

The Political, Ecclesiastical and National Unrest in Herzegovina and Neighbouring Bosnia during the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars (1789-1814)

PETAR VRANKIĆ
Augsburg
E-mail: vrankic@t-online.de

UDK: 94(497.6)"1789/1814"
32(497.6)"1789/1814"
Original scientific article
Received: 24 April 2022
Accepted: 23 June 2022

Summary

The author presents the complexity of the unrest in Herzegovina, neighbouring Bosnia and in other border regions (Dubrovnik, Dalmatia, Croatia and Serbia) at the turn of the nineteenth century, starting with the major tenets of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, the subsequent unrest and its consequences in all of Europe. In this part of Europe, which was practically unknown to the average European of the time, direct and indirect consequences of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars and their attendant phenomena spread rapidly throughout Europe, the Ottoman and Russian Empires. As the French Revolution was losing its attraction for civil circles at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a military and organisational genius, Napoleon Bonaparte, emerged in its wake, becoming the worthiest bearer and disseminator of the legacy of the French Revolution, French civilisation and its imperial hegemony that inundated

Europe and attempted to abolish its old state, political, social and religious order (*l'ancien régime*).¹ The perception of the spirit and nature of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars in these countries will be shown as very complex and more antagonistic than acceptable.

Keywords: French Revolution; Napoleonic Wars; Ottoman Empire; Dalmatia, Dubrovnik; Boka; Hercegovina; Bosnia; Nikola Ferić; Petar I. Petrović; Dadić family; Rizvanbegović family.

Političko, crkveno i narodnosno previranje u Hercegovini i susjednoj Bosni u doba Francuske revolucije i Napoleonovih ratova (1789.-1814.)

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Primljeno: 24. travnja 2022.
Prihvaćeno: 23. lipnja 2022.

Sažetak

Tematika ovoga priloga, koju autor nastoji prikazati, vrlo je opširna, kompleksna i višestrano osjetljiva. Radi se o trideset godina (1789.-1819.) političkog, društvenog, crkvenog, vjerskog i narodnosnog previranja na istočnojadranskoj obali. Premda se u radu redovito susreću mletačko-austrijsko-francusko-hrvatska pokrajina Dalmacija i nekoć zadnja slobodna hrvatska država, Dubrovačka Republika, kao ulazna i izlazna vrata, rad se usredotočuje na njihovo zaleđe: Hercegovinu, Bosnu, Crnu Goru i Srbiju. Ove zemlje, smještene u višekutnoj interesnoj sferi između tadanje četiri susjedne velesile: Austrije, Francuske, Osmanskoga Carstva i Carske Rusije, predstavljaju isto tako jednu drugu, manje poznatu, europsku pozornicu važnih vojnih, političkih, vjerskih i narodnosnih sučeljavanja toga vremena.

1 This paper, which covers the time period from the outbreak of the French Revolution (1789) to the death of Nikola Ferić (1819), the last bishop of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese, was presented in an abbreviated form as one of the introductory lectures in Stolac on May 13, 2019, at the Scientific Conference: *The Diocese of Trebinje-Mrkan at the time of its last bishop Nikola Ferić (1792-1819) and after him*.

Vladajuće aristokratske snage u Veneciji i u Dubrovniku lebdjele su krajem 18. stoljeća u najvišoj i najumišljenijoj sferi političkog ovapnjenja, koji je *l'ancienne régime* u povijesti Europe mogao stvoriti, dok ih nije smrtno pogodio politički vihor Francuske Revolucije i imperijalnih pretenzija Napoleona Bonaparte. Mletci su izgubili slobodu 1797., Dubrovnik 1806., odnosno 1808. godine. Istočnojadranski posjedi Mletačke Republike, većinom hrvatske zemlje, postaju predmetom političko-trgovačke razmjene između pobjedničke Francuske i gubitničke Austrije i dolaze u ljeto 1797. pod austrijsku upravu. Oduševljenje hrvatskoga pučanstva s novim činjeničnim stanjem bilo je veliko, kako u Dalmaciji tako u susjednoj Hercegovini i Bosni, u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj, no, ostat će neostvaren san ujedinjenja s hrvatskim zemljama u sastavu Hrvatsko-Ugarskoga Kraljevstva, jer to nije odgovaralo Bečkom dvoru.

Austrijsku upravu na Istočnom Jadranu prekinuo je Požunski mir 1805. godine i cijela istočna obala Jadrana bila je sada dodijeljena Francuskoj i pridružena Talijanskom Kraljevstvu od Napoleonove milosti. Ova nova odluka i političko-trgovačka raspodjela hrvatskih zemalja između Napoleona i cara Franje I. nije naišla na oduševljenje u većini hrvatskoga pučanstva i njegovih staleža. Prvo, nova državna konstelacija u sklopu Kraljevine Italije i kasnije, nakon Schönbrunnskoga mira, unutar Francuskoga Carstva kao Ilirske provincije, bila je vidno udaljavanje od postojećega hrvatskog državno-pravnog koncepta i proklamiranih aspiracija. Drugo, francuska revolucionarna, imperijalna i militaristička vizija i administracija, slovila je već unaprijed kao liberalna i protukatolička i nije odgovarala političkom psihogramu prosječnoga hrvatskog čovjeka i građanina *homo et civis croatus*. Stoga je razumljivo da će najveći otpor francuskoj upravi u ovim pokrajinama pružiti Crkva, koja nije reagirala preko visokoga klera, nego preko nižega svećenstva, redovnika, kršćanski svjesnih laika i katoličkih bratovština. To je izazvalo kod naroda prosvjede i ustanke na koje će francuska uprava reagirati oštrim mjerama: progonima, uhićenjima i strijeljanjima, kako među laicima tako i u kleru.

Najmarkantnija žrtva novonastale političke konstelacije postala je zadnja još slobodna hrvatska država, Republika Dubrovnik, koja se iznenada našla u žarištu velikofrancuskih strateških planova, velikocrnogorskih pretenzija, podupiranih od ruskih imperijalnih ciljeva, izlaska na Jadran. Auktor je ipak mišljenja da je francuska uprava hrvatskih zemalja, osobito u doba Ilirskih provincija, počevši od Istre do Boke, na mnogim područjima, posebno u školstvu, prosvjeti, gospodarstvu i prometnim infra-

strukturama napravila velik politički, kulturni, građanski i gospodarsveni pomak u usporedbi s prethodnim administracijama.

No, ovaj rad poklanja glavnu pažnju političkom, vjerskom i narodnosnom previranju i položaju katolika u Hercegovini i susjednoj Bosni, na čijem su se teritoriju nalazile dvije važne katoličke institucije: Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija i Apostolski bosanski vikarijat. Dubrovčanin Nikola Ferić upravljao je kao biskup Trebinjsko-mrkanskom biskupijom i njegova jurisdikcija protezala se na pet župa u istočnoj Hercegovini. Kao vjerni podanik Dubrovačke Republike prebivao je najprije u Gružu, potom u Dubrovniku, unutar gradskih zidina, gdje se jedino osjećao sigurno, za razliku od njegova svećenstva i puka u Donjoj Hercegovini. Apostolskom bosanskom vikarijatu, koji je obuhvaćao osim Bosne i zapadnu Hercegovinu u ovo vrijeme stajali su na čelu biskupi-apostolski vikari: fra Augustin Botoš-Okić (1784.-1798.), fra Grgo Ilijić Varešanin (1798.-1813.) i fra Augustin Miletić (1813.-1831.). Posebno će biti impresionantan nastup i molba apostolskoga vikara fra Grge Varešanina Ilijića, iz godine 1797., u kojoj se obratio tadanjem caru Svetoga Rimskog Carstva sa sjedištem u Beču i zamolio ga za sjedinjenje Bosne i Hercegovine sa zemljama Hrvatsko-Ugarskoga Kraljevstva. Nije to bila zamolba nekoga skromnog bosanskog ujaka, nego državnički čin ugledna i nekadanjeg redodržavnika Bosne Srebrene, čovjeka koji je u sebi ujedinjavao i doživljavao kontinuitet i svijest pripadnosti Bosanskom Kraljevstvu, Vojvodstvu sv. Sabe i kruni Hrvatsko-Ugarskoga Kraljevstva.

I pored austrijske i francuske blizine i vladavine u susjednoj Dalmaciji, Dubrovniku, Boki, Istri i Hrvatskoj južno od Save sve do ušća Une, kao i u prisutnosti francuskih i austrijskih konzula u Travniku, katolici u Hercegovini kao i u susjednoj Bosni, te njihovo svećenstvo, dume i franjevci, koji su živjeli u svojoj kompleksnoj i egzistencijalnoj ugroženosti, svakodnevnom progibanju i izrabljivanju, zauzimaju isto tako vrlo vidno mjesto u ovom uratku.

U članku autor posvećuje dužnu pažnju susjednim pravoslavnim kršćanima, Srbima i Crnogorcima. Dok dostojno vrjednuje njihovu borbu i žrtvu za oslobađanje od osmanskoga jarma, san svih južnoslavenskih naroda, istovremeno se kritički osvrće na pljačkanje i izrabljivanje hrvatskih i katoličkih krajeva na području Dubrovnika i Boke Kotorske, kao i na imperijalne crnogorsko-srpske planove o inkorporaciji hrvatskih zemalja u *Slaveno-serbsko carstvo*.

Hercegovačko-bosanski muslimani (Bošnjaci) u ono vrijeme, premda su trebali biti logični saveznici katolika Hrvata, od kojih dobrim dijelom potiču, iscrpljivali su sebe i svoje energije u međusobnim borbama do uništenja, više iz želje za vlastitom obiteljskom dobrotom nego za prestiž i autonomiju kako Hercegovine tako i Bosne. Druga upadljiva činjenica koju auktor uočava jest da Visoka Porta vidi u Napoleonu saveznika, posebno u dugotrajnim ratovima protiv Rusije. Hercegovački muslimanski prvaci razumiju ovu politiku Porte i čine isto, njeguju vojnu suradnju s Francuzima u Dubrovniku i Dalmaciji. Bosanski muslimanski prvaci, naprotiv, vrlo su nepovjerljivi prema Francuzima, caru Napoleonu, kao i prema njegovim predstavnicima i simpatizerima u Bosni, i prvim susjedima-katolicima.

Na kraju ovoga prikaza autor se ukratko osvrće na prirodne katastrofe i pandemije, posebno na kugu kao posljedicu dugih ratova, koja je od 1812. do 1818. godine vrlo teško pogodila Bosnu, Hercegovinu, Dubrovnik i Dalmaciju.

Sve skupa ovo su samo neka važnija zapažanja o političkim, crkvenim i narodnosnim previranjima i prelamanjima koje istraživač ili zainteresirani čitatelj može susresti u ovom prikazu koji je utemeljen na bogatoj domaćoj i međunarodnoj literaturi kao i na brojnim konzultacijama objavljene i neobjavljene arhivske građe.

Ključne riječi: Francuska revolucija; Napoleonovi ratovi; Osmanско Carstvo; Dalmacija, Dubrovnik; Boka; Hercegovina; Bosna; Nikola Ferić; Petar I. Petrović; obitelj Dadić; obitelj Rizvanbegović.

1. Unrest in Europe

The onset and spread of the ideals of the French Revolution, and particularly its motto *liberté, égalité, fraternité* (liberty, equality and brotherhood), its political, military, social, cultural and religious premises, which would become the political and administrative reality in many provinces and countries, shook and inundated nearly all of Europe. The French Revolution did not spare the French king in Paris, the Pope in Rome, the Emperor in Vienna, the Sultan in Constantinople, the long-lived Republic of Venice, or the miniature but proud Republic of St Blaise in Dubrovnik. The spirit of the more temperate French Revolution, epitomised in its unique, enlightened, military and cosmopolitan coryphaeus, Napoleon Bonaparte, forced the Republic of Venice into an undignified truce and surrender in

1797.² The Treaty of Loeben and the Treaty of Campo Formio confiscated Venice's traditional hinterland (*terraferma*) and its eastern Adriatic estates (Istria, Dalmatia with the Adriatic islands and the Bay of Kotor, and Albanian Dalmatia). Napoleon generously handed these lands, as if they were his property, over to the German Emperor and the Croat-Hungarian king Francis II as compensation for lost estates in Northern Italy and the Netherlands.³ Napoleon, the restless and competent military spirit, in his desire to defeat the English and exclude them from the European continent, also indirectly shook up the Ottoman Empire with his Egyptian expedition (1798-1801) and his visit to the Holy Land. Although he experienced more military defeats than victories, his expedition brought him scientific fame, a unique myth and positive Christian recognition.⁴ Upon achieving national reconciliation, i.e., staging a coup d'état on November 10, 1799, Napoleon abolished the Directory and established a new governing body, the Consulate, which proclaimed that the revolution in France was over.⁵ Napoleon appointed himself the First Consul for life, and through his absolutist rule and style, he promulgated the *Code civile*⁶ which was effective from Portugal to Warsaw, from Am-

2 ALVISE ZORZI, *La Repubblica del leone. Storia di Venezia*, Rusconi, Milano, 1981, pp. 533-555; AMABLE DE FOURNOOX, *Napoléon et Venise (1796-1814). L'aigle et le Lion*, Editions de Fallois, Paris, 2002; FREDERIC CHAPIN LANE, *Povijest Mletačke Republike*, Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga, Zagreb, 2007, pp. 463-465.

3 FRANCOIS FURET, *La Révolution française. De Turgot à Napoléon (1770-1814)*, Hachette, Paris, 1988, pp. 337-338; GUNTHER ROTHENBERG, *Die Napoleonischen Kriege*, Brandenburgisches Verlagshaus, Berlin, 2000, pp. 106-116.

4 JEAN-PAUL BERTAUD, "L'expédition d'Égypte et la construction du mythe napoléonien", *Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, 57, 1998, pp. 281-288; YVES LAISSUS, *L'Égypte, une aventure savante: avec Bonaparte, Kléber, Menou 1798-1801*, Fayard, Paris, 1998; F. FURET, *La Révolution*, pp. 348-353; JACQUES DEROGY, *Bonaparte en Terre Sainte*, Fayard, Paris, 1992.

5 F. FURET, *La Révolution*, p. 395; Three consuls proclaimed the end of the Revolution to the citizens of Paris in a demagogic manner on December 15, 1799: *the Revolution is finished having been established on the principles that began it*. ("Citoyens, la Révolution est fixée aux principes qui l'ont commencée: elle est finie.") Cf. MAX GALLO, *Révolution Française. Aux Armes, citoyens*, II, XO Éditions, Paris, 2009, p. 374.

6 The French Civil Code was a successful symbiosis of the national and revolutionary, the rural and the bourgeois, which Napoleon announced in November 1800 with the famous sentence: "We have finished the novel of the Revolution; we must now begin its history." (*Nous avons fini le roman de la Révolution: il faut en commencer l'histoire*). F. FURET, *La Révolution*, p. 402.

sterdam and Hamburg to the Bay of Kotor and the Ionian islands, and which is still a model and basis for all civil legal codes in democratic countries.⁷ At the beginning of December 1804, he crowned himself emperor and held himself to be, following the example of Charlemagne, the emperor of all of Europe.⁸ From 1805 to 1815, Napoleon was constantly at war with England, the German states, Austria, Spain, Prussia and Russia.⁹

Under the Treaty of Pressburg (Bratislava), dated December 26, 1805, Napoleon brought Austrian lands on the eastern Adriatic coast to his crown and annexed them to the Kingdom of Italy.¹⁰ The following year, in 1806, he ended the thousand-year-old institution, the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.¹¹ In military campaigns from 1806-1807, and especially under the Treaty of Tilsit,¹² he devastated Prussia, defeated and humiliated Russia, established the Warsaw Duchy and forged his way to the banks of the Nemen, the border of the Russian Empire.¹³ In the War of the Fifth Coalition against Austria in 1809, Napoleon entered Vienna twice with his army. At the beginning of July 1809, he defeated Austria in the Battle of Wa-

-
- 7 Napoleon spoke of the Civil Code with pride during his incarceration: "My fame does not rest on the fact that I was victorious in forty battles... Waterloo will wipe the memory of so many victories ... But what it will never wipe, what will live on forever, is my Civil Code." Cf. CHARLES-TRISTAN DE MONTHOLON, *Recits de la captivité de l'empereur Napoléon à Sainte Hélène*, I, Pauline, Paris, 1847, p. 401.
- 8 F. FURET, *La Révolution française*, p. 401-447.
- 9 GUNTHER ROTHENBERG, *Die Napoleonischen Kriege*, Brandenburgisches Verlagshaus, Berlin, 2000, p. 84-209.
- 10 GRGA NOVAK, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, II, Zagreb, 1944., p. 290; TRPIMIR MACAN, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*, Matica hrvatska - Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1992, p. 266; STJEPAN ANTOLJAK, *Pregled hrvatske povijesti*, Orbis/Laus, Split, 1994, p. 123; <https://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=49908> (1. 4. 2022.).
- 11 JOHANN CHAPOUTOT, *Histoire de l'Allemagne (1806 à nos jours)*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2017, pp. 9-18.
- 12 "Tilsitski mir". *Hrvatska enciklopedija, mrežno izdanje*. Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2021. <https://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=61326> (16. 3. 2022.).
- 13 ELISABETH FEHRENBACH, *Vom Ancien Régime zum Wiener Kongress*. (Grundriss der Geschichte, Bd. 12), Oldenburg, München, 2008, pp. 52-53; JAROSŁAW CZUBATY, *Das napoleonische System in Europa und das Herzogtum Warschau*, in IGOR KAŁOLEWSKI - KARSTEN HOLSTE - ROBERT TRABA, *Polen in der europäischen Geschichte*, Band 3. Anton Hiersemann, Stuttgart, 2018, pp. 103-127.

gram and seized definite control of Austria and all the German lands of the former Holy Roman Empire.¹⁴ In order to prevent the arrival of French troops from Dalmatia to help Napoleon, which consisted predominantly of Croatian conscripts, Austria tried to spread anti-French sentiments and supported rebellions and revolts all over Dalmatia, Croatia. From 1807 onwards, the Croats had already revolted across all of Dalmatia, supported in their authentic or artificial anti-French convictions by the local clergy, predominantly Franciscan friars, and by present Russians and Englishmen, losing young lives in vain.¹⁵ The Treaty of Schönbrunn (October 14, 1809) allowed Napoleon to divide up the plunder. Austria had to cede Galicia to the Warsaw Duchy, Tarnopol to the Russians, Salzburg and Tyrol to Bavaria.¹⁶ The same treaty forced Austria to cede part of Carinthia (Villach District), along with Carniola, Gorizia, Trieste, Rijeka (Fiume), all the Croatian lands south of the Sava River to the delta of the Una River as well as its access to the Adriatic Sea. Of the newly conquered Croatian and Slovenian regions and the already existent French lands along the Adriatic (Istria, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor), Napoleon established the Illyrian Provinces with their seat in Ljubljana and annexed them to the French Empire.¹⁷ Desiring to be recognised in Europe as a real emperor and securing an heir for the new French dynasty, Napoleon endeavoured to find the right mother for his future heir. When he failed to convince tsar Alexander I of Russia to give him the hand of one of his sisters for the future empress of France, (allegedly the empress mother Maria Fjodorovna protested the match), and thereby finalise the Treaty of Tilsit and consolidate his Europe from Portugal to Nemen (*Grande Empire*),¹⁸ Napoleon turned to Austrian Emperor Francis I. This is how Napoleon transformed from Austria's primary enemy to her primary ally and imperial son-in-law. In order for everything to be

14 G. ROTHENBERG, *Die Napoleonischen Kriege*, pp. 128-131.

15 G. NOVAK, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, II, pp. 298-301; S. ANTOLJAK, *Pregled hrvatske povijesti*, p. 124; VICKO KAPITANOVIĆ, *Fra Andrija Dorotić, (1761.-1837.) reformator, političar i dobrotvor*, Književni krug, Split, 2016, pp. 190-214.

16 GÜNTER MÜCHLER, *Napoleon: Revolutionär auf dem Kaiserthron*. WBG Theiss, Darmstadt, 2019, pp. 366-368.

17 G. NOVAK, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, II, pp. 301-302; T. MACAN, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*, p. 270; S. ANTOLJAK, *Pregled hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 124-125; <https://www.britannica.com/place/Illyrian-Provinces> (6. 6. 2022.).

18 F. FURET, *La Révolution française*, p. 474.

legally valid he divorced his first wife *Joséphine de Beauharnais* in accordance with both civil and canon law. He then took as his new wife Marie Louise, Duchess of Parma and the daughter of Emperor Francis I, who bore him an heir on March 20, 1811, subsequently named Napoleon II.¹⁹ The alliance with Austria and the accompanying new family and dynastic ties spoiled Napoleon's relations with Russia and Tsar Alexander I, who had been on Napoleon's side from the War of the Fifth Coalition and had apparently remained loyal to the secret Erfurt Agreement of October 12, 1808, until Russia was capable of entering a definite war against France.²⁰ Napoleon, who was at the apex of his family and political fortunes and military rapture, did not miss a thing. Therefore, he attempted to conquer the Russian Empire in 1812 and become the master of all continental Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Although he was convinced that Russia was ready for war, he did not know that the Russians had prepared a real trap for him, the so-called Scythian plan, retreating into the heartland of the country.²¹ The battles at Smolensk, Borodino and the experience of a deserted and razed Moscow, the retreat of the Russian army into the heartland and the battle on the Berezina River were already sufficient signs of Napoleon's military, physical and psychological exhaustion.²² However, the defeats at Leipzig and Waterloo turned Napoleon's very successful military and political career to an infamous end: abdication and final deportation to the island of Saint Helena, where he died in 1821.²³ Insofar Napoleon the person and his works can or may be summarised, one can conclude that Napoleon was, first and foremost, one of the most celebrated generals on horseback, a brave but impatient negotiator, a great statesman and reformer, a revolutionary on the emperor's throne, the first European

19 F. FURET, *La Révolution française*, p. 474; G. MÜCHLER, *Napoleon: Revolutionär auf dem Kaiserthron*, pp. 381-383.

20 CLAUS SCHARF, "Rußlands Politik im Bündnis von Tilsit und das Erfurter Gipfeltreffen von 1808", in RUDOLF BENL, *Der Erfurter Fürstenkongreß 1808. Hintergrund, Ablauf, Wirkung*, Stadtarchiv Erfurt, 2008, pp. 167-221.

21 *Op.cit.*, p. 220.

22 JACQUES-OLIVIER BOUDON, *Napoléon et la campagne de Russie 1812*, Armand Colin, Paris, 1912, pp. 103-192; JEAN TULARD, *Napoléon ou le mythe du sauveur*, Fayard, Paris, 1977.

