

The Patriarchate of Peć as a Contested Frontier of Faith and Loyalty: Islam,
Orthodoxy, and Catholicism in the 18th-century Ottoman Balkans

By

Camilla Pletuhina-Tonev

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Comparative History, with a specialization in
Eastern Mediterranean Studies

Supervisor: Assistant Prof. Tolga U. Esmer
Second Reader: Associate Prof. Jan Hennings

Central European University
Budapest/Vienna
June 2020

Copyright Notice

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

This thesis explores the shifting character of inter-confessional relations in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Balkans and its implications for intra-confessional dynamics within the Ottoman Orthodox Christian denomination [*mezheb*]. The thesis focuses on Orthodox Christian Patriarchs and the congregation of the Serbian Patriarchate of Peć, which was an autocephalous ecclesiastical institution in the Ottoman Balkans until its abolition in 1766. By exploring previously overlooked petitions related to the short career of the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć Vasilije Brkić before the dissolution of his institution, my thesis examines the narrative strategies and rhetoric used to construct the petitions that Brkić and his Greek, Serbian, and Muslim detractors wrote around the mid-eighteenth century, a veritable “black hole” in Ottoman historiography. It does so in order to assess the prevailing discourses of proper religious belief and practices as well as loyalty and trustworthiness during this understudied, sea-change moment of Ottoman history.

By the turn of the eighteenth century, the Ottomans’ standing in inter-imperial power and political configurations shifted against the Ottomans to their Habsburg and Russian rivals in novel ways. Increasing losses of wars and territories, foreign invasions, and Ottoman Christian subjects’ joining the armies of imperial rivals en masse fundamentally altered the social fabric of Ottoman society. This thesis contextualizes the developments in the late Serbian Patriarchate in these larger inter-imperial power struggles and argues that the division of the Patriarchate of Peć between the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires as a result of the “Great Migrations of Serbs” to the Habsburg domains contributed to the emergence of the Patriarchate of Peć as a trans-imperial institution and its congregation as trans-imperial actors. The in-betweenness of the Serbian church and people crystallized the inter-imperial rivalry and

confessional tensions dominating the Ottoman imperial agenda. With that, the Patriarchate of Peć emerged as contested frontier of faith and loyalty where inter- and intra-confessional relations challenged preconceived notions of imperial and confessional belonging.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I extend my gratitude to my former supervisor in Istanbul Elif Bayraktar-Tellan. Despite the distance and the fact that I was no longer formally her student, she continued to provide me with guidance and support throughout this year. If it were not for her, I would never be where I am doing what I do.

Other than being intellectually challenging and truly transformative, this year at CEU was a pure joy, and I am grateful to everyone, who was a part of this amazing journey. I thank CEU for financing my studies and giving me an opportunity to obtain education and experience that would otherwise be unattainable for me. I am grateful to CEU History Department for creating environment that feels like home while simultaneously challenging to grow. I am thankful to Aniko Molnar, who on top of her daily job of coordinating everything involving our student lives, spent so many of her evenings organizing our departmental leisure events.

I am grateful to my second reader Jan Hennings. From the day he interviewed me for admission to CEU to this moment, his kindness, support, dedication to his students, and zeal in enabling our growth (like the “sample” conference we had in Vienna) provided me with a role model of who I would like to be as a scholar and as a professor.

I am thankful to my supervisor Tolga U. Esmer for asking me challenging questions and for provoking me to expand my intellectual comfort zone. I am grateful to him for being so involved in my performance as a student and in my general well-being. Tolga hocam managed to be a kind and supportive supervisor while simultaneously leading a relentless battle against my loyalty to passive voice and run on sentences. While the battle is far from over, Tolga hocam’s place in it will always be special.

I would also like to acknowledge Tijana Krstić whose work inspired me to pursue a degree at CEU in the first place.

I thank my CEU friends, Joni, Mari, Oliverchik, Adamchik, and Sasa for bringing so much laughter, outdated Russian songs, alcohol, and garlic bread into my life. If it were not for you, this year would be less joyful, and I would still be fit and healthy.

Finally, I am grateful to my family back in Moldova for putting up with my absence for the sake of my studies, and for taking care of me on so many levels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 Literature Review	7
1.2 Methodology	10
1.3 Structure	13
1.4 The Ottoman Empire and the Catholics: from Tolerance to Enmity.....	14
1.5 The Patriarchate of Peć and the Catholics	17
CHAPTER 2.....	20
The Patriarchate of Peć between the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empires.....	20
in the 17th-18th Centuries	20
2.1 The Moving Patriarchate: the First Migration of Serbs to Habsburg Domains under the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III.....	26
2.2 The Organization of the Serbian Church after the Migrations and the Emergence of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać	28
2.3 The Moving Patriarchate: the Second Migration of Serbs to Habsburg Domains under the Patriarch Arsenije IV	31
2.4 A Divided Patriarchate: the Impact of the two Great Migrations on the Serbian Church and Congregation	33
Conclusion.....	40
CHAPTER 3	
Inter-confessional relations with Intra-confessional implications: Vasilije Brkić - the “Catholic” Patriarch of Peć and his Networks in the Habsburg Domains	
3.1 Vasilije as the Last ‘Serbian’ Patriarch of Peć	45
3.2 Vasilije as the Preserver of Order.....	49
3.3 Vasilije as The <i>Re’âyâ</i> and Sultan’s Loyal Servant	50
3.4 Vasilije as a Catholic, a Traitor, a Fugitive Convict	53
3.5. Vasilije as an Innocent Trans-Imperial Entrepreneur.....	58
Conclusion.....	65
CONCLUSION	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

Chapter 1

Introduction

The eighteenth century marked a period of major transition for the Ottoman dynasty and its society. In the historiography, this period is mostly associated with the Ottoman wars against the Habsburg, Russian, Venetian, as well as Persian Empires. Continuous military campaigns followed by losses of some of the Empire's largest territories, popular unrest among the Ottoman subjects, financial shortages, decay of administrative systems the Empire relied on for centuries, and the alleged dispersion of central authority to various local actors traditionally prompted Ottoman chroniclers and modern historians to approach the period inauspiciously as one of destitute decline.¹ At the same time, numerous studies have recently reconsidered decline and decentralization paradigms suggesting that the Ottoman state in the eighteenth century managed to adapt its fiscal and administrative structures to the challenges of the time by ushering institutional centralization, inclusion of various provincial elites in the administration, and reconsidering the Empire's legal and monetary systems, bureaucracy, and stance in international relations.²

¹ For decline and de-centralization paradigm see Halil İnalçık, "Centralization and Decentralization in Ottoman Administration," in *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History*, eds. T. Naff and R. Owen, (London, 1977); Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age, 1300-1600* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973); H.A.R Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West: A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1950); for the change in administrative and fiscal policies see Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi* (İstanbul: Ötüken, 2000); Suraiya Faroqhi, "Crisis and Change, 1590-1699," in Linda Darling, *Revenue-raising and Legitimacy: Tax collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660* (Brill, 1996); Yavuz Cezar, *Osmanlı Maliyesinde Bunalım ve Değişim Dönemi: XVIII.yy'dan Tanzimata Mali Tarih* (İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1986); Halil İnalçık, *Military and fiscal transformation in the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1700* (Peeters-Leuven, 1980); Halil İnalçık, *Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); for the power-dynamics between the Porte and various local actors see Bruce McGowan, "The Age of Ayans," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Halil İnalçık (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

² For the power-dynamics between the Porte and various local actors see Ali Yaycıoğlu, *Partners of the Empire: Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions* (Stanford University Press, 2016);

After the Treaty of Karlowitz, the Ottoman Empire entered the eighteenth century stripped of unprecedented amounts of territories and subjects, as a significant part of the Ottoman Balkans was lost to Habsburg armies as a result of the Great Turkish War (1683-1699). Along with the territories and taxpayers, the Ottoman Empire lost significant numbers of its Orthodox Christian warrior populations. Among these were the Serbs. Having been under Ottoman rule since the fifteenth century, the Serbs provided the Porte with taxpaying and irregular warrior populations for centuries. In return, they had access to certain military and administrative positions, were granted the status of “the Sultan’s protected subjects,” and had the freedom to practice their rite under the banner of the autocephalous Patriarchate of Peć, which is the focus of this thesis.³

Yavuz Cezar, “The Role of the Sarrafs in Ottoman Finance and Economy in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries”, in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, Vol. 1, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (Tauris, 2005); for ‘revisionist’ studies on the 18th century Ottoman Empire see, Hasan Çolak and Elif Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution: A study of Early Modern Patriarchal Berats* (Istanbul: ISIS, 2019); Başak Tuğ, *Politics of Honor in the Ottoman Anatolia: Sexual Violence and Socio-Legal Surveillance in the Eighteenth Century* (Brill: Leiden & Boston, 2017); Hasan Çolak, *The Orthodox Church in the Early Modern Middle East: Relations between the Ottoman Central Administration and the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2015); Betül Başaran, *Selim III, Social Control and Policing in Istanbul at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Between Crisis and Order* (Boston: Brill, 2014); Elif Bayraktar Tellan, “The Patriarch and the Sultan: The Struggle for Authority and the Quest for Order in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire” (PhD Dissertation, Bilkent University, 2011); Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge University Press, 2008); Virginia Aksan, “War and Peace”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: The Later Ottoman Empire 1603-1938*, Vol. III, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge University Press, 2006); Cemal Kafadar, “The Question of Ottoman Decline,” *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 4, no. 1-2 (1997-98); Ariel Salzmann, “Measures of Empire: Tax-Farmers and the Ottoman Ancien Regime, 1695-1807” (PhD Diss., Columbia University, 1995); Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization* (Cornell University Press, 1994).

³ Tolga U. Esmer, “War, State and the Privatisation of Violence in the Ottoman Empire,” in *The Cambridge World History of Violence*, eds. Robert Anthony, Stuart Carroll, and Caroline Dodds Pennock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 194-216; Noel Malcolm, *Agents of Empire: Knights, Corsairs, Jesuits and Spies in the Sixteenth-Century Mediterranean World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Virginia H. Aksan, “Mobilization of Warrior Populations in the Ottoman Context, 1750-1850,” in *Fighting for a Living: A Comparative Study of Military Labour 1500-2000*, ed. Erik-Jan Zürcher (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), 331-52; Sima M. Cirković, *The*

Two larger eighteenth-century trends in the Ottoman Empire this thesis examines are the heightened struggles between the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires and the intensification of Catholic proselytizing activities on Ottoman territories.⁴ This, along with Ottoman centralization efforts, resulted in a major shift in attitudes toward and discourses about Catholics in the empire. This shift was fueled, as least partly, by the Porte's growing hostility towards Catholic proselytizing activities as well as instances of conversion to and toleration of Catholicism among Ottoman Orthodox subjects. This period witnessed a drastic increase in petitions submitted to the Porte by the Orthodox high clergy and Christian *re'âyâ*⁵ containing complains about Catholic missionaries and the Orthodox subjects' converting, supporting, or merely tolerating these activities. The premise was that these activities bring unrest [*ihtilâl*] to the society and put the "order" [*nizâm*] at risk. With the aim to maintain the order [*nizâm*] among its subjects and hinder conversions, the Porte responded positively to petitions regarding the people acting in contravention with their rite, severely punishing the Orthodox congregation and especially Orthodox high-clergy who displayed any form of inclination towards Catholicism.⁶

For the Patriarchate of Peć the eighteenth century was a period of drastic changes, too. Starting in the last decade of the seventeenth century on throughout the entire eighteenth century, the Serbs of the Patriarchate of Peć sided with the Habsburg Empire in every war they fought against the Ottomans. When the Habsburg armies retreated, however, the Serbs headed by the Patriarch of Peć Arsenije III, retreated with the armies to the Habsburg domains, leaving

Serbs (Blackwell, 2004); *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Serbia.", 3 Vols. (Oxford University Press, 1991).

⁴ See Chapter 1.3 and 1.4.

⁵ Taxpaying subjects of the Ottoman Empire, for more on *re'âyâ* see Clifford E. Bosworth and Suraiya Faruqi, "Ra'iyya", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol.1, (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Aleksandar Fotić, "Tracing the Origin of a New Meaning of the Term Re'âyâ", *Balkanica* XLVIII (2017), 55-66.

⁶ See Chapter 1.3.

their Patriarchate and the large part of congregation behind. Having settled mostly in former Ottoman lands in what is now modern Hungary that the Habsburgs renamed as the Vojvodina, the Serbian migrant communities established a Metropolitanate with the seat first in Krušedol (1708) and later in Karlovać (1713). A new Patriarch assumed the Patriarchal throne of Peć. And thus, the Serbian church and congregation was divided between the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires. The Porte started to treat the Serbs and their religious leaders with growing suspicion introducing the practice of appointing the Patriarchs of Peć from Phanariot circles, instead of confirming the patriarchs chosen by the Serbian clergy for themselves.

The short but remarkable career of the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć, Vasilije Jovanović (1763-1765), is the topic of this study, and his tumultuous tenure as the last leader of the Ottoman Serbian Orthodox congregation demonstrates how inter-imperial rivalries undermined confessional tensions within Ottoman society. Born outside the Ottoman Empire in the Habsburg Vojvodina, Brkić would become the Patriarch of Peć – an Ottoman ecclesiastical institution, only to be accused by his own congregation of being a Catholic convert when he decided to visit his relatives from the Habsburg domains.

Along with Vasilije Brkić, whose short career, I argue, is very representative of the volatile domestic politics and intrigue in Ottoman lands emanating from trans-imperial and intra-confessional dynamics dominating the first half of the eighteenth century, other actors central to this study are the congregation and the Patriarchs of Peć, the Metropolitanate of Karlovać and its clergy, the Patriarchs of Istanbul and other high clergy of Phanariot origin, and on a larger stage, the Habsburg and Ottoman authorities. Thus, when using the term “inter-confessional” I refer to the relations between the Orthodox versus Catholics and Muslims, while by “intra-confessional”, I refer to the dynamics unfolding within what the Ottomans called the “Orthodox *mezheb*” (faith; confession), which would include both the Orthodox

Serbs from the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires and the Orthodox “Greeks”, *i.e.* the Phanariots.

By analyzing the career of the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć along with the interplay of imperial and confessional power dynamics characteristic to the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire, the present study aims to reconsider relations between the Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman Empire, in this case the high clergy and the congregation of the Patriarchate of Peć, and the various Catholic actors in the context of eighteenth-century developments in Ottoman society. To do so, I will locate the inter-confessional relations of Patriarchate of Peć in the larger context of shifting Ottoman attitudes towards Catholics. Thus, I will attempt to follow how the relations between the Ottoman Orthodox and Catholic actors were affected by and reflected general changes in the Ottoman – Catholic discourse and Ottoman-Habsburg dynamics in the eighteenth century.

Most importantly, I will employ unpublished Ottoman primary sources to demonstrate how inter-confessional dynamics affected intra-confessional relations in the Patriarchate of Peć. Namely, I will argue that the high clergy and the *re‘âyâ* of Peć were not only aware of the empire-wide shift in Catholic discourse, but they also actively employed the terminology and rhetoric adopted by the Ottoman administration towards the Catholics in order to negotiate with the Porte through petitions. I do not suggest that the narrative of petitions reflected “reality.” Rather, I argue, that the petitioners used specific rhetoric and “buzzwords” in order to construct carefully a reality that addressed current discourses and prevailing Ottoman “anxieties” about which subjects were loyal and which ones were treacherous and in cahoots with foreign imperial rivals.⁷

⁷ For the imperial anxieties in archival vernacular, see Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton University Press, 2009).

Finally, I will consider the novel webs of interaction that the division of the Peć's congregation between the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empires brought about. I suggest that the formation of the Ottoman Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovać in the Habsburg domains facilitated a lasting institutionalized presence of the Serbs and their religious leaders in this rival imperial domain. At the same time, the Metropolitanate of Karlovać extended its financial, educational, and power webs back to the Patriarchate of Peć, which continued to function as an autocephalous Orthodox institution in the Ottoman Empire. I argue that these trans-imperial webs had a principal effect on the way inter-confessional and intra-confessional relations unfolded in the Patriarchate of Peć in the last years of its existence as an autocephalous ecclesiastical institution. Divided between two rival empires the Serbian church and congregation earned the mistrust of Ottoman central authorities and local Muslim populations. To avoid further disorder in the regions under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć, the Porte started to appoint high clergy of Phanariot origin at the head of the Serbian church. This contributed to the crystallization of intra-imperial tensions within the Orthodox *mezheb*. At the same time, the Serbian patriarchs of Peć who sought the financial support of their counterparts in the Habsburg Empire also felt the urge to distance from relegating themselves confessionally, emphasizing instead the linguistic, cultural, and "ethnic" commonalities that the Serbian subjects of both empires allegedly shared. In addition to their already compromised reputation, the trans-imperial body of the Serbian church and congregation made them vulnerable and easily reprimandable in the context of inter-imperial rivalry and cross-confessional tensions.⁸ By addressing these points in my thesis, I intend to demonstrate how as

⁸ By referring to the Serbs as trans-imperial actors I imply that that their status as subjects of the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires, as Orthodox, as 'Serbs' was in flux. Moreover, they did not hesitate to "regularly mobilize their roots 'elsewhere' to foreground specific knowledge, privileges, or

a result of the division of the Serbian Orthodox church between the two rival empires, the Patriarchate of Peć emerged as a contested frontier of faith and loyalty where inter- and intra-confessional relations unfolded in a trans-imperial setting.

1.1 Literature Review

In Serbian historiography, the Patriarchate of Peć occupies an honorable place, as an institution associated with the preservation of the Serbian faith, state and nationality. As such, the concept of the Serbian church is attributed a surprising degree of human-like consciousness, intentionality, and constancy in its motives and ambitions. Accordingly, the Serbian Church was not only aware of its distinguished role in the lives of Serbian people, but acted in the interests of the Serbian state and the religion at all times.⁹ Throughout its existence, the Serbian

commitments to further their current interests,” see Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*, (Cornell University Press, 2012), 11.

⁹ Here and hereafter by the “Serbian historiography” I mostly refer to major works on the Serbian Orthodox Church written in the twentieth century, many of them based on Serbian primary sources. More recent works on the same topic, are mostly following the same arguments as their predecessors, as they are based on the same set of primary sources and secondary literature. See, Dushan T. Bataković (ed.), *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda [The New History of the Serbian People]* (Naš Dom, 2000); Djoko Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve Od Pokrshtavanja Srba do Kraja XVIII Veka [The History of the Serbian Orthodox Church from the Christianization of the Serbs till the End of XVIII Century]*, Vol. I (BIGZ: Belgrade, 1991); Jovan Radonić and Mita Kostić, *Srpske Privilegije od 1690 do 1792 [Serbian Privileges from 1690 till 1792]* (Belgrade, 1954); Jovan Radonić, *Rimska kurija i južnoslovenske zemlje od XVI do XIX veka [Roman Curia and South Slavic lands from the 16th to the 19th centuries]* (Belgrade, 1950); Rajko Veselinović, *Arsenij III Chrnojević u Istoriji i Knizhevnosti [Arsenij III Crnojević in History and Literature]* (Belgrade, 1949); László Hadrovics, *L'eglise serbe sous la Domination Turque* (Paris, 1947); Djoko Slijepčević, “Ukidanje Pečke Patrijarshije 1766. Godine [Abolition of The Patriarchate of Peć in 1766]”, *Bogoslovlje XIII* (Belgrade, 1938); Vladimir Corović, *Istorija Jugoslavije [History of Yugoslavia]* (Belgrade, 1933); Radoslav Grujić, “Pečki Patrijarski i Karlovachki Mitropoliti u XVIII Veku [The Patriarchs of Peć and the Metropolitans of Karlovac in the XVIII Century]”, *Glasnik Istoriskog Drustva u Novom Sadu*, Vol. IV (1931); Radoslav Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška [the Patriarchate of Peć]”, in *Narodna enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenačka*, Vol. III, (Zagreb, 1928): 389–399; Radoslav Grujić, “Karlovachka Mitropolija [Metropolitanate of Karlovci]”, *Narodna Enciklopedija SHS*, Vol. II, (Zagreb, 1927): 249–257; Radoslav Grujić, *Pravoslavna Srpska Tsrkva [The Orthodox Serbian Church]* (Belgrade, 1921); Aleksa Ivić, *Istorija Srba u Ugarskoj od Pada Smedereva do Seobe pod Charnojevichem [The History of the Serbs in*

Church faced numerous obstacles. Undoubtedly, among these challenges were the Catholic proselytizing activities, the pressure of Rome and other Catholic states like Venice and the Habsburg Empire aimed to convert the Serbs to Catholicism and put an end to “Turkish slavery” in Europe.

