The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 17 (2020)

The Greeks under the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Karlovci in the Eighteenth Century

Goran Vasin, Nenad Ninković, Ifigenija Radulović

doi: 10.12681/hr.27070

To cite this article:

Vasin, G., Ninković, N., & Radulović, I. (2021). The Greeks under the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Karlovci in the Eighteenth Century. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, *17*, 161–180. https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.27070

Articles

THE GREEKS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF KARLOVCI IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Goran Vasin, Nenad Ninković and Ifigenija Radulović

Abstract: In the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy during the eighteenth century, the only Orthodox Church whose jurisdiction was recognised by the imperial authorities was that of the Archbishopric of Karlovci, which up to 1766 was an autonomous part of the Patriarchate of Peć. The believers who were part of this archbishopric had the freedom to profess their religion, which is why the Greeks who took up temporary residence in the towns of the Habsburg Monarchy turned to its archbishop when seeking their religious rights. However, there was an important difference in the status of the Greeks and the Serbs, since the former would not become subjects of the Habsburg Monarchy on a large scale until the 1760s while the former were already subjects. Due to their shared religion, in smaller settlements where they were a minority the religious needs of the Greeks were met within the existing Serbian parishes. This article describes the development of Greek parishes under the administration of the archbishop of Karlovci, how the authorities treated them and how they attained their religious rights.

Until the Great Turkish War against the Ottoman Empire (1683–1699), the Habsburg Monarchy did not have a large Orthodox community in its territory. Its then Orthodox community included the Serbs who inhabited the Croatian periphery and several Hungarian towns. They were under the jurisdiction of the Eparchy of Marča and the Metropolitanate of Buda, eparchies that were part of the Patriarchate of Peć.[1] Before the eighteenth century, there were several unsuccessful attempts to impose a union with the Roman Catholic Church on these Orthodox believers. Wars waged by the Habsburg dynasty against the Ottoman Empire (1683–1699 and 1716–1718) resulted in an expansion of territory under Viennese control and in the migration of people, which increased the Orthodox community. For that reason, their status had to be regulated by law, and as the Serbs started uprisings in the Ottoman Empire during the war and fought on the side of Vienna, Emperor Leopold I granted those who migrated to his country the right to publicly profess their religion through three Privileges (1690, 1691 and 1695), thus granting them equal rights to those of Catholic

[1] Goran Vasin and Nenad Ninković, *Историја Будимске епархије* (Sremska Mitrovica: Istorijski arhiv Srem, 2018), 14–15.

The Historical Review / La Revue Historique
Section of Neohellenic Research / Institute of Historical Research
Volume XVII (2020)

believers.[2] These rights, which his successors later confirmed on several occasions (in 1706, 1713, 1715 and 1743) were granted to all Orthodox people in the Archbishopric of Karlovci, while outside of its borders, in Transylvania and some towns in Hungary, the Orthodox faith was merely tolerated.[3] Consequently, the archbishops attempted to extend the right to religious freedom to all Orthodox people, regardless of the complex structure of the Habsburg Monarchy, its legal heterogeneity and the diverse ethnic background of its believers.[4]

The Archbishopric of Karlovci was the only Orthodox church whose jurisdiction the Habsburg Monarchy accepted on its territory. Although it was an autonomous part of the Patriarchate of Peć, the Peć archbishop, who was based in the Ottoman Empire, did not interfere in the affairs of those parts of the patriarchate that lay in Habsburg territory. When the patriarchate was abolished in 1766,[5] the Archbishopric of Karlovci took over in the diptychs

---

[2] Nenad Ninković, "Привилегије-основа српске аутономије у Хабзбуршкој монархији 1690–1779," in *Стотину двадесет година од почетка борбе српског народа у Босни и Херцеговини за црквено-школску самоуправу 1896–2016*, ed. Brane Mikanović and Goran Latinović (Banjaluka: Filozofski fakultet, 2017), 35–50.

[3] Dejan Mikavica, Nenad Lemajić, Goran Vasin and Nenad Ninković, *Историја Срба у Хабзбуршкој Монархији 1526–1918*, pt. 1 (Novi Sad: Prometej-Filozofski fakultet-RTV, 2016), 154–55, 157, 162–63.

[4] Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht: Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im kofessionellen Zeitalter, Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699*, pt. 1 (Vienna: Carl Ueberreuter, 2003), 170–71.

[5] After the Great Migration of the Serbs (1690) to the Habsburg Monarchy, the sultan installed Kalinik I (1691–1710) as the patriarch of Peć in 1691. This caused a canonical issue, since the incumbent, Arsenije III, was alive, but was in the Habsburg Monarchy. The ensuing schism was not resolved in Arsenije's lifetime (d. 1706), even though the patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos, tried to influence him to accept the spiritual authority of Kalinik. The first step towards canonical unity was made at the Assembly of 1708 in Krušedol Monastery, where the most important Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy had gathered. On this occasion it was decided that the Serbian Orthodox Church in the Habsburg Monarchy would be an autonomous part of the Patriarchate of Peć, at the level of an archbishopric. Kalinik was also familiar with this decision and gave his consent. There was a great degree of autonomy, so much so that the patriarchs of Peć did not take part in electing the archbishops in the monarchy. Rather, they would issue a confirmation in advance, with a blank space for the name of the new archbishop to be written. In this way, the unity of the church was formally confirmed, as was the autonomy of the Archbishopric of Karlovci. Dependence could only be seen in the fact that the archbishop always mentioned the name of the patriarch of Peć first in the prayers during liturgies, and the correspondence between the archbishops of Karlovci and other autocephalous churches was supposed to go through the patriarch of Peć, rather than directly. This second rule was not always respected and, after 1737, it disappeared completely, with the archbishops of Karlovci communicating with heads of autocephalous churches themselves. Nevertheless, canonical unity was not disrupted. We

as an autocephalous church.[6] Ecumenical Patriarch Samuel (1763–1768) did not approve of the abolition of the patriarchate, despite the fact that relations

