

movement. The monarchy wanted to take political issues out of the hands of the metropolitanate, yet educational and ecclesiastical issues were inseparable from political issues, which made matters even more complex. For four decades there was a rift in the Serbian movement, which ultimately resulted in autonomy being revoked in 1912. Vasin argues that a precedent was set at Long Assembly of 1869-1871, at which, for the first time, the patriarch was not chosen as chair of the assembly, but instead the liberals, led by Svetozar Miletić, asked for a majority vote. The episcopacy responded to Miletić's Constitution, which included some Protestant principles for church leadership (such as, for example, that secular representatives participate in selecting the patriarch), with a *Separate votum* in defense of church canon. Vasin points out that this dispute was destroying the power of the Serbian elite, and it gave the government an opportunity to accelerate the process of Magyarization. Things became further complicated when the Viennese Court and the Hungarians began to make use of the disputes at the assemblies and impose their choice for patriarch, which is what happened with German Anđelić in 1882. Even more formidable opponents of the church were the radicals led by Jaša Tomić, who used their positions on socialism and anti-clericalism to attack the hierarchy. Vasin notes that the status of Serbian schools and the Cyrillic alphabet in Croatia and Slavonia was poor, so Patriarch Georgije Branković worked to preserve schools and seminaries as a means of halting the denationalization of the Serbs. Interestingly, he was also concerned about the religious status of Serbs in the United States, who were seeking a Serbian priest in Chicago without having to rely on Russian jurisdiction.

A relative and successor of Patriarch Georgije—Lukijan Bogdanović—assumed the office of metropolitan/patriarch during the Annexation Crisis of 1908 and a time of strained relations between Austria-Hungary and Serbia. After autonomy was rescinded and the constant attacks from the radicals, his health deteriorated, and this ultimately led to his disappearance and eventual death in 1913. Vasin explains that, after this scandal, a new patriarch was not elected, but

on the eve of World War I, Bishop Miron Nikolić of Pakrac was chosen as the administrator for the metropolitanate. He would cautiously guide the metropolitanate through the First World War and would remain loyal to the Habsburgs in order to protect the position of the clergy and the Serbs. After a period of hardship, the Karlovci Metropolitanate came to an end in 1919 when the Serbian Orthodox Church united under Patriarch Dimitrije. The Karlovci Metropolitanate's place in the history of the Serbian Orthodox Church, and also of the Serbian people, remains one of its most valuable chapters and a worthy research topic.

A century after the Serbian Orthodox Church was restored and unified, the authors of *A History of the Karlovci Metropolitanate* have presented its past, which speaks to a long period when there were Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy, an institution that influenced not only faith but also the genesis of a Serbian national identity and the creation of an educational system. This institution was a guardian for Orthodoxy, not only for the Serbs but also for the Romanians, Greeks, and Aromanians living under Viennese rule.

Translated by *Elizabeth Salmore*

Pavle Petković

doi: 10.19090/i.2023.34.210-212

© Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, 2023

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 34, 210-212

Slobodan Bjelica, *Disputes over the autonomy of Vojvodina: book 2. 1974–1988*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2021, 568 pp.

(Slobodan Bjelica, *Sporovi oko autonomije Vojvodine: knjiga 2. 1974–1988*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2021, 568 str. (Serbian Cyrillic))

The two books by Slobodan Bjelica, which deal with disputes about autonomy of Vojvodina, together comprise wholesome historical research on complex problems. Prior to Bjelica's work these questions has been mostly left intact, except for few cases (mentioned in the author's introduction) such as *Biography of Stevan Doronjski* (Ranko Končar and Dimitrije Boarov), *Study of Serbian statehood* by Ljubodrag Dimić

