Original scientific article
UDC: 614:343.81/.82(497.11)"18"
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7556948

Miroslav M. Popović
Department of History, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade
Čika Ljubina 18-20, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
E-mail: miroslav.popovic@f.bg.ac.rs

HYGIENIC AND SANITARY CONDITIONS IN THE PRISONS OF THE PRINCIPALITY AND KINGDOM OF SERBIA: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Abstract: The aim of the paper is to briefly present the hygienic and sanitary conditions of life of prisoners in the prison institutions of the Principality and Kingdom of Serbia, based on preserved testimonies of prisoners, as well as literature and sources related to the Belgrade County Court, the Požarevac Penitentiary, and some other prison facilities in different periods of the 19th century, paying attention to both male and female prisoners. In this way, in the form of an overview, the work is an attempt to present how Serbian state dealt with the question of sanitary conditions and modernization in Serbian prison institutions during the previously mentioned period, with an introductory section, which refers to the institution of prisons in Europe in the 19th century, for a wider context.

Keywords MeSH: prisons, Principality of Serbia, Kingdom of Serbia

Non MeSH: hygienic conditions, sanitary conditions

Institution of prisons in Europe and Serbia in the 19th century

An attempt to define the problem of development of modern prison institutions, from a theoretical point of view, was given by Michel Foucault (1926–1984), who saw the birth of the prison as a product of a certain degree of rationalization and "normalization" of the French society in the early nineteenth century: "The prison should not be seen as an inert institution, shaken at intervals by reform movements. The 'theory of the prison' was its constant set of operational instructions rather than its incidental criticism - one of its conditions of functioning. The prison has always formed part of an active field in which projects, improvements, experiments, theoretical statements, personal evidence and investigations have proliferated. The prison institution has always been a focus of concern and debate. Is the prison still, then, a dark, abandoned region? Is the fact that one has ceased to say so for almost 200 years sufficient proof that it is not? In becoming a legal punishment, it weighted the old juridical-po-

litical question of the right to punish with all the problems, all the agitations that have surrounded the corrective technologies of the individual." [1 p235]

Patricia O'Brien (1945), writing about prisons on the continent Europe 1865–1965, quotes Léon Faucher, French reformer who tried to redesign French prison system in the mid nineteenth-century, as a reflection of the progress of his society: "The penal institutions of a people should be, like all laws, the expression of its social state." [2 p199] According to O'Brien, the history of prison institutions in Europe, from the mid-19th to the mid-20th centuries, can be seen as a continuity of changes that reflect cultural, economic, political and social transformation of modern European states, where there was a constant pressure to find ways to define more enlightened, humane, but adequate punishment for committed crime. The prison became central focus of reform efforts that can be seen through various and numerous prison reform movements existing during this period. As O'Brien says:

> "Each European nation formed and maintained its own prison system. In spite of distinct, national institutions, however, the prison systems that developed throughout Europe in the nineteenth century were remarkably similar, reflecting a commonly held penal philosophy. Shared ideas about how to create prisons that were secure, sanitary, and rehabilitative produced similar prison populations, architecture, work systems, and inmate subcultures." [2 p199]

Norbert Finzsch (1951) confronts several views on the development of the 19th century penology and confinement as a means of punishment, especially in Germany. According to Eberhard Schmidt (1891–1977), the new penology in Germany was a product of religious traditions, emphasizing that "the idea of modern punishment by confinement emerged from religious reform in connection with a change in the perception of poverty". Robert Roth (1952) stated, according to Finzsch, "the prison was at the end and not at the beginning of development of practices with which the *Ancien Régime* had experimented a long time before 1789", because theoretical foundation of a new penology was fully developed during the Enlightenment. Pieter Spierenburg (1948–2019) insisted on the *longue durée* when he wrote about the history of confinement, making an assumption that the houses of correction around 1600 preceded the prison as an institution. There is also a group of historians that acknowledge that first punishment reform attempts can be seen in the early modern times, but also insist that for the realization of such ideas Enlightenment was of the most importance. Finzsch stated that Michelle Perrot (1928), in her critique of Foucault, "made clear that the efficiency of the reforms in the sixteenth as well as in the nineteenth century cannot be rated low enough". Numerous studies on the different European systems can give us a picture of the importance of national and regional differences in historical understanding of prison institutions. Gordon Wright (1912–2000) thought that during the French Revolution a fundamental conceptual shift has been made, when imprisonment on remand and imprisonment as a form of punishment were introduced. [3 p215–19]