---

can also find evidence for the existence of this autonomous part of the Patriarchate of Peć in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Sintagmation by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthus, from 1715, stating that the archbishoprics "under German rule" (that is, in the Habsburg Monarchy) were subject to the patriarch of Peć. This situation existed up to the Austro-Turkish War (1737–1739), when there was another schism in the Patriarchate of Peć. During this war, Patriarch Arsenije IV (1725–1748) escaped from Peć due to his participation in the war on the side of the Habsburgs. He then became the archbishop of Karlovci in 1737 and the Turks installed Joanikije III (1739–1746) as patriarch, but Arsenije did not recognise him. The new schism lasted up until 1749, when Pavle Nenadović was elected as the archbishop of Karlovci and the patriarch in Peć was Atanasije II (1747–1752), and communication between Karlovci and Peć was reestablished. Canonical unity was not formally disrupted until the Patriarchate of Peć was abolished, but frequent changes on the throne in Peć, which was also occupied by clerics appointed by the Archbishopric of Karlovci, led to diminished communication between Peć and Karlovci or its occasional interruption. When the Patriarchate of Peć was abolished in 1766, the Archbishopric of Karlovci continued to exist in the Habsburg Monarchy uninterrupted. See Nenad Ninković, *Митрополит Павле Ненадовић* (Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2017), 257, 272; Radoslav M. Grujić, "Аутокефалност Карловачке Митрополије," *Гласник Историјског друштва у Новом Саду* 2 (1929): 365–79.

[6] The autocephaly of the Archbishopric of Karlovci was not regulated by a decree (*tomos*) from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, to which it was supposed to be subjected following the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć, although it did not happen. The church continued to exist independently tacitly, spreading its influence over all Orthodox people in the Habsburg Monarchy. This fact was also connected with state politics that no church whose head was a subject of the Ottoman Empire could have jurisdiction in Habsburg territory. This was only tolerated in the case of the Patriarchate of Peć, since the authority of the patriarch was not emphasised except in prayers. Maria Theresa pointed out that in her state there could be no jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople who was a subject of the sultan, and that all the Orthodox had to depend on her subjects, first and foremost the archbishop of Karlovci. Even though the reasons were clearly political, rather than canonical, the archbishops of Karlovci were not subjected to any patriarchates after 1766, and so also not to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The autocephaly of the archbishopric was emphasised by its most significant archbishop, Stefan Stratimirović (1790–1836), in his explanation to Franz I as to why he did not have the title of a patriarch (circa 1798, and then again in 1815). Stratimirović pointed out that the autocephaly of the archbishopric was based on the autocephaly of the former Patriarchate of Peć, which was transferred to the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy, adding that his very title of archbishop guaranteed independence. He pointed out that his church was part of the pan-Orthodox community and that the teaching and chirotony were the same in all Orthodox churches. When a catalogue of autocephalous Orthodox churches was issued in 1855 by permission of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Archbishopric of Karlovci was included as autocephalous in place of the former Patriarchate of Peć. Two years later, it was also mentioned in a list of autocephalous churches published in Russia. Архив Српске академије наука и уметности у Сремским Карловцима (АСАНУК), Митрополијско-патријаршијски архив (МПА), А, 208/1761, 46–47/1815; *Συνταγμάτιον, περί της τάξεως των πατριαρχικών θρόνων, και των αυτοκεφάλων Συνόδων, Αρχιεπισκόπων, και*

between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Peć were complex after Patriarch Arsenije IV (1725–1748) moved to the Habsburg Monarchy in 1737. Due to frequent changes of patriarchs on the throne in Peć, Samuel only agreed to abolish the Patriarchate of Peć and the Archbishopric of Ohrid under pressure from the sultan and the Porte.[7]

Since Karlovci was the only Orthodox archbishopric recognised by the Habsburg Monarchy in its territory, all Orthodox believers, regardless of their ethnic origin, referred to its leader. As a result, the emperor held the view that Ottoman subjects living temporarily in the Habsburg lands, primarily merchants, had to be under the spiritual authority of the archbishop of Karlovci.[8] When they organised their parishes, Greek trading companies requested to be placed under his authority themselves, so the solution was very practical.[9] From the beginning of the eighteenth century, a Greek presence began to emerge in major Habsburg towns, where Greeks started trading companies independently or in cooperation with Serbs. The Orthodox identity in the Balkans and southern Pannonia – insisted on by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which made efforts to preserve it in the eighteenth century through the establishment of church missions – remained untouched. The Archbishopric of Karlovci contributed to this by tending to the needs of Serbian and Greek Orthodox believers in the Habsburg lands. A considerable number of monks from Mount Athos, Sinai and Trebizond, and priests and monks from Moscopole, as well as a large number of traders lived, travelled and traded in the Habsburg Empire. They brought with them a specific enlightened Orthodox idea which developed in the Phanar in the second half of the eighteenth century.[10]

Μητροπολιτών (Athens: G. Chartofylakos, 1855), 20; Nikodim Milaš, *Православно црквено право* (Mostar: Izdavačka knjižnica Pahera i Kisića, 1902), 139–40, 328–29.

[7] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Православни комонвелт: симболичка наслеђа и културна сусретања у Југоисточној Европи* (Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike, 2016), 66–67, 105–8.

[8] For the migration of merchants from the Ottoman to the Habsburg empires, see Olga Katsiardi-Hering and Maria A. Stassinopoulou, "The Long 18th Century of Greek Commerce in the Habsburg Empire: Social Careers," in *Social Change in the Habsburg Monarchy*, ed. Harald Heppner, Peter Urbanitsch and Renate Zedinger (Bochum: Dr Dieter Winkler, 2011), 191–212.

[9] Eighteenth-century Serbian sources that mention these companies rarely distinguish between the Aromanians (occasionally referred to as "Argonauti" in these sources) and the Greeks. Because they spoke Greek and were involved in trade, they were identified as Greek. In this paper the term "Greek" will be used to refer to both Aromanians and Greeks, without emphasising this, as the sources do not lead us to any different conclusions. Dušan J. Popović, *O Цинцарима, прилози питању постанка нашег друштва* (Belgrade: Prometej, 1998), 18–20.

