

## WHO IS A SERB? Internal Definitions and External Designations

by Milan V. Dimić (Edmonton, Taipei)

revised edition of: Dimić, Milan V.: *Who is a Serb? A Survey of Internal Definitions and External Designations*. In: Waugh, Earle/Dimić, Milan V. (Eds.): *Diaspora Serbs: A Cultural Analysis*. Edmonton/AB: M.V. Dimić Research Inst. Univ. of Alberta 2004, pp. 15-54, pp. 281-307.

1 Nankov's article suggested this motto, as well as some of the theoretical considerations involved in a discussion of national identity. Cf. Nankov, Nikita: *Narratives of National Cultural Identity: The Canonization of Thomas Eakins*. In: *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue de Littérature Comparée* 27/1-2 (2000), pp. 94-127.

2 Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović: *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkim i latinskim riječima [Lexicon Serbico-Germanico-Latinum]*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [identical with the 3<sup>rd</sup>] Beograd: Državno izdanje 1935.

3 Another possible translation is »Nation«; the connotations and implications of the two terms will be discussed later in the article.

4 *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Ed. by Djuro Daničić, Petar Budmani, Tomislav (Toma) Maretić et al. 23 vols. Vol. 16/1 (1956-1958). Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademija 1880-1976, p. 185.

5 In: *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 712f.

6 *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*. 6 vols. Vol. 5 (1973). Novi Sad, Zagreb: Matica Srpska; Matica Hrvatska 1967-1976, p. 959.

7 In: *ibid.*, vol. 6 (1976), p. 747.

8 I am limiting myself to English language examples; entries in German, French, Russian, and Italian dictionaries are of the same kind, so that quoting them would be redundant.

9 *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary*. Ed. by F.G. Fowler and H.W. Fowler. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Ed. by J.B. Sykes. Oxford: Clarendon Pr. 1978.

10 *Chambers Maxi Paperback Dictionary*. Ed. by Catherine Schwarz et al. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers 1992 [rpt. 1993].

11 *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*. Ed. by Philip Babcock Gove. Springfield/Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co. 1971.

*Thus, we choose our past in the light of a certain end, but from then on it imposes itself upon us and devours us.*  
(Jean-Paul Sartre: *Being and Nothingness*, tr. Hazel E. Barnes)<sup>1</sup>

Dictionaries, as one might have predicted after reading Derrida, are either tautological or offer perpetually deferred meanings. Some, as for instance that by Bakotić, do not include words for nationalities, such as *Srbin* or *Hrvat*, or their derivatives. Karadžić, who is famously informative about folkloric terms as *vrzino kolo* (a kind of devilish Sabbath) and *vukodlak* (vampire), tells only that a *Srb*, *Srbalj*, *Srbin*, *Srbinj*, *Srbljin*, [*Srbljak*, *Srbljanin*, *Srbo*] is *der Serbe*, *Serbus*; a *Hrvat* [*Rvat*] is *der Kroat*, *Croata*.<sup>2</sup> The encyclopaedic dictionary on historical principles of the Croat or Serb language (*Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*), begun for the Zagreb Yugoslav (now Croat) Academy by Daničić and continued by Budmani, Maretić and other distinguished philologists, is more explicit and states as follows: »SRB, S'rb, S'rbā. m. pripadnik naroda, koji govori istim jezikom kao Hrvati i koji se smjestio u sjeverozapadnom dijelu Balkanskog poluostrva i pripada južnim Slovenima. O doseleju Srba vidi s.v. *Hrvat*.« [*»SRB, S'rb, S'rbā. m. Member of a people<sup>3</sup> who speak the same language as the Croats and who settled in the north-western part of the Balkan Peninsula and who belong to the south Slavs. About the settlement of the Serbs cf. *Hrvat*.«*]<sup>4</sup> Before proceeding to the usual linguistic information and illustrative quotations, the article offers then a useful short list of historical uses of the Serbian name, as well as a brief survey of scholarly speculations about its origin and meaning. The much older article on *HRVĀT*, *Hrváta* is structured in a similar way, but begins as follows:

[...] čovjek iz jednoga od dviju plemena (drugo su Srbi) iz kojih se sastoji naš narod. po Konstantinu Porfirogenetu Hrvati i Srbi dodjoše VII vijeka odñekle (iz Češke? Poljske? Rusije?) sa sevjera i naseliše se u našim stranama, te granice kod Hrvata odgovaraju dosta dobro granicama sadašnjih štokavaca zapadnoga govora, ali istina pripadali bi im po istome piscu i neki čakavci (n.pr. u hrvatskom primorju) i kajkavci. I za čakavce po otocima i po dalmatinskom primorju, koji se dandanašnji drže da su čisti Hrvati, ne zna se po Porfirogenetu kojemu plemenu pripadaju; [...] istina je svakako da Porfirogenet miješa etnografke i političke granice.

[...] person belonging to one of the two tribes [the other are the Serbs] which constitute our people. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus the Croats and Serbs came from somewhere (from Czech territory? from Poland? from Russia?) in the North and settled in our lands. The boundaries for the Croats correspond quite well to the boundaries of the present western variant of *štokavian* speech, but it is true that according to the same writer to them belong also some *čakavians* (e.g. on the Croatian coast) and *kajkavians*. And for the *čakavians* on the islands and on the Dalmatian coast, who are considered today to be pure Croats, according to Porphyrogenitus it is not known to which tribe they belong; (...) the truth is assuredly that Porphyrogenitus confuses ethnographic and political frontiers.]<sup>5</sup>

The article then summarizes alternative theories (current in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century) about the arrival of the Slavs on the Balkans, but sides basically with the Byzantine sources.

The more recent large dictionary of the Serbo-Croat language, published in Novi Sad and Zagreb by the *Matica Srpska* and *Matica Hrvatska* states simply: »*S'rbī*, *S'rbā* m. mn. (jd. *S'rbīn*, redje *S'īb*) narod iz grupe južnih Slovena čija većina živi u SR Srbiji.« [*»Serbs, Serbian m. pl. (sing. Serb, more rare Srb) people belonging to the group of South Slavs, with a majority living in the Socialist Republic of Srbija.«*]<sup>6</sup> The entry under *Hrváti* (Croats) is identical in structure and scope of its information.<sup>7</sup>

Foreign dictionaries offer similar pointers; their scope depends on the publication's character.<sup>8</sup> *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English* is suitably short: »Serb(ian) (Native, language) of Serbia.«<sup>9</sup> *Chambers Maxi Paperback Dictionary* states similarly: »Serb or Serbian a native or citizen of Serbia (formerly a kingdom, now a republic of Yugoslavia); a member of the people principally inhabiting Serbia; the South Slav language of Serbia.«<sup>10</sup> *The Webster's Third International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*<sup>11</sup> restricts Serb and Serbian or Servian to »a native or inhabitant of the former kingdom of Serbia or of the federal republic of Serbia in Yugoslavia« (a Croat or Croatian is equally »a native or inhabitant of the former



12 The Compact Oxford English Dictionary: Complete Text Reproduced micrographically. Ed. by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Clarendon Pr.; New York: Oxford UP 1991.

13 Grand dictionnaire encyclopédique Larousse. 10 vols. Vol. 9. Paris: Larousse 1982-1988, p. 9505. – A few other examples will have to suffice. For instance, the Brockhaus Enzyklopädie. 19<sup>th</sup> ed. 24 vols. Vol. 24. Mannheim: Brockhaus 1993 affirms: »Serben, serbokroat. Srbi, südslaw. Volk«, and offers population figures in the previous republics of Yugoslavia, with a brief history of the settlement in the Balkan, which follows Byzantine sources. The final sentence is: »Die S., im 9. Jh. durch Schüler des Slawenapostels Methodios missioniert, sind heute überwiegend orth. Christen.« In: Vol. 20 s.v. *Serben*.

The Bol'shaja Sovetskaja Enciklopedija. 51 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Moskva 1948-1958 [also: 30 vols. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Moskva, 1970-1978] specifies: »Serby, narod, prinadležašćij k gruppe južnyh slavjan, blizkih horvatam (sm.). V vidu obščnosti proišoždenija oboih narodov oni neredko ob'edinjajutsja pod obščim nazvanijem serbo-horvatov. Odnako istorič. razvitie oboih narodov šlo različnymi putjami: vznikšee v 10 v. horvatskoe gosudarstvo primknulo k rimsko-katolič. cervki i zapadno-evropejskoj kul'ture, primjav latinskoe pis'mo, togda kak S., dolgoe vremja kolebavšiesja meždu Rimom i Vizantiej, v 13 v. okončatel'no prisoeđinilis' k pravoslaviju, usvoiv kirillicu i vizantijskiju kul'turu.« In: Vol. 50 s.v. *Serby*. The Encyclopædia Universalis, 20 vols. Paris: Encyclopædia Universalis France 1968-1975, plus 4 vols. and yearly supplements 1974-2001 under *Serbie* presents a historical survey of the Serbian state(s) and in its Thesaurus adds geographic and economic facts about the FR of Serbia.

14 The Canadian Encyclopedia. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 4 vols. Edmonton: Hurtig Publ. 1988 [1985]; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc. 2000, p. 1142. – While accepted by and applied in the past and present to many Serbs, this definition seems to preclude the belief by Vuk Karadžić, Ilija Garašanin, and other prominent intellectuals and politicians that the Serbs are, nevertheless, a nation with three religions (Orthodox, Catholic, and Muslim); also it does not account for those who write in the (adapted) Latin script and those who today, under the influence of secularized modernity and the half century of Communist rule, have become estranged from the church and conscious atheists or at least agnostics. While understandable in the light of Pavlovich's interpretation of history (cf. Pavlovich, Paul: *The Serbians: The Story of a People*. Toronto: Serbian Heritage Books 1983) and of the role

Austrian province of Croatia or of the federal republic of Croatia in Yugoslavia«). *The Shorter Oxford Dictionary on Historical Principles*, derived from the great OED<sup>12</sup>, traces Serb and Serbian in the English language to *Servian* (1862) and the meaning »a native or inhabitant of Serbia; the language of Serbia« (there is no entry under »Croat« or »Croatian«). Most of these designations are approximative and sometimes misleading; it is difficult to evaluate how these statements, as well as those in encyclopaedias, may have influenced private opinions and public debates about the different nations, their territories and history.

