

Power and History in the Serbs: Historiography after 1990*

Sevba Abdula

Abstract: This study aims to examine the processes brought forth in Serbian historiography using the structural nature of the mutually influential relationship between power and history as data. The study focuses on the post-1990 period and examines the history, institutions, major works, and historians of Serbian historiography. The period under study includes two distinct power eras: the nationalist transition and the postmodern period. The study examines the characteristics, structures, and dynamics of these periods within this framework and attempts to determine the continuity and differences between these two periods. The study analyzes the results of Serbian historiography's relationship to power and history by examining the Ottoman narrative in general works on Serbian history.

Keywords: power, history, Serbian historiography, nationalist transition period, interaction with EU period.



Dr., Fettah Efendi Association, sevbaa@gmail.com



0000-0003-2890-5832



© Fettah Efendi Association
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.51331/A23>
Journal of Balkan Studies, 2 (2), 2022
balkanjournal.org



Received: 15.02.2022
Accepted: 23.06.2022

* The article was produced from Sevba Abdula's PhD dissertation titled "Power, History and Identity: Narrative of Ottoman and Habsburg Empire in Serbian Historiography and History Textbooks."

Introduction

Serbian historiography has largely shaped its existence using the same themes of ideology and identity perspectives of the Serbian nation and state. In this context, Jovan Rajić's work written at the end of the 18th century can be considered the beginning of modern Serbian historiography. Since the second half of the 19th century, Serbian historiography has experienced an upsurge, and this process has also opened the door for new schools to emerge. Different historical perspectives can be stated to have emerged in Serbian historiography, both in terms of method and approach. The reasons for these are independence, constant changes in the borders of the Serbian state, migrations, ideologies, the coexistence of religious and cultural groups with different ethnicities and sects, wars, and pressure from international institutions.

Serbian historiography is area where the use of history for power and ideology collides with the scientific understanding of history. While the Romantic nationalist school, the Marxist school, and the post-Romantic nationalist school reflect historiography's entanglement with power and ideology within the positivist scientific paradigm, the Ruvarac school, the Annales school, and the post-2000 social historiography represent a postpositivist scientific paradigm. While the role of the Enlightenment and positivism had been dominant at the beginning of Serbian historiography, the Annales and the Marxist schools gained importance over time. Moreover, post-positivism began appearing in Serbian historiography within the framework of social historiography and common history studies after 2000.

Historians such as Branković, Rajić, Julinac, and Srećković are the main figures who founded the Romantic nationalist school of 18th-century Serbian historiography. Under the influence of Enlightenment thought, these historians prioritized the interests of politics and ideology using the historiography they developed by focusing on the independence, reconstruction, and national consciousness of the Serbian state (Györe, 2006: 89–108). Ruvarac's critical school had been influenced by Ranke since the second half of the 19th century and aimed to develop historical facts and data around a scientific discipline by developing a new historiographical perspective. The most distinctive features of the Ruvarac school were the criticism and rejection of traditional romantic-nationalist historiography, especially the one based on mythology and nationalistic

elements as advocated by Srećković. Together with names such as Popović, Stojaković, and Stojanović, Ruvarac developed a new approach, claiming that historical phenomenon can only be obtained from historical sources that have been thoroughly verified and studied. The Ruvarac school, whose influence on Serbian historiography has persisted through many historians, was adopted in particular by historians trained in Vienna and Germany.

The victory of the communists in World War II and the power they seized has had a lasting impact on Serbian historiography. The combination of the perspective of historical materialism and studies on economic and social development with the historiography developed through political and diplomatic history has opened the door to new excitement in this discipline. By clarifying the limits of the irredentist perspective of history that had been predominant until World War II, its influence began to wane, and the discourse on unity and brotherhood and sensitive nationalist issues began being excluded and ignored. Partisan resistance and the creation of a common historical memory by mythicizing this resistance were one of the most fundamental approaches of this period. The turbulence of the political history of socialist Yugoslavia, the foreign policy decisions, the death of Tito, and the disintegration of Yugoslavia were the main factors in the processes historiography would undergo. Although many important historians were arrested, fled the country before World War II, or died in the war, the historians who remained in the history department were silent on the issue of contemporary historiography and represented traditional Serbian historiography.

Attempts had been made at the congresses of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia since the 1960s to integrate Marxism into the historical methodology through directives aimed at Yugoslav researchers (Vucinich, 1951:41-57). Professor Branislav Djurdejev at the University of Sarajevo was the one who applied this new methodology most seriously. According to Vucinich, the principles of ethnic democracy and cultural autonomy were combined during this period with Marxist materialism and national sentiments. The disagreements between Tito and Stalin led to criticism of the Soviet historical school and to the denigration of revisionism, idealism, and mysticism. By criticizing the historians of the golden age, the dynasty, the church, and the bourgeoisie, the revolutionary movements and the people were affirmed and made the central theme. An important part of the historical works published in the Tito period aimed at building the “common historical memory” of the peoples of Yugoslavia by focusing

on the partisans' struggle (Marković, Miličević, & Ković, 2004:280). The publishing market, having been shaped by the demands of the republics, should be noted to have influenced the historiography of the Tito period, as did the works of politicians such as Tito, Đilas, and Kardelj.

As the authority of social and political life, Tito's death in 1980 represents another break in Serbian historiography. Tito's death being accompanied by the global debt crisis, the domestic political crisis, and the process of disintegration triggered a great process of unrest and transformation that was to last until the 2000s. Issues came to the fore such as the end of the ideology of the Tito period, the Chetnik movement in particular being redefined in Serbian historiography, the new approach to pre-communist Yugoslavia, and the reinterpretation of Serbian losses in World War II, as well as the oppression of the communist regime and its victims and the non-academic historiographical criticism. The Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the involvement of Serbian historians in the Bosnian and Kosovo wars, and their legitimization of the wars damaged public confidence in historiography during the 1980-2000 period. The works of Cirković and Gasević on Serbian historiography and the publications of other researchers during this period are also noteworthy. Andrej Mitrović qualified this period as "parahistoriography," by which he meant a period that imitates actual historiography but lacks the methods, criticisms, and standards of verification (Marković, Miličević, & Ković, 2004:292-293), and as the period of the "new romantic and nationalistic historiography." With the end of communism, the disappearance of official control paved the way for many books to be published.

Educated in Germany under the leadership of Andrej Mitrović, the new and younger generation began coming to the fore in Serbian historiography after 2000. With Milošević's fall from power in 2000, the effect of the Europeanization process triggered postpositivist historiography and prioritized social, economic, and cultural history studies with common bases. Through the influence of the newly founded institutes, the door was opened to a new era that sought to eliminate the effects of the traditional nationalist and communist historiography.

This study analyzes the years 1980-2000, which have been defined as the nationalist transition period, and the years post-2000, which have been defined as the postmodern period, in terms of the relationship between power and history. At the same time,

the results of this relationship will be examined in terms of general themes regarding Serbian historiography and the Ottoman historical narrative in well-known works on general Serbian history.

The New Romantic and Nationalist Historiographies: From a Communist Ethos to a National Ethos

The years 1980-2000 are undoubtedly a turning point for the history of Serbs, Yugoslavia, and the Balkans. Crises, wars, and disintegration changed areas such as politics, ideology, nation, education, economy, and international relations and also shaped the study of history with positive and negative effects. The understanding of history, in which the Marxist perspective had been extensively used during the period of socialist Yugoslavia, led to many traumas that were repressed and forgotten within social memory, something known as the culture of collective forgetting. The 1974 Constitution wanted to use traumas such as the death of Tito and the difficulties that accompanied the economic depression to construct a new identity, especially by remembering these traumas. The socialist and national ethos was replaced by themes such as myths, the history before and during World War I, heroes, saints, and Chetniks. As a result of this replacement, partisans and Chetniks were equated, people began to talk about communist oppression, many studies were published about whether Tito was a saint or a devil, questions were asked about who the Bosnians were, and studies about Kosovo increased.

According to Marković and Miličević five main themes came to the fore in Serbian historiography during the nationalist transition process: the Chetnik movement that had been discredited in the historiography of World War II was redefined, the pre-socialism period in Yugoslavia (i.e., the period before and after World War I monarchies) was again made the focus, the losses suffered in World War II were reinterpreted, and statements on the communist regime's oppression and discovery of its victims and non-academic historical studies were strongly propagated in the public opinion. The structural situation that led to the formation of this framework was the attempt socialist Yugoslavia had made to build a "common historical memory" as a country with a multinational, ethnic, religious, and sectarian population (Miličević & Marković, 2007:147). The above problems came to the fore with the dissolution of the common historical

communist consciousness after 1980 and the strengthening of the idea of the nation in the republics, as well as the deepening of national, sectarian, and ideological divisions/conflicts (e.g., Serbian/Croatian, Orthodox/Catholic, communist/nationalist), especially between Serbs and Croats. The institutional structure and historiography of socialist Yugoslavia was initially divided and disunited over the Serb-Croat problem but transformed into a totality of religious and ethnic problems, including the Bosnia and Kosovo problems. The question of whether the content historians had produced had also contributed to the background of conflicts and wars should be noted as having been an ongoing debate since the 1990s.

The revival of the revisionist/expansionist historiography and perspective led to the acquittal of many people who'd been labeled as World War II criminals, especially in previous periods, and also allowed the claim to be made that many had been victimized at that time. The harsh policies of Dragoljub Mihailović and Milan Nedić during World War II were claimed to have been ignored to protect *the brotherhood and unity of Serbs*, and no voice was claimed to have been heard about the perpetrators who had committed great injustices such as genocide. This kind of framing was particularly linked to the Serbian national identity, which views Croats as the Other, but this case largely rebounded with negative consequences for Bosnian Muslims and Kosovo Albanians. The official history studies created through the socialist regime, a memorandum written in 1987 by a group of historians from the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU), and the appointment of certain historians to important political positions (e.g., Vesilije Krestić & Milorad Ekmecić became advisors to the President of the Republic of Serbia, Radovan Karadžić), the privatization of publishing, and history publishing in particular led to the beginning of the period that became known as parahistoriography and to viewing the study of "so-called official history as a discipline that praised the regime and shook confidence in the field. This view largely persisted until around 2005.

The political and economic problems caused by the disintegration and the war between 1980-2000 also confronted historical research with the problem of resources. Academic historiography was unable to respond to the negative nationalistic historiography that had developed through popular historiography. The younger generation of academic historiographers tried to survive through projects supported by Soros and the international community in particular, but they preferred not to research many topics from recent history. Serbian historiography was unable to develop its strong historical meth-

odology, theory, and approach within the framework of the historians who'd remained in Serbia and those who'd tried to survive abroad (Nielsen, 2020:92).

Although the League of Communists of Yugoslavia decided at its 13th Congress to promote common historical studies, historians were faced with three basic choices: focus on the common socialist history, on the common Yugoslav history, or on studying the past state and national origins of the republics. The party insisted on the history of the peoples of Yugoslavia and appointed Dušan Bilandžić, Janko Pleterski, and Branko Petranović as commission members. In the 1980s, these historians attempted to develop a historical perspective through national debates, and discussions ensued on fundamental issues such as the Chetnik movement, national historiography, and the events of World War II. For example, Durić's (1985) *Saveznici i Jugoslovenska Ratna Drama* portrayed the Chetniks as victims of British treachery and a conspiracy of Soviet spies. Also of note, the cult of Tito was gradually subjected to criticism, and publications emerged during this period. Meanwhile, the first parahistoriographical work was Dedić's *Novi Prioliz za Biografiju Josip Broz Tito*, published in three volumes between 1981-1984 (Milićević & Marković, 2007:150).

Nielsen divides post-1980 historiography into three periods: 1983-1991, 1991-1997, and 1997-2000 and notes that critical publications on Tito between 1983-1991 confirmed that, despite the emergence of the Memorandum of Serbian Historians, the majority of historians still adhered to the party-state perspective in the face of ethnic tensions. However, between 1991 and 1997 when criticism of the former communist regime and Tito became vocal, the partisan movement was equated with the Chetnik movement. In some cases, the historians denounced the partisans' actions after World War II, such as extrajudicial executions and mass reprisals.

