ANDREIU ŞAGUNA AND THE RESTORATION OF THE RUMANIAN ORTHODOX METROPOLIS IN TRANSYLVANIA, 1846-1868

By the fourth decade of the nineteenth century the Rumanians of Transylvania had attained a high level of national consciousness. As far as their political destinies were concerned, they were striving to replace the stifling tutelage of the Austrian bureaucracy in Vienna and of the Magyar-dominated provincial government in Cluj with some form of autonomy which, they believed, would allow the full development of their nationality. At the same time they were also anxious to establish on a firm foundation those institutions which they regarded as essential for their moral and spiritual growth.

The Orthodox, who numbered approximately half the Rumanian population of 1,200,000, had as their particular goal the restoration of the Metropolis of Alba-Iulia as it had existed before the conclusion of the Church Union with Rome at the end of the seventeenth century. In so doing they hoped to bring the organization of their church into harmony with the canons of the Ecumenical Eastern Orthodox Church and, what was especially important to the laity, to promote their national development. To be successful they were convinced that they would first have to reassert their right to manage their own affairs without interference from a hostile and indifferent civil authority and, second, sever all administrative ties with the Serbian Orthodox Metropolis of Carlovitz (Sremski Karlovci).

Their success was in large measure due to the leadership of their bishop Andreiu Şaguna, who, according to his own testimony, had made the restoration of the Metropolis his life's work.[1] Nicolae Popea, his first biographer and close collaborator for almost a quarter of a century, in fact, dates the beginning of the campaign to re-establish the Metropolis with his coming to Transylvania in 1846.[2] Şaguna's zeal may be explained by his belief that the extinction of the Metropolis in 1700 had had a disastrous effect on the spir-

1. Haus -, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv, Vienna, Bibliothek des Bundesministeriums für Unterricht, Praes. Z. 282. ad 6494/St. M. I. 1864, 2, Şaguna to Nadasdy, July 26, 1863.

2. Nicolau Popea, *Vechi'a Metropolia ortodosa romana a Transilvaniei, suprimarea si restaurarea ei* (Sabiniu, 1870), 146, 155.

itual development of the Rumanian people and that only when the church resumed its rightful place in the life of the nation could his people hope to achieve true moral and spiritual well-being.[3]

The discussion which follows will be divided into two parts. The first will deal in summary form with the history of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania to 1846; the second will describe in detail Şaguna's campaign to restore the Metropolis of Alba-Iulia.

I

An Eastern Orthodox archbishopric was in existence in Transylvania at least as early as the fourteenth century, and a Metropolis with its headquarters in Alba-Iulia was functioning by the fifteenth century.[4] The Metropolitan of Alba-Iulia was subordinate to the Metropolitan of Ungro-Valachia, whose see was in Bucharest, and was elected by the Synod of Bishops of Ungro-Valachia.[5] As a result of the national hostility which the Orthodox had had to endure since the fifteenth century, the constitution of Transylvania did not recognize the legal existence of their church. It reserved political power and economic privilege to the four "received," or constitutional, churches — the Roman Catholic, Calvinist, Lutheran, and Unitarian.

By the end of the seventeenth century the position of the Orthodox Church had become desperate. It possessed little property from which to derive income to pay its clergy and to maintain its charitable and educational institutions. As a "tolerated" church it received no financial support from the state and was, furthermore, forbidden to collect the tithe from its own faithful, who were obliged instead to contribute to the maintenance of the Catholic priest or Protestant pastor of their district.

Most Orthodox priests knew how to read and write, but their training was usually limited to the memorizing of the liturgy and of portions of the prayer books and to the performance of the elementary duties of their office.[6]

---

3. Ilarion Puşcariu, *Mitropolia Românilor ortodocşi din Ungaria şi Transilvania* (Sibiu, 1900), Acte, 178.

4. Ioan Lupaş, *Istoria bisericească a Românilor ardeleni* (Sibiu, 1918), 23, 26-27; A. Bunea, *Ierarchia Românilor din Ardeal şi Ungaria* (Blaj, 1904), 168.

5. I. Mateiu, *Conţributiuni la istoria dreptului bisericesc. Volumul I: Epoca de la 1848-1868* (Bucureşti, 1922), 30-34, 53.

6. Onisifor Ghibu, "Din istoria literaturii didactice româneşti: I. Bucoavnele; II. Abecedarele din Transilvania; III. Cărţile de cetire din Transilvania", *Analele Academiei Române*, Memoriile Secţiunii Literare, seria II, v. XXXVIII (1915 - 1916), 239-240 and *passim*; Augustin Bunea, *Episcopii Petru Pavel Aron şi Dionisiu Novacovici sau istoria Românilor transilvăneni de la 1751 până la 1764* (Blaş, 1902), 363.

A few could not go beyond reciting the Lord's Prayer.[7] There were no seminaries in the proper sence of the term, so that candidates for the priesthood were usually trained by village priests, often their own fathers, or at a monastery (Bălgrad, Bistriţa, Geoagiu, Silvaş), or at a school run by the Calvinists.[8] Once ordained, the priest usually entered into an agreement with his prospective parishioners concerning the fees he would receive for baptisms, marriages, funerals and other services.[9] These fees were his main source of income, for he possessed no canonical portion, an endowment usually in land, for the support of himself and his family. Often, to make ends meet, he worked the land of a noble side-by-side with his parishioners, and was reduced to the status of a serf with all the attendant indignities and disabilities.[10] Such was his poverty that he could usually not be distinguished from his parishioners.

The upper clergy enjoyed a higher standard of living than the parish priest, but lived quite modestly in comparison with their Roman Catholic and Protestant colleagues.[11] They bitterly resented the economic and social indignities which the estates heaped upon them and their faithful and the administrative controls to which the civil authority subjected them.

Under the circumstances it was not surprising that the Orthodox clergy should have been receptive to the offer of a union with the Church of Rome. In the pursuit of their respective goals the Habsburg emperor Leopold I (1657-1705) and the Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, Leopold Cardinal Kollonics, made the Rumanians of Transylvania the special object of Roman Catholic proselytism. In the last decade of the seventeenth century Austria had expelled the Ottoman Turks from Transylvania and had, in effect, incorporated it into the Empire. In order to attach his newest acquisition more securely to the rest of his dominions Leopold I desired to increase the power of the Roman Catholic Church, which he regarded as a vital unifying force. Cardinal Kollonics was eager to spread the faith in Transylvania at the expense of the dominant Calvinist Maygars and took charge of the campaign to convert the Rumanians. Ably assisted by the Jesuits, who returned to Transylvania about 1693, he directed his efforts primarily at the

7. Nicolao Nilles, *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiae Orientalis in Terris Coronae S. Stephani*, 2 v. (Oeniponte, 1885), I, 259.

