

# UC Berkeley

## GAIA Research Series

### Title

Ivo Andric Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8c21m142>

### Journal

Research Series, uciaspubs/research/92

### Author

Vucinich, Wayne S.

### Publication Date

1995

Peer reviewed



## **Ivo Andric Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands**

Edited by Wayne S. Vucinich

### **Description:**

Ivo Andric won the 1961 Nobel Prize for Literature for an extraordinary body of fiction and poetry rooted in the politics and cultural history of the Balkans. Andric drew on his formal studies, political activism, diplomatic career, and extended residence in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia to explore the human links that have united the region, to argue that conflict is not inevitable, and to lay the basis for a unified Yugoslavia. Today, Andric is claimed by all Yugoslavs as their greatest literary figure, but tragically missing the point of his work, often criticized by each group for not championing its own particular cause. This volume explores many facets of Andric: the artist immersed in both the written and oral South Slavic literary traditions developing his own unique narrative style; the humanist examining the relationships of victimization, grief, shame, and art; the anthropologist analyzing the role of women and the dynamics of gender relations; and the historian peeling through the layers of local traditions and historical experience.

Research Series / Number 92

*Ivo Andrić Revisited:  
The Bridge Still Stands*

*Wayne S. Vucinich, Editor*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Ivo Andrić revisited : the bridge still stands / Wayne S. Vucinich, editor.

p. cm. — (Research series ; no. 92)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-87725-192-4

1. Andrić, Ivo, 1892–1975—Criticism and interpretation. I. Vucinich, Wayne S. II. Series: Research series (University of California, Berkeley. International and Area Studies) ; no. 92.

PG1418.A6Z7113 1995

891.8'235—dc20

95-25086

CIP

©1995 by the Regents of the University of California

*Printed in the United States of America*

*Cover illustration:* Lisa M. Bryant

*Cover font:* *Ex Ponto*, designed by Jovica Veljović for Adobe Systems.

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xiii
Introduction: Ivo Andrić and His Times	
<i>Wayne S. Vucinich</i>	1
Ivo Andrić's Short Stories in the Context of the South Slavic Prose Tradition	
<i>Thomas Eekman</i>	47
<i>Ex Ponto</i> and <i>Unrest</i> : Victimization and "Eternal Art"	
<i>Gordana P. Crnkovic</i>	63
Imagining Yugoslavia: The Historical Archeology of Ivo Andrić	
<i>Andrew Wachtel</i>	82
Ivo Andrić and the Sarcophagus of History	
<i>Dragan Kujundžić</i>	103
East Within the West: Bosnian Cultural Identity in the Works of Ivo Andrić	
<i>Tomislav Z. Longinović</i>	123

Grief, Shame, and the <i>Small Man</i> in the Works of Ivo Andrić	
<i>Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover</i>	139
Women in Andrić's Writing	
<i>Radmila Gorup</i>	154
Folk Tradition in the Storytelling of Ivo Andrić	
<i>Tatyana Popović</i>	173
Andrić on Bosnia: The 1924 Dissertation	
<i>John F. Loud</i>	187
Narrative Voice and Listener's Choice in the Prose of Ivo Andrić	
<i>Ronelle Alexander</i>	200
<i>Index</i>	231

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to the panelists who participated in the conference; all the papers were excellent. I am also grateful to those who helped prepare and organize the conference, especially Irina Barnes, assistant director of the Center for Russian and East European Studies (CREES), and Rosemary Schnoor, CREES administrator, both dedicated professionals. Also I grateful acknowledge the assistance and encouragement of Professors Ronelle Alexander, Gordana Crnkovic, and Radmila Gorup and of Mrs. Zaneta Perišić of the Andric Foundation in Belgrade. I am deeply indebted to Professors Gordana Crnkovic, Thomas A. Eekman, Radmila Gorup, and Tomislav Longinovic, who read the manuscript and made valuable suggestions. The work of Jasmina Bojic on publicity was much appreciated, as was the administrative and technical assistance of Dusan J. Djordjevich, Stark Draper, JoAnn Giaconi, Jasmina Mandaric, and Glen Reed.

On behalf of the panelists and other dinner guests, I want to thank Mrs. Sophia McConnell and her husband, Professor Harden McConnell of the Department of Chemistry, Stanford University, for hosting a splendid reception and dinner at their home. Finally, the conference would not have been possible without the financial support of CREES, the Mara Tomashevich Karabas Fund for Serbian Language and Culture, the Sara Stys Vucinich Fund for Serbian Studies, the Steve P. Rados Fund for East European Studies, and the Wayne S. Vucinich Fund for Russian and East European Studies.

W. S. V.

## PREFACE

The one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Ivo Andrić, the distinguished Yugoslav poet, storyteller, and novelist, was commemorated in 1992 by many scholarly circles. On 22 November 1992, a conference at Stanford University, sponsored by the Center for Russian and East European Studies (CREES), honored Andrić; and undertook an in-depth assessment of his work. Scholars have examined many aspects of Ivo Andrić's work, evaluating him as a writer, historian, artist, political philosopher, psychologist, and humanist. There have been studies of how Andrić treats madness, prison, myth, withdrawal and alienation, Jews, Franciscans, and women and on how he uses humor and physical imagery. Critics have assessed Andrić's language, poetry, prose, short stories, novels, works in foreign translation, and much else. The papers in this collective work—an introductory essay, eight papers read at the conference, and two commissioned papers—contribute significantly to a better understanding of Andrić's literary achievements and to our knowledge of Andrić as a writer and a man.

In the first paper, Thomas A. Eekman argues that Andrić was not an isolated "monadic" phenomenon in the literature of Southeastern Europe, even though his talent lifted him above his fellow writers, but that the main aspects of his creativity (his realistic peasant and urban themes; his stories about old, half-oriental, legendary Bosnia; and the lyrical prose of his earliest stories) are also present, both thematically and stylistically, in the works of numerous predecessors, contemporaries, and followers in Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, and Bulgarian literature.

Gordana Crnković opposes the common critical assessment that considers Andrić's early works inferior to his later ones. She juxtaposes *Ex Ponto* (1918) and *Unrest* (1920) with Andrić's acclaimed masterpieces, *The Bridge on the Drina* (1945) and *Bosnian Chronicle* (1945), focusing on the relationship between individual victimization and art. In the later novels, the eternity of art, community, or humanity in general minimizes and displaces specific individual



victimizations. *Ex Ponto* and *Anxieties*, in contrast, assert an art that does not neutralize but rather articulates the urgency of individual victimizations, which cannot be glossed over by the immortality of humanity or art.

Andrew Wachtel concludes that Andrić imagines the Yugoslav nation by appealing to the specificity of its historical experience. Wachtel claims that the central historical metaphor in Andrić's major works is archaeology and that the structure of his major fiction is an attempt to explore the archaeological site that is Yugoslavia vertically (*The Bridge on the Drina*), horizontally (*Bosnian Chronicle*), and randomly (*The House on Its Own*). Through this multichronotopic exploration of his nation's history, Andrić concludes that the only constants are ethnic conflict, interaction, and interrelationship, combined with a conviction that nothing ever changes. But no matter how much the different ethnic groups that make up the mosaic of Yugoslavia may hate one another and wish to shut themselves off from the various others who surround them, they are unable to do so. Just as pagan civilization folded into Roman civilization, as Roman ways were incorporated by the Bosnian and Serbian kingdoms, and as the Slavs became part of the Turkish empire, so Andrić imagined a Yugoslav nation that would be unified through its common legacy of change and stasis.

The historical aspect of Ivo Andrić's writing is also examined by Dragan Kujundžić, who notes that history plays the most prominent role in Andrić's work. The metaphor Andrić uses to represent history in his stories and novels is that of a bridge, which becomes both the lasting historical monument commemorating the great man who built it (the Grand Vizier Yusuf in "The Bridge on the Žepa" or Mehmed Pasha Sokolović; in *The Bridge on the Drina*) and a monument to the historical conflicts, violence, and wars that surround it. Kujundžić explores these two contradictory aspects of the bridge and history—the monument that connects past and present yet at the same time represents violence, disruption, and destruction in Bosnia. He also interprets Andrić's interest in bridges in psychoanalytic and biographical terms in that Andrić, as some biographers have pointed out, experienced the bridge in Viéegrad as separating him from his mother.

Tomislav Longinović places Andrić in the context of the current debate about Bosnian cultural identity. He analyzes narrative strate-

gies Andrić used to qualify the influence of Turkish rule on the formation of Bosnian culture, infusing it with a peculiar type of orientalism. In Bosnia, the Turkish colonial domination over the Slavic population produced a hybrid culture where clear distinctions between Eastern and Western elements gradually became indistinguishable. Although the worlds of Christianity and Islam drifted apart, the people they controlled imperceptibly blended together. This, according to Longinović, creates the problem with the Bosnians' identity: their religion forces them to define their particular national allegiance as Serb, Croat, or Muslim.

Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover foregrounds the Kierkegaardian motifs of grief and shame in Andrić's prose as affective states or states of the soul of Andrić's heroes and heroines. The hero or heroine is characterized as a small man (or woman) in contradistinction to the poetics of tragedy and Romanticism with their valorization of the exceptional or socially elevated individual. In her nonlinear reading of Andrić's "The Pasha's Concubine," Vladiv-Glover discounts the Bosnian historical setting and asserts that contrary to traditional interpretations, Andrić's stories are not historical and ethnographic studies of *homo bosniensis* but offer instead a universal picture of the psyche and its relation to the structure of meaning or discourse, as well as to the semiology of the text and narrative. Setting Andrić's poetics in the context of European Modernism, Vladiv-Glover rejects the traditional reading of Andrić as a historicist and chronicler of Bosnian and Balkan history.

Radmila Gorup points out that women hold a central position in Andrić's writing. Rather than attempting to classify the female characters in Andrić's prose, however, she explores the dynamics of male-female relationships as depicted in Andrić's stories and as the major themes of his poetics. Through his female characters Andrić reveals a world filled with evil, which he sees not so much as the consequence of historical conditions but as something inherent in men. His prose not only depicts the historical and social background in which the female characters live but also deals with their inner lives. In Andrić's poetic universe, woman, whether she represents a platonic idea, an elusive object of desire, or a creature of flesh and blood, always possesses a mysterious power that is the driving force of society.

Andrić's use of folk tradition is explored by Tatyana Popović, who provides a definitive study of the motifs, legends, and epic

heroes that Andrić captured from the genre of oral literature and transformed into a literary medium of high artistic expression. The essay contributes to a better understanding of Andrić, who hoped to reveal the true meaning of life through a few major legends of humanity.

John Loud discusses the connection between Andrić's doctoral dissertation and his literary work. Loud found the dissertation in the Graz University Library in the 1970s. In the late 1980s, he and a colleague, Želimir Juričić, translated, explained, and published it. Although the work has some structural and technical difficulties, it abounds with topics and ideas that Andrić later used in his mature prose. Andrić the storyteller employed in fictionalized form many topics and ideas drawn from his dissertation.

Ronelle Alexander takes as a starting point the fact that Andrić communicates one of his most basic messages—the idea that the tale is more real, more true, than the actual events it relates—in numerous different forms. She then examines the unique nature of Andrić's narrative style, which is that of a prevailing gnomic, detached wisdom periodically illuminated by flashes of intense intimacy. One of the means by which this intimacy is expressed is through the use of first-person plural narration. The central portion of Alexander's study is a detailed examination of the usage of first-person plural in two of Andrić's major works, both of which are directly "about" the idea of tale-telling: *The Bridge on the Drina* and *The Devil's Yard*.

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

*Wayne S. Vucinich* is Robert and Florence McDonnell Professor of East European History, Emeritus, at History at Stanford University.



*Ronelle Alexander* is Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California at Berkeley.

*Gordana P. Crnković* is Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Washington.

*Thomas Eekman* is Professor Emeritus of Slavic Literatures at the University of California, Los Angeles.

*Radmila Gorup* teaches at Columbia University. She has published on linguistics, cultural history, and Yugoslav literatures.

*Dragan Kujundžić* is Assistant Professor of Russian at the University of Memphis, Tennessee.

*Tomislav Z. Longinović* is Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

*John F. Loud* is Associate Professor of Russian and Latin at Texas Christian University.

*Tatyana Popović*, who received her doctorate from Syracuse University, is an honorary member of the Association of Serbian Writers and Librarian Emerita of Le Moyne College, Syracuse, New York.

***Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover*** is Senior Lecturer in Slavic Studies and in the Centre for Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies at Monash University in Melbourne and specializes in Modernism/Postmodernism in European and Slavic literatures.

***Andrew Wachtel*** is Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Northwestern University.

## INTRODUCTION: IVO ANDRIĆ AND HIS TIMES

Wayne S. Vucinich

Ivo Andrić, the Yugoslav recipient of the 1961 Nobel Prize for Literature, was a product of the syncretic culture of Bosnia. Andrić called Bosnia his “spiritual home” and said that “when you call a place by that name you have admitted everything.”<sup>1</sup> He was born in Travnik, Bosnia, on 9 October 1892 while his mother, Katarina, was visiting there and was soon after taken to the family home in Sarajevo. His father, Antun, a struggling artisan employed as a caretaker, died in 1894. Katarina entrusted her son to his father’s sister, Ana, and her husband, Ivan Matković. He was brought up by them in the Catholic faith in Višegrad while his mother worked in Sarajevo. Andrić grew up in a society which had changed little from the Ottoman days before Bosnia-Hercegovina was mandated to Austria-Hungary by the Congress of Berlin (1878).<sup>\*</sup> He soaked up the history and legends of Višegrad and its region, including the stories about the wars between Turks and Christians.

The years Andrić spent in Višegrad, which was hardly more than a *kasaba* (a small provincial town), became an enduring source of inspiration. It was in Višegrad, closely linked to the surrounding villages and inhabited primarily by Muslims and Serbs, that he acquired his first friends, attended the elementary school, and formed lasting memories of some of his teachers and the beloved school principal, Ljubomir Popović. Despite Višegrad’s geographic insularity and struggling economy, Andrić came to love and cherish his community and closely observed the social customs of the local peo-

<sup>\*</sup>The problem of translation has been a difficult one. For reasons of simplicity and consistency, I have decided to employ Serbo-Croatian orthography throughout and to provide Turkish terms whenever useful. I have also elected to use the term “Bosnia-Hercegovina” in place of the native “Bosna-Hercegovina” and to employ interchangeably the terms “Bosnia” and “Bosnia-Hercegovina” and “Austria” and “Austria-Hungary.”

ple. Later, Andrić drew inexhaustible themes and motifs from life in Višegrad.<sup>2</sup>

After finishing the four-year elementary school, Andrić received a three-year stipend from Napredak (Progress), a Croatian cultural society founded in Sarajevo in 1902, that enabled him to attend the Great Sarajevo Gymnasium (Velika Sarajevska Gimnazija) in the city that the natives sometimes affectionately called “*šeher* Sarajevo” (after the Turkish *şehir*, great). Andrić arrived in Sarajevo during an important period in South Slavic history. Several significant events occurred during his enrollment at the gymnasium. In 1903, Benjámín Kállay, governor of Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1882 to 1903, and Károly Khuen-Héderváry, ban of Croatia, ended their anti-Yugoslav rules, and in Serbia the nationalist Karadjordjević dynasty replaced the Austrophile Obrenović family. In that same year there was an uprising in Macedonia. Two other major events, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5 and the Russian Revolution of 1905, stirred the South Slavs and the budding revolutionaries in South Slavic lands.

