

ИСТОРИЈСКИ ЧАСОПИС
Књ. LXVII
(2018)



INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Vol. LXVII
(2018)

Editorial board

Mihailo Vojvodić, Biljana Vučetić, Neven Isailović, Jovanka Kalić,
Tatjana Katić, Angeliki Konstantakopoulou (Greece), Giuseppe Motta
(Italy), Konstantin Nikiforov (Russia), Ana Stolić, Ilija Todev (Bulgaria),
Lubomíra Havlíková (Czech Republic)

Editor-in-chief

Srdan Rudić, Ph.D.
Director of the Institute of History

BELGRADE
2018

ИСТОРИЈСКИ ИНСТИТУТ

ИСТОРИЈСКИ ЧАСОПИС

Књ. LXVII
(2018)

Редакциони одбор

Михаило Војводић, Биљана Вучетић, Невен Исаиловић, Јованка Калић,
Татјана Катић, Ангелики Константакопулу (Грчка), Ђузепе Мота
(Италија), Константин Никофоров (Русија), Ана Столић, Илија Тодев
(Бугарска), Љубомира Хавликова (Чешка)

Одговорни уредник

др Срђан Рудић
директор Историјског института

БЕОГРАД
2018

Овај број *Историјског часописа*
штампан је уз финансијску помоћ
Министарства просвете, науке и технолошког развоја
Владе Републике Србије

САДРЖАЈ

ЧЛАНЦИ И РАСПРАВЕ

- Александар Крстић, Невен Исаиловић, Александар Јаковљевић
Б(И)ЈЕЉИН(А) – ЗЕМЉА, КНЕШТВО, АРХИЋАКОНАТ,
ДИСТРИКТ, НАХИЈА 13
- Ивана Коматина, Предраг Коматина
НАСТАНАК „МЛЕТАЧКЕ АЛБАНИЈЕ“ И УСПОМЕНА НА
ВИЗАНТИЈСКУ ВЛАСТ У СРПСКОМ ПОМОРЈУ 55
- Срђан Рудић
РАТНА ФЛОТА БАЛШИЋА 83
- Татјана Катић
ОСМАНИЗОВАЊЕ СРЕДЊОВЕКОВНОГ ГРАДА: УРБАНИ И
ДЕМОГРАФСКИ РАЗВОЈ ПРИЗРЕНА ОД ПОЛОВИНЕ XV ДО
КРАЈА XVI ВЕКА 101
- Јелена Илић Мандић
О ПОЧЕЦИМА ТРАНСПОРТА И ТРГОВИНЕ ЖИТОМ НА САВИ
И КУПИ: ТРАСА ЗЕМУН–СИСАК–КАРЛОВАЦ У ДРУГОЈ
ПОЛОВИНИ 18. ВЕКА 141
- Војана Милjkовић Katić, Ljubodrag P. Ristić
‘DOMESTIC FOREIGNERS’: THE PROCESSES OF ACCULTURATION
AND ENCULTURATION IN SERBIA IN THE FIRST HALF OF
THE 19TH CENTURY 177
- Урош Татић
ПОЛИТИКА ФРАНЦУСКЕ ПРЕМА КНЕЖЕВИНИ СРБИЈИ У
ВРЕМЕ ОДРЖАВАЊА ПРЕОБРАЖЕНСКЕ СКУПШТИНЕ
1861. ГОДИНЕ 207
- Милан Ранђеловић
СПРОВОЂЕЊЕ ТАНЗИМАТА У НИШУ ЗА ВРЕМЕ
МИДХАТ-ПАШЕ 1861–1864. ГОДИНЕ 223
- Јелена Н. Радосављевић
МИТРОПОЛИТ ЕВСТАТИЈЕ И УСПОСТАВЉАЊЕ СРПСКЕ
ЦРКВЕНЕ УПРАВЕ У НИШАВСКОЈ МИТРОПОЛИЈИ 1878. 247
- Урош Шешум
ПЛАНИРАЊЕ СРПСКЕ ЧЕТНИЧКЕ АКЦИЈЕ У СТАРОЈ СРБИЈИ И
МАКЕДОНИЈИ 1897. ГОДИНЕ 271

Андрей Л. Шемякин

СЕРБСКИЕ СОЧИНЕНИЯ П. А. РОВИНСКОГО (ПЕРВИЧНОЕ
ОСМЫСЛЕНИЕ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ) 287

Ана Столић
ИЗМЕЂУ НАЦИОНАЛИЗМА И ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛИЗМА
Српкиње на конгресима организација Међународног женског
покрета до Првог светског рата 309

Биљана Вучетић
„SESTRAS AMERICANA” – АМЕРИЧКЕ МЕДИЦИНСКЕ СЕСТРЕ
У СРБИЈИ У ПРВОМ СВЕТСКОМ РАТУ 339

Божица Б. Младеновић, Милић Ј. Милићевић
ДНЕВНИК ТОШКА ВЛАХОВИЋА КАО ИСТОРИЈСКИ ИЗВОР 357

ПРИКАЗИ

Небојша Порчић,
*ДОКУМЕНТИ СРПСКИХ СРЕДЊОВЕКОВНИХ ВЛАДАРА У
ДУБРОВАЧКИМ ЗБИРКАМА: ДОБА НЕМАЊИЋА*, Балканолошки
институт, Београд 2017, 362 стр. + илустр.
(Марко Гавриловић) 371

Дејан Јечменица,
НЕМАЊИЋИ ДРУГОГ РЕДА, Филозофски факултет, Београд 2018, 217 стр.
(Бењамин Хекић) 374

Божидар Зарковић,
ТРГОВИ И УРБАНИЗАЦИЈА СРБИЈЕ У СРЕДЊЕМ ВЕКУ,
Филозофски факултет у Приштини, Косовска Митровица 2017, 490 стр.
(Дејан Гашић) 377

УРЕДБЕ И ПРОПИСИ МИТРОПОЛИЈЕ БЕОГРАДСКЕ (четири књиге)
и *ОДЛУКЕ И РЕШЕЊА ЕПАРХИЈЕ БРАНИЧЕВСКЕ* (три књиге),
приредили Зоран Ранковић, Мирослав Лазић, седам књига, Одбор за
просвету и културу Епархије браничевске, Пожаревац 2010–2013.
(Ѓакон др Ивица Чаировић) 383

Владимир Јовановић, Александра Вулетић, Момир Самарџић,
*НАЛИЧЈА МОДЕРНИЗАЦИЈЕ. СРПСКА ДРЖАВА И ДРУШТВО
У ВРЕМЕ СТИЦАЊА НЕЗАВИСНОСТИ*, Историјски институт,
Београд 2017, 505 стр.
(Бојана Миљковић Катич) 389

- Živko Andrijašević,
CRNOGORSKA IDEOLOGIJA 1860–1918,
Državni arhiv Crne Gore, Cetinje 2017, 922 str.
(Аднан Прекић) **391**
- Биљана Вучетић,
*БОГДАН РАДЕНКОВИЋ (1874–1917), СУДБИНА ЈЕДНОГ СРПСКОГ
НАЦИОНАЛИСТЕ*, Историјски институт, Београд 2018, 355 стр.
(Урош Шешум) **397**
- Биљана Стојић,
ФРАНЦУСКА И БАЛКАНСКИ РАТОВИ (1912–1913),
Историјски институт, Београд 2017, 498 стр.
(Александра Колаковић) **401**
- ЖИВ СЕ НЕ ПРЕДАЈЕМ!!! – ДНЕВНИК КОСТЕ ВОЈИНОВИЋА КОСОВЦА.
ОД 1916. ДО 1917. ГОДИНЕ*, приредила Божица Младеновић, Талија
издаваштво; Филозофски факултет у Нишу, Ниш 2017, 303 стр.
(Саша Станојевић) **406**
- Ignacij Voje,
PISMA GREGORJA ČREMOŠNIKA,
Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Ljubljana 2016, 167 str.
Korespondence pomembnih Slovencev 15
(Невен Исаиловић) **408**

НАУЧНИ ЖИВОТ

- BETWEEN THREE SEAS: BORDERS, MIGRATIONS,*
Connections The Third Biennial Conference of the Medieval Central Europe
Research Network (MECERN)
Загреб, 12–14. април 2018.
(Милош Ивановић) **413**
- Међународни научни скуп
БОСНА И ЊЕНИ СУСЈЕДИ У СРЕДЊЕМ ВИЈЕКУ
Институт за историју Универзитета у Сарајеву
Сарајево, 10–11. мај 2018.
(Невен Исаиловић) **417**

- Четврта међународна конференција
IMPERIALISM AND IDENTITIES AT THE EDGES OF THE ROMAN WORLD
(PIERW 4)
Одељење за археологију Филозофског факултета у Београду, Одсек за историју
Филозофског факултета у Новом Саду, Истраживачка станица Петница
Петница, Србија, 20–23. септембар 2018.
(Драгана Кунчер) 424
- Међународна научна конференција
КРАЈ ВЕЛИКОГ РАТА: ВОЈНЕ ОПЕРАЦИЈЕ И МИРОВНИ УГОВОРИ
Институт за стратегијска истраживања, Историјски институт
Београд, 25. и 26. септембар 2018.
(Миљан Милкић) 429
- Међународна научна конференција
BYZANTIUM IN THE ADRIATIC FROM THE 6TH TO 12TH CENTURY
Хрватско друштво за византијске студије, Одсек за историју Филозофског
факултета Универзитета у Сплиту, Одсек за историју Филозофског
факултета Универзитета у Загребу
Сплит, Хрватска, 28–30. септембар 2018.
(Драгана Кунчер) 432
- Међународни научни скуп
ВЕЛИКА ИСТОЧНА КРИЗА И СРПСКО ПИТАЊЕ
Српска академија наука и уметности, Одељење за историју,
Историјски институт
Београд, 4. октобар 2018.
(Јована Шаљић) 437
- Међународна научна конференција
180 ЛЕТ ДРУЖБЫ, ДОВЕРИЯ, СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА: К ЮБИЛЕЮ
УСТАНОВЛЕНИЯ РУССКО-СЕРБСКИХ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКИХ
ОТНОШЕНИЙ
(СТО ОСАМДЕСЕТ ГОДИНА ПРИЈАТЕЉСТВА, ПОВЕРЕЊА, САРАДЊЕ:
ЛУБИЛЕЈ УСПОСТАВЉАЊА РУСКО-СРПСКИХ ДИПЛОМАТСКИХ
ОДНОСА)
Институт за руску историју Руске академије наука – Амбасада Републике
Србије у Руској Федерацији
Москва, 15–16. октобар 2018.
(Јована Блажић-Пејић) 440

Међународни научни скуп
УРБАНИЗАЦИЈА У ИСТОЧНОЈ И ЈУГОИСТОЧНОЈ ЕВРОПИ
Историјски институт Београд, Државни универзитет за архитектуру и
грађевину (ННГАСУ) Нижњи Новгород, Русија
Београд, 26. октобар 2018.
(Ирена Цвијановић) 443

Међународна конференција
*БАЛКАНСКО ПОЛУОСТРВО ЈОВАНА ЦВИЈИЋА: ИСТОРИЈСКА
ПОЗАДИНА И УПОРЕДНИ ТРЕНДОВИ У АНТРОПОГЕОГРАФИЈИ*
Географски институт „Јован Цвијић“ САНУ, Београд,
Центар културе „Вук Караџић“, Лозница
Тршић, 29–30. октобра 2018.
(Ирена Цвијановић) 445

Међународна конференција
*ПРОСТРАНСТВА ИСТОРИЈЕ И ИСТОРИЈА ПРОСТРАНСТВА:
МЕТАМОРФОЗА ПЕРЦЕПЦИЈЕ, САЗНАЊА И СТВАРАЊЕ*
Државни универзитет Лобачевски, Институт за светску историју
Руске академије наука
Нижњи Новгород, Русија 16–17. новембар 2018.
(Ирена Цвијановић) 447

Међународна научна конференција
СТЕФАН ПРВОВЕНЧАНИ И ЊЕГОВО ДОБА
Историјски институт
Београд 22–23. новембар 2018.
(Ивана Коматина) 448

