

Two Viennese Students – the Bishop and his Disobedient Pastor Jakov Stojanović*

Branko OSTAJMER

UDK: 94(497.5)-05 Stojanović, J.:
272-722.52 Strossmayer, J. J.
Original Scientific Paper

Based on literature, published and unpublished sources and the press, the paper analyzes the complex relationship between the Bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo and Srijem Josip Juraj Strossmayer (1815-1905) and his younger contemporary Jakov Stojanović (1842-1910). From initial closeness and a series of connections, including the fact that they were both alumni of the Higher Scientific Institute for Diocesan Priests at St. Augustine's in Vienna (Frintaneum), in later years, the political and every other disagreement between the two grew deeper, only to finally end in an open and for the Diocese very unpleasant conflict.

Keywords: Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Jakov Stojanović, Frintaneum (Augustineum), the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Bosnia or Đakovo and Srijem Diocese

Introduction

The Bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo and Srijem Josip Juraj Strossmayer (Osijek, 1815 – Đakovo, 1905) ranks among the most prominent and most deserving individuals in the history of the Croatian people. His merits were recognized and appreciated even during his lifetime, whether in connection to his political, cultural, or church activities. The broad circle of his admirers included Croatian politicians who followed his ideas and the clergy of the Diocese of Đakovo. However, in the ranks of the clergy there were also those that did not have a favorable opinion of the bishop and were, in fact, in confrontation with him. One of them was Strossmayer's younger contemporary Jakov Stojanović (Osijek, 1842 – Vinkovci, 1910).

The first phase of the Strossmayer – Stojanović relationship is characterized by a series of common points, as well as closeness in many social and political views: they were both from the same city (Osijek), Strossmayer was at one time very close to Stojanović's uncle and tutor Antun Stojanović¹, Strossmayer had ordained Stojanović, and by placing great hopes in him, he sent him to the Higher

* The research was supported by the Croatian Science Foundation under project 4919.

¹ Antun Stojanović (Osijek, 1822 – Osijek, 1896), a lawyer and politician.

Scientific Institute for Diocesan Priests at St. Augustine's in Vienna (Augustineum or Frintaneum). In the end, at their own time, they were both students of this higher educational institution.

Many authors have written about Josip Juraj Strossmayer, including the years he spent in Vienna and his Viennese influences, from Ferdo Šišić and Đuro Šurmin, to academician Radoslav Katičić. On the other hand, Jakov Stojanović is a little-known personality and so far, only certain segments of his activities have attracted the attention of Croatian historians, linguists, and other scholars. The aim of this paper is to analyze the complex relationship between Strossmayer and Stojanović, starting from certain similarities and connections, the formative influences of years spent in the imperial center, to their gradual disagreements, and eventually their open and very unpleasant conflict. Although there is an obvious disparity in intellectual abilities and the historical significance of these two men, the analysis of their parallel lives, that is, the analysis of their mutual relationship can help to throw some light on the role and views of Croatian clergy, and the Croatian people in general, towards Vienna and the Habsburg, i.e. the Austria-Hungary Monarchy.

The Biography of Jakov Stojanović

Jakov Stojanović was born on 25 April 1841 in Osijek,² in a prominent Croatian family. His uncle Antun Stojanović was a lawyer and a prominent Croatian politician, who in the first part of his political career had mostly shared the political ideas of Bishop Strossmayer. In the revolutionary years 1848-1849, and in the later years of the so-called Bach's absolutism, Antun Stojanović advocated the idea of Slavic reciprocity in his journalistic works.³

Jakov Stojanović attended public school and grammar school in Osijek, and in 1858 he entered the Seminary in Đakovo.⁴ As a seminarian he was very active and he distinguished himself with his knowledge and talent. Among other things, on two occasions during 1862 and 1863, he was the President of the Assembly of

² A. JARM, *Dijecezanski svećenici koji su djelovali na sadašnjem području Biskupije Đakovačke i Srijemske od 1701. do 2003. godine* (*The Diocesan Priests Who Worked in the Present Area of Đakovo and Srijem Diocese from 1701 to 2003*), Biskupski ordinarijat, Đakovo, 2003, 150.

³ V. ŠVOGER, *Zagrebačko liberalno novinstvo 1848.-1852. i stvaranje moderne Hrvatske* (*Zagreb Liberal Journalism 1848-1852 and the Creation of Modern Croatia*), Hrvatski institut za povijest, Zagreb, 2007, 291.

⁴ L. MARIJANOVIĆ, *Kulturno-prosvjetna i prepородna djelatnost profesora i studenata đakovačke bogoslovije* (*Cultural-educational and Revival Activities of Professors and Students of the Đakovo Seminary*), Diacovensia, 4 (1996), 1, 135.

Spiritual Youth of Đakovo.⁵ He cooperated with the linguist and writer Professor Fran Kurelac,⁶ who at the beginning of 1862 and at the invitation of Bishop Strossmayer, came to Đakovo and took over the newly opened Department for Old Slavic Language.⁷ Among other things, Stojanović made a handwritten copy of the work *Stope Kristove* for Kurelac.⁸ Many years later, Stojanović testified that Kurelac had a strong influence on him, especially with his lectures on the Old Slavic language and the Glagolitic script.⁹

In his youth, like most Đakovo seminarians and young priests, Stojanović was strongly influenced by Bishop Strossmayer. In those years, he expressed his respect for the bishop publicly. For example, in 1860, on Strossmayer's name day, Stojanović published a song in honor of the bishop in the Zagreb newspaper *Narodne novine*.¹⁰ After finishing his theological studies, Stojanović was ordained by Bishop Strossmayer, on 10 July 1864,¹¹ exactly on the millennium anniversary of the Slavic apostles St. Cyril and Methodius. In a way, this fact marked the rest of Stojanović's life. After his ordination, Stojanović briefly served as a chaplain in Andrijevići and in his hometown of Osijek (the parish of Tvrđa), and after that Strossmayer sent the gifted young priest to continue his studies at the Higher Scientific Institute for Diocesan Priests at St. Augustine's in Vienna (Frintaneum).

⁵ M. PAVIĆ, *Biskupijsko sjemenište u Djakovu 1806.-1906. (Episcopal Seminary in Đakovo 1806-1906)*, Biskupska tiskara, Đakovo, 1911., 344; L. MARIJANOVIĆ, *Kulturno-prosvjetna i preporna djelatnost profesora i studenata đakovačke bogoslovije (Cultural-educational and Revival Activity of Professors and Students of Đakovo Seminary)*, 135.; J. HORVATH – J. RAVLIĆ, *Pisma Ljudevitu Gaju (Letters to Ljudevit Gaj)*, in: Građa za povijest književnosti Hrvatske, knjiga 26, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb, 1956, 373.