[10] See Kitromilides, *Православни комонвелт*, 53–87; Raymond Detrez, "The Orthodox Christian Community and Ottoman Ohrid in the Pre-National Period (Late 18th–Early 19th

Towns with no Serbian parishes but which may have contained some Serbs represented a new challenge for Orthodox believers and the Archbishopric of Karlovci alike. Vienna, where the presence of Greek traders was growing, was one such city.[11] Until 1709 the local Greeks and the Serbs used a private chapel in the residence of Alexandros Mavrocordatos for their prayers.[12] Between 1709 and 1720, the efforts of the Belgrade Archbishop Mojsije Petrović (1718–1730) bore fruit and a new chapel was established. Little is known about the Orthodox parish in Vienna at that time. The third chapel was opened in 1723 with the permission of Emperor Charles VI (1711–1740). At that time it had already been determined by the emperor that the Serbs and the Greeks in Vienna were under the spiritual authority of the archbishop of Karlovci, which was confirmed by Ecumenical Patriarch Parthenios II in 1727.[13] In order to avoid misunderstandings between these two nations, the next archbishop of Karlovci, Vikentije Jovanović (1731–1737), determined that each nationality would choose one epitropos – a layperson who was in charge of the parish's finances, about which they reported to the archbishop – and three assistants.[14]

In 1717, as the Viennese parish was on the rise, Greek colonies along the Adriatic, in Rijeka, Trieste and Vinodol, were established.[15] In Rijeka, the spiritual authority was immediately transferred from the archbishop of Karlovci to the bishop of Gornji Karlovac, whose diocese extended to the Adriatic Sea. The same was done in Trieste in the mid-eighteenth century.[16] After 1720, Greek

---

Century)," in *Balkan Nationalism(s) and the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Dimitris Stamatopoulos (Istanbul: Isis, 2015), 1:29–46.

[11] For the history of the two Greek Orthodox communities in Vienna, see Anna Ransmayr, *Untertanen des Sultans oder des Kaisers: Struktur und Organisationsform der beiden Wiener griechischen Gemeinden von den Anfängen im 18. Jahrhundert bis 1918* (Vienna: V&R Unipress), 2018.

[12] Kitromilides, *Православни комонвелт*, 109–21.

[13] Nenad Ninković, "Карловачка митрополија и Грци у Бечу (1731–1776)," in *Антика и савремени свет данас*, ed. Ksenija Maricki Gadjanski (Belgrade: Društvo za antičke studije, 2016), 251–64.

[14] Charalambos Papastathis, "Un document inédit de 1726–1727 sur le conflit hellénoserbe concernant la chepelle grecque a Vienne," *Balkan Studies* 24 (1983): 581–607; Vasiliki Seirinidou, "Griechen in Wien im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert: Soziale Identitäten im Alltag," *Das achtzente Jahrhundert und Österreich: Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* 12 (1997): 7–28.

[15] Olga Katsiardi-Hering and Ikaros Mantouvalos, "The Tolerant Policy of the Habsburg Authorities Towards the Orthodox People from South-Eastern Europe and the Formation of National Identities (18th–Early 19th Century)," *Balkan Studies* 49 (2014): 17–18.

[16] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 193/1717; Ljubinka Toševa Karpovic, "Проблеми изградње православне цркве у Ријеци 1717–1746," *Артефакти* 6/7 (2004): 6–99; Nenad Labus,

merchants could be found in Hungarian towns. They stayed in these towns for a short time, so there is little record of their spiritual life. We know that they had a trading company in Kecskemét in 1721 at the latest and that they came under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Karlovci.[17] Soon their company also started growing in Eger, a town in northern Hungary that was under the spiritual authority of the bishop of Bač.[18] However, up until the mid-eighteenth century, the largest Greek trading colony was the one in Vienna, which is why it was the archbishops' greatest concern. Patriarch Arsenije IV, head of the Serbian Church in the Habsburg Monarchy from 1737, further defined the position of the Orthodox community in Vienna in 1746. Its members chose their epitropoi themselves, but the archbishop of Karlovci had to confirm them. The chapel's accounts were submitted to him for inspection every year, and he confirmed the Serbian and Greek priests. It was emphasised that the Greeks were not to pay anything to support the Serbian priest.[19] The patriarch did not manage to go through the accounts submitted for the year 1747 due to his death.[20]

A new archbishop, Isaija, was elected, but his death just a few months later in 1749 left the Viennese parish without supervision until 1752, when Archbishop Pavle Nenadović (1749–1768) repeated previous orders, according to which he was to confirm the epitropoi.[21] Pavle was a leader with strong organisational skills and a firm hand, which was soon to be felt in Vienna when he ordered that an inventory of the chapel's property be made and that this kind of stocktaking was to be done every time epitropoi changed. All these documents, along with annual bills, were to be reviewed by him personally. At least two priests served in the chapel at that time – one Greek and one Serbian.[22]

"Православна заједница у Ријеци," *Артефакти* 3 (2000): 75–76.

[17] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 17/1721; For the Greek Orthodox communities of Kecskemét, see Ikaros Mantouvalos, "*Conscriptiones Graecorum* in Eighteenth-Century Central Europe. Crossing Borders: The Sociocultural Identification of Migrants from the Balkans to Hungarian Territories," in *Encounters in Europe's Southeast: The Habsburg Empire on the Orthodox World in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Harald Heppner and Eva Posch (Bochum: Dr Dieter Winkler, 2012), 121–33.

[18] Vasin and Ninković, *Историја Будимске епархије*, 73–74.

[19] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 614/1753.

[20] Ninković, *Карловачка митрополија и Грци у Бечу*, 253–55.

[21] Nenad Ninković, "*Исаија Антоновић, епископ арадски и митрополит Карловачки (1731–1749)*," *Истраживања* 24 (2013): 186–200.

[22] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 397/1752; Dejan Medaković, *Срби у Бечу* (Novi Sad: Prometej, 1998), 24–95.

Disagreements about running the chapel turned into a conflict between the Greeks and the Serbs in 1759, with the Greeks refusing to accept the spiritual authority of Pavle and also demanding that the position of the Serbian priest be abolished. They then went a step further and brought a monk, Meletije, who had previously lived in Trieste, to be their priest – without the archbishop's blessing.[23] Pavle, whose spiritual authority was recognised by Greeks in other trading companies, could not accept this situation, so he complained to the Illyrian Court Deputation, which was in charge of the Serbs, and the Archbishopric of Karlovci.[24] An investigation was ordered, resulting in a resolution being passed on 28 March 1761 determining that, although the Greeks in Vienna were subjects of the sultan and were under the spiritual authority of the ecumenical patriarch, in the Habsburg Monarchy they were to accept the authority of the archbishop of Karlovci, since the hierarchy in the Ottoman Empire could not apply its jurisdiction within the Habsburg state.[25] This conclusion is supported by the fact that the renowned Iossipos Moissiodax sought Pavle's permission to sell his book to the Orthodox communities in the Habsburg Monarchy.[26]

The archbishop of Karlovci had the authority to install as a priest, if he met all the religious requirements, a Greek from the Ottoman Empire at the request of the Greeks.[27] The Greeks, who did not accept this solution, left the chapel. Empress Maria Theresa tried to make concessions, emphasising that she was the one with patron rights (jus patronatus), which she exercised through the archbishop, so that all the bills should be submitted to her for inspection, rather than him, but that did not help matters. In the meantime, Pavle succeeded in having Meletije removed from the clerical state, but it would take until 1767 for him to have the Greeks accept his jurisdiction again and return to the chapel. Still, the conflict continued to bubble under the surface, so the imperial court handed over the chapel of St George entirely to the Greeks in a new resolution dated 23 April 1776.[28] However, it was once again emphasised that the chapel was under the authority of Karlovci. From that moment on, the priests, exclusively

[23] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 563/1759; 19, 38, 65/1760.