and few articles. The value of this demanding work is not just in enlightening question of understanding genesis of Vojvodina's autonomy, its moving forces and the political and economic forces which have actively co-created dynamics of this multicultural and multi-ethnic region; it also brings to the table new pieces of mosaic which shed multiple lights on how socialist Yugoslav politics on regional, republican and federal level have functioned; on the other hand, it further helps in understanding the history of socialist Yugoslavia, its processes and its disintegration. What contributes to the value of the book is the usage of vast archival material from Belgrade and Novi Sad archives and new, previously not researched materials (fond Pokrajinskog komiteta). This is complemented by memoirs and interviews of many political actors who were involved or present during period of political clashes on autonomy of Vojvodina, as well as by the analysis of two established newspapers - *Дневник* (Daily news), from the province of Vojvodina and *Политика* (Politics) from Belgrade. Putting the book in a wider temporal and spatial context (both throughout history and in contemporary world), the autonomism, separatism and tensions via centralist and provincial authorities seem like the worldwide phenomena worth of research. This is obvious if we have in mind contemporary similar experiences such as tensions in EU and member states' relation, or republic versus province confrontations as in the cases of Great Britain and Spain. As the author also concludes in the epilogue, the idea of autonomism of Vojvodina still lives and it might become more serious political subject in the future.

The initial chapter of first book gives reader a brief but concise overview about well needed earlier history of Vojvodina, as its legacy has resonated in incoming historical periods. The "autonomous spirit" can be traced to Serbian struggles to gain autonomy inside the Habsburg monarchy during 17th and 18th centuries which brought some success with various privileges being issued, with Serbs choosing their own *vojvoda* (duke) as a representative of profane authorities, and with the establishment of the

Metropolitane of Karlovci as a religious aspect of autonomy. The year of 1848 when revolution spread throughout Europe, influenced Serbian population to demand their own autonomous unit inside the monarchy, which would encompass territories of Banat, Bačka, Baranja and Srem. As a reward of opposing Hungarian uprising, the short lived Voivodeship of Serbia and Tarnish Banat was proclaimed in 1849 stretching over regions of Bačka, Banat and Srem. Nevertheless, this was a brief episode, and it was abolished by the emperor in 1860. On the other hand, it also did not satisfy Serbian national demands as it did not encompass all the territories settled by Serbs, whereas the German population held upper hand in administration. With abolition of short lasting voivodeship, and the establishment of dual monarchy in 1867 the Serbian population has been pressured by Hungarization until the end of First World War. After the First World War, the leading Serbian politicians organised Assembly of Serbs, Bunjevci and other Slavs which declared its decision to unite regions of Banat, Bačka and Baranja with Kingdom of Serbia. The territory of Srem remained part of Croatia and entered Yugoslavia through political decision of short-lived state of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. The so called autonomist tendencies have not been present at that time when the territory called Vojvodina became part of kingdom of Yugoslavia. It is important to explain that earlier autonomist tendencies had a Serbian nationalistic character, as author puts it, and being united with other Serbs in Yugoslavia it seemed that those tendencies have fulfilled its job. The new autonomist tendencies in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia did not come from many different non-Serb ethnicities, which rather anticipated border changes, but from Serbian and Bunjevci landowners as a reaction to the ill economic situation of the region after the unification and formation of kingdom of Yugoslavia (Kingdom of SHS). It is important to mention this essential fact as these autonomisms had different moving powers - the first one national and the second economical. These differences resonate throughout the period covered by the book and are therefore important to understand further

developments. With economic stagnation and exploitation of territory of Vojvodina, first political initiatives have been born that saw solution to the economic issues in gaining certain degrees of autonomy, but they were marginal at that time. The powerful counter to constituting Vojvodina as an autonomous territory was fuelled mostly by the fact that Serbs comprised only third of population and therefore mostly supported centralistic governing under the Karadorđević dynasty. Even so the idea of autonomy has gained certain popularity. During and after the Second World War communists, whose resistance movement took main initiative in the liberation of Yugoslavia, decided to transform the state, based on federalist approach, and to solve national issues unaddressed in the first Yugoslavia. The population of Vojvodina was comprised of various ethnic groups with Serbs, although most numerous, still representing just one third of it, while there was a significant Hungarian minority, but also Romanian, Croatian, Slovak and many others. Prior to the war the local Germans also presented a significant population, but as a main culprit of World War II they have been mostly forced to leave, while their estates and wealth has been confiscated by the authorities. The solution for Vojvodina in the after-war plans predicted possible forming of separate republic, but it was decided that Vojvodina and Kosovo will take the role of autonomous provinces within the Socialist Republic of Serbia. It is important to mention that decision to include Vojvodina in the Socialist republic of Serbia has been made through various representative bodies of communist authorities of Vojvodina, which were supposed to represent the democratic will of its population. The formation of autonomy might have been powered by various reasons but it was mostly considered to be solution to the multi-ethnic character of Vojvodina and had its foundation in socialist self-governing. Through this configuration the possible inter-ethnic tensions would, according to authorities, be overcome, while the rights of numerous minorities would be better protected.

