

Ana Stolic

Forum

Elites and the Court in Belgrade in the 19th Century



Michael-Zikic-Stiftung

Ana Stolic

**Elites and the Court in
Belgrade in the 19th Century**

**Michael-Zikic-Stiftung
Bonn**

Copyright © 2002 Michael-Zikic-Stiftung
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Herstellung: Michael-Zikic-Stiftung

Michael-Zikic-Stiftung
Universität Bonn
Lennéstr. 1, 53113 Bonn

Elites and the Court in Belgrade in the 19th Century

It is clear that associating the institution of court with discussions about modern elites may be confusing. An explanation can be found in the arguments of theories on elite, and especially in relatively new findings concerning the specific qualities of Balkan elites.¹ I will repeat some of these arguments here. But, in order to consider the specific qualities, it is necessary to draw an outline of the Serbian society of the 19th century that would show all common characteristics of the Balkan states, as well as their special features. Then I would give a picture of the court in Belgrade and its position in the context of the concept of elite, that is, of modern states of Balkan societies.

In order to go deeper into these considerations, we should raise the issue of the authenticity of the triangle consisting of the concepts of court, elite, and elite-related modernization processes. Although, at first sight, it may seem contradictory to link elites and modern states, on one hand, and court as extremely traditional institution, on the other, we shall see that they can be related. As a matter of fact, specific features of the Serbian society made this relationship possible. Besides, gradually and especially in late 19th century, a separate court elite differentiated itself, and it should not be confused with court suite which was predominantly composed of the military. This fact is significant for the developments to ensue – the assassination of the king and an attempt of the military factor to take the role of a political arbiter after 1903.

The findings about Balkan elites that were presented at the symposium on elites in South-East Europe (Tutzing near Munich, October 1997) are based on the fact that in the period of liberation from the Ottoman rule the Balkan societies of late 18th and early 19th centuries, were without traditional elite,

¹ This article is based on a lecture held on invitation by the Michael Zikic Foundation, Bonn and the Institute for European History of the Mainz University, November 2001.

aristocracy and middle class.² This could be seen as an advantage, considering that traditional elite and aristocracy are those who struggle to preserve their privileges. According to well-known arguments about modernization theory, the process may go faster without aristocracy – a well-known argument about incomplete societies, such as the Balkan societies are, that introduce modern institutions, liberal constitutions and on paper adopted the achievements of the political modern. In new Serbian society, created after the Serbian revolution of early 19th century, an elite closely related with the development of the state emerged. The state itself had a need for educated people and often provided them scholarships, which resulted in creating of a special intellectual-civil servant model. The idea of dependence to the people was the leading principle. In other words, become educated to serve your people. This elite had a missionary, or ideological character, which, in order to fulfill the mission, called for political organizing. Although in late 19th century, the majority of educated people in the country – university professors, writers and scientists were highly respected and had an important political role, they were tightly connected with or dependent on the government apparatus and the livelihood found in this sector. Such close connection between professionals and the state continued even after the process of development of the state was over in late 19th century. Finally, until the First World War, but also in the period between the two wars, the government remained the main market of professionals in the absence of a more powerful business elite. This is a remarkable different from Central European countries where an increasing number of professionals became independent from the government with the industrialization and development of their countries.

These are some general, probably known theses that do require additional information to portray a picture of Serbia of the 19th century. During the whole 19th century the majority of population remained rural. If urbanization implies expansion of urban life to the countryside, and not migration of peasants to towns, by 1914 Serbia created only hypotheses for such a process. The number of population living in the countryside was never below 84%. Expressed in

² *Eliten in Südosteuropa. Rolle, Kontinuitäten, Brüche in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Hrsg. von Wolfgang Höpken und Holm Sundhaussen, Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, München 1998.