According to Vladimir Jovanović (1966), prison institutions are a clear expression of the state's need to control the individual. Physical labor in state institutions, as a type of punishment, was present in Europe during the 19th century, and was also ac-

cepted in the new Serbian state, in the form of imprisonment, which was used to punish serious crimes. Since Turkish times, convicts have been thrown into dungeons, and during the First Serbian Uprising, the Nebojša tower in the lower town of Belgrade Fortress was the place of imprisonment. The first places for detention were created near the police headquarters, without a specific order. Prisoners stayed in towers, basements or auxiliary buildings of police headquarters. One of the first improvised detention facilities was the basement in the building of Prince Miloš's (ruled 1815–1839, 1858–1860) palace in Kragujevac. In the villages, prisoners were placed in inappropriate places, lagums, cellars or *obor*, as the first local prisons were called. In the mid-1830s, the idea of rooms for imprisoning women, which were supposed to be similar to a *burdelj*, was mentioned. *Burdelj* was a room dug into the ground similar to a dugout or cellar. The place for the arrestees was called *apsana* or *aps*. There were also detentions at the county courts. The first prison in the Principality of Serbia, built according to plan, was the *Arrestees' Workplace* in Topčider, founded in 1851. [4 p685–90]

In general, the hygiene habits and customs of the Balkans were, by European standards, primitive. The nineteenth century did bring a new perspective on personal hygiene and daily needs. The human body became the object of state intervention and attention, and Serbian police power had two elements: security police and medical police. At the beginning of the twentieth century, citizens became disgusted with unpleasant smells and raised their voices against hygiene in the countryside. Insects, flies, fleas, lice or bed bugs also caused discomfort. A special problem was the daily personal hygiene of people, which was left up to the individual. The majority of doctors in Serbia believed that the people were careless towards their bodies. The 19th century brought different sanitary needs in Europe, night pans and city cloacas, and well-organized private bathrooms and luxurious public bathrooms. Since the second half of the century, efficient sewage systems have been created. In the first decades of the twentieth century, there was a system of periodically emptied septic tanks in Belgrade, the latrine pits overflowed, and the stench of feces could be felt. [5 p359–84]

Hygiene and sanitation: examples from penitentiary practice

The institution that represented the connection between Prince Miloš and the Turkish administration was established under the name of the People's Office in Belgrade in 1815. At first it had limited jurisdiction in court affairs, and in 1826 it became a court of general jurisdiction, the Court of Belgrade, competent only for the city of Belgrade. From 1827, the judicial authority in other settlements of the Belgrade Nāhiye was transferred to the newly established Court of the Belgrade Nāhiye, based in the village of Rogača, only to be abolished in 1831, and its jurisdiction and cases were taken over by the Belgrade Court, which until 1841 was responsible for the city of Belgrade and the whole the territory of the Belgrade County. Since 1841, there has been a Court of the County of Belgrade, competent for the territory of the county without the city of Belgrade, and a Court of the Municipality of Belgrade, competent for the territory of the city. In the rented house of Ilija Milosavljević Kolarac "on the Market", i.e. on today's Student Square, the Belgrade County Court was located from 1830 to 1838.

During that time, the Court and the police shared the building, and the arrested were housed in the basement, while minor criminals and women were imprisoned in two rooms in the building. The accommodation in the basement was extremely unhealthy, due to dampness and overcrowding, and there are testimonies of sick and dead detainees. When the participants of the so-called Jovan's rebellion were situated there, there is evidence that the detention under the police building was deadly for the health of the detainees, due to the humidity. The newly built complex of the Belgrade Court was built in Savamala in 1838, and the detainees were kept in the basement and stables, the noise they created disturbed the work of the Court, and the basement space, due to humidity, harmed the health of the detainees. The work of the Court was also hindered by the stench of detainees coming from the basement. There was no heating in either the basement or the barn. The new *apsana* was built in 1841 for the needs of the Belgrade County Court and the Belgrade County Head Office. [6 p197–205]

The problem in all rooms designated for detention was the excessive number of detainees. [6 p217] The new prison, built in 1841, could roughly accommodate a hundred detainees, but their number was always significantly higher. Doctors believed that overcrowding was the main reason for illness and death. A particularly high mortality rate was recorded in 1845, and the county physician warned that in the coming winter, due to overcrowding, the death of prisoners would occur again, if their number was not reduced. Two years later, the doctor claimed that the cause of the disease was a large number of detainees housed in a small space. [7 p15–6]

