

# THE PRILUŽJE ENCLAVE: A CONSTRUCTION OF LOCAL IDENTITY

Biljana SIKIMIĆ<sup>1</sup>

COBISS 1.01

## ABSTRACT

### **The Priluzje Enclave: A Construction of Local Identity**

The present study examines a view of the “Other” in the enclave of Priluzje (Kosovo). The image of the “Other” was obtained by qualitative analysis of interviews made with Serbs in this enclave.

KEYWORDS: Serbs, Kosovo, Other, enclave

## IZVLEČEK

### **Enklava Priluzje: Oblikovanje lokalne identitete**

Prispevek s pomočjo kvalitativne analize obravnava poglede na »druge«, izoblikovane v diskurzu Srbov v enklavi Priluzje na Kosovu.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: Srbi, Kosovo, »drugi«, enklava

## INTRODUCTION: SITUATING THE FIELDWORK

In the summer of 2003 when the fieldwork in the Priluzje enclave was done, the station in Priluzje could be reached twice a day by train from Zvečane.<sup>2</sup> The train also stopped in Plemetina. However, Priluzje was additionally connected to other villages in the enclave (Grace, Babin Most, Janina Voda and Crkvena Vodica) by a school bus. Most of the interviews took place in Priluzje, while due to the difficulties with transport connections, research in Grace, Babin Most and Plemetina was reduced to only half a day and a handful of interviewees.

**Babin Most** is a Serbian-Albanian village in the foothills of Mt. Kopaonik, 18 km northwest of Priština. It is mentioned in the Turkish census of the Province of the Serbian Despot Đurađ Branković from 1455 as *Babinos*, with 33 Serbian houses and the priest Radivoje heading the list. On January 13, 1530, the Austrian travel writer Benedict Kuripešić spent a night in the village of “Babinos in Kosovo Polje” upon his return from

---

<sup>1</sup> Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Balkan Studies, Kneza Mihaila 35/4, 11000 Belgrade, e-mail: biljana.sikimic@sanu.ac.yu.

<sup>2</sup> The article results from work on the project “Ethnic and Social Stratification of the Balkans”, No 148011, financed by Serbian Ministry of Science.

Constantinople. The village was later deserted, probably by the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. It was reconstructed around 1800 as the chiflik (Ottoman-Turkish economic system characterized by a money-goods relationship) or feudal estate of the Džinić family from Priština. Serbian clans listed in the first half of the twentieth century (1935) had originally come from various areas, while the Albanians came from Golak around Priština and belonged to the Berisha *fis*, or clan. There were also a few houses of Ashkalia (Albanian-speaking Roma). The village is divided into the Gornja Mahala or upper quarter, the Donja or lower Mahala and *Kod bunara* – By the Well (Urošević 1965: 141–142). At the beginning of the twentieth century all Serbs were in the chiflik system and had to forfeit one-fourth of their wheat and hay (Mikić 1988: 179).

The village of **Grace** is divided into Gornja Mahala, Donja Mahala and *Otud potoka* [From the Stream], which emerged later. It was a feudal estate whose population changed over time, but nevertheless, “two indigenous or very old settler clans of Christian Orthodox Gypsies remained” (Urošević 1965: 187–188). According to anthropologist-geographer Atanasije Urošević, in the mid-twentieth century the clans of Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Grace were: the Živići (2 houses, whose *slava* [family patron saint’s day] was St. Basil) and who were indigenous, the Vučovići (20 houses, St. Basil), indigenous, the Nastovići, old settlers from Gusinja (7 houses, St. Nicholas), the Đorđevići, moved from Samodreža around 1820 (14 houses, St. Basil), and the Staniškovci or Skovrani who settled from Letanac in Lab, originally from the Leskovac area (3 houses, St. Basil). Archives dating from 1912 list 18 Serbian and 15 Albanian settler families in the village of Grace at the beginning of the twentieth century (Mikić 1988: 181).

**Plemetina** is a mixed Serbian-Albanian village in the valley between the Lab and Sitnica rivers, 12 km northwest of Priština. It is mentioned in the charter granted by King Milutin to Banjska in 1315. In the 1455 Turkish census of the Branković Province it is called Plametino with 22 Serbian houses and a priest, Nikola. It is mentioned several times between 1765 and 1780 in the Memorial Book of Deviç Monastery. In the village are the ruins of an old church with old graves; the new village church was built in 1971 (Ivanović 1987: 501). The village is divided into a Gornja and Donja Mahala and the Mahala Bragačije, settled by *Muhadžiri* (Muslim colonists). The mahala was founded in 1878. There are no indigenous clans since it was in the chiflik system and the feudal lords of the estate were the Šeremetovići family from Peć and later an Albanian family, the Šiškovići from Vučitrn. The Serbian clans came from various areas. There are also some colonists from the period between the two world wars, as well as Christian Orthodox and Muslim Gypsies. The Albanian settlers originate mainly from the Toplica region in Serbia (Urošević 1965: 267; Mikić 1988: 180).

**Prilužje** is a Serbian village at the confluence of the Lab and Sitnica rivers, 12 km southeast of Vučitrn. In the Turkish census of the Branković Province from 1455, it is mentioned as the large village of Priluža with 53 Serbian houses, and it is also mentioned in the Memorial Book of Deviç Monastery in Drenica in 1761 and 1775. On the site of the old place of worship, *Sveta Nedelja* [Holy Sunday], a new church of the same name was inaugurated in 1969. There are traces of two more old churches (Ivanović 1987: 512). The

village is divided into a Gornja and Donja Mahala, and the indigenous clan is the Mašić family (3 houses celebrating their *slava* or patron saint's day on the feast of St. John the Baptist). It was the chiflik of the Mehmudbegović family from Peć. Apart from a few houses of Muslim Roma, Serbs were mainly settled here from different areas (Urošević 1965: 273). In the early twentieth century Priluzje was inhabited only by Serbs and the agas [minor Turkish feudal lords] of the village were Aslan and Liman-beg Mehmudbegović from Peć (Mikić 1988: 180).

**Cr(k)vena Vodica** is a Serbian-Albanian village in the foothills of Mt. Čičavica, 8 km west of Priština. An earlier name for the village was Crvena Vodica. Serbs from "Crvena" or "Careva Vodica" were registered as donors in the Memorial Book of Devič monastery several times from 1763 to 1780. The remains of the old church and graveyard with stone crosses are in the village (Ivanović 1987: 541). The village was probably deserted for a certain time and was reconstructed at the beginning of nineteenth century. The Menići clan is regarded as an indigenous family that was displaced and then brought back, while the Albanians belong to the Berisha *fis*. The Serbian clans are settlers and there are also some Gypsies (Urošević 1965: 312–313). At the beginning of the twentieth century all Serbian households were in the chiflik system (Mikić 1988: 138). *Janina Voda* is a small village dating from 1860 when the Kovačani clan from Kopaonička Šalja bought the land. It is regarded as a hamlet of Crvena Vodica (Urošević 1965: 216), and at the beginning of the twentieth century it numbered 3 Serbian households with their land (Mikić 1988: 181).

In the research in the Priluzje enclave and the surrounding villages the focus of scholarly curiosity was the complexity of ethnic relations prior to 1999. The present study examines a one-sided view of the "Other", as only Serbs were interviewed in this enclave, which is still mixed today. The image of the "Other" that was obtained through analysis of the interviews does not aspire to universality, unless the well-preserved traditional culture in the Priluzje enclave and surrounding villages is taken as a safe indicator that the individual opinions of elderly, less educated people may reflect the attitude of the whole community.<sup>3</sup>

## **THE OTHER IN TRADITIONAL CULTURE AND IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT**

The traditional semiotic binary opposition *own* : *alien* is today analyzed as if it were on a sliding scale, and the alien/stranger/other may be less or more formally alien depending on the point s/he occupies in time and/or space.

