

# Chapter 4. The Serbian Orthodox Church

***Bojan Aleksov***

There are two mutually related issues that require clarification when discussing the history of the Orthodox faith and church among the Serbs during the long nineteenth century. Firstly, although the Serbian Orthodox Church carries the legacy of the Patriarchate of Peć (1346–1463 in medieval Serbia and 1557–1766 in the Ottoman Empire), the Karlovci Metropolitanate (1691–1920 in the Habsburg Empire) and an independent archbishopric established in 1219, its name and present structure date back only to 1920. It was only after the First World War and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (Yugoslavia from 1929) that the Orthodox Serbs, previously living under six ecclesiastical authorities, united into a single patriarchate and their church took the name by which it is now commonly known. Although united in dogmatic matters, over the previous centuries, these ecclesiastical authorities had developed different practices and administrative systems. Importantly, while Serbs shared some beliefs and customs, local religiosity, morals, and values in the lives of individuals and communities greatly differed.

Secondly, the concept of a monolithic national character of the Orthodox Serbs and their common aspirations for the unification prior to the First World War (and even after it) disregards evidence and ignores the dialectic and dynamic nature of historical processes. Unfortunately, this is a feature of most history writing upon which this chapter is unavoidably based.<sup>i</sup> During the twentieth century the Serbian Orthodox Church came to be considered an inseparable and key part of a timeless and immutable Serbian national identity. When writing about the church, Serbian historiography tended to view church history as indistinguishable from national history, with both inevitably leading to national liberation and unification.<sup>ii</sup> Thus, national consciousness and unity are projected back onto the past of the church when other issues and interests prevailed. As a prominent Serbian clergyman and metropolitan commented regarding the concept of an overarching national principle as recently as the second half of the nineteenth century, “To speak about the national principle in interpreting church canons is sheer anachronism. The national principle only came into being in the middle of this century. The more we look into the past the harder it becomes to find any evidence of it. In the beginnings of our holy church there is no mention about it whatsoever.”<sup>iii</sup> Taking this tendency into account, this chapter evaluates the position of the Serbs and their church during the nineteenth century from a more nuanced perspective. Following a general introduction, it will provide a

separate account for each ecclesiastical authority and identify the main features and conflicts underlying their history preceding their abolition and amalgamation in one entity in 1920. The concluding section will identify some common developments across the lands inhabited by Serbs in the nineteenth century, which fermented the Serbian religious nationalism that was cemented in the interwar period.

The nineteenth century in Southeastern Europe began in turmoil due to Napoleonic wars and uprisings against the local Ottoman rulers. During previous centuries Serbs had spread across the western part of the Balkan Peninsula and crossed Sava and Danube into Habsburg central European lands. After two waves of Serbian migration led by church hierarchs (1690 and 1740) away from the Ottoman Empire, there were church structures in both empires. In the Ottoman lands the Sublime Porte nominated its own candidates for Peć (Serbian) patriarchs until 1766, when this patriarchate was abolished. Spiritual authority over the remaining Serbs in the Empire was transferred to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and the Phanariots were appointed to former Serbian eparchies (dioceses). The latter remained in notorious collective memory for their extortions from the flock, corruption and lack of contact with the lower clergy, which continued to be exclusively Serbian, uneducated, and unfamiliar with the tenets of Orthodoxy, let alone versed in pastoral care. The influence of the Orthodox spiritual center at Mount Athos waned as its Hilandar Monastery lost its Serbian character and ceased to be a place of learning for Serbian priests. Under these circumstances, the religion of Serbian peasant folk saw the blending of pre-Christian and Islamic traditions with those of Orthodoxy, a necessary and natural process in order to exercise autonomy and use religion to accommodate daily needs.<sup>iv</sup> Nevertheless, in comparison to other Balkan peoples, the Serbs were advantageous. There was the opportunity for Serbian priests or monks who wished to engage in learning to cross the Sava or Danube and join their brethren in Hungary, where there was an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which, for all but formal purposes, was Serbian. The Karlovci Metropolitanate of the Habsburg Empire in particular cherished the legacy of the abolished Peć Patriarchate. Despite imperial restrictions, the Karlovci Church provided a backbone for all future Orthodox ecclesiastical administrations for Serbs in neighboring lands and finally for the creation of the unified Serbian Orthodox Church. The Ottoman legacy, therefore, and especially the all-pervasive influence of the Habsburg domain, determined the history of the church among Serbs in the nineteenth century. The importance of the Habsburg influence also accounts for the order in which various administrations are presented below.

---

# Karlovcı Metropolitanate

The Orthodox Metropolitanate of Karlovci (1691/1713–1920) was initially the sole ecclesiastical organization of Orthodox Christians in the Habsburg Monarchy. However, by the nineteenth century its jurisdiction covered only historic Hungary and Croatia as other Habsburg lands acquired their own jurisdictions. Most Orthodox peoples settled in the Habsburg lands in fleeing the Ottoman invasion or some of the failed Habsburg military campaigns to defeat the Ottoman Empire.<sup>v</sup> The foundations of the metropolitanate were laid by the privileges gained from Emperor Leopold I in 1690, 1691 and 1695 following the greatest exodus of Orthodox Serbs from the Ottoman Empire.<sup>vi</sup> Leopoldian privileges defined the Serbian ethnic community along the lines of the Ottoman *Rum Millet* (i.e., in confessional terms), and with Orthodox hierarchs as its leaders.<sup>vii</sup> The metropolitan (the title of patriarch was reintroduced in 1848) was not only the head of the church but also acted as the leader of the whole Orthodox community and served as intermediary between his flock and the imperial government. Similarly, Orthodox bishops in their dioceses functioned as prefects over the Christian population. In return for their services, bishops and black clergy (monks), from which they were recruited, enjoyed the privileges of landed nobility.<sup>viii</sup> These privileges bound the clergy with a tiny stratum of Orthodox merchants, military officers and nobility, creating a confessional community in which the sacral and civil authorities were united and mutually reinforcing.<sup>ix</sup> Ethnicity played no role as the Leopoldian privileges were envisioned for the whole Orthodox confessional community. Yet almost all positions of high rank were occupied by the Serbs just as the Greeks dominated the Ecumenical patriarchate under Ottoman rule.<sup>x</sup> Not only were the Greek and Vlach communities of small urban merchants subjected in all matters to the Serbian hierarchs but also the Romanian Orthodox, which made up a majority of the population in Banat and Transylvania, and on the whole were as numerous as the Serbs in the Monarchy.<sup>xi</sup> Among Serbian settlers in the Monarchy, those in the Military Border (most of which lies in today's Croatia), the *Grenzer*, enjoyed a special patronage of the emperors and their military but not that of local notables or the Catholic Church. This prompted a centuries-long struggle of the Orthodox *Grenzer* for confirmation of their rights against attempts to bring them into a Union with the Catholic Church.<sup>xii</sup> The *Grenzer* were relieved from paying feudal dues, and were allowed a certain degree of autonomy and freedom of religion in return for their military services. Military interests were pivotal in restraining Habsburgs from fully supporting the Catholic Church's engagement in forcing the Orthodox into the Union. However, with the disappearance of the Ottoman threat in the nineteenth century, the services of the *Grenzer* became increasingly redundant until the whole institution of the Military Border was finally abolished in 1881.

Soon after their arrival in the Habsburg lands, the Serbian hierarchs established ties with Russia from where they imported teachers who brought with them a heavy Russian influence in theology, liturgical language, and chant, which were also indicative of their political leanings. Serbs obtained their first taste of higher education at the Kiev Academy, which was firmly in Orthodox ecclesiastical hands yet undergoing strong Western or Latin scholastic influence.<sup>xiii</sup> By the end of eighteenth century this influence was curtailed by counter-reformation and subsequent reforms by emperors Maria Theresa and Joseph II in the spirit of the Enlightenment.<sup>xiv</sup> The two imperial *Regulaments* of 1770 and 1777, and the explanatory *Rescript* of 1779, issued to pacify opposition to the first two, established the primacy of Habsburg emperors in Orthodox Church matters, requiring imperial approval and confirmation of all nominations, visitations, excommunications, and other actions performed by the church.<sup>xv</sup> In addition, the office of the Imperial Commissar was established, similar to that of the state's *Oberprocurator* in the Russian Church Synod. The new regulations also limited the bishop's power in dioceses by introducing the *Konsistorialsystem* (Catholic-style consistory), which required lay representation in church-governing bodies. Eventually, Theresian and Josephinian reforms not only strengthened imperial control over the Orthodox Church but also decreased its powers by reducing the number of monasteries, monks and religious feasts, and by clearly defining contributions for religious rites. At the same time the Karlovci Metropolitanate acquired a seminary and permission was granted for the first Serb newspaper to appear in Vienna.

These efforts frustrated most clergy but pleased the so-called enlighteners among the Serbs, personified by Dositej Obradović, who, after fleeing the Hopovo Monastery, became the chief proponent of Western education and rationalism.<sup>xvi</sup> The incipient secular intelligentsia deemed the church hierarchy backward, greedy, selfish, and duplicitous, accusing it of betraying its people and neglecting its basic mission.<sup>xvii</sup> Travelers' accounts and other surviving testimonies from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries indicate that the education level of the clergy and especially of monks was abysmally low. Nevertheless, boasting a relatively advantageous status over most of their ethnic neighbors thanks to Leopoldian privileges, in possession of a modest school system, political representation and closely linked to the nobility, the Karlovci hierarchy throughout the nineteenth century strove to preserve its status and resisted any change in culture, education, or social relations. A major dispute between the church and reformers erupted when Vuk Karadžić began advocating the use of Serbian vernacular into which he translated the New Testament and devised a new orthography. Karadžić's language and orthography reforms were taken as an attack on the existing Church Slavonic liturgical language and the standing of the church not only as the carrier of the eternal truth but also as the most powerful political and social institution of the Serbs and indeed their representative in the

Monarchy.<sup>xviii</sup> Karadžić's principal adversary was the longest-acting and most noteworthy metropolitan in the nineteenth century, Stefan Stratimirović (1790–1836). Brilliantly educated and in possession of the best library among Serbs at the time, Stratimirović was remembered as a strict, conservative, and authoritarian church leader. He maintained links with the leaders of anti-Ottoman uprising in Serbia, and provided some support for, but stood firm and dogmatic against, any reform attempts that might imperil the church's primacy and monopoly based on dated principles. Nevertheless, threats to the church's real and imagined prestige ensued one after another. Not just Stratimirović but the whole Karlovci hierarchy long refused to acknowledge ethnic distinctions among its flock, thereby discriminating against Romanian believers who in the nineteenth century comprised 40 percent of the Orthodox in Hungary and Transylvania. In 1868, after decades of struggle for the use of the Romanian language, Latin alphabet, and for the appointment of Romanian-born and speaking clerics, the Crown and Hungarian Parliament sanctioned the separation of the Romanian dioceses and the establishment of their own Metropolitanate in Sibiu, headed by Andrei Șaguna.<sup>xix</sup>

The struggle of the Romanians for their own church is illustrative of the magnitude of changes faced by the multiethnic Habsburg Empire at the dawn of the age of nationalism, the first outburst of which came in 1848, when Hungarians demanded democracy and self-rule in their half of the Empire. Without any guarantees that their positions would improve, Habsburg Serbs sided with the emperor in confronting the Hungarians. At their assembly in Sremski Karlovci in 1848, Metropolitan Josif Rajačić was elected Patriarch of the Serbs and as such shared political and military leadership during the one and a half years of bloody revolution and interethnic war.<sup>xx</sup> Following the Hungarian defeat, for his services to the throne, Rajačić was appointed administrator of the newly created Serbian Vojvodina albeit with insignificant powers. The Serbs did not get the autonomy they wanted and even the entity called Serbian Vojvodina would soon be abolished. The only rather symbolic benefit of these events was that the emperor confirmed the title of patriarch for Serbian metropolitans.

Invigorated after the Revolution of 1848/49, the Serbian secular intelligentsia began to openly question church domination. On the political level, it focused on the most important institution derived from the Leopoldian privileges, the Peoples' and Church Congress (*Narodno-crkveni sabor*), whose competencies and tasks were drastically reduced in the aforementioned reforms. From the 1860s onwards, a clash evolved regarding which principle the Serbian community should put forward in its struggle to strengthen its political representation and eventual autonomy: the principle of historic rights, as advocated by the church hierarchy and conservatives, or the modern principle of national sovereignty advocated by emerging nationalist liberals led by Svetozar Miletić.<sup>xxi</sup> The Conservatives were convinced that the social stability, security and rights of all Serbs depended on the church's position. They wanted to install more discipline and emancipate parishes

and schools from lay influence, and in these respects, invoked the holiness of the church, its unchangeable Orthodox tradition, and the inherited dignity of the hierarchy (apostolic succession). The Liberals and secular nationalists, on the other hand, claimed that the rights enjoyed by the Serbs had been heavily eroded by the church, and strove to turn the autonomous institutions and, indirectly, the church into instruments of modern politics and nationalism. Lay dominance can be traced from 1864, when the administration of parishes was reformed in accordance with the statute of Protestant churches in Austria. Having acquired a majority in the Peoples' and Church Congress, the Liberals almost fully surrendered administrative organization of Serbian autonomy and the church to elected lay representatives. Gradually the consistorial system of lay participation took hold and by the time the Serbian autonomy was finally abolished in 1912, laymen had a majority in all church bodies with the exception of the Holy Synod.

