Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade | 2025



oncepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse: Medieval, Modern, Contemporary

Proceedings of the Conference held on 30–31 May 2024 at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy

> Edited by Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić Aleksandar Z. Savić

Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse: Medieval, Modern, Contemporary Proceedings of the Conference held on 30–31 May 2024 at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy

> Edited by Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić Aleksandar Z. Savić Belgrade 2025

Publisher University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy Čika Ljubina 18–20, Belgrade 11000, Serbia www.f.bg.ac.rs

> For the Publisher Prof. Dr Danijel Sinani Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy

Editorial Board Branko Bešlin, Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, Nebojša Porčić, Mira Radojević, Aleksandar Z. Savić, Aleksandar Životić

> Translated by Olivera Nićiforović-Babac and the Authors

> > Cover design OCM

Pre press Dosije studio, Beograd

Printed by JP Službeni glasnik, Beograd

Run in 300

ISBN 978-86-6427-341-1

The present volume is published within the framework of the project *Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse – Medieval, Modern, Contemporary* (CoNatPat), which is funded by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia (IDEAS, project no. 7750060).





TABLE OF CONTENTS

9 | Serbian Collective Memory – Some Introductory Remarks (Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, Aleksandar Z. Savić)

THE HERITAGE OF NEMANJA'S FATHERLAND

- 25 | *Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić* Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in the Political Discourse of the Serbian Middle Ages: A Theoretical Approach
- 29 | *Aleksandar Z. Savić Novus Israel*: An Outline for a History of the Concept of Divine Election in the Serbian Milieu (13th–16th Centuries)
- 34 | *Marija Vasiljević* Dynasty as a Carrier of Identification: Old Serbian Genealogies
- 38 Miloš Ivanović
 The Borders of the Serbian Land from the End of the 12th to the Middle of the 15th Century According to Narrative Sources
- 42 | Zorica Vitić "Our" Language in Serbian Slavonic Marginalia and Writings (13th-15th Century)

47 | Nebojša Porčić

"For the Patrimony, Fatherland, Country and Realm": The National and the Patriotic in the World of Serbian Medieval Chivalric Romance

52 | Srđan Pirivatrić

Serbs as Triballi, Dalmatae and Dacians: A Contribution to Understanding the Use of Some Classical Ethnonyms as Byzantine Identifiers for the Serbs (from the Mid-10th to the Early 13th Century)

56 | *Neven Isailović* The Feeling of Belonging in Medieval Bosnia: From Local to State Identity

- 61 | *Dejan Došlić* Saint Gregory, Ban Stephen II Kotromanić and the Creation of Regional Cohesion in Medieval Bosnia
- 65 | Aleksandar Krstić
 Between Serving the Holy Crown and Keeping Serbian Traditions
 on the Identity of the Serbs in Hungary in the Second Half of the 15th and the First Half of the 16th Centuries

IN FOREIGN EMPIRES

- 73 | *Nebojša S. Šuletić* The Influence of the Church on the Formation of Serbian National Identity (16th–18th Centuries)
- 77 | Jelena Ilić Mandić
 Collective Identity(ies) in the 18th-Century Military Frontier:
 A Study of the Serbian Case
- 83 | *Isidora Točanac Radović Natio nostra Illyrico-Rasciana seu Serviana*: The Creation of a Privileged Identity of Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy
- 88 | Vladimir Simić
 Religion, Dynasty and Enlightenment: Serbian Patriotism in the Habsburg Monarchy in the 18th Century
- 92 | *Miroslav Pavlović* On the Ethnicity of Janissaries and Local Troops in the 18th Century
- 97 | *Marija Andrić* Connection to the Roots or Integration: The Status of the Herzegovinian Merchant Marko Mirković in 18th-Century Venetian Republic
- 102 | Branko Bešlin
 "Both Serbs and Citizens" Shaping the Concept of the Nation in the Spirit of the Political Ideas of the 19th Century
- 107 | *Radovan Subić* Between the Emperor and the Prince. The Serbian Uprising in Herzegovina in 1875–1876

6

ON THE PATHS OF INDEPENDENCE

- 113 | Miloš Ković
 A Contribution to the History of the Yugoslav Idea: The Influence of Great Britain on Serbian Identity Politics (until 1918)
- 119 | Igor Borozan
 In the Service of the Nation: The Ruler's Portrait in Serbian
 Visual Culture of the 19th and Early 20th Century
- 124 | *Dušan Fundić* "Kohn Dichotomy" and the Discourses of Serbian Nationalism (c. 1890–1914)
- 127 | Petar S. Ćurčić
 The State, National Interest, and the Understanding of International Relations in the Nedeljni pregled Magazine (1908–1910): A Conservative View
- 131 | *Darko Gavrilović* Patriotism of the Freemasons of the Kingdom of Serbia at the Turn of the 20th Century

YUGOSLAV EXPERIENCES

- 139 | *Mira Radojević* Identity Issues of the Serbian Nation at the Time of the Foundation of the First Yugoslav State
- 144 | Nedeljka V. Bjelanović Let Die Who Wants to Live, Let Live Who Wants to Die: Patriotic Literature of Young Bosnians
- 149 | *Slobodan Vladušić* Miloš Crnjanski and *Serbia*
- 153 | Slobodan Bjelica National Policy of the Vojvodina Radicals in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (1918–1929)
- 157 | *Aleksandar Životić* The Comintern and the Montenegrin National Question (1919–1941)
- 162 | *Ljubodrag Dimić* Integral Yugoslavism

8	Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse
166	<i>Miloš Žikić</i> Pro-Bulgarian Propaganda on Yugoslav Territory, 1934–1941
170	<i>Boris Tomanić</i> Carriers of Bulgarisation on the Territory of Yugoslavia during the Second World War
175	<i>Igor Vukadinović</i> Popular Narrative under the Scrutiny of Research: Did the Communist Regime in Yugoslavia Implement a Policy of National Equality?
179	<i>Katarina Mitrović</i> Socialist Modernism and (A)National Identity: Serbian Art of the Second Half of the 20th Century
184	<i>Nikola Mijatov</i> From Socialism to Nationalism: Fan Identities in Yugoslav Football
188	<i>Michael Antolović</i> Serbian Historians and the Yugoslav Crisis
192	<i>Slobodan Antonić</i> "Serbian Nationalism" as a Stigma and Its Genealogy

SERBIAN COLLECTIVE MEMORY – SOME INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

At the beginning of this volume, it seems appropriate to refer to an important but now almost forgotten polemic of the early 1960s about the significance of Kosovo to Serbian history, culture and national ideology. The polemic started when Marko Ristić (1902-1982), a leading Serbian surrealist in the inter-war years, but a committed supporter of the communist regime after 1945, attacked an essay on the modernist poetry of Rastko Petrović (1898-1949) by the well-known literary critic and anthologist Zoran Mišić (1921-1976).¹ Mišić had dared to suggest that Serbian literary modernism, and Serbian literature in general, should not turn a blind eye to the moral and historical significance of the "Kosovo myth", the roots of which went back to the Serbian defeat in the Battle of Kosovo in 1389. In line with the official communist ideology, Ristić rejected this as reactionary and completely unacceptable, though stopping short of condemning Mišić in straightforwardly political terms. In a scathing, brilliantly written reply,² Mišić went much further in defending his original position: he suggested that a truly modern Serbian culture and literature needed to integrate the left-wing *avant-garde* sensibility of the period between the 1910s and 1930s on the one hand, and the elements drawn from the rich depository of traditional moral beliefs associated with the Battle of Kosovo on the other. Insisting on its wider significance, Mišić finds the moral choice of Prince Lazar present at the crucial moments of later Serbian history. This made it possible for the Serbs, in spite of centuries of subjection to Ottoman rule, to keep intact their national identity: "We had known how to preserve from death the crucial time-conquering values our monuments and our memories".3

¹ Z. Mišić, Rastko Petrović, Delo 7 (1961), 1276-1285.

² M. Ristić, Zavisi i ne zavisi. (O poeziji! Prvenstveno o poeziji Rastka Petrovića i to povodom jednog nepogodnog povoda. Čemu i kome i u koju svrhu i zašto, opet?) [It depends...], *Poetika* 4 (2012), 108–116 (= M. Ristić, *Prisustva*, Beograd 1966, 197–205; first published in the weekly *NIN* on 26 November 1961).

³ Z. Mišić, Šta je to kosovsko opredeljenje. Odgovor na jedno pitanje Marka Ristića [What does Kosovo mean today?], *Poetika* 4 (2012), 117–124 (= Z. Mišić, *Reč i vreme* II, *Pesničko iskustvo*, Beograd 1963, 169–178). In his text "What does Kosovo mean today?" Mišić gave probably the best formulation of the idea of the indissoluble con-

The decision to open the publication which summarises the results of the research project Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse – Medieval, Modern, Contemporary (CoNatPat)⁴ by recalling the above-mentioned polemic is by no means accidental. The topic of the present volume is directly related to the multi-dimensional discourse of Serbian collective memory which relies, among other things, on the idea of the Kosovo pledge. In everyday (mis)use, particularly to date, this concept has assumed a flexible and, therefore, blurred meaning. Few were the individuals who bore witness to the social climate of the 1960s and who, in spite of being disputed, believed, together with Zoran Mišić, that "the Kosovo pledge is not just a myth, but also a law of historical necessity", in a country in which "from day to day, it becomes rather unseemly, not to say dangerous, to utter a word or two from our mythological vocabulary - one such word is Kosovo".5 The context in which the polemic was conducted belongs to the time of deconstruction of Serbian national identity, characterised by the aspiration to "sacrifice today the living tradition of our homeland for the sake of European models... (because) we have started searching for ourselves in a reflection of the world that runs the risk of not even recognising itself".⁶ These words in the least call for a consideration of tradition, which inevitably begins from our own day. We hope that the contributions to this volume will also help us to answer the question posed in the above-mentioned literary and, to a certain extent, ideological debate. The "Kosovo myth" is indisputably related to the concept of Serbian national identity and its interpretations have been current and emotionally coloured to date.

The subject of this volume does not need any special justification: to describe and interpret accurately the important notions of patriotism and nationalism has long been a scholarly *desideratum*, and the papers collected here are devoted to meeting this need.⁷ In the European political discourse, the term "nationalism" appears at the end of the 18th century, and in the 19th century it often refers to the exaggerated manifestations of the much older concept of patriotism. It was only at the beginning of the 20th century, with the emergence of the concepts of national sovereignty and the nation's right to self-determination, and later in the context of the

nection between the properly understood Kosovo pledge and the very essence of national identity.

⁴ The project has been carried out with the generous financial support of the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia (IDEAS, no. 7750060).

⁵ Mišić, Šta je to kosovsko opredeljenje, 117.

⁶ Ibid., 122-123.

⁷ Cf. Nationalism: Intellectual Origins, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, ed. J. Breuilly, Oxford 2013; P. Lawrence, *Nationalism. History and Theory*, Routledge 2005.

anti-colonial and anti-imperialistic movements, that the term "nationalism" lost its negative connotations and acquired a broader meaning, associated with patriotism and symbolising the sum of different loyalties owed to the nation and its state. The traumatic experiences of the 20th century have often led to a different understanding of these concepts, and the past few decades have witnessed a renewed interest in the interpretation of their social and political importance.

It goes without saying that a reconsideration of these issues within the long span of Serbian history, from the Middle Ages to the present date, must build on the results of earlier scholarship. The complex issue of the relation between patriotism and nationalism among the Serbs has been dealt with by researchers of different profiles over the past few decades.⁸ At the comparative level, research has been so comprehensive that any attempt at compiling a representative list of relevant publications would by far exceed the framework of introductory notes to this volume. However, the fact that patriotism was one of the defining concepts already in early modern culture - although as a term it did not emerge until the 18th century – and that the very same concept, related to the perceptions of the *patria*, has been present in the European territory ever since antiquity, speaks most eloquently to the nature of the problems addressed on the ensuing pages.⁹ At the same time, it has not gone unnoticed by medievalists studying the Serbian past that even in the pre-modern era individuals developed emotionally charged relationships towards their fatherland, and that such relationships were defined by continuities as well as discontinuities.¹⁰

10 S. Marjanović-Dušanić - N. Porčić - Z. Vitić - A. Z. Savić, Politički okviri kolektivnih identiteta. Svedočanstva srpskog srednjovekovlja [Political Frameworks of Collective

⁸ On the issue of Serbian statehood, see the three-volume publication M. Blagojević -D. Medaković – R. Ljušić – Lj. Dimić, Istorija srpske državnosti [A History of Serbian Statehood] I-III, Beograd 2001. Important works in the field of visual culture include M. Timotijević, Rađanje moderne privatnosti. Privatni život Srba u Habsburškoj monarhiji od kraja 17. do početka 19. veka [The Birth of Modern Privacy. Private Life of the Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy from the End of the 17th to the Beginning of the 19th Century], Beograd 2006; N. Makuljević, Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku. Sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije [Art and the National Idea in the 19th Century. The System of European and Serbian Visual Culture in the Service of the Nation], Beograd 2006; V. Simić, Za ljubav otadžbine. Patriote i patriotizmi u srpskoj kulturi XVIII veka u Habsburškoj monarhiji [For the Love of Fatherland. Patriots and Patriotisms in 18th-century Serbian Culture in the Habsburg Monarchy], Novi Sad 2012; I. Borozan, Slika i moć. Predstave vladara u srpskoj vizuelnoj kulturi XIX i početkom XX veka [Image and Power. Representations of Rulers in Serbian Visual Culture of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries] I-II, Novi Sad 2021.

⁹ The development of the ancient understanding of patriotism as a virtue of love for the fatherland towards the concept of political virtue in the service of the nation was long and complex. See, in brief, Simić, *Za ljubav otadžbine*, 16–21.

The papers brought together in this volume draw heavily on the results of modern scholarship, starting from the works of Reinhart Koselleck on the phenomenon of patriotism,¹¹ or indeed those of Clifford Geertz,¹² whose influence in the sphere of cultural history can hardly be overestimated; in addition, one would be amiss not to mention the seminal texts by Colette Beaune,¹³ Anthony Smith,¹⁴ Benedict Anderson,¹⁵ Eric Hobsbawm,¹⁶ Aleida Assmann¹⁷ and other authors whose insights remain to this day the very cornerstone of studying the concepts of patriotism and nationalism.¹⁸ Relying on these foundations, our task is based on the theoretical solutions which were searched for in the context of discourse

Identities. Evidence from Medieval Serbia], Beograd 2024 (with an overview of primary and secondary sources).

- 13 C. Beaune, Naissance de la nation France, Paris 1985.
- 14 A. D. Smith, The Cultural Foundations of Nations. Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic, Oxford 2008; id., Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism. A Cultural Approach, London – New York 2009; id., Nationalism. Theory, Ideology, History, Cambridge 2010.
- 15 B. Anderson, Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, London – New York 1991.
- 16 E. J. Hobsbawm, Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality, Cambridge 1990; The Invention of Tradition, ed. E. Hobsbawm T. Ranger, Cambridge 1983.
- 17 A. Assmann, Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik, München 2006; ead., Formen des Vergessens, Göttingen 2016.
- Even the most superficial review of the immense historiographical production con-18 cerning the birth of the nation, identity policies, and collective memory would largely exceed these introductory notes. That is why we have decided to provide a somewhat arbitrary selection of outstanding works which might be of particular interest for medievalists: J. Huizinga, Patriotism and Nationalism in European History, Men and Ideas, London 1960, 97-155; H. Kohn, The Idea of Nationalism. A Study of its Origin and Background, New York 1951; F. A. von der Heydte, Die Geburtsstunde des souveränen Staates, Regensburg 1952; B. Guenée, État et nation en France au Moyen Age, Revue Historique 237/1 (1967), 17-30; A. Hastings, The Construction of Nationhood. Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism, Cambridge 1997; G. Delannoi - E. Morin, Avant-propos, Communications 45 (1987), 5-6 (thematic issue Eléments pour une théorie de la nation); H. Schulze, Staat und Nation in der europäische Geschichte, München 1994; P. J. Geary, The Myth of Nations. The Medieval Origins of Europe, Princeton 2002; Histoire, mémoire et dévotion. Regards croisés sur la construction des identités dans le monde orthodoxe aux époques byzantine et post-byzantine, ed. R. Paun, Geneva 2016; J. Szücs, Sur le concept de nation, Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales 64 (1986), 51-62; Nation et nations au Moyen Age, XLIVe Congrès de la SHMESP (Prague, 23-26 mai 2013), Société des historiens médiévistes de l'Enseignement supérieur public, Paris 2014; Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies, ed. A. L. Totta - T.

¹¹ R. Koselleck, Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten, Frankfurt am Main 1989; id., Begriffsgeschichten: Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache, Frankfurt am Main 2006; R. Koselleck, Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories (Cultural Memory in the Present), Stanford 2018.

¹² C. Geertz, The integrative revolution, *Old Societies and New States*, ed. C. Geertz, New York 1963; id., *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York 1973; id., *Local Knowledge*, New York 1983.

analysis.¹⁹ Of particular importance for the development of this sort of analysis are the works written in the domain of identity studies and cultural history,²⁰ while our approach to defining said concepts in Serbian historical memory is facilitated by the fact that a solid methodological apparatus for studying the issues of "identity construction" of this type has long been established.²¹

The crystallisation process of modern national consciousness made European nations, including the Serbs, turn towards the Middle Ages, in which they searched for their national roots. The medieval period was a particularly suitable field for situating the beginnings of the national past owing to the strength of the values such as religion, loyalty and order (*ordo*), which had a specific, broader social importance at that time. Owing to the rapid development of historiography, the nations that gained state independence during the 19th century strove to strengthen their connections with the past. In so doing they relied on different continuities, e.g., linguistic, religious, and ethnic (hence the development of genealogical theories).²² All this unambiguously points to the need for termi-

- 20 P. Geary, Phantoms of Remembrance. Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millenium, Princeton 1994; Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity. New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape, ed. N. Moore – Y. Whelan, Aldershot 2007; Ch. Lorenz, Representations of Identity: Ethnicity, Race, Class, Gender and Religion. An Introduction to Conceptual History, The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories, ed. S. Berger – Ch. Lorenz, Basingstoke 2008, 24–59. For medievalist studies on identity and the politics of memory, cf. R. Miles, Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity, London – New York 1999; Medieval Concepts of the Past. Ritual, Memory, Historiography, ed. G. Althoff – J. Fried – P. J. Geary, Cambridge 2002; P. J. Geary, Writing History: Identity, Conflict, and Memory in the Middle Ages, Bucharest 2012.
- 21 For some general considerations on the importance of a community's common (real or imaginary) past for its cohesion and identity construction, see A. P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, New York 1985, 98–103; E. Hobsbawm, Introduction: Inventing Traditions, *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Hobsbawm Ranger, 1–14; A. D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, New York 1986, 174–208.
- 22 Modern research of these phenomena relies on the study of the medieval past as a "golden age". Here we would like to point to several thought-provoking studies on the Byzantine roots of Greek identity: P. Magdalino, Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium, *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium* (Variorum Collected Studies Series, 343), Farnham 1991, 1–29; *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. B. Ricks P. Magdalino, London 1998; A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzan-*

Hagen, London - New York 2016; S. Grosby, Nations and Nationalism in World History, London - New York 2022.

¹⁹ C. Barker – D. Galasinski, Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity, London 2001; M. Bloor – T. Bloor, The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. An Introduction, Oxford 2007; D. Apter, Political Discourse, International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, ed. N. J. Smelser – P. B. Baltes, Oxford 2001, 11644–11648; M. Foucault, Lordre du discours. Leçon inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970, Paris 1971.

nologically precise explanations of the concepts, which require one to be mindful of the heritage, of a living tradition that has affected both written and oral culture, of collective emotions, but also of an awareness – persisting over a very long period of time – of the existence of a distinctive Serbian national community.

At this juncture we find it appropriate to emphasise at least two important phenomena which we have encountered over the course of this endeavour. Firstly, one ought to point out the process of sacralisation of the concept of patriotism. Present ever since antiquity, as first demonstrated by Ernst Kantorowicz,²³ this phenomenon had far-reaching implications in medieval and early modern societies, not least among the Serbs. Another noteworthy concept – likewise originating from the close interaction of the state and the church, and subsequently from the role of the church as the only remaining force of national cohesion of the Serbian people – is that of religious patriotism.²⁴ A necessary element for understanding Serbian culture in post-medieval times, this notion is documented in a number of historical sources which have been tackled in the course of this research.

The results of individual research on the source material conducted by the members of the project team have been collected into three volumes published by our *alma mater*, the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade.²⁵ A particularly significant contribution from the standpoint of the medieval source dossier is the publication of a glossary of terms denoting attachment to the wider community and/or country; based on a representative sample of hagiographical texts, the glossary offers valuable insight into the notional apparatus of the Serbian medieval society (i.e., its upper echelons).²⁶ In studying the (early) modern age, other members of the

tium. The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition, Cambridge 2009; G. Page, Being Byzantine. Greek Identity before the Ottomans, Cambridge 2008; A. Kaldellis, Romanland. Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium, Cambridge, Mass. 2019.

²³ E. H. Kantorowicz, Pro Patria Mori in Medieval Political Thought, *The American Historical Review* 56/3 (1951), 472–492.

²⁴ M. Viroli, For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism, Oxford 2003.

²⁵ Marjanović-Dušanić et al., Politički okviri kolektivnih identiteta; B. Bešlin – I. Točanac Radović – J. Ilić Mandić – M. Andrić, Državno-pravni okviri i osećanje pripadnosti. Srpski kolektivni identiteti u novom veku [State-Legal Frameworks and the Feeling of Belonging. Serbian Collective Identities in the Modern Age], Beograd 2024; M. Radojević – Lj. Dimić – A. Životić – D. Gavrilović – M. Antolović, Patriotizam i nacionalizam kod Srba u XX veku. Ideje i praksa [Patriotism and Nationalism among the Serbs in the 20th Century. Ideas and Practice], Beograd 2024.

²⁶ Z. Vitić, Patriotska leksika u srpskoj srednjovekovnoj hagiografiji: Nacrt za pojmovnik [Patriotic Lexemes in Medieval Serbian Hagiography: Towards a Glossary], Marjanović-Dušanić et al., *Politički okviri kolektivnih identiteta*, 115–179.

project team found themselves before the task of investigating the changes in the meaning of certain concepts in radically different socio-political environments, while those working on the contemporary period have faced the challenges of analysing a vast array of documents that shed precious light on the development of national identity, which is to say on the factors of its emergence, deconstruction, and replacement by other identities.

×

Building upon the initial results of the research carried out in the framework of the project, in May 2024 the team convened a conference at the Faculty of Philosophy in order to broaden the scope of the discussion on the concepts of nationalism and patriotism in Serbian political discourse from the medieval period to our own day. This event brought together more than thirty historians, literature historians, and art historians, but also representatives of other related academic disciplines whose specific insights offered valuable contributions to a more comprehensive consideration of the subject phenomena in their full thematic and diachronic complexity. The present book of proceedings contains extended summaries in English of the papers presented at the conference, and is therefore meant to complement the simultaneously published two-volume collection of essays in Serbian.²⁷ In what follows we shall not delve into a detailed review of the content of each and every paper; instead, we shall try to show that, notwithstanding their pronounced diversity (notably in terms of theoretical-methodological approaches), they can be grouped into distinct yet mutually overlapping thematic-chronological segments.

The volume begins with a contribution by Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić. By laying the foundations of a specific medievalist platform for studying the phenomena of nationalism and patriotism, the author focuses on what she perceives as two key concepts elaborated in Serbian hagiography: "love/pain for the fatherland", which she interprets as a medieval equivalent of the patriotic sentiment; and divine election, in which she sees the nucleus of the Serbian protonation. The idea of chosenness, present for centuries in the cult writings of Serbian provenance, is thoroughly explored by Aleksandar Z. Savić, who strives to identify the elements of continuity discerned in different stages of its existence while stressing the importance of considering each of these stages in its proper socio-political

²⁷ Koncepti nacionalizma i patriotizma u srpskom političkom diskursu. Srednji vek, novi vek, savremeno doba [Concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism in Serbian Political Discourse. Medieval, Modern, Contemporary] I–II, ed. S. Marjanović-Dušanić – A. Z. Savić, Beograd 2025.

context. The central role of the ruling Nemanjić house, emphasised in both papers, is addressed by Marija Vasiljević as well, although from a somewhat different perspective. In her examination of Serbian genealogies, founded on the theoretical postulates of Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, the dynasty is seen as a crucial, albeit not the only "category of identification"; these also include (but are not limited to) religion, language, and territory, but also the perception of the "Other", which in its own way takes part in the self-determination process.

The following papers represent a valuable contribution to understanding these different identity factors. Thus, Miloš Ivanović examines the syntagm Serbian land as attested to in the narrative sources between the 12th and the 15th century, pointing to the political circumstances leading to changes in its use. On the other hand, Zorica Vitić presents the results of her meticulous analysis of a wide array of medieval texts in which the Serbian Slavic language is termed as "Slavic", "our language", or indeed - "Serbian". Apart from the meaning which it has preserved to the present day ("language"), the Old Church Slavonic word "назыкъ" – as emphasised by Vitić - had another conspicuous meaning in the Middle Ages: as a rule, it denoted foreign peoples, i.e., the "others", whose (often negative) characterisation was founded in the identity strategies of the creators of the predominant discourses. Nebojša Porčić shows that the categorial barrier between "us" and "them" is also present in chivalric romances, particularly in the Serbian Alexander Romance; in his view, the account about the Macedonians' encounter with the Persians and Indians may well be read through the prism of national and patriotic sentiments shared by the members of the medieval nobility. The identity/alterity dichotomy is also tackled by Srđan Pirivatrić, but from a completely different angle; in Byzantine sources examined by Pirivatrić, the Serbs are the "others", and their perceived cultural inferiority is articulated through a deliberate use of ancient ethnonyms.

Following a sequence of contributions mainly based on various types of narrative sources, the next section shifts the focus to the documentary material, as well as to other spatial frameworks. The subject of Neven Isailović's research is medieval Bosnian identity, which the author understands as a resultant of local, regional, and state factors dependent on the changes in the territorial scope of the Bosnian Banate (and, later, Kingdom). Isailović's general consideration is aptly complemented by a paper with a narrower thematic focus: an attempt to learn why the bans of Bosnia, starting from Stefan II, mentioned Saint Gregory in their intitulations has led Dejan Došlić to conclude that the reasons were not only or primarily religious, but that there was also the need for the political unification of the newly-annexed regions under the Kotromanić rule. The two papers dedicated to the Bosnian case are then accompanied by one that concentrates on South Hungary, i.e., on the local Serbian community, which steadily grew during the second half of the 15th and the first half of the 16th century. Its author, Aleksandar Krstić, is primarily interested in the peculiar status of the Serbian nobility which, although integrated in the Hungarian feudal milieu, played an important role in the preservation of Serbian identity embodied in specific religious, linguistic and cultural features. Another key actor in these aspirations was undoubtedly the Serbian Orthodox Church; along with other arguments corroborating this claim, Nebojša S. Šuletić stresses one exceptional accomplishment of this institution in the period from the 16th to the 18th century – namely, the preservation of the traditions of Serbian medieval literature.

Although Krstic's paper in effect rounds off the medievalist segment of our volume, it is equally possible to place it at the beginning of the next segment, which is dedicated to identity problems of the Serbian people in Hungary, i.e., in the Habsburg Monarchy, during the early modern period. Jelena Ilić Mandić provides a thorough insight into the collective identity of the Serbian population of the Military Frontier, insisting on the need to see it as an amalgam sui generis, one that integrates ethno-linguistic, religious-political, professional-status and, finally, territorial-class factors. It goes without saying that the (self-)determination of the Serbian community was closely related to its members' status as subjects of the Monarchy. Bearing that in mind, Isidora Točanac Radović ventured a textual analysis of the Serbian Privileges in search of the lexical apparatus used by the court administration to denote Serbs and their religion, which was instrumental to the formation of what the author calls "privileged identity". Indeed, it is precisely the attachment to Orthodox Christianity, loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty and preservation of the Privileges - in other words, the religious, dynastic and constitutional patriotism - that Vladimir Simić recognises as three main pillars of the identity of Serbs living in the Monarchy in the 18th century.

Albeit the following two papers belong to approximately the same chronological framework, the authors, each in their own way, deal with subjects of another empire – that of the Ottomans. Miroslav Pavlović focuses on the identities of military units (janissaries and local troops), particularly their ethnic component; on the basis of a thorough examination of the political and social circumstances in the 18th-century Sanjak of Smederevo, he concludes that ethnicity was an important (although perhaps not a crucial) aspect of identity paradigms in the Ottoman army. On the other hand, Marija Andrić follows the trace of one Marko Mirković, a former subject of the Ottoman Empire who (by all appearances for business reasons) settled down permanently on the territory of Venice. Starting from this particular case, Andrić provides some observations of a more general nature about the liminal status of merchants and their composite identities, which seem to have largely depended on the degree of their integration in the new environments.

Branko Bešlin's contribution takes us back to the Habsburg Monarchy and ushers us into the 19th century, during which the modern concept of the nation among Serbs assumed its definite form: in his paper, he follows the maturation of the national idea from the Timişoara Assembly (1790) to the 1870s, pointing to the challenges its formulation posed to Serbian intellectuals and politicians in the given historical circumstances. The next paper, authored by Radovan Subić, is dedicated to the Herzegovina Uprising of the Serbs in 1875-1876, i.e., to the various regional interests affecting its course and, finally, determining its outcome. Miloš Ković also addresses the issue of the Herzegovina Uprising, but in a much broader context; namely, he scrutinises Great Britain's strategic interests in Southeast Europe during the greatest part of the 19th and in the early 20th centuries. In an attempt to turn the Serbs away from Russia, British elites, in Ković's opinion, encouraged an identity paradigm which prioritised language and origin over Orthodox Christianity, thus contributing to the conception and realisation of the Yugoslav project.

Another perspective on the 19th century, this time through the prism of visual culture, is offered by Igor Borozan, whose analysis of the portraits of Serbian rulers - from Karadorde to Peter I - reveals the importance of this medium in contemporary manifestations of the national idea. We learn more about the nationalist discourses among Serbs at the turn of the 20th century from Dušan Fundić. In an attempt to assess their character, Fundić turns to the so-called "Kohn dichotomy", which presupposes the existence of two basic models: the political (civic) and the cultural (ethnic). Although Serbian nationalism should theoretically belong to the latter category, the author points to the significance of its "civic" dimension, which brings him to a more general conclusion that complex phenomena such as this one can hardly be seen in strictly schematised, binary frameworks. As for Petar S. Ćurčić, his paper is centred on the political discourse of the Progressive Party at the close of the first decade of the 20th century, particularly on those aspects regarding the attitudes towards the state, national interest and international relations.

A further contribution to understanding the socio-political circumstances at the turn of the 20th century is given by Darko Gavrilović, whose paper deals with the patriotism of Serbian Freemasons. Basing his research on modern theories of patriotism, Gavrilović argues that the Freemason

organisation actively worked on the strengthening of the international position of the Kingdom of Serbia, but that it also largely contributed to Serbian-Croatian relations by advocating the unification of the two peoples into a common state. The issue of the Yugoslav unification is discussed in detail by Mira Radojević, whose aim is to shed light on the way in which the new state was perceived at the time of its foundation, especially by the Serbian population; her conclusion is that radically different and often conflicting attitudes attested to in the historical evidence derived from the complex post-war circumstances and completely opposed expectations of the interested parties. As opposed to this consideration, which highlights the political-intellectual perspective, the following segment tackles 20thcentury national and patriotic sentiments from the perspective of literary production: Nedeljka V. Bjelanović analyses the writings of Young Bosnia members, characterised by patriotic aspirations towards the liberation from foreign rule, while Slobodan Vladušić, through a careful reading of the poem Serbia by Miloš Crnjanski, attempts to reconstruct the latter's attitude towards his own national identity, which was thoroughly permeated by the specific historical experience of Vojvodina Serbs.

The challenges of the inter-war period - marked by the crystallisation of numerous problems caused by the foundation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes - are thematised in several papers within the present volume. Slobodan Bjelica examines in detail the politics of the National Radical Party in Vojvodina, with a special emphasis on the national question, in the period from the unification to the abolition of parliamentarism: guided by what they perceived as the interest of the Serbian people living in Vojvodina, the Radicals strived towards its "nationalization" and the suppression of the idea of its autonomy. Moving on to a different regional context, Aleksandar Životić then ventures a discussion on the Montenegrin national question, specifically on how it was regarded by the Comintern and its Yugoslav branch: as Životić points out, the Soviet influence during the decades preceding the Second World War had far-reaching consequences on the process of differentiating the Montenegrin national community from the Serbian corpus. Integral Yugoslavism, a particular national concept deriving from the complex socio-political background of the late 1920s, is the subject of Ljubodrag Dimić's paper. A meticulous analysis of its ideological assumptions and practical implications allowed Dimić to reach the conclusion that the concept in question constitutes "the greatest defeat of the Yugoslav idea", albeit King Aleksandar I Karadordević considered it exactly the opposite at the beginning of the 1930s.

The papers authored by Miloš Žikić and Boris Tomanić are thematically related: both deal with identity policies which were supported or implemented by Bulgaria in southern and south-eastern parts of Yugoslavia, but in very different contexts: Žikić focuses on pro-Bulgarian propaganda which encouraged a particular Macedonian linguistic and cultural identity on the eve of the Second World War; in contrast, Tomanić examines the situation during the war itself, when the Yugoslav territories occupied by the eastern neighbour were subject to an intense process of Bulgarisation.

The last segment of the volume covers the post-war period, while also opening certain perspectives towards the current moment. The focus of Igor Vukadinović's paper is the so-called "national equality principle", on which the distribution of places in government and public administration in socialist Yugoslavia nominally relied. According to Vukadinović's assessment, however, the application of this principle was inconsistent and, what is more, quite damaging to Serbia's jurisdiction in its autonomous provinces. The next paper addresses the manifestations of (a)national identity in Serbian art of the second half of the 20th century, in which, as shown by Katarina Mitrović, it is possible to identify not only different artistic practices and aesthetic means, but also different perceptions of the past and politics of memory. Sport, and particularly football, has been recognised by Nikola Mijatov as a highly potent domain for expressing political and ideological aspirations. An examination of Yugoslav football associations and fan groups emerging around them has enabled Mijatov to point to the maturation of strong nationalist nuclei which would play a considerable part in the disintegration of the country. Michael Antolović's paper also deals with the Yugoslav crisis, but from the perspective of academic historiography: to wit, he aims to consider the positions and roles of the leading Serbian historians during the 1980s, notably their attitudes towards the ideological burden of Yugoslav historiography, towards its common institutions and traditions, but also towards the Yugoslav project in general. Finally, the last contribution is authored by Slobodan Antonić, whose sociological analysis of the changeable attitudes towards the phenomenon of Serbian nationalism and its (mis)use to date gives an additional interdisciplinary dimension to our volume, highlighting the dynamics of the research concepts to which it is dedicated.

Dealing with the origin and the long, still unfinished career of the concepts of nationalism and patriotism in Serbian political discourse has an additional, more general aim: it is meant to contribute to the theoretical and methodological foundations of identity studies in the Serbian academic milieu. We have tried to show that research of this type must go beyond the field of history narrowly understood and use concepts from related disciplines such as sociology, political theory and cultural studies. In view of this, it must be admitted that the present volume lacks a

×

number of contributions devoted to various questions relevant to our topic such as the ideological shaping of collective memory, the causes of alternate strengthening and weakening of Serbian national consciousness, or the phenomenon of Serbian identity being replaced by others and vice versa. These are all processes that would have to be considered in a wider temporal framework leading up to the present if we are to obtain a complete and reliable picture of the current situation, which is marked by a crisis of both nationalism and patriotism. For the moment, however, we have to be satisfied with what has been achieved within the framework of our research project. This is not to say that we do not wish to return to these questions in a different and enlarged context. But we also believe that the following papers have usefully drawn attention to a number of important issues. We live today in a global unsettled world of which Serbia is a part. Long established views and values are now being questioned, as is characteristic of transitional periods: the crisis in which we find ourselves demands carefully thought out answers, and finding them will have to engage with historical experience as well.

Belgrade, December 2024

Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić Aleksandar Z. Savić

THE HERITAGE OF NEMANJA'S FATHERLAND

Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy smilja.dusanic@gmail.com

CONCEPTS OF NATIONALISM AND PATRIOTISM IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE SERBIAN MIDDLE AGES: A THEORETICAL APPROACH

The primary aim of this paper is to provide a survey of theoretical positions on the emergence of the concepts of nationalism and patriotism. These concepts are important not only because they are currently employed both in public discourse and in historical research: it is our view that the varying significance accorded them at different times, in historical writing and even more so in popular representations and political life, may lead us to a clearer understanding of the relationship between collective memory and constructed identities. As our point of view is that of a medievalist, it seemed natural to return to the beginnings, that is to the medieval roots of these concepts. They have to do with the question how the full-fledged idea of the nation was formed, i.e. with the role of protonational communities in the process of shaping national identity.

As the Serbian, predominantly hagiographic material presented in the paper clearly shows, the concepts that crucially influenced how the idea of the Serbian nation gradually emerged are already adumbrated at the time of the first Nemanjićs, above all in the work of St. Sava. We have chosen to illustrate this process by concentrating on the development of two concepts of paramount importance.

The first concept, found at the very beginning of the Nemanjić dynasty (the end of the 12th and the first decade of the 13th century), is the notion of the *love for fatherland*. It appears as the medieval precursor and functional equivalent of the feeling of patriotism. The love for fatherland is founded on the notion of homeland: it presupposes belonging to a complex entity the elements of which are (a) a territory with shifting borders, (b) a common (Serbian) language and (c) the awareness of the "beginnings" that mark the sanctity of the founder of the dynasty. The second concept, which we meet for the first time in the work of the famous hagiographer, the Athonite monk Domentian (mid-thirteenth century), is the notion of Serbs as a chosen people.

The concept of the holy Nemanjić dynasty presupposes the idea of the chosen people, which was of course also found elsewhere in mediaeval times. It was based on the cults of the two founders of the Church and State, St. Simeon (Nemanja) and his son St. Sava. From the mid 13th century the Serbian fresco painting suggests the holy roots of the Nemanjić dynasty by its renderings of the Line of Jesee, and somewhat later the analogy is quite explicit in the parallel representations of the two chosen lines, the Line of Jesee and the Line of Nemanjićs. The Serbian state is understood as a New Israel led by a holy dynasty whose sanctity is transmitted to the entire Serbian people. Formulated in this way, the idea of Serbs as God's chosen should be seen as crucial to the development of the Serbian proto-nation.

The other subject considered in the paper are the ties between the idea of celebratory memory as found in various religious practices and the development of the Serbian proto-nation through the sacralization of the idea of fatherland. One of the best examples is the case of St. Stefan of Dečani. Given the importance of Dečani as a holy place in later Serbian history, it could be argued that there is no saintly memory as significant as the one embodied in the essential ties between the monastery of Dečani, where the remains of the holy king are preserved, and the *Eulogy of the Saint* by Gregory Camblak, the prior of Dečani. This is a unique amalgam between a carefully elaborated saintly memory, based on the miraculously preserved bodily remains of the holy king, an actual holy place belonging to the Serbian tradition and the complex messages communicated by the celebratory texts, an amalgam that has no parallel in its fullness of expression and depth of meaning.

The principal message of Camblak's text concerns the most valuable Dečani relic: the reliquary with the founder's body in the naos of the monastery, where the relic had been left as a precious heritage to his fatherland. The cult of Stefan of Dečani was focused on the miraculous, healing properties of his remains. Through Camblak's text the coffin with the remains of the holy king is seen as the Serbian counterpart of the Arc of Covenant. Camblak's metaphor is placed in a theological context which emphasizes the Jerusalem symbolism of his analogy.

The early 15th century saw the appearance of a new type of celebratory texts focused on the martyr's holy body. Dynastic celebration is replaced by a conception of holiness centering on the hope for the salvation of fatherland and the prayers for it of its intercessors, the first two saints of the God-chosen Nemanjić dynasty. Martyrdom based on the typical model of sacrifice now serves as the sacral basis of the people's identity, making it a part of the entire Christendom. The neomartyr cults thus give rise to a new kind of public memory including the Jerusalem associations introduced by Camblak. His choice to speak of the saint's body, the miraculous relic which had been (and still remains) the principal guardian of the monastery, as "the fatherland's heritage" is particularly significant: it tells us more than the usual celebratory references to the incorruptible body and the healing properties of the remains by emphasizing that this is a treasure left to future generations. Typical of the foundational legends associated with holy places, fortified by invoking the blessing of the holy ancestor (in this case, St. Sava), the solemn founding charter of the Dečani monastery contains a number of important messages related to our subject which had become a part of the monastery's public memory.

With the gradual emergence of the idea of the holy Serbian empire religious identity is increasingly replaced by national identification and the consequent laicization of the pantheon of Serbian saints. This notion thus preserves the memory of the glorious, sacralised past and, in this guise, becomes a part of the Serbian national programme. The set of myths and memories included in the idea of the "golden age" is in most cases spatially determined as well: they are tied to celebrated holy places, as is clearly shown by the complex memory associated with the Dečani monastery. In Serbian early modern history monasteries become the focal points of renewed national memory which represents the miraculous powers shown by the remains of their own, Serbian saints as incontestable proof of the nation's sacredness. In this context, on the basis of the remembered and recorded past, a redefined need for a unified sacred space tied to the nation's past becomes a part of the new national memory.

The uses of the past for medieval societies are important both because they saw the past as constituted by memory and because the authority of the past served to legitimate the new public memory, itself subject to future changes. By its symbolic significance for society as a whole, collective memory transcends its initial basis in the recollections of individuals and comes to "represent" the group to which it is ascribed. The writing of history and dynastic hagiography (the typical genre of Serbian medieval literature) was important in medieval times because works belonging to these genres were capable of addressing issues of contemporary politics. They did this through projecting these issues into the past, more precisely by situating them into the eternal present, by reading history in the biblical and prophetic framework. "The right to history" goes back to early Christianity and the tradition of the Holy Fathers. In a similar fashion, whether by using well-known literary strategies to establish an uninterrupted continuity with the biblical past, or by relying on prayers and miracles of the "holy ancestors", these works were operating with the notion of historicized, eschatological time. Thus seen, the past served as an irrefutable argument invoking sacredness, tradition and the authorities that was capable of legitimating current political concerns and decisions. This way of treating the past, the present and their relationship provided the basis for the emergence of the idea of national identity which may be followed through several phases.

If seen from the perspective of the elites who had fashioned a representative picture of their present and their past, even in the time of St. Sava and, somewhat later, Domentian, we find the notion of the holy ancestor/holy founder/pater patriae, which is then generalized into the complex conception of the chosen people. In the second formative phase, during the reign of King Milutin, a new idea emerges: that of the pantheon of Serbian saints, mostly due to the hagiographic writings of Archbishop Danilo. This expansion of collective memory could take place only after the dynastic glory of the saintly Nemanjićs was complemented by the hagiography of St. Peter of Koriša, written by the monk Theodosius, and later by the new type of ascetic hagiography of King Dragutin and the hagiographies of the holy Serbian archbishops. During the 15th and the 16th century, at the time when important hagiographies of the late medieval neo-martyrs were composed, a canon of national martyrs also emerged. Celebrated individuals, embodiments of exempla virtutis, now joined the pantheon of Christian saints. Through these changes, the dream of the "golden age" with its emphasis on saints as heroes was gradually transformed into historical memory. The increasingly dominant martyrological model of holiness was focused on the suffering body, the "chosen" event such as the death of Prince Lazar on the battlefield of Kosovo, and the celebration of the redeeming sacrifice as the final victory over death. This idea, decisive for the choice of primary focus in the construction of collective memory among the Serbs, clearly reveals the process through which constructed memory becomes historical recollection, a process relying on the pantheon of national saints and the martyrological model of holiness.

To conclude: it follows from our discussion that the roots of the concepts of nationalism and patriotism, which are the focus of our research, should be traced back, in the Serbian case, to three definite elements. The first is the idea of a holy founder, as the beginning of a holy lineage/dynasty. The second is the idea of fatherland, which includes a series of complex messages that can be summed up in the notion of patriotism. The third is the idea of a chosen people, enjoying heavenly protection, which is guaranteed to the flock of Saint Simeon by the pantheon of Serbian saints, a powerful basis for the further development of the Serbian national ideal.