[24] Архив Војводине, Фонд Илирска дворска канцеларија и депутација (АВ, ИДКД), 1718–1721; Ninković, *Карловачка митрополија и Грци у Бечу*, 256.

[25] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 08/1761.

[26] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *The Enlightenment as Social Criticism: Iosipos Moisiodax and Greek Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 47–49.

[27] АВ, ИДКД, 1722; АСАНУК, МПА, А, 208/1761.

[28] Katsiardi-Hering and Mantouvalos, "Tolerant Policy," 29; Stefano Saracino, "Griechisch-orthodoxe Bruderschaften in der Habsburgermonarchie (18. Jahrhundert): Multifunktionale Dienstleister und karitative Akteure," in *Bruderschaften als multifunktionale Dienstleister der*

monks, could only be Greeks, Ottoman subjects, while the bills were inspected by the officials of the imperial court. There were no more problems, and in the same year, in accordance with the Greeks' wishes, Archbishop Vikentije Jovanović Vidak (1774–1780) confirmed the appointment of the monk Antim Georgijević from Dionysiou Monastery as the priest, and in 1777 the appointment of a monk from Iviron was confirmed.[29]

At the time of the dispute over the chapel in Vienna, Archbishop Pavle managed to secure the jurisdiction of the bishop of (Gornji) Karlovac from Trieste.[30] He could proudly point out that he was recognised by the Greeks in Kecskemét, Eger and Miskolc as their archbishop.[31] These towns also had Serbian merchants, which made it easier for spiritual authority to spread from Sremski Karlovci. However, it was only when Greeks arrived in larger numbers that the possibility of increasing the number of parishes arose. They did not have the same status as Serbian parishes in the archbishopric. Regardless of this, Pavle fought to ensure their religious rights and their right to build temples. In 1755, immediately before the Seven Years' War (1756–1763), he tried to guarantee the religious rights of the Greeks of Vác and Kecskemét. In these two cities, the bishop of Vác, Michael Karl von Althann (1734–1756), prohibited funerals with chanting – an expression of the right to profess religion in public.[32] In Vác the situation was more difficult, since von Althann was at the same time the governor of the county in which this town was situated, so he denied the Greeks the right to buy property.[33] The Seven Years' War reduced the pressure on the Orthodox; since the Serbs constituted a significant percentage of Habsburg soldiers, the state showed more understanding for them. The end of the war marked the beginning of new problems. The pressure was first and foremost directed at Kecskemét, which is why the Illyrian Court Deputation eventually had to react. After the archbishop's claims that the parish included 41 Orthodox families at the time, the court gave them permission to build a church as well as the right to profess their religion in public (in 1766). However, the new bishop of Vác, Christoph Anton von Migazzi, denied that right in 1766–1767 and later, which

---

Frühen Neuzeit in Zentraleuropa, ed. Elisabeth Lobenwein, Martin Scheutz und Alfred Stefan Weiss (Vienna: Böhlau, 2018), 500-501.

[29] АВ, ИДКД, 1723-1725; АСАНУК, МПА, А, 206, 208, 216, 242-244/1761, 447/1763, 116, 119/1764, 286, 339, 340/1765, 613/1767, 61, 68/1776.

[30] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 8–10/1757; АВ, ИДКД, 2407; Mita Kostić, *Из историје Срба у Угарској и Аустрији XVIII и XIX века* (Zagreb: Prosvijeta, 2013), 167.

[31] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 263/1765.

[32] АВ, ИДКД, 2376

[33] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 528/1755.

is why the Greeks could not accomplish everything that they had been promised by Maria Theresa.[34]

The death of Archbishop Pavle, the arrival of Count Franz Koller as head of the Illyrian Court Deputation and the second wave of reforms in the Habsburg Monarchy created a new chapter in the history of the Orthodox. At the same time (after 1770) there was an influx of Greek merchants into the areas to the north of the Sava and the Danube, which was one of the consequences of the displacement of the Aromanians.[35] Thus, after 1770 new Orthodox communities and trading companies appeared, whose believers were under the spiritual guidance of the archbishops of Karlovci. Two very agile archbishops, who were successors and students of Pavle, tried to uphold their religious rights: Vikentije Jovanović Vidak and Mojsije Putnik (1781–1790). They focused their attention in particular on the Greeks from Kecskemét, Balassagyarmat, Lučenec, Hódmezővásárhely, Gyöngyös, Tokaj, Miskolc and Uzhhorod – towns located in present-day Hungary, Slovakia and Ukraine. In addition to these towns, they also occasionally resolved problems in Eger, Győr, Sopron and Szolnok.[36]

The difference between these parishes and the ones in the Archbishopric of Karlovci could be found in the religious rights they enjoyed. While in these

---

[34] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 2, 3/1764, 242, 253, 257, 261/1765, 371, 480/1766, 501, 503, 566, 567, 569, 570/1767.

