



Bosko M. Branković*

University of Banja Luka
Faculty of Philosophy

Sandra Lukić**

University of Banja Luka
Faculty of Philosophy

Оригинални научни рад

УДК 271.2-472:323.1(497.15)

DOI 10.7251/SIC2205056B

METROPOLITAN MIHAILO (JOVANOVIĆ) AND PROVINCES OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Abstract: *The authors of this article examine the relations of Metropolitan Mihailo (Jovanović) of Belgrade with the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Recognizing the fact that the Metropolitan was supportive for the idea of liberation of all Serbs from Ottoman rule and their unification in one single nation state, the Ottoman ruled provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina were, without exception, the focus of his attention and actions. He especially proved this during the Serb uprisings in the periods 1852–1862, 1875–1878 and in 1882. Politically, the Metropolitan supported co-operation with Russia. As such his determination in the period when Serbia was relying on Austro-Hungary caused him difficulties, resulting in his dismissal in 1881. After return to Serbia he was reappointed as Metropolitan in 1889 and continued his work for nationhood, but did so by paying attention to Old Serbia and Macedonia rather than to the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina.*

Key words: *Mihailo (Jovanović), Serbia, the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, politics, church, Ottoman Empire, Austro-Hungary*

* bosko.brankovic@ff.unibl.org

** sandra.lukic@ff.unibl.org

The social, economic and political crisis that the Ottoman Empire faced from the end of the 17th century, and through the entire 18th and 19th centuries, resulted in a decline of central power over all the territories that it held, including the Eyalet of Bosnia. In order to preserve the system by which it administered its Empire, the central power struggled throughout the 18th and first half of the 19th century to implement, more or less, successful reforms to sustain the Empire's functions. The reforms were also implemented in the Eyalet of Bosnia, but provoked protests of the Muslim feudal lords who belonged to conservative Muslim groups.¹ It was in this political climate that by the middle of the 19th century the strongly held idea for the unification of the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Serbia developed in the Eyalet of Bosnia. The Šabac based Bishop Mihailo (Jovanović)² was well informed about the uprising in Herzegovina in the middle of the 19th century. He was one of crucial persons acting as a liaison between the Serb rebels and the Government in Belgrade, even though over time disagreements arose between the Bishop³ and the Government regarding the future direction of the uprising.⁴ In the same period, after the political defeat of Austria's Chancellor Klemens von Metternich, Vienna became more interested in the Balkans. And recognizing that military circles were the dominant influence in the Habsburg house, their stance was that the Ottoman provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina should not be shared with Serbia, but rather fully integrated within the Monarchy.⁵

During the uprising in Herzegovina between 1852 and 1862 the Austrians gave great attention to the activities of Mihailo as Bishop and also later when he became Metropolitan of Belgrade. They regarded him to be the main connec-

¹ D. Nikić, „Bosna u političkim planovima Srbije s kraja XIX i na početku XX veka“ (Doktorska disertacija: Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1987), 1–6.

² Mihailo (Jovanović) was appointed as the Šabac based Bishop in 1854. P. M. Грујић, *Православна српска црква* (Београд, Крагујевац: Евро, Каленић, 1995), 151.

³ Bishop Mihailo was a huge Russophile. He displayed this publicly in 1856 during the visit of the Russian general consul to Serbia when he sanctified the flag of Russia in front of the Consulate in Belgrade. Љ. П. Ристић, *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)* (Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, 2008), 61.

⁴ Д. Берић, *Устанак у Херцеговини 1852–1862* (Београд – Нови Сад: САНУ, Удружење Срба из Херцеговине у Војводини, 1994), 171.

⁵ В. Ћоровић, *Борба за независност Балкана* (Београд: Логос арт, 2007), 94; 96.

tion of the rebels with the Serbian Government, as well as with Russian circles in the Balkans and with Serbian public opinion. Their goal was to disable the Metropolitan's activities in providing a link between the rebels and the Serb political leadership in the Danube region and halt the increasing politicization of Serb public support for the uprising.⁶

The Austrians were not wrong in their assessment. During his visit to Vienna in 1859, Prince Mihailo Obrenović spoke with the Russian ambassador Viktor Petrovich Balabin and emphasized the Turkish violence over the Serbs in the Ottoman provinces along the border with Serbia. He specified that this was an issue of concern that Serbia wished to resolve permanently. Balabin's response was to request Prince Mihailo to convey a message from Russia to the Serb leadership in the provinces, asking them for more patience. This especially referred to Bosnia, where people of Šabac's based Bishop Mihailo were expected to deliver the message notifying people there to prepare for an uprising which would be supported not only by Serbia, but also by Russia and by France.⁷

During March of 1859 intensive efforts were made in raising the aspirations of Muslims in Bosnia against the state power, in which, as could be seen, the Bishop played an active part. Kosta Cukić wrote about this to Miloje Lešjanin on March 20th/April 1st 1859, stressing the hypocrisy of Serbian state politics: *This can be seen from the fact that the old politics of the uprising inhibition and expectancy that the events would themselves do something for the Serbian Government and its interests in Bosnia was still in effect during the month of March. In the instruction from March 20th, it was said that "Through Bishop Mihailo and other known people we have to tell Bosniacs who ask for help from us against those criminals, the Turks, who are not obeying the emperor, that they should be peaceful for some time and only submit complaints. Those who are afraid from being killed should run. We should not take away their hope in Serbia, which will certainly help them and fully release them"*.⁸

⁶ Д. Берић, *Устанак у Херцеговини 1852–1862*, 343–344.

⁷ Љ. П. Ристић, *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)*, 143.

⁸ Д. Берић, *Устанак у Херцеговини 1852–1862*, 572.

However, in the same months of March and early April the Serbian Government was working on settling the uprising in Herzegovina. The role of the Šabac based Bishop was significant in this process since he enjoyed huge respect among leaders of the uprising. In that regard Bishop Mihailo told the British delegate in April that it would not be possible to end the uprising without satisfaction of the basic Christian requests. In particular was the need to resolve the agrarian issue in the Ottoman provinces, which represented a major cause of social difficulties for the Serb people.⁹

Mihailo became Metropolitan of Belgrade on July 25th 1859. His appointment followed the forced resignation of Metropolitan Petar (Jovanović).¹⁰ According to the British consul in Belgrade, Thomas de Grenier de Fonblanque, this development meant Russian influence in Serbia was strengthened.¹¹ De Fonblanque's assessment proved accurate. With Mihailo's appointment as the Head of the Serbian Church he became the central figure of Panslavistic propaganda in the Balkans,¹² as well as for the national fight for liberation and union of all Serbs, who were under foreign rule in the Serb state. His keen interest in the situation in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina was in accordance with the politics of Serbia toward these Ottoman provinces at that time. The idea was to work through church organization for an uprising of the entire Serb people living outside out of Serbia, their home country.¹³

In the last months of 1859 and early 1860 an attempt was made to organize an uprising by the people in Bosnia. Metropolitan Mihailo was known to be one of the main initiators of this idea. Commencing in the second half of 1859 the Serbian Government in Belgrade, using confidential channels, asked Russia to approve the establishment of a private organization, which would not have public relations with the Government in Belgrade, but would act in the territories of Greece, Bulgaria, the Danubian Principalities, Austria, Macedonia and

⁹ Ibid, 573–574.