БИБЛИОГРАФИЈЕ

Проф. др Јадран Ферлуга 451
Проф. др Вејн Вучинић 469

IN MEMORIAM

Андреј Шемјакин (Радомир Ј. Поповић) 485

УПУТСТВО АУТОРИМА 489

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- Aleksandar Krstić, Neven Isailović, Aleksandar Jakovljević
B(IJ)ELJIN(A) – LAND, KENEZIATUS, ARCHDEACONRY, DISTRICT,
NAHIYE 13
- Ivana Komatina, Predrag Komatina
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF “VENETIAN ALBANIA“ AND THE MEMORY
OF BYZANTINE RULE IN THE SERBIAN LITTORAL 55
- Srđan Rudić
BALŠIĆ’S WAR FLEET 83
- Tatjana Katić
OTTOMANISATION OF A MEDIEVAL TOWN: URBAN AND
DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT OF PRIZREN FROM THE SECOND
HALF OF THE 15TH UNTIL THE END OF THE 16TH CENTURY 101
- Jelena Ilić Mandić
ABOUT THE BEGINNINGS OF CEREAL TRANSPORTATION AND
TRADE ON THE SAVA AND KUPA RIVERS: ZEMUN–SISAK–KARLOVAC
ROUTE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 18TH CENTURY 141
- Бојана Миљковић Катић, Љубодраг П. Ристић
„ДОМАЋИ СТРАНЦИ“. ПРОЦЕСИ АКУЛТУРАЦИЈЕ И
ЕНКУЛТУРАЦИЈЕ У СРБИЈИ ПРВЕ ПОЛОВИНЕ 19. ВЕКА 177
- Uroš Tatić
FRENCH ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE GREAT
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF PREOBRAŽENJE IN 1861 207
- Milan Randelović
IMPLEMENTATION OF TANZIMAT IN NIŠ DURING THE MANDATE
OF MIDHAT-PASHA IN 1861–1864 223
- Jelena Radosavljević
METROPOLITAN EUSTATIUS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
SERBIAN CHURCH ADMINISTRATION IN THE METROPOLIS
OF NISHAVA IN 1878 247
- Uroš Šešum
PLANNING OF THE SERBIAN CHETNIK ACTION IN OLD SERBIA
AND MACEDONIA IN 1897 271

Andrey L. SHEMYAKIN SERBIAN WORKS OF P. A. ROVINSKY (PREVIOUS EXAMINATIONS AND RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES)	287
Ana Stolić BETWEEN NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM. Serbian women at congresses of organisations of the international women's movement until the First World War	309
Biljana Vučetić "SESTRAS AMERICANA" – AMERICAN NURSES IN SERBIA DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR	339
Božica B. Mladenović, Milić J. Milićević DIARY OF TOŠKO VLAHOVIĆ AS A HISTORICAL SOURCE	357
REVIEW ARTICLES	371
ACADEMIC EVENTS	413
BIBLIOGRAPHIES	451
IN MEMORIAM	485
INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS	492

Bojana MILJKOVIĆ KATIĆ*

Institute of History Belgrade

Ljubodrag P. RISTIĆ*

Institute for Balkan Studies

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Belgrade

**‘DOMESTIC FOREIGNERS’: THE PROCESSES OF
ACCULTURATION AND ENCULTURATION IN SERBIA
IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY****

Abstract: The paper analyzes the processes of acculturation and enculturation in the Principality of Serbia through the prism of the appearance of so-called domestic foreigners – individuals and groups that in legal terms should have been seen as the domestic population but were treated as foreigners in local communities. Although they were native to the same state (Jews, Muslims and Christians, settlers from the Ottoman Empire, resettled Serbs and members of other nations in the Habsburg Empire who had taken the citizenship of the Principality of Serbia), large parts of the local population were not accepted as parts of the community and were instead treated as foreigners. The reason could be their different patterns of life and work; religious differences; or their membership in a guild. Only those who had learned their trade or were members of the local guild were fully integrated and considered domicile, regardless of their nationality. Some newcomers were not willing to adopt the cultural patterns of the new milieu, particularly Muslims/Turks, Jews and Gypsies, as well as well-educated Serbian newcomers and natives educated in the West. The intensity of enculturation processes among Serbs and other Christians dropped in the second half of the 19th century, due to the integration of the society through the rise of the national concept.

* bojana.miljkovic.katic@iib.ac.rs

* risticljp@yahoo.com

** This paper is a result of research within the project of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia: *From universal empires to nation states. Social and political transformations in Serbia and the Balkans* (N^o 177030) and *The Danube and the Balkans: Historical and cultural heritage* (N^o 177006). Translated by Miljana Protić.

Key words: Principality of Serbia, settlers/newcomers/émigrés, ‘domestic foreigners’, citizenship, acculturation, enculturation

The building of the national state in the Principality of Serbia rested, among other things, on the principle of the transmigration of the Muslim population (as the non-Christian masters who had ruled the region for centuries), the settlement of Christians, and the ‘soft’ assimilation of the non-Serbian, mostly Orthodox population.¹ These processes were protracted and gradual, and the assimilation processes were low-intensity, although they occasionally varied in strength, and included the ongoing processes of acculturation and enculturation of individuals and groups.² In terms of the legal status of Serbia as an autonomous part of the Ottoman Empire, imperial subjects were not foreigners in Serbia.³ In line with this, in the first half of

¹ ‘Soft assimilation’ can be described as ‘banal’ or ‘cold nationalism’, which replicates the population’s national feelings through daily, almost imperceptible reminders of their national identity and gradually transforms the forms of everyday thinking and ideological consciousness, thereby transforming an ethnic group into a nation/national group (Majkl Bilig, *Banalni nacionalizam*, tr. Veselin Kostić, Biblioteka XX vek, vol. 175, Beograd 2009, 28–29. See also: Marija Todorova, *Imaginarni Balkan*, tr. D. Starčević, A. Vajazetov-Vučen, Biblioteka XX vek, vol. 103, Beograd 1999, 302–303; Душан Ј. Поповић, *О Цинцарима, прилози питању постанка наше чаршије*, Београд с. а, 127, 129, 131).

² Acculturation denotes a process in which individuals or groups adopt the cultural features, beliefs and patterns of behavior of another community, either due to cultural contacts between two or more communities or due to settlement in a new cultural and social milieu. Modern literature defines acculturation as part of intercultural communication. The meaning of the term enculturation has not been standardized in modern scholarship. In this paper enculturation refers to the process of preserving the cultural patterns, values and patterns of behavior of the individual’s original milieu, including their unwillingness to adopt the cultural models of the host country (See, for example: Ана Јуричић, Николина Врцељ, *Значај интеркултурне комуникације за ефикасно управљање различитостима*, Комуникације, медији, култура, Годишњак Факултета за културу и медије Мегатренд универзитета у Београду (2012) 127, 131–132; ^b<http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=1249>, 17 May 2018).

³ It was Otto Dubislav von Pirch noted the peculiar status of an individual in Serbia that stemmed from its international state status and the characteristics of the political organization of the Ottoman Empire, and these idiosyncrasies also included the citizenship matter: ‘At the first glance, Serbia seems like a state within a state. Would it be a sophism to ask of European Turkey could be described as a state in the European

the 19th century they were not required to officially take the citizenship of the Principality of Serbia. They were also excluded from stipulations that forbade foreign citizens from owning immovable property, as evidenced by an 1852 regulation that required foreign subjects who lived or owned property in Serbia to sell their real estates; if they failed to do so, their property would be sold to the highest bidder.⁴

All newcomers to Serbia were asked to provide a permit for settlement from the domicile state (a passport or 'writ of release'). Settlement without this permit (defection) was tolerated, especially in the case of the rural population. However, there were occasional campaigns to verify the legality of settlement. Foreign subjects who had come from other European states rather than the Ottoman Empire were then asked to provide proof of having the necessary permits for emigration and to renounce their old citizenship in favor of Serbian citizenship. The newly settled ethnic Serbs were not exempt from this requirement.⁵ Settlers from the Ottoman Empire had to have a document called 'teskera' (Tur. tezkere), which could be a tax receipt, identification card or a travel document. The fact that Serbian authorities did not seem interested in the kind of document a settler had shows that this was not a point of concern

sense of the word? Is it a community that strives to work for collective and individual good and can the military authority governing a province be described as administration?' Pirch goes on to conclude: 'The great difficulty of this position must not be disregarded' (Ото Дубислав Пирх, *Путовање по Србији у години 1829*, Просвета, Библиотека Баштина, vol. 1, Београд 1983, 180).

⁴ The regulation stipulated that foreign subjects were to be informed via the 'relevant consulate' of their obligation to sell their immovable property. At this time the Ottoman Empire did not have a consulate in Serbia (Бранко Перуничих, *Управа вароши Београда 1812–1912*, Београд 1970, 250–253). See also: *Сборник закона и уредба и уредбени указа издани у Књажевству Србији (=Зборник закона) VI*, Београд 1853, 139–142; Радош Љушић, *Историја српске државности*, vol. II, Србија и Црна Гора – нововековне српске државе, Нови Сад s. a. [2001], 100; Ђорђе Н. Лопичић, *Конзуларни односи Србије (1804–1918)*, Београд 2007, 65–66, 141; Љубомир Дурковић-Јакшић, *Аустрија и питање јурисдикције над римокатолицима у Кнежевини Србији, 1851–1860*, *Историјски гласник* 2 (1956) 44–56; Тихомир Т. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за насеља у Србији у време прве владе кнеза Милоша (1815–1839)*, *Српски етнографски зборник*, vol. XXXVII, прво одељење, *Насеља и порекло становништва*, vol. 22, Београд–Земун 1926, 4–5; *Живети у Београду 1842–1850, документа Управе града Београда*, vol. 2, ed. Мирослав Јовановић et al., Београд 2004, 86.

⁵ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за насеља у Србији*, 20, 22, 41–44; Б. Перуничих, *Управа вароши Београда*, 252; Petar V. Krestić, *Political and Social Rivalries in Nineteenth-century Serbia: Švabe or Nemačkari*, *Balkanica* XLI (2010) 73–92.

for them and suggests that they were treated differently from newcomers from other European states.⁶

However, Ottoman subjects – Muslims and Christians alike – were sometimes seen as foreigners in Serbia, including ‘domestic Turks’, i.e. those who lived in the Principality of Serbia. In some cases, even the subjects of the Principality of Serbia were considered foreigners, most of all Jews. Serbs who had settled in the Principality of Serbia from the Habsburg Monarchy were also sometimes seen as foreigners, even after they had taken Serbian citizenship.

The ways in which a community sees settlers or members of another community belong to the field of social perception and essentially come down to how those on the ‘inside’ see those on the ‘outside’. Subtle differences in the perception of newcomers and even some members of the indigenous population mostly arose from observing the relations between individuals and groups, their patterns of behavior, style of dressing, diet, accommodation and general way of life, as well as on their legal status and self-perception.⁷ Information about the criteria needed for someone to be considered a foreigner or stranger is rarely encountered in historical evidence and mostly pertains to urban environments, where literacy was more widespread, social groups more differentiated, and rules of behavior, dressing and interrelations between individual and group more clearly defined already in the beginning of the autonomous development of the Principality of Serbia. Hence this paper will attempt to analyze ‘domestic foreigners’ in the Principality of Serbia through the processes of acculturation and enculturation among the urban population. These processes were relevant for natives and even more so for newcomers. One of the criteria for assessing the membership of the ‘other’ was citizenship (so-called ‘podanstvo’, which loosely translates to the state of being a subject).⁸ Based on the contemporaneous notion

⁶ Тихомир Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе у Србији од Другог устанка до Еснафске уредбе 1847. године*, Српски етнографски зборник, vol. XXXIII, друго одељење, Живот и обичајни народни, vol. 15, Београд 1925, 67–68; Никола Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, Београд 2006, 181–182; Радош Љушић, *Кнежевина Србија (1830–1839)*, Српска академија наука и уметности, посебна издања, vol. DLXX, Одељење историјских наука, vol. 12, Београд 1986, 339–340; *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, JAZU, vol. 75, Zagreb 1962, 237.

⁷ Peter Burke, *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy, Essays on perception and communication*, New York 1987, 27; M. Todorova, *Imaginarni Balkan*, 270.

⁸ Jelena Vasiljević, *Ideje građanstva i politike državljanstva – izazovi antropološkoj imaginaciji*, *Etnološko-antropološke sveske* 20 (2012) 106–107; Jadranka Božić, *Ostvarenje Jastva/Sopstva i nesvodljivosti Drugog: etički bezdan susreta s Drugim*, *Etnološko-antropološke sveske* 15 (2010) 90 (available at: <http://www.anthroserbia.org/Content/PDF/Articles/70eb5016db7a48c78a55c55a10f7e242.pdf>, 17 May 2018).

that the subjects of the same state can be strangers, this paper will refer to them as 'domestic foreigners'.

