

Nedeljko V. RADOSAVLJEVIĆ

BELGRADE METROPOLITANATE 1825–1831*

Abstract: The paper sheds light on the situation in the Belgrade Metropolitanate from 1825 to 1831, at the time of gradual withdrawal of the Ottoman authorities and strengthening of the Serbian people’s authorities. Information is given about the structure of the Orthodox Church in the area of the Smederevo sanjak, with its centre in Belgrade. It is explained that Ottoman Belgrade was not only a Muslim, but also an important Christian centre, where the Belgrade Metropolitanate had its seat and a range of buildings that fit in the Oriental physiognomy of the varoš. The territory of the Belgrade Metropolitanate followed the lines of the Ottoman administrative division for the purpose of easier communication with the government authorities. It is shown why the Ottoman authorities in the interior of the Smederevo sanjak, which gradually became the core of the modern Serbian state, were becoming increasingly weaker, while remaining in Belgrade proper until the withdrawal of the Ottoman garrison in 1867. A great change is also seen in the fact that the Serbian national authorities, established after the Second Serbian Uprising of 1815, increasingly intervened in ecclesiastical issues. The paper also focuses on the great restoration of church life after 1815, particularly in the 1825–1831 period, when the Belgrade Metropolitanate was led by Metropolitans Kiril and Antim. Belgrade Metropolitan Antim played a significant role in the consolidation of Serbian statehood in 1830, when he anointed Prince Miloš as ruler of Serbia, and in the transformation of the church structure into the autonomous Orthodox Church in the Principality of Serbia.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, Smederevo sanjak, Principality of Serbia, Belgrade, Orthodox Church, Belgrade Metropolitanate, metropolitans, clergy, autonomy.

During direct Ottoman rule in the major part of the Balkan peninsula, Belgrade stood out in terms of its importance as a garrison stronghold, and an economic and religious centre. Excluding periods of discontinuity, it was within the Ottoman Empire from its conquest in 1521 until the surrender of the fortress “for keeping” to the

* This article is the result of the project No. 177031 of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

Principality of Serbia in 1867.¹ The first discontinuity of Ottoman rule occurred upon the Habsburgs' conquest of the town in 1688, but lasted for a short time, until 6 April 1690, when the Ottoman army recaptured it. Only the Habsburg military administration existed during such short time, and not organised civilian authorities.² After the new war between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy in 1716–1718, borders between them shifted significantly. Under the Treaty of Požarevac (1718), the Habsburg Monarchy received northern and a part of central Serbia with Belgrade, which became the centre of the new “crown land” of the Habsburg “Kingdom of Serbia”.³ With the Ottomans' recapture of the town in 1739, after another war waged between the two states (1737–1739), the situation concerning borders was mainly restored to that before 1718, while the traces of the Habsburg rule in Serbia, notably those of architectural and fortification nature, had to be eliminated.⁴ Thus, within a short period, from 1789 to 1791, the Habsburg rule of Belgrade was re-established, but Belgrade was returned to the Ottoman Empire under the Treaty of Sistova.⁵

¹ *De iure*, Ottoman rule lasted until 1878, i.e. while the Principality of Serbia was in a vassal relationship with the Ottoman Empire. It was symbolically manifested in the presence of the Ottoman flag next to the Serbian one on the Belgrade fortress, which was removed in 1876 at the start of the Serbian-Ottoman war.

² After the unsuccessful second Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1683, the Habsburg army mounted a counter-offensive and, together with its allies of the Holy League, established in 1684 (the Venetian Republic, Poland, Papal States, including Russia from 1686), pushed the Ottoman Empire from the Pannonian Basin and a part of the Adriatic and Ionian littoral. Belgrade was captured in 1688, but the Ottoman army recaptured it in 1690.

³ The Treaty of Požarevac ended the war between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy lasting from 1716 to 1718. The Habsburg Monarchy entered the war after the Ottoman Empire entered the war with the Venetian Republic in 1714, with the intention to restore the lost Peloponnese. The territorial losses of the Ottoman Empire, apart from the mentioned northern and central Serbia with Belgrade, included Banat and a narrow strip along the Sava river in Bosnia. *Историја српског народа*, IV–1, Београд 1986, 110–111 (Рајко Веселиновић).

⁴ The Habsburg army entered the 1737–1739 war unprepared, following Russian operations against the Ottoman Empire which began in 1736. After minor successes (short-term conquest of Užice and Niš in 1737), the Habsburg army found itself in a defensive position in the territory of Serbia, and almost the entire area fell again under the Ottoman rule in the same year. Under the 1739 Treaty of Belgrade, entire Serbia with Belgrade was returned to the Ottoman Empire, and the border was consolidated on the Sava and Danube rivers. *Ibidem*, 150–162.

⁵ The war of 1788–1791, also known as the Habsburg-Ottoman war, brought initial success to the Habsburg army, which was actively supported by Serbian voluntary units (Freikorps). However, complex international circumstances, auspicious for the Ottoman Empire, brought about the Treaty of Sistova in 1791, on the principle *status quo ante bellum*, excluding minor adjustments around the flow of the Una river. Д. Пантелић, *Београдски пашалук после Свиштовског мира 1791–1794*, Београд 1927, 47–48; 58–67.

Another discontinuity of Ottoman rule of Belgrade can be seen – it concerns the time of the First Serbian Uprising (1804–1813), sparked by the janissaries' usurpation of power and annulment of the Serbian privileges.⁶ In late 1806 and early 1807, the Serbian insurgent army took the town, retaining it until the fall of the Serbian insurgent state in 1813.⁷ After the Second Serbian Uprising in 1815,⁸ a joint Ottoman-Serbian administration was introduced into the Smederevo sanjak,⁹ which ceased to exist with the creation of the Principality of Serbia in 1830. The joint administration remained only in those towns where Ottoman military and Muslim civilian presence persisted. The capital of the Principality was transferred to Belgrade in 1838. Foreign consuls were also in Belgrade, as well as bodies of the Ottoman authorities up until 1867.¹⁰

Apart from the above periods of discontinuity, until 1830 Belgrade had an oriental physiognomy and lifestyle, without significant European influences, except for some buildings surviving from the period of the Habsburg *Kingdom of Serbia*. After 1739, the town was strategically exceptionally important, as a border fortress towards the Habsburg Monarchy. After the Ottomans reconquered it in the same year, the administrative centre of the Smederevo sanjak was restored to Belgrade.