¹⁰ Р. М. Грујић, *Православна српска црква*, 151.

¹¹ Љ. П. Ристић, *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)*, 151.

¹² Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Историја српске православне цркве*, књ. 2 (Београд: ЈРП, 2002), 384–385.

¹³ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије* (Минхен: Искра, 1980), 506–507; М. Војводић, „Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић“, *Историјски записи*, 1–2 (2000), 154.

Bosnia and Herzegovina and be headed by either Serbia's Prince Miloš or Prince Mihailo. Russia was also requested to assist in starting the uprising in Bosnia. It is more than likely that Metropolitan Mihailo and Serbia's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Cvetko Rajović, were creators of this plan. This is based on Austrian intelligence, which emphasized their connections with merchants in Vinkovci and Vukovar, as well as notable links with merchants in Bulgaria. For example were the messages sent by Metropolitan Mihailo that: *Serbs do not sleep but they are preparing seriously to settle accounts with Turkey.*¹⁴ Further, in July 1860 a work program in the form of a public manifesto, written without the knowledge of the Serbian Government, predicted liberation of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina from Ottoman rule and in August *The Serbian-Bosnian Committee* was established with a secret patron, but who was known to be Bishop Mihailo. Other members were: Matija Ban, Zarija Kurtić, Dimitrije Golubović and Niko Okan. The idea in forming the *Committee* was that it would provide the conditions for launching and maintaining the uprising in Bosnia and as a means to involve Serbia and Russia indirectly in assisting the uprising.¹⁵

It is hard to believe that the Serbian Government did not know about this *Committee* and its ideas having in mind that Dimitrije Golubović held the position of Administrative Department Secretary of the Prince's Office and Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.¹⁶ From 1859 and throughout the 1860's Prince Mihailo and Ilija Garašanin were engaged in activities with the goal of recruiting European public and diplomatic circles in supporting the liberation of Serb people from Ottoman rule. Garašanin was running secret propaganda through the *Serbian Committee*, especially in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹⁷ In 1866, just prior to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, Garašanin discussed the status of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Josip Juraj Štrossmajer. Štrossmajer accepted that in case of a breakdown of the Habsburg's house Croatia would create a union not with Hungary, but with Serbia in which case

¹⁴ Д. Берић, *Устанак у Херцеговини 1852–1862*, 641.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 650–651.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 650.

¹⁷ Ч. Попов, „Међународни положај, спољна политика и дипломатија Србије 1804–1878“, У: *Два века модерне српске дипломатије* (Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, 2013), 48.

the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina would belong to Serbia.¹⁸ However, this agreement failed following a meeting between Prince Mihailo and the Hungarian Prime Minister Gyula Andrassy in August 1867. Their agreement was for Serbia to abandon active politics in the Balkans and, in return, Austro–Hungary would persuade the Ottoman Empire to peacefully handover the two provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbia to govern.¹⁹ Although it seemed that Serbia and the Ottoman Empire might reach an agreement over the two provinces, Austro-Hungary was alert to reconciling its own interests and those of Serbia on what the future of the provinces should be. Vienna did not hide its intentions to pursue control of the Balkans, despite the 1867 agreement between Prime Minister Andrassy and Prince Mihailo.²⁰ As such in 1870 Vienna was more assertive on what had been agreed three years earlier. It directly offered Serbia to share the Bosnia and Herzegovina provinces between themselves. The real motive of Vienna behind this proposal, however, was to estrange Serbia from Russia and to align it to Austro–Hungary, and assume at the same time this would weaken Serbia’s political and propaganda activities in both provinces.²¹

Metropolitan Mihailo understood the official game of Vienna very well. In March 1868, based upon his idea for the church organizations to launch an uprising of the entire Serb people living outside of Serbia, he sent a proposal to Ministry of Education and Church Affairs asking that a Committee be established to improve education in the Serb territories under Ottoman rule.²² In it he specified that a special department be created within the Belgrade Seminary for students from the Ottoman Empire, since upon their graduation priests and teachers from that area would be fully occupied after return home. Due to the death of Prince Mihailo in June 1868, the Metropolitan did not receive a re-

¹⁸ Ibid, 49–50.

¹⁹ Ibid, 50.

²⁰ В. Ћоровић, *Борба за независност Балкана*, 95.

²¹ D. Nikić, *Bosna u političkim planovima Srbije s kraja XIX i na početku XX veka*, 14.

²² Metropolitan Mihailo had earlier worked on improving the education of Serb people in Bosnia. He had intense correspondence with Vaso Pelagić in the period 1866 to 1869 regarding the work of the Seminary in Banja Luka. The first school textbooks needed for that newly opened Seminary in 1866 were sent from Belgrade to Banja Luka personally by Metropolitan Mihailo. Д. Страњаковић, „Васа Пелагић и митрополит Михаило (преписка и документи)“, *Живот*, год. III, св. 19, књ. IV (1954), 260.

spouse and the future politics of Serbia, mainly advocated by Jovan Ristić, was focused on the area of Old Serbia under Ottoman rule. Nevertheless, in August that year the Metropolitan's plan was adopted and soon after *The Committee for schools and teachers in Old Serbia, Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina* was established. The Metropolitan was dominant in leading its work with others prominent individuals Nićifor Dučić, Panta Srećković and Miloš Milojević. A range of achievements denoted the Committee's contribution, mainly in the area of Old Serbia²³ and Bosnia and Herzegovina, constructing and opening schools, obtaining financial aid, providing books and teachers and funding the building of new churches.²⁴

In the early 1870's the situation in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina became linked to an expectation that Serbia and Montenegro would liberate and associate those provinces with themselves. Serbian and Montenegrin propaganda contributed to this since it had proved to be very successful in these provinces.²⁵ Very often discussions between Serbian and Austro-Hungarian diplomats on the destiny of these provinces at the end of the 1860's and early seventies caused the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina fear and hope

²³ Since his arrival in Prizren in 1866 Ilija Stavrić (1844–1879) was very effective in works of national significance. Sima Igumanov was regularly informing the Metropolitan about this. В. Бован, „Срби из Босне и Херцеговине – просветни и национални радници у Старој Србији од шездесетих година XIX века до краја турске владавине (Илија Ставрић у Призрену)“, *Зборник за историју Босне и Херцеговине*, 6 (2009), 97–98.