Encyclopaedias are, of course, more explicit and more detailed; they direct readers to historical facts about nations and explain in that way the customary usage of such terms, but nowadays do not attempt any essentialist definition. Typical is the opening statement of the *Grand dictionnaire encyclopédique Larousse*: »Les Serbes forment un rameau des Slaves du Sud (ou Yougoslaves). Avec leurs frères de race, les Croates et les Slovènes, [...] les Serbes s'en différencient progressivement sous l'influence des dominations politiques et des Églises.«<sup>13</sup>

*The Canadian Encyclopedia*, in its articles *Croatians* and *Serbs*, distinguishes the two groups from each other, and other immigrants, indirectly – by place of origin, history, religion, language, and other characteristics. The article *Serbs*, by Paul Pavlovich in the recent *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples* defines the Serbs in a rather exclusionary way:

[Serbs] are adherents of the Eastern Orthodox branch of Christianity, and, like other Orthodox Christians, they have traditionally used the Cyrillic alphabet. The Orthodox religion has historically been the main characteristic that distinguishes Serbs from their linguistically related neighbours, the Roman Catholic Croats and Bosnian Muslims, and Serbs share this faith with Orthodox Macedonians and Bulgarians.<sup>14</sup>

Yugoslav encyclopaedias are usually more detailed, although often with a similar range of information. The *Narodna enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenačka* under *Srbi*, ahead of its historical coverage, offers two articles,<sup>15</sup> by necessity inconclusive, on the origin and name of the nation. The same encyclopaedia presents under *Hrvat* a similar article by Novak,<sup>16</sup> while the history is covered under the term *Hrvati*. The Belgrade publisher Prosveta's first post-World War II *Mala enciklopedija* prudently only speaks of Serbian history in the article on *Srbija* (Serbia), without any definition.<sup>17</sup> The ambitious Zagreb based *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* opens its coverage of Serbs (*Srbi*) with a contribution on »Ethnic development«,<sup>18</sup> with a survey of essential facts and theories but without a bibliography. (The coverage of the Croats [*Hrvati*] begins with a similar contribution on their »Name« [*Ime*], which contains a detailed bibliography.<sup>19</sup>) The equally ambitious *Vojna enciklopedija*, published about the same time in Belgrade, reverts to the practice of Prosveta and includes only an article on Serbian history under the heading of *Srbija*.<sup>20</sup>

Dictionaries, lexicons, and encyclopaedias are supposed to summarize objectively the relevant facts. Inevitably, they reflect the state of scholarship at the time of their publication; they also reproduce in their omissions and selective inclusions political and other considerations prevalent at certain places at a given time. Nevertheless, handbooks of this kind, when the full entries are taken into account, seem to be unanimous in certain assertions, otherwise frequently contested by politicians and sometimes by scholars. These are, for instance, the statements that both Serbs and Croats are of Slavic origin and, if this information is provided, that they migrated to the Balkans during the early Middle Ages. They differ in the assessment how close these nations (tribes) and their languages are to each other; they hesitate greatly how to account for the Serbs who lived, or are still living, outside of the state (kingdom or republic) of Serbia, with its changing frontiers, and in designating their religion and script. Here one can already perceive some of the fault-lines of polemics about Serbian and Croat and other ethnic relations, and their history in general. While much of the conflicting views are the direct result of fluctuating ideological and political positions, some can be attributed also to the lack of data and their inconclusive character, as well as to the very nature of such concepts as nation and people.

Contemporary studies of nations and nationalism, at least since the books by Armstrong<sup>21</sup> and Anderson<sup>22</sup> and up to the recent overview by Wehler<sup>23</sup>, have demonstrated that, as a rule, notions of national identity are constructs which evolve over time; these, and many other studies have also shown, often with glee, how concepts of this kind can be deconstructed and how historical memory involves a process of selective amnesia. Studies, published over the last two or three decades, have proven to the satisfaction of most scholars that such concepts as





Plaice, Stephen Plaice, and Paul Knight. Cambridge MA: MIT Pr. 1995, p. xxvii.

26 Boym, Svetlana: *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books 2001, p. xvi.

27 French and German works of the mediaeval and later Renaissance and Baroque literature, for instance, contain clear manifestations of national pride and frequent moral and other disparagements of neighbours.

28 Karadžić 1935.

29 Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika 7 (1911-1916), pp. 587-590.

30 Rječnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika 3 (1969), p. 612f.

31 The historical examples of this usage begin in the *Rječnik*, both in the Croatian and Serbian linguistic space, with the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

32 In: *ibid.* Vol. 3 (1969), p. 656.

33 All available census data from the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries confirm this heterogeneity; some of the data are reproduced in standard Serbian, Croatian, Yugoslav, and foreign encyclopaedias. (Methods and categories adopted in the various censuses vary greatly and have been criticized as problematic, even biased, and unreliable.)

34 Cf., e.g., Lazarovich-Hreblianović, Prince, with Princess Lazarovich-Hreblianovich (Eleanor Calhoun): *The Servian People: Their Past Glory and Their Destiny*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1910, under *The Servian Race*. Vol. 1, p. 3ff.; Cvijić, Jovan: *La Péninsule balkanique: Géographie humaine*. Paris: Arman Colin 1918; Cvijić, J.: *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje: osnovi antropogeografije*. Prev. s franc. Borivoje Drobñaković. Beograd: Državna štamparija 1922; Cvijić, J.: *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje: osnovi antropogeografije*. II: Psihičke osobine južnih Slovena. Prev. s franc. Borivoje Drobñaković, ispravke i dopune Jovan Erdeljanović. Beograd: Izdavačka knjižarnica Gece Kona 1931. (2. izd., Beograd, 1966); Cvijić, J.: *Studies in Yugoslav Psychology* 1, 2, and 3. In: *Slavonic and East European Review* 9 (1930/31), pp. 375-390, pp. 662-681; 10 (1931), pp. 50-79; Cvijić, J.: *Opšta geografija*. Antropogeografija. Ed. by Milovan Radovanović. Srpsko geografsko društvo. Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika 1969 [Previously unpubl. MS from 1901]; Cvijić, J.: *Antropogeografski spisi*. Ed. by Milišav Lutovac. In: *Sabrana dela*. Ed. by Mihailo Maletić and Dragutin Ranković. Vol. 4. Beograd: Srpska akade-

In spite of such vicissitudes, the Serbian name and, probably, the feeling of belonging to a distinct and defined traditional community seems to predate history; in any case it is strongly vouchsafed throughout recorded times. The oldest explanation of the name Serb (*Srbi/n*) is offered by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, who derives it from the Latin *servus* (although he is aware that the name is older than any contact with either the Western or Eastern Roman Empire).<sup>35</sup> Dobrovský and Šafárik derived the name first from the Sarmats, then from *ser-* (sansk. *su*) = to be born, kins, people. Daničić<sup>36</sup> saw the root in *sar, sarbh* = protector or fighter. Later, Županić<sup>37</sup> related *sur* or *ser* to Caucasian languages, and the terms *ser-bi* or *sur-bi*, meaning men or people (according to this hypothesis both the Croats and the Serbs were originally of a non-Slavic origin). There were also attempts to relate the (Balkan) Serbs and the »White« Serbs – Lužički Srbi or Lužani (German Lausitzer Serben or Sorben, also called Wenden), who since the early Middle Ages lived in the heart of present Germany and who still speak two main West-Slavic dialects, one akin to the Polish and the other to the Czech language.<sup>38</sup>

The Slavic tribes and nations, taken as a whole, are ultimately of uncertain origin and come from diversely designated territories, although most probably from the basin of the Dnieper and the region extending to the Carpathians and the Vistula. They are first mentioned by the Alexandrian scholar Ptolemy (about AD 100-178) and more frequently and specifically since the 6<sup>th</sup> century of the Christian era. Older linguists usually related their name to *slava* (glory) and more recent ones to *slovo* (word), i.e. the Slavs can speak, while in contrast the Germans are »dumb« (*nemci*). It should be noted that the oldest historical references to the Slavs were made under the designation Wends (Venedi), so for instance by Pliny (*Nat.hist.*, IV 97), Tacitus (*Germania* 46) and Ptolemy (*Geographike* III 57). At no time were linguists in agreement about the number of Slavic languages or their names; in addition to philological reasons, they were divided by other considerations, such as religion and politics.

The oldest historical mention of the Serbs is in Plinius the Elder (1<sup>st</sup> century AD), the next in the geographer Vibius Sevester (6<sup>th</sup> century AD), and afterwards quite frequently by historians from Byzantium (for instance Prokopios, Jordanes, and the aforementioned Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus [1<sup>st</sup> half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, in his *De administrando imperio*]). The first clear non-Roman or Byzantine reference to their name dates from Einhard's *Annals of the Franks* (in the year 822). In any case, it is assumed that, after dwelling in the South-West of present Ukraine, or some adjacent territory, the Serbs (and other Slavs of the Balkans) began to move westwards in the 4<sup>th</sup> and at the latest in the 5<sup>th</sup> centuries; they arrived at the north shores of the Danube in the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. Historians are divided about the exact time of their arrival in the Balkan Peninsula: while some propose the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries, others set a later, 7<sup>th</sup> century date; a few even claim that the Serbs were native to this region.<sup>39</sup>

According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the emperor Heraclius (610-40) invited the Serbs to settle in the devastated northwestern provinces of the Byzantine Empire and to defend them against the Avars. In any case, the Slavs had become firmly established throughout the Balkans by the late 7<sup>th</sup> century, but their dominance in the area was a long and erratic process, as was the period of their cultural assimilation under Roman and Byzantine rule. During the 7<sup>th</sup> century the Serbs became the object of Greek, Roman, and Armenian historians. As mentioned before, certain scholars conjecture that the Serbs (and Croats) were originally a non-Slavic warrior tribe that conquered larger Slavic populations and became assimilated, a process similar to the much later origin of the Bulgars.

Serbs entered parts of their present territory at the latest in the 7<sup>th</sup> century AD, settling in six distinct tribal delimitations: present-day Western Serbia and Northern Montenegro, Bosnia (indistinct from Rascia until the 12<sup>th</sup> century), Neretva/Pagania (middle Dalmatia), Zachumlie/Zahumlje (western Hercegovina), Trebounia/Travunija (eastern Hercegovina), and finally Zeta (predecessor to Montenegro). The Croats also probably arrived from the North, during the early 7<sup>th</sup> century (the exact date is not known), and were christianized in the 9<sup>th</sup>, but without being obliged to use Latin in masses and at first writing with the Glagolic alphabet. In addition to the various conjectures about their ethnic roots and the origin of their name, the Croats of the Balkans are related by some historians to the White Croats (Bielo-Chorvats, Croatia Alba), also mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus; these apparently had a kingdom in the 10<sup>th</sup> century around present Kraków and stretching into Bohemia and Ukrain.