Ottoman Belgrade was not only a Muslim town. As in many other urban centres of the Ottoman Empire, it was inhabited by members of other faiths as well. In addition to Muslims, dominant at the time, it was inhabited by Orthodox Ottoman subjects, who included, besides Serbs, a significant number of Greeks and Cincars. There were also Monophysite Armenians, as well as Jews. Roman Catholics, whose colonisation was conducted aggressively by the Habsburg authorities, withdrew in 1739 together with the Habsburg army, and their numbers were not significant.¹¹

⁶ The First Serbian Uprising broke out over the janissaries' usurpation of power in the Smederevo sanjak and extreme measures that their commanders (*dahijas*) undertook to eliminate the possibility of a revolt against them. These measures included murders of the most reputable Serbian leaders and priests ("slaughter of the knezes"). Their usurpation was proclaimed illegal, by the Porte as well, and an act of rebellion, but the central authorities did not make sufficient effort to remove the rebellious janissaries from the Smederevo sanjak. At the time, they were also supported by Osman Pazvantoğlu from Vidin.

⁷ The insurgent army took Belgrade in late 1806, while the remaining part of the fortifications surrendered on 8 January 1807, on St Stephen's Day. Six years later, after the insurgents' defence failed, the Ottoman army entered the defenceless town in 1813.

⁸ The Second Serbian Uprising broke out over the tyranny and unbearable fiscal pressure of Belgrade vizier Suleiman Pasha of Uskoplje in the Smederevo sanjak.

⁹ In Serbian historiography, after the Treaty of Belgrade, the Belgrade Pashalik became the dominant and most commonly used name for the Smederevo sanjak. However, the official name of the province remained the Smederevo sanjak, although its seat was transferred from Smederevo to Belgrade after its capture.

¹⁰ Р. Љушић, *Историја српске државности: Србија и Црна Гора*, Нови Сад 2001, 53.

¹¹ After 1718, Roman Catholic orders were allowed to engage in proselytic activity and were granted numerous existing mosques. Particularly prominent were the Jesuits, Cappuccini, Franciscans, Trinitarians and Minorites. Д. Поповић, *Србија и Београд од Пожаревачког до Београдског мира*, Београд 1950, 119.

In regard to the Orthodox Church, Belgrade was its important seat both before and after the Ottoman conquest. The tradition of existence of the Belgrade Bishopric or Metropolitanate, depending on the rank of this ecclesiastical-administrative unit, lasted, with certainty, from the 9th century when Belgrade bishop Sergije was mentioned in 878.¹² The Belgrade Bishopric lasted at the time of the Byzantine Empire, as well as during the rule of medieval Balkan Slavic countries, Serbia and Bulgaria, over Belgrade. With smaller interruptions, it also existed from the Ottoman conquest of the town in 1521, first within the bounds of the Ohrid Archbishopric, and from 1557 within the restored Patriarchate of Peć. After the Patriarchate of Peć was abolished in 1766, the Belgrade Metropolitanate became a part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹³ The situation changed in 1831, when the autonomous Orthodox Church was established in the Principality of Serbia.¹⁴

In the context of Ottoman Belgrade, the meaning of the term “Belgrade Metropolitanate” is twofold. First, it refers to the buildings in Belgrade that belonged to the Belgrade Metropolitanate or served its needs. The second meaning pertains to the territory of the entire Belgrade Metropolitanate – the area over which the Belgrade Metropolitanate had spiritual power.

In terms of buildings of the Belgrade Metropolitanate in the town of Belgrade, their state from the first half of the 18th century is relatively well-known. Upon the consolidation of the Habsburg rule in 1718, the new metropolitan’s residence and the new church were built as the old buildings had to be demolished due to the expansion of fortifications.¹⁵ However, after the Ottomans recaptured the town in 1739, such buildings were not acceptable for the authorities and their destruction was ordered.

¹² К. Жиречек, *Историја Срба: политичка историја до 1537. године*, Београд 1990, 103; Т. Живковић, *Црквена организација у српским земљама*, Београд 2004, 69.

¹³ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, Београд 2007.

¹⁴ The autonomous Orthodox Church was established in the Principality of Serbia by the 1831 canonical letter (Tomos) issued by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as the *Mother Church*. Н. В. Радосављевић, *Аутономија Православне цркве у Кнежевини Србији и арондација епископија*, Истраживања 25 (Нови Сад 2014) 236–238.

¹⁵ The building of the new metropolitan’s residence, impressive for the time, as well as the new church, school and spiritual seminary for the education of the clergy, began at the time of Metropolitan Mojsije Petrović in 1726. The Habsburg authorities, which did not often give permits for the construction of Orthodox churches in the Kingdom of Serbia, made a concession as the old Metropolitanate and the church were to be demolished due to the expansion of fortifications. The new building of the Metropolitanate had two wings and two floors. The inventory of its property from 1733 reads that it had 39 rooms. The property of the Metropolitanate was also enlarged – it included stores and shops in the Belgrade town, estates outside the town, a fishpond etc. Г. Гарић Петровић, *Митрополитски намесници и придворни служитељи у Сервијској епархији (1718–1739)*, *Наша прошлост* 14 (Краљево 2013) 89–91; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Ваљеуска епископија 1718–1739*, *Гласник. Историјск архив Ваљево* 32 (1998) 16.