²⁴ М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 154–155; М. Екмечић, „Српски народ у Турској од средине XIX века до 1878.“, у: *Историја српског народа*, V–1 (Београд: СКА, 1994), 499; В. Milošević, S. Lukić, „The Serbian orthodox church and Serbian education in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the last century of ottoman rule“, *Istraživanja – Journal of historical researches*, 31 (2020), 141; В. Стојанчевић, „Улога митрополита Михаила у помагању ослободилачког покрета Срба у Турској“, у: *Живот и дело митрополита Михаила (1826–1898)* (Београд: САНУ, 2008), 97, 102; К. В. Мельчакова, *Боснија и Герцеговина в общественно-политической жизни России в 1856–1875 гг.* (Москва: Индрик, 2019), 287; С. Рајић, *Спољна политика Србије. Између очекивања и реалности 1868–1878* (Београд: СКА, 2015), 275–276, 279; С. Терзић, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку* (Београд: Историјски институт, Нови Сад: Православна реч, 2021), 282; И. Тепић, *Босна и Херцеговина у руским изворима (1856–1878)* (Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1988), 541–542.

²⁵ D. Nikić, *Bosna u političkim planovima Srbije s kraja XIX i na početku XX veka*, 10; V. Masleša, *Mlada Bosna* (Београд: Kultura, 1945), 43, С. Рајић, „Криза пре кризе – Србија и Велике силе 1870–1875. године“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019), 20–21, 24.

at the same time. One such discussion from January 5th 1870 with Milivoje Blaznavac was noted by Béni Kállay: *He is just worried about one thing. The Serbian Government is doing everything to reach the biggest influence in Bosnia and Herzegovina and totally terminate the Russian influence. This was partially successful but not fully and the Serbian Government was afraid if they make that step Russia would initiate one “early Russian oriented uprising”, and Serbia would be forced to participate but not to lead the uprising. He promised to think carefully about this matter. He was talking on the most drastic way against the Russian politics stressing some examples of his attempts to prevent Russian influence.*²⁶

Metropolitan Mihailo was of an opposite opinion. He was against suppressing Russian influence,²⁷ and was actively helping Serb refugees from Bosnia or political exiles. Among them was the priest Đoko Karanović Karan who, on escaping to Serbia in September 1870²⁸ was appointed to the parish in Vladimirci by Metropolitan Mihailo.²⁹

In a later discussion with Blaznavac on June 12th 1872, Kállay noted: *He talks about creation of one Serbia with Bosnia as it is the best way to suppress the Russian influence. He states if it is possible to create “one independent Serb state” it would be the best to neutralize it since it would be the most appropriate when it comes to security. I told him that we could not approach them because their attitude (I stressed that I was not talking about facts) consolidated our South Slavs in their decision against us. He only responded that our Slavs used tense situation but the Serbian Government was always fair and never agitated against us.*³⁰

²⁶ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије*, 404–405.

²⁷ *Москва – Србија, Београд – Русија, Документа и материјали*, том 2, Друштвене и политичке везе 1804–1878, приредили М. Јовановић, А. Тимофејев, Л. Кузьмичева, Е. Иванова (Београд – Москва: Архив Србије, Главно архивно управление города Москвы, Государственный архив Российской Федерации, 2011), 239; 244–245; 289–290.

²⁸ Priest Đoko Karanović Karan and his cousin, priest Stevo Karanović were deported from Bosnia to Asia Minor by the decision of the Ottoman provincial and judicial authorities in the spring 1870 due to their encouragement of the peasants' uprising. They managed to escape from the Turkish police escort close to Izmir and through Montenegro they managed to arrive in Serbia.

²⁹ В. Красић, *Војвода босанских Срба поп – Ђоко Каран Карановић* (Бања Лука, Босански Петровац: Епархија бихаћко-петровачка, 2011), 15–16.

³⁰ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије*, 405.

Regardless of official and unofficial discussions that the Government was having with Vienna based diplomats, the Metropolitan worked increasingly for the idea of liberation and unification of Serbs in one state. Under his patronage a secret association *The Main Committee for Liberation of Serbs in Turkey* was established in Belgrade in early 1872.³¹

After the Serb uprising took place in the Bosnia and Herzegovina provinces, public opinion in Serbia was divided. Some supported it, but others were saying: *We do not need karst of Herzegovina or stones of Bosnia whose poor people would make Serbia poor and fail.*³² Metropolitan Mihailo, being among those supporting the uprising, was appointed to the position of Chairman of *The Main Uprising Support Committee*, while Đoko Vljaković was appointed Secretary.³³ The Committee was established with the assistance of the Serbian Government at the end of July 1875, and provided liaison between the Serb rebels, the Serbian Government and the Slavophil committees. Its tasks were to recruit and send volunteers to Bosnia and to collect and distribute money, weapons and other necessary equipment to the rebels.³⁴

Thanks to his good connections with Bosnia, on August 8th 1875 Metropolitan Mihailo was informed by Sava Kosanović that the Serb uprising was impossible to stop: *Shall we get support and help from you, and do you want us to be at your disposal? Whatever you thought about the uprising before, it is impossible to stop it anymore. We will not purposely discuss details now.*

³¹ Љ. Дурковић Јакшић, „Припреме 1872. год. за ослободилачку борбу“, *Гласник – Службени лист СПЦ*, 1–2 (јануар – фебруар 1959), 101–103.

³² М. Екмечић, „Српска војска у националним ратовима од 1876. до 1878“, *Balkanica*, IX (1978), 126.

³³ В. Чубриловић, „Србија од 1858. до 1878. године“, У: *Српски народ у XIX веку*, књ. 3 (Београд: Геца Кон, 1938), 74–75; Б. М. Бранковић, „Митрополит Михаило и устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године“, у зборнику: *Устанак Срба у Херцеговини и Босни 1875–1878. године* (Бања Лука: Филозофски факултет Универзитет у Бањој Луци, 2016), 35; Ч. Попов, „Србија 1868–1878.“, у: *Историја српског народа*, V–1 (Београд: СКА, 1994), 370; С. Рајић, *Спољна политика Србије. Између очекивања и реалности 1868–1878*, 377.