---

<sup>3</sup> In this kind of field studies, a problem-centred approach to interviewing is intended to neutralise the contradiction between steering the conversation by theory and a completely open approach. Communication strategies were aimed at a subjective approach to the problem. The narratives thus stimulated were enriched through dialogue and the use of imaginary and semi-structured prompts. Theoretical knowledge is developed by using elastic concepts, further developed through empirical analysis (cf. Wietzel 2000).

Slavic ethnolinguistic research has shown that in a traditional folk culture the image of someone ethnically or confessionally alien can be described with the help of a standard pattern. This can be selected from a series of main positions by which a community “recognizes” the alien. These are: outward appearance, smell, absence of soul, supernatural attributes, language, and inappropriate behaviour from the point of view of local tradition. However, Slavic material shows that there is a specific hierarchy in attitudes towards the alien; it is divided into an attitude towards the “other” and towards the “alien”. The positive meaning of the foreigner’s folkloric image (as the bringer of abundance, health, fertility etc.) is based on his “alien-ness”. Hence, foreigners are effective in various rituals and works of magic (Belova 2002: 71, 81). Tradition attracts and uses “aliens”, while behaving indifferently to “Others”, and so the attribute “Other” becomes almost neutral. However, “alien” is a marked element, in many cases effective and important within the system that the bearer of tradition experiences as his or her “own”. There is reference also to a specific “bilingualism of characteristics/attributes” – the ascribing of additional characteristics across cultural spheres. While in the area of “learnt culture”, the perception of Jews as “alien, damned and the like” survives, in the area of everyday culture there is a complex idea of “our own aliens” who are always to hand and can cooperate in everyday life, above all in magic, more so than “Others”. There is reason to presume the existence of great differences in the traditional culture of local communities in the Slavic world, conditioned both by the concrete reasons of history and the mechanisms of a general mythologisation of foreigners or people of different religions (Belova 2002: 83; 1997). Among the Slavs, however, it seems impossible to reconstruct the figure of a person of specifically different ethnic background in a particular local community using standard methodological procedures, except as the figure of a faceless foreigner, without his ethnic, religious or regional traits. Each local community has its own complex system for marking others, and this system proves to be changeable in the diachronic perspective.

In this article, the “foreigner/alien” is not viewed in his traditional role of guest or in any other role that is characteristic for traditional culture. The image of the other was constructed spontaneously in conversation or, more rarely, in answer to a direct question. To analyze the image of the “other” from the material recorded among Serbs in the Priluzje enclave, we took only statements about “others”, “aliens” who speak the same (Serbian) language, i.e., who have the same language identity.

Conversation about “others”, about neighbours with whom one does not marry or did not marry “before”, reflects the traditional concept of the relation between “us” and “others”. In contemporary linguistic-anthropological writing the researcher is also the subject of attention as the third party, thus further impairing the binary opposition. The limitations on the researcher-outsider are due not only to lack of knowledge of the language or the local vernacular; they often result from mutual misunderstanding between the representatives of the local culture (about the purpose of the research itself) and the researcher (about the scholarly presentation of “private” conversations with the informant). Older local ethnographic and historiographic sources were used to complement transcripts of the constructed subjective image of Priluzje, whereas the applied linguistic

methodology and lexicographic sources are seen as being more objective, or at any rate less subjective.

We will try here to take into consideration local knowledge and the social or psychological distance of the interviewee from the problem. Oral histories provide a sort of barometer of history, proof that members of the local community have noticed that things have changed, that certain historical changes have taken place. Oral history cannot explain how these changes came about, but it can indicate how the local community dealt with them. Transcripts of oral history are constructed stories with a co-narrator, not the pure narrative of an experienced story-teller. The researcher wishes to build his or her own coherent picture. We are faced with the peculiar “hegemony of the researcher” which limits the informant (Agar 2005: 15). The limitations thus imposed affect the very topic of the conversation, depending on what the researcher wants the narrative to become. A closer reading of transcripts reveals elements of co-construction of the local discourse and the researcher’s contribution to its success or failure. Deixis (understood as socio-psychological distance) is another reason for limitation of local discourse. It is affected by the closeness of the narrator – physical, social or psychological – to the events of which s/he speaks, since the location in time and space, the psycho-social location, the coordinates of the events observed and of oral histories all differ.

In their approach to researching ethnic conflict in Kosovo, anthropologists indicate the need to include the urban/rural dichotomy, but also to take into consideration the traditional context: religion, family, kinship, tribalism, gender etc. (Duijzings 2000: 20–21).

The Priluzje enclave has preserved several interesting and distinctive characteristics that deserve the researcher’s serious attention: a characteristic cult of the dead which drapes tombstones in items of clothing, complex systems of customs in the circle of life (postmortem and for weddings), an archaic manner of inviting people to their *slava*, the cult of St. Ionnachius and the Devič monastery in the Drenica hinterland, or the well preserved epic saga of the Battle of Kosovo. Nevertheless, the ethnic diversity and ethnic mingling that still take place around Priluzje today seem particularly relevant for an approach to the problem of “enclaveness”.

## **THE CONCEPT OF HONOUR AND DISGRACE IN CONSTRUCTING THE IMAGE OF THE OTHER**

Local concepts of honour and disgrace in Priluzje emerged in conversations without any authorial intervention by the researcher. Here, the interviewee is probing the researcher’s knowledge of local circumstances, and getting negative answers, constructs an image on his own:

[1] The Kovačani are people whose surname is Kovačević, but they were in Kovačica village up beyond, you don’t know where that is? (No.) Through Zvečane, Kovačica. They fell out with the Šiptari there and left, and now they are called Kovačani, some

were in the village of Sibovac, some in the village of Plemetina, some were in the village of Bivoljak, here and there. And the Drobnjaks, the Drobnjaks are the ones who celebrate their slava on St. George's Day and the Prophet Elijah's day. And who the Drobnjaks are, you don't know? (No, I haven't heard that at all). The Drobnjaks are, it's the tribe and the seed of Vuk Branković. Remember that. The seed of Vuk Branković is cursed because it was cursed by the mothers, wives, sisters, all who lost sons, sisters who lost brothers, wives who lost husbands at the Battle of Kosovo, they cursed him: For your treachery at Kosovo, may God grant, Vuk Branković, that your seed, breed and generation be cursed while the world turns and the ages pass. And cursed it was, see, six hundred years have passed and three hundred more must pass, since it goes to the ninth generation. And that's the seed of the Drobnjaks, it's what they were called, but the seed is of Vuk Branković. Well, even now his family hasn't had one member that wasn't born blind, crippled, deaf, or dumb, handicapped, and that's the tribe of Vuk Branković. A man from Slakovac village came here to us in Priluzje thirty years ago, twenty years they kept their handicapped son, he couldn't get up, or stand up, or talk, the seed of Vuk Branković. Well, well, well, later one son died, left two children and a wife, the second son died, a son and two daughters and that daughter of the second son was supposed to marry our cousin. The girl was normal and all, and she married here with us and had a handicapped child with us, from her tribe. No matter it wasn't in their house, but it's their seed and she came to my cousin and had a handicapped child, there has to be some consequence. A girl from Kuzmin married during the occupation in Priluzje, had a handicapped daughter and be that as it may, she found a man, and he's no good, she married him. Handicapped, see. And she's from Vuk Branković's tribe too, that seed is cursed. See what it did, Vuk Branković and his tribe and seed, they celebrate St. George's Day, and I told my nephew, ask which [family] celebrates St. George's Day or *Ilijindan* [Elijah's Day] in August, don't take her, it's Vuk Branković's tribe. It'll have to come out, either in their house or in another house where she goes, it'll have to come out that she's not right. (136-Priluzje-14-BS)

Many folklorists and historians have researched the tailoring of historic facts and the creation of the myth of betrayal by Vuk Branković at the Battle of Kosovo, as well as his primal sin and that of his descendants.<sup>4</sup> There are many local legends about the fate of certain places and their inhabitants in relation to Lazar's curse (see Đurić 1989: 72–75).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. for example Ljubinković 1989: 136–152. For the curse of the Brankovići see: Pešikan-Ljuštanović 2002: 64–66. For Lazar's curse see especially Loma 2002: 166–172, on the far-reaching consequences of the curse and its extension to the traitor's descendants see Loma 2002: 167, illustrated by Đurđe Branković's daughter who languished a long time because Lazar's curse had fallen upon her grandfather, Vuk Branković, until she was healed by Ionnachius of Devič. For the historical facts on the anti-hero of Kosovo, Vuk Branković, and the legend see: Mihaljčić 1989: 109–124, which includes further literature on the origin of the myth of Vuk Branković's perfidy. For the motive of betrayal at the Battle of Kosovo, 1389, see Mihaljčić 1989: 127–147. The problem of Vuk Branković's treachery was the subject of a series of studies by historian Momčilo Spremić (e.g. Spremić 1991, 1992, 1996, 1998).

