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Author’s Preface

Dear readers, before you is the fifth volume named *Srebrenica through past centuries* of the well-known edition *Monumenta Srebrenica*. Why do I say well-known? The reason is simple. This is the fifth year of regular publishing and the fifth volume of Edition which presents a small jubilee that not many scientific and cultural projects can boast about. The result is accomplished with much hard work, effort and understanding of not just authors, publishers, translators, but also members of the Editorial Board with Dr Sadik Ahmetović at the head and the Organization Board for Commemoration of 11th July 1995, the anniversary of the genocide against Bosniaks in UN “Safe Area Srebrenica” with Ćamil Duraković at the head. Dr Selma Kešetović invested special effort and work in translation of the texts into English. We use the opportunity to thank cordially to all the mentioned. We also thank our dear readers because without your interest this Edition would make no sense. The result of our five-year-long work is composed in 36 published scientific works, out of which 30 are first time published original scientific works and 6 pre-published works that we published as appendices. The works have been written by 23 authors from various scientific disciplines with many scientific and academic years of service, and majority of them are university professors.

There are seven works in the fifth volume and they follow the structural pattern of the Edition. There are four original scientific works in the first part of the volume and those are: Edin Mutapčić’s *Spiritual and religious characteristics of Srebrenica and its surrounding in the 15th century*, Adib Đozić’s and Rusmir Djedović’s two texts *Musala, Varoš and Ciganluk in the city of Srebrenica in the late 19th century* and *Villages Orahovica, Vigor and Buće in the late 19th century*. The fourth part of the volume is Nusret Hodžić’s *The village Sućeska: Socio-historical and demographic sketches of continuity of life*. Mihajlo J. Đinčić’s *Srebrenik near Srebrenica*, published in 1934 by the Serbian Royal Academy, is placed in the second part of the volume. In his text from 1934 Đinčić did not translate sources from Latin. We have done that as a help to our readers for better understanding. Benjamin Hasanović translated parts of the text from Latin into Bosnian. We have so far published original documents of verdicts brought before domestic and international tribunals for
the crime of genocide against Bosniaks in UN “Safe Area Srebrenica” in July 1995. This time we decided to publish two scientific works in this part of the volume. The first is Rasim Muratović’s *The verdict of the Hague tribunal in the case of Radovan Karadžić – the confirmation of Serbian hegemony, politics and practice in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. We believe that this approach, at the moment, is absolutely justified because the verdict to Radovan Karadžić for joint criminal enterprise with elements of genocide is too spacious to be published. The second reason for justification of this interpretation of the verdict is that readers will be able to understand its essence, motifs, intentions and goals of the joint criminal enterprise with Radovan Karadžić at the head, and for which he was given a sentence of 40 years imprisonment before the International Criminal Tribunal for ex-Yugoslavia in the Hague on 24th March 2016. The second work in this part is Muamer Džananović’s *The crime against children in Goražde during the 1992-1995 siege*. This work helps us understand all the brutality, mercilessness, scope, and above all uncivilized and inhuman character of the 1992-1995 War against Bosnian society and state which resulted in the genocide against Bosniaks not only in Srebrenica but throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. This work keeps our promise that we made when writing the proposal of this project that we would not refer only to the area of Srebrenica in our research but to the wider area of Bosnian Podrinje which includes Goražde and its surrounding.

We decided to give one documentary supplement that refers to the Bosnian language in this part of the volume. It is the cover page for a textbook *the Grammar of Bosnian Language* from 1890. The reason for this is that, unfortunately, the government of Republic of Srpska still denies Bosniaks and other residents of that entity the right to call their language by its historic name Bosnian, which even the occupational Austro-Hungarian rule in the 19th century did not do. We will use this opportunity to emphasize only several historic facts that undoubtedly confirm centuries-long existence of Bosnian as a

---

1 The defendant was one of the founders of the Serbian Democratic Party and its president from July 1990 till July 1996. He was the president of the Council for national Safety of Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and on 12th May 1992 he was elected for the president of the Presidency of Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He was the only president of Republic of Srpska and supreme military commander of armed forces of Republic of Srpska on 17th December 1992.

separate linguistic subject, completely equal to Croatian and Serbian and other south-Slavic languages. The first known mention of Bosnian can be found in one notary act in the city of Kotor, when a Venetian prince bought on 3rd July 1436 a girl “of Bosnian origin and a heretic, named in Bosnian (aut. emphasis) Djevena”. In the multitude of facts that confirm the continuity of centuries of Bosnian Senahid Halilović emphasizes the following: „Constantine the Philosopher (a writer from the end of 14th and the beginning of 15th century) in his record ‘Skazanie izjavljen o pismeneh’ mentions Bosnian in addition to Bulgarian, Serbian, Slovenian, Czech and Croatian. (...) A bishop from Nin in Peri wrote to Fra Arsenio in 1581 in the Bosnian language. (...) Many writers from the 17th century until present day called it Bosnian (together with Slovene, Illyrian, Croatian), such as: Matija Divković (...), Stjepan Matijević, Stjepan Margitić, Ivan Frano Jukić, Martin Nedić, Anto Knežević... (...) In addition to the Czech, Polish, Croatian, Serbian and other languages, a writer Matija Antun Reljković (1732-1798) mentioned the Bosnian language.”3 Rightfully Alija Isaković wrote: „Therefore, unlike what is today considered to be the Serbian literary language and the Croatian literary language, the Bosnian language has had the least culturally historic watershed, meanders, internal rising, regional and foreign interference, and the least difference between the folk and literary language. ‘Bosniaks are something special and their language is special among other languages’, wrote Muhamed Hevai uskufi in 1631. The language of this Alhamiado poet and the Bosnian language in his Turkish-Bosnian dictionary Potur-Šahidija (Magbûli ‘ārif) from 1631, the language of Fejzo Softa from the 18th century, the language of a ballad ‘Hasanaginica’, published in 1774 in Venetia, the language of Mustafa Firakija in his petition ‘Mahzar piše bosanska fukara’ (tr. The Bosnian poverty writes mahzar (a petition)) from 1815, the language of Umihana Čuvidina’s poetry from the first half of the 19th century, very progressively continues into the language of Bosnian writes from the beginning of the 20th century (Edhem Mulabdić, Safvet Bey Bašagić, Musa Ćazim Ćatić).”4

By displaying these few historical facts about the Bosnian language, we want to point out the unjustified, unfounded, unscientific and violent denial of Bosnian. The ultimate goal of this denial is the denial of everything that is Bosnian, and first of all the national identity of Bosniaks as a quintessential comprehensiveness of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in order to retain only Serbian

---

3 See more in: Halilović, Senahid (1991), Bosanski jezik, Biblioteka Ključanin, Sarajevo; Rizvić, Muhsin (1999), Bosna i Bošnjaci: jezik i pismo, Preporod, Sarajevo
facilities because according to Serbian hegemony Bosnia and Herzegovina is Serbian land and everything in it is Serbian. Historical facts, as we see, speak quite different. Bosnia and Herzegovina presents multiethnic, multicultural and multi-religious society and state, as the state and society is neither Bosniak nor Croatian nor Serbian, but belongs equally to all its citizens.

The denial of genocide against Bosniaks and the Bosnian language presents open, brutally ruthless and overt form of ideology of Serbian hegemony. Along with these forms there is one intensive, not at all harmless, insidiously hidden activity “Serbization“ of history and socio-cultural reality of Srebrenica and its surrounding, of the whole Bosnian Podrinje, but also of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is done through pseudo-scientific, without historical facts, unfounded writing of the history of Srebrenica. Typical such example is a book of Željko Teofilović, Pravoslavlje u Srebrenici, SPCO Srebrenica, Srebrenica, 2010. When we have all of these facts in mind, then we see that the Edition Monumenta Srebrenica has an exceptional scientific and cultural value in learning the truth, and it is manifested in multilateral character of socio-historical being of Srebrenica and its surrounding that adamantly opposes monoethnic, pseudo-scientific interpretations of the history of Srebrenica. The Edition Monumenta Srebrenica is not only a light of truth that shines but it ,at the same time, presents the lamp that illuminates the road of truth about Srebrenica and its near and distant surrounding.

Professor Adib Đozić
SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF SREBRENICA AND THE SURROUNDINGS IN THE 15TH CENTURY

Abstract:

Srebrenica was first mentioned in the written sources on 16 August 1352. It was in the wider area of Osat, the region that was first mentioned in the written sources in 1283. Precisely, from the first mention it is clear that the area shares the characteristics with other parts of Bosnian spiritual aegis. Thus, the Bosnian church was a dominant religious institution that in the Srebrenica area had a significant economic role via inns that were provided to merchants within the Bosnian Church’s houses. However, through the economic strength more significant role in Srebrenica started to obtain foreigners people from Dubrovnik and the saxons – who erected the Church of St. Mary with a convict for their own needs – and around which the religious life of those settlers was built. With the establishment of Despot Stefan Lazarević’s administration Orthodox spiritual interests also penetrated. Although metropolitan and the clergy occasionally resided in the town, there were no institutional penetration of the faith and the construction of its objects until the Ottoman conquest. Thus, the Ottomans deserve the credit for the spread of both Islam and Orthodoxy (through migration of Vlachs) in the Srebrenica area, and the rest of Bosnia. At the same time Srebrenica became a significant economic and spiritual center from which Bosnian spiritual influence spreads over the area of east Podrinje.

Key words: Srebrenica, the Bosnian Church, the Catholic Church, Orthodoxy, Podrinje
1. SREBRENICA – BASIC NOTES

1.1. SREBRENICA – DURING THE BOSNIAN RULERS’ PERIOD

When Kulin Ban in 1189 signed a merchant agreement with the Dubrovnik Republic, at that point he probably could not imagine what the reflection of that agreement would be in the future. However, it took one and a half century for true reflection of that agreement be present on economic and political scene and to bring effect of development to both countries to the mutual satisfaction. Still, the rule of Stjepan II (1314-1353) and Tvrtko I (1353-1391) lead to the peak of those mutual trade relations that had their strongest economic and demographic reflection exactly in Srebrenica. Srebrenica was placed in the area of Osat that appeared in the written sources seventy years before its central and most significant place. Namely, Parish of Osat was mentioned for the first time in the written sources on 12 July 1283 in records of the office of Dubrovnik during the sale of a slave “Radosclauuam de Osat”.\(^1\) This is very valuable data that gives us not only the first information on immediate area of Srebrenica in the Middle Ages but also confirms state and legal position of the area. The very fact that the object of trade are slaves and that was not possible in non-Christian surroundings. Thus, the aforementioned fact leads us to state and legal affiliation of Srebrenica to the Bosnian state where “heresy” (heterodoxy), from the aspect of dominant religious beliefs of that time, only in Bosnia was the Bosnian Church, condemned by all as “a heretic church“ the state religion. Accordingly, the information on the sale of a slave from Srebrenica gives us very significant information on religious beliefs of residents of the area. In addition of the leading medievalists Sima Ćirkovićev more than half a century ago concluded that “from Serian state teritorries was no record on any person“ as the object of the before mentioned trade. They also noted that majority of “people sold to Dubrovnik originated from Bosnia“, and this form of trade was also noted in Sirmium.\(^2\)

Srebrenica alone was first mentioned in historical sources on 16 August 1352, when two mailmen from Dubrovnik stated that they had on behalf of Grub Mančetić delivered a letter to Bevenjutić (Bene de Benuennuta) “in Sebernica“.\(^3\) Due to its economic significance and valuable mines Srebrenica

---

\(^1\) Josip Lučić, *Spisi dubrovačke kancelarije*, Knjiga II, Zagreb, 1984, pp. 275
soon became one of the most important urban centers of the medieval Bosnian state. Enormous interest of foreigners, especially people from Dubrovnik, caused significant demographic expansion with very profound Dubrovnik’s colony. Thus, at the beginning of 15th century Srebrenica had the status of the city. However, residents of Srebrenica also took part in trade. Therefore, Srebrenica developed as an area of omnipresent prosperity and an open city for all who had some kind of significance in the economy of the time. Since 1389 customs were mentioned in this city. Merchants from Dubrovnik took ores and duty rates as rent from Bosnian rulers. Somewhat later, money was minted in the city. Next to Srebrenica was its fort Srebrenik. Surely, Srebrenica was “developed urban area, and the fact that the city had its own sewer system added to the claim.“ „Thus, Srebrenica, is our only known settlement from the Middle Ages that had some kind of sewer system.“ The Franciscan monastery and the Church of St. Mary added to the urban appearance of Srebrenica. In time it expanded due to abundant contributions from people from Dubrovnik. The aforementioned commercial cooperation with the Republic of Dubrovnik “opened the doors to new and stronger cultural influence from Italy and the Western Europe.“ Again, the Church of St. Mary and the Franciscan monastery should be mentioned because they had “features of the Gothic style“, which presented the characteristics of churches and monasteries in the Western Europe of that time. In those communication circumstances, trade was no easy job. Namely, “high mountains contributed to localism“, so communication within the Bosnian Kingdom, “as well as with the outer world“, were “bad“. According to Dubrovnik’s sources, a caravan from Dubrovnik, in the 15th century “took seven or eight days to Srebrenica and ten days to Zvornik“. But all of that did not prevent Srebrenica at the beginning of the 15th century to develop into one of the most significant urban centers of the continental part of the Balkan Peninsula.

---

4 Desanka Kovačević – Kojić, Gradska naselja srednjovjekovne bosanske države, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1978.; 40-41; 73.
5 Marko Vego, Naselja bosanske srednjevjekovne države, Svjetlost, Sarajevo 1957., 108.
7 Desanka Kovačević – Kojić, Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek, SANU, Beograd, 2010., 122-123; S obje strane kuće Marina Gučetića nalazile su se kloake, tj. odvodna kanalizacija, pokriveni pločama, kako je to uostalom bilo u primorskim gradovima tog doba. U dubrovačkom Statutu je i formalno naređeno „da kloake moraju biti pokrivene“.
8 D. Kovačević – Kojić, Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek, 122-123
9 D. Kovačević – Kojić, Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek, 133.
10 John V. A. Fine, Bosanska crkva: novo tumačenje - studija o Bosanskoj crkvi, njenom mjestu u državi i društvu od 13. do 15. stoljeća, Bosanski Kulturni Centar, Sarajevo, 2005, pp. 51
“The only known data on fair gathering in urban settlements“ is related to Srebrenica in the inside of Bosnia and also Serbia. One of the basic features of a fair as a temporary square, where buyers and merchants, city residents and surrounding and neighbouring villagers met, presented the mass gathering. As in other parts of Bosnia, a place name Panđurište remained in Srebrenica until today.11

We have already in our earlier papers pointed to the influence of Srebrenica to its surroundings, on both sides of the Drina River. Namely, the area on the east from the Drina and on the south from the Sava and the Danube (present Serbia) is in the state context interregnuma area towards which its aspirations show Hungary, Byzant, Bulgaria and many other peoples that took significant role in the mass migration. The affiliation of the immediate Srebrenica area in the state context is very simple. Namey, the border of the Bosnian state formed in the early Middle Ages on the rivers Sava (northern) and Drina (eastern). It is confirmed by the network of fortified early medieval settlements that were situated next to the aforementioned rivers (on the south from the Sava and on the west from the Drina).12 However, the strengthening of Srebrenica in both economic and administrative aspects is connected to a significant part of present east (Serbian) Podrinje. One very valuable data is given by Feliks Petančić, a diplomat from Šenj and travel writer from the second half of the 15th century and the beginning of 16th century13, in his description of “roads to Turkey“ gave us one exceptionally valuable data that was greatly neglected in historiography until today. We shall quote the aforementioned text due to its significance and many interesting names that the author gave: “The second place, which leads from Panonija to Mizija, is near Zaslon (Saslon) or Šabac (Sabacus), not far from the place where Drina, from Dalmacija14 meets the Sava. There are two provinces, Bijeljina (Beligna) and Mačva (Maza). On the right is the Bijela River (Flumine albo), and the following: Sacer, Chirbernico, Crupno and Zaëza, then follows a well-known village Valjevo (Vagbem) and highlands Larzi, impervious for armies because of cars and luggage. On the left side is the Morave, that flows next to a small town of Kruševac (Cruscevam arcem), and the aforementioned roads.“15 Although there are many interesting pieces of information, the most important fact for us is that the Drina River flew into the sava near Šabac, thus, a lot more on the east than it is the situation today (it flows next to Bosanska Rača).

11 D. Kovačević – Kojić, Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek, pp. 57
14 Pannonia, Mezija and Dalmatia are ancient names used throughout the Middle Ages.
15 Petar Matković, Putovanja po balkanskom poluočtu XVI wieka, Felix Petančić i njegov opis puteva u Tursku, Rad JAZU XLIX (1878), Zagreb, 1879, pp. 137.
1.2. SREBRENICA UNDER THE RULE OF STEVAN LAZAREVIĆ

Srebrenica and the surrounding was continuously controlled by the medieval Bosnian state until 1410. Then the situation changed under the influence of Hungary. Namely, one of the leading persons then in the manor-political life in Bosnia, Herceg (Duke) Hrvoje Hrvatinić, surrendered Srebrenica to Hungarian King Sigismund. In our opinion the reasons are twofold. First, the desire to ingratiate himself with an intense Hungarian King, and second, because, among Zlatonosović family in the north and in the south Pavlović, his temporary master of this area was unsustainable.

Basically, the outcome of the epilogue, that happened, probably, during May 1410, was that Sigismund awarded Hrvoje with the title of vice-King of Bosnia, and in return received Srebrenica, Kušlat, Brodar and Susjed in Usora, i.e. Podrinje. This document undisputedly confirmed that Srebrenica was in Usori. Hungarian garrisons were placed in the above mentioned cities during their fall military campaign of the same year. In the new circumstances, Sigismund donated Srebrenica to Serbian Despot Stevan Lazarević in July 1411. The question is what made Hungarian King Sigismund decide this way? Although the answer to it is not easy to get, this event made Srebrenica unstable area to live in, but for the Serbian despotism of primary importance because of the obligation to pay tribute to the Sultan, so that in time it constantly increased the allocations for customs and other measures that the despotism introduced and imposed a huge burden on the city’s production regardless of the decrease in production and the then colony of foreigners. Let us remind that The Serbian Despotate was a vassal state of the Ottoman Sultan, and it was even for some time, if necessary, was in a double vassal relationship with both the Sultan and the Hungarian King, provided that, depending on the circumstances, acted differently. On the other hand, the decline of the medieval Serbian state led to the loss of some stable national and geographic area, where its ethnic and religious group could have performed some kind of reorganization, and for which there was an ambition where the Orthodox Church was an important factor. Thus, the ambition of the Serbian state was not extinguished it was alive, which was the Hungarian King well aware

19 See note 17.
of. For this reason Sigismund let Despot Stefan Lazarević in the area that was inadequate for life (due to numerous debris of rivers) and created him economic conditions for existence through the mines of Srebrenica. Thus was created the Despotate between the Ottoman Empire and the Hungarian Kingdom from which both sides provided. Namely, this vassal Ottoman state, presented somekind of *interregnum* between these two forces (The Ottoman and Hungary) for almost half of century. Stefan Lazarević fullfilled his vassal obligations toward the Ottoman Empire, i.e. the Sultan until the Andorran battle, and then with the defeat of Bayazed “gained larger freedom of act, and, thus, acknowledge the supremacy of the Hungarian King Sigismund“. However, the general situation in the Balkans and contracts that “Byzantium, Venice, Genoa and Rhodes in 1403 concluded with the master of European Turkey Suleyman, Steafn remained a Turkish vassal with the commitment to pay taxes“.20 Precisely, in such conditions of paying double vassalage the Serbian Despotate temporarily established its rule over Srebrenica at the beginning of the second decade of the 15th century.

1. 3. THE RETURN OF SREBRENICA IN THE AEGIS OF ITS PARENTAL KINGDOM AND THE FALL UNDER THE OTTOMAN RULE

From the moment Despot Stefan Lazarević arrived to rule, the constant battle for Srebrenica began between the Despot and Bosnian kings and noblemen, and later the Ottoman would become a part of that battle. Probably on this occasion a skillful Sigismund’s diplomacy started in the direction “divide and conquer“, so Srebrenica would become an object of conflict between Bosnia and the Despot until Stjepan Tomašević came the the head of the Despotate. Perhaps the best indicator of how the situation in Srebrenica was unstable between 1410–1458 lies in the fact that at that time, according to Jiriček, Srebrenica was once Hungarian, 5 times Serbian, 4 times Bosnian and 3 times Ottoman, and out of which it was 5 years under the Ottoman rule continuously from 1439 to 1444, when it was the Despotate under the Ottoman rule longer for the first time. Thus, the duration of the Bosnian rule in the area during the Middle Ages was much longer.21 It is from this period when Srebrenica fell under the rule of Stefan Lazarević, that relations in Srebrenica became strained. With the arrival of the Despot to Srebrenica, ceased “idyllic

21 A. Handžić, *Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1975, pp. 95
time that they expressed their grief for to King Sigismund\textsuperscript{22} for the Dubrovnik settlers. In the immediate neighborhood there were open ambitions of the Ottoman Empire to overrule this part of the Balkans as well. The role of Srebrenica greatly depended on the opportunities in the other neighbouring, now the Serbian side of the Drina. Precisely, the control over that area would be established through marriage liason of Bosnian King Stjepan Tomaš’s son, Stjepan Tomašević. Thus, the last Bosnian King Stjepan Tomašević was also the last Serbian Despot. The fort Smederevo was at the center of events. On the other hand, Smederevo presented a turning point in the determination of the Ottoman conquest policy towards Bosnia. Namely, as the Ottoman chronicler Neşrî wrote “Bosna kirah ol vakit Semendire’ye hakimdi”. Accordingly, the last stronghold of the area, the city of Smederevo, was under his rule, and with its fall in 1459 the traces of the Serbian Despotate formally disappeared.\textsuperscript{23} According to Dursun Bey, the Bosnians taking of Smederevo only, was one of the excuses for Sultan Mehmed II to start the war against Bosnia.\textsuperscript{24}

The city of Smederevo was handed over to the Ottomans without resistance. The only thing that King Stjepan Tomašević tried at that moment was an activity to get Srebrenica in exchange. Although there was the Sultan’s premordial incline towards the exchange, it did not occur after it became known that the Bosnian King did not pay taxes.\textsuperscript{25} Surely the mentioned fact once again confirms our belief that there was awareness in Bosnian kings to define borders on the Sava and the Drina, giving up easily areas on the east of the Drina continuously through history. This precisely mentioned incident about the tax led to Sultan Mehmed’s II sending of representative to Bosnian King Stjepan Tomašević, who, almost ultimatively, asked the taxes to be paid. After the Bosnian King refused to do so, the process of conquest of the medieval Bosnian state in 1463 started.\textsuperscript{26} This sealed the destiny of the medieval Bosnian domain of Srebrenica, which fell under the Ottoman rule three years earlier than its parent state, and it was a prelude to the final

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} D. Kovačević – Kojić, \textit{Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek}, pp. 19-20
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Gliša Elezović, \textit{Turski izvori za istoriju Jugoslovena}, Bratstvo, XXVI, Beograd, 1932, pp. 112-117
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Ve eydürler ki, Kıral Hünkâra elçi gönderip “Serayinik’le bile Semendire’yi bari istibdal edelim” dedi. Hünkâr razı oldu. Semendire’yi verdiklerinden sonra hesap ettiler ki, haracından kiralin Hünkâra dahi borcu var. Borcuna tutup, Serayinik’i dahi vermediler. Ve bil-cümle çınkû Semendire feth olundu; çanlarını yıkıp, kiliselerini mesacit ettiler. Ve Lâz ili tamam ol vakit feth olundu. Bu fetih hicretin sekkiz yüész almış dördünde vakti oldu.” Thus, it happened in 864, which suits the period from 28 October 1459-16 October 1460. (Neşrî Tarihi, pp. 737).
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Neşrî Tarihi, pp. 762-763.
\end{itemize}
breakdown of the medieval Bosnian state. Thus, the area of Srebrenica and its surroundings was definitely defeated by the Ottoman Empire around 1460.  

2. “THE BOSNIAN CHURCH“

Certainly one of the dominant issues when it comes to medieval Srebrenica is religious and spiritual aspiration of the area during this period. This is particularly important due to the ever more frequent falsifying of its primarily ethnic, and thus the religious medieval demographic structure. For this reason, the center of this research is the aim to respond to the mentioned task and during which we will not observe Srebrenica isolated, because that kind of research could be easily manipulated with. Thus, our analyses will go into wider geographic area encompassing both banks of the Drina, i.e. Podrinje.

Srebrenica was significant economic center. We can talk about Bosnian domination in the area of Srebrenica since the early Middle Ages without doubt. Surely, next to the aspect of political rule there is the question of religious organization in the mentioned area. We have already concluded that the early mentioning of Osat and the slave trade noted in Dubrovnik in 1283 undoubtedly leads us to conclude that for Dubrovnik and the circumstances residents of the immediate surrounding of Srebrenica was “heretic“, i.e. they belonged to the Bosnian Church. There are numerous written proofs to support the claim. What is interesting and what we will certainly discuss is the fact that Srebrenica was not only regional economic center for gathering merchants, craftmen and miners from all Podrinje, but also a crossroad from which the representatives of the Bosnian Church sent their learning and beliefs to both traditionally and historiographically characterised as Bosnian and today’s Serbian.

In traditional historiography P. Andelić, was the first who tried to put Srebrenica in the structure of the medieval Bosnian state and in the area of Usora. Thus, the region of Osat, lands of Podrinje are the constituting parts of Usora. It can be seen from the contract by which Herceg Hrvoje Vukčić-Hrvatinić surrendered cities Srebrenicu, Kušlat, Brodar and Susjed where it was listed that they were placed in Usora, and thus in Podrinje. Therefore, this document confirmed that Srebrenica was in Usora.  

27 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, 42-43.; T. Vukanović, Srebrenica u Srednjem veku, GZM, 1946, pp. 51-80
the Zlatonosović family who performed the duty of duke of Usora as their masters. Surely that this valuable data adds to the fact that above them in hierarchy stood dukes of Usora. The graphic location of Srebrenica in the structure of the medieval Bosnian state would look as follows:

![Graphic Location of Srebrenica in Medieval Bosnian State]

Usora and Soli were first mentioned in historic sources in 1225, in the letters of Pope Honorius III to Kalocsa Archbishop Ugrin. In the first letter the Pope thanked the Hungarian prelat to destroy the heretics “de Bosna, Soy, et Wossora“, while he confirmed with the second letter the decision of King Andrija II to give to Kalocsa Archbishop “terrás quasdam, videlicet Bosnam, Soy et Wossora“, in order to clean them from the heretics. So, two decades after the Parliament on the Bilino field and the so-called Act of abjuris, the Bosnian Church was present even in the northernmost parts of the former Bosnian state in Usora and Soli (which encompassed most probably the latter Podrinje). Of course, the lack of written documents for the direct area of Srebrenica partly hides a puzzle about religious relations in the mentioned area, but indirect source surely claim that we can talk about the influence of the Catholic Church only after the establishment of the Dubrovnik’s colony, and about partial presence of the Orthodoxy only from the time when Stevan Lazarević instilled his rule over Srebrenica.

2.1. SHELTERS OF THE BOSNIAN CHURCH IN SREBRENICA AND THE SURROUNDINGS

So, the Dubrovnik sources tell us that their merchants “repeatedly“ in the time interval from 1407 to 1418 used “Christian shelters“ as boarding houses (inns) for their merchants. Thus, “Patarins homes“ became the safest places for their rest, but also for their trade. It sounds incredible but they rather stayed in their (Patarin) houses then in royal inns. The explanation can surely be found in the Bosnian inter-noble conflicts, and we know that those were the times of turmoil and fight, and even interregnum, between kings Ostoja and Tvrtko II. In such circumstances, skillful people from Dubrovnik “strived to ensure their men and trade interest safety by leaning to the representatives of

30 Pejo Ćošković, Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću, Institut za istoriju, Sarajevo, 2005, pp. 143-145
the Bosnian Church“. Thus, “promises“ from those lines were not pro forma but truly “had their practical side.“ It seems that Ljubskovo led in the role of Patarin caravan station. So, as a destination of merchants and caravans from Dubrovnik in Bosnia the most often Ljupskovo and their Patarins with their shelters are mentioned.“31 In this case “the archives of Dubrovnik“, that is a result of “practical needs of their business relations with Bosnia“, present valuable testimonies about the concentration of Christians (contrata dei patarini), with several of their shelters (domus patarenorum), i.e. (case dei paterini) like the one in u Ljupskovo, that as we know presented a significant caravan station “on the road to Srebrenica“ and which they (people from Dubrovnik) used to bring their goods to Srebrenica.32 It is precisely that the sources of the Dubrovnik provenance confirm that “in the given period“ the teachings of this religious movement were transmitted. Namely, in historic sources “exclusively members of the Bosnian Church, their shelters, and the wider area of ‘cotrat’ are mentioned. The followers of the Bosnian Church played very important mediating role in the development of Dubrovnik caravan trade in the area u historijskim izvorima se. “33 The first man “of their Christian community“ was Patarin Radojko “who after the house“ in Ljubskovo in one document from 21st September 1415 was named. It was normal that Vlachs lead caravans and in the same year they were also hired to go to Patarins to “Glubuskovo“34. With the second contract Vlachs were hired to lead merchants to Christian house (domo Christianorum) in Glubuskovo.35 In the contract Dubrovnik used a term “Christians“, which Patarins used when they talked about themselves. Vlachs were hired in 1414 in the house of Ruksin, a Patarin from Glubuskovo. It is assumed that Ruksin was a prior of the house.36 The second contract from 1414 mentioned only Patarin house in Glubuskovo, as a place of their residence

31 In the documents from Dubrovnik one can often find expressions like “usque in Glubsouo usque ad patarenos ... usque ad domos Christianorum in Glubscho... usque ad locum dictum Ruxin patarino ad Glubsouo ... usque ad locum patarenorum in Glubsouo ... ad Glubsouo usque ad domos Radoychi ... ad Glubsowo ad patorinorum contratas“, (M. Dinić, Iz Dubrovačkog arhiva, III, 184-187; Diversa Cancellarie, XXXIX (1411-1414), fol. 77, fol. 115, fol. 75, fol. 19, fol. 36).
33 See note 30.
34 M. Dinić, Iz Dubrovačkog arhiva, III, 186-187. (Diversa Cancellarie XXXIX (1411-1414), fol. 19): “ad Glubscoo usque ad domos Radoychi”.
35 M. Dinić, Iz dubrovačkog arhiva, III, 185, (Diversa Cancellarie XXXIX (1411-1414), fol. 115).
36 The sources precisely state: „usque ad locum dictum Ruxin patarino ad Glubsouo“. The document is from 7 November 1414. (M. Dinić, Iz Dubrovačkog arhiva, Knjiga III, SANU, 1967., 185.; Diversa Cancellarie XL (1414-1416), fol. 75).
during the trade. Already, according to the contract from the following 1415, Vlachs were ordered to take merchants to Radojho’s house in Glubuskovo/Ljubuskovo („ad Glupscovo usque ad domos Radoychi“).37 We presume that he was a Patarin and inherited Ruksin’s position. In the document it is stated that merchants were on their way to Srebrenica. So, we presume that Glubuskovo (probably Ljubuskovo) was near Srebrenica and most probably, a day-long travel from Srebrenica.38 References on Glubuskovo and Patarins continued in 1416.39 Sources inform us that Ljubuskovo was on the territory of the Dinjičić family. In 1450 the mentioned family sent a Patarin to Dubrovnik, as its emissary. Petar Dinjičić used those services. Of course, it is not a proof that the Dinjičić family belonged to the Bosnian Church, but surela “had cordial relationships“ with its supporters and priests.40 Thus, there is no mention of the religious affiliation of the Dinjičić family. However, it did not disturb their close relationship with the Bosnian Church. The shelter in Ljubuskovo in question was on their territory.41

The often mentioning of Ljubuskovo, as the goal of Dubrovnik’s merchants and caravans, confirms the significance of the place as the transition station on the way to Srebrenica and the role of the representatives of the Bosnian Church in the development of caravan trade in Bosnia during massive internal turmoil. „On the contrary, even in the time of war against Bosnia, people of Dubrovnik sought help from the representatives of the Bosnian Church in order to protect their interests in the country of Kotromanić.“42 This type of politics must be understood “through the prism of real protection“ that only representatives of the Bosnian Church could provide to citizens and merchant “interests in Bosnia“ of Dubrovnik. Precisely this religious community in those “troubled times“ was the strength that could efficiently provide protection because it “had a stronghold in the Bosnian society“. People of Dubrovnik did not leave this practice even later, in times of peace, explaining the fact “that their reliance on Christians and their hierarchy suffered

37 M. Dinić, Iz Dubrovačkog arhiva, pp. 186-187 (Diversa Cancellarle XL, fol. 19.); J. V. A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, 258, (see notes 167, 168 and 169)
40 John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, 288-289., note 172.; M. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva, I, 34, cites documents for the Dubrovnik Archives from 1425 and 1426 (see not 18 and 19) where he says “…usque in Glubscovo in contrata Dragisini”, indicates that Ljubuskovo was on the Dragiša Dinjičić’s territory.
41 John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, pp. 269
42 P. Ćošković, Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću, pp. 146
Therefore, the wise people of Dubrovnik primarily analyzed political conditions relying still on the Bosnian Church while conducting the trade. However, after the state intervention of King Stjepan Tomašević and repression against members of the Bosnian Church the image of religious parable changed, where the role of the Bosnian Church lost its strength in economic and political life. In the Srebrenica region the ruler’s intervention also had weaker intensity, which can be seen from Petar Dinjičić’s usage of patarens in diplomatic relations – relatively late (1450) and the Ottoman sources that indicated that the members of the Bosnian Church in Srebrenica were active even after the disappearance of their own state that favored this religion as the state one for centuries. Thus, they found justification for the change in relations “depending on the development of political condition” that “Bosnian state, society and the Church” went through in the last four decades of its independence. Yet we cannot escape the conclusion, that in the end, under “the influence of the missionary activity of the Franciscans” and the support of the Bosnian rulers and a significant number of aristocrats who accepted the Catholic Church, sanskih vladara i značajnog broja velikaša koji su pristali uz Katoličku crkvu, there was a stagnation of the social impact of the Bosnian Church.

Dinić registered that “in the vicinity of Ljubuskovo was Likodra, a caravan station, but which had a lower turnover than Glubskova/Ljupskova”. Our sources recorded that “for the same price of transportation“, Vlachs transported the goods to this caravan station (1405) „usque in Lochodra (sic) aut in Glubschouo“. It is undeniable that today in the municipality of Krupanj in Podrinje there is a polace named Likodra, that is several kilometers away from Krupanj in the north-east direction. The area is recognizable after remains of Bosnian cultural legacy, i.e. tombstones (aut. Stećak). Thus, “there are old cemeteries next to the road Krupanj - Stolice and Krupanj - Likodra, ima starih grobalja“.

Therefore, this caravan station and the Bosnian Church’s hostel were situated in that part. There is a necropolis with 10 pillar-shaped tombstones (stećak) at the locality of Ivanovića njive (aut.tr. Ivanović’s field) near the village. They are placed in the west-east direction. The monuments are poorly fenced and preserved. One example is decorated with motifs of a plastic cross and crescent. Therefore, the existence of the

---

43 P. Ćošković, Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću, pp. 146
44 P. Ćošković, Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću, pp. 146,147
45 M. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva, I, pp. 35
46 Arheološki spomenici i nalazišta u Srbiji, knjiga I, Zapadna Srbija (urednik: Đorđe Bošković), SAN, Beograd, 1953., 184. See other sites in the vicinity.
47 Šefik Bešlagić, STEĆCI, kataloško-topografski pregled, “Veselin Masleša”, Sarajevo, 1971, 416-417; The whole area is abundant with tombstones. Those are the following
Bosnian religious and cultural influences from the other side (eastern) of the Drina River is undeniable. Furthermore, Dinić excluded that it was this Likodra “in the Serbian part of Podrinje”, as Jiriček “thought“ earlier, because it was exclusively placed in Bosnia according to one contract – “in Bosnam ad locum vocatum Lichoder.”

A traditional historiography cannot think that this caravan station could have been in Bosnia, but on the east of the Drina River (today’s Serbian part of Podrinje), where the Bosnian political, cultural and spiritual powers also extended during one period in the Middle Ages. Such written source on the Bosnian Church’s hostels are rare. Numerous Christian hostels “based on remembrance of Church representatives who were believed to be at the head of these communities and symbols on tombstones“ are in historical literature.

2.2. TOMBSTONES (STEĆCI) IN THE SREBRENICA REGION

It has already been stated that at the beginning of the 15th century source from Dubrovnik mentioned Ljubuskovo on the south of Srebrenica, wheara a Pataran’s house was located, and „ad Glupskovo ad Patarinorum contratas“ might be Pataran’s properties, because our medieval parishes (Šidak) were called “contrata“. Those properties could have been in hands of Christians and Vlachs in the village Gornja Tatovnica or Tatinica in the nahia Hrtar. The same data were recorded in a document from 1599 that the remaining Christian land were heritages: Ratko Christian, Radmil Christian and Radovan Christian in the village Starovo, in the nahia Hrtar, a heritage of Radosav Christian in the village Gornja Tatovnica in the nahia Hrtar as well as a heritage of Vukić Christian in the village Peć, and then a heritage Radosav in the village Klokotnica and heritages of Christian Ostoj and Vladislav in the village Donji Zgunj in the nahia Osat; all but the last one

sites Dvorska, Zavlaka, Tolisavic, Bela Crkva, Šarampov, Mačkov kamen, Mramorje, Šljivova, Vrbić, Burića rast, etc.

48 M. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva, I, pp. 35
49 According to local sources, hostels appeared without some special territorial schedule and interconnection, such as in Moištra, Janjići, Bradina, Konjic, Biograd and Ljupskovo. Dominik Mandić dealt with these issues (See in: Dominik Mandić, Bogomilska crkva bosanskih krstjana, Bosna i Hercegovina, Svezak Drugi, Chicago, 1962., 302-320), but this number of “reliable“ and “probable“ source of the number of Christian hostels is not reliable.

50 Zemin (Pers. zemin = land, soil); agrar-legal term denoting a large complex of arable land that has no status of mezra, čifluk or baština (aut.tr. feudal estate, feudal property). (Rječnik termina, in: Opširi popis Bosanskog sandžaka iz 1604., sv. III, Rječnik izradila: Lejla Gazić, Sarajevo, 2000, pp. 595).
are in the document from 1599.\textsuperscript{51}, an the last one in the document after 1534. The memorial to the heritage of Christian Ostoja and Vladislav in the village Donji Zgunj should be given special attention because Šefik Bešlagić exactly in Zgunj recorded a tombstone (stećak) with an inscription „Ase leži Ostoja kr(s)tijan na Zguno( aut.tr. Here lies Christian Ostoja from Zgunj)“\textsuperscript{52}; this Ostoja was probably the same Ostoja Christian from the document completed after 1534.\textsuperscript{53}

These are the very reasons that we should reconsider previous analysis of the mentioned tombstone from Donji Zgunj. According to Truhelka’s interpretation of forms of letters in such inscriptions the monument most probably dates from the 15th century. However, one recently published Ottoman document gives more safe time. Namely, this phenomenon was highlighted by a Turkish researcher of our origin, Tajib Okić, more than a century ago. Okić was the first who on the bases of the Ottoman archives in Anakara from the 16th century warned us of Ostoja’s heritage from Donja Zgunja („Baština des Kristijans Ostoje et Vladislav dans le village de Doljinji Zgunj, nahive Osat“).\textsuperscript{54} It means that the Ottomans found this medieval settlement (Donja Zgunja), where the heritage of Christian Ostoja was located and it was recorded at the beginning of the 16th century, while Christian Ostoja was still alive. The tombstone of this religious person (leader) was most probably erected in the 16th century.\textsuperscript{55} There is no doubt that this tombstone and other above mentioned documents will be actual in research


\textsuperscript{52} Šefik Bešlagić, \textit{Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima}, Naše starine IX, Sarajevo 1964, 138-140. – The following data indicate that there was a Christian “house“ at that place, and identical to the one in Ljubskovo: It was not marked that Ostoja lied “in his noble“ etc, thus, it is not an individual heritage; it also contains a motif of a stick – a symbol, according to some, of “an engieneer“; Next to ostaja’s tombstone is an older tombstone with an inscription “an engieneer“.

\textsuperscript{53} M. Hadžijahić, \textit{Zemljišni posjedi »Crkve bosanske«, pp. 472


\textsuperscript{55} The 1604 census’ record: \textit{Haji Pirija’s (Abdullah) feudal property, was a heritage of Christians, now owned by Mehmed (Ferhad) (Opširni popis Bosanskog sandžaka iz 1604, Vol.II, 597).
of the Bosnian Church for a very long time, but also a constant scientific gist of those who research medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The following questions are being imposed: What does Christian actually mean; if it was an educated follower of medieval heretic church – a monk, then it means that heretics in Bosnian and Herzegovina in the 15th century freely confessed their religious feelings? The shape of the tombstone, decorations and symbols, as well as linguistic paleographic characteristics of the inscription are valuable elements for research of such and similar tombstones. However, we believe that the conclusion that “a stick on the tombstone seriously endangers previous interpretation of the motif. A stick on tombstones will not be anymore ascribed to a grandfather or a guest, as a symbol of the highest religious dignitaries because there is a stick that belongs to a Christian“ does not stand. This conclusion could be accepted if it was an organization of this religious movements until the mid-15th century. However, surely then its official church hierarchy was broken down, so that non-existence of its earlier organization did not provide production of new hierarchical structure. In new circumstances, pretty much broken down groups of “true Christians“ continue their learning building some kind of untitled domestic hierarchy when surely the mentioned Christian Ostoja was a leader of that structure, and let us not forget that tombstones are erected by heirs who put a symbol denoting the highest ranking officials of the Bosnian Church which was used in this case as well. We also cannot avoid the fact that in 1604 “a heritage of Christians Ostoja and Vladosav“ presented a feudal property of Haji Pirija (Abdullah). It was probably the first generation of a converter to Islam (son of Abdullah). The question of true blood heir of earlier owner of the estate, and now the property is, of course, presented. In any case the mentioned written sources and epigraphic monument (tombstone) represent a great value and should be examined separately.

At the same necropolis in Zgunja, following a tombstone remote from Ostoja’s about 20 m to the east, is a quite sunken and damaged a larger chest with a plinth. Its dimensions are: length 200 cm, width 83 cm, heigth 28 cm. It is placed in the west-east direction and was not moved. It has no decorations, but has, unfortunately, a damaged inscription on the south side.

56 Šefik Bešlagić, Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima, pp. 138-139
57 Šefik Bešlagić, Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima, pp. 138-139
As a result of lack of substantial proportion of the tombstone at its height, only parts of letters of one word (probably the second last) and the whole last word “an engineer”. This inscription also has its great significance, because it reveals for the first time an engineer on a tombstone who in medieval “heretic“ hierarchy represented a high rank, that is a guideline that referred to the clergy of the Bosnian Church, maybe right after a grandfather and a guest, or better say bringing together both of them. It is a shame that we don not know more on this engineer. According to the letter shape and a basic form of the tombstone itself, it is believed in science that the tombstone of this engineer is somewhat older than Christian ostoja’s tombstone, probably from the 15th century, or even from the end of the 16th century.

58 Šefik Bešlagić, Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima, pp. 138-139
59 Šefik Bešlagić, Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima, pp. 138-139; Pejo Ćošković, Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću, pp. 16, 218).
60 Šefik Bešlagić, Novopronađeni natpisi na stećcima, pp. 138-139
Silvije Piccolomini had that connection in mind, when he while writing about circumstances in Bosnia called Christian hostels *coenobia*.61 Despite their importance there are no sufficient original data on their number and schedule. Present researchers have more accidentally preserved data on hostels in the eastern Bosnia. Considering the type of original sources and circumstances in which some of them were mentioned, the known examples cannot be a abse for completing the whole territorial organization of the Bosnian Church.62 The present science recognizes 53 necropolis with around 850 tombstone on the territory of the municipality of Srebrenica.63 Of course, that number could be much bigger if we observe a wider area of the Srebrenica region.

A review of the locality of *tombstones* that were registered before the aggression to Bosnia and Herzegovina can be seen with the help of map in the appendix of this study.

### 2.3. TOMBSTONES (STEĆCI) ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE DRINA RIVER

A high concentration of tombstones on the right side of lower Podrinje certainly talks about the powerful Bosnian influence in these areas. We just want to note that the concentration of tombstones in these areas does not fall behind the one on the other side of the Drina River, present Bosnian, where the Hungarian rule was gradually established during the 15th century and which destroyed them selectively. The reasons for their destruction can be found in the character that tombstones had for Bosnian spirituality and religiosity.

---

61 See note 31.
Please note that the tombstone’ sites were found in the following municipalities on the right side of the bank (present Serbian) of lower Podrinje: Bogatić, Loznica, Mali Zvornik, Krupanj, Osečina, Valjevo, Lajkovac, Ljig, Ljubovija, Bajna Bašta, Kosjerić, Užice, etc. here we list only those municipalities that stretch to the Drina River’s big bend. Please note that sites with tombstones continue further south, and on the righ bank of the Drina River.

One glance at a map is sufficient to show that the eastern corner between the Drina and Sava Rivers geographically more directly connect to Sirmijum. Also, the analysis of medieval Hungary and Serbian countries

64 In the immediate the Sava River area, where this municipality is located, one site with tombstones was registered, in the settlement Klenje – the site Drum (Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, 413)

65 The following tombstone sites were registered in the area of the municipality of loznica: a) The site Crkva, where the cult of the place continues with the Orthodox grave, with two tombstones with invisible inscriptions; b) In the city center, in Varoš, at the site Rađev kamen, a nicely decorated tombstone was decorated but is now destroyed. In the Banja Koviljača region there are the following sites: Zejtin točka (10), Gradac (10). As well as at the following sites: Donja Nedeljica – Crkva (4), Šurići (6), Stupnica – Groblje (10), Donja Borina-Mramorijača (20) (Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, pp. 413-414).