Another important issue in this period was the genocides against Serbs committed by the *Nezavisna Drzava Hrvatska* [Independent Croatian State]. 1997-2000 was a period when historians turned away from World War II-based research and focused on Kosovo and Serbian-Albanian relations. Dimitrijević focused mainly on studies of the history of occupied Serbia and concentration camps (Nielsen, 1991:93).

The influence of Marxist historiography on Balkan, Yugoslav, and Serbian historiography was limited and only occurred for a short time. With the introduction of Marxism into historiography in the world, some studies were developed on economic history,

including agriculture, peasantry, mining, trade, and urban development. However, Serbian historiography did not produce much work in the field of economic or social history, because the Marxist paradigm focused heavily on the history of the party and the history and structure of local labor movements (Milićević & Marković, 2007:154). The market for historical studies was formed for the ideological interests of local organizations such as the revolution and the party, rather than for new methods, approaches, or works on academic historiography. The nationalist transition, however, created a dichotomy in Serbian historiography due to the political environment, privatization of publishing, and international cooperation (Fleming, 2000:1227). Under the influence of civil war, economic crisis, and isolation, the first group of historians focused mainly on new methodological and thematic issues. The impact from politics, politicians, and political history caused dissatisfaction, especially among young researchers. Traditional political history studies with strong themes relatively declined, and research on social histories such as everyday life, women, urban history, minorities, and family began being published. The second group of historians continued their political history research, which was instrumentalized by politics and power to anticipate current political conditions.

Parahistoriography, which Andrej Mitrović defined as false historiography, would be created by popular historians. Popular history emerged alongside the privatization of the history market and the state no longer controlling publications and was produced by amateur historians who began to appear in the media and newspapers in opposition to academic historiography. By imitating the methods, critical approach, and verification standards of historiography without following them, these historians brought popular history publications to the forefront. In this process, every group created works showing how they'd suffered and become victims under the Yugoslav regime. The expansionist and revisionist historians who contributed to Serbian history, such as Gligrijević, Dimitrijević, Đurenović, and Pintar, can be noted to have prepared, whether consciously or unconsciously, the groundwork for the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo by denying and personalizing many crimes related to the World War II and by heroizing leaders such as Karađorđević and the Chetnik movement (Nielsen, 1991:95-96). For example, Predrag Dragić Kijuk's *Catena Mundi* was published in 2 volumes based on the victims of Serbian history; it intended to prove Serbs as the oldest local people in Europe and to prevent the spread of the Vatican's militant form of Catholicism. Like-

wise, the demand was made that many of the names that had fallen victim to the extrajudicial executions of the communist regime, especially in 1944-1945, should be retried and their rights restored. On the other hand, attempts also occurred at this time to rehabilitate even the most controversial figures in Serbian history, such as Dragoljub Mihajlović and Milan Nedić. In particular, the historians of this group claimed that the politicization of the nationalist transition historiography was effective in forming the nationalist historical consciousness of the Serbian nation and state.

The younger generation, identified by the young researchers focusing on social history, especially in academic historiography, who'd received international grants and project support to study, and research in Austria, Germany, and Hungary represents another group. Also noteworthy is the work Andrej Mitorvić (Milićević & Marković, 2007:153), one of the most important historians leading this young generation, produced in the field of theory and methodology. Mitorvić published many works during this period and focused mainly on concepts and approaches. Ranke presented studies on myths, the historical subconscious, the history of science, the three dangers of consciousness, and the famous concept of parahistoriography.

The changing institutional framework in Serbia's political, social, economic, and international relations after the period of nationalist transition also brought changes to historical institutions, journals, and other historical publications over time. The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts came to the fore with the memorandum it published as the center of traditional historians or official history setting the framework for Serbian revisionist thought. After 1994, the institution focused on conferences and published their records. Its official publication was *Istoriski Casopis* and includes chapters on methodology and the history of historiography. The journal *Istoriski Glasnik* was published with contributions from Belgrade University Department of History's Faculty of Philosophy, carried out traditional historiography based on political and economic history during this period, but ceased publication in 1998 due to economic problems.

Institutions, Journals, Historians, and Featured Themes

Scientific journals such as *Istorija 20. veka* and *Tokovi Istorije* published respectively by the *Institut za Savremena Istorija* [Institute of Contemporary History] and the *Institut*

za *Noviju Istoriju Srbije* [Institute of Recent History for Serbia] are important examples of the expression of change that began during this period (Popović & Stolić, 2017:13–25; Pavlović, 2009:9–17). *The Institut za Savremena Istorija* had 35 researchers between 1989–2000, 53% of whom had been born post-1940. This institution has been rejuvenated as most of its historians retired. While 650 studies and 103 books were published by researchers during this period, most of the studies were publications from the older generation. Meanwhile, the journal *Istorija 20. Veka*, attracts attention with the 445 articles it published between 1989–2000. The journal also specified the institution's position with its special issues on important and sensitive topics such as the Spring of 1941; the local, ethnic, sectarian, and political boundaries in the history of Yugoslavia; the origins of the dissolution of Yugoslavia; and the Kosovo issue (Marković, Ković, & Milicević, 2004:287).

The Institute of Recent History for Serbia was another institution that played an important role until 1992. The Institute became an institution for social history and interdisciplinary studies and had the great advantage where 72% of its researchers had been born post-1940. Twelve researchers conducted studies on social and economic history, 11 on political history, and two on cultural history. *Tokovi Istorija*, the Institute's journal, published 330 articles in the 1990s. Of these, 50% dealt with Serbian history, 30% with Yugoslav history, and 15% with international topics. Its special issues studied the modernization of Serbia. One special issue had 24 studies, of which four dealt with women's issues. Other special issues covered World War II in 1993, Russian and Soviet history in 1995, and national minorities in 1999 (Marković, Ković, & Milicević, 2004:288).

The most valuable work in terms of the nationalist transition historiography is undoubtedly the 832-page encyclopedia by Ćirković and Mihaljčić (1997) on Serbian historiography. More than 350 authors contributed to the encyclopedia, which was published in 1997; which gathered all the persons, institutions, and works related to Serbian historiography; and which revealed a very valuable study of the history of historiography. Two years after the encyclopedia's publication, the same authors made a major contribution to the field with their study on the Serbian Middle Ages titled "Leksikon Srpskog Srednjeg Veka" (Ćirković & Mihaljčić, 1999). The study involved social history, cultural history, daily life, intellectual history, law, and economic history. Meanwhile, Dimić and Stanković (1996) raised the studies of Yugoslav historiography

to another level with their work (1996) on the Yugoslav historiography published between 1945 and 1964. At the same time, new editions of works by Jovanović (1990) and Corović (1989), also known as outstanding works of Serbian nationalist historiography written between the two world wars, found readers.

The church photographs that were used mainly in the new editions attracted attention. The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts thus organized conferences on Novaković and Jovanović and made efforts to discover these two writers who'd developed a historical perspective on dynasty, nation, and heroes. The 10-volume *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* (1981-1993), written as a joint effort by 44 historians, covered many aspects of Serbian history up to 1918 and became one of the most fundamental works in uncovering the historiography of that period. Likewise, Ekmečić's (1989) famous work *Stvaranje Jugoslavije 1790-1918* is considered one of the pioneering works in this field. Additionally, Petranović's (1988) *Istorija Jugoslavije* and Ćuretić's (1985) *Saveznici i jugoslovenska ratna drama* are outstanding works on the history of Yugoslavia.

When looking at the publications from the Jugoslovenska Bibliografski Institut in the 1990s, the nation and the people are seen to be prominent in the published books instead of the themes of the party, war, and revolution. Among the 210 published studies, the presence of books dealing with the victims of World War II, the Muslim casualties, and the genocide of the partisans is noticeable. Pjanović's (1990) book *Srbi Narod Najstarije* [The Oldest People: Serbs] is also interesting.

During this period, studies were published on the Middle Ages within the framework of the medieval Serbian kingdom and its people. These publications were particularly important for reconstructing the Serbian nation and also reflected the decision to turn away from the current political history. While Kalic and Colovic had focused on settlement and urban history, Blagojević, Kalić, and Spremić dealt with Nemanjić and the Middle Ages, the rulers of the medieval Serbian Kingdom, and its administrative structure.¹ Meanwhile, the young historian Dušancić published works focusing on the political symbolism and ideology of the Middle Ages (Marković, Ković, & Miličević, 2007:298). Among the biographies, the works on Charles V, Yeğen Osman Pasha, Karađorđe Petrović, and Radoš Ljušić are also important (Samardžić, 2001; Katić, 2001; Ljušić, 1993-1995).

Studies on immigration, demography, and church history and influenced by the political context of the nationalist transition period also come to the fore. While Samardžić, Zivojinović, Ljušić, and Jagodić were interested in immigration and demographic history² Zivjinović, Dimić, Antonović, and Radić were interested in church history.³

The works on social life include Vuletić's *XIX Century Serbian Family Structure* and Mladenović's *Serbian Village in the Austro-Hungarian Occupation*. Studies on daily life were done by Mitrović and Ristović. Krestić, Ljušić, Rajić, and Stojanović focused on the party, political life, ideologies, democracy, and the political elite of contemporary Serbian life⁴. The history of modernization and gender studies also began to enter Serbian historiography⁵ Perović (1998) published "Srbija u Modernizacijskim Procesima 20. Veka," a history of modernization, while Božinović (1998) published "Žensko pitanje u Srbiji u 19th i 20th Veku" [Women's Issues in Serbia in the 19th and 20th Centuries].

Another important feature of the nationalist transition historiography is the prominence of the internationalized market, international funds, and scholarship. Financial difficulties, international isolation, historians' inability to access resources and archives, exchange programs for international projects, and donations played a key role for Serbian historians. Although the Milošević government did not like this process, the institutional and economic crisis it experienced meant that it could not sufficiently resist internationalization and money transfers, nor could it adequately support its own traditional historiography. On the other hand, it created the basis for a different historiography to develop for the first time outside of socialist Yugoslavia and beyond Milošević's rule and caused historical studies to be conducted jointly with international institutions after 2000. Between 1994-2000 especially, these opportunities that facilitated existing conditions arose with the support of historians by most of the institutions of the Soros network. Mitrović draws attention as the one who sent many young historians (e.g., Marjanović, Prelić, Spasojević, Dimitrejević, Janjetović, Marković, Alekson) to Berlin (Milićević & Marković, 2004:153). When considering the relationship Serbian historiography after the nationalist transition period had with the international historical schools in this context, its interactions with the Austrian school of historical anthropology and the Annales School should be mentioned. The historians who were sent to Germany and met with professors such as Jürgen Kocka and Holm Sundhaussen established contact with these schools. Meanwhile, Cirković's (1997)

Rabotnici, vojnici, duhovnici, Društva srednjovekovnog Balkana is an important work that shows the influence from the Annales school (Marković, Ković, & Milicević, 2007:307).

While the Central European University in Budapest opened its doors to most young historians for a year, some researchers completed their postgraduate studies at this university and returned to Serbia, and others stayed abroad. The Research Support Scheme program has allowed researchers to continue their education and research in countries such as Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands with two-year scholarships from institutions such as German foundations. Between 1998 and 2000, the study of the German *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*, which brought together Serbian and Croatian historians, published six conferences and four book editions (Milićević & Marković, 2004:153).

Meanwhile, the Department of Southeast European History at the University of Graz, Austria, has worked with the region to develop projects such as *Childhood in Southeast Europe* (Jovanović & Naumović, 2001). The institutions Social History Union, European Council, and EUROCLIO focused on history education and signed off on the projects *History and History Education in Southeast Europe*, *Joint History Project*, *National Memory*, and *Southeast European Peoples* (Marković, Ković, & Milicević, 2007:290). One of the research topics funded by international institutions during this period involved German and Jewish minorities. While Popović, Ristović, and Koljanin studied the Jewish community, Janjetovic and Beslin published studies on the Germans in Vojvodina.⁶

The institutions Udruženje za Društvenu Istoriju and Udruženje za Srpsku Povecnicu can be cited as examples of international cooperation with local and international institutions focused on the research of 19th and 20th-century social history and history education. The positive side of privatization and internationalization of publishing is that small publishing houses have translated many works into Serbian. The works of prominent names in nationalist literature such as Gellner, Habsbawn, Anderson, Smith, Todorova, and Colović were translated and published by 20th-century publishing houses. The publishing houses Zoran Stojanovic and CIO also introduced works such as the *History of Private Life* and the *History of Balkan Countries* to Serbian literature (Milićević & Marković, 2004; Žunić, 2002).