Many of these legends are etiological and paraetiological, reflecting the identification of the “heroic age” with that of the earliest mythical beginnings (Loma 2002: 153).

The legend from Priluzje has parallels in Metohija. In the oral tradition of the Dabižljević clan from the old village of Drsnik in northern Metohija, two main figures appear: the founder of the dynasty, *Vojvoda* [Duke] Daba, killed at Kosovo, and in another, later generation another “crippled” Daba, since whom there is “always someone crippled in the tribe” (Loma 2002: 156). In the village of Prilep near Dečani, the Dabići, “Albanians living in Dabaj Mahala, are descendents of the Serbian Duke Daba who was at the Battle of Kosovo in 1389. They also recount that they are kin to the Dabići from the village of Drsnik near Klina, who are Serbs and who claim to be Daba’s descendents. They say that in those days there were two brothers: Daba and Kraso, and so the Dabići are descended from Daba and the Krasnići from Krasa. They further say that there were always two or three lame people in the Dabići tribe” (Džogović 1985: 489).

The interviews conducted in Priluzje locate the Kosovo Drobnjak family in the villages of Slakovce and Kuzmin, or links the Drobnjak clan to the *slavas* of St. George’s Day and the Prophet Elijah.<sup>5</sup> In his “Dictionary of Dialects of Kosovo-Metohija” (Elezović 1932, s. v. Drobnjak), Gliša Elezović confirms that the Drobnjaks are “all who celebrate St. George’s Day.” Anthropologist-geographer Atanasije Urošević confirms the existence of the Drobnjak clan in Kosovo. There were 5 houses in Kuzmin that celebrated St. George’s Day and the Prophet Elijah. Due to oppression, they moved from Drobnjak (near Nerodimlje) to Mala Slatina, and then to Kuzmin in the mid-nineteenth century. The founding clan of the village of Slakovce were the Drobnjaks. There were 18 houses celebrating St. George’s Day. Originally from Drobnjak, they later lived in Preseke (Stari Kolašin), from where they moved to Slakovce in the eighteenth century (Urošević 1965: 209, 226, 292).<sup>6</sup>

Anthropo-geographical material contains much data on the Kovačani clan in Kosovo.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The sound archives of the Serbian Language Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU) contains recordings of conversations with people born in the villages of Vrnica and Bukoš (301-K-Mitrovica-1-ML, 303-K-Vrnica-1-ML) by Miloš Luković. Both interviewees are originally from the village of Drobnjak, celebrate St. George’s Day and their “little *slava*” is Elijah’s Day. Recent fieldwork in Ibarski Kolašin shows that in this area it is the Bosnians who are regarded as descendants of Vuk Branković.

<sup>6</sup> From other data provided by this anthropologist-geographer, it could be reconstructed that there were also Drobnjaks in Kosovo in the following villages: Babin Most – 3 houses, Vrnica – 11 houses, Gojbulja – 12 houses, Nevoljane – 1 house, Novo Selo Begovo – 6 houses, Novo Selo Mađunsko – 4 houses, Ugljare – 5 houses (Urošević 1965: 142, 171, 177, 252, 255, 256, 310–311). According to summary in the same study, there were 12 clans and 70 houses of immigrants from Drobnjak (Urošević 1965: 72). There are also twentieth-century colonists in Kosovo from Drobnjak, but it is not likely that they are linked to the legend of Vuk Branković. They are probably regarded as “Montenegrins”. According to the tradition of the Serbs from the Drim river valley, the Staletović clan from the village of Zojčić – one house celebrating *Djurdjic* (Renovation of the Church of St. George) and St. George’s day – are descendants of Vuk Branković “who sold the Serbs to the Turks and took the money” (Vukanović 1986: 430).

<sup>7</sup> Urošević mentions the Kovačani clan in Babin Most, Bivoljak, Vrnica, Glavotina, Janina Voda,

Urošević (1965: 118) notices that “Serbs do not have endogamy in their clans [...] This is so in the Kovačani clan, which is divided into the Pantići, Mićolci and Lazići, but there is still no intermarriage.” The village of Bivoljak is mentioned in an account from Priluzje, and anthropo-geographic research in 1934 registered the Kovačani clan with four houses and celebrating Sts. Cosmas and Damian. They were moved from Kovačica (Kopaonička Šalja) on to chiflik land around 1830 and their earlier origins were in Montenegro. At that time there were also four houses of Kovačani in Premetina celebrating Sts. Cosmas and Damian and who moved from the village of Kovačica around 1840. There were nine houses of Kovačani in Sibovac, celebrating Sts. Cosmas and Damian, who moved from Kovačica around 1860. Their earlier origin was in Montenegro (Urošević 1965: 153, 267, 289).<sup>8</sup>

### THE CONCEPT OF CLAN: SEED, TRIBE, GENERATION

The construction of the local identity in Priluzje is still based on traditional moral categories – on the concept of clan and on the concept of honour<sup>9</sup> – which are here directly related to undesirable human characteristics. In local discourse, these are not stratified according to linguistic criteria.<sup>10</sup> Negative physical and character traits are conceived of

---

Plemetina and Sibovac. The Kovačani, therefore, also lived in places not mentioned in conversations in Priluzje: there were two houses of Kovačani in Babin Most, one in Vrnica, 11 in Glavotina, and only the Kovačani clan lived in Janina Voda – six houses. They were all moved from Kovačica to Kopaonička Šalja at the beginning of the nineteenth century; they were originally from Montenegro and celebrated the feast of Sts. Cosmas and Damian (Urošević 1965: 142, 171–172, 175, 216).

<sup>8</sup> A particular type of clan stratification by *slava* existed among the Metohija Serbs. The following example comes from the town of Peć: “Serbs are here divided into tribes according to their *slava*, and the most numerous are: Nikolčani (celebrating St. Nicholas), Jovančani (celebrating St. John), Arhandelovčani (celebrating the Archangel Michael), Đorđevčani (celebrating St. George), Petkovčani, (celebrating St. Petka), Aleksandrovičani (celebrating St. Alexandar), Lučevčani (St. Luke), Vračevčani (Cosmas and Damian) etc.” (The Constantinople Herald, III/29, Constantinople, 21 August 1897).

<sup>9</sup> Lexicologist Stana Ristić points out that the battlefield unites the concepts of honour and disgrace (personal responsibility to ethical principles). In literary Serbian and the language of folklore, they appear in examples such as: an *honourable hero*, *to die honourably*, *the field of honour*, *it is disgraceful to flee from battle*, which gives these concepts a universal value handed down from ancient times. In this case, the parallel ideas of “honour” and “disgrace” are founded in “inner shame”, which gives a positive connotation to words of this meaning. The feeling of shame as a conscious regulator of one’s behaviour is the same as the moral norm that guides a person to conduct him or herself honourably. This awareness of personal responsibility to the community appears among speakers of the Serbian language as a moral norm peculiar not only to soldiers, but to the best kind of people (Ristić 2003: 249–250).

<sup>10</sup> Contemporary Serbian lexicology takes into consideration the situation-dependence of undesirable human characteristics, but separates the physical from the spiritual, cf. Dragičević 2001: 170–180. This lexicological study (Dragičević 2001: 193–216) also introduces a hierarchical structure of adjectives describing human characteristics in literary Serbian, primarily determined by urban culture, which can be used for comparison with dialectal speech, still determined today by the traditional culture.

as a unique complex of the consequences of an ancestor's mythical sin and its secondary collectivisation (cf. discourse excerpt quoted above).

