as in the songs of the Subcarpathian people.*”<sup>15</sup>

In his articles, Bishop Gorazd first of all critically appealed to the state administration and urged them to intervene in the ecclesiastical situation in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and to support the Orthodox movement. The conditions that had formed in the country were unsustainable in the long term and required immediate action. The situation in the area of legislation was particularly acute. “*The Orthodox Movement releases the dormant mental abilities of the Subcarpathian people; we only need to capture them. Unfortunately, both Czechoslovak intelligence and the Czechoslovak government are blind, deaf, and helpless, because they do not understand or try to understand the problems of the church.*”<sup>16</sup> [...] *It is indeed high time for this issue to be adjusted as soon as possible, possibly by a provisional law, until a definitive adjustment is made by the Autonomous Council in Subcarpathian Ruthenia.*”<sup>17</sup>

The bishop referred to the first governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Grigorij Žatkovič (1886 – 1967), as a major obstacle to the consolidation of relations and the opening up of space for the emancipation and development of Orthodoxy.<sup>18</sup> It seemed to him that he was not impartial to the confessions, and he linked the hope that the situation would change and “relief” would be brought with his retirement:

<sup>13</sup> ŠTEFÁNEK, Anton. Marmarošský proces a zahraničná politika našej monarchie. In *Prúdy. Revue mladého Slovenska*, 1914, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp. 241 – 244; GRABEC, Miroslav. *K istorii Marmaroškogo processa. Užgorod* : Tipografija Školnaja pomošč, 1934; Beskid, Konstantin M. *Obrázky z bývalého maďarského ráje: monstrosní proces v Marmarošské Sihoti*. Chust : Novotný a Bartošek, 1926. – In 1934, Bishop Damaskin (Grdaničiči) invited Bishop Gorazd to unveil a commemorative plaque in honour of the 20th anniversary of the Maramaros-Sziget trial in Iza, and he returned the kindness with an invitation to the consecration of St. Cyril and Methodius in 1935 in Prague. Cf. K 20. výročí marmarošského procesu. In *Věstník české pravoslavné eparchie*, 1934, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 15.

<sup>14</sup> When Bishop Gorazd again visited Velke Lúčky on 14 – 18 October 1925 to reunite with the clergy there and met the Archimandrite Alexij (Kabalyuk) in Strabičov, the Subcarpathian political administration speculated that he, as a bishop in the Serbian jurisdiction and a person who was counted as the leader of the Orthodox Church in the Czech Lands, was going to take over the Orthodox Christians in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and would become a bishop there. National Archives in Prague (hereafter NA), collection of the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment (hereinafter MŠNO), sig. 47 I, card 3812 – report of the Praesidium of the Political Administration of Subcarpathian Ruthenia of the MŠNO, 20 November 1925. Ibid, collection of the Presidency of the Ministerial Council (hereafter PMR), sig. 263, card 142 – zpráva prezidia politickej správy Podkarpatskej Rusi PMR, 20 November 1925.

<sup>15</sup> GORAZD. Z Podkarpatskej Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, Vol. 2, No. 15, p. 94.

<sup>16</sup> *Otázka kostelů a jiné časové otázky církevně politické*. Olomouc : Diecézní rada Církve československé, 1922, p. 258.

<sup>17</sup> PAVLÍK, Církevní poměry, p. 15.

<sup>18</sup> MORÁVEK, Jan. Osobnost Grigorie Žatkoviče. In *Listy katedry historie a Historického klubu – pobočka Hradec Králové*, 1996, No. 10, pp. 84 – 87; LICHTJEJ, Ihor M. Roľ T. G. Masaryka i H. Žatkoviča v urehľuvanni deržavno-pravovoho statusu Pidkarpats'koi Rusi (1918 – 1919). In *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatkách novodobých dejín 1848 – 1918. Zborník venovaný prof. PhDr. Michalovi Danilákovi, CSc. k jeho 65. narodeninám*. Prešov : Universum, 1999, pp. 300 – 308.

*“He was the one who prevented the Serbian bishop Dositej from visiting Subcarpathian Ruthenia.”<sup>19</sup>*

Bishop Gorazd was very interested in the issue of the taking over and returning of the churches of the Greek Catholic Church, which was close to his heart. While in the Czech environment, he considered the best way out of the situation to be the mutual sharing of churches by the Catholic Church and the Czechoslovak Church,<sup>20</sup> in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, he did not want to understand the rigorous standpoint of the state administration, insisting on the temples being returned, even in those cases where no member of the Greek Catholic Church remained and all the residents had converted to Orthodoxy. He welcomed the decision of the government to support the construction of new Orthodox churches in Subcarpathian Ruthenia as a constructive step towards the consolidation of the situation.

### *Bishop Gorazd in the role of organizer of the Subcarpathian eparchy*

A fundamental change in the relationship of Bishop Gorazd to the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia occurred after 1926: from the position of an observer of events and intervening in events mostly indirectly, through his private correspondence with some priests (especially with the protojerej Ivan Ileček)<sup>21</sup> or by personal or written consultations [in particular with Bishop Dositej (Vasić, 1878 – 1945),<sup>22</sup> Archimandrite Alexiy (Kabalyuk, 1877 – 1947),<sup>23</sup> JUDr. Alexei Gerovsky (1883 – 1972),<sup>24</sup> the Ministry of Education, etc.] in which he provided advice, he moved to the role of an active organizer, who had, to a limited extent, an opportunity to intervene and interfere directly in events up to 1931. This change of role took place after he finally broke with the Czechoslovak Church, stepped out of it, and confirmed his Orthodox confession, already formalized by the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade, as part of the Episcopal Chirotony, by taking over the post of Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec). The circumstances that accompanied these changes contributed to the fact that the government administration of cult affairs started to perceive him not only as a serious and hardworking man standing at the head of the Czech Orthodox Christians, but also as a capable organizer with a broad knowledge, possessing the qualities to take a central position in the forefront of the national Czechoslovak Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the future. Therefore the Ministry of Education

<sup>19</sup> PAVLÍK, *Církevní poměry*, p. 15 – An allusion to the Bishop of Dositej (Vasić) relates to the beginnings of his mission in 1921, when he came to Prague to discuss the issue of the Orthodoxization of the Czechoslovak Church. The negotiations were prolonged, causing speculation that he was being detained in the Czech lands and therefore could not leave for Subcarpathian Ruthenia. However, it is true that local civil servants feared his stay in the country. They correctly anticipated a deterioration in the relationship between Orthodox followers and the believers of the Greek Catholic Church.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. MAREK, Pavel. *Zápas o vlastnictví kostelů po vzniku Československa*. In *Moderní dějiny*, 2015, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 89 – 126.

<sup>21</sup> <[http://zarubezhje.narod.ru/gi/i\\_096.htm](http://zarubezhje.narod.ru/gi/i_096.htm)> [8. 12. 2020].

<sup>22</sup> MAREK, Pavel. *„Obtížný cizinec“*. Vladyka srbské pravoslavné církve Dositej (Vasić) a meziválečné Československo (1920 – 1939). Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2020.

<sup>23</sup> DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. *Obranij Božim Providinnjam. Žittepis prepodobnogo Oleksija Karpatoruskogo spovidnika*. Černivci : Místo, 2013.

<sup>24</sup> MAREK, „Obtížný cizinec“, pp. 276 – 294.

started to make use of him as an unofficial government expert on the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia and consulted him on all the significant steps in the direction of the Orthodox community in the country. In addition, he was given the role of a supervisor of the Serbian bishops who administered the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia as delegates of the Serbian Orthodox Church. He was to take care that during the construction of the Church, "they would not fall into the wrong way right from the beginning", as noted by the Ministerial Councillor Václav Müller, who was responsible for solving the Church's problems within the state administration, in a letter to the Minister of Education, Milan Hodža (1878 - 1944),<sup>25</sup> on 16 December 1926.<sup>26</sup>

A complete list of all the interventions of Bishop Gorazd in the construction of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia is unrealistic at this point, as the historical data is rare and broken down into small fragments. Therefore, we will focus on two of his most important inputs which significantly influenced the development of Orthodoxy in Subcarpathian Ruthenia.