[35] These migrations were first and foremost a consequence of the destruction of Moscopole, a strong and important Aromanian/Greek settlement in what is now southern Albania. The city's thriving development started at the end of the seventeenth century and its merchants possessed significant capital after the mid-eighteenth century. The rebellion organised in 1769 by the Greeks in the Peloponnese, together with the Russian Navy and led by Konstantinos Kolokotronis was closely connected with Moscopole, which, as Serbian historians have observed, was one of the main centres of Greek culture and the Greek national idea. It was exactly for this reason that the surrounding Muslim Albanian population plundered and destroyed the city in 1769, while the Ottoman authorities turned a blind eye to the event. After this event, many Greeks from Moscopole settled in the Habsburg Monarchy, where they had temporarily resided before. They settled in towns, easily fitting into the existing economic and cultural framework, especially in those towns that already included Greeks and Serbs. In 1769, the Greeks left other places in addition to Moscopole, such as Šipiska, Blace, Kleisoura and Nikolica. Moscopole was later destroyed twice more, both times at the beginning of a movement for independence from Ottoman rule, in 1788 and 1821. Поповић, *О Цинцарима*, 33–40; Ikaros Mantouvalos, "Greek Immigrants in Central Europe: A Concise Study of Migration Routes from the Balkans to the Territories of the Hungarian Kingdom (from the Late 17th to the Early 19th Centuries)," in *Across the Danube: Southeastern Europeans and Their Travelling Identities (17th–19th C.)*, ed. Olga Katsiardi-Hering and Maria A. Stassinopoulou (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 33–35.

[36] Mantouvalos, "Greek Immigrants in Central Europe," 30–31.

parishes the Orthodox religion was merely tolerated, the believers in the Archbishopric of Karlovci had the right to profess their religion in public. For that reason the archbishops also tried to provide chapels and temporary priests in these settlements. In June 1775 Archbishop Vikentije sought the permission of the Illyrian Court Deputation for the Greeks in Gyöngyös to establish a chapel and have a Greek priest.[37] In Hódmezővásárhely a priest came to the Greeks occasionally, but in 1772–1773 he was banned from entering the town, leading them in 1776 to request Vikentije to return things to their previous state.[38] In the same year the Greeks and Serbs from Kecskemét asked to be granted religious freedom based on the resolution from the time of Archbishop Pavle. Along with the request, there was a detailed list of Orthodox families in Kecskemét and neighbouring settlements, which was provided to demonstrate that the community had the financial wherewithal to build a church and support a priest.[39] Supporting the Greeks' request, Vikentije addressed the Illyrian Court Deputation with an appeal for permission to build temples in Balassagyarmat, Miskolc and Gyöngyös. At the beginning of September that year, the same request was sent to the Hungarian court chancellor, Count Franz von Eszterházy, accompanied by an explanation that in accordance with the current law – the Illyrian (Serbian) Regulation – a financial plan for building a church had been drawn up.[40] In addition to the archbishop's requests, Orthodox people in Miskolc sent a representative to Pressburg (modern Bratislava, the centre of Hungarian institutions) and Vienna, so as to get permission to build a temple as quickly as possible. In 1778, they included in their request the question of the freedom to profess their religion in public.[41]

In 1777 and 1778, Archbishop Vikentije tried to solve numerous problems related to the Illyrian (Serbian) Regulation and the watering down of the Privileges.[42] This took him to Vienna, where he also tried to improve the situation

[37] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 409/1775.

[38] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 261/1776.

[39] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 175/1776, 313/1777.

[40] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 339, 346/1777.

[41] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 1, 60/1778.

[42] In 1745, as part of Maria Theresa's reforms, the Illyrian Court Commission (Illyrischen Hofkommission) was established, and later renamed the Illyrian Court Deputation (Illyrischen Hofdeputation) in 1747. By 1777, when it was abolished, this institution was in charge of the Serbs and all issues related to the Privileges, that is, to religious freedom within the Archbishopric of Karlovci. Thus, this institution also discussed the status of Greek parishes in the archbishopric, but it occasionally also dealt with the Greeks who were outside of the archbishopric. Even though its primary role was concerned with the Serbs, Serbs were merely office clerks in this institution, while royal court advisors changed at the head: Ferdinand Alois

in the Greek parishes. Concerned about the believers, in April 1778 he ordered the Pest Protopresbyter Mihail Kastra, a Greek, to send Priest Haris, a Greek living in Pest at the time, to Kecskemét, where he was to give an Easter liturgy. In the same letter he gave orders to the protopresbyter to send Priest Dimitrije Čorlenda (Csőrlenda), also a Greek, to Balassagyarmat as a spiritual father.[43] The temporary stay of Priest Haris in Kecskemét inspired the Greeks to request a permanent priest in August 1778, and as a possible candidate they mentioned Theodor Sterija from Pest, since the archbishop was not satisfied with Haris.[44] Along with the new appeal to the archbishop, they also sent another list of family heads in Kecskemét and several neighbouring settlements.[45]

During his stay in Vienna, the archbishop confirmed the appointment of a new priest of the chapel of St George, the monk Meletije from the Athonite Monastery of Great Lavra, who replaced the elderly monk Hrizant. The following year, the monk Sergije was confirmed as the priest of the chapel of St George, since Meletije had left Vienna. In addition, the Greeks also asked for the monk Makarije, a decision left to Archbishop Vikentije's successor, Mojsije Putnik.[46] Vikentije also determined that a priest from Zemun, Jovan Vretić, should go to Miskolc although the Greeks had asked for the monk Meletije Mihailović, who actually became a spiritual father there sometime later. Beginning in 1778, the monk Wreta Bendela was engaged in Miskolc.[47] In early February 1780, the secular authorities in Balassagyarmat confirmed Dimitrije Čorlenda, who had been suggested two years before. However, the archbishop died before he heard news of this.[48] A few months before his death, he managed to engage Protopresbyter Dimitrije Georgijević, who could speak Greek, to go through the settlements with Greek trading companies and announce the order regarding the reduction of non-working religious holidays adopted by the synod of the Archbishopric of Karlovci. All Orthodox believers

---

Kolowrat-Krakowský (1745–1751), Karl Ferdinand von Königsegg-Erps (1751–1755), Johann Christoph von Bartenstein (1755–1766) and Franz Koller von Nagymánya (1766–1777). They devised and carried out numerous reforms in Serbian society which were in line with the court's policies. The most significant work in this area was passing the First (1770) and the Second (1777) Illyrian Regulations, which were designed to interpret the Privileges in a way that suited the imperial court best. However, the basis of the Privileges – the right to profess religion in public – remained intact. Mita Kostić, *Гроф Колер* (Zagreb: Prosvijeta, 2011).

[43] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 65/1778.

[44] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 54, 116/1778, 266/1779.

[45] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 319/1779.

[46] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 127, 147, 168, 171, 172, 212, 220/1778, 348/1779, 381/1780.

[47] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 358/1779, 366, 367/1780.