The Priluzje affirmation of the *seme i pleme* (seed and breed [tribe]) formula is probably of South-Slav origin since it is not assonant in Proto-Slavonic.<sup>11</sup> In construction or reconstruction, oral discourse relies on folklore tradition, and hence the folklore appellation of the anti-hero with the inevitable curse:<sup>12</sup>

For your treachery at Kosovo, may God grant, Vuk Branković, that your seed, breed and future generations be cursed while the world turns and the ages pass.

The duration of such a curse has a specific time limit (while the world turns and the ages pass). As a generation is considered to cover a period of a hundred years, the duration of this curse has been calculated in folklore terms to nine hundred years (six hundred and three hundred); the number nine is used in South-Slav tradition to signify “a very great number.”

The curse and its consequences are expounded in the discourse, showing how the collective sin is transferred to the individual, from the general to the specific. In Priluzje, “one's own” is also defined as a complex of desirable moral and physical traits: from a healthy family, an honest one, a hardworking child.

## **OTHERS IN KOSOVO: SRBIJANCI**

The image of Srbijanci (Serbs from Serbia proper) as “others” was constructed spontaneously in conversation, as a digression when talking of Serbian Gypsies, since the local ban on marriages does not apply to them. The local ban on Kosovar marriages used to refer to all Serbian newcomers, Serbs who were not native Kosovars, i.e. Srbijanci, Montenegrins, colonists, Šopovi (inhabitants of the Šop region on the borders of Serbia, Bulgaria and Macedonia). By including the Moravci in this list, a local Priluzje identity is easily constructed, narrower than the regional:

[2] They are Christian Orthodox, but we called them Serbian Gypsies. Serbian Gypsies. And then, bit by bit – they never married our girls – they brought in Srbijanke [Serbian women from Serbia Proper] from over there. They brought them from Serbia, all Srbijanke. (White, so they're not Gypsies?) No, Srbijanke, white, if you only knew, oof! These women didn't pay attention to that, that they were Serbian Gypsies, but we Kosovars did. Their men didn't marry into us, and we didn't marry our women into them, no. They didn't give us [their women] and our men didn't take them either. A Serbian Gypsy, how could you take her? Having Gypsies coming to

<sup>11</sup> For more details on the semantic development of South Slavic *seed* (“seme”) that acquired meaning *clan* and the semantic relationship of *seed and tribe*, see: Bjeletić 1999: 55–56; for *generation* [kolen] see Bjeletić 1999: 56–60.

<sup>12</sup> Contemporary use of curses in Serbian language is treated by Petrović 1997.

visit you? That's it. But with these Srbijanke from Serbia, they did. And now they have a mixture, such Srbijanke, such beautiful women! (It's a mixture now?) A mixture, all white women, look, we have them from Stari Obilić too, they are here in a refugee camp, what a woman, blond, can't take your eyes off of her, and he's a Gypsy, a Gypsy. But there it is. (139-K-Premetina-5-BS)

[3] (Whom else couldn't women marry?) We wouldn't let them marry Srbijanci, for example from Župa. Some people from Župa moved to our village and our people wouldn't let you marry a Srbijanac. Kosovars marry through friendships, like, you recommend me to someone and so on. Here and there, there was a good girl, a good family, good parents, the girl would be good, hardworking, healthy, it wasn't good to be thin back then, but healthy, fat, strong, to work, to hoe. Here and there, there was a good girl, hardworking, and so on through friendship, and you wouldn't get to see the boy at all, your folks married you off and off you went. (127-K-Priluzje-4-BS)

[4] Both the Ashkalia and the pure Roma people, they didn't use to marry into one another before, the Ashkalia and the Roma, and now they do, like we marry Montenegrins or Srbijanci. (139-K-Premetina-5-BS)

[5] Yes, for the Moravci to see them, oh, what an idea, no! Then we [women] didn't marry Montenegrins either, it was not our faith, our folks, oh no! How could you marry one, a Montenegrin's not of our faith. (And where are there Montenegrins in the vicinity?) Well, they used to be everywhere, everywhere. Mainly in Priština, the town was there, people went to school and... And they would be looking at each other. And the village girls would go to the market, there were pretty village girls, you'd go to the market, but on foot. (127-K-Priluzje-4-BS)

The expected social distance between indigenous inhabitants and newcomers in Kosovo has already been the subject of scientific research (cf. Zlatanović 2004). Relations and clashes between the native population and the colonists have been described by an anthropologist-geographer:

Between the two World Wars intermarriage (among colonists and Kosovar Serbs) were such that usually Kosovar Serb men married into the colonists, since they could take girls from them without money, while the reverse was rare because the custom among Kosovar Serbs was to ask for money in compensation for the girl. Buying a girl was abolished after the national war of liberation, but even before World War II, Kosovar Serbs had begun to depart from this custom as one having outlived its usefulness. Nevertheless, there are no strong relationships between the colonists and Kosovar Serbs even today. Differences in how households are run, differences in dress (national costume) and a certain mutual disparagement stand in the way of stronger relationships. The colonists view Kosovar Serbs as backward, while Kosovar Serbs view colonists as newcomers who have not adjusted to the rules and circumstances of their new home. Costume is an obstacle to these marriages since the bride must give up her national costume. And so almost all Montenegrin

women, women from Lika and other women from colonists' homes who married Kosovars had to start wearing Kosovo-Serbian costume almost immediately after the wedding. (Urošević 1965: 110–111; see also Petrović 1990).<sup>13</sup>

A cultural distance also exists in relation to the latest wave of migrations, cf. the linguistic marking: “*our / people*”, compared with: *these ones who escaped from Croatia*:

[6] Here in the village are Shiptars, up there Shiptars, and here too, we are surrounded, but nobody's ever said anything bad to us. (And were there any cases of marriage?) With a Shiptar girl? (Or the other way around?) No, our people here, no, but these ones who escaped from Croatia, yes, they took a Shiptar girl here. (You still have those refugees here?) Yes, here in the camp, there are, they took a Shiptar girl. (You still have the refugee camp?) Yes, over there. Kosovo B. (Kosovo B has refugees from Croatia?) Yes, it has. It has, trust me. He has a Shiptar wife, he has. (139-K-Plemetina-5-BS)

## **OTHERS IN KOSOVO: SERBIAN GYPSIES**

The image of the inhabitants of the village of Grace also emerged as the result of co-construction by the researcher and interviewees from Plemetina and Priluzje. While researching the Priluzje enclave in Grace, the topic of identity was never explicitly imposed in conversations. The researcher discovered the existence of the problem of negative marking in this village while working with displaced persons in the *Radinac* refugee centre in Smederevo. Personal contact with people from Grace who had been placed in this centre helped greatly with making contact and establishing trust in later work in the enclave. In order to receive an answer to the sensitive question of the identity of the inhabitants of Grace, the researcher asked guiding questions of interviewees from other villages in the enclave. The deixis was marked (*the ones from Grace, these people from Grace*), but the questions were not explicit.

[7] (What was your relationship with these people from Grace?) From Grace? Ah, well, those are these people, a bit like Gypsies. But they speak Serbian, our language, celebrate slava and we got on well. We didn't have anything. – We didn't marry each other. – We didn't marry into them or give in marriage, yes, as if it was another religion, but they are really Serbs, just the colour was different, black. (132-K-Priluzje-10-BS)

[8] (Tell me, can they take women from Grace?) From Grace? They can. (Did they ever take one?) Well, some did, those are these people in Grace, they are good Serbs,

<sup>13</sup> For immigration of Montenegrins to Kosovo cf. ethnological research by Radovanović 2004 and Radojičić 2004.

they are good people, good Serbs, honest. Workers and all, in my opinion. It's close, not far, they go around Serbia, take wives. They take them from Kragujevac, Niš, Prokuplje, Kuršumlija, the women. (I was there the day before yesterday, I saw that all the women are from different parts.) From different parts, yes, yes. They are black men and the women are white. It's a crossbred race. Did you see it? (136-K-Priluzje-14-BS)

These segments of transcript open up the comparatively unresearched question of the ethnic origin of Grace's inhabitants.<sup>14</sup> At the turn of the twentieth century, Jovan Cvijić (1996: 432) having no information of his own on the villages around Priluzje, gave the number of Serbian houses based on the lists of the Metropolitan, or Orthodox Archbishopric: *Priluzje 27 Serbian houses, Plemetina 12 Serbian houses, Grace 17 Serbian houses*, in which the figure for Grace certainly refers to those of Christian Orthodox denomination.