Since then, Belgrade metropolitans stayed in a modest residence which – according to several narrative sources and topographic maps of the Habsburg army created upon the conquest of the town in 1789 – was a two-floor building with six rooms. The residence also had a stable for 20 horses.¹⁶ That such situation remained broadly unchanged at the time chronologically covered by this paper is confirmed by travel writer Joakim Vujić. He writes that in 1826 he visited the “residence” of the then Belgrade Metropolitan Kiril which, as he emphasises, was “a very old edifice with different rooms”. Vujić must have entered those premises because he noticed that there was no residential space.¹⁷ For residential needs and other activities developed by the Belgrade Metropolitanate (school, soup kitchen) in the limited circumstances of Ottoman rule, metropolitans would take under lease or buy buildings in the town of Belgrade, primarily near the Sava river, where Orthodox inhabitants were concentrated. Some metropolitans, such as Leontios Lambrou (1801–1813), personally possessed, bought and sold houses. An example of such practice was the offer of Hadži Nikola Brzak, the former bezirganbasi, who in 1826 offered his house for sale to Metropolitan Kiril at the price he himself determined. However, such favourable offer was probably not used due to the metropolitan’s illness and limited means.¹⁸

The Belgrade Cathedral Church, built at the time of the Habsburg rule, was demolished after the new Ottoman conquest of the town in 1739, while the church of St John the Baptist in the Lower Town was turned into a mosque. The Ottoman authorities allowed the construction of an Orthodox church only in 1742, after they issued permits based on the fact that the church existed before the Ottoman loss of the town in 1718. The charity for its new construction was collected in the area of the Belgrade Metropolitanate, as well as in the Habsburg Monarchy, primarily in numerous monasteries on Fruška Gora mountain. Until the 1820s, the church was in a bad condition. Serbian Prince Miloš Obrenović took it over from the Greek-Cincar community and extensively renovated it.¹⁹

In regard to the Belgrade Metropolitanate as a whole, it is noteworthy that the 1825–1831 period was rather specific for the history of the Orthodox Church in the Smederevo sanjak. It was a direct consequence of the introduction of the joint Ottoman-Serbian rule after the Second Serbian Uprising of 1815 in the province. The joint administration implied the establishment, in addition to Ottoman, of the Serbian national authorities, which assumed a part of competences. From then, the Belgrade

¹⁶ Р. Тричковвић, *Главна тврђава Царства према Европи*, Историја Београда 1, Београд 1974, 615; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 365.

¹⁷ Ј. Вујић, *Путешествије по Србији*, 1, Београд 1900, 26–27.

¹⁸ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 365.

¹⁹ М. Гавриловић, *Милош Обреновић*, 2, Београд 1909, 690–700; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 379–380.

Metropolitanate existed in the circumstances which did not change significantly in the town of Belgrade, but did in the interior of the Smederevo sanjak, which reflected on its structure. In 1825, some institutions of the Serbian national authorities were already built (the Prince's Office, National Office, nahiye courts – magistrates) and their strengthening reflected on the church as well.

In 1825, the borders of the Belgrade Metropolitanate were those established after the Treaty of Belgrade of 1739. The Metropolitanate persisted within them also at the time of Serbian insurgent state (1804–1813), as well as after the introduction of the joint Ottoman-Serbian administration in 1815. These borders, as those of other metropolitanates, followed the Ottoman administrative division, as this facilitated communication between the ecclesiastical and state authorities. Some metropolitanates could encompass several sanjaks (Metropolitanate of Raška-Prizren and Skenderija), one sanjak (Zvornik Metropolitanate and Herzegovina Metropolitanate) or a part of one sanjak, as was the case with the Belgrade Metropolitanate.²⁰

The northern, eastern and south-eastern borders of the Belgrade Metropolitanate coincided with the borders of the Smederevo sanjak, while towards the west those were the borders of the nahiyes that is comprised. It covered the area of six nahiyes: Belgrade, Smederevo, Požarevac, Kragujevac, Jagodina and Ćuprija.²¹ Upon the establishment of the joint Ottoman-Serbian administration in 1815, its existence within its hitherto borders was not brought into question. Prince Miloš Obrenović and the Serbian authorities could not influence the establishment of new or abolishment of old metropolitanates, determination of their borders and seat, and the choice of metropolitans. As before, these competences were firmly in the hands of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.²² However, already in 1816, the first misunderstandings between the ecclesiastical and Serbian national authorities appeared. The reason was the changed situation concerning authority in the Smederevo sanjak. Namely, until then, the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Ottoman authorities was clear – it was determined back at the time of Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror and the first patriarch after the fall of Constantinople, Gennadius Scholarius. Its basis consisted of the system of tayife, and later of millet, as a community of subjects of the same faith. Such relationship implied certain independence in issues of faith, marital and partly inheritance law. At the level of the

²⁰ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 349–350; *idem*, *Авксентије III Петров Чешмеџијев, херцеговачки митрополит*, Истраживања 24 (Нови Сад 2013) 271; *idem*, *Црквене прилике у Старој Србији од укидања Пећке патријаршије до Велике источне кризе (1766–1878)*, *Историја и значај Призренске богословје: (поводом 140 годишњице од оснивања)*, Ниш 2013, 9–29.

²¹ West to the Belgrade Metropolitanate, there was the Užice-Valjevo Metropolitanate, which comprised the nahiyes of Užice, Valjevo, Soko, Požega, Rudnik and Šabac. Н. В. Радосављевић, *Ужичко-ваљевска митрополија 1739–1804*, Ваљево 2000, 120–123.