³⁴ В. Чубриловић, *Босански устанак 1875–1878* (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, Балканолошки институт САНУ, 1996), 327–328; М. Екмечић, *Устанак у Босни 1875–1878* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1973), 91; Ч. Попов, *Србија 1868–1878.*, 370; М. Екмечић, „Историјски значај устанка у Босни и Херцеговини 1875–1878“, у зборнику радова са међународног научног скупа: *Povodom 100-godišnjice устанка у Босни и Херцеговини, другим balkanskim zemljama i Istočnoj krizi 1875–1878.*, том I (Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1977), 65

*There will be time, if you need us (...) Now it is not time for explanations but for prompt work.*³⁵

The Metropolitan was also having contact with Josip Juraj Štrosmajer through *The International Aid Committee for Bosnia and Herzegovina Refugees*.³⁶ Being the Chairman of this Committee he asked Štrosmajer to actively participate in its work by sending him an invitation letter on October 20th 1875. Štrosmajer's reply arrived on October 25th: (...) *our heart witness with comfort, the most educated peoples with no difference judge hard slavery of our people under inhuman Ottoman yoke, they bless its heroism, every form of yield that we protect relieves misery and pressure, the holy goal that is taking our martyrs to death, it is a pledge that blood of our brothers will be seed for better and happier future (...)*.³⁷

When the 1875 uprising broke out in Herzegovina and Bosnia, Metropolitan Mihailo was trying to get help from Russia.³⁸ On September 14th that year he addressed the people of Russia³⁹ with message⁴⁰ in which he wrote: *Tens of thousands of poorly dressed and hungry women, children and weak old people running away from enemy are asking for help and protection from Serbia, Montenegro and Austrian brothers. Unfortunate people, without roof and shelter,*

³⁵ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије*, 522.

³⁶ Л. Ю. Пахомова, *Балканский лакмус. Австро-венгерская политика в Боснии и Герцеговине и российская дипломатия 1878–1908* (Москва: Индрик, 2021), 148.

³⁷ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Историја српске православне цркве*, 386–387; Б. М. Бранковић, *Митрополит Михаило и устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године*, 36.

³⁸ *Москва – Србија, Београд – Русија, Документа и материјали*, 408–409; *Россия и восстание в Боснии и Герцеговине 1875–1878. Документы*, редактор К. В. Никифоров (Москва: Российская академия наук. Институт славяноведения, 2008), 154–155; 162–164; С. Рајић, *Спољна политика Србије. Између очекивања и реалности 1868–1878*, 419; И. Тепић, *Босна и Херцеговина у руским изворима (1856–1878)*, 541; В. Ј., Гросул, „Руско друштво и Источна криза 70-тих година XIX века“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019): 51.

³⁹ According to the data that Grigory Konstantinovich Gradovsky published in one of his texts in Russia, by December 28th 1875 financial aid in the amount of 330,873 rubles was collected in Russia for the people of Herzegovina and Bosnia. J. Jovanović, „Zbornik: Bratskaja pomoć postradavšim' semejstvam' Bosnii i Gercegovini“, *Bibliotekarstvo*, XV/1–2 (1969), 25.

⁴⁰ Metropolitan of Montenegro Ilarion Roganović sent a message to Russia describing Turkish persecutions in Herzegovina and Bosnia and asking for help and protection for Serbian people suffering in these provinces. J. Jovanović, *Zbornik: Bratskaja pomoć postradavšim' semejstvam' Bosnii i Gercegovini*, 11.

*they are hiding in woods. Winter is coming, hunger and cold, there is no bread, there is no money.*⁴¹

This and similar actions of the Metropolitan, as well as the pressures that the Serbian authorities placed on him were the subject of a letter from Milica Stojadinović on January 10th 1876 to German Anđelić: (...) *anyhow (...) I feel sorry for him, if he falls, Orthodox Christianity in Turkey would lose, would lose everything (...) He works without rest.*⁴²

Metropolitan Mihailo developed good connections with Anglican Church circles in the United Kingdom. Since the British Government and Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli were not supportive of the Serb uprising in Bosnia, good relations with Methodists and Baptists were of huge importance for the Serb issue among the British public. Henry Liddon, a clergyman at St Paul's Cathedral, had regular correspondence with the Metropolitan during that time. He wrote that when he was travelling to Serbia, he had the opportunity to witness Turkish cruelty over Orthodox Christians in Bosnia and reported of seeing people impaled on a stake along the Sava river.⁴³

After Belgrade realized that the war with the Ottoman Empire failed following the defeat of the Serbian army to the Turks in Djunis on October 29th 1876, it also recognized the urgent need to establish an organization to deal with the issue of Serb refugees from Bosnia, Old Serbia and Bulgaria and which would act as a liaison between the Serbian Government and Serb rebels in Bosnia. Serbia's Ministerial Council decided on September 6/18th 1877 to reactivate the work of *The Main Uprising Support Committee*. Metropolitan Mihailo⁴⁴ was

⁴¹ J. Jovanović, *Zbornik: Bratskaja pomoć postradavšim' semejstvam' Bosnii i Gercegovini*, 9.

⁴² Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Историја српске православне цркве*, 419; Б. М. Бранковић, *Митрополит Михаило и устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године*, 37; М. Ковић, *Дизраели и Источно питање* (Београд: СЛЮ, 2007), 150.

⁴³ М. Ковић, „Велика Британија и Босна и Херцеговина у Источној кризи (1875–1878)“, *Зборник за историју Босне и Херцеговине*, 6 (2009), 166; М. Ковић, *Дизраели и Источно питање*, 244; Б. М. Бранковић, *Митрополит Михаило и устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године*, 37.

