

Localize and rule

*Politics and practice towards the Jews in the Serbian principedom 1838-
1868*

By:

Željka Oparnica

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Michael Laurence Miller

Second reader: Professor Balázs Trencsényi

Budapest, Hungary

2016

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

Connections between space and politics have inspired many eye-opening works since the spatial turn. Nevertheless, the existing literature so far has not shown interest in influence of space on politics in the post-Ottoman world. Encompassing the transition from the empire to the post-imperial countries, this question is deeply connected with larger discussions on imperial legacy, imperial and post-imperial identities and nation-building.

The starting point of the thesis is *Jalija*, a non-Christian living space in Belgrade, where the sole existence of the principedom's Jewish population was bound to, throughout the period of more than four decades. But *Jalija* draws borders not only of the Balkan-type ghetto, but the line of the local-foreign dichotomy. Following the dynamics of the policies towards small but consistent Jewish community in the post-Ottoman Belgrade in the period from 1838 to 1868, thus the rule of the Constitutionalists and prince Mihailo, this thesis tracks the authorities' mechanisms of comprehending, categorizing and finally engaging with the Jews. I suggest that the idea of *local*, which was identified as a lens of the imperial existence, had the same purpose in the post-imperial world and, hence, the instrument to deal the Jewish population. The *localization* of Jews is visible in the categories of the censuses conducted by the authorities, in the space they were allowed to live and, finally, in the position they were assigned to within the principedom's institutional system.

On a larger scale, this thesis tackles questions of the post-imperial spatial identity, the questions of place of minorities in the newly established countries and, thus, the basis on which the nation-state was built. Therefore, it captures both continuity and learning processes of the period of significant social changes.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Michael Laurence Miller, for being open to and supportive of my project. The classes I took with him and the conversations we had always had an inspiring and encouraging effect. I am very much grateful to my second reader as well, Professor Balázs Trencsényi, for his support and enthusiasm for my topic, but especially for opening so many other directions that kept intriguing me and certainly influenced my interests and future plans.

Special gratitude I owe to the History Department and the Jewish Studies Specialization. Challenging classes, guest lectures, excursions, field trips and all conversations and informal chats with the people who stand behind them made CEU experience truly different and enriching more than any educational experience I have had before.

In the last weeks of writing Milan Vukasinović and Taylor Gombos helped me as friends and colleagues. I cannot wait to see them teaching in few years.

I dedicate this thesis to my grandma Estera Abramović. The words she used to repeat “wherever you go – always be local” were on my mind while writing.

Table of Content

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Table of Content.....	iii
Abbreviations	v
Introduction.....	1
Numbering and categorizing.....	10
The categories	11
The sub-categories.....	14
Counting the guilds	17
The rules of Glavna čaršija	21
Absolutism of the market.....	23
Bureaucratic Liberalism of the Market.....	27
The rules of exceptions	32
An institution among institution.....	38
State as an organizer.....	39
State as an educator.....	43
State as a book keeper.....	47

Conclusion	51
Bibliography.....	53
Primary sources.....	53
Literature.....	54

Abbreviations

AS – Arhiv Srbije [The Serbian Archive]

- * MUD-PO – Ministarstvo unutrašnjih dela, Policijsko odeljenje [Ministry of Interior, Department of police]
- * MP – Ministarstvo prosvete [Ministry of Education]
- * MPc – Ministarstvo prosvete i crkve [Ministry of Education and Church]

AGB – Arhiv Grada Beograda [The Archive of Belgrade]

- * UGB – Uprava Grada Beograda [Belgrade's Municipality]

Introduction

The first literary work on Belgrade was written from the perspective of Jaliya, the city's Jewish quarter, and came from the pen of the Jewish author, diplomat and theater critique, Hajim Davičo¹ at the turn of the 19th century.² On the one hand, the fact that this collection of novellas was written from a Jewish perspective and only at the end of the nineteenth century is remarkable and surprising for a city that had existed for, up to that moment, around two and a half thousand years. On the other hand, from the “cultural condom”³ of the Venice Jewish ghetto to the mellah of Fez, also outside of the Mediterranean basin, the Jews framed their experiences of the changing world into and through spaces.

The case of Jaliya is, nevertheless, interesting from the perspective of a post-imperial, border city turned into a new capital. The configuration of spaces is in deep connection with the Ottoman, almost three century long, past of the city. In the Ottoman empire, religious affiliation was more than a system of belief and practice – it was “system regulating individual, family, and social life through commands and prohibitions.”⁴ Religion also defined social spaces. Therefore, the religious categories that had existed in the city in the previous centuries should be taken into account especially since historians tend to agree that the Jewish spaces are defined only in relation to non-Jewish spaces.⁵

In the shift that Belgrade went through, from a city in the province of the Ottoman empire to a capital, population ratios between Christians and Muslims shifted, yet the city's Jewish

¹ All names of Jewish origin in the text I have kept in original and have only transliterated from Cyrillic.

² H. Davičo, *Sa Jaliye*, Beograd 1898. Predrag Palavestra mentions that Davičo's collection of novellas is the first book on Belgrade (P. Palavestra, *Jevrejski pisci u srpskoj književnosti*, Beograd 1998, 87-91.).

³ R. Sennett, *Flesh and Stone. The Body and the City in the Western Civilization*, London/Boston 1994, 228.

⁴ M. Akif Aydin, “The Ottoman Legal System”, in: *History of the Ottoman State, Society & Civilization* (ed. E. Ihsanoglu), Istanbul 2001, 473.

⁵ A. Gromova et al., “Introduction”, in: *Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context*, Berlin 2015, 14.

population remained relatively stable. From the mid 1830s when the Muslim inhabitants of the city made sixty percent of the population, to the end of the century when the city was almost entirely Christian. However, in the period between 1841 and 1868, on which I focus, the percentage of Jews was constant – remaining at around eleven percent.⁶ It is important to stress that Jaliya was not only an example of Jewish urban space within the Serbian principedom but that it was *the* Jewish locality in the state. Only a year after Belgrade became the capital, in 1842 and up until the emancipation in 1878, Jews of the newly established principedom were not allowed to live outside of Belgrade's borders, and all aspects of their life were confined to the city walls. Therefore, this thesis is not only an urban case study; it is an urban case study with the repercussions of the entire state. Accordingly, Belgrade was not only a locality – the city drew the borders of the local.

I argue that the way the authorities of the newly established autonomous principedom developed a mechanism of comprehending, categorizing and finally engaging with the Jews through *localizing* them. Frederick Anscombe recognized the *local* as the cornerstone identity in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman world⁷, while Isa Blumi went as far as to argue that the population of the whole Balkan region “had no firm ethnonational consciousness that superseded their immediate local needs” up until 1912.⁸ Therefore, I suggest that the *localization* of Jews was the an instrument to deal with this population or a lens to look through at the post-imperial world.

The first layer of making the Jews *local* had its physical aspect in confining their existence to Belgrade in between 1842 and 1878. In this period, with a short break between 1858 and 1860, the Jewish life in all its aspects was bound to Jaliya, the city's Jewish quarter. Therefore, making the Jews local meant keeping them in one precisely defined space; close enough to the center of power to be under control, but far enough to be in danger of it. On the level of identity, therefore, the physical

⁶V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 28.

⁷ F. Anscombe, *State, faith and Nation in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman lands*, Cambridge 2014, 16.

⁸ I. Blumi, *Reinstating the Ottomans. Alternative Balkan Modernities, 1800-1912*, New York 2011, 9.

localization of Jews in the principedom's capital was closely connected to re-framing the meaning of the local. Nevertheless, the local does not refer only to a physical, defined space. Henri Lefebvre pointed out "the abyss" social sciences created between mental and real space, separating the mental sphere from the physical and social. Put simply, his argument was that space has a social character.⁹ According to the social aspect of space, I frame the question of the categorization of Jews.

On one occasion in 1861, thirty years after the establishment of the autonomous principedom, when asked about the legal basis of the existence of their community the representatives of the Jewish community declared: "We are not in possession of any document issued by the Serbian state authorities; then what exists is what was encountered since the old times."¹⁰ The importance of this question has been recognized on the example of Istanbul after the collapse of the Ottoman empire. The study has shown even after dismantling of the millet system no longer exists juridical, "the social organization of the Jews of Istanbul shows a distinct continuity as a Millet in their sociological self-definition as well as in their perception of the social and political environment the passage from the pluralistic empire to a 'Turkish nation-state'".¹¹ This kind of insight, through the eyes of the Jewish community is, nevertheless, almost impossible to grasp in the case of Belgrade's Jewish community due to the lack of sources. However, I was interested in the continuity of perceiving the Jews as a millet, or a religious community with a significant level of self-government.

Lastly, in the broad literature that has discussed Jews within national histories, this spectrum of research has been recognized as valuable. With reference to the great anthropologist Levi-Strauss, the historian Ronald Schlechter noted that "Jews were 'good to think'". He introduced the idea of Jews as a means of thinking for pre-revolutionary French philosophers. Jews were not the only

⁹ H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford/Cambridge 1991, 6, 27.

¹⁰ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izvidanje komisije. 30.9.1861.*

¹¹ R. Kastroyano, "From Millet to Community. The Jews of Istanbul", in: *Ottoman and Turkish Jewry. Community and Leadership* (ed. A. Rodrigue), Bloomington 1992, 254.

group that served these mental exercises. However, the symbolic content of Jews as the quintessential other, as a group both familiar and strange, with their famed obstinacy made them a good object of mental game with a strong message – if Jews could change, everyone could.¹² Using this line of thinking, I would like to propose looking at the formative years of the Serbian principedom through the lens of establishing what is *local*.

To interpret the Jews in the principedom as a particle of the Ottoman millet system, it seems appropriate to mention, what I recognize as Balkan-scale type *Historikerstreit* that focused on the aspects of the Ottoman legacy in the countries. In the context of imperial and post-imperial countries, the term *legacy* certainly had a wider usage than tradition. What is deeply imbedded in this term is the passivity of the object, therefore this term carries a heavy meaning, it is a *burden*. L. Carl Brown noted this when he wrote that the Ottoman empire “is generally viewed as either a burdensome heritage that must be expunged or as belonging to a bygone age that has been overtaken by events and is irrelevant to today’s reality.”¹³

In the same volume, whose subtitle *The Ottoman imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East* suggests that the authors have embraced the idea of passivity of imperial subjects, Maria Todorova claims that “the Balkans *are* the Ottoman legacy.”¹⁴ On the one hand, she is trying to fight the “nonorganic accretions on the indigenous natural body” narrative of the national historiographies that is built in the greater myth of the Ottoman yoke. On the other hand, the one-sidedness of this argument is comparable to the side that is arguing that there is nothing Ottoman in the Balkan culture. This approach also, indirectly, negates the possibility that there is anything left from the

¹² R. Schlechter, *Obstinate Hebrews. Representations of Jews in France, 1715-1815*, Los Angeles/London 2003, 7-8.

¹³ C. Brown, “The background”, in: *Imperial legacy*. . The Ottoman imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East (ed. L. Carl Brown), Columbia University Press 1996., 6-7.

¹⁴ M. Todorova, “The Ottoman legacy in the Balkans”, in: *Imperial legacy*, 45-46.

culture into which the Ottoman “legacy” was built. On the top of this, the possibility of dialogue between the old and the new remains overlooked.

The debate of the place of imperial legacies has the opposite side that is reflected in the volume *Introducing images of imperial legacy*, co-edited by Tea Sindbaeck and Maximilian Harthmuth. The editors’ main argument is that the legacies cannot be taken as set in stone – they are only interpretations.¹⁵ Therefore, they focus on the change of interpretation of legacies in Southeastern Europe, especially on the political preconditions for it. However, this volume does not offer much more than what the legacies are on the surface, while the social structures remain untouched.

This certainly does not entail that Jews did not have or did not express any agency. Au contraire, the frequent pleas and petitions suggest that Jews were directed towards achieving civic rights. After the Paris Treaty in 1856, where the rights of religious minorities were mentioned for the first time and the formation of the Alliance Israelite Universelle in 1860, their acts were supported from the international organization and wider audience. However, only on the example of the Alliance, the Balkans and thus the Belgrade’s Jews were not high on the list of priorities, since in its Manifesto, the founders mention “brothers” in Israel, Africa and Asia, which proves the fact that the most northern school was open in Edirne.¹⁶ Therefore, the scarce sources related to the international involvement follow the scarce international involvement in the principedom’s Jewry.