The first is his support for the establishment of the Mucachevo Orthodox eparchy, constituted in 1929. His role consisted of methodological and financial intervention in religious communities and intervention in solving the problems of the churches and in assisting in the approval of the constitution of the Orthodox eparchy. The second level of Gorazd's activities was related to efforts to solve the financing of church activities, which we consider one of the key problems of the Orthodox Church's existence, including the payment of the salaries of the clergy. He succeeded in pushing for the Orthodox Church to be financed from the state budget from the early 1930s; until then, its income depended on facultative government grants, financial contributions from the Serbian Orthodox Church, and in the Czech lands, money raised by the collection of religious tax.

Bishop Gorazd acted very actively in relation to Orthodoxy in Subcarpathian Ruthenia in 1926, when, as already mentioned, he took charge of CORC. When he came to the conclusion that the state-monitored and preferred project of constituting a nationwide Orthodox Church was currently impossible,<sup>27</sup> he supported the idea of gradually creating the preconditions for the emergence of the Subcarpathian eparchy and its establishment from the bottom up. This did not mean, however,

<sup>25</sup> Cf. CAMEL, Samuel. *Štátník a národohospodár Milan Hodža: 1878 - 1944*. Bratislava : Veda, 2001.

<sup>26</sup> National Archives Prague (NA), Fund (f.) Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment, 1918 - 1938 (MŠNO), sig. 47 VII, card 3907 - Report to the Minister, 16 December 1926. The councillor Müller formulated Gorazd's role in the following words: "*Bishop Gorazd-Pavlik, who is already working to improve the Orthodox situation in Subcarpathian Russia and who will be in contact with the Serbian bishop who will come here soon, will be in constant communication with the state cult administration, to supervise the work of this bishop and, in contact with us, to direct it.*"

<sup>27</sup> Both in the Czech lands and in Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia in the mid-1920s, the basic preconditions for the realization of this project were not created and in the Orthodox movement more or less chaotic conditions still prevailed. Although the Serbian Orthodox Church supported this intention verbally, it made its consent to the granting of autocephalous status conditional on the fulfilment of all the necessary conditions that generally applied to all Orthodox Churches. The attitude of the Orthodox Church activists in Subcarpathian Russia and the general mood among believers influenced especially by anti-Czechoslovak propaganda, who rejected Pragocentrism and longed for their own eparchy, were not negligible.

that he resigned from the project of an autocephalous Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia. He merely accepted reality and moved his vision far into the future. He considered that the first necessary step towards the fulfilment of his intention was to establish religious communities in localities with populations converting to Orthodoxy. He perceived communities as the cornerstones of the organizational structure of the eparchy, in which the activities of the clergyman are connected with the lay community. He leaned on his ordainee Dimitrij Beljakov of Goronda,<sup>28</sup> to whom he passed on his experience twice in Prague and also instructed him and provided him with the know-how to establish religious communities and gain state approval for them. He also involved his Prague episcopal office, which prepared sample application forms, in this administrative process. Gorazd also supported Beljakov financially from his private income. This allowed him to travel to individual locations and cover the costs of bringing the project to life. We will appreciate the bishop's efforts if we consider the cultural level of the region and the fact that the work was carried out by immigrants who did not have legal knowledge and did not understand or know the mechanisms by which the state apparatus functioned. In this context, the bishop's commitment was effectively irreplaceable. At the same time, the efforts of the organizers working on Gorazd's intentions in the communities were aimed at promoting the Serbian Orthodox Church and its acceptance by the faithful. It was not entirely successful, because it encountered and clashed with similar efforts made by the sympathizers with, and supporters of, Prague Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec), asserting the jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarchate.<sup>29</sup> This group also elaborated their own statutes for the establishment of religious communities and sought their constitution and legal blessing.<sup>30</sup> This, of course, caused tensions and clashes in the Orthodox community and weakened the stability of the established communities. Neither the government nor the Serbian Orthodox Church had enough forces and resources to prevent clashes between the two Orthodox streams. The process of establishing religious communities took place in an environment characterized by mutual competition between the supporters of both Orthodox streams, and the campaign suffered as a result of that and basically stagnated.

Bishop Gorazd's second significant intervention in ecclesiastical events in Subcarpathian Ruthenia also dates from 1926. It was related to the search for a suitable person, enjoying general authority, who would take the lead in organizing the

---

<sup>28</sup> Bishop Gorazd considered Beljakov one of the most capable organizers of Orthodoxy in Subcarpathian Russia and in 1925 selected him, together with the archimandrite Alexiy (Kabalyuk) and clergymen Luka (Olkhovij) and Mikhail Mejgeš for the Advisory Council, which he then set up on the request of a Member of the National Democratic Party, Antonín Hajn (1868 - 1949). Archive of the National Museum in Prague (ANM), f. Antonín Hajn, i. no. 5767, card 209 - Letter from Bishop Gorazd to A. Hajn, 6 February 1925. - On Hajn's personality cf. ŠUBRTOVÁ, Alena. Osobní fond Antonín Hajn. In *Sborník archivních prací*. Praha : Archivní správa Ministerstva vnitra ČR, 1991, Vol. 41, No 1, pp. 151 - 169.

<sup>29</sup> NA, f. P the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (PMR), sig. 263 / 2-3, card 143 - ČNOP applications processed by Gorazd Vacek.

<sup>30</sup> Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec) acted independently in the matter of the statutes for religious communities, but after the proposal prepared by Červinka was not officially confirmed, he cooperated with Vice-Governor Petr Ehrenfeld.

Orthodox movement and be able to streamline it and transform it into a standard church. The problem occurred immediately after the revival of the local Orthodox movement, stretched out for many years, and remained unresolved even after the Orthodox mission of the Serbian bishop Dositej. It clearly demonstrated that a man of this type – a permanent bishop for this area – was urgently needed. The mission also confirmed that only a strong personality could calm the situation and build the eparchy. Bishop Dositej did not manage to be such a person for various reasons. Attempts to establish the Subcarpathian Ruthenian bishopric by appointing some prominent figures connected mainly with the Russian milieu, such as Bishops Antony (Khrapovitsky), Venyamin (Fedchenko), Sergei (Korolyov), or Sawatij (Vrabc), had failed. It was therefore logical that, by quite early in the 1920s, the clergy had started to support the idea of selecting a bishop from among their own priests who had been active in Subcarpathian Ruthenia for a relatively long time. The potential of this idea is evidenced by the fact that, regardless of the opposition of the Serbian Orthodox Church and scepticism in the state apparatus, it occurred several times and caused tensions in the Orthodox movement that could not be left without response, trivialized or disregarded. In 1926, when it was clear that Dositej's Czechoslovak mission would be terminated, the problem of the further organization and management of the Orthodox movement in the country became not only topical, but also a burdensome issue for the state administration.

Here it is necessary to look for the reasons why the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment addressed Bishop Gorazd and sent him to the east of the country in April as a government expert. The State Cult Administration gave him the task of examining the current state of the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and making constructive proposals that would help resolve the confusing situation caused by the departure of Bishop Dositej on the one hand and the intervention of Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabc) on the other.<sup>31</sup> Gorazd's Subcarpathian Ruthenian mission was officially covered by the consecration of a new Orthodox temple in Novoselica, near Teresva, but the bishop also managed to arrange a series of consultations with both priests<sup>32</sup> and believers during the short period of his residence, with the aim of getting as much information as possible. At the same time, however, he gave them advice and instructions to calm and stabilize the situation. It was mainly served by meetings in Novoselica, Khust, and Mukacheve.<sup>33</sup> After returning from Subcarpathian Ruthenia, he elaborated and presented to the Ministry

<sup>31</sup> Gorazd's trip to Subcarpathian Ruthenia must also be seen as his response to Sawatij's activities in the country at that time. In March and April 1926, the Archbishop sent three pastoral letters to Orthodox believers in Czechoslovakia in which he strongly attacked Bishop Gorazd as a fraudulent consecrated heretic and a church vagrant. Sawatij then even made three trips to Subcarpathian Ruthenia in an effort to counter Gorazd's local activities. Cf. MAREK, Pavel. *Pravoslavní v Československu v l. 1918 - 1942*. Brno : L. Marek, 2004, pp. 185 - 186.