Although the Serbian church had entered and initiated numerous contacts with these states, it allegedly had done so with the intention of “liberating” itself from “the Turks” and obtaining long-awaited freedom for the Serbian people and state.¹⁰ Indeed, the Serbian church was misused by powerful states for their own purposes. As a consequence, it was in the second half of the eighteenth century that it was finally abolished, allegedly, as a result of a plot organized by the Porte and “the Greeks” of the Patriarchate of Istanbul who sought to “usurp” the jurisdiction of the Serbian Church as a part of their “Hellenization agenda.”¹¹

Hungary since the fall of Smederevo to the Migration under Čarnojević (1459-1690)] (Zagreb, 1914); Radoslav Grujić, “Prilozi za Istoriju Seobe Srba u Rusiji” in *Srpska Kraljevska Akademija: Spomenik*, Vol. LI (Belgrade, 1913); Stanoje Stanojević, *Istorija Srpskoga Naroda [History of the Serbian People]* (Belgrade, 1908); Dmitrije Ruvarac, “O Ukidanju Pechke Patrijarshije i njenom Nasledu [On the Abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and its Heritage]”, *Srpski Sion*, (1904), 293-299; Nikodim Milash, *Pravoslavna Dalmacija [The Orthodox Dalmatia]* (Novi Sad, 1901); Nikanor Ruzicić, *Kratki Istoriski Pregled Uzajamnih Odnoshaja Izmechu Srpske i Grchko-Tsarigradske Tsrkve i Njihovih Predstavitel'ja [Brief Historical Overview of the Mutual Relations between the Serbian and Greek-Constantinople Churches and their Representatives]* (Belgrade, 1875); For some of the recent works written on the Patriarchate of Peć, see Ognjen Karanović, “Privilegijalna Politika Tsara Leopolda I: Pravni Fundament Opstanka Srpskog Etnosa u Habzburshkoj Monarhiji [The Privilegial Policy of Tsar Leopold I: The legal foundation of the survival of Serbian ethnicity in the Habsburg Monarchy]” in *LIK: Cheasopsis za Literaturu i Kulturu* 4/5, (2018): 133-163; Vladan Gavrilović, “Primeri Migracija Srpskog Naroda u Ugarske Provincijalne Oblasti [Examples of migration of the Serbian people into the Hungarian provincial areas 1699-1737]”, *Istrajivanja* 25, (2014): 139-148; Aleksandar Fotić, “Serbian Orthodox Church” in *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, eds. Gabor Agoston and Bruce Masters (New York, 2009): 519-520; Nedel'ko Radosavljević, “Pečka Patrijarshija, od Obnove Autokefalnosti do Ukidanja [The Patriarchate of Peć from the Restoration of Autocephaly till Abolition]”, in *Bratstvo* XI, 11-34 (Belgrade: Društvo “Sveti Sava”, 2007); Tatjana Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, in *Österreichische Osthefte*, Vienna (2005): 145-158; Cirković, *The Serbs*.

¹⁰ For the most representative and brief overview of such rhetoric, see Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška.”

¹¹ See for example, Ruvarac, “O Ukidanju Pechke Patrijarshije,” Slijepčević, “Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve”; Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge, 1968); alternatively, sources written in English and Greek maintain that the Patriarchate of Peć was abolished as a result of its long lasting struggle with corruption, poverty, and disorder, see

Such an approach to the history of the Serbian Church and its congregation not only is anachronistic in its projection of contemporary views and values on the past, but it also fails to contextualize the history of the Serbs and their church in the prevailing dynamics of the period and the various actors that interacted with the Serbian church and people. Most importantly, this approach hardly sees the Serbs and their institutions as a congruent part of the Ottoman Empire. The actions undertaken by the Serbs and their religious leaders are thus reified as acts and decisions made autonomously, free from Ottoman politics and social dynamics.

In a similar vein, the decisions and actions of the other related actors such as Venice, France, the Papacy, as well as the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires also appear as linear, inherent and lacking context when it comes to the Serbs' struggles with Muslims, the Greeks, and Catholics — not to mention the Orthodox Patriarchate's larger struggle with Catholic missions. According to this logic, therefore, the Ottoman Empire existed largely to oppress Serbs; the Greeks were bent on the Hellenization of the Serbs; the Venetian and Habsburg Empires "used" the Serbian people in their campaigns against the Ottoman empire only to abandon them when they failed to hold onto the territories Serbian irregular warriors played a key role in winning; and the primary aspiration of the Vatican in its dealings with the Serbian patriarchs was to con them into a union between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, thereby making the Serbs abandon their faith and submit themselves to the tiara of the popes.¹²

Such an approach, furthermore, ignores the shift in anti-Catholic sentiment that already engulfed Ottoman Muslim and Orthodox Christian communities by the end of the seventeenth

Charles Jelavich, "Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century", *Church History* 23(02), (1954), 144 – 152; Theodore H. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, (Aldershot: Variorum, 1990); Sathas, *Mesaionike bibliotheke epistasia*, Typois tou Chronou, Vol III, 1872.

¹² Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 386-388; Milash, *Pravoslavna Dalmacija*; Radonić, *Rimska Curijska*.

century. It presents relations between the Patriarchate of Peć and Catholic actors as unfolding out of the context of Ottoman imperial politics. In the same spirit, the Porte's role in these interactions is confined to sporadic punishments in form of the imprisonment, exile, and execution of Serbian clergy. The possibility of cooperation between the Serbian Church and the Porte in form of petitions, decrees and adjustments of *berât* stipulations are overlooked. Moreover, the probability of the awareness of the congregation of Peć in the shifting discourse on the Catholic in the Ottoman Empire and their employment of this discourse to negotiate with the Porte is likewise neglected. Thus, following the "*millet system* myth," the high clergy of Peć and its congregation appear as unaware of and unaffected by Ottoman developments of the eighteenth century, while operating their "state within a state"¹³ with the sole aim of "liberation from the Turk".¹⁴

This thesis therefore aims to contextualize the major events unfolding in the last seven decades of the Patriarchate of Peć's existence as an Ottoman institution. Rather than assuming that all actors proceeded in predictable ways, I examine in detail the brief career of the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć Vasilije and major events in Ottoman history that preceded his career. I argue, that the disregarded Ottoman petitions related to Vasilije's rise and demise reveal valuable nuances to the interplay of confessional discourses, power dynamics, as well as legal and administrative anxieties that dominated the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire, of which the Patriarchate of Peć was a part.

1.2 Methodology

¹³ Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek* (İstanbul: Klasik Yayınevi, 2004), 31.

¹⁴ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 326

In order to organize extant material on the history of the Patriarchate of Peć, the range of secondary literature used in this study has been limited to those works written in English, Serbian and Turkish. The Serbian secondary sources include monographs and large collections of periodicals such as *Glasnik*, *Srpski Sion*, *Spomenik*, *Glas Istine*, and *Bogoslovski Glasnik*. Scholarship composed in English, Russian, and Turkish will be used as supplementary material in order to trace the general dynamics of the eighteenth century. Though the Ottomans interacted much more frequently, more as equals of the Habsburg, Russian, and Venetian Empires as well as the Papacy during this period, the ramifications of these novel, more symmetrical antagonistic relations between these states and institutions on inter- and intra-confessional relations within the Ottoman empire have not been explored adequately.

The primary sources for this study are the *piskopos mukâta'ası* registers located in the Prime-Ministry Ottoman Archives in Istanbul.¹⁵ More specifically, I aim to focus on the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth folder in the D.PSK classification, covering the last years of the Patriarchate's existence. Among the documents in these folders, I will mostly consider petitions, which concern the developments in the Patriarchate of Peć. Along with this, I will examine *ahkâm* and *berevât* registers from the Kamil Kepeci collection as supplementary sources. The Ottoman primary materials used in this study are mostly the ones recorded in the period from the end of the seventeenth century until 1768, *i.e.* immediately after the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć. The use of unpublished Ottoman primary sources will allow me to reconsider the approaches existing in historiography on the inter-confessional relations between

¹⁵ The *piskoposluk kalemi* was a part of the *Evâmir-i Mâliye Kalemi*. It contains primary documents, such as petitions, *fermâns*, *berâts* concerning major Orthodox Christian institutions of the Ottoman Empire. These include the Patriarchate of Istanbul, the Armenian Patriarchate, the Orthodox Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Peć and Ohrid, see Halil İnalcık, "Ottoman Archival Materials on Millets", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Braude and Lewis, Vol. I (Holmes and Meier, New York and London: 1982) 437-449.

the Patriarchate of Peć and Catholic actors. Moreover, these sources demonstrate the high degree of cooperation and intense interplay between the Porte and the Patriarchate of Peć in matters concerning Catholics and perceived Catholic threats to their respective institutions and communities, which is a point largely ignored in historiography. My analysis of Ottoman petitions written by various actors from Peć will reconsider the ways in which the changing discourse towards Catholics affected intra-confessional dynamics within the Serbian Orthodox congregation.

In this study, I approach petitions as a collaborative and dialogic field, where the petitioners (*i.e.* Ottoman non-Muslim subjects) and the state “developed rhetorical strategies in the boundaries of a given official language in order to maneuver within existing power struggles.”¹⁶ Thus, within the scope of this thesis, I am not asking whether the content of petitions in question reflects any ‘reality’ on the ground. Rather, my focus lies on the rhetorical strategies the petitioners employed to construct a plausible narrative and achieve the Porte’s cooperation. These rhetorical strategies included the utilization of highly political and sensitive terms associated with banditry, disorder, the discontent of Ottoman subjects, oppression, transgression, and conversion. In this way, the rhetorical tools employed in the process of petitioning, provide a vantage point into the matters that were considered most important at the local and imperial level in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire.¹⁷

¹⁶ Tuğ, *Politics of Honor in Ottoman Anatolia*, 73-74.

¹⁷ For the studies with a similar approach to rhetorical tools in primary sources, see Tuğ, *Politics of Honor in Ottoman Anatolia*; Tolga U. Esmer, “Notes on a Scandal: Transregional Networks of Violence, Gossip, and Imperial Sovereignty in the Late Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 58 no. 01, (2016): 99–128; Bayraktar-Tellan, “the Patriarch and the Sultan”; Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain*; John Chalcraft, “Engaging the State: Peasants and Petitions in Egypt on the Eve of Colonial Rule,” *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37, (2005): 303-325; Milen V. Petrov, “Everyday Forms of Compliance: Subaltern Commentaries on Ottoman Reform, 1864-1868,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 4 (2004): 730-59; Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford University Press, 1987).

1.3 Structure

In the two following subchapters, I will focus on the interaction between the Ottoman Empire and its subjects with various Catholic actors. The first subchapter elaborates on the shift in the way the Ottoman Empire approached Catholic activities in its territory. It also addresses the way in which the shift in the Catholic discourse was addressed in petitions that Orthodox subjects submitted to the Porte seeking its collaboration. The second subchapter focuses on the relations between the Patriarchate of Peć and Catholic states. One of the objectives of this thesis is to demonstrate that as the congregation of the Patriarchate consisted of Ottoman Orthodox Christian subjects, they were affected by an eighteenth-century empire-wide shift in Catholic discourse along with the rest of the Empire's subjects. This being said, the subchapter 1.5 demonstrates that nature of relations between the Patriarchate and Catholic actors had its specificities, because some representatives of the Serbian high clergy tended to seek support from Catholic rival states in hope of "liberating themselves from the Turk."

In the second chapter, I focus on one specific instance of interaction between the Patriarchate of Peć and the Catholic Habsburg Empire. While the Serbian Church has previously come in contact with Catholic powers, these contacts were sporadic and depended on personal choices of a given patriarch and his supporters. Meanwhile, the two cases of migration of the Patriarchs of Peć and a part of their congregation to the Habsburg domains during the Great Turkish War (1683-1699) and Austro-Ottoman war of 1736-1739 resulted in the settlement of a large number of Serbs and their religious leaders in Habsburg lands and subsequent founding of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać. In this way, the migrations facilitated the emergence of a centralized and institutionalized Orthodox presence in a Catholic empire. The educational and financial webs that connected parallel Serbian institutions that spanned

two rival empires would crystallize intra- and inter-confessional tensions in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire.

Finally, in the third chapter I analyze the career of the last Serbian Patriarch Peć Vasilije Brkić. To do so, I rely on petitions submitted by his congregation and *kadı* of the region to the Porte, as well as on a number of Russian and Serbian sources that elaborate on Vasilije's fate. I argue that the empire-wide change in inter-confessional dynamics affected intra-confessional relations within the Patriarchate of Peć. The rhetorical tools cultivated in the context of imperial discursive field enabled the high clergy and the *re'âyâ* of Peć to collaborate with the Porte through petitions in an attempt to affect existing power dynamics.

1.4 The Ottoman Empire and the Catholics: from Tolerance to Enmity

The eighteenth century in the Ottoman Empire was a time of increasing demographic flux and social turmoil among the Ottoman Christian populations because of heightened inter-imperial wars and resulting confessional tensions. Under such circumstances, the Porte relied on its ecclesiastical institutions for information regarding the state of their subjects in distant corners of the empire as well as for the preservation of the order and countering the influence of foreign powers such as Russia, Venice, and the Habsburgs on the Ottoman Christian subjects. The eighteenth century therefore emerged as a time of the centralization for the Orthodox Patriarchates Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria under the auspices of the Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul in line with other social, economic, and administrative trends in Ottoman imperial governance.

By the time the Ottomans expanded into the Balkan Peninsula from the mid-fourteenth century onwards, various Roman Catholics groups of western European background had

already inhabited the peninsula¹⁸ and acquired the status of *re‘âyâ* upon the expansion of the Ottoman rule over the territory. Catholic presence in the Empire, moreover, was represented by diplomatic envoys, merchants,¹⁹ and missionaries.²⁰ Relations between Orthodox and Catholic Christians in the Ottoman Empire were for the most part cordial and productive; thus, it was not rare to witness mixed marriage, Ottoman Orthodox clerics often granted western Catholic missionaries the right to preach in Orthodox churches, participate in Orthodox services, give communion, or appear as godparents in Orthodox baptisms.²¹ Moreover, from the late sixteenth on through the seventeenth centuries the Roman Church won over the inclination of some Greek Orthodox metropolitans and Patriarchs.²² The proximity between the Patriarchs and the ambassadors of the Catholic states reached the point where the latter could exert influence in appointments and demotions between rival patriarchs.²³

From the end of the seventeenth throughout the eighteenth centuries, the attitude of the Patriarchate towards Western churches grew visibly negative as the Ottomans' own posture towards the west became increasingly defensive. The shift in anti-Catholic sentiment in the Ottoman Empire is particularly visible in petitions submitted by the Orthodox high clergy as

¹⁸ Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*, (I.B. Tauris, 2004), 20.

¹⁹ Elif Bayraktar Tellan, "The clash of 'Rum' and 'Frenk': Orthodox-Catholic Interactions on the Aegean Islands in the mid-seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries and their Impact in the Ottoman Capital", in *The Islands of the Eastern Mediterranean: A History of Cross-cultural Encounters*, eds. Özlem Çaykent and Luca Zavagno (London: I. B. Tauris, 2014), 64-78; Çolak, *The Orthodox Church*, 112-137.

²⁰ The Catholic missionaries were sent out to the Ottoman domains following the Council of Trent (1545–63), which a start to the structural Catholic missionary activities among Christians, including the non-Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire, see Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire*, 35; Çolak, *The Orthodox Church*, 112; Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and the Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire 1453-1953* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 88-92.

²¹ Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: a Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (Oxford, 1964), 17.

²² Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge, 1968), 230-237; Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans*, 28-39 and 70-72.

²³ Bayraktar Tellan, "The Patriarch and the Sultan," 59-79.

well as common *re'âyâ* to the Porte. The clergy frequently queried the Ottoman administration to issue decrees against Catholic activities that “upset the Orthodox *re'âyâ*.”²⁴ In petitions, the Catholic rite referred to as *âyîn-i Frenk* was considered to be a problem that caused disorder [*ihtilâl*] in the society.²⁵

At the same time, the Eastern Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, too were facing the challenges brought about by the Catholic activities.²⁶ As Hasan Çolak has demonstrated in his monograph on Eastern patriarchates, the Greek Orthodox clergy, who negatively perceived infiltration of the Catholic missions among their clergy and flock, tended to resist the infiltration and conversion by seeking the support of the Patriarchate of Istanbul, and the Ottoman central administration.²⁷ The Porte responded by issuing *berâts* and modifying their stipulations in a way, which would provide the *berât*-holders with the tools to oppose the infiltration of Catholics, to discipline and punish lay and ecclesiastical members of its flock who acted contrary to the Orthodox rite, and in this way, they tried to maintain order over the Orthodox congregation.²⁸

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, therefore, the reaction of Orthodox Patriarchs against Catholic influence over Orthodox subjects converged with that of Ottoman administrative policies, which together altered official as well as local discourse and sentiment against Ottoman as well as foreign Catholic communities. The cooperation between Orthodox

²⁴ Patriarch of Istanbul Kyrillos' petition from 1755 concerning the Catholic activities on the island of Kos, see Bayraktar-Tellan, “The Clash of Rum and Frenk”, 69; A year later – in January 1756 – a similar request was submitted by the Patriarch this time with regard to the activities of the Catholics on the island of Rhodes, see KK.d. 2540,120, 12 Rebî'ü'llevvel 1169 / 15 January 1756.

²⁵ Karen A. Leal, “The Ottoman State and the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul: Sovereignty and Identity at the turn of the Eighteenth Century” (PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2003), 357.

²⁶ Hasan Çolak, “Catholic Infiltration in the Ottoman Levant and Responses of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates during the Late 17th and Early 18th Centuries,” *ARAM* 25 no. 1&2, (2013): 85-95, 91-92; For more details on the Catholic activities in the Eastern Patriarchates see Çolak, *The Orthodox Church*.

²⁷ Çolak, “Catholic Infiltration”, 89.

²⁸ Çolak and Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church*, 50-51.

Christians and the Ottoman administration in the context of Catholic activities in the empire represented a major element in the steps of the Ottoman Orthodox Patriarchates towards institutionalization and centralization. Under such circumstances, petitions acquired an increasing role in mediating imperial politics. Not only were they a means to transfer valuable information or requests from the distant regions to the center, they now emerged a contested sight of alternative realities, where various groups across confessional lines and those belonging to similar *mezhebs* fought to craft plausible and effective narrative that impelled the Porte to take action and decisions benefitting respective authors and their communities.

1.5 The Patriarchate of Peć and the Catholics

The Serbian Orthodox Church was established in 1219 and was elevated to the status of a patriarchate with its seat in Peć on a State Assembly held in Skopje in April, 1346.²⁹ Following the Ottoman annexation of the Branković lands in Kosovo (1455), the Serbian Orthodox Church changed its seat transferring it from Peć to Smederevo, which was the capital of the Ottoman vassal state Serbia. As the Serbian state came under direct rule of the Ottoman Empire in 1459, the Serbian Orthodox Church organization continued functioning.³⁰ In the middle of the sixteenth century, the patriarchate covered a territory larger than its original size stretching its borders into Dalmatia, Croatia and Hungary, and incorporating other Orthodox followers in Sofia and Skopje. Along with these, the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć

²⁹ Bataković, *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, 42; Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška,” 389.

³⁰ Fotić, “Serbian Orthodox Church,” 519; for more details on the fate of the Patriarchate of Peć under the Ottoman Empire see Vladislav B. Sotirović, “The Serbian Patriarchate of Peć in the Ottoman Empire: The First Phase (1557-94)”, *Serbian Studies* 25 no. 2, (2011): 143-167.

extended to some dioceses outside the Ottoman Empire, including those in Habsburg Croatia and along the Venetian Adriatic coast.³¹ Thus, for some time, the Patriarchate of Peć emerged as an institution, which incorporated a number newly conquered Ottoman territories and their Christian but not exclusively Orthodox inhabitants. In some cases, the patriarchs of Peć were given the right to collect duties from the Catholic population as long as he did not interfere with the organization of the Catholic community.³²

Inter-confessional interactions within the Patriarchate of Peć were not confined to the Catholic and orthodox *re'âyâ* under its jurisdiction. From its inception in the thirteenth century until its incorporation into the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the eighteenth century, the autocephalous Patriarchate of Peć was actively interacting with Catholic states; thus, at the end of the seventeenth century, as the tensions between the Ottoman and the Habsburg empires culminated in wars, the Serbian higher clergy took an active position supporting their Orthodox followers and Catholic interlocutors in various ways. The patriarchs did so in a number of different ways: they established frequent contact with Habsburg, Venetian, and Roman authorities; they supported the rebellions of Serbian irregulars and the local population against Istanbul; and they spearheaded large migrations of Serbian subjects out of the Ottoman Empire into the Habsburg Vojvodina.³³

The latter brought about the change from Muslim Ottoman to Catholic Habsburg rule and the division of authority between Peć and the Orthodox Mitropolitanate of Krušedol that was established in the Habsburg Empire after the settlement of the Orthodox Serb congregation. Furthermore, the cooperation of the high clergy of Peć with the Catholic powers is approached

³¹ Fotić, “Serbian Orthodox Church”, 520; For details on the territories under the jurisdiction of the restored Patriarchate of Peć see Sotirović, “The Serbian Patriarchate of Peć”, 152-155.