A history of political correctness runs parallel to the history of scientific interest in the identity of Serbian Gypsies. *Đorgovci* or *Jorgovci* (in Preševo – *Karađorđevci*) are viewed in ethnographic literature as “Gypsies”, whose native language is mainly Serbian, but until the nineteenth century there were some whose native language was Roma. According to oral report, they come from a nomadic herdsman's *ćaja* the Jorgo. In the twentieth century they lived in southern Serbia, in Kosovo and Metohija, and in Macedonia, and it is assumed that they once lived in Montenegro as well. They are indigenous inhabitants and work in farming and as blacksmiths. In addition, they work in agriculture as wage labourers (Vukanović 1983: 140). In Izmornik in Kosovo they are called *Kiseli* (“Sour”) (Vukanović 1983: 141).

Ethnologist and romanologist Tatomir Vukanović has dealt in detail with the question of “converting Gypsies into Serbs.” He mentions examples from Kosovska Mitrovica where Serbianisation took place in the nineteenth century through assimilation by marriage; in Metohijski Podgor “there are occasional Serbianised Gypsies, mainly *Đorgovci*”; in Prizrenski Podgor, and especially in Suva Reka, the *Đorgovci* “vigorously declare themselves as Serbs, and are in fact assimilated with the Serbs.” In Orahovac in Metohija at the end of the nineteenth century, “there were about forty houses of Christian Orthodox Gypsies who became Serbs.”<sup>15</sup> In the Vokš area (the village of Loćani), near Dečani monastery, the Antići clan are “Serbianised Gypsies”, who in addition to farming engaged in carpentry and wood engraving; in Gnjilane the *Đorđević* clan are “Serbianised Gypsies” (Vukanović 1983: 96–97).

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, *Đorgovci* in the south of Serbia were in the *chiflik* system. The village houses of the *Đorgovci* and *Mađupi* stood in groups, the

<sup>14</sup> For the full complexity of the ethnic background in the village of Grace, contained *passim* in an analysis of attitudes towards Circassians in the Priluzje enclave, see Sikimić 2004: 277.

<sup>15</sup> At this point Vukanović uses information from Branislav Nušić who mentions on his journey to Orahovac (Raovac) in 1894 “30 to 40 houses of Christian Orthodox Gypsies, who have been completely absorbed into the Serbs” (Nušić 1988: 204).

plots around them surrounded by a fence, thorns and outbuildings. Following the First Balkan War, many Đorgovci and Mađupi were freed of the chiflik regime, and only sporadic chiflik estates remained on the lands of the Devič Monastery. In urban settlements of Kosovo and Metohija the housing conditions of the Đorgovci and Mađupi did not differ from those of other people (Vukanović 1983: 107, 113).<sup>16</sup>

Atanasije Urošević (1965: 104) mentions intermarriage between Serbs and Christian Orthodox Gypsies and states “three new cases of Serbs marrying Gypsy girls”, all three from Gračanica. Urošević also cites examples “where Christian Orthodox Gypsies took Serbian women”, interpreting this as being due either to ignorance or economic reasons.<sup>17</sup> From the sociolinguistic standpoint, his remarks on the linguistic identity of the Đorgovci are also indicative since at one stage (until the beginning of the twentieth century) it was entirely Albanian.<sup>18</sup>

Ethnologist Tatomir Vukanović confirms that terms *Arđanovci* and Đorgovci mark the same ethnic group – “Serbianised Gypsies”, “Gypsies in Kosovo whose native language is Serbian” (Vukanović 1983: 95, 138). Obviously, neither of these two terms is sufficiently well known in Priluzje. In response to a direct question by the researcher we get a very unexpected description of the Muslim Slav population:

---

<sup>16</sup> Available ethnological data on the Đorgovci refers to wedding customs which coincide with those of the Serbs in the surrounding area. The Đorgovci are endogamous, but the Roma custom of buying the bride is noted, or where payment was exacted for the girl’s dowry and for the costs of the wedding at the girl’s home. This payment was made in instalments – three from the time of asking for her hand in marriage to the wedding, usually in six to twelve months. Weddings took place in churches, and the age of the spouses was the same as that in the surrounding areas (Vukanović 1983: 248).

<sup>17</sup> “The Gypsy Iva Milić from Badovac married a Serb woman from a house in his village where he worked as a servant. In Obilić, a girl of the Subotić colonists (from Boka) married a Gypsy of the Đokić clan in the same village just after the colonisation, ‘while they still did not know that the Christian Orthodox villagers were Gypsies.’ A poor girl from Lika, from among the Krivošija colonists, married a Christian Orthodox Gypsy in Skulanovo. In Dobri Dub, a Gypsy, Kosta Ilić, married a poor Montenegrin girl who was a servant in Priština (Urošević 1965: 104).

<sup>18</sup> Urošević in fact believes that “in some mixed Arbanasi- [Albanian-] Gypsy villages, even Christian Orthodox Gypsies adopted the Arbanasi language, that during the Turkish rule and even long after it, it was the only language they knew well or even the only language they knew at all [...] At that time (around 1935) Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Obilić spoke Serbian very badly, since they still used Arbanasi among themselves. Young people in Grace tried to replace the constant use of Arbanasi by constant use of Serbian, but because of the elderly and women who did not know Serbian well, very often they too switched to Arbanasi at home [...] It is probable that Christian Orthodox Gypsies in these villages switched to Arbanasi from the Serbian spoken by other Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Kosovo, such as those in Gračanica, Badovac, Priština and Kosovska Mitrovica. They probably did not know the Gypsy language when they switched to Arbanasi, just as other Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Kosovo who did not fall under the influence of the Arbanasi language do not know it, and hence their native language is Serbian. Therefore, all Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Kosovo must have abandoned the Gypsy language long before and that those speaking Arbanasi today must have first switched from Gypsy to Serbian. Christian Orthodox Gypsies in Kosovo, one and the other, including therefore those speaking Arbanasi, claim to be Serbs, and for all Kosovo Christian Orthodox Gypsies it is an insult to refer to them as Gypsies in their presence” (Urošević 1965: 108–109).

[9] (Who are the Radanovci?) Well they are, those Radanovci are half Serb, half Muslim, you see. Half Serb, half Muslim. (And where were they?) They are around Prizren there, that's where they were. I was in hospital with one patient, she was a Serb and the Shiptars made her a Muslim [lit. "a Turk?"]. Her family was made Muslim. And now she still speaks Serbian, but she's Muslim, and her family and all. That's the tribe. She says to me – We're Serbs, my folks, my family is Serbian, but they made us Muslims, that's how it is. (That's around Prizren?) Towards Macedonia. There, that area over there, she says, they made us Muslims. And in Priština, for example, until recently those women from over there, from Peć and Prizren, even though they were Serbs, they wore, the older women wore *dimije* [Turkish trousers]. (139-K-Plemetina-5-BS)

### OTHERS IN KOSOVO: JANJEVCI

The image of the *Janjevci* (people from the town of Janjevo) obtained through research in Priluzje was supported by a number of secondary questions by the researcher aimed at clarifying the degree of local synonymity between the terms *Latins*, *Catholics*, and *Janjevci*. In Priluzje, the *Janjevci* are defined by their traditional occupation, and their religious persuasion by opposition to Serbs and "Shiptars": *they are of different faith, they're not Shiptars or Serbs either, [they're] Catholics; because they're not Christian Orthodox, [they're] Catholics.*<sup>19</sup> Belonging to Christian affiliation is marked by eating habits: *They eat pork, but they're Catholics.*