Keywords: proto-national communities, patriotism, collective identity, ethnic election, hagiography

Aleksandar Z. Savić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy aleksandar.savic@f.bg.ac.rs

NOVUS ISRAEL: AN OUTLINE FOR A HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF DIVINE ELECTION IN THE SERBIAN MILIEU (13TH–16TH CENTURIES)

The fact that the ancient concept of divine election (in its Judeo-Christian iteration) received a distinct political-theological elaboration in medieval Serbia is well-known and has long been acknowledged by scholars. Indeed, the belief that the secular and spiritual leaders of the Serbs - and through them the broader community - enjoyed a special status in the eyes of the Almighty is so prevalent in the sources that it simply could not go unnoticed. However, despite the fact that medievalists of various profiles have successfully illuminated certain aspects of this complex phenomenon over the past decades, a comprehensive study that would transcend the thematic and/or chronological limitations of previous considerations has yet to be written. Of course, this paper does not aspire to such an ambitious research endeavour. My aim, rather, is to present, through several examples that I consider representative, the range of religious, social, and, above all, political implications that the discourse of divine election had in various historical contexts. The discussion, which is based on the preserved corpus of celebratory texts from the period spanning the 13th to the 16th century, consists of three segments: in the first, I attempt to discern the meaning and function of the idea of chosenness in early Nemanjić hagiography, primarily in the works of hieromonk Domentian; in the second, I examine, through the same lens, the corpus of writings celebrating the memory of Prince Lazar in the years and decades following the Battle of Kosovo; finally, in the third section, I focus on the cult texts dedicated to the Branković despots of Syrmia.

The essence of the Nemanjić political-theological programme, as encapsulated in Domentian's hagiographical opus, is well known thanks to prior research: as God's chosen one, the Grand Župan Stefan Nemanja (known as Symeon after taking monastic vows) became not only the progenitor of a sacred lineage but also the spiritual father of a "new Israel". This effectively meant that, in addition to members of the ruling family, their compatriots also shared in a privileged relationship with the Almighty, themselves destined for salvation. However, if we say that Symeon Nemanja was the central figure in Domentian's vision of divine election, it can equally be asserted that his youngest son, Archbishop Sava, was the principal actor in the process through which the secular ruler of the Serbs was transformed into the spiritual bedrock of the "fatherland", and his kinsmen into a "perfect people". Of key importance in this regard was Sava's "discovery" of the East, which began with his journey to Mount Athos and continued with pilgrimages to Jerusalem and Mount Sinai. In my view, these three geographical landmarks correspond to three stages of a single, hierarchically structured progression, which, although narratively shaped as a story of travel (physical advancement through space), essentially speaks of the spiritual progression of both the protagonist himself and, indirectly, all the people whose souls were entrusted to his care. Guided by a "second Moses", the Serbs were ultimately ushered into the Holy Land, whereby their belonging to the (Eastern) Christian world was finally formalised. The elaboration of this idea should be viewed in the context of the broader ruling programme of King Uroš I (1243-1276) under whose commission Domentian wrote his hagiographies of St Sava and St Symeon - for his reign was marked not only by the economic and political strengthening of the Nemanjić Kingdom but also by the ideological consolidation of the dynasty's authority.

From the perspective of the historical circumstances under which specific discourses of divine election were created, my next case study differs significantly from the previous one. The death of Prince Lazar in battle against the Ottomans at Kosovo on 15 June 1389 marked only the beginning of a politically turbulent period characterised not only by external threats but also by internal unrest that hindered the consolidation of the state. With this in mind, it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the newly established cult of the martyr prince, which can arguably be described as the key factor of social and spiritual cohesion in the territories under the rule of the Lazarević family at the turn of the 15th century: although they had lost their ruler, the Serbs gained a heavenly protector whose relics, according to the texts composed for Lazar's veneration, became the new sacred foundation of God's chosen people. What should not be overlooked, however, is that hope for deliverance from the socio-political crisis caused by Ottoman aggression stemmed from the fact that, despite significant losses, certain structures of power survived the initial conflict and were capable of spearheading the restoration of the old order. The central figure in this endeavour was undoubtedly Prince, and later Despot, Stefan Lazarević, who possessed both the political and spiritual capital of his predecessor, drawing from it the legitimacy necessary to maintain authority during the chaotic post-Kosovo years. The discourse of divine election promoted during this time should be understood as part of the same project: shaped by the combined efforts of secular and ecclesiastical elites, it served to further emphasise the connection of Lazar's successors to the Nemanjić dynasty, to transform the ruler's sacrifice into the primary source of social unity, and to conceptualise the Ottoman threat as merely another iteration of the familiar meta-historical cycle subject to God's will (sin – punishment – repentance – redemption), which would, sooner or later, end in favour of His chosen people.

Unlike the Kosovo writings, composed during a time when hope for deliverance from external threats and the preservation of statehood could find support in relevant political actors gathered around Lazar's son, the majority of celebratory texts dedicated to the Branković family were created in a period when such expectations were, essentially, unfounded. Politically and economically weakened by the death of Despot John in 1502 and permanently extinguished by the end of the second decade of the 16th century, this lineage failed to fulfil its ruling ambitions, which appear to have been considerable at the outset. (This is clearly evidenced by their invocation of Nemanjić traditions, as documented in charters issued in the late 15th century.) In fact, the cults of the Branković despots were cultivated in an atmosphere of intense Ottoman expansion, beginning with the conquest of Belgrade (1521) and the Battle of Mohács (1526), which resulted in most of the Hungarian territories falling under the rule of Suleiman I. In search of spiritual guidance, the increasingly numerous Serbian population in Syrmia gravitated towards the local Church, specifically the Krušedol Monastery; as the seat of the metropolitan and the resting place of the holy despots, the monastery was undoubtedly its most prestigious centre. It is precisely in this context, marked by pervasive eschatological concerns, that the concept of "new Israel", evident in the cult writings dedicated to the Branković family, should be understood.

Having outlined the basis of the three case studies, I should now like to proceed to some general observations that have emerged from my research. First and foremost, it has been observed that certain patterns identified by comparative medieval studies also hold true in the Serbian case. Specifically, I believe that the discourse of divine election, both in the Serbian and many other medieval contexts, is marked by an extraordinary adaptability to various socio-political circumstances. Domentian made this discourse the cornerstone of the political-theological programme that represented a vital aspect of the Nemanjić state-building project. Owing to its privileged position before God, the dynasty was considered the intermediary between its subjects and the realm of the divine. By showing the people "a most splendent path to Jerusalem" - first the earthly and, in the long-term, the heavenly - Archbishop Sava introduced the Serbs into sacred history as a new chosen people, worthy of the Almighty's special care. However, while my first case study reflects the effort to complement the political and economic successes of the Nemanjić house with an appropriate ideological framework, the second reveals the mechanisms through which the Serbian elites at the turn of the 15th century sought to come to terms with the crisis brought on by the death of Prince Lazar on the battlefield. Drawing on the meta-historical cycle established in the Bible, the learned supporters of the Lazarević family within the Church sought to frame the consequences of the battle as part of God's plan. The defeat was depicted as punishment for sin, while the ruler's violent death was portraved as a willing sacrifice and a pledge of the salvation of the entire people. In spite of the obvious differences, these two situations are linked by the presence of a state and social order, which, in the first case, needed to be solidified according to the standards of the time, and in the second, preserved and consolidated after the destructive conflict. In contrast, the third example is completely distinct. The majority of the celebratory texts concerning the Branković family were created in a time when the titular despots' dreams of restoring their rule over the "fatherland" were already a relatively distant memory (as, in fact, were the despots themselves). The idea that the community gathered around their relics in Krušedol represented a "new Israel" is not based on the interests of any secular power centre, as in the previous cases. Their cults, into which the idea of chosenness was deliberately woven, primarily served to offer spiritual leadership to the Serbian population in southern Hungary, but also a hope for salvation, based on the intercessory role of their heavenly protectors.

It can thus be concluded that the discourse of divine election gradually assumed different forms, connotations, and functions over time. However, it is clear that despite all their specificities, the individual iterations do not represent completely isolated phenomena. This means that there is a certain degree of continuity that must be taken into account. Needless to say, one should be particularly mindful of the influence that the oldest, Nemanjić model had on the two subsequent cases studied. There is no doubt that in the Kosovo texts the focus shifted from Nemanja's holy lineage to the redemptive act of Prince Lazar, whose relics became the focal point of the "new Israel". Nonetheless, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that in some of the texts within said corpus the connection with the Nemanjić dynasty, and particularly with SS Symeon and Sava, is clearly apparent: notably, one of them depicts Lazar calling on the two saints on the day of the battle to intercede for the preservation of the covenant with God. Similarly, the writings dedicated to the members of the Branković family often invoke Symeon and Sava, emphasising the connection between the holy despots and their distant ancestors, whose salvific role they continued through their own means. Therefore, one can confidently conclude that any comprehensive study of the idea of divine election – one that would delve deeper into already examined examples and also thoroughly consider those which have not been addressed here – must take into account all the factors of continuity and discontinuity, whose intertwining, always under specific circumstances, defined the nature and meaning of its individual manifestations.

Keywords: new Israel, chosen people, St Sava, St Symeon Nemanja, Domentian, Prince Lazar, the Battle of Kosovo, the Branković despots of Syrmia

Marija Vasiljević

Institute for Balkan Studies SASA Belgrade marija.vasiljevic@bi.sanu.ac.rs

DYNASTY AS A CARRIER OF IDENTIFICATION: OLD SERBIAN GENEALOGIES

When studying the concepts of patriotism and nationalism in the political discourse of the late Middle Ages and the early modern period, it is important to consider the use of these terms. Both originated in the 18th century and have significantly shaped the modern world. These are Grundbegriffe (Reinhart Koselleck) - concepts without which political and social life cannot be fully understood. They provide a framework within which we interpret the past, draw on collective experiences, and shape our hopes, desires, and expectations for the future. Patriotism and nationalism emerged as Bewegungsbegriffe. Patriotism fostered the development of sovereignty of the people, emphasizing sacrifice for one's country and loyalty that transcends familial, local, and regional ties. In its most idealistic form, patriotism is cosmopolitan. A more localized version - national patriotism or nationalism - has adopted elements of this idea, defining itself as loyalty to one's state, land or people. Today, both concepts carry significant historical weight, and their meanings have evolved. Nationalism is often viewed negatively, while patriotism is increasingly seen as a constructive form of loyalty to an imagined community.

Although patriotism and nationalism draw on ideas and concepts with a long prehistory – *patria* and *natio* have long been studied – we do not find in them a prediction of a patriotic future or the need for a just constitution. Therefore, patriotism and nationalism, as a category of (everyday) practice, can lead to research anachronism when used as a category of scientific analysis. To avoid this, the terms could be defined as ways of imagining and defining supra-local/regional, i.e. political affiliation, and not as political ideologies that are oriented towards the future. However, it should be borne in mind that such a redefinition represents a departure from the premises of conceptual history, since these terms did not exist in the Middle Ages or the early modern period. Also, defining nationalism, and therefore national identity, as anything other than political ideology – i.e. stressing different cultural elements as crucial for national identity, which could have existed even in the Middle Ages, risks turning towards essentialism.

To address the shortcomings of both essentialism and constructivism and stress the insights of both approaches, Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper developed an approach to studying identity that utilizes the term "identification". This term, derived from a verb, emphasizes that identification is an active and cognitive process that can be driven by individuals, institutions, discourses, etc. Every identification is context-dependent and it does not always lead to the formation of a sense of community. Depending on the significance and frequency of identification, a sense of belonging to a group may or may not emerge. Furthermore, it is crucial to recognize that even the most stable identifications – ones that become the grounds for essentialist arguments – are connected to specific events, their context, and cognitive processes (perception, interpretation, and representation). Since senses of belonging are variable, would be useful to introduce the terms that reflect this spectrum, such as: commonality, connectedness, identification, groupness or community.

This approach allows for a more precise understanding of (collective) identifications in the Middle Ages and Early Modern period. These processes were multifaceted and aimed at fostering a sense of belonging to larger groups, though their scope was not all-encompassing. The crucial events that facilitated these identifications are to be found mostly in the reading of written texts. Those who were present became part of a "textual community", while the content could (cognitively) promote the idea of a broader community. The impact of a written work was shaped by the circumstances of its creation, its content, the frequency of its reading, and its distribution.

Old Serbian genealogies illustrate how texts contributed to the formation of a sense of belonging over a long period. These genealogies were written from the second half of the 14th century until the 16th century, and they continued to be copied and revised until the 18th century. They portrayed Serbian rulers as members of a single dynasty, with the history of the ruling family symbolizing the history of their state. By uniting listeners around what could be seen as a shared experience, these texts fostered a sense of belonging.

It is important to note that genealogies are "open texts", meaning their content has been changed to varying degrees and members of the dynasty were often added during the copying process. We can identify several stages in which these genealogies were written: the first describes the Nemanjić dynasty (1168–1371); next depicts Bosnian ban Tvrtko Kotromanić (Ban

1353–1377, King 1377–1391) as their member; then, Nemanjić successors, Stefan Lazarević (Prince 1389–1402, Despot 1402–1427) and Despot Durađ Branković (1427–1456), are named; after, Emperor Constantine the Great (306–337) is portrayed as an ancestor of the Nemanjićs; and finally, the last stage concerns the late Brankovićs (until beginning of the 16th century). In these instances, the ruling dynasty served as the primary category of identification. Also, other categories were part of this process, such as attribute "Serbian", the concept of Orthodoxy, and the mentions of the "Others". Due to the theme of this volume, I will also focus on the concept of fatherland. Throughout the second phase – copying and slight revisions, these categories remained relevant, symbolizing a shared past represented by the ruling dynasty.

The aforementioned categories change their meaning, sometimes from one version to another. As every representation of the past is a reflection of the present, these interpretations are tied to the time of their creation. In accordance with the genre, the dynasty itself was the key category of identification. However, its members could rule the "Serbian lands", the early Christian or Dušan's (King 1331–1346, Emperor 1346–1355) empire, or even be displaced from Serbian lands, indicating that it was not a guarantor of identification. In fact, the attribute Serbian is the most consistent category because it is tied to both the dynasty and the lands, and on two occasions the Serbs as a community are also mentioned. Orthodoxy is significant for the description of the first Nemanjićs, the story of Constantine the Great and the last Brankovićs, and it proves to be another important category. Naming the Others is present in all stages or writing, but they are mainly related to the ruling families, with the exception of Dušan's imperial title (Greeks) and the Ottomans (Turks). Fatherland, mentioned at the beginning of the dynasty, has a different meaning than the one attributed to it today - family and personal inheritance, and it was not a significant category of identification.

Genealogies, which may appear to be simple and concise writings, actually reveal complexities of identifications in older periods. The process of identification was dynamic, influenced by the specific time and place in which it occurred. This is evident in the varying emphasis on different categories in certain sections of the text, as well as the differences between the texts themselves. Additionally, we must consider the reach of these writings. While their straightforward language likely contributed to their influence – evidenced by their copying and editing – we cannot definitively determine the extent of their impact.

The question arises as to whether these writings genuinely fostered a groupness or if categories and relationships shaped various degrees of commonality or connectedness. It cannot be convincingly claimed that these writings created a clearly defined group with distinct characteristics, particularly since they narrated events that even listeners from noble or ecclesiastical backgrounds could not always relate to. If a sense of community did emerge, it likely stemmed from the internalization of the narrative as significant. In conclusion, the concepts and categories included in genealogies represent just one of the many possible ways to interpret a sense of belonging during that period. They were part of the repertoire from which meanings were drawn amidst the intense nation-building efforts of the 19th century. Notably, the most important idea that endured in the following centuries was the connection of the Nemanjić dynasty to these identifications.

Keywords: identification, genealogies, dynasty, Serbian, Orthodoxy, fatherland

Miloš Ivanović

Institute of History Belgrade misaveritatem@gmail.com

THE BORDERS OF THE SERBIAN LAND FROM THE END OF THE 12TH TO THE MIDDLE OF THE 15TH CENTURY ACCORDING TO NARRATIVE SOURCES

The term *Serbian land* can be said to be continuously encountered in narrative sources written in the Serbian-Slavonic language. These sources shed light on the events that occurred from the later decades of the 12th century until the mid-15th century. The authors of those works were mainly the highest state or church dignitaries. Their accounts are somewhat connected to the information that can be found in documents issued by the rulers. Consequently, the comparison of those sources is to a certain extent inevitable. We should note that the term *Serbian land* is closely connected to the term "fatherland" (*otačastvo*).

In the biographies they dedicated to their father, Grand Župan Stefan Nemanja (1166-1196), in 1208 and 1216 respectively, Saint Sava and Stefan Nemanjić basically equate the territories he held with Serbian land. From the data presented by them, it is clear that Serbian land also included the maritime territory of Zeta (Dioclea). Sava described all territories conquered by Stefan Nemanja as the renewal of his grand paternal heritage. It should be pointed out that in the charters issued by Stefan the First-Crowned (1196–1227), besides the term "all Serbian lands", the names Dioclea, Dalmatia, Travunia and Zachlumia (Hum lands) were also mentioned and used particularly for Serbian maritime principalities. In 1263/1264, in The Life of Saint Simeon, hieromonk Domentijan describes the conquests of Stefan Nemanja in an almost identical manner as Stefan Nemanjić. A decade earlier, the same author wrote *The Life of Saint Sava*. In this biography, he mentions, as a rule, maritime lands together with Serbian land. In this manner, he applied the intitulation that could be seen in the contemporary documents issued by the Serbian rulers. However, we cannot generally doubt that he also perceived the entire state territory as *Serbian land*. Monk Theodosius the Hilandarian, about whom there is scarce information, apparently wrote in the later decades of the 13th century. It can be discerned

that in *The Life of Saint Sava*, he mainly used the term *Serbian land* to denote the entire territory which was governed by the Serbian rulers. He clearly indicated that the maritime principalities, mentioned in the intitulations of documents issued by the Serbian rulers, were actually *Serbian lands*. Furthermore, Theodosije the Hilandarian consistently called Saint Sava the *Archbishop of all Serbian lands*, except in one specific instance.

Archbishop Danilo II left an extensive hagiographic body of work. He is believed to have written the biographies of Queen Jelena, as well as of her sons, King Dragutin and King Milutin, between 1317 and 1324. In the period 1317–1324, when he was head of the Serbian Church, Danilo II wrote the biographies of Archbishop Arsenije I and Archbishop Jevstatije I, and he may also have authored *The Life of Archbishop Joanikije*. From numerous examples it is clear that he also used the term *Serbian land* for the entire state territory. Writing about King Dragutin, he made a clear distinction between *Serbian land* and the territories which had been given to King Dragutin by the Hungarian Crown for his governance. It appears that he clearly understood that, although these territories were held by a member of the Nemanjić dynasty, they actually belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary. Danilo II wrote about King Milutin's conquests of vast Byzantine territories as extending the borders of *Serbian land*, i.e., the fatherland (*otačastvo*).

Danilo's anonymous disciple wrote *The Life of Archbishop Danilo* and most likely authored the hagiographies of King Stefan of Dečani (1321–1331) and his son Stefan Dušan (1331–1355), thus covering the period until 1335. These hagiographies are believed to have been written between 1337 and 1345, definitely before Dušan's coronation as emperor. We could say that, much like his teacher, this unnamed disciple used the term *Serbian land* in the meaning of the state of Serbian kings. Nevertheless, certain differences between the two authors are detectable. Namely, Danilo's disciple does not state that the territories of *Greek lands*, conquered by King Stefan of Dečani after the Battle of Velbazhd, were included in the fatherland. It is not clear whether the absence of such a statement is merely a coincidence or whether it should be interpreted as a different treatment of the conquered lands.

In his descriptions of King Dušan's early conquests, Danilo's disciple emphasises that the ultimate intention of the Serbian ruler was to banish Byzantine emperor Andronicus III (1328–1341) from *his empire of Greek land*. On the other hand, as was the case before, he notes that the conquered Greek territories were added to the lands of the fatherland (*otačastvo*). Further conquests by Stefan Dušan were not described in more detail in the Serbian narrative works, but information about them, known from other sources, is worth mentioning. After new conquests, approximately in August 1343, Dušan added to his royal title *Greek lands*, i.e., territories, and the Greeks alike. By the end of 1345 he declared himself emperor and in April 1346 he was crowned emperor, and that is how a new stage ensued. Stefan

Miloš Ivanović

Dušan signed Serbian documents as the "emperor of the Serbs and Greeks", whereas in the documents written in Greek he used the phrase the "emperor and autocrat of Serbia and Romania". It is also obvious from the intitulations of his charters that there was a distinction between Serbian and Greek lands. Owning and governing Greek territories was considered a prerequisite for being elevated from a kingdom to an empire. Multiple sources indicated the existence of two parts of the empire – the Serbian and the Greek. Roughly speaking, we could say that *Serbian land* was considered to be the one-time lands of the Nemanjić dynasty, extended during King Milutin's rule, whereas Greek land referred to the former Byzantine Empire territories which were conquered by Stefan Dušan.

The period of weakening and fall of the Serbian empire during the rule of Dušan's son Uroš (1355-1371) had practically no accounts in biography literature. Still, one of Danilo's successors, the author of the notes on Patriarch Sava IV (1354-1375) and Patriarch Jefrem (1375-1379; 1389–1390/1391) provided valuable information about the collapse of the Serbian Empire. According to him, one part of Uros's empire was claimed by Prince Lazar, the other by Vukašin, who even dared to take the title of king, whereas the Greek territories and cities were seized by Uglješa. This is yet another piece of information that stands witness to the fact that Greek lands were treated as a special part of the Empire, different from other Nemanjić lands. This comes as no surprise because it was specifically the governing of these territories that gave rise to schism, when Patriarch Callistus of Constantinople anathematised Emperor Dušan, Patriarch Joanikije and his bishops. The authors of some older Serbian chronicles also stress that Stefan Dušan declared himself emperor once he had subdued Greek land. It can be seen that they renounced the territories which actually remained within the Serbian state for a very short time.

The term *Serbian land* is again found in the iconic texts about Prince Lazar, written in the period between 1393 and 1419/1420. In *The Oration of Saint Prince Lazar*, written around 1393, Patriarch Danilo III indicates in one statement that the territories conquered by Stefan Dušan could not be included in the fatherland (*otačastvo*). This author consistently refers to the territory governed by Prince Lazar, who was killed in 1389 in the Battle of Kosovo, and subsequently by his son Stefan Lazarević, as *Serbian land*. The authors of other cult texts wrote in a similar manner when referring to the territory governed by prince Lazar. The data provided by the authors of the cult texts are essentially in accordance with what can be found in the intitulations and signatures of Prince Lazar's charters. Admittedly, the terms Podunavlje (the Danube River basin lands) and Pomorje (maritime lands) can also be found in reference to Serbian land. However, the absence of their mention in the iconic writings is understandable since the mentioned lands did not have any particular identity.

The Life of Despot Stefan Lazarević by Constantine the Philosopher was written in the 1430s and it stands for one of the most significant narrative sources in the first half of the 15th century. Constantine the Philosopher uses the term Serbian land for the territories governed by the Lazarević family. On the other hand, Balša III (1403-1421), who ruled the territory of Żeta, was mentioned as an Albanian lord. The name "Albania" is known to have become accepted and used for Venetian lands in the South Adriatic region from the late 14th century. The term later became a part of the Latin version of the title of Despot Đurađ Branković (1427-1456), heir to despot Stefan. It seems quite certain that "Albania", i.e., Zeta, was treated as a special part of the state territory, which was apparently not perceived as Serbian land. It should be noted that this had nothing to do with the ethnic structure of this region. On the whole, it can be said that Constantine thought of other territories added by Despot Stefan to his state as his fatherland, although he treated the territory governed by the Branković family in the same manner. Wanting to stress the border position of Belgrade, which was Despot Stefan's capital, Constantine said that, although the city lay in Serbian lands, it was located in the heart and on the shoulders of Hungarian land.

The anonymous author of a text about the transfer of the relics of Holy Evangelist Luke to the Serbian capital of Smederevo on 12th January 1453 mentions maritime towns, regions around the Sava and Danube Rivers, as well as some parts of Hungary and Bosnia as special territories under the rule of Despot Đurađ Branković. What was meant by parts of Bosnia was Srebrenica, which Despot Stefan Lazarević in all likelihood got in 1411 from Hungarian King Sigismund, as well as estates in the region of Usora, which Despot Đurađ Branković succeeded in conquering in 1433. The last narrative source to be highlighted in this research is the *Account of the Transfer of the Relics of Saint John of Rila from Tarnovo to the Rila Monastery*, known as *The Story of Rila*, which was written around 1469 by Vladislav the Grammarian, born in Novo Brdo (present-day Kosovo) in the 1430s. As was the case with Danilo's disciple, this scribe did not consider *Serbian land* the territories conquered by King and Emperor Stefan Dušan.

Based on the analysed sources, we could say that the expanse of *Serbian land* until the rule of Stefan Dušan grew and matched the entire territory under the rule of this king. Byzantine lands which were conquered by King and Emperor Dušan were indicated as *Greek land* and were in this manner perceived all through the end of the Middle Ages. In the late 14th and the early 15th centuries, the term *Serbian land* was equated with the territory governed by Prince Lazar and his son, Prince and Despot Stefan. The lands acquired by the Serbian despots in Zeta and Bosnia were not perceived as *Serbian land*.

Keywords: Serbian land, borders, fatherland, Greek land, biographies, Byzantine Empire, territory Zorica Vitić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philology zvitic@fil.bg.ac.rs

"OUR" LANGUAGE IN SERBIAN SLAVONIC MARGINALIA AND WRITINGS (13TH-15TH CENTURY)

The paper offers an analysis of the ambiguous noun *E3biKb* ("language", "people") in numerous Serbian Slavonic marginalia from the 13th to the 15th centuries, in two philological texts from the 15th century (*The Skazanie o Pismeneh* by Constantine the Philosopher and *The Epistle on the Language* by deacon Grigorios), as well as in the most common genre of old Serbian literature – hagiography.

In the oldest original works of Slavonic writers (Clement, Constantine, anonymous writers of biographies and services dedicated to the Thessaloniki Brothers, Chernorizets Hrabar), there is already a common belief that "God's word" in one's own language was "God's gift for the right side" (Constantine of Preslav, *Proclamation of the Holy Gospels*) and, therefore, the only proper manner of the Slavs being equally included in the community of Christian nations. Although as early as the 11th century there were different versions of the Old Church Slavonic language, in the entire Slavonic world one literary language was still in use, preserving their cultural togetherness and overcoming ethnic divisions (R. Picchio). Nevertheless, gradual modifications, particularly at the phonological and lexical levels, made the Old Slavonic literary text close and comprehensible to Serbian native speakers. "Hence, they felt that the Serbian version was their own language, different from other versions of the Old Church Slavonic" (D. Bogdanović).

In Serbian Slavonic, the language was denoted concurrently by the syntagms "Slavonic", "our/own" and "Serbian" language, while marginalia happen to be the main source for monitoring the time of their emergence and frequency in certain periods. In the oldest manuscripts, as well as later on, "there is a visible Slavonic sentiment" (Đ. Trifunović) – the Slavonic language, books, script, and "our Slavonic people" are mentioned. In the marginalia from the *Ilovica nomocanon* (1262), the following is written for the translation from Greek into Serbian Slavonic: "[books] appeared in the **Slavonic** language" and "**our** language appeared in the world" (SSZN, I, No. 19, 38).

Monk Isaija (Elder Isaija) begins the introductory, "philological" part of the famous colophone about the Battle of Maritsa (1371) by recalling the centuries-long experience of translating Greek books among the Slavs and honouring the Greek language, as well as the "Enlighteners of the Slavs" (Constantine/Cyril and Methodius):

Since there were many, a long time and many years ago, in different places, among **our Slavonic people**, who translated divine tests from the extremely wise, artistic and very precious Greek language into **our language**, but whose names are not known to the people, but are written in the books of the living in God's name, after them, many years later... I happened to learn a little Greek so that I can understand its preciousness and the difficulty of translating it into **our language**. Namely, the Greek language was first given and spread by God, and then it was perfected with time by various lovers of wisdom. And **our Slavonic language was greatly created by God**, because everything created by God is great, but the one who is deprived of love in learning venerable words is not worthy of men's skills.

Together with the topos of humility, common in marginalia, Isaija's statement "fits in with an understanding and with the world of profound acceptance and true Byzantine-Slavonic togetherness in which the hierarchical values of Byzantine civilization are exactly known and observed" (I. Špadijer).

The oldest mention of the Serbian language from 1374 is in the marginalia at the end of the *Pentekostarion* written at Mount Sinai for the Monastery of the Holy Archangels Michael and Gabriel in Jerusalem, the foundation of King Milutin (A. Mladenović). Now it is kept in the library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem. However, the last sheet of this manuscript, with the marginalia, was lost in the process of returning manuscripts from Russia to Jerusalem in the 19th century:

The last part of this *Pentekostarion* was written at Mount Sinai, by the hand of God's servants hieromonk Jacob and sinful Yanniki in the Serbian Church of Holy Archangel in Jerusalem, from the true Athonite copying template, comparing everything with the Typicon and with the Octoichon so that nothing was omitted, from the new but reliable transcript of the Bulgarian language, and only God knows how uneasy was for us to translate it into the Serbian language (SSZN, I, 144).

The marginalia often contain the technical term related to transcribing – "izvod", meaning "copying template". Priest Panaret had to do serious editorial work when transcribing the book in 1424:

I, sinful Priest Panaret, wrote this book from the **Serbian template**, not knowing anything about it. But when I began comparing it to the Greek extract, many things were not consistent, so I had to turn to other books in order to be able to follow the Greek books. And I was terribly sad because of it and began comparing it word for word. And then I began erasing something and writing something else instead, so that I could use little from many books, but I could not correct everything because it is impossible to turn the Sun into the Moon or the Moon into the Sun (SSZN, I, 235).

In two philological texts from the 15th century, the following positions about the nature and sound of the Serbian language were stated:

Constantine the Philosopher, *The Skazanie o Pismeneh*: "Because how could the subtlety unique, Syrian or Jewish be expressed in such a strong (rough) language? But neither could it be expressed by the **Serbian high and thin voice**."

Deacon Grigorios, *The Epistle on the Language*: "**The Serbian speech** seems to flow slowly and fully, while Bulgarian is much sharper, as if resembling Greek. Hence, **the Serbian language** prefers *varies* (strong accents), while Bulgarian prefers *oxies* (sharp accents)".

In Serbian extensive biographical literature, "our language" is mentioned only three times – by Domentijan, Theodosije the Hilandarian, and Constantine the Philosopher.

The meaning and role of language is precisely defined by hieromonk Domentijan in *The Life of Saint Sava*, in the part where Saint Sava teaches new bishops: "And that is how we are always worthy of caring for ourselves without leaving our nearest and dearest to care for us. And if someone reaches the books, let him be sweet with the salt of **our language**". D. Bojović gives an inspiring interpretation of this quote: "That language has the sweetness of the salt spoken about by Saint Sava to his disciples, newly-appointed bishops. That language in which Christ is the salt (because He is the salt), is the greatest barrier against blandness and death (cf. Matthew 5, 13). That is why our language is alive, sweet, eternal. Its antiquity is measured by its future and not by past centuries. These centuries are only the foundation of the indestructible home, in which the language is the host to memory".

In the scene preceding Sava's first prayer for myrrh-pouring over Simeon's relics in Hilandar, in Theodosije's *Life of Saint Sava*, addressing the Protos of Mount Athos, Saint Sava suggests the following: Therefore, father, I shall, with the brethren, withdraw to the tower to hold the morning service **in my language**, and you, Holy Father, with all your people here in the great church, by my father's grave, sing the morning hymns celebrating his memory and, please, pray for his resting in peace.

Moreover, Constantine the Philosopher in *The Life of Despot Stefan Lazarević* only mentions the language briefly, speaking about the Turkish struggle over power: "And this one (Musa), running away, found the place called Stenimaha (Stenimachos), which in **our language** means *close fight*, a long existing town fortification".

The noun "language" was much more used as a metonymy for speech. In writing Saint Sava's biography, Domentijan managed to emphasize in different ways the "sweetness" of the language whenever it is mentioned, and he even coined a special compound adjective "honey-worded speech":

And that is how this disciple of God (Stefan) by terrible force and miracles and divine words, with the help of God's word and the **honey-worded speech** and love ties of apostle love, trapped this king.

In Bethlehem: "And with all cordial love of Him in his bright soul, and with unspeakable **sweetness** and heavenly praise in **his God-loving language**."

Translation of Sava's relics: "And spreading the loving hearts previously infused by his divine teaching and **sweetened by his God-praising eloquent language**."

Theodosije the Hilandarian describes Sava's language as "God-praising eloquent" and "devout", while in Danilo's *Life of Archbishop Jevstatije I* it is described as "God-inspired".

Within the favourite topos of ineffability, most frequently in a series of rhetoric questions, at the beginning of the praise to the saint, there is a common formulation: "Which **language** will speak your secrets, you, great holy old man" (Stefan the First-Crowned, *Life of Saint Simeon*). Archbishop Danilo II asks a similar question in *The Life of King Milutin*:

I am terrified and I tremble from where to begin, and what to put at the end. Who will list all his miracles? Which **polysemous language** will tell his secret deeds to God, of which human nature cannot learn...

However, in *The Life of Queen Jelena*, the topos of unworthiness and the prayer to God for creation are combined:

And what should I, a sinner, attempt, being the one who tries to confess separately the God-pleasing deeds of this blessed venerable lady? But you, my Lord God, who sent your Holy Spirit, who strengthens this servant of yours by his three-fold grace, enlighten my mind, **clarify the language too**, so that I can sensibly and meaningfully end writing about the life of this blessed lady. In *The Life of Archbishop Danilo II*, his Disciple summarizes the characteristics making the initial portrait of the saint in two syntagms. "My blessed Lord and God-chosen monk Danilo, shining in the midst of the assembly as the brightest lighthouse, **was of a benevolent appearance and an eloquent language**". However, before the end of this biography, the Disciple meticulously describes his teacher's eloquence:

The God-beloved one... treasuring a wealth in himself, an art of sense and wisdom, and a narration with mysterious words, whose **eloquent language** resembles the prophet's praise, as well as the pen of a quick-writing scribe, because grace poured out on his lips.

The words of Saint Stefan of Dečani also refer to Danilo in the eponymous biography:

My Lord and father... you would multiply your God-given talent, and you would sow the divine seed, or your words, into the ruts of our hearts, withered by the malice of the vanities of this life, and you would give them water **as from the hail-bearing cloud of the language** of your message.

Therefore, the language question was dealt with throughout the Middle Ages mainly in the marginalia by translators, transcribers as well as true philologists in shorter or longer debates, such as those penned by the *prevodnik* (translator) Constantine and deacon Grigorios. However, in other works of our authors the language is also emphasized as something determining and one's own; indeed, one of the most important characteristics of holy Serbian rulers and archbishops is "our" sweet, honey-worded, God-loving, divine, theological, eloquent language.

Keywords: language naming, Serbian Slavonic, marginalia, philological texts, hagiographies

Nebojša Porčić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy nebojsa.porcic@f.bg.ac.rs

"FOR THE PATRIMONY, FATHERLAND, COUNTRY AND REALM": THE NATIONAL AND THE PATRIOTIC IN THE WORLD OF SERBIAN MEDIEVAL CHIVALRIC ROMANCE

A recent study of the presence and forms of expression of national and patriotic sentiments in the documents of medieval Serbian rulers confirmed that in the given historical setting such sentiments had to contend with other powerful sources of collective identification: the Christian faith and its church, the network of personalized relationships characteristic of the feudal or feudally derived political system, and the sharp division of society into various legally distinct groups. Conversely, the same study also demonstrated that forms of national and patriotic sentiments did exist and were not infrequently expressed. However, within that corpus of historical sources these expressions were for the most part permeated and shaped by the tenets, teaching and rhetoric of the Christian faith, most notably in the concept of God's chosen people and special grace. Only occasionally there appeared glimpses of national and patriotic sentiments cast in a more secular mold, closer to the expressions of the "mature" nationalism and patriotism characteristic of the 19th and 20th centuries.

In an attempt to further illuminate these early traces of the "modern" forms of national and patriotic sentiments, attention is drawn to another corpus of surviving medieval Serbian texts – the works of chivalric literature. Intended primarily for the education and entertainment of the main political class of that society – the secular nobility with the monarch as its highest representative – these works often touched on the subjects of politics and war, thereby gaining access to current political discourse as a source of role models and guidance. Although medieval Serbian literature

is known to have included tales of such chivalric characters as Tristan, Lancelot and Bevis of Hampton, the only works of the genre available today in their Old Serbian language versions are the *Romance of Troy* and the *Alexander Romance*. Fortunately, even in a much wider pool of chivalric romances, these two stories, centered on the course of a legendary war and on the biography of one of history's most renown monarchs, would certainly rank among the best suited for the examination proposed here.

After these promising general observations, a more attentive analysis of the text of the *Romance of Troy* may prove disappointing. In its roughly 9,000 words, national and patriotic content is practically nonexistent. Although the sides in conflict are designated as "Greeks" and "Trojans", the main framework of collective identification is provided by the sense of belonging to the noble warrior class, the "knights". In fact, the designations of "Greek" and "Trojan" are frequently used as adjectives with the noun "knight", while the protagonists, including the monarchs, fight under their own personal standards and for their knightly companions, at the same time displaying a sense of kinship with their knightly opponents.

At first glance, the Serbian Alexander Romance may seem similar. Its approximately 35,000-word text frequently refers to its protagonists as "knights", while their actions are depicted against the backdrop of a society based on personalized loyalties and imbued with the knightly ethos. Alexander occasionally presents himself as "a knight and Macedonian emperor", addresses his followers as "my Macedonian knights" and utters moral statements such as: "It is better for us all to die in battle than to flee before the Persians". In addition to that, use of the possessive pronoun in Alexander's address exemplifies an oft-repeated pattern mirroring the personalized nature of monarchical power within that system - concepts like "country", "state", "realm", "cities", "riches", "domain", "army", as well as individuals and groups, are all described as "his" and all acts of betrayal are portrayed as committed against "him". Finally, the motif of God's special grace, which appears in the Serbian Alexander Romance as part of its characteristic effort to Christianize a story set in pagan times, is again linked not to the people, country or state but to the person of the monarch.

Nevertheless, the Alexander of the *Romance* could not evade his historical role of a powerful ruler and general who crosses paths with other rulers of states and peoples, notably Darius of Persia, Porus of India and Nectanebo of Egypt, and descriptions of those interactions did in the end provide an environment favorable to expressions of national and patriotic sentiments. An instructive example, demonstrating their intermingling with other factors of collective identification, is offered by the episode with the Persian nobleman Ambysos. Motivated by personal loyalty to his emperor Darius, Ambysos volunteers to assassinate Alexander in the Macedonian camp, but Alexander captures him and spares his life. Ambysos returns to Darius, reports his failure ("God, who loves him [Alexander], preserved him") and states that his attempt has settled his debt of loyalty to Darius and that he will now enter the service of his new benefactor Alexander. Within this tale steeped in knightly ethos and personalized politics, with a touch of special divine grace, we also encounter preconditions for the existence of national and patriotic sentiments and their clear expressions. Ambysos disguises himself by placing "the Macedonian sign on this shield" and identifies himself as "a Persian and Darius' nobleman", but the most striking are the words with which Darius sends him on his initial mission: "If you succeed and pay with your own life for the death of Alexander, thus delivering Persia from that terrible peril, your death shall turn into life eternal, you shall give me the realm with your own hand and the Persians shall call you great!"

Evidently, the world of the *Serbian Alexander Romance* belonged not only to knights and God's chosen monarchs, but also to peoples who are ethnically self-aware and have their own ethnonymous countries whose self-sacrificial defense they regard as a great deed, worthy of eternal memory. The frequency of ethnonyms and their stable, even casual, use to name countries, both as "lands" and as "states", "domains" or "realms", corresponds well with similar practices noted in the documents of Serbian medieval rulers, indicating the existence among the contemporary Serb audience of the necessary preconditions to recognize and validate expressions of national and patriotic sentiments in the literary text as reflections of their real political sensibilities.

On the most basic level, concrete examples of these sentiments in the Serbian Alexander Romance take the form of general expressions of affection towards one's own people, country and state. These could include directly addressing compatriots as "beloved" (notably also "beloved above all others") or showing a preference for being in their company, but also subtly associating thoughts of home with the feeling of being enamored, as in Alexander's epistle to his mother, tutor and others he left in Macedonia: "Know that my thought never once touched upon you and the home folk until the love of a woman took over my heart, yet as soon as love pierced my heart I also started thinking about you." In a similar vein, death away from home is frequently brought up as a grave misfortune, especially in the elegiac prophecy that Alexander, for all his greatness, will never again see his "country", "realm" or "fatherland". Homeland and home folk are preferable even to a prosperous life in foreign lands ("Every treasure and glory is sweet among one's home folk, while among foreigners they are as gold that lies dead"). It is therefore not surprising that Alexander refuses to let anyone else govern Macedonia ("I shall grant and parcel out the whole world, but Macedonia I shall give to none"), adding: "I am emperor of the whole world, but everyone calls me the Macedonian emperor".

The more specific motif of concern for the wellbeing of the people, country and state is exemplified by refraining from actions that would result in the "destruction of all the beauties of our land", enquiring "how does the land/realm of Macedonia/Persia stand" or lamenting oncoming perils ("Woe unto you, oh great land of Egypt!") and even criticizing monarchs for causing them ("And they shall gravely injure Egypt, solely because of you"). Also, monarchs often deliberate about the fate of their peoples and realms after their deaths. The dying Darius exhorts Alexander to "love the Persians for they are true to their master" adding that, if he does so, "my sorrow shall turn into joy", while Alexander commands his generals to "divide all earthly realms among yourselves, and keep Macedonia (or, in variants in different manuscripts, the Macedonian banner/throne/people/ army') well". An interesting insight into some of the qualities which were deemed to constitute the wellbeing of a country or people is given when Alexander, lacking an heir, proudly bequeaths to "Macedonia" (var. "Macedonians") his "grand achievements and good deeds".

True to its genre, the Serbian Alexander Romance contains some striking examples of the willingness to contribute to the wellbeing of the people, country and state by participating in armed struggle. A prime example of this motif is Nectanebo's call to Egyptians to "make ready to defend the patrimony, fatherland, country and realm" (var. "patrimonial land and realm of the fathers"). Perhaps not altogether random, this sequence of terms covers a wide range of factors capable of provoking patriotic sentiments in the Middle Ages – a nobleman's landed inheritance guaranteed by the monarch, the territory marked by the community's historical heritage, the territory serving as the physical support of the community's livelihood and the community's political structure. A particularly Serbian note is provided by some manuscripts which apply here the term *dedina*, "heritage of the grandfathers", most famously used by Stefan Nemanja, the founder of the Nemanjić dynasty, to describe the object of his rule. There are similar examples of this motif associated with Macedonians, but two of the more distinctive are, perhaps expectedly, spoken by the defending Persians and their monarch Darius: "Yesterday Alexander shattered us, tomorrow we shall shatter him; not a few Persian knights shall rise to defend the land of their fathers" and "I shall either defeat you and yours or honorably die on my land with my people".

A culmination of sorts is provided by expressions of national and patriotic sentiments through claims of superiority in relation to others. Such "chauvinistic" examples are practically exclusively attributed to Macedonians. They include statements of general superiority ("With my father Philip you were better than all peoples, and therefore you rule with me"; "Macedonian sword arms are unfaltering", and even: "There are no obstacles for Macedonian horses, no river can thwart them"), but also statements directed against particular opponents. Alexander delivers several of these to Darius and the Persians ("Be content with the eastern lands, pontificating over the Persians who are as trepid and unheroic as you are, but stay clear of the West, lest you yourself perish"; "Count not on the Persians when coming against us: they are fair and adorned like women, but the Macedonians are indomitable lions"; "You know already that Persians are called sheep, and Macedonians wolves: before one wolf many sheep flee") and they are shown to be shared by his "Macedonian knights", but the most elaborate example is saved for Porus and the Indians: "O, great Porus, you Indian jackass ... come to the battle with all your might, to do more honor to the Macedonians; for the more troops you bring against us, the greater shall be the courage with which I shall shatter you."

