

Terms and citations in Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated according to the international scholarly transliteration system. Book reviews falling within the journal's scope are solicited by the Editor who should be consulted before an unsolicited review is undertaken. Reviews submitted should ordinarily not exceed 500 words and should in format conform to the stylistic rules cited above.

The Editor and Editorial Board members assume no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.

# SERBIAN STUDIES

PUBLISHED BY THE NORTH AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR SERBIAN STUDIES

CONTENTS VOLUME 3, NUMBERS 1/2, FALL/SPRING 1984/85

- Michael Boro Petrovich 3  
SLOBODAN JOVANOVIĆ (1869-1958): THE CAREER AND FATE  
OF A SERBIAN HISTORIAN
- Vasa D. Mihailovich 27  
WAR IN THE WORKS OF DOBRICA ĆOSIĆ
- Biljana Šljivic-Šimšić 35  
THE BEGINNINGS OF THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT IN  
NINETEENTH CENTURY SERBIA
- Sofija Škorić 53  
CANADIAN ARTISTS OF SERBIAN ORIGIN: A SURVEY
- George V. Tomashevich 65  
BRANISLAV PETRONIJEVIĆ (1875-1954)  
PHILOSOPHER, MATHEMATICIAN AND NATURAL SCIENTIST
- Henry R. Cooper, Jr. 83  
THE IMAGE OF BOSNIA IN THE FICTION OF IVO ANDRIĆ
- Želimir B. Juričić 107  
THE RELATION BETWEEN POETIC AND PROSE STRUCTURAL  
ELEMENTS  
IN ANDRIĆ'S EARLY POETRY: THE CASE OF 'TAMA'

REVIEWS

- W.S. Dolph Owings, Elizabeth Pribić, Nikola Pribić 115  
*The Sarajevo Trial*  
 Chapel Hill, N.C.  
 Documentary Publications, n.y., 2 vol., 555p.  
 (George V. Tomashevich)
- Linda A. Bennett 119  
*Personal Choice in Ethnic Identity Maintenance: Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in Washington, D.C.*  
 Palo Alto, CA  
 Ragusan Press, 1978, 218p.  
 (Branko M. Čolaković)

Michael Boro Petrovich

3

SLOBODAN JOVANOVIĆ (1869-1958):  
 THE CAREER AND FATE OF A SERBIAN HISTORIAN

I

Slobodan Jovanović was not primarily a historian. He was trained in the law and spent forty-two years of a long life teaching and writing works in the field of constitutional law and political theory.<sup>1</sup> Though he did not become active in politics until late in life, he was premier of the Royal Yugoslav Government in London, from January 1942 to June 1943, and president of the émigré Yugoslav National Committee after the Second World War. Slobodan Jovanović has also earned a distinguished place as a literary critic, thanks especially to his brilliant essays and reviews. Jovan Skerlić included a whole section on Jovanović in his *Istorija nove srpske književnosti*, long the most authoritative standard survey of modern Serbian literature.<sup>2</sup> Yet Slobodan Jovanović's most lasting reputation rests on his being one of the foremost Serbian historians of his time. Indeed, his eight volumes on the history of Serbia from 1838 to 1903 have no equal in historiography.

Slobodan Jovanović was born as he died, in exile. His father Vladimir (1833-1922) was twice driven from Serbia for his liberal views in 1860 during Prince Miloš's second reign, and in 1864, when Prince Michael's régime deprived him of his teaching post.<sup>3</sup> In 1864 Vladimir Jovanović began publication, in Switzerland, of an opposition newspaper called *Sloboda (Liberty)*. It lasted only into 1865. He then joined the forces of Serbian liberalism in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in Budapest, where he was associated with Svetozar Miletić's newspaper *Zastava (The Banner)*, and in Novi Sad. It was in the latter city that his son was born, in 1869, and given the then quite unorthodox and un-Orthodox name of Slobodan, after the Serbian word for liberty, *sloboda*, (just as a famous Greek contemporary and premier to be, Venizelos, was given the name Eleutherios, after the Greek word for liberty.) This was to start a very popular fashion to which the Belgrade telephone directory is an impressive testimonial. After Prince Michael's assassination in 1869, Vladimir Jovanović was arrested by the Austro-Hungarian authorities in Novi Sad and held seven months as a suspect. Upon being declared innocent by a Budapest court, he returned to Serbia, where he held the post of



finance minister three times.

If we have gone into such detail concerning Vladimir Jovanović's career it is because the parallel with his son's career is so very striking. Rarely has a son followed so closely in his father's footsteps. Both studied abroad: the father studied economics in Germany, and the son obtained a law degree in Geneva, in 1890. The father began his career as a parliamentary recorder and as a secretary in the Serbian Ministry of Finance; the son began as a recorder in the District Court of Belgrade, in 1892, and then as an employee in the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The father became a professor of political economy at the Velika Škola of Belgrade; the son was appointed professor of constitutional law at the same school, in 1897, and stayed on at the Law School when the Velika Škola was made a university. It was through the father that the son became an admirer of the ideas of Western liberalism. In 1874 the father published his translation of John Stuart Mill's *Essay on Government*; in 1903 the son published a book on the English parliamentary system (*Engleski parlamentarizam*). Both father and son suffered exile for their beliefs. One could draw even other parallels. For example, Vladimir Jovanović was president of the Serbian Learned Society; Slobodan Jovanović was president of its successor, the Serbian Academy of Sciences.

However, let us leave this comparison to take up another, even more germane to the career of Slobodan Jovanović as a historian: in many ways Slobodan Jovanović is the Thomas Babington Macaulay of Serbia.<sup>4</sup> Both were the offspring of reforming fathers active in public life. Both "grew up to the sound of earnest men debating large issues of public policy."<sup>5</sup> Neither was trained as a historian but they began their careers in the law. Just as Macaulay inspired the Indian Criminal Code, so Jovanović was the leading expert on the constitution of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Both were champions of liberalism. Macaulay the Whig entered politics earlier than Jovanović. The latter scrupulously avoided it until 1936, when he became president of the Serbian Cultural Club, a nationalist organization of largely Belgrade intellectuals concerned over Serbian interests in the Yugoslav state. But it was not until the Second World War that Jovanović entered the Government, first as vice premier and then as premier. He was then past seventy. But whether actively in politics or not, both the Englishman and the Serb, though sup-

porters of monarchy, were devotees of constitutionalism and parliamentarianism.

Both Macaulay and Jovanović were *littérateurs* whose most impressive genre was the historical and biographical essay. Indeed, they even wrote on similar or even identical subjects, for example, Dante, Machiavelli, Mirabeau, Burke and Carlyle. G.P. Gooch cites the testimony of a traveller in pioneer Australia who recorded that the three works he found on every squatter's shelf were the Bible, Shakespeare, and Macaulay's *Essays*.<sup>6</sup> At least in intellectual or would-be intellectual Serbian homes the Bible and even Shakespeare might be missing, but the works of Njegoš and Jovanović were prized possessions. Whether people actually read Jovanović or not, it is an undisputed fact that he was better known among the Serbs than any other scholar of his day. Both Macaulay and Jovanović are known for a monumental history of their people, and each chose to work in a previously neglected period. As Macaulay wrote in 1841, "I really do not think that there is in our literature so great a void as that which I am trying to supply. English history from 1688 to the French Revolution is even to educated people almost a *terra incognita*."<sup>7</sup> Jovanović's period, from the end of Prince Miloš's first reign in 1838 to the accession of King Peter in 1903, was rather better known to Serbs, but almost exclusively through the memoirs of protagonists.

Both Macaulay and Jovanović were the most popular historians of their nations, because each believed history writing to be more than "the accumulation of isolated facts for the benefit of a few secluded scholars."<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, it may be said that both shared to at least some extent Carlyle's emphasis on the hero in history. Both were also superb stylists who could depict the truth with just a few deft strokes. Gooch wrote, "If Macaulay did not invent the historical essay, he found it of brick and left it of marble."<sup>9</sup> So Skerlić wrote of Jovanović, "Together with Bogdan Popović, he did most to lift literary style high in Serbian literature and to give younger generations of writers models of a true literary style."<sup>10</sup>

Macaulay and Jovanović share another distinction in that both achieved among their respective countrymen a reputation for an omniscience which no man could possibly deserve. In Yugoslavia Jovanović's name was invoked with awe as the man-in-the-street's symbol for unsurpassable knowledge, something like Einstein!

Both Macaulay and Jovanović enjoyed society immensely, and society enjoyed their keen wit. They were brilliant causeurs. Yet they were diligent workers who drove themselves hard and found time to produce an enormous output.

## II

As one might expect when such diligence is combined with longevity, Jovanović wrote more books and articles than one could possibly describe adequately in a brief survey. The most complete bibliography of his works prior to the Second World War lists twenty-two books, some in several volumes and many in several editions: only a partial selective list of his articles takes up twenty crowded pages.<sup>11</sup> To this must be added several more pages devoted to a listing of his works after 1941.<sup>12</sup>

To treat Jovanović's historical works in isolation from his writings in public law, political science, and literature would do violence to the integral character of this scholar. We are not dealing with a professional jurist to whom history, literature, and politics were side interests. All of Jovanović's works, taken in sum, treat the same basic problem: the relationship of the developing individual to the developing society of which he is a part. This is why Jovanović's works run the gamut from studies on the state and its workings to the human and his strivings — not just any human, but the individual engaged in some significant relation with society and the state. In viewing these poles locked in tension, Jovanović considers all aspects of their relationship — political, economic, social, cultural, and psychological.

Jovanović's fullest treatment of the role and organization of the state is, of course, in his works in the field of political science. His inaugural lecture as a law professor was on the problem of sovereignty.<sup>13</sup> The second article he ever published was on bicameralism.<sup>14</sup> He wrote short books on both the Serbian National Assembly and English parliamentary practice.<sup>15</sup> His books on public law and political theory, as well as on the constitutional law of both the Kingdom of Serbia and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, were all standard textbooks with no equal.<sup>16</sup> His numerous articles on parliamentary procedure became a kind of Yugoslav Robert's Rules of Order. In a politically seething union of peoples who had never

before been joined in a single state, Jovanović's discussions of such problems as federalism, ministerial responsibility, parliamentary immunity, valid elections, and a plethora of similar problems were no mere academic discussions. Basic to Jovanović's treatment was the typically liberal view that the state does not represent the hegemony of any particular class but serves as a neutral impersonal umpire among many vested interests.

There is always the danger that the social scientist — whether political scientist, economist, or sociologist — will come to focus on the external structure of government, on general trends, mass behavior, or patterns of development, and thus forget the individual with all his vagaries. Jovanović never succumbed to this mechanistic approach. To him the state was not primary, nor was history the fulfillment of abstract laws. Man makes history — man creates ideas, principles, laws, in concrete situations. It was this belief in the primacy of the creative man that led Jovanović to stress the individual in history.

Though far from being a Materialist, neither was Jovanović entirely an Idealist in his philosophy. History was not for him the progression of "leading guiding ideas" but simply the sum total of man's activities. And Jovanović's view of man was neither simple nor idealistic. He had no illusions about man. He did have a deep respect for the complexity of human nature. Jovanović regarded men as individuals acting from subjective motives. He departed from one of the basic tenets of an earlier British Liberalism when he rejected rational self-interest as the prime-mover of men's actions. After all, Serbian history was simply too full of characters whose heroism or villainy could not possibly have sprung from reason or profit. This assumption led Jovanović the political scientist and the historian to become also the psychologist.

Jovanović's most extensive and controversial biographical study was his book on the nineteenth-century Serbian social critic and socialist Svetozar Marković.<sup>17</sup> Ljubomir Nedić's account of Marković is a caustic attack. Jovan Skerlić's monograph is an emotional defense. Slobodan Jovanović's treatment falls in between. A Western liberal by conviction, and a conservative by nature, Jovanović was fundamentally at odds with Marković's radicalism and philosophy. Furthermore, he regarded Marković as an immature, half-baked young man, a raw student who took himself far too seriously and who



seduced others into overrating him. Jovanović denied Marković either learning, logic or originality. On the other hand, Jovanović recognized Marković's significance as the first Serbian socialist and gave him the respect due a man who stood for his ideas courageously and in the face of opposition. Skerlić came rather closer to the mark than Jovanović. Yet, despite their divergent conclusions regarding Marković, Skerlić wrote in the preface of his own work on Marković that "the excellent book by Mr. Jovanović is perhaps our best political-legal monograph."<sup>18</sup>

Some of Jovanović's most penetrating biographical studies are contained in his literary essays. There are any number of Serbian and non-Serbian historical figures which Serbs know best through Jovanović's essays. His short book on Machiavelli underwent three editions.<sup>19</sup> His volume on Mirabeau, Dumouriez, and Danton had two editions.<sup>20</sup> Some of Jovanović's most extensive studies were devoted to Plato, Burke, and Marx as political thinkers and social philosophers.<sup>21</sup> As was the case with Marković, Jovanović was very critical of Marx and regarded his ideas as confused and contradictory. Slobodan Jovanović introduced many significant figures, most of them British and French, to the Serbian public through his essays: John Morley, Arthur Balfour, Thomas Carlyle, Harold Laski, Benjamin Constant, and George Meredith, to name just a few. His Serbian and Yugoslav portraits are even more numerous. They include exclusively men of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Among them are Prince Miloš, Jovan Hadžić, Franjo Rački, Bishop Strossmayer, Filip Višnjić, Jovan Skerlić, Ljubomir Nedić, Uroš Petrović, Bishop Njegoš, Milan Piročanac, Pera Todorović, Nikola Pašić, and many, many others. Stanojević's *Narodna Enciklopedija* alone contains some seventy biographical articles contributed by Slobodan Jovanović.

### III

Jovanović's interest in the state and in leading personalities joined to produce his remarkable survey of the history of Serbia from 1838 to 1903. This monumental work comprises eight of the seventeen volumes of his *Collected Works*. The first treats the years 1838 to 1858, a period in which the so-called Defenders of the Constitution

were successful in ousting the Obrenović dynasty and in setting up what they at least hoped to be their own hegemony under Prince Alexander Karadjordjević.<sup>22</sup> The second work in the series takes up the restoration of the Obrenović dynasty in the second reigns of Prince Miloš and his son Michael (1858-1868).<sup>23</sup> The third work, which is devoted to the reign of Milan Obrenović, is divided into three books: the first includes the decade from 1868 to the eve of the war with the Turks: the second takes up the war period and aftermath: the third extends from the proclamation of the Serbian Kingdom in 1882 to King Milan's abdication in 1889.<sup>24</sup> Jovanović similarly devoted three volumes to the reign of Milan's son Alexander: the first to the Regency and young Alexander's premature assumption of power in the coup of April 1, 1893: the second to the period from ex-King Milan's return to Serbia to the attempt to assassinate him in 1899: and the third to Alexander's personal régime, from his fateful marriage to the assassination of the royal couple in 1903 and the extinction of the Obrenović dynasty.<sup>25</sup> For our purposes the series may be treated as a unit.

At the time that Slobodan Jovanović first published these volumes — between 1912 and 1931 — there was more scholarly literature about medieval Serbia than there was about nineteenth-century Serbia after the liberation from the Turks. The professional historians tended to regard the reigns following Miloš Obrenović as being too recent and more the concern of politicians than scholars. And indeed, it was the politicians who made the memory of those three-quarters of a century their task. What twentieth-century Serbs knew about the period came largely from hearsay or from the memoirs of protagonists. Especially the memoirs often took the form of an *apologia pro domo suo*. Among the most useful of these are the works of Jovan Ristić, Vladan Djordjević, and Stojan Novaković, to mention only a few of the literate and articulate premiers and ministers of the period. Perhaps the most flagrant example of Serbian partisan political history was Ž. Živanović's four-volume *Politička istorija Srbije*. It dealt with almost the same period as Jovanović's series, from 1858 to 1903, and appeared in 1923-25 while Jovanović was in the middle of his series. The contrast between the two works is remarkable in many respects. The basic difference is that while Živanović wrote what amounted to a justification of his Liberal Party and the policies

of his friends and himself, Jovanović presented a detached account.

Two factors above all others explain this difference. The first is Jovanović's professional attitude as a trained political scientist. He was not a politician himself, at least not until after he had written the works under discussion. Thus he was not burdened with any political legacies; he had no need either to hide skeletons in closets or to glorify anyone. Furthermore, he was by temperament a man of the golden mean. One trained in the law naturally assumes that there are at least two sides to every question and that the way to justice is through thorough and impartial investigation.

A second reason for Jovanović's detachment is his age. Born in 1869, he was old enough to have lived through a good part of the period about which he wrote, yet he was too young to have participated actively in it. One of his first memories was when, as a child of five, he witnessed Prince Milan's return from Istanbul in 1874; actually, as he later recounted, being so small and unable to get to the first row of bystanders lining the street, he never got a proper look at Prince Milan himself through the crowd but mistook the liveried footman sitting on top of the coach for the Prince!<sup>26</sup> Thanks to his father's prominence in public life Slobodan got to see and to know personally many of the people he wrote about. He was immersed in the lively oral traditions which the period had produced — but he was not himself of that period nor did he have a particular stake in it. He wished only to inform his and succeeding generations about what had happened, to give a picture and an analysis of the times just preceding his own.

Unable to rely on his own memory or personal record, Jovanović had to treat the period as a scholar, that is, on the basis of the best and most complete evidence. The lack of footnotes in Jovanović's works, plus his seemingly facile style, might lead the reader to suspect that little scholarly rigor went into the writing of these volumes. However, a careful reading of the text reveals the author's prodigious knowledge of the primary sources. He sometimes refers to these in the text itself, but even when he does not, the perceptive reader can still detect their presence. For example, let us take Jovanović's sources for the reign of King Milan. These include the stenographic reports of the National Assembly; contemporary newspapers in Serbia and Vojvodina; the reports of the Austro-Hungarian consuls; the archives of the Serbian Foreign Ministry; the papers of King Milan; the cor-

respondence of Jovan Ristić with Filip Hristić; the papers of Milosav Protić and Jovan Marinović; the diaries of Milan Milicević, Nikola Krstić, and the author's father: the memoirs and personal accounts of Jovan Ristić, Jevrem and Sava Grujić, Kaljević, Piroćanac, Mijatović, Djordević, and Živanović; and finally the testimony of foreign observers such as the Russians Kartsov and Bobrikov.<sup>27</sup>

Despite all his research, it cannot be said that Slobodan Jovanović revealed much that was not already known, at least to some people. The value of his historical works does not lie in their originality but in their reliability. They brought a whole period of Serbian history out of the morass of social gossip, political partisanship, and folklore and into the realm of critical scholarship.

If Jovanović wrote with detachment, he was certainly not neutral in his judgments. It should be obvious to his reader that Jovanović generally spared the Liberals and Conservatives, that he was cool toward the Radical Party, and disinclined toward the Socialists. Nevertheless, unlike previous Serbian writers in this area of modern political history, Jovanović arrived at his judgments free of any personal political commitments. There is something to be said for the assessment by Živorad Stojković that while Jovanović dealt with the earlier period, up to Prince Michael's assassination in 1868 as a detached observer, "as though he were some foreign consul in the Balkan principality," he began to treat Serbian history from 1868 to 1903 more and more like a secretary in the foreign ministry, which he indeed was for a while.<sup>28</sup>

For Jovanović history was essentially a drama of human relations, and the essence of this drama is tension. He was not content merely to describe what happened: he had to show how and why it happened. This was the whole point. The quest for causal connections led him to a view of history that was pluralistic rather than monistic, eclectic rather than doctrinaire. He perceived the inevitable complexity of the historical process and thus learned to seek his answers in various quarters.

Second, the practical effect of this method was that, unlike all previous accounts of the period, Jovanović's dealt with far more than the workings of domestic politics and foreign policy. The reader finds in his pages a conscientious consideration of economic, social, and cultural history — never for its own sake, but always to help explain the course of historical events. Such treatment lends Jova-



nović's accounts a richness and variety unequalled in the literature of that generation of Serbian historians.

Third, we have already observed Jovanović's interest in historic personalities. The men and women he wrote about were no mere puppets in a play with a predetermined plot: they were neither the playthings of the Fates nor automatons in some inexorable process of development. They were humans whose rational and irrational urges affected events. Indeed, one could hardly deal with the rulers of nineteenth-century Serbia, for example, without concluding that their personal greed, moral weakness, ambition, lust, vindictiveness, and vanity were often decisive factors, more so, alas for Serbia, than whatever virtues they possessed. The historian who would deal with a Toma Vučić-Perišić confronts a man who is not merely the expression of historical "forces": here is someone who is himself a historical force with all his drive, fury, cruelty, ambition, and reckless heroism. Jovanović's picture of this lone man, who had to borrow a horse to get to his native district in order to raise a rebellion against the Prince of Serbia, and a successful rebellion at that, is an unforgettable picture of the primitive warlord in conflict with the modern state. Similarly in his penetrating comparison of Prince Miloš and his son Michael, Jovanović was able, through two personal portraits, to delineate the difference between the old Serbia and the new — the patriarchal and the bourgeois, the Levantine and the Western — and thus dramatize the central problem in mid-nineteenth-century Serbian history. The quarrel between King Milan and Queen Natalie, and their son's immature quest for love in the arms of an older woman — these are not just the private scandals of an unfortunate family, they are the substance of much of modern Serbian history. It is of no little consequence to Jovanović that Milivoje Petrović-Blaznavac was an adventurer, a liar, a gloryseeker, and an unscrupulous intrigant: that Jovan Ristić was vain and egocentric: that Garšanin was a bureaucrat wholly absorbed in politicking. Yet Jovanović does not strip these men of all virtue. On the contrary, he recognized Miloš's political acumen, Michael's moral dignity, the patriotism and self-sacrifice of even some of his worst villains. In short, man is a complex being, and a vastly interesting one.

Finally, even if not one word of what Slobodan Jovanović wrote was true, his historical works would still be great art. No one will

gainsay that he was the greatest stylist in all Serbian historiography. Some are apt to confuse style in historical writing with flamboyance, lofty rhetoric, grandiloquence, and pathos. Jovanović's style is great for its simplicity and clarity. Where many Serbian scholars consciously or unconsciously modelled their prose after a heavy-footed and involved German scholarly prose, it is obvious that Jovanović received his higher education in a French-speaking center. There is a Gallic crispness and esprit in his writing, married to the best kind of solid, strong, simple and sturdy Serbian language of the people. The Serbian literary critic Mirko Žeželj has suggested that this is perhaps why, whatever they may think of Jovanović's political views, the Serbian people recognized him as one of their own.<sup>29</sup> Jovanović obviously loved his native language and hated to see it bastardized through the helter-skelter incorporation of foreign words. At a time when the ostentatious use of Slavicized Greek, Latin, German, and French words marked a certain type of Serbian intellectual, Jovanović clung to the purer language of his fathers.<sup>30</sup> With him this was no pose, as with professional purists, but a natural and normal stance. It was, perhaps, the language of the nineteenth-century Serbian documents he had to read, only brought up to date and in cultivated form. As any good writer knows, it takes painstaking care to write concisely and plainly. Yet Jovanović's prose seems utterly effortless, the kind a reader might think he too could write — until he has tried!

Calling Slobodan Jovanović a "sovereign stylist and connoisseur of the language," the Serbian literary critic Mirko Žeželj attributed the clarity of that style primarily to Jovanović's logical approach, to his love of the dialectic.<sup>31</sup> Žeželj made clear that he was not using the term "dialectic" in the common meaning of polemic; rather he was referring to Jovanović's love of full analysis, proof through evidence, and carefully weighed conclusions. He never simply described; he was always advancing a case, whether the reader was aware of it or not. Moreover, Jovanović did not regard moderation of judgment a virtue where the facts of the matter called for sharp criticism and even condemnation. He was not at all averse, for example, to calling King Milan a debauchee who brought Serbia to coups d'état and crises just for the sake of gaining himself some money . . . . It is not difficult to perceive in this approach the virtues

of the young Jovanović's training in the law.

But there is far more to Jovanović's writing than style. Seeing history as a vast drama, Jovanović had the talent and the intuition of the dramatist.

No one has described this talent of Jovanović's more perceptively than Isidora Sekulić, herself a great stylist of another order.<sup>32</sup> As she observed, when one first begins to read something of Jovanović's, he seems strictly matter-of-fact, disengaged, but read further and you are almost immediately gripped. Jovanović had a gift which scholars often lack, and the more some know, the more they lack it: he had a knack for distinguishing the important from the less important. Hence his narrative is an artful blend of high and low relief. Jovanović had a talent for bypassing irrelevancies and getting to the heart of any matter or to the depth of any character, with a rare insight. And he could depict this to the reader with just a few clean strokes.

#### IV

It is to be expected that historians writing on Serbian history after Slobodan Jovanović have been able to dig even deeper into nineteenth-century Serbian history than he did, to uncover more, and to give their own interpretations. Yugoslav historiography after the Second World War has greatly enriched our knowledge and understanding of that period. Yet it is not surprising that not only specialists and connoisseurs in Yugoslavia appreciate the lasting value of Slobodan Jovanović's historical as well as other scholarly and literary works.

Presumably with this in mind, in the early 1980s two Belgrade publishing houses, Prosveta and Književne Novine, got into a dispute over which of them would publish a new edition of Slobodan Jovanović's works. A legal suit was instituted, on a charge of unfair competition. The feud became somewhat of a public scandal, all the more so since here were two reputable publishing firms, in Socialist Yugoslavia, fiercely competing to publish the works of a proscribed anti-Marxist and anti-Communist royal premier in exile who had been declared a war criminal by a Yugoslav court just after the Second World War. Finally the authorities stepped in and put a lid on the whole affair. The League of Communists organized workers' pro-

test meetings of its members in both publishing enterprises, and a few days later, on February 14, 1985, the Municipal Committee of the League of Communists in Belgrade announced that "the publication of these books by the war criminal Slobodan Jovanović would be a politically unacceptable act which would have harmful social and political consequences."<sup>33</sup>

Even having in mind that Yugoslavia has been probably the least authoritarian and most permissive Communist-led country, one must still wonder how this affair could ever have gone so far, given official condemnation of Jovanović, on both political and ideological grounds.