The Balkan Slavs, on the frontier between the Western Roman Empire and the Byzantine Empire, exposed to invasions by semi-nomadic peoples of Asia, acquired a measure of inde-



mija nauka i umetnosti etc. 1987; Cvijić, J.: Balkansko poluostrvo. Ed. by Vasa Čubrilović. In: *ibid.* Vol. 2. 1987; Cvijić, J./Andrić, Ivo: O balkanskim psihološkim tipovima. Ed. and comm. by Petar Džadžić. Beograd: Prosveta 1988; Niederle, Lubor: La Race slave: Statistique – démographie – anthropologie. Trad. du tchèque par Louis Leger. Paris: Alcan 1911 (2<sup>ème</sup> éd. 1916); Niederle, L.: Manuel de l'antiquité slave. Vol. 1: L'Histoire; vol. 2: La Civilisation. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion 1923-1926; Radosavljević, Paul R.: Who are the Slavs? A Contribution to Race Psychology. 2 vols. Boston: Badger 1919; Gesemann, Gerhard: Volkscharaktertypologie der Serbokroaten. *Jb. der Charakterologie* 5 (1928), pp. 207-270 [rpt. in Gesemann, G.: *Ges. Abhandlungen*. Vol. 2. Ed. by Wolfgang Gesemann and Helmut Schaller. Neuried: Hieronymus 1983 (Selecta Slavica 8), pp. 171-244]; Lebzelter, Viktor: Rasse und Volk in Südosteuropa: Eine paläo-ethnographische Studie. In: *Mitteilungen der Anthropolog. Ges.* in Wien 59 (1929), pp. 61-126; Kászonyi, Franz: Rassenverwandschaft der Donauvölker. Zürich, Wien: Amalthea 1931; Ancel, Jacques: Essai d'une psychologie des peuples balkaniques. In: *Les Balkans* 4/8-9 (1933), pp. 1-10; Czekanowski, Jan: Zur Rassenkunde der Serbokroaten. In: *Slav. Rundschau* 6 (1934), pp. 393-404; Dvorniković, Vladimir: Karakterologija Jugoslovena. *Čovečanstvo* 2. Beograd: Kosmos-Geca Kon 1939; Coon, Carleton Stevens: *The Races of Europe*. New York: Macmillan 1939; Miskiewicz, Brunon: Anthropologische Struktur der mazedonischen Bevölkerung. Mit einer Einl. v. Heinrich Schade. *Polska Akademia Nauk, Materiały i prace antropologiczne* 62. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk 1961; Hecker, Hans: Völkerpsychologische Gesichtspunkte zur osteuropäischen Geschichte: Methodologische Ansätze zur Charakterisierung der Völker Osteuropas in der Zeitschrift *Ethnopsychologie. Revue de psychologie des peuples*. In: *Jb. für Geschichte Osteuropas* 25 (NS 3) (1977), pp. 364-785; Jovanović, Bojan (Ed.): *Karakterologija Srba*. Beograd: Naša knjiga 1992; Jovanović, B.: *Karakter kao sudbina: Studije iz etnopsihologije*. Beograd: Narodna knjiga 2004 [also interview with the author: *Senke na ljudskoj sreći: Prošlost u sadašnjosti – Bojan Jovanović*. In: *Politika*, 26.03.2005 (web-site)] and others.

35 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus: *De administrando imperio*. Greek text ed. by Gy. Moravcsik. Engl. transl. by R.J.H. Jenkins. New, rev. ed. Washington/D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies 1967 [1985 printing].

36 Daničić, Dj[uro]: *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih*. 3 vols. Beo-

pendence. The basis of the Serbian social organisation was the *zadruga*, or extended family; several *zadrugas* were grouped under a *župan* (chieftain or duke), and the *župans*, who vied to control the Serbs for centuries, sometimes united under a *veliki župan* (grand chieftain or duke). History reports, for example, that the first *župan* was Višeslav (century AD 760) and that his great-great-grandson Mutimir accepted Orthodox Christianity in 879. Vlastimir created the first larger state in about 850: it covered an area in eastern Montenegro and southern Serbia known as Raška. Toward the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the political centre of Serbs was transferred to Zeta (Montenegro) and the seacoast (*primorje*). The early Serb proto-states already established the enduring link between the people and the Slavonic liturgical tradition of Orthodox Christianity, in spite of the substantial influence of the Church of Rome on Serbs living in coastal and western regions and of the sporadic relations between Popes and Serbian rulers.

After a turbulent and historically not always clear past, with shifting territorial attributes, Croatia emerged, it is usually accepted, as an independent nation in 924, when Tomislav established himself as the first king of Croatia, ruling a domain that stretched from the Croatian heartland to the Danube and Dalmatia.

In the 7<sup>th</sup> century, Croats and Serbs settled in the land that now makes up Bosnia and Hercegovina. Dominance of the region shifted among the Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Byzantine and, much later, Hungarian rulers for centuries. The heretical Bogomil faith, a dualistic offshoot of Christianity, strongly influenced Bosnian politics. Ban Kulin (1180-1204) and other nobles, struggling to broaden Bosnian autonomy, rejected both the Catholic and Orthodox faiths. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Bosnia became a formidable state under the rule of Ban Stefan Tvrtko I (1353-91). He joined Bosnia with the principality of Hum (a forerunner of Hercegovina), and attempted to unite the South Slavs under his rule: after the Nemanja dynasty expired in 1371, Tvrtko was crowned King of Bosnia and Raška in 1377, and he conquered parts of Croatia and Dalmatia. His troops fought beside the Serbs at Kosovo Polje. During the centuries of Ottoman rule, many of the local Slavs (previously Serbs and Croats) converted to the Muslim faith.

A look at mediaeval Slavic texts is quite revealing of the linguistic usages of the times, as well as of the attempts to conceptualize, and deal with, questions of nationality and citizenship. In the Balkans, they show a fairly early use of terms designating various nationalities and their territories, including a very steady appearance of the various variants and spellings of »Serb« and »Serbian«.40 A substantial list is provided in the *Rječnik* (vol. 16);41 in addition to state and church documents of the rulers belonging to the Nemanjić dynasty, there are explicit documents from Dubrovnik and even a decree issued by the Turkish sultan Murat II (in 1430).42

In the 9<sup>th</sup> century, one of the earliest and most beautiful of Slavic written poems, the *Prologue (Proglas)* to the Gospels, believed to have been written by Constantine-Cyril, the Apostle to the Slavs (827-869), still addresses itself to all the Slavs collectively (»listen all Slavs«).43 The Slavs in the Balkans were first approached by missionaries sent by Rome, but later were mostly exposed to missionaries coming from Constantinople, representing the Eastern Orthodoxy. After the final schism of Christianity, this became one of the lasting divisions in the Peninsula.

Almost three centuries later, in 1208, *The Life of Nemanja* (St. Simeon) by his son St. Sava (Rastko Nemanjić), speaks of Stephan Nemanja as »ruler of all Serbian lands« (*vsee srbskiv zemlje*),44 justifying his rule with God's will and the right of inheriting his forefathers. At least rhetorically, St. Sava's text establishes an identity between the concepts of rightfully inherited lands (whatever their geographic designation) and Serbian lands:

God [...] appointed this thrice blessed man, truly our lord and father, named Stephan Nemanja, to rule over all the Serbian land (*vseju srbskoju zemljeju*) [...]. And he restored his patrimony and he consolidated it further [...], and he raised up his ruined patrimony, and of the coastal land he acquired [...], and from Albania he got [...], and from the Greek land he got [...] he acquired all these places which were part of his patrimony and belonged to him as Serbian land (*srbskije zemlje*), but which had been lost because of war.45

Only a few years later, in 1216, the other *Life of Nemanja*46 (St. Simeon) by his elder son Stephan Provenčani, the king, is more political than spiritual in its main aims. The narrative, as a whole and in its parts, emphasizes the unity of state and nation. The subject of the two hagiographies, Stephan Nemanja, in his famous charter (endowment) of the Hillandar Monastery on

grad 1863-1864 [rpt. Graz: Akad. Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt 1962].

37 Županić, Niko M.: Le Sang et la race yougoslave. Avec 1 carte et 6 planches hors texte. Paris 1919 .

38 Cf. Feng-fang, Tsai: Germany's Sorbian Minority: A Case Study of Germany's Language Policy. In: Taiwan News, 03.03.2003, p. 7 and 04.03.2003, p.7 [summary of a Ph.D for the Graduate Inst. of Cultural Anthropology and European Ethnology Frankfurt/M.] about the persistent attempts to Germanize the Lužički Srbi, Sorben, Wenden, which continue into the present; also Škekić, Draško: Sorabi: Istorijopis. Saborna sfera. Beograd, Podgorica: Sfairos-Timor 1994. – In favour of this hypothesis are Šafárik and Müllenhoff, but against Zeuss, Jireček and many others; cf. Jireček, [Josip] Konstantin/Radonić, Jovan: Istorija Srba. I. Politička istorija do 1537 godine. II Kulturna istorija. 2 vols. Vol. 1. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Beograd: Naučna knjiga 1952 [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 4 vols. Beograd: Geca Kon 1922/23], p. 41 and p. 61f.

39 The thesis that »the Serbs are the oldest nation [on the Balkans]« was first formulated by the late-Byzantine historian Laonicos Chalcocondyl (writing in the 1480s); it is today usually developed with a political purpose and includes attacks on a presumed German and Vatican inspired historiography that is perceived as dominant in both the Western and Slavic academe. (For a polemical attack on this attitude cf. Radić, Radivoj: Srbi pre Adama i posle njega: Istorija jedne zloupotrebe, Slovo protiv »novoromantičara«. Beograd: Stubovi kulture 2003; Radić, R.: »Klio se stidi.« Istoriografija na udaru nezalaza: Slovo protiv »novoromantičara«. In: Politika, 05.09.2003, web-site). Among the innumerable historians who basically accept the mainstream Byzantine version about the Slavic arrival in the Balkans cf., e.g., Ostrogorski, Georgije: Vizantija i Sloveni. Beograd: Prosveta 1970; Ostrogorski, G.: Istorija Vizantije. Sabrana dela Georgija Ostrogorskog 6. Beograd: Prosveta 1996 [rpt. with additions, of ed. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga 1959]; about Laonicos Ostrogorski 1996, p. 437f.

40 The designations Raška and Rašani (Rascienses) were particularly used by the Hungarian court and the Vatican, and quite seldom internally or by the Byzantine authorities and writers (as amply documented by Jireček/Radonić 1952, Vol. 1, p. 459f., Vol. 2, p. 348ff., and others).