*

Until the creation of the autonomous Principality of Serbia, the majority of the Muslim population lived in urban settlements. From then on, with the exception of a few villages in the Drina valley, it lived exclusively in cities. This population had a clearly defined way of life, behavior, dressing and interacting with the subjugated population and members of other religious. This formed the foundation of the Muslims' dominant cultural model. 'Turkish' cultural models had been adopted by the urban Christian population, although there were many other factors that shaped their culture.⁹ The viewpoint from which the Serbian community assessed the status of the 'Turkish' community experienced shifts during the 19th century, largely due to the changing economic and political position of both communities, and the influence of 'Turkish' cultural models on the majority population changed with it.

Although there very few Christians and Serbs lived in urban settlements in the early 19th century, they lived, worked and dressed differently from the majority of their own people: 'Оно мало варошана и грађана сједе међу Турцима, друкчие се од народа носе и живе, и с њим се не мијешају ни у какијем народнијем пословима; за то се међу народ готово и не броје'. The situation in Serbia was the same: 'У Србији је до нашега времена било као што рекох да је у Босни и у Херцеговини', wrote Vuk Karadžić in 1836.¹⁰ Due to these differences in their respective ways of life, the members of the same people almost saw the Serbian urban population as foreigners – members of another people.

This example clearly shows that Serbs and other Christians in urban settlements strove to conform their way of life to that of the dominant Muslim community; in other words, they adopted Muslim cultural models. The creation of a guild system seems to have been the key factor that inspired the economically and culturally leading parts of the urban Christian population to conform to the Muslim culture after the Principality of Serbia received

⁹ Ненад Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд: визуелност и креирање градског идентитета (1815–1878)*, Београд 2014, 67; Ненад Макуљевић, *Визуелна култура и приватни идентитет православних хришћана у 18. веку*, in: *Приватни живот у српским земљама у освит модерног доба*, ed. А. Фотић, s. 1. [Београд] 2005, 73–74.

¹⁰ Вук Стефановић Караџић, *Срби сви и свуда*, in: *Ковчежић за историју, језик и обичаје Срба сва три закона I*, Беч 1849, 11, 13. See also: Н. Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд*, 75–76; Тихомир Р. Ђорђевић, *Србија пре сто година*, Београд 1946, 158–160, 154.

autonomy. After joining Turkish guilds craftsmen and merchants adopted the business practices and rituals of Ottoman entrepreneurs, a when they founded their own guilds and bazaars, they organized them in the same or similar fashion.¹¹ Membership in a guild usually meant observing not only prescribed or established norms, but also other models of behavior in everyday life, such as regularly attending church services; modest, honorable and respectable life, etc. – in other words, membership in a guild was closely tied to other cultural models.¹² According to Nenad Makuljević, another very important reason for accepting Ottoman cultural models in the first half of the 19th century was emphasizing freedom ‘in plain view of their former masters and oppressors’ and emancipating themselves from the limiting laws for Christians in the Ottoman Empire.¹³ It was precisely these circumstances that could have led to the remarkable endurance of processes of adopting and replicating existing (Ottoman) cultural models despite the accelerated decline of the economic status and cultural influence of the Muslim community following the acquisition of autonomy.

However, in the general Serbian community (and not just the elite), the processes of ‘rejecting’ Muslims/Turks quickly intensified and began by the secession of Serbian guilds in 1828. After the Turkish cannonade on Belgrade from the city’s fortress and the Canluja Conference of 1862, the entire Muslim urban population left Serbia, and by 1867 the Ottoman army and administration also withdrew from Serbia.¹⁴ In the second half of the century, de-Ottomanization

¹¹ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, XIX, XXVIII, XXXIII–XXXIV, 38, 115, 207; Бојана Миљковић Катић, *Структура градског становништва Србије средином XIX века*, Историјски институт, посебна издања, vol. 36, Београд 2002, 120.

¹² When admitting an artisan who had not been trained in the local town guild, the candidate was required to provide a testimonial about his honorable behavior in his previous location: ‘Који би пак из друге вароши и из ког му драго другог места државе наше Србије као прави отечества нашег поданик у вароши Београду болтацијску трговину отворити и у наш еснаф ступити желио, а да није трговину болтацијску у нашој вароши никако учио [...] да дужан буде [...] показати достоверно од своје надлежне судејске власти сведочанство каквог је он стања и владања донде био и да никаквом подозрењу не подлежи’ (Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 179).

¹³ Н. Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд*, 76.

¹⁴ Some Muslims, mostly Gypsies, took the citizenship of the Principality of Serbia and thereby left the body of so-called Turkish population. In 1868 Serbian Muslim subjects founded the Islamic Community in the Principality of Serbia and were granted all civil rights enjoyed by Orthodox citizens (Недељко Радосављевић, *Ужице, град и нахија – окружење у времену страха (1788–1862)*, Ужице 2013, 147, 151, 155–156).

became even more pronounced due to the spreading of the national idea as a cohesive force between the political elite and wider societal circles. These processes led to the negation of Ottoman heritage in Serbian culture.¹⁵

By the late 1830s and early 1840s, it had become possible for the Serbian authorities to issue a recommendation to the Belgrade tavern keepers' guild not to let Turks into their taverns – not even to have a conversation with other patrons and certainly not as customers. This meant that they had no choice but to frequent Turkish (albeit numerous) taverns. A few years later, unprovoked attacks, beatings and even knifings by Serbs against Muslims began to occur occasionally, without the courts taking any action. The mutual distancing of members of both communities – Christian and Muslim – became increasingly apparent, and the complaints and incidents of their members more and more evident.¹⁶

By the 1840s numerous cases of maltreatment of Turks by Christians, primarily Serbs, were recorded. The usual targets were the members of lower social classes: military recruits (Tur. *nizam*), drinking fountain keepers, brickworks workers etc., and the perpetrators were both civilians and policemen. In these cases, the Serbian authorities often failed to respond in these cases and had been even known to ignore the pleas of the Turkish local commander.¹⁷ Newcomers from Rumelia seem to have been more antagonistic towards the Turks in Belgrade than the local population. Camil Pasha, the Belgrade vizier 1840–1842, complained to the Serbian authorities of frequent police mistreatment of Turks and suggested recruiting local Serbs into the police forces instead of foreigners from Rumelia ('којекакви страни из Румелије, него овдашњи Срби').¹⁸ Evidently, to the highest representatives of Ottoman authorities even the subjects of their own state could be foreign(ers).

¹⁵ M. Todorova, *Imaginarni Balkan*, 282; Н. Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд*, 199, 209–210, 220, 222, 226–227, 230; Наташа Мишковић, *Базари и булевар*. *Свет живота у Београду 19. века*, Музеј града Београда, посебна издања, vol. 7, Београд с. а., 378–379.

¹⁶ *Живети у Београду 1837–1841, документа Управе града Београда*, vol. 1, ed. Мирослав Јовановић et al., Београд 2003, 158, 172; On the frequent conflicts between Muslims and Serbs, see: Živorad Đorđević, *Џикур-ћесма 1862. Studija o odlasku Turaka iz Srbije*, Београд 1983, 7–60; Љубодраг П. Ристић, *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)*, Српска академија наука и уметности, Балканолошки институт, посебна издања, vol. 102, Београд 2008, 69–73, 101–106, 203–231.

¹⁷ *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 172–175; *Живети у Београду*, vol. 2, 224–227, 232–233.

¹⁸ *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 175; Н. Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, 189. See also: Урош С. Шешум, *Србија и Стара Србија (1804–1839)*, Београд 2017, 321.

Over time the majority Christian community began to increasingly abandon Muslim cultural models in favor of Central and Western European examples. However, the features of Western European culture in the way of dressing, eating and living, and particularly in organization and patterns of doing business were slow to spread in Serbia. Only Belgrade adopted European fashion and general way of life fairly early on, but these models were adapted and gradually transformed into a hybrid form of an Ottoman-European visual identity that would persevere until the 20th century.¹⁹

In the process of building their own identity and economic space, even the multacentennial masters – the Ottomans – could be seen as ‘domestic foreigners’ by the indigenous elite.²⁰ Evidence about this usually refers to Turkish tradesmen, whom Serbian merchants were trying to suppress from the market. For example, in 1845 a draft regulation on guilds in Belgrade was meant to include shops, crafts and taverns, and all persons who engaged in these activities in Belgrade except ‘Turks and foreign subjects’. This meant that, in the eyes of business legislation, the domestic Muslim population was fully equated with foreigners, although Belgrade townspeople must have been aware that local Muslims were not foreigners and hence only foreign subjects were required to provide proof that they had legally left their homeland in order to be allowed to pursue their trade in Belgrade.²¹ In 1841 Turks were also considered foreigners in Negotin, where the county governor declared

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, 14, 80–86, 88, 96, 105, 137, 195. See also: Јован Скерлић, *Симо Матавуљ: „Београдске приче“*, in: Писци и књиге, vol. I, Прикази и чланци, ed. Ј. Пејчић, Београд 2000, 129; Љубодраг П. Ристић, Војана Миљковић Катић, *Ottoman-Serbian Cuisine and West-European Influences – An Ambience of Contacts and Disaccords – First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, in: *Debata о kuhinji – Kitchen Debate*, ed. О. Habjanič, К. Šrampf Vendramin, V. Bevc Varl, Collection Museo europe 4, Maribor 2017, 175 (available at: <http://www.museoeurope.si>); Димитрије Ђорђевић, *Србија и Београд у време оснивања Народног позоришта*, in: *Један век Народног позоришта у Београду*, Београд 1968, 31.

²⁰ All Muslims were considered Turks, regardless of if they were of Turkish ethnicity or not, with the exception of Gypsies. Sometimes other demonyms were used to refer to Albanians (‘Arnauti’) or Bosniaks (‘Вошњаци’), although the latter could also apply to Christians from Bosnia. Being an ethnic Gypsy was always the main mark of identity, regardless of the person’s faith (Muslim or Christian) (Б. Перуничкић, *Управа вароши Београда*, 38, 53; Бранко Перуничкић, *Београдски суд 1819–1839*, Београд 1964, 117–118, 185; Урош Шешум, *Арбанаси у Поморављу 1815–1834*, in: *Алексинач и околина у прошлости*, 500 година од првог писаног помена, 1516–2016, зборник радова са Међународног научног скупа одржаног 3. септембра 2016. године у Алексиначу, Алексинач 2016, 130–131; *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 484).

²¹ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 268.

that unrests could potentially break out in the town and at the request of locals banned 'Turks and foreign merchants' from per-piece buying and selling of individual items. The central government, however, whatever the conflict might have been, instructed the local administration not to ban local merchants and especially Turks from selling their goods per-piece as they were not foreigners.²² Turks, i.e. Muslim merchants from other parts of the Ottoman Empire were also treated as foreigners: in the town of Jagodina, the members of the local guild of grocers asked the state authorities to intervene because some Turks and other merchants, from Vidin brought fish to sell in the town square. This request was made with the full support of the local authorities.²³ Even some travel writers, such as Abdolonyme Ubicini, were clearly aware that 'domestic Turks' were seen as strangers in Serbia. Ubicini writes that in Serbia, in addition to Gypsy travelers, Muslims who lived in the urban areas of forts were also seen as foreigners; listing the population of the Principality of Serbia in 1863 (using 1859 data for these population categories), he includes the following into a separate category: 'Sujets étrangers (musulmans et européens, 1859) 9,000'.²⁴

The sudden drop in the economic power of the Muslim community in Serbia after the hatt-i sharifs of 1830 and 1833 and the economic rise of the Christian community led to a shift in the social position of Turks, who showed themselves unwilling to adapt to these altered societal circumstances. They failed to get involved in new business ventures and hardly changed their attitude to the Christian majority. It seems that they even widened the gap by trying to remain dignified in poverty by being disdainful of Christians, i.e. Serbs.²⁵ However, some changes were made, especially in Belgrade, as this attitude of Muslim merchants and artisans as well as sipahi toward their Christian

²² *Ibidem*, 197.

²³ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 248.

²⁴ Abdolonyme Ubicini, *Les Serbes de Turquie. Études historiques, statistiques et politiques sur la Principauté de Serbie, le Montenegro et les pays Serbes adjacent*, Paris 1865, 34, 36.

