

**GORAN VASIN**

University of Novi Sad  
Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History  
goran.vasin@ff.uns.ac.rs

---

***FROM RENAISSANCE TO A PRECIPICE OVER THE ACHE***  
**PATRIARCH LUKIJAN BOGDANOVIĆ**

---

**Abstract:** Patriarch Lukijan Bogdanović was the last head of the Patriarchate of Karlovci, which had existed for two centuries, first as a metropolitanate and later a patriarchate. He was elected Bishop of Buda when he was very young, and he proved to be a highly capable at running the diocese/bishopric. From 1908 on, as a young patriarch, he faced unresolvable difficulties and issues related to religious and educational autonomy, the Patriarchate itself, and relations between Austria-Hungary and Serbia. Attacked, defamed, and misunderstood by the Serbian public, he soon began falling victim to poor health. His tragic death, which many years later again became an object of public interest, made him seem more sensational than he actually was, and his educational and ecclesiastical work remained in the background.

**Keywords:** Patriarchate of Karlovci, Lukijan Bogdanović, Radicals, Jaša Tomić, Mihailo Polit Desančić.

---

In late October 1913, the Serbian press in the Habsburg Monarchy wrote of a day, sunny and cold, with palpable apprehension and disbelief hanging in the air around those present, as the body of Patriarch Lukijan Bogdanović was taken from the church in Sremski Karlovci and placed in the crypt of the Upper Church. Lukijan Bogdanović, the Patriarch of Karlovci, had disappeared without a trace in early September 1913 while recuperating at Bad Gadstein. Soon after, speculation grew over the reasons behind his disappearance, his financial difficulties, his private life, and his political leanings. An air of spectacle and sensationalism began to grow around the patriarch, which was certainly not beneficial for either the Patriarchate of Karlovci or the Serbian elite in the monarchy. For a while, it was forgotten that all this had been about one of the most important ecclesiastical and, for quite some time, political offices the Serbs had in the monarchy. It was also about a man who had become a patriarch when he was only forty-one, and whose many talents had distinguished him within the Church. Even-tempered, mild-mannered, yet highly experienced in Church affairs, he could potentially have been one of the most significant patriarchs to sit the throne of the patriarchate. Nevertheless, his close ties to government

elites in Budapest made him highly unpopular with the Serbs.<sup>1</sup>

It was clear from his very first days with the Church as a monk and a bishop, he was something quite alien for the Serbs. He was born in Baja in what is now Hungary, educated at Serbian and Hungarian schools, had a distinct gift for languages, and spend a great deal of time in Egra and Buda, where he was elected bishop on the recommendation of his uncle, Patriarch Georgije Branković, when he was only twenty-nine. They were both sober and realistic in their understanding of key decisions made in Budapest and Vienna regarding the status and position of Serbs in the monarchy, and that Karlovci was no longer the main Serbian center in the monarchy that it once had been. By the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Novi Sad and Zagreb had more attractive political and financial power, so the seat of the patriarchate had become the center for all events during sessions of the National Church Council, and from 1869 onwards it became an arena for Serb-on-Serb fights and disputes and the destruction of the potential for Serbs in the monarchy.<sup>2</sup>

Patriarch Georgije Branković, a former liberal, understood very well that it would not be enough for the Church to simply settle its finances or reorganize monastic life. He quickly decided to surround himself with young, energetic bishops who would be capable of running the Church according to the prevailing zeitgeist and in the best interests of the Church. Many of his protégés would go on to have important roles in Church life even up until the First World War. This was how the patriarch's decision led Lukijan Bogdanović to find himself at the head of one of the most demanding bishoprics in the Karlovci Patriarchate. The decision proved to be a good one. Bishop Lukijan ran the bishopric for fifteen years, and during this time he made notable progress in organizing and repairing the Serbs' standing in the center of the Hungarian half of the monarchy. His predecessor, Asenije Stojković, had headed the bishopric for forty years, which had resulted in almost everything coming to a complete standstill during the last few years of his tenure. His involvement in the National Church Councils held in 1872–1874, 1879, and 1881, when as part of the Miletić's group he was elected patriarch, had been met with criticism from the Hungarian elite, and especially from Kálmán Tisza. For this reason, old bishop tried to stay out of the attention of the police in Buda and Pest.<sup>3</sup>