While in Sarajevo, Andrić lived with his mother, who worked in a rug factory. In the fourth grade, he began to experience the first symptoms of tuberculosis.<sup>3</sup> Study at the gymnasium did not come easily to him. He found mathematics particularly difficult and had to repeat the sixth grade.<sup>4</sup> For a time, he lost his stipend because of poor scholarship. Andrić, however, excelled in languages, especially Latin, Greek, and German. Although he initially showed a predilection for natural sciences, he later focused on literature, probably under the influence of two of his Croat instructors, Djuro Šurmin, a writer and politician, and Tugomir Alaupović, a poet. Of all his teachers in Sarajevo, it was Alaupović whom Andrić liked best, and the two became lifelong friends.

Young Andrić was an avid reader, and his breadth of literary interest was enormous. He read Greek and Latin classics in addition to the major works of many European authors, including Carlyle, Cervantes, Chernyshevsky, Conrad, Flaubert, Goethe, Heine, Hugo, Ibsen, James, Kafka, Leopardi, Mann, Masaryk, Maupassant, Montaigne, Nietzsche, Pascal, Rilke, and Scott.<sup>5</sup> Andrić liked Polish literature and claimed to owe a great deal to Polish poets and novelists. He held several South Slavic writers in high esteem, particularly Vuk St. Karadžić and Petar Petrović Njegoš of the older generation, and the more contemporary Petar Kočić and Aleksa Šantić. Andrić fa-

vored the Slovene poets Fran Levstik, Josip Murn, and Oton Župančič and translated some of their works. The literary creations of several Scandinavian writers appealed to him, and he translated Strindberg. He was also influenced by Franz Kafka, whose work may have inspired Andrić's more mature prose. Probably no author left as strong a philosophical impact on young Andrić as Søren Kierkegaard. Andrić also attached great importance to a number of distinguished American authors, especially Walt Whitman. At one time Andrić was interested in Chinese and Japanese authors, whom he read in French and German translations.

Life in Sarajevo—a large urban community that was not only the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, but also the political and cultural center of the Muslims, Serbs, and Croats—had a profound impact on Andrić. In the Sarajevo gymnasium, he met students of different ethnic, confessional, and social backgrounds and political views. Of great importance in Andrić's intellectual development were the European political, literary, and revolutionary currents that stimulated many young minds in his day. The young generation in Bosnia-Herzegovina particularly admired Giuseppe Mazzini, an Italian author and poet, and read the works of revolutionary writers such as Bakunin, Herzen, Kropotkin, and Marx. When he was in the seventh grade, Andrić already had contacts with young South Slavic patriots and writers, including Gaćinović, Jevtić, Mitrinović, Mras, Palavestra, Samokovlija, Varagić, and Vidaković.<sup>6</sup> In this kind of environment Andrić grew, matured, and developed his *Weltanschauung*. Caught in a world changing from traditional to modern, Andrić was a product of both eras.

The rich Ottoman legacy in Bosnia-Herzegovina appears in the local art and architecture, social customs, dress, furnishings, handicrafts, food, speech, and much else. A large number of Turkish words (including borrowed Arabic, Iranian, and other foreign words) found their way into the language of the Muslims, Serbs, and Croats. These Turkisms have become so deeply rooted in the local Serbo-Croatian language that the natives are often unaware of their origin. In his writings, Andrić uses Turkish terms masterfully and generously to describe life in Ottoman society and to express oriental nuances and subtleties that cannot be rendered as well in his own Serbo-Croatian. Andrić's writings reflect an intimate knowledge of the languages of the rural and urban worlds.



### FROM OTTOMAN TO AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN RULE

The final one hundred and twenty-five years in the history of the Ottoman Empire comprise a pivotal period in the Bosnia-Herzegovina of Andrić's youth. Russia's victories over the Turks during the reign of Catherine the Great gave the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire hope of imminent liberation from Turkish rule. The treaty of Kuchuk Kainardji, to which the Ottomans acceded in 1774, opened the struggle over the Ottoman inheritance. In 1782 Russia and Austria considered expelling the Turks from Europe and for the first time discussed partitioning Ottoman territory between them, with Austria to receive Bosnia, Herzegovina, Serbia, and Dalmatia.<sup>7</sup> Napoleon's expansion into the Adriatic region, his conquest of Vienna and Dubrovnik, his founding of the Illyrian provinces (Napoleon's mini-Yugoslavia), and his enlightened policies aroused not only the people he conquered, but also Christians and Muslims in neighboring Bosnia and Herzegovina. Foreign agents, adventurers, and missionaries in increasing numbers visited the provinces. In the mid-1850s two English women founded a school for girls in Sarajevo that survived until World War I.

In an attempt to stave off the collapse of their empire, the Ottoman sultans proposed a series of reforms known as the Tanzimat. But the reformist forces of the sultans clashed with the conservative feudatories, who opposed any systemic change. Moreover, Bosnia-Herzegovina witnessed conflicts between the feudal landlords and the Christian serfs, as well as border fighting between the Montenegrins and Turks. The uprising of Djordje Petrović (Karadjordje) in 1804 and that of Miloš Obrenović in 1815 undermined the foundation of the Ottoman Empire. The Croatian cultural renaissance (Illyrism) and nationalist ferment in Serbia and Serbian lands in Austria accelerated the development of national consciousness in the peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In the summer of 1875, Serbian peasants rose against the Turks in Nevesinje. Montenegro, which assisted the insurgents with arms and manpower, concluded an alliance with Serbia in July 1876 and declared war on the Turks. Russia and other great powers urged the Turks to implement reforms necessary to stop the violence but without success. In preparing for war with the Turks, Russia entered into a secret treaty with Austria-Hungary at Reichstadt in 1876 that of-

ferred Bosnia-Herzegovina to the Habsburg monarchy if Austria remained neutral in the event of a Russo-Turkish war. Russia attacked the Turks in April 1877 and dictated to them the Treaty of San Stefano (3 March 1878). The great powers protested the treaty and called for a congress in Berlin to resolve the Balkan crisis.

Article 25 of the resulting Treaty of Berlin (13 July 1878) gave Austria-Hungary a mandate to occupy and administer Bosnia-Herzegovina. In a secret agreement with the Ottoman Empire (13 July 1878), Austria-Hungary acknowledged that the occupation of the province would be temporary and that the customary laws of the subject peoples and the sovereignty of the sultan would be respected. The Convention of Novi Pazar (21 April 1879) confirmed the sultan's sovereign rights over Bosnia-Herzegovina and guaranteed the inhabitants of the province their religious, personal, and property rights.<sup>8</sup> The convention also gave the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina the right to maintain contact with their spiritual leaders in Istanbul, to mention the sultan's name in daily prayers, and to hang Ottoman flags on mosques.<sup>9</sup>

Contrary to the easy occupation anticipated by Austria-Hungary, the Muslims, and to a lesser extent the Serbs, resisted the Austro-Hungarian army of occupation for nearly three months. A police regime was established and laws issued to tie Bosnia-Herzegovina to Austria-Hungary.<sup>10</sup> The province was incorporated into the Austro-Hungarian customs system on 20 December 1879, and a military recruitment law, which was strongly opposed by the Muslims and Serbs of eastern Herzegovina, was announced in 1881. After initial successes, the insurgents were defeated and dispersed in April 1882.<sup>11</sup> While a certain amount of ambiguity remained over the status of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the citizenship of its inhabitants, Austria-Hungary increasingly treated the province as part of the Habsburg Empire. The inhabitants of the province, especially Muslims and Serbs, preferred to believe that the occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina was provisional.<sup>12</sup>

After Bosnia-Herzegovina was mandated to Austria-Hungary, a provincial administration had to be provided for it. To maintain imperial harmony, the province was made a joint possession of Austria-Hungary and placed under the joint Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Finance.<sup>13</sup> The provincial government was made responsible to the emperor. Much time was spent debating what Bosnia-Herzegovina's

flag and coat of arms would be to avoid injuring the sensitivities of Austria and Hungary.<sup>14</sup>

The Ministry of Finance and the Bosnian Bureau, located in Vienna, supervised the work of the provincial government (*Landesregierung*) of Bosnia-Hercegovina in Sarajevo. The head (*Landeschef*) of the provincial government was the general in command of the army corps in Bosnia-Hercegovina, though he was rapidly eclipsed in importance by the *Adlatus*, his civilian counterpart, who was in charge of civilian affairs. A complete separation of civil from military authority did not take place, however, even after the government was reorganized in 1882. The office of *Adlatus* was abolished in 1912 and its duties assigned to other agencies.

The administrative subdivision of Bosnia-Hercegovina was modeled on that of the Ottoman Empire. The provincial government was divided into six regions; the six regions were divided into fifty-four districts and twenty-four administrative extensions embracing sparsely populated areas.<sup>15</sup> Sarajevo, the capital, was the first city to have a statute that provided for a partially elected city council and a government headed by a commissioner.

#### ETHNICITY, CONFESSION, AND NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The Muslims, Serbs, and Croats of Bosnia-Hercegovina each hoped to achieve dominance over the province. Serbs and Croats competed with one another for Muslim patronage and continued to debate whether a Muslim could be a Croat or a Serb without also being Catholic or Orthodox.<sup>16</sup> A few Muslims did identify themselves as Croats or Serbs and sometimes switched allegiance from one to the other; most identified themselves as Muslims or Turks.<sup>17</sup> Demographic factors contributed to ethnic and confessional friction among the three peoples. According to the census of 1879, Bosnia-Hercegovina had 1,023,405 inhabitants, of which 11.67 percent were urban and 88.33 percent rural (see facing table on population statistics). In 1895, the Serbs formed an absolute or relative majority in twenty-five districts, the Muslims in Sarajevo and fourteen districts, and the Croats in twelve districts. Muslims had an absolute majority in forty towns and a relative majority in two out of forty-seven

Table 1

## Population of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Groups: Census Years 1879–1981

Year	Serb	Muslim <sup>a</sup>	Croat
1879	496,485	448,613	209,391
1885	571,250	492,710	265,788
1895	673,246	548,632	334,142
1910	825,918	612,137	434,061
1921	820,290	588,244	444,308
1931	1,028,139	718,079	547,949
1948	1,136,116	788,403	614,123
1953	1,264,372	591,800	654,229
1961	1,406,057	842,248	711,665
1971	1,393,148	1,482,430	772,491
1981	1,320,644	1,629,924	758,736

<sup>a</sup>1948—undeclared Muslims; 1953—Yugoslavs undeclared; 1961—Muslims (ethnic belonging); 1971—Muslims (in sense of nationality). Minorities not included in this table.

towns. Although most feudal landowners (sing. Turk. *aga* or *beg*) were Muslims, most peasant-serfs were Serbs, followed by a much smaller number of Croats. Nearly all free peasants were of the Islamic faith. The 1910 census indicates that there were 9,537 landowning Muslim family heads. Another 5,000 or more Muslim family heads were religious leaders, civil servants, and members of the merchant class. Finally, there were 77,518 Muslim heads of family who were free peasants and 6,334 who were serfs.<sup>18</sup> Muslims and Orthodox Serbs formed the largest and most powerful commercial groups, followed in size by Catholics (Croats and immigrants) and Jews.<sup>19</sup>

The most crucial problem in Bosnia-Herzegovina was the ethnic and confessional antagonism among the province's three peoples. From the very start, Austria-Hungary strove to limit nationalism by placing the religious administrations under imperial control. Under

agreements concluded with the papacy, the patriarchate, and the *şeyh-iül-İslâm* (the supreme authority of the Islamic faith), the emperor of Austria-Hungary acquired the right to appoint and dismiss religious heads and to sustain the religious establishments financially.<sup>20</sup>

For Austria-Hungary the Orthodox Serbs were the principal problem because of their numerical size, close proximity to and ties with Serbia and Montenegro, and the nationalist fervor of a dozen or more church and school communes controlled by an increasingly nationalistic urban middle class.<sup>21</sup> Established in Ottoman days, the Serbian church and school communes had enjoyed autonomy in managing church and school affairs and wished to preserve and expand those rights. Fourteen Serbian church and school communes submitted a memorandum to the emperor in 1896 in which they criticized the imperial policy on Serbs and demanded autonomy in cultural and educational affairs.<sup>22</sup> After a great deal of debate, a statute on autonomy was issued in 1905.<sup>23</sup>

The Austro-Hungarian objective of preventing the Orthodox Church from becoming a rallying point for Serbian nationalism required Serbian church leaders loyal to the monarchy.<sup>24</sup> Austria-Hungary initially planned to place the Serbian Orthodox Church under the metropolitan of Karlovci and through him to control it, but most Serbs opposed this arrangement. Under the convention signed by the emperor of Austria-Hungary and the patriarch of Constantinople, the Orthodox Church in Bosnia-Herzegovina was to remain under the authority of the patriarch, whose rights would be restricted to a few canonical formalities.<sup>25</sup> Shortly thereafter, Antim, Sarajevo's metropolitan, who was of Greek origin, was replaced by a Serb, Sava Kosanović. By 1888, no Greek bishops were left in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but the patriarch continued to hold nominal leadership over the Orthodox Church. Additional episcopal positions were created in 1900, and the four bishops were made equal with the patriarch's approval.

