

Taming the Tavern: Social Space and Government Regulation in 19th Century Belgrade

Апстракт: Чланак се бави односом између регулације деветнаестовековног Београда и кафана као чинилаца друштвеног живота. Сматра се да је уплитање власти удаљило ове облике јавног простора од отоманских друштвених норми и приближило их одобреним културним дносима. Опорезивање, морални кодови, зонирање и финансијска иницијатива подстицали су оно што је сматрано западњачким или космополитским. Истраживањем докумената Београдске Општине утврђени су различити начини на које је та специфична урбана форма реинтерпретирана или су јој градске власти давале нове функције. Закључује се да потреба да се регулише кафански живот била нераскидиво повезана са легитимизацијом власти српске аутономне управе.

Кључне речи: Српска влада, градска регулација, механе, друштвени живот

Urban expansion and the reshaping of cityscapes was an important characteristic of government policy in the 19th century nation-state. Likewise, the transformation of urban space in Southeastern Europe mimicked the monopoly of identity asserted by the region's rising national projects. This process of reconstruction entailed an elaborate redefinition of the cityscape, coupled with active government involvement in cultural and social life. As Alexandra Yerolympos has demonstrated, regulating urban space was paramount in the construction of Balkan capitals, from Athens to Bucharest.¹ This growing interest of governmental structures in managing public space also hailed a need to structure and control venues of social interaction.

Due to its unique political position, late Ottoman Belgrade is one of the most interesting examples of governmental incursion into city life. By the 1830s, the Porte was pressured to relegate the responsibility of administering the Orthodox Christian subjects to rebel Serbian authorities. However, the sultan's *hatt-ı şerif* of 1833 excluded several towns with sizeable Muslim populations, including Belgrade, from

¹ Yerolympos, Alexandra, „A New City for a New State. City Planning and the Formation of National Identity in the Balkans (1820s–1920s),“ in: *Planning Perspectives* 8 (1993), pp. 63–220.

autonomous administration.² Since a clear distinction had never been drawn between the city itself and the suburban neighborhoods under Serbian jurisdiction, parallel power structures emerged.

The existing imperial system of urban management was supplemented by the Belgrade City Magistrate, an autonomous municipal government covering both the suburbs and the city itself. The Magistrate's modernizing policies were executed in conjunction with the general expansion of governmental authority in the rest of the autonomous principality. In Belgrade's case, a suburban area located on the banks of the Sava river was uprooted and reconstructed, forming a distinct, modern neighborhood modeled after Habsburg and French influences.³ Through this project, the Magistrate was able to expand the scope of governmental involvement in urban management.⁴ Furthermore, the prolonged project of urban planning and development allowed for the accumulation of bureaucratic and legislative capacity which could begin to regulate public space and social life.

Taverns (*механа, meyhane*) are a particularly appealing example of government influence on social life in 19th century Belgrade. As multifunctional establishments offering alcoholic beverages, food, and occasional lodging, they were an interesting point of interaction both between ethnic and social groups. Travelers could meet with locals, Muslims could gamble with Christians, and peasants from the surrounding villages were able to participate in the public discourse of the city. The *meyhane* juxtaposed varied communal functions and strata of people in a single space, challenging the rigidity of the established social order.⁵ Taverns represented the quintessential of urban space – a sphere without privacy, an identity not associated with home, community or state. In this sense, they played a role similar to that seen in other cities both in Europe and the Ottoman Empire at the brink of modernity, forming distinct cultural patterns and norms.⁶ Their ambivalent position in the social order had been gradually developing within the cultural fabric of Ottoman cities, occupying the area

² Besides Belgrade, these included Šabac, Smederevo (*Semenderi*), Užice, Kladovo (*Fetislam*) and Soko. See: Veselinović, Rajko L., *Beograd 1807–1862–1867*, Beograd 1962, pp. 60–62.

³ For more on this specific reconstruction see: „*Le Cité Nouvelle: Constructing Belgrade without an Ottoman Legacy*” in: Jovanović, Miloš, “Constructing the National Capital: De-Ottomanization and Urban Transformation in 19th Century Belgrade” (MA diss., Central European University, 2008).