²⁵ Б. Миљковић Катић, *Структура градског становништва*, 21–24; Ендру Арчибалд Пејтон, *Србија. Најмлађи члан европске породице или Боравак у Београду и путовања по планинама и шумама унутрашњости 1843. и 1844. године*, т. Бранко Момчиловић, Нови Сад 1996, 192–193. There is a large body of evidence showing numerous examples of intolerance or conflicts between Turks and Serbs: Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 105–106; Б. Перуничкић, *Београдски суд*, 30–32, 39–40, 69, 127–129, 192–193, 195–197; Н. Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, 107–110, 181–183, 194–195, 202–203, 211–218, 337–339, 415–418; *Живети у Београду*, vol. 2, 154, 218–221, 231, 234–235.

neighbors seemed to some members of the Muslim community – Albanians (‘Arnauti’) as excessive tolerance. They believed that the ruthlessness, savagery and arrogance from the period of full Turkish control was the standard that needed to be preserved in order to maintain their dignity and established customs: ‘Нисмо ми београдски спа[х]ие да те избит не смемо него сам ја Арнаут’, one of them declared during a conflict with a Serb.²⁶

*

The perception of Christian settlers from the Ottoman Empire as strangers and foreign subjects was abundantly clear and fairly widespread in Serbia. Merchants and craftsmen who lived in Serbia without their families were usually seen as foreigners, as evidenced by the way shopkeepers and artisans who had come from the Ottoman Empire were treated by the local authorities in 1836 in Jagodina, although they had shops in the local high street. In Šabac these settlers were referred to expressly and simultaneously as subjects of the Ottoman Empire and foreigners: ‘У месту Шабцу находе се неки страни житељи и подајници, који су дошли из Турске и занат свој непресечно раде као мутавције и бардагције’.²⁷ In the eyes of the indigenous population, the subjects of the Ottoman Empire had the same status as the subjects of other European state – even if they had lived locally for twenty years, as in the case of the abovementioned artisans, or if they had lived in Serbia from 1800 or 1807 and owned real estate. They were treated as foreigners regardless of if they were of the ‘Eastern Christian’ or ‘Greek Orthodox’ faith, i.e. if they were Serbs, Greeks, or Aromanians (‘Cincari’).²⁸

²⁶ Књажевска канцеларија. *Јагодинска нахија*, vol. II, 1823–1830, eds. З. Марковић, Љ. Поповић, Јагодина 2008, 52, 109, 185. See also: Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за насеља у Србији*, 210–212, 236–237; Б. Перуничкић, *Београдски суд*, 94, 145, 185–186, 411; У. Шешум, *Арбанаси у Поморављу*, 130–131, 134–136, 143–146, 149; Vladimir Jovanović, ‘Good’ Turks and ‘Evil’ Ones: Multiple Perspectives on the Turkish Community Reflected in Serbian Sources of the Early Nineteenth Century, *El Prezente. Studies in Sephardic Culture*, vol. 7, MENORAH, collection of Papers, vol. 3, Common Culture and Particular Identities: Christians, Jews and Muslims in the Ottoman Balkans, eds. Eliezer Papo, Nenad Makuljević, Belgrade 2013, 77–94.

²⁷ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 69–70, 535; У. С. Шешум, *Србија и Стара Србија*, 271.

²⁸ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 71–72, 562–563, 570–571. The differences between the ‘Eastern Orthodox’ and ‘Greek Orthodox’ faith began increasingly fading with the standardization of language and the rise of national literature, science and culture; Greek and Aromanian merchants, most of whom had

Even the settlers themselves were unsure if they were foreigners or natives. 'Greek tavern keepers, who have their own land property, such as houses, taverns and inns, meadows, and who indeed pay their taxes here and do their state labor' addressed the National Council in 1836 to ask if they were foreigners, since every six months they went home to Rumelia where their houses, wives and children were.²⁹

To understand the processes of acculturation of 'domestic foreigners', it is important to note that the different perception of newcomers as foreigners was not based on their religious or national identity, but on a particular understanding of the legal status of foreigners (based on citizenship), and certainly the competition created by newcomers in the local economic environment. Hence in 1841 the draft of the textile merchants' guild of Belgrade stated that any Christian – Orthodox or otherwise – could be admitted for training at their guild: 'сваки без разлике християнског вероисповеданија, који би у вароши Београду трговину учити и у болтацијски еснаф наш за трговца ступити желио, моћи ће бити примљен, без да ће му се по изученију трговине и најмање препјаствије у том положити моћи, што није восточног вероисповеданија'.³⁰

The status of an individual as a native or foreigner crucially depended on whether he had learned his trade in the same town where his status was being assessed and whether he belonged to a guild. Those who had been

migrated from the Ottoman Empire, were Serbified (M. Bilig, *Banalni nacionalizam*, 57–60; M. Todorova, *Imaginarni Balkan*, 169, 302–303; Н. Мишковић, *Базари и булевару*, 270; Р. Љушић, *Турско наслеђе у Кнежевини и Краљевини Србији*, 279–280, 284; Васа Чубриловић, *Београд – национално и културно средиште Србије у XIX веку*, in: Ослобођење градова у Србији од Турака 1862–1867. год. Зборник радова приказаних на научном скупу Српске академија наука и уметности, одржаном од 22. до 24. маја 1967. год. у Београду поводом прославе 100-годишњице ослобођења градова, Београд 1970, 229). Aromanians are the most illustrative example of Serbification; they had settled in Serbia in the 18th or 19th century, mostly from other parts of the Ottoman Empire and many of them had become fully Serbified by the late 19th century (Душан Ј. Поповић, *О Цинцарима. Прилози питању постанка нашег грађанског друштва*, Треће издање са 30 слика и једном картом, Београд 2008. The Afterword to this book is also remarkably valuable for our discussion: Ненад Љубинковић, *Студија Душана Ј. Поповића О Цинцарима – пре седамдесетак година и данас*, 521–560).

²⁹ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 532, 535, 537.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, 175, 179; *Протокол кнеза Милоша Обреновића 1824–1825*, ed. В. Крестић, Н. Петровић, Српска академија наука и уметности, Архив Србије, посебна издања, vol. CDLX, Одељење историјских наука, vol. 1, Београд 1973, 44–45.

trained locally were already considered ‘domestic’ regardless of their religion, nationality or citizenship. The same applied to all members of the local town guild.³¹ This gave rise to a special consciousness that allowed the subjects of the Ottoman Empire and the Principality of Serbia to be occasionally treated as foreigners, as evidenced by the fact that ‘domestic’ tradesmen paid a lower admittance tax (*ustaluk*, *majstoršag*) than newcomers, and local apprentices had a shorter training period before they could become master craftsmen. Anyone who had not been trained locally or was not a member of the local guilds was more or less seen as a foreigner. In 1841 the guild members of Negotin even asked for subjects of the Principality of Serbia who came to the town during great religious feasts and opened temporary shops to be limited to wholesaling, as if they all came from abroad.³² The general regulation draft of 1846 was even more stringent. The authorities intended to levy additional taxes for doing business outside of one’s town of residence (essentially a kind of internal import tax) even on merchants who traveled the Principality selling their goods, as if they were foreign subjects.³³ Although none of these proposals were included into the final version of the Guild Members’ Regulation of 1847, they clearly show that the view that only a local guild member was considered ‘domestic’ was still remarkably strong. Such views were anachronistic in a modern capitalist state.

Greek and Aromanian merchants and craftsmen who were members of local guilds were seen as natives for all means and purposes, although they had settled in Serbia relatively recently, mostly from Rumelia. Many of them had settled in the urban parts of the Pashalik of Belgrade after the Second Serbian Uprising, and established shared guilds with the Serbs. They were part of the Serbian town scene regardless of some noticeable differentiating features in their way of dressing, family life and doing business, and regardless of their ‘Greek’ rather than ‘Eastern’ Christian faith.³⁴ However, newcomers

³¹ Since the pre-Uprising period, another necessary precondition needed to be met in order for an individual to be seen as a prominent or respectable member of the community – to be a native (Ханс-Михаел Мидлих, *Патријархални менталитет као сметња државне и друштвене модернизације у Србији XIX века*, *Историјски часопис XXXVIII* (1991) 116).

³² Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 145, 173–174, 195–196, 200.

³³ According to this regulation, outside of their town of residence guild craftsmen and tradesmen could only sell their goods on fairs; to be allowed to sell in other towns – and only on the designated market day (the weekly fair), all foreigners alike, except local townsmen (‘сви без разлике страни, осим оноварошана’) had to pay special taxes stipulated by the Regulation on Fairs of 1839 (*Ibidem*, 252, 273, 275).

³⁴ Урош Шешум, *Насељавање Србије у Првом српском устанку*, in: *Српски народ на Балканском полуострву од 6. до 20. века*, ed. Славиша Недељковић, Ниш 2014,

from the Ottoman Empire – Greeks, Aromanians and Serbs alike, regardless of ethnicity – were seen as foreigners until they were admitted into a local guild. By joining a guild, in the eyes of local Serbian townspeople, the newcomer lost his foreigner status wherever he might have come from – the Ottoman Empire, Habsburg Monarchy, another European state or another part of the Principality of Serbia. Notably, the nationality of this new member did not have an important role.³⁵

Depending on their personal decision, some settlers from the Ottoman Empire agreed to pay double taxes – to the Ottoman Empire and Serbia, in order to gain the status of a 'native'.³⁶ Settlers from the Habsburg Monarchy who were protected by the Porte's international treaties generally refused these conditions.³⁷ Local craftsmen saw newcomers as disloyal competition; however, their attempts to convince the state to levy more taxes on them failed and so they resorted to insisting on citizenship from the 1840s, which was also an important requirement for admission into civil service. In the mid-1840s, in a wide poll about the new guild regulations, an increasing number of guilds proposed to only accept citizens of the Principality into their ranks. However, the Guild Regulation of 1847 did include these requirements.³⁸

From the mid-1830s the Serbian authorities seem to have been particularly intent on integrating newcomers and stipulated that foreigners or foreign subjects were 'only those who had a passport issued by their relevant authorities'.³⁹ This meant that all who had defected to Serbia and those who were unable to prove that their settlement had been legal automatically became citizens of Serbia. In 1837 the National Council decreed that all foreign subjects who owned shops, warehouses and taverns, or did business throughout the

223–224; *Ibidem*, *Србија и Стара Србија*, 62, 130–131, 134, 283, 286–295, 303; Д. Ј. Поповић, *О Цинцарима*, 96–97; Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 115.

³⁵ These views support the theory of so-called infranational localism, which deems national consciousness too irrelevant for the needs of the modern state. This awareness was usually eradicated by the national state through language unification, education, culture and national ideology (Mirjana Prošić-Dvornić, *Odevanje u Beogradu u XIX i ročetkom XX veka*, Beograd 2006, 76–77; M. Bilig, *Banalni nacionalizam*, 53–54).

³⁶ *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 217, 219, 221, 226–228, 230–231; Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 70–72; У. С. Шешум, *Србија и Стара Србија*, 284–285, 296.

³⁷ *Протокол кнеза Милоша Обреновића 1824–1825*, 32, 44–45.

³⁸ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 182; Уредба о еснафима, *Зборник закона IV (1849)* 86–92.

³⁹ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 532.

year had to pay taxes ‘wherever they might come from’ and all craftsmen and merchants who had settled from the Ottoman Empire were then registered as the domestic population.⁴⁰ To facilitate the integration process, in 1846 Prince Aleksandar Karadorđević advised the authorities to grant Serbian citizenship to all craftsmen and merchant willing to accept it. However, the Ministry of the Interior had a much different opinion on the matter, suggesting that citizenship was to be granted only to those who could prove their commendable behavior before and after moving to Serbia regardless of how long they had lived in Serbia: ‘само они странци у поданство примају, о којима се достатачно уверење набави, каквога су они поведенија били пре и после доласка њиног у Србију, па ма колико времена овде живили’.⁴¹

*

Settlers from the Habsburg Monarchy and other European states – mostly merchants and craftsmen, along with some professionals – were considered foreigners both in terms of their legal status and in the eyes of the Serbian community. They also underlined their status as foreigners and continually fostered a distance toward Serbian authorities. They refused to join existing guilds and work with local guild members, and often ignored calls from the Serbian authorities, believing that their rights and obligations could only be fulfilled through their own consulate. Serbian civil servants who had migrated from the Habsburg Monarchy (mostly Southern Hungary) seem to have acted similarly.⁴² This stance was met with so much antagonism in the ‘domestic’ community of Belgrade and frequent attacks against Austrian subjects that in

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 583–586.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, 78–79. Act 44 of the Civil Code of 1844 stipulated that a foreigner could be granted Serbian citizenship after having spent seven years in the Principality of Serbia (*Законик грађански за Књажевство Србско обнародован на Благовести 25. марта 1844*, Београд s. a. [1844], 7).

