

AN EXAMPLE OF THE CHURCH ISSUE IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE: THE KUMANOVA CHURCH

NİMET AYŞE BAKIRCILAR*, HATİCE AKIN**

After the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, because of the decree's unclear stipulations, Macedonia became a coveted target for the two separate Orthodox Churches who wanted to extend or consolidate their influence. The Kumanova Church (Kosovo Province) is one such example. The Serbs based their claim on the fact that the church had been built in the period when the Orthodox Christians were subject to the Greek Patriarchate. The Bulgarians, on the other hand, claimed the church because they vastly outnumbered the Serbs. The present study brings information about the development of the issue from 1882 to 1899. Despite the attempts to find solutions to satisfy both sides, the Macedonian church issue was not solved completely until 1910. The Kumanova Church case shows that, far from being simply a religious problem, the struggle for influence had a deeper, political basis.

Keywords: Kosovo; Macedonia; Kumanova Church; Ottoman Empire; Serbia; Greek Patriarchate; Bulgarian Exarchate; denomination; minorities

Introduction

The nineteenth century was a difficult period for the Ottoman Empire, fraught with numerous problems in different fields. Leaving its mark upon the century, the wind of nationalism took the Ottoman non-Muslim people under its influence. This influence could be first seen in the Balkan population's demand for becoming independent of the Phanar Greek Patriarchate. The Bulgarians struggling for religious independence were the first Balkan people to separate from the Patriarchate. Speaking of the Bulgarian attempts to establish an independent church in his book, Ahmed Lütü Efendi implied that in this regard the Bulgarians were supported by the Russians. According to him, the reason why the Bulgarians acted that way was bad treatment of the reverends sent to the Bulgarians by the Greek Patriarchate.¹ In this way, the Bulgarians, initiating a struggle against the dominance of the Greek Patriarchate, started a fight against the Ottoman administration. After obtaining their

* Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey; nbakircilar@akdeniz.edu.tr.

** Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey; hakin@akdeniz.edu.tr.

¹ "... Rusya tarafından Bulgaristan derûnuna hafiyeler dolaştırılmakla, Bulgarların durgun damarları oynamaya başlamış ve diğer cânibden ise Rum Patrikhanesi Bulgaristan memleketlerine gönderdiği despotların ettikleri te'addiyât Bulgarların boyunduruklarını çekemeyecek dereceye getirmesi husûsu baltayı omuzlamalarına sebep olarak ..." – Ahmet Lütü Efendi, *Lütü Tarihi*, ed. M. Münir Aktepe, vol. 13 (Ankara, 1990), 46.

autonomy, the Bulgarians began a struggle against the Greek Patriarchate and the Serbians that were subject to it in Macedonia, which still belonged to the Ottoman Empire.

The Outset of the Kumanova Church Struggle

The Bulgarian Exarchate, which can be labeled as the first important step the Bulgarians took in favor of independence, was proclaimed with the decree of 12 March 1870. Particularly Article 10² of this decree (that consisted of 12 articles) is of great political importance, since it refers to the metropolitans within the territory of the Bulgarian Exarchate. Macedonia, however, was not a part of this territory. Besides, whether Macedonia would be included in the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Exarchate or not remained unclear. The same article of the decree stated that for the unspecified residential areas this would be allowed if at least two thirds of the Orthodox population located there decided to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Exarchate.³ This article caused Macedonia to become shortly afterwards a bone of contention between two separate churches of the same denomination. The Bulgarian Exarchate endeavored to spread its influence, whereas the Phanar Greek Patriarchate tried to protect the lands within its jurisdiction. With the help of Ottoman archive documents one may see that after the 1890s, the church struggle intensified among the Balkan peoples. The most important conflict between the Bulgarians and the Bulgarian Exarchate, on the one hand, and the Greek Patriarchate on the other regarded the church in the Kumanova District, Kosovo Province. The Kumanova Church was an issue that remained on the agenda of the Ottoman administration for many years. In this study, we will give detailed information about the development of the issue from 1882 to 1899.