Austria-Hungary was apprehensive about Croatian circles that worked to strengthen their people's national consciousness.<sup>26</sup> Yet Croatian nationalism was not perceived to be as dangerous to the monarchy as Yugoslavism and Serbian nationalism because both the Croats and their Vienna rulers were Catholics.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, in carrying out its Balkan mission, Austria-Hungary needed the help of the Catholic Church.<sup>28</sup> After protracted discussions, on 8 June 1881 Aus-

tria-Hungary signed a concordat with the Vatican. Under this arrangement, the Franciscan order, long in control of the Catholic Church in Bosnia-Herzegovina, was pushed aside in favor of the Jesuits, who were “secular” and considered to be “more closely attuned to Austrian state needs.”<sup>29</sup> The Franciscans had welcomed Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina but were unhappy with the introduction of the secular hierarchy. Benjámín Kállay worked strenuously to achieve harmony between the Franciscans and the Jesuits.<sup>30</sup>

Under the concordat, the emperor named the archbishop and bishops, Sarajevo was elevated to an archbishopric, and the state assumed the obligation to finance the Church.<sup>31</sup> Catholic bishops in Bosnia-Herzegovina were obliged to pledge loyalty to the emperor, take an oath to the government, and forbidden from engaging in disruptive activity. The Catholic Church received generous financial support from state and private sources in Austria-Hungary and from abroad.<sup>32</sup> Josip Stadler, a professor of theology from Zagreb, was designated archbishop, and the Church was given a new administrative organization by being divided into four dioceses. Church-state relations were marred somewhat by Stadler’s authoritarian personality and his tolerance of Catholic proselytizing, which caused a certain amount of tension between Muslims and Croats.<sup>33</sup>

The religious question concerning the Muslims was even more complicated than that among the Christians. In the Muslim community there was no clear-cut division between civil and religious life. Unaccustomed to Christian rule, the Muslims wished to remain attached to the *meşihat* (residence of the şeyh-ül-Islâm) in Istanbul, maintain close ties with the Ottoman Empire, and ultimately return to sultanic rule. Austria objected to the Turkish appointment of religious functionaries in Bosnia-Herzegovina because it implied continuing Turkish protectorship over the Bosnian Muslims.<sup>34</sup>

With the support of some influential Muslims, Kállay was able to establish a separate Muslim religious authority in Bosnia-Herzegovina, headed by the *reis-ül-ulema* and a four-member council.<sup>35</sup> An Islamic judicial system was instituted with a two-man *şeriat* court in Sarajevo to supervise the work of lower judges. Dissatisfied with Christian rule and their new status, the Muslim community in Mostar initiated the Movement for Educational and Religious Autonomy in 1896.<sup>36</sup> In fighting for the management of their own cultural

and religious affairs, Muslims and Serbs were able to find common ground and cooperate politically for several years.<sup>37</sup>

In assuming governorship over Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kállay said that the monarchy's objective was to civilize "the Oriental peoples."<sup>38</sup> He promised to bring to the peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina peace and order, prosperity, justice, education, and improved agriculture and communications.<sup>39</sup> Kállay was ready to encourage the inhabitants to participate in "voluntary religious, educational, and cultural associations" but not in political organizations. The purpose of education was to develop loyalty for Bosnia-Herzegovina as a political and geographic entity. Kállay advocated equality between Christians and Muslims and favored secularizing certain aspects of public life previously controlled by Islamic law. He partially curbed the privileges of the Muslim landowning class by transferring to the state particular administrative functions that had been previously exercised by Muslim landlords and judges. Despite those restrictions, however, the Muslims retained a dominant social and economic position.<sup>40</sup>

Austria-Hungary, determined not to allow Muslims to become attracted to Serbian or Croatian nationalism, discouraged Muslims from using Cyrillic script. In place of the three separate peoples in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kállay wished to create a single "Bosnian" (Bošnjak) people, speaking the same "Bosnian" language and consisting of three separate but equal religious communities.<sup>41</sup> Many Muslims were ready to espouse the Bošnjak nationality (*bošnjaštvo*) and work with Austria-Hungary because they felt threatened by Serbian and Croatian nationalism. The weekly journal *Bošnjak*—published in Sarajevo from 1891 to 1910 and founded by Mehmed-beg Kapetanović Ljubušak (1839–1902)—was dedicated to promoting the Bošnjak nationality and language. This government-subsidized publication warned that if Bosnia-Herzegovina ever became a part of Serbia and Montenegro, Muslims would become "servants of their one-time slaves and serfs."<sup>42</sup>

The concept of a Bosnian nationality and language was not new; it had been debated in the governing circles of Bosnia since the middle of the nineteenth century, when Omer-pasha Latas (1806–1871) and Osman Topal-pasha (1806–1869) discussed "interconfessional bosnianism." Ljubušak argued that the inhabitants of Bosnia-Herzegovina were one nation regardless of which religion they professed.<sup>43</sup>

He was the first Muslim to advance the theory that the Muslim feudatories were of Bogumil origin and thus preservers of the medieval Bosnian state tradition. Ljubušak contended that the begs—feudal landlords and Bogumil descendants—had faithfully served the sultan and would in like fashion serve the Habsburg court.<sup>44</sup> The concept of a separate Bosnian nation was never accepted by Serbs, Croats, or Muslims; by the mid-1890s, the nationalism of the Serbs and Croats was too firmly rooted to yield to another ethnic label.<sup>45</sup> Many years later, after the disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1991, Bosnian Muslim leaders would once again return to the Bošnjak theory and the search for identity.

#### ECONOMY, SOCIETY, AND EDUCATION

Ethnic problems in Bosnia-Herzegovina were exacerbated by economic problems, the most serious of which was land reform. It did not take Austria-Hungary long to realize that it could not rule Bosnia-Herzegovina without the support of the Muslim feudal class. For this and other reasons it retained the Ottoman feudal land tenure system, a decision particularly detrimental to the Serbs, who constituted the largest bloc of the dependent and land-hungry peasant population, and thus continued the tension between Muslims and Serbs and Muslims and Croats.<sup>46</sup> Like the Serbs, most Croats were peasants who in time had become enserfed by the Muslim landlords. Some Muslim peasants, hardly better off than Christian serfs, also depended upon Muslim landowners for their survival. Yet in social confrontations between Muslim landlords and Christian peasants, the Muslim poor invariably identified with the Muslim landowners. Most Muslims opposed land reform, Serbs gave it the highest priority, and Croats did not consider it a pressing issue.

Austria-Hungary, reluctant to introduce basic land reform, instead made small improvements in agriculture, animal husbandry, and veterinary services. It settled foreign colonists into Bosnia and transplanted inhabitants from one part of Bosnia to another.<sup>47</sup> Austria also introduced a modern, comprehensive system of land registry and improved the collection of taxes. It instituted a system of voluntary redemption under which peasants could buy their freedom from the landlord if they could secure loans from banks and



private individuals. As a result, from 1879 to 1910, 28,481 peasants were able to redeem themselves from their landlords.<sup>48</sup>

For several years Muslims and Serbs found it expedient to postpone the land question and instead cooperated in fighting the government for autonomy in religious and school affairs. This cooperation collapsed in 1910, when a peasant "strike" broke out in Bosanska Krajina and Posavina in which Petar Kočić, his peasant followers, and a faction centered around the journal *Otadžbina* (Fatherland) demanded an abolition of the feudal privileges.<sup>49</sup> The peasants wanted an end to the delivery of one-third of the harvest to the landlord as well as other feudal obligations. The peasants incited the villagers to rise to arms, burn homes of the landlords, and engage in violence. Only by brute force was the government able to crush the insurgents. The Muslims blamed Kočić for the strike, and cooperation between them and the Serbs came to an end.

After a protracted debate, the Diet passed a law on 4 April 1911 guaranteeing peasant serfs (*kmets*) long-term loans for voluntary redemption,<sup>50</sup> meaning that after a peasant and landlord had reached an agreement, the government would provide the peasant with a long-term loan covering his redemption. This did not, however, fully resolve the agrarian question. The peasant was still obligated to deliver a third of his harvest to the landlord and an additional tenth as tax to the state.

The state provided an impetus to the economy by building an infrastructure of roads, railways, telegraph and telephone systems, and other public works. Modest industrial progress was attained, especially in the production of iron, salt, timber, and tobacco.<sup>51</sup> Marked advances were made in trade and crafts. There was a widespread belief that the quickest way to attain economic security was by acquiring a vocation. This may be one reason for the rapid growth in the number of Serbian, Muslim, and Croatian merchants, artisans, and craftsmen, who together constituted the *čaršija* (Tur. *çarşı*; also the part of town in which they lived). By the first decade of the twentieth century there were twenty-five associations of craftsmen and artisans in Bosnia (sixteen Serbian, eight Muslim, and one Croatian) and forty-four native banks (twenty-six Serbian, ten Croatian, and eight Muslim).<sup>52</sup>

Before its occupation by Austria-Hungary, there was not a single industrial plant in Bosnia-Hercegovina; by 1904 there were more than one hundred such plants employing more than thirty thousand

workers. Although the local population could supply the needed manual labor, many of the skilled workers had to be imported. By 1905 the Main Workers' Alliance had been organized, and in 1906 the first organized general strike in Bosnia-Herzegovina occurred, attributed to the exploitation and abuse of workers. In the meantime and with the gradual breakdown of rural isolation, more and more peasants migrated from village to town in quest of an education, a better life, or to escape military service. Some Muslims emigrated to Turkey rather than face an uncertain future in a Christian state.<sup>53</sup> In Turkey they organized a committee and plotted a return to Bosnia and restoring the sultan's rule. A large number of Serbs and some Croats emigrated to the United States in search of economic opportunity.<sup>54</sup> This prompted Aleksa Šantić (1868–1924), a popular Serbian poet, also admired by Croats and Muslims, to appeal to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the moving poem "Ostajte ovdje" not to abandon their homeland.

One of the most difficult problems confronting Austria-Hungary in Bosnia-Herzegovina was introducing a modern educational system. Because of the diverse educational practices, high illiteracy, ethnic and religious divisiveness, and burgeoning nationalism of the province's inhabitants, however, Austria-Hungary considered it urgent to standardize and modernize education.

The Ottomans had not had a state education system, and a number of schools had been damaged during the Austrian military occupation. Under the Ottoman Empire, the political and cultural environment favored Muslim schools over Croatian and Serbian ones. Furthermore, the teaching methods were primitive and the school curriculum was religious, particularly in Muslim schools. In Muslim communities the two basic schools, the *mekteb* and the *medrese*, were common. In the *mekteb* the children were exposed to the Koran and memorized a few of its passages. In 1878, the year of occupation, there were 847 *mektebs* in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and each of Sarajevo's many *mahalas* (quarters) had one. Islamic religion and law were taught in the province's 43 *medresas*, one of which was in every large Muslim community and most of which survived until 1918. The most famous in Sarajevo was the Kuršumlija, attached to the Gazi Husrev-bey mosque.<sup>55</sup> The third most numerous Muslim school was the *rişdiye*, where secular subjects were taught.<sup>56</sup> The first of these schools was founded in 1864 by Osman Topal-pasha; by 1878

there were about 20 in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 2 of which were in Sarajevo.<sup>57</sup> The language of instruction in Muslim schools was either Arabic or Serbo-Croatian, written in either Cyrillic script or in *arabica*, an Arabic script adapted for Serbo-Croatian phonetics.<sup>58</sup>

With the gradual national and cultural awakening in the nineteenth century, the quality of Croatian and Serbian education in Bosnia began to improve. In 1855 the first Serbian gymnasium opened in Sarajevo. That same year the Croats acquired a secondary school in Livno, and a few years later one opened in Sarajevo (1865), followed by a comparable school in Fojnica (1871).<sup>59</sup> In 1878 the Habsburg monarchy inherited, along with the aforementioned Muslim schools, 56 Serbian elementary schools (75 teachers and 3,523 pupils) and 54 Catholic elementary schools (56 teachers and 2,295 pupils), as well as a few Serbian and Croatian secondary schools.

During the early months of the occupation, Austria-Hungary provided a temporary school program for its new subjects, assigning some of the more talented noncommissioned officers in the Austro-Hungarian army to be teachers. Austria and Hungary debated over the kind of educational system to be introduced in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Austria favored a "secular" system of education and Hungary a "confessional" one. Austria won the debate, and in 1879 the Law on Education introduced modern public elementary schools, also known as communal schools because they were attended by children of all confessions.<sup>60</sup> A number of Franciscan schools and Muslim *ruždijas* were transformed into public schools, while other Muslim and Orthodox schools and schools of the Catholic Sisters of Mercy were preserved. Austria-Hungary reluctantly allowed some of the Muslim traditional schools to continue but endeavored to improve them. In 1893 a teachers' training school (*dar-ul-muallimin*) was established to train teachers for the newly established three-year religious schools (*mekteb-i iptidai*). By 1910 there were ninety-four of these improved mektebs, ten of them for women.<sup>61</sup>

Soon after the occupation, Bosnia-Herzegovina acquired modern secondary schools. In 1879, amid much fanfare, the first state gymnasium (Ivo Andrić's alma mater) was opened in Sarajevo, followed by another smaller one and a preparatory school for military studies. The gymnasium teachers were foreigners, and it was not until 1894 that the first native, Tugomir Alaupović, was appointed to the faculty of what became the highly regarded Sarajevo gymna-

sium. A number of other types of secondary schools were opened in the following years, yet by 1914 there were still only seven modern gymnasiums in the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The most important goals of the Austro-Hungarian educational system were to instill the youth with loyalty for the ruling house and to promote a Bosnian “national ideology.”<sup>62</sup> But Serbs objected to the schools’ discriminating against the Serbian language and the Cyrillic alphabet. The government yielded on this score, issuing a law on 10 May 1880 which stated that Orthodox children would be taught first the Cyrillic and then the Latin alphabet while the Muslim and Catholic children would be taught first the Latin alphabet and then the Cyrillic. The official journal, *Bosnian-Herzegovinian People’s News* (Bosansko-hercegovačke narodne novine), which was initially printed in the Latin script, later (with its name changed to *Sarajevo Newspaper* [Sarajevski list]) began to publish articles in both the Latin and the Cyrillic alphabets.<sup>63</sup> From this time on, one notes an increasing use of the Cyrillic alphabet.<sup>64</sup>

The government provided funds for building and repairing churches and schools and for staffing mosques and churches.<sup>65</sup> The appointment of teachers and the procurement of textbooks required government approval. Schools were periodically inspected. After the issuance of the Statute on Serbian Church and School Communes in 1905 and a comparable one in 1909 for the autonomous administration of Muslim religious and educational affairs, government supervision of schools and religious institutions became less rigorous. Under the statute of 1909, the Muslims acquired expanded rights in the management of their religious affairs, but the Austro-Hungarian government retained control over Muslim religious organization.