Slobodan Jovanović entered the political arena relatively late in life, in his late sixties, when he took part in forming the Serbian Cultural Club in 1937.<sup>34</sup> This was a patriotic organization of largely Belgrade professionals and intellectuals, many of them Belgrade University professors.<sup>35</sup> Various motivations have been ascribed to this group. The American historian Jacob Hoptner wrote that the older members were deeply committed to the Yugoslav idea while "others wanted to establish the primacy of Serbia in the Yugoslav culture and eventually to organize a new nationalist party."<sup>36</sup> The Canadian professor Ivan Avakumović, a Yugoslav émigré, wrote in his 1959 obituary of Slobodan Jovanović simply that the Serbian Cultural Club "aimed at rousing public opinion against the growing threat of Germany."<sup>37</sup> Hoptner, on the other hand, cites various authorities as proof that members of the Serbian Cultural Club "had asked Germany's tacit approval of a plan for Yugoslavia to take Salonika when King Peter came of age in 1941."<sup>38</sup> However, he offered no evidence that this was the stance of the Serbian Cultural Club as such. The American historian Alex Dragnich stressed that the members "were greatly concerned about the neglect after 1919 of certain Serbian institutions in the parts of Bosnia, Vojvodina, and other regions" that would fall under Croat control after the Sporazum of 1939 which created an autonomous Croatia within Yugoslavia.<sup>39</sup> Jovanović's political associate abroad, Radoje L. Knežević, added that Jovanović and other members of the Serbian Cultural Club were particularly eager to support Serbian consciousness among the Macedonians and Bosnian Moslems.<sup>40</sup> Whatever may have been the case, the article on Slobodan Jovanović in the official Yugoslav Encyclopedia, published in Zagreb in 1960, simply characterized the



Serbian Cultural Club as "chauvinistic."<sup>41</sup>

When, on March 27, 1941, mass demonstrations and a coup in Belgrade overturned the Cvetković government, which had joined the Axis Tripartite Pact, Slobodan Jovanović was appointed vice premier of the new Simović government. When Hitler's Germany attacked Yugoslavia, on April 6, Jovanović and other members of the government fled the country and found their way to London. There Jovanović became premier of the Royal Yugoslav Government-in-exile, a post which he held from January 12, 1942, to June 28, 1943. He and his government supported Colonel, later General, Draža Mihailović and his remnants of the Royal Yugoslav Army, commonly known as the Chetniks, who had begun guerrilla actions against the Axis invaders in Yugoslavia. Indeed, Mihailović was appointed war minister in that cabinet, and it was Premier Jovanović who represented him in the affairs of the cabinet. Nevertheless, once the Western Allies began to favor Tito's Partisans and to abandon the Chetniks, especially after reports of collaboration between various Chetnik commanders and the Italians and even Germans, it was Jovanović's fate to be condemned by all sides. Mihailović's supporters, including some of Jovanović's closest friends and former pupils, blamed him for not supporting the Chetnik cause more energetically. The Communists, on the other hand, condemned Jovanović as a war criminal. When, just after the Second World War, Mihailović was captured and brought to trial by the now established Tito government, Slobodan Jovanović was among those who were included, in absentia, in the same trial as accomplices. Jovanović and other ministers of the Royal Government were charged with encouraging Mihailović and the Chetniks not to fight the Germans but to wage war on the Partisans and their supporters. Jovanović was sentenced to twenty years imprisonment at hard labor, the loss of his civil rights for an additional ten years, the confiscation of his entire property, and loss of Yugoslav citizenship.<sup>42</sup>

The seventy-seven-year-old Slobodan Jovanović lived another twelve years, in London, in a modest hotel on Cromwell Road. He continued his open opposition to the Communist-dominated regime in Yugoslavia until his death, on December 16, 1954, less than two weeks after his eighty-ninth birthday. He was one of the founders, and lifelong president, of the Yugoslav National Committee in London. This coalition of Yugoslav political leaders in exile was formed

in August 1945, on the eve of the meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Allied Powers. Their aim was to inform the Council and the world of Yugoslavia's fate under Communist control.<sup>43</sup> Aside from writing memoranda, Slobodan Jovanović published many articles critical of developments in Yugoslavia. The last of these, entitled "Tito and the Bulgarians," dealt with the Macedonian Question and castigated Tito for forming a separate Macedonian Orthodox Church. One of the last sentences Jovanović ever wrote appeared at the end of that article: "Yugoslavia under the Communist régime has lost its economic independence. Without foreign loans, which are sometimes concealed subventions, it not only could not build socialism in its own way, but it could not even provide bread for the people."<sup>44</sup> Apart from articles dealing with current politics, Jovanović also wrote many historical studies, returning to earlier themes — Svetozar Marković, Nikola Pašić, Vojislav Marinković, and other Serbian figures of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Even if Slobodan Jovanović had never been active in politics, he would have been *persona non grata* to the present Yugoslav authorities on ideological grounds alone. Not only was he a philosophical liberal, a skeptical pragmatist and a political conservative, but he was explicitly anti-Marxist and anti-socialist, even in his writings before the Second World War. Just his biography of Svetozar Marković alone would have brought Communist disapproval on his head. Svetozar Marković (1846-1875) was revered in the new Yugoslavia as the founder of the socialist idea in Serbia. Yet, for Slobodan Jovanović, writing in 1903, Marković was an immature ideologue hungry for popularity, a man who was "greater in character than in mind." His summation of Marković, written at the beginning of the century, is devastatingly critical and especially embarrassing in the context of the present:

His ideas were neither sufficiently original nor sufficiently precise. He had neither the power of examination, nor a critical spirit, nor a passion for truth, nor any scholarly scruples in general. But he was one of those who is capable of loving ideas and of being enthused by them. He believed in socialism, so much so that, under other circumstances, he might have become its martyr. He was a singular example among us of the

doctrinaire who places his principles not only above personal interests, but also above the interests of his country, for he considers his own principles to be of universal value, and the interests of his own country as something local and transitory . . . . By his ideological fanaticism, Marković gave the impression of being a foreigner, a man who had brought from Russia not only Chernyshevskii's principles, but also something of the temperament of her mystical revolutionaries.<sup>45</sup>

Jovanović was rather more respectful of Karl Marx, but quite critical. He concluded his lengthy study on Marxism with the observation: "By combining materialism and historicism, economics and sociology, Marx created a special doctrine, one which bears the name of Marxism, and which is neither philosophy nor history nor economics nor sociology in the real meaning of the word. But in all these disciplines, Marxism provoked a ferment, a clarification of concepts, and opened new horizons."<sup>46</sup> Jovanović denied Marx's ideology its claimed scientific basis without denying its appeal. He denied its philosophical basis, too, namely, Materialism, when he observed, "Materialism claims that the spirit is dependent on matter: consciousness is only the function of the brain. Marx wished to apply this view to the social sciences as well, but can one make a differentiation between spirit and matter with regard to society? Society is the relationship among men, a relationship that is thoroughly spiritual, for it is maintained by their consciousness of common aims and common principles."<sup>47</sup> He concluded categorically, "It is erroneous to think that material conditions create spiritual forms of life."<sup>48</sup> Jovanović also criticized Marx's economic theory, pointing out that even if capitalism should crash at some future time, "from the scientific point of view, the burden of Marxism does not lie in predicting the ruin of capitalism, but of predicting the process of its ruin."<sup>49</sup> In this respect, too, Jovanović concluded, "With all of its determinism, Marxism is not in a position to predict the course of historic events. Its fundamental error is that the economic situation 'determines' historical development: it does not determine it, but conditions it."<sup>50</sup> Much of Jovanović's study entails not only his own critical description of Marxism, but a lengthy review of the opinions of such anti-Marxists as Rudolf Stammler, Hans Kelsen, Otmar Spann,

Werner Sombart, Franz Oppenheimer, Ludwig Mises, Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber, and Max Scheler, all of whom criticized Marxism from various standpoints.

It is, of course, not our aim here either to present a full summary of Jovanović's work on Marxism or to analyze it. Rather we wished to show how even in 1935, when this work was published, Jovanović was opposed to Marxism on philosophical theoretical grounds, before he ever confronted Marxian communism as a political opponent. Though published a half-century ago, Jovanović's study of Marx and Marxism remains, even if only *faute de mieux*, one of the best informed critiques of Marxist theory in the Serbian language. It is incredible how Književne Novine would have ever thought it possible to publish such a study in socialist Yugoslavia today, and without any deletions or commentary. It is even difficult to conceive how Prosveta would have gone about publishing an annotated and "critical" edition of this work without being forced to get bogged down in lengthy refutations which might, and might not, convince the reader.

To be sure, it was not only on philosophical and theoretical grounds that Yugoslav Communists would object to publishing Jovanović's writings. Even if only the most safely historical and least provocative of his works were selected for publication, and sufficiently offset by critical notes, the very fact that a condemned war criminal and political opponent of the Yugoslav Revolution was being published in the new Yugoslavia would by itself be of political significance. As an article in the Zagreb periodical *Danas* pointed out, this would give comfort to the supporters of all sorts of undesirable trends in Yugoslav society, especially regarding the tangled nationalities question, given Jovanović's views on Serbian nationalism vis-à-vis the Croats, the Muslims, the Macedonians, and the Montenegrins.<sup>51</sup>

Perhaps what encouraged both publishing houses was the fact that, in 1963, the prestigious Matica Srpska had succeeded in publishing a volume of Slobodan Jovanovic's selected "Portraits from History and Literature", as part of a series of the Srpska Književna Zadruga called "Serbian Literature in One Hundred Books."<sup>52</sup> The editor, Živorad Stojković, took pains to explain in his foreword that, however Jovanović's works in Serbian political history might be evaluated, they had their place in Serbian culture as literary works, like the memoirs of Archpriest Mateja Nenadović or the historical



writings of Vuk Karadžić. Stojković made clear his awareness of Jovanović's methodological faults as a historian. Nevertheless, he characterized Jovanović's history as "a great fresco of our nineteenth century" and concluded, "If, then, it is not always a faithful picture in the sense of documents and judgments, it is faithful, authentic, as a picture of the country, the milieu and the man of our past."<sup>53</sup>

Yet not even this carefully selective and circumspectly introduced volume of Jovanović's writings escaped criticism. From among the Marxist historians it was Nikola Petrović who published an especially trenchant denunciation of Slobodan Jovanović as a historian, in the leading Yugoslav historical journal *Jugoslovenski Istorijski Časopis*.<sup>54</sup> Petrović explicitly opposed Stojković's attempt to justify the publication of Jovanović's work by attempting to distinguish between Jovanović as a significant cultural figure and Jovanović as a politician. Even if such a distinction between the "good" and the "bad" Jovanović were valid, Petrović asserted, the question would still arise whether anyone with Jovanović's political past deserved to be published in today's Yugoslavia. However, Petrović went further. His whole article was based on his conviction that there were not two Jovanovićaes but one; even as a historian, Petrović asserted, Jovanović was a reactionary monarchist who selected and used facts to buttress his own subjectivist and idealist views of the Serbian past. "Therefore," Petrović concluded, "there can be no discussion about whether our historical science will be able to make profitable use of Slobodan Jovanović's work." To support his thesis, Petrović presented a detailed analysis of some of Jovanović's studies. As one might expect, he found especially useful for his criticism Jovanović's work on Svetozar Marković. However, he also saw in Jovanović's treatment of Serbia's rulers in the nineteenth century, particularly Prince Miloš Obrenović, largely an apologia for monarchical despotism as the most suitable government for the Serbian masses. Finally, especially from his own Marxist point of view, Petrović criticized Slobodan Jovanović for stressing personal elements, even to the point of gossiping, instead of getting at the real work of a professional historian, namely, to penetrate and explain the causes and movement of social processes. "It seems to me," Petrović concluded, "that the examples which we have presented show fairly clearly that, regardless of the practical political activity of its author, the historical work of S. Jovanović is filled with a deep lordly con-

tempt for the people, for the common working men, and that it is permeated with a respectful awe for kings and monarchical institutions in general. Written with an unconcealed intent to serve the propagation of the monarchical idea at a time when the monarchy was in an ceaseless conflict with the people, it necessarily had to abandon the method of scientific research and to stoop to the level of common apologetics."<sup>55</sup>

It is indicative of Jovanović' preeminent position in Serbian historiography and literature that, despite both ideological and political considerations, two leading Belgrade publishing houses should have decided to publish his works. The first of these was Prosveta. It made the decision in late 1983 and publicized its intention in two announcements, in 1984 and 1985. Prosveta's plan was to publish a critically annotated series of Jovanović's "Selected Works". To lend respectability and legitimacy to this politically delicate enterprise. Prosveta appointed an editorial board which included such well-known historians, lawyers, and historians of literature as Najdan Pašić, Jovan Djorđević, Dragoslav Janković, Radoslav Ratković, Andrej Mitrović, Jovan Deretić, Čedomir Popov, Momčilo Zečević, Milorad Ekmečić, and Radoš Ljubišić, all scholars with doctorates.<sup>56</sup> It was to be a big and expensive undertaking. The edition was to consist of some six thousand pages, and was offered to advance subscribers for 12,000 dinars.<sup>57</sup>

Not to be outdone. Književne Novine announced that it had bought the copyright to Slobodan Jovanović's Collected Works and that it would publish them all, in twenty volumes. Its editors let it be known that the edition would be a copy of the original and would be published without a commentary. It was reported that Jovanović's heir-ess, who held the copyright, was not at all pleased with Prosveta's approach of a "critical" edition, and only of selected works. In reporting this, the Zagreb newspaper *Danas* stated that her decision was especially welcomed by the Serbian "nationalistic lobby" in Belgrade.<sup>58</sup> Similarly Belgrade's NIN also referred to a "nationalistic lobby" which, its reported said, initiated the project of Književne Novine for fear that through Prosveta's critical and selective approach "the Marxists will destroy our Slobodan Jovanović!"<sup>59</sup> All this raises various questions. Among these is the lack of a more precise identification of this "nationalistic lobby" in Belgrade. Another involves the validity of a copyright to Jovanović's works when

his entire property had been confiscated by the Yugoslav state in 1946.

Inevitably the affair became politicized. The forum chosen for this discussion was the Belgrade Municipal Committee of the League of Communists. At this body's meeting of January 30, 1985, its secretary — ironically also called Slobodan Jovanović — declared, "Have we come to such a pass that our publishing houses are not only competing but wrangling over the works of Slobodan Jovanović, who headed the émigré government, who was condemned as a war criminal and in whose cabinet Draža Mihailović was minister of war — not to speak of the books themselves, nor of their critical apparatus, about which specialist scholars will express their appropriate critical evaluations and judgments. As there are plenty of other collected works and personalities waiting to be published, do we really need this kind of disloyal competition and squabbling, in which our press has played its own part and is not without responsibility."<sup>60</sup>

Both publishing houses attempted to justify themselves, but without success. On February 14, 1985, the Presidium of the Belgrade Municipal Committee of the League of Communists demanded of both houses and of their Communist employees to reconsider the matter, "including the determination of ideological and political responsibility" in the affair.<sup>61</sup> These last words had a particularly ominous ring.

As a result of various meetings, both publishing houses withdrew their plans to publish Slobodan Jovanović's works. As to the consequences for those who bore "ideological and political responsibility" in the matter, that was left for the future — "sooner or later," Danas reported, "but most certainly."<sup>62</sup>

Truly books, like their authors, have their own destinies.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

<sup>1</sup>For biographical sketches of Jovanović written after his death, see, among others, M. Kočinović, "Beogradska zrna," *Naša Reč*, XII (January, 1959), 10–11; and Ivan Avakumović's obituary in *The Journal of Central European Affairs*, XIX (April, 1959), 77–78.

<sup>2</sup>Jovan Skerlić, *Istorija nove srpske književnosti*, (2d ed.; Belgrade: Kon, 1921), pp. 482–484.

<sup>3</sup>The article on Vladimir Jovanović in Stanojević's *Narodna enciklopedija*, II (Zagreb: Bibliografski Zavod, n.d.), p. 192, was written by Slobodan Jovanović. For an excellent scholarly account of the political career of Vladimir Jovanović, see the work by Gale Stokes, *Legitimacy through Liberalism: Vladimir Jovanović and the Transformation of Serbian Politics* (Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1975).

<sup>4</sup>The comparison was suggested by K.N. Milutinović, "Slobodan Jovanović kao istoričar," *Pregled*, XVI, Nos. 202–203 (1940), 529.

<sup>5</sup>H.A.L. Fisher, *The Whig Historians, Proceedings of the British Academy*, XIV (London: 1928), p. 8.

<sup>6</sup>G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 279–280.

<sup>7</sup>Arthur Bryant, *Macaulay* (Edinburgh, 1952), pp. 113–114.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>9</sup>Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

<sup>10</sup>Skerlić, *op. cit.*, pp. 483–484.

<sup>11</sup>Ilija Pržić, "Bibliografija radova Slobodana Jovanovića," in *Sabrana dela Slobodana Jovanovića*, XVI (Belgrade: Kon, 1935), 439–463.

<sup>12</sup>K.S. Pavlović published a bibliography of Jovanović's works from 1941 to 1954 in the London émigré periodical *Poruka*, No. 25 (December 16, 1954), 9–10. After Jovanović's death Pavlović compiled a sequel which included not only works published from 1954 to Jovanović's death, but included articles which did not appear in the previous list. This bibliography was published in *Poruka* Nos. 53–54 (January March 1959), 44–45 and 52.

<sup>13</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *O suverenosti* (Belgrade, 1897).

<sup>14</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *O dvodomnom sistemu* (Belgrade, 1899).

<sup>15</sup>*Velika Narodna Skupština; studija o ustavotvornoj vlasti* (Belgrade, 1900). *Engleski parlamentarizam* (Belgrade, 1902); also in *Sabrana dela*, IV (Belgrade: Kon, 1933), 291–369.

<sup>16</sup>*Osnovi pravne teorije o državi* (Belgrade, 1906; 2nd ed.; Belgrade, 1914). *Ustavno pravo, Osnovi javnog prava Kraljevine Srbije*. I (Belgrade, 1907). *Ustavno pravo Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca* (Belgrade, 1924).

<sup>17</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Svetozar Marković* (Belgrade, 1903; 2d, enlarged ed.; Belgrade, 1920; 3d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, II, Belgrade: Kon, 1932, pp. 61–298).

<sup>18</sup>Jovan Skerlić, *Svetozar Marković; njegov život, rad i ideje*. (2d ed.; Belgrade, 1922), p. 8.

<sup>19</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Makiaveli* (Belgrade, 1907; 2d, enlarged ed.; Belgrade, 1912; 3d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, XV, Belgrade: Kon, 1935, pp. 147–272).

<sup>20</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Vodji francuske revolucije* (Belgrade, 1920; 2d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, I, Belgrade: Kon, 1932).

<sup>21</sup>For Plato and Burke see *Iz istorije političkih doktrina*, Book I, in *Sabrana dela*, XV (Belgrade: Kon, 1935). The long study on Marx required a separate volume, *Iz istorije političkih doktrina*, Book II, in *Sabrana dela*, XVI (Belgrade: Kon, 1935).

<sup>22</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Ustavobranitelji i njihova vlada (1838–1858)*, (Belgrade: 1912; 2d, enlarged ed.; Belgrade, 1925; 3d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, V, Belgrade: Kon, 1933).

<sup>23</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila (1858–1868)*, (Belgrade, 1925; 2d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, VII, VIII, and IX, Belgrade: Kon, 1934).

<sup>24</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Vlada Milana Obrenovića*, I (Belgrade, 1925); II (Belgrade, 1927); 2d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, VII, VIII, and IX (Belgrade: Kon, 1934).



<sup>25</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, *Vlada Aleksandra Obrenovića*, I (Belgrade, 1929); II (Belgrade, 1931); 2d ed. in *Sabrana dela*, X (Belgrade: Kon, 1934); XI (Belgrade: Kon, 1935); and XII (Belgrade: Kon, 1936).

<sup>26</sup>K. St. Pavlović, "Od Kneza Milana do Degola," *Poruka*, Nos. 53–54 (January–March, 1959), 23.

<sup>27</sup>Sima Pandurović, "Slobodan Jovanović," *Misao*, XXIV, Nos. 177–178, 79.

<sup>28</sup>Živorad Stojković, "Umesto predgovora," in Slobodan Jovanović, *Portreti iz istorije i književnosti* (Novi Sad — Belgrade: Matica Srpska. Srpska Književna Zadruga, 1963), p. 11.

<sup>29</sup>Mirko Žeželj, "Slobodan Jovanović kao književnik," *Srpski Književni Glasnik*, LX, new series, (July 16 and August 1, 1940), 464.

<sup>30</sup>Dragoljub Jovanović, "Slobodan Jovanović i narod," *Srpski Književni Glasnik*, LIX, No. 3, new series, (1940), 193. The author gives some characteristic examples of Slobodan Jovanović's diction.

<sup>31</sup>Žeželj, *op. cit.*, p. 465.

<sup>32</sup>Isidora Sekulić, "Stil Slobodana Jovanovića," *Nova Evropa*, I (September 16–December 28, 1920), 56–64, see especially pp. 57–58.

<sup>33</sup>Stanko Katić, "Između biznisa i politike," *Danas* (Zagreb), February 26, 1985, p. 25.

<sup>34</sup>Sources differ as to the date of the founding of the Serbian Cultural Club. The editor's biographical note to Slobodan Jovanović's work *O totalitarizmu* (Paris: Oslobodenje, 1952) states that Jovanović was made president of the Serbian Cultural Club in 1936. Ivan Avakumović gives the date as 1937 in his obituary of Slobodan Jovanović in *The Journal of Central European Affairs*, XIX (April 1959), 78. So does Radoje L. Knežević in his article "Slobodan Jovanović u politici." *Poruka* (London: No. 52 (December 1958): 26. Alex N. Dragnich also gives 1937 as the founding date in *The First Yugoslavia* (Stanford University: Hoover Institution Press, 1983), p. 128. However, the article on Slobodan Jovanović in the *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, IV (Zagreb: Leksikografski Zavod FNRJ, 1960), p. 544, gives 1939 as the date of the founding.

<sup>35</sup>Jacob B. Hoptner, *Yugoslavia in Crisis 1934–1941* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 255.

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>37</sup>Avakumović, *loc. cit.*

<sup>38</sup>Hoptner, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>39</sup>Dragnich, *loc. cit.*

<sup>40</sup>Knežević, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>41</sup>*Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>42</sup>"Presuda," in *Izdajnik i ratni zločinac Draža Mihailović pred sudom: steno-grafske beleške i dokumenta sa sudjenja Dragoljubu-Draži Mihailoviću* (Belgrade, 1946), p. 528.

<sup>43</sup>For the texts, in Serbo-Croatian, of the various memoranda sent by the Yugoslav National Committee to the foreign ministers of Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, France, and China, as well as to the United Nations and President Truman, see the London émigré periodical *Poruka*, Nos. 30–31 (August 1–September 16, 1955), and No. 31 (November 1, 1955), *passim*.

<sup>44</sup>Slobodan Jovanović "Tito i Bugari," *Poruka*, No. 52 (December, 1958), 6.

<sup>45</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, Svetozar Marković, in *Političke i pravne rasprave*. I. *Sabrana dela Slobodana Jovanovića*, II (Belgrade: Kon, 1932), pp. 262–263.

<sup>46</sup>Slobodan Jovanović, Marks, in *Iz istorije političkih doktrina*, Book 2, in *Sabrana dela Slobodana Jovanovića*. XVI (Belgrade: Kon, 1935), p. 282.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 116.

<sup>51</sup>Stanko Katić. "Između biznisa i politike," *Danas*, February 26, 1985, pp. 25–26.

<sup>52</sup>Slobodan Jovanović. *Portreti iz istorije i književnosti*, ed. Živorad Stojković, vol. LX of *Srpska književnost u sto knjiga* (Novi Sad: Matica Srpska — Srpska Književna Zadruga, 1963).

<sup>53</sup>Živorad Stojković, "Umesto predgovora," *ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>54</sup>Nikola Petrović, "Filozofija istorije i istorijski metod Slobodana Jovanovića," *Jugoslavenski Istorijski Časopis*, I (1963), 3–24.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>56</sup>Milorad Vučelić, "Šta ko hoće od s. jovanovića." *NIN*, February 10, 1985. p. 35.

[sic]

<sup>57</sup>Katić, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup>Vučelić. *op. cit.*, p. 35.

<sup>60</sup>Cited by Katić, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*

## WAR IN THE WORKS OF DOBRICA ĆOSIĆ

Almost all of the literary works of Dobrica Ćosić are concerned with war, in one form or another. Even those that do not (*Koreni* [Roots], *Bajka* [A Fable], *Akcija* [Action]), are indirectly connected with what for Ćosić must be the most important human behavior — war. One can only conjecture why he is so obsessed with this theme. Several possible explanations come to mind. The traumatic experiences of the people around him, as well as his own, in the Second World War must have had such a powerful impact on him that, when he began to write, it was natural to start with what he was most familiar. Undoubtedly, his Marxist upbringing conditioned him to see in every human action an inherent conflict of opposing forces, and war easily fits into this world view. Also, throughout his activities, both literary and non-literary, Ćosić has shown a pronounced humanistic approach, which compels him to try to understand human behavior so that he can help through his understanding. His unerring sense as a true artist for the most dramatic of all human experiences — war — led him to its exploration in his works. Most likely, however, it was his fervent desire to fathom war, something that in reality defies understanding and explanation, that made him return to the theme of war time and again.

It is not my intention here to chronicle all the war circumstances depicted in Ćosić's works, nor to answer all questions concerning his political, ideological, and philosophical views that may have influenced his depiction of war. Books can be written about it and many disciplines could, and should, be involved. Rather, I would like to trace the basic attitudes of Ćosić toward war and to shed some light on his motives and conclusions, in hope of contributing to our understanding of a writer, who is rapidly becoming one of the most important writers of all Serbian literature.

Quite naturally, Ćosić started with what he knew best: the struggle for the liberation of his country during World War II. His first work, *Daleko je sunce* (Distant Is the Sun, 1951),<sup>1</sup> not only made him famous overnight, it also lay the foundations for the overriding theme of his writing career. It came as a logical result of his preoccupation with the conflicts and ideas involved in the Second World War. As a prewar communist and a partisan in the war, he felt eminently competent to present that war as he and his like-minded compatriots



saw it. What struck me even as I read *Daleko je sunce* the first time, was the objectivity with which he treated his subject matter. To be sure, one can see the obvious signs of his allegiance, the thinly disguised black-and-white characterization, and the bursts of unbridled enthusiasm typical of a beginner's work. Still, even in this work one can detect the contours of Ćosić's basic attitude toward war, foreshadowing his further development in that direction.

Along with other, more obvious aspects of war, which are so self-explanatory that they need not be mentioned, Ćosić discovered early that war is a great school of life, in which one discovers the true nature of man. "I was compelled to realize," he says in the introduction to his first novel, "that man presents both an enormous uncertainty and an immeasurable secret. Without this experience, without this realization and feeling which I acquired in the war, it seems to me I wouldn't have had anything with which to comprehend man and life; most likely, I wouldn't be able to write books either" (*DJS*, 12-13). This notion of war as a great school of life leads Ćosić to the next question: Who or what can provide the best answers about war. "The answers of science and history to that question, even when they are truly objective, are not efficient. That question must be answered by the arts, first of all by literature."<sup>2</sup>

Other realizations at which Ćosić arrived early stem from the nature of the war in which he was involved. The unevenness of the struggle of the Serbian rebels against the powerful enemy not only struck him as being unfair, it also led to sporadic manifestations of the loss of courage and resolve (*DJS*, 63), the depiction of which demonstrates Ćosić's objectivity mentioned before. This objectivity is further seen in the tragic end of one of the partisan leaders, the peasant Gvozden, who is executed by his own people for refusing to continue to fight for fear of the enemy reprisals (*DJS*, 108-116). As always in the history of the Serbs, peasants bore the burden of the fighting, suffering, and dying. They did not like to fight far away from their homes: "If I must be killed, it's better to be killed in front of my own house" (*DJS*, 162). Eventually, the peasants, like all other participants, realized that the struggle for freedom overcomes all concerns and fears: "There is no defeat in the struggle for freedom. . . . And what is one's death and the death of the whole regiment measured against freedom and a war like this?" (*DJS*, 232). It is interesting that already in his first work Ćosić has hit upon the

main theme of his best work, *Vreme smrti* (A Time of Death): the fate of the Serbian people throughout history and their enormous capacity for suffering, endurance, and survival. At this stage Ćosić was primarily concerned with the struggle of the partisans against the enemies for a better future according to the communist ideological prescription. But one of the partisan leaders seems to perceive the real reason for the struggle when he says: "All my ancestors were born for trenches. As if their only purpose and task was to grow up for war, bring to the world an only son for the next war, and die themselves in war. . . . In our entire history we've had only two occupations: tilling the land and fighting war. And other nations have built culture, science, industry, cities, and other miraculous things" (*DJS*, 85-86). How much this constant warring weighs on the minds of his family is best illustrated by the fact that they take the name "Živić" in a superstitious hope that they will not become extinct. The partisan leader hopes that this will be the last war the Serbs must fight; the reader is struck by the historical oddity of the fate of this small nation.

All these features of Ćosić's attitude toward war appear again in his ambitious, though less successful work, the three-volume novel *Deobe* (Divisions, 1961).<sup>3</sup> Although the novel is much more tendentious and one-sided than *Daleko je sunce*, it still offers ample proof of Ćosić's increasing obsession with war as the most tragic but also the most mystifying of all human activities. For even though he wanted to discredit the main opponents of the partisans — the Chetniks — and by maligning them, to enhance the moral superiority of the partisans in the war (who are never criticized for anything!), the reader gets the impression that behind Ćosić's primary motive there lies a persistent effort to *understand* why the Chetniks acted so despicably (as he describes them) and whether they could have acted otherwise. Why do human beings commit such bestial acts of horror against each other? (Ćosić makes the knife used in committing these horrors the symbol of this bestiality). Why is hatred so deep that it simply destroys reason? Can the descendants of those same people comprehend and believe many years later that such acts were, or even can be, committed by men?

In addition to these weighty questions, we meet again the situations encountered in *Daleko je sunce*: bravery under the most trying circumstances (*D*, I, 238, 415); the struggle of a small nation against

an overpowering enemy (*D*, I, 46, 192); the corruption of the existing order (*D*, I, 143); the weaknesses and sins of the enemies (*D*, I, 188, 190); and the reluctance of the peasants to fight away from their homes (*D*, I, 291-93). But, as the war drags on and the inhumanity of man to man intensifies to alarming proportions, Ćosić becomes more and more philosophical, almost existential. "In the wars up to now soldiers died, in this one — nations die. Death has no face. In the relationship between the conqueror and the conquered the moral consequence of sincerity is capitulation on both sides. Sincerity brings a hazard and a suicide" (*D*, I, 96). War leads to total demoralization (*D*, I, 111), total chaos and the psychosis of despair (*D*, I, 183). Everybody fights everybody (*D*, I, 204), hatred permeates everything (*D*, I, 178), all are killers (*D*, I, 15, 342), and everyone commits crimes (*D*, II, 147). The eye-for-an-eye principle dominates, and even fathers and sons can no longer work and live together; on the contrary, they are killing each other (*D*, II, 147). Even though Ćosić attributes most of these traits and attitudes to the enemies of the partisans, he begins to realize that more is involved than just a struggle for social, political, and ideological changes. On the one hand, war has moved inward, into the hearts and souls of the people, and against one's own kin. On the other, the signs of resignation and helplessness are more and more visible. Sentiments and conclusions such as "We are at war. It's war" (*D*, I, 400) and "we are to be blamed for being humans and peasants, that we're alive" (*D*, I, 28) are expressed more often. Ćosić almost even admits that war is a total mystery (*D*, III, 132), therefore beyond one's understanding of it or ability to explain it.

Ćosić explores most exhaustingly the phenomena of war in his latest work, the tetralogy *Vreme smrti*.<sup>4</sup> The title indicates the author's realization that he is dealing with the ultimate experience that everyone faces sooner or later — death. By juxtaposing death and war, he is suggesting that war is much more than an abundant cause of death, that it is, indeed, a time when man faces, more than at any other time, the basic questions of both life and death.

It is fashionable, in political and literary circles, to see in *Vreme smrti* Ćosić's awakening of nationalistic feelings and retreat from his former ideas and political views. It is difficult to establish the truth in this matter without his own public testimony. It is also outside the limited scope of this paper. Whatever his views are today, however, one thing is certain: for him, war remains the most important

experience of every man and nation, against which everything else is judged and measured. *Vreme smrti* is the most poignant testimony to that.