⁴⁴ Following disputes among the Serb rebels after the defeat at Crni Potoci, Vid Milanović and Simo Čavka travelled for help and advice to Jovan Ristić and Metropolitan Mihailo in early August 1877 but they were not received in friendly manner. Since divisions among the rebels were constant, Petar Uzelac allegedly asked the Metropolitan in September 1877 whether it was true that the Government in Belgrade was not supportive of Golub Babić as had been stated by

reappointed as Chairman of The Committee.⁴⁵ Three letters that he received at the end of 1877 and in early 1878 from the rebels and people in Bosnia supporting the uprising, testify how much they trusted the Metropolitan. Even though it was known that Serbia had withdrawn its support to the Serb rebels in Bosnia, the three letters asked for help to continue supporting the troops of the uprising, as well as addressing the situation of Bosnian refugees in Austria.⁴⁶

On February 16th 1879 Archimandrite Sava Kosanović wrote to Metropolitan Mihailo about the difficulties of Serb people in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina immediately after the occupation: *Peasants, majority of our people, remain slaves and they are under bigger pressure than ever before. Agha preserves all previous rights that are protected by rigorism of the Government. Maybe it is temporary matter and political direction for the reason of further occupation – to Thessaloniki. Croats in Sarajevo are furious and everything that is Serb or Orthodox is despised. I would say that Vienna Ministry does not approve too much of Croatism. However, Roman Curia and propaganda work hardly on establishment of schools. Society “Jeronim” is very much present in Bosnia with support of the Government. Besides diocese and seminary in Sarajevo, there will be vicars in Travnik, Banja Luka and even Zvornik. We do not have any support and encouragement for Orthodox Christianity and our nationality. Merchants are devoted to acquisition, clergy is thoughtless and incautious while peasants are confused – it is so poor position that it cannot get worse.*⁴⁷

Jovo Skobla. В. Красић, *Устанак у Босни 1875–1878. Грађа за новију српску историју рата за ослобођење* (Нови Сад, 1884), 189–190; Н. Ћурић, *Arhivska zbirka Vladimira Desnice. Prilozi radu Obrovačkog odbora i ustanku u Bosni 1875–1878* (Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1971), 141.

⁴⁵ В. Чубриловић, *Босански устанак 1875–1878*, 328.

⁴⁶ *Letter of Jovo Skobla sent to Metropolitan Mihailo on September 20th (October 2nd) 1877 from Knin* (Архив Србије Београд, ФМИД–ПО (1871–1918)-1/23); *Letter of Jovo Bilbija sent to Metropolitan Mihailo on January 13th 1878 from Tiškovac*; *Letter from Vid Milanović and Pero Kreco sent to Metropolitan Mihailo on January 19th 1878 from Tiškovac*; *Letter from Aleksandar Katić sent to Metropolitan Mihailo on January 14th 1878 from Knin* (Архив Српске православне цркве Београд, Лични фонд митрополита Михаила, несређена грађа; Бранковић, 2015); *Србија 1878. Документи, приредили М. Војводић, Д. Живојиновић, А. Митровић, Р. Самарџић* (Београд: САНУ, 1978), 334.

⁴⁷ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије*, 523; Б. М. Бранковић, *Митрополит Михаило у устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године*, 41.

After the death of Prince Mihailo, Serbia lost the support of Russia. The strengthening of democracy in Serbia caused the autocratic regime in Russia to shift the center of its support to Montenegro, while the main focus of Balkans' politics was on the consolidation of Bulgaria. This was visible from the Articles of The Treaty of San Stefano.⁴⁸

At the Congress of Berlin Austro – Hungary was given mandate to occupy and govern Bosnia and Herzegovina and this resulted in new problems for the Orthodox Serbs. Metropolitan Mihailo devoted much attention in trying to resolve them. The highly complex state and legal system that came with Austro-Hungary's control in the provinces, required changes in the structure of the Orthodox Christian Church.⁴⁹ This situation was used by the occupation authorities to interfere in the work of the Orthodox Church. One such example was to gain influence over lower positions in the clergy and the Orthodox population through the church hierarchy. Knowing those intentions made it necessary to downgrade relations with the Patriarch of Constantinople to a formal kind.⁵⁰ The occupation authorities were not wasting time. They began their offensive against the Orthodox Church immediately after being assigned control and occupational authority for the provinces. Besides interference from state officials, Roman Catholic proselytist propaganda, with a very aggressive attitude toward the Orthodox Church and Serb people, was also part of the offensive.⁵¹ Further, The Patriarchate of Karlovci wanted to place the Orthodox

⁴⁸ В. Поповић, *Источно питање. Историјски преглед борбе око опстанка османлијске царевине у Леванту и на Балкану* (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, Балканолошки институт САНУ, 1996), 186; 193.

⁴⁹ Metropolitan Mihailo was trying to influence how the status of the Serb Orthodox Church in the Eyalet of Bosnia should be resolved prior to conclusion of The Treaty of San Stefano and also after its suspension. В. Стојанчевић, „Митрополит Михаило и питање аутономије Српске цркве у Турској 1878. године“, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор*, 1–4 (2002/03), 236–237.

⁵⁰ Б. Маџар, „Конвенција о положају Православне цркве у Босни и Херцеговини закључена 1880. године између Аустро-Угарске и Цариградске патријаршије“, *Прилози*, 11–12 (1975–1976), 79; Б. М. Бранковић, „Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године“, *Синеза – Часопис за хуманистичке и друштвене науке*, 2 (2021), 9–10.

⁵¹ С. Вуковић, „Мешање Земаљске владе у Сарајеву у унутрашње послове Српске православно цркве 1879. године“, *Зборник за историју БиХ*, 3 (2002), 195; Б. М. Бранковић, *Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године*, 10.

Church in the occupied provinces under its jurisdiction. These initiatives were met with strong resistance from the Serb people. They were influenced by Serbia. It realized the danger posed by The Patriarchate of Karlovici's intention to expand jurisdiction over the provinces. Robert Vasić was of the opinion that the issue of association of the Orthodox Church in the occupied provinces with The Patriarchate of Karlovci should be discussed when the ecclesiastical and legal relations of the Church were being decided. This was accepted by Vienna.⁵²

One year later, in 1879, during the decision-making process on the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Serbia, Metropolitan Mihailo sent a request to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This request was not clear about the territories under jurisdiction of the Serb Autocephalous Church, nor whether the Patriarch or Synod should be the head of the Church. The decision to prevent association of the Orthodox Church in the occupied provinces with the Serb Orthodox Church seated in Belgrade was taken at the joint session of the prime ministers of Austria and Hungary.⁵³ The view of Austro-Hungary was obvious. It regarded such an association as a permanent threat to their interests in the provinces.⁵⁴ The extent of Austro-Hungary's applied authority was clear from the co-operation between Vienna and The Patriarchate of Constantinople. This

⁵² Б. Маџар, *Покрет Срба Босне и Херцеговине за вјерско-просвјетну самоуправу* (Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1982), 17; Б. Маџар, *Конвенција о положају Православне цркве у Босни и Херцеговини закључена 1880. године између Аустро-Угарске и Цариградске патријаршије*, 81; 83; В. Богићевић, „Стање Српске православне цркве у БиХ од окупације 1878. до почетка борбе за вјерско-просвјетну аутономију 1896. године“, *Гласник СПЦ*, 3–4 (1959), 50–67; Б. М. Бранковић, *Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године*, 10–11.