Despite various kinds of official restraints, Serbian confessional schools in Austria-Hungary grew in number, as did state schools.<sup>66</sup> Yet in 1911, when a four-year elementary school education was made mandatory, the law could not be enforced because of the shortage of schools. The number of secondary schools, both public and confessional, also remained inadequate.<sup>67</sup> Bosnia-Herzegovina had fewer schools than the other provinces in Austria-Hungary—indeed, fewer than Serbia and Montenegro.<sup>68</sup> One-fourth of the state elementary schools and a number of lower secondary schools, especially commercial schools, were built along the borders with Serbia and Montenegro, apparently to discourage young Serbs from seeking education

in those two countries and to reduce the influence of Serbia in the region.<sup>69</sup>

In 1914, 80 percent of the population of slightly less than 2 million in Bosnia-Herzegovina remained illiterate. According to one source, in 1912 there were 331 state schools, 116 Orthodox, 28 Catholic, 2 evangelical, and 10 private schools—a total of 487 schools and 42,578 pupils (26.75 percent of the school-age population).<sup>70</sup> Another source indicates that in 1914 Bosnia-Herzegovina had 469 state elementary schools, only 7 state gymnasiums, and a dozen or so lower secondary schools.<sup>71</sup>

In 1914 not a single university or other school of higher learning existed in Bosnia-Herzegovina, although the founding of a university had been discussed in the years immediately preceding World War I.<sup>72</sup> The regime did establish three research centers in Sarajevo, the best known of which was the Provincial Museum (*Zemaljski Muzej*), founded in 1885. The museum published the *Herald of the Provincial Museum* (*Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja*), which contained research papers written by foreign and native scholars.<sup>73</sup> Another center was the Institute for the Study of the Balkans, which focused its attention on Albania, a country that figured in Austria-Hungary's plans for further Balkan expansion.<sup>74</sup> Learned societies of this kind satisfied the emerging intelligentsia and more sophisticated civil and military personnel. The monarchy brought artists, theatrical groups, and musical ensembles to Sarajevo, financed and honored trusted authors, and sponsored meetings of scientists and scholars.<sup>75</sup> The state subsidized publications on a number of subjects, including politics, government, art, and literature, and it also published textbooks. Whatever the shortcomings of Austria-Hungary may have been in advancing education and culture in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the presence of foreign administrators, carpetbaggers (*koferaši, kuferaši*), merchants, investors, industrialists, professional people, and armed forces exposed the former Ottoman province to modern European civilization and stimulated social change.<sup>76</sup>

By the turn of the twentieth century the emerging middle classes had begun to found cultural societies, political parties, and associations.<sup>77</sup> Serbs established a number of reading rooms (*čitaonica*), including one in Banjaluka in 1893. In the 1890s, the Croat Party of Right (*Hrvatska Stranka Prava*) came to exercise powerful influence on the Croats of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and several Croatian

patriotic societies were founded.<sup>78</sup> The first Muslim reading room was founded in 1888 in Sarajevo, followed by another the next year in Banjaluka.<sup>79</sup> Different societies for the advancement of education appeared, providing stipends to cover the costs of student housing and education.<sup>80</sup> To facilitate education, various kinds of dormitories were built, including one for native students enrolled in the University of Vienna.

During the occupation a number of Croatian, Serbian, and Muslim journals were published, some of good quality but none of long life.<sup>81</sup> Of considerable importance was the bimonthly *Bosanska vila* (Bosnian fairy, 1885–1912). Initiated by teachers, who constituted the largest percentage of intellectuals in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the journal published articles, essays, and reviews. All forms of literature except drama appeared between its covers; it also published translations of foreign works. Though primarily a Serbian journal, Croatian and Muslim authors also published in it, especially in its final years.<sup>82</sup> While still a gymnasium student, Andrić was one of its many contributors; he published in it some of his translations.<sup>83</sup>

#### POLITICAL ORGANIZATION AND ACTION

Although progress was modest in many fields of human endeavor until the beginning of the 1900s, the inhabitants of Bosnia-Herzegovina lacked modern political organizations. The Muslims were the first to establish a political party. In early 1906 Muslim leaders met at Slavonski Brod and founded the Muslim National Organization (Muslimanska Narodna Organizacija—MNO), led by an executive committee stationed in Budapest and headed by Ali-beg Firdus. Its news organ, *Musavat* (Equality; Mostar, 1906–10, and Sarajevo, 1910–12), was owned by the Muslim Serb Smail-aga Ćemalović and was printed in both Cyrillic and Latin script. The MNO's program consisted of a demand for the religious and political autonomy of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the sovereignty of the sultan. The MNO had the support of all Muslims, but the large landowners dominated it and made the agrarian question the party's primary concern.<sup>84</sup>

On the eve of the elections to the Diet, a group of young Muslim activists of pro-Serbian orientation, including Ćemalović, withdrew from the MNO and started their own newspaper, *Samouprava* (Self-

government). The new party sought cooperation with all religious communities and with the caliphate, advocated direct contact with the Habsburg crown, and demanded autonomy and a parliamentary system of government.<sup>85</sup> Although the Serbian Muslim students worked closely with Orthodox Serbs, the group's sole candidate for a seat in the Diet, Osman Djikić, was defeated.<sup>86</sup> Another Muslim party, which consisted of persons engaged in cultural, educational, and economic activities, was the Muslim Progressive Party (Muslimanska Napredna Stranka—MPP), founded in August 1908. This party identified itself as Croatian. In 1910 the party altered its program and took the name Muslim Independent Party (Muslimanska Samostalna Stranka—MIP).

After a modest victory in 1905 in the struggle for autonomy in the management of church and school affairs, the emerging Serbian intelligentsia pressed for the establishment of a democratic government. The Serbian political life at this time rested in three groups. One of them, led by Gligorije Jeftanović, Vojislav Šola, and Milan Srškić, voiced political demands through the pages of *Serbian Word* (Srpska riječ), published in Sarajevo from 1904 to 1914. This news organ carried articles on politics, economics, and education, but the younger intelligentsia criticized it for not being bold enough in tackling important political issues. Overpowered in Sarajevo, the older influential leaders of the group chose Mostar as the base of their activity and in 1907 started publishing the journal *People* (Narod) there, edited by Risto Radulović and Vasilj Grdjić. A third group of Serbs, speaking largely for the peasants from the Bosnian regions of Krajina and Posavina, rallied around Petar Kočić and his journal *Otadžbina*. A small group of intellectuals identified with this group and demanded a radical solution to the agrarian question and the abolition of the surviving vestiges of Ottoman feudalism. After long discussions, the representatives of the three groups agreed to proceed on 31 October 1907 with the founding of a Serbian National Organization, which declared the right of Serbs to national sovereignty, self-determination, personal and property rights, and constitutional and parliamentary rule. There were other smaller Serbian political groups, including the pro-Habsburg Serbian National Independent Party.<sup>87</sup>

Liberal groups and the Franciscans took the first initiative to organize a Croatian political party in Bosnia-Herzegovina. After much discussion, the Croatian National Union (Hrvatska Narodna

Zajednica—CNU) was founded in February 1908. On the basis of state rights, this party proclaimed Bosnia-Herzegovina a Croatian land and sought its union to Croatia. Because the number of Croats living in Bosnia-Herzegovina was small and because many of the Catholics in the region were immigrants, the CNU leaders, Ivo Pilar and Nikola Mandić, explained that the CNU could not be an exclusively Catholic organization and that it should encourage the Muslims to join it and accept the Croatian national idea.

The leaders of the CNU and Archbishop Josip Stadler clashed over the place of religion in nation-building.<sup>88</sup> After an unsuccessful attempt to take over the CNU leadership, Archbishop Stadler, on 18 January 1910, founded his own Croatian Catholic Association for Bosnia and Herzegovina (Hrvatska Katolička Udruga za Bosnu i Hercegovinu—CCA). In this endeavor he had the support of Austria's Christian Socialists and the Slovene clericals. Like some other leaders in his time, he too considered the possibility of reorganizing the monarchy into a tripartite state.

Neither Catholic organization had a solution for the land question in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The problem, of course, was of little concern to the CCA because the Muslims were excluded from its ranks.<sup>89</sup> In regard to Bosnia-Herzegovina, both organizations sought its union with Croatia on the basis of Croatian states' rights. For the benefit of common Croatian and Catholic interests, the CNU and CCA merged in 1911.<sup>90</sup> It was important that all ethnic and confessional groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina at this time had their own political parties and could debate questions of mutual interest in their own press and in the Diet.

Beyond the borders of the province, foreign problems, especially those affecting Serbia and the Slavic world, were of particular concern. The year 1908 was especially critical in the history of the South Slavs. The Austro-Serbian economic conflict (the "Pig War" of 1906–11) was still in progress, as was the Sanjak of Novi Pazar railway controversy, initiated by Austria on 28 January 1908.<sup>91</sup> Both these problems were a major concern to the Serbs and other South Slavs. The Bomb Affair (May 1908) in Cetinje, a plot by Montenegrin youths to assassinate Prince Nicholas, led to the severing of relations between Serbia and Montenegro, which Austria-Hungary welcomed and abetted. Similarly disturbing was the Young Turk Revolution in July 1908 that brought a constitutional government to Turkey and



threatened to spread to Bosnia. The Viennese government believed that the granting of a constitution to Bosnia was opportune but not until after the province's annexation, which was considered urgent to curb the Young Turk influence in Bosnia.<sup>92</sup> Encouraged by recent developments, the Serbian National Organization and Muslim National Organization presented a joint statement to Minister Leon von Bilinski on 7 September 1908 demanding a constitution for Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Containment of Serbia was the primary goal of Austria-Hungary. Austro-Hungarian military and political circles—including Archduke Francis Ferdinand, the heir apparent to the Habsburg throne, and Konrad von Hötzendorff, the chief of the general staff—planned to create a Yugoslav state within the empire and transform the monarchy from a dualist into a tripartite state.<sup>93</sup> Josip Frank and some of his Croatian nationalist followers pressed for a Croatian state within the Habsburg empire, an idea not viewed with favor by Hungary.<sup>94</sup>

For years Austria-Hungary had talked about annexing Bosnia-Hercegovina and finally proclaimed it on 7 October 1908. The Muslims, Croats, and Serbs reacted to the annexation much as they had toward the occupation of the province in 1878: Croats welcomed the annexation because it united the Croats of the Ottoman Empire with those in Austria-Hungary. The Muslims hoped for a restoration of Bosnia-Hercegovina to Turkey and the Serbs for its becoming a part of Serbia. The Muslims and the Serbs objected to Austro-Hungarian unilateral violation of the Treaty of Berlin and sent representatives abroad to seek the support of the great powers.<sup>95</sup>

To counter the negative European reaction, the government in Vienna encouraged public demonstrations endorsing the annexation. Municipal meetings praised the emperor for his action, and deputations were dispatched to Vienna to congratulate him and offer him obeisance. The Croatian deputation was the largest—it consisted of more than 430 persons and was received by the emperor on 27 November 1908. Archbishop Stadler gave an emotional speech in which he thanked the emperor for his people's survival, for freedom of religion, and for the blessings that his rule had given Croats.<sup>96</sup> The mayor of Sarajevo, Esad Kulović, who headed the Muslim delegation, also congratulated the emperor on the annexation and thanked him for making it possible for Muslims to develop culturally and

materially and to retain their landed possessions.<sup>97</sup> Other deputations of ethnic groups appeared in Vienna, including a small Serbian deputation, as well as those representing the Sephardic and Austro-Hungarian Jewish communities.<sup>98</sup>

Serbia and Montenegro objected to the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and prepared for war. Serbia initiated secret discussions with the Ottoman Empire to take common action against Austria. The two European alliance systems, the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance, also took the annexation crisis seriously. The tension subsided after Turkey recognized the annexation on 26 February 1909 in exchange for a modest financial compensation and the withdrawal of Austro-Hungarian troops from the Sanjak of Novi Pazar, where they had been stationed since 1879.<sup>99</sup> A military confrontation was averted when, under an ultimatum from Germany, Russia and the other signatories of the Treaty of Berlin recognized the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina.<sup>100</sup> Serbia and Montenegro were told to recognize the annexation as a *fait accompli* and to address a note to that effect to Austria-Hungary. They were also obligated to demobilize their armies, to declare that the annexation did not infringe on their rights, and to promise that they would pursue good neighborly relations toward Austria-Hungary. As for the Muslim and Serbian national organizations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, they did not recognize the annexation until this was done by the European powers.<sup>101</sup> A step toward further Austro-Muslim amity occurred on 15 April 1909, when the emperor issued a statute granting the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina cultural and religious autonomy.<sup>102</sup>

In the meantime, during the annexation crisis, an embarrassing moment occurred for the Viennese government. To justify the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Austria-Hungary started an anti-Serbian campaign, indicting members of the Serbian Independent Democratic Party in Croatia and the Croat-Serb Coalition for high treason in a trial in Zagreb on 3 March 1909. After some delay the accused were sentenced to eight years in prison. Franjo Supilo, the prominent Croat political leader and the head of the Croat-Serb Coalition, and other members of the accused sued the historian Heinrich Friedjung for slander in articles he had published in *Neue Freie Presse*, as well as the editor of the *Reichpost* for articles that had appeared in his paper. In a libel suit in Vienna, Thomas G. Masaryk, the future president of Czechoslovakia and an idol of many young Bosnians,

showed that the convictions of the South Slavs were largely based on documents forged in the Austro-Hungarian legation in Belgrade with the foreknowledge of Austro-Hungarian authorities. Disgraced by Masaryk's revelations, Archduke Francis Ferdinand sent his confidant to Franjo Supilo with a request that judicial proceedings be suspended to save the empire's honor. The sentences already pronounced were canceled.

During the annexation crisis and the months immediately following, issuance of a constitution for Bosnia-Herzegovina became particularly urgent. After a great deal of discussion about ending the colonial regime, on 20 February 1910 the emperor granted a limited constitution to Bosnia-Herzegovina that recognized the existing social, religious, and ethnic order.<sup>103</sup> Bosnia-Herzegovina, however, remained *corpus separatum* and a joint possession of Austria and Hungary. It was not an independent state and did not have direct representation in the delegations. Much debate ensued over the citizenship of the inhabitants of Bosnia-Herzegovina.<sup>104</sup> Laws were issued on implementing the constitution, electoral and parliamentary procedures, and civil rights. For Muslims, shariat law was recognized in matters of family relations.<sup>105</sup> Membership in the Diet consisted of 72 elected and 20 ex officio members. The latter included the head of the state and the civilian Adlatus, who had no voting rights but could speak in the Diet.<sup>106</sup> Suffrage was extended to males 24 years of age and older. The electorate was divided into 3 curiae based on ethnic and religious representation. The first included landlords, educated clergy, civil servants, and teachers (18 members). The second curia represented merchants and craftsmen (20 seats), while the third consisted of peasants with 34 seats, although they represented 87 percent of the population. (A member of the first curia equaled 150 peasant votes.) The electoral system was devised in such a way that peasants could never win an election. Members of the Diet were also chosen by religious affiliation, with the Orthodox receiving 31 seats, Muslims 24, Catholics 16, and Jews 1 seat.<sup>107</sup> The president of the Diet was designated by imperial decree and rotated annually among the three confessions, starting with a Muslim, followed by an Orthodox and then a Catholic.<sup>108</sup> The government was not responsible to the Diet but to the Ministry of Finance, so the Diet was little more than a forum for public debate. Bills passed by the Diet required the approval of both the Austrian and Hungarian par-

liaments before becoming law.<sup>109</sup> In the first elections to the Diet, the Serbian National Organization won all 31 Orthodox seats, the MNO all 24 Muslim seats, and the CNU 12 out of 16 Catholic seats, with the CCA taking the remaining 4 Catholic seats.