23 ALAN SCHOM, *One Hundred Days: Napoleon's Road to Waterloo*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993, p. 301; G. ROTHENBERG, *Die Napoleonischen Kriege*, pp. 158-213.

dictator and the greatest usurper, and a unique son of the "goddess" of military fortune.²⁴

The French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, the Austrian and French occupation of Dalmatia, the Bay of Kotor and Dubrovnik, the establishment of the Illyrian Provinces, the French "discovery" of the Ottoman Empire, its market, geostrategic position as well as its eventual military and political alliance, had indirect reverberations in neighbouring Herzegovina, Bosnia, Serbia, Montenegro, Albania and Greece.²⁵ After the fall of Venice in May 1797, France tried to assume its centuries-long political and commercial role in the Adriatic and Mediterranean, and adapt them to its revolutionary and conquering-interests. Although France was the first European and Christian country to sign the Capitulation with the Ottoman Empire in 1528 and 1536, and from that point on nearly always had a permanent ambassador in Constantinople,²⁶ it rediscovered the geostrategic importance of Turkey for the attainment of its new political aims in eastern and south-eastern Europe during its revolutionary and military expansion at the turn of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, even Sultan Selim III admired the French Republican Army and its strike force; he decided to reorganise the Ottoman army and form new units according to the French model and with the help of French officers; this was a bold enterprise which he paid for with his own life in 1807.²⁷ However, the French presence in

24 G. MÜCHLER, *Napoleon: Revolutionär auf dem Kaiserthron*, pp. 9-18.

25 AUGUSTE BOPPE, *L'Albanie et Napoléon*, Hachette, Paris, 1914; JEAN SAVANT, *Napoléon et les Grecs. Sous les Aigles impériales*, Nouvelles Éditions Latine, Paris, 1916; ANTUN DABINOVIĆ, "La France révolutionnaire et le pays balkaniques", in *Annales de l'Institut français de Zagreb*, (hereafter: AIFZ), 2-3, 1937, pp. 87-97; MIDHAT ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni na pragu XIX stoljeća i njihovi utisci o njoj*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1966, pp. 69-87; JACQUES BAAYENS, *Les Français à Corfou, 1797-1799 et 1807-1814*, Institut français d'Athènes, Athènes, 1973; ANTOINE CASANOVA, *Napoléon et la pensée de son temps. Une histoire intellectuelle singulière*, La Boutique de l'Histoire, Paris, 2000; SLOBODAN ŠOJA, "La saga napoléonienne en Bosnie dans l'histoire et la littérature", in *Glas CDXXVIII de l'Académie serbe des sciences et des arts Classe des sciences historiques*, 18, 2018, pp. 253-266.

26 GÉRARD PÉLISSÉ DU RAUSAS, *Le régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire ottoman*, Éditions A. Rousseau, Paris, 1902; JOSEF MATUZ, *Das Osmanische Reich. Grundlinien seiner Geschichte*, Primus Verlag, Darmstadt, 1996, pp. 122.

27 ÉDOUARD DRIAULT, *La politique orientale de Napoléon*, Félix Alcan, Paris, 1904, pp. 20-27; J. MATUZ, *Das Osmanische Reich*, p. 214.

the Adriatic did not begin with the French Revolution. French influence in the Adriatic was present long before which is evident from examples of collaboration with the Republic of Dubrovnik. In 1757, the French consulate was reinstated, and in 1776, the Dubrovnik-French commercial agreement was signed.²⁸ Desiring to avoid Mediterranean and central-European post and merchant routes that were controlled by England and Austria during the Jacobin dictatorship, France attempted to establish a direct continental route with the Ottoman Empire and its representative in Constantinople by opening a consular agency in Travnik, in the Bosnian Eyalet (1793-1797).²⁹ During the Empire, it opened a consulate like the one in Travnik, which was operational from 1806-1814 and strengthened the continental merchant exchange that had been threatened by England's continental blockade.³⁰ Parallel to official political attitudes and relations, military and political travellers, spies, were sent to Herzegovina, Bosnia and Albania to prepare for the subsequent incursion onto the Danube as the rounding off of Austria and Russia to the south.³¹

The most important treaties for this topic are the Treaty of Campo Formio, signed on October 17, 1791, the Treaty of Pressburg (Bratislava), signed on December 26, 1805, and the Treaty of Schönbrunn, signed October 14, 1809. The Treaty of Pressburg returned the lands on the eastern Adriatic coast to Napoleon's crown and annexed them to the Kingdom of Italy.³² The fall of the Republic of Venice and the establishment of the first Austrian administration in Dalmatia and the Bay of Kotor, the French occupation in 1806, the conquest and abolishment of the Republic of Dubrovnik, the establishment of the Illyrian Provinces after the Treaty of Schönbrunn, the introduction of modern French administration and the repeated and final return of Austria to once Venetian lands in the eastern Adriatic triggered

28 MIRKO DEANOVIĆ, *Anciens contacts entre la France et Raguse*, Institut français, Zagreb, 1950; ZRINKA NOVAK, "Zapadna Europa", in LOVORKA ČORALIĆ (ur.), *U potrazi za mirom i blagostanjem: hrvatske zemlje u 18. stoljeću*, Biblioteka Povijest Hrvata, vol. V, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2013, pp. 477-479. <https://dokumen.tips/documents/zrinka-novak-zapadna-zrinka-novak-zapadna-europa-473> (7. 4. 2022.).

29 A. DABINOVIĆ, "La France révolutionnaire et le pays balkaniques", pp. 88, 92-96; M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni*, pp. 69-84.

30 M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni*, pp. 85-135.

31 *Op. cit.*, pp. 136-153.

32 T. MACAN, *Povijest hrvatskog naroda*, p. 266.

numerous national, political and social aspirations and pretensions, unrest and uprisings as well as ecclesiastical aspirations and changes in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor and their hinterlands, starting with Provincial and Military Croatia, the Bosnian and Belgrade Eyalets (Sanjak of Smederevo) and the Church Principality of Montenegro, all of which were present in the mentioned lands throughout the nineteenth and even twentieth centuries.³³ The militant, cosmopolitan spirit of the French Revolution and its military superiority were felt in the most brutal manner by two proud maritime republics: the Republic of Saint Mark in 1797 and the Republic of Saint Blaise from 1806-1808. The Congress of Vienna, which attempted with all its might to restore and extend the old order in Europe (*l'ancienne régime*), did not find in Metternich's visions the need to restore independence, freedom and nearly a millennium of dignity to two maritime republics, Venice and Dubrovnik.

2. Ottoman and Muslim Stratification in Herzegovina and neighbouring Bosnia

At the beginning of the 19th century, political and military unrest, battles and turmoil simultaneously struck not only Istria, the Croatian coast, Provincial and Military Croatia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor, but also Eastern and Western Herzegovina, Western, Central and Eastern Bosnia, which were partially inhabited by many Catholics and Croats. The weakness of the Ottoman Empire, the attempts at reform during the reigns of Selim III and Mahmud II and the interpersonal conflicts within the ruling Ottoman-Bosnian-Muslim caste in the Bosnia Eyalet (pashaluk),³⁴ the beginning of

33 ALFRED DUMAINE, "Un consulat de France en Bosnie sous le premier Empire: Pierre David", in *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, XXXVIII, 1924, pp. 129-169; A. DABINOVIĆ, "La France révolutionnaire et le pays balkaniques", pp. 87-97; BERNARD LEWIS, "The impact of the French Revolution on Turkey. Some notes of the transmission of ideas", in *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, 1, 1953, pp. 105-125; M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni*, pp. 13-135; S. ŠOJA, "La saga napoléonienne en Bosnie dans l'histoire et la littérature", pp. 253-266; GIUSEPPE PIO CASCAVILLA, "L'aimable Vesir": Pierre Davids Consulship under Hüsrev Mehmed Pasha's Rule", in *French Historical Studies*, 41 (4), 2018, pp. 611-645.

34 VASA ČUBRILOVIĆ, "Poreklo muslimanskog plemstva u Bosni i Hercegovini", (cyr.), in *Jugoslavenski historijski časopis*, 1, 1935, pp. 358-403; AVDO SUĆESKA, *Ajani. Prilog izučavanju lokalne vlasti u našim krajevima za vrijeme Turaka*, Djela XXII ND SR BiH, Sarajevo, 1965, pp. 210-222; M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni na pragu XIX. stoljeća*, pp. 171-216; MUHAMED

the First Serbian Uprising in 1804 and the spread of Serbian rebel propaganda amongst the Orthodox in BiH,³⁵ as well as the reaction of the Ottoman-Bosnian-Muslim authorities and aristocracy in the Bosnia Eyalet to the spread of the Serbian Uprising,³⁶ all provoked new threats, pillaging, persecutions and murders of Catholics and their religious shepherds, and provoked daily fear as to whether and how the newly arisen political, military, ideological and religious mix of national and international character would survive.³⁷ In or-

-
- HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar bis zum Jahre 1833", in *Südst-Forschungen*, 28, 1969, pp. 123-181; IDEM, "Ajanske borbe u Mostaru do 1833. godine", in *Gračanički glasnik*, 22, 2006, pp. 65-70; SREĆKO M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini na prijelazu iz 18. u 19. stoljeće*, (*Analecta croatica christiana*), Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 75-102; HAMDİJA KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1980, pp. 210-260; HAMDİJA KAPIDŽIĆ, *Ali Paša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine - Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2001, pp. 33-39.
- 35 MILORAD EKMEĐIĆ, "Mesto Bosne i Hercegovine u Srpskoj revoluciji 1804-1815", in *Srpska revolucija i Bosna i Hercegovina 1804-1815*, (cyr.), ANU RS, naučni skupovi, vol. VI, Odjeljenje društvenih nauka, vol. 8, Banja Luka, 2004, pp. 37-71; MILIĆ PETROVIĆ, "Bosna i Hercegovina u oslobodilačkim planovima ustaničke Srbije i učenih Srba" in *Srpska revolucija 1804-1815.*, (cyr.), Banja Luka, 2004, pp. 207-218, here pp. 208-209; BRATISLAV TEINOVIĆ, "Bosanski elajet u prvim godinama Prvog srpskog ustanka (1804-1806)", in *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju*, (cyr.), 1, Novi Sad, 2018, pp. 83-105.
- 36 ĆIRO TRUHELKA, "Bošnjaci i prvi srpski ustanak", in *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja*, (hereafter: GZM), XXIX, Sarajevo, 1917, pp. 245-296; JOVAN MILEKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana 1814 godine, novi prilozi za proučavanje bosansko-hercegovačke prošlosti*, Zagreb, 1917; JOVO TOŠKOVIĆ, *Odnosi između Bosne i Srbije 1805-6, i boj na Mišaru*, (cyr.), Subotica, 1927, pp. 64-65; VLADIMIR STOJANČEVIĆ, *Prvi srpski ustanak. Ogledi i studije*, (cyr.), Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Vojska, Beograd, 1994; HOLM SUNDHAUSEN, *Geschichte Serbiens. 19-21. Jahrhundert*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln-Wien-Weimar, 2007, pp. 65-69; B. TEINOVIĆ, "Bosanski ejalet u prvim godinama Prvog srpskog ustanka", (cyr.), pp. 83-104; IDEM, "Pregled srpsko-turskog ratovanja na Drini (1804-1815)", in *Vojnoistorijski glasnik*, (cyr.), 2, Beograd, 2020, pp. 9-35.
- 37 MIJO V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevaca u Bosni i Hercegovini za prvih šest vjekova njihova boravka*, III, Zagreb, 1887, pp. 175-221; TOMO MATIĆ, "Izvjestaji austrijskog političkog emisara o Dubrovniku i njegovu balkanskom zaleđu iz godine 1805.", in *Starine*, JAZU, XXXVII, Zagreb, 1934, pp. 177-188; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, pp. 93-102; BAZILIJE PANDŽIĆ, "Trebinjska biskupija u tursko doba", in IVICA PULJIĆ, *Tisuću godina Trebinjske biskupije*, Studia Vrhbosnensia, 2, Sarajevo 1988, pp. 91-122, here 119-122; MARIJAN BOGDANOVIĆ, *Ljetopis kreševskog samostana*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1984, pp. 200-217.

der to better understand the position of Catholics and Christians in Herzegovina in general and in neighbouring Bosnia at the turn of the 19th century, it is necessary to first understand the institution of the *ayans*, the major support of the High Port in these countries. It sprouted from the political desire of the High Port that the ayans (elders or local government officials) should become an instrument via which the central state government in Istanbul and vizier protectoral government in the Bosnia Eyalet could come closer to the wider parts of the conquered population and thus hold it more successfully in dependence and submission. Ayans were supposed to actively oppose the sallies of individual local Ottoman and Islamic officials, even the tyranny, violence and lawlessness of senior state government representatives. Thus, the ayans were primarily supposed to be representatives and defenders of the people's desires and needs. They were not supposed to have direct authority (jurisdiction). Therefore, the institution of the ayans is reminiscent to a certain extent of the role and institution of the *defensor civitatis* in the Byzantine state administration.³⁸ From the second half of the 18th century in Mostar, the ayans started playing an important role and transformed their once protective role into pure government over the town and region. The most evident example of new unrest at the beginning of the 19th century was the conflict between Ali-aga Dadić,³⁹ the Mo-

38 A. SUČESKA, *Ajan*, pp. 210; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Ajanske borbe u Mostaru", in *Gračanički glasnik*, 22, 2006, pp. 65-69, here 67.

39 Ali-aga Dadić (died in 1813) was the son of Smail-aga Dadić. He was born at the beginning of the second half of the 18th century in Mostar and is mentioned for the first time in 1790. The Dadićs originally hailed from Egypt (Misir) and were therefore called Misirlije (natives of Misir). They were first mentioned in Mostar in 1669. At the turn of the 19th century, Dadić would allegedly become a supporter of greater Herzegovinian and Bosnian autonomy, directly subject to the High Port, trying to surpass the authority of the vizier, the Sultan's deputy in Travnik. That was why they reluctantly and rarely appeared before the vizier of Travnik. Ali-aga Dadić, whom Sutjeska and Hadžijahić believed to be a Janissary aga, had at his disposal a larger estate and did not recognise the authority of the local Mostar captain from the Vučijaković family. It is still unclear whether Ali-aga Dadić was the first Muslim fighter for Herzegovinian independence in the Ottoman Empire and thereby a forerunner to Ali-pasha Rizvanbegović. Dadić performed the function of ayan in Mostar for almost 25 years, if short breaks are taken into consideration. Sources and historical overviews are not unanimous in the depiction of this influential Herzegovinian leader, about his rivals and about the aims of his policies. For his depiction of events, Bosnian friar and historian Batinić relied on the annals *On the*

star leader, ayan and muslim (regional administrator), and Ali-Aga Voljevica,⁴⁰ the ayan of Blagaj, from 1802 to 1804, who was fighting to becoming the ayan of Mostar. Whilst Ali-aga Dadić, according to Kalamut and Batinić, gathered the most important leaders from the most eminent Muslim families from Mostar and from the Orthodox merchant classes, his rival leaned heavily on paid ruffians and troublemakers from rural settlements. Allegedly, the main aim of Dadić's rival Vojevica was plunder and robbing Christian but also Muslim property rather than the title of ayan of Mostar. Because of these plans, crimes and unrest, many Muslims as well as Christians suffered in Mostar and the surrounding region. The former and the latter, feeling unsafe in Mostar and the region, held Ali-Aga Dadić as

Herzegovinan revolt 1802-1813 by friar Marko Kalamut (1808-1891), bishop Barišić's secretary, who had written this account based on what people said. The manuscript was once kept in the Archive of the Franciscan Monastery in Fojnica. Cf. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevacu u Bosni*, III, pp. 186-189. Serbian historian Vukičević took Kalamut's annals and transformed Dadić into an eminent Serb from Mostar. Cf. MILENKO M. VUKIČEVIĆ, *Znameniti Srbi Muslomani*, (cyr.), Belgrade, 1906, (Reprint Middletown De, 2019), pp. 99-113. Muhamed Hadžijahić and Srećko Džaja have already cautioned about the limited value of Kalamut's manuscript and Batinić's work and have brought into question several claims made by Kalamut's annals and Batinić's account. A. SUČESKA, *Ajani*, p. 190; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 127-129, 134-137; IDEM, "Ajanske borbe u Mostaru", pp. 65-69; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 97; HIVZIJA HASANDEDIĆ, *Genealoška istraživanja*, Mostar, 2009, p. 48. Mostar historian Tihomir Zovko recently pointed out Vukičević's problem, however, he did not take into consideration either Hadžijahić's, Džaja's or Hasandedić's works nor the fate and value of Kalamut's annals. Cf. TIHOMIR ZOVKO, "Proces hrvatske nacionalne integracije u Mostaru", in *Hercegovina*, 2, Mostar - Zagreb, 2016, p. 146.

- 40 The family of Ali-aga Voljevica originated in the village Svinjarina in Podveležje. Its inhabitants were Catholics, and they still had St. Peter's Church in Podveležje in 1629. In the following decades, they converted to Islam to avoid higher taxation. One part of the Voljevicas later moved to Blagaj, whereas others were still living in Podveležje in the 1950s. They have been mentioned in Mostar since 1755. In the Blagaj records for 1767, Ali-Efendi Voljevica was mentioned as a witness. It is impossible to ascertain whether this was our Ali-aga or one of the older members of his family. Furthermore, it is not possible to determine when he became the ayan of Blagaj. After the battles with Ali-aga Dadić, Voljevica fled to Egypt via Dubrovnik. Later, most probably after Dadić's death in 1813, he returned to the country of his ancestors. Cf. TVRKO KANAET, *Podveležje i Podvelešci*, ND SR BiH, Djela VI, Sarajevo, 1955, pp. 154, 232-235; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 138-142; H. HASANDEDIĆ, *Genealoška istraživanja*, pp. 48, 180-181.

the more reasonable man, who behaved more humanely and justly towards the population. After his victory over Voljeвица, if Kalamut's and Batinić's depiction can be credited, Dadić also led fierce battles against other Mostar pretenders to the position of ayan in Mostar, aga Balić and aga Karabegović, who had risen against him.⁴¹ Again, Ali-aga Dadić proved victorious in this contest, which allegedly led to mutual reconciliation in Mostar. Dadić's victory was supported by the Christians of both denominations, the Orthodox and Catholics, in Mostar and the environs.⁴² None of these battles stopped Dadić from introducing new levies on an already materially exhausted population and from governing and behaving like a true master in the heart of Hercegovina. It is also noteworthy to mention that ayan Dadić, together with other captains, attained a significant victory over the Montenegrins, Russians and east-Herzegovinian Serbs in the captaincy of Klobuk (Gacko), which was defended by captain Arslan.⁴³ Dadić's troops also included Catholics under the leadership of friar Nikola Ilić and Mostar Orthodox under the leadership of monk Tanasija.⁴⁴ Even the French under the command of general Launay came to assist the Herzegovinian captains and ayan Dadić in their battle against the Montenegrins. On this occasion, many Montenegrins and their allies died, while around 70 of them were captured. General Launay ransomed the captives and released them.⁴⁵ The defeated Montenegrins did not rest until, according to their custom,

41 M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 138-139.

42 JOANIČIJE PAMUČINA, "Početak dolaska grčki(h) vladika u Hercegovinu", in *Srpsko-dalmatinski magacin, ljubitelj prosvjete i narodnog jezika za godinu 1848*, (cyr.), vol. XIII, Zadar, 1848, pp. 169-181, here 173; VLADIMIR ČOROVIĆ, *Mostar i njegova srpska pravoslavna opština*, (cyr.), Belgrade, 1933, p. 31; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 138.

43 SAFVET-BEG BAŠAGIĆ, *Kratka uputa u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine. (Od g. 1463-1850.)*, Vlastita naklada, Sarajevo, 1900, p. 121; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 139-140; H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, p. 220; This battle has been immortalised in a Muslim epic poem *Vojevanje Cernogoracah i Rusah s Hercegovcim*, which was transcribed by Ljubomir (friar Grga Martić) and published by friar Ivan Franjo Jukić. Cf. IVAN F. JUKIĆ, *Bosanski prijatelj*, II, Zagreb, 1851, pp. 150-156.

44 M. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevacu*, III, p. 179; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 160.

45 PAUL PISANI, *La Dalmatie de 1797 d 1815. Épisode des conquêtes Napoléoniennes*, Paris, 1893, pp. 267, 280, 298; FRANO BARAS, *Maršal Marmont memoari*, Logos, Split, 1984, p. 67.

they had avenged themselves for the losses in a new battle, which although lesser known, occurred in the vicinity of Mostar in July 1807. The casualties of this battle included numerous Herzegovinian "Turks", while no mention was made of the losses of the Christians, Catholics and Orthodox Montenegrins.⁴⁶

Immediately following this battle with the Montenegrins, conflict broke out in the period 1807-1809 between the already mentioned captain from Hutovo Hadži-bey and his neighbour, the captain of Počitelj, Smail-bey Gavran-Kapetanović, who was laying claim to several neighbouring villages in the captaincy of Hutovo. Dadić went to war again, siding with the captain of Počitelj. This evoked a reaction from the vizier in Travnik, Ibrahim Hilmi-pasha, who sent Sulejman-pasha Skopljak to assist the captain of Hutovo. In this battle, which lasted until spring 1809, Dadić defeated Hadži-bey, who besides the vizier from Travnik, was also supported by Ali-aga Voljevica and the High Port.⁴⁷ Seeing that the French were expressly supporting the vizier and the captains loyal to him, i.e., supporters of imperial centralism, Ali-aga Dadić attempted to support the dissatisfied citizens of Dubrovnik over the following two years (1808-1809) in their symbolic resistance to the French, but did not have much success and had to retreat to his fortress in Mostar.⁴⁸ It appears that representatives of both Christian denominations in Mostar supported Dadić, particularly the Orthodox bishop, Phanariot Jeremija, who flew

46 Major Rukavina informed the military command in Vienna on July 30, 1807, that numerous "Turkish" horses had returned to Mostar without riders ("daß eine große Menge 'türkischer' Pferde ohne Reiter nach Mostar zurückgekehrt sei"). Cf. ALEKSA IVIĆ, *Spisi bečkih arhiva o Prvom srpskom ustanku*, vol. IV - 1807, in *Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda*, (cyr.), vol. XII, SKA, Subotica, 1938, p. 737; M. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevacu*, III, pp. 185-187; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 140-142.

47 MIHAILO GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva: Građa za istoriju Prvog srpskog ustanka*, (cyr.), *Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost Srpskog naroda*, Odeljenje 2, Spomenici na tuđim jezicima, vol. 1, SKA, Belgrade, 1904, 305, no. 260; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 142. In one folksong, Ali-aga Voljevica was presented despicably: "Alija, veleški balija, lahko ti je cviliti udovice, i sićahnu djecu iz mejtefa, a sad češ nam odmazdu platiti." (Alija, balija from Velez, it's easy to make widows and wee children from the mekteb cry, but now you will suffer our revenge.) *Loc.cit.*

48 M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), 463, no. 401; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 142; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 97.

three flags in front of his house and collected financial assistance for the Mostar ayan.⁴⁹ As early as April 1808, consul David reported to Paris that Ali-aga, the commander of Mostar, was too powerful to attack with military units.⁵⁰ This was something his Ottoman, Bosnian and Herzegovinian rivals would soon find out. As all the efforts of Istanbul, Travnik and the French to date were unable to stop Dadić's separatist policies and desires to rule independently in Hercegovina, the new vizier, Ali-pasha Derendeli,⁵¹ had Dadić physically removed, poisoned or strangled. The newly appointed muslim, Omer-pasha Rizvanbegović, the third of the four younger Rizvanbegović brothers from Stolac, did this for the vizier, most probably in Mostar in December 1813.⁵² All three of Ali-aga's sons (Mehmed-aga, Mustafa-aga and Ahmed-aga) attempted to maintain their father's policies as they still enjoyed the support of both the Muslim and the Christian population in Mostar and Hercegovina. Their days, however, were numbered in Mostar and Hercegovina. Mehmed-aga, Ali-aga's oldest son, who had become the ayan in the meantime, was removed from office, robbed and killed in Čelebić čošak in Luka by the same muslim Omer-pasha Rizvanbegović.⁵³ The other two brothers fled to

49 M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), 474. no. 412.

50 "mais ces comandant de Mostar est trop puissant pour être attaqué de vive force." M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), 305, no. 260.