[10] Ah, while Catholic girls, they're different. They eat pork, but they're Catholics. (These are people from Janjevo?) Yes. Janjevo. The Janjevci. They're of a different religion, they're not Shiptars, they're not Serbs either, [they're] Catholics. (You called them Catholics or Latins?) No, they call them Latins over there, and we call them Catholics. They are Croats. For example, my daughter-in-law from Čaglavica, she says Latins, and we here, we say Janjevci. They knew how to make all sorts of gadgets, trinkets, bracelets, chains, you know, then in the city, in Priština, they used to sell all that, those Janjevci. Where did you buy that – from the Janjevci, for example. They were experts at making that. (They didn't work on the land?) No, they were only in trade. Traders. They had a lot of gold. (They made jewellery?) Jewellery, oh yes! You buy from them when you get engaged, where do you go to buy something for your daughter-in-law – you go to the Janjevci to buy gold. That's how it is. (139-K-Plemetina-5-BS)

Ethnographic writing confirms that women from Janjevo were skilled weavers who also wove to order:

The women of Janjevo produced household cloth not only for home use but sometimes

<sup>19</sup> The concept of "faith" in the Priluzje enclave is analyzed in Sikimić 2004: 277–278.

for others too. Between the two world wars, some textile merchants from Priština used to order certain products from Janjevo women to be made for their customers (Barjaktarović 1971: 45).

Nevertheless, the literature shows that the *Janjevci* were much better known in the area as craftsmen who made jewellery and the like. (Barjaktarović 1972: 155–158, on *Janjevci* as “metal casters” (*livci*) and “ring-men” (*prstendžije*), see also Barjaktarović 1971: 43–45).

It is right to say that Janjevo is in the main one big ring-factory [*prstendžinica*], since about 300 Catholics make rings, there are 30 wheelwrights, 4 butchers, 10 innkeepers, 10 grocers and 2 bakers. (...) However, the main occupation of Janjevo Catholics, for which they are well known not only in their area, but also in parts much further away, is ring-making [*prstendžiluk*]. *Janjevci* call their craft ring-making and themselves – ringmakers. (...) *Janjevci* mainly make things of brass [*pirindž*], as they say, and they do not know the word bronze. (...) Only since the '40s did they begin to make things of pakon [an alloy], especially bangles, earrings and rings. They do not make anything out of silver, iron, copper or any other metal or compound. When using brass, they mainly cast it into rings, holders for icon lamps, bangles, earrings, buckles, necklaces, and girdles with metal clasps [*paft*]. (Trojanović 1906: 106–107)

Still,

The *Janjevci* are, indeed, no artists in their work, on the contrary: their work is primitive, but they produce it in vast quantities, they know the roads well, the countries and languages, they go into towns, where the poor especially await them eagerly, and then buy what they need for an entire year. The *Janjevci* specialize in only a few items, among them the *stolovat* – a number of wedding rings joined together with a thick band, adorned with 5 to 10 large silver coins. (Trojanović 1906: 109)

It is not easy to reconstruct today the distant mirror,<sup>20</sup> but, in his description of Janjevo in 1910, Jovan Cvijić mentions that the *Janjevci* Catholics used to call the Christian Orthodox *Vlasi* (Vlachs).<sup>21</sup> Hesitation in naming the inhabitants of Janjevo is at least a

<sup>20</sup> For the economic situation in Janjevo at the beginning of the twentieth century see Mikić 1988: 307–308. For statistical data on Janjevo inhabitants in Kosovo, their emigration to Croatia and life in the new area see: Šiljković/Glamuzina 2004.

<sup>21</sup> “In 1910 (...) there were 515 houses in Janjevo, of which 400 belonged to Catholic Serbs or “Latins” (as the Christian Orthodox call them), 75 houses of Arnauts (Albanians) and *Arnautashi* (*Albanianised Serbs still speaking Serbian*), 20 of *Muhadžiri* from Serbia, 2 belonging to Turks from *Šam* (Asia Minor), and about 18 houses of Mohammedan Gypsies. The houses are usually free-standing, separate from the community and 2–3 of the most crowded contained 15 people. Among the “Latins” (the latter call the Christian Orthodox “Vlachs”) two families are indigenous, moved from Staro Janjevo and account for 110 houses. These two families are the Glasinovići and the Palići. The others are old settlers, more than 200 years in the area (...) The business of Janjevo is rudimentary since the last

century old: “The Serbs speak pure Serbian, and by law they are all Catholics to the last man [...] The Franciscan fathers Jukić and Slišković and many German writers call these Catholics *Croats*, which in any event comes to the same thing” (Trojanović 1906: 105). In the collection of documents (issued by the Ottoman authorities), in a receipt from the Sandžak of Novi Pazar: a Latin (sic.) called Mihoč, is one of the Dubrovnik unbelievers, living in Novi Pazar.

This is good example showing that during this period the people from Dubrovnik were Latins as far as the Turks were concerned, just as our people from Vučitrn and throughout Kosovo and Metohija used the term Latin for every foreigner of Christian faith and Roman-Catholic by law, and in general, any man from the Christian West who was not of their religion and law. (Elezović 1940: 814–815)

At the end of the nineteenth century, Serbs from Peć used to call Albanians of Catholic denomination *Latins*.<sup>22</sup>

## FEMALE OCCUPATION OR THE ETHNONYM ČERČIKE

The researcher prompts the topic of anticipated ethnic marking by the clothes worn by women by using the term *costume*, inadequate for the local vernacular (and further inadequately marked as *specific*). The female interviewee specifies a “foreign” item of clothing: the *dimije*, which does not fit the traditional marker of Orthodoxy: *And Christian Orthodox too, were baptised, ate pork and all*. This introductory question steered the conversation to the naming of a series of local women’s ethnonyms: *Pećanke* (women from Peć), *Srpkinja* (Serbian women), *Čerčike*, *Katolinke* (Catholic women).

[11] (Were there any women who wore black šalvare [Turkish trousers], who had a specific costume?) Yes, yes, a costume. Well also, for example, in Priština until

---

vestiges of the metal works at Novo Brdo have been preserved in this town. From bronze they make icon lamps, candlesticks, bracelets, rings, and in particular many crosses, and sell them throughout Kosovo, Metohija and the Prizren area, but also in Serbia, Bulgaria and Wallachia. Before, they used to travel and sell their crafts throughout Macedonia, as far as Thessaloniki. Furthermore, they go from house to house making women’s costumes and various kinds of napkins and towels in great quantities but very bad taste, which they sell in Kosovo, crowding out the graceful but costly Kosovo costumes. Nonetheless, wealthy Janjevci are rare.” (Cvijić 1996: 525–526) For dialectological and sociolinguistic descriptions of the Janjevo vernacular see: Pavlović 1970; for craftsmen’s terminology: Rodić 1974. For more recent ethnographic work on archive material from Janjevo cf. Petrović 2004.