However, encompassing the Jewish perspective the sources were few or only as a direct reaction to the governmental policies that had already come into power. On the other hand, the international framework was impossible to grasp because it would open a whole new field. Nevertheless, I will use this opportunity to state that the international interference, both in the name

¹⁵*Images of Imperial Legacy: Modern Discourses on the Social and Cultural impact of Ottoman and Habsburg rule in Southeast Europe*(Eds.T. Sindbaeck, M. Hartmuth), Berlin 2011, 2-3.

¹⁶ A. Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews. The Alliance Israelite Universelle and the Politics of Jewish Schooling in Turkey, 1860-1925*, Bloomington 1990, 23.

of Jews and in general, had an influence on the treatment of Jews, but to integrating this perspective would be possible in a different format or a different thesis.

The timeframe of my thesis span three decades of rule of the “liberals” in the principedom, between the abdication of prince Miloš in 1838 and the assassination of prince Mihailo in 1868. On the one hand, this period was chosen as a logical temporal unit. With the grant of autonomy in 1830, the only major physical conflict between the Muslims and Christians in summer of 1862 resulted in a war-like situation. Choosing to focus on the peaceful period is important because during war, revolts and organized violence loyalties tend to “narrow”¹⁷, making it impossible to track commonalities and patterns. It should be taken into consideration that this period was not static. The changes that the constitution and the bureaucratization brought to the new state, influenced the everyday life of all inhabitants. The rules that were once minted were to be re-coined.

With an aim to define precisely the form and content of the Jewish spaces, the already traditional and argued but still indubitably helpful center-margin distinction will not be used. While, on the one hand, I do agree with the editors of the *German history from the margins*, who aimed to write German history from the “marginal” Jewish perspective, and who claimed that the margin “engaged the center and thereby altered its contours and character.”¹⁸ However, I argue instead that the place of the *margin* did not belong to the Jews. Rather it was “the Muslim question” which preoccupied the minds and occupied the marginal space. What is important to stress, is that the Muslims residing in Serbia between 1838 and 1868 were not the subjects of the principedom. The existence of the population, albeit gradually declining in number, but still very significant, is completely invisible in the functioning of the inner affairs – Muslims are not counted in lists, they were not the object of

¹⁷ H. Grandits, N. Clayer, R. Pichler, “Introduction”, in: *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans. The Great Powers, The Ottoman Empire and Nation-Building* (eds. H. Grandits, N. Clayer, R. Pichler), London/New York 2011, 6.

¹⁸ N. Gregor, N. Roemer, M. Roseman, “Introduction”, in: *German history from the margins*, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2006, 2.

any policies of the state, besides the ones that came out of bilateral agreements between the principedom and the Ottoman empire.

It cannot be said that “the Muslim question” as a concept, rather than a history of immigration and conflicts in the Serbian principedom and even later received enough of academic attention. Marko Dogo’s comparative work on the Muslim question in the Balkan nation-states has a wide temporal framework, aiming to cover from the 19th to the mid 20th century. He recognized important tropes of the topic in the questions of land and demography, loyalty to the sultan, nature of national ideologies in the Balkans, connection between modernization and de-Osmanization and, fairly important for our topic, the question of citizenship. In relation to the last, he defined the status of Muslims in the Serbian principedom as “some sort of extraterritoriality.” Nevertheless, he only raised the question of the structural issue of this status, wondering if it was a reversed application of the capitulation system or remnant of the millet system, without offering a solution.¹⁹

Certainly worthy is the comparative work of Dietmar Müller on the citizenship of Jews in Romania and Muslims in Serbia in between 1878 and 1941²⁰. Müller covered the broad source material in depth, thus giving a solid basis for comparison of the nature of the Muslim question with the Jewish question. However, his research does not cover the prehistories of the both state emancipated on the Congress of Berlin and, therefore, the prehistories of the outlined nation-states. Nevertheless, the comparative aspect that Müller proposed is important, especially since the comparison between Serbia and Romania, with regards of their minority questions, almost became a trope for the region. Professor Constantine Iordachi wrote an article about Jews in Romania and

¹⁹ M. Dogo, “Balkanske nacionalne države I pitanje muslimana“, in: *Godišnjak društvenih istorija* 11/1 (1995), 354.

²⁰ D. Müller, *Staatsbürger auf Widerruf. Juden und Muslime als Alteritätspartner im rumänischen und serbischen Nationscode. Ethnonationale Staatsbürgerschaftskonzepte 1878-1941*, Wiesbaden 2005.

Serbia in period from 1830 to 1878 as the question of securitization²¹, which is an additional interesting paradigm to use.

On the other hand, Jews are present as subjects of the state and as objects of the state policies because of the special demand made during the negotiations on the autonomy of the principedom.²² Therefore, through the category of the subject, the Jews were present physically, first in the entire principedom and later only in its capital. Surprisingly, especially in comparison with other European capitals, the list of works on Jews of Serbia is not that long. The first book on the capital's inhabitants of the Mosaic affiliation was by the rabbi Isak Šlang, written in 1926.²³ This book still gives the best overview of the cultural and theological achievements of the Belgrade's Jewish community. Bogumil Hrabak's book gives a comprehensive overview of the Jewish history in Belgrade, starting with antiquity and ending with the emancipation in 1878. However, even though useful because of the vast source material it covers, this work does not pose any deeper questions neither on the Jewish experiences nor on the interactions between Jews and non-Jews.

All three chapters have direct spatial reference, but also a metaphoric one. The first chapter is dedicated to the imagined spaces of the censuses, the spaces which create categories. This chapter demonstrates the changes in the perception of Jews and gives a spectrum of categories that tell the story of who were the Jews to the state and what was their place in it. Following this line of argument, the second chapter goes into the physical space, more specifically, into the Belgrade's Great market. This chapter gives the prehistory of Jewish presence in the context of the uprisings and during the rule of prince Miloš in the market which, I would argue, reflects their position in the principedom in general. Coming from the boundaries of the market the aim of this chapter is to shed

²¹C. Iordachi, "Unermünte Bürger. Die 'Judenfrage' in Rumänien und Serbien zwischen 1831 und 1919", in: *Transit* 43 (Winter 2012/2013), 107-127.

²² B. Hrabak, *Jevreji u Beograd do sticanjanezavisnosti 1878*, 127.

²³ I. Šlang, *Jevreji u Beogradu*, Beograd 1926.

light on the localization of Jews in a particular part(s) of the city. The third chapter takes us to the time and place where the active involvement of Jews and the principedom gave the basis of the new definition of the local.

Numbering and categorizing

In autumn 1861, after discussions between Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews, which had lasted for years, the state organized the so-called “committee” made up of state officers to question the representatives of both groups, to get to the crucial questions for the state and finally resolve the conflict. The state interest in this case was in solving the conflict mainly because of the matters of fiscal responsibilities of the Jews residing in Belgrade and the jurisdiction of the rabbi(s) in Belgrade. Therefore, the committee asked about the number of Jews living in Serbia, regardless of their origin and subjecthood. Confronted sides of Ashkenazi and Sephardi, however, were unified in their answer: “the authorities will know that better.”²⁴ Behind this sensibly cynical answer of the Jewish representatives, is the idea of the power of numbers.

By 1868 the population of the Serbian principedom went through seven censuses of different kinds. The first one was in 1834, concentrated strictly on tax matters, counting tax units (adult men) and households. From this first census on, collected information became more stratified and lists more detailed.²⁵ A special state office dealing just with state statistics, which reflected state’s needs and perspectives, oriented toward the growth of Christian population, was opened.²⁶

The sources used for this analysis come from the censuses ordered by different authorities of the state. Vladimir Jakšić’s *Državopis* or *Statistique du Serbie* from 1855 and 1863 gave the official overviews of the state-led statistics, sometimes also reflecting on the situation in the capital. The next layer are the two municipal censuses of the Jews only from 1845 and 1856 when categories were imposed on them in the name of the state. Yet another perspective on categorizing and labeling brings the guilds and their members to the forefront. I approach these different lists with an

²⁴ AS, MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izvidanje Komisije, 30.9. 1861*. (This translation and all the rest in the text are author’s.)

²⁵ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije. I sveska, Beograd 1863*, 86.

²⁶ V. Stojančević, o “Etnički odnosi u XIX veku”, in: *Istorija Beograda II. Devetnaesti vek* (ed. V. Čubriločić), Beograd 1974, 428.

aim of extracting the patterns and explaining the the exceptions. Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to portray three different layers of categorizing and thus defining Jews or capturing the social realities the state reflected through the different censuses, but also social realities that the state itself had constructed.

Listing your own subjects has different means. On the one hand, censuses are obvious ways to count the number of inhabitants, which is important both for tax and military purposes. On the other hand, censuses are seen as another act of governmentality – the way the state expressed and exercised its power. Hand in hand with other state-issued documents, it is a way through which collective identities could be not only expressed but also dictated.²⁷ In other words, the censuses of the population give the state the power of numbers but also the power of categorizing.

The categories

The uprisings were followed by the trend of Muslims retreat to the cities or to other provinces of the Ottoman empire, the process which was more rapid with the announcement of the hatt-i-sharifs of 1830 and 1833 which proclaimed the end of the Ottoman rule in the province. The practical consequences for Muslim inhabitants were the loss of the right to own land and the urgency to move, in the course of one year, to the cities where the Ottoman regiments had the right to reside – Belgrade, Užice, Šabac, Smederevo, Sokol or Kladovo.²⁸ The physical separation from the rest of the population is made clearer by the fact that the Muslims were not counted as the subjects of the principedom. Hence, they were not counted in the censuses as well.²⁹

However, Muslims were not the only group that was left out from the censuses. Roma were counted for the first time in 1847, both the ones “residing permanently” in the principedom and the so-called

²⁷ D. I. Kertzer, D. Arel, “Censuses, identity formation, and the struggle for political power”, in: *Census and Identity. The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses* (ed. D. I. Kertzer, D. Arel), Cambridge 2002, 3.

²⁸ D. Müller, op. cit, 107.

²⁹ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije. Sveska prva*, Beograd 1863, 87.

“wanderers”, further defined by their religious affiliation. From 1854 the “permanently residing” Roma started paying taxes “as all other Serbian subjects.”³⁰ In comparison, the Jewish case was significantly different. Especially since, during the negotiations regarding the autonomy, the principedom’s representatives asked that the Jews, previously Ottoman subjects, to become their subjects.³¹ Therefore, their subjecthood was not in question, it was embedded in the autonomy of the principedom.

The censuses show that as far as 1834 the non-Muslim population of Belgrade made around 40 percent.³² In order to define the “Jewish question”, we need to confront the numbers. If we detach the “Jewish question” from its discursive and symbolic meaning and focus on the numbers, many different conclusions could be made. In the different periods, political moments and situations, when “the Jewish question” reached its peak in the public discourse, we can look at the numerical value the Jews had in specific countries. In France, for instance, in the dawn of the revolution of 1789, when the question of whether the Jews should or should not be politically emancipated together with the rest of the population, the Jews were only one percent of the population.³³ Before the unification, the situation in German lands differed from province to province but united Germany that had also just slightly more than one percent Jewish inhabitants.³⁴ In the named countries, the Jewish question had a significant influence on the public discourse

In numerical values, Jews were never a significant threat in the Principedom. As an illustration: in 1854 the official statistics compared the numbers of the state’s officials, which made twelve percent of the

³⁰ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije*. Beograd 1863, 87-88.

³¹ B. Hrabak, op. cit, 127.

³² V. Stojancević, op.cit., 525.

³³ R. Schlechter, *The Obstinate Hebrews*. 7.

³⁴ J. Jacobs, “Statistics”, in: *The Jewish Encyclopedia. The unedited full-text of the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia.* (<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/13992-statistics>) Approached: May 5th 2016.

capital's population, with the capital's Jews, who at that moment made around eleven percent.³⁵

The percentage of Jews in the capital city did not change significantly until the end of the period I am focusing on.

	1846		1854	
	numbers	percentage	number	percentage
The Caucasian type	12.608	87.07	14.836	88.67
Jews	1662	11.48	1746	11.56
Christian Gypsies	89	0.61	62	0.37
Muslim Gypsies	122	0.84	89	0.53
In total:	14.481 ³⁶	100	16.733	100

Table 1: *Percentage of Jews in Belgrade in contrast to other "types"*³⁷

The retreat of Muslims from the principedom's towns in 1862 brought the homogenization of the city and the state on another level, which the censuses reflected significantly. For instance, in the first census of the capital in 1846 the basic way of categorizing the population was targeted on permanently or not permanently inhabited population, obviously with an aim to establish the number of tax units.³⁸ Nevertheless, the census did encompass the stratification of the population, based on the "types" (*fele*). The biggest recognized "type" was the "Caucasian type" (*kavkaska fele*), while the other categories were Jews (*Jevreji*), Christian Roma (*Cigani bristijani*) and Muslim Roma (*Cigani mudžahedini*). The same pattern was followed in the census of 1854.³⁹ The *fele* seem to be unclear categories, between the distinction based on religious affiliation and race. On the one hand,

³⁵ V. Jakšić's *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 28.