41 *Srbel, Srbija* (first in 1430), *Srbini* (uninterrupted usage since Domentian), *Srbjanin, Srbjin, Sribl, Sribl* (in the meaning »Serbian land« since

Mt. Athos, highlighted the importance of the language for the nation: »After lost battles and lost wars, the nation [people] remain. After the language is lost, there is no nation [people].«<sup>47</sup>

In 1219 St. Sava obtained from the weakened Patriarch the autonomy of the Serbian Church, i.e. the establishment of an independent, autocephalous national church, which included in its official designation the name of the nation. This proved to be the single most important event in Serbian state and cultural life during the Middle Ages, at a time when culture, including education, was largely the domain of the Church. It also sealed the link between the Serbs and Eastern Orthodoxy, after about half a century of simultaneous tentative contacts with Roman Catholicism: according to some historians, the founder of the dynasty, Nemanja, was first baptized according to the Western rites and later according to those of the Greek Church; his son Stephan received his crown first from the West and then from the East. St. Sava and his brother probably acted mostly out of contemporary geopolitical considerations but their choice influenced the whole subsequent history of their nation, although Serbian kings, when fearing Byzantine might, repeatedly attempted to reach political and religious accommodations with the Holy See.

In an early example of a long series of decrees regulating the relations between Serbs and merchants from Dubrovnik, king Stephan designates his subjects as *Sr'blinom'* (1222-1228 – the same term is used by king Stephan Uroš in a proclamation of privileges for the merchants from that city, 1240-1272). During the 13<sup>th</sup> century the gifted monk Theodosius (Teodosije) wrote in the monastery Hillandar, on the basis of a previous biography by the monk Domentian, *The Life of Saint Sava*. The biography praises Sava as a Serbian saint and diplomat.

When Stephan Dušan Nemanjić proclaimed himself emperor in 1346, he took the title of emperor of Serbs and Greeks (*car Srbljem i Grkom*), a title which in itself reflects the mediaeval understanding of national differences. His famous Law Code (from 1349, with supplements in 1354) is quite relevant for our topic.<sup>48</sup> It should be noted that the Law Code was used in all Serbian regions, well beyond the time of the Empire.<sup>49</sup>

The first 38 articles in the 1349 Code, out of a total of 135, are devoted to the religion and the Church. The very first article proclaims the necessity of »purging Christianity« (*da se včisti hristijanst'vo*); articles 6 to 8 speak about Roman Catholics as »Latin heretics« (*eres' latinskoi*) and other articles, for example 9, call them »half-believers« (*polouver'ci*). The Codex, otherwise for the times a progressive synthesis of Byzantine jurisprudence and Serb common law, enumerates harsh punishments for those who remain obdurate Catholics or, even worse, Bogumils (article 10), who have to be branded on the face and driven off. Still, the same Code is protective towards travelling Dubrovnik merchants and immigrant Saxon miners (*o saseh*), all or most of whom were Catholics.<sup>50</sup> Although the Codex decrees heavier fines for the Vlachs and Albanians (*vlahom' i ar'banasom*) than for Serbs (article 77), it is also protective of them and recognises them as a special group.

The term »Vlach« was subjected over time to peculiar transformations. The Vlachs were, initially at least, of Romanian origin; later, this became a term designating shepherds, both Romanian and Serb (article 32, cf. article 82).<sup>51</sup> The Ottoman Turks later often called all Christians Vlachs. Still later, the term was used by Catholic and Croatian writers to designate, sometimes in a neutral way and sometimes pejoratively, all Serbs, especially those of the Orthodox creed.

In the Codex, the nobility is identified as Serb and Greek (*sr'blje i gr'cii*, article 39) and Greek, German, and Serb (*gr'k', nem'c', and sr'bin'*, article 173). The terms »Serb« or »Serbs« are used in articles 39, 153, and 173, as well as in the text appended to the Code. This autobiographic text, known as *The Word of Emperor Dušan about his Code (Reč cara Dušana uz njegov zakonik)*,<sup>52</sup> proclaims him, in an enumeration which includes other areas such as the West and the littoral, as the »emperor of all Serbs and Greeks and of Bulgarian lands [...] and Albanians« (*car' V'sem' Sr'bljem' i Gr'kom' i Stranam' bl'gar'sk'iim' [...] i Aravanitom'*)<sup>53</sup>; the same text refers to his father, Uroš III, as ruler of »all Serbian lands and the littoral«<sup>54</sup>. Finally, the Code (for instance articles 132 and 133), and the additional text clearly distinguish between »our lands« and »foreign lands« (*touge zemlje*).

The apparent contradiction in the Code between the legal and religious exclusion of all those subjects who are not Orthodox (*pravoslavni*) and the tolerance of Catholic foreigners has lead historians to propose diverse and complex interpretations. It seems to me that the inner logic resides in the equation of citizenship in the newly proclaimed Empire of the Serbs and Greeks with the belonging to Orthodox Christianity, which was the religion of the vast majority of its inhabitants, while foreigners were allowed to preserve the beliefs and rites of their

1300) – all in vol. 16/1. In this article I am quoting only a few of the best-known examples that illustrate the evolution of mediaeval concepts of nationality and statehood.

42 For the historical context of the texts quoted here I am mainly indebted to Jireček/Radonić 1952 and Srejović, Dragoslav/Gavrilović, Slavko/Čirković, Sima et al. (Eds.): *Istorija srpskog naroda*. 6 parts in 10 vols. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga 1981-1993 [ I. Od najstarijih vremena do Maričke bitke (1371). II. Doba borbi za očuvanje i obnovu države (1371-1537). III Srbi pod tuđinskom vlašću, 1537-1699. 2 vols. IV. Srbi u XVIII veku. 2 vols. V. Od Prvog ustanka do Berlinskog kongresa, 1804-1878. 2 vols. VI. Od Berlinskog kongresa do ujedinjenja, 1878-1918. 2 vols.].

43 Butler, Thomas: *Monumenta Serbocroatica: A Bilingual Anthology of Serbian and Croatian Texts from the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> century*. Michigan Slavic Publ.: Joint Committee on Eastern, European Publ. Ser. 6. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan 1980, p. 7.

44 For technical reasons, my transliterations of mediaeval Slavic and Serb texts are approximations; this would not satisfy a philological study, but should suffice for the exploration of meanings and semantic fields.

45 Butler 1980, p. 39f.; cf. Pavlović, Dragoljub/Marinković, Radmila (Eds., tr. & com.): *Iz naše književnosti feudalnog doba*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Sarajevo: Svetlost 1959, p. 53.

46 Sava [Saint] [Rastko Nemanjić]/Prvovenčani [Nemanjić], Stefan: *Spisi svetoga Save i Stevana Prvovenčanog*. Preveo L. Mirković. Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Jugoslavije 1939.

47 Stojanović, Ljubomir: *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi, skupio ih i sredio*. Ed. by Sima Čirković. 6 Vols. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti 1982-1988 [1902-1922].

48 A survey of the preserved MSS i.a. in Radojčić, Nikola: *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana 1349 i 1354*. Ed. & tr. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti/Naučno delo 1960, pp. 1-24, and of the published versions and translations *ibid.*, pp. 25-39.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 29.

50 Cf. e.g. §§ 121-123, 153, 159, 160; also Butler 1980, p. 95, p. 98ff.

51 For the philological documentation cf. Radojčić 1960, p. 97 n. 2. A contemporary web-site, consulted on 18.04.2003, *The Little Vlach Corner* (<http://bastian.freeyellow.com/>

states of origin.<sup>55</sup> If my understanding of this presumed paradox is correct, this would be an early example of the principle »*cuius regio, eius religio*«, a principle adopted in the *Treaty of Augsburg* (1555) and confirmed in the *Treaty of Westphalia* (1648) as a way of ending the Thirty Years War.

The privileges of emissaries and merchants from Dubrovnik are confirmed in a number of other Serbian documents and treaties, so in an edict by Balša, the Duke of Drač, from the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>56</sup> and in an edict by Stephan Prince Lazar Hrebeljanović, from 1387, two years before the fateful battle of Kosovo.<sup>57</sup> Both mention their traditional rights as granted by previous Serb rulers and the emperor Dušan. The order issued by Prince Lazar clearly distinguishes between Serbs and citizens of Dubrovnik living in or passing through his country; it also mentions as his own subjects, or as people living in his lands, Saxons, Vlachs »or who ever else« (*ili či gode človek*).<sup>58</sup>

From 1404 dates *The Life (Žitije) of Stephan Dečanski* by Grigorije Camblak,<sup>59</sup> the much travelled Bulgarian writer and theologian, who for a while was the abbot of the monastery of Dečani and who later became the archbishop (*mitropolit*) of Kiev. At the very beginning of the biography, Camblak equates language and nationality. He uses the term »tongue«, i.e., *ezik*, in the meaning of »nation«: »He [i.e., Stephan the Serbian, MD] was of the great and most glorious Serbian nation. Not only did it surpass other nations in military force [...] (»Bše i se velikaago i slavnjeišago srpskago ezika, ne tkmo konistvninmi silami drougih ezika prvshoditi [...]«).<sup>60</sup> Dictionaries of Old Slavonic and etymological dictionaries of modern Slavic languages show that in both Old Slavonic and Church Slavonic, for centuries, the term *ѣзыкъ* combined the two fields of meaning: mother tongue and nation. This dual meaning is now rare, but not impossible;<sup>61</sup> it may be of some relevance to the modern discussions about the concept of a nation and its dependence on language.

Mediaeval texts mentioned by me, and others largely too repetitive to be quoted here,<sup>62</sup> demonstrate that the Serbs – and other peoples in the region – had a contrastive vision of two basic human categories: »us« and »the others«, as well as of the fact that not only in foreign countries but also under the same ruler there are groups and individuals who belong to both categories. These texts show also that the rulers and their officials tried, while privileging one element or different combinations of elements, a multiplicity of definitions of »us«, referring to common ancestry and inheritance, language, religion, citizenship, and territory. There is also a clear continuity of such designations from the early Serb statehood to its decadence and destruction by the Ottomans.

From the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and the battles at the Marica River and the Kosovo field to the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century, the Ottoman Empire extended its administrative and other powers over the whole previous territory of the Serbian state(s) and well beyond into Bosnia and parts of Croatia and Hungary. The invasion and occupation led to large waves of migrations of Serbs to the west and north, especially to the border (*krajina*) regions of the Austrian empire, as well as to arrivals of new ethnic populations.<sup>63</sup> Some of those under the Habsburg rule over time joined the Catholic faith, while those under the Ottoman occupation frequently, especially in Bosnia and Hercegovina, accepted Islam. Gradually, these migrations created a new Serb centre of gravity to the north of the past kingdom and altered demographic proportions among the inhabitants of the previous, more southern regions such as Kosovo and Metohija, and Macedonia, which were central to the old kingdom. Nevertheless, throughout these movements of large populations, masterfully expressed in Miloš Crnjanski's novel *Seobe (Migrations)*,<sup>64</sup> the Serbs kept their name and sense of identity.<sup>65</sup> In the far-away diaspora of Ukraine there was, for a short while in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, a »New Serbia« or »Slavjanoserbija« (*Novaja Serbija/Slavjanoserbija*).<sup>66</sup> The repeated forced movements of populations created among the Serbs durable feelings of victimization; people already living in the new settlement and border areas entertained at best mixed feelings towards their new neighbours, who although similar to them in language and custom were still so different in religion and other traits of culture, and who at times received crown privileges for their military services.