<sup>32</sup> Gorazd's meeting with Archimandrite Alexij (Kabalyuk) was important, as he recommended him to process the statutes for the monasteries and have them recognized by the authorities. He also negotiated with Igumen Jov (Vojtishin), the priest Vladimir Potapov of Novoselica, and Protoiereus Ivan Ilečka from Velke Lüčky. ANM, f. Antonín Hajn, i. no. 5767, card 209 - Report by Bishop Gorazd, 13 April 1926.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Subcarpathian Rus. In *Za pravdou*, 1926, vol. 6, No 15, p. 60.

of Education a summary of the current problems that, in his opinion, the Orthodox movement faced and could help to consolidate the situation there if resolved. We will look at the contents of this document in more detail.

Firstly, in his proposal Bishop Gorazd recommended enforcement of the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the Orthodox movement. It should not concern only the territory of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, but the whole territory of the Czechoslovak Republic. He argued that the shift of a part of the clergy to the Constantinople jurisdiction had caused controversy and could not be expected to be as profitable as the pro-Serbian orientation. He considered the second key problem of Subcarpathian Ruthenia to be the absence of a permanent bishop. He felt that the Orthodox movement lacked a higher ecclesiastical authority that would devote itself systematically to pastoral work and management and would simultaneously intervene operatively against those who violated church and state laws. He proposed that a competent bishop of the Serbian Orthodox Church be sent to the country for a transitional period, whose main task would be to create the conditions for the establishment of a permanent and elected bishop. The permanent bishop, in the position of an organizer, was to speed up the process of obtaining autocephalous status for the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia.<sup>34</sup> In Gorazd's view, to calm the situation in the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, however, it was not enough to pay attention only to issues of church management, but the stabilization of the situation within religious communities was equally important. He considered the most urgent task in this area to be to constitute communities on the basis of the constitution of a church and its approval by the state administration. Gorazd was convinced that the full and developed religious life of municipalities was difficult to imagine in the long run without the existence of sacral premises. Therefore, the solution of the issue of church ownership was considered one of the key tools for stabilizing the situation. He tempered the indignation of the Orthodox Christians, caused by the need to return the seized churches to the Greek Catholic Church, by references to the need to comply with the laws and by giving assurance that the Czechoslovak Church in the Czech lands had to return them too.<sup>35</sup>

Part of Gorazd's report on his stay in Subcarpathian Ruthenia consisted of recommendations on personnel. He identified the Bishop of Dositej (Vasić) as the most suitable candidate for the office of bishop. Recognizing the infeasibility of this proposal, however, he recommended focusing on obtaining the Rashko-Prizren Bishop Mihajl (Šiljak),<sup>36</sup> Stipa Bishop Serafim (Jovanović) and Bitola Bishop Josif (Cvijović, 1878 – 1957).<sup>37</sup> At the same time he commented on the considerations concerning the candidacy of Bishop Mitrofan (Abramov, 1876 – 1944).<sup>38</sup> He was

---

<sup>34</sup> NA Praha, f. MŠNO 1918 – 1938, sig. 47 VII, card 3907, report by Bishop Gorazd to the Ministry of Education, 10 May 1926.

<sup>35</sup> ANM, f. Antonín Hajn, i. no. 5767, card 209 – a letter by Bishop Gorazd to A. Hajn, 14 August 1926.

<sup>36</sup> On the bishop's personality, cf. Vladyka raško-prizrenský Michail Šiljak zemřel. In *Za pravdou*, 1928, Vol. 8, No. 34, p. 172.

<sup>37</sup> SAVA (VUKOVIĆ), episkop šumajjski. *Srpski jerarsi od devetog do dvadesetog veka*. Beograd – Podgorica – Kragujevac : Kalenih, 1996. Heslo Josif (Cvijović) mitropolit skopski 1932 – 1957, pp. 261 – 263.

<sup>38</sup> <<https://drevo-info.ru/articles/17980.html>> [13. 7. 2020].

restrained in this matter.<sup>39</sup> In the event that none of these bishops were interested in a post in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Bishop Gorazd suggested striving to acquire an associate professor of the theological faculty in Belgrade, Damaskin (Grdanički, 1892 – 1969).<sup>40</sup> He saw him as a well-educated man with a wide-ranging knowledge of Western Europe, who was already one of the candidates for episcopal office in the Serbian Orthodox Church, and working in Subcarpathian Ruthenia would be a good opportunity for him to speed up his career.<sup>41</sup>

We do not know the response of the Ministry of Education to Gorazd's suggestions and recommendations,<sup>42</sup> because in the second half of 1926 Czechoslovakia transferred the main burden of the contacts with the South Slavs to its Belgrade envoy Jan Šeba (1886 – 1953).<sup>43</sup> However, the fact that in late November of that year the state authorities again sent Bishop Gorazd to official meetings in the Kingdom of Serbians, Croats, and Slovenians speaks for itself. This time he was given the delicate task of supervising the selection procedure for the post of a bishop for Subcarpathian Ruthenia, organized by the Serbian Orthodox Church. The Ministry of Education in Prague concluded that they had to look at the selection procedure and influence the outcome to such an extent that the person who was selected enjoyed their confidence. Bishop Gorazd appeared to them to be an ideal figure for the role of guarantor, because he seemed to know the Serbian ecclesiastical environment. The Ministry ordered him to push among the candidates the Novi Sad Bishop Irenaeus (Čirić, 1884 – 1955) and present him as a person who had the full support of the Czechoslovak government. The Serbian side respected this fact and delegated him to Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Thus Bishop Gorazd accomplished his task, but it certainly had not been easy.

It seems that Gorazd's diplomatic role in addressing the confusing situation in the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and in the selection of the Subcarpathian Bishop was evaluated very positively by the state administration. We conclude this from the fact that, in the new concept of the relation of the state to the Serbian bishops in Ruthenia, formulated as the result of the experience with the selection procedure organized by the Serbian Orthodox Church and the decision that the responsibility for his operation would remain with the Czechoslovak

<sup>39</sup> NA Praha, f. PMR, sig. 263/2-3, card 143 – report of Bishop Gorazd to the Ministry of Education, 10 May 1926. Ibid, f. MŠNO 1918-1938, sig. 47 VII, card 3907.

<sup>40</sup> <file:///C:/Users/Marek/Downloads/Humensky%20(1).pdf> [8. 7. 2020]; SAVA (VUKOVIĆ). Srpski rjarski, heslo Damaskin (Grdanički), pp. 149 – 150.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. MAREK, Pavel – LUPČO, Martin. *Nástin dějin pravoslavné církve v 19. a 20. století. Prolegomena k vývoji pravoslaví v českých zemích, na Slovensku a na Podkarpatské Rusi v letech 1860 – 1992*. Brno : Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2012; Švorc, Peter. *Zakletá zem. Podkarpatská Rus 1918 – 1946*. Praha : Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007, s. 141.

<sup>42</sup> This assessment is not entirely accurate, as on 22 May 1926 the Ministry of Education informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the results of Gorazd's mission in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, saying that his proposal appeared appropriate and they had no objections to the people who were being proposed. The Presidency of the Ministerial Council also took note of this information. NA Prague, f. PMR, sig. 263 / 2-3, card 143 – letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (hereinafter MZV), 22 May 1926.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. DEJMEK, Jindřich (ed.) *Jan Šeba. Paměti legionáře a diplomata*. Praha : Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2016.

