

Dubravka Božić Bogović, assistant professor

Faculty of Philosophy, J. J. Strossmayer University Osijek

31 000 Osijek, Lorenza Jägera 9

Phone: 031/211-400 Fax:031/212-514

E-mail address: dbozic@ffos.hr

JURAJ PATAČIĆ DE ZAJEZDA, BISHOP OF BOSNIA OR ĐAKOVO (1670-1716)

JURAJ PATAČIĆ DE ZAJEZDA, BOSANSKI ILI ĐAKOVAČKI BISKUP (1670-1716)

ABSTRACT

This paper will present the data on the life and ministry of Juraj Patačić, bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo. The primary aim is to assess his merit in the re-establishing the institutions of the Catholic Church in the Eastern Slavonia, and his role in the renewal of the Diocese of Bosnia or Đakovo, the diocesan estate and the organisation of the religious life in the first decades after the liberation from Ottoman power. The paper relies on the analysis of published and unpublished historical documents and previous historiographical results.

Juraj Patačić de Zajezda was the bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo from 1703 till 1716. He was the son of count Nikola Patačić and countess Marta Oršić and therefore a member of one of the most prominent Croatian noble families. According to literature, he was born in 1670 in Vidovec near Varaždin, while some historical documents recorded that he was born in the family estate Novi Marof. At the age of sixteen, he joined the Jesuit order in Zagreb where he studied humaniora and Greek philosophy and began to study theology. He left the Jesuit order because of poor health and continued the studies in the Hungarian Illirian course in Bologna where he received his doctoral degree. At a time when he took the office of bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo he was thirty-three years old. Besides the bishops, he held a number of other religious and secular services: he was an archdeacon in Varaždin, a canon in Zagreb and a provost in Požega; a rector of the Hungarian Illirian course in Bologna, the imperial advisor and the participant in the national parliament in Pressburg in 1708 and 1714.

Juraj Patačić was the first bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo who continuously resided in his diocese after Slavonia was freed from Ottoman power in the late 17th century. The conditions in the diocese were difficult: the incomes of churches and clergy were low, the diocesan estate was devastated and, in general, the religious circumstances were not good. Bishop Patačić resolutely approached the material and spiritual renewal of his diocese, and was very active and busy with the various episcopal functions, not only in his own diocese but also in the surrounding dioceses in which their bishops have not resided. Among the other things, on the ruins of the old cathedral in Đakovo he build a new one in 1706. He also renovated and adapted former Ibrahim Pasha Mosque which he consecrated into the parish church of St. George. In 1706 he built a wooden bishop's residence whereas the construction and equipping of the Franciscan monastery in Đakovo lasted from 1711 to 1714. Patačić also granted the benefits and properties to the Franciscan monastery and the parish priests in Đakovo, defined the incomes from the stola, preached, consecrated churches, confirmed, inaugurated the priests in the holy orders not only in his own but also in the surrounding dioceses.

He died in March in 1716 at the age of forty-six. According to his own desire, he was buried in the Franciscan church in Đakovo.

Key words: *Juraj Patačić de Zajezda, Diocese of Bosnia or Đakovo, Eastern Slavonia, 18th century, bishop, diocesan estate, religious life*

SAŽETAK

U ovome će se radu iznijeti podaci o životu i službi bosanskog ili đakovačkog biskupa Jurja Patačića s prvenstvenim ciljem procjene njegovih zasluga u ponovnoj uspostavi institucija Katoličke crkve u istočnoj Slavoniji, obnovi Bosanske ili Đakovačke biskupije, biskupijskoga posjeda i vjerskoga života nakon oslobođenja od osmanske vlasti. Rad se oslanja na analizu objavljene i neobjavljene izvorne povijesne građe te na dosadašnje historiografske spoznaje.