³⁶ In V. Jakšić's *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 3. an obvious mistake in counting was made while counting the data presented here, stating that the total number of Belgrade's inhabitants was 14.371, even though their summation gives 14.437.

³⁷ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 2-3.

³⁸ V. Stojancević, op. cit, 526,

³⁹ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 2-3.

the “Caucasian type” seems as a clear race-focused group. However, defined from the perspective of the other groups, it becomes clear that “Caucasians” are Christians, therefore, the full-right citizens of the principedom.

Nevertheless, the census of 1863 puts an emphasis on different traits of the population. It defines the ethnicity (*narodnost*) of the inhabitants on the basis of three different groups: Serbs, Vlachs, and Roma, simultaneously claiming that not many of other ethnicities are represented in the principedom.⁴⁰ Even though the patterns that the censuses are following are not the same, as it was previously mentioned, there is a shift that I consider important stressing. From the basic lists of subjects, following the interest of the state which obviously was to distinguish the number of tax-paying units, the categories grew and changed their conceptual shape. The attempt to make a certain racial distinction, using “the Caucasian” for basically all Christians, certainly did not follow the pattern it set straight. However, the shift from the “types” to “ethnicities” in the census of 1863 is even more interesting and it definitely reflects the new realities and focus of the principedom.

The sub-categories

When focused on the Jews only, censuses gave away other perspectives of the state. The census of Jews from 1845 was a reaction to another plea of the Belgrade community to the Ministry of Interior to restrict the Jews since they spread their business throughout the city. Therefore, the Ministry inquired about the numbers, in attempt to collect data about Jews. What they collected was that there were 363 Jewish families living in Belgrade, altogether 1471 persons. What is interesting is that the city authorities are naming that there are twenty-five bachelors (*bećara*) in the city, and since they are working only for themselves and are not supporting families, they are “burden for both

⁴⁰ V. Jakšić, *Državopis Srbije*. Beograd 1863, 91.

Christian and Jewish community”.⁴¹ Therefore, the accent was on the profile of Jews and the justification of their settlement in the principedom.

The census of 1856 was handed over in June, with some delay, as the Belgrade governor explains, due to lack of obedience and compliance of Jews.⁴² Therefore, we only know that the census was late, though not exactly how much late it was and what were the precise reasons for the delay. Nevertheless, only a few months before, in March, the Paris treaty put an emphasis on the stability in the Balkans, reflected in the religious and political rights of the Sultan’s subjects. One paragraph (XXVIII) mentioned the Serbian principality which was to preserve its independence and national administration and, among other things, liberty of worship.⁴³ The Ottoman empire reacted in the form of Hatt-I Humayun which proclaimed the equality of religions.⁴⁴ This certainly had inspired the principedom’s recounting of Jews.

This “inner” census of 1856⁴⁵ is the most detailed. Its focus is on the tax-paying units. It counted 283 units, out of which 275 were married men older than 18 years and eight widows. Their wives and children are counted as separate categories, but only in connection to them, without stating their names or any other detail besides their existence. Nevertheless, if a tax-paying man lived under the same roof with his adult (and married) son, they still made one tax-paying unit. Therefore, the main unit of tax was a household, so there were 283 households, but 295 adult men and widows altogether.

Nevertheless, the most interesting category is also the one which is most diverse. Based on their origin, Jews living in Belgrade were categorized into ten different groups, among which I see the

⁴¹MUD-PO, 1846, F V, R 61. *Visokoslavnom Početeljstvu vnutenih dela Upravitelj varoši Beograda. 14.6.1845.*

⁴²MUD-PO, 1856, FXI, R 20, *Visokoslavnom Početeljstvu vnutenih Dela, 6.6.1856.*

⁴³M. J. Kohler, “Jewish Rights at International Congresses”, in: *The American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 19 (1917-1918), 137.

⁴⁴N. M. Gelber, “The intervention of German Jews at the Berlin Congress”, in: *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* (1960), 226-227.

⁴⁵AS, MUD-PO, 1856, F IX, R 20, *Visokoslavnom Početeljstvu unvnutrenih Dela . 6.6.1856. 4-14.*

“domestic” meta-group: native (*starosedelac*), local (*ovdašnji*), born in Belgrade (*rođen u Beogradu*). On the other hand, there were special categories for “foreign” Jews: came from Bosnia (*iz Bosne*), came from Turkey (*iz Turske došao*), came from Niš (*iz Niša došao*), came from Castra (*iz Kastre došao*), with two eye-catching exemptions: came from Smederevo, explained by a possessive adjective *Smederevac*, and Bosniak or *Bošnjak*. The “foreign” Jews had, however, to say how many years ago did they come to the principedom. The sign that this information was of a high importance to the both who inquired and the ones who had it, testifies that not all of Jews were ready to give out this information.

From the provided it is becomes evident that the categories, especially the “domestic” ones do not speak directly to the interpreter. The perspective becomes much clearer from the numbers. Out of 295 adult men and widows, 205 were “local”, while 54 of them were “born in Belgrade” and only 17 were “native”. Therefore, the “domestic” Jews made 94 percent of the Jewry residing in Belgrade in 1856. Having in mind the decree that expelled the Jews from the interior of the principedom to its capital in 1842, we can identify that the “native” Jews had ancestors who were residing in Belgrade themselves, probably even prior to the change of authorities from Muslims to Christians. Therefore, the “local” Jews were the ones expelled from the other towns of the principedom, while those “born in Belgrade” filled in the category between the previous two. With the average of thirty-six years old⁴⁶, we can assume that they were the first generation of the Jews who moved to Belgrade from the outside of the principedom, but inside the Ottoman empire.

The frustration that this behavior caused is expressed in the complaints of the Belgrade’s governor in the report attached to the census. He claimed that Jews were not willing to collaborate, especially the newcomers when it came to giving information about the time they settled in Belgrade or where did they first settle in the city. The “domestic” Jews showed solidarity and refused to give the

⁴⁶ Based on in the census stated years of 41 our of 43 of “in Belgrade” born Jews. Two widows did not state their names.

information, which the authorities were sure they had.⁴⁷ The reason behind this behavior is most certainly fear – not only were the Jews who came after the prince's decree from 1844 concerned that they might be expelled, but the domestic Jews were afraid that they might bear the consequences of helping their coreligionists.

Counting the guilds

The major conflict between Christians and Jews in the principedom was tightly connected to trade and artisanship. The affiliation with guilds should be looked upon as one of the most important traits of social life, especially from the times of the edict of 1842 when Jews were banned from living outside of Belgrade. The socio-economic space that they were confined to asked for a lot of compromises, therefore the category which the Jews occupied in this highly competitive economic vacuum should be taken into consideration.

Nevertheless, confining Jews to life in between four streets of Jaliya, the quarter they shared with Muslims, was not the only move of the Constitutionalists' rule. Under the pressure of the local merchants in 1847 the law on guilds came to power. The law was protecting its initiators from competition by insisting on membership in a guild by each and every merchant.⁴⁸ The guild of merchants complained in 1851 to the municipal authorities of the capital that the Jews were opening shops, but were not participating in taxes and other contributions of the merchant guild. The Jewish response to this was that they were never members of a guild and that they never aimed to be. They did not see the point in paying the taxes since that money was reserved for the Christian poor and would never go to the Jewish poor, which is many and supported from by the Jewish community.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ MUD-PO, 1856, F XI, R 20, *Visokoslavnom Popociteljstvu vnutrenih Dela*, 6.6.1856.5.

⁴⁸ Z.-M. Calic, *Socijalna istorija Srbije 1815-1941. Usporedni napredak u industrijalizaciji*, Beograd 1994, 43.

⁴⁹ 151 *Jevreji otvaraju dućane po Beogradu, ali odbijaju da snose terete esnafske*, in: *Uprava varoši Beograda 1820-1912* (ed. B. Peruničić), 256-257.

The Jews also showed a significant amount of distrust to their colleagues merchants claiming that they would sabotage their entrance exams to guilds and that they would never judge in conflicts honestly. Therefore, they think it would be right given that “the same (e.g. Jewish) community existed independently from the Serbian community and Serbian guilds since ancient times”, for the situation to remain the same. Nevertheless, the municipal authorities did not find this plea concerning. They reflected only on the last remark about the certainty of unjust trials for Jews inside of the guilds, answering that this reason is not valid since everyone had the right to complain to municipal courts regarding any decision.⁵⁰ But relying on the lists of guild members in the city, this “recommendation” of the state was not applied strictly.

Indeed, there were Jews, identifiable by their names, who became members of Serbian guilds. Menahem Jevrejin (or Menahem *The Jew*) is for, instance, listed on a joint list of coppersmiths’, gun-maker’s beam scalars’ and tinsmiths’ guild, alongside with eight of his coreligionists.⁵¹ Menahem also appears in the census of Jews from 1856 as a “local” (*ovdašnji*) tinsmith. His coreligionist, Gavril Levi, is on the list from the same year, registered as “local” saddler.⁵² The same goes for four of their coreligionists who appear on the same list and were either “local”, “native” or “born in Belgrade”.⁵³ Besides them, Hajim Samuil Adanja and Isak Levi were members of the shoemaker’s guild.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, what is far more interesting is that parallel to the “regular” merchant guild there was a Jewish merchant guild. The Jewish guild had 43 members, while its Christian counterpart had 117.⁵⁵ The non-consistency in Jewish affiliation with the Christian guilds reflects both the agency of the wealthier guilds and the infirmity or lack of capacity of the municipal authorities to subsume the Jewish artisans under the existing “Christian” guilds.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹*Spisak Esnafa kazandžijskog, puškarskog, kantardžijskog i tenećerdžiskog u varoši Beogradu* in: Uprava varoši Beograda, 443.

⁵²AS, MUD-PO, 1856, F IX, R 20, *Visokoslavnom Popečitelstvu vnutrenih Dela*, 6.6.1856. 13.

⁵³ Ibid, 6, 10, 12.

⁵⁴*Spisak Esnafa kazandžijskog, puškarskog, kantardžijskog I tenećerdžiskog u varoši Beogradu* in: Uprava varoši Beograda, 445.

⁵⁵Ibid, 465-466.

Distinguishing subjects based on their religious affiliation was certainly not a novelty. If introducing the *types* cannot cover up the fact that the core of distinction was religion, which is, in the end, made very obvious on the example of Roma – Christians and Muslims – who were categorized the same way they were listed under the Ottoman rule.⁵⁶ The only difference is that the Ottoman authorities offered lower taxes for Muslim Roma, while in the case of the principedom, it seems that both groups were counted as the rest of population. What is even more important is that this division begins already in 1863, only one year after the Muslim officially left the principedom. The most important religious group is, it seems is the only one that was not listed.

The shift from *types* to *ethnicities* seems sharp but does not have to mean the complete renouncement of the religious perspectives on the population. This seems especially useful when looking at the lists numbering social categories other than the origin. The fact that the Jewish merchant guild existed in spite of the authorities' agenda to merge the confronted merchants shows that the authorities were either not carrying out their own instruction, or they saw negotiating with Jews as a viable option. Since the shoemakers, Adanja and Koen, are among the scattered examples of Jews who joined "Christian" guild, could mean, as well, that the number of Jewish artisans was not high enough to form separate guilds for each group.

Speaking of numbers, according to the census of 1856, the majority of Belgrade's Jewish population, namely 69 percent was made up of "local" Jews, with 205 tax units. These were exactly the *localized Jews*, the ones who were relocated from within the principedom to the capital. Together with significantly smaller groups of "natives" and "born in Belgrade" they make the absolute majority. The rest, "foreign" Jews were the primary focus of the authorities. However, since the sources do

⁵⁶ E. Marushiakova, V. Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire*, Bristol 2001, 28-29.

not show the significant decrease in the number of Jews in Belgrade, the chances are that their next generation was identified as “born in Belgrade”. The next chapter will dissect the story of the process of making Belgrade the Jewish locality within the principedom.