⁴² Н. Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, 180, 219–220; Ђ. Н. Лопичић, *Конзуларни односи Србије*, 87–88; Никола Вучо, *Београдски еснафи у деветнаестом веку*, Годишњак Музеја града Београда, vol. III (1956) 137, 141–142; Милорад Екмечић, *Србија између Средње Европе и Европе*, Београд 1992, 75; *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 191, 388; Е. А. Пејтон, *Србија*, 170; Ђуро Шурмин, *Документи о Србији од 1842–1848*, Споменик СКА LXIX, други разред 54 (1929) 40; *Зборник закона I* (1840) 241. The Austrian consulate was also responsible for settlers from the German states and the Swiss, because their domicile countries did not have treaties with the Porte (*Живети у Београду*, vol. 2, 77–78, 130).

1839 Prince Miloš issued a special decree to the Belgrade administration to try to prevent them.⁴³

Serbs who had come to Serbia from the Habsburg Monarchy in the first half of the 19th century were mostly well-educated individuals who worked as civil servants ranging from diplomats to teachers. Of course, not all of them were highly educated. If they chose to stay in Serbia for a longer period of time, they usually took Serbian citizenship and lost their foreign legal status. However, in many aspects they continued to be seen as foreign elements, strangers or almost foreigners. They were often stigmatized as by the derogatory terms 'Švabe' (derived from the German *Schwaben*) or 'Nemačkari' since the local community saw them as exponents of the German/Austrian culture – almost as Germans rather than Serbs. This became particularly noticeable during the *Ustavobranitelji* (Defenders of the Constitution) period, when a strongly antagonistic climate towards people from German-speaking areas was created and Serbs from Serbia often demanded their expulsion from the country.⁴⁴

By the late 1830s the central government began giving preferential treatment to the domestic population when selecting candidates for civil service, especially when they had the same level of education as foreigners or were applying to lower administrative positions. In 1839 the Regency of Prince Milan Obrenović issued guidelines for admission into civil service favoring local intellectuals and claiming that it was merely trying to amend the injustices that had been inflicted on the domestic population (whose wellbeing was its primary concern and duty) and that it was apprehensive about the process of enculturation. The decree stated that domestic candidates had a superior knowledge of the local people, customs and situation and, if they were equally competent, would do a better job than foreigners: 'познавајући наше људе, наше обичаје и наша обстојатељста, при једнаким наукама боље од иностранца усовершенствовати могли'.⁴⁵ Newly settled clerks were believed to not only have failed to adapt to local customs but to have

⁴³ Петар Крестић, „Швабе“ или „немачкари“ у *Сербским Народним новинама Теодора Павловића*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 49 (1994) 35.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, 34, 36; Н. Мишковић, *Базари и булевару*, 173; Бартоломео Куниберт, *Српски устанак и прва владавина Милоша Обреновића 1804–1850*, Издање Илије М. Коларца, vol. 96, tr. М. Р. Веснић, Београд 1901, 277; Слободан Јовановић, *Уставобранитељи и њихова влада*, in: *Сабрана дела Слободана Јовановића*, Т. 3, ed. Р. Самарцић, Ж. Стојковић, Београд 1990, 59–60, 74–76.

⁴⁵ *Зборник закона* I (1840) 232, 242; *Зборник закона* 30 (1877) 257; Лазар Ђелап, *Поступак са аустријским поданицима у Србији у време кнеза Милоша и Уставобранитеља*, *Годишњак града Београда* XIV (1967) 369; Јован Милићевић,

familiarized themselves with them. Prince Aleksandar Karađorđević's decree of 1844 finally banned foreigners from civil service unless they took Serbian citizenship. A foreign subject could be hired only if the National Council and the Prince agreed to it; the new employee was given the status of a civil servant only after he had proven his competence; those who were already in the service of the state were asked to provide a 'writ of release' from their domicile country and to apply for Serbian citizenship; if they failed to do so, they lost their status.⁴⁶ These requirements were later expanded to include all lower administrative positions and became increasingly stringent: the Law on Civil Servants of 1861 stipulated that foreigners could be hired into civil service only with the Prince's authorization and only 'under contract', while the new law of 1864 reduced the contract to a period of three years. Propaganda against 'foreign' Serbs that initially targeted only those from German-speaking countries ('Швабе', 'немачкари') grew to include Serbs from other regions and countries.⁴⁷

The growing antagonism towards 'foreigners' in civil service, especially among the youth educated abroad, were the result of their view that it was unfair to them that they were required to rise through the ranks from the lowest positions although they were just as qualified as 'foreigners' in high-ranking positions. This resentment was exacerbated by the intention of the Ustavobranitelji to destabilize Prince Mihailo, and after his abdication to neutralize their political opponents.⁴⁸ The relations between educated settlers of Serbian ethnicity and local educated Serbs were mostly dependent on the processes of enculturation and acculturation of the social elite, since there were large social and cultural differences between these two groups, especially under the first Obrenović ruler. The differences between the elite and the 'people' were strongly emphasized in this period. Having received their education in a different cultural environment, newly settled Serbs spoke a different (Slavonic-Serbian) variant of the language; introduced a new, civil code of behavior and changes in the way of dressing, architecture, and home furnishings; had lavish

Народне скупштине у Србији 1839–1843. године, Зборник Филозофског факултета IV–1 (1956) 167, 171.

⁴⁶ *Зборник закона VIII* (1856) 68–69. As early as 1836, Prince Miloš decreed that new settlers could not serve as priests (Ђоко Слијепчевић, *Историја Српске православне цркве*, vol. II, *Од почетка XIX века до краја Другог светског рата*, Београд 1991, 342).

⁴⁷ Ј. Милићевић, *Народне скупштине у Србији 1839–1843*, 171; *Зборник закона XIV* (1862) 39; *Зборник закона XVII* (1865) 5; *Constitution de la Principauté de Serbie*. Annotée et expliquée par A. Ubicini, Paris 1871, 90.

⁴⁸ П. Крестић, „Швабе“ или „немачкари“, 36–37, 39.

and opulent habits and lifestyles, which included frequenting theaters, balls; and disrupted traditional values in various ways.⁴⁹ This led to misunderstandings and antagonism towards newly settled Serbs, especially in the first half of the 19th century, and gave rise to feelings of resentment among native Serbs towards Serbs born abroad („мрзе на стране, хотја рођене Србе“).⁵⁰ Even the willingness of those who quickly adopted the local fashion did not do much to alleviate these differences and tensions.⁵¹

In the new environment, living conditions were drastically different for newcomers from the Habsburg Monarchy, because even the highest-ranking civil servants had to be fully subordinated to Prince Miloš; demeaning and harsh sanctions loomed over their heads; and their living conditions were much less comfortable.⁵² However, they soon began building and furnishing their homes in the ‘German fashion’ and sought other ways to replicate as much of the living conditions in their former homeland as they could and at the same time rejected the cultural models of their new environment; hence, in the first half and middle of the 19th century, the processes of enculturation were more characteristic of well-educated Serbian newcomers.⁵³ They could not or did not want to impose their own cultural model in the first half of the 19th century either in fashion or in other standards. Distancing and antagonism between the ‘imported’ and the ‘domestic’ cultural elite became very pronounced.⁵⁴ However, great cultural differences between the educated elite and the indigenous population also affected the treatment of native intellectuals who

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, 34, 36; Радош Љушић, *Димитрије Давидовић – секретар кнеза Милоша Обреновића*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 32 (1985) 67; Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Србија пре сто година*, 172–175, 178–179; Љубинка Трговчевић, *Планирана елита. О студентима из Србије на европским универзитетима у 19. веку*, Историјски институт, посебна издања, vol. 43, Београд 2003, 238.

⁵⁰ П. Крстић, „Швабе“ или „немачкари“, 36–37, 39. О. Д. Пирх, *Путовање по Србији у години 1829*, 49, 158.

⁵¹ Бранислав Миљковић, *Београд прве половине XIX века у делима књижевника*, Годишњак Музеја града Београда, vol. III (1956) 216; Б. Куниберт, *Српски устанак и прва владавина кнеза Милоша*, 277; Тихомир Ђорђевић, *Из Србије кнеза Милоша – културне прилике од 1815. до 1839. године*, Београд 1922, 59–60; Коста Н. Христић, *Записи старог Београђанина*, s. a. s. I. [Београд 1923], 451.

⁵² Р. Љушић, *Димитрије Давидовић*, 59–60, 66–68.

⁵³ С. Јовановић, *Уставобранитељи*, 60; О. Д. Пирх, *Путовање по Србији у години 1829*, 49, 158.

⁵⁴ Ј. Милићевић, *Народне скупштине у Србији 1839–1843*, 171; Мирјана Прошић-Дворнић, *Вечерње забаве (балови) у Београду крајем XIX и почетком XX века*, Етнолошка свеска V (1984) 25; Т. Ђорђевић, *Из Србије кнеза Милоша – културне прилике*, 67.

had received their education in Central and Western Europe. Upon their return to their fatherland they often encountered the same treatment as they failed to ‘adapt to their old environment, feeling alien and being received as strangers’. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić especially insisted that they ‘had even forgotten to think Serbian’. They were given a distinctive name – Parisians (parizlije). At the same time, the elite itself tended to critically judge cultural loans from the West, often deeming them excessive (admittedly, this criticism focused on the non-critical attitude to adoption rather than the mere process of loaning or adopting).⁵⁵

This local sentiment led to reactions both among newly settled ‘domestic foreigners’ and educated ‘returning foreigners’. Some were disdainful of their own people and cultural circumstances in Serbia, which – as noted by Lukijan Mušicki – sometimes verged on slandering the people.⁵⁶ The gap between Serbs educated abroad and learned Serbs from Serbia began to decrease from the mid-19th century, but the gap between the elite and the ‘people’ endured. According to Jovan Deretić, this gap was particularly evident in literary realism, when the range of topics in Serbian literature became reduced to traditional forms of folk life, with marked apprehension towards the modern city and intelligentsia.⁵⁷

*

Jews were seen as foreigners based on very different premises. The Jewish community had a long history in Belgrade, as did the distance between the Serbs and the Jewish, as neither of these communities was interested in adopting the cultural models of the other. In 19th-century Serbia, the Jewish

⁵⁵ Јован Деретић, *Пут српске књижевности. Идентитет, границе, тежње*, Београд 1996, 255; Љ. Трговчевић, *Планирана елита*, 241; Радош Љушић, *Турско наслеђе у Кнежевини и Краљевини Србији*, in: *Ислам, Балкан и Велике силе (XIV–XX век)*, Историјски институт Српске академије наука и уметности, зборник радова, vol. 145, Београд 1997, 287–288; Vojislav Pavlović, *Influence culturelle de la France en Serbie à l’époque des Ustavobranitelji*, in: *Rapports franco-yougoslaves. À l’occasion des 150 ans de l’ouverture du premier consulat français en Serbie*, Institute d’histoire, Livre 10, Belgrade 1990, 103–111; Душан Т. Батаковић, *Француски утицаји у Србији 1835–1914. Четири генерације „паризлија“*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 56 (1997) 78, 81, 83; Трајан Стојановић, *Pogledi na Nas/Vas i na Drugoga*, Beograd 1999, 14–16; С. Јовановић, *Уставобранитељи*, 74–76.

⁵⁶ Mušicki highlighted the emergence of ‘slandering authors’ who humiliated the people and believed it to have ‘the darkest of faults and not a single virtue’ (Ј. Деретић, *Пут српске књижевности*, 238).