51 Vizier Ali-pasha Darendeli was the vizier in Bosnia from March 4, 1813-March 30, 1815. In October 1813, he put down the First Serbian Uprising and entered Belgrade, and in December, he put down the ayan revolt in Mostar and had Ali-aga Dadić killed. He also had many Serb prisoners and disobedient Bosnian ayans killed, however, he lost the decisive battle against the dissatisfied Janissaries from Sarajevo and rebels in autumn of 1814 and had to leave Bosnia the following year. Cf. SALIH SIDKI HADŽIHUSEINOVIĆ-MUVEKKIT, *Povijest Bosne*, 1-2, El-Kalem, Sarajevo, 1999, pp. 805-806; J. MILEKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana*, pp. 7, 26; GALIB ŠLJIVO, "Nemiri u Sarajevu 1814. godine", in *Prilozi proučavanju historije Sarajeva*, 5, 2008, pp. 29-38. The Bosnian Franciscan and annalist Baltić, who is not always reliable, claimed: "Ovaj vezir nije znao čitati slova." ("This vizier could not read letters.") Cf. JAKO BALTIĆ, *Godišnjak od događaja crkvenih, svjetskih i promine vremena u Bosni 1754-1882.*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1991, p. 73.

52 J. MILEKĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana*, pp. 7, 26; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 146, note 70; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, pp. 97-98.

53 J. PAMUČINA, "Početak dolaska grčki(h) vladika u Hercegovinu", (cyr.), pp. 169-181; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 153; H. HASANDEDIĆ, *Genealoška istraživanja*, p. 96.

neighbouring Dalmatia via Imotski, and Metković. Upon returning to Mostar, they were killed off one by one, by April 1814 at the latest, in a new conflict with the vizier's troops. The only survivor was the grandson Mahmud, the son of Mehmed-aga, who was disguised in girl's clothes, and taken secretly from the Dadić house by a Catholic servant and hidden in her village Uzarići until a safer time.⁵⁴

Desiring to finally break the Dadićs and their followers as well as discourage the Catholics from offering armed assistance to the rebelling Mostar population, vizier Ali-pasha Derendeli addressed the Herzegovinian Catholics via the Kreševo monastery on April 15, 1814, and threatened them seriously if they offered any more resistance to the sultan's army and the army of his deputy. He tried to support his persuasion, threats and commands theologically correctly by mentioning the Gospel:

"I, Ali-pasha, Deputy of the worthy Emperor, and Vizier of all of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the name of the worthy Emperor command the raiyah (*people*) of Herzegovina as follows. Emperor's raiyah, who have been loyal to the worthy Emperor from the Fatihah to this day, have no cause to betray, nor can you betray, any law against the Emperor and the Emperor's deputy, because such a betrayal is forbidden to the raiyah by the same Gospel. For the vizier is in the Emperor's place; the worthy Emperor is in God's place. Whoever betrays and raises his hand against the Emperor's Deputy is against the Emperor and whoever raises his hand against his Emperor, raises his hand against God; for the worthy Emperor is in God's place in his land. Such a betrayal the Almighty eternal God never left unpunished as has been seen through all ages past and in other lands and past years in ours as well."

He finishes his deputy's decree with the following:

"I command my subject the friar of the Mostar nahiyah (*a small administrative unit smaller than a kadiluk*) parish to proclaim my decree to the Emperor of Herzegovina's raiyah, which if they fulfil loyally what has been commanded of them, let them remove themselves and come to my commanders, who will

54 A year later, he was returned to his mother, nee Hadžiomerović, in Mostar. Immediately after that, the mother moved with her son to Ljubuški and found sanctuary with the family of bey Kapetanović. Mahmud Dadić later married into the Gavrankapetanović family in Mostar. The male line of the Dadić family in Mostar died out in 1998 while the Sarajevo line is still extant. Cf. M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), pp. 825-827, nos. 760-762; J. MILKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana*, pp. 21-26; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", p. 153; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 98; H. HASANDEDIĆ, *Genealoška istraživanja*, p. 97.

pardon them; but if they cannot repair to me, they should remove themselves wherever they can. I command thus, I will this be done."⁵⁵

This very dangerous, mutual conflict between Muslim leaders was a pure battle for survival for the Catholics. The Mostar parish priest friar Mijo Nikolić, the Blato parish priest friar Filip Letić and the Brotnjo parish priest friar Jako Jeličić were responsible for the Catholics in Western Hercegovina.⁵⁶ When the vizier's decree arrived in the Mostar nahiyah and whether it met with success is debatable. Moreover, the friar from Kruševo mentioned that the vizier's decree had no effect with the Catholics "because the Mostar natives, who tailored justice in the war melee and who were closest to them, forced them to rise against the army".⁵⁷ Simultaneously, the Sarajevo supporters of Dadić and the Mostar citizens, predominantly Janissaries, came to Kruševo and forced the friars to move with armed parishioners to assist the Mostar population against the vizier's troops. The Catholics from Kruševo and the region were led by friar Bartol Tucaković from Vranak (near Kruševo) and friar Luka Vidović from Deževica. When they arrived in Goranci above Mostar, the Sarajevo rebels together with the Catholics from Kruševo defeated the vizier's units and executed their leader pasha Srebrenica and then returned to their homes.⁵⁸ After the final victory of the vizier's army over the Mostar rebels, the Catholics found their lives in even greater jeopardy. Wali's replacement, *čehaja*, put the Catholics from Mostar together with the

55 IGNACIJE STRUKIĆ, *Povjestničke crtice Kreševa i franjevačkog samostana*, Sarajevo, 1899, p. 101; JULIJAN JELENIĆ, *Izvori za kulturnu povijest bosanskih franjevaca*, Zemaljska Štamparija, Sarajevo, 1913, pp. 107-108. The vizier's letter was addressed to the Guardian and Franciscan friars at the monastery in Kruševo, who performed pastoral duties in western Hercegovina. A copy was sent to the Franciscan-parish priest in Blato. Whether news about the vizier's decree reached the parish priests in the Trebinje diocese is unknown.

56 M. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevaca*, III, p. 186; Vukičević mistakenly mentions friar Nikola Ilić instead of friar Mijo Nikolić. Cf. M. VUKIČEVIĆ, *Znameniti Srbi Muslomani*, p. 105; Bogdanović does not even mention this event which is very important for the Herzegovinian parishes of the Kruševo monastery. Cf. M. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Ljetopis Kreševskog samostana*, pp. 213-214; ROBERT JOLIĆ, *Leksikon hercegovačkih franjevaca*, Mostar, 2011, pp. 168, 296.

57 I. STRUKIĆ, *Povjestničke crtice Kreševa*, p. 102.

58 M. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Ljetopis Kreševskog samostana*, p. 215; V. ĆOROVIĆ, *Mostar i njegova srpska pravoslavna opština*, (cyr.), pp. 33-34.

three mentioned parish priests on trial and started threatening them with execution, asking why they had helped the rebel Dadić and his followers. The friars attempted to explain to the local magistrate that they had not done this voluntarily or out of conviction, but out of fear for their own lives. When the "Turkish martial court" saw these justified reasons, and the "intense weeping of the present raiyah, it forgave the Catholics and thereby gave a rare, until now unusual, example of their tolerance", an author from Kreševo wrote.⁵⁹

Although the Catholics were regularly mentioned at the beginning of the 19th century in Mostar, it is difficult to talk of a concrete number. Only by consulting the baptismal registers of the Mostar parish, which was a large area, was it possible to ascertain approximate numbers. In 1807, the future secretary of the French consulate, Chaumette de Fossés, passed through Mostar on his way from Dubrovnik, and neither observed nor noted anything about Catholics in the town.⁶⁰ He may have been partially correct because Catholics lived predominantly dispersed outside the town. In fact, the parish of Mostar, whose seat was in Gradac near Mostar, encompassed an enormous region at the time from the city of Mostar to the inaccessible Mostar valleys north and south of the surrounding hills and places: Mostarski Gradac, Goranci, Blagaj, Bijelo Polje, and from Grabovica

59 I. STRUKIĆ, *Povjestničke crtice Kreševa*, p. 102. Nevertheless, numerous Christian supporters of Dadić were killed in Mostar: 17 Orthodox and 9 Catholics. 13 Muslims from Mostar were strangled as Dadić's supporters. J. PAMUČINA, "Početak dolaska grčki(h) vladika u Hercegovinu", (cyr.), p. 175; V. ČORVIĆ, *Mostar i njegova srpska pravoslavna opština*, (cyr.), p. 34.

60 Chaumette de Fossés is not always a reliable and accurate travel writer or witness of his time. He claimed, incorrectly, that Mostar had 12,000 inhabitants in 1807-1808 of which two-thirds were Orthodox, ("dont les deux tiers sont Grecs"). Later he cited that the Orthodox in the town got on well with the Turks (Muslims) and that they enjoyed great freedom ("Les Grecs y vivent en bonne intelligence avec les Turcs, et y jouissent d'une grande liberté"). It is interesting that he does not even mention Catholics, perhaps out of Jacobin animosity, but also because the Catholics lived discretely, being dispersed across the town and surroundings. M. AMÉDÉE CHAUMETTE-DE-FOSSÉS, *Voyage en Bosnie dans les années 1807 et 1808*, P. Didot, Paris, 1816, p. 43. In another section, Chaumette de Fossés talked in detail about the organisation of the Catholic Church in Bosnia and Herzegovina, more phenomenologically rather than historical-statistically and he erred with respect to many numbers and terms. IDEM, pp. 67-70.

to the north to the villages Lise and Knešpolje to the south-west. In 1813, 2913 Catholics lived in this region.⁶¹

Besides the Dadić family, their battles and unrest, further great tension and unrest in Hercegovina at the beginning of the 19th century was caused by the members of the Stolac captain family Rizvanbegović.⁶² In fact, their leader, the Stolac captain Zulfikar-bey, who had usurped the captain's honours between 1752-1757 from the rival Šarić family from Stolac and performed the function for nearly 50 years, with small breaks, stepped down in 1802.⁶³ In order to deter battles among his sons but also with rivals from the Šarić family, Zulfikar-bey divided the captaincy of Stolac in favour of two of his sons from his first marriage, Mustafa-bey and Hadži Mehmed-bey. The older son Mustafa-bey⁶⁴ inherited the duty of captain of Stolac from his father, whereas Mehmed-bey, popularly known as Hadži-bey, received a new but much smaller captaincy in nearby Hutovo, which he would administer as captain to his death in 1832. Hadži-bey had the old city/fortress in Hutovo renovated and built a taller tower in which he accommodated the "region's guards" and moved in himself.⁶⁵ When the French were on their way to conquer the Bay of Kotor in the spring of 1806, they found Dubrovnik occupied by Russians and Montenegrins. From Hutovo, Hadži-bey came to the assistance of the French with allegedly 1000 Herzegovinians, mostly Catholics, and he suppressed the advance of the Montenegrins to Slano in June 1806, where they had planned to thwart the arrival

61 LEO PETROVIĆ, "Katoličko stanovništvo u Mostaru", in *Napredak Hrvatski narodni kalendar*, 1937, Sarajevo, 1936, pp. 120-132; DRAGUTIN KAMBER, "Stanje župa i duša apostolskog vikarijata u Bosni srebreničko-otomanskoj prema popisu izvršenom 1813.", in *Franjevački vijesnik*, 3, Belgrade, 1932, p. 87.

62 On the origins of the Rizvanbegović family and the captaincies of Vidoški and Hutovo cf. KOSTA HÖRMANN, "Hadži begova kula u Hutovu", in *GZM*, II, Sarajevo, 1890, pp. 165-175; *GZM*, III, 1890, pp. 268-271; A. SUĆESKA, *Ajani*, pp. 219-222; H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, pp. 224-234, 252-260; IVICA PULJIĆ, "Kroz našu prošlost", in IVICA PULJIĆ (ed.), *Hutovo*, Mostar, 1994, pp. 177-183; H. KAPIDŽIĆ, *Ali-paša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, pp. 30-33; H. HASANDEDIĆ, *Genealoška istraživanja*, p. 54.

63 H. KAPIDŽIĆ, *Ali-paša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, pp. 25-33.

64 H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 231-233.

65 H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 252-256; H. KAPIDŽIĆ, *Ali-paša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, pp. 33-39.

of French reinforcements in Dubrovnik. Through this "spontaneous" and politically calculated move, he attained the great partiality of the French generals.⁶⁶ Together with the other Herzegovinian captains from Mostar, Stolac, Počitelj and Ljubuški, he participated in the battles against the Montenegrins and Russians in the summer of 1807 and helped break the combined Russian-Montenegrin forces near Klobuk. That the Catholic Croats, from Hrasno in particular, were once again numerous in the troops led by the captain of Hutovo Hadži-bey, should not be a secret.⁶⁷ However, the most Catholics would fall in the clan conflicts between the Rizvanbegović and Šarić families and in the fratricidal wars that were waged between Hadži-bey and Mustaj-bey, and then later the even longer conflict between Hadži-bey and his younger half-brothers Ali-aga,⁶⁸ Halil-aga, Omer-bey and Derviš-bey.⁶⁹ On July 14, 1808, the French Consul David from Travnik reported to his government in Paris:

66 M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), p. 362, no. 307; K. HÖRMANN, "Hadži begova kula", pp. 171-172; ENGEL - STANOJEVIĆ, *Povjest Dubrovačke Republike*, p. 269; M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni*, pp. 148-149; F. BARAS, *Maršal Marmont memoari*, p. 29.

67 K. HÖRMANN, "Hadži begova kula", p. 172. H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, p. 256; I. PULJIĆ, *Hutovo*, p. 179.

68 Ali-aga is the future Ali-pasha Rizvanbegović-Stočević (Stolac, 1783-Dobrinj near Banjaluka, 1851), the Stolac captain from 1813 to 1833, and from 1833 to 1851 the vizier and independent administrator of Herzegovina. He was buried near the Ferhadija mosque in Banja Luka, where a Turbe was later erected over his grave. Besides other merits, he also received much credit for the Catholic church in Herzegovina. Cf. RIZVANBEGOVIĆ, "Ali-Paša", in *Hrvatska Enciklopedija*, 9, p. 376; OTON KNEZOVIĆ, "Ali-paša Rizvanbegović-Stočević, hercegovački vezir 1832-1851", in *GZM*, year XL, vol. 2, Sarajevo, 1928, pp. 11-53 (particularly pp. 19-53); HAJRUDIN ČURIĆ, "Ali-paša Rizvanbegović-Stočević, hercegovački vezir", in *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića*, vol. XLVI, 1937, pp. 201-297; IDEM, "Ali-paša Rizvanbegović i organizacija Katoličke crkve u Hercegovini", in *List za sokolski naraštaj*, 6, 1938, pp. 160-161; IVAN PEDERIN, "Oblici otpora balkanskih muslimana reformama iz Carigrada", in *Radovi Leksikografskog zavoda Miroslav Krleža*, vol. 4, Zagreb, 1995, pp. 203-220, here p. 219; H. KAPIDŽIĆ, *Ali-paša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, pp. 33-41.

69 JOANIKIJE PAMUČINA, *Život ali-paše Rizvanbegovića Stočanina (pričanja savremenika i očevica)*, in PROKOPIJE ČOKORILO - JOANIKIJE PAMUČINA - STAKA SKENDEROVA, *Ljetopisi*, (cyr.), Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1976, pp. 75-78; K. HÖRMANN, "Hadži begova kula", p. 173; O. KNEZOVIĆ, "Ali-paša Rizvanbegović-Stočević", p. 19; M. HADŽIJAHIĆ, "Die Kämpfe der Ajane in Mostar", pp. 143, 146.

"When I arrived in Bosnia, the greater part of Herzegovina was the stage for a bitter war being fought between the members of a powerful family. Of the five brothers who constituted it, the three younger brothers were fighting against the two older ones, of which one was the captain of Stolac and the other the master of Hutovo. The latter had kindly received the wives and children of the citizens from Dubrovnik who had been hiding on Ottoman territory during the siege of Dubrovnik. This same bey, in order to show his amity towards us, started a war against the Montenegrins. His loyalty did irreparable damage in the eyes of many Bosniaks."⁷⁰

The French liked helping Hadži-bey with forces, food and weapons and defended him against the jealous younger Rizvanbegović brothers, the war-mongering captain of Počitelj, Gavran-Kapetanović, and the representative of the Bosnian vizier, Sulejman-pasha Skopljak, as the French consul and French historian Pisani reported.⁷¹ Hadži-bey continued his fratricidal war even after the departure of the French until his death in his native Stolac in 1832.

3. Catholics in the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese during the Period of Unrest and Political Conflicts

Very little is known from published and accessible sources to what extent and how bishop Ferić⁷² in Dubrovnik and his general vicar in the diocese, father Grgo Matušковиć, together with the clergy of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese were able to, at least, try to intervene and protect their faithful from constant conscription into the captain's troops, from daily persecution, taxes, additional levies, beatings and pillaging, which the Ottoman authorities – both local and foreign – practiced every day. The sources tell us even less about the relation of the bishop, the clergy and the Catholic population in the Trebin-

70 M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), p. 344, no. 292; H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, p. 256.

71 P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, p. 267; M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), pp. 345-346, no. 292; H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, p. 256; I. PULJIĆ, *Hutovo*, pp. 179-180.

72 Nikola Ferić (Gvozdica), (Dubrovnik, 1736 - Dubrovnik, 1819), was the Trebinje-Mrkan bishop from 1792 to 1819. He was ordained a priest in 1759, consecrated and appointed bishop in 1792. Cf. MILENKO KREŠIĆ, "Dubrovačka Republika i ferman za trebinjsko-mrkanskog biskupa Nikolu Ferića", in *Anali Dubrovnik*, 58, 2020, pp. 217-219; <https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bferrn.html> (20. 3. 2022.).

je-Mrkan Diocese towards neighbouring Austrians (1797-1805) and French (1806-1813) during their occupation and rule in Dalmatia, the Bay of Kotor and Dubrovnik. It can be assumed that the clergy of the Trebinje Diocese looked upon the Austrian occupation of Dalmatia and the Bay of Kotor in 1797 benevolently, and that they saw in the Austrian Emperor not only the Croatian-Hungarian king but also the main defender of Christians, particularly Catholics in the Ottoman Empire. The Catholics in the Trebinje Diocese, however, did not have a political or religious leader who would dare appeal to the Austrian Emperor and the Croatian-Hungarian King to annex Hercegovina – the Duchy of St. Saba, to the crown of St. Stephen, which the bold and far-seeing Bosnian "uncle", the apostolic vicar and bishop, friar Grgo Ilić Varešanin did for Bosnia on November 25, 1797.⁷³ They lacked clergy of the calibre of someone like the Dalmatian friar Andrija Dorotić, who in his *Proclamation to the Dalmatian People*, printed in Venice towards the end of May 1791, and in the *Karin Statement of the Dalmatian Franciscan Parish Priests* of June 14, 1797, professed "the deep desire to be united with the peoples and Kingdom of Croatia with whom they used to be united with the crown and kingdom of Hungary as an associated party".⁷⁴ Such a political and national profile, if he possessed such at all, bishop Ferić could not and was not allowed to display. He had to act like a local patriot, a citizen of the Republic of Dubrovnik that lived in the shadow of three protectors: the Sultan in Istanbul, the Pope in Rome and the Emperor in Vienna, all three of whom were threatened by the French Revolution and its combative flagbearer Napoleon Bonaparte. Thus, from the beginning, bishop Ferić behaved like a conscientious but simultaneously powerless shepherd, which was best seen from his partially jumbled, initial reports on the status of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese sent to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1793 and 1794. Already in November and December 1792, he started visiting the smaller parishes of his diocese and reached three border parishes: Gradac, Ravno and Trebinja. He did not, however, dare go any further as the Republic of Dubrovnik had not yet obtained a new imperial firman allowing him to perform his duties in the Ottoman

73 See notes 129-130 and the relevant text.

74 G. NOVAK, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, II, p. 272; V. KAPITANOVIĆ, *Fra Andrija Dorotić*, p. 83.

Empire.⁷⁵ This is why the two farthest and largest parishes, Hrasno and Dubrave, had remained unvisited. It was only the following year, thanks to good relations with the Stolac captain and expensive gifts, naturally, that he managed to visit Hrasno and Dubrave. It is noteworthy that in Stolac at the time the first family uprising occurred against the aging captain Zulfikar Rizvanbegović and there were four or five rebellious agas. The uprising was most probably organised by two of Zulfikar's older sons, Mustafa-bey and Mehmed-bey, with the assistance of the removed Šarić family and others – all desirous of dividing up the captaincy of Vidoški amongst themselves. Ferić reports to Rome, that whereas earlier it was only necessary to send a gift to the captain of the fortress, now it had also become necessary to gift the other four or five agas.⁷⁶

Before the greater unrest began, bishop Ferić wrote to the prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1796 that his diocese, Trebinje, had found itself in grave and critical circumstances due to the constant raids and civil wars with the Ottoman "barbarians", who persecuted poor Catholics, beat them violently and raided their flocks and goods. The Catholics were thus forced to leave their homes, to wander and break their legs on steep hills and hide in caves if they wanted to live. His priests were also forced to hide in one village or another to protect themselves from Ottoman harm and save their lives from the latter's wrath.⁷⁷ Certain priests also advo-

75 The firman (mandate) was obtained on the third attempt in 1798. In his greed, the then Bosnian deputy Husamudin-pasha (1792-1797) sought exorbitant sums which the Republic of Dubrovnik refused to pay. Cf. M. KREŠIĆ, "Dubrovačka Republika i ferman za trebinjsko-mrkanskog biskupa Nikolu Ferića", p. 227.

76 "...dove prima il Vescovo mandava i regali al solo Capitano della Città di Stolaz, ora gl'Aghe, cioè nobili del Paese a norma dei Francesi si sono sollevati contro questo Comandante e vogliono comandare loro, è questi sono quattro o cinque; onde per essere quieto ed esercitare il mio ministero, ogni volta che si va nella Visita bisogna regalare ogni uno di questi, in fuori degl'altri Turchi di basso rango che arrivano in quei Casali ove mi trovo." Bishop Ferić to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome 1794, Archivio Storico di Propaganda Fide (ASPF) Roma, SOCG, vol. 900, fol. 170v. Cf. MILENKO KREŠIĆ, *Don Vidoje Maslač i Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija (1795.-1862.)*, Župni ured, Trebinje, 2012, p. 20, note 17.