66 The following sites: a) Brasina – Mramorijača, a large necropolis that is destroyed lately. Inscriptions are preserved on four of them, where Moisav Pripković (noble), Obrad – noble Planjanin, and Obrad Milatović and Pripko Ilić were mentioned; b) Radelj – a tombstone with a motif of cross, and below is an inscription that Boguš lies there and that his son Mladen. (Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, pp. 414-415)

67 The area of Krupnje is very rich with tombstones at the sites: a) Dvorska – two sites named Mađarsko groblje (15+23); b) Zavlaka – Markovo brdo (6); c) Bela Crkva – Crkva (10); Tolisavac – Mađarsko groblje (100 – 20 decorated). The following sites are in the center of Krupanj: Šarampov (1); Mačkov kamen (Mramorje) (10); Burdića rast (4); Ivanović njive (10). And also in: Kržava (2); Lipenović-Mramorje (100); Vrbić – Mađarsko groblje (10); Šljivova – Gujina bara (Mramorje) (10) (Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, pp. 415-417)

68 In the village Peslop at the site Mramorje there are 11 registered tombstones. (Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, pp. 417)

69 There are three sites in valjevo: a) Dokmir Monastery (2); Bobova – Rimsko (Mađarsko) cemetery (14); Suvodanje – birčansko cemetry (6).

70 Š. Bešlagić, Stećci, pp. 418

71 Ibid.

72 Ibid.

73 Ibid, pp. 419-421

74 Ibid, 421-422)

75 Ibid, 422)

76 Ibid

77 Mihajlo Dinić, Srednjovekovni Srem, Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku, Beograd, 1978, pp. 272
shows that the mentioned area represents certain “interegrum“, that is interspace, which Hungary constantly showed its aspirations to. Unfortunately, since historiography of Bosnia is still observed from the 15th century perspective, as Nada Klaić concluded,\textsuperscript{78} noone even thought to see in that area in certain time the area of Bosnian countries. After all, the two 15th century powers, hungary and the Ottoman Empire, knew that Bosnian presence and Hungary put outposts there for further Ottoman conquests in the form of three (Bosnian) provinces: Jajačka, Srebrenička and Mačvanska. On the other side, the Ottoman Empire, after conquering the mentioned area, included it in the Zvornik Sandjak, bringing together area from both sides of the river.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{2.4. REAL ESTATES IN THE SREBRENICA REGION REGISTERED IN THE OTTOMAN BOOKS}

Numerous place names that indicate the existance of the Bosnian Church were registered by lists in the vicinity of Srebrenica. A field owned by the following Christians:

- Christian Radko’s estate, a village Stavoro, a nahia Hrtar, (Ankara, book, number 6, page 127.b);
- Christian Radmilo’s estate, (ibid);
- Christian Radovan’s estate, (ibid);
- Christian Radosav’s estate in a village Gornja Tatovnica, a nahia Hrtar, (ibid, 129.a);
- Christian Vukić’s estate in a village Peći, a nahia Osat, (ibid, 169.a);
- Christian Radovan’s estate in a village Klokotnica, a nahia Osat (ibid, 166.a).\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{78} Hazim Šabanović, Bosanski pašaluk, Postanak i upravna podjela, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1982., 50-54; A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 32-51.


\textsuperscript{80} T. Okić, Bosanski kristijani (Bogumili) prema nekim neobj. osmanskim izvorima, pp. 156.
- In a nahia Soko, on the other side of the Drina River, in a book from 1585 another two Christian heritages were mentioned, one (with a pasture) in a village Podi, and one in a village Suhodlak.\(^{81}\)

- It is of particular importance to mention Cvitko, a guest in a book from Herzegovina from December 1477. His land was in a village Kunovo in a nahia Soko (the mouth of Tara and Piva).\(^{82}\)

2.5. “LIFE OF STEFANA LAZAREVIĆ“ AND BOGOMILS

Dealing with primarily terminology of the Bosnian Church J. Fine citing Constantine the Philosopher’s “The Life of Despot Stefan Lazarević (1389-1427)“ (acc. to Fine written between 1431-1432) notes that “the city on banks of the Drina River was for the most part of that century in the Bosnian hands, but was then under Serbs (1431-1432 note E. Mutapčić). However, what draw a special attention of all researchers, Fine included, is the fact that one of the manuscripts for the residents pf Srebrenica says that “they are all of Bogomil heresy.”\(^{83}\) Thus, it seems that Fine made a correct conclusion: “It is useful to dedicate oneself to the problem, because the mentioned paragraph is often cited in a way that a reader does not suspect anything questionable.”\(^{84}\)

Namely, paragraphs from the mentioned manuscript were published in 1859 by V. Grigorovič\(^{85}\), and “the manuscript immediately draw attention паžnju”\(^{86}\), thus, we give it as it is in the original (as Grigorovič stated it(1859): „1425. Стефанъ князь въ присутствіи Патріарха на соборъ архіереевъ и властелей объявляетъ Георгія Бранковича своимъ наслѣдникомъ въ Сребреницѣ и тоу благословляеть шого собоно на Господство. Городъ этотъ, возвращенный отъ Босніи, отложился отъ Сербім, но скоро усмиренъ и мятежники его наказаны, си же въсъ ереси богомильскіе суть.”\(^{87}\)

The event is not in question, it is mentioned by other editorials, but there is no the last sentence them “that all the residents (of Srebrenica note E.M.)

---

\(^{81}\) Muhamed Hadžijahić, Zemljišni posjedi »Crkve bosanske«, pp. 472.
\(^{82}\) M. Hadžijahić, Zemljišni posjedi »Crkve bosanske«, pp. 472
\(^{83}\) Виктор Иванович Григорович, О Серби в ея отношенияхъ къ соседнимъ державамъ, преимущественно въ XIV и XV столетияхъ, Рѣчь, Казанъ, 1859, pp. 52
\(^{84}\) John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, pp. 65-66
\(^{85}\) John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, pp. 101
\(^{86}\) John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, pp. 65-66, 101
\(^{87}\) В. І. Григорович, О Серби ..., pp. 52
are of Bogomil heresy" („си же вси ереси богомильские суть“). John Fine remarkably observes that “the quote is obviously exaggerated” and gives and extremely high-quality arguments for the conclusion: “because it was not possible to claim that all the residents of the city, where a great Dubrovnik’s colony and a Franciscan monastery were situated, were Bogomils“. Fine himself says that he “does not mind”, and in the analysis of other manuscripts and revisions of “The Life of Stefan Lazarević“ left out this part. The question of usefulness and authenticy of such sources is always asked. Yet, since historiography uses this source for more than a century, and not many of referred to this issue, we cannot avoid it as a source. It is known that “after the death of Grigorović, a great philologist Jagić“ examined Grigorović’s library and “among other things specially searched for a manuscript on the Life of Stefan Lazarević“, but did not “find“ it.

There are, of course, several justified questions:

- was it an early manuscript whose scribe, for example, knew from his own experience that Srebrenica was full of Bogomils and just added a sentence or was it a later made copy and the writer did not have a reason to add this sentence.

- is it “authentic, term Bogomil is used only once in a primal source for heretics, somewhere in Bosnia“.

First, the possibility tha it was done by a copyist is rejected, because “heretic“ learning in Bosnia in the following period was less present, and Srebrenica itself, which was confirmed by the first ottoman sources, received features of Oriental-Muslim town. The question is whether Grigorović had a motif to construct one such sentence. Of course, it is only possible for pro-Slavic policies, but in that case he would have used some other construction. Therefore, he had no reason to change the text in that way. However, maybe we could turn to other part of the question, connected to the authenticity of the term “Bogomil“ and the uniqeness of its usage in the manuscript. In that case

88 Konstantin Filosof, Život Stefana Lazarevića despota Srpskog, Translation and notes: Gordana Jovanović, Beograd, 2009; Also,identicat text in: Konstantin Filozof, Povest o slovima, Žitije despota Stefana Lazarevića, Translation and notes: Prof. dr. Gordana Jovanović, Prosveta, Srpska književna zadraga, Beograd 1989, pp. 122-123
89 Constantine the Philosopher around 1431 noted that all were Bogomils in that city in the manuscript U manuskriptu on Stefan Lazarević’s life. There may have been Bogomils in Srebrenica, but there were also a Franciscan monastery and a developed Dubrovnik’s colony. Wouldthe Despot call for Orthodox Concil in a city where onyl heretic lived?
90 Grigorović never published original text, or even a full translation, and the experienced paleograph or good philologist did not have the opportunity to study the manuscript before it disappeared. (John V.A. Fine, Bosanska crkva - Novo tumačenje, pp. 65-66).
we must return to the author himself, i.e. Constantine the Philosopher with a question: Who is he? Exactly there is the answer to our question!

*Constantine the Philosopher* was born in today’s Bulgaria (probably Konstenc), sometime around 1380. He gained his education in Bačkovica Monastery. There he became a follower of reformed Bulgarian orthography of Patriarch Evtimov. When at the beginning of the 15th century his previous residence (the area around Plovdiv in Bulgaria) fell under the Ottoman rule, Constantine the Philosopher moved to Serbia where he was in the service of Despot Stefan Lazarević. In the new circumstance “he dealt with pedagogical and literary work and participated in diplomatic missions.” After Stefan’s death he wrote, *Nakon smrti Stefanove napisao je*, by order of Patriarch Niko, Stefan’s biography (*Žitije i žizn gospodina despota Stefana*, 1431), “the first true historical work in the Serbian literature.”

Therefore, it becomes clear where this the only one in usage term “Bogomil” originated from. Constantine the Philosopher carried it from his own fatherland, i.e. from Bulgaria where the story of Pope Bogomil and Bogomilism remained in the collective memory of at least the clergy there. In that way, the author aware of the similarity between the two “heretic“ (dual) movements inserted a term that was ofetn used in his environment not really aware how many misconceptions would develop in history connected to the term, as well as scientific views on Bulgarian roots of the Bosnian Church’s learning.

The value of the claim that residents of srebrenica were Bogomils is not lessened by the political background which a glossarist had in mind when he noted it, despite his visible hostility towards residents of Srebrenica. Despite strong political reasons, the emphasis of Bogomilism as a ground for understanding political turmoils in Srebrenica, confirms that the Orthodox contemporaries in the neighbouring medieval Serbian state considered the followers of the Bosnian Church to be Bogomils, but in their official documents called them generally heretic or baoons. Recently in Serbian historiography M. Petrović “completely arbitrarily tried to interpret that name claiming da it encompassed Catholics and opponents of Serbian government in that Bosnian

---

91 In his discussions on grammar (*Priča izrečena o slovima – Skazanie izjavljeno o pismeneh*, etc.) he promoted introduction of old-church Slavic Ь, Ьь, ь, into Serbian orthography although they were no longer used in everyday speech. He wanted to make Serbian orthography closer to Greek with the usage of accents and other Greek signs. The so-called Resavska škola (school)(after a monastery in Resava or Manasija, the center of Constantine’s activities) spread his ideas across Serbian countrie, Bulgaria and Russia (http://www.enciklo-pedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=32887; Acces: 18 April 2016. (website: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža).
city“. After Srebrenica was returned under the Serbian rule, rebels were punished. The justification for this was that they were all Bogomils, heretics, and everything was allowed against them, even to be sold into slavery. The usage of the term *Bogomil* for political opponents in Srebrenica was identical in meaning and intention to the name *Pataran* that people from Dubrovnik gave to members of Bosnian aristocracy during the periods of open hostility.

In fact, in the vicinity of Srebrenica was a cemetery Bogumilovac according to the Ottoman books. Also it was mentioned as Bogumilovo Selo or Bogumilovas in some sources. This village was near village Sućeska, on the west of Srebrenica. Until the end of 16th century it was mentioned only as an arable land that residents of Sućeska use.

3. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

We have already stated that Srebrenica was considered to be in a wider sense a part of Usora, and later of the Usora province. It is generally known that the Catholic Church tried to establish its hierarchy in the parts of Bosnia since the 13th century. Thus, the wish to establish it was very intensive especially in the north Bosnia and Srebrenica, as the most significant economic center. Some significant Church structure and organization was established after introduction of the Franciscan monastery in Bosnia. That process actually started in the first half of the 14th century, and a couple of decades later there were first church organizations in the North Bosnia, but also in neighbouring Slavonia and the Western Serbia. Those written sources tell us that that area in church-administrative sense was divided into two Franciscan custodies (among seven custodies of Bosnan vicariate: Danube, Greben, Bosnian, Usora, Mačva, Bulgaria and Kvinj): Usora based in Đakovo and mačva based in Alšan, on the left of the sava River, on the north-east of brčko, near today’s

---

92 P. Ćošković, *Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 110.; based on these the future picture of Bogomils in Serbian source would change. As an inevitable proof serves the data that residents of Srebrenica in the 15th century were called Bogomils because they were mostly saxons – miners, and coastal traders, that is Roman catholics. That data is in congruence with the name kudugeri in Simeona Solunski’s documents on heresy, who under kudugeri considered exclusively Latin Bogomils (Miodrag Petrović, *Kudugeri-bogomili u vizantijskim i srpskim izvorima, i Crkva bosanska*, Istorijski časopis, Knj. XLIV (1997), Beograd, 1998, pp. 62).

93 P. Ćošković, *Crkva bosanska u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 110

village Gunja. After the establishment of those central monasteries in the borderline of Bosnia in the second half of 14th century other monasteries were also built soon. To the custody of Usora before 1378 belonged monasteries: Đakovo, Vrbica, Modriča, Skakava (a village Gornja Skakava, on the northeast of Srebrenik, toward Brčko), Lindva and Bukovica. On Bosnian side, then, within the custody of usora there were certainly two monasteries: Modriča and Skakava. At the same time in the custody in Mačva existed monasteries: Alšan, Bijeljina, Teočak, Srebrenica, Crnča, Vrhkrupa and „S. Maria in Campo“, which was situated in Koraj. Then other moasteries of the custody were built (Zvornik, Gornja and Donja Tuzla). They were, of course, confirmed by the ottoman books, but at the same time revealed new ones. Thus, as mezras according to the 1533 list there were “St. Mary’s Church“ near village Bili Potok in nahia Koraj, and mezra “Ilinska Polja Church“ in nahia Gra(da) čac. The Church was present in village Dvorište in nahia Gornja Tuzla. St. Mary’s Church from Srebrenica had one heritage in village Bratovo (Bratovo and Popovica; Bratunac; in 1548). The Ottoman lists registered “the income from cerals from the fields of the Church, that are near the Zvornik fortress“. Certainly it is a Catholic church that was registered in medieval sources (a franciscan monastery and St. Mary’s Church).

It cannot be closely determined when Franciscans came to Soli. Pizanski’s list of monasteries and custodies in Bosnian vicariate did not mention monasteries in Gornja and Donja Tuzla, and since the Ottomans did not find them there, it turns out that they were built after 1378, and before 1460. We have already mentioned the church in the village Dvorište in nahia Gornja Tuzla. This church was also registered in the Ottoman books. Accordingly, the Ottomans found in Donje Soli a Franciscan monastery dedicated to St.

95 Julijan Jelenić, Kultura i bosanski franjevci, knj.1., Sarajevo, 1912, pp. 37-38
96 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 86
97 J. Jelenić, Kultura i bosanski franjevci, pp. 37-39
98 The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak, pp. 145
99 The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak, pp. 154
100 The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak, pp. 87
101 The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak, pp. 42.
102 Adem Handžić, The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak (from 1519 and 1533), ANUBiH, Sarajevo, 1986. (further: The first two lists of the Zvornik Sandjak), pp. 180; Desanka Kovačević-Kojić, Zvornik (Zvonik) u srednjem vijeku, Godišnjak Društva istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine, godina XVI, Sarajevo, 1966, pp. 33.
103 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 86.
104 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 92, 190-191, 199-200, 201, 218, 252 and 253
Peter, and which was in the city center, which was, under the influence of Islamic-Oriental culture, moved to the city periphery.\textsuperscript{105}

Yet, the primary interest of our research are spiritual-religious opportunities in Srebrenica and its nearest surroundings. Only two decades after it was mentioned for the first time the Catholic clergy was also mentioned. \textit{Therefore, we learn on presence of the Catholic clergy in Srebrenica for the first time from the Dubrovnik’s sources. A Catholic priest Marko was in 1376 a chaplain in Srebrenica (,,presbyter Marcus capellanus fori Srebrenice“).}\textsuperscript{106} Several years later, i.e. since 1387 sources record constant presence of Franciscans in Srebrenica (,,Male braće“).\textsuperscript{107}

Of course there were authors who due to the existence of a monastery and a church in Srebrenica pretetiously stated that “…, as Mihajlo Dinić wrote. Namely, according to Dinić, “on Patarans in the city there are no direct testimonies…” Dinić found explanation in the fact that “in Srebrenica and the vicinity existed three Catholic churches“, and: there were in Srebrenici and Crnča a Franciscan monastery and dedicated church each, as well as St. Nikola’s Church in the village Čagalj (near Srebrenica) that was built in the mid-15th century. Dinić did not try to find those places with those religious objects, and when he thought that that could be on present side of the Drina river, a blockage would appear automaticall.y We have already seen such a similar case with Likodra, which was proved to be on the other side,i.e. eastern side of the Drina River. Yet, it seems that the Franciscan monastery in Srebrenica is the oldest one in the area, which the very name of Bosnian Diocese in the 15th century: \textit{Biskupija srebreničko-visočka (Srebrenica-Visoko Diocese) testifies about.}\textsuperscript{108} Srebrenica itself was a nursery from which Dubrovnik’s merchants, as well as miners opened new mines in the immediate neighbourhood on the left of the Drina River, and they carried with them a part of their inherited forms of life among which was building of new religious object. It all indicates that Srebrenica till the end of the 15th century was not only well-developed mining but also a merchndising settlement with powerful Dubrovnik’s colony that left its mark on the layout of the city. \textit{“We should add the Franciscan monastery that appeared in the Dubrovnik sources since 1760-ies, as well as St. Mary’s church“}, whose archeological remains

\textsuperscript{105} A. Handžić, \textit{Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku},92; Ambrozije Benković, \textit{Tuzlansko područje negda i sada - s posebnim obzirom na vjerske prilike, Županja - Đakovo}, 1971, pp. 131-132
\textsuperscript{106} D. Kovačević – Kojić, \textit{Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek}, pp. 139-140
\textsuperscript{107} M. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva, I, pp. 95
\textsuperscript{108} A. Handžić, \textit{Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku}, pp. 7
are recognizable even today. Namely, “at Klisa in Srebrenica traces of two object are visible, obviously a church and a monastery. According to those traces St. Mary’s Church is shown as a rectangular hall with right-angled sanctuary. The length of the building is about 17 m, width of main part 8 m, and entrance around 5 m.”

This is how several Catholic churches in the area disappeared in the transition period. Namely, in the first Ottoman lists only the names of the following churches were mentioned in: Srebrenica, Zvornik, Koraj, Gornja Tuzla, Donja Tuzla and Modriča, and others were not mentioned. Therefore, the following disappeared: St. Mary’s Church with a Franciscan monastery in Crnča. There also existed important crossing over the river on the Bosnian side. Crnča is today a village not far from Ljubovija that was first mentioned in written sources as a square-forum in 1367. It is the area recognizable after the Saxon exploitation of silver and copper. It experienced its peak at the first half of the 15th century, with a large colony of Dubrovnik. Catholic population built St. Mary’s Church in the area. The exact location of the Church was found in a testament, where a house in Crnča near the Great River was mentioned („caxa in Velicha Riecha“). “The Great River, in whose valley the house was located, flows on the west of crnča to the Drina River.”

St. Nikola’s Church in Čagalj disappeared in the same way. However, the fact that until the 1230-ies a church organization did not exist in the area shows that the east bank of the Drina River was very interesting. From our point of view everything is simplified by the Pope Georg’s the 9th letter from 1229 where he mentioned „Sirmia citerior i ulterior“. It is visible from the letter that in the area they did not establish regular church organization, so „quam terre illius homines episcopalem appellant“. Therefore, in the spacious Sirmium did not exist regular church organization. What was Sirmium? We assume that it was, according to Dinić, the area later known as Mačva. The mentioned area, we believe, was divided between the lands under the Hungarian rule and the lands under the Bosnian rule, probably in Usoara and Soli, as its most eastern border. This exact organization of Usora

---

109 D. Kovačević – Kojić, Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek, pp. 112
110 Juraj Kujundžić (Duro Basler), Srednjovjekovne crkve u Srebrenici, Dobri pastir, god. XVII-XVIII, Sarajevo 1968, pp. 85
111 Arheološki spomenici i nalazišta u Srbiji, knjiga I, pp. 25
112 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, 88.; ČAGLJE – today’s hamlet Čagalj, on the north of Provo. It was first mentioned in 1548. It was developed village then: 21 houses (1 on a feud), 2 single men, and 4,800 akchas on the name of feud Mustafa Čauš, Budim Begler Bey (Grupa autora, Šabac u prošlosti, knjiga I., Šabac, 1970, pp. 217).
113 Féjer: Codex diplomaticus Hungariae, III/2, pp. 157-158; M. Dinić, Srednjovekovni Srem, pp. 272
and Soli in the 15th century lent on the late antique division of the Pannonia Province.114

In support of the fact that in the area of Sirmium existed Bosnian confirmed the fact that in the period of Sebastianus in the end of 6th century until Oliverus in 1231 did not exist regular church organization, and that the mentioned Oliverisus was considered to be „post restitutam Episkopi Sirmienses“. Thus, there were no organized Catholic or Bishop organization at the time, which adds to the claim that the area was a part of Bosnia.115 Also Ćirković’s conclusion on slave trade adds to the claim, where he said that the most “of people sold in Dubrovnik were of Bosnian origin“, and such a trade was recorded also from “Sirmium“, while there are “no records on any person from the Serbian state territories“.116 As we stated earlier, language remains, that exist in place names of today’s Mačva and Serbian Podrinje hide numerous traces of ikavian dialect, which later iekavian dialect lent on.117

We have seen that mostly in scientific circles presence of medieval Serbian state in those northern parts of eastern podrinje connected to Dragutin. Please note that only after the death of Dragutin, his brother and Serbian King Milutin tried to occupy Mačva, Beograd, Kučevo and Braničevo (both sides of Mačva) during the expansion of the medieval Serbian state toward the north, and did not succeed. However, he did not succeed to connect the most north parts that were later in the Serbian state; the valley of the Mlava and Peka rivers, to Serbia.118 For all of this the reason that is today generally accepted in science when it comes to the right side of the Drina River is not important, and that is that among “today’s residents of Krupanj and Rađevina should not be sought descendants of the medieval residents. The whole Podrinje is the area from which people displaced in the past, but also moved in again“.119

Bosnian Bishop Rev. Franjo Visočanin visited Srebrenica at the end of the 16th century, and found 400 Catholics and a convict with 6 Franciscans there, and “Renegades and Tursk“ lived in the neighbouring villages. There

114 M. Dinić, *Zapadna Srbija u srednjem veku*, Srpske zemlje, pp. 52
115 Daniele Ferlato, *Illyrici sacri*, tomos septimus, Ecclesia Diocletana, Venetiis, MDCCCLXVII.
116 S. Ćirković, *Istorija srednjovekovne bosanske države*, pp. 76
are only summary reports on the layout of the church. Thus, Rev. Pavao from Rovinj said in 1640 that the church was “old and dark“, and Bishop Ogramić-Olovčić (1675) stated that there were 5 altars at the church. Rev. Franjo (1679) from Varadin claimed that the church in Srebrenica was “quite spacious, with a simple monastery“, which was, according to him, built by King Stjepan Tvrtko. Rev. Pavao from Rovinj (1640) described the monastery. According to him it laid in the city center, with one wing under the roof, and only 12 little rooms “very miserable and badly equipped“ that they did not even had linens. The monastery had, not far from the city center, quite spacious property. The population gradually decreased. The business connected with silver mines gradually died out, and the number of believers gradually decreased. Rev. Franjo Viskočanin in the late 16th century in Srebrenica found 400 Catholics and 6 Franciscans in the monastery. At the beginning of the 17th century there were 379 Catholics. Rev. Pavao from Rovinj (1640) did not give the number of believers, but said that people lived nicely, and distinguished Catholic families came to greet him. Bishop Ogramić (between 1672-1675) in Srebrenica noted 150 believers and 4 Franciscans. That was also the last remebrance of the monastery and perish in Srebrenica. According to Evlija Čelebija there were “six streets and six mosques with minaret“ in the city of Srebrenica. “There are 800 one-floor and two-floor brick and nice houses“, „covered with shingle.“ “Residents are Bosniaks, and their serfs are Serbs and Bulgarians.“ Therefore, the city had the layout of Oriental-Muslim origin. Catholics from Srebrenica and gereally from Podrinje had great problems at the end of medieval independence and the beginning of the ottoman rule due to aggressive politics of the Orthodox clergy. That is how we found from official records preserved in the Franciscan monasteries that Bosnian friars complained “to the sultan in the first half of the 15th century and first decades of the 16th century that Serbian patriarch imposes taxes on them“.

Ivana Kapistran, the head of Franciscans in Bosnia, wrote a report to Pope Kalikst III, on 4 July 1455, about Franciscans’ complaints “about Metropolitan of Raška, who prevented them to christianize Patarens“, so that many died “out of faith“ because they preferred to die in that way than to convert to Orthodoxy. This is how we receive an image of the conflict between Christian churches in Bosnia at the end of its independence. Distrust between Christians became deep, not only between Catholics and Patarans, Orthodox and Patarans, but also between Orthodox and Catholics, which speeded the fall of their mutual state. Despot Đurđ Branković was not in a mood for Catholicism. Sultan Bayezid

121 Evlija Čelebi, PUTOPIS – odlomci o jugoslavenskim zemljama, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1967, pp. 99
II intervened in 1498 sending a četter to kadis of Novo Brdo and Srebrenica where he forbade to patriarchs and metropolitans to intervene into the rights of catholic priests there.\textsuperscript{122}

4. THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN SREBRENICA AND ITS SURROUNDING

4.1. ORTHODOXY IN SREBRENICA AND ITS SURROUNDING?

Somewhat concrete presence of the orthodox church in the medieval Bosnia came with “the expansion of Bosnian rulers’ governance on neighbouring Serbian areas”. That is how the Orthodox arrived to expanded borders of Bosnian Kingdom in the upper Podrinja and a part of Polimlje.\textsuperscript{123} In addition to these areas, the Orthodox Church succeeded in imposing its presence in Bosnian medieval lands in “the bordering areas around Srebrenica, which becomes a lot more clear if we have in mind that that mining center went under Serbian rule probably in 1411, and only a few years later, i.e. in 1415 and 1428, started the first news on a metroploitan from Srebrenica.\textsuperscript{124} But, through the period of Serbian rule in Srebrenica, a Franciscan monastery was very active as the center of religious life and business transactions. Conversion of the residents there to the Orthodoxy was difficult, as can be concluded from a remark in a biography of Despot Stefan Lazarević, where it was claimed that all people in Srebrenica were “Bogomil heretics”\textsuperscript{125}, with a note that the background of the claim was in politics. Until the fall of Bosnian Kingdom in 1463, the Orthodox Church in the remaining parts of the country did not have its followers, and it could be understood that it was not able to change the balance of power in those circumstances. Its influence on political and public life in Bosnia in the 14th and 15th centuries was insignificant in comparison to the influence of other two churches. It was the basic frame within which church opportunities changed in the medieval Bosnian state in the 14th and 15th centuries, when the Bosnian Church won over its important place by becoming unavoidable fact whose objectivity Bosnian subjects and foreigners counted for. In the years of deep crisis that the Bosnian state and society went

\textsuperscript{122} Boris Nilević, \textit{Srpska pravoslavna crkva u Bosni i Hercegovini do obnove Pečke patrijaršije}, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1990, pp. 84,112,132


\textsuperscript{124} D. Kovačević Kojić, \textit{Gradska naselja}, 297-298; usp. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva, I, pp. 63

\textsuperscript{125} Aleksandar Solovjev, \textit{Svedočanstva pravoslavnih izvora o bogumilstvu na Balkanu}, Godišnjak društva istoričara, broj V, Sarajevo, 1953, 97; compare Jaroslav Šidak, \textit{Studije o Crkvi bosanskoj i bogumilstvu}, \textit{Liber}, Zagreb, 1975, pp. 320
through after the death of King Tvrtko I. Some scientists believe that the only moment of medieval Serbian presence there was the establishment of Zvornik eparchy in the 15th century. Namely, the mention of Dubrovnik’s merchants in a complaint to “metropolitan and Duke Bogdan of Srebrenica” in 1415.126 If such an interpretation be taken into account, then we could certainly state that the Pope ruled over Bosnia at the beginning of the 21st century, because they visited it twice. The founder of the theory did not stop there but further continued that: “it is probably that metropoliy of Srebrenica disappeared after the fall of Srebrenica under the Turkish rule, because it was not mentioned anymore.”127 We have to add that many researchers forgot the mining Srebrenica. Exactly that, Mining Srebrenica played a certain role during the time of Despot Stefan Lazarević, as Mihajlo Dinić stated.128 Comparing the above mentioned data with the data from the Ottoman books on Srebrenica from 1533 and 1548, Adem Handžić, rightfully expressed his doubt that they “really referred to Bosnian Srebrenica“. Because, if around 1413 the Orthodox church was built with Serbian metropolitan residing there, the question then would be where did the object disappeare.129 Therefore, there is no doubt that it was the mining Srebrenica, on the east of the Drina River.

In the 1533 book “Priest Radivoj“ was mentioned in Srebrenica and A. Handžić concluded that he was “without any doubt, orthodox priest“. “Priest Radivoj’s mentioned in 1533 among those 44 house of ex-dependent residents, and not between those 179 houses in 23 streets as called peasants in the old book.“ Those dependent residents earlier had the status of Vlachs, as Handžić concluded, i.e. “paid tax, and moved there later“. The Vlach privileges were lost before 1528 because “Vlach population“ was not recorded then in the nahia. The fact that in the context of list of old peasants, residing in 23 streets “a note on the Catholic church put in the book“... “St, Mary’s Church in Srebrenica. Friars that reside in their church do not pay tax because they are not regular“. After the list of Muslim houses a note on their privileges was put

126 “It is very probable that some parts east of the Drina River belonged to that eparchy, because otherwise it would be a very small territory.” (Milenko S. Filipović, Počeci i prošlost Zvorničke eparhije, Bogoslovlje VIII (XXIII), Beograd, 1964, pp. 5)
127 Mil. S. Filipović, Počeci i prošlost Zvorničke eparhije, pp. 6-7
128 Mihailo J. Dinić, Za istoriju rudarstva u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji i Bosni, II deo, SANU, Beograd, 1962
129 Handžić concludes: “It is unlikely that the Orthodox Church just disappeared in the transition period when the Catholic Church remained which was much older and registered by all Ottoman lists from the 16th century, marking its correct name: St. Mary’s Church“ (A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, 102-103). See in: Adib Đozić, Gradske džamije Srebrenica, Monumenta Srebrenica, knjiga I, Tuzla - Srebrenica, 2012, pp. 41, note 126
leds us to conclude that “the old peasants were Catholics, and ex-dependants Orthodox.” These data confirm Bishop Baličević’s description i.e. there were 200 Catholic houses in 1600 in Srebrenica. Almost the same situation was in the village Sax were “among ex-dependants was: Priest Đuro’s heritage, owned by Jakov, while in the 1548 list it was recorded in that place: Priest Đuro’s heritage owned by Priest Marko”.

Recently in Srebrenica “sprout“ medieval churches that were not recorded in medieval sources, or Dubrovnik’s sources, or the ottoman sources. It can be seen from the following review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS OBJECT</th>
<th>FOUNDER ACCORDING TO SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH FORGERY AND THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>TRUE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAX MONASTERY</td>
<td>Uroš I (1243-1276) 1244</td>
<td>1858; 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLY TRINITY CHURCH IN BULJIM</td>
<td>Stefan Dragutin’s endowment from the 13th century. In the immediate vicinity are the remains of St. Martyr Prokopije’s monastery.</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLY VIRGIN MOASTERY IN KARNA</td>
<td>“A monastery church existed in the time of King Uroš Nemanjić...“</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST ANGEL MICHAEL’S CHURCH AT THE CITY CEMETERY</td>
<td>In the time of Despot Stefan Lazarević (a place where he prayed)</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, The Orthodox Christianity invaded the area of earlier Bosnian Kingdom primarily due to Tvrtko’s conquests in 1370-ies. A Russina scientist Е. Голубинскiй stated it: „Что касается до въры самихъ бановъ и королей, то большая часть ихъ были патаренами, меньшая - католиками, и какъ кажется ни одного между ними не было православнаго. Считается православнымъ первымъ королемъ Стефанъ Твартко на томъ основании, что онъ вънчался королевскимъ вънцомъ въ православномъ Милешевомъ монастыръ отъ православнаго сербскаго митрополита.“ He basically dissociated from the claim with the words that the Orthodox in Bosnia: „до второй половины XIV столтъя, не имъли ни одного собственного епископа“. In the end we cannot by conclude that the ottomans inhabited Bosnia with the Orthodox by bringing Vlachs to the territories.

130 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 103
131 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 103
132 Željko Teofilović, Pravoslavlje u Srebrenici, SPCO Srebrenica, Srebrenica, 2010, pp. 115-168
133 Е. Голубинскiй, Краткiй очеркъ исторii православныхъ церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской, Москва, 1871, pp. 570
4.2. ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND MONASTERIES IN THE FIRST OTTOMAN BOOK RECORDS OF THE BOSNIA AND ZVORNIK SANDJAKS

It is generally known that reviews of religious opportunities in the past were the subject of misuse and various constructions. Yet from the aspect of accuracy very few documents can be as precise as the ottoman books, because they were used as tax books at the time. They registered all the objects that paid or was freed from paying taxes. We shall start with the oldest record that is a record of Isa Bey Ishaković’s Region from 1455. The only church according to this record encompassed the areas: provinces Zvečan, Jeleč, Sjenica and Ras (acc. to the oldest book from 1455) was the Ivrač Church (Vrač) in a village Kozarevo (present hamlet in Raška on the northeast of Novi Pazar). It also registered some pre-Ottoman churches. Such was a church with a small village Donja Mogulina with only 6 homes from the 1455 list. The 19th century literature registered that “there was only one house in Mikulina, but residents call it a village. There were also an old cemetery and a church“.

In the 19th century St. Atanasije’s Church in a village Gorno Fališe was registered. In the 1455 list the village was recorded as Gornije Hvalište (Gornje Hvalište) without a church. This village in the valley of the river Vardar was displaced after 1870. Place names point to a village Cirkvejani (Crkvejani) with a church in Tetovo province. It also mentioned a village Isveti Nikola, that disappeared, but we know that there is a monastery in Treska today (St. Nikola), and a camp Manastir (Bitolj) in today’s Macedonia.

The only recorded Orthodox monasteries and churches according to Summary list of sandjaks in Bosnia from 1468/69 were Mileševa, with 11 persons who “only pay a small amount“, and St. George’s Church) in Donje Brdo near Goražde, with five priests, who paid the same amount. A village Žitomislići near Mostar with no religious object is also mentioned. Thus, “the church and the monastery were built in the 16th century“ during the ottoman
rule. In the outskirt of the city ras there was a property karadoz and it consisted of “two fields that belonged to Peter’s Church.” It was the village Petrovo on the northwest of Novi Pazar. At the same area (near ras) eas Mehmedalija’s (Kadi Husamedin) property and consisted of “seven fields and a vineyard that belonged to Dimitrova Monastery near Ras. A village Crkovna Potok (probaly a hamlet Crkvine in a village Babljak near Rogatica) in a nahia Prača. In a nahia Lašva there was an empty village Črkova (Črkva). But, if there were churches there they belonged to the Bosnian Church, or eventually the Catholic Church. Namely, as Christian villages the following were mentioned in Summary list of Bosnian sandjaks from 1468/69: a village Tirebun, in nahia Neretva (today a hamlet Treboje in a village Nevizdraci, near Konjic), Bila (Bijela) belonged to Vrabač nahia Neretva (today a village near Konjic), Ribić and Idbar belonged to nahia Borovac, and Osek in nahia Neretva (today Osjek in Turija near Konjica). There was a Christian village Rastok that belonged to nahia Samobor (today unknown but probably in Goražde-Čajniče region). In nahia Dubrovnik there were Christian villages: Hoćevje (today’s Očevje, near Vareš), a village Dubrovnik, Brezoviča (present Brezovica near Visoko). In nahia Trebotić (Vlasenica) there were empty villages Vrbo and Vrbo-Drugo, where the second one was Christian. In the Zenica region this list keeps very interesting place names: Krstajansku goru and a mezra Krstjan and Krstajansko Selište, as well as villages Didovo and Zgošća. The list also registered Catholic chruches that “collected income from cereals from churche’s fields near the Zvornik fortress“.
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Građačac. Also a church in village Dvorište in nahia Gornja Tuzla. St. Mary’s Church from Srebrenica had a heritage in village Bratovu (Bratovo and Popovica; Bratunac?; 1548). These interesting data show that the Orthodoxy in Srebrenica organically came after the establishment of the Ottoman rule, and that the entrance of the Orthodoxy came with the Vlach’s colonization of the area.

4.3. THE CONSTRUCTION OF ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND MONASTERIES IN THE NORTH-EASTERN BOSNIA

Based on the Ottoman sources one can conclude the time of construction of several Orthodox churches in the north-eastern Bosnia, and the oldest ones, as well as churches which existence remains unknown even today.

1.) GRABOVA CHURCH – The wider area of Teočak was under the Ottoman rule in 1474. The first list show that that demographic area was empty and inhabited by Vlachs’ colonization, who also protected “the whole Tuzla region“. Handžić assumes “that majority of catholics withdrew to the north“, as well as followers of the Bosnian Church. Instead of previous Franciscan monastery in Teočak according to Handžić “hides today’s old mosque“ within the. Lists from the 1530-ies in this nahia recorded seven villages, that were mainly concentrated “around the village with the same name“, and inhabited exclusively with Vlachs. The Duke of the nahia “sat in the village Srednji Lokan“. In this village according to the book’s lists was erected “the first Orthodox church in the area, Grabova Church, first mentioned in 1533“. Therefore, since it was not mentioned in previous lists, it was erected in the second and the beginning of the third decade of the mentioned century under the Ottoman rule!

2.) A CHURCH IN VILLAGE CRVUŠI – There is also “a church in village Crvuši (probably present village Crveno Brdo) somewhat on the north of village Jasenice the cednter of nahia (near the city of Srebrenik). “A fair near the 20 akchas church“ was mentioned then. It can be seen that that was the Orthodox church because Vlachs inhabited the whole village before 1528.
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Also, please note that Franciscan monasteries do not mention the existence of Catholic church, that is monastery in the area. Therefore, written sources do not give us data on existence of any religious object of Orthodox church in the northeastern Bosnia. Of course, without written sources develop myths, legends and forgeries. For example, churches that are considered to be the oldest ones in Srebrenica, that is the northeastern Bosnia.

3.) TAMNA MONASTERY - According to unobjective legends and traditions, “ancient monastery Tavna was built during the reign of Nemanjić...“ “The construction of monastery Tavne began during the reign of Serbian King Stefan Dragutin, between 1282-1316...“ “Anals of monasteries Tronoša and Peć’s patriarchy testify that it was erected by Dragutin’s sons - Vladislav and Urošić...“ “According to his biographer Danilo, King Dragutin converted Patarans in the eastern part of Bosnia into Orthodoxy, and his endowments are Tava, Papraća and Tronoša finished by his sons Vladislav and Urošic served not only as sanctuaries of converts but also as headquarters of those who gathered and confirmed themselves in the Orthodoxy. King Dragutin, Queen Katelina and sons Vladislav and Urošić, as founders of these endowments, equipped them with all the church materials and books and endowed many villages, lands by their charters. Later these monasteries were gifted by latter Serbian rulers from the Nemanjić dynasty - Hrebljanović, Branković and Kotroman, until the fall of Serbian despotate and Bosnian state."

On the other side, Ljiljana Ševo, in her scientific approach and quite true stated: “archeological excavations, conducted during hydroisolation works in the Holy Trinity Church monastery Taverna in July 1994, gave new data for its possible date. Namely, a legend, written in the 13th century in Peć’s and Tronoški’s script stated that sons of King Dragutin – Vladislav and Urošica built the monastery and dated by that Tavna at the beginning of the 15th century. However, tavna was first mentioned in 1533 and 1548, and then in 1586, and then in the Ottoman lists of the Zvornik Sandjak - first recorded as Grabova church, and then as Tavna monastery. The following data on the monastery dated from 1627 – it was the news on the death of Zvornik’s patriarch Gavril, in the Holy Trinity monastery on the Tavna river, written at the end of one fourth evangelicism in the Cetinje monastery. The architecture of present monastery puts it among monuments of Serbian construction of the 16th and 17th centuries." The

159 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 113.
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Ottoman sources clearly show that “in the second half 16th century” “also erected Tamna monastery” in a village banjica. It was not recorded in the 1548 book list. Thus, until then it did not exist. It was first mentioned in 1587. Therefore, in 1548 there were no elements that would indicate recent erection of a monastery, except the existence of a church in a near village Srednji Lakanj.

But during the 1587/8 list next to village Tamna Banja or Krčina was also recorded a monastery near the mentioned village owned by monks who owned monastery’s lands and a heritage Okrugla, for which 350 akchas was paid annually. Its first erection happened between 1548 and 1587. Therefore, we cannot confirm “its erection” for the time being. The village was inhabited with Vlachs’ colonizers where they built a monastery.163

4.) PAPRAČA MONASTERY164 – There are several traditions on a founder of the monastery and the date of its erection. According to the first it was King Dragutin and his sons Vladislav and Urošić, (Peć’s and Tronoški’s script from the 18th century), while the folk poetry in a poem “Miloš u Latinima” states that the monastery was endowment of Vukan who built it to repent his conversion. The second poem monastery was ascribed to numerous endowments of Stefan Nemanja, who as a great duke erected “Papraća near Borogovo”. The tradition on four sisters of Serbian “Tzar Šćepan” states that each one of them built a church in: Tavna, Papraća, Lovnica and village Cikote. In the Birač region (with the monastery) the continuity of life lasts since the ancient times which is confirmed by Roman coins. Numerous tombstones (medieval cemeteries) as well as a medieval fortress Perin confirms this continuity.165 Ševo answers these statements as follows: “A legend that ascribes the erection of Papraća monastery to King Dragutin does not have reliable sources in historic documents. Architecture and painting date it to the 16th century. Relatively early mention of papraća in priest Oliver’s script in Čajniče’s evangelicism and Turkish documents are certainly proofs of the existence of monastery or a church before Peć’s patriarchy was renewed in 1557, but also in the case of the monastery Tavna, and a church in papraća, with a few arguments is connected to King Dragutin...”166

According to the list between 1540 and 1542 out of which 12 houses had a property. The church was first mentioned in this list. Namely, it was

163 A. Handžić, Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku, pp. 111.
164 The Papraća Monastery belongs to Serbian Orthodox Church. It is located in the village Papraća, on the south-west of Zvornik.
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stated that two properties were kept by the church: a Radice, Vladojev’s son Herak’s, (son of) Stahinja. The church was erected there after 1533 and before 1540. Seven years later the monastery papraća was mentioned.  

5.) LOVNICA MONASTERY - According to another tradition, Lovnica monastery was endowment of King Dragutin Nemanjić who ruled as Serbian King (1284-1321). According to the tradition, Dragutin built a monastery there where he “hunted“ and which impressed him with its beauty. A name Lovnica originates according to some authors because that place was “breakable“, and both terms Lomnica and Lovnica have common origin in the old agrar terminology and meant little finger. In 1971 Tronoški’ script a founder of monastery menetiones Queen Katalina Nemanjić, a wife of King Dragutin. It is believe that it was erected between 1276 and 1282. Therefore, Ševo, on the bases of the mentioned data, concludes:“obviously the name of the monastery in Donji Birač has nothing in common with huntin passion of King Dragutin, but belongs to terminology of old Slavic communities. It can be assumed that original form of the monument Lomnica, and that in the form Lovnica is more common in the 18th and 19th centuries. Therefore, the name of the monastery in the north-eastern Bosnia cannot be an argument for its attribution to King Dragutin. This monastery was erected at the end of the 16th century, inhistorical sources was first mentioned in 1578. Namely, on November 7th was written one script on Arsenije jeromonk.

The first data on the Zvornik episcops date from the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th decade of the 16th century.

When it comes to the eastern side of the Drina River in nahia Šubin there were village Crkvica (near village Blađevina), then village Crkvište, and
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in nahia Rađevina selo Bela Crkva. In nahia Dolnja Mačva there was a village Crkvenac. In addition to the mentioned name that point to the existence of religious objects the first lists of the Zvornik Sandjak record in nahia Ptičar a village Klupnica (Klupci) with a church. In bordrs of Brvenik Kaza the following monasteries were mentioned: Studenica, Tušimlja, Kukanj, Gradac and Nova Crkva, which, based on tax paymenst, largest estates had Studenica and the monastery Gradac near Raška.

There also existed four churches in villages in nahia Radovašnica, Kamenica, Kaona and Krivaja. That was generally the earliest mention of those churches, except the church (monastery) in Krivaja that was mentioned before the Ottoman conquest of the area. All the other churches in that nahia originated from the renewed Peć’s patriarchy.

Researchers of cultural heritage from the area of eastern side of the Drina River, i.e. the Western Serbia believe that “Bele Crkve in Karan, Čokešina and Krivaja and maybe Ključ are churches that “date from the 15th century“, and all others, according to their architecture, “date from the period of renewed Peć’s patriarchy e“(1557- 1693). Majority of these buildings was erected at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century. However, we must note that none of these churches were registered in the first Ottoman books. So, in the area that encompassed the Šabac Kaza only in the 1548 Ottoman list 6 churches were mentioned, and “four in nahia Šabac and two in nahia Gornja Mačva“. In nahia šabac, churches were in Krivaja, Kaona, Kamenica (St. Mary’s Church) and in Radovašnica; and in Gornja Mačva – „Ivanje Church“, in village Vrbovac (Novo Selo), near village Čokešine, and one – in northern part of nahia (St. Virgin’s Church), presumably in village Donji Banov Brod, at the mouth of Bosut and Sava rivers.
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Thus, only after the fall of Mačva province and the battle at the Mohač field in 1526, construction activities of Vlachs speeded up. Of course, all under the supervision of the Ottoman Empire.

We cannot but conclude: Why would any Church, if existed, diminish, because as we see from the study, for the Orthodox entrance to Bosnian lands and present day’s western Serbia the Ottomans were responsible more than any other medieval Serbian ruler.