Numerous and rich in content, the examples cited above strongly justify the initial expectation that works of this genre can provide a deeper insight into expressions of national and patriotic sentiments in medieval Serbian society. However, it must be remembered that the Serbian Alexander Romance was a translation and adaptation of literary accounts of the (sometimes altogether fantastic) adventures of a non-Serbian monarch, which originated outside Serbia and were themselves based on texts from classical and late antiquity, a distant and socio-pollitically very different era. To what extent then can the *Romance* be considered illustrative of medieval Serbian political discourse? In view of the extremely complex tradition and wide diffusion of the Alexander Romance throughout medieval Europe and the Mediterranean, this matter requires additional research. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the Romance enjoyed great popularity in Serbia at least from the early 14th century, when its episodes and the person of Alexander are evoked several times as models in *Danilo's Anthology*, the collection the hagio-biographies of Serbian rulers from the Nemanjić dynasty which, through its subject-matter, authors and audience, constituted the very essence of the current Serbian political discourse. Therefore, considering the evident popularity, confirmed influence and clearly stated didactic purpose of the Alexander Romance, it seems justified to postulate that its expressions of national and patriotic content had their parallels and echoes among contemporary Serbs, thus enabling us to contemplate a Serbian medieval ruler calling on his subjects to "make ready to defend the patrimony, fatherland, country and realm", confident that "not a few Serbian knights shall rise to defend the land of their fathers" and that "Serbian sword arms are unfaltering" to the point that "the more troops the enemy brings against us, the greater shall be the courage with which he shall be shattered".

Keywords: Serbia, Middle Ages, political discourse, national sentiment, patriotic sentiment, chivalric romance, *Romance of Troy, Serbian Alexander Romance*

Srđan Pirivatrić

Institute for Byzantine Studies SASA Belgrade srdjan.pirivatric@vi.sanu.ac.rs

SERBS AS TRIBALLI, DALMATAE AND DACIANS: A CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING THE USE OF SOME CLASSICAL ETHNONYMS AS BYZANTINE IDENTIFIERS FOR THE SERBS (FROM THE MID-10TH TO THE EARLY 13TH CENTURY)

The text is dedicated to the consideration of selected examples of the use of certain ancient ethnonyms as identity marks for Serbs in Byzantine texts written between mid-10th century and the beginning of the 13th century. The most commonly used ethnonyms have been considered having in mind the influence of Byzantine-Roman perceptions of the exceptionality of the Roman Emperor, Empire and Romans, as well as the dichotomy Romansbarbarians as the main matrix determining the politically and culturally dominant view of other nations. The emphasis is placed on the political connotations of the use of ancient ethnonyms as the element of the general Byzantine barbarian discourse and the form of barbarization of the other in representative texts such as imperial speeches and imperial histories.

As an important topic of Byzantine writers, Serbs appear in the middle of the 10th century, in the writing of Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and his circle. Porphyrogenitus' approach to the ethnonymy and horonymy of Serbs as the linguistically adapted endonyms is principally characterized by verism which, in the spirit of his writings, has practical political purposes. Theophanes Continuatus associates Serbs with the ethnonym Scythians which, inherited from ancient times, represented a barbarian archetype in Byzantine literature. However, this identification is ephemeral and may be encountered only subsequently in John (Joannes) Tonara's writing. In his text, also with a practical purpose, Katakalon Kekaumenos follows the realistic, veristic approach in the ethnonymy of Serbs, but also introduces elements for the identification of Serbs as Triballi and Serbs as Dacians, present among writers later on.

The Byzantine discourse about Serbs became more complex during the reign of the Komnenos dynasty and its successors from the Angelos dynasty, first in imperial histories and the in the rhetoric essays which were also focused on presenting a certain - both ideal and realistic - imperial image. John (Joannes) Skylitzes was the first Byzantine writer who in his history, for unclear reasons, placed Serbs into the barbarian discourse, through the horonymy Triballia (Trivallia, probably by modifying the terms Tribunia/Trivunia and Prevalis/Praevalitana, later Trivallis), existing concurrently with the horonym Serbia as part of the ruler's title. Moreover, Skylitzes introduced approximate identification of Triballi as inhabitants of Diokleia and of Serbs as inhabitants of Serbia, i.e., the remaining Serbian lands. In the so-called imperial speeches of the court rhetors, they become a common and relatively important topic, of course, in line with the manner and purpose of the genre, with the main topic of emperors and their praise as rulers, particularly of their military successes, in case those were emperor-warriors, such as John II Komnenos, his sone and heir Manuel I Komnenos and, eventually, Isaac II Angelos. In addition, these texts were sometimes also a medium for the informal political speech which served to announce potential future directions of politics or to justify the ones from the past. In imperial speeches or other rhetoric essays Serbs most frequently appear under the name of one of the older, late-ancient peoples who inhabited the same or similar territory, while in the essence of that archaization was the principle of geographical identification of old and new barbarians. The key to understanding the archaization by the geographical principle was provided in the 6th century by Procopius, who, regarding the group of Goths living north of the Black Sea, explained that in ancient times they had been called Scythians, just as all the peoples inhabiting this region were called. In an unusual rhetor text from the Komnenos era, the key is given to understanding the relationship between archaic and modern ethnonyms: "Serbs were called both Dacians and Dalmatae, Bulgarians were called Triballi, as well as Illyrians, while Hungarians were called Peons, Pannonians and Gepids", although it should be emphasized that this key was neither completely accurate nor consistently applied. For the less educated and competent listeners and readers of imperial speeches, the introduction of various barbarians named by a repertoire of old ethnonyms to the historical stage, which was dominated by the Roman emperor, definitely made an impression of its antiquity, as well as of certain unchangeability in the roles of the victorious and the defeated. However, the use of archaic ethnonyms in imperial speeches also had a special political purpose. Archaization emphasized the ancient quality of the imperial right to power over a certain people and territory inhabited by it, and thus justified the previous or future military and political steps. In the 12th-century texts, mainly in imperial speeches and imperial histories, Serbs are most frequently denoted by ancient ethnonyms as Triballi, Dalmatae and Dacians, more rarely as Diokleians and Serbs. The reason why in the texts of Byzantine rhetors of the mid-12th century Serbs are most commonly mentioned as Dalmatae, while the venue of imperial clashes with them is referred to as Dalmatia, is the focus of the imperial politics on the restoration of Byzantine power in former topic of Dalmatia, as well as in its hinterland, the historical province of Dalmatia. The introduction of the ethnonym Dalmatae and the horonym Dalmatia implied the imperial historical right to Dalmatia in its non-defined late-ancient borders and, accordingly, to all the nations inhabiting this territory. Serbs also appear in the role of ancient Dacians, in line with the geographical identification of the eastern Serbian territory, in the context of the apology of imperial politics in the Danube River basin, while the actual Hungarians appear mainly under the names of Gepids and Peons in the rhetor writings. The actual ethnonym "Serbs" rarely appears in rhetor texts, mostly in those written immediately after the events they refer to, while with the passage of time, when describing past events, writers preferred using the palette of archaic ethnonyms. The texts of court rhetors reflect the political moment and focus of the imperial politics on the territories of ancient provinces or dioceses of Dalmatia and Dacia. Old names of imperial enemies were supposed to be understood among the listeners of imperial speeches as the names of former and future imperial subjects, which were used for the purpose of appropriation and metonymy that removes their primary endonymous ethnic identity, thus placing them into the provincial map of the empire. In imperial historiography, John (Joannes) Kinnamos uses the actual ethnonym Serbs in his text, as well as the archaic ethnonym Dalmatae, already common in that epoch; the emperor's military actions against Serbs are said to occur in Dalmatia, while the Serbian Grand Prince is referred to as the arch-prince of Dalmatia. In this respect, the same observation also refers to these cases - that the chosen ethnonymy was determined by the Byzantine political focus on Dalmatia. The success of the imperial politics in reconquering Dalmatia in 1165 was reflected in the ethnonymy of Serbs so that they were no longer be associated with the notion of Dalmatia, which changed once again after the annexation of this region to Hungary in 1181, when the term "Dalmatae" was once again associated with Serbs in Byzantine texts. Even the historical context of the first Byzantine-Serbian dynastic marriage - the engagement of Evdokia Angelina Komnene and Stefan Nemanjić - was

not a sufficient reason for not referring to Serbs as Dalmatae in the contemporary rhetoric writing, although the dissolution of that marriage was probably the reason why they were called Triballi in the history of Niketas Choniates, the writer who referred to Serbs both as Dalmatae and by using their authentic ethnonym.

After the first fall the Byzantine Empire in 1204, the main features of the Serbian discourse in educated Byzantine circles changed regarding ethnonymy so that Dalmatae practically disappeared from it, just as Damlatia had already disappeared from the Empire's practical politics as well, while the most common archaic ethnonym was Triballi, who alternate with Serbs under their authentic name in the texts of late-Byzantine and post-Byzantine writers before and after the fateful year of 1453 that marked the collapse of the Byzantine Roman Empire as a state. In that way, the representations of one, with time increasingly important factor of foreign, as well as home politics of the Empire, gained the necessary barbarian tone and were fitted into the general Byzantine discourse about barbarians as others and significantly different from the Romans. This is conspicuously illustrated by an example - the imperial rank of Stefan Dušan was in 1346 delegitimized in Byzantine texts in different ways and barbarized exactly by the use of the term Triballi. Although the earlier Byzantine writers considered a barbarian, in principle, a pagan, even if he became Christian, he would not become Roman at the same time, nor would he cease being a barbarian. In that respect, there is a well-known case of the meeting of Alexios I Komnenos and Serbian Grand Prince Vukan at the end of the 11th century on the occasion of ending their years-long conflicts. According to the description by the emperor's daughter Ana Komnene in her Alexiad, the emperor benevolently received the barbarian because he did not want a civil war waged between the Christians. To the society we call Byzantine nowadays, along with Roman political thought, culture permeated by Christian faith, Greek philosophical heritage and often a high language expression, barbarians were also necessary as the topic of indirect speech about themselves, while an important position in that worldview was also held by Serbs.

Keywords: barbarians, ethnonyms, Serbs, Triballi, Dalmatae, Dacians, Dalmatia, Dacia, Praevalitana

Neven Isailović

Institute of History Belgrade neven.isailovic@gmail.com

THE FEELING OF BELONGING IN MEDIEVAL BOSNIA: FROM LOCAL TO STATE IDENTITY

Among historians, there is still no consensus regarding the character and statehood of medieval Bosnia, as primary sources are relatively scarce, and the burden of contemporary political connotations is ever-present. The aim of this paper is to examine the development of Bosnia as one of the rare Slavic states of the Middle Ages that arose on a territorial basis and, despite its gradual expansion, remained composite while still building a central state identity. The scarcity of information from reliable historical sources does not allow the reconstruction of the beginnings of medieval Bosnia. At the moment when it was first recorded as a political entity, in De administrando imperio of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Bosnia is mentioned in the chapter on the Serbs as a small land ($\chi \omega \rho (ov)$, within Serbia and surrounded by it. The sources are not sufficiently explicit to clarify the origins of this entity within the then-existing Serbia. Historians' opinions are divided: some believe that Bosnia was a separate sclavinia before being integrated into the Serbian state, others that it was a territory given by the Franks to the Serbs as allies. There is also an opinion that early Bosnia was a periphery of the Croatian state that, after turmoil in Croatia, became part of Serbia, and yet others see a distinctive Bosnia already recognizable in Porphyrogenitus' account. What is unequivocal is that Bosnia existed from the outset as a geographical concept, referring to a region named after a major river. Compared to the names of other Slavic political entities, this indicates that its origin is not ethnic but territorial.

The frameworks from the 10th century already implied a territory of the rank of a land, encompassing the area of the upper and middle course of the Bosna River, stretching from Sarajevo to Zenica, as well as regions gravitating toward this territory, including the *župas* (districts) formed around the rivers Miljacka, Prača, Lepenica, Krivaja, and perhaps even Lašva. The center of this entity was undoubtedly in Visoko and its surroundings, forming the original *župa* of Bosnia. Neighboring *župas* – Trstivnica, Brod, Lepenica, Vidogošća, Vrhbosna, and Lašva – gravitated toward the *župa* Bosna, constituting the aforementioned Land of Bosnia and the nucleus of the future state. The temporary strengthening of the Croatian state and relocation of the Serbian state's center to Duklja, as well as the influence of Hungary as the dominant political force from the 12th century onward, all contributed to Bosnia's independent development. In the work of John Kinnamos, Bosnia was identified as an entity separated from the rest of Serbia by the Drina River, not subordinated to the Serbian Grand Župan, and characterized by a unique way of life and governance.

As a state, Bosnia was composite throughout its entire development. The original Land of Bosnia demonstrated a significant capacity for expansion into the peripheral regions of other neighboring Slavic states (primarily Serbia and Croatia, but also parts of Hungary inhabited by Slavic populations). The political idea of Bosnia's "ideal" borders from the time of Ban Kulin emerged in the early 15th century, reflecting both a culture of memory and the construction of a strong Bosnian state identity. The actual borders during Kulin's time likely only slightly exceeded the Land of Bosnia from the 10th century, extending into the Vrbas Valley (the land of Donji Kraji) and the area from Sarajevo Field toward the Neretva River. This expansion likely also encroached on the border area of Croatia. It is challenging to speak reliably about expansions into Usora and Soli, as well as the area of Belin (modern Semberija), the areas with Slavic populations that early on came under Hungarian control. For centuries, Hungarian authorities attempted to establish a suzerain-vassal relationship with Bosnia, marking Bosnian state identity, which was built either with Hungary's support or in resistance to it. However, Bosnia was never an integrated part of the Hungarian state.

As it was composite, Bosnia also remained a land governed by uncodified customary law, where patrimonial estates formed the basis of political legitimacy and economic power. The ruling Kotromanić dynasty may have been of foreign origin, although theories on this issue are inconclusive and represent a phenomenon documented only at the beginning of the 15th century. Judging solely by the rulers' titles in Bosnian documents before Ban Stjepan II, one might gain the impression that, despite territorial expansion, the state identity developed early and was closely tied to Bosnia, as the rulers were referred to exclusively as bans of Bosnia. However, there are only few available documents. In its early phase, it is evident that the ethnic-linguistic separation of Bosnia from Serbia was a prolonged process that incompletely concluded only in the 14th century during the reign of Stjepan II. He played a pivotal role in integrating the Bosnian state as a strong political entity through a syncretic vision that incorporated elements derived from Hungary and Serbia, and envisioned close collaboration with the Hungarian Angevins, maintenance of the domestic church organization, and connections with the Roman Curia and Catholic monastic orders. Seemingly paradoxically, Stjepan, who dramatically expanded the Bosnian state and strengthened its collective state identity, was also the ruler whose era provides the most evidence of the composite nature of the state and its local identities. The greater availability and diversity of documentary sources from Stjepan's time allow for the coexistence of unity and division within the Bosnian state to be examined during his reign.

For example, while Ban Ninoslav, between 1235 and 1249, referred to his subjects as Serbs and to the inhabitants of Dubrovnik as Vlachs, Ban Stjepan II, in 1332, spoke of Bošnjani (Bosnians) and Dubrovčani. Nevertheless, Bosnian rulers consistently referred to the Nemanjić dynasty in the 13th and 14th centuries as rulers of Raška (Rascia). Later, Serbian, Rascian and Bosnian lords were mentioned as the ancestors of Bosnian kings. Mentions of the Serbian language in Bosnia, although rare, persisted until the first decades of the 15th century. It has been shown that, in documents issued to foreigners, unity was emphasized, while in charters addressed to domestic recipients, the composite nature of Bosnia was highlighted. For instance, in the charters for local addressees there are mentions of representatives of the social elite, referred to as "good Bosnians", as well as "good Usorans". Additionally, witnesses were often listed according to the lands comprising Bosnia. Stjepan's reintegration of Donji Kraji brought forth interesting examples. It is noted that the *župa* of Banica abandoned the Croatian lord (Mladen II Šubić) and the Babonić family. Another example comes from the župa of Zemunik, where a local property ruling mentions an assembly of noblemen emphasizing the connection of their župa with Bosnia, but also reffering to a local knez. The charter concludes with a sanction stating that anyone who violates the provisions "is not a man of Zemunik".

Mentions of the *stanak* (assembly) of "all the lands of Bosnia and Donji Kraji and Zagorje and the Land of Hum" (1354) are intriguing, as are references to the principle that "no nobleman can be condemned until his case is reviewed by Bosnia and Usora" (1367). Over time, these composite designations evolved, and by the end of the 14th century, they had been simplified to the *stanak* of "all Bosnia". In Hum, certain peculiarities were recorded for the longest time. Around 1360, Sanko Miltenović emphasized that prices should not be set for him as they were for any Vlach, man of Primorje, or man of Hum, while Stjepko Čihorić insisted that the legal dispute he was involved in be resolved according to the customs of Hum, rather than Hungarian, Croatian, or Dubrovnik law. In 1453, Duke Stjepan Vukčić Kosača mentioned a judgment of "the court of Hum". The status-based division of the population into Serbs and Vlachs in Hum persisted and is documented in the charters of the noble families of Kosača, Nikolić, and Hrvatinić-Vojsalić, as well as of the Ottomans.

The expansions of Stjepan II into the Slavic regions of Hungary, and parts of Serbia and Croatia necessitated a strategy of preserving certain local specificities (customary law, social divisions, and property rights), as imposing changes would have been counterproductive. At the same time, it required fostering a degree of cohesion through a dynastic narrative about the Kotromanić family and the cultivation of the cult of St. Gregory. Bosnia's perception as a state-based rather than ethnically-based entity is evidenced not only by its composite nature and the geographical origin of its name but also by how it was viewed by its immediate neighbors. In a charter of Serbian Emperor Dušan's from 1349, Bosnia and the Land of Basarab are distinguished from other states named after ethnic communities (e.g., Hungarians, Bulgarians). Bosnia's expansion and economic growth eventually led to the emergence of a class of court nobility who increasingly tied their identity to the state. This class included figures instrumental in Bosnia's territorial expansion during the reign of Ban and King Tvrtko, such as Hrvoje Vukčić, Pavle Radenović, Sandalj Hranić, and Batalo Šantić. From the late 14th century come the first mentions of the terms Bosnian rusag and all Bosnia as alternative names for the state and the assembly. However, even within this layer of the nobility, local identities were evident. While the Sanković family maintained an awareness of being successors to the lords of Hum, the Kosača family, only turned to a local identity after Stjepan Vukčić became a Duke. At that point, Hum, Primorje, and the Drina region, along with the cult of St. Sava, were incorporated into Kosača's title and ideology, while he also retained the title of Bosnian Grand Voivode and the association of the Kosača domain with the Bosnian Kingdom. References to Hum west of the Neretva were a hallmark of the Radivojević-Vlatković nobility, who, by the late medieval period, began to identify as "Humski", practically adopting it as a surname.

Despite these centrifugal tendencies, the Bosnian state identity appeared to be complete. Foreigners referred to the state in its entirety as Bosnia and its inhabitants as *Bošnjani/Bosnenses*. Neighbors treated Bosnia as a polity with the rank of a state (*regnum*). In relation to the Serbian state, distancing was evident. Despite Tvrtko's proclamation as King

of the Serbs in 1377, the political reality and the nobility promoting a Bosnian identity gradually diminished the Serbian element, reducing it to a component of the Kotromanić dynastic identity. The Serbian Despotate, particularly after border conflicts and the Catholic orientation of the Kotromanićs during the final phase of both states' existence, harbored mistrust toward Bosnia and Bosnians, even referring to them as *inoplemenici* (foreigners).

Interestingly, the collective Bosnian identity temporarily disintegrated quickly after the fall of the Bosnian Kingdom, reflecting its dependence on the state, dynasty, and territory. With the establishment of Ottoman rule, the absence of a state formation and legitimate claimants to the throne, combined with migration processes and the construction of *krajišta* (borderlands), brought to the forefront more enduring identity traits – ethnic, religious, and social. Ultimately, the concept of Bosnia was preserved primarily by two factors: the Bosnian Eyalet, established in 1580 by the Ottomans as an administrative unit, and the persistent organization of the Franciscan Province of Bosna Argentina, alongside its already entrenched place in European geography.

Keywords: Bosnia (medieval), South Eastern Europe, Middle Ages, župa, land, polity, belonging, identity

Dejan Došlić

University of Banja Luka Faculty of Philosophy dejan.doslic@ff.unibl.org

SAINT GREGORY, BAN STEPHEN II KOTROMANIĆ AND THE CREATION OF REGIONAL COHESION IN MEDIEVAL BOSNIA

61

The uncommon intitulations of Ban Stephen II Kotromanić (1322–1353) from the beginning of his independent rule, "I, Saint Gregory, and my name is Ban Stephen, lord of Bosnia, and my brother Prince Vladislav" reformulated in the second part of his reign to "I, Ban Stephen, called the servant of Saint Gregory, I, Ban Stephen, by the grace of God, and my brother Prince Vladislay, lord of all Bosnian lands and Usora and Hum and Donji Kraji" have long attracted the attention of researchers who have put forward various theses on this issue in an attempt to decipher their true meaning. So far, it has been concluded that such intitulations were emphasized in charters addressed to domestic recipients, and that their use continued during the reign of Ban Tvrtko. The most frequently cited thesis, namely that they were a reflection of Bogomil teaching, is difficult to accept due to the evocation of a Christian saint alongside other Christian formulas in the documents themselves. The other proposed solution, that it was a scribal error, can also be questioned because it is really difficult for errors to be repeated several times. In this paper we offer a different solution, arguing that the saint's name was deliberately evoked owing to specific contemporary political circumstances in Bosnia itself. At the beginning of the 14th century, the family ruling Bosnia was defeated and suppressed by the Croatian Šubić family and a part of the Bosnian nobility, which is why the ban's mother Elizabeth sought protection in Dubrovnik together with her children. Over time, political circumstances in Hungary changed: the Angevins took the throne and began to strengthen central authority and crush the power of the feudal lords. The new circumstances favored the return of the Kotromanić family to Bosnia, after which King

Charles Robert bound the young Ban Stephen II to himself; the alliance with the Hungarian court, as it turned out, was highly beneficial for Stephen and his family. The protection of the Hungarian king enabled him to strengthen his position in the "land" of Bosnia over time and begin to spread his power to the surrounding areas - Donji Kraji, Usora and Soli, Krajina and most parts of Zahumlje. At one point, the ban had under his rule many territories that had been ruled by different lords in previous decades, and he had to impose his authority in all areas in order to ensure the dominance of his family. As a consequence, in the first decade of his independent rule, the intitulations of his charters addressed to domestic recipients evoked Saint Gregory for two reasons: on the one hand, the saint was his personal protector; on the other hand, he was also the patron saint of all the lands that were under his rule. It would seem that the authority of the young ban in the first years of his independent rule was contested; in that sense, the mention of Saint Gregory at the beginning of the intitulations was supposed to strengthen his standing among his subjects, allowing his title to take on a more "realistic" form at the end of his long and successful reign. The same formulation was used by Prince Vladislav and his son Tvrtko in their own documents, although we do not know whether it was only meant to be an expression of continuity with the traditions of Ban Stephen II, or if reflected a practical need because the ban's authority was still not strong enough.

The second part of the paper is dedicated to the personality of the saint himself, who was revered as the protector of medieval Bosnia. Medieval families, monarchies, communes, and indeed certain areas had a patron saint, and the possession of relics in the community was considered a source of help and protection from the saint. Ban Stephen II Kotromanić promoted an early Christian saint - Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocaesarea (213-270) - as his protector. In this way, he integrated the areas under his rule and placed them under the protection of Saint Gregory, although his state still retained its composite nature and rested on the territorial principle. We based the thesis on the evocation of Saint Gregory on the research and conclusions of relevant authors, primarily Gábor Klaniczay, who defined the phenomenon of veneration of saints as a form of creating "regional cohesion", but defined the concept of region (regio) or regional not in the sense of the modern perception and meaning of that term, but rather as a space (regio) on which the protection of one saint (patrocinium) extended - perhaps best expressed in one liturgical verse from the late Middle Ages, "Cuius patrocinio tota gaudet regio". Regional cohesion, understood in this form, is not national but is rather based on the spread of the cult and veneration of a saint in a certain area. Ban Stephen II obviously invoked a well-known and respected saint in order to

strengthen his authority in his state and thereby ensure the continuity of his family in power. On the other hand, this did not call into question the supreme authority of the Hungarian king; Stephen's territory was under the protection of Saint Gregory and thus had its own peculiarity, although it still retained its composite nature. The ban issued his documents to his subjects, who were designated by regional names as *dobri Bošnjani*, or *Usorani*, together with magnates from Donji Kraji and Zahumlje.

One of the questions that arise is what might have inspired Ban Stefan II to choose a patron saint and how this affected the perception of his power and the position of his family. Stephen Dečanski, who in the same period fought for the Serbian throne and on that occasion announced that Saint Nicholas had miraculously restored his sight, could have served as a model for him. On the other hand, the stay of Ban Stephen II in Dubrovnik, where Saint Blaise was revered as patron saint, could have influenced the formation of his ideas. After his return, the ban worked on the strengthening of his family, so that what happened to his father would not be repeated. The concretization of the ruler's authority proceeded by highlighting the patron saint, who connects the ruler, his lands and the people; the idea was to present them as the people or lands of Saint Gregory, that is, of the ban himself (and, consequentially, of his family). His mother Elizabeth, who, as the daughter of king Stephen Dragutin Nemanjić, must have been familiar with the mechanisms of developing a cult of family sanctity and holy ancestors, could have influenced the strengthening of the family's self-awareness. By strengthening the reputation of his family, Ban Stephen II contributed to the development of the dynastic consciousness of the Kotromanić family. It was reflected in the use of extended intitulations with the listing of the lands he ruled. After his death, Prince Vladislav and Ban Tvrtko mentioned Saint Gregory in their documents, and his cult was still strong in the first years of King Stephen Tvrtko. The new king of Serbs and Bosnia issued his famous charter to the commune of Dubrovnik in 1378 in the church of Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus, but apart from that information, we do not know how much the saint's cult was cultivated in the following period. Saint Stephen was revered to a greater extent, because King Stephen Tvrtko modeled his idea of rulership on that of the Nemanjićs. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus is mentioned on the coins of King Stephen Tvrtko II Tvrtković, while the image of Pope Gregory the Great was on the coins of Stephen Tomaš as part of a compromise with the Roman Church, due to the impending danger from the Ottomans. King Stephen Tomašević wrote to Pope Pius II in 1461 that Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus was publicly revered in his kingdom (it was recorded that he was celebrated on November 16th), which is the first official mention of that saint, but as we have already pointed out, he was

probably promoted during the time of Ban Stephen II, and perhaps even earlier. Although it has been pointed out in the scholarship that this was probably a scribal error, we have nevertheless argued that such a statement at the beginning of his reign was deliberate, caused by the current political situation and the struggle of Ban Stephen II to strengthen his position in Bosnia. Evoking the saint was necessary in order to integrate the areas under his rule and thereby create regional cohesion under the protection of Saint Gregory, through the personality of the ban himself. When his position was sufficiently strengthened, the intitulation was reformulated so that the ban was listed as the ruler and servant of Saint Gregory; the same formula came to be used by his successors, Prince Vladislav and Ban Tvrtko. In this way, all areas retained a certain degree of independence and autonomy, but they were all in unity with the central government, as the people and lands of Saint Gregory.

Keywords: Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus, ban Stephen II Kotromanić, ban Tvrtko I Kotromanić, medieval Bosnia, regional cohesion

Aleksandar Krstić

Institute of History Belgrade aleksandar.krstic@iib.ac.rs

BETWEEN SERVING THE HOLY CROWN AND KEEPING SERBIAN TRADITIONS – ON THE IDENTITY OF THE SERBS IN HUNGARY IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 15TH AND THE FIRST HALF OF THE 16TH CENTURIES

Faced with the continuous Ottoman attacks on the southern borders of Hungary after the Ottoman conquest of Serbia (1459), which brought huge destruction and depopulation, King Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490) actively encouraged the settlement of the Serbs in his country. Serbian refugees came from all social strata: from members of the Branković despot family and eminent old nobility (such as the Jakšić brothers or, later on, Miloš Belmužević), a number of petty Serbian nobles, many of whom had served the Ottomans as Christian timar holders, other members of military and paramilitary ranks, to the inhabitants of urban settlements and villagers. Serbian noblemen, as well as ordinary people, entered the royal military service, most often as light cavalry, or hussars. They got estates in return, or served as paid soldiers, members of the river flotilla troops and of the fortress garrisons. They fought not only against the Ottomans, but also participated in the wars waged by Hungarian kings Matthias Corvinus and Władysław II Jagiełło (1490-1516) against Czechs, Poles and Austrians. The number of the Serbs in the kingdom constantly increased and by the mid-16th century they made up the majority or substantial part of the population in some regions of southern Hungary, primarily in Srem, western regions of Banat and in the Mures region.

Crossing over to Hungary, the Serbs found themselves in the environment which was foreign to them in linguistic, religious and cultural terms. As a matter of fact, the related Slavic population – although religiously and culturally different – lived in the territories of Slavonia and Croatia, while in the territory of today's Banat and Transylvania there were many Romanians with the same Orthodox religion as the Serbs. More intense social contacts and marital ties with the members of those nations, as well as with the Hungarians, were established primarily by the Serbian nobles, which gradually led to their assimilation. However, as a whole, the Serbs in Hungary kept their specific features, i.e., their linguistic, religious and cultural identity until the Ottoman conquest of the central parts of Hungary in the middle of the 16rh century, and later, under the Ottoman rule. Thus, for example, only on the basis of the onomastics recorded in the censuses of the Ottoman sandjaks in the territory of Pannonia from the second half of the 16th century it is possible, without any difficulty, to establish whether the registered population was Serbian or it belonged to other ethnic and religious groups.

The main elements supported by the sources according to which it is possible to research the identity of the Serbs in Hungary in the second half of the 15th century and the first half of the 16th century, as well as later, are the language, Orthodox religion, awareness of belonging to the Serbian people, and preservation of Serbian state traditions. The sources for this topic are scarce and they mainly refer to the members of the nobility, primarily the most distinguished Serbian aristocrats in Hungary.

The most important element in preserving Serbian state traditions in Hungary was the despot title which was, until the beginning of the 16th century, borne by the grandsons of the Serbian ruler, Despot Đurađ Branković (1427–1456). Vuk Grgurević Branković, who had the despot title ever since the struggle for the Serbian throne at the time of the state collapse in 1459, went to Hungary in the second half of 1464. King Matthias Corvinus either recognized or confirmed this title. It was not only a way in which the Hungarian ruler personally awarded his former opponent who had distinguished himself in the service to the Crown, but also part of the broader plan to gather the Serbs and encourage them to leave the Ottoman territory for Hungary. After Vuk's death (1485), King Matthias invited Vuk's relatives, Đurađ and Jovan Branković to Hungary and appointed the former as a Serbian despot. Đurađ had this title from 1485 to his taking monastic vows (1497/9), while his brother Jovan had it 1491 until his death in 1502.

Although the Serbian despots in Hungary were legally and factually Hungarian barons, they persistently preserved and cherished old Serbian state traditions and the ruling ideology formed back in the Nemanjić state, and the legacy of the Branković dynasty. It can be best seen in the charters issued to the monasteries of Mount Athos - to Chilandar, the endowment of Saint Simeon (Stefan Nemanja) and Saint Sava, which was cared after by all subsequent Serbian rulers, as well as to Saint Paul and Esphigmenou. Helping the last two of them was the continuation of the endowment activities of the previous generations of the Branković family. The same aim of emphasizing the legacy of the holy Nemanjić dynasty and the continuity of the Branković dynasty was also supported by the establishment and cultivation of the cult of Saint Despot Stefan the Blind, father of Đurađ and Jovan Branković. By protecting and helping the church, particularly the monasteries of Mount Athos, in line with their modest means, the Serbian despots in Hungary showed their aspirations to continue the activities of their holy ancestors on the Serbian throne. And even more than that - although they considered themselves "foreigners in the foreign land", the Serbian despots in Hungary had unambiguous ambitions to become one day, with God's help, "the successors of their fatherland". Or, in other words, they hoped God would make them "the rulers of Serbs". Relying on divine help, the despots were active both in the battlefield and in diplomacy in order to achieve this, as shown by the correspondence in Serbian between Despot Vuk and Sultan Bayezid II from 1482-1483.

Due to their title, origin and the reputation they enjoyed, the despots from the Branković family were seen among Serbs in the second half of the 15th century as legitimate rulers and leaders of their people. For example, the Serbian chronicles record that Despot Vuk "ruled" for 26 years (from 1459 until his death in 1485), while the notes in manuscript books state that they were copied "during the reign of pious and Christ-loving Serbian despots". Serbian genealogies also show the Brankovićs from Srem as legitimate successors of their descendants. It is mentioned that despots Durađ and Jovan Branković held "whole Srem land", while one record from 1521 refers to this region as "the glorious and lovely despot's land". In fact, despots had no administrative power over the territory of Srem, but only over their own estates and people, including the detachments of predominantly Serbian warriors under their command. The larger part of Srem, although mostly inhabited by the Serbs, was at that time the property of other Hungarian landowners, church institutions and aristocrats.

Considering the perception of the Branković despots as legitimate rulers or at least as leaders of the Serbian people in Hungary and beyond, it should not be forgotten that the sources testifying about it mainly come from the Orthodox Church. The Church undoubtedly supported the idea of the legitimacy of the despots from the Branković lineage who, in turn, were loyal to the Church, its teaching and traditions. Despot Đurađ (latter Metropolitan Maksim), his brother Jovan and their mother Angelina, who, apart from helping the monasteries of Mount Athos, also built new spiritual centres in Srem (in Kupinik and Krušedol), were canonized as early as the first half of the 16th century. However, recent research of certain cult objects, such as Trsat reliquary, commissioned by Barbara Frankopan, Despot Vuk's widow, show that he was also deeply committed to Orthodox Christianity. Respecting the relics of the new martyrs, killed by the Turks during the conquest of Asia Minor and the Balkan countries, played an important role in the religious-ideological agenda of Despot Vuk who was, together with his warriors, involved in the decades-long fights against the Ottomans. His contemporaries and following generations remember him primarily as a brave warrior (Vuk the Fiery Dragon), but in the local tradition of Srem he is seen as the founder of certain churches and monasteries (e.g., Saint Nicholas Church in Slankamen, definitely built in the 15th century).

Hungarian authorities were aware that the Serbian settlers, so necessary to their state in this period, were strongly committed to Orthodox Christianity. That fact led to the change in the Hungarian restrictive and proselytizing politics towards Orthodox inhabitants, which characterized the 14th and the first half of the 15th centuries. In 1481, at the time of organized resettlement of the population from northern Serbia to Hungary, the Diet adopted legal regulations according to which "Serbs (*Rasciani*) and other schismatics" were temporarily exempted from paying the Catholic Church tithe. It was not only approved at the Diet in 1495, but also the part referring to the temporary nature of this privilege was omitted from the law. From his correspondence with the Archbishop of Kalocsa the following year, it can be seen that Despot Đurađ self-consciously emphasized his own privileges and the religious rights of the Serbs in Hungary.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the appointment of Croatian nobleman Ivaniš Berislavić for the Serbian despot after the death of Jovan Branković caused dissatisfaction among the Serbs, particularly in the clerical circles. The Hungarian court tried to legitimize this change by Ivaniš's marriage to Jovan's widow Jelena Jakšić, while the new despot, although a Catholic, tried to continue the previous traditions. The dissatisfaction of the Serbian inhabitants with the despot was substantially compounded by Ivanis's attitude towards the former despot, now monk Maksim, and his mother Angelina, who had to leave Srem because of the "foreigner" and temporarily go to Wallachia. During the first half of the 16th century in Hungary, it was well known that the Serbian despots were expected to help and protect the Orthodox Church. This is also proved by Catherine Batthyany, who was married to Despot Stefan Berislavić, the son of Ivaniš and Jelena. Although Hungarian and Catholic, Catherine continued her contacts with the Serbs and the Serbian church even as a widow (condam despotissa), after her husband's death in the battlefield in 1535. For example, she embroidered rich ornaments for the mitre for the Metropolitan of Belgrade and Srem (about 1546/1547).

Not only the despots, but also other aristocrats and noblemen of Serbian origin were strongly committed to the Orthodox Church and the traditions of the former Serbian state although, on the other hand, they were quite well integrated in the Hungarian noble environment. An illustrative example of this is the charter issued by "Christ-loving lady Milica, with God-blessed and beloved sons and lords, Voivode Stefan and Voivode Marko Jakšić" to the Chilandar Monastery in 1506. Emphasizing that the monastery had been built by Saint Simeon and Saint Sava "with great efforts and feats", in this charter the Jakšićs announce their intention of becoming new founders of Chilandar. Traditionally they are also attributed the foundation of several Orthodox monasteries in the territory of Hungary, in Banat, the Mures region and Bačka. According to the hagiography of Saint Maksim Branković, Stefan and Marko Jakšić gave their land in which the Monastery of Krušedol in Srem was built. The Jakšićs' merits for Krušedol were remembered because many members of this family are registered in the oldest *pomenik* (commemorative book) of this monastery. They are mentioned on the introductory pages of the *pomenik* which record "holy archbishops, divines, emperors, kings and sainted despots, and other Orthodox lords of all the Serbian land". A list of 64 names of "Serbian lords" begins with Saint Simeon and Saint Sava and includes numerous members of the Branković family and their relatives, as well as the rulers of Wallachia and Moldova who are praised for helping this monastery and the Serbian Church.

The devotion of the Serbian nobility in Hungary to the Orthodox Church is also proved by the last wish of another outstanding aristocrat, Voivode Miloš Belmužević (1500). The voivode left 100 ducats to his spiritual father, monk Timotej, asking him to take them to Mount Athos for his soul. Belmužević's will shows the image of the nobleman completely loyal to the Hungarian king and the service to the "Holy Crown", who had the guarantees of King Matthias and the Hungarian nobility to leave "the pagans" (i.e., the Ottomans) and come to Hungary. Thanks to his loval service to King Matthias, he was given numerous estates which are listed in his will. It should be considered that the voivode's last will was mainly aimed at dividing Belmužević's estates, most of which he left to his daughter and wife. For such a decision, since he had lost his male successors in the battles against the Ottomans, he needed the approval of King Władysław II, which he actually received. That is why it comes as no surprise that the will is focused on emphasizing Belmužević's loyalty to the Hungarian crown, his loyal service and military merits for the Hungarian king, and the acquired land.

After the Battle of Mohács (1526), the Ottomans occupied Srem, while Hungary was divided between two kings – Ferdinand Habsburg and John Zápoly. In the following turbulent years, filled with struggles between the two sides and the increased pressure by the Ottomans, the Serbs assumed an important role in the Kingdom of Hungary. They were counted on both by the Ottomans and by Zápoly and Ferdinand, not only as individuals but also as a community. This is proved by the facts that both Hungarian kings appointed their Serbian despots. In June 1527, John Zápoly gave the despot title to Radič Božić, a distinguished warrior and commander of the river flotilla troops. During the Ottoman conquest of Slavonia in 1537, Ferdinand I appointed another prominent Serb leader, the captain of hussars Pavle Bakić the Serbian despot. However, since Bakić lost his life in the battle of Gorjani only three weeks later, this last attempt of reestablishing the most important Serbian secular title in Hungary failed.

King Ferdinand I continued granting privileges to eminent Serbian leaders who recognized his rule and to groups of Serbian inhabitants, guaranteeing them certain collective rights. In summer 1551, he issued two charters in an attempt to keep the Serbs in Banat on his side during the Ottoman conquest of this region. The king confirmed all the privileges and rights of the Serbian noblemen, communities and entire Serbian people living "around the fortress of Timisoara and the surrounding areas". Serbian warriors engaged in the Hungary military service turned to Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, Governor-General of Rumelia, who addressed them in Serbian and offered them certain privileges. Nevertheless, the old Serbian state traditions continued to exist among the Serbs under the Ottoman rule as well. During the anti-Ottoman uprising in Banat (1594), its organizers led by Bishop Teodor turned to the authorities of Transylvania "on behalf of all *sipahis, knezes* and entire Serbian king or despot.

Keywords: Serbs in Hungary, Serbian despots in Hungary, Brankovićs, Jakšićs, Orthodox Church, cults of saints, national identity, late Middle Ages, old Serbian genealogies IN FOREIGN EMPIRES

Nebojša S. Šuletić

Institute for Balkan Studies SASA Belgrade nebojsa.suletic@bi.sanu.ac.rs

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE FORMATION OF SERBIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY (16TH–18TH CENTURIES)

There is a notable lack of comprehensive studies on the emergence and historical evolution of Serbian ethnic and national identity. Nevertheless, the existing scholarly discourse largely aligns with one of two predominant perspectives on Serbian ethnicity during the Middle Ages and early modern period.

The first perspective, primarily advocated by historians within the Serbian academic community, posits that Serbian ethnic identity began to take form in the early Middle Ages, ultimately reaching its definitive expression in the medieval Serbian Kingdom. Proponents of this viewpoint, including prominent scholars such as Sima Cirković, argue that from the 11th to the 15th centuries, the Serbs established several ethnic states across territories that were also home to a variety of other ethnic groups. Historically, these groups are referred to as Greeks, Bulgarians, Albanians, Latins, and Vlachs. Despite the ongoing process of integration between the Serbs and these diverse social groups - a phenomenon that persists to this day - it is commonly asserted within this discourse that Serbs emerged as a well-defined ethnic group before their incorporation into the Ottoman Empire. This distinct identity was passed down consistently through generations, contributing to the resilience of Serbian culture and traditions until the eventual liberation from foreign rule and the establishment of nation-states during the 19th and 20th centuries. Scholars supporting this view often reference Anthony Smith's theoretical model, which underscores the pivotal role of ethnic symbols from the Middle Ages and early modern period in shaping the foundational elements of national identities.

The second perspective originates from the German and Austrian academic communities. In this context, local historiographic schools typically do not engage extensively with Serbian ethnicity. Instead, they tend to present a view that suggests a limited degree of ethnic integration among Serbs during the Middle Ages and early modern period. This viewpoint finds its theoretical grounding in the classic works on nations and nationalism, particularly those authored by influential scholars such as Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson. Adherents of this perspective frequently equate the ethnic integration of Serbs with their national integration and suggest that this process began after the French Revolution of 1789.

×

Despite these fundamental disagreements, most historians agree that the Serbian Orthodox Church played a crucial role in shaping the Serbian ethnic and national identity as we recognize it today. During Ottoman rule, the Church revived the cultural and political discourse of the medieval *Archbishopric of Serbia and the Maritime Lands*, along with the historical symbols of the medieval Serbian states. The primary material for this revival came from studying medieval historical manuscripts found in the better-equipped monastery libraries. Monks fostered their identity by examining these writings, but they also transmitted their contents orally, which helped develop the folk's oral tradition. By copying these medieval texts, the monks preserved them from decay. Several important works of medieval Serbian literature, such as Sava's *Life of Saint Simeon*, Domentijan's *Life of Saint Sava*, and a collection of biographies of Archbishop Daniel II, have survived exclusively in copies made by anonymous monks during this period.

The texts written by Serbian priests during this time are rich in historical themes derived from medieval literary works. They also reflect a developed sense of ethnic identity. Besides frequent mentions of the *Serbian faith* (as Orthodoxy is often called in older texts) and references to the *Serbian language* (which some writers identified as their native tongue), Serbian clerics in the early modern period expressed their ethnic identity by emphasizing their real or imagined relations with the medieval Serbian states. They particularly liked to do this in correspondence with foreign princes. Assuming their correspondents lacked a clear understanding of their identity, they filled their letters with brief historical accounts, substantiating their claims by referencing old historical texts and church chronicles. This approach is typical and equally characteristic of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries.

| 75

The existing sources do not provide a comprehensive understanding of how familiar the lower and illiterate strata of the Orthodox community were with church-historical literature. Nevertheless, medieval history constituted a significant discourse among the peasant elites. Some of these leaders engaged in genealogical studies and did not hesitate to invoke their family's historical rights to enhance their social standing when deemed appropriate. In such circumstances, in written form, the confirmation of these genealogies by representatives of the Church proved beneficial.