The rules of Glavna čaršija

In the Old Town of Belgrade, the center of social and economical life was, unsurprisingly, a bazaar. Its surface area covered the core of today's city center. Coming from the main street to the contemporary Students' Square, a 19th century wanderer would have found the Market square (or *Velika pijaca*). The market was sloped down, towards the Danube, while the Main Bazaar (or *Glavna čaršija*) was at the higher points of what is today Kralja Petra Street, where the building of the Jewish Community is placed at this moment.⁵⁷

The Jewish quarter, Jewish mahala or Jaliya, was facing the market, coming from the Danube side of the Old Town. Four streets – Jewish, Moses', Salonican and Prince Eugene's – made its backbone together with alleys that intersected them. The external appearance of the houses did not give away the religious affiliation of their inhabitants since, so they resembled typical Turkish houses of the age.⁵⁸ The social structure of Belgrade's Jews is not easy to generalize, since they were never listed in the same censuses, mainly because of their different allegiance. Therefore, the biggest part of the Ashkenazi Jews was never counted together with Sephardi, simply as they were Austrian subjects, even though they lived and worked in Belgrade. However, the most detailed census of the Belgrade Jews testifies that the biggest majority were small-time peddlers or shopkeepers, therefore, like most of the Ottoman and post-Ottoman subjects, poor and later working class.⁵⁹

From the beginning of the history of the city in the context of the autonomous Serbian principedom, as far as 1834, Christians and Jews together made up only 40% of the city's population.⁶⁰ The slow

⁵⁷ N. Mišković, *Bazaaren und Boulevards. Belgrad in 19. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2008, 152.

⁵⁸ I. Šlang, op. cit, 90.

⁵⁹ J. P. Cohen, S. A. Stein, "Introduction", in: *Sephardi lives. A documentary history, 1700-1950*, Stanford 2014, 4-5.

⁶⁰ B. Stojančević, „Etnički odnosi u XIX veku“, y: *Istorija Beograda 2. Devetnaestovek* (ed. V. Čubrilović), Beograd, 1974, 526.

growth of the urban population was explained through the presence of Turks and their still sovereign rule in cities.⁶¹ When the province's administration was transferred from Kragujevac to Belgrade in December of 1841, the percentage of Christians in the new capital in contrast to other religions was rising with each census. As the aftermath of the Christian uprisings in 1804-1812 and 1815 and the establishment of the autonomous principedom, the previously established balance between different groups in the city became obsolete. This fact became painfully obvious in the city's market.

The approach to the market should be through a multi-layered prism, as the place where different religious and ethnic groups met in Belgrade in the mid of the 19th century, as the spot where different languages and customs were exchanged on a daily basis. However, the Belgrade's market reflects, probably better than any other place of cultural exchange, the shifts and political moves of the authorities. Focusing closely on the Jews, in the line with the nature of their occupations, Jewish lives were deeply connected to the market. Therefore, whoever controlled the market had a significant influence on their lives. On the other hand, the ways in which the market was controlled reflected the attitude towards Jews. Taking this perspective, the market becomes the spotlight of the cultural engineering – any measures that authorities took in the market is a larger reflection of their attitude.

The moves authorities made on the market began the physical separation of the Jews in the corners of the principedom's capital. Therefore, this chapter aims to shed light on the process, mechanisms and consequences of defining the living and working space of Jews.

⁶¹ John R. Lampe, Marvin R. Jackson, *Balkan Economic History, 1550-1950. From Imperial Borderlands to Developing Nations*, Bloomington 1982, 118.

Absolutism of the market

It has been said that in 1835 David Bekor Hajim saved prince Miloš's life, warning him about the plot against him set by Belgrade's Pasha. He was representative of the Belgrade branch of the Hajim family. Their influence could be to some extent measured through one of their members who became the head of the Viennese Sephardic community. From that moment on, David was called Davičo, by the diminutive the prince gave him which reflected his gratitude and affection.⁶² Without getting into the authenticity of the legend, this story reflects the liminality of Jewish life between the new and old regime and, finally, their affiliation to the new, represented in the prince. Certainly this story cannot stand for the totality of Jewish choices in Serbia, especially since Davičo was from a wealthy family and was personally benefiting from this alliance with the prince, but it still shows the nature of the connection of Jews with the state which was directly connected with the person of the state and the Jewish position in the conflict between Muslims and Christians.

Previous to this choice to stand with the new state, Jews went through a rough path in the first decades of the century, during the uprisings in the Belgrade pashalik. The First uprising was in its beginning a revolt of Belgrade's Orthodox population against the depredations of janissaries.⁶³ Hand in hand with the Greek revolt that would follow in less than two decades, these uprising and their ensuing developments showed that religious identity played a stronger motivating role, than the previous historiography was willing to admit.⁶⁴ The leading idea was to go back to the justice the sultan was able to provide in the past.

⁶²B. Hrabak, *Jevreji u Beogradu do sticanja ravnopravnosti*, Beograd 2009, 254.

⁶³ For a broader outlook on the labeling and self-labeling of the uprisings and its actors look further in: F. Anscombe, "The Balkan Revolutionary Age", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 84. No. 3 (September 2012), 572-606.

⁶⁴ F. Anscombe, *State, faith and nation*, 66.

On the one hand, by Karageorge's⁶⁵ rebels, Jews were seen as the people of the Ottoman regime. On the other hand, the Ottoman authorities were certain that the city's Jews were involved with the uprising, since their coreligionists from Semlin were providing Christians with munitions.⁶⁶ By the time the last Ottoman resistance in the empire's most northern point was broken, the Jewish stores were already plundered twice – once during the siege in June and then again when the defense was broken.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, upon entering Belgrade in December 1806, Karageorge's soldiers, by the proclamation of their leader, were forbidden to do any harm to the Muslim and Jewish population of the city, alongside with respecting their private property.⁶⁸ Counting on a truce, Karageorge kept his soldiers calm.

The truce ended in 1807, unexpected as it started, on the one hand because the Porte asked for disarmament of the rebels, on the other hand because they gained Russian support. In the new constellation of power and re-opened frontiers, one of Karageorge's closest associates, Mladen Milovanović, merchant and governor of Belgrade, expelled around a thousand Jews from the city. This was one of the side effects of merchants gaining political power during the uprising, since the specter of their roles expanded to the sphere of international politics, where their personal connections and multilingualism was more than useful.⁶⁹ They looked for support and haven in the Austrian empire and among foreign consuls. The explanation that foreign consuls got after inquiring about the reasons of expulsion was the Jewish serviceto 'Turks'.⁷⁰ On the one hand, taking into consideration the liminal position Jews had in this conflict, the lack of support to the Christian

⁶⁵ Đorđe Petrović (1768-1817) was the leader of the First Uprising (1805-1812). He is more famous under his nickname Karadžorđe, meaning Black George. The Ottoman authorities gave prefix „Black” to rebels. Serbian historiography usually refers to him by his nickname, while in foreign literature the transcriptions of it can vary from: Karadžorđe, Karadjordje, Black George, Kara George or the one I prefer to use – Karageorge.

⁶⁶ J. Lebel, “The Evolution of the Serbian State and the Struggle of Serbian Jewry for Equal Rights”, in: *The Last Ottoman Century and Beyond: The Jews in Turkey and the Balkans 1808-1945 II* (ed. M. Rozen), 47.

⁶⁷ V. Vinaver, “Jevreji u Srbiji početkom XX veka”, *Jevrejski almanah* (1855-1856), 32-33.

⁶⁸ B. Hrabak, op. cit, 220.

⁶⁹ E. Davidova, *Balkan Transitions to Modernity and Nation-States. Through the Eyes of Three Generations of Merchants (1780s-1890s)*, Leiden/Boston 2013, 25.

⁷⁰ J. Lebel, op. cit, 47.

rebels could have been interpreted as siding with Muslims. Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked that Milovanović was one of the most prominent representatives of the growing class of Serbian merchants, that was aiming to consolidate their power in the market and outside of it.

But the times to get the hold on the market were still far from sight. The Second Uprising brought a new leader and the new pretender for the controller of the market. Prince Miloš's political actions followed the path of (re-)assuring political autonomy of the principedom, gave him personal autonomy inside of his political creation. *Turkish pasha*, the famous epithet ascribed to him by Slobodan Jovanović, sheds light on his political actions so precisely that it is no wonder that it had been used so often in historiography. As his political power relied on his personal good relations with the Porte, the relationship of his subjects imitated this scheme.

The growing power of merchants was not going hand in hand with Miloš' imagined economical space. As he did not see the difference between public and his personal possessions, it is no wonder that he was considered among the wealthiest persons of the time.⁷¹ Besides, the prince did not hide his intentions to control the market. In 1822 he introduced the monopoly of prices, explaining it as a measure of protecting the peasant population which was under attack from the growing merchant class.⁷² Even though he did not allow re-feudalization, which was among the things that wealthier representatives of the new state pursued, changes in the taxation were not tangible in everyday life. Instead of whole set of taxes Christian population was paying under the direct Ottoman rule (for each adult man, yearly yields, exemption from military service etc.), under Miloš' rule was changed into an unique tax paid in two installments – at the beginning of May (on St. George's Day) and in

⁷¹ B. Jelavich, *History of the Balkans. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century I*, Cambridge 1983, 239.

⁷² B. Hrabak, op. cit, 272.

the middle of September (on St. Mitar's Day).⁷³ Therefore, Christian population of the principedom did not feel that big of a change.

Since Miloš was working on expanding autonomy and acquiring hereditary title for his son any kind of conflict with the sultan would be an extreme political luxury. Therefore, his animosity towards Greeks and restrained attitude towards their rebellion could be interpreted just as a necessary tactical move. However, the prince's relationship with Greeks had its reflection in the politics in the interior. Not only had the Greek merchants agitated for Karageorge and, therefore, undermined Miloš' legitimacy, but their dominance in import and transit trade of the principedom draw the boundaries of his economical influence. The Greek position on the market also had its cultural side – their commercial practice and language were dominant cultural pattern.⁷⁴ On the one hand, he was trying to suppress Greek multi-layered influence in commerce, but, on the other hand, he did not allow the emergence of the Serbian merchant class.

In this light, therefore, his alliance with Cincars and Jews should be interpreted as alliance of need. However, this economical move had a significant influence on ethnical structure of the population in the long run. This favoritism shown towards Cincars and Jews by granting them trade passports and trusting them with the state orders, had moved Cincars from complete hellenization to which they were leaning to previously, to assimilation of Serbian language and custom.⁷⁵ Since there was no religious barrier, Cincars were soon recognizable by their Serbianized last names in the census lists.⁷⁶

The religious barrier did not enable Jews to undergo the same path. There are also indications that inclusion of Jews under the prince's protection was not as universal as in Cincars' case. Wealthy and well established Jews had preference. For the Hajim family, for instance, we know that they were

⁷³ R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830-1839)*, Beograd 1886, 71.

⁷⁴ J. R. Lampe, M. R. Jackson, op. cit, 118.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 117- 118.

⁷⁶ V. Stojančević, op.cit, 527.

among Miloš' closest associates since 1819. David Hajim had a significant role as a supplier of weaponry and munitions and foreign goods in general, but also as informal banker and money lender. However, good reason to conclude that the poorer Jews, small artisans and merchants also gained from the prince's inclination to the Jews as a group, are complaints from merchants' and artisans' guilds since the middle of the 1820s.⁷⁷ During Miloš' rule, not only that the guilds did not enjoy political power, then also Jews had rights to confine directly to him, that to say – they had the possibility to get around the whole state structure.

Nevertheless, after the joined pressure of the still sovereign Porte with the inner support ended in an attempt to confine Miloš's autocracy through the so-called Turkish constitution ended in prince's abdication. Afterwards, his two sons ruled for less than two years but the pressures of the growing elite ended in abolition, for the time being, of the rule of Obrenović house and beginning of the rule of Constitutionalists.

Bureaucratic Liberalism of the Market

In petition to the Belgrade's authorities, the members of guilds and other inhabitants claimed that in the case of danger, Jewish presence in the state will make it more significant, since that means "feeding a hostile people in our close proximity".⁷⁸ The spatial metaphor of *vicinity of the hostile element* was the dominant rhetoric on the matter of Jews during the new regime. This has certainly influenced the policies of the authorities

Throughout the region in this period "monopoly on power maintained by monarchs and aristocratic oligarchies remained unchallenged, and the rivalry between them was the only legitimate form of

⁷⁷ B. Hrabak, op. Cit, 264, 273.

⁷⁸ AS, MUD-PO 1844, F IX, R 138. *Zahtev nekih stanovnika Beograda I esnafa da se zabran inaseljavanje Evreja. 24.2.1844.*

political opposition”.⁷⁹ Therefore, the nature of power in Serbia changed its outward scaffolding but not its underlying structures, since the constitutional projects were essentially meant to establish and protect political and economic privileges.