Marković and Milicević addressed the importance of literature, especially historical novels, which together with Serbian historiography have influenced Serbs' historical consciousness. Cošić's novel *The Time of Death about the First World War* has greatly influenced the agenda, with half a million copies sold. Also, Drašković's war trauma novel *Nož* [Knife] about the murder of a Serb family in Herzegovina by their Muslim neighbors on Christmas Eve in 1942, Isaković's *Tren 2*, and Selenić's *Ocevi i Oci* [Fathers and Ancestors] on communist oppression have also played notable roles in building Serbian national consciousness following the Nationalist-transition period (Milićević & Marković, 2004:169).

Serbian Historiography in the Postmodern Era: Social Historiography with a National Ethos

In the period of nationalist transition, the state, national identity, and society were redefined, and attempts were made to construct them. During this period when wars were central, historiography focused on marketization, parahistoriography, and the new nationalist paradigm. With the end of Milošević's rule, democratization and Europeanization were the main components in the construction of the Serbian state-identity-society to greater or lesser degrees until 2020. Under the strong pressure from international institutions, the years 2001-2003 and 2008-2014 represent the periods of intense liberalization, democratization, and Europeanization, while 2004-2007 and 2014-2020 represent a balanced nationalist-conservative period that cooperated with international institutions. This institutional framework of the state, society, and identity that developed in the balance of domestic and foreign politics is reflected in Serbian historiography. In this period, positivist and post-positivist approaches as well as nationalist and common history conceptions could appear together. Likewise, research was conducted on more topics than had been in other periods. While the presence of young researchers in the publications is noticeable, studies on the Middle Ages and the 20th-century can also be noted to have come to the fore. Diplomacy, politics, and wars as the main topics of the positivist tradition continue to be the main subjects of historiography. Comparative studies and studies with new methodological perspectives were also added. Prominent names in this period of Serbian historiography are Milan Koljanin, Goran Latinović, Radmila Radić, Slavko Gavrilović, Goran Vasin, Isidora Točanac, Dejan Mikavica, Vesilje Krestić, Aleksandar Krstić, Momilo Pavlović, Dra-

gana Amedoski, Mirjana Marinković, Ema Miljković, Tatjana Katić, Srdjan Katić, Aleksandar Fotić, and Olga Zirojević.

Journals, Historians, Works, and Featured Topics

Focusing on the work of the four main scientific journals of Serbian historiography to examine post-2000 historiography in more detail can help at seeing the current trends and themes. These journals are *Tokovi Istorija*, *Istorijski Časopis*, *Istorija 20. Veka*, and *Zbornik Matice Srpske za Istoriju* and were published during the period of socialist Yugoslavia. *Istorijski Časopis* emerged in 1949 as the journal of the Historical Institute and published one issue per year (except for two issues in 2007 and two in 2008). *Istorija 20. Veka* was launched in 1983 as a publication of the Institute of Contemporary History and published biannually between 1991-2021 (except for three issues published in 2010 and three in 2012). The journal *Tokovije Istorija* belongs to the Institute of Recent History for Serbia and was published biannually between 1997-2005 and thrice a year between 2006-2021. *Zbornik Matice Srpske za Istoriju* is part of the famous Matice Srpske publishing house and has been published biannually in Novi Sad since 1970. Between 2003 and 2020, about 1,200 studies were published in these four journals. 63% of which were devoted to topics such as wars, diplomacy/international relations, power, political party, political movement, and army, which in traditional historiography are treated under the heading of politics. Studies on the economy, modernization, culture, education, and printing/publishing under the title of society account for 10% of all studies. After 2000 in particular, studies such as language and media, demography, historiography, migration, social groups, gender, childhood, religion, memory, everyday life, and traditions increased under the influence of post-positivist historiography and methodology and account for 15% of all studies. A look at the journals shows that 50% of the studies published in 53 issues of the journal *Tokovije Istorija* between 2003-2020 focused mainly on the 20th century and the post-1945 period (Simić, 2017:219), while 15% of its studies were on society, and the number of studies dealing mainly with comparative research and new research areas accounted for 25% of the total research. The journal *Istorija 20. Veka* published the most research, with 65% of its studies dealing with traditional topics, 10% with social issues, and 25% with new areas. The journal *Zbornik Matice Srpske za Istoriju* focuses on studies of the history of Serbs outside the Habsburg Empire, Vojvodina, and Serbia, and its studies dealing with traditional poli-

tics accounts for 61% of the total research, while studies on society account for 8% and other areas for 30%. Finally, the journal *Istorijski Časopis* was found to devote 53% of all its studies to traditional politics, 12% to community studies, and 35% to new areas of study. Meanwhile, 95% of the published studies were found to be by local researchers, with over 65% of them using the traditional positivist method alongside traditional topics and about 10% dealing with new topics/new historical methods. More than 80% of the studies were found to not be based on a theoretical framework, while 20% of the new researchers avoided citing the old literature.

After 2010, the works from Stanojević, Corović, Mikadica and Krestić as the leading historians of post-Romantic and nationalist historiography were republished. Noteworthy, these works were republished even at a time when the postmodern and post-positivist period was focused on common culture, daily and social life, and women. In this context, one can speak of a strong structure of the post-romantic and nationalist historical perspective in Serbian historiography that is self-reproduced in every period.

Traditional political themes are seen to have retained their weight in Serbian historiography even after 2000. Topics such as diplomatic/international relations, party movements/ideologies, political elite and their biographies, war-riots, dynasty, state-power-institutions, army, Serbs, Belgrade, and the Great Wars were grouped under the heading of politics. Under the title of diplomatic/international relations, Latinović studied Yugoslavia's relations with countries such as Denmark, Sweden, and Italy. At the same time, topics such as the Crnka Ruka organization, the evils of Bulgaria, the Sarajevo assassination, and the Ottoman-Montenegro War were also studied with regard to World War I. The number of studies on England notably increased, with Aleksandar Rastović in particular having published many studies on this topic after 2014.⁷

Researchers such as Miloradović, Janjetović, Nikolić, Teinović, and Pešić have engaged in studies on political parties and movements, ideology, and political elites.⁸ As part of joint studies, they published papers on the Balkan Wars, World War I, and the Serbs, especially under the leadership of Srđan Radić. Meanwhile, Jovanović and Radosavljević focused on intelligence and weapons in the 20th century.⁹

Church studies have always been one of the main topics of Serbian historiography. Between 2001-2020, the quantity and quality of church studies increased significantly, with Radić, Koljanin, Radosavljević, and Bulić becoming prominent names through

their research. While Radić wrote important works focusing on state and religious institutions and biographies, Radosavljević did research on churches and patriarchs in the 19th century, Koljanin studied the relationship between Jews and the Serbian Orthodox Church, and Bulić researched churches in various settlements.¹⁰

Studies such as gender, everyday life, and traditions, minority groups/others, history of historiography, and cinema in the period 2001-2020 attract attention as new topics of study in Serbian historiography. Many researchers who study the history of historiography believe that, while these developments in Serbian historiography are valuable, they lag behind current developments in world historiography due to their small share in all studies. Nevertheless, one can mention a Serbian historiography that has diversified in comparison to the pre-2000 studies, that incorporates comparative analyzes, and that has also put the issues of the post-positivist paradigm on the agenda. Within the framework of gender studies, studies on women have greatly expanded and deepened under the leadership of Dragana Amedoski, especially during the Ottoman period. The women's studies by Stolić, Škodrić, and Marković have also received attention.¹¹

Daily life and traditions can be stated to play a role in Serbian historical research, especially after 2010. Younger researchers have written studies on the basic components of daily life at home, in the village, and the city from the 16th-20th centuries. Also, Miljković-Katić, Vuletić, and Fostikov published works on crafts in the medieval Kingdom of Serbia.¹²

Studies on minorities and groups defined as "different" have also come to the fore during this period, with Germans and Jews being the most studied groups in this sense. While Radovanović focused on the immigration of Jews in Yugoslavia to Israel, Antolović published on the German minority, Stojanov on the Gypsies, and Koljanin, Ivanković, and Stojanović on anti-Semitism.¹³

After 2000, many young researchers have written studies on the history of Serbian historiography; examined history journals, main themes, trends, and developments of world historiography in Serbian historiography; and begun analyzing the content of history journals.¹⁴ Yugoslav cinema, which occupied an important place in the cultural policies of the Tito period, began to occur in research in the first decade of the new

millennium. The works from Pantić (2017:103-124) and Jeknić (2019: 65-84) on this topic are noteworthy.

Novaković (2008:460) and Šaljić (2013:345-360) published studies on the Islamic Union in Yugoslavia and Serbia. Also, Kosovo continued to be a main topic of Serbian historiography. Kosovo's declaration of independence in 2008 also had an impact on historiography. During the deepening of the Kosovo literature, publications were published on topics such as Kosovo politics, Albanian persecution, pre-20th-century Kosovo, and relations with Albania. Under the heading of Kosovo and politics, Gatalović, who'd dealt with the politics of Kosovo during the period of socialist Yugoslavia under the title "The Evils of Albanians in Kosovo," and Antonijević also published studies in this field. Stijović and Rastović attempted to study the influence of foreign policy in 19th-century Kosovo through ambassadors.¹⁵

Mirroring Developments in Serbian Historiography: Istorija Srpskog Naroda (1981-1993) and Istorija Srba (2017)

The Nationalist Transition Period

The Nationalist Transition Period was a period in Serbian historiography when the socialist ethos was replaced by the nationalist-conservative ethos, and some important historians who produced parahistoriography [false history-popular history] in the course of marketization advised the politicians on the wars of the 1990s. The most fundamental works for Serbian historiography also come from this period and covers the years 1981-2000. *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* is one of the most important works showing the relationship between the nationalist transition historiography and power. The work includes historians from the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts such as Cirković, Mihaljčić, Mitrović, Stojanočević, Ekmečić, Samarčić, Veselinović, Gavrilović, and Medaković. These historians are among the leading names of socialist Yugoslavia and the nationalist transition period and contributed to *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* with many articles as well as edited several volumes. Except for Volume 4, a two-part book covering the period from the fall of Belgrade to the Great Migration, which was released in 1993, the other volumes were published between 1981-1986. In addition, *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* was republished in 1994 and 2000. All but one of the volumes from

this work covers a thousand years of Serbian history (the one exception only partially covers the topic) and are about the Ottoman Empire.

The current research considers the Ottoman narrative to be an exemplified variable of the relationship between power and history in Serbian historiography and history textbooks. The work *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* is also important because it involves the authors whose works had been published in Yugoslavia during the nationalist transition period and shows the transformation between the two periods. The preface to the first volume of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* states that this work had been planned since 1966 but was just published in the 1980s. The work also states that it aims to create a perspective on Serbian history by referring to historical sources and artifacts and by taking into account the methodological developments of world historiography within a Marxist perspective removed from the traditional presentation of history, which is far from being scientific and especially from a military and political point of view. The 10-volume book includes sections on language, literature, art, and architectural developments and has a special focus on politics and military developments. While the study attracts attention by referencing literature in the Ottoman and Habsburg areas up to the 1980s, it makes no mention of any theoretical or methodological framework (Cirković, 1981:7). In addition to *Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, other notable works that reveal the basic themes and content of the relationship between power and history in Serbian historiography are *Istorija Srba* by Corović (republished in the 1990s), one of the pioneers of nationalist historiography at the beginning of the 20th century, Ekmečić's *Stvaranje Jugoslavija*, and Luković's *Srbi Narod Najstarije*.