²² *Idem*, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 163–164.

local autocephalous church, patriarchs were *millet-başı*, i.e. *ethnarchs*, responsible for their faithful whom they represented before the government authorities. At lower levels, those were metropolitans and bishops.²³ However, after 1815, the third factor appeared in the Smederevo sanjak, hitherto unknown in public law acts in the Ottoman Empire – those were the Serbian national authorities, whose increasing impact was based primarily on the authority of Prince Miloš Obrenović. The Serbian authorities could not impact the church structure, but could influence metropolitans and the clergy.²⁴

There were several fields in which the Serbian authorities and two metropolitans clashed as of 1816. The main issue concerned the right to collection of metropolitans' and patriarchal revenue in a defined amount, which was confirmed by the acts of church (*sinđelije*) and state authorities (*berats*). This amount was unilaterally limited by decisions of the Serbian Prince and Serbian assemblies. Metropolitans did not acquiesce to this and were unable to exercise these rights without cooperation with the Serbian authorities. Even when it seemed that Prince Miloš Obrenović was giving them concessions, such as the abolishment of the regulation that an annual salary should be introduced instead of the collection of revenue in metropolitanates defined based on the number of houses, this was not the case. He restored their right to collect revenue, but limited the amount they could claim on the faithful.²⁵

Prince Miloš Obrenović and the Serbian authorities actively endeavoured to discipline the Orthodox clergy. Already as of 1816, it was them and not the competent metropolitans who determined the level of revenue they could collect from the faithful. In terms of ethnicity, the majority of priests were Serbian. They accepted the decisions of the Serbian authorities and took part in their implementation. Thus, the metropolitans' authority towards them weakened even more and Prince Miloš largely determined their position. The Serbian authorities could bring priests to trial, punish them in different ways and even banish them from their parishes if they were in a conflict or disagreement with them.²⁶ Prince Miloš made another precedent when he tried to take over control of trials over the clergy in the ecclesiastical field by establishing the Consistory (Spiritual Court) in 1823. The Consistory was modelled probably upon the Consistory of the Karlovci Metropolitanate. However, it was on this example that one could see the Serbian authorities' poor understanding of the purpose of the Consistory and the order in the Karlovci Metropolitanate. While the Consistory of the Karlovci Metropolitanate, an autonomous Orthodox church in the

²³ St. Runceman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge 1968, 170; M. O. H. Ursinus, *Millet*, Extract from the Encyclopedia of Islam, CD ROM, edition v. 1.0.1; P. Детрез, *Не търсят гърци, а ромеи да бъдат: Православната клтурна общност в Османската империя. XV–XIX в.*, София 2015, 43; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 34–35.

²⁴ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 24.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 136–140.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, 308–313.

Habsburg Monarchy, was canonically established by the decision of the highest church authorities, this was not the case in the Belgrade and Užice-Valjevo Metropolitanates. Metropolitans protested and immediately disassociated themselves from such Consistory.²⁷

The analysis of the situation at the time also opens the following important question: why the clergy did not support metropolitans, but sided with Prince Miloš and the Serbian authorities. The reason is blatantly clear and was not of ethnic nature. Prince Miloš could protect them from metropolitans' decisions, while metropolitans could not protect them from Prince's decisions. They were also perturbed by the fact that one of the Užice-Valjevo metropolitans, Meletije Nikšić (1815–1816), was killed upon the order of Prince Miloš, who was not sanctioned.²⁸ In 1816, the Ottoman authorities were still present to a considerable degree. The metropolitan was the only one in Serbia with the Sultan's berat, but his murder caused no significant reaction. Given such distribution of forces, the authority of the two metropolitans increasingly weakened, although Belgrade Metropolitan Agathangelus (1816–1825) persevered in the rights granted to him by the Sultan's ferman or berat, and the patriarchal *sindželija*.

A great shift occurred in the Belgrade Metropolitanate in 1825 with the deposal of Metropolitan Agathangelus. A role was also played by the Ottoman authorities, after a longer period. Intending to get rid of the disobedient metropolitan, Prince Miloš – in a masterful action agreed with vizier Abdurrahman Pasha, accused him of the gravest possible offence of the time – maintenance of links with Greek insurgents.²⁹ This was no exception in those times as many metropolitans who were Greek by ethnicity after the outbreak of the Greek Uprising in 1821 were detained and heard by the Ottoman authorities.³⁰ Metropolitan Agathangelus was arrested in March 1825, and was released with a fine, and then invited to Constantinople, where he became the Chalcedon Metropolitan, and the Ecumenical Patriarch already in 1826. This well-educated intellectual, a benefactor of hospitals, libraries and schools,

²⁷ Members of the Consistory included one archimandrite and one local *oborknez*. It was envisaged that one of the metropolitans should be involved in its work, which was unacceptable for them. М. Гавриловић, *op. cit.*, 673, 677; М. Петровић, *Финансије и установе обновљене Србије*, 1, Београд 1901, 626–627.

²⁸ Љ. Н. Митровић, *Мелентије Никшић, епископ шабачки*, Београд 1910, 71.

²⁹ М. Гавриловић, *op. cit.*, 682–690; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 206.

³⁰ Such situation existed in the Bosnian Pashalik, where three metropolitans were detained in 1821 and released with a fine and obligation to invite the flock to be loyal to the Sultan. Н. В. Радосављевић, *Вести о православној цркви у Босанском пашалуку у извештајима кнезу Милошу из Ужичке нахије и Ужичког окружја (1816–1839)*, Зборник МС за историју 74 (Нови Сад 2006) 105–116. At the very onset of the Greek Uprising, the situation in the Smederevo sanjak was similar. The Ottoman authorities reckoned with the possibility of Serbs staging a new uprising, and ordered Ecumenical Patriarch Eugenius to follow the developments among the Serbian faithful and inform the grand vizier. *Велики везир патријарху Евгенију*, 4. шабана 1236 (7. мај 1821), ОАК Софија, НБКМ, 19/79.

continued to maintain his links with Serbia, but did not influence the circumstances in the country.³¹

The events surrounding Metropolitan Agathangelus, his arrest and deposal, also open the question why the Ottoman authorities, still present in the Smederevo sanjak, did not help the metropolitans exercise their rights, also guaranteed by the Sultan's *berats*? The reasons were manifold. In the 1815–1825 period, the Serbian authorities were gradually building their structure, maintaining even armed units. They were increasingly present in everyday life, gradually assuming a number of functions from the Ottoman authorities. The Ottoman authorities were narrowing their focus on issues that were certainly more important to them than the rights of the two metropolitans, such as the protection of fortresses, control of traffic arteries and care about the Muslim population that was gradually withdrawing towards major centres (Belgrade, Užice) or even selling their estates and moving out to provinces next to the Smederevo sanjak (Belgrade Pashalik, Vidin sanjak...). The relationship between representatives of the Ottoman authorities and Prince Miloš was complex, but they invariably found ways to cooperate with him. This was particularly important from the outbreak of the Greek Uprising in 1821. The peaceful attitude of the Serbs was a strategic question for the Ottoman authorities at the time. This is why they did not show excessive ambition to meddle into something that was considered an internal religious issue of the Orthodox population, with no significance for the state authorities.