The Tower of Gurgusovac, a building made of hard material in Gurgusovac (today Knjaževac), was the strictest prison in Serbia, intended for political criminals, for example, convicted for participating in the Katana Rebellion of 1844. From 1844, three to six female prisoners were housed there, who cooked food and did laundry for prisoners. In November 1844, a decision was made according to which women sentenced to prison were sent to Požarevac, with the aim of using their work for the needs of the military industry. The *Women's Detention Center* received its organization, as a legal act. It was located in the old military barracks in Požarevac, and the women stayed first in the northern part of the barracks, and then in the southeast, which was much more unhealthy. They slept on boards slightly raised from the floor, in scanty bedding, and in 1851 the district doctor suggested that female prisoners should be given straw bags and one or two blankets to cover themselves. Kosta Magazinović, the head of the Military Department in Požarevac, during an inspection in 1851, found that the premises where the female inmates stayed were full of garbage and dirt, the supervisor kept cattle and poultry in the yard. There was no water supply or sewage system in the building, washing was done in buckets and troughs. The organization provided for weekly washing of clothes, not bathing. Washing the whole body was not common in Serbia at that time, nor was maintaining intimate hygiene. The doctor recommended that female prisoners wash their intimate parts at least once a month. [7 p17–9]

Female prisoners were treated at state expense, in case of illness they were released from work, and they were treated by the Požarevac county doctor. The rate of morbidity and mortality was very high, during less than three months in 1851 it was 20%. District physician Aćim Medović performed an autopsy in order to submit a re-

port and take measures, according to the order. The causes of death were hepatitis, inflammation of the brain, tuberculosis and something that today could be called the flu. Female inmates most often suffered from rheumatic, stomach and skin diseases, according to Medović. [7 p23–5]

The Principality, later the Kingdom of Serbia, had three penal institutions in the nineteenth century: the Belgrade Penitentiary with the Topčider prison, founded in 1851, the Požarevac Penitentiary, founded in 1865, and the Niš Penitentiary, founded in 1878. In other European countries, the reform of the penal system was in progress, which meant ensuring minimum civilized living conditions for convicts, spatial and ambiental, improving nutrition, health and safety of convicts. The Serbian authorities had the intention of implementing a reform of penal institutions in the Kingdom of Serbia, in order to resemble modern European institutions. Emil Taufer and Franz Winter in 1885 and Dr. Nikola Ogorelica in 1905 presented their proposals, being engaged by the authorities. An advanced, Irish penal system was adopted. [8 p98–100]

In all penal institutions in the Kingdom of Serbia, convicts did not have the right to access fresh air. The carpentry was in bad condition, the doors were cracked, the windows were rotten with broken panes, which allowed for air circulation, but also damaged the health of the convicts. When it comes to hygiene, it was at a low level in penal institutions, except in the women's section of the Požarevac Penitentiary, which could not be said for the men's section as well. The institution in Požarevac was the height of impurity, the walls were covered with the blood of millions of killed bedbugs, there were fleas, bedbugs and lice. The glass on a large number of windows was half-broken, the furniture in the rooms included a wooden bed and a toilet bowl, but there were no beds in a large number of rooms in the Požarevac Penitentiary, because people were lying next to each other, body to body. The hospital for female convicts was better than the room where the male convicts were treated, which was almost without ventilation and the necessary hospital furniture and disinfection. There was even no use of soap and combs. [8 p109–10] About female prisoners of the Požarevac Penitentiary there are preserved testimonies and modern scholar researches. [9, 10 p371–406]

Dimitrije Mita Cenić (1851–1888)[1] left a testimony from 1874 about the infamous "hrastovac", a place where arrested persons were imprisoned in the Šabac county. [11 p229] He stated that he was placed in "a den that only Turkish despotism could build. That night I wanted to die and couldn't sleep for a moment. Millions of bedbugs and fleas attacked me, to use their suckers to drain the little blood that vampires in human form did not drink from me." („jednu jazbinu kakve je mogla samo turska despotija da podiže. Te noći htedoh svisnuti i ne mogoh ni za trenut oka zaspati. Milioni stenica i buva jurišalo je na me, da mi svojim sisaljkama iscrpe ono malo krvi što mi ne ispiše vampiri u obliku ljudskom.") [12 p50]