⁶ Fran Kurelac (Bruvno, 1811 – Zagreb, 1874), a linguist and a collector of folk poetry

⁷ Al. T. [Aleksandar TOMIĆ?], *Iz Đakova (From Đakovo)*, Zagrebački katolički list, 13 (1862), 8, 62-63; B. BUDISAVLJEVIĆ PRIJEDORSKI, *Iz mojih uspomena (From my Memories)*, Komisionalna zaklada knjižare Mirka Breyera, Zagreb, 1918, 10.

⁸ Marin SRAKIĆ, »Odgovitelji u Bogoslovnom sjemeništu i profesori na Teologiji u Đakovu od 1806. – 1996.« (*Educators at the Theological Seminary and Professors at the Theology in Đakovo from 1806 to 1906*), *Diacovensia*, IV/1996, 1, 192.

⁹ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića (Roses and Thorns from the Life of Dean Stojanović)*, ed. Matiša Stojanović, Knjigotiskara Franje Rulica, Zagreb, 1910, 21.

¹⁰ The song was published on the cover of the newspaper, and its full name reads: »Vruće želje iskrenih rodoljubah u ime naroda: za presvietloga i preuzvišenoga gospodina Josipa Jurja Strossmayera, biskupa đakovačkoga i sriemskoga, apoštolskoga upravitelja biskupijah beogradske i smederavačke u vojvodstvu srbskom; Nj. c. k. veličanstva tajnom savjetniku i začastnomu dvorskomu kapelanu; bogoslovja i mudroslovja doktoru itd. itd., osobitomu podupiratelju svega, što je narodno na njegov godovni dan 19. ožujka 1860.«, *Narodne novine* (Zagreb), god. XXVI., br. 65, 19. III. 1860., 1.

¹¹ [M. PAVIĆ – M. CEPELIĆ], *Josip Juraj Strossmayer, biskup bosansko-djakovački i sriemski. God. 1850.-1900. (Josip Juraj Strossmayer, the Bishop of Bosnia-Đakovo and Srijem. 1850-1900)*, Tisak Dioničke tiskare, Zagreb, 1900-1904, 63.

Jakov Stojanović at Frintaneum

If Strossmayer was registered in the annals of Frintaneum as one of the best and most talented students to whom a great future was predicted very early on,¹² that was not the case with Stojanović. Although he came to Vienna as a young priest from whom much was expected, Stojanović did not leave a good impression, and his lack of success was largely a result of his deep aversion towards the Institute, as well as towards the highest religious and political circles of Vienna in general.

Stojanović was accepted at the Institute with an imperial decision from 6 October 1864, and entered on 2 November 1864. He first studied dogmatics from which he passed the rigorous exam in December 1866, and then on 26 April 1867 he passed the rigorous in morality and pastoral. He was dismissed from the Institute with an imperial decision from 10 February 1868, and left on 17 February 1868. Stojanović's behavior and performance during the study were evaluated relatively negative.¹³

In later recollections, Stojanović described his years at the Frintaneum with extreme bitterness. He claimed that he was in disfavor with the headmasters because of his closeness with Bishop Strossmayer, whom they saw as a federalist and a fighter for the Slavs and the Croats.¹⁴ About the Institute and the education there, Stojanović wrote that they were the state and church apparatus that had the task of educating pioneers of dynastic ideas and interests. The Catholic Church in Austria, according to Stojanović, confirmed itself in the case of Frintaneum as a blind, submissive and obedient servant of the emperor and the dynasty. In addition, he also complained about the very strong discipline that prevailed at the Institute.

The headmasters did not like the bishop, because he was a federalist, a Slav, and too committed for Croatia, so of course they did not like me either. This disfavor made my stay at the Institute unbearable. [...] In a few months, I saw that this institution and education are nothing but the state and church apparatus aimed at creating elegant and agile officers that will be elevated and positioned in high places by imperial grace, to be obedient and agile, the pioneers of dynastic ideas and interest. If anywhere, it is at this institute at every step visible that the Church

¹² Diözesanarchiv Wien (hereinafter: DAW), Archiv des »Frintaneums« (hereinafter: AF), Institut-protokolle, sv. 2., pp. 475-476.

¹³ DAW, AF, Protokoll, sv. 4., fol. 119r-119v.

¹⁴ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića (Roses and Thorns from the Life of Dean Stojanović)*, 29. On the other hand, especially in the Croatian liberal thought, the role of the Catholic Church in the Monarchy, and also in Croatia, was observed in a similarly negative way. As an example we could mention Imbro Ignjatijević Tkalac.

is a blind, obedient, and submissive servant of the emperor and the dynasty. The entire administration, entire education, entire system, and entire life at the institution, all of this always has only one purpose. The police system is so widespread and sophisticated, like at the imperial court, from the principle headmaster to the last kitchen chef, all of them watch day and night over each member of the institution.¹⁵

Strossmayer's conflict with the Viennese authorities

Regarding Strossmayer's reputation in Vienna at the time (the middle of 1860s), we can safely say that Stojanović was not exaggerating, because by that time the Bishop of Đakovo had lost almost all the prestige he once enjoyed at the Viennese imperial court. As a proof of that, it is enough to point out that after 1858 the bishop did not receive a single honor from Vienna. The last one, from that year, was his appointment as the real secret advisor to His Majesty, in honor of Strossmayer's merits in the field of art, science, and culture.¹⁶ After that, that is, after the fall of the so-called Bach's absolutism (1859), came a long period of Strossmayer's political disagreements and conflicts with the Viennese authorities. It all culminated in the years 1866-1868, during the preparation and conclusion of the Austro-Hungarian and the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise, and a symbolic climax of Strossmayer's confrontation with Francis Joseph was their public dispute in Bjelovar in 1888 (the so-called »Bjelovar affair«).

General Milan Kušević, who was the President of the Croatian Royal Chancery in Vienna from 1865 to 1869, gives us a characteristic Viennese impression of Strossmayer. Kušević was a person of confidence of the Viennese court, an officer loyal to the dynasty and the empire, and as such an express political rival of Strossmayer. According to his opinion, »Bishop Strossmayer [is] one of the most dangerous agitators of Southern Slavs and his extremely nationalist tendencies only harm the interests of the common Monarchy.«¹⁷ Kušević's words represent a typical Viennese impression of the eternally disgruntled Bishop of Đakovo, and not only when it comes to the Viennese political circles, but also in the church (as confirmed by Jakov Stojanović in his memoirs).