Immediately upon Agathangelus' departure, the Holy Synod elected Kiril, a Bulgarian from Kriva Palanka, for the Belgrade Metropolitan. He showed a lot of understanding for his Slavic faithful.³² His election was confirmed by the Sultan's *berat*, which reflects the still strong influence of the Ottoman authorities. Metropolitan Kiril was poor and seriously ill. He administered the Metropolitanate without problems and had no misunderstandings with the Serbian authorities. He died in 1827.³³

After Kiril, the hitherto bishop of Lovech Antim was elected Belgrade Metropolitan. His choice was not accidental. Antim was a Greek, born on Andros island. His work in the church and his experience singled him out as someone who could help improve relations with the Serbs in the Smederevo sanjak. Before his arrival in Belgrade, Antim spent most of his life in the Slavic areas of the Balkan peninsula. Along with his paternal or maternal uncle – Užice–Valjevo Metropolitan Danilo I (1794–1802),³⁴ he lived among the faithful Serbs for years. He was ordained

³¹ It was engraved on the tomb of Ecumenical Patriarch Agathangelus in Constantinople that he was a Belgrade metropolitan.

³² Д. Алексијевић, *Прилози за историју српске цркве*, Весник СЦ за 1910 (Београд 1910) 553.

³³ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 207. Ј. Нешковић, *Беседе*, Београд 1868, 654.

³⁴ Danilo I became the Metropolitan of Trnovo in 1802, remaining at the head of this respectable Metropolitanate until his death in 1806. Н. В. Радосављевић, *Данило, митрополит ужичко-ваљевски и трновски*, Српске студије 6 (Београд 2015) 147.

bishop, first administering the Vratsa Bishopric and then the Lovech Bishopric of the Trnovo Metropolitanate.³⁵ Antim of Belgrade spoke excellent Bulgarian and was fluent in Serbian as well. Before departing for Belgrade, he received extensive advice in the Patriarchate about the circumstances awaiting him there – in addition to the patriarchal *sindeliija* and the Sultan's ferman, he brought to Belgrade two letters addressed to the *ruler of the Serbian people and master of Serbia*. These letters, addressed to Prince Miloš, indicated that the situation in the Smederevo sanjak was changing. Earlier, it was sufficient for the metropolitan to have with himself the patriarchal *sindeliija* and the Sultan's berat, which Metropolitan Antim also had. However, based on the previous events, the Ecumenical Patriarchate assessed well that the first man of the Serbian state should be addressed with a lot of attention. This was, in fact, the decision of Patriarch Agathangelus in person, who was the Belgrade Metropolitan two years before. There was no one who could better prepare Antim to take over the Belgrade Metropolitanate.³⁶

Metropolitan Antim arrived in Serbia by road. He came to Kragujevac, where Prince Miloš resided, on 20 August 1827.³⁷ He was received in his audience with full honours. The Prince ordered that believers should ceremoniously welcome and see him off on his way to Belgrade. Throughout his journey, he was accompanied by Prince's trustworthy people, including archimandrite Meletije Pavlović. When he arrived in Belgrade, on 26 August 1827³⁸, he was presented to Princess Ljubica and heir Milan.³⁹

With his arrival, the misunderstandings between the ecclesiastical and Serbian authorities, which lasted for almost the entire period of administration of Metropolitan Agathangelus, were quickly overcome. This also reflects an important change compared to other areas of the Balkan peninsula under direct Ottoman rule. Since then, relations between the state and church authorities in the Smederevo sanjak related primarily to the Serbian and not Ottoman authorities. Besides, the fact that the new Metropolitan presented himself to the Prince's family first and not to the Belgrade vizier also indicates that the situation changed.

The experience of Metropolitan Antim and the Patriarchate's new approach towards the Serbs in the Smederevo sanjak enabled gradual resolution of the hitherto disputable issues. Metropolitan Antim respected the new reality and communicated with Prince Miloš directly, aiming to resolve the earlier misunderstandings in good

³⁵ Unlike the metropolitanates in the areas inhabited by the Serbs, the Trnovo Metropolitanate had a complex structure. It comprised four bishoprics. Н. В. Радосављевић, *Данило, митрополит ужичко-ваљевски и трновски*, 154–155.

³⁶ *Idem*, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, Црквене студије 14 (Ниш 2017) 304–305.

³⁷ Julian calendar.

³⁸ Julian calendar.

³⁹ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 305; Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Историја Српске православне цркве*, 2, Београд 1991, 311.

faith.⁴⁰ Prince Miloš responded with concessions that would have been hardly imaginable at the time of Metropolitan Agathangelus. It was then that the issues of the manner of collecting metropolitanate and patriarchal revenue and the manner of visiting the Metropolitanate by the metropolitan were finally defined. Antim went around the Metropolitanate once a year, asking for the permission from Prince Miloš, which was always granted.⁴¹ The non-canonically established Consistory, which was practically extinguished, was officially abolished upon Antim's arrival, while the spiritual authority of the clergy was ceded to him as the metropolitan in charge. No one interfered with the metropolitan when it came to the marital right of the Orthodox. Respecting such gestures of the Serbian Prince, Antim treated the clergy mildly and without many sanctions, which were always aligned with the opinion of representatives of the Serbian authorities.⁴²