Serbian autonomy was finally legally regulated with the Hungarian Law of Nationalities in 1868 (Article 9).<sup>xxii</sup> Although the confirmation required by the Hungarian Parliament clearly reduced the competencies of the autonomy and the Congress that governed it to matters of confession and education, this status was still of extreme importance for a minority ethnic group in times of intensified magyarization. The Karlovci Metropolitanate boasted over seven hundred parishes with churches and other adjacent buildings and twenty-seven monasteries in its seven dioceses. Serbian autonomous institutions at the close of the century included 356 elementary schools, two high schools, four schools for teacher training, three high schools for girls, and one seminary.<sup>xxiii</sup> The Congress also managed the economic affairs of the Church and School Autonomy (*Crkveno-školska autonomija*), whose economic power was guaranteed by the church's large estates of over 130 thousand hectares and charity funds whose value was estimated in 1905 at over 40 million Hungarian forints.<sup>xxiv</sup>

However, during the Dualist period (after the 1867 reform that divided the governing of the monarchy into its Austrian and Hungarian lands), the role of the throne in Orthodox church affairs was replaced by the Hungarian government, which convened the Congress irregularly and usually ignored decisions taken by Serbian representatives instead inaugurating its own. From 1875 to 1908 the Hungarian government sanctioned only one decision of the Serbian Congress. In 1882, in flagrant violation of Congress regulations and Orthodox Church tradition, Emperor Franz Joseph I appointed his own candidate, German Anđelić as patriarch, although he had been heavily defeated in the Electoral Congress in successive ballots. Tight imperial and governmental control over the Karlovci Metropolitanate—as in the appointment of unpopular patriarchs—tended to discredit the hierarchy in the laity's eyes, further encouraging the rise of the anti-clerical Radical Party among Hungarian Serbs (a successor party to Miletić's Liberals).<sup>xxv</sup> It was a vicious circle whereby the conservatism of the church made its opponents more violently anticlerical, and the violent anticlericalism of its

opponents made the church more conservative. The two fractions engaged in protracted disputes within the Congress, which often paralyzed its functioning and contributed to the gradual diminishing of the prerogatives of the Serbian autonomy. The issues at stake were (a) the spiritual jurisdiction over Bosnia and Herzegovina after it was occupied by Austria-Hungary in 1878; (b) the control of great monastic estates after the number of monks drastically declined and estates fell into debt; and (c) the inability of the institutions of the Serbian Church autonomy to maintain Serbian schools, which were in disarray while enrolment oscillated at around only 25 percent.<sup>xxvi</sup> Other problems surfaced within the church alone. Pastoral care was mostly in the hands of white (or married) clergy, who increasingly found themselves in conflict with their superiors. The material position and lack of proper education among married priests weakened their authority and exacerbated their poor pastoral performance. Their sole monetary income (as was the case for priests in all other jurisdictions detailed below) was emoluments paid for rites such as baptism and marriage. At the same time, Karlovci patriarchs enjoyed exorbitant pensions and profited from huge landed estates such as Dalj, which, for example, under Patriarch Georgije Branković, was managed by his son-in-law.<sup>xxvii</sup>

The overall grim and deteriorating position of the Serbs in Hungary in the nineteenth century exacerbated the conflict between the church hierarchy, and Serbian secular elites and political parties. Toward the end of the century, Serbs made up only 5.5 percent of the population of Hungary inclusive of Croatia/Slavonia and only 2.5 percent of inhabitants in Hungary proper. Together with Romanians and the least numerous Ruthenians, they were over-represented among the rural and agrarian population. Over 80 percent of them were agricultural laborer peasants and 90 percent lived in villages. The few Serbian craftsmen were particularly affected by the advent of industrialization. Their traditional occupations as tanners, wax makers, coppersmiths and the makers of traditional fur and wool clothes and pig skin shoes were destined for extinction in comparison to modern trades usually practiced by German and Hungarian craftsmen. Similarly, the once-powerful, Serbian merchants lost their prestige in the course of the nineteenth century as trade required more investment, new trade roads opened, and bans were lifted allowing other peoples, especially the Jews, to engage in trade. All of these developments contributed to much harsher competition. Furthermore, together with Romanians and Ruthenians, Serbs made up the bulk of Empire's illiterate population. Serbs also showed the highest discrepancy between the percentages of literate men and women, which testifies to the heavily patriarchal character of the Serbian community. The Serbian bourgeoisie and intelligentsia was accordingly the most under-represented among all ethnic elites in the Monarchy.<sup>xxviii</sup> Serbs barely reached one percent of students from Hungary attending foreign universities.<sup>xxix</sup> Needless to say, all of the above

factors—increasing competition, weak elites, land shortage, and lack of job outlets—forced many Serbs to emigrate overseas.<sup>xxx</sup>

Analyzing the origins of the crisis, several contemporary observers blame the Karlovci hierarchy and stress it was thoroughly alienated and removed from the vast majority of simple folk.<sup>xxxii</sup> At the same time, being most exposed to outside influences of all lands inhabited by the Serbs, those in the Karlovci Metropolitanate also experienced the most profound transformations of old traditions and institutions, family and kin ties, and underlying religious and moral norms. It is unsurprising that their political elites were the most vocal in demands for reform of the church. Miletić tried to reconcile the liberal demands for democratization of church administration with the Orthodox tradition, claiming for laymen the same rights as those enjoyed by the rulers of Orthodox Empires such as Byzantium or Russia, where the Tsars still governed the church.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Besides demand for the laity's control of church affairs, the reformers sought to make the church more "popular" by making the liturgy more comprehensible and attractive, and by addressing the main social questions of the period. Only enlightenment and education, Miletić and his followers believed, combined with the Orthodox faith, would raise the spirit of the nation and place Serbs on equal terms with their neighbors and competitors. Liberals and Radicals accused the hierarchy of all church irregularities and conflicts with lower clergy, blaming it for driving out people from the church because of its insistence on controlling Church and School Autonomy finances.<sup>xxxiii</sup> The pro-government stance of the Karlovci leadership was especially targeted. Bishop Gavriilo Zmejanović of Vršac, elected with pressure by the Hungarian government and aspiring to become a patriarch, was reported, for example, as fully participating in magyarization policies, ordering clergy not only to vote but even campaign for Hungarian candidates, suppressing and deposing nationalist priests, teachers and other officials, and duly placing Serbian schools under the full control of local Hungarian authorities.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Yet the final alarm for the hierarchy and clergy was not sounded by the Liberals or Radicals but by the conversion of many Serbs to neo-Protestant Nazarenes, signaling that the Orthodox Church was losing its last dominion—the spiritual realm.<sup>xxxv</sup> The "Nazarene disease," as it was often described, provided the final push for the church's belated but vehement adoption of nationalism. For a long time the hierarchy ignored the new "threat," supplying the Liberals with yet another argument in their anticlericalism.<sup>xxxvi</sup> But by the end of the century some prominent clerics began to use the Nazarenes to promote an agenda, which consisted of the rejection of liberal reforms and the vision of a Serbian nation united and strengthened only through its bond with the Orthodox faith. The reaction to the Nazarene renegades blended with a mythologized narrative of forced conversions in the past to create the exclusive confessional nationalism of the Serbs. The traditional anti-Catholic theological discourse of the Orthodox Church was revived into concrete anguish. Serbian history in the monarchy was



portrayed as nothing more than constant suffering for Serbian nationality and Orthodox faith evident in earlier resistance to the Union. Furthermore, the conversion-threat discourse provided a unique weapon to emphasize and exaggerate the authority and role of the Orthodox Church as the institution of the defense and preservation of a people and their identity from all possible dangers such as secularization or marginalization. Finally, with the appearance of the grassroots lay religious movement later known as *Bogomoljci*, the Serbian clergy found an audience ready to listen and a chance to influence its community.<sup>xxxvii</sup> While many priests rejected the *Bogomoljci* from the outset, others tried to channel their religious zeal by applying a set of strategies already used by other churches that were similarly trying to prevent their believers from falling away to other confessions or religious indifference.

As a reaction or in opposition to the appearance and mass spread of the Nazarenes and the Nazarene-inspired *Bogomoljci* movement, the Serbian Church appropriated, adapted, and particularized some of the very strategies of the Protestant and Catholic Churches and forms of piety from folk religion, that it had opposed for a long time. Patriarch Georgije Branković (1890–1907) undertook several important measures to reform the economy and administration of numerous monasteries in Karlovci Metropolitanate as well as to improve the educational level of monks by opening up a monastic school.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Order was established in the rather unruly Karlovci Seminary, administration of parishes and eparchies improved, church statistics, press and publishing flourished, and improvements were noticeable in pastoral care.<sup>xxxix</sup> In 1912, with the approval of the Karlovci hierarchy under Patriarch Lukijan Bogdanović, the Hungarian government abolished the Serbian Church and School Autonomy, depriving laymen of any influence. Nevertheless, the Habsburg legacy of self-government and modernization of the Karlovci Metropolitanate in the decades before the autonomy was abolished distinguished this church, its priests and faithful from their brethren in other Serbian regions for a very long time.

---

## Dalmatia

While an Orthodox presence in Dalmatia dates back to medieval times, most Orthodox people settled in the Dalmatian hinterland in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, in some areas even forming the majority of the population over the Catholics.<sup>xl</sup> Following the Treaty of Karlovac (1699) and of Požarevac (1718), all of Dalmatia fell under the rule of the Venetian Republic. Strictly Catholic, *la Serenissima* did not envisage confessional arrangements similar to those of the Ottoman and Habsburg Empire. Serbs and other Orthodox were duly placed under the administration of the Archbishopric of Philadelphia, which was a Greek diocese in union with the Catholic Church. Not allowed to have their own

hierarchs, Serbian candidates for priests usually went across the border to be consecrated by bishops in the Ottoman or Habsburg lands. Even bishops were occasionally appointed by neighboring Serbian hierarchs but soon after their return were expelled by the Venetian authorities. Only in 1780, Venice proclaimed religious tolerance and allowed the Serbian Orthodox to have a vicar. Little changed during the first Habsburg possession of Dalmatia (1787–1805) and only the French occupation (1805–1814) brought full recognition of the Orthodox Christians. In 1810, by Napoleonic decree, Venijamin Kraljević, a Phanariot bishop who escaped from Bosnia, was appointed the first bishop for the Orthodox Serbs of Dalmatia.

The isolation, religious discrimination, and lack of proper ecclesiastical organization reduced the church life of Dalmatian Serbs to basics. Gerasim Zelić, who was first appointed vicar by the Venetians and then served under the Austrians and French, described a dire lack of priests, schools, church books, and records.<sup>xli</sup> In the Montenegrin littoral, Zelić testifies, no priest would leave home without arms. To make matters worse, under Austrian rule the threat of the Union reappeared. Reports conflict upon whether bishop Kraljević himself accepted the Union. In any case four Uniate teachers were brought from Galicia to open a seminary in Šibenik, which provoked an uproar among the people, led by vicar Zelić. Metropolitan Stratimirović intervened with the emperor personally but to no avail. One of the teachers was killed in the uproar, probably plotted in Krka Monastery, for which they were duly sentenced and soon Kraljević withdrew to Venice.

The situation settled down after 1828 as the Dalmatian diocese was joined to the Karlovci Metropolitanate and Josif Rajačić was appointed bishop (1829–1834). Nevertheless, problems abided as occasionally a priest would join the Union and drag some parishioners along, usually after a conflict with bishops. Bishops were also removed every so often by the authorities. For some time, there were no consistories or other diocesan and parish bodies. It was only under bishops Stefan Knežević (1853–1890) and Nikodim Milaš (1890–1910)<sup>xlii</sup> that the necessary administrative organization was established along the Karlovci model. These two bishops nourished close contact with Belgrade Metropolitan Mihailo, who spearheaded Serbian irredentism abroad, and vociferously engaged in Dalmatian politics.<sup>xliii</sup> During this period cooperation between Serbs and Croats was replaced by exclusivism and chauvinism. First in Dalmatia and later in Croatia, clergy on both sides actively took part in partisan and nationalist squabbles that seriously undermined the position of South Slavs vis-à-vis Austrian and Hungarian authorities in Vienna and Budapest.

Following the reorganization of the Monarchy in 1873, Dalmatia was extracted from the jurisdiction of the Karlovci Metropolitanate and together with the bishopric of Boka-Kotorska (established in 1870 for the Austrian-controlled Montenegrin littoral) placed alongside Bukovina (inhabited by Orthodox

Romanians and Ruthenians) in a rather artificial Bukovina-Dalmatia Metropolitanate. Responsible for the Orthodox in the Austrian half of Austria-Hungary, this ecclesiastical administration merged the opposite borderlands of the Empire, whose bishops had to communicate via interpreters. However, there were tangible benefits for a small church administration. In Dalmatia, the lack of priests was slowly overcome so that by the end of the century around 80 priests cared for around 115,000 Orthodox in 106 parishes. In addition, there were 35 monks in three monasteries in Dalmatia and eight in the Montenegrin Littoral. As elsewhere, the church in Dalmatia was not immune to fraudulence, corruption, and even dramatic scandals. The suicide of Dositej Jović, Bishop of Boka-Kotorska, in 1910 was explained by his manipulation of the Serbian autonomous church and school funds. The public accused the Bishop of Zadar, Nikodim Milaš, of the same and he retired.<sup>xliv</sup> These and other conflicts notwithstanding, the jubilant celebrations in Dalmatia after Serbian victories in the Balkan wars anticipated big changes on the horizon. While centuries of separation left the Orthodox Church in the littoral considerably poor, the long repression as well as recent radicalism of its leaders, made its faithful nationally conscious and eager to unify with their Serbian brethren in Serbia and elsewhere.

---

## Bosnia and Herzegovina

The late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, marked by the decay of the Ottoman Empire and the rule of Phanariot bishops in Bosnia, is considered in some contemporary reports and later historiography as a gloomy period for the Orthodox Church with the Phanariots faring worse than the “Turks.”<sup>xlv</sup> As in Serbia and other lands in the Balkans under the Ottomans, most Christians in Bosnia lived in remote rural areas in patriarchal communities with all but a very rudimentary knowledge of their faith. Over centuries their religious practice had acquired many syncretic features under the influence of Islam.<sup>xlvi</sup> Monastic life had almost died out and almost no new churches were built until the mid-nineteenth century when Tanzimat reforms awoke hopes among the Orthodox for equality. At the same time, some Orthodox communities in towns such as Sarajevo or Mostar saw their economic power increase due to trade links with Orthodox merchants in the Habsburg Empire and beyond. Their prosperity and self-confidence translated into a vivid church life of urban parishes and the almost independent administration of these communities. From the 1850s, there were more consistent efforts to open Orthodox schools and in 1866 the first if short-lived Orthodox seminary opened its doors. When the Ottoman reform era finally reached Bosnia, Sultan Abdul Aziz and his vizier, Mehmed Asim Pasha, even helped financially with the construction of monumental Orthodox churches in Sarajevo and Mostar. The process whereby Christians were awarded new rights was anything but

smooth as evident in the incident when the installation of church bells provoked the public outcry of local Muslims whom the Ottoman authorities forcibly had to put under control. At the same time, the movement for an autocephalous Bulgarian Church also influenced Bosnian Serbs to protest themselves against docile Greek bishops accused of amassing personal wealth and neglecting their flock.