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 256.

community was mostly Sephardic. Although decimated during the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 and especially the First Serbian Uprising, it recovered relatively quickly and during the first reign of Prince Miloš became the economically strongest community after the Turks (despite the fact that there were still many impoverished individuals among the Jews).⁵⁸ However, native Jews were usually seen as 'foreigners' by the local community and even as antagonistic foreigners (they were often accused of being the reason behind rising real estate prices, although there was not that many of them).⁵⁹

Jews were the most compact and isolated group in Belgrade. The majority lived in a single city neighborhood, although they had shops in other parts of the town as well; they had their own municipality, which as not territorial but rather an ethnic/religious unit; they were governed by their own official; they never joined Serbian guilds or resolved their social problems in cooperation with the Serbian authorities – they took care of their own poor, school, synagogue, cemetery, and business dealings. And despite the unwillingness of the Jewish community to adopt the cultural models of the Serbian milieu in the first half of the 19th century, under Prince Miloš Obrenović Jews enjoyed the same rights as other subjects of the Principality of Serbia. Grateful for their aid in arms and supplies to the rebels during the Uprising as well as for help he had personally received from the Jewish community, Prince Miloš was harbored a sympathetic view of Jews.⁶⁰

As subjects of the Principality of Serbia, Jews were treated as members of the 'domestic' population. They paid the same taxes and municipal levies like other subjects of the Principality.⁶¹ However, in many aspects they were also treated as 'domestic foreigners'. After Prince Miloš left Serbia in 1839,

⁵⁸ Н. Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд*, 89; Haris Dajč, Maja Vasiljević, *Status Jevreja u osmanskom i habzburškom Beogradu (XVII–XVIII vek): Stranci, manjine ili saradnici?* in: *Limes plus* 10/2 (2013) 96–97; Богумил Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду до стицања равноправности (1878)*, Етнолошка библиотека, посебна издања, vol. 4, Београд 2009, 225–226, 231, 253, 258, 267–269, 282, 285–287, 291–292; *Историја Београда*, vol. II, ed. В. Чубриловић, Београд 1974, 520 (Видосава Стојанчевић); Н. Вучо, *Београдски еснафи у деветнаестом веку*, 142–143.

⁵⁹ Н. Даж, М. Vasiljević, *Status Jevreja*, 100; Б. Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду*, 266, 284.

⁶⁰ Н. Макуљевић, *Османско-српски Београд*, 89–90; *Историја Београда*, vol. II, 521 (В. Стојанчевић); Б. Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду*, 263–264, 273–274, 318; Игњат Шланг, *Јевреји у Београду*, Београд 1926, 79–81; Т. Ђорђевић, *Из Србије кнеза Милоша – становништво – насеља*, Београд 1924, 154–155, 157; Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, XXIX; Н. Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, 192.

⁶¹ *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 248.

the native Serbian population began to call for suppressing Jewish influence in trade and artisanry. This was driven by purely economic reasons, because the Jewish community – skilled in many crafts and trade, were seen as competition to Serbian merchants and craftsmen. From the Ustavobranitelj period saw the introduction of the first anti-Jewish regulations. In 1839 they were banned from keeping their shops open on Sundays and on Serbian feast days; in 1841 from owning real estate and settling in the Serbian countryside; in 1844 from settling in Serbia (with the exception of those who had passports with their designated period of residence in Serbia). After many complaints and demands by Serbs – merchants from Šabac and Smederevo, in 1856 a decree was passed to ban Jews from living and owning property in the interior of the Principality, forcing many of them to move to Pest, Vienna, Paris and even to London and Palestine. Their position was briefly improved during Prince Miloš's second rule in his effort to extend 'freedom and wellbeing to the entire population of this country, regardless of faith and ethnicity'.⁶² In 1861 Prince Mihailo bowed to the pressure of Serbian merchants and issued a decree ordering the displacement of Jews from the interior of the Principality of Serbia and by 1865 local Jews were essentially banned from working in shops owned by Jews with other citizenships outside of Belgrade. In Belgrade, their property rights were limited to the township within the town moat and it was not until 1856 that they were expanded to the entire city of Belgrade and its outskirts.⁶³ The legal discrimination of Jews gradually led to attacks against them in the press and eventually the British consul in Belgrade intervened to urge Prince Mihailo to suppress them.⁶⁴ Based on these discriminatory laws, Jews in Serbia/Belgrade were also 'domestic foreigners' – they were 'natives' because they were expected to abide by local laws, and foreigners because they did not enjoy full civil rights, with the exception of the brief period of Prince Miloš's second rule and his decree on Jews, which suspended existing anti-Jewish regulations (1859–1861). Their attempts to prove to the authorities that they – 'Евреји и поданици србски' – had been unlawfully denied their constitutional and legal rights to equality, earning livelihood, and freedom to settle in the entire territory

⁶² Quoted in: И. Шланг, *Јевреји у Београду*, 81.

⁶³ Ženi Lebl, *Do „konačnog rešenja“*. *Jevreji u Beogradu 1521–1942*, Beograd 2001, 82, 85–87, 128–129; Б. Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду*, 302–303, 306, 324–325, 343; Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе*, 179, 274; *Зборник закона* 30 (1877) 340–341.

⁶⁴ И. Шланг, *Јевреји у Београду*, 82–84; Небојша Поповић, *Јевреји у Србији 1918–1941*, Београд 1997, 18–20; See also: Никола С. Јовановић, *О јеврејском питању у Србији*, Београд 1879.

of the state remained unsuccessful until the Congress of Berlin (1878), which forced Serbia to make them equal to other citizens.⁶⁵

Discriminated in anti-Jewish laws and motivated by economic interests, Jews sometimes identified as foreigners – subjects of the Ottoman Empire or Habsburg Monarchy. In the 1854 population census, for example, 82 Jews renounced Serbian citizenship in favor of Ottoman. Turkish authorities in the Principality were willing to grant them Ottoman citizenship. Jews who renounced their Serbian citizenship on that occasion had indeed mostly come to Serbia from the Ottoman Empire (Vidin, Sofia, Thessaloniki, Bosnia, Herzegovina, or Albania), although some had moved from Vienna (Avram Jakov Eškinazi). However, some were from Belgrade, with three that had even been born in the city (David Ruso, Avram Farki, Isak Be Solomon), and yet they identified as foreign subjects (foreigners). This was not a new phenomenon. Fifteen years earlier, for the same reasons some Jews stated that they identified as Austrian subjects and even asked the Austrian consulate to officially grant them Austrian citizenship. Others claimed they were in fact Austrian citizens, although they were Serbian subjects; in a bid to avoid discrimination, others received foreign citizenships but kept their property in Belgrade (in violation of law), securing a status similar to modern dual citizenship.⁶⁶ These actions suggest that a change of citizenship could be motivated by tax exemptions, especially when it served to avoid general discrimination; and on the other hand, that citizenship was relatively unimportant in building personal identity. However, renouncing Serbian citizenship does not seem to have been a widespread practice, since the Jewish population of Belgrade remained relatively stable. The fact that in 1850 Serbia closed its borders to Jewish émigrés from the Ottoman Empire at least partially contributed to this, and prevented a more noticeable growth in the number of Jewish foreigners.⁶⁷

*

Taxpayer status certainly played a major role in the perception of an individual as a foreigner or local, as evidenced by changes in self-determination and identification of Gypsies. By renouncing levies specific to their ethnic group and accepting general tax duties, in the first half of the 19th century

⁶⁵ Ž. Lebl, *Do „konačnog rešenja“*, 96–98, 101, 146; Б. Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду*, 324.

⁶⁶ Б. Перуничкић, *Управа вароши Београда*, 314–319; *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 311; Н. Христић, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, 182, 190–191; Б. Храбак, *Јевреји у Београду*, 327, 330.

⁶⁷ Н. Мишковић, *Базари и булевари*, 184.

Gypsies were included into the Serbian population body, at least in the case of Gypsy Christians (who were the majority). In 1822, Stanoje Jovanović, among others, was granted release from the Gypsy tax and Gypsy name and accepted into the ranks of Serbs („ослобођава од циганског арача и имена циганскога и ставља се у ред Србаља“) (authors' emphasis).⁶⁸ These allowed them to bear a 'Serbian name' and forbade anyone from referring to them as Gypsies and inviting them to Gypsy meetings.⁶⁹ Later on, however, the 'Gypsy name' was no longer associated with taxpayer status. And although Gypsies were made equal to Serbs in terms of their tax status in 1853, their new tax status did not automatically make them Serbs. From the 1840s, the taxpayer status of Gypsies became dependent on their property and sedentary way of life. Owning property and adopting sedentism were seen as prerequisites for joining the taxpaying body of the Principality of Serbia, while selling property and returning to a traveling lifestyle led to changes in personal taxpayer status, i.e. reintroduction of the special Gypsy tax.⁷⁰ This implicitly suggests that the willingness of the Serbian community to accept Gypsies as part of their own people had declined by the mid-19th century compared to the early years of the same century.

*

In the first half of the 19th century, natives in Serbian towns even saw some subjects of their own state as foreigners – both those from the suzerain

⁶⁸ Т. Р. Ђорђевић, *Архивска грађа за насеља у Србији*, 27; *Књажевска канцеларија*, vol. II, *Крагујевачка нахија 1815–1839*, I, 1815–1827, ed. Радосав Марковић, Државна архива НР Србије, Грађа, vol. V, book 1, Београд 1954, 164, 184–185; Јован Гавриловић, *Речник географско–статистични Србије*, ed. Милорад Радевић, Београд 1994, 158. The fact that a change of taxpayer status was seen as a change of nationality is attested by the words of Prince Miloš, who refused to change the taxpayer status of a Gypsy whose father had already made use of this possibility. To justify his decision, Miloš stated that he adhered to the principle that a Serb should remain a Serb and a Gypsy should remain a Gypsy, adding that everyone should pay the tax determined by his nationality: „себи основание положио [сам], Србин да Србином свагда остане, а Циганин Циганином; кад га отац његов посрбио није, ја га заиста не могу, него свакиј онај данак да даје и кулук да чини ка којој нацији принадежи“ (*Протокол кнеза Милоша Обреновића 1824–1825*, 59–60).

⁶⁹ Михаило Гавриловић, *Милош Обреновић*, vol. II, (1821–1826), Београд 1909, 389.

⁷⁰ *Живети у Београду*, vol. 1, 275; Бранко Перуничкић, *Насеље и град Смедерево*, Смедерево [1976], 680; *Зборник закона VII* (1854) 69–70. Like Jews, Gypsies were isolated in Belgrade and usually lived on the outskirts of the town, in Gypsy neighborhoods (*Историја Београда*, vol. II, 523 (В. Стојанчевић); *Ž. Lebl, Do „kopačnog rešenja“*, 85).

Ottoman Empire and, in some circumstances, the subjects of the Principality of Serbia. Settlers from the Ottoman Empire were almost always seen as foreigners, as were some native groups (primarily Jews). Since the society of the Principality of Serbia had yet to become fully integrated, surprisingly nationality was not seen as criterion that determined if someone was a native. Those who were not members of a local guild in a town were more or less seen as foreigners, regardless of their citizenship and nationality. From the mid-19th century on, the status of a foreigner began to be increasingly identified with the status of a subject, particularly in hiring civil servants. The society remained divided based on cultural models, primarily the cultural differences between Turks and Christians or Jews and gentiles, as well as between educated newly settled Serbs and natives, and native Serbs educated in the West and their primary social milieu.

With the rise of the nation-state, standardization of language, national literature, science and culture, integration of subjects was implemented through the Serbification of culture, faith and population. Differences between native and newly settled Serbs increasingly faded, as did the gap between the 'Eastern Orthodox' and 'Greek' faith, with Aromanians and Greeks, most of whom had come from the Ottoman Empire, also Serbified. The notion of a 'foreigner' eventually came to be seen in the modern sense – a person who had come from another country, usually a member of a different nation. Only Jews remained 'domestic foreigners' with limited entrepreneurial and civil rights despite being subjects of the Principality of Serbia.