⁴ The City Magistrate's new construction regulations are well-documented and analyzed in Đurić-Zamolo, Divna, ed., *Najraniji pravni propisi iz arhitekture i urbanizma u Srbiji XIX veka*, ed. Balkanološki institut SANU, in: *Gradska kultura na balkanu XV–XIX vek*, Zbornik radova, vol. 2 (1988).

⁵ In this sense, it is useful to think of taverns as *heterotopias*, defined by Michel Foucault as heterogenous sites, where seemingly incongruent spatial expressions challenge pre-conceived power relations. See Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces” *Diacritics* 16 (Spring 1986), pp. 22–7.

⁶ See: Brennan, Thomas, „Taverns in the Public Sphere in 18th Century Paris,” *Contemporary Drug Problems* 32, no. 1 (Spring 2005) and Akyazici Özkoçak, Selma, “Coffeehouses. Rethinking the Public and Private in Early Modern Istanbul,” *Journal of Urban History* 33 (2007), pp. 965–86.

below the coffee-house (*кафана*, *kahvehane*) in the hierarchy of social interaction.⁷ However, the encroaching relationship between modern (vicariously, also national) government and the individual was inherently in conflict with such an unregulated, unmanaged space.

As the Ottoman Empire began to negotiate modernity into its own context, specific trends in urban management emerged in its cities. In the Balkans, nascent national projects sought to neutralize the imperial legacy of the cityscape, by rapidly departing from cultural markers which had previously defined it. Nationalist historiography has argued that such a departure hailed urban modernity and was intrinsically linked to the emergence of national consciousness.⁸ However, this teleological approach ignores the rapid growth in city management and reconstruction which took place in the Arab provinces. In places like Isma'il Pasha's Cairo, urban regulation was a method of legitimizing rule vis-à-vis West European powers.⁹ In areas where the push towards nation-states had not yet taken place, shaping urban space was a paramount component in the establishment of power.

The incipience of aggressive intervention in the cityscape was certainly not unique to the Ottoman Empire during this period. Certainly, Haussmann's revitalization of Paris is the archetypal example of a plethora of immense transformations undertaken in the European city. Reclaiming of old city cores and the construction of new neighborhoods was a fundamental component of projecting the bourgeois state to its emergent citizens.¹⁰ In this sense, the 19th century city can be understood as a site of construction, a place where new buildings and boulevards embody the community imagined by the elite that is engaged in the process of constructing it. Old spaces of encounter were reframed to suit the modernization project – the open-air market was reconstituted as Les Halles, the dark tavern as a working-class café.¹¹

Maria Todorova suggests that the necessity of shedding the vestiges of Ottoman heritage in the Balkans was not necessarily related just to nationalization, but rather

⁷ Akyazici Özkoçak, p. 973.

⁸ The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts' edited volume on the history of 19th century Belgrade is a good example of this viewpoint. See: Čubrilović, Vasa, ed., *Istorija Beograda – XIX vek*, Beograd 1974.

⁹ For an overview of Isma'il Pasha's stark influence on Cairo, see: Farouk-Ahmed, Heba, "Pre-Colonial Modernity: The State and the Making of Nineteenth Century Cairo's Urban Form" (PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2001).

¹⁰ Dana Arnold addresses this expression of bourgeois modernity in the context of London's 19th century reconstruction. See: Arnold, Dana, *Re-Presenting the Metropolis. Architecture, Urban Experience, and Social Life in London, 1800–1840*, Burlington, 2000.

¹¹ See: Harvey, D., „Paris 1850–1870,” in *Consciousness and the Urban Experience. Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*, Baltimore 1985, pp. 63–220. and Haine, W. S., *The World of the Paris Café. Sociability among the French Working Class, 1789–1914*, Johns Hopkins University 1996.

a desire to mimic European nation-states as forms of social organization.¹² Through this mimicking process, modernization and urbanization were used as tools to foster the symbiotic relationship between governmental expansion and political autonomy. Thus, approaching the 19th century Balkan city requires an understanding of how urban management was used as a method of legitimizing power.

***Control and the City:
Discourses of Power in the Cityscape***

There are several important theoretical tools that can be used in order to understand this relationship. Two concepts developed by Michel Foucault, governmentality and biopower, both provide an excellent basis from which primary evidence should be approached. The changing mentality of modern government requires understanding how subjects and practices were counted, evaluated, and institutionalized. As the justification of power shifted from justice towards public welfare in the late 18th and early 19th century, the very mentality of governing also changed.