[48] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 364/1780.

were granted 42 non-working holidays in addition to 52 Sundays. Although this was announced for a different reason, it de facto guaranteed Greek believers certain rights.[49]

Following the death of Archbishop Vidak, the temporary administration of the "widowed" church was taken over by Mojsije Putnik, who was chosen as the new archbishop in 1781.[50] When he was still an administrator, he had sent the Greek priest from Pest to Kecskemét.[51] In Pest, he also had to resolve a significantly more serious problem that had arisen as a result of discord between the Greeks, Aromanians and Serbs. These were all Orthodox believers with the right to profess their religion in public, since Pest was part of the archbishopric and a stauropegic parish. It received this status in 1698 and was subsequently under the direct supervision of the archbishop, even though the seat of the Buda bishop was nearby.[52] As Pest was an important place for trade, large numbers of Greeks had moved there over time and become part of the Serbian parish. The archbishops brought Greek priests so as to meet the spiritual needs of Greek believers, and they adopted the practice for epitropoi from both nations to have control over the finances – just as in Vienna. However, the word of the Serbian epitropoi carried more weight, which gradually created divisions, particularly since the bishops of Buda attempted to arbitrate in these conflicts. That was one of the reasons why the wealthy Greek community intended to separate from the Serbian parish and establish its own.[53] As Greek priests continued to come to Pest even without the archbishop's permission, the situation grew more and more complex, since the archbishop was responsible for them in the eyes of the authorities. When the conflict escalated in 1779–1780, the magistrate in Pest became involved and notified the archbishop that the Greeks and the Aromanians had violated the procedures and disrupted the peace during the election procedure for the epitropoi, about which Maria Theresa had also been informed. The problem became more complex when two epitropoi, Prodanović (Serbian) and Jorgović (Greek), refused to hand over the accounts and were consequently arrested. In the end, the Hungarian institutions appointed a designated representative, Pal Slavije, who was tasked with investigating the causes of the conflict.[54] The problem related to the election of the epitropoi finally

[49] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 278, 289/1779.

[50] Nenad Ninković, "Администрирање Мојсија Путника Карловачком митрополијом," *Истраживања* 25 (2014): 197–201.

[51] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 425/1780.

[52] Vasin and Ninković, *Историја Будимске епархије*, 19.

[53] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 392/1780.

[54] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 481, 482, 486, 529/1781.

resulted in the Pest parish losing its stauropegic status; the Greeks were promised their own parish, which they received in the following decade.[55]

The accession of Emperor Joseph II to the throne (1780–1790) brought with it the emergence of rationalist ideas, that is, a more radical continuation of reforms initiated by his mother, Maria Theresa. One of the most important parts of his legacy was the Patent of Toleration. The first act of this kind was passed as early as 1778 for Belgium; this formed the basis for a significantly more important one that was proclaimed on 13 October 1781 and applied throughout the monarchy.[56] This act did not refer to the Orthodox believers in the Archbishopric of Karlovci, because they, as we have already mentioned, had the right to profess their religion in public – a right that Orthodox people outside the borders of the archbishopric did not have, even after the Patent of Toleration. Although the title suggests a higher level of religious equality, the proclamation still bore elements of discrimination against the non-Catholic population, as they were not granted the right to profess their religion in public, but rather to profess it in private. Nevertheless, this amounted to progress, as before the patent they were merely tolerated without any rights, without the possibility to build chapels and churches, and without the right to be educated or buried in accordance with the rites prescribed by the Orthodox (or Protestant) church. Progress could be perceived in the fact that this act excluded the possibility of forced religious conversion, which had occurred up to the 1780s, especially along the borders of the Archbishopric of Karlovci.[57]

The Patent of Toleration was crucial for the Greeks under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Karlovci. It gave them a de jure right to profess their religion in private, although some parishes, such as Kecskemét and Uzhhorod, pointed out that they had had the right of public profession ever since the time of Archbishop Pavle. The state did not go any further in the matter, and all parishes under the supervision of the archbishop received the right to private profession and had to act accordingly.[58] The patent granted them the right to build houses of worship, though without bells, bell towers or entrances facing town squares, which meant they could only erect modest chapels instead of churches. Permission to build could be granted only if the parish had a hundred or more families, but

[55] Vasin and Ninković, *Историја Будимске епархије*, 63.

[56] Derek Beales, *Joseph II: Against the World, 1780–1790* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 168–70, 186–87; Hans Magenschab, *Josef II: Österreichs Weg in die Moderne* (Vienna: Amalthea, 2006), 167–70.

[57] Karl Vocelka, *Glanz und Untergang der höfischen Welt: Österreichische Geschichte 1699–1815* (Vienna: Carl Ueberreuter, 2004), 383–85.

[58] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 7, 81/1782, 451/1784.

sometimes families in neighbouring settlements were counted as well. They had the right to have a teacher and a permanent priest, rather than a temporary one as before. Teachers held classes in Greek, but were obliged to follow the educational practices defined through a number of legislative acts between 1774 and 1777. Services of worship were allowed in all settlements in the parish, as was the right to public burial, which meant carrying the deceased in a procession to the cemetery accompanied by chanting. If they paid the priests themselves, which was always the case with the Greeks, they could also choose them themselves. This law enabled them to buy property and gave them equal rights with Catholics in the civil service.[59]

In accordance with the Patent of Toleration, the settlements in which the Greeks lived were supposed to submit a request to the imperial court in order to be granted the right to profess their religion in private. Together with the request, they were obliged to submit a report on the number of families and their financial situation to demonstrate that paying a priest, paying a teacher or building a temple would not burden the believers to the extent that they would be unable to pay state taxes. After the patent was passed, the Greek parishes did not hesitate to seek the recognition of their right to profess their religion in private and they immediately showed that they were under the spiritual authority of the archbishop of Karlovci. Even before 1781, counties occasionally required proof that Greeks had private religious rights and that they were under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. In that respect, a testimony given to the county by the Greeks from Balassagyarmat is of great importance. They claimed that they, as well as other Greek trading companies in Miskolc, Tokaj, Gyöngyös and Kecskemét, had been paying six ducats per year to the archbishop, as agreed. The archbishop had given the counties a receipt for this, based on a previous agreement with the Greeks, and it was emphasised that the payment was an expression of the believers' free will.[60]

The provision in the Patent of Toleration that the Greeks perceived as the most difficult concerned paying a tax for the services of Catholic priests, the so-called stolae, as they kept records of baptisms, marriages and deaths. This rule was something that at least one Greek community was already familiar with, as in Miskolc they had been paying such taxes since 1779.[61] The practice became compulsory for everyone after the patent. Archbishop Mojsije immediately protested, claiming there were no grounds for it, since the Orthodox had their

[59] Boris Zakošek, "Патент о вјерској сношљивости," *Артефакти* 6–7 (2004): 167–85.