The *bureaucratic liberalism* or *Beamterliberalismus* that developed after Miloš’ abdication did, on the one hand, introduced the legal state in terms of respecting private property and rejecting arbitrary rule, alongside with the free market.⁸⁰ On the other hand, notions such as political rights, a free public sphere and popular representation were not on the Constitutionalists’ agenda.⁸¹ Another important factor in their domestic affairs is populism. Concentrating on the unpopular political moves of precursors and with the help of short lasting political tricks such as lowering the tax portions, Constitutionalists managed to gain wider popularity.⁸² Therefore, the combination of their own interests, especially in the market, and concentration on personal and not political rights, left a gap in which Jews suffered as “anomaly” of the system.

Throughout the period of the Constitutionalists’ rule the attack on Jews primarily originated from the backbone of the regime – the merchant class who aimed to take over the monopoly from the hands of rulers. In line with A. A. Shelven’s definition of *political tolerance*, with the change of political realities, concessions of tolerance are most probably to change as well.⁸³ The shifts were possible since the state institutions were still fragile, the opposition non existing and social questions wide open. Therefore the Jewish question was addressed as common denominator.⁸⁴ In the reality of Belgrade in early 1840s, the points of conflict were deeply imbedded in the laws of market, making

⁷⁹ D. Mishkova, “Balkan Liberalism: Historical Routes of a Modern Ideology”, in: *Entangled Histories of the Balkans, Volume Two: Transfers of Political Ideologies*, 106.

⁸⁰ S. Jovanović, *Vlada Ustavobranitelja*, 122.

⁸¹ D. Mishkova, “Balkan Liberalism”, 111-112.

⁸² A. N. Draganich, *The development of parliamentary government in Serbia*, New York 1978, 23-24.

⁸³ A.A. van Schelven, quoted in Hans J. Hillerbrand, "Religious Dissent and Toleration. Introductory Reflections," in: *Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe*, (ed. B. K. Kiraly), New York/London 1985, 2.

⁸⁴ C. Iordachi, op. cit, 121.

the Main bazaar a battlefield of conflicting ideas of “liberal” market but also conflicting ideas of otherness.

It is important to state that Constitutionalists were not reformers and certainly not political thinkers. The impulse of political change was coming from the north, where, in the Austrian empire educated Serbian diaspora was active. However, due to attempt to restrain their influence *Decree on strangers* was published in 1844 that stated that no “foreigners” could be admitted in the service of Praviteljstvo⁸⁵ as long as that place was occupied by the “sons of patria”.⁸⁶ This insisting on the *local* identity, prior to ethno-national (in making), will be reflected in the dealings with the Jews, as well.

But the *local* was to be redefined. Through the example of Jews and their presence in Belgrade, we can aim to track the meaning of this obviously important term for the period of 1842-1858. Three decrees concerning their right of settlement and work were published in close proximity to each other – in 1842, 1844 and 1856. The first set the tightest boundaries of the Jewish life. It banned Jews from living and working outside of Belgrade, but sets the limits inside of the city as well. From the city in a more narrow sense, Jews had to displace their stores to the city’s outskirts – Belgrade’s šanac, Schanze or the entrenchment.⁸⁷ This liminal position Jews shared with the remaining Ottoman garrisons.

When early in 1844 the city authorities found out about a wave of around 30 poor Jewish families heading to Belgrade from Sarajevo, after being expelled from their homes, this policy got at the migration aspect. The decision of the Minister of Interior was not to let them enter the county, unless they either possess enough money to sustain themselves, or if they have crafts and goods to

⁸⁵Praviteljstvo is a term for the collegial executive body of Government, based on the country's senior government officials and other public officials.

⁸⁶ AS, MUD-PO 1844, F VIII, R 81. *Knez Aleksandar Karađorđević Popečiteljstvu unutrašnjih dela.*

⁸⁷ AS, MUD-PO, R X, R 1. *Predstavka jevrejske veroispovedne opštine.*

trade. Nevertheless, valid passports were also necessary.⁸⁸ On the one hand, the authorities Belgrade's bazaar was still to certain extent welcoming of productive guests but not to mere settlers.

However, representatives of the guilds and city's inhabitants had addressed the city authorities soon after the word about the incoming refugees was spread. Their main idea to "move the Jews residing here, since it is the border, and to limit the number the incoming foreign Jews". Among the arguments to support this demand, they portrayed Jews as "twofaced and world-known frauds, who are leaving their previous residences because of crimes, distrust and because of extreme poverty, and since they do not have their own homeland, they found here freedom like nowhere before, they have swarmed up at our Homeland as predators and grasshoppers". The petitioners' impression was that the Jews left people "without bread", since "the characteristic of their law and national character is to be enemy to Christians". The petitioners also refer to the limited rights and control of movement Jews are to obey in other countries.⁸⁹

Therefore, the ideas of the authorities and civil representatives were heading in different directions. On the one hand, the locals and especially local merchants, besides obviously projecting tread of cohabitation with Jews, were aiming at, if possible removing Jews from the capital under the excuse of its importance as a border city. Further step would be to restrain, as far as possible, or at least prevent increase of Jewish refugees in the principedom. The position of the authorities was different. First of all, after pleading for Jews to come under the subjecthood of principedom, they could not remove the Jews. Their aim was different – to *localize the Jews* – to define and draw the lines of the Jewish existence in the capital precisely, close to the center and, thus, controlled by the center.

The prince's office first initiated the census of Jews that would be the list of Jewish property, including real-estate, their *origin* and listing how long they had been living in Belgrade and finally,

⁸⁸ AGB, UGB 1884, K 30, R 243.

⁸⁹AS,MUD-PO 1844, F IX, R-138.

listing the number of both female and male grownups. The result showed that there were 363 Jewish families in Belgrade, listing 773 men and 673 women. Besides that, Jews owned 129 shops and stores, while 235 among them did not own any kind of real estate. After acquiring that information, the Ministry addressed the Council, to express inability to meet the demands of the guilds since “there are no rules on which this decision could be based on”. Therefore, “for now, no limitations to Jewish commercial work can be made without including our merchants as well.”⁹⁰ The only thing that Ministry could have done is to leave this question further to the Council, the body that exercised executive powers.

However, the prince did re-announced the degree that prohibited the Jews to live outside of Belgrade in October 1844. The decree did not introduce any further boundaries to the settlement of Jews in Serbia. The physical estrangement of Jews was still bound to *šanac*, not only reflecting on the place of their residence, but their business as well. They were denied the right to conduct their business, nor to possess any real estate outside of Belgrade.⁹¹

The difference between wishes expressed by the petitioners and the resulting actions taken are significant. Therefore, from the perspective of the *margin*, the center seems less homogenous and finite and more fluid and tenuous. Also, the genuine capacities of the authorities to carry out this order is questionable. It seems that the decree was followed, at least its part that refers to the prohibition of settlement outside of the capital, since in 1845 already there was report that testifies that three Jews settled in Belgrade, originally from the Austrian empire and they have established small businesses – Naftali Aškenazi had continued peddling, while Isak Meulani opened a grocery shop and Israeli, whose last name remained unknown to us, resold flour.⁹² These Jews have most probably remained the subjects of the Austrian empire and therefore were not under jurisdiction of

⁹⁰ AS, MUD-PO 1844, F-61, P-5.

⁹¹ AS, MUD-PO, F-IV, P-66.

⁹² AS, MUD-PO 1845, Φ-V, P-61.

the Serbian authorities. Which also shows that even though authorities must have aimed at their decrees to be universal, they did not take into account any further than the general category that was known to them.

Exactly this issue was addressed in Alexander's last decree concerning Jews in 1856. Through the address at the authorities of all of the principedom's counties, the prince was answering on the Jewish plea to allow them to conduct their business outside of Belgrade's walls. This, however, was not accepted and it was emphasized that this rule refers both to domestic and foreign Jews. However, the prince did abolish allow them to spread their business to the entirety of the capital city.⁹³ The Jews were once again back on the Velikačaršija, after fourteen years. They did not lose that position until the emancipation came, but conceptually their place in the state and its market was re-positioned under the rule of Miloš and Mihailo.

The rules of exceptions

Joseph Almuli expressed his disdain and wounded pride when the authorities of the town Šabac, in the North Western part of the principedom, warned him that he needs an approval from the state authorities to open a shop in January 1858. Since he was a foreign citizen, Almuli interpreted that the rule of the Jewish confinement to the capital did not apply to him. Therefore, he could allow himself the confidence to say that he is not even interested in the rules of principedom, since the French consul allowed him to open a shop. And indeed, the support of the French consul was not lacking and soon the French Jew held a shop in the town.⁹⁴ Almuli's case is the first one that gave reason to question and change the attitude towards Jews.

⁹³ AS, MUD-PO, 1856, F XI, R 20. *Knež svim okružima. 30.10.1856.*

⁹⁴ AS, MUD-PO, 1861, F XIII, R 21.

However, the change of policies had to wait for the change of the government. After the turbulent events around the so-called St. Andrew's Assembly in December 1858, prince Miloš Obrenović began his second rule. A wave of absolutism splashed Serbian politics once again. Since the split in the country was dynasty-based, Milos worked on replacing the bureaucratic structure with people loyal to him.⁹⁵ Even though his rule lasted less than two whole years, its impacts on certain policies and regulations were visible and among them those related to the Jewish presence in the state's interior.

The debate on Jews opened around another foreign citizen, Abraham Leon, Austrian Jew. But the poles of the debate changed. On the one hand, the authorities of the town Šabac, where Leon opened a shop in the first months of 1859, had on their side the Ministry of Interior, that openly stated there should be no difference between Jews, disregarding their subjecthood, since the measures against Jewish migrations reflected the concerns of massive immigration from the Ottoman empire.⁹⁶ The town's authorities sealed the shop of three Jews but not Joseph Almuli's, since he was still under protection of the French consul.⁹⁷ This exception gave space for further exceptions to be made. However, the 1844 decree was still not abolished.

Nevertheless, the prince prompted by the plea of the Jews whose shops were sealed in Šabac, in which they expressed the miserable social conditions that made them move from Belgrade stating that "necessity changes the law."⁹⁸ Miloš openly addressed his concern about the difference the authorities made between foreign and domestic Jews. This was soon reflected in a decree the prince published in September 1859 that enabled Jews to settle, live and work outside of the state's capital.

⁹⁵ S. Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila*, Beograd 1923, 28-29.

⁹⁶ AS, MUD-PO, 1861, F XIII, R 21, *Načelníštvo Šabačko Početeljstvu inostranib dela 5.3. 1859.*

⁹⁷ Ibid, *Popečeteljstvo vnutrenib dela Knjazju*, 19. 6. 1859.

⁹⁸ Ibid, *Bohor Zadik Cohen, Leon Cirasi i Isak Levi knezu* 20.2.1859. (*underlined in the original*)

Even though the next Assembly, in November 1859, in which four Jews were present⁹⁹, suggested to the Council, the main executive body, not to abolish the 1844 decree prince's decree stayed in power.

However, personal intervention of prince Miloš was fairly different than the ones he made during his first rule. First of all, this time the intervention, even though it was an exception, it was a part of the system or the systematic decision making. Therefore, it did not bear the weight of personal protection as it had before. Nevertheless, this political move reflected in prince Miloš' decree had a major impact on the future of Jews in Serbia.

Slobodan Jovanović claimed that Miloš' successor, prince Mihailo was lead by one thought – liberation from Ottoman rule. Mihailo approached the Serbian political scene with an idea of unifying confronted political actors – conservatives and liberals – with enlightened absolutistic type of rule.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, his further policies did not engage with Jewish mobility on a state level after this decree. Rather his authorities dealt with questions that were opened thanks to exceptions Miloš' policies. Soon after succession of his son, it has been decided that the prince Miloš' decree will stay in power until February 1861.¹⁰¹ Therefore, Jews who settled outside of the capital and opened business in period between September 1859 and February 1861 got the right to stay. However, the inheritors of Jews who settled and opened shops outside of Belgrade in the giving period had to return to capital and close their shops.¹⁰² Nevertheless, these exceptions just gave space for still further exceptions to be made.

Among different cases, I chose to mention another from Šabac which shows in which directions *necessity did change the law*. The authorities at first wondered if Jakob Koen, Juda Avramović, Jakob

⁹⁹Ibid, *Popečiteljstvo vnutrenih dela Upraviteljstvu varoši Beograda*, 4.9.1859.

¹⁰⁰ S. Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila*, 89-91.