A very famous *apsana* in the Kingdom of Serbia was the main *apsana* of the Administration of the City of Belgrade, near the Great Market, known as *Glavnjača*. It

[1] Serbian politician, journalist and publicist, one of the first Serbian socialists, who spent six years in jail uder false accusation for preparing a coup against Milan Obrenovic.

was described by several publicists and arrested persons, among them Pera Todorović (1852–1907),[2] who was imprisoned there several times, mainly because of his writing in the newspaper. [11 p230]

"[...] but no, you can't even enter, you can't stand in this room, but stand at the door and guess what the 'best room the administration has' is like. Of course, in order to see anything, you have to open the door wide, because otherwise it's dark in the 'best room' in the middle of the afternoon.

The first thing that catches your eye is that the room was built for a prison, thick walls with vaults everywhere. But no, even before that, you can see the once-painted walls, now all waxed, on which big red stains from the killed bedbugs are spreading everywhere, and in some places they themselves are hanging, 'with thoughts and personality' as if glued to the wall, how they are crushed. A cobweb hangs from the corners of the vault, in it a large spider and its trout made of caught and dried flies. [...] you feel a kind of heavy, very suffocating [...] breath. You can keep the door open all day, this smell still remains. This is the characteristic of this dark place, which is never warmed by the sun. [...] there are no windows; above the door, only one hole, 60 centimeters wide and half meter high. [...] this hole does not look into the field, but into the hall (porch) [...] in front of that hall stands a tall walnut tree, on which twenty chickens sleep every night."

„[...] al ne, ni ne možete ući, ne možete stati u ovu kočinu, no stanite na vrata i pogledajte, kakva je ta 'najbolja soba koju ima uprava'. Naravno da biste što videli, morate vrata širom otvoriti, jer inače u 'najboljoj sobi' u sred podne je mrak.

Prvo što vam pada u oči to je, da je soba zidana za hapsanu, svuda debeli zidovi na svodove. Al ne, još i pre toga padaju vam u oči nekada okrečeni sada sve namolovani duvari, po kojima se na sve strane šire velike crvene mrlje od poubijanih stenica, a po negde vise i one same, 's mislima i personom' onako prilepljene na zid, kako su zgnječene. Po uglovima na svodu visi paučina, u njoj veliki pauk i njegova pastrma od pohvatanih i sasušenih muva. [...] osećaš nekakav težak, veoma zagušljiv [...] zadah. Možeš držati vrata otvorena po ceo dan, ovaj zadah opet ostaje. To je osobina ove mračne kočine, koju sunce nikad ne greje. [...] prozora nema; nad vratima samo jedna rupa, široka 60 santimetara a visoka po metra. [...] ova rupa ne gleda na polje, no u hodnik (trem) [...] pred tim hodnikom se diže visoki orah, na kome svake noći spava dvajestak kokošiju." [13 p2]

Vladan Đorđević (1844–1930)[3] also wrote about the basements of the main Belgrade police facility, after the whitewash in 1905:

"I went inside to take a closer look, at least now. It took me three months to decide on that, that den looked so terrible, whenever I happened to look through the ajar door in passing.

The black walls of the main room were now white, and it was now more visible in it than it would have been through that little window above the door, and the other one above the

[2] Serbian journalist and writer, one of the founders and the leader of the People's Radical Party. During the Timok rebellion in 1883 he was imprisoned and sentenced to death, but the penalty was changed into the prison sentence.

[3] Serbian politician, doctor of medicine, military officer and a writer. He was the president of the Ministerial Council of the Kingdom of Serbia, medical colonel and the founder of the Serbian Red Cross and the Serbian Medical Society.

low ceiling, because both of those little windows let in light only from the dark corridor. The main room is a large but very low basement room, with one furnace and a wide bench that takes up more than half of the room. It is a shared bed for 15 to 20 adults as many as there are. My first thought was, how do so many people not suffocate in that volume of air? Those two small windows under the attic, if they are open both in winter and summer, both day and night, can they sufficiently renew the air in this space in which 40 lungs breathe? Fortunately, I saw a hole in the longest wall in front of the door, as if a brick had been taken out of the wall.