During Stojanović's stay in Vienna (1864-1868) there occurred some major political changes that have fundamentally changed the situation in the Habsburg Monarchy, as well as the position of the Monarchy in Europe; primarily there was

¹⁵ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića (Roses and Thorns from the Life of Dean Stojanović)*, 29-30.

¹⁶ *Strossmayer meghalt. 1815-1905.*, Az Újság (Budapest), no. 101, 9. IV 1905., 7.

¹⁷ W. B. TOMLJENOVICH, *Biskup Josip Juraj Strossmayer: Nacionalizam i moderni katolicizam u Hrvatskoj (Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer: Nationalism and Modern Catholicism in Croatia)*, Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Dom i svijet, Zagreb, 2001, 182-183.

the defeat of the Habsburg Monarchy in the war against Prussia (1866), the conclusion of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (1867) and the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise (1868). As a pupil at Frintaneum, young Stojanović was a witness when the Croatian delegation, led by Strossmayer, at the end of 1866, came to Vienna to have an audience with King Francis Joseph. They hoped that the Croatian national problem could be solved in direct agreement with the crown, that is, they advocated the need for the federalization of the Monarchy, but at that moment the decision on the dualist state framework had already been made and the king received the Croats in a very cold manner. In his memoirs, Stojanović described the anger of the members of the Croatian delegation after the audience,¹⁸ and this disappointing experience had certainly influenced Stojanović and his growing aversion towards Vienna, the Monarchy and Germanness in general.

Two years later, in 1868, there was the drafting and adoption of the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise, where, among other things, the king fulfilled the Hungarian wish that the City of Rijeka be separated from Croatia, and established as a separate area under full and direct control of Budapest. There were only a few left in Croatia that still held the old belief that said »Aula est pro nobis«. Indeed, it must be said that the king had never fully aligned himself with the Hungarian side; recent research of the Hungarian historian Imre Rész have shown that the king was faced with strong pressure from the Hungarian side and that he refused to accept all the demands which he saw as unjust and unfounded, which tried to reduce even further the church and state status of Croatia and Slavonia.¹⁹ However, all these conflicts took place at the highest political circles of the black-yellow Monarchy, where the Croats in general rarely had access.²⁰ Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the vast majority of the Croatian politics had turned its back to

¹⁸ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića (Roses and Thorns from the Life of Dean Stojanović)*, 35.

¹⁹ I. RESS, *Neformalni čimbenici u sustavu vladavine ugarsko-hrvatske vlade u vrijeme dualizma (Prilog poznavanju praksi imenovanja bana i sudjelovanje bana u radu Ministarskog vijeća između 1869–1876.) Informal factors in the rule of the Hungarian-Croatian government during the dualism (An article on the knowledge of the practice of appointing a ban and the participation of Ban in the work of the Council of Ministers between 1869-1876)*, in: *Mint nemzet nemzettel... Tudományos tanácskozás amagyar-horvát kiegyezés 140. Évfordulója emlékére / Kao narod s narodom... Konferencija u spomen 140. obljetnici Hrvatsko-ugarske nagodbe*, ed. Dinko Šokčević, Budimpešta, 2011., 157-174.

²⁰ Unlike the Hungarians, Croats were very poorly represented in the bodies of the common Austro-Hungarian government; those individuals of Croatian origin who made significant careers, as a rule, had no strong Croatian national identity. See more in: Éva SOMOGYI, *Hivatalnokok a Habsburg Monarchia közös kormányzatában / Službenici u zajedničkoj vladi Habsburške Monarhije (Officials in the Common Government of the Habsburg Monarchy)* in: *A magyar-horvát együttélés fordulópontjai / Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata i Mađara (Milestones in the coexistence of Croats and Hungarians)*, ed. Pál Fodor and Dinko Šokčević, Institut za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra za humanističke znanosti Mađarske akademije znanosti – Hrvatski institut za povijest, Budimpešta, 2015, 411-418/447-453.

the king and turned toward other centers of power, in hope. However, until the beginning of the 20th century there really was no relevant political force in Croatia that would seek its support in Vienna (it will be the Pure Party of Rights led by Dr. Josip Frank).²¹

At the time of the conclusion of the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise the relations between Strossmayer and Stojanović were apparently still relatively good, however in the following years Stojanović was no longer publicly expressing himself as an admirer of Bishop Strossmayer, from which we can draw the conclusion that their relations had already become colder. On the one hand, Stojanović will increasingly resent Strossmayer that he is compliant and that he does not do enough for the introduction of Old Slavic liturgy in the Croatian countries, and on the other hand, it is possible that Stojanović was influenced by the political conflict between Bishop Strossmayer and Antun Stojanović, Jakov's uncle. In 1861, Strossmayer and the older Stojanović still held the same or similar political views, which was evident in the installation of Strossmayer as the Great County Executive of Virovitica County.²² However, through his activities in the Croatian Parliament, Antun Stojanović at the same time displayed political views that were ever closer to those of the Unionists. His political transformation was completed in the years 1866-1868, when he participated in the negotiations on the adoption of the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise, and in 1867 he led the Osijek delegation to the coronation of Francis Joseph as the Hungarian king, despite the decision of the Croatian Parliament that the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia will not be represented at the coronation.²³ After the adoption of the Compromise, Antun Stojanović became a member of the Croatian Land Government, i.e. he became the Head of the Department of Justice, and in that way he completely terminated his relationship with Strossmayer.²⁴

Strossmayer's conflict with the Vatican

Jakov Stojanović's extremely negative views on the administration of the Institute at St. Augustine, as well as towards the top of the Catholic Church in

²¹ S. MATKOVIĆ – M. TROGRLIĆ, *Iz korespondencije Josipa Franka s Bečom: 1907. – 1910. (From the Correspondence of Josip Frank to Vienna: 1907 – 1910)*, Hrvatski institut za povijest, Zagreb, 2014.

²² At the time, Antun Stojanović welcomed Strossmayer with a grand speech, F. ŠIŠIĆ, *Županija virovitička u prošlosti (The Virovitica County in the Past)*, Osijek 1896., 116.

²³ [M. PAVIĆ – M. CEPELIĆ], *Josip Juraj Strossmayer*, 525-526, 577-578, 602, 608.

²⁴ About the circumstances of the political disagreement between Strossmayer and Antun Stojanović see: A. STOJANOVIĆ, *Opisanje mog života. Memoarski zapisi o Osijeku (1822.-1866.) (A Description of My Life. Memoirs of Osijek (1822-1866))*, ed. Stanislav Marijanović, Matica hrvatska Osijek – Rijec, Osijek 2000, 157.

the Monarchy, can surely be partly explained by Strossmayer's disagreements and conflicts with the Holy See, especially Pope Pius IX.