³² Fotić, “Serbian Orthodox Church”, 520.

³³ Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 153.

in historiography as a major factor in the loss of trust of the Porte towards the Patriarch of Peć, and consequent practice of the Porte to appoint the Patriarchs of Peć from among the Phanariots as opposed to Serbs. This factor, among others, led to the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć initiated by the high clergy of Peć, who, as the Serbian sources emphasize, were Greek, *i.e.* the Phanariots, and not the Serbs.³⁴ Under these circumstances, the intra-confessional tensions crystallized within the Orthodox *mezheb*. As I will demonstrate in further parts of this thesis, the intra-confessional tensions within the Orthodox community sharpened the importance of the formal endorsement of the religious leaders by their congregation promoting the necessity of plausible representation of these leaders in the petitions addressed to the Porte.

³⁴ Charles Jelavich, “Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development,” 147-148; Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 154; Veselinović, *Arsenij III Chrnjević*, 57; Radonić, and Kostić, *Srpske Privilegije od 1690 do 1792*, 442-457.

Chapter 2

The Patriarchate of Peć between the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empires in the 17th-18th Centuries

On September 11, 1766, the Ottoman Sultan Mustafa III (r. 1757-1774) issued a decree that incorporated the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate of Peć into the Patriarchate of Istanbul.³⁵ The Patriarchate, which maintained its autocephality for more than four centuries,³⁶ was abolished and brought under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Istanbul as a result of series of petitions directed to Porte by the incumbent high clergy of Peć, including the Patriarch at the

³⁵ D.PSK 25/73 the document is a draft copy [(...) *Zikr olunan İpek patrikliğinin kaydı ref' ve terkîn ve re'âyâ İstanbul patrikliğine ilhâk ve mahalline kayd olmak bâbında 6 Rebî'ü'l-âhir 1180 tarihinde sâdır olan fermân-ı 'âlîşânım mûcibince patriklik-i mezbûrun kaydı ref' ve terkîn ve İstanbul rum patrikliğine ilhâk (...)]].*

³⁶ The Serbian Orthodox Church was established in 1219 as an autocephalous member of the Orthodox communion. As such the Serbian Orthodox Church adhered to the norms and traditions of Orthodox Christianity, while was not subordinate to an external patriarch. When in 1345 after conquests of prominent Byzantine domains the Serbian king Dushan sought to be proclaimed the *tsar* or the *emperor* of the Serbs and the Rhomaioi, a State Assembly was organized in Skopje in April, 1346 when Joanikije II - former archbishop of Peć and former logothet of Dushan, was solemnly proclaimed the Patriarch of Peć and Dushan was crowned as tsar by the first Serbian Patriarch. Following the coronation of Dushan and the proclamation of Joanikije II as the Patriarch of Peć, began the process of reorganization of the Serbian Church into a patriarchate, see Slijepčević, *Ukidanje Pećke Patrijarshije 1766. Godine*; Fotić, "Serbian Orthodox Church"; *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Serbia." 1872-73; Grujić, "Pećska patrijarška [the Patriarchate of Peć]," 389–399; Hadrovics, *L'eglise serbe*.

time.³⁷ The legality and validity of the abolition is one of the most highly disputed topics in historiography on the Serbian church and state. Ottoman primary sources as well as a number of secondary sources written in Greek and English portray the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć as a natural repercussion of the corruption of its high clergy, indebtedness of the church, and lack of order in the Patriarchate.³⁸ In these sources, the abolition is viewed as consequence of a unanimous request that “the authorities” of Peć made to the Porte. According to this view, the authorities of the Patriarchate, aware of the financial difficulties of their institution, initiated the incorporation of Peć into the Patriarchate of Istanbul as the only solution to the material decay of their Church.³⁹ The relevance and sincerity of this request is questioned in Serbian, and to some extent Bulgarian and Russian historiography.⁴⁰ This approach argues that “the authorities” petitioning the Porte for the abolition were the Greek patriarch of Peć and his Greek hierarchy—and certainly not the Serbs. On this basis, a number of Serbian historians underline the illegitimacy of the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and see it as a result of the

³⁷ D.PSK 25/74, 2 Ramazân 1180 / 1 February 1767 [(...) *İpek metropolidlerinin bu vech üzere giriftâr oldukları zulm ve ta‘addîye sıyâneten bu def‘a İstanbul patrikliğine ilhâk ile nizâm-ı müstahseneye ifrâğ ve ihyâ olunduğu mesmû‘ları olub anlar dahi İstanbul patrikliğine ilhâk olunmak ricâsı için metropolidân ‘ale’l-ittifâk mahsûsen Âsitâne-i ‘aliyyeye geldiklerinde (...)]].*

³⁸ D.PSK 25/74, 2 Ramazân 1180 / 1 February 1767 [(...) *İpek metropolidlerinin bu vech üzere giriftâr oldukları zulm ve ta‘addîye sıyâneten bu def‘a İstanbul patrikliğine ilhâk ile nizâm-ı müstahseneye ifrâğ ve ihyâ olunduğu mesmû‘ları olub anlar dahi İstanbul patrikliğine ilhâk olunmak ricâsı için metropolidân ‘ale’l-ittifâk mahsûsen Âsitâne-i ‘aliyyeye geldiklerinde (...)]]; D.PSK 25/93 12 Muharrem 1181 / 10 June 1767 [(...) *İpek ve Ohri patrikliklerinin kaydları ref‘ ve terkîn ve İstanbul rum patrikliğine ilhâk ile nizâm-ı kaviyyeye? rabt olunmuşiken (...)]]; Jelavich, “Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development,” 147-148; Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents*, 89.**

³⁹ Makarios, in Sathas, *Mesaionike bibliotheke epistasia*, Typois tou Chronou, Vol III, (1872), 250-252.

⁴⁰ For this point of view and references to other Serbian historians of similar views see Grujić, “Pećka Patrijarsija”, 396-397; Slijepčević, *Istorijska Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-450; Radonić, *Rimska kurija*, 664-668; Corović, *Istorijska Jugoslavije*, 395.

schemes of Phanariot Greeks at the head of the Patriarchate of Istanbul and their “Hellenization” agenda.⁴¹

This chapter does not dwell on the credibility and validity of either approach to explain the abolition of the patriarchate. It rather asks how is it possible that an autocephalous ecclesiastical institution in Ottoman Serbia led by high clergy of local origin for centuries would start to ‘import’ Christian clergy from Istanbul to replace their local leaders? After all, even if “ethnicity” the way we perceive it today did not inform the consciousness of the congregation of the Patriarchate of Peć in the eighteenth century, it is hard to overlook the importance that language and the awareness of the local customs played in the performance of liturgies and religious practices.

While the “Greek” clergymen submitted a petition requesting to abolish the Patriarchate of Peć only in 1766, a “Greek” patriarch already occupied the seat of Peć in 1739 after the Porte appointed the Phanariot Joanikije III Karadža because the locals expressed their “complete loss of trust of the Porte in Serbian Church dignitaries”.⁴² Almost five decades earlier in 1691, Köprülü Mustafa Pasha, the Grand vizier of the Ottoman Empire, himself appointed a hand-picked a patriarch of Peć Kalinik I [1691-1710], thus bringing to an end the preceding custom whereby Ottoman authorities merely confirmed the candidacy of the future patriarch elected by the church synod.⁴³ Unfolding within the space of a half century, both of these developments have something in common: the appointments of two “Greek” patriarchs on the throne of Peć

⁴¹ Ruvarac, “O Ukidanju Pechke Patrijarshije i njenom,” 296; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-426; Juraj Križanić, *Russkoe Gosudarstro v Polovine XVII veka [The Russian State in the middle of the Seventeenth Century]*, part II, Moscow, 1860, 212-220; Grujić, “Pećka partijarska”, 397.

⁴² Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 154.

⁴³ Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 154; in the account of Jovan Radonić, Kalinik I is referred to as “Greek” see Radonić, *Rimska Curija*, 442-457.

were preceded by the “Great Migrations” of the Serbian high clergy and congregation [*Velika Seoba Srba*] to Habsburg domains during and as an aftermath of the Habsburg - Ottoman wars.

In this chapter, I aim to explore the connection between these migrations and their impact on relations among Ottoman subjects in the Balkans as well as institutional relations within the Ottoman Orthodox church hierarchies across the empire stretching from Ottoman Serbia to Istanbul. The extant literature tends to merely comment generally on the obvious political and demographic impact the “Great Migrations” must have had on both empires. Scholars emphasized that Serbian subjects of the Ottoman Empire sided with Habsburg forces during Vienna’s unprecedented invasions deep into Ottoman territory starting from the aftermath of the siege of Vienna in 1683 to 1739. After the wars when the Ottomans reconquered their lost territories, Serbian subjects physically crossed to Habsburg domains to escape local retribution, resulting in Istanbul’s losing a sizable tax-paying population in the process. To be sure, these events had tremendous political, economic and socio-demographic repercussions on both empires. However, my focus lies not merely on the tenuous imperial belonging and political loyalties of the subjects but also on their confessions, that is on the fact that these were Orthodox Christians migrating to a predominantly Catholic state. I argue, that the settlement of the Serbian Orthodox clergy and *re’âyâ* in the Habsburg Empire widened the reach of Peć Patriarchs’ influence and activities, thereby allowing them to acquire new trans-imperial networks replete with more power, influence, and resources that could serve to augment their power within the Ottoman empire but also attract the unwanted attention of other groups in Ottoman society that could accuse them of Habsburg and Catholic “sympathies.”

What also gets lost in the historiography is that these migrations created a noticeable Orthodox presence in a predominantly Catholic empire amplifying as much inter-confessional tensions in the Habsburg Vojvodina as it did in the traditional Serbian heartland within the

Ottoman Empire. I argue therefore that while the scale of Serbian migrations to Habsburg domains was unprecedented, the arrival and settlement of Serbian Orthodox Patriarchs in a predominantly Catholic state had far reaching impact on inter-confessional relations among migrant Orthodox Serbs and their Catholic neighbors in the Habsburg empire. The new ties and access to resources they enjoyed in their new setting across the Danube likewise impacted inter-confessional relations between the Porte, Habsburg Catholics, and Serbs on the one hand and intra-confessional relations within Serbian and Greek/Phanariot Orthodox communities on the other in the Ottoman Empire. The establishment of another major, parallel Orthodox ecclesiastical institution, the Metropolitane of Krušedol/Karlovać, as a result of the Great Migration of 1690 created a trans-imperial stage of contentious intra- and inter-confessional interaction among the Orthodox Serbs of both Empires, Catholic, Muslim, and Greek actors, as well as both the Ottoman central administration and Habsburg authorities.

Existing historiography tends to interpret the consequences of the two Great Migrations of Serbs to the Habsburg domains as the Porte's no longer trusting the Serbian high clergy, hence their appointing their own candidates to the position. Moreover, some of the appointed patriarchs were chosen from among Istanbul Phanariot circles as opposed to local Serbian clergy, which, along with the division of the church and the congregation between the two rival empires, contributed to the weakening of the Serbian Orthodox church. Ostensibly, this weakness made the Patriarchate of Peć vulnerable to the ambitions of the Phanariot circles, especially the Patriarchate of Istanbul. Coupled with the Porte's alleged loss of trust in the Serbian high clergy, the migrations brought closer the eventual abolition of Peć and its incorporation into the Patriarchate of Istanbul.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Paraskevas Konortas, *Othomanikes Theoriseis gia to Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio: 17os-arches 20ou aiona* (Athenes, 1998), 218-219; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-422; Grujić

While the above-mentioned implications of the two instances of migration are valid, in this chapter, rather than focusing only on the things that the Patriarchate of Peć got stripped of as a result of migrations, I suggest to focus on what it gained. I maintain that the establishment of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać in the Habsburg domains created an institutionalized, permanent presence of the Orthodox Church in a predominantly Catholic state. This church, while physically and legally divided from the Patriarchate of Peć, extended its financial and educational webs back to the Ottoman Empire, contributing to the emergence of the Serbian Orthodox church as a trans-imperial body and its high clergy and congregation as trans-imperial actors.

“Pećska patrijarška”, 396-397; Constantin Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876), 470; Evgeni Golubinsky, *Kratky Oчерk Istoriji Pravoslavnyh Tserkvei: Bolgarskoi, Serbskoi i Ruminskoi ili Moldo-Vlaskoi* [A Brief Review of the History of the Orthodox Churches: Bulgarian, Serbian and Romanian or Modo-Vlahian] (Moscow, 1871), 293.

2.1 The Moving Patriarchate: the First Migration of Serbs to Habsburg Domains under the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III

During the seventeenth century, the Serbian Church sought to restore the efficacy of its organization as well as solvency, which was damaged by its increasing debts. With the hope of realizing these aspirations some representatives of the Serbian clergy turned to Rome attempting to augment their institution's financial situation through church union while others sought the support of Russia.⁴⁵ Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the Patriarchs of Peć openly collaborated with Venice and the Habsburgs during the Ottoman war against the Holy League (1683 – 99).⁴⁶ Having taken Belgrade in 1688, Austrian armies advanced into the Balkans, while their commander incited local Slavic populations to rise against the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁷ As the Ottomans lost their positions in Belgrade, Macedonia, and other parts of Rumeli along Danubian river, the Patriarch of Peć Arsenije III issued an official call encouraging the Serbs to rise against the Ottomans. However, Austrian victories ceased in 1689 followed by their retreat across Danube. Aware of the consequences of his community's participation in the uprising, Arsenije, the members of the church hierarchy, and some 30,000 of his supporters followed the retreating Habsburg armies until they settled provisionally in empty spaces in southern Hungary.⁴⁸ Upon their settlement, Habsburg Emperor Leopold I granted the Serbs "Privileges" with the proviso that the Serbs would return to the northern Balkans once they were reconquered by Habsburg armies, something that never happened

⁴⁵ Katić, "Serbian Church under the Ottoman Rule", 153.

⁴⁶ Fotić, "Serbian Orthodox Church", 520.

⁴⁷ Carlile A. Macartney (ed.), *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Macmillan, 1970), 78.

⁴⁸ Veselinović, *Arsenij III*, 5-43; Nicholas C. J. Pappas, "Between Two Empires: Serbian Survival in the Years After Kosovo", in *Serbia's Historical Heritage*, ed. A. Dragnich (Boulder, 1994), 27; Macartney states that Arsenije was followed to the Habsburg domains by as many as 200,000 of his countrymen, see Macartney, *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties*, 79.

again.⁴⁹ The privileges mostly concerned religious matters, giving Serbian settlers the freedom to practice the Orthodox rite and the Serbian church the opportunity to appoint its archbishops, bishops and priests.⁵⁰

Although the Serbian clergy and people were formally granted privileges, the premise in the Serbian historiography is that the interests of the Serbian Church conflicted with those of the three powerful groups in the Habsburg Empire: the Magyars, Croats, and the Catholic Church due to limited economic resources, the increasing competition for lands and work opportunities. Moreover, the settlement of large numbers of Serbs and, most importantly, the appearance of their highest ecclesiastical officials in the Habsburg lands, complicated the campaign waged by the Catholic Church to convert the new Orthodox inhabitants of Vojvodina to Catholicism. Allegedly, the Catholic Church was willing to recognize the Patriarch of Peć only as the spiritual leader of the Serbs settled in the south of Danube, leaving the Habsburg Serbs under a separate authority.⁵¹ Thus, a few years after the Patriarch's settlement in the Vojvodina, Habsburg imperial authorities introduced series of limitations on the Patriarch's activities, prohibiting visitations, the use of the patriarchal title, and preventing bishops from western eparchies from attending Sabor (an assembly of ecclesiastical dignitaries).⁵² Amid the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14) and rebellion headed by Ferenc II Rákóczy (1703–11), the Viennese court grew more lenient toward the Serbian patriarch, repealing previously imposed sanctions and prohibitions. Arsenije III received a long promised estate drawing on the

⁴⁹ Macartney, *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties*, 79; for the English translation of the contents of the Privileges see Macartney, *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties*, 79–82.

⁵⁰ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 395.

⁵¹ Jelavich, "Some Aspects", 145–146; Corović, *Istorija Jugoslavije*, 374–375; Radoslav Grujić, "Karlovachka Mitropolija", 250; Macartney states that the Serbs were "bitterly hostile, on national, religious and social grounds to the Hungarian state and Magyar people" and thus remained a "foreign body", Macartney, *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties*, 79; Benedict H. Sumner, *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford, 1949), 33–34; Cirković, *The Serbs*, 144–147.

⁵² Cirković, *The Serbs*, 147.

revenues and surpluses of five villages along with an annual pension of 3,000 forints.⁵³ A considerable part of the congregation who followed Arsenije III to the Habsburg domains joined military organizations grouping into *šanci*, that is, settlements divided into military units under the command of local warrior chieftains.⁵⁴ The Patriarch died in 1706, the same year that the new Emperor Joseph I confirmed the “privileges” previously granted to the Serbs. During the last years of his life, the Patriarch had to resolve the issue of relations between the Serbian high clergy and congregation living in the Habsburg Empire and the Patriarchate of Peć, which was now headed by Kalinik I, “the Greek”, whom the Serbian congregation did not unanimously accept as their patriarch.⁵⁵

2.2 The Organization of the Serbian Church after the Migrations and the Emergence of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać

Having migrated to the Habsburg domains, Patriarch Arsenije III and those who followed him faced problems organizing the Serbian Orthodox community given that the Patriarchate of Peć was still an Ottoman institution operating far away across the Danubian border. The migration of Arsenije and a considerable number of Serbian high clergy into a foreign empire immediately resulted in the question of who was legitimate Patriarchate of Peć and its congregation that still remained in the Ottoman Empire. If Arsenije were to create another ecclesiastical institution in the Habsburg Empire, how was this institution related to the patriarchate in the Ottoman Empire? The Patriarch, Serbian high clergy from the Habsburg domains and from territories under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć, as well as the

⁵³ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 148.

⁵⁴ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 148.

⁵⁵ Radmila Tricković, “Srpski Patrijarh Kalinik I. Druga Obnova Pećke Patrijarshije [The Serbian Patriarch Kalinik I. The Second Renewal of the Patriarchate of Peć],” *Revue Historique* 39, (1992): 87-118.

representatives of the Habsburg court addressed and negotiated these and other questions related to the organization of the Serbian Orthodox Church under the Habsburgs and its full scope and jurisdiction.

Radoslav Grujić relying on the text of the Privileges issued in 1691 and on sources from Vienna's Kriegsarchiv, maintained that Patriarch Arsenije III sought to preserve the title of the Patriarch for himself and his successor through the Privileges, as he underlined his intention to return to his "homeland and to free Serbia and Peć from the Turk."⁵⁶ Major objection to the preservation of the title of the Patriarch by Arsenije's successors came from the cardinal of the Roman Church, Leopold Karl von Kollonitsch, who was entrusted with the reorganization of new Hungarian territories won over by the Habsburgs from the Ottoman Empire during the Habsburg-Ottoman War (1683 – 1699).⁵⁷ Ostensibly, both the cardinal and the Emperor at the time, Joseph I, shared the belief that only the current patriarch Arsenije III should preserve his title; however, his title should not pass on to his successor, as, this would go against the Catholic Church and the doctrine of the Fathers of the Church.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, on September 29, 1706 the Hungarian Court Chancellery issued its confirmation of Serbian privileges obtained from the emperor Leopold I. This confirmation was issued to the title of the "patriarch", whereas, the privileges issued before (1690, 1691, 1695) were issued to the name of "archbishop". This was perceived as a sign of preservation of their traditional title and prerogatives connected with it. During the life of Arsenije III, the Serbian church under Austro-Hungarian rule was viewed as a constituent of the Patriarchate of Peć. After the death of Patriarch Arsenije III in 1706, the

⁵⁶ Radoslav Grujić, "Problemi Istorije Karlovačke Mitropolije [Problems of the History of the Karlovač Metropolitanate]", *Glasnik Istoriskog Društva u Novom Sadu*, Vols. 2 (1929), 53-65, 53-54.

