

Political and Social Rivalries in Nineteenth-century Serbia *Švabe or Nemačkari*

Abstract: The nature of the relationship between the Serbs from Serbia and the Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy in the nineteenth century is important for understanding the process of national development of the Serbian people as a whole. Therefore the paper analyzes the controversy over *Švabe* or *Nemačkari*, as the Serbs from Austria were called, which was one of the factors responsible for internal instability of the Principality of Serbia in the nineteenth century.

Key words: Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy, Principality of Serbia, Prince Michael (Mihailo) Obrenović, Constitutionalists, *Serbske narodne novine*, Vuk Karadžić

Understanding the nature of the relationship between the Serbs in Serbia and the Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy in the nineteenth century is vital for understanding the national development process of the Serbian people as a whole. The controversy over the *Švabe* or *Nemačkari*,¹ which was how the Serbs from the Monarchy were nicknamed in Serbia, was a contributing factor of Serbia's internal instability.

Relations between the Serbs in the Principality of Serbia and the Serbs in the Monarchy have not received due attention in Serbian historiography. They have only been touched upon in the context of discussing individual and rather narrow periods of time, and even then as a subsidiary topic within more general studies.²

¹ The word "Nemačkar" (Nemachkar; pl. *Nemačkari*) was derived from the Serbian word for Germany (Nemačka), and denoted an ethnic Serb born or educated in a German-language country, notably the Habsburg Monarchy. The word "Švaba" (Shvaba; pl. *Švabe*), originally referring to Swab settlers in the region, came to be used for any person of German origin. Both terms could be used as neutral or derogatory, depending on the context.

² Undoubtedly the most important among them is Slavko Gavrilović, *Vojvodina i Srbija u vreme Prvog ustanka* [Vojvodina and Serbia at the time of the First Serbian Uprising] (Novi Sad 1974), which provides a very clear picture of the national, political, military and economic aspects of the cooperation among the Serbs during the First Serbian Uprising.

Slobodan Jovanović, in his text “Nemačkari” (1936),³ recognized the distinctive character and importance of the relations between the Serbs in Serbia and the Serbs in Austria. According to him, the term *Nemačkari* was used in the first half of the nineteenth century for the Serbs who crossed over from Austria into Serbia, where they mostly pursued a career in state administration. They saw their golden days in the reign of Prince Alexander Karadjordjević (1842–58), under the regime of the Constitutionals or Constitution Defenders (*ustavobranitelji*).⁴ Jovanović’s statement finds corroboration in a relevant source of information for the topic, the newspaper *Serbske narodne novine*,⁵ which kept track of the developments almost on a daily basis for as long as it was published.

There had never been a break in relations between the Serbs in Serbia and the Serbs “across the border”. On the contrary, after Serbia achieved autonomy within the Ottoman Empire (1833), they grew in intensity and diversity, as a result of the country’s pressing need for internal structuring and development in all fields. Although after the Second Serbian Uprising (1815) the eyes of the entire Serbian people were turned towards Serbia as a political centre, the Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy remained the pivotal force in cultural, educational, economic and social terms for the next half century. Serbia needed to provide for a constitutional government and civil rights, to abolish unpaid forced labour (*kuluk*), to encourage the development of trade and commerce, to carry out reforms in education in order to increase literacy and improve the general educational level of the population. Determined to address these issues, the country’s leadership, embodied in the Prince, had to cope with a number of difficulties from the very outset,

³ Slobodan Jovanović, “Nemačkari”, vol. 11 of *Sabrana dela* [Collected Works] (Belgrade 1991), 513–515.

⁴ Jovanović, “Nemačkari”, 513.

⁵ *Serbske narodne novine* [Serbian Popular Newspaper] (1838–1848), a political paper started in Pest to uphold the interests of the Serbian community in the Habsburg Monarchy, and strongly inclined towards the Constitutionals in Serbia. Its owner and editor-in-chief was the lawyer Teodor Pavlović, a prominent Serb journalist, publicist, secretary of the Matica Srpska (founded in 1826 in Pest, since 1864 seated in Novi Sad) and editor of *Letopis Matice srpske*, *Serbski narodni list* and the almanac *Dragoljub*. For more on the *Serbske narodne novine* and its editor Pavlović, see M. Maletin, “Teodor Pavlović”, *Glasnik IDNS* 8 (1935), 371–396 and *Glasnik IDNS* 9 (1936), 32–64, 284–299, 365–383; Vasilije Dj. Krestić: *Istorija srpske štampe u Ugarskoj 1791–1914* [History of the Serbian Press in Hungary 1791–1914] (Novi Sad 1980), 35–80; Petar V. Krestić, *Prečani i Šumadinci. Teodor Pavlović i “Serbske narodne novine” o Kneževini Srbiji 1838–1848* [The Serbs from across the border and the Serbs from the heartland of Serbia. Teodor Pavlović and his *Serbske narodne novine* on the Principality of Serbia 1838–1848] (Belgrade–Novi Sad 1996).

the most pressing of all being the lack of well-trained and qualified people.⁶ In the first half of the nineteenth century, in a Serbia exhausted by her long struggle for independence and isolated from European cultural developments, educated people were scarce, and her nascent administration needed them badly.⁷

Under the circumstances, it was quite natural that the Serbian government should count on educated Serbs from Austria. It therefore made requests to the Austrian government for facilitating the issuance of the necessary permits to its citizens of Serbian origin willing to accept employment in Serbia.⁸ In most cases the Habsburg government granted such requests, assuming that through the Serbs from the Monarchy it would be able to influence Serbia's policies, at least indirectly, swaying them towards a position favourable to its own interests.

Some of the Serbs from the Monarchy only stayed in Serbia until their employment contracts expired, or for so long as it took to get a particular job done. This was the case with Jovan Hadžić,⁹ modern Serbia's first law code author, Jovan Stejić,¹⁰ founder of the Serbian Health Service,

⁶ That the shortage of qualified staff was huge is suggested by the fact that even uneducated young men were appointed as trainees and scribes in state administration. Cf. a decree of the Regency of the Principality to the minister of finance: *Ukaz Knjaževskog namesništva popečitelju finansija* No. 32, 9 June 1839, Belgrade, Arhiv Srbije [Archives of Serbia (hereafter AS)], PO, XXIII, p. 16.

⁷ This statement finds corroboration in the data provided by Radoš Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)* [The Principality of Serbia 1830–1839] (Belgrade 1986), 243: "In 1815, after the end of the Second Uprising, Serbia had 24 state employees. By 1830 their number increased to 169, and by 1833 to 245. Between the issuance of the Second and the Third Hatti-sherif the Principality considerably enlarged its territory and, consequently, the number of state employees constantly grew, notably in the nascent judicial system, army and highest state bodies, and particularly after the promulgation of the Constitution of 1838 [...] In 1836 there were 412 state employees, and the following year the figure rapidly rose to 546."

⁸ Since educated Serbs from Hungary were in great demand in Serbia, the incoming physicians, teachers, engineers and the like were not required to renounce Austrian citizenship and take Serbian instead. Serbian citizenship was only required for "political service" posts. Cf. AS, MID-V, 1939, II, No. 1202, *Rešenje Saveta* [Council Decision], 1 Aug. 1839, 28.