Concepts of “natural” development and epistemology began to permeate state practice as rational justification. At the same time, the success-rate of a policy superseded legitimacy as the authorization of power over the citizen. Novel practices entailing elaborate systems of bureaucratic management and statistical analysis were put to use in order to subjectivize entire populations. For Foucault, authority stemmed from the “disposition of knowledge-power which in reality truly marks that which does not exist and legitimately divides it into true/false.”¹³ Thus, discourses such as free market competitiveness, public health, or morality were introduced as justifications by and for government regulation. Through this mechanism, personal goals became aligned with political order, thus rendering the population governable.¹⁴

In his examination of discipline and punishment, Foucault demonstrates how the very mechanisms of management were infused with certain elements of power. The modern organized system was arranged so that “the exercise of power is not added on from the outside... to the functions it invests, but is so subtly present in them as to increase their efficiency by itself increasing its own points of contact.”¹⁵ The tendency of modern development to regulate and structuralize created a system of social conditioning that reduced the individual ability to function independently. Simultaneously, it invested the subject with a degree of political and economic power. However, this ability owed its existence to the value-system from which it was infused. As Patrick Joyce’s study of the workings of modern government suggests,

¹² Todorova, Maria, *Imaginarni Balkan*, Beograd 1999, p. 32.

¹³ Foucault, Michel, *Rađanje Biopolitike*, Novi Sad 2005, p. 34.

¹⁴ Rose, Nikolas, *Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge 1999.

¹⁵ Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish – the Birth of the Prison*, New York 1991 [1977]), p. 206.

such freedom is innately related to the justification of authority. Concepts such as welfare, communication systems, and regulating behavior are all vital to the understanding of freedom as a “formula for exercising power, ... as a technique of rule, as *technological*.”¹⁶

An application of Foucauldian perspectives in the Balkan city of the 19th century is particularly interesting, as the region represented a contested space in which authority was not clearly defined. The fluidity of the Ottoman management system allowed for the urban environment to strive in diversity, yet at the same time supported a fragmented, communal lifestyle.¹⁷ Low building densities and lack of organized civic areas fostered an unregulated approach to public space. Thus, the incursion of modernity in the region also signified a redefinition of power, in which control needed to be justified and authority appropriated. The discourse of public welfare and urban reform became one of the central components through which pretenders sought to institutionalize rule and constitute subjects.

Before delving further into the particularities of urban management in Belgrade, I would like to address two specific methodological problems. Using the Foucauldian approach is particularly difficult in 19th century Southeastern Europe due to the abundance of border areas and contact zones. In this context, the ability of individuals to move relatively quickly between areas of political authority drives an inescapable wedge between government control and power. As in other contact zones, the Danubian region during this period is a fertile ground for trans-riparian migrants. The seminal work of Traian Stoianovich on Orthodox Christian merchants in this area demonstrates the importance individuals and transnational actors played in the development of modern nation-states.¹⁸ Thus, drawing a connection between governmental policy and its effect on individual actors in these contact zones is a cumbersome task.

As David Gruber has suggested, the permanent incorporation of individual actors into disciplines is the fundamental basis of Foucault’s analysis – people are “constituted as the particular objects that have a dynamic of subjectivity.”¹⁹ Thus, it seems ever more vital to avoid the deterministic nature so quickly associated with the Foucauldian approach. After all, concepts of efficiency and diligence with which policies were enacted in a provincial Ottoman city such as Belgrade were much different from those seen in 19th century Paris or London. This is not a problem unique to the Balkans at all – similar criticisms have been raised about the application of

¹⁶ Joyce, P., *The Rule of Freedom. Liberalism and the Modern City*, Verso 2003, pp. 1–2.

¹⁷ Stoianovich, T., „Model and Mirror of the Premodern Balkan City,” *Studia Balkanica* (1970).

¹⁸ Stoianovich, T., „The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant,” *Journal of Economic History* 20, no. 1 (1960).