⁵⁷ Charles Ingrao, *The Habsburg Monarchy 1618–1815* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 87.

⁵⁸ Grujić, "Problemi Istorije", 54.

Serbian Church Council held in the Monastery of Krušedol in 1708 elected Isaija Đaković as an the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the newly established Serbian Metropolitanate of Krušedol.⁵⁹ The question of the relation between the Patriarchate of Peć and the newly established Metropolitanate of Krušedol was a major issue that had to be addressed after the emergence of the new Serbian ecclesiastical institution in the Habsburg domains. While the Serbian high-clergy including the Metropolitan claimed to accept the Serbian Patriarch as their elder and to be dependent on him in spiritual matters, some representatives of the Habsburg court were against the dependence of the Serbian Metropolitanate on the Patriarchate of Peć, as it created, ostensibly, the danger that such a dependence would impede the realization of the union between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches.⁶⁰

In 1714, another war shook the region involving the military forces of Venice, the Habsburg (since 1716), and the Ottoman Empires. The war ended with the truce of Passarowitz in 1718, as a result of which the Ottomans lost to the Habsburg Empire Belgrade and the core territories of Ottoman Serbia (i.e., lands of the former Serbian medieval Despots).⁶¹ With that, the number of Serb subjects of the Habsburg emperor significantly increased resulting in the necessity to reconsider their position and organization within the empire. Thus, in 1720, the “privileges” were extended to all the Serbs in newly acquired territories, but the imperial authorities were reluctant for them to be bound together. The Habsburg authorities exuded similar reluctance and even distrust towards the Serbian church. Thus, after the death of metropolitan of Karlovać in 1725, the Serbs requested that the Sabor be enabled to elect another metropolitan that would take under his jurisdiction all the Serbian bishoprics in the Habsburg territories, including the metropolitanate of Belgrade. Although the authorities initially did not

⁵⁹ Grujić, “Problemi Istorije”, 62.

⁶⁰ Grujić, “Problemi Istorije”, 61 – 64; Cirković, *The Serbs*, 150-151;

⁶¹ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 151.

grant the request preferring to keep the two Serbian Sabors and two metropolitans functioning, later a compromise was reached whereby the metropolitan of Karlovać assumed the role as administrator of the Belgrade metropolitanate.⁶²

2.3 The Moving Patriarchate: the Second Migration of Serbs to Habsburg Domains under the Patriarch Arsenije IV

After a long period of peace following Vienna's conquest of Ottoman Serbia, Habsburg authorities began secret negotiations with the patriarch of Peć, Arsenije IV, as well as with Serbian and Albanian clan chiefs in order to incite them to rise against the Ottomans who were at war with the Russian Empire since 1735. Finally, in the summer of 1737, the Habsburg Empire joined another war against the Ottomans alongside the Russians and received the support of the Patriarch of Peć Arsenije IV and his congregation.⁶³ However, within only two years of the war, the Habsburg monarchy suffered significant losses in Bosnia and Serbia, which forced the local population to migrate north to the Vojvodina. Thus, despite the pressure that the Serbs who settled in the Habsburg Empire after the first migration allegedly faced, the defeat of the Habsburg armies brought about another instance of a mass migration of Serbs from the Ottoman to Habsburg domains. In a similar vein as half a century earlier, this migration, albeit smaller than that of 1690, was again headed by the Patriarch of Peć, Arsenije IV.⁶⁴ Upon settlement in Habsburg domains, Arsenije IV assumed the position of the Metropolitan of Karlovać at a Sabor held in 1744. After the second Great Migration, the position of the Serbs in the Habsburg domains was continuously challenged by the Hungarian diet, which sought the demilitarization of the Serbs and incorporation of the Military Border into the neighboring *comitats* and criticized the Serbian church for attempting to create "a state

⁶² Cirković, *The Serbs*, 153.

⁶³ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 153.

⁶⁴ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 154.

within a state”.⁶⁵ Allegedly, the Serbian population inhabiting the Military Border perceived the idea of demilitarization as a threat to their religion, ethnicity, and freedom. These challenges coincided with appeals from Russia who sought the settlers and soldiers for its unpopulated southern territories it also slowly conquered from Ottoman territories farther east in Eurasia. Despite the opposition of the church and the metropolitan, between 1751 and 1753 several waves of Serbian migration to Russia transpired until Habsburg authorities prohibited the Serbs to settle in Russia.⁶⁶

Apart from the challenges posed by the Hungarian Diet, the Serbian church and its congregation confronted the Catholic Church, which sought to assert a spiritual monopoly on the land of “apostolic kings.” The policies for reconversion to Catholicism, previously practiced in Bohemia and Moravia, were now vigorously implemented throughout the territories conquered from the Ottoman Empire, supplying the Catholic Church with a chance to reclaim the long-lost congregations of the “non-united Christians of Greek rites.”⁶⁷ On the other side of the border, the already damaged trust of the Porte towards the Serbs and their spiritual authorities endured yet another blow. As Patriarch Arsenije IV left his patriarchal seat behind heading towards the Habsburg domain in the quest for “liberation from the Turk”, the Porte responded with appointing yet another “Greek” Joanikije III Karadža as the Patriarch of Peć.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 153 – 156.

⁶⁶ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 154 – 155.

⁶⁷ The Orthodox Christians in the Habsburg domains were not deemed as “Orthodox” but as non-united Christians of Greek rites (*graeci ritus non uniti*), see Cirković, *The Serbs*, 157, 162-163.

⁶⁸ Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 154.

2.4 A Divided Patriarchate: the Impact of the two Great Migrations on the Serbian Church and Congregation

Despite the challenges and inconsistencies in the implementation of the imperial “privileges”, the Great Migration of 1690 altered the position of the Serbian inhabitants of the Habsburg domains in several ways. Dispersed over large areas, unprotected by Habsburg governance, and under-represented by mere village chieftains and a few bishops, the early Serbian settlers in Habsburg territories and their descendants were stripped of mechanisms that would enable them to defend, negotiate, and represent their community’s interests on the imperial level. The arrival of a large number of Serbs recognized and protected by the “privileges”, headed by the Patriarch of Peć Arsenije III, introduced an internal structure around which tied and unified the dispersed Serbian settlers under the framework of the Serbian Church.⁶⁹

Moreover, as was already mentioned, the migration led to the establishment of a second religious center of the Serbian people: a metropolitanate with its seat first at Krušedol (1708-1713) and later in Karlovać in southern Hungary. The widely accepted premise in historiography is that the administrative division of the church and its congregation along with the Porte’s initiation of a practice by which the Patriarchs of Peć were appointed on the patriarchal throne from among Phanariot circles contributed to the weakening of the position of the Patriarchs of Peć in comparison with a considerably stronger position of Arsenije and his successors in Kalovać.⁷⁰ The appointment of the Greek high clergy on the patriarchal throne of Peć severed the ties between the Serbian Church in the Habsburg and Ottoman domains. With

⁶⁹ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 147.

⁷⁰ Hadrovics, *L’eglise serbe*, 147-54; Selim Aslantaş, *Osmanlı’da Sırp İsyanları: 19. Yüzyılın Şafağında Balkanlar*, (Kitap Yayınevi, 2007), 46; Konortas, *Othomanikes Theoriseis gia to Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio*, 218-219; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-422; Grujić “Pećska patrijarška”, 396-397; Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren*, 470; Golubinsky, *Kratky Ocherk Istoriji Pravoslavnih Tserkvei*, 293.

the migration of the Patriarch Arsenije IV to the Habsburg Empire where he ascended the office of the Metropolitan of Karlovać, the relations between the Patriarchs of Peć and Metropolitans of Karlovać halted for the most part, experiencing sporadic renewals only when Patriarchs of Serbian origin reoccupied the Patriarchal throne of Peć.⁷¹ In this section, I will demonstrate how through education and financial support, the Metropolitanate of Karlovać maintained strong connections with the Patriarchate of Peć, creating a trans-imperial stage through which money, information, power, and people travelled in between the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires.

Although “liberated from the Turk,”⁷² the Serbian Church in the Habsburg domains had to face the pressure of the Catholic Church and the Hungarian Diet, which continuously challenged Serbian “privileges.” Accordingly, “ever since Patriarch Arsenije III had crossed over to the monarchy”, it became apparent to him, to the high clergy from surrounding areas, and to their successors that “the identity and the traditions of their church could only be preserved through education and increasing its members’ self-awareness.” The expectation was that a better educated clergy would be more capable of suppressing the Catholic attempts to convert their flock; such a clergy would be better-equipped to communicate to the Serbian congregation the value of their faith and traditions.⁷³ With that in mind, Patriarch Arsenije III addressed the Assembly of 1706 with the request to establish a school and a printing press as a means of educating the Serbian high clergy in the Habsburg lands. The authorities did not immediately endorse this undertaking and kept the Serbs waiting for two decades before allowing the establishment of schools for the Serbs. After the Patriarch died, the task of

⁷¹ Radoslav Grujić, “Pečki Patrijarsi I Karlovacki Mitropoliti u 18 veku [The Patriarchs of Peć and the Metropolitans of Karlovać in the 18th Century],” *Glasnik Istoriskog Društva u Novom Sadu* 4/1, (1931), 13.

⁷² Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška,” 396.

⁷³ Cirković, *The Serbs*, 163.

promoting, establishing, and managing educational facilities for the Serbs of the Habsburg monarchy lay on the shoulders of the metropolitans of the newly established Metropolitanate of Karlovać and that of Belgrade.⁷⁴

Lacking necessary funds and educated clergy who could teach at Serbian schools, the metropolitans turned to Russia for support. Tsar Peter I “The Great” (d. 1725) and the Russian synod accommodated the request providing the metropolitans with necessary books and a small number of teachers.⁷⁵ With that, the Serbian metropolitans embarked on a mission to educate the Serbian high clergy inhabiting Habsburg territories. One of the schools in Karlovać established as a result of this endeavor - *Collegium Slavono-Latino Carloviciense* – had among its graduates the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć – Vasilije Jovanović Brkić, who is the focus of the next chapter. Thus, Karlovać became the center for educating the Serbian high clergy, which then went on to occupy positions the Ottoman Empire. This made the situation possible in which Vasilije—a Serb who was born, raised, and educated in the Habsburg Empire and who held his first ecclesiastical office in Karlovać in the court of Patriarch Arsenije IV who abandoned the Ottoman Empire along with tens of thousands of Serbs—could become the Patriarch of Peć holding a decree of appointment granted by the sultan himself. Hence, the emergence of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać as an educational center for the Serbian high clergy created a trans-imperial stage of networks and knowledge-production through which educated Serbian priests could move in search for occupation, financial resources, and favors, thus connecting the two ecclesiastical institutions and the two empires.

Another point of convergence for the two Serbian churches was the insolvency of the Patriarchate of Peć experienced as a result of the two Great Migrations. Within fifty years

⁷⁴ Cirković, “The Serbs”, 163.

⁷⁵ Cirković, “The Serbs”, 164.

between the 1720s and 1770s, the Patriarchs of Peć and the Metropolitans of Karlovać exchanged at least thirty-four letters that are now published.⁷⁶ From the letters it becomes apparent that one of the most persistent topics binding the two Serbian church organizations was the grave financial situation of the Patriarchate of Peć. Thus, we learn from a letter the Patriarch of Peć Mojsije Rajović (1712-1726) addressed to the Metropolitan of Karlovać in 1714, that after the escape of the Patriarch Arsenije III to the Habsburg domains, “the Turks” captured all of the estates belonging to the Patriarchate of Peć and looted all of its valuable items. In a time-honored tradition, the central government apparently authorized local authorities to confiscate the lands and assets of the Patriarchate of Peć, turn them into *çiftliks* open for bidding, and the Patriarchs were unable to redeem these lands [*da je ne vazmožno nam jest vase čiflake otkupiti*].⁷⁷ Furthermore, the Austro-Turkish war of 1716-1718 and the Peace of Passarowitz signed in 1718 stripped the Patriarchate of Peć of a number of vital provinces and bishoprics that were now part of the Habsburg domains and thus entered under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać.⁷⁸ The loss of lands and bishoprics to the Ottomans and the Habsburgs respectively left the Patriarchate of Peć in a grave financial state, forcing the patriarchs to stroll through the patriarchal domains personally collecting alms. As another way out of financial difficulties, the patriarchs of Peć turned their hopes and letters to their “brothers” across the border – the Metropolitans of Karlovać.⁷⁹

From the early eighteenth century onwards, therefore, a persistent practice developed between the Patriarchate of Peć and the Metropolitanate of Karlovać: the patriarch not only sent

⁷⁶ *Spomenik SKA*, LI. Due to restrictions related to Coronavirus pandemics, I can not obtain the periodical, but the article written by Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” is based solely on primary sources and they are not interpreted but rather directly cited in this article. In this part of the chapter, I rely on the cited parts of the Serbian primary sources.

⁷⁷ *Spomenik LI*, 111-112; Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 22.

⁷⁸ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 26.

⁷⁹ *Spomenik LI*, 111-112; Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 22.

letters asking for assistance in various matters, but he also appointed permanent representatives to Habsburg domains who collected alms from the Orthodox Serbs living under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać. The issue of financial support from the Metropolitanate of Karlovać to the Patriarchate of Peć was addressed at the Ecclesiastical Sabor in 1713 when a proposal was put forth to provide permanent material support to the Patriarchate of Peć as to a “mother church” [*materi crkvi*]. However, Habsburg authorities opposed the idea of imposing any regular tax on the people to meet the needs of a Patriarchate under the Ottoman rule. This being said, the Sabor concluded that the Patriarchate of Peć may keep one permanent representative in the Metropolitanate of Karlovać who would be responsible for the collection of yearly voluntary alms on behalf of the Patriarchate from all the Serbian eparchies on the Austro-Hungarian lands.⁸⁰

Apart from this, the Patriarch of Peć requested the Metropolitan of Karlovać to issue a synodic instruction addressing the high clergy and those particularly rich people among the congregation of Serbs in the Habsburg domains. The instruction proposed that part of inheritance of the well-off clergy and laymen must be endowed primarily to the Patriarchate of Peć rather than any other ecclesiastical institution. It is unknown if such an instruction were ratified; however, sources reveal that prosperous Serbs from the Habsburg domains contributed significant endowments to the Patriarchate of Peć throughout the eighteenth century.⁸¹ Additionally, upon the request of the Patriarch of Peć, special “Peć boxes” [*Pećka kutija*] were placed in the churches under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać to facilitate the collection of donations specifically for Peć from the congregation of Habsburg Serbs.⁸²

⁸⁰ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 23.

⁸¹ Spomenik, 112; Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 24.

⁸² Spomenik, 112, 119; Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 26.

In their pleas for financial help addressed to the Metropolitans of Karlovać, the Patriarchs of Peć likewise employed recurring rhetorical devices in most of their letters to their Habsburg counterparts. Letters frequently refer to how the Patriarchate of Peć suffered greatly from the “Turkish wrath,” for the seat of the patriarchate and all of its monasteries were ransacked and left barren without any decoration and accoutrements appropriate for a church. The Patriarchs further emphasized the proximity and emotional connection between the representatives of the two ecclesiastical institutions by constantly employing registers such as “brother” [*brate/sveti brate/gospodine brate*], “brotherhood” [*bratstvo/bratstviye/bratolubije*], “love” [*l’ubav*], and “hope” [*nadeždu*]. In their correspondence, the patriarchs of Peć often refer to their seat as “the mother church” [*materi crkvi*]. While he expressed his gratitude for Metropolitanate of Karlovać’s supporting the Patriarchate of Peć for years, Patriarch Mojsije Rajović (1712-1726) even wrote that it was in this manner that one “should take care of one’s mother – the great holy church” [*tako i podobno jest pril’ežati o svojej matere, svetjej velicei crkvi*]. Along with using vernacular aimed at setting a discourse in which the idea of the Metropolitanate’s support of the Patriarchate would seem normal, necessary, and expected, the Patriarchs of Peć also evoked the continuity of such support, creating a semblance in which the support was there from the time immemorial.⁸³ The infrequent attempts of some Karlovać metropolitans to disrupt the continuity by halting the financial support to Peć met the official condemnation not only from the representatives of Peć but also from the ecclesiastical synod in Karlovać.⁸⁴ Finally, in their letters the Patriarchs convincingly emphasized the unity of the Serbian church and people regardless of the fact that they were now separated by the border between two rival empires. The patriarchs made it clear that the Serbian clergy and laymen on

⁸³ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 22-24, 29-33.

⁸⁴ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 33.

both sides of the border had a lot in common, such as their Serbian kin [*rod*], language, tradition, faith, and a special kind of honor and glory [*naš rod imeo osobišuju svoju čest i slavu*] shared by all Serbs. Furthermore, it was made clear that the existence and proper functioning of the Patriarchate of Peć was imperative for the preservation of all of these values that the Serbs in the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires happened to share.⁸⁵

Perhaps it was due to the lack of these unifying features that all the Serbs supposedly shared that the financial support from Karlovać to Peć halted when the Patriarchs at the head of the “mother church” were “Greek,” *i.e.* of the Phanariot origin. The support and the letters requesting support resumed once a patriarch of Serbian origin managed to ascend to the Patriarchal throne.⁸⁶ The last letter containing the money request arrived to the metropolitan of Karlovać from Vasilije Brkić in 1771 – five years after the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć. The last Serbian Patriarch of Peć who got banned from staying in the Habsburg domains begged the metropolitan of Karlovać for sixty ducats to pay for his trip from Vienna to Russia.⁸⁷

While Vasilije’s case is somehow exceptional because he was the Patriarch of Peć who was born, raised, and educated in Habsburg domains, Habsburg authorities were generally not supportive of relations between the two Serbian churches. At a Sabor held in 1713 in Karlovać, consequently, Habsburg authorities opposed the idea to provide permanent financial support to the Patriarchate of Peć by imposing a tax on the Serbian congregation in the Habsburg domains specifically for this purpose.⁸⁸ Finally, from the synodic resolution of the Metropolitan of Karlovać Pavle Nenadović we learn that in 1751 Maria Theresa issued an edict according to

⁸⁵ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 22, 24, 30.

⁸⁶ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 26, 32.

⁸⁷ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 33.

⁸⁸ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 23.

which clergy from the Ottoman domains would not be allowed to gather alms in the Habsburg Empire without informing the Habsburg authorities about their intentions and getting corresponding permission from the Viennese royal court.⁸⁹

Conclusion

The two Great Migrations of the Serbs to the Habsburg domains were by far not the first time Ottoman subjects moved to another state in search for a better life. It was neither the first not last time, moreover, that the Patriarchs of Peć sided with foreign powers in their persistent aspiration for “liberation from the Turk.”⁹⁰ According to Serbian historiography, for example, relations between the representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church and Russia date back to the thirteenth century, when St. Sava who later became the first archbishop of the Serbian church, was influenced by the Russian books and writing as a young monk. When the Ottoman Empire took over the domains of former Serbian state in the fifteenth century, Russia emerged in the eyes of Serbian Orthodox high clergy and monks as a potential savior to whom they addressed their lamentations and hopes for material and political support for centuries to come.⁹¹ At the same time, other Serbian sources mention that “in the great aspiration for the liberation of the people from the Turks” that the patriarchs of Peć and some of their bishops often entered in friendly relations with the Papacy as well as Western princes and rulers. Realizing the inability of Western parties to act against the Ottomans due to unfavorable political circumstances, the patriarchs [here Pajsije (1614-1647)] started to pay more attention to Orthodox Russia.⁹²

⁸⁹ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 34.

⁹⁰ Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška,” 396, Bataković, *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, 115; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 340-341.

⁹¹ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 373-374.

⁹² Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška,” 396.

During the time of Pajisije's successor Patriarch Gavriilo I Rajić (1648-1655/1656) the Serbian Church sought to restore its organization as well as material situation, which was damaged by increasing indebtedness. With the hope to realize these aspirations some representatives of the Serbian clergy turned to Rome wishing to realize church union, while others sought the support of Russia. Meanwhile, the opponents of the union with the Roman Catholic Church turned to the Ottoman authorities for help. With the Porte's interfered in this matter, a number of Serbian bishops were displaced, while the patriarch of Peć Gavriilo I Rajić was hanged in 1659.⁹³

Towards the last decades of the seventeenth century, some representatives of the high clergy of Peć undertook personal visits to Russia where they expressed their bitter experience of the "slavery" under the Ottomans. Thus, the Metropolitan of Skopje, Jevtimije, pleaded in September 1687 in Russia: "We do not live, but we are suffering greatly from those who rule over us and who impose heavy unbearable taxes on us. The metropolis is our old building and it is breaking down, but it is by no means we are allowed to renew or fortify it. Today, the German Caesar seized the seven bishops of the Serbs on the one hand; the Venetian army is closing in on us on the other. The Turks, furthermore, visit upon the Orthodox peoples endless tyranny and terror".⁹⁴ According to Serbian sources, a year after the visit of the Metropolitan Jevtimije to Russia, the Patriarch of Peć Arsenije III (1674-1690) sent a diploma to Moscow in which he called upon the Russian tsar to launch an armed assault against the Ottomans in order to bring unity to the Orthodox Christians of the Balkan Peninsula under the scepter of the Russian tsar with the capital in Istanbul.⁹⁵ He also expressed his eagerness to migrate to Russia,

⁹³ Katić, "Serbia under the Ottoman Rule", 153.