8. Furtuna, *Preoţimea românească în secolul al* XVIII-*lea* (Vălenii-de-Munte, 1915), 107.

9. *Ibid.*, 109.

10. Ştefan Meteş, *Istoria bisericii i a vieţii religioase a Românilor din Transilvania şi Ungaria*, 2nd rev. ed., (Sibiu, 1935), 457-471; Bunea, *Episcopii Aron şi Novacovici*, 393-400.

11. Meteş, *Istoria bisericii*, 448-449.

clergy, for he considered it too difficult a task to persuade the devout peasantry to abandon the church of their fathers.

After some initial hesitation the Orthodox hierarchy accepted the Four Points of Union, which actually required little change in their beliefs and practices: the recognition of the Pope of Rome as the visible head of the Christian Church; the use of unleavened bread in the communion; the belief in Purgatory; and the acceptance of the Latin doctrine of the Holy Trinity,that is, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *and* the Son. What made the Union irresistible was the promise from Leopold I and Kollonics that in return they would acquire the same privileged status as their Roman Catholic colleagues.[12] The Orthodox clergy could not resist the prospect of immediate relief from constitutional and economic disabilities and of a position in society befitting their dignity. At a synod attended by 54 protopopes and 1,653 priests at Alba-Iulia on September 4, 1700, Bishop Atanasie Anghel solemnly accepted the Four Points of Union.[13] On March 20, 1701, he formally severed his ties with the Metropolitan of Ungro-Valachia and five days later in a Roman Catholic ceremony in Vienna was consecrated Bishop of the Uniate Church in Transylvania.

Only part of the Orthodox clergy and faithful actually accepted the Act of Union. Throughout the eighteenth century Uniate and Roman Catholic proselytism encountered strong resistance in many areas, notably in the south along the frontier of Orthodox Wallachia.[14] In 1760-1761, opposition to the Union took the form of a massive peasant uprising in the Munţii Apuseni (Western Mountains) and the Mureş Valley led by Sofronie, a monk from Wallachia.[15] In the face of such violence Empress Maria Theresa (1740 - 1780), who had assumed that the Orthodox Church had ceased to exist, reluctantly decided to recognize it. In order to maintain peace and order the devout Empress yielded to the recommendations of her ministers and in 1761 appointed a bishop for the Orthodox in the person of Dionisie Novacovici, the Orthodox Bishop of Buda and a Serb. Since she did not wish to interfer with the progress of the Union, she admonished Novacovici not to prosely-

12. Samuil Clain, Istoria şi lucrurile şi întâmplările Românilor, Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R. (Cluj), ms. fond Oradea, nr. 67-70, vol. IV, 358-359; Nilles, *Symbolae*, I, 261; N. Iorga, *Istoria bisericii româneşti şi a vieţii religioase a Românilor*, 2nd ed., 2 v. (Bucureşti, 1928-30), II, 12ff.

13. Nilles, *Symbolae*, I, 247-249.

14. Silviu Dragomir, *Istoria desrobirei religioase a Românilor din Ardeal în secolul XVIII*, 2 v. (Sibiu, 1920-30), I, 33-41, 96-112, 150-162, 224-259.

15. *Ibid.*, II, 152-219.

tize and, in general, severely limited his freedom of action.[16] After his death in 1767 the diocese was administered by another Serb, Ioan Georgevici, Bishop of Vršac in the Banat, until 1773, and then by Ioan Popovici of Hondol, vicar of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania, until 1784.[17] All three together with their clergy and faithful sent petition after petition to Vienna requesting that a permanent bishop be installed, but to no avail.

Only after the accession of Joseph II (1780-1790) did these entreaties receive a sympathetic hearing. Deeply influenced by the rationalism of the Enlightenment, he wished to bring order into the affairs of the Orthodox, so that they might become more valuable assets to the state. He decided, therefore, to replace the temporary bishop-administrators appointed by his mother with a permanent bishop, but, true to his absolutist principles, he did not bother to consult the Orthodox regarding his choice. Instead of convoking a church synod to deal with the matter, as canon law prescribed, he instructed the Serbian Metropolitan of Carlovitz to propose three candidates, from among whom he would choose one. His choice was Ghedeon Nichitici, the archimandrite of the monastery of Šišťovac and a Serb, who assumed his duties in 1784. His independence was severely limited, for Joseph had, by decrees of September 30 and October 9, 1783, made him subordinate to the Metropolitan of Carlovitz in all matters concerning dogma and ritual.[18] In addition, he forbade him to have regular contacts with the Metropolitan of Ungro-Valachia[19] or to receive priests native to or ordained in Wallachia.[20] He also imposed strict limits on the number of priests which each village could have, so that its resources would not be diverted to what he regarded as unproductive ends,[21] and reduced the number of religious holidays, so that the peasants would be able to devote more days to field work.[22]

Nichitici, who died in 1788, and his successor, Gherasim Adamovici, archimandrite of the monastery of Bezdin in the Banat and also a Serb, who died in 1796, found their diocese to be in a state of complete disorganization.

16. Şt. Lupşa, "Inceputul păstoriei ardelene a lui Dionisie Novacovici", in *Biserica şi problemele vremii* (Sibiu, 1947).

17. Şt. Lupşa, Biserica ardeleană, 1767-1774", *Anuarul Academiei Teologice din Sibiu pe 1947* (Sibiu, 1947), 22-52; I. Lupaş, "O încercare de reunire a bisericilor române din Transilvania la 1798", in *Studii, conferinţe şi comunicări istorice*, I (Bucureşti, 1928), 390-391.

18. Puscariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 1-2.

19. Mateiu, *Contribuţiuni*, 83, 198.

20. Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R. (Cluj), Arhiva, Doc. 657: Transylvanian Gubernium to Orthodox consistory, November 12, 1782; *Ibid.*, Protocol cu acte consistoriale, 5: Gubernium to Orthodox consistory, May 17, 1784.