The church in question was built in the period when the Orthodox Christians were subject to the Greek Patriarchate.⁴ The decree of the Ottoman Sultan Mahmud II of 18 Safer 1264/25 January 1848 clearly indicates that this church was subject to the Greek Patriarchate. The decree allowing the reparation of the church issued in the time of Sultan Abdülmecid, on 15 Safer 1266/31 December 1849, also shows

² The places subjected to the Bulgarian Exarchate were defined as follows in Article 10: Rusçuk, Silistre, Şumnu, Trnova, Sofya, Vraça, Lofça, Vidin, Niş, Şehirköyü, Köstendil, Samakov, Velisa and Varna, Ahyolu and Misivri towns, İslimye Sancağı and besides the villages on the sea coast, the Süzebolu district, Filibe city center, İstanimaka town, Koklina, Vodina, Arnabudköy, Panaya, Lovesli, Lasko, Arhalani, Paçkov, Velastice villages and Paçkova, Aya Anarkiri, Aya Paraşkooy, Aya Yorgi Monasteries and Filibe Metropolitanate. See "Bulgar Eksarhlığı" (master's thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale, 1998), 100.

³ Fikret Adanır, *Makedonya Sorunu*, trans. İhsan Catay (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yay., 2001), 77.

⁴ The church called Sveti Nikola, which was built in Kumanova, was constructed by the regional church committee. Архиепископ Михаил, *Нашето свето православие кратка историја на Македонската Православна Црква* (Skopje, 1996), 70.

that it was subject to the Greek Patriarchate. The Serbian side based their claim that the Kumanova Church belonged to them on these two decrees.

The Bulgarians, however, implied that they wanted to use again the church they had been using for a long time, due to an increase in their population after the establishment of the Exarchate, and that they should have the final say about the church as they were subject to a different spiritual administration. The March 1870 decree stipulated that the region would be subject to the Bulgarian Exarchate provided that all or at least two thirds of the Orthodox community living in the region wished to be subject to it. The Bulgarians demanded that the church be given to them since they outnumbered the Serbians. However, the March 1870 decree didn't include any provisions regarding the course of action to be followed when there was only one church for two different communities under different spiritual administrations. In 1873 the issue was resolved; the church was to be used by the Bulgarians and the Serbians in turn. However, Hacı Mustafa Bey, one of the notables of Üsküp (Skopje), who put this system into practice, died a year and a half before the Kumanova Church issue arose. The Bulgarian Metropolitan deputy Efram Efendi became responsible thereafter. Efram Efendi came to Kumanova in 1896 and decided against the Bulgarians' claims.⁵ The Kumanova Church issue emerged thus and affected the Ottoman Empire for a long time.

Clashes of Interests – Recurring Conflicts

In November 1882, the Ottoman Empire asked the Serbians to postpone the planned military maneuvers, since the Bulgarians had mobilized two divisions of soldiers. In this context, Fethi Bey, the ambassador of Belgrade, met the Serbian prime minister. In the meeting it was understood that the Serbians had planned these maneuvers three months before. Furthermore, foreign military attaches were invited to watch these maneuvers and it was unlikely to postpone the plan. From the Serbians' point of view, the Bulgarians' decision to mobilize troops was not a response to the Serbian maneuvers, but a result of external factors. According to Fethi Bey, both the prime minister and the Serbian Council of Ministers were of the same opinion. The way to prevent the Serbians from acting accordingly was to give the Kumanova Church to the Bulgarians and approve the appointment of the Serbian Metropolitan.⁶

Fifteen years later, the Kumanova Church issue reappeared as a problem for the Ottoman Government. At the time, the church was being used by the Bulgarians and the Serbians in turn. However, neither of the sides was satisfied with this solution. According to a document dated 25 March 1897, at the feast of the Orthodox community the doors of the church were opened, and both sides held their religious

⁵ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Istanbul, Turkey) (hereafter: B.O.A.), Y.MTV 177/164.