Juraj Patačić de Zajezda obnašao je dužnost bosanskog ili đakovačkog biskupa od 1703. do 1716. godine. Sin je grofa Nikole i grofice Marte Oršić te stoga pripadnik jedne od najuglednijih hrvatskih plemićkih obitelji. Prema podacima u literaturi rodio se 1670. godine u Vidovcu pored Varaždina, dok neki povijesti izvori navode da je bio rođen na obiteljskom imanju Novi Marof. Sa šesnaest godina pristupio je isusovačkome redu u Zagrebu, gdje je učio humanioru i apsolvirao grčku filozofiju te započeo studij teologije. Zbog slaboga zdravlja napustio je isusovački red, a studij je nastavio u Ugarskom ilirskom kolegiju u Bolonji, stekavši akademski stupanj doktora. U vrijeme kad je preuzeo službu bosanskog ili đakovačkog biskupa imao je trideset i tri godine, a osim biskupske, obnašao je i niz drugih crkvenih i svjetovnih službi: bio je varaždinski arhiđakon, zagrebački kanonik i požeški prepošt; rektor Ugarskog ilirskog kolegija u Bolonji, carski savjetnik, a kao bosanski i đakovački biskup, sudjelovao u radu državnih sabora u Požumu 1708. i 1714. godine.

Juraj Patačić bio je prvi bosanski ili đakovački biskup koji je nakon oslobođenja Slavonije od osmanske vlasti krajem 17. stoljeća stalno boravio u svojoj biskupiji. Prilike u samoj biskupij bile su teške: prihodi crkava, redovnika i svećenstva bili su mali, biskupijski posjed devastiran, a vjerske prilike loše. Biskup Patačić odlučno je pristupio materijalnoj i duhovnoj obnovi svoje biskupije te bio iznimno aktivan i zauzet najrazličitijim biskupskim funkcijama ne samo u svojoj, nego i u okolnim biskupijama u kojima njihovi biskupi nisu boravili. Među ostalim, na ruševinama stare katedrale u Đakovu dao je 1706. godine podići novu, a pristupio je i obnovi i preuređenju nekadašnje Ibrahim-pašine džamije koju je posvetio u župnu crkvu Sv. Jurja. Godine 1706. dao je sagrađiti drvenu biskupsku rezidenciju, a od 1711. do 1714. godine trajala je gradnja i opremanje franjevačkog samostana u Đakovu. Patačić je također dodjeljivao beneficije i posjede, kako franjevačkom samostanu, tako i đakovačkim župnicima, te je odredio prihode od štole, propovijedao je, posvećivao crkve, krizmao i uvodio svećenike u svete redove kao u svojoj, tako i u susjednim biskupijama.

Umro je u četrdeset i šestoj godini života, u ožujku 1716. godine. Prema vlastitoj želji bio je sahranjen u franjevačkoj crkvi u Đakovu.

Ključne riječi: *Juraj Patačić de Zajezda, Bosanska ili Đakovačka biskupija, Istočna Slavonije, 18. stoljeće, biskup, biskupijsko imanje, vjerski život*

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present information about life and ministry of Juraj Patačić, bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo, who was filling that post from 1703 to 1716. In addition to basic biographical data, we tried to determine the characteristics of Patačić as a bishop, and to

evaluate his contribution in the process of re-establishing the institutions of the Catholic Church and renewal of religious life in Eastern Slavonia in the period immediately after the liberation from Ottoman rule. So, it was necessary research the role of the bishop in organization of parishes, pastoral work and care for religious life in general, his relationship with lower clergy, role in reconstruction and construction of religious buildings, care for ecclesiastical revenues, and organization of diocesan property. The paper relies on analysis of published and unpublished original historical documents and on past historiographical perceptions.