77 "La mia diocesi, pure di Trebigne, presentemente si trova in gravi e critiche circostanze delle continue scorrerie e guerre civili tra questi barbari Ottomani quali perseguitano i poveri Cattolici e a forza delle battiture rapiscono le loro

cated the freedom of their faithful. A known example of this is the undated entreaty of father Jozo Sokolović, the parish priest in Ravno (1804-1824), to the Sultan in Constantinople to protect the "humble servants from the Herzegovinian Sanjak, county of Ljubinje, outpost Popovo", the possessors of an imperial firman, and to issue them with a decree "which will command the authorities in writing not to impose any tolls and not to bother us in the performance of our rites". The vizier's response arrived, commanding: "To the Ljubinje cadi, agas and officers! It is hereby decreed that you will take into your protection any priest who possesses an imperial firman, that you shall not allow him to be insulted, nor will you insult him, you will fulfil his requests as guaranteed by the firman and you shall avoid any burden that would be contrary to the issued commands."⁷⁸

Whatever bishop Ferić and his clergy personally thought or planned had to coincide with the political and territorial interests of the Republic of Dubrovnik, whose visions, political orientation and free sea-trading were greatly threatened by the Treaty of Campo Formio.⁷⁹ The Treaty of Pressburg, the French occupation of Dalmatia, the Bay of Kotor and Dubrovnik itself reduced all the plans and desires of bishop Ferić and his clergy to a bare battle for subsistence and survival.⁸⁰ So, it should not be strange to presume that bishop Ferić and his few clergymen must have been against French policies, par-

mandrie e beni, talmente per salvare la vita non possono stare nelle proprie case, ma sono costretti andare raminghi per scoscesi, e alpestri monti, e nascondersi nelle caverne, i miei Parrochi pure sono costretti andare or in uno or in altro casale per garantirsi dai loro insulti ed potersi salvare la propria vita dal loro furore". Bishop Ferić to Cardinal Hyacinthe Sigismond Gerdil, Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 25. 7. 1796. ASPF Roma, S.C. Dalmazia vol. 16, fol. 282^r. One part of this report has already been published by Pandžić. Cf. B. PANDŽIĆ, "Trebinjska biskupija", p. 120; M. KREŠIĆ, *Don Vidoje Maslač*, p. 20, note 18.

78 Copy in the Bishop's archive in Mostar. Cf. RATKO PERIĆ, *Da im spomen očuvamo*, Biskupski ordinarijat, Mostar, 2000, p. 145.

79 V. FORETIĆ, *Povijest Dubrovnika*, II, p. 336.

80 Already in the autumn of 1806, Dubrovnik had de facto stopped being the shield and security of bishop Ferić, his clergy and the faithful in the diocese. Supreme political control was in the hands of Marshall Marmont and his generals, the Bosnian pasha in Travnik and the Herzegovinian captains in Stolac, Trebinje, Hutovo and Počitelj. Cf. P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, pp. 266-267; V. FORETIĆ, *Povijest Dubrovnika*, II, pp. 447-456; STJEPAN ČOSIĆ, *Dubrovnik nakon pada Republike (1808.-1848.)*, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Dubrovnik, 1999, pp. 13-31.

ticularly after the abolishment of the Republic of Dubrovnik on January 31, 1808, which, besides the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, was their only protector at the time. Furthermore, as the Trebinje clergy had predominantly been educated in Italy, they knew the country well, and they must have had an aversion towards French methods when they discovered or experienced the French generals, together with local Jacobins, destroying or pillaging numerous dioceses, monasteries, religious schools, desecrating churches, stealing sacral artworks, and transferring everything to Paris, capturing popes twice and abolishing his Church State.⁸¹

A report, although not always clear, by French consul David from December 15, 1808, sheds some light on the silence of archive sources. In the report, the consul was complaining to his Minister of Foreign Affairs in Paris, de Champagny, that the French were not accepted in Bosnia, and that the Catholic monks (*moines*) speak and preach against them. If this were just the case with Bosnian Franciscans, this would be understandable. However, when David began asking the trustworthy beys who these "monks" were, one confirmed that they were not Bosnian but Herzegovinian clergy and that he had heard with his own ears how they spoke ill of the French in the canton/captaincy under his control. However, these were not priests from Bosnia but from Dubrovnik, and the bey added: "The jurisdiction of the Bosnian Franciscans does not extend beyond Mostar. Everything beyond and all the way to Montenegro are those from Dubrovnik monasteries, which have been supplying priests for the Catholics in Herzegovina. Rest assured in one thing, he added, and that's that the French have no greater enemies than the nobility and priests from Dubrovnik."⁸² Since there were no monks from Du-

81 ANDRÉ LATREILLE, "L'Église et l'État en France sous le Premier Empire", in *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France*, 96, 1936, pp. 338-348; SIMON DELACROIX, *La réorganisation de l'Église de France après le Concordat (1801-1809)*, Ed. du Vitrail, Paris, 1962; BEATRICE MASCHETTO, "Cultura e politica nell'Italia giacobina. Spunti dell'esperienza cisalpina", in *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée*, 2 (1966), pp. 731-740; GIOVANI SALE, "Napoleone e la religione", in *La civiltà cattolica*, 4015, 3. 7. 2021, pp. 23-37.

82 "La juridiction des Franciscaines bosniaques ne vas plus loin que Mostar. Tout ce qui est au-delà jusqu' à Monténégro est sons celles de couvents de Raguse, qui du tout temps ont fourni des prêtres au Catholiques de l'Herzégovine. Soyez bien persuadé d'une chose, a-t-il ajouté, c'est que les Français n'ont des plus grandes ennemies, que les nobles et les prêtres de Raguse". M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), p. 376, no. 322.

brovnik at the time, except for refugees and displaced persons, who could perform spiritual duties in the Trebinje Diocese, they could only have been diocesan priests, who had practically been the only spiritual shepherds in Eastern Herzegovina since the 14th century. The unidentified bey, who was a person of trust for the French, could only have been Hadži-bey from Hutovo, who was notorious as an oppressor and persecutor of Christians, both Catholics and Orthodox. Bishop Ferić wrote about him in June 1803, depicting him as "a proud man, greedy for money and a bitter persecutor of poor Christians, from whom he unjustly extorts property and money, usurps their lands and commits other undignified and barbaric deeds".⁸³ In January 1804, father Grgo Matušević added his opinion, comparing Hadži Mehmed-bey, who had arrived in Hutovo five years earlier, with Lucifer.⁸⁴ The much younger, Orthodox priest Joanikije Pamučina, who had later listened to many witnesses and testimonies, described Hadži-bey's multiple atrocities, particularly those towards the young Catholic women of the time:

"The area around Hutovo is inhabited only by Catholics. When Hadži-bey needed people to harvest the wheat, prune or do anything else, he would only call for the maidens, and when the daily work was done, he would feed them and get them drunk, then he would force them into a round to sing, and he would observe them. Sometimes if one of them especially caught his eye – he would grab her by the hand and take her to the tower and would remain there until he wanted to and he would do whatever he wanted, and then he would select young men of her faith from the most honourable families and unite them by force, against their volition."⁸⁵

83 "il presente Comandante della Torre d' Utovo uomo fiero, avido al denaro, e acerrimo persecutore di questi poveri Cristiani, che estorce ingiustamente roba e denaro, usurpa e toglie i terreni, e fa dell'altre indegnità e barbarie". Bishop Ferić to the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 2. 6. 1803. AP, SC, *Dalmazia*, vol. 17, fol. 326r; MILENKO KREŠIĆ, "Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija u vrijeme posljednjega dijecezanskog biskupa Nikole Ferića (1792.-1819.)", in MILENKO KREŠIĆ (prir.), *Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija u vrijeme posljednjega dijecezanskog biskupa Nikole Ferića (1792.-1819.) i nakon njega*, Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog simpozija održanog u Stocu, 13. svibnja 2019., Teološko-katehetski institut, Mostar, 2020, p. 97.

84 "Di più trovandosi in mezzo di questa Cristianità una forza di Turchi, alla quale da cinque anni addietro è venuto un comandante Turco simile al Lucifero." Grgo Matušević to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, 18. 1. 1804. ASPF Roma, SC, *Dalmazia*, vol. 17, fol. 377r; M. KREŠIĆ, *Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija*, p. 97.

85 J. PAMUČINA, *Život ali-paše Rizvanbegovića Stočanina*, (cyr.), p. 78.

According to Kosta Hörmann, who indirectly refers to Pamučina, Hadži Mehmed-bey tortured his rivals and locked them in the dungeons where they died, and the corpses were thrown into chasms which were plentiful around Hutovo. "Because of such stories, even today, a traveller will pass by the Hutovo fort fearfully, and many will say that they heard voices of souls pleading for help."⁸⁶ As we know this from contemporary sources, it is not difficult to explain Hadži-bey's claim that the "monks from Dubrovnik", i.e., the priests of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese, "hated" the French and spoke poorly of them, but also of him, Hadži-bey. The explanation should be sought in two causes: first, the few clergymen of the Trebinje Diocese were deeply shocked by the intolerance of the French administration towards the Catholics and the multiple religious, sacral and cultural actions of the French army and Jacobin policies not just in France and Italy but also in neighbouring Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor. The other reason must be sought in the person of Hadži-bey himself and his own personal intolerance and hatred towards his Catholic subjects in Hutovo and Popovo and their priests, whose taxes, levies and extorted monies enabled him to live well the whole time and fight the numerous wars against his rivals. Hadži-bey continued the persecution and oppression of Catholics even after the departure of the French from Dalmatia and the return of the Austrians. Complaints were levelled against him and his neighbour in Počitelj by father Andrija Maslač, the parish priest in Donji Gradac, in a letter to his brother Vidoje in Đakovo on January 12, 1820: "It is not possible to describe the persecution and oppression that we suffer in these wretched lands at the hands of the heathen Turk, who has the greatest hatred and envy of us bearers of the laws, that is, us priests... as you also know how much they persecute us and the entire populace". Father Andrija complained about "cursed Mujaga Tasovac, the son of the captain of Počitelj" who together with Hadži-bey Rizvanbegović "one or the other collects all the money the people have, and then the collectors, their men, follow one after the

86 "Wegen derartiger Erzählungen ziehen die Reisenden noch heutigen Tages fürchtsam unter der Burg Hutovo vorbei, denn der Aberglaube des Volkes weiss von hilferufenden Geisterstimmen Schauergeschichten zu erzählen". KOSTA HÖRMANN, "Die Kula des Hadži-Beg in Hutovo", in *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und der Herzegowina*, 2, 1894, pp. 301-313, here 313.

other".⁸⁷ Hadži-bey's era was one of the most difficult periods for the Christians of this part of the Trebinje Diocese as far as malevolence and oppression were concerned, and it only ended with Hadži-bey's death in the fratricidal war and siege of Stolac on February 27, 1832.⁸⁸ The captaincy of Hutovo was annexed to Stolac again, and the Christians, Catholics and Orthodox, were left with hope for better and more tolerant times.

The reformist, cultural and rebellious nature of the ecclesiastical and political unrest in neighbouring Dalmatia, in the Republic of Dubrovnik region and the Bay of Kotor had repercussions on ecclesiastical and political life in Herzegovina and neighbouring Bosnia. Due to the nature of the historical sequence of events, here we will mention a significant fact of an ecclesiastical-legal-political nature which was not practiced in Herzegovina: the oath-taking of the bishop and clergy before the new state rulers. Of the three Dalmatian archbishop seats (ecclesiastical provinces) Dubrovnik, Split and Zadar, only Dubrovnik was not vacant the whole time till 1815, and the Dubrovnik archbishop can serve as an example to briefly show how church dignitaries adapted to the newly arisen political unrest. The Dubrovnik archbishop was also the metropolitan bishop of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese, and its political and ecclesiastical position certainly affected bishop Ferić, its only living suffragan bishop. The Austrian conquest of Dalmatia in 1797 spared and respected Dubrovnik as a free and neutral state. Thus, after the death of archbishop Spagnoletti on June 24, 1799, the Senate of the Republic of Dubrovnik proposed to the Pope the Dubrovnik priest Nikola Ban (1736-1815) for the future

87 IVICA PULJIĆ, "Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija u 19. stoljeću", in PETAR BABIĆ - MATO ZOVKIĆ (eds.), *Katolička crkva u Bosni i Hercegovini u XIX i XX stoljeću*, Studia Vrhbosnensia, I, Sarajevo, 1986, p. 92; Krešić published the full letter in modern Croatian. Cf. M. KREŠIĆ, *Don Vidoje Maslač*, pp. 128-130. The Mujaga Tasovac mentioned here, the local nickname for the Gavran-Kapetanovićs, did not appear as the heir to Smail-bey as the captain of Počitelj. According to Father Andrija Maslač, he supported his father in the battles against Hadži-bey from Hutovo and in the raising of double taxes. Mujaga most probably died in these battles because the new captain was Ibrahim-aga. Cf. H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, pp. 240-241; STIPE JURKOVIĆ, "Prikaz povijesti Počitelja od pada pod Turke do 1878", in *Povijest hrvatskog Počitelja*, Čapljina - Zagreb, 1996, pp. 80-87, here 86; JUSUF MULIĆ, "Počitelj u vrijeme osmanske vladavine", in *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke*, vol. XXV-XXVI, 2006/2007, pp. 261-294, here 288.

88 H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, pp. 259-260.

bishop.⁸⁹ Pius VII appointed Ban the new Dubrovnik archbishop on May 12, 1800, and Bishop Ferić consecrated him in the Dubrovnik seat on November 9, 1800.⁹⁰ Archbishop Ban had no difficulties giving his oath according to the usual practice before the Senate of his Republic. After the fall of the Republic, however, he had to adapt to the new turbulent times and thus evoked positive and negative reactions in the populace, the clergy and the rulers. The Dubrovnik historian, Lujo Vojnović, who spares no one, asks who the "traitor" to the Republic was, and believes that Archbishop Ban was "the prototype of boorishness and servility".⁹¹ After the establishment of the Province of Dubrovnik (*Province Raguse*) within the Illyrian Provinces, intendant Ivan Dominik Garagnin, on Marmont's orders, called for all civil servants and the entire Dubrovnik clergy to declare their loyalty to Emperor Napoleon. The first of the clergy to enter the Duke's Palace on October 8, 1810, and sign the oath was Archbishop Ban. He was followed, as was expected, by Bishop Ferić and 69 priests. Archbishop Ban addressed those present in Italian:

"Nothing could be more pleasant or joyful for me and my clergy than to declare our loyalty and obedience to the greatest of rulers Napoleon the Great. These are the duties of a true subject towards his monarch, whose wise, God-loving and Christian decrees should turn everyone to obedience. Therefore, together with my clergy, I am here to swear my oath of obedience to our glorious Ruler in a repeated sign of true servility which binds us like gentle children to such a kind Emperor, Napoleon the Great."⁹²

Vojnović comments on the implacable and loathsome comportment of Archbishop Ban, accusing him of betraying the Republic and offending the Church with his oath. The oath to Emperor Napoleon was signed on the same day by the Jewish rabbi and the Orthodox monk, who tended the Orthodox Christians in Dubrovnik. Whilst the oath-taking by the Catholic clergy was conducted relatively peacefully and without major incident in the other provinces, the situation was much more complicated in the Dubrovnik province. A smaller part of the clergy, the moral and intellectually superior and

89 ANTE DRAČEVAC, "Ban, Nikola", in *HBL*, 1, Zagreb, 1993, p. 411.

90 <https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bbanin.html> (30. 3. 2022.).

91 LUJO VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika, Knjiga druga 1807-1815*, Dionička tiskara, Zagreb, 1908, p. 111.

92 IDEM, p. 112 (Translated by Vojnović). I. STOJANOVIĆ, *Povjest Dubrovačke Republike*, pp. 287-289.

more respectable, did not heed Archbishop Ban. Four reputable diocesan priests, five Franciscans (Little Brothers), four Dominicans and a cleric refused to take the oath.⁹³ Under physical duress in prison, four of the Franciscans, two Dominicans and the priest Karaman repented and begged for forgiveness the next day, whilst the others spent 50 days in prison. After they were released on Christmas Eve 1810, and still refused to take the oath, they had to leave Dubrovnik within 4 days and the Illyrian Provinces within a fortnight. Father Ivo Mitrović and the Lalić brothers, Father Đuro and Father Pero, Dominicans Ivan Krstitelj Resaver and Vittorio Giaime (*Giaimè!*) fled to Turkish territory in neighbouring Herzegovina and settled in Popovo in the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese.⁹⁴ It is unknown whether Bishop Ferić dared, via his general vicar in Gradac, Grgo Matušковиć, advocate the cases of these refugee priests and secure them a type of ecclesiastical asylum in his diocese. It is, however, known that Dominican Vincenzo Giaime died in Popovo, whilst the other Dominican, Ivan Krstitelj Resaver, fled to Italy via the Ionian island of Zakynthos.⁹⁵ Archbishop Ban stood out a few more times as an exponent of every authority that came, passed and left. In his sermons and instructions to his clergy, he advocated the conscription of young Croatian men into the French navy, which found obvious resistance in the Catholic population.⁹⁶ In the fall of 1813, when the French government started to flounder and the uprising was gaining more and more momentum on all levels of Dubrovnik society, Archbishop Ban published his pastoral epistle on Christmas Eve 1813, in which he threatened those who continued to rebel against France with church fines. However, less than two months later, on February 16, 1814, he urged the clergy and faithful to respect their duties towards the new

93 L. VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika*, 2, p. 113; I. STOJANOVIĆ, *Povjest Dubrovačke Republike*, p. 288; S. ČOSIĆ, *Dubrovnik nakon pada Republike*, p. 84. Whilst Vojnović and Stanojević mention 13 clergymen, Čosić mentions 16 not listing names.

94 P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, pp. 372-373; L. VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika*, 2, pp. 113-114; S. ČOSIĆ, *Dubrovnik nakon pada Republike*, p. 84.

95 L. VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika*, 2, p. 114; MAKSO PELOZA, "Ivan Krstitelj Resaver O.P., istaknuti hrvatski bibličist XIX stoljeća", in *Bogoslovska smotra*, 2-3, 1969, pp. 245-257. It appears that the flight of Dubrovnik priests to the Trebinje Diocese and to the territory of the Ottoman Empire remained unnoticed by local historians.

96 L. VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika*, 2, p. 114; S. ČOSIĆ, *Dubrovnik nakon pada Republike*, p. 84.

lawful sovereign, the Austrian Emperor, Francis I.⁹⁷ Whilst the civil servants took their oaths on February 15, the clergy, led by Archbishop Ban, took their oaths on March 2, 1814, before general Milutinović, an Orthodox Christian, without a single dissenting vote.⁹⁸

Bishop Nikola Ferić is not mentioned among the priests who refused to pledge their oaths to the French and Austrian emperors. However, how could Ferić refuse the oath if he was the suffragan of Archbishop Ban, a citizen of the Dubrovnik Province and the French Empire and earned his livelihood from it. His brother Father Đuro Ferić-Gvozdenica, priest, canon, author, polyglot, eminent member of the Dubrovnik clergy, a known Francophile, also took the oath and later succeeded Archbishop Ban in 1815 as acting vicar. Nor could Bishop Ferić refuse the oath to the Austrian emperor because Dubrovnik had become part of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, a peripheral and very poor province of the Habsburg monarchy by decision of the Congress of Vienna. Bishop Ferić was overjoyed that he had survived the Montenegrin siege of Gruž and Dubrovnik in the summer of 1806. He had to flee Gruž, where he had lived and had two houses, and seek sanctuary in the city with the French because his houses and property had been pillaged and razed to the ground, most likely destroying all of his correspondence and archives, as well as the archives of his predecessors.⁹⁹ Thus, it is rather certain that Ferić followed the example set by Archbishop Ban and swore loyalty to the French Emperor Napoleon on October 8, 1810, and his fealty to the new master, the Austrian Emperor Francis I on March 2, 1814.

97 " ...ce vieillard affaibli avait publié le 24 décembre une pastorale menaçant des censures ecclésiastiques quiconque persisterait dans la rébellion contre la France, et, le 16 février il rappelait au peuple ses devoirs envers son souverain légitime, l'empereur François." P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, p. 456.

98 L. VOJNOVIĆ, *Pad Dubrovnika*, 2, pp. 112-113; I. STOJANOVIĆ, *Povjest Dubrovačke Republike*, p. 312; H. BJELOVUČIĆ, *The Ragusan Republic*, p. 157.

99 AP Roma, SC Dalmazia, vol. 17, fil. 542^r; B. PANDŽIĆ, *De Diocesi Tribuniensis et Mercanensi*, p. 72, note 2; IDEM, "Trebinjska biskupija u tursko doba", p. 120. Thanks to the research conducted by prof. Krešić we nearly have Ferić's complete text here: "Arrivando qua le truppe Francesi per passare nelle Bocche di Cattaro, e per terra e per mare dai Moscoviti e Montenegrini siano stati assediati, quali con Bombe e Balle incendiane hanno rovinato la Città, saccheggiato le Campagne, spogliate le Chiese e le case, e la maggior parte incendiate, principalmente nel Borgo di Ragusa (Gruž), ove erano due mie case d'abitazione totalmente spogliate dalle suppellettili, e poi abbruciate sicché ho perduto tutto. ... di più ho perduto tutta la mia ... e le notizie del mio Vescovato parte

The Kotor Diocese was located south of Dubrovnik. It was fortunate that during the politically turbulent years between 1801-1815, it was filled and had a capable bishop in the person of Marko Antun Grgurina (1801-1815).¹⁰⁰ As bishop, Grgurina must have had great human and diplomatic experience in order to preserve the faithful and the diocese, maintain balance between the numerous heirs of the Republic of Venice and the new masters, Austrians, French, Russians, English and the self-invited neighbouring Montenegrins, who led by the Orthodox bishop Petar I entered Kotor and Boka with great joy and left very reluctantly. The mandate of Bishop Mark Antun Grgurina remains to this day an example of the political, legal, ecclesiastical and human skill of the agile and last nobleman from the Bay on the seat of St. Tryphon on how to survive in Kotor which was occupied by multiple forces.¹⁰¹

The ultimate Trebinje-Mrkan bishop, Nikola Ferić (1792-1819) was a direct witness to these historical events two hundred years ago, whose testimonies have, unfortunately, only been partially preserved.¹⁰² The Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese was a small and inconspicuous, but long-lived institution, covering a large area, insignificant with respect to numbers of believers, but exceedingly significant with respect to its ecclesiastical-political position, a longevale testimony to Christen-

lasciate dai miei Antecessori, parte con sommo travaglio e fatica da me raccolte." Bishop Ferić to the Vice-Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Dubrovnik, 1807., ZBIRKA BALTAZARA BOGIŠIĆA HAZU, Cavtat, Rukopisi Bogišićeva Arhiva, Ferrich, *Copia di diverse lettere del M^e Ferrich 1806.-1814.*, no. 36, f. 3r; M. KREŠIĆ, *Trebinjsko-mrkanska biskupija*, p. 124, note 142.