The introduction of the constitutional government broke down Serbian political unity and the cooperation between the Serbs and Muslims on the land question. Austria-Hungary wanted the land question settled by voluntary agreement between the landlords and tenants, a policy that would retain Muslim friendship for the crown. When the voluntary redemption of peasants was voted on in the Diet on 4 April 1911, most Muslims supported it, and with their backing and that of the two Catholic groups, the government secured the majority of the vote.<sup>110</sup> As discussed above, under this law the government was obliged to grant peasants long-term loans with which to redeem themselves from feudal obligations after having voluntarily reached an agreement with the landlord. The Serbs, however, were not united on how to settle the land question. Most of them wanted it settled without compensation, and others (for example, a group associated with *Narod*) in a way that would not radicalize the peasants.

The government and its subjects clashed over a number of other questions, including the important one concerning the use of language in the railway administration. After much debate, Vienna decided that German, the official language of the army, must remain in use in administering railways. Because of the language controversy and the Scutari crisis (April 1913), the emperor adjourned the Diet on 4 May 1913 and it never reconvened.<sup>111</sup> The Diet's four years of existence were characterized by party bickering and political maneuvering, the resignation of Diet members and the appointment of replacements, supplementary elections, and debates over a variety of other questions.<sup>112</sup>

Whereas the political leaders of the Muslims, Serbs, and Croats in the Diet and outside it debated issues within the legal system, Ivo Andrić and his young generation of secondary school and university students waged their struggle for national liberation in a conspiratorial atmosphere. Until 1909 the Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim student societies were primarily literary. After the annexation crisis and the high treason trial in Zagreb, the student societies began to move away from exclusive nationalism toward South Slavic unity and revolutionary tactics.<sup>113</sup> Interestingly enough, this occurred at the

time Archduke Francis Ferdinand, Chief of General Staff Hötendorff, and others began to consider creating an Austro-Hungarian Yugoslavia within a trialist or federalist system.<sup>114</sup>

The young South Slavs wished for a Yugoslav state that would be erected outside the Habsburg monarchy. Initially calling themselves “progressives” and later “nationalists,” South Slavic university students in Belgrade, Zagreb, Prague, Ljubljana, Graz, and Vienna began to promote vigorously the unity of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes and urged the secondary school pupils to do the same.<sup>115</sup> They founded Croatian and Serbian progressive organizations. At this same time the anger of the youth was beginning to run high, culminating on 2 June 1910 in Bogdan Žerajić’s failed attempt to assassinate general Marijan Varešanin, the civilian head of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This act of self-sacrifice inflamed the progressives, who interpreted Žerajić’s deed as a declaration of war on the Viennese rulers and a rejection of gradualism in the struggle for national liberation.<sup>116</sup> Pero Slijepčević observes that whereas before there were “revolutionaries” and “Yugoslavs” among the South Slavs, now “revolutionary Yugoslavs” had appeared on the scene.<sup>117</sup> At the beginning of August 1910 clashes between Serbian peasants and Muslim landlords increased, culminating in widespread unrest, which the peasants called a “strike.” The government employed the gendarmerie and the army to restore order and compel the peasants to pay the *hak* (a third of the harvest) to the landlord.

When Andrić was in the seventh grade at the gymnasium, he was chosen president of the Croatian Progressive Organization (CPO) and proved to be a likable and effective leader. In late 1911, as a leader of the Croatian progressives, Andrić initiated the union of the Serb and Croat progressive organizations and was chosen president of the new Serb-Croat Progressive Youth (SCPY).<sup>118</sup> He maintained order in the ranks of the progressives and was respected and trusted by the group, which counted among its founding members Gavrilo Princip, a staunch advocate of the union of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes and remembered in historical annals as the assassin of Archduke Francis Ferdinand.<sup>119</sup>

After the founding of the SCPY, the Serbian students were left divided into progressives and a much larger group of “radicals,” the ethnic exclusivists named after the Serbian Radical Party in Vojvodina and Croatia. They reasoned that liberating the Serbs from Aus-

tria-Hungary could come only with the help of Serbia and Montenegro and large national patriotic organizations. Their ultimate goal was the unification of the Serbs under a single ruler and the inculcation of the Muslims with Serbian national consciousness.<sup>120</sup> The progressives and the radicals criticized and insulted each other. Serbs and Croats attacked the progressives as traitors to their nations and called them chameleons—their secret badge was composed of both Croatian and Serbian flags.<sup>121</sup> Muslims saw in their own progressives a secular threat to Islam and criticized them for introducing the concept of “nation” into Islamic culture and for violating Islamic religion and morality.<sup>122</sup>

A large number of Croatian youth in Bosnia-Herzegovina were members of Catholic clerical societies, which were tolerated by the government because they posed no threat to it.<sup>123</sup> Societies of Croatian school pupils in Bosnia-Herzegovina modeled their programs on the political situation in Croatia. Most Croatian secondary school pupils in Sarajevo were ethnic exclusivists and subscribed to the nationalist ideology formulated by Ante Starčević (1823–96), the founder in Croatia of the Party of [Croat State] Right (Stranka Prava), and by Josip Frank (1844–1911), the head of the Pure Party of Right (Čista Stranka Prava), which advocated full national independence of the Croats. The nationalist Croats were called Young Croats, a name derived from the journal *Young Croatia* (Mlada Hrvatska), published in Zagreb.<sup>124</sup> Young Croats constituted the largest Croatian student association, even after a number of its Croatian and Muslim members defected from the ranks to join the newly organized CPO, whose journal *Croatian Pupil* (Hrvatski djak) spoke passionately for the union of the Croats and Serbs.

Thus along with the Serbian and Croatian ethnic exclusivists and Muslims (some of whom identified as Turks, Serbs, or Croats), there were now also progressives and those who called themselves Yugoslavs, Serbo-Croats, and Croato-Serbs. The paper *Dawn* (Zora), published in Vienna, became the mouthpiece of the progressive students. There were, to be sure, progressives who had not completely abandoned ethnic exclusivism. Vladimir Gaćinović, for example, was an exclusivist Serb until 1912, when he became an exponent of the Yugoslav idea, after he had accepted socialism.<sup>125</sup> Similarly, the followers of Petar Kočić did not declare themselves for Yugoslavism until 1913; even then their declaration to this effect was more formal than real.<sup>126</sup>

By early 1912 political tension was on the rise throughout the ranks of the progressive youth in the South Slavic lands. Oscar Jászi writes that so unreasonable was Hungarian rule that it threw Croatia and the whole Yugoslav world into “despair and exacerbation.”<sup>127</sup> Archduke Francis Ferdinand more than once raised his voice against the Hungarian style of rule, declaring that the Magyar lands were “maintained in quite medieval conditions by a small oligarchy” and that “the Magyar nobility was working continuously against Austria and the monarchy as a whole.” In an attempt to bring stability to Croatia, on 20 January 1912 Slavko Cuvaj was appointed ban and given emergency powers to establish order. Students called for a public meeting on 31 January and soon after for a strike of secondary school youth throughout Croatia.<sup>128</sup> Young Bosnians of all three confessions poured out onto Sarajevo streets. They elected a strike committee (with Ivo Andrić as one of its leaders),<sup>129</sup> and on 18–19 February, Serbs and Muslims joined Croats in anti-Hungarian demonstrations.

Not since the general strike of 1906 had the streets of Sarajevo seen demonstrations of such magnitude. This was the first such undertaking in Sarajevo by the South Slavic progressive youth.<sup>130</sup> A few workers were attracted to the melee. The demonstrators gathered in front of Sarajevo’s cathedral and sang “Hej Sloveni!” (Oh, Slavs!) and burned the Magyar flag. *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* criticized the mounted police, gendarmes, and army for excessive use of force in dispersing the demonstrators.<sup>131</sup> On 29 February about one hundred students met at Sarajevo’s railway station to hear a moving speech by Ivo Andrić.<sup>132</sup> He reminded those present of what had been achieved by demonstration and what was yet to be accomplished. In an expression of revolutionary zeal, Andrić praised the Young Croat Luka Jukić for his attempt on 8 June 1912 to assassinate Ban Cuvaj. In his diary Andrić wrote:

Long live those who are dying on the pavements, expressing so well our common misfortune. Long live those who secretly, with a few words, are scheming new rebellions. . . . But unfortunately, I am not one of them.<sup>133</sup>

As the quote indicates, Andrić was a revolutionary but not of the bomb-throwing type. Later in the summer of 1912 he went to Zagreb to enroll in the university.<sup>134</sup>

During the police investigation of the demonstrations in Sarajevo, a SCPY document advocating the union of the South Slavs fell into police hands and branded Austria-Hungary its greatest enemy. Those held responsible for the violence in Sarajevo were charged with planning to destroy Austria-Hungary and plotting to establish the political union of the South Slavs.<sup>135</sup> As a result, ten students were expelled from school or were given other sentences.<sup>136</sup> Members of the SCPY were harassed and prosecuted by the police, and they fell into disagreement over ideology and tactics, allowing their organization to die.<sup>137</sup>

The outbreak of the first Balkan War in October 1912 stiffened the revolutionary élan of the youth. Serbs hailed the Balkan Wars, the purpose of which was to liberate the Serbian lands still under Ottoman rule. They sent aid to Serbia and Montenegro and volunteers to serve in the armies of the two countries. The Balkan Wars, however, once again revealed the differences in the ethnic and confessional objectives of the three Slavic peoples in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Muslims sympathized with the Turks (their fellow Muslims) and drew closer to Austria-Hungary, at the time friendly toward the Turks. Croats were largely indifferent to the war but hoped to profit through the union of Bosnia-Herzegovina with Croatia. The Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina were completely dedicated to Serbia and Montenegro and the union of the Serbs.

The new political climate prompted the young Bosnians to organize another conspiratorial society, which was named the Serbo-Croat Nationalist Youth (Srpsko-Hrvatska Nacionalistička Omladina—SCNY).<sup>138</sup> Compared with the SCPY, which had evolved under the inspiration of the Croatian progressives, the SCNY was molded under the influence of the Slovenes.<sup>139</sup> The members of the new organization called themselves nationalist (*nacionalista*), Yugoslav nationalist (*nacionalista Jugoslaven*), or progressive (*naprednjak*),<sup>140</sup> or nationalist youth (*nacionalistička omladina*). Although the progressives did not share the same political views, they had in common a belief in conspiratorial work and in Yugoslav unity.<sup>141</sup> Most of them preached the use of terror, though few practiced it. Even Vladimir Gaćinović, the ideological leader of the young Bosnians, had begun to waver on the use of terrorist tactics.<sup>142</sup>

The Yugoslav platform of the SCNY did not have mass support; it faced strong opposition from ethnic and religious exclusivists,



young and old.<sup>143</sup> Yugoslavism was not homegrown; it was imported into Bosnia-Herzegovina as the best formula with which to build a government in an ethnically, confessionally, and socially diversified society.<sup>144</sup> The inhabitants were beginning to accept this solution, and the number of those in favor of Yugoslav unity and social harmony had steadily grown. But it proved difficult for many exclusivists to become “Yugoslavs.”

#### ANDRIĆ IN UNIVERSITY, WAR, AND DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Before the first Balkan War broke out, when Ivo Andrić had finished gymnasium and was on his way to Zagreb to enroll in the university, he had been already identified as a promising poet and writer, one of a few Young Bosnians whose published work revealed literary promise.<sup>145</sup> Andrić published his first two poems in 1911 while still a gymnasium student. Entitled “At Dusk” (U sumraku) and “Gentle and Good Moonlight” (Blaga i dobra mjesečina), they appeared in *Bosanska vila*, which espoused Serb-Croat solidarity.<sup>146</sup> Before World War I his poems, essays, reviews, and translations appeared in such journals as *Vihor*, *Savremenik*, *Hrvatski pokret*, and *Književne novine*. One of Andrić’s favorite literary forms was lyrical reflective prose, and many of his essays and shorter pieces are prose poems.<sup>147</sup> In this early period, Andrić’s poetry was subjective and mostly melancholic. Andrić’s translations of J. A. Strindberg, W. Whitman, and a number of Slovene authors also appeared at this time.

On his arrival in Zagreb, where he was well received by the nationalist youth, Andrić promptly began joining student activists and participating in demonstrations. (He was reprimanded by the university for his political activities and regular participation in demonstrations.)<sup>148</sup> At the university he enrolled in the department of mathematics and natural sciences because these were the only fields for which stipends were offered; nonetheless, he was able to take some courses in Croatian literature. After completing two semesters in Zagreb, Andrić transferred to the University of Vienna, where he resumed his study of South Slavic literature. While in Vienna, he joined South Slavic students in promoting the cause of Yugoslav unity and worked closely with two Yugoslav student societies—the Serbian cultural society Zora and the Croatian student

club Zvonimir, which shared his views on “integral Yugoslavism.” Yet the cultural and political ambience in Vienna was not to Andrić’s liking, and the climate was harsh on his frail body. At the time, Yugoslav integralist students in Vienna were campaigning against the study of the language and culture of Austria-Hungary and were encouraging study in a Slavic country. Therefore Andrić decided to enroll in a university in a Slavic land. For a time, he considered going to Russia but ultimately chose to do his fourth semester at Jagiellonian University in Cracow, Poland.<sup>149</sup> There, despite personal hardships, Andrić continued to write and publish short poems, translations, and reviews.<sup>150</sup> Six of his poems were published in June 1914 in an anthology entitled *Hrvatska mlada lirika* (New Croatian lyrical verse) and were hailed as the most subjective lyric poetry in the volume.<sup>151</sup>

In Cracow Andrić learned of the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand in Sarajevo and decided to return home. He traveled by train to Zagreb and from there to Split with Vladimir Čerina, a poet, friend, and one of the most active members of the nationalist youth. On 4 August 1914, the week after Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia, the police arrested the twenty-two-year-old Andrić for antistate activities and jailed him in Split.<sup>152</sup> He was then moved to Šibenik and from there to a prison in Maribor, where he arrived on 19 August 1914.<sup>153</sup> Andrić and his cellmates spent time reading, discussing various subjects, and learning languages.<sup>154</sup> Tuberculosis plagued him, and the cramped prison quarters made life difficult. Andrić’s letters at the time exuded despondency. In writing to his mother, however, Andrić sought not to worry her with reports about his deteriorating health and the harsh conditions of prison life.<sup>155</sup> His incarceration gave him ample time to think about writing and the future, and two of his important works germinated during the war.