This novel includes great variety of opinions on what war is and why people wage wars. These opinions vary according to the person expressing them; not all of them can be attributed to Ćosić, of course. (Unlike other works of fiction in which ultimately everything expresses indirectly the author's points of view, *Vreme smrti* utilizes many historical events, personalities, and documents which often differ from the author's views.) Still, by tracing the different opinions and characterization of war in this novel, one can obtain a composite picture of Ćosić's conception of war and how he presents it.

At first, and for a long time in the novel, the notion of war depends to a large degree on the social background and position of the person in question. An old peasant leader, Aćim, expresses a conservative peasant view when he advises his grandson against deserting: "Go with the people, my son. There is no better road for man" (*VS*, IV, 390). His son Vukašin, a politician and opposition leader, has the more sophisticated notion of war of a highly educated intellectual: "War is the only time when we live for history, when we get some respect through our suffering and dying" (*VS*, I, 79). For the crafty political leader of the country, Nikola Pašić, war is a supreme test of statesmanship and of the stamina of the people: "No one knows how much a man and a nation can do for their own survival" (*VS*, IV, 474). "For a man, and especially a nation, there is no hopeless situation" (*VS*, IV, 476). A high commanding officer, General, and later Voyvoda Živojin Mišić, has, perhaps not surprisingly, a loathing for war: "War is loathsome to me" (*VS*, I, 271). "War is the worst activity of man. . . . It's always the evil that wages war" (*VS*, II, 114). He considers himself the greatest coward (*VS*, III, 366), yet he insists time and again that Serbia fights only for survival and therefore right and justice are on her side. A young socialist, Bodgan Dragović, has misgivings: "War is a plunder under the pretext of a great idea" (*VS*, I, 235). "Serbia can be saved only by a revolution" (*VS*, I, 215). Yet even he fights on bravely, as does almost everyone else.

Other opinions on war, expressed at random as the situation dictates, indicate the degree to which the participants must cope with this cataclysmic upheaval. For some, war is a great equalizer (*VS*, I,



22, 289) that unmasks everything (VS, I, 113) and shames more people than it kills (VS, I, 272); it is a terrible illness (VS, I, 310), which will conquer us all (VS, I, 348). As the disaster brings more misery, suffering, and death, some people become more philosophical. They see war as being older and more enduring than man (VS, II, 299), revealing essential truths about man and life (VS, II, 335). Others, less stout-hearted, seem to falter under this calamity (VS, II, 412). Peasants and city dwellers, leaders and simple soldiers alike are disappointed in their allies and in civilization in general. They feel that small nations never completely win a war (VS, IV, 31) and that the deck is always stacked against them. Europe is a criminals' hunting ground and thieves' bazaar (VS, IV, 73) that has made politics uncontrollable, has removed any restraints from hypocrisy and permits any means to an end (VS, IV, 98), so that murderers may kill murderers (VS, IV, 282). Coupled with Ćosić's skillful description of war scenes — without the glorification of heroic deeds but also without unduly dwelling on the more gruesome aspects — these opinions of war can best be summed up in one phrase: WAR IS HELL!

As the agony of the Serbian army and nation unfolds, most, if not all, of these characters seem to come to an agreement about the calamity that has befallen them, as well as about the reasons for, and meaning of, war. Most of them tend to concur now that war, cruel and unjust as it is, must be endured to the bitter end, because the alternative is even worse. Death becomes unimportant as everyone's will to survive is put to the sternest test. The symbol of this iron will is expressed through the thoughts, works, and actions of Voyvoda Mišić. Of peasant stock himself, unpretentious and down-to-earth, he repeatedly tells everyone, from the king down to the foot soldier, why he thinks Serbia must fight on and endure beyond what is humanly possible. "Ours is a peasant army. It defends the home and children. It fights for survival and life" (VS, II, 37). "When one defends his existence, he has the right to do anything" (VS, I, 269). "Only the sacrifices we make for our survival are not in vain" (VS, III, 514). Perhaps the best indication of his thoughts is contained in the following statement: "The greatest respect earn those. . . who defend the survival of their people" (VS, II, 171). Most other people accept this simple reasoning and do more than they themselves ever thought of being capable of. Even the young socialist Bogdan Dra-

gović changes his mind and accepts his date with destiny: "War has acquired a meaning larger and more inevitable than all other ideas, deeper than any known reason" (VS, II, 245).

It is through the thoughts and actions of Živojin Mišić that Dobrica Ćosić expresses his final conclusions about war. If in *Daleko je sunce* he seems to condone war primarily for the sake of an idea, and in *Deobe* he has no answer for the incomprehensible cruelty of man, in *Vreme smrti* he finds justification for war, even if in one case only: in the struggle for national survival. He has found a perfect example for such justification in the death struggle of his small nation against seemingly unsurmountable odds. He does so not out of nationalistic or chauvinistic impulses but rather from the position that every man, through his nation, has the right and the obligation to defend his dignity and liberty. It must be added, however, that it is not so much biological survival that Ćosić has in mind as is the defense of a nation and society where liberty, justice, and dignity prevail. Ćosić believes that even in such fateful struggles for survival man should display high moral qualities, for only thus is life worth living and freedom necessary (VS, II, 79). He believes that his nation values justice above freedom (VS, II, 190), that war is won and lost in the soul (VS, II, 270), and that the victor's bravery is not always the most important thing (VS, II, 210). Barbarism in the name of one country and of freedom is a sign of military despair (VS, II, 337).

Thus, he seems to have found the answer to the question that has troubled him since he began to write (or, possibly even earlier, since he began to think): Why do people war against each other and what is the meaning of it? While they will probably never stop warring, committing atrocities and inflicting suffering, war for Ćosić is justified for those who defend themselves against annihilation and then only if they fight for freedom and justice at the same time. This is the final and the most significant message of *Vreme smrti* and of Ćosić's entire opus.

From a narrow view of war as a means for an ideological and political end, Ćosić moves to a much broader position, with a global approach to a universal problem. By shifting from a setting to which he himself was a witness to a period before his birth, he gains in perspective and objectivity. The more complex situation of fratricide in the Second World War has given way to the simpler though no less tragic conflict of World War I, thus enabling him to probe the

more lasting and universal facets of war. It is safe to say that Ćosić has found answers to the burning questions about war and the in-born cruelty of man. Through that, he has found peace with himself.

University of North Carolina

<sup>1</sup>*Daleko je sunce* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1951). All references to this novel appear in the text under DJS.

<sup>2</sup>*Akcija* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1964), vol. II. p. 221.

<sup>3</sup>*Deobe* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1961), 3 vols. All references to these volumes appear in the text under D.

<sup>4</sup>*Vreme smrti* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1969-1979), 4 vols. All references to these volumes appear in the text under VS.

#### THE BEGINNINGS OF THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT IN NINETEENTH CENTURY SERBIA

The first wave of activities aimed at the emancipation of Serbian women surged forth in the late 1860's. It was preceded by almost a hundred years of individual and small group efforts to provide a meaningful and systematic education for Serbian girls, and coincided with the founding of the United Serbian Youth Organization (*Ujedinjena omladina srpska*) in 1866 and with the work of Svetozar Marković (1843-1875), the first Serbian advocate of socialist ideas and an ardent supporter of the emerging feminist movement. Among the women active in that early phase of the movement, one of the most visible was Draga Dejanović (1840-1871). First an actress and a poet, she later became a student of education and a persuasive public lecturer for the women's cause. Another woman, who distinguished herself in public and educational life and took part in pro-feminist activities for over forty years, was Katarina Milovuk (b. Novi Sad, 1844-d. Belgrade, 1909). She was an able principal of the first upper level Serbian school for women (*Viša ženska škola*) which opened in Belgrade in 1863. Although not as vocal as Draga Dejanović, especially in the early phase of the movement, K. Milovuk would remain in the history of Serbian feminism as the writer of a memorandum submitted to the Parliament in the mid-1890's requesting, for the first time in the history of Serbia, the civil and political rights for Serbian women. A bill, introduced as a result of Milovuk's action, came the closest to a successful passage in 1902, when it was defeated by only two votes.

Under the new political and social conditions created in Serbia after the fall of the Obrenovići in 1903, the women's movement entered a new phase. In the 19th century, it represented a united force led by the educated women of the affluent classes. When the new, working class woman appeared on the political scene in the early 20th century, she and her peasant sisters did not feel affinity for or allegiance to the feminist movement in the form in which it was inherited from the 19th century. Instead, they joined a new women's organization created under the wing of the Socialist-Democrat Party which promised them "an effective struggle" against all the social injustices and a victory that would bring them "true equality with men". Thus, the beginning of the 20th century meant the



end of a united women's movement in Serbia and the creation of two different factions, each of which would continue to struggle for the same goal but from different platforms and using different means.

## I.

At the peak of the early phase of the feminist movement, in 1871, John Stuart Mill's book *The Subjection of Women* appeared in Belgrade in Serbo-Croatian translation<sup>1</sup>, only two years after its first publication in London (1869). The introduction was written by Svetozar Marković, who had joined the active supporters of the movement in 1870, when he published his famous article "Is Woman Capable of Being Equal to Man".<sup>2</sup> The article was written in Zurich, on the occasion of the graduation of an Englishwoman at the University of Zurich Medical School,<sup>3</sup> and was based on the ideas of John Stuart Mill which Marković adapted to the current situation in Serbia.

Due mainly to this article and to the importance of his work in Serbian political and cultural history in general, Svetozar Marković has been viewed for many decades as the *initiator* of the feminist movement in Serbia. Not only that such a view is simplistic (a movement is never begun by one man's activities!), but it does correspond to the factual evidence we have. It is true that before Svetozar Marković no man in Serbia or in Vojvodina wrote so eloquently and with so much persuasion and common sense about the woman's rights and her role in an enlightened society. But he was not the first one to do so. The roots of the movement of 1860's can be traced as far back as to the times of Dositej Obradović (1743-1811). As for its first active phase in the 1860's, the activities of the *Ujedinjena omladina srpska* and at least two known public lectures of Draga Dejanović preceded the article on the equality between women and men written by Svetozar Marković. Thus, although Marković was one of the ardent and very valuable supports of the Serbian feminist movement, the movement had actually started before he became actively involved in it.

## II.

The early phase of Serbian feminism was defined by Skerlić as

being basically *patriotic* in character. Indeed, the movement had a very strong patriotic component, virtually unknown to the movements in the more developed, industrialized countries of Western Europe or in the U.S. In the 1860's, while Western women already fought for their civil and political rights, the feminists in Serbia idealized *enlightened motherhood* as the most important factor for the further development of the Serbian nation. The immediate goal of the feminists was, therefore, to bring about the creation of a systematic higher education for Serbian women in their native tongue and in the national spirit. The feminists maintained that the new enlightened Serbian mother would be able to raise better citizens of both sexes. She would also be able to make the young generations understand that women and men have equally important roles in the fulfillment of the common national goals and that they must contribute equal shares toward their nation's progress.

In addition, the early feminists acknowledged that in Serbian society there were women who were in need of work. Such women were encouraged to acquire practical skills. Consequently, the feminists demanded that qualified women be allowed to enter the job market and compete with men for jobs for which they had equal skills. This was especially important for single women from modest and low income families as well as for impoverished widows who were forced to provide for themselves and their children.

Because of their emphasis on education and the acquisition of professional skills by women who needed work, it is possible to conclude that the early feminists in Serbia advocated emancipation of women through education, while seeing the progress of the Serbian nation as its ultimate goal. As a result, Serbian feminists, both women and men, never advocated conflict between the sexes. On the contrary, Draga Dejanović, for example, believed that women alone were to be blamed for their humiliating status in Serbian society. Dejanović criticized well-to-do-women from affluent classes for their laziness, useless lives and bad upbringing of their children. According to Dejanović, if such women allowed themselves to become a burden to their fathers and husbands, they had no right to blame the men for treating them as lower human beings and slaves. The feminists also liked to point out that in Serbian villages, where the woman traditionally shared work with the man, she enjoyed

more respect and was treated much better than in the "so-called 'civilized' societies".

### III.

A Vojvodina Serb, Dositej Obradović (1743-1811), was the first prominent Serbian author to advocate, almost as eloquently as Svezotar Marković, the need for systematic education of Serbian girls. He was also the first to tie that need to the enlightened motherhood which would benefit the entire nation. In his *Sověti zdravago razuma* (Leipzig, 1784; Buda, 1806, 2nd ed.) he said: "...our little girls were born for no other purpose than to become mothers; if we educate them — what a wonderful hope for our national enlightenment!" Obradović suggested that girls from age 5 to 12 go to school every day (except on Sunday) for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon. The subjects they should study should be history, geography, logic and ethics. "From history, they will learn what has happened in the world until our time. . . Logic will teach them how to think wisely and make their own judgments. Ethics will open their eyes to see and learn what are their duties and obligations as wives, mothers and homemakers; it will also teach them. . . what they should do and what they should avoid doing so that they can please God and people and spend their lives in peace and do good." Dositej, further, stated that his plan could be realized very easily, in 4-5 years, if good teachers were hired and the instruction provided in the native tongue, the vernacular, which the girls understood. In this way, thought Dositej, in 10-15 years there would be Serbian sons and daughters who would be well educated and able to translate useful books of enlightened nations for the benefit of the Serbian people. He also warned his readers, that "hoće se ovome poslu nekoliko godina, jer učeni ljudi ne postaju brzo kao pečurke po ledini!" ("This job would require several years, since learned people do not grow as fast as mushrooms in the field" p. 304). Dositej pursued his ideas about the need for women's education in other works including the morals of some of his fables.

Among the women influenced by Obradović's ideas during his lifetime, was Eustahija von Arsič, nee Cincić (1777-1843),<sup>4</sup> the first Serbian woman author who ever published her literary works. An intelligent and wealthy woman, von Arsič spent all her life sup-

porting Serbian (and Romanian) education, literature and culture. She subscribed to many Serbian books and even contributed substantial sums toward their publication. She read Dositej's works and shared his concerns about the education of Serbian women. As she herself had no formal education, Eustahia von Arsič did not focus on the problem of developing formal education for young women. Rather, she advised them and their mothers to educate themselves through reading good and useful books. Her own books, published in 1814 and 1816, as well as an article in the *Letopis Matice srpske*, contain materials which she thought useful for instructing parents how to raise and education children of both sexes.<sup>5</sup>

In a later, 19th century generation, there were at least three women who were well known and respected by their compatriots for their intelligence, talent and accomplishments. Those were Katarina Ivanović (1811-1882), the first renowned woman-painter,<sup>6</sup> Mina Vukomanović-Karadžić (1828-1894), the daughter and an able collaborator of her illustrious father, Vuk St. Karadžić,<sup>7</sup> and Milica Stojadinović Srpkinja (1830-1877), the first Serbian poetess who was popular and widely acclaimed in the period of Romanticism.<sup>8</sup> Mina Karadžić was born and raised in Vienna, while both Katarina Ivanović and Milica Srpkinja came from the Vojvodina. Although these three women did not actively advocate feminist ideas, they certainly contributed to the birth of the movement in the 1860's by their accomplishments, stature and visibility in public life. Actually Milica Stojadinović Srpkinja was the only one of the three who complained, at least to her diary and to her friends, about the miserable position of Serbian women trapped in their homes regardless of their abilities and ambitions. She, herself, never married. Eventually, because of her ill health and problems at home, she was forced to leave the world of excitement and action in Novi Sad and Belgrade and to return to Fruška Gora to Vrdnik, to take care of her health and later that of her ailing father. It was there, in 1854, that she wrote her diary *In Fruška Gora* which was published in 3 volumes in 1861, 1862 and 1866. Ironically, although hailed in the 1850's as the greatest Serbian woman-poet (they called her *Srpska vila*, *vila iz Vrdnika*, etc.), Milica is today interesting mainly because of her prose contained in this diary. She particularly complained about the impossibility to work creatively: "My flowers which I once saw in my beautiful dreams are now wilted; the long illness, housework and



constant come-and-go, all that became like one big log which rolled over me and hasn't allowed the spirit to move. . ."<sup>9</sup> She also complained about her lack of systematic education and more than once reported that she frequently thought "da je krajnje vreme da se ozbiljna pažnja obrati na izobraženje ženske dece".<sup>10</sup> She didn't like the so-called "educated" Serbian women of her time: "Contemporary education of women has been nothing else but an imagination of education (uobraženje da su izobražene)", she says in her *Diary*, Vol. II, on p. 75. "The parents spend money on education of their girls, but are incapable of determining in which directions it will go. . . When finally they acquire an 'educated person' at home, she knows how to grimace and make compliments; she reads damaging novels; and spoils our beautiful language by inserting in it foreign words, while the parents think: 'What an educated daughter we have!' (*loc. cit.*). Srpkinja also disliked foreign fashion, and considered love and falling in and out of it a waste of time which could be better used for a serious education. In her opinion, the only correct upbringing for Serbian women must be in Serbian national spirit. All her thoughts on women and their difficult position in life, however, were scattered in various places in her diary and she never attempted to write an article or a book in which she would put them all together and elaborate on them more systematically. Taking into account, however, that her *Diary* was published in the 1860's, she can be considered one of the contributors to the ideas which would be advocated by the feminists of the late 1860's.

Draga Dejanović (1840-1871), who was only 10 years younger than Srpkinja, was one of the first prominent women of the new generation. An actress, a published poet and speech maker, Draga was dynamic and enthusiastic about her mission. Instead of resignation and bitterness, which are expressed in Srpkinja's *Diary*, Draga fostered hope. Her tenacity and willpower enabled her to pursue her ideals with energy and vigor which Srpkinja never had. With Dejanović in the Vojvodina and Svetozar Marković in Serbia, the latent feminism obtained articulate leaders and became a movement.

#### IV.

The question of acknowledging the equality of Serbian women and men was posed publicly for the first time in 1867, at the Second

Annual Assembly of the United Serbian Youth organization held in Belgrade.<sup>11</sup> As the minutes from the Assembly inform us, "a Russian brother", Bochkarev, a delegate at the Assembly, commented in the very beginning of the plenary session that he had not yet either heard or seen any mention of women; nobody explicitly said whether women could take part in the Assembly or not. The Young Europe, Bochkarev said, should not suppress any more the right of women to participate in various activities together with men. He finally suggested that the Assembly passes a resolution "formally proclaiming the right of women to participate in all public activities (of the organization) and, consequently, in the work of the United Youth Annual Assemblies."<sup>12</sup>

The reaction of the Serbs was mixed and a heated discussion followed<sup>13</sup> until another Russian delegate, Andrejev, expressed his regrets that among the Youth organization members there appeared to be opposing views about the women's rights. The next speaker suggested that the discussion be closed for the time being "until the natural sciences give us their definitive answer" concerning the woman's biological and intellectual equality with men. Finally, in order to solve the problem in a compromising way, a Serbian delegate, Stojan Bošković, proposed an amendment concerning women's participation which would be acceptable to both sides.

The goals of the United Serbian Youth were predominantly cultural and educational (cf. footnote 11). They were expressed in one of the preliminary articles of its constitution which says: "The United Serbian Youth *does not solve* literary and scholarly problems; it is only instrumental in presenting them to as wide an audience as possible, so that people can form their own opinions about them. . ." Considering the orientation of the United Serbian Youth, it is not surprising that this organization could not lead effectively the struggle for the emancipation of women, much less to bring it to victory. However, the final version of the *Resolutions of the Second Assembly*, article 3, states the following: "Women also, depending on the opportunities and their natural situation, should help in the realization of the tasks of the Serbian Youth" (the source, as quoted in footnote 12, p. 144). This was, essentially, the compromising amendment as formulated by Stojan Bošković. It was also the earliest statement on women's rights that was found in an official document of a large and well known Serbian organization founded by men.

Regardless of the disagreements which existed among the male members of the organization, among their women counterparts there was a small number of militant feminists who promoted the cause of the emancipation of women in public speeches and in their published materials. In 1868, women not only attended the Third Assembly held in Veliki Bečkerek but also participated in the discussion (Mila Vidakova, Draga Petrović)<sup>14</sup>. The Constitution of the Organization which came out of this Assembly contains as its 4th article the text concerning women members: "Serbian women also can be members of the United Youth, to help the realization of the Youth's task, if their social position calls for them to do so." (*Matica* 3/1868, p. 860).

At the fourth Annual Assembly in Velika Kikinda, in 1869, among other items on the agenda, a discussion was planned about the ways in which the women-members could be involved in the activities of the organization. The Assembly, however, ran out of time and had to be adjourned without discussing that issue. Right before the adjournment, however, it was decided to meet that afternoon and talk about the women's issue with those delegates who were planning to stay in town. The session was unruly.<sup>15</sup> The speeches of some male delegates were frivolous and generated laughter and joking. Those supporting the full integration of women into various activities of the organization were serious, well augmented and forceful,<sup>16</sup> but the mood was such that few people seemed to have listened to them carefully. It is strange, however, that the minutes do not mention speeches of any women-delegates. It is clear that some women were present at that meeting (minutes from the 4th Assembly, p. 220; also p. 229 and 230-231), but they chose to remain silent, perhaps intimidated by some of their "brothers'" speeches.

## V.

Fortunately for those who want to study the early feminist movement in Serbia, Draga Dejanović<sup>17</sup> chose not to remain as silent as her "sisters" at the Fourth Assembly. As it was pointed out earlier in this paper, she was the first truly outspoken and highly articulate Serbian woman-feminist. Born in 1840 in Stara Kanjiža, she began her public life as an actress and as a poet, publishing her patriotic and love poems as early as in 1862. In 1869 a collection of her poetry

came out in Novi Sad. It was entitled *Spisi Drage Dejanovića* ('Writings of Draga Dejanović'). That same year, her first, and perhaps the best, public lecture appeared in the *Matica*<sup>4</sup> (1869), pp. 63-65, 88-89, 110-112, 137-139. It was entitled "Two or Three Words to our Serbian Women" ('Dve tri reči našim Srpkinjama'). Her second public lecture, "The Emancipation of Serbian Women" ('Emancipacija Srpkinja') was published in *Matica* 5 (1870), pp. 56-61, 81-85, 108-111 and, finally, her third and last public lecture "To Serbian Mothers" (Srpskim majkama) appeared in *Mlada Srbadija* 2 (1871), pp. 85-89, 100-105, shortly before her death in childbirth in July of the same year. These three lectures are among the most important sources for the ideas advocated by early Serbian feminists. On the other hand, they also provide us with a rather broad picture of Serbian women and their social position at the peak of the early phase of the feminist movement.

From these lectures, Draga Dejanović emerges as an enthusiastic, energetic and intelligent woman. She was emancipated and liberated as much as she could have been as a devout "omladinka" with all the qualities and drawbacks of the Youth Movement. In an article entitled "Omladinka Draga Dejanović" (*Misao* 5, 1924), J. Hlapec-Djordjević noted that Draga "possessed an enthusiasm and energy of an Olympe de Gouges or Mary Wolstonecraft, but lacked their logical thinking". Exemplifying this statement, Hlapec-Djordjević brings up the fact that Draga, being an emancipated woman, urged her Serbian "sisters" to become as useful and productive members of Serbian society, as the Western, especially American, women were in their own countries. On the other hand, says Hlapec-Djordjević, as an *omladinka*, Draga deplored the disappearance of the good old patriarchal way of life, and criticized Serbian women for being "poisoned by European civilization" and under the influence of the "rotten West".

It is true that Dejanović detested certain aspects of the Western way of life, because of the distorted, misunderstood version in which they were transplanted in Serbian provincial towns familiar to her.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, she admired truly well educated, professional Western European and American women, especially the self-confident feminists of whose activities she could read in various liberal newspapers and journals of her time. She underscored the impressive achievements of those women and their determination to up-



grade themselves through a proper education and through an active participation in the public life of their countries, insisting that her Serbian "sisters" follow their example. It hardly seems justifiable to accuse Draga Dejanović of contradicting herself in this specific instance. On the contrary, from the perspective of the 1980's, one finds a lot of wisdom, good taste and common sense in Draga Dejanović's lectures: in the small and relatively provincial Vojvodina, she was able to distinguish between the positive and the negative foreign influences, and to advocate the rejection of those which were not beneficial for the Serbian nation.

As a lecturer, Draga Dejanović directed most of her attention to the problems concerning the emancipation of the middle class urban and semi-urban Serbian women from the "činovnički, trgovački, and zanatlijski stalež" ('civil servants', merchants', and craftsmen's wives'). Her goal was to reach the adult woman, primarily the mother who, as Draga felt, was most responsible for the low status of women in Serbian society. In the name of Serbdom and its future, she called upon her "sisters" to recognize that they are created equal with men, and that, consequently, they must share the responsibilities in making their home and their country prosperous. A woman grows up to be a mother, wrote Draga. Mothers are the pillars of the society. They procreate the race and must raise good Serbian men and women. The better the mothers, the faster the progress of the Serbian nation.

Were Serbian mothers in Draga's opinion capable of fulfilling their important role in Serbian society? Enough were; thanks to them the nation had survived. Many were not, and Draga's criticism was mainly directed at them.

The reasons why Serbian mothers failed in their most sacred duty, were, for Dejanović, the lack of a proper upbringing of girls at home and the lack of a good post-elementary education for women. Bad mothers gave a bad example to their daughters. They raised them with the false idea that their only goal in life should be to marry well, to trap a wealthy husband, and be fed and supported by him for the rest of their lives, in the same style to which they were accustomed in their father's home. For Draga this arrangement was unacceptable, humiliating and degrading. Those idle, lazy, and shallow women sat all day in front of their mirrors making themselves "beautiful". They spent their husbands' hard-earned money without giving them much in return. When they became mothers themselves,

a vicious circle would close: they feared so much for their looks ("da će se zbabiti pre vremena"), that they refused to take care of their own children, even to nurse their babies. Foreign women, usually Hungarian or Austrian, were hired for nurses, and many Serbian children, boys and girls alike, grew up without speaking their native Serbian tongue and without knowing anything about their traditions, their national history, or Serbian folk poems and stories.<sup>19</sup> While a boy's education would later on become more meaningful because the fathers wanted their sons to become successful craftsmen, businessmen or professional people, the girls would remain home under the deplorable influence of their mothers or they would be sent to foreign boarding schools for girls to become "majmunasto nakindjrene lutke" ('tastelessly made up money-like dolls'). Under the circumstances, Draga was not surprised that Serbian men looked down at women, who, in her opinion, behaved as spoiled children due to the poor upbringing and their prejudices against work. The only way to get out of that vicious circle, was, in Draga's opinion, meaningful education for women. Her frequent "Učimo se, sestre!" ('Sisters, let us educate ourselves') was her most typical slogan. Draga understood the term "education" very broadly. In her lectures she advocated not only "umno obrazovanje" (i.e. intellectual, formal education) for women, but also "telesno" (meaning, in her context, learning of practical skills, or getting ready for physical, vocational work). In terms of formal education, Draga was adamantly against sending Serbian girls to "instituti" (foreign girls' boarding schools). There, she said, they felt like "izgubljene ovčice" ('lost little sheep') and were taught absolutely nothing useful. Criticizing the choice of subjects taught (music, singing, embroidery), as well as the quality of the instruction, Draga underscored that Serbian women needed a completely different set of subjects and the best possible teachers if they were to become emancipated and useful members of their society:

"Mi, Srpkinje, sasvim drugi izbor u naukama treba da imamo, da učimo ono što će nam koristiti, našu kuću podići, a narod radnim učiniti", "Inštitut nas je doveo do toga da iz svačega ponešto znamo, a kad dodjemo doma te stupimo u porodični život ili padnemo u kakvu nuždu i sirotinju onda tek vidimo da ništa ne znamo".<sup>20</sup>

As far as practical skills are concerned, Draga admits that there are some jobs that are physically too difficult for women, but recommends a list of skills she thinks are perfectly suitable for them, and could provide them with an honest income should they be forced, for one or another reason, to take care of themselves and their children. This was for Dejanović, "radena emancipacija", and the recommended crafts were: "ženski krojač (note that she did not use the usual modern feminine noun *krojačica*!) cipelarski, sajdžijski, pekarski, kolačarski, bojadžijski, tkački, rukavičarski, kuvarski, poslastičarski, staklarski i drugi zanati" ('making tailored clothes for women, shoemaking, repairing watches, professional baking and pastry making, house painting, weaving, glove making, professional cooking, running a pastry shop or being a glaser'.)<sup>21</sup> This list of crafts recommended for women is somewhat unusual even for the second half of the 20th century. It must have sounded outrageous to Dejanović's contemporaries, since she expected "many sisters to laugh at my suggestions and my opinion, but I am not a bit afraid of that! I am more afraid that because of such an attitude, our women will remain for a long time in their sad present day situation".<sup>22</sup>

The lecture "To Serbian Mothers" (1871) is devoted to Draga's views on raising young girls at home. By this time Draga had already given birth to a child who had since died, and she was getting ready to deliver another. She was also preparing her teaching certificate examination and had read books on child rearing and child psychology. All these experiences are reflected in her third published lecture, which is, in some ways, the most romantic and most patriotic of the three.<sup>23</sup>

No matter how we characterize her feminism, as patriotic or concerned with education, or both, the fact remains that Draga Dejanović spoke on the emancipation of women as freely and convincingly as no Serbian woman did before her. She publicly demanded the recognition of the fact that women are equal to men not only biologically, but also intellectually and in terms of their social and national obligations. Because she believed that Serbian women were not yet ready to assume those obligations, Draga was not immediately concerned with civil and political rights and she never advocated them. For her, as for most of the early feminists in Serbia, the right to equal education and acquisition of professional skills ("radena emancipacija") was the first and most urgent goal to achieve.