The most direct and powerful impetus for the Bosnian Orthodox came from neighboring Serbia, where a series of uprisings against the Ottoman lords took place in the early nineteenth century. The attempt to spread the revolt over the river Drina to Bosnia failed, but the autonomy achieved in Serbia never ceased to radiate over Ottoman-held Bosnia. Liberation seemed to be within easy reach and revolts of Orthodox Christians flared occasionally, often headed by rather destitute village priests. Some clergymen, after attending schools in Serbia or the Habsburg Monarchy, returned to Bosnia and began to set up schools, disseminate books and spread the idea of Serbian national unification. The most noteworthy of them was archimandrite Vaso Pelagić, who was behind the first seminary in Banja Luka. He was not only remembered for his nationalist fury but also for very liberal ideas and a drive to enlighten Bosnian Serb peasants. The Ottoman authorities soon had him arrested and exiled to Asia Minor.<sup>xlvii</sup> Despite moves toward religious equality, the discontent of the mostly landless peasant Christian population in Bosnia continued unabated. The Herzegovina rebellion of 1875 eventually triggered an all-out war against the Ottoman Empire throughout the Balkans and unleashed the better-known Eastern Question crisis (1875–1878), which resulted in the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbs initially opposed the occupation and, together with Muslims, fought the new conquerors but soon succumbed to the force of the mighty Empire.

Despite its Catholic bias, the new Christian rule in Bosnia brought great improvements for the Orthodox. One of the most pressing issues for the Habsburg rulers was how to structure and administratively organize and control the Orthodox Church and especially the increasingly nationally conscious and active urban religious communities.<sup>xlviii</sup> There were several options available, none of which foresaw granting the Orthodox self-governance in church affairs or allowing any connection with the church organization of their Serbian brethren in neighboring Serbia and Montenegro. The most logical and historically justifiable option was to join the Bosnia Metropolitanate to the existing Orthodox Church in the Monarchy, that is, the Karlovci Metropolitanate. This was also politically opportune since the emperor and the Hungarian government had full control over its hierarchy. Jointly they blocked all of the actions taken by the Serbian Church and People's assembly, which was, as noted above, dominated throughout this period by nationalist laymen and lower clergy. Indeed, the initial strategy of the Austro-Hungarians was to transfer the Bosnian Orthodox Serbs to Karlovci. Warmly welcomed by the Karlovci hierarchy, the transfer was fiercely rejected by the Serbian nationalists who understood it as the subjugation of Serbian interests.

For them the integration of the Orthodox Church in Bosnia into the Karlovci Metropolitanate equaled ceding the fate of Bosnia to the Habsburg Monarchy. Nationalists believed Serbian interests would be better defended by a degree of independence for the Orthodox Church in Bosnia or a continuous link with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, both of which would leave the option of eventual unification of Bosnia with Serbia.

Unification did eventually take place but with a different outcome whereby Habsburg interests and primacy in church matters were secured. As already noted in connection with the Karlovci Metropolitanate, Austro-Hungarian administration in Bosnia strove to dissuade nascent Serbian nationalism by attaining the loyalty of the church leadership and fostering confessional adherence.<sup>xlix</sup> This policy is well personified by Béni von Kállay, the Habsburg governor of Bosnia for almost a quarter of a century. The cornerstone of his confessional politics was the Convention with the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1880, which awarded Vienna the right to appoint and remove religious hierarchs and to have full legal and financial authority over them.<sup>l</sup> In this case the *raison d'état* was more influential than respect for canonicity, in that, the Habsburg Monarch, who was by definition Catholic, obtained the right to appoint Orthodox Metropolitans, who the patriarch in Constantinople only confirmed. The convention with the Ecumenical Patriarchate (then under Patriarch Joachim III) was attained by the regular greasing of palms, as Robin Okey euphemistically put it, while Austro-Hungarian support for the patriarchate's authority over Christians in the Ottoman Empire against Russian, Bulgarian, Romanian and Serbian pretensions also featured prominently in strictly confident negotiations in Constantinople.<sup>li</sup>

Once obtained, the emperor made ample use of his right to decide on church heads or metropolitans in Bosnia. Apart from the first short-lived metropolitan, Emperor Franz Joseph I selected bishops from among the loyal clergy of Hungary and Croatia. Most members of the Orthodox Consistorial or the church's governing body were also imported. They in turn had the authority to appoint, move or punish lower clergy and deal with most day to day affairs. In addition, the government assumed the right to certify priests and teachers in Orthodox schools, against the previous autonomous practices of urban church communities acknowledged by the Statute of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1862. The authorities made every effort to make churches part of the state apparatus, providing salaries to bishops and awards to loyal priests and teachers. In order to prevent irregularities, the arbitrary Phanariot tax was replaced by regular taxation, which was fairer but made bishops directly and completely dependent on the state. At the same time, the idea of the occupational authorities was not only to govern religious institutions but also to make them functioning and sustainable in line with its enlightened Absolutism. Once loyalty was achieved, religious institutions were supported and flourished. According to the first census conducted by the new rulers, out of 268 Orthodox parishes many were without a church building

although there were as many as 265 priests and eleven monks, a solid number for Bosnia's 352,664 Orthodox Christians. During Austro-Hungarian rule 236 new churches were built and 91 churches and monasteries reconstructed. In addition, a permanent seminary opened, schools and social life were organized, and from 1887 the metropolitanate had its own press.

Nevertheless, the construction boom and overall development in this period of the Orthodox Church could not dissuade the widespread perception of Catholic domination, which was evident in the mass colonization and employment of Catholics from the rest of the Monarchy and over-proportional state funding for the Catholic Church. Furthermore, only a couple of years after being appointed, the first Orthodox Metropolitan Sava Kosanović was forced to resign when he denounced what he perceived as Catholic proselytism and entered into an open conflict with the Catholic Archbishop Josip Stadler. The reaction of Serbs was immediately translated into the existing matrix of anti-Catholicism, which was already at work in the Karlovci Metropolitanate and Dalmatia and which had been cultivated among the Orthodox at least since the early seventeenth century after often violent attempts of the Roman Curia and Habsburg or Venetian authorities to force them into the Union with the Catholic Church.<sup>lii</sup> Worrying signs were not hard to find. In 1894, Pope Leo XIII named Stadler the Apostolic Commissar for fostering the Union in the Balkans and Stadler launched a journal devoted to the issue, appropriately named *Balkan*.

Furthermore, frequent intervention from above caused suspicion among both Orthodox and Muslims, who feared the omnipresent state control despite statistically noticeable benefits for religious life. Von Kállay's authoritarian paternalism reflected the Josephinist legacy in which Habsburg power made its impact personally rather than through bureaucratic forms. Holding back on reforms, using school stipends as political weapons, limiting expenses for schooling, preserving elementary confessional schools and fostering only higher and technical schools, as Okey demonstrates, aggravated the standing of the Monarchy and doubtlessly nurtured radical and nationalist opposition especially among the Bosnian youth.<sup>liii</sup> Even the distinct dress code for various confessions inherited from the Ottomans went unchanged throughout the period of Habsburg rule, evidence that confessionalism remained the main tool of social genetics in comparison to half-heartedly introduced modernization. More than anything else, the appointment of docile bishops resulted in rising dissatisfaction among the Orthodox Serbs.

Less than two decades into the occupation, the largest Orthodox urban communities launched a movement for autonomy and began handing out petitions and sending delegations to Vienna. They demanded (a) the right to an assembly without the presence of the authorities; (b) the right to choose their priests and teachers and gain a voice in electing metropolitans; (c) the freedom to manage their funds; and (d) national and cultural rights such as the free use of the national

name and the Cyrillic alphabet and the right to establish reading halls, choirs, and other associations. Throughout their struggle the Serbs insisted on their connection with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and on maintaining a link with the Ottoman Empire, hoping that this would prevent annexation and ease their position vis-à-vis the Roman Catholics. In their second memorandum written in 1898, they sought a model of autonomy that foresaw that (a) bishops would be elected by assemblies of priests and laymen and confirmed by the Ecumenical Patriarch claiming the same rights that they enjoyed during the Peć patriarchate; (b) church communities would be in charge of salaries for priests and bishops; (c) priests would maintain church courts and be autonomous in many church issues; (d) church communities would elect priests, which were then confirmed by bishops (metropolitans); and (e) the Orthodox Church in Bosnia would remain part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The patriarch, however, rejected this proposal as uncanonical and advised that civic leaders reconcile and find an acceptable solution together with metropolitans. The solution was not reached. Instead members of Serbian urban church communities began a boycott of church services in Sarajevo, Mostar, Livno, and other towns. Thousands refrained from confession and the Eucharist, the baptism of children, and even funerals accompanied by priests, from 1896 until 1905. In Mostar alone, in the course of seven years, there were 438 burials without a church ceremony.<sup>liv</sup>

After its protracted refusal, in 1905, the Austro-Hungarian government finally accepted most of the demands and Emperor Franz Joseph I issued the act of Serbian Church autonomy in Bosnia. Church communities were to be governed by assemblies made up of all men of age. They would elect the school and church governing councils, priests and their deputies for diocesan councils and courts. Autonomy was financed by a 10 percent tax that the state collected from all Orthodox Serbs in addition to state support for schools, churches, and priests. The Serbian Orthodox name was reinstated for all communities, courts, and councils. Church communities were also able to maintain a direct link with the patriarchate. Nevertheless, while the new constitution envisaged the right of communities to elect their priests, it stopped short of the right to elect bishops. The emperor continued to use his privilege to choose loyalists as Orthodox hierarchs to the dismay of the people. When, in 1912, Serbian members of the newly established Bosnian assembly condemned in a statement Austro-Hungarian diplomatic reactions to Serbian successes in the First Balkan War, the Sarajevo Metropolitan Evgenije Letica was the only one to abstain. Some years later, after the First World War was over and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was created out of the ruins of the Habsburg Monarchy, some of the Habsburg Serb bishops had to resign and hand over their seats to more nationally aware hierarchs in the newly unified Serbian Orthodox Church. Yet national independence and unification of all Serbs into one church organization in the Yugoslav Kingdom also meant the abolition of church autonomy in Bosnia, which maintained hundreds of parishes, 120 primary

schools, and two high schools for girls in Mostar and Sarajevo, an active press, and a plethora of cultural associations. Another paradox was that in their own country the Serbs lost their long-fought right to elect their own priests.

---

## Serbia

The modern history of Serbia begins with two uprisings in the early nineteenth century (1804–1812 and 1815) that paved the way, first, for its autonomous status within the Ottoman Empire, and then, in 1878, for internationally recognized independence. The rebellion was famously led by mostly illiterate pig merchants, village chieftains, and priests, the only elite in rural Serbia.<sup>lv</sup> At first it was hardly more than one in a series of revolts against unruly Ottoman regional lords. Over the years, the close proximity of more nationally conscious Serbs in the Habsburg Empire just across rivers Sava and Danube, and the Napoleonic turmoil in Europe, contributed to the gradual transformation of the uprising into a national liberation struggle. Fervent enemies Karlovci Metropolitan Stratimirović and enlightener Dositej Obradović settled their differences over the need to help their brethren across the rivers. Eventually Dositej Obradović went to Belgrade where he established the first school and became advisor to the leader of the uprising, Karađorđe Petrović, who then appointed him the first Serbian education minister.<sup>lvi</sup>

Post-Ottoman Serbia was in desperate need of assistance and so was its church. After the Great Migration (1690), the educated clergy almost wholly disappeared from Serbia. The people and lower clergy had hardly any connection to the Phanariot who were usually remembered for wealth-squandering and debt-making.<sup>lvii</sup> During most of the eighteenth century, monasteries were the only centers of basic learning, and monks served as the chief spiritual care-takers. But monasteries were few and monks were often absent, out collecting alms. Vuk Karadžić left a famous description of the poor state of monastic schools in Serbia in which pupils forgot in summer what they had learnt in winter being forced to mind the livestock of often illiterate and greedy monks.<sup>lviii</sup> However, Karadžić also pointed out the enormous social importance monasteries played in the life of village flock and described the gatherings in and around monasteries on Sundays and holidays as major social and economic events. A well-disposed Habsburg Serb observer noted that the patriarchal life of the villagers seemed to have no real connection to the churches except for their role as gathering places and fairgrounds on their patron saint day.<sup>lix</sup> Karadžić's recording and description of Serbian customs and religion found an echo in Leopold Ranke's seminal *History of Servia and Servian Revolution*.<sup>lx</sup> Ranke was astonished that the village *kneses* (heads) were obliged to keep the churches in good repair and enjoyed the prescriptive right of nominating, from among the monks, the *hegoumens*



(abbots)—a privilege without any precedent in the Christian world. Furthermore, Ranke promoted the view of the solid national character of the Serbian Church, determined by the founding of numerous monasteries by Serbian medieval kings, almost all of whom were canonized and venerated by the church. Notwithstanding its firm medieval foundation, some memory of which was preserved in liturgical texts and the celebration of saints, the position of the church changed dramatically during the centuries of the Ottoman rule. After the imposition of Phanariot bishops, the church leadership lost its relevance for the people. Indeed, the hierarchy of the church played a rather minor role in the uprising. On the other hand, many lower Serbian clergy took an active role and fought together with insurgents. One of them, Father Matija Nenadović, achieved the high status of the president of the first provisional government and led negotiations with the Porte. His memoirs provide testimony both of the uprising and of the church in Serbia at the time.<sup>lxi</sup> In the nascent Serbian state ruled by Prince Miloš Obrenović, the leader of the Second Uprising, the Phanariot leadership was insignificant in his efforts to establish public law, state structures and order, education and culture.<sup>lxii</sup> The aspirations of bishops, if they were expressed, were castigated by Prince Miloš who did not refrain from slaying priests and even bishops and subjecting the church and clergy to his will.<sup>lxiii</sup>

In the Habsburg Empire at that time, the Serb national consciousness was already fostered by mostly secular activists and intellectuals. There were Serbian presses in Vienna and Budapest, cultural societies, and a growing Serbian literature and historiography. Prince Miloš Obrenović, who eliminated the previous leader Karađorđe, shared his example of establishing close ties with more advanced brethren in Habsburg lands, the so-called Prečani, many of whom he imported to Serbia. When the prince finally managed to acquire autonomy for the Belgrade Metropolitanate from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1831, he also assumed the right to select bishops who were then only confirmed by Constantinople. In order to serbianize the Orthodox Church, Prince Miloš got rid of Phanariot bishops and, after the short tenure of local Melentije Pavlović, brought in Metropolitan Peter Jovanović from Hungary.<sup>lxiv</sup> Furthermore, the establishment of a state-sponsored, independent Serbian Church reaffirmed the substitution of Greek by Old Slavonic as the liturgical language, thereby facilitating the redeployment of Orthodoxy as an integral part of Serbian identity. During the rule of Prince Miloš, the practice of state interference in church affairs and the primacy of state interests over canonical principles were firmly established and would remain in place in Serbia until the end of the period observed.<sup>lxv</sup> The Belgrade Metropolitanate's role was to organize and regulate the life of the people and the church according to the demands of Serbia's rulers or later ruling parties. Implementing their tasks, the metropolitans and consistory also closely emanated Karlovci Metropolitanate policies. Yet unlike its counterpart in the Habsburg Monarchy, the Belgrade Metropolitanate acquired a state-church status in what

was becoming an overwhelmingly Serbian and Orthodox country, adding further weight to its role. Surveying the orders of the church authorities, which are preserved for the whole century, it is worth mentioning that the greatest number refers to secular affairs, the most numerous being the imposition of compulsory vaccinations.<sup>lxvi</sup> They are followed by those outlining wedding or burial regulations, providing lists of recruits, maintaining financial records, and reminding state servants to attend church services regularly. Other orders included those banning priests from visiting inns “without particular necessity”; explaining how to make the sign of the cross; and preaching against the use of bad language or weapons at church feasts. Besides administrative regulation, there was a serious need to eradicate the numerous irregularities in religious practice and to achieve uniformity in the church’s liturgical and religious outlook. Finally, a considerable number of orders from “higher places” demanded loyalty to and veneration of the royal family, proscribed celebrations of national victories, or, in other ways, tried to instill national consciousness. The measures undertaken were far-reaching and inevitably impacted on education, mores, and the rise of patriotism and loyalty toward the new nation-state.