figures, without too many of them, in 1887, out of 23 towns in Serbia the largest was Belgrade with about 35,000 inhabitants, followed by Nis, Leskovac, Kragujevac etc. With about 11% literacy rate at the close of the century and a specific economic structure, Serbia went through the hard times of modernization in an atypical way.³ After achieving independence, Serbia embarked on a thorough and irreversible process of social change. Serbia's way into the modern age was marked by a series of specific features. Feudalism was abolished in 1835, but without an all-encompassing social reform. From this moment on, the policy of the protection of a small land property was on the scene, which, despite the advantage of excluding agrarian crisis, hindered market developed. Social changes were halted halfway. This is evident by the legislation of that time. Foreign models in family, agrarian, commercial legislation were adjusted, but not always applicable. Two factors were opposed to modernization and innovations: communal household of the patriarchal family and a production model based on this family type. The main principle was not market orientation but the preservation of the property at all costs, which led to stagnation and production of as much as it is necessary to make ends meet. Disintegration of communal households and establishment of independent properties meant that now small parts of the divided property were inherited. This was followed by unfavorable demographic situation – high demographic growth, marriage at an early age, regardless of whether a young person was capable of providing for a family, because they could always rely on other members of the extended family who would provide help when needed. Low agricultural productivity led to creation of huge number of unemployed rural population. The result was strong concentration of the labor in the countryside. There was no large land properties or its reflected picture: a mass of landless peasants. Industry developed from crafts and not protoindustry. In Serbia, as in many countries of South-East Europe, food

³ As Janine Mary Calic showed in probably the most serious book on the economic history of the modern Serbian state, Serbia does not fit into the well-known patterns of the inevitable course of modernization process. On its way, Serbia was losing momentum, and even giving up due to its own inner structure and development, foreign and economic constellations and an ambivalence of the leading institutional factors of modernization. Marie-Janine Calic. *Sozialgeschichte Serbiens 1815-1941: Der aufhaltsame Fortschritt während der Industrialisierung*. Muni: R. Oldenburg, 1994.

industry was the main sector of export and trade. From the beginning agriculture was controlled by the state, but not in those sectors where it was desirable: social reforms, educational and social policy. All these things together brought about a constant social equilibrium between the peasantry, tradesmen and a small number of professional-intellectuals supported by the state. Serbia entered the 20th century without clear demarcation line between the peasant and the citizen, the latter of whom had an ideological task to remember the rural origin.

As for the role of social institutions in the developing process of the of the state and nation, balance of power between traditional and modern fractions of the elite was decisive. In the struggle between local leaders (knezovi) and local military commanders on one hand, and central government and educated people (often living in the Diaspora), on the other, the local forces were defeated. New institutions, often copied from foreign models, were strictly centralized and served as the main source of power and livelihood for the elite. In an attempt to eliminate the Ottoman heritage and traditional customs of the Balkan peasantry, the modernists embarked on a radical development program ignoring the price which had to be paid by the majority of population.

I'll try to give a description of the other important component of this outline through the relationship between the political elite and modernization. It can be best viewed through a dilemma between two options. Being educated either in Western Europe or Russia, educated Serbs had divided attitudes towards Europe. Basically, there were two blocs – young conservatives, liberals and progressives, on the one side, and radicals on the other, whose roots were in the movement of Svetozar Markovic. This ideological division was formalized in the organization of political parties in the 80s of the 19th century and was reflected in their struggle within the Parliament.⁴ One ideology was populism which starting from the 60s of the 19th century became counterpart to liberalism, expressed through the socialist ideas of Svetozar Markovic, radicalism or communism. These two blocs represented two historical

⁴ Slobodan Jovanovic, *Vlada Milana Obrenovica*, II, Beograd 1991, 191.

tendencies in the development of the state and society in Serbia, and were sometimes called patriarchal and modern.⁵ For a long time they were under the scrutiny of the dominating radical wing. Even the historiography couldn't escape such a view – the liberal and progressive parties, who were pioneers of constitutionality, creators of modern laws and political, economical and cultural institutions of the Serbian state in the first decade of its autonomy, were pushed into the background as a worn-out part of the Serbian nation by the dominant, radical historiographers. The central problem of the Serbian elite at the end of 19th century was breakaway from the patriarchal and transition to modern society.

Now I would go back to already mentioned dilemma concerning compatibility between the court, elite and modernization. The assumption that new elite tended to decentralize the existing power centers, which has for a long time been considered an axiom in modernization theories proves wrong in this case. In Serbia two processes went side by side – attempts to modernize the political and social life and attempts to establish the missing institutional tradition. The institution of court is the best example for this. To support this statement I'll try to define an approach to the past of this institution. Court is a ruling institution and its function, position and role may be studied in several ways. First, classical approach would imply chronological survey of the history of this institution with the change of the rulers, dynasties and occupants. Even this approach would be difficult because the Serbian historiography lacks data about institutions of modern Serbian state. There are no studies of the structure and organization of the court and its functioning during all political and social upheavals of 19th century. During two alternating dynasties everyday life at the court did not draw much attention, either. Study on this matter is hard to carry out partly because the court's archive, particularly after the overthrow of the Obrenovic dynasty in 1903, got irretrievably lost. The way of living and a relatively quickly acquired fortune can be partially reconstructed from the Obrenovic dynasty's property inventory that was made after the assassination of King Alexander and Queen Draga in 1903 (the Obrenovic dynasty was