(and not the Serbian) side, the Ministries of Education and of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic entrusted him with another important task, formulated in the following form: *“The State Cult Administration will look after the work of the Serbian bishop here and will exercise influence to ensure that his activities follow a direction favourable to the government and contribute to the consolidation of the Orthodox situation in the country. Bishop Gorazd-Pavlik, who is already working to improve the Orthodox situation in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and who will be in contact with the Serbian bishop who comes here, will, in constant communication with the State Cult Administration, supervise the work of this bishop and drive it in interaction with us.”*<sup>44</sup> On 16 December 1926, in a report addressed to the Minister of Education, Milan Hodža, the Councillor of the Ministry of Education, Václav Müller, who was responsible for the management of the Cult Administration, confirmed the role of Gorazd and formulated it even more explicitly: when the Serbian church officials arrived, he would take care of them and go with them to Subcarpathian Ruthenia, *“first, to guide their direction of action, and second, to take care they do not fall into the wrong way right from the beginning”*.<sup>45</sup>

Existing archival material convinces us that Bishop Gorazd agreed to the role assigned to him by the Ministry of Education and, until 1930, fulfilled it. However, his concept of performing some kind of supervisory work was not solely in terms of direct management of the delegates of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Rather, he acted as an active advisor to initiate the hierarchs coming into a foreign environment into the situation and acted as a link between the centre and east of the country. He acted alongside the Serbian bishops as a colleague with experience from their home environment. He helped them to establish contact with the state administration in Prague and Bratislava and transferred his know-how in solving problems related to the construction of the Orthodox Church in the Czech lands to the Subcarpathian environment, which he had had the opportunity to acquaint himself with through relatively prolific personal correspondence with several clergymen or due to requests for his intervention received from local religious communities.

Bishop Gorazd actually began to perform the task received from the state administration in the east of the republic<sup>46</sup> in May 1926. In 1927, he worked closely with the Serbian delegate, Bishop Irenej (Čirić). The Bishop saw the main task of his stay in Subcarpathian Ruthenia as being the elaboration of the eparchial constitution as part of the future status of the nationwide church. His proposal was delivered to the state administration for comment in March 1927. Bishop Gorazd perceived the act of approval of the draft eparchial constitution by the state authorities as an unreasonable step. He realized that Bishop Irenej (Čirić) was dividing his work between the Serbian and Subcarpathian Ruthenian eparchies and commuting between these two places. In addition, he was performing other tasks in Western

---

<sup>44</sup> NA Praha, f. MNO, sig. 47 VII, card 3907 – Official record of December 1926. – The new concept was to apply from November 1926, when the delegate Bishop Dositej (Vasić) definitively finished his Czechoslovak mission.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. – Report to the Minister, 16 December 1926.

<sup>46</sup> <file:///C:/Users/ProBook/Documents/Irenej%20a%20Serafim.pdf> [9. 7. 2020].

Europe imposed on him by the Sabor of the mother church. Therefore, he was not prepared for negotiations on possible changes that would require an operational procedure. Bishop Gorazd not only envisaged a long delay in the approval process of a constitution that was much needed for organizational work, but even came to the pessimistic conclusion that this was a great complication that threatened the whole project. Therefore, he tried to stand in for the delegates of the Serbian Orthodox Church in some matters.

As Bishop Gorazd followed the fate of the submitted draft constitution carefully, we know that the project document took into account only the territory of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, while the state administration at that time wished to include Slovakia in the Subcarpathian eparchy.<sup>47</sup>

The Orthodox movement in Slovakia during 1928 found itself in an organizational vacuum and neither the Czech nor the Subcarpathian Orthodox Christians looked as if they were taking note of it. We consider the fact that this situation contributed to the emancipation of this movement and the formation of its headquarters. The first step in this direction was taken by the Orthodox clergy in Slovakia by convening an assembly of representatives of religious communities operating in Slovakia in Medzilaborce on 14 May 1928. The attendees resolved to formulate a request to bring the Eastern Orthodox Movement into the administration of the emerging Subcarpathian Mukacheve eparchy and to send a delegation to the Czech Bishop, Gorazd (Pavlík), to help them initiate negotiations with the government authorities in Prague and Bratislava in this spirit. The choice of mediator was by no means accidental, since Bishop Gorazd was involved in the east of the Republic after 1926. The Provincial Office in Bratislava submitted desideria concerning the Orthodox Church in Slovakia<sup>48</sup> with the conviction that their fulfilment *“will be a benefit not only for this church but also the state itself, especially if it is carried out with the cooperation and under the spiritual direction of the Serbian Orthodox Church”*, which would, in Slovakia, undoubtedly proceed in agreement with the state authorities.<sup>49</sup> We do not know whether it affected the requirement for a change of organization formulated in Medzilaborce in 1928. On the contrary, it is certain that he prepared a memorandum for the delegates in Czech and introduced them to the Ministry of Education in Prague. This effort brought its results at the congress of the clergy and representatives of ecclesiastical committees in Ladomirová on 14 May 1930, where the *“Protopresbyterate of the Orthodox Church for Eastern Slovakia”* was established, with its seat in Prešov. This authority was headed by a for-

---

<sup>47</sup> NA Praha, MŠNO, sig. 47 V II, card 3912 – Notes on the Constitution of the Subcarpathian Orthodox Eparchy of Mukacheve. – Bishop Gorazd was of the same opinion. He agreed to include the Slovak Orthodox community in the administration of the bishop in Mukacheve as a temporary solution, in which he saw the possibility of limiting the influence of Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec) on this territory.

<sup>48</sup> NA Praha, f. MŠNO, sig. 47 VII, card 3908, Report of the Ministry of the Interior in Bratislava to MŠNO in Prague, 18 October 1927.

<sup>49</sup> The registry office of the eparchial council of the Olomouc-Brno eparchy of the Orthodox Church in the Czech Lands and Slovakia in Olomouc (hereafter APC), f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Bishop Gorazd, correspondence, the Serbian Church, copy of a letter of Bishop Gorazd and apparently Bishop Irenej to the Government of Czechoslovakia, Uzhhorod, September 1927.

mer priest of the Greek Catholic Church, 72-year-old Irenej Chanát (1857 – 1934).<sup>50</sup> Then the bishop immediately recommended<sup>51</sup> requesting the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church to appoint a bishop for the Slovak Orthodox Christians, despite the fact that only six state-recognized religious communities were active in the east of the country, while another nine had applied for approval. It is understandable that under these circumstances the application had no chance of succeeding. However, we consider the fact that these events highlighted the problem of the Orthodox Christians in Slovakia and prompted the Serbian Orthodox Church to reconsider the concept of the Subcarpathian eparchy to be positive. In the period up to 1931, the Serbian Orthodox Church, apparently also under pressure from the Czechoslovak authorities, took gradual steps and after the appointment of Bishop Damaskin (Grdanički), who originally defended the project of an independent Slovak eparchy, and after the adoption of the new ecclesiastical constitution in 1931, the Prešov eparchy was constituted as a part of the Serbian Orthodox Church abroad but directly controlled by its own bishop. This act, even though this constitution did not officially take effect, in fact definitively concluded the effort to establish a (common, united) autocephalous Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, to which the Slovak and Czech Orthodox Christians returned after the war, but in a completely different situation. Until the end of the 1930s, the Slovak Orthodox Christians shared their fortune with the believers in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. However, it should be said that the state authorities themselves considered the merger of the Slovak and Subcarpathian eparchies as a temporary act and a transitional condition.<sup>52</sup>

From April 1928 to January 1930, Bishop Gorazd was in close correspondence with Irenej's successor as the delegate of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Serafim (Jovanović).<sup>53</sup> After his arrival in Czechoslovakia he was again not only his guide but also an advisor. In his work, Bishop Serafim followed the activities of his predecessor. In the first place he tried to push through approval of the constitution of Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Bishop Gorazd did not actually interfere with the draft text of the eparchy status at this stage and provided only administrative services to the Serbian bishop. However, his pressure to refine the constitutional articles concerning the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the Mukacheve eparchy is clear by his intention to strengthen the range of argu-

---

<sup>50</sup> NA Praha, f. MŠNO, sig. 47 VII, card 3908, report of the Ministry of Interior to MŠNO, 2 June 1930.