In 1687, when most of the Slavonian territory was liberated from Ottoman rule, the Catholic Church in these areas found itself in very different circumstances to those prevailing during about a century and a half long Ottoman rule. Significant political and social changes which happened due to shifting of borders between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy (the two states deep-rooted in their own religious traditions) had led to changes in actual and legal position of the Catholic Church, which influenced the church and religious life at all levels. After liberation, together with the political and military organization there was restoration and (re)organization of the church structures. It was influenced not only by political interests, but also specific religious circumstances and conditions of ecclesiastical institutions, which could be described (beyond any doubt) as difficult. During the Ottoman rule it was impossible to fully preserve the traditional church organization based on dioceses and the parishes. So the beneficial holder of pastoral ministry became and stayed franciscan province of Bosna Srebrena. Bishops did not generally reside in their dioceses, which is why, among other things, the old borders of dioceses were forgotten. That led to conflicts over jurisdiction between some bishops. Church buildings were few. Many of them were ruined (without chance to be renewed) or destroyed during the war. There were also permanent difficulties associated with securing funds for the life of the clergy.

Religious life was connected to and to significant extent dependent on the institutional, church frame of dioceses and parishes within which majority of the activities of the local church took place. All the congregation in the diocese and all the clergy were subjected to the bishop who was largely responsible for the good conduct of his church (Opći religijski leksikon, 2002, 103). Since the organization of church and religious life was to a great extent dependent on episcopal ministry, we had to take under consideration its general features, but also characteristics of individual bishops, so we could understand the actual church and religious circumstances. In addition, the bishops in the Habsburg Monarchy in the late 17th and early 18th century were not only ecclesiastical persons trying to ensure conditions under which church institutions could work and trying to meet the religious needs of congregation, but they were also the holders of different, often high, secular posts. They participated in the work of state estates and often were advocates of state interest among congregation, which gave yet another aspect of the meaning of their role. The importance of the functions of episcopal ministry is even more significant when you take into account the difficult situation in which was the Church in Eastern Croatia in the late 17th and early 18th century. Another aggravating factor for the Diocese of Bosnia or Đakovo was in the fact that its territory was divided between two hostile countries. Slavonian part of the diocese was within the Habsburg Monarchy and the Bosnian part remained in the Ottoman Empire.

Bishop Juraj Patačić was the third bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo after liberation from Ottoman rule. Bishop Nikola Olovčić (1669 to 1701), who began restoration, died only two years after the conclusion of Karlovac peace. Bishop Petar Crnković was appointed in 1703, but died shortly afterwards, before he took over the diocese. Therefore, it is clear that bishop Patačić was facing very difficult and challenging task.

2. Bishop Juraj Patačić de Zajezda

Juraj Patačić was the son of count Nikola and the countess Marta Oršić, which made him member of the most prominent Croatian aristocratic families (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 305, Gašić, 2000, 36, Pavić, 1896, 56, b). He was born in 1670. Place of birth is not certain as there were different data depending on sources. According to literature, he was born in Vidovec, near Varaždin. But according to the data from the investigation prior to his appointment to bishop led in front of wienna nuncio, he was born on a family estate Novi Marof, in the diocese of Zagreb and Varaždin county (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 305, 307, 309, Gašić, 2000, 36, Jarm, 2003, 10, Pavić, 1896, 56, b). At the age of sixteen he joined the Jesuits in Zagreb, where he studied humaniora and graduated Greek philosophy and began to study theology. However, because of poor health he left the Jesuits, and continued his education on Hungarian Illyrian course in Bologna, acquiring a doctoral degree and leaving "great memories of himself among the Italians". That was how bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo Antun Mandić wrote about his predecessor while visiting the parish of Aljmaš in 1813. (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 306, 309, Gašić, 2000, 37, Kanonske vizitacije Osijeka, 1997, 268-269, Pavić, 1896, 56, b). Juraj Patačić filled a number of religious and secular posts: he was archdeacon of Varaždin, canon of Zagreb and provost of Požega, rector of Hungarian Illyrian course in Bologna, imperial advisor, and as bishop of Bosnia and Đakovo, he participated in the national Parliament in Pressburg in 1708 and 1714 (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 304, 306, 308, 309, 311-312, 313, 314, Gašić, 2000, 37, Pavić, 1896, 56, b). At the time he took the office of bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo he was thirty-three.