⁵ Latinka Perovic, *Politicka elita i moidernizacija u prvoj deceniji nezavisnosti srpske drzave*, Srbija u modernizacijskim procesima, 1, Beograd 1994, 235.

overthrown and Karadjordjevic dynasty took its place) and the Diary of the guardianship of the underage King Aleksandar, where valuable data about the court's economy can be found.

Another approach would center upon the transformation of the court from a small ruling house in the first half of the century into an institution of political and social power at the end of 19th century, and eventually a scene of crime. The assassination of the royal couple did not only mean that the military elite broke their oath and that a part of the political elite was involved in the assassination, but also complex social processes projected within the court.⁶ These processes were of an older date than the officers' conspiracy, and only more recent Serbian historiography called into question this event and some sort of a myth about the golden age of democracy that ensued after the overthrow at the Belgrade court (a concept of the dominating radicals that was accepted by historiographers).⁷ This approach requires looking back at the problem of the organization and functioning of the political life in Serbia. Constitutions limited the power of the prince and later king (as of 1882), to a larger or smaller degree, through the legislative role of the national assembly. Nevertheless, during the whole 19th century the parallel centre of power personified in the ruler existed. Knez Mihailo (1860-1868) was an enlightened absolute ruler. But his successor, Knez and subsequently King Milan had to deal with political parties. The fact that as of the 80s of the 19th century political passions in Serbia ran so high that they exceeded the framework of regular multi-party parliamentary life enabled the crown to have everything under control. A drawn game between two political options, one in favor of a decentralized state and strong self-government based on popular traditions (radicals), and the other supporting limited parliamentarism with strong state institutions that would introduce modern European achievements (progressive and liberal parties), left enough room for the ruler. The weaker of these two options, the progressive one, was the first to ask the Court for assistance, because the opposition it was facing as the ruling political option was very

⁶ Ana Stolic, *Kraljica Draga*, Beograd 2000, 148-149.

strong. (The most striking example of this was the introduction of the railway). This marked the beginning of the political dominance of the court. Supporting the European option, and not wishing to accept the predominance of the radicals, the court became an arbiter in the political life.

Considering this, analysts should pay attention to several issues. One of them is general and concerns the possibility of political modernization of the Serbian society in the circumstances of the latent absolutist methods of ruling from one centre of power. Then, since court represents a traditional institution, it should be defined what sort of modernity could be connected with the reigning house. Was it modernism only on a manifestation level – level of behavior and appearances? A very careful approach should be taken to all developments which, at first sight, look like changes of introduction of innovations into the organization, structure and spirit of the ruling institution. During decades of building non-existent tradition, the court was a forerunner in innovations, but it also went through a phase of marked retraditionalization, and this happened in early 20th century (the chief supporters were King Alexander and Queen Draga). At this time there was an attempt to establish some sort of aristocracy, based on the lists of descendants of families who had taken part in the first uprising against the Turks in early 19th century, as it was a milestone for the idea of nation-building. And, finally but important, it is necessary to define the elite associated with the court, that is, to define their mutual relationship.

The main features suggesting a traditional character of the institution of court are its origin, protocol, court rules, spirit and organization. According to a description of the court at the time of Knez Mihailo (60s of 19th century) given by Felix Kanic, the court was a place where “with a chibouk and a cup of coffee, entirely “alla turca”, the city and country developments were commented”.⁸ From this time, when the ruling house still had oriental character, up to late 19th century, judging by external signs – appearance,

⁷ Milorad Ekmecic, *AustroUgarska obavestajna sluzba i Majska prevrat u Srbiji 1903*, Istorijski casopis 32, Beograd 1985. Dragan Zivojinovic, *Kralj Petar I Karadjordjevic*, 1, Beograd 1988.