*

During the period of Ottoman rule, the bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church sought to emulate the administrative practices of medieval Serbian chancelleries in their daily routine. The establishment of the autocephalous Serbian Church, or the Patriarchate of Peć, by Sultan Suleiman I (1520-1566) and Grand Vizier Rustem Pasha (1555-1561) was interpreted by Serbian clergy as a restoration of the medieval Archbishopric of the Serbian and Maritime Lands. The title of patriarch was shaped according to the political situation of the latter half of the 14th century rather than the situation in the 16th century. Makarije (1557-1574), the first patriarch of the restored patriarchate, initially adopted the title of Archbishop of the Serbian Lands. However, in about 1565, after restoring the medieval archbishop's residence in Peć (Ipek), he assumed the title of Archbishop of Peć and Patriarch of the Serbs. One of his successors, Patriarch Gerasim (1575-1586), added the honorary title of Patriarch of the Bulgarians. By the early decades of the 17th century, additional honorary titles, including Patriarch of the Western Littoral, the Northern Lands, and the Vretanian Islands, were also introduced. Three of the five components of the patriarchal title were medieval political symbols. The first element - Serbian Land or Serbs - pertained to the Nemanjić kingdom, where an autocephalous archbishopric was established in 1219. The second element - Bulgarian Land - referenced the territory of the Ohrid Archbishopric, which fell under the dominion of Emperor Stefan Dušan (1331-1355) during the mid-14th century. The third element - Western Littoral - was recorded in the administrative practice of the Serbian Empire, denoting present-day Thessaly and Epirus in Greece. In the late 14th century, some Serbian chancelleries misappropriated this term to refer to the Adriatic coast, a practice that continued among Serbian patriarchs in the Ottoman Empire. The last two elements of the patriarchal title emerged in response to the migrations of the Orthodox population from medieval Serbian territories to regions of the former Kingdom of Hungary. This included the

Northern Lands and the *Vretania* or *Vretania Islands*, with the latter term derived from the Greek word for Britain, signifying the authority of the Archbishops of Peć over the Orthodox communities within the Habsburg military border of Slavonia and Croatia – two westernmost Serbian diasporas during that period.

×

An examination of the sources concerning the history of the Serbian Orthodox Church reveals that during the early modern period at least some members of the Serbian clergy had a developed sense of ethnic identity. They expressed their belonging to the Serbian ethnicity by using their ethnic name and by emphasizing their real or imagined kinship with the inhabitants of the medieval Serbian states. Additionally, they drew upon historical narratives about the Serbian kin and language for personal representation in interactions with members of other nations. Some of these narratives contained ethnic myths preserved from obscurity by the creators of medieval church literature or by historians of the 17th and 18th centuries. However, while the sources indicate that Serbian ethnic identity was present among the literate elite during the 16th to 18th centuries, it is challenging to determine the nature, quality, and extent of that identity, particularly among the illiterate population. Given that the Serbian church hierarchy in the Ottoman Empire could not establish a centralized education system, it is reasonable to assume that the church could not be the sole source of ethnic identity. Young priests might have developed their Serbian identity within their families, but the church, with its complex infrastructure, was essential for preserving the treasures of medieval literacy and facilitating the emergence of national culture in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Keywords: Serbs, Serbian Orthodox Church, ethnicity, nation, proto-nationalism, identity

Jelena Ilić Mandić

Institute of History Belgrade jelena.ilic@iib.ac.rs

COLLECTIVE IDENTITY(IES) IN THE 18TH-CENTURY MILITARY FRONTIER: A STUDY OF THE SERBIAN CASE

Multiple identities and parallel integration tracks

The political nature of collective identities was further strengthened by the fact that the peoples on the periphery of the Habsburg Monarchy lived in various territorial-administrative units (counties, military frontiers, chamber domains, free cities) and, as subjects of different legal systems, gradually became representatives of diverse political interests. Military service represented a source of emancipation for the frontier population compared to serfs under civilian administration. Given that frontier soldiers were personally free individuals with the right to own and enjoy land without being subject to the authority of the nobility, it is clear that this status had not only de jure but also significant de facto implications. In addition to collective efforts to defend frontier rights, political expressions of solidarity included dynastic patriotism and a localized patriotism tied to their own settlements as their homeland. The factors driving integration were twofold. On one hand, they were intrinsic to frontier society as a distinct socio-economic group. On the other, they transcended administrative borders and the status-based interests of specific groups, grounded instead in shared linguistic and religious identity. For instance, soldiers of the Wallachian-Illyrian Regiment in the Banat Military Frontier voiced two key demands at the National and Church Assembly in Timişoara in 1790, driven by fears of losing their military status: first, to remain within the Frontier and not be placed under county administration, and second, to continue enjoying the protection of privileges granted long ago by Emperor Leopold I.

Dynastic patriotism and the unification policy

Numerous examples demonstrate that dynastic patriotism was almost palpably present within frontier society. Referring to the sworn oath and solemn promise made personally to the ruler upon his accession to the throne, often invoking the Holy Trinity, was a common feature in the frontiersmen communication with representatives of authority. The institution of the oath was grounded in the formal declaration that they understood the obligations read to their collective by an official representative: to protect the ruler, his property, and his lands, even at the cost of their lives ("to the last drop of blood"). The status of frontier soldiers was formalized through this oath and, from a legal standpoint, equated with the status of other state officials. Conversely, evading military duties was automatically classified as the criminal offense of desertion, while acts of resistance or incitement to unrest were deemed treason, punishable by death. The behavior of frontier officers and soldiers was expected to remain strictly confined to their defined roles - loyal service on the battlefield and within the Military Frontier. The frontier population referred to their new homeland as *Cesarija* (the Emperor's land) reflecting their direct subordination to the Emperor and the central military authority, the Court War Council, rather than to the landowning nobility. This designation became widely adopted not only by the inhabitants of the Monarchy but also by their neighbors. It consistently underscored the fact that this land was neither Turkish nor Hungarian. Alternatively, due to the origins of the dynasty and its officials, it was also called "Austrian" or "German". The perception of their homeland in this new environment was more complex than it had been in their place of origin in the Balkans under Ottoman rule. Upon settlement, they also referred to their new homeland as "Christian lands".

Religious community and political mobilization

A key element of Serbian national integration is considered to have been the institutionalized position of the Orthodox Church within the Habsburg Monarchy after 1690. Rather than the presumed dichotomy between Roman Catholicism and Orthodox Christianity, it was the policy of emphasizing similarities rooted in their shared Christian faith that played a far more significant role in rendering Orthodoxy politically acceptable. By focusing on shared faith as the foundation of spiritual and political symbiosis, one can better understand the affirmative nature of the legal-political concept of the *Illyrian nation*, which persisted from the early to the late 18th century. In narratives highlighting contributions to the Austrian dynasty during wars against the Ottoman army, the Serbian Orthodox hierarchy consistently affirmed its political (and not merely religious) status. This was achieved through a persistent emphasis on the theme of unity in Christ and the shared struggle against a common enemy of non-Christian faith, the infidels. At the same time, the hierarchy also underscored the distinctiveness of the Orthodox religion, which was guaranteed by the Privileges. These Privileges gave rise to a broader social framework that included all Orthodox Christians in the Monarchy as the Illyrische nicht unirte Nation, often referred to as Illyrische Nationalisten. It is evident that the wars and territorial expansions into the deep Balkans and Wallachia, which occurred successively between 1683 and 1739, contributed to elevating the status of Orthodox Christians regardless of their ethnicity. These developments also supported the emergence of the broader concept of the Illyrian nation. From Vienna's perspective, the political significance of the Orthodox population was ensured not only by their demographic strength but also by the existence of institutions that acted as intermediaries with the authorities. These institutions operated through the Orthodox Church hierarchy and the national-ecclesiastical assembly. Protective charters addressed the corpus Illvricae Nationis as an exclusive patrimonium Domus Austriae (heritage of the House of Austria). They defined the special status and rights to religious self-governance of the Orthodox population based on a personal principle, rather than a territorial one. Identification of individuals and groups by religious affiliation was standard in the Military Frontier, where censuses were conducted solely based on confessional identity. The population was categorized as Catholisch and Graeci ritus non uniti (Greek Orthodox, non-united with Rome).

Ethnic and political Nation

The affirmation of the term *Nation*, along with its associated term *Nationalisten*, in the sense of "peoples" residing in the newly conquered Habsburg territories, is believed to have emerged in the context of German colonization. This process highlighted the differences in language, religion, and culture between the German settlers and the native populations. Examples of the synonymous use of ethnonyms are found in contemporary sources, including the Privileges, which reference *Rasciani seu Serviani Populi* (1695). Although the term *Illyrische Nation* primarily referred to *Graeci ritus non uniti* (Greek-rite non-Uniates), the dominance of Serbs within the Orthodox Church hierarchy led to the Illyrian designation being used as a synonym for Serbian ethnicity. For instance, in the 1781 census of the German-Banat Regiment near Pančevo, inhabitants

were recorded as either Illyrians or Germans, depending on whether they belonged to the community of native Serbs or German colonists. Similarly, settlements in the region were named accordingly, with examples like Razisch Opova and Razisch Sakule for Serbian communities, and Deutsch Opova and Deutsch Sakule for German ones. The numerically dominant and autochthonous ethno-linguistic communities found in the region after the Habsburg conquests - Raizen (Serbs) and Wallachen (Vlachs) - were privileged in terms of religious and professional rights for two primary reasons. They were recognized both as communities instrumental in the expulsion of the Ottoman enemy and as subjects and elites essential for constructing the new order. Certain ethnic communities, due to the dominant professional roles of their members, attained legal status modeled on exclusive groups defined by the "degree" of their utility. In this context, one can speak of a professional community of the Razische National Miliz (Serbian National Militia). The "political" aspects of the term nation are most clearly reflected in the existence of political municipalities for native populations, which were granted the right to participate in governance on the principle of parity with the newly settled and politically favored Germans. Razische and Deutsche municipalities coexisted in cities across the periphery, including Belgrade, Zemun, Timişoara, Pančevo, Bela Crkva, and others.

The Illyrian Nation and the estate order

The Illyrische Nation, whose representatives had been assembling at national-church assemblies since 1708, included Orthodox members of the spiritual, provincial, and military estates, and from 1790, the noble estate as well. Orthodox deputies from various Military Frontier regiments advocated for the interests of the military estate, which primarily revolved around preserving their military status and resisting integration into the less desirable provincial administration in Hungarian counties. The social order to which the frontier population (Militärgrenzer) belonged was distinctly separate from civilian subjugation, and this dichotomy was the cornerstone of their "political identity". A significant precedent occurred on two occasions when segments of the frontier population consciously opted for civilian status. It happened with the establishment of two privileged cameral districts or dominiums, first of Tisza in Bačka (in 1751) and the second of Kikinda in Banat (in 1774). By making this choice, the former frontier population - now district residents - prioritized private landownership over their military status. This decision disrupted the idealized notions of the advantages tied to the frontiersmen's status, particularly concerning landownership, and challenged the belief that a desirable legal-political system was intrinsically linked to the territory of the Military Frontier. Between 1740 and 1780, significant territorial and administrative changes took place on the periphery. Hungarian counties were reestablished in Slavonia, Srem, Bačka, and Banat, compelling many frontier communities to either relocate to retain their status or abandon their status to remain in their homes. Simultaneously, a process of acculturation was underway. Membership in a specific territorial-administrative unit and adherence to its order – or to its status, which was based on the exclusive rights of certain social groups – contributed to the emergence of differing interests even within the same ethno-linguistic and religious communities.

Territorial demands at the Timişoara Assembly

By 1790, social divisions along horizontal lines had become more pronounced, and for the first time, they were manifested at the Timisoara Assembly. The central demand at the time concerned securing Orthodox landowners' rights to Hungarian nobility. The debate focused on the modalities for addressing this issue, with two distinct positions: one advocating for the integration of religious and land rights for Orthodox population into Hungarian legislation, and the other supporting Vienna's stance, which was "favorable to the Monarch and the Nation" (without further specification). It is hard to ignore the impression that Vienna supported a strict separation between the political interests of the Illyrian nation and the Hungarian state. Amid these circumstances, the idea of territorial autonomy for the Illyrian nation emerged. Since the assembly's representatives did not seek changes to the territorial status of the Military Frontier, it is clear that the demand was not aimed at uniting all members of the Illyrian nation on a single territory, but rather at those deemed to be under threat in terms of their religious and political rights. The political model and legal framework for this demand for territorialisation appear to have been inspired by the central areas of the region: the Tisza cameral district and the Kikinda cameral district, former frontier regions that had managed to retain a privileged status in comparison to the Hungarian counties by being placed under the supervision of the Court Chamber. The loss of military status for their inhabitants was compensated by territorial-administrative autonomy, while officers were granted noble status and landholdings. Although the idea of territorial autonomy presented at the Assembly in 1790 was framed in terms of the religious rights of the Illyrian nation, there is no doubt that its political substance was rooted in the tradition of the de facto independence of the Military Frontier and Cameral districts in relation to the Kingdom of Hungary, along with the idea of representing the interests of new landowners and the bourgeoisie outside the system of Hungarian counties.

Conclusion

The proposal for territorialisation represented the culmination of the political affirmation of the religious concept of the Illyrian nation, but the conditions for its legalization were lacking. The ruler did not disregard existing laws in favor of the Hungarian estates and certain privileged groups. He explicitly confirmed that none of this applied to the territory and inhabitants of the Military Frontier, whose status and identity were not called into question. In this way, the foundations for the existence of multiple identities were preserved: the "Orthodox nation" (protected by privileges, though with varying ethnolinguistic elements within its framework), as well as the "estate" and "professional" associations (with their own interests within the territorial-administrative frameworks of the Frontier regions, Hungarian counties, and free cities). Sources indicate that ethnolinguistic identity did not, by itself, carry political significance. Status could be clarified through ethnonyms, as members of the same linguistic community often dominated professional associations or social estates. However, their political character did not stem from ethnicity, but from a legal definition of a collective based on territorial, religious, and/or professional standing. Nonetheless, these identities frequently overlapped and contributed to the formation of an amalgamated nation, understood simultaneously as an ethnic, religious, and political community. The identity of the Serbian frontiersmen provides a clear example of the amalgamated nature of collective identity, combining ethnolinguistic, religious-political, professional-estate, and territorial-status aspects. The identified elements are paradigmatic because they were equally involved in constructing the identity of the "other" in provincial society.

Keywords: collective identity, nation, ethnicity, Illyrian nation, Military Frontier, Habsburg Monarchy, 18th century

Isidora Točanac Radović

Institute of History Belgrade isidora.tocanac.radovic@iib.ac.rs

NATIO NOSTRA ILLYRICO-RASCIANA SEU SERVIANA: THE CREATION OF A PRIVILEGED IDENTITY OF SERBS IN THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

The edicts of Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Hungary, played a significant role in shaping the identity of Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy. Between 1690 and 1695, he issued special edicts, known as Privileges, that granted Serbs certain freedoms and rights. As believers of the Orthodox Church, Serbs were granted rights that other non-Catholic communities in the Habsburg Monarchy did not have at the time, the most important of which was the right to freely practice their Orthodox faith. In addition to the rights, freedoms and protections that the ruler granted to the Serbian Orthodox community by the Privileges, these edicts also laid the foundation for its communication with the state. The Privileges determined the way in which the imperial and royal court offices in Vienna described and defined the Serbian community and its church organisation, including the terms and expressions used. The Habsburg administration's terminology relating to Serbs established in the 17th century changed little during the 18th century. In official communication with the Court, Serbs adopted the terms and expressions from the Privileges, while in their communication within their community they often used different terms and expressions.

Emperor Leopold I began to address the peoples living south of the Sava and Danube during the Great Turkish War, when the Habsburg army was conquering Hungary in 1686/1687. Calling upon the peoples under Ottoman rule to rise in revolt, the emperor referred to them by the general term *Christiani*, emphasising the unity of Christian peoples in the fight against "Turkish tyranny". Leopold I later replaced this general reli-

gious designation with another term that specified a particular confession and introduced a precise ethnic designation for the people to whom he presented himself as a legitimate ruler. Through the text of the Privilege, issued through the Court Secret Chancellery on 21st August 1690, the Habsburg terminology regarding Serbs, their faith, and their church began to take shape. In that text, the Orthodox Church was referred to as the "Eastern Church of the Greek Rite" (Orientalis Ecclesia Ritus Graeci). The Serbian people were referred to as "Rascians", i.e. the "community of the Greek Rite and the Rascian nation" (Communitas ejusdem Graeci Ritus, et Nationis Rascianorum). At the time of issuing the Privilege, Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević was recognised with the title "Archbishop of the Rascians of the Eastern Church of the Greek Rite" (Orientalis Ecclesiae, Ritus Graeci Rascianorum Archi-Episcopus). The same terms and expressions are found in the Protection Diploma of Leopold I issued on 11th December 1690 and the Privilege issued on 20th August 1691, both through the Hungarian Court Chancellery. To describe the people, adjective "Serbian" was used for the first time in the Privilege issued through the Hungarian Court Chancellery on 4th March 1695. From the context in which it is used in the text, there is no doubt that it was a synonym for the adjective "Rascian". Patriarch Arsenije III was mentioned with the title "Archbishop of Serbs of the Greek Rite" (Servianorum Graeci Ritus Archi-Episcopus), and for describing the people, the terms Populum Servianum and Rasciani seu Serviani Populi were used.

The "Greek Rite" as a term for the Orthodox faith became established in the Habsburg administration during the reign of Leopold I. Consequently, the expression "Eastern Church of the Greek Rite" became the official name of the Orthodox Church in the Habsburg Monarchy. These expressions appear sporadically in sources about Serbs in Hungary from the time of the issuance of the first two Privileges in 1690 and 1691, and later their use spread and was maintained throughout the following century. The terms *Graeci ritus* and *Orientalis Ecclesia Graeci Ritus* logically referred to that part of the Christian world that, after the Great Schism of 1054, retained the Byzantine, i.e. Greek rite in worship. For the Orthodox population, these were much more acceptable terms than *Schismatici*, a designation that had been frequently used until then in the state where the Roman Catholic faith was dominant.

In the process of accepting the names "Greek Rite" and "Eastern Church of the Greek Rite", Serbs also played a role. The term "Our Holy Church of the Eastern Greek Law" was used in the petition submitted by representatives of the clergy and people gathered at the Assembly in Belgrade in June 1690. That petition, written in Serbo-Slavic, later served as the template for the first Privilege issued on 21st August 1690. In addition to that petition, Bishop Isaija Đaković of Jenopolje (Ineu), submitted a memorandum in Latin at the Court in Vienna, in which Patriarch Arsenije III was referred to by the title *Orientalis ecclesiae Graeci ritus Rascianorum archiepiscopus*, the Orthodox faith was called *Graeci ritus*, and Serbs were called *Graeci ritus Rasciani*.

After 1690, in official documents issued by central court institutions in Vienna, Serbs were consistently referred to as "Rasciani". This name was adopted by the imperial administration from the Hungarian royal administration and is frequently found in sources of Habsburg origin from the 1670s onwards. The terms *Rasciani* and *Razy* appear in Hungarian sources sporadically from the late 12th century and are derived from the name Raška, which was a region of the medieval Serbian state. Their use gradually spread, and after the fall of the Serbian state to Ottoman rule, they became predominant terms for Serbs.

After the death of Leopold I, indications emerged that the Habsburg terminology referring to Serbs would be extended. In 1706, in a comprehensive response to the petition by Patriarch Arsenije III to the new ruler Joseph I, requesting confirmation of the Privileges, the Primate of Hungary, Cardinal Leopold Kollonitsch, referred to Serbs as the "Illyrian tribe" (*Gens Illyrica; Gens Illyrica seu Rasciana*), and to the Serbian language as the *Lingua Illyrica*. He also used the already established privileged terms for the Serbian Church (*Graeci Ritus Ecclesia*), the Serbian people (*Populus Rascianus*), and addressed Arsenije III by the title *Patriarch of Rascianorum*. However, he repeatedly called Serbs "schismatics".

In the text by which Joseph I confirmed the Privileges through the Court Secret Chancellery on 7th August 1706, a new term was officially introduced to describe Serbs – *Illyrians* – as a synonym for the already established names. The Serbian people were referred to as the Illyrian or/and Rascian tribe and people (*Gentis et Populi Illyrici, sive Rasciani; Gentem Illyricam*). However, in the confirmation of the Privileges issued through the Hungarian Court Chancellery on 29th September 1706, there were no significant changes in terminology compared to the language of Leopold's Privileges (*Gentis Rascianae, Populique Serviani Nominibus; Gentis et Populi Rasciani Ritum, gentis seu populi Rasciani*). The official title of Arsenije III at that time was Archbishop of the Eastern Church of the Greek Rite and Patriarch of Rascians (*Orientalis Ecclesiae Graeci Ritus Archi-Episcopus, et Rascianorum Patriarcha*), and this title was used in the confirmations issued through both chancelleries.

As a synonym for the Serbian people, the term Illyrian began to be officially used during the reign of Joseph I. In its original meaning, it referred to an imaginary concept of ancient heritage of the Balkan Slavs. The idea of an Illyrian nation as a large Slavic community with a common origin emerged in the 16th century. It was widely accepted during the Great Turkish War, when the Habsburg army, following its capture of Belgrade in 1688, set out to liberate the Balkan Christians from Ottoman rule. The proponents of the idea of Illyrian nation were Count Đorđe Branković and Patriarch Arsenije III.

During the reign of Joseph I, Serbs began using the term Illyrian in their communication with state authorities, although they still more frequently referred to themselves as the Rascian people and Rascians. For example, in 1708, the signatories of a petition to General Kreutz in Osijek signed as *Ritus Graeci Gens Rasciana*. At the end of the same year, the decision to engage an agent in Vienna was signed with the words: *Ad servitia paratissimi Gentis Illuricae Graeci Ritus Status et Ordines*.

During the reign of Charles VI and Maria Theresia, there were no significant changes in terminology regarding Serbs. In their confirmations of Privileges issued through the Court Secret Chancellery in 1713 and 1743, respectively, the adjective Illyrian was used to describe the people, along with Rascian and Serbian. In the texts of the confirmations of Privileges issued through the Hungarian Court Chancellery in 1713 and 1743, the established terminology of Leopold's Privileges and the confirmations of Joseph I, issued through the same court chancellery, were used. The people were referred to as Rascian and Serbian. In the confirmations issued through both chancelleries, the Orthodox Church was referred to as the Eastern Church of the Greek Rite.

The terminology regarding Serbs from the Privileges and their confirmations remained in use throughout the 18th century. It is observed, however, that during the second half of the century, the term Serbian gradually disappears in sources of Habsburg origin, while Rascian and Illyrian are frequently used in describing the people. By the end of Maria Theresia's reign, the term Illyrian had prevailed over the term Rascian.

In rulers', court offices' and government representatives' official communication with Serbs, all the terms from the texts of the Privileges and their confirmations were used. In communication with state authorities, Serbs fully adopted and used the terminology of the Privileges and their confirmations. The expression *Nos Unversitas Nationis Illyrico-Rascianae*, *Ecclesiasticis simul et Secularis Status*, or "We, the entire Illyrian-Rascian people, the clergy and the secular class together", was used by the National-Church Assembly in 1731 to describe itself as a distinct Serbian institution in the Habsburg Monarchy. The Assembly's decision to engage an agent in Vienna was intended for state authorities, and was composed in Latin using the Privileges' terminology. Thus, the Assembly emphasised that the decision was made in the name of "our Illyrian-Rascian or Serbian nation" – *Nationis Nostrae Illyricae Rascianae, Seu Servianae.*

In communication within their community, Serbs retained traditional terminology. In the conclusions of the first National-Church Assembly held in the Krušedol Monastery in 1708, the people were referred to as "Slavo-Serbian". In the documents related to the convening of the Assembly in 1781, we find the same expressions. In the instructions for the Assembly delegates, the terms "our Slavo-Serbian people" and "our Serbian people" are found. In most petitions and complaints submitted to the Assembly from all parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, there was no need for Serbs to use for themselves any term other than the simple "our people". In describing the Orthodox faith, they used the terms common in their community: "Eastern piety", "Christian law" or simply "Our law".

The rights and freedoms granted by the Privileges, along with the terminology from the texts of these edicts and their confirmations imposed by the state and adopted by Serbs in official communication, shaped the identity of that religious and ethnic community in the Habsburg Monarchy. The names "Rascian and Illyrian people", "Greek rite" and "Eastern Church of the Greek rite" became an integral part of the image that Serbs accepted of themselves and used to present themselves to others. This terminology became an integral part of the Serbian privileged identity. However, there was no need to describe a personal sense of belonging to the community with grandiose words. Expressions such as "our people" and "our law" were entirely sufficient for Serbs to define their ethnic and religious community.

Keywords: Serbs, Rascians, Illyrians, nation, identity, Privileges, Habsburg Monarchy, 17th century, 18th century

Vladimir Simić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy vmsimic@f.bg.ac.rs

RELIGION, DYNASTY AND ENLIGHTENMENT: SERBIAN PATRIOTISM IN THE HABSBURG MONARCHY IN THE 18TH CENTURY

Patriotism in the 18th century was not a universal or singular phenomenon but one shaped by the cultural, political, and social contexts in which it developed. It was deeply rooted in the structures of monarchy and feudalism and later connected to ideas of civic rights and duties. This transformative period, marked by significant societal changes, saw patriotism evolve into a concept integral to national identity and statehood, spurred by civic revolutions. At its core, patriotism reflected the individuals relationship with their fatherland (patria) or homeland. This concept carried multiple meanings, influenced by humanist thinkers who emphasized the fatherland as a collective ideal transcending individual interests. Humanists propagated the noble idea of dving for one's fatherland, a notion that gained moral significance over time, deeply embedded in classical traditions of duty and sacrifice from ancient Greece and Rome. These ideals were adapted by medieval Christian theology, integrating virtues of compassion and self-sacrifice. During the Baroque era, patriotism was intertwined with religious devotion, aligning patria with pietas, or faith. This fusion transformed patriotic duty into a Christian ethic, encouraging individuals to serve their fatherland as an expression of religious piety. Figures like Thomas Aquinas stressed that love for the homeland and justice were the foundations of societal cohesion. Baroque art and emblems, such as the phrase "pro deo et patria", encapsulated this idea, blending earthly and heavenly loyalties. By the Enlightenment, patriotism became a platform for critiquing the social order. Citizens, particularly the middle class, demanded administrative participation and rights protection. Revolts and calls for greater representation marked the rise of civic engagement and the foundations of modern political thought. In the multiethnic Habsburg Monarchy, patriotism varied by community, with elites shaping public discourse and policy. The Serbian Orthodox Church in the Karlovci Metropolitanate played a pivotal role in fostering religious, dynastic, and reformist patriotism, reflecting the complex relations between Serbian communities, their church, and Habsburg authorities. This multifaceted patriotism underscored loyalty to the fatherland, homeland and community, balancing individual and collective responsibilities.

Christian patriotism, deeply rooted in medieval traditions, linked the concept of heavenly homeland with practices like pilgrimages and saint cults. These elements were instrumental in shaping religious and secular identities, leaving a lasting impact on subsequent generations. The Heavenly Jerusalem was not merely a metaphor for paradise but symbolized an ideal community of believers united by shared faith and patriotism. This dual spiritual and social force significantly influenced the lives and identities of Christian communities. Visual culture played a pivotal role in disseminating Christian patriotism. Iconostases, frescoes, icons, and other church elements conveyed patriotic and religious messages. Artists used biblical motifs to depict ideals of faith and patriotic feelings. Frescoes showcasing saints' lives or biblical narratives inspired reflection on one's faith and societal duties. Central to this visual culture was the depiction of the Heavenly Jerusalem, representing eternal Christian unity. These images, rich in detail and artistry, strengthened religious sentiment. Biblical writers described the heavenly realm using earthly metaphors such as kingdoms, cities, and gardens, reflecting the divine nature of paradise. This ideal became central to a Christian's life journey, striving toward eternal salvation. Pilgrimages to holy sites like Jerusalem and Mount Athos reinforced a shared identity among pilgrims, fostering communal belonging. Such journeys inspired profound spiritual experiences and provided tangible reminders of faith, including illustrated guidebooks. Travelogues and journey diaries of Serbian pilgrims and travelers exemplify this tradition. These works combined religious instruction with cultural memory, influencing church interiors and practices. Liturgy played a key role in conveying religious and patriotic values. Liturgical texts celebrated saints like St. Sava and St. Simeon, emphasizing their contributions to preserving faith and national identity. Liturgical observances, including prayers and processions, strengthened community bonds and reinforced patriotic devotion. The Serbian Church, particularly in the Metropolitanate of Karlovci, emphasized the veneration of saints as protectors of the Serbian people and land. Saints' relics became focal points of devotion, preserving spiritual and cultural heritage. Liturgical books like the "Srbljak" perpetuated this tradition, highlighting the unity of church and state. Christian patriotism merged faith with loyalty, fostering a collective identity grounded in shared religious and cultural values.

Dynastic patriotism in the 18th-century Habsburg Monarchy was a complex phenomenon that united diverse peoples and religious communities under the shared loyalty to the ruler and dynasty. This form of patriotism deeply intertwined with religious, political, and cultural life, manifesting in art, ceremonies, and public celebrations. The ruler was perceived as a divinely chosen protector of Christianity and justice. Represented as the image of God, monarchs such as Leopold I and Charles VI were depicted in religious and mythological scenes underscoring their role as guardians of faith. Ceremonies, such as the Holy Thursday foot-washing ritual, symbolized the ruler's care for the people, reinforcing dynastic loyalty through acts of humility and charity. Public rituals, festivals, and prayers for the monarch emphasized the sacred duty of the ruler to serve both God and the people. These events, including royal birthdays and coronation anniversaries, provided opportunities for public demonstrations of loyalty and attachment to the dynasty, fostering political unity in the multiethnic and multiconfessional state. The Habsburg dynasty used marriage alliances and symbolic representation of territories and ethnic groups to maintain cohesion. Monarchs portrayed themselves as stabilizing forces, with art and architecture, such as palaces and sculptures, celebrating their achievements and authority. Portraits of rulers like Maria Theresa emphasized their maternal care, while historical artworks highlighted dynastic continuity and legitimacy. The Enlightenment introduced significant changes to dynastic patriotism, shifting focus toward rationality, equality, and justice. Joseph II implemented reforms aimed at modernizing the state and promoting religious tolerance, equality, and administrative efficiency. His enlightened absolutism sought to unify subjects under shared rights and duties, despite resistance from traditional elites. The Serbian community in the Habsburg Monarchy embraced dynastic patriotism as a survival strategy. The Serbian Orthodox Church, notably through the Metropolitanate of Karlovci, played a pivotal role in fostering loyalty while preserving cultural and religious autonomy. Clergy promoted dynastic allegiance through sermons, ceremonies, and education, ensuring integration while safeguarding Serbian identity. Art and propaganda further reinforced dynastic patriotism, using visual media to celebrate the monarchy's role in uniting and protecting its diverse subjects. This blending of religious, political, and cultural elements ensured the enduring relevance of dynastic loyalty in the Habsburg Monarchy.

Enlightenment reformist patriotism in the 18th century was championed by individuals committed to improving societal conditions, particularly for lower social classes, through ethical and political reforms. These patriots, inspired by ideas of universal morality, justice, and the common good, emphasized openness, tolerance, and a cosmopolitan worldview. Rooted in Enlightenment principles, they believed in reason and education as tools to uplift society, advocating for individuals to transcend personal interests in favor of communal welfare. Ethical cosmopolitanism formed the foundation of this patriotism, emphasizing universal moral values and the responsibility of individuals toward humanity. Reformist patriots sought to overcome religious and ethnic divisions by promoting shared moral obligations. They encouraged active participation in society, inspiring others through their actions and demonstrating that all, regardless of social or economic background, could contribute to societal advancement. Education was central to Enlightenment patriotism. Reformers established schools and initiatives to improve living conditions, believing education was vital for societal progress. Scientific discoveries and technological innovations significantly influenced daily life, enhancing public health and addressing threats like plagues. Figures like Zaharija Orfelin published works "for patriotic reasons" to disseminate scientific knowledge and combat superstitions. These efforts included promoting hygiene, vaccination, and medical advancements. Civic patriotism under the Enlightenment was political rather than ethnically or nationally driven. Reformist patriots associated loyalty to the state with a duty to its defense and prosperity, engaging in public life to achieve the common good. Intellectuals like Dositej Obradović advocated for education and moral progress, emphasizing love for humanity as the foundation of a just society. His works reflected a vision of universal human rights and equality. In the Habsburg Monarchy, these ideas supported political stability and unity within its multiethnic empire. Serbian communities, enjoying certain privileges since the 1690 migration, embraced constitutional patriotism, fighting to preserve rights and privileges. Leaders like Patriarch Arsenije IV advanced these ideals, combining religious loyalty with demands for justice and legal protections. Enlightenment reformist patriotism combined universal principles with concrete actions, advancing education, public health, and equality. It provided a framework for social progress and political reform, influencing broader European and local Serbian contexts in the 18th century.

The examination of Serbian patriotism in the Habsburg Monarchy reveals a rich tapestry of religious devotion, dynastic loyalty, and constitutional aspirations. These elements, though distinct, were deeply interconnected, reflecting the dynamic interplay of tradition, power, and progress. Patriotism in this context was not merely an abstract ideal but a practical and lived experience that shaped the lives and aspirations of the Serbian people. It served as a unifying force, fostering a sense of purpose and belonging that transcended individual and communal boundaries. By embracing and adapting these diverse forms of patriotism, the Serbian community demonstrated its resilience and commitment to preserving its identity and values in the 18th century.

Keywords: patriotism, Serbs, Metropolitenate of Karlovci, 18th century, Habsburg Monarchy, visual arts, Orthodox Church

Miroslav Pavlović

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy miroslav.pavlovic@ff.uns.ac.rs

ON THE ETHNICITY OF JANISSARIES AND LOCAL TROOPS IN THE 18TH CENTURY

The research on the origins of Ottoman soldiers on the Danube defence line, with a focus on the Sanjak of Semendire (Ser. Smederevo) and its central and the most important fortress – Belgrade, aimed to investigate the importance of their ethnic identity. In this sense, ethnic identity is viewed as one of multiple identities in the socio-economic and proto-political context. Conflicts and cooperation among members of the Ottoman military units were examined in order to determine potential importance of ethnicity as one of the factors in political initiatives and the formation of collective identities in these areas.

It was confirmed that the janissary units and the local army comprised individuals from various ethnic backgrounds. In Belgrade itself and its wider hinterland, a group of soldiers from Asia Minor was identified in the sources, which indicate that their primary origin was from Alanya. It was concluded that this formation from Alanya cannot be the only one and that the presence of the term *dahi* in the contemporary sources about the area certainly indicates the Anatolian origin of other members of some military units, primarily the imperial janissaries and auxiliary janissary units, i.e. yamaks. Apart from them, the group of Albanians was numerous, dominantly in the eastern part of the Sanjak of Semendire and in Belgrade itself. Soldiers of Albanian origin were associated and very well connected with formations that came to the region from parts of today's Bulgaria, primarily Vidin and Rushchuk, but also Sofia, Pazardzhik, etc. In the western part of the province, a significant part of the soldiers were Bosnian Muslims. Their presence was also significant in Belgrade fortress. It can be concluded that the viziers hired units from the regions of their origin or simply recruited soldiers of an ethnic origin different to the one

they had problems with. Furthermore, ethnicity did not always play a decisive role in the processes of group formation, because business interests prevailed, but ethnic identity cannot be ignored in the observation of proto-political conflicts in this area, also bearing in mind the interests of the local population in this predominantly Serbian ethnic area.

It was noticed that numerous Albanian units entered military service in Smederevo, Belgrade and the surrounding towns through the network of a'van Osman Pazvanoğlu, who hired and paid them for his personal military objectives. Sources, however, suggest that they were present there immediately after the restoration of the Ottoman rule in 1739, and consequently probably significantly earlier. Thus, the very basis of the conflict between the (imperial) janissaries and the yamaks was established in that period of early recruitment. An entry in the Mühimme Defters (a register of imperial orders) from 1762 gives permission to replace ineffective (bozulan) soldiers, who have no connection with the janissaries, with reinforcements from the category of pseudo-janissaries (taslakci makulesi) and a group of Albanians (Arnavut taifesi). Somewhat earlier, in 1750, the Sublime Porte confirms that, due to several cases of bad behaviour and actions (bazi uygunsuz hal ve halistirim sebiliyle), a decision was made to relocate a thousand janissaries and yamaks from Belgrade to other border fortresses. Two points are significant here: the mention of the janissaries and yamaks in the same context, and the mention of ethnic identity as the direct basis for recruitment into the units. In both instances, there is no specific mention that Albanians were excluded from the imperial janissary units. However, their inclusion is not explicitly highlighted either, although we could perhaps assume that they were not accepted into the unit. Thus, the conflict between the two formations cannot be linked to the ethnicity of the recruits. However, from further mentions of Albanians in the documents, it could be concluded that they were primarily recruited as yamaks.

Problems arising from the influx of large numbers of Albanian recruits into the Belgrade fortress were recorded in several sources from 1753. A group of soldiers was punished and expelled for abuse and injustice (*fesatlik ve karışıklık*), which was reported to all major centers in Rumelia. In the document, these former soldiers, without specifying the unit they belonged to, are called bandits (*eşkıya*). It was previously stated that in the same year, the Albanians were expelled for oppression from Belgrade and other towns and *palankas* (small wooden forts) by a fatwa. They were led by Mehmed Matli, Ali Derviş, Deli Yusuf and Alemdar Ali. They were initially imprisoned in Kruševac (Ott. Alacahisar), but very quickly they successfully escaped and occupied the palanka Kolari. There they began to gather forces from Niš and Kruševac in order to capture Belgrade that same year.

The imperial janissary units were more often filled with recruits of a various ethnicities, and this is perhaps the essential difference compared to the predominantly Rumelian origin of the yamaks. However, when the need for military force was significantly higher than the number of local volunteers, recruits were sought after even in distant areas. This is indicated by a document requesting an end to the practice of recruiting soldiers of local origin from the area of today's Alanya (Alaiye'li zümre). These soldiers could have been recruited into service by one of the Belgrade viziers originating from those regions, or who previously served there, the same as the later vizier Hacı Mustafa Pasha did by recruiting his compatriots from Plovdiv and Pazardzhik into his kapu halki (his personal retinue). Shortly before 1796, he recruited 1,800 soldiers from Bosnia into the local or *yerlü* units, and then, as sources suggest, due to the collusion of the ianissaries and the verlü soldiers with the people of Vidin, he accepted seymens from Plovdiv into his entourage. Following a similar model, the Belgrade vizier Ibrahim Pasha from Malatya interfered in local affairs in his hometown in 1757 and supported a group of bandits there. A conclusion can be made that in the middle of the 18th century, mercenaries were predominantly recruited as yamaks, afterwards as members of the local provincial army, and at the end of the century, as a part of vizier's entourage. The reason for this practice was that the viziers had by then lost any effective control over other military units.

Bandits of Albanian origin are mentioned as members of both the janissaries and vamaks. Expelled from Belgrade and Vidin, between 1718 and 1739, they settled down in Niš and caused great problems there. A certain Süleyman Bese, a member of the 82nd janissary unit, and described in sources as a criminal (müfsid), killed Vaiz Ali Efendi from Pirot, a member of the same unit, in 1759. In that region, Albanian recruits, by all accounts, closely cooperated with the group from Alanya. However, it cannot be concluded that this was an ethnically motivated crime. The cooperation of the two ethnic groups testifies to the fact that the group from Alanva did not only invested money in different financial endeavours but also seemed to have an active influence on military units, whatever that meant in terms of their efficiency. Perhaps the best evidence of this behaviour is the information from the sources about some janissaries from Niš, who are reported to have raided the houses of other janissaries between 1748 and 1758. Moreover, they robbed the "German re'ayya" and usurped their property, spreading strife all the way from Pirot to Leskovac. The documents state that among these janissaries there were Albanians and bandits from Alanya. In 1764, it was recorded that people sent from Leskovac usurped and sold the house of a yamak in Belgrade from the 83rd unit.

Here we can only note that the return of the yamaks to Belgrade after 1739, eased the pressure in Niš, that the Albanians moved north and that the operations of these units in the southernmost city of the Sanjak of Semendire were prevented. Unfortunately, riots started to be a new reality in Belgrade in the last decades of the 18th century. At that time, there was a conflict between the janissaries and the yamaks in Belgrade, and this is one of two known cases in the Empire where the yamaks played a key political role.

The so-called Janissary attacks on Belgrade became a regular occurrence since the middle of the 18th century. It should be noted that Belgrade was not attacked really by the janissaries, but by bandits, former volunteers, yamaks, etc. They were mostly former members of the regular imperial or local army in Belgrade. The firste attacks were started by Albanian mercenaries, who moved through Vidin and further along the Danube, in parallel with a land attack through Paraćin and Ćuprija towards Smederevo and all the way to Belgrade. A similar situation was repeated in 1794 and 1795, but also in 1798 and 1799. The only difference was that in the latter attack Belgrade was defended by the Bosnian army. An interplay of different political interests was reflected in that situation. Firstly, the Zvornik (Ott. Izvornik) vizier was appointed to the position of the kaymakam in Belgrade, and then the Bosnian vali himself appeared on the battlefield. One document states that his troops were joined by a'yans from the kazas closer to the area on their march towards Belgrade. From other sources we have information that Bosnian Muslims competed for local administrative positions - kadis, mütesellims, muhafizis or a'yans - in the western part of the Sanjak. They did not appear there until the end of the century but had already systematically settled the areas of the western part of the Sanjak of Semendire earlier. The viziers settled them in Belgrade through military recruitment, where they represented a counterbalance to other ethnic groups. When the people of Vidin or troops of Albanian origin were under the control and paid by Pazvanoğlu, the Bosnians represented the strongest supporters of the Belgrade viziers, giving them refuge when needed. Thus, Belgrade viziers started to play a political game counting on the support of Westerners (notables and soldiers from Bosnia) or Easterners (Albanians and those hailing from Asia Minor or other eastern provinces).

Ethnicity did not play a significant role in the formation of group identities in the Sanjak of Semendire and in Belgrade itself in the 18th century. However, ethnic identities cannot be ignored in considering protopolitical conflicts. In this sense, apart from groups whose members came from the Asia Minor, Albania, Bosnia, Vidin or some other places that the sources do not explicitly mention, another ethnic group had a decisive role in further political movements and in the shaping of the history of this area – Serbs, whose national idea was just emerging at that time. As a provincial capital, and an administrative and military center, Belgrade was a cosmopolitan town, a meeting place of different religious and ethnic identities – Easterners and Westerners, Christians and Muslims. Conflicts and cooperation might not be based on ethnic criteria in the 18th century, but ethnic identities were an integral part of all important historical processes in this area. If they were not the main catalyst of historical phenomena and processes, they certainly represented a significant factor in their development.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, 18th century, janissaries, pseudo-janissarism, yamaks, yerli askeri, ethnicity

Marija Andrić

Institute of History Belgrade marija.andric@iib.ac.rs

CONNECTION TO THE ROOTS OR INTEGRATION: THE STATUS OF THE HERZEGOVINIAN MERCHANT MARKO MIRKOVIĆ IN 18TH-CENTURY VENETIAN REPUBLIC

Merchant Marko Mirković came from Herceg Novi to Ancona in September 1761 in order to finish some business and settle his debts. It is unknown where he stayed in Ancona, but by October of the same year he moved to the house of his colleague Jeronim Drašković. He did this because he was feeling unwell, and after just ten days of staying at his colleague's house, Marko passed away. It is likely that his condition worsened significantly on the tenth day, as he received the holy rites in the morning according to Orthodox customs, only to lose his battle with the illness later that afternoon. A priest from the Greek chapel of St. Anna in Ancona took care of him, and he was buried in the Greek church in the same city.

Chances are small that we would know these details about the life of this merchant had certain administrative matters not been initiated in Ancona regarding his death in the same year. First, *the consul of the Levantines* (It. *Console de Levantini*), upon learning of Marko's death, went to make an inventory of the merchant's estate. The body of the deceased and all his possessions were in the house of Jeronim, where an inventory was made, and the chest containing the belongings was sealed in the presence of a notary and other witnesses. The following day, when the consul of the Levantines returned to complete the procedure, he found *the consul of Venice* (It. *Console di Venezia*) Agostino Belarossa there. Declaring that "the deceased should be treated as a Venetian citizen", Belarossa did not approve the involvement of the consul of the Levantines in the administrative matters that, in his view, were under the jurisdiction of the Venetian office. Firm in his stance, both consuls claimed the right to inventory the deceased's belongings, and they simultaneously began the procedure, which led to a dispute over who was actually authorized to carry out this task.

A formal protocol of a commercial-administrative nature raised a number of questions and uncertainties regarding the identity of the merchant Marko Mirković. Where was he born, and in which territory did he spend his life? How much wealth did he accumulate? With whom did he start a family? Small fragments of his life were gathered in order to form a whole and shed light on a case that in Venetian documents was characterized as a dilemma about which merchant community Mirković belonged to. The problem was that the views of the two consuls differed, and there was no material evidence. Namely, the merchant died in the Ancona without an heir present and without a written will. The lack of written evidence of this kind meant that Mirković had not personally explained his status, so we only learn about his identity through the perceptions of those who knew him.