The same story spread through other parts of Bosnia. In the following tables are given years of erection of the churches and monasteries according to their official websites. Please note that none of the objects is older than the 15th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS OBJECT</th>
<th>FOUNDER ACCORDING TO SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH FORGERY AND THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMNA MONASTERY</td>
<td>“The construction of Tavne Monastery started during the reign of Serbian King Stefan Dragutin... from 1282 till 1316.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPRAĆA MONASTERY</td>
<td>In addition to Vukan and Stefan Nemanja... A legend ascribes the foundation of papraća Monastery to King Dragutin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOVNICA MONASTERY</td>
<td>According to other tradition, Lovnica Monastery is the endowment of King Dragutin Nemanjić.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZREN MONASTERY</td>
<td>Ozren Monastery, a foundation of the family Nemanjić, that is King Dragutin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOZUĆA MONASTERY</td>
<td>a foundation of the family Nemanjić</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSTOVIĆ (UDRIM) MONASTERY</td>
<td>a foundation of the family Nemanjić and King Dragutin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLIŠINA MONASTERY</td>
<td>The original, medieval monastery, was demolished immediately after the fall of Bosnia under the Ottoman rule in 1436.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOGOVAC MONASTERY</td>
<td>It disappeared during the reign of Kings Dragutin and Milutin in the first half of the 14th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMANJ MONASTERY</td>
<td>Folk tradition ascribes its construction to Katarina Branković</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIPLJE MONASTERY</td>
<td>It is clear today, according to Justin, that the monastery is the endowment of King Dragutin from the end of 13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRUPA MONASTERY ON VRBAS</td>
<td>It is presumed that it was built during the time of the dynasty Nemanjić.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGIOUS OBJECT</td>
<td>FOUNDER ACCORDING TO SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH FORGERY AND THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGATICA MONASTERY</td>
<td>“in the branch of Romanija and Derventa, on Crkvina a church was built on the foundations of the one that King Dragutin Nemanjić built in the 13th century.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOŠTANICA MONASTERY</td>
<td>King Dragutin Nemanjić is most frequently mentioned as a founder of the monastery who received these areas and ruled over them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOMIONICA MONASTERY</td>
<td>This is the only objective review of the history of a monastery that we have come across while conducting the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAGALJEVAC MONASTERY</td>
<td>There are no official written sources on dates of these churches, but it is assumed that they date from 1310 (The time of Dragutin Nemanjić, note by E.M.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the east side of the Drina River the story is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS OBJECT</th>
<th>FOUNDER ACCORDING TO SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH FORGERY AND THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADAC MONASTERY</td>
<td>Built during the King Dragutin’s time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRONOŠA MONASTERY – in the village Koreniti, near Loznica.</td>
<td>According to Tronoški yearbook, “monastery was built by Katarina, the wife of King Dragutin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETKOVIC MONASTERY</td>
<td>Folk tradition connects the construction of the monastery to King Dragutin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRABOVAC MONASTERY</td>
<td>Built by Kings Dragutin and Milutin in the late 13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH IN ARILJE (St. Ahilije) near the mouth of Veliki Rzav to Moravica near Guča</td>
<td>Renewed by King Dragutin in 1296. Foundation of King Dragutin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĆELIJE MONASTERY six kilometers from Valjevo on the left bank of the river Gradac</td>
<td>According to folk tradition, it was built by King Dragutin, who ruled the region from 1282 to 1316.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH IN RADOVAŠNICA</td>
<td>It was dedicated to holy angels Michael and Gabriel, and is considered to be the foundation of King Dragutin Nemanjić.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRABOVAC MONASTERY near Obrenovca</td>
<td>Built by Serbian King Dragutin in 1280.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUSTINJA MONASTERY with the church of Vavedenja Presvete Bogorodice in Poćuta near Valjevo.</td>
<td>According to tradition was founded in the 13th century at the time of Serbian King Dragutin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEŠENOVO MONASTERY</td>
<td>Was founded by Serbian King Dragutin at the end of the 13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ĐURĐEVI STUPOVI MONASTERY</strong></td>
<td>Endowment of Grand Duke Stefan Nemanja (1170/71). <em>King Dragutin renewed it later and built a tower with a chapel.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVETI STEFAN - Banjska near Kosovska Mitrovica</strong></td>
<td>Built by Kings Dragutin and Milutin around 1314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SV. DIMITRIJE in Prizren</strong></td>
<td>King Dragutin added to Chilandar, then (1308) King Milutin to Chilandar Pirgo, and finally (1348) Tzar Dušan to Chilandar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAČA (VAZNESENJA) MONASTERY</strong></td>
<td><em>Rača was founded by King Dragutin, but apparently built between 1276 and 1282.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lies on the slopes of the mountain Tara.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRKV A SV. MATIJE U KAMENICI on Tamnava.</strong></td>
<td>The enumerator in 1548 also mentioned “St. Matija Church” in Kamenica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULJKOVIĆ MONASTERY</strong></td>
<td>Until 1600 in Drenovac was also erected “Culjković Monastery”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in Drenovac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An in the end we ask whether it was possible that Dragutin, who as an exile at the Hungarian court had a certain political role could have been as great a builder as recorded. According to what he is credited for, he was the greatest founder in the Balkans of all time. In the end we have to state that King Dragutin only fixed churches in Arilje and Đurđevi Stupovi in Rasa.\(^1\) That was his founder’s activity, and all the rest is a mirage.
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3. INTERNET SOURCES:

MUSALA, VAROŠ AND CIGANLUK IN SREBRENICA IN THE LATE 19TH CENTURY

Summary

The paper deals with urban geographic and demographic and genealogical layout of the part of the city of Srebrenica in the late 19th century that is located on the north of its center - Čaršija. The central part (Čaršija and its surrounding) and the southern part of the city (with its mahalas (aut.tr.quarts) experienced its full development in the Middle Ages and the Ottoman period. The northern part of the city, although with elements of older urban development, experienced its intensive development in the late 19th century. A detailed urban geographic content of some city parts on the north of Čaršija is presented based on the original data from the Land Registry for c.p. Srebrenica from 1894, the Srebrenica Land Registry. Cadastral plans with ratio 1:6.250 for c.p. Srebrenica, Cadastre Srebrenica. Those are traditionally urban geographic parts – mahalas: Musala, Varoš and Ciganluk. In addition to a review of basic elements of urban geographic and demographic and genealogical structural content of Musala, Varoš and Ciganluk, it is also pointed to basic urban changes of the mentioned parts of the city of Srebrenica at the late 19th century.

Key words: northern part of Srebrenica, urban geographic layout, Musala, Varoš, Ciganluk, the end of 19th century, families.

Introduction

It has already been in detail researched, and known, urban geographic and demographic and genealogical layout of the central and southern part of the city of Srebrenica at the end of the 19th century. The central part of
the city, well-known as a historic and geographic entity, named Čaršija was researched in a separate paper. It provides detailed historic and geographic, as well as socio-urban characteristics of Čaršija and its various facilities.\(^1\) Also, special scientific works are also devoted to old quarts of Srebrenica, named Crvena rijeka and Skender mahala.\(^2\) The research on the southernmost quarts of Srebrenica, Petrič and Grad (with old fortifications Donji and Gornji Grad) will soon be published.\(^3\)

All the above urban parts of the city of Srebrenica are very old, from the period of the medieval Bosnian state. Namely, they exist continuously at the same place since the Middle Ages, and through the Ottoman period. Often under the same name, such as Crvena rijeka, Petrič, Grad (the outskirts of the medieval fortress – Grad). Čaršija is the name for the medieval square – Trgovište since the 15th century. Skender mahala is the name for an earlier Dubrovnik colony and Trgovačka street with the Franciscan monastery since the beginning of the 18th century.

A bit northern of Čaršija, dating from the Ottoman period, on the location of the medieval square – Trgovište, down the river Križevica on both of its banks, from the Middle Ages to the Ottoman period there was no fully formed urban entity. The mentioned space, on both of the river križevica’s banks, a distance of just over one kilometer is used for public facilities. Primarily for large public gatherings, such as weekly markets and seasonal and annual fairs. Also, it was used for common grazing of Srebrenica’s residents’ cattle. In this area people could freely settle and engage in business activities, primarily in the function of markets and fairs (blacksmith, cattle sale, butcher, etc.).

This space intended for fairs was regularly since the Middle Ages until the end of the 19th century called Panađurište. Its southern part was called Musala in the Ottoman period. Musala in the city of Srebrenica leans

3. The works on these quarts will be published in the following volumes of Monumenta Srebrenica.
on the north immediately on business and public center of the neighbourhood Trg – Trgovište or Čaršija. This name is frequently used in our areas to denote such spaces.

The intensive settlement and the formation of a group of houses stared in the parts of Pandurište and Musala in the northern part of Srebrenica, especially those along hillsides and immediate end of the river Križevica.

1. Musala

It has already been written on the part of Srebrenica, known for its traditional name Musala. Thus several date was given on Musala: It is ocated downstream of Čaršija, the river Križevica, and on its left flat side. Musala, as a larger free space in the city (intended for mass public and religious gatherings), in addition to Čaršija developed in Srebrenica since the beginning of the Ottoman period. In time, the more distant parts turn into a cemetery and in some parts began the construction of residential, public and other buildings. In the late Ottoman period there were about ten houses and a decorated musala (a constructional entity for prayers) in Musala. This location became expecially interesting for construction (roads, public facilities) with the arrival of the Austro-Hungarian rule.4

It is necessary to distinguish Musala as traditonaly urban geographic part of the city, as well as Srebrenica, from musala, a religious facility in our cities. The first term is significantly wider that the second and encompasses larger area. Musala as a religious facility, or a mosque under the open sky, was on the place of the latter kindergarten in Srebrenica. It had a special waqf (aut. tr. endowment), intende for its upkeep. Musala in Srebrenica was established at the beginning of the Ottoman period, it was maintened by a special waqf and encompasses a large complex of land on the north of Čaršija.5 It is unknown when the musala was built in Srebrenica and who was its benefactorer. Based on the construction of the wall, it could have been built in the 16th century.6

5 Rusmir Djedović, Vakufi u Srebrenici od 15. do 20. stoljeća, Baština sjeveroistočne Bosne, broj 3(2010), JU Zavod za zaštitu i korištenje kulturno-historijskog i prirodnog naslijeda Tuzlanskog kantona, Tuzla, pp. 47.
6 Hifzija Suljić, Spomenici islamske kulture u Srebrenici, Sabrani tekstovi knjiga II, BMG, Bosanska medijska grupa, Tuzla, 2007, pp. 287.
The waqf Musala in Srebrenica during the establishment of land registry county of Srebrenica in 1864 had recorded only one parcel of former larger complex that was located on the north of Čaršija in Srebrenica. Then Musala’s waqf had a plot of land on c.p. 98 with the area of 650 m², and it was placed in the sharp corner made by a new road from Čaršija to the north and a street that went on the right to Varoš. Actually that plot on c.p. 98 in the late 19th century was in cadastral plans marked as a Muslim cemetery. The waqf Musala in Srebrenica according to the budget of the waqf from 1913 had revenue of 200 kronas. They were gathered from rents of waqf’s plot located at the headquarters (it refered to a shed on that land) in the amount of 150 kronas, as well as from the sale of the garden in the amount of 50 kronas. The repair of Musala costed 100 kroans and the surplus in the waqf that year amounted to 100 kronas. Ahmetaga Pašagić was the head of the waqf and the most other waqfs in Srebrenica.8

The waqf of Haji Skender mosque in Srebrenica had significant properties in Skender mahala, Čaršija and the city of Srebrenica since forever. A larger complex of land on Musala (on the north of today’s municipal building) belonged to the mentioned waqf that was in the status of a cemetery. Those are parcels on c.p. 1/164, 1/521 and 118/1 with areas of 740, 2.640 and 12.560 m².10

Musala usually had a mihrab (aut.tr. a central part at the topa of a mosque) and a minber (aut.tr. a bit distinguished part at the top right corner of a mosque). Those were, actually, mosques under the open sky. They were used for performance of common prayers on Fridays and Eid days. A musala in Srebrenica also had both mihrab and minber. The mihrab was built into the wall and the minber was made of timber, covered and fenced. The musala was located about 100 m on the northeast of the Čaršija mosque. It was situated on a flat plateau with dimensions of 20x15 m surrounded by a stone wall two meters high and 100 cm wide, covered with beam. The musala in Srebrenica was a rare cultural and historic monument of the city, under the branches of various old fruits.11

The musala, as a religious object, was in the late 19th century on a parcel c.p. 1/521. It was rectangular in shape and on the right side of the road from Čaršija to the north. Later, the musala was demolished and a kindergarten was built on that parcel. Around the musala in the late 19th century there was

---

7 Land registration X, entryNo. 459, from 1894, The Land Registry in Srebrenica.
8 The waqf’s budget in Bosnia and Herzegovina for the year of 1913, Sarajevo, pp. 288.
9 Rusmir Đjedović, Vakufi u Srebrenici..., str. 48.
10 Land registration X, entryNo. 461...
11 Hifžija Sulukić, Spomenici islamske..., pp. 287.
a larger parcel, c.p. 1/758. It was actually a cemetery of Bosniaks-Muslims of Srebrenica.¹²

Older people of Srebrenica remember that Eid prayer was performed several times on Musala. It was active until 1935. It existed as a construction object until 1953. The last imam of musala in Srebrenica was effendi Abid (Mustafa) Đozić.¹³ The Forest Service demolished Musala and erected its building, that later served as a clinic and then a kindergarten.¹⁴

Čaršija in Srebrenica during the Ottoman period and in the late 19th century leaned on its northwestern and northern side on other urban facilities of the city. On the northwestern side it was a part of the city traditionally called Musala and on the north it was Varošt, lately also called Srpska Varošt. Čaršija in Srebrenica leaned on the wider area where a musala was situated since the Ottoman period in the following way. From the bridge on the river Križevica on the west gate from of Čaršija in Srebrenica (a road across Bojna to the west and southwest) contact follows the river all the way behind the locality of a musala. Musala is on c.p. 1/5521. A kindergarten is there today.¹⁵

From this line of contact, to the northwest there are numerous urban facilities and they make the special part of the city of Srebrenica named Musala. Immediately to the left across the bridge on the river Križevica and in the slope of a hill is well-known land and water named Kneževac. The old family begović owns several houses on both sides of the road.¹⁶

---

¹² Tako označeno na katastarskim planovima grada Srebrenice razmjera 1:3125, sa kraja 19. stoljeća.
¹⁴ Hifzija Suljkić, Suljkić, Spomenici islamske..., pp. 287. According to Mustafa Siručić (1929.-) a group of youth and himself, immediately after the WW2, while looking for the location for a volleyball court, first decorated the site of today’s court, and when the construction there started, went to “Livada“ where a residential buildings are today, and when they were deprived from playing volleyball there as well, they then went to Musala and built a volleyball court there. Musala was at that time abandoned and buried with construction and other waste. The waste was disposed on the area of Musala during the construction of objects across Musala. There was a lot of stone there and among the stone there were remains of gravestones. Siručić said that they drove material from Musala in wheels and threw it in the river Križevica. Later on that area, even extending it, the Forest Service built its administration building, and which was later used as a clinic and finally as a kindergarten. Even today the building has the same shape and serves as a kindergarten.
¹⁵ A. Đozić, R. Djedović, Čaršija u Srebrenici..., pp.159.
¹⁶ Ibid, pp. 159.
1.1. A detailed review of Musala in the late 19th century

Just behind the bridge on the river Križevac, from Čaršija, and at the very beginning of the Ottoman road to Sarajevo and Višegrad Odmah in the late 19th century, there were three houses belonging to the Begović family.

Immediately next to a well/water Kneževac and above the road is a house on c.p. 140/2 from 1894 owned by Sulejman Begović late Ahmetaga’s. Sulejman also owned a plot 140/1 Kneževac. Below the road is a house on c.p. 1/105 owned by Mujaga and Husein Begović late Ahmetaga’s. They also owned a plot Podput on c.p. 103. Jusuf and Salih Begović late Osmanaga’s owned neighbouring houses on c.p. 1/102.

Some parcels near water Kneževac and on the left of Križevac owned the Muhagić family from Čaršija. Such is c.p. 1/129 orchard across the river owned by Abdulah Muhagić son of Suljaga. Arif Muhagić late Hasanaga’s owned a parcel 128 Mala Bojna, and somewhat Begović family and Mehmed Rumičanin called Kozara late Mustafa’s.

The following houses were above the road in the slopes of hill Bojna:

A house on c.p. 138/2 in 1894 owned by Hasan Halilagić late Sulejman’s. In 1913 he was succeeded by: Almas late Hasan’s, a widow Džemila Bašimamović, Husein Halilagić from Jajce, minor Mehmed late Husein’s from Jajce.

Moše Hajm Finzi son of Avram from Sarajevo owned a house on c.p. 137.

A house on c.p. 136 again owned Hasan Begović late Ahmetaga’s. In 1918 he was succeeded by: Husein, Suljaga, Mehmed Salimović’s widow Bida and Ifeta.

A house on c.p. 133/2 in the late 19th century owned minor Emina late Husein Agišević’s and his widow Abida Tepić. In 1896 it was owned by Mahmut Tepić late Avdo’s and in 1897 Uzeir Hankić late Sulejman’s. The last house above the old road to the hil Bojna on c.p. 132/2 owned Hurija née Kasumović first married to Memišević, and then married to Saliha Mehića.

Across the river Križevica from Čaršija there were in the wider area of Musala in the late 19th century objects that were in some way in function of Čaršije itself. On c.p. 1/82 there was Mlinište with a yard and a gulf owned by Haji Hasanaga and Avdaga Hadžiselmanagić with ½ and Mikajlo Stiepanović late Vasilije’s with ½. In 1899 Vukašin and Milivoj (Stiepanović) were mentioned.
There was a house on c.p. 1/79 owned by: Fejzaga and Alijaga sons of Haji Hasan Hadžiselmanagić. In 1901 The City Hall Srebrenica owned it, and it circled administration complex around Konak – the County Adminstrative Board and National School.

Some old families from Srebrenica owned parcels downstream from the left side of Križevica to Musala. On c.p. 1/502, directly below the bridge on the main road from Čaršija to the north a construction site owned the Efendić family, i.e. Mujaga Efendić late Muhamedaga’s from Skender.

Below, behind Musala (later kindergarten), on c.p. 1/514 was a construction with a yard, as well as on c.p. 1/515 “Pod Musalom” garden, all owned by: Mujaga and Hasanage Efendić late Muhamedaga’s and Salih Efendić late Avdaga’a. Parcels on c.p. 1/513 Gradilište, were owned by: Abid, Huseinaga, (Smajlaga?) Efendić late Jusufaga Efendić’s and Fatima née Junuzagić.

Since urban areas named Musala in Bosnian cities during the Ottoman rule served for public needs, they were always state-owned or waqf-owned. These larger areas in our cities served for centuries for public facilities such as markets and fairs. They were also used for religious needs. There were regularly a part that served as a mosque under the open sky for performing religious sermons: Friday noon and Eid prayers, or farewells to Hajj pilgrims. A part of Musala was usually used for cemeteries as well. Musalas were always in the city, usually close to the center – Čaršija. Therefore, the Austro-Hungarian administration soon after their arrival used these areas for speed urban development. Over Musalas they built their new roads and streets and on them their public objects: Administration, inns, schools, barracks. As we see Musala in Srebrenica is also situated immediately on the north of Čaršija and during the Austro-Hungarian rule was intensely urbanized. A wide street was built over it and it was actually the main road that went from Srebrenica to the north. This road was registered as the state-owned in the late 19th century on the following parcels: 1/670, 673, 675, 676, 677 and they were named Cesta (aut.tr. road).

One report from the beginning of the Austro-Hungarian rule is about the construction of then modern road from Zvornik to Srebrenica. It states that

---

17 A construction site is a parcel that some commercial objects or object intended for commerce were situated on and not for agricultural production, e.g. an orchard, garden, arable land could not be Gradilište.

18 Musala (ar.) place (meadow, garden or some other larger area) where Muslims of the town, as a group, under the open sky, pray. Almost every city in Bosnia and Herzegovina has it. Abdulah Škaljić, *Tvrćizmi u srpskohrvatskom-hrvatskorsrpskom jeziku*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1985, pp. 476.
Cesta goes following the river Drina valley across Drinjača to Bratunac. At the end of 1885 it was mentioned as almost completed. Cesta from Bratunac to Srebrenica following the stream Kruševica valley (presumably Križevica) was being built since 1881 and at the end of 1885 completed.19

Waqfs often did not have title deeds to all of their plots, and as such the Austro-Hungarian administration enrolled them to the state ownership. Although the name itself, Musala or Mezarje (aut.tr. Muslim cemetery), points to their ownership. Also the old cemeteries suffered from the same fate, with evidently present gravestones, which had no title deeds of waqf’s parcel. Therefore, near Čaršija on Musala in Srebrenica, The Austro-Hungarians built a larger building intended for the County Administration Board. It was built in the so-called pseudo-Moorish style as numerous other buildings in Bosnia and Herzegovina. People started to call this building Novi Konak or Konak, as administration boards were called during the Ottoman period.

Around 1890 the Austro-Hungarian administration on c.p. 1/97 and 1/99 built two buildings and one was Konak. The other was Narodna osnovna škola (aut.tr. People’s elementary school). They were both registered in 1894. Together with these buildings parcels were registered on c.p. 1/100 garden, 1/90 and 1/96 meadows. Then, Bosnian-Herzegovinian erar also owned a house on c.p 118/4, and meadow 118/2. Soon on c.p. 118/19 was built a building of Hotel20 owned by the Bosnian-Herzegovinian erar. In the vicinity was also a house on c.p. 121/2 and a meadow 121/1, and all owned by the Municipality of Srebrenica.

The wholesale tobacco building in Srebrenica in Musala

19 Azem Kožar, Granica na Drini prema izvjerštuju Huge Kutschere, administrativnog direktora Zemaljske vlade za Bosnu i Hercegovinu od 14. 11. 1885. godine, Saznanja 4, Društvo historičara Tuzla, Odsjek za historiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Tuzli, Tuzla, 2013, pp. 64.

20 A building of Hotela was before the war “Pivnica” (aut.tr. alehouse), and is located upstream immediately next to the building where the Centar for Social Work of the Srebrenica municipality is today.
The construction of private objects started with urban activation of the area of Musala on the north of Konak and The School. Those were:

A house on c.p. 106 owned by Mirko Kršić late Josip’s. In 1899 owners were: Paulina, Anna, minor Simo, Gabrijela and Marija. Mirko Kršić late Josip’s also owned a house on c.p. 107. In 1899 the successors were the same.

A house on c.p. 119/2 owned Živana née Blažić married to Kojo Urošević. In 1906 she was succeeded by Drago and Marla (Koje).

Jefimija called Vasilija née Lazarević, married to Jako Nikolić, owned a house in 1894 on c.p. 92/10. In 1920 she was succeeded by Ilija late Jakov’s.

The owner of a house on c.p. 123/2, was Ana née Petrović married to Stojan Petrović called Mitrović.

A house on c.p. 122/2 was owned by Risto and Ljubo Milošević called Samardžić late Simo’s. In 1898 it was owned by Teodosije Popović late Stevo’s and in 1909 a widow Savka, minor Svetolik and Dragomir. The owner of a house on c.p. 1/83, was Mihajlo Stiepanović late Vasilije’s, and later Sveto. The very same Mihajlo Stiepanović late Vasilije’s owned a house on c.p. 1/84. A housing on c.p. 1/91 owned Jefto Ostojić late Lazar’s. In 1912 he was succeeded by: Anda, Svjetlana and Anka. The owner of a house on c.p. 1/93 and a parcel 1/95, was Simo Ostojić called Sokanić late Risto’s. In 1908 owners were Milka and Julijana.

More houses on Musala, immediately on the north of Konak, in the late 19th century owend very enterprising Haji Mitar Urošević. Those were the following houses:

A house on c.p. 120. In1896 Drago owned it. A house on c.p. 126(?). A house on c.p. 1/86. A house on c.p. 1/87 also owned Haji Mitar Urošević late Pero’s. In 1897, the last three houses owned: Ana, minor Drago and Sofija married to Milanović.

There was another house on the crossing from Musala to Čaršija. On the right of the road below the bridge (around 50 m) on the left of the river Križevica was a house on c.p. 1/503 owned by Jovan Božić late Simo’s and Milice Orašanin first married to Božić and then to Pavle Dragićević.21

For Musala was important a long-lasting role of the city of Srebrenica as an administrative center of the Srebrenica Kaza during the Ottoman period

---

and the Srebrenica County during the Austro-Hungarian administration. Since the establishment of definite Ottoman administration in the Middle Bosnian Podrinje in 1459, Srebrenica was the center of a larger kaza with appropriate governance. The Srebrenica Kaza encompassed many nahias on the left and right banks of the Drina river. From then until the end of Ottoman rule in the city of Srebrenica was situated a building with administrative authority of the kaza (Konak), as well as other similar (for gendarmes, court, etc.). Surely, there were also buildings with military administration and troops. This military part was presumably placed in buildings within the Donja fortress immediately above the city center.

Hasan paša from Srebrenica, as well as Haji Salih Bey, an officer from Srebrenica, called Hadžibeg were mentioned at the beginning of the 19th century. In the mid-19th century, in 1850, about the events surrounding Omer Pasha Latas, Haji Rustembeg Srebrenica was mentioned. He was an officer from Srebrenica.

The city of Srebrenica left the Ottoman period with a building of administration board Konak and Donja utvrda with many objects for military purposes. We see from the document dating from 1888 that Konak surely was in the city, or better the administration building of the Srebrenica Kaza in the Ottoman period. The proposal of the government commissioner from June 29th, 1888 requested the exchange of waqf’s plot “Livada” for the house of the Provincial Government “Stari konak” in Srebrenica. The waqf’s commission approved the exchange of October 13th, 1888. Therefore, a building of Novi Konak, present building of the municipality of Srebrenica, was built on the exchanged waqf land “Livada”. As a replacement the Srebrenica waqf received Stari konak with the land.

Explicitely in this case Stari Konak was mentioned because immediately before 1888 in Srebrenica was built a new building intended for the county administration, named Konak, or Novi Konak. According to Huge Kutschere’s report, the administrative director of the Provincial Government from 1885, although the Srebrenica County Office was placed in a remote and pretty bad private house – Konak, it was the best of all seen. All registrations and notebooks were in the best order and there were almost no delay in work.


Azem Kožar, Granica na Drini..., pp. 64.
Then, in 1885 the head of the Srebrenica County was Baron Schweiger.\(^25\) The waqf’s commission in Srebrenica in a plea dating from December 8th, 1891,\(^26\) mentioned a land (hukumet) next to the old inn in the city of Srebrenica in addition to all.\(^27\) This was probably the same Stari Konak, the administration building of the Srebrenica Kaza from the Ottoman period.

### 1.2. General urban geographic and demographic and genealogical characteristics of Musala in the late 19th century

There were nearly thirty houses in Musala in the late 19th century. Those were mainly private residential houses and several larger buildings for public needs. In the part of Musala next to Čaršija and around old bridge across Bojna and further to the south there were about ten houses owned by old families from Srebrenica. The Begović family had the most, four. The families Hadžiselmanagić, Halilagić, Agišević owned one house each. It is obviously the first settled part of Musala.

Immediately further were larger buildings owned by the state and the municipality of Srebrenica. First of all the building of The Crebrenica County Administration (Konak) and People’s elementary school. They were used for the city’s and the county’s public needs.

Between the lower Čaršija and public buildings old families from Srebrenica on Musala had other facilities: the Hadžiselmanagić family had a mill and probably an inn, and the Efendić family many construction sites.

At the beginning of the Austro-Hungarian rule on the north on Musala the Orthodox population from Srebrenica and the newly arrived Catholics treated building houses. There were about fifteen of such houses, mostly belonging to families Urošević (4) and Stiepanovića (2). Two houses owned Catholic family Kršići who migrated into Srebrenica.

During the Austro-Hungarian rule at the turn of 19/20 century, different objects with different facilities continued to be built at Musala. All previous and new objects were built mainly on the former Muslim cemeteries that were

---

\(^{25}\) Azem Kožar, *Granica na Drini...*, pp. 64.  
\(^{26}\) Dokumenat: ZVK-34, 1891. godina, 3350 - Srebrenica – Prijedlog, Gazi Husrev-begova biblioteka Sarajevo, Fond: Zemaljska vakufska komisija za Bosnu i Hercegovinu.  
developed next to a musala, the mosque under the open sky. Such were the state-owned objects Hotel and Centrala.

The description of well-known travel writer Renner from the end of the 19th century is important for knowing important urban facilities of the city of Srebrenica and its part Musala. He mentioned: Casino and Edbauser’s inn with a bowling club. Then, nice Novi Konak – administration building and Škola (aut.tr. school).28

There are no accessible data on other newly built urban facilities at Musala during the Austro-Hungarian rule for the time being. On a postcard of Srebrenica from that period one can see in the north part of Musala, on the west of the main road, a long building, probably for public needs. When one goes from Čaršija immediately behind the Križevica bridge, at the beginning of Musala, on the right is the building of Hotel.

2. Varoš

Parts of Bosnian cities inhabited by Christian (Catholic or Orthodox) population were regularly named Varoš. Sometimes they were named Kršćanska (Christian) or Latinska (Latinluk (Latin)) and Srpska (Serbian) Varoš.

Since the city of Srebrenica had complex urban geographic structure, it also had Varoš. In Varoš in Srebrenica at the end of the Ottoman period lived only Orthodox residents. In recent years, therefore, it was sometimes also called Srpska Varoš. Some data on Varoš in Srebrenica at the end of the 19th century has already been given.

Downstream of Musale, on the right, pretty steep, side of the river Križevica, during the 18th and 19th centuries developed Varoš. It was inhabited by newly Serbian Orthodox population from the southern mountain areas and, was, therefore, called Srpska Varoš. At the end of the Ottoman period there were about 55 houses and an old Orthodox church in Varoš. Its former place is named “Crkvište“. The church was registered in 1883-1885 in the Austro-Hungarian plan, and it disappeared after 1903, when new Orthodox church was built immediately above Čaršija.29

28 Herceg-Bosnom uzduž i poprijeko – putovanja Henrika Rennera, Mitrovica, 1900, pp. 224.
In the late 19th century there were properties in Varoš that were owned by the municipality of Srebrenica, that is the City Hall. It was a plot and Gradilište on c.p. 1/631 that was situated in the lower part of Varoš closer to the river Križevac at the crossroad. It seem that there were a larger object of some barn intended for public needs. The property of the City Hall somewhat later was a parcel on c.p. 81 named Kiselica. Next to the previous and most important object in Varoš was then an Orthodox church. It was at the top of Varoš and as an object dominates over the quart. There are almost no accessible on the layout of the church. Some data about the church gave, at the end of the 19th century, well-known travel writer renner. He described the church as a handsome building and observed the cemetry around it with grave tombs.

A flor plan of the church can bee seen in the Austro-Hungarian cadatral plans with ratio 1:3125 from 1882-85. The building is elongated and in the direction of east-northeast towards west-southwest. The semicircular part is on the east side. A fromal owner of the church was the Serbian Orthodox Church school district. Next to the object on c.p. 1/606 under the name church with the yard, this district in 1894 owned: parcel 1/607 “plum orchard around the church“, one store in Čaršija (on c.p. 1/69), c.p. 1/480 yard, plot on c.p. 39 Racel and somewhat later a house on c.p. 1/495. According to the mentioned cadastral plan it seems that the parish since the Ottoman period also owned some houses next to the church that was on a parcel 1/606.

At the same time the Serbian Orthodox Church school district in Srebrenica also owned two houses on c.p. 1/506 and 1/507, as well as on 1/504 Gradilišta and on 1/508 “plum orchard below the school“. All of the facilties were in the part of Varoš that we conditionally added to Čaršija. One of the houses seemed to be the Orthodox school.

In addition to the above mentioned objects the Serbian Orthodox Church school district in the late 19th century stoljeća also owned the building of the church in Soločupa, at the very border of the city of Srebrenica and a settlement Goštij.35

30 The Land Registration VI, entry 251.
31 Herceg-Bosnom uzduž i poprijeko..., pp. 224.
32 The Cadastrial Plans ratio 1:3125 from 1882-85.
33 The Land Regitration VI, entry 263, The property of Serbian Orthodox Church school municipality.
34 Adib Đozić, Rusmir Djedović, Čaršija u Srebrenici..., pp. 158
35 Next to the church with a yard on c.p. 13, the municipality owned also two cemeteries and an inn on c.p. 10. The history of the church is a special issue. The Grobljanska Church in Srebrenica built in 1971 is there now. It is dedicated to the Holy Archangel Michael.
2.1. A detailed review of Varoš in the late 19th century

We have already described in detail a part of Varoš that is near the market in Srebrenica. In that area in the late 19th century there were 25 houses inhabited by Serbian Orthodox residents. At the contact of this location and Čaršija a new Orthodox church was erected in 1903.36

A part of Srebrenica named Varoš starts from Musala to northeast. There were many houses in Varoš before the river Križevica. Those were:

A house on c.p. 1/517 owned by Risto Mladenović late Mladen’s in 1894. In 1903 he was succeeded by: minor Milan, Jovanka and Anica.

Houses on c.p. 1/534 (later also houses on c.p. 1/704) owned: Đordo Marković late Marko’s, Savka a widow of Pavle Crničić and Janja Đuranović married to Đordo Marković.

The owners of a house on c.p. 1/535 were: minor Vlastimir late Marko Radovanović’s and a widow Simeuna Urošević. Also a house on c.p. 1/536 was owned by minor Vlastimir late Marko Radovanović’s and a widow Simeuna Urošević. Alempije called Zeko Jovanović or Jakovljević son of Jakov owned a house on c.p. 1/539 in 1894. In 1898 it was owned by Tanasije late Simo Papučić’s.

A house on c.p. 1/540 (later a blacksmith) was owned by: Jakov Jovanović late Jovan’s, Jovan’s widow Mara Ostojić and Mara Vukosavljević first married to Jovanović and later to Pavle Šukilović. In 1899 Vaso and Jovo late Jakov’s were mentioned.

On c.p. 1/542 was also Gradilište with a yard ownd by Miloš Milošević called Đerić late Jovan’s.


A house on c.p. 1/546, and a parcel 97/3 Kazani were owned by Cvijetin Mičić late Mićo’s. In 1907 minor Leposava and Zdravka inherited him.

', In the part of Varoš across the river Križevica in the hill slopes, that is on its right side, there were majority of houses of this Srebrenica’s quart. An old Orthodox church was above them. In Varoš there were the following houses:

36 A. Đozić, R. Djedović, Čaršija u Srebrenici..., pp. 155-158.
A house on c.p. 1/520, owned by: Dimšo, minor Saveta, Ana Milošević late Jovo Božić’s widow. That house was approximately across the river behind Musala, present kindergarten.

Lazar Jovanović late Jovan’s house was on c.p. 1/519. In 1906 the owners were: a widow Joka, minor Grozdana and Milica.

The owners of a house on c.p. 1/524 were: Obrad Tomić late Miloš’s and Nedjeljko called Cvijetko Tomić late Miloš’s. A house on c.p. 1/527 was owned by Spasa Tomić married to Vaso Jovanović.

A house on c.p. 1/529 was owned by Joka Nikolić married to Jovo. In 1928 it was owned by Ilija Zubenica? A house on c.p. 1/530 in the late 19th century owned Vaso Ristanović late Risto’s. In 1904 Luka Nikolić late Gavriljo’s was mentioned.

Towards the Orthodox church were the following houses in Varoš:

Savo and Rado Andrić late Spasoje’s owned a house on c.p. 1/571. In 1903 the owners were Stevo and Simo late Rade’s.

A house on c.p. 1/570 in 1894 owned Ana Gvozdenović a widow of Gavro Nikolić. In 1919 he was succeeded by: Luka, Makso and Zeko Nikolić late Gavro’s.

A house on c.p. 1/575 was owned by: Krsta and Simo Simić late Obrad’s, Persa Simić married to Milovan Jokić and Stanka a widow of Obrad Simić.

A house on c.p. 1/573 owned Jelka Jovanović a widow of Gavro Spasojević. In 1900 he was succeeded by Đordo and Mihailo late Gavo’s.

From the church toward the southwest and the river Križevica there were the following houses:

Blagoje Simić called Stanišić alte Simo’s and Andrija Spasojević late Stojan’s owned a house on c.p. 1/566. In 1912 Pero Simić called Stanišić from Podravna was mentioned.

A house on c.p. 1/560, was owned by Stana Milošević married to Vaso Trifković.

A house on c.p. 1/ and a parcel 1/605 Gradilište was owned by Aleksa Popović late Stevo’s.

There were two houses immediately on the south of the church owned by Aleksa Jovanović. Those were: a house on c.p. 1/579 owned by Aleksa Jovanović late Jovan’s and a house on c.p. 1/580 of Aleksa Jovanović late Jovan’s. In 1909 both were owned by: minor Petka, Staka and Savo late Aleksa’s. Those two houses and several ancillary objects formed larger estate.

Houses in Varoš that were situated on the northwest of the church down the slope and on the north towards the stream Kiselica were:


A house on c.p. 1/611 owned by Danica Tomić married to Cvijetin Ristić. In 1910 it was owned by Milka married to Hrkalović?.

A house on c.p. 1/612 owned by Mitar Dangić called Stevanović late Stevan’s. Also Mitar Dangić called Stevanović late Stevan’s owned a house on c.p. 1/613. Both houses were in 1911 registered to: a widow Simana, Milenko and minor Slavko.

A house on c.p. 1/617 owned by Đuka Bogićević married to Spasoje Podrugović called Gordić or Lazić. Later Spasoje late Lazar’s was mentioned.

A house on c.p. 1/618 and a parcel Kiselica on c.p. 81 was owned by Trišo Stanojević late Stanoje’s.

A house on c.p. 1/620 was owned by: Tanasije and Zaharije Ristić late Mićo’s and Aleksija married to Tanasije Spasojević. In 1902 the owners were: minor Staka, Jelenka and Mileva late Tanasije’s.

The owner of a house on c.p. 1/623 was Grujo Vidaković called Đurišić late Vidak’s. He also owned a house on c.p. 1/625. In 1905 Jovo and Stojo late Pavle’s owned both houses.


A house on c.p. 1/627 in the late 19th century was owned by: Milovan Jokić late Mato’s, Svetozar called Zaharije minor, Obrad, Jovo and Miloš late Mato Jokić’s and Perunika Trivković a widow of Mato Jokić. Ivan Mladenović late Nikola’s owned a house on c.p. 1/.

In the northern part of Varoš around the stream Kiselica the following houses were situated:

A house on c.p. 78/2 and a parcel 78 Kiselica were owned by Ranko Mitrović called Zečić late Mitar’s. A house on c.p. 79/2 and a parcel Kiselica (79, 80 i 82) as well as Racel (92 i 100) owned Jakov Jovanović late Jovan’s. In 1899 they were registered to minor Kristo.
A house on c.p. 86/5 had Spasa Marković a widow of Vaso Obradović.

A house on c.p. 73/2 had Pero Lazić son of Ilija. Pero Lazić also owned a house on c.p. 73/3.

A house on c.p. 1/657 and later on c.p. 1/775 a housing, were owned by Jovan Jovanović late Živan’s and his widow Sava Stožaranin.

A house on c.p. 1/656 and later on c.p. 1/656 a house, were owned by Lazar Mičić late Mićo’s. In 1897 a widow Stana and Petar were the owners. A house on c.p. 1/654 was owned by minor Miloš, late Milan Miloševića’s.

A house on c.p. 1/652 was owned by: minor Spaso late Spaso Gordić’s, Zdravko and Aleksa.

Across the stream kiselica in the hill there were:

A house on c.p. 1/661 had Cvija a daughter of late Jovan Jovanović.

A house on c.p. 1/663 had Stevan Šarac late Marko’s. In 1899 it was registered to Anda Đerić married to Stevan. In 1895 at the top of Varoš and Kiselice a house was built on c.p. 1/690 owned by Danica Šarac a widow of Manojlo Avramović.

Somehow below the center of varoš, on the northwest of the church towards the river Križevica there was an old larger building. It was in the Austro-Hungarian cadastral plans from 1882-85 drawn as the “L“ shape. In 1894 it was registered as the property of the municipality of Srebrenica. We can presume its role. Maybe it was a huge barn for food and other goods for public needs storage.

Near the river on the northwest of the building were the following houses:

A house on c.p. 1/648 was owned by Andelija Jovanović married to Anto Jovanović.

A house on c.p. 1/649 was owned by minor Jovan son of Risto Lazarević and Marta married to Risto Lazarević. In 1910 Jovo son of Risto inherited it.

From this building towards the river and Ciganluk were the following houses:

---

37 The Land Registration VI, entry 289. Presumably on c.p. 631?
38 We presume it based on the neighbouring parcel on c.p. 1/632 that was in the late 19th century called “za hambarom” (aut.tr. behind the barn).

A house on c.p. 1/638 was owned by: minor Milorad, Cvjetka and Vladimir late Ranko Rankić’s. A house on c.p. 1/639 was again owned by: minor Milorad, Cvjetka and Vladimir late Ranko Rankić’s.

Below the Church on the border towards the settlement Ciganluk were the following houses in Varoš:

A house on c.p. 1/603, then on c.p. 1/632 an orchard behind the barn and 97/2 Kazani, were owned by Jovan Stevanović late Stevan’s. In 1901 all was registered to: a widow Smilja and minor Toša late Jovan’s.

A house on c.p. 1/601 had Anda Stiepanović married to Stevan Mihajilović. In 1908 it was registered to Čedomir son of Stevo.

A house on c.p.1/589 was owned by: Savka Uljarević married to Đordo Popović from Sarajevo, minor Lazo late Krsto Uljarević’s residence unknown and minor Višnja daughter of Krsto Uljarević from Sarajevo.

A house on c.p. 1/598 had Savo Dangić late Đoko’s. A house on c.p 1/599 was also owned by Savo Dangić late Đoko’s. In 1922 the owners of both houses were: Milka a widow of Savo Dangić, Dušan, minor Jezdimir, Vojin and (T)Ankosava? From Bratunac.

Near the river Križevica between the houses of the settlement Ciganluk was: a house on c.p. 1/554 owned by Pavlija Simić married to Mitar Ostojić called Sokanić.

2.2. General urban geographic and demographic characteristics of Varoš in the late 19th century

The following facts add to the thesis that Varoš stopped in the 18th century and developed throughout the 19th century and in the side of the hill in the part of old Panadurište. A large number of parcels in Varoš, both state and private owned, in the late 19th century were named Panadurište.  

39 Those were parcels on c.p: 1/522, 523, 548, 630, 644, 659 all named Panadurište and all state-owned. Private ones were on c.p.: 1/619 Panadurište (owned by Tanasije and Zaharije Ristić late Mićo’s and Aleksija married to Tanasije Spasojević), 1/621 Panadurišta (Makso and Mihajlo Mićić late Mićo’s), 73/1 Panadurište (Pero Lazić son of Ilija), 1/647 Panadurište (Andelija Jovanović married to Anto Jovanović), 1/655 Panadurište (Lazar Mićić late Mićo’s) and 68 orchard Panadurište (minor Milorad, Cvjetko and Vladimir late Ranko Rankić’s).
Parcels named Panđurište were in 1894 across the whole Varoš. Those were most often wider areas of streets. It all points out that the oldest houses in varoš were built in the large free location of Panđurište and with widening of housings streets of quarts were being formed.

One person from the Orthodox surroundings from the late 19th and the beginning of the 20th century should be specially emphasized in the city of Srebrenica. It was Aleksa Jovanović late Jovan’s. In 1894 he owned several houses in Čaršija and Varoš. He had a growing number of serf’s homesteads in 1885. He was active member of the city’s public life. He was the patron of the new Orthodox church built in Srebrenica in 1903.

In the late 19th century there were somewhat more than 60 houses in Varoš. If we add those 25 houses in the part of Varoš towards Čaršija that were described earlier, then there were more than 85 houses in Varoš. Then there was the Orthodox church with a cemetery next to it, as well as larger public object near the river Križevica in Varoš.

**3. Ciganluk**

In complex urban geographic structures of Bosnian cities there were regularly settlements inhabited by Gypsys, that to some extent settled down in that place. Something has already been known about such a settlement in Srebrenica in the late 19th century.

Below Musala and Varoš and immediately next to the river Križevica during the Ottoman rule developed a quart named Kiptijan. That was the usual Ottoman name for the part of a city settled by Gypsys. Due to their life style and traditional crafts the position of the quart is of no surprise. In the late Ottoman period there were around 25, mostly minor houses in Kiptijan (somewhere Gypsy Kiptijan).

This quart developed along the river Križevica. First of all because of free land from the old Pandurište and the possibility to perform traditional crafts. Those crafts were: butcher, blacksmith, merchants (resellers of horses

---

40 Aleksa Jovanović was the most significant political figure among the orthodox population in Srebrenice between the 19/20th century. In 1900 he was a vice-mayor of srebrenica, and in 1910 one of the representatives of the Orthodox in the city hall. (Bošnjak, 1900 and 1910, or Šematizam svijeh oblasti u Bosni i Hercegovini, Zemaljska štamparija Sarajevo.)

and cattle). They were all closely connected to markets and fairs that were held in the close proximity of Panadurište.

3.1. A detailed review of Ciganluk in the late 19th century

Ciganluk touched Varoš. Some houses were practically mixed. Thus, several houses of Ciganluk were below the Orthodox church and between the houses of Varoš. Those were:

A house on c.p. 1/609 was owned by: Maja? a daughter of late Mustafa Duraković, Ajkuna married to Smajo Mejrić (Rakovac), minor Arifa, Ramo and Fatima Osmanović Šavrakić? married to Bajro Komšilačević.

A house on c.p. 1/604 that had in the late 19th century Salih Alić called Dubinčević late Alija’s. In 1901 the owners were: minor Sumbul, Jusuf, Elfa and Fatima.

A house on c.p. 1/602 had Zeko Omanović. In 1899 the owners were Huso, Zemina late Zeko’s.

Houses of Ciganluk below Varoš and on the right side of the river Križevica were:

A house on c.p. 1/641 owned by Ibrahim Mujanović late Mujan’s. In 1903 it was registered to: minor Ibro, Durija, Derva and a widow Fatima Kovačević.

On c.p.1/642 was Halil Kizić’s late Ahmet’s housing with a yard. It was later registered to the family of Petrović.

A house on c.p. 1/549 in 1894 was owned by minor Mustafa son of Bešlija Čakanović. In 1916 the owners were Nefa late Bešlija’s and Halil late Čakan’s.