ЛИСТА РЕФЕРЕНЦИ – LIST OF REFERENCES

Извори – Primary Sources

- Гавриловић Јован, *Речник географско–статистични Србије*, ed. Милорад Радевић, Београд 1994. [Gavrilović J., *Rečnik geografsko–statistični Srbije*, ed. M. Radević, Beograd 1994]
- Ђорђевић Тихомир Р., *Архивска грађа за насеља у Србији у време прве владе кнеза Милоша (1815–1839)*, Српски етнографски зборник, vol. XXXVII, прво одељење, Насеља и порекло становништва, vol. 22, Београд–Земун 1926. [Đorđević T. R., *Arhivska građa za naselja u Srbiji u vreme prve vlade kneza Miloša (1815–1839)*, Srpski etnografski zbornik, vol. XXXVII, prvo odeljenje, Naselja i poreklo stanovništva, vol. 22, Beograd–Zemun 1926]
- Ђорђевић Т. Р., *Архивска грађа за занате и еснафе у Србији од Другог устанка до Еснафске уредбе 1847. године*, Српски етнографски зборник, vol. XXXIII, друго одељење, Живот и обичајни народни, vol. 15, Београд 1925. [Đorđević T. R., *Arhivska građa za zanate i esnafe u Srbiji od Drugog ustanka do Esnafske uredbe 1847. godine*, Srpski etnografski zbornik, vol. XXXIII, drugo odeljenje, Život i običajni narodni, vol. 15, Beograd 1925]
- Живети у Београду 1837–1841*, документа Управе града Београда, vol. 1, ed. Мирослав Јовановић et al, Београд 2003. [*Živeti u Beogradu 1837–1841*, dokumenta Uprave grada Beograda, vol. 1, ed. M. Jovanović et al, Beograd 2003]
- Живети у Београду 1842–1850*, документа Управе града Београда, vol. 2, ed. Мирослав Јовановић et. al, Београд 2004 [*Živeti u Beogradu 1842–1850*, dokumenta Uprave grada Beograda, vol. 2, ed. M. Jovanović et al, Beograd 2004]
- Законик грађански за Књажество Србско обнародован на Благовести 25. марта 1844*, Београд s. a. [1844] [*Zakonik građanski za Knjažestvo Srbsko obnarodovan na Blagovesti 25. marta 1844*, Beograd s. a. /1844/]
- Књажеска канцеларија. Јагодинска нахија*, vol. II, 1823–1830, ed. З. Марковић, Љ. Поповић, Јагодина 2008. [*Knjažeska kancelarija. Jagodinska nahija*, vol. II, 1823–1830, ed. Z. Marković, Lj. Popović, Jagodina 2008]
- Књажеска канцеларија*, vol. II, *Крагујевачка нахија 1815–1839*, book I, 1815–1827, ed. Р. Марковић, Државна архива НР Србије, Грађа, vol. V, book 1, Београд 1954. [*Knjažeska kancelarija*, vol. II, *Kragujevačka nahija 1815–1839*, book I, 1815–1827, ed. R. Marković, Državna arhiva NR Srbije, Grada, vol. V, book 1, Beograd 1954]
- Перуничич Бранко, *Београдски суд 1819–1839*, Београд 1964. [Peruničić B., *Beogradski sud 1819–1839*, Beograd 1964]
- Перуничич Б., *Насеље и град Смедерево*, Смедерево s. a. [1976] [Peruničić B., *Naselje i grad Smederevo*, Smederevo s. a. /1976/]
- Перуничич Б., *Управа вароши Београда 1812–1912*, Београд 1970. [Peruničić B., *Uprava varoši Beograda 1812–1912*, Beograd 1970]
- Протокол кнеза Милоша Обреновића 1824–1825*, ed. В. Крестић, Н. Петровић, Српска академија наука и уметности, Архив Србије, посебна издања, vol. CDLX, Одељење историјских наука, vol. 1, Београд 1973. [*Protokol kneza Miloša Obrenovića 1824–1825*,

- ed. V. Krestić, N. Petrović, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Arhiv Srbije, posebna izdanja, vol. CDLX, Odeljenje istorijskih nauka, vol. 1, Beograd 1973]
- Сборник закона и уредба и уредбени указа издани у Књажеству Србији (=Зборник закона), I (Београд 1840); IV (1849); VI (1853); VIII (1856); XIV (1862); XVII (1865); 30 (1877) [Sbornik zakona i uredba i uredbeni ukaza izdani u Knjažestvu Srbii (=Zbornik zakona), I (Београд 1840); IV (1849); VI (1853); VIII (1856); XIV (1862); XVII (1865); 30 (1877)]*
- Христић Коста Н., *Записи старог Београђанина*, s. a. and s. l. [Београд 1923] [Hristić K. N., *Zapisi starog Beograđanina*, s. a. and s. l. /Beograd 1923/]
- Христић Никола, *Мемоари 1840–1862*, Београд 2006. [Hristić N., *Мемоари 1840–1862*, Beograd 2006].
- Шурмин Ђуро, *Документи о Србији од 1842–1848*, Споменик Српске краљевске академије LXIX, други разред, 54 (1929) 16–61. [Šurmin Đuro, *Dokumenti o Srbiji od 1842–1848*, Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije LXIX, drugi razred, 54 (1929) 16–61]

Литература – Secondary Works

- Bilig Majkl, *Banalni nacionalizam*, tr. V. Kostić, Biblioteka XX vek, book 175, Beograd 2009.
- Božić Jadranka, *Ostvarenje Jastva/Sopstva i nesvodljivosti Drugog: etički bezdan susreta s Drugim*, Etnološko-antropološke sveske 15 (2010) 79–92.
- Burke Peter, *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy, Essays on perception and communication*, New York 1987.
- Vasiljević Jelena, *Ideje građanstva i politike državljanstva – izazovi antropološkoj imaginaciji*, Etnološko-antropološke sveske 20 (2012) 105–115.
- Dajč Haris, Vasiljević Maja, *Status Jevreja u osmanskom i habzburškom Beogradu (XVII–XVIII vek): stranci, manjine ili saradnici?* Limes plus 10/2 (2013) 85–104.
- Đorđević Živorad, *Čukur–česma 1862. Studija o odlasku Turaka iz Srbije*, Beograd 1983.
- Jovanović Vladimir, 'Good' Turks and 'Evil' Ones: Multiple Perspectives on the Turkish Community Reflected in Serbian Sources of the Early Nineteenth Century, El Prezente. Studies in Sephardic Culture, vol. 7, MENORAH, collection of Papers, vol. 3, Common Culture and Particular Identities: Christians, Jews and Muslims in the Ottoman Balkans, editors Eliezer Papo, Nenad Makuljević, Belgrade 2013, 77–94.
- Krestić Petar V., *Political and Social Rivalries in Nineteenth-century Serbia: Švabe or Nemačkari*, Balcanica XLI (2010) 73–92.
- Lebl Ženi, *Do „konačnog rešenja“: Jevreji u Beogradu 1521–1942*, Beograd 2001.
- Pavlović Vojislav, *Influence culturelle de la France en Serbie à l'époque des „Ustavobranitelji“*, in: Југословенско-француски односи. Поводом 150 година од отварања првог француског конзулата у Србији, Историјски институт, зборник радова, vol. 10, Београд 1990, 103–111 [Pavlović, V., *Influence culturelle de la France en Serbie à l'époque des „Ustavobranitelji“*, in: Jugoslovensko-francuski odnosi. Povodom 150 godina od otvaranja prvog francuskog konzulata u Srbiji, Istorijски институт, zbornik radova, vol. 10, Beograd 1990, 103–111]
- Prošić-Dvornić M., *Odevanje u Beogradu u XIX i početkom XX veka*, Beograd 2006.
- Ristić Ljubodrag P., Miljković Katić Bojana, *Ottoman-Serbian Cuisine and West-European Influences – An Ambience of Contacts and Disaccords – First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, in: Debata o kuhinji – Kitchen Debate, Ed. by: Oskar Habjanič, Katarina Šrimpff Vendramin, Valentina Bevc Varl, Collection Museoeurope 4, Maribor 2017, 168–177 (available at: <http://www.museoeurope.si>).
- Stojanović Trajan, *Pogledi na Nas/Vas i na Drugoga*, Beograd 1999.

- Todorova Marija, *Imaginarni Balkan*, tr. D. Starčević, A. Bajazetov-Vučen, Biblioteka XX vek, book 103, Beograd 1999.
- Ubicini Abdolonyme, *Constitution de la Principauté de Serbie*. Annotée et expliquée par A. Ubicini, Paris 1871.
- Ubicini A., *Les Serbes de Turquie. Études historiques, statistiques et politiques sur la Principauté de Serbie, le Montenegro et les pays Serbes adjacent*, Paris 1865.
- Батаковић Душан Т., *Француски утицаји у Србију 1835–1914. Четири генерације „паризлија“*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 56 (1997) 73–95. [Bataković D. T., *Francuski uticaji u Srbiji 1835–1914. Četiri generacije „parizlija“*, Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju 56 (1997) 73–95]
- Вучо Никола, *Београдски еснафи у деветнаестом веку*, Годишњак Музеја града Београда III (1956) 135–164. [Vučo N., *Beogradski esnafi u devetnaestom veku*, Godišnjak Muzeja grada Beograda III (1956) 135–164]
- Деретић Јован, *Пут српске књижевности. Идентитет, границе, тежње*, Београд 1996. [Deretić J., *Put srpske književnosti. Identitet, granice, težnje*, Beograd 1996]
- Дурковић-Јакшић Љубомир, *Аустрија и питање јурисдикције над римокатолицима у Кнежевини Србији, 1851–1860*, Историски гласник 2 (1956) 44–56. [Durković-Jakšić Lj., *Austrija i pitanje jurisdikcije nad rimokatolicima u Kneževini Srbiji, 1851–1860*, Istoriski glasnik 2 (1956) 44–56]
- Гавриловић Михаило, *Милош Обреновић*, књ. II, (1821–1826), Београд 1909. [Gavrilović M., *Miloš Obrenović*, vol. II, (1821–1826), Beograd 1909].
- Ђорђевић Димитрије, *Србија и Београд у време оснивања Народног позоришта*, in: Један век Народног позоришта у Београду, Београд 1968, 29–39. [Đorđević D. *Srbija i Beograd u vreme osnivanja Narodnog pozorišta*, in: Jedan vek Narodnog pozorišta u Beogradu, Beograd 1968, 29–39]
- Ђорђевић Тихомир, *Из Србије кнеза Милоша – културне прилике од 1815. до 1839. године*, Београд 1922. [Đorđević T., *Iz Srbije kneza Miloša – kulturne prilike od 1815. do 1839. godine*, Beograd 1922]
- Ђорђевић Т., *Из Србије кнеза Милоша – становништво – насеља*, Београд 1924. [Đorđević T., *Iz Srbije kneza Miloša – stanovništvo – naselja*, Beograd 1924]
- Ђорђевић Т. Р., *Србија пре сто година*, Културна историја, vol. II, Београд 1946. [Đorđević T. R., *Srbija pre sto godina*, Kulturna istorija, vol. II, Beograd 1946]
- Екмечић Милорад, *Србија између Средње Европе и Европе*, Београд 1992. [Ekmečić M., *Srbija između Srednje Evrope i Evrope*, Beograd 1992]
- Јовановић Слободан, *Уставобранитељи и њихова влада*, in: Сабрана дела Слободана Јовановића, Т. 3, ed. Р. Самарџић, Ж. Стојковић, Београд 1990. [Jovanović S., *Ustavobranitelji i njihova vlada*, in: Sabrana dela Slobodana Jovanovića, ed. R. Samardžić, Ž. Stojković, Beograd 1990]
- Јовановић Никола С., *О јеврејском питању у Србију* (Прештампано из „Заставе“), Београд 1879. [Jovanović Nikola S., *O jevrejskom pitanju u Srbiji* (Preštampano iz „Zastave“) Beograd 1879]
- Караџић Вук Стефановић, *Срби сви и свуда*, Ковчежић за историју, језик и обичаје Срба сва три закона I, Беч 1849 [Karadžić V. Stefanović, *Srbi svi i svuda*, Kovčežić za istoriju, jezik i običaje Srba sva tri zakona I, Beč 1849]
- Крестић Петар, *„Швабе“ или „немачкари“ у Сербским Народним новинама Теодора Павловића*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 49 (1994) 31–43. [Krestić P., *„Švabe“ ili „nemačkari“ u Serbskim Narodnim novinama Teodora Pavlovića*, Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju 49 (1994) 31–43]