Witnesses to the inquiry procedure for the appointment of Patačić described him as a distinguished man, reputable, prudent, virtuous, and capable. And all the other available documents speak in favour of this assessment. Mild bishop Patačić was from his youth devoted to learning and books, and his scholarship was proved by writing the history of Bologna course "Gloria collegii Ungarico-Illyrici" and booklet "Heroes Hungariae et Illyrici, tam bellica fortitudine, quam singulari aliquo faciore illustres" (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 312, Gašić, 2000, 37, Pavić, 1896, 56, b). It is true that Antun Vukmerović, Zagreb canon, testifying to the inquiry procedure did not fail to mention certain Patačić's "weakness", that is poor eyesight, due to too much learning, but he also stressed that this shortcoming did not present any obstacle to Patačić because it was enough to put the book closer to the eyes and he could read without difficulty and without glasses (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 306).

Since Patačić was on good terms with secular authorities and with the Franciscans who ran most of the parishes, it was not surprising that in the available sources there could be found very few complaints about his behaviour or performance of services. The only one more serious accusation was presented in 1709 by the Bosnian Franciscans, who were complaining to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith that the bishop never came to Bosnia and that "he abandoned his flock." Patačić's reaction to these allegations and to reprimand sent from Vienna internuncios Marcantonio Santini, who warned Patačić to go to his residence, was very restrained, readily expressing his intention to obey the orders of the higher ecclesiastical authorities. However, in the letter of justification that he sent to internuncios, he considered important to warn that the situation in Bosnia was such that life and dignity of the bishop could be threatened. A certain measure of frustration could be traced only in the part of the letter which outlined the history of moving the bishop's residence from Bosnia to Đakovo. There he called his prosecutors Franciscans foolish because of their ignorance of the facts related to the history of their own diocese (Dević, 2003, 114-124).

There was found very mild complaint on Patačić account, or more precisely - a note, in a letter by Ivan Grličić, Đakovo parson, sent to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Grličić asked for permission to join the Jesuits, or for missionary, and if he should

remain in Đakovo, he asked them to speak to bishop on behalf of the needs of his parish church, so that he did not have to share with bishop the income he receives from his parishioners (Dević, 2003, 77-79). This letter was written in summer 1707, only a few months before Grličić's catechism *Puut nebeski* was printed in Venice. It was dedicated to "most holy and highly respected" Bosnian bishop Juraj Patačić (Grličić, 1707, title-page) and nothing indicates that the relationship between the bishop and his priest was compromised. Moreover, the bishop, perhaps inspired by the earlier remark, at the beginning of 1708 presented Ivan Grličić and his successors with arable land, vineyards, meadow and plum orchard in Đakovo district (NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence, Pavić, 1896, 73, b).¹¹³

However, it seemed that his successor, bishop Petar Bakić (1716 to 1749), did not like Patačić's generosity in donating the property and certain casualness regarding the bishop's possessions. Trying to prove his right over the village Koška, Bakić said that if the "benevolent Mr. Juraj late Patačić, my predecessor bishop, during his episcopate and life, either out of neglect, or ignorance, or something else" let Koška be alienated, this did not mean it could be carried on with such illegal activities (NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence).¹¹⁴

There were no other critics on Patačić's account in all the available resources.

During the thirteen years of service, Patačić was extremely active and engaged in various episcopal functions, not only in his own, but also in surrounding dioceses in which their bishops were not resident. The fact is that the bishop of Pécs never visited the Slavonian and Srijem part of his diocese, as well as Srijem bishops never visited their own diocese. Regarding the fact that the Belgrade bishop Brnjaković, who had the authority to take care after Hungarian dioceses without their bishops, left his diocese in 1683 never to return, the circumstances became even more complicated. The situation in which bishops did not stay in their dioceses led to practical organizational problems that had to be resolved so the congregation would not be deprived of fulfilling their religious needs. Help from neighbouring bishops emerged as one of the possible solutions. So in 1703, when Juraj Patačić was appointed bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo, he was also entrusted to care for the spiritual needs of the two neighbouring dioceses, Pécs and Srijem, where he preached, consecrated churches, confirmed and introduced priests in holy orders, "not without costs, difficulties and dangers" (Dević, 2003, 119-121, 122-124). The same year (1703), the cardinal Leopold Kolonić sent a pro memoria, which purpose was to stop the controversy about the borders between dioceses. It stated clearly that Osijek is exempt parish under the authority of Kolonić as archbishop of Esztergom, and the whole district of Valpovo was given to bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo, Juraj Patačić. That way neighbouring bishops, especially the bishop of Pécs, should not have been deprived in any way (NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence). Patačić was also the one who in the early 1709 in Đakovo appointed the Srijem priest and vicar Luka Natali to Belgrade bishop (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 499-500, 502-505).