Urban settlements, previously mostly inhabited by Turks, were serbianized, with Belgrade being the most important. Besides Serbs, many Slavs, Vlachs, and others migrated from the Ottoman and Habsburg territories to Serbia, which was perceived as free and victorious. The tiny educated elite, heavily dominated by Prečani, strove to transform the small state into the Serbian homeland and later the South Slav Piedmont. Once Serbia gained autonomy, Serbian rulers and elites immediately turned to building churches, which was seen as an expression of national activism in the Serbian medieval tradition.<sup>lxvii</sup> During the early days of this sacral construction boom, Karlovci models were replicated. In the eighteenth century, the architecture and painting of these churches abandoned the traditional Byzantine style and leaned toward contemporary European or more precisely Central European artistic trends found in the Habsburg Monarchy.<sup>lxviii</sup> The Cathedral of Belgrade, built in 1841, with its neoclassical style façades and a Baroque bell-tower, became the chief achievement and symbol of this new architectural style. Gradually, Central European views and customs were imposed even upon the traditional burial and death commemoration culture.<sup>lxix</sup> After a couple of decades, however, the search began for a genuine Serbian style, or for what were believed to be the expressions of the Serbian spirit, sought in artistic styles cherished by the Orthodox Church in its “golden” medieval times.<sup>lxx</sup>

Nevertheless, the radical transformation of a backward rural country into a modern nation-state proved extremely difficult if not entirely elusive. Whereas in 1846 one priest was in custody of 1,102 people, the number increased by 1874 to more than 1,600, making some of the above tasks delegated to priests unattainable. While the state and Metropolitan Petar Jovanović had already laid the ground for the seminary in 1836, due to lack of funds and cadre, it provided little in terms of a

theological education, which was initially to last only one year and was later extended to three. Unsurprisingly, Serbian students who went abroad to study, for example in Halki near Constantinople, could not match their peers and often gave up.<sup>lxxi</sup> For most village priests monasteries remained the only place of learning throughout the century.

The gradual emancipation of the church in Serbia from the Karlovci Metropolitanate became evident when Metropolitan Petar Jovanović was forced to retire and was succeeded by Serbian-born Mihailo Jovanović. One of the first Serbs from the principality to have studied in Russia, Belgrade Metropolitan Mihailo, elected in 1859, was remembered as a tireless national and political activist but a rather weak church administrator.<sup>lxxii</sup> Already in 1862, Metropolitan Mihailo proscribed uniform rules on how to celebrate *Slava* (the Family Patron Saint Day) in a series of attempts to establish *Slava* as the key distinguishing element of Serbian Orthodox identity, which included a journal under the same name later launched in Niš.<sup>lxxiii</sup> Furthermore, under Mihailo, the Belgrade Metropolitanate embarked on the introduction of new cults and the veneration and celebration of Serbian saints, most notably Saint Sava. Ever since his death in the thirteenth century, the founder of the Serbian medieval autocephalous church, Prince Rastko Nemanjić or Saint Sava, was celebrated in the church and among the people. The cult of Saint Sava, as we know it today, began to emerge only at the beginning of the nineteenth century, parallel to the liberation struggles of the Serbs, when, according to one church historian, it assumed its new role to “nourish national pride and flame the patriotism and readiness for sacrifice.”<sup>lxxiv</sup> Over the course of the century, first among Serbs in Hungary and then in Serbia, secular content intermingled with religious celebration and national romanticism shifted the focus from ecclesiastical and religious rites to Enlightenment ideas, the glorification of the medieval past and resistance to foreign culture and oppression. The feast of Saint Sava left the churches where it originated to become a national school holiday, a celebration of the Serbian language and a plea for the unification and liberation of Serbs from foreign domination. The cult was continuously enriched with new content as Saint Sava’s preserved hagiographies were unearthed and reinterpreted. After Arsenije Teodorović, in 1807, depicted Saint Sava reconciling his two brothers over their father’s relics, Saint Sava’s role as unifier became the single most exploited image in the narrative surrounding the cult.<sup>lxxv</sup> National romantic painters first introduced what would later become the much-exploited, figurative representations of the burning of Saint Sava’s relics by the Turks, thereby emphasizing Serbian victimhood. The hymn to Saint Sava, the verses of which stress Serbian unity and renewal, was initially sung in Serbian schools in Hungary, and by the middle of the century became an unofficial national anthem. Other elements such as processions from churches to schools, performances in which schoolchildren recited patriotic poems, and a special Saint Sava sermon followed. In 1867, Vladan Đorđević, a medical student in Vienna

and a future Serbian prime minister, reported, “Saint Sava is celebrated everywhere, from Pest to Peć (the seat of the Serbian Patriarchate), from Niš and Timok to the Adriatic Sea, in all four countries where Serbian people live torn apart from each other, and even in all countries and cities of Europe where only a few Serbs gather.”<sup>lxxvi</sup> The veneration of Saint Sava acquired additional significance under the direct influence of Russophiles and Slavophiles, whose chief proponent in Serbia was Metropolitan Mihailo. Whereas the Holy See featured Cyril and Methodius, apostles of Slavs, to strengthen the religious and ecclesiastical adherence of Catholic Slavs and, hopefully, win over those Slavs of the Byzantine rite, the church in Serbia under Metropolitan Mihailo raised the flag of Saint Sava to awaken and assemble Serbs scattered in four countries and under diverse ecclesiastical jurisdictions.<sup>lxxvii</sup> After gaining independence in 1878, Serbia was conditioned by Vienna to reject its claims over Bosnia and Herzegovina. Under prince/king Milan Obrenović and the party of the Progressives, Serbia redirected its expansionist campaign to Ottoman Kosovo and Macedonia; one of the most importance auspices under which it was conducted was the Society of Saint Sava, formed in 1886 in Belgrade.<sup>lxxviii</sup> At the same time, students of the first Serbian seminary founded in the area under the Ottomans in Prizren, christened their association “Rastko,” Saint Sava’s secular name, emblematically blurring and superseding the division between the religious and secular under national imperatives.

Following the recognition of Serbia’s independence at the congress of Berlin, the Belgrade Metropolitanate attained autocephalous status from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in line with the canonical principle of the Orthodox Church, which sets the ecclesiastical order according to the political one.<sup>lxxix</sup> Nevertheless, the dispute with the Bulgarian Exarchate and the Ecumenical Patriarchate regarding the jurisdiction of Christians in the remaining Ottoman parts of the Balkans, namely Kosovo and Macedonia, intensified toward the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>lxxx</sup> Despite its aspirations and support from Serbian political elites, the Belgrade Metropolitanate under Mihailo and newly established Society of Saint Sava could not compete with the Ecumenical Patriarchate or Bulgarian Exarchate in the struggle for souls in still Ottoman Macedonia as they lacked both funds and educated teachers or priests. The first Serbian bishop was installed in Skopje only in 1902, followed by one in Veles in 1910, whereas the Bulgarian Exarchate already had seven, claiming the loyalty of two-thirds of the faithful in the respective eparchies. Even smaller was the Serbian share of schools in Macedonia in the period when schools served as the chief tools in this church-state pursuit for Orthodox souls in Ottoman lands that preceded their conquest and division during the Balkan wars.<sup>lxxxi</sup>

The only seminary in Belgrade that could have provided priests or teachers, as already noted, offered a very poor education, lacking personnel and discipline.<sup>lxxxii</sup> Compulsory school catechetical instruction was deemed doctrinaire,

dull, dreary, and unable to inspire moral and religious sentiments.<sup>lxxxiii</sup> Pastoral care was lacking throughout Serbia. After 1878, the population of Serbia increased tremendously, from less than 1.5 to almost three million before the Balkan wars of 1912–1913. The number of priests, however, remained more or less unchanged throughout the period, oscillating around 1,000. In 1909, Serbia had roughly 976 secular parish priests and 109 monks compared to Orthodox Romania, which acquired its independence and autocephalous church at the same period and boasted roughly 1,700 monks, 2,700 nuns, and over 8,000 priests.<sup>lxxxiv</sup> Even more striking was the small number of monks in Serbia in comparison to other countries, both Catholic and Orthodox during that period. Altogether fifty-three monasteries in Serbia housed ninety-six monks in 1884 and ninety-eight in 1910.<sup>lxxxv</sup> Most monasteries had been ruined by high taxes and poor management. Traditional methods of land exploitation and land lending to local peasants could not endure the pressures of a modern economy. Finally, it was widely noted that the monastery elders cared more about their own well-being than about future investment and saving,<sup>lxxxvi</sup> all of which resulted in monasticism dying a slow death and monastic tonsure reduced to a prerequisite for entering into the church leadership and rank of bishops. The lack of monks was circumvented by an increasing number of widowed priests being turned into monks only to be elected bishops immediately thereafter.

A particularly serious problem was that despite the prohibition of political activities, many priests led the campaigns of nascent political parties, thereby sowing divisions among the people and clergy and actually contributing to indifference toward church and religion. They had, however, a very palpable reason for doing so. Some priests, led by Milan Đurić, himself a parliamentary deputy, struggled to obtain a regular salary from the state budget instead of being forced to charge for their services. They blamed the bishops for not resolving this issue and even demanded their resignation.<sup>lxxxvii</sup> Moreover, political parties and ideas that attracted Serbian priests and seminarians included clearly secular Socialists. Usually depicted as nationalist hotbeds, Serbian schools became fertile grounds for various other ideas originating in the West, including materialism, atheism, and even anarchism, which appalled Serb visitors from the Habsburg Empire. Famous poet Milica Stojadinović lamented that while she always felt Serbia was her motherland, she feared for its future as destructive, atheist, anticlerical, and antimonarchical ideas took sway.<sup>lxxxviii</sup>

Despite bans, imprisonment, and the occasional death penalty, the Serbian Nazarenes from Hungary also spread their faith in Serbia.<sup>lxxxix</sup> A Scottish philanthropist in Serbia, Frances Mackenzie, indirectly involved his friend and Serbian minister of finance and foreign affairs, Čedomilj Mijatović, in his efforts to protect the Nazarenes from state and church repression.<sup>xc</sup> Although Mijatović remained Orthodox until his death and was even featured as a candidate for patriarch, he was continuously accused of being a Nazarene because he sincerely

respected and often praised the Nazarenes as true believers. In his book about Serbia and Serbs written for an English language audience, Mijatović even cites them as proof that Serbs “as a race, are not incapable of religious piety.”<sup>xcii</sup> Not surprisingly, Mijatović was remembered as the only religious politician in Serbia in the nineteenth century. Together with Mackenzie he was among the founders of a journal, *Hrišćanski vesnik* (Christian Herald), the aim of which was to reform Serbian religious and moral life, pleading for a free exchange of ideas and opinions.<sup>xciii</sup> In addition to John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Mijatović translated several works by English Protestant thinkers and preachers and often published his own religious treatises.<sup>xciii</sup> Nevertheless, his and Mackenzie’s ideas and strivings for a religious revival like that of the Nazarenes, the Biblical Society or temperance societies attained little influence or relevance in Serbia.<sup>xciv</sup>

More successful were the attempts to strengthen the Serbian character of the church. In the overwhelmingly nationalist political atmosphere at the turn of the century, Metropolitan Mihailo was charged in 1895 to head the Committee for the construction of a grandiose church on Belgrade’s Vračar Hill, dedicated “to the memory of the greatest Serbian saint, Enlightener and Unifier, Saint Sava.” The poor response to the metropolitan’s appeal for donations demonstrated not just the poverty of the Serbs at the time but also the lack of a fully developed and widespread national consciousness ready to respond. The general population lacked the cultural homogeneity of a nation, which is, in turn, dependent on a level of literacy and the spread of the printed word.