⁵³ Fear that such an idea could be implemented was expressed in the report that the chief of the Provincial Government of the occupied provinces sent to the Joint Ministry of Finance: *Honored Ministry is aware that the idea of association of the Orthodox Church in Bosnia with the Serb Orthodox Church is being intensively discussed in the circles of the Orthodox clergy and this is being supported by the Serb and Russian side*. Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine Sarajevo, ZMF, 5848/VH, 1879, Virtemberg Hofmanu 17 novembra, 1879; Б. М. Бранковић, *Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године*, 12.

⁵⁴ Б. Маџар, М. Папић, *Политика и Српака православна црква у Босни и Херцеговини 1878–1945* (Бањалука: СПКД Просвјета, 2005), 15–16; Б. Маџар, *Конвенција о положају Православне цркве у Босни и Херцеговини закључена 1880. године између Аустро-Угарске и Цариградске патријаршије*, 85; Б. Маџар, *Покрет Срба Босне и Херцеговине за вјерско-просвјетну самоуправу*, 22–23; Б. М. Бранковић, *Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године*, 12.

was absolute when it came to the prevention of association of the Orthodox Church in the occupied provinces with the Orthodox Church in Serbia. That was confirmed by the decision of the Ecumenical Council dated October 20th 1879 by which the independence of the Serb Orthodox Church was declared as being within the territory of the Principality of Serbia under the name *Independent Holy church of the Principality of Serbia*.⁵⁵

Within Bosnia, Metropolitan Mihailo had a significant role in the appointment of Sava Kosanović to the position of Metropolitan of Dabar-Bosna in 1881 following the dismissal of the previous Metropolitan Antim. While the Serb public was supportive of Kosanović, the occupation authorities opposed the idea based upon police reports from Sarajevo warning that he was having regular contacts with Serbia and the Russian consul.⁵⁶

After brief discussion, however, the authorities decided to appoint Kosanović as the Metropolitan believing that in this way they could have control over him. During the appointment process Sava Kosanović⁵⁷ asked from the Patriarch of Constantinople to allow him to address Serbian church-school municipalities in the provinces, in order to learn whether the Serb people there supported his appointment. Besides the opinion of the church-school municipalities, he also asked for the opinion of Metropolitan Mihailo. His response to Kosanović's question was: *There are many times when one man cannot do what he wants to do, and he must accept what he can do at that moment. You know that even holy laws are being desecrated by inadequate executors. It is the most important that people over there get righteous bishop who will not increase their suffering but try to decrease it. People look at you and people want to give you a hug trying to get fatherly comfort and morality. These are the reasons that make us advice you to not to give up the offer and leave a poor herd without a good shepherd*.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Б. Маџар, *Конвенција о положају Православне цркве у Босни и Херцеговини закључена 1880. године између Аустро-Угарске и Цариградске патријаршије*, 86.

⁵⁶ Б. Маџар, М. Папић, *Политика и Српака православна црква у Босни и Херцеговини 1878–1945*, 48.

⁵⁷ He was chirotonized on April 10th 1881.

⁵⁸ В. Максимовић, *Митрополит Сава Косановић 1839–1903* (Добрун – Сарајево: Дабар, 2003), 38.

During the uprising in Herzegovina in 1882, Metropolitan Mihailo was an active member of the group in Serbia that was agitating against Austro-Hungarian politics of occupation in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as collecting aid for the rebels.⁵⁹ According to Austro-Hungarian intelligence data, activities of aid collection for the rebels were made through the Red Cross in Serbia, in which the Metropolitan was its head.⁶⁰

In the same period the Metropolitan began having to deal with problems that were directly affecting him within Serbia. After the Austro-Serbian Convention of 1881 Serbia ceased its duties to Serb nationals in the occupied provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Austro-Hungarian support in the process of proclamation of Prince Milan as King of Serbia.⁶¹ This development saw Stojan Novaković assigned with responsibility to place the Church and Metropolitan Mihailo under state control. This he carried out by publication of the *Law on Charging High Fees for Clerical Ranks* in April 1881. The Metropolitan reacted harshly. He believed that this Law represented interference of the state in the internal affairs of the church.⁶² Serbia's Progressive Party led Government, Prince Milan and supporters of Austro-Hungary criticized him. Vienna officially warned Prince Milan about the Metropolitan's agitation in the occupied provinces, demanding that such activities end. This was a clear signal that Prince Milan should dismiss Mihailo from the position of Metropolitan. The decision to do so was carried out on October 30th 1881.⁶³

⁵⁹ Н. Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak 1882. godine* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1973), 256; В. Казимировић, *Никола Пашић и његово гоба 1845–1926*, књ. 2 (Београд: Нова Европа, Култура, 1990), 437.

⁶⁰ Н. Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak 1882. godine*, 260–261; В. Казимировић, *Никола Пашић и његово гоба 1845–1926*, 437.

⁶¹ М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 157; С. Терзић, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку*, 622; М. Војводић, „О неким аспектима последица кризе 1875–1878. на Србију“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019), 9.

⁶² Р. Радић, *Живот у временима. Патријарх Гаврило (Дожић) 1881–1950* (Београд: ПБФ, 2011), 32–33; М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 158–159.

⁶³ Ј. Блажић Пејић, Е. В. Иванова, „Нова сведочанства из живота митрополита Михаила: од свргнућа до поновног повратка (1881–1889)“, *Мешовита грађа*, XXXVII (2016), 135; М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 159–160; Н. Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak 1882. godine*, 255; Д. Т. Батаковић, М. Ст. Протић, Н. Самарџић, А. Фотић, *Нова историја српског народа* (Београд: Наш дом, 2002), 183; Р. М. Грујић, *Православна српска*

Although that was the situation, according to Austro–Hungarian intelligence data, even after his dismissal Metropolitan Mihailo continued as head of the Committee that was supporting the Serb uprising in Herzegovina. This was one reason why such pressure was placed on him in Serbia in 1882. That was especially demonstrated by the Austro–Hungarian representative in Belgrade, who requested that the Government transfer the Metropolitan from Belgrade to a monastery to prevent his connections with the Committee and with Serbs in the occupied provinces. That this was the extent to which action against him could go, was confirmed by a communication from Metropolitan Mihailo to Jovan Ristić, saying that Stojan Novaković had informed him that the Government *would send him to monastery by force*. Because of these extreme pressures, the Metropolitan left Serbia in 1883. He journeyed through Constantinople and Bulgaria and arrived in Russia in the summer of 1884.⁶⁴ During the time he spent in Russia he refrained from plans for subversions. Rather he engaged in assessing the politics of Serbia, criticizing the Government of the Progressive Party and in emphasizing that Serbia's alliance with Austro–Hungary would result in losing Old Serbia and Macedonia in the same way that its earlier actions had resulted in losing Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶⁵

However, within five years political circumstances had changed. With the abdication of King Milan in 1889 and adoption of the new Constitution, the improved environment enabled Metropolitan Mihailo to return to his homeland safely. The invitation for his return was sent in April by the new Government led by Sava Grujić.⁶⁶ He came back quietly and his first task was to resolve the disputable laws between the state and Church. His main aim was to strengthen national politics in Old Serbia and Macedonia.⁶⁷ His return was objected the most strongly by Austro–Hungary, which feared he would renew activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶⁸ His interest in the situation affecting Serb people

црква, 151–152; С. Терзић, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку*, 622.