21. *Ibid.*, 8, April 18, 1786.

22. *Ibid.*, 8-10, December 9, 1786.

They could not even conduct their business in Sibiu, the nominal seat of the diocese, because no suitable quarters for them could be found. Instead, they were obliged to move to the nearby Rumanian village of Răşinari where the peasants provided them with lodgings in a private home.[23] For lack of sufficient time and resources neither was able to make fundamental reforms.

After the death of Adamovici his see remained vacant for fourteen years. The Court apparently assumed that a prolonged vacancy would cause such demoralization among the Orthodox that they would gladly accept the Union as their only salvation. These hopes proved to be as illusory as those of Leopold I and Maria Theresa; the Orthodox would not be shaken in their faith. Finally, on October 10, 1810, the Court convoked an electoral synod to choose a successor to Adamovici. In accordance with the procedure adopted by Joseph II, the names of the three candidates with the largest number of votes were submitted to Emperor Francis I (1792-1835). He chose Vasile Moga, a priest from Sebeş near Sibiu, who on several occasions had assured the Court that in administering the affairs of his diocese he would always let its desires be his guide. In order to ensure his submission to the civil authority and to prevent him or his clergy from interfering with the Union, Francis I obliged him to accept a set of nineteen conditions, which made him little more than a servant of the state.

Moga was to regard his elevation to the dignity of bishop not as a consequence of a right enjoyed by the Orthodox Church but as an expression of the Emperor's grace; he was to keep in mind at all times that there were only four churches recognized by the Constitution and that the Orthodox Church was merely tolerated; he and his clergy were to discourage all opposition to the Union among their faithful and were to refrain from proselytism among the Uniates; he was to send home immediately priests who entered Transylvania from Wallachia or Moldavia; he might seek the advice of his archbishop, the Metropolitan of Carlovitz, on spiritual matters only, and then only with the approval of the civil authority in Transylvania; he was to make no collections of money without the prior consent of said civil authority; he was to reduce the number of priests in his diocese and to take measures to improve their education; finally, he was to encourage the study of the Magyar language in all Orthodox church schools.[24]

In spite of these restrictions Rumanian nationalists of both confessions warmly applauded Moga's election, for he was the first Rumanian bishop to

23. Andreiu de Şaguna, *Istoria biséricei ortodocse rèsaritene universale, dela întemeierea ei până în zilele noastre*, 2. v. (Sibiiu, 1860), II, 187-188.

24. Popea, *Vechia Metropolia*, 149-152.

preside over the diocese since 1700. One of these was Petru Maior, a protopope of the Uniate Church and a pioneer in the development of modern Rumanian historiography, who predicted rapid progress for his people now that the leadership of the Orthodox Church had passed from Serbian into Rumanian hands.[25] These expectations proved to be ill-founded, for Moga, intelligent and preoccupied with the welfare of his people though he was, lacked the material resources and the courage to do more than hold his church together. His long episcopate (1811-1845) was a period of stagnation, with the result that his successor was obliged to undertake his program of reform from the beginning.

II

The beginning of the renaissance of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania coincides with the appointment of Andreiu Şaguna as general vicar in 1846.[26] He was born in 1809 in Miskolc, Hungary, where his Macedo-Rumanian forebears had settled in the eighteenth century as wine merchants. His uncle Atanasie Grabovschi, a leader of the Macedo-Rumanian community in Buda, assumed responsibility for his education and at the same time instilled in him a keen sence of duty toward his people. In 1829, upon the completion of his studies in philosophy and law at the University of Buda, Şaguna enrolled in the Rumanian section of the theological institute in Vršac to prepare for entrance into the Orthodox priesthood. He was ordained in 1833, and from then until his appointment as vicar in 1846, he held every position in the Serbian Church below that of bishop.

Even before Moga's death the Serbian Metropolitan Joseph Rajačić (1842-1861) had decided upon Şaguna as his successor. He was deeply concerned over the decline of the Transylvanian diocese[27] and believed that only

25. Petru Maior, "Istoria bisericei Românilor," in T. Cipariu, *Acte şi fragmente latine romanesci pentru istori'a beserecei romane mai alesu unite* (Blasiu, 1855), 157-158.

26. The first sketch of Şaguna's life was the memoir written in the year of his death by his long-time secretary and confidant Nicolae Popea: *Escelenti'a Sea Archiepiscopulu si Metropolitulu Andreiu Baron de Siaguna* (Sibiiu, 1873). It is brief and laudatory. A few years later Popea published a full-length biography based upon personal recollections and documents which are no longer extant: *Archiepiscopul şi Metropolitul Andreiu Baron de Şaguna* (Sibiiu, 1879). The most complete biography to date is by Ioan Lupaş: "Vieaţa şi faptele Mitropolitului Andreiu Şaguna", which appeared in a volume of studies issued in commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of his birth: *Mitropolitul Andreiu baron de Şaguna. Scriere comemorativă la serbarea centenară a naşterii lui* (Sibiiu, 1909). A second edition appeared under the title: *Mitropolitul Andreiu Şaguna. Monografie istorică* (Sibiiu, 1911).

27. Országos Levéltár, Budapest, Cancellaria Transylvanico-Aulica Praesidialia, 1847/163.

a man with Şaguna's energy and experience could effect lasting reforms. He was also anxious to maintain the administrative unity of the church in the face of the strong separatist movement which had developed among the Rumanians. He believed that Şaguna, who had always shown himself to be a faithful servant of the church, would, as a Rumanian, be an effective intermediary between the Serbian Metropolitan and his Rumanian flock.[28] Upon his recommendation Emperor Ferdinand I (1835-1848) appointed Şaguna general vicar of the Orthodox diocese in Transylvania on June 27, 1846.

Immediately upon his arrival in Sibiu at the beginning of September 1846, Şaguna plunged into the work of reform. In order that everything which he and his associates accomplished might endure, he insisted that his church be rebuilt on a solid constitutional base. Two goals seemed to him to be most pressing: first, to bring the government of his church into harmony with the canons of the Ecumenical Eastern Church, and, second, to normalize the relations between it and the state. Although he believed that Church and State had mutual obligations toward each other and that their co-operation was beneficial,[29] there were certain areas where only one or the other could legitimately act. As far as the church was concerned, within its special province lay all purely religious matters and the administration of its own institutions and property.[30]

Şaguna believed that he could accomplish his objectives and at the same time ensure the spiritual well-being of his people only through the restoration of the Orthodox Metropolis of Alba-Iulia.