⁹ Dr. Jovan Hadžić (alias Milos Svetić) (1799–1869), a jurist, writer, founding member of *Matica Srpska* and editor of its *Letopis*.

¹⁰ Dr. Jovan Stejić (1803–1853), personal physician of Prince Miloš Obrenović, head of the Health Service, secretary of the State Council, writer, promoter of culture, member of the Serbian Learned Society (*Društvo srpske slovesnosti*) and creator of Serbian medical terminology. He was a harsh opponent of Vuk Karadžić's language and orthography reform.

and Jovan Sterija Popović,¹¹ founder of the Serbian Learned Society, architect of the school system and first modern Serbian comedy playwright. The same goes for many artists, such as the painters Georgije Lacković,¹² Georgije Bakalović,¹³ Jovan Isailović,¹⁴ Katarina Ivanović,¹⁵ or Dimitrije Avramović,¹⁶ painter of the icons for the iconostasis of Belgrade Orthodox Cathedral (*Saborna crkva*), and the sculptor Dimitrije Petrović.¹⁷ Having completed their commissions, almost all of them left Serbia. The usual reason for the newcomers' leaving so soon was their inability to adjust themselves to very different conditions from those in the Monarchy. Some came to Serbia inspired by the patriotic ideal, but their disillusioning encounter with what they saw as an uncouth environment and despotic rule led to their decision not to prolong their stay, convinced that their individual effort would not be enough to spur any change for the better.¹⁸ Others, on

¹¹ Jovan Sterija Popović (1806–1856), a playwright and professor.

¹² Georgije Lacković (late 18th century).

¹³ Georgije Bakalović (1786–1843), a painter of icons, frescoes and portraits.

¹⁴ Jovan Isailović (mid 18th century–1807).

¹⁵ Katarina Ivanović (1819–1882), the first Serbian woman painter, painted portraits, historical compositions and still-lives.

¹⁶ Dimitrije Avramović (1815–1855), a painter and writer, one of the promoters of Romanticism in Serbian painting.

¹⁷ Dimitrije Petrović (1799–1852).

¹⁸ Justin Mihailović, describing in his *Diary* the arrival of the philologist and pedagogue Adam Dragosavljević in Serbia and his prompt departure, reveals how Serbs from the Monarchy saw the situation in Serbia in the first half of the nineteenth century. On 16 September 1831, Mihailović writes: “Adam went to Serbia and came back [...] I eagerly wished him to go there where he could put his experience and knowledge to good use, immeasurably good use indeed, and I was expecting his letter from the Promised Land to come any day, but instead he came back determined to stay here [...] So, now I see that everything is not as it should be over there, it is not yet a place for a man who has grand plans and the intention to carry them out. What then would be the point of our kind-hearted friend's staying there? If people are unable to recognize and understand his intentions and goals, what he can do with his high altruistic, cosmopolitan ideas people know nothing about, ideas which are still bitterly struggling for recognition even in enlightened and civilized Europe, in Germany, in England, in France; what he can do with them amidst that uncouthness, in that country freshly reclaimed from barbarism and violence where the Russian master is intent on flying his despotic flag and on grooming an ally for the future. Nothing can be done there, they won't let you raise your head and look at the wide world, but instead: 'Help me fight against our tyrant, and become one instead of him. Change the master, and you, you're a slave anyway.' That's the *Losungswort* of all national activists.” Cf. Borivoje Marinković, “Dnevnik Justina Mihailovića (1831–1844)” [Diary of Justin Mihailović (1831–1844)], *Zbornik za društvene nauke* 26 (1960), 103–128.

the other hand, especially in a later period, adjusted themselves to the new environment. They took Serbian citizenship and brought their families with them or started one in Serbia. This was the case with Dimitrije Davidović,¹⁹ author of the first Serbian Constitution and editor of the first newspaper in Serbia, *Novine srbske* (Serbian Newspaper); Dimitrije Isailović,²⁰ professor at the Lyceum (institution of higher learning); the engineer Atanasije Nikolić,²¹ designer of Serbia's first landscaped park, in Topčider. The artists Djura Jakšić,²² Stevan Todorović,²³ Djordje Krstić,²⁴ and many others joined them a little later. It was through their effort and influence that a fossilized patriarchal society such as Serbia was at the beginning of the century began to change and to accustom itself to a different code of behaviour, to a different dress style, to luxury, gradually abandoning the traditional system of values.²⁵ In other words, they contributed to a faster pace of the Europeanization process of a largely Orientalized Serbia.

The Serbs "from across the border" held almost all important positions in the Principality.²⁶ They served as the Prince's diplomats, councillors, first secretaries of the princely chancery, senior secretaries of the State Council, heads of ministry departments, as headmasters, professors, teachers, priests, engineers, physicians and state administration employees. Petar Jovanović, Archbishop of Belgrade and Metropolitan of Serbia (1833–1859), was one

¹⁹ Dimitrije Davidović (1789–1838), a politician and diplomat, secretary to Prince Miloš, state secretary, minister, author of the first constitution of the Principality of Serbia, the so-called *Sretenjski* (Presentation Day) Constitution of 1835, journalist and publicist.

²⁰ Dimitrije Isailović (1783–1853), an education promoter, professor, and editor of *Srpske novine* [Serbian Newspaper].

²¹ Atanasije Nikolić (1803–1882), a professor, writer of mathematics textbooks, assistant minister of interior.

²² Djura Jakšić (1832–1878), a Romantic poet and painter.

²³ Stevan Todorović (1832–1925), a painter and enthusiastic promoter of sports, theatre and music.

²⁴ Djordje Krstić (1851–1907), one of the first proponents of Realism in Serbian painting.

²⁵ The Serbs newly arrived from Austria described living conditions in Serbia as virtually unbearable. For more, see Radoš Ljušić, "Dimitrije Davidović, sekretar kneza Miloša Obrenovića" [D. Davidović, Secretary to Prince Miloš Obrenović], *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 32 (1985), 66–68.

²⁶ "...Serbs born outside Serbia are among the members of the State Council, the ministers and the judges of the Court of Appeals; lesser officials are countless and their number is growing daily." Vuk to Struve, published in vol. XXV of *Sabrana dela Vuka Stef. Karadžića* [Collected Works of V. St. Karadžić], *Prepiska* [Correspondence] VI (1837–1842) (Belgrade 1993), 840.

of them. They have tremendously contributed to the development of legislation, economy, education, culture and arts in nineteenth-century Serbia. A few characteristic examples from the area of education may illustrate how valuable the Serbs from the Monarchy were to Serbia.

According to the official census of July 1836, Serbia had a total of sixty-eight teachers, of whom twenty-five from Srem (Syrmia), twelve from Banat, seven from Bačka, three from Slavonia, two from Croatia, and two “from the [Austrian] Empire in general”, while the rest, or only seventeen, were native-born.²⁷ Also, the lists of professors teaching at the Lyceum in the first twenty years since its founding in 1838 clearly show that the education system in Serbia almost completely depended on Serbs from Austria. Thus, in the first academic year (1838/39), all Lyceum professors were Serbs “from across the border”.²⁸ In 1849, seven out of its eleven professors were from the Monarchy.²⁹ A more balanced ratio was not established until 1860, when half of the fourteen professors in the faculty list were Austrian-born Serbs. On the other hand, only four of the other seven were Serbs born in the Principality of Serbia.³⁰ Elementary schools showed almost the same ratios.³¹

The *Serbske narodne novine* made it a routine practice to report on virtually every important example of cooperation between the Serbs from the two sides of the Sava and Danube rivers. By way of illustration, let me mention a few reports involving some of the most prominent figures originally from the Habsburg Monarchy.