The correspondence between Prince Miloš and Metropolitan Antim was continuous. Judging by his Bulgarian vocabulary, Antim wrote many letters personally. In time, such confidence was developed between the two of them that the Metropolitan trusted the Prince with sending mail to Constantinople, and even informed him about the movement of the Ottoman army, which was in full alert in 1828, in order to prevent the expected Russian forcing the Danube.⁴³ In 1829, Metropolitan Antim even informed Prince Miloš about the confidential stance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to ask in advance, due to its difficult material situation, for the revenue that it was entitled to for 1830, which was also unprecedented.⁴⁴

In the Belgrade Metropolitanate, and the entire Smederevo sanjak, the period after the Second Serbian Uprising of 1815 was the time of great renewal of church and spiritual life. The main precondition was demographic revival as Serbia lost more than 20% of its population in the Serbian Revolution (1804–1815), while thereafter people were exposed to the epidemics of plague and hunger due to barren years, which lasted up until 1820. Demographic recovery was gradual, only to speed up with the settlement of the new population coming outside the Smederevo sanjak. This is confirmed by the 1826 census of the Belgrade Metropolitanate and the comparison with the situation on the eve of the First Serbian Uprising of 1804. In 1804, the Belgrade Metropolitanate had around 15,000 houses, and in 1826 it had 33,703 houses in 787 inhabited places, up by as much as 114.68%. It is noteworthy that the new census was carried out in one church-administrative area upon the order of

⁴⁰ П. Швабић, *Антим, митрополит београдски (1827–1831) у својим писмима кнезу Милошу*, Гласник ПЦ у Краљевини Србији (Београд 1903) 494–511; 617–632.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, doc. 10, 506.

⁴² *Ibidem*, 497; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 306.

⁴³ П. Швабић, *op. cit.*, doc. 3, 501–502; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 308–309; *idem*, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 209.

⁴⁴ Another reason could be that the difficult obligation of collecting revenue in advance would be transferred to him personally. П. Швабић, *op. cit.*, doc. 7, 503–504.

Serbian, and not of the church or Ottoman authorities, which is another example of the strengthening of their power.⁴⁵

The most visible evidence of the restoration of church life was the construction of new churches and monasteries. After 1819, Prince Miloš no longer heeded the restrictive legal measures pertaining to the building of churches.⁴⁶ The only exception was the use of bells, which was made possible only after the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, but still not close to large Ottoman garrisons, such as Belgrade.⁴⁷ An important part of the great construction restoration of Orthodox churches in the Belgrade Metropolitanate took place at the time of Metropolitan Antim. This is also attested by the following data: in 1813, before the collapse of the insurrectional Serbian state, the Belgrade Metropolitanate had 76 churches and monasteries, while in 1830, at the moment of creation of the Principality of Serbia, there were 109 of them, 33 more. Of this, 15 churches were built during the administration of Metropolitan Antim, i.e. 46% of the total churches built after the Second Serbian Uprising in 1815. The construction momentum in the Smederevo sanjak was even greater given that numerous churches and monasteries were heavily damaged at the time of war activities in 1804–1815, and that their restoration implied, in fact, new construction.⁴⁸

The construction of new churches in the Belgrade Metropolitanate in 1825–1831 was not important only in terms of their numbers, but also in terms of the volume and quality of works. It was at the time of Metropolitan Antim that churches of solid material, instead of wood, were increasingly constructed. These construction endeavours were extensive, spanning several years, and resulting in better equipped, significantly larger churches.⁴⁹ Metropolitan Antim did not neglect his spiritual mission either. He made sure that priests should regularly and correctly perform the rites, pointing out to earlier irregularities, and particularly caring about the conditions of child baptisms.⁵⁰

The representatives of the Ottoman authorities no longer had an impact on relations among the Serbian authorities and metropolitans in the Smederevo sanjak. Their position, as a whole, was much less favourable than in 1816, when Metropolitan Agathangelus came to the Belgrade Metropolitanate. International circumstances significantly contributed to their passive stance. It was already the Akkerman Convention of 1826 that envisaged the creation of autonomous Serbia, while at the Battle of Navarino of 1827 the joint British-French maritime forces destroyed the Ottoman-Egyptian armada. The Russian declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire in 1828 and fast advance to Constantinople led to the 1829 Treaty of Adrianople.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Попис Београдске митрополије из 1826*, Мешовита грађа (Miscellanea) 31 (Београд 2010) 164.

⁴⁶ *Idem*, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 404.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, 430–434.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, 401, 422.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, 415–421.

⁵⁰ *Idem*, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 309.

⁵¹ V. Popović, *Istočno pitanje*, Sarajevo 1965, 158.

The resolution of the Serbian question began in such new circumstances, becoming a part of the Treaty of Adrianople. The Treaty envisaged the creation of the autonomous Principality of Serbia, under the supreme rule of the Ottoman Empire and under the auspices of the Russian Empire. Such solution was exceptionally unfavourable for the Ottoman presence in Serbia. Under the 1830 Hatt-i Sharif as the supreme act of Sultan's mercy, the Principality of Serbia was established as a modern national state with full internal self-governance, but without three attributes that would make it fully independent (*jus legandi, jus contrahendi, jus belli gerendi*). The Principality of Serbia had its ruler – Prince Miloš Obrenović, who was recognised the princely dignity by the imperial berat. The Ottoman military presence was limited to six garrisons (Belgrade, Smederevo, Šabac, Užice, Soko, Kladovo), while the Muslims who did not accept to be the Principality's subjects had to leave.^{52,53} The last provision was not fulfilled until 1862 (Užice, Soko) and 1867 (Belgrade, Šabac, Kladovo, Smederevo). The Hatt-i Sharif also laid the legal foundations of full freedom of confession. The great importance of this question for the new state is also reflected in the fact that the first and fourteenth points of the Hatt-i Sharif covered this issue.