⁶ Ibid., Y.PRK.EŞA 31/78.

ceremonies. Nevertheless, the sides fought around the church, but the fight was suppressed. The Sublime Porte, as stated in the telegram sent by the Kosovo Province, decided to prohibit the use of the church in order to solve the problem, and to promote someone else in place of Üsküp Metropolitan Deputy Sinesi Efendi.⁷

One year later, on 17 April 1898, a similar incident took place in Kumanova. A riot burst between the Bulgarians and the Serbians, while the Serbians were trying to enter the church. Five or six Serbians were injured, and a cipher telegram was sent to Istanbul indicating that an officer from the Kosovo Province was sent to the region to take the necessary measures so that the situation would not worsen.⁸ Brigadier Şemsi Bey from the 18th Regiment of the 5th Üsküp Division was assigned to go to Kumanova and hold an inquiry. The investigation showed that the Bulgarians and the Serbians did not want to hold a common ceremony in this church. Although about a year earlier the government had banned the Serbians from using the church, they now demanded to use the church for Easter, and they were holding meetings in schools around the church to prepare for it. Upon hearing about this, the local government called the 4th Battalion of the 72nd Regiment, which was in Kumanova, in order to prevent them from breaking into the church. Despite all these measures, the Serbians attempted to break into the church with a group of 400–500 people, including their spiritual leaders and notables, while the Bulgarians were performing their own ceremony. The Bulgarians were removed in order to lessen the severity of the riot. Slight injuries occurred during the incident, caused by the Serbians' pushing each other while breaking in, roof tiles dropping on those who were trying to jump over the wall and the prevention efforts of the soldiers. This incident, however, should have been excused, according to Brigadier Şemsi Bey, as the soldiers and the gendarme had warned the crowd beforehand. The initiators of the riot were identified; moreover, in their testimonies the rioters confessed that they had tried to break into the church.⁹

The Kosovo Province was informed in a telegram that after the events new regulations were to be introduced regarding the use of the church. The Bulgarians would use the church for two weeks and the Serbians for one week, whereas the key to the church was to be held in custody by the government. However, the Sublime Porte was in its turn informed that this practice caused trouble. There were many complaints from both sides to the provincial administration and the latter was petitioned for the church to be used over equal periods, like before.¹⁰

These incidents also attracted the Serbian Government's attention. According to the Serbian Government, the solution of the problem was to revert to the previous practice and to use the church for equal periods of time. Furthermore, the Serbian Government expected the Ottoman Government to conciliate the

⁷ Ibid., BEO 899/67385.

⁸ Ibid., Y.PRK.UM 41/96.

⁹ Ibid., Y.MTV 176/65.

¹⁰ Ibid., İ.MTZ (04) 19/1274.

Serbian hearts were broken because of the events.¹¹ The sensitiveness of the Serbians on this issue became obvious during King Milan's visit to the Ottoman Embassy to make a similar request.¹²

Contested Solutions

The Ottoman Government decided to conduct necessary investigations in order not to give way to further complaints concerning the issue.¹³ Teron Bey, the chief clerk of the Department of Justice and Denomination Affairs, Nail Bey on behalf of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the deputy manager of the General Registry of Births, and a military assistant of the Sultan were assigned to the investigation to be conducted in the district.¹⁴

Hüseyin Hüsni Pasha, one of the military assistants, arrived in the district and started the inquest. The Muslim community in the district petitioned him in their turn, indicating that the Bulgarians and the Serbians not only fought against each other, but also posed a threat to the Muslim community. Moreover, they mentioned that the Bulgarians and the Serbians adopted unfavorable attitudes towards both the Muslims and the Ottoman officers.¹⁵ In addition, they requested two battalions of soldiers and a battery of artillery for protection because of the district's proximity to the borders of Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Austria. To support their case, they also cited the example of Kazım Bey, the son of a very well-known family, and his mother, who were persecuted.¹⁶

The report Hüseyin Hüsni Pasha sent to Istanbul as a result of his investigation on 8 Muharrem 1316/29 May 1898 comprised detailed information about the onset of the problems and also the arguments the Serbians and the Bulgarians used to prove their case.

Hüseyin Hüsni Pasha indicated that although the Serbians and the Bulgarians belonged to the same religious community, the Serbians were subject to the spiritual administration of the Greek Patriarchate and the Bulgarians to the Bulgarian Exarchate, after its establishment. The basis of the church problem was the social competition over Macedonia, which became more acute after the

¹¹ Ibid., Y.PRK.EŞA 29/48.

¹² Ibid., Y.PRK.EŞA 29/59.

¹³ Ibid., İ.MTZ (04) 19/1275.

¹⁴ Ibid., İ.DH. 1354/44.