For instance, the newspaper reported that the engineer Atanasije Nikolić had arrived in Serbia to take up a professorship at the Lyceum,³²

²⁷ Vladimir Stojančević, “Škole, učitelji i prosvetne prilike u Srbiji 1815–1839” [Schools, Teachers and Education in Serbia 1815–1839], *Istorijski glasnik* 1-2 (1974), 72–75.

²⁸ Vladimir Stojančević, “Kultura obnovljene Srbija (1835–1839)” [Culture of Restored Serbia 1835–1839], in vol. V-1 of *Istorija srpskog naroda* [History of the Serbian People] (Belgrade 1994), 150.

²⁹ *Licej 1838–1839, Zbornik dokumenata* [Lyceum 1838–1839. Collection of Documents], ed. Radoš Ljušić (Belgrade 1988), 316–319.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 586–591.

³¹ Stojančević, “Škole”, 82–93. The fact is both interesting and significant that the first full members of the Serbian Learned Society (*Društvo srpske slovesnosti*) appointed by Prince Milan at the proposal of the Ministry of Education were not Serbs from Serbia. Apart from one from Bosnia, they all were Serbs from Hungary. Cf. Vasilije Dj. Krestić, “Društvo srpske slovesnosti” [The Serbian Learned Society], *Danica* for 2006 (2005), 184.

³² *Serbske narodne novine* [hereafter *SNN*] No. 48, 21 June 1839, 185.

that Dimitrije Isailović had been transferred from a ministry to the position of rector of the Lyceum,³³ or that Metropolitan Petar Jovanović had been appointed chairman, and Jovan Hadžić, Novi Sad senator, a member of the education committee.³⁴ The newspaper also reported about the work of sculptor Dimitrije Petrović and icon painter Dimitrije Avramović on the iconostasis of Belgrade Cathedral,³⁵ about the theatrical success of Jovan Sterija Popović's plays,³⁶ about the circular of the Ministry of Education to all schools in Belgrade and Kragujevac, instructing them to work on improving the quality and purity of the Serbian language, and recommending public reading of Jovan Stejić's texts to that end.³⁷ Strongly spurring the awareness of spiritual unity and of the need for coordinated efforts among the Serbs, Teodor Pavlović in all these and similar reports promoted the idea of the nation's political, economic and cultural revival,³⁸ consistently emulating the model set by Count Széchenyi's³⁹ paper *Jelenkor*.⁴⁰ *Serbske narodne novine* provided this kind of information for as long as it was published, though most prominently in 1838–1842 or, more precisely, until the end of Prince Michael's reign.

The first signs that the presence and role of *Švabe* in Serbia might become a controversial issue — which was to preoccupy the domestic public even after the fall of the Constitutionalists' regime in 1858 — had appeared at the moment the Constitutionalists forcefully stepped into the Serbian

³³ *SNV* No. 33, 26 Oct. 1838, 127.

³⁴ *SNV* No. 13, 18 Feb. 1840, 50.

³⁵ *SNV* No. 103, 26 Dec. 1840, 414.

³⁶ *SNV* No. 101, 21 Dec. 1841, 401; No. 7, 30 Jan. 1842, 27; No. 9, 5 Feb. 1842, 35.

³⁷ *SNV* No. 3, 14 Jan. 1840, 9.

³⁸ A text in *SNV* No. 65, 17 Aug. 1841, 258–259, is illustrative enough: “No sooner had a feud among brothers ended in Prince Miloš's expulsion than another feud led to their expulsion too: and even then, there is no peace and concord [in the country]; and, trust me, there will be none until the Serbs change radically, until they become enlightened in the true sense of the word and turn to that as a source of remedy...”

³⁹ Count István Széchenyi (1791–1860), a wealthy Hungarian aristocrat and landowner, one of the main protagonists of the reform movement in Hungary.

⁴⁰ A conservative paper funded by Count Széchenyi, which promoted his idea of a renaissance of the Hungarian nation through the country's economic, political and cultural development. On Széchenyi's influence on Pavlović, see Maletin, “Teodor Pavlović” (1936), 365–383; Petar V. Krestić, “*Serbske narodne novine* o Stefanu Sečenjiju povodom 200-godišnjice rođenja” [*Serbian Popular Newspaper* on István Széchenyi on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of his birth], *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 44 (1991), 111–116.

political scene.⁴¹ In 1839 the Constitutionals forced Prince Miloš to abdicate.⁴² Three of their political leaders — Toma Vučić Perišić,⁴³ Avram Petronijević⁴⁴ and Jevrem Obrenović⁴⁵ — became regents on behalf of Milan Obrenović, Prince Miloš's ailing underage son.⁴⁶ *Serbske narodne novine* did not fail to report on the developments: "These days almost all newspapers describe the situation in Serbia as one of shameful quarrel, discord and mayhem. Among other things, they bring this report from the Serbian border, noting that it comes from a Serb. After Prince Miloš's expulsion from Serbia, it was hoped that all beneficial effects of the new Constitution would be fully enjoyed, rights secured, peace and order established in the country. But all those well-meant hopes were nothing but delusions, mere wishful thinking. The present government is composed mostly of men either dull-witted or eager for money. Their catchword is: 'We won't have *Švabe* in this country.' This unpolitical parade of theirs is meant to elicit support from plain people. There is widespread loathing of Germans..."⁴⁷

⁴¹ Frequent harassment of Austrian citizens by common people and state officials compelled even Prince Miloš, towards the very end of his reign, to issue (5 Feb. 1839) an order to the Belgrade Police Head Office aimed at preventing such incidents: AS, PO, CXLVII, 35. On the origin of the *Švabe* controversy, see also Bartolomeo Kunibert, *Srpski ustanak i prva vladavina Miloša Obrenovića 1808–1850* [Serbian Uprising and the first reign of Miloš Obrenović, 1808–1850] (Belgrade 1988), vol. II, 63–64.

⁴² A pasquinade against Prince Miloš from early 1839 says: "To remove everything that stood in his way, he — instructed by the venomous *švaba* fugitives, whom he, like a snake, gathered around himself to poison our happiness — devised to pull us from under the wing and protection of the Russian Emperor and our Russian brothers..." Cf. Arhiv srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti [Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (hereafter ASANU)], Istorijaska zbirka [Historical Collection], No. 14556.

⁴³ Toma Vučić Perišić (1788–1859), leader of the so-called Constitution Defenders or Constitutionals (*ustavobranitelji*), minister, president of the State Council.

⁴⁴ Avram Petronijević (1790–1856), Prince Miloš's official, member of the State Council, one of the regents, prime minister, and minister of foreign affairs.