A house on c.p. 1/550 was onwed by: Alija, Mehmed and Halil Čakanović late Mustafa’s.

A house on c.p. 1/551 were again owned by: Alija, Mehmed and Halil Čakanović late Mustafa’s. In 1899 the heirs were: Rašid, Šifa and Ahmet late Alija’s.

A house on c.p. 1/596 (later also on 1/771 kuća) had: Mustafa and Emin Musić called Alić late Alija’s, Naza Mujanović awidow of Alije Musića called Alić. In 1917 it was registered to Sejfo and Fejza late Mustafa Alić’s.
A house on c.p. 1/595 had: minor Redžo, Nazifa, Remša, Nezir and Malkuna a widow of Hasan Harbić and Fatima Meškulić a widow of Ramo Harbić.

A house on c.p. 1/594, a parcel 1/760 Gradilište and later 1/593 a house, had the same: minor Redžo, Nazifa, Remša, Nezir and Malkuna a widow of Hasan Harbić and Fatima Meškulić a widow of Ramo Harbić. 770

A house on c.p. 1/593 and later on 1/594, in 1894 was owned by Osman Harbić late Ramo’s. In 1909 the owner was Selim son of Osman.

A house on c.p. 1/555, later also on 1/ was owned by Ramo and Ređo Zenunović late Mustafa’s. In 1896 the owners were: Sehva a widow of Rešo, Salko and Ramo late Mustafa’s and in 1898: minor Mustafa, Džemo and Mehmed late Salih’s.

A house on c.p. 1/556 was owned by Salih Zenunović late Mustafa’s. In 1898 the heirs were: minor Mustafa, Džemo and Mehmed late Salih’s.

A house on c.p. 1/591 was owned by Hasan Zenunović late Zenun’s. Hasan Zenunović late Zenun’s owned a house also on c.p. 1/592. On c.p. 1/587 a housing with a yard owned: Begto Hamzić called Osmanović late Osmo’s and Hanifa Hamzić married to Bešlija Čakanović. In 1913 owners were Šemso and Osman late Begto’s.

A house on c.p. 1/586, in 1894 had Smajl Mušić late Hasan’s. In 1898 he was inherited by minor Sado and Nurko.

A house on c.p. 1/584 had Mehmed Fejzović late Fejzo’s and Suljo Turbić late Salko’s.

A house on c.p. 1/565 was owned by Mehmed Meškulić late Sumbul’s.

In the late 19th century was also on c.p. 1/564 a housing with yard owned by Mašo Alić late Alija’s and Ruja Alić a widow of Fejzo Turbić.

A house on c.p. 1/563 and a parcel 1/561 Gradillište (above the road to the church) were owned by: Nuko and Nurija Atanović late Ibrahim’s, as well as minor Mustafa and Mina a widow of Ahmet Zenunović.

Near the river Križevica were the following houses:

A house on c.p. 1/553 and a parcel Kazan (29 i 30), were owned by Sumbula Jahić called Kvakić late Jahija’s. In 1908 the owner was Abid Kvakić.

A housing on c.p. 1/642 was owned by Halil Kizić late Ahmet’s.
A house on c.p. 1/645, parcel 1/646 plum orchard Panđurište and later a house on c.p. 1/703, as well as a parcel 97/5 Kazani, had Began Duraković late Hasan’s. In 1907 the owners were: Omer, Zejnil, Behara and minor Hajra, the Petrović family owned it later.

A house on c.p. 1/634 had Junuz Omerović late Omer’s. In 1917 Hermina Štemnic was the owner?.

A house on c.p. 1/636 had: Šaban and Sulejman Dizdarević late Began’s, Muška married to Jusuf Papučić from Novoselo (Zvornik), Šaban Omerović called Turbić late Omer and Ruma Mujanović’s first married to Omerović a widow of Began Dizdarević.

3.2. General urban geographic characteristics of Ciganluk in the late 19th century

In the late 19th century Ciganluk or Kiptijan in Srebrenica consisted of 28 houses. Out of which there were several housings. Majority of houses were owned by the Zenunović family-four, Harbić and Čakanović three houses each.

There are some data on old families in Srebrenica’s Ciganluk at the researchers of forced migrations of Muslims from Serbia during the 19th century. Namely, Šaban Hodžić found in the mid-20th century in Srebrenica the following Gypsy families that were persecuted in the mid-19th century from the present day Serbia: Mehmedović, Omerović, Osmanović and Zenunović. Šaban Hodžić listed the number of homes and persons refugees – Gypsies from Užice who in 1862 settled down in the city of Srebrenica. The same author analyzed also the number of homes and families, not only


43 Those were the following homes and persons (with their age): 1. (a home of) Ibrahim son of Osman 40, his sons: Nuko 10, Nurija 8 and Osman 8; 2. Mustafa son of Zenun 34, his sons Salih 8 and Bešlija 22 (probably Mustafa’s brother); 3. Missing: 4. Ramadan son of Osman 60, his sons: Osman 19, Salih 10 and Hasan 4; 5. Salih son of Mehmed 40, his son Mehmed 16; 6. Mehan son of Barutdžija 60, his sons Mehlan 23 and Sulejman 6; 7. Bećir son of Omer 50, his sons Salih 12 and Sulejman 7; 8. Omer son of Barutdžija 90; 9. Ibrahim son of Mustafa 26, his sons Hasan 6 and Mustafa 4; 11. Osman Mehmed’s 34. Šaban Hodžić, Migracije muslimanskog..., pp. 35-36.
Conclusion

Parts of the city of Srebrenica, actually quarts Musala, Varoš and Ciganluk were in the late 19th century almost formed traditional urban entities. First of all Varoš with over 60 and Ciganluk with almost 30 houses. Musala was still in the process of formation, because urbanization affected it only at the end of the Ottoman period by the process of building houses of old srebrenica’s families around the river Kneževac and a road over Bojna, extended during that period.

Musala experienced its intensive urban development during the Austro-Hungarian rule, when new streets and roads were built through it and also different public urban facilities. Musala had nearly thirty houses in the late 19th century. They were mostly private residential houses owned by old Srebrenica’s families: Begović, Hadžiselmanagić, Halilagića, Agišević and several larger buildings for public needs. First of all a building of the Srebrenica County Administration (Konak) and National elementary school. Soon in 1894 on a c.p. 118/19 Hotel was built. There was another public object in Musala that dated from the Ottoman period. It was Musala, a religious object. In the late 19th century it was on a parcel c.p. 1/521. It was rectangular in shape and a rare cultural historic and religious monument. It is necessary to emphasize that a larger complex of land within Musala (on the north of present municipality building) was actually a cemetery in the legal status of a

---

44 Those were: 1. Mustafa son of Malaga 55, his sons: Omer 32, Salih 24, Ibrahim 21 and Ismail 6; 2. Mustaфа Selimović son of Sulejman 33; 3. Derviš Ibrahimović son of Ibrahim 40; 4. Hasan Drljačić son of Haji Ibrahim 62, his son Sulejman 32; 5. Abdurahman Alemdarović son of Ahmed 42, his sons Ahmed 2 and Mustafa 1; 6. Sulejman Alemdarović son of Ahmed 40; 7. Salih Torlaković son of Alija 34; 8. Halil Ćivan son of Mustafa 40; 9. Ahmed son of Velid 42, his sons Mustafa 5 and Bajram 3; 10. Mehmed son of Velija 32, his sons Salih 4 and Selim 2; 11. Bečir son of Velija 35, his brother Osman 20. It was found that only the following families are still in Srebrenica under the same names after checking the names of inhabited families in Srebrenica: Aliefendić, Begić, Dozić, Efendić, Malagić and Torlaković. When it comes to the list of homes, the number of adults and children of refugees from Užice, Belgrade, Sokol and Šabac in kazas, the author confirmed that then migrated to the Srebrenica: from Užice 96 houses, 406 adults and 140 children; from Sokol 199 houses, 711 adults and 508 children and from Belgrade one house with 5 adults. A total of 297 houses with 1771 persons migrated to the Srebrenica Kaza from Serbia. Šaban Hodžić, *Migracije muslimanskog...*, pp. 135-140.
waqf. Those were parcels on c.p. 1/164, 1/521 i 118/1 with the areas of 740, 2,640 and 12,560 m². The cemetery was destroyed with construction of roads and other public objects.

In the late 19th century there were somewhat more than 60 houses in Varoš. If we add those 25 houses in the part of Varoš towards Čaršija, than Varoš counted more than 85 houses. In Varoš was then also the Orthodox church with a cemetery next to it, as well as larger public object near the river Križevica. In Varoš lived the Orthodox population exclusively. Among those residents there were very enterpreneuring and distinguished people of the city of Srebrenica. Surely, the most significant Serbian Orthodox person of the time was Aleksa Jovanović late Jovan’s. In 1894 he owned a number of houses in Čaršija and Varoš. He had a larger number of serf’s homesteads in the villages around Srebrenica, a store registered in 1885. He was active in public and religious life of the city. Among meny things he was a vice-mayor, protector of the new Orthodox church in Srebrenica in 1903.

Ciganluk or Kiptijan in Srebrenica counted 28 houses in the late 19th century. Several of those were housings. Majority belonged to the following families: Zenunović-four, Harbić and Čakanović three each. All the residents of Ciganluk were persecuted from Serbia. They dealt with many crafts, and most often: blacksmith, butcher, merchant, etc.

With the detailed analysis of characteristics of Musala, Varoš and Ciganluk, we explicitely learn that Srebrenica even in the Ottoman period, presented developed city with complex and various urban geographic facilities, multireligious and multietnic structure of the residents.
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VILLAGES ORAOVICA, VIOGOR AND BUĆE NEAR SREBRENICA – IN THE LATE 19TH CENTURY

Summary

Smaller settlements Orahovica, Viogor and Bučje are located at the southwest side of the city of Srebrenica. At the end of the 19th century Orahovica and Viogor are predominantly inhabited by Orthodox and Bučje predominantly by Muslim population.

Across all the settlements there are numerous antiques and traces of earlier settlements and earlier population. In the paper we give historical and geographical characteristics and the development of these settlements. Also, we give a detailed overview of the urban-geographical characteristics of each settlement in the late 19th century. Mainly on the basis of so far unused sources of Austrian origin, land registration books and cadastral maps and the end of the 19th century.

Key words: Orahovica, Viogor (Vijogor), Buče (Bučje), the urban-geographical characteristics, historical and geographical characteristics, the late 19th century, Srebrenica

Introduction

Settlements Orahovica, Viogor and Buče are located in the vicinity of Srebrenica on its southwest side. Orahovica immediately leans on the territory of Srebrenica on the southwest and Viogor and Buče are at the same direction but somewhat further. These three settlements are relatively small and we will explain them in detail in this paper.
Orahovica, Viogor and Buće are predominantly hilly and mountainous area. Parts of the village are mostly at an altitude of 500-700 m. Slightly lower the northeastern parts of Orahovica are at 370-460 m and higher southern parts of Buće (only Buće at about 800 m) and Ložanj (part of Buće) and Kiprova (part of Orahovica) at almost 900 m.

1. Older history

Orahovica, Viogor and Buće were probably inhabited even in the oldest times, prehistoric and ancient times, but for the time being there are no certain clues from that period.

As the considerable antiquity could be included a recent discovery of the foundations of some old construction in Borovac, a part of Orahovica.\(^1\) The media talks about the medieval Orthodox church.\(^2\)

\(^1\) According to many news that could be found on the internet in the last few years. First in 2014 a cross was erected on R. Dračićević’s private property “who said that there used to be a church there”. Then, a location named Crkvište in Borovac is mentioned. In 2015 foundations of a building 13x7 m were discovered, and some source listed 10x6 m. Also, there were several skeletons discovered, brick sourface and other sources (Austrian coins, metal objects, etc.)

\(^2\) The judgment of age and type of archaeological findings without archaeological research should be taken into careful consideration. Especially in the localities such as Crkvinja and the of the possible old buildings on the site. Often archaeological research declare the prehistoric or ancient site there. And a possible church itself can be late antique or medieval of any church present in the medieval Bosnia.

There is such example around recently discovered Gradina and Crkvina in Mramorak, Osmaci municipality (on the west of Zvornik). At first the public thought it was medieval antiquity (fort, church...). However, it was concluded that those were the remains of prehistoric fort (probably from the Bronze Age) and late antique church. The late antique monument with characters and inscriptions was also found, as well as a crypt. They could date from the 4th-5th century according to the oral data of Mirko babić, M.Phil., and archeologist who conducted archeological research (They were given to the author of the paper in the Summer of 2015.)

The fast construction of a house of worship of some of then religious organizations on similar archeological localities can prevent archeological research and scientif determination of the type and age of the finding. There is such a case in Rožanj, Sapna municipality (on the northeast of Zvornik). There was a locality of Crkvišće with the remains of buliding and a tomb with 3 human skeletons. Archeologist V. Milić during the first review noticed that it might be the middle ages. However, without archeological research several years ago on the locality an Orthodox church was erected. More in: Rusmir Djedović, Ostaci srednjovjekovne zgrade u Rožnju, Baština sjeveroistočne Bosne, časopis za baštinu, kulturno-historijsko i prirodnog naslijeđe, No. 2, Zavod za zaštitu i korištenje kulturno-historijskog i prirodnog naslijeda Tuzlanskog kantona, Tuzla, 2010, pp. 163-170.
In the literature of the Catholic provenance is often said that in the Middle Ages there were several Catholic churches in Srebrenica, as well as in Čagalj near Srebrenica and Jasenova. Jasenova is a part of settlement and cadastral municipality Pusmulići, immediately next to Orahovica.

Of the old fortified towns the closest is the medieval town and the Ottoman fort Kličevac that is located just west of Buča. Also, names of hills such as Koštur, just south of Buča and Gradno, just north of Viogor, remaind of some forts. These three settlements were surely inhabited during the medieval Bosnian state, thus, prior to the 15th century. There are numerous traces (material, historic, place names) to support the claim. The most common material traces of the Middle Ages are tombstones. The science knows for several such necropolis so far. Three necropolis of tombstones in Orahovica and one in Buča are known. On a gentle incline in Bučje called Mramorje, there is a necropolis with tombstones. This necropolis has recently been declared protected by the Commission for protection of national monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In this area medieval necropolis with tombstones are called Mramor, Mramorje, Biljeg etc. That name was noted in the late 19th century in Borovac, a part of Orahovica. Back then a c.p. 285 in the status of a pasture, was called Mramorje with the area of 12.5 acres. There is a locality named Mramorje also in the village Viogor, and in this area it is named Nike. It is a pasture on c.p. 30 that in 1894 was called “on Mramorje“ with the area of 20 acres. A place name Katar in Nike i Viogor (c.p. 42/1 and 42/2) in addition to tombstones could point to members of the Bosnian church. The name Mramor is present in the neighboring village Bajramovići.

---


4 In 2011 a necropolis at the site Mramorje in Bučje, Srebrenica, was declared a national monument. It consists of 15 tombstones and encompasses c.p. 126 and 143, c.m. Bučje. More in: http://kons.gov.ba/

5 Entry 22, Land Register for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.

6 Entry 69, Land Register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.

7 It is named Mramor, due to medieval monuments made of marble. Rusmir Djedović, Naselje Bajramovići na razmeđu 19 i 20. stoljeća, Monumenta Srebrenica, knjiga 4, Zavod za zaštitu i korištenje kulturno-historijskog i prirodnog naslijeđa Tuzlanskog kantona, Tuzla-Srebrenica, 2015, pp. 177.
Larger lands named Biljeg are in the village Orahovica and neighboring Čičevci (with preserved tombstones). Biljeg in Orahovica is a bigger complex of land and a line above the mouth of Bajramovićka and Pusmulićka rivers. In the old ages there was a significant road from Srebrenica to the south. Biljeg was in the late 19th century owned by Haji Husejn Ef. Đozić who owned two houses with a property. The name of Biljeg also had a parcel, then forst, on c.p. 14 owned by Đozić.8

Many place names in villages Orahovica, Viogor and Buče remaind of the Middle Ages. Especially interesting are many such as Stop, Stopovi, Stup, Stupine...

It has already noticed that in neighboring Bajramovići place names Stupine, Stupinsko brdo and Stupinski grob date from the Middle Ages.9 The same is the case with place name Stop (an altitude near Vučevac).10 In the village Orahovica there were in the late 19th century stoljeća larger complexes of land named Stop and Stopovi. Even at the Ottoman period, the following properties were listed next to village of Orahovica: Stup, Dolnji Stup, Osojevište Stup.

In The southern extension of the hill Bojna above the part of Orahovica, Rajna, is a flattened hill with a piece of land called Krst. This name is present since the late 19th century. It is a plot on c.p. 72, an arable land, Dolnji Krst (area of 10.100 m²), 73 a meadow, Dolnji Krst (1.590 m²) and 69, an arable land, Gornji Krst (later Brdo, a total of 33 acres).11 Probably from the Middle Ages date the following names: Banjevac and Baština in Bujakovići. Baština was marked in the cadastral plan from 1882-85 for the part of Orahovica. The same goes for a place name Kiprova in Orahovica.

On the tradition of mining in the village of Orahovica point some place names from the late 19th century. Those are a part of village with houses named Kovačice, as well as lands around them with the same name. In the vicinity are also place names Metala, Metaljka and Čagalj (German name for the first ore). Maybe neighboring lands named Miješci point to the metal processing (with the help of bellows).

The area of villages Viogor and Buće were placed in the eastern part of the Trebotić district with a medieval fort Kličevac as its center in the Middle

---

8 A parcel c.p. 14. „Šuma“ Biljeg then had the area of 2,050 m². Entry 13, Land Register for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry Srebrenica.
9 Maybe from the medieval name for arable land “stup” or from the medieval name for a tower.
10 Rusmir Djedović, Naselje Bajramovići..., pp. 176.
11 Entry 2, 3 i 47... The family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica owned the land in the 19th century.
Ages. On the south of Trebotić was the Vratar district. On the east was a district of Srebrenica with medieval castle-fortress Srebrenik and an outskirt with a square Srebrenica. On the south-east was a district, earlier a larger region of Osat, which comprised a village Jasenova, i.e. Donji Jadar.

With the arrival of the Ottoman administration in the first half of the 1460-ies these districts became nahias. Already in 1468 there were 48 villages and 4 homesteads listed in nahia Trebotić. Among others those whose present location is well-known: Sučeska, Klič (in the vicinity of fort Kličevac if not around hill Klik 852 m on the south from Bučja towards Podravno), Kutuzero, Žedanjsko, Štedra... Bilo Polje (Bijelo Polje) was probably today’s south-western part of Kutuzera with the same name, Nikolići were in the basin of a stream Nikolić (also marked on the oldest topographic maps from the late 19th century) that is directly on the south of Kutuzer and Bučja. The village Bogumilovo (later Bogumilovo village, Bogumilovac) which is near Sučeske because it was later used by the villagers, might be later Bogodo in Podravno or some other site in the vicinity of Sučeska. Locations of numerous villages of Trebotić from the 15th century are unknown. Those were: Vrbovo, with another name Krstjan and Hranov cemetery (where Ahmed, a builder or a fort’s commander owns a property but not far from it).12

The nahia Osat in 1468/9 included villages Jasenova or Donji Jadar, as well as Gornji Jadar that was a bit more on the east next to Zeleni Jadar. Villages Čičevci with Kožlje, Srebrenica, Gostilj and Milačević comprised the nahia Srebrenica.13

The area between Kutuzer, Srebrenica and Orahovica during the 15th and 16th centuries probably occupied a larger settlement that was in the oldest Ottoman censuses named Hanovo cemetery, i.e. Hranulov’s grave or Ugor. It probably stretched to Lehovići in Babuljice on the north.

Also a settlement Vranić was mentioned but not its location. It was probably located on the slopes of a smaller mountain that was marked on old topographic maps from the late 19th and early 20th century as Vranić. It was marked in the same manner on cadastral maps from 1882-85. Vranić then was actually located on the area of later settlement Viogor. Also, Vukanović could be a part of later settlement Bajramovići that was in the late 19th century known as Vukadinović (Bukadinović).

---

Soon the south-eastern part of nahia Trebotić was referred to nahia Osat and the north-western part to nahia Birač (before 1485). From the late 15th century till the end of the Ottoman period the area of villages Viogor, Orahovica and Buče constantly belong to stalno pripada kadiluk Srebrenica, and during the Austro-Hungarian period to district Srebrenica.

We found more data in older historic and geographical characteristics of villages Orahovica, Viogor and Buče in the ottoman census from the early 17th century, or more precise in 1604 villages Orahovica, Bučje and Hranulov cemetery were listed. A village Orahovica in 1604 belonged to Osat, with a total of 10 houses, 9 Muslim with gardens and one non-Muslim. The first listed then were: (I)Skender son of Živisav, Veli(ja) son of (I)Skender, Ibrahim son of Abdullah, Ferhad son of Mehmed.... Orahovica also comprised lands named Jadovnica and some fields. A total annual income was 1,277 akchas, mostly from cultivation of cereals (wheet, hybrid, oats) and less from vegetables, flax, hay, hives, onion.\textsuperscript{14}

A settlement Budanik, known as Orahovica belonged to Osat. It consisted of 19 Muslim houses with gardens. The first listed inhabitants were: Abdi son of Kurd, Kurd son of Milovan, Kurd Ali(ja) son of Pervane... It also encompassed čifluk (estate) named Prisada Derbića. A total annual income of Budanik – Orahovica was 1,500 akchas, mostly from cultivation of cereals (wheet, hybrid, oats) and less from vegetables, flax, hay, hives, onion.\textsuperscript{15}

Near Orahovica between the 16th and 17th century were a lot of large estates named: Stup and Bukovac, Mihaljević, Dolnji Stup, Osojevište Stup. They were owned by Ishak son of Hizir and other Muslims.\textsuperscript{16}

Near Budanik – Orahovica were many independent estates: čifluk of Petar son of Bogašin with the income of 250 akchas, property Matušići and Radilovići with one field and the income of 700 akchas and the estate Marići with the income of 300 akchas.\textsuperscript{17}

A settlement named Bučje, belonging to Osat, was also mentioned in 1604. It then comprised the estate of Stojan son of Sekula and the estate of Marko son of Nikola. There were 2 houses in total with 315 akchas, as well as income from renting the land in the amount of 200 akchas. The

\textsuperscript{14} A group of authors, A wider description of Bosanian Sandjak from 1604, Vol. II, Bošnjački institut Sarajevo, Orijentalni institut Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2000, pp. 596.
\textsuperscript{15} A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 598-599.
\textsuperscript{16} A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 598.
\textsuperscript{17} A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 599-600.
settlement Bučje, was listed as a village with the same name on the southwest of Srebrenica. Immediately next to Bučje was listed a settlement called Slipomičica (location unknown) with 9 houses. It should be researched whether it was the settlement Slapovići.

Between the 16th and 17th century there was an estate Vavgor in the village Hanulov grave and it belonged to Osat. It consisted of 4 Muslim houses with properties and income of 300 akchas mostly from the cultivation of cereals. The name reminds on the later settlement Vioger.

In 1604 was mentioned a hamlet Bogumilovac near Sutjeska. It was used by Bogdan son of Marko from Srebrenica.

2. Old roads

Probably, the greatest significance of villages Orahovica, Viogor and Buče in the past were important roads that went from Srebrenica to the south-east. The most renowned is the Ottoman road that leads from Čaršija in Srebrenica across hills Bojna and Bjelila through Viogor and across Slapovići to the mountain Javor and to Žepa. The first part of the road has already been described in details.

It is known in the folk tradition of Srebrenica and Žepa that there was an important road that led from Srebrenica to Sarajevo and Višegrad. This old road (probably medieval) whose route was modified during the Ottoman period led from Čaršija in Srebrenica. This road from Čaršija in Srebrenica went across the hill Bojna then led to the valley of the river in Bjelila towards Bajramovići and to an important crossroad which has a branch that went toward the south and the river Jadar. The road to the south went from it following the right side of the river and soon went on the other side following the land Luka and below the land Strana next to the river. The remains of cobble pavement can be seen even today and the road goes the maous well Lehovac. Below

---

18 A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 581.
19 A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 621.
20 A group of authors, A wider description..., pp. 603.
22 Rusmir Djedović, Naselje Bajramovići..., pp. 174.
the forest Košpovina (today’s Gošpovina) the road crosses the Bajramovićka River and goes next to a quart Kovačice of the village Viogor to Slapovići. There are numerous antiques on this route with an old stone bridge in Slapovići on the river Zeleni Jadar, that is today unfortunately unrenewed. Further this road goes across the mountain Javor and in Žepa it bifurcates into two routes, one toward Sarajevo and the other toward Višegrad.  

To be more precise, from the Bajramovićka River valley a route of this road climbs across a long slope of the mountain Vranić. It goes immediately above a part of Viogor named Kovačice and Vranić on a saddle between the hill Brdo (Veliko Brdo, 810 m) and Malo brdo. The road then goes next to the land Metal and a part of Viogor named Sarači. This name points to the presence of craftmen (sarač) who made saddles and horse equipement and caravans.

There are two tombstones of killed soldiers, probably from the 16th century, somewhat before the part of Viogora Brdo near the route. These two tombstones aredecorated with an apple’s half. The road soon goes down to the valley of the river Zeleni Jadar and next to an old Muslim graveyard. This old graveyard was declared a national monument of Bosnia and Herzegovina due to its significance.

There is a mosques in Slapovići in the very valley of the river Zeleni Jadar next to this route of the old road. This mosque is surely from the Ottoman period and it was drawn in the Austro-Hungarian cadatsral plans from 1882-85. U samoj dolini rijeke Zeleni Jadar pored ove trase starog puta nalazi se

---

24 Rusmir Djedović, Naselje Bajramovići..., str. 174.
25 This slight saddle is at about 150 m and recently there was a wooden cross and the locality was called Krst (cross).
26 Sarač (Arabic), craftman who amkes and sells equipment for horses made of leather. Abdulah Škaljić, Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom-hrvatskosrpskom jeziku, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1985, pp.549.
27 The were declared to be national monumet of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Hazim Numanagić, a connoisseur and orientalist, placed these tombstones in the 16th century. They have almost identical dimnesions, square base 28x28 cm and a height of 115 cm. It was decorated with a motif of an apple on all four sides. Turbans are crowled. A fence is old wooden around the tombstones. http://kons.gov.ba/
28 A cemetery and two tombstones in Slapovići were declared the national monument in 2012. The cemetery is on c.p. 51. Its main characteristic is that it is very authentic and with symbolic value. It now contains about 30 tombstones. One dates from the 17th century and others from the 18th and 19th centuries. It is about 200 m aways from the mosque and from the cemetery about 500 m to two (killed soldiers) tombstones. http://kons.gov.ba/
džamija u Slapovićima. Due to its importance the newly renewed mosque in Slapovići is also protected.\(^{29}\)

The most sensitive spot on the old roads’ routes were river crossings. Due to heavy waters, caravans and travelers passed them with difficulties. Thus, the state built stone or timber bridges over them. There is such a stone bridge across the river Zeleni Jadar since the ancient times. This cultural and historic wealth, both place and remains of historical construction, was also declared a national monument named Most na rijeci Zeleni Jadar (The Bridge across the river Zeleni Jadar) in Slapovići.\(^{30}\)

From the important spot on the old road from Srebrenica, the bridge across the river Zeleni Jadar, an older branch of the road goes directly uphill to Buće and next to the necropolis Mramorje. Then it crosses the stream Nikolić and next to Šljivova climbs to Podravina. This oldest route is well memorized in the folk tradition of neighbouring villages.\(^{31}\) There are some tombstones (stećak) next to the road on the south of Šljivova.\(^{32}\)

The newest branch of the road (the late centuries of the Ottoman rule) leads from Slapovići to Kutuzer. There is a necropolis on the crossroad. It went further through Bijelo polje.\(^{33}\)

Next to this route on the hill Kak above Kutuzero was an Ottoman observation post. A mosque was built for military troops. It was situated at the site Pašina džamija (Pasha’s mosque). That was also the name of the mosque. The site of the mosque was below the hill Kak toward Bijelo polje. It had

---

29 It was declared a national monument in 2010. It was named as the mosque in Slapovići, a historic building. It is listed that, the renewed mosque is a significant monument of cultural memory, that, except for commemorating tragic events from 1995, also celebrates rich cultural diversity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. [http://kons.gov.ba/](http://kons.gov.ba/)

30 It was declared in 2014 and lies on c.p. 69 c.m., Buče and c.p. 363 c.m., Viogor. Više na [http://kons.gov.ba/](http://kons.gov.ba/)

31 The oldest road in the area was named Kaldrma. It went from Srebrenica, over Buće and Podravna to Stublić and further. I saw the remains of the old road in Sarači (towards Srebrenica) and from Buće over Nikolići and up Šljivova. The one that goes over Nikolići up Šljivova is called Djevojačka kaldrma. Girls were carrying and putting down the stone according to folk tradition. Also, according to folk tradition three sisters were saying how they would come to Sarajevo following the old road. The saying of Ćamil (Ramo) Ajšić (1943) from Kutuzer, July 2014.

32 There is a good old stone road from the stream Nikolići to Šljivova. The stoe is the same as it was on the bridge over the river Zeleni Jadar. The saying of Hamdija Hasanović (1957) from Buće, now in Ilijaš, May 2016.

33 The road went through Bijelo polje, across Toluša. There was an old wooden bridge in the old days. The saying of Ćamil (Ramo) Ajšić (1943) from Kutuzer, July 2014.
stone foundations. Traces of the stone foundations were visible until a few decades ago.\textsuperscript{34}

The old road went to higher fields as it was a custom, and with similar direction, from Srebrenica to the hill Koštur, via Orahovica. One branch of the road went from Bjelila following the slope of Biljeg and through Orahovica (Stopovi). Place names Bajraktareva barica and Raskršće (according to the 1882-85 cadatradal plan) are on that route. A parcela below on c.p.231 is called a forest under a crossroad (38 d). It further goes to a saddle at Borovac. The second branch of this road climbs from Srebrenica on the hill Bojna across Hrid or from a quart Petrič. It then went down following the slope to the mouth of a stream from Orahovica to the Pusmulička River. From there it went on a hill near Podgajnica and further to a slight saddle between Orahovica and the Zeleni Jadark valley. There are numerous antiques there. Several old cemeteries and necropolis. Foundations of the late antique church were discovered recently there. Place names near that road speak to its significance. On c.p. 265/1 and 266 named Drum and 283/3 Vratca.\textsuperscript{35}

The road crosses Zeleni Jadark and then further on the southwest following a long slope (the forest Ložnja) exits on a plateau of a high cliff (about 850 m). There a branch near the hill Alibegovac goes to the south-west through Bučje, and then on the crossroad of an old Srebrenica-Žepa road, and further to Kutuzero. The road to the south-west climbs the hill Koštur (936 m). The place name is probably from an antique fort – Kastruma. It then goes down to Podravno (near Parabučje) and further can go to Žepa on the right and to Osat on the left.

3. Islamic heritage

Immediately after the Ottomans conquered Srebrenica, Kličevac and surroundings in 1459, started the process of islamization, development of Islamic spirituality and creation of Islamic heritage. There were imams in the second half of the 15th century, and therefore, mosques for troops settled in the Kličevac fort.

Numerous place names remind of old Muslim population in villages Orahovica, Viogor and Buče (they are listed in the part on villages). There were mosques in this area since the old age. Also, there are material remains in

\textsuperscript{34} The saying of Ćamıl (Ramo) Ajšić (1943) from Kutuzer, July 2014.
\textsuperscript{35} Entry 19, Land Register for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica. The owners are families from Srebrenica.
the area, such as Muslim graveyards and tombstones. In the late 19th century Mujanov grob

In the late 19th century Mujanov grob (Mujan’s grave) was well known in Viogor. It was in a forest on c.p. 61/1 that was called: Žernica, Borik and Mujanov grob, with the are of 385 acres. There are old tombstones on Vranić, between Vijenac and Veliko brdo, as well as in Osredak. Maybe Mujanov grob. An old cemetery with tombstones is also at the top of Benin dol, in the corner of the old road to Viogor.

Next to the oldest mosque, in the Ličevac fort from the 15th century, there were many more in these villages in the old age. The folk tradition recognizes the site Pašina džamija, that was above described.

Also, folk tradition speaks about the existence of a very old mosque in the part of Viogor named Miješci. The tradition knows its place, foundations and remains of cemetery around it. The Muslim cemetery in Milješci was situated at several sites. Most of it overgrew into a forest, which testifies that it is very old and that the area of cemetery was not ploughed. A place name Miješci was, in the cadastral plans from the 19th century, recorded as Mesce.

There is a mosque in Slapovići in the last centuries for villages: Buće, Viogor, Kutuzero, Lipovac and other neighbouring places. It was declared a national monument of Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the spatial organization concept, a mosque in Slapovići belonged to single-room mosques types with square roof and stone minar. It has rectangular front foundation, dimensions 6.05m x 7.95m and the height of walls is 4.50m till eaves, and 7.10m till the ridge of roof. A total height of minaris 11.15m, and the base of its foundation is rectangular with dimensions 1.60m x 2.12m.

---

36 Entry 49, Land Register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica. The owners of the forest was the family Muhagić from Srebrenica then.
37 The saying of Hamir Fejzić, Bajramovići, May 2016.
38 The saying of Hamir Fejzić, Bajramovići, May 2016.
39 There is a cemetery around the mosque and on the northeastern slope about 4 m away are 3 gravey with front and foot tombstones. One is of Mula Selim Alemić (1860 – 1938), an on the north of that grave on the surface can be seen stone remains that indicate that there was an older grave and two are recent. See more in: http://kons.gov.ba/
The mosque in Slapovići

The benefactor of the mosque was Selim Alemić late Ibrahim’s from Buče according to a contract on gift from 29th June 1939, when he gave parcels 358/1 the forest Hamajlija and 358/2 the pasture Hamajlija, (a total area of 5 acres), as listed, in favor of the mosque’s waqf and a religious school in Buče. Selim Alemić late Ibrahim’s from Buče also gave in 1939 his house (on c.p. 60/4 a housing with a yard and a house on No. 2) in the immediate vicinity of the mosque and religious school in Buče. He also then gifted many parcels of land, i.e. arable land: c.p. 61 Luka, 66 Ječmište, 71 Premakuća (a total of 10 acres), then, a house on c.p. 60/2 and parcels: 68 arable land and a forest Luka, 38/1 arable land Radan Luka, 55 arable land Podkućnica, 38/2 meadow Ravna luka (a total of 28 acres). There was a waqf’s parcel somewhat further from the mosque in Slapovići in the late 19th century.

The presence of waqf’s estates in the Ottoman period speaks about the presence of Islamic spirituality and heritage in these villages. Thus, in the late 19th century, parcels on c.p. 8/2 arable land Vinograd (980 m²) and 9 aforest Vinograd (770 m²) were registered in Nike and Viogor, then owned by the waqf of Čaršijska džamija in Srebrenica. Those were two complete serfs’ homesteads in Kiprova in the southmost part of Orahovica.

40 Selim Alemić owned these properties since forever. In 1894 he was registered as the owner. Entry 20...

41 Entry 2, Land Register for c.m. Buče from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica

42 Entry 65...

43 Those were serf’s moesteads woned by the Skender Mosque waqf in Srebrenica together with families: Hadžiselmanagić, Aydagić and Omerović. The family Trifković lived in homesteads. Entries: 25, 26 and 44, Land register for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
Below Bujakovići, also in Orahovica, in the late 19th century were waqf’s parcels on c.p. 379/1 a forest Podgor (1.500 m²) and 379/2 a meadow Podgor (4.700 m²). Parcel on c.p. 39 a river islet Palučak (area of 3 acres) in Buće, in the late 19th century owned the waqf of Bijela džamija (The White Mosque) in Srebrenica.

4. The village Orahovica

The village Orahovica is situated immediately on the southwest side of the city of Srebrenica. The name of Orahovica derived from the natural forests of nut, that, obviously, dominated over the area. There are many place names in the village that speak about the old population. Such are: Raine, Milićine Raine, Bujaković, Ostojine Rajine, Antolovac, Muzarović, Perovina, Marino kolibište. There are also place names of originating from older Muslim population: Delijino Brdo, Dedino Brdo, Halilovo Brdo, Ahmetovina, Berberovac, Tabanova ravan, Tepić. A part of Orahovica was named Hodžino selo from the old age. It is unknown who is the hodža (imam) that it speaks about. The owners of this land are families Akagić and Đozić from the old days.

Some old place names in Orahovica speak about significant characteristics of the village then. Guvnište was a place were the whole village treated cereals and paid taxes in goods in the old days. Razboišta point to some old unfortunate events, duhanište is a trace of old tobacco cultivation, Banjice again speak about the presence of water usage. Place names such as: Selišta, Stara kuća, Podkućnice, Nadkućnice,... remind us of the old population in certain parts of Orahovica.

In the past a significant part of Orahovica was covered with state-owned pastures and forest, which residents used for their own needs. In the late 19th century those were the following parcels:

44 They then belonged to the Petrička Mosque waqf in Srebrenica. In 1936 owners became: Milovan, Ostoja, Vučeta Grujić late Todor’s. Entry 64, Land register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.

45 Entry 67, Land register for c.m. Buće from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica. Before the WWII Mula Selim Alemić endowed 110 acres of meadow and forest. Slapovići then presented inhabited place and its congregation consisted of eight villages: Slapovići, Bučje, Kutuzero, Bjelo Polje, Lipovac, Kasapići, Strane and Sarači. Between the two world wars near the mosque were built a mill, a stone bridge and a religious school where the imam lived. After Mula Selim Alemić’s death in 1938, Effendi Jusuf Begić obtained the duty of imam and after his death until 11th July 1995 the imam was Mehmed (Selman) Delić, when he was listed as a missing person. Vidi detaljnije dalje http://kons.gov.ba/

46 Place names of this origin are very often: Orahovica, Orahovac, Orašje, Orašlje...
39, 46 and 47 a pasture and a forest Brdo, 70 a pasture Kamenjak, 297/4 a forest Borovac (area of 424 acres), 310/1 a pasture Vaganj (27 acres), 345 a pasture Luka, 429/3 a pasture next to a cemetery (1.500m²), 430/1 a forest Solila, Ložnja, Čahorka, Banjevac and Tepečije (a total of 3,665 acres), 437 a pasture Velika Ložnja (62d), 438 a pasture Lazanska Ravan, 439 a pasture Mlečanj, 440 a pasture Tabanova Ravan, 441 an underwood Skakavac (63d), 442 and 443 a pasture Tepešija, 444 a pasture Solila, 446 a pasture Široka Ravan, 447 a pasture Ravanica. Somewhat later on a state land on c.p. 437/3 a site of 40 m² was registered. The river Jadar as c.p. 323, in the area of Orahovica was also registered as the state-owned.

A Muslim tombstone at the site Okolište in Orahovica

---

47 All owned by the Bosnian state in 1894. Entry 65, Land Registry for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.

48 Entry 1, Land Registry for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
The village Orahovica left the Ottoman period with 22 houses. A year after the Austro-Hungarian rule was established, in 1879, there were 22 houses with 26 apartments and 192 residents in Orahovica.  

In 1885 there were 23 houses and 22 apartments in Orahovica. There were 179 residents, all eastern Orthodox, out of which 43 serfs, 3 men and 133 women and children.  

At the very end of the 19th century, according to the census in 1895, the village Orahovica encompasses the following parts: Biljeg, Borovac, Bujaković, Dolovi, Kiprova, Orahovica, Poretak and Stop. There were 24 residing and 2 non-residing houses, a total of 26. There were 187 eastern Orthodox residents. When it comes to social and ownership structure, there were 22 serfs with 135 members and one other ploughman with one member in Orahovica.  

### 4.1. The review of the village Orahovica in the late 19th century

#### 4.1.1. Raine

Raine, later listed as Rajne, is the eastmost part of the village Orahovica. Next to the old road from Srebrenica to the south, Skelani and further. In the late 19th century there were two housings on serfs’ homesteads. Those were:

A housing with a yard belonging to the family Lazić a house number (No.) 1 on a serf’s homestead that was oned in the late 19th century by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica. During the Kingdom of Yugoslavia the family Lazić became the owner.  

---

49 Štatistika miesta i pučanstva Bosne i Hercegovine, C. I kr. vladina tiskarna, Sarajevo, 1880, pp. 95.  
50 Štatistika mjesta i žiteljstva Bosne i Hercegovine po popisu naroda 1. maja 1885., Zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1886, pp. 154-155.  
51 Glavni rezultati popisa žiteljstva u Bosni i Hercegovini od 22. aprila 1895., zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1896, pp. 350-351.  
52 This homestead in addition to a housing with a yard on c.p. 56/1 also encompassed parcels: 50 and 51 Delijino Brdo, 52 Brdo, 53 and 54 Dolac near Razboište, 58/1 Glavašice, 58/3 Miličine Raine... and all owned by Haji Hasanaga nd Avdage Hadžiselmanagić late Haji Selmanaga from Srebrenica. In 1922 Hasanaga was succeeded by: Effendi Ali and Fejzaga, Ifeta a widow of Šahinagić from Sarajevo, Bida married to H. Egrić from Brezo Polja, Hana married to Alikadić from Brčko, Tifa married to Zečirović from Brčko, Zulfa married to Alajbegović from Zvornik, Fata married to Krtičić from Zvornik and Šida married to H. Efendić from Tuzla. In 1923 Avdaga was succeeded by: Hiba a widow of Halilbašić from Sarajevo, Tifa a widow of Škaljo from Sarajevo and Mula a widow of Begtašević from Sarajevo. Entry 1, Land Register for c.m. Orahovica from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
A housing with a yard belonging to the family Savić No. 2 on a homestead owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić. In 1930 Petar Savić late Mitra and Milorad Savić’s late Gligo’s became the owners of a housing and a homestead according to the decision of county’s board.53

Parts of Raine according to new owners were also called Miličine Raine (Milica’s Raine) or Ostojine Raine (Ostoja’s Raine). Below Raine was, according to old maps, a place name Vodice toward Stop. There was probably an old mill on the Pusmulička River below Pusmulić there.

4.1.2. Bojna, Debelo brdo

There were two housings with serf’s homesteads on the very border of Orahovica toward the city of Srebrenica on slopes of the hill Bojna, that is Debelo brdo in the late 19th century.

A housing with a yard of the family Savić No. 3 on a serf’s homestead of the family Hadžiselmanagić.54

A housing with a yard of the family Savić No. 4 on a serf’s homestead of the family Hadžiselmanagić. In 1930 Jevrosima Savić a widow of Ilić became the owner.55

The prior two serf’s homesteads encompassed in the late 19th century other parcels owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrebnic. In 1929 the county board in Srebrenica decided that Jevrosima Savić a widow of Ilić became the owner of a one and Jovo Savić late Pavle’s57 of the other.

4.1.3. Hodžino selo (the Hodža’s village)

Hodžino selo is the part of Orahovica on western slopes of the Pusmulička River. There were two housings with serf’s homesteads. A housing

53 Next to a homestead with a housing and a yard on c.p. 74 were also parcels: 26 Brdo, 44 i 45, Srednji brjeg, 73 a meadow Dolnji Krst (1590 m²), 75 Vranjevina, 76 Luka, 77 Ravna Luka... owned by in 1894 Haji Hasanaga and Avdaga Hadžiselmanagić late Haji Selmanaga from Srebrenica. Entry 2.

54 Next to on c.p. 35 a housing with a yard it encompassed: 23 a cleared land in Debelo Brdo, 27-29 Brdo, 33 Podkućnica, 40 Zavodom, 43/1, 43/2 Antolovac, 72 an arable land Dolnji Krst (10,100 m²), all owned by Haji Hasanaga and Avdaga Hadžiselmanagić late Haji Selmanaga from Srebrenica. Entry 3.

55 Entry 4...

56 Entry 46...

57 Entry 47...
with a yard belonging to the family Ilić No. 5 on a serf’s homestead that the family Akagić from Srebrenica owned in the late 19th century.\(^{58}\)

A housing with a yard belonging to the family Vasić on a serf’s homestead in 1894 belonged to the family Đozić. Those were: Abdurahman, Hakija, minor Mehmed, Ahmet and Vehbija sons of Haji Husejn Đozić from Srebrenica.\(^{59}\)

The following pieces of land were around Hodžino selo (Hodža’s village) in the late 19th century: 22 a forest Debelo Brdo (228 d), 61 Luka, 76/1 a forest behind Vranjevina (20 d), 79 Luka, 81/1 a forest below Vranjevina and Duhanište (53d), 82/1 a forest behind Antolovac (34 d).

4.1.4. Biljeg

Biljeg or somewhere Bileg, is the part of Orahovica in its northern part. An old road from Srebrenica to Žepa goes above Biljeg. There were two houses with estates in Biljeg in the late 19th century.

In the late 19th century there was a housing with a yard and a house No. 7 on c.p. 5/1 owned by the family Đozić from Srebrenica. Precisely: Abdurahman, Hakija, minor Mehmed, Ahmet and Vehbija sons of Haji Husejn Đozić from Srebrenica. In 1911 it was all registered to Mehmed (Meho) Đozić late Husejn’s. In 1949 the owners were: Alija, Husejn and Ajka Đozić late Meho’s from Orahovica, and Sadika married to Husejnović from Bučinovići.\(^{60}\) The same family members of the family Đozić owned a house on c.p. 10/1, a housing and a yard and a house No. 8. The same members inherited it in 1911 and 1949.\(^{61}\)

Members of the family Đozić in the vicinity were owners of other parcels as well in the late 19th century.\(^{62}\) In 1894 the owners were: Abdurahman, Hakija, minor Mehmed, Ahmet and Vehbija sons of Haji Husejn Đozić from Srebrenica. In 1911 it was all registered to Effendi Haki Đozić late Husejn’s and in 1922 Vehbija Đozić late Haji Husejn’s bought it.\(^{63}\) The family Đozić from Srebrenica also owned larger estates in Bjelila and Bukadinovići, that lean to estates in Orahovica but are in neighbouring Bajramovići.\(^{64}\)

\(^{58}\) Entry 5...
\(^{59}\) Entry 6...
\(^{60}\) Entry 7...
\(^{61}\) Entry 8...
\(^{62}\) The family Đozić owned majority of significant estates in the old days in Bajramovići (Bjelila, Bukadinović, Dodilovac...)
\(^{63}\) Entry13...
\(^{64}\) More in: Rusmir Đedović, Naselje Bajramovići..., pp. 171-194.
Immediately on the south-west of Biljeg started the estates of the family Akakgić. The family Akagić from Srebrenica owned a house on c.p. 121/1, a housing and a yard and a house No. 9. Alija Akagić late Mujaga’s from Srebrenica owned it in 1894, an in 1899 it was registered to: minor Džafer, Abdurahman, Salih, Mehmed, Ešrefa, Arifa and Hasna Akagić late Alija’s from Srebrenica. Numerous parcels were listed next to the house. Neighbouring lands: Okolišta, Podkućnica, Nadkućnica owned the family Akagić. The family Akagić from Srebrenica also owned the western part of Orahovica in the late Ottoman period. From Podkućnica over Petrovići and Jeremići to Borovac.