"Born on Ottoman territory" – implicit connections to the origins

The consul of the Levantines claimed rights over the affairs concerning the estate of the merchant Marko Mirković, highlighting the deceased's religious identity, noting that Mirković was a "schismatic Orthodox" (*greco scismatico*). Undoubtedly, the merchant had respected the traditions of his ancestors during his life and remained faithful to the Orthodox faith, as he received the holy rites from the chaplain of the same church at the time of his death and was buried at the Greek church in Ancona. Since the jurisdiction of the consul of the Levantines applied to "all Orthodox Christians, regardless of where they came from", his right to conclude the procedure over the deceased merchant's estate was argued. Holding firmly to this right, the consul's office justified such actions by the fact that the duty of this official "implicitly includes any other legal act whenever it concerns an Orthodox, or Levantine".

It is also necessary to link to the second part of the consul's argument, in which the merchant's identity was defined from the perspective of his geographical origin. Namely, he believed that the deceased should be treated as a "subject of the Ottoman Sultan, because he was originally from Herzegovina". The fact that Marko Mirković was born in Herzegovina, in the Ottoman Empire, was used as a legal basis to claim that he was a subject of that state. The legal status of an individual in the Ottoman Empire was conditioned by the fact that they lived in that state and enjoyed certain rights and had specific obligations. Non-Muslims who were subjects of the Ottoman Empire was guaranteed the right to life, liberty, property, and freedom of religion within the borders of the Ottoman state, with the obligation to pay a poll tax and to obey the regulations imposed by Sharia law. For the consul's claim to be convincing, he had to provide evidence that the merchant had lived in the Ottoman state or at least that he was part of a smaller Orthodox community within the Empire. Aside from the fact that this was not demonstrated, it was also not established to what extent the deceased maintained ties with his hometown.

"A Venetian subject in accordance with general legal principles"

It was not disputed by the Venetian consul in Ancona Agostino Belarossa that the deceased merchant was a "Greek Orthodox" and "born in the Ottoman Empire". However, he believed that the consul of the Levantines' interference in the case was not justified. In one memorandum, it was emphasized that the consul of the Levantines was intended to represent merchants, specifically "Orthodox Christians, Jews, and Muslims", and was authorized by the Office of the consul of the Levantines to oversee trade exchanges with the Levant and operate within that domain. However, a significant difference rested on the fact that the consul of the Levantines' jurisdiction should not affect maintaining relations with individuals from merchant communities that had their own representative in Ancona (*console proprio nazionale in Ancona*).

Shifting the focus away from Marko Mirković's origin, consul Belarossa emphasized that the deceased merchant, during his life, "became a Venetian subject in accordance with general legal principles". On the other hand, the consul of the Levantines' sought to refute any connection of the deceased merchant with the Venetian Republic, emphasizing that he "never presented himself nor identified as a Venetian citizen", and considered that, he should not be treated as such even after death. Aside from a will, the only documents in which we might find the merchant's personal stance on this matter are petitions addressed to a state office. Since no petition or other written representation from Marko Mirković was presented, it is not possible to discuss whether and in what way he expressed a sense of belonging to the Venetian society. On the other hand, becoming an equal member of a community required a special procedure and the fulfillment of certain criteria. From a legal standpoint, personal statements played no role, as the main conditions for that status were dictated by the government, while in some cases, the community itself could also prescribe additional requirements.

Immigrants in Venice could obtain citizenship status. That group of people was divided into two categories: legal citizenship, which was granted to all citizens by birth, and citizenship granted as a type of diploma. The authorities approved the latter upon request, which essentially represented an individual's petition to formalize their integration into Venetian society. Granting a new status brought numerous privileges, and this rank was also classified (*de intus, de intus et extra*). A similar model, with minor adjustments likely depending on the local community, their statutes, and city governance, also applied to the status of Venetian subjects, although it was probably more often defined at the *de intus* category level.

From Ottoman Herzegovina to Venetian Herceg Novi

Although born in the Ottoman territory, the merchant Marko Mirković became a Venetian subject because he lived for twenty-nine years in the territory of the Venetian Republic. He was a resident of its holdings on the Adriatic coast, in Herceg Novi, a town in the Boka Kotorska bay, where he founded a family and adhered to the local regulations and laws. How did the Venetian consul prove this? Focusing on the last few decades of the merchant's life, which he spent under Venetian rule, and gathering testimonies from his fellow countrymen, acquaintances and colleagues from that period. Statements were given by people from Boka, and their claims were presented as authoritative statements from representatives of the Boka community, into which the late merchant had integrated over decades, becoming a well-known and respected member.

How did Marko integrate into the Boka community? The issue of immigrants from various regions of the Balkans to the territory of Venetian Republic is a special topic in historiography, with results showing how the process of integration depended on the period and the external political circumstances of that time. Studies addressing the integration of minorities into new environments highlight three key steps in the process: finding accommodation, employment, and forming a family. Especially, marriage was considered the foundation for assimilation into the local society.

We know that both of Marko Mirković's marriages were to women from prominent families of Boka Kotorska. Regarding the first wife, it is only known that she came from one of the noble families of the region, but none of the witnesses knew her name or surname. After her death, he married the daughter of the esteemed Luka Vučetić from Kotor, which was under the administration of the Venetain Republic. He likely gradually built his economic status in Herceg Novi. Testimonies confirmed that during his life in the city, the merchant amassed wealth, which made him one of the wealthiest in the community. The people of Boka confirmed that he owned several properties, including houses and land in Herceg Novi. Another indicator of the deceased's prosperous status in the Venetian territory was the fact that he owned several ships.

Conclusion

Based on the data we presented, there are several questions that need to be addressed. First and foremost, the dilemma arises: did Marko Mirković maintain connections with his roots? If we judge by the lack of certain information about his life, it is likely that this was not the case. None of the respondents could say anything about his parents, name the exact place of his birth, or testify about his trading life before coming to the Venetian territory. Moreover, no one mentioned whether his family from his hometown had any role as a financial support that helped him create a better life in the Venetian Republic's territory. The only family of Marko Mirković we can speak of is the one he created in Herceg Novi, although it is not known whether he had descendants from the mentioned marriages.

In the final decision that arrived from Rome in December 1761, it was explained that the solution was reached based on information about "Marko's submission" (*la sudditanza del Mircovich*). It was concluded that the late merchant "should be treated as a Venetian subject" because his residence and business had long been tied to Herceg Novi, a city under Venetian rule. It was literally stated that for these reasons, it was necessary to "give preference" to the place of his long-term residence over his homeland, which was under Ottoman rule. In other words, it was concluded that the merchant did not live as an Ottoman subject.

Most likely, the late merchant did not maintain direct contacts with the place where he lived before moving to Herceg Novi, and that within the Venetian society, in Boka Kotorska, he established business, friendly, and family connections. If community is the foundation of every integration, then the testimonies of those who emphasized Marko's professional and social reputation in the Boka community showed that he, at the same time, became its equal member.

Keywords: 18th century, merchant Marko Mirković, Ancona, origin, identity, Venice, Herceg Novi, Boka

Branko Bešlin

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy beslin@ff.uns.ac.rs

"BOTH SERBS AND CITIZENS" – SHAPING THE CONCEPT OF THE NATION IN THE SPIRIT OF THE POLITICAL IDEAS OF THE 19TH CENTURY

The paper presents the development of the modern concept of nation among Serbs from the Timisoara Assembly in 1790 and the Serbian Revolution in 1804, when its formation began, to the 1870s, when the process was completed by the activities of the "United Serbian Youth". The relatively long period in which the phenomenon is being considered, as well as the fact that the Serbs were not included in the same state and legal framework, required that the historical context be presented in a synthesized manner and that various projects for resolving the Eastern Question and creating new states in southeastern Europe be omitted from it. During the 18th century, the Serbian political, religious and cultural center was in the Hungarian part of the Habsburg Monarchy. The Timisoara Assembly was convened in 1790 after the death of Joseph II, who sought to centralize and homogenize the composite early modern state through a series of reforms, including imposing German as the official language. For this reason, as well as for the abolition of feudal privileges, he was hated by the Hungarian nobility, who considered only members of their own estate, regardless of their different ethnic origins, to be a "nation" (Natio Hungaricana) and demanded the restoration of Hungarian statehood. In 1790, the Serbian leaders had to reckon with the fact that absolutism was over in Hungary and that the privileges obtained from the Habsburg rulers would not be a guarantee for the preservation of ethnicity and religion unless they were legalized ("inarticulated") by a representative body - the Hungarian Parliament. In Timisoara, a group called the

"nationalists" prevailed. They were led by the clergy and military officers, who traditionally relied on Vienna and the dynasty. They demanded that Banat be separated from the jurisdiction of the Hungarian parliament and that the Serbs be granted territorial autonomy within it. The minority that was against this and advocated "inarticulation" consisted of some citizens and nobles. Their spokesman, Sava Tekelija, was one of the most educated and influential Serbs of the time. He failed to dissuade the majority, who believed that the absolutism of Vienna suited the Serbs better than the parliamentarism advocated by the Hungarian nobility. The ruler gave in to the Hungarians. The Serbs were not given territorial autonomy; they became equal before the law with the other inhabitants of the state - this did not mean the equality of all individuals, but rather their integration into the feudal social order that was in force. The Serbs' ethnic identity was not threatened, since the very term "Hungarian nation" was linked only to state and estate affiliation. The Hungarian language was not yet in official use - not even a good part of the noble-patriots who were ethnic Hungarians knew it. The Serbs were not, nor could they be, collectively recognized as a nation, but rather as a denomination, which was a surrogate for "status politicus".

Stefan Stratimirović was elected metropolitan in 1790 and would remain in that position until 1836. A Freemason with extensive connections, he gathered intellectuals around him and did much with them to form a national consciousness among the Serbs. In addition to the previously established network of primary confessional school schools, a gymnasium was founded in Sremski Karlovci in 1791 under the patronage of the Metropolis, a seminary in 1793, and a gymnasium in Novi Sad in 1810. Stratimirović maintained ties with Karadorde and other leaders of the uprising that broke out in Serbia in 1804 with the aim of turning the rebellion into a national revolution in which the Serbian state would be restored. Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy played an important role in establishing the administration and education system. In 1807, the most prominent writer of the Serbian Enlightenment, Dositej Obradović, came to Serbia, and in 1808 the Great School was opened. After 1790, the Hungarian nobility began to build on its state-class nationalism by emphasizing Hungarian linguistic and cultural identity. The concept according to which the nobility itself was considered a nation gradually evolved, in accordance with the idea of national sovereignty, into the attitude that all inhabitants of Hungary, regardless of ethnicity and language, constitute a single political nation - Hungarian. Following the example of the Hungarian magnates who laid the foundations of the future Academy of Sciences with monetary contributions, seven Serbs - all from the bourgeois class - founded the Matica Srpska in Pest in 1826. Its goal was to support

the publication of a literary magazine and then to publish books in the Serbian language. In 1838, Sava Tekelija was elected president for life of the Matica Srpska and, with his personal endowments, made it the richest non-Hungarian cultural institution in Hungary. In the same year, the Lyceum was founded in Serbia, from which the Great School would develop, and later the University of Belgrade. The Matica focused its activities on all countries where Serbs lived, regardless of the state borders of the time, and Tekelija intended to create a national academy of sciences from it, but his death prevented him from doing so in 1842. In the same year, the Serbian Learned Society, the forerunner of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, was founded in Belgrade.

The Principality of Serbia was not independent, but in a vassal-tributary relationship with the Porte, and most Serbs lived outside its borders. The creation of the state and its very name - Serbia - were the most important turning points in the formation of the nation. Despite this, Serbs in the Principality, as well as those outside its borders, would not identify the nation with state affiliation. Serbian intellectuals and politicians adopted the concept of a nation as a natural community, founded in ancient times on the basis of origin and language. However, they did not deny that in Europe and among the Serbs, the process of creating modern nations ("national revival", "awakening") began towards the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, and that their task was to complete it, that is, to develop a "full national consciousness" among their compatriots. Under the influence of German folklorists, Vuk Karadžić made a huge contribution to the construction of Serbian national identity. If we bear in mind that a small number of Serbs knew how to read and write and modern literature was in its infancy, folk literature was the most receptive reading material. They also aroused deep emotions in more educated and newly literate readers - the latter were impressed by the fact that the recording in books demonstrated that the oral tradition on which they were raised was not worthless in comparison to the cultural achievements of the "learned" classes and developed nations. In Serbia, the strengthening of the self-awareness of the broadest strata was also influenced by the fact that they themselves had won independence, as well as the fact that feudalism had been abolished in 1835. The first constitution adopted that same year was liberal, and in addition it emphasized state independence inappropriately given Serbia's vassal status, so it was repealed at the request of the Porte, Austria and Russia. The next constitution from 1838 limited absolutism but did not bring parliamentarism and civil liberties. Nevertheless, Serbs were equal before the law, there was no nobility, there were no large capitalists in the European sense of the word. There were poor and rich, but there were no class barriers built over centuries - in

the first half of the 19th century, differences in behavior, everyday habits and lifestyle among the population were rudimentary. In the neighboring Habsburg Monarchy, there were few serfs among the Serbs compared to other peoples, as many of them lived in the Military Frontier with the privileged status of free peasant-soldiers.

Vuk's demands for a simplified alphabet and the acceptance of the vernacular as a literary language divided educated Serbs. Vuk's most influential opponent was Metropolitan Stratimirović, and by the mid-1860s also the Matica Srpska and the Serbian Learned Society. Opponents praised Vuk for his work in collecting folk tales, but they questioned his competence in solving complex linguistic issues - which was not the most important thing. They had reason to suspect that, consciously or unconsciously, he was working in the interests of Vienna's Austro-Slavic policy - he was easily and quickly depriving the Serbs of their centuries-old literary, and therefore also part of their linguistic heritage, with which the uneducated people were not yet able to identify, but which was as necessary for the construction of national culture and identity as oral tradition. They accused Vuk of separating the Serbs from the Russians, of wanting to convert them to Catholicism. The background to the conflict becomes clearer in the context of the dispute that was being waged at the same time with the Croatian "Illyrians". Since its foundation, Matica Srpska had opposed the name "Illyrians" that the Austrian administration used in the 18th century for the Slavic population in the Balkans and in Pannonia, and in the case of the Serbs, it also applied it to their institutions. The leaders of the Croatian national revival, which emerged as a resistance to Magyarization, called their movement "Illyrian" and in the mid-1830s adopted the same dialect (Štokavian) spoken by the Serbs as the basis of the literary language. Although they publicly expressed sympathy for the "awakening" of their fellow Croats and accepted cooperation, some Serbian intellectuals suspected that behind the Illyrian name and language policy stood another Austro-Slavist trap with the intention of disorienting and dividing the Serbian ethnic corpus at the very beginning of the process of creating a modern nation. By accepting Vuk's reform, Serbian national integration was placed on broad, democratic foundations, and the far-reaching negative consequences that contemporaries pointed out became noticeable later.

It turned out that belonging to Orthodoxy would play a decisive role in the formation of the modern Serbian nation. The leaders of the national movement in the 1860s and 1870s, Svetozar, Miletić, Vladimir Jovanović, Mihailo Polit Desančić, and Jevrem Grujić, fought simultaneously for civil liberties and parliamentarism. They were aware that in addition to the common linguistic heritage between Roman Catholics, Muslims, and Orthodox Christians, there was also a heritage of religious division, fraught with hatred, intolerance, and, at its mildest, distrust. Therefore, at first glance, it may be surprising that they rarely mentioned it in public discourse about the nation - for several reasons. Otherwise, as liberals, they fervently believed in progress and believed that religious contradictions were a relic of the past and would be overcome in time. The Croats formed themselves as a separate nation with a pronounced Catholic identity, so some Serbian intellectuals kept quiet about the problem because they did not want to exclude those who were not of the Orthodox faith from their national corpus, that is, to automatically label Catholics as Croats, and potentially Muslims as well, because it was not known in which direction their national consciousness would develop after the expulsion of the Ottoman government. Serbian liberals believed that in the process of creating a nation, it was not enough to simply awaken identity consciousness, but also to improve all areas of material, political and cultural life. Following the example of Young Italy, they founded the United Serbian Youth in 1866. Although Serbian scientific and literary potential was not significant compared to that of developed nations, in this way it was mobilized and united in the general aspiration towards national liberation and cultural revival, so that publishing production greatly surpassed that of previous decades.

Keywords: Serbian nationalism, Timisoara Assembly, Matica srpska, Serbian Learned Society, United Serbian Youth, Sava Tekelija, Vuk Karadžić, Svetozar Miletić, Vladimir Jovanović

Radovan Subić

University of Banja Luka Faculty of Philosophy radovan.subic@ff.unibl.org

BETWEEN THE EMPEROR AND THE PRINCE. THE SERBIAN UPRISING IN HERZEGOVINA IN 1875–1876

The liberation from the Ottoman rule was the guiding idea of the Serbian people living in the Eyalet of Bosnia. In the period from 1804 to 1875, there were several attempts to fight for liberty - in 1809, the rebellion led by Jovan Jančić failed in the Bosnian Krajina region; in 1834, the rebellion was organized by priest Jovica Ilić in Posavina (the Sava River basin), while in 1852, the uprising broke out in Herzegovina and lasted until 1862. In the meantime, in 1858, rebellions were organized in the Bosnian Krajina region and in Posavina. These movements, apart from poor leadership and participants with no military experience, were characterized by bad organization and lack of weapons and support that could come only from their compatriots in the neighbouring regions. Small Montenegro had no resources to undertake something serious. In 1809, rebellious Serbia tried to expand the uprising spirit into the territory west of the Drina River, but it turned out it that it was impossible to wage war on several fronts. The Serbs in the Eyalet of Bosnia had numerous home and foreign opponents. Local Muslims were first to rise against the rebels. The Roman Catholic clergy made its believers to distance themselves from the liberation efforts of their Orthodox Christian neighbours. Russia was not present in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina until the 1860s. However, the "Orthodox emperor in the north" and the importance of Russia were common knowledge among the European countries for a long time. The Serbs in Herzegovina "always wondered whether Russia was on their side". This large power, the only one benevolently inclined towards the Serbs, did not support the uprising idea. The Russian ruler opposed revolutionary movements and, after the defeat in the Crimean War, Russian politics was focused on the breakthrough to Asia. Great Britain, whose society was increasingly consumed by Russophobia, watched every movement in the Ottoman Empire as a result of intrigues of Russian agents. The third power involved in the Balkan pandemonium was the Habsburg Monarchy which, after a series of defeats and territorial losses once again turned towards the Westernmost Ottoman territory in Europe.

The last time it tried to conquer it in the war in 1788-1791, but it failed on to a large extent. After the Congress of Berlin, due to the assessment of the leading people of the time that the Ottoman Empire was more useful as a weak neighbour "than the sea", the Monarchy helped to keep "the sick man of Europe". The following decades lead to changes and in the 1860s many outstanding figures recommended the occupation of the neighbouring provinces. Historiography has shown that the session of the Imperial Council on 29th January 1875 and Franz Joseph's visit to Dalmatia in April-May 1875 clearly announced the Monarchy's intention. It was necessary to initiate such a series of events in which the Habsburg Monarchy would show its "good intentions" and also benefit from its engagement. The uprising action could at the same time be the proof that status quo was unsustainable and that it was a pretext for intervention, particularly if the rebels themselves supported such an act. That is why the uprising was encouraged among the part of the population that considered the Monarchy its protector - namely the Catholic population. After May 1875, the Catholics along the border between Herzegovina and Dalmatia were prepared for the uprising. The governor of Dalmatia was in charge of organizing these "purely Catholic places" in the broader territory of Popovo polje. The first rebel shot was fired "probably on 19th" June 1875, and no Ottoman soldiers were killed in the conflict. On 22nd June, the parish priest of Gabela wrote that "all the Christians" (Catholics) in the territory of Gabela, Dračevo and Hrasno wanted the help of Austria, whose emperor they recognized as theirs. He emphasized that they had no weapons or ammunition, that they begged for food and carried the "Austrian flag". Ivan Musić led the rebels and the fact that he was the nephew of the bishop of Mostar, loval to the Vienna government, certainly led to his assuming this role. Raising the Austro-Hungarian flag proved to the Ottoman authorities that the Vienna government was involved in the initiation of the uprising. After initial skirmishes in which the Ottoman troops did not suffer any losses, Musić no longer entered any clashes, while "the Turks did not look for him either". His "administration" over the small region next to the Austro-Hungarian border was tolerated. In October 1875, he raised the Turkish flag on the church and no longer participated in the battles. Concurrently with that artificial rebellion, the Serbs' autochthonous aspiration towards national liberation escalated.

The haiduks' attack in the vicinity of Mostar provoked an armed conflict near Nevesinje and the Serbian uprising began on 9th July 1875. During July, it included the surroundings of Nevesinje, Bileća and Stolac, as well as of Trebinje. In August, the uprising was already flaring "on all sides". This "movement from the people" developed independently for a very short period of time because Montenegrin Prince Nikola (1841-1921) became involved in it. The prince feared that he would be blamed completely for the outbreak of the uprising. That is why he sent only volunteers ("jajoši") across the border, led by some trustworthy people. He believed that the Principality of Serbia would use the newly-created situation and, by helping the compatriots in Herzegovina, obtain the influence in the territory he considered his own. His paranoia was worsened by the arrival of Mića Ljubibratić (1839–1889), former associate of Luka Vukalović (1823–1873) who had led the previous Herzegovina Uprising (1852-1862). In Serbia, Ljubibratić tried to organize a new Serbian uprising for several years in vain. However, the leading people of the Principality were more concerned about the internal organization of Serbia than about flaring up the uprising in the Ottoman Empire. After May 1875, Ljubibratić was no longer in contact with the state institutions. However, Nikola still considered him the "agent of Šumadija" and false information about him as a spy was sent to Vienna, together with the plea for his arrest. By all accounts, the leading figures of the Monarchy anticipated that Mića Ljubibratić's presence in Herzegovina

Ljubibratić did not hide that he wanted to stop the traditional warfare which implied beheading, looting and plundering. It was necessary to introduce discipline, supreme command and a provisional government. That government was supposed to show to the European public that the uprising was not a bandit movement but a legitimate and civilized creation with a political agenda. In a letter to the prince, he wrote that a national assembly, composed of the eminent people and leaders, should be established in Herzegovina. The assembly was supposed to be a legislative and executive body in charge of forming the government, which would subsequently organize the army and officially declare the war to the Ottoman Empire. Within that plan, Ljubibratić's intention was to have the uprising leaders elected and not appointed. By this act, the prince would lose control and that is why he tried to keep Ljubibratić away and, if possible, have him expelled. The session of the leaders was not held because Ljubibratić had been attacked and beaten up, so he had to go to Dubrovnik for medical treatment.

would strengthen the rivalry between the princedoms and weaken the Ser-

bian national movement, and that is why he was not arrested.

In his wish to present himself as a well-intentioned ruler who would never organize an attack on the famous fighter against the Turks, Prince Nikola invited Ljubibratić to Cetinje and appointed him a duke. The attempt of liberating Trebinje in August 1875 was used by the prince to humiliate his rival further. That town next to the border was defended by a small number of people and it was a relatively easy prey. This success would be heard everywhere and Ljubibratić, who had devised the plan of synchronous attack from three directions. Would prove his military abilities. However, when the action began on 21st August, two columns led by the people under Prince Nikola's control, did nothing and the attack failed. The battle was fought for more than six hours only by Ljubibratic's detachment and, in the end, it had to withdraw. The defeat was used for showing that Ljubibratić was an incapable military leader.

In the Ottoman counter-attach, the monastery of Duži was plundered and destroyed as the centre of Ljubibratić's action. He once again tried to organize the assembly of the uprising leaders in the monastery of Kosijerovo, but most of them, under the influence of Prince Nikola, did not come. It was clear that Ljubibratić was prevented from doing anything. At the same time, different rumours circulated: that he had known that Duži would be attacked, that Herzegovina, in agreement with the Austrian emperor, had already been given to Prince Nikola, that Ljubibratić had divided the people because he was a Serbian agent. The gullible ones were even told that he had been sent by Vienna to destroy the uprising. Finally, he had to leave Herzegovina and was arrested by the Austro-Hungarian authorities and interned to Linz as a Serbian agent who wanted to go to Bosnia and organize an uprising.

After declaring war to the Ottoman Empire in 1876, Nikola went to Crni kuk in Banjani. There he was awaited by the detachments of Herzegovina rebels of whom he formed the people's army. The Herzegovina people greeted him cheering "Long live our master!". He read the proclamation in which he emphasized that he would provide any assistance to the rebels and share troubles, life and death with them. The prince told them that he had come because "Herzegovina had to be free!" Then he allegedly undertook the action of liberating Herzegovina. Soon the utter pointlessness of his move was proved - instead of advancing fast towards Mostar, which was absolutely panic-stricken, he set up camp near Nevesinje and returned five days later. In the meantime, the vanguard of the Montenegrin army was defeated at Velež. This decision was justified both by the defeat and by the arrival of the Austro-Hungarian representative who informed the prince that the Bosnia Vilayet would be joined to the Monarchy. It is possible that Prince Nikola knew that the Herzegovina territory would not be liberated and that he led the entire operation badly in order to justify himself in the eyes of his contemporaries and descendants. The rebels as parts of the Montenegrin army lost their lives on other fronts, while the fate of their homeland was decided at the Congress of Berlin. Torn between the interests of the Austro-Hungarian emperor and the Montenegrin prince, the Serbian uprising in Herzegovina ended in a monumental defeat.

Keywords: Austria-Hungary, Montenegro, Serbs, Herzegovina uprising, Ottoman Empire

ON THE PATHS OF INDEPENDENCE

Miloš Ković

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy mkovic@f.bg.ac.rs

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE YUGOSLAV IDEA: THE INFLUENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN ON SERBIAN IDENTITY POLITICS (UNTIL 1918)

The studies of the nation, national identity, and nationalism primarily deal with the internal dynamics of these phenomena. In the study of the origins and formation of nations, sociological, discursive-cultural, political, economic, and other factors are explored. Writers with a modernist orientation particularly emphasize the fact that national identities are often deliberately constructed. The influence of the state has been especially studied, with its governing elites guiding identities in desired directions through public culture, the educational system, and recruitment.

However, research on the impact of the "external factor", foreign states, most often the so-called Great Powers, on the shaping and political articulation of national identities is scarce. This includes studies of the role colonial metropoles played in the creation of today's African, Asian, and Pacific nations. Such influences, however, can also be found in the history of European nations.

Great Britain and its colonial empire did not have Serbs either within its borders or on its borders. However, alongside the rise of Russia, the Orthodox, Slavic Serbs, were seen as an obstacle to British interests. From the London perspective, they could be a useful tool for Russia in its advance toward Constantinople and the Mediterranean.

On the one hand, after 1833, Russophobia in British governing elites also became intertwined with Serbophobia, as Milorad Ekmečić writes, a "branch of Russophobia" and a "legitimized and overt expression of Russophobia". The axiom of this policy was that the Ottoman Empire was the most reliable barrier to the southward advance of Russia. Therefore, in every conflict between the Serbs and the Turks, a large part of the British elite sided with the Turks.

However, alongside this current in British political life, there was another, equally long-standing geopolitical tradition. Uncertain about the vitality of the Ottoman Empire, it believed that it should be preserved, but also that preparations should be made for its eventual collapse. The main goal of this current was to transform the Balkan Orthodox Christians from a tool of Russian politics into a barrier to Russia's advance toward the southern seas. In the case of the Serbs, this was to be achieved by uniting the Serbs with their Roman Catholic and Muslim fellow countryman, resistant to Russian influences.

To make this possible, it was necessary, contrary to the traditional religious identity of the Serbs, which led them towards Russia, to foster a modern linguistic and ethnic nationalism that would turn them towards their ethnically related people of different faiths, as well as towards the Western Great Powers. European science and public opinion considered the Štokavian language spoken in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Old Serbia, the Military Frontier, Slavonia, Croatia (since the reform of the Croatian literary language in 1835), and southern Hungary, to be Serbian. In the works of learned Slavs and historians, from Josef Dobrovský and Pavel Josef Šafařík to Jernej Kopitar and Leopold von Ranke, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and in the British press, the ethnic origin and historical heritage of these lands were referred to as Serbian.

Serbs were promised support in achieving the ideals of "liberation and unification", provided that it occurred gradually, in the form of autonomies, without threatening the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Strengthening Serbian national consciousness, with support from the Western powers, was expected to lead the Serbs, sooner or later, to a conflict with Russia, which had been the official protector of Orthodox Balkan Christians since 1774. In any case, however, in the future united Serbian state, with the British support the Catholic and Muslim communities would dominate.

The expanded Serbian state would be only part of the "belt" of Balkan autonomies, which would also include the Orthodox territories of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria. In these countries, a similar policy as in Serbia was to be pursued – promising support for national unification, against the imperial interests of Russia.

If such plans did not succeed, all of these countries were to come under the rule of the Habsburg Monarchy. Britain's long-time ally, Catholic Austria, was, in the opinion of the British, the most reliable barrier to the advance of Russia into Central and Southeastern Europe. From the perspective of London, as well as Paris, this, along with preventing the creation of a large German state in the heart of Europe, was the most important geopolitical role of the Habsburg Monarchy. In this way, in British thinking, it played a similar role to that of the Ottoman Empire.

The persistence and influence of British concepts regarding the unification of Serbs with ethnically related people of different faiths, as well as the creation of a "belt" of Balkan autonomies or states, all aimed at containing Russia, are most evident in three key historical moments: during the era of Palmerston, David Urquhart, Prince Miloš, and the creation of "Načertanije" by Ilija Garašanin (1837–1844); during the time of Disraeli, Gladstone, Arthur Evans, and the Serbian wars for liberation and unification (1875–1878); and during the period of Lloyd George, Seton-Watson, and the First World War (1914–1918).

These concepts in British foreign policy emerged during the era of Lord Palmerston, specifically in the fourth decade of the 19th century. Official and unofficial emissaries from London to Serbia could say, write, and do all that cautious, official London could not or did not want to. Among the key figures in this were the adventurer and failed diplomat David Urguhart, as well as the first British consul in Serbia, Colonel George Lloyd Hodges. It can be said that Prince Miloš himself played an important role in the development of these ideas. Urguhart, who was considered an expert on the Eastern Question and a fervent Russophobe, after conversations with Prince Miloš, wrote in reports to the government, as well as in his books, that Serbia should be separated from Russia by strengthening its autonomy and supporting its territorial expansion ambitions. Furthermore, Serbia could become a key part of the "belt" of autonomies within the Ottoman Empire, which would enhance Turkey's role in preventing Russia's advance southward. If the Ottoman Empire were to collapse, under Austrian protection a "Danube Confederation" would emerge, including Bosnia, Herzegovina, Serbia, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria. Within this framework, Serbia could unite with Bosnia and Herzegovina. Over time, Urquhart increasingly placed his hopes on the Habsburg Monarchy.

At the same time, Urquhart worked with Adam Czartoryski and Polish émigrés, who, after the failure of the Polish Uprising (1830–1831), gathered in Paris. They believed that one of the conditions for the liberation of Poland and containing Russia was transforming Serbia into a gathering point for neighboring countries under the supreme authority of Turkey. If the Ottoman Empire were to collapse, Serbia would be the "reserve position" for France and Britain in the Balkans. These ideas were materialized in the first Serbian written national program, "Načertanije" by Ilija Garašanin, based on documents previously prepared by Czartoryski and Franjo Zah, the Polish envoy in Serbia. Garašanin saw greater danger in Austria than in Russia; however, over time, the Polish émigrés increasingly turned toward Austria.

Lord Palmerston was forced to dismiss the self-willed adventurer Urquhart from diplomatic service. He did, however, send Consul Hodges to Serbia to encourage Serbian ambitions and distance Serbia from Russia. Palmerston and his associates wanted to push Austria into the Balkans and into Serbia, seeing it as the most reliable barrier to Russian influence. Since Prince Metternich was not willing to confront Russia for Britain's interests, London played the "Serbian card".

British and French support for the Ottoman Empire in the Crimean War did not lead to the cessation of international crises in the East. When uprisings broke out in 1875 and 1876 in Herzegovina, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, followed by bloody Turkish reprisals, Serbia and Montenegro went to war with the Ottoman Empire in defense of their endangered compatriots. Benjamin Disraeli's conservative government warned about the connections between the Serbs and Russia and advocated for the defense of the "sovereignty and territorial integrity" of Turkey. The liberal opposition, led by William Gladstone, called for the creation of a belt of autonomies within the Ottoman Empire, from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Bulgaria, which would serve as protection against Turkish violence and as a barrier to Russian expansion southward. The liberals also spoke in public about the creation of a "Yugoslav Confederation" and a "Greater Slavic Empire". It was to be built by the Serbs; over time, its dominant powers would be the Roman Catholics and Muslims, who did not show pro-Russian sympathies.

Disraeli, as an alternative to preserving the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, envisioned the entry of Austria-Hungary into these regions. Even among the liberals, some advocated for placing the Serbs and other South Slavs under the rule of the Habsburg monarchy. Notably, the young archaeologist Arthur Evans, similar to the former Urquhart, enjoyed a reputation as an expert on the Balkans, a firm opponent of Russian influence, and a supporter of the expansion of Austrian power.

At certain moments during this crisis, even Disraeli considered limited Balkan autonomies. In the end, the Berlin Congress did not consistently follow any of these solutions. Bosnia and Herzegovina were handed over to Austria-Hungary, Serbia, Montenegro, and Romania gained independence, while the solution to the Bulgarian question was sought through autonomies. However, in the following decades, all these countries would fall under greater or lesser influence of the Habsburg monarchy. Britain, especially during the time of Conservative dominance under Lord Salisbury, would support this process and draw closer to the powers of the Triple Alliance.

When Germany would demonstrate its global and naval ambitions, it would take the place of Russia as the main enemy of the British Empire in the eyes of Britain's ruling elites. Defeated in the war with Japan and shaken by the revolution (1904–1905), Russia, together with France, would become a British ally.

During World War I, the role of David Urquhart and Arthur Evans in resolving the Serbian question would be played by Robert William Seton-Watson. This Balkan expert and political Russophobe gathered a circle of influential friends around him, including the editor of the foreign policy section of *The Times*, Henry Wickham Steed, and the already famous and influential archaeologist Arthur Evans. Among them was Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, who would play a role in winning over the Serbs and South Slavs to these ideas, similar to the role once played by Adam Czartoryski. Also in this circle was John Halford Mackinder, the founder of British geopolitics. Notably, Seton-Watson's circle included Croatian members of the Yugoslav Committee founded by the Serbian government to propagate the creation of a Yugoslav state in the Allied capitals. From 1917, Seton-Watson would formally become an official of the British government.

Arthur Evans had long since abandoned his pro-Austrian views. After the entry of the Habsburg Monarchy into the war against Britain, Seton-Watson also renounced his sympathies for Austria-Hungary. Now, they advocated for the creation of an independent Yugoslav state. The Serbian army was to fight for it, after which, through constitutional arrangements, the dominance in it was to belong to the "more cultured" and "pro-Western" Croats and Slovenes. Seton-Watson, Steed, Evans, and the members of the Yugoslav Committee quickly clashed with Serbian Prime Minister Nikola Pašić in the name of the future Yugoslav state. They believed that he, with the help of Russia and Italy, was working to create a Greater Serbia. When the Russian Empire collapsed in 1917, their positions were strengthened. At that point, in contrast to Pašić, who was fighting for a unitary Yugoslav state based on the principle of "one man, one vote", they demanded that the state be structured on a dualist or federal principle.

Since Britain's traditional allies, the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy, had sided with the enemies, Britain would not hesitate to divide them. Together with its allies, Britain would build a new belt of states in Eastern Europe, from Poland, through Czechoslovakia, an expanded Romania, to Yugoslavia, which would contain the militaristic Germany and the communist USSR. This solution almost entirely followed the proposals of Masaryk, Mackinder, Seton-Watson, and their circle of friends. The newly created Yugoslav state would, however, be organized on Pašić's unitary principle. In the interwar period, Seton-Watson, Evans, and their friends would support the demands of Croatian political elites – the federalization of Yugoslavia, the unification of Croats, and the division of Serbs into six or seven federal units. Therefore, it was no surprise that during World War II, Seton-Watson would support the concepts of resolving the national question in Yugoslavia preached by Josip Broz Tito and the Yugoslav communists. These concepts were, in fact, fully in line with pre-war Croatian demands. At that time, Seton-Watson was once again a British government official; unlike in 1918, Britain fully followed this policy. The creation of Yugoslavia, especially Tito's socialist Yugoslavia, was thus a result of various processes and influences, but its formation clearly reflects the impact of this specific British geopolitical school and tradition.

Keywords: British Empire, Russian Empire, Habsburg Monarchy, Serbs, Yugoslavia

Igor Borozan

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy iborozan@f.bg.ac.rs

IN THE SERVICE OF THE NATION: THE RULER'S PORTRAIT IN SERBIAN VISUAL CULTURE OF THE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY

Understanding the Serbian rulers' portrait and its position towards the nation in modern times is closely connected with the studies of national ideologies of the long 19th century. Defining the national concept has been the subject of interest of social sciences and humanities in the past few decades. A large number of studies approach the understanding of the national idea phenomenon from various theoretical postulates and methodological frameworks. The question of the definition and history of this phenomenon largely relied on two different views. The idea of eternal existence of the nation as an autochthonous, primordial category existing in early stages of history - here referring both to ancient and Christian eras - mostly implied its religious and then cultural existence in a period which was not necessarily marked by a chronological (linear) determination, but is understood as specific ethnosymbolism, as defined by modern researchers of the nation. In this concept, the nation was based on the thesis of the selected people which confirms its agreement or covenant with God, thus placing it into the mystic sphere and defining it as a religious category. This sacral character of the nation ensured, to a larger or smaller extent, its placement in the metaphysical space of ontological identity. The search for common categorial denominators, such as religion, customs, symbols or the common places of memory and, above all, the language, supported the thesis of the autochthonous nation's existence in various proto-national periods. The search for identity roots in the past was confirmed by first-class visual, verbal and other historical sources, thus enabling the nation to gain the foundations for further homogenization and national mobilization, which led to the mass agreement of the increasingly wider concentric circles of the civic public. That is why the conceived nation had to have a common goal and value pattern as the product of social agreement, typically placed by the constituent cultural, scientific, religious and other institutions and by the leading figures in the community. In its being static, the nation was founded on the paradox. Although seemingly eternal, it had to develop continuously, almost dialectically. In that light, it is possible to understand the birth of the oldest scientific, cultural and educational institutions in the Serbian cultural space in modern times (Matica srpska, the National Museum, the Lyceum, the Serbian Literature Society...), which, in compliance with the Enlightenment worldviews, operated within the idea of the general good and national education.

In line with the economic foundations, as defined by Georg Simmel in *The Philosophy of Money* in 1900, liberal citizenship was established on objective foundations, which implied an unrestricted economic framework, conservative morality, faith in scientific positivism, embodied in technological and cultural progress, and the concept of individual freedom and, consequently, the limitation of the rulers' and class privileges. In that process, European rulers were normed in parliamentary and constitutional frameworks, which, indisputably with some exceptions, essentially marked the citizenship emancipation during the 19th century.

On the other hand, the theoreticians of the concept of the political nation and its birth from the spirit of the French Bourgeois Revolution think that a defined territory is the foundation giving identity to a nation, within which its inhabitants are homogenized by the principles of state patriotism. Therefore, instead of the nation's eternal existence, the thesis is emphasized of the modern concept of the nation as a historical category generated by liberal citizenship, the key social structure of the 19th century. In this manner, the position is advocated of the production of modern nations and national symbols, which are compressed in the process of homogenization – from the insufficiently clear ethnic entity to the modern nation as a political subject. In line with the continual, never-ending development, the nation's sustainability relies on the everyday plebiscitary support, from which it draws its emancipatory and modernization potential.

In any case, diverse concepts of the national ideal defined the political and cultural life of the Serbs on both sides of the Sava and the Danube Rivers in the 19th century. The birth of the modern Serbian state from Karadorde's era and its cultural and political development made the young Serbian principality, subsequently kingdom, become the key, unifying factor in the homogenization of the Serbian people and in overcoming regional differences. The status of the Serbian Piemonte, gained by the renewed Serbia state at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century confirmed its cultural and political supremacy in the Serbian *ethnies* corpus, which eventually resulted in its leading role in the creation of a large state union of South Slavs after the First World War. The long 19th century among Serbs was characterized by the continued progress of the nation, as well as by diverse national strategies, frequently with an uneven starting point regarding the foundations of national identity. From the emancipatory process of the country's liberation from the Ottoman rule to diverse strategies of cultural and political elites – inclined towards Austria and Austro-Hungary or Russia, via the activities of modern political parties with their respective attitudes towards current events and identity questions.

The Serbian rulers of the 19th century had to consider the ideology of the nation as the most important social category, on the establishment of which depended their staying in power. From Grand Vožd Karađorđe, via subsequent rulers from the Karađorđević and Obrenović dynasties, through to King Petar I Karađorđević and the foundation of the new state union, inevitably harmonized their reign with the expectations of the largest part of citizenship and increasingly broader strata of the public which saw the nation, at least to the greatest extent, as the key link between overall emancipation and modernization trends.

*

Art played a huge role in the creation of national identity. Works of visual arts were the key carriers of certain messages and first-class symbols in the mutual self-understanding and homogenization of diverse regionalisms in the Serbian ethnic corpus. In that process, an exceptional role was also played by numerous artists who were not only carriers of certain ideas, but also active participants at the levels of painting and theory, of artists' social influence and the establishment of the national canon in art. In that respect, the outstanding artists were Anastas Jovanović, Dimitrije Avramović, Steva Todorović, Đorđe Krstić, Uroš Predić and others.

Although reproduced *en masse* in the so-called low media, rulers' portraits relied on original oil portraits which were then reproduced in other media. Their iconographic patterns were established and implied the standing, sitting, waist-length, horseback-riding and profile representation of the ruler, defined by the accompanying national symbols (folk costume, national flag, state and dynastic emblems, national landscape...) as a consequence of current social trends, while painting poetics changed in line with aesthetic worldviews.

That is how we reach the foundations of the ruler's portrait with its stronghold in the Renaissance culture, which was observed by the Serbian artists of the 19th century, educated at European art academies, in the shaping of portrait representations of rulers. On the foundations of Aristotle's concept of grandeur, the most important components of the ruler's portrait are – large size, magnificence, nobility and seriousness. Even if these virtues were not integrated in the ruler's character, they had to be manifested in his portrait, culminating in the representation of the ruler's whole figure, reserved only for the most exceptional members of the community.

The above-mentioned theoretical frameworks of rulers' portraits are also evident in the representations of the Serbian rulers of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century. Knowing that the expectations of the citizenship elite largely relied on the attainment of national ideals and were often its part as well, artists aligned the iconography of the rulers' representations with the ruling ideal. That is why in certain cases rulers' portraits were defined by the accompanying national symbols, thus underlining the identity of the community leader and his commitment to national homogenization.

From the very beginnings of the use of rulers' portraits and representations in broader terms in Serbian art and visual culture, there is a clearly observed connection between dynastic propaganda and the national idea.

The public space in the service of the state and dynastic representation was often emphasized by rulers' portraits. Because of their representational character, public edifices, either high state institutions, the royal court, schools, courts of law, army barracks, parliament buildings, and other toposes of power were, in line with the theory of decorum, natural habitats for displaying rulers' portraits.

Rulers' portraits played an important role in creating private spaces. In line with the ideology of the nation and the visualization of its symbols, the rulers' figures acknowledged the national spirit in the citizens' homes, but also in the broader strata of the public.

Serbian rulers' portraits were created between the recipient's wishes and the intention of the message sender - sent by the court, but also by the broader state apparatus, as well as by organizations and individuals, participants in the creation and placement of the rulers' representations. Of course, it is difficult to give a full answer to the shaping and functioning of rulers' pictures in Serbia during the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century. Almost total absence of archive documents about the process of production of rulers' portraits - regarding primarily oil portraits, along with an occasional archive source related to the multiplication of rulers' portraits in mechanical media (photography, lithography...), prevent the complete deconstruction of the creation of Serbian monarchs' portraits. Moreover, frequent dynastic conflicts of the Obrenovićs and the Karadordevićs, as well as the conflicts of some monarchs with the most relevant political parties (the Radicals, the Progressives), some of which were largely anti-dynastic as well, such as the Radicals, speak about the difficulty of absolute equalization of rulers' portraits and the rulers themselves as inviolable national symbols. However, particularly in the broader circlers of public opinion, Serbian monarchs in the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries mostly aspired to present themselves as the embodiment of national ideals. Although they did not always succeed in it – let us remember the objections to Prince Aleksandar Karadorđević because of the absence of the pro-national principle, the conflict between Prince Mihailo and the United Serbian Youth, dissatisfaction because of King Milan's Austrophile politics, to name but a few situations which undermined the principle of unconditional acknowledgment of the ruler as a national leader of the community – monarchs were limited by the national idea.