The dispersal of Serbs was a second major problem in achieving a sense of national unity and attaining national homogeneity. Furthermore, frequent clashes between Serbian secular and religious elites weakened both groups and the national project. As already emphasized, the Serbian state and its rulers, ever since Prince Miloš Obrenović, clearly saw and cherished the church as an integrative force in building the nation and their own authority. However, they went beyond supporting the church, striving to impose strict control and frequently interfering in church life and the canonical order. The most blatant example was the deposition of Belgrade Metropolitan Mihailo, for so long a thorn in the regime’s side due to his many political ties with Russia ever since his student days. Moreover, his support for the irredentism of brethren outside Serbia’s borders was often beyond state control. Once Prince Milan Obrenović and his government of the Progressives embarked on a clear Austrophile policy, conflict was inevitable. It happened in 1881, over the Taxation Law that the government proposed and the National Assembly adopted and that included taxes on ordination into the priesthood and even monastic tonsure. The metropolitan vociferously opposed this state intrusion in what he defended as holy sacraments (for Orthodox, sacred mysteries). Nevertheless, the government insisted that the Law was passed by the parliament and the particular taxation was necessary because of the abuses of the clergy. Conflict erupted and the king eventually deposed the metropolitan; other

bishops, in solidarity, resigned. A new metropolitan was “imported” from Austria-Hungary and a new loyalist uncanonical hierarchy was established. This extraordinary situation lasted until 1889, when King Milan abdicated and Metropolitan Mihailo was allowed to return from exile and reclaim his seat.

Modernizing Progressives were not the only political option available. In fact their pro-Habsburg stance sentenced them to a rather negligent share of Serbian political sympathies. Initiated by the ideas of Svetozar Marković, a self-confessed Socialist, and later modified by Nikola Pašić and his followers, it was the Radical Party that turned into the most powerful, if oppositional, political force in Serbia in the 1880s. Inspired by Russian Slavophiles and Narodniks, the key concern of the Radicals became the destruction of the traditional mode of life by the forces of capitalism. Instead, hope was set in traditional institutions (the extended family, village commune, and so on), which were deemed apt for the creation of a just social order, together with a mystical belief in the particularity of the Russian or Serbian people and their organic development. While Marković remained a firm believer in science and progress, Nikola Pašić, leader of the Radical Party until his death in 1926, adopted from Slavophiles the notion of the superiority of the Orthodox religion as both institution and creed.<sup>xcv</sup> Influenced by Konstantin Aksakov and other Russian Slavophiles, Pašić praised the Orthodox Church as conciliatory, popular and democratic compared to the hierarchical, expansionist, and absolutist Catholic Church. Pašić and the Radicals came to Orthodoxy via the “West” and criticism thereof in Russia. Nevertheless, they brought a change in the position of the Orthodox Church in Serbia. All previous rulers since liberation saw it only as their political tool, not least because of its potential link to national mobilization. Yet, by the end of the century, Serbia was ruled by the party whose core belief was the special link between Orthodoxy and Serbdom and that strove to make that link immutable and impermeable. At the same time as adopting the idea of nationalism from the West, there was a growing resistance to domestic westernization and modernization. Entering the world market on a big scale as an independent state, Serbia faced enormous problems in modernizing its farming economy, and in the period 1878–1914 experienced a significant decline in per capita output.<sup>xcvi</sup> Fearing the loss of their authority that had been enjoyed in a traditional peasant society, many among the Orthodox clergy also joined the anti-Westernism of the Radical Party. However, in the church, as recent research by Klaus Buchenau has demonstrated, most of the emerging educated theologians chose to associate themselves with secular nationalism and only a minority reflected critically on the rapid social change in Serbia and its ostensibly destructive consequences.<sup>xcvii</sup> Their anti-West interpretation of Orthodox tradition was largely derived from the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian Slavophiles.

---

# Montenegro

As in large rural and mountainous areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Military Border in Croatia, with almost no or a weak literacy tradition and limited contact with the outside world, the remote highlands of Montenegro were naturally the bastions of patriarchal folk religion. The pre-modern belief system of the Montenegrins was defined as essentially Manichean.<sup>xcviii</sup> Isolated in their villages, the people maintained the tribal and kin structure of life that, besides social organization, acted in place of Christian ethic norms. Writing about religion in Montenegro, Christopher Boehm concluded that the entire formal apparatus of the Eastern Church for maintaining social control appeared to have been relatively ineffectual and tribal community life reigned supreme.<sup>xcix</sup> The fear of eternal punishment for committing sins, which lay at the core of Christian belief, was modified by means of a patriarchal society that with the help of pagan rituals established its own survival rules. Prevailing superstition and the norms of a patriarchal society never allowed for a strong influence from the Orthodox or any other church for that matter. Absurdly enough, patriarchal Montenegro has been termed in historiography as a theocracy, a system that presumes the authority of religion. In reality, as Michael Petrovich points out, in Montenegro even the priests were anticlerical. In fact, the clergy and bishop in Montenegro achieved respect only on the battlefield.<sup>c</sup> Dominated by local customs and morals and divided among the clans, the social and institutional role of the church in Montenegrin highlands was almost non-existent, prompting some foreign travelers to conclude that Montenegrins and sometimes Serbs in general have no religion. In reality, the religion they found there was just too remote from their mostly Protestant or sometimes Catholic religious background for it to be recognizable as such.

After the Ottoman invasion and the abolition of the ecclesiastical structures of the medieval Peć Patriarchate, the seat of the Zeta (Montenegro) diocese was transferred to high in the mountains of Cetinje. Real power lay with the squabbling clan chiefs, who variously recognized the authority of the Austrian Empire, the Republic of Venice, the Ottoman Empire or the Cetinje Metropolitan. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the position of bishops became hereditary and occupied by members of the Petrović-Njegoš clan, although every new bishop had to be confirmed by the assembly of clan chiefs. With the abolition of the Peć Patriarchate in 1766, the Cetinje or Montenegrin diocese was left further isolated and independent.<sup>ci</sup> Bishop Petar I, Petrović Njegoš (1784–1830), obtained consecration in Karlovci, but his successors on the Cetinje throne went to Montenegro's potent ally Russia for consecration and financial aid that reinforced their spiritual and secular powers. During his long and remarkable rule, bishop Petar I strengthened Montenegro by uniting the quarreling clans and suppressing



blood vendettas. Petar I also strove to consolidate his own control and introduced the first written laws. Remembered as a brave commander in encounters with the Ottomans, his attempts at liberation and unification of Serbs nonetheless failed. In an exemplary move of nation building, his nephew and successor, Petar II Petrović Njegoš, had him canonized shortly after his death and venerated as Saint Peter of Cetinje. Petar II Petrović or simply Njegoš became the most famous of all the Njegoš bishop rulers, but he is primarily remembered as a poet. Obtaining his education from the leading Habsburg Serb poet and early nationalist Sima Milutinović, Sarajlija Njegoš wrote his magnum opus *The Mountain Wreath* (*Gorski vijenac*) in 1847 as a mighty anthem of the national struggle for liberation and the struggle against evil in general. Dedicated to the liberator of the Serbs, Karađorđe, in a form of poetic drama, it describes the attempt at the beginning of the eighteenth century to wipe out clansmen who converted to Islam, perceived as a threat to the integrity of the Montenegrin Christians. In *The Mountain Wreath*, Orthodox Christianity was conceived as coterminous with Serbdom, and the moral imperative of fulfilling the national mission was reconciled with Christian morality. Its undisputed poetic qualities as well as descriptions of the celebration of the Serbian patron saint (Slava), the dancing of the Serbian round dance (*kolo*), and frequent allusions to the battle of Kosovo soon made it into the Serbian and later Yugoslav national literary canon as a mighty propaganda tool. *The Mountain Wreath* was crowned as the final link in the vertical of Serbian continuity between the mythical Kosovo battle, centuries of the Ottoman yoke, popular resistance as evident in the oral folk epic, and the nineteenth century liberation struggle. Moreover, Njegoš as a historical figure, bishop and political leader of his people became the emblem of Serbian identity, a literary reification of Serbian culture and spirit, embodying what was later projected as the symbiosis of the church and nation, the key element of the foundation of the Serbian collective self. Celebrated as a hymn to freedom, a glorification of national and human ideals and a rejection of force and tyranny, his poem's troubling plot, which revolves around the alleged massacre of Islamicized Montenegrins, has only recently been questioned.<sup>cii</sup>

After Njegoš's death, his successor, Danilo Petrović, decided not to be consecrated a bishop, but, after a short power struggle, became the first secular ruler/prince, which finally transformed Montenegro from a formal theocracy into a secular state. Once devoid of secular powers, the role of Cetinje metropolitans became almost superfluous. Indeed for six years there were none followed by the short-lived tenure of Nikanor Ivanović, which was abruptly terminated by the decision of the new Montenegrin ruler, Prince Nikola Petrović. During this period, attempts were made to set up the first seminary in Cetinje with Russian help although its impact was felt only in the 1880s.

It was only during the three and half decades of Mitrofan Ban's tenure as a metropolitan (1885–1920) that the Orthodox Church in Montenegro finally established institutions and administrative discipline necessary to face the

challenges of modern times and state church status.<sup>ciii</sup> These included the creation and legal constitution of a Holy Synod and Consistory (1904), the establishment of a fund for priests' widows and orphans (1901), and The Law on Parish Priesthood (1909). More than eighty priests came out of the Cetinje Seminary during this period and over forty churches were built or reconstructed. Montenegro's metropolitan was a permanent member of its state council and assembly (1906–1914) and also the president of Red Cross. As in Serbia, the church was absolutely submitted to the state, its social role remained weak and folk religiosity prevailed. The church's poor institutional structures and weak links with the people could not be easily strengthened, not even after unification in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.<sup>civ</sup>

---

## ■ Conclusion

Throughout lands inhabited by Serbs and under their various ecclesiastical administrations, the meager development of secular educational systems constituted a major factor accounting for the slow nationalization of the peasantry and their transformation from peasants into Serbs, to paraphrase Eugen Weber.<sup>cv</sup> During the nineteenth century, illiteracy was a key obstacle that had to be overcome in order to enact the change from a parochial religious into a secular Serbian identity. By 1866, only 4.2 percent of Serbia's population could read and by 1900 the figure only grew to 17 percent. Lagging behind Greece and Bulgaria in literacy and education, the popularization of the Serbian national program was also slow when compared with the Greek and Bulgarian experience. As late as the Eastern Crisis of 1875–78, regionalism prevailed among Serbia's peasantry, thereby undermining Serbia's war effort.<sup>cvi</sup> Furthermore, political and ecclesiastical divisions and inherited traditions and interests prolonged and dwindled the nation-building process. The hierarchy of the major "Serbian" ecclesiastical administration, that of the Habsburg Monarchy (including Bosnia and Herzegovina formally under the Ecumenical Patriarchate), remained a hostage to the anachronistic union of throne and altar. Its role in ensuring its flock's political loyalty and emphasis on the religious aspect of ethnic identity conflicted with the more secular model of linguistic nationalism. Churches in Serbia and Montenegro were freed from the imperial legacy but because of their lack of educated clergy became easily manipulated by new secular rulers, which then deteriorated their prestige and ability to reform according to the demands of modern times.

Nevertheless, throughout the areas inhabited by the Serbs, the new notion of the church as the upholder of its people and carrier of its tradition and identity began taking hold. More importantly, new traditions were imagined and created that, via migration, free movement and a rising level of literacy, spread and spanned across borders and unified the Serbs. Some such included the patron-saint

celebration of Slava and the cult of Saint Sava have already been mentioned. Changes affected church music, arts, and all other aspects of religious life. Church singing among Serbs in the nineteenth century transitioned from the medieval monophonic chants that were praised as celestial, angelic hymns to choral polyphony required to fulfill certain artistic tasks.<sup>cvii</sup> The use of polyphonic harmony first spread under Russian influence but was soon adopted by composers and practitioners from the Habsburg monarchy, most notably Czechs or Serbs who studied in Vienna. This huge transformation affected not only church services but the wider religious, cultural, and social context as it led to a new public, new practitioners (choral or singers' societies), concert halls, composers and conductors, and so on. Romanticism in music meant the search for chants believed to be genuinely Serbian despite similar musical motifs found in all Balkan Orthodox countries.<sup>cviii</sup>

The Romantic era also brought to the fore the search for the visual resuscitation of the medieval heritage. After some self-taught builders introduced initial changes, the Serbian disciples of Viennese professor Teophil Hansen in the 1880s launched the neo-Byzantine style, which represented a fashionable historicist eclecticism based rather artificially on elements of Byzantine, Islamic, and medieval Romanesque architecture.<sup>cix</sup> While introducing a Byzantine ordering of space, the new designs had little to do with Serbian medieval churches. At the same time, the nationalist campaign in the still Ottoman Kosovo and Macedonia, carried out by the Saint Sava Society among others, brought about the (re)discovery of Serbian medieval churches in these areas, notably the church of Gračanica Monastery in Kosovo. The desire to revive the glorious medieval past and furnish Serbia with its own national style in art thus gave birth to the notion of a Serbo-Byzantine style, purportedly a style of architecture dominant in Serbia during the reign of King Milutin at the beginning of the fourteenth century with the Gračanica Church as its archetype.<sup>cx</sup> The ascension of this style to the level of an undisputed architectural genre by the end of the nineteenth century in Serbia was clearly underpinned by the dual imperative to celebrate simultaneously both an ancient and an emerging state.<sup>cxii</sup> Out of all spheres of the arts, church architecture made the most radical break with European trends, which it abandoned for the sake of a revived Serbian-Byzantine style, regarded as a pure manifestation of the Serbian national spirit. The ideology of national regeneration translated into the language of architecture rejected European influences and proclaimed a return to the medieval Serbian golden age. Similarly, the choice to start the construction of a national cathedral in 1895, known as Saint Sava Church, its prominent location and envisaged extensive physical layout indicated, from the beginning, intentions beyond the religious; its dominance and immensity were to impress and accentuate the Piedmontian role of Serbia in the unification of Serbs. This coupling of the secular and religious dimensions set irreversibly the future position of the Saint Sava Church in Belgrade in the visions of national

monumentalization advanced by the ecclesiastic hierarchy as well as lay builders of the nation.