- Is that a vent hole? -

- Yes, Mr. Minister. -

- Those must be very long pipes that take the air through this hole, because here we are in the middle under the entire Administration building? -

- That's right. The pipes come out from under the Mr. Warden's office and from the alley are covered with bars. -

- Thank God. Now all this woodwork needs to be taken outside and given a good treatment with steam?... -

- Can not. It's all nailed down. -

- Then pour hot water. -

- I did. It doesn't help anything... The new spring from downstairs."

„Uđoh unutra da je bar sad izbliže razgledam. Tri meseca mi je trebalo da se rešim na to, tako strašno izgledaše ta jazbina, kad god sam u prolazu slučajno pogledao kroz otškrinuta vrata.

Crni zidovi glavnjače behu sad beli, te u njoj beše sada vidnije nego što bi bilo po onome prozorčiću nad vratima, i onome drugom nad sniskim tavanom, jer oba ta prozorčića puštaju svetlost samo iz mračnog hodnika. Glavnjača je velika ali vrlo sniska suterenska soba, sa jednom furunom i sa širokom klupom koja hvata veću polovinu sobe. To je zajednički krevet za 15 do 20 odraslih ljudi koliko ih kad ima. Prva mi je misao bila kako se toliki ljudi ne uguše u onolišnoj kubaturi vazduha? Ona dva prozorčića pod tavanom, baš ako su i zimi i leti, i danju i noću otvoreni ne mogu dovoljno obnavljati vazduh u ovome prostoru u kome 40 pluća diše? Srećom ugledah u najdužem zidu spram vrata jednu rupu kao da je iz zida izvađena jedna ciglja.

- Je li ta rupa za ventilaciju? –

- Jeste G. Ministre. –

- To mora da su vrlo dugačke cevi koje odvode vazduh kroz ovu rupu, jer ovde smo u sredini ispod cele zgrade Upravne? –

- Tako je. Cevi izlaze ispod kancelarije g. Upravnikove i sa sokaka su pokrivene rešetkicama. –

- Hvala Bogu. Sad samo još ova drvenarija da se izvuče napolje i da se dobro popari?... –

- Ne može. To je sve zakovano. –

- Onda polivaj vrelom vodom. –

- Uradio sam. Ne pomaže ništa... Izviru ozdo nove." [14 p230–31]

Namely, in 1905, an indictment was brought against Đorđević, since in one of his books he published confidential documents that were not the property of the writer, but of the state. He was called before the Court of First Instance and in March 1906 he was imprisoned in the prison of the Administration of the Municipality of Belgrade, in cell number six. He was forbidden to maintain personal hygiene, ie. to go out for a weekly bath. For the first time in his sixty-two years of life, he spent thirty-five days without bathing. [15 p279–82]

Arrested persons housed in *Glavnjača* suffered humiliation for using a completely ruined communal toilet. For more than 25 years, a major reconstruction of the sanitary facility was awaited. In addition to Todorović and Vladan Đorđević, there was also a complaint by a group of police officials about the state of custody of the main police, but all were unsuccessful. [11 p231]

When it comes to the Belgrade Penal Institution, i.e. Belgrade Fortress, which was part of it, Pera Todorović left a testimony from 1883, when he stayed here:

"I enter - and find myself in a spacious casemate. From above, a low, newly painted vault appeared; all around were huge, thick walls. The casemate was lined with brick. In the middle of the casemate, there was a candlestick, in which a piece of lard was dangling. In one corner could be seen a large iron furnace, and in front of it a prisoner was crouching and blowing, to kindle the fire in the furnace; but since the wood was raw, the fire could not be lit for a long time. [...] There was only one narrow window, and it was very high and closed with wishbones, almost as thick as a hand. The casemate was spacious; I was looking forward to at least being able to walk at will."

[...] "I saw that I would stay, in this cold winter season, in a cold casemate, without a fire, without a bed, without anything anywhere. There wasn't even a chair to sit on, so I had to either stand on my feet all night, or sit on the bare, cold pathos made of bricks. Finally, there wasn't even a jug of water, so that at least I wouldn't suffer thirst if I had to endure the winter."

„Uđem – i nađem se u prostranom kazamatu. Odozgo se belio snizak, skoro okrečen svod; svuda unaokolo bili su ogromni, hvat i više debeli zidovi. Kazamat je bio patosan cigljom. Nasred kazamata stajao je na patosu svetnjak, u kom se klatilo parčence lojanice. U jednom uglu videla se velika gvozdena peć, a pred njom je čučao nekakav robijaš i duvao, da potpali vatru u peći; no kako su drva bila sirova, vatra se zadugo nije mogla razgoreti. [...] Svega je bio jedan uzan prozorčić, pa i to vrlo visok i zatvoren železnim kolenikama, debelim skoro kao ruka. Kazamat je bio prostran; radovao sam se da ću bar po volji moći hodati.