The first in a series of clearly defined rulers' representations with a pronounced national character, although not in the form of an oil portrait, is associated with Georgije Mihaljević's famous *Calendar for the New Year* from 1808, while only the subsequent portraits of Prince Miloš Obrenović, painted by the prince's unofficial court painter Pavle Đurković, had a national determination (1824). The portrait of young Prince Mihailo Obrenović by Anastas Jovanović, in the lithography medium modelled after the oil portrait by Jovan Popović (the beginning of the fifth decade of the 19th century was marked by the continuation of the practice of nationalizing rulers in portrait art, as well as the representations of Prince Mihailo in the national costume, painted in the lithography medium by Anastas Jovanović during the 1840s (in 1848), and of young Prince Mihailo, painted by Uroš Knežević in 1869.

The culmination of rulers' nationalization in Serbian art, in the portrait medium, occurred at the beginning of the 20th century. In 1902, Dorđe Krstić, formerly King Milan's cadet, painted the monumental portrait of the monarch in the small Church of Saint Petka in the village of Šurlina near Niš.

Finally, in the interwar period, the practice continued of painting the rulers in the form of portrait representations. The cultivation of this process can be seen in the monumental portrait of King Petar painted by Uroš Predić in 1920.

In any case, the creation of rulers' portraits in Serbian art of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century relied on certain generaltype regularities. Along with the censorship, usually difficult to establish and, most probably, self-censorship, as well as artistic autonomy of certain painters, including occasional friendships between painters and rulers (Anastas Jovanović and Prince Mihailo, Đorđe Krstić and King Milan) and potential suggestions of the court circle and other elite classes of society inclined towards artists, rulers' portraits were constituted, bounded by the national idea and the patriotic spirit in Serbian visual culture of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century.

Keywords: Karađorđević dynasty, Obrenović dynasty, ruler's portrait, national idea, mass media, visual culture

Dušan Fundić

Institute for Balkan Studies SASA Belgrade dusan.fundic@bi.sanu.ac.rs

"KOHN DICHOTOMY" AND THE DISCOURSES OF SERBIAN NATIONALISM (C. 1890–1914)

The paper analyzes the possibilities of approaching the discourses of Serbian nationalism (c. 1890–1914) through the concepts of the "Kohn dichotomy", a framework developed by one of the early researchers of nationalism, Hans Kohn. Kohn argued that there are two forms of nationalism: political (civic) and cultural (ethnic). He associated the "civic" form with Western Europe, while the Central and Eastern parts of the continent were marked by an "ethnic" model. Although Kohn's model has faced challenges within nationalism studies notably over the past two decades, it remains an influential concept.

Cohn's model continued to exert influence through the works of John Plamenatz, who described nationalisms outside Western Europe as "hostile, illiberal, oppressive, and dangerous". By highlighting the contrasts between "Western" and "Eastern" nationalisms, scholars such as Anthony Smith, Eric Hobsbawm, Ernst Gellner, Leah Greenfield, and Yael Tamir broadened this perspective in various ways. Similarly, researchers focusing more directly on nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe, including Peter Sugar, Ivo Lederer, and Michael Ignatieff, adopted comparable approaches. For instance, Anthony Smith asserted that "Cohn's philosophical distinction between a more rational and an organic version of nationalist ideology remains accurate and valuable".

The dichotomy should also be linked to the transformation of nationalism that unfolded during the later decades of the "long 19th century". Between 1880 and 1914, any community, regardless of its size or "historical traditions", could lay claim to a nation-state, with ethnicity and language becoming primary criteria for identification. During this period, a form of myth emerged in Western Europe portraying the nation as an idealized entity – not merely a civil community bound by political traditions but also a harmonious "organic" community "blessed by natural boundaries". Western nations were thus depicted as both civil and ethnic, a privilege denied to others, that were characterized either as narrowly ethnic without civil traditions or as artificial political constructs lacking "organic roots".

Cohn's dichotomy endures, despite years of critique and deconstruction, as part of a broader narrative of orientalization that defines the Other as inferior to the "West". At the same time, it has been suggested that Cohn's perspective was shaped by his personal experiences during the traumatic events of World War II and the optimism of postwar liberal thinkers, this origin is overshadowed by the concept's subsequent evolution. As demonstrated, the dichotomy persisted in the works of numerous influential scholars of nationalism. It then gained renewed relevance during the collapse of the Soviet Union and Socialist Yugoslavia, when, after 1989, a "rapid response" to the phenomenon of "ethnic awakening" was required, and Cohn's model proved seemingly applicable.

I stand by claims that the political legitimacy of national sovereignty is crucial to understanding the rise of nationalism and the processes of nationbuilding. Consequently, I adopt an approach grounded primarily in the research of John Breuilly and Rogers Brubaker. This perspective treats nationalism mainly as a political ideology centered on the sovereignty of the nation. Furthermore, Brubaker's concept of "nationalizing states" is essential, emphasizing that nationalization is an ongoing and continuous process, making it a vital framework for studying nationalism. Regarding Cohn's dichotomy, it is important to recognize that nineteenth-century European nationalism was far more complex than such framework suggests. Few Europeans of that era considered the nation to be a voluntary association. On the contrary, even numerous liberal thinkers considered the nation-state as a natural entity. Their calls for assimilation, progress, and civilization often betrayed assumptions about the inherent superiority of their community. In essence, nearly all citizens accepted the nation "as a natural or primordial entity".

The challenges in understanding ethnicity and nation stem largely from the tendency to view them as unchanging, whereas they are, in reality, dynamic and evolving processes. Nationalism, therefore, should be interpreted as an ideological framework in which the majority of people exist and which defines the character of their era. To move beyond typological approaches, it is essential to adopt a perspective that refrains from treating nations as inherent, facts – an approach that, in effect, shapes the reality it purports merely to describe. Traits often regarded as primordial, such as language or religion, should instead be understood as sources of social and political identification that intersect and overlap with nationalism and the nation. By examining selected quotes from Serbian nationalist discourses and comparing them with ideas on the state-run reshaping of national identity in Ottoman Macedonia at the turn of the century, it is evident that Serbian nationalism's features were contrary to the principles of "ethnic nationalism". According to Kohn's dichotomy, Serbian nationalism should align with the "Eastern", "cultural" or "ethnic" model, which is typically based on myths, shared narratives of origin, and common territory.

In the Principality, later the Kingdom of Serbia, state-building played a crucial role in shaping Serbian nationalism and national identification. This effort was characterized by strong centralization and military strengthening, aligning with elements of the "civic model". The redistribution of land helped transform peasants into loyal citizens, a process that accelerated following independence in 1878, as political, party, and electoral systems rapidly evolved. The struggle for political freedoms and individual rights – framed by Nikola Pašić, the leading politician, as a conflict between the autocratic state and the people – was seen as a defining issue of late 19th-century Serbian history. Pašić's People's Radical Party championed full national sovereignty in political and economic domains.

Serbian nationalism's transformation was also fueled by military defeats against the Ottoman Empire (1876) and Bulgaria (1885). The first was mitigated by Russian military success, while Austria-Hungary's diplomacy eased the defeat at Slivnitsa. These setbacks, along with Austria-Hungary's occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878), prompted a new state strategy led by the Progressive Party. This strategy emphasized fostering national consciousness in Serbia and among the Orthodox population in Ottoman Macedonia and Old Serbia (roughly defined as Ottoman Vilayet of Kosovo), which were viewed as potential areas for expansion. The period (1885– 1912) saw a significant rise in nation-building, with Serbia developing a civic community infused with nationalism, especially in its capital, Belgrade.

The state's role in shaping identities was a widely held belief among Serbia's intellectual elites. This conviction was influenced by a preference for the "French model" of nation-building over the "German model", particularly after 1903, when Serbian nationalism became framed in resistance to Austro-Hungarian imperial ambitions. Serbian elites feared their community could become a geopolitical vacuum, vulnerable to imperial influence, and thus saw territorial expansion into Old Serbia and Macedonia as essential. Serbian consuls in these regions established networks of influence, acting as instruments of nationalization and extensions of the state apparatus.

State interests dictated methods, leading Serbian politicians to oppose applying historical principles in relations with Croatia, while using historicism strategically in Macedonia – an approach reflecting the "ethnic" concept of nationalism. Resistance to imperial pressures further democratized the discourses of Serbian nationalism, portraying it as both modern and forward-thinking. This perspective framed nationalism as the defining "idea of the century", reflecting the belief that the 19th century was the "century of nationalities".

Keywords: Hans Kohn, "Kohn dichotomy", theories of nationalism, Serbian nationalism, 1890–1914 **Petar S. Ćurčić** Institute of European Studies Belgrade petar.pero.curcic@gmail.com

THE STATE, NATIONAL INTEREST, AND THE UNDERSTANDING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE *NEDELJNI PREGLED* MAGAZINE (1908–1910): A CONSERVATIVE VIEW

Roger Scruton, a prominent British philosopher known for his conservative viewpoints, offers a foundational definition of conservatism in The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Political Thought (1991). He posits that conservatism is a social and political ideology aimed at preserving the established order, grounded in the belief that the current system is inherently superior and safer than any potential alternatives. According to Scruton, conservatism possesses distinct conceptualizations of society, governance, and political praxis. In terms of society, conservatives advocate for the preservation of customs, traditions, and values, which they regard as the bedrock of political, cultural, and ethical stability. In relation to governance, Scruton emphasizes the importance of strong institutions that are deeply embedded in the history, customs, and collective identity of the people. Finally, in political practice, conservatism is marked by a pragmatic, localized approach, eschewing universalistic and ideological solutions that lack empirical grounding, in stark contrast to ideologies such as liberalism or communism. The intersection of nationalism, patriotism, and progressivism, particularly within the Serbian political context of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, remains an underexplored facet of political discourse. The era of the Progressive party was characterized by frequent interruptions in party activities, from the 1880s through the conclusion of World War I, and the scattered, sometimes inconsistent quality of its periodicals. Notably, *Nedeljni pregled* (1908–1910), a periodical that emerged during a tumultuous period marked

by the Young Turk Revolution, the Annexation (Bosnian) Crisis, the Customs (Pig) War, and other significant political events, offers valuable insight into the progressive-conservative political thought of the time. This paper aims to examine the political narrative surrounding nationalism, statehood, and national interests as articulated by Serbian progressives, as reflected in the pages of *Nedeljni pregled* during a particularly volatile epoch.

The philosophical underpinnings of conservative thought, particularly as articulated by German Romanticism, are deeply interwoven with the political discourse surrounding nationalism and patriotism. German Romanticism rejected the Enlightenment-era, absolutist conceptions of the state, which were grounded in rationalism, military proficiency, and bureaucratic efficiency. For Romantics, and later for German conservatives, the state was not merely a rational construct or a contractual aggregation of individuals; rather, it was a living organism shaped by the customs, traditions, language, culture, and shared history of a people, with the monarch serving as a symbolic leader, akin to the head of an extended familial unit. This view of the state as a reflection of the organic unity of the people found resonance in the Serbian Progressive party, which, while aligning itself with conservative principles, emphasized the preeminence of the state over the individual. For these conservative progressives, the state was the ultimate guarantor of order and stability, and they expressed skepticism toward the excesses of democracy, which they believed led inexorably to demagoguery and revolutionary unrest. The existence of a conservative party, in their view, was crucial to counteracting the democratic impulses that threatened the stability of the nation.

During the 19th century, the shift from a covenantal to a republican model of nationhood prompted significant reflections on the role of religion in shaping national identity, particularly among Serbian progressives. While their approach to the role of religion was at times ambivalent, the progressives' understanding of the state was deeply influenced by German cultural traditions, especially in their opposition to the radical political forces within Serbia. The pressures exerted by Austria-Hungary on Serbia during this period also temporarily muted the ideological divide between progressives and radicals. In their political struggles with the radicals, progressives emphasized the importance of state sovereignty, particularly in the context of the resolution of conspirators' status after the 1903 May Coup, the Customs War, and the broader issue of financial independence. Regarding the conspiratorial issue, Serbian progressives criticized the Radical Party's reliance on foreign intervention, notably from Great Britain, in resolving internal crises, arguing that Serbia's national interests should be safeguarded through internal legal and political processes rather than through external mediation. A critical point of contention within the Progressive party was the critique of the radical financial

policy. Progressives contended that the Geneva Agreement of 1906 and the subsequent laws of December 14, 1906, undermined Serbia's financial sovereignty by establishing the Autonomous Monopoly Administration as an international institution. Although the Autonomous Monopoly Administration had proven effective in regulating Serbia's public finances and repaying foreign debt, particularly after the Carlsbad Arrangement of 1895, progressives argued that it was the radicals, not the progressive government, who had compromised Serbia's financial independence by allowing foreign influence to permeate the nation's fiscal affairs. This critique extended beyond financial matters to include the role of the military in the state. Progressives opposed the democratization of the military, fearing that a politicized military could become an instrument of internal instability rather than a bulwark against external threats. In their view, the military's role should be strictly apolitical, serving as a protective force rather than a potential agent of revolution or coup.

The progressives' vision for the Serbian state was predicated on the idea of national unification, which they believed could only be achieved through a strong, authoritarian state led by a monarch and supported by a formidable military force. This vision was heavily influenced by the Realpolitik traditions of 19th-century Prussia, which prioritized military strength and centralized authority as central components of national power. As such, progressives rejected the Italian model of national unification, which they deemed ill-suited for the circumstances of the Serbian state. The Annexation Crisis, in particular, highlighted the progressives' belief in the necessity of a strong monarchy and military to safeguard national interests, especially in the face of the competing great powers of the region. In contrast to the Radicals, who favored a more conciliatory approach toward Austria-Hungary, the progressives critiqued the idea that territorial compensation in the south could be traded for Serbia's consent to the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Instead, they advocated for a more assertive stance, one that prioritized the strengthening of Serbia's sovereignty and military capabilities.

The progressives' critique of Serbia's foreign policy during the Annexation Crisis was further articulated in the ideas of Živojin Perić, a prominent professor at the Faculty of Law in Belgrade. Perić's proposal for a closer union between Serbia and Austria-Hungary was grounded in a pragmatic assessment of Serbia's position in the Balkans, arguing that Serbia's expansion should be directed toward the Ottoman Empire rather than against the Dual Monarchy. Perić, who espoused a Germanophile stance, believed that Serbia's national interests could be reconciled with the economic imperatives of the German Empire and its allies. This vision, which called for closer economic and political ties between Serbia and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, was largely rejected by progressive intellectuals who viewed the Hungarian political elite as a primary obstacle to Serbian aspirations. However, some progressives entertained the possibility of a closer relationship with Austria-Hungary, recognizing the strategic importance of aligning with the great powers of Central Europe.

The Progressive party's views on the status of Serbs outside Serbia, particularly in the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, were complex and varied. Progressives critiqued the Hungarian policies of Magyarization and advocated for a more autonomous position for Serbs in these territories, seeking to integrate them into a broader national framework that transcended the political boundaries of the time. In the context of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, progressive thinkers like Perić saw potential for greater cooperation between Serbia and Austria-Hungary, though they acknowledged the difficulties posed by the Hungarian desire to dominate the region. In contrast, progressives viewed the situation in the Ottoman Empire more negatively, particularly following the effects of the Young Turk Revolution, which they believed thwarted the prospects for full national emancipation for the Christian peoples of the Empire. Nevertheless, progressives recognized the importance of supporting Serbs in Macedonia and Kosovo, advocating for greater political and military coordination between the Kingdom of Serbia and Serbs living under Ottoman rule.

In terms of internal political developments, the progressives expressed dissatisfaction with the growing trend toward constitutionalism in Montenegro under Prince Nikola Petrović Njegoš. As a conservative movement, the progressives preferred a more autocratic model of governance, viewing the shift toward parliamentary democracy as detrimental to the stability of the state. Moreover, the question of Yugoslavism, or the unification of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, was a point of contention within the progressive movement. Stojan Novaković advocated the idea of unity between Serbs and Croats, while others, such as Jovan B. Jovanović, dismissed the Yugoslav project as unrealistic, given the entrenched political divisions within the region and the external pressures exerted by Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria.

In conclusion, the Serbian progressives of the late 19th and early 20th centuries were a complex political force that combined elements of conservatism, nationalism, and Realpolitik. Their vision of a strong, centralized state, led by a monarch and supported by a robust military, sought to preserve traditional values and safeguard Serbia's national interests in a period of great geopolitical upheaval. Their writings in *Nedeljni pregled* offer valuable insights into the evolving political landscape of the time, as well as the internal and external challenges faced by the Serbian state as it navigated the complexities of Balkan politics and the broader European order.

Keywords: Progressive Party, Weekly Review (Nedeljni pregled), nationalism, patriotism, state, national interest, conservatism

Darko Gavrilović

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Sciences chdr.novisad@gmail.com

PATRIOTISM OF THE FREEMASONS OF THE KINGDOM OF SERBIA AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH CENTURY

From the ancient times to the modern age: the evolution of patriotism between heroism, civil virtue, and challenges in global society

Patriotism is a complex and multifaceted concept which throughout history developed from the ancient times to the modern age, with diff6erent underlying meanings and roles in society. Its roots can be traced back to Ancient Greece, in which the notion of a "patriot" stood for a citizen and patriot (*patria amans*), the one who loved his native land. During this period, patriotism was deeply connected to the shared common values and virtues reflecting the unity of *poleis*, as elaborated by Pericles in his famous speech. Patriotic, heroic deeds, such as the 300 Spartans in the Battle of Thermopylae, became a symbol of sacrifice for the community and remained an inspiration to many generations. This ancient-time patriotism continued to have an impact on the later epochs, including Roman republican patriotism and the Christian concepts of sacrifice for the wellbeing of the community.

With the emergence of modern nations in the 18th and 19th centuries, patriotism assumed a new form. Modern patriotism no longer relied merely on celebrating heroic deeds from earlier history. Instead, it also included the elements of civil virtue, public duty, and responsibility to the state. This change first started taking shape after the civil revolutions in Europe and America, when the notion of patriotism became intricately connected to the concepts of freedom, democracy, and national identity. Jean-Jacques Rousseau understood patriotism as love of one's fatherland,

Darko Gavrilović

which was supported by civil freedom and civil rights rather than the mere sentiment. To him, patriotism was a deeply political concept which encompassed common good and the citizens' general will.

Traditional patriotism, although deeply rooted in historic events, frequently focuses on glorifying heroic deeds, national symbols, and historical myths. This form of patriotism, which can be seen in many societies, played a crucial role in strengthening national unity and cultural cohesion, especially during the times of crises. Nevertheless, it also carries the risk of misuse, whereby the patriotic sentiment can be used as an excuse for extremism or aggression. At the same time, symbolic patriotism, which strives to promote universal and moral values, stands in opposition to blind patriotism, which is often driven by fear and the self-preservation instinct in such situations when a community is under threat.

On the other hand, modern patriotism emphasises more rational and ethical aspects of one's love to the fatherland. Its roots can be found in the Enlightenment, when patriotism first started being defined as "public spirit", this including civil virtues and obligations to the community. This form of patriotism was crucial in the establishment of new social structures upon the completion of the civil revolutions in France and the United States of America. Love of the fatherland, as defined by thinkers such as Rousseau and Alexis de Tocqueville, was not only sentimental, but also deeply rooted in political and social values, such as freedom, equality, and civil rights.

However, modern times pose new challenges to patriotism. In a globalised world, where the boundaries between nations are becoming increasingly blurred, patriotism must face the challenges of cosmopolitism, multiculturalism, and universal human rights. While traditional patriotism often points out the community's homogeneity, modern patriotism must integrate diversity and promote inclusivity. The idea of patriotism that combines the love of one's fatherland with respect for other cultures and values is becoming ever more significant in the present-day discourse.

Despite it being frequently connected to nationalism, patriotism is not necessarily exclusive. It can be a tool for strengthening civil solidarity and building responsible society. As noted in the works of American thinkers, such as Abraham Lincoln, patriotism can be an instrument not only for promoting national interests but also for promoting the universal values of freedom, human rights, and social progress.

Finally, patriotism nowadays has to be a dynamic concept, which has the ability to adapt to present-time requirements. It must overcome the extreme forms leading to isolation and must aim for a crystallisation of new forms, which are affirmative both in terms of the national and universal values. In this regard, patriotism remains an important segment of collective identity and an inspiration for facing the challenges of the future.

Throughout its historic evolution, patriotism has remained an important social concept that incorporates one's love of the fatherland and civil virtues and responsibilities. Starting from the ancient heroic ideals through to the present-day democratic values, patriotism has demonstrated the ability to adapt to various historic and social circumstances. In the modern globalised world, its challenge is to overcome exclusion and to integrate diversity, by promoting universal values while preserving the national identity. As a dynamic concept, patriotism can remain the bridge between tradition and the future by building a community that is based on respect, solidarity, and common progress.

Patriotism of the Serbian Freemasons: from national liberation to building and preserving Yugoslav unity

Patriotism of the Serbian Freemasons constitutes one of the most significant aspects of their activity in the history of Serbia, especially in wartime periods, and the periods of political turmoil, which marked the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Their activity was not limited to clandestine meetings and symbolic rituals; just the opposite, they actively participated in the shaping of the ideas of the Serbian state, national awareness, and Serbia's international reputation. As members of the intellectual and political elites, the Freemasons combined their principles of freedom, equality, and fraternity, with history– and nation-specific contexts.

The Serbian Freemasonry found its way through the influence of Hungarian and French lodges, which inspired many Serbian intellectuals, politicians, and members of the clergy with their liberal and Enlightenment ideas. One of the first major proponents of the Freemasonry ideas in Serbia was Josif Jovanović Šakabenta, the Bishop of Novi Sad, who personally set an example and opened a door to these ideas to be spread among the Serbs. In the 19th century, at the time when the autonomy was gained, followed by the independence of Serbia, the Freemasons set up multiple lodges such as Svetlost Balkana (*The Light of the Balkans*) and Pobratim (*The Blood Brother*), which became the meeting points for many prominent figures. Their work was not limited only to Serbia; instead, they actively cooperated with the lodges from other countries, thus strengthening ties with the Freemasons internationally, in order to strengthen the position of their fatherland.

Patriotism of the Serbian Freemasons came to the fore during the Annexation Crisis of 1908, when the Serbian lodges became involved in diplomatic efforts to protect Serbia's interests. Their collaboration with the Freemason circles in France and other allied countries resulted in the media and political dissemination of the ideas of Serbian national aspirations. The Serbian Freemasons, such as Svetomir Nikolajević, worked on gaining international support, while at the same time putting up resistance to the influence of the Hungarian Freemasons, in this manner expressing their patriotic position. Unification with the French *Grand Orient* lodge, as well as the setting up of new lodges, such as Ujedinjenje (*The Unification*), were all steps towards creating a strong national network with clear political objectives.

Another important Serbian Freemason who actively participated in the forming of Yugoslavia was Đorđe Vajfert. As a prominent industrialist, the Governor of the Central Bank of Serbia, and a philanthropist, Vajfert played a major role in the strengthening of Serbia's economic and political stability, which was of utmost importance for the process of unification. His participation in the Masonic lodges focused on the promotion of the ideal of Yugoslavism, and also on forging international ties supporting the establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

Collaboration with the Croatian Freemasons was one of the most significant aspects of their work. Maintaining close connections with the lodges such as Hrvatska vila (*Croatian Fairy*) and later *Ljubav bližnjega* (*Love of Thy Neighbour*) made it possible to build trust between Serbs and Croats, which was crucial for strengthening the Yugoslav idea. Masonic lodges became the platforms for political dialogue and joint activity, which culminated in the formation of a Croatian-Serbian coalition. The Freemasonry ideals of brotherhood and solidarity constituted a foundation for strengthening Serbian-Croatian collaboration, but also for overcoming mutual historic divisions.

In the wars waged by Serbia, the Freemasons demonstrated utmost commitment to the cause. During the Balkan Wars, they provided financial aid and logistic support, as well assistance to the victims of war. The lodges, such as Pobratim (*The Blood Brother*), collaborated with the French and other European Freemasons and thus raised funds and humanitarian aid. Their activity resumed during the First World War, when the Freemasons who lived abroad worked to promote Serbian interests among the Allies, whereas the local lodges provided support to military efforts through fundraisers and support to the families of the fallen soldiers.

One of the most significant contributions of the Serbian Freemasons was the work they invested to form Yugoslavia. As strong advocates of the idea of Yugoslavism, the Freemasons used their network of contacts and their clout to promote the idea of the unification of South Slavs. Their role in the Yugoslav Committee and cooperation with the Serbian Government were of fundamental importance for accomplishing this goal. The Masonic lodges became the symbols of Yugoslavism, as the hubs for the intellectuals and politicians from all parts of the new state.

After the establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovens, the Freemasons' patriotism transformed into support for Yugoslav unity. They were in favour of preserving the new state, and often supported King Alexander and his policies. Although the dictatorship of King Alexander was opposed to the ideals of the Freemasonry, the lodges proceeded as before and continued promoting Yugoslavism as an idea transcending national and religious differences. Their commitment to these ideals remained noticeable until the outbreak of the Second World War, when the political changes and repression resulted in the extinguishment of the formerly extensive Freemasons' activity.

Patriotism of the Serbian Freemasons still remains an example of how secret societies can have a major impact on political and social processes. Their role in the strengthening of the Serbian state, building Yugoslav unity, and the promotion of humanist values left a deep mark in Serbia's history as well as that of the region.

Patriotism and the Freemasonry among Serbs: links between the national and humanism activities of the Serbian Freemasons

Drawing a parallel between patriotism and the Freemasonry among Serbs points to a deep connection between national and humanism ideals, which shaped historical processes during the 19th and 20th centuries. Patriotism, as an emotion of love of one's fatherland and readiness to sacrifice for its progress, and the Freemasonry, as a philosophy that is based on freedom, equality, and fraternity, had one goal in common – to build a strong and modern Serbian state, which would be the pillar supporting broader Yugoslav unification and union.

The Serbian Freemasons expressed their patriotism by actively participating in national politics and Serbia's war efforts. During the Annexation Crisis of 1908, the Freemasons strived through diplomatic and public activity to ensure international support for Serbia, which was a reflection of their commitment to defending the national interests. At the same time, patriotism constituted integral part of their activities within the lodges, thereby connecting national freedom with the ideas of the Enlightenment and humanism.

Darko Gavrilović

The Freemasonry in Serbia represented a focal point that drew the intellectual elite, who, inspired by the humanist values, attempted to improve society by fighting for national independence and social justice. Their beliefs in freedom and equality were reflected in their efforts to build a state that would guarantee rights to all its citizens. Such an understanding of patriotism endeavoured to include a wider base of South Slav peoples in the common state project.

Collaboration with other Masonic lodges, especially the Croatian ones, showed the ability of the Serbian Freemasons to overcome the national and religious divisions in favour of a common goal. While patriotism among the Freemasons was aimed at preserving and strengthening the Serbian state, their vision also included broader regional unification through forming Yugoslavia. Secret societies served as networking platforms for people of different national backgrounds, with which the Serbian Freemasons contributed to breaking down the boundaries that separated South Slav peoples.

One of fundamental parallels is the attitude to humanitarian and social matters. During the Balkan Wars and the First World War, the Serbian Freemasons organised aid for the victims, which confirmed that to them patriotism was not merely an expression of their fight for the state, but their genuine concern for the people. This humanitarian aspect was deeply rooted in the Freemasonry ideals that insisted on the importance of solidarity and brotherly relief.

In the process of establishing Yugoslavia, the Serbian Freemasons' patriotism acquired a new meaning by being transforming into support for the Yugoslav idea, as the ideal of political and social unity. The work on unification was not only a result of political pragmatism, but also of deep faith in the value that transcended the national interests. Their activities were inspired by the belief that patriotism was not solely love of one nation, but also a striving for peace and prosperity in a broader regional context.

Patriotism and the Freemasonry among Serbs were intricately linked through a vision of society in which national and humanism ideals should go hand in hand. While patriotism infused with strength and determination to defend national interests, the Freemasonry offered breadth and an ethical foundation for striving towards freedom, equality, and unification. These two values were mutually complementary and they shaped the historic path of Serbia and South Slavic peoples alike.

Keywords: patriotism, community, Freemasons, Yugoslavism, Yugoslavia

YUGOSLAV EXPERIENCES

Mira Radojević

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts Belgrade mradojev@f.bg.ac.rs

IDENTITY ISSUES OF THE SERBIAN NATION AT THE TIME OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE FIRST YUGOSLAV STATE

The historical decision of the leading officials of the Kingdom of Serbia, the representatives of the Karadordević ruling house, main political parties, intellectual elite and military factors in December 1914 to proclaim the liberation and unification of the "unliberated brothers Serbs, Croats and Slovenes" as the most important war aim and then, four years later, in 1918, the firm determination to create the Yugoslav state, encountered plenty of criticism during the previous century. This criticism, most frequently inspired by huge passion, became particularly fierce and recurrent in the periods of great crises, such as the Second World War, the breakup of socialist Yugoslavia and the post-Yugoslav period, during which the Serbian people faced extremely difficult political, national, identity and economic problems. In these circumstances, attempts were made to consider the causes of such conditions, whereas on one side there were visible rational and scientific aspirations, and on the other side, there was indisputable presence of strong emotions, mainly of bitterness and anger, deriving from the feeling that Serbs had become the greatest losers of the existence of two Yugoslav states. According to such opinions, both of these states, although built through Serbian efforts and immeasurable suffering, led to hundreds of thousands of sacrificed lives, the loss of the territories with the Serbian majority population, undeserved accusations, imposition of guilt for Yugoslav defeats, specific public demonization in Europe and the world, the loss of self-awareness as the nation which, even when encountering the greatest challenges, instinctively chose the "right side" of history, and, finally, the identity crisis. In that painful combination of problems and unsolved issues, a claim could often be heard about Serbs

being primarily Serbs from Serbia who – having in mind the responsibility of the parent Serbian state – became the target of the main odium for all possible faults, and made the first or consequential historical error when, instead of creating Great Serbia at the end of the First World War, invested all their remaining efforts into the creation of Yugoslavia, renouncing not only their statehood achieved in a long series of uprisings and wars, but also their national identity. This interpretation, as non-scientific and completely unilateral, is at the same time too simplified and politicized, but has remained predominant in today's Serbian society. In order to prevent increasing misconceptions, with the obvious tendency of their becoming part of "distorted" national consciousness, it is necessary to return to indisputable historical facts and proven scholarly findings, which alone provide an adequate basis for addressing said problems in a critical manner.

Among other things, it is necessary to recall once again that the Yugoslav idea, in its different forms, before the foundation of the first Yugoslav state, had its long history, the roots of which can be explored as early as the end of the 18th century. Moreover, as a possible solution to the problem accompanying the fate of South Slavs in the Balkans, this idea was taken into consideration in the critical moments of the 19th century and advocated by individuals, rulers, statesmen and politicians whose views of the future had visionary tones. However, the realistic foundations for the revival of the Yugoslav idea were not created until the first years and decades of the following century, in the atmosphere of anticipating the decisive war conflict between great powers, whose interests clashed throughout the world, with one of the more important centres being in the Balkans, primarily due to its relevance for the long-term politics of Russia, Austria-Hungary and Germany.

Thus, finding itself targeted by Austro-Hungarian and German ambitions, in those years the Kingdom of Serbia made multiple attempts to defend the acquired independence, to complete the mission of liberating and uniting the Serbian people imprisoned under the Turkish and Austro-Hungarian rule, and to create the conditions for a less risky future. The idea of the unity of South Slavs in that context assumed both a defensive and an offensive character, encouraging the occupied nations in Austria-Hungary to awaken their national consciousness and to stand up against an essentially conservative, almost medieval creation. Yugoslavism in the Kingdom of Serbia was first accepted and publicly advocated by the intellectual and art elite, unrestricted by the considerations which had to be shown by official political factors towards Austria-Hungary and international circumstances. The first steps towards Yugoslavism on their part could be undertaken only after the Balkan wars and in the years when the outbreak of the war among great powers was already seen as inevitable.

In contrast to this temporal mismatch in expressing attitudes and taking concrete initiatives, what intellectuals and politicians had in common was that in their addresses and publications they showed essential ambiguities regarding their beliefs about how to speak about Serbs, Croats and Slovenes: as a single, three-tribe or three-name people. Being quite conspicuous, this phenomenon constituted the obvious evidence of insufficient elaboration and maturity of the idea on which farther-reaching government and national politics needed to be built. At the same time, it showed that the claim about the single Yugoslav people, "three-tribe" or "three-name", would be used in the propaganda of destroying Austria-Hungary - which, being the "prison of nations", proved to be unsustainable - but also in the advocation for creating that nation's own state. Namely, it was impossible to protest against a multinational state in order to build another one on its ruins, a state also consisting of several nations and divided by different historical experiences, level of economic and cultural development, religious affiliation, mentalities, customs etc. In those years, such political orientation was justified and enforced through the right of the nation to self-determination, the real democratic legitimacy of which was recognized only after the USA entered the war in 1917, and the subsequent efforts of the US President Woodrow Wilson.

In the meantime, in order to strengthen the idea of Yugoslav unity, government authorities of the Kingdom of Serbia and followers of Yugoslavism from the ranks of intellectuals had to hide numerous indicators of enmity, primarily between Serbs and Croats, from the Serbian public and war allies. This approach to an extremely sensitive and risky problem derived from the evident unpreparedness for implementing more concretely planned Yugoslav politics, since before and at the beginning of the Great War only political principles of unification and a general Yugoslav agenda had been considered. In that respect, it emphasized as the ultimate aim the need for creating a strong national state in Southeast Europe, capable of preventing Germany's advance to the East.

The outbreak of the war accelerated the process of popularization of Yugoslavism, thus making it achievable what was expected from the forthcoming future, since the imposed defence of state independence created the possibility for using the historical opportunity for uniting the South Slavs. Ever since then, the government ideology has relied on unquestionable beliefs about the necessity of defending the fatherland and preserving state independence, about the national mission of liberation, about the prevention of German danger and creation of a large state in the Balkans, with Serbia as the centre of gathering the South Slavs. On the basis of these beliefs and in line with the tradition, situation on the warfronts, propaganda needs, attitudes of the allies and the capability of the leading social forces, the vision of the future state and Serbia's place in it were gradually formed.

The presentation of the more elaborate attitudes and the increasingly pronounced polarization in opinions became more frequent from mid-1918, after the allies' diplomacy agreed about the potential end of Austria-Hungary and the creation of other states on its ruins. In addition, the successes of the Serbian army during September and October had a large effect on the final outcome of the war and contributed to imposing the agenda advocated by Nikola Pašić ever since 1914 to other unification factors. In the final stage of the Yugoslav unification, a great political role was played by the army, thus becoming its outstanding factor.

From military and many other historical sources, it can be concluded that throughout the Yugoslav territory extremely different sentiments and attitudes were manifested. Serbs were the only ones who showed an almost general enthusiasm. However, the future proved that the Serbs living in different parts of the newly formed state failed to understand each other because the long separation had left almost insurmountable differences, and this in time inevitably led to disappointment among them. Yet, in autumn 1918 they were, like never before and never afterwards, united by the feeling of the gained freedom and victory over their historical fate.

It cannot be claimed that the *in the days of unification*, as the sources of that time often stated, the previously divided Serbian people actually thought about *Yugoslavia* and about a different identity, apart from the Serbian one. Furthermore, it is also questionable whether at that time Serbs even imagined that the state whose unification had been declared was actually a *Yugoslav*, and not a unified Serbian state. Although in numerous scholarly works and political debates it was conspicuously emphasized that Croats and Slovenes had not been asked whether they accepted Yugoslav unification, it is an unambiguous fact that this historical decision had not been made by Serbs either, but that they were the only ones who saw the new state as their own.

The problem is incomparably more complex when the attitude of the Serbian political and intellectual elite is analyzed. The existing scholarly interpretations show that Serbia's political and intellectual representatives, for the sake of creating the Yugoslav union, agreed to renounce their statehood and, in some cases, to accept a new, Yugoslav national identity. Individual examples testify that such decisions were often short-lasting, as well as caused by an illusion about the beginning of a completely new age, by dialogues with European officials and intellectuals, by the intolerance towards Nikola Pašić, by the resentment due to bad circumstances in domestic politics etc. It is also evident that a large number of public figures often changed their attitude towards Serbdom and Yugoslavism from 1914 to 1920-1921. Former "Croatian devotees", as some propagandists of the Yugoslav unification from the ranks of the Independent Radical Party were sometimes called, became "embittered Serbs" only several years later, reluctant to tolerate the anti-state methods of the political struggle of the Croatian opposition. Similar interpretations become even more complex when longer periods of several years or decades are seen through historical sources, since only then, depending on the actual experience and historical circumstances, the changes in opinions and attitudes are more visible.

Keywords: Serbian people, Yugoslav idea, Kingdom of Serbia, statehood, national identity

Nedeljka V. Bjelanović

Institute for Literature and Arts Belgrade nperisic@gmail.com

LET DIE WHO WANTS TO LIVE, LET LIVE WHO WANTS TO DIE: PATRIOTIC LITERATURE OF YOUNG BOSNIANS

The paper discusses the patriotic tendencies in the literature created by the members of Young Bosnia in the period before the First World War, as well as the echoes of the Sarajevo Assassination in the post-war texts of the surviving members of this movement. The texts by Young Bosnians are also seen as an authentic expression of libertarian aspirations, revolutionary impulses of the epoch, as well as clear signals of the forthcoming unrest in literature and culture themselves (anti-avant-garde tendencies). In that respect, Young Bosnians are seen simultaneously as exceptional individualists, educated young spirits with pronounced interests in the contemporary and modern, but also as a clearly defined collectivity, whose efforts are formed by the aspiration to throw off the foreign yoke and to defend national identity and its essence.

History of literature much later than history itself began dealing with the literary work of Young Bosnians, perhaps because it remained in the shadow of the rebellious efforts of these young people and probably because that work, both in their minds and in practice, was inseparable from all other libertarian efforts and achievements. We also tend to see this group's literature as collective, as semi-verbal or, in the least, as generational, where it is definitely crucial who the author is, how important its ideas and its poetic zest are. From various testimonies, letters, recorded conversations and trial transcripts it is clear that Young Bosnians were passionate readers and that most of them wanted to write something as well. Of course, not all of them were writers, and that is why the most famous among them (here we refer to Princip), despite his wish, sporadic attempts and apocryphal recordings was not a writer, while the greatest writer among them (Andrić) later often emphasized that he had only a supporting role and minor merits in the movement.

In the heart of all conversations and considerations about trauma, including trauma in literature, which the Sarajevo assassination and subsequently the First World War definitely are, there is an essential question about the possibility of its language embodiment, its true translatability into the communication level, the introduction of conversations of particular or common experiences. After all, literature has always applied a verbalizing method of fixing and overcoming trauma in its specific manner – the formation of traumatic, personal as well as collective experiences in literature is one of the main foundations on which the art of words lies.

Why is the conversation about trauma introduced in the conversation about patriotic literature and the formation of identity? The answer is imposed as more or less logical – trauma is an internal, psychological and somatic answer of a being to an identity violation, above all, a violation of love, love for oneself, love for others, love for the community, for an idea etc. All these violations meet at a single focal point, in the period before the First World War, in annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. From that violation, i.e., continued violation and responses of the hurt being, both individual and collective, the literature of Young Bosnia group emerged, in parallel with the revolutionary action or, most precisely, preceding it. By the nature and conditions of its emergence, it could not be anything but patriotic. In its essence, it is activist and, very rarely and exceptionally, atavistic.

The relapses of the above-mentioned trauma can be found years later among the members of the movement, sometimes until the end of their lives among those who were fortunate (or *misfortunate*, according to Andrić) to survive. Some of them camped in traumatic silence, observing the obligation to keep the conspiracy secret (for example, Andrić) and cautiously and rarely speaking about their young friends who had died, while some of them, for example Borivoje Jevtić, almost obsessively focused on it until their death. This topic is reluctantly seen in Andrić's narrative prose, essays and interviews when, in line with the laws of internal necessity or social considerations, he was forced to speak about it; therefore, we encounter Young Bosnians in the novel *The Bridge on the Drina*, in Andrić's unusually personal confession for the journal Ideas, and in his essay "In Danilo Ilić Street".

Patriotic literature is characterized by its writing being branched in relation to the manner in which the lyrical or narrative subject (more rarely, instance) decidedly treat three categories of time – the past, the present and the future. All literature is necessarily launched into some time since the nature of the story demands it and there are no grammatically com-

pletely timeless statements, but by the nature of its topics, patriotic literature emphasizes this temporal component in a clearer and more pregnant way. That is why patriotic literature, particularly poetry, can be roughly divided into literature looking at the past and taking its direct inspiration from the motifs of the past (mostly bright and grandiose); literature concentrated on the present moment and, because of this strong concentration on the present, it is ascribed activism and the fighting spirit and, finally, patriotic literature that is mainly oriented towards the future, in terms of idea and emotional literary projections related to the fate of the community and the nation. The literature of Young Bosnia almost completely belongs to the second subcategory – all its topics and motifs are focussed on the necessity of action, fight and the crucial moment of collapse and liberation. Almost in apocalyptic visions, the texts written by these young people warn that the last hour has struck and that action must be taken at all costs because soon nothing will remain to be defended.

It would also be useful to describe the literary framework, within the patriotic subcategory, in which the literature of Young Bosnia developed. Skerlić wrote about the periods in the development of Serbian patriotic literature in 1908. He stated that Serbian patriotic poetry reached its peak in the 1860s, when the national sentiment flared up to a paroxysm. Such frenetic poetry had its strongest troubadour in Đura Jakšić. However, according to Skerlić, as well as to the literary-historical judgment, reaction and sobering soon ensued, primarily because of the general context of the declining of romantic enthusiasm and the strengthening of realism. According to Skerlić, the time came for elegance of words and music of phrases; poetry is, just as in Dučić, artificially processed and, according to the strict judgment of the same critic, it is inhumane and non-national. However, following the eternal law of action and reaction, a new patriotic impulse comes from Herzegovina, in the figures of Aleksa Šantić and Veljko Petrović. In their poetry, new tones of love for homeland can be heard, but they are quieter and turned towards the peasant, the poor man, the land. These are the tones of the new, more *down-to-earth* and, therefore, more receptive patriotism close to everyday life and blatant reality.

Patriotic literature of the Young Bosnian organization took a further poetic step towards the future. Today it is clear that the influences of German expressionism and then of Italian futurism (most pronouncedly in Mitrinović's case) crucially affected the lines written by Young Bosnians. As Crnjanski also says, it was necessary to hear "a little bit of a new song" (in the poem "Prologue" from *Lyrics of Ithaca*, 1919).

The indications of the *new song* can also be discerned in the literature of Young Bosnians.

Generally speaking, their literature speaks, on the one hand, about the need of the physical national liberation and, on the other hand, about the importance of cultural emancipation which must not threaten the national core and the national spirit. All this is written about by Young Bosnians, primarily Vladimir Gaćinović, Miloš Vidaković and Dimitrije Mitrinović. These new tones are heard when the emphasis is placed on glorifying the ashamed and humiliated ancestors, i.e., "the hanged, hanged", "the noblevillainous" ones.

The praise for the *ancestor's neck broken on the rope* is, for example, the motif that would fully flare up only seven years later (but crucial seven years which, in poetic, humanistic, cultural and any other terms, seem as a whole epoch) – in *Lyrics of Ithaca*. It is an evident entry of grotesque into the concept of patriotic literature; those are the new, dissonant tones giving it a new depth, revitalizing it and decidedly shaping it in line with the spirit of the time. Later on, when Crnjanski introduced the challenging motif of those who *like hanging – out of shame* in his "Ode to the Gallows", it should be recalled that Vidaković referred to the same motif in his "Crazy Song" several years earlier. The cry of the humiliated reaches its culmination in Gaćinović's cry "Fatherland, you are being sold like a prostitute!"

Apart from the physical liberation of the fatherland, the imperatives of its cultural emancipation also emerge. The urgency and necessity of these two processes occurring in parallel, and about cultural liberation, were written about by Dimitrije Mitrinović as early as 1908. Those texts speak both about the integral national and about the need being involved in modern trends. Namely, the concepts of patriotism were not closed within the boundaries of their own local experience and, consequently, literature, but they cultivated awareness of literature being included in the world trends, being inspired by them and not being lost in them. A mystic, visionary, conspirator, philosopher, essayist, anti-avant-gardist and avantgardist, Mitrinović has been declared for one of the leading promoters of the idea of integral Yugoslavdom. However, in the early years of gathering of Young Bosnian members, he was undoubtedly only and solely a Serb, and the literature he speaks about is "our, Serbian literature".