Patačić had a new cathedral built on the ruins of the old cathedral in Đakovo in 1706,¹¹⁵ and he also started the renovation of the former Ibrahim Pasha Mosque, which he dedicated to the parish church of St. Juraj. In 1706 he had the wooden episcopal residence built. From 1711 to 1714 lasted the construction and equipping of the Franciscan convent in Đakovo, and he also had churches in Gorjani, Vrbica and Vrpolje built (Damjanović, 2008, 160-162, Hoško, 1995, 382, 383, NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence, Pavić, 1896, 74, b, Valenčić - Papić,

¹¹³ Bakić Documents 1716-1749. from Archdiocesan Archives in Đakovo, the letter of Emerik Sadecki, manager of Đakovo estate, 18th July 1717.

¹¹⁴ Bakić Documents 1716-1749. from Archdiocesan Archives in Đakovo, the letter of Petar Pakić, 20th October 1718.

¹¹⁵ Matija Pavić wrote that the cathedral was built from 1708 to 1709.

1995, 89).¹¹⁶ These were all modest buildings with modest facilities. Witnesses to the inquiry procedure for Petar Crnković in 1703 stated that Đakovo Cathedral Church had silver chalices, monstrance and chasuble, and other necessary holy equipment and furniture, but there was no organ, choir or any saintly relics. Also, next to the church there was only a small bell tower with one bell, and throughout the diocese there was only one church with baptistery. Almost identical testimony was given by witnesses in the investigative process for Petar Bakić in 1716. The only difference was that it was stated that the Cathedral Church had both choir and bell tower with two bells, and that it was the late bishop Patačić who supplied it with enough sacred equipment, furniture and other necessities for the cult. In 1718 in the dispute between Petar Bakić, bishop of Bosnia or Đakovo, and royal governor of Slavonia Alexander Joannes Kallaneka, among others there was mentioned the religious equipment that was left after the death of bishop Patačić. Bakić accused Kallaneka of illegally appropriated altar ornaments, bishop clothing, church clothing, books, chalices, golden bowl, silverware, tablecloths and other decorations that were placed in the Cathedral Church, the bishop chapel and bishop house. Bishop was particularly indignant that some of the silver sacred items were melted down and sold, so he firmly demanded from the Royal Chamber to support him in his efforts to claim on his rightful inheritance (Dević - Martinović, 1999, 89-108, 186-303, NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence).

Patačić was also the one who awarded benefits and properties, both to the Franciscan convent, and to the Đakovo parsons, and he also set revenues from the stola (Pavić, 1896, 73, b). In his time there were Diocesan Library and Archive in Đakovo. They were run by Đakovo parson, under the supervision of bishop. Diocesan library and archive were reasons for the dispute of bishop Bakić with the Franciscans in 1716. Bakić accused the monks of misappropriating that harmed him, as lawful successor of the legacy of the late bishop Patačić, but it also caused extensive damage throughout the diocese (NAĐ, Collection of bishops correspondence, Pavić, 1896, 184, a).

Among the tasks that were before the bishop Patačić there was restoration and organization of Đakovo diocesan estate. Bishops of Bosnia or Đakovo had no major problems in exercising their rights to Đakovo estate, that was confirmed by Habsburg rulers on several occasions to Patačić's predecessors (1650, 1697). However, the estate was largely destroyed and its reconstruction was started by bishop Olovčić, and continued by Patačić. In Patačić's time there began the restoration of bishop's stables. Together with this relatively modest estate, in 1703 Patačić has become provost of Kaptol, but given that revenues were unattended and small, he gave it up. Then he has become provost of St. Adrijan de Zala in Hungary by Emperor Joseph I. However, it also did not provide more tangible benefits and Patačić renounced it in 1715 (M. Pavić, 1896, 81, b).