¹⁰¹Ibid, *Popečiteljstvo vnutrenih dela Predsedateljstvo Sovjeta*, 26.11.1859.

¹⁰²Ibid, *Knjaga Popečiteljstv uvnutrenih dela*, 4.11.1861.

Fins and Hajim Mutiji can reside in the town, since it was clear that they had moved there after Mihailo's decree from the February 1861. They reflected on their social condition, emphasizing their poverty and health and/or age and close family they had in the town and which had a significant influence on the quality of their life.¹⁰³ Even though, both the town's authorities and targeted Jews proved that their existence was dependent on the family they had there, the Ministry of Interior stated that Jews are not allowed to settle in Šabac. However, stays concerning trade and visits to fairs are allowed.¹⁰⁴ The grip was loosening.

After the famous incident of Čukur-česma (the Sulfur fountain), when in the summer of 1862 a physical clash between Muslims and Christians brought the principedom and the Ottoman empire to the verge of a war. Residing in Jaliya, the space which they shared with Belgrade's Muslim population, the Jews were suffering damage from both sides. There were no human victims noted, however between 3rd and 5th of June, Jaliya was pillaged, by both Christians and Muslims and even Jewish robbers.¹⁰⁵ The treaty eventually led to the eviction of the remaining Muslim from the principedom. The event was not only politically significant for the history of Serbia and Belgrade, since the departure of the Ottoman authorities marked another phase of autonomy, another step to independence. But this conflict also resulted in bombing of Belgrade by the Ottoman forces, in which, ironically, the biggest part of the city's visibly Ottoman architecture and structure perished. Nataša Mišković called the Čukur-česma incident "the end of the Ottoman Belgrade".¹⁰⁶ However, among the remnants of the Ottoman rule was still not completely homogeneous structure of population. It seems that prince Mihailo was aware that the presence of Jews in the new situation,

¹⁰³ AS, MUD-PO, 1864, F X, R 1. *Faithful subjects to the prince 20.6.1863*; Ibid, *Šabac's mayor to the Minister of Finance 10.6.1864*

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, *Ministar unutrenih dela Šabačkom praviteljstvu, 18.12.1864.*

¹⁰⁵ J. Đorđević, „Beogradski Jevreji u događajima iz 1862“, *Zbornik Jewish studies* (1992), 324.

¹⁰⁶ N. Mišković, *Bazaaren und Boulevards*, 41

without the imagined “Muslim shield”, opened up a new type of Jewish question(s) – thus the willingness to negotiate but still not abolish the previous set of rules.

Using the metaphor of “margin” to describe the Jewish position in the Serbian principedom through the spatial context of the market is very tempting. And margin is moveable, does not have to be bilaterally negotiated and leaves enough of space for labeling. In the case study of this sphere of the Jewish experience we have seen that the market space was highly conflicted and negotiated without participation of all interested sides. Being legally constrained to trade in Belgrade, and even in its outskirts for fourteen years, Jewish economical life was pushed to the margins of existence but not entirely to the margins of the city, of the state and the politics. This is visible through the subtle and less subtle shifts in policies.

However, it is important to stress that even though there were noticeable shifts from the “absolutism of the market” during Miloš’ first rule, to the liberalization of the market, that the state was always controlling it. Therefore, even though the initiative to extract the Jews from the markets in the interior of the principedom, they cannot be exclusively blamed for concentrating the Jews in Belgrade. Their plea dating in 1844 specifically asked the authorities “to move the Jews residing here, since it is the border.”¹⁰⁷ The decision of the authorities to confine the principedom’s Jews to Belgrade cannot be explained only through the aim of keeping Muslims and Jews together, as the same type of “anomaly”, since Muslims and Ottoman garrisons were scattered in six other towns in the principedom.

¹⁰⁷ AS,MUD-PO 1844, F IX, R-138.

This applies especially for the labeling Jews. During the uprisings and early years of the principedom, during times when the Ottoman danger was seen behind every merchant, identifying Jews and Muslims as one category does make analytical sense. Nevertheless, the categories changed with time. Miloš' case probably shows this the best. As he gained control over the market, support of Jews and Cincars seemed necessary. In the time of the oligarchic rule of the Constitutionalists, the priorities were not necessarily on the ethno-religious side than on the social position, even class, base of the scale. This certainly does not have to mean that "the Jewish question(s)" were not part of the greater "Muslim question" that the political actors were facing in this period. Only that this question was not on the top of the agenda. In the end, this can be understood through the situation in the moment when the majority of the Muslims left the principedom and its Jewish inhabitants stayed became the first "other" in line. This approach to political engineering is necessary if we opt to choose and use our generalizations wisely.

Having that in mind, the focus of the next chapter shifts to the interaction between the Jewish community and the principedom's authorities, which will end up in a joint endeavor of making the Jewish Church Community.

An institution among institutions

Rabbi Šlang suggested that the first time Jews in Belgrade were mentioned was around the middle of the tenth century. From that point on, there is no reason to believe that their presence in the city had significant discontinuities. The major influx of Jews, however, came with the Ottoman occupation of the city in 1521. Not only had the number of the Jews increased, but the city also became among the most important Jewish centers, starting from the seventeenth century, when rabbi Judah Lerma, from Salonica, became the chief rabbi. From that moment on, Belgrade was mentioned as one of the reference points of the Sephardic world, side by side to Salonica and Constatinopolis.¹⁰⁸

Taking these facts into consideration, it is possible to conclude that a certain kind of a community, an institution, or a body of the Jews residing in Belgrade existed from a period long before the establishment of the principedom. The simultaneity of the two frameworks of existence ended in 1864, with the establishment of the Jewish Church School Community (*jevrejsko crkveno-školska obština*). This chapter argues that the appropriation of the Jewish community within the principedom's institutional system was another way of localizing the Jews.

The intervention of the already mentioned state-organized committee in the internal affairs of the Jewish community was the first step towards localizing the Jewish Church School community. The committee was made of three officials from different ministries – Aleksa Davidović was the controller of the Ministry of Finance, on the behalf of Ministry of Interior the member was Miloš Šukić and finally, Milan Đ. Milićević was the representative of Ministry of Education and the Church.¹⁰⁹ Among them, the best known is Milan Đ. Milićević as a biographer and ethnologist.

¹⁰⁸ I. Šlang, op.cit, 2.

¹⁰⁹ AS, MP 1878, Φ VII, 6poj i55. *Knjaževski predstavnik minister inostranib dela S. Nikolić Upravi prosvete 7.8.1861.*

According to the report, the focus of the committee was to establish the differences between “German” and “Spanish” Jews but also to list the sources of finances and authority within the community. Therefore, they were mainly interested in the origin of the rabbi of the community, the power rabbis of Salonica, Edirne and Constantinople enjoyed in the community living in Belgrade.

Besides that, they were interested in the real estate the community controlled. From the first question it is clear that the authorities knew close to nothing about the Jews under their rule. Not only had the committee asked about Jewish dogma but they also inquired about any kind of document issued by the authorities about the community. “We are not in possession of any document issued by the Serbian state authorities; then what exists is what was found since the old times.”¹¹⁰ Therefore, the committee was the first step to the further involvement of the authorities to the internal affairs of the community.

State as an organizer

Laying on the confluence of two rivers, holding relevance as a strategic point, Belgrade was, as it was shown in the previous chapter, a significant meeting point for trade. Even though the Ottoman Jews, especially in the Balkans were of the Sephardic origin, Ashkenazi Jews were not an obscurity in the empire. In this regard, Belgrade was not an exemption. In general, conflicts between Sephardi and Ashkenazi were not uncommon. The famous example from the region is Sarajevo, where the relations between “native” Sephardi community and the Ashkenazim, who came alongside with the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The term used to explain stands of the Sephardim towards their coreligionists is “resentment”.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ AS, MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izvidanje komisije*. 30.9.1861.

¹¹¹ H. P. Freidenreich, op. cit, 15.

During the first half of the eighteenth century, certainly as the consequence of the Austrian occupation of the Belgrade's pashalik in the period between 1717 and 1739, the Ashkenazi community was the more numerous one. Rabbi Šlang wrote about a conflict in the Sephardic community around this time, which resulted in the accession of the wealthier members of this community with the Ashkenazi. From that moment on, the conflict had outgrown the communal framework and became Jewish in general. The rabbi notes that the "discord" lasted for five years and was finally solved through the mediation of the city authorities.¹¹² The distortion of balance between the two Jewish communities must have reflected the tax issues of both of the communities which was the reason why the city authorities reacted.

Another occasion when Belgrade's authorities felt obliged to consult the Ministry was when a major split between Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jews in Belgrade occurred at the end of the fifth decade of the nineteenth century. The sources do not offer a linear explanation of the conflict and its roots, especially since the whole conflict lasted for more than three years, starting in 1858 and ending only after 1861 and obviously included various changes of camps.

It appears that one of the layers of the disagreement was in the Sephardic supremacy. This is reflected in the fact that the conflict, as it was presented, started with questions of burial. According to the Ashkenazi representatives it started with the higher burial taxes their "Spanish" coreligionists charged them, but the flood of complaints had no end. The institutions of the community were accused of not following the strict rules under which the decedent was to be buried, followed by other "dogmatic" disagreements. Ashkenazi, in the end, had no other option but to hire a "priest"

¹¹² I. Šlang, op. cit, 55.

and a teacher on their own expenses.¹¹³ Their argument was that these extra expenses put on them were unfair, since “German Jews” settled in Belgrade in the same time as the “Spanish Jews.”¹¹⁴

On the other hand, the “Spanish” community argued that Ashkenazi plotted against them with the aim of being relieved from communal taxes and, thus, coexisting outside of the existing rules. Their explanation for the extra expenses for the Ashkenazi community was, in the fact, that the mentioned cases were foreign subjects, therefore since they have not contributed to the communal life, the funeral expenses had to be higher for them.¹¹⁵ Therefore, in a way, the clash was behind the definition of who was, or was not, the Serbian subject. This particular idea of *subjecthood* was pointing out the very tight relationship between responsibilities and privileges.

Following the line of argument of the Ashkenazim, there is no doubt about the presence of the Ashkenazi Jews in Belgrade previous to the 19th century, as it was stated earlier. However this group that was agitating against the majority of the Sephardim, by their own words, traced their roots in the principedom from the time of prince Miloš, who had invited them as goldsmiths to decorate military uniforms. They had, at first, settled in Kragujevac, the former capital, and afterwards moved together with the authorities to Belgrade, the new capital. According to the statement of Lazar Levenson, their representative, from the time the German Jews settled in the principedom, they had formed a community together with some Polish Jews, who took Serbian subjecthood and therefore had the right to have their own synagogue. In Kragujevac their synagogue was in a place of a former pharmacy, opened with support of the prince. Afterwards, in Belgrade they rented Milutin Radovanović's house in Dorćol.¹¹⁶ The existence of a separate synagogue, or more precisely a synagogue with a different language of service was not a problem on its own. Nor was it a sign that

¹¹³MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izabrani obštinarci Vašoj svetlosti*, 17.5.1860.

¹¹⁴MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izabrani obštinarci Vašoj svetlosti*, 17.5.1860.

¹¹⁵MP 1878, F VII, R i55, *Upraviteljstvu varoši Beograda predstavnici obštine ovde španske jevrejske*.

¹¹⁶MP 1878, F VII, R i55, *Lazar Levenson Upraviteljstvu varoši Beograda* 16.9.1861.

the Ashkenazim made some sort of a institutionally separated community, especially since it was recognized by that the holder of the right to open and run a synagogue were Polish Jews – turned Serbian subjects. If that was the case, for instance, they would not have the problem of organizing separate burial service.

Another layer of the problem occurred when Jews coming from the “Empire” (Ćesarija), therefore Austrian subjects, started agitating with the goal of forming their own community, with the support of the Austrian consul. Therefore, the Ashkenazi community was not unique in pursuing the idea of a separate community. More or less of a foreign influence was an influx, which was, according to Levenson, seriously resisted. They had no tolerance for the supremacy of the Austrian subjects in the synagogue and they did not intend to pray for the health of the Austrian emperor instead for the ruler of Serbia, prince Mihailo M. Obrenović.¹¹⁷ What started, or appeared to have started as an inter-communal disagreement, became a topic of international relations.