¹⁵ Ibid., Y.PRK.AZJ. 37/2: "... çünkü milleti-i merkumenin tavr-ı hâzırı ve ahali ve gerekse memurin-i hükümet aleyhinde her türlü bühtan ve kullandıkları lisan mücerred fesad kuyularını açarak millet-i necibe-i İslamiyemizin temelini yıkmak fikirlerine müstenid bulunduğu anlaşılmaktadır ..."

¹⁶ Ibid.: "... ahali-i İslamiyemiz azim tehlike içinde kalıp şaşırılmış ve burasının Sırbistan ve Bulgaristan ve gerekse Karadağ ve Avusturya hududlarına kurbiyeti hasebiyle daimi suretle iki tabur asâkir-i şahane ile bir batarya topun bulundurulmasına ol suretle muhtaç bulunduğumuzdan rahat ve selametimizin taht-ı temine alınması esbabının istikmâlini ..."

establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate. After the establishment of the latter, when at least two thirds of the population in the region demanded to be subject to it, the region was included in the Bulgarian Exarchate. In his report Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha specified that the Serbian population was almost half of the Bulgarian population. As a result of the census conducted before the Serbian and the Bulgarian spiritual leaders, the village council members and the notables of Kumanova, the following table was obtained¹⁷:

	Houses	Women and Men
Bulgarian	698	3,027
Serbian	320	1,453
TOTAL	1,018	4,480

As a solution to the problem of the two churches in Kumanova, it was decided to allocate the bigger one to the Bulgarians and the smaller one to the Serbians. However, both sides opposed the decision. This was because the building called “the little church” was registered as the outbuilding of the bigger church according to the license of the Kumanova District Board of Directors dated 24 Şevval 1300/28 August 1883. It could only hold 60–70 people, so it could not be used as a church.¹⁸

Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha invited the spiritual leaders, village council members and notables on both sides, and tried to solve the problem through discussions. Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha offered two solutions; the first one was to use the small church as well. This offer, however, was not accepted. The other solution was to enlarge the bigger church and build a wall in its middle so that both communities could perform their religious ceremonies. Nevertheless, this offer was refused by both sides because they would have been under the same roof. Other arguments against this suggestion were that the mingling of voices during the ceremonies was not convenient from a religious point of view, and the common use of the church for 25 years had caused some hostility between the two groups. As a final solution, Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha proposed to collect money from both communities in proportion to their populations – provided the Sublime Porte allowed it –, and to build a new church, but both sides responded negatively.¹⁹

Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha then went to Üsküp, the center of the Kosovo Province, to meet with the Bulgarian Metropolitan Simenos Efendi. In the discussion, Simenos Efendi indicated that if the Sublime Porte allowed the construction of a new church, the Bulgarian side would donate 1,000 liras, a portion of the land of the present church to build the new church on, and two thirds

¹⁷ Ibid., Y.MTV 177/164.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

of the church income. Also, the Greek Metropolitan Kırımliyan Efendi, representing the Serbians, stated that the Orthodox community subject to himself would obey any decision of the Ottoman Sultan on condition that they preserved their rights of performing their religious ceremony and worship.²⁰

As a solution to the Kumanova Church issue, Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha proposed to remove the Bulgarian Metropolitan deputy Efram Efendi and his supporters from Kumanova, whom he thought to be the cause of the events. He also proposed the assignment of an efficient officer either from Istanbul or from the Kosovo Province so that the use of the church in turns could be practiced fairly. In this way, the hostility between the two sides could have been ended and the Sublime Porte could have avoided the necessity of constructing a new church.²¹ By the order of the Sultan dated 2 Rebiülahir 1316/20 August 1898, the bigger church was allocated to the Bulgarians and the smaller one to the Serbians, along with the aforementioned church income and the previously mentioned financial contribution of the Bulgarians.²²