In the later general enthusiasm regarding the Yugoslav idea, which is a process that would recur in somewhat different circumstances, in the creation of new Yugoslavia, it was constantly forgotten that the initial patriotic impulse among the majority of these young people was decidedly nationally determined, i.e., it was Serbian. This refers to Mitrinović, Vidaković, Jevtić; this is pronounced in Gaćinović as well as in tragic Gavrilo Princip who, according to his Czech friend's testimony, although tortured, ill, but proud and firm, constantly inquired about how Serbia fared in the war. The sacrifice of Young Bosnia is built in the foundations of our culture and, in a tautological emphasis, of our literature. "Perhaps Gavrilo Princip is more accomplished as a poetic topic and symbol than as a poet", wrote Dragan Hamović. Gavrilo's name and character may be seen in metonymic terms as well – many of them are actually seen by our memory rather as symbols than as creating figures. From contemporaries and comrades-in-arms, via Ivan V. Lalić, Stevan Raičković, Rajko Nogo, Đorđe Sladoje to Milena Marković and others (these names have been listed almost randomly, but the list is far from being complete), Young Bosnians have become and remained an obsessive topic of our literature, particularly poetry.

Keywords: patriotic literature, Young Bosnia, national identity, avantgarde, First World War

Slobodan Vladušić

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy svladusic@ff.uns.ac.rs

MILOŠ CRNJANSKI AND SERBIA

The title of the paper *Miloš Crnjanski and Serbia* may be understood in two ways: as a relationship between the poet and his poem *Serbia*, written in Corfu in 1925, or as Crnjanski's relationship to the space he named Serbia. These two ways of understanding are not mutually exclusive but, on the contrary, they are interrelated: starting from the poem analysis, we learn about Crnjanski's attitude to Serbia, i.e., national identity.

In one of his later interviews, Crnjanski defined his poem *Serbia* as a combination of pain and love towards his people. Therefore, the word "Serbia" in the eponymous poem has a two-fold meaning: it is both the object of love and the source of pain. In order to understand this two-fold meaning of the word "Serbia", we must pay attention to the relationship between it and the word "Serbia". The word "Serbia", as it is well known, comes from the Slavonic-Serbian language spoken by the educated classes of the Serbs living across the Danube and the Sava Rivers. For these people, Serbia at first sight denoted only the territory from which they had come but in which they no longer lived, since in the 17th and the 18th centuries they were forced to leave it in two great migrations.

To the Serbs living in Vojvodina, "Serbia" was not merely a geographical territory. It became the ideal territory which refers to a great idea – the idea of return. Thus, Serbia stopped being only the country of origin and became a mythical homeland to which the Serbian people living north of the Sava and the Danube Rivers wanted to return.

When Crnjanski entitles his poem "Serbia", in this way he wants to suggest that his national identity contains something specific, meaning that this identity is founded on the experience of the Serbs from Vojvodina. Therefore, the title of the poem first points to the poet's *distinctive* experience. Secondly, in his poem "Serbia" denotes the *supersensible, heav*- *enly space* the poet longs for. This longing for "Serbia" is actually the longing for the return to homeland from abroad.

Before Vuk, the national experience of the Serbs in Vojvodina may be understood as a synecdoche of Serbian national identity. Vuk's reform suppresses the Slavonic-Serbian language of the educated Serbs in Vojvodina, giving primacy to the folk language of oral literature. As it is known, the language reform also had its cultural, as well as political echoes. At the level of literature, the former classicist paradigm of Serbian literature, which relies on ancient poetics, gives place to the romanticist paradigm whose model is folk literature. At the political level, the Serbs in Vojvodina, who had previously identified themselves with the centre of national identity, gradually became aware of the identity centre shifting southwards. In short, "Serbia" was replaced by Serbia.

Shifting the centre of national identity generates a paradoxical situation in the minds of the Vojvodina cultural elite: along with the idea of Serbia, which had until then been both the *ideal* territory of origin and the *ideal* homeland strived for in the future, something new and specific emerged – Serbia. It is paradoxical because to the Serbs in Vojvodina that Serbia was not the embodiment of their dream of Serbia because they did not create it with their return while, at the same time, that Serbia was not a foreign country either since Serbs also lived in Serbia.

As we have seen, Crnjanski used the title of the poem "Serbia" to suggest his Vojvodina-based experience and, thus, the specific form of national identity as well. However, it does not mean that, in this poem, ideal and supersensible Serbia across the Danube and the Sava Rivers is opposed to actual, non-ideal Serbia which is situated south of these two rivers. On the contrary. In Crnjanski's poem, the word Serbia *simultaneously* contains in itself the idea of the heavenly, supersensible homeland the poet longed for, but also the awareness of the actual homeland in which the desired ideal was not accomplished, which causes pain. The first, supersensible and heavenly Serbia is addressed with "You" in this poem, while the other, actual and sensible, is addressed with "She".

The opposition between the invisible, supersensible ideal and the sensible negation of that ideal is compounded by the biographical context of the poem, which is emphasized by Crnjanski in the note at its end. The note says: "Corfu, 1925". In addition to this note, in the first verse of the poem Crnjanski thematizes the motif of the grave, which refers to the Serbian military graveyard in Corfu. In that manner, the longing of the Serbs across the Danube and the Sava Rivers for the faraway, supersensible homeland is associated with the longing of the Serbian soldiers who died in Corfu, far away from Serbia. Crnjanski suggests that the longing of

Vojvodina Serbs for the ideal homeland was not realized, just as the wish of the Serbian soldiers who died for their Serbia in Corfu failed to be realized. That heavenly Serbia, about which the soldiers-exiles daydreamed, did not materialize is proved by the neglected military graveyards explicitly mentioned by Crnjanski in his Corfu travelogues and which are implicitly implied in the poem, in the poet's pain before the visible homeland which has forgotten those graves.

Crnjanski's attitude towards national identity in his poem "Serbia" is ambiguous: it is positive towards the invisible ideal of Serbia, and negative towards the visible concretization of that identity, i.e., the centre of Serbian national identity. The syntagm centre of identity denotes the social mechanism which runs the visibility regime in the sphere of national identity. This mechanism decides about what will be and what will not be visible, or acceptable and institutionally established, in the sphere of national identity. That is why Crnjanski was able to associate the neglected Serbian graveyard in Corfu with Slobodan Jovanović's words quoted in the first of the cycle of texts he sent from Corfu to the editorial board of Vreme (Time). As a matter of fact, Jovanović advised Crnjanski to leave the dead rest in peace in Corfu and to write about the living and for the living. If Jovanović's position is taken into account in Serbian civic circles today, his words may be understood as an order sent by the centre of identity to Crnjanski. However, Crnjanski did not take this advice and did not write about the living, but about the dead and affected by the dead.

In the 1920s, the centre of Serbian national identity was the Serbian civic elite and its institutions: the Academy, the publishing house *Srpska književna zadruga* and the journal *Srpski književni glasnik*. It was determined by the Vidovdan cultural concept which saw the Thessaloniki front as the continuation of the Serbian Middle Ages depicted in the poetry of Dučić and Rakić. Crnjanski's position towards the centre of identity was ambiguous due to the well-known biographical fact from his life: Crnjanski, although Serbian, fought as a soldier on the Austrian and not on the Serbian side in the First World War.

Now we may pose the question as to how Crnjanski's attitude towards the centre of national identity could have been solved.

- Crnjanski could have negated Serbian national identity in the name of class identity, in which case he would have become a Communist. Crnjanski did not do it.
- 2) Crnjanski could have negated Serbian national identity in the name of some different, provincial identity as the first stage of distancing from his national origin. Crnjanski did not do it either.

 Crnjanski could have erased his authentic Vojvodina-based experience of the First World War in order to fit better into the Vidovdan cultural concept. Crnjanski did not do it either.

Finally, what did Crnjanski actually do?

Crnjanski became an advocate of *invisible* components of national identity. He tried to use these invisible components to complement the field of the visible which was run by the centre of national identity. Thus, in *Lyrics of Ithaca* he tried, apart from the visible Vidovdan concept of culture, crowned by spectacular successes of the Serbian army, to make equally visible the invisible and neglected experience of Vojvodina Serbs which was represented by Gavrilo Princip. In this way, he tried to *connect* the experiences of Vojvodina Serbs and Serbs from Central Serbia and, thus, to expand and enrich their unique national identity.

The poem "Serbia" is also an attempt to expand the sphere of the visible with what was invisible – the longing for Serbia of Miloš Crnjanski, a Serb from Vojvodina, founded on the longing of the Serbian soldiers buried in the military graveyard in Corfu, who had sacrificed their lives for Serbia without encountering it again.

Crnjanski's poem "Serbia" gives us the opportunity to anticipate one of the potential functions of national literature in the context of the strengthening of national identity. Complementing the field of the visible centre of national identity with specific and formerly invisible experience, national literature simultaneously enriches and homogenizes national culture, connecting what is visible in its entre with what lies in the shade, in the periphery.

Keywords: national identity, the regime of the invisible, long poem *Serbia*, the Vidovdan cultural concept, internal integration

Slobodan Bjelica

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy sbjelica@ff.uns.ac.rs

NATIONAL POLICY OF THE VOJVODINA RADICALS IN THE KINGDOM OF SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES (1918–1929)

Radicalism among the Serbs in Vojvodina appeared in the 1880s and was strongly influenced by the European and Serbian models. It was advocated by the group gathered around Jaša Tomić, which separated from Miletić's party because they were not satisfied with the amount of attention devoted to social issues. In 1887 that wing formed an independent political party, which was named The Serbian People's Radical Party in 1891. Very soon it turned from the social orientation to national issues and became the main proponent of national rights of the Serbs in Hungary. When the First World War broke out the Radical Party, like all other Serbian organizations in Austria-Hungary, stopped working. Its leadership spent the following war years in internment. The Radicals started working again in the rather tumultuous autumn of 1918. The Radicals from Srem, led by Žarko Miladinović, established ties with the People's Council in Zagreb. Their main goal was to protect the Serbian national interests and to demand unconditional unification with Serbia. In early November the Serbian People's Council was formed and the culmination of its activity was the Great People's Assembly held in Novi Sad on 25 November 1918. Thanks to the Radicals, and especially to Jaša Tomić, at this assembly the decision was made to unite Bačka, Banat and Baranja with Serbia directly and not through the People's Council in Zagreb, which was another alternative. The day before, the delegates of the people's councils from Srem expressed their readiness for direct unification with Serbia at the meeting held in Ruma.

Soon after the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the Vojvodina Radicals started their work again in February 1919. In

March, they united with the Serbian People's Radical Party because they thought that a strong "state-building" party is needed to rule the newly formed state. However, the Vojvodina Radicals retained some organizational particularities, such as their main governing body – the Central Board headed by Žarko Miladinović. At that time, they started to organize the party locally. Due to this, local boards were founded throughout Vojvodina and the number of party members increased substantially. The party's infrastructure, which exceeded all opponent parties, was taking shape. The structure of the People's Radical Party in Vojvodina was based on peasants, although an increasing number of party members (especially among the leadership) came from the more well-off layers of the society. The number of priests was quite considerable. The Vojvodina Radicals had always emphasized their loyalty to Orthodoxy although they had been in conflict with the clergy.

Along with organizing the party, the Vojvodina Radicals dedicated themselves to the pre-election campaign for the Constituent Assembly. They demonstrated some of their ideological particularities in this campaign. They distinguished themselves by supporting the idea of "Great Serbia" and by denying the idea of "one three-named nation". Jaša Tomić was one of the outspoken supporters of both ideas respectively. Later on, they accepted the official ideology, but they still remained bitter opponents of the Yugoslav ideology. They supported a centralistic social structure, refusing any demands for autonomies or federalism which came from the part of the Croats. The Radicals from Srem, who were known as the most energetic and organized part of the party in Vojvodina, were the most determined in this respect. The Vojvodina Radicals were loyal monarchists and sworn anti-communists, convinced that hidden behind the communist mask were separatist activities backed by the national minorities. As far as the other political parties are concerned, the Radicals always perceived them not only as opponents but also as anti-state and anational factors (there were some rare exceptions however), and they strove to put an end to their influence in Vojvodina altogether.

In the early 1920s the Vojvodina Radicals showed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the conditions in the party in general, and especially with the coalition with the hated Democrats. They accused them of various offences in Vojvodina and especially of dismissing clerks who belonged to the Radical Party. At the Novi Sad Conference held in 1922 they ultimately requested the breakup of the cooperation with the Democratic Party as well as the decentralization of the People's Radical Party by the formation of independent bodies in the provinces. Since these changes had not happened, the dissatisfaction grew and culminated at the meeting in Sombor in October 1922. At this event the coalition with the Democrats was severely criticized once again. Nevertheless, the party leadership allowed the creation of the Action Board for Vojvodina and Slavonija at the end of 1922. Žarko Miladinović was elected president of the Board, but the Board itself did not last long. The Vojvodina Radicals were left dissatisfied with both their position within the party and their participation in the highest government bodies (which usually meant only one minister position). Some of these dissatisfied members (Emil Gavrila, Mita Klicin and others) were attracted by Stojan Protić, but this group did not manage to impose their opinions, especially those concerning constitutional issues, to the majority of Vojvodina Radicals. The "Protić supporters" achieved marginal results in the 1923 elections not only in Vojvodina but also throughout the country and therefore disappeared from the political scene.

The German, Hungarian and Romanian minorities got the right to vote for the first time in those elections. Throughout 1922 the Radicals ran a great campaign for the organization of local boards and encouraged massive admission of new party members in places inhabited by minorities all over Vojvodina. However, this did not lead to the expected results since the members of the minorities had decided to form independent political parties which would not join the Radicals in a coalition. The only exception were the Bunjevci among whom the Radicals had a lot of supporters. The Radicals had some kind of cooperation with minorities' parties from time to time, but a permanent one was not possible for two reasons. On one hand, the Radicals feared the minorities' irredentist activity; on the other hand, the national minorities did not trust the Radicals because of their policy of "nationalization" of Vojvodina. Among the means whereby this "nationalization" was carried out were the agrarian reform and colonization. However, since the Vojvodina Radicals had a certain number of large estate owners in their leadership, they thought that the agrarian reform must be implemented not only according to the national principle but also according to the principle of economic rationality. Unsatisfied by the carrying out of the agrarian reform, the Vojvodina Radicals submitted their own bill on this issue in mid-1923. The bill was written by Joca Lalošević and it proposed a rather moderate form of the reform. This bill attracted odium in Belgrade. Some members of the People's Radical Party in Vojvodina were accused of neglecting national interests in favor of personal ones. To legalize the agrarian reform was their main demand, but it was not obtained in spite of constant pressure.

In the 1925 elections the Vojvodina Radicals – this time in association with the independent Democrats of Svetozar Pribićević (whom they

perceived as their bitterest enemy) - were once again successful, thanks to the many non-democratic methods they used. In the following period they paid more attention to economic problems in Vojvodina. Ever since the unification there had been complaints about the underdevelopment of Vojvodina and the exploitation of its wealth. Another big problem was the unbearable tax burden which was twice as big as the state average. At the end of 1925 the representatives of the Vojvodina Radicals in Parliament started the campaign for tax reduction threatening the government that they would not support the budget proposal. It did not happen: tax was reduced only slightly and the total equalization finally happened in 1928. The late 1920s marked the split of the Radical party in Vojvodina which began at the time when Ljuba Jovanović contradicted Pašić. In 1926, after the death of Pašić and Miladinović, the Radicals openly divided themselves into "Pašić supporters" and the supporters of the Prime Minister Velja Vukićević. In Vojvodina, the former were led by Slavko Miletić while the latter were led by Svetozar Stanković. Just before the 1927 elections there had been a complete split in the party and many parallel boards were formed. The members decided which board to join on the basis of their personal reasons rather than general principles. The conflicts between them became the main issue of the election campaign which was outrageously unfair. The "Vukićević supporters" won a landslide victory.

In spite of mutual accusations of neglecting the interests of Vojvodina as well as constant complaints about the pushing out of people from Vojvodina into the background, both of these wings supported the ideas of state unity and centralism. They both rejected all demands for autonomy, stated by the opponent parties, thinking it would be fatal for the Serbs with respect to the ethnic structure of the province. They energetically opposed the policy of the "Prečanski front" represented by the Peasant-Democratic coalition and especially their demands for the constitutional revision submitted after the assassination of Stjepan Radić in Parliament in spring 1928. The King's gesture of 6 January 1929 was welcomed if not delightfully then at least with certain relief, as beneficial for the state. All these things were in accordance with the policy carried out by the Vojvodina Radicals in the period from 1918 to 1929 in all aspects including cultural and educational ones. The predominant element in their activity was the concern for national survival and development of the Serbs in Vojvodina, whom they represented by a majority as the most powerful party in the region.

Keywords: the Radical Party, Vojvodina, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the national question

Aleksandar Životić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy aleksandar.zivotic@f.bg.ac.rs

THE COMINTERN AND THE MONTENEGRIN NATIONAL QUESTION (1919–1941)

The end of World War I, the collapse of the Russian Empire, the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War, and the creation of the first socialist country produced a global alternative to the existing social system. The Bolshevik insistence on a fundamental transformation of social and economic relations carried with it an ultimatum to redefine existing interethnic relations in ethnically diverse state communities, which implied the practical realization of previously exclusively theoretical views on the relations between the national center and the periphery, the constituent peoples of multinational states, and the relations between the "main people" and national minorities.

The widely known concepts of "nation" and "nationality" entered the Russian political, scientific, and everyday vocabulary largely thanks to the Russian Social Democrats, who, as is known, were quite familiar with modern Western social sciences, mainly German. The famous and often quoted text of Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin "Marxism and the National Question" was of fundamental importance for the introduction of these concepts into everyday use. Written in Vienna in 1913, after the victory of the Bolshevik revolution, it became not only the "alphabet" of nationbuilding, but also the most important tool for rooting new concepts in the Russian language, and from there into the vocabularies of communist parties around the world. It should be noted that many of the basic propositions presented in that work are not particularly original, since by their nature they summarize the understanding of the concept of "nation" in German science during the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. However, Stalin managed to transform this material into clearly forged formulas, and so skillfully that many contemporary Russian ethnologists still refer to his definition of "nation" today - as an example of the understanding of "nation" by science of the end of the 19th century. In contrast, Lenin criticized Stalin's understanding of the right of a nation to self-determination: while Lenin insisted that "it would be a mistake to understand the right to self-determination as anything other than the right to a separate state existence", Stalin understood the right to self-determination as "the right to organize one's life on the basis of the principle of autonomy", with the right to federation and the right to secession. In the days following the October Revolution, especially after the formation of the Communist International, Stalin's views on the national question became a kind of ideological and practical framework within which communists around the world viewed various aspects of the national question. While great empires were disintegrating, nation-states were being created, and the outlines of future decolonization were being formed, Stalin's simply formulated forms found their official confirmation in the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia" adopted on November 15, 1917. The proclaimed principles of equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia, the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to secession and the formation of an independent state, the abolition of all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions, and the free development of national minorities and ethnographic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia thus became the model according to which the Yugoslav communists, during the period of the constitution of the Yugoslav state, formed their view of national differences within the newly created state and its future state structure.

At its founding congress, the Comintern took the position that the Yugoslav state was created "through the use of armed force", with Serbia as one of the victorious countries annexing parts of the defeated Austria-Hungary. The new state was treated as an arbitrary combination of different regions held together by the armed forces of Serbia. For this reason, the Comintern insisted on the temporary nature of the newly established borders resulting from the military defeat and collapse of Austria-Hungary and the position that new borders would be established by the Soviet authorities after the victory of the revolutionary forces. This led to the position that only the Serbian question had been resolved in the Yugoslav territory, and that all others would be resolved in the coming period through revolutionary transformation. In the ethnically and confessional diverse Yugoslav community, the Montenegrin national question, which was treated as closely related to the Serbian one, had a number of specificities and, for the communists, a number of unclear features that were difficult to fit into Stalin's "four characteristics" and Lenin's statements about "oppressed and oppressive nations" and the tasks of the communist

parties of "backward countries" which, in order to achieve revolutionary goals, should assist national liberation movements led by the bourgeoisie. Although, due to historical circumstances, Montenegro was formed over a long period of time and then existed as a separate state entity, it did not have linguistic, ethnic or religious distinctiveness in relation to the entire Serbian national corpus. On the contrary, the expressed awareness of Montenegro as an integral part of the Serbian national space and the belief that its economic and social potentials did not guarantee its independent development made the aspiration towards unification natural and achievable in the conditions of the Serbian military victory at the end of the First World War. For these reasons, the Montenegrin question in the newly created Yugoslav kingdom was not posed as a national one, but exclusively as a state one. The insistence on the uniqueness of Montenegro within the Yugoslav community by the supporters of the deposed King Nikola did not imply the negation of unification and, accordingly, the demand for the restoration of statehood. The lack of a special national consciousness in Montenegro, from the point of view of the communist movement's understanding of the essence of the national question as an international political force, represented not only a theoretical but also a practical problem, especially if we take into account the popularity of the communist idea in Montenegro and its victory in the elections for the Constituent Assembly in 1920. In this way, in reality, the popularity of the idea itself clashed with historically rooted national identity and national tradition.

A major turning point in the national policy of the Yugoslav communists occurred in mid-1922, when the position on the "three-named people" was officially abandoned. Starting from the newly adopted position according to which the theory of the national unity of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, as formulated by the ruling Serbian bloc, is only a mask of the imperialism of the Serbian bourgeoisie, the communists advocated the principle of self-determination as the basis for the resolution of existing inter-ethnic disputes. The Comintern found the key stronghold of its future position on the Montenegrin state and national question in the Soviet position on the non-recognition of the "Treaties of the Versailles System" according to which "entire countries and provinces, such as Macedonia, Montenegro, Thrace, Dobrudza, territories and cities of Albania, Dalmatia, Croatia, are included in the composition of other states without the question of their inhabitants". The fundamental act of the Comintern on which it based its attitude towards the national question in the Yugoslav region was the Resolution of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern entitled "National Questions in Central Europe and the Balkans", adopted on July 8, 1924 in Moscow.

The programmatic theses adopted at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern influenced the positions taken at the Third Regional Conference of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in 1924, that the main blame for the worsening of interethnic relations in the country lies with the Serbian bourgeoisie, which "led a policy of conquest in Macedonia and Albania before the war" and "suppresses Montenegrin autonomy" in the newly created state. However, the conference resolution itself did not fully define the issue of differences between Serbs and Montenegrins, although based on the analogy with the definition of Macedonians as a separate nation, the position on the national uniqueness of Montenegrins was nevertheless hinted at. In practice, this emphasis did not represent a step towards further affirmation of Montenegrin national uniqueness in the positions of Yugoslav communists. In the following period, the formation of a Montenegrin republic within the Balkan Federation was insisted on, but without emphasizing Montenegrin national identity. Although the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in 1926 indirectly hinted at the position on the national identity of Montenegrins, the thesis was not fully developed. The process of affirmation of the Montenegrin nation was completed at the Dresden Congress in 1928. In this regard, the implementation of the postulates of the Comintern's national policy had its own special expression in Montenegro. Unlike other national issues in the Yugoslav region, which were approached from the perspective of the need for national emancipation in order to achieve state identity (Slovenia, Croatia) or the territorial constitution of separate regions and national integration of the entire Slavic population into a single nation in that region (Macedonia), in the case of Montenegro, a new nation had to be created on the basis of former reminiscences of state identity. This was the uniqueness of the communist movement's actions, because until then there had been no social or political force that, in its public or political activities, advocated the separation of Montenegro and Montenegrins from the general Serbian national body. In this sense, there was a clear distinction in relation to the Montenegrin federalists, whose political foundation was linked to Montenegro's previous statehood and, accordingly, the need to preserve Montenegrin uniqueness in the Yugoslav community, who always emphasized their affiliation with the Serbian nation in their political activities. Unlike the communists, the Montenegrin federalists believed that Montenegro could not survive as a separate state for economic and political reasons, but that with the centralist system in the newly created state, it had lost not only influence in the decision-making process, but also been neglected in terms of economic and political development, so they based their policy on resistance to that system. They fought against state centralism, declaring themselves as Serbs, and demanded equality not on a national, but on a more regional provincial basis. They criticized centralism as a phenomenon that arose not from the need to protect Serbs but from the "class interests of the Serbian bourgeoisie". For these reasons, the constitutional order based on the "Vidovdan Constitution" was considered by them to be an equal violence against the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian peoples, and therefore against the entire Yugoslavia, which they emphasized should by definition represent the equality of all united regions.

Using the general postulates of the Comintern when it comes to the Yugoslav state and the national question, the Yugoslav communists tried to carry out such a complex and major turning point in the life of a people with rather simple and extremely schematic methods based on ideological representations and propaganda phrases. A major shift in the policy of the Comintern and the Soviet Union related to the creation of a broad "popular front" with ideologically related movements, the strengthening of internal cohesion through a partial return to the Russification of the country, and the constitutional changes that led to the further federalization of the Soviet Union after 1936 created an ideal framework into which the Comintern, through its Yugoslav branch - the CPY, could "mold" the Montenegrin national question, which was legally sanctioned by the decisions of the AVNOJ decisions from 1943 - the creation of a separate federal unit without pronounced national distinctiveness and linguistic separation as key differences in relation to the "hegemonic people" - a model acceptable and popular in the Montenegrin environment that in the long run led to a dual, and then a completely separate national identity embodied in the firm affirmation of Montenegrin ethnic nationalism in the period between 1944 and 1948.

Keywords: Comintern, Yugoslavia, Soviet Union, Montenegro, Serbs, national question, communists

Ljubodrag Dimić

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts Belgrade ljubodrag_dimic@yahoo.com

INTEGRAL YUGOSLAVISM

The personal regime of King Alexander I Karadordević, established on January 6, 1929, was characterized by pronounced state interventionism in the areas of political, economic and cultural life. The dictatorship was justified by the "highest national and state interests and their future", and the monarch was labeled as the "captive" and "guardian" of national unity and state unity and a fighter against "tribal blindness" and "spiritual disunity". In the "Proclamation" issued on that occasion, the king labeled parliamentarism as a phenomenon that "is beginning to lead to spiritual disunity and national disunity". The sovereign designated "national unity" and "state unity" as the highest goal of his rule and the law of the land. The ruler called on all Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to help him in his efforts "to achieve in the shortest possible time the realization of those institutions, that state administration and that state system, which will best meet the general needs of the people and the interests of the state". He particularly emphasized the need to seek and apply "new methods" and "pave" new paths in future work that lead to the realization of the proclaimed goal. The king demanded from the ministers responsible to him that "each in his own department" represents the "greatest state authority", which will be preserved only if they "strictly adhere to the laws of the land, not allowing either circumvention or the slightest violation of them". He also demanded from the ministers that both they and their subordinate bodies "in every decision and in every act" be guided exclusively by "the interests of the service and the interests of the State". He considered this the only way to create trust in the people towards the authorities and the belief that the state was ruled by law, justice and absolute equality. The monarch expected that the ministers would "in the spirit of national unity, nurture and develop harmony, equality and equal rights of all Serbs, Croats and Slovenes", engage in "intensive work and develop the greatest activity in all fields of state administration", and "immediately proceed with the reform of state administration with quick and appropriate measures". The king's words that "the salvation of the state is the highest law, and service to the people is the most sacred service" marked the beginning of the work of the Council of Ministers and determined the ideological coordinates on which the dictatorship regime was to rest. Essentially, in the form of an unquestionable order (decree), the imposition of personal power (monarchy dictatorship) was justified, its "captive" (monarch) was designated, the culprit in the form of parliamentarism was named, the goals were specified, binding for all, the help and support of the people were requested, the methods by which the desired could and must be achieved were indicated, those responsible for their proclaimed implementation were designated, and the irresponsibility in the achievement of the set goals and tasks was expressed. For the regime, ten years of life in a common state was a sufficiently long period after which the ideology of "integral Yugoslavism" should have been revived by a "decree". The fact that the peoples who "entered" the common state in 1918, despite their mutual ties, closeness and affinity, did not know each other well enough, was ignored and denied. In circles close to the government, there was a belief that centuries-old life as part of foreign states and civilizations, national division and opposition, religious isolation and confrontation, different life experiences, organization of society, political and general culture, political systems and institutions, unequal economic development, economic and production relations, agrarian regimes, transport, monetary and tax systems, legal particularism, educational content, historical interpretations, traditions, mentalities, the disastrous consequences of wars and other differences could be overcome with a new ideological concept and with the help of the state apparatus. The achievement of this goal and the overcoming of the "negative remnants of the past", which persisted in everyday life in the form of numerous antagonisms, were to be served by politics, economy, culture and education imbued with the Yugoslav ideology.

The Yugoslav ideology was to receive significant support through the adoption of numerous systemic laws. The ministries were tasked with "as soon as possible" implementing the unification of existing legislation. These actions were to express the regime's aspiration in the spirit of the ideology of integral Yugoslavism. In the ideologically-oriented programs of the dictatorship regime, the task of primary schools was not only to spread literacy "but, even more so, to educate nationally". Politicians criticized the educational authorities for having "neither the sense nor the strength" to force teachers to be "at the height of their role", i.e. to be, like every civil servant and body, "the bearer of the state idea". When "he does not want to or cannot do that", as it was emphasized, "the state and the profession should be rid of him immediately". Teachers' schools were expected to produce staff who "in their teaching work would not come into conflict with important ideas about the organization of the state, the form of government, the social order, as well as the unity of the state and the people". The state required schools to provide "nationally conscious teaching". "Their task," as stated in reports on the upcoming tasks that the regime set for schools, was not only to educate citizens "who would know geometry, history or physics well," but to form "nationally cultivated" citizens, capable and useful "in all fields of state and people's life." The dictatorship authorities tasked educational inspectors with, in addition to their professional qualifications, also controlling the national orientation of educational workers, as well as their loyalty to the state idea. Inspector-ates in other ministries had similar competences.

The delusion that haunted the monarch, that ten years of life in a common state was a sufficiently long period after which he could begin to revive a new state ideology and build a Yugoslav nation, was based on the illusion that human consciousness and opinion could be changed by applying administrative measures in short, precisely defined and planned terms. The belief that the idea of the state, national unity, national education could be imposed as the dominant consciousness on the population of the Kingdom primarily through a "national school", new educational legislation, the unification of curricula and textbooks, and public enlightenment, and that tradition, existing cultural, civilizational, economic, and confessional differences could be suppressed from people's minds was also shown to be unattainable, and in part fatal. The implementation of megalomaniacal state, economic, cultural, educational and other plans, proclaimed and taken on by the dictatorship regime, most directly depended on the readiness of the bureaucracy to accept the new state ideology. The development of events showed that the bureaucracy's faith in the dictatorship regime and the possibility of resolving the issues that had caused the dictatorship was rapidly waning. In the process of forming "spiritual national unity" and "unified Yugoslav consciousness", in addition to the school, the regime's press played an important role. During the summer of 1930, it became clear to the most responsible people in the Council of Ministers that the Yugoslav ideology could no longer be "decreed from above" and that the regime, if it wanted to survive, needed "active cooperation from all layers of the people". For these reasons, greater attention began to be paid to culture, education, and the Yugoslav-oriented press. There were no politicians in the Council of Ministers who thought about establishing parliamentary democracy, but only about introducing a form of limited constitutionalism with great powers for the king and the ruling political elite committed to the ideology of Yugoslavism and national state unitarism. If there were any differences of opinion, they were reflected only in the severity with which the state program of dictatorship was to be implemented.

Within the Council of Ministers itself, there were several different opinions about the formation of a new political organization that would not have an exclusively political-party character and whose task would be to, like a kind of transmission, "support", "bring to life", "implement" the numerous actions that the dictatorship regime proclaimed and the measures it was taking. With its mass size and activity, this "political organization" was supposed to fill the entire social and political space and thus dis-

ures it was taking. With its mass size and activity, this "political organization" was supposed to fill the entire social and political space and thus disable the activities of the former political parties. It was also planned that by taking over membership from the old parties, they would be reduced to "embodied political leaderships" without any real political power. The goal was for the new patriotic political organization, which the Government wanted to form, to gather "all elements that are willing to positively cooperate in the direction of the Royal Manifesto". This was seen as a way to bridge the time period until the "new Yugoslav generation" that had yet to be formed entered social and political life. In the second year of the dictatorship, the ideological concept of "integral Yugoslavism" was proclaimed, but it turned out that the government had no way of putting its intentions into practice. The regime sought to revive the new state ideology, but the interpretations of the government's intentions, in numerous cases, encountered difficulties, were abused, and fell into futility. The economic crisis that shook the Yugoslav state, but also the whole of Europe, further destroyed the future of the government's efforts to revive the new integral Yugoslav ideology. In such circumstances, the government did not have the strength to implement what was proclaimed.

In the months and years that followed, circles close to the regime continued to insist on the racial, linguistic and psychological unity of the Yugoslavs, the view that political unification had occurred after 1918, and the belief that the Yugoslav state still had a difficult task ahead of it, in the process of unifying regional cultures and particularities, to achieve the cultural unity of a "synthesized Yugoslav nation". What seemed to the personal regime of Alexander I Karađorđević, in the early 1930s, as the final victory of Yugoslavism, the consolidation of national unity, the definitive liquidation of tribal and provincial differences, the "merger, the merging of all three Yugoslav tribes into one great and unified Yugoslav nation", was in essence the greatest defeat of the Yugoslav idea. At that time, integral Yugoslavism was less and less considered by the population as a "synthesis" that could be achieved over time, and more and more perceived as a forced "amalgamation" and "fusion" that was imposed without delay, immediately, by administrative means, and by force.

Keywords: Yugoslavia, kingdom, King Alexander, integral Yugoslavism, nation, constitution, parliamentarism

Miloš Žikić

Institute for Contemporary History Belgrade zikic90@gmail.com

PRO-BULGARIAN PROPAGANDA ON YUGOSLAV TERRITORY, 1934–1941

One of the largest problems between the Yugoslav state and Bulgaria in the interwar period was the Macedonian question. The roots of this problem date back to the 19th century, when the process of the creation of national states, based on historicism, began in the Balkans as well. Since both Serbia and Bulgaria claimed the territory of Macedonia, the conflict between these two countries was inevitable. Due to the existence of the Bulgarian Exarchate (founded in 1870) as a legal Ottoman institution, Bulgarian propaganda had a significant advantage over Serbian propaganda. Its almost unobstructed years-long work through churches and schools on the creation of Bulgarian national consciousness led to the formation of a large teaching and clerical personnel which then worked on the Bulgarization of the population. However, despite this success, Serbian clerical-educational activities in Macedonia also achieved certain success, and that is why Bulgarians decided to radicalize their operations. At the beginning of 1894, a group of Exarchate intellectuals in Thessaloniki founded the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (MRO, subsequently VMRO), the purpose of which was to create autonomous Macedonia. However, it was seen as an interim solution to the annexation of this region to Bulgaria. Soon after the foundation of this organization, the expansion of its network in Macedonia began. In 1897, Serbian Chetnik action began in Turkey, which led to fierce clashes between Serbian and Bulgarian followers in the following period.

At the end of the Balkan wars in 1913, the territory of Vardar Macedonia became part of the Kingdom of Serbia, while at the end of the First World War, after the Bulgarian occupation period, it stayed within the newly-established Yugoslav state. However, Bulgaria did not reconcile

166

itself with the loss of this territory. Since the territorial changes, due to the newly-created circumstances in Europe, were not realized, Bulgaria applied a new tactic: it asked for the minority rights for the population of Macedonia. Still, the Yugoslav state did not recognize the existence of the Bulgarian national minority in its territory, considering Macedonian population Serbian. That is why individuals and organizations from Bulgaria filed petitions to the League of Nations in Geneva, accusing Belgrade of disrespecting the assumed minority-related obligations. In that manner, there was a tendency to keep the Macedonian question still open in the eyes of the European public.

In order to have the foundations for their revisionist aspirations in the eyes of Europe, Bulgarians tried to maintain the "Bulgarian national spirit" among the Macedonian population. That task was assumed by the VMRO which used its presence in the field, its terrorist attacks and pressure on the local population to compensate for the earlier propaganda by Exarchate priests and teachers. Simultaneously with the VMRO, the Macedonian Youth Secret Revolutionary Organization (MMTRO) was active in Macedonia during 1920s. This was an organization closely connected with the VMRO, composed of students and secondary-school students of higher grades. Within their activities, they organized trips and excursions for the sake of expanding Bulgarophile ideas, as well as for performing Bulgarian national songs and dances. In addition, this organization also transmitted and distributed messages and pro-Bulgarian literature and press. However, the MMTRO was revealed in public during 1927. That year in December, in Skopje, the arrested members were tried in court, nine of whom were sentenced to prison ("Skopje Student Process").

A situation similar to that in Macedonia was also present in Caribrod and Bosilegrad regions (the so-called "Western districts"), annexed to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1920, whose population was also seen by Belgrade as officially Serbian. Following the example of the IMRO, in 1924 in Bulgaria, the emigrants from these regions founded the Internal Western Outland Revolutionary Organization (VZRO or $B \sigma p \bar{u} o \bar{u}$) with the aim of returning these territories to Bulgaria. The members of this organization then started crossing the border illegally and working on the expansion of the organization in the field and the distribution of propaganda material, while their terrorist acts did not begin until 1929. At the same time, the population tried to use legal means for their aims by joining both opposition and ruling political parties.

Bulgaria officially tolerated and even helped the operations of the VMRO and the VZRO until May 1934 when, after the coup, Kimon Georgijev's government came to power, known for its aspirations to bring Yugoslavia and Bulgaria closer. Soon after the coup, the organizations were banned, which led to their dissolution and the apprehension of a large number of their members in the following period.

With the dissolution of the above-listed organizations, Bulgarophile elements in the Yugoslav territory lost significant support for their activities. That is why they had to apply a new tactic. While the still-unrevealed MMTRO members continued their illegal operations, the compromised members of this organization (sentenced at the Skopje Trial), as well as their followers, crossed over to legal territory, trying to wage their struggle against Yugoslavia on a much broader front. One of the methods of legal work was acting through opposition political parties. An important point of contact with the opposition was Zagreb, where a large number of students from Macedonia studied. In 1935, part of the left-oriented students founded the "Vardar" association which the following year, under the influence of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, participated in the foundation of a new organization - the Macedonian National Movement (MANAPO). This movement advocated for the federalization of Yugoslavia and, thus, the autonomy of Macedonia, as well as for the recognition of the Macedonian nation. The movement was also joined by former MMTRO members led by Dimitrije Đuzelović (Димитър Гюзелов) and Dimitrije Čkatrović (Димитър Чкатров), who publicly advocated for the autonomy of Macedonia within Yugoslavia. However, their true aim was the creation of independent Macedonia as an interim step towards joining this territory to Bulgaria. Part of the pro-Bulgarian activists also joined the left wing of the Agrarian Party, since it also advocated for the federalization of Yugoslavia.

A special episode in these activities was the launch of the journal *Luč* in Skopje in 1937, which was owned by former Exarchate teacher Đorđe Kiselinović (Георги Киселинов). The tendency of the journal was exclusively to gather intellectuals from "the South", to promote the specific features of the local speech and culture, to criticize the agricultural politics in the Banate of Vardar, and to use the term "Macedonia" instead of "South Serbia". Therefore, it was the response to the "Official cultural-educational work" in the Banate and that is why it was prohibited the following year, in 1938.

Apart from the opposition parties, Bulgarophile elements also became members of the ruling Yugoslav Radical Union (JRZ), thus gaining the opportunity to conduct their operations more easily. Namely, during 1938, it could be seen that a substantial number of the advocates of the idea of autonomous Macedonia were at the same time JRZ followers, which placed a dilemma to the authorities as to how to treat them. Because of this situation in the south of the country, the Ministry of Interior Affairs held a special conference at the end of May 1938, when the majority of the participants believed that the demands for establishing autonomous Macedonia were the result of the propaganda coming from Bulgaria. The same was also claimed by the Yugoslav military envoy in Sofia, labelling migrant workers who returned from Bulgaria to Yugoslavia as its main implementors.

Encouraged by the revisionist steps of the Axis powers in Europe during the first half of 1939 (the disappearance of Czechoslovakia and Albania from the map), the pro-Bulgarian propaganda in the Yugoslav territory increased substantially. It was implemented through the Sofia-based radio station, travellers and family ties, while a great role in its expansion was also played by the local grammar-school teachers. In the middle of 1939, Yugoslav services concluded that 70% of the population in the south of the country were in favour of Bulgaria. It was stated that it was impossible to hear the Serbian language anywhere, not even among the school youth, while the increasing hate towards Serbs and everything Serbian was felt. The unobstructed development of this situation was also contributed to by the unsettled political circumstances, which discredited public political life. Therefore, the people began mistrusting the power of state administration, and that is why they believed that the current state was temporary and transient. At the same time, it was possible to see the agitation among the population in the so-called "Western districts" regarding the return of these regions to Bulgaria.

The outbreak of the war in Europe in September 1939 made the situation in the Banate of Vardar even more complex. The officials in Belgrade were informed about the increase of communism and the idea of Macedonian autonomy, used by pro-Bulgarian elements to conceal their work, as well as about increasingly bolder and frequent pro-Bulgarian and anti-Serbian incidents. In several reports from 1940, the situation was characterized as "desperate". Promoting "anational" or Bulgarian sentiments continued through to April 1941 and the occupation of Yugoslavia, when many people with this sentiment participated in the establishment of the Bulgarian occupation administration.

Keywords: Yugoslavia, Macedonia, Bulgaria, VMRO, MMTRO, VZRO, propaganda

Boris Tomanić

Institute for Contemporary History Belgrade borisbox62@gmail.com

CARRIERS OF BULGARISATION ON THE TERRITORY OF YUGOSLAVIA DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

In the short April war (6th–17th April 1941), Yugoslavia suffered a military defeat and was divided between the Axis powers and their satellites. Bulgaria, with slight changes during the occupation, was given the major part of Macedonia (with the exception of the towns of Gostivar, Struga and Tetovo), the so called "Western districts" (Caribrod and Bosilegrad counties), a part of Southeastern Serbia, which also included the towns of Pirot, Vranje, Surdulica, as well as several villages in Eastern Serbia, on the right bank of the Timok River, and also some parts in the east of Kosovo (around Gnjilane and Kačanik). As a result of the final division, Bulgaria gained 28,250 km², which accounted for 11.4% of the Yugoslav territories. A population of 1,260,000 lived in this territory, which, according to German estimates from 1941, accounted for 7.9% of the total population of Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, Bulgaria's aspirations were challenged by German economic and Italian territorial ambitions, so it remained deprived of certain territories to which it aspired.

Bulgarian infiltration, as well as the final definition of the occupied lands, continued between April and August 1941. By the end of April, Bulgaria exacted military occupation of all lands that it had been given. Army units were followed by a massive administrative, policing, and judicial apparatus that was brought in from Bulgaria. Later that month, the orders were issued according to which all civil and administrative laws of the Kingdom of Bulgaria were to be applied. At the end of April, Bulgaria divided the obtained part of Macedonia into the districts of Skopje and Bitola, which were in turn subdivided into counties (*okolia*) and municipalities. Parts of Southeast Serbia in the Vranje region and a portion of Kosovo (Kačanik county) were included in the District of Skopje. Pirot and the surrounding area, as well as the zone around Zaječar, were incorporated into the Sofia District. This administrative division continued throughout the occupation (1941–1944) and was only slightly changed. By the end of April, division in terms of the church also took place. Four new eparchies were established, these including the territories which Bulgaria had annexed from Greece.

For the purpose of more successful national alienation and subsequently Bulgarisation of the population of the annexed territory, a number of institutions and organisations specialising in this form of assimilation were sent there. It was as early as the April invasion that together with German troops that penetrated the Macedonian territories, a group of political emigrants, formerly the members and close associates of IMRO (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization), arrived in Skopje. Immediately upon their arrival, on 13th April, they established the Central Bulgarian Action Committee with the headquarters in Skopje. The main objective of this Committee was to make Bulgarian occupation appear like an act of liberation. This Committee exacted a certain form of authority, until such time when the Bulgarian regulatory, administrative, and executive structure was in place. Head of the District of Skopje dismissed the Committee on 7th August 1941. The Committee for the Morava River Region was established in May 1941 in order to maximise the results of the propaganda in Southeast Serbia. The Committee's primary objective was to complete the task of "national unification and the fulfilment of Bulgarian people's historical mission in the Balkans".