⁸ Felix Kanitz, *Das Königreich Serbien und das Serbenvolk von der Römerzeit bis zur Gegenwart*, Leipzig 1904 (F. Kanic, *Srbija - zemlja i stanovnistvo*, Beograd 1985, 70).

organization and glamour, the court was transformed into an institution organized entirely according to western models. The fact that the ruling family bought the court building from a wealthy tradesman shows how the establishment of the ruling institution began. *Konak*, the house that Knez Aleksandar Karadjordjevic bought from Aleksa Simic in 1839, was the ruling family's residence until early the 20th century. In early 80s of the 19th century, King Milan Obrenovic initiated the construction of the new court. The court was furnished slowly and with great care; rococo, renaissance and oriental salons were made by famous Viennese manufacturers of the time, Porto and Fix. The new court was the place of celebrations, receptions and balls. The court was the only building with electrical lights in the Balkans of the time, and especially impressionable for the contemporaries was the ballroom lighted by 322 electric bulbs. According to some recollections, at receptions in honor of foreign statesmen, 64 persons were seated at one table, food was served in dishes of Saxon porcelain, wine was served into Czech crystal glasses with royal crowns, and the flowers from Topcider were arranged in vases from Sever. Pieces composed by Mendelssohn, Wagner and Verdi were played during these lavish meals.⁹

Achieving material symbols of grandeur was a trend among the ruling families in the 80s and 90s. This was obvious at the Bulgarian, Romanian and Serbian court. One characteristic common to both the Bulgarian and Serbian court was a huge disproportion between the appearance and style of the court and the picture of the capital, and especially the provinces. Of course, it is clear these were only outward signs which can not be easily identified as modernizing attempts. They are even more difficult to categorize since this was an attempt to transplant traditional customs of developed court milieus to the domestic ground. Unlike the Bulgarian court, where the suite and elite were of foreign origin, French and Austrian brought by Knez Ferdinand, the elite at the Belgrade court was of domestic origin.¹⁰ The "imported" suite, despite the arrogance and scorn showed for the new surroundings, largely based on lack of

⁹ Gavro Vukovic, *Memoari*, III, Cetinje 1985, 317.

¹⁰ H. Hesapciev, *Sluzba na Blgaria v Zuzbina*, Sofia 1993, 40.

understanding local circumstances, did convey lifestyle and system of values partly imitated and accepted by young middle-class societies.

Crucial points in transforming the Serbian court into a ruling institution of European type was the introduction of protocol in the 60s, although there is no information whether Spanish or Dutch protocol were applied at first. Gradually this protocol was adjusted to current political and social needs. The same protocol was modified by the Karadjordjevic dynasty after their coming to the throne.

It seems that two things were decisive for the court's harmonization with European models: autonomy gained at the Berlin Congress in 1878 and proclamation of the country a kingdom in 1882. In order to strengthen the legitimacy of newly acquired power, the crown was taking swift steps in creating conditions for the newly established customs to become tradition. Such retroactive building of tradition is particularly interesting for us. In this process, equally important were both the inspirers and witnesses, the people who directly participated in this process and verified it in some way. The acquired prerogatives of political power now had to be turned into social power. It happened that the court, in addition to being a centre of political decision-making, became the centre of social life. This was not possible without the elite surrounding the ruling house. On the other hand, as much as the court needed the elite, the elite needed the ruling institution. So, the elite found a way to demonstrate its power. This relationship was reflected in various newly established customs, or behavior that had a ritual character. It was a specific mixture of royal and civil rituals.

Thus, awaiting the birth of the heir to the throne in 1901, the court made a point of assigning the court's service with a task of finding the document in the court's archive about the ceremony organized on the occasion of the then King's birth. The schedule for the celebration was precisely determined, and only the invited guests attended the ceremony for the first anniversary of the pronouncement of kingdom. During the 80s the king and queen drove in a coach, lackeys wore uniform coats from the time of Lui 14th and powdered wigs.

During the 90s modifications of this ceremony were insignificant and depended on the actual political situation.¹¹

In the 80s, the circle of people who were readily invited and seen at the court was already clearly defined. To a three-day vintage in Smederevo thirty-six people were invited. Apart from the members of the ruling family (Bogicevics), ministers and their wives, generals and most successful Belgrade tradesmen and businessmen, were included. The presence in the ruler's home meant an obligation to comply to certain behavior patterns and special clothes. Invitations to different happenings always indicated the type of clothes. Such requirements often made problem to that part of the political elite entering the court for the first time, for their achievement in the elections. When radicals came into power in 1887, they were invited to the court for the first time in large number. As they had never attended court ceremonies before, most of them did not have appropriate clothes. According to some statements, those days all tailors in Belgrade were occupied making suits for the new ministers. Radicals had a reputation as old-fashioned, and the parties they attended were mostly monotonous.