Folksongs from the 18<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many among them probably of older origin, contain scores of examples for the term »Serb« and its derivatives (for instance in the poem *Propast carstva Srpskoga – The Fall of the Serbian Empire*)<sup>67</sup>.<sup>68</sup> The renewed production of Serbian texts in the 18<sup>th</sup> century resumes the old terminology. The monk Jerotej Račanin describes his 1704 trip from Hungary to Jerusalem; in the travelogue he speaks of the Serbs and their customs.<sup>69</sup> The ambitious but unlucky count Djordje Branković (1645-1711) writes a

littlevlachcorner.html), defines the Vlachs as follows: »The Vlachs (or, as they call themselves, *Aromanians*, *Macedo-romanians* or *Tzantzarii*) are romance-speaking people scattered all over the Balkan Peninsula. Not too many people heard about them, partly because many Vlachs live as wandering shepherds in remote and mountainous areas, partly because of their readiness to merge with other nationalities (the Vlachs are often difficult to distinguish from the medieval Bulgarians or, in modern times, from Greeks or from Serbs).« Cf. also Wace, A.J.B./Thompson, M.S.: *The Nomads of the Balkans, an Account of Life and Customs among the Vlachs of Northern Pindus*. London: Methuen 1914.

52 About this text, its character, and importance cf., i.a., Radojić 1960, pp. 145-162.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 83, n. 142.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 84, n. 142.

55 Cf. Butler 1980, p. 97ff.; Pavlović/Marković 1959, p. 398ff.

56 Butler 1980 p. 107f.

57 *Ibid.*, pp. 109-113.

58 I have not been able to consult yet the first full edition of all preserved edicts and other documents of Prince Lazar, edited by Mladenović, Aleksandar: *Povelje kneza Lazara*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa 2003.

59 Camblak, Grigorij: *Žitije na Stefan Dečanski*. Ed. by Angel Davidov, Georgi Dančev, Nevjana Dončeva-Panajotova, Penka Kovačeva, Todorka Genčeva. Sofija: B'lgarskata Akademija na Naukite 1983.

60 Butler 1980, p. 73; Pavlović/Marković 1959, p. 124f.

61 Cf., e.g., Miklosich, Franz v.: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Amsterdam: Philo Pr. 1970 [rpt.], p. 105 who under *jen-žykü* explains that *język* equals *lingua* and *populus*; similarly Fasmer, Maks: *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Perevod i dopolnenija O.N. Trubačeva. 4 vols. Moskva: Progress 1964-1973, vol. 4., p. 55of. For a 19<sup>th</sup> c. example cf.: »Do groba ne smijem vratiti se u svoj zavičaj, već sam osudjen medju tuđim jezikom trajati dalje.« August Šenoa – quotation offered by the *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika 2* (1967), p. 591, under the 4<sup>th</sup> meaning of *język=narod*.

62 Many more documentary sources could be quoted for the whole period from the high Middle Ages until the renewal of the Serbian state in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, from the West (for

huge unfinished work *Slavensko-srpske hronike (Slavic-Serbian Chronicles)*, in which he speaks of the origin and history of Slavic nations, particularly the Serbs, but also of Vlachs. This is the first attempt of this kind by a Serb; although unpublished, the manuscript was read and frequently copied, so that it reached a considerable audience and it is a valuable source for the state of knowledge at that time.<sup>70</sup> A manuscript of 1736 containing poems about Serbian saints by the Rev. Aleksandar carries the title *Srbljak*.<sup>71</sup> Old Serbian religious manuscripts or printed books, which preferred Serbian Slavonic terms to Russian ones, are beginning to be called *srbulja/srbulje*.

Vasilije Brkić (ca. 1719-1791), the last Serbian patriarch of the Second Peć patriarchy, writes in 1771 for the Russian admiral Orlov (and the Russian secret service) a detailed *Opis turskih oblasti i u njima hrišćanskih naroda, a naročito naroda srpskoga (Description of the Turkish regions and their Christian peoples, and especially of the Serbian people, only published in 1891)*.<sup>72</sup> A few decades later, Petar Runjanin, priest in the village of Kuzmin in Srem, writes a *Povesnica sela Kuzmina (History of the village Kuzmin, published in 1936)*, in which he discusses the arrival of Serbs from Bosnia, Hercegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, and Venician territories during the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>73</sup>

Dositej Obradović (1742-1811), in the opening passage of his famous autobiography *Život i priklučenja (Life and Adventures)*, published in 1783, as well as in the appended *Letter to Haralampije*<sup>74</sup>, appeals for the acceptance in literature of the spoken language, instead of the traditional mixture of spoken Serbian and Russian Slavonic, and equates the nation with the language.<sup>75</sup>

Archbishop Stevan Stratimirović (1757-1839), today best known for his opposition to the reforms proposed by Karadžić, left voluminous notes about Serbs under Ottoman rule, including observations about the spread of Islam in Serbia and Bosnia,<sup>76</sup> and a monograph *O Volohah'* about the Vlachs.<sup>77</sup> The distinguished erudite patron of Serbian culture Sava Tekelija (1761-1842) speaks in his autobiography both about Serbs in Arad, in Austria, and those who emigrated to Russia; with the help of Karadžić, he also published a treatise on the Vlachs.<sup>78</sup>

Terms like »Serb« and »Serbia« are accepted by other South-Slaves, too. In 1756 Andrija Kačić-Miošić, a Croatian Franciscan, publishes *Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga (A Pleasant Discourse about the Slavic People)*<sup>79</sup>; the second edition of 1759 is dedicated to Saint Sava, »born 1169, son of the Serbian king Stephan Nemanja the Great, first Serbian Archbishop, established church administration and laid the foundation for national education. Died in 1237.«<sup>80</sup> In the epic poems, printed in Kačić-Miošić's book, Turks and Muslims designate all Christians as »Vlasi«.<sup>81</sup> The same is the case much later in Ivan Mažuranić's epic poem *Smrt Smail-Age Čengića (The Death of Smail Aga Čengić, 1846)*.<sup>82</sup>

While Kačić-Miošić stresses the ultimate kinship of all South Slaves, Stephan Rajić felt that the linguistic and other differences between Croats and Serbs are sufficient to warrant translations from one language into the other. In 1793 and 1807 he publishes a »Slaveno-Serbian« translation of Marija Antun Reljković's *Satir iliti divlji čovik (Satyr or the Wild Man, 1762)*<sup>83</sup>, which was originally in »*ikavian*« and followed a particular orthography. Reljković (1742-1811) describes quite vividly, in the spirit of the Enlightenment, the customs and beliefs of the Croats and Serbs who lived intermingled in his native Slavonia.

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864) in all his publications uses the term Serbia and Serbs; this is the case also in the oral epic poetry collected by him and others. Although Karadžić did not explore systematically the origin and historical ethnic characteristics of the Serbs as a nation, he did have certain firm convictions about this topic. His strongest declaration appears in an article of 1836, *Srbi svi i svuda (Serbs all and everywhere)*, first published in Vienna in 1849, in the only volume of his journal *Kovčezič za istoriju jezika i običaja Srba sva tri zakona (Small Treasure Chest of the History and Customs of Serbs belonging to all three religions)*.<sup>84</sup> He claims in the article, but already in the title of his periodical that evokes Serbs belonging to three faiths, that not religion or citizenship but language makes a nation, and that Serbs are all those who speak *štokavian* throughout the Austrian and Ottoman lands regardless of their Orthodox, Catholic or Muslim creed. He considered here to be Croats only those who speak *čakavian* and some of those who speak *kajkavian* (the majority is Slovene), while all *štokavians* were Serbs, whether they adopted this name or not.<sup>85</sup>

Basing his judgement on linguistic and, to a lesser extent, on grounds of common customs, Karadžić already held such opinions in 1814, when he published his first collection of folk songs. In the first edition of his dictionary, *Riječnik* (1818), he distinguishes between the gene-



instance the Vatican, Venice, and Hungary) and East (Greece, Bulgaria, Russia, Turkey, and other parts), which explicitly name the Serbs and the Serbian lands.

63 Already in their Balkan early mediaeval past the Serbs were exposed to voluntary and involuntary re-settlements; the former to what constitutes present day Greek territory, the latter to Asia Minor.

64 Crnjanski, Miloš: *Seobe i druga knjiga seoba*. Beograd: SKZ 1962.

65 For settlement in Hungary cf. Radonitch, Yovan: *Histoire des Serbes de Hongrie. Les Serbes de Hongrie. Études historiques et économiques*. Paris et al.: Bloud & Gay 1919, Ivić, Aleksa: *O srpskom i hrvatskom imenu*. Beograd: Knjižarnica B. Cvijanovića 1922; Ivić, A.: *Migracije Srba u Hrvatsku tokom XVI, XVII i XVIII stoleća*. Subotica 1926; Ivić, A.: *Srbi. Istorija Srba u Ugarskoj*. In: *Narodna enciklopedija [Stanojevića]*. Vol. 4 (1929), pp. 317-319; Ivić, A.: *Istorija Srba u Vojvodini od najstarijih vremena do osnivanja potisko-pomoriške granice (1703)*. Novi Sad 1929; and Popović, Dušan J.: *Srbi u Vojvodini. I. Od najstarijih vremena do karlovačkog mira 1699. II. Od Karlovačkog mira 1699 do Temišvarskog sabora 1790. III. Od Temišvarskog sabora 1790 do Blagoveštenskog sabora 1861*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 3 vols. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1990 [first publ: 1957].

66 Cf. Polon'ska-Vasilenko, N.D.: *The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine (1730-1775)*. In: *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US* Ins. 4/4 (1995); Polon'ska-Vasilenko, N.: *Zaselennja pivdennoï Ukraïni v polovini xviii st. (1734-1775)*. I: *Zaselennja Novoï Serbii ta Slav'janosrbii*. II: *Zaselennja Novorosijs'koï gubernii*. 2 vols. Mjunhen: Ukraïns'kij Vil'nij Univ. 1960.