The topic is not divided into two books provisory. Even though the central question in both periods nevertheless remained the degree and

existence or possible nonexistence of autonomy of Vojvodina, the political and constitutional realities were different and so were therefore the dynamics. The period covered by first book 1961–1974 is characterised by initiative from provincial politicians of Vojvodina to gain higher degree of autonomy while central/republican politicians of Serbia took conservative stance in this regard, considering that the relation between two autonomous provinces and central authorities should be tightened. In a similar manner as political parties in Vojvodina during the first Yugoslavia have been divided about question of autonomy, with majority supporting unitarist and centralistic approach and minority agitated for certain degree of autonomy, the early decades of socialist period were marked by the same internal division among representatives of autonomous province of Vojvodina, where one group leaned towards centralism and other demanded deepening of Vojvodina's autonomy (which are colloquially referred to as "autonomaši"). The second book which covers the period after new federal, republic and provincial constitutions in 1974, which configured much looser relation between "narrow Serbia" and its provinces, examines a dynamic of political clash between provincial and central authorities around those constitutions and their interpretations and eventual revision of the arrangements. The provincial authorities in Vojvodina, enjoying vast autonomy took a defensive stance protecting the constitution while the central/republican took initiative to undermine the existing constitution. The clash revolved not just around the reformation of constitution but was marked by different interpretations of certain parts of it, more precisely paragraphs 300 and 301. The author does not leave out the personal careerist ambitions and personal political and statehood views of both republican and provincial politics which provide us with more complex interpretation than just bipolar antagonism between two political camps. Nevertheless, especially because of the discourse that was prescribed by the state ideology in the "top to bottom" manner, the statements which uncover either separatist, nationalistic, centralistic or any other tendency are almost always wrapped in politically acceptable vocabulary. In the same

fashion politically discrediting either side was done mostly in a false or honest defence of the so-called foundational pillars of Yugoslavia like federalism, self-governing, internationalism, democratic centralism etc. One cannot miss to notice how dispute influenced wider political processes in Yugoslavia, where the “Yoghurt revolution” and political liquidation of Ivan Stambolić by Slobodan Milošević were definitely in correlation by the dispute. On the other hand, the influence of events in the province of Kosovo can be clearly seen in the dynamics between the republic and province of Vojvodina, especially in 1980s.

Getting back to the first book, after aforementioned short genesis of history of Vojvodina, the author presents first years of political activity in the central and provincial institutions and organs, marked by ethnic and economic issues in Vojvodina. The already complex national composition was burdened by events during the war and war crimes committed by various factions like Hungarian fascists and later retributions by Yugoslav partisans. Propagating internationalism and “brotherhood and unity” authorities had difficulties in extinguishing different local excesses of chauvinism and disproportioned national composition of Communist party where Serbs and Montenegrins were far most numerous ethnic groups and many minorities were initially not motivated to participate. Even in communities where minorities prevailed, mostly Serbs took over local positions as representatives of authority. Trying to focus on class rather than nation and actively working on balancing the national composition authorities have been partially successful. The issues were further complicated after clash in Cominform in 1948 which resulted in Yugoslavian split with Eastern Bloc. Consequently, that further complicated ethnic relations as relations deteriorated with neighbouring communist states like Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia whose minorities were concentrated in Vojvodina. Nevertheless the economic situation in socialist province of Vojvodina presented much more troublesome question which revived autonomist tendencies and question of constitutional reforms. The