A step toward the realization of this goal was the Emperor's appointment of Şaguna as Bishop of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania on February 5, 1848. Previous to this, on December 2, 1847, an electoral synod of the diocese had chosen three candidates for the office. Although Şaguna had stood third in the number of votes received, Ferdinand had selected him over his rivals. His success in carrying out two dangerous missions to calm the peasantry in the Munţii Apuseni in September 1846 and January 1847,[31] his

28. Lupaş, *Vieaţa şi faptele Şaguna*, 117, note 1.

29. Andreas von Schaguna, *Compendium des kanonischen Rechtes der einen, heiligen, allgemeinen und apostolischen Kirche* (Hermannstadt, 1868), 280-283.

30. *Ibid.*, 284-285; Andreiu de Şaguna, *Anthorismos, sau deslușire comparativă asupra brosurei "Dorinţele dreptcredincioşului cleru din Bucovina..."* (Sibiiu, 1861), 6.

31. Orzágos Levéltár, Budapest, Militär und Civil Gouvernement in Siebenbürgen, 1850: 9322, report of prefect of Zlatna, October 4, 1846; Cancellaria Transylvanico - Aulica,Acta generalia, 1846: 5562, Şaguna's report to the Transylvanian Chancellor, October 7, 1846; Gub. Trans.: Praesidialia, 1847:116. Allgemeines Verwaltugsarchiv, Vienna, Ministerium des Innern, Pras. Z. 140.852: Kurze Lebenskizze des Bischofs Schaguna.

strength of character, and the vigor with which he had pursued church reform had won him the support of the Transylvanian Chancellery and the Commander of Imperial Armies in Transylvania.[32] The attitude of the Court toward the Orthodox had changed significantly in the last decade; it was now anxious for them to have firm leadership as a guarantee against disorder in the troubled times through which Transylvania was then passing.

Upon learning of his appointment, Şaguna wrote immediately to Rajačić to express his gratitude for his support and to announce his intention of administering his diocese in strict conformity with canon law and the spirit of the times.[33] It is probable that Rajačić did not grasp the significance of this remark. Throughout his career Şaguna made certain that his actions conformed to the spirit of the times, and in 1848 that spirit was clearly nationalism. However sincere his feelings toward his friend and patron may have been, their paths inevitably diverged under its influence. No compromise was possible between the Serbian Metropolitan's insistence upon maintaining the administrative unity of the Orthodox Church in the Habsburg Monarchy—which to the Rumanians signified Serbian hegemony—and Şaguna's campaign for an independent Rumanian church organization.

Caught up in the political turmoil and civil war which blighted Transylvania between March 1848 and the fall of 1849, Şaguna had few occasions to pursue his plans for the Metropolis. Rumanian leaders generally were far too concerned with the achievement of their political objectives to risk the destruction of national unity which the sponsorship of sectarian religious programs might have caused.[34] Şaguna was obliged, therefore, to limit his interventions on behalf of the Metropolis to some behind-the-scenes maneuvring to obtain permission from the civil authorities to hold a diocesan synod[35] and to the inclusion in national petitions of appeals for the restoration of the "old Rumanian Metropolis," all to no avail.[36]

Following the suppression of the Magyar independence movement in August 1849, the victorious imperial government installed a despotic regime

---

32. Haus -, Hof -, und Staatsarchiv, Staatsratsakten, 246/239, 1848; 175/168, 1848.

33. Silviu Dragomir, "André Şaguna et Joseph Rajačić", *Balcania*, VI, 1943, 280: Şaguna to Rajačić, February 18, 1848.

34. Simeon Bărnuţiu, *Românii şi Ungurii. Discurs rostit în catedrala Blajului, 2(14) Maiu 1848*. Introduction and commentary by G. Bogdan-Duică, (Cluj, 1924), 43-44.

35. Ioan Lupaş, *Şaguna şi Eötvös* (Arad, 1913), 12ff.

36. T.V. Păcăţian, *Cartea de aur, sau luptele politice - naţionale ale Românilor de sub coroana ungară*, 8 v. (Sibiiu, 1904-1915), I, 330: Petition drawn up on the Field of Liberty at Blaj on May 16, 1848; I, 521: Petition of February 25, 1849 presented to Emperor Francis Joseph.

in Transylvania which discouraged all manifestations of national feeling. During the ensuing decade of absolutism, as the 1850's are usually designated, Şaguna's efforts on behalf of the Orthodox Metropolis were almost completely frustrated. On the one hand, the Court systematically promoted the interests of the Roman Catholic Church at the expense of the Protestant and Orthodox churches, for it continued to regard the former as an indispensable unifying force for the conglomerate realm. In Transylvania and the adjacent areas of the Banat the Rumanian Orthodox once again became the object of intensive Uniate proselytism. On the other hand, the Serbian hierarchy, led by Patriarch Rajačić,[37] flatly refused to consider any proposal which would weaken its control of the church and its ability to resist Roman Catholic pressures.

In the spring of 1850, the Governor of Transylvania, General Ludwig Wohlgemuth, unexpectedly gave Şaguna permission to convoke a diocesan synod for March 24. Pursuing the traditional Habsburg policy of divide and conquer and not at all concerned about Orthodox church affairs, he intended to use the Rumanians as a counterweight to the Saxons[38] and Magyars, who had been displaying too much independence of late.[39] In order to prevent the synod from becoming a forum for "nationalist agitation" he limited its membership to forty-four and instructed Şaguna to dispense with the usual parish elections and to choose the delegates himself.[40] He also appointed an observer with authority to dissolve the synod on the spot if its members strayed from religious to political discussions.[41]

In the face of such harassment the members of the synod displayed extraordinary courage. They demanded that their church be granted full equality with the other churches of Transylvania and that its constitutional status be brought into harmony with the canons of the Eastern Orthodox Church. They approved Şaguna's contention that the restoration of the Metropolis was a prerequisite for genuine national equality and must precede any reorganization of the diocese. When, therefore, a delegate proposed that the synod adopt forthwith a new constitution for the diocese, Şaguna immediately shut off debate, for he feared that under existing conditions the only constitution the government would approve would be one which gave it broad pow-

37. The Austrian government had raised the Serbian Metropolis of Carlovitz to the rank of a Patriarchate in 1848.

38. The name by which the Germans of Transylvania were generally known.

39. *Memoriile Arhiepiscopului şi Mitropolitului Andrei Şaguna din anii 1846-1871* (Sibiu, 1923), 42.

40. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 62.

41. *Ibid.*, 64-65.

ers to interfer in church affairs. He did not wish to make this a permanent feature of church government.[42] On April 10, the synod drew up a petition to the Emperor containing its recommendations and then adjourned. Thus ended the first Orthodox diocesan synod in Transylvania in 150 years. Owing to the boldness with which its members had discussed their grievances, ten more years were to elapse before another was permitted to assemble.

The enthusiastic support which the synod had given the Metropolis encouraged Şaguna to pursue the matter at the Conference of Orthodox Bishops, which opened in Vienna on October 15, 1850. The Austrian government had convoked it for the purpose of defining the status of the Orthodox Church within the new absolutist system. Before going to Vienna Şaguna had discussed the restoration of the Metropolis with Rumanian lay and church leaders in Hungary, Bukovina, and the Banat and had found them eager to be included in it.[43] At the Vienna Conference, on November 5, he proposed that all the Rumanian Orthodox of the Habsburg Monarchy—not just those in Transylvania— be incorporated in the new Metropolis. Well aware of Rajačić's concern for church unity, he was quick to point out that although the new body would have its own hierarchy and would be administratively independent of the Serbian Patriarchate, both churches would, in fact, be united by the strong bonds of a common dogma and tradition. A separate Rumanian Metropolis, he asserted, was in complete harmony with both canon law, which provided that each nationality should have a church of its own, and the imperial constitution of March 4, 1849, which guaranteed equality to all the peoples of the Empire.[44]

Patriarch Rajačić, the chairman of the Conference, postponed further consideration of Şaguna's project until March 23, 1851. By this time all hope for an agreement had been abandoned as both men indulged in bitter recriminations. Şaguna objected strenuously to Ragačić's assumption of the title "Patriarch of the Eastern Church in the Austrian Empire" and to his proposal to establish a single printing press at Carlovitz for all Orthodox reli-

42. Mateiu, *Contribuţiuni*, 209.

43. *Ibid.*, 106; *Memoriile...Şaguna*, 45; Nicolae Popea, *Memorialul Archiepiscopului şi Mitropolitului Andreiu baron de Şaguna, sau luptele naţionale politice ale Românilor, 1846 - 1873*, I (Sibiu, 1889), 385-389; A. Schaguna, "Tagebuch über die bischöflichen Berathungen in Wien," in Ilarion Puşcariu, *Documente pentru limba şi istoriă*, 2 v. (Sibiiu, 1889-1897), I, 293.

44. Andreas Schaguna, *Promemoria über das historische Recht der nationalen Kirchen - Authonomie der Romanen morgenländ. Kirche in den k.k. Kronländern der österreich. Monarchie* (Wien, 1849); Andreas Schaguna, *Anhang zu der Promemoria...* (Hermannstadt, 1850); Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Ministerium für Cultus und Unterricht, Cult 1311/86, April 20, 1851.

gious publications.[45] Rajačić, in turn, published anonymously a violent attack on Şaguna in which he accused him of wanting to destroy the unity of the Orthodox Church out of a desire for personal gain.[46] He also tried to play upon the nationalist phobias of the Court by suggesting that the establishment of a Rumanian Metropolis would merely be the prelude to the formation of a Daco-Rumanian state embracing the two Danubian principalities as well as the Rumanians of the Empire.[47] So bitter had relations between Şaguna and Rajačić become that Rajačić failed to invite Şaguna to the session at which the Rumanian Metropolis was discussed.[48]

Since the Conference had lasted much longer than anyone had anticipated and had accomplished precious little the bishops were impatient to return to their dioceses. On July 2, 1851, Rajačić, for unknown reasons, abruptly left Vienna, and the Conference perforce came to an end.

During the rest of the decade of absolutism the question of the Metropolis remained dormant. It was only in 1860, after Francis Joseph had decided to abandon absolutism in favor of moderate constitutionalism as a means of preserving his dynasty's position at home and abroad, that Şaguna felt sufficiently encouraged to resume his efforts on behalf of the Metropolis. He had strong support for the Metropolis from laymen as well as the clergy. The former regarded the inclusion of all the Rumanian Orthodox of the Empire in one central organization such as the Metropolis as an important step toward that national unity which they had failed to achieve in 1848. This objective was not foreign to Şaguna either, for as early as March 5, 1849, he had suggested in a petition to Francis Joseph that true national equality could be achieved only by the elimination of existing territorial boundaries and by the regrouping of the various peoples of the Empire around some "central point" (*Mittelpunkt)* such as the church.[49]

During the 1850's relations between Şaguna and the Serbian hierarchy had remained cool. Serbian dominance of the church had become an intolerable burden to Rumanian clergy and laity alike. They regarded it as the chief obstacle to the spiritual and cultural development of their people,[50] for they were convinced that the Serbian hierarchy was employing church endowments

45. Schaguna, *Tagebuch*, 276-277.

46. *Antwort auf die Angriffe einiger Romanen und der Presse gegen die Einheit der Hierarchie der Mongerländischen Kirche* (Wien, 1851).

47. Popea, *Archiepiscopul*, 129; *Memoriile...Şaguna*, 56.

48. Schaguna, *Tagebuch*, 293.

49. Mihail Popescu, *Documente inedite privitoare la istoria Transilvaniei între 1848-1859* (Bucureşti, 1929), 34.

50. Andreiu Baronu de Siaguna, *Proiectu de unu Regulamentu pentru organisarea tre-*

and income for purely Serbian projects and were denying the Rumanians their rightful share of these funds.[51]

It was under these adverse circumstances that Şaguna resumed relations with Rajačić at the meetings of the *Verstärkter Reichsrat*, which Francis Joseph had convoked in Vienna from May to September 1860 to study the constitutional reorganization of the Empire. Şaguna tried to persuade Rajačić that a Rumanian Metropolis would be in complete harmony with the Orthodox principle that the church of any given people should be administratively independent of the churches of all other peoples. By its very nature, he pointed out, the Eastern Church was national, for it recognized the right of every nationality to use its language in the worship service and in church government and to have the latter conform to its own traditions and practices.[52] Andrei Mocsonyi, a wealthy landowner representing the Rumanians of the Banat and one of Şaguna's most ardent supporters, proposed that the question of the Metropolis be settled at a general church synod at which each diocese would be represented in proportion to its population.[53] Since the Rumanians outnumbered the Serbs by more than two-to-one, the result, as Mocsonyi well knew, would have been approval of the Metropolis.