Volume I of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* covers the period from humanity's beginnings to 1371, Volume II covers 1371-1537, Volume III covers 1537-1699, Volume IV covers 1699-1805, Volume V covers 1805-1878 and Volume VI covers 1878-1918. This periodization was also made according to the turning points in Serbian history as determined by historians. Accordingly, the most fundamental turning points in eight centuries of Serbian history are the Battle of Maritsa in 1371, the Fall of Belgrade in 1537, the Great Migration in 1699, the First Serbian Uprising in 1805, the establishment of the Serbian Kingdom in 1878, the end of World War I in 1918, and the establishment of the Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian Kingdom. Corović, on the other hand, considered the turning points in *Istorija Srba* to be the founding of the Nemanjić dynasty, the defeat in the Kosovo War, the fall of Belgrade, and the beginning of the Serbian uprisings.

At the center of all these historical turning points are the Ottomans (i.e., the Turks). Although the developments in language, literature, economy, and art are treated in broad sections and an attempt is made to move away from the nationalist narrative in the early 20th century and the socialist post-World War II Serbian historical narrative, the main themes of wars, uprisings, Serbs between Turks and Hungarians, migrations, and occupied Serbian territories are at the center of the narrative. Volume X of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* starts with the Serbian Kingdom; the Socialist Republic of Serbia; the existence of the Serbs outside Serbia; the Serbs living in Bosnia, Montenegro, Croatia, and Dalmatia as well as on the military border and in Hungary and evaluates and examines the Ottoman Empire (Rumelia) within the history of Serbia. Thus, *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* should be noted as having constructed the history and identity of Serbs with an essentialist and ethnosymbolic approach. Volume I remarkably conveys the history of the region they internalized as Serbian land from 30,000 years in the past to 1371 and narrates the South Slavs to have settled in the Balkans in the 6th century, to have then separated into two ethnic groups (i.e., Serbs and Croats) in the 9th century, and finally to have founded the magnificent medieval state under the Nemanjić dynasty in the 11th-13th centuries.

The 6000- to 7000-page work considers the Ottomans and Turks to be the same people. The first encounter with them takes place during the Battle of Maritsa, which is presented as the end of the medieval Serbian kingdom, the collapse of the dynasty, an unexpected loss, and the key battle of the Ottoman advance in the Balkans. Volume I of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* (1981:47) deals with the reliability of historical information about these wars. Apart from the place, time, and results of the wars, this volume states that no reliable information has yet been made available and the information within to have been based on myths. The death of Tsar Dušan in 1351 and the death of the brothers Uglješ and Vukašin in 1371 are stated to have plunged the 200-year tradition of the Nemanjić dynasty into a major crisis. The introduction of Volume II states that the 1371 Battle of Maritsa and the 1389 Battle of Kosovo led the Ottomans to settle in the region and colonize the territories they had won, moving them to Central Europe. After this date, the Serbian territories clearly became important for European countries, and the struggle between Serbs and Turks became one of the protective pillars of European civilization for Serbs. This resistance was made by Serbs long before the fall of Istanbul (*Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, Vol. I, 1981:7). Noteworthy, the Volumes I

and II intensively contain pictures of churches and priests. The relations of the medieval rulers with the church and the support of the church can be stated as important details in the narrative. The Battle of Kosovo is one of the main themes that have been addressed in all eras in terms of its consequences, the end of the medieval Serbian kingdom, and events such as betrayal. *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* should be noted to explain in detail the period before the Kosovo War, in particular the leadership of Prince Lazar, his relationship with the Church, and as a figure who'd revived the Nemanjić tradition. An attempt was noteworthy made to draw a framework by referring to many sources and documents related to the Battle of Kosovo itself. By examining the letters of the Bosnian king, Turkish and Byzantine documents, and the works of Constantine the Philosopher, the work attempts to provide a comparative perspective on the victor of the Battle of Kosovo and the developmental processes. Expressing how the Battle of Kosovo had quickly turned into a myth with new elements added, the work states Mavro Obrin to have written down the Kosovo myth in Italian for the first time in 1601 and that it had occurred in the oral tradition as the Heroes of Kosovo in the form of epic poems between the 18th-19th centuries (translated from Mihaljčić, 198:46):

Enriched with details from tradition, the Kosovo War had a strong impact on the following generations and contributed to the formation of people's historical consciousness. In people's minds, this war was and still is the most important and fateful event in the entire Serbian history, if not in all history. Likewise, the Battle of Kosovo was absolutely crucial for the relationship between Serbs and Turks. As a key event, the Battle of Kosovo has become a central point in the traditional historical calendar. Simplified and obscure information about the Serbian past was shared in the public consciousness in the period before and after the Battle of Kosovo. The Serbian state was believed to have been destroyed by this war, and both conflicts were associated with the beginning of centuries of slavery to foreigners. The surrender or betrayal of Kosovo was long denied, but these events have not been forgotten, driven by public testimony. The Battle of Kosovo and awareness of it undoubtedly played an important role in the liberation wars of the Serbian people.

Corović, the leading figure of romantic and nationalist historiography, is one of the historians constantly quoted in the post-nationalist transition period. His famous work *Istorija Srba* [History of the Serbs] is one of the main works on Serbian history to have

been reprinted repeatedly since the 1990s. The treatment of the Battle of Kosovo in his work is noteworthy. Corović addresses the Battle of Kosovo through Prince Lazar, Miloš Obilić, epic poems, and the deep traces it left behind, explaining Lazar as having viewed the strong relationship between the Church and the Nemanjić dynasty as an essential part of Serbian history. According to him, no other catastrophe occurred that has affected Serbian history as much as the Kosovo catastrophe, which has lingered for quite some time and left deep wounds. Miloš Obilić was a hero, and Corović (1993:260), who refrained from the claims of accusing Vuk Branković of treason, deliberately chose Lazar's death to set an example of national freedom and state independence for future generations. Reference is made to Prince Lazar's speech before the war:

Death may be better for us than survival. I would rather let death come to us than remain in the hands of the enemy. We have had enough on Earth, now it is time to fight a little to live in heaven forever (Corović, 1993:261).

The work explains the most important issues such as the Serbs' vassal relationship to the Ottoman Empire, the establishment of despotates, and the alliance with the Hungarians between 1389-1537 in great detail. The despotates of Stefan Lazarević and Đorđe Branković are situated within Serbian history in terms of the re-establishment of a state and the assumption of power up to the accession of Mehmet the Conqueror. In Đorđe Branković's words, the fate of Istanbul and the fate of Serbia and the Serbs are one. The fall of Serbia after the conquest of Istanbul and the death of Đorđe Branković as the most important political figure of the Serbs and Christians in 15th-century Balkans marked the end of the medieval Kingdom of Serbia. The struggle with the fall of Serbia between 1454-1459 and the fall of Belgrade in 1521 are described in the work *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* and given much more space than the Battle of Kosovo:

In 1459, the medieval Serbian kingdom, which had possessed an empire a century earlier and was one of the greatest powers, disappeared in the Balkan Peninsula. The struggle against the Turks lasted almost a hundred years, from the middle of the XIV century to the middle of the XV century. Of all the Balkan peoples, the Serbs put up the greatest resistance, but they could not stop the conquests. Nobody in Europe could stop the conquests. The united Balkan countries were replaced by a single political power, the Turkish Empire. The disintegration of the Serbian state could not be stopped either. After the Kosovo War in 1389, the Serbian kingdom

became a vassal country of the Sultan, and the region was the scene of wars almost all the time. While collecting a huge tribute, the Turks first collapsed the kingdom economically, then burned the villages, looted and destroyed the cities until they were in ruins. During all this time, the Serbian people were displaced. They were scattered across the Sava and Danube rivers. Serbian slaves were taken to the East, where they were sold and resold, settling in much of Southeastern Europe and Asia Minor. The fall of Smederevo on June 20, 1459, marked the beginning of centuries of Serbian enslavement. (Spremic, 1981:313)

The death of the last Serbian despot Pavle Bakić in 1537 after the fall of cities such as Belgrade, Mohacs, and Srem represents a new era and a turning point for the directors of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda*. This remarkable work was published in 1993 as a single volume covering the years 1537-1699 in Serbian history and differs significantly from other books written in the 1980s in terms of its Turkish narrative. Chapters such as “Turks and Islamization in Serbian History,” written by Radovan Samardić, are some of the most fundamental texts representing the nationalist-conservative historiography of the nationalist transition period. Although the footnotes at the beginning of the chapter indicate that it was written after the author reviewed 40 years of works and the archives of Venice, the Vatican, Vienna, Dubrovnik, and Paris, unlike other volumes published in the 1980s, the work in this volume is noteworthy rarely referenced. However, the chapter “Characteristics of the Turkish Administrative System” cites long quotations from Halil Inalcık’s classic work on the Ottoman Empire. *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* covers topics under the headings of “Turks in Serbian History,” “The Penetration of Islam in Southeastern Europe,” “Basic Features of Turkish Power,” “Serbs and the Regime of the Turkish Empire,” “Migration in Serbian History,” “The Serbian Orthodox Church,” “Serbs,” and “Wars.” The first topic of Volume III begins with the chapter “Turks in Serbian History” and expresses the relationship Turks have with Islam, Sharia, laws, the changes they brought to society, and the change of the Christian world in the Balkans in the face of the powerful Turkish Empire, where certain freedoms were granted through the religious communities. The Christian lands under Turkish rule had to change their appearance. The new settlers, the Timar system, the Qadis, and Islamization changed the ethnic and religious balance not only at the individual level but also at large. The Serbs were the largest Christian group to resist the Turks between 1371-1537 until the death of the despot Đurać after the Maritsa War. According to the

Serbs, the Turks were the ones who were repulsive, unreliable, and ultimately hostile; they were responsible for the destruction of Kosovo and Metohija, the most developed region of medieval Serbian civilization and the Albanian Arbanasi, until the Albanians revolted in 1912.

Samarčić (1993:14-15) writes openly in his text about forced Islamization, the *devshirme* [blood tax], and the genocide by the Turks:

No nation in Southeastern Europe has resisted as much as the Serbs. No one had been exterminated, killed, exiled, chained to slaves, or forcibly expelled as much as the innocent Serbian people. The Serbs had to endure Turkish persecution. With a single law, the lands were settled and the legal status of the region was changed. The Serbian people were shamelessly disregarded, and their lands were burned and destroyed. As a result of persecution and various tortures, people were humiliated, women were slapped in the face, and the laws and rites of the priests were slandered. The Turks collected tribute by blood, protected their sultans by taking the best and youngest children of the noble families, and strengthened their armies, yet undermined the power of the Serbian people and committed genocide.

According to Samarđić (1993:85-86), Islamization was practiced most on the Serbs. Although historiography debates whether or not this happened due to oppression, the transition from one religion to another can never be explained without it. Most Serbs converted to Islam to protect their lives and property. The Turks settled much less in the lands of the Serbs compared to other regions, instead bringing the Muslim population into existence through Islamization. Samarđić points out the settlement and Islamization of Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija. He explains that the poor population in Bosnia chose Islam because the Turks had promised economic and political prosperity. Likewise, he talks about how Serbs in Bosnia and Kosovo had been expelled from the region by various means. Samarđić (Samarđić, 1993:35-37) interestingly notes that the Christians of the region who'd converted to Islam experienced psychological and mental changes over time that led to fundamental ethnic differences.

The nationalist-conservative narrative, which claims that Serbs prevailed under foreign powers with great vitality and were able to preserve their own identity through constant uprisings, was also used in the 1990s. Migrations have been discussed at length as another major trajectory of Serbian history. With the departure of the Nemanjić dy-

nasty from the historical scene, Serbs became constantly exposed to migration to the south and southwest (southern Hungary, Habsburg Empire). The Serbian presence in places such as Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and the military border is argued to have been created by these migrations, that the Serbs were used by the Habsburg Empire due to their military and strong structure alongside and against the Turks, and that this was especially envied by the Croats (Samarđić, 1993:103). On the other hand, the Serbs fleeing from the Turks were exposed to the policies of the Roman Catholic Church, which wanted to abolish Orthodoxy (Samarđić, 1993:83-84).