⁹⁴ Stevan Dimitrijević, "Odnosaji patrijaraha pećskih s Rusijom u XVII Veku [The relations between the Patriarchs of Peć and Russia in the XVII Century]", *Glas SKA*, Brochure 60 (1901), 155.

⁹⁵ Dimitrijević, "Odnosaji patrijaraha pećskih s Rusijom", 160-166.

but, as we already know, in 1690 Arsenije III was at the head of tens thousands of Serbian Ottoman subjects leading them to the Habsburg domains in the first instance of the Great Migration of the Serbs.

Why is it then that in historiography the two early migrations of Arsenije III and Arsenije IV are perceived as the beginning of an end for the Patriarchate of Peć, whereas, for almost a century after migrations, the institution would continue to endure the mistrust of the Ottoman authorities, financial insolvency, and the schemes of “Greek” patriarchs up until 1766 when it was finally abolished? Is it because in comparison with these two Great Migrations, other instances of the Serbs’ continuing to ally with foreign powers and abandon their Ottoman motherland are simply not as significant?

The reason behind the far reaching and in a way detrimental repercussions these two migrations had for the Patriarchate of Peć could be that it was the first time that patriarchs who held sultans’ decrees of appointment not only abandoned the Ottoman Empire themselves but also lead large numbers of tax-paying *re‘âyâ* and soldiers out of Ottoman domains. It could also be, in contrast, that in the eighteenth century when the Ottoman Empire’s power in the region was constantly challenged not by one but by four powerful states at once, the Serbs’ siding with the enemy was particularly noticeable for Porte. Possibly, at the point at which Orthodox ecclesiastical institutions throughout the Ottoman Empire sought the Porte’s endorsement and support in fighting increasing Catholic proselytizing activities, it turned out to be particularly hard blow to take for the Porte when two Orthodox patriarchs followed by thousands of Ottoman subjects chose to move to and settle in a Catholic state.

While there are merits to all of these explanations, I submit that the initial two “Great Migrations” were peculiar in their character and repercussions for the Serbian church, people, and the empires involved because Ottoman Serbs developed a lasting centralized

institutionalized presence in a foreign, Catholic state. This presence was provided by the establishment of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać which took under its jurisdiction all the Serbian churches and congregation inhabiting the Habsburg Empire. The decisions concerning the Metropolitanate were not taken on whim of a sole Metropolitan as was often the case with the Patriarchs of Peć. Instead, the Sabor gathered to discuss and decide on important matters of the church and the people. Thus, the policies of the Metropolitanate depended on approaches of a number of prominent clergymen of the region as well as on the position of the Habsburg authorities. With that, the Metropolitanate of Karlovać emerged as a Habsburg institution, in a similar vein as the Patriarchate of Peć was an Ottoman institution. Furthermore, having developed facilities for educating the Serbian high clergy and having secured a more solid financial footing, the Metropolitanate of Karlovać emerged as an institution in a Catholic empire that the Patriarchate of Peć depended upon. As a result of this dependence the Patriarchate of Peć sought to exert influence on the Metropolitanate by, for example, interfering in the appointments of metropolitans supporting a candidate more favorable for the Patriarchate as opposed to a candidate supported by Habsburg authorities.⁹⁶

Thus, with the establishment of the Metropolitanate of Karlovać money, people, knowledge, and power were exchanged on a permanent basis between the two Serbian churches and between the two empires. The Serbian church emerged on a trans-imperial stage, which transcended the boundaries of states, confessions, and loyalties. It did not transcend, however—but rather amplified—notions of “ethnicity” bound to common language, traditions, and history. While the Ottoman Empire still read its subject along confessional lines appointing the Patriarchs of Phanariot origin at head of the Patriarchate of Peć, the two Serbian Churches identified as one and maintained close relations as long as the high clergy at their heads were of

⁹⁶ Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsi,” 32.

the Serb origin. The constant rivalry between the “Greek” and Serb patriarchs maintained by the Ottoman distrust towards the Serbs and the Karlovać’s unwillingness to support financially the Greeks, increased the importance of representation of the patriarchs in the petitions of their *re’âyâ* and sharpened the role of ethnicity in the intra-confessional relations. This, coupled with the increasing inter-imperial rivalry and growing confessional tensions, contributed to the emergence of the Patriarchate of Peć as a contested frontier of faith and loyalty, which is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Inter-confessional relations with Intra-confessional implications: Vasilije Brkić - the “Catholic” Patriarch of Peć and his Networks in the Habsburg Domains

3.1 Vasilije as the Last ‘Serbian’ Patriarch of Peć

In historiography on the Patriarchate of Peć there are a few developments portrayed in a more tragic and emotional way than the migrations of Serbs to Habsburg domains around the turn of the eighteenth century. Unlike the previous instances of Serbs’ migration to the Austro-Hungarian territories, the two Great Migrations (1690, 1740) were led by the Patriarchs of Peć – Arsenije III and Arsenije IV respectively. This resulted in the division of the congregation and administrative body of the Serbian Church in two different entities, the Patriarchate of Peć remaining under the Ottoman rule and the newly established Metropolitanate of Krušedol (1708), later Karlovać (1713) in the Habsburg domains. As it was demonstrated in the previous chapter, according to the prevalent discourse in the Serbian historiography, the Patriarchs of Peć wary of the ‘Turkish Yoke’ turned to the Habsburg Empire to finally liberate their church and people from “the Turk”. What they found instead was religious oppression and the division of the Church in their new Habsburg home as well as the loss of the Porte’s trust, which eventually led to the abolition of the Serbian church in Ottoman lands.⁹⁷

The case of Patriarch of Peć Vasilije (1763 – 1765) that is the focus of this chapter suggests, however, an alternative interpretation to the migrations of Serbs and the division of the Serbian Church —not that of division and oppression but that of interconnectedness and

⁹⁷ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 386; Grujić, “Pećska patrijarška,” 396-397; Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 145-158; Slijepčević, *Ukidanje Pečke Patrijarshije*; Radonić, *Rimska kurija*.

alliance with far reaching implications. As it was argued in the previous chapter, the migrations of Serbian clergymen and *re'âyâ* to the Habsburg domains and the establishment of a new Serbian ecclesiastical institution widened the stage upon which the Serbian high clergy could create and make use of the new trans-imperial networks in accordance with their circumstances and aspirations. Thus, the Patriarchate of Peć emerged as a trans-imperial body and its high clergy and congregation as trans-imperial actors, who were affected by and operated in the dynamics and discourses of both Empires.

This was a setting in which Vasilije Jovanović-Brkić, the thirty-seventh patriarch of Peć mostly renowned in historiography as “the last Serb Patriarch of Peć,” was appointed to the patriarchal throne in 1763 with the support of the congregation.⁹⁸ He held the office only for two years until 1765, when he was replaced by Kalinik II of the Phanariot origin, who became the last Patriarch of Peć. From the petitions that will be discussed below, it might be concluded that, in fact, Vasilije lost his patriarchal seat as early as the middle of 1764, as in a petition submitted by the *re'âyâ* of Peć in August of 1764, Vasilije is already mentioned as “the former Patriarch Peć” [*sâbık İpek patriği*].⁹⁹

⁹⁸ The premise is that Kalinik II who occupied the patriarchal throne of Peć after Vasilije, was not of Serb, but of “Greek” or Phanariot origin, hence the emphasis the Serbian historiography puts on Vasilije’s Serb origin. The importance of the origin of the patriarchs in Serbian historiography stems from the wide-spread argument among historians that the Patriarch Kalinik II having replaced Vasilije on the patriarchal throne petitioned the Porte requesting the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and its incorporation into the Patriarchate of Istanbul were Greek and not Serb. Such an argument questions the canonical legality and voluntariness of the act of abolition and, as represented in the Ottoman documents and much of the Greek historiography. It is implied that the Phanariot origin of the Patriarchs would make them allies and in some cases puppets of the interests of the Patriarchate of Istanbul and its leaders. For the Ottoman documents related to the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć, see D.PSK 25/150, 8 Receb 1182 / 18 November 1768; a prominent proponent of the voluntary abolition thesis is Papadopoulos, “Studies and Documents”. For the arguments behind the emphasis of Kalinik’s non-Serb origin see Grujić, “Pećka Patrijarsija”, 396-397; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-450; Slijepčević, “Ukidanje Pećke Patrijarshije”; Radonić, “Rimska kurija”, 664-668; Corović, *Istorija Jugoslavije*, 395; Ruvarac, “O Ukidanju Pećke Patrijarshije”, 293-299.

⁹⁹ D.PSK 24/98 7 *Sâfer* 1178 / 6 August 1764.

In the present chapter, I will trace the short-lived but very representative career of Vasilije Brkić, the last Serb who served as the Patriarch of Peć. To do so, I analyze a number of petitions from the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul. I then complement Ottoman primary sources with evidence gathered from Serbian, English, and Russian primary and secondary sources. I trace how the microcosm of Vasilije's life was affected by, interconnected with, and representative of the macrocosm of vigorously evolving dynamics of the eighteenth century Ottoman Empire.

Thus, by exploring Vasilije's career I locate the breakdown of inter-confessional relations unfolding within the lands of the Patriarchate of Peć in the larger context of the shifting Ottoman attitudes towards Catholics, which in the eighteenth century were characterized by growing tension and hostility. I then argue that the empire-wide change in inter-confessional dynamics affected intra-confessional relations in the Patriarchate of Peć, leaving the high clergy and the *re'âyâ* of Peć not only aware of the empire-wide shift in sentiments and discourses relating to Catholics, but also enabling them to employ the tropes and rhetoric adopted by the Ottoman administration towards Catholics in order to negotiate with the Porte through petitions.

Finally, I will consider what kind of dangers and opportunities the division of the Peć's congregation between the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empires brought about. These expanding, trans-imperial networks, I argue, had a principal effect on the way inter-confessional and intra-confessional relations unfolded in the Patriarchate of Peć in the last years of its existence as an autocephalous ecclesiastical institution. By addressing these points, I intend to demonstrate how the Patriarchate of Peć emerged as a contested frontier of faith and loyalties where inter- and intra-confessional relations transcended the boundaries of states and empires.

Thus, in this chapter, I follow the gradual transformation of the way Vasilije was represented in petitions addressed to the Porte by the patriarch himself, his congregation, Serbian high clergy, and local *kadi*. Within a few years, Vasilije's image changed from that of an exemplary patriarch to a Catholic convert violently imposing his newly embraced faith to his congregation. As is the case with the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć, the matter of Vasilije's conversion is often treated in the Serbian historiography as a plot rigged by the Porte, Patriarchate of Istanbul, and Phanariots. In doing so, these actors, allegedly, sought to replace the Serbian Patriarch by the Greek one, and engage him in another dubious enterprise – the so called “voluntary” abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć.¹⁰⁰

While this chapter relies on the Ottoman petitions, I do not approach them as a reflection of reality, rather as an attempt to carefully and intentionally construct a certain reality that aimed at augmenting the petitioners' stance and negotiation tools vis-à-vis the Porte and their opponents. To construct a plausible narrative the petitioners employed a highly effective rhetoric that addressed current discourses, dynamics, and Ottoman anxieties. Thus, the question of this chapter is not whether or not Vasilije did convert to Catholicism. The question is rather, what made it possible for the petitioners to construct a plausible narrative, which would be powerful enough to convince the Porte to depose Vasilije and send him into exile? The question is also, what kind of vernacular and techniques did rival parties employ to represent themselves in the petitions? Finally, the question is what does this interplay of contested realities, opposing rhetoric, wars over labeling and representation unfolding in petitions, tell us about the eighteenth century Ottoman Empire and the place the Serbian church occupied in it?

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter 3.5.

3.2 Vasilije as the Preserver of Order

In the Ottoman archival sources, Vasilije's name first appears in a series of petitions he submitted to the Porte soon after his appointment as patriarch of Peć. Two documents dating February 1763 that are now preserved in Ottoman archives in Istanbul in the *Piskopos Mukataasi Defterleri* register narrate Vasilije's complains against Gavril who at the moment served as a metropolitan of several dependencies of the Patriarchate of Peć.¹⁰¹ Vasilije accuses Gavril of overstepping his limits [*râhib kendü hâlinde olmayub*] and characterizes him as deceitful [*hile-kâr*] and disloyal [*sâhib-i hıyânet*]. Vasilije emphasizes the fact that the local *re'âyâ* was displeased with Gavril's actions while he held the office of metropolitan, and he was thus expelled from this position as a result of a petition Vasilije's predecessor, Patriarch Kiril II, dispatched to the Porte.¹⁰² Although a new local priest was appointed as a metropolitan after Gavril was dislodged, the latter, apparently, managed to return to the post through his trceries. Vasilije addresses the Sultan Mustafa (r. 1753-1774) with the request to reappoint the previous metropolitan [Evstratios], whom Vasilije characterizes as the "true representative" appointed by the *re'âyâ*.¹⁰³ We learn from the same document that Vasilije's request received a positive answer from the Porte.¹⁰⁴

A week after the petition was submitted, Vasilije initiated another request to the Sultan this time complaining about Theodosios, the metropolitan of Uziçe, another region under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć. In a similar vein to the previous case, Vasilije again

¹⁰¹ D.PSK 24/38 3 *Şa'bân* 1176 / 17 Şubat 1763, The dependencies are as follows [(...) *Yenipazar ve Yenivaroş, Perguşta, Perdnik, Mitroŕça...ve tevâbi'* (...)].

¹⁰² D.PSK 24/38 3 *Şa'bân* 1176 / 17 Şubat 1763 [(...) *Re'âyâ kulları ber-vech ile hoşnud olmadıklarında selefim kulları arzuhâliyle mukaddemâ 'azl ve yerine ref'inden yerlû râhibinin tâ'yîni* (...)].

¹⁰³ D.PSK 24/38 [(...) *Re'âyâ kullarının muhtârları olan mezbûr (Evstratios) râhibe tevcîh ve yedine kâdim-i şürûti tasrîhiyle müceddeden berât-ı âlîşânım* (...)].

¹⁰⁴ D.PSK 24/38.

maintained that this metropolitan overstepped his limits [*râhib kendü halinde olmayub*]. Vasilije claims that this resulted, as in Gavril's case, in dissatisfaction of *re'âyâ*, causing disorder [*ihtilâl*] among the tax paying non-Muslims in the region. Thus, Vasilije requests a *fermân* in order to seize the said metropolitan [*bulunduğu mahallde ahz*] and send him to a monastery in the *sancak* of Iskenderiye to facilitate the metropolitan's self-correction [*ıslâh-ı nefs için*]. This petition, as the previous one, received a positive response.¹⁰⁵

3.3 Vasilije as The *Re'âyâ* and Sultan's Loyal Servant

A week after the Patriarch Vasilije sent out his petitions to the Porte in an attempt to pursue justice and restore order in the region under the jurisdiction of his patriarchate, a sealed petition written by a Muslim, supposedly *kadı*, was sent to the Porte. According to the petition the a number of locals including the *re'âyâ*, *kocabaşı*, and priests appeared before *kadı* in order to support the current Patriarch Vasilije and testify against the former Patriarch Gavril III, who, apparently, made attempts to overtake Vasilije's office and regain the patriarchal seat. To do so, Gavril used bribery and managed to obtain petitions in his favor from certain districts.¹⁰⁶ Having heard of Gavril's plan and strategies, the above mentioned petitioners decided to interfere on behalf of Vasilije, whose position was now under a threat. In their petition, the residents of the Patriarchate of Peć characterized the period when Patriarch Gavril III held the office as full of cruelty and violence [*zulm ve tâ'addi*] and emphasized that his rule left the patriarchate in a state of poverty and misery [*patrikliği hâlde-i sefâlet eylediği*].¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ D.PSK 24/39 10 Şa'bân 1176 / 24 February 1763.

¹⁰⁶ D.PSK 24/41 17 Şa'bân 1176 / 3 March 1763 [(...) *Der-i devlet mekine arz-ı dai-i kemine budur ki İpek kazasında mutemekin ehl-i zımmet re'âyâ ve kocabaşları ve papasları bi'l-cümle meclis-i şer'e gelüb tazallüm-i hal ve ıstika'-yı makal iderler ki bundan esbak İpek patriği olan Gavril (....) müfessir-i mesfur Gavril bu defa' yine patriklik için kuvvet-i irtişa' ile bazı mahallerden arz aldığı (...)].*

¹⁰⁷ D.PSK 24/41 17 Şa'bân 1176 / 3 March 1763.

Having established that Gavril III was unsuitable for the patriarchal office and undesired by the residents of the region, the petitioners expressed that they were pleased and content [*hoşnud ve razı*] with their current Patriarch Vasilije and, most importantly, found him suitable for the performance of their Orthodox rites [*âyînimizin icrâsına liyâkat...*]. The petitioners' endorsement of the current head of their church and rite is further expressed in the use of possessive suffix 'm' attached to the word 'patriarch', meaning 'Vasilije – who is currently *my* patriarch' [*hâlâ patriğim olân Vasilios nâm râhib*].¹⁰⁸ While it is common to refer to the Sultan using possessive suffixes in petitions, for example *sultanım*, *pâdîşahım*, *der-i devletim*, meaning 'my Sultan', it is noteworthy, that such form of reference to a patriarch is quite unusual, especially when the petition is not addressed to the patriarch directly. Thus, having illustrated their content with Vasilije and frustration with his rival, the petitioners concluded by pleading the Sultan to keep Vasilije as their Patriarch and, by doing so, protecting the "poor *re'âyâ*" from the cruelty and violence of Gavril.¹⁰⁹

A month later, on March 26, 1763, Vasilije made a stand for his patriarchal throne in the face of adversity against his rival Gavril who still sought to regain the patriarchate. To do so, Vasilije composed a petition in which he narrated a vivid story of 'before' and 'after' he assumed the role of the Patriarch of Peć. According to the petition, before Vasilije, that is in the period when Gavril III held the office, the Patriarchate of Peć was drowning in debt [*İpek patrikliğinin müstağrık olduğu düyûn-ı kesîresinin*].¹¹⁰ However, Vasilije strongly emphasizes that since the blessed year when he himself was kindly granted a decree of appointment: the *re'âyâ* elected him for this position; the old order was finally revived; the patriarchate was

¹⁰⁸ D.PSK 24/39 10 *Şa'bân* 1176 / 24 February 1763.

¹⁰⁹ D.PSK 24/39 10 *Şa'bân* 1176 / 24 February 1763. [(...) *Vasilios râhib fi-ma-ba'd Patriklikten azl olunmayub fukârâ-yı râiyyeti sabaret ve müfessir-i mesfur Gavril'in tetâvül ve zulmundan himâyet recâsında olduğumuzu der-devletimden arz ve i'lâm ederiz (...)*].

¹¹⁰ D.PSK 24/45 11 *Ramazân* 1176 / 26 March 1763.

moving towards stability; and the position of the tax-paying non-Muslims of the region was under his protective service.¹¹¹ And just when everything was evolving in accordance with their [Orthodox] rite, the former Patriarch Gavril appeared bent on retaining the seat and undermining its newfound order. Taking into consideration the fact that Vasilije was chosen by the *re'âyâ* as their leader as well as the fact that the patriarchate achieved order, stability, and prosperity under Vasilije's short, but apparently, fruitful tenure, Vasilije requests that any petition's addressed by Gavril to the Porte with the intention to regain the status of the Patriarch of Peć should be disregarded.¹¹²

Thus, by March of 1763, only a few months after Vasilije was appointed to the position, he managed to bring order to the institution, which, apparently, was drowning in debt, injustice, violence and disarrange at least since the times of Gavril III, that is for eleven years before Vasilije assumed the role of patriarch. Judging from the petitions of the residents of the Patriarchate of Peć as well as from Vasilije's own petitions, the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć was blessed with an unprecedented, or maybe, unrecorded degree of support, loyalty, and involvement of his *re'âyâ* – a fact that he never failed to mention in his petitions. Vasilije's career as a righteous loyal patriarch and a winner of *re'âyâ*'s hearts seemed inviolable, until it suddenly was not.