Bogdanović's education in Baja, Eger, and Karlovci would shape his views on many future political and ecclesiastical decisions. Living in Eger and Karlovci gave him a clear view of all the advantages and disadvantages of life at the center and at the periphery of this great empire. As a young student in the 1880s, he made some acquaintances who would slowly but surely help establish him among the Budapest elite. Stevan Čamprag, a priest in the Bishopric of Buda, saw Lukijan as a handsome, elegant man who should become a priest rather than a monk, but Patriarch Georgije had had a direct influence on Bogdanović being tonsured in 1891 in Beočin on Fruska Gora. His priestly path was then tied to all higher and lower offices. He was a religious teacher at the gymnasium in Novi Sad and also taught at the Karlovci Seminary. The period from 1892 to 1896 was a difficult one for the patriarchate, and during this time, Bogdanović learned about the Serbian parties' political

---

<sup>1</sup> Vasin 2020: 17–20.

<sup>2</sup> Mikavica, Lemajić, Vasin, Ninković 2016: 72–77; Mikavica 2015: 292–295.

<sup>3</sup> Vasin, Ninković 2018: 123–127; Vasin 2020: 231–248.

situation and their conflicts, primarily through the example of Patriarch Georgije who was a daily target in opposition newspapers of vicious attacks and horrible smears. Branković's attempts to bring order to religious and educational autonomy were obstructed by the Radicals, who stood at the forefront of anti-clerical opposition. During these years, Bogdanović had an opportunity to see what would be in store for him if he became more deeply involved in politics and religious and educational autonomy. This may have been at the root of the health problems that would later befall him. For a young man of only twenty-five in the patriarch's inner circle, exposed to the daily attacks, schemes, and provocations of the political elite, there was no respite and nowhere to hide. The monarchy's older, experienced politicians, whose time had passed, gave little thought to the next generation of clerics and politicians.<sup>4</sup>

This proved to be to the detriment of the Serbs in the monarchy. The generation gap was wide, and during the National Church Councils the decades between Mihailo Polit Desančić and Svetozar Pribićević were readily apparent. The Serbian elite were no longer acting in concert as they had been during the revolution of 1848–1849 or under Svetozar Miletić's leadership. After the Congress of Berlin and a decade of wholly unsuccessful opposition, there was an attempt to pursue a policy of realism or balance. Voices were growing louder that they needed to also engage with the Hungarian political system and abandon Miletić's stubborn opposition, which had not delivered any results and for which he himself had fallen victim to in a show trial in 1876. Patriarch Georgije, then Miletić's closest associate, was aware of this and found a way to move closer to government circles. In the 1880s, politics in the Kingdom of Serbia were also moving in that direction, so the situation was somewhat different. King Milan's abdication in 1889 caused another political stir on both sides of the Danube.<sup>5</sup>

The political situation behind the scenes during Lukijan Bogdanović's election as Bishop of Buda in 1897 was difficult. The electrified anti-Church atmosphere among the Serbs in the monarchy left little room for maneuver. The Millennium Celebrations of 1896 in Budapest and throughout Hungary evoked considerable political emotions among the Serbs in Hungary. The Church was constantly under attack as being the main collaborator with Dezső Bánffy's government and the main support behind the process of Magyarization. Although this could not have been further from the truth, the Radical's manipulations of their electorate left no room for compromise. The patriarch and the Synod were openly accused of actively taking part in Magyarization and were presented in the radical, rather anti-Semitic press as servants of the Jews and whose goal was to destroy religious and educational autonomy. This all culminated in a series of articles written against Patriarch Branković in which he was referred to as Satan himself. This was the atmosphere surrounding Lukijan Bogdanović's election as bishop, which the press welcomed with a series of attacks claiming the patriarch had decided to introduce the principle of inheritance in the Serbian church and that he was readying a "dauphin" to continue his dynasty.<sup>6</sup>

On 20 January 1898, Bishop Lukijan was officially confirmed by Emperor Franz

---

<sup>4</sup> Vasin 2014: 96–137.

<sup>5</sup> Vasin 2015: 441–457; Mikavica 2015: 297–308; Mikavica 2018: 268–272.

<sup>6</sup> Vasin 2020: 42–55.