[...] „Ja videh da ću ostati, u ovo hladno zimsko doba, u studenom kazamatu, bez vatre, bez postelje, bez igde ičega. Čak nije bilo ni stolice, na koju bi se bar moglo sesti, te mi je ostajalo ili da cele noći prestojim na nogama, ili da sednem na go, hladan patos od cigalja. Najposle, nije bilo ni testije s vodom, da bar žeđ ne trpim, ako moram trpeti zimu." [16 p192–3]

Nikola Hristić (1818–1911),[4] the administrator of the Belgrade Town at the time, testified about the treatment of convicts in connection with the Tenka conspiracy in 1857, which had as its goal the murder of Prince Alexander Karađorđević (ruled 1842–1858). There can be seen what kind of prison conditions political prisoners, ex state councilors, had. He emphasized that the convicts assured everyone who visited them that during the investigation by the police and by Nikola Hristić personally, there was no inhuman behavior and torture. Cavalry captain Todor Petković was supposed to escort the convicted to the Tower of Gurgusovac. Convicts could take up to 6 shirts, 6 underpants, 6 socks, 6 towels, 6 scarves, 6 "long johns", a mattress, a blanket - a rug, a quilt, winter clothes, a turkey or a fur coat, a warm hat, warm shoes, chibuk and tobacco. Captain Todor examined each convict down to the bare skin. He took away handkerchiefs, "long johns", boots and warm shoes, warm hats and left them only in light clothes. The convicts were shackled in Gurgusovac, Captain Todor continued with cruelty, and Radovan Damjanović (1811–1858), one of the convicts, fell ill and soon died. Stefan Stefanović Tenka (1797–1865) and Radovan Damjanović were stripped of the belt they used to tie their hernias. Similar testimonies are confirmed by Jevrem Grujić (1826/27–1895). [17 p242–45; 18 p275–79; 19 p250; 20 p65–6, 97]

When it comes to the treatment of political prisoners, Austrian scientist Felix Kanitz (1829–1904), who visited the Požarevac Penitentiary in 1887, left his testimony. He stated that 129 prisoners, some of whom were convicted of murder under affect, and many more because of political offenses, moved a lot outside the cells, and that the food was not bad. He noticed a difference in the treatment of political convicts, who were lying five on one wooden bed in the cramped space. [21 p187; 22 p172] Kosta Milutinović, cited by Jasmina Živković, presents excerpts from an article in the newspaper *Zastava*, written on the occasion of the death of Svetozar Marković (1846–1875).[5] Svetozar Marković served his sentence in the Požarevac Penitentiary for political offenses in 1874. Those passages describe the details of the conditions of dealing with political prisoners. It is emphasized that these conditions caused quick and certain physical and spiritual disorder. One to twelve people were confined in extremely small rooms. Mention is made of stench, dirt, bed bugs, lice, rats and the smell of unwashed prisoners. The walk was in a small area, one couldn't read, writing was strictly forbidden. The food was bad, and the prisoners were humiliated by the cops. Svetozar Marković spent nine months in Požarevac Penitentiary, because of his published articles in the press. [21 p187–8] Đorđe Genčić (1861–1938),[6] a former minister from the liberal government, was a political prisoner in the Požarevac Penitentiary during the

[4] Started his career as judicial and police official, was the administrator of Belgrade Town, and multiple times minister of internal affairs, prime minister and the president and vice-president of the State Council.

[5] Serbian political activist, literary critic and socialist philosopher. Because of his attacks on the authorities, he was convicted on nine months of prison, in 1874. He left prison with damaged health, and soon died of tuberculosis.