4.1.5. The central part of Orahovica

There were several housings and one house toward the central part of the village Orahovica in the late 19th century that is lately called Petrovići, Jeremići i Stopovi.

A housing with a yard of the family Petrović No. 10 on a serf’s homestead was in 1894 owned by the family Akagić from Srebrenica. A housing on c.p. 222/2 of the family Stevanović No. 11 on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Akagić from Srebrenica. It was Alija Akagić late Mujaga’s from Srebrenica. Also, a housing on c.p. 225/2 of the family Stevanović No. 13 on the same homestead were the same owners. The previous serf’s homestead also encompassed other parcels owned in the late 19th century by the family Akagić.

A housing of the family Stevanović No. 12 on one more serf’s homestead of the family Akagić.

On a parcel c.p.198 was a house, but it disappeared at very end of the 19th century.

65 Entry 9.
66 At the site of Okolište there was a Muslim cemetery since the Sultan Fatih’s time. In the middle was a turbe until recently upkept by the family Đozić. The turbe is no longer present but both tombstones are in good condition.
67 Entry 10...
68 Entry 11...
69 Entry 11...
70 Entry 31...
71 Entry 12...
A housing with a yard of the family Mihaljević No. 14 on a serf’s homestead was owned by Avdaga Effendić late Muhamed’s from Srebrenica in 1894. This homestead included other parcels in the late 19th century.

Also on c.p. 175 there was an old house, that disappeared in 1894.

On the east of Stopova on c.p. 172 was a graveyard Jasik (14,700 m²), state-owned in the late 19th century.

On the north of the graveyard, on c.p. 175 there was a housing with a yard and a house No. 15 owned by the family Effendić from Srebrenica in the late 19th century. It was Mujaga Effendić late Muhamed’s from Srebrenica. In 1894 in addition to the house the following parcels were listed: 183 Brezumila, 140 Krčevina, 141 a forest Krčevina, Brijeg and below Ornica (area of 64 acres), 176 and 177 Ornica, 178-185 Brezumile. In 1911 it was all inherited by: Hasanag and Mehmed Effendić late Mujaga’s, Zehda? Married to Pašagić, Fata married to Abdurahmanović, minor Esma and Ifeta late Mujaga and his widow Filda?. In 1919 it was passed from Fata to Hivzo Abdurahmanović late Rašidbeg’s and minor Enver Abdurahmanović son of Hivzo.

4.1.6. Jasik and Stop

On the east of the Orahovička River were two more parts of Orahovica Jasik and Stop with one housing each. In 1894 a housing of the family Ilić No. 16 on a serf’s homestead owned by Avdaga Effendić late Muhamed’s from Srebrenica. There was one more parcel on this serf’s homestead in the late 19th century with the same owner. In 1930 some parcels received Radoja Ilić late Lazar’s.

A housing with a yard of the family Petrović No. 17 on a serf’s homestead owned by families Effendić and Pašalić from Srebrenica. The names of lands in this part on c.p. 163 near musluk (a fountain) and 66 and 167 near Stara kuća (The Old House) are interesting.

---

72 Entry 14...
73 Entry 40...
74 Entry15...
75 Ibid
76 Entry 16...
77 Entry 37...
78 Entry 17...
4.1.7. Poretak

Poretak is on the south of the central part of Orahovica and it had two housings.

A housing of the family Gruičić No. 18 on a serf’s homestead was, in 1894, owned by families Effendić, Parić and Pašalić from Srebrenica.79

A housing of the family Gruičić No. 19 on a serf’s homestead was owned by families Effendić, Parić and Pašalić from Srebrenica.80 In 1894 there were other lands within this serf’s homestead owned by families Pašalić81 and Efendić 82 from Srebrenica.

In the late 19th century there were some other parcels included in the two previous homesteads.83

4.1.8. Dolovi

Dolovi are also on the south. There were two housings.

A housing of the family Milosavljević No. 20 on the serf’s homestead of families Abdurahmanbegović from Bijeljina and Halilagića from Srebrenica. In 1898 the owner was Pavle Milosavljević late Nikola’s and in 1930 Blagoje Milosovaljević late Pavle’s.84

A housing of the family Milosavljević No. 21 on the serf’s homestead of families Abdurahmanbegović from Bijeljina and Halilagića from Srebrenica. In 1898 Pavle Milosavljević late Nikola’s owned a part of it and in 1920 Hilmibeg Hafizbegović late Avdibeg’s from Maglajaca.85 The previous two serf’s homesteads encompassed also other lands owned by the same people.86

79 Entry 18...
80 Entry 19...
81 Entry 38...
82 Entry39...
83 Entry 41...
84 Entry 20...
85 Entry 21...
86 Entry 27...
4.1.9. Borovac

A part of Orahovica Borovac is at the very mouth towards the river Zeleni Jadar. There is a lower saddle that old roads from Srebrenica to the south-west followed. There was one housing there in the late 19th century.

A housing with a yard of the family Dragičević No. 22 on a serf’s homestead owned, in 1894, families Abdurahmanbegović from Bijeljina and Rustanbegović from Srebrenica. In 1930 Jovo and Kosta Dragičević late Ilija’s became the owners.87

Nems of the parcels: 294 next to the old house, 293/1 next to the old house, 301 Kućurina owned by the family Akagić point that they owned a house there.

The state owned lands 252 a graveyard (790 m²) in the late 19th century.

4.1.10. Bujaković

On the south of the river Zeleni Jadar in the mountain part, there are parts of Orahovica called Bujakovići and Kiprova. They could have been a village on its own.

There were two housings in Bujakovići in the late 19th century.

A housing with a yard of the family Milutinović No. 23 on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Pašalići from Srebrenica in the late 19th century.88

Toward the land Rosulje there was a housing with a yard of the family Savić No. 24 on a serf’s homestead that was in 1894 owned by the family Pašalić from Srebrenica. In 1903 the owner was Luka Savić late Savo’s and in 1912 Stojan, Zarije and Rado Savić late Luka’s.89

In the late 19th century the previous two homesteads also encompassed other parcels owned by the family Pašalić.90

The same family owned some other estates from the old days.91

87 Entry 22...
88 Entry 23...
89 Entry 24...
90 Entry 54...
91 Entry 55...
4.1.11. Kiprova

There were two housing with homesteads in Kiprova in 1894 as well that is situated in the further mountain south of the village Orahovica.

A housing with a yard of the family Trifković No. 25 on a serf’s homestead, in the late 19th century owned families Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica, Avdagić, Omerović from Sikirići and the Skender Mosque’s waqf in Srebrenica.92

A housing with a yard of the family Trifković No. 26? on a serf’s homestead, was also, in the late 19th century, owned by families Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica, Avdagić, Omerović from Sikirići and the Skender Mosque’s waqf in Srebrenica.93

A land on c.p. 449 a meadow Jezero was within the two previous homesteads and with the same owners.94 There was also a state-owned parcel 429/4 a graveyard (1.300m²).

In addition to earlier menitoned, some other owners from other sides owned lands in the village Orahovica in the late 19th century. Some of those were: Ejub Salčinović called Latifović late Salčin’s from Pusmulići.95 Aiša a daughter of late Derviš Saračević called Dervišević from Srebrenice (since 1927: Stevo, Vako and Cvjetin Stevanović late Milija’s).96 Then: Mehmed, Ahmet, Osman and Hamid Suljić late Suljo’s; minor Šema and Meva late Bilal Suljić’s, Behara Ferhatović first married to Suljić then married to Halil Halilović; minor Bejta, Šaban and Smajl late Begto Suljić’s; minor Salko, Jakub and Avdo late Avdo Suljić’s, all from Pusmulići; Rahima married to Mušan Mandžić, minor Suljo and Merka children of Salko Memčić all from Ljeskovik; Hadžira Memčić married to Osman Čumurović from Osmače; minor Hasan, Rahima children of late Mustafa Hodžić from Zaklopača; Merka Smajlović married to Muharem Omić and Pemba Smajlović married to Halil Halilović both from Pusmulići and Safija Smajlović married to Mujo Gutić from Zalužje (the last three 1/3).
4.1.12. General characteristic of the village Orahovica in the late 19th century

In the late 19th century and according to the 1885 census the following parts of the village Orahovica were inhabited: Biljeg, Borovac, Bujaković, Dolovi, Kiprova, Orahovica, Poratak and Stop.

According to detailed research based on the Austro-Hungarian cadastral plans from 1882-85 and the Land Register from 1894 there were the following parts of Orahovica: Raine with 2 housings of Lazić’s and Savić’s on serf’s homesteads owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenic. Bojna or Debelo brdo with 2 housings of Savić’s on Hadžiselmanagić’s homesteads. There were 2 housings on serf’s homesteads owned by families Akagić and Đozić. Two houses belonging to the family Đozić in Biljeg and one house belonging to the family Akakgić in Podkućnica. The central part of Orahovica (later Petrovići, Jeremići and Stopovi) with one house belonging to the family Efendić and 4 housings (Stevanović-2, Petrović and Mihaljević) of homesteads owned by families Akagić 3 and Efendić. There were two housings of families Ilić and Petrović in Jasik and Stup on homesteads of families Efendić and Pašalić. Poretak with two housings of the family Gruić on homesteads owned by families Efendić, Parić and Pašalić. Dolovi with two housings of the family Milosavljević on homesteads belonging to families Abdurahmanbegović and Halilagić. Borovac with one housing of the family Dragičević on a homestead owned by families Abdurahmanbegović and Rustenbegović.

Bujakovići and Kiprova are somewhat further parts of Orahovica. In 1894 there were two housings in Bujakovići of families Milutinović and Savić and on homesteads owned by the family Pašalić. There were two housings of the family Trifković in Kiprova on homesteads owned by families Hadžiselmanagić, Avdagić, Omerovića and the waqf.

Therefore, there were in total 4 houses and 21 housing in the village Orahovica in 1894. Families from Srebrenica were owners of all of them.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{97} In the mid-20th centuries the structure of Orahovica was as follows: Biljeg 4 houses (25 residents); Bojna 3 (22), Borovac 3 (20), Bujaković 1 (11), Debelo brdo 2 (8), Dolovi 5 (25), Hodžino selo 1 (5), Jasik 2 (15), Jeremići 6 (43), Kipova 4 (37), Orahovica 5 (52), Poretak 3 (17), Rajne 6 (37), Rosulje 1 (10), Stop 3 (17), Stopovi 3 (18). There were 52 houses and 362 residents in Orahovica then. Imenik naseljenih mjesta NR BiH stanje 12. VII 1955. godine, Zavod za statistiku NR BiH, Sarajevo 1955, pp. 221-222.
5. The village Viogor

The village Viogor is several kilometers on the south-west of Srebrenica. In the center of the village is a smaller mountain (880-900 m). The highest is the top Šiljato brdo on 901 m and the lowest is Vijenac on 869 m and the top of 883 m on the north-west of Šiljati vrh. The mountain ridge twists in the northwest-south-east direction. The ultimate top on the south-east is Vagan (850m) immediately above the valley of the river Zeleni Jadar and on the north-west following the slopes goes down into the valley of the stream Kasapić, the right affluent of the river Zeleni Jadar. Maybe the village was named Viogor because of the twist.

The old name of this mountain is Vranić, as can be found in the maps and plans from the end of the 19th century. Between rounded tops of Veliko Brdo (810 m) and Malo Brdo (810 m) the old Srebrenica-Žepa road crosses this mountain via a saddle of about 750 m. The name of the village might originate from the estate Vavgor near Orahovice that was mentioned in 1604.

Among numerous antiques of Viogor is also a site on c.p. 96 named Groblje (area of 2.5 acres). It is situated next to Viogor and the fact that it was registered as the state-owned in the late 19th century speaks about its origin.

There are numerous place names in the village that speak about the old population. Such are: Nika, Zilina Ravan, Kutlov dol, Benin dol⁹⁸, Tadino Selo, Vrlovića livada, Spasovnica, Vlaški dol...

Place names in Viogor that remind of Muslim residents from the old Ottoman period are: Barakova ravan, Fatino brdo, Tabakov salaš, Hodžina ravan, Hamajlija, Mujanov grob, Bajraktarova barica. As well as a place name Helja, above killed soldiers tombstones Slapovići from the family Helja in Slapovići, then Hadžin...? next to the previous one.

The place names that speak about ancient residence and industry are: Selište, Donja selišta, Vinograd...

A significant area of the village Viogor was state-owned in the old days. Those were mostly pastures and forests, that residents mutually used. In the late 19th century the following lands were registered as the state-owned: c.p. 10 a forest Vinograd, 14/1 a pasture Vinograd and Jelah, 19 a forest Zagajnica and Jelah, 26/1 a forest Breztopova ravan and Veliko brdo (area of 646 acres), 30 a pasture on Mramorje (20 cres), 32 and 33 stone, 46 and 48

⁹⁸ There was certain Beno according to folk tradition.
a pasture Studenac, 61/3 a forest Previje, Palike (318 acres), 121/1 a pasture Podkućnica, Brijeg, Poratak, Glavičica (191 acres), 130/3 a pasture Poratak, 162/1 a pasture Glavica, 224/1 a forest Kaparovac and Zabrdalje (538 acres), 224/7 a forest Jasikovača, Krajna, Jelah, Vranić and Vjenac (1055 acres), 227 a pasture Gaj, 229 a pasture Jelah, 250 a pasture below Metal.99 Also, the following parcels were state-owned: 1 roads, 375 the river Jadar, 251 and 252 Selište and 369/2 a forest Kamenita Luka, as well as 374.100

There were 16 houses in the village Viogor at the end of the Ottoman period. Right after the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian rule in 1879, there were, in addition to 16 houses, 22 apartments with 175 residents in Viogor.101

According to the 1885 census there were again 16 houses with 19 apartments in Viogor. A total number of residents was 189, all east-Orthodox, 54 serfs and 135 women and children.102

In 1895 there were the following parts of the village: Kovačice, Prljuge, Sarači, Strane and Vijogor. Then there were 17 residing houses with 215 residents in Viogor and all were east-Orthodox. When it comes to social and ownership structure, there were 15 serfs with 183 members, one free ploughman who was also a serf with 10 members and one ploughman with 5 members of a household.103

5.1. The review of the village Viogor in the late 19th century

5.1.1. Nike (Nika) and Muletići

In the part of the village Viogor that is located at the mostnorthwestern part there were several housings. It was called Nika in the old days and recently there is a group of houses called Muletići. Actually, in the late 19th century, there were only three houses within serf’s homesteads and those were:

---

99 It was all state-owned in 1894. Entry 69, Land register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land registry in Srebrenica.
100 Entry 1 and 2, Land Register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
101 Štatistika miesta i pučanstva Bosne i Hercegovine, C. I kr. vladina tiskarna, Sarajevo, 1880, pp. 95.
102 Štatistika mjesta i žiteljstva Bosne i Hercegovine po popisu naroda 1. maja 1885., Zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1886., str. 154-155.
103 Glavni rezultati popisa žiteljstva u Bosni i Hercegovini od 22. aprila 1895., zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1896, pp. 356-357.
A housing with a yard of the family Stojanović, listed on No. 14. It was a part of larger serf’s homestead that was owned by the family Muhagić from Srebrenica in the late 19th century. On the ground of legally valid decision of the county board in Srebrenica from 1930, the right of ownership was transferred from the family Muhagić to Jevrem Stojanović late Stevan’s from Viogor.

A housing of the family Jovanović No. 15 was a part of serf’s homestead owned by the family Salihović from Potočari. According to the decision of the county board in Srebrenica from 1930, the owners were: Milan Jovanović late Lazar’s, Rado and Tatomir Jovanović late Mark’s and Kosana Jovanović late Jovan’s. The family Mulalić from Sućeska owned parts of this homestead in the late 19th century.

A housing of the family Milosavljević No. 16 on a serf’s homestead was again owned by the family Salihović from Potočari. Since 1930 the owners were Krsto Milosavljević late Đoko’s and Miloš and Aleksa Milosavljević late Vaso’s. The family Mulalić from Sućeska owned parts of this homestead in the late 19th century.

Families Mulalić from Sućeska and Salihović from Potočari owned parts of the previous two serf’s homesteads. The family Muhagić from Srebrenica owned many lands in Viogor in the late 19th century.

There were a house and a restaurant in Nika.

5.1.2. Viogor

This part of village Viogor had the same name since the old days. It is probably its oldest part after which the whole village was named. There were three housings within serf’s homesteads in Viogor in the late 19th century and those were:

---

104 Entry 14, Land Register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
105 Entry 15...
106 Entry 54....
107 Entry 16...
108 Entries 52 and 55...
109 Entries 53 and 61...
110 Entry 49...
111 The saying of Hamdija Fejzić, Bajramovići, May 2016.
A housing of the family Milosavljević No. 12 on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Muhagić from Srebrenica. In 1930 it was owned by Zarije Milosavljevića late Joksim’s.\footnote{112}

The family Muhagić from Srebrenica also owned parts of this serf’s homestead\footnote{113}.

A housing of the family Lazarević No. 13 on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Muhagić from Srebrenica. In 1930 it was owned by Cvija Lazarević married to Tomo Stevanović and Aleksa Vasić late Milan’s.\footnote{114}

Prethodna dva kmetovska selišta imala su i druge dijelove u vlasništvu Muhagića.\footnote{115}

A housing with a yard of the family Milovanović No. 7 owned by the family Jovanović from Srebrenica. Since 1930 godine it was owned by Prodan Milovanović late Jovo’s.\footnote{116} This serf’s homestead encompassed some parcels owned by the family Murathodžić from Srebrenica. This shows that Aleksa Jovanović immediately before 1894 bought a part of the homestead from the old owners Murathodžić.\footnote{117}

5.1.3. Ravne

Ravne that are also near Viogor had several homesteads with three housings.

A housing with a yard No. 9 of the family Vasić on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Jovanović from Srebrenica. In 1930 the owner was Jovo Vasić late Marko’s from Viogor.\footnote{118} In the late 19th century the homestead encompassed other lands owned by the family Muhagić from Srebrenica.

A housing with a yard No. 10 of the family Vasić on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Jovanović. Since 1930 it was owned by: Vasilije, Obrad, Tatomir and Milivoje Vasić late Panto’s.\footnote{119}
In 1894, it also encompassed lands owned by several families from Srebrenica: Delimehmedović, Murathodžić and Muhagić.

A housing with a yard No. 11 of the family Milovanović on another serf’s homestead that was in 1894 owned by the family Jovanović from Srebrenica. In 1930 the owners were Petar and Milovan Milovanović late Neđo’s.

In the late 19th century the owners of parts of this serf’s homestead were families outside of Viogor. Those were: Huremović called Mujić from neighbouring Bajramovići, Jovanović and Murathodžić from Srebrenica.

Some parcels were registered as parts of homesteads that houses of the family Vasić from Ravne and the family Milovanović from Ravne and Viogor were located.

Nearby, there was a homestead immediately in the area of neighbouring Bajramovići. A serf’s homestead Molovanović was on the north of Vučevac on a land Stop. It then encompassed c.p. 87 a meadow Zasojnica and the owner was Alekśa Jovanović late Jovan’s from Srebrenica. In 1929 with the decision of the county board, the owner became: Desimir and Cvijetin Milovanović late Radovan’s.

In the eastern part of Ravne a parcel on c.p. 160 a pasture Glavica owned the family Efendić in 1894.

In 1894 there were Muslim families around Viogor and Ravne. Haji Husejn Effendi Đozić late Latif’s from Srebrenica owned a parcel on c.p. 67/1 Vranić. Owners of parcels 71 and 72 Donja selišta owned: Husein and Hamid Huremović called Mujić late Mustafa’s from Bajramovići, Zada née Huremović married to Omer Abdullahović from Srebrenica, Šeća née Huremović married...
to Hasan Tokić from Jagodnja, Naza late Mustafa’s Huremović and Murat Huremović late Mešan’s (1/2) both from Bajramovići.132

The family Zekić owned many lands in the part of Viogor called Miješci (Mešče) in the late 19th century.133

Examples in Muslim cemetery at the site Jasik in Mješci

Names of parcels c.p. 202 and 203 Podkućnica in 1894, point that immediately before that year housing was formed, probably owned by the family Zekića.

---

132 Entry 32...
133 Parcels: 192/1, 193 Mlakva, 194 and 199 Gornja Poreduša, 195 Dolnja Poreduša, 200 and 201 Pašuma, 202 and 203 Podkućnica, 214 Vlaški dol, 217 a meadow Vlaški dol and Brezak, Bajraktarova barica (32 acres), 218 Bajraktarova barica, 224 a pasture Ovčije njive (45 acres), 224/6 a forest Podzabrdalje (103 acres), 224/15 and 228 a pasture Zabrdalje. Owners were: Krsto, Mikajlo and Aleksa Zekić late Pavle’s, Antonio, Tanasija Zekić late Petar’s, minor Luka, Ilija and Maksim sons of Mark Zekić. In 1913 Pavle and Petar Zekić late Krsto’s. Entry 67...
Examples in a cemetery at the site Brezak in Kovačica
5.1.4. Kovačice

A part of Viogor named Kovačice was the biggest in the village in the late 19th century. It is situated in the southeastern slopes of Vranić and on the old road. There was one house and three housings and those were:

A housing No. 1 of the family Stevanović on the serf’s homestead in the late 19th century owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica. In 1930 the owners became Lazar Stevanović late (?unreadable) and Tadija Stevanović late Zarija’s.134

A housing with a yard No. 2 of the family Zekić on the serf’s homestead in 1894 owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica and Kurtić? from Luka. The family zekić gradually bought it.135

Families Delimehmedović136 and Hadžiselmanagića137 from Srebrenica owned parts of this homestead in the late 19th century.

A housing with a yard No. 17 of the family Stevanović on the serf’s homestead owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić from Srebrenica. In 1930 Stevan Stevanović late Simo’s become the owner.138

A housing with a yard No. 18 owned by Stevan and minor Kosta, sons of Marinko Jovanović from Viogor.139

Parcels on c.p.: 242, 243 and 244 a housing, in the late 19th family owned the family Milanović.140

5.1.5. Sarači

Sarači are located on the southern slopes of Vranić and in the late 19th century there were two housings on one serf’s homestead. A housing on c.p. 280/1 of the family Stevanović and on a housing c.p. 280/2 the same family. The homestead with both housing was, in 1894, owned by the family Salihović

134 Entry 1...
135 Entry 2...
136 Entry 22...
137 Entry 28...
138 Entry 17...
139 Entry 18...
140 Those were: Milko Milanović (1/2) late Milan’s, minor Jovo, Voisava and Ilinka late Radoje Milanović’s. In 1928 minor Drago, Milorad and Sreten Milanović late Vojko-Vojisav’s. Entry 38...
from Potočari. In 1930 the owners became: Stojan Stevanović late Jovo’s, Petar Stevanović late Vasilije’s and Milovan Stevanović late Mihajlo’s.  

5.1.6. Stara kuća

This part of Viogor was called Stara kuća in the late 19th century, which means that there was an old house there in the old days.

In 1894 there was only one housing with a yard of the family Jovanović No. 8 as part of the housing owned by the family Salihović from Potočari. In 1930 the owners were: Đukan Jovanović late Jovan’s, Miloš Jovanović late Petar’s and Obren Jovanović late Ilija’s.  

5.1.7. Brdo

Brdo is located on the old road and there was only one housing with a yard No. 4 where the family Milanović lived in the late 19th century. The owners of the housing and the serf’s homestead was the family Siručić called Avdić from Voljevica. From the period of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia the owners were the family Milanović. Often this part of Viogor was called Milanovići.

Parcels: 267 and 268 Brdo, 269/1 a site with a yard owned the family Milanović.

5.1.8. Strane

Strane is situated above Slapovići and the valley of the river Zeleni Jadark. There were two housings in the late 19th century.

141 Entry 3...
142 On c.p. 304/2 homestead encompassed: 224 Borik, 224/10 Vrlovića, 290, 296, 298, 299 and 300 Medran, 297, 308, 310, 311 Stara kuća, 312, 313 Duboki potok, 346, 347 Hamajlija all owned by Hasan and Salih Salihović late Salih’s from Potočari. In 1899 owners were Salko and minor Aza Salihović and in 1906 the same owners. Entry 8...
143 A serf’s homestead on c.p. 269/2 a housing with a yard, and parcels: 266 Strana; 314, 337, 341, 345 and in 1894 it was all owned by: Abid, Salih and Kasuma Siručić called Avdić late Abdullah’s from Voljevica and minor Kada late Abdullah’s. In 1902: minor Ibrima? And Zahid late Abid’s. Entry 4...
144 Milko Milanović (1/2) late Milan’s, minor Jovo, Voisava and Ilinka late Radoje Milanović’s. In 1928 minor Drago, Milorad and Sreten Milanović late Vojk-Vojisav’s. Entry 38...
A housing with a yard No. 5 of the family Petrović on a serf’s homestead was owned by the family Siručić called Suljagić from Voljevica.\textsuperscript{145} The family Petrović became the owner during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

A housing with a yard No. 6 of the family Jeremić on a serf’s homestead was owned by families Đozić, Brezovica and Siručić from Srebrenica in 1894.\textsuperscript{146}

A part of this homestead was owned by similar owners in the late 19th century.\textsuperscript{147}

The family Akagić\textsuperscript{148} and some other families\textsuperscript{149} were owners of common parts of the two previous serf’s homesteads in Strane.

A housing on c.p. 336/2 Diljka in Strane had the similar owners.\textsuperscript{150}

There was a graveyard on parcel 335 (430 m\textsuperscript{2}).\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{145} In addition to c.p. 330 a homestead encompassed: 323 Jelah, 335 a cemetery (430 m\textsuperscript{2}), 354 Hamalija Mustafa Siručić zw. Suljagić late Suljaga’s, Derva married to Ibrahim Krajina both from Voljevica, Haša Klančević a widow of Salih Siručić called Suljagić. In 1899 owners were: Abdullah, minor Ibrahim, Sulejman, Sado and Čima Siručić called Suljagić late Mustafa’s, all from Voljevica. In 1902 Derve was succeeded by: Mehmed, minor Sulejman and Tifa Osmanović called Krajina late Ibro’s from Voljevica. Entry 5...

\textsuperscript{146} It is c.p. 328/1 a housing with and yard and 316,317 and 318 Metalka owned by: minor Ahmet son of Haji Husejn Effendi Đozić, Mehmed, Ibrahim, Osman and Abdulah Brezovica late Omer’s, as well as Ibrahim Siručić late Omer’s. Entry 6...

\textsuperscript{147} It is a land on c.p. 365-370 Urve owned by: minor Ahmet son of Haji Husejn Effendi Đozić, Zada née Pašalić a widow of Ibrahim Halilović, Mehmed, Ibrahim, Osman and Abdulah Brezovica and Ibrahim Siručić all from Srebrenica. In 1905 owners of a part were: Mustafa Siručić son of Ibrahim and minor Ragib and in 1907 minor Hakija son of Mustafa. In 1908 a part was owned by: Salih, Husejn and minor Alija Brezovica late Mehmed’s. Entry 25...

\textsuperscript{148} Lands: 224/3 forests Zvekara and Palike, 224/14 a forest Studenac owned by Alijaga Akagić late Mujaga’s from Srebrenica. In 1900 registered to: minor Džafer, Abdurahman, Salih, Mehmed, Ešref, Arif and Hasan Akagić late Alijaga’s from Srebrenica.

\textsuperscript{149} Parcels 314 Stranski Jelah and 326, owned: minor Ahmet son of Haji Husejn Effendi Đozić, Mehmed, Ibrahim, Osman and Abdulah Brezovica late Omer’s, Ibrahim Siručić late Omer’s all from Srebrenica, Mustafa Siručić called Suljagić late Suljaga’s from Voljevica, Derva née Siručić married to Ibrahim Krajina from Voljevica, Haša née Klančević a widow of Salih Siručić called Suljagić from Srebrenica. Entry 27...

\textsuperscript{150} Those were: minor Ahmet son of Haji Husejn Effendi Đozić, Zada née Pašalić a widow of Ibrahim Halilović, Mehmed, Ibrahim, Osman and Abdulah Brezovica and Ibrahim Siručića all from Srebrenica. In 1905 Mustafa Siručić son of Ibrahim and minor Ragib, in 1907 minor Hakija son of Mustafa and in 1908 Salih, Husejn, minor Alija Brezovica late Mehmed’s. Entry 26...

\textsuperscript{151} Entry 5...
5.1.9. Around the mosque

The most southern part of the village Viogor at the very bottom of the Zeleni Jadar river’s valley is around famous and old mosque. The mosque is on the very border of the cadastral municipality of Viogor but is more known as the mosque in Slapovići, a part of neighbouring village Buće.

The mosque on c.p. 358/3 c.m. Viogor in the late 19th century belonged to the waqf of the mosque in Viogor.152

Two parcels around the mosque named Hamajlija and on the territory of Viogor in 1894 owned Selim Alemić and in 1939 he gave them as a gift to the waqf and religious school in Buće.153

5.1.10. General characteristics of the village Viogor in the late 19th century

In the late 19th century according to the previous research, the village Viogor had the following parts: Nike, Viogor, Ravne, Miješci?, Kovačice, Sarači, Stara kuća, Brdo and Strane.

We did not determine the position of the part that was named Prljuge in the 1885 census.

Nike (with Muletići) in 1894 consisted of 2 housings on serf’s homesteads and those were: Stojanović, Milosavljević and Jovanović owned by families Muhagić 1 and Salihović 2. Viogor consisted of 3 housings on serf’s homesteads: Milosavljević, Lazarević and Milovanović and owners were the family Muhagić 2 and Aleksa Jovanović 1 (the family Murathodžić in the old days). There were 3 housings in Ravne on serf’s homesteads of families Vasić 2 and Milovanović and owned by the family Jovanović (the family Murathodžić in the old days), Miješci with a housing of the family Zekić, Kovačice with a house of the family Jovanović (Marinko and his sons Stevan and Kosta), and 3 housings of families Stevanović 2 and Zekić 1 all owned by the family Hadžiselmanagić, Sarači with 2 housings of the family Stevanović both owned by the family Salihovići from Potočari. An old house with a housing of the family Jovanović on the family Salihović’s homestead. Housings of the family Milanović on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Siručić is in Brdo. Families Petrović and Jeremić had housings on serf’s homesteads owned by families: Siručić, Đozić and Brezovica.154

---

152 Entry 66...
153 Entry 20...
154 The structure of the village Viogor from the mid-20th century: Bare 1 house (4 residents);
Viogor had a mosque then, that only formally belonged to that cadastral municipality, but was in Slopovići, that is Buče.

Thus, in the late 19th century there were 19 houses and housings in Viogor. Almost always on serf’s homesteads owned mostly by families from Srebrenica. It seems that immediately before 1894 many housings bought and owned Aleska Jovanović from Srebrenica, as a very enterprising man.

6. The village Buče

The old name of this part was Buče, as can be seen in maps and documents from the late 19th and early 20th century. It is often pronounced Bučje today but the old name Buče is still present in folk’s speech. That is why we use the old name.

Buče is, considering its altitude, a mountain village. Buče is the settlement of the broken type and consists of Buče and Slapovići. The name originates from the name of the forest – a beech forest present in Buče.¹⁵⁵

There are numerous antiques in the village Buče. Necropolis of medieval tombstones (one in the village and two toward Kutuzer and Šljivovi). Several routes of the road goes through the village and there is an old mosque in Slapovići. The following place name refer to the old population: Vlaški Dol, Kurtića Luka, Tabanova Ravan...

In the late 19th century significant pieces of land were covered with pastures and forests and mostly state-owned. Such parcels were: 1 a pasture Vagani (area of 104 acres), 49 a pasture Podbrdo (20 acres), 51 a graveyard (14 acres), 86 a pasture Vlaški Dol (76 acres), 167 and 168 a forest Kremen (172 acres), 174 a pasture Ložanka (35 acres), 176 a pasture Brezak, 177 a forest Bashačica and Tabanova Ravan (2,377 acres).¹⁵⁶

Between the ottoman and Austro-Hungarian rule there were 7 houses in Buče. In 1879 there were: 7 houses, 7 apartments, 36 residents, 30 Muslims and 6 Greek Orthodox.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Entry 39, Land Register for c.m. Buće from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.
¹⁵⁷ Štatistika miesta i pučanstva Bosne i Hercegovine, C. I kr. vladina tiskarna, Sarajevo, 1880, pp. 95.
According to the 1885 census there were in Buče: 6 houses, 6 apartments, 34 residents, 21 Muslim and 13 estren Orthodox. In the social and ownership structure there were 10 free peasants, 2 serfs, and 22 women and children.\footnote{\textit{Štatistika mjesta i žiteljstva Bosne i Hercegovine po popisu naroda 1. maja 1885.}, Zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1886., str. 154-155.}

According to the 1895 census naselje Buče encompassed parts of Buča and Slapovići and there was a mosque there. It was registered: 6 houses, all inhabited, 37 residents, 22 Muslims and 15 estern Orthodox. In the social and ownership structure there were 5 free ploughmen (with 19 members), 1 serf (with 8 members), and the remaining 2 were ploughmen with one member each.\footnote{Glavni rezultati popisa žiteljstva u Bosni i Hercegovini od 22. aprila 1895., zemaljska štamparija, Sarajevo, 1896, pp. 344-345.}

\section*{6.1. The review of the village Buče in the late 19th century}

\subsection*{6.1.1. Slapovići}

Slapovići is the lowest part of Buče at the bottom of the Zelena Jadar river’s valley and the altitude of 610 m. It is situated in the northern part of Buče and on the very border to Viogor and Orahovica. Even the mosque was across the border (the stream Duboko) on the territory of the village Viogor.

Some believe that the name Slapovići originates from the old village Hlapovići that was mentioned in the vicinity of Srebrenica in the 16th century.\footnote{Alija Suljić, \textit{Stanovništvo i naselja...}, pp. 147.} It could also originate from waterfalls (rapids) on the river Zeleni Jadar.

In the late 19th century Slapovići in their urban geographic structure contained the following:

A mosque, sometimes placed in Slapovići, sometimes in Viogor and sometimes in Buče. In 1894 on c.p. 358/3 was a site with a yard and a mosque (area of 460 m²). It was the property of the \textit{Viogor’s Mosque Waqf}.\footnote{Entry 66, Land Register for c.m. Viogor from 1894, Land Registry in Srebrenica.}

Immediately across the stream Duboko from the mosque was a house on c.p. 60/ on a housing with a yard and a house No. 2 owned by Selim Alemića, late Ibrahim’s from Buče. There were arable lands next to the house: s.p. 61 Luka, 66 Ječmište, 71 Premakuća (a total area of 10 acres).\footnote{In addition to these parcelc Selim Alemić owned a house on c.p. 60/2 , and parcels: 68 arable land and a forest Luka, 38/1 arable land Radan Luka, 55 arable land Podkućnica,}
It was previously stated that the family Alemić in Bučje originate from Kutuzer.163

There was a state-owned old cemetery (area 14 acres) on c.p. 51 near the mosque on the old road to Srebrenica.

Somewhat further following the old road to Srebrenica, near the Muslim cemetery, on c.p. 56 was a housing with a yard and a house No. 1 owned by: Mustafa, Smajl and Ramo Helić late Hasan’s from Buče, and Durija a minor daughter of Hasan Smajić from Staroglavica with (1/14). Registered parcels next to the house were: 52 an orchard with a barn, and later 9 and 10 Prosišta, 11 Ćeteništa, 53 Luka, 58 Vrtovi. In 1896 it was inherited by minor Omer late Mustafa Helić’s, and in 1898 minor Alija, Salih (Salko), Šaban and Emina Helić late Smajl’s.164

The only stone inn was on the south of the stream Duboko, that is across the mosque in Slapovići and it served as a hay stag until it was demolished. http://kons.gov.ba/

Then in the late 19th century it was a serf’s homestead of the family Milanković owned by the family Siručić from Voljevica.165

Various families owned some pieces of land upstream of Slapovići following the river Zeleni Jadar in the late 19th century. A forest Borovac on c.p. 8 (20 acres) owned: Selim Alemić late Ibrahim’s (1/10), Mustafa, Smajl and Ramo Helić late Hasan’s (3/6), Milko Milanović late Milan’s, Petar Stevanović late Stevan’s, Đoko and Mihajlo Stevanović late Lazo and Janko Stevanović late Nedeljko’s (the last five from Viogor). Since 1895 Mustafa Helić’s part was owned by minor Omer and since 1898 minor Alija, Salih, Šaban, Emina?, Smajl’s children.166

The owners of parcels were: 28 a meadow Jadar Kurtića Luka (27d), 29 a forest Jadar Kurtića Luka, later 28/2 Borovac Mustafa Alemić son of Medin, Salih, Selim and Mušan Alemić late Ibrahim’s, Daut, Arif and Ibrahim

38/2 a meadow Ravna luka (in total around 28 acres). In 1939 he endowed it all to the waqf in Slapovići. Entry 2...
163 Alija Suljić, Stanovništvo i naselja..., pp. 151.
164 Entry 1...
165 In 1894 it encompassed parcels: 34 a meadow Ravan Luka, 43 Gornji Laz, 45 and 46 Brdo viš Groblja, all owned by: Abid, Salih and Kasum Siručić late Abdullah’s and Kade, all from Voljevica. In 1901 Abid was succeeded by: minor Ibrim and Zahid Avdić called Siručić late Abid’s. Entry 33...
166 Entry 6...
Hirkić late Sulejman’s all from Kutuzer, Mitar and Jovo Stevanović sons of Petar, Stevan Stevanović son of Mitar, Đoko and Mihajlo Stevanović late Lazo’s and Janko Stevanović late Nedjeljko’s, all from Viogor.

Mula née Alić married to Hasib Saračević from Zvornik owned across the river Zeleni Jadar of Slapovići c.p. 70 a meadow Premakuća in the late 19th century. In 1894 the owners were: Mujo, Lutfo and Haso Siručić called Salihović late Salih’s from Srebrenica.

A tradition on Selim Alemić is still very vivid in Slapovići.

6.1.2. Palučak

Somewhat downstream from Slapovići following the river Zeleni Jadar is a piece of land called Palučak (at the same altitude as Strana in Viogor).

There was one serf’s homestead in Palučak in the late 19th century. It was the family Jeremić’s and in 1894 it was owned by families Brezovica, Siručić and Đozić. In 1929 it became the property of: Krst Jeremić late Mališa and Andelko and Stojadin? Jeremić late Pero’s all from Buče. Somewhat later, 1936, Milan and Mileta Jeremić late Krsto’s from Viogor were mentioned.

6.1.3. Buće

Buće is located in the upper southern area on a mountain plateau at the altitude of 800 m. There were two houses in the late 19th century.

A house on c.p. 101/1 a housing with a yard and a house No. 4, in 1894 owned many families, first of all Hasanović and Omerović. A parcel 100 a

167 Entry 8...
168 Entry 9.
169 Selim Alemić owned a house across a stream. On the first floor was a religious school, and on the second an apartment for an imam. Until 1960 near it were stone walls, remains of an inn. Suljo Hirkić (1900-the WWII) owned a stoe in Slapovići and in Srebrenica. The waqf’s mill was about 50 m upstream of the bridge. Hirkić’s mill was downstream. Certain Heljo owned a house in Slapovići. iao je kuću preko potoka od džamije. U prizemlju mekteb a na spratu hodžinski stan. Koji metar istočno od nje do šedesetih godina bile He had a daughter. Dermelovine, above Kurtića luka to Vaganj in the hill. The Orthodox family Tomić lived there. The saying of Hamdija Hasanović (1957) from Buče, now in Ilijaš, May 2016.
170 In 1894 encopmassed on c.p. 81 a meadow Palučak owned by: Mehmed, Ibrahim, Osman and Abdullah Brezovica late Omer’s, Ibrahim Siručić late Omer’s and Mehmed minor son of Haji Husejna Effendi Đozić all from Srebrenica. In 1918 Abdullah was succeeded by: Šačir, Mujo, minor Džanan? and Dževa Brezovica all from Brezovica. Entry 12...
garden around the house was listed, and some time later two houses on c.p. 101/2 and 101/3.

The owners then were: Ibrahim Hasanović late Hasan’s, Hata married to Selman Begtić from Sućeska, Mehmed Omerović late Omer’s, Begija a widow of Ibrahim Alemić from Kutuzer, Salih Omerović late Halil’s, Mejra married to Rašid Begtić from Sućeska, Šehrija married to Ikan Šehić from Luka, Zeka married to Hasan Jašarević from Derventa, Hana married to Adem Mujanović from Lipovac.

In 1897 the owners were: Bida Mahmutović a widow of Mehmed Omerović, Emina married to Emin Sandžić from Derventa, minor Šehra and Šaha late Mehmed Omerović’s, Begija a widow of Ibrahim Alemić from Kutuzer, Kada married to Hamid Džananović from Podosoj and Hana married to Adem Mujanović from Lipovac. Then, in 1897: Šerif, Hasan, Alija and Hajra Hasanović married to Halil Lučanin from Srebrenica and Safija Hasanović late Ibrahim Hasanović’s. 171

Asit was stated earlier above there were 5 households of the family Hasanović in Bučje before the last war, and, thus were the most numerous family there.172

The family Hasanović originate from su Sevojne in Serbia.173

A house on c.p. 102 a housing with a yard and a house No.5, owned the family Ibrahimović in the late 19th century. Next to the house was registered a parcel 104 an orchard Dol and all was owned by: Mehmed Ibrahimović late Ibrahim’s and Hata née Ibrahimović first married to Sahić and then married to Halilović and then married to Porča Penharović from Derventa. In 1896 Hata wa succeeded by Mehmed Ibrahimović late Ibrahim’s. In 1918 Hata Ibrahimović late Ibrahim’s was mentioned.174

In Buče was also a serf’s homestead of the family Radović, No. 3 owned by the family Begtić from Sućeska. The homestead encompassed on c.p. 136/1 a housing with a yard, then parcels: 129/2 a forest Buče (195 acres), 134 Dolnja bašča, 135,136 and 138 Gornja bašča. In 1894 Selman Begtić 171 Entry 4...
172 Alija Suljić, Stanovništvo i naselja..., pp. 151.
173 The family Hasanović comes from a village 3 km away from Sevojno. Ibro Hasanović (around 1900-after 1970) dealt with herbs and incantation. He cured cattle. He was Šerif’s son who also had Ibro and Smajo (and he had Alija, Meho, Redžep and two daughters). The saying of Hamdija Hasanović (1957) from Buče, now in Ilijaš, May 2016.
174 Entry 5...
late Ibrahim’s from Sućeška owned them all. In 1929 Blagoje Radović late Stjepan’s became the owner.\textsuperscript{175}

On the south-east on the mountain pasture Ložanj or Ložnja, at 820-900 m, were pastures in the late 19th centuries. Therefore, in addition to temporary occurred permanent residents as well. Recently, some residents have been seen in.\textsuperscript{176}

Larger parcels 129 a forest Buće (111 acres) and 131 a meadow Barna Luka (30 acres), in the late 19th century owned Haji Mustafa Verlašević late Osmanaga’s from Srebrenica.\textsuperscript{177}

A place name Tepić in Ložanj in the cadastral plans from 1882-85 point to the fact that the family Tepić from Srebrenica owned estates there.

Around Buće in the old days the following owned properties: Selim Alemić late Ibrahim’s, Mustafa, Smajl and Ramo Helić late Hasan’s, Ibrahim Hasanović late Hasan’s, Hata married to Selman Begtić from Sućeška, Mehmed Ibrahimović late Ibrahim’s, Hata née Ibrahimović married to Porčo Penharović from Derventa, Salih Omerović late Halil’s, Mehmed Omerović late Omer’s, Ibrahim Siručić late Omer’s from Srebrenica and Durija a minor daughter of Hasan Smajić from Staroglavica.\textsuperscript{178}

Begija née Omerović a widow of Ibrahim Alemić from Kutuzera owned some parcels.\textsuperscript{179}

6.1.4. General characteristics of the village Buće in the late 19th century

According to the 1895 census parts of Buće were Buče and Slapovići and a mosque was also registered (acc. to cadastar in Viogor).

\textsuperscript{175} Entry 3.
\textsuperscript{176} The Orthodox Šarac who moed from Podravnje lived there. Certain Bećir owned a hose there but moved away. The saying of Hamdija Hasanović (1957) from Buće, now in Ilijaš, May 2016
\textsuperscript{177} In 1909 the owner was Ibrahim son of Haji Mustafa and in 1912 Salko Alemić late Ibrahim’s from Kutuzer bought it, Entry 38...
\textsuperscript{178} A parcel 129/3 a forest Borovnice and Jaz of 271 acres. Later on c.p. 129/6 a house was built. In 1895 Mustafa Helić wa succeeded by minor Omer and in 1896 Mehmed Ibrahimović late Ibrahim’s of Hata Penharović. Entry 7...
\textsuperscript{179} Parcels: 148 Malinovac, 150, 151 and 166 Ravan, 170 Kremen. In 1904 Huso Begtić late Ibrahim’s from Sućeška owned it and in 1908 it was exchanged with Selman Begtić late Ibrahim’s. Entry 24...
After a detailed research in 1894 in Buće were the following parts: Slapovići with the mosque, house of the families Alemić and Helić, as well as housing of the family Milanković on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Siručić. In Palučak was one housing of the family Jeremić on a serf’s homestead owned by families Siručić, Đozić and Brezovica. There were two houses in Buće, one owned by families Hasanović and Omerović and the other of the family Ibrahimović, as well as a housing of the family Radović on a serf’s homestead owned by the family Begtić. There were pastures on Ložanj without permanent residents.180

In the late 19th century there were 4 houses, 3 housings on serf’s homesteads and the mosque with the waqf.