67 Butler 1980, p. 378ff.

68 For impressive listings, mainly from Vuk's collections, cf. *Rječnik*, vol. 16/1 s.v. *Srb, Srbaļ, Srbija, Srbini, Srbiñ, Srbiñski, Srbļak, Srbļanin, and Srbļin*.

69 Publ. only 1871 by Novaković, Stojan: *Prilozi k istoriji srpske književnosti*. *Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva* 31. Beograd 1871, pp. 292-310. Cf. Filipović, Milenko S.: *Vuk St. Karadžić i srpska etnologija*. In: *Karadžić, V.: Sabrana dela 17 (1972)*. *Etnografski spisi*. Ed. by Mil. S. Filipović, pp. 513-573, here p. 516.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 516f.

71 Butler 1980, p. 87ff.

72 Filipović 1972, p. 517f.

ral term *Srb* and the term for the Serbs living in Serbia: *Srbijanac*. In the 1820's, collecting materials about the history of the Serbs, which he gave Leopold Ranke for his *Die Serbische Revolution*<sup>86</sup> and used in an article of his own, he seems to assume similar principles.<sup>87</sup> From the 1830's to the 1850's he prepares, and perhaps finishes, ethnographic and statistical maps of the South-Slavs that reflect his presuppositions.<sup>88</sup> Finally, in 1861, probably taking into account some critical reactions to his article of 1849, he maintains his preference for linguistic criteria, but accepts that those who are of the Catholic church and prefer to consider themselves Croats should have the right to do so.<sup>89</sup>

Vuk's conclusion agrees with opinions expressed by the distinguished Slavic linguists J. Kopitar, P. Šafárik, and F. Miklosich,<sup>90</sup> and ideological principles established earlier by the German philosopher Fichte. Undoubtedly, Vuk's position, which loosens the link of the Serbs with Orthodoxy, may have been negatively influenced by his heated conflicts with the authorities of that religion, particularly archbishop Stratimirović, about the need to abandon Church Slavonic and the old orthography and embrace the spoken language and his own new phonetic spelling. A child of his times and an ardent patriot, Karadžić was nevertheless no chauvinist and maintained all his life excellent relations with Croats from all walks of life.

Petar II Petrović Njegoš (1813-1851), poet and Prince Bishop of Montenegro, championed a strong Montenegrin state, but expressed himself at innumerable occasions as belonging to the larger Serbian nation (for example in *Ogledalo Srpsko [Serbian Mirror, 1845]* and *Gorski vijenac [The Mountain Wreath, 1847]*<sup>91</sup>). In his view, the nation depends on a common bloodline and language, and needs a common religion.<sup>92</sup>

Ilija Garašanin's 1844 *Načertanije (Draft)* became both famous and notorious as a 19<sup>th</sup> century statement on the Serbian nation and its vital interests. Although written by a statesman and politician identifying Serbian needs with those of the new Principality, Garašanin was strongly influenced by broader views of the Polish émigré Prince Adam Czartoryski and his advisers, as well as French and British attitudes toward nationality and statehood. Ideologically, Garašanin combines in his *Draft* the German and French models of a nation; politically, he is attempting to balance the interests of the present Serbian state with contemporary demographics (the fact that very many Serbs are still living under Turkish and Austro-Hungarian rule) and past, mediaeval possessions in »Old Serbia« (i.e., present Kosovo and Metohija, and Macedonia).<sup>93</sup>

From then on a similar Serbian national ideology was favoured by both the Obrenović and Karadjordjević dynasties – regardless of their differences and foreign policy fluctuations between Vienna and St. Petersburg, as well as the impact of other political and cultural factors. This ideology was in the main a blend of three elements: the evocation of the absolute historical and mythical legitimacy based on the Nemanjić mediaeval state; the German (Herderian, Fichtean and in general romantic) concept of the nation based on linguistic and cultural unity; and the French, Enlightenment and Jacobinic, model of the nation-state and its citizenship. A closer look at the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries would show, of course, particularities and specific preferences, reflecting interests of institutions, groups, and individuals. So, for example, the church élite held to the religious tradition and folk heritage as the main unifying factors, while both the educated intelligentsia and the peasants demanded the restoration of the mediaeval Empire.

A romantic, idealized vision of that mediaeval state was often proposed as a paradigm for the future in the popular discourses of politics, scholarship and literature. Among the Serbs and their neighbours this invocation of the past as a justification for present and future rights and options, the coupling of history with contemporary issues, not only durably influenced debates about choices to be made today and tomorrow, but also clouded the critical examination of historical facts – that were often problematic or incomplete in themselves – giving them additional moral and political weight. This tendency was equally pronounced in the school system, its syllabi and textbooks.<sup>94</sup> Another prominent factor in the propagation of the Nemanjić myth, often combined with that of Kosovo and the noble defeat, which through victimization saves a person's and a nation's soul, were the new leading periodicals of the times, and the newly founded publishing house *Srpska književna zadruga (Serbian literary collective, Belgrade, 1892)*, with its strong national and cultural mission. Among the periodicals I am particularly thinking of the following:

73 Ibid., p. 518.

74 Obradović, Dositej: Izabrani spisi. Predgovor Vojislav Djurić, izbor i redakcija Božidar Kovačević. Novi Sad: Matica srpska 1989.

75 Examples for this in Butler 1980, p. 306ff.

76 Ruvarac, Dimitrije: Geografske beleške o Turskoj mitropolita Stefana Stratimirovića iz godine 1803 i 1804. In: Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije 39 (1903), pp. 107-116; Filipović 1972, p. 518f.

77 Cf Radonić, Jovan: Pismo A.I. Turgenjeva mitropolitu Stevanu Stratimiroviću s prilogom njegove rasprave o Vlasima. In: Letopis Matice Srpske 223-228 [Novi Sad] (1904), pp. 68-121.

78 Sava Tekelija: Erweis, daß die Wachsen nicht römischer Abkunft sind. Halle 1823; Filipović 1972, p. 519f.

79 Kačić-Miošić, Andrija: Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga. Hrvatski pisci. Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Hrvatske 1946.

80 Butler 1980, p. 277.

81 E.g., *ibid.*, p. 278f.

82 Examples for this in *ibid.*, p. 346f.

83 Reljković, Matija Antun: Satir, iliti, Divlji čovik. Priredio i predgovor napisao Ivo Bogner. Osijek: Glas Slavonije 1974 (Biblioteka vez 1).

84 Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović: Srbi svi i svuda. In: Kovčević za istoriju jezika i običaja Srba sva tri zakona [Small Treasury of the History and Customs of Serbs belonging to all three religions] 1 [Vienna] (1849), pp. 1-27 [critical ed. in Filipović 1972, pp. 31-48, cf. p. 429f.].

85 About this article and related ideas in Karadžić cf. Etnografski spisi. Sabrana dela 17 (1972), p. 429f., p. 534f., and p. 555f.; also Dobrašinović, Golub: [Vukova] Gradja za etnografske karte južnoslovenskih naroda. In: *ibid.*, pp. 501-509.

86 Ranke, Leopold: Die Serbische Revolution. Hamburg 1829.

87 Karadžić. V.S.: Pjesnarica. s.n. 1814, pp. 15-18 [rpt. in Sabrana dela 1 (1964), pp. 40-42].

88 Karadžić, V.S.: Geografičesko-Statističesko opisanije Srbije. In: Danica (1827), pp. 25-120; esp. in the second part, pp. 74-78. Cf. Filipović 1972, p. 523f., p. 535, and p. 565.

89 Cf. Dobrašinović 1972; Filipović 1972, p. 555f. – Karadžić, V.S.: Srbi i Hrvati [Serbs and Croats], 1861. Rpt.

- *Javor (The Maple)*,<sup>95</sup> a periodical for entertainment, edification, and literature, was founded and edited for many years by Zmaj Jovan Jovanović, a great poet and one of the founders of SKZ (Novi Sad, 1862-63, 1874-92, Zemun 1893).
- *Otadžbina (The Fatherland)*, a journal for literature, scholarship, and social life, was founded and edited by Vladan Djordjević, later by M. Jovanović (Belgrade, 1875, 1880-1883, 1887-1892); its 32 volumes feature a large number of contributions by historians.
- *Bosanska Vila (The Bosnian Muse)*, a periodical for entertainment, edification, and literature, was founded and edited for many years by the prominent Serbian nationalist Nikola T. Kašiković (Sarajevo, 1885-1914); often in conflict with Austrian authorities, Kašiković collected oral folk literature and had a predilection for ethnographic and historical contributions.
- *Delo (Action)*, a journal for scholarship, literature, and social life, was the mouth piece of the *Serbian Radical Party* (Beograd, 1894-1899, 1902-1915); it published many texts about the past.
- *Brankovo kolo (Branko's Dance)*,<sup>96</sup> a periodical for entertainment, edification, and literature, was also like *Javor* and *Bosanska Vila* published under Austrian rule (Sremski Karlovci, 1895-1914), by Pajo Marković Adamov and others, and maintained a strong Serbian stance.
- *Iskra (The Spark)* and *Nova Iskra (The New Spark)*, founded and edited by Andra Gavrilović (Beograd, 1899-1905, irregularly until 1912), displayed the publisher's strong interest in Serbian history.

Even the modern and more exclusively literary journal *Srpski književni glasnik (The Serbian Literary Messenger)*, Beograd, 1901-1914, 1920-1941), edited by such outstanding literary critics as the brothers Bogdan and Pavle Popović, Jovan Skerlić, and others, did not completely neglect, at first, the traditional patriotic vocation of Serbian periodicals. Two of the mentioned editors have also directly contributed to the idealized evocation of the past. The prominent literary historian and writer Andra Gavrilović (1864-1929) published, under the auspices of the SKZ, three historical novels. The influential politician, prime-minister, scholar, writer, and physician Vladan Djordjević (1844-1930) wrote a much read historical novel in three volumes about the Emperor Dušan (*Car Dušan*, 1919/20). (A standard history of Serbian literature like that by the late Jovan Deretić<sup>97</sup> provides many additional examples of depictions of the glorious and tragic past that is always presented with an aim at contemporary events and choices. Such instances begin with the baroque literature of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, continue during the preromantic and neo-classical periods, and flourish, in narrative prose, epic and lyric verse, and drama during the romantic and post-romantic 19<sup>th</sup> century.)