- 100 GRACIJA BRAJKOVIĆ, "Odnosi kotorskog biskupa Marka Antuna Grgurine sa mitropolitom Petrom I Petrovićem i Centralnom komisijom 1813-1814. godine", *Zbornik radova Ujedinjenje Crne Gore i Boke Kotorske*, Titograd, 1991, pp. 163-167; PEJO ČOŠKOVIĆ, "Gregorina Mark Anton", in *HBL*, 5, p. 68; PAVAO BUTORAC, *Boka Kotorska nakon pada Mletačke republike do Bečkog kongresa: (1797-1815)*, Rad JAZU, knj. 265, Zagreb, 1938, pp. 173-189.
- 101 P. BUTORAC, *Boka Kotorska nakon pada Mletačke republike do Bečkog kongresa: (1797-1815)*, pp. 184-189; G. BRAJKOVIĆ, "Odnosi kotorskog biskupa Marka Antuna Grgurine sa mitropolitom Petrom I Petrovićem", pp. 166-167; VANDA BABIĆ, "Kulturni život Boke Kotorske uoči preporoda", in *Dani Hvarškoga kazališta*, 23 (1), Split, 1997, pp. 317-320; SAŠA KNEŽEVIĆ, "Boka Kotorska i Primorje između Crne Gore i velikih sila 1797.-1814.", in *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 63, 2021, pp. 227-254.
- 102 Although the scientific conference held on May 13, 2019, was dedicated to the bicentennial of the death of Bishop Ferić on May 30, 1819, it should also

dom and Catholicism. Although it had been ecclesiastically and legally independent, it enjoyed the *de facto* status of the extended and protective arm of the Republic of Dubrovnik and the Archdiocese of Dubrovnik over the widespread Catholics of its extensive territory. As the Republic of St. Blaise lost its sovereignty and independence after this unrest and became one of the seven Illyrian Provinces and later one of the four counties in the Kingdom of Dalmatia (*Königreich Dalmatien*), the Dubrovnik and Split archdioceses lost their archdiocesan and metropolitan dignity and ecclesiastical prestige. They were reduced to ordinary suffragan dioceses in the lap of the newly expanded metropolis of Zadar.¹⁰³ Zadar thus became not only the administrative and ecclesiastical, but also the political and autonomist centre of Dalmatia.¹⁰⁴ The Dubrovnik Diocese was expanded through the defunct suffragan dioceses of Korčula and Ston, and the Split diocese through those of Makarska and Trogir. Amongst the biggest losers was the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese, because it, having lost its bishop, had to satisfy itself with the title of acting vicar. Indeed, the Dubrovnik bishops benefited from the situation, because, after the temporary administration of the Dubrovnik Chapter, they took over the administration of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese on January 1, 1840, at the Holy See's pleasure, and maintained it till 1890. In other words, because of the unrest, the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese experienced "collateral damage" and lost its bishop to this day. We encounter him from January 1, 1840, just as an apostolic administrator in a personal union with the Dubrovnik bishop and as of July 8, 1890, in a personal union with the bishop of the Mostar-Duvno Diocese.¹⁰⁵

be dedicated to all the individuals of this region who sought humane, political, religious and national solutions for men, Christians and non-Christians, for the good and less-good neighbours in the restless eastern Adriatic region. It should above all be dedicated to the faithful and guardians of the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese, the bearers, defenders and guardians of the faith, culture, traditions and hopes of their distant and near ancestors.

103 Cf. *Locum Beati Petri*; KARLO JURIŠIĆ, "Bula pape Lava XII. Mjesto Bl. Petra i Crkva u Hrvatskoj danas", in *Kačić*, 3, 1970, pp. 101-127; STJEPAN ĆOSIĆ, "Državna uprava u Dalmaciji i crkveni preustroj 1828./1830. godine", in *Croatica Christiana periodica*, (CCP), 65, Zagreb, 2010, pp. 51-66.

104 JOSIP VRANDEČIĆ, *Dalmatinski autonomistički pokret u XIX. stoljeću*, Dom i svijet, Zagreb, 2002, pp. 45-81.

105 BASILIUS PANDŽIĆ, *De diocesi Tribunensi et Mercanensi*, Romae, 1959, pp. 77-82.

In the end, it should be discerned and highlighted that it was neither revolutionary, Jacobin or Imperial France which dealt the fatal blow to the Dubrovnik Archdiocese, to the old ecclesiastical order in Dalmatia and the appointment of their own bishop in the Trebinje-Mrkan Diocese but "Catholic" Austria in its later and still rigid Josephinian political vision, embodied in the absolutist spirit of the imperial chancellor of Duke Metternich and Emperor Francis I.¹⁰⁶

4. Unrest during the First Serbian Uprising: The International Constellation of Montenegrin-Serbian Pretensions on Croatian Lands

Besides the cited battles between Ottoman and local Muslim leaders in Herzegovina and Bosnia, and their resistance to the efforts of the High Port and the Bosnian vizier to quell the unrest and to subject them once more to imperial authority, Catholics in the Trebinje Diocese and in other parts of Herzegovina and the whole Bosnian vicariate also had to deal with threats from neighbouring Serbia and Montenegro. Specifically, the Serbs led by Đorđe Petrović (Karađorđe) organised and started an uprising against the Dahijas in the Belgrade Eyalet, and thereby against the Ottoman Empire in February 1804.¹⁰⁷ The leaders of the uprising drafted their aims in their political programme from June 1804 as the taking of the Bay of Kotor, Dalmatia and Srijem, as well as the annexation of a large part of Bosnia and Herzegovina east of the Pliva and Vrbas rivers. Both the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Serbs and their fellows in Serbia were traditionally more orientated towards Russia than towards Austria. According to the terms of the treaty between Russia and Turkey in Kuchuk-Kainardzhi from 1774, Russia gained the international right to protect the interests of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. The First Serbian Uprising was, without doubt, *casus*, where

106 HERBERT RIESER, *Der Geist des Josephinismus und sein Fortleben*, Herder, Wien, 1963; HELMUT REINALTER, *Josephinismus als aufgeklärter Absolutismus*, Böhlau Verlag, Wien, 2008; KARL VÖLKER, "Metternichs Kirchenpolitik", in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, (ZKG), 49, 1930, pp. 222-246.

107 VLADIMIR ČOROVIĆ, *Istorija srpskog naroda*, (cyr.), Ars libri, Beograd, 1997, p. 462; STANOJE STANOJEVIĆ, *Istorija srpskog naroda*, (cyr.), Book & Marso, Beograd, 2001., pp. 324-326; MILORAD EKMEČIĆ, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja, Istorija Srba u Novom veku (1492-1992)*, (cyr.), Zavod za udžbenike, Beograd, 2008, p. 160.

Russia could apply her newly gained right. By potentially applying this case to Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Russia entered into conflict with Austria. According to the agreement, which the Russian Empress Catherine II and the Austrian Emperor Joseph II defined in detail in their negotiations and correspondence in 1782, the Balkans were divided into spheres of interest and accordingly, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Bulgaria to Sofia were supposed to fall to Austria.¹⁰⁸ Resistance to this agreement on the division of the Ottoman Empire was found in Russia, Montenegro and Serbia. The main Serbian negotiator with Russia during the First Serbian Uprising, the metropolitan from Karlovac, Stevan Stratimirović (1790-1836), defined Serbian interests twenty-two years after the agreement between Vienna and Petrograd and moved the border from Bulgaria to the Vrbas and Pliva rivers, and in historical terms, he called the western part of Bosnia "Turkish Croatia". According to his proposal, which is no *lapsus calami*, to the disgust of today's Serbian historians and politicians, Stratimirović agreed that upon the collapse of the Turkish Empire, Western Bosnia, "Turkish Croatia", should become part of Austria. He also agreed that a German Protestant nobleman should succeed to the Serbian throne, who would subsequently convert to the Orthodox faith, like the German Protestant duchesses, who became empresses of Russia, something no Catholic nobleman would do.¹⁰⁹ Therefore the position of the political leadership of the

108 ALFRED RITTER VON ARNETH (Hrsg.), *Joseph II. und Katharina von Russland. Ihr Briefwechsel*, Wien, 1869, pp. 169-175; ADOLF BEER, *Die Orientalische Politik Österreichs seit 1774*, Prag-Leipzig, 1883, pp. 30-145; VASILJ POPOVIĆ, *Istočno pitanje*, (cyr.), Izdavačka kuća Gece Kona, Beograd, 1928, pp. 74-75; VASA ČUBRILOVIĆ, "Crna Gora i rusko-austrijski ugovor o podeli Turske 1782. godine", (cyr.) in *Glas SANU*, CCL, Odjeljenje društvenih nauka, n.s., 10, 1961, pp. 171-196; BORO BRONZA, "The Habsburg Monarchy and the projects for divisions of the Ottoman Balkans, 1771-1788", in PLAMEN MITEV - IVAN PARVEV - MARIA BARAMOVA - VANIA RACHEVA, eds., *Empires and Peninsulas. Southeastern Europe between Karlowitz and the Peace of Adrianople, 1699-1829*, Lit Verlag, Berlin, 2010, pp. 51-62.

109 MIROSLAV ĐORĐEVIĆ, *Politička istorija Srbije XIX i XX veka*, I, (1804-1813), (cyr.), Prosveta, Beograd, 1956, pp. 19-20; MILIĆ PETROVIĆ, "Bosna i Hercegovina u oslobodilačkim planovima ustaničke Srbije i učenih Srba", (cyr.), pp. 208-209; VLADISLAV B. SOTIROVIĆ, "The 'Memorandum' (1804) by the Karlovci Metropolitan Stevan Stratimirović", in *Serbian Studies: Journal of the North American Society for Serbian Studies*, *Slavica Publishers*, 1-2, 2010, pp. 27-51.
<http://www.novinar.de/2012/03/30/the-memorandum-1804-by-the-karlovci-metropolitan-stevan-stratimirovic.html?lang=lat>, (11. 5. 2020.).

Uprising in Serbia was that all the above-mentioned regions, along with Šumadija, represented the so-called "Serbian state". Montenegro would be included within the framework of this imagined new state, whilst metropolitan Stratimirović wrote to the Russian emperor that the *Slavic-Serbian Empire* should be established.¹¹⁰ The first public declaration on Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of the "Serbian state" was made in poetic spirit by the former monk, Serbian educator, philosopher and mason, Dimitrije (Dositej) Obradović, in Vienna, in his poem "Vostani Srbije" ("Rise Serbia") in 1804,¹¹¹ in which he calls for the "liberation of Bosnia, Herzeg's lands and Montenegro".¹¹² In early spring of 1804, the rebels sent Damjan Martinović to the Montenegrin metropolitan and asked for his assistance.¹¹³ Karađorđe personally sent his emissary to Arsenije Gagović, the abbot of the Piva monastery, on August 27/September 10, 1804 and appealed to "brother Serbs" across Herzegovina to follow Serbia's example and "to liberate yourselves and unite with us" in defence of our faith, church and monastery, "and for the freedom of your fatherland".¹¹⁴ According to some rebels, Bosnia was ready for an uprising like the one in Serbia in the summer of 1804, but they were waiting for preparations to be finalised in Herzegovina and for them to move together on Sarajevo from above and below, and "the armies would meet in Sarajevo" in a month's time.¹¹⁵ However, the planned joint uprising of

110 M. EKMEČIĆ, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja*, pp. 162, 170.

111 "Vostani Srbije, Vostani carice, I daj čedom tvojim videt tvoje lice... Davno si zaspala, U mraku ležala. Sada se probudi i Serblje vzbudi... Bosna, sestra tvoja, na tebe gleda, I ne želi tebi nikakva vreda... Hercegovina Zemlja i Černaja Gora, Daleke države i ostrovi mora" ("Rise, O Serbia! Rise, O empress! And let your children see your face... You fell asleep long ago, You lay in darkness. Wake up now And stir up the Serbs! ... Bosnia, your sister, looks at you And wishes you no harm... Herzeg's land and Montenegro, Far-away countries and islands in the sea") DOSITEJ OBRADOVIĆ, *Vostani Srbije*, (cyr.), Wien, 1804.

112 ALEKSANDAR BANOVIĆ, *Pedagoško-prosvetiteljsko delo Dositeja Obradovića*, (cyr.) Nolit, Beograd, 1956, p. 37.

113 VASA ČUBRILLOVIĆ, *Prvi srpski ustanak i bosanski Srbi*, (cyr.), Geca Kon, Beograd, 1939, p. 31.

114 RADOSLAV PEROVIĆ, *Prvi srpski ustanak. Akta i pisma na srpskom jeziku*, (cyr.), I, Beograd, 1977, pp. 92-93; VLADIMIR STOJANČEVIĆ, "Srbija i oslobođenje Bosne u vreme Prvog srpskog ustanka", (cyr.), in *Zbornik za istoriju BiH*, I, Beograd, 1995, pp. 191-201, here 194.

115 V. ČUBRILLOVIĆ, *Prvi srpski ustanak*, (cyr.), p. 31; DRAGOSLAV STRANJKOVIĆ, *Karađorđeva nacionalna politika*, (cyr.), Bratstvo Društva Sv. Save, XXXII,

Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina did not eventuate because metropolitan Petar I did not have a small Montenegrin-Herzegovinian-Bosnian vision, but thought globally at the same time and planned a more favourable future, creating a slightly different *Slavic-Serbian Empire* which would be made up of contemporary Montenegro, and Podgorica, Spuž, Žabljak, the Bay of Kotor, Herzegovina, Dubrovnik and Dalmatia. The Montenegrin Orthodox bishop knew well that it would not be possible to include "the remaining Serbian historical and ethnic territories: Slavonia, Vojvodina, Šumadija, Kosmet and Macedonia" in the new *Slavic-Serbian State*. The capital of Petar's imagined *Slavic-Serbian State* was to be Dubrovnik. The Russian emperor was supposed to become the *Emperor of Slavic-Serbs*, metropolitan Petar his co-ruler, a type of Russian deputy in the south of Europe. Furthermore, besides establishing the new "Empire, metropolitan Petar also thought about ecclesiastical changes and the establishment of a *Slavic-Serbian* metropolis with its seat in Cetinje, with episcopal seats in Zadar for Dalmatia, in Trebinje for Herzegovina and in Kotor for the seat of the metropolitan deputy."¹¹⁶ It is very conspicuous that bishop Petar I did not propose a new eparchy in Bosnia, knowing well that the old Dabro-Bosnian metropolis under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, the richest eparchy in the Ottoman Empire, already existed and he did not want to cause unnecessary tensions with the Constantinople patriarch. Political Petrograd, forced by the defeat at Friedland and the Treaty of Tilsit, allowed the French entry into the Bay of Kotor and the occupation of the Ionian islands, which caused dissatisfaction in Russia and also amongst the Montenegrins.¹¹⁷ The Treaty of Tilsit thwarted the great plans of the

knj. 52, Beograd, 1941, p. 9; M. ЕКМЕЧИЋ, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja*, (cyr.), pp. 165-166.

116 The plan laid out by metropolitan Petar I was published by Russian historian Petrov. Cf. ANDREJ NIKOLAEVIČ PETROV, *Vojna Rossii 1806-1812*. (rus.), Sankt Peterburg, 1885, pp. 220-222; LJUBOMIR DURKOVIĆ-JAKŠIĆ, "Udeo Cetinjske mitropolije u borbi uspostavljanja redovnog stanja u Srpskoj pravoslavnoj crkvi", in *Srpska pravoslavna crkva 1219-1969. Spomenica o 750-godišnjici autokefalnosti*, (cyr.), Beograd, 1969, pp. 241-270, here 257-259; JOVAN MILIĆEVIĆ, "Crna Gora 1797-1851. Petar I. Petrović. Ideja o obnovi srpske države", in *Historija srpskog naroda*, (cyr.), V/1, Beograd, 1994, pp. 170-171.

117 C. SCHARF, "Rußlands Politik im Bündnis von Tilsit und das Erfurter Gipfeltreffen", pp. 189-199.

Montenegrin bishop for the creation of the *Slavic-Serbian Empire* on the eastern banks of the Adriatic.¹¹⁸ From the above it is clear that parallel to Karađorđe's plan and much earlier than Garašanin's *Načertanije*, there was also a Montenegrin vision of a greater Serbia. Before and after the occupation of the Bay of Kotor, the French attempted to win over the belligerent Montenegrin metropolitan.¹¹⁹ They offered him the title "patriarch of all the Serbian people and all of Illyricum", by the grace of Napoleon, of course. For this honour and authority, he would be paid 20,000 Franks on the condition that he subject himself to the French and stop collaborating with the Russians.¹²⁰ Although the offer was tempting, metropolitan Petar I rejected it, afraid that he would not be acknowledged by the Orthodox in Slavonia and Vojvodina who were under the Habsburgs as well as the Orthodox in Serbia, Kosovo and Macedonia, who were still the Sultan's subjects. When rejecting the offer, metropolitan Petar justified himself to the French with the "masterfully imagined" fear that his church could fall under the Pope's jurisdiction.¹²¹ In response, the French administration started establishing an independent Orthodox church for Istria and Dalmatia with the eparchial seat in Šibenik, whilst the Bay of Kotor would be served by an archimandrite. The Orthodox Church in Dalmatia and the Bay of Kotor, despite the wishes and plans of Bishop Petar I, did not come under the jurisdiction of the Montenegrin metropolis but were organised by the French ad-

118 MARKO DRAGOVIĆ, *Prilozi za istoriju Crne Gore i Boke Kotorske*, (cyr.), *Spomenik SKA*, 31 (1898), p. 107; HENRIK BATOWSKI, "Un précurseur polonais de l'Union balkanique, le prince Adam Czartoryski", in *Revue internationale des études balkaniques*, 2-4, 1936, pp. 149-156; H. BJELOUČIĆ, *The Ragusan Republic*, pp. 82-83.

119 The French efforts to open their own consulate in Cetinje in 1807-1808 should be understood in this context. The negotiations failed because Bishop Petar I could allow no other consul but the Russian in Montenegro, that is in Cetinje. Cf. RADOSLAV RASPOPOVIĆ, "Un projet manqué: L'ouverture de le Consulat française à Cetinje 1807/1808", in *Istorijski zapisi*, LXXXII, 3-4, 2009, pp. 57-63. Gavrilović brings Marmont's letter to Bishop Petar I and the bishop's response to general Marmont from the beginning of 1808. Cf. M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), V-VI, p. 276, no. 252.

120 DIMITRIJE MILAKOVIĆ, *Istorija Crne Gore*, (cyr.), Tipografija braće Battara, Zadar, 1856, pp. 258-259.

121 DIMITRIJE RUVARAC, *Avtografija protosindela Kirila Cvetkovića i njegovo stradanje za Pravoslavlje*, (cyr.), Beograd, 1898, p. 11; LJ. DURKOVIĆ-JAKŠIĆ, "Udeo Cetinjske mitropolije", (cyr.), pp. 258-259.

ministration and bear its insignia to this day.¹²² Since Metropolitan Petar I did not have enough soldiers in Montenegro and in Brdi for the battle against Dubrovnik and the French, or for his military campaigns on Eastern Herzegovina, he issued a circular letter pleading for help and volunteers from the Orthodox in Herzegovina, Bosnia, Dalmatia and the Military Frontier. The Uprising in Serbia in 1804 opened up a new front and a new page in Montenegrin-Serbian solidarity. Metropolitan Petar I was willing to help, but as he had committed his military in another direction, and had overestimated and exhausted himself materially and militarily in his pillaging in the Bay of Kotor, Konavle, Dubrovnik and eastern Herzegovina, he could not jump to Karađorđe's assistance against the Turks until 1809, although the latter had begged him to do so as early as 1804, and then especially in 1806: "Against this our, I claim, sworn, eternal local enemy, we beg you for present and immediate military assistance: which we hoped for at the very beginning of our formation."¹²³

For the Croat Catholics and their guardians, the Franciscans in Bosnia and Western Herzegovina and the diocesan priests in eastern Herzegovina, the messages and calls of Đorđe Petrović, Dositej Obradović, Miloš Obrenović, Metropolitan Petar I and others, if they ever reached them, were not their desire nor their vision of the future, although they nurtured a strong common Slavic and Christian antipathy towards the Ottoman-Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslim authorities, oppressors and persecutors. The hardships of the Catholics and the Ottoman-Muslim terror against them was best presented by Apostolic Vicar Miletić in an important and detailed written report dated April 7, 1815, which he submitted to the Austrian proconsul Paulić.¹²⁴ The Catholics of north-western Bosnia had exposed themselves to great danger 16 years earlier and supported Austria in the last Austro-Turkish war, which had been proclaimed

122 TULLIO ERBER, *Storia della Dalmazia dal 1797 a 1814.*, II, Zara, 1888, pp. 146-149; P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, pp. 236-237; NIKODIM MILAŠ, *Pravoslavna Dalmacija. Historijski pregled*, (cyr.), Cfairis, Beograd, ²1989, pp. 468-485; LJ. DURKOVIĆ-JAKŠIĆ, "Udeo Cetinjske mitropolije," (cyr.), p. 258.

123 Correspondence of Karađorđe to bishop Petar from the beginning of 1806. <https://svetigora.com/ljetopis-2-januar-2019/> (4. 4. 2022.).

124 Miletić also sent his report to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome where it was preserved. Cf. ASPF Roma, Acta 179, fol. 464-482; ANDRIJA NIKIĆ, *Događajnica Bosne i Hercegovine 614.-1918*, Mostar, 2003, pp. 404-440.

and led by Emperor Joseph II on February 8, 1788. As the decisive battles were fought around Bosanska Dubica, the war entered history as the War of Dubica.¹²⁵ Although the war could have been very successful, it only resulted in insignificant military successes and territorial expansion on the Croat-Bosnian border. Due to the unfavourable political constellations caused by the French Revolution and the pressure of the British and Prussian chancelleries, the war was over in three and a half years with the signing of the Treaty of Sistova in 1791.¹²⁶ The consequences for the Catholics in Bosnia were already negative and culminated in the torture of father Jozo Valentić, the parish priest in Bihać, numerous human casualties, flight and displacement into neighbouring Croatia, along with additional economic hardships and levies.¹²⁷ This negative experience was a strong warning to the Catholics to avoid all unrest, even that which raised high hopes. In the meantime, revolutionary France became Austria's major political and military rival and shifted the focus of battles to Central Europe, Italy and the Adriatic. After evident defeats in the First Coalition War, Austria was given Venice and Dalmatia as reparation for territories lost across Europe. Directly after the Treaty of Loeben and the Treaty of Campo Formio in 1797, Austria occupied Dalmatia. In this moment, much earlier than the arrival of the Dahijas in the Belgrade Eyalet, before the "slaughter of the knezes (princes)" on February 4, 1804, and the Serbian Uprising, the co-adjutor of the Apostolic Vicariate in Bosnia, friar Grgo Ilijić, reacted on November 25, 1797, in a completely different direction than the Serbs could ever have imagined, planned or desired. He "handed over by oath" to Emperor Francis II the "Bosnian Kingdom" and the "Duchy of St. Saba." He communicated to the Emperor that over 100

125 HAŠIM ŠERIĆ, "Dubički rat (Borbe između Austrije i Turske oko Dubice 1788-1790. godine)", in *Gajret, kalendar za godinu 1939. (1357-1358. po Hidžri)*, Sarajevo, 1938, pp. 109-125; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, pp. 86-88; GALIB ŠLJIVO, *Bosna i Hercegovina 1788-1812*, Institut za istoriju u Banjaluci, Banja Luka, 1992, pp. 63-197; IVA SALOPEK BOGAVČIĆ, "Prilog istraživanju događanja na gradiškom području tijekom rata 1788.-1791.", in *Scrinia slavonsica*, 7, 2007, pp. 161-201; BALÁZS LÁZÁR, "Turkish Captives in Hungary during Austria's Last Turkish War (1788-91)", in *Hungarian Historical Review*, 2, 2015, pp. 418-444; ELMA KORIĆ, "Bosansko pograničje u vrijeme Dubičkog rata 1788-1791", in *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 65, Sarajevo, 2016, pp. 213-237.

126 <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=59096> (21. 2. 2022.).

127 S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 88.

thousand Christians, three Franciscan monasteries, 32 parishes, over 80 clergymen, the delegate to the Holy See, bishop and guardian of the Bosnian Kingdom and the Duchy of St. Saba¹²⁸ cheered and were joyous after the fall of the Republic of Venice, "that the neighbouring Dalmatians quickly and readily flew into the dear embrace of the Imperial Majesty".¹²⁹ During his canonical visitations, friar Grgo from Vareš, co-adjutor and heir to the Bosnian apostolic vicar, had collected the desires of the faithful in the Bosnian Kingdom and the Duchy of St. Saba

"in which everyone unanimously and in one voice cheered, voluntarily submitting to your Holy Majesty and chose Your Holy Majesty for the sweetest father and the most charitable king, as we had submitted of old to the Hungarian kings, wishing this to occur as soon as possible, so that Your Holy Majesty can deliver the Bosnian Kingdom and the Duchy of St. Saba from the yoke of tyrannical oppression and proclaim them in Christian and civilised freedom, preserving for eternity and charitably heeding this and other requests presented by our representative."¹³⁰

128 Ilijić, in his vicar's elation, placed the whole Duchy of St. Saba under his jurisdiction, although it was only the part on the right bank of the Neretva River. It is good, nevertheless, that a Croatian intellectual at the time was thinking of all of Hercegovina!