<sup>51</sup> On March 21, 1930, a delegation led by the priest and editor of the Prešov National Democratic newspaper *Narodnaya Gazette*, Alexander Laschonov, and the Secretary of the Uzhhorod eparchy, Sergei N. Ryasnansky, visited Bishop Gorazd on 15 May 1930. He recommended them to ask the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church to appoint their own bishop immediately, despite the fact that there were only six religiously approved municipalities and nine municipalities were still waiting for sanction by the state. NA Prague, MŠNO, sig. 47 VII, card 3908 - letter of the Ministry of the Interior MŠNO, 2 June 1930; <<https://www.facebook.com/rusyn.sk/photos/pb.225681114296104.2207520000.1471677052./544814365716109/?type=3>> [15. 7. 2018].

<sup>52</sup> APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card *Pravoslavná církev, první republika, Vyjádření oddělení VI/2*, Insert to no. 141 000/32, January 1933.

<sup>53</sup> SAVA (VUKOVIĆ), Srpski jerarsi, heslo Serafim (Jovanović), p. 442.

ments on the basis of which he wanted to expel Archbishop Sawatij (Vrabec) from the eparchy.<sup>54</sup>

When in June 1929 the Board of the Ministerial Council approved the eparchial constitution<sup>55</sup> and work began on its formal establishment, Bishop Gorazd offered selfless help to his Subcarpathian colleagues. At the end of October 1929 he invited Serafim's secretary Sergei N. Ryasnansky (1886 - 1976) for a two-day consultation in Prague<sup>56</sup> and provided a multi-page manual to Father Ivan Ilečka on how to constitute eparchial organizational structure according to the constitution.<sup>57</sup> On 28 November 1929, he attended a gathering of delegates from religious communities in Khust, who elected the eparchial council as the supreme administrative body of the Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia.<sup>58</sup> The official sources of the civil administration of Subcarpathian Ruthenia report that the people also addressed the question of whether the administration of the Subcarpathian eparchy should be taken over by Bishop Gorazd.<sup>59</sup> Unfortunately, further details to clarify the circumstances of this event are not known. We only know that all present rejected this possibility. We believe that this is important information in relation both to the eparchy and to the personality of Bishop Gorazd.

We have mentioned the correspondence between Bishops Gorazd and Serafim (Jovanović). It concerns in particular the preparation of the ecclesiastical constitution. The largest numbers of letters, however, relate to finance, or to the processing of applications for subsidies for the Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Bishop Serafim, like all the delegates of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia in general, was poorly oriented in Czechoslovak legislation, did not understand the operation of the state apparatus, and had no contacts with influential stakeholders in political life. He did not have enough information and his contacts with Prague lacked operability. In this context, Bishop Gorazd's involvement, interventions, and support were of extraordinary and effectively irreplaceable importance. His role was emphasized by the fact that he had confidence in the apparatus of the Ministry of Education, headed by the councillor Václav Müller, who also accommodated

<sup>54</sup> APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Bishop Gorazd, Correspondence, Subcarpathian Ruthenia - Concept of a letter from Bishop Gorazd to Serafim, June 22 1928. - In August 1928, Serafim (Jovanovic) issued a pastoral letter against the activities of Archbishop Sawatij. Bishop Gorazd informed him about the case in detail in letters and recommended ignoring the steps taken by the Archbishop as being the best tactic.

<sup>55</sup> MAREK - LUPČO, *Pravoslavní*, pp. 209 - 211. - Since the final text of the constitution was not submitted to the Serbian Orthodox Church before its official approval in Czechoslovakia, the elected authorities did not work and the construction of the church stopped again. The correction, revision, amendments, and final approval took place only in 1931. The problematic behaviour of the state, especially by the Councillor Václav Müller, when approving the constitution in 1929, was one of the reasons for Serafim's great disappointment and resignation as delegate.

<sup>56</sup> APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Biskup Gorazd, correspondence, miscellanea - report of Bishop Gorazd at the meeting of the Synodal Council, 5 November 1929.

<sup>57</sup> APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Biskup Gorazd, correspondence, Subcarpathian Ruthenia - draft letter of Bishop Gorazd to Ilečko (Joannov), 3 December 1929.

<sup>58</sup> For its staffing cf. e.g. *Pravoslavná církev*. In *Ročenka Československé republiky*, 10. Praha : A. Hajn 1931, p. 228.

<sup>59</sup> NA Praha, f. PMR, sig. 263/2-3, card 143 - report of the land governor to PMR, 12 December 1929.

him with regard to the aforementioned mandate to supervise the situation in the Subcarpathian region. It is also worth noting the practical aspect of the matter, i.e. the fact that Bishop Gorazd helped the Serbian bishops to overcome the language barrier and introduced and accompanied them on their journeys and to meetings.

Bishop Gorazd's support for the Orthodox Christians in Subcarpathian Ruthenia in negotiating the financial backing of the Church was the main focus of his efforts in assisting the Serbian delegates after the departure of Bishop Serafim (Jovanović), when in 1930 - 1931 the Orthodox mission was headed by Bitola Bishop Josif (Cvijović),<sup>60</sup> who co-ordained him as a bishop, accompanied by the theologian Archimandrite Justin (Popovič, 1894 - 1979),<sup>61</sup> and from the turn of 1931 through 1932 by Bishop Damaskin (Grđanički).<sup>62</sup> Bishop Gorazd's last major intervention in the economic securing of the existence of the Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia was his memorandum of 28 April 1932 to the Government, which he filed together with Bishop Damaskin (Grđanički).<sup>63</sup>

### *Bishop Gorazd in the role of a witness to events and a guest in Orthodox Subcarpathian Ruthenia*

The establishment in 1929 of the Mukacheve eparchy, to which Bishop Gorazd contributed, paradoxically lay at the beginning of the third transformation of his role in the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. After 1931, he moved from being an organizer to an observer of the events in the country, without any possibility of active intervention. This remained his role until the break-up of Czechoslovakia in 1938. We are looking for an explanation of this change in three facts:

1) From the turn of 1931 through 1932, the role of the permanent bishop of Mukacheve was taken by Bishop Damaskin (Grđanički). He was a capable and independent organizer, a personality beside whom there was no space for another similar one. Bishops Gorazd and Damaskin exchanged letters, were in friendly contact, and helped each other, but Gorazd's influence on events in the east of the Republic was essentially limited to this. Their contacts reached a level of mutual respect and non-interference in their competences and life in both eparchies. Bishop Damaskin had a different approach to managing the eparchy, compared to his fellow-delegates. He did not rely on anyone and took everything into his own hands. He was

<sup>60</sup> SAVA (VUKOVIĆ), Srpski jerarsi, heslo Josif (Cvijović), pp. 261 - 263.

<sup>61</sup> <[https://orthodoxwiki.org/Justin\\_Popovich](https://orthodoxwiki.org/Justin_Popovich)> [11. 7. 2020].

<sup>62</sup> Grđanički, Damaskin (Dragutin) In *Srpski biografski rečnik*, 5. Novi Sad : 2001, pp. 795 - 796; the Sabor of the Serbian Orthodox Church appointed Bishop Damaskin (Grđanički) from 10 candidates on 6 October 1931. On the Czechoslovak side, the ambassador in Belgrade, Robert Flieder (1883 - 1957), was most instrumental in this decision. NA Praha, f. MŠNO, sig. 47 VII, card 3913 - letter of the Presidium of the Land Office in Uzhhorod to MŠNO in Prague, 24 December 1931; Instalace pravoslavného biskupa Damaskina. In *Lidové noviny*, 1931, Vol. 39, No. 612, p. 3; <[https://www.google.cz/search?ei=TAuAWqKhH4\\_8kwWQirPwBA&q=Rudolf+Flieder+diplomat&oq=Rudolf+Flieder+diplomat&gs\\_l=psy-ab.3...6100.7939.0.8391.9.9.0.0.0.0.103.783.8j1.9.0....0...1c.1.64.psy-ab..0.5.463...33i160k1.0.B2kn4M-KrJdA->](https://www.google.cz/search?ei=TAuAWqKhH4_8kwWQirPwBA&q=Rudolf+Flieder+diplomat&oq=Rudolf+Flieder+diplomat&gs_l=psy-ab.3...6100.7939.0.8391.9.9.0.0.0.0.103.783.8j1.9.0....0...1c.1.64.psy-ab..0.5.463...33i160k1.0.B2kn4M-KrJdA->)> [15. 7. 2020].