Although an attempt has been made to explain the social life of Serbs under Turkish rule through farms, towns, villages, and the Timar system, the main trajectory of the narrative about Serbs under Turkish rule involves the period between 1537-1804 and the vividness of uprisings and wars. Battles like Banat, Budin, Cyprus, the Habsburg-Ottoman Wars, and the Sieges of Vienna and personalities like Suleiman the Magnificent and Mehmet the Conqueror are the main elements of this narrative.

Volume IV, published in 1983, is about the 17th century. Samarđić also wrote the chapters "Serbs in the Turkish Empire (1699-1804)," "Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 18th Century," and "The Serbian Orthodox Church in the Turkish Empire." As can be seen from these titles, the chapters he'd written in 1993 on the 16th and 17th centuries are very similar to the main themes of the historiography of a socialist Yugoslavia devoted to Serbian history. These chapters present a framework that focuses on the administrative, social, and economic relations of Belgrade and the Bosnian Pashalik and their relations with Istanbul. He makes intensive references to Tricković's doctoral dissertation on the Belgrade Pashalik of 1687-1739.

Meanwhile, Gavrilović (1981:352-353) noted how the Turkish-Russian (1768) and Turkish-Austrian (1788) wars had intensified the Serbs' hopes for freedom and includes the Russian and Austrian rulers' and religious leaders' proposals to the Serbian people to fight together against the Turks:

Christians, churches, and women were severely tortured by the Turks, they were severely persecuted by the Turks, they hated them very much. The armies took oil, sheep, and more from the houses of the Christians and committed atrocities. The poor cried a lot because of anger and pain. Trade was destroyed under this pressure.

The Battle of Kochana Krajina, the persecution of the Janissaries, and the Selim III's reforms are dealt with extensively in Gavrilović's narrative, as they played an important role in the process that led to the Serbian uprisings of 1804. Volume V deals with the Serbian uprisings and the Serbian Revolution between 1804-1878 and tells the story of the Janissaries' daily terror, anarchy, and destruction of political and social order. The authors refer to the consequences of the Serbian uprisings as the Serbian Revolution. The images used in Volume V are also noteworthy, some of the heavily used ones being Cele Kula, Hajdut Veljko, the Tribute to the Janissaries, Vuk Karadžić, Obrenović, and the Uprising:

Before the Second Serbian uprising, the Turkish administration committed terrible atrocities, not only against the insurgents but also against women and powerless people, under the treatment of slaves, setting fire to every living thing. Jihad against Serbia was proclaimed, and most women were taken to the harem of Turkish soldiers. (Stojančević, 1986:96)

Hadži-Prodan's rebellion was started in 1814 under these conditions, but ended with the Turks taking revenge and killing hundreds of villagers, priests, nuns, and princes. Volume V also examines the First and Second Serbian Uprisings, Obrenović's and Karađorđević's leadership differences, their relations with the Ottoman Empire, and their proximity to Russia and Austria in the context of the impact of foreign policy. Obrenović gave the Serbs autonomy and a dual structure, laying the foundation for the Serbian principality in 1838 and the Serbian kingdom in 1878. After the topic of the Serbian uprisings, the volume goes on to deal with the Bosnian Pashalik and the province of Rumeli in the chapter "The Serbs Remaining in the Ottoman Empire." The narrative addresses the relations of the Bosnian Pashalik, Prištine, and Niš Sanjaks with the region involved in the First and Second Serbian Uprisings, the uprisings that developed in these regions (1809, 1835, and 1841), the terror of the Turkish administration, and the positions of the Serbs. The work addresses what had been going on in the borders of the Old Serbian geography as determined by Vuk Stefanovic Karadžić and also shows the borders of the Serbian State (Stojančević, 1986:217-135). Volume V gives the population figures of the Serbs within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Statistics referring to the censuses after 1876 show 43,035 Muslims and 28,091 non-Muslims to have been in Pristina and 74,212 Muslim and 24,297 non-Muslim men to have been in the Sanjak of Prizren. The work indicates by citing Austro-Hungarian that 1,158,000

Bosniaks and 496,000 Serbs were present in Bosnia. Settlements, wars, uprisings, and diseases are cited as the main reasons for the changes in the Serbian population (Stojančević, 1986:452-455). According to Stojančević, the expulsion of the Turks from Belgrade as a result of the Serbian uprisings had an enormous impact on the social, material, and spiritual world of the Serbs and enabled the liberation of the peasants from feudal obligations as well as free expression of traditional and religious life, national freedom, safety, and economic security.

The Period of EU Interaction

Parallel to the interaction with the EU and the developments in the historiography of the postmodern period, new perspectives and fields of study were introduced into Ottoman and Habsburg studies. The studies were deepened, and the obstacles to accessing the documents available in the archives were removed. When looking at the Ottoman and Habsburg studies that are increasing daily in the Serbian historiography, new institutions, journals, and young researchers are seen to be coming to the fore. These new structures and studies deepen and diversify Ottoman and Habsburg studies, underline the quality and objectivity of historical knowledge using methodological tools, and lay the foundations for writing new works.

In this regard, examining the extent to which the main works dealing with Serbian history reflect this framework is extremely important. In this period focused on democratization, Europeanization, and market economy, finding an impartial/true representation is not easy, as the works in the field of Serbian history can be written within the framework of different ideologies. Because the political life and historiography in Serbia after 2000 experienced fundamental turning points in 2001 and 2012, one can focus as an example on the differing main trajectories of the works published in this period on the narratives of Ottoman and Habsburg. Bataković's (2000; 2010) *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, Logos' (2017) *Istorija Srbija*, and Antić and Kecmanović's (2016) *Istorija Republike Srpske* added new developments to Serbian history alongside the nationalist view. On the other hand, the works *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* by Stanojević and *Istorija Srba* by Corović, the main historians of Serbian nationalist historiography respectively in the 1920s-1930s and the 1990s were noteworthy constantly republished between 2000-2010.

When examining the works *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda* (2001) and *Istorija Srbija* (2017), which are based on Serbian history, one can see the traces of Serbian nationalism and positivist movements in both works. After 2000, Serbian historiography was noted to have expanded so as to include a dimension dealing with social and everyday life, women, and minority groups, but studies and narratives focusing on politics and diplomacy continued. In this context, one can state that these works are good examples of this observation. Logos' *Istorija Srbija* makes frequent references to the 10-volume *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* from the nationalist transition period, *Istorija Srba* by Stanojević, and *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* by Corović. In addition, Aşıkpaşazade's work and Çelebi's *Seyahatname* are drawn from in many places, especially in *Istorija Srbija*, which made some different decisions in periodizing Serbian history and naming these periods (i.e., Serbs before the Nemanjić dynasty, Serbs from the Nemanjić dynasty to the mid-15th century (fall of Serbia), 15th- to 18th-century Serbs, and 19th-century Serbs). The turning points are the foundation of the Nemanjić dynasty, the fall of Serbia, and the beginning of the Serbian uprisings. He refrains from using descriptive adjectives in naming the periods. Bataković's work *Nova Istorija Srpskog Naroda* periodizes the eras as the settlement in the Balkans, the fall of the Despotates (5th-15th centuries), under the power of strangers (16th-18th centuries), struggle for independence and unification (19th century), and Serbs in Yugoslavia (1918-1991).

The borders of the medieval Kingdom of Serbia (i.e., Ancient Serbia) are the backbone of the Serbian historical narrative, which focuses on Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Kosovo, Vojvodina, the military border, the military and political history of the Serbs in Slavonia, their positions, social structure, economy, and the structures of the empires that ruled them. With the influence of postmodern historiography, advances in the studies of the Ottomans and Habsburgs, EU relations, and the departure from radical, nationalist, and conservative political lines compared to pre-2000, the main theme in works on Serbian history can be seen to persist but to also include new approaches and themes. As one of the main trajectories, the Battle of Kosovo is explained in terms of its development, course, and results as well as through the Kosovo myth. Throughout history only the Serbs were stated to have killed the Ottoman Sultan and the war was considered a Serbian victory; however, because of its results over time people, defined it first as a Pyrrhic victory and then as a Serbian defeat and Turkish victory. Despite the lack of information about the Battle of Kosovo in popular poems and developed myths,

Branković has been expressed as a traitor, Miloš Obilić as a hero, and Prince Čar Lazar as the most important saint in Serbian history with the involvement of the Church. This narrative is referred to especially in Mihaljčić's relevant chapter in *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* (Logos, 2017:326-330) The war tactics of the Ottomans in the Balkans are mentioned by referring to Krstić's works (as cited on p. 352).

Logos discusses the *devshirme* system and Islamization, which are indispensable themes of the narrative about the Ottoman period, through Sokollu Mehmed Pasha. The information about Sokollu Mehmet Pasha is much more detailed than the information in the works from other eras. His education, family, youth, political life in Istanbul, and contributions to Serbian history and to the Ipek Patriarchate are discussed and supported with visual materials. On the other hand, Logos describes *devshirme* in the classic narrative as a blood tax and mentions Muslim families who want their Muslim children to register as Christians and become a *devshirme*:

One of the most difficult obligations of the conquered Christian population was the devshirme, or blood tax, as it is popularly known. Every five years or so, families had to give some of their 8- to 15-year-old non-Muslim boys. Sometimes as many as 3,000 boys were accumulated in a year. Parents tried to prevent their children from becoming devshirme by bribing or even mutilating their own children. The townspeople and Muslim villagers did not pay their tribute with their blood because they were Muslims, but there were cases of poor Muslim children being handed over to Christians and made devshirme for a better life. (Logos, 2017:318-319)

Islamization is central to the narrative of Bosnia and Kosovo and Serbs' forced emigration from their homeland. After the Kosovo War, Islamized Albanians were argued to have settled in the region and the Serb population living in Bosnia to have been intensively Islamized to prosper under the Ottoman system, especially in the late 15th and 16th centuries. In the current period of postmodern historiography and the approach to the EU in terms of power and politics, the most basic theme that differs in the narrative compared to other periods is the addition of sections on the social, daily, urban, and village lives of Serbs in the Ottoman and Habsburg empires. The narrative begins with negative examples such as the constant state violence against non-Muslims. This violence is evident, for example, in the fact that church bells were not allowed to be

rung and important churches had been converted into mosques such as Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, St. Dimitri Church in Thessaloniki, and Goddesses of the Thessaloniki and Banya churches in Prizren (Logos, 2017:392)

Logos (2017:394) mentions how the Christian populations and Serbs in the cities had been Islamized, migrated, or moved away and settled in the suburbs and villages:

The Christian population decreased in the cities. According to the Shari'a, they had the right to life and property and could preserve their faith, but they were obliged not to interfere in the lives of Muslims. They were not allowed to disturb Muslims by ringing church bells or to move on the streets as they pleased. The poor, who had hardly anything, had to seek shelter with the Muslims. Non-Muslims were not allowed to ride horses or carry weapons unless they had a special certificate (berat).

Logos (2017:395) states that, since the 16th century, the Muslim population had increased in Serbian cities, and the cities took the form of Eastern architecture and consisted of quarters, bazaars, mosques, madrasas, hammams, and caravanserais:

Hammams, madrasas, and buildings for administrators were built in the cities. The streets were winding and dirty, mostly dirt, without cobblestones. Muslims mostly built houses of brick and wood, rarely stone. The more modest houses in towns had two or three rooms. The houses in the city were one or two stories high. The middle part of the floor was the hallway, but there was a sofa. There was space for family gatherings and receiving guests, as well as areas for smoking and chatting. The Muslim house consisted of two parts. The male part of the house (selamlık) was the part where life happened and was open to visitors. The female part of the house (harem) was accessible only to the family. The floors were covered with carpets. The windows were located on the wall facing the courtyard.