Joseph and was hirotonisan by Patriarch Georgije in Szentendre. In 1898 he was faced with a number of serious problems in his bishopric that for years had not maintained ordinary church life. Expenses were high, and some churches were lacking even the most basic liturgical objects, which Lukijan complained to the patriarch about at the Conference in Karlovci in June 1898. This conference was meant to serve as a forum for some of the bishops to meet with politicians who were seeking a resolution to for the issue of religious and educational autonomy. Some of the most prominent of these were Baron Jovan Živković, Ilija Vučetić, and Nika Maksimović. None of them were Radicals. Between 1898 and 1902, things further deteriorated. The attacks on the patriarch and the Synod were so vehement, that in 1902 the Radicals took control of all affairs related to religious and educational autonomy. The Church had no means of defending itself from so many attacks aimed solely at attaining power, no matter the cost to the Radicals, of whom Jaša Tomić wielded the mightiest pen.<sup>7</sup>

It was during these years that, contrary to the prevailing circumstances, were incredibly fruitful for Bishop Lukijan in the Bishopric of Buda. From his personal correspondence and archives, it is easy to see that many churches and priests were looked after, a significant number of churches were renovated, and a magnificent building project was started to erect the Tekelijanum in central Budapest. Bishop Lukijan had a feel for the prevailing zeitgeist. From the 1890s until the First World War, substantial funds were allocated to present Budapest in all its splendor through a revitalized city center, broad boulevards, the Parliament building and the Opera House, numerous hotels and cafés, the first metro lines (which the city was at the forefront of in Europe). This gave the Serbian community the chance to establish itself and contribute to the city's development. The Serbian churches of Saint George in Pest and Saint Demetrius in Buda (in the Taban) were well-positioned, which provided the bishop an opportunity to raise funds to maintain and expand the capacity of the Church community on Váci Street and to begin the ambitious construction of the Tekelijanum on Veres Pálné Street. Capable Serbian merchants had been well-known for years in the center of Pest and they did more than enough to fully preserve the church's splendor. A not small number of individuals personally contributed to these grand ventures. Serbian members of the Hungarian Parliament within the ranks of the Hungarian parties also helped.<sup>8</sup> Patriarch Georgije Branković did the same in Sremski Karlovci. Sure and persistent in his convictions, he chose to seize the opportunity offered and turned Karlovci into a true Serbian residential center in Hungary. He was quite successful in this endeavor. Grand buildings were built, the city was electrified, and new streets began to spread through the city—all due to the work of the patriarch, who invested millions of crowns into repairing and building new schools and renovating countless churches and monasteries throughout the patriarchate.<sup>9</sup>

One of the most prominent of those in Bishop Lukijan's circle in Szentendre was the longtime mayor and patron of the Church, Jenő Dumtsa/ Evgenije Evgen Dumča. Dumča/Dumtsa, a strong supporter of Bishop Lukijan's church renovation projects, was wealthy and had an extensive, primarily mercantile, network and strong connections in

---

<sup>7</sup> Vasin 2014: 182–188; Mikavica, Vasin 2017: 22–27.

<sup>8</sup> Vasin, Ninković 2018: 129–132.

<sup>9</sup> Vasin 2014: 215–237.

Budapest. Contemporary writers described the bishop as soft hearted, averse to conflict, and very popular among the elites at the center of Hungary. He may have been hated and essentially misunderstood in Karlovci, but in Budapest he was successful in surrounding himself with his own people and connecting with the most influential people in the capital.<sup>10</sup>

Bogdanović, did not find it particularly difficult to manage the affairs of his parish, to obtain gas driven machines for wells, to advise priests on how to better manage their resources, to support electrification, or to use his own private funds to purchase books or assist poorer students and clergy. During the years when laws symbolic of Magyarization were passed that eventually culminated in the Apponyi laws in 1907, he raised considerable funds to begin building the Tekelijanum. The priest Stevan Čamprag openly wrote that the bishop was good and wise in how he managed the bishopric, that he was kind and gentle with his subordinates and supported their ideas, but he could not abide negligence and indolence in those closest to him.<sup>11</sup>