Toward the end of the century, the bishops and clergy of Karlovci Metropolitanate in the Habsburg Monarchy also became imbued with the modern political ideology of nationalism, slowly transforming it from an imperial into a national institution. This process finished only after the First World War when the Karlovci Metropolitanate united with various other Orthodox jurisdictions under which the Orthodox Serbs lived in the newly created Serbian Orthodox Church. The pace of changes was faster in the Metropolitanate of Belgrade. In the late nineteenth century, its Metropolitan Mihailo was more of a political than a religious figure. This was common among all newly independent Balkan states where, as a rule, the church came to be seen primarily as a nationalizing and patriotic agent. While the Orthodox in Serbia or Montenegro might not have been considered as ardently religious as their brethren in the Habsburg lands, their leaders, such as Metropolitan Mihailo or Bishop Njegoš, recognized the church's value and magnificent historic legacy for their aspirations. Nevertheless, it was primarily the state and secular elites in Serbia and Montenegro that led the way in rendering the Orthodox Church into an ethnically based national religion using the power of laws, education, and, later, the mass media. The church followed, assuming a national-salvationist self-image and embracing the logic of nationalism. In addition, in all areas examined, the traditional Orthodox hostility to Catholics became imbued with a rather Romantic secular Pan-Slavism and anti-Westernism imported from Russia. The bond between nation and religion among the Serbs (and Croats for that matter) would be finally cemented in interwar Yugoslavia with wide-ranging consequences. The most obvious and tragic were inter-confessional conflicts in the 1940s and then again in the 1990s. While confessional (or religious) differences between Croats and Serbs (and Bosnian Muslims) are indisputable, this chapter has demonstrated how in the Serbian case during the nineteenth century the (Orthodox) religious markers of identity were supplanted by secular and essentially national ones. Not surprisingly in the high age of nationalism during the early twentieth century, political arguments and conflicts among South Slavs have been little concerned with religion except as the expression of national peculiarity.<sup>cxii</sup> In order to confront these conflicts and their legacy, one needs to begin with the painstaking revision of existing history writing and the commonly held understanding of the bond between nation and religion.

---

## List of Metropolitans and Patriarchs

**Karlovci Metropolitanate** (Habsburg Monarchy)

Stefan (Statimirović), Metropolitan 1790–1836

Stefan (Stanković), Metropolitan 1837–1841  
Josif (Rajačić), Metropolitan 1842–1848, and Patriarch 1848–1861  
Samuilo (Maširević), Patriarch 1864–1870  
Prokopije (Ivačković), Patriarch 1874–1879  
German (Anđelić), Patriarch 1882–1888  
Georgije (Branković), Patriarch 1890–1907  
Lukijan (Bogdanović), Patriarch 1907–1913

**Belgrade Metropolitanate** (autonomous from 1831, autocephalous from 1879) (Serbia)

Leontije (Lambrović), 1801–1813  
Dionisije II (Popović Nišlija), 1813–1815  
Agatangel, 1816–1825  
Kirilo, 1826–1827  
Antim, 1827–1831  
Meletije (Pavlović), 1831–1833  
Petar (Jovanović), 1834–1859  
Mihailo (Jovanović), 1859–1881; 1889–1898  
Teodosije (Mraović), 1883–1889  
Inokentije (Pavlović), 1898–1905  
Dimitrije (Pavlović), Metropolitan 1905–1920, First Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church 1920–1930

**Metropolitanate of Cetinje** (Montenegro)

Petar I (Petrović Njegoš), 1784–1830  
Petar II (Petrović Njegoš), 1830–1851  
Nikanor (Ivanović), 1858–1860  
Ilarion (Roganović), 1860–1882  
Visarion (Ljubiša), 1882–1884  
Mitrofan (Ban), 1885–1920

**Orthodox Church in Dalmatia** (Dalmatian bishops were initially under the jurisdiction of Karlovci Metropolitanate but were transferred in 1873 to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia)

Venedikt (Kraljević), Bishop 1810–1828  
Josif (Rajačić), Bishop 1829–1834  
Pantelejmon (Živković), Bishop 1834–1836  
Jerotej (Mutibarić), Bishop 1843–1853  
Stefan (Knežević), Bishop 1853–1890  
Nikodim (Milaš), Bishop 1890–1910  
Dimitrije (Branković), Bishop 1910–1920  
Eugenie (Hacman), Bishop 1835–1873, Metropolitan 1873;  
Autocephalous Church after 1873 (Metropolitanate of Bukovina and Dalmatia)  
Teofil (Bandella), Metropolitan 1873–1875  
Teoctist (Blajevici), Metropolitan 1877–1879  
Silvestru (Morariu-Andrievici), Metropolitan 1880–1895  
Arcadie (Ciupercovici), Metropolitan 1896–1902

Vladimir (Repta), Metropolitan 1902–1924  
**Orthodox Church in Bosnia-Herzegovina** (Dabar-Bosnia Metropolitanate  
under the Jurisdiction of Ecumenical Patriarchate)

Venedikt (Kraljević), 1805–1808  
Kalinik, 1809–1817  
Venijamin, 1817–1835  
Amvrosije, 1835–1840  
Ignjatije I, 1841–1850  
Prokopije, 1851–1853  
Dionisije I 1856–1860  
Ignjatije II, 1861–1868  
Dionisije II Ilić, 1868–1871  
Pajsije, 1871–1874  
Antim, 1874–1880  
Sava (Kosanović), 1881–1885  
Đorđe (Nikolajević), 1885–1896  
Nikolaj (Mandić), 1896–1907  
Evgenije (Letica), 1907–1920

---

#### **4. The Serbian Orthodox Church** **Bojan Aleksov**

---

<sup>i</sup> Some of the general works used in preparing this chapter are Sima Ćirković et al, *Istorija srpskog naroda I–VI* [History of the Serbian People I–VI] (Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga 1981–1985); Đoko Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske pravoslavne crkve I–III* [History of the Serbian Orthodox Church I–III], 2nd ed, (Belgrade: Bigz, 1992); *Azbučnik Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve po Radoslavu Grujiću* [ABC of the Serbian Orthodox Church according to Radoslav Grujić] (Belgrade: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1993); Predrag Puzović, *Kratka istorija Srpske pravoslavne crkve* [Short History of the Serbian Orthodox Church] (Kragujevac: Kalenić, 2000); Čedomir Marjanović, *Istorija srpske crkve* [History of the Serbian Church] (Belgrade: Ars libri, 2001); Radomir Milošević, *Srpska pravoslavna crkva u vremenu i prostoru* [The Serbian Orthodox Church in Time and Space] (Smederevo: Narodna biblioteka, 2009). I have used archival material of the Archive of Karlovci Metropolitanate (AMK) and Archive of Serbia (AS), period church and secular press as well as monographs on specific topics.

<sup>ii</sup> As this chapter was going to press, a comparable interpretation of Serbian Church history and its link to nationalism was offered in Bratislav Pantelić, “Memories of a Time Forgotten: The Myth of the Perennial Nation,” *Nations and Nationalism* 17, no. 2 (2011): 443–64.

<sup>iii</sup> *Poslanica Nikodimu Milašu* [Letter to Nikodim Milaš], *Pančevo* (1884): 5. The author signed as Bosanski popo was most probably Rev. Đorđe Nikolajević, the dean of the Sarajevo Seminary and future metropolitan. He was referring to disputes over church jurisdiction in Bosnia and Herzegovina after annexation by the Habsburg Monarchy.

<sup>iv</sup> Anthony Giddens, *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 37–39, as interpreted by Peter T. Alter in “Nineteenth-Century Serbian

---

Popular Religion: The *Millet* System and Syncretism,” *Serbian Studies* 9, no. 1–2 (1995): 88–103.

<sup>v</sup> See Dušan Popović, *Velika seoba Srba 1690* [Great Migration of Serbs 1690] (Belgrade: Kultura, 1954).

<sup>vi</sup> There is no recent history of the Karlovci Metropolitanate. However, it features in all volumes on Serbian Church history mentioned above as well as in Vasilije Krestić, *History of the Serbs in Croatia and Slavonija 1848–1914*, translated by Margot and Boško Milosavljević (Belgrade: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1997). Some early attempts include Emile Picot (Stevan Pavlović), *Les Serbes de Hongrie* (Prague: Grégr & Dattel, 1873) and Alois Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoxe Nationalkirche* (Graz and Leipzig: n.p., 1922).

<sup>vii</sup> For the Serbian Church under the Ottomans and their *Rum Millet* system, see László Hadrovics, *Le peuple serbe et son église sous la domination turque* (Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1947).

<sup>viii</sup> For estates of the metropolitanate, see Slavko Gavrilović, “Daljsko vlastelinstvo karlovačke Mitropolije u XVIII veku” [Dalj Estate of the Karlovci Metropolitanate in the Eighteenth Century] and “Daljsko vlastelinstvo karlovačke Mitropolije (od kraja XVIII veka do revolucije 1848–1849)” [Dalj Estate of the Karlovci Metropolitanate from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the 1848–1849 Revolution], *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke* [Matica Srpska Almanac for Social Sciences] 46 and 47 (1967).

<sup>ix</sup> See Traian Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant,” *Journal of Economic History* 20, no. 2 (1960): 234–313.

<sup>x</sup> The Serbian hierarchs refused to appoint Romanians, claiming there were no satisfactory candidates. This attitude is reminiscent of the arrogance of the Ottoman Greeks who looked down upon the other Balkan peoples as dull and ignorant country bumpkins or *kondrokephalai* (wooden-heads or blockheads) as recorded by J. H. A. Ubcini, *Letters on Turkey II* (London: John Murray, 1856), 173.

<sup>xi</sup> For Vlachs or Aromanians, see Victor A. Friedman, “The Vlach Minority in Macedonia: Language, Identity, Dialectology, and Standardization” in *Selected Papers in Slavic, Balkan, and Balkan Studies*, ed. Juhani Nuoluoto et al., *Slavica Helsingiensia: 21* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2001), 26–50, which focuses on the Vlachs of Macedonia but summarizes the origins and history of the Vlachs. More details are in Tom Winniffrith, *The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan People* (London: Duckworth, 1987) and *Shattered Eagles, Balkan Fragments* (London: Duckworth, 1995). Romanians inhabited Transylvania and Banat throughout the period these regions formed part of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary, Ottoman Empire, and finally Habsburg Empire.

<sup>xii</sup> For *Grenzer* and Union attempts, see Gunther Rothenberg, *The Austrian Military Border in Croatia, 1522–1747* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960) and *The Military Border in Croatia, 1740–1881* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966); Johann Schwicker, *Politische Geschichte der Serben in Ungarn* (Budapest: L. Aigner, 1880); and Bojan Aleksov, “The ‘Union’ as a Seed of Dissension between Serbs and Croats” in *Konfessionelle Identität und Nationsbildung. Die griechisch-katholischen Kirchen in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Hans-Christian Maner and Norbert Spannberger (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Mitteleuropa, 2007), 211–23.

<sup>xiii</sup> From 1721 to 1762 at least 28 Serbs attended this academy and thus made the most numerous foreign student group. See Nikola Radojčić, “Kijevska akademija i Srbi” [The Kiev Academy and the Serbs] in *Srpski književni glasnik* [Serbian Literary Herald] 31 (1913).

---

<sup>xiv</sup> In the Habsburg Empire, at least since the Counter-Reformation, a specific sort of Clericalism played an important role, usually described as sinister. On the one hand, most changes in the religious sphere undertaken during the reign of Maria Theresa and Joseph II and later associated with *Josephinismus* such as legal equality, religious toleration and rational government were in the secularizing spirit of the Enlightenment. At the same time, the state's control over the church was reinforced so that the Catholic and, to a similar extent, other recognized churches, including the Orthodox, remained key institutions in governing people, both in controlling them and providing for their welfare. In addition, religious allegiance and ecclesiastical organization were often abused for political and economic purposes; hierarchies were appointed and kept in close touch with the throne in order to exercise influence on their flock whereby domination, intrigue and corruption abided. Moreover, a distinct attitude to non-Catholic minorities was established, described by Okey as a confessionalising approach, with the tendency to recognize their religious rather than ethnic aspects of their identity. The emperor remained the protector of the Catholic Church possessing and using the veto right in church matters including the election of Popes. Furthermore, leaning on the structures of the Catholic Church stood at the core of the monarchy's foreign policy. The Holy See also profited from Habsburg patronage as in the case of Bosnia, as demonstrated below, where it hoped the Habsburg occupation could secure Bosnia as a jumping board for the Catholic mission among South Slavs. See Robin Okey, "State, Church and Nation in the Serbo-Croat Speaking Lands of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1850–1914" in *Religion, State and Ethnic Groups. Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe*, ed. Donald Kerr (Dartmouth, N.H.: European Science Foundation and University Press, 1992), 51–78.

<sup>xv</sup> For the impact of Theresian and Josephinian reforms on the Karlovci Metropolitanate, see Mita Kostić, *Dositej Obradović u istoriskoj perspektivi XVIII i XIX veka* [Dositej Obradović from the Historical Perspective of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries] (Belgrade: Naučna knjiga, 1952) and *Grof Koler kao kulturnoprosvetni reformator* [Count Collet as Cultural and Educational Reformer] (Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1932).

<sup>xvi</sup> *The life and adventures of Dimitrije Obradović, who as a monk was given the name Dositej, written and published by himself*, translated from the Serbian, and edited, with an introduction, by George Rapall Noyes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953) is the translation of Dositej's autobiography containing the most important contextual information.

<sup>xvii</sup> The first conflict between the secular intelligentsia and church hierarchs took place at the Serbian People's and Church Congress in Timișoara in 1790. See Slavko Gavrilović and Nikola Petrović, eds., *Temišvarski sabor 1790* [Timișoara Congress in 1790] (Novi Sad and Sremski Karlovci: Institut za izučavanje istorije, and Vojvodine: Arhiv Vojvodine, 1972).

<sup>xviii</sup> For more on Karadžić and his conflict with the Karlovci hierarchy, see Miodrag Popović, *Vuk Stef. Karadžić* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1964) and Wilson Duncan, *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanovic Karadzic, 1787–1864: Literacy, Literature, and National Independence in Serbia* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1986).

<sup>xix</sup> For the Romanian struggle for ecclesiastical emancipation, see Keith Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania 1846–1873* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977).

<sup>xx</sup> Gordana Petković, *Patrijarh Josif Rajačić (1785–1861)* [Patriarch Josif Rajačić (1785–1861)] (Belgrade: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, 2009).

<sup>xxi</sup> For the role of the church in the early stages of Serbian nationalism, see Emanuel Turczynski *Konfession und Nation. Zur Fruhgeschichte der serbischen und rumanishchen Nationsbildung*, (Dusseldorf: Schwann, 1976); Philip Adler, "Nation and Nationalism among the



---

Serbs of Hungary, 1790–1870,” *East European Quarterly* 13 (1979): 271–85 and Gale Stokes, “Church and Class in Early Balkan Nationalism,” *East European Quarterly* 13 (1979): 259–27.

<sup>xxii</sup> Regulation of the Church and School Autonomy for Serbs in Hungary was followed by a special law adopted in the Croatian Assembly in 1887, which had powers regarding the interior affairs of Croatia, then part of the Kingdom of Hungary.