Belgrade Metropolitan Antim also played an important role in consolidating Serbian autonomy. Prince Miloš received the berat on the hereditary princely dignity of the Obrenović house, whereby the Ottoman authorities fulfilled their part of obligations. As far as they were concerned, this was just sufficient. However, given the importance of the Orthodox Church in Serbian society, without its blessing, such act would not have had full legitimacy among the subjects. This is why Metropolitan Antim anointed Miloš Obrenović the Prince of Serbia, according to the rite applied in cases of princes of the old autonomies, Wallachia and Moldavia. The rite was performed in Greek, with the metropolitan switching to Church Slavonic when mentioning the Prince, his family and the Principality of Serbia.⁵⁴

The creation of Serbian statehood and establishment of the local dynasty were thus completed. At the same time, a step forward was made compared to the rights enjoyed by the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. Wallachian and Moldavian princes were appointed for a mandate and originated mainly from the ranks of Greek patriciate from Constantinople. Their rule was limited to seven years and they received their appointment berats in Constantinople. The ceremony of their anointment was performed in the Constantinople Patriarchate and not in the principalities to whose thrones they were appointed.⁵⁵ Unlike them, Prince Miloš was anointed in Belgrade, where he received the Sultan's berat on the heredity of the princely throne. His position thus became significantly stronger compared to the

⁵² Р. Љушић, *Кнежевина Србија 1830–1839*, Београд 1986, 20–21; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 148.

⁵³ Р. Љушић, *Кнежевина Србија 1830–1839*, 7–14.

⁵⁴ М. Гавриловић, *Милош Обреновић*, 3, Београд 1912, 295–300; Н. В. Радосављевић, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 310.

⁵⁵ St. Runceman, *op. cit.*, 374.

princes of Wallachia and Moldavia. Since its inception, the Principality of Serbia was more independent than the two old autonomous Romanian principalities. Metropolitan Antim made a significant contribution as well.

In September 1831, based on an agreement between the Serbian authorities and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, an autonomous Orthodox Church was created in the Principality of Serbia. Negotiations did not last long, both owing to the provisions of the 1830 Hatt-i Sharif and suggestions of the Porte and the Russian ambassador to Constantinople, as well as owing to the fact that Belgrade Metropolitan Antim, sincerely inclined to both parties, took part as well. Archimandrite Meletije Pavlović was elected the leader of the new autonomous church, with the title "Archbishop of Belgrade and Metropolitan of Serbia". The hitherto Belgrade Metropolitanate within unchanged borders was under his immediate spiritual and administrative authority. The Užice-Valjevo Metropolitanate was divided into two bishoprics, of Užice and Šabac. Nikifor Maksimović was elected and appointed the Bishop of Užice. Upon their return from Constantinople, they were officially welcomed by Metropolitan Antim, who participated together with them in the election and ordainment of the new Bishop of Šabac, Gerasim Georgijević. Antim thanked for the offer of Prince Miloš to stay in Serbia, and then left for his homeland, the Kingdom of Greece.⁵⁶ This marked the end of the Belgrade Metropolitanate under direct administration of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in the area which was until then under direct control of the Ottoman authorities. With the creation of the Principality of Serbia in 1830 and its autonomous Orthodox Church in 1831, geopolitical circumstances and the church structure changed. The Ottoman authorities remained in a very narrow area until 1867 and had no impact on church circumstances.

Conclusion

Except for shorter periods of discontinuity, from the Ottoman conquest in 1521 until 1815, Belgrade had an oriental physiognomy, but was not an exclusively Muslim town. After the introduction of the joint Ottoman-Serbian rule in the Smederevo sanjak in 1815, it was exposed to European influences. The Muslim and Orthodox population lived together in Belgrade also after the establishment of the Principality of Serbia in 1830. Such situation persisted until 1867, when the Belgrade fortress was handed over to the Principality of Serbia. The Ottoman sovereignty was symbolised by the flag of the Ottoman Empire hoisted on the fortress up until 1876. Belgrade was an important centre of the Orthodox Church from as back as the ninth century, and remained as such even after the Ottoman conquest. The network of bishoprics and metropolitanates changed in time, only to consolidate in the longer run after the

⁵⁶ Н. В. Радосављевић, *Антим, епископ врачански, ловечки и митрополит београдски*, 310–311; *idem*, *Православна црква у Београдском пашалуку 1766–1831. (управа Васељенске патријаршије)*, 149.

Treaty of Belgrade in 1739. The Belgrade Metropolitanate was its important part. The Belgrade church and residential buildings of Belgrade metropolitans were located in the town of Belgrade, in its part close to the Sava river, where Orthodox inhabitants were concentrated (the Serbs, Greeks, Cincars). Those buildings were of modest dimensions because the Ottoman practice in Slavic areas of the Balkans was restrictive in terms of their size, construction and repairs. Until the creation of the Principality of Serbia in 1830, the Ottoman authorities had a strong presence in Belgrade, but were increasingly less visible in the interior of the Smederevo sanjak, which reflected on church circumstances in the major part of the Belgrade Metropolitanate. Belgrade Metropolitan Agathangelus (1816–1825) insisted on the privileges he received from the Patriarchate and the Sultan, but the newly formed Serbian authorities, with whom he therefore had disagreements, managed to prevail and depose him through a skilful action. From 1825, in the new conditions of a diminished presence and reduced competences of the Ottoman authorities, ecclesiastical and spiritual restoration after the period of wars gained in intensity. Merits went to the Serbian national authorities, as well as new Belgrade Metropolitan Antim, who built a constructive relationship with them and overcame the inherited misunderstandings. Antim remained at the head of the Belgrade Metropolitanate until the creation of the Principality of Serbia (1830) and the autonomous Orthodox Church in the Principality of Serbia (1831), whereafter he withdrew to the Kingdom of Greece. He gave his contribution to the consolidation of Serbian autonomy, anointing Miloš Obrenović as the hereditary ruler of the Principality of Serbia and helping in negotiations about the establishment of an autonomous church in the Principality.