[60] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 364/1780.

[61] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 308/1779.

own priests. When the imperial court responded that Catholic priests included Orthodox in their records, especially those of the deceased, he pointed out that Orthodox priests also had these and that they were obliged to keep them according to laws and regulations passed for the Archbishopric of Karlovci (under the Declaratory Rescript of the Illyrian Nation of 1779). Since these laws did not apply to Greeks with private religious rights, his arguments were rejected and the old solution was maintained, to the detriment of priests and the Orthodox community. Because of tax payments, problems related to funerals also arose. Even though Joseph II guaranteed in the first article of the Patent of Toleration that non-Catholics could bury their dead in public with the involvement of a priest, in practice there was a request to avoid chanting during the procession. Local authorities changed these rights in accordance with their needs. There were cases when a Catholic priest buried an Orthodox or tolerated chanting in return for a considerable amount of money as compensation, reckoning that the financially strong Greek merchants would rather pay the amount requested than disrupt their burial rites. Hence in Kecskemét the Catholic priest asked for double the amount required under the tax.[62] Greeks from this town and from Miskolc demanded that the archbishop work to eradicate this practice, but Archbishop Mojsije's hands were tied by the emperor's reply.[63] The Miskolc Orthodox even considered stopping the practice of burying their dead in the Catholic cemetery and to use the Protestant cemetery instead, so as to have the provision on taxes changed, but there were no legal grounds for doing so.[64] The most extreme case related to burials happened in Tokaj in 1783, where the body of the deceased was impounded until the tax was paid to the Catholic priest.[65]

After repeated complaints from Archbishop Mojsije regarding the taxes paid to Catholic priests, the emperor granted permission for the provision to be changed if it could be proved that this practice had not existed before. For every settlement this had to be proved separately and very often committees were formed with the aim of accomplishing this task. One such committee in Uzhhorod in 1784 determined that the taxes should be given to the Uniate priest, since the committee included the Uniate bishop of Mukachevo as well as the Catholic bishop of Eger. However, the proposal was not accepted.[66] The committee in Tokaj determined that the Orthodox need not pay any other taxes

[62] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 203/1783.
[63] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 177, 343/1783.
[64] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 341/1782.
[65] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 233/1783.
[66] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 435, 507/1784.

except when a person died, since they themselves said that they had been paying this tax before, but after the committee had finished its work they were also exempted from that.[67] It was not until 1791 that the payment of taxes to Catholic priests was definitively abolished. In the meantime, the archbishop tried to secure the right to conduct public funerals for the Greeks – in processions and with chanting. Until September 1784, the Greeks had tried to perform their funerals in exactly this manner, referring to the Patent of Toleration, and claiming that the law that obliged them to carry their dead in silence applied to Protestants only; however, the emperor then extended this decision to the Orthodox, which the archbishop had to communicate to all priests.[68] This meant that t17hey could not pray and the dead could not be buried with chanting outside of chapels.[69] In practice this was not always applied, so while the new law was strictly followed in Uzhhorod in 1785, the Greeks in Miskolc continued to bury their dead with chanting.[70] The following year they started doing so in Uzhhorod as well,[71] but in Tokaj the situation remained as it had been before – not only were they not allowed to bury the dead with chanting, but if they tried to do so, the body was seized and buried by a Catholic priest.[72]

Although the Patent of Toleration had much discriminatory content (the obligation to pay taxes to Catholic priests being one example), and in practice local authorities often infringed on many rights (as in the case of funerals), it did guarantee what the Greeks wanted – a temple, a priest, a school and a teacher. The schools had to be organised according to regulations that applied across the Habsburg state. When choosing a teacher, they referred to the archbishop of Karlovci, since he was the first instance authority for them when it came to school supervision. The Greeks from Eger also turned to him, even though they were outside his jurisdiction, regarding their school and teacher (daskal) Jovan Apostolović from Macedonia.[73] In an attempt to help them open a school and support a teacher, Archbishop Mojsije worked on behalf of the Greeks in Uzhhorod in 1784 with much success, but the process of obtaining a teacher proved a good deal easier than building a place of worship or ensuring the arrival of a priest, so little trace remains of all this in historical sources.[74]

---

[67] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 424, 450, 497, 528/1784.
[68] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 215/1785.
[69] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 591/1784.
[70] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 230/1785.
[71] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 378/1786.
[72] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 621/1786.
[73] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 154/1782.
[74] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 403, 451/1784.

The schools and the teachers were part of the archbishop's attempts to provide a good spiritual life for the Greeks. The main task in this enterprise was choosing the priest and building the places of worship. The towns often could not reach the required one hundred families as stated in the patent, but the Greeks' economic power guaranteed the priest's material security, and so permission was given to have one even when there were fewer than a hundred families. The Greeks almost always hired monks to be their priests, following the custom in Vienna, which meant that they needed to set aside considerably less money to support them as they were unmarried and had no families. Installing a priest was a process which reflected the spiritual authority of the archbishop of Karlovci, which was of a significantly different nature than within the archbishopric. The main difference was that Greek priests came from the Ottoman Empire, and they had to have a written confirmation of their clerical state, based on which the archbishop confirmed their appointment to a parish. He could only do this once the priest had been accepted by the secular authorities. The reason for this procedure was the existence of the Declaratory Rescript, a law related to the Archbishopric of Karlovci that said foreign citizens could not be priests in the monarchy, among other things, because after the reduction in the number of clerics, there were too many priests in the monarchy. However, since the imperial court was favourably inclined towards any increase in the population, the migration of people from the Ottoman Empire, including Greek priests, was considered progress, with the condition that they become Habsburg subjects. They were, however, strictly prohibited from leaving the monarchy, and not everyone was prepared to comply. This is why there were requests for people to serve for 10 years and then to be able to stay or leave the Habsburg Monarchy if they wanted. The Habsburg authorities in Vienna did not approve of this and the granting of such requests were the exception rather than the rule.