⁶⁴ М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 160.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 161.

⁶⁶ С. Терзић, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку*, 635.

⁶⁷ М. Војводић, *Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић*, 161.

⁶⁸ С. Терзић, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку*, 633.

and Church in these provinces proved that Austro-Hungary was not wrong. In order to obtain as precise information as possible Metropolitan Mihailo, in one of his last acts for the cause he had served, sent Mile Pavlović Krpa on a secret mission in the occupied provinces. Pavlović published his observations in the book *Orthodox Christianity in Bosnia and Herzegovina* in 1898. In it he described the difficulties from political, economic and religious pressures on Serb people in these provinces.⁶⁹

The death of Metropolitan Mihailo in 1898 was a huge loss for the Serbian people. A great hero for national unification had passed. As Metropolitan across four decades he was not only a dedicated servant of the Orthodox Church. His commitment and support to Serbs in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina made an extensive impact on the development of the idea of nationhood, as well as in the formulation of national goals in those provinces. So too were his predictions on the hostile attitude of Austro-Hungary toward the Serb people, which proved to be correct and very obvious before, and during, World War I.

⁶⁹ Ђ. Слијепчевић, *Историја српске православне цркве*, 415–416.

Archival retrieved:

Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine Sarajevo.

- Zajedničko ministarstvo finansija.

Архив Србије Београд.

- Фонд Министарства иностраних дела – Политичко одељење (1871–1918).

Архив Српске православне цркве Београд.

- Лични фонд митрополита Михаила, несређена грађа.

Published sources:

Москва – Србија, Београд – Русија, Документа и материјали, том 2, Друштвене и политичке везе 1804–1878, приредили М. Јовановић, А. Тимофејев, Л. Кузьмичева, Е. Иванова (Београд – Москва: Архив Србије, Главно архивно управление города Москвы, Государственный архив Российской Федерации, 2011).

Россия и восстание в Боснии и Герцеговине 1875–1878. Документы, редактор К. В. Никифоров (Москва: Российская академия наук. Институт славяноведения, 2008).

Србија 1878. Документи, приредили Михаило Војводић, Драгољуб Живојиновић, Андреј Митровић, Радован Самарцић (Београд: САНУ, 1978).

Ćurić, Najrudin, *Arhivska zbirka Vladimira Desnice. Prilozi radu Obrovačkog odbora i ustanku u Bosni 1875–1878* (Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1971).

Literature:

Батаковић, Душан Т., Протић, Милан Ст., Самарцић, Никола, Фотић, Александар, *Нова историја српског народа* (Београд: Наш дом, 2002).

Берић, Душан, *Устанак у Херцеговини 1852–1862* (Београд – Нови Сад: САНУ, Удружење Срба из Херцеговине у Војводини, 1994).

Блажић Пејић, Јелена, Владимировна Иванова, Екатарина, „Нова сведочанства из живота митрополита Михаила: од свргнућа до поновног повратка (1881–1889)“, *Мешовита грађа*, XXXVII (2016): 123–157.

Бован, Владимир, „Срби из Босне и Херцеговине – просветни и национални радници у Старој Србији од шездесетих година XIX века до краја турске владавине (Илија Ставрић у Призрену)“, *Зборник за историју Босне и Херцеговине*, 6 (2009): 91–100.

- Богићевић, Војислав, „Стање Српске православне цркве у БиХ од окупације 1878. до почетка борбе за вјерско-просвјетну аутономију 1896. године“, *Гласник СПЦ*, 3–4 (1959): 50–67.
- Бранковић, Бошко М., „Четири писма српском митрополиту Михаилу из 1878. и 1879. године“, *Радови*, 22 (2015): 21–32.
- Бранковић, Бошко М., „Митрополит Михаило и устанак Срба у Босни 1875–1878. године“, у зборнику: *Устанак Срба у Херцеговини и Босни 1875–1878. године* (Бања Лука: Филозофски факултет Универзитет у Бањој Луци, 2016): 33–43.
- Бранковић, Бошко М., „Босна и Херцеговина и потписивање Конвенције 1880. године“, *Синеза – Часопис за хуманистичке и друштвене науке*, 2 (2021): 9–17.
- Војводић, Михаило, „Митрополит Михаило и Стојан Новаковић“, *Историјски записи*, 1–2 (2000): 153–164.
- Војводић, Михаило, „О неким аспектима последица кризе 1875–1878. на Србију“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019): 7–15.
- Вуковић, Сава, „Мешање Земаљске владе у Сарајеву у унутрашње послове Српске православне цркве 1879. године“, *Зборник за историју БиХ*, 3 (2002): 195–199.
- Гросул, Владислав Ј., „Руско друштво и Источна криза 70-тих година XIX века“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019): 41–56.
- Грујић, Радослав М., *Православна српска црква* (Београд, Крагујевац: Евро, Каленић, 1995).
- Дурковић Јакшић, Љубомир, „Припреме 1872. год. за ослободилачку борбу“, *Гласник – Службени лист СПЦ*, 1–2 (јануар – фебруар 1959): 101–103.
- Екмеčić, Milorad, *Ustanak u Bosni 1875–1878* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1973).
- Екмеčić, Milorad, „Istorijski značaj ustanka u Bosni i Hercegovini 1875–1878“, у зборнику *radova sa međunarodnog naučnog skupa: Povodom 100-godišnjice ustanka u Bosni i Hercegovini, drugim balkanskim zemljama i Istočnoj krizi 1875–1878.*, том I (Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 1977): 49–89.
- Екмечић, Милорад, „Српска војска у националним ратовима од 1876. до 1878“, *Balkanica*, IX (1978): 97–129.
- Екмечић, Милорад, „Српски народ у Турској од средине XIX века до 1878.“, у: *Историја српског народа*, V–1 (Београд: СКА, 1994): 449–526.
- Jovanović, Jovan, „Zbornik: Bratskaja pomoč postradavšim' semejstvam' Bosnii i Gercegovini“, *Bibliotekarstvo*, XV/1–2 (1969): 9–25.