[6] Serbian industrialist, mine owner, minister of internal affairs during the reign of king Alexander Obrenović, one of the leaders of conspiracy against the king and the mayor of the city of Niš (1894–1899).

radical-progressive government in 1901. His wife complained to the Minister of Justice about the behavior of the administration of the Požarevac Penitentiary, which did not allow his daughter to visit him. The Minister of Justice ordered a doctor to examine Genčic and allowed visits. In 1902, there were 34 political convicts in the Požarevac Penitentiary, for acts of high treason, insulting majesty, insulting the ruler through the press, and one convicted under military laws. For the act of high treason due to the so-called Alavantić's affair, i.e. attempted coup against the regime of King Aleksandar Obrenović (1889–1903) in 1902, 30 political prisoners were sentenced. Also, on the occasion of the application of regulations on political crimes, among the convicts of the Požarevac Penitentiary there were, along with Svetozar Marković, a number of representatives of cultural, educational and political elites. [21 p192, 198–200]

* * *

When we look at the hygienic and sanitary conditions in prison institutions in restored Serbia, we can draw several conclusions. First, with the development of the Serbian state in the 19th century, along with the development of prison system reforms in Europe, Serbian prisons also developed, from improvised detention centers to real, organized, planned prisons. There was an awareness, especially in the third quarter of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, that the living conditions of prisoners must be improved, in accordance with modern European trends, among other things, due to the understanding that prison is for punishment, but also for rehabilitation. However, many complaints from prominent police officials, ministers, and even prominent prisoners did not influence the state to change anything fundamentally. It was only at the beginning of the twentieth century, after several proposals on the reform of the penal system, that the Irish system was adopted, as the most progressive. Treatment of political prisoners was worse in comparison to the treatment of others. Hygienic and sanitary conditions in Serbian prison institutions were extremely bad, and this is the picture that prevails throughout the entire period of existence of the restored Serbian state. The construction of new prison buildings and the finding of new buildings with larger spatial capacities throughout the 19th century, as well as the overcrowding of prison premises mentioned in the sources, speaks of the constant increase in the number of prisoners in Serbian prison institutions.

Rezime

Cilj rada je da na osnovu sačuvanih svedočanstava zatvorenika, kao i literature i izvora vezanih za zatvorske ustanove (Okružnog suda u Beogradu, Kazneno-popravnog zavoda u Požarevcu i nekih drugih zatvorskih objekata) ukratko prikaže higijensko-sanitarne uslove života zatvorenika u zatvorskim ustanovama Kneževine i Kraljevine Srbije, u različitim periodima 19. veka, obraćajući pažnju i na zatvorenike i na zatvorenice. Na ovaj način, u vidu pregleda, rad je pokušaj da se predstavi kako se srpska država bavila pitanjem sanitarnih uslova i modernizacije u zatvorskim ustanovama Srbije u prethodno pomenutom periodu, uz uvodni deo koji se odnosi na ustanovu zatvora u Evropi u 19. veku, za širi kontekst.

Kad se osvrnemo na higijenske i sanitarne uslove u zatvorskim ustanovama u Srbiji možemo doneti nekoliko zaključaka. Prvo, sa razvojem srpske države u 19. veku, naporedo sa razvojem reformi zatvorskih sistema u Evropi, razvijali su se i srpski zatvori, od improvizovanih pritvora do pravih, organizovanih, planski građenih, zatvora. Postojala je svest, pogotovo u trećoj četvrtini devetnaestog veka i početkom dvadesetog, da se uslovi života zatvorenika moraju poboljšati, u skladu sa modernim evropskim trendovima, između ostalog, zbog shvatanja da zatvor služi za kažnjavanje, ali i rehabilitaciju. Međutim, mnoge žalbe uglednih policijskih činovnika, ministara, pa i uglednih zatvorenika, nisu uticali da država nešto suštinski promeni. Tek početkom dvadesetog veka, posle nekoliko predloga o reformi kaznenog sistema, usvojen je irski, kao naprogresivniji. Higijenski i sanitarni uslovi u srpskim zatvorskim institucijama bili su izuzetno loši i to je slika koja preovladava tokom čitavog perioda postojanja obnovljene srpske države.