⁴⁵ Jevrem Obrenović (1790–1856), the youngest brother of Miloš Obrenović, for many years *obor-knez* (governor) of the Šabačka Nahija (District of Šabac), governor of the City of Belgrade and the Belgrade District, benefactor, supervisor of public buildings, head of the Military Police Office, president of the State Council and member of the Regency government. As a Constitutionalist, he bitterly opposed the rule of his brother, Prince Miloš.

⁴⁶ Milan Obrenović (1819–1839), the elder son of Prince Miloš, became Prince of Serbia in 1839, but died soon afterward and was succeeded by his younger brother Michael (Mihailo) Obrenović.

⁴⁷ *SNV* No. 23, 14 Mar. 1840, 90–91.

With time the attacks on the *Švabe* gained impetus. Demands that all Austrian subjects be expelled from Serbia and replaced with “native-born sons” followed one another.⁴⁸ They continued throughout the first reign of Prince Michael, whom Pavlović’s newspaper repeatedly, and often unjustly, accused of being prejudiced against the “Serbs from across the border”.⁴⁹ Such accusations, however, cannot be conclusively substantiated. Upon acceding to the throne after his brother’s death, Prince Michael changed almost nothing in the government structure established by his father.⁵⁰ His cabinet members had mostly been Serbs from the Monarchy who, with few exceptions, continued to serve the new Prince loyally.⁵¹ The young Prince even acted as their protector on more than one occasion.⁵² Campaigning against the *Nemačkari* was for the most part instigated by the Constitution-

⁴⁸ See Jovan Milićević, “Narodne Skupštine u Srbiji 1839–1843. godine” [National Assemblies in Serbia 1839–43], *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* IV-1 (1956), 171–172.

⁴⁹ E.g., an article published in *SNV* No. 65, 17 Aug. 1841, 259, describes the attitude of Prince Michael and his government towards the Serbs from Austria in the following way: “But Serbs loathe foreigners, even their own Serbs [from Austria]; and they are already seeking to prevent the employment of all foreigners, which is also the fruit of envy and belief that a more worthy person should not enjoy that which otherwise would necessarily fall to the lot of the native, even an unworthy one. It is true that they did not prohibit it explicitly, but they insist that every foreigner should start from the lowest position, because the employed foreigners already hold high posts and cannot be made accountable to others. It is a great pity that the young Prince does not realize that this practice is more harmful to the fatherland than an explicit and definitive removal of foreigners; because, which educated and respectable man would be willing to go over there under such conditions? Only deplorable sons, who already are many there...”

⁵⁰ E.g., Nil Popov, *Srbija i Rusija od Koča Rebellion to St Andrew’s Day Assembly* (Belgrade 1870), vol. I, 343, claimed that even Prince Miloš had been surrounded by Serbs “from across the border”: “After Dolgoruky left, Miloš’s first concern was to make it up with Simić, Protić, Vučić and Jefrem. He allowed the first three to return to Serbia. They chose Hodges to act as a mediator between themselves and Miloš; but none of them was willing to admit his own mistakes; all justified their actions by referring to their good intentions and claimed that they had not fought against Miloš, but against those around him, notably the newcomers who had stood in the way of the genuine citizens of Serbia...”

⁵¹ The statement finds substantiation in a letter of Prince Miloš to Prince Michael of 3 January 1841 (AS, PO, XCIV, p. 6): “Dear son, if Radičević is as loyal and attached to you as he was to me...”

⁵² As reported by *SNV* No. 25, 12 Apr. 1842, 103: “A special commission has been appointed to examine the case of a member of the Court of Appeal solely on the grounds of his being denounced for grumbling about the intention of the Ministry of Justice to appoint more Austrians to some posts. It is believed that, should the grumbling be proven, the said member will be dismissed because such behaviour is categorized as pitting one side against the other, causing discord and tension...”

alist circles,⁵³ and for many reasons. The first, and in the eyes of the Constitutionalists certainly the foremost, was their intention to weaken their main political rivals, the Obrenović dynasty and their supporters, by sowing discord among them. The presence of Habsburg Serbs provided the perfect pretext for destabilizing Serbia using verbal means. Namely, the Constitutionalists generally accused them of a lack of patriotism,⁵⁴ corruption⁵⁵ and arrogance,⁵⁶ while blaming Prince Michael for alienating all prominent figures and popular representatives, and for surrounding himself with foreigners instead.⁵⁷ The Constitutionalists exploited even the slightest opportunity to score a point in their struggle for power, which they obviously did in the *Švabe* or *Nemačkari* case as well; that does not mean, however, that all of their accusations against the Serbs from the Monarchy were unfounded. Apart from the Constitutionalists, and Vučić as the loudest of

⁵³ *SNV* No. 94, 27 Nov. 1841, 373, brings the following piece of information in a rather long text devoted to the issue of “Švabe”: “It is known that Vučić has been a great loather and critic of the Serbs from the Austrian side even before. And now the press reports that he was offered a passport for a foreign country to await better days there, and he stated that he would like to cross over into the Austrian Empire and become an Austrian citizen...”

⁵⁴ *SNV* No. 24, 29 March 1842, 98, published the following observation of “a Serbian-born Serb”: “But you cannot find in this newspaper a single case of a Serb from across the border following this positive example. I know almost all state employees in Serbia and none of them, except for three or four, have ever made a contribution to a hospital or a school fund, although they are more numerous in the administration than Serbian-born Serbs. Many of them earn thousands of thalers a year, but wouldn’t donate one or two to the institutions the benefits of which they know better than anyone...”

⁵⁵ See *SNV* No. 91, 14 Nov. 1843, 362–363; *SNV* No. 8, 30 Jan. 1847, 31–32; *SNV* No. 16, 27 Feb. 1847, 62–63; and Stojan Simić to Teodor Pavlović, 9 Mar. 1848, *Rukopisno odeljenje Matice srpske* [Manuscript Department of Matica srpska (hereafter ROMS)], No. 12854.

⁵⁶ As reported by *SNV* No. 79, 7 Oct. 1845, 315: “Thus, e.g., a few days ago, an important official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, born in the [Austrian] Empire, lost his temper over a trifle and, swearing at them, drove all lesser employees out of the office, and then, blinded by rage, hit the son of a deceased worthy father in the arm with a chair [...] then he pushed him towards the stairs in the hall and threw him down the stairs, so that the poor fellow [...] ended half-dead at the bottom [...] So you can see how the behaviour of some people from the other side [of the border] sometimes puts all of us Serbs from across the border in a position to be blasted by our good brothers from around here...”