Unable to prepare a solid case against him, the authorities released Andrić, though he had to remain in prison until a location for his confinement could be arranged. On 20 March 1915 he was freed and sent to Ovčarevo, near Travnik, the place of his birth. He arrived in Ovčarevo on 22 March 1915 and was entrusted to a Franciscan monastery, where he met Fra Alojzije Perčinlić. The two became close friends.<sup>156</sup> While in Ovčarevo, Andrić was often seen walking with a book in hand. He was interested in the history of the local Francis-

cans and the Catholic and Orthodox churches under Ottoman rule and was given the opportunity to read the monasterial chronicles. The chronicles would later inspire his doctoral dissertation on spiritual life in Bosnia-Herzegovina under Ottoman rule.

There were moments of happiness for Andrić in Ovčarevo, as he was able to work in the fields with the parish priest and teach religious songs to pupils at the monastery school. He was also pleased that his mother, whom he had not seen for three years, was able to join him in Ovčarevo, where she served as the housekeeper for the parish priest. At first Andrić lived in the parish headquarters but later was transferred to the Zenica prison. Fra Alojzije continued to watch over him. In the meantime, the army declared Andrić to be a political risk, which meant that he was denied the right to serve in the student unit. In March 1917 he was assigned to the noncombat force until February of the following year.<sup>157</sup> Andrić was at Zenica when, on 2 July 1917, Charles I, emperor of Austria and king of Hungary, issued amnesty to political prisoners. Free at last, Andrić visited his beloved Višegrad, where he found a number of his school friends. He remained there until late July.

After his brief respite in Višegrad, Andrić was mobilized once again, but because of his poor health he was admitted briefly to the hospital in Sarajevo and then to the *Reservospital* in Zenica, where he stayed for several months before leaving for Zagreb. Internees from throughout the empire converged on Zagreb after the amnesty, and for a moment many old friends were reunited. Those that required treatment were admitted to the hospital of the Sisters of Mercy. In November 1917 Andrić himself was again in need of medical attention and was attached to the Sisters of Mercy as a noncombatant.<sup>158</sup>

In January 1918 Andrić joined some other nationalist writers in founding and editing the short-lived *Književni jug* (Literary South), a journal of Yugoslav orientation. He spent some of the spring of 1918 in Krapina writing *Ex Ponto* (which appeared in August 1918) and the summer in Crikvenica.<sup>159</sup> At the end of World War I Andrić enrolled in the Faculty of Philosophy at Zagreb University and planned to complete his studies. He was credited with two semesters because of wartime imprisonment and internment. Andrić attended classes in 1918 and 1919 and became a university graduate (*absolvent*).<sup>160</sup> He continued to write verse, essays, and translations, and in 1920 began a five-year association with the literary and political journal *Nova*

*Evropa* (New Europe), published in Zagreb and edited by Milan Ćurčin, an acquaintance.

Two of Andrić's important works, *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest* (Nemiri, 1920), are the products of a new, more mature writer. *Ex Ponto*, together with its author, was praised by Ivo Vojnović, playwright and poet, and Miloš Crnjanski, journalist and writer. Vojnović described Andrić as "a young Catholic, a perfect young man. A Serb from Bosnia."<sup>161</sup> *Unrest* appeared after the author's stint in the hospital and a period of rest in sunny Dalmatia. *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest*, Andrić's earliest prose works, reveal his transition from poetry to meditative prose.

As Andrić's health worsened, Vojnović wrote Tugomir Alaupović, Andrić's former teacher and friend who in December 1918 had been named minister of religion, and asked him to help Andrić go abroad for medical treatment. In early February 1919 Andrić complained in a letter to Alaupović of a sense of isolation in the absence of their mutual friends and asked for help in finding an appointment in Belgrade.<sup>162</sup> In the end, Andrić chose to seek a cure in Split, where he arrived late in April. He remained in Split half a year, dividing his time between Split and Sutivan-on-Brač while putting the finishing touches on *Unrest*.<sup>163</sup> At the end of August Andrić left Split to visit his family in Višegrad and returned to Zagreb two weeks later. There he wrote to Alaupović and asked him again to keep him in mind for a position of some kind. At this time Andrić hoped to visit his mother and was troubled by the news that his uncle was seriously ill.

Andrić was also in dire financial straits. While writing and editorial work enabled him to eke out a living, he was concerned about his future and the security of his impoverished and aging family—his mother, uncle, and aunt. He needed an income that could sustain both himself and his family, which is why he set his eyes on a government position in Belgrade. Eventually, Alaupović offered Andrić a secretarial position in the Ministry of Religion; the official appointment came through on 12 September 1919.<sup>164</sup>

Andrić accepted the position but quickly became disenchanted with it; on 3 January 1920 he wrote to Alaupović asking for a transfer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and an assignment to the Yugoslav Consulate General in New York. On 20 February 1920, Andrić was informed of his transfer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, though Alaupović was unable to get him the assignment in New York. Instead, Andrić was assigned to the Royal Yugoslav Mission at the

Vatican, where he reported for duty at the end of February. The new assignment gave him time for writing and travel; it was in Italy that Andrić wrote some of his finest stories. At this time he published his first short story, "The Journey of Alija Djerzelez" (Put Alije Djerzeleza, 1920), which was followed by two others, "Mustafa Madžar" (1923) and "The Bridge on the Žepa" (Most na Žepi, 1925), all on themes from the history of Bosnia and in the style of traditional Serbian storytelling.<sup>165</sup> Andrić could not stay put, however, and asked for another assignment. The request was granted, and he was attached to the Yugoslav consulate in Bucharest, where he assumed duties at the end of November. His consular responsibilities remained light, and he had time to write. He contributed articles on literary trends in Yugoslavia to a Romanian journal and found time to visit his family in Bosnia.

In compliance with his request for yet another assignment, Andrić was sent to the consulate in Trieste, where he arrived on 9 December 1922. Because of his continuing bouts with tuberculosis, he once more asked for a transfer, and after a few days of rest in Venice he was on his way to the consulate in Graz, where he arrived on 12 January 1923. Despite his consular chores, Andrić continued to write, and in early 1924 the first of three volumes of his *Stories* (Pripovetke, 1924, 1931, 1936) appeared.

When, after a short vacation in Yugoslavia, Andrić returned to Graz in August 1923, he was astonished to learn that he had lost his job, for a new regulation stipulated that those holding higher government positions, especially in the foreign service, must have a doctoral degree. Andrić had not completed the required coursework in Slavic studies, his principal field.<sup>166</sup> Consequently, he was dismissed and given two months' severance pay.<sup>167</sup> Andrić's superior, the consul general in Graz, appealed to Foreign Minister Momčilo Ninčić to retain Andrić in the consulate and praised Andrić for his diplomatic and linguistic skills. Influential friends also intervened on his behalf. At last, in February 1924 the decision was made to retain Andrić in the consulate as a day worker but with the salary of a vice consul. This economic security enabled Andrić to put his entire energy into working on his Ph.D.

Andrić completed his dissertation and on 14 May 1924 submitted it to a committee of examiners at Graz University who found it to be of superior quality. One of the readers, however, noted that

some aspects of the dissertation were insufficiently researched and that certain sources had not been consulted; nevertheless, the door was open for Andrić to take the required examinations in two fields—Slavic philology and Austrian history—which he passed with high marks. On 13 June 1924 Andrić was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and the examiners recommended that his dissertation be published. The subject Andrić chose for his dissertation, “The Development of Spiritual Life in Bosnia under the Influence of Turkish Rule” (Die Entwicklung des geistigen Lebens in Bosnien unter der Einwirkung der türkischen Herrschaft), is not surprising; life and schooling in Sarajevo and his stay in Ovčarevo had prepared him for such a topic.

A few days after receiving his degree, Andrić appealed to the foreign minister to be allowed to return to his earlier position as vice consul attached to the Yugoslav consulate in Graz.<sup>168</sup> Andrić submitted a copy of his dissertation, documents showing that he had completed his studies, and a medical certification attesting to his good health. His request was granted in September 1924. He stayed in Graz until 31 October 1924, when he was transferred to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Belgrade. During the two and a half years he was in Belgrade, Andrić spent a great deal of time writing. In 1926 Andrić was named vice consul in Marseilles and on 9 December 1926 was temporarily assigned to Yugoslavia’s consulate general in Paris. While in France he traveled and spent time in the Paris archives, where he examined reports sent to the home office by the French consul general in Travnik from 1809 to 1814, material he later used in writing *Bosnian Chronicle* (Travnička hronika, 1945). In this period, he lost his uncle (1924), mother (1925), and aunt (1927).<sup>169</sup>

Andrić made steady advances in his diplomatic work. At the end of April 1928 he left France for a new post as vice consul to the Yugoslav legation in Madrid. Of all the countries in which he served, none excited and inspired him as did Spain. While in Spain, Andrić wrote essays on Francisco José de Goya and Simon Bolivar and began *The Devil’s Yard* (Prokleta avlija). In June 1929 Andrić was sent to Brussels as secretary of the Yugoslav legation for Belgium and Luxembourg and in January 1930 to Geneva as a secretary of the permanent delegation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia at the League of Nations.<sup>170</sup> In 1931 he was made the head of the Political Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On 5 November 1937, he was

named assistant to Milan Stojadinović, the minister of foreign affairs who was also prime minister. On 28 March 1939, now in his forty-sixth year, Andrić was named Yugoslavia's minister to Germany.<sup>171</sup> The close association of Andrić with Stojadinović and his designation as minister to Nazi Germany aroused doubt in some circles as to the strength of his democratic convictions.<sup>172</sup>

After the Axis invasion of Yugoslavia in April 1941, the German government refused to permit Andrić and his diplomatic staff to go to neutral Switzerland. (Andrić had refused an earlier offer to go there without his staff.) As a result, the Yugoslav diplomatic personnel were kept at Bad Schachen during May 1941; at the beginning of June they were sent to Belgrade, where some were imprisoned and Andrić was placed under surveillance. While in Belgrade, Andrić devoted himself to writing and refused all invitations to publish.<sup>173</sup> His public life resumed in October 1944, after the liberation of Belgrade.

Immediately following World War II, Andrić published three novels that reveal his literary greatness and his skills at critical realism and analytic psychology. The first to appear, in March 1945, was *The Bridge on the Drina* (Na Drini ćuprija), the book for which Andrić is best known. This highly praised novel records the history of the famous Višegrad bridge and the people who lived around it from the time it was built in the sixteenth century to the outbreak of World War I. The second novel, *Bosnian Chronicle*, tells about the Western intrusion into Bosnia during the Napoleonic Wars and the local repercussions. The novel, partly told from the perspective of a cultured French diplomat in Travnik, deals with Bosnia as a point of contact between Eastern and Western cultures and politics. The third novel, *The Woman from Sarajevo* (Gospodjica, 1945), presents a portrait of a woman who is not the oriental femme fatale typical of his stories, but rather a cerebral and calculating woman defined by her greed for money. Critically realistic in its style, the novel describes a woman whose misery poisons her life.

Along with these novels, a collection of short stories written during the interwar period was published under the title *New Stories* (Nove pripovetke, 1948). Andrić continued with translations and wrote stories, novellas, and essays on a number of Yugoslav and foreign personages.<sup>174</sup> Literary critics praised him for his sensitive and elegant prose. His works, distinguished for their simplicity and subtlety, had a powerful influence on a number of Yugoslav writers,

including Branko Ćopić, Vladan Desnica, Mihailo Lalić, and Meša Selimović.

In 1954 the short novel, *The Devil's Yard*, appeared, telling about life in an Ottoman prison in Istanbul. Critics consider this one of Andrić's finest works and the quintessence of his art. In it, Andrić gives a picture of man's behavior in the face of adversity and hardship. Historical and fictional personalities appear in this allegorical story within a story within a story, creating a text of many voices.

During the early postwar period, Andrić adapted to the new political situation in Yugoslavia. Although Communist Yugoslavia was not a democratic state, Andrić was himself committed to the idea of a Yugoslav state and South Slavic unity. He was chosen to serve as a representative in the Republican Assembly of Bosnia-Herzegovina (1946–50) and later in the Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia (1949–53). In 1954 Andrić became a member of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. He was a founding member of both the Federation of Serbian Writers and the Federation of Yugoslav Writers, of which he was the first president. On 27 September 1958, relatively late in life, Andrić married Milica Babić, a costume designer at the National Theater in Belgrade.

Throughout his life, Andrić was honored by Yugoslav and foreign institutions and governments, receiving prizes, medals, and other honors.<sup>175</sup> In 1931 he received a prize from the Kolarac Endowment for his second volume of *Stories*. Andrić became a regular member of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1939 (proclaimed in 1946). The Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb (now the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts) elected him corresponding member in 1951, and comparable institutions in Slovenia (1953) and Bosnia-Herzegovina (1969) also honored him. Honorary doctorates were bestowed on Andrić by the universities of Sarajevo (1962), Cracow (1964), and Belgrade (1972). In 1956 Andrić received the highly esteemed Charter from the Federation of Writers and the Alliance of Publishers. In 1961, his literary achievement was crowned with the Nobel Prize for Literature. On this great occasion, Andrić noted that "the writer and his works do not serve anyone if they . . . do not serve humanity." After he received the Nobel Prize, the number of honors Andrić received multiplied, recognizing either his individual creations or his collective works. Andrić received the AVNOJ award (1967), the July 27 Award of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the



Order of the Republic (1962), and the Order of Hero of Socialist Labor (1972).

Shortly before his death on 13 March 1975, Andrić conveyed to friends a wish that his possessions be preserved as an endowment to be used for "general cultural and humanitarian purposes."<sup>176</sup> On 12 March 1976, an administrative committee decided that the purpose of the endowment would be to promote the study of Andrić's work and literature, art, and culture in general. Andrić's will also provided for an annual prize to be awarded to the author of each year's best collection of short stories. Soon after his death, three additional books were published: *The House on Its Own* (Kuća na osami, 1976), *Signs by the Roadside* (Znakovi pored puta, 1976), and the novel *Omer Pasha Latas* (1976).

In May 1980 the Ivo Andrić Endowment sponsored an international meeting in Belgrade to discuss the work of Andrić in the context of European literature and culture. Since then it has helped organize conferences on Andrić in London and Nancy. The endowment issues a yearbook entitled *Sveske Zadušbine Ive Andrića*, which publishes Andrić's correspondence and papers, as well as scholarly works on Andrić. The endowment also makes grants to foreign scholars and students working on Andrić in Belgrade and offers financial aid to cover the publication costs of studies on Andrić. Within the endowment there is a Center for Documentation, which collects sources on Andrić, and the Vera Stojić Fund, which makes awards for the best translations of Andrić's works and studies of his literary accomplishments. (Vera Stojić was Andrić's longtime collaborator and the administrator of the endowment until 1988.)