In accordance with the Declaratory Rescript, the arrival of any clerics had to be reported to the secular authorities.[75] The archbishop did not choose priests himself. Rather, he accepted the choice offered to him by Greek parishes. This involved representatives of a parish, and, at times, the head of every family signing the proposal. If the priest was also acceptable to the secular authorities and had proof of his vocation, the archbishop would issue him a confirmation for his appointment to the parish. On such occasions, Archbishop Mojsije pointed out that he was doing so based on the rights granted to him by the Privileges, rather than by the Patent of Toleration. In 1782 in settlements such

[75] Dejan Mikavica, Vladan Gavrilović and Goran Vasin, *Знаменита документа за историју српског народа 1538–1918* (Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2007), 108–9.

as Kecskemét, where priests came only for major Christian holidays, the Greeks were granted the right to have a permanent priest. Following their wish, the archbishop installed the monk Jevstratije Manojlović from Lepavina Monastery as priest. However, in this case there was not much correspondence with secular authorities, since he was a Habsburg subject.[76] Two years later, in 1784, he confirmed a new spiritual father, Georgi Jakomy, who moved with his entire family from the Ottoman Empire.[77] A permanent priest was also confirmed in Tokaj in 1783, and in this case the Greeks asked for the monk Joakim from Great Lavra.[78] At the request of the Orthodox, the monk Avram Janković from Bešenovo was confirmed as priest in Uzhhorod in 1784, and then replaced by the monk Metodije in 1786. Satisfied neither with him, nor with Avram Janković before him, the parishioners asked for yet another replacement – Georgije Papa from Kecskemét.[79] In Gyöngyös in 1785 they asked Archbishop Mojsije to install as priest the monk Cosmas Kutkutagy. Their request could not be met immediately, but in 1786 it was confirmed that he could settle and live in the monarchy and Archbishop Mojsije issued a parish confirmation for him.[80] In Miskolc two spiritual fathers held short tenure – the monks Meletije Mihailović (d. 1783) and Wreta Bendela (d. 1786). After their deaths, a new spiritual father had to be found; meanwhile, they temporarily retained as their parish priest Protopresbyter Petar Kuzmanović. The following year, in 1787, they asked for the monk Haris from Bihar county.[81]

The archbishops of Karlovci always supported requests from Greeks to build a church or chapel. They did this before the Patent of Toleration, when obtaining permission involved lengthy correspondence with state institutions, as well as after 1781, when this process was somewhat easier. Archbishop Mojsije did the most in this respect, overseeing every stage of temple construction, from the acquisition of a permit, through to the purchase of land, to the consecration of the cornerstone. According to the regulations, the Greeks had to submit a building plan for churches, as the Greeks in Miskolc did in 1783, when they also submitted the data about buying the land for the church as well as building the houses for the priest and the teacher. With Mojsije's support, they sought to have this land exempted from taxes, succeeding in 1784. With the archbishop's blessing, Wreta Bendela consecrated the cornerstone on the Feast of the Transfiguration (6/17

[76] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 131, 151/1782.
[77] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 512, 525/1784.
[78] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 317/1783, 507/1786.
[79] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 541/1784, 571/1786.
[80] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 18, 105/1785, 304, 372, 402/1786.
[81] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 594/1781, 5, 42, 72/1782, 603/1786, 56, 116/1787.

August) in 1785. According to the then-existing canons, in the foundation of the temple he placed a plate with the time of building inscribed on it, as well as the data about Joseph II, the archbishop, the epitropoi and the priest.[82] The Greeks from Tokaj made equal efforts to obtain a place of worship. In their demands submitted to the county and the emperor, they pointed out their numbers, that is, that there were 335 of them. The fact that they were well-to-do was enough for them to obtain permission to build a temple.[83] A new Greek parish also appeared in Sopron, which requested the archbishop to provide a priest and permission to build a chapel.[84] The Greeks most often devoted their new temples to Emperor Constantine and Empress Helena – such was the case in Uzhhorod and Tokaj (1786)[85] – and their feast day was considered a Greek national holiday in the Habsburg Monarchy. The church in Gyöngyös, the construction of which began in 1784, was devoted to St Nicholas, while the church in Kecskemét was dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Later on the patron saints were changed and the church in Tokaj was devoted to St Nicholas and the church in Miskolc to St Naum. Although the Patent of Toleration stated that these churches could have neither bells nor bell towers, the archbishops managed to obtain permission for these features as well, and in this way chapels turned into real churches, built in the styles of late baroque or neoclassicism, which were the predominant artistic expression of the Orthodox in the Habsburg Monarchy.[86]

Conclusion

The development of Greek Orthodox parishes in the Habsburg Monarchy during the eighteenth century was represented in the struggle of the archbishops of Karlovci to protect their Orthodox religion. At the same time, there were internal clashes in parishes, such as Vienna, which led to divisions along ethnic lines, even though all believers, including the Greeks, were under the spiritual supervision of the archbishops of Karlovci. This was a consequence of the fact that the Habsburgs did not allow any church whose leader (patriarch) was not their subject to interfere in their realm. Even though in a formal sense the Archbishopric of Karlovci was part of the Patriarchate of Peć, all the decisions in it were made independently, including even the issue of electing the archbishop. Believers under

[82] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 189, 333/1783, 361, 537/1784, 136/1785.

[83] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 380/1784.

[84] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 174/1785.

[85] АСАНУК, МПА, А, 378, 390, 395/1786.

[86] Zoran Vukosavljev, *Архитектура српских православних цркава у Мађарској* (Budapest: Srpski institut, 2013), 427–28.

the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Karlovci had the freedom of religious profession, which is why Greeks turned to the archbishops to organise their parishes and to secure their religious rights. The archbishops always tried to meet their needs, attempting in every possible way to protect Greek believers from any kind of religious proselytism. The status of Greek parishes was different in various settlements and depended on local conditions until 1781, when Joseph II issued the Patent of Toleration, which regularised their status. Although after the end of the seventeenth century Serbs in the Archbishopric of Karlovci enjoyed more rights than those granted by the Patent of Toleration, the patent is still considered an advanced act. It simplified the profession and preservation of the Orthodox faith in Greek parishes, which then built their own temples and established Greek-language schools. Thus, Greek communities could continue to develop in the ensuing period and through the turbulent nineteenth century – watched over by the archbishops of Karlovci.

University of Novi Sad