The relationship between Pope Pius IX and Strossmayer was primarily disrupted because of Strossmayer's significant role at the First Vatican Council (1869-1870), where he stood out as one of the most determined opponents to the adoption of the dogma of papal infallibility.

Also, Strossmayer felt a great dissatisfaction with the fact that the Holy See did not support the Croatian side in the dispute over Međimurje. Međimurje, the Croatian border area with Hungary, had been a constant place of controversy, and in 1860 it was left to the Zala County, i.e. Hungary.²⁵ Strossmayer and the majority of Croatian people had difficulty to reconcile with that decision. A little later, during the 1870s, Strossmayer made efforts to preserve Međimurje at least under the Croatian ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but these aspirations also remained unsuccessful.²⁶

Because of these disappointments, in the early 1870s, Strossmayer could hardly conceal his great dissatisfaction with Pope Pius IX and the policy of the Holy See. Suffice it to say that, at the time, the bishop refused to even meet with the Pope. Such hard-strained relations were normalizing very slowly, and a mediator in the partial smoothing of the relations was the Croatian priest and bishop's confidant Nikola Voršak. Besides Voršak, Strossmayer was also encouraged to yield by Mihovil Pavlinović, a prominent Croatian priest and politician who was also close to the bishop. Under the influence of Voršak and Pavlinović, Strossmayer managed to somewhat restore the relations with Pope Pius IX. His position in the Vatican had greatly improved, but it was never the way his two friends would have liked. Describing Strossmayer's status at the Vatican, in the letter from 28 February 1876, Voršak wrote to Mihovil Pavlinović that »the Roman Curia writes the black book with lead and very deep«.²⁷

In Croatia, many interpreted Strossmayer's compliance with the Roman Curia and Francis Joseph as opportunism, and even cowardice. Especially critical was one of the most important and influential Croatian writers of the 20th century, Miroslav Krleža. Such accusations on Strossmayer's account were unfounded, and to a large extent, from Krleža on, also politically motivated. Namely, there was probably no high church dignitary in the Monarchy who would in such a manner

²⁵ V. KOŠČAK, *Josip Juraj Strossmayer, političar i mecena (Josip Juraj Strossmayer, a politician and a patron)*, Revija – Izdavački centar Otvorenog sveučilišta Osijek, 1990, 63; W. B. TOMLJENOVICH, *Biskup Josip Juraj Strossmayer.*, 98.

²⁶ W. B. TOMLJENOVICH, *Biskup Josip Juraj Strossmayer.*, 98.

²⁷ M. PAVLINOVIĆ, *Povijest, ljudi, istina (History, People, Truth)*, Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb 1978, 202.

oppose the emperor. A step forward would probably have brought Strossmayer some really serious consequences, and perhaps he would be even forced to step down from his episcopal honor.

Stojanović in Đakovo and Vinkovci

After returning to Đakovo in 1868, Jakov Stojanović was appointed professor at the Seminary in Đakovo. He spent thirteen years in Đakovo, and then in 1882 he was appointed a parish priest in Vinkovci.²⁸ Such a turn of events was common at the time, and Stojanović had served as a professor even longer than was usual, since the professors at the Seminary were poorly paid and have regularly sought an opportunity to leave Đakovo and become pastors in one of the rich parishes.²⁹

Vinkovci were a big and rich parish, and this appointment can be seen as an expression of Strossmayer's affection. It is especially important to emphasize that Vinkovci were a distinctly German-speaking center with a strong influence of rather large military garrison. In fact, the city was an important military center, until recently it was a part of the Military Border, and this fact had strongly influenced the German spirit of the city, including all spheres of the society, even education (this particularly applies to the gymnasium, founded in 1792).

Pastor Stojanović did not adapt to the new environment, he did not back away from the conflicts and he expressed his anti-German attitude whenever there was a chance for it, and in this he was unwavering. As expected, this resulted in various conflicts, primarily with the military circles, and then with various civil societies in Vinkovci which were also dominated by the German language, but also with the local German-speaking folk in general.

One of the examples that confirm this occurred in 1893. The military garrison in Vinkovci asked Stojanović for a possibility of Easter confession in German, but the pastor refused. What Stojanović had refused, they happily got from Florijan Činček, a pastor from the nearby Nuštar.³⁰ Such an outcome can be easily explained if one keeps in mind that Nuštar was the place of origin of the Croatian Ban Dragutin Khuen-Héderváry, and that the parish of Nuštar was the patronage

²⁸ [M. PAVIĆ – M. CEPELIĆ], *Josip Juraj Strossmayer*, 73.

²⁹ I. HORBEC – B. OSTAJMER, »*Institut sv. Augustina (Frintaneum) u Beču i pitomci iz Bosanske ili Đakovačke i Srijemske biskupije*« (*The Institut of St. Augustine (Frintaneum) in Vienna and the alumni from the Bosnia or Đakovo and Srijem Diocese*). *Croatia Christiana Periodica*, 38 (2014), 73, 85-111.

³⁰ »*U Vinkovcib, 22. ožujka*« (*In Vinkovci, March 22*), *Narodne novine* (Zagreb), 59 (1893), br. 71, 28. III. 1893, 3.

parish of family Khuen-Belasi.³¹ Pastor Florijan Činček was an open political supporter of Khuen-Héderváry, and as such was elected as a Member of Parliament.

Bishop Strossmayer had a similar position toward Germans in Slavonia. The Germans in Vinkovci have repeatedly asked to be allowed to have sermons in German, but Bishop Strossmayer refused. They even sent special deputations to the bishop with pleas to be allowed a sermon in German, but the bishop was obstinate, because he saw it as having political tendencies and an attempt at Germanization. On one occasion, a deputation came to Strossmayer in Đakovo representing 3000 of Vinkovci Germans asking for the permission to have sermons in German, and Strossmayer openly said to them that they need to learn Croatian or return to Hungary from which they came, and he added that the German sermons will not be allowed while he is alive and while there is a majority of Croats living in Vinkovci.³²

It is important to point out that the Germans were not the exception, because Strossmayer and Stojanović saw the Hungarian immigrants in Slavonia in much the same way. At the end of the 19th century, there were more Hungarians seeking better life opportunities on the south side of the River Drava, and equally important is the fact that at the same time Vinkovci became a major railway hub which employed an increasing number of Hungarian officials. Stojanović allegedly knew the Hungarian language well, but he and Strossmayer had in full compliance rejected the possibility of a sermon in Hungarian.³³

In any case, during his first years as the parish priest in Vinkovci, Stojanović and Strossmayer still cooperated well together, including on the political field. In this regard, it is especially important to emphasize that Stojanović used all his influence in 1887, during parliamentary elections in Vinkovci, to elect Fran Vrbanić, a member of the opposition, of the Strossmayer's Independent People's Party. However, the severity of the electoral result was not in that the member of the opposition was elected, but in that Vrbanić defeated Antun Khuen-Belási,

³¹ Dragutin Khuen-Héderváry held the position of the Croatian ban for twenty years (1883-1903). In his rule he relied on the Croatian People's Party (pejoratively called »madaroni«), and enjoyed the support of King Francis Joseph. In Croatian historiography, his role is assessed extremely negatively (as a representative of Hungarian interests).