At the National Church Council of 1906–1907, when the question of Georgije Branković's removal was raised, he stood in open opposition to such a radical initiative and supported the older patriarch in front of the government in Budapest. After Patriarch Branković's death on 30 July 1907, the forty-year-old Lukijan soon found himself in an unenviable position.<sup>12</sup> Not only did the Serbian press claim he was the Hungarians' pet, but his fellow bishops also believed he had been elected only because he spoke fluent Hungarian. The Hungarians, on the other hand, viewed Lukijan as well-educated, intelligent, and popular, and also as the only individual who could represent the symbolic connection between Serbs and Hungarians. The bishop tried not to engage with all the speculation and spent the greater part of 1907 working on the construction of the Tekelijanum. He also intentionally set aside time to consecrate renovated churches and meet with many members of the clergy. During these years, there were extensive construction projects in the bishopric of Budapest. In numerous epistles, the bishop also endeavored to strengthen the spiritual health of both clergy members and the congregants who attended church. These epistles are still relevant today. He openly criticized and condemned intemperance, greed, selfishness, and disrespect for one's fellow man, and recommended moderation and respect for modern medicine and recent scientific achievements that benefited humanity. Significant parts of his epistles were also symbolically linked to politics, and he appealed to his readers to respect the Hungarian state and its ruler, Franz Joseph. He stated unequivocally that there were storm clouds gathering over the Serbs and rough times were ahead, but he also stressed the Serbs' love of the Crown of St. Stephen and the dual monarchy. His pleas were also directed at the consciences of the Serbs, asking them to refrain from needless criticism or speaking publicly about politics without knowing all the facts.<sup>13</sup>

Nevertheless, despite his reticence, it was impossible to avoid the National Church Council of 1908, which had to be convened to select a new patriarch for the Patriarchate of

---

<sup>10</sup> Vasin, Ninković 2018: 131–134.

<sup>11</sup> Vasin, Ninković 2018: 142–144.

<sup>12</sup> Rakić 1986: 186–189.

<sup>13</sup> Vasin, Ninković 2018: 139.

Karlovcí. Prior to this, the government of Sándor Wekerle had named Lukijan as the patriarchate's administrator in March 1908. He was also named secret advisor and the title of His Excellency, which accompanied this office.<sup>14</sup> Not long after, the press launched a campaign to elect a new patriarch. The Radical newspaper *Zastava* insisted that Wekerle would force through Lukijan Bogdanović. The situation only became more heated with frequent speculation about the impending annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Elites in Budapest felt Nikola Pašić, Jaša Tomić, and King Petar were trying to interfere with Serbian ecclesiastical affairs in the monarchy. In an interview on 18 July 1908, the Radical candidate for patriarch, Bishop Gavriilo Zmejanović of Vršac, said he had discussed this several times with Wekerle. He did not conceal the fact that he had mentioned to Wekerle that Kálmán Széll and Dezső Bánffy could confirm he was working to tamp down anti-state activity.<sup>15</sup> He also felt that not speaking Hungarian posed a problem for him but gave Bishop Bogdanović full advantage. Mihailo Polit Desančić, a veteran of the Serbian political scene, stated unequivocally that if there were no other option, Wekerle would force Bogdanović, and that the Radicals bore full responsibility for all of this because they had permitted Wekerle's interference with their own malfeasance in the business of religious and educational autonomy.<sup>16</sup>

At the Serbian National Church Council, the proceedings eventually fell into chaos. First, Bishop Gavriilo Zmejanović of Vršac was elected patriarch on 1 August 1908, which Wekerle did not wish to recognize due to Zmejanović's lack of Hungarian. In the second round on 6 September 1908, Bishop Mitrofan Šević of Bačka was elected, but he withdrew, announcing that he had not been asked or consulted, and that he did not want the position. Finally, on 22 September 1908, Bishop Lukijan was elected. A Radical majority supported him, but they had first consulted with Wekerle and Ferenc Kossuth. Following the election, dozens of articles were written by the ruling Radicals and opposition Liberals, in which both sides hurled insults, threats, and a litany of accusations that only further undermined the election. Patriarch Lukijan was enthroned on 8 October 1908 in Karlovcí, but the atmosphere was strained and bleak due to the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina a few days prior and the tensions that followed among the Serbs in the monarchy. The monarchy's Serbian elite openly discussed the historic defeat and the Austro-Hungarian hostility directed at the Serbs, along with growing warnings of a clash between the dual monarchy and the Kingdom of Serbia.<sup>17</sup>

It was against this backdrop that Lukijan Bogdanović assumed leadership of the patriarchate. At only forty-one, he found himself needing to resolve issues that his predecessors, German Anđelić and Georgije Branković, had been unable to for decades. Both had been energetic and persistent, which were qualities the patriarch's contemporaries did not believe he possessed. Constant references were made to him being soft, mild-mannered, and conciliatory, and this made him an ideal target for Serbian and Hungarian politicians, who saw issues related to the Church and religion as nothing more than

---

<sup>14</sup> Vasin 2018: 22–29.