<sup>63</sup> APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Biskup Gorazd, correspondence, Subcarpathian Ruthenia - memorandum of Bishop Damaskin to the Government of the ČSR, 29 April 1932; MAREK, Biskup Gorazd, pp. 434 - 437.

a bishop of order and self-discipline. He lived and worked in Subcarpathian Ruthenia without interruption throughout the mandate of the Serbian Church.

2) The establishment of the Mukacheve eparchy signals a reassessment of the concept of creating a unified Orthodox Church nationwide. The government authorities postponed it to the future, and in their intentions Bishop Gorazd ceased to perform the role that he was given after 1926. This role was taken on by Bishop Damaskin and Bishop Gorazd devoted himself fully to building the Czech Orthodox eparchy.

3) However, Gorazd's resignation from involvement in the development of the Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia was also the result of his private decision. Its roots go back to the conflict that took place between him and some members of the Sabor of the Serbian Orthodox Church in 1930. We do not know its exact nature, but we have one of Gorazd's activity reports sent regularly to Belgrade. There he devoted a lengthy passage to a defence of his activities in the eastern regions of the Republic, which he put in the context of criticism of the role of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia since 1920.<sup>64</sup> After listing eight issues he encountered in Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Bishop Gorazd writes: *"That's all I did. If I have sinned, I should be punished. However, before you condemn me, take note and consider: a) when I intervened on my own behalf and when I was charged by Bishop Dositej (Vasić). b) my interventions were unofficial; rather advice and assistance - and that can be done by any priest or even believer. Sabor members have the right to speak in the affairs of the Czech and Subcarpathian Orthodox Church, but the same right is also held by the bishop, who knows the situation in Czechoslovakia better than they do, because he lives in this country. Or does he not have the right? It is not about my person, but about anyone in my position. I was not interested in being a bishop, but as long as I hold this office, I cannot renounce certain rights. If you have ordained me, you have placed a great burden on my shoulders. Before deciding, consider carefully everything that has happened in the last five years."* Bishop Gorazd then apparently decided to limit his engagement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia.

### Conclusion

The aim of our paper is an attempt to capture and evaluate the relationship of the bishop of the Czech Orthodox Church, Gorazd (Pavlík), to the Orthodox Movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia during the First Czechoslovak Republic. Although its involvement in the east of the former state represented a mere episode in the context of his lifelong efforts, we believe that reflection on it is useful for detailed knowledge

---

<sup>64</sup> Bishop Gorazd criticized the Serbian Orthodox Church for its hasty behaviour in his consecration in 1921, which allegedly earned him the label of an unreliable man in government circles. It was a mistake that Bishop Dositej (Vasić) chose Archimandrite Matvej (Vakarov) and Alexei Gerovsky as his collaborators. Most of all, the Church was wrong to act passively where it was necessary to be active, to intervene, and to speak. The Church was not struggling to enforce its jurisdictional law on the territory of Czechoslovakia, and no one became involved in this matter; it had to be done by Bishop Gorazd, who had grown up in the Catholic Church. APC Olomouc, f. Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, card Bishop Gorazd, correspondence, Serbian Church - Report by Bishop Gorazd to the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church, typescript, in Serbian, 1930.

of his work efforts in the establishment of Orthodoxy in interwar Czechoslovakia, as well as being a contribution to capturing the efforts to consolidate the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s. We have dealt with this rarely discussed topic in three time periods. In each of them, the bishop's relation to Orthodoxy in the country has distinctive features, culminating in the second half of the 1920s, when his inputs into the events were essentially creative and were aimed at establishing the Subcarpathian Orthodox eparchy. The efforts to build religious communities as the basic organizational structures of the eparchy were followed by a share in the preparation of the eparchial constitution and the building of the administrative bodies of the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. After leaving the Czechoslovak (Hussite) Church, taking the lead in the Czech Orthodox Religious Community, and becoming the leader of the Orthodox movement in the Czech lands, he was commissioned as a government expert to mediate the contacts between the State Cult Administration and the delegates of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and to perform certain tasks related to the fulfilment of the government's concept of building a nationwide autocephalous Orthodox Church. We consider the Bishop's greatest success in relation to the Orthodox movement in the east of the Republic to have been his intervention in the funding of the existence of the Subcarpathian eparchy in the context of the integration of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia among congruous churches. The activity of the bishop in this sphere was unprecedented and absolutely essential for the existence of the Orthodox Church in the country and the whole republic.

### Primary Sources

The Archive of the President Office, Prague [Archiv Kanceláře prezidenta republiky v Praze], Fund D.

Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Prague [Archiv ministerstva zahraničí v Praze], 2nd section, 1918 - 1939.

The Archive of National Museum in Prague [Archiv Národního muzea v Praze], Fund Antonín Hajn.

Archive of the Orthodox Church - Registry of the Office of the Diocesan Council of the Olomouc-Brno Diocese of the Orthodox Church in the Czech Lands and in Slovakia in Olomouc [Archiv pravoslavné církve - Spisovna úřadu eparchiální rady Olomoucko-brněnské eparchie Pravoslavné církve v českých zemích a na Slovenku v Olomouci], Fund Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd

Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Academy of Sciences [Masarykův ústav a Archiv Akademie věd ČR, v. v. i.], Fund MA-R.

National Archives, Prague [Národní archiv Praha], Fund The Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment [Ministerstvo školství a národní osvěty], 1918 - 1938.

National Archives, Prague [Národní archiv Praha], Fund Presidency of the Council of Ministers [Předsednictvo ministerské rady], 1918 - 1945.

Central Archive and Museum of the Czechoslovak Hussite Church in Prague [Ústřední archiv a muzeum Církve československé husitské v Praze], Fund Correspondence of Karel Farský [Korespondence Karla Farského].