**Conclusion**

Villages Orahovica, Viogor and Buće, present in the administrative-cadastral sense two cadastral municipalities: Orahovica and Viogor that are situated in the south-west, immediately next to the city of Srebrenica. On centuries long tradition of the population of this place testify until today preserved remains of the material culture, such as: old roads, tombstones, remains of the late antique churches, mosques, old Muslim cemeteries with preserved tombstones, as well as numerous place names from the ancient and medieval past.

In fact, Orahovica, Viogor and Buće are three larger inhabited broken type places where residents in the late 19th century exclusively engaged in farming and cattle breeding. The village Orahovica consists of 15 smaller parts (hamlets): Biljeg, Bojna, Borovac, Bujakovići, Debelo brdo, Dolovi, Hodino selo, Jasik, Jeremići, Kiprova, Orhovica, (today more often called Petrović), Poretak, Raine, Rosulje and Stopovi. There live the following families: Dragičević, Gruičić, Đozić, Ilić, Petrović, Milosavljević, Mihajlović, Savić, Stevanović, Dragičević, Trifković, etc. Viogor consists of 7 hamlets: Brdo, Kovačice, Nika, Ravne, Sarači, Strane and Viogor. Families that live in Viogor are: Jeremić, Jovanović, Lazarević, Milovanović, Milanović, Petrović, Stevanović, Vasić and Zekić. Buće is the smallest one and consists of only three hamlets: Buće, Palučak and Slapovići. Families that live in Buće are: Alemić, Helić, Hasanović, Ibrahimović and Omerović.

180 We will give parts of Buće and its residents in the mid-20th century for comparison. Those were: Bučje 3 houses (17 residents), Palučak 1 house (6 residents), Slapovići 2 houses (7 residents). In total there were 6 houses and 30 residents in Buće. Imenik naseljenih mjesta NR BiH stanje 12. VII 1955. godine, Zavod za statistiku NR BiH, Sarajevo 1955, pp. 221-222.
In the confessional sense majority of residents of Orahovica and Viogor are Orthodox, and Muslims in Buće. In the village Orahovica, in the hamlet Biljeg live Muslims while in other hamlets live Orthodox. The owners of land in all three villages are families from Srebrenica: Akagić, Hadžiselmanagić, Đozić, Efendić, Jovanović, Mahagić, Murathodić, Salihović and others. The land was given as the lease to landless who cultivated it and with the obligation to pay rent to landowners, usually in goods. This form of possession was called “a serf’s homestead“. Land tenants built houses on serf’s homesteads. It is important to emphasize that ancestors, former tenants, of present owners of land in Orahovica and Viogor, in most cases, became the owners based on the decision of the county district in Srebrenica in 1929 and 1930.
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Abstract

This paper outlines the study results of the origin and settlement of the inhabitants in the Sućeska region. The research was conducted on the basis of available archaeological and historical sources as well as individual exploration. Sućeska is a major part of municipality of Srebrenica.

The area of focus in this paper is the topography of 13 settlements that were taken into account and their physical-and anthropogeographic aspects defined as Sućeska region.

Today, the Sućeske region mainly includes territory that encompass locally community “Sućeska”, with the following settlements: Bostahovine, Brakovci, Bučinovići, Lipovac, Opetci, Podgaj, Podosoje, Slatina, Starglavice, Sućeska and Žedanjsko.

In addition, due to the preservation of historical, cultural, geographical and ethno-geographic longevity of the development of this area it is appropriate to assume that the Sućeska region also includes settlements Kutuzero and Bučje.

Key words: Sućeska, Srebrenica, population, settlement, the origin.

INTRODUCTION

The Sućeska region occupies a smaller part of the area in the northwestern part of the Municipality of Srebrenica. In a narrow sense, this area is bordered with the canyon of the river Zeleni Jadar in the south and a valley of the Bukovička river in the north. In a broader sense, the Sućeska
region occupies the area between the upper basin of the Potočarska river in the north and the plateau of a village Podravanje in the south. The western border is the valley of Zeleni Jadar river and the water source of the river Kazani and the Kutlička river in the east. These physical-geographic border should be taken conditionally because one defining borders of an area one should take into account its anthropogeographic characteristics, e.g. historical development, cultural and ethno-geographic qualities, and a sense of belonging to a geographical area, etc.

In the Middle Ages the Sućeška region belonged to the Trebotići parish that encompassed a significantly wider area that extended to most parts of the upper and middle flow of the Zeleni Jadar river.

The geographical location of Sućeška is unfavorable. The cause for this is the fact that this hilly area is economically underdeveloped and outside the main traffic routes.

The territory of Sućeška changed its borders and size in the past which directly reflected in demographic, economic, cultural religious and other changes.

According to the census of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1991, in this area of 4,673 hectares or 46.73 km², lived 3,291 persons, of which 3,242 Bosniaks, 28 Serbs and 3 Yugoslavs. There were 638 households, mostly family, with average size of 5.1 member.

The prehistoric times

The remnants of material culture from prehistoric times, ancient times and the Middle Ages witness that the Sućeška region was interesting for settlement from the earliest time to present day. A necropolis, from the Bronze of Iron Age, found in the village Podravno on the site of Crvene Njive confirms that this region was inhabited even in the prehistoric times. According to censuses in 1879, 1885 and 1948 the village Podravno was part of the Sućeške region.

The Antique

During ancient times this region was inhabited by Illyrian tribes Dindar (Bojanovski, 1998: 183). At the beginning of a new era Romans occupied the present area of Srebrenica and Sućeška that became the part of the Roman
province Dalmatia. A late antique church and a vaulted tomb was situated at the site of Crkvice that belongs to the settlement Staroglavice. A part of apse and the vaulted tomb are preserved. A fragment of a stele with relief and inscription was found in the ruins.¹

During the 4th and 5th centuries of new era various tribes succeeded each other, from Germanic Goths to Altai Avars and South Slavic tribes, who at the end of the 6th and at the beginning of the 7th permanently inhabited the area. With the arrival of Slavs to the area, ethnic composition of the population shanged.

The truth is that the Celts and Avars occupied the area first but with no significant consequences for the Romanized Illyrian population. The arrival of South Slavvs to the Sućeska region was followed by persecutions, killings and assimilation of the indigenous Illyrian population in the 7th and 8th centuries (Vego, 1957: 108). Little is known about Bosina in the period from the 8th to 11th century, except that the Byzantine Emperor Porphyrogenitus mentioned Bosina as an independent area with its own rulers. U periodu od 8. do 11. stoljeća o Bosni se malo zna osim što bizantijski car Porfirogenet spominje Bosnu kao samostalnu oblast koja ima svoje vladare.

The Middle Ages

Testimonials of the settlement of the area in the Middle Ages were numerous tombstones that are located on the following sites: Sjedaljka-Bostahovine, Mramorje-Sućeska, Bektića-Han–Staroglavice, Kutuzero – on the way to Bučje, Mramorje-Žedanjsko.

During the medieval Bosnian state, the Srebrenica area was divided between the parishes: Vratar, Birač, Osat and Trebotić (Kulenović, 1995: 186). The present day Sućeska region belonged to the parish Trebotić. The parish Trebotić was first mentioned in the charter that Ban Stjepan II issued to the Duke Vukoslav Hrvatinić at Mile in 1326-1329. Four Bosniaks, two people

¹ Arheološki leksikon Bosne i Hercegovine, Arheološka nalazišta-regija 14-25, Tom 3, Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo, 1988, pp. 68.
from Usora and two from Soli, as well as one from Zagorje, one from Ramaa, one from Uskoplje and one from Trebotić were registered as 12 witnesses of the charter. The county prefect Ivan and “his brotherhood” was listed as the witness of Trebotić. ²

Illustration 2. A gabled with a decorative motif of crescent at the Sjedeljka site in the settlement Bostahovine ²

Illustration 3. Tombstones at the site of Mramorje (wider area of Osoje) in the settlement Žedanjsko

Illustration 4. A pillar at the site of Mramorje in the village Sučeska³

Illustration 5. A group of tombstones at the site of Mramorje in the village Sučeska⁴

² There is a necropolis with 48 tombstones (35 chests, 7 gabled ones and 6 pillars) on the lowland that is around 500 m on the southeast and above the village, at the site of Sjedeljka. A material of tombstones is of unequal quality, the fence is good, but the present state is pretty poor. It is oriented from the west to the east in lines and one chest is decorated with a motif of crescent. There is a Muslim cemetery on the east of tombstones with a mosque next to it. See in: Bešlagić, Š.: Steći: Kataloško-topografski pregled, Sarajevo, 1971, pp. 234.
Trebotić was mentioned for the second time in the charter that Ban Stjepan II issued after 1329 to the Prince Grgur Stipanić Hrvatinić. The witnesses were five Bosniaks, two from Usora and two from Trebotić, and one from Zagorje, one from Rama, one from Neretva, one from Duvno, and one from Donji krajevi and one from Soli. The witnesses from Trebotić were: the county perfect Ivan with his Brotherhood and Goisav Obradović also with Trebotić bortherhood, and then it was mentioned in the charter of the King Tvrtko I from 1380 issued to Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, the charter of Dabiša from 1392 to Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, as well as the charter of Tvrtko II from 1426 (Andelić, 1977: 244). The last, but for the solution of the issue of location the most important, is the mention of Trebotić in the oldest census of the Bosnian pashaluk from 1469. Resul, a construction worker from the city of Kličevac with a feud in the village Sutecka in the township Trebotić was also recorded in the census that was conducted for the record of taxpayers.

Illustration 6. The remains of the medieval city of Kličevac in the village

3 A pillar is unusually decorated; a dog, a tree, a hand, a twisted rope and an apple. The form is also unusual, with a thinner top and a spheric ending. See in: Bešlagić, Š.: Stećci: Kataloško-topografski pregled, Sarajevo, 1971, pp. 235.

4 At the Mramorje site, about 500 m on the north of the village houses, there is a necropilis with 52 tombstones distributed in two groups (31 chests, 3 gabled ones, 18 pillars). Monuments are moderately treated and poorly preserved. They are predominantly placed from the west to the east, and a small number is placed in the northwest-east direction. Two are decorated, one chest and one pillar. The chest is decorated with a crescent. Contemporary Muslim graves with tombstones continue after ancient tombstones. See in: Bešlagić, Š.: Stećci: Kataloško-topografski pregled, Sarajevo, 1971, pp. 234.

5 The remains of the city of Kličevac are placed on the right bank of the river Zeleni Jadur towards the krast rock around which the river makes a sharp turn. The turnaround that
It can be seen from the context of the census that both the city and township were in the Kovač province, meaning the country of Kovačević. The interpretation of the source shows that at the time Kličeavc was the only city of the country of Kovačević (the Kovač province) were the Ottomans kept their troops and that there was probably located the headquarters of the master of the whole area - subaša or the Duke Hasanbeg (Andelić, 1977: 245).

The boundaries of the parish Trebotić were mainly clear neighboring areas (parishes). The border line towards Srebrenica and Ludmer is not controversial either, because the border had to follow the junction mountain. The border with Birač is not quite clear, neither its configuration nor ethnologic characteristics of the population. A record from the Dubrovnik archives published by Mihajlo Dinić seriously implies that this located and limited territory of the Trebotić township was called Jadar. Namely, in a dispute between two merchants it was recorded in 1439 that Tvrtko Kovačević-Dinjić, the Prince of Jadar, seized some store that was situated in Jadar (Dinić, 1955: 42). Since there is no other territory in Podrinje that could reasonably be named Jadar, and that Kličeavc is the only fortified city on the river Jadar and that it is the prince from the most powerful aristocratic origin of the time and in Bosnian Podrinje, the administrative unit Jadar is identical to the township Trebotić (Andelić, 1977: 247).

The oldest known aristocrat from Trebotići was the earlier mentioned the county prefect Ivahn “with brotherhood“. He was mentioned in two charters as a witness (from 1326-1329), and in both cases his function and title (the county prefect), name, note that he was a representative of broader genus (“with brotherhood“), as well as a sign that he was from Trebotić were recorded. From the formulation it is visible that it was a more diversified genus, whose ancestor’s name was Trebota, Tribota or the like. It is important to note that Vlatko Vojvodić Tvrtković an aristocrat from Trebotić, son of the
county prefect from Podrinje (Tvrtk Ivahnić son of Ivahn) became the Duke of Usora after succeeding Vojko Bilošević (Andelić, 1977: 248).

Three, or four generations of the Trebotić family (Ivahnić-Tvrtković-Vlatković) can be traced through 75 years of the 14th century. Those were Ivahn (1326-1329), his sons Tvrtko (1333, 1357, 1366, 1367, 1373), Novak (1357), a grandson Vlatko (1378, 1380, 1390, 1931-2, 1392, 1394, 1399) and probably great grandson Vučihna (1392, 1395, 1395). As the name Tebotić by his patronymic form (last name) that appears next to great men, members of Bosnian state council from Podrinje, we conclude that it originated from the name Trebota, as was one of older (and more distinguished) ancestors of the genus called. The formulation “with brotherhood“ shows that this genus was branched and far wider than that which can be traced in the written source. In feudal power of Trebotić one should surely count the rest of Podrinje unless it was singled out as the ruling domain (as was the case with Srebrenica in the second half of the 14th century). There are direct data that Osat belonged to the Trebotić area if we rely on the connection between the name of the aristocratic genus and the village Poznanovići.

Another important observation that should be emphasized when talking about the family Trebotić is the fact that members of this family became the dukes of Usora. Those were: Tvrtko (mentioned as the Duke of Usora in 1357, 1366., 1367, 1373), Vlatko (1380, 1390, 1392- four times, 1394, 1392- two times), and probably – Vučihna (1395- two times). Through this generation and function of the Duke of Usora, we find that Podrinje – at least for some time and in a certain sense was the part of Usora. In addition to that, the fact that an aristocratic kin based in Podrinje gives dukes, the highest administrative and political function for the wider area of Usora, show that the achievement of honor and position was not the result of chance of ephemeral political ambition, but a deeply rooted and generally recognized right (Andelić, 1977: 253).

The wealth of mines in Srebrenica was the reason why the supreme authority in this area was often passed from hand to hand. In the dynastic struggles of the first decades of the 15th century Srebrenica, Kušlat and neighbourhood was occupied by Hrvoje Vukčić – in 1405. In 1410 Hrvoje was forced to give Srebrenica to the Hungaro-Droatian King Sigismundu, who already in 1411 – consigned it to Despotu Stevan Lazarević. Bosnian King Tvrtko II tried to restor Srebrenica under his authority in 1425 but without success. Somewhat more successful (but not completely) was the King Tomaš, who held Srebrenica in some sort of condominium together with the Serbian
despot from 1444 to 1451. In the meantime from 1439-1444 the Ottomans ruled over the city. In 1451, thanks to the Ottomans, Srebrenica again fell in the arms of the Srebian despot, and Tomaš’s attempt from 1455 to return the city of Bosnia again failed. Only in 1459 Tomašu succeeded to win over Srebrenica for Bosnia. But that success did not last for long time.

The Ottoman rule

Already in 1462, prior to the conquest of most of the Bosnian state, the Ottomans occupied Srebrenica and its surroundings (Kušlat, Šubin, Ludmer), (Dinić, 1955).

The lowest or basic units of the Ottoman administration, immediately after the conquest of the whole Podrinje, were the following regions: Osat, Šubin, Srebrenica, Ludmer, Trebotići, Birač, Kladanj, Kušlat, Perin, Zvornik and Sapna. The Šubin, Srebrenica, Ludmer and Kušlat regions belonged to the Srebrenica Kaza. Osat, Trebotići and Birač consisted the Kovač province, that was the constituting part of kazas Pavli and Kovač. In Zvornik a special kaza was established that encompassed some regions of Soli, while Sapna entered the new Srebrenica banate, which was preserved under the direct Hungarian authority until 1512.godine (Andelić, 1977: 262).

Based on the available historical sources from the late feudal, ottoman or ethnological sources three early feudal parishes can be differentiated in Podrinje: Osat, Birač and Podrinje. According to present administrative division there are parts of three municipalities in in the parish Birač: Vlasenica, Srebrenica as a whole, and Kladanj for the most part.
During the Ottoman rule there were two regions organized temporarily or permanently: Birač, Kladanj and Trebotići, and that was the case in the Bosnian late feudalism (Anđelić, 1977: 264). Via Skoplje, Kosovo and Sjenica the Ottomans descended on the Drina River and at the beginning of May 1463 arrived in the area of pavlovići and Kovačevići, who surrendered without resistance, because they were told that the ceasefire was reached (Šabanović, 1959: 38). The Bosnian King’s won countries, the areas Pavlovići and Kovačevići, and the occupied part of Herzegovina, the Ottomans turned into provinces that they merged with earlier provinces in Raška and Bosnia and out of the whole territory established the Bosnian Sandjak. Showing in his own way the Sultan’s first campaign against Bosnia Dursun Bey (a biographer and the Sultan’s companion) concluded his announcements as follows: “Thus, in
this blessed war all four townships were conquered and subdued“. Sanjak Bey and kadis were appointed, emins were appointed into mines, and the Sharia’s poll tax was imosed on the people. Dursun Bey thought about the countries of the Bosnian King, Pavlović, Kovačević and Herzog Stjepan (Šabanović, 1959: 39). The first Sanjak Bey of the Bosnian Sanjak was Mehmed Bey Minetović (Minet-oglu) who had already been “the master of Serbian land“ (Šabanović, 1959: 40). In 1464 Isa Bey Isaković became the sandjak bey of the Bosnian Sanjak (Šabanović, 1959: 41).

From the oldest preserved Ottoman cadastral census of the Smederevo Sandjak it can be seen that at the time of the census Zvornik, Srebrenica with Srebrnica, Kušlat, Šubin, Sokol which preserved the first known core of the Zvornik Sandjak, belonged to the Smederevo Sandjak (Šabanović, 1959: 179). The Zvornik Sandjak was founded in the late 1480 or at the beginning of 1481. It then consisted of only several regions and cities belonging to the Smederevo Sandjak in Podrinje, mainly on the left side of the Drina River: Srebrnica, Zvornik, Kušlat, Šubin, as well as Krupanj, Bohorina, Jadar, Ptičar, Rađevina on the right side of the Drina River. This sandjak remained in its territorial scope until the fall of the Srebrenica banate in 1512/15. From its establishment until 1541 the Zvornik Sandjak was a part of the Rumelia region. After the fall of Budim (1541) and establishment of the Budim region it was separated from the Rumelia region and added to the Budim region, in order to strengthen a sensitive Budim front. The Zvornik Sandjak was a part of the Budim Pashadom until the foundation of the Bosnian Pashadom in 1580 when it was added to that Pashadom and remained within until the end of the Ottoman rule (Šabanović, 1959: 53).

The area of old Bosnian family Kovačević-Dinjčić also entered the Bosnian Sandjak as a separate unit. The Ottomans called this area Kovač or the Kovač Province, or Kovač or the Province, thus, “The country of the family Kovačević“. Before 1463 the large parish Vratar with the city of Vratar and a square, the perish Trebotić with the city of Ključevac, the large parish Osat with the city Đurđevac, Petrič on the Drina River and parts of today’s Vlasenica and Nova Kasaba, therefore, the whole area between the Drina and Jadar rivers and across the rivers almost till Srebrenica belonged to the country of the Kovačević family (Dinić, 1955: 43).

From the above it can be concluded that the present day Sučeska region was also in their possession. From the available sources it is clear that a special duke, a master of the country of the Kovačević family, reigned over that region and the Pavlović family’s lands at the beginning of the Ottoman
rule. There was a certain Hasanbeg at that position in 1469. But, while the Pavle province remained within landowner and timar organization until the end of the 18th century, the Kovač province before the end of the 18th century lost the significance of a separate political and administrative unit. Evenmore, it seems that that region had already in 1485 been in military and political terms connected to the Pavle province. In the judicial-administrative terms both of the provinces always had mutual “Kadi of the Pavle and Kovač provinces“. While in the 1469 census the Kovač province was mentioned as an administrative unit, in the 1485 census this province was mentioned casually without any closer data. In the next 1489 census only the Osat township in the Kovač province was mentioned. The headquarters of the province, while it represented a separate military and political unit, was probably in Ključevac, the only city of the province where the Ottomans kept their troops. According to the mentioned old parishes and areas the country of the Kovačević family was divided into four regions: Vratar, Trebotić, Birač (Birče) and Osat (Šabanović, 1959: 134).

The present day Sućeska region belonged to the Trebotić region. The Trebotić region was first mentioned in 1469 and a fortified city Ključevac and a village Sutiska. It was mentioned later. Its territory was added to the Osat region. At the end of 1470 the first larger changes in administrative and territorial division of Bosnia and Herzegovina had been conducted. Thus, the Bosnian Sandjak was divided into the following six province and four kazas: the Novi Pazar Province and Kaza, the Sarajevo Province and Kaza, the Brod Province and Kaza, the Neretva Province and Kaza, the Pavli Province and the Kovač Province.

The last two, where the Sućeska region belonged, were under the jurisdiction of the Višegrad Kaza. Such division remained mostly until 1525. The only changes that happened in the interior were gradual disappearance of the names the Kiral Province and the Kovač Province which was largely annexed to the Višegrad Kaza and to a lesser extent to the Srebrenica Kaza (Šabanović, 1959: 38).

While the Kin’s Land was still in 1470 divided into two smaller provinces, the process in the Pavlović and Kovačević regions gradually developed into the opposite direction. Namely, both of the provinces always composed one kaza, which was for some time called the Pavli and Kovač Kaza – the Pavlović Kovačević Country Kaza. Therefore, the term province did not coincide in a territorial sense with the term kaza, which was the case with other provinces and kazas, until the Kovač Province vanished completely.
in the 1420ies. However, the Pavli Province remained until the beginning of the 19th century and the abolition of the timar system and landowner’s army.

The Višegrad Kaza, after the changes in terms of territorial supremacy and administrative division of the Pavlović and Kovačević regions which were conducted between 1470-1525 included the following regions: Višegrad, Dobrun, Hrta, Brodar, Borač (with Praća), Studena, Glasinac (Mokro), Olovči, Kladaň, Kamenica (Pribić), Jelaška Župa, Vratar, Trebotić, Birče and new regions: Priboj, Rogatica and Banja (Šabanović, 1959: 155).

Significant changes in the territorial scope and administrative division of the Zvornik Sandjak appeared in the 1530ies. The Sandjak was divided into two kazas: Srebrenica, which in addition to Mačva from the Smederevo Pashadom and the Osat region from the Bosnian sandjak and the Brvenik. After 1533, and before 1548, the Šabac Kaza was established, and before 1572 the Zvornik Kaza as well. Therefore, the Zvornik Kaza was in the 16th century divided into four kazas. During the 17th century another five kazas were established in this Sandjak (Šabanović, 1959: 198). After everything the Srebrenica Kaza was reduced to the area of Srebrenica and the following regions: Kušlat, Ludmer and perhaps one or two more (Šabanović, 1959: 199).

Before the Ottoman conquest Bosnians lived in this area and numerous tombstones testify this claim. The Ottoman conquest of Srebrenica had negative demographic effect on domicile – Bosniak population that was partly killed, partly taken into captivity, and party forced to seek refuge. The Ottomans brought Vlachs from Monte Negro and Herzegovina to demographically empty area of thoday’s municipality of Srebrenica (Imamović, 1998: 72-75). There are no reliable data whether the Sučeska region was affected by these migrations. Yet most of the villages were listed as “derbend” (which means cliff, isthmus) The duty of cliff-keepers was to keep the roads and care for the safety of roads. The word derventa derived from the word derbend, which is now a name for many inhabited places (Selimović, 2002: 26). The neighbouring place of Sučeska is Derventa that belongs to the municipality of Milići. In 1832 the Zvornik Sandjak was abolished and its territory was added to the Zvornik Sandjak. Bosnia was divided into districts, kazas, captain’s offices were abolished. Omer Pasha Latas divided Bosnia into five counties and Srebrenica became a part of the Tuzla District and, therefore, the area of today’s Sučeska. In 1851 the first official census in Bosnia and Herzegovina was conducted as the order of Omer Pasha. The summary results of the census were published in districts and counties, and is, therefore, not possible to know
the exact number of people in the cities (Selimović, 2002: 36). Significant changes of population in the municipality of Srebrenica happened during the Austro-Ottoman wars 1683-1699, 1717, 1737, 1738, 1876/78 and during the First and Second Serbian Uprising. There are no available data whether this change affected Sućeska. In 1829 a peace agreement was signed between Russian and the Ottoman Empire in Adrianople. One of the provisions of the agreement was that all Bosniak-Muslim population except the military troops in the cities move out of Serbia until 1834. Majority of Bosniak-Muslim population from the northwestern Serbia moved to the Zvornik Sandjak, i.e. to the northeastern Bosnia. A total of 1,800 men moved to the area of the Srebrenica Kaza (Hodžić, 1958: 140). Mostly likely, a proportion of the population settled in the area of Sućeska.

The contemporary age

Sućeska until 1955 belonged to the Srebrenica District. Srebrenica then lost the status of the district center and was added to the Zvornik District, and since 1958 was the part of the Tuzla District (Suljić, 2011).

Since 1878 when the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy received a mandate to administer Bosnia and Herzegovina (Article 25), official censuses were conducted. This was done in 1921 during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, as well as when Bosnia and Herzegovina was a part of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia until its dissolution in 1991. The changes in the development of population in the Sućeska region can be monitored from those censuses.

CONCLUSION

The life continuity exists in the Sućeska region from the prehistoric times as evidenced by necropolis at the site of Crvene Nive – the village Podravno, which is in the vicinity of the area, and according to earlier censuses this village was also the part of Sućeska. In the ancient times the territory of Sućeska was inhabited by Illyrian tribe Dindars. At the beginning with new era and the Roman conquest, the area became the part of the Roman province Dalmatia. At the site Crkvice – the village Staroglavice was situated a late antique church, where its remains were discovered. During the 4th and 5th centuries different tribes, from the Goths to the Avars, succeeded, until the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th century when the area was inhabited by southern Slavs.
Numerous tombstones in the area are the proof that in the Middle Ages in Sućeska lived Bosniaks (Sjedaljka–Bostahovine, Mramorje–Sućeska, Bektića Han–Staroglavice, Kutuzero–on the way to Bučje, Mramorje–Žedanjsko). The Sućeska region belonged to the perish Trebotić in the medieval Bosina. The remains of the medieval city Kličevac are on the right side of the Zeleni Jadar River, not far away from the present day village Sućeska.

The wealth of Srebrenica’s mines was a reason why many wars were led in this area between the Bosnian state, Hungary, the Serbian despotate and the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans occupied Srebrenicu and its neighbourhood together with Sućeska in 1462 before conquering other parts of the Bosnian state. Three early feudal perishes were established in Podrinje: Osat, Birač and Podrinje. During the Ottoman rule temporarily or permanently were organized the following areas: Kladanj, Gornji Birač, Donji Birač and Trebotići – which Sućeska belonged to.

The significant movement of population within the area of the municipality of Srebrenica appeared during the Ottoman conquest of the area when the Ottomans inhabited the empty areas of the northeastern Bosnia with Vlachs from Monte Negro and Herzegovina, as well as during the Austro-Hungarian wars and the First and Second Serbian Uprising.

After the 1829 Adrianople agreement between Russia and the Ottoman Empire majority of Bosniak-Muslim population from the northwestern Serbia moved to the area of the Zvornik Sandjak, that is to the northeastern Bosnia, and a part of the population moved to the Sućeska region.

Official censuses of population were conducted from 1879 to 1991 which provide insight into the movement of population from the Sućeska region.
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APPENDICES
Konstantin Jireček\(^1\), when speaking about Srebrnica, specifically emphasised that it should not be confused with Srebrnik in Usora and noted that these two places were mistaken in sources since 1450. In his *Istorija Srba (The History of Serbs)*\(^2\) Jiriček pointed to one such case from 1444 where, according to his opinion, Srebrnik was put instead of Srebrnica.

Actually, Jiriček made a mistake, or better say did not notice that there were two Srebrniks, one in Usora and the other, unknown until recently, above Srebrnica itself that was very suburb – *suburbium* – of that Srebrnik. There are reliable facts for this claim dating from the 15th century, and even from the first half of the 17th century.

I The Dubrovnik’s Major Council unanonymously decided on May 22nd, 1444 to reward the Bosnian king Tomaš’s representative who brought the news that the military fortification Strebrnich was taken from the Turkish hands\(^3\). Jiriček affirmed in May 1444 that the Bosnian king occupied Srebrnica – that was the case when he thought that it was a scribe’s mistake; - However, from the further presentation it would be seen that the Major Council’s decision was completely correct and very precise – people from Dubrovnik of all the places in Bosnia knew Srebrnica the best – and that Srebrnik was mentioned exactly because it dominated over Srebrnica as a castle (*castrum*) and because Turkish garrison was settled there. Together with the fall of Srebrnica fell Srebrnik as well.

II On May 27th, 1448 the rector and the Minor Council responded to a letter from Dubrovnik’s merchants from Srebrenica where they complained about the “innovations“ that the protovestiar Restoje did in the name of the Bosnian King. The Dubrovnik government sent sent their merchants a letter for King Tomaš to be given by two of them and to complain about Restoje

---

1 Die Handelstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien währund des Mittelalters (1879) 50.  
2 IV, 91 nap. 2.  
to the King, that constantly before, as in the time of the King of Bosnia and King Sigismund and Duke Hrvoje, who ruled the said city of Srebernica there had not been represented similar innovations. Indeed, if they suspected at the beginning of the war, they did not want to come back. Thus, they were always given the possibility to freely go wherever they liked and felt pleasure in that citadel... And regarding what you say you were asked by the aforementioned protovestiar (manager of financial affairs) Restoje to build a house in Kaštel and to take care of fortification, etc. I tell you that in no way you have to enter, or accept, or in any other business without the extreme of allowing our Signoria (government4).

This letter clearly distinguishes Srebrnica from the castle Srebrnika. This Srebrnik, in which the people of Dubrovnik from Srebrnica took refuge in case of war danger, could be just the castle, where they built houses under orders of protovestiar Restoje. It is impossible to assume that the merchants from Dubrovnik always took refuge in the remote Srebrnik in Usora in case of emergency. Also it is impossible to think of any clerical error, because Srebnica and Srebrnica were listed at the same time.

III When in 1451 Duke Stjepan started the war against Dubrovnik, he was trying to settle peace between Bosnia and Serbia, so that King Tomaš could, as an ally of Republic of St. Blaise, freely turn against the Duke. The main issue was Srebnica. The Dubrovnik government sent to its deputies in the Bosnian court, Vlah Ranjin and Jacob Marin’s Gundulić, a commission on 17th June 1451, which, among other things was given to them as a duty to seek that the castle Silver be given to people of Dubrovnik on the safekeeping until the dispute of possession of Srebrnica was settled, and that in that way the Republic can guarantee that the agreement would be actually executed. From the instruction it is obvious that it was Srebrnik that dominated over Srebrnica, because only if it was held by people of Dubrovnik then they could be sure that the agreement between the King and Despot would be carried into effect. Envoys had to adduce to King Tomaš that the Despot might be afraid that the agreement between Serbia and Bosnia would not be executed and that they would want certain guarantees in this regard. Since this was said – stands further in the commission - expect an answer that will be given by the King. And if he says that he is happy to take over our Signoria or castle Strebernich (or another castle), respond that you do not know whether our Signoria wants to do business in this way, to keep a castle under its auspices. We will inform our Signoria and will answer your Majesty, - crossed out and added on the

---

4 Letters and orders from Levant 13 (1444-1448) page 260.
side: you should answer him that in the name of God we will be happy to take it into our hands. We will be happy to take it later under our wing. But you will say, that we would be glad if you write a letter, openly and clearly that it is in your property with which you will put the mentioned castle Strebernich under our umbrella ... (damaged further). But if they say that they do not want to put the mentioned castle under our umbrella, but just says that we should talk with the Lord Despot, then you say that you will be happy to talk to Despot.

Ministers had to visit both King Tomaš and Despot Đurađ. The castle Srebrnik was again mentioned in the part of instruction that refers to the Despot: And when you say these things if the King gives you a castle Stiebel nich then you will tell that to the Lord Despot and you will also him a condition with which it is given under our umbrella. And you will use all our forces to preserve peace and to stay in good harmony according to the information that you have from the mentioned King. And if the parties agree and if the King wants you to hand over the mentioned castle to the Despot, so you will do. But if the mentioned parties do not agree, you will return the castle into the hands of the king, because we want you to take him under your wing. In our behalf under the above condition, that is if the parties do not agree, you return it into the hands of the king. And under such a condition you will take it from the king and not otherwise. But if he gives you Strebernich in your hands, you will then say the following⁵.

The negotiations between Bosnia and Serbia ended so that in July 1451 Srebrnik was given to Despot Đurađ – the castle Strebernich was given into hands of mister Despot⁶) – and of course with this act Srebrnica returned to Serbian hands⁷). One cannot here think about Srebrnik in Usora because there was no Dubrovnik colony there.

IV The aforementioned that we extracted from the listed sources stands, at last, in a clear description of the Bosnian Pashadom from the first half of the 17th century, - the proof that even then Srebrnik was differentiated from Srebrnica, the castle from the borough: Strebernich is only a town on a hill surrounded with walls with somewhat of land, some addition, there is a piece of land in the valley called Srebranizza, where the good quality silver is made. The houses can be between the town and the land, around 200 of them, and around 600 working people. The Aga is in town, and on the land are the

---

⁵ Letters and orders from Levant 15 (1451-1452) page 1 etc.
⁶ Dipl. Rag 514 (incorrect 1452).
⁷ Jireček, History of Serbs IV, 91.
houses of Christians, around 50, and there is also a monastery of friers in the boots (Franciscan) there, a day long away from Zvornik (Zvornich)\textsuperscript{8}).

Srebrnica, according to the afore mentioned, looked like majority of towns in Bosnia where town was differentiated from suburb. The only difference is that here they had special names – derived from the same word – and in others only preposition pod would be put before the mane of the town (Zvornik – Podzvornik, Visoki – Podvisoki, Kučlat – Podkučlat; - Subsuonich, Sottovisochi, Subtusboraz, Suchuzlat, etc.).

\* \* \*

The fact that there were two Srebrniks in Bosnia helps us to understand correctly one place from the life of Stevan Lazarević from Konstantin the Philosopher. In chapter 83 Konstantin said that the Sultan hit the Despot’s land and robbed the area around Kruševac, but soon left Serbia. The Despot, the philosopher continues, had gained leadership of all who had been against them. Then all Bosnians had run towards Srebrnica. They had gathered around their Despot but refused to cross the Drina River, and then the Despot had left them and run to his king. They had left behind with the two huge Hum plates. The Despot hand sent the news to the great Belgrade that the confiscated plates had been taken to Srebrnica\textsuperscript{9}).

All the comentators took this paragraph correctly, but as far as I know none tried to explain what is that Srebrnik like that the confiscated plates had been taken to\textsuperscript{10}). After the aforesaid it is undoubtedly Srebrnik over Srebrnica. After all, Srebrnik in Usora was not in Serbian hands atthe time.

\textsuperscript{8} Starine 14, 187. Srebrnik and Srebrnica were described with almost the same words in 1626 Atanasije Georgić’s relations; the only difference is in numbers: Srebarnich is only the medium-size city on a hill surrounded by walls with a small tower and the addition of some kind inside: there is under in the valley one piece of land called Srebarnica, where silver is produced in large quantities. Between the town and the land can be 200 houses, and four or five hundred working people; there is one Aga in the town and there are around 50 working people on the land; there is one Aga in the town and there are about 50 houses of Christians on the land, included in the above number, and there is a Franciscan monastery of the Father (the monks in their boots). Starine 17, 147.

\textsuperscript{9} Glasnik 42, 317.

\textsuperscript{10} Sr. Ć. Mijatović, Despot Đurad Branković I² (1907) 49; St. Stanojević, Archiv für slavische philologie XVIII (1896) 470; K. Jiriček, The Hisotry of Srebs II; 120; Vl. Ćorović, Prilozi II (1922) 75.
It is accepted in science that the conflict between Despot Stevan with Turkey and Bosnia, that Konstantin the Philosopher described, happened in the Summer of 1426, because the Despot was in July that year in Srebrnica\(^{11}\)). According to some news from the Dubrovnik’s state archives, however, the mentioned event happened in the Fall of 1425. In October of that year there had been some kind of hostile entry into Srebia as proven by the following decisions of the Council of Request.

I. The first part is about giving his master Despot twenty-five balistas fixed strut (devices for throwing stones and other missiles). Accepted by XVII votes. 9\(^{th}\) October 1425.

II. The second part is about the donation also said Despot thirty pound (libra 327 grams) of powder required for bombarde (big guns). Accepted by XXV to VII.

III. The first part is about giving undersigned Mr. Despot three hundred harness of rope to rope balistas. Accepted by XVIII to XIII. 9\(^{th}\) October 1425

IV. The first part is about writing to all our citizens, both to noblemen and commoners who live in Slavic regions, and who cope well with all accidents in that region. Accepted by all. 9\(^{th}\) October 1425.\(^{12}\)

At the end of October there had been a war on the Drina River and a siege of Srebrnica had been mentioned, whil at the beginning of that month relations had still been normal in Srebrnica and there had been a discussion on deposit:

I. The first part is about giving freedom to Mr. Rector and the Minor Council to respond to a letter from the Duke Bogdan and brothers and the Guardian of Srebrniza about the fact of the deposit about which they speak

\(^{11}\) On 25th July 1426 the Despot issued a muniment in descencu nostro Zreberniza. Listine IX, 18.

\(^{12}\) Acta Consilii Rogatorum 3 (1420 1426) fol. 264 id. The day before – on 8th October – The Chamber suspended the trade with Serbia in both the Despot’s and Đurađ Branković’s areas, prohibiting even those who were approved by the custom officers to go to Serbia; a sign that the intrusion into Srebia came unexpectedly. Acta Consilii Minoris 3 (1422 – 1426) fol. 258. Act of the Minor Council, Oct 3 258: it was accepted due to advice of a customs officer of higher customs office, because they do not calculate customs to marketers who would also like to go to the place of Mr. Despot of Raša and to the place of Mr. Đurđ. But to traders who would like to go to other areas except for areas of Mr. Despot and Mr. Đurđ, before the mentioned, they do calculate the duty: but of those commodities that will bear let them not dare to bear their own goods in specified regions of Mr. Despot and Mr. Đurđ without the apparent permission of Mr. Rector and his Minor Council.
against Dumchum de Nicola. Accepted by all ballots (unanimously) regarding the letter from the Duke Bogdan of Srebreniza and the Guardian and the brothers from Srebreniza. 1st October 1425.

II. The first part is about the decision about a letter that had been recently received from the nobles and merchants of Dubrovnik’s Subsuonichs and in the defense of noblemen and merchants besieged in the military fortress Srebrnich. For nobles and merchants besieged in the fortress Srebrnich. The last day in October. The second part is about the delay in prior to receiving the first response from these nobles and merchants. Accepted by XXII to XVI.

III. The first part is about the postponement of new facts of Bosnia, which should be publicly discussed in the present council, until the first news that will be received there. Accepted by XXX to V.

IV. The first part is about the delay of the answer in the future until a letter from the king of Bosnia is obtained, until the first news. Accepted by XXVIII against V, sustained II. 3rd December 1425.

V. The first part is about giving freedom to Mr. Rector and the Minor Council to write to the Duke Vukašin Zlatonosović. Accepted by XXXIII to II. 3rd December 1425.13).

The attack of Bosnians on Srebrnicu was mentioned in an instruction to Dubrovnik’s deputies at the court of King Tvrtko II dating from 19th April 1428. The Bosnian king required a satisfaction for the involvement of Bosnian merchants in the defense of the town. About Srebrenica - the instruction said - who says that the damage was 10,000 ducats because of us, it should be answered to him: Your Majesty, almighty God and the value of your lordship gave you mastery and wit so that you can completely and clearly see and realize that those poor merchants of ours had not sinned against anybody. Because the case was that they found themselves with their possessions and persons in the fortress – castello - they could not and should not do anything but defend their lives and honor and their homeland ... But let Your Majesty consider how this conflict – novita - in Srebrenica damaged our merchants, because many of them were cut down and captured and tied down by the supreme lord Despot. And lost everything they had in the world. And then after Dinjičić also burned down Srebrnica, Your Majesty’s subject, their ruin was completed, so we can tell the truth and that more than 50,000 ducats would not repair the damage of our own.14).

14 Letters and comments from Levant 10 (1427 – 1430) paper 85’. Jorga o c.241. – Jiriček
We think that there could be no doubt that the events that took place in Serbia and Bosnia in the Fall of 1425 are the same ones described in the 83 chapter of Konstantin the Philosopher’s book. The prohibition for merchants to go to Serbia, the help of the Despot in guns and gunpowder, and especially the recommendation of the Council of Request to Dubrovnik’s merchants in Serbia to hold up in an accident that happened to Serbia, clearly point to the intrusion of Turks in the Kruševac area. On the other side, there is a confirmation that Turks sold Serbia in the October of 1425. In a letter of Simon Boundelmonti from 2nd November of the same year it was stated that Pipo from Ozora and all in Raša were against Turks, and that the Despot was attacked, and the big war was in all the country\textsuperscript{15}). In the above mentioned instruction, where Despot Stefan Lazarević was explicitly mentioned, Dubrovnik’s merchant who are besieged in the fortress were also mentioned. Those were obviously those besieged merchants in Srebrnich in the October of 1425. Because they took part in the defense of the town, king Tvrtko wrote “the threatening letter” to the Republic of St. Blaise in the November of 1425. On the occasion of the event on the Drina river it was also certainly written to Duke Vukašin Zlatonosović in early December of the same year\textsuperscript{16}).

Our dating of the event described by Konstantin the Philosopher does not interfere with the note of a yearbook, according to which in 6934 Czar Murat had enslaved Serbs and marched to Kruševac\textsuperscript{17}). The mentioned year began on 1\textsuperscript{st} September 1425.

While the events that according to the mentioned Dubrovnik’s news took place in Serbia and Bosnia nicely overlap with Konstantin’s

\textsuperscript{15} St. Stanojević, Pipo Spano (1901) 11.

\textsuperscript{16} At the same meeting it was first discussed about the Bosnian king’s letter, then the rector and the Minor Council were given authorities to write to Zlatonosović, and right after that it was suggested to write lord Despot of Raša about them, who said the decision in the present circumstances. However, the counter suggestion was adopted – the second part was about the delay until the first news. All the three decisions are obviously in causal relationship.

\textsuperscript{17} Lj, Stojanović, Stari srpski rodoslovi i letopisi (1928) 226.- In Stojanović, Stare srpske povelje i pisma I, 1 (1929) 232, there is a Despot Stefan’s letter written in Pavlovci on 21\textsuperscript{st} November. Stojanović mistakenly dated it as 1425 instead of 1424, because he did not take into account that in Dubrovnik a new aear started with Christmass (the latter was filed 28\textsuperscript{th} December). We list this in order not to be misrepresented that the Despot could not be in 1425 in Srebrnica.
representation, there are no data that in June or July 1426 – where Konstantin’s earlier chronological representation of Despot’s conflict with Turks and Bosnia was placed – happened any intrusion into Serbia, or any conflict on the Drina river. There are no traces about that in the sources, especially not in Dubrovnik’s where it could be expected first. This argument from silence cannot be easily overthrown when it is known that Dubrovnik had taken great care about everything that could have endangered a very extensive network of trade of citizens of the Republic of St. Blaise in Serbia and Bosnia. It is hard to imagine that about a siege of Srebrnica, that was mentioned in Dubrovnik’s archives in the early 15th century more frequently than any other our town – more frequently then Novo Brdo – that it had left no trace. Finally, if we take that Konstantin’s text does not refer to the events from 1425, how can we explain that there is no mention in Dubrovnik’s and others sources of exactly these events described by the Despots’ biographer, and yet he thoroughly described similar events that we know for sure happened in the Fall of 1425? Again, we underline that the current dating of the Bosnian attack on Srebrenica, and therefore the intrusion of the Turks in the region around Kruševac, relied solely on the fact that the Despot Stefan was in Srebrenica on 25th July 1426.

It seems even more so that the events described in the 83rd chapter of Despot’s biography could not happen in June or July 1426. At that time Turks invaded Bosnia; in a letter dating 6th August 1426 the Dubrovnik’s government apologized to king Sigismund for irregular connection with him, listing, among other reasons, the insecurity in Turks-raided Bosnia: or maybe because of the road to Bosnia that had been occupied for months, and now it is occupied by Turks from all sides. In the same letter people of Dubrovnik give very precise data of Turkish activities in the Balkans: “During almost all of this summer the army of about four thousand Turks was in Bosnia; neither his excellency the king nor his barons dared to take against them. Dukes Sandalj and Radosav Pavlović after mutual attempts to make deal made peace with each other. Turks, however, intruded the areas in Croatia twice and enslaved many Croats and Vlachs. They also marauded the areas of Usora and Srebrnik twice; They were also in the area of duke Zlatonosović; These Turks returned to their country and very few of them left in Bosnia. The famous lord Despot made peace with Venetians in Zeta together with distinguished lord Đurad, his nephew; One part of that area in Zeta went to lord Despot and his nephew, and the other part went to the Venetian Republic. Many Turks made hostile entrances from Durres to Thessaloniki and across Achaia or Morea, having a major war with the Venetians, devastated and inflicted enormous damage against Venetian possessions.” How could King Tvrtko II, with all the misery
that befell Bosnia from the Turks, even imagine at that time to raid Srebrnica? And why would Republic of St. Blaise miss, and in a letter sent after a lengthy break to the Hungarian King, to notify on the so-called Despot’s conflict with the Turks and Bosnia, which would definitely be of much more Sigismund’s interest than Cyprus, Saracens, “Barbary” and Catalani, about which he, among other things, he wrote?

At the end of the letter, buried in the data unlike most of the letters of Dubrovnik, people of Dubrovnik themselves expressly emphasized that they no longer had any news that would be of Sigismund’s interest: _Neither is new to us and we are at present in force, which is calmness and keeps your customs loyalty, our humility to disclose._\(^{18}\)

As a reason of the Sultan’s attack on Despot Stefan, Konstantin the Philosopher listed his connections with Hungary: he went towards the western Amorea and was welcomed by the Hungarian King and heard some slanders, and decided to send an army against the Despot. Some historians, logically, deduced from this that Sultan Murat II found about the contract that the Despot made in Tata in May 1426 with King Sigismund and that was the reason he attacked Serbia\(^{19}\). According to our representation of the event, that is completely not the case. Thus, other explanation of Konstantin’s text should be looked for.