⁵⁷ Dragoslav Stranjaković, *Vlada ustavobranitelja 1842–1853* [The Constitutionalists’ Government 1842–53] (Belgrade 1932), 266–267.

them,⁵⁸ Prince Alexander did not hide his lack of sympathies for the *Švabe* either.⁵⁹

One of the reasons for the Constitutionalists' antagonistic attitude towards the *Švabe* lay in the fact that most Serbs from the Habsburg Monarchy supported the Obrenović dynasty. Moreover, after the dynasty's fall, some of them had been involved in plots to support its return to power,⁶⁰ which Serbia's new leaders held bitterly against them. So, after Vučić's Rebellion (*Vučićeva buna*) overthrew Prince Mihailo, sending him

⁵⁸ "He did not care much for educated people and therefore greatly loathed the Serbs from Vojvodina who came over to Serbia. He could not put up with the fact that the Serbs from Vojvodina, being more literate and better educated than the Serbs from Serbia, held all important positions in state administration. So, he had a grudge against them almost all his life, looked askance at them, considered them uninvited guests, and insisted whenever he could upon their being dismissed from state administration." Cf. Dragoslav Stranjaković, *Vučićeva buna 1842* [Vučić's Rebellion of 1842] (Belgrade 1936), 106. Vučić was consistent in his resentment towards the *Švabe*. During the revolutionary ferment of 1848/49, he was vehemently opposed to sending volunteers or extending any assistance to the movement in Vojvodina. As a result, the peasants in his native locale (Kragujevac District) massively boycotted the government's campaign to enlist volunteers. Cf. Stranjaković, *Vlada ustavobranitelja*, 283; and Grgur Jakšić and Dragoslav Stranjaković, *Srbija od 1813 do 1858 godine* [Serbia from 1813 to 1858] (Belgrade n.d.), 121–122.

⁵⁹ That Serbs from Austria were not in favour with Prince Alexander is readable from Austrian General Maximilian Ungerhoffer's report to the Court in Vienna. Namely, in reply to an Austrian citizen's request for employment in Serbia, the Prince expressed his opinion rather bluntly: "I like native Serbs much better than you, *Švabe*, because you've got into the habit of running to your Consul to complain about every little thing, causing our government problems and unpleasant paperwork." Cf. Djuro Šurmin, "Dokumenti o Srbiji 1842–1848" [Documents on Serbia 1842–1848], *Spomenik SKA* LXIX, 2nd class, 54 (1929), 40. Nor was Vuk Karadžić any more inclined to the *Švabe* (Vuk to Struve, *Prepiska* VI, 840): "The increasing number of Austrian Serbs in Serbia, particularly those from the so-called educated class, can be considered to be Serbia's great misfortune. Their number is increasing so rapidly that now that the quarantine is no longer compulsory and thanks to the Serbian government, Belgrade has almost become an Austrian city [...] True, one must admit that these Austrian Serbs are better educated than those born in Serbia; but one must also admit that, having been raised amidst Germans and Hungarians, they do not even know the common Serbian people they were born into, let alone those in Serbia. They come to Serbia without being put through a sieve (mostly adventurers) and, since the Serbian government does not know how to tell them apart and make a selection, they may be said to be self-selected and granting grades to one another, thereby making mischief and trouble. On top of it, there is no doubt that, at this point, common Serbian men from Serbia are abler and more reliable in governing this people than Hungarian lawyers."

⁶⁰ Among the most prominent Hungarian-born plotters in favour of the Obrenović dynasty were Cvetko Rajović, minister of interior under Prince Michael; Stojan Jovanović

into exile in Austria in September 1842, the Constitutionalists began to settle the score with their open or suspected political opponents who had come from the “Empire”. This included a massive purge of state administration,⁶¹ at first of the Serbs “from across the border” who, amidst the general chaos, had left the country together with Prince Michael, and then those of them who stayed in Serbia, regardless of whether they were politically active or not.⁶² Their banishment from the country was prompt and brutal.⁶³ Moreover, the new Serbian authorities disregarded all state’s obligations as regards their salaries, pensions and other forms of compensation.⁶⁴ The Vienna government reacted, at first through its consul, Dimitrije Atanacković, and then through its provisional representative, Colonel Filipović, by presenting a protest note which demanded the setting up of a joint Austrian-Serbian commission to ensure that the rights

Cukić, leader of the Katanska Rebellion, and Konstantin Bogdanović, secretary of the State Council.

⁶¹ In most cases, the banishment of Austrian subjects from Serbia only encompassed the Serbs employed in state administration. Other subjects of the Habsburg Empire, such as craftsmen, merchants and peasants, who were not involved in the political turmoil in Serbia, were left in peace. See Stranjaković, *Vučičeva buna*, 147.

⁶² As reported by *SMN* No. 71, 13 Sep. 1842, 289: “Apart from those who had fled to Austria, thus giving up their jobs, many of those (more than 80) who stayed were dismissed, mostly those born in the Austrian Empire. Only few from Serbia were also dismissed, and only few of those who came from Austria still hold their positions [...] Today, 96 state employees crossed over here from Belgrade, including the illustrious Messrs. Isailović, both Gavrilovići, Bogdanović and Raić. Many schools are closed. Steić has also been dismissed.” Princess Ljubica (to Prince Miloš, 25 Sep. 1842, *ASANU*, *Istorijska zbirka* [Historical Collection], No. 14556) claimed that, by order of Vučić, initially ninety Austrian-born state employees were to leave Belgrade alone within twenty-four hours. According to her, Vučić’s supporters kept repeating: “We want to drive Swabs to Swabia, Greeks to Greece, Tsintsars to Tsintsaria, Bosniaks to Bosnia, etc., so as to see if we, pure and genuine Serbs, will be able to work well for Serbia.”

⁶³ How strong and irrational animosity towards the *Nemačkari* was is also shown by the fact that apart from the state employees appointed under the previous government, dismissals were also inflicted on those whom underdeveloped Serbia needed badly, such as physicians, teachers and the like. See Lazar Čelap, “Postupak sa austrijskim podanicima u Srbiji u vreme Kneza Miloša i Ustavobranitelja” [Treatment of Austrian subjects in Serbia under Prince Miloš and the Constitutionalists], *Godišnjak grada Beograda* XIV (1967), 362–368.

⁶⁴ Georgije Petrović to Vuk Karadžić, Zemun (Semlin), 7 Sept. 1843, vol. XXVI of *Sabrana dela, Prepiska* VII (1843–47), 75, describes the difficult situation of the expelled Serbs: “There are many expellees here in Zemun. Some have not eaten for three days.” See also *SMN* No. 95, 28 Nov. 1843, 300; and *SNV* No. 35, 4 May 1844, 138.

of Austrian citizens were protected,⁶⁵ but the situation of the expelled saw little improvement. Instead, as reported by *Serbske narodne novine*: “The Prince and the Council (*Sovjet*) in Serbia issued a new decree for non-natives, which reads: that from now on no foreigner, either with or without [citizenship] release, is to be employed in state administration; should any [foreigner] be indispensable, he can be hired only with permission from the Prince and the Council; and those currently employed in state administration are all, without exception, to submit a release from their [present] citizenship and take Serbian citizenship not later than six months from now; those who fail to meet this requirement before the set deadline will instantly cease being a Serbian state employee, and ministries will be able to dismiss them at will...”⁶⁶ Because of Serbia’s poor finances, the problem of compensating the expelled employees was only partly resolved, and mostly in favour of the former highest-ranking state officials.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Georgije Petrović to Vuk Karadžić, 28 Sep. 1843, *Prepiska* VII, 88: “Filipović has already arrived, but it is known that he is not here as a consul, but as a commissioner of some sort. Some say he’s here because of our subjects in Serbia...” See also Vojislav Vučković, *Srpska kriza u Istočnom pitanju 1842–1843* [Serbian crisis within the Eastern Question] (Belgrade 1957), 48; Jovan Milićević, “Istorija Katanske bune” [History of the Katanas’ Rebellion], *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta V-1* (1960), 273. That relations between Serbia and Austria reached a critical point over the *Nemačkari* issue after this rebellion was crushed may be seen from *SNV*No. 87, 2 Nov. 1844, 346: “The request the Serbian Government submitted to the Austrian Government contains the following items: 1) to implement strict control in order to preclude any further attempt to cause unrest in Serbia; 2) to move the fugitives from Serbia away from the Serbian border; 3) to implement the same measure against all those who are known to have connived against the Serbian government; 4) to recall all Austrian subjects still residing in Serbia who served under Prince Miloš; and 5) to bind them all to sell out the real property they possess in Serbia. If this request is not met, the Serbian government contends that good relations will be impossible to maintain...”