³² *Heimatbuch der Deutschen aus Vinkovci und Umgebung*, Biberach, 1975, 50. On the relationship between Bishop Strossmayer and the Slavonian Germans, see more in: V. GEIGER, »Biskup Josip Juraj Strossmayer u produnavskošvapskoj historiografiji i publicistici« (*Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer in the Pro-Danube-Swabian Historiography and Publicist Writing*), in: Goran Beus Richembergh (ed.), *Godišnjak Njemačke narodnosne zajednice / VDG Jahrbuch 1996 (German People's Community's Yearbook)*, Njemačka narodnosna zajednica / Volksdeutsche Gemeinschaft, Zagreb, 1996., pp. 85.-96.

³³ *Magjarski list 'Vasutasok lapja'*, *Obzor* 38 (1897), br. 7, 11. I. 1897, 3.

the father of the Croatian Ban Dragutin Khuen-Héderváry. Later in his memoirs, Stojanović complained that because of these elections he temporarily gained special favor with Strossmayer, but he also lost all chances of one day becoming an abbot or a canon.³⁴

By all indications Stojanović was not wrong and his active role in the lines of Croatian political opposition really made his desire to become a canon in Đakovo impossible. Of course, that was not the only reason, and it should be kept in mind that the ruling political circles were well acquainted with his conflicts with the military garrison in Vinkovci, particularly regarding the use of the German language in the church. Strossmayer, however, still advocated Stojanović and was willing to have him as a canon in Đakovo. In 1895, Strossmayer, among others, proposed Stojanović for the honor of honorary abbot and canon, but some other priests from his list were accepted, while Stojanović was refused. In his letter addressed to Khuen-Héderváry, Strossmayer wrote:

Of course, I would have preferred that those two parish priests from Vinkovci and Zemun had also become honorary canons, as I have suggested and recommended them. Both are well educated, honest, fervent, worthy therefore and deserving of the highest honors, and the places where they serve and fulfill their ministry, also recommend them for higher honors. I know, however, that the pastor from Vinkovci had imprudently confronted with the excellent military class [...]. I warned them about that and seriously rebuked them. I hope however, that both priests have already corrected themselves and that they will never give another cause for anyone to complain about them. That is why I also hope, that they will both be worthy and deserving of the highest graces all the more since that is what great places like Vinkovci and Zemun demand.³⁵

The rejection of his candidacy was very difficult for Stojanović, he showed lack of understanding for any excuses and his bitterness turned to Strossmayer as well. His unfulfilled desire for the canon position was one of the issues that opened up the gap between the bishop and the Vinkovci parish priest, and from that moment on, we can track how some earlier intolerances and disagreements turned into an open conflict.

In later years there were growing political and other differences between Strossmayer and Stojanović (from 1882 until the death of the Vinkovci pastor), and Stojanović confronted the bishop even publicly and openly, like no other diocesan priest. For the most part Stojanović was trying to refrain from an open confrontation with the already elderly bishop, but there was still at least one open

³⁴ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića*, 83-85.

³⁵ Hrvatski državni arhiv, Predsjedništvo Zemaljske vlade (Croatian State Archives, Presidency of the Land Government), PRZV, kut. 416, 2531-1895.

conflict, during an encounter in the Vinkovci parish. If we are to believe Stojanović, during a meal, before a large number of people among whom were the representatives of secular authorities, Strossmayer provoked the Vinkovci priest. Stojanović fought back by counting all his political failures and telling him that, in fact, his whole life was a big disappointment.³⁶ No other priest in the Diocese of Đakovo would allow himself such an open and public opposition to Bishop Strossmayer, and it was a real scandal which we can compare to the famous Strossmayer's dispute with King Francis Joseph in Bjelovar.

The Russophilia of Jakov Stojanović

As the years passed and Stojanović got older, his always present dissatisfaction with the Viennese politics had grown into a pure and increasingly difficult to conceal hatred. At the same time, he started to display a growing Russophilia, and Slavophilia in general. On various occasions, Stojanović expressed such political views publicly, in a very open and direct way (in contrast to many other Croatian priests who were like-minded). One such occasion was the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1905.

The war in the Far East attracted huge attention of the Croatian public and ignited much controversy, especially in the newspapers. When reading the Croatian newspapers from that time one gets the impression that the Croatian politics, as well as the general public, were very interested in the outcome of the war that was a prelude to World War I, which would follow only ten years later. The sympathies for the Russian and the Japanese side had very strictly followed the line of the old political divisions in Croatia. The old Strossmayer opposition, gathered around the paper *Obzor* (*Horizon*), once again wholeheartedly supported the Slavic brothers, while, for example, the Pure Party of Rights, which led an exclusive Croatian politics that relied on Vienna and against all South Slavic projections, gave open support to Japan.

In the Zagreb *Obzor*, the paper which unreservedly stood on the Russian side, they debated with what they saw and called the »Jewish-German-Hungarian press«³⁷ and their Croatian, but actually »non-national« like-minded people (primarily the Pure Party of Rights or »Frankovci«). In the scope of the debates, there were no limits to *Obzor* in exalting the Slavic Russia, and Jakov Stojanović fit such a program and on 21 May 1904 he published a poem entitled »For the Russian Heroes«.³⁸ As in many similar situations, in the ranks of the Croatian clergy

³⁶ *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića*, 142-151.

³⁷ »Politički stečaj« (*Political Bankruptcy*), *Obzor* 34 (1904), No. 52, 4. III. 1904, 9.

³⁸ J. STOJANOVIĆ, *Ruskim junacima* (*For the Russian Heroes*), *Obzor* 45 (1904), br. 116, 21. V. 1904, 9.

there were others who viewed the Russian-Japanese conflict in a similar way, but they were all holding back from any open and public declarations like Stojanović.