One of the prominent themes in the narratives about the Ottoman period relating to gender studies is that evaluations about women have started to take place. "In the eastern cities, women avoided going out and men dominated the streets. But this did not mean the complete isolation of women" (Logos, 2017:394). One narrative that makes observations about women's dress in Ottoman society includes the following information:

Women's shirts are decorated with embroidery on the sleeves, chest, and lower hems. The rest of the clothing (belt, skirt, dress, vest) is usually made of sheepskin. Women adorn themselves with silver or gold jewelry and do not go out in public without a headscarf, hat, or veil. Muslim women must dress in such a way that men can mainly only see their eyes, hands, and feet in public. There is also a patriarchal lifestyle in the villages. (Logos, 2017:394)

On the other hand, Muslims are stated to have made music with wind and percussion instruments when they gather, while Christians mostly use bagpipes, violins, and flutes (Logos, 2017:395).

Logos' (2017:394) *Istorija Srbija* also contains a narrative about daily life in Serbian villages in the Ottoman Empire, where most villages are predominantly Christian, that they are spread out due to the fear of violence and the arbitrariness of the rulers, and that the order consists of desolate and neighboring houses:

The representations of peasant houses in Vojvodina are particularly deplorable. They are shelters and semi-shelters. Since the Ottoman conquest, the Serbs have lived in small villages and moved away from the Ottoman center, trying to build their houses away from the important roads. Unlike the Christians, the Muslim villages had more houses. Only the poor population made their own clothes.

Another problem villagers were stated to face in their daily lives was travel, with safety problems, uncertainty, the traders having houses along the routes, and the attacks on their caravans causing great harm to the villagers.

Conclusion

Before comparatively examining the impact these turning points in ideological and political power had on the historical narrative through history textbooks, the results need to be analyzed in terms of historiography. Obviously, the general trend of the historiography of the period in question reveals the main reference texts of official history. For this reason, the general trends, framework, ruptures, institutions, and studies of historiography clearly were not developed separately from the basic framework of ideological power. The basic texts written in the nationalist transition periods and the historians can be suggested to have fed the official historiography. The research themes from the postpositivist period began to take root in Serbian historiography in parallel with

the political and methodological transformations that took place during the period of interacting with the EU.

In Serbian historiography, the romantic-nationalist, Marxist, and post-romantic nationalist schools developed by using the positivist scientific historical methodology. Therefore, these schools are intertwined with power, ideology, and national interests. Post-2000 in particular, the effects of Europeanization, liberalization, democratization, and methodological differentiation through the presence of historians trained abroad made the existence of the post-positivist school visible through themes such as gender, minorities, common history, the other, everyday life, memory, and childhood. During the period of nationalist transition, historians who tried to stay away from government relations and develop strategies to escape official historiography, as well as young historians who had studied abroad, especially during the Milošević period, paid attention to the development of academic historiography and conducted studies on the need for a historical methodology. The young historians who were educated during the period of nationalist transition and who emphasized academic historiography notably came to the fore with their differentiating works in historiography after 2000.

The interventions of ideological power, values, and conception of history in the nationalist transition historiography are clearly observable. Historians were employed, active, and prominent in the historical institutions of the state. Clearly the changes in the sphere of power and ideological power have affected the general framework of historiography. The most important development in the period from 1980-2000 was the Memorandum published by the members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in 1987. Likewise, historians in the 1990s came to the fore who produced the period of fake history/parahistoriography by publishing articles in or addressing the official publications of the state. The Chetnik movement that had been denounced in the socialist period and defined as post-romantic and nationalist historiography was redefined. The victims of World War II have been heroized, the oppression from the communist regime has been expressed, and the victims have been highlighted. Therefore, the main themes of pre-World War I historiography such as the golden age, dynastic history, the leadership and protection of the Church, the victimization of the nation, the genocide and the subjugation of the Serbs, and the uprisings were replaced with the Marxist terminology and perspective in order to generate the values of ideological power and the legitimacy of the new order and the wars.

Historians such as Cirković, Ekmečić, Mihaljčić, Samardžić, Zirojević, Krestić, Veselinović, and Gavrilović made themselves prominent by participating in and producing works on both the socialist and nationalist transition periods. Another common feature of all these historians is that they had been long-time members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU), one of the basic institutions of official historiography. Historians such as Miljković, Katić, Fotić, Marinković, and Amedovska are also historians who participated in both the nationalist transition period as well as the post-2000 interaction period with the EU.

Meanwhile, historians such as Cirković, Ekmečić, Mihaljčić, Samardžić, Krestić, Veselinović, and Gavrilović have written the 10-volume *Istorija Srpskog Naroda*, which presents the general trajectories of the historical concept of Socialist Yugoslavia and the nationalist transition period. The work was published between 1981-1993 and embodies both positivist and Marxist historiography as well as the spirit of the time when historiography had turned into a post-Romantic and nationalist historiography. The third volume of *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* was published in 1993 and consists of texts that also include works from Samardžić and Krestić. In contrast to the works published between 1981-1986, this third volume contains texts that use nationalist terminology the most. Genocide, immigration, blood tax, Kosovo as the homeland, the Serbian Orthodox Church, the Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia, and the processes of Catholicization and Islamization are strongly emphasized and form the undisputed legitimization for wars. Meanwhile, Krestić is also represented in this work and was one of the leading authors of the famous SANU Memorandum published in 1987. He authored the book *Through Genocide to a Greater Croatia* and then became an advisor to the Prime Minister of the Republic of Serbia. Radovan Karadžić was later tried as a war criminal and was an ardent supporter of Slobodan Milošević throughout the 1990s until being handed over to the Hague. These two historians not only uncovered the basic framework of the historical perspective of official historiography but also provided extremely important evidence to show that ideological power was involved in the main works from that period.

Historians such as Miljković, Zirojević, Katić, Fotić, Marinković, and Amedovska are the historians who studied history between 1990-2020 (i.e., the post-Romantic nationalist period and Europeanization and the post-positivist period), and one can see differences in the topics and methods they studied during these two periods. While Miljković published many studies on Islamization and resettlement in the 1990s, she

also worked on topics such as everyday life, Ottoman heritage in the Balkans, Serbian society under Ottoman rule, the Ottoman Empire in Serbia, and the Serbs in the Ottoman Empire alongside the effects from the change of ideological power after 2000 and the post-positivist historiography and became one of the historians who enabled the transformation between the two periods. In addition, authors such as Zirojević, Fotić, and Marinković focused on the Church, converts, Islamization, and waqfs and continued their studies after the first decade of the new millennium, producing studies that focus on Ottoman archives, documents, and social historiography. While historians such as Amedovska focused on gender studies, women's studies, and waqfs, young historians such as Todorović and Ristonović wrote studies on such topics as Islamic common culture, Islamic holidays and festivals, and the common Ottoman heritage in Serbia, topics that first found their place in historical studies after 2000.

The works *Istorija Srpskog Naroda* and *Istrorija Srba* on Serbian history were written by different authors from different perspectives in two different periods after 1990 and have significant thematic similarities such as names, subtitles, concepts used in the content, periodization, and created differences in terms of the ideological power, values, and methodology of each period, and these are reflected in the Serbian historical narrative in terms of continuities and changes.

Endnotes

- 1 See also: Jovanka Kalic, Colović M. (ed.) (1992), *Socijalna struktura Srpskih Gradskih Naselja XI-XVIII*, Smederevo: Muzej u Smederevu.; Blagojević M. (1989), *Srbija u Doba Nemanjica*, Belgrade: Vajat, IRO Beograd, 1989; Mijusković J. V. (1994), *Srbi i Poznom Srednjem Veku*, Belgrade: Balkanološki Isntitut SANU; Spremić M. (1994), *Despot Durad Brankovic i njegova doba*, Belgrade: Srpska knjijevna zadruga.; Veselinović A., Mišić S., Mihaljić R., (2001) *Sabrana Dela*, 4 vols, Belgrade: Srpska školska knjiga, Beograd; Knowledge.
- 2 See also: Tašić N.- Stošić D. (ed.) (1989), *Migrations in Balkan History*, Beograd: Prosveta; Živojanović D. (1989) Wars, Population Migrations and Religious Proselytism in Dalmatia during the second half of the 17th century, *Balkan History*, s.77-82, Nikola Tašić-Dušica Stošić (ed.) (1989), Beograd; Prosveta; Radoš Ljušić, Doseljavanje, iseljabanja I gubici stanovništva u novovekovnoj Srbiji (1804-1918), s.77-99, Ranković D. (ed.), *Zbornik Seobe srpskog naroda od XIV do XX veka*, Beograd: 1990,
- 3 See also: Živojanović D. (1998), *Srpska Pravoslavne Crkve I nova rat 1944-1950*, Beograd: Srbinje, 8; Fotić A. (2000), *Sveta Gora I Hilandar u Osmanskom carstvu (XVI-XVII vek)*, Beograd: SANU; Radić R. (1995), *Verum protiv vere, Država I verske zajednice u Srbiji 1945-1953*, Beograd: INIS.
- 4 See also: Krestić V., Ljušić R. (1991), *Programi i statuti srpskih političkih stranaka do 1918 godina*, Beograd; Knjezve Novine; Rajić S. (1999), *Memoari srpskih liberala*, Beograd: Filozofski Fakultet; Dubravka Stojanović (1994), *Iskustvanje načela, Srpska socijaldemokratska partiha i ratni program Srbije 1912-1918*, Beograd: Timit Book.