Bishop Patačić was mainly on good terms with the lower clergy and the Franciscans, who had fierce fight with his successor and predecessor, and there was only a minor conflict (mentioned earlier) with the Bosnian Franciscans. Some slight tensions were traced in the writings of Ivan Grličić, Đakovo priest and the only secular priest who was active in Patačić's time in his diocese. There were also no data that suggest possible Patačić's disputes with the Jesuits, with whom he probably came into contact during his frequent trips to Osijek, where he had a house.

Patačić showed his concern for the pastoral work, folk piety and religious climate in general when he convened the Synod held in Đakovo in 1706. At the very beginning, the priests were warned that no one is allowed to administer the sacraments, or perform any parochial functions unless he was given permission by the bishops. There were also presented obligations of parsons and congregation regarding liturgy, behaviour and morality. Parish

¹¹⁶ Bakić Documents 1716-1749. from Archdiocesan Archives in Đakovo, undated letter of Petar Bakić to Viennese Court Chamber.

priests were required to keep the holy oil in suitable, covered containers, keep books of the state of souls and parish registers, hold catechetical instruction, before and after the sermon, "always in sublime voice" pronounce the Lord's Prayer, Hail Mary, Creed, the Ten Commandments and church commandments, during the processions, baptisms and other occasions to take care that the religious rituals were performed according to the law and with the utmost devotion and work to eliminate the differences in the way the feasts were celebrated, which had previously often happened, "not without disgust among people", that is to ensure that only approved and prescribed holidays were celebrated. The priest's duties also included monitoring compliance with obligations of Easter confession, encouraging the faithful to confess as often as possible, to celebrate the holidays with dignity, with the greatest devotion, rather than being left to drunkenness.

Parish priests were warned that they should act reasonably when determining the prudence and public penance should be assigned only to severe sinners for acts of heresy, virgin rape, incest, abortion, desecration of church, voluntary homicide, arson, beating parents, sorcery and false prophecy. The sacrament of Holy Communion should be accepted with obedience and dignity, taking it into the hand. All the parsons were strictly instructed no longer to celebrate in private houses, except in the case of "near-death powerlessness," and they should also encourage parishioners to build the village chapel. On that occasion, it was ordered not to misuse holy service for the blessing of the newly built houses. When it comes to marriage, parsons were warned not to conduct a wedding ceremony unless it had been announced three times in succession, and if the bride and groom came from different parishes, the disclosure should be done in both parishes.

It was visible in the regulations that they were not in favour of marriages of two people coming from different parishes, except if they had issued special certificates from the parish priest. It was also not looked favourably on marriages of parishioners with "tramps", that is foreigners. Such an attitude is understandable if we have in mind the Church's efforts to provide a solid religious, but also wider social control over its flock, through religious practices in the most important events in the life of individuals and families, such as birth, marriage and death. As for widows or widowers, they could have been remarried only if they presented credible confirmation of the death of a spouse. Otherwise, new marriage was allowed only after thirty years of absence of a spouse. Strict regulations regarding the re-marrying of widows and widowers had special meaning during the war and in the years that followed, because the number of those killed, missing or taken into captivity or slavery was significant. It was not easy to issue a death certificate, and it appears that the cases of sudden return of the missing person (already mourned) were relatively frequent. At the synod it was determined that the priests are not allowed to marry those who had not settled the prescribed fee, which should not exceed 10 florins. They were also warned that they had to endeavour to eradicate the abuses associated with the customs of "buying the bride" and excessive gift giving (M. Pavić, 1896, 63-64, b).

Always of poor health, bishop Patačić died in March 1716 at the age of forty-six. According to his wish, he was buried in the Franciscan church (Pavić, 1896, 89, b).