<sup>15</sup> Mikavica 2006: 396–398.

<sup>16</sup> Mikavica 2011: 256–259; Mikavica 2018: 273–283; Rakić 1983: 57–59; Pal 2009: 265–270.

<sup>17</sup> Vasin 2015: 687–697; Vasin 2014: 301–314; *Branik*, br. 173, 2/ 15 avgust 1908; *Branik*, br. 184, 17/ 30 avgust 1908; *Branik*, br. 192, 27 avgust/ 9 septembar 1908; ASANUK, MPA, A, 349/ 1908.

additional tools for dealing with major crises in the Balkans. The trial of Serb elites accused of treason in Croatia in 1908–1909 only served to further inflame political tensions. The patriarch kept himself removed from this politically motivated proceeding, but he publicly called for Serbs to be allowed the Cyrillic script and the flag and to preserve their traditions within Croatia and Slavonia.

A multitude of new and unresolved issues were raised at new National Church Council that met over two sessions between 1 June 1910 and 28 July 1911. The agendas at both lengthy sessions were dominated by the monasteries' accounts, aid for the clergy, financial disarray, running the Council committee, and the current state of various funds. Friction continued relentlessly within the Radical–Liberal Independents. It was almost impossible to conduct a meeting without interruptions or to make any more important decisions. The question of religious and educational autonomy continued to elude the Serbian political actors and it eventually fell to the government in Budapest, where on-and-off discussions had been going on for years about introducing some sort of special administration for Serbian schools and religious affairs. The adoption of the Synod organization in 1911 was a step in this direction. The patriarch wanted the Church to take full control over all internal administrative affairs without any secular interference, which had been the case since the Assembly Statute of 1869–1875. Earlier attempts by Patriarch German Anđelić in 1882 and Patriarch Georgije Branković during 1892–1897 were unsuccessful, and Lukijan's move was viewed as by some of the Serbian public as a betrayal.<sup>18</sup>

The abolishment of religious and educational autonomy in 1912 went hand-in-hand with all of these other issues. There is no doubt that, for many years, the government wanted to limit autonomy or partially suspend it, but it is also true that the Serbian ecclesiastical and the political elites were supportive of this. The patriarchate had been in disarray for decades, which was reflected in its poor financial state, constant in-fighting, failure to implement decisions, the work of autonomous institutions being constantly blocked, and the catastrophic state of Serbian schools. This all came to a head during the period of 1911–1912. Patriarch Lukijan was not directly responsible for this state of affairs. Decades of neglect and discord were the consequences of prior inaction long before the events of 1912. Nevertheless, blame was largely attributed to Lukijan personally.

After several petitions sent by members of the Hungarian parliament to the prime minister, László Lukács, religious and educational autonomy was considerably narrowed by the Emperor Franz Joseph's infamous Decree.<sup>19</sup> With this, numerous decisions made by the National Church Council were repealed. These included Act of 29 May 1871 on the interim organization of the bishopric, the Act of 29 May 1871 on the interim Patriarchate Ecclesiastical and Education Council, Act of 29 May 1871 on the selection of representatives to the council Act of 14 May 1875 on the National Church Council, all the rules and regulations based on interpretations of these decrees, and the Statue of 23 March 1908.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Vasin 2015: 700–707.

<sup>19</sup> ASANUK, MPA, A, 237/ 1912, from a handwritten letter from Franz Joseph and László Lukács, with an accompanying letter from the bishopric written by the patriarch's secretary, Dr. Laza Sekulić.

<sup>20</sup> Rakić 1986: 207–215.

Minister Lukács instructed Patriarch Bogdanović on 17 July to carry out this order, and in response Bogdanović sent a representative on 26 July 1912. His representative received a very hostile welcome from the Serbian political parties. The patriarch was labeled a traitor, and his administration declared the worst since the patriarchate had been founded. By now it was already evident that the patriarch was having difficulties dealing with the situation he had found himself in. His valuable humanitarian and building initiatives had gone completely unnoticed. He was not accustomed to public gatherings and did not care to engage in controversy through the press, so he instead spent a considerable amount of time in Budapest between 1910 and 1912. His frequent absences from Karlovci were interpreted as wanting to move the seat of the patriarchate to Budapest. There was no evidence to substantiate this, but it was nevertheless mentioned regularly in the Serbian press.<sup>21</sup>