- 5** See also: *Položaj ženekao merilo modernizacije*, (1998) Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Mladenović B. (2006), *Žene u Topličkom ustanku 1917. Godine*, Beograd: Baština, C.20, S-2, s.313-322; *Gender Relations in South East Europe*, (2002.), Belgrade-Graz: Udruženje za društvenu istoriju, Abteilung Südosteurop. ische Geschichte.
- 6** See also: Popović N. (1998), *Jevreji u Srbiji 1918–1941*, Beograd: ISI, 1997; Ristić M. *U potrazi za utopištem*, Beograd: Službeni list SRJ; Koljanin M. (1992), *Nemački logor na Beogradskom sajmištu 1941–1944*, Beograd: ISI; Janjetović (2000), *Between Hitler and Tito*. Beograd: Private author's edition; Bešlin B. (2001), *Vesnik tragedije. Nemačka štampa u Vojvodini 1933–1941*, Novi Sad: Sremski Karlovi.
- 7** See also: Mičić S. (2020), The Influence of France and Italy's (Central)European Projects on Yugoslavia's Re-Evaluation of Regional Pacts (1927–1933), *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.2, s.39–60; Latinović G. (2017), Jugoslovensko-Italijansko Pomorsko Rivalstvo na Jadranskom Moru 1919–1929, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.1, s.59–70; Sahara T. (2016), Novo Viđenje Nastanka „Crne Ruke“, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.1, s.9–29; Gulić M. (2016), Dalmatinska Javnost i Sarajevski Atentat, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.1, s.31–54; Vavrišuk P. (2016), Poljsko-Jugoslovenski Odnosi 1945–1948, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.2, s.63–82; Koljanin M. (2014), Zločini Bugarske u Srbiji 1915–1918 Prilog Istraživanju Bugarske Okupacije U Prvom Svetskom Ratu, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.2, s.39–52; Latinović G. (2014), Jugoslovensko-Danski Odnosi 1920–1941, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.2 s.91–104; Latinović G. (2015), Jugoslovensko-Švedski Odnosi 1941–1945, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.1, s.45–60; Štermenski J. P. (2011), Dva Srpska Kneza, Otac I Sin – Slike Iz Britanskih Diplomatskih Izveštaja, *Istorijski Časopis*, I.60, s.333-356; Rastović A. (2012), Britanska Diplomacija O Stanju U Kosovskom Vilajetu Posle Berlinskog Kongresa, *Istorijski Časopis*, I.61, s.187-204; Popović R. J. (2016), Delatnost Prvog Ruskog Konzula U Srbiji Gerasima Vaščenka 1838–1843 Godine, *Istorijski Časopis*, I.65, s.183-204; Bakić D. L. (2020), Opasnost Od Izbijanja Crnogorsko-Osmanskog Rata 1911. Godine“, *Istorijski Časopis*, I.69, s.375-400; Ristić L. P. (2014), Srbija U Britanskoj Politici 1889–1903, *Srpska Akademija Nauka I Umetnosti* (2014), Balkanološki Institut, Beograd: Posebna Izdanja 124; Rastović A. (2015), *Englezi i Balkan 1837–1914*, Beograd: Zavod Za Udžbenike; Rastović A. (2015), *Velika Britanija i Kosovski Vilajet 1877–1912. Godine*, Beograd: Zavod Za Udžbenike.
- 8** See also: Miloradović G. (2019), Miroslav Krleža i Pravaštvo. Prilog Istoriji Ideja i Ideologija, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I, 29–64; Nikolić K. (2020), The Ideocratic State and National Identity: The Serbian Experience in the 20th Century, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I, 9–34; Janjetović Z. (2018), Dimitrije Ljotić i Drugi Svetski Rat, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I.1, 93–118; Nikolić K. (2009), Saveznici, Partizani i Etnici u Drugom Svetskom Ratu, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 161-170; Pešić M. D., Božica B. Mladenović (2017), Kriza Parlamentarnog Sistema U Kraljevini Srbiji od 1892. do 1894. Godine, *Istorijski Časopis*, 66, 401-436; Teinović B. (2020), Politički Život u Bosanskom Ejaletu (1815–1822) – Srpsko i Austrijsko Tumačenje, *Istorijski Časopis*, 69, 275-302.
- 9** See also: Rudić S. (2019), *Velika Istočna Kriza i Srpsko Pitanje*, Istorijski Institut, Beograd; Vojvodić M. (2015), *Prvi Balkanski Rat 1912–1913: Istorijski Procesi i Problemi u Svetlosti Stogodišnjeg Iskustva*, Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti; Živojinović D. R. (2015), *Srbi i Prvi Svetski Rat 1914–1918*. Zbornik Radova Sa Međunarodnog Naučnog Skupa Održanog 13–15. Juna 2014. Godine, Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti; Rudić S., Milkić M. (2015), *Prvi Svetski Rat, Srbija, Balkan i Velike Sile*, Istorijski Institut, Institut Za Stratejska Istraživanja, Beograd; Srđan Rudić, Lela Pavlović (2016), *Srpska Revolucija i Obnova Državnosti Srbije – Dvesta Godina Od Drugog Srpskog Ustanka*, Istorijski Institut, Beograd, Čačak: Međuopštinski Istorijski Arhiv; Jovanović V. (2012), *Tajna Policija Kneževine Srbije (Političko Nasilje I Upravljačke Strategije U Srbiji 19. Veka)*, Beograd: Istorijski Institut; Amedoski D., Petrović V. (2018), *Gradska Naselja Kruševačkog Sandžaka (XV–XVI Vek)*, Beograd: Istorijski Institut; *Belgrade 1521–1867* (2018), The Institute of History Belgrade, Beograd: Yunus Emre Enstitüsü – Turkish Cultural Centre.
- 10** For detailed information see: Radić R. (2022), *Država i verske zajednice 1945-1970*. 1-2. Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Radić R. (2005), *Patrijarh Pavle: Biografija*, Beograd: Novosti Tanjug, 2005; Radić R. (2006), *Život u vremenima: Gavrilo Dožić 1950-1881*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Radić R. (2007), *Serbian Christianity, The Blackwell Companion to Eastern Christianity*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 231-248; Radić R. (2011), *Život u vremenima: Patrijarh Gavrilo Dožić 2) 1950-1881. dop. izd.*. Beograd: Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet; Radić R. (2014), Jugoslavija i Vatikan 1918-1992. godine, *Annales: Anali za istrske in mediteranske študije*, 24, 4, 691-702; Radić R. (2015), *The Serbian Orthodox Church in the First World War, The Serbs and the First World War 1914-1918*, Belgrade: SANU, 263-285; Radmila R. (2018), *Vojislav Janić (1890-1944), sveštenik i političar: Pogled kroz analitički prozor*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Radić R. (2009), Izbor Patrijarha Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve u 20. Veku, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I, 17-36; Koljanin M., Srpska Pravoslavna Crkva i Jevreji 1918–1937, *Istorija 20. Veka*, I, 67-78; Koljanin M. (2010), Srpska Pravos-

lavna Crkva i Jevrejsko Pitanje, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 23-40; Čairović I (2018), The Role of Vicar Bishop Dositej (Stojković) at the Beginning of the Church Schism in Macedonia in 1958, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 155–176; Lompar R. (2020), Kontakti Nemačke Evangelističke Crkve I Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve U Kontekstu Nemačke Spoljne Politike Prema Balkanu 1935–1941, *Tokovije Istorija*, 2, 51-73; Bećirović D. (2010), *Komunistička Vlast i Srpska Pravoslavna Crkva u Bosni i Hercegovini (1945-1955) – Pritisci, Napadi, Hapšenja i Suđenja*, Tuzla, Beograd:Institut za Noviju Istoriju; Radosavljević N. (2009), Beogradska Mitropolija Po Popisu Iz 1826, *Istorijski Časopis*, 58, 209-230; Bulić D. (2010), Dejan Crnčević Zvuk i Građenje: Primeri Akustičkih Sudova Iz Crkve Manastira Davidovica, *Istorijski Časopis*, 59, 95-120; Petrović G.G. (2010), Demografske Prilike i Mreža Parohija u Beogradskoj Eparhiji od 1718. Do 1739. Godine, *Istorijski Časopis*, 59, 267-298; Kunčer D., (2011), Portret Dalmatinskog Episkopa Krajem 6. Veka, *Istorijski Časopis*, 60, 13-24; Bulić D., (2013), Crkva u Šumniku, Novi Pogled na Datovanje, *Istorijski Časopis*, 62, 47-78; Radosavljević N. V. (2013), Vikarni Episkopi, Dabrobosanske Mitropolije (1766–1878), *Istorijski Časopis*, 62, 161-192; Radosavljević N. V. (2104), Kiril Živković, Episkop Pakračko-Slavonski (Prilozi Za Biografiju), *Istorijski Časopis*, 63, 59-76; Kunčer D. (2015), Religijska Praksa Stanovnika Kosmajskih Rudnika u Doba Carstva, *Istorijski Časopis*, 64, 13-32; Bulić D. (2015), Crkva U Radošićima, *Istorijski Časopis*, 64, 85-133; Matić M. (2016), Borba Za Dalmatinskobokeljsku Episkopiju U XVIII Veku, *Istorijski Časopis*, 65, 159-182.; Radosavljević N. V. (2016), Mostarska Crkvenoškolska Opština i Promene na Hercegovačkom Mitropoljskom Tronu (1888–1889*), *Istorijski Časopis*, 65, 307-330.; Radosavljević J. N. (2018), Mitropolit Evstatije i Uspostavljanje Srpske Crkvene Uprave u Nišavskoj Mitropoliji 1878, *Istorijski Časopis*, 67, 159-182.; Katić S. (2019), Manastir Mrkšina Crkva Poslednja Stara Srpska Štamparija, *Istorijski Časopis*, 68, 155-174; Radosavljević N. V. (2020), Crnogorski Mitropolit Sava Petrović I Ukidanje Pečke Patrijaršije 1766, *Istorijski Časopis*, 69, 227-248, Komatina I. (2016), *Crkva i Država u Srpskim Zemljama od XI Do XIII Veka*, Beograd:Istorijski Institut, 2016.

11 For detailed information see: Amedoski D. (2019), Žena u ulozi naslednice u osmansko doba: primer žene muslimanke na Centralnom Balkanu (18–17. vek), *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, 67, 325-338; Amedoski D. (2009), Women waqfs in the sixteenth-century Sanjak of Kruševac (Alaca Hisâr), *Balkanica*, XL, s.43-55; Amedovska D. (2018), Osmanska žena na Centralnom Balkanu između stereotipa i stvarnosti (16–18. vek), *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, 66, 1, 119-137; Stolić A. (2020), Rat i Pitanje Nasleda Srpskog Narodnog Ženskog Saveza Na Osnivačkom Kongresu Narodnog Ženskog Saveza SHS 1919 Godine, *Istorijski Časopis*, 69, 495–516; Škodrić L. (2013), Horizontalna Kolaboracija – Intimne Veze Žena sa Nemačkim Okupatorom u Srbiji 1941–1944, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 105–122; Mišambled R. (2017), Seksualno Potiskivanje: Pokretač Napretka Zapada od 1500. do Naših Dana?, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 135–147, Marković P. J. (2017), Istoriografija i Seksualnost (Polnost): Skica za Istoriju Jedne Discipline, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 149–171; Miličević M. J. (2010), Neverna Caja Ili Razvod Jednog Oficirskog Braka, *Istorijski Časopis*, 59, 341-364.

12 For detailed information see: Vukman P. (2018), Socijalna Kompozicija i Svakodnevni Život Informbirovaca u Mađarskoj (1948–1980), *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 133–146; Dobrivojević I. (2011), Slika Jednog Društva. Životne Prilike na Srpskom Selu 1945–1955, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 143–158; Vuletić A. (2015), Razvojni Ciklus Porodičnog Domaćinstva Sredinom 19. Veka. Primer Sela Gostilja, *Istorijski Časopis*, 64, 287-312; Jakovljević A. (2011), Selo Dubnica u Nahiji Senice: Naselje, Stanovništvo i Običaj Proslave Petrovdana Početkom 17. Veka, *Istorijski Časopis*, 60, 213-230; Katić T. (2009), „Sirote Kudeljnice” i Baštince: Dva Tipa Hrišćanskih Udovičkih Domaćinstava u Osmanskom Carstvu - na Primeru Prizrenskog Sandžaka u 16. Veku, *Istorijski Časopis*, 58, 209-230; B. M. Katić (2013), Seosko Profesionalno Zanatstvo Kneževine Srbije (1834–1866), *Istorijski Časopis*, 62, 309-330; Isailović N. (2011), Nekoliko Novih Podataka iz 1436. Godine O Familijarima Hrvatinića U Župama Zemunik I Glaž, *Istorijski Časopis*, 60, 153-178; Vuletić A. (2020), Fostikov Mobilnost Zanatlija Na Teritoriji Srednjovekovne Srbije, *Istorijski Časopis*, 69, 81-98; Kovačević D. (2016), Kojić Kuća Voštana (Geto) U Dubrovniku Prema Trgovačkim Knjigama Braće Kabužić (1426–1433), *Istorijski Časopis*, 65, 101-112; Tošić Đ. (2012), *Srednjovekovna Turobna Svakodnevica (Od Prostitutke, Preko Vještice Do Vampira)*, Beograd:Istorijski Institut, Studije, C.6; Kurtović E. (2014), Konj U Srednjovekovnoj Bosni, Univerzitet u Sarajevu, *Istorijski Časopis*, 63, 134-137; Fostikov A. (2019), *Zanatstvo Srednjovekovne Srbije*, Beograd:Istorijski Institut Beograd – Narodni Muzej Požarevac.

13 For detailed information see: Antolović M. (2013), Nemačka Nacionalna Manjina y Jugoslaviji kao Predmet Nemačke Istoriografije (1945–2010), *Malice Srpske*, 87, 137-151; Radovanović M. (2019), The Internal Framework of Organized Jewish Migration from Yugoslavia to Israel (1948–1952), *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 121-138; Katić S. (2001), Uloga Jevreja u otvaranju i razvoju rudnika Kučajna i Majdanpek u drugoj polovini XVI veka, *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju*, 7, 1-2, 7-17; Ivanković M.- Stojanović A. (2019), Anti-Semitic Propaganda and Legislation in Serbia 1939–1942:Content, Scale, Aims And Role of the German Factor, *Is-*

torija 20. Veka, 2, 85–104; Radovanović M. (2020), Migration Spawning Migration -on Continuity in Jewish Emigration from Yugoslavia to Palestine/Israel, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 187–202; Stojanova P. (2012), Kratak Pogled na Istoriju Cigana u Bugarskim Zemljama do Kraja Prvog Svetskog Rata, *Istorijski Casopis*, 61, 205–214; Koljanin M. (2008), *Jevreji i antisemitizam u Kraljevini Jugoslaviji*, Beograd; Gavrilović M. (2020), O Srbima U Dalimilovoj Hronici, *Istorijski Casopis*, 69, 13–38.