Dejanović used her energy and eloquence to bring that goal closer to realization. Her pioneering work occupies an important place in the history of Serbian feminist movement: her lectures remain the most important source revealing the character and content of the early phase of the movement viewed from a woman's perspective.

## VI.

The untimely death of Draga Dejanović in 1871, as well as the death of Svetozar Marković in 1875 and the weakening and disintegration of the United Serbian Youth organization at about the same time, left the feminist movement in Serbia and Vojvodina without its most prominent leaders and somewhat slowed down its activities. But the movement didn't die. With varied force and success, Serbian women continued to struggle for their emancipation throughout the 1880's and 1890's.

Dejanović's message "Učimo se, sestre!", the leading slogan of the early Serbian feminists, was heard by a number of talented and bright young women in Serbian and Vojvodina towns. Their degrees and diplomas, teaching certificates, publications, educational and social service organizations came at least partly as a result of Dejanović's example and spiritual influence. While in the 1850's, self-educated Milica Stojadinović Srpkinja was the only Serbian woman of acknowledged literary accomplishments, by mid-1890-s the list of "srpske spisateljice" ('Serbian women of letters') rose to over 150 names.<sup>24</sup>

As early as in the 1870's the women achieved recognition in some other "male" fields as well. Katarina Milovuk continued to lead successfully the Viša ženska škola in Belgrade, which celebrated in 1873 its 10th anniversary. In 1874, a similar school, Viša devojačka škola, was opened in Novi Sad. In 1876, the painter Katarina Ivanović was elected the first woman member of the Serbian Learned Society. Dr. Draga Ljočić (b. Šabac, 1855 — d. Belgrade, 1926) returned in 1879 from the Zürich University Medical School with an M.D. degree, thus becoming the first woman physician in Serbia and in the Balkans. Savka J. Subotić (Novi Sad, 1834-1918) traveled through Serbian and Vojvodina villages and small towns collecting samples of folk embroidery and building her reputation as an authority in that field. A student of Franz Liszt and an accomplished



pianist, Jovanka Stojković (1855-1892) eventually gained fame as one of the three outstanding pioneers of performing arts in Serbia.<sup>25</sup> Finally, even the first Serbian cookbook written by a woman appeared in the late 1870's. The author was Katarina Popović-Midžina. The book was published in Novi Sad in 1878, under the title *Veliki srpski kuvar sa slikama, za upotrebu srpskih domaćica*. An ad in the *Javor* (1878, pp. 1235-36), highly recommended the cookbook ending with these words: "... bolje je nabaviti ovu srpsku knjigu nego tudje 'kohlbuhe', jer srpska će knjiga bez sumnje bolje pogoditi naš ukus i zadovoljiti naše blagoutrobije nego li strane." ('it is better to buy this Serbian book than a foreign 'kochbuch', because the Serbian book will, undoubtedly, please our taste and our tummies better than a foreign one').

At the end of the first wave of activities aimed at the emancipation of Serbian women, the results were quite satisfactory. The number of educated women was on the increase and in spite of occasional drawbacks, the movement continued to grow. In 1905, only fifty years after the first public elementary schools for girls were set up in Belgrade, the newly created University of Belgrade opened its door to all qualified young Serbs regardless of their sex. The principle of intellectual equality of men and women and the right to equal education on the highest level were officially acknowledged in Serbia.

University of Illinois at Chicago

<sup>1</sup>The book, *Potčinjenost ženskinja* od Džona Stuarda Milja (Belgrade: Državna štamparija, 1871), was translated by Ilija Dušmanić, Raša Milošević and S. Protić who were originally referred to as "tri beogradska djaka" ('three Belgrade students'). Cf. *Ženski pokret* 14(1933), 7-8, p. 92. Even prior to the publication of this book, an excerpt, entitled "Žene, nauke, veštine" and translated by "V.", was published in the *Mlada Srbadija* 1(1870), pp. 428-33.

<sup>2</sup>"Je li žena sposobna da bude ravnopravna s čovekom," *Mlada Srbadija* 1(1870).

<sup>3</sup>The Englishwoman was Elizabeth Morgan who is better known under her married name Dr. Frances Elizabeth Hoggan (1843- ? ). She eventually became a prominent physician in London and an activist in the feminist movement. With Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell she founded *The National Health Society* and was its first Honorary Secretary. She took interest in educational and social reforms and in all the activities

aimed at the improvement of the legal and social position of women in England. In 1884 she contributed a chapter on "Women in Medicine (in England)" for the book *The Woman's Question in Europe*, edited by T. Stanton (London, New York: Putnam's Sons, pp. 63-89).

<sup>4</sup>See my article on "the Prominent Serbian Women of the 19th Century, Part I: Eustahija von Arsić (1776-1843)" in *Serb World*, 2 (1980), #4, pp. 18-19.

<sup>5</sup>In 1814 she published *Sovět Maternij* ('Advice for Mothers') in Buda and in 1816 *Poleznaja razmyšljenija o četyreh godišnih vremene* ('Useful Thoughts about the Four Seasons').

<sup>6</sup>More on Katarina Ivanović in Lj. Popović's article "Katarina Ivanović (1811-1882), The First Significant Serbian Woman Painter" in *Serbian Studies* 1 (1980), pp. 17-28. Cf. also my "The Prominent Women. . . , Part II: Katarina Ivanović (1811-1882)", *Serb World* 3 (1981), #1, pp. 20-21.

<sup>7</sup>See my article on Mina Karadžić ("The Prominent Women. . . , Part III) in *Serb World* 3 (1981), #4, pp. 8-9, 16, 28.

<sup>8</sup>Srpkinja published her collections of poems (all three entitled *Pesme*) in Zemun, in 1850 (40 pp.) and in 1855 (113 pp.), and in Belgrade in 1869 (126 pp.). The first two were those that brought her great fame and admiration of her contemporaries. Her Diary: *U Fruškoj Gori 1854* appeared in Novi Sad in 1861 (Vol. I, 104 pp.) in Zemun in 1862 (Vol. II, 100 pp.) and in Novi Sad in 1866 (Vol. III, 110 pp.). The last volume contains also a number of poems from 1855 and 1864. Srpkinja's letters to D. Rajković written in 1861-62 were published in *Javor* in 1889 (issues 15-17, 19-23 & 25). In 1905 Skerlić wrote about them the following: "To je jedna od najmanje banalnih prepiski na srpskom jeziku, i žaliti je samo što nije saopštena sva i što se ne zna ze njegova pisma njoj." ("Milica Stojadinović Srpkinja: Književna slika," *LMS*, 234, 1905, p. 12).

<sup>9</sup>Skerlić, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>10</sup>*Javor* 16 (1889), p. 335.

<sup>11</sup>Ujedinjena omladina srpska was an organization of young Serbian intellectuals, whose aim was to work toward the progress, liberation and unification of the Serbian nation, divided at the time between the Austrian and Ottoman empires.

Its tasks were formulated at that Assembly as follows:

"... to perfect itself, to enrich the national life on all levels, complementing in that respect the activities of the church, school and learned societies. To accomplish that, the youth will (help) educate people and spread knowledge and culture among all the segments of our nation. . . The youth groups shall be broadly based in order to be able to initiate and bring to realization the following activities:

- weekend schools...;
- public lectures and discussions;
- founding of saving societies;
- founding of gymnastics clubs;
- advocating public morality;
- spreading knowledge of arts and music;
- publishing books on various problems which are pertinent to the life of the nation;
- help in developing theatrical life and spreading good books;
- cultivating the purity and correctness of Serbian language, especially making sure that in societies and in public places foreign words are not mixed with Serbian usage.

<sup>12</sup>"Radnja Ujedinjene omladine srpske na (drugoj) skupštini u Beogradu, 5.7.1867" in *Omladinska zajednica* 1 (1868), published by Ujedinjena omladine srpska.

<sup>13</sup>Some of the most prominent members at the Second Assembly, considered the comment of Bochkarev superfluous, because they felt that the word *youth* included both men and women. They agreed with him that it would be good to make an official statement to that effect (for ex. Ilija Vučetić, p. 128). A poet, Laza Kostić, spoke against Bochkarev's proposal. His argument was that nature itself determined the area of women's abilities: they could, in his opinion, get together with the young men and stay in touch with them, but he was opposed to any official proclamation which would state that the women are equal to men. Milan Đorđević supported Kostić's stand. Aleksander Sandić was inclined to agree with Bochkarev, if the situation among the Serbs would be different than it was: Sandić believed that among the Serbs, women were already equal to men and he supported this statement by the examples from home life. It was well known, for example, that a woman could become the head of an extended family (*zadruga*) after the death of her husband. Vladan Đorđević, who would eventually become a very powerful political figure in Serbia, noted that men and women are not different intellectually but only physically. Since nature did not predetermine women's mental abilities he would support Bochkarev's proposal, etc.

<sup>14</sup>"Zapisnik Tréce skupštine Ujedinjene omladine srpske. . . 22-25. avgusta 1868. godine". *Omladinska zajednica* (1868), p. 28 and pp. 30-31, 67.

<sup>15</sup>"Zapisnik Četvrte skupštine Ujedinjene omladine srpske. . . u Velikoj Kindi. . . avgusta 1869", *Omladinska zajednica* 3(1869), pp. 202-232.

<sup>16</sup>For example, Ilija Vučetić's speech, *Ibid*, pp. 208-211, and especially the speech of Milan Kujundžić, p. 211-215. Isa Pavlović also spoke on the education of women without which there couldn't be true emancipation (pp. 216-217).

<sup>17</sup>D. Dejanović (1840-1871) was the daughter of a well-to-do lawyer Živojin Dimitrijević and Sofija, nee von Međanski. Upon completing elementary school in her native Stara Kanjiža, she was sent to an "inštitut" to Temicqara which she left at age 13 because of illness. Soon after that, her mother died and Draga, as the oldest child, took it upon herself to take care of the home and of her youngest sister who was then 7 years old. In 1861, against her father's wish, she married a poor school teacher Dejanović with whom she lived only several weeks because he was a weak man, influenced by his alcoholic mother. In 1861, Draga went to Pest with her sister. There she became a friend of Serbian students gathered around the journal *Preodnica* ('The Avant Guard'). Many later prominent Serbian Youth organization members such as G. Geršić, L. Kostić and others, formed the circle of her friends. Under their influence, Draga began publishing poems. When the Serbian National Theater was founded in Novi Sad, Draga joined it as an actress. She believed that one of the main tasks of the Serbian Youth was to develop theatrical life in Serbia, and that a woman should be free to choose her profession and make a living for herself. In 1865 she rejoined her husband whose mother had died in the meantime. Between 1865 and her death, she was most active as a wife and mother, a member of the United Serbian Youth, and an advocate of the emancipation of women.

<sup>18</sup>It is enough to remind ourselves of Jovan Sterija Popović's comedies such as *Laža i paralaža* ('Liar and Superliar') or *Pokondirena tikva* ('A Conceited Pumpkin'), or of the novel *Pop Ćira and pop Spira* written by Steven Sremac, to understand Dejanović's negative feelings toward foreign influences coming to the Serbs and especially to Serbian women from Central and Western Europe.

<sup>19</sup>"Dve-tri reči našim Srpkinjama", p. 65, 88.

<sup>20</sup>We, the Serbian women, should be offered a completely different set of subjects, to learn things which would be useful for us, benefit our home, and teach our people to work. . . The Institute brought us to the point that we know a little bit of everything, but when we return home and acquire our own family or are in need of financial

means, only then we realize that we really do not know anything.' *Ibid*, p. 111.

<sup>21</sup>"Emancipacija Srpkinja", p. 110

<sup>22</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>23</sup>It would be interesting to study Draga's pedagogical advice to Serbian mothers in the light of the European pedagogical thought of her time. She quotes Pestalozzi, Froebel, Phenelon and perhaps, some others.

<sup>24</sup>The editor of the *Javor* (Novi Sad), Dr. Ilija Ognjanović, compiled a list of Serbian women who wrote, translated and published their works in the course of the 19th century. That list was published in the yearbook (*Godišnjak*) of the *Viša devojčka škola* in Novi Sad which marked the 20th anniversary of that school (1874-1894). In 1896, the list was revised by the editors of the calendar *Srpkinja* for 1897 (Pančevo, 1896) and more names were added to it. Among the names recorded on the list some have gained a lasting place in the history of Serbian literature and culture in general (e.g. Jelena Dimitrijević, Isidora Sekulić, Danica Bandić, Milka Grgurova, Kraljica Natalija Obrenović, Stanka Glišić, Katarina Milovuk, Draga Dejanović, Savka Subotić, and others).

<sup>25</sup>The other two artists were men, a violinist Dragomir Kovačević, (1847-1929) and an opera singer, Žarko Spasić (1860-1928) as recorded in the *Mala enciklopedija*, Belgrade: Prosveta.



## CANADIAN ARTISTS OF SERBIAN ORIGIN: A SURVEY

A survey of Canadian artists of Serbian origin raises the important question of criteria: who should be considered an artist? While we could agree on certain principles or standards for an artist's recognition in general, the issue becomes a little complicated when it comes to identifying Yugoslav artists in Canada.

As immigrants to a new country, many artists were forced by the necessity of survival and by the extremely poor conditions for arts in Canada generally to earn their living in another field or, in some instances to develop their talents late in life. This was further influenced, in the case of many artists, by their lack or interruption of formal training. It was not at all uncommon that some developed as artists only after achieving financial security or, in the case of some women artists, after they had raised their families. Such artists, although talented and devoted to art, would be considered by some as weekend artists or hobbyists rather than professionals, with a somewhat lower status. Since this study is based, for practical reasons, only on available written sources, the artists identified are those with some formal public recognition; in my opinion future studies should also include other categories of artists.

Unfortunately the available sources imposed certain restrictions: the Canadian literature proved to be rather sparse, out of date, and highly selective; thus I am sure it omits a considerable number of artists. Moreover, the paucity of information made it very difficult indeed to establish the number of artists of Serbian origin in Canada, as the biographical dictionaries indicate simply Yugoslavia for their place of birth. One could attempt to identify artists by their surnames or place of education, but such an approach would be unreliable.

Bearing all this limitations in mind, this brief study is only an attempt to provide some glimpses of the state of the contemporary art scene in Canada, some facts about artists of Yugoslav origin, and a selective number of examples of the accomplishments and contributions by Serbs to Canadian art generally.

According to the Canadian sources (the ethnic press was not examined) there are about 76 Yugoslav-born artists in Canada. This estimate is certainly a conservative one, since the published literature covers only the period up to 1980 and is not comprehensive.

This figure, nevertheless, is quite impressive when we consider that Canada was never known as a fertile, promised land for artists and even Canadian-born artists have found it necessary to go out abroad for their training, experience, and recognition. A sociological study would indicate that the decision of many artists to come to Canada in the first place was motivated by political or economic reasons, by the fact that Canada had her immigration doors open, rather than by a special Canadian inducement for artistic inspiration or marketing. We have only to look at the conditions of the visual arts in Canada in the 1940s and even the 1950s, to see that the level of artistic activity was very low, the audience was apathetic, and public and private support extremely limited. The well known Canadian art historians David Burnett and Marilyn Schiff described Canada in this way: "The artistic community that did exist was dominated by inward looking attitudes, resistance to change, and procedures that for the most part owed more to the styles and structures of the XIX century than to the XXth century."<sup>1</sup>

A large number of European artists who emigrated to Canada after the Second World War were influenced by more progressive art movements and thus found Canada rather stifling. It is not surprising that many of these artists used Canada as their entry to the United States, or had to abandon art and turn to other more realistic ways of making a living.

Nevertheless, the experiences of Canadian soldiers in Europe and the great influx of European immigrants after the war, who settled in the larger Canadian cities, all contributed to the import, transplantation, and acceptance of new ideas and new artistic expressions. The steady growth of public interest in and appreciation of art in general in the 1960s and 1970s exerted an important pressure on society and the Canadian government to create more favourable conditions for creative activities in all the performing and visual arts. Canadian society changes rapidly from an awkward conservative and parochial one, with an apathetic and resentful audience, into a dynamic, progressive, and appreciative one. It witnessed the rapid development of theatres, museums, public and commercial galleries, and literary and artistic journals. The new architecture in the fast growing and prosperous cities encouraged and created space for modern art. Canadian art liberated itself from the dominance of native art and from the famous Canadian Group of Seven. Innovative

art, modern and daring, original and avant-garde, became accepted and appreciated.

According to David Burnett "this unprecedented growth and richness in the arts in Canada is due to the strength and commitment of individual artists."<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt in my mind that a lot of credit is due also to European artists who came to Canada, among whom a number of talented Yugoslav artists contributed their share. The next stage in Canadian art was the obvious effort to liberate itself from European and American dominance, to discover and create a unique Canadian expression.

This short description of the changes in the art scene in Canada would provide one of the explanation for the easier establishment and success of some Yugoslav artists who came in the 1970s, while many talented artists who arrived immediately after the war failed tragically.

The largest number of Yugoslav-born artists are Croats, followed by Slovenes, Serbs, and a few Macedonians. There are also a number of artists who were born and educated in Yugoslavia but belong to national minorities, such as Ukrainians, Russian, and Hungarians. We could add to this a number of young Canadian-born artists whose parents were Yugoslav.

The majority of Yugoslav artists are to be found in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver (in this order), in the main art centres of Canada. These are the cities with the largest populations, established art schools, museums, and galleries, as well as the potential art market.

The Yugoslav artists represent a wide range of age groups, belonging naturally to various art schools and trends. The majority of them are from a post-war born generation that came to Canada in the late 1960s or 70s. Their art varies from realism to surrealism, from the formal abstract to the post modern, from the primitive to the highly sophisticated innovative computer art. There is no particular predominant school or trend among them. They do not represent a distinctive individual group nor do they demonstrate any apparent typical national characteristics. The only exception I could identify was Julian Kolesar, a Montreal artist who very consciously transfers onto canvas memories of his childhood, folk themes, colours, and rich traditions of his native Djurdjevo. His Ruthenian roots are strongly represented in the predominant usage of red colours.



Details preserved in his memory and his artistic imagination are combined in a visual fantasy, which Kolesar called "lyrical realism."

It is obvious in the visual arts, more than in any other art form, that artistic expression, although developed under the influence of specific periods and conditions, is in fact a highly individualistic and original vision of the world by the artist. In my opinion it is almost irrelevant to study a group of artists on the basis of their ethnic origin, except when we want to take pride in their accomplishments, promote their recognition, and encourage their support. In Canada, where multiculturalism is a well established government policy, these artists should be recognized for their valuable contributions to the Canadian cultural mosaic.

The first artist of Yugoslav origin who achieved success in Canada was a Dalmatian, Joseph Ernest Gause. He was born in Split in 1910 and studied art in Prague in one of the best European art school. He was already an accomplished artists before he came to Canada in 1951 and settled in Burlington, a small town on lake Ontario not far from Toronto. Many of Gause's works were commissioned by the government and large corporations.

Another internationally known artist was Željko Kujundžić, a Canadian citizen who now lives and teaches in the United States. Kujundžić was born in 1920 in Subotica and obtained his art degree from the Royal College of Art in Budapest. After an adventurous period in wartime, young Kujundžić left for England and Scotland. In 1958 he came to Canada, to the West, which for him was of great inspiration. "I am almost overwhelmed with it all," he exclaimed; "It would take a blind person to miss the beauty around him in Canada. There is no lack of themes here for an artist."<sup>3</sup> As an extremely versatile artist, Kujundžić created sculptures, paintings, graphics, tapestries, stained glass, and worked in virtually every form and medium. He transferred this enormous experience to his students at Edinborough University, University of British Columbia, Penn State University, and as visiting professor at many other art schools. Kujundžić is a recipient of many awards of distinction. Today Professor Kujundžić is still very active, dividing his time between British Columbia and Pennsylvania.

One of the most typical examples of the great problem of adjustment in Canada is the case of the Serbian Academic painter Moma Marković. Marković was born in Belgrade in 1902. He graduated

from the famous Ecole National des Arts Decoratiff in Paris in 1933. His successful art career in Belgrade was interrupted by the war and he spent most of the war years in German labour camps. After the liberation he refused to go back to Yugoslavia and remained in Italy. He devoted himself to art and soon mounted a well-received solo show in Padua. Marković was persuaded by some friends that the new world would be a happier and more prosperous place for an artist, so he decided to come to Canada in 1951. For five years Marković tried desperately to survive as a freelance artist. Finally forced to secure a decent living, he entered the Civil Service in 1955 as an ordinary draughtsman. His great talents were discovered and put to some use. This made Marković relatively happy as there was also some security and permanence to his work which allowed him to paint. His painting, however, was dictated by his employer, both as to dates and subject matters. He lacked the freedom which is the very foundation for creative growth of any artist. He was expected to produce paintings on particular topics as special rewards to be given by the Government, or as decorations for Civil Service offices and government buildings. Moma Marković did not dissappoint his patrons: he demonstrated his great talent, superb technique, and academic training. Each of his paintings is a museum piece, reflecting his artistry and the taste of Canadians of the time. He created a series of 70 oil paintings depicting the historical development of Ontario roads and highways; another series of 30 large oil paintings portray colourful Ontario scenery and activities such as logging, trapping, fishing, recreation, and similar themes. No wonder it was pointed out that his name would stand beside such great Canadian historical art masters as James Pattison Cockburn, J.D. Kelly, H.B. Goodridge, Rex Woods, Thomas Mitchell, and Bruce Stapleton.<sup>4</sup> Although Moma Marković deserves to stand among these great Canadian classics, his name, unfortunately, never entered any of the Canadian dictionaries and is not to be found in the extensive files of Canadian artists in the National Art Gallery of Ottawa which serves as the Union Catalogue for the entire country.

The explanation is very simple: Marković's paintings were never exhibited in any art show, never reviewed by any art critic, and in fact never commercially available. For the Canadian art world and art market, Moma Marković did not even exist. He died as an obscure civil servant in 1977.

The tragedy of Moma Marković was that he did not set himself free. A former D.P. (Displaced person), he had neither the health nor the energy to start a highly competitive struggle for recognition and fame. His superiors looked upon his creativity as a special talent, for which they paid him a draughtsman's salary. The Serbian ethnic community was predominantly of peasant origin with little understanding for art and could not be expected to provide support. There were no available government funds, as today, to encourage the development of arts in Canada. Three years after his death in 1980 his paintings were collected and exhibited in a show entitled "Resource management in Ontario", but the emphasis was on the Ministry's history and not on art. After the show, Marković paintings were returned to the government offices and stock room, to be admired only by occasional visitors.

Another tragic figure was the Serbian artist John Popović. His life saga, however, was completely different, one of those Hollywood overnight success stories, with a tragic ending to be found in the artist's own personality.

John Popović was born in Belgrade in 1938. He completed his art training at the Fine Arts School in Belgrade. Soon after his graduation, he left his homeland and lived for many years as a hobo in Italy, France, Germany, and England. He considered himself then as an average painter but, as he said, "beneath it all I knew I was not ordinary and that one day I would move away from the ordinary."<sup>5</sup>

Young Popović came to Canada in 1960 and by 1968 he had achieved fame, becoming a real cause célèbre of the Montreal art scene. He exhibited in the best galleries, his paintings were sought by all art collectors. His works were represented in the collections of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Van Beurens, David Rockefeller of New York, and many other prominent collections and art galleries. He himself called his art Celestial Art. The influential art critic Michael Ballantyne described Popović's paintings in this way:

"Most of the more than forty canvases are concerned with experiences and objects on the loftiest of scales — whales, mammoths, volcanic eruptions, the creation of the earth, the music of the singing spheres, all in all a rather Blake-like vision of the universe although carried out with great style and sophistication and a su-

perbly subtle palette — if palette is the word since Mr. Popović's particular technique and combination of materials is, in his own words, a jealously guarded secret. Popović depicts (although that is too simple a word to describe his sorcery) nature at its most violent and majestic. His fiery images convey the old-fashioned and, I suppose, unfashionable notion of the painter possessed, his eyeball in a fine frenzy rolling. There are glorious sunbursts of infinitely varied color like the coronas which leap in immense arcs from the solar rim, and moons as cool and translucent as nacre. These are paintings not to be appreciated in a single viewing but studied, absorbed quietly, lost in — and if this sounds unabashedly romantic, so be it. Mr. Popović is a creator of strange, exotic blooms — . . . and he is doing his own thing . . . and doing it beautifully. Let there be light!"

Over the next few years, Popović experienced what would be considered dream come true for any artist. He accepted fame and did not display surprise or modesty. With great self-confidence he proclaimed: "I believe that I am to painting what Tolstoy was for writing."<sup>7</sup> There is no doubt that Popović brought to Montreal his own original, strange, exotic, and dynamic vision of the universe, in an abstract form for which Montreal was then prepared.

Popović worked feverishly, travelled to the Bahamas, combined painting with scuba diving, discovering and transferring to canvas brilliant undersea colours. Unfortunately, he took also to drinking, and in a short time burned out his body and soul. This unusually talented young man was sensitive and full of tensions and fire. One art critic who interviewed him described him as a "powder keg with a perilous fuse."<sup>8</sup> That fuse was quite short; just a few years later, Popović was killed in a car accident.

It is never easy for an artist to achieve success, regardless of his background and conditions. The art world is competitive and highly unpredictable. But it seems to me that if the artist happened to be an immigrant, he has even greater obstacles. As Duška Arežina, a gallery owner and artist herself, pointed out, most Yugoslav artists despaired when they first arrived in Canada. They experienced a



cultural shock and it took some time before they were able to adjust and start creating in a relaxing way.<sup>9</sup>

Although Canada has become in the last decade a much more sympathetic country for artists, it could not provide an easy path to success or instant fame. A relatively young painter and poet, Slobodan Vujović, exemplifies perfectly the crisis of identity with the country of his residence, whether it was Canada or Yugoslavia. Vujović described himself as a "Yugoslav by origin, Canadian by adoption, Christian by religion, cosmopolitan by acceptance, teacher by duty, artist by love, free man by conviction, an implacable enemy of all sort of prejudices."<sup>10</sup>

Slobodan Vujović, the artist and man, was in constant conflict with society because his ideas, criteria, and attitude towards life were non-conformist. He was a perennial rebel, and most likely will remain so until the bitter end. His rebellious and unhappy nature was in constant search of his own vision of justice and beauty. This disposition conditioned his artistic expression: his paintings became more and more symbolic messages, a conscious criticism of contemporary society, often taking the form of the grotesque. Fantasy and realism became intertwined; reality was the prison of the artist while fantasy became his free world.

Vujović belongs to a Serbian generation that had suffered a great deal through personal and national tragedies. He was born in Cetinje in 1938. Graduated from the University of Belgrade in 1964 in French language and literature, Vujović emigrated to France and then to Canada in 1967. He worked for years in Quebec as a teacher of French, published two collections of poems in French, and devoted his free time to painting. He exhibited in a few solo and group shows, but categorically refused the services of any art agent. After a decade in Canada, Vujović felt unhappy and decided to return to Yugoslavia with his family. In Yugoslavia, however, he was unable to accept the reality of life and conditions, sensing himself a stranger in his native land. He came back to Canada, but this time went to Manitoba.

More recently Vujović's work was included in the Winnipeg Art Gallery in a show entitled "Modern art from Manitoba" which represented an artistic recognition of his talent. Although his work received good reviews and he made some sales, it was not enough to support his family. When I tried to get in touch with him to update

my information, I was told that Vujović had left again for Yugoslavia, while his family remained behind, tired of his wanderings. Slobodan Vujović is an exceptionally powerful but restless artist and man, a modern Don Quijote. He displays all the elements of a great talent combined with the symptoms of deep human tragedy.

There are many other artists of Serbian origin who are active in Canada and contributing in a meaningful way to Canadian arts. There is no doubt that some will not only be commercially successful, but will also secure a name in the history of the development of art in Canada. In addition to those I have already discussed, there are a few other artists that I would like to introduce to you and show you some samples of their work, to give you an idea of the versatility and quality of their contributions.

One of the younger generation of successful Serbian painters is Miša Čolović. He was born in Kruševac in 1944 and graduated from the Academy of Fine Arts in Belgrade in 1969. He continued his studies on scholarships in Stockholm and London and emigrated to Canada in 1973. Since his arrival, Čolović has had almost every year a one man show, and he contributed to an impressive number of group shows. He is a prolific painter who creates in a representational style and shows an unusually strong and original sense for colour. He is one of those perfect examples of a young immigrant who was immediately recognized as talented and encouraged to develop fully as an original painter. He is a recipient of a number of government grants which enabled him to remain free to devote himself entirely to art.

On the subject of Slavic artists who are new Canadians, Duška Arežina observed: "The main impact that Canada has on their work, soon after they have settled here, is that space becomes a big component. It is the huge scale of the country. They tend to move towards monumental scales. You can sense the narrow spaces of European art and the heroic scale of the Canadian sense of space."<sup>11</sup>

This is certainly true in the case of the painter Miroslav Nešić. His canvases are enormous, with sweeping colours and an expressionistic sense of freedom. Nešić is a native of Kragujevac, born in 1945 and a graduate of the Academy of Fine Arts in Belgrade. He came to Canada in 1974 and the same year had a solo show in the Gallery Scollard in Toronto. He was well received as an artist who reintroduced surrealism to the Canadian scene with special fresh-

ness and obvious strength. A triptych which he exhibited in his first show, entitled "My generation", reveals in a symbolic way the need of his generation to find itself and its sense of freedom and purpose.