In Stojanović's lengthy poem perhaps the last three stanzas deserve a special attention:

*Only one thing you need to know,
The one who drinks Slavic blood
And shortens Christian life,
He will be captured by the cross*

*So you will too, you ugly
Pagan dragon
Drink the Slavic blood
And have to become Slavic*

*Eternal Father of your people
Defend our beloved Russia,
Unite all Slavic brothers
So they could resist any devil.*

At the beginning of the 20th century, *Obzor* was still one of the most respected and widely read Croatian newspapers, but its reputation and influence in other Slavic countries was certainly not comparable to any other Croatian newspapers. Stojanović's open and enthusiastic support for the Russian side in the war also reflected the lack of allegiance to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and of that there could be no doubt. By publishing the poem on the pages of *Obzor*, Stojanović has certainly gained further sympathy in Croatia, but it is also likely that many others resented such a declaration and remembered it.

Strossmayer, Stojanović and the Old Slavic liturgy

His entire life, Jakov Stojanović stood out as an advocate for the Glagolitic script and the liturgy in the vernacular. He wrote a number of articles about the issue that were published in various newspapers (*Obzor*, *Hrvatska*, *Narodna obrana*, *Hrvatski branik*). Finally, he collected the newspaper articles on the Glagolitic script and published them in the book *Za sveto pravo naše – za glagolicu majku našu* (*For our sacred right – for the Glagolitic our mother*, Vinkovci, 1904). In interceding for the introduction of Old Slavic liturgy and the Glagolitic script Stojanović was getting increasingly impatient and fervid, which near the end of his life had led him into conflicts with Strossmayer, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Croatia and into harsh debates with most of the church press in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The desire for the introduction of the vernacular in the liturgy was deeply rooted in the Croatian clergy and people in general, which is confirmed by the fact that the request had been included in the *Zahtijevanja naroda* (*People's Requests*), the key document of the Croatian national movement in the revolutionary 1848. In the following decades, one of the main promoters of this idea was precisely Strossmayer, under whose auspices matured Stojanović.

Bishop Strossmayer saw a bridge in the Old Slavic language that could be a link between the Orthodox and Catholic Slavs. He could count on many who thought the same way, but there were also many of those who were suspicious because in the Old Slavic language they saw a danger of being swallowed up by the other side. In other words, many did not want to hear anything about a unity, neither regarding people nor regarding the church, because they did not believe that it could bring anything good. The Serbian Orthodox Church was also completely distrustful, since in the Croatian, Slovenian and Czech advocates of the Old Slavic language it usually saw the pawns of the Vatican whose aim was to make up for the areas lost with the advent of Protestantism.³⁹

In any case, the issue of the Old Slavic liturgy has always been much more than a church issue, and during the second half of the 19th century, it was constantly in the center of political debates. Strossmayer and those that were like-minded had opponents both in Vienna and Budapest, as both the Austrian and Hungarian political authorities, in the spreading of the Old Slavic liturgy, saw the danger of powerful Slavic connections, especially the Croatian-Serbian. Accordingly, the Austro-Hungarian diplomacy exerted a strong pressure on the Holy See, asking it to limit the use of Old Slavic liturgy in the Croatian lands as much as possible.

In promoting the Slavic liturgy, Strossmayer always went to the limit set by the Roman Curia. When, for example, in 1882, under the influence of the Austro-Hungarian diplomacy he was denied a request to celebrate the solemn Mass at the opening of the Đakovo Cathedral in the Old Church Slavic, Bishop Strossmayer called Juraj Posilović, the Bishop of Senj, who had the right to worship in Slavic.⁴⁰ Posilović celebrating the Mass in the Old Church Slavic – according to Strossmayer's biographers – made a very big impression on the guests from Bohemia and Poland.⁴¹

In contrast to the bishop, Jakov Stojanović was not only inflexible, but his interest for studying the Glagolitic script and the introduction of the vernacular

³⁹ S. DAMJANOVIĆ, *Sve za vjeru i domovinu* (*Everything for the Faith and Homeland*), Vijenac 23 (2015), no. 546, 5. II. 2015, 16-17.

⁴⁰ A. ŠULJAK, *Biskup Josip Juraj Strossmayer i ćirilometodsko-glagoljska baština* (Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer and the Cyrillo-Methodian-Glagolitic Heritage), *Diacovensia*, 1 (1994), no. 1, 286-288.

⁴¹ [M. PAVIĆ – M. CEPELIĆ], *Josip Juraj Strossmayer*, 369.

in the liturgy turned into an obsession. Stojanović spent a lot of his own income in the effort, and had increasingly less patience and consideration for the top of the church hierarchy. In various parts of Croatia, he could count on a certain number of equally uncompromising supporters and like-minded people, but most of them were in his Vinkovci. He was especially in favor of the Vinkovci weekly journal *Svjetlost (Light)* that had politically supported the policies of the Croatian-Serbian Coalition. At the time, the Coalition was the most powerful political organization in Croatia and it advocated the Croatian-Serbian cooperation, that is, it represented the Yugoslav (South Slav) idea.

At the same time, the criticism against Stojanović became stronger and more frequent. He did not back down and his defiance of political and church authorities became even more open. He turned his back on Đakovo, Vienna and Rome, and turned more toward the east, to Serbia and Russia. Characteristic in this sense is one of his evaluations from 1903, when he said, among other things, that Serbs and Croats suffer from the same issue, and that is the weak influence of the Western culture and liberalism.⁴²

It was a thought with which Strossmayer would certainly never have agreed, let alone publicly pronounced it. The bishop believed that the Roman Curia supported the Hungarians at the expense of the Croats, but in his relations towards Rome he acted according to the principle he expressed in 1888, while celebrating the Golden Jubilee of his ordination:

»The first principle is, that I have always defended, when possible, my holy faith and priestly vocation, God's Holy Church and the Holy Roman See, completely and totally convinced, that therein lies the true light, true life, true salvation and better future of our people. But if I am asked whether this went without hardship, suffering, suspicion, and persecution, my answer is: no; because it is in the nature of things, and because Jesus and the apostles followed the same path ...«⁴³

Bishop Strossmayer died at the beginning of 1905 in Đakovo, reaching the age of 90. Shortly after, in December 1906, the Holy See issued a decree »Acres«, regulating the use of the Glagolitic script and the Old Slavic liturgy in Croatia and Dalmatia. The restrictive provisions, including the one according to which the use of the Old Slavic language was a local and not a personal privilege, have caused discontent in part of the Croatian clergy. However, the Croatian clergy believed that the blame for these restrictions lies primarily with Vienna and Budapest, and in the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic efforts. The content of the encyclical was not

⁴²J. STOJANOVIĆ, *Otkud nehajstvo prema glagolici u našem svećenstvu (Where Does the Indifference of Our Clergy Towards Glagolitic Script Come From)*, *Obzor* 44 (1903), br. 42, 21. II. 1903., 1-2.