129 "Centum et ampius Christianorum millia, tria Fratrum Minorum de Obs(ervan)tia Monasteria, eorumdem Fratrum Residentiae, triginta duae Parochiae, Octoginta et ultra Animarum Curatores cum Delegato ab S. Sede Episcopo Pastore Bosnensis Regni, ac *S. Sabbae Ducatus*, exultaverunt et laetati sunt qualiter post Reipublicae Venetae eversionem Dalmatae limitrophi ad amantissimum Sacratissimae Majestatis vestrae sinum festini, libentesque sponte convolaverint." HR-DAZD, Presidijalni spisi, Fond Brady, N°. 1746, 1805, fol. 5r-v; Cf. S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 95.

130 "...ego Fr. Gregorius a Varess Ruspensis Episcopus, et Apostolici Vicarii Bosnensis viribus, et mente a multo tempore ad presens destituti Coadjutor ac Successor, dum comissum mihi frequentissimum Gregem paulo canonica visitatione invisebam ardentissima universi fidelis Populi Regni Bosnensis, ac Ducatus s. Sabbae vota collegi quibus omnes uno ore, unaque exultationis voce Sacratissimae Majestatis Vestrae voluntarios subditos se dare gestiunt, eandem Sacratissimam Majestatem Vestram in Patrem dulcissimum, ac clementissimum Regem eligunt, prout antiquitus Hungariae Regibus subdebantur, exoptantes ut quam primum fieri poterit, Sacratissima Majestas Vestra Bosniae Regnum et Ducatum S. Sabbae e gravissimo Tyranicae captivitate jugo ornat, atque in libertatem Christianam, et Civilem asserat, perpetuoque custodiat, ac legati nostri ceteras preces pro nobis faciendo clementer exaudiat". *Loc. cit.*, fol. 5r-v.

Furthermore, Bishop Ilijić begs the emperor to graciously accept as a gift the mentioned Kingdom and Duchy within the borders between the Drina river and the delta of the Sava river to the east, to the Republic of Dubrovnik and Coastal Dalmatia to the south, to the Cetina river, Krbava hills and the Una river to the west and all the inhabitants, and for them to be entered into the register of subjects (*in subditorum Album referre*).¹³¹ The conduct of assistant Apostolic Vicar Ilijić was doubtlessly certain and confident, as if he were not at the time the assistant apostolic vicar and bishop for a hundred or hundred and twenty thousand Catholics, but as if he were the chancellor of the vacant Bosnian Kingdom and the Duchy of St. Saba, and he were the only one who had the opportunity to hand over the mentioned kingdom and duchy into the hands of Emperor Francis II.¹³²

It is not known whether bishop Grgo's memorandum reached Emperor Francis II, and if the Emperor had found it appropriate to send a consolatory message to bishop Ilijić, since Napoleon not only imposed "peace" on him in Campo Formio, but had also secretly planned to destroy the Holy Roman Empire. We know that Ilijić's letter was in the office of the Dalmatian governor in Zadar as of 1804, where it was most probably preserved from the start. Even though Ilijić's request reflects the religious and Croatian political consciousness of this Bosnian Franciscan, it is simultaneously, if it had been known to the general clergy and population, a clear sign of the direction the political awareness of Catholic Bosnian and Herzegovinian Croats had to take. As can be clearly seen from the request, liberation from the Ottoman yoke and the violence of its local Herzegovinian and Bosnian authorities, captains, ayans and cadis was certainly a conscious and unconscious vision and desire of all Catholic Croats in

131 *Loc. cit.*

132 Besides this broad political and all-Croatian profile of Ilijić, the vicar co-adjutor, his narrowminded ecclesiastical, canonical and bishop profile came to the fore eleven years later (1808). In a letter to the parish priest of Roško Polje dated November 2, 1808, Ilijić bans two Glagolitic priests from the parish of Vinica in the Duvno region from holding their First Mass in their native parishes, stating that he would not give them jurisdiction for pastoral work in the Bosnian vicariate nor would he, so long as he was living, ordain any Glagolitic priest. Ilijić's decision had additional repercussions before the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith in Rome. Cf. ASPF Roma, Scrittura Riferite nei Congressi Bosnia (SC Bosnia), vol. 9, f. 515; ANTE ŠKEGRO, "Jedno biskupovo pismo i usud", in *Bosna Franciscana*, 41, Sarajevo, 2014, pp. 369-384, here 370-372.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, and not union with Serbia and its medieval and new age Empire.

Catholics and their priests, centuries-long neighbours of the Orthodox Serbs, then and now, were bothered primarily by the ideology which the Orthodox Church advocated amongst the Serbs and amongst the Bosnian, Herzegovinian and Dalmatian livestock farmers-Vlachs, who became Serbs en masse in the nineteenth century. The ideology was that the medieval Serbian state, Dušan's Empire, continued to live on in the Serbian Orthodox Church even after its fall, and that all South Slavs, except for the Bulgarians and Slovenes, speak the same language – Serbian – as the former Orthodox monk Dositej Obradović had started teaching in 1783.¹³³ Furthermore, they were more bothered and existentially threatened by the procedures of patriarchs and metropolitans from Constantinople, Peja (Peć), Phanariots, Bulgarians and Serbs, who in their unrestrained desire to become rich as quickly as possible used all forces and means to get the Catholics to submit to their spiritual governance and to have them convert to Orthodox or become Serbs.¹³⁴ Of the many available examples, we will mention two examples of the violence of the patriarchs from Peja over the Catholics from Macedonia to Bosnia. Phanariot Kiril II (1758-1763) and his companion, the metropolitan of Prizren, had a case against Catholics (Franciscans) before the vizier in Travnik in 1760. The patriarch wanted to subject the Catholics under his jurisdiction and take levies and tenths from them on the basis of a newly received Sultan's firman which was in contradiction to the *ahdnama* of Mehmed the Conqueror. The Franciscans managed to preserve their heads and the freedom, dignity and future of

133 DOSITEJ OBRADOVIĆ, *Pismo Haralamniju*, (cyr.), Leipzig, 1783; IDEM, *Život i priključenija*, (cyr.), Beograd, 1975, p. 43; VLADISLAV SKARIĆ, *Sarajevo i njegova okolina od najstarijih vremena do austrougarske okupacije*, (cyr.). *Izabrana djela*, vol. I, Sarajevo, 1985, pp. 246-247; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 94; DRAGUTIN PAVLIČEVIĆ, "Dva stoljeća velikosrpskih težnji prema Hrvatskoj 1793-1993", in *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opća društvena pitanja*, 2-3, Zagreb, 1993, pp. 247-283, here 262-263; IVO BANAC, *Nacionalno pitanje u Jugoslaviji*, Zagreb, 1995, pp. 49-51; LJUBOMIR ANTIĆ, *Velikosrpski nacionalni programi. Ishodišta i posljedice*, Golden market - Tehnička knjiga - Hrvatski institut za povijest, Zagreb, 2007, pp. 23-25, 51-54.

134 JULIJAN JELENIĆ, *Kultura i bosanski franjevci*, I, Sarajevo, 1912, pp. 191-192; BONO VRDOLJAK, *Apostolski vikarijat u Bosni 1735.-1881.*, Visoko, 1961, pp. 150-158.

Catholics, only when they pledged the vizier that they would pay a thousand Venetian ducats into the state treasury which they, over the next few days, either had to borrow or melt liturgical vessels into gold.¹³⁵ Even the archbishop from Skopje, Mazarekić (Mazareki) had the same problem in 1774 with Gavriilo, the "impostor" patriarch of Peja even though the patriarch of Peja had been defunct since 1766, and with the exarch of the patriarch of Constantinople because he demanded through violence and fraud the Skopje archbishop give him all the Catholic levies, which had been paid by the Orthodox faithful, the priests and bishops.¹³⁶ Especially fanatical in this respect in Hercegovina was the Hercegovina-Zahum Orthodox bishop and Phanariot, Ananija (1772-1802), who tried to force the Bosnian apostolic vicar and Franciscans in Mostar and western Hercegovina to submit in 1781, and he tried to impose obligatory donations on the Franciscans, which only the Orthodox Christians were obligated to give him as their bishop. He also tried to prohibit Catholic priests and the bishop the right to move freely on the territory of the Hercegovina-Zahum eparchy.¹³⁷ Bishop Ananija or another delegate of the Constantinople patriarch attempted the same in the spring of 1778 in Stolac in the Trebinje diocese. In fact, the delegate came to Stolac with the Sultan's firman in hand, which stipulated that the Catholics were obligated to recognise the jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch and to pay him taxes, with the justification that this was the case during the Ottoman occupation of the region. Father Mate Bogojca, the Dubrave parish priest, acted quickly, seeking the intervention of the Stolac *cadi*, and with the help of local "Turks", Muslims, as witnesses, the attempt to subject the Catholics to the jurisdiction of the Constantinople patriarch was thwarted.¹³⁸ Similar attempts were often made in B-H,

135 BONO BENIĆ, *Ljetopis sutješkog samostana*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1979, pp. 184-192. Jelenić is of the opinion that this was the patriarch from Ohrid (archbishop) accompanied by the bishop from Kosovo. JULIAN JELENIĆ, "Ljetopis franjevačkog samostana u Kr. Sutjesci", in *GZM*, 37, Sarajevo, 1925, pp. 5-42, here 15-19.

136 JOVAN RADONIĆ, *Rimska kurija i južnoslovenske zemlje od XVI do XIX veka*, (cyr.), Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1950, pp. 672-674.

137 B. BENIĆ, *Ljetopis sutješkog samostana*, pp. 171-172; M. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*, III, pp. 179-150.

138 Bishop Katić to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 30. 12. 1778. ASPF Roma, SOCG, vol. 851, fol. 471v-473r; M. KREŠIĆ, "Dubrovačka Republika i ferman za trebinjsko-mrkanskog biskupa Nikolu Ferića", pp. 219-220.

and the Dabro-Bosnian metropolitans either hindered the arrival of apostolic vicars (bishops) in Sarajevo or in "Turkish Croatia", in Bihać. Catholics and their pastors had to keep collecting large sums of money, since the "Turks", Muslims, thought more of Venetian ducats than the Sultan's firmans.¹³⁹ All of these and similar attempts of Orthodox dignitaries towards the Catholics across B-H and Kosovo, whether they were Greek, Bulgarian, Serb or Orthodox Vlachs, despite relations between local Orthodox clergy and Catholic clergy being frequently exemplary, were fresh and cut into the consciousness of the Catholic clergy and faithful that they could not rely on the Orthodox and their spiritual leaders, just like they could not always rely on the centuries-old Ottoman and local Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims.¹⁴⁰

However, the events linked to the First Serbian Uprising strongly impacted general Christian-Muslim relations in the Bosnian Eyalet, and they partially shook up the basic Catholic-Muslim trust. Even though the official Ottoman representatives in Travnik and the local Muslims across the captaincies knew that the Catholic Croats would not join the Serbian rebels, nevertheless they did not know how they would react or if they would approach Austria or France, the historical defenders of Catholics in the Ottoman empire. They also did not know whether a weakened Austria would intervene or open a new front west of the Bosnian Eyalet. At the beginning of the 19th century, Catholics predominantly lived in the vicinity of smaller towns (*kàsaba*) which were held by the Ottomans and the local Muslims in Central and Western Bosnia, Western Herzegovina, to a lesser extent in level Posavina or in the karst of Eastern Herzegovina. Vasa Čubriović (1897-1990) one of the better scholars of Bosnian and Herzegovinian history, presents, albeit from a Serbian and unitarist position yet objectively enough, the status of Croat Catholics at the beginning of the 19th century:

"The most difficult position was that of the Croats under the Turks in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the beginning of the 20th century. Having been destroyed and persecuted for centuries, they abandoned whole areas to which the Serbs moved, or they withdrew to inaccessible areas of central Bosnia. Thanks to the Uskok actions from the coastal region, they managed to preserve the majority in western Herzegovina and in neighbouring Bosnia. The old Franciscan monasteries, Fojnica, Sutjeska, Kreševo and Olovo formed the nucleus in cen-

139 B. VRDOLJAK, *Apostolski vikarijat u Bosni 1735.-1881.*, p. 155.

140 IDEM, pp. 154-155, 158-162.

tral Bosnia. Otherwise, they lived scattered all over Bosnia and Herzegovina. Without the interconnectedness and dynamics that the Serbs have from the Church of St. Sava in Bosnia and the Nemanjić-State tradition, and under the great influence of their clergy, tortured and frightened by centuries of persecution, they are numerously the smallest group of the three confessions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Through the displacement of the old inhabitants who spoke Čakavian between the Vrbas and Una rivers, the tradition of the once Croatian state also disappeared, if there had been anything left after the conquests of the Bosnian rulers in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Catholics in central Bosnia, the descendants of the old Bosnian miners, have the best-preserved Bosnian tradition after the Muslims. Not even the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, like that from the Dalmatian hinterland, has tradition, but it has all the conditions for a quick awakening. And there the language, costume, customs and songs of the Catholics differ very little from the Orthodox there, and their dialects, Štokavian and Ijekavian will serve as a reason for the Croats to also adopt Vuk's orthography and this is how a Serbo-Croatian literary language was begot.¹⁴¹

Although their first neighbours were Ottomans and local Muslims, they were immediately suspicious of the Catholics because of the Austrian and French presence in Dalmatia and the influence of the French and later Austrian consul in Travnik. On November 24, 1808, consul David informs Champagny, the foreign affairs minister in Paris, that the Latin monks, referring here to the Bosnian and Dalmatian Franciscan, were to blame the most for the population not accepting French-Turkish collaboration, which was directed against the Russians and Montenegrins. He calls the Franciscans ungrateful and claims that he never stopped defending them. It was to his credit that Marmont took the Franciscans under his protection in Dalmatia. So that the connection between the Franciscans and French would not be suspicious to the Muslims in Bosnia, he stopped going to their monasteries, not wishing to compromise them in the eyes of the suspicious Ottomans. David, despite being intelligent and agile, was himself a victim of his Jacobin and anti-Catholic prejudices and complexes and could not understand that the local Muslims were Slavs who had converted to Islam, once predominantly Catholics, and that they were more suspicious of the French than the present Ottomans in Travnik, Sarajevo and other towns. The Ottomans were aligned with the politics from Istanbul and knew well that the High

141 VASA ČUBRILOVIĆ, *Politička prošlost Hrvata. Hrvatski narod na početku XIX veka*, (cyr.), Beograd, 1939, https://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/politička_prošlost_Hrvata_ (9. 6. 2020.).

Port needed French assistance against Russia. The Franciscans even refused to conduct the chaplain's service in the French consulate in Travnik, just so that no suspicion would fall on them that they were secretly collaborating with the French.¹⁴²

In this very complex position, the Franciscans across Bosnia and western Herzegovina and the diocesan priests in Eastern Herzegovina and all Croat Catholics as a national and religious minority could not share the hopes of part of the Orthodox Serbs who believed that they would be able to free themselves of the violence of the Ottoman authorities. It was clear to both the priests and the population that Catholics neither had the weapons nor a powerful protector in the neighbourhood in the new state of affairs, that could or would be prepared to support their rebellious efforts. Therefore, they believed they needed to keep the peace and remain under the patronage of the High Port and seek its protection against the exploitation and intolerable oppression to which they were subjected predominantly by the local authority representatives from leading Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslim families. However, since the Sultan and High Port were caught up in constant conflict with Russia, Montenegro and from 1804 with the Serbian rebels in the Belgrade Eyalet, along with the pressures of many local problems and unrest, they could neither offer nor secure Catholics the desired protection. Even many Orthodox Christians in Herzegovina, the Serbs and Phanariot bishops, preferred the protection of the Port from the violence of the local Muslim ruffians than the Uprising and its uncertain outcome. The reforms introduced by vizier Bećir-pasha (1802-1805) in the Bosnian Eyalet may have contributed to this: in 1802, he prohibited the transformation of timars into *čitluks* and thus greatly relieved the position of Christians, especially Orthodox, in the Bosnian Eyalet.¹⁴³ However, since one part of the Orthodox Christians could not avoid the Uprising and the war in the newly arisen circumstances, they often had to choose whether to emigrate to neighbouring Serbia or to flee to Montenegro. This is how it came to migrations between Bosnia and Serbia. The Muslims from Serbia moved to Bosnia, and

142 "Je me suis même abstenu, d'après leur prier, d'allé les voir dans leurs couvents, pour ne point les compromettre aux jeux des Ottoman déjà si ombrageux." M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), p. 368, no. 315.

143 M. EKMEČIĆ, *Dugo kretanje između klanja i oranja*, (cyr.), p. 152; B. TELNOVIĆ, "Bosanski elajet", (cyr.), p. 83.

the Orthodox crossed the Drina River and settled on the abandoned Muslim estates in Mačva and Serbian Podrinje.¹⁴⁴

The army of the Bosnian vizier, led by Sulejman-pasha Skopljak, gathered in three large camps in the spring of 1806 before it marched on Serbia and in the direction of Montenegro: near Mostar, Livno and in the Neretva valley, all regions which were predominantly inhabited by Croat Catholics. To what extent these Ottoman forces gave the Catholics in Hercegovina, in Central or Western Bosnia trust and hope, and uncertainty and a new fear, can very easily be deduced. The case of friar Jozo Ivić (+1827), the parish priest from Travnik (or from Duvno), who is mentioned by Batinić,¹⁴⁵ serves as an example of an anthology of the global ferocity and persecution of Catholics in the Bosnian Eyalet. The case was described in 1815 by the Apostolic Vicar Miletić in his report to the Austrian proconsul in Travnik, and it was later forwarded to the Congregation in Rome. Miletić placed the event in 1807, during the rule of Husrev Mehmed-pasha. The parish priest, Ivić, was accused before him "that he had taken out of a Turkish grave a Turkish child that was already decaying and that he had christened it and then buried it in a Christian grave, because, people said, a convert had given birth to it".¹⁴⁶ Although the indictment was more the fruit of the sick fantasy of the cruel ruffian, the Travnik/Duvno parish, parish priest Ivić and the monastery in Fojnica had to pay the then astronomical sum of 3,000 Groschens, which would have corresponded to the value of 30 Ottoman ducats of the time.¹⁴⁷ In August 1807, another infamous example occurred which certainly did more damage to the necessary coexistence of Catholics, Muslims

144 V. ČUBRILLOVIĆ, *Prvi srpski ustanak i bosanski Srbi*, (cyr.), p. 130.

145 He mentions Batinić again, that "some bey from Duvno Teskeredžić" introduced new fines and levies on the faithful, the parish priests and the Fojnica monastery. M. V. BATINIĆ, *Djelovanje franjevacu u Bosni i Hercegovini*, III, p. 179; R. JOLIĆ, *Leksikon hercegovačkih franjevaca*, p.164. As Mustafa-aga Teskeredžić is mentioned in the Duvno captaincy as the ayan of Duvno in 1815, it is most probably Mustafa-aga Teskeredžić. Cf. H. KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ, *Kapetanije u Bosni Hercegovini*, pp. 133-134. A bey Teskeredžić is also mentioned in Andrić's *Travnik Chronicles*.

146 BAZILIJ PANDŽIĆ (ed.), *Acta Franciscana Hercegovinae 1700-1849*, vol. II, Ziral, Mostar-Zagreb, 2003, pp. 476-477; ANDRIJA NIKIĆ, *Događajnica Hercegovine od 614. do 1918*, Mostar, 2003, pp. 425-426.

147 JOSIP MATASOVIĆ, *Fojnička regesta*, Spomenik SKA, vol. LXVII, Beograd, 1930, p. 242.

and Jews in Herzeg-Bosnia. That year, two Jews from Sarajevo ("Ajmiko i Musija") opened a store in Kreševo. Shortly after they started noticing that goods were disappearing from the store, and they tried to catch the thieves. Instead of finding the thieves, they stumbled upon the "Turks Maljane" (local Muslims) who persuaded them to say that the goods had been stolen by the Catholics from Kreševo in agreement with the Guardian of the monastery. When the two Jews confirmed this to the *cadi* in Kreševo, he accused the guardian and Catholics before the vizier in Travnik. The latter immediately sent his officers and transported guardian friar Mijo Nikolić and another seven Catholic *malbaša* (village heads) to Travnik as responsible for the theft. Vizier Husrev-pasha, who declared himself a humanist and Francophile before consul David, did not give the guardian or the Catholics an opportunity to prove their innocence. He insulted them like thieves and threw them into jail. Not having any other options, the Catholics borrowed 1823 Groschen and 30 *para* from a man, "Colonia of the Turks". Only after they had handed the money over to the Jews on the vizier's orders were they released. Not long after, the real thieves, Muslims from Kreševo, "Ali-basha Derko and his brother", both Janissaries from Kreševo, were caught. Just as it was in vain to expect the *cadi* or vizier to order the return of the unjust fee and to do justice to the monastery and the Catholics, it was also in vain to expect the real thieves, who were briefly imprisoned, to be punished. The saddened monastery annalist, friar Marijan Bogdanović adds:

"And that is how the Turks stole and the friars paid their punishment. And if, something happens, and the guilty party cannot be found, the Turks immediately lay the blame on the friars. My dear readers, I cannot write enough to tell you how miserable our status was at this time! I hope our brothers see better and happier times, but in our lives, we have lost the hope of seeing better times but God is almighty, he can do it. Lord, give us the patience to endure and we will certainly be repaid by you in heaven."¹⁴⁸

All of this occurred when the weakened High Port, Bosnian viziers Bećir-pasha, Mustafa-pasha Smailpašić, Husrev Mehmed-pasha and Ibrahim Ilmi-pasha together with numerous Bosnian and Herzegovina captains and ayans unsuccessfully tried to quell the Serbian rebels in Serbia and Bosnia, and the Montenegrin rebels in Eastern

148 M. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Ljetopis kreševskog samostana*, pp. 207-208; I. STRUKIĆ, *Povjestničke crtice Kreševa*, pp. 98-99.