The first panel of the triptych brings to memory a tragic event in recent Serbian history, the German mass execution of high school students in Kragujevac in the Second World War. This memory lies heavily on the heart of every Serb and has even greater tragic meaning to someone like Nešić, who grew up in the place where this event is still a living sorrow. The second panel depicts a typical Canadian scene — boys playing hockey — in which Nešić uses movements to symbolize the great surge of new energy and his trust in Canada. The last panel of the triptych represents a mystical image of the painter himself, the artist who seeks his new direction in life.

Miroslav Nešić is an artist who adjusted well and quickly to his new country. In discussions with him one can observe his satisfaction as an artist in Canada and most importantly with his own achievements. He admits that it is especially difficult for an artist of Slavic origin to become fully recognized by Canadians; the best known galleries tend to ignore them. In his opinion it is very important for any artist, regardless of origin, to be universal in his message and form; Nešić has no doubt achieved such universality in his own style. The great feeling of liberated force, movement, and strokes of colour, which seem to have a life of their own, are prominent features of Nešić's paintings. He calls his style "The New Dynamics."

A Serbian painter who has found unlimited inspiration in the landscapes of Canada is Aleksandar Petričić who was born in Novi Sad in 1936 and grew up in Zemun. He graduated from Belgrade University in 1960 and emigrated with his family to Canada in 1968. The fact that Petričić's primary career is architecture explains why, as a painter, he does not produce a great number of paintings. Being independent financially, he does not have to supply the art market nor does he have to cater to fashionable trends. He creates as inspiration moves him and always works on location. Petričić masterfully transfers his ideas of harmony of form and colour and captures the tranquility, serenity, and sheer beauty of nature. He paints only in watercolours, sometimes without sketching, finding this medium most suitable to achieve the desired light air, pastel colours, and tender sensitivity of transparency. Petričić has had several group

exhibitions of his paintings and a one man show in 1985.

Undoubtedly the most famous Serbian painter in Canada today, one of the most interesting artists, is George Petrović from Montreal, originally from Zaječar, born in 1924. Petrović is regarded as a forerunner of Spatial Art, the first Canadian painter of the Cosmos. Doctor of science, an architect and writer, former professor at Belgrade University, Petrović is well known as a theoretician of composition and proportions in architecture and art. He has produced five scholarly books on these topics. He transfers onto canvas his great knowledge, scientific data, and his own ideas and visions of the architecture of the future. What might look to us as fantasy is actually a well-designed, seriously researched, planned, detailed blue print of spatial architecture, where beauty is not forgotten but developed in a new, imaginative manner. Although he devotes most of his time to painting, he still writes and teaches occasionally. To give you an idea of Petrović's popularity in 1984 he has already had five solo shows, all instantly sold out, numerous praise, worthy reviews, and seven interviews for English and French Television and Radio Canada. His visionary insights, presented on impressively large pictures, in intricate design in Chinese ink technique, are of exceptional beauty and full of bright optimism. There is nothing morbid or frightening; space becomes more feasible and acceptable. One cannot help but suppose that Petrović purposely enlarged our horizons and provided us with hope in the future.

Canada today is the home of many successful Yugoslav artists of all nationalities. This paper has given emphasis to Serbian painters, as this was my main topic. The selection was not made on evaluative judgment, but rather on the information available in my research. Thus any exclusions are not intentional, but accidental and limited to my sources and enquiries. I am sure that there are many more Serbian artists who deserve our attention and I hope that this short review will expand research in this field.

University of Toronto



<sup>1</sup>Burnett, David and Marilyn Schiff. *Contemporary Canadian Art*. Toronto, Hurtig Publishers Ltd. in co-operation with the Art Gallery of Ontario, 1983. p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 290.

<sup>3</sup>Macdonald, Colin s. *A dictionary of Canadian artists*. Ottawa, Canadian Paperbacks, 1967. Vol. 3, part I, p. 690.

<sup>4</sup>Walters, Avis. "M.M. (Moma) Markovich." *DTTO NEWS*, May/June 1968, p. 2-4.

<sup>5</sup>Mogelon, Alex. "John Popovic — Tolstoy of Painters." *The Montrealer*, Vol 42, November 1968, p. 40.

<sup>6</sup>Ballantyne, Michael. "Early Canadian.-late celestial." Exhibitions around town. *Montreal Star*, August 21, 1968.

<sup>7</sup>Mogelon, Alex. "John Popovic — Tolstoy of Painters." *The Montrealer*, Vol. 42, November 1968, p. 40.

<sup>8</sup>Kritzviser, Key. "Art." *Globe & Mail*, December 8, 1969, p. 14.

<sup>9</sup>Testa, Bart. "Art mirrors the new land." *Globe & Mail*, January 17, 1981, Fanfare, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup>*New art from Manitoba*. Winnipeg, The Winnipeg Art Gallery, 1983. p. 22.

<sup>11</sup>Testa, Bart. "Art mirrors the new land." *Globe & Mail*, January 17, 1981, Fanfare, p. 7.

BRANISLAV PETRONIJEVIĆ (1875–1954)  
PHILOSOPHER, MATHEMATICIAN AND NATURAL SCIENTIST

One of the most intriguing figures in the history of Serbian and Yugoslav culture is undoubtedly the internationally renowned hypermetaphysician, mathematician and paleontologist, Branislav Petronijević.

In his impressive and solemn inaugural address to the Royal Serbian Academy on the occasion of his election to its full membership (January 2, 1921), this is what he said about himself, with an obvious eye to posterity:

"I am a born metaphysician, just as there are born poets. And just as a poet, in order to divest himself of his poetic mood, must sing out a song, so I also had to construct my metaphysical system in order to free myself from the psychic restlessness provoked in me by the enigmatic existence of the world and of life in it. It is paradoxical to say, but it is true, that I became a scientist only in order to be able to continue being a metaphysician. For, all of my scientific activity and all the results of my scientific researches are ultimately aimed at the removal of the conflicts which had to arise between my metaphysical system and empirical reality, that is, at the complementation and confirmation of that system even from the empirical side. And the Academy, by electing me to its regular membership, has even inadvertently acknowledged metaphysics as well, that one-time queen of the sciences to which people used to bow as if it were a deity, but which today is exiled and forgotten."<sup>1</sup>

This unusually honest, strangely ironic and somewhat defiant confession must be taken seriously by everyone who wants to understand Petronijević and his proper place in the annals of Serbian and Yugoslav intellectual history.

Branislav Petronijević was born on April 27, 1875 in the village of Sovljak in the vicinity of Ub. It deserves to be noted in passing that Ub is also the birthplace of Božidar Knežević, well known philosopher of history, and that the entire region of northwestern Serbia contributed, for some as yet unexplained reasons, a disproportionately great number of highly gifted individuals in virtually all fields of endeavor.<sup>2</sup>

Branislav's father, Marko Jeremić, was a widowed graduate of a Serbian orthodox seminary whose second marriage to Branislav's

mother, Ana Milutinović, made it impossible for him to become a priest. Instead, he worked as a village and town hall scribe and later ran a *kafana* in which he helped many a local peasant in writing various petitions to the authorities.<sup>3</sup>

The future philosopher's last name, Petronijević, comes from his grandfather, Petronije Jeremić, a prominent local citizen and, like his son, Branislav's uncle Janko, a Serbian Orthodox priest. The whole family had once been quite well off but later fell into economic straits which had an adverse effect on the boy's schooling beyond the elementary level. Amidst considerable financial hardships, Petronijević finished the lower grades of gymnasium in Valjevo and the higher ones in Belgrade. Despite some scholastic ups and downs directly related to his economic insecurity, he was from the start an exceptionally intelligent and uncommonly promising pupil. According to his memoirs, even in grammar school he had "a distinct feeling and conviction" that he was "something higher than (his) classmates and could achieve more than they."<sup>4</sup>

In secondary school he read serious novels and popularizations of astronomy. Very early he excelled in chemistry, mathematics, physics and philosophy.<sup>5</sup> For years he supplemented his living as a private tutor to socially prominent youngsters in need of such assistance. One of these was a son of Professor Stevan Todorović, a distinguished and prosperous Belgrade burgher and gifted and fashionable academic portrait painter.<sup>6</sup>

Toward the end of his eighth year of gymnasium he was so far ahead in most subjects that he, at times, had to interrupt some of his teachers' lectures in order to correct, in all politeness, their mistaken deductions on the blackboard. In other classes he read major philosophical treatises while his neighbors paid attention to their instructors' recitals of facts already familiar to him. No wonder he was exempted from the oral portion of his *matura* and graduated with honors.<sup>7</sup>

His classmates included Momčilo Ninčić, the later Minister of External Affairs, and Aleksandar Belić, the later famous linguist and president of the Serbian Academy.<sup>8</sup>

Petronijević decided to study pure philosophy for which, alas, no one would give him a scholarship. It was officially held that his then recently liberated and underdeveloped country was far more in need of physicians than of metaphysicians. Consequently, in the

fall of 1894, he registered as a student of medicine at the University of Vienna with a scholarship from his home town district of Tamnava. He concentrated particularly on lectures in anatomy and physiology, although he spent most of his time at the university library. There he read Lotze, Spinoza, Hartmann and Schopenhauer, and began to articulate his own future metaphysics. He also steeped himself into Leibniz and Herbart, passed his examination in mineralogy and continued his studies in medicine despite certain setbacks caused by the diversion of his time, energy and attention to his first preference.<sup>9</sup>

In the fall of 1896 he registered as a student of philosophy at the University of Leipzig, lost his scholarship, abandoned medicine, and began to support himself as an instructor in German to Bishop Nikanor Ružičić, who at the time lived in Leipzig as an émigré.<sup>10</sup>

In 1897, Petronijević published his first essay, *Der ontologische Beweis für das Dasein des Absoluten* (*The Ontological Proof for the Existence of the Absolute*).<sup>11</sup> This is a philosophical treatise in which he seeks to formulate a new proof for the necessary existence of Being. With the help of the bishop's friends in the Serbian Ministry of Education, the young philosopher again obtained a scholarship which was to support him through his doctorate.<sup>12</sup>

After eight months of concentrated work, Petronijević submitted his dissertation to Professors Johannes Volkelt and Max Heinze. Its title was *Der Satz vom Grunde, Eine logische Untersuchung* (*The Principle of Sufficient Reason — A Logical Inquiry*). The former accepted the thesis immediately, praising its systematic character and consistent development. The latter was even more explicit in his encouragement. He told the young scholar, then only twenty-three: "Sie sind ein scharfsinniger, tiefgehender und konsequenter Denker." ("You are a sharp-minded, deep and consistent thinker.") This compliment was the more significant because the German pedagogue actually disagreed with the results of Petronijević's arguments. When two years later, in 1900, the Serbian metaphysician sent Heinze his first completely original philosophical work, *Principien der Erkenntnislehre* (*Principles of the Theory of Knowledge*), the German scholar cited it in the next edition of the fourth volume of the Überweg-Heinze *History of Philosophy*.<sup>13</sup>

On January 28, 1898 Petronijević defended his dissertation before Professor Volkelt (for philosophy), Professor Wiedeman (for phys-



ics), Professor Pfeffer (for botany) and Professor Zirkel (for mineralogy). In congratulating the new Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Leipzig, the Chairman of the Examining Commission, Professor Zirkel, said: "Die Kommission hoft, dass Sie der erste Philosoph auf der Balkanhalbinsel werden werden." ("The commission hopes that you will become the leading philosopher in the Balkans.") Petronijević's reply was quite indicative of his youthful self-confidence and undisguised ambition: "Ich danke der hohen Kommission für Ihre gute Wünsche, aber, Herr Geheimrath, Ich hoffe mehr." ("I thank the high commission for its good wishes, but, Mr. Chairman, I hope for more.") To this the chairman graciously added: "Meinetwegen auch mehr." ("On my behalf even more.")<sup>14</sup> In Professor Volkelt's opinion, Petronijević's logical exploration of the principle of causality was clearly based upon a metaphysical system already firmly established in its outlines.<sup>15</sup>

On his return to Serbia in 1898, the young Ph.D. obtained a position in Belgrade's Third Gymnasium where he taught German and philosophy. Toward the end of the same year, following the publication of his dissertation and of a couple of essays, including a review of the first volume of Knežević's *Principles of History*, Petronijević became a docent at the Velika Škola. His candidacy was supported by the learned philosopher and literary critic, Dr. Ljubomir Nedić.<sup>16</sup>

In the year 1900 Petronijević began to publish his brilliant study of Nietzsche which came out as a separate book in 1901. This work contains highly poetic passages translated by the Serbian thinker with great artistry. In 1903, in the wake of the publication of his *History of Modern Philosophy (Istorija novije filozofije)*, he became a full professor.<sup>17</sup> In 1904 he published the first and in 1912 the second volume of his major work *Principien der Metaphysik (Principles of Metaphysics)*. Both came out in Heidelberg.<sup>18</sup>

In 1905, when the Velika Škola became the University of Belgrade, Petronijević was reduced to the rank of an associate. This he perceived as a grave injustice. The following year he declined a corresponding membership in the Academy because one of his age-mates was offered a full membership.<sup>19</sup>

Petronijević participated in the epic Serbian retreat through Albania. He took along a trunk of books and manuscripts. Between

1916 and 1917 he worked in the British Museum on his widely acclaimed reconstruction of the fossil remains of *Archeopteryx*, an important Jurassic transition between reptiles and birds.<sup>20</sup> The results of these significant contributions to the science of paleontology and theory of evolution are listed in the bibliography under the entry on *Archeopteryx* in the fourteenth edition of *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Here we find articles "On the Pectoral and Pelvic arches of the British Museum specimen of *Archeopteryx*" by B. Petronijević, and A.S. Woodward (1917) and "Der Londoner *Archeopteryx*" by Petronijević himself (1921). He also wrote on "Slav Achievement in Advanced Science", a 1917 essay on the principal contributions of Copernicus, Boscovich, Lobatchevski and Mendeleev.<sup>21</sup> Petronijević must have left a strong impression on the British intellectual establishment: in a review of Dr. Ksenija Atanasijević's work on Bruno's *Tripple Minimum* in London's *Nature* of August 15, 1925, a British scholar recalls that Dr. Petronijević, whose theories about the discontinuity of space and time represent a further development of Bruno's finitism, is "the Professor of Philosophy at Belgrade, recently in Great Britain working at the reconstruction of *Archeopteryx*."<sup>22</sup>

In 1918 Petronijević lived in Paris, where he gave a series of lectures at the Sorbonne. At the same time he did his best to acquaint the public opinion of our Western allies with his country's struggle for survival.<sup>23</sup>

After World War I, in 1919, he became a full professor at the University of Belgrade and soon thereafter a regular member of the Academy. In 1921 he published his *L'Evolution Universelle*, conceived as the third volume of his *Principles of Metaphysics*. His most significant work as a naturalist was done between 1921 and 1927. It was he who established the genetic difference between the London *Archeopteryx* and the Berlin *Archaeornis*, and discovered new bones on the English exemplar.<sup>24</sup>

In 1927 Petronijević retired in order to have more time for research. He was allowed to keep a working cabinet at the University of Belgrade.<sup>25</sup> Although often in love, he spent his life as a bachelor. For years he lived in a Belgrade hotel; traveled abroad; represented the Academy at international congresses; maintained a lively contact with his colleagues in philosophy, mathematics and the natural sci-

ences; and never ceased to write and publish.<sup>26</sup>

In 1941, he lost valuable books and manuscripts to a great fire in his apartment hotel. In 1944, during the liberation of Belgrade, a major part of the University was burned down: Petronijević lost his cabinet, his unfinished new manuscripts and all his library to the same destructive element. After the war he continued to write, especially in the field of mathematics, but with increasing difficulty and in failing health. He died as a near recluse on March 6, 1954.<sup>27</sup>

Two years before his death he was deeply hurt by a sarcastic and mocking diatribe. In 1952, before the beginning of his gradual deMarxification which led to his imprisonment and political limbo as one of Yugoslavia's best known dissidents, Milovan Djilas, then still a youthful and powerful revolutionary and communist politician, saw fit to write the following:

"And when, for example, Dr. Branislav Petronijević was being officially proclaimed a philosopher among us, no one serious in Europe would regard him as being anything other than what he in fact was — an ordinary, banal, more or less learned professor of philosophy. But, as we had a nation, a state and a king, we also had to have philosophers, and nothing was more logical and natural than that the philosopher himself should be the professor of philosophy, since that was anyway some sort of duty of his, and otherwise there were no other persons to plod through the craft of philosophy. And because in the civilized world philosophers are honored, they had to be awarded orders and decorations and invited to festivities; for this would prove that we are not beets without roots either, that we also have 'something' to show the world, although in fact, in real relations, no one took these 'minds' of ours for anything other than common court lackeys, and the lackeys' mind was not capable of grasping even that. For the powerful and mighty this was, in fact, practical politics, and for the would-be minds 'statesmanlike sense' for science and culture."<sup>28</sup> Fortunately for the honor of the Serbian people, five years after this deplorable literary burp and only three years after Petronijević's death, the Serbian Academy decided to pay homage to its departed member with a special memorial volume.<sup>29</sup>

Contrary to Mr. Djilas' attempt to belittle an intellectual figure of considerable stature, foreign critics have treated Petronijević very respectfully. His doctoral dissertation was extensively reviewed in *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* for 1899, and his *Principles of the Theory*

of Knowledge were favorably assessed in Volume X of *The American Philosophical Review* for 1900. The first volume of his *Principles of Metaphysics* was critically evaluated by L. Coutura in *Bulletin des science mathématiques* and *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*. The French reviewer recognizes the merits of Petronijević's consistent development of the finitist doctrine which is said to amount to a "réduction à l'absurde du finitisme qui en est peut-être la meilleure réfutation" ("a reduction of finitism to absurdity which is perhaps its best refutation.").<sup>30</sup>

In another presentation, in *Revue philosophique* of 1905, Petronijević's new geometry is described as "ingenious" and even logical, but, alas, bound to remain only "a strange curiosity." Much more favorable was the review in the American journal *Monist* of 1906, in which the new geometry is called "admirable. . . ingenious, original and daring." The reviewer sincerely wishes that it could be logically preserved as well, but adds that "the scientific world is conservative and there is no hope that the new geometry will replace the old one." The metaphysical aspects of Petronijević's *Principles* are copiously discussed in *Archiv für systematische Philosophie* of 1906, where the work is called "bedeutend" (significant).<sup>31</sup>

The second volume of his *Principles of Metaphysics* was received much better than the first one. In the English philosophical journal *Mind* for July, 1913 it is called "monumental" and the reviewer marvels at its "immeasurable" contents. In the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* (Bd. 150, 1913), the work is praised for its "Gründlichkeit" (thoroughness) in argumentation and demonstration and for its author's "dialektische Begabung" (dialectical gift) which is characterized as "hervorragend" (outstanding). The German reviewer also acknowledges the unquestionable positive value of certain parts of the work.<sup>32</sup>

The most flattering, however, was a review in the Nov. 1912 issue of the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* which lauds the writer's "truly philosophical spirit" ("esprit vraiment philosophique") and his "conceptual virtuosity" ("virtuosité conceptuelle"). The French critic also points out the work's systematic character, restates its basic theses and concludes by saying that the book deserves to be admired "for the ease with which its writer moves amidst the greatest difficulties that have ever engaged the human mind"; "for the great coherence of its theories" and "for the metaphysical ardor that



inspired so intensive and so prolonged a reflection."<sup>33</sup> Finally, in the 1916 edition of the fourth volume of the Überweg-Heinze *History of Philosophy*, prepared by Professor K.T. Oesterreich of the University of Tübingen, Balkan philosophy was assigned a special section, with Petronijević at its head.<sup>34</sup>

In his own country the philosopher's reputation continued to grow, but he was always more respected than loved. Although loyal to his people, he was a cosmopolitan, not a nationalist.<sup>35</sup> He even regretted not having been born a German, a Frenchman or an Englishman, because of the lingual obstacles and ethnic prejudices a genius has to overcome when born in a small country. In his obituary on the death of Bozidar Knežević, whom he respected without fully realizing his greatness, Petronijević observed: "It is unjust of nature to allow a gifted thinker to be born in a small nation. It is true that it would also be unfair were nature not to give small nations any thinkers, but the first injustice is certainly greater."<sup>36</sup> Here Petronijević laments his own fate as well: his truly impressive major works, mainly in German and French, remain unperused by most of his educated compatriots who find it easier to criticize than to read and understand him. Many of these compatriots are hard to please. Some blame him for having influenced his pupils, Dr. Nikola Popović and Dr. Ksenija Atanasijević, to contribute to the advancement of their master's finitism.<sup>37</sup> Others point out that, as a hypermetaphysician, he had little to do with the essentially realistic world view of his people and could not find actual disciples among Serbs and other Yugoslavs.<sup>38</sup> Professor Andrija Stojković, who is writing a thorough study of Petronijević, rightly notes that "like Bogdan Popović in the domain of esthetics and art criticism, Petronijević remained a stranger in Serbian midst, but a stranger who sovereignly radiated his intellectuality, his erudition and his diligence."<sup>39</sup>

In the 1920s, Dr. Svetomir Ristić unfairly accused Petronijević even of plagiarism, though the latter clearly indicated what in his *History of Modern Philosophy* is derivative and borrowed from other sources. Finally, when in 1937 Petronijević published a book of poems (*Pesme*), it was virtually ignored and remains unassessed despite its author's undeniable literary talents.<sup>40</sup>

Petronijević's psychological theories are presented in his *Osnovi empiriske psihologije* (*Foundations of Empirical Psychology*, 1926) and two additional works: "Über die Wahrnehmung des Tiefendi-

mensionen" (On the Perception of the Dimension of Depth), in *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, 1906, and "Begriff der zusammengesetzten Farbe" (The Notion of Complex Color), in *Zeitschrift für Sinnesphysiologie* for 1908.<sup>41</sup>

His mathematical works include his "Postulats fondamentaux de la géometrie discrete" (Basic Postulates of Discrete Geometry), in *Delo*, 1905; "Deduction of the Derivations of Circular Functions by the Geometric Method of Limits," in *Nastavnik*, 1909; "The Conception of Discrete Space in R.J. Bošćović," in *Delo*, 1909; "Sur les nombres infinis de Fontenelle," in *Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincei*, vol. XXVI, 1917; "Die typischen Geometrien und das Unendliche" (Typical Geometries and the Infinite), Heidelberg, 1907, etc.<sup>42</sup>

His definitive statement on metaphysics is his book *Hauptsätze der Metaphysik* (Main Propositions of Metaphysics), Heidelberg, 1930, and a comprehensive summary of his main output can be found in *Résumé des travaux philosophiques et scientifiques de Branislav Petronievics* (Resumé of Philosophical and Scientific Works of Branislav Petronijević), in *Bulletin de L'Académie des lettres, Académie Royale Serbe*, Belgrade, 1937.<sup>43</sup>

Petronijević is also the author of many scholarly studies and essays from the entire range of philosophical and scientific disciplines as well as of numerous popular works scattered through books and periodicals at home and abroad. These contributions include his exquisite studies of Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Spencer, Hartmann, Njegoš, Aristotle, Bergson and many others. His thoughtful article on "Ernest Renan and the Legend of Jesus Christ," in *Misao*, 1923, shows that, though convinced of Jesus' historicity and respectful of His ethical teaching as preserved in Matthew's text of the Sermon on the Mount, this descendant of a family of priests was not conventionally religious.<sup>44</sup>

By and large, Petronijević's literary style is simple, lucid and elegant in all the languages he uses. The only lingual slip that I was able to detect is a curious sentence reminiscent of certain secondary writers from nineteenth-century Vojvodina. In a reference to the psychological aftermath of the failed Revolution of 1848, he says: "Posle revolucije, pak, koja nije reusirala, sve je bilo u dešperatu." (After the revolution, which did not succeed, everything was in despair). Here, one would have to know Serbian to appreciate the full flavor of the original.<sup>45</sup>

Let us now briefly summarize the essential elements of his philosophy. In his brilliant study *Tri dijalektike* (Three Dialectics), Beograd, 1946, Petronijević subjects the very idea of dialecticity to a dialectical treatment. In his own words, "According to whether or not the synthesis will be considered an essential component of dialectical deduction, three kinds of deduction or dialectics are possible. In the first of these, the synthesis is an essential component and the thesis and the antithesis represent notions not only contrary but also contradictory; in the second, too, the synthesis is an essential ingredient but the thesis and the antithesis are notions only contrary and not contradictory as well; whereas in the third, also, the thesis and the antithesis are merely contrary notions, but the synthesis is not an essential component."<sup>46</sup>

The first type of dialectic was formulated by Hegel in his *Wissenschaft der Logik* of 1812 and 1816; the second, by the French philosopher Hamelin in his *Essai sur les éléments principaux de la représentation* of 1907 and 1927; and the third, by Petronijević in both his *Principien* of 1912 and his *Hauptsätze* of 1930.<sup>47</sup>

According to his empirio-rationalist epistemology, one must distinguish the facts of immediate or internal experience from those of mediate or external one. He maintains that the origin of knowledge lies in the former. Among the facts of immediate experience one can distinguish between simple facts and complex ones. The numerically simple facts of immediate experience are logically necessary truths, while among the complex facts some are necessary truths and others, accidental ones. Our knowledge is not limited to the facts of immediate experience, for it is possible to verify the existence and structure of the external world.<sup>48</sup>

In other words, Petronijević admits that experience alone can be the foundation of knowledge, but claims that there are logically necessary facts of immediate experience which empiricism has neglected and in which one should seek the source of transcendental knowledge.<sup>49</sup>

He argues that intuitive knowledge is limited, while abstract knowledge is not. He does not question the absolute reality of immediate experience which to him is identical with present individual consciousness. He thinks that in immediate experience appearance is only relatively possible and that it really exists.<sup>50</sup> All kinds of knowledge proceed from the facts of immediate experience which

are numerically and logically simple and have an axiomatic value. Consequently, the source of all knowledge lies in immediate experience, but the value of knowledge is apodictic and its domain exceeds experience.<sup>51</sup>

Petronijević discerns three distinct spheres of reality: a metaphysical, a transitional and an empirical one. To these correspond three branches of knowledge: pure philosophy, philosophy of science and science itself. Philosophy is the vertex of the pyramid whose base consists of the particular sciences.<sup>52</sup>

In his metaphysics, Petronijević studies the problems of substance, of the world's extension in space and of the nature of substance. The first of these problems is the general ontological one; the second is quantitative and the third qualitative.<sup>53</sup>

He holds that there are two sources of metaphysical knowledge: the facts of immediate experience and the laws of logic. To be sufficiently verified, metaphysical knowledge must be deduced not only speculativo-deductively, but also empirico-synthetically.<sup>54</sup>

In his ontology, the Serbian thinker combines substantialism and monadology, and in his methodology, metaphysics and dialectics. He demonstrates that, although immanent illusion exists as a relative appearance, being is nevertheless real, because it is not of absolute appearance; that the elements of being are in touch with one another; that being has a unity. The relation of opposition is original to these elements and being is discrete and composed of simple qualitative points. Every real qualitative point is said to be internally composed of infinitely many parts inseparable from one another.<sup>55</sup>

In tackling the problem of becoming, Petronijević refutes Hegel's teaching about absolute becoming and asserts that the substratum of reality is an absolutely continuous substance. It is from substance that qualities proceed, and it is in it that they lose themselves. Transcendental substance is not beyond logic, because it is instituted by the logical act of negation.<sup>56</sup>

As pointed out by Dr. Ksenija Atanasijević, Petronijević develops especially the problem of quantity, which includes the formal categories of time, space, movement and number.

Time is a form of the order of being, a succession of changes in it. "Neither in the sense of absolute continuum nor in the sense of inconsecutive discretum is time divisible to infinity: it is a consecutivo-discrete magnitude." Time consists of moments full of the



present, whose chronometric value is zero. In the direction of the future, time is finite in an indeterminate manner, and in the direction of the past, in a determinate manner.<sup>57</sup>

Space is also a form of the order of being; it is a simultaneous coexistence of the elements of its content. Neither in the sense of absolute continuity nor in that of inconsecutive discretion is space divisible to infinity: it is a consecutivo-discrete magnitude. For Petronijević, space consists of real, central points, and unreal, intermediate ones. To the unreal intermediate point corresponds a point of real extra-spatial division or a quantitative act of negation. The geometrical magnitude of the central points equals zero, that of the intermediate points equals one. Space without extension is said to have  $n$  dimensions and space endowed with extension no more than four. The number of spatial points being limited, the world is finite.<sup>58</sup>

As appropriately stressed by Professor Andrija Stojković, "(Petronijević) was the first among the Serbs to grasp the logical foundations of a non-Euclidean geometry and to develop one of its variants."<sup>59</sup> The actual basis of Petronijević's conception of space is a further development of a discrete geometry presented by the greatest Italian philosopher of the Renaissance, Giordano Bruno, in his work *De Triplici Minimo (On the Triple Minimum)*.<sup>60</sup>

In relation to space, Petronijević has demonstrated that the contrast between movement and rest is absolute; that there is a maximum speed of motion; and that the trajectory of all movement is a closed line.<sup>61</sup>

Within the framework of the qualitative problem of metaphysics, he deals with the monad, matter and soul. He believes that individual consciousness is an indivisible being, a monad. All the contents of being immediately given to a particular self belong to that self; consequently, sensations are subjective. The simple qualities of feeling are either positive, that is pleasurable, or negative, that is painful. Feeling and sensation are two immanent attributes of the monad; consciousness and will are its transcendental attributes. Consciousness is simple and will is an intensely discrete qualitative point.<sup>62</sup>

In his universal pan-psychism, Petronijević rejects the possibility of existence of absolutely unconscious atoms; according to his idealist views, inspired by Leibniz and his predecessors, matter is composed of relatively unconscious monads whose movement in the

universe is provoked by a qualitative change in the extra-spatial acts of negation separating the qualitative points from their transcendental attributes. . . The number of monads is not infinite, but equal to the greatest finite number.<sup>63</sup>

In a surprising assertion reminiscent of Descartes, Petronijević believes that the soul has a fixed punctual seat in the brain and is immortal not only as a transcendental spiritual substance but also as a particular formal self.<sup>64</sup>

As an evolutionist, he proposes a theory about two different stages or alternate phases of the universe: a primary, static stage, and a secondary, dynamic one. Inextensive space is a form of primary space, while extensive space is a form of space of the secondary stage of the universe.<sup>65</sup> This is a significant anticipation of the most up-to-date astrophysical theories, especially that of a Big Bang beginning of the cosmos.