⁶⁶ *SNV*No. 41, 25 May 1844, 162. It may be interesting to note that at some point Vuk Karadžić, although unsympathetic for the Constitutionalists, sent the Russian diplomatic representative to Vienna a letter containing an almost identical suggestion as regards the Serbs from Hungary (Vuk to Struve, *Prepiska* VI, 841): “For all this, I hold it necessary for our Constitution to be amended as soon as possible by stipulating that under no conditions can government and judicial posts be filled by any person other than those born in Serbia, so that the only posts left for foreigners would be those of scribes, teachers, physicians, engineers and the like; but even then, they should be hired under specified conditions without enjoying the rights of a permanent state employee. The Serbian people in Serbia would welcome such an amendment to the Constitution and it would protect them against many abuses and the premature and detrimental European or, to be more precise, undergraduates’ and lawyers’ statutes.”

⁶⁷ According to *SNV*No. 35, 4 May 1844, 138: “Those born in the [Austrian] Empire who were employed and dismissed from state service following the changes in 1842, are

Pavlović's *Serbske narodne novine* kept close track of the ongoing friction between the Serbs from the two sides of the Sava and Danube rivers. Every issue of his paper ran polemical articles debating about who had started the scrimmage, and about the motivations of the Habsburg Serbs to migrate to Serbia: was it patriotism or the wish to get rich? The questions were answered in a roundabout manner, by enumerating everything that had been achieved owing to the *Prečani* (Serbs "from the other side", "othersiders"), with the conclusion that the core of the problem lay in the ungratefulness of the Serbs in Serbia.⁶⁸

In the mid 1850s, the nature of the antagonism over the *Nemačkari* took on new forms. In the 1820s and 1830s, Serbia had been in urgent need of "imported brains", which had created a welcoming atmosphere for the Serbs from the Monarchy. Round the middle of the century, however, the situation changed considerably. There was a growing ill feeling towards the Serbs "from across the border", particularly among the younger generation of educated natives. Most of them, having returned home from their studies abroad,⁶⁹ believed that they, as "sons of the fatherland", should be accorded priority in employment, particularly in state services. Also, most were sons of prominent figures who had played a significant role in the struggle for national liberation, and they felt frustrated with having to work their way to the posts and salaries they thought they deserved from the lowest-ranking position, whereas some "foreigners" who had not done that much for Serbia held the highest state offices and enjoyed many attractive privileges. A text published in *Serbske narodne novine* in 1846 clearly reveals the crux of the problem: "I suggest to Mr Reporter to find out how many Serbian sons qualified for higher grades and better in all respects, even in horse riding and weapons handling, have nonetheless remained at lower-grade positions than foreigners, who have mostly acquired experience only through working in Serbian administration, and all that in spite of the Decree of 1842 [...] stipulating that an equally able native should be given a promotional priority over a foreigner; which the foreigner should not be frustrated about, because he should know where such a right comes from. If, however, our Mr Reporter wish the Serbian government to disregard all patriotic consider-

now entitled to remuneration in the amount of a year's salary to be paid from the public coffers, which all exceeds a total of 20,000 thalers. On the same occasion, the State Council also discussed the possibility of dismissing and appropriately compensating the still serving Austrian-born employees, but it was put off, mostly due to lack of funds..."

⁶⁸ *SNN* No. 31, 22 Apr. 1845, 123-124.

⁶⁹ Jovan Milićević, "Prva grupa srbijanskih studenata, državnih pitomaca školovanih u inostranstvu (1839-1842)" [The First Group of Serbian state scholarship holders educated abroad (1839-1842)], *Istorijski časopis IX-X* (1960), 363-374.

ations and, for the sake of the Austrian Serbs employed in the administration alone, pass over true sons of the fatherland and so many deserving men (who, while the Austrian Serbs were able to pursue their studies in peace, shed their blood and selflessly exposed their lives and property to peril for the liberation of their native land), there is nothing else we can wish Mr Reporter in this case than to be wiser.”⁷⁰

It is interesting to note the stance of Teodor Pavlović in the controversy over the *Nemačkari*. A supporter of the Constitutionals and a close friend of the Simić brothers,⁷¹ but also a Serb from Austria deeply upset by the developments in Serbia, Pavlović was torn by contradictory feelings. Believing that all Serbs should hold together no matter where they came from and where they were,⁷² he simply could not understand the reason for this friction.⁷³ Struggling to work out a solution acceptable to both sides, he wrote: “There is no doubt whatsoever that in considering employment applications, the Serbian government should first take into account those submitted by the qualified and deserving sons of the fatherland or natives; it is as justified and just as it is wise to separate the wheat from the chaff among

⁷⁰ *SNV* No. 25, 28 Mar. 1846, 100. It appears that even Vuk Karadžić was thinking of writing an article to help identify the real cause of the conflict between the Serbs from Serbia and the Serbs from Hungary. This may be inferred from a letter he received from Georgije Petrović (1 July 1844, *Prepiska* VII, 188): “Yet, I don’t think you should give up your intention to describe why Švabe are being blasted, because the truth, however unpleasant, should come out. Wise people will always cherish it and welcome it, and it will also show both to the Švabe and to the Serbs [from Serbia] how they should treat one another.”

⁷¹ Leaders of the Constitutionals: Aleksa Simić (1800–1872), minister, Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople, and Stojan Simić (1797–1852), superintendent of Prince Miloš’s estates in Romania and president of the State Council.

⁷² *SNV* No. 92, 26 Nov. 1842, 377: “And now, every pure-hearted Serb is at liberty to harbour sweet hopes that Serbia will flourish, and that Serbdom will achieve good repute. From now on Serbs will kiss and embrace their fellow Serbs, without caring whether they are separated by the Drina or the Danube or the Sava. From now on a Serb will call another Serb a Serb, not a Švaba, even if the latter is a loyal subject of the Austrian emperor; after all, he is called a Serb by his own emperor.”