3. Conclusion

After the liberation of Slavonia and Sirmium from the Ottoman rule and after they became a part of the Hapsburg Empire, it became necessary to (re)organize the institutions of the Catholic Church in accordance with the new circumstances. Establishment of a permanent church organization was marked by the fight for setting borders of dioceses, the jurisdiction of bishops and struggle for control over parishes fought between the Franciscans and secular clergy. At the parish level, pastoral activity retained most of its features from the previous

period, mainly because the parishes remained in the hands of the Franciscans. The biggest problems in the organization of religious life arose from the fact that most bishops did not reside in their dioceses and the difficult financial circumstances in which the Church found itself. The organization of the Church and religious life in war time occurred in extremely difficult conditions, and problems such as insufficient number of priests and the poor state of sacred objects still remained in the first decades after the conclusion of Karlovac peace. However, the religious life showed its vitality even under the most difficult circumstances. But after the situation all together became more stable, we can trace back its revival and forming in accordance with the rules of the Church, with special attention to the behaviour of believers with a commitment to remove the existing "superstitions" and "violations" and the faithful are urged to obey religious commitments and behave in accordance with Christian morale.

Bishop Juraj Patačić de Zejezda played a significant role in rebuilding the institutions of church and religious life and not only in his diocese but also in the neighbouring dioceses. He maintained good relations with the clergy and secular authorities, preached, consecrated churches, confirmed and introduced priests in holy orders, renovated and built religious buildings, intensified renewal of devastated Đakovo estate. Because all of that, it can be concluded that bishop Juraj Patačić with his formal education, his service, and religious and moral character came very close to the ideal bishop required by Church.

UNPUBLISHED AND PUBLISHED HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

Dević, A. - Martinović, I. (1999): *Đakovačka i Srijemska biskupija. Biskupski procesi i izvještaji*, Monumenta croatica Vaticana, Hrvatski državni arhiv - Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb

Dević, Antun (2003): *Đakovačka i Srijemska biskupija. Spisi generalnih sjednica Kongregacije za širenje vjere: 18. stoljeće*, Monumenta croatica Vaticana, Hrvatski državni arhiv - Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb

Kanonske vizitacije Osijeka u 18. stoljeću (1732.-1761.) (1997), Državni arhiv u Osijeku, Osijek

NAĐ (Archdiocesan Archives in Đakovo): *Bakić Documents 1716-1749*, Collection of bishops correspondence

LITERATURE

Damjanović, D. (2008): *Srednjovjekovno-barokna đakovačka katedrala i njezina sudbina*, RADOVI - Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, Vol. 40, pp. 151-173

Gašić, E. (2000): *Kratki povijesni pregled biskupija Bosansko-đakovačke i Srijemske*, Državni arhiv u Osijeku, Osijek

Gričić, I. (1777): *Puut nebeski*, Venice

Hoško, F. E. (1995): *Višestoljetno djelovanje franjevaca u Đakovu (1347-1806)*, Diakovensia: teološki prilozi, No. 1, pp. 373-394

Jarm, A. (2003): *Dijecezanski svećenici koji su djelovali na sadašnjem području Biskupije Đakovačke i Srijemske od 1701. do 2003. godine*, Biskupski ordinarijat, Đakovo

Opći religijski leksikon (2002): Leksikografski zavod "Miroslav Krleža", Zagreb

Pavić, M. (1896, a): *Petar Bakić, biskup bosansko-đakovački (1703-1716)*, Glasnik Biskupija bosanske i srijemske, No. 20, pp.175-180

Pavić, M. (1896, b): *Gjuro Patačić, biskup bosansko-đakovački (1703-16)*, Glasnik Biskupija bosanske i srijemske, No. 24, pp. 56-59, 63-64, 73-75, 79-81, 87-89

Valenčić, B. - Papić, T. (1995): *Župna crkva Svih Svetih u Đakovu - građevinski razvoj objekta*, Diakovensia: teološki prilozi, No. 1, pp. 85-94