The report of Fethi Bey, the Ottoman ambassador in Belgrade, dated 25 September 1314 (7 October 1898), shows that this decision was one of the reasons that made the Ottoman Empire fall out with Serbia. Details of the interview between Fethi Bey and the Serbian Prime Minister Vladan Corceviç are mentioned in this report. One of the topics of the interview was the unpleasant comments in the Serbian media on the allocation of the Kumanova Church to the Bulgarians. Corceviç indicated that the decision of the Sublime Porte in favor of the Bulgarians had dealt a severe blow to his policy of strengthening relations between his country and the Ottoman Empire. Fethi Bey reported that the issue was a very sensitive matter for Serbia, and that the Serbian prime minister no longer trusted the Sublime Porte or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as much as before.²³ In his interview with the Ottoman ambassador, Corceviç characterized the investigation carried out by Hüseyin Hüsnü Pasha on the riot in Kumanova in April 1898 as “*superficial*.” He further claimed that the Ottoman Government had let the Macedonian Serbians suffer, which was in favor of the Bulgarians. At the end of his report, Fethi Bey indicated that the Serbian administration was in a difficult financial situation and that the allocation of the Kumanova Church to the Bulgarians increased the opposition against the government. He also emphasized the need for approving the

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid., İ.MTZ (04) 20/1295.

²³ Ibid., Y.PRK.EŞA 31/77: “... Babiâli'nin Kumanova Kilisesi'nin Bulgarlara teslimi ile Sırlara reva gördüğü haksızlık, Sırbistan ile Osmanlı Devleti arasında ilişkileri sağlamlaştırmaya ve komşuluk ilişkilerini geliştirmeye yönelik kurduğumuz siyaseti alt-üst etmiştir. Bu nedenle Kral Aleksandır'ın dönüşünde hemen başkanlıktan çekileceğim ... Artık sizin Hariciye Nezareti'nden ve Babiâli'den gelecek sözlere itimat etmiyorum ve Osmanlı Hükümeti'nden hiçbir şey beklemiyorum”

appointment of the Üsküp Serbian Metropolitan Fermilyanos so as to mitigate the adverse effect on Serbia caused by the Kumanova Church problem.²⁴

On 8 December 1898, the Kosovo Governor Hafız Mehmet Pasha sent a telegram to the Sublime Porte indicating that the church issue had not been solved yet. Although the metropolitan subject to the Greek Patriarchate and the one subject to the Bulgarian Exarchate compromised unofficially, the Bulgarian side was not willing to give the money needed for the construction of the new church. This time, the Russian and the Serbian consuls were involved in the issue and they proposed that 1,300 liras of the cost should be paid by the Ottoman Empire and the rest should be shared by the two communities.²⁵ This telegram was announced to the Meclis-i Mahsus on 11 December 1898. The aforementioned church had been built with the contributions of the Bulgarians and the Serbians, who were then both subject to the Greek Patriarchate. Therefore, it was decided that the Bulgarians, who retained the right of use, refund the Serbians the amount the latter had given for the construction of the church.²⁶

We can see from the documents in the Ottoman Archive of the Prime Ministry that this decree could not be put into practice immediately. It was revealed that the Serbians looked for ways to reach an agreement with the Bulgarians because they lacked the support of the Ottoman State and could not protect themselves from the Bulgarians. A possible alliance could have harmed the Ottoman Empire, therefore it was emphasized that the Kumanova Church should be built as soon as possible and that the necessary arrangements should be made for the assignment of Fermilyanos Efendi to the Üsküp Metropolitanate as the Serbian Prime Minister Vladan Corceviç had requested. The assignment of Fermilyanos Efendi was also supported by the Russian ambassador.²⁷

The fact that the Bulgarians did not pay the money needed for the construction of the church delayed the settlement of the problem. The Kosovo Governor Hafız Mehmet Pasha invited the notables of both communities to Üsküp. This time the Kosovo governor,²⁸ hoping to obtain a positive result, listened to the complaints of the Bulgarians. The Bulgarians sent their petitions to the Sadaret (the Grand Vizierate), indicating that they were exposed to the pressure of the Kosovo governor and that ten of the notables of the community had been in custody for five days. In his statement in which he explained the situation on 14 March 1315/26 March 1899, the Kosovo governor stated that he had invited the Bulgarian notables to Üsküp and that these notables had left Üsküp after a while. He then added: "*The Bulgarians reflected the situation contrary to facts, as they always have.*"²⁹

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid., BEO 1264/94789.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid., İ.HUS 73/3 Za 1316.

²⁸ Ibid., BEO 1283/96219.

²⁹ Ibid., BEO 1285/96335.