The change to the dynamic stage of the universe is due to a process of evolution whose result is the awakening of the conscious organisms to a highly developed psychic life. Petronijević admits the possibility of a passage from the dynamic back to the static stage as well as the prospect of a new dynamic stage of the universe,<sup>66</sup> in other words, a perhaps infinite series of cosmic pulsations involving expansion and contraction, movement and rest.

As a hypermetaphysician, he seeks the absolutely first principles of things, those pertaining to the original proto-reality, a state before the beginning, "in the metaphysical embryo of the world." In these speculations Petronijević clearly anticipates the thoughts of Georges Lamaitre, presented in his work *The Primeval Atom: An Essay on Cosmology* (1931, 1950).<sup>67</sup>

Petronijević believes that being has existed since all eternity and will never be annihilated. The two essential principles of being are its indivisible one-ness and its infinite divisibility. Pre-unity is the pre-connection and pre-multiplicity the pre-content of being. In pursuit of these hypermetaphysical explanations he goes to the extreme limits of sustainable abstract deduction and combination and displays extraordinary conceptual prowess in intellectual fireworks unmatched among Southern Slavs.<sup>68</sup>

As an axiologist, Petronijević explores the value of life. He emphasizes that traditional pessimism and optimism have not taken into account the short duration of life. He therefore criticizes the

pessimism of Schopenhauer as well as the optimism of Leibniz and Dühring. Even the moderate pessimism of Eduard von Hartmann does not satisfy him.<sup>69</sup>

Petronijević argues that only a compromise between them, only a simple malism can fit our actual experience, because such a theory gives equal weight to indifferent emotional states which last longer than our violent feelings. This, he says, is true even of non-human monads. In view of the fact that the number of conscious monads in the animal organisms on this planet and other celestial bodies is extremely small compared to the number of relatively unconscious monads, it seems to him that his theory of malism would make sense even if the sum of pain in human and animal life could be shown to exceed very greatly that of pleasure. With regard to man's future perspective, Petronijević taught indifference and, transcendently, a form of cosmic optimism.<sup>70</sup>

As shown in his essay *O slobodi volje, moralnoj i krivičnoj odgovornosti* (*On the freedom of the Will, Moral and Criminal Responsibility*), Beograd, 1908, in the realm of morality he was an indeterminist.<sup>71</sup> Obviously, his method of reasoning is a highly discursive mixture of metaphysics and dialectics.<sup>72</sup>

To a metaphysical synthesis of Spinoza and Leibniz, a monadological monopluralism *sui generis*, and an epistemological combination of Berkeley and Hume,<sup>73</sup> Petronijević adds important new ideas of his own that propel Serbian and Yugoslav philosophy to the most highly rarefied spheres of purely abstract reflection. In this, as pointed out by K. Atanasijević, he dramatically diverges from the predominantly intuitive approach of most of his Slavic predecessors. The greatest merit of this inspired synthetic philosopher and objective idealist consists in his having created a complete, coherent and self-consistent system woven of gossamer abstractions, deduced with rigorous logic and suffused with an original dialectic.<sup>74</sup>

Above and beyond his valuable contributions to the exact sciences, his opus of more than 150 major publications includes ingenious and vastly conceived attempts at bridging the chasms between monism and pluralism, substantialism and monadology, rationalism and empiricism, optimism and pessimism and many other opposites. These efforts and their impressive results are duly recorded in world literature and Petronijević is well known to the experts in philosophy, geometry and paleontology.<sup>75</sup>

In an intellectual environment dominated by an officially favored materialism, some of his idealist elucubrations are bound to appear outmoded and arcane. But this does not necessarily make them either logically untenable or forever useless and uninteresting.

In my opinion, in this Heraclitean flux of constant changes there are no final judgements of anything and this gifted thinker is still awaiting a critic capable of reading his principal works in German and French and at the same time sufficiently grounded in philosophy, mathematics and science to do justice to all of him. Such a combination is very hard to find.

State University College at Buffalo

<sup>1</sup>See Branko Pavlović in "Petronijević u istoriji novije filozofije," (Preface — Preface), *Istorija novije filozofije*, Branislav Petronijević, Nolit, Beograd, 1982, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Branislav Petronijević, *Iz mojih uspomena* (odlomak), Novi Sad, 1946, p. 3. See also "B. Knežević: A Yugoslav Philosopher of History," by G.V.T., in Božidar Knežević, *History, The Anatomy of Time*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1980, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>*Iz mojih uspomena*, p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>5</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>6</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 7,8.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>12</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 9,10.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>15</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>16</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 11,12.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>18</sup>See *Principien der Metaphysik*, von Branislav Petronievs, Dr. Phil., Erster Band, Erste Abtheilung, Allgemeine Ontologie und die Formalen Kategorien, mit einem Anhang: Elemente der neuen Geometrie und III Tafeln mit 56 geometrischen Figuren, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung Heidelberg, 1904, and *Principien der Metaphysik*, Erster Band, Zweite Abtheilung, Die Realen Kategorien un die letzten Principien, C. Winters Verlag, Heidelberg, 1912. See also *Iz mojih uspomena*, pp. 12,13.

<sup>19</sup>*Iz mojih uspomena*, pp. 14, 15. See also D. Pajin, "Beleška o piscu," at the end of Petronijević's *Istorija novije filozofije*, p. 769, as well as B. Pavlović, "Predgovor," p. 22.



<sup>20</sup>D. Pajin, *op. cit.*, p. 769 and *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, fourteenth edition, *Archaeopteryx*, pp. 260–262, esp. p. 262.

<sup>21</sup>See *Slav Achievement in Advanced Science*, by Dr. Branislav Petronievcis, professor at the University of Belgrade, The American Book Supply Co., LTD., London, 1917.

<sup>22</sup>See *Nature*, No. 2911, vol. 116, Macmillan & Co., LTD., London, Saturday, August 15, 1925, p. 257.

<sup>23</sup>See D. Pajin, *op. cit.*, p. 769.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 770.

<sup>25</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>26</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>27</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>28</sup>See Milovan Djilas, *Legenda o Njegošu*, Kultura, Beograd, 1952, p. 52.

<sup>29</sup>See *Spomenica Branislava Petronijevića*, San, Beograd, 1957.

<sup>30</sup>Iz *mojih uspomena*, p. 14.

<sup>31</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>34</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>35</sup>See Branko U. Pavlović, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>36</sup>*Ibidem*, pp. 18,41.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 32,33.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 34. See also Andrija B. Stojković, *L'Evolution de la philosophie serbe*, *Aperçu*, "Radiša Timotić," Beograd, 1977, pp. 52,53.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Dr. A.B. Stojković, in a personal communication as well as in the above work, p. 53.

<sup>40</sup>Branko Pavlović, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. A.B. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>42</sup>Stojković, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, as well as B. Petronijević, *Članci i studije II*, Napredak, Pančevo, 1920, Appendix, "Od istog pisca."

<sup>43</sup>See *Résumé des travaux philosophiques et scientifiques de Branislav Petronijevcis*, in *Bulletin de L'Académie des lettres, Académie Royale Serbe*, Belgrade, 1937.

<sup>44</sup>See B. Petronijević, "Ernest Renan i legenda o Isusu Hristu," in *Članci i studije*, Nova serija, Geca Kon, Beograd, 1932, pp. 156–165.

<sup>45</sup>See B. Petronijević, "Artur Šopenhauer," in *Šopenhauer, Niče, Spenser*, Beograd 1920, p. 17.

<sup>46</sup>See Dr. Branislav Petronijević, *Tri dijalektike*, Beograd, 1946, p. 6.

<sup>47</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 6 as well as pp. 7,11,15.

<sup>48</sup>For these very sketchy highlights of Petronijević's philosophy I am gratefully indebted to a selective condensation of Dr. Ksenija Atanasijević's excellent essay "Branislav Petronijević" in *Penseurs Yougoslaves*, Bureau central de presse, Belgrade, 1937, pp. 185–198, and to Dr. A.B. Stojković's expert critical summary in his *L'Evolution de la philosophie serbe*, pp. 47–49 and 52–53.

<sup>49</sup>Atanasijević, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–187.

<sup>50</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 187–188. See also A. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs yougoslaves*, p. 188.

<sup>52</sup>See A.B. Stojković, *L'Evolution de la philosophie serbe*, p. 47.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs*, pp. 188–189.

<sup>54</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>55</sup>*Op. cit.*, 189–190. Cf. also A.B. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs*, p. 190.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibidem*, pp. 190–191. See also Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>58</sup>Atanasijević, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. A.B. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>60</sup>See *The Metaphysical and Geometrical Doctrine of Bruno as Given in his Work De Triplici Minimo*, by Dr. Ksenija Atanasijević, translated from the French original by G.V. Tomashevich, Warren H. Green, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, USA, 1972, especially Chapter III, "Critique of Bruno's Doctrine of the Minimum," pp. 95–132.

<sup>61</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs*, pp. 191–192.

<sup>62</sup>*Op. cit.*, pp. 192–193.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibidem*, pp. 193–194.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.* p. 194.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.* p.194–195.

<sup>67</sup>Cf. A.B. Stojković, *L'Evolution*, p. 48 as well as Georges Lemaître, *The Primeval Atom: An Essay on Cosmology*, (1931), D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1950.

<sup>68</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs*, p. 195.

<sup>69</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 196 as well as A.B. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>70</sup>Cf. K. Atanasijević, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

<sup>71</sup>Cf. A.B. Stojković, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>72</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 48 as well as K. Atanasijević, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

<sup>73</sup>Cf. Petronijević's own words quoted by Prof. Branko U. Pavlović, in his *Predgovor* (Preface) to Petronijević's *Istorija novije filozofije*, pp. 23–24.

<sup>74</sup>K. Atanasijević, *Penseurs*, p. 198.

<sup>75</sup>Cf., *inter alia*, Mihailo Marković, "Yugoslav Philosophy," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by P. Edwards (Macmillan, New York, 1967, Vol. 8., pp. 361–362, B. Petronijević's *Résumé des travaux* and the article on *Archaeopteryx* in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, pp. 260–262.

THE IMAGE OF BOSNIA  
IN THE FICTION OF IVO ANDRIĆ\*

The year 1984 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of Lovett Edwards' most successful translation of *Na Drini ćuprija*,<sup>1</sup> as well as the twenty-fifth anniversary of Ivo Andrić's debut in the writings of Anglo-American literary critics.<sup>2</sup> While the first notices on Andrić were short and full of an open-mouthed sense of discovery of this "Yugoslav Tolstoy" (the favorite description of continental critics, who had "discovered" Andrić a few years earlier<sup>3</sup>), soon scholarly works on Andrić began to appear in the Slavic studies journals of Britain, the U.S., Canada and elsewhere. The very first of these, I might point out, was written by my colleague, Professor Emeritus Ante Kadić of Indiana University.<sup>4</sup> It concerned the historical sources of Andrić's first novel, *Travnička hronika*<sup>5</sup>, and anticipated significant later interest in this topic. Another early survey of Andrić's entire opus to that time was prepared by the British Slavist E.D. Goy.<sup>6</sup> With his wonted meticulousness he not only outlined in terms of plot, style, and technique, Andrić's numerous tales and his three novels, but also sought to synthesize for Andrić a world view that would make his writings more accessible to the non-Yugoslav reader. In this respect it strikes me Goy succeeded in large part.

In the same year the noted American Slavist Albert B. Lord delivered a paper at the Američko-jugoslovenski seminar held in Zadar and sponsored by the League of Yugoslav Universities and Indiana University.<sup>7</sup> It dealt en passant with American views of Andrić and particularly Lord's view on the importance of the concept of *zanos*, "ecstasy", in Andrić's writings. This he followed up on the next year with an article for *Slavic Review* on the works of Ivo Andrić in English translation.<sup>8</sup> In the late 1960s two well-known US Slavists also contributed brief analyses of Andrić's work. Vasa Mi-hailovich, discussing Andrić's basic world view, concluded that

... The picture of life that Andrić presents is hard, bleak, torturous, but it is not Kierkegaard's "sickness unto death." Fear of life never becomes fear of death; just

\*This paper was read at the Second Yugoslav Studies Seminar, devoted to Bosnia and Hercegovina and held at UCLA on 23-27 January 1984.



the opposite is the case. Though life may be accursed and walled-in, its creative forces emerge as much stronger than the adversities or the adversaries.<sup>9</sup>

And Nikola Pribić provided a succinct review of the historical background of *Na Drini ćuprija*.<sup>10</sup> As an additional North American work, though not strictly speaking part of English-language criticism of Andrić, we might also make mention of the lengthy *Leben und Werk* written by Njegoš M. Petrović, *Ivo Andrić: L'Homme et l'oeuvre*, published in Ottawa in 1969.<sup>11</sup>

At the very beginning of the 1970s Professor Thomas Eekman turned his attention to "The Later Stories of Ivo Andrić" for the *Slavonic and East European Review*. In close readings of Andrić's postwar short fiction Professor Eekman detects among other interesting conclusions Andrić's distancing of himself from his prewar concern with Old Bosnia,<sup>12</sup> as well as his development of a specifically Yugoslav philosophy, a kind of proto-existentialism based not on Sartre and Camus but rather Njegoš.<sup>13</sup> Rejecting the notion that Andrić was a realist pure and simple, Professor Eekman concludes that Andrić was truer to life than a realist could be in that he marked "the accelerations and rifts in life, in human fate, which are indeed momentous and decisive for human existence."<sup>14</sup> At the end of the decade Professor Eekman turned to Andrić again, it should be noted, in his very valuable survey of modern Yugoslav literature<sup>15</sup>: here he places Andrić within the ranks of the Bosnian literary tradition, a classification fraught with numerous interesting possibilities for further discussion!

Also in the seventies appeared two studies of Andrić by Albert Lord's student, John Loud: the first takes up Lord's concern with *zanos* in Andrić's early stories,<sup>16</sup> the second his narrative technique,<sup>17</sup> a topic, we might note, of abiding concern to foreign critics of Andrić.<sup>18</sup> Two studies of Andrić in English were also part of the proceedings of the 1972 Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages: a brief study of genre by Ivo Ćurčin,<sup>19</sup> and a lengthier examination of time and its essence in Andrić by Nicholas Moravcevic (also published in the *Slavic and East European Journal*).<sup>20</sup>

Finally in the present decade there have been at least three more additions to English-language criticism on Andrić (though I have reason to believe there are even more, I have not been able to secure

yet the specific references to other studies). The first, entitled "Bosnia Demythologized," by Vida Taranovski Johnson,<sup>21</sup> provides close readings of two Andrić short stories set in Bosnia. As her title suggests, Professor Johnson here seeks to demonstrate that in his later Bosnian stories Andrić moved away from the mysterious Bosnia of the 1920s to the "historical reality of a country torn by complex economic, cultural and political problems."<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately she also claims that the "myth of Bosnia" was reestablished in Andrić's posthumous novel, *Omerpaša Latas* (issued as volume 16 in the *Sabrana dela Ive Andrića* [SdIA] in 1977), an assertion difficult to maintain if we remember that this "novel" is in fact a "reconstruction"<sup>23</sup> of short stories published between 1950 and 1973 and "stitched together" in part by Andrić toward the end of his life, but in larger part by the editors of his papers. We will return to this problem later in the paper.

In the recent issue of *Serbian Studies* Želimir B. Juričić discusses the young Andrić's experiences in the two towns of his childhood, Višegrad and Sarajevo.<sup>24</sup> And in the last issue of the *Slavic and East European Journal* my own contribution has just appeared: it deals with the underlying literary structure of *Na Drini ćuprija* and the truly novelistic nature of that work.<sup>25</sup>

Thus in the quarter-century since *Na Drini ćuprija* was put into English, thereby effectively bringing Ivo Andrić to the attention, both popular and scholarly, of the English-speaking world, Anglo-American Slavists have contributed their part to the growing body of critical material on Yugoslavia's most famous writer. Both subjects and approaches have been eclectic. We still lack a book-length treatment of the man and his work.<sup>26</sup> And, with a few exceptions, our critical insights continue to be beholden to the vast body of Yugoslav criticism on Andrić. We have not yet perhaps done as much as we might to provide our own unique appraisals of Andrić's creativity, thereby to enrich the international appreciation of his genius. But then twenty-five years is a short time.

## II

What of Yugoslav criticism of Andrić? Here we enter a vast realm of insights and ideas, polemics, politics and passions. The Serbian Academy's 1974 bibliography of works by and on Andrić<sup>27</sup> lists well

over 1200 critical items, dating from as early as 1914 and stretching to the early seventies (and of course there has been a great deal more written since then, especially after Andrić's death in 1975 and the publication of his posthumous works). The lion's share of these studies was composed by Andrić's countrymen. In a paper of this brevity, and even in a book, it would be impossible to do justice to this wealth of material. Indeed it has proved difficult to isolate and synthesize the critics' important ideas even in one small area, that is, Andrić's depiction of Bosnia in his short stories and novels.<sup>28</sup>

That topic has been of critical interest right from the beginning of Andrić's prose career, when he moved from the lyrical, subjective posturing of his poetry (in *Ex ponto* [1918]) and poems in prose (*Nemiri* [1920]) to the epic, impersonal style of his prose (in his first full-length short story, "Put Alije Đerzeleza" [1920]). In commenting on this story, Milan Bogdanović, the prominent Serbian literary critic himself at the beginning of a long career, wrote:

Ivo Andrić, koji je Bosanac, hteo je u popularnom bosansko-muslimanskom čoveku Aliji Đerzelezu da stvori jedan sintetizovan tip te sredine. U isto vreme on je hteo da dâ jedan simbol. U tome pogledu Andrićeve pripovetka ne predstavlja samo lokalni interes, kao što je slučaj sa delima mnogih naših pripovedača, nego ima svoj mnogo širi značaj . . . Ivo Andrić je uzeo da slika ljude iz jedne egzotične sredine, ali, nasuprot onome kako su radili romantičari, on u tim ljudima ne traži ono što im' je apsolutno specijalno i specifično, ono čime se oni udaljavaju od nas, nego, naprotiv, ono što im je zajedničko sa nama. Na taj način Andrić ide za omiljenom idejom nekih neorealista, po kojoj su svi ljudi u osnovi jednaki, jer da se kod svih, i pokraj mnogobrojnih i na prvi pogled dubokih lokalnih, rasnih i etničkih razlika, krije jedna ista psihološka suština.<sup>29</sup>

This long passage, written in 1920, anticipates many points later critics would make in analyzing Andrić's Bosnia. (And, we might mention parenthetically, the general correctness of its conclusions for *all* of Andrić's subsequent work demonstrates both the critic's acumen and the early coherence of the writer's depiction of his

native land.) What are the prescient points in Bogdanović's critique? One certainly is that Bosnia is *not* what it at first glance seems to be. Bosnia in Andrić's works, according to the critics, stands for something else. What that symbolic meaning may be was not yet clear to Bogdanović in the early twenties, but would be elaborated by the critics who followed him. Another point that would subsequently prove of enduring validity was that Andrić was not an exotic writer, the local practitioner of a regional literary tradition. On the contrary, from the beginning he was understood to transcend his Bosnian background, and we can see Bogdanović grasping at labels ("not a romantic," "like some neorealists") to describe what he was. Finally, no more than Andrić's Bosnia is like the real Bosnia is Andrić the narrator like a real Bosnian teller of tales. That is, Andrić's stories are not meant to be taken at face value, either. Here Bogdanović fatefully signaled the start of a great hunt for the hidden meanings, the *psihološka suština*, in all of Andrić's writings. The idea that something was concealed under the mass of realistic Bosnian detail Andrić used made hermeneutics the operative approach to his work henceforth. Needless to add, Andrić's lengthy diplomatic silence on his own evaluation of his work merely served to stimulate further the critics' hunting instincts.

Also in the early twenties — to be specific in 1923 — Isidora Sekulić wrote her famous essay "Istok u pripovetkama Iva Andrića."<sup>30</sup> Frequently cited by later critics, this insightful piece established the dichotomy inherent in Andrić's short stories, between their "eastern" content and "western" plan, tone and structure. Uninterested in these (one has the feeling) pedestrian "western" components of his artistry, Sekulić entered into a careful examination of the "eastern characteristics" of Andrić's stories. They include (1) Andrić's narrative style, which recalls oral recitation, (2) the absence of bourgeois life, bourgeois "interiors" and the omnipresence of eastern or easternized characters, (3) the absence of female protagonists, the use of women as if they were not "ličnosti, nego jedino pokretne snage"<sup>31</sup> (these last two aspects seem a bit dated now in light of Andrić's later writing), (4) lust for women as a principal motivation of the characters (what Sekulić calls "*nečista krv*" and compares with Borisav Stanković's characters), and finally (5) eastern suggestiveness displacing western analysis. This last element is particularly important to her argument, and indeed is often repeated by



modern Andrić specialists. In her own words

Rekli bismo stoga da ta snaga sugestije neće biti da je samo osobenost talenta i umetničke tehnike u Iva Adrića, nego da je neka, od talenta još dublja, urođenost. Direktni dar one stare Bosne, koja Andriću ne da mira kroz bog zna koje pretke, ili kroz bog zna koju tajanstvenu silu istočnih krajeva i života. . . Šta je bila, i šta je mogla darovati ta stara Bosna? Da li veštinu analize, da li moć sugestije? Raja, pa muslimani Bosanci, pa Stambolije, mešavina. . . nemir, trvenje, nasilje, mržnja, i sve u večitom strahu i mraku. Turčin Bosanac muči i prezire raj, Stambolija prezire sve što je Bosna. Lukavstva, intrige, vrebavanja, zlostavljanja, osvete. Kraj toga ratovi i sirotinja. I ništa drugo. . . Pitamo zato ponovo kakva posla tu ima analiza, ili psihologija, ili apstrakcija? Gde da započnu, na čemu da se zaustave? Ne, ne, to je bio život koji nije znao za zaključke. I zato se o tom životu ne da misliti. Mesto misli dolazi mašta, ljubav za avanturu, konkretan i sugestivan izraz. I još nešto: ono bezimeno i tajanstveno što se krije u svakom detetu Istoka, a pogotovu umetniku. Ono specifično istočnjačko što niko ne može imati i niko ne može dati ako nije rođen tamo gde se sunce rađa. . .<sup>32</sup>

Beneath this very purple prose Sekulić has the germ of an important idea, it seems to me. Bosnia for her is not a place but a way, it is the evocation of a particular style of living, different from that which westerners are accustomed to, yet of great interest to them. As with Bogdanović, Andrić is for Sekulić not the chronicler of exotic locales. Despite the quantity and specificity of the details in his stories, he is no analyst of Bosnian reality but rather uses that reality to speak of something else.

With the accumulation of both further critical thoughts and new works from Andrić's pen, later analysts of his writings have managed to broaden and deepen the early hypotheses of Bogdanović, Sekulić and others. Moreover a whole new body of literature has arisen with which to compare Andrić and the Bosnia he created. Among Yugoslav writers he was most often contrasted to Krleža<sup>33</sup>

(in a rare fit of exasperation Andrić himself complained that he and the Croatian writer were frequently treated like two competing football teams, not individual artists<sup>34</sup>); he has also been compared to the Serbs Crnjanski and Ćosić,<sup>35</sup> and of course to the most genuinely Bosnian of Yugoslav writers, Meša Selimović.<sup>36</sup> Outside of Yugoslavia writers such as Whitman and Kierkegaard,<sup>37</sup> Henry James, Joseph Conrad, E.M. Forster,<sup>38</sup> and I might also suggest Thomas Hardy, with his semifictive locale Wessex, serve probably more as potential sources for Andrić than contemporaries whose writing might be fruitfully contrasted with his. But the American Nobel Prize winner William Faulkner, almost an exact coeval of Andrić's (1897–1962), certainly offers the comparatist food for thought.<sup>39</sup> How valuable it would be to juxtapose Faulkner's south with Andrić's Bosnia, Yoknapatawpha County with Višegrad or Travnik, the American's narrative techniques, his use of regionalisms and dialect with the Yugoslav's.

Seductive as this last possibility in particular is, time and space make it impossible to pursue now. I would, however, like to mention a valuable study, in the matter of contrasting Andrić's work with that of his contemporary, by Radovan Vučković, entitled "Meša Selimović, između Istoka i Zapada."<sup>40</sup> Concerning Selimović, Andrić and Crnjanski he says: "U sva tri slučaja literarna putovanja u prošlost imala su isti smisao: da se sadašnjost, posredstvom literarne alegorije, sagleda kao prošlost."<sup>41</sup> In the exploitation of historical materials he notes that both Selimović and Andrić drank from the same Bosnian spring and that even though Andrić himself was not a part any longer of the Bosnian milieu he described, nonetheless he had: "intuiciju i imaginaciju, koje, na osnovu podataka istorijske ili etničke vrednosti, stvaraju literarnu fikciju za koju su ti podaci, u krajnjem slučaju, i nebitni."<sup>42</sup> What Vučković is saying, in fact, is that in contradistinction to Selimović, for whom Bosnia was perhaps of the essence, for Andrić Bosnia is peripheral. This is a thought we will find in a number of other modern Yugoslav critics of Andrić as well.

Meša Selimović himself, in commenting on Andrić, hints at the same conclusion, but in a different way:

Andrićevo djelo je univerzalno. "Ma od čega da pođe, ma od kako sitnog detalja, misao se odjednom proširi,

razbokori, preraste skromni značaj početnog povoda, postane opšta, poveže se sa širokim svijetom, mada je pošao sa uboge bosanske staze." Zašto je Andrić svoju mučnu misao o cijelom svijetu i o svim ljudima ova-plotio na terenu svoga zavičaja? "Možda zato što je svejedno. Možda zato što je to psihološki neizbježno, jer gdje bi pisac locirao svoju misao o svijetu ako ne na terenu koji mu je najbliži, da ne kažem i najdraži, i koji ga bolno podsjeća na njegovu ranu misao o bogatom i lijepom svijetu negdje izvan rodne Bosne." Andrić piše o Bosni ali on je suviše veliki pisac da bi bio hroničar samo jednog kraja. "Možda baš zbog ljubavi prema Bosni, Andrić, na mjestima nazvanim njenim imenom, razvija složenu, često granginjolsku viziju čovječanstva."<sup>43</sup>

Thus for Selimović too the real Bosnia moves into the background in Andrić's fiction. What role then does Bosnia play?

E.D. Goy, cited before, calls Andrić's Bosnia merely a "landscape of the mind"<sup>44</sup> and a 'microcosm where Andrić can dissect existence.'<sup>45</sup> The Polish critic Jan Wierzbicki, whose book on Andrić I have not yet seen, but read about in Radovan Vučković's extensive positive review of it,<sup>46</sup> claims Bosnia is "as much a metaphor as a real country" and "the key to understanding Andrić's work,"<sup>47</sup> the fundamental idea of which is that truth is not singular but plural, the property not of an individual but of a collective. Bosnia then is the locale wherein Andrić searches for truth in all its multifacetedness.<sup>48</sup> Stanko Korać, one of Andrić's more astute, I think, modern commentators, maintains Bosnia is merely the lower level of Andrić's stories:

Slike zemlje, pejzaž, klima, običaji, sve je precizno dato i dobro prostudirano, te nam se čini da je pisac išao za tim da dadne određene podatke o Bosni. Ali to što se čini kao podatak, to je samo jedan sloj romana koji ima tu svrhu da izrazi neugodu pomoću objektivne slike prostora . . . Moderni pisac, s jedne strane daje precizne podatke o ambijentu, a s druge strane tim podacima stvara atmosferu koju njegovi junaci teško podnose.<sup>49</sup>

Yet the notion of Bosnia as a layer or level of the stories does not quite satisfy Korać, either, and so he and a number of other modern critics (including Selimović,<sup>50</sup> Dragoljub Stojadinović,<sup>51</sup> and Regina Minde<sup>52</sup>) speak also of Bosnia as a land on the border, or more exactly, as a *land of borders*, and of Andrić as a "border writer." Korać and Minde go the farthest in making this point, and it is the idea with which I would like to conclude this portion of my paper.