As before, these arguments made no impression upon Rajačić. At two meetings with Şaguna and Rumanian leaders from the Banat and Bukovina on June 28 and 30, he refused even to discuss a separate Rumanian Metropolis. Instead he explained his own plans for the further centralization of church government, which, if adopted, would have had all bishops elected by the synod of Carlovitz and would have made their dioceses administratively and financially subordinate to the Patriarch.[54] There can be no doubt that Ragačić was genuinely concerned about the welfare of his church, but, at the same time, there is strong evidence that he was pursuing a Serbian national policy. For example,early in 1860, he petitioned the Minister of Religion in Vienna to establish within his ministry a separate department for Orthodox affairs and to staff it with "national co-religionists," by which he meant Serbs. He also suggested that the name of the "Wallachian (Rumanian)-Banat" border regiment be changed to "Serbian-Banat."[55]

---

biloru bisericesci, şcolare, şi fundaţionale romane de relegea greco-orientale în Statele austriace (Sibiiu, 1864), 9; Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 180.

51. Puşcariu, *Documente*, I. 379.

52. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 26, 179.

53. Lupaş, *Vieaţa şi faptele Şaguna*, 229.

54. Schaguna, *Tagebuch*, 331.

55. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Minister Conferenz Kanzlei, K.Z. 2800.60; M. C.Z. 578.

Convinced that Serbian leaders would never of their own volition agree to the restoration of the Rumanian Metropolis, Şaguna decided to place the whole matter before the Emperor. On August 21, 1860, he submitted a lengthy petition in which he argued that the pretensions of the Serbian hierarchy to suppremacy over the Rumanian Orthodox lacked both canonical and historical justification. He cited the records of the Ecumenical Eastern Church to prove that a Rumanian Orthodox Metropolis had existed in Transylvania at least as early as 1391, when the Patriarch of Constantinople placed the diocese of Munkacs under its jurisdiction, and pointed out that King Mathias and King Vladislav of Hungary in 1479 and 1491, respectively, had issued diplomas granting the Rumanian Metropolis full recognition. After the House of Habsburg had added Transylvania to its possessions the Metropolis continued to have an independent existence until its head signed the Act of Union in 1700. The last two Metropolitans Teofil (1693-1697) and Atanasie Anghel (1697-1700), in accordance with ancient custom, went to Bucharest, not to Carlovitz, for their consecration. After 1700 the Metropolis ceased to function owing to the adversity of the times rather than to any piece of lay or church legislation. Its subordination to Carlovitz was the result of a political act and was, consequently, illegal from the standpoint of canon law. Therefore, he concluded, the Emperor himself could terminate this abnormal situation by a simple decree.[56]

Francis Joseph replied on September 27, that he was "not disinclined" toward the establishment of a Rumanian "non-united"[57] Metropolis, but made the final settlement of the question dependent upon favorable action by a synod of bishops.[58] He also gave Şaguna permission to convoke a diocesan synod for the purpose of sounding out opinion on the Metropolis.

The synod, the first since 1850, was held on October 24-26, 1860. The delegates drew up a petition to the Emperor which repeated all the arguments already adduced in support of the Metropolis. Gaging accurately the conservative disposition of the Court, they argued that their people were not seeking something new but merely a return to conditions as they had existed before 1700. They suggested that the Serbian overlordship was so repugnant to them that an impasse might arise in Transylvania similar to that in Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina where Greeks dominated predominantly Slavic churches.[59]

56. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 166-167.
57. The term used in place of "Orthodox" by Austrian officials.
58. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 167-168.
59. *Ibid.*, 172.

Although much encouraged by the changed attitude of the Court, Şaguna still faced formidable obstacles. Not the least of these was the ponderous ways of the Austrian bureaucracy with its multiplicity of councils and chancelleries and its delight in paperwork. In addition, the Roman Catholic and Uniate hierarchies used all their influence at Court to prevent the strengthening of Orthodoxy.[60] Metropolitan Alexander Şterca Suluţiu of the Uniate Church in Transylvania and the Papal Nuncio in Vienna protested repeatedly against the creation of an Orthodox Metropolis on the grounds that it would have a harmful effect on the progress of the Union.[61]

In the early sixties a serious division occurred within the ranks of the Orthodox themselves. Eugene Hacman, Bishop of Bukovina since 1835, had at first favored the establishment of a single Rumanian Orthodox Metropolis for the Empire as a means of escaping from Serbian jurisdiction, but now demanded that his own bishopric be raised to the rank of a Metropolis. His change of heart was owing partly to personal ambition and partly to the presence in Bukovina of a large Ruthenian minority.[62] Hacman argued that the Ruthenians could not very well be included in a Rumanian Metropolis and that if they were, they might decide, in protest, to join the Uniate Church in Bukovina, which was almost completely Ruthenian.[63] The majority of Hacman's clergy sided with him, but influential lay leaders such as the intensely nationalist Hurmuzachi family supported Şaguna, for they regarded a single Metropolis as an important preliminary to some form of political unification. Hacman disregarded these views, for, he declared, "The church does not concern itself with such matters; the Kingdom of Christ is not of this world."[64] Şaguna invoked canon law and appealed to Hacman's patriotic sentiments, but without success.[65]

The death of Rajačić on December 13, 1861, removed a major obstacle to the creation of the Metropolis. Rumanian leaders in the Banat, led by Andrei Mocsonyi, were quick to take advantage of the inevitable confusion within the Serbian hierarchy. At a conference in Timişoara on January 21,1862,

---

60. *Ibid.*, 207.

61. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Kabinettskanzlei, Z. 1895. 862.