⁴³[M. PAVIĆ – M. CEPELIĆ], *Josip Juraj Strossmayer*, 429-430.

questioned, and the public did not criticize the Holy See.⁴⁴ One of the exceptions was Jakov Stojanović.

In response to the decree, Stojanović released a letter of the late Bishop Strossmayer, but he also went a step further and invited Croats to go to Orthodox churches, because there they could at least hear the liturgy in the vernacular, a language that they understand.⁴⁵ His actions were met with condemnation on the pages of the *Glasnik biskupije Bosanske i Srijemske (Bulletin of the Diocese of Bosnia and Srijem)*. Stojanović's appearances were marked as a serious insult to Bishop Strossmayer and the Đakovo Diocese. It was pointed out that the defense of the Old Slavic liturgy should be left exclusively to the Croatian episcopate, and they expressed hope that the »erring brother« would recognize his mistake and correct it.⁴⁶

But Stojanović not only did not intend to give in and admit that he had made a mistake, but in the coming years he was even more stubborn in his positions.

As an example, we can mention the celebration of the feast of St. Cyril and Methodius in Vinkovci in 1910. Stojanović was already retired at that time, but he invested a lot of effort and resources to solemnly mark the day of the Slavic Apostles. According to an article published in the Vinkovci journal *Svjetlost (Light)* after Stojanović's death, the delegates of city authorities had asked the pastor for financial help in the organization of the celebration of St. Cyril and Methodius, and he agreed but only if the solemn Mass was served in the Old Slavic language. Stojanović was attributed with the following words:

»Gentlemen, I will give 200 crowns, but the Mass must be celebrated in the Old Slavic language, and celebrated by the Uniate priest from Petrovac. If this is not permitted, then there should be no Latin Mass. Better nothing than to celebrate the Latin Mass on that day.«⁴⁷

They fulfilled Stojanović's condition, and the Vinkovci weekly covered the event with enthusiasm, giving it an extremely cultural and political significance and emphasizing the role of the retired pastor Stojanović.

»Well, even though it all happened so quickly, we in Vinkovci have shown the true understanding of this folk feast day and organized the whole celebration accord-

⁴⁴ »Pitanje Glagoljice« (*The Question of Glagolitic Script*), *Glasnik biskupije Bosanske i Srijemske* 35 (1907), no. 31, 28. II. 1907, 31-32.

⁴⁵ *Na lomaču s njim! (Burn Him at the Stake!)*, *Svjetlost* 3 (1907), br. 11, 17. III. 1907, 2.

⁴⁶ »Pitanje Glagoljice« (*The Question of Glagolitic Script*), *Glasnik biskupije Bosanske i Srijemske* 35 (1907), no. 31, 28. II. 1907, 32.

⁴⁷ Jakob Stojanović, *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), no. 35, 28. VIII. 1910, 2.

ingly, from which everyone immediately saw, that this is not only about an entirely church celebration, that this is not about ordinary saints, like any other saints, but that this is about something that has an important and truly remarkable national and cultural background.

That is what we tried to show with our celebration. And we hold that we have shown. That is the only reason why we have prepared a festive torchlight parade, that is why we have celebrated the solemn Old Slavic Mass, because we wanted to show in this way that we are celebrating our national saints, who fought for our national language in the church, for the Slavic liturgy against the supremacy of Rome. [...]

It's all for nothing, there are no more of those, our Strossmayer's priests... But! There are, there still are, more men of the people! ... One such folk priest, one such Strossmayer's priest, our retired pastor and dean, Jakov Stojanović, understood his duty and his task as a man of the people, a national teacher and patriot. From him came the initiative to celebrate God's service in the Slavic language and that it is celebrated by a Greek Catholic priest, from him came all the expenses, so we could organize a grand event for our word.

[...]

But few places have – besides Zagreb, celebrated the Old Slavic Mass, which alone gives true meaning to this folk celebration – and it was celebrated here in Vinkovci! We must thank him – our pastor for that, him, who has, to this day, remained faithful to the great Strossmayer's ideas.⁴⁸

The mass was celebrated by the Greek Catholic priest from Petrovac, Andrija Segedi (Szegedy), in the Greek Orthodox rite, of course, and the newspaper report on the celebration in the journal *Svjetlost* stated that there were also many Serbs and Jews in the church.

»All were extremely impressed by the Old Slavic Mass. The people heard their own word from the altar, which they understand, which is not foreign to them, which was warm, their own...«⁴⁹

Of course, many in Croatia, especially in the Catholic Church, did not share the enthusiasm of the Vinkovci *Svjetlost*. The events in Vinkovci, and especially Stojanović as their instigator, have triggered some strong reactions. For

⁴⁸ »Proslava narodnog blagdana« (*The Celebration of the Folk Feast Day*), *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), no. 28, 10. VII. 1910., 1. [on the next page is information on the Greek-Catholic parish priest who served the mass – Andrija Segedi / Szegedy from Petrovci (1862-1920), later a rector in Zagreb]

⁴⁹ »Staroslavenska misa« (*The Old Slavic Mass*), *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), No. 28, 10. VII. 1910, 2. [Then the speech on Slavic liturgy and Strossmayer at the folk ceremony held by prof. Đaković]

example, a Zagreb newspaper *Hrvatstvo* described the entire event as a political demonstration and an »anti-religious circus fest«.⁵⁰

Stojanović's death and memoirs – a posthumous confrontation with the bishop

In 1908, Jakov Stojanović started to become gravely ill, which is why in 1908 and 1909 he repeatedly traveled to Vienna to look for a cure.⁵¹ Health problems and advanced age must have been preventing him in exercising his ordinary priestly obligations, so he was retired at the beginning of 1910.⁵² On the other hand, it is very likely that the hard-strained relations with the leaders of the Catholic Church in Croatia had contributed to his retirement.

After the retirement Stojanović remained to live in Vinkovci, but his retirement life was brief. He died on 23 August 1910,⁵³ and he was buried in the Vinkovci cemetery the next day. He died five and a half years after Bishop Strossmayer, in the year when finally, after five years of waiting, they appointed a successor to Bishop Strossmayer on the see of the Đakovo Bishop.⁵⁴

At the time of his death, Stojanović was almost an outcast from the Catholic Church. This can be seen most clearly in the fact that the *Glasnik biskupije Bosanske i Srijemske*, the official diocesan newspaper, did not report even one word about his death. In contrast, a warm and relatively lengthy obituary was published in the local Vinkovci journal *Svjetlost*. In the obituary, they praised the deceased particularly with respect to his struggle for the Glagolitic script and the Old Slavic liturgy. He was called a »folk priest«, an anticlerical and one of the last students and followers of Strossmayer.⁵⁵

The anonymous author of the obituary mentioned the name of Bishop Strossmayer repeatedly, and Stojanović's fight for the Glagolitic script and Old Slavic liturgy was generally mostly tied to the influence of Bishop Strossmayer.