⁷³ *SNV* No. 94, 6 Dec. 1842, 385: “To the Serbs from the other side [of the border], a French is a French, a Magyar is a Magyar, a German is a German. Only a Serb from here is a thorn in their side, he is a Švaba to them. And why? [...] [Monastery] Ravanica in Fruška Gora, is it a Švaba monastery? Raić, Dositej, Mušicki, Stojković, Terlaić, and many other figures so highly respected in foreign empires, were they Švabe? Are the laws for Serbia being written by Švabe? Was the song ‘I’m a young Serbian girl’ that every citizen of Belgrade sang on the day Prince Alexander’s was anointed, was it composed by a Švaba? It is not at all at odds with the duties of an Austrian subject to be fond of Serbian nationality...”

those employed by the previous government, and to reinstate those possibly wrongfully afflicted, and otherwise quiet and peaceful men [...] and harmless for the future. However, to exclude from consideration all Serbs born outside Serbia is something we do not expect from the justice-loving and perceptive new government [...] because that would be neither productive, nor just; it would not be productive because it is well-known that Serbia still does not have enough qualified native sons of her own, and it would not be just because there were before and there are now many Serbian sons born on this side of the border who have done much good for Serbia...⁷⁴

At the same time, seeking to avoid adding fuel to the fire, Pavlović reworded and softened the tone of the texts published in his *Novine*. For instance, the passage he omitted from the published riposte of Aleksa Simić sent from Temesvar (modern Timișoara) in 1846 reads: “Let me be allowed to ask the author of the abovementioned article to suggest to some of our brothers called *švabe*, whom he represents, to give up acting and judging upon bribery, and they’ll have their goal achieved faster; otherwise, I fear for what they have now, because what one [claims to] know, one must prove, and then there’ll be no getting away. I beg the honest and diligent ones to forgive me; this discussion is of no concern to them. Natives are also prone to bribery, it is true, but in their case the alarm bell doesn’t ring as loudly, supposedly because [the bribes] are not as big as in [the case of] those others, or perhaps because people tend to fail to see the log in their own eye, while the speck in somebody else’s eye seems like a log to them.”⁷⁵

Pavlović, however, took a diametrically opposite attitude towards Jovan Hadžić. At the time of the dynastic change in Serbia in 1842, Hadžić was considered a fervent supporter of the Karadjordjević dynasty and a friend and adviser of the leaders of the Constitutionalists’ regime. Being a distinguished lawyer, he came to Serbia with the primary task to draw up a civil law code. In the volatile political situation after Vučić and Petronijević had been banished from Serbia, Hadžić, being one of the most eminent figures in the Serbian community in Austria, acted as a pillar of strength, so to speak, of the as yet unconsolidated regime. Although useful both to Serbia and to the Constitutionalists in more than one way,⁷⁶ Hadžić was frequently

⁷⁴ *SNV* No. 86, 5 Nov. 1842, 346.

⁷⁵ Aleksa Simić to Teodor Pavlović, 9 Mar. 1846, ROMS, No. 12854. Compare with the text published in *SNV* No. 22, 17 March 1846, 86.

⁷⁶ The fact that all of the most influential members of the Austrian government were inclined to Hadžić made Russia highly suspicious. (See Andra Gavrilović, “Beč kao zaštitnik M. Svetića i početak rada Dj. Daničića” [Vienna as protector of M. Svetić and the beginning of the work of Dj. Daničić], *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića XXXIII* (1914), 77–90). The Constitutionalists must have been aware of that. Hadžić’s influence on the

and harshly criticized for having secured an exorbitant salary⁷⁷ and for his condescending demeanour, while his work was often denigrated.⁷⁸ When he entered into an open conflict with Vučić over the Civil Code and found himself abandoned by Simić and other friends, the disappointment led him to leave Serbia for good.

Pavlović's *Novine* kept track of all these attacks against Hadžić with poorly concealed malice. The reason may be found in the history of the two men's mutual relations. The conflict between Hadžić and Pavlović had started in 1832, when Hadžić was dismissed from the position of President of the *Matica Srpska*,⁷⁹ resumed over Hadžić's *Sitnice jezikoslovne* (Linguistic technicalities) published in 1839,⁸⁰ and culminated in July 1860, as a result of Hadžić's intention to start a new paper with a literary supplement in Novi Sad.⁸¹ The start of a new Serbian paper at the moment that *Serbske narodne novine* were barely surviving due to the small number of subscribers must have seemed to Pavlović like pouring salt on the open wounds. This succession of events may explain his harsh and uncompromising attitude towards Hadžić.

Finally, it may be interesting to quote an excerpt from the letter of 15 March 1851 which Jovan Stejić sent from Belgrade in reply to Teodor

policy of the Habsburg Monarchy could have been crucial in the critical period for the newly-established Serbian government prior to its consolidation.

⁷⁷ According to *SNV* No. 60, 31 July 1841, 238, and No. 88, 4 Nov. 1843, 350, while a Serbian minister's annual salary was 2500 thalers, Hadžić's was more than 3000, and his fee for the authorship of the Code was 1000 imperial gold ducats. The hue and cry against Hadžić was instigated by the Russian representatives to Serbia and their local supporters, who frowned on his close relations with Vienna. The Russian Consul in Serbia at the time was particularly active in that respect, as may be seen from Ilija Garašanin to A. Petronijević and T. Vučić Perišić, 15 Dec. 1843, published in Grgur Jakšić, *Prepiska Ilije Garašanina 1839–1849* [Correspondence of I. Garašanin], *Gradja SANI* (Belgrade 1950), 61: "I had a meeting with Danilievsky the day before yesterday [...] Among other things, he suggested that it was not wise to give Hadžić so high a salary and that we might sustain many more state employees with that money."

⁷⁸ *SNV* No. 33, 29 Apr. 1839, 128; No. 88, 14 Nov. 1843, 350; No. 95, 28 Nov. 1843, 380; and No. 100, 16 Nov. 1843, 399.

⁷⁹ Živan Milisavac, *Istorija Matice srpske* [History of Matica Srpska], Part I. *Vreme nacionalnog budjenja i kulturnog preporoda 1828–1864* [The Age of National Awakening and Cultural Renaissance 1826–1864] (Novi Sad 1986), 250.

⁸⁰ Miraš Kićović, *Jovan Hadžić (Miloš Svetić)* (Novi Sad 1930), 93–106.

⁸¹ *Obšte novine srbske i literarni dodatak Književnij sad* [General Serbian Newspaper with Literary Supplement "Literary Garden"]. For more, see Krestić, *Istorija srpske štampe*, 56–60.

Pavlović.⁸² It perfectly reflects the situation in Belgrade in the 1850s as regards the *Nemačkari* issue and requires no additional explanation: “You write me about considering the possibility of moving permanently over here to the P[rincipality of] Serbia, and you ask me to tell you what I think about it. Here is my answer, and rest assured that it is a sincere and brotherly one. There is no good place for us anywhere: that’s our lot, you should know, even Dositej;⁸³ said that; our fate hasn’t changed since. You speak about your love and all that you’ve done for us here; strangely enough, you believe that we are better and smarter than you over there are. Love and merit are rewarded and acknowledged among us here as they are among you there, in the Empire; we are following the example of your civilization, not the other way round. In a word: brothers’ embrace is quite cold, particularly if we don’t think you’re our sibling. Sapiienti sat! You are where you are. Toil through life as God teaches you to; but be wise not to lose the little you say you can get over there hoping for what, as far as the situation is known to me, you’ll not be able to get. I’m surprised that you still don’t know what ‘švaba’ means! It means neither a German or of German origin, but a *Vojvodjanin* [a Vojvodina Serb], an othersider.⁸⁴ His old mother has disowned him! There is no Serbdom for you other than that one, in the *Vojvodstvo*, for better or for worse, God’s will [...] Take my advice as it is, and not as you and I would like it to be [...] But then, I know what hope’s going to say; you’re hoping and so you’re thinking: if my application is approved and I get a job in Serbia, what then, Stejčić? May it be so, with God’s help! I’m not writing you on behalf of the ruler or his ministers, whose names I’ve mentioned, but only on my own behalf and about what I see and know. Indeed, Mr Stojan Simić shares my opinion about you and your intention...”