¹¹¹ D.PSK 24/45 11 Ramazân 1176 / 26 March 1763 [(...) *Selef patrik 'azl vech ile re'âyânın rây [rey?] ve intihâb ve ihtiyârlarıyla yedine ihsân olunan berât-ı padişahi mantukunce inayeten ve merhameten işbu sene-i mübarekeden patriklik-i mezbur bu kulları üzerine tevcih olaldan berü patriklik (be can) ve nizâm-ı kâdimimizin istiâde ve istikrârına vâzife-i zimmet hizmet-i me'munum muktezâsınca (...)]*.

¹¹² D.PSK 24/45 11 Ramazân 1176 / 26 March 1763 [(...) *Fi-ma-b'ad mesfûr Gavril patrik olmak zımnında arz ve arzuhal zuhur eder ise kaydı ihrac ve i'tibar olunmayub kaleminden (haval) olunmak (...)]*.

3.4 Vasilije as a Catholic, a Traitor, a Fugitive Convict

It took a little more than a year, and Vasilije's mysterious conversion to Catholicism made the sentiments of the *re'âyâ* of Peć turn from love, devotion, and unconditional endorsement of their Patriarch to hate, enmity, and mistrust. From a petition dated 6 August 1764 that the same *re'âyâ* composed and directed to the Porte, we learn that Vasilije, who is referred to as the former Patriarch of Peć and a Catholic, has recently abandoned the Orthodox rite and converted to Catholicism. Having done so, he brought cruelty and violence to the poor *re'âyâ*, and even forced the Orthodox people to perform the Catholic rite.¹¹³ To liberate themselves from Vasilije's hatred, treachery, and brigandage, all the representatives of the *re'âyâ* of Peć came to Istanbul to present their collective complaint against Vasilije.¹¹⁴ Having obtained a necessary *fermân* [imperial edict], the Patriarch of Istanbul, the Synod,¹¹⁵ the Patriarch of Peć, the *re'âyâ* of Peć, as well as some "knowledgeable and impartial people" have established as a result of research that Vasilije was truly a Catholic, and this information started to spread from mouth to mouth.¹¹⁶ With that the *re'âyâ* of Peć elected Kalinikos, one of the metropolitans under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć, as their patriarch. In accordance

¹¹³ D.PSK 24/98 7 Sâfer 1178 / 6 August 1764. [(...) *İpek kazâsı re'âyâ fukârâsı kullarının arzuhâlleridir ki sâbık İpek patriği olan Katolik Vasilios âyin-i kâidemiz üzere olmayub hilâf-ı âyin Katolik mezhebine ta'yin itmekle re'âyâ fukârâsına eylediği zulm ve ta'addisinden ma'ada Frenk âyînî icrâsına Rum tâifesini dâhi istilâle ve mübâdere (...)*].

¹¹⁴ D.PSK 24/98 [(...) *umûmen re'âyâ kendüsünden nefret ve fesâd ve şekâvetinden halâs için 'arz ve mahzarlarıyla der-aliyyeye gelüb iştika' olundukta (...)*].

¹¹⁵ The establishment of the system of elders (gerontismos) altered the structure of the Synod of the Patriarchate of Istanbul, i.e. the community of metropolitans. It was a gradual process that was concluded in 1763. Accordingly, the Synod would consist of five prominent Orthodox metropolitans who would elect the Patriarchs of Istanbul and assume collective responsibility for his actions. The liability of the metropolitans for the Patriarchs they elect was imposed by the Ottoman administration. This collective liability is considered to be one of the initial steps towards institutionalization of the Orthodox Church in the eighteenth century Ottoman Empire, see Elif Bayraktar-Tellan, "The Patriarchate of Constantinople and the 'Reform of the Synod' in the 18th century Ottoman context", *Chronos* 39, (2019), 7-22.

¹¹⁶ D.PSK 24/98 [(...) *bâ fermân-ı 'âlî İstanbul Rûm patriğinin sıhhât ve hakikatı şevvâl ve kirâren akd meclis cema'at-i metropolidan ile gerek İpek patriği ve re'âyâlarından ve gerek ehl-i vukuf bi-garez civar bila ahalilerinden tafahhus ve mesfur Vasilios rahibin sahîh Katolik olduğu tevatüren (...)*].

with this, a request was made to the Porte, and the Patriarchal office was transferred to Kalinikos while Vasilije was captured and sent to exile to the castle of Magosa in Cyprus. With that the “poor *re‘âyâ*” of Peć was finally at ease and went on with their prayers.¹¹⁷

The reason the *re‘âyâ* submitted the petition in the first place was that, apparently, Vasilije managed to escape from the castle with the help of his allies. The *re‘âyâ*, concerned about the implication of this escape for their well-being, requested that the Porte made sure that Vasilije was detained and kept in exile for the sake of *re‘âyâ*. From a document dated July 1766, it becomes apparent that the allies, who helped Vasilije escape, were Catholic Armenians, who resorted to bribery to facilitate the escape. This petition was a collective request of the priests, metropolitans, monks, and other Orthodox Christians of the Patriarchate of Peć. Having established once again that Vasilije was indeed a Catholic who coerced the Orthodox *re‘âyâ* into Catholicism under the threat of exile, the petitioners made it clear to the Porte that if Vasilije remains the Patriarch of Peć, he will convert the entire *re‘âyâ* into Catholicism [*patrik bulunduğu sûrette bi’l-cümle re‘âyâyı Frenk ideceği nümâyân olduğundan*].¹¹⁸

From additions made to the previous petition, it becomes clear that the *re‘âyâ*’s concerns and requests were taken into consideration by the Ottoman central administration. Kalinikos, whom the *re‘âyâ* “elected” as their Patriarch, was granted a decree of appointment [*berât*] and became the last Patriarch of Peć before its incorporation into the Patriarchate of Istanbul. As for Vasilije, the Ottoman documentation does not shed light on his whereabouts after he escaped Magosa. It is clear, however, that he was expected to be found somewhere around Belgrade, as an imperial decree issued soon after his escape addressed the *muhâfiz*

¹¹⁷ D.PSK 24/98 [(...) *İpek re‘âyâlarının intihâb ve iltimâslarıyla yine İpek patrikliği metropoliğinden Kalinikos rahibi der-aliyyeye emr ve telbiye imtisâlen arz idüp İpek Patrikliği Kalinikos rahibe tevcîh ve mesfur katolik Vasilios Magosa kalesine bâ fermân-ı ali kal’a-bend olunub re‘âyâ fukârâsı âsûde hâl duâ‘-yı devâm-ı amel (...)]].*

¹¹⁸ D. PSK 25/11 7 *Sâfer* 1180 / 15 July 1766, the date of the petition is recorded as 5-14 January 1764.

(governor-protector) of Belgrade, the *kadis* serving in the regions between Belgrade and Istanbul, and the regent of Magosa. According to the decree, Vasilije – once found - should be returned to his place of exile.¹¹⁹

Thus, the Ottoman documentation presents us with an unusual incident of an impetuous fall from grace. Rarely do we encounter in the Ottoman sources instances of such a collective endeavor undertaken by the *re'âyâ*, the high clergy, and the local office-holders together to support the candidacy of a certain Patriarch with such a vigor, only to take him down with a similar vigor just a year later. The petitions, as unusual as they seem, were deliberately crafted to address the most pertinent values, discourses, and expectations of the Ottoman central administration.

First of all, the alleged involvement of the *re'âyâ* in the crafting of petitions, and the frequent mention of the *re'âyâ*'s approval or disapproval of a certain individual or situation was expected to attribute urgency to petitions in the eyes of the Ottoman central administration. After all, the ostensible dissatisfaction of the *re'âyâ* presented as the reason for a possible disorder [*ihtilâl*] or the corruption of existing order [*nizâm*] was a trope frequently used by various rival parties to negotiate with the Porte and obtain desired solutions.¹²⁰ After all, the satisfied *re'âyâ* pays taxes, the disorderly one – not necessarily. This being said, both Vasilije and later Kalinik¹²¹ went a bit further in their use of the poor *re'âyâ* trope.¹²² Vasilije in his petitions was not a mere Patriarch; he was “my Patriarch”. Kalinik was not merely liked by the *re'âyâ*; he was “elected” by it. Similarly, Vasilije did not merely overstep his limits [*kendü hâlinde olmayub*] or act in contravention with the Orthodox rite [*âyînlerinin hilâfî/na hâreket* or

¹¹⁹ D.PSK 24/98 7 *Safer* 1178 / 6 August 1764.

¹²⁰ See for example Bayraktar-Tellan, “The Clash of Rum and Frenk”.

¹²¹ Kalinik is referred in the petitions as Kalinikos, and Vasilije as Vasilios.

¹²² For the “poor *re'âyâ*” trope see BOA.KK.d.2540/16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 49, 86, 92, 112, 114, 123.

âyîn-i atılâlarının hilâfî] – the tropes often employed in petitions to describe individuals who show inclinations to confessions to which they did not belong.¹²³ Rather, he was a vicious offender on a mission to convert to Catholicism the entire Orthodox population under the jurisdiction of Peć. He was not merely the source of cruelty and violence [*zulm ve ta‘addî*] – also an accusation frequently used in petitions against various offenders. Rather, he was a source of hatred.¹²⁴

Above all other shortcomings, Vasilije was a Catholic, even a “genuine” Catholic [*sahih Katolik*] as his former *re‘âyâ* and high clergy named him. As I illustrated in the first chapter of this thesis, at the moment when Vasilije was accused of being Catholic, a major shift in anti-Catholic discourse spread throughout the Ottoman Empire, and more specifically in the Ottoman Orthodox institutions. From the Eastern Patriarchates to the Aegean Islands the tension was growing between the Orthodox high clergy and the Catholic missionaries. The 1724 schism in the Patriarchate of Antioch as well as the increase of Catholic proselytizing activities in the Ottoman Empire resulting in an increase of conversions to Catholicism among the Orthodox *re‘âyâ* and clergy combined together incited a move towards the institutionalization of the Orthodox Patriarchates and the Porte’s adoption of drastic measures against Catholic activities among the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire.¹²⁵ The local actors fought against Catholic activities by submitting petitions to the Ottoman central

¹²³ For examples of such petitions see BOA.KK.d.2540/8, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 31, 32, 34, 49, 55, 75, 96, 111, 112, 114, 123, 124, these documents cover a period from January 14th, 1754 to February 15th, 1756.

¹²⁴ For *zulm* and *ta‘addî* see, BOA.KK.d.2540/53, 57, 60, 92; and D.PSK 25/74,75 (February 1767) – the two documents elaborate on how the archbishopric of Ohrid and its congregation suffer from the cruelty and violence [*zulm ve ta‘addî*] of the local high-clergy, the way to put an end to this disorder and injustice according to the petition is to appoint a different Metropolitan (doc. 75), or to abolish the Archbishopric and incorporate it into the Patriarchate of Istanbul (doc. 74); also see D.PSK 25/93 1181.M.12/10 June 1767 – a ferman.

¹²⁵ See the Chapter I and Leal, “The Ottoman State and the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul,” 375-378; Bayraktar-Tellan, ““The Clash of Rum and Frenk”; Çolak, “Catholic Infiltration.”

administration. The premise was that, Catholic activities caused disorder [*ihtilâl*] in society. The Porte responded to this problem by issuing decrees in response to petitions and adjusting stipulations of the Patriarchal *berâts* in a way that would allow the Patriarchs to punish the *re'âyâ* and the high clergy that showed inclination towards Catholicism.¹²⁶ When it was an Orthodox Patriarch, who favored Catholicism, the punishment was severe: imprisonment, exile, or death.¹²⁷

An Armenian Patriarch was once imprisoned for tolerating the practice of Catholic rite in the region under his jurisdiction.¹²⁸ If so, what could be the expected fate of an Orthodox Patriarch, who not only allegedly converted to Catholicism himself, but also forced his *re'âyâ* to follow his example? Claiming that a Patriarch is hated by his *re'âyâ*, which brings disorder to the society, and accusing this Patriarch of being an actively and violently proselytizing Catholic convert at the time when Catholic activities were strongly opposed by the Ottoman central administration, was bound to create a perfect storm that Vasilije had no chance to withstand. And probably to prevent the addressee of the petition, *i.e.* the Porte, from forgetting that Vasilije was indeed a Catholic, the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć was not once mentioned in a petition by the typical for petitions patterns such as 'the former Patriarch' [*patrik-i sâbık*] or a priest named Vasilije [*Vasilios nâm râhib*]. Throughout the whole petition, Vasilije's name is none other than Catholic Vasilios [*Katolik Vasilios*].¹²⁹

Chances are Vasilije had a serious rival. Quite possibly, this rival was Kalinik II, who assumed the patriarchal throne after Vasilije's exile. Patriarch Kalinik II, as petitions vividly demonstrate, was much respected by the local high clergy and *re'âyâ*, who have "elected" him

¹²⁶ Çolak, Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church*, 50.

¹²⁷ Çolak, "Catholic Infiltration", 89-94; Bayraktar-Tellan, "The Patriarch and the Sultan", 59-79.

¹²⁸ Bayraktar-Tellan, "The Patriarch and the Sultan", 120-121.

¹²⁹ D.PSK 24/98 7 Safer 1178 / 6 August 1764.

as their Patriarch, despite him being of the Phanariot origin. Vasilije's unexpected passion for Catholicism allowed Kalinik II to assume the patriarchal throne only to let go of it a year later when he and eight other representatives of the high clergy of Peć petitioned the Porte requesting that the Patriarchate of Peć be incorporated into the Patriarchate of Istanbul.¹³⁰ Their request received a positive answer, and on September 11, 1766, the Patriarchate of Peć was abolished making Patriarch Kalinik II the last Patriarch of Peć.

Unfortunately, the petitions remained silent as to what may have caused this drastic change in Vasilije's faith and loyalties. What could possibly turn a faithful Orthodox Patriarch enjoying the love and respect of his clergy and *re'âyâ* into a malicious villain, who not only betrayed his faith and rite but went as far as to impose it on the very subjects who defended him in petitions against his rival Gavril III just a year before? Alternatively, if one is to maintain that Vasilije was in fact innocent and fell victim to the intrigues and ambitions of Kalinik II, another question emerges: what made it possible for Kalinik II or anyone else to make such a strong accusation? Moreover, what made this hardly conceivable in the given circumstances accusation plausible in the eyes of the Porte and the inhabitants of the Patriarchate of Peć? What could Vasilije possibly do within a period of less than a year to convince the Porte and his congregation in the necessity of his deposition and exile? The Ottoman sources remain silent.

3.5. Vasilije as an Innocent Trans-Imperial Entrepreneur

It is noteworthy that the Serbian sources do not mention any inclination on behalf of Vasilije towards Catholicism. In fact, in the Serbian historiography Vasilije is presented as a

¹³⁰ The actual petition is not found yet (although there are translations of it in Serbian that I can not acquire due to Coronavirus), but its contents are summarized in this document from the Ottoman Archive D.PSK 25/150, 8 *Receb* 1182 / 18 November 1768.

victim of the Greek plan to abolish the Patriarchate of Peć. Thus, according to Grujić, the Patriarch of Istanbul Samouil (1763 – 1768) took advantage of the difficult situation of the Patriarchate of Peć for his own purposes and prepared the ground to abolish the autocephaly of the Serbian Patriarchate and to subject its territory to the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Istanbul. Vasilije – the last Serbian Patriarch of Peć – was indeed an obstacle for Samouil’s plan. Thus, to remove the hindrance, “the Greeks” (i.e., Phanariots who enjoyed proximity to the Sultan and occupied leading positions in the Ottoman administrative system and in the Patriarchate of Istanbul) accused Vasilije in the face of Ottoman authorities as a spy and traitor; thus in April of 1765 he was sent in an exile to Cyprus.¹³¹

While it is clear from the petitions mentioned above that it was not the Greeks who accused Vasilije but rather his own *re’âyâ*, it is possible to argue that the *re’âyâ* were inspired in their decision by Vasilije’s successor Kalinik II who was also “a Greek”.¹³² As for Samouil – the Patriarch of Istanbul – and his plan to overthrow Vasilije in order to open the way for the incorporation of the Patriarchate of Peć, it is clear from the petitions that the Patriarch of Istanbul and Synod were indeed involved in Vasilije’s matter. It was them, along with some “knowledgeable and impartial people from the region”, who performed the investigation, which arrived to the conclusion that Vasilije was a genuine Catholic [*sahîh Katolik*].¹³³ Overall, in the Serbian sources I have encountered, Vasilije is always represented as an innocent Patriarch, importantly, a Serb, who fell victim to the intrigues and aspirations of “Greek” Phanariot circles in Istanbul, which included the serving Patriarch of Istanbul, members of Synod, and Vasilije’s

¹³¹ Grujić, “Pećka Patriarsija”, 397.

¹³² In the Serbian historiography, Kalinik II is referred as “the Greek” i.e. Kalinik II Greek, in a similar fashion with Vasilije’s predecessor Kirilo II (Greek), see Aleksandar Fotić, “Patriarcat Serbe Orthodoxe”, in Georgeon F., Vatin N., Veinstein G. (eds.) *Dictionnaire de l’Empire Ottoman XVe-XXe siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 2015), 920.

¹³³ D.PSK 24/98 7 *Safer* 1178 / 6 August 1764.

rival and successor – Kalinik II.¹³⁴ There is an alternative opinion, according to which Vasilije was accused by the relatives of his predecessor, Patriarch Kirill II (1758-1763), who happened to be a Greek, too.¹³⁵

Perhaps the unanimity of the Serbian historiography in maintaining that Vasilije was cruelly accused is not groundless. After all, Kalinik II was of Phanariot descent; he had connections in the Patriarchate of Istanbul; and was the one who initiated the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć a few months after ascending the patriarchal throne. This notion that Vasilije was merely removed as a hindrance to the abolition of the Serbian Patriarchate emerges in connection with another arguable thesis that is widely accepted in the Serbian historiography. The thesis is that the Patriarchate of Peć was incorporated into the Patriarchate of Istanbul not because of the fact that the former was on the verge of bankruptcy or drowning in debt and corruption, but rather because “the Greeks” headed by the Patriarch Samouil sought to subjugate the Serbian patriarchate motivated by their “Hellenizing agenda.”¹³⁶

The truth is that neither the alleged baselessness of the accusations that took Vasilije down, nor the assumed involvement of the Patriarchate of Istanbul in these intrigues, suffice to give a cohesive answer to what made these accusations plausible and the intrigues viable in the eyes of the Porte and the congregation of the Patriarchate of Peć. Slijepčević, the author of several comprehensive volumes on the history of the Serbian church, maintains that it was quite

¹³⁴ Grujić, “Pećka Patriarsija”, 397; “Vasilije Jovanović-Brkić” in *Narodna enciklopedija*, (Zagreb: Bibliografski zavod. 1927); Grujić, “Pećki Patrijarsji,” 239-241.

¹³⁵ Radonić, *Rimska Kurija*, 367.

¹³⁶ For a summary of the various views on the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć see Charles Jelavich, “Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century”, *Church History*, 23(02), (1954), 144 – 152; for the Samuel’s and the Phanariot’s ‘fault’ in the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć see Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 379- 380; Marin Drinov, “Bolgare i Konstantinopol’skaja Patrijarhija [The Bulgarians and the Patriarchate of Constantinople]”, *Sochinenija na M. S. Drinova*, Vol. II, (Sofia, 1911), 184-185; Grujić, “Pećska partijarska”, 396-397; Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve*, 421-422; Ruzićić, *Kratki Istoriski Pregled*, 95.

easy for the Vasilije's rival to accuse him, since he was a man of a "restless spirit" and "quite bright."¹³⁷ It is noteworthy that there is not a hint in the Serbian historiography that Vasilije might have converted to Catholicism. Moreover, according to the Serbian sources Vasilije was not accused of being a convert to Catholicism. Rather, he was accused of being a "spy" and a "traitor."¹³⁸ If so, spying for whom and trading what in exchange for what?