Soon after Andrić's death the Belgrade Municipal Assembly decided to establish an Ivo Andrić Memorial Museum. A year and a half later, the museum—housing books, manuscripts, documents, photographs, engravings, and items of art that belonged to Andrić—opened to the public. Still other honors to Andrić are being contemplated. Emir Kusturica, an internationally acclaimed Muslim film director from Sarajevo and a strong believer in Yugoslavia, has been planning a film based on Andrić's *Bridge on the Drina*.<sup>177</sup> Andrić is more than deserving of the honors and recognitions that have been accorded to him. His brilliant literary work, cast in the spirit of South Slavic unity, will have an enduring value.

## NOTES

1. Ljubo Jandrić, *Sa Ivom Andrićem, 1968–1975* (Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1977), p. 296.
2. On Andrić as a youngster and pupil in Višegrad, see Miroslav Karaulac, *Rani Andrić* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1980), pp. 16–23.
3. On life with his mother and Andrić's health, see Karaulac, p. 28.
4. Nadežda Andrić, *Spomen muzej Ive Andrića* (Belgrade, 1977), p. 28.
5. Celia Hawkesworth, *Ivo Andrić: Bridge between East and West* (London and Dover, N.H.: Athlone Press, 1984), pp. 31–41. This excellent study contains an authoritative biography of Andrić and a statement on foreign literary influences on him. Another valuable study of Andrić is Vanita Singh Mukerji, *Ivo Andrić: A Critical Biography* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1990). For a list of books read by Andrić and other followers of Young Bosnia, see Karaulac, p. 35; Predrag Palavestra, *Književnost Mlade Bosne*, vol. 1 (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1965), pp. 12, 34; Pero Slijepčević, *Napor Bosne* (Sarajevo, 1929), pp. 182–218; and Veselin Masleša, *Mlada Bosna* (Belgrade, 1945), p. 152.
6. On Andrić's meeting and discussions with Vladimir Gaćinović, a leading Bosnian revolutionary, see Karaulac, pp. 35–37.
7. J. A. R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question* (Oxford, 1940), p. 155.
8. Hamdija Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak 1882 godine* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1958), p. 17.
9. Robert J. Donia, *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Hercegovina, 1878–1914* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1981), pp. 19–20.
10. Todor Kruševac, *Sarajevo pod austro-ugarskom upravom (1878–1918)* (Sarajevo: Muzej grada Sarajeva, 1960), p. 225.
11. On various methods employed in containing Serbian nationalism and isolating Bosnia-Hercegovina from Serbia and Montenegro, including the use of special police (*Streifkorps*), see Tomislav Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1987), pp. 457–60. Kraljačić is the best study on the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Hercegovina.
12. On the legal status of Bosnia-Hercegovina, see Milorad Ekmečić, "Društvo, privreda i socijalni nemiri u Bosni i Hercegovini," in *Istorija srpskog naroda*, ed. Andrej Mitrović et al., vol. 6, p. 555 (Belgrade, 1983).
13. Donia, pp. 10–11.
14. On this debate, see Kraljačić, pp. 213–14; *Narodna Enciklopedija*, Cyrillic ed. (1928), vol. 3, pp. 665–66. (Hereafter *NE*.)
15. Donia, p. 13. For a detailed analysis of the Austro-Hungarian occupation government, see Kapidžić, pp. 24–25. Also see Ferdinand Schmid, *Bosnien und die Hercegovina unter der Verwaltung Österreich-Ungarns* (Leipzig, 1914).
16. Robin Okey, "State, Church and Nation in the Serbo-Croat Speaking Lands of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1850–1914," in *Religion, State and Ethnic Groups:*

*Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe*, ed. Donald Kerr, vol. 2, p. 75 (Dartmouth: European Science Foundation, New York University Press, 1992). Okey notes that there was much debate on the nature of "Yugoslavism" and such concepts as "political nation" and "cultural nation." For further discussion of Yugoslavism, see pp. 26–29 in the text.

17. Ratko Parežanin, *Mlada Bosna i prvi svjetski rat* (Munich, 1974), pp. 46–47; Kraljačić, pp. 298–99.

18. Donia, pp. 6–7.

19. Kraljačić, pp. 13–17; Ekmečić, "Društvo, privreda," p. 560; A. Feinfalik, *Ein neuer aktueller Weg zur Lösung der bosnischen Agrarfrage* (Vienna, 1916), p. 2; Dj. Pejanović, *Stanovništvo Bosne i Hercegovine* (Belgrade, 1955), p. 49.

20. Okey, p. 63.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 62. The Turks had allowed the Serbs to have autonomous church and school communes that were in charge of religious and educational affairs. The commune represented the people before the Turkish authorities and protected them from Greek bishops. Immediately after the occupation, Austria-Hungary proceeded to restrict the rights of the commune, while the Serbs tried to expand them, including the right to choose their own teachers (*Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, 1982, vol. 2, pp. 193–94 [hereafter *EJ*]).

22. Kraljačić, pp. 371–72.

23. *NE*, vol. 1, pp. 231–33; Kraljačić, p. 373.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 337.

25. *NE*, vol. 1, pp. 231–33; Donia, p. 18; *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina* (Vienna: K. K. Hof und Staatsdruckerei, 1906), pp. 131–32.

26. For details, see Schmid.

27. Okey, p. 55.

28. Kraljačić, pp. 309–18.

29. Donia, p. 19; Dr. Fra Berislav Gavranović, *Uspostava redovite katoličke hijerarhije u Bosni i Hercegovini 1881 godine* (Belgrade, 1935), pp. 366–67; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 190.

30. Kraljačić, p. 310. Long before he became joint minister of finance in Austria-Hungary, Kállay, statesman and historian, traveled through the Balkans studying the region. He was aware of how difficult it would be to introduce Western ways in Bosnia-Hercegovina and therefore counseled that modern practices and institutions be introduced cautiously. At the same time, he considered it of utmost importance to isolate Bosnia-Hercegovina from Serbia and Montenegro, as well as from Croatia and Dalmatia (see Kraljačić, pp. 45–429, esp. 88–295; Benjámín Kálaj: *Rusija na istoku* [Novi Sad, 1885], and Benjámín von Kállay, *Geschichte der Serben* [Vienna, 1878]; *Bošnjak*, no. 32 [10 August 1893]).

31. Gavranović, pp. 201–2.

32. Kraljačić, p. 310.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 309–33; *Donia*, pp. 56, 62, 64–67, 141.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
35. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 190.
36. Kraljačić, p. 400.
37. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, pp. 190–91.
38. *Daily Chronicle* (London), 3 October 1895.
39. *Donia*, pp. 14–15.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16.
41. Kraljačić, pp. 236–42, 280, 294; Vladimir Ćorović, *Bosna i Hercegovina* (Belgrade, 1925), p. 63; Vojislav Bogičević, *Pismenost u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo, 1975); *Donia*, pp. 50–55, 58, 79, 102.
42. *Bošnjak*, no. 45 (10 November 1898); Kraljačić, p. 227.
43. Mehmed-beg Kapetanović Ljubušak, *Šta misle Muhamedanci u Bosni* (Sarajevo, 1886), pp. 4–6; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 201.
44. Ljubušak, pp. 8, 16; Kraljačić, pp. 196–97. The quest for Muslim identity no doubt inspired studies of Muslim culture. For example, see Kosta Hörmann, *Narodne pjesme Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*, 2 vols. (Sarajevo, 1888, 1889). On Muslim ethnicity, see Atif Purivatra, *Nacionalni i politički razvitak Muslimana* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1969); Muhamed Hadžijahić, *Od tradicije do identiteta: Geneza nacionalnog pitanja bosanskih Muslimana* (Sarajevo, 1924), p. 101.
45. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 201.
46. On the survival of the Ottoman feudal land tenure system and attempts at land reform, see *Donia*. For an excellent survey of the history of the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Hercegovina, see Ekmečić, “Društvo, privreda,” pp. 555–603, and “Nacionalni pokret u Bosni i Hercegovini,” in Mitrović et al., eds., pp. 604–48; Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak*, pp. 36–47. See also William Lockwood, *European Moslems: Economy and Ethnicity in Western Bosnia* (New York: Academic Press, 1975), and Priscilla Gonsalves, “A Study of the Habsburg Agricultural Programmes in Bosanska Krajina, 1878–1914,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 63, 3: 349–71.
47. Ekmečić, “Društvo, privreda,” p. 594. To improve agriculture and weaken the Serb hold in some areas, by 1911 twenty German colonies had been planted in exclusively Serbian districts (see Ekmečić, “Društvo, privreda,” pp. 562–63). There were also colonies of Poles, Ruthenes, Czechs, Slovaks, Italians, and Magyars, totaling 52,504 colonists in 1911 (*EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, p. 65).
48. Ekmečić, “Društvo, privreda,” p. 594.
49. *Donia*, p. 179.
50. Kruševac, p. 365; Ekmečić, “Društvo, privreda,” pp. 558.
51. On the industrialization of Bosnia, see Peter F. Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia and Hercegovina* (Seattle: University of Washington, 1963); K. Hrelja, *Industrija Bosne i Hercegovine do kraja prvog svjetskog rata* (Belgrade, 1961).

52. Ekmečić, "Društvo, privreda," pp. 566, 576.
53. Kruševac, p. 394.
54. From 1878 to 1914 approximately 180,000 Muslims, 140,000 Serbs, and a smaller number of Croats emigrated abroad (Ekmečić, "Društvo, privreda," p. 562).
55. Kruševac, p. 394.
56. Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2d ed. (London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 113–14; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, pp. 316–17.
57. Kraljačić, p. 249; *EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, p. 65; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 66. According to Kruševac (p. 394), there were only seven rüşdiye schools in Bosnia.
58. Arabica was also known as *aljamiado*, *bosančica*, *bosanica*, and *al-agamiyya* (*EJ*, 1955, vol. 1, pp. 144–45; *EJ*, 1980, vol. 1, pp. 222–23). The first modern press in Bosnia, called *Vilajetska štamparija*, was founded in Sarajevo (1866) (Kruševac, p. 420).
59. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 319.
60. *EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, p. 64.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
62. Kraljačić, pp. 264–72.
63. *EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, p. 64; Kruševac, p. 396. The language of instruction was often also called Bosnian (*bosanski*), Croatian, Serbian, Croato-Serbian, Serbo-Croatian, and the language of the province (*zemaljski jezik*). For additional information on the language question, see Kraljačić, pp. 230–64.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 201–3.
65. The Muslims had ample medresas for training Muslim teachers and judges. Muslims could go to a number of centers of learning in the Ottoman Empire for advanced education. Franciscan monasteries were able to train a sufficient number of Catholic priests, some of whom went abroad for further religious studies in Hungary, Italy, and elsewhere. A Jesuit school of religion was founded in Travnik in 1882. In that same year a Muslim *şeriat* (legal school) was founded in Sarajevo. In 1882, with Austro-Hungarian assistance, the Serbs acquired a seminary (*bogoslovija*). First established in Sarajevo, it was moved to Reljevo before being returned to Sarajevo after World War I.
66. Mitar Papić, *Istorija srpskih škola u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo, 1978), pp. 173–76; *EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, pp. 64–65; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 317.
67. Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak*, pp. 61–63; *EJ*, 1956, vol. 2, p. 64.
68. Mitar Papić, *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme austro-ugarske vladavine, 1878–1918* (Sarajevo, 1972), pp. 46–47.
69. Kraljačić, p. 249.
70. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 317.
71. Sćepan Grdjić, "Prosvjetne borbe," *Napor Bosne i Hercegovine za oslobodjenje i ujedinjenje* (Sarajevo, 1929); cited in Kraljačić, p. 248.

72. Hamdija Kapidžić, *Bosna i Hercegovina u vrijeme austro-ugarske vladavine* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1968), pp. 372–77.
73. Ćorović, pp. 144–47. To inform the wider scholarly world about its work, a special periodical was published containing selected studies: *Wissenschaftliche Mittheilungen aus Bosnia und der Hercegovina (1893–1916)*, 13 vols.
74. It published *Zur Kunde der Balkanhalbinsel* (1904–1918), 23 issues.
75. Risto Besarović, *Iz kulturne i političke istorije Bosne i Hercegovine* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1966), pp. 9–13. It was argued that scholarly and scientific organizations and meetings were needed for the promotion of the “national ideology” and Austro-Hungarian “state idea” (see Kraljačić, p. 272).
76. Two-thirds of the province’s civil servants were from outside Bosnia-Hercegovina. Some of these civil servants made important contributions to the study and promotion of Bosnian history and culture. One of these was Hungarian historian Ludwig (Lajos) Thallóczy, a student of the ancient Illyrians, medieval Hungary, Bosnia, Dubrovnik, and Serbia. He was in charge of educational and cultural affairs of Bosnia and Hercegovina in the joint Ministry of Finance. One purpose of his research was to establish the origins of Bosnia and Bosnians in line with the official policy (Kraljačić, pp. 252–56, 267–72).
77. Besarović, pp. 9–13. On international meetings in sciences and arts in Bosnia and Hercegovina, funding of specific meetings, and names of recipients of awards given at these meetings, see pp. 9–10. For a list of periodicals and newspapers on religious, political, and cultural topics, see pp. 18–19; Kraljačić, p. 163. Kraševac, 420. Djordje Pejanović, *Štampa u Bosnia i Hercegovina* (Sarajevo, 1949), 26.
78. *Ibid.*, pp. 147, 161. In 1895 the Party of Right had split into two groups: radical Croatian nationalist Josip Frank’s wing, called Pure Party of Right (Čista Stranka Prava), and the group gathered around the newspaper *Croatian Homeland* (Hrvatska domovina). The former was anti-Serb, and the latter group cooperated with the Serbs and fostered South Slavic unity. This party later fused with the followers of Bishop Juraj Strossmayer, the principal proponent of Yugoslavism, in 1903 (Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia* [Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1984], p. 96).
79. Kraljačić, p. 161; Donia, p. 50.
80. These societies were Prosvjeta (Serbian, founded in 1902), Napredak (Croatian, founded in 1902), and Gajret (Muslim, founded in 1903).
81. Many journals appeared for a brief period, and often the same familiar names of prominent men returned as editors. Some journals were privately owned and others state-subsidized. Among the better known journals were *Musavat* (Equality); *Rehber* (Guide); *Bošnjak*; *Behar* (Blossom—a Muslim journal printed in Serbo-Croatian, Latin script, and Turkish); *Zora* (Dawn—a literary journal whose contributors included prominent Serbian writers); and the Austrian-subsidized literary journal *Nada* (Hope), published in Sarajevo in both Latin and Cyrillic scripts, with Konstantin Hörmann and Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević as the editors.

82. Mitar Papić, "Bosanska vila," *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 99.

83. Karaulac, p. 31.

84. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 201.