King Sigismund prepared in the Summer of 1425 “grand coalition of westerners“ against the Ottomans. He offered alliance to Republic of Venetia asking for a loan of 20,000 ducats and an authority to draft within its teritorry. At the same time he won for himself the Bosnian king Tvrtko II. In the mid-August 1425 Sigismund was together with his army in Oršava\(^{20}\). His plan obviously included Despot Stefan Lazarević into alliance against Turks, and he personally visited him. We believe that this is how one should interpret Konstantin the Philosopher’s “an there he said to the Despot“,

---

18 Dipl. Rag. 319.
19 Mijatović o.c. I, 47: The fact that Đurađ was declared to the heir of Serbian throne did not please the Ottoman Porte. Even more so when the rumor came that Stefan makes alliance with Hungary. – Jiriček, The History of Serbs II, 126: Murat II was worried very much when he found out about the deal between the Despot and Sigismund. He came to Sofia and let his troops rob Serbia till Kruševac. – Ćorović, The History of Yugoslavia (1933) 224: When Edirne found about the contract. In Tata, - the Sultan asked for closer explanations form the Despot on that matter via his close delegate. Since Stevan refused to do so, Sultan Murat II attacked Serbia. Sr. I Prilozi II, 74.
20 J. Radonić, Zapadna Evropa i balkanski narodi prema Turcima u prvoj polovini XV veka (1905) 48 id. A. Huber, Geschichte Österreichs. II (1885) 531.
emphasised that the Despot visted the Hungarian King “every Summer“. Also, the aforementioned Simon Boundelmonti’s letter points to that. All the King Sigismund diplomatic activities and his arrival with his army to the Turkish border caused, naturally, concern at the Sultan and thus he decided to go “towards the westerners“ and attack Serbia.
JUDGMENT OF THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL AGAINST RADOVAN KARADZIC- CONFIRMATION OF THE GREATER SERBIAN IDEOLOGY, POLICY AND PRACTICE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

ABSTRACT

It has been a well-known fact that Radovan Karadzic as the President of the Republic of Srpska and Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces, was an exponent of the ideology of Serbian hegemony of the Serbian political, military and police regime. That regime was planned, organized and he carried out the aggression against the internationally recognized state, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the aggression and destruction of the constitutional order of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Radovan Karadzic gave repeated impetus and organized political and armed rebellion against the constitutional order of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina having been given the support by the Army of Yugoslavia, which represented the most serious offence in all socio-political systems. The main objective of the aggressive war-mongering campaign, led by Milosevic and Karadzic as his assistant in charge of Bosnia, was the war with the purpose of conquering the territory, expulsion and physical liquidation and elimination of non-Serbs from criminally conquered space. It was committed under the flag of fascist ideological fanaticism of the “national threat”. Under the same flag, the wars from Slovenia to Kosovo were led along with the systematic and media-hoopla propaganda about the alleged “demonization of Serbs”. Everybody were guilty, Muslims, Croats, Albanians, Ustasha, Bali, KLA, the Green Berets, mujahedeen, NATO, CIA, the intelligent services of France, Germany, the Vatican, Tehran, all but them. To be precise, the lie is ubiquitous and methodically designed constant which verbally supports and evaluates each

1 Cekic, Smail. The aggression against the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina - planning, preparation, execution (Volume 1 and 2). Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, University of Sarajevo. Sarajevo, 2004, p. 496-497.
war option, massacre and each and every crime. At the same time, the Serbian “victories” and praise appeared in a row².

The crimes preceding those “victories” were displayed as the suicide victim treachery of the victims themselves: the Muslims shelled themselves, KLA displaced people and NATO forced Albanians to flee while the French secret services planned the genocide in Srebrenica. That is the essence of the Greater expansionist, aggressive and criminal-genocidal policies and practices, drenched in blood and violence of fascistically drawn “ethnic cleansing”.

“Were those people different from all of us”, Stanley Milgram, an American psychologist at Yale University kept on asking himself studying the psychological profile of the Nazis in WWII. “Were there corrupt, damaged and ready to commit evil persons? Or was there an unfortunate combination of various factors that produces a defective and sick people?”³ It is possible that in the case of Milosevic and Karadzic, in the socially broadest sense of the word, there is about the “ideas and beliefs that must be considered as the symptoms of mental illness in the modern world.” It suggests that some views and values, despite its common-sense abnormality, are being groomed as dominant in certain areas not allowing others to develop. It produces catholicity of personal mutual similarity of a number of individuals which will facilitate the division of the planned set of roles. Certain personality types correspond to each other mutually and to a particular time. The alike people with neurotic and hysterical character are found together. Radovan, as well as Slobodan, were legitimated as the persons of whim, lies and exclusion. More than hundreds of thousands killed, millions of marginalized and displaced non-Serbs are the price of their ethnic pride and ethnic Nazi/narcissoid complacency.

Expected life imprisonment for Karadzic was something that involved the minimum expectation for victims of genocide below which there was nowhere to go. Life sentence would be a glimmer of comfort for victims, a little satisfaction and great hope that justice was still attainable and that it was still over injustice in this mute and unjust world. The tribunal manifested itself to 40 years in prison. Whatever the judgment, it will be of great importance, especially for science. Holocaust was a “dumb” tragedy that began to truly unfold only when there appeared significant sociologists, anthropologists,

---

² Bajtal, Esad. The crimes and lies of Milosevic crypto - politics. Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, University of Sarajevo. Sarajevo, 2014, p. 170

³ Muratovic, Rasim. Holocaust against the Jews and genocide against Bosniaks. Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, University of Sarajevo. Sarajevo, 2012, p. 47
historians, poets, writers and philosophers who gradually created the vocabulary for its articulation because suppression of any form of verbiage is nothing but a form of dehumanization.

**Key words:** Greater Serbian ideology, Great Serbian policies, Radovan Karadzic, genocide, joint criminal enterprise.

**INTRODUCTION**

In his life experience Radovan Karadzic from the Durmitor mountain heights to the Dutch sandy plains came to Sarajevo in 1960 as fourteen-year-old boy after having finished primary school in his native Petnjica, the village between Zabljak and Savnik.

Without any problems, firstly he enrolled the Medical secondary school and subsequently the Medical faculty, University of Sarajevo. For many young people of that time enrolling one or the other, especially both the school and faculty of this kind was just an abstract noun. A secret hand opened widely the door of Sarajevo to Vuk’s son, a member of the fascist Chetnik movement of Dragomir Drazo Mihailovic during WWII.

Not just the door of Sarajevo was opened for him. The student’s volunteering in Denmark is what followed as well as the medial specialty in the USA etc. He got employed at the state University Medical Centre in Sarajevo immediately after graduation. Then he got married and was given the apartment in the center of Sarajevo, fifty meters away from the Central Committee building of the League of Communists of Bosnia and Herzegovina, at the street of the revolutionary name Sutjeska 2, and max three hundred meters away from the Clinic where he was everything but the director.

Radovan didn’t like cities that was written down in one of his poems *on the eve of nineties*: “Down to the cities to fight the bastards”. Radovan especially didn’t like Sarajevo justifying it by one of the Serbian myths according to which Sarajevo “was built on the holy Serbian land”. Radovan was spreading hatred and igniting the fire of nationalism, chauvinism and fascism by his myth-based speeches which were well accepted in the time of decaying of a system and state disintegration. In that vacuum Radovan Karadzic and his cooperatives were daily directed from the highest places in Belgrade while they behaved as protectors of Serbianism, Christianity and Europe in exchange for the destruction of those who were engineered barriers and opposite of all these i.e. Bosniaks.
“For just a few day Sarajevo will be destroyed to the ground and 500 000 of them will be dead. Within a month, Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be destroyed.” These are the words which Radovan Karadzic told his close ally Momcilo Mandic, in early October 1991 (i.e. six months before the start of the Bosnian war) and therefore mathematically precise he explained genocidal and mapped plan of Belgrade Greater politics and his mathematically projected consequences by the logic of the Holocaust. The consequences were the following: 2 200 000 persons were displaced which makes more than a half of total population of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the census of March, more than 100 000 people were killed; around 30 000 women, young girls and men were raped and sexually abused; 650 of concentration camps were formed through which about 200 000 inmates passed out of which 200 were killed. There were more than 700 mass graves and 1 200 buildings of the Islamic architecture were systematically destroyed and looted; 500 buildings owned by the Catholic Church and several dozens of Jewish religious sites, hundreds of thousands of houses and flats were looted, destroyed and burned to the ground. Between 60 and 70 percent of the total housing units were damaged in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; various infrastructure facilities in the field of transport and communication were destroyed while numerous industrial buildings, farms, hotels, motels and tourist centers as well as various small private craft and shopping outlets were destroyed and damaged. 60 percent of industrial facilities and 55 percent of health facilities were destroyed while 349 doctors were killed and almost all educational, scientific, cultural and sports facilities were destroyed. The National Library was burned down as well as the Oriental institute.

These are just fundamental results of the ground Serbism and geopolitical grand-mania, fascist, dark and aggressive-conquering mentality of the Serbian duo Slobodan Milosevic from the Left River and Radovan Karadzic from Petnjica on Durmitor mountains. They were of rural mentality which (led by the logic of plowing boundaries and brigandage of neighbor’s fields) was seen in each of their gestures. Even limited military mind of Ratko Mladic even from the conceptual stage of the Great Serbian project called everything that was listed by genocide, asking himself at one of the military-political meeting:” I don’t know how Krajisnik and Karadzic will explain this to the world. This is genocide, dear people.”

4 Cekic, Smail. The aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina - planning, preparation, execution (Volume 1 and 2). Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo 2004, p. 496-497
INDICTMENT AGAINST RADOVAN KARADZIC

In the third amended indictment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague, Radovan Karadzic was charged, among others, with genocide, crimes against humanity and international law and violation of the laws and customs of war, as follows:

**Article I** - Genocide: Radovan Karadzic by prearrangement committed, planned, instigated and/or aided and abetted genocide over the part of the national, ethnic and/or religious groups of Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats as such. Radovan Karadzic participated in joint criminal enterprise to permanently remove Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats from the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina which were the Serb-claimed territories. The intention to partially destroy these groups is manifested in the most extreme way in Bratunac, Foca, Kljuc, Prijedor, Sanski Most, Vlasenica and Zvornik.

**Article II** - Genocide: Radovan Karadzic participated in joint criminal enterprise to eliminate Bosnian Muslims by killing men and women from Srebrenica as well as by forcible removal of women, girls and the part of older men.

**Article III** - Persecution: Radovan Karadzic is specifically charged with the persecutions in the following municipalities: Banja Luka, Bijeljina, Bosanski Novi, Bratunac, Brcko, Foca, Hadzici, Ilidza, Kljuc, Novi Grad, Novo Sarajevo, Pale, Prijedor, Rogatica, Sanski Most, Sokolac, Visegrad, Vlasenica, Vogosca, Zvornik as well as persecutions from Srebrenica.

**Articles IV, V, VI.** Extermination, murder: Radovan Karadzic by arrangement with others committed, planned, instigated, ordered and abetted the extermination and murder of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats from Srebrenica and Sarajevo.

**Articles VII, VIII-** deportations, inhumane acts: Forced displacement of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats from Bosnian Serb-claimed territory by means which included the crimes of forcible transfer and deportation.

**Articles IX, X-** Terror and unlawful acts: Radovan Karadzic participated in joint criminal enterprise to establish and carry out the campaign of sniping and shelling against the civilian population of Sarajevo. By sniping and shelling thousands of civilians of both sexes and of all ages, including children and the elderly were killed and wounded.

---

**Article XI**- taking of Hostages: Radovan Karadzic by arrangement with others committed, planned, and instigated, ordered and/or aided and abetted taking the UN military observers and UN peacekeepers hostages. Between approximately 26 May 1995 and 19 June 1995 ARS detained over two hundred peacekeepers and UN military observers in various locations including Pale, Sarajevo, Banja Luka and Gorazde and held them hostage at various locations.

**General Allegations**: All acts and omissions the accused was charged with as the crimes against humanity and international law, with the exception of the one as the part of the campaign of sniping and shelling of Sarajevo, were the part of a widespread and systematic attack directed towards the civilian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Victims of all crimes that were alleged as violations of common article II of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 were persons taking no active participation in hostilities.

**TRIAL CHAMBER JUDGMENT AGAINST RADOVAN KARADZIC- SUMMARY**

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) on 24 March 2016 in The Hague pronounced the judgment against Radovan Karadzic, as follows:

The accused was one of the founders of the SDP and its President from July 1990 to July 1996. He was chairman of the National Security Council of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on 12 May 1992 was elected President of the Presidency of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. From 17 December 1992, he was the only President of the Republic of Serbian and supreme commander of the armed forces of the Republic of Serbian.

The accused was arraigned on charges of eleven-count indictment: two counts of genocide, five counts of the crimes against humanity (or persecution, murder, extermination, deportation and forcible transferring), and four counts of violation of the laws and customs of war (i.e. murder, acts of violence with the main aim of spreading terror among the civilian population, unlawful attacks on civilians and taking hostages).

In the indictment, the prosecution indicted the accused of participation in four joint criminal enterprise (JCE). The allegations were stated as follows:

---

From no later than October 1991 and 30 November 1995, the accused participated in a JCE with the aim of permanently removing Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats from the ostensible Bosnian Serb territory, for which they had legal right through the commission of crimes for which he was charged. It is an overall JCE.

Between April 1992 and November 1995, the accused participated in a joint criminal enterprise in order to initiate and carry out a campaign of sniping and shelling against the civilian population in Sarajevo with the primary goal of spreading terror among the civilian population. It is a JCE connected to Sarajevo.

Between approximately 26 May and 19 June 1995, the accused participated in a JCE to take United Nations personnel hostage in order to force the North Atlantic Treaty to refrain from conducting air strikes against Bosnian Serb military targets. It relates to JCE concerning hostages.

Starting from the days immediately preceding 11 July 1995 until 1 November 1995, the accused participated in joint criminal enterprise for Bosnian Muslims to be eliminated by killing men and boys from Srebrenica and by forcible removing women, children and a number of older men. It relates to JCE concerning Srebrenica.

Furthermore, the charges were brought against the accused for planning, instigated, ordering and/or aiding and abetting the crimes in the indictment. The accused is also charged as a superior pursuant to Article 7 (3) of the Statute.

Prosecution presented its opening statement on 27 October and 2 November 2009, and the first witness for the prosecution testified on April 13, 2010. Closing arguments were set out between 30 September and 7 October 2014. The Trial Chamber sat for 499 days of the trial and heard the testimony of 434 witnesses. In addition, the Council took evidence of 152 witnesses in written form. In total, 11,469 exhibits were included into the file. The entire file has more than 48,000 pages of transcript, over 95,000 pages of submissions and more than 190,000 pages of listed exhibits, i.e. the file is a total of more than 330,000 pages.

The conclusions of the Council and their explanations will be briefly presented here. It should be however borne in mind that this is only a summary which in any case does not represent the part of the Judgment of the Trial Chamber. Confidential copies of the judgment will be distributed to parties at the end of this session, and the public redacted version will be published.
Before we get to the above mentioned components, the Trial Chamber concludes, on the basis of evidence, that there was the armed conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina throughout the whole period relevant to the indictment, according to which the general requirements for crimes under Article 3 of the Statute were met. With regards to the crimes against humanity and international law, the Panel concludes that there was a widespread and systematic attack against the civilian population at all times relevant to the indictment and that the perpetrators knew of the attack and the fact that the crimes were the part of the attack.

1. The overall joint criminal enterprise

The Council reviews the component items dealing with the municipalities and joint criminal enterprise. It is claimed that the crimes were committed in Bijeljina, Bratunac, Brcko, Foca, Rogatica, Sokolac, Visegrad, Vlasenica and Zvornik in eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as in the municipalities of Banja Luka, Bosanski Novi, Kljuc, Prijedor and Sanski Most in the Autonomous Region of Krajina (ARK); and in the municipalities of Hadzici, Ilidza, Novi Grad, Novo Sarajevo, Pale and Vagosca in the Sarajevo area. These locations will be called “municipalities”.

The Council concludes that starting from the end of March 1992 and throughout 1992, Serbian forces took control over the municipalities in the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina in which the Serbs allegedly had legal right. During and after these well-planned and coordinated takeovers of municipalities, there was an organized and systematic pattern of crimes committed against Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats who lived in those municipalities.

The Panel concludes that a large number of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats in the municipalities were forcibly displaced from their homes to other locations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in third countries. The accused stated in his defense that the movement of the population was voluntary and a natural consequence of the war with no policy of expulsion. In contrast to that, the Council states that, in many cases, the victims were forced to leave after the attacks on their villages or after Serbian forces captured the city. Other victims were first arrested, kept in detention facilities and then transported out of the municipality. The expulsion resulted in drastic changes in the ethnic composition of the municipality.

Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats were also removed from the positions of authority and dismissed from their jobs in a number of
municipalities. In addition to the unlawful arrests and arbitrary trial, the restrictions on the movement of Bosnian Muslims were introduced in some municipalities. Thousands of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats were unlawfully detained into 50 detention facilities in all municipalities. Non-Serbs were often massively arrested and taken from their homes in those detention facilities after the attacks on towns and cities. However, the Council notes that it did not adopt the conclusion of unlawful confinement for prisoners who were fighters and civilians who took an active part in the hostilities.

Political and state authorities of the Bosnian Serb and Serbian forces also introduced and permanently maintained inhumane living conditions in several detention facilities. The victims were subjected to poor living conditions. Insufficient food and water, medical care was inadequate or non-existent, and sanitary and hygienic conditions were poor as well as sleeping conditions. In many of these detention centers, the detainees were subjected to torture, beatings and physical and psychological abuse by Serbian forces. Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, men and women, were subjected to rape and other acts of sexual violence by Serbian forces during their confinement. Therefore, the victims sustained severe mental or physical sufferings or injuries. Non-Serb detainees were forced to work on the frontlines or they were used as human shields in order to protect Serbian forces.

After or during expulsion from their homes, Bosnian Serbs confiscated the property of victims. Non-Serb property was widely looted and in many municipalities Serbian forces implicated the destruction of villages and property of Bosnian Muslims and Croats in a large scale. Serbian forces destroyed mostly mosques, Catholic churches and other cultural monuments and sacred sites in Bratunac, Bosanski Novi, Foca, Kljuc, Novi Grad, Prijedor, Rogatica, Sanski Most, Sokolac, and Zvornik. The cultural monuments and sacred objects were selected for destruction for their importance for Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats in these locations. However, although the Council concludes that the cultural monuments and religious places were destroyed in Bijeljina, Pale and Vrgosca, the presented evidence were not sufficient to state who, beyond any reasonable doubt, the responsible people for this destruction were.

Serbian forces also killed many Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats during and after taking over the municipalities. Victims were killed in mass executions or after an attack to non-Serb villages. The victims were executed, imprisoned or taken away by Serbian forces from detention facilities and killed. In other cases, victims died as the result of severe beatings by Serbian
forces or lost their lives due to inhumane living conditions they were subjected to. For 26 cases of killings attached to the indictment, the Chamber finds the proven element of the crime of mass killing and the adequate intent concluding that those killings thus represent extinction.

The Council also states that the perpetrators chose their victims in the municipalities on the basis of their identity or because they were Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, and that therefore those crimes were committed with discriminatory intent.

Accordingly, the Council concludes that the Serbian forces, as well as political and state government bodies of Bosnian Serbs, committed murder as the violation of the laws and customs of the war, extermination, deportation and other inhumane acts (forcible transfer) and persecution as crimes against humanity. Judge Howard Morrison appends a dissenting opinion in connection to the incident in the annex to the indictment B.12.2.

In paragraph 1, the prosecution claimed that a campaign of persecution in seven municipalities i.e. Bratunac, Foca, Kljuc, Prijedor, Sanski Most, Vlasenica and Zvornik included and escalated in such a great deal that it included behavior and intent which represent genocide. The Council notes that in those municipalities the members of the protected group, namely Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, were killed and subjected to serious physical or mental injury and therefore the actus reus elements of Articles 4 (2)(a) and 4 (2)(b) were fulfilled. However, when it comes to the acts referred to the Article 4 (2)(c) of the Statute, although the Chamber notes that Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats were held in terrible conditions, it wasn’t proved that such evidence show that those conditions were calculated to bring about physical destruction of Bosnian Muslims or Bosnian Croats in those municipalities. Furthermore, the Council did not satisfy itself that the actions under Articles 4(2) (a) and 4(2)(b) of the Statute were committed with genocidal intent, i.e. with the intent to destroy in part the group of Bosnian Muslims or Bosnian Croats as such. In conclusion, the Panel could not identify either conclude that there was the genocidal intent of the accused and those who were said to be members of the JCE, nor of the physical perpetrators of the crime and therefore, it could not draw such a conclusion based on patterns of crimes in those municipalities. Having analyzed the overall body of evidence on this issue, the Council did not make sure that the only reasonable inference was that there was an intent to destroy in part the group of Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats in the municipalities as such. The Council therefore, had no sufficient evidence to conclude, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the genocide was committed in those municipalities.
The Council is now turning to the responsibility of the accused for the crimes he was found to have been committed in the municipalities.

The essence of the defense, having been put forward by the adversary, was that the goals of the Bosnian Serbs were not criminal and they did not entail committing any crime. According to him, the movement of non-Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina was not a result of the JCE, but a consequence of the fact that people voluntarily crossed into areas under the control of their national groups. After the statement of the accused, each individual case of forcible expulsion was the result of hatred or revenge, and it was never the goal of the Bosnian Serb’s leadership. His defense also suggested that all the crimes were isolated cases which were committed by individuals, such as members of paramilitary forces, who were acting on their own, rather than carrying out incriminating common criminal purpose. According to his thesis, the central authorities have been unsuccessful in their attempts to exercise their influence at the municipal level and in such a mess he could not do more than what he did.

In contrast, the Trial Chamber finds that the creation of parallel political and state structures of Bosnian Serbs, the campaign of violent takeover of municipalities and expulsion of non-Serbs, were carefully coordinated and the accused and Bosnian Serbs coordinated them and represented their ultimate intention. To achieve these goals, the accused and the Bosnian Serb leadership announced and promoted the precise instructions in the form of Instructions for the variant A/B and strategic objectives. The Council has assessed the evidence presented in relation to the acts and conduct of the accused and other alleged members of a comprehensive JCE in the light of the systematic and organized manner in which the crimes were committed in each municipality.

On this basis, the Council states that between October 1991 and November 1995, there was a common plan for Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats to be permanently removed from the territory of the Bosnian Serb-claimed territory by the commission of crimes. The accused, as well as Momcilo Krajisnik, Nikola Koljevic, Biljana Plavsic, Ratko Mladic, Mico Stanisic, Momcilo Mandic, Zeljko Raznatovic (Arkan) and Vojislav Seselj were among those persons who acted on the basis of the common plan and shared the intent for the crimes constituted the part of the plan.

The Council also concluded that the accused contributed significantly to the overall JCE. It took into account the impact of his behavior with respect to functions and positions he took at the relevant time. The accused was of
vital importance in developing and promoting the ideology and policy of the SDP and the creation of parallel government, military, police and political structures which were used to establish and maintain control over the territories the Bosnian Serbs allegedly had a legal right, in order to conduct a comprehensive goal of JCE. The accused was central to defining the objectives of the Bosnian Serb leadership, including the separation of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, taking the territories over which Bosnian Serbs allegedly had legal right, and the creation of mainly ethnically homogeneous state of Bosnian Serbs. The accused was also a central figure in spreading propaganda against Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats whom they identified as the historical enemies of the Serbs and with whom they thought the coexistence was impossible. The accused was playing a card of an inverted historical perspective, and his rhetoric was used to create fear and hatred towards Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats and to worsen the inter-division and tensions in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The accused was also found at the top of political, civil and military structures and could have used his power and influence to implement the goal of a comprehensive JCE. He finally supported the military implementation of their aims, which was necessarily implied the occupation of the territory and forcible transfer of non-Serb population. He was a central figure in the mobilization and creation of Bosnian Serb Territorial Defense, ARS and private policing structures of Bosnian Serbs. Furthermore, following the withdrawal of the YNA from Bosnia and Herzegovina, the accused supported the operational cooperation of military forces and local authorities and, in some cases, of paramilitary groups. Those military structures and units were used to take over and maintain the authority of the Bosnian Serbs and to conduct a comprehensive objective of the JCE. Although the accused later in the conflict took some steps to control the paramilitaries, the steps were taken after those paramilitaries were used to implement the goals of a comprehensive JCE and only after their members began to turn against local Bosnian Serb authorities. The accused and other members of the JCE used to their authority and influence towards the supreme headquarters, TD, ARS, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Bosnian Serbs and paramilitary units in order to perform crimes envisaged by common plan and comprehensive JCE. In addition, sometimes the paramilitaries, local Serbs and the YNA units, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Bosnian Serbs, TD, and ARS acted on the orders of the Crisis Staff, who were under the power and influence of the accused to commit the crimes in implementation of the common plan. Crimes committed by the Serbian forces in the municipalities were therefore attributed to the members of JCE or to the accused.
Although the civil courts existed during the conflict and the accused founded the military courts, the system operated in a discriminatory manner, paying little attention to the crimes committed against non-Serbs. The failure of the accused to adequately exercise his authority to prevent or punish crimes having been committed against non-Serbs, gave the signal that such punishable actions would be tolerated throughout the entire period of the JCE and this resulted in encouraging and facilitating the crimes that were an integral part of the objective of the joint criminal enterprise.

At the same time, as he learned about the crimes having been committed against non-Serbs, he did not take any sufficient steps to prevent or punish the accused and he consistently and systematically gave such information to the representatives of international organizations, the public and the media in order to mislead them about these crimes. By the denial of the commission of crimes by Serbian forces in municipalities and by his fraudulent presentation of reality on the ground that he was perfectly aware of, the defendant created an environment in which the Serbian forces could continue to commit crimes through which they could achieve the goal of a JCE.

The accused and other members of the JCE were not just informed of the violent occupation of cities by Serbian forces, but they also knew that it led to massive demographic change, by forcibly transferring non-Serb civilians, as well as to ethnic homogenization, which they supported. Additionally, the way Serbian forces took control over the municipalities involved the widespread practice of unlawful arrests and detention of thousands of non-Serbs before they would remove them from the area of “Bosnian Serb territory”. The accused and the Bosnian-Serb leadership not only knew of these objects of detention, but they used such illegal detention of people as one of the key elements in achieving the goal of a JCE.

Based on these findings, the Trial Chamber considers that the only reasonable conclusion is that the acts of deportation, forcible transfer and persecution were the intent of members of the JCE to serve in the realization of the objective of this joint criminal enterprise. Acts of persecution, which were deliberate and which represented the goal of a comprehensive JCE, were forcible transfer and deportation, unlawful detention, and the introduction and implementation of restrictive and discriminatory measures. To the accused and other members of the comprehensive JCE, the intent for this crime was common. The Trial Chamber, however, did not find out that the other acts of persecution or the crimes of murder and extermination were also the part of a common plan or that the accused planned them.
The Trial Chamber will now turn to whether those crimes were predictable. It took into account a wide geographical territory covered by the common plan and concluded that there was a genuine concern for the way of retrieving the power to municipalities and implementing a comprehensive plan of the JCE. The Trial Chamber finds that, regarding the nature of the common design and the way it was implemented, it was predictable that Serbian forces could commit crimes with elements of violence against non-Serbs during and after the takeover of municipalities and the campaign of forcible transfer of non-Serbs. In addition, evidence of awareness of the accused of criminal activities in the municipalities show that he was perfectly aware of the atmosphere of extreme intimidation in which non-Serbs were forced to leave. The Trial Chamber further finds that the accused was aware that the common plan, under which thousands of non-Serb civilians were massively expelled from their homes during and after the violent takeover of towns and villages and detained in facilities across municipalities, was implemented in the context of inter-ethnic hostility and violence. Moreover, he was familiar with the atmosphere of impunity for crimes against non-Serbs.

Taking into consideration these factors, the Trial Chamber finds that the accused should have known that the non-Serb population was at risk of violent crime that could be committed by Serbian forces carrying out their common plan. That possibility made the accused indifferent; he followed the common plan, having been aware of the possibility that those crimes could have been committed in the course of its implementation, and he willingly took that risk.

Consequently, the Chamber finds that the accused could have foreseen the murder, extermination and persecution. Acts of persecution, that could have been predicted, were cruel treatment, forced labor on the front line, the use of non-Serbs as human shields, seizure and plunder of property and wanton destruction of private property, including cultural and religious sites.

Therefore, in the conclusion, with respect to the municipalities, the accused bears individual criminal responsibility under Article 7 (1) of the Statute of persecution, extermination, murder, deportation and forcible transfer as the crimes against humanity; and for murder, as a violation of the laws and customs of war. However, in respect to the conclusion that the Trial Chamber did not find out that the genocide was committed in seven above-mentioned municipalities, the defendant is not guilty of genocide under Count 1 of the indictment.
2. Joint criminal enterprise for Sarajevo

The Trial Chamber will now turn to the Sarajevo component of the case and the Sarajevo JCE as alleged in the indictment.

The Trial Chamber finds that since the end of May 1992 to October 1995, the civilian population of Sarajevo was subjected to shelling and sniping by Bosnian Serb forces, specifically by Sarajevo-Romanija Corps (“SRC”). Throughout this period, units of SRC kept their positions in the hills around the city, surrounding it and holding it under siege.

From their locations, they deliberately fired at civilians from sniper fire, aiming at trams, as well. The practice of targeting civilians by sniper fire was common and continuous. This was done almost daily and lasted mostly by unreduced intensity at all times of conflict. Sarajevo civilians were targeted by sniper fire as they went to fetch water, walking around the town and riding on public transportation. In addition, a sniper was shooting at the children as they played in front of their house, walking with their parents or returned home on foot from school, even while riding a bicycle. The SRC was opening a sniper fire at civilians from many notorious locations throughout the city where they established professionally-built, long-term sniper nests. The Trial Chamber also satisfied itself that, starting from the end of May 1992, units of SRC deliberately shelled the civilian population of the city and opened excessive and/or indiscriminate fire onto the city. While doing so, they used a large amount of heavy weapons, including mortars of 80 and 120 mm, as well as artillery pieces, some of which were more or less constantly located in the hills around Sarajevo. Thousands of shells fell onto the city during the conflict, including the residential areas and civilian facilities such as hospitals, markets and other places where civilians gathered. Often there was no military value in the targets chosen by the gunners and SRC’s fire was winding down randomly throughout the city. In 1995, units of SRC threw a number of modified air bombs onto the city, along with the weapons of extraordinary destructive power which had not been properly tested at that time. Therefore, these attacks by modified air bombs were very unselective.

The practice of shelling and sniping targeting of civilians continued for over three years. Bearing in mind the long duration and nature of that practice, the Trial Chamber concludes that the intention of SRC units and their commanders was to target civilians and to use excessive and unselective fire on the city. The Trial Chamber, therefore satisfied itself that the SRC conducted a campaign of sniping and shelling of Sarajevo with an intent of,
among other things, terrorizing the civilian population who lived in it. The Council also notes that, in the relevant period as a result of the campaign in the city, thousands of civilians were wounded and killed. Furthermore, the Trial Chamber finds that all the civilians who were at that time in the city suffered immense fear and great torture, since they never knew when they would be targeted by SRC.

The Trial Chamber notes that, in carrying out the above conclusions, they relied both on general evidence regarding the situation in the city in 1992-1995, and the evidence of specific incidents of shelling and sniping listed in Annexes F and G to the indictment. Regarding the latter annexes, the Trial Chamber finds that the SRC is responsible for all incidents except three, namely it is not responsible for incidents F.5, F.7 and G.6. In addition, Judge Melville Baird appends a dissenting opinion in connection with the incident G.8.

The accused during the trial claimed that units of SRC never targeted civilians, but they responded to the attacks from the city and in doing so they focused on military targets located within the city. The defendant also argued that the party of Bosnian Muslims shelled and targeted by snipers its own civilians in order to blame the Bosnian Serbs and provoke the intervention of the international community. The Trial Chamber, however, in the execution of the above findings, rejected this claim of the accused. The Trial Chamber accepts that the war was waged on both sides, and that the two warring sides were leading mutual fighting throughout the conflict, and that the units of SRC targeted the military personnel and military positions opponents. However, the evidence in this case are full of examples of SRK fire that was not directed at military targets in the city, but at civilian objects, as well as examples of SRC opened fire at random and excessively. Specific incidents listed in the Annexes for which, after the conclusion of the Trial Chamber, SRC was responsible, are the obvious examples of such fires. Furthermore, the continuity of sniping and shelling attacks on the civilian population cannot be explained by the fact that the war in Sarajevo was led on both sides. Therefore, the Trial Chamber found it clearly that civilians were targeted directly by SRC, as for example, the sniper incidents in the Annex illustrate, or were subjected to indiscriminate and excessive heat, as when SRC threw the modified aerial bombs or fired mortar shells at the location where the civilians gathered.

With regard to the argument of the accused that the party of Bosnian Muslims targeted its own civilians, the Trial Chamber accepts that the Bosnian Muslims were very keen to indicate the international community to stand up
for them and therefore they sometimes targeted UN personnel or opened fire
over the territory under their control in order to blame the Bosnian Serbs. The
evidence, however, show that such cases are completely insignificant when
compared with the existing evidence on the fire opened by SRC at the city. As
such, they do not affect the position of the Trial Chamber on the practice of
SRC to target civilians in the city in their unselective and excessive attacks.

The Trial Chamber therefore finds that the members of the SRC
committed murder, unlawful attacks on civilians and terror as a violation of
the laws or customs of war and murder as a crime against humanity. The Trial
Chamber will now turn to the topic of responsibility of the accused for these
acts.

The defense of the accused in relation to this component is that there
was no Sarajevo JCE nor plan to launch a campaign of sniping and shelling,
and that there was no intent to kill, attack or terrorize the civilian population in
the city. Instead, in the words of the accused, the city was affected by the war,
and panic fear of the population was just a common consequence of that war.

However, as noted above, the continuity of sniping and shelling against
the civilian population and the large number of civilian casualties in the city
cannot be explained by the fact that there was the war in Sarajevo. In addition,
the Trial Chamber found out that the individual snipers or sniper units within
the SRC, as well as the crew of mortars and artillery, were all controlled by
the SRC Command, and, ultimately, the Main Staff of the ARS. And finally,
from the very beginning of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, political
and military leadership of the Bosnian Serbs, in particular, the accused as well
as Momcilo Krajsnik, Nikola Koljevic, Biljana Plavsic and Ratko Mladic
recognized and emphasized the importance of Sarajevo for fight for Bosnian
Serbs and the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The city was significant
not only because of its symbolism but for the fact that without it, the party
of Bosnian Muslims could not function as an independent state, and also
because it had a special significance for the accused which he considered it his
hometown. For all these reasons, they wanted to take control over Sarajevo or
at least parts of Sarajevo. It was a venture which they were striving to at all
time of the conflict and which, according to the multi-ethnic nature of the city,
could be achieved only by constant fire, i.e. sniping and shelling.

Accordingly, the Trial Chamber finds that there was a common plan
which began in May 1992 and lasted until October 1995 and that it originated
from the political and military leadership of the Bosnian Serbs. The primary
goal of the plan was to spread terror among the civilian population of Sarajevo by the campaign of sniping and shelling. Based on the evidence related to incidents of sniper fire and shelling incidents in the Annex, the Trial Chamber also considered indisputable that this plan included the murder, terror and unlawful attacks on civilians. The accused as well as Ratko Mladic, Stanislav Galic, Dragomir Milosevic, Momcilo Krajisnik, Nikola Koljevic and Biljana Plavsic formed the group of persons who acted in accordance with the common plan and had a common intention to commit crimes which were the part of this plan.

The Council also concluded that the accused significantly contributed to the plan. Since he was at the forefront of political, military and government structures, the accused has supported Mladic in his strategy towards Sarajevo, which included increased intensity of the campaign of sniping and shelling and military deal with the situation in the city. As the supreme commander of the ARS, the accused issued or approved military directives related to Sarajevo, by which he extended siege, allowing the campaign of sniping and shelling to last forever. Accordingly, because he had de jure control of the SRC and ARS, which he actually continuously performed throughout the conflict, the accused directly participated in military issues related to Sarajevo and he issued numerous orders on strategic and operational level. Occasionally, he promoted and awarded Mladic, Galic and Dragomir Milosevic, despite knowing that they were involved in the attacks on the civilian population of Sarajevo.

Since the creation of the joint criminal enterprise referred to Sarajevo, the accused was consistently informed of SRC attacks on the civilian population in the city, including the numerous incidents listed in the Annexes to the indictment, they were explained in detail in the judgment. However, instead of making sure to stop attacks on civilians, he denied that SRC was responsible for the attacks and instead he accused the party of Bosnian Muslims. He also drew attention from the strong criticism of the armed conflict of SRC by launching some unrelated issues or stressing that such actions were necessary to defend the territory of the Bosnian Serbs. Despite functioning system of military justice within the ARS and SRC, it was not made a single attempt to prosecute SRC soldiers who targeted the civilian population in Sarajevo, which indicates the prevailing attitude of impunity in the SRC. Although there was an attempt by the accused to stop the operations against civilians in Sarajevo, this happened only when he was subjected to pressure by the International community or the threat of NATO intervention, and these attempts never led to real punishment of a single soldier of SRC.
Conversely, in the absence of such pressure, he would allow a campaign of sniping and shelling to intensify again. He would intensify the campaign in cases when the Bosnian Muslims would refuse to accept the peace agreements under the terms of which he dictated. The Council is therefore convinced that the accused used the campaign of sniping and shelling, whose purpose was to spread terror among the civilian population of Sarajevo, as the means of pressure on the Bosnian Muslims and the International community to achieve their political goals. Based on all this, the Council concluded, as well as for Mladic, Galic and Dragomir Milosevic, that the contribution of the accused to a joint criminal enterprise in relation to Sarajevo was so important that without his support, SRC attacks on the civilian population in the city would not have been performed.

The Council also considers that the only reasonable inference to be drawn on the basis of these acts and omissions of the accused, as well as on the basis of his statements which were explained in detail in the judgment, is that he intended to commit murder, unlawful attack on civilians and to spread terror, and that he shared that intention with other members of the Sarajevo JCE.

Accordingly, in connection with the Sarajevo JCE, the accused individually bears criminal responsible in conformity with the Article 7 (1) of the Statute for murder, unlawful attack on civilians and the spread of terror, as violations of the laws or customs of war, and murder as a crime against humanity.

3. Third joint criminal enterprise for taking hostages

The Council will now address the question of hostages. On 26 May 1995, after NATO air strikes on military targets to Pale, Bosnian Serb forces detained the personnel of UNPROFOR and UNMO in Bosnia and took them to various locations across the country. Some of the staff members were driven to the location of military significance for the Bosnian Serbs, as to a radar station on Mount Jahorina and various barracks.

While they were detained by Bosnian Serb forces, UN personnel were made threats: some of them were told to be hurt or even killed if NATO continued to carry out air strikes. The UN was informed of these threats. Some members of staff were handcuffed in front of the place of military significance. When it became clear that NATO would no longer run attacks on Bosnian
Serb military targets, the accused ordered the UN personnel to be released, and until June 18, all members of the UN were released.

The Council notes that the UN personnel which Bosnian Serb forces detained had the right to protection under Common Article 3, including a provision that prohibits taking hostages. The Council rejected the argument of the accused that after NATO air strikes, UN personnel was considered to be the participants in the battle and therefore was not covered by the protection provided for by Common Article 3. The Council notes that the UN and its peacekeeping forces were not parties to the conflict and that the detained UN personnel did not take an active part in the hostilities.

During the period of 26 May and 19 June 1995, Bosnian Serb forces detained the staff of the UN and UNMO and indicated their threats to obtain the concession, or to achieve NATO’s suspension of its air strikes against Bosnian Serb military targets in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The staff of the UN was deliberately detained in order for this concession to be achieved. The Council, therefore, concluded that this meets the elements of the crime of taking hostages in violation of the laws or customs of war, under Article 3.

The Chamber found out, beyond any reasonable doubt, that there existed a joint criminal enterprise, the common purpose of which was to take members of the UN hostages in order to force NATO to abstain from conducting air strikes against Bosnian Serb targets. The common goal was achieved after NATO air strikes on 25 and 26 May 1995, and it ended in releasing all members of the UN. The joint criminal enterprise included more persons, involving the accused, Mladic, Krajisnik and Milovanovic.

The only reasonable conclusion that the Council can draw from the evidence presented on the statements, acts and conduct of the accused is that he not only had the intention to detain members of the UN, but he also wanted to use them as the means of threat during their detention in order to achieve the objective of NATO suspension of air strikes. Council came to this conclusion after finding that prior to the act of taking hostages, the accused warned UNPROFOR that the UN soldiers would be treated as enemies if NATO air strikes were executed, and made it clear that if NATO carried out air strikes, the UN forces would be attacked or at least detained. On 27 May 1995, the accused issued an order for the captured members of UN personnel and other international humanitarian organizations to be deployed at potential targets of air strikes. After having taken hostage, the accused publicly warned them not to resort to any military intervention to free the hostages, having said that
it would end in “catastrophe” and “bloodshed”. Consequently, the Council rejected the argument of the accused that the prosecution had failed to prove his mens rea for this crime, as well as his claim that although he agreed with the capture of members of the UN, he never thought nor even agreed that they should be exposed to threats.

The Council also notes that the accused made a significant contribution to the common goal for the members of the UN to be taken hostages to dissuade NATO from further air attacks. The accused was the main driver of the act of hostage-taking and active participant in the events in every respect. He was directly involved in the operation of taking UN hostages, as seen from his participation in the following: the formulation and implementation of the plan for taking hostages; statements formulated to attack and detain members of the UN; orders to others to capture members of the UN and take the place of military importance to ARS after the air strikes of NATO; in overseeing the operations of hostage-taking; receiving reports of hostages; and setting the conditions for the release of hostages.

Taking into consideration the JCE related to the hostages, the accused bears individual criminal responsibility under Article 7 (1) of the Statute for the crime of taking hostages, on Count 11 of the indictment.

4. The joint criminal enterprise for Srebrenica

Finally, the Council will consider a part of the case relating to Srebrenica.

As the Council had previously concluded in early October 1991 there was a common design for Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats to be permanently removed from the area which was allegedly the Bosnian Serb’s territory. In early 1993, after a series of Bosnian Serb attack on nearby villages, among which there were Cerska and Konjevic Polje, the population of Bosnian Muslims fled to Srebrenica, which was on April 16, 1993 declared a safe area.

In March 1995, the defendant issued Directive no. 7, ordering the Drina Corps to “create the conditions of total insecurity, intolerance and the loss of perspective of further survival or life for the inhabitants of Srebrenica”. After the issuance of Directive 7, restrictions in relation to humanitarian aid convoys and supply for UNPROFOR were intensified, which led to catastrophic conditions in the Srebrenica enclave.
On 2 July, a few days after visiting of the Drina Corps by the accused, the Commander Zivanovic issued an order of active combat operations in order to reduce the enclaves of Srebrenica and Zepa to their urban areas. Bosnian Serb forces progressed slowly after the start of active combat operations on July 6, but Mladic arrived in Bratunac on July 8 and the next day the accused was informed that favorable conditions for the extension of the attack on Srebrenica were created. The defendant approved that and ordered the takeover of Srebrenica. At the end of the day on July 11, the city fell into the hands of Bosnian Serbs. The Bosnian Serbs called for all those who remained in the city to leave their homes. Mladic turned to television cameras and said: “And finally, the time has come to [...] revenge upon the Turks here.”

Bosnian Muslim population had already earlier in the day fled because of the bombing of the city. The vast majority of able-bodied men formed a column and left the enclave in an attempt to reach Tuzla, while women, children and elderly men went to the north, in the UN base in Potocari. During the flight, the group which was headed for the UN base was shelled. The humanitarian situation in Potocari was also disastrous. In the night between 12 and 13 July, the Bosnian Muslims who had gathered in Potocari heard gunshots nearby; some of them had seen members of the Bosnian Serb forces beating and sexually abusing Bosnian Muslims, while some Bosnian Muslims were taken by members of the Bosnian Serb forces and those people never came back. All these circumstances taken together worsened fear and panic that pervaded the atmosphere in Potocari.

That evening and the next morning, Mladic called members of UNPROFOR and representatives of the Bosnian Muslim population in Potocari to attend three meetings at the Hotel Fontana in Bratunac in order to discuss their fate. During one of these meetings, Mladic told the Bosnian Muslim representative that he wanted to get a “clear position [...] whether you want to survive, stay or disappear [...] The fate of your people, not only in this area is in your hands “. However, during the night, Mladic, Zivanovic and deputy commander of the Drina Corps Radislav Krstic mobilized the huge number of buses to arrive the next day in Bratunac. On the third and last meeting which was held at the Hotel Fontana the following morning, Mladic gave the impression that he would respect the wishes of the representatives of Bosnian Muslims, but he hinted that they had no choice but to go if they wanted to survive. He also stated that the Bosnian Muslim men between the ages of 15 and 70 go through the verification process.

Ahead of the meeting, the chief of security of the Drina Corps, Vujadin Popovic said to the Security Chief of the Bratunac Brigade Momir Nikolic that
the Bosnian Muslim women and children who had been gathered in Potocari would be transported, while the able-bodied men would be separated. Popovic told Nikolic that “all of Bali should be killed”. The defendant challenged the credibility of Momir Nikolic in a whole, and specifically in relation to this conversation. However, as explained in detail in the written judgment, the Chamber considers that the testimony of Momir Nikolic in this respect is reliable and accepts his testimony about the conversation.

From noon on July 12 to 8.00 pm on July 13, approximately 30,000 Bosnian Muslim women, children and elderly were transported by buses from Potocari to the territory under Muslim control. Taking into account Mladic’s statements at the meetings at the Hotel Fontana, Chamber finds out that the sum of circumstances due to the imposition of restrictions on humanitarian aid in accordance with the Directive 7, the attack on Srebrenica, as well as the atmosphere in Potocari created an environment of coercion that Bosnian Muslims had no other realistic alternative than to leave the enclave. In contrast to the defendant’s statement that the departure of Bosnian Muslims from Potocari represented a genuine choice of this population, the Chamber finds that the Bosnian Muslim population was forced to leave.