62. Menachem Beir Safran, *Die inneren und kulturellen Verhaeltnisse in der Bukowina (1825-1861)*, (Botoşani, 1939), 156; In 1848, the population of Bukovina was: 208,293 Ru- and 108,907 Ruthenians. I. Nistor, *Românii şi Rutenii în Bucovina* I (Bucureşti, 1915), 150.

63. *Ibid*,. 88-89; Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 187-188.

64. Eugen Hakman, *Nationale und kirchliche Bestrebungen der Rumänen in der Bukowina, 1848-1865*, p. 199, cited by I. Nistor, *Istoria bisericii din Bucovina* (Bucureşti, 1916), 89.

65. Şaguna, *Anthorismos*, 6-13, 22-32.

they invited Şaguna to lead a delegation to Vienna to present a new petition on behalf of the Metropolis. They also urged Rumanian churchmen not to participate in the Serbian National Congress which was scheduled to meet soon to choose a successor to Rajačić.[66] Şaguna accepted their invitation and on March 8 arrived in Vienna at the head of the largest Rumanian delegation ever to appear in that city.[67] They presented their petition—a summary of earlier arguments, canonical and historical, on behalf of the Metropolis—to Archduke Rainer on March 15.[68] A few days later most of the delegates departed for home, but Şaguna, Mocsonyi, and Eudoxiu Hurmuzachi from Bukovina stayed behind to discuss the Metropolis with high officials and with Francis Joseph himself after his return from a holiday in Venice.

The Emperor and his ministers were on the whole favorably disposed to the creation of a Rumanian Metropolis, which was, in fact, the subject of of numerous meetings of the Council of State and of the Council of Ministers in 1862 and 1863. Anton von Schmerling, the Minister President, and Count Franz Nadasdy, the Transylvanian Chancellor, favored it for political reasons. They needed the support of the Rumanians to ensure the success of the new constitutional experiment in Transylvania begun in 1860 and to overcome the stubborn resistance of the Magyars to it. They were counting upon Şaguna to rally his people behind it and believed that approval of the Metropolis would assure them of his support.[69] They and most of their colleagues accepted Transylvania and the Rumanian districts of Hungary and the Banat was the nucleus of the Metropolis, but decided that Bukovina, on account of its mixed population and the opposition of the clergy to inclusion in Şaguna's Metropolis, merited special treatment.[70] They were also anxious not to offend Uniate sensibilities and in order to make the Orthodox Metropolis more palatable proposed that the salaries of the clergy be raised and that more schools be built.[71] These matters could be attended to later; the critical political situation required the immediate implementation of Şaguna's project.

On June 25, 1863, Francis Joseph informed Şaguna that he had approved the recommendations of his ministers concerning the Metropolis, but

66. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 193-194.

67. Popea, *Vechi'a Metropolia*, 218-219.

68. *Ibid.*, 219-226.

69. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Kabinettsarchiv, Kabinettskanzlei, K.Z. 4072/1862, M.R.Z. 1093. Protocol II; K.Z. 214.863, M.R.Z. 1115.

70. *Ibid.*, Kabinettsarchiv, Kabinettskanzlei, K.Z. 4072/1862; K.Z. 214.863.

71. *Ibid.*

reminded him that the final resolution of the question would depend upon a prior agreement with the Serbian hierarchy.[72]

After a three-year delay the Serbian National Congress met on August, 5, 1864 to elect a successor to Rajačić. Its choice was Samuel Maširević, Bishop of Vršac. No Rumanian delegates participated in the election because they considered it strictly a Serbian affair. Instead, on August 1, Rumanian representatives from the dioceses of Arad, Vršac, and Timişoara made an impassioned plea to the Imperial Commissioner, Baron Iosif Philippovics, for the separation of the Rumanian from the Serbian church[73].

A synod of bishops met three weeks after the election of Maširević to settle the question of the Rumanian Metropolis. Its recommendations were to have little effect on the course of events, for on August 13, Francis Joseph had already informed Maširević of his desire to have a separate Metropolis established for the Rumanians of the Empire. The new Patriarch had no choice but to accept the inevitable, but this did not prevent a bitter confrontation between Rumanians and Serbs at the synod. In lengthy speeches each side cited canon law and history to buttress its position. Şaguna insisted that the final decision rested with the Emperor, while the Serbian bishops clung stubbornly to the view that the episcopal synod was the proper place to settle the affairs of the church.[74] In order to satisfy Serbian demands for the maintenance of Orthodox unity in the Empire Şaguna proposed that a general synod of bishops be created and that it meet periodically under the alternaing chairmanship of the two Metropolitans; that the protocols of these meettings be drawn up in Rumanian and Serbian; and that Carlovitz and Sibiu alternate as places of meeting. The Serbian bishops refused to consider these proposals and demanded instead that Şaguna recognize the precedence of the Serbian Patriarch and of Carlovitz and accept Slavonic as the official common language of the church. To this Şaguna replied simply that his people were too intensely concerned with their national development to accept such limitations.[75]

Under pressure from Baron Philippovics, who was serving here also as Imperial Commissioner, the synod finally agreed to the separation of the two hierarchies, but so great had the hostility between Serb and Rumanian be-

72. *Ibid.*, Kabinettskanzlei, K.Z. 4073.862, M.R.Z. 1437; ad 4073.862.

73. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 223.

74. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Unterrichts Ministerium, Prot. 6067: telegram from Philippovics to the Emperor's adjutant, August 26, 1864.

75. *Ibid.*

come that it could reach no decision on the boundaries of the new Metropolis or on the division of church property.[76]

Approval by the synod had removed the last formal obstacle to the restoration of the Metropolis, but owing to bureaucratic complications almost three months elapsed before Francis Joseph made known his final decision. Şaguna had hoped that a Rumanian church congress would be allowed to bring the Metropolis into being and to elect the Metropolitan, subject only to the Emperor's confirmation, but Francis Joseph reserved for himself the right to announce creation of the Metropolis and to appoint the first Metropolitan.[77] Finally, on December 24, 1864, he informed Şaguna that he had approved the establishment of the Metropolis with its see in Sibiu and had appointed him Metropolitan. Şaguna had long before acquiesced in the loss of Bukovina, but had hoped that four bishoprics — Transylvania and Arad, already in existence, and two new ones, Timişoara and Caransebeş — would compose the Metropolis. Francis Joseph allowed three — Transylvania and the Rumanian districts of Arad and Caransebeş. He left the question of church boundaries and property to direct negotiations between Rumanians and Serbs, and instructed Maširević to convoke a Serbian National Congress at Carlovitz for that purpose as soon as possible.