province of Vojvodina has entered second Yugoslavia as one of the most developed regions together with Slovenia and Croatia. The Yugoslav focus on investing in base industry left Vojvodina, predominantly agrarian region, neglected. Serious portion of Vojvodina’s industry has been moved outside the region due to its border and multi-ethnic character. Along with these contributors, non-modernizing remaining industrial infrastructure in the region left the province lagging behind. The distribution of funds on federal and republican level has throughout years made provincial authorities more and more displeased and has contributed to popularizing of idea of systematic changes which would let province of Vojvodina to control its own investing and financing more independently especially in regard to republican institutions. The mentioned problems that gain momentum in the 1950s slowly transcended into the question of constitutional reforms which would give province more autonomy and therefore secure economic growth. The mobilisation of autonomist representatives in Vojvodina and symbolical beginning of decades lasting conflict started with publishing of the article by Miloš Minić “Prilog diskusiji o novom ustavu”. By that time the question of constitutional rearrangements has already become a topic of discussion between political authorities of provinces and central political leaders. The article of Minić analysed the roots and genesis of existing Vojvodina’s autonomy considering that it has contributed to significant improvement in inter-ethnic relations and advocated its existence in population, historical and economical specifics of the region. His opinion was that the autonomy is and should be based as republican and not federal category, while he suggested that the autonomy should be further developed and deepened (but based on republican constitution) as he noticed the lack of realisation of possible right, especially on the field of lawgiving and also executive, where it remained merely symbolical. For some reason this article has mobilised political leaders of the province of Vojvodina who considered it to be an attempt of annulment of autonomy of the province. Different political actors like Geza

Tikvicki, Šoti Pal, Radovan Vlaković, Jožef Nad and Đuro Jovanović, who in the meeting of the Secretariat of Provincial Committee criticised mentioned article considering it first step of reduction of autonomy. Their main disagreement with the central authorities originated from the belief that autonomy of Vojvodina should be organised and developed via federal constitution, exactly contrary to the concept in Minić's article that conformed to the opinion of most representatives of the republican authorities. From this conflict originated different interpretations of genesis of autonomy of Vojvodina as well. After this event the political clash between provincial authorities and central ones gained momentum with multiple meetings and discussions through various organs and institutions of both provincial and central and even federal level. The provincial politicians of Vojvodina were divided into two fractions: one considered pro-centralist i.e. loyal to the Belgrade authorities, and the other autonomist who considered themselves Vojvodina's "patriots". The division is embodied in two leading figures: Stevan Doronjski as the leader of the so called "autonomaši", and Jovan Veselinov Žarko, highly ranking politician from Vojvodina who served as a leader of Serbian party organisation and president of republican Assembly, and embodied the centralistic stance which leaned towards reduction of provincial self-governing rights. Veselinov was considered to be the one of Ranković's people. Aleksandar Ranković, who in earlier years used to advocate the provincial autonomy but afterwards considered it to be redundant, was one of the most influential Serbian politicians at the top of the political elite, serving as organisational secretary of the central committee of League of Yugoslavia. The clash was deep at many levels as it was not just the thing of few political disagreements, but the matter of understanding of source, reason, and legitimate base of Vojvodina's autonomy. He perceived demands by part of provincial Vojvodina's authorities to be a step towards creating separate Vojvodina nation and fear of Vojvodina becoming a republic or semi republic. For Veselinov the question of Vojvodina was

essentially a Serbian question and not Yugoslavian and therefore should be addressed on republican and not federal level, especially considering that Serbs were the most numerous ethnic group in the province. The echoes of past can be well traced in this clash which is also characterised in different understanding of genesis of the autonomy and the purpose of its existence. Veselinov perceived the autonomy as a struggle of Serbian nation in 18th and 19th century and had according to him no practical use in existing circumstances. The members of provincial committee have also been divided about the issue. Opposed to aforementioned Vojvodina politicians with autonomist tendencies and their leader Doronjski, some of them like Đorđe Nikšić, Petar Relić, Đura Jovanović etc, supported the stance of central authorities. Nikšić, Relić and Jovanović criticised Doronjski leadership favouring Hungarians and his decentralist self-governing initiatives – he called them centralists and unitarists – saying that Great Serbian nationalism has been revived. Throughout the whole period of the clashes similar statements can be found on both sides to delegitimize each other: calling each other centralistic, etatist, Serbian nationalistic, separatist etc. With the influence of Ranković and Veselinov, Doronjski and part of his followers have been substituted in 1963 by new secretary of provincial committee Jojkić but the autonomist tendencies have been far from extinguished and persisted to live on as many of its idea carriers remained in provincial institutions. The majority of "autnomaši" remained and have exploited their prevalence: through the principle of position rotations they degraded their factionist opponents to less significant position, which has produced new crisis as they have swept the ranks of centralist leaning politicians in both 1963 and 1965 rotation. The author also gives us an overview of influence of various events and crisis in Yugoslavia on the province of Vojvodina. MASPOK or Croatian spring influence, student protests in 1968 and political liquidation of Aleksandar Ranković and his circle had its echo also in Vojvodina. The Matica Hrvatska as a central cultural institution had a significant role in