<sup>xxiii</sup> “Karlovačka mitropolija” [Karlovci Metropolitanate] in *Azbučnik Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve* [ABC of the Serbian Orthodox Church] and Arpad Lebl, “Privredna politika Sabora” [Economic Policy of the Congress] in *Godišnjak filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* [Annual of the Philosophy Faculty Novi Sad] 13, no. 1–2 (1970).

<sup>xxiv</sup> By that time the Hungarian forint or Austrian florin (Austro-Hungarian gulden) were already replaced by krone/korona as part of the introduction of the gold standard {I assume the slash here indicates two different terms for the same currency?}.

<sup>xxv</sup> For Serbian Radicals in Hungary, see Lazar Rakić, *Radikalna stranka u Vojvodini do početka XX veka* [The Radical Party in Vojvodina until the Beginning of the XX Century] (Novi Sad: Istraživanja 3, 1974). The leader of the Serbian Radical Party in Hungary and a prolific author, Jaša Tomić was the most vocal opponent of the hierarchy and clergy, which he disdained and held responsible for the decline, poor faith and morals of the people. Among many of his anticlerical works *Karlovačka Mitropolija i Hrišćanstvo* [The Karlovci Metropolitanate and Christianity] (Novi Sad: Štamp. S. Miletića, 1913) stands out.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Vladimir Radašin, *Srpska autonomna školska uprava u Karlovačkoj mitropoliji 1867–1912* [The Serbian Autonomous School Administration in the Karlovci Metropolitanate 1867–1912] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1987).

<sup>xxvii</sup> Dušan N. Petrović, *Patrijarh Georgije Branković (1890–1907)* [Patriarch Georgije Branković (1890–1907)] (Sremski Karlovci: Srpska pravoslavna bogoslovija Svetog Arsenija I Sremca, 2005), 28. When Patriarch Prokopije Ivačković resigned in 1879, he was awarded a 24,000 forint annual pension, compared to 800 earned by a doctor or 1,100 by a professor at the Karlovci High School at the time. See Mladen Leskovac, *Zmajev bečki dnevnik* [Vienna Diary of Jovan Jovanović Zmaj] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1983): 24–25.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Horst Haselsteiner, “O profesionalnoj, obrazovnoj i socijalnoj strukturi u Ugarskog početkom XX veka s posebnim osvrtom na Srbe” [in original “Zur Berufsgliederung, Bildungs- und Sozialstruktur in Ungarn am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Serben,” On Professional, Educational and Social Structure in Hungary at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century with Special Regard on Serbs] in *Kulturno-politički pokret naroda Habsburske monarhije u XIX veku* [Cultural and Political Movements of the Peoples of the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century] (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1983). The statistics come from 1910 when Serbs composed 5.3 percent of the population of Hungary including Croatia.

<sup>xxix</sup> László Szögi, *Ungarländische Studenten an den Deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen 1789–1919* (Budapest: ELTE, 2001): 55–58.

<sup>xxx</sup> Michael Pupin, *From Immigrant to Inventor* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1960) is the memoir of one of the most famous of these immigrants.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Đorđe Natošević, *Za što naš narod u Austriji propada?* [Why Are Our People in Austria in a State of Decay?] (Novi Sad: n.p., 1866) or Josif Podgradski, *Otvorena knjiga dru Svetozaru Miletiću u Vac via Pest. O žalosnom stanju narodno-crkvenog života kod Srba* [Open Letter to Dr. Svetozar Miletić in Vac via Pest. about the Sad State of the Serbian Peoples and Religious Life] (Novi Sad: n.p., 1871).

---

<sup>xxxii</sup> For Miletić, see Nikola Petrović, *Svetozar Miletić* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1958).

<sup>xxxiii</sup> This was a golden age of anti-clericalism throughout Europe, very much related to the hardening of the position of its principal adversary, the church, as best exemplified by the progress of ultramontanist in the Catholic Church. See René Rémond, “Anticlericalism: Some Reflections by Way of Introduction,” *European Studies Review* 13 (1983): 121–26. In Greece, similarly, criticism of the church related neither to its monopoly of spiritual authority, nor to a questioning of its doctrines but toward what might be called the “practical” conduct of its representatives and what was seen as its privileged position. See Roger Just, “Anti-Clericism and National Identity: Attitudes toward the Orthodox Church in Greece” in *Vernacular Christianity: Essays in the Social Anthropology of Religion Presented to Godfrey Lienhardt*, ed. Wendy James and Douglas H. Johnson (Oxford: JASO, 1988), 15–30.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Quoted in Vasilije Đ. Krestić, “Pismo Mite Klicina Milanu Đ. Milićeviću” [A Letter of Mita Klicin to Milan Đ. Milićević] in *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* [Matica Srpska Almanac for History] 49 (1994): 152–54.

<sup>xxxv</sup> On the changes in the Karlovci metropolitanate as a result of the Nazarenes, see Bojan Aleksov, *Religious Dissent in the Age of Modernization and Nationalism: Nazarenes in Hungary and Serbia 1850–1914*, *Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen*, vol. 43, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006). For the ecclesiological and theological turn that followed, see Thomas Bremer, *Ekklesiale Struktur und Ekklesiologie in der Serbischen Orthodoxen Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, (Würzburg: Augustinus Verlag, 1992).

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Archive of Karlovci Metropolitanate Fond A, 1881–108, 1882–167, 1886–538, 1897–347, 1897–408.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> *Bogomoljci (Bogomolytsy)* was variously translated in English as God-worshippers, God-prayers and Devotionalists.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Petrović, *Patrijarh Georgije*, 53–103. See also Gordana Petković, *Patrijarh Georgije Branković (1830–1907)* (Novi Sad: Muzej grada, 2007). Monastic school turned out to be a cumbersome if not fully vain task as only a handful of monks remained and were too busy with the economic maintenance and survival of the large estates of which they were in charge to improve their education.

<sup>xxxix</sup> For more on the Karlovci Seminary, see Nikola Gavrilović, *Karlovačka Bogoslovija (1794–1920)* [The Karlovci Seminary (1794–1920)] (Sremski Karlovci: Srpska pravoslavna bogoslovija Svetog Arsenija, 1984). For the Karlovci Metropolitanate press, see Triva Militar, *Štamparstvo u Vojvodini* [Publishing in Vojvodina] (Novi Sad: Štamparsko i izdavačko D. D., 1940). The Karlovci Metropolitanate regularly published its schematism and many parish priests published detailed surveys of their own parishes. These publications then facilitated pastoral care while today they represent invaluable historical evidence.

<sup>xl</sup> Mile Bogović, *Katolička crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji za vrijeme mletačke vladavine* [The Catholic Church and Orthodoxy in Dalmatia during Venetian Rule] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1982 and 1993); Marko Jačov, *Venecija i Srbi u Dalmaciji u XVIII veku* [Venice and Serbs in Dalmatia in the Eighteenth Century] (Belgrade: Istorijski institut, 1984); Nikodim Milaš, *Pravoslavna Dalmacija* [Orthodox Dalmatia] (Belgrade: Sfairis, 1989; first edition in 1901).

<sup>xli</sup> *Žitije Gerasima Zelića I–III* [The Life of Gerasim Zelić] (Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruka, 1897, 1898, 1900). {I have assumed that 1898 and 1900 refer to reprint dates; if they are page numbers, please let me know and I will change the formatting.}

---

<sup>xlii</sup> Nikodim Milaš was the best educated of all the Serbian hierarchs in the nineteenth century. Prolific historian and writer he is remembered as author of many editions of church canons.

<sup>xliii</sup> Lujo Bakotić, *Srbi u Dalmaciji od pada Mletačke republike do ujedinjenja* [The Serbs in Dalmatia from the Fall of Venice until Unification] (Belgrade: Geca Kon, 1938).

<sup>xliv</sup> “Dalmacija” in *Vesnik srpske crkve* [Serbian Church Herald] 1 (1912): 93.

<sup>xlv</sup> Sources are listed in Svetislav Davidović, *Srpska pravoslavna crkva u Bosni i Hercegovini (od 960 do 1930 god.)* [The Serbian Orthodox Church in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 960 to 1930] (Sarajevo: n.p., 1991) and Slijepčević, *Istorija*, 454–73. Among Phanariot bishops in addition to Greeks there were a couple of Bulgarians. See Nedeljko Radosavljević, *Šest portreta pravoslavnih mitropolita 1766–1891* [Six Portraits of Orthodox Metropolitans 1766–1891] (Belgrade: Istorijski Institute SANU, 2010).

<sup>xlvi</sup> Alter, “Nineteenth-Century Serbian Popular Religion”; Milenko Filipović, “Folk Religion among the Orthodox Population in Eastern Yugoslavia,” *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954): 359–75; and Davidović, *Srpska pravoslavna*.

<sup>xlvii</sup> Risto Besarović, *Vaso Pelagić* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1969); and Slavko Mićanović, “Predgovor” [Foreword] to Vaso Pelagić, *Izabrana djela I–III* [Selected Works I–III] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1971): 5–21. Being awarded the highest monastic rank of archimandrite at the age of only 28, Pelagić had the chance of a brilliant ecclesiastic career. Yet after he escaped from internment, he caused embarrassment and unease for the authorities albeit now among his own people and in his own church. Once settled in Serbia Pelagić lessened his nationalist zeal and instead turned to preaching social and class emancipation. He helped organize artisans’ and workers’ societies, was among the founders of the Belgrade newspaper *Socijal-Demokrat* and became the most vocal advocate of socialism, materialist views on the development of nature, and atheism. Because of his relentless criticism of the church, Pelagić was defrocked and excommunicated by Belgrade Metropolitan Mihailo in 1895 in an inquisition-style ceremony performed in Belgrade Cathedral in 1895.

<sup>xlviii</sup> For churches in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Habsburgs, see Petar Vrankić, *Religion und Politik in Bosnien und der Herzegowina* (1878–1918) (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998). The Serbian Orthodox Church produced its own volume on this period, *Spomenica povodom osamdesetogodišnjice okupacije Bosne i Hercegovine (1878–1958)* [On the Eightieth Anniversary of the Occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1958)] (Belgrade: Srboštampa, 1959). More generally on Habsburg rule of Bosnia, see Srećko M. Džaja, *Bosnien-Herzegowina in der österreichisch-ungarischen Epoche (1878–1918) Die Intelligentsia zwischen Tradition und Ideologie* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994) and Robin Okey, *Taming Balkan Nationalism. The Habsburg “Civilizing Mission” in Bosnia 1878–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>xlix</sup> Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey II*.

<sup>i</sup> Bojan Aleksov, “Habsburg ‘Colonial Experiment’ in Bosnia and Herzegovina Revisited” in *Schnittstellen: Gesellschaft, Nation, Konflikt und Erinnerung in Südosteuropa. Festschrift für Holm Sundhaussen zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Stefan Troebst and Ulf Brunnbauer, *Südosteuropäische Arbeiten*, vol. 133 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2007): 201–16.

<sup>ii</sup> Robin Okey, “A Trio of Hungarian Balkanists: Béni Kállay, István Burián and Lajos Thallóczy in the Age of High Nationalism,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 80, no. 2 (2002): 234–66.

<sup>iii</sup> Aleksov, “The ‘Union.’<HS>”

---

<sup>liii</sup> Robin Okey, “Education and Modernisation in a Multi-Ethnic Society: Bosnia, 1850–1918” in *Schooling, Educational Policy and Ethnic Identity*, ed. J. J. Tomiak (New York: European Science Foundation and University Press, 1991), 319–41.

<sup>liv</sup> Božo Madžar, *Pokret Srba Bosne i Hercegovine za vjersko-prosvjetnu autonomiju Bosne i Hercegovine* [The Movement of Serbs of Bosnia and Hercegovina for Religious and Educational Autonomy] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1982), 219–22.

<sup>lv</sup> One of the most notable ones, Father Matija Nenadović, left his memoirs full of vivid descriptions of the beginning of the modern Serbian state and society. See *The Memoirs of Prota Matija Nenadović*, edited and translated from Serbian by Lovett F. Edwards (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

<sup>lvi</sup> Dositej is said to have come to Serbia in August 1807 on the day of the Transfiguration. One of the laudatory speeches after his death exclaimed: “Dositej came to Serbia and Serbia transfigured.” Quoted in Andra Gavrilović, *Dositije u Srbiji 1807–1911* [Dositej in Serbia 1807–1811] (Belgrade: n.p., 1902).

<sup>lvii</sup> This is the general opinion of the historiography often based on contemporary travel accounts such as Oto Dubislav pl. Pirh, *Putovanje po Srbiji u godini 1829* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1983), 22–23. In the original *Reise in Serbien im Spätherbst 1829, von Otto v. Pirsh* (Berlin, 1830), first edition in Serbian (Belgrade, 1900). Recent research, however, paints a more complex and dynamic picture as illustrated by the study of lives of Ecumenical Patriarchate hierarchs in Serbia and Bosnia in this period. See Nedeljko Radosavljević, *Šest portreta and Pravoslavna crkva u Belgradeskom pašaluku, 1766–1831 (uprava Vaseljenske patrijaršije)* [The Orthodox Church in the Belgrade Pashaluk, 1766–1831] (The Administration of the Ecumenical Patriarchate) (Belgrade: Istorijski institut, 2007).

<sup>lviii</sup> Translated in Duncan Wilson, *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić 1787–1864* (Oxford University Press, 1970; reprinted Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1986), 18–20.

<sup>lix</sup> Joakim Vujić, *Putešestvije po Srbiji* [Travel in Serbia] (Gornji Milanovac: Lio, 1999; first published in Buda, 1828). Travelers were puzzled by the absence of church towers in villages in Serbia, many of which had no churches. See Franz Sherer, *Bilder aus dem serbischen Volks- und Familienleben* (Neusatz: n.p., 1882), 64 and 142–72.

<sup>lx</sup> Leopold von Ranke, *A History of Servia and the Servian Revolution*, translated by Mrs. Alexander Kerr (New York: Da Capo Press, 1973; reprint from London, 1848). For a recent synthesis of popular religion in Serbia, see Radmila Radić, *Narodna verovanja, religija i spiritizam u sprskom društvu 19. i u prvoj polovini 20. veka* [Popular Beliefs, Religion and Spiritism in the Serbian Society of the Nineteenth and the First Half of the Twentieth Century] (Belgrade: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, 2009).