I argue that it was the close connections with the Habsburg domains, namely, with the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovać that along with the Ottoman anti-Catholic dynamics and imperial rivalry played a crucial role in Vasilije's demise. The last Serbian Patriarch of Peć was born in Karlovać, a town which was a part of the Habsburg Empire. There Vasilije received his education having attended a Latin school of Emanuel Kozačinski - Collegium Slavono-Latino Carloviciense. At a young age, Vasilije assumed the role of a monk in the court of Arsenije IV Jovanović – Šakabenda – a Patriarch of Peć who, as was mentioned in the previous chapter, was at the head of the second Great Migration of the Serbs from the Ottoman Empire to the Habsburg domains during the Austro-Ottoman war of 1736-1739. Naturally, Arsenije IV lost the status of the Patriarch of Peć as a result of his siding with the Habsburgs against the Ottomans and leading away a significant number of the Ottoman tax-paying subjects. Having moved to the Habsburg Empire, the former Patriarch of Peć became the head of the Serbian Metropolitanate of Karlovać and kept this office until his death in 1748. The migration of Arsenije IV and his congregation to the Habsburg domains is described in Serbian historiography as a moment when the Porte completely lost trust in Serbian Patriarchs and from

¹³⁷ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tserkve*, 362-363.

¹³⁸ Grujić, "Pećka Patriarsija", 397; Radonić, *Rimska Kurija*, 367.

that moment on sought to appoint “Greeks” of Phanariot descent to the patriarchal throne of Peć.¹³⁹

Vasilije’s career at the court of the former Patriarch of Peć and the current Metropolitan of Karlovać rapidly developed, and soon he was promoted to the rank of archdeacon. In the years between 1760 and 1763 Vasilije served as a bishop of the Eparchy of Dabar-Bosnia, which was at the moment under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć. Finally, in 1763 Vasilije Jovanović Brkić became the thirty-seventh Patriarch of Peć. Serbian sources remain silent when it comes to the details of his tenure and the exact moment or action that turned Vasilije’s career and life upside-down inviting the accusations of being an active Catholic proselytizer.

Arsenii Ivashenko, a nineteenth-century Russian historian and bishop who wrote extensively about the histories of various Orthodox Christian communities and institutions, wrote in 1868 an article on Serbian Patriarchs and Metropolitans in the eighteenth century. In his article, he states that Patriarch Vasilije in the autumn of 1763 arrived to Belgrade in order to meet his relatives from Karlovać. On this ground, “the Turks” suspected him of treason, captured and imprisoned him on one of the islands of the Mediterranean. From there Vasilije escaped to Montenegro.¹⁴⁰ Thus, if we combine evidence from the Russian, Serbian, and the Ottoman sources, it appears that a few months after ascending the Patriarchal throne, Vasilije decided to go see his relatives from Habsburg Karlovać in Belgrade. Apparently, these facts prompted the Porte, Vasilije’s congregation, and Kalinik II to suspect Vasilije’s sudden change of heart when it came to his faith and loyalty. He arrived to Belgrade on his short visit in the

¹³⁹ Katić, “Serbia under the Ottoman Rule”, 154.

¹⁴⁰ Arsenii Ivaschenko, “Arhijepiskopi i Patriarhi Serbskije s Nachala XVIII do Vtoroi Polovini XVIII Stoletija [Serbian Archbishops and Patriarchs from the Beginning till the Second Half of the XVIII Century]”, *Pravoslavnoje Obozrenije*, (Moscow, 1868), 18.

fall, but already in January, his priests entreated the Porte in the petition that allowing Vasilije to remain as patriarch will inevitably result in his converting his entire flock into Catholicism.¹⁴¹ Having Ivaschenko's record in mind, it also becomes clear why the Ottoman document recorded in August 1764 refers to a *fermân* issued soon after Vasilije's escape which addressed the *muhâfiz* of Belgrade as well as the *kadıs* serving in the regions between Belgrade and Istanbul. The document orders that Vasilije should be detained and sent back to the place of his exile.¹⁴² Apparently, the Porte expected Vasilije to return to Belgrade after his escape.

Another Russian source, the journal notes on the expedition of Prince Yuri Dolgorukov to Montenegro, Albania, and Bosnia, unveils more details of Vasilije's whereabouts after his escape from exile.¹⁴³ The Russian Prince Dolgorukov arrived to Montenegro from Venice in August of 1769 following the order of the Russian empress Catherine the Great (1762-1796) and Count Alexis Orlov who served as commander of the Preobrazenskii Regime. Having been assigned to Orlov's command as a major, Prince Dolgorukov was ordered to expose the imposter Šćepan Mali (Stephen the Little) – a Serbian nobleman, who gained significant power in Montenegro by falsely, albeit successfully, representing himself as the Russian Tsar Peter III.¹⁴⁴ Upon his arrival to Montenegro, Prince Dolgorukov received two emissaries who came to confer with the prince on behalf of the former Patriarch Vasilije and Metropolitan Sava. After the meeting, Dolgorukov issued a proclamation inviting all Montenegrins to send representatives to an assembly to be held in Centije.¹⁴⁵ At the assembly, the pastoral letter authored by Patriarch Vasilije was read. In the letter, Vasilije called upon the Montenegrins to

¹⁴¹ D. PSK 25/11 7 Safer 1180 / 15 July 1766, the date of the petition is recorded as 5-14 January 1764.

¹⁴² D.PSK 24/98 7 Safer 1178 / 6 August 1764.

¹⁴³ *Russkii Vestnik*, Vols. III (Saint-Petersburg, 1841), 39 – 109.

¹⁴⁴ Michael Boro Petrovich, "Catherine II and a False Peter III in Montenegro," *The American Slavic and East European Review* 14, no. 2 (1955), 180-181.

¹⁴⁵ Petrovich, "Catherine II and a False Peter III," 182.

abandon Šćepan the imposter and declare loyalty to the Russian Crown.¹⁴⁶ Vasilije's and Dolgorukov's efforts payed off as the imposter was soon arrested. However, Šćepan's arrest only aggravated the position of Russian mission in Montenegro, as it spiked violence and unruliness among the Montenegrins. At the same time, the Ottoman troops had formed a cordon around the Montenegrin border while the Venetians blocked communication between Dolgorukov's mission and home base in Italy. Concerned about his life and the survival of his mission, Dolgorukov decided to return to Italy.¹⁴⁷ His mission departed on October 20th, 1769 carrying on board Metropolitan Sava, some local monks, and Patriarch Vasilije. The Patriarch was apparently in an "awkward" position:

"Already a fugitive from his own See, he had made his stay in Montenegro untenable by having earned the jealousy of Metropolitan Sava and the hatred of Montenegrin people. First Brkić had supported Stephen the Small, and then abandoned him for prince Dolgorukov, and both times he had lost. To remain in Montenegro was impossible for the unhappy prelate. Moved by compassion and obligation, Prince Dolgorukov agreed to take the Patriarch with him."¹⁴⁸

The notes of Dolgorukov's mission unveil further details on the Patriarch Vasilije's grievances before his departure to Venice:

"Expelled from his homeland and his Serbian see, Patriarch Vasilije hoped to find refuge in Montenegro, but as Turks, who desired to get his head, promised several bags of money to the Montenegrins in return for [the Patriarch's] head, so this sum appealed to their [the locals'] avarice. Twenty-four men approached the above mentioned Patriarch at night and declared their intention to deliver him to the Turks. As he did not doubt that these inhuman traitors would accomplish their endeavor, he first exhorted them with his pastoral instruction, then threatened them with excommunication, then he fell on his knees to the feet of his spiritual children. Shedding bitter tears, he begged them to spare his miserable life. [As these measures

¹⁴⁶ Petrovich, "Catherine II and a False Peter III," 184.

¹⁴⁷ Petrovich, "Catherine II and a False Peter III," 186-188.

¹⁴⁸ Petrovich, "Catherine II and a False Peter III," 189; Reference to primary sources – the notes from the mission published by Peter Bartenev, ed., "Zurnal'naja zapiska proishestviam vo vremja ekspedicii ego sijatel'stva Knjaz' Jurija Volodimirovica Dolgorukova, ot armii general-majora i leib-gvardii Preobrazenskago polku majora, v Cernuju Goru, dlja, ucinenija ottuda v Albanii i Bosnie neprijatelju diverzii 1769-i god," *Russkij arkhiv*, Vols. IV (1886), 429.

did not work] he gave them all his money, fifty-four cekins, and thus he hardly saved his life that night.”¹⁴⁹

The notes on the mission further reveal that Vasilije managed to escape to Italy, however he arrived there barely alive as his health decayed during the hard journey.¹⁵⁰ It is unknown how his life unfolded in Italy, however, it is clear that sometime after his escape to Venice, Vasilije returned to Vienna, where he offered his services to the Habsburg imperial court “in case of the Austrian war with Turkey.”¹⁵¹ Vasilije also contacted his acquaintances from the court of Arsenije IV - Jovan Georgijević, then the Metropolitan of Karlovać and Mojsije Putnik who held the office of the Bishop of Novi Sad and later the Metropolitan of Sremski Karlovci. Vasilije begged them for support; he did not expect to be put at the head of an eparchy but only needed some modest income from the court to feed himself. However, Vasilije did not receive the support he expected and was banned from further staying in Vienna. On June 27, 1771 Vasilije sent a letter to Metropolitan Georgijević asking him for 60 ducats to cover Vasilije’s travel from Vienna to Russia. Finally, Vasilije received the help and left for Russia. His tomb is in Saint-Petersburg to this day.¹⁵²

Conclusion

Inter-confessional relations in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire were unstable and charged during this volatile time of inter-imperial wars. The dynamics between the Orthodox of the Ottoman Empire and various Catholic agents, such as missionaries, clergy, and the Catholic states such as Venice, the Habsburg Empire, and Rome were growing tense and

¹⁴⁹ The translation from Russian is mine, *Russkii Vestnik*, 79-80; the entry is dated September 24th, 1769 – roughly three weeks before Vasilije’s departure to Venice with Dolgorukov’s mission.

¹⁵⁰ *Russkii Vestnik*, 100.

¹⁵¹ Slijepčević, *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tserkve*, 362-363.

¹⁵² Grujić, “Pečki Patriajarsi I Karlovachki Mitropoliti,” 33-34; In this article, Grujić relies on the Serbian primary sources as well as on the primary sources from Austrian archives.

hostile. Whereas previously it was possible to witness baptisms, liturgies and other religious activities attended by both Catholics and Orthodox, by the mid-eighteenth century the petitions penned by the Orthodox high clergy complaining about Catholics started pouring to the Porte from various parts of the Empire, from Khios to Alexandria, to Peć. In response to the growing discontent of the Orthodox with the Catholic, the Porte increasingly sought to discipline and punish Orthodox subjects for exerting, enabling, or tolerating the Catholic activities. The Orthodox high clergy showing inclination to Catholicism was not tolerated. To enable the patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops of various regions to cope with the local clergy's tendencies towards Catholicism, if such tendencies did actually, the Porte changed the stipulations of the patriarchal *berâts*. Eighteenth-century decrees of appointment were formulated in a way that allowed the local high clergy to punish disorderly priests acting in contravention with their rites at the spot, without requesting a corresponding decree from Istanbul.

At the same time, the Serbian Patriarchate of Peć was going through the difficult process of the reorganization of the church after a couple of Serbian Patriarchs with a difference in forty years joined Habsburg forces during the Habsburg-Ottoman wars. As a result of the retreat of the Habsburg armies, the Patriarchs and the congregation who joined them, being aware of the consequences of their choices, followed their retreating armies to the Habsburg domains. The Patriarchate of Peć and the remaining congregation were left behind having to deal with the alleged mistrust of the Porte towards the Patriarchate and its clergy. Those who left, on the other hand, had to deal with the pressure of living in a Catholic state and, allegedly, fight back the constant danger of a possible union between the Catholic and the Orthodox churches. To do so, the Serbs established an Orthodox metropolitanate with the seat in Krušedol, and then in Karlovać. This fact is often presented in the Serbian historiography in a

negative vein, as it is associated with the Catholic oppression and the weakening of the Serbian church due to its division into two ecclesiastical institutions.

It is under these dynamics and circumstances that Vasilije Brkić ascended the patriarchal throne only to become the last Serbian patriarch two years later. Vasilije from the start had what we would today call an international career. He was born and held ecclesiastical offices in the Habsburg Empire and then moved on to become the head of a patriarchate in the Ottoman Empire. With him, he brought not only his trans-imperial work experience but also his trans-imperial networks and allegiances. Although, he was initially embraced by his congregation to the extent that his *re'âyâ* petitioned the Porte to support Vasilije's claim against his rival Gavril, the tables turned when Vasilije went to Belgrade to tend to his trans-imperial relationships. The Orthodox patriarch's trip to the Catholic Habsburg Empire brought him under the accusation of being Catholic. Under the circumstances of eighteenth-century cross-confessional relations in the Ottoman Empire, the accusation sufficed to depose the Vasilije and send him in exile.

This being said, would it be possible to interpret Vasilije's alleged Catholicism in this vein if it were not for the trans-imperial connections of the Patriarch and the trans-imperial body of the Serbian Orthodox church? I argue that, while the Empire-wide shift in the cross-confessional discourse might have given the petitioners a certain vernacular that they could employ against Vasilije when addressing this issue in the Porte, it was the trans-imperial and trans-confessional bonds in the Habsburg domains built by Vasilije in particular and the Serbian church in general that made it possible for the accusations to have such a far-reaching effect. Thus, the Orthodox *re'âyâ* and the high clergy of Peć, as well as, probably, Vasilije's Orthodox rivals aware of the empire-wide shift in the Catholic discourse, actively employed the rhetoric adopted by the Ottoman administration towards the Catholics against their own Orthodox

patriarch. Coupled with the growing tension between the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires and the dual body of the Serbian church existing in both empires, these cross-confessional relations with intra-confessional implications enabled the Patriarchate of Peć to emerge as a contested trans-imperial frontier of faith and loyalty.

CONCLUSION

This thesis sought to reconsider inter-confessional relations in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Balkans and their implications for the intra-confessional dynamics within the Orthodox Christian community. The developments related to the Patriarchate Peć that is the focus of this study, were contextualized within empire-wide dynamics and discourses. The Serbian church and its congregation went through a major transformation in the eighteenth century. As the Patriarchs of Peć and their followers consistently rose against Ottoman rule by joining the armies of the rival Habsburg Empire, they undermined the Porte's trust calling upon themselves the wrath of the local Muslim population. Having settled in Habsburg domains, the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III contributed to the emergence of the Serbian Metropolitanate in Catholic lands, thereby creating a permanent centralized and institutionalized presence of Serbs

and Church in the Catholic Habsburg Empire. By the mid-eighteenth century, the Serbian Metropolitanate acquired financial stability and established educational institutions in “foreign lands” that cultivated accomplished Serbian clergy fit to occupy leading ecclesiastical offices.

The Patriarchate of Peć meanwhile struggling financially in the Ottoman Empire sought to establish networks with the Metropolitanate in Habsburg lands. The networks served to facilitate the exchange of financial support and educated clergy between the two churches, thereby revolving the Serbian church and its congregation into both a trans-imperial body and trans-imperial subjects. In this way, Vasilije Brkić, a Serb who was born, reared, and educated in the Habsburg domains where he held several ecclesiastical offices under the patronage of Arsenije IV, went on to become the Patriarch of Peć. Despite his distance from the Ottoman realities throughout most of his life, as a Patriarch Vasilije proved to be adept at navigating the volatile world of Ottoman politics. Through his petitions to the Imperial Council (*divân-i hümayûn*), Vasilije fashioned himself as a legitimate representative of the *re'âyâ*, loved and supported by his congregation, and as an administrator, who cared deeply and did his best for the preservation of the order and justice among the sultan's protected subjects entrusted to him through his patriarchal *berât*. In order to outmaneuver his local rivals, Vasilije effectively employed in his petitions a political voice that addressed primary Ottoman sensibilities, such as the preservation of order and justice in the provinces.

Successful as Vasilije was for a while, the preservation of order was by far not the only Ottoman sensibility at the time. The eighteenth century Ottoman Empire, involved in wars with its powerful rivals—the Habsburg, Venetian, Russian, and Polish-Lithuanian states—concomitantly—was losing its lands and subjects to these states. This disorder was further aggravated by an increasing in Catholic proselytizing activities among Ottoman Orthodox Christians. In an attempt to prevent their congregation from converting to Catholicism, the high

clergy from various corners of the Empire addressed multiple petitions to the Imperial Council seeking the Porte's assistance against the Catholics. The Porte responded to the Orthodox clergy's pleas by adding stipulations to the patriarchal decrees of appointment, which expanded the patriarchs' rights and tools to punish and control Catholic converts and sympathizers in their congregation. At the imperial and local level, Catholicism and Catholic activities were approached with caution and growing animosity. The Porte was particularly intolerant towards instances in which its Orthodox Christian high clergy deviated from the rite. Offenders, among them patriarchs, faced severe punishment such as exile or execution.

In this context of imperial rivalry, growing acrimony towards the Catholic, and the Empire's pressing urge to control and reign in provincial power-holders and populations, especially those as vulnerable as the Serbs, Patriarch Vasilije's career fell victim to a series of accusations. His congregation, high clergy, and the local *kadi* sent multiple petitions to and even personally appeared in the Imperial Council accusing their previously beloved Patriarch of being a Catholic convert and an offender. To ensure the Porte's awareness of the urgency of the situation, the petitioners threatened that unless the Porte intervenes, Vasilije would succeed at converting the whole congregation of the Patriarchate of Peć to Catholicism. Vasilije's accusation of being a Catholic convert converged with his trip to visit the relatives from the Habsburg domains. Thus, I argued that it was the trans-imperial body of the Serbian church spread over two rival empires that coupled with Ottoman cross-confessional tensions and disorder to transform the Patriarchate of Peć and its congregation into discursive battlefields where notions such as confessional belonging, subjecthood, and imperial loyalty were constantly contested, reclaimed, and reconstructed.

What does Vasilije's rise and fall tell us about the power-dynamics and archival sensibilities along with legal, administrative, and institutional practices in the eighteenth-

century Ottoman Empire? What does his story, moreover, tell us about the character of interactions between the provinces such as those under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć, vulnerable provincial subjects such as Serbs, as well as institutions such as the Serbian Church and Ottoman central administration?

First of all, Vasilije's career, or rather the way it was narrated in petitions, demonstrates the importance of representation in Ottoman provincial and central power dynamics. Recent studies attempting to go beyond the millet system paradigm used the concept of representation in order to reconsider the role of ecclesiastical institutions and high clergy in the Ottoman state and society. The premise is that the role of church as the representative of the *re'âyâ* before the Imperial Council and the central power before the *re'âyâ* was not inherent to Ottoman ecclesiastical institutions and their officials but, rather, contested by other parties.¹⁵³ This thesis demonstrates that the concept of representation was a vital tool for the patriarchs as well. They relied on this tool to validate their position vis-à-vis their rivals and to be able to acquire desired outcomes for their requests from the Porte. Keenly aware of the importance of the concept of a contented *re'âyâ* in Ottoman parlance and their ability to fashion themselves as fit for the preservation of the order in their congregation, the patriarchs relied on Ottoman legal, administrative, and political rhetoric in order to construct a plausible narrative in their petitions that would prove them legitimate representatives of the *re'âyâ* and successful agents of empire solemnly committed to the upkeep of order and peace. While the sultans were the officials who granted the patriarchs their office through *berâts*, it was the endorsement of the *re'âyâ* that made this office valid and lasting. The Porte therefore endorsed patriarchs whose "representation narratives" were convincing. The central power, it seems, did not initially find

¹⁵³ Antonis Hadjikyriacou, "Beyond the Millet Debate: the Theory and Practice of Communal Representation in Pre-Tanzimat Era Cyprus," *Ottoman Political Thought and Practice*. Halcyon Days in Crete IX, ed. Marinos Sariyannis (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2019), 71-96.

it problematic that a clergymen born, raised, and educated in the Habsburg Empire would occupy a patriarchal throne of an Ottoman ecclesiastical institution.

This being said, Vasilije's case demonstrates that patriarchs and provincial elites were not the only parties entering into a sophisticated engagement with the Ottoman center through petitions. From the petitions analyzed in this thesis, it appears that the *re'âyâ* took an active stance in the fate of their patriarchate and region by consistently submitting petitions and thus participating in a dialog with the center. Aware of Ottoman sensibilities and the role of justice and order in the imperial self-fashioning and legitimization, the *re'âyâ*, just like other parties, employed the "poor *re'âyâ*" trope, fashioning themselves as helpless subjects in need of protection and just interference by the hands of Ottoman authorities. From the responses that the Serbian *re'âyâ* received to their petitions regarding Vasilije, it becomes clear that the reality constructed by *re'âyâ* in their petitions had the same chance to be perceived by Porte as plausible and valid as those crafted by the Patriarchs and lay elites. Thus, in the quest for the preservation of order the Ottoman administration cooperated not only with the provincial elites but also with the provincial *re'âyâ*.