## Literature

- ALEŠ, Pavel. *Pastýř a martyr*. Olomouc : Pravoslavná církev, 1992 – 1995.
- ALEŠ, Pavel. *Směřování*. Olomouc : Pravoslavná církev, 2002.
- Archimandrit Alexij Kabaljuk. In *Za pravdou*, 1926, roč. 6, č. 17, s. 67.
- BERWID-BUQUOY, Jan. Das Attentat auf den Stellvertretenden Reichsprotektor von Böhmen und Mähren, Reinhard Heydrich. Offene Fragen in den Publikationen tschechischer Autoren. In *Bohemia*, 1981, Bd. 22, s. 413 – 423.
- BESKID, Konstantin M. *Obrázky z bývalého maďarského ráje: monstrosní proces v Marmarošské Síhoti*. Chust : Novotný a Bartošek, 1926.
- CAMBEL, Samuel. *Štátník a národohospodár Milan Hodža: 1878 – 1944*. Bratislava : Veda, 2001.
- ČVANČARA, Jaroslav. *Heydrich*. Praha : Gallery, 2011.
- DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. *Obranj Božim Providinnjam. Žittepis prepodobnogo Oleksija Karpatoruskogo spovidnika*. Černivci : Místo 2013.
- DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. Protojerej Dimitrij Beljakov (27. 10. 1895 – 25. 8. 1967). In *Spovidniki ta podvižniki Pravoslavnoj cerkvi na Zakarpatje v 20 st*. Užgorod : Mukačivska Pravoslavná eparchija, 2011, s. 320 – 325.
- DEJMEK, Jindřich (ed.). *Jan Šeba. Paměti legionáře a diplomata*. Praha : Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2016.
- GORAZD. Z Podkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, roč. 2, č. 15, s. 94.
- GRABEC, Miroslav. *K istorii Marmarošského processa*. Užgorod : Tipografija Škoľnaja pomošč, 1934.
- Grđanički, Damaskin (Dragutin). In *Srpski biografski rečnik*, 5. Novi Sad : 2001, s. 795 – 796.
- CHADIMA, Karel. *Dr. Karel Farský. 1. patriarcha Církve československé (husitské)*. Hradec Králové : Královéhradecká diecéze Církve československé husitské, 2019.
- Instalace pravoslavného biskupa Damaskina. In *Lidové noviny*, 1931, roč. 39, č. 612, s. 3.
- JEDLINSKI, Radomir. *Gorazd, episkop českomoravski (1879 – 1942)*. Kragujevac : Kalenić, 1991.
- JINDRA, Martin. *Česká pravoslavná církev od Mnichova po obnovu v roce 1945*. Praha : Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů, 2015.
- K 20. výročí marmarošského procesu. In *Věstník české pravoslavné eparchie*, 1934, roč. 5, č. 3, s. 15.
- KADEŘÁVEK, Václav – TRTÍK, Zdeněk. *Život a víra ThDr. Karla Farského*. Praha : Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1982.
- LICHTEJ, Ihor M. Roľ T. G. Masaryka i H. Žatkovyča v urehľujuvanni deržavno-pravovoho statusu Pidkarpats'koji Rusi (1918 – 1919). In *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatkách novodobých dejín 1848 – 1918. Zborník venovaný prof. PhDr. Michalovi Danilákovii, CSc. k jeho 65. narodeninám*. Prešov : Universum, 1999, s. 300 – 308.
- MAREK, Pavel – BUREHA, Vladimír Viktorovič – DANILEC, Jurij Vasilovič. *Arcibiskup Sawatij (1880 – 1959). Nástin života i díla zakladatelské postavy pravoslavné církve v Československé republice*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2009.
- MAREK, Pavel. *Biskup Gorazd (Pavlík). Životní příběh hledání ideální církve pro 20. století*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2019.
- MAREK, Pavel. *Česká reformace 20. století? K zápasu Církve československé (husitské) o vizi moderního českého křesťanství v letech 1920 – 1924*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2016.
- MAREK, Pavel. *České schizma. Příspěvek k dějinám reformního hnutí katolického duchovenstva v letech 1917 – 1924*. Rosice u Brna : Gloria, 2000.
- MAREK, Pavel. K dějinám pravoslavné církve na Podkarpatské Rusi v letech 1918 – 1938. In *Acta historica Neosoliensia*, 2016, roč. 19, č. 2, s. 52 – 77.
- MAREK, Pavel. K problematice tzv. Sawatijova rozkolu v pravoslavné církvi v meziválečném Československu. In *Časopis Matice moravské*, 2020, roč. 139, č. 1, s. 129 – 148.

- MAREK, Pavel - LUPČO, Martin. *Nástin dějin pravoslavné církve v 19. a 20. století. Prolegomena k vývoji pravoslaví v českých zemích, na Slovensku a na Podkarpatské Rusi v letech 1860 - 1992*. Brno : Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2012.
- MAREK, Pavel. „Obtížný cizinec“. *Vladyka srbské pravoslavné církve Dositej (Vasić) a meziválečné Československo (1920 - 1939)*. Olomouc : Univerzita Palackého, 2020.
- MAREK, Pavel. *Pravoslavní v Československu v l. 1918 - 1942*. Brno : L. Marek, 2004.
- MAREK, Pavel. Protopresbyter Miloš Červinka a Podkarpatská Rus (1922 - 1930). In *Naukovi zapiski Bogoslovsko-istoričnogo naukovo-doslidnogo centru im. archimandrita Vasilija (Pronina)*. Užgorod : Karpati, 2020, No. 7, s. 412 - 418.
- MAREK, Pavel. Vladyka Gorazd (Pavlík) a Podkarpatská Rus. In *Naukovi zapiski Bogoslovsko-istoričnogo naukovo-doslidnogo centru imeni archimandrita Vasilija (Pronina)*. Ed. Jurij V. Danilec. Užgorod : Nauka, 2015, No. 4, s. 300 - 327.
- MAREK, Pavel. Z Kišíněva do Prahy. Podíl Vladimíra Gruzína na budování české pravoslavné eparchie v období první Československé republiky (1918 - 1938). In *Naukovi zapiski Bogoslovsko-istoričnogo naukovo-doslidnogo centru im. archimandrita Vasilija (Pronina)*. Užgorod : Karpati, 2019, No. 6, s. 192 - 226.
- MAREK, Pavel. Zápas o vlastnictví kostelů po vzniku Československa. In *Moderní dějiny*, 2015, roč. 23, č. 1, s. 89 - 126.
- MORÁVEK, Jan. Osobnost Grigorie Žatkoviče. In *Listy katedry historie a Historického klubu - pobočka Hradec Králové*, 1996, č. 10, s. 84 - 87.
- Náboženské poměry na Podkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, roč. 2, č. 6, s. 42.
- Otázka kostelů a jiné časové otázky církevně politické*. Olomouc : Diecézní rada Církve československé, 1922.
- PAVLÍK, Matěj. Církevní poměry v Podkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1921, roč. 1, č. 4, s. 14.
- Podkarpatská Rus. In *Za pravdou*, 1926, roč. 6, č. 15, s. 60.
- POKORNÝ, František (ed.). *Sborník Dra Karla Farského. Kniha vzpomínek, dojmů a úryvků z díla a života zakladatele církve československé*. Praha : Nakladatelské družstvo Církve československé, 1928.
- Pravoslavná církev. In *Ročenka Československé republiky*, 10. Praha : A. Hajn 1931, s. 228.
- Pravoslavní na Příkarpatské Rusi. In *Za pravdou*, 1922, roč. 2, č. 34, s. 210 - 211; č. 35, s. 216.
- PULEC, Miloš Josef. Svátý novomučedník Gorazd a české bohoslužby. In *Pravoslavný teologický zborník*. Prešov : Pravoslávna teologická fakulta, 2013, zv. 39 (24), s. 148 - 159.
- SAVA (VUKOVIĆ), episkop šumajjski. *Srpski jerarsi od devetog do dvadesetog veka*. Beograd - Podgorica - Kragujevac : Kalenij, 1996.
- ŠTEFÁNEK, Anton. Marmarošský proces a zahraničná politika našej monarchie. In *Prúdy. Revue mladého Slovenska*, 1914, roč. 5, č. 6, s. 241 - 244.
- ŠUBRTOVÁ, Alena. Osobní fond Antonín Hajn. In *Sborník archivních prací*. Praha : Archivní správa Ministerstva vnitra ČR, 1991, roč. 41, č. 1, s. 151 - 169.
- ŠUVARSKÝ, Jaroslav. *Biskup Gorazd*. Praha : Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1979.
- ŠVORC, Peter. *Zakletá zem. Podkarpatská Rus 1918 - 1946*. Praha : Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007.
- URBAN, Rudolf. *Die tschechoslowakische hussitische Kirche*. Marburg/Lahn : J. G. Herder-Institut, 1973.
- Vladyka raško-prizrenský Michail Šiljak zemřel. In *Za pravdou*, 1928, roč. 8, č. 34, s. 172.
- VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. O jurisdikcích pravoslavné církve, které působily na území Československa. In *Theologická revue Církve československé*, 2004, roč. 75, č. 3 - 4, s. 398 - 404.
- VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. *Pravoslavná církev v Československu v letech 1945 - 1951*. Brno : Nakladatelství 3K, 1998.
- VOPATRNÝ, Gorazd. Pravoslavná církev v protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1938 - 1945. In *Theologická revue Církve československé*, 2003, roč. 74, č. 3 - 4, s. 435 - 444.