14 For detailed information see: Čolić L. (2020), Zloupotreba Prošlosti U Političke Svrhe Kritička Analiza Radova Albanskih Istoričara i Lingvisti, *Istorijski Casopis*, 64, 539–555; Jovanovic M. (2010), Savremena Srpska Istoriografija: Karakteristike i Trendovi, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2010/1, s.183–192; Pavlović M. (2010), Zloini Oslobođioca – Zadatak Srpske Istoriografije Visokog Prioriteta, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 9–22; Škodrić L.- Petrović V. (2020), Digitalna Istorija: Geneza, Oblici I Perspektive, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 9–38; Gulić M. (2013), Trideset Godina Časopisa Istorija 20. Veka 1983–2013, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 219–232; Stanković Đ. – Ljubodrag D. (1996), *Istoriografija pod nadzorom, Prilozi za istoriju istoriografije*, 1–2, Beograd: Službeni list SRJ; Petranović B. (1997), *Istoriografija i kritika*, Podgorica: CID; Mitrović A. (1996), *Propitivanje Klio*, Beograd: Medija centar Odbrana; Pintar O. P. (2006), *Istorija i sećanje. Studije istorijske svesti, zbornik radova, uredila*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Kuljić T. (2002), *Prevladavanje prošlosti. Uzroci i pravci promene slike istorije krajem XX veka*, Beograd: HOLJP; Nikolić K. (2003), Prošlost bez istorije. Polemike u jugoslovenskoj istoriografiji 1961–1991. *Glavni tokovi*, Beograd: ISI; Marković P., Miličević N., Ković M. (2004), Developments in Serbian Historiography since 1989, s.277–317, Ulf Brunnbauer (ed.), *(Re) Writing History, Historiography in Southeast Europe*, Zbornik Radova, Münster: LIT Verlag; Bjelajac M., (2007), *Pisati istoriju Jugoslavije. Viđenje srpskog faktora*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Jovanović M.-Radić R. (2009), *Kriza istorije, srpska istoriografija i društveni izazovi kraja 20. i početka 21 veka*, Beograd: UDI; Bjelajac M., Krivokapić G. J. (2011), *Prilozi iz naučne kritike – Srpska istoriografija i svet*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije; Naumović S. (2009), *Upotreba tradicije u politici i javnom životu Srbije na kraju dvadesetog i početkom dvadesetprvog veka*, Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju; “Filip Višnjić”; Milošević S. (2013), *Istorija pred sudom. Interpretacija prošlosti i pravni aspekti u rehabilitaciji Kneza Pavla Karadorđevića*, Beograd: Frabrika knjiga; Popov Č. (2016), *Istorija na delu. Razgovori 1892–2012, priredila Jelena Popov*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska; Jovanović M. (2010), “Savremena srpska istoriografija: karakteristike i trendovi”, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 181–190.

15 For detailed information see: Mirić B. S. (2020), Srpsko-albanski odnosi u albanskom udžbeniku iz istorije za 9. razred osnovne škole na Kosovu i Metohiji, *Tokovije Istorije*, 1, 199–220; Mirić B. S. (2019), *Moda i Zabava na Kosovu i Metohiji u Periodu Između Dva Svetska Rata, 2019*”, *Tokovije Istorija*, 3, 53–78; Janjetović Z.- Antonijević N. (2017), *Kosovo i Metohija 1941–1945. Godna. Ratni Zločini*. Beograd: Muzej Žrtava Genocida; Gatalović M. (2016), *Kosovo i Metohija u Državnoj Politici Jugoslavije 1958–1965*. Beograd: Institut za Savremenu Istoriju, Društvo Istoričara Srbije; Pelikan J. (2014), *Kosovo u Prvim Mesecima 1968. Godine, 2014, Tokovije Istorija*, 2, 99–132; Tripković Đ. (2013), Izveštaji o Albanskoj Politici i Propagandi Prema Kosovu I Metohiji 60-Ih Godina 20. Veka. 2013, *Tokovije Istorija*, 2, 283–302; Antonijević N. (2008), Albanski Zločini nad Srbima Na Kosovu i Metohiji u Periodu Jun–Oktobar 1999, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 157–164; Antonijević N. (2008), Kidnapped Serbs And Other Non-Albanians in The Territory Of The Autonomous Province of Kosovo and the Metohija, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 201–205; Životić A., Pitanje Albanije U Odnosima Između Jugoslavije i Zapada 1945–1947, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 83, 83–96; Slavković B. (2012), “Jugoslovensko-Albanski Ekonomski Odnosi 1945–1948, Planovi i Saradnja”, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 133–148; Slavković B. (2012), Jugoslovensko-Albanska Saradnja u Oblasti Kulture, Nauke i Prosvete 1945–1948, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 3, 109–128; Stambolija N. (2012), “Izveštaj o Stanju u Kosovskoj Mitrovici i Okolini Aprila 1941”, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 3, 225–236; Slavković B. (2013), Šume i Šumarstvo na Kosovu i Metohiji 1929–1941, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 3, 75–92; Gatalović M. (2016), Uticaj Otvaranja Nacionalnog Pitanja u Jugoslaviji Na Kreiranje Državne Politike Prema Kosovu i Metohiji 1964–1965, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 117–136; Mirić B. S. (2020), Pogranični Promet Jugoslavije i Albanije i Dvovlasnička Imanja 1945–1948, *Istorija 20. Veka*, 1, 107–128; Rastović A. (2011), Izveštaji Britanskih Diplomata o Upadu Albanaca u Srbiju 1878–1897 Godine, *Istorijski Casopis*, 60, 419–435; Fundić D. (2011), Ismail Kemal – Preobražaj Osmanskog Službenika u Vođu Albanskog Nacionalnog Pokreta, *Istorijski Casopis*, 60, 361–386; Stijović M. (2019), Prilog Odnosima Srpskih Konzula u Prištini Sa Osmanskim Vlastima na Kosovu i Metohiji, *Istorijski Casopis*, 68, 331–347; Čolić L. (2019), Zloupotreba Prošlosti U Političke Svrhe Kritička Analiza Radova Albanskih Istoričara i Lingvisti, *Istorijski Casopis*, 68, 539–555; Ljubinković N. (2018), *Od Kosovske Bitke Do Kosovske Legende*, Novi Sad: Matica Srpska; Zarković V. (2019), *Kosovo i Metohija U Politici Velikih Sila 1896–1908*, Leposavić: Institut Za Srpsku Kulturu, 2019.

References

- Bjelajac, M., & Jović, G. K. (2001). *Prilozi iz naučne kritike – Srpska istoriografija i svet*. Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije.
- Ćirković, S. (1981). *Istorija Srpskog Naroda I*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Ćirković, S., & Mihajlić, R. (1997). *Ensiklopedia Srpske istoriografija*. SANU.
- Ćirković, S., & Mihajlić R. (1997). *Ensiklopedija Srpska Istoriofrafije*. Knowledge.
- Ćirković, S., & Mihajlić R. (1999). *Leksikon Srpskog Srednjog Veka*. Knowledge.
- Corović, V. (1989). *Istorija Srba*. Beogradski Izdavački-Grafički Zavod.
- Corović, V. (1993). *Istorija Srba*, Beogradski Izdavački-Grafički Zavod.
- Dimić, L., & Stanković, Đ. (1996). *Istorigrafija pod nadzorom*. Novinsko-izdavačka ustanova Službeni list.
- Dragović, J. S. (2002). *Saviors of the nation: Serbia's intellectual opposition and the revival of nationalism*. Hurst.
- Dragović, J. S. (2004). Rethinking Yugoslavia: Serbian intellectuals and the 'national question' in historical perspective. *Contemporary European History*, 13(2), 170–184.
- Ekmečić, M. (1989). *Stvaranje Jugoslavije 1790-1918*. Prosveta.
- Fleming, E. K. (2000). Orientalism, the Balkans, and Balkan historiography, *American Historical Review*, 105, 1218–1233.
- Gavrilović, S. (1981). Ka Srpskoj revoluciji, *Istorija Srpskog Naroda IV*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Györe, Z. (2006). Serbian historiography and the modern state, *Historiographic Approaches* 89–108.
- Istorija Srpskog Naroda* (10 vols). (1981-1993). Srpske Književna zadruga.
- Jovanovic, M. (2010). Savremena Srpska Istoriofrafija: Karakteristike i Trendovi, *Istorija 20.Veka*, 1, 183–192.
- Jovanović, M., & Naumović, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Childhood in Southeast Europe: Historical perspectives on growing up in the 19th and 20th Century*. Udruženje za društvenu istoriju,
- Jovanović, M., & Radić, R. (2009). *Kriza istorije, srpska istoriofrafija i društveni izazovi kraja 20. i početka 21 veka*. UDI.
- Jovanović, S. (1990). *Sabrana dela*, 12 vol. BIGZ.
- Logos, A. A. (2017). *Istorija Srba 1*. ATC.
- Mihaljić, R. (1981). Kosovska Bitka, *Istorija Srpskog Naroda II*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.

- Milićević, N., & Marković, P. (2007). Srpska istoriografija u vreme tranzicije: Borba za legitimitet. *Istorija 20. veka*, 1, 146.
- Mitrović, A. (1996). Propitivanje klio. Medija centar Odrbrana.
- Naimark, N., & Case, H. (Eds.) (2003). *Yugoslavia and its Historians: Understanding the Balkan Wars of the 1990s*. Stanford University Press.
- Nielsen C. A. (2020). Serbian Historiography after 1991. *Contemporary European History*, 29, 90–103.
- Pavlović, M. (2009). Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1958–2008, *Istorija 20. veka*, 27, 9–17.
- Pavlović, M. (2010). Zloini Oslobođioca – Zadatak Srpske Istoriografije Visokog Prioriteta. *Istorija 20. Veka*, 2, 9–22.
- Petranović, B. (1997). *Istoriografija i kritika*. CID.
- Pintar, O. P. (2006). *Istorija i sećanje. Studije istorijske svesti, zbornik radova, uredila*. Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije.
- Pjanović, O. L. (1990). *Srbi narod najstarije*. Dosije.
- Predrag M., Milićević N., & Ković, M. (2004). Developments in Serbian historiography since 1989. In U. Brunnbauer (Ed.), *(Re) Writing History, Historiography in Southeast Europe* (pp. 277–317). Zbornik Radova, Münster: Lite Verlag.
- Popović, R., & Stolić, A. (2017). Historijski institut 1947–2017. Godine. *Istorijski časopis*, 66, 13–25.
- Samardić, R. (1993). Prodor Islama u Jugoistočnu Evropu. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda III*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Samardić, R. (1993a). Seobe u Srpskoj Istoriji: Vreme tuđinske vlasti, do 1683, In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda III*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Samardić, R. (1993b). Turci u Srpskoj Istorije. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Simić, B. (2017). Tokovi Istorije 2006–2015, Analiza Sadržaja, Savremena Istoriografija i Razvoj Državne Uprave Kroz Vekove. In G. Đigiđ (Ed.), *Društveno Nauka Pred izazovima savremenog društva*. Izdavački Centar.
- Spremić, M. (1981). Propast Srednovekovne Država. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda II*. Srpske Književna Zadruga.
- Stanković, Đ., & Ljubodrag, D. (1996). *Istoriografija pod nadzorom, Prilozi za istoriju istoriografije*, 1–2. Službeni list SRJ.
- Stojančević, V. (1981). Srpski Narod u Rumeljijskom Vilajetu. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda V*.

Srpske Knjževna Zadruga.

Stojančević, V. (1981). Srpski narod u Turkoj od sredina XIX veka do 1878. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda*. Srpske Knjževna Zadruga.

Stojančević, V. (1986). Obnova Turkse Vlasti u Srbije 1813-1815. In *Istorija Srpskog Naroda V*. Srpske Knjževna Zadruga.

Vucinich, W. (1951). Postwar Yugoslav historiography, *The Journal of Modern History*, 23(1), 41-57.