On the basis of the overall evidence, particularly taking into consideration the requisition of huge number of buses that took place while the Bosnian Serb forces consolidated their control over the Bosnian Muslims gathered in Potocari, the Panel concludes that when Srebrenica fell, long-term strategy to eliminate the Bosnian Muslims in Srebrenica began to be transformed into the concrete joint plan to eliminate them. The operation of the elimination took the form of forcible transfer of Bosnian Muslim population. The Council does not doubt that Mladic’s appearance at the meetings at the Hotel Fontana was a mere cover with the intent to conceal the fact that there was already a concrete plan regarding Srebrenica to forcibly remove the Bosnian Muslim women, children and elderly by vehicles that have previously been requisitioned. Taking into account the overall effect of the creation of an environment and the final taking over Potocari by Bosnian Serb forces, as well as the operation of huge proportions with the buses, the Council found out that Mladic, Zivanovic, Krstic, Popovic and Kosorić shared a common objective to eliminate the Bosnian Muslims in Srebrenica by forcible removal of women, children and elderly Bosnian Muslims.

After the first convoy left Potocari, Bosnian Serb forces began to separate the men and boys, Bosnian Muslims, who were approaching vehicles, forcing them to leave their families and their personal belongings and
documents, and conducted them into a building known as the White house, which was located on the other side of the road. The separation continued to happen all day on 12 and 13 July. When the house was filled and when it was full of Bosnian Muslims, there appeared buses to take them away to Bratunac, where they were detained around the city in the same overcrowded conditions. Meanwhile, Bosnian Serb forces began to receive information about the column of Bosnian Muslim men who were trying to get to Tuzla, and they started to take steps to stay in their way by making ambushes or by shelling. After intense attacks and pursuing the column, on 13 July, Bosnian Serb forces detained between 1,500 and 2,000 Bosnian Muslim men who surrendered or were captured and held them at a crossroads near Konjevic Polje, in a meadow in Sandici and the football stadium in Nova Kasaba. During the afternoon and evening the detainees were removed from those sites and taken to the Kravica warehouse or by trucks and buses to Bratunac. Beginning late in the afternoon and during the night Bosnian Serb forces killed between 755 and 1,016 Bosnian Muslim men at the Kravica warehouse.

That evening, Miroslav Deronjic, who was appointed civilian commissioner for the Serbian municipality of Srebrenica by the accused two days earlier, complained to the Chief of Security of the Main Staff Ljubisa Beara because of the presence of buses full of prisoners which were parked all over Bratunac, which caused concern among the population of Bratunac. Around 8 o’clock at night, Deronjic spoke to the accused, who asked him, “how many thousands?” Deronjic said, “about two for now [...] but there would be more during the night.” Then, he told Deronjic that “all goods must be placed in warehouses before twelve o’clock the next day [...] not in the warehouses there, but somewhere else.”

Starting from that evening, and in accordance to Mladic’s orders, thousands of Bosnian Muslim men, were transported by bus from Bratunac to Zvornik, where they were shortly held in schools in Orahovac, Rocevic and Kula and the Pilica Cultural Centre. Over the next few days, they were taken to these detention at nearby locations throughout the municipality of Zvornik field in Orahovac, the Petkovci dam, bank of the Drina near Kozluk and Branjevo Military Farm. There, they were executed by the members of the Bosnian Serb forces. Even before the mass murder in Zvornik, which began on 12 July, Bosnian Serb forces executed Bosnian Muslim men in Potocari, on the meadow in Sandici at school in Luke near Tisca, on the bank of the Jadar River, as well as in front of the school “Vuk Karadzic” in Bratunac. In the days that followed after the end of the killing operation in Zvornik, Bosnian Serb forces continued to kill Bosnian Muslim men who were captured, which
could be seen from the example of the murder of Bosnian Muslim men in Snagov, Bisina and Trnovo. The evidence presented in this case showed that at least 5,115 Bosnian Muslim men were killed in connection with the events of the Annex to the charges, the accused was blamed for. However, the Trial Chamber could not determine, beyond reasonable doubt, that the incident referred to the Annex E.2 took place as it was stated in the indictment.

The Trial Chamber satisfied itself that these killings were carried out in a systematic manner and on the basis of a well-organized plan. To reach this conclusion, the Trial Chamber has taken into consideration that the Bosnian Serb forces began to receive detailed intelligence service information regarding the presence of Bosnian Muslim men, among people in Potocari on the night of July 11, and that, approximately at the same time, they began to receive reports about the existence and movement of the column of men and boys of Bosnian Muslims, who were trying to reach Tuzla. Furthermore, prior to the third meeting at the Hotel “Fontana”, which was held on July 12 at 10 a.m., Popovic told Momir Nikolic that all Bali should be killed. The Trial Chamber found out that the plan was that all able-bodied men and boys of Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica should be killed, had already been determined at the time when he started the third meeting at the Hotel Fontana. The defendant claimed that the plan to kill the Bosnian Muslim men who were captured by Bosnian Serb forces did not exist until at least the killing that was carried out in the Kravica warehouse on the afternoon of 13 July. However, the Trial Chamber considers that this incident marks the beginning of the implementation of a plan to commit mass murder.

This insidious operation in the field was supervised and carried out by a large number of ARS officers, at all levels of command, from the General Staff to the members of the battalion who were part of the Zvornik and Bratunac Brigade. The Trial Chamber specifically draws attention to the fact that the officers of the General Staff of the Drina Corps and the Zvornik Brigade who were in charge of security- i.e. Beara, Popovic and Drago Nikolic – were constantly present at the locations in the Zvornik municipality, where between 14 and 17 July 1995 the killing was carried out. The Trial Chamber further notes that this complex operation of killing would not be possible without the authority and orders of the Commander of the ARS, Ratko Mladic. Accordingly, the Trial Chamber finds that Mladic, Beara and Popovic shared expanded mutual goal for Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica to be eliminated in a way for men and boys to be killed. Therefore, they had intention through killing, to commit murder, extermination and persecution.
Furthermore, the Trial Chamber notes that Bosnian Serb forces vigorously persecuted members of the column, and they were very persistent in implementing the intent to kill all Bosnian Muslim men who were captured, regardless of whether they were combatants or civilians, and regardless of whether they were captured or surrendered after leaving the column. The Trial Chamber considers that this, combined with the way the murder was committed, as well as the systematic and well-organized nature of this killing, displays a clear intention for all able-bodied Muslim men from Srebrenica to be killed. The killing of all able-bodied men of a certain group of people has resulted in serious implications in terms of opportunities to create offspring, which can lead to the extinction of the group, the Trial Chamber finds that the only reasonable inference to be drawn from that is that members of the Bosnian Serb forces who organized and coordinated this operation had intended to destroy the Bosnian Muslims of Srebrenica as such.

In conclusion, taking in consideration the constant presence and involvement of Beara and Popovic to locations where they performed mass killings in the Zvornik municipality, their numerous actions which have contributed to the achievement of the murder operation, and the fact that this large-scale operation was conducted by the substantive participation of Mladic, the Trial Chamber found out that members of the JCE related to Srebrenica who have agreed to extend the measure by including the killing of men and boys, Mladic, Beara and Popovic had intended all able-bodied Bosnian Muslim men to be killed, and that intent in such circumstances was equal to intention of destroying Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica.

The Chamber now turns to the responsibility of the accused for the crimes he was found to have been committed in the part of the case relating to Srebrenica. The accused admits that he approved of the original plan to reduce the Srebrenica enclave and then to take the undefended town of Srebrenica, but claims that the execution of Bosnian Muslim prisoners was never discussed in the plan. The defendant expressly stated that he was never informed of those killings.

The Trial Chamber found that at the time of issuance of Directive 7 in March 1995, the accused and Mladic created a long-term plan that was aimed at the Bosnian Muslims at the end of forcibly removal from Srebrenica, and considered that the fact that defendant had established the structure of the Bosnian Serbs in Srebrenica, showed intention of permanent and forcible removal of Bosnian Muslim population from the city. In conclusion, the Trial Chamber notes that during the operations around Srebrenica, the accused
received information through various channels, including contacts with senior officers of the ARS, i.e. Gvero, Tolimir, as well as with Zivanovic on July 11 at night and Mladic in the afternoon of 13 July. The accused also twice met with Tomislav Kovac from the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Srpska, who stayed on 13 July and 14 July in the area of Bratunac and Srebrenica. The accused also received regular written reports from many people from the Bosnian Serb forces, including the daily combat reports of the ARS, on the basis of which it was obvious that the Bosnian Serb forces noticed a relatively small number of able-bodied Bosnian Muslim men in Potocari, and the actions that Bosnian Serb forces were taken in the context of the pursuit of the column were also described.

As mentioned earlier, around 8 o’clock in the evening on July 13, the charged was with Deronjic, who as a civilian commissioner for Srebrenica was directly responsible to him, and they spoke about the fate of thousands of captured Bosnian Muslim men who were at that time held in Bratunac. Despite the fact that during that conversation, the killing of detainees was not explicitly mentioned, and the accused and Deronjic spoke in code, calling the prisoners “goods” which must be placed in warehouses before twelve o’clock the next day. Moreover, the Trial Chamber recalls that immediately after the conversation, Beara and Deronjic discussed where the prisoners should be killed rather than whether that should be done. Therefore, it was clear at that moment that the decision had been already made to kill the prisoners, and Deronjic invoked the authority of the accused to convince Beara to accept their transfer to Zvornik. The Trial Chamber finds out that this dialogue, together with the subsequent actions of the defendant, beyond a reasonable doubt, shows the consent of the accused for the objective to be expanded thus including the killing of Bosnian Muslim men. As the President of the Republic of Srpska and Supreme Commander of the ARS, the accused was the only person in the Republic of Srpska, who had the power to intervene in order to prevent Bosnian Muslim men to be killed. And yet, the accused not only failed to intervene to prevent mass executions, but he personally ordered detained Bosnian Muslim men at that time to be held in Bratunac or to be transferred to other places to be killed. They were eventually taken to Zvornik and killed.

Having been fully aware of the murder operation that was under way, the accused on July 14 declared a state of war in the municipality of Srebrenica-Skelani, which in practice allowed the armed forces, deployed in the area of responsibility of the Drina Corps, to use all human and material resources while not having to adhere to the complicated rules of procedure, which facilitated the implementation of the killing operation. Based on the overall
evidence, the Trial Chamber concluded that the accused shared the common extended goal which related to Bosnian Muslim men from Srebrenica to be killed, and that he had contributed significantly.

The Trial Chamber will now consider whether the accused had participated in a joint criminal enterprise in Srebrenica with the intention to destroy Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica.

The Trial Chamber found out, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the accused knew that thousands of captured Bosnian Muslim men, having been imprisoned by Bosnian Serb forces in Srebrenica area, made a very significant percentage of Bosnian Muslim men from Srebrenica. Although he had regularly updated information on the progress of the operation, the accused agreed with the part of the plan related to the elimination of prisoners between the evening of 13 July and 17 July, and therefore did not intervene to stop or prevent their killing. Instead, he ordered the prisoners to be transferred to Zvornik, where they were then killed. Moreover, when Pandurevic on 16 July reported that he opened a corridor to allow the passage of members of the columns who had not yet been captured nor surrendered, Karišik was immediately sent to investigate a corridor which was closed within one day. Finally, the Trial Chamber recalls that the accused communicated with the international press and praised the opening of the corridor, but that at the Bosnian Serb Assembly session closed to the public, which was held a few weeks later, he expressed regret that the Bosnian Muslim men managed to pass through the lines of Bosnian Serbs. Accordingly, the Trial Chamber considers that the only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn from such evidence is that the accused Mladic, Beara and Popovic shared the intent for all able-bodied Bosnian Muslim men from Srebrenica to be killed, which was, in the opinion of the Trial Chamber, equal to the intention of destruction of Bosnian Muslims from Srebrenica.

However, the Trial Chamber finds that it can only be concluded that the accused agreed to the extended common purpose at the time of his conversation with Deronjic, on July 13, at 8 p.m. Therefore, he cannot, on the basis of their participation in the JCE related to Srebrenica, be responsible for the killing and associated acts of persecution that took place prior to that point in time. As for the killings that took place before his conversation with Deronjic in the evening of 13 July, the Council considered that the accused had known or had reason to know that his subordinates, after the fall of the Srebrenica enclave, had committed crimes and that he failed, as a supreme commander, to perform his duty and take necessary and reasonable measures
to punish genocide, murder, extermination and murder as acts of persecution. He is, therefore, criminally responsible for such failures under Article 7 (3) of the Statute. However, as the Trial Chamber had already found the Accused responsible for genocide on the basis of participation in the JCE related to Srebrenica, the Council would not impose a conviction under Article 7 (3) of the Statute, in conjunction with the count 2 of the indictment.

PASSING THE SENTENCE

The Chamber now turns to sentencing. In determining the appropriate sentence to be imposed on the accused, the Trial Chamber took into account the special gravity of the crimes for which it was determined the accused was responsible for, as well as the significant contribution that he made to their commission. These works are among the most serious crimes in international criminal law and include extermination as a crime against humanity and genocide.

When it comes to mitigating circumstances, the defendant has presented evidence regarding the agreement to which he claims to have made with Richard Holbrooke in July 1996, by which he withdrew from public and party positions, as well as from public life, which meant that in return he would not be prosecuted before this Tribunal. The Trial Chamber considers the decision of the accused to withdraw from public and party positions, regardless of reasons for which it was made, as a mitigating circumstance. It also took into account other arguments of the accused, such as his expression of regret, his good behavior in the Detention Unit of the United Nations and his personal circumstances.

As far as the cumulative convictions, the Council considers that, in those cases where the incidents relating to the killing overlap, i.e. murder as a crime against humanity covered by extinction, and in connection with these incidents, the accused was not convicted under count 5 of the indictment. For all other identified incidents relating to killing, the Trial Chamber imposed a conviction for murder as a crime against humanity. This, however, does not affect the conviction for murder as a violation of the laws or customs of war under Article 3 of the Statute, which can be cumulatively passed along with a verdict of murder or extermination as a crime against humanity.

The Chamber now turns to the disposition. Mr. Karadzic, would you, please, stand up?
From the above-mentioned, briefly stated reasons, the Trial Chamber, having heard all the evidence presented by the prosecution and the defense, finding that you, Radovan Karadzic:

Are NOT guilty to Count 1: genocide.

While you are guilty on the following counts:
COUNT 2: genocide;
COUNT 3: persecution, as a crime against humanity;
COUNT 4: extermination, as a crime against humanity;
COUNT 5: Murder, as a crime against humanity;
COUNT 6: murder, as a violation of the laws or customs of war;
COUNT 7: Deportation, as a crime against humanity;
COUNT 8: inhumane acts- a forcible transfer, as a crime against humanity;
COUNT 9: spreading terror, as well as violations of the laws or customs of war;
COUNT 10: unlawful attacks on civilians, as well as violations of the laws or customs of war; and
COUNT 11: hostage-taking, as well as violations of the laws or customs of war.

The Trial Chamber sentences you, Radovan Karadzic, to a single forty-year term of imprisonment. Please be seated, Mr. Karadzic.

The accused has been in custody since 21 July 2008 and, in accordance to regulation 101 (C) of the Statute, the time he spent in custody would be taken into account in serving jail term.

In accordance to regulation 103 (C) of the Statute, the accused will remain in custody of the Tribunal pending the finalization of arrangements for his transfer to the State where sentence will be served.

Judge Howard Morrison Judge Melville Baird contribute their partly dissenting opinions.

The session ended.
CONCLUSION

During the trial against Radovan Karadzic before the Hague Tribunal, judges accurately described evidence suggesting that: “The accused was of vital importance in developing and promoting the ideology and policy of the SDP and the creation of parallel, state, military, police and political structures that were used to establish and maintain control over the territories over which Bosnian Serbs had allegedly legal right and to carry out the objective of an overall joint criminal enterprise. The accused has been central to defining the goals of the Bosnian Serb leadership, including the separation of Bosnian Muslims and Croats, occupation of territory by over which Bosnian Serbs had legal right and creation of a large ethnically-homogeneous state of Bosnian Serbs. The accused was the central figure in spreading propaganda against Bosnian Muslim and Bosnian Croat civilians, which made it possible to identify them as the historical enemies of the Serbs and to insist on the impossibility of the coexistence. The accused played the card of such historical perspective to be able to use the rhetoric in order to create fear and hatred of Bosnian Muslims and Croats. “

Offering a recipe on how to transform the reality created by Karadzic’s crimes, Hodzic states “that the completion of the trial against Karadzic represents the end of an era in which we sought the antidote to his evil exclusively in war crimes trials. This does not mean that we should stop the trials but that we should stop to expect that the criminal process would transform our society. Shifts of vast importance have been made during this era: “mountains” of evidence were collected, the countless facts about the crimes committed were established; many perpetrators suited for their crimes before the court, and the judiciary in Bosnia and Herzegovina began building the capacity to persecute criminals until they live and while there are people who can testify against them.

Among the Bosniacs, an unfounded expectations flourished during these two decades (often caused by reckless political manipulation) that trial could produce everything starting from collective catharsis among Serbs and/or Croats, through the authoritative history of the wars in the former Yugoslavia, to the abolition of the RS. These expectations have never been based on solid precedent nor they included a concrete “road map” that clearly demonstrated a causal link between the trial and the desired outcomes.

Inflamed by the influential opportunists in the media, and academic, religious and political circles, such expectations usually assumed a great
power—America, Europe, whoever—would finally realize the extent of injustice and suffering documented in some of the judgments of the Tribunal and do something to undo results of Karadzic’s genocidal enterprise. The creators of these myths, relying on cult of a victim as the perceived spine of the Bosniak identity, wasted our years which paralyzed meaningful conversation about the real truth of the causes, objectives and scale of crimes. What should we do next? In such a perverted discourse, trials before the Tribunal were viewed by many as a way to somehow regain the territory and constitutional framework which was lost in the war.

If we want to avoid a new armed conflict, this situation must be changed. This does not mean that we should embrace oblivion instead of justice, but it does mean that we should put an end to the dominance of the criminal proceedings as a cure for our sick society and the collective energy should be directed to other methods of degradation of Karadzic’s legacy. This really means that, instead of tapping in vicious circles about the trials in The Hague, we have to open a serious public debate on the final acceptance of the truth about the crimes and recovering for victims.

For the Republic of Srpska, the acceptance of the truth about the crimes and its public recognition is not just a matter of the moral imperative nor its obligations to its non-Serb citizens who were exposed to extermination and genocide by its military and police forces—it is a question of a political purpose. The alternatives are a continuation of the current destructive paralysis of society and/or a future renewal of armed conflict.

Between 2002 and April 2006, the Republic of Srpska, with strong “encouragement” from the international community, has made the first steps in this direction through public recognition of the crime in Srebrenica, which was imposed by the then President, Dragan Cavic. Until then, an unprecedented act public recognition of truth emerges from the report of the Commission for Srebrenica, whose work enabled and supported institutions of the RS. During these years RTRS regularly showed the reports of the agency SENSE from the trial in The Hague, while a serious effort to establish a truth commission at the state level with the full participation of representatives of the RS was made. Things were moving in a positive direction. But then, the political leadership of the Bosnian Serbs rejected the acceptance of the truth as a political method and turned to aggressive denial of the facts about crimes. RS President, Milorad Dodik personifies this shift—sometimes an uncompromised opponent of Slobodan Milosevic and Radovan Karadzic, the man who publicly spoke about the genocide in Srebrenica, has now been the most vocal denier of the
truth about the crimes who never misses a chance to humiliate the victims of some of the worst crimes and who justifies Karadzic’s methods. In such an atmosphere, most of the Bosnian Serb consider public Cavic’s recognition as a betrayal of Serbian national interests. The political leadership of the RS uses every opportunity to deny the right of non-Serb victims to public remembrance and celebration of starvation. These moves have enabled a big return of ideology which was created by Karadzic.

What are the steps of accepting the truth about the crimes and its public recognition that the Republic of Srpska could implement in order to distance itself from Karadzic’s method?

First, the public denial of the facts about crimes must stop immediately. Humiliating the victims of some of the worst crimes, such as genocide in Srebrenica, the massacre at the Markale market or at the Gate of Tuzla, in which Serbian politicians and media in the RS and Serbia are often involved, are nothing but incitement of hatred.

Another “front line” is the education system. The evidence about the crimes of the Serbian forces, their systematic and consequences for the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina must find their way into the history books in primary and secondary education in Serbia and RS. Textbooks must be free of inflammatory language directed against other nations that represent them as “eternal enemies” of the Serbian people. The curricula at law and political science faculties, which are among the most active foundries of extreme nationalism and revisionism, should be reformed to include the study of evidence of systematic crimes against non-Serbs, their patterns and consequences.

The potential effects of such a new approach to the authorities in the RS and Serbia could be transformative, not only in relation to the breakdown of Karadzic’s reality. The clear distancing from Karadzic’s method of implementation of the political goals which are now authoritatively documented and labeled as being criminal in the judgment of the Tribunal would be achieved.

And that would be only the beginning. In the long term, we would have a chance to build a stable, lasting peace, whatever constitutional arrangements are agreed on the basis of consensus, which will reflect the current political, economic and cultural developments, not rotten foundations built on Karadzic’s vision of relations within Bosnia and Herzegovina.
Karadzic Judgment of 24 March 2016 was, above all, the obligation of the international community (the International Criminal Court in The Hague for the former Yugoslavia is a UN court), which it performed the way it did. The essential question is: What do we have to do? In this long-term process with uncertain completion it is up to all of us to remain as one of the heroes of the novel “Songs of wild birds”, written by the academic Enes Karic, while in the bazaar; katil firmans are coming there and while the silk cords work, we are sitting on the sunny hill of Seher, planting, harvesting and selling cabbage out of which we live. No judgment will ever change our past, but to a large extent it can influence our future. Of course, if you learn the lesson and draw lessons. There are the upcoming years and centuries of work on ourselves for God and people are satisfied with our effort. Throughout his life, in this world, one must be daily hardworking, agile and serviceable to become economically, politically and culturally strong one day, which represents the best dam against the onslaught of all kinds of evil.
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CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN IN GORAZDE DURING THE SIEGE 1992-1995

Abstract

Children in war benefit from the general protection of international humanitarian law as civilians or combatants in any sort of conflict. Despite that fact, it is obvious that the Army of the Republic of Srpska during the war against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina 1992-1995, highly violated fundamental rights of children by depriving them of the right to life, education, of electricity, water and food supplies, having them wounded and their home destroyed.

The aggressor knew that by the commission of crimes against children a multifaceted crime was committed. In addition to the crimes against children, the crimes were committed against their parents, brothers, sisters, relatives, friends and everyone who had children and against those who could realize the gravity of such crimes.

By recently completed scientific and empirical research on crimes against children in Gorazde under the siege 1992-1995, the facts were established that the children in this area had been exposed to constant artillery and infantry actions from the surrounding hills, including sniping. The Resolution 824 of the Security Council of the UN issued on 6 May 1993 by which the so called status of the UN Safe Area of Srebrenica was extended to Gorazde, Sarajevo, Bihac, Tuzla and Zepa (Resolution 819 of 16 April 1993) did not change anything.

From firing the first missile onto the city (4 May 1992), there began to be committed the crimes of crimes i.e. the crimes against children in Gorazde under siege, which will be the study of this paper.

Keywords: children, Gorazde, aggression, safe zones, crimes, UN Resolutions
**Introduction**

While the events in the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina drew attention of the world public in the spring of 1992, the Yugoslav National Army (YNA) in cooperation with the activists of the Serbian Democratic Party (SDP) in Bosnia and Herzegovina occupied towns in eastern Bosnia.

The strategy of the YNA to put under control Pale, Rogatica, Visegrad, Rudo, Cajnice and Foca and to completely surround Gorazde, was almost entirely met with success until 2 May 1992, when the representatives of the SDP openly sought from Hadžo Efeđic, president of the Assembly of Gorazde, the entire municipality to be put under their political and military control, at the last meeting between the party leaders.

Although the Muslim population in the area of Gorazde was most dominant and despite the fact that in the 1990 elections, the representative of the Party of Democratic Action (SDA) was elected as the President to the Assembly of Gorazde; all those facts were not enough for aggressor to abandon its ideological intention, because it was an area of “strategic importance” for Greater Serbian politics. “The whole Podrinje (including Bijeljina, Zvornik, Bratunac, Srebrenica, Vlasenica, Rogatica, Visegrad, Rudo, Gorazde, Cajnice and Foca), with an absolute majority of Bosniak population, is the area of huge strategic importance for the Greater Serbian ideology, politics and practice of conquest and genocidal character”.

Representatives of the SDP in Gorazde were driven by the great-state project and in accordance with the recommendations of the political leadership of Serbia by the fact “that the area, 50 kilometers west of the Drina River, will all be Serbian, pure Serbian”, regarding the recommendations

---


2 The majority in Gorazde after the 1991 census were Muslims – Bosniaks; out of 37 573 inhabitants, there were 26.296 of Muslims (69, 98%), 9.843 of Serbs (26, 19%), 789 of Yugoslavs (2, 09%) and 80 of Croats (0, 21%). (The ethnic composition of the population - Results for the Republic by municipalities and settlements, Statistical Bulletin, no. 234, State Statistical Office of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, 1993, pp. 45-49.)

3 Cekic, Smail, *Genocide and the truth about the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law in Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2012, p. 46

4 One of the most important witness in the trial of Slobodan Milosevic was Miroslav Deronjic, a war criminal who pleaded guilty and agreed to cooperate. He, among others, testified about the arming of the Bosnian Serbs before the beginning of the aggression
of the “Assembly of Serbian people”⁵ in Bosnia and Herzegovina of 21 November 1991, and in accordance to the “strategic objectives of the Serbian people”⁶, they did everything while planning and preparing the ground for the occupation.

Although the preparations for capturing Gorazde began long before spring 1992⁷, the first grenade was fired at the town in the early hours of 4 May 1992, marking the start of a general strike, mass killing and wounding civilians, the civilian population, including the large number of children.

**Crimes against children in Gorazde**

In addition to the general protection the entire civilian population was put under, the children fall into the category of civilians who are entitled to special protection in all types of armed conflict, which is guaranteed by the

---

5 The highlight of the Greater policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina before the official start of the aggression was on 21 November 1991, when the self-proclaimed «Assembly of the Serbian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina» announced that all municipalities, local communities and settlements, where Serbs are the majority, become parts of «Serbian autonomous authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina». At this session of the Assembly, Momcilo Krajsnik says: «The Serbian people should not be - but it must ... be organized in state-legal terms into a single unit, in a common state ... The best way to express their interests and their will is through the Constitution». (More info on: Javnost, 26 October 1991, No. 54, p. 1.)

6 At the 16th session of the «Assembly of the Serbian people», held on 12 May 1992, during the session Radovan Karadzic has openly published the «six strategic objectives» of the Serbian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina. (More info on: Donia, Robert, From the Assembly of the Republic of Serbian 1991-1996, University Press, Sarajevo, Tuzla, 2012)

7 More info about the preparations for the occupation of Gorazde, the arming of the Serbian population of Gorazde and the surrounding municipalities, provocations of YNA, barricades, etc., in Cekic, Aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina: planning, preparation, execution (Volume I and II), Research Institute crimes against humanity and international law, University of Sarajevo, 2004; Bahto, Hamid, With defenders of Sarajevo and Gorazde, the Council of Congress of Bosniak Intellectuals, Sarajevo, 2008;
International humanitarian law. The General Assembly of the UN adopted the
Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989, which requires the State Parties
to take all measures to prevent children from taking direct part in hostilities\(^8\). 
Even the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the two Additional Protocols
of 1977 contain provisions that aim to ensure the protection of this vulnerable

group of the civilian population. The majority of more than 20 members who
are dealing only with the protection of children in armed conflict, being found
in the Geneva Conventions and the Additional Protocols, are in the IV Geneva
Convention, while the principle of special protection stems from Article 77 of
Additional Protocol I\(^9\) and Article 4 (paragraph 3) of the Additional Protocol
II.\(^{10}\)

During the period of 1992-1995, numerous violations of international
humanitarian law and crimes against children were committed. The aggressor’s
strategy of taking civilians and civilian population for the target, the children
were an everyday aim.

The aggressor violated continuously for almost four years the
fundamental rights of children thus having taken away their right to life, not
allowing them to be properly buried\(^{11}\) after having been killed, along with
the fact of difficult injuring, destroying their homes, denying the right to
education, food, water, electricity.

Apart from mass and individual murders, the children were injured,
while severe psychological consequences were inflicted upon them (which are
present even today); many of them were expelled, been a refugee in various
countries, after which their complete life environment was changed. Their fate
was shaped by the surrounding hills, and they were deprived of the right to
everything they should have been allowed to.

\(^8\) The Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 38, paragraph 2,
\(^9\) http://www.tuzilastvorz.org.rs/html_trz/PROPISI/zen_protokol_1_lat.pdf, (visited 15. 3.
2016).
\(^{11}\) The target of aggression artillery-infantry abuse were the areas where the funerals were
conducted. For example, after he was killed by sniper, Šubo (Mehmed) Adnan (1990 –
18 August 1992), the day after, at his funeral his uncle, Velic (Ali) Vejsil (1969), was
badly wounded who died due to the consequences of wounding on August 22, 1992.
The systematic killing of children

Generally, in any type of conflict, most severe form of the crime is the murder of a child.

According to the current results of scientific research there have been killed at least 121 and 430 of children were wounded in Gorazde during the siege of 1992-1995. Taking into account all the difficulties involving such research, it is clear that the final number of children having been killed, is difficult to be determined. Data on children being killed, were collected and based on directed interviews (which was done with a parent, next of kin or other witness to the event), from which you can see detailed information about the victim and the crime that was committed, and thus we checked and expanded knowledge from other sources.

The interview was conducted with witnesses of the event (usually next of kin) to most children and in the study it will be shown the structure of the various characteristics with regard to the circumstances of the killing of children in Gorazde during the siege.

Structure of children killed according to characteristic gender reveals that:

- 69 (57.025%) of children are male, and
- 52 (42.975%) of children are female.

The structure of the murdered children by age:

- 0-2 years ......................... 14 children (11.57%)
- 2-4 years ......................... 8 children (6.612%)
- 4-7 years ......................... 26 children (21.488%)

The survey was used to determine the identity and circumstances of the crime of 551 children who were killed and wounded in Gorazde under siege 1992-1995. The survey was conducted with the assistance of the Federal Ministry of Education and Science, as financiers of the research project: “Crimes against children in Gorazde under siege 1992-1995.” In the team for the realization of research participated dr. Rasim Muratovic, director of the Institute for Research of Crimes Against Humanity and international law, University of Sarajevo, as the head of research and Mr. Muamer Džananović, a senior associate at the Institute- as the researcher.

The only problem is not the fact that it is a research in which object events occurred twenty or more years ago, but the problem is that society does not recognize the importance of and need for such research. This and similar studies require long-term scientific research, adequate financial resources, including more staff, scientists and researchers.

---

12 The survey was used to determine the identity and circumstances of the crime of 551 children who were killed and wounded in Gorazde under siege 1992-1995. The survey was conducted with the assistance of the Federal Ministry of Education and Science, as financiers of the research project: “Crimes against children in Gorazde under siege 1992-1995.” In the team for the realization of research participated dr. Rasim Muratovic, director of the Institute for Research of Crimes Against Humanity and international law, University of Sarajevo, as the head of research and Mr. Muamer Džananović, a senior associate at the Institute- as the researcher.

13 The only problem is not the fact that it is a research in which object events occurred twenty or more years ago, but the problem is that society does not recognize the importance of and need for such research. This and similar studies require long-term scientific research, adequate financial resources, including more staff, scientists and researchers.
7-12 years ......................... 36 children (29.752%)
12-14 years ....................... 7 children (5.785%)
14-16 years ....................... 10 children (8.264%)
16-18 years ....................... 20 children (16.529%)

Of the total percentage of the children who were murdered, 39.6% of them were children of preschool age (0-7 years), while 60.3% of children were of school-age (7-18 years).

Structure of children killed by ethnicity:
Bosniaks ............................................ 119 (98.347 %)
Serbs ................................................... 1 (0.826%)
Albanians ............................................. 1 (0, 826%)

Structure of children killed by residence status:
Domicile......................................... 61 children (50.413%)
Expelled......................................... 52 children (42.975%)
Unknown......................................... 8 children (6.612%)

Children who were killed after the years of the crime:
1992 .................................................. 50 children (41.322%)
1993 .................................................. 36 children (29.752%)
1994 .................................................. 24 children (19.835%)
1995 .................................................. 11 children (9.091%)

The research demonstrated that most children were killed in the following months:
May 1992 ........................................... 9 children (7, 5%)
July 1992............................................ 6 children (5%)
August 1992................................. 10 children (8, 333%)
September 1992.......................... 12 children (10%)
June 1993 ......................................... 10 children (8, 333%)
April 1994........................................ 18 children (15%)
Murdered children at the **time of the day** in commission of the crime:
- **00-06**............................................ 2 children (1, 653%)
- **06-12**............................................ 29 children (24.967%)
- **12-6 p.m.**............................................. 57 children (47.107%)
- **6 p.m.-00**............................................ 9 children (7.438%)
- **Unknown**......................................24 children (19.835%)

Children who were killed after the **manner** of the crime:
- Shelling......................................... 86 children (71.074%)
- Sniper ........................................... 6 children (4.959%)
- Bullet.............................................. 8 children (6.612%)
- Mine............................................... 2 children (1.653%)
- Depriving of medical help ... 14 children (11.57%)
  (Lack of medicines)
- Others ................................................. 1 child (0, 826%)
- **Unknown** .......................................... 4 children (3.306%)

**The precise location** of the murder of children:
- Garden (of the house or an apartment) ....... 33 (27.273%)
- On the street ................................................ 27 (22.314%)
- In house/apartment ........................................ 18 (14.876%)
- In the hallway of the building ...................... 2 (1.653%)
- In the hospital .............................................13 (10.744%)
- During the evacuation ................................. 3 (2.479%)
- On the “way of salvation” ............................. 4 (3.306%)
- On the line ............................................. 3 (2.479%)
- In refuge ................................................... 9 (7.438%)
- On the lawn ............................................. 3 (2.479%)
- River ........................................................ 1 (0.826%)
- **Unknown** .............................................. 5 (4.132%)

Out of 60 children who were killed in the mass murder of civilians, in eight crimes by the shrapnel of the same shell two children were killed, while in seven crimes three children were killed. It is clear that 15 times during the
war, in the mass murder 37 children i.e. respectively 30.579% of the total percentage of the children were killed in the mass murder of children.

**Systematic wounding of children**

The aggressor’s strategy of taking civilians and civilian population for the target, children were one of the most important goals which we demonstrated in this paper. As they were killed in different locations, so they were wounded in the streets, at their homes, apartments, hospitals, in the queue for humanitarian help, while playing, as well as in many other occasions.

Very often at least one family member (often a brother or sister), or even the whole family suffered with the wounded child. This is demonstrated in the following examples:

- On 14 May 1992 Suljovic (Ibrahim) Saudin (1983) was badly wounded and the same grenade killed his sister Selvira (1976) and his friend, Čulov (Hamid) Mirsad (1976). Saudin’s father, Ibrahim was wounded by the same grenade. During the siege of Gorazde, Saudin’s mother, Suljovic (Muradif) Džehva (1946-1992) was killed by a sniper.

- On 5 July 1992, Sijerčić (Hajrudin) Edin (1981) was seriously wounded by a shell and the same grenade killed his twin brother Emir (1981) and friend Bajrami (Zurapi) Xharije (1982);

- On 13 August 1992 in the mass killing and wounding of civilians, the brothers Džebo (Edin) Amer (1990) and Damir (1986) were wounded. From the same grenade their father Edin (1960) and mother Belkisa (1961) were killed;

- On 31 January 1993, Lihić (Ahmed) Sanela (1976) was severely wounded, and in the mass murder of civilians and in wounding by the mine on the Kacelj, her sister Amela (1977) was killed;

- On 10 July 1993 in the mass killing and wounding of civilians Cagara (Salko) Admir (1984) was wounded in their own home, when his sister Senada (1977), mother and several other relatives were killed. In Visegrad in 1992, Admir’s father was killed, as well;

- On 9 November 1993 in a shell game, Karahodža (Ferid) Emira (1986) was seriously injured after which her leg was amputated. The same grenade
killed her sister Amira (1982) and Mirela (1984). During the aggression her father Ferid was killed;

- On 20 April 1994, Dizdarevic (Hajrudin) Emina (1985) was seriously wounded by a grenade, and as a result of the wounds she was left without an eye. In the crime, her brother Nermin (1987), mother, grandmother and her cousin, Silajdzic (Huso) Elma (1978) were killed, as well as Elma’s brother. Besides her brother and mother, her father was also killed in 1992.

On average, almost every other day in Gorazde during the siege, one child was wounded or killed, while according to the current results of scientific research 430 children were wounded in Gorazde. In this study, the structures across different characteristics for wounded children will be displayed:

The structure of the wounded children to the characteristic of gender reveals that:

294 (68.372%) of children were male,

135 (31.395%) of children were female,

1 (0.233%) child was of unknown gender.

The structure of the wounded children by age:

0-2 years ......................... 8 children (1.86%)

2-4 years ......................... 17 children (3.953%)

4-7 years ......................... 35 children (8.14%)

7-12 years ....................... 113 children (26.279%)

12-14 years ..................... 65 children (15.116%)

14-16 years ..................... 69 children (16.047%)

16-18 years ..................... 122 children (28.372%)

Of the total percentage of children who were killed, 15% of them were preschool-age children (0-7 years), and 85% of them were school-age children (7-18 years).
Wounded children according to the years of the commission of the crime:

1992.................................................. 178 children (41.395%)
1993.................................................. 118 children (27.442%)
1994.................................................. 81 children (18.835%)
1995.................................................. 53 children (12.326%)

The research demonstrated that most children were wounded in the following months:

June 1992 .......................................... 22 children (5, 14%)
July 1992 ........................................... 28 children (6, 542%)
August 1992........................................ 34 children (7, 944%)
September 1992................................. 35 children (8, 178%)
June 1993 .......................................... 30 children (7, 009%)
April 1994......................................... 43 children (10, 047 %)
July 1995 .......................................... 23 children (5, 374%)

Wounded children according to the manner of the crime:

Shelling ........................................... 276 children (64.186%)
Sniper ............................................. 12 children (2.791%)
Bullet............................................... 78 children (18, 14%)
Mine ................................................. 9 children (2.093%)
Bomb ............................................... 2 children (0.465%)
Self-inflicted................................. 8 children (1.86%)
Unknown...................................... 45 children (10,465 %)
Severe forms of violation of mental integrity of children

Imposing extremely harsh living conditions in the siege, with clear and precise intention of complete or partial destruction of a protected group (as we tried to show in this paper), the children were at the same time starved, fell ill and died from the cold or a variety of diseases, due to insufficient supplies of medicines, food. They were deprived of the quality of schooling and education, sports and recreational purposes, their childhood was stopped.

Ramo Arnautovic in his work “Children in the whirlwind of war” puts into the second place within three categories of the suffering of children in war, so-called, war orphans, i.e. children who lost one or both parents at war. “The war orphans who survived the war torture constitute a separate group of children, with some common traits acquired by warfare. They mostly suffered so much pain. They were scared by torture or exhausted by the lack of sleep. They were exhausted by starvation and filled with deep sorrow.” “In Gorazde, there is a large number of children whose father or mother were killed during the aggression killed, but there is a significant number of children whose both parents were killed. Violent separation of children from their parents is a cause of severe mental trauma. “Separation of the child, especially from her/his mother represents the cause of deep psychological conflict between the child and the environment.”

Certainly, the killing of a close person, relatives, was one of the crimes that was carried out against children. Very often in this research, we talked to the brother or sister of the child who was killed. They coped with the talk about the crime quite hard and they generally indicated another empirical

14 “The term of psychological integrity is defined as a state of mental well-being that is reflected in the psychophysical unity of the personality while the term mental disintegration was defined as a condition of deteriorated mental integrity. Mentally disintegration, in medicine known as mental morbidity, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, called the mental violation (IHL). Specifically, under Article 2 of the Convention it was reliably established that acts of genocide “by themselves include mental elements”. (Cekic, Smail, Šestanović, Muhamed, Karović, Merisa and Mastalić-Kosuta, Zilha, Crimes against children in the besieged Sarajevo, Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law in Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2010, p. 132)

15 Ramo Arnautovic, Children in the whirlwind of war, the Institute of Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law in Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2000, p. 31

16 Ibid. p.174

17 Muhamed Šestanović, Crimes against mental integrity of children, the Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law in Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2000, p. 175
source or they did not even want to talk about it all, which was one of the serious problems in the realization of research.

Many authors point out that psychological trauma, especially in children, can be life-long or even transgenerational i.e. not only the victim can suffer the psychological trauma until the rest of his/her life, but the consequences can be transferred to the offspring of the victims. Severe forms of violation of mental integrity of children in Bosnia and Herzegovina was increased by 350 times. “Per thousands of children, before the war, one child suffered from heavy mental disintegration one child; during the first year of the war the number increased to hundred and thirty, and after the war, to three hundred and fifty children. War brutality, recorded in the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, caused an increase in psychological morbidity of children by around three hundred and fifty times. The absolute trend of the increase in psychological morbidity was present in the first year of the war. The trend of increasing the number of children with ‘severe’ mental health history continued after the war, but not in such a degree. “

Many children, during the siege were deported, forcibly expelled and escaped and they were forced to adapt to a new system of values and other behavior, which is in some ways worse their psychological state. Also, many parents arbitrarily displaced their children in order to ensure them a biological survival. In one or another case a lot of children were integrated and mostly assimilated into a local society and gradually lost their connection with their country.

Conclusion

Although the total number of those killed, injured and forcibly displaced, and the victims of other forms of crimes against humanity and international law in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not yet been scientifically established, that number is obviously enormous, while the material destruction was also large.

Due to the desire for an ethnically pure Serbian state, the aggression on Bosnia and Herzegovina has caused very serious demographic consequences that are or will be felt in the future. When looking at the 1991 census, it is clear that the demographic structure of the population was violently changed especially in places where the majority population were Bosniaks who suffered the greatest loss, including the greatest number of those who were killed, injured, displaced.

18 Ibid. pp. 116-117.
In eastern Bosnia, demographic changes are best seen. The third strategic goal of the Serbian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina was almost accomplished. The majority Bosniak population was killed or expelled, and the reality is such that those who wish to return to their homes do so at their own risk, and they are every day exposed, directly or indirectly, to violence and harassment, without sufficient guarantees of safety.

Siege warfare and indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force is the characteristics of the aggressor’s attempts to take over Gorazde. From April 1992 until the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement, the aggressor took almost all Podrinje. Part of the Bosniak population stayed in several enclaves which were in 1993 and 1995 occupied, except for Gorazde.

UN Security Council resolutions did not help the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Gorazde, Sarajevo, Bihac, Tuzla, especially the Srebrenica and Zepa, were not helped by so-called “safe UN areas”. One piece of evidence that supports the fact that the status of the safe-zone represented nothing to the residents of Gorazde was that on 6 May 1993, when Gorazde was declared a safe zone of the UN, at least 57 people were killed and 226 children were wounded. After obtaining the status of the safe zone of the UN, from 6 May 1993 until the end of aggression, at least 64 people were killed while at least 204 children were wounded. Consequently, most children have been killed under the so-called status of “the safe zone of the UN”.

The siege of Gorazde was developed in the high military circles of YNA and in full cooperation with the SDP. According to Mladic’s command that “Turks must disappear from this area,” he said during the course of action entitled “Star 94” of the ARS on Gorazde in April 1994. All forms of crimes against the civilian population, especially against children were expressed in the most brutal way.

The population of Gorazde was completely surrounded, without adequate assistance, and in a constant struggle for biological survival. The aggressor intentionally exhausted population so that it was left without electricity, water, food, basic medicines, adequate treatment, which should have accelerated biological extermination of the dominant ethnic group in this area.

By the excessive campaign of shelling of civilian areas and facilities, the aggressor has deliberately changed the environment in which civilians lived. A favorite target of the aggressor artillery was the hospital in Gorazde.
which was reported by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, a special rapporteur of the UN, but the UN Security Council did not do anything to stop such aggression campaign. Radovan Karadzic also knew before the end of the aggression that they were “beating around the hospital,” as he called artillery-sadistic abuse in this area.

During the siege thousands of people, including hundreds of children were killed in various ways; they were physically and mentally wounded and died in different circumstances. The dimension of the crime of murder and wounding with the emphasis on crimes against children committed in the area of Gorazde under siege of 1992–1995, were partly determined by this study.

From a review of children who were killed in Gorazde during the siege on the basis of the observed characteristics and conditions of committed crimes, it can be concluded the following:

- 57% of children who were killed are male;
- Children of all ages were killed almost equally, on the basis of which 60.3% were school children (7-18 years old);
- The children of Bosniak nationality were killed predominantly (98.3%);
- Thesis that the large number of displaced people by force from Podrinje municipalities tried to find salvation in Gorazde, is being confirmed since it is seen that there was almost equal percentage of indigenous children who were killed to children with the exiled residence status;
- According to the age of the commission of the crime, the highest percentage occupy children killed in 1992 (41.3%) while regarding “months” the highest percentage of children were killed during the aggressor’s offensive “Star 94”, in which on 23 April 1994, 15% of the total percentage of children was killed during the siege;
- The highest percentage of children was killed between 12 a.m. and 6 p.m. (47.1%) when the aggressor clearly saw his goal;
- By the manner of the crime, the highest percentage of children was killed by shelling (71%);
- The highest percentage of children was killed in the yards of their residential buildings (27.2%);
During the mass murder of children, 30.8% of the total percentage children was killed.

From a review of the wounded children in Gorazde during the siege and on the basis of the observed characteristics and conditions of committed crimes, the following can be concluded:

- The injured children were dominantly male (68.3%);
- The highest percentage of children, according to the year when the crime was carried out, was wounded in 1992 (41.3%);
- The highest percentage of children, according to the months when the crime was carried out, was wounded in April 1994 (10%);
- According to the manner of commission of the crime most children were wounded by shelling i.e. 64.1% of children.

From the above-mentioned facts, it is clear that the aggressor in Gorazde during the siege committed the crime of genocide and other forms of crimes against humanity and international law and against children by killing, wounding them and breaking their childhood, leaving them with serious physical and mental disorders and circumstances they will not be able to get out of them ever in their life. By indiscriminate shelling, the aggressor killed and injured civilians and the civilian population, and among them, as can be seen from this work, a large number of children, intentionally, in order to exterminate Bosniaks as the national, ethnical and religious group.
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