## Internet

- <[https://zarubezhje.narod.ru/gi/i\\_096.htm](https://zarubezhje.narod.ru/gi/i_096.htm)> [8. 12. 2019].  
<<file:///C:/Users/ProBook/Documents/Irenej%20a%20Serafim.pdf>> [ 9. 7. 2020].  
<<https://drevo-info.ru/articles/17980.html>> [13. 7. 2020].  
<[file:///C:/Users/Marek/Downloads/Humensky%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Marek/Downloads/Humensky%20(1).pdf)> [8. 7. 2020].  
<<https://www.facebook.com/rusyn.sk/photos/pb.225681114296104.2207520000.1471677052./544814365716109/?type=3>> [15. 7. 2020].  
<[https://orthodoxwiki.org/Justin\\_Popovich](https://orthodoxwiki.org/Justin_Popovich)> [11. 7. 2020].  
<[https://www.google.cz/search?ei=TAuAWqKhH4\\_8kwWQirPwBA&q=Rudolf+Flieder+diplom+at&oq=Rudolf+Flieder+diplom+at&gs\\_l=psy-ab.3...6100.7939.0.8391.9.9.0.0.0.0.103.783.8j1.9.0...0...1c.1.64.psy-b..0.5.463...33i160k1.0.B2kn4MKrjdA](https://www.google.cz/search?ei=TAuAWqKhH4_8kwWQirPwBA&q=Rudolf+Flieder+diplom+at&oq=Rudolf+Flieder+diplom+at&gs_l=psy-ab.3...6100.7939.0.8391.9.9.0.0.0.0.103.783.8j1.9.0...0...1c.1.64.psy-b..0.5.463...33i160k1.0.B2kn4MKrjdA)> [15. 7. 2020].  
Společná česko-slovenská digitální parlamentní knihovna, Národní shromáždění RČS 1925-1929, Poslanecká sněmovna. Available online: <<https://www.psp.cz/eknih>> [20. 7. 2020].

## SUMMARY

### Subcarpathian Ruthenia in the Life and Work of Bishop Gorazd (Pavlík)

Matěj Pavlík (\*May 26, 1879 in Hrubá Vrbka, municipality Hodonín, † September 4, 1942, Prague-Kobylisy), in the Orthodox Church, as the Holy New Martyr and as Bishop Gorazd II, plays a significant role in the Czech national church and religious history of the first half of the 20th century. At the same time, this personality extends beyond the Czech borders. Pavlík is one of the Czech proselytes who went through three Churches at the beginning of the 20th century - Catholic, Czechoslovak and Orthodox. Stating that he went down significantly in history in each of them is not too much of an exaggeration. As an originally exemplary Catholic priest, after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic (1918) he joined the reform movement of the Catholic clergy seeking to make changes in the Church in the spirit of its nationalization and democratization. Here, he turned to the radical faction of clergy, which, under the leadership of the Pilsen catechist Karel Farský, prepared the founding of the Czechoslovak National Church (1920). However, he soon established himself as an opponent of theological modernism and became a leading figure in the movement seeking to accept the doctrine of the Eastern Churches. In 1924, he left the Czechoslovak Church and became a leading figure in the Orthodox movement in the Czech lands. From this moment until his tragic death in 1942, his interest lay in the Orthodox Church with the aim of establishing a Czech variant of Orthodoxy in the Czech environment under the patronage of the Serbian Orthodox Church and preparing for the establishment of an Autocephalous Church. He worked with the intention of detaching the Czech nation from Catholicism and incorporating it into the family of Slavic nations united by the idea of Eastern Christianity.

Although the focus of Bishop Gorazd comes under Moravia and the Czech lands in general, a significant part of his activities is connected with the territory of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, which, in the interwar period, formed an integral part of the first Czechoslovak Republic. It is a thematically and temporally closed phase, in which his involvement in the local Orthodox movement underwent three changes. In the period of the first half of the 1920s (1921 - 1925), in relation to the Subcarpathian Orthodox movement, he was more or less only an observer, a registrar and commentator of events in the press. In the second half of the 1920s, his role changed and in the years 1926 - 1931 he acted as an organizer, intervening in local

events. The third change his role took occurred after 1931, when the organizer became a mere spectator, with no possibility of influencing events directly or actively. He maintained this role until the disintegration of Czechoslovakia in 1938.

Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd came into closer contact with the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia around 1921. At that time, the first broader information about the Subcarpathian Orthodox movement, coming from his pen, began to appear on the pages of the Olomouc newspaper "*Za pravdou*" (For the Truth). An analysis of these articles shows that he not only sympathized with the movement but was aware of the problems the movement was facing. Gorazd's articles in the newspapers are mainly a critical appeal to the state administration, in which he called for interventions in church affairs in Subcarpathian Ruthenia and for support for the Orthodox movement. He considered it necessary to change the outdated Hungarian church legislation. The bishop saw the first governor of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Grigory Žatkovič (1886 – 1967), as a great obstacle to the consolidation of circumstances and the opening of space for emancipation and the development of Orthodoxy. Bishop Gorazd was very interested in the issue of the occupation and the return of the churches of the Greek Catholic Church, which was close to his heart. While in the Czech environment, he considered the optimal way out of the situation the coexistence of the Catholic and Czechoslovak Churches in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. He did not want to understand the rigorous position of the state administration insisting on the return of churches even in cases where no single member of the Greek Catholic Church remained, and all residents converted to Orthodoxy. He welcomed the government's decision to support the construction of new Orthodox cathedrals in Subcarpathian Ruthenia as a constructive step towards consolidating the situation.

A fundamental change in the relationship of Bishop Gorazd to the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia occurred after 1926, when, thanks to the intervention of Prague's Ministry of Education, he became an unofficial government representative for the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. To a limited extent, he had the opportunity to interfere in local religious affairs. In addition, he became the supervisor of the Serbian bishops administering the Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia as delegates to the Serbian Orthodox Church. At that time, he also definitively moved away from the Czechoslovak Church and took over the position of spiritual administrator of the Czech Orthodox Religious Community in Prague from the hands of Archbishop Sawatia (Vrabec). He moved the focus of his activities to Subcarpathian Ruthenia, developing there a fierce struggle for the exercise of jurisdiction between the Serbian and Constantinople patriarchates. The exponents of these Orthodox Churches were Bishop Gorazda and Archbishop Sawatij.

A concrete list of all Bishop Gorazd's interventions in building an Orthodox Church in Subcarpathian Ruthenia is unrealistic at this point. Therefore, we recall only two of his most important inputs, which significantly influenced the development of Orthodoxy in Subcarpathian Ruthenia. The first is his help in establishing the Orthodox Eparchy of Mukachevo (later Mukachevo-Prešov), founded in 1929. It consisted of methodological and financial intervention in religious communities, interventions in resolving the issue of churches and assistance in approving the constitution of the Orthodox eparchy. The second part of Gorazd's activities is related to the efforts to solve one of the key problems of the Church's existence, which we consider to be the financing of its activities, including the rehabilitation of the clergy's salaries. He succeeded in pushing for the Orthodox Church to be financed from the state budget from the beginning of the 1930s. Until then, its income had depended on optional state subsidies, on financial contributions provided by the Serbian Orthodox Church and, in the Czech lands, on money obtained by collecting a religious tax.

Although Bishop Gorazd's interventions in the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Ruthenia were undoubtedly productive, they ceased after 1931 and he remained in friendly

contact with the community. We see three reasons for the change in the scope and quality of his involvement. The first reason was the appointment of the first permanent Subcarpathian Orthodox bishop, the capable and independent Damaskin (Grdanički). In this situation, Gorazd's intervention was no longer necessary or desirable. Secondly, the state authorities reconsidered the concept of building a nationwide Orthodox Church, the creation of which Bishop Gorazd was to prepare. After the establishment of two eparchies in Czechoslovakia, he was to continue to focus only on building the Church in the Czech lands. The third reason was Gorazd's private decision to focus only on his eparchy due to misunderstandings with some members of the Sabor of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

prof. PhDr. PaedDr. Pavel Marek, Ph.D.; Palacký University Olomouc  
Faculty of Arts, Department of History  
CZ-779-00 Olomouc, Na Hradě 5  
e-mail: <pavel.marek@upol.cz>