<sup>22</sup> “What is more, the Catholics themselves that we call “Latins”, whether in towns or *nahije* [administrative districts], although they have betrayed their old faith and set it aside, would not abandon their Serbian national *slava*, the sign of their blood and nationality. Most celebrate St. Nicholas, St. Dimitrije, the Feast of the Transfiguration etc. The greatest oath you will hear them utter is: “*Pasha qirim e Shënikolit!*” which in the language of the Arnauts (Albanians) means: “By the candle of St. Nicholas!” (Constantinople Herald, III/34, Constantinople, 25 September 1897, Dim. P-dj).

recently those women from over there, from Peć and Prizren, they wore them, although they were Serbs, the older women wore the *dimije*. (Even though they were Serbs?) Even though they were Serbs, they wore *dimije*, and then that *gajtan*. (The Christian Orthodox women too?) The Christian Orthodox too, they were baptised, ate pork and all, but they wore only *dimije*, we called them *Čerčike*. (Those women who wore it?) Who wore the *dimije*, but are Serbs, for example. They're Serbs. (139-K-Plemetina-5-BS)

The term *Čerčika* has been noted in a dictionary of the Kosovo-Metohija vernacular as an appellative: *čerčika*, f. "a woman who sells various home-made types of cloth, old suits etc., in public: *Every Saturday the čerčike go to the bazaar in Mitrovica*" (confirmation from Gornja Sudimlja, Turcism, Elezović 1935 s.v.).<sup>23</sup> The example from Priluzje shows the onymisation of this appellative (meaning the doer, practitioner of the occupation), but it is also possible that the interviewee is not sure of the real meaning of the term *čerčika*. In both cases the term refers only to women, whether they sell their cloth at the market or wear some elements of Muslim costume. The possible connection to the selling of goods indicates the further course of the interviewee's associations as she continues to speak of the *Janjevke* (women from Janjevo): *they are Catholics, that sell, Janjevci*. On the other hand, it is clear that in Kosovo at the turn of the twentieth century, to which period this data refers, travelling peddlers of small goods belonged to another social and ethnic class, and this would apply all the more to women who did so.<sup>24</sup>

An outsider's view of women's costumes in Kosovo at the beginning of the twentieth century can be observed in a description by Branislav Nušić (1902: 138–150), who neutrally notes that in contrast to women in villages, "town women wear *dimije* which are made a little shorter than for Turkish women and are girdled with a silken sash. *Dimije* are usually made of *basma* [type of thin cotton fabric] or *jum-basma* [woolen fabric]. Over a linen or silk shirt, they wear a *jelek* made of homespun or velvet or even of silk" (Nušić 1902: 148). Around the same time, Petar Kostić sees women's clothing in Kosovo in the nineteenth century as an ethnic marker:

Our women had to dress and cover themselves as the Muslim women do, in a

<sup>23</sup> An Etymological Dictionary of the Croatian or Serbian Language marks the lexeme *čerčija* as masculine, even though the source from which it was taken (Skok 1971–1974, s.v. *čerčija*), with examples from Banja Luka and Sarajevo, marks it only as feminine, with the synonyms: *woman trader*, *pazar-bula* (market woman in Oriental costume), *carrier*. By comparing this with confirmation from Priluzje and surroundings, apart from what is certainly a specific social status, a certain ethnic marking of women traders at town markets in the central Balkans of the twentieth century may also be suggested. The lexicographical and ethnolinguistic confirmation cited hitherto indicate that these women traders certainly existed in Bosnia and Kosovo. For traditional attitudes towards market-women (in South Slav folklore material) cf. Sikimić 1999.

<sup>24</sup> In the period following the Second World War, *the Gypsy Redžo from Mitrovica* used to peddle a variety of goods in the villages around Leposavić (Lešak, Krnjin, Tvrden). He used to go to Leposavić twice a month by train, to more far-flung villages on foot. He carried his goods in a sack, gave goods on credit or exchanged them for food: flour, beans, meat (oral confirmation by Grozdana Mladenović, born in 1931 in Krnjin, near Leposavić).

feredža with an avlija [havlja: a large, white kerchief that went over the feredža], and in some places in džarove [fabric used by Muslim women to cover their heads] too, and they also had to wear yellow slippers. On one occasion, a Mohammedan assaulted a Muslim girl thinking she was Serb. Thereupon came the order for the giaours to wear red slippers, in contrast to Mohammedan women who wore yellow ones. What had to be done out of fear, gradually turned into a custom which was not easily abolished. It was only on Good Friday 1913 that the feredža was abolished for Serbian women, and the avlija set aside. Prizren Latins (Catholic women) still retain this costume, but gradually, especially after the second liberation, they too are beginning to abandon it. (Kostić 1988: 300).<sup>25</sup>

## LOCAL – GLOBAL

How are historical changes to the ethnic image reflected in local memory? The enclave still remembers the arrival of the colonists in Kosovo between the two world wars, the gradual changes to folk costume, the arrival of refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s. In informal communication, no politically correct terminology in speaking of the “other” has yet emerged. In Priluzje (as in all other enclaves) the older ethnonym, *Šiptari* (Shiptars) is consistently used: *They fell out with the Shiptars there; Here in the village are Shiptars, up there Shiptars; and the Shiptars made her a Muslim*; cf. examples quoted from other enclaves: *for the Shiptars, for example, they sewed breeches* (Sirinić), and *Shiptars always guarded the terzija* (Zubin Potok). It is the same when naming the Albanian language: *No, they don't know the Roma language, but they know the Shiptar language*, where the politically correct term “Roma language” was introduced by researcher’s question. The case is the same with the use of the ethnonym “Roma” since it is only a repetition of the researcher’s question. Nevertheless, the marking of the Roma ethnic group whose native language is Albanian as *Ashkalia* is very common:<sup>26</sup>

[12] (They speak only Serbian? They don't know the Roma language?) No, they don't know the Roma language, but they know the Shiptar language. The Shiptar language they know. (And you have pure Roma people too?) We have pure Roma people too. There are pure Roma people in our village. (Who speak the Roma language?) Only the Roma language, we don't have Ashkalia, Ashkalia we don't have. [139-K-Plemetina-5-BS]

In Priluzje today, as in other Serbian enclaves in Kosovo, only *Shiptars* and *occupiers*

<sup>25</sup> For an ethnographic view of Kosovo town costumes, especially female, see for example in Vukanović 2001: 281–286; Vukanović 1986: 110–111.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. an example from a transcript by Miloš Luković (Luković 2005): *There were, there were, they are different Gypsies, who spoke only the Shiptar language. They are Ashkalia* (the English version of the article Luković 2007).

are clearly negatively marked on the hierarchical scale of otherness.<sup>27</sup> The image of the other in Priluzje retains traces of a pre-modern time, a time which in the diachronic sense preceded ethnic partition and was based on language differences, religious division and a territorial framework that was dynastic.<sup>28</sup> The “insiders” on this scale are today neutrally marked, and connected only to the local community of Priluzje.

The global/local opposition is equally tenable as an adequate methodological choice in researching the enclave. This opposition reflects the same relationship as that existing between methodology in researching the standard and literary language and in researching dialect and idiolect. To inventory all the meanings of a lexeme in the standard language cannot explain the use of the same lexeme in the local vernacular or by an individual. The “anthropological twist” (which places the individual and the local in the foreground) brings us only a step away from relativising many universally acknowledged sociolinguistic and dialectological conclusions.

## REFERENCES

- Agar, Michael (2005). Local discourse and global research: The role of local knowledge, *Language in Society*, 34 (1): 1–22.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Revised Edition). London – New York: Verso.
- Bakić-Hayden, Milica (2004). National Memory as Narrative Memory: The Case of Kosovo. *Balkan Identities, Nation and Memory* (ed. Maria Todorova). London: Hurst & Company, 25–40.
- Barjaktarović, Mirko (1971). Janjevo (istoriski razvitak, antropogeografske i etnološke karakteristike). *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje*, 45: 31–55.
- Barjaktarović, Mirko (1972). Livci Janjeva kao izdanak starog rudarstva. *Glasnik muzeja Kosova*, XI, 151–160.
- Belova, Ol'ga (2002). „Другие“ и „чуждые“: представления об этнических соседях в славянской народной культуре. *Признаковое пространство культуры*, Москва: Библиотека Института славяноведения 15: 71–85.
- Bjeletić, Marta (1999). Kost kosti (delovi tela kao oznake srodstva). *Kodovi slovenskih kultura*, 4, *Delovi tela*, 48–67.
- Cvijić, Jovan (1996<sup>2</sup>). *Osnove za geografiju i geologiju Makedonije i Stare Srbije* [Sabrana dela, knjiga 12]. Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika.
- Dragičević, Rajna (2001). *Pridevi sa značenjem ljudskih osobina u savremenom srpskom jeziku, tvorbeni i semantička analiza*, Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

<sup>27</sup> For a sociolinguistic analysis of the language of hatred during the wars of the 1990s in South Slav areas, especially the language of the media during the war of 1999, see: Okuka 2002.