MASPOK which involved top tier politicians of Socialist republic of Croatia and had its impact in Vojvodina especially in certain areas where Croatian minority was concentrated in Vojvodina, where different nationalistic excesses took place. In regard to Brioni plenum which as a political consequence meant political liquidation of Ranković and his circle, politicians of Vojvodina mostly confirmed the opinions formed on Brioni plenum and also evaluating the role of their regional branches of secret services which allegedly resisted tendencies by Ranković and his people. The fall of Ranković in 1966 symbolised the victory of “autonomaši” faction and presented important step towards deeper and wider autonomy of Vojvodina.

The displeasure with economic lagging of Vojvodina remained as well, and was a subject of debates and discussions in 1960s with various analyses and comments where a minimum consensus existed that lack of investments, non-modernisation of existing industry and mostly agrarian economy, small portion of industry, unused oil and natural gas potential etc. The debate revolved around seven years plan for period of 1964 to 1970. The question of petrochemical and oil industry divided Vojvodina internally as it also caused tensions with Belgrade in regards of where the petrochemical plant and oil refinery is going to be constructed. The other pressing issue was the subject of culture, education and science as republic assembly once again confirmed controversial law which would grant only half of funds accumulated in Vojvodina for that matter and redistributed it to other regions in 1967. Similar but even worse was the situation with cinemas of Vojvodina that of all the funds they contributed to the treasury got back merely 10 percent. This mobilised authorities in Vojvodina in initiative to protect their financial interest and make more firm step against centralization.

The end of 1960s was marked by constitutional changes. The new constitution form 1963 brought changes but has not satisfied ambitions of provincial leaders. With approval and initiative of certain federal high ranking politicians like Kardelj through amendments in 1967 and 1968 significantly stretched the

autonomy and new federal, republican and provincial constitutions de facto made both provinces of Serbia almost republic being tied to central authorities very loosely. Nevertheless the last years of 1960s up until 1972 have been a period of somehow almost idyllic relations between the province of Vojvodina and central authorities, both having colloquially called “liberal” leadership but which were both politically swept in 1972 together with the leaders of MASPOK in Croatia.

The second book starts where the previous left, with constitutions proclaimed in 1974. The impact of them was immense and has caused the displeasure and initiatives of republican authorities as early as 1975. If we simplify the content of the second book, it can be said that it covers dynamics of the period marked by constant attempts of republican authorities to address the issue of political realities created by 1974, where in almost all aspects both provinces resembled separate federative units, with their own supreme courts and own representatives on federal level and presidency. Provinces enjoyed such autonomy that they lead their own international relations, had their own supreme courts, enjoyed intellectual independence as VANU (Vojvodina’s academy of art and sciences) was created and republican/state level law giving and executive power seemed reduced to symbolical minimum. When the military practice of TO (teritorijalna odbrana - territorial defence) of Vojvodina was organized without any cooperation with same organisation in the republic, this sure raised red flag especially as the Croatian TO was invited. There have been many similar cases where the republican authorities suddenly felt ignored. An unclear specification in the constitution about the competence and jurisdiction level of socialist republic of Serbia was the important contributing factor to this situation. Under the empty phrase of unity and wholeness of the republic which should be pursued, both sides had different interpretation what does that mean and the same was applied to the 300 and 301 paragraphs of constitution which was defining the legal matter and domain that should be addressed by republican laws. As we follow political development, we see first