In the 90s of 19th century innovations were introduced to distinguish the court elite. After the construction of the new court building, a custom to hold the Sunday service in the court chapel was established for this occasion and visitors were invited. The list of persons who were admitted to the church precisely defines the court elite. In addition, holiday liturgies imposed strict rules about the clothes: women were supposed to wear high (up to the chin) dresses of light colors and a hat, or "the Serbian middle-class clothes", men tailcoats, and military persons ceremonial uniforms. Apparel was especially significant for it represented an important element of the identity of the newly formed elite. For example, the fact that the women's Serbian middle-class clothes is mentioned as formal, ritual apparel, shows to what extent it lost its function in everyday clothes. It also shows that one part of the Serbian society distinguished itself from the mass by turning their everyday clothes into a

¹¹ Ana Stolic, *Dvor u Beogradu izmedju tradicionalnog i modernog (1880-1903)*, Srbija u modernizacijskim procesima, 2, Beograd 1998, 103.

symbol, but national one this time. Clothes were also important for power weighing. For the members of the elite it was a possibility to show their fortune and power through the clothes of the wife and daughters. Thus, about the middle of the 19th century which was the time of most splendid ceremonies and balls, wives and daughters of the richest people in Serbia had their clothes made in Viennese fashion studios. Such a trend made it difficult for the less well-to-do members of the court elite, because they couldn't always keep pace.

Beside politicians, tradesmen and few bankers and their families, military men had an important role in power distribution at the court. Officers of higher ranks belonged to the leading social stratum and the more educated part of the Serbian society. Military career offered a good opportunity for social promotion. In some situations, these people took part in government, for instance, regency during the minority of the ruler, the presidency of generals over the government, and chair position in the newly established Upper house of the parliament in 1901. Gradually their presence at court grew bigger through the institutions of court marshalcy and adjutancy. These institutions produced a special court military clique. The representatives of this clique and their families had a secure niche close to the elite.

Why was the court so attractive to its contemporaries? Their perceptions about the court speak of its strength and power. Some people thought that one should be very careful about the court, since “the court was like a fire in the fireplace, if you are too far, it is too cold, if you are too close, you get burnt”.¹² In attempt to define real reasons for such attitude towards the court, two aspects should be considered. First, the ruling house was a place where matters that could not be solved at other instances were solved there, and second, practical one, implying that the presence at court was the only safe way to make a career and a first-class position for social promotion. In the first case, typical for the whole 19th century, the practice of direct addressing to the ruler evading the state institutions shows of insufficiently developed institutions. Although the absence of traditional elite in Serbia, enabled fast social promotion, it should

¹² R. Ljusic, *Nikola Pasic i Obrenovici*, Nikola Pasic-Zivot i delo, Beograd 1997, 87.

be noted that earlier clientele connections (from the time of Knez Milos), family and clannish connections as well as the ruler's benevolence were very important for social affirmation.¹³ There were two different attitudes towards the ruler typical for the whole of the 19th century: allegiance and deputation. This did not mean that the institution of the ruler, in relation to other European monarchies, had deep roots and was awarded undisputable respect. On the contrary, there is an evidence that outside the sphere of individual or group interest, the ruler was barely respected, and, according to the opinion of foreigners the respect for the ruler was not even formally expressed. Allegiance is especially interesting since it could provide some insight into the question of allegiance mentality.

Being a gathering place of the political elite, the court was an important stepping-stone in career making. During frequent changes of governments and political parties in power, which was one of the main characteristics of this time, presence or absence of representatives of some political option from a reception, ball or dinner was a proof of their good prospects or ruler's disfavor. All this questions the real power of the political elite in the last decades of 19th century. This elite was best represented at the court because economic or business elite was insignificant. An evidence of the predominance of "politicians" at the court was the request of Queen Natalia in 1895 that the lists of invited guests for the New Year's ball made in her honor should include as many tradesmen as possible, so that the ceremony should not look like party meetings. In most cases, the ability of steering a middle course determined the success and length of a political career. There was a saying that "someone entered the court at two doors" as a sign of utmost success, showing that someone got quite close to the ruler and was in his favor, and at the same time reached the peak of his political career.