- Куниберт Бартоломео, *Српски устанак и права владавина Милоша Обреновића 1804–1850*, Издање Илије М. Колараца, vol. 96, tr. М. Р. Веснић, Београд 1901. [Kunibert B., *Srpski ustanak i prava vladavina Miloša Obrenovića 1804–1850*, Izdanje Ilije M. Kolaraca, vol. 96, tr. M. R. Vesnić, Beograd 1901]
- Лопичић Ђорђе Н., *Конзуларни односи Србије (1804–1918)*, Београд 2007. [Lopčić Đ. N., *Konzularni odnosi Srbije (1804–1918)*, Beograd 2007]
- Љубинковић Ненад, *Студија Душана Ј. Поповића О Цинцарима – пре седамдесетак година и данас*, in: Д. Ј. Поповић, О Цинцарима. Прилози питању постанка нашег грађанског друштва, Треће издање са 30 слика и једном картом, Београд 2008, 521–560. [Ljubinković N., *Studija Dušana J. Popovića o Cincarima – pre sedamdesetak godina i danas*, in: D. J. Popović, O Cincarima. Prilozi pitanju postanka našeg građanskog društva. Treće izdanje sa 30 slika i jednom kartom, Beograd 2008, 521–560]
- Љушић Радош, *Димитрије Давидовић – секретар кнеза Милоша Обреновића*, Зборник Матице српске за историју 32 (1985) 51–69. [Ljušić R., *Dimitrije Davidović – sekretar kneza Miloša Obrenovića*, Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju 32 (1985) 51–69]
- Љушић Р., *Историја српске државности*, vol. II, *Србија и Црна Гора – нововековне српске државе*, Нови Сад s. a. [2001] [Ljušić R., *Istorija srpske državnosti*, vol. II, *Srbija i Crna Gora – novovekovne srpske države*, Novi Sad s. a. /2001/]
- Љушић Р., *Кнежевина Србија (1830–1839)*, САНУ, посебна издања, vol. DLXX, Одељење историјских наука, vol. 12, Београд 1986. [Ljušić R., *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, SANU, posebna izdanja, vol. DLXX, Odeljenje istorijskih nauka, vol. 12, Beograd 1986]
- Љушић Р., *Турско наслеђе у Кнежевини и Краљевини Србији*, in: Ислам, Балкан и Велике силе (XIV–XX век), Историјски институт Српске академије наука и уметности, зборник радова, vol. 145, Београд 1997, 279–292. [Ljušić R., *Tursko nasleđe u Kneževini i Kraljevini Srbiji*, in: Islam, Balkan i Velike sile (XIV–XX vek), Istorijski institut SANU, zbornik radova, vol. 145, Beograd 1997, 279–292]
- Макуљевић Ненад, *Визуелна култура и приватни идентитет православних хришћана у 18. веку*, in: Приватни живот у српским земљама у освит модерног доба, ed. Александар Фотић, s. I. [Београд] 2005, 72–111. [Makuljević N., *Vizuelna kultura i privatni identitet pravoslavni hrišćana u 18. veku*, in: Privatni život u srpskim zemljama u osvit modernog doba, ed. A. Fotić, s. I. [Beograd] 2005, 72–111]
- Макуљевић Н., *Османско-српски Београд: визуелност и креирање градског идентитета (1815–1878)*, Београд 2014. [Makuljević N., *Osmansko-srpski Beograd: vizuelnost i kreiranje gradskog identiteta (1815–1878)*, Beograd 2014]
- Мидлих Ханс-Михаел, *Патријархални менталитет као сметња државне и друштвене модернизације у Србији XIX века*, Историјски часопис XXXVIII (1991) 111–129. [Miedlich Hans-Michael, *Patrijarhalni mentalitet kao smetnja državne i društvene modernizacije u Srbiji XIX veka*, Istorijski časopis XXXVIII (1991) 111–129]
- Милићевић Јован, *Народне скупштине у Србији 1839–1843. године*, Зборник Филозофског факултета IV–1 (Београд 1956) 157–195. [Milićević J., *Narodne skupštine u Srbiji 1839–1843. godine*, Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta IV–1 (Beograd 1956) 157–195]
- Миљковић Бранислав, *Београд прве половине XIX века у делима књижевника*, Годишњак Музеја града Београда III (1956) 205–220. [Miljković B., *Beograd prve polovine XIX veka u delima književnika*, Godišnjak Muzeja grada Beograda III (1956) 205–220]
- Миљковић Катић Бојана, *Структура градског становништва Србије средином XIX века*, Историјски институт, посебна издања, vol. 36, Београд 2002. [Miljković Katić B., *Struktura gradskog stanovništva Srbije sredinom XIX veka*, Istorijski institut, posebna izdanja, vol. 36, Beograd 2002]

- Мишковић Наташа, *Базари и булевари. Свет живота у Београду 19. века*, Музеј града Београда, посебна издања, vol. 7, Београд с. а. [Mišković N., *Bazari i bulevari. Svet života u Beogradu 19. veka*, Muzej grada Beograda, posebna izdanja, vol. 7, Beograd s. a.]
- Пејтон Ендру Арчибалд, *Србија, најмлађи члан европске породице или Боравак у Београду и путовања по планинама и шумама унутрашњости 1843. и 1844. године*, тр. Б. Момчиловић, Нови Сад 1996. [Pejton E. A., *Srbija, najmlađi član evropske porodice ili Boravak u Beogradu i putovanja po planinama i šumama unutrašnjosti 1843. i 1844. godine*, tr. B. Momčilović, Novi Sad 1996]
- Пирх Ото Дубислав, *Путовање по Србији у години 1829*, Просвета, Библиотека Баштина, vol. 1, Београд 1983. [Pirh O. D., *Putovanje po Srbiji u godini 1829*, Prosveta, Biblioteka Baština, vol. 1, Beograd 1983]
- Поповић Душан Ј., *О Цинцарима. Прилози питању постанка нашег грађанског друштва*, Треће издање са 30 слика и једном картом, Београд 2008. [Popović D. J., *O Cincarima. Prilozi pitanju postanka našeg građanskog društva. Treće izdanje sa 30 slika i jednom kartom*, Beograd 2008]
- Прошић-Дворнић Мирјана, *Вечерње забаве (балови) у Београду крајем XIX и почетком XX века*, Етнолошка свеска V (Београд 1984) 23–32. [Prošić-Dvornić M., *Večernje zabave (balovi) u Beogradu krajem XIX i početkom XX veka*, Etnološka sveska V (Beograd 1984) 23–32]
- Радосављевић Недељко, *Ужице, град и нахија – окружје у времену страха (1788–1862)*, Ужице 2013. [Radosavljević N., *Užice, grad i nahija – okružje u vremenu straha (1788–1862)*, Užice 2013]
- Ристић Љубодраг П., *Велика Британија и Србија (1856–1862)*, Српска академија наука и уметности, Балканолошки институт, посебна издања, vol. 102, Београд 2008. [Ristić Lj. P., *Velika Britanija i Srbija (1856–1862)*, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Balkanološki institut, posebna izdanja, vol. 102, Beograd 2008]
- Скерлић Јован, *Симо Матавуљ: „Београдске приче“*, in: Писци и књиге, vol. I, Прикази и чланци, ed. Ј. Пејчић, Београд 2000. [Skerlić J., *Simo Matavulj: „Beogradske priče“*, in: Pisci i knjige, vol. I, Prikazi i članci, ed. J. Pejčić, Beograd 2000]
- Слијепчевић Ђоко, *Историја Српске православне цркве*, vol. II, *Од почетка XIX века до краја Другог светског рата*, Београд 1991. [Slijepčević Đ., *Istorija Srpske pravoslavne crkve*, vol. II, *Od početka XIX veka do kraja Drugog svetskog rata*, Beograd 1991]
- Стојанчевић Видосава, *Етнички састав становништва 1815–1830. године*, in: Историја Београда, vol. II, ed. Васа Чубриловић, Београд 1974, 513–524. [Stojančević V., *Etnički sastav stanovništva 1815–1830. godine*, in: Istorija Beograda, vol. II, ed. Vasa Čubrilović, Beograd 1974, 513–524]
- Трговчевић Љубинка, *Планирана елита. О студентима из Србије на европским универзитетима у 19. веку*, Историјски институт, посебна издања, vol. 43, Београд 2003. [Trgovčević Lj., *Planirana elita. O studentima iz Srbije na evropskim univerzitetima u 19. veku*, Istorijски институт, posebna izdanja, vol. 43, Beograd 2003]
- Ћелап Лазар, *Поступак са аустријским поданицима у Србији у време кнеза Милоша и Уставобранитеља*, Годишњак града Београда XIV (1967) 351–370. [Čelap L., *Postupak sa austrijskim podanicima u Srbiji u vreme kneza Miloša i Ustavobranitelja*, Godišnjak grada Beograda XIV (1967) 351–370]
- Храбак Богумил, *Јевреји у Београду до стицања равноправности (1878)*, Етнолошка библиотека, посебна издања, vol. 4, Београд 2009 [Hrabak, B., *Jevreji u Beogradu do sticanja ravnopravnosti (1878)*, Etnološka biblioteka, posebna izdanja, vol. 4, Beograd 2009]

- Чубриловић Васа, *Београд – национално и културно средиште Србије у XIX веку*, in: *Ослобођење градова у Србији од Турака 1862–1867. год.* Зборник радова приказаних на научном скупу Српске академија наука и уметности, одржаном од 22. до 24. маја 1967. год. у Београду поводом прославе 100-годишњице ослобођења градова, Београд 1970, 217–242. [Čubrilović V., *Beograd – nacionalno i kulturno središte Srbije u XIX veku*, in: *Oslobodenje gradova u Srbiji od Turaka 1862–1867. god.* Zbornik radova prikazanih na naučnom skupu Srpske akademija nauka i umetnosti, održanom od 22. do 24. maja 1967. god. u Beogradu povodom proslave 100-godišnjice oslobođenja gradova, Beograd 1970, 217–242]
- Шешум Урош, *Арбанаси у Поморављу 1815–1834*, in: *Алексинац и околина у прошлости, 500 година од првог писаног помена, 1516–2016*, зборник радова са Међународног научног скупа одржаног 3. септембра 2016. године у Алексинцу, Алексинац 2016, 125–154. [Šešum U., *Arbanasi u Pomoravlju 1815–1834*, in: *Aleksinac i okolina u prošlosti, 500 godina od prvog pisanog pomena, 1516–2016*, zbornik radova sa Međunarodnog naučnog skupa održanog 3. septembra 2016. godine u Aleksincu, Aleksinac 2016, 125–154]
- Шешум У., *Насељавање Србије у Првом српском устанку*, in: *Српски народ на Балканском полуострву од 6. до 20. века*, ed. С. Недељковић, Ниш 2014, 211–225. [Šešum U., *Naseljavanje Srbije u Prvom srpskom ustanku*, in: *Srpski narod na Balkanskom poluostrvu od 6. do 20. veka*, ed. S. Nedeljković, Niš 2014, 211–225]
- Шешум У. С., *Србија и Стара Србија (1804–1839)*, Београд 2017. [Šešum U. S., *Srbija i Stara Srbija (1804–1839)*, Beograd 2017]
- Шланг Игњат, *Јевреји у Београду*, Београд 1926. [Šlang I., *Jevreji u Beogradu*, Beograd 1926]

**Бојана Миљковић Катић
Љубодраг П. Ристић**

**„ДОМАЋИ СТРАНЦИ“.
ПРОЦЕСИ АКУЛТУРАЦИЈЕ И ЕНКУЛТУРАЦИЈЕ
У СРБИЈИ ПРВЕ ПОЛОВИНЕ 19. ВЕКА**

Резиме

Истраживањем процеса акултурације и енкултурације у Кнежевини Србији уочени су у варошкој средини прве половине 19. века различити степени прихватања дошљака или грађења дистанце према досељеним припадницима истог и другог народа. Пошто друштво још увек није било интегрисано, прихватање или дистанцирање није било у тешњој вези с националном припадношћу досељеника, као што би се очекивало. Потпуно прихватање обезбеђивало је једино чланство у еснафу. Сви који нису били чланови еснафа у матичној вароши били су за тамошњу чаршију у мањој или већој мери странци, независно од држављанства или националности. Иако је Кнежевина Србија била део Османског царства, поданици тог царства сматрани су такође странцима и у српској и у муслиманској средини.

Од средине века основ интеграције нађен је у држављанству, које је постало *conditio sine qua non* за бављење државном службом, а потом и у мекој асимилацији. Јачањем националне државе, јачала је и стандардизација језика, национална књижевност, наука и култура интегришући народ у нацију. Међусобна условљеност политике и јавног дискурса потенцирала је интеграцију поданика на основу србизације културе, вере и становништва. У све већој мери брисана је разлика не само између староседелаца Срба и Срба досељеника, већ и разлика између „источно-православне“ и „грчке“ вере, па су србизовани и цинцарски и грчки трговци досељени већином из Османског царства. Појам странац почео се разумевати у данашњем смислу речи – човек, најчешће припадник другог народа, који је дошао из друге државе. Само су још Јевреји остали „домаћи странци“, пошто су им до 1878. године била ограничена и пословна и грађанска права, иако су били поданици Кнежевине Србије.

Кључне речи: Кнежевина Србија, досељеници, „домаћи странци“, држављанство, акултурација, енкултурација.

Чланак примљен: 30. 03. 2018.

Чланак коначно прихваћен за објављивање: 12. 06. 2018.

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

93/94

ИСТОРИЈСКИ ЧАСОПИС = Historical Review / одговорни уредник Срђан Рудић. –
1948 – . – Београд : Историјски институт, 1948 – (SAJNOS доо Нови Сад). – 24 cm
Годишње

ISSN 0350-0802 = Историјски часопис
COBISS.SR-ID 3687170