A close look at the successive Serbian constitutions and published records of parliamentary debates about them – covering the period from 1805 to the end of World War I – proves that the new Serbian state struggled quite deliberately with definitions of nationhood (in the traditional ethnic sense) and citizenship (in the French post-Revolutionary spirit).<sup>98</sup> Anthony Smith's concepts of »ethno-nationalism« and an »ethno-national state« are quite relevant in this context.<sup>99</sup> The adopted solutions, on balance and in hindsight, seem quite moderate and secular. They were particularly meant to ensure for the Principality and Kingdom a strong sense of citizenship and statehood while opening the door to qualified Serbs from foreign territories to join the new administration and participate in the political and cultural life. These Serbs from abroad belonged often to the Orthodox creed, but not exclusively so, and it seems that in some cases a Slavic sounding name and self-proclaimed adherence to the nation were among the criteria for acceptance. Needless to say, throughout the history of Serbian states, many distinguished writers, poets, scholars, administrators, and public figures originated from beyond the state's boundaries.

The Yugoslav monarchy (1918-41) acknowledged three constituent nations (the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians) and made some concessions to the Muslim citizens; it largely ignored ethnic principles in its administrative regions (*banovina*). After World War II, the socialist Yugoslav federation made great efforts to accept additional nationalities and recognize minorities, and it created five republics and two autonomous regions; it also combatted most manifestations of nationalist sentiment, especially those of a Serbian inspiration. Unfortunately, the regime only succeeded in fostering pent-up national resentments that lead to the ultimate downfall of the state. During the dissolution of Yugoslavia there have been, for instance in Croatia, constitutional changes that contributed to inflame inter-ethnic suspicions and confirmed the



in Karadžić . V.S.: Skupljeni gramatički i polemicki spisi. Vol 3. Beograd: Državno izdanije 1896, p. 467f. About this article and question cf. for instance, Stojanović, Ljubomir: Život i rad Vuka Stef. Karadžića. Beograd 1924, pp. 688-691; Popović, Miodrag: Vuk Stef. Karadžić: 1784-1864. Beograd: Nolit 1964 [3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1987], pp. 326-338, p. 476; Filipović 1972, p.430. Karadžić 's article was in part an answer to a rebuttal of his statement from 1849, published by Bogoslav Šulek in the periodical *Neven* in 1857.

90 Belić, Aleksandar: Jezičko jedinstvo Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca kod Djure Jakšića i njegovih savremenika. In: Daničićev zbornik, Posebna izdanja Srpske Kraljevske Akademije. 55 vols. Vol. 28. Beograd, Ljubljana: SKA 1925. pp. 28-71, esp. pp. 32-41.

91 Njegoš, Petar II Petrović: Celokupna dela. Ed. by N. Banašević et al. 7 vols. Beograd: Prosveta 1975 [Vol. 3: *Gorski vijenac*; Vol. 5: *Ogledalo srpsko*].

92 Examples in Butler 1980, p. 357ff.

93 About the text and meaning of Garašanin's memorandum, as well as some of the controversies provoked by this document and its sequels cf. particularly Bataković, Dušan T.: *Načertanije*: baština ili hipoteka. In: Josić-Višnjić, M. (Ed.): *Načertanije*. Beograd: Književna zajednica MJ 1991, pp. 5-12; Bataković, D.: *Načertanije* Ilije Garašanina. Beograd: Književna zajednica MJV 1991; Bataković, D.: Ilija Garašanin's *Načertanije*: A Reassessment. In: *Balkanica* 15/1 [Belgrade] (1994), pp. 157-183; Bataković, D.: *Načertanije* Ilije Garašanina. In: *Pola veka nauke i tehnike u obnovljenoj Srbiji 1804-1854*. Kragujevac: Univ. u Kragujevcu 1996, pp. 19-44; Bataković, D.: Ilija Garašanin's *Načertanije*: A Reassessment. With a Transl. of the *Načertanije*. In: [www.bglink.com/bgpersonal/batakovic/nacertanije.html](http://www.bglink.com/bgpersonal/batakovic/nacertanije.html) [as in *Balkanica* 1994, downloaded 30.01.2001]; and also Stranjaković, Dragoslav: *Jugoslavenski nacionalni i državni program kneževine Srbije iz 1844*. In: *Glasnik istoriskog društva* 4 [Novi Sad] (1931): 392-418; Stranjaković, D.: *Srbija pijemont Južnih Slavena 1842-1853*. Beograd, 1932 [about Garašanin's *Načertanije* and its meaning, pp. 1-61]; Stranjaković, D.: *Kako je postalo Garašaninovo Načertanije*. In: *Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije Nauka* 91. Beograd: SAN, 1939, pp. 63-113; Šimunjić, Petar: *Načertanije*. Tajni spis srpske nacionalne i vanske politike. Zagreb: Globus 1992 [1937, 1944]; Aleksić, Lj[iljana?]: *Šta je dovelo do stvaranja Načertanija*. *Historijski pregled* 1 (1954), pp. 68-71; Vučković, Vojislav J.: *Učešće Hrvata u pripremi Garašaninovog Načertanija*. In: *Jugoslavenska revija za međunarodno pravo* 1 [Beograd] (1956), pp. 3:44-58; Vučković, V.: *Knez Miloš*

sensitivity of such issues in countries that lack a homogenous population. In most parts of the previous Yugoslavia, and sometimes in certain regions of Serbia, there is a steady distancing from any links with Serbian traditions, even in matters of language; by state decree and popular practice the Serbo-Croat language has been divided not only into Croat and Serbian but also into new languages, Bosnian and Montenegrin. There is a revival of theories that not only radically separate the South Slavic nations from each other, but which moreover deny that some of them have a Slavic origin at all; this is sometimes used pejoratively and sometimes as a positive distinction. It is also characteristic that almost nobody wishes to be identified with »Tito's Yugoslavia«, which is always presented as having been dominated by some other nationality than one's own. Present debates in Serbia about the new constitution, progressing slowly and often stalled, demonstrate again how difficult and heart-rending the implications of such definitions can be.

During the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century certain members of the Croatian élite who were opposed to any Yugoslav idea, designated the Serbs alternatively but always pejoratively as »Vlasi« (Vlachs), as Orthodox Croats, as non-Slavs, and Gipsies. The attacks on Serbs formulated in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Ante Starčević (1823-1896) and others helped develop in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the extreme ideology of the Ustasha movement (since 1928/29) and state (1941-1945), and contributed to shape certain more recent pronouncements by President Franjo Tuđman (1922-1999) and many others. Extreme rhetorical attacks on other nations and religions, as well as on political opponents within one's own people or group, manifestations of the often so labelled »dark Balkan hatred« (*crna balkanska mržnja*), were frequent. Tragic events during World War II, the violent dissolution of Yugoslavia, the crisis and military campaign in Kosovo, and many incidents since the separation, as well as articles in newspapers and other mass-media in the newly constituted states demonstrate dramatically the lasting effect of such propaganda that was coming from all antagonistic sides. In general, from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century onward, there has been a negative dialectic in the polemics between the various nationalist and religious ideologies on the territory of the previous Yugoslavia, especially among the ideologies that are openly ethnically exclusionary and intent on demonizing the opponents.<sup>100</sup>

The avoidance of mutually inflammatory statements and, in the more distant future, the elaboration of a common historical vision – covering at least the crucial events in inter-ethnic and inter-religious relations – remain, among many other urgent tasks, inescapable preconditions for any durable and favourable settlement of relations.<sup>101</sup> While a peaceful and prosperous Balkan Peninsula requires a multi-national and multi-ethnic effort at conciliation and reconciliation, there is no doubt that each of the entities involved will have to exert heroic deeds of self-examination. The means by which some other European nations have come to terms with each other and with their changing fortunes and frontiers might serve as an example. Any re-evaluation of the past and present, any programme for the future will have to separate facts from (desired or desirable) fictions and try to eliminate, or at least temper, national myths that by bitter experience have been proven to be harmful. Although intermingling and contacts with other nations bring cultural and other benefits, the nations of the old Yugoslavia with a relatively stable and homogenous territory, like the Slovenes, have fared much better than those with a varied population. Among these, the Serbs seem to have been most frequently displaced and marginalized. Be that as it may, traumatic events of the last century have deepened the collective feeling of isolation and victimization among Serbs and their impression that the ethnic memory of all nations, near and far, is encouraged, but not theirs. At the same time, their neighbours were increasingly convinced that they are being endangered by the Serbs, because they perceived them as being violent, vengeful, and tending to resolve their needs and lacks at other peoples' expense. Solutions are further complicated not only by the weight of the real and imagined past, but also by the present dismal position of Serbian society and statehood in terms of the international and internal, economic and financial, health care, and even demographic situation and prospects; rare are the countries in which a similar percentage of the young desire to emigrate.<sup>102</sup>

\*

Our rapid, and often superficial, overview of the concept »Serb« has pointed out, I trust, certain important features of long duration: first of all, the name itself and the conscience of be-



i osnovna politička misao sadržana u Garašaninom *Načertaniju*. In: *Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo* 4 (1957), pp. 1:35-44; Vučković, V.: *Prilog proučavanju postanka Načertanija (1844) i Osnovnih misli (1847)*. In: *Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo* 8 (1961), pp. 1: 49-79; Valentić, Mirko: *Konceptija Grašaninova Načertanija (1844)*. In: *Historijski pregled* (1961), pp. 2:128-137; Perović, Radoslav: *Oko Načertanija iz 1844 godine*. In: *Istorijski glasnik 1 [Beograd]* (1963), pp. 71-94; Jelavich, Charles: *Garašanin's Načertanije und das großserbische Programm*. In: *Südostforschungen* 27 (1968), pp. 131-147; MacKenzie, David: *Ilija Garašanin: Balkan Bismarck*. Boulder: *East European Monographs* 181; New York: Columbia UP 1985; Stojančević, Vladimir (Ed.): *Ilija Garašanin (1812-1874). Zbornik radova sa međunarodnog naučnog skupa održanog 9. i 10. decembra 1987. povodom 175. godišnjice rođenja*. Beograd: SANU 1991 (Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Naučni skupovi 54, Odeljenje istorijskih nauka 16) [of the 31 papers, 6 are about the *Načertanije*, which is also mentioned in many of the other contributions]; Stojančević, V.: *Garašaninova politika oslobođenja Srba u Turskoj – koncepcija, metodi i rezultati*. In: Stojančević 1991, pp. 389-395, and others.