⁵⁰ See, for example: »*Osobita proslava 'narodnog blagdana' u Vinkovcima*« (*A Special Celebration of the 'Folk Feast' in Vinkovci*), *Hrvatstvo* 7 (1910), No. 164, 21. VII. 1910, 2-3.

⁵¹ »*Uspjela operacija*» (*Successful Operation*), *Svjetlost* 4 (1908), No. 28, 12. VII. 1908, 3.; »*Povratak*« (*The Return*), *Svjetlost* 5 (1909), No. 15, 11. IV. 1909., 4.

⁵² *Jedno umirovljenje* (*A Retirement*), *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), No. 3, 16. I. 1910, 2.

⁵³ A. JARM, *Dijecezanski svećenici koji su djelovali na sadašnjem području Biskupije Đakovačke i Srijemske od 1701. do 2003. godine* (*The Diocesan Priests Who Worked in the Present Area of Đakovo and Srijem Diocese from 1701 to 2003*), 150.

⁵⁴ The five years long *sede vacante* was the result of political circumstances; neither Vienna nor Budapest wanted one of Strossmayer political followers to become the new bishop. In the end, the choice fell on Ivan Krapac which really pleased monarchical centers.

⁵⁵ Jakob Stojanović, *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), br. 35, 28. VIII. 1910, 1.-2.

Such an assessment could lead an uninformed reader to the conclusion of their mutual relationship marked by respect, but the truth was quite different. The long latent conflict peaked at the time of Stojanović's death when they published Stojanović's memoirs which were actually a posthumous confrontation with all opponents, and above all Bishop Strossmayer.

The memoirs were entitled *Ružice i trnje iz života dekana Stojanovića* (*Roses and Thorns from the Life of Dean Stojanović*), they were published in Zagreb, and Prof. Matiša Stojanović was listed as the editor. However, Matiša Stojanović certainly played no significant role in the preparation and publishing of this work, but the avoidance of authorship should have served as an excuse to avoid submitting it for censorship to Đakovo.

By all accounts, Stojanović's memoirs that also have the character of a funeral pamphlet, were published shortly before the author's death. According to some sources, copies of his memoirs were distributed at his funeral.⁵⁶ Stojanović's admirers at the Vinkovci journal *Svjetlost* began to advertise the book in early September 1910, immediately after Stojanović's death. The book was appraised positively, with a note that it is a book that has caused »universal attention«.⁵⁷ What is indisputable is that Stojanović's memoirs really strongly resonated with the public of that time; they invoked schadenfreude in all the opponents of the late Strossmayer, and an outrage in the ranks of the admirers of the great bishop. On 15 September 1910, in the village of Piškorevci, there was a regular meeting of the priests of Đakovo District and the gathered clergy publicly expressed »their greatest outrage and disgust over the unworthy book of the late Vinkovci pastor Jakov Stojanović '*Ružice and trnje*', that falsely, maliciously and defamatorily insults people who are dead and who cannot defend themselves.«⁵⁸

Conclusion

A comparison of the biographies of Josip Juraj Strossmayer and Jakov Stojanović, two priests who have in common that they were both alumni of the Higher Scientific Institute for Diocesan Priests at St. Augustine's in Vienna (Frintanum), allows us a more comprehensive insight into the broad problematics of the Croatian political, ecclesiastical and social history of the 19th century. Although

⁵⁶ I. MARTINOVIĆ, »*Slava va višnjih Bogu*« (*Glory to God in the Highest*), Godišnjak Ogranka Matice hrvatske Vinkovci za 1995. godinu (Yearbook of the Vinkovci Chapter of Matica Hrvatska for 1995), 13/1995, 157.

⁵⁷ The book was printed in the bookstore of Antun Rotta, the editor of *Svjetlost* (*Light*), and he also received book orders. »*Književnost*«, *Svjetlost* 6 (1910), No. 36, 4. IX. 1910., 4. The notice of the book's release was also published in the following issues of *Svjetlost*.

⁵⁸ *Dopis. Piškorevci* (*Report. Piškorevci*), Glasnik biskupije Bosanske i Srijemske 37 (1910), No. 18, 30. IX. 1910, 143.

there is a clear disparity in the intellectual abilities and historical significance of the two, the analysis of their mutual relationship is valuable because it contributes to a better knowledge of the position and attitudes of the Croatian clergy and of the Croatian people in general towards Vienna and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

In the beginning, the political and ecclesiastical ideas of Strossmayer and Stojanović were very close, and with the younger Stojanović we can see a deep respect for Strossmayer who enjoyed great reputation among the Croatian people and among the Slavs in general. Gradually there arose differences between them that increased over time, and the disagreements eventually turned into an open conflict. The reasons that influenced the separation of the two paths of life were numerous and stemmed largely from the bad social and political circumstances surrounding the Croatian lands at the time, squeezed between Vienna and Budapest. Of course, different personal characters of Strossmayer and Stojanović played a significant role (Stojanović was particularly impulsive), as well as Stojanović's unfulfilled personal ambitions. Among these personal ambitions, the desire for the canon position in Đakovo stood out in particular, but he never achieved it.

On the other hand, the case of Jakov Stojanović is one of numerous cases and also the best-documented case that shows how Frintaneum had little success in trying to educate priests loyal to the dynasty; indeed, it was very common for the education and the overall atmosphere at the Frintaneum to cause the opposite effect in the alumni, and they returned to their dioceses as irreconcilable, radical opponents of the highest political and church authorities in the Monarchy.

Jakov Stojanović outlived Bishop Strossmayer by exactly five years. King Francis Joseph lived another six years after Stojanović, and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy eight more. It is difficult and delicate to offer an answer to the question how would Strossmayer and Stojanović, had they lived, have experienced the collapse of the Habsburg Empire and the unification of Croatian lands with the Serbian and other South Slavic lands. Based on what was said and the one-hundred-year-long hindsight, we might carefully assume that Stojanović would have welcomed this transformation with greater enthusiasm, but that both of them would soon become disappointed with the newly-emerged state, and that the Habsburg Empire would then seem in a better light.