The resentment of the Belgrade’s municipal authorities towards the idea of two Jewish communities is obvious from the beginning. As the first instance, already in 1858, the Belgrade authorities are particularly concerned with the setting of the synagogue and the community without permission, but also with the fact that the number of the Austrian subjects was minor – five families and fifteen individuals without families. Pointing out numbers, especially through families, meant the obvious awareness and decrease of income for the existing Jewish community. Finally, this would open a set of communal questions – how to give land for cemetery and a synagogue when foreign subjects do not have the right to possess real-estate in the principedom.¹¹⁸

Already two years into the conflict, the Ministry of Education and Church had already many the frequently mentioned Committee with an intention to question and give further suggestions of ways

¹¹⁷ MP 1878, F VII, R i55, *Lazar Levenson Upraviteljstvu varoši Beograda 16.9.1861.*

¹¹⁸ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Visokoslavnom Popečiteljstvu unutrašnjih dela Upraviteljstvo varoši Beogradske, 20.10.1858.*

the situation is to be handled. The knowledge about the existing and functioning of the community was new to the members of the committee. It seems that the institution of the community was made up of sixteen to eighteen members.¹¹⁹ In their recommendation to the Ministry of Interior, the committee gave a suggestion to officially allow the separation of the two Jewish groups, since they notice “great hatred among German and Spanish Jews.”¹²⁰

Nevertheless, the reconstruction of the Jewish communal life came in three years. It seems that the state got involved after the Jewish community asked for help in book keeping in the same way as the state led books of the Christian/church communities in mid of 1864.¹²¹ This reflected the constitution and form of the community. Now the Jewish community had “one Serbian community” and became the *community of Jewish church (obština evrejsko-školska)*.¹²²

State as an educator

One of the rare occasions Belgrade’s Jewry caught the attention of the wider academic audience was due the existence of Jewish school(s) which were teaching Serbian already in the 1860s.¹²³ The particularity of the Belgrade’s example is especially striking when compared with the schools opened by Alliance Israélite Universelle at the same time throughout the Ottoman and post-Ottoman regions. From the first one, which was opened in Morocco in 1862 to the entirety of 183 schools in 1913, geographically ranging from Morocco to Iran, Alliance promoted ‘regeneration’ of the Jews

¹¹⁹ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izviđanje komisije. 30.9.1861. (question number 13)*

¹²⁰ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Upravi prosvete M. Đ. Miličević, A. T. Davidović, M.M. Šukić 13.10.1861.*

¹²¹ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Ministru Prosvete I Crkvenih dela Ministar Finansija 1.10.1864.*

¹²²

¹²³B. Friedreich, op. cit, 37; A. Rodrigue, “Eastern Sephardi Jewry and New Nation-States in the Balkans in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries”, in: *Sephardi and Middle Eastern Jewries. History and Culture in the modern era* (ed. H. E. Goldberg), Bloomington 1996, 86.

through the curriculum based on French instruction and Jewish subjects, such as history, religion and Hebrew.¹²⁴

However, the education was a significant aspect of the Constitutionalists' program as well. The laws directing the opening and the funding of elementary schools from the municipal and later Ministry of Education funds have been established.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, even though the building of the Jewish school existed already in the mid of the nineteenth century, the state authorities had nothing to do with it.¹²⁶ As in most of Jewish communities a school must have existed previously, since in the census of 1827, out of the 239 listed persons, 22 of them were teachers, students or priests.¹²⁷ However, the school was a private endeavor, some sort of a cultural reserve, of the Jewish community.

Nevertheless, presumably after the reached high concentration of the Jews in Belgrade, in 1847 the leading members of the community came to an idea to establish a fond which would financially support the Jewish school and would mainly serve for covering the teachers' salaries. The fond was supposed to be financially supported by the members of the community. The key word in the previous sentence is *financially*. Their enthusiasm at this point could not have been brought to reality without the government allowing the new tax to be conscribed on its subjects. Therefore, the fifteen enthusiasts submitted the funding plan to the authorities and in the next five years, every member of the community was supposed to contribute to the fund with a sum that was around 1/6 of the main tax of the principedom. Following the five year periods, the fund would not be closed but it will

¹²⁴A. Rodrigue, "From Millet to Minority: Turkish Jewry", in : *Paths of Emancipation. Jews, states and citizenship* (ed. P. Birnbaum, I. Katznelson), Princeton 1995, 253.

¹²⁵ S. Jovanović, *Vlada Ustavobranitelja*, 77-78.

¹²⁶ I. Šlang, op.cit,89.

¹²⁷ D. Sidnik, "O jevrejskim školama u Beogradu u XIX veku", *Jevrejski almanah*(1961-1862), 99.

depend only on voluntary donations.¹²⁸ The state seemingly had no contact in the almost decade and a half with the Jewish school and even then its interest was vague.

However, in 1861, the Committee showed interest in the school system of the Jewish community. One out of fourteen questions was dealing with the school, namely, focusing on the profile of students and the origin of the teacher, as well as the source of his funding. Hence, we found out that the school was open for male children from the age of three and that it had seven grades. However, all children went in the same class and worked individually. The curriculum focused on learning Hebrew and the Bible. Nevertheless, during the last year of schooling children did learn “some Serbian and German”. The teachers, mainly ruined merchants, either Serbian or foreign subjects, were financed through the tax on meat. At that moment, based on the notes the scribe left on the margins, there were seven teachers.¹²⁹ The committee obviously paid a visit to the school, because in a separate note directed to the Ministry of Education and Church Affairs they asked for the Ministry to pay attention to the building of the Jewish school which is “currently killing the health of few thousand small children.”¹³⁰ However, there was no mention of the further involvement or interest of the Ministry in Jewish education.

The most eventful year for the Jews living in Belgrade was 1864, which left its marks on this sphere of the community’s life. Two representatives of the Jewish community Hajim Abramović and Avram Koen, who wrote to the Ministry of Education, concluded that their generation is in a worse position, both socially and economically, than their ancestors were a century ago, and found that “the main reason for our downfall is in lack in knowledge and education”. The Jewish school did not anymore fit the needs of the reality – its accent on the “Jewish language” disabled the students to pursue further education in a gymnasium or a school for merchants. This had obviously cut down

¹²⁸ 129 *Beogradski Jevreji – o školovanju Jevrejske dece*, in: *Uprava varoši Beograda*, 210-211.

¹²⁹ AS, MP 1861, F VII, No 1155, *Izveštće komisije*.

¹³⁰ Ibid, *Upravi prosvete M. Đ., Miličević, A. T. Davidović, M. M. Šukić 13. Oktobra 1861.*

the possibilities for personal development and left Jews “as blind people without eyes, not even knowing the language of their country.”¹³¹

Therefore, their idea was that the Ministry would organize the already existing Jewish school according to the rules used for Serbian schools – the same classes and subjects, and especially the teaching of the Serbian language, but also helping to modify the upbringing of the Jewish youth using ‘Serbian ways’. They were hoping that as soon “as sons of the same homeland with join forces [they would] work for the interests of their home.”¹³² Nevertheless, one thing is important for them – not to mix the Jewish students with the Serbian ones. The reason for this was that the school on Dorćol was too far away from Jewish mahala and already too crowded, while on the other hand the mixing would complicate the following of the Jewish laws and they already have a building.

Soon enough, the community had not only one but two schools funded from the Ministry’s fund for schools. On the initiative of the Ministry, the other school was open for girls, which was welcomed in the community. The only condition was that the teacher in the school is Serbian and that they keep the number of students in both of the schools to at least 25, the condition that was prescribed for Serbian schools as well. Not only was it on the municipal authorities to check whether the old building was “pleasant” enough for a school, but also the teacher’s salary and his and schools contributions were to become part of the fiscal responsibilities of the Belgrade’s municipality.¹³³

That the authorities had not thought the issue through is evident from the pleas the Jewish community submitted to the Ministry asking for Jewish students to be exempt from school on Sabbath and other holidays.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, the community expressed their gratitude for schools in

¹³¹ AS, MP 1861, F VII, No 1155, *Gospodinu ministru prosvete i crkvenih dela u Beogradu, predstavnici obštine Evreiske Haim Abramović i Avram Koen 17.2.1864.*

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ AS, MP 1861, F VII, No I 155, *Upravi Beograda Min. Prosvete 24.2.1864.*

¹³⁴ AS, MP 1861, F VII, No I 155, *Ministartstvu prosvete i crkvenih dela najpokornije sluge Samuel S. Koen, Haim Abraimović, Avram M. Koen, 23.11.1861.*

the name of all “Serbian citizens of Jewish confession.”¹³⁵ This was the first time, in the sources I went through at least, that the representatives of the community referred to themselves this way.

State as a book keeper

The question of the finances was mentioned at the time when the Jewish community, which was “existing from the old times,”¹³⁶ was in the process of transformation into the Jewish Church Community in 1864. The key change was in keeping the book in the way other “Serbian churches”, meaning the other church communities, were doing the.¹³⁷

Previously the authorities apparently did not have much information about the functioning of the community. The distance between the parallel existence of the two communities, Jewish on the one hand, and Christian on the other, was one of the crucial within the borders of the local. The proofs for this claim have been stated – not only it was mentioned in the official statistics overviews, the official committee formed in 1861 did not have any documents nor knowledge about functions of the community.¹³⁸ Information acquired through the committee’s report in 1861 tell us about the internal taxes and additional taxes the community had, which served for paying the rabbi and expenses of different services.¹³⁹ However, even though questions were posed about the community as an institution, the first information about the existence, role and duties of the community’s tutors become revealed in the plea referred to the city authorities.

The reframing of the financial autonomy went in three directions. Financial autonomy was the last major pillar of the autonomy of the community, which was, surprising or not, being renounced. The involvement of the principedom’s authorities can be traced back to the open conflict within the

¹³⁵ AS, MP 1861, F VII, No I 155

¹³⁶ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izviđanje komisije.30.9.1861.*

¹³⁷ Ibid. *Gospodinu Ministru prosvete I crkvenih dela pokorni tutori I predstavnici crkve I podanici srpski jevrejske veroispovedanja 23.8.1865.*

¹³⁸ V. Jaksic, *Državopis Srbije*, Beograd 1855, 17

¹³⁹ MP 1878, F VII, R i55. *Izviđanje komisije.30.9.1861.*

community reflected the dissatisfaction with the book keeper, Abraham Macliah. According to the complaints of his coreligionists to the city authorities, Macliah was self-willed in controlling the funds and withheld the paying of the priests and teachers.¹⁴⁰ The offenses on the book keeper do not reflect the same language used in the Sephardi-Ashkenazi dispute in the previous years and his affiliation to any of the two groups is not mentioned. Even though we do not know who pressed the charges against Macliah, they signed themselves as “in the name of the Serbian citizens of Jewish confession” but they asked that he gives in all the books since the last bombing of Belgrade.¹⁴¹

The authorities reacted and all the invoices from the “church’s, school’s and hospital’s money” were given to the Ministry and it appointed three tutors from the members of the community and with their agreement to deal with the books until the next orders follow.¹⁴² The further orders most probably never came and, thus, this solution was not final – in less than a year, “representatives of the church and Serbian subjects of Jewish confessions” complained against the three new tutors, stating their doubts that they were abusing the office and asked the Minister of education and church for a committee that would release them from “misery, suffer and prosecution (*gonjenje*),”¹⁴³ suggesting with the last that the community was possibly in a debt.

The final act was publishing “The rule book of managing of the religious, school and the rest of the estate of the Jewish Church School community” in April 1866, which was said to be an act based on consultations with the community. The instructions gave a rule book which proclaimed the institutions of the community to be the assembly, the committee, and the tutors. Therefore, “the assembly of twenty seven of their (Jewish) equal citizens” got the right over the selection and

¹⁴⁰MPs 1864, FXII, r 1774. *Gosp. Ministru prosvete i crk. Dela u ime gradana srbski Evreiskog ispovedanja*, 20.8.1864.

¹⁴¹ AS, MPs 1864, F XII, r 1774. *Gospodinu Ministru prosvete i crkvenih dela u ime gradjana Srbski Evreiskog veroispovedanja*, 20.8.1864.

¹⁴² Ibid, *Gospodinu Ministru prosvete i crkvenih dela Upravitelj varoši Beograda* 30.9.1864.