References:

1. Foucault M. Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison. Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage books; 1979.
2. O'Brien P. The Prison on the Continent Europe, 1865–1965. In: Morris N, Rothman DJ, editors. The Oxford History of the Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1995. p. 199–225.
3. Finzsch F. "Comparing Apples and Oranges": The History of Early Prisons in Germany and the United States, 1800–1860. In: Finzsch N, Jütte R, editors. Institutions of Confinement: Hospitals, Asylums and Prisons in Western Europe and North America, 1500–1950. German Historical Institute, Cambridge University Press: Washington, D. C; 1996. p. 213–233.
4. Јовановић В. Затвори у Србији. [Prisons in Serbia] In: Столић А, Макуљевић Н, editors. Приватни живот код Срба у деветнаестом веку: од краја осамнаестог века до почетка Првог светског рата. Београд: Clio; 2006. p. 683–707.
5. Јовановић В. Здравље и нега тела. [Health and Body Care] In: Столић А, Макуљевић Н, editors. Приватни живот код Срба у деветнаестом веку: од краја осамнаестог века до почетка Првог светског рата. Београд: Clio; 2006. p. 359–384.
6. Јанковић И. Апсеници Суда Окружија београдског 1837–1841. [Arestees of the Belgrade County Court 1837–1841] Српске студије. 2015;(6):196–221.
7. Јанковић И. Женско апсеничко радилиште у Пожаревцу 1848–1852. [Women's Detention Center in Požarevac 1848–1852] Годишњак за друштвену историју. 2013;(3):9–28.
8. Кнежевић Лукић Н, Живковић Ј, Радовановић РВ. Квалитет и услови живота у Пожаревачком казненом заводу до 1918. године. [Quality and Conditions of Life in Požarevac Penitentiary until 1918] In: Казнено-поправни заводи у Србији: пример Пожаревачког казненог завода 1853–1918, Књига прва. Пожаревац: Историјски архив Пожаревац, Криминалистичко-полицијска академија; 2016. p. 97–149.

9. Popović MA: Zatvorenice: album Ženskog odeljenja Požarevačkog kaznenog zavoda (1898). [Female Prisoners: Album of Female Department of Požarevac Penitentiary (1909)] Tomić S, editor. Beograd: Laguna; 2017.
10. Tomić S. Vrste strahova, etika i estetika terora, i politika emocija u albumu zatvorenica Milutina A. Popovića. [Types of Fears, Ethics and Aesthetics of Terror, and the Politics of Emotions in Milutin A. Popović's Album of Female Prisoners] Temida. 2020; 23(3):371-406.
11. Јовановић В. Сјај и беда варошког живота: маргиналне скупине и државна реакција у Србији 19. века. [Glitter and Misery of City Life: marginal groups and state reaction in 19th century Serbia] Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства; 2017.
12. Ценић М. Испод земље или моја тамновања. [Under the Ground or My Imprisonments] Београд: Просвета; 1983.
13. Тодоровић П. Хапсанске красоте. [The Beauties of the Dungeon] Мале новине. 1882 Jul 29:1-3
14. Ђорђевић В. Министар у апсу. [Minister in Jail] Београд: Штампарија „Штампе"; 1909.
15. Рајић С. Владан Ђорђевић: биографија поузданог обреновићевца. [Vladan Djordjevic: biography of relialable suporter of the Obrenovic Dinasty] Београд: Завод за уџбенике; 2007.
16. Тодоровић П. Крвава година. [The Year of the Blood] Београд: Српска књижевна задруга; 1991.
17. Христић Н. Мемоари 1840–1862. [Memoirs 1840–1862] Београд: Просвета; 2006.
18. Јовановић С. Уставобранитељи и њихова влада (1838–1858). [Constitutionalists and their Government] Београд: Издавачка књижарница Геце Кона; 1933.
19. Јовановић Н. Кнез Александар Карађорђевић (1806–1885): биографија. [Prince Alexander Karadjodjevic: a biography] Београд: Албатрос Плус; 2010.
20. Грујић Ј. Записи Јеврема Грујића. Књ. 1. Пред Светоандрејску скупштину. [Records of Jevrem Grujic. Vol 1. Before St Andrew's Assembly] Београд: Српска краљевска академија; 1922.
21. Живковић Ј. Поступање са осуђеницима у Пожаревачком казненом заводу – случај политичких криваца. [Dealing with Convicts in the Požarevac Penitentiary – the Case of Political Criminals] In: Казнено-поправни заводи у Србији: пример Пожаревачког казненог завода 1853–1918, Књига прва. Пожаревац: Историјски архив Пожаревац, Криминалистичко-полицијска академија; 2016. p. 181–212.
22. Каниц Ф. Србија: земља и становништво од римског доба до краја 19. века. [Serbia: Country and Population from Roman Times to the End of the 19th century] Прва књига. Четврто издање. Београд; 1989

Submitted: 28/10/2022
Reviewed: 07/11/2022
Accepted: 18/11/2022