¹⁹ Gruber, David F., „Foucault’s Critique of the Liberal Individual,” *The Journal of Philosophy* 86, no. 11. p. 617.

discipline and law in imperial Russia.²⁰ In this sense, the value of applying Foucauldian analysis should be sought in the stricter definition of governmentality as the examination of the way governments try to produce the citizen best suited to fulfill their policies.

***Regulating the Meyhane:
Taverns as Targets of Government Intervention***

Belgrade's taverns experienced a rapid expansion of governmental regulation throughout the 19th century. Through reconstructing the chronology of the process, we can begin to understand the way in which this involvement grew, and the methodology of its spread to different areas. While the majority of the work came out of the authority bestowed on the City Magistrate, *meyhanes* were listed and regulated even before the Sultan's autonomy decree. This regulation was administered by provisional regulatory bodies formed to administer the Christian population in the aftermath of the Second Serbian Uprising. Stemming their authority from the stature of the Serb leader, Miloš Obrenović, their administration process seems to have not gone much further than responding to popular requests. This is suggested by repeated complaints by various neighborhood heads regarding a *meyhane* owner's behavior and pricing, recorded in the 1820s.²¹ It is important to note that the tavern business was both profitable and considered socially acceptable. Even members of the local elite, both Christian and Muslim, did not shy away from participating in such a successful venture.²²

By 1825, the Obrenović authority sought to record the various tavern owners (*механџија*, *meyhaneci*) in the predominantly Christian neighborhood of Savamala. The following year, all the members of the city's *meyhaneci* guild (*esnaf*) were added to the list. It included mostly ethnically Serb members, however there are certain Latin, possibly Sephardic, names on it (*Đino*, *Bibo*, *Paulo*), as well as Slavicized Greek names (*Kostandin Ćestelij*, *Argir Kostandin*).²³ These were part of a larger project to record all members of the Christian *esnafs* into lists which were used for taxation purposes. This information indicates that the level of governmental involvement in tavern life throughout the city was not high. Repeated petitions of the population demonstrate a lack of willingness or ability to pursue an expansion of authority into this area of social life. However, although the tavern guild census was intended for

²⁰ Engelstein, Laura, „Combined Underdevelopment: Discipline and Law in the Imperial and Soviet Russia,” in *Foucault and the Writing of History*, ed. Jan Goldstein, Oxford 1994.

²¹ Peruničić, Branko, *Beogradski Sud 1819–1839*, Beograd 1964, p.151.

²² While Muslims associated with the sale of imported wine to the taverns, purchasing parts of a *meyhane* business could be handled by local Christian leaders (*knez*). See: Peruničić, B., *Beogradski Sud 1819–1839...*, pp. 74, 154.

²³ For a full reproduction of the list, see: Peruničić, B., *Beogradski Sud 1819–1839...*, p. 313.

taxation purposes, the epistemological process associated with it allowed for the centralization of statistical data in the bureaucratic body whose authority was to be expanded.

After the formation of the City Magistrate, the first regulatory decrees regarding the taverns were proclaimed. In 1834, a yearly *meyhane* tax was instituted, for the first time distinguishing between urban and rural establishments by doubling the amount which city tavern owners needed to pay.²⁴ The new autonomy decree also allowed for the newly-formed Serbian officers (*serdar*) to ensure the execution of this tax act. However, these were not their sole duties. All overnight stays at *meyhanes* needed to be reported to the local branch of the police, including those who had come from abroad and were unassigned to a social status (*bekyar*). Furthermore, this decree included a prohibition against “Turks”, who were not allowed to drink alcoholic beverages in the taverns any longer.²⁵

That same year, the local authorities demanded that all *meyhanes* from the center of town be shut down and relocated to the newly reconstructed suburbs in the Savamala and Palilula districts. Initially, the *meyhaneci* guild complained about the request to move taverns out of the town center, citing financial difficulties if they were to be moved to the periphery.²⁶ Tax receipts of the Belgrade administrative district (*nahiye*) three years later suggest that only a small number had done so, considering that 4290 out of a total 5280 *kuruş* were gathered from urban taverns. Rather than moving the taverns, the government increased taxation on the ones remaining in the city center tri-fold.²⁷ The transformation seen in the approach towards regulating tavern life is strikingly interesting, considering the previously lackluster attitude of the Obrenović-led People’s Office (*Narodna kancelarija*). By the second half of the decade, this approach continued and expanded in scope, including moral justification into prescriptions for social life.