* * *

After the Second Serbian Uprising (1815–17) ended and peace was restored, a considerable number of Habsburg Serbs accepted employment in Serbia at the invitation of the Serbian authorities. In that way Serbia ensured, to the extent possible at the time, the functioning of her state apparatus. According to Teodor Pavlović’s *Serbske narodne novine*, a conjuncture of circumstance made it possible for the Constitutionalist to use the incomers for their own political ends, the struggle against and eventual deposition of

⁸² ROMS, No. 3418.

⁸³ Dositej Obradović (1742–1811), an Enlightenment philosopher, linguist and writer, modern Serbia’s first minister of education.

⁸⁴ This is a reference to the Serbian community in southern Hungary (modern-day Vojvodina), on the other, left, side of the Sava and Danube rivers, north of the Principality of Serbia.

the Obrenović dynasty. Soon after the 1848/49 revolution, the newcomers began to lose the status and role they had played in Serbia, being slowly but surely replaced by young educated native-born men. The antagonism towards the *Švabe*, essentially socially and politically motivated,⁸⁵ gradually took the form of opposition to the kulturträgerism of the “othersiders”, of a regional rivalry, occasionally assuming features of a conflict between two opposing mentalities and two different cultures. It had a detrimental effect on the relationship between the Serbs from the two sides of the Sava and Danube rivers, as it encouraged particularism and eroded the sense of unity among the Serbs as a whole.

UDC 94(497.11:436)18”
316.356.4(=163.41)(497.11:436)
316.643.3

Bibliography and sources

- Archives of Serbia, Belgrade. PO, XXIII, CXLVII, XCIV; MID-V, 1839, II No. 1202.
Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade. Historical Collection, No. 14556.
Ćelap, Lazar. “Postupak sa austrijskim podanicima u Srbiji u vreme Kneza Miloša i Ustavobranitelja”. *Godišnjak grada Beograda* XIV (1967), 362–368.
Gavrilović, Andra. “Beč kao zaštitnik M. Svetića i početak rada Dj. Daničića”. *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića* XXXIII (1914), 77–90.
Gavrilović, Slavko. *Vojvodina i Srbija u vreme Prvog ustanka*. Novi Sad 1974.
Jakšić, Grgur. *Prepiska Ilije Garašanina 1839–1849. Gradja SANI*. Belgrade 1950.
Jakšić, Grgur and Dragoslav Stranjaković. *Srbija od 1813 do 1858 godine*. Belgrade n.d.
Jovanović, Slobodan. “Nemačkari”. Vol. 11 of *Sabrana dela*. Belgrade 1991.
Kićović, Miraš. *Jovan Hadžić (Miloš Svetić)*. Novi Sad 1930.

⁸⁵ Stranjaković, *Vučićeva buna*, 85, puts forward his view: “Apart from the peasants, the Constitutionalists wanted to win over as many state employees and merchants as possible [...] They used to tell Serbian-born state employees that they were in most cases neglected and even at risk of losing their state jobs, because the Prince and the government had hired too many foreigners, ‘Nemačkari’, for state services.” See also M. Popović, *Traganje za trajnim* [In Search for Permanence] (Belgrade 1959), 33. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija*, 244, looks at the issue in the following way: “After the promulgation of the Second Hatti-sherif, ‘an entire cloud of Serbs from Hungary rushed to Serbia in search for state jobs’ [...] Because of their conduct and poor education, and also because the Prince favoured all those who happened to be in his chancery, they soon grew very unpopular among the natives, and began to be labelled ‘foreigners’, ‘Nemačkari’ and ‘Švaburija’. There were two reasons for that: 1) they were perceived, particularly by young native-born Serbs, as an obstacle to getting a job faster; and 2) the Prince relied on them in his struggle against the Opposition. As a result, the Opposition demanded their dismissal from all state services, except those which could not be filled up with natives.”

- Krestić, Petar V. "Serbske narodne novine o Stefanu Sečenjiju povodom 200-godišnjice rođenja". *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 44 (1991), 111-116.
- *Prečani i Šumadinci. Teodor Pavlović i "Serbske narodne novine" o Kneževini Srbiji 1838-1848*. Belgrade–Novi Sad 1996.
- Krestić, Vasilije Dj. *Istorija srpske štampe u Ugarskoj 1791-1914*. Novi Sad 1980.
- "Društvo srpske slovesnosti". *Danica* for 2006 (2005).
- Kunibert, Bartolomeo. *Srpski ustanak i prva vladavina Miloša Obrenovića 1808-1850*, vol. II. Belgrade 1988.
- Ljušić, Radoš. *Kneževina Srbija 1830-1839*. Belgrade 1986.
- "Dimitrije Davidović, sekretar kneza Miloša Obrenovića", *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 32 (1985), 51-69.
- ed. *Licej 1838-1839, Zbornik dokumenata*. Belgrade 1988.
- Maletin, Marko. "Teodor Pavlović", *Glasnik IDNS* 8 (1935), and *Glasnik IDNS* 9 (1936).
- Matica Srpska, Manuscript Department, Novi Sad. Nos. 3418 and 12854.
- Marinković, Borivoje. "Dnevnik Justina Mihailovića (1831-1844)". *Zbornik za društvene nauke* 26 (1960), 103-128.
- Milićević, Jovan. "Narodne Skupštine u Srbiji 1839-1843. godine". *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* IV-1 (1956).
- "Istorija Katanske bune". *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* V-1 (1960).
- "Prva grupa srbijanskih studenata, državnih pitomaca školovanih u inostranstvu (1839-1842)". *Istorijski časopis* IX-X (1960), 363-374.
- Milisavac, Živan. *Istorija Matice srpske*. Part I: *Vreme nacionalnog budjenja i kulturnog preporoda 1828-1864*. Novi Sad 1986.
- Popov, Nil. *Srbija i Rusija od Kočine krajine do Sv. Andrejevske Skupštine*, vol. I. Belgrade 1870.
- Popović, Miodrag. *Traganje za trajnim*. Belgrade 1959.
- Sabrana dela Vuka Stef. Karadžica*. Vol. XXV *Prepiska* VI (1837-1842). Vol. XXVI *Prepiska* VII (1843-1847). Belgrade 1993.
- Serbske narodne novine*
- Stojančević, Vladimir. "Škole, učitelji i prosvetne prilike u Srbiji 1815-1839". *Istorijski glasnik* 1-2 (1974), 72-75.
- "Kultura obnovljene Srbija (1835-1839)". In vol. V-1 of *Istorija srpskog naroda*. Belgrade 1994.
- Stranjaković, Dragoslav. *Vlada ustavobranitelja 1842-1853*. Belgrade 1932.
- *Vučićeva buna 1842*. Belgrade 1936.
- Šurmin, Djuro. "Dokumenti o Srbiji 1842-1848". *Spomenik SKA* LXIX, 2nd class, 54 (1929).
- Vučković, Vojislav. *Srpska kriza u Istočnom pitanju 1842-1843*. Belgrade 1957.