Patriarch Lukijan's attempts to put the patriarchate's finances in order were ultimately unsuccessful, but some important progress was still made. When securing pensions for the clergy, Patriarch Lukijan promised to make a permanent yearly contribution from his personal funds, and when the Pension Decree for Serbian Orthodox Clergy in the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate of Karlovci was adopted, he donated 20 percent of his net income to the fund for clergy and their widows. In 1909 he founded the *Synod Fund*, to which he contributed 50,000 crowns annually for the Synod and religious education. On his initiative, the Holy Synod passed the Decree for the Court Monastic Clergy in the Orthodox Patriarchate of Karlovci in 1911. Only a young man with a formal education and who was of the Orthodox faith and Serbian ethnicity could be admitted as a novitiate. This was a school where young monks were trained for higher positions in the Church. At the end of January 1909, when the government in Zagreb revoked the rights for a Serbian teachers' college in Pakrac, Patriarch Lukijan took the necessary steps and the school was allowed to reopen. With the patriarch's initiative *The Blessing of Metropolitan Stefan (Stratimirović)*, it was reopened as the Stefaneum, a modern residential gymnasium where around forty students received free room and board. As a result of Patriarch Lukijan's beneficence, the fully renovated Church of Saint Nicholas was reconsecrated in 1910, as is evidenced by a memorial plaque inside the church. At the initiative of the patriarch, Uroš Predić's famous painting *The Turbulent Sea*, which depicts Saint Nicholas blessing Patriarch Lukijan as he kneels before him, asking for a blessing for the salvation of the church. The painting is now kept at the Serbian Patriarchate in Belgrade.<sup>22</sup> These important accomplishments, achieved over a relatively short period, were never given enough attention, and the negative image of him created in the Serbian press endured for many years after his death.

The Balkan Wars were the final turning point in relations between the Kingdom of Serbia and Austro-Hungary, but they were also crucial for the Serbs in the monarchy. The loyal Serbian population was viewed with mistrust. As tensions grew, the Serbs collectively became a people to be viewed with suspicion and antipathy. This was particularly evident in the fall of 1914, but the groundwork for this had already been laid earlier. The patriarch did not navigate this well. The Serbian army's victories in October and November 1912 were met with suspicion at Ballhausplatz. The Serbian advance on the Albanian coast, which

---

<sup>21</sup> Vasin 2015: 727–739.

<sup>22</sup> Vuković 1996: 345–346.



was condemned by the monarchy, was met with echoing salvos in Belgrade. Patriarch Lukijan's speech at the Hungarian Parliament in November 1912, during which he expressed loyalty to the dual monarchy and support for Count von Berchtold's policy in Albania was interpreted as being tantamount to treason. Criticism and insults were directed at him at every turn. The Radicals openly claimed the patriarch was supporting the Albanians over the Serbs.<sup>23</sup>

At the beginning of 1913, relations between Austria-Hungary and the Kingdom of Serbia were poor, as was the patriarch's health. The political parties quickly began calling for his replacement or resignation. After fifteen years of daily political and Church struggles and the attacks that culminated in the events at the end of 1912, it is no wonder the patriarch's health began to decline. His associates began saying that the patriarch had fallen into a depression and no longer had any interest in carrying out his daily responsibilities.

In July 1913, it was announced that the fall session of the Synod would be postponed, and that Patriarch Lukijan would be leaving for Bad Gastein for medical treatment and recuperation. It was the last time there was any news about his health or his whereabouts. The Synod announced to the public in early September 1913 that the patriarch had disappeared during his treatment at Bad Gastein. He had last been seen on 1 September 1913. Jaša Tomić quickly claimed that derangement and mental disorder had caused his death. He rejected the theory he had been murdered. The leader of the Liberal party, Mihailo Polić Desančić, was of a similar opinion that the patriarch was feeble, mentally ill, and personal weakness and inadequacies had caused him to make mistakes. For weeks, the Serbian elite in the monarchy recounted the details of his life, his disappearance, and later death, which was confirmed when his body was discovered in waters of the Gasteiner Ache on 26 October.