Certainly, it is difficult to discuss taverns as an example of public space, particularly when that public was fairly limited. In the 19th century, the *meyhane* is an example of gendered space – an area by men for men, in which women were relegated to either maintenance jobs or prostitution. The fact that taverns are exclusively described as areas of masculinity in both Christian and Muslim Balkan epic song demonstrates the extent to which this division is accepted throughout society.²⁸ Thus, the gender

²⁴ Peruničić, B., *Beogradski Sud 1819–1839...*, p. 597.

²⁵ Peruničić, B., *Beogradski Sud 1819–1839...*, pp. 590, 610.

²⁶ The 120 families of the tavern guild to His Light the Graceful Lord. 19 Jul 1834. IAB. UGB. Box III, No. 45

²⁷ Chief list by member of the Belgrade City Magistrate (Draft). Upraviteljstvo grada Beograda (UGB). Istorijski arhiv Beograda (IAB), February 1838, No. 819.

²⁸ Beissinger, Margaret, „Gender and Power in the Balkan Return Song,” *SEEJ* 45, no. 3 (2001), p. 406.

dynamic present in tavern life was essentially different other areas representative of public space in the Balkan city, such as the marketplace or the water fountain.

Similarly, the Belgrade City Magistrate seems to have had difficulty in delineating taverns as a homogenous ethnic space. Four years after the initial regulation, another letter was sent to the city police, recommending that it should ensure “that a *meyhaneci* should not receive a single Turk in his tavern, or give him drink”, suggesting that in the future, the dealings with Muslims should take place outside the establishment.²⁹ These regulations had an adverse effect on the number of tax-paying taverns in the city. Magistrate records suggest a drop of almost 30% in the city guild members between February 1837 and August of next year.³⁰ Business, however, quickly rebounded and the numbers had recuperated by the spring of 1839. Those who could not afford to cover their tax debts had their property seized. From one of the seized tavern-owners’ property lists, we can induce that the primary purpose of the establishment revolved around the distribution of alcoholic beverages and tobacco. A certain Jedik Nastas Vasiljević had six wine barrels at twelve *akov* each, totaling 7200 liters, 115 brandy (*rakija*) glasses, 1 water pipe (*nargile*) and 5 long pipes in his tavern, yet only one iron skillet for preparing food.³¹ Two years later, another increase in tavern-specific taxation took place. This time, however, the fees took into account the amount of *rakija* and wine sold, specifying increasing tax brackets for specific varieties sold. What is quite striking is that the Magistrate’s proposal envisioned that all purchases of food and drink should be followed by a written receipt.³²

This level of government involvement was not limited to fiscal policy, as the regulation of behavior in and around taverns also became an important issue. In early 1838 gambling and public drunkenness were banned on the surrounding streets, and arrest records used the discourse of “subjecting oneself and the public to danger.”³³ By spring of that year, the Magistrate’s attitude towards taverns had crystallized – they were seen as places in which activities morally incompatible with city life took place. In April, a proclamation was issued suggesting that strict measures will also be undertaken to prevent drinking and gambling in taverns during the night. The language which justified this act points to a relationship between the discourse of morality, public safety and legal order:

²⁹ Member of the Belgrade City Magistrate Golub Petrović to the Belgrade City Police. UGB. IAB. 10 Mar 1838, Book 2, No. 182.

³⁰ List of taxed heads from whom the Mitrovdan tax of 1836 was collected. UGB. IAB. 18 Feb 1837. UGB. IAB, 1837, Book 1, No. 53 and List of all *esnaf* and town folk and suburbs from which the Durdevdan tax of 1838 was collected. UGB. IAB. 1 Aug 1838. Book 3, No. 486.

³¹ List of possessions by Jedik Nastas Vasiljević, the tavern keeper. UGB, IAB. 10 Dec 1839, B. 6, No. III 81.

³² Member of the Magistrate Jefta Popović to the Belgrade City Magistrate (Draft). UGB. IAB. 8 Jan – 28 Jan 1841, B. 12, No. I 29.