However, in the case of deposition of Vasilije, as in many other petitions authored by the *re'âyâ*, it is unclear who exactly the *re'âyâ* were. Taking into consideration that the petitions concerning Vasilije came from an environment marked by intrigue and intra-confessional rivalry between "the Serb" and "the Greek" patriarchs, the issue of representation acquired a different dimension: how representative were the petitioners calling themselves "the *re'âyâ* of Peć" of the general opinions of the Serbian congregation? To know decisively, it would be necessary to analyze a vast number of petitions coming from different regions under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Peć. Until then, it can only be concluded that in the

eighteenth-century Ottoman Balkans, the *re'âyâ*—factual or nominal—had a major say in the matters of appointment and depositions of the patriarchs and did not hesitate to collaborate and negotiate with the central authorities in order to acquire a desired outcome.

With this, another question arises. If the petitions can be read “as an offer by the local population to collaborate with the central authorities in working against intermediate power holders,”¹⁵⁴ the question is what made the local population of Peć collaborate with the central authorities against their own patriarch? Moreover, if the mostly Serbian congregation of the Patriarchate of Peć could effectively influence the Porte’s decisions as to who was the representative of the *re'âyâ* in the provinces, why would it support a Greek over a Serb? The Porte might have “read” the Serbs along confessional lines rather than ethnic ones, but did the Serbs identify themselves merely as Orthodox Christians or there was more to them than their confession?

A notable feature from the period is that the metropolitans of Karlovać abstained from extending their financial assistance to the patriarch of Peć whilst the patriarchal see was head by a Greek patriarch. The fact that Serbian patriarchs in Ottoman Peć, in contrast, could successfully rely on help from Karlovać highlights the importance of the Serbs’ common language, kin, and shared commitment to “Serbian glory” at work across both empires. This also suggests that the Serbs read themselves along ethnic and cultural lines in addition to the confessional lines along which their respective Ottoman and Habsburg authorities viewed them. In other words, ethnic belonging started having currency among Ottoman and Habsburg subject populations well before the nineteenth century and influence from revolutionary France started trickling into these domains.

¹⁵⁴ Lex Heerma van Voss, “Introduction,” *International Review of Social History* 46, no. supplement S9 (2001): 4; Tuğ, *Politics of Honor in the Ottoman Anatolia*, 92.

So, what could prompt the Serbian congregation to turn against their Serbian patriarchs? One explanation could be that while the Serbs were not reading themselves along confessional lines only, they were aware of the fact that the Porte did so. This period was characterized by growing confessional tensions, inter-imperial rivalry, and the mistrust of the Porte and the local Muslim populations on account of the Serbs' treachery against the Ottomans by joining the invading armies of imperial rivals and abandoning the empire multiple times. Under such circumstances, it is possible that the congregation of Peć launched their enthusiastic villainizing campaign against Vasilije, who recklessly decided to visit his relatives from the Habsburg domains, in order to disassociate themselves and their patriarchate from Vasilije's actions and their possible consequences. After all, in the period of growing bureaucratization of the Ottoman legal institutions, seeking justice and protection through cooperation with the Porte was gradually formalized as loyal service and exemplary imperial subjecthood.¹⁵⁵ In this case, in a dubious and potentially dangerous situation, the Serbian congregation might have chosen to render themselves as "readable" to the ways in which they perceived the Porte would have liked to read them, thereby trumpeting their status as loyal Ottoman subjects and prioritizing their initial rite and social order above all else.

Alternatively, it is possible that the accusations against Vasilije were completely groundless and emerged only as a result of an impressive plot that involved the *re'âyâ*, the high clergy of Peć, as well as the *kadı* of the region. The plot, as we know from historiography, may have been organized by Phanariot circles in Istanbul who sought to take the Serbian church under their jurisdiction. In such a case, one cannot help but wonder why did not Vasilije strike back? As we have seen, he was extremely eloquent and a persistent petitioner, and he did not hesitate to make it clear for the Porte that he was an exceptional Patriarch—loved and respected

¹⁵⁵ Tuğ, *Politics of Honor in the Ottoman Anatolia*, 144.

by his *re'âyâ*. If the accusations were groundless, what would stop Vasilije and his supporters from sending their own petition and presenting their version of reality? Most importantly, it is unclear why the Porte or the Patriarchate of Istanbul felt the need to organize such a dangerous plot in order to abolish a Patriarchate, whose congregation and patriarchs had already risen against the Ottoman Empire on multiple occasions, deserted the army and their lands, and established a Metropolitanate in the Habsburg Empire?

While the petitions that were the primary source of this thesis did come from a place of intrigue, intra-confessional tensions, and contested power dynamics, I believe that their messages and vernacular employed to pass these messages across are highly important for understanding the angst and fears of non-Muslims and their Muslim interlocutors during this volatile, overlooked period of Ottoman history. The petitions indeed are a product of the professionalized conventions of *arzuhalcıs* and their nuanced construction of narratives. But the conspicuous inconsistency of petition patterns underscored in petitions concerning Vasilije allows us to hear the voice of the actual petitioners. What is clear is that the “thought-through” rhetoric of petition writing does not exist in a bubble: it is contextual and constructs and reconstructs itself depending on the discursive field in which it operates. The very intentionality and thought-out nature of petitions, with its occasional slips and deviation from conventionalized patterns, provide a vantage point to look at the dynamics, priorities, policies, and sensibilities of the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire. In this way, this thesis suggests that Vasilije’s career and the way it was fashioned in petitions is highly representative of eighteenth-century Ottoman anxieties and power-struggles.

Perhaps most importantly, this thesis demonstrates the interplay of power and sensibilities between the Imperial center and the Ottoman Balkans. On the one hand, it is clear that the Christian subjects of the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire were in tune with empire-

wide dynamics and discourses in some cases. Thus, for example, we see that petitioners from the Patriarchate of Peć successfully address Ottoman sensibilities of the time such as inter-confessional relations and the preservation of the social order. This not only entailed officials not to exceed the limits of the rights granted to them in *berâts* but also that the local Christians remain within the boundaries of their *mezheb* (confession).

Nevertheless, my case studies demonstrated that in some ways a visible veritable detachment surfaced between the Central authorities and the provincial petitioners starts to slip in the Ottoman Balkans. The detachment is particularly visible in the matters of intra-confessional relations in the intra-confessional struggles between the Greeks and the Serbs. While the Ottomans continued to read the Orthodox Christians along confessional lines, the nature of financial relations between the Patriarchate of Peć and Metropolitanate of Karlovać demonstrates that for the Serbs confession was intertwined with cultural and ethnic specificities particular to their “kin” [*rod*]. Not long after Vasilije’s demise, the subsequent abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and its entering under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Istanbul headed by Phanariots would further crystallize the intra-confessional tensions that the Porte failed to notice or chose to overlook. However, the quickly approaching “age of revolution” that would soon follow this era beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, give a new meaning to the notions of confession, subjecthood, faith, loyalty, and to even empire itself.

Bibliography

Unpublished Primary Sources

D.PSK, Folders 12, 24, 25

BOA.KK.d.2540/8-124

BOA.KK.d.2542/16,17

Published Primary Sources

Russkii Vestnik, Vols. III (Saint-Petersburg, 1841)

Secondary Literature

Aksan, Virginia. "Mobilization of Warrior Populations in the Ottoman Context, 1750-1850." In *Fighting for a Living: A Comparative Study of Military Labour 1500-2000*, edited by Erik-Jan Zürcher, 331-52. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013.

Aksan, Virginia. "War and Peace." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey: The Later Ottoman Empire 1603-1938*. Edited by Suraiya N. Faroqi, Vol. III, 81-117. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Aslantaş, Selim. *Osmanlı'da Sırp İsyanları: 19. Yüzyılın Şafağında Balkanlar*. Kitap Yayınevi, 2007.

Barkey, Karen. *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization*. Cornell University Press, 1994.

Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Başaran, Betül, *Selim III, Social Control and Policing in Istanbul at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Between Crisis and Order*, Boston: Brill, 2014.

Bataković Dushan T. (ed.), *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda* [The New History of the Serbian People], Nas Dom, 2000.

Bayraktar Tellan, Elif. "The clash of 'Rum' and 'Frenk': Orthodox-Catholic Interactions on the Aegean Islands in the mid-seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries and their Impact in the Ottoman Capital." In *The Islands of the Eastern Mediterranean: A History of Cross-cultural Encounters*, edited by Özlem Çaykent and Luca Zavagno, 64-78. London: I. B. Tauris, 2014.

Bayraktar Tellan, Elif. "The Patriarch and the Sultan: The Struggle for Authority and the Quest for Order in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire." PhD Dissertation, Bilkent University, 2011.

Bayraktar-Tellan, Elif. "The Patriarchate of Constantinople and the 'Reform of the Synod' in the 18th century Ottoman context", *Chronos* 39 (2019): 7-22.

- Bosworth, Clifford E. and Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Ra'yya." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol.1. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Cezar, Yavuz. *Osmanlı Maliyesinde Bunalım ve Değişim Dönemi: XVIII. yy'dan Tanzimata Mali Tarih*. İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1986.
- Cezar, Yavuz. "The Role of the Sarrafs in Ottoman Finance and Economy in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." In *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, edited by Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki, Vol. 1. Tauris, 2005.
- Cirković, Sima M. *The Serbs*. Blackwell, 2004.
- Chalcraft, John. "Engaging the State: Peasants and Petitions in Egypt on the Eve of Colonial Rule," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37 (2005): 303-325.
- Corović, Vladimir. *Istorija Jugoslavije [History of Yugoslavia]*. Belgrade, 1933.
- Çolak, Hasan, and Bayraktar-Tellan, Elif. *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution: A study of Early Modern Patriarchal Berats*. İstanbul: ISIS, 2019.
- Çolak, Hasan. "Catholic Infiltration in the Ottoman Levant and Responses of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates during the Late 17th and Early 18th Centuries" *ARAM* 25, no.1&2 (2013): 85-95.
- Çolak, Hasan. *The Orthodox Church in the Early Modern Middle East: Relations between the Ottoman Central Administration and the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2015.
- Darling, Linda. *Revenue-raising and Legitimacy: Tax collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*. Brill, 1996.
- Dimitrijević, Stevan. "Odnosaji patrijaraha pečkih s Rusijom u XVII Veku [The relations between the Patriarchs of Peć and Russia in the XVII Century]", *Glas SKA*, Brochure 60, 1901.
- Drinov, Marin. "Bolgare i Konstantinopol'skaja Patrijarhija [The Bulgarians and the Patriarchate of Constantinople]", *Sochinenija na M. S. Drinova*, Vol. II, Sofia, 1911.
- Esmer, Tolga U. "Notes on a Scandal: Transregional Networks of Violence, Gossip, and Imperial Sovereignty in the Late Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 58(01), (2016): 99–128.
- Esmer, Tolga U. "War, State and the Privatisation of Violence in the Ottoman Empire." in *The Cambridge World History of Violence*, edited by Robert Anthony, Stuart Carroll, and Caroline Dodds Pennock, 194-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Crisis and Change, 1590-1699." In *Revenue-raising and Legitimacy: Tax collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, edited by Linda Darling. Brill, 1996.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*. I.B. Tauris, 2004.
- Fotić, Aleksandar. "Patriarcat Serbe Orthodoxe." In *Dictionnaire de l'Empire Ottoman XVe-XXe siècle*, edited by Georgeon F., Vatin N., Veinstein G., 919-920. Paris: Fayard, 2015.
- Fotić, Aleksandar. "Serbian Orthodox Church." In *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Agoston, G., Masters, B., 519-520. New York, 2009.
- Fotić, Aleksandar. "Tracing the Origin of a New Meaning of the Term Re'âyâ." *Balkanica* XLVIII, (2017): 55-66.
- Frazer, Charles A. *Catholics and the Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire 1453-1953*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Gavrilović, Vladan. "Primeri Migracija Srpskog Naroda u Ugarske Provincijalne Oblasti Examples of migration of the Serbian people into the Hungarian provincial areas 1699-1737", *Istrajivanja* 25, (2014): 139-148.
- Genç, Mehmet. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 2000.
- Gibb, H.A.R., and Bowen, Harold. *Islamic Society and the West: A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East*. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Golubinsky, Evgeni, *Kratky Oчерk Istoriji Pravoslavniх Tserkvei: Bolgarskoi, Serbskoi I Ruminskoi ili Moldo-Vlaskoi [A Brief Review of the History of the Orthodox Churches: Bulgarian, Serbian and Romanian or Moldo-Vlachian]*, Moscow, 1871.
- Grujić, Radoslav. "Karlovachka Mitropolija [Metropolitanate of Karlovci]", *Narodna Enciklopedija SHS*, Vol. II, 249-257. Zagreb, 1927.
- Grujić, Radoslav, "Pećska patrijarška [the Patriarchate of Peć]," *Narodna enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenačka*, Vol. III, 389–399. Zagreb, 1928.
- Grujić, Radoslav. "Pećki Patrijarsi I Karlovachki Mitropoliti u XVIII Veku [The Patriarchs of Peć and the Metropolitanates of Karlovac in the XVIII Century]. *Glasnik Istoriskog Drustva u Novom Sadu*, Vol. IV (1931).
- Grujić, Radoslav. *Pravoslavna Srpska Tsrkva [The Orthodox Serbian Church]*. Belgrade, 1921.
- Grujić, Radoslav. "Problemi Istorije Karlovacke Mitropolije [Problems of the History of the Karlovač Metropolitanate]." *Glasnik Istoriskog Drustva u Novom Sadu* 2 (1929).

- Grujić, Radoslav. "Prilozi za Istoriju Seobe Srba u Rusiji" *Srpska Kraljevska Akademija: Spomenik*, Vol. LI. Belgrade, 1913.
- Hadrovics, László. *L'eglise serbe sous la Domination Turque*. Paris, 1947.
- Hadjikyriacou, Antonis. "Beyond the Millet Debate: the Theory and Practice of Communal Representation in Pre-Tanzimat Era Cyprus," *Ottoman Political Thought and Practice. Halcyon Days in Crete IX*, edited by Marinos Sariyannis, 71-96. Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2019.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Centralization and Decentralization in Ottoman Administration." In *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History*, edited by T. Naff and R. Owen, 27-52. London, 1977.
- İnalcık, Halil. *Military and fiscal transformation in the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1700*. Peeters-Leuven, 1980.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Ottoman Archival Materials on Millets." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Benjamin Braude, Vol. I, 437-449. Holmes and Meier, New York and London: 1982.
- Halil İnalcık. *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age, 1300-1600*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973.
- Ingrao, Charles. *The Habsburg Monarchy 1618–1815*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ivaschenko, Arsenii. "Arhijepiskopi i Patriarhi Serbskije s Nachala XVIII do Vtoroi Polovini XVIII Stoletija [Serbian Archbishops and Patriarchs from the Beginning till the Second Half of the XVIII Century]." *Pravoslavnoje Obozrenije*. Moscow, (1868).
- Ivić, Aleksa. *Istorija Srba u Ugarskoj od Pada Smedereva do Seobe pod Charnojevichem [The History of the Serbs in Hungary since the fall of Smederevo to the Migration under Čarnojević (1459-1690)]*. Zagreb, 1914.
- Jelavich, Charles. "Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century", *Church History* 23 no. 02 (1954): 144 – 152.
- Jireček, Constantin. *Geschichte der Bulgaren*. Prague, 1876.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "The Question of Ottoman Decline," *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 4, no. 1-2 (1997-98).
- Karanović, Ognjen. "Privilegijalna Politika Tsara Leopolda I: Pravni Fundament Opstanka Srpskog Etnosa u Habzburskoj Monarhiji [The Privilegial Policy of Tsar Leopold I: The legal foundation of the survival of Serbian ethnicity in the Habsburg Monarchy]." *LIK: Cheasopis za Literaturu i Kulturu* 4 no. 5, (2018): 133-163.

- Katić, Tatjana. "Serbia under the Ottoman Rule." *Österreichische Osthefte*, Vienna, (2005): 145-158.
- Kenanoğlu, Macit. *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınevi, 2004.
- Konortas, Paraskevas. *Othomanikes Theoriseis gia to Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio: 17os-arches 20ou aiona*. Athenes, 1998.
- Leal, Karen A. "The Ottoman State and the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul: Sovereignty and Identity at the turn of the eighteenth century." PhD Dissertation. Harvard University, 2003.
- Macartney, Carlile A. ed. *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Macmillan, 1970.
- Malcolm, Noel. *Agents of Empire: Knights, Corsairs, Jesuits and Spies in the Sixteenth-Century Mediterranean World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- McGowan, Bruce. "The Age of Ayans." In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire* edited by Halil İnalcık. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Milash, Nikodim. *Pravoslavna Dalmacija [The Orthodox Dalmatia]*. Novi Sad, 1901.
- Papadopoulos, Theodore H. *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990.
- Pappas, Nicholas C. J. "Between Two Empires: Serbian Survival in the Years After Kosovo." In *Serbia's Historical Heritage*, edited by A. Dragnich, 17-37. Boulder, 1994.
- Petrov, Milen V. "Everyday Forms of Compliance: Subaltern Commentaries on Ottoman Reform, 1864-1868." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46 no. 4 (2004): 730-59.
- Petrovich, Michael Boro. "Catherine II and a False Peter III in Montenegro," *American Slavic and East European Review* 14, no. 2 (1955): 169-94.
- Radonić, Jovan, and Kostić, Mita. *Srpske Privilegije od 1690 do 1792 [Serbian Privileges from 1690 till 1792]*. Belgrade, 1954.
- Radonić, Jovan. *Rimska kurija i južnoslovenske zemlje od XVI do XIX veka [Roman Curia and South Slavic lands from the 16th to the 19th centuries]*. Belgrade, 1950.
- Radosavljević, Nedel'ko. "Pećka Patrijarshija, od Obnove Autokefalnosti do Ukidanja [The Patriarchate of Peć from the Restoration of Autocephaly till Abolition]." in *Bratstvo XI*, 11-34, Belgrade: Društvo "Sveti Sava", 2007.

- Rothman, Natalie. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*. Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Ruzićić, Nikanor. *Kratki Istoriski Pregled Uzajamnih Odnoshaja Izmechu Srpske I Grčko Tsarigradske Tsrkve i Njihovih Predstavitel'ja [Brief Historical Overview of the Mutual Relations between the Serbian and Greek-Constantinople Churches and their Representatives]*. Belgrade, 1875.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge, 1968.
- Ruvarac, Dmitrije. "O Ukidanju Pechke Patrijarshije i njenom Nasledu [On the Abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć and its Heritage]." *Srpski Sion*, (1904): 293-299.
- Salzmann, Ariel. "Measures of Empire: Tax-Farmers and the Ottoman Ancien Regime, 1695 1807." PhD Dissertation. Columbia University, 1995.
- Sathas. *Mesaionike bibliotheke epistasia*, Typois tou Chronou, Vol III, 1872.
- Slijepčević, Djoko. *Istorija Srpske Pravoslavne Tsrkve Od Pokrshtavanja Srba do Kraja XVIII Veka [The History of the Serbian Orthodox Church from the Christianization of the Serbs till the End of XVIII Century]*, Vol. I. BIGZ: Belgrade, 1991.
- Slijepčević, Djoko. "Ukidanje Pečke Patrijarshije 1766. Godine [Abolition of The Patriarchate of Peć in 1766]" *Bogoslovlje XIII*, Belgrade, 1938.
- Sotirović, Vladislav B. "The Serbian Patriarchate of Peć in the Ottoman Empire: The First Phase (1557-94)." *Serbian Studies* 25 no. 2, (2011): 143-167.
- Stanojević, Stanoje. *Istorija Srpskoga Naroda [History of the Serbian People]*. Belgrade, 1908.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Sumner, Benedict H. *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford, 1949.
- The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Serbia.", 3 Vols. Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Tricković, Radmila. "Srpski Patrijarh Kalinik I. Druga Obnova Pečke Patrijarshije [The Serbian Patriarch Kalinik I. The Second Renewal of the Patriarchate of Peć]." *Revue Historique* no. 39, (1992), 87-118.

Tuğ, Başak. *Politics of Honor in the Ottoman Anatolia: Sexual Violence and Socio-Legal Surveillance in the Eighteenth Century*. Brill: Leiden & Boston, 2017.

Veselinović, Rajko. *Arsenij III Chrnjević u Istoriji i Knizhevnosti [Arsenij III Crnojević in History and Literature]*. Belgrade, 1949.

Yaycıoğlu, Ali. *Partners of the Empire: Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions*. Stanford University Press, 2016.

Ware, Timothy. *Eustratios Argenti: a study of the Greek Church under Turkish rule*. Oxford, 1964.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth Century France*. Stanford University Press, 1987.