At the same time, Bulgarian authorities launched the exercise of banishing all Yugoslav civil servants, along with their families, all Serbian bishops and priests, as well as all settlers and their families. According to Bulgarian authorities' estimates, the annexed territory was the home of 240,000-250,000 Serbs. The process of banishing was prompt and very ruthless, so during the summer of 1941, between 25,000 and 45,000 Serbs were forcibly expelled. Their property was soon confiscated, while the very process of banishing was carried out by the National Security Service. The expulsion and flight of the Serbian population continued throughout the occupation period. The Albanians - a total of 130,000 according to Bulgarian estimates - enjoyed a less strict treatment because they were mainly favoured by Italians who were in serious confrontation with the Bulgarian side, due to unresolved border issues. The Turkish population, consisting of approximately 88,000 inhabitants, was treated severely. Concurrently with the population banishing practice, the annexed area saw the commencement of the process of settling Bulgarians. To this end, the Commissariat for Internal Colonization was established. The Commissariat was in charge of the colonisation of Thrace, Macedonia, and Southern Dobruja.

Boris Tomanić

In the summer of 1941, the assimilation of the local population through regulatory institutions was launched. In the early days of the occupation, the Bulgarian government put its Ministry of Education in charge of a special task of performing extensive activity in the annexed lands. The occupied territory was divided into school districts, which reflected the administrative division. The Bulgarian Ministry of Education soon divided the schools in which regular classes were given into the following three categories: 1) people's primary schools, 2) pre-grammar schools (seven grades), 3) grammar schools. Educational activity of the Bulgarian occupier went hand in hand with the publishing activity. Relevant Bulgarian authorities also started publishing several newspapers. In this regard, of particular importance was the daily *Entire Bulgaria* which was published in Skopje from 21st May 1941 to 31st August 1944. Its circulation was 5,000 copies.

A major role in Bulgarisation of the population and in the establishment of Bulgarian power in the annexed territories was played by various nationalist organisations. According to the Bulgarian National Security Service records, by the end of 1941, a total of 41 charity organisations, cultural-educational societies, sports associations, patriotic, professional, cooperative, and volunteering organisations were registered in the annexed territories. The organisation with the largest membership was definitely the *Branik* youth organisation, modelled after *Hitlerjugend*. In addition to this organisation, we should also mention *Father Paisios*, the Union of Bulgarian National Legions (*legionaries*), and the Union of Warriors for the Advancement of Bulgarianness (*warriors*).

After August 1941, certain differences in the system of occupation could be identified. Specific institutions, military units, assimilation-oriented organisations active in the initial months of occupation were fully replaced by regular authorities. Stage one of the Bulgarian assimilation policies, which can be characterised as a period of establishing, was replaced by stage two – the period of pacification.

After operation Barbarossa was launched, Bulgaria assumed a new role, which entailed maintaining the currently established situation in the Balkans. A "peacetime" army unit was established as part of the Fifth Army. This unit was sent to the Yugoslav territories and replaced the units previously operating there. In the eastern regions of Yugoslavia, near Pirot, parts of the First Army were deployed.

Additionally, once the Central Bulgarian Action Committee was dismissed, to fill the void created by this dismissal, the Bulgarian Government decided to establish "public clubs", and then also "culture clubs" (committees), which were renamed into "citizens' national clubs" in September 1941. The aim of these clubs was to gather "sound national elements" and create a strong political factor which would work actively among the people. The institutionalization of this form of assimilation occurred when the National Propaganda Directorate, with the headquarters in Sofia, was established. The Directorate had its main branch office in Skopje.

Nevertheless, soon after the authorities were first established, problems for the Bulgarian system started emerging. Civil and armed resistance first started in 1941, only to grow during the year 1942, while changes in the warzones in Europe, which had a direct impact on Germany, and indirectly on Bulgaria, also resulted in changes in the system of occupation, which over time became more direct and repressive. The Decree of Citizenship of 9th June 1942, according to which Yugoslav citizens automatically became Bulgarian citizens, in the event they failed to move from the annexed territory or failed to opt for another foreign citizenship, was a good illustration of the increasingly restrictive position taken by the Bulgarian government.

The propaganda that was exacted through the institutions of education also gained momentum. In response to the ever-increasing resistance of the population, repressive measures became stronger and propaganda work more extensive. The first step was the introduction of the Moral Education subject in schools. Additionally, the number of schools increased, especially the (seven-grade) pre-grammar schools. Another way of influencing the students was by organising school trips to Bulgaria, visits to historic sites, classes in which lectures were given by Bulgarian "revolutionaries", etc.

It was obvious that the pace of assimilation was not as originally envisaged, so the Bulgarian authorities resorted to establishing new army units such as counter-chetniks, "Benkovski", "Vardar" and "Birman" brigades (together with the Germans), etc. Educational and propaganda institutions were also established, with the exercise of even more radical measures, marking the introduction to stage three of Bulgarization, which can be called a period of radicalisation. During March 1943, Bulgaria finally caved in under the pressure of German antisemitic politics and consequently deported approximately 7,500 Jews from the annexed territory to the Treblinka death camp. As was the case with the banished Serbs, the Jewish property was also confiscated and nationalised.

Apart from another wave of race-based pogrom, the Bulgarian authorities made another school a part of the institutions system in 1943. The University of Skopje was established on 6th January 1943, in accordance with a decree issued by the Bulgarian government. The newly-established university was named the Faculty of History and Philology. Although it was just one faculty, in 1943 it was renamed into the University of Tsar Boris III the Unifier. The first academic year at the University was 1943/44. On 2nd August 1943, the Bulgarian government issued a decision on the establishment of the *Public Force*, an institution intended to be organised from within the "body of citizens", in which the membership was formally on a voluntary basis. However, this organisation designed by the Bulgarian government with the purpose of creating a wider platform lacked broader support of the "nationalistic elements" unwilling to collaborate with it, hence it did not develop any substantial role.

Although by establishing such institutions the Bulgarian authorities tried an all-level systematic approach to the problems that emerged and needed to be resolved, some initial signs of a collapse of their assimilation strategy became increasingly discernible. The year of 1944 brought new challenges to the Bulgarian system and led it to stage four of Bulgarisation – a period of stagnation. In the last year of occupation, the Bulgarian authorities mainly relied on the army and the police, which resulted in violent and unsuccessful methods of Bulgarisation. Concurrently with the wish for Bulgarian troops to retreat from Serbia (not Yugoslavia), which was supposed to put Bulgaria in good graces of the Allies and give it a more favourable position at the negotiating table, the Bulgarian government initiated broader propaganda activities through newspapers, openly expressing the Bulgarian right to claim the annexed territories. At that time, the Bulgarian government hoped that it would succeed in retaining the lands it had been given, provided that it was skilled enough at manoeuvring in negotiations to exit the war. Military success and siding with the Red Army in the Balkan Peninsula, but also political pressures from the Western allies, ruffled some feathers in Bulgaria. In an attempt to come up with a swift exit from the war, on 25th July 1944 the Bulgarian government issued a Decree on withdrawing the Bulgarian army from the "territories to which Bulgaria had no claim". A number of laws and decrees were annulled during the summer. In early September, other repressive and regressive laws and decrees were annulled, while the Bulgarian army units retreated from the territory of former Yugoslavia by 6th September 1944. On the same day, Bulgaria declared war to Germany, while three days later, on 9th September, a coup d'etat took place in Bulgaria, as a result of which the Fatherland Front government was established. The government immediately undertook measures for forging closer relations with Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, as well for withdrawing the entire Bulgarian apparatus from the annexed lands in Yugoslavia. This marked the end of Bulgarisation attempts among the population residing in Yugoslav territories, which had lasted since April 1941.

Keywords: Second World War, Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, occupation, assimilation, Bulgarisation

Igor Vukadinović

Institute for Balkan Studies SASA Belgrade vukadinovicigor3@gmail.com

POPULAR NARRATIVE UNDER THE SCRUTINY OF RESEARCH: DID THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN YUGOSLAVIA IMPLEMENT A POLICY OF NATIONAL EQUALITY?

The aim of this research is to determine to what extent the slogan of ensuring "national equality" in Yugoslavia during the communist rule was implemented in practice. The thesis that the communist regime ensured national equality in Yugoslavia was included in the state constitutions of Yugoslavia, mentioned in certain legal provisions and history textbooks, and was often highlighted in public appearances and propaganda by party officials. Consequently, this notion became entrenched in the collective memory of the population. However, historical sources provide a completely different picture regarding the national policy of the communist regime, the national rights, and the political status of various peoples in Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1991.

The undemocratic and autocratic nature of the communist regime was a key precondition for implementing its national policy in contradiction to the proclaimed principle of "national equality". The leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) orchestrated the creation of new state entities within Yugoslavia and determined their borders without any involvement of the Yugoslavi citizens in this process. Instead of the people, the division of Yugoslavia into new states and their mutual delimitation was decided by Tito, with occasional consultations with his closest associates. The decision to establish the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in violation of the proclaimed principle of the "right of nations to selfdetermination" and the rule that republics should be formed based on national criteria, was made in November 1943 by Tito and Slovenia's leading

| 175

communist, Edvard Kardelj. They played a key role in drafting the conclusions of the Second AVNOJ Session, despite opposition to this solution from other members of the Party leadership. This decision, which determined the fate of millions, was made possible by the political dominance of Broz and Kardelj over other cadres within the communist leadership.

Available sources and the recollections of communist officials indicate that the key decisions regarding the formation of new republics within Yugoslavia, the determination of their borders, the creation of autonomous units in Serbia, the rejection of proposals to establish an autonomous unit for Serbs in Krajina, and the rejection of autonomy for Dalmatia were made by a small group of individuals from the Party leadership. These decisions were marked by an unofficial hierarchical superiority of Croatian and Slovenian officials over Serbian cadres within the CPY leadership, and final decisions could not be made without Broz's approval.

Another evident inconsistency in the national policy of the communist regime in Yugoslavia pertained to the appointment of the highest state positions. To ensure Tito's personal power to the greatest extent possible, the positions of head of state, prime minister, and leader of the League of Communists were reserved for individuals of Croatian nationality. The communist regime did not allow these positions to be filled in accordance with the principle of "national equality", nor did it permit their rotation among representatives of the republics. Even after "national equality" became an indispensable slogan of the regime during the 1960s and was interpreted as a confederal concept of state organization, it was never implemented in practice.

It was only after Tito's death in 1980, and after the positions of party leader and head of state had been stripped of any substantive political significance, that they began to be filled through one-year rotations by representatives of the six republics and two autonomous provinces. Overall, between 1945 and 1991, individuals of Croatian nationality occupied the position of President of Yugoslavia for 80% of the time, the position of leader of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia for 80% of the time, and the position of Prime Minister of Yugoslavia for 65.5% of the time. Collectively, all other nationalities combined held these positions far less frequently than Croats.

When it comes to the Politburo, or the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia – the highest party body – a striking disparity can again be observed between the national composition of this body and the ethnic composition of Yugoslavia as a whole. Serbs, who accounted for approximately 40% of Yugoslavia's population, were consistently underrepresented in the Politburo, often by more than half. In contrast, Slo-

venians were represented about three times more than their share of the population, while Montenegrins held a proportion of seats in the highest party bodies several times greater than their demographic share in Yugoslavia.

One of the key features of federal Yugoslavia was that every state constitution adopted under communist rule solemnly proclaimed the guarantee of "national equality", while simultaneously including provisions that directly undermined the equality of nations and republics within Yugoslavia.

The fact that two parts of Serbia had separate delegations in the Yugoslav Assembly was not the only constitutional provision that placed Serbia in an unequal position within Yugoslavia. The constitutional subordination of Serbia to the other republics in Yugoslavia was taken to a new level with the adoption of the 1963 Constitution of the Yugoslavia, whose fundamental idea was to affirm the statehood of the republics and weaken the federal level of government. In line with this approach, the 1963 Constitution of the SFRY designated the republics as "state communities", and all provisions concerning the organization and functioning of republican institutions and organs of power were removed from the Yugoslav constitution, as these matters were declared to be the "internal affairs of the republics", into which the federal constitution should not intervene.

However, an "exception" was made in the implementation of this constitutional principle, so the federal Constitution still "protected" the position of the autonomous provinces in Serbia and safeguarded their status. Edvard Kardelj fought to have a provision included in the constitution stating that any potential abolition of the autonomous provinces would require a prior amendment to the federal constitution, which meant the agreement of the other republics in Yugoslavia. With this provision, Serbia was the only republic in Yugoslavia for which changing the internal structure of the country required the consent of the other Yugoslav republics.

The exception made in the 1963 Constitution, after the removal of Aleksandar Ranković and the initiation of the post-Brioni campaign, became the main motive for the new constitutional changes in Yugoslavia. The goal of the communist leadership was to, as much as possible, "tie the hands" of Serbia regarding its autonomous provinces and effectively remove its state powers over 36% of its territory. Therefore, the 1968 constitutional amendments included a provision that "the federation protects the rights of the autonomous provinces in Serbia". All constitutional amendments related to the status of the autonomous units in Serbia were aimed at emphasizing the statehood of the provinces and removing the distinctions between these entities and the republics. Judicial and legislative authority in Serbia's autonomous provinces was abolished, and the provinces were granted their own judicial and legislative systems, as well as powers in defense and foreign relations. After consolidating Tito's and Kardelj's constitutional policies in 1974, the autonomous provinces in Serbia were treated in every aspect of the SFRY Constitution in the same manner as the republics, which unequivocally points to the formal inequality of Serbia in Yugoslavia under communist rule.

Research on the distribution of leading state positions in Yugoslavia, the national composition of the most important party organs, and the constitutional and legal status of the republics in federal Yugoslavia reveals that the communist regime in Yugoslavia did not ensure national equality. Although proclaimed in official documents, speeches by party officials, and school textbooks for students in Yugoslavia, the equality of the Yugoslav republics was not guaranteed even at a formal level. Due to the government's tendency to undermine the integrity of Serbia through its autonomous provinces and create conditions for the country's rapid disintegration, the constitutions of Yugoslavia and the political order established under the communist regime did not guarantee equal rights and the same level of authority for all republics over their territories. Numerous provisions in the 1946 Constitution, the 1963 Constitution, the 1968 constitutional amendments, and the 1974 Constitution formally placed Serbia in a subordinate position relative to the other republics in Yugoslavia.

Historical sources show that nationalism and national reckonings were much more present in the party leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia than contemporaries believed, as well as that behind many moves made by the communist authorities regarding the internal organization of the state, there were nationalist motives of Josip Broz Tito and people from his circle.

Keywords: Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, national equality, national question, Communism, League of Communists of Yugoslavia

Katarina Mitrović

Historical Museum of Serbia Belgrade katarinamit1974@gmail.com

SOCIALIST MODERNISM AND (A)NATIONAL IDENTITY: SERBIAN ART OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

After World War II, Serbia experienced a violent disintegration of national identity, marked by a backlash against the monarchical tradition, the destruction of many monuments, the persecution of intellectuals, and the targeted elimination of civil culture and its traditions. At the same time, after a brief period of direct party control over art, the early fifties saw the so-called liberalization of culture and a departure from ideologically doctrinaire socialist realism and its apparent propagandistic model of art. Gradually, but systematically and organized, there was an introduction of the then-current Western modernist model of creation based on the premises of the autonomy of the artwork as a projection of the artist's subjective and politically and ideologically liberated inner world.

As is well known, this creative freedom was conditional; the party undertook more subtle mechanisms of control through a developed system of artistic institutions, associations, awards, acquisitions, and scholarships, resulting in the successful production of a respectable corpus of artworks that were in complete correlation with current global events. A central role in this process was played by the founding of the Modern Gallery, which in 1965, with the construction of a inovative architecture, evolved into the Museum of Contemporary Art. Its primary function was the representation of the Yugoslav modern identity through the universal language of art as a code of internationally valued high culture.

Along with the institutional network that provided it with appropriate presence and visibility in the public sphere, the Yugoslav art system

| 179

served as a limited space of freedom that was safe for the regime, validated through the artistic "scene" where professional actors (artists, theorists, critics) expressed their own often opposing and polemical views and understandings. Concealing its role as an important operational mechanism of the dominant ideological model of culture, the socialist world of art had characteristics of "soft power" and played an important role in constructing a new Serbian collective consciousness, adapting to the conditions of single-party control of society on one hand, and the needs for symbolic representation of the supranational socialist Yugoslavia on the other.

This position of modern art as a simultaneous space of freedom and a means of "narrative control" served as an instrument for adequately reshaping collective identity, but not towards its integration, not even at the level of the newly formed federal unit of Vojvodina, and focused instead on reducing it to a sub-republican identity (the so-called narrower Serbia, without the newly formed provinces of Kosovo and Metohija in the south and Vojvodina in the north) or the mimicry of national memory, cloaked in contentedly indeterminate but politically acceptable forms.

In this process, which can be identified as a tacit, systematic, multidecade manipulation, the crucial importance lay in the takeover of the control over the understanding of the past by relevant cultural actors, who, in accordance with the socio-political system of culture, were part of the same statist establishment. The term "past" here does not refer so much to the customary party memorialization of World War II, the establishment of the cult of Tito, the labor movement, the National Liberation struggle, and revolution, and the condemnation and persecution of the defeated forces of the monarchy and the Yugoslav Army in the homeland, but rather to the relationship towards the past as an inexhaustible source from which, through the selection of events and artifacts of national cultural heritage, as an immediate "testimony" of imagined past, desirable national, pseudo-national (Serbian), or anational (Yugoslav) identities were actively shaped in the field of modern art.

In a situation of national repression and the promotion of Yugoslav identity, both through the populist motto of "brotherhood and unity" and through the realm of high culture and art, artistic practice and the accompanying discourses of criticism and art history necessarily followed the fundamental state political and ideological premises. In such a situation, in Serbian and Yugoslav art of the so-called socialist modernism, the basic term that has conceptualized the question of cultural heritage, shared identity, and memory could be called modern socialist archaicism.

Within this term, it is possible to understand the aesthetic and ideological reprocessing of the firmest points of national history in the art of the second half of the 20th century, such as the Kosovo epic and medieval heritage, on which the idea of modern Serbian identity was founded from the restoration of statehood in the 19th century. Modern socialist archaicism is, namely, connected to the cult of the primordial and rudimentary, embeded in folk art, in prehistoric and civilization-remote pasts, or in nature. Such poetic archaicism appeared as early as the beginning of the 1950s, simultaneously in sculpture, monumental art, and painting, and was an important instrument of radical emancipation of art from the descriptive, narrative language still prevailing in socialist realism. The return to the past or distant cultures and civilizations acquired a connotation of the specificity of Yugoslav culture in socialist modernism, relying on the idea of the people – as an indefinite collectivity based on the amalgam of multiple ethnic, therefore apolitical identities, and the primordial newly created "folk culture".

In the reduced plastic language of modern art, as well as in architecture and design, the archaic tendency is most reflected in the combination of stylized or completely abstract forms, pre-classical and folk motifs, and rustic processing of materials, which become carriers of associative connections with a distant, undefined past, to which certain spiritual properties are simultaneously attributed. A typical example could be the concept of the "beleg", (sign for stećci - regionally distinctive medieval monolithic tombstones) as one of the favored metaphors used to describe modernist monuments of the National Liberation struggle (NOB). The strongest impetus to this archaicism was given by architect Bogdan Bogdanović in his numerous monuments, "necropolises", in which he developed a distinctive poetics inspired by the "geological-ethnic-cultural character of the region". Generally accepted as an identity marker, such modernist mystical archaicism could be applied to the most varied themes. Starting from the National Liberation struggle and revolution as the most important categories of Yugoslav cultural policy, all the way to the processing of Kosovo mythology, which, due to its significance in the symbolic politics of the Kingdom of Serbia and Yugoslavia, was carefully constituted as a new, cleansed of undesirable religious and national content, mythical-historical topos of the new socialist Serbia and its differentiated identity. The painting "Battle of Kosovo" by Petar Lubarda, a celebrated post-war modernist painter, was, in the spirit of the time, interpreted as a sacrifice of "our ordinary (medieval) man who rose to heroism". The picture was not intended to be a Serbian national icon and representation of a historical event but an imaginary prototype of the National Liberation struggle and socialist revolution.

The second major theme of the modernist reinterpretation of the past, through which the new republican identity of Serbia was shaped, is medieval and Byzantine art. The use and significance of medieval art in the culture of socialism, however, are related to the context of the moment it was introduced into the official Yugoslav cultural policy. The representative exhibition titled "Medieval Art of the Peoples of Yugoslavia", organized at the prestigious Palais de Chaillot in Paris in 1950, was the first major post-war cultural diplomacy action. Organized during a sensitive political moment, immediately after Josip Broz Tito's break with the Soviet Union, in the early intense phases of the Cold War, this exhibition marked the first presentation of Yugoslavia in the West and its newly established position in the world. The Yugoslav cultural appropriation of frescoes as the most valuable part of Serbian heritage, in fact, also indirectly signified the condemnation of referring to medieval art in a national context.

In the narrowed space of national identification, where the entirety of Serbian history and culture was proscribed as hegemonic, the term Byzantine, despite its "Yugoslavization", remained the only term that could replace the adjective Serbian and at least somewhat frame the consciousness, if not openly about the national, then at least about the cultural identity of the new Socialist Republic of Serbia. Thus, the foundation for future ideological rethinking of Serbian medieval art was laid, its displacement from the authentic national and historical context and the subsequent introduction into the realm of pure aesthetics, as the only possible space for survival amid revolutionary confrontations with ideological enemies.

When, in 1953, after the conclusion of the international exhibition of medieval art, the Gallery of Frescoes was established, the placement of Serbian medieval art in a decontextualized and hermetic world of pure visual problems that preoccupied the practice and theory of contemporary art was further solidified. Only in this form, stripped of its historical, religious, and national elements, did it find affirmation and processing in modern art, especially in the abstract paintings of Lazar Vozarević and Aleksandar Tomašević, alongside the theoretical support of the critic Lazar Trifunović.

The transformation of national medieval art into the language of contemporary abstract painting and its references, whether they belong to the realm of Byzantine art or not, was understood as a "local component", which served as an appropriate substitute for recognizable elements of national identity. Through a certain allusive and associative "iconography" rooted in various elements of either monumental religious or folk art, a consciousness of Serbia and the Balkans as a "different" cultural space in relation to the culture and art of the West was rounded up, both practically and discursively, through the poetic and meta-theoretical discourse of visual criticism and art history.

If, in the art of the second half of the 20th century, a Serbian identity constant can be recognized, encompassing both its modernist and post-

modernist phases, it could be described in terms of the poetic, mystical, and symbolic, based on respect for the past, humanistic tradition, spirituality, and religious thought, as opposed to rational, analytical, technical, and depersonalized. Thus, the art reflected the projected cultural and political duality of Tito's Yugoslavia in the Cold War geopolitical environment and its divisions by which Serbia was assigned to the East. In that sense, the events on the "scene" with the modernist paradigm as mainstream art had the task of sublimating such a role through a generalized, associative reflection of Serbian-Byzantine themes in a highly aestheticized language of art, bringing it to a level of culturally acceptable collective identity.

Keywords: art, Serbian art, Modernism, social modernism, social archaism, Battle of Kosovo, Byzantine Empire, Middle Ages

Nikola Mijatov

Institute for Contemporary History Belgrade nikolamijatov@gmail.com

FROM SOCIALISM TO NATIONALISM: FAN IDENTITIES IN YUGOSLAV FOOTBALL

Football and nationalism reached their peak during the turbulent 20th century. The rapid development of football contributed to its importance as by far the most popular sport in the world. In addition, this sport also plays a significant role in the collective identity of a nation, where the nation is reflected in the football team of a country. In nationalist ideology, football falls under the common mass and public culture, however, its importance in terms of national identity far exceeds other cultural forms. However, below the national team as the highest symbol of football of a country, but also of the country itself, are football clubs. The phenomenon of fans became endemic after World War II and is gaining momentum every day. Supporting a particular football club carries a strong identity determinant that can be both local and national in character. In Yugoslavia, a country composed of several nations and several religions, football clubs and their fan groups acquired a special identity significance as well as a form of specific resistance to the ruling Yugoslav ideology.

In Yugoslavia after 1945, football was crucially determined by the ideology of socialism. Efforts were made to reflect the unity of Yugoslavia on the football field, and new socialist clubs such as "Partizan" or "Crvena Zvezda" were founded. The idea was that each republic would have its own club that would represent it in the highest football league, and that the football club "Partizan", as a club of the Yugoslav People's Army, would represent the whole of Yugoslavia.

Although the clubs were new, they immediately gained widespread support among the people and football established itself as by far the most popular sport in socialist Yugoslavia. However, far from the idea of socialism, the phenomenon of hooliganism emerged, which had a special dimension in Yugoslavia. Nationalist forces gathered around the republican clubs, using football to express their dissatisfaction with the official state system or to express inter-ethnic hostility. The first clashes between fans were local patriotic in nature, but nationalist ones quickly emerged, between Serbs and Croats, especially between "Red Star" and "Dinamo".

The first fan group was mentioned as early as 1950. These were "Hajduk" fans and the "Torcida" fan group, which clashed with "Red Star" fans. The top of the state had to react. Milovan Djilas, a member of the Politburo, published an article in Borba entitled "That's Not How You Should Cheer". Even then, the nationalist dimension of these fan clashes was clearly visible, and it would only grow further as football became more popular and nationalist currents in the republics grew.

Finally, the top of the state itself reacted: on February 2, 1952, the Central Committee issued a letter "On the State and Tasks in Physical Education". The letter contains a series of criticisms of the general state of Yugoslav sports, which was far from the socialist idea. The focus of the criticism was on mass organizations, whose obvious task was also to control fans, because as it is stated: "The proper education and raising of the consciousness of the mass of athletes and sports audiences, and the suppression of various harmful petty-bourgeois and hostile influences, depend on the extent to which party organizations and the People's Youth are engaged in physical education. In this way, we will drive out into the open various problematic people from our sports clubs and other physical education organizations who, thanks to our lack of vigilance, have crept into those places to act hostilely, because it is 'sport' and 'everything is allowed in it', and they are 'experts', etc." First and foremost, it is the communists who should have fought against these negative phenomena: "Our unions and the administrations of individual clubs, and especially the communists, should fight against petty bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois influences that create an unhealthy atmosphere in our physical education clubs."

Party plea was in vogue. In a process that lasted almost half a century, fan groups were formed around football clubs, the key feature of which was nationalism. From the initial socialist idea, football clubs became strongholds of separatism that announced the breakup of Yugoslavia as early as the 1980s. After the death of Josip Broz Tito, nationalism began to manifest itself more clearly and loudly. During the 1980s, there were a number of incidents involving football fans, where stadiums became places of violence, both verbal and physical. The most common manifestation of nationalism through football was on the Serbia-Croatia route, which were clearly colored by a nationalist but also anti-communist tone. In Croatia, fan groups such as "Torcida", "Bad Blue Boys", "Armada" and

"Kohorta" became so powerful that the State Security Service began to regularly monitor them.

In addition, the growing Albanian nationalism left its consequences for football: the away games of Red Star fans in Pristina usually had a starting point that was far from football. On the one hand, the "Delije" always emphasized Kosovo as an integral part of Serbia, and on the other, FC "Pristina" became a stronghold of Albanian nationalism. Slogans could be heard from the Albanian crowd: "Trepča works, Belgrade builds" but also "Echo! Echo!", alluding to Enver Hoxha. In the sea of Albanian demonstrations, even the stadium played a significant role: at the FC Pristina stadium, Azem Vlasi and Kaćuša Jašari told the demonstrators that they would not grant Kosovo autonomy.

Finally, in 1989, at the Maksimir Stadium in Zagreb, the largest interethnic clash between fans of "Dinamo" and "Red Star" took place, symbolically announcing the breakup of the state. In the general chaos, fans rushed onto the field and clashed with both the police and members of the other club. In total mayhem, the Yugoslav flag was also burned which was broadcasted live on TV. Football players also participated in the riots, and "Dinamo" football player Zvonimir Boban stands out, who kicked policeman Refik Ahmetović in the middle of the football field, where an attack on the police as a representative of the system is also a symbolic attack on the state itself.

From an initial socialist idea, Yugoslav football turned into a stronghold of nationalism. All sports clubs established in 1945 carried within them the foundation of the ideology of socialism, which was reflected primarily in the names of these clubs, but also in their coats of arms and emblems. The breakup of Yugoslavia was greeted by sport's societies with readiness. Each republic had its own dominant football club, which had a large core of fans who were nationalistic and anti-Yugoslav in nature. Interethnic tension erupted at the Maksimir Stadium, where fans of "Dinamo" and "Red Star" clashed and where the Yugoslav flag was burned in the general commotion. With the breakup of the state into its republics, sports continued the process of nationalization, and even purely Yugoslav clubs like "Partizan" became additional strongholds of nationalism.

The process did not stop with the collapse of Yugoslavia and the interethnic tensions in the post-Yugoslav area. Within Serbia, the process of nationalism through fan groups takes on a significant dimension in which both history and religion intertwine. Namely, in the area of Stara Raška or Sandžak, the dominant club is "Novi Pazar", which has taken on a distinctly nationalistic and religious character. The bloody conflict that took place in that area during World War II left its consequences. Today, Bosniaks from the Sandžak area represent a significant national minority whose relations with the state of Serbia have several dimensions. Not only was World War II influential, but also the wars of the 1990s, when Sandžak was also the scene of ethno-religious conflicts. People have lived in peace for decades, but it is precisely through football that it is possible to channel old intolerance. The Novi Pazar football club gathers around itself a significant group of fans who, as a fan group, have a clear ethno-religious character. A clash with Serbian fan groups was inevitable. The genie of nationalism was let out of the bottle in 2021 during Partizan's away game. Then, chants of "Knife, wire, Srebrenica!" could be heard from the stands, while the other side responded with the slogan "Yellow House".

Overall, in a process that lasted half a century, the originally socialist sports associations whose goal was an internal Yugoslavia based on "brotherhood and unity" became breeding grounds of nationalist tendencies. Stadiums, as specific places where the accumulated frustration in society was expressed, became arenas of nationalist conflicts long before the wars of the 1990s. In the new century, the same socialist associations dominate the football of the former Yugoslav republics and represent bastions of nationalism and in mutual conflicts a regular occurrence of the strengthening of interethnic tensions.

Keywords: Yugoslavia, football, nationalism, hooligans, identity

Michael Antolović

University of Novi Sad Faculty of Education antolovic.michael@gmail.com

SERBIAN HISTORIANS AND THE YUGOSLAV CRISIS

The paper analyzes the positions of Serbian historians during the growing crisis of the Yugoslav state in the 1980s – primarily their attitudes towards the so-called "outburst of history" in public discourse and the opening of the previously neglected taboo issues, i.e., ideological frameworks in which Serbian historiography operated, efforts to preserve the common institutions of Yugoslav historiography, as well as the relationship to the Yugoslav project.

The deep political, economic, and social crisis that commenced in Yugoslavia in the early 1980s affected the main routes of Serbian historiography of the time. Some of the most prominent Serbian historians expressed very critical views of the "outburst of history" in public discourse, which got under way in parallel with the deepening crisis. By highlighting the discrepancy between collective historical awareness deriving from historical stereotypes and myths on the one hand, and from sophisticated historical knowledge gained by history on the other hand, Serbian historians warned that "primitively underdeveloped" historical awareness constituted a foundation on which chauvinism in public life was developed (Sima Ćirković), that the myths, stereotypes, and prejudice in historical culture were "further intensified by traumas of a nation" (Dorđe Stanković), and that they were also a convenient tool for the instrumentalization of history (Andrej Mitrović). At the same time, there were multiple debates between historians about certain "controversial" issues from the Yugoslav peoples' modern history, which directly or indirectly were a reflection of the deepening crisis of the "Yugoslav project". These debates between Yugoslav historians (who as a rule expressed views from the perspective of particular nations they belonged to), mainly had to do with the interpretations of certain disputed events from the Second World War, whereas the main issues were those of the genocide of Serbs in the Independent State of Croatia and the number of victims in the Jasenovac concentration camp. There was a pronounced presence of these issues in the pubic since relative debates were typically conducted on the pages of various dailies and weeklies. After 1985, these debates became fiercer and, in some instances, they escalated into proper "guarrels" between Yugoslav historians who addressed the issues that cut across the very fibre of certain Yugoslav peoples' national identities as well as the already precarious relations among the nations. Since the pivotal point of these discussions was the issue of the genocide of Serbs and also that the platform for these discussions were dailies and weeklies, and as such were under scrutiny, they can be compared to a "quarrel between historians" (Historikerstreit), which was instigated by the issue of the attitude to the Holocaust that was discussed approximately at the same time in the Federal Republic Germany. In addition to this, the view expressed by Imanuel Geiss, given the fierceness of this debate and mutually exclusive positions of the participants, was that it was a "quarrel between hysteric persons" (Hysterikerstreit), which in good part also applied to the activity of Yugoslav historians - who took on increasingly exclusive positions, whereas the voices who made appeals for a discussion in the spirit of scientific objectivity became increasingly isolated amidst the boiling nationalist cacophony. Another significant feature of Serbian and Yugoslav historiography at the time was a strong presence of the ruling ideology, which was also a decisive factor for almost all debates between historians to be primarily ideologically driven.

The structural crisis of Yugoslav society during the 1980s also directly affected the crisis of Yugoslav historiography and institutions, including the most significant of all - the Yugoslav Historical Journal. Originally envisaged as a scientific journal which was to give insights into the entire body of Yugoslav historiography, the Yugoslav Historical Journal placed its focus on the topics of general Yugoslav significance, at the same time insisting on theoretical and methodological matters of history. In 1982, the publication of the Yugoslav Historical Journal was suspended, but in 1986, after a four-year hiatus, it was relaunched, mainly due to the efforts of the Union of Societies of Yugoslav Historians, The renewal of this journal was an attempt to strengthen the relations between Yugoslav historiographies (firmly organised within republic/autonomous provinces) and, from the perspective of scientific rationality, to make historiography stand opposed to the ingression of extra-scientific and, especially, para-scientific historical accounts which, to an ever-greater extent, shaped the collective historical conceptions. Nevertheless, despite good intentions, the third publication cycle of the Yugoslav Historical Journal finally ended in 1989. Apart

from the "nationalist policies which took over, and the anti-Yugoslav trends in the majority of our republics", the main cause for the dissolution of the Union of Societies of Yugoslav Historians and the closure of the *Yugoslav Historical Journal* was the "unbearable financial crisis, which prevented any serious and significant larger-scale action from being taken".

The "swan song" of Yugoslav historiography and, at the same time, a form of an apotheosis of the Yugoslav project of national unification, were two "major accounts", unprecedented not only in Serbian culture but also in entire Yugoslav culture of the time. These were published not long before the breakup of Yugoslavia, in 1988 and in 1989 respectively. They are extensive syntheses: Creation of Yugoslavia 1790-1918 by Milorad Ekmečić and History of Yugoslavia 1918-1988 by Branko Petranović. Ekmečić and Petranović were the most prominent Serbian historians who shared a distinct Yugoslav orientation. Both of them saw the national unification of South Slavs in the Yugoslav state as an expression of natural striving of very similar peoples for liberation from foreign oppressors, as well as a form of eschaton of their centuries-long history. Never losing sight of the existence of deep differences in historical experiences of certain South Slav peoples, or how deep the crisis of the Yugoslav state and society was, Ekmečić and Petranović (as was the case with the majority of Serbian historians) did not bring into question the historical purpose of the Yugoslav project - primarily having in mind that the establishment of Yugoslavia, as was deemed by these two authors, definitively resolved the "Serbian national question", i.e., national unification of the majority of Serbian people within one state. While Ekmečić sought historical reasons for "the crisis of Yugoslav unity" in the insufficient level of national, social, and cultural integration, strong religious influences on the constitution of the nations (the so called sectarianism or "disaster nationalism"), in the defensive character of the Serbian national movement after 1918, which was demographically depleted ("feeble and historically worn out") and limited to "defending the laid foundation", and in the political polarisation emerging during the "Yugoslav Revolution of 1941-1945", in 1988 Petranović ended his book by expressing a view that the reasons for optimism in terms of Yugoslavia should primarily be sought in the inclination of people "who demonstrate their faith in Yugoslavia and its democratic perspectives".

Eventually, the breakup of Yugoslavia had devastating effects on the conceptions of Serbia's leading historians. Until the very breakup of Yugoslavia in 1991, Serbian historians believed that it was meaningful to preserve the Yugoslav union, which they primarily understood as an expression of direct existential interests of all Yugoslav peoples. At the same time, Serbian historians were rightly concerned about what the breakup of Yugoslavia would bring. They believed that with the establishing of the

Yugoslav state the 'Serbian question' i.e., Serbian national unification, had been permanently resolved although not in the best possible way – until the very escalation of war events (and even afterwards) they, as a rule, were still open to the possibility of preserving a type of thoroughly rearranged and functional, union of Yugoslav peoples. The inevitable need to face harsh realities of the disintegration of Yugoslavia, in the face of the spiralling war, led Serbian historians to reconsider their beliefs. In this sense, 1991 represented an *annus horribilis* and, additionally, it was a sobering realisation to them that they had to give up their Yugoslav conceptions on which, like a vast majority of their intellectual generation, they based their political self-understanding and accepted the necessity of resolving the newly reopened "Serbian question".

Keywords: Serbian historiography, historians, ideology, master narratives, Yugoslav crisis

Slobodan Antonić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy santonic@f.bg.ac.rs

"SERBIAN NATIONALISM" AS A STIGMA AND ITS GENEALOGY*

"Serbian nationalism" is a frequent disqualification, a fighting word (German, *Kampfbegriff*), present in one part of our public. It is a specific stigma by which ideological rivals or political opponents are most often marked as *public enemies* (enemies of peace, enemies of Europe, enemies of progress and good living standard etc.), with the simultaneous *virtue signalling*, or self-emphasizing of own ideological (political) correctness. Serbian nationalism is almost always "retrograde", "regressive", "reactionary", "intolerant", "isolationist", "exclusivist", "atavistic", "authoritarian", "xenophobic", "aggressive", "expansionistic", "fanatic", "anti-liberal", "antidemocratic", "pro-fascist" etc.

There are several common places ($\tau \dot{\sigma} \pi o \iota$) related to this stigma, via which there is an attempt, as a rule, to exercise the typical moral blackmail of other members of the communicative or political community in order to renounce "nationalist" attitudes or to distance the public from "nationalists". For example, it is claimed that every nationalism is evil, but that Serbian nationalism is the worst in the Western Balkans – it is qualitatively (essentially) different and in many aspects the most dangerous. Moreover, the causes of the breakup of Yugoslavia are reduced solely to Serbian nationalism or it is claimed to be the main cause of the collapse of the SFRY.

However, it remains unclear how "benevolent" neighbouring Balkan nationalisms led to the expulsion of more than 400,000 Serbs from Croatia, of almost 400,000 Serbs from the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and of 200,000 Serbs from "Kosovo", while the "malevolent" Serbian

^{*} The paper is part of the work on the project funded by the Science Fund: *Formation of Serbian identity and theoretical controversies concerning attempts of its deconstruction* (FSITC 1561).

nationalism expelled a negligible number of members of other nations from Serbia. How is it possible that, encumbered by so much "evil", Serbia was and remains the most functional multi-national state of all former Yugoslav republics? Why do the comparative measurements of nationalism in the Balkans show almost the lowest level for Serbia, while racism measurements rank Serbia in the last place in Europe? How is it possible that there is the smallest number of nationalist incidents in allegedly nationalist Serbia?

When Serbian nationalism in Serbia is proclaimed as the main problem of Serbia and the Balkans, it is only one of the indicators of specific *inverse nationalism* – in which the whole nation or the whole country are disqualified. The demonization of Serbian nationalism may also be seen as part of the systemically dominant (neo)colonial ideology which in that manner prevents and amortizes the resistance to Atlanticist imperialism. A explained by Albert Memmi, the defence from the colonizer and its exploitation and oppression cannot be imagined without nationalism, regardless of whether if appears in the form of ethnic or religious populism. Nationalism is such a dangerous weapon against colonizers that it is hardly surprising it is an archenemy both of colonialists and of their allies from the ranks of comprador bourgeoisie or auto-colonial intelligentsia. They tend, almost instinctively, to qualify even the slightest resistance to colonial practices as a *nationalist threat*, i.e., as the all-explanatory *arch-evil*.

However, it is definitely surprising that in Serbian society, having in mind its neocolonial position and strong historical traumas, we do not find much more nationalism than we have today. But, instead of the reflexion of that phenomenon, in Serbia we witness the growth of entire neocolonial culture of inverse nationalism in which, through satanization of "Serbian nationalism", there is an ultimate defamation and dehumanization of the whole nation.

Furthermore, there is a pronouncedly large similarity between the decades-long demonization of Serbian nationalism by the ruling communist ideology as the most dangerous nationalism in Yugoslavia, to its today's satanization by the dominant neocolonial ideology. This similarity is, first of all, the consequence of the personal continuity of the most eminent representatives of "other Serbia" in the criticism of Serbian nationalism, then of the influences of their school of thought, as well as of the action of certain structural factors. The most significant of them is definitely the assessment by the Western factors of the *latent pro-Russian character* of Serbian nationalism. It was assessed that Serbian nationalism, in the former case, threatened non-Soviet Yugoslavia, while in the latter it threatens the Euro-American order established in the Western Balkans by the wars in 1991–1999.

The constant inundation of the public sphere with the narratives about Serbian nationalism, its pronounced toxicity and malignance to the region, as well as for Serbia itself, has a two-fold function. Firstly, this narrative constructs the reality, as well as public knowledge about society and history. Foucault defined discourses as practices which *construct objects that are spoken about*, i.e., "as a system of statements constructing an object". The frequent use of certain language instruments creates *language routines* which tend to be generally accepted by assuming a strong discursive function – to shape the mental (cognitive) map of reality. That is exactly why the repetitiveness of the narratives about Serbian nationalism is functionally significant to establish in the public opinion of Serbia and the region the idea of the Serbs' and Serbia's guilt not only for the breakup of the SFRY and the wars in 1991–1999, but also for the present or future violation of security and political stability in the Western Balkans.

Secondly, the narrative about the pronounced malignity of Serbian nationalism is part of the collective stigmatization of Serbs and Serbia as a specific form of "semantic enslavement". In fact, incessant negative substantializing of a certain ethnic group has the function of "producing fear and self-doubt, self-dissatisfaction, the feeling of misfortune and unworthiness, with the aim of making the stigmatized ones to accept and internalize their guilt" (B. Šijaković). Semantically strong labels, particularly if they come from the one with the power of ruling the semantic sphere of public stigmatization, leads "the unbearable pressure of the stigma to encourage (...) the renunciation of identity". Since "nations are exactly narrations", "it derives that national identity relies on the circulation of one corpus of stories within a group", i.e., it is "everyday confirmation and affirmation of a system of narration over others" (S. Vladušić). Thus, the contamination of the discourse by narratives about the demonic nature of Serbian nationalism leads to the escape of one part of the bearers of inverse nationalism to other identities, both those supra-national ("Yugoslavs", "regionals", "Europeans", "cosmopolitans") and those sub-national ones ("Vojvodina people", "Belgraders").

The deconstruction of this narrative and the renunciation of the stigmatization practice are an important step for social sciences and humanities in Serbia towards a more objective perception of our position in the regional political circumstances, as well as of the problems of our own society, no matter whether it refers to the present or the near future.

Keywords: inverse nationalism, neocolonial ideology, modern imperialism, ideological conflicts, cultural war

CIP – Каталогизација у публикацији – Народна библиотека Србије, Београд 323.1(497.11)(048) 329.17(497.11)(048) 316.75(497.11)(048) 94(497.11)"10/19"(048)

CONCEPTS of nationalism and patriotism in serbian political discourse : medieval, modern, contemporary / Proceedings of the Conference held on 30–31 May 2024 at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy ; edited by Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, Aleksandar Z. Savić. – Belgrade : University Faculty of Philosophy, 2025 (Beograd : Službeni glasnik). – 194 str. ; 24 cm

Tiraž 300. – Str. 9-21: Serbian collective memory – Some introductory remarks / Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, Aleksandar Z. Savić. – Napomene i bibliografske reference uz tekst.

ISBN 978-86-6427-341-1

а) Патриотизам -- Србија -- Апстракти

б) Национализам -- Србија -- Апстракти

в) Србија -- Историја -- 11в-20в -- Апстракти

COBISS.SR-ID 162957833