Hercegovina. It would have been logical for them to come to an understanding that they needed help from an ally as early as 1806, even from the Catholics in B-H who were few in number, but also from the French. Even after the Treaty of Pressburg, Russia was still in conflict with the French and as a century-long rival of the Ottoman Empire was still constantly at war with the High Port. Therefore, official Petrograd sent its Baltic fleet into the Adriatic Sea and in March 1806, had the Bay of Kotor occupied and started dreaming of definite access to the sea on the Adriatic and the Mediterranean with the help of their Slavic Orthodox brothers, Serbs and Montenegrins. To exert more pressure on Istanbul, in the following months Russia occupied Moldavia (Bessarabia) and Wallachia, reached the Danube and arrived to offer assistance in the rear to the Serbian rebels. Selim III, acknowledging all the weaknesses of the Ottoman and his own position, attempted to consolidate the straits between the Aegean and the Sea of Marmar, regroup his army and in December 1806, he declared war on the Russians, without managing to neutralise the open front against the rebels in Serbia.¹⁴⁹ Even the English, who at the time were Russian allies and Ottoman rivals, rushed to display their maritime force before Istanbul. However, thanks to the military advice of Napoleon's representative in Constantinople, general Horatio Sebastiani, the Turkish canons drove the English from Bosphor and the Sea of Marmar. Not having attained their goal in Istanbul, the English set off for Egypt and supported Muhamed-Ali, an Arbanasi from Greek Kavala, the new star of anti-Ottoman and anti-Sultan centralism.¹⁵⁰ It was at this point that the High Port, its viziers and Bosnian leaders, who generally underestimated the significance of the Serbian Uprising, grasped the gravity and the jeopardy of its position in Bosnia, Hercegovina, Serbia and the whole Balkans and started to prepare seriously for the oncoming war. At the same time, Napoleon's France, which had its own plans for the Adriatic and south-eastern Europe, began conquering Dalmatia and strengthened its influence on the French-Russian war and on the Russian-Turkish war in the Mediterranean and on the eastern coast

149 L. A. J. MORDACQUE, *Histoire de Napoléon Bonaparte*, Londres, 1832, p. 235; É. DRIAULT, *La politique orientale de Napoléon*, pp. 75-76; JOSEPH VON HAMMER, *Historija Turskog/Osmanskog Carstva*, 3, Zagreb, 1979, pp. 272-274; ROBERT MANTRAN, "Le débuts de la Question d'Orient (1774-1839)", in R. MANTRAN, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, Fayard, Paris, 1989, pp. 431-433.

150 É. DRIAULT, *La politique orientale de Napoléon*, pp. 98-105.

of the Adriatic. The dream of a tripartite alliance between France, Turkey and Persia, directed against Russia, must have originated in this constellation.¹⁵¹

A Catholic and Croat in contemporary Dalmatia, the Republic of Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor, in Eastern and Western Herzegovina and in the Bosnian Eyalet found himself surrounded and hemmed in by a quartet of superpowers - Austria, France, Turkey and Russia and the local rebels and persecutors from Serbia, Montenegro and the Bosnian Eyalet. Metropolitan Petar I joined his Montenegrin forces to the Russian navy and tried to realise his greater Montenegrin and "Slavic-Serbian" dreams, which will later coincide with the general Serbian political plans of Karađorđe Petrović, Dositej Obradović, Vuk Karadžić, Miloš Obrenović, Ilija Garašanin and numerous adherents, all up to the Memorandum SANU from 1986.¹⁵² Thus, Metropolitan Petar I and his Montenegrin troops, who used to raid the coastal regions of the Venetian estates south of the Bay of Kotor, directed their attacks and pillaging in two directions. The first direction led Bishop Petar I and his Montenegrins, together with the Russians and Herzegovinian Serbs, from the summer of 1806 to the summer of 1807 into the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik, into pillaging in Konavle and the siege of Dubrovnik, "the imagined capital city of the *Slavic-Serbian state*", which the French had entered shortly before. After the unsuccessful siege, but successful plunder, Bishop Petar I had to retreat to the Bay of Kotor. Hutovo captain Hadži-bey together with Herzegovinian Catholic Croats jumped to the aid of the besieged population of Dubrovnik and the French.¹⁵³ Bishop Petar's second military venture occurred the following year with incursions onto Turkish territory, advancing in the direction of Nikšić and all Eastern Herzegovina. This campaign was supposed to lend direct support to the Serbian rebels and the spreading of the Uprising to Herzegovina. However, Bishop Petar I suffered his second heavy defeat, together with the Russians and the Herzegovinian Serbs, in Klobuk in July 1807, the south-eastern Herzegovinian fort and captaincy seat. The opposing force consisted of the troops of the Bosnian vizier and Her-

151 B. JELAVICH, *Russia's Balkan Entanglements*, pp. 80-97; É. DRIAULT, *La politique orientale de Napoléon*, pp. 60-61.

152 M. VALENTIĆ, *Rat protiv Hrvatske*, pp. 23-42, 60-67.

153 P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, 267; M. GAVRILOVIĆ, *Ispisi iz pariških arhiva*, (cyr.), p. 376, no. 322.

zegovinian captains, amongst whom there were many Catholics, with the French coming to their aid from Dubrovnik.¹⁵⁴

The cited voluntary or forced military collaboration between Catholics and the local and Ottoman Muslims were of no political or material benefit to the Catholics. In the consciousness or subconsciousness of the average B-H Muslim of this period, the term alliance did not exist. Therefore, it is no wonder that the Croat Catholics nurtured sympathies and the desire to liberate themselves from the Turkish yoke, its viziers, captains and ayans, just like all the Slavic peoples in south-eastern Europe did, especially the Serbs, who were the first to initiate a general uprising, the First Serbian Uprising or the so-called Serbian Revolution, as Ranke called it.¹⁵⁵ Simultaneously, all sympathies and similarities aside, in their ideas for Croatian statehood, politics and the Church, Croats, if led by local sons in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, had to constantly defend but also do battle with not only the four existing neighbouring countries, bearers of imperialist ideologies and pretensions, such as the Republic of Venice (later the Kingdom of Italy), the Austrian Empire, the Kingdom of Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, but also a fifth and the latest, albeit newly formed, bearer of a just-as-dangerous imperialist ideology and pretensions, the embodiment of the *Slavic-Serbian State* - the future Greater Serbia. The already mentioned Serbian historian and politician, Vasa Čubrilović, in his intellectual honour, albeit restrained, in the spirit of Yugoslavism and in principle *ad usum Delphini*, hinted in 1939 at the far-reaching consequences of this fifth, new, for Croats fatal, neighbouring imperialist and hegemonistic ideology. It is thus worth citing his ideas here lest they not be forgotten:

"The First Serbian Uprising from 1804 to 1813 also marked a new age for Balkan nations. With the establishment of the Principality of Serbia and Montenegro, the Serbian people entered the 20th century with a clear goal before them, the battle for liberation and union. The unusually high spiritual connection of all Serbs already found expression in this period. Their desire to unite by establishing a national state cut deep into the life of the Croatian nation. As strong minorities in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, and as the relative majority in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbs had been a powerful cultural-poli-

154 HAMDİJA KAPIDŽIĆ, "Prilozi istoriji grada Klobuka", in *Gajret*, 13, 1940, p. 267; IDEM, *Ali-paša i njegovo doba*, pp. 33-34; M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski punici u Bosni*, pp. 148-153. Cf. above notes 43-46, 66 and 67 and the corresponding text!!!

155 LEOPOLD VON RANKE, *Die serbische Revolution. Aus serbischen Papieren und Mittheilungen*, Duncker und Humboldt, Berlin, ²1844, pp. 137-159.

tical factor for Croatian history since the 16th century. Upon the dissolution of Turkey, the battle to establish their own state, in which they wanted to ensnare a part of the Croatian lands, saw the Serbs represent another very important factor for Croats in the centuries-long battles over these lands with Germans, Hungarians and Italians."¹⁵⁶

At the time, there were very few Catholic and Croat leaders in the Bay of Kotor, Dubrovnik, Sinj, Split, Šibenik, Zadar, Senj, Istria, Zagreb, Đakovo or in the three Franciscan monasteries in Bosnia, who like friar Andrija Dorotić and friar Paško Sekula in Dalmatia, bishop Vrhovac in Zagreb and friar Grga Varešanin Ilijić in Kraljeva Sutjeska in Bosnia, who comprehended and understood the scope of the new emerging political plans and constellations, as well as the factors, that were emerging both in the East among Croatia's close Orthodox neighbours as well as within the Croatian national corpus in the West: *the movement and desire of Serbs for union via the establishment of a Serbian national state on the territory of Croatian lands as well.*¹⁵⁷

5. Epidemics and Natural Catastrophes

Alongside all the unrest caused by the French Revolution, Napoleonic wars, serious state of war and battles with more-or-less well-intentioned neighbours, the Catholics and Croats of Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor and all the inhabitants of Bosnia and Hercegovina were struck by additional, numerous and unavoidable natural and war calamities, catastrophes and epidemics. The numerous wars and movement of warring forces through these regions inevitably led to increased migration movements, which were expressed in several ways: the flight of unprotected inhabitants in the face of the violence and pillaging of warring factions, the flight of young men out of fear of conscription which was first conducted by the Ottomans in the Bosnian Eyalet, then the Austrian and French authorities in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor,¹⁵⁸ the temporary Dalmatian deserters during the uprising against the French government, especially in 1807, 1809 and 1813, the arrival of Polish refugees during the Napole-

156 V. ČUBRILOVIĆ, *Politička prošlost Hrvata*, (cyr.), https://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/politička_prošlost_Hrvata_ (9. 6. 2020.).

157 *Loc. cit.*

158 P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, pp. 119-120.

onic wars, the victory and defeat in the wars against the Russians and Prussians and their settling in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia.¹⁵⁹ Additional constant companions of all of these numerous war events in the last decades of the 18th and the first two decades of the 19th century were long and harsh winters, dry and unfruitful years, forest fires, a domestic animal plague, famine, contagious diseases like the plague, cholera, syphilis, the smallpox and other typical war diseases. The plague, cholera, syphilis and other infectious diseases were initially brought predominantly by Ottoman soldiers who arrived via continental routes from Rumelia, the Vidin borderlands, Epirus and Albania. Later the plague was brought by Russian, French and Austrian soldiers as well as merchants and travellers from Morean, Ionian and Albanian regions, who entered Dalmatia via the ports in the Bay of Kotor, Dubrovnik, Herzegovina, Split and Zadar.¹⁶⁰ The plague was usually transmitted via clothing, luggage, foodstuffs, repositories and beasts of burden. The plague struck Bosnia particularly hard in 1796, 1801-1803, and 1807. It broke out the same year in Dalmatia, so people fled in fear and trepidation, crossing borders

159 J. MILEKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana 1814.*, 8-9, 1, 16, 19; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 100.

160 ĐURO ORLIĆ, "Dubrovačke vijesti o epidemijama u Bosni i Hercegovini u XVII vijeku", in ND NR BiH, Građa 2, Odjeljenje med. nauka, 1, 1956., pp. 47-64; SEID TRALJIĆ, "Trgovina Bosne i Hercegovine s lukama Dalmacije i Dubrovnika u XVII i XVIII stoljeća", in *Pomorski zbornik*, I-II, Rijeka, 1962, pp. 341-371; J. MILEKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih muslimana 1814.*, pp. 8-9, 16, 19; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, pp. 100-102; BOGUMIL HRABAK, "Organizatori karavanskog prometa iz južne Hercegovine u XVI i XVII veku", in *Tribunia*, 8, Zavičajni muzej Trebinje, 1984, pp. 3-24; ANTE ŠKEGRO - ANTE IVIĆ, "Kuga, kolera, boginje ubojstva... Neuobičajene smrti katolika Uskoplja od 1775 do 1883. g.", in *Bosna Franciscana*, 36, Sarajevo, 2012, pp. 317-354; STIPAN MIŠURA, *Biser Uskoplja. Crctice iz župe svetoga Ilje Proroka u Kandiji (1875.-2010.)*; JOZO TOMIĆ, *Uspomene s Kupresa*; ANTE ŠKEGRO, *Kuga u gornjovrbaskom kraju od 1814. do 1817.*, Zagreb - Kandija, 2011, pp. 245-309; ROBERT JOLIĆ, "Zarazne bolesti u ljubuškoj krajini u tursko doba. U prigodi 200. obljetnice početka najveće ikad zabilježene kuge u Hercegovini (1814.-2014.)", in *Hercegovina franciscana*, 10, Mostar, 2014, pp. 122-129; VESNA MIOVIĆ, "Život u karanteni: Lazareti na Pločama u vrijeme Republike", in ANTE MILOŠEVIĆ, (ed.), *Lazareti u Dubrovniku. Početak karantenske službe u Europi*, Zavod za Obnovu Dubrovnika, Dubrovnik, 2018, pp. 40-41; JESSE HOWELL, "Balkanske karavane: Dubrovačka mreža kopnenih puteva za vrijeme Osmanskog Carstva", in ANTE MILOŠEVIĆ, (ed.), *Lazareti u Dubrovniku*, pp. 51-64.

from one country to another, yet still accompanied by famine, drought, high food costs, animal plagues and other tribulations.¹⁶¹

However, all these cited calamities were exceeded by the plague which ravaged Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dubrovnik and Dalmatia from 1812 to 1818, and which, according to some sources, first broke out in Sarajevo,¹⁶² according to others in the Travnik region. The first mention of the 1812 plague was made on April 14, 1812. That day vicar Ilijić's secretary, friar Stjepan Marković, wrote from Kraljeva Sutjeska to the Dalmatian provincial friar Šimun Rebić, that it was true that the disease called the *carboncolo*, popularly known as *čarnec*, was ravaging certain villages and that people were dying, but it was not the plague, like he had written from Dalmatia.¹⁶³ Nevertheless, the plague ravaged Travnik, Jajce, Kotor Varoš and Bosnian Krajina in the summer of 1813. In the parish of Travnik, around 4000 Catholics died and 750 in Fojnica.¹⁶⁴ The plague spread rapidly to Central and Western Bosnia and as of 1814, to Herzegovina, Dubrovnik and Dalmatia.¹⁶⁵ The plague arrived in Kreševo in 1814 but the register of the number of casualties has been lost. In the neighbouring parish, in Sarajevo, in 1814 and 1815, 165 Catholics died of the plague, as the Sarajevo parish registry confirms.¹⁶⁶ At the same time, around 4000

161 P. PISANI, *La Dalmatie*, pp. 118-120; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 100.

162 Friar Stjepan Marijanović, who continued Benić's annals in 1821, claims that the plague broke out first in Sarajevo in 1814, and then in other larger towns (*in aliis majoribus urbibus*). Marijanović, because of his long sojourn abroad, was not well informed about the more recent history of Bosnia so his claims about the beginning of the plague are incorrect. Cf. JULIAN JELENIĆ, "Ljetopis franjevačkog samostana u Kr. Sutjesci", in *GZM*, 39, Sarajevo, 1927, p. 8.

163 "È vero che in certe Ville serpeggia il male detto carboncolo, volgo Czarnecz, e muoiono Persone, ma non è tanta strage come scrive V.P.M.R...", HR-DAZD, Spisi pokrajinske intencence za Dalmaciju, 1812., kutija XIII, originalna pisma, no. 2486; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 101.

164 MIJO V. BATINIĆ, *Franjevački samostan u Fojnici od stoljeća XIV.-XX*, Zagreb, 1913, pp. 111-112; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 100.

165 MIJO V. BATINIĆ, "Njekoliko priloga k bosanskoj crkvenoj poviesti", in *Starine JAZU*, XVII, 1885, pp. 77-150, here 102-110; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 102.

166 M. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Ljetopis Kreševskog samostana*, p. 214.

Catholics died in the Travnik region,¹⁶⁷ and over 2000 in Jajce.¹⁶⁸ In the Upper Vrbas region, over 1330 people or 42.5% of the Catholic population lost their lives from the plague or similar diseases from 1814 to the autumn of 1817.¹⁶⁹ In the Livno region, according to the registry, the plague arrived in the autumn of 1814. In the Ljubunčić parish, 1057 people died in the period between 1814 and 1818. The highest number of casualties were in the villages Rujani, Priluka and Kovačić. In another Livno parish, Vidoši, there were 1592 deaths from the plague in the same four-year period. Thus, in the entire Livno region, 2649 people had been entered in the Registry of Deaths, dead of the plague, in the period 1814-1818, i.e., half of the Catholic population.¹⁷⁰ Apostolic Vicar Miletić, aware of the difficult and immeasurable position of his faithful, wrote from Fojnica on September 10, 1817: "The terrifying scourge of the plague still has us in fear and frequently appears here one moment and then on the other side of this country."¹⁷¹ This all confirms the thesis that a very large number of Catholics died of the plague in Central and Western Bosnia, and that, in the opinion of some historians, the number of Catholics was nearly halved.¹⁷²

The situation was similar or perhaps even worse in Hercegovina. The plague was most probably brought by the vizier's forces that arrived from Bosnia in early spring of 1814 and joined in the definitive rec-

167 J. BALTIC, *Godišnjak*, p. 74.

168 MATO KRISTIĆEVIĆ, *Enhiridion*, MARKO ČORIĆ (translator and editor), Franjevački samostan Svetoga Duha, Fojnica, 2019, pp. 130-132; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 102.

169 A. ŠKEGRO; "Kuga u Gornjovrbaskom kraju od 1814. do 1817", in STIPAN MIŠURA, *Biser Uskoplja. Crtice iz župe svetoga Ilije Proroka u Kandiji (1875.-2010)*, p. 309.

170 <https://sites.google.com/site/selomisi/livanjska-katolicka-prezimana> (9. 6. 2020.); DAMIR TADIĆ, "(Prigodom 200. obljetnice epidemije kuge u livanjskom kraju 1814.-1818.): Apokaliptična pandemija", in *Kalendar svetog Ante*, 2015, Sarajevo, 2014, pp. 180-181.

171 JULIJAN JELENIĆ, *Spomenici kulturnoga rada franjevaca Bosne Srebreničke*, I, Mostar, 1927, p. 315.

172 J. JELENIĆ, "Ljetopis Franjevačkog samostana u Kr. Sutjesci", pp. 174-175; LEO PETROVIĆ, "Katoličko stanovništvo u Mostaru," in *Napredak Hrvatski narodni kalendar* 1937., Sarajevo, 1936, pp. 120-132; VOJISLAV MIKULIĆ, "Kuga u mostarskoj župi godine 1814-15", in *Kršćanska obitelj*, 4, 1944, pp. 54-56; IDEM, "Kuga u širokobrieškoj župi godine 1814-15.", i *Kršćanska obitelj*, 7, 1944, pp. 105-106.

koning against the Dadić brothers and their followers in Mostar and the surrounding region. Many Catholics from Nahija fought on the side of the Dadić brothers because they had been coerced by Dadić's forces. Amongst them were also those, who out of personal conviction ran to the assistance of the partially tolerable Muslim neighbour. Furthermore, Dadić's army contained many volunteers and adventurers, who hailed from Western Herzegovina and Dalmatia. A type of soldier's wage existed for them. The diverse makeup of Dadić's army and its collision with the vizier's units was the most favourable condition for the spread of the epidemic across Herzegovina. Thus, logically the plague continued spreading from Mostar onto the entire surroundings and then onto the parishes in Western Herzegovina, when the volunteers and forcibly conscripted Catholics returned to their homes. Parish Mostar had 2913 Catholics in 1813 according to the records of parishioners maintained by vicar Miletić.¹⁷³ Herzegovinian Franciscan Petrović asserted that in the period 1814-1815, 371 adults died in the parish of Mostar; this number is most probably incorrect because that would suggest that the children and youth had either been spared or not counted at all. This was just 12.7% of the total number of faithful of this vast parish.¹⁷⁴ This opinion was countered by research, most probably by friar Vojislav Mikulić, who claimed that on the territory of the parish of Mostar in 1814-1815, 677 Catholics died of the plague, meaning 23.2% of the total number of the Catholic population. That the scale of the plague in Herzegovina was great is confirmed by Vladimir Bazal, citing 3000 dead just in the city of Mostar.¹⁷⁵ In the neighbouring parishes of Brotnjo and Veljaci, the plague arrived in June 1814, and petered out by March 1816. According to the parish records in Brotnjo, the plague took 2215 lives, which was slightly less than half of the parish, which in 1813, according to the report of Apostolic Vicar Miletić, numbered 4904 inhabitants. In the parish of Veljaci, which numbered 2243 Catholics in 1813, only 297 people died or 13.2% of the parishioners. That the parish of Veljaci truly had fewer deaths is confirmed by the

173 DRAGUTIN KAMBER, "Prilozi povijesti bosanskih franjevaca. Stanje župa i duša apostolskog vikarijata u Bosni srebreničko otomanskoj prema popisu izvršenom 1813", in *Franjevački vjesnik*, XXXVIII (2), 1931, pp. 83-88, here 87.

174 ROBERT JOLIĆ, "Zarazne bolesti u Hercegovini u doba turske vladavine", in *Hercegovina*, 1, series 3, Mostar, 2015, pp. 187-213, here 200.

175 VLADIMIR BAZALA, "Calendarium pestis", in *Acta Historica medicinae, pharmaciae, veterinaire*, 2/1, Beograd, 1962, pp. 55-65.

fact that in 1818, vicar Miletić found the parish numbering 2241 parishioners. According to Miletić's records from 1818, the total number of all the deaths in Herzegovina during the plague years, from 1813-1818, amounted to 5858 people.¹⁷⁶ The greater part had died of the plague. However, according to Jolić, the total number of dead in the same period might total between 8000 and 9000 souls, and the plague death toll in the western part of Herzegovina would be between 6000 to 7000 Catholics.¹⁷⁷ The percentage of Catholics who perished of the plague in the parishes of western Herzegovina are in accordance with the percentage of deceased Catholics in the entire Apostolic Vicariate. According to Miletić, in 1813, that is, before the plague, there were 114,391 Catholics in Bosnia and Western Herzegovina, and after the plague in 1818, the count had been reduced to 50,928 souls, which means that more than half of all Catholics in the Bosnian Vicariate had died.¹⁷⁸

The Trebinje Diocese, which has to be regarded as separate from the Apostolic Vicariate, was frequently struck by the plague, particularly in the 18th century.¹⁷⁹ However, at the beginning of the 19th century, the plague that started spreading from Bosnia in 1812 arrived in Eastern Herzegovina in 1814. Thus, on the territory of the parish of Ravno, in the period from 1814 to 1818, 181 people, a quarter of the Catholic population of the time, died of the plague. The plague spread to the parish of Gradac in 1815 and killed 20 people between January 1815 and June 1816.¹⁸⁰

176 Cf. D. KAMBER, "Stanje župa i duša apostolskog vikarijata u Bosni srebreničko-otomanskoj prema popisu izvršenom 1813.", 57, pp. 86-88, 112-113; BORIS JAKOV BARUN, *Dušobrižnički rad biskupa fra Augustina Miletića (1763.-1831.)*, Matica hrvatska, Umag, 1998, pp. 192-193. Milekić claims that the plague broke out in Mostar first and that in three days killed 3000 people. It allegedly spread from Mostar to other towns and villages. Cf. J. MILEKIĆ, *Pokret bosanskih. Muslimana 1814. godine*, pp. 26, 37, 39-40; S. M. DŽAJA, *Katolici u Bosni i Zapadnoj Hercegovini*, p. 100.

177 R. JOLIĆ, "Zarazne bolesti u Hercegovini u doba turske vladavine", p. 203.

178 *Loc. cit.*

179 BOGUMIL HRABAK, "Kušne radnje u Bosni i Hercegovini 1463-1800", in *Istorijski zbornik*, 2, Banja Luka, 1981, pp. 22-24, 37; HAMDİJA KAPIDŽIĆ, "Stolac u XVIII vijeku", in *Slovo Gorčina*, 79, Stolac, 1997, pp. 57-74.