94 Cf., i.e., Jelavich, Charles: *Serbian Textbooks: Towards Greater Serbia or Yugoslavia?* In: *Slavic Review* 42/4 (1983), 601-619; Jelavich, C.: *The Issue of Serbian Textbooks in the Origins of World War I*. In: *Slavic Review* 48/2 (1989), pp. 214-233; Jelavich, C.: *South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914*. Columbus/Ohio: Ohio State UP 1990; Jelavich, C.: *Education, Textbooks, and South Slav Nationalism in the Interwar Era*. In: Reiter, Norbert/Sundhaussen, Holm (Eds.): *Allgemeinbildung als Modernisierungsfaktor: Zur Geschichte der Elementarbildung in Südosteuropa von der Aufklärung bis zum zweiten Weltkrieg*. Berlin: Harrassowitz 1994 (Balkanolog. Veröff.), pp. 127-141; Meyer, Martin: *Grundschulen in Serbien während des 19. Jahrhunderts. Elementarbildung in einer ›Nachzüglergesellschaft‹*. In: Reiter/Sundhaussen 1994, pp. 77-102; Reiter, Norbert: *Die Schule der Nation*. In: Reiter/Sundhaussen 1994, pp. 11-20.

95 The traditional fiddle-like instrument (*gusle*), used to accompany heroic folk songs, was preferably made of that wood (*gusle javorove*).

96 The name was inspired by a patriotic song by the popular poet Branko Radičević.

longing to a particular group – even if that group depends on self-definitions and acceptance by others; second, a broad range of attempts, since the Middle Ages, to define this group and to distinguish it from other groups living in the neighbourhood or sharing the same space; third, to reconcile, albeit in a variety of ways, the changing, and often contradictory, needs of ethnicity and statehood. Other prominent traits, again not unique in Europe, are, for instance, the repeated reincarnation of past paradigms of the self and the state into later debates, under changed circumstances, and the permanent and often pernicious dialectic of Serbian words, feelings, and actions and those of the adjacent nations.<sup>103</sup>

Questions pertaining to modern nation states have been traced by scholars usually to the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and to the two main ideological solutions proposed at that time: the Jacobin identification of nationality with citizenship, i.e. the belonging to the same state and being under one judicial and administrative authority, and the romantic theories, developed particularly by Herder and Fichte, of communities based on common ancestry (blood and heredity), language, culture, customs, and, preferably, one religion and a stable ancestral territory. The 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century state, whether fully sovereign or not, attempted in its successive constitutions, dominant ideologies, political discourses and educational policies, to find ways how to reconcile these two basic attitudes towards nationality both in themselves, and with the local data of society and geography. In doing so, they were obliged to grapple with the fact that the Serbian state had changing borders, that it was never inhabited exclusively by Serbs, and that very many people who considered themselves, and whom others considered to be Serbs, lived outside of its jurisdiction. Matters are further complicated by internal and external perceptions that some of the spaces where Serbs had the strongest historical claims, such as Kosovo and Metohija, were spaces of their demographic feebleness, while other spaces, where they were demographically strong, such as areas in Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina, where those of weaker or disputed historical validity.

A particular, albeit not unique feature of Serbian history is the existence of a Serbian state in the high and late Middle Ages under the Nemanjić dynasty. While having many elements of a nation state, including a very strong sense of being Serbian, this feudal state also had radically changing frontiers and inhabitants who did not belong to the same religion or the same nationality; there were at the same time very many people living in foreign countries, under other rulers and often of another Christian persuasion, but still claiming to be Serbs and also being designated so by others. The rulers of that state, in their edicts and laws, as well as the church and other producers of the official and semi-official ideology already at that time attempted a broad range of solutions to the question who is, legitimately, a Serb and what such a person's relationship to the Serbian state and crown should be. As indicated earlier, definitions were used that privileged respectively the ideas of a people of the same ancestry, of the same language, of subjects of the same ruler and state, of belonging to the same Greek (later Serbian) Orthodox Church, etc. These criteria were used at various times in different combinations, but that of the same religion was less pervasive than most of the others.

For this reason, modern constitutions of Serbia and other legal measures, as well as political debates during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, were influenced by these mediaeval attempts at solutions, and not exclusively by Western European models of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. In addition, the nostalgia for the Nemanjić glory and empire lead to anachronistic attempts to resolve problems of the present in the spirit of the real and imagined past. Relations with neighbouring nations and states were further complicated by the fact that among them some, and notably the Croats and Bulgars, had a similar history of mediaeval sovereignty, centuries of foreign rule, and temptations to shape their future in the light of the past.

At the beginning of this article, I mentioned the presently dominant – and still fashionable – deconstruction of nations and nationalisms both as terms and as referred to realities. Even if we were to accept the idea that, seen in a strictly critical scholarly light, such notions are largely unstable constructs, grammatically belonging to »imaginary nouns« (*mislene imenice*) that are altered over time, history proves without any doubt that »out there«, in the non-verbal world, some persistent realities correspond to these, volatile but often deeply felt, beliefs, which contribute powerfully to shape a society's life and evolution. To ignore them completely is, therefore, another ideological thesis that leads to conflicts with tangible, stubborn realities. After all, attempts to preserve some kind of – admittedly reconstructed – past are a necessary part of establishing a sense of self, and identity is intimately connected to memory and imagining a possible future. Without excusing in any way the excesses and atrocities that



97 Deretić, Jovan: Istorija srpske književnosti. 3. prošireno izd. Beograd: Prosveta 2002.

98 Documented in Prodanović, Jaša M.: Ustavni razvitak i ustavne borbe u Srbiji. Srpski narod u 19 veku. Ed. St. Stanojević. Vols. IV-VI. Beograd: Geca Kon, n.d. [1936?]; Djordjević, Miroslav R.: Ustavni razvitak Srbije u XIX veku. Izbor izvora i predgovor. Izvori za političku i pravnu istoriju. Leskovac: »Naša reč« 1970; Čubrilo- vić, Vasa: Istorija političke misli u Srbiji XIX veka. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Beograd: Narodna knjiga 1982 [1958], and other sources.

99 Smith, Anthony: National Identity. London: Penguin Books; Reno: Univ. of Nevada Pr. 1991, esp. p. 89f.

100 About the attacks on any »Yugoslav« ideology cf., i.a., Djilas, Aleksa: The Contested Country: Yugoslav Unity and Communist Revolution, 1919-1953. Cambridge/Mass., London: Harvard UP 1991 and Wachtel, Andrew Baruch: Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford: Stanford UP 1998; the latter, it seems to me, does not highlight enough the nefarious interplay of opposing chauvinistic voices. Cf. also Behschnitt, Wolf Dieter: Nationalismus bei Serben und Kroaten, 1830-1914: Analyse und Typologie der nationalen Ideologie. München: Oldenbourg 1980. [Rev. PhD Diss., Köln 1976] (Südosteurop. Arbeiten 74) and Banac, Ivo: The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics. Ithaca/N.: Cornell UP 1984; Banac, I./Verdery, Katherine (Eds.): National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Europe. New Haven/Conn.: Yale UP 1995 (Yale Russian and East European Publ. 13); Banac, I. (Ed.): Srbi u Hrvatskoj: Jučer, danas, sutra. Zagreb: Hrvatski Helsingški odbor za ljudska prava 1998.

101 From newspaper reports, for instance in the Belgrade *Politika*, I gather that there are already tentative constructive dialogues among scholars and that new versions of authorized Serbian textbooks of history reflect the desire to be less one-sided in the presentation of the past.

102 Symptomatic of the crisis is also the present possibility that the »national« publishing houses, *Matica Srpska* and *Srpska Književna Zadruga*, are facing extinction. – Cataclysmic difficulties are otherwise endemic also in the post-communist unconscionable market economies of Ukrain, Belarus, and Russia.

103 Dimić, Milan V.: Attempts to Define Serbian Identity: Certain Peculiarities. Paper at the Conference Na-

happened at times of crisis, one has to acknowledge that it is to be expected that when what we fear most is the total erasure of social memory, then an idealized past seems better than none at all. Even if »such nostalgic feelings are [...] ultimately directed towards an imaginary past of plenitude and security, their strength is no less pertinent for the fact that their object is imaginary.«<sup>104</sup> The political success of certain politicians has hinged on their ability to mine the past for symbols and images that enabled them to articulate a reassuring response to modern and postmodern uncertainties. Moreover, by creating ideal worlds inside our heads, we are keeping the possibility of better worlds alive, at a time when there is almost no remaining public or psychic space available to us. »Contemporary nostalgia is not so much about the past as about the vanishing present.«<sup>105</sup>

There is, incidentally, a clear positive side to the deconstruction of mythic essentialist ideas concerning nations and national identities. It is the realization that all notions about any nation's identity and presumed »essence« vary over time, that they are attributes that evolve as a consequence of conscious and unconscious socio-cultural processes. This perspective opens the possibility for positive revisions of the ideas of national identity, for a deliberate striving to avoid perpetuating myths and attitudes that have not served the people well, and to substitute them with ideals that are more propitious. I should like to hope that Serbs, in their fatherland and in their world-wide Diaspora, will take from their past, which is rich in achievements and also in calamities inflicted by others but also at times self-inflicted, only the best elements and build, why not – construct, a healthier and even better identity.

*tionalist Myths and Pluralist Realities in Central Europe.* The Canadian Centre for Austrian and Central European Studies, Univ. of Alberta, and The Center for Austrian Studies, Univ. of Minnesota, 26-27 Oct. 2001, Univ. of Alberta. Edmonton/AB, Canada (MS) elaborates on these topics.

104 Morley, David: Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity. London: Routledge 2000, p. 247.

105 Boym 2001, p. 351. For Boym nostalgia functions as »an intermediary between collective and individual memory« (p. 54), it has the potential to help build community and imagine a future. »It resists both the total reconstruction of the local culture and the triumphant indifference of technocratic globalism.« (p. 342).

**Milan V. Dimić** is a University Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature at the Univ. of Alberta (Canada) and a Visiting Professor of English at Shih Hsin Univ. (Taipei, Taiwan). A Fellow of the *Royal Society of Canada*, he has founded the first Canadian department of Comparative Literature, the Univ. of Alberta: *Research Institute for the Comparative Study of Literature and Culture* (which now carries his name), and the *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* and its series of monographs. He is the editor of many academic and literary books and the author of over one hundred scholarly articles, essays, and chapters in books, mainly in the areas of international romanticism, folklore, identity questions in ethnic literatures, and the theory and methodology of Comparative Literature as a discipline. He was born and raised in Belgrade; he studied German and Romance Languages and Comparative Literature at the Universities of Belgrade, Vienna, Freiburg i. Br., Strasbourg, and Tübingen (as a Fellow of the *Humboldt-Foundation*, 1963-66). He taught Comparative Literature at the Univ. of Belgrade (1957-62), and German, French, English, Russian and especially Comparative Literature at the Univ. of Alberta (1966-2001), and English and American literature at Shih Hsin Univ. (since February 2001). A visiting professor at many universities in Europe, North America, and China, he has presented papers at over one hundred international and national congresses and symposia in Europe, the Americas, and Asia.

Contact: dimic@cc.shu.edu.tw