Korać compares Andrić with a famous contemporary of his:

U Kafkinom i Andrićevom svijetu bez boga nema ni uma, ni svrhe, ni cilja. Kod ova dva velika pisca egzistencijalna ugroženost i ontološka briga zbog *neograničenih* [stress supplied, HRC] mogućnosti zla u svijetu, izbija u svijesti njihovih junaka kao temeljno pitanje.<sup>53</sup>

The crucial word here, at least in my understanding, is *neograničenih*, "unbounded," for indeed in Andrić's world evil, hate, fear, anxiety and death know no bounds or boundaries. Man, on the other hand, lives in inescapable, bounded situations (*granične situacije*, a concept Korać takes from the German existentialist philosopher Carl Jaspers)<sup>54</sup>. And in Andrić's depiction, says Korać, man does not even desire to escape: "Andrićev čovjek ne traži bolji svijet, on hoće da se snađe u postojećem."<sup>55</sup> Man would be destroyed by all the overwhelming evil of the world if it were not for the borders that life places around him. In many of Andrić's stories these borders bear a clear designation: Bosnia. They are the embodiment in space and time of the existential borders which characterize all human life. The world then, can be divided in most all of Andrić's works as "Bosnia and not-Bosnia," in Regina Minde's formulation:

Entweder ist es Bosnien, oder Nichtbosnien, das erste eine kleine, in sich geschlossene Welt mit ihren Zentren Sarajevo und Višegrad, ihren einsamen Dörfern, Klöstern und Herbergen, das zweite eine ganze Reihe unzusammenhängender, kaum definierter Punkte, Belgrad, Triest, Bordeaux, eine alte österreichische Universitätsstadt, wahrscheinlich Graz.<sup>56</sup>



And the space within these Bosnian borders, how is that to be understood? Svetozar Koljević likens it to ancient Babylon, the place of the mixing of tongues and the interpenetration of civilizations.<sup>57</sup> Everyone has a difficult time of it in this Bosnia, but there is hope for all insofar as they manage to weave their own nests there and share the anxieties experienced by all. I find Koljević's concept enticing but unconvincing: on a practical level language almost never poses a communications problem for Andrić's characters, unlike Babylon's denizens; they all speak a Bosnian koiné of some sort. On an existential level there is little sharing of emotional anxieties, even though there is occasionally a division of social burdens and troubles. I am afraid Regina Minde's opposite conclusion is probably more valid (even though she wrote this a decade and a half before Andrić's last works appeared):

Das zentrale Thema der Erzählungen ist die menschliche Einsamkeit, die existentielle zwischenmenschliche Beziehungslosigkeit. Das Böse — "zlo" — und Sünde und Schuld — "greh, krivica" — . . . erscheinen immer nur als untergeordnete Aspekte dieses Weltverständnisses. Wenn Bosnien als das Land des Hasses, das Land der unversöhnlichen Gegensätze bezeichnet wird, dann ist das vor allem in diesem Sinne zu verstehen. Die dargestellte Welt ist eine Welt nach dem Sündenfall, in der jede Erinnerung an das verlorene Paradies ausgelöscht ist und deshalb keine Hoffnung besteht, es jemals wiederzuerlangen. Es ist eine Welt in der das Wort Glück unbekannt ist, in der es keine allgemeingültigen Maßstäbe gibt, "keine deutliche und scharfe Grenze zwischen dem, was Gottes, und dem, was des Teufels ist, gezogen ist. . ." <sup>58</sup>

In other words, but to continue the Biblical allusion, Bosnia is "the land of Nod," the land "to the east of Eden" (Genesis 3:24 and 4:16) to which our primeval parents were expelled after their fall from grace. Bosnia in Andrić is a place where humanity, despite four major religions, has effectively rejected God, a place where the boundary between good and evil has as a result been blurred (this idea Minde took from Petar Džadžić), a place where humans may

live protected from the complete chaos and total evil of a godless universe, but may no longer be either happy or immortal. As Korać puts it, an individual may live in constant danger from this world, but he lives at all only thanks to the existence of this world. "To je dijalektika egzistencijalne suštine života i pojedinca."<sup>59</sup> Perhaps this is the same *suština* Bogdanović hinted at in 1920,<sup>60</sup> that mysterious essence that critics have spent six decades trying to define in Andrić's Bosnia. In this very hasty survey of analyses of Andrić's work I have tried to synthesize the critics' appraisal of the image of Bosnia in Andrić's fiction. There remains, now, it seems to me, only one task left to complete: a systematic review of how Andrić himself depicted Bosnia in his own writings. That is the third and final part of my paper.

### III

When Anders Österling, Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy, presented Ivo Andrić with the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1961, he identified him as a "Yugoslav writer," "a young Serbian student," who was born of a family of artisans that had "settled in Bosnia." Several times Andrić is spoken of as coming "from the Balkans," and the actual wording on his Nobel diploma sounds as follows: "for the epic force with which you have traced themes and depicted human destinies from your country's history."<sup>61</sup>

In accepting his prize, Andrić speaks of the award as an honor to "my little country":

Moja domovina je zaista "mala zemlja među svetovima," kako je rekao jedan naš pisac, to je zemlja koja u brzim etapama, po cenu velikih žrtava i izuzetnih napora, nastoji da na svima područjima, pa i na kulturnom, nadoknadi ono što joj je neobično burna i teška prošlost uskratila.<sup>62</sup>

Perhaps I am reading too much into both these speeches, but I am surprised that they both seem so consistently to avoid naming the country which Andrić is from. I have no intention here of entering into a discussion of Andrić's "true ethnicity"<sup>63</sup> — in fact that does not interest me. But the reticence of both the Nobel Committee and

the Nobel laureate does: as the critics have already helped us to see, in Ivo Andrić's literary life his Bosnia is neither to be completely identified or carelessly confused with the real geographic and historical entity of that name.

That Bosnia does figure most prominently and enduringly in Andrić's writings there can be no doubt. I have surveyed the sixteen volumes of the *SdIA*<sup>64</sup> and have the following statistics to offer. Of the 144 short stories contained therein (and for my purposes here I have considered both "Prokleta avlija" and the individual chapters of *Omerpaša Latas* all as short stories), fully 80, or 55%, deal with Bosnia in some way or another (most are set there; a few, set elsewhere, nonetheless have some significant Bosnian connection). Sixty-nine of the 80 Bosnian stories were published in Andrić's lifetime (of the 11 posthumous ones, 4 are chapters in *Omerpaša Latas* and 7 are chapters from *Kuća na osami*, all probably composed in the last years of the author's life). In the 1920s he published 15 Bosnian stories, in the 1930s 9, in the 1940s 12, plus the so-called Bosnian Trilogy, *Travnička hronika*, *Na Drini ćuprija* and *Gospođica*, in the 1950s 21 (the record), in the 1960s again 9, and in the last half decade of his life, 3 (or 14, if you add the posthumous tales). Of course the Bosnian setting does not play an equally substantive role in all these tales and novels. This we will address in a moment. But it is safe to conclude, I believe, that most of Andrić's stories and all three (or four or four and a half or five, depending on how you treat "Prokleta avlija" and *Omerpaša Latas*) of his novels contribute to, or perhaps more correctly, partake of the image of Bosnia so central to his work.<sup>65</sup>

And what is this image? In the 1920s three tales in particular present us with a rather specific picture. Consider this lengthy excerpt from "Za logorovanja" (1922); it concerns the paša of Bosnia:

U takvim časovima paša nije skrivao svoju odvratnost prema Bosni i Bosancima. Rođen u Carigradu, dvorski čovjek, on je svoje naimenovanje za bosanskog valiju smatrao uspjelom protivničkom intrigom i nesrećom koju valja mudro podnijeti.

On je prezirao te Bosance, muslimane, neuke, surove, nevjerovatno ograničene ljude, što tako svečano i s toliko važnosti govore svoje gluposti. Prezirao je Srbe,

čupavu, mrku, fanatizovanu raj, što se tako bezumno bore protiv starih i velikih institucija i slepo srću u smrt, gubeći za puste snove i lagarije "lijepi život," kako ga je on zvao. Prezirao je ponizne Jevreje, bradate popove i lukave fratre, kao svijet bez časti i dostojanstva . . . On je mrzio svu tu zemlju, mračnu i gorovitu, s rastrganim pejzažom i ludom klimom, kao i njene stanovnike, vječno nemirne i zavađene, jer mu je bilo odvratno sve što je glasno, oštro i neumjereno. Volio je miran rad u kolotečini i umjerene slasti i uživanja, koja je obožavao. Pokatkad bi svu noć sanjao more, puno bijelih jedara, a sutra bi onda dvostruko mrzio plećate i brkate Bošnjake oko sebe i silovite linije planina iznad Travnika, koje su mu zatvarale vidik. Potajno je radio preko prijatelja, u Carigradu, da se vrati na staro mjesto.<sup>66</sup>

Much briefer is the description of Bosnian life given in a short story from the following year, "Ljubav u kasabi" (1923):

Zatvoren vidik, mršava zemlja, divlja klima, česte pohare i ratovi, davali su već djeci kasabalijski izgled, borben i manijački . . .<sup>67</sup>

Such unremitting negative tones are lightened somewhat in "Most na Žepi" (1925), where grand vizier Jusuf recalls his native land with kind thoughts:

Setio se Bosne i sela Žepe, iz kog su ga odveli kad mu je bilo devet godina.

Bilo je prijatno, tako u nesreći, misliti na daleku zemlju i rastrkano selo Žepu, gde u svakoj kući ima priča o njegovoj slavi i uspehu u Carigradu, a gde niko ne poznaje i ne sluti naličje slave ni cenu po koju se uspeh stiže.<sup>68</sup>

By the end of even this brief tale that happy picture — happy because seen from so far away in space and time — fades, to be replaced by the vizier's current reality:



I ovoga jutra vezir je bio umoran i neispavan, ali miran i sabran; očni kapci su mu bili teški a lice kao sleđeno u svežini jutra. Mislio je na stranca neimara koji je umro, i na sirotinju koja će jesti njegovu zaradu. Mislio je na daleku brdovitu i mračnu Bosnu (oduvek mu je u promislili na Bosnu bilo nečeg mračnog!) koju ni sama svetlost Islama nije mogla nego samo delimično da obasja, i u kojoj je život, bez ikakve više uljuđenosti i pitočnosti, siromašan, štur, opor. I koliko takvih pokrajina ima na ovom božjem svetu? . . . <sup>69</sup>

The very same dichotomy, between love for Bosnia from afar and distaste for it up close is to be found in one of Andrić's Franciscan tales, "Kod kazana" (1930), where at the beginning Fra Marko Krneta in Rome longs for Bosnia:

To je bilo jedno popodne grozničavo i teškog rimskog proljeća, puno prašine, omorine i neprijatnog svjetla. Voćke su cvale i Fra Marka je više nego ikad mučila želja za Bosnom i svojimima.<sup>70</sup>

When he returns, however, to Bosnia, disappointments and the realities of a hard life cool his ardor. He realizes his is a small life, indistinguishable from so many millions of others. Yet from time to time his zeal to save the world flares anew:

Ne paleći svijeće, naslonjen na prozor, fra Marko je umjesto tih kreševskih njiva i mračnih kućeraka prelazio pogledom sve varoši svijeta sa njihovim ulicama, baštama, kućama, sa svim onim što je đavo podigao ljudima kao zamku za njihovu sujetu, lakomost i razvrat. Mjerio je svoju snagu sa snagom koja bi bila potrebna da se sve to zбриše sa lica božje zemlje, sve od Travnika do Sarajeva pa do onoga nepoznatog grada što trepti negdje u dnu Evrope ili mrske Azije, gdje je đavo kod kuće. To je bio trenutak kad je fra-Markova želja da se spasi čovječanstvo prelazila sve granice, i postajala opasnost i za njega samog . . . U fra-Marka se, ne prvi put, dizala strašna misao da božje i đavolje nije

jasno ni pravo podijeljeno, i da se ne zna, da niko ne zna, kolika je čija sila i gdje im je prava međa.<sup>71</sup>

At the very end of the decade, right before the war, in another of the Franciscan stories, "Čaša" (1940), a new, unique note enters Andrić's descriptions: Bosnia may be poor, but it is ours, and only here are we at home.

Nije tebi mjesto u svijetu i u Njemačkoj, nego u manastiru i u Bosni. Šta ćeš? Ovo je zemlja oskudna i uboga, tijesna i mrka, ni valija nije u njoj lako biti, a kamoli raja i redovnik. U ovoj se zemlji jedna čaša vidi i bode oči kao najviša kula u nekoj drugoj . . . Ovdje se dram radosti dušom plaća. A ti idi sad pa pitaj zašto je tako . . . E, moj Jusufe, nije to za nas fratre i Bošnjake. Jeste, ovdje te čeka kriva bosanska brazda i fratarska muka i sirotinjski bir i teška služba, a s druge strane, može biti, kolaj i svaka ljepota. Ali šta ti vrijedi kad to nije tvoja strana!<sup>72</sup>

The second world war, of course, forced a pause in Andrić's publication career and afforded him, it would seem, the time he needed to create his three longest fictional works, "The Bosnian Trilogy." The last of the three, *Gospođica*, is Bosnian merely in so far as about two-thirds of it are set in Sarajevo, and frequent mention is made in passing of important events from the beginning of this century. But all agree that in no way is this book an exploration of the Bosnian milieu or the Bosnian soul. The same cannot be said of the other two novels.

Both *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija* are filled to the brim with 'the matter of Bosnia' (*realia bosnensia*). Each novel opens with an extensive introduction on Travnik and Višegrad respectively. Details from daily life, explanations of words, customs, folk ways, names, mini-histories of all the principal characters, descriptions of buildings, streets, markets, churches, bridges, monuments overflow the hundreds of pages of both works. In terms of conveying the realistic texture of life in a Bosnian town at specific times in the past, the novels appear to be much richer than the stories that preceded them.

As a result, however, of this almost ethnographic examination of Bosnia, the very quality of Bosnia as a semi-mythic arena in which humanity could confront the evil of the universe — a quality abounding in the stories — is absent from the novels, particularly *Na Drini ćuprija*. In that novel, for example, there are no generalizations (as far as I could detect from a quick rereading) about Bosnia per se, and none of the negative assessments such as we have seen thus far.<sup>73</sup> The philosophical reflections that occasionally appear there, on bridges or God's love disappearing from the world, arise from the local Muslim characters' frustration at being caught between two empires which represent two civilizations. Their struggle is for the most part a cultural one, not an existential one, as in the stories.

*Travnička hronika*, however, the earliest of the novels, does resemble the stories more than the other two novels in that it presents Bosnia from the point of view of those alien to the land, those "exiled to Bosnia," as the novel itself says.<sup>74</sup> These characters, particularly the "young consul" Desfossés and the consul's doctor, Mario Cologna, frequently allude to the horrors and ugliness of the country,<sup>75</sup> the stubborn, backward and benighted quality of the people,<sup>76</sup> the fact that Bosnia somehow represents not merely itself, but all places where the forces of good and evil clash. Most important, *Travnička hronika* is the drama of one man, Jean Daville, who finds himself drained by the reality of Bosnia and its "Turks".<sup>77</sup> Only when he is preparing to leave the country does his ability to work and his certainty that life has a purpose reappear:

Od onog februarskog dana, pre više od sedam godina, kad je . . . došao uzburan i ponižen u Baruhovu sobu u prizemlju i pao na tvrdu minderluk, svi poslovi i naponi u vezi sa Bosnom i Turcima vukli su ga ka zemlji, sputavali i slabili. U njemu je, iz godine u godinu, raslo i aralo dejstvo "orijentalnog otrova" koji muti pogled i podgriza volju, a kojim je od prvog dana počela da ga zapaja ova zemlja. . . A sada, kad se . . . sprema da sve napusti i krene u neizvesnost, javljaju se u njemu podstrek i volja, kakve nije poznavao za ovih sedam godina. Brige i potrebe su veće nego ikad, ali ga začudo ne izbezumljuju kao dosada nego mu oštre misao i šire

vidik. . .<sup>78</sup>

Daville's drama is existential, for it involves the sources and motivations of life, questions of purpose, perception of right and wrong, ultimate issues of God — if there is one — and humans. And in this one novel alone Bosnia does function as the place of exile, the "land of Nod, east of Eden," wherein an individual is forced to confront the contradictions of earthly life.

It cannot be said that Bosnia figures less frequently as a setting in Andrić's postwar fiction than it does in his prewar and wartime compositions. But with a few exceptions it seems safe to assert that the image of Bosnia in these tales of the last thirty years of the author's life resembles the descriptive, geographic, historical, ethnographic Bosnia of *Na Drini ćuprija* far more than the existentialist, poisonous Bosnia of *Travnička hronika* and earlier works. In most of the later stories (and again I include here "Prokleta avlija" and the individual chapters of *Omerpaša Latas*<sup>79</sup>), Bosnia is merely a location, a device to give physical setting to the tale, and little else.

Three important exceptions to this general rule were published in 1946, 1947 and 1948: "Pismo iz 1920. godine," "Priča o vezirovom slonu," and "Zmija" respectively. Together they comprise another "Bosnian trilogy," as it were. "Pismo" is the tale of two friends who meet by chance at a railway station in Slavonski Brod, just outside of Bosnia. The main character, Max Levenfeld, though born in Sarajevo of a catholicized Jewish family, is nonetheless an outsider, "Švapče,"<sup>80</sup> whose only desire is to leave Bosnia forever. "Zmija" relates the arrival in Bosnia of two sisters, who "trace their background to some Bosnian princes or other."<sup>81</sup> They are following their father, General Radaković, to Višegrad, where he is to serve as the Austrian commander. "Priča" is a tale of tale-telling, specifically Bosnian tale-telling as practiced in the country by and about those living there, in this case a Turkish vizier from Adrianople and his elephant. In all three stories outsiders of one sort or another confront Bosnian hatred: many die as a result.

"Pismo" is the most explicit of these stories, and so on it I would like to concentrate our attention. In a writing within his writing, Andrić adduces, as it were, a letter from Max Levenfeld, translated for us "from the German" by the first-person narrator of the story (in itself *Ich-Erzählung* in Andrić's prose is rare, and makes this tale



all the more noteworthy in his corpus<sup>82</sup>). The letter is meant to explain the hatred which Max claims has driven him from his Bosnian home. "Bosna je divna zemlja," it begins, "zanimljiva, nimalo obična zemlja i po svojoj prirodi, i po svojim ljudima."<sup>83</sup> Its fatal flaw, however, is this: "Bosna je zemlja mržnje i straha."<sup>84</sup> This hatred is so deeply rooted that people are unaware of it, but hate those who seek to remove it. It is a hatred with no redeeming social benefits: "ona je prosto oruđe nagona za uništenjem ili samouništenjem, samo kao takva i postoji, i samo dotle dok svoj zadatak potpunog uništenja ne izvrši."<sup>85</sup>

On the other hand, Bosnia is also a land of faith, four faiths, to be specific. But hate has infiltrated these, too: "Možda je vaša najveća nesreća baš u tome što i ne slutite koliko mržnje ima u vašim ljubavima i zanosima, tradicijama i pobožnostima."<sup>86</sup> A land of four faiths should, however, have four times as much love and understanding as other places. In Bosnia quite the contrary happens. And, he writes, it will continue to happen for a long time to come. In a passage much cited by the critics, Max says:

Ko u Sarajevu provodi noć budan u krevetu, taj može da čuje glasove sarajevske noći. Teško i sigurno izbija sat na katoličkoj katedrali: dva posle ponoći. Prođe više od jednog minuta (tačno sedamdeset i pet sekundi, brojao sam) i tek tada se javi nešto slabijim ali prodornim zvukom sat sa pravoslavne crkve, i on iskucava svoja dva sata posle ponoći. Malo za njim iskuca promuklim, dalekim glasom sahat-kula kod Begove džamije, i to iskuca jedanaest sati, avetinjskih turskih sati, po čudnom računanju dalekih, tuđih krajeva sveta! Jevreji nemaju svoga sata koji iskucava, ali bog jedini zna koliko je sada sati kod njih, koliko po sefardskom a koliko po eškenaskom računanju. Tako i noću, dok sve spava, u brojanju pustih sati gluvog doba bdi razlika koja deli ove pospale ljude koji se budni raduju i žaloste, goste i poste prema četiri razna, među sobom zavađena kalendara, i sve svoje želje i molitve šalju jednom nebu na četiri razna crkvena jezika. A ta razlika je, nekad vidljivo i otvoreno, nekad nevidljivo i podmuklo, uvek slična mržnji, često potpuno istovetna sa njom.

And then he concludes:

A u zemlji kao što je sadašnja Bosna, onaj koji svesno neće da mrzi, uvek je pomalo tuđin i izrod, a često mučenik. To važi i za vas, rođene Bosance, a pogotovu za čoveka došljaka.

Andrić ends this letter of 1920 with the briefest of mentions that in 1938 Max Levenfeld was killed by a fascist air attack in broad daylight on his hospital somewhere in Spain during the Civil War. "Thus ended the life of man who had fled from hatred."

It strikes me as highly inappropriate, perhaps even very rude, at a conference devoted to Bosnia and Hercegovina to cite this, at first glance, most anti-Bosnian of Andrić's tales. But after such a long paper, with so many quotes from so many places, I hope you will agree with me that the Bosnia of such great hatred which Andrić writes of here is *not* necessarily the Bosnia of reality, but a Bosnia of fiction; the symbol of a very ancient myth of "the land of Nod, east of Eden." Max Levenfeld is our murdered ancestor Abel, whose gifts and motives we find so acceptable, as God once did. The hatred he tried to escape is that of Abel's brother and murderer Cain, whom God rejected. The land of Nod, east of Eden, is the place where humankind first learned to hate itself. As Eden was the site of the first personal sin, so Nod, east of Eden, was the place of the first social sin, and as such is the mythic model for the Bosnia of Ivo Andrić's fiction.

To sum up, Bosnia in Andrić is the land of exile within whose borders humans confront not only the impersonal evil of a purposeless universe, but more critically, confront the evil each human generates in him or herself. It is a land of many faiths but an absent God, a tight, confining space with no visible horizon. In its confines its residents, particularly its exiles, like Cain, wander in misery, horrified at the possibilities for evil they detect in themselves or experience at the hands of others. Perhaps it is about this land that Andrić wrote in an untitled poem published in 1973<sup>87</sup>:

Ni bogova, ni molitava!  
Pa ipak biva ponekad da čujem  
Nešto kao molitven šapat u sebi.

To se moja stara i večno živa želja  
 Javlja odnekud iz dubina  
 I tihim glasom traži malo mesta  
 U nekom od beskrajnih vrtova rajskih  
 Gde bih najposle našao ono  
 Što sam oduvek uzalud tražio ovde:  
 Širinu i prostranstvo, otvoren vidik,  
 Malo slobodna daha.

Indiana University

<sup>1</sup>Ivo Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*, translated from the Serbo-Croat by Lovett F. Edwards (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1959). Though *Travnička hronika* was translated earlier (1958), there were no notices of it in the English-language press. See Radomir Lukić, ed., *Ivo Andrić: Bibliografija dela, prevoda i literature* (Belgrade: SANU, 1974), items 672, 690, 762, 816 and 819, for the earliest Andrić translations into English.

<sup>2</sup>Lukić, op. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., items 1529 ("Un Tolstoi yougoslave?") and 1544 ("Ein jugoslawischer Tolstoi").

<sup>4</sup>Ante Kadić, "The French in *The Chronicle of Travnik*," *California Slavic Studies* 1(1960), 134–69. Professor Kadić has also written two other articles on Andrić: "Andrićevi franjevci," *Domovinska riječ* (Barcelona) (1978), 218–40; and "The Occupation of Bosnia (1878) as Depicted in Literature," in: *The Tradition of Freedom in Croatian Literature: Essays* (Bloomington, IN: The Croatian Alliance, 1983), 166–80.

<sup>5</sup>Written in 1941–2; see Thomas Eekman, *Thirty Years of Yugoslav Literature, 1945–1975* (Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Studies, 1978), 94.

<sup>6</sup>E.D. Goy, "The Work of Ivo Andrić," *Slavonic and East European Review* 41(1963), 301–26.

<sup>7</sup>Albert B. Lord, "An American View of Contemporary Yugoslav Literature," in: Charles Jelavich and Tihomir Vulović, eds., *Reports on American-Yugoslav Seminar, Zadar, June 18–23, 1963* (Ljubljana: Indiana University-Bloomington & League of Yugoslav Universities-Belgrade, 1968), 155–162.

<sup>8</sup>Albert B. Lord, "Ivo Andrić in English Translation," *Slavic Review* 23(1964), 563–73.

<sup>9</sup>Vasa D. Mihailovich, "The Basic World View in the Short Stories of Ivo Andrić," *Slavic and East European Journal* 10(1966), 177.

<sup>10</sup>Nikola R. Pribić, "Ivo Andrić and His Historical Novel *The Bridge on the Drina*," *The Florida State University Slavic Papers* 3(1969), 77–80.

<sup>11</sup>Les Editions Leméac.

<sup>12</sup>Thomas Eekman, "The Later Stories of Ivo Andrić," *Slavonic and East European Review* 48(1970), 342.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 347.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 355.

<sup>15</sup>Eekman, *Thirty Years*, op. cit., 91–101.

<sup>16</sup>John F. Loud, "'Zanos' in the Early Stories of Ivo Andrić," PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1971, iii + 408 pp.

<sup>17</sup>John Loud, "Between Two Worlds: Andrić the Storyteller," *Review of National Literatures: The Multinational Literature of Yugoslavia* 5/1(1974), 112–26.

<sup>18</sup>See above all Regina Minde, *Ivo Andrić: Studien über seine Erzählkunst* (Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1962) (Slavistische Beiträge, 8).

<sup>19</sup>Ivo Čurčin, "Andrić's *Bridge on the Drina* and the Problem of Genre," in: *Proceedings: Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages 23rd Annual Meeting 28–29 April 1972* (Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University, 1973), 233–5.

<sup>20</sup>Nicholas Moravcevic, "Ivo Andrić and the Quintessence of Time," in: *ibid.*, 229–32; and in: *Slavic and East European Journal* 16(1972), 313–18.

<sup>21</sup>V.T. Johnson, "Bosnia Demythologized," *Welt der Slaven* 25(1980), 98–108.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 98.

<sup>23</sup>SdIA, 16/310 (the first number refers to the volume, the second to the page).

<sup>24</sup>Želimir B. Juričić, "The Young Andrić: A Tale of Two Towns," *Serbian Studies* 2/1(1982), 13–32.

<sup>25</sup>Henry R. Cooper, Jr., "The Structure of *The Bridge on The Drina*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 27/3(1983), 365–73. Please note that while I have tried to be reasonably thorough in adducing literary studies of Ivo Andrić's work, I have omitted completely linguistic and other studies of his language and the like. Two additional studies not covered in my text are: Mary P. Coote, "Narrative and Narrative Structure in Ivo Andrić's *Devil's Yard*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 21(1977), 56–63; and Želimir B. Juričić, "Andrić's Visions of Women in *Ex ponto*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 23(1979), 233–39.

<sup>26</sup>Though one is in preparation in Great Britain, by Celia Hawkesworth. See also the volume of papers on Andrić she is preparing for publication from the 1984 Andrić Symposium at the University of London.

<sup>27</sup>Lukić, op. cit., pp. 129–227 and 239–41.

<sup>28</sup>In addition to the works cited below, I have also consulted: Boško Novaković, "Andrićevi pripovedački ciklusi," in: Vojislav Đurić, ed., *Ivo Andrić* (Belgrade: Institut za teoriju književnosti, 1962), 117–29; and Vjekoslav Lise, "Iz Andrićevog ciklusa o patologiji Bosne," *Život* 49/1(1976), 3–7.

<sup>29</sup>Milan Bogdanović, "'Put Alije Đerzeleza'" (1920), in: Branko Milanović, ed., *Ivo Andrić u svjetlu kritike* (Sarajevo: "Svjetlost," 1977), 44.

<sup>30</sup>Isidora Sekulić, "Istok u pripovetkama Iva Andrića" (1923), in: *ibid.*, 50–8.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 55.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 57–8.

<sup>33</sup>E.g., in Dragan M. Jeremić, *Prsti nevernog Tome* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1965), 9–76; and Nikola Milošević, *Andrić i Krlježa kao antipodi* (Belgrade: Slovo ljubve, 1974).

<sup>34</sup>Unfortunately at the moment I am unable to locate the exact source of this statement.

<sup>35</sup>E.g., in Jeremić, op. cit.; and Radovan Vučković, *Problemi, pisci, dela I* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1974), 92.

<sup>36</sup>Vučković, op. cit.

<sup>37</sup>Goy, op. cit. 313–14 and note 13, 314.

<sup>38</sup>Svetozar Koljević, "Andrićev Vavilon: Dijalog civilizacija u Andrićevom umetničkom svetu," in: Antonije Isaković, ed., *Zbornik radova o Ivi Andriću* (Belgrade: SANU, 1977), 31.

<sup>39</sup>This is Regina Minde's suggestion (op.cit., 56).

<sup>40</sup>Vučković, op. cit.