The Serbians kept on complaining, since the problem was not resolved. A letter sent from the Greek Patriarchate to the Department of Justice and Denomination Affairs on 12 April 1315/24 April 1889 mentioned that the community in Kumanova had not held any religious ceremony for two years and demanded that the Kumanova Church, which belonged to the Greek community, be allocated to them, so that they could perform their religious ceremony at Easter.³⁰ Five days after the delivery of this letter, the Board of Directors of the Province and the officers sent from the provincial center set up a joint commission. The commission decided to determine the value of the property and land of the Kumanova Church and share it out between the two communities. The value was assessed at 48,000 kuruş. It was decided to leave a house, a bakery, the girls' school and a shop to the Bulgarians; two houses, a drinking house with its outbuilding, a field and five houses near the field to the Serbians. It was also decided by majority vote that a new church should be built on a certain plot of the field, that both sides should determine the locations for their cemeteries within two months, and that the Bulgarians should pay the amount required for the construction of the church to the Serbians within six weeks.³¹

However, the Bulgarians objected to this decision. A petition with the signature of the three Bulgarian village headmen was sent to the Sadaret. They indicated that the commission's decision was inconsistent with the decisions made earlier and claimed that the Province Board of Directors was in favor of the Serbians, called the Greeks, living in the area. The Bulgarian headmen demanded that the field allocated to the construction of the church should be left to the Bulgarians, the cash in the church safe should be shared out in proportion to the population, and the Serbians should renounce their claims on the church and its property.³²

Another reason why the sides could not come to an agreement was the way the Ottoman Empire managed the problem. A cipher telegram sent to the Sublime Porte by the Kosovo Governor Hafız Mehmet on 6 June 1315/18 June 1889 indicated that another telegram of 3 June 1315/15 June 1889 regarding the construction permit for the new church had remained unanswered. Because the Serbians appealed to the governor's office constantly and claimed that they were harassed, the construction permit for the church was submitted once more.³³ On 7 July a cipher telegram was sent from the Sadaret to the Kosovo Province indicating that the issue was discussed in the Department of Denomination Affairs and that the results would be announced.³⁴ However, the construction permit for the new church had not yet been notified on 15 July 1899.³⁵

³⁰ Ibid., BEO 1303/97683.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., BEO 1326/99447.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., BEO 1357/101721.

After the construction permit was granted, the Bulgarians still didn't pay the money to the Serbians; moreover, they claimed that the field left to the Serbians was their old cemetery. This incident led to the suspension of the construction of the church and more complaints from the Serbians. In order to satisfy both sides the Sublime Porte decided to change the place of the construction and withdraw the cash and income from the Bulgarians.³⁶

Another incident took place on 29 October 1899. The cross erected on the field allocated to the Serbians to construct the church on was removed by the Bulgarians. Then the Bulgarians closed their shops and started to gather. Therefore, a platoon of soldiers was sent to the scene and the Kosovo Province was informed about the situation.³⁷

In the last days of 1899, the issue had not been solved yet. The Bulgarians paid 450 liras, but they did not pay the receipts determined as the cost of the land. The Bulgarian metropolitan stated that no information was received from the Bulgarian Exarchate regarding this issue and that it was not possible for them to pay the sum.³⁸ The Sublime Porte appealed to the Bulgarian Exarchate for the payment of the receipts.³⁹

Conclusion

The conflict between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Exarchate over the Kumanova Church was not settled at the beginning of the twentieth century. It would be more correct to define the numerous church issues that affected the Ottoman Empire for many years as political conflicts of interest and struggle for influence rather than religious problems. Moreover, other countries tried to get involved in the issue for similar purposes. In the case of the Kumanova church, both Serbia and Russia tried to interfere with the decision of the Ottoman Empire. What appeared to be a religious conflict was in fact only an effort to extend their influence over Macedonia.

The church issue in Macedonia was not solved completely until 1910. On 20 June 1326/2 July 1910 the problem was settled by the "Rumeli'de kâin münâzaun-fih kilise ve mektepler hakkında kanun," which came into effect after being published in *Takvim-i Vekayi*.

³⁶ Ibid., BEO 1371/102798.

³⁷ Ibid., DH.MKT 2288/83.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., BEO 1414/106013; *ibid.*, BEO 1415/106060.