Nedeljko V. RADOSAVLJEVIĆ

BELGRAT METROPOLİTANLIĞI 1825-1831

Özet

Belgrat Metropolitanlığı, özellikle de İmparatorluk ile Habsburg Monarşisi arasında 1739 senesinde imzalanan Belgrat Antlaşması akabinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Avrupa cepheri bölgesinde yer alan en önemli piskoposluklardan bir tanesi idi. Antlaşma uyarınca Ortodoks Kilisesi yeniden düzenlenmiş ve istikrar kazandırılmıştı. Metropolitanlığın önemi Sırp devriminin patlak verdiği Smederevo Sancağı'nın (Belgrat Paşalığı) bir kısmında yerleşik bulunduğu için zaman içerisinde artmış, takip eden süreçte modern Sırp devletinin kuruluşu gerçekleşmişti. Her ne kadar Metropolitanlık 1766 senesinin Ekümenik Patrikliğinin bir parçası olsa da kendisine bağlı Ortodoks inancına sahip kişiler Sırp ulusundandı. 1815 senesinde İkinci Sırp Ayaklanması sona verip de bölgede ortak bir Osmanlı-Sırp yönetimi kurulduğunda Prens Miloş Obrenoviç kilise yapısını değiştirecek ya da yeni Metropolitler atama kararlarını nihayi olarak etkilemeye yönelik bir adım atamadı. Buna rağmen, 1821 senesinde patlak veren Yunan İsyanı gibi birtakım hadiselerin de sayesinde zaman içerisinde ekseriyeti Yunan olan Metropolitlerin iktidarlarını sınırlandırmayı başarabilmişti. 1825 senesinde 1816 yılından bu yana Belgrat Metropolitanlığı tahtında oturan ve Sultan'ın beratı ile Patrikliğın buyruğu ile örtüşen haklarını kısıtlayıp yetkilerini elinden almak isteyen Sırbistan otoritelerinin teşebbüslerine direnen Belgrat Metropoliti Agatangel görevinden azledilmiş ve İstanbul'a davet edilerek daha sonra burada Ekümenik Patriği olmuştur. Ardılları olan Metropolitler, Kiril (1826-1827) ile Antim (1827-1831), Prens Miloş ve etkileri gittikçe artan Sırbistan otoriteleri ile iyi ilişkilere sahipti. Bu, Sırbistan'ın otonomisinin kurulmasını perçinleyecek ve güçlendirecek bir diğer adımdı. Metropolit Antim, Prens Miloş ile yakın bir işbirliği içersine girmiş, bu sayede ruhani misyonunun istikrarını garanti altına almıştı. Bu ilişkilerin onanması ayrıca 1830'da Prens Miloş'un yeni oluşturulan Sırbistan Prenslığı'nın soy icabı yöneticisi olarak takdis edilmesinde de görülebiliyordu. Bu dönem 1831 senesinde son buldu. Piskoposların bir tanesinin doğrudan Ekümenik Patrikliğe tabi kılınması ile Belgrat Metropolitanlığı Sırbistan Prenslığı'ndeki otonom Ortodoks Kilisesinin bir parçası oluverdi. Metropolit Antim katkılarını sunmuş, yeni Şabac Piskoposu Gerasim Georgijeviç'in aynı yıl kutsanmasına da katılmıştı. Akabinde ise doğduğu ülke olan Yunanistan'a gitmek için Sırbistan Prenslığı'nden ayrılmıştı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Smederevo Sandağı, Sırbistan Prenslığı, Belgrat, Ortodoks Kilisesi, Belgrat Metropolitanlığı, metropolitler, ruhban sınıfı, otonomi.

Недељко В. РАДОСАВЉЕВИЋ

БЕОГРАДСКА МИТРОПОЛИЈА 1825–1831

Резиме

Београдска митрополија била је једна од најзначајнијих епархија на европској периферији Османског царства, нарочито након Београдског мира који је закључен између Царства и Хабзбуршке монархије 1739. године, када је структура Православне цркве реорганизована и стабилизована. Значај Митрополије временом је растао будући да се налазила у делу Смедеревског санџака (Београдског пашалука) где је избила Српска револуција, након чега је створена модерна српска држава. Иако је Митрополија била део Васељенске патријаршије од 1766. године, њени православни верници били су српске националности. Након завршетка Другог српског устанка 1815. године и успостављања заједничке османско-српске управе у провинцији, кнез Милош Обреновић није могао деловати у правцу мењања црквене структуре нити је суштински утицао на одлуке о избору нових митрополита. Међутим, користећи низ околности, укључујући и избијање Грчког устанка 1821. године, временом је успео да ограничи моћ митрополита, који су углавном били Грци. Године 1825, београдски митрополит Агатангел, који је био на митрополитском трону од 1816. године и пружио отпор покушајима српских власти да га лише дела надлежности и ограниче права која је имао у складу с патријаршијском синђелијом и султановим бератом, смењен је и позван у Цариград, где је касније постао васељенски патријарх. Његови наследници, митрополити Кирил (1826–1827) и Антим (1827–1831) одржавали су добре односе с кнезом Милошем и све утицајнијим српским властима. Био је то још један корак ка успостављању и јачању основа српске аутономије. Митрополит Антим је блиско сарађивао с кнезом Милошем и на тај начин обезбедио стабилност своје духовне мисије. Потврда тих односа види се и у томе што је миропомзао кнеза Милоша за наследног владара новоформиране Кнежевине Србије 1830. године. Тај период трајао је до 1831. године. Као једна од епархија које су биле директно подређене васељенском патријарху, Београдска митрополија постала је део самосталне Православне цркве у Кнежевини Србији. Митрополит Антим дао је свој допринос, такође учествујући у рукоположењу новог, шабачког епископа Герасима Георгијевића, исте те године. Потом је напустио Кнежевину Србију и отишао у свој завичај, Краљевину Грчку.

Кључне речи: Османско царство, Смедеревски санџак, Кнежевина Србија, Београд, Православна црква, Београдска митрополија, митрополити, свештенство, аутономија.