<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 92.<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 94.<sup>43</sup>Meša Selimović, "Ivo Andrić, čovjek i pisac," *Književne novine* 478 (1 January 1975), 4.<sup>44</sup>Goy, op. cit. 313–14.<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 315.<sup>46</sup>Vučković, op. cit., II (1976), 296–314; Jan Wierzbicki, *Ivo Andrić* (Warsaw: 1965).<sup>47</sup>Vučković, op. cit., II, 312.<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 313.<sup>49</sup>Stanko Korać, *Andrićevi romani ili svijet bez boga* (Zagreb: Prosvjeta, 1970), 170.<sup>50</sup>Selimović, op. cit., 9.<sup>51</sup>Dragoljub Stojadinović, *Mudrosti i tajne u delu Ive Andrića* (Priština: Jedinstvo, 1980), 15.<sup>52</sup>Minde, op. cit., 40.<sup>53</sup>Korać, op. cit., 18.<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 20–1.<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 30.<sup>56</sup>Minde, op. cit., 36.<sup>57</sup>Koljević, op. cit., 13.<sup>58</sup>Minde, op. cit., 190.<sup>59</sup>Korać, op. cit., 30.<sup>60</sup>See above, note 29.<sup>61</sup>Anders Österling, "Presentation Address," in: *Novel Prize Library* (New York: Alexis Gregory, and Del Mar, CA: CRM Publishing, 1971), 117–20.<sup>62</sup>SdIA, 11/65.<sup>63</sup>See, i.a., Ante Kadić, *Contemporary Serbian Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), 57, note 33.<sup>64</sup>SdIA, 1-16.<sup>65</sup>It is perhaps of marginal interest to note that Andrić's attention is far and away greater for Bosnia than Hercegovina. Only one story is set there, as if by chance: "Ranjenik u selu" (SdIA, 15); and just a few others have Hercegovinian characters: "Dan u Rimu" (1920), "Olujaci" (1934), "Proba" (1954), and "Audijencija" (chapter 7 of *Omerpaša Latas*, published posthumously).<sup>66</sup>SdIA, 5/12–13.<sup>67</sup>SdIA, 7/184.<sup>68</sup>SdIA, 6/181.<sup>69</sup>SdIA, 6/188.<sup>70</sup>SdIA, 6/45. Also in "Smrt u Sinanovoj tekiji" (1932), 6/192 and 201–2.<sup>71</sup>SdIA, 6/46–7.<sup>72</sup>SdIA, 6/131. The same note is sounded in "Staze", SdIA, 10/10.<sup>73</sup>There may be a simple explanation for this: the number of foreign visitors to Bosnia in *Na Drini ćuprija* is relatively small in comparison with the stories. But it is through foreigners that Andrić develops most strongly the image of Bosnia as a land of hatred and horror (though there are exceptions to this rule, too). I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Zdenko Lešić, for this observation.<sup>74</sup>SdIA, 2/162.<sup>75</sup>SdIA, 2/120.<sup>76</sup>SdIA, 2/68, 258, 261–2, 292.<sup>77</sup>SdIA, 2/121.<sup>78</sup>SdIA, 2/456.<sup>79</sup>Though in chapter 13 of the novel, "Posle," first published in 1963, there is a brief passage (16/254) on how Bosnia makes everyone who comes into her worse.

The idea is not developed, however.

<sup>80</sup>SdIA, 9/166.<sup>81</sup>SdIA, 9/101.<sup>82</sup>Minde, op. cit., 16.<sup>83</sup>SdIA, 9/174.<sup>84</sup>Ibid.<sup>85</sup>SdIA, 9/175.<sup>86</sup>Ibid.<sup>87</sup>SdIA, 11/243.

## THE RELATION BETWEEN POETIC AND PROSE STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS IN ANDRIĆ'S EARLY POETRY: THE CASE OF 'TAMA'

*The Journey of Đerzelez Alija (Put Alije Đerzeleza)* — henceforth referred to as *The Journey* — 1920, can be considered a turning point in Andrić's literary career. There are several reasons for this. This work is his first short story, and it was in this genre that he eventually established himself as a major Yugoslav writer and attained international stature. Secondly, it was the first work he wrote which was set in Bosnia, the land where Andrić was born and schooled, and which eventually provided him with a rich pool of characters with which he populated many of his short stories and novels. *The Journey* also marks Andrić's first venture into the area of Bosnian folklore, the field which the writer will later make an integral part of his creative process. Most importantly, however, this "my first literary work" ("moj književni prvjenac")<sup>1</sup>, as Andrić called it, characterizes his definite shift from the highly subjective and lyrical tone of his early writings — i.e., the two volumes of lyrical prose (*Ex Ponto*, 1918 and *Disquiet/Nemiri*, 1920), and a number of poetic pieces — to a harsh, realistic expression through the medium of his characters. *The Journey* is thus an important 'literary border marker' in Andrić's total creative output. In the pre-*Journey* period it is possible to speak of 'Andrić the poet', and in the post-*Journey* period of 'Andrić the short story writer and novelist'. Can such an arbitrary division of Andrić's literary achievements be made? And justified? Would it imply that in his post-*Journey* period the author refrained completely from writing poetry, and vice versa? On the basis of the material found after his death, entitled *All my Verses and Prose Poems (Svi moji stihovi i pjesme u prozi)*, it appears that Andrić wrote verses throughout most of his life — the last poem (*Bez naslova*, 1973) as late as two years before his death. "I have written a considerable number of verses," he once disclosed to a friend, "which I will eventually have to leave behind. Whenever I needed a rest from strenuous work on my prose, I reverted to poetry."<sup>2</sup> An unsubstantiated report even purports that "Andrić considered poetry his first love and his prose as a hindrance to his poetic pursuits."<sup>3</sup> Even in the post-*Journey* period of his career Andrić never really abandoned the writing of poetry; he only ceased publishing it. A recently published study entitled *Skriveni pesnik (A Concealed Poet)*<sup>4</sup>



supports this claim. Andrić had not started out as a poet and, eventually, developed into a novelist, but he remained a poet, although a concealed one — 'skriveni pjesnik' — throughout his literary career. There is an indivisible lyric layer to be found permeating Andrić's entire prose. It mirrors the inner world of the writer's intimate perceptions and confessionary-contemplative dispositions. Andrić the prose writer and Andrić the poet had always walked hand in hand; as result, both the poetic and the prose structural elements are delicately intertwined in everything he wrote. If the relation between poetry and prose can be observed in the totality of Andrić's literary output, then, conversely, it ought also be possible to detect this relationship in every one of his works separately. Using the poem *Tama* as an example, an attempt will be made to ascertain this postulate.

## TAMA

Ja ne znam kud ovo idu dani moji,  
ni kuda vode ove noći moje.  
Ne znam.

Ni otkud magla ružna  
na sve što se čekalo,  
ni otkud nemar jadni  
na sve što se radilo,  
ni zaborav otkuda,  
žalosni na sve što se ljubilo.

Magla.

Ko će da mi kaže noćas, šta meni znače  
lica i stvari i spomeni minulih dana?  
I kuda idu ovi dani moji  
I zašto bije tamno srce moje  
Kuda? Zašto?

1914.

## DARKNESS

I don't know where these days of mine are going  
or where these nights are leading.  
I don't know.

Or whence this ugly fog  
on all that was expected,  
or whence the poor indifference  
to all this has been done,  
or whence the sad oblivion  
to all that was loved.

Fog.

Who will tell me tonight the meaning of  
faces and things and memories of past days?  
And where these days of mine are going,  
and why my dark heart is beating?  
Where? Why?

First published in 1914, in *Hrvatska Mlada Lirika*<sup>5</sup> (*The Lyrical Poetry of Young Croatia*, 1914), *Tama* is symbolic of Andrić's poetry in general. Thematically, it mirrors the young poet's search to find the sense of things in the chaos which surrounds him. Sadness and resignation are indistinguishably mixed. Structurally, like much of Andrić's poetry, *Tama*<sup>6</sup> is a prose poem. It contains figures and tricks of language which are generally considered more appropriate to poetry than to prose, yet, it is not marked by rhyme or metrical regularity which is characteristic of a poetic composition. The lines are of uneven length and stanzas are organized on loose metrical principles. For example, in the first stanza, there are lines of twelve, eleven, and two syllables; in the second, except for the last line which has ten syllables, there are five seven-syllable lines; in the last stanza, one fourteen-, one thirteen-, two eleven-, one four-, and a two-syllable lines.

As regards the number of lines in the poem, Andrić is not far from the most used poetic form of the period — the sonnet.

Because of the varying lengths of his rhythmic blocks — and no rhythmic effect is attained by this diversity — the poem tends to

gravitate towards spoken intonation where syntax rather than euphony rules. In view of the versificational tendency towards spoken intonation, the poet is forced to strengthen the poetic aspect of his lines so that we are obliged to read this creation as a poem, not as prose. For in prose-poems the prosaic and poetic elements ought to be, whenever possible, equally distributed and indivisibly intertwined, so as to make a solidly bonded 'hybrid' composition.

What are the poetic signals in *Tama*? We normally take inversion, the placing of a sentence element out of its normal position, as a sign of poetic language.<sup>7</sup> Andrić's inverted syntagmas 'dani moji', 'noći moje', 'magla ružna', 'nemar jadni', 'tamno srce moje', that is, the placing of adjectives after the nouns, is an effective rhetorical device. Having abandoned proper verse and rhyme, the author resorts to the type of verse organization which strengthens it in at least some ways.

The dominant motive of the poem is the subject's search for the meaning of existence. In the darkness where the flowing of the "ja" and the duration of time are the only things perceived, where one does not know the direction of the days or nights, the reason for the beating of the dark heart, or the origin of the "magla ružna", the "nemar jadni", and the "žalosni zaborav", the resigned and solitary "ja" wonders about the meaning of existence — "Kuda?" "Zašto?"

It is standard with Andrić to make each stanza a complete semantic unit, for each stanza bring specifically different motives in relation to the themes in other stanzas and to the progressive development of a poem as a whole. In this case, the stanza is not unlike a paragraph in a prose composition. The poem as a whole, and each stanza separately, reinforce the poet's pessimism and dark moods.

Andrić often begins his poems with a statement, the function of which is to create an atmosphere, a mood. In the opening stanza, the shortest of the three, the subject "Ja" is baffled ("Ne znam.") by the aimless passing of time ("Kuda idu dani moji . . . noći moje.") The "ja", which appears in the poem only once, is alone in its predicament. In the following stanzas, the burden of the "ja" will be shared by others — there will be the mystical unity of the "ja" and the world.

The second stanza, which speaks of the senselessness of hope, work, and love, is elliptical; the subject is mislaid and there is no proper verb. The participles "se čekalo", "se radilo", "se ljubilo",

have no function of proper verbs, but rather of verbal nouns; it is up to the reader to supply the implied suppressed elements. The purpose of elliptical structures in Andrić's work, both poetry and prose, is to create a universal, timeless (hence the neuter forms of verbal adjectives) situations in which the subject's accustomed place as the 'head', controller of things and events, is undermined. How are we to read this stanza, then, if the key elements of speech are missing? The reader must resort to a semantic extension into the other parts of the poem. The logical, and the most obvious place, is the preceding stanza, where the "ja" stands in the dominant position. By intertwining the two stanzas in this way, not only is the subject "ja" more strongly felt — extra emotional force is gained from the pronouns *moji* ("dani moji"), *moje* ("noći moje") and the negativized verb *Ne znam* — but the unity of the "ja" with someone/something else is not abstract, but rather implicit. "Ja" finds himself in all things, and all things in himself. By such semantic extension, "ja" merges with *mi* (we), *vi* (you), *oni* (they), *svi* (everybody).

The key to this type of reasoning lies in the last line of the second stanza: "Žalosni na sve što se ljubilo." From the point of view of syntax, it requires special attention because of its double meaning. Andrić could have written "Žalosni zbog sveg što se ljubilo" (Sad because of everything which was loved"), which would satisfy all the rules of the language. Or, he could have used the locative form of the adjective *sav, na svemu* (on everything), which would also be — grammatically speaking — within an acceptable tolerance level of the language. However, the poet abandons the use of either of these forms opting instead for the incorrect accusative form of the adjective, i.e., "sve". Then, for the sake of symmetry, he couples it with the preposition *na* (on), borrowed from the preceding line. The formula "na sve" appears thus in the stanza in three regular intervals, at the beginning of every even line.

Why is Andrić using such 'forced' grammatical structures? There are several reasons. By using the direct, accusative form instead of the indirect, locative, or the genitive, as suggested above, the poet wishes to emphasize the special character of the poem's subject. An object in the accusative ("sve") approaches the desire for the fact, a direct answer, a firm, concrete footing in reality. But, it fails to find it. The emphasis on denial — on reality which is denied — is achieved by means of negative conjunctions. A series of negative sentences



— every uneven line is preceded by the conjunction *ni* — emphasizes the poet's intention. Andrić often uses negation to emphasize, as strongly as possible, the emptiness of being and his futile search for stability and fulfilment. Everything is in a condition of essential absence: only by negation can one deny it, explicitly and implicitly. But the individual is not alone in his effort to find the meaning of existence. The last line of the second stanza supports this assumption.

The key word in the entire second stanza is the adjective "žalosni". If it is interpreted as "zaborav žalosni", where "žalosni" qualifies the noun "zaborav", from the preceding line, then the second stanza would be an example of perfect order; both the odd and the even lines would be symmetrical. However, by separating the last two lines by a comma, the poet removes all doubt as to his intentions. "Žalosni" can only refer to a plural subject, to the extended forms of "ja", i.e., *mi, vi, oni, all* — *MI smo svi žalosni* (We, all, feel sorrow). Just as there is no symmetry and order in our lives, there can be no order and symmetry in the poem. This identification is complete and unassailable.

The last stanza is very important. It has the function of bringing the poem to an end while widening its semantic field. If the opening lines of the poem reflect the poet's wishes and desires, the closing ones mirror his realized experience; there is a discord between the two.

First three lines:

Ja ne znam kud ovo idu dani moji  
ni kuda vode ove noći moje.  
Ne znam.

Last three lines:

I kuda idu ovi dani moji  
I zašto bje tamno srce moje?  
Kuda? Zašto?

A whole series of correlations can be made in *Tama* from the last three lines.

Firstly, the end runs into the beginning (. . . "Kuda idu ovi dani moji"). The "ja" is returned to itself, but in interrogative rather than affirmative form. (A question mark in the stanza.) This dramatizes the subjective emotional state which in the first two stanzas created a quiet, even, intonation. The different nature of the elements is emphasized by comparison ("dani", "noći"), expectancy is eliminated, and "srce" finds itself in place of "noći" — dark heart is beating in the night — ("ove noći" — these nights, explains the relationship.) It is as if one is moving in an eternal circle. The subject cannot find an answer to the riddle which has arisen before it. There is a crescendo with the question mark in "Zašto?", and, then, there is calm. The relation between future and past ("minulih dana") is stated not by adverbs of time (*kada*), but rather by adverbs of place ("Kuda?") The poet does not wonder where he is because the present is covered by darkness and fog ("Magla."); he is troubled (" . . . šta meni znače lica i stvari i spomeni minulih dana?"), the future is not perceived, but something is happening and that something is rushing towards something which is beyond its grasp. (The adverb of place — *kuda/kud/otkud* is the most frequently used word in the poem — it appears six times, twice in each stanza). On the other hand, the interrogative adverb "Zašto?" accentuates the worry of the subject, who finds no sense in things. "Zašto?" is a spasm of consciousness which cannot reconcile itself to the fact of going in any given direction. It is a state of restlessness, a desire to find sense in existence. A return to oneself in the night is a true return. The chaos is clearly defined only against a background of consciousness which cannot bear the fact that it has not found itself. What part can one take out of the darkness and fog without wandering and losing oneself? And if the decision to follow the path of the heavy heart were taken, why should that particular path be chosen? The three shortest lines in the poem mirror the subject's despair:

"Ne znam". "Magla." "Kuda? Zašto?"

In many of his poems, including *Tama*, Andrić creates two simultaneous planes of perception: the lyrical *I* looking inward (individuality and authenticity of being) and, the lyrical *I* looking outwards

(recognition, logic, objectivity, reality). The subjective lyrical I alternates with the objective lyrical I. The subjective is hemmed in by reality which renders it impotent even though the subjective is the only authentic reality.

In both his prose and poetry, Andrić deals with two perceptions of reality, two forms through which the same thing may manifest itself. But he does not favor either one: bonded inextricably together (i.e., the semantic extension in *Tama*), they condition one another. It is not surprising that Andrić entitled his largest poem cycle *Što sanjam i što mi se događa* (*What I dream and what is happening to me*) — the title clearly indicates this duality.

If the poetic element is an integral part of Andrić's prose expression, then, as shown in *Tama*, the prose aspect of his poetry is just as important. In his poetry, as in his prose, Andrić tried to comprehend and reveal the reality which stands before him, to render it comprehensible and, in this way, his verse imperceptibly 'pools' towards prose whose most important element, the ultimate aim, is this very comprehension. The prose element in Andrić's poetry is essential.

University of Victoria

---

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, ALL TRANSLATIONS ARE MINE.

<sup>1</sup>Ljubo Jandrić, *Sa Ivom Andrićem* (Beograd: Srpska Književna Zadruga, 1977), 200.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 106–107.

<sup>3</sup>Popović Bogdan, "Andrićev Skriveni Lik" *NIN* (Beograd: 13 June, 1982).

<sup>4</sup>Predrag Palavestra, *Skriveni Pesnik, Prilog kritičkoj Biografiji Ive Andrića*. (Beograd: Slove Ljubve, 1981).

<sup>5</sup>Ljubo Wiesner, ed., *Hrvatska Mlada Lirika* (Zagreb: Društvo Hrvatskih Književnika, 1914), 5.

<sup>6</sup>This version of the poem is from Ivo Andrić, *Ex Ponto, Nemiri, Lirika. Sabrana Djela Ive Andrića* (Sarajevo: Udruzeni Izdavaci, 1981), 145.

<sup>7</sup>Thrall, William and Addison, Hibbard, *A Handbook to Literature* (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1960), 245.

*THE SARAJEVO TRIAL* - The monumental story of the assassination that began World War I, vols. I and II. Narrative by W.A. Dolph Owings, Elizabeth Pribic and Nikola Pribic. Documentary Publications, Chapel Hill, NC, 27514, U.S.A. Pp. xxiii & 258, 297 (555). Price, 2 volumes \$44.95. (With thirty photographs).

The work is hard-bound, well produced and richly illustrated. Most of its photographs come from the private collection of the late Professor Vojislav Bogičević, the noted Serbian archivist who authored its original published in Serbo-Croatian in 1954. *The Sarajevo Trial* (*Sarajevski Proces*) is indeed an important contribution to the growing body of scholarly literature on the so-called *Schuldfrage*, i.e., the still discussed question about the causes of and responsibilities for the First World War and its consequences. These include the collapse of several empires, the loss of millions of human lives both military and civilian and a series of international conflicts, wars and revolutions which continue to this day. The discussion is of great interest not only to professional historians, jurists and other specialists, but also to the general public. Quite naturally, it is of particular concern to the educated Serbs and other Yugoslavs as well as to citizens of the former Central Powers. In these troubled times of unabating ethno-lingual, religious, ideological and other antagonisms, global intrigues and mounting terrorism in the name of every conceivable cause under the sun, a proper critical perspective on the assassination of the Austro-Hungarian heir apparent Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sofia by Gavrilo Princip is of growing significance.

According to a report in the Belgrade daily *Politika* of September 25, 1984 ("Medjunarodno TV i Radio Takmičenje Prix Italia" - "The International TV and Radio Contest Prix Italia"), "of special interest for Yugoslavia was the documentary 'Flight From Peace' (*Bekstvo od mira*) in which an ample team of researchers are trying to reconstruct the cold-war atmosphere immediately preceding the outbreak of the First World War. The exciting documentary material is so organized as to lead (the viewer) to the conclusion that Austria had to go to war with little Serbia. Doubts are awakened by the applied method of reconstruction of certain historical scenes with actors (so that from time to time one does not know who is portraying himself and who is acting someone else), and it gets still worse when one sees that a statement by Dr. Vaso Čubrilović is announced as 'The First Interview of the Last Surviving Assassin (?) . . .'"

*The Sarajevo Trial* "contains the first complete translation of that trial" and maybe "one of the most important trial records in modern world history." A monumental result of a lifetime of effort by the late Professor Bogičević, the compilation and critical editing of this text required extensive travels and patient and tedious digging through archives both at home and abroad. At the end, this distinguished Serbian scholar succeeded not only in re-establishing the fullness and integrity of the original trial transcripts but also in eliminating the flaws in their earlier translations. As a result,



the reader may rely on the truth and validity of this critical enterprise which goes beyond the well-known German and French versions of the same documents published in 1918 and 1930, respectively. The present work restores all their omissions and exposes all their inaccuracies.

This authentic and definitive text of the entire trial transcript was translated into English and edited by Dr. W.A. Dolph Owings, Professor of History at the University of Arkansas, Dr. Elizabeth Pribić, Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Florida State University in Tallahassee and Dr. Nikola Pribić, Professor Emeritus in the same field and at the same institution of higher learning. It is not without significance to mention that Dr. Owings is also a lawyer and that this additional expertise was of considerable use to him. Only those of us who are familiar from personal experience with the difficulties, frustrations, dilemmas, and pitfalls of serious scholarly translation can fully appreciate the magnitude of the translators' painstaking labor over a long period. Such undertakings are thankless, indeed! It should be stressed, however, that, despite all the hurdles it had to overcome, this translation is both faithful and smooth and that all three translators deserve high compliments and sincere commendations. This applies in a very special sense to Dr. Nikola and Dr. Elizabeth Pribić without whose unselfish sacrifice of time, energy, erudition and expert knowledge of several languages this work would not be what it is.

As the reader will notice sooner or later, both volumes contain, alas, not a few typographical and other errors. These occurred, regrettably, beyond the translators' control because they were not given the opportunity to inspect and correct the proofs. Unfortunately, in our times of increasing costs and changing technology, such errors are becoming ever more the rule rather than the exception. All in all, however, these cosmetic imperfections are relatively minor and insignificant. In any event, they in no way diminish the singular documentary value of the work as a whole which all interested readers should gratefully welcome. Dr. Nikola and Dr. Elizabeth Pribić particularly regret that the printer was not able to include the diacritical marks used, *inter alia*, in both Serbo-Croatian and Czech. Fortunately, this detail, which only the native and expert foreign readers will notice, is almost completely offset by the provision of Anglicized transliterations of Slavic names in parentheses. Somewhat more problematic are a reference to Bosnia, as a "province of Serbia" and the inaccurate citation of the name of Major and later Colonel Dragutin Dimitrijević - Apis as "Dmitrije Dimitrijević."

Dr. Owings' excellent introduction shows that he is a scholar thoroughly familiar with the intricacies of Balkan politics and their tragic historical and cultural backgrounds. In discussing the role of the Serbian government in the events preceding the First World War, the American historian and legal expert states: "A Serbia small in size and exhausted by the Balkan Wars was in no position to provoke her powerful neighbor, and her prime minister, Nikola Pasic, was one of the ablest statesmen of his day. Unless

some convincing evidence to the contrary is someday discovered, the idea that the Serbian government planned the killing of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand can safely be dismissed."

For this vote of confidence all Serbs owe Dr. Owings a debt of gratitude. They owe the same to Dr. Nikola and Dr. Elizabeth Pribić whose major role in the realization of this work represents more than a notable scholarly accomplishment. It is also and above all a patriotic gesture in defense of the Serbian people and their international reputation.

That this reputation is very much in need of defense can be seen from an incident that took place only five years ago. Referring in his Washington-merry-go-round of August 16, 1979 to the then recent (political?) murders among the Serbian exiles in this country, the noted American columnist Jack Anderson saw fit to say that:

"assassination of political opponents is an old Yugoslav tradition. It was, after all, a political assassination in what is now Yugoslavia that ignited World War I."

Without for a moment trying to defend the crime of murder in any form and for whatever reason, I had to remind Mr. Anderson that, far from being a peculiarity of the Yugoslavs, fanaticism and violence are, also, a common curse of all mankind. What Mr. Anderson says about the Yugoslavs is as abominable as the claim that the Jews are guilty of deicide, the Greeks of poisoning Socrates, the Irish of being drunkards and terrorists, etc. I also added that it is ethically impermissible to generalize about a whole ethnic group's moral character on the basis of isolated and tendentiously selected incidents. Besides, let us not forget Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, John and Robert Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King and others, not to speak of fortunately unsuccessful attempts on the lives of several additional presidents and other public figures in this country and throughout the world. Indeed, Mr. Anderson's arguments bring to mind Christ's famous exhortations, "You hypocrite! First get the beam out of your eye and then you can see to get the speck out of your brother's eye," and "Let him among you who is without sin cast the first stone!"

For all these reasons, *The Sarajevo Trial*, which can be ordered from the publisher, should be bought by every Serbian institution and individual able to afford it. Once again, its learned and diligent translators and editors deserve our sincere congratulations and warm gratitude.

George V. Tomashevich  
Buffalo State University College

Linda A. Bennett, *Personal Choice in Ethnic Identity Maintenance: Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in Washington, D.C.*, Palo Alto California: Ragusan Press, 1978, 218 pages.

Linda Bennett is one of several scholars of non-Slavic origin with an interest in studying South Slavs in the United States. As an anthropologist, Bennett relied upon the methodology of her discipline to observe Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in the Washington area. The objective of her study was to understand the patterns of ethnic identity of individuals of South Slavic origin and explain the reasons underlying their choices to either maintain or discard this identity. According to the author, "An underlying assumption of this research is that an investigation of ethnic identity patterns can provide clues to the relationship between socialization, decision-making, and values, as found among members of these three ethnic groups".

The first chapter of the book is a review of the existing literature on the subject and presents the main anthropological concepts related to the topic of the study. The second chapter offers detailed information on Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in Yugoslavia and the United States. This includes a survey of the history of Yugoslavia and her ethnic groups, as well as a discussion of the origins of nationalism and other relevant issues affecting these groups. Further, the author examines the process of South Slavic migration to the United States, explaining the reasons for emigration and areas of main settlements.

The third chapter describes the history of migration by Serbs, Croats and Slovenes into the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. It is well documented by use of available census and other statistical data. This information covers sex, age, residence, education, occupation, income and other social and demographic characteristics of the immigrants.

The fourth chapter reveals the author's main findings which are based upon her extensive interviews in the field. Changes of name, among other forms of adaptation to the American social environment were discussed, with numerous examples given to illustrate this process. Kinship was a central focus of the study, including the meaning of "family", household composition, the issue of marrying-in or marrying-out, distinguishing characteristics of families, family rituals such as Christmas, Easter and *Krsna Slava*, and the role of godparents. The chapter further deals with ethnic bonds beyond the family, such as informal social groupings and formal organizations which encompass various political and religious affiliations. Ethnolinguistic questions are explored as well, including language acquisition and maintenance. The last part of the chapter covers specific aspects of ethnic identity, including how members of the groups perceive Washington as a city, the advantage and disadvantages of the maintenance of ethnic identity, and the reference to heroes as symbols of ethnic identity. Since the Serbs are the most numerous of Washington-area Yugoslavs, this chapter, as well as the entire book primarily covers this group. While the Slovenes are discussed in some detail, Croats receive infrequent mention



due to their small number in this location.

The last chapter gives a summary overview and prospects for further research based upon the study. Evidence of ethnic identity maintenance is summarized as resulting from certain factors which operate as incentive or constraints. Several of these factors are discussed, including the life experiences of the interviewee, availability of ethnic peers of similar age, sex ratio of the group, the social impact of the wider society, the availability of ethnic organizations, the influence of family members, and the role of individual initiative. The second part of the chapter deals with key decision-making areas of ethnic identity, such as changing one's surname, giving children ethnic or non-ethnic names, marriage to an ethnic as opposed to non-ethnic spouse, deciding whether to learn or maintain the ethnic language, and choosing religious affiliation as the primary focus of ethnic identity. As usual, the attention is primarily on Serbs due to their number, organizational structure, and visibility.

The appendices of the book are devoted to specifics of the study, including a sample interview questionnaire, social and demographic characteristics of interviewees, place of family origin in Yugoslavia, U.S. census data, and other relevant information.

Bennett's study of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in the Washington, D.C. area is a valuable contribution to the study of South Slavs in America. The book has a wealth of information; the author obviously has a firm grasp of scholarly methodology and its application. Although from a non-Slavic background, she reveals solid understanding of South Slavic cultural diversity and its historical background.

This study will also be helpful as a resource for other ethnic research projects dealing with Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in America. It is fortunate that more community studies like this are completed or in progress. Perhaps these studies can be part of a more comprehensive project examining ethnic life among South Slavic Americans in the United States and Canada.

Normally, books that deal with more than one of the Slavic groups have limited use to those who want to learn about one specific group. Bennett was able to walk this fine line skillfully, offering specific information about one group, while describing South Slavs in general; she consistently refers in her discussion to Serbs, Slovenes, and Croats as distinct cultural groups. Thus, while the reader is given generalizations concerning what is common for South Slavs, he or she can also discern what is particular for each of the subgroups. As a consequence, anyone interested only in Serbs will still learn a great deal from this study.

Some readers might find this book somewhat heavy in its reliance upon the concepts of anthropology. This is understandable, since Linda Bennett was trained as an anthropologist, and this book was her doctoral dissertation. Also, pages 185 and 188 are blank and the text is missing, an obvious error of the printer. If the missing pages are not attached to the book, readers should write to the publisher requesting them.

This book was published by Adam S. Eterovich's Ragusan Press in California. He should be commended for his contribution to scholarly research about South Slavs in America. Without his dedication to public service, few studies would be available to the public. Despite limited resources, Eterovich has maintained an extensive collection of works on South Slavic groups. He is also a recognized authority on South Slavs in the western states.

Branko M. Čolaković  
Mankato State University