republican initiatives addressed more concrete and specific application of constitution with the accent on realisation of unity and wholeness of the republic (even though as mentioned consensus about what that means between provincial and republican leaders was not achieved except for more trivial areas). The author than sheds light on previously unknown details of very influential and controversial incident colloquially referred to as “Plava knjiga” (The Blue book). Incident started in 1975 with the initiative of republican leadership of making an analysis of how well the realization of cooperation and unity between provinces and republic is going, as well as of practical aspects of application of constitution of SR of Serbia. The colloquial name “Plava knjiga” came from the blue covers of the book itself. The formed commission that was put in charge compiled vast material on constitutional position and practice of Socialist republic of Serbia and its autonomous provinces. The conclusions of the commission evoked negative reactions in provincial leaderships as they claimed that constitutional solutions are not applied in practice as they should be, while also claiming that autonomy of the provinces is developing on expense of republican sovereignty. The repetitive pattern of cliché like discredit phrases was once again used by provincial leaderships which called conclusions tendentious, nationalistic, centralistic etc. That was the first serious attempt of undermining and revising political realities by republican leadership even though due to the political climate have not seriously gone in way of challenging constitutional solutions as much as it insisted on different application and realisation. In 1977 with interference of top tier federal politics the conceptions of “Plava knjiga” have been marked as unacceptable and temporarily the republican initiatives have been put to stop. The political issues in the province of Kosovo with the rise of nationalism and disorder in 1981 presented a chance for republican leaders to try once again to address constitutional issue. The republican leadership interpreted problems in province of Kosovo as a direct result of constitution of 1974 position of provinces and the unresolved issues

rooted in it, especially the unclearly defined jurisdiction of republican authorities, which served them as a new base to readdress the same matter as few years earlier. Naturally, provincial authorities of Vojvodina fiercely opposed that interpretation disqualifying republican claims of disintegration, and claiming that inter-ethnic relations in Vojvodina are on very good level. This started new political discussions which echoed both in media and spilled into territory of culture and science. The antagonism was further fuelled through newspapers *Politika* and *Dnevnik*, first promoting republican and second Vojvodina’s views. The issue of Vojvodina making its own Encyclopaedia of Vojvodina was in eyes of the republic’s representatives seen as another step in creation of separate Vojvodina nation while the conflict also spread to question of how should both provinces of Serbia be marked and presented in the Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia. The theatre show *Golubnjača* which dramatizes Croatian-Serb relations in hinterlands of Dalmatia after the World war II and massive Ustasha crimes, became another subject of dispute which communist authorities of Novi Sad considered controversial, nationalistic and against the parole of “brotherhood in unity” and have forbid it. This was just another issue which media used to further fuel the antagonisms. Even though the republican representatives officially avoided any stance, this definitely mobilised cultural workers in fierce debate. With shorter periods of alleged approximation towards political consensus which mostly touched less important fields, the representatives could not reach agreements on most important questions. The pressure of unresolved issues has in 1985 put in motion the presidency of League of communists of Yugoslavia which leaned more towards republican side. The discourse of reforming or changing constitution has during those years remained mostly peripheral and tabooed. The important step in the development represents 1986 political change of generations in SR of Serbia. The wind of changes brought two hardliners Ivan Stambolić and Slobodan Milošević with definite centralistic and nationalistic views. Their political rise brought

more direct addressing of possible constitutional changes which have for years been considered anti federalist, centralistic etc. Stambolić was later politically removed in 1987 by the same person he brought into politics - Milošević. The event is controversial especially because of the still not completely clear role of present Vojvodina's provincial politicians on the 8th meeting of League of communists of Serbia. Abstaining voting was considered highly unorthodox, but that was precisely what Vojvodina's representatives did. Author presents us with different interpretations of what was happening: from rationalisations that they would not want to interfere into internal republican political clashes, up to the fact that they considered Stambolić to be the one embodying centralistic and nationalistic tendencies. This event meant further rise of Milošević and consolidation of his power. The next step in relations between Vojvodina and the republic was once again influenced by the province of Kosovo. With the so called "meetings of solidarity" where Serbs of Kosovo try to inform people and authorities of Vojvodina of their problems, pressuring the leadership of Vojvodina to succumb to demands of republic leadership, and claiming that constitutional change is the solution. The "meetings of solidarity" with Serbs from Kosovo and numerous local population in different cities and villages in Vojvodina became a regular thing and pressure was increasing for the autonomist leadership until the "Yoghurt revolution" where the leadership of Vojvodina was forced by the aggressive mass to resign in 1988. This process made it possible for Milošević to install leadership loyal to him and consolidated his strength and revising the constitution.

Aljoša Rebrača

doi: 10.19090/i.2023.34.212-219

© Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, 2023

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL
RESEARCHES 34, 212-219