<sup>28</sup> For more detail on nations as “imagined communities” see Anderson 1991: 12–22; for historical changes of the *us* : *them* opposition regarding the relationship between Turks and Albanians in Kosovo see Bakić-Hayden 2004.

- Duijzings, Ger (2000). *Religion and the Politics of Identity in Kosovo*. London: C. Hurst & Company.
- Đurić, Milorad. (1989). *Boj na Kosovu u narodnoj pesmi i priči*. Beograd: Vuk Karadžić.
- Džogović, Alija (1985). Onomastika Dečana i okolnih sela. *Onomatološki prilozi*, VI, 439–507.
- Elezović, Gliša (1932–1935). Rečnik kosovsko-metohiskog dijalekta 1–2. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, IV.
- Elezović, Gliša (1940). *Turski spomenici I/1*. Beograd: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
- Ivanović, Milan (1987). Crkveni spomenici XIII–XX vek. *Zadužbine Kosova, spomenici i znamenja srpskog naroda*, Prizren, Beograd, 385–547.
- Kostić, Petar (1988). Listići iz bliže i dalje prošlosti. *Savremenici o Kosovu i Metohiji 1852–1912*. Beograd, 299–310.
- Loma, Aleksandar (2002). *Prakosovo, slovenski i indoevropski koreni srpske epike*, Beograd: Balkanološki institut SANU.
- Luković, Miloš (2005). Istorijske, urbano-demografske i sociolingvističke osobnosti Kosovske Mitrovice. *Liceum 9, Život u enklavi*. Kragujevac, 11–87.
- Luković, Miloš (2007) Kosovska Mitrovica: present and Past. *Kosovo and Metohija. Living in the Enclave*. Belgrade: Institute for Balkan Studies of SASA, 83–105.
- Ljubinković, Nenad (1989). Kosovska bitka u svome vremenu i u viđenju potomaka ili logika razvoja epskih legendi o kosovskome boju. *Kosovo u pamćenju i stvaralaštvu*. Beograd, 127–164.
- Mihaljčić, Rade (1989). *Junaci kosovske legende*. Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.
- Mikić, Đorđe (1988). *Društvene i ekonomske prilike kosovskih Srba u XIX i početkom XX veka*. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti.
- Nušić, Branislav (1902). *Kosovo, opis zemlje i naroda*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Nušić, Branislav (1988). S Kosova na sinje more. *Savremenici o Kosovu i Metohiji 1852–1912*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 177–215.
- Okuka, Miloš (2002). Jezik, mržnja, nasilje. *Srpski jezik*, 7: 395–442.
- Pavlović, Milivoje (1970). *Govor Janjeva, međudijalekatski i miksoglotski procesi*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Pešikan-Ljuštanović, Ljiljana (2002). *Zmaj Despot Vuk – mit, istorija, pesma*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Petrović, Ruža (1990). Etnički sastav stanovništva SAP Kosova i njegove promene u poratnom razdoblju. *Kosovsko-metohijski zbornik*, 1: 355–366.
- Petrović, Tanja (1997). Priroda kletve i njene komunikacijske funkcije u srpskom jeziku. *Srpski jezik*, II, 87–95.
- Petrović, Đurđica (2004). Zlatari u Trepči, Novom Brdu, Prištini i Janjevu u srednjem veku. *Zbornik radova Kosovo i Metohija u svetlu etnologije*. Beograd: Etnografski muzej, 233–280.

- Radojičić, Dragana (2004). Neki podaci o migracijama iz Crne Gore na Kosovo i Metohiju početkom XX vijeka. *Zbornik radova Kosovo i Metohija u svetlu etnologije*. Beograd: Etnografski muzej, 411–416.
- Radovanović, Milovan (2004). Crnogorci na Kosovu i Metohiji u kontekstu polarizovanih istorijsko-antropogeografskih, etničkih, demografskih i geopolitičkih procesa. *Zbornik radova Kosovo i Metohija u svetlu etnologije*. Beograd: Etnografski muzej, 373–410.
- Ristić, Stana (2003). Nacionalna etika i kultura u konceptima nekih reči srpskog jezika. *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku*, 63: 237–253.
- Rodić, Nikola (1974). Zanatstvo u Janjevu i njegova leksička građa. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, XIX–XX: 73–95.
- Sikimić, Biljana (1999). Koža deverska. *Srpski jezik*, 4: 337–360.
- Sikimić, Biljana (2004). Etnolingvistička istraživanja skrivenih manjina – mogućnosti i ograničenja: Čerkezi na Kosovu. *Skrivene manjine na Balkanu* (ed. Biljana Sikimić). Beograd: Balkanološki institut SANU, 259–282.
- Skok, Petar (1971–1974). *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–IV. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Spremić, Momčilo (1991). Kosovska bitka – problem izdaje, *Kosovska bitka i posledice*, Beograd: SANU, 35–47.
- Spremić, Momčilo (1992). Brankovići u istoriji i predanju, *Boj na Kosovu starija i novija saznanja*, Beograd: Književne novine, 509–542.
- Spremić, Momčilo (1996). Vuk Branković i Kosovska bitka, *Glas SANU, Odeljenje istorijskih nauka*, 9: 85–107.
- Spremić, Momčilo (1998). Treba li rehabilitovati najvećeg izdajnika?, *Srpsko nasleđe*, 1: 18–27.
- Šiljković, Željka. Glamuzina, Martin. (2004). Janjevo and Janjevci – from Kosovo to Zagreb. *Geoadria*, 9 (1): 89–109.
- Trojanović, Sima (1906). Janjevo i njegove prstendžije. *Srpski književni glasnik*, 17: 104–111.
- Urošević, Atanasije (1965). Kosovo. *Srpski etnografski zbornik*, LXXVIII, *Naselja i poreklo stanovništva*, 39. Beograd: SANU.
- Vukanović, Tatomir (1983). *Romi (Cigani) u Jugoslaviji*. Vranje: Nova Jugoslavija.
- Vukanović, Tatomir (1986). *Srbi na Kosovu II*. Vranje: Nova Jugoslavija.
- Vukanović, Tatomir (2001). *Enciklopedija narodnog života, običaja i verovanja u Srba na Kosovu i Metohiji, VI vek – početak XX veka*. Beograd: Vojnoizdavački zavod, Verzalpres.
- Wietzel, Andreas (2000). The problem-centered interview, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (on-line Journal) 1 (1), <http://qualitative-research.net/fqs>
- Zlatanović, Sanja (2004). „Šopovi“ u Kosovskom Pomoravlju. *Skrivene manjine na Balkanu* (ed. Biljana Sikimić). Beograd: Balkanološki institut SANU, 83–93.

POVZETEK

ENKLAVA PRILUŽJE: OBLIKOVANJE LOKALNE IDENTITETE

Biljana Sikimić

Prispevek s pomočjo kvalitativne analize obravnava poglede na »druge«, izoblikovane v diskurzu Srbov v enklavi Priluzje na Kosovu. Intervjuji, ki so bili izvedeni leta 2003 v vaseh Priluzje, Babin Most, Plemetina in Grace, pokažejo, da se v diskurzu lokalnih prebivalcev oblikuje več koncentričnih krogov *drugosti*. Omenjena stratifikacija zajema osebne percepcije tako imenovanih *Kovačanov*, *Moravcev*, *Latinov*, *Črnogorcev*, *Srbijancev*, *Čerčik*, *Radanovcev* in lokalnih potujočih trgovcev, ki vsi govorijo srbski jezik. Stopnjevanje *drugosti* se udejanja na lokalni ravni in ima značilnosti »predmodernega«, to je časa pred etničnimi delitvami. Tako je podoba »drugega« v enklavi Priluzje utemeljena na podlagi jezikovnih in verskih razlik, medtem ko etnične razlike ne igrajo pomembne vloge. Vpliv procesa oblikovanja nacij pa se vendar kaže v dejstvu, da so med različnimi *drugimi* samo Albanci (*Šiptari*) negativno označeni. Tako prebivalci enklave Priluzje oblikujejo lastno identiteto z uporabo konceptov, ki sodijo v področje tradicionalne kulture.