Descriptions of his mutilated body that had been in the Ache for several weeks cast a pall over his funeral, held a few days later on 3 November 1913.<sup>24</sup> It seemed like a bad omen indicating that religious and educational autonomy was now out of reach. Patriarch Lukijan's death exacerbated the already tense atmosphere between Austria-Hungary and Serbia. It was now clear that Serbian political and Church elites had neither the strength nor imagination to overcome crisis that had arose from the events of 1912–1913.<sup>25</sup>

The patriarch's death did not become a topic of discussion until several years later. Only in the 1920s a theory began to emerge in ecclesiastical circles that he had been murdered. A full century later, there was repeated speculation that informal groups in Vienna and Pest had somehow been behind it. A police report taken at the scene was inconclusive. There were no signs of struggle, and based on the evidence, it seemed the patriarch had gone for a walk at night and fallen from an unmarked part of a cliff over the Ache. There was no benefit from his death for the government in Budapest, which had found him to be a loyal partner, one who did not provoke incidents to undermine the state or rally the opposition to his cause. The young patriarch's health had deteriorated under the weight of problems, struggles, attacks, and slander. Misunderstood by those around him, he was a man who, by all accounts, should have been one of the most effective patriarchs, yet he had fallen prey

---

<sup>23</sup> Vasin 2020: 205–222.

<sup>24</sup> ASANUK, MPA, A, 366/1913

<sup>25</sup> Vasin 2013: 285–303.

to mental anguish and, in the end, the Ache. A century later, his death stands as a stark reminder of the fall from grace of the Serbian church and political elites in the monarchy, who had been torn between reality and nationalism, and by attempts to strengthen, transform, and integrate into a state system they were an integral part of, yet whose policies they no longer had any real influence over.

Translated by *Elizabeth Salmore*

#### REFERENCES:

##### Sources:

Arhiv Srpske akademije nauka u Sremskim Karlovcima (ASANUK)  
Mitropolijsko patrijaršijski fond A, br 349/ 1908, 237/ 1912, 366/ 1913  
*Branik*, br 173, 184, 192, Novi Sad 1908.

##### References:

- Mikavica, D. *Mihailo Polit Desančić*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2006. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Srpsko pitanje na ugarskom saboru*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2011. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Srpska politika u Hrvatskoj 1538–1918*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2015. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Srpska Vojvodina*, Novi Sad: Prometej, 2018. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Mikavica, D. Lemajić, N. Vasin, G. Ninković, N. *Istorija Srba u Habzburškoj monarhiji 1526–1918*, knj. 1, Novi Sad: Prometej, 2016. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Mikavica, D. Vasin, G. *Jaša Tomić*, Novi Sad: Prometej, 2017. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Rakić, L. *Jaša Tomić*, Novi Sad: Matica Srpska, 1986. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Vasin, G. *Patrijarh Georgije Branković i njegovo doba*, Novi Sad: Malo istorijsko društvo, 2014. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Sabori Raskola- srpski crkveno-narodni sabori u Habzburškoj monarhiji*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2015. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Arhijereji Karlovačke mitropolije na prelomu vekova*, Novi Sad: Prometej, 2018. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Patrijarh Lukijan Bogdanović-kraj jedne epohe*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2020. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Vasin, G. Ninković, N. *Istorija budimske eparhije*, Sremska Mitrovica: Istorijski arhiv Srem, 2018. (Serbian Cyrilic)  
Vuković, S. *Srpski jerarsi od šestog do dvadesetog veka*, Kragujevac: Kalenić, 1996. (Serbian Cyrilic)

**ГОРАН ВАСИН**

Универзитет у Новом Саду  
Филозофски факултет, Одсек за историју

***ОД РЕНЕСАНСЕ ДО ПОНОРА АХЕ:***  
**ПАТРИЈАРХ ЛУКИЈАН БОГДАНОВИЋ**

**Резиме**

Патријарх Лукијан Богдановић, последњи Карловачки првојерарх био је изузетна личност на трону најважније српске институције. Талентован, благ и одмерен имао је ставове који су импоновали елитама центра Угарске и на тај начин је добио подршку за изборе у црквена звања. Српска средина га није разумела. Управо у том односу крио се кључ његових проблема и великог број тешкоћа са којима се сусретао најпре као епископ, а потом и као патријарх. Његова блага природа није одговарала прохтевима српских политичких елита са периферије Монархије. Век касније после смрти, поново се актуелизовало питање о његовом убиству, али не и о његовом животу. Патријарх Лукијан Богдановић био је ренесансна појава последњег пламсаја Карловачке митрополије.

**Кључне речи:** Карловачка патријаршија, Лукијан Богдановић, радикали, Јаша Томић, Михајло Полит Десанчић.

© Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, 2022

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 33, 107–117