¹⁴³ Ibid, *Gospodinu Ministru prosvete i crkvenih dela pokorni tutoti i predstavnici i crkve i podanici srpski jevrejskog veroispovedanja*. 23.8.1865.

discharge of the rabbi and the executive power over the finances. Their duty was also to keep a short protocol in Serbian. The committee, on the other hand, was in charge of mediation with the state authorities, while the tutors kept their position in keeping the communities books.¹⁴⁴

The choice of the rabbi might have fallen under the jurisdiction of the assembly but his salary, in the same year, fell on the state funds. Current tutors, the ones impeached, asked the Ministry of Education and Church to recognize rabbi as a state official and cover his salary. The explanation for this was in the “deficiencies and flaws” of the previous system. The tutors thought that their ancestors, “coming from Turkey”, kept the traditions, used the “corrupted Spanish” and without enough of funds, they had to chose rabbis from Turkey, whose proficiency in theology and science was not on the level of the important assignment the priest job entails. Therefore, the state funding would enable bringing to service an educated rabbi “who would, while corroborating us in the faith of our fathers, lead the Jewish cult in the lines of science and the Zeitgeist.”¹⁴⁵ The community was modernizing alongside with the state.

Nevertheless, this financial dependence brought to question the independence of the choice of the community assembly. Abraham Elias, who was the rabbis representative for almost two years in between autumn 1866 and spring 1868, was not allowed to stay in the place since the authorities were not willing to pay for anything less than a real rabbi.¹⁴⁶ Alongside with the recently acquired influence, the state preempted the right to re-categorize internal groups. In another dispute between the Austrian Ashkenazi Jews with the, now unified Serbian Church School Community about the cemetery taxes, they allowed, after the involvement of the Austrian consulate but still, the unification of the taxes.

¹⁴⁴ MP 1878, F VII, i55. *Pravila o rukovođenju imanjem religioznim, školskim i ostalim blagotvornim zavedeniem Jevrejsko crkveno-školske obine.* 30.4.1866.

¹⁴⁵ MP 1868, F II, R 166. *MinistruprosveteiCrkvenihDela z imesvihSrbskihEvrea.* 27.4.1865.

¹⁴⁶MPc 1868, F II, R 166. *GospodninuministruProsvete I CrkvenihdelaUpraviteljparošibeograda* 16.4.1868; *UpraviteljstrugradaBeograda* 22.4.1868.

The involvement of the state in keeping books and choosing tutors is, however, only one side of the story. The other side brings the socio-economic background of the Jewish community throughout of the period in focus. The “downfall” which Avramović and Koen mention in the context of the education of Jews, was certainly the result of the economic decline. In the same plea to the government, in February 1864, they say that the Jews are not able to fulfill the basic civic responsibilities anymore, in the form of the tax payment.¹⁴⁷

From the community that was not that willing to cooperate less than a decade ago, what made the Jewish community to step out, reach for help, assistance of the principedom and, thus, renounce their autonomy? The reason is, more or less, mentioned in sources explicitly. The community was drastically impoverished, even compared to the previous generation. It came to that moment, that the Jews could not even fulfill their fiscal duties to the state. However, the reason for the impoverishment was the *localization*, confining Jews to the Belgrade walls but also to the category of “Jews”, the unchangeable variable. The bookkeeping, the school and finally the financial support of the principedom’s authorities led to making of the “Serbian citizen of Jewish confession”. However, the moment is equally important as the process. Only two years after the Muslims left the principedom, the Jewish community approached the authorities. On the one hand, the loss of the vacuum of the extraterritorial place the Muslims had become a sign to re-shift the focus of the community.

Nevertheless, even within the institutional system of the state, the Jews were *localized*. The Jewish Church School Community was organized *as a* Serbian church. The schools were not mixed. The Jews stayed within the boundaries the state drew.

¹⁴⁷MPs 1864, F XII, R 1774. *Ministru prosvete i crkvenih dela u Beogradu, predstavnici obštine Evreiske 17.2.1864.*

Conclusion

Coming from the end, from the institutional point, we can see that the Jewish community became a part of a wider system of the principedom churches, as the Jewish Church School Community. The path leading to this solution I see in two stages. The first one is the *localization* based on space and categories but without further involvement from the state. This stage was in lines with bureaucratic liberalism of the Constitutionalists that was highly dependent on other structures of the state, dominantly the merchant class. However, as it was previously shown, while merchants were for confining Jewish market space, they certainly was not arguing for confining them to Belgrade. The authorities choice to limit them in the capital city had to do with their aim to have the possibility to control the Jews and keep them on eye.

However, the second stage is based on the *localization* within the system. The events that preceded this stage cannot be overseen. Mihailo's aims to gain independence for his county came only to deliberation of the principedom from the Muslim population in 1862. The change that occurred was, nevertheless, initiated by the Jews but it was a consequence of their experience in the previous two and a half decades. Since the principedom, as it seemed, was a step closer to the independence, and the Muslim population already left and the Jews have felt the financial consequences of the localization from the previous decades, they approached to the authorities.

Localization of the Jews of the entire Serbian principedom to a specific place, first to the entrenchments of Belgrade and later to their quarter, Jaliija, was disturbing, eventful and brought up new questions every few years. Ranging from the question of the domestic Jewish population, prohibition of the immigration of Jews from within the Ottoman empire to which the principedom still officially belonged and the questions of the status of the foreign Jews, it seems that those

questions showed the impossibility to deal with different layers of population and their constant tendency to simplify the internal divisions.

This is especially visible in the state's genuine disinterest in the questions of the Jewish community, as far as they were not causing issues with the fiscal responsibilities of the community. This attitude goes beyond the ignorance showed during the work of the Committee in 1861 and questions dealing with the dogma and responsibilities of a rabbi. It shows this effect of the 'benign neglect', how Bernard Lewis described the attitude of Muslims towards non-Muslims in the Ottoman empire. The possibility of simultaneity of such dynamic changes and tranquil continuity is the most striking overall conclusion of this thesis. Following the collapse of the Ottoman rule in the Balkans, the establishment of the Serbian principedom and internal political changes within it was just a case study. Further research should go in directions of comparing the relationship of the new authorities towards religious groups throughout the territories of the Ottoman empire.

Bibliography

Primary sources

AS – Arhiv Srbije [The Serbian Archive]

- * MUD-PO – Ministarstvo unutrašnjih dela, Policijsko odeljenje [Ministry of Interior, Department of police]
- * MP – Ministarstvo prosvete (Ministry of Education)
- * MPc – Ministry of Education and the Church

AGB – Arhiv Grada Beograda [The Archive of Belgrade]

- * UGB – Uprava Grada Beograda [Belgrade's Municipality]

Uprava Varoši Beograda 1820-1912 (ed. B. Peruničić), Beograd 1970.

V. Jakšić, *Državna Srbija*, Beograd 1855.

V. Jakšić, *Državna Srbija. Knjiga Prva. Beograd 1863.*

Literature

- ❖ F. Anscombe, *State, faith and Nation in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman lands*, Cambridge 2014.
- ❖ F. Anscombe, "The Balkan Revolutionary Age", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 84. No. 3 (September 2012), 572-606.
- ❖ I. Blumi, *Reinstating the Ottomans. Alternative Balkan Modernities, 1800-1912*, New York 2011.
- ❖ M-Ž. Čalić, *Socijalna istorija Srbije 1815-1941. Usporedni napredak u industrijalizaciji*, Beograd 1994. [Published in German as: M-J, Calic, *Sozialgeschichte Serbiens 1815–1941. Der unaufhaltsame Fortschritt während der Industrialisierung*, Munich 1994.]
- ❖ Census and Identity. The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses (ed. D. I. Kertzer, D. Arel), Cambridge 2002.
- ❖ *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans. The Great Powers, The Ottoman Empire and Nation-Building* (eds. H. Grandits et al), London/New York 2011.
- ❖ H. Davičo, *Sa Jalijs*, Beograd 1896. [From *Jalija*]
- ❖ E. Davidova, *Balkan Transitions to Modernity and Nation-States. Through the Eyes of Three Generations of Merchants (1780s-1890s)*, Leiden/Boston 2013.
- ❖ M. Dogo, "Balkanske nacionalne države i pitanje Muslimana", in: *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju* 11/5 (1995), 352-263. [*Balkan nation-states and the Muslim Question*]
- ❖ A. N. Draganich, *The development of parliamentary government in Serbia*, New York 1978.
- ❖ J. Đorđević, „Beogradski Jevreji u događajima iz 1862“, *Zbornik Jewish studies* (1992), 315-325.
- ❖ *Entangled Histories of the Balkans, Volume Two: Transfers of Political Ideologies* (eds. R. Daskalov et al), Boston/Leiden 2013.
- ❖ *Entangled Histories of the Balkans, Volume Two: Transfers of Political Ideologies* (eds. R. Daskalov et al), Boston/Leiden 2013.
- ❖ H. P. Friedenreich, *The Jews of Yugoslavia. A Quest for Community*, Philadelphia 1979.
- ❖ *German history from the margin* (eds. N. Gregor, et al), Bloomington/Indianapolis 2006.
- ❖ Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe, (ed. Bela K. Kiraly), New York/London 1985.

- ❖ *History of the Ottoman State, Society & Civilization* (ed. E. Ihsanoglu), Istanbul 2001.
- ❖ B. Hrabak, *Jevreji u Beogradu do sticanja ravnopravnosti*, Beograd 2009. [*Jews in Belgrade until emancipation*]
- ❖ *Images of Imperial Legacy: Modern Discourses on the Social and Cultural impact of Ottoman and Habsburg rule in Southeast Europe* (Eds. T. Sindback, M. Hartmuth), Berlin 2011.
- ❖ *Imperial legacy. . The Ottoman imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East* (ed. L. Carl Brown), New York 1996.
- ❖ C. Iordachi, “Unerwünschte Bürger. Die ‘Judenfrage’ in Rumänien und Serbien zwischen 1831 und 1919“, in: *Transit* 43 (Winter 2012/2013), 107-127.
- ❖ *Istorija Beograda II. Devetnaesti vek* (ed. V. Čubrilović), Beograd 1974. [*History of Belgrade II. Nineteenth century*]
- ❖ J. Jacobs, “Statistics”, in: *The Jewish Encyclopedia. The unedited full-text of the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia.* (<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/13992-statistics>)
Approached: May 5th 2016.
- ❖ B. Jelavich, *History of the Balkans. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century I*, Cambridge 1983.
- ❖ *Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context* (eds. A. Gromova et al), Berlin 2015.
- ❖ S. Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila*, Beograd 1923. [*The second rule of Miloš and Mihailo*]
- ❖ S. Jovanović, *Vlada Ustavobranitelja*, Beograd 1923. [*The rule of Constitutionalists*]
- ❖ M. J. Kohler, “Jewish Rights at International Congresses”, in: *The American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 19 (1917-1918), 106-160.
- ❖ J. R. Lampe, M. R. Jackson, *Balkan Economic History, 1550-1950. From Imperial Borderlands to Developing Nations*, Bloomington 1982
- ❖ H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford/Cambridge 1991.
- ❖ R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830-1839)*, Beograd 1886. [*Princedom Serbia (1830-1839)*]
- ❖ E. Marushiakova, V. Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire*, Bristol 2001.
- ❖ C. Müller, *Staatsbürger auf Widerruf. Juden und Muslime als Alteritätspartner im rumänischen und serbischen Nationscode. Ethnonationale Staatsbürgerschaftskonzepte 1878-1941*, Wiesbaden 2005.
- ❖ *Ottoman and Turkish Jewry. Community and Leadership* (ed. A. Rodrigue), Bloomington 1992.

- ❖ P. Palavestra, *Jevrejski pisci u srpskoj književnosti*, Beograd 1998. [*Jewish writers in Serbian literature*]
- ❖ *Paths of Emancipation. Jews, states and citizenship* (ed. P. Birnbaum, I. Katznelson), Princeton 1995.
- ❖ A. Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews. The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Politics of Jewish Schooling in Turkey, 1860-1925*, Bloomington 1990.
- ❖ R. Schlechter, *Obstinate Hebrews. Representations of Jews in France, 1715-1815*, Los Angeles/London 2003.
- ❖ R. Sennett, *Flesh and Stone. The Body and the City in the Western Civilization*, London/Boston 1994.
- ❖ *Sephardi lives. A documentary history 1700-1950* (eds. J. Phillips Cohen, S. Abrevaya Stein), Stanford 2014.
- ❖ D. Sidnik, “O jevrejskim skolama u Beogradu u XIX veku”, *Jevrejski almanah* (1961-1862), 98-109. [*On Jewish schools in Belgrade in the XIX century*]
- ❖ I. Šlang, *Jevreji u Beogradu*, Beograd 1926.
- ❖ *The Last Ottoman Century and Beyond: The Jews in Turkey and the Balkans 1808-1945 II* (ed. M. Rozen), Tel Aviv 2005.
- ❖ V. Vinaver, “Jevreji u Srbiji pocetkom XX veka”, *Jevrejski almanah* (1855-1856), 28-45. [*Jews in Serbian at the beginning of the XX century*]