Interest of ordinary people in the developments at the court was considerable. Curiosity was constantly encouraged by the fact that few court secrets remained unrevealed. Majority of court stories soon became a public topic of

¹³ Tetsuja Sahara, *Patronsko-klijentelisticke mreze i stvaranje srpske drzave pocetkom 19. veka*, Godisnjak za drustvenu istoriju (Annual of social history), IV-1, Beograd 1999, 11.

conversation in the public. A possibility to learn about the events at the court gave an illusion of closeness to the ruler and those people who distinguished themselves from the mass through their status, manners or clothes. On the other hand, the outer glamour of the court was attractive for all who, beside their fortune, wished to boast about some symbols of court life. A well known example is the case of a rich merchant Luka Celovic, who, after the assassination of King Alexander and Queen Draga employed a court hunter as a servant because his court uniform looked very impressive.

Chronologically speaking, the court passed through several phases in this period. After Serbia was granted autonomy, there were efforts to compensate for the lack of traditional forms of court life. Everything indicated that the court was to become the centre of social power in a small peasant's country of Serbia. Entire political, economic and mental constellation pushed the elite in to the brace of the ruling house. In early 90s, a political reasons caused a short standstill. In this period, after the abdication of King Milan Obrenovic and deportation of Queen Natalia, underage Alexander was surrounded by officers only. Thus this period was marked by a strong presence of military people in the ruling house. The third period began in 1895, when the Kings' parents occasionally stayed in Belgrade. Each, according to his or her political calculation attracted representatives of the elite. The fact that the elite had already been well-defined is evident through one detail, and it was that Queen Natalia used to open Sunday receptions without special invitations - for it was well known who were the invited ones. Finally, it is impossible to ignore the significance of certain individuals in acceptance of certain patterns of behavior typical of the elite. Queen Natalia laid foundations of court lifestyle. If we leave aside the visible side of the story related to fashion and entertainment style taken from the European capitals, still there is its hidden side. This side implied behavior that stressed differences and suitability to distinguish from the mass and to develop the elitist feeling. Sometimes the state of consciousness was not in harmony with the power gained, brilliantly shown by the famous Serbian comedy writer Branislav Nusic. He and some foreigners

who lived in Belgrade noticed that women were those who initiated certain families to detach from the mass.¹⁴

Fashion novelties from Vienna and Paris were not always favorably received. It is interesting that the opposition was always justified by social reasons and hence sounded demagogically. The stories about the Queen teaching young girls to dance “pas-a-quatre”, a sort of cancan, circling through Belgrade provoked real confusion. Curiously enough at the same time, the same dance was played among the French part of the Bulgarian court’s suite.

The last phase, in early 20th century, was marked by the idea to return to popular tradition. The recently established continuity was slowed down at the beginning of the century. Private reasons, that is, an attempt to ensure support for his inappropriate marriage, made King Alexander to proclaim a return to the old values of the patriarchal society, whatever that meant. During this period organization of the court was modified up to a certain extent, all orthodox holidays were observed, the King fasted, which was not the case earlier. The advantage of domestic manufacture over industry was publicly emphasized. Elitism was suppressed, and the communication with the public was addressed to those groups which did not make the elite.

¹⁴ Albert Male, *Journal de Serbie* (Alber Male, *Dnevnik sa srpskog dvora 1892-1894*, Beograd 1999, 132)

Ana Stolic wurde 1962 in Belgrad geboren. Sie hat Geschichte an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Belgrad studiert, wo sie auch ihren Magister erlangt hat. Sie schreibt zur Zeit an ihrer Promotion zum Thema „Die Frau in der serbischen Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts“. Seit 1995 ist sie als wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Historischen Institut der Serbischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste tätig. Ihre Forschungsschwerpunkte sind Nationalgeschichte des 19. und dem Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts, Institutionsgeschichte – der Hof in Belgrad und Gesellschaftsgeschichte.

Michael-Zikic-Stiftung
Universität Bonn
Lennéstr. 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49.(0)228.73-7393
Fax: +49.(0)228.73-7595

e-mail: office@m-z-s.org

Internet: <http://www.mzs.info/>