<sup>lxi</sup> *The Memoirs of Prota Matija Nenadović*, edited and translated from the Serbian by Lovett F. Edwards (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

<sup>lxii</sup> Dragan Novaković, *Državno zakonodavstvo o pravoslavnoj crkvi u Srbiji od 1804. do 1914. godine* [State Legislation of the Orthodox Church in Serbia 1804–1914] (Belgrade: Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet Univerziteta u Belgradeu, 2010).

<sup>lxiii</sup> Ranke describes the slaying of Bishop Nikšić in 1816, *A History of Serbia*, 334–35.

<sup>lxiv</sup> Victor Roudometof, “Invented Traditions, Symbolic Boundaries, and National Identity in Southeastern Europe: Greece and Serbia in Comparative Historical Perspective (1830–1880)” in *East European Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (1998): 445.

---

<sup>lxv</sup> These were the features of all laws regulating the church in Serbia that were passed in 1836 (1847) 1862, 1882, and 1890. See Novaković, *Državno zakonodavstvo*.

<sup>lxvi</sup> See Zoran Ranković and Miroslav Lazić, eds., *Uredbe i propisi Mitropolije Belgradeske 1835–1856 1893* [Regulations and Directives of Belgrade Metropolitanate 1835–1856] (Požarevac: Eparhija braničevska, 2010); Zoran Ranković and Miroslav Lazić, eds., *Uredbe i propisi Mitropolije Belgradeske 1857–1876 1893* [Regulations and Directives of Belgrade Metropolitanate 1835–1876] (Požarevac: Eparhija braničevska, 2010); Zoran Ranković and Miroslav Lazić, eds., *Uredbe i propisi Mitropolije Belgradeske 1877–1893* [Regulations and Directives of Belgrade Metropolitanate 1835–1893] (Požarevac: Eparhija braničevska, 2011).

<sup>lxvii</sup> Miroslav Lazić, “Ktitori i priložnici u srpskoj kulturi 19. i početkom 20. vek” [Maecenas and Contributors in the Serbian Culture in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century] in *Privatni život kod Srba u devetnaestom veku* [Private Life among Serbs in Nineteenth Century], ed. Ana Stolić and Nenad Makuljević (Belgrade: Clio, 2006), 611–59.

<sup>lxviii</sup> Miodrag Jovanović, *Srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo i slikarstvo novijeg doba* [Serbian Modern Church Architecture and Painting] (Belgrade and Kragujevac: Kalenić, 1987), 53.

<sup>lxix</sup> Igor Borozan, “Kultura smrti u srpskoj građanskoj kulturi 19. i prvim decenijama 20. Veka” [The Culture of Death in Serbian Bourgeois Culture of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century] in *Privatni život*, ed. Stolić and Makuljević, 889–983.

<sup>lxx</sup> Nenad Makuljević, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije* [Art and National Idea in the Nineteenth Century: European and Serbian Visual Culture in the Service of the Nation] (Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 2006).

<sup>lxxi</sup> Radić, *Narodna verovanja*, 82.

<sup>lxxii</sup> Dimitrije Stefanović, ed., *Život i delo Mitropolita Mihaila (1826–1898)* [The Life and Deeds of Metropolitan Mihailo (1826–1898)] (Belgrade: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, 2008).

<sup>lxxiii</sup> Bojan Jovanović, “Krsna slava” [Patron Saint] in *Privatni život*, ed. Stolić and Makuljević, 610.

<sup>lxxiv</sup> See Radoslav Grujić, “Kult Sv. Save u Karlovačkoj mitropoliji XVIII i XIX veka” [The Cult of Saint Sava in the Karlovci Metropolitanate in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries], in *Bogoslovlje* 10, no. 2–3 (1935): 143.

<sup>lxxv</sup> The image appeared on the fresco in the church of the Assumption of Virgin Mary in Zemun. See Dejan Medaković, “Istorijske osnove ikonografije sv. Save u XVIII veku” [Historical Foundations of the Iconography of Saint Sava in the Eighteenth Century] in *Sava Nemanjić—Sveti Sava—istorija i predanje*, ed. Jovan Babić, Dimitrije Blagojević, et al. [Sava Nemanjić—Sveti Sava—History and Tradition] (Belgrade: SANU, 1979), 400.

<sup>lxxvi</sup> *Matica* [Matica], vol. 2 (Novi Sad: n.p., 1867), 495, quoted in Grujić, “Kult Sv. Save u Karlovačkoj mitropoliji XVIII i XIX veka.”

<sup>lxxvii</sup> Geert van Dartel, *Ćirilometodska ideja i Svetosavlje* [The Cyrillo-Methodian Idea and Svetosavlje] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1984) is the pioneering attempt to describe the interactions of these two competing ideologies. See also Ljubomir Durković-Jakšić, *Kult slovenskih apostola Ćirila i Metodija kod Srba* [The Cult of Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs, among the Serbs] (Belgrade: Sveti Sinod SPC, 1986).

<sup>lxxviii</sup> For the activities of the Saint Sava Association in Kosovo and Macedonia, see Đorđe Mikić, “Delatnost Društva Sv. Save na Kosovu (1886–1912)” [Activities of St. Sava Society in

---

Kosovo (1886–1912)] in *Naša prošlost* [Our Past] (Kraljevo: n.p., 1975), 61–87; Jovan Hadži-Vasiljević, *Spomenica Društva Sv. Save 1886–1936* [St. Sava Society Memorial 1886–1936] (Belgrade: Društvo Sv. Save, 1936).

<sup>lxxxix</sup> *Nezavisnost Srpske crkve proglašena 1879 godine* [The Acquisition of Autocephalous Status by the Serbian Church in 1879] (Belgrade: n.p., 1880) contains all relevant documents.

<sup>lxxx</sup> Athanasios Angelopoulos, “Relations between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Church of Serbia during the Period 1885–1912,” *Balkan Studies* 13, no. 1 (1972): 119–27.

<sup>lxxxi</sup> By 1886, Greek institutions maintained 836 schools, enrolling 45,000 students in Macedonia. In addition, they were running theaters, presses, and musical and gymnastic societies. Bulgarians were influential at the time and had a solid state budget to finance over 800 schools and close to 30,000 students plus those in secondary schools and teaching colleges. Serbia, on the other hand, by 1900 had opened only 217 schools with around 9,000 students. See Andrew Rossos, *Macedonia and the Macedonians: A History* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2008), 72–78.

<sup>lxxxii</sup> *Sveštenstvo i manastiri u Srbiji iz putnih beležaka jednog bogoslova* [The Clergy and Monasteries in Serbia from Travel Notes of a Seminarist] (Belgrade: n.p., 1892), 11.

<sup>lxxxiii</sup> Jos. V. Stojanović, “Hrišćanski katihisis pravoslavne crkve za učenike niže gimnasije i realke” [Christian Catechism for High School Students] and “Crkveno Obredoslovlje za učenike srednjih škola” [Liturgical Manual for High School Students] in *Nastavnik* [Teacher] 8 (1897): 74–79 and 121–23.

<sup>lxxxiv</sup> For Romanian figures, see *Romania. Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office. No. 23* (London: H.M.S.O., 1920), 57. For Serbia, see S. M. Veselinovitch, “Religion” in *Servia by the Servians*, ed. Alfred Stead (London: Heinemann, 1909), 155. The number of clergy in Romania was at its lowest since the ecclesiastical reform of 1864 abolished the privileges of the church and left it in destitution.

<sup>lxxxv</sup> Holm Sundhaussen, *Historische Statistik Serbiens 1834–1914* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1989), 595.

<sup>lxxxvi</sup> “Govor na skupštini našoj o kaluderima” [Speech on the Assembly regarding Monks] in *Pravoslavljje* [Orthodoxy] 1 (1871): 532–34. Also see *Sveštenstvo i manastiri u Srbiji*, 21.

<sup>lxxxvii</sup> It is a topic of every issue of *Vesnik Srpske Crkve*; see, for example, the report from the XVI Assembly of Priests, held on August 1905, in *Vesnik Srpske Crkve* 11 (1905): 1028–42.

<sup>lxxxviii</sup> Aleksa Ivić, *Arhivska građa o jugoslovenskim književnim i kulturnim radnicima, Vol. 4, 1723–1887* [Archival Sources on Yugoslav Literary and Cultural Figures, vol. 4, 1723–1887] (Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1935), 411–12.

<sup>lxxxix</sup> Đoko Slijepčević, *Nazareni u Srbiji do 1914. godine* [Nazarenes in Serbia until 1914] (Belgrade: Jugoistok, 1943) provides a detailed account based on documentation of the Ministry of Education and Church in AS.

<sup>xc</sup> Count Chedomille Mijatovich, *The Memoirs of a Balkan Diplomatist* (London: Cassel and Company, 1917), 204.

<sup>xci</sup> Chedo Mijatovich, *Servia and the Servians* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1908), 52.

---

<sup>xcii</sup> Branko Cisarž, *Jedan vek periodične štampe Srpske pravoslavne crkve* [A Century of Publication of the Serbian Orthodox Church Press] (Belgrade: Sveti arhijerejski sinod, 1986), 61.

<sup>xciii</sup> Slobodan G. Marković, “Grof Čedomilj Mijatović—protestantski duh među Srbima” [Count Čedomilj Mijatović—Protestant Spirit among the Serbs] in *Liberalna misao u Srbiji. Prilozi istoriji liberalizma od kraja XVIII do sredine XX veka* [Liberal Thought in Serbia. Contributions to the History of Liberalism from the End of the Eighteenth to Mid-Twentieth Century], ed. Jovica Trkulja and Dragoljub Popovic (Belgrade: CUPS and Fridrich Naumann Stiftung, 2001), 247–80.

<sup>xciv</sup> See more in Petar Kuzmič, *Vuk-Daničićevo Sveto pismo i Biblijska društva* [Vuk-Daničić Translation of the Bible and Biblical Societies] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1983).

<sup>xcv</sup> For a recent English language evaluation of the Radicals and their ideas, see Augusta Dimou, *Entangled Paths towards Modernity* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2009), especially 113–18.

<sup>xcvi</sup> Michael Palairt, *The Balkan Economies c.1800–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>xcvii</sup> Klaus Buchenau, *Auf russischen Spuren. Orthodoxe Antiwestler in Serbien, 1850–1945* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011).

<sup>xcviii</sup> Michael B. Petrovich, introduction to Milovan Djilas, *Njegoš* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), 23.

<sup>xcix</sup> Christopher Boehm, *Montenegrin Social Organization and Values* (New York: AMS Press, 1983), 89.

<sup>c</sup> Petrovich, introduction to Milovan Djilas, *Njegoš*, xx.

<sup>ci</sup> This later caused many controversies and some people in Montenegro in recent years have opposed the Serbian Orthodox Church asking for an autocephalous church.

<sup>cii</sup> Andrew Baruch Wachtel, “How to Use a Classic: Petar Petrović Njegoš in the Twentieth Century” in *Ideologies and National Identities: The Case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*, ed. John Lampe and Mark Mazower (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004), 131–53, discusses the trajectory of Njegoš as a national poet. For a less critical but extensive biography, see Djilas, *Njegoš*.

<sup>ciii</sup> M. Pavle, “Voštanica na grobu Mitropolita Mitrofana” [Speech at the Grave of Metropolitan Mitrofan], [http://stari.mitropolija.me/aktuelno/svedocenja/mpavle-mitrofan\\_ban\\_1.html](http://stari.mitropolija.me/aktuelno/svedocenja/mpavle-mitrofan_ban_1.html) (accessed February 8, 2013).

<sup>civ</sup> During Communist rule (1945–1990), Montenegro experienced almost an eradication of the (Serbian Orthodox) Church, incomparable with that in any other region of Yugoslavia.

<sup>cv</sup> Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: the Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1979).

<sup>cvi</sup> When, following the Bosnian insurrection of 1875, the Serbian Parliament considered going to war against the Ottoman Empire, a peasant deputy reportedly protested by saying: “If we wrench Bosnia, my own field will not become any larger.” Quoted in Dimitrije Đorđević, “The Serbian Peasant in the 1876 War” in *War and Society in East Central Europe*, vol. 17: *Insurrections, Wars, and the Eastern Crisis in the 1870s*, ed. B. K. Kiraly and G. Stokes (Boulder, Colo: Social Science Monographs, 1985), 309–11.

<sup>cvii</sup> Ivana Perković-Radak, *Od anđeoskog pojanja do horske umetnosti: srpska horska crkvena muzika u periodu romantizma, (do1914.godine)* [From Angelic Chanting to Art of Choir

---

Singing: Serbian Choir Church Music in the Age of Romanticism, until 1914] (Belgrade: Fakultet muzičke umetnosti, 2008).

<sup>cvi</sup> In Serbia this new genre of church music was defined and personified in the works of Stevan Stojanović Mokranjac. See Jelena Milojković-Djurić, “The Roles of Jovan Skerlic, Steven Mokranjac, and Paja Jovanovic in Serbian Cultural History, 1900–1914,” *Slavic Review* 47, no. 4 (1988): 687–701, and *Tradition and Avant-Garde: Literature and Art in Serbian Culture, 1900–1918* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Monographs; distributed by Columbia University Press, 1988).

<sup>cix</sup> Pavle Vasić, “Crkvena umetnost kod Srba u XVIII and XIX veku” [Serbian Church Art in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries] in *Srpska Pravoslavna Crkva 1219–1969* [Serbian Orthodox Church 1219–1969] (Belgrade: Sveti Arijerejski Sinod SPC, 1969), 349. On Hansen and its school, see also Jovanović, *Srpsko crkveno*, 109–30.

<sup>cx</sup> Slobodan Ćurčić, *Gračanica: King Milutin’s Church and Its Place in Late Byzantine Architecture* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979).

<sup>cxi</sup> The Serbian King Petar also opted for the Serbo-Byzantine style in the competition for the Royal Family Mausoleum Church that ran parallel to that for Saint Sava Church. Miodrag Jovanović, *Oplenac* (Topola: Centar za kulturu Dušan Petrov, 1989), 27.

<sup>cxii</sup> This was first noted by R. W. Seton-Watson who referred to a certain similarity between their relationship and that of the English to the Irish. Hugh and Christopher Seton-Watson, *The Making of a New Europe. R. W. Seton-Watson and the last years of Austria-Hungary* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981), 57.