The Congress opened on February 18, 1865, but Şaguna and his thirteen-member delegation did not at once participate in it. Instead, they waited, in accordance with the Emperor's instructions to Maširević, for the Serbs to elect a committee to negotiate with them. The Serbs procrastinated until March 17, when a royal commissioner, sent especially from Vienna, ordered them to begin negotiations with the Rumanians forthwith.[78]

Şaguna proposed that his Metropolis be assigned 500,000 florins, about one quarter of the total, from the endowments and other property of the church and four monasteries, Bezdin, Hodoş, Mesici, and Sîngeorz. He promised that he would use these resources solely to enable the church to fulfil its spiritual mission and not to promote the interests of one nationality at the expence of another. He disclaimed any desire to people the four monasteries exclusively with Rumanians, and promised that merit alone would be the criterion for admission and that both Rumanian and Serbian would be used in the holy liturgy. Finally, he urged the Serbian prelates to compa-

76. *Ibid.*, Unterrichts Ministerium, Prot. 6391: Report of Philippovics, September 7 1864; Popea, *Vechi'a Metropolia*, 278.

77. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Jüngerer Staatsrat, Z. 972; Kabinettskanzlei, K.Z. 3848/864, M.R.Z. 1535.

78. Ilarion Puşcariu, "Spicuiri şi fragmente din corespondenţa lui Şaguna," in *Mitropolitul Andreiu baron de Şaguna. Scriere comemorativă* (Sibiiu, 1909), 489.

re the prosperity of their church with the poverty of the diocese of Transylvania and then to ask themselves whether the cause of Orthodoxy would not be greatly strengthened by granting his modest requests.[79]

By arguing that church endowments and monasteries had not been created to assist Serbs or Rumanians in their worldly endeavors, Şaguna sought to de-emphasize the national aspect of the problem, but it was obvious to all concerned that the transfer of money and property to the new Metropolis would contribute greatly to the progress of Rumanian education and culture. Also, Şaguna did not hesitate to use nationality to support his clains. For example, he argued that the monasteries of Bezdin and Sîngeorz had been founded in the sixteenth century long before the Metropolis of Carlovitz had come into existence (1690); that they had been intended for Rumanian Christians; and that they were situated in the midst of large Rumanian populations.[80] The Serbs, in turn, claimed that the property and endowments in question were possessions of the Serbian nation.[81] Since, according to their calculations, the Rumanian contribution to the common property of the church amounted to only 43,000 florins, they should be content with 100,000 florins. After much discussion they raised their offer to 200,000 and the Rumanians lowered their demands to 400,000. Neither side would make further concessions, and the Serbs absolutely refused to discuss the monasteries.[82] On March 20, after three days of futile negotiations, the Rumanian delegation left Carlovitz for home.

On July 15, 1865, Francis Joseph approved the final act which separated the Rumanian from the Serbian hierarchy and recognized the dioceses of Arad and Caransebeş as fully constituted. Şaguna regarded this as the date when the Metropolis officially came into being[83] and made plans to convoke a synod whose task it would be to draw up a constitution for the Metropolis. Owing to drastic political changes, he was unable to proceed for almost three years.

Between 1865 and 1867 the Austrian Empire passed through a period of crisis which eventually resulted in the creation of the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy in 1867. Since Transylvania and the Banat lay within the Hun-

79. Patriarchal-Metropolitan Archive "B", Sremski Karlovci, Nr. 16, excerpt from the petition of the Rumanian delegation to the royal commissioner, March 6, 1865; Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 337-339.

80. *Ibid.*, 342.

81. Patriarchal-Metropolitan Archive "B", Sremski Karlovci, Nr. 34 (1864), Nr. 10 (1865).

82. Puşcariu, *Mitropolia*, Acte, 331-333.

83. *Telegraful Român* (Sibiu), May 2/14, 1865.

garian half of the Monarchy and since the sole legal basis for the existence of the Metropolis was the Emperor's *billet de main* of December 24,1864, Şaguna was obliged to seek recognition of it from the new Hungarian government. He benefitted greatly from the good will of his friend from university days, Joseph Eötvös, the liberal Minister of Religion and Education, who guided the desired legislation through the Hungarian diet.[84] The so-called Article of Law IX of 1868, which Francis Joseph sanctioned on June 24, 1868, extended full recognition to the Rumanian Orthodox Metropolis and granted it the right to manage its own religious and educational affairs and to control all endowments and other church property. In this way Şaguna finally achieved that independence and equality for which he had struggled unceasingly since his installation as bishop twenty years before.

The enactment of Article of Law IX made possible the convocation of the first National Church Congress of the Rumanian Metropolis, which met in Sibiu from September 28 to October 19, 1868. Its most significant achievement was the adoption of a constitution for the Metropolis, the so-called *Statutul Organic*, which Francis Joseph sanctioned on May 28, 1869.

The final act in the restoration of the Metropolis occured on October 6, 1871, when the Serbian hierarchy finally agreed to a division of church property. It retained jurisdiction over the monasteries, but agreed to turn over to the Rumanian Metropolis endowments and property to the value of 300, 000 florins.[85]

The restoration of the Metropolis was an event of major significance in the history of the Rumanian Orthodox of the Habsburg Monarchy. In the first place, it provided them with an orderly and canonical administration of their church affairs, which, in turn, facilitated the development of their national culture. In the second place, it constituted an important center of resistance to the Magyarization campaigns of the 1880's and 1890's. Lacking political institutions of their own or a national territory within the Monarchy, the Rumanians were able to make good use of the governing bodies of the church, particularly of the synods from the parish to the diocesan level, to marshal their resources against those who would deprive them of their nationality.

Wake Forest College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

KEITH HITCHINS

84. Haus—, Hof—, und Staatsarchiv, Kabinettskanzlei, K.Z. 651.868; ad 651.868.

85. Patriarchal-Metropolitan Archive "A", Sremski Karlovci, Nr. 486, September 8, 1871; Nr. 542, October 6, 1871.