³³ Verdict to Jovan Madžar (Draft). UGB. IAB. 24 Mar 1838, B. 3, No. 802.

“Considering that various foulnesses here in the town may happen, wherever a mehana or a coffee-house (kafana) might be, as people every night, in all parts of this town, go into them, and spend every night sitting and drinking, breaking ordinances already issued, and then dare to play cards for money – so that any danger or criminality which may happen ... is prevented and removed prior to happening to the pleasure and well being of the public”³⁴

The shift which took place in just two decades is fascinating. The language used to describe *meyhane* business indicates a complete transformation in the way of thinking that city officials held. Tavern life which the Magistrate could not regulate was to be expelled from the public eye for its own benefit. This was enacted through a system of control which ultimately sought to transform the practice of alcohol consumption in Belgrade’s taverns. Hence, regulation pushed social activities previously thought of as acceptable to the sphere of illegality. Furthermore, it assigned negative connotations through the implementation of a designed system of moral values.

Changes in Effect: Evaluating Policy and Sponsoring New Practices

The effect governmental involvement had on tavern culture is difficult to assess. While regulation seems to have increased in both detail and scope, practices which were not officially sanctioned did persist. The ban against “having drinks with the Turk” seems to have been one which was difficult to enact. As far as fifteen years after the first act instructing him to do so, a certain Sreten Petrović had to sign an affidavit promising not to allow any Muslim in his tavern.³⁵ The following year, regulations regarding working hours stipulated that such should be printed or displayed on every tavern, and banned nighttime operations. The same publication notes that all-night drinking and gambling persevered in spite of earlier prescriptions against it.³⁶ It would be another decade before the Magistrate instituted regular police surveillance in all taverns to ensure that proper conduct was upheld.

In August 1861, a prescription was issued to administrators of all neighborhoods that authorities should monitor the behavior in the taverns, preferably naming an officer to each.³⁷ The mentality with which the administrator approached the issue is revealed in the justification to the text:

*“I here cannot keep silent and fail to say that it is free, even up to the very dawn, to spend your time in the tavern, in pleasant merriment and conversation, **only not to***

³⁴ Publication of the Belgrade City Magistrate (Draft). UGB. IAB, 21 Apr 1838, Box 2, P. 258a.

³⁵ Obligation by Sreten Petrović. 16 Aug 1849. IAB. UGB, B. 116, No. IX 1802.

³⁶ Publication by the Belgrade City Magistrate. 20 Dec. 1850. IAB. UGB. B. 147, No. XVII 2788.

³⁷ To all neighborhood administrators. (Draft). 7 Aug 1861. IAB. UGB. B. 749, No. XVII 399.

all company and not any tavern, but rather according to character, and in classier taverns... the police authorities should act with caution and diligence, to determine in what company and in what taverns should merriment be put an end to."³⁸

The distinction made between appropriate "places of merriment" and those which should be disbanded suggests a new development in the city government's approach. As prescriptions and ordinances dealing with taverns were repeated several times, it is clear that old practices persevered. Managing tavern visitors, delineating their visitation rights and controlling alcohol consumption proved to be a task impossible to pursue through simple coercion. Rather, the acceptance of the so-called "classier taverns" – places which chose to adopt "appropriate" cultural practices – allowed the City Magistrate to appropriate public space and dominate the social landscape.

The formation of new taverns that would cater to the economic elite and wealthy immigrants from the Habsburg Empire was supported. In 1856, a Moravian factory manager named Wilhelm Schinzel sought permission to open a tavern in Belgrade.³⁹ Nine years later, Ignjat Bajloni, a brewer of Czech origin, was given a concession to open a beer-hall in the center of town.⁴⁰ While these cases are the most prominent, there are several other examples of Habsburg subjects being allowed to open up taverns and beer-halls in areas for which locally-owned establishments had been considered inappropriate. Taverns were also brought into the sphere of acceptability through reassigning funds to organize public balls for the elite. This practice became widespread, as it was an easy method to bypass the alcohol tax and keep taverns open throughout the night. In 1866, 58 persons applied for licenses to organize balls, while next year the number rose to 108, occupying one quarter of the town's taverns.⁴¹ That same year, the Magistrate classified the various *meyhanes* according to location and stature, and began to charge venues ranked lower for the privilege to organize balls. Ultimately, these regulatory practices created a dichotomy of social value. Acceptable taverns were those able to adapt to cultural and social norms, while those unable to do so were consigned to the sphere associated with criminality and debauchery.