- Казимировић, Васа, *Никола Пашић и његово доба 1845–1926*, књ. 2 (Београд: Нова Европа, Култура, 1990).
- Кapidžić, Hamdija, *Hercegovачki ustanak 1882. godine* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1973).
- Ковић, Милош, *Дизраели и Источно питање* (Београд: СЛИО, 2007).
- Ковић, Милош, „Велика Британија и Босна и Херцеговина у Источној кризи (1875–1878)“, *Зборник за историју Босне и Херцеговине*, 6 (2009): 159–172.
- Красић, Владимир, *Устанак у Босни 1875–1878. Грађа за новију српску историју рата за ослобођење* (Нови Сад, 1884).
- Красић, Владимир, *Војвода босанских Срба поп – Ђоко Каран Карановић* (Бања Лука, Босански Петровац: Епархија бихаћко-петровачка 2011).
- Максимовић, Војислав, *Митрополит Сава Косановић 1839–1903* (Добрун – Сарајево: Дабар, 2003).
- Masleša, Veselin, *Mlada Bosna* (Beograd: Kultura, 1945).
- Маџар, Божо, „Конвенција о положају Православне цркве у Босни и Херцеговини закључена 1880. године између Аустро-Угарске и Цариградске патријаршије“, *Прилози*, 11–12 (1975–1976): 79–97.
- Маџар, Божо, *Покрет Срба Босне и Херцеговине за вјерско-просвјетну самоуправу* (Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1982).
- Маџар, Божо, Папић, Митар, *Политика и Српака православна црква у Босни и Херцеговини 1878–1945* (Бањалука: СПКД Просвјета, 2005).
- Мельчакова, Ксения В., *Боснија и Герцеговина в общественно-политической жизни России в 1856–1875 гг.* (Москва: Индрик, 2019).
- Milošević, Borivoje, Lukić, Sandra, „The Serbian orthodox church and Serbian education in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the last century of ottoman rule“, *Istraživanja – Journal of historical researches*, 31 (2020): 131–149.
- Nikić, Dragoljub, „Bosna u političkim planovima Srbije s kraja XIX i na početku XX veka“ (Doktorska disertacija: Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1987).
- Пахомова, Лидия Ю., *Балканский лакмус. Австро-венгерская политика в Боснии и Герцеговине и российская дипломатия 1878–1908* (Москва: Индрик, 2021).
- Попов, Чедомир, „Србија 1868–1878.“, у: *Историја српског народа*, V–1 (Београд: СКА, 1994): 305–421.
- Попов, Чедомир, „Међународни положај, спољна политика и дипломатија Србије 1804–1878“, у: *Два века модерне српске дипломатије* (Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, 2013): 27–60.

- Поповић, Васиљ, *Источно питање. Историјски преглед борбе око опстанка османлијске царевине у Леванту и на Балкану* (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, Балканолошки институт САНУ, 1996).
- Радић, Радмила, *Живот у временима. Патријарх Гаврило (Дожић) 1881–1950* (Београд: ПБФ, 2011).
- Рајић, Сузана, *Спољна политика Србије. Између очекивања и реалности 1868–1878* (Београд: СКА, 2015).
- Рајић, Сузана, „Криза пре кризе – Србија и Велике силе 1870–1875. године“, у зборнику: *Велика Источна криза и српско питање* (Београд: Историјски институт, 2019): 17–39.
- Ристић, Љубодраг П., *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)* (Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, 2008).
- Слијепчевић, Ђоко, *Михаило, архиепископ београдски и митрополит Србије* (Минхен: Искра, 1980).
- Слијепчевић, Ђоко, *Историја српске православне цркве*, књ. 2 (Београд: ЈРЈ, 2002).
- Стојанчевић, Владимир, „Митрополит Михаило и питање аутономије Српске цркве у Турској 1878. године“, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор*, 1–4 (2002/03): 235–240.
- Стојанчевић, Владимир, „Улога митрополита Михаила у помагању ослободилачког покрета Срба у Турској“, у: *Живот и дело митрополита Михаила (1826–1898)* (Београд: САНУ, 2008), 93–108.
- Страњаковић, „Драгослав, Васа Пелагић и митрополит Михаило (преписка и документи)“, *Живот*, год. III, св. 19, књ. IV (1954): 259–284.
- Тепић, Ибрахим, *Босна и Херцеговина у руским изворима (1856–1878)* (Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1988).
- Терзић, Славенко, *На капијама Константинопоља. Русија и балканско питање у 19. веку* (Београд: Историјски институт, Нови Сад: Православна реч, 2021).
- Ђоровић, Владимир, *Борба за независност Балкана* (Београд: Логос арт, 2007).
- Чубриловић, Васа, „Србија од 1858. до 1878. године“, у: *Српски народ у XIX веку*, књ. 3 (Београд: Геца Кон, 1938).
- Чубриловић, Васа, *Босански устанак 1875–1878* (Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, Балканолошки институт САНУ, 1996).

Бошко М. Бранковић, Сандра Лукић

МИТРОПОЛИТ МИХАИЛО (ЈОВАНОВИЋ)
И ПОКРАЈИНЕ БОСНА И ХЕРЦЕГОВИНА

Резиме: Митрополит Михаило (Јовановић) био је поборник идеје о ослобођењу свих Срба од османске власти и уједињења у једну националну државу, с тим у вези и покрајине Босна и Херцеговина су неизоставно биле у фокусу његове пажње и националног дјеловања, што је нарочито показивао за вријеме српских устанака 1852–1862, 1875–1878. и 1882. године. Његова ангажованост у помагању српском народу у покрајинама Босни и Херцеговини извршила је велики утицај на развој националне мисли и формулисање националних циљева у овим покрајинама, а његова предвиђања о непријатељском држању Аустро-Угарске према српском народу показала су се тачна и нарочито видљива за вријеме Првог свјетског рата. Политички је био привржен сарадњи са Русијом што му је доносило неприлике у Србији у моментима кад се она ослањала на Аустро-Угарску, а што је довело до његове смјене 1881. године. Након повратка у Србију и у митрополитску столицу 1889. године наставио је са националним радом, али овај пут више обраћајући пажњу на Стару Србију и Македонију, него на покрајине Босну и Херцеговину. Са смрћу митрополита Михаила 1898. године српски народ изгубио је великог борца за национално уједињење.

Кључне ријечи: Михаило (Јовановић), Србија, покрајине Босна и Херцеговина, политика, црква.