180 ANTUN KONCUL, *Od mora do Mramora. Stanovništvo Graca u Hercegovini*, Zagreb - Dubrovnik, 2018, pp. 152-153; MARINKO MARIĆ, "Epidemije kuge u Dubrovačkom zaleđu tijekom 17., 18. i 19. stoljeća i protuepidemijske mjere

It is a fact that the other inhabitants and faithful in BH, the Muslims, Orthodox and Jews, had to bury members of their communities who died of the plague every day. The only problem is that the accurate number of casualties cannot be ascertained as they were not bound to maintain internal statistics like the Catholic registries of births, baptisms and deaths. As both the Muslims and the Orthodox were much more numerous than the Catholics, they must have had much greater casualties during the epidemic, but unfortunately, we have no accurate records. During the plague that struck Bosnia between 1781-1785, according to the testimony of a Franciscan annalist, 20,000 Catholics and 100,000 Orthodox, Muslims and Jews died.¹⁸¹

It is a fact that the plague spread from Mostar, its surrounding region and the territory of the Trebinje Diocese to the Dubrovnik region, Makarska and other coastal towns.¹⁸² Allegedly, the first focal point was in Čepikuće near Slano, in Slano itself and in Podgora with a total of 47 dead of the plague. The second focal point for the rider of the Apocalypse were villages on Pelješac: Področje, Pijavičina and Kuna with 34 plague casualties. The total number of plague casualties on Pelješac, in Slano and in Župa near Dubrovnik amounted to approximately 100 people.¹⁸³ The new Austrian administration reacted briskly and effectively for the time, to which the 1815 report to general Milutinović by Baro Bettero, the former secretary of the Republic, testifies.¹⁸⁴

The plague and other epidemics in Bosnia and in Hercegovina broke out and spread in the last phase of the battles of the Mostar ayans from the Dadić family and in the phase of suppressing the First and the beginnings of the Second Serbian Uprising. It was causally connected to the arrival of Ali-pasha Darendeli, who arrived

na Dubrovačkoj granici", in *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 62, 2020, p. 176.

181 J. BALTIĆ, *Godišnjak*, p. 63.

182 LUCA STULLI, *De peste que in exitu anni MDCCCXV, in circulum Rhacusanum irreperat*, Bononiae, ex Typographeo Annesii Nobilii et Soc., 1828, pp. 5-25.

183 NENAD VEKARIĆ, "Kuga u Čepikućama 1815/6. godine", in *Zbornik Dubrovačkog primorja i otoka*, 2, 1988, pp. 135-139.

184 BOGDAN KRIZMAN, "Mémoire Bara Bettere austrijskom generalu T. Milutinoviću o Dubrovačkoj Republici iz 1815. godine", in *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku*, 1, 1952, pp. 423-464; ROBIN HARRIS, *Dubrovnik: A History*, Saqi Book, London, 2006, p. 32.

in Bosnia in March 1813 with numerous troops from Rumelia. At the same time, the arrival of the plague in Dalmatia coincided with the final battles, defeats and the retreat of the French army from Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor at the end of Napoleon's reign.¹⁸⁵ The presence of many foreign and local soldiers, travellers, merchants, refugees and local inhabitants, who would spend winter with families and livestock in places where more food, pasture, work and favourable temperatures were readily available,¹⁸⁶ together with the long-lasting war-related suffering, the inevitable natural catastrophes, minimum hygiene and poor nourishment, were all additional causes and consequences of the epidemic miseries and unrest in the history of Catholics at turn of the 19th century in the mentioned Croatian lands, which has still not been researched sufficiently.

6. Concluding Thoughts

The seductive motto of the French Revolution: *Liberté, égalité, fraternité* was no longer the only guiding ideal, the only attractive and driving force of the French man and society, the French nation and its political and military coryphaeus Napoleon only ten years after the outbreak of the Revolution. Both the motto and the French Revolution itself were very complex phenomena whose fruit – both sweet and savoury and sweet and sour – were "enjoyed" directly and indirectly by all European nations, including the Croats and their numerous neighbours. The French Revolution was a true volcanic eruption of long thwarted, conscious and unconscious human forces, dreams and desires; revolution as the "very fertile mother" that will bring to European man, directly or indirectly, a wide and variegated palette of numerous left-wing and right-wing political options, which can be listed here: proto-totalitarianism, proto-nationalism, proto-imperialism, proto-socialism, proto-communism, proto-national-socialism, proto-national-fascism, proto-national-communism, post-communism and post-fascism. Although the French Revolution at its onset was a dream and the subconscious projection of liberty, equality, brotherhood, justice, progress and the future, particularly

185 Napoleon's army in Russia in 1812 had been greatly weakened by typhus, which is in essence just a milder variant of the plague. Cf. FREDERIC F. CARTWRIGHT - MICHAEL BIDDIS, *Bolest i povijest*, Naklada Ljevak, Zagreb, 2006, p. 270.

186 LJUBO MIĆEVIĆ, *Život i običaji Popovaca*, Beograd, 1952, p. 63.

in the so-called "third estate", new mottos and facts, dubious values and conceited egos started emerging, albeit just as attractive a force, such as: *Être suprême*, *Temple de la Raison*, *La Guillotine*, *La Grande Armée*, *Le Grand Empire*, *La Grande Nation*, *Napoleon le Grand*, *Empereur de France et Roi d'Italie*, all mottos in which dreams became scarcer, reality uncertain and the battlefields across Europe all the more numerous, soaked in fresh young blood.¹⁸⁷ In whose name did this all occur? In the name of liberty, equality and brotherhood? Never! In the name of the Third estate? Certainly not! In the name of someone's heightened ego, personal or national, or in the name of complexes more-or-less national, cultural and libertarian values? Probably! Despite this, a part of humanity has always been carried away, both at the beginning and at the end, by ideological mottos, the terrible guillotine, bloody fields, military medals, battles won or lost, victory monuments and celebrations, great military-memorial complexes such as the *Hôtel des Invalides* in Paris!

We still do not have a clear, fixed understanding of the form and the degree that the French Revolution penetrated the Croatian provinces and their neighbours in south Europe. At the turn of the 19th century, the unrest in Istria, Civil and Military Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor, in neighbouring Herzegovina and in Bosnia was not only political and ecclesiastical in nature, as the title wishes to suggest, but was also national, cultural, migrational, sanitary, existential and revolutionary unrest in all Croatian lands and neighbouring provinces – a micro-cosmic flash of the macro-cosmic European explosion.

Whilst Dalmatia was experiencing four administrative and political governments in a few decades (1789-1814): Venice, Austria, Napoleon's France and Austria again at the end, Dubrovnik, after its own aristocratic narcissism, was tasting in full all the charms of "Napoleonic democracy" and Austrian post-Josephinian rigidity. Neighbouring Herzegovina and Bosnia, which was only formally united with the former at the time, maintained the Ottoman government *de jure*, which in this period had been *de facto* reduced

187 LUCIEN JAUME, *Le discours jacobin e la démocratie*, Fayard, Paris, 1989, pp. 9-29. The introduction is especially worthy of attention in this critical presentation of the French Revolution and the Jacobin dictatorship and ideology. Also see: HANS KELSEN, *La Democratie: Sa nature, sa valeur*, Economica, Paris, 1988, p. 92. This author espouses the principle: The democratic ideal requires the existence of the philosophy of relativism!

to the minimum of statehood. High Port and sultans Selim III and Mahmut II attempted to introduce new administrative and military reforms in the Empire, *tanzimât*,¹⁸⁸ which were supposed to end the independent desires of individual provincial deputies in Egypt, Syria, Rumelia, Epirus, Albania and in the end, Bosnia; in other words, to modernise and prolong the life of an already dying Empire on the Bosphorus. Simultaneously, first in Herzegovina and then in Bosnia, conflict emerged between local, Muslim leaders, ayans and captains, agas and beys, instigated by the powerlessness and failure of the central Ottoman government, and the incompetence and corruptibility of the Ottoman deputies in Travnik. This crucial historical moment, *kairos*, of the absolute weakness of the Ottoman Empire and mutual discord between the leading Muslim leaders in the Belgrade and the Bosnian Eyalets would be first taken advantage of by the Serbs from Šumadija in their uprisings in 1804 and 1815, until first, they attained autonomy and then later an independent Principality. In Bosnia and in Herzegovina, where there was no existing national and religious monolith such as existed in the Belgrade Eyalet (Serbia), it was not possible to build and achieve state autonomy and independence on national or religious principles. The only principle which came into consideration was allegiance to land (Bosnian or Herzegovinian) with Islamic supremacy, which two Muslim leaders would try to realise: Ali-pasha Rizvanbegović in Herzegovina and Husein-captain Gradašćević in Bosnia. Rizvanbegović, having accepted *pro forma* the Sultan's new policies, managed to achieve his autonomous plan, but only on the territory of the defunct Duchy of St. Saba (Herzegovina), by simultaneously becoming Gradašćević's rival and the Port's ally. The attempts of his rivals in Bosnia, particularly those of Husein-captain Gradašćević and his followers from 1830-1832, were just yearnings to secure deputy functions for themselves and to preserve the old and rigid Bosnian-Ottoman-Islamic order in Bosnia and thereby create a type of Bosnian-Islamic autonomous semi-state on the borders (*sèrhat*) of the Ottoman Empire. These attempts failed along with their plans for Bosnia, primarily due to their lack of military experience, discord and lack of diplomatic skill to present and prove themselves as advocates of the High Port and its contemporary aims at reform by the ever-successful Sultan Mahmut II.

188 ELCIN KÜRSAT, *Der Verwestlichungsprozeß des Osmanischen Reiches im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Zur Komplementarität von Staatenbildungs- und Intellektualisierungsprozessen*, IKO - Verlag, Frankfurt am Main/London, 2003.

Dalmatia in the narrow sense, with the Bay of Kotor but without the Republic of Dubrovnik, did not experience any significant changes during the eight-year Austrian administration. The previous Venetian administration had been established for centuries and was partially petrified. Official Venice gave no cause, nor did it tolerate any greater political, cultural and economic changes. It proved itself to be, despite a larger number of enlightened individuals from the citizenry, "third estate", resistant to nearly all the ideals of the French Revolution, even immediately before its own fall. Surrounded and partially numbed by the Habsburg Monarchy, Venice reacted to all challenges with insufficient mobility and intelligent reflexes. The greatest aim of the Republic of St. Mark in the 18th century was to preserve the status quo: *mantenere lo status quo!* Thus, Venice experienced the final decades of the 18th century as its death throes between Austria, France and the first calls for the unification of Italy and the jealous preservation of its own independence, despite its, *douceur de vivre*, which was adored by all of Europe.¹⁸⁹ The Venetians transferred their own immobility and death throes onto its subjects in Dalmatia, on the continent and the sea from Istria to Sutomore, its largest estates across the sea, although they were subconsciously proud of their imperial and colonial past.¹⁹⁰ After the fall of Venice, the government in Vienna considered from the start that Emperor Francis II acquired Venice and Dalmatia with it through a treaty as personal compensation for other lost Austrian provinces (Austrian Netherlands and Lombardi), which he had to cede to France in accordance with the Treaty of Campo Formio. Instead of being united with the Kingdom of Croatia, which Croats burned for but naively desired and welcomed as was advocated both diplomatically and boldly in vain by the agile Dalmatian Franciscan Dorotić, Dalmatia was transformed into a separate territorial-administrative unit and directly subjected to Vienna, and it was not united with Croatia, its mother-country. Dalmatia found itself again, just like under Venetian rule, separated from the other Croatian lands, this time within the framework of Austria, organised like other inherited lands. During the whole

189 A. ZORZI, *La repubblica del leone*, p. 476; CLAUDE JAMAIN, *La douceur de vivre: D'une esthétique de la grâce au XVIIIe siècle*, Presses universitaires des Rennes, Rennes, 2011.

190 MARINO BERENGO, "Problemi economico-sociali della Dalmazia veneta alla fine del '700", in *Rivista storica italiana*, 66, 1954., pp. 469-510; A. ZORZI, *La repubblica del leone*, pp. 430-482.

eight-year Austrian administration, Dalmatia would remain for the most part closed to the spirit of the foundational ideals of the French Revolution, far from its ideas, dreams and mottos, but simultaneously also far from a real Croatian national awakening. Here and there the first seeds of revolution could be felt in Dalmatia as well, sown on the streets of Paris in the non-distant 1789, planted in the meantime in Zadar, Šibenik, Split and Dubrovnik and the latter's Konavle.

The growth and nurturing of the revolutionary seed and generally accepted human good could only be secured in Croatian lands by a newer, fresher political force, supported by the national will, which was supposed to be reflected in the French occupation and administration starting from February 1806. The Treaty of Pressburg between Austria and France ended the first Austrian administration and brought enormous changes and tensions to Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor, neighbouring Herzegovina but also to Bosnia. The fate of the inhabitants of Dalmatia was sanctioned by the emperor-king because they had become *adopted children of the French emperor and Italian king, the greatest autocrat*.¹⁹¹ This new phraseology of an adopted nature hid in itself several features of a paternalistic-nationalist exchange, agreed to in Bratislava, rather than the enchanting spirit of liberty, brotherhood and equality. At the same time, the occupation of Dalmatia opened up new possibilities for Napoleon to get closer to or penetrate the Ottoman Empire via Albania and Greece to the Dardanelles, Bosphorus and the Black Sea or via Herzegovina, Bosnia and Serbia with access to the Danube, or the even bolder and rarely mentioned alternative present in Napoleon's policies: to besiege Austria and Russia from the southeast of Europe. The tiny Republic of St. Blaise stood in the way of France's strategy more as a logistic obstacle than as a political or military rival or desirable ally. Forced into a corner by the French, Russians and Montenegrins, Dubrovnik also started its death throes like its "venomous" rival from the Venetian lagoons. Dubrovnik suddenly found itself far from its historical protectors, who were simultaneously going through their own agony: the Sultan in Istanbul, the Emperor in Vienna and the Pope in Napoleon's temporary or definitive enslaving campaign across Italy and France. Although the Republic of St. Blaise's long tradition merited preservation as an interesting museum or political

191 "Habitants de Dalmatie, Vos destinées sont fixées: vous êtes réunis aux états de l'Empereur des Français et Roy d'Italie le plus grand des Monarques vous adopte pour ses enfants." HR-DAZD, Zbirka STAMPE, box 9, no. 17/9.

petrifact, like the *Republic of San Marino* or the *Principality of Andorra*, Napoleon and his generals held that strategically it was neither a significant military fortress nor did they have any political-moral-emotional duty towards its past, culture and tradition. The French saw greater difficulties but also greater chances in the Bay of Kotor where the Russians and Montenegrins were nesting, as well as the Ionian islands, occupied by the Russians, Turks and British, which Napoleon's generals gave a large geostrategic and military-technical role.¹⁹²

If the proclamations and decisions of the Constitutional Parliament of the Revolutionary era in Paris are regarded, France should have been the first, true and exemplary democratic country in Europe. However, it was not. There was always a discrepancy between the proclaimed ideology and the democratic reality. However, not even its leaders, starting with the First Republic to the Directory, from the Consulate to the Empire were not exemplary democrats. Napoleon, a competent general, first Consul and later first Emperor, was the main and most powerful scion of the Revolution: he was not a democratic person but a conceited emperor and the conceited saviour of France.¹⁹³ He did not come to power via democratic elections but with a coup d'état on November 9, 1799 (18. brumaire).¹⁹⁴ He did not know how to, nor could he democratically govern an Empire which stretched from the Atlantic to the Baltic, from the North to the Ionian Sea. Napoleon was not a person who had time or patience, but a person who wanted everything immediately and at once which was contradictory of itself. It is true that Napoleon's conquests in Europe destroyed the *l'ancien régime*, however, it is also true that he did not succeed in establishing a new, more stable, modern and democratic order (*le nouveau, moderne et démocratique régime*), which Europe eagerly needed at the beginning of the 19th century. Napoleon is the source of the above-mentioned statement that the revolution is over: *Citoyens, la révolution est fixée aux principes qui l'ont commencée, elle est finie.*¹⁹⁵

192 JACQUES BAËYENS, *Les Français à Corfou, 1797-1799 et 1807-1814*, Institut français d'Athènes, Athènes, 1973, p. 174.

193 JEAN TULARD, *Napoléon e la noblesse d'Empire*, Tallendier, Paris, 1986. IDEM, *Napoléon ou le mythe du sauveur*, Fayard, Paris, 1977.

194 JACQUES BAINVILLE, *Le 18.-Brumaire*, Hachette, Paris, 1925; IDEM, *Napoléon*, Editions rencontre, Paris, 1965.

195 *Citizens, the Revolution is finished having been established on the principles that began it.*

What the Croatian lands and all of Europe had imported from Napoleon's France were not the bold and sympathetic mottos of the French revolution but revolutionary ideas reworked and embodied in Napoleon's Concordat, *Le Concordat de 1801*¹⁹⁶ and Napoleon's civil code *Code civil de 1804*.¹⁹⁷ If someone would dare try to summarise Napoleon's concordat and code in two words, then they would be: *la laïcité de l'état*, that is, laity, secularity of state, today's common motto and the main ideological guideline of the European Union.¹⁹⁸ The new French government, introducing new and necessary state reform in the newly conquered regions, introduced the spirit of Napoleon's legislation which must have collided with the social and religious patriarchal environment of the Croatian lands from Istria to Budva and the neighbouring countries in its hinterland. Thus, the French were not *ipso facto* agnostics and atheists, as they were regarded and presented by the patriarchal Catholic, Orthodox and Islamic understanding at the time, particularly in the social-theological considerations of the Dalmatian and Bosnian Franciscans and the Dalmatian and Herzegovinian diocesan priests, B-H imams and Orthodox priests and monks. The French were sons of their time, patriots, officials and soldiers loyal to their emperor, people and state, who also had to learn and adapt that faith was a "private issue" of every citizen, which had to be regulated by the state, which had the right to control everything, the foundational principle and message of the French Revolution, embodied in the Declaration of Human and Civil Rights, the civil constitution of the clergy and in Napoleon's Civil Code.

A negative impression of the French and their rule was absorbed by Catholic Croats in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, the Bay of Kotor, in neighbouring Herzegovina and in Bosnia thanks to the strong influence of their priests; thus, the French consular official's report of the proverbial hatred of Catholic monks (clergy) across B-H towards the French and their politics. Furthermore, according to the French, a very negative picture of the French was also nurtured by the Mu-

196 Cf. note 81 above, the accompanying text and the cited sources.

197 J. GOY, "Code civil", in M. FURET - M. OZOUF, *Dictionnaire critique de la Révolution française*, Paris, 1988, pp. 508-519. Cf. note 7 above and the accompanying text.

198 CARLOS HAGE CHANINE, *La laïcité de l'État et sa contrefaçon. Pouvoir spirituel - Pouvoir temporel*. Beyrouth, 2014; PHILIPPE PORTIER, *L'État et les religions en France. Une sociologie historique de la laïcité*, Presses universitaires des Rennes, Rennes, 2016.

slims ("Turks") and their religious and political leaders across Bosnia. Whilst the Herzegovinian Muslim leaders, captains and ayans: the Dadić, Rizvanbegović, Resulbegović, Gavran-Kapetanović and other families, despite their merciless mutual battles with unclear separatist goals, managed to establish good relations with the French in Dubrovnik and established mutual trust, whilst the Bosnian Muslim leaders: the Gradašević, Fidahić, Kulenović, Ljubunčić, Firdus and some other families had a panicky fear of the French and their ideas.¹⁹⁹ The Muslim leaders in Bosnia did not understand Napoleon's Egypt campaign as an imperialist battle between France and England for domination in the Mediterranean, as a battle for control over the merchant sea routes, but rather more as a hostile act towards the Sultan, Islam and the Ottoman Empire. They could not presume that a Christian nation, predominantly Catholic, could be in a goodwill alliance with the Ottoman Empire.²⁰⁰ This was noticed and reported by French officer, captain Jean Leclerc de Montpye, who travelled through Bosnia and Herzegovina in August 1806 as a French spy. On this occasion he wrote, not always in a flattering way, about the Bosnian "Turks" who were considered to be less civilised than those in the Levant. Macedonian, Greek and Constantinople "Turks" treat the Bosnian "Turks" as ignorant and barbaric. When talking about the hospitality of the Bosnian "Turks", he reports that it is practiced generally without restraint, albeit not majestically.²⁰¹ Another French travel-writer and spy, captain Roux-la-Mazelière, wrote about the Muslims ("Turks") that, in the case of a French invasion of which rumours were rife, he thought that the agas and other rich Muslims would be the first to submit on the condition that they keep their

199 The very diligent doctor at the Sorbonne, Midhat Šamić, hints at all of this in his presentation but does not dare define it publicly. Cf. M. ŠAMIĆ, *Francuski putnici u Bosni*, pp. 171-216.

200 "L'occupation de l'Egypte a laissé dans l'esprits un souvenir que ne s'efface pas. Trop ignorant d'ailleurs pour apprécier les circonstances et avoir les moindres notions de politique, traitent en ennemi tous ce que ne pas musulman, ils ne peuvent imaginer qu'une nation chrétienne s'allie a eus de bon fois". VJEKOSLAV JELAVIĆ, "Francuska izvješća o Bosni", in *GZM*, XVIII, Sarajevo, 1906, pp. 307-340, here 338.

201 "Les Turcs de cette province passent pour beaucoup moins civilisée que cette de Levant e sont traités d'ignorance et des barbares par ceux de la Macédoine, de la Grèce e de Constantinople. L'hospitalité est exercée généralement chez eux sinon avec magnificence, au moins sans aucun réserve". *Loc. cit.*

goods.²⁰² Both officers present very briefly the very difficult position of Christians, especially the Orthodox, during the Serbian Uprising. Captain Leclerc de Montpye observed that their position (yoke) had become visibly worse. All Christians had suffered humiliation and hatred before this time: they were forced to get off their horses when they passed by a "Turk", they lived without weapons in the midst of a people who was always armed, they underwent even worse treatment, even beatings without the ability to defend themselves and were in danger of having their throats cut legally (*sous peine d'être légalement égorgés*). The French officer further reported that there was a constant and massive suspicion of the Christians; they were regarded and treated like people who were loyal to the great powers that shared the same faith. Christians were afraid that the "Turks" would start slaughtering them if the French or Russians entered the country with weapons because they were already preparing to defend the lands (*que les Turcs, pour se préparer à le défendre, ne commençaient par les égorger*).²⁰³ According to a report by the same officer, the position of Jews was less suspicious to the "Turks" and they were abused less as their people did not rule anywhere. Only the Jews in Travnik lived in fear of Dubrovnik's attempts to convince the "Turks" that Napoleon also professed the Jewish faith (*il y a quelque années des Ragusais qui cherchèrent à persuader aux Turcs que l'empereur Napoléon professait la religion juive*).²⁰⁴

The reports of the agents of the only great power of the time, as is evident from these examples, and which we cited here as a smaller *pars per toto*, contained specific military, political and religious opinions which they advocated and communicated to their governments and sympathisers but also to their opponents. At the same, even then, they cautioned about the existing religious, national and political divisions which reigned particularly in Bosnia, in Herzegovina, and partially in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and Boka.

The main characteristic of all these political, cultural, religious and national perceptions and unrest did not have any national, religio-

202 "D'après les bruits qui se sont souvent répandus lors de l'invasion des Françaises, l'on a pu juger que les agas et les gens riches seront ceux que se soumettront les premiers, pourvu qu'ils aient l'assurance de conserver leurs biens." *Op. cit.*, p. 319.

203 *Op. cit.*, p. 338.

204 *Loc. cit.*

us or political commonality, i.e., mutual efforts of all three religions and future nations for the resolution of acute mutual problems, but division and the desire to achieve their own hegemony. Thus, these reports can be considered additional testimonies that the unrest and future in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and the Bay of Kotor, and especially in Herzegovina and in neighbouring Bosnia at the turn of the 19th century was multifaceted, complex and strongly conditioned by history, the consequences of which the citizens and believers of these countries still "enjoy" at the beginning of the 21st century.