The transformation of government involvement with taverns in 19th century Belgrade had two important implications for social life. As certain activities were relegated to the illegal sphere, public space was redefined both in qualitative and

³⁸ *Ibid.* Emphasis mine.

³⁹ Schinzel Wilhelm to the glorious Belgrade City Magistrate. 9 Apr 1856. UGB. IAB, B. 323, No. XVI 20.

⁴⁰ Secretary of the Police Division Kosta Jovanović to the City Magistrate. 15 Feb 1865, B. 1820, No V 251.

⁴¹ The Bajloni family became a successful part of the city elite, pioneering the beer business and importing the first industrial steam engines. Their financial success carried on to the interwar period, as Ignjat Bajloni's grandson became the Governor of the National Bank of Yugoslavia.

⁴¹ List of persons approved to organize balls starting from 1 Jan 1866. & secretary St. Popović to unknown (draft) UGB. IAB, B. 1040, No, XXXIV 228.

quantitative terms. The Magistrate's policies defined proper behavior not only on the street, but also in indoor establishments which catered to the city's residents and visitors. Using the discourse of public welfare, it presented the urban dweller with a social dichotomy in which proactive government became a synonym for development. The *meyhane* was a vestige of Ottoman culture, a space of interaction between local and traveler, where entertainment and trade brought different religious communities together. By its very definition it attracted visitors due to its unregulated nature, a feature which made it incompatible with the City's project of modernization. The final result of this process was not the disappearance of taverns as modes of public interaction, but rather their relegation to a lower social class.

Our understanding of the process of modernization is inseparable from the formation of nation-states in the Balkans. However, that process can also be viewed as a method of legitimizing power, an expansionary practice deemed necessary by the governmental project. In this sense, the rejection of Ottoman social practice is borne out of a need to invent new modes of governing through which to constitute citizens. This process was based on the state's monopoly over the dialectical knowledge of clean and unclean, in which the discourses of order, public welfare, and morality were used to justify the expansion of state power.

Резиме

Милош Јовановић

Обуздавање кафана: Друштвени простор и државна регулација у Београду у XIX веку

Кроз призму живота у механама рад илуструје промене у менталитету управљања које су настале у београдском друштву XIX века. Механе (и кафане као њихове наследнице) су одличан пример *хетеротопних* простора, мултифункционалних зона које задовољавајући различите потребе грађана подривају ригидност утврђеног друштвеног поретка. Као и други хетеротопни простори, београдска механа XIX века се својим постојањем супростављала развојним трендовима у управљању градским становништвом који су били засновани на симултаним процесима хомогенизације и субјективизације. Реконструкција односа између градских власти са једне стране, и власника и посетилаца механа са друге, омогућава нам да боље разумемо како је власт конституисала хомогене националне субјекте у Београђанима, као утицај тог процеса на легитимизацију државног апарата и санкционисаних културних норми. Од 1838. дискурс јавне безбедности и морала почиње да продира у законска акта, са циљем да преобликује „неприхватљиве“ културне норме одређеног дела Београђана. Коцкање, пијанчење, и кршење закона постају честе теме у објавама и указима. Притиснута немогућношћу да оствари „прихватљиве“ културне норме, као и турбулентном политичком ситуацијом, градска власт шири своје амбиције и на полицијску смотру. Поврх тога, Управитељство почиње да издаје дозволе за одржавање балова и игранки средином 1850-тих, тиме стварајући хијерархијски однос између различитих механа. Овај приступ кулминира класификацијом механа и кафана од стране Града 1866. године. Кроз креирање нових и санкционисање постојећих културних пракси, београдска власт XIX века је легитимисала свој положај моћи користећи се дијалектичним знањем прихватљивог и неприхватљивог. Разумевање овог модернизацијског пројекта је јасно везано за формирање српске националне државе на Балканском полуострву. Међутим, овај процес се такође може видети као општи метод субјективизације становништва у хетерогеним (претежно градским) срединама.