85. Kruševac, p. 351; *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, pp. 201–2.

86. Kruševac, p. 351. Ćemalović succeeded Djikić as leader of the Serbian Muslims and on 1 September 1912 founded *Srpska omladina*, whose purpose was to bring together all student societies and develop Serbian national consciousness among Muslims. Djikić, one-time secretary of Gajret, visited Belgrade with a group of Muslims who considered themselves to be "Serbs" (Dragoslav Ljubibratić, *Vladimir Gaćinović* [Belgrade, 1961], p. 95).

87. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 202.

88. *Ibid.*

89. *Ibid.*

90. Kruševac, p. 367.

91. On Austro-Serbian relations, also see Dimitrije Djordjević, *Carinski rat austro-ugarske i Srbije, 1906–1911* (Belgrade: Istoriski institut, 1962), and Wayne S. Vucinich, *Serbia between East and West: The Events of 1903–1908* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954).

92. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 192. Austria-Hungary took advantage of the Young Turk revolution to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina in accordance with an agreement reached at Buchlau in Moravia on 15 September 1908 between the foreign ministers of Austria-Hungary and Russia. This agreement permitted Austria-Hungary to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina in return for Austria's willingness to allow the opening of the straits to the Russian navy. While Russia's foreign minister was seeking the consent of other European powers to the opening of the straits, Austria-Hungary, to his embarrassment, announced the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina on 7 October, as discussed below.

93. Oscar Jászi, *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* (Chicago and London: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 116.

94. Robert A. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1526–1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), pp. 447–48. For a first-rate study of Croatian nationalism and the nationalisms of the other Yugoslav peoples, see Banac; Dragoslav Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna i sarajevski atentat* (Sarajevo: Muzej grada Sarajeva, 1964), p. 96.

95. Kruševac, p. 348.

96. *Ibid.*, pp. 348–49; *Sarajevski list*, no. 143 (29 November 1908).

97. *Sarajevski list*, 11 November 1908, p. 347.

98. Kruševac, pp. 346–48.

99. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 192.

100. Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, pp. 30–31.

101. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 192.

102. Kruševac, pp. 350–51.
103. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 192.
104. Ekmečić, “Nacionalni pokret,” p. 639.
105. *Ibid.*, pp. 638–39.
106. Kruševac, pp. 356–57.
107. Ekmečić, “Nacionalni pokret,” p. 639.
108. Kruševac, pp. 353–61.
109. Kann, p. 446.
110. Fuad Slipičević, *Istorija naroda Federativne Narodne Republike Jugoslavije* (Sarajevo, 1954), pp. 224–25.
111. Kruševac, p. 372.
112. *EJ*, 1982, vol. 2, p. 202.
113. Kruševac, p. 419; Vojislav Bogićević, *Mlada Bosna: Pisma i prilozi* (Sarajevo, 1954), p. 449; Okey, p. 75.
114. Bogićević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 9.
115. Many young Bosnians who visited or studied in Belgrade were in contact with men who had joined irregular military formations and volunteers (*komiti, tadji, četniks*) and fought against the Turks and others in Macedonia and Old Serbia; they also worked with the members of the Serbian patriotic organizations called Slavic South (Slovenski Jug), National Defense (Narodna Odbrana), and Union or Death (Ujedinjenje ili Smrt), or Black Hand, as it was known popularly. The young Bosnians were particularly inspired and guided by Ljuba Jovanović-Čupa, the editor of *Piedmont* (Pijemont, 1911–15), and Jovan Skerlić, who became the symbol of liberation to many young Bosnian admirers. Vladimir Gaćinović, the ideologue of Young Bosnia, visited Serbia a number of times, finished gymnasium in Belgrade, had some training in the use of arms, and was initiated into Union or Death. On contacts between the Bosnians and Serbs, see also David MacKenzie, *Apis: A Congenial Conspirator. The Life of Colonel Dragutin T. Dimitrijević* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); East European Monographs.
116. Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, pp. 113–14.
117. Slijepčević, pp. 192–93.
118. It is difficult to ascertain the precise name of the organization. Sometimes it appears as the Serb-Croat Progressive Organization and other times as the Serb-Croat Progressive Youth.
119. Bogićević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 10; Karaulac, pp. 38–39.
120. Bogićević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 13.
121. Vladimir Dedijer, *The Road to Sarajevo* (New York, 1966), p. 216.
122. Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 97.
123. Bogićević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 12.



124. On Young Croatia, see Banac, pp. 99–101. In the years immediately before World War I the most passionate Yugoslav leaders among the youth were Augustin Ujević, Krešimir Kovačić, and Vladimir Čerina, editor of *Val* and Andrić's close friend.
125. Tin Ujević, "Vladimir Gaćinović," *Jugoslavenska njiva*, no. 44–45 (Zagreb, 1921). Gaćinović's revolutionary career sheds light on almost the entire period of Bosnian revolutionary activity. For additional information on Gaćinović and the progressives, see Dragoslav Ljubibratić: *Gavrilo Princip* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1959), pp. 126–29, and *Vladimir Gaćinović*, pp. 129–30.
126. Masleša (1964 ed.), pp. 115–16.
127. Jászi, p. 122.
128. Ljubibratić, *Gavrilo Princip*, pp. 94–99, 134–39.
129. Karaulac, pp. 33–41. For background, see Kapidžić, *Bosna i Hercegovina*, pp. 155–97.
130. Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 100.
131. Karaulac, pp. 39–40; Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 100.
132. Karaulac, pp. 39–41.
133. Cited in Ljubibratić, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 97; Dedijer, p. 261; Bogičević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 135.
134. Karaulac, p. 41.
135. Bogičević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 11.
136. Karaulac, p. 40.
137. Bogičević, *Mlada Bosna*, p. 11.
138. *Ibid.*, pp. 414–47.
139. Slijepčević, pp. 184–85. Especially Ivan Endlicher, who participated in the Croat Youth Movement and supported terrorism (Ljubibratić, *Vladimir Gaćinović*, p. 98).
140. Wayne S. Vucinich, "Mlada Bosna," in *The Habsburg Empire in World War I*, ed. Robert A. Kann et al., pp. 50–55 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977).
141. Masleša, p. 158.
142. Dedijer, pp. 235, 311.
143. The political leaders of the South Slavs in Bosnia-Hercegovina and some university and secondary school pupils objected to the nationalist platform. The weekly *Serbian Youth* (Srpska omladina), founded in September 1912, had a dynamic beginning but survived only a year. The journal was owned by Smail-aga Čemalović, whose objective was to instill Muslims with Serbian consciousness. More and more, Serbian exclusivists became national federalists. Even *Serbian Youth* assumed the nationalist cause and dropped from its title the adjective "Serbian" (Ljubibratić, *Gavrilo Princip*, p. 148; Dedijer, pp. 215–16).

144. Nikola Babić, "Osvrt na mjesto i ulogu Mlade Bosne u istoriji naroda Bosne i Hercegovine," *Pregled*, June–August 1974, p. 717.
145. One or two others were also highly thought of (see Borivoje Jevtić, "Miloš Vidaković—Jedan od pesnika Mlade Bosne," *Srpski književni glasnik*, no. 5, 1940, pp. 245ff.; Dejan Djuričković, "Pjesnici Mlade Bosne," *Pregled*, July–August 1974, p. 824.
146. *Bosanska vila*, nos. 18 and 20, 1911.
147. Hawkesworth, p. 50.
148. Milan Bogdanović, "Andrić, Ivo," *EJ*, 1955, vol. 1, p. 107; Karaulac, pp. 47, 50–53.
149. Milorad Živančević, "Ivo Andrić u Poljskoj," *Letopis Matice srpske*, vol. 4 (Novi Sad, 1962), pp. 362–63; Karulac, pp. 54–62.
150. Hawkesworth, p. 14.
151. Palavestra, vol. 1, p. 205; Ljubo Wiesner, ed., *Hrvatska mlada lirika* (Zagreb, 1914), p. 147. Andrić is described as being sensitive, delicate, fragile, brief in his creations, and a promising writer (Hawkesworth, p. 15).
152. N. Andrić, pp. 29–30.
153. Karaulac, pp. 70–71. See also A. Tresić-Pavičić, *Govori i pisma iz ere užasa i oslobođenja* (Belgrade, 1922), p. 34.
154. Hawkesworth, p. 16.
155. Karaulac, pp. 72–75.
156. *Ibid.*, pp. 76–81.
157. *Ibid.*, pp. 82–84.
158. N. Andrić, p. 30; Želimir B. Juričić and John F. Loud, eds. and trans., *The Development of Spiritual Life in Bosnia under the Influence of Turkish Rule* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1990), p. viii.
159. Karaulac, pp. 93–95.
160. *Ibid.*, pp. 171–72; Dragoljub Vlatković, "Iz diplomatskog službovanja Ive Andrića," *Zbornik Matice srpske književnost i jezik* 23, 2 (Novi Sad, 1975).
161. Hawkesworth, p. 18, citing Radovan Popović, *Životopis delatnost i dokument* (Belgrade: Ivo Andrić Foundation, 1980), p. 74.
162. Andrić sent letters to Alaupović and friends in Belgrade; see Želimir B. Juričić, *Ivo Andrić u Berlinu*, trans. Ivo Šoljan (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1989), pp. 11–12. Juričić's objective was to investigate, on the basis of archival materials, Andrić's period of service in Berlin from 1939 to 1941. See letter from Andrić to Alaupović in Juričić and Loud, eds., p. viii.
163. Karaulac, pp. 97–98.
164. *Ibid.*, pp. 98–99.
165. These include "Ćorkan and the German Girl" (Ćorkan i švabica, 1921), "In the Camp" (Za logoravanja, 1922), "Love in the Kasaba" (Ljubav u kasabi,

1923), "In the Guest House" (U musafirhani, 1923), "The Rzav Hills" (Rzavski bregovi, 1924), and "The Pasha's Concubine" (Mara milosnica, 1925).

166. Vlatković.

167. Juričić, pp. 18–20, and Juričić and Loud, eds., p. x.

168. Juričić, pp. 18–20.

169. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

170. *Ibid.*, pp. 24–26.

171. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

172. Because of a paucity of sources, Andrić's political and personal lives remain yet to be systematically investigated. The main problem here is that Andrić did not keep a diary or write his memoirs. Recently an article appeared on Andrić's critical view of fascism, as well as a revealing book that tells of Andrić's unhappy diplomatic service in Berlin and bitterness toward his government in Belgrade for circumventing him in discussions with Germany preparatory to joining the Tripartite Pact. His literary works, however, best reflect his character and political ideology. See Miodrag Kujundžić, "Prvi koraci velikog zla," *Dnevnik*, 17 August 1992, p. 3. The article is written in parts appearing in several issues. Also see Juričić, pp. 8, 27, 221.

173. N. Andrić, pp. 35–36.

174. Some of those on whom Andrić wrote essays since 1919 are Bolivar, Goya, Petrarch, Njegoš, Karadžić, Kočić, Gorky, Francis of Assisi, Preradović, Skerlić, and Whitman.

175. For a comprehensive listing of honors and awards received by Andrić, see N. Andrić, pp. 36–37.

176. *Ivo Andrić, 1892–1992* (Belgrade: Ivo Andrić Foundation, 1991), p. 20.

177. David Binder, "A Bosnian Movie Maker Laments the Death of the Yugoslav Nation," *New York Times*, 25 October 1992, p. E7.

## IVO ANDRIĆ'S SHORT STORIES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SOUTH SLAVIC PROSE TRADITION

Thomas Eekman

In the United States and Western Europe, Ivo Andrić is considered a representative of Bosnian literature, a painter of historical Bosnian life—and to many people he is even *the* representative of Yugoslav—i.e., South Slavic—literature and culture. This unique position can in no way be denied him, and his uniqueness has been demonstrated, studied, and corroborated in numerous articles, essays, and books. In this contribution I would like to draw attention to his position within the traditions and trends of South Slavic prose writing—his niche in the literary currents of this part of Europe, especially as far as the short story is concerned.

The short story as a literary form and genre has always been the paramount type of prose among the South Slavs, much more so than the novel or any other genre. The critic Jovan Skerlić (1877–1914) called the short story “the national genre of Serbian literature,” and that could be said of Croatian, Bosnian, Slovene, or Bulgarian literature as well. Only since World War II has the novel made great strides in all the six South Slavic literatures we may distinguish, and Andrić probably contributed a great deal to that development with his novels, which, published immediately after the war, engendered such prestige and publicity.

Andrić wrote a respectable number of short stories in the period between the two world wars and shortly thereafter—106 of them all told in the latest edition of his works. With them he won wide recognition in interwar Yugoslavia among critics and the public alike. But it should be emphasized that in all the South Slavic lands there were good and successful story writers, building on a rich tradition; Andrić was *primus inter pares*, even though it may be true that, as the Serbian critic Petar Džadžić wrote, Andrić is “perhaps the first poet of human fate in our short story.”

Among Andrić's older contemporaries, still going strong in the 1920s and some in the 1930s—the period when Andrić made his career—were (to mention just a few) Borisav Stanković and Isidora Sekulić in Serbia; Milan Begović and Vladimir Nazor in Croatia; Fran Finžgar and Alojz Kraigher in Slovenia; and Elin Pelin, Jordan Iovkov, and Georgi Raichev in Bulgaria. They all emerged from the nineteenth-century school of prose writing, realistic in style, ethnographic and predominantly rural in its settings and contents. They did not write exclusively “rural” prose; Begovic, for example, was an author from and writing about the city; Stanković and Sekulić depicted mostly small town milieus, and the Bulgarians too would occasionally turn to urban themes. However, the rural setting was still very strongly present in all these literatures. There were rural stories by Pelin, Iovkov, Angel Karaličev, and other contemporary authors in Bulgarian literature; peasant and small town stories by Finžgar, France Bevk, and Juš Kozak (who was born in the same year as Andrić) in Slovenia; by Slavko Kolar and Dinko Šimunović in Croatia, and by Ivo Ćipiko, who was a Serbianized Dalmatian. Peasant stories have their roots in the earliest beginnings of each of these national literatures and are inspired and nourished by the oral folk-tale. And Andrić fits very well here: at least ten of his stories entirely and two partly take place in the village among peasant men and women (e.g., “Veletovci” [The people from Veletovo], “Olujaci” [The village Olujaci], and “Kosa” [The scythe] in the former category and “Lov na tetreba” [Black cock hunting, which could be characterized as a Chekhovian story] and “Zmija” [The snake] in the latter). When we range Andrić among the authors on rural themes, we place him in a long and fruitful tradition that is still alive, as is evidenced by such writers as Ćamil Sijarić, the painter of the Sandžak region and its Muslim peasants, and the popular Bulgarian Nikolai Khaitov.

The rural setting, natural in these traditionally agrarian countries, is only part of the broad stream of realistic literature that has been pouring forth since the 1880s and is still continuing—from Milovan Glišić, Fran Levstik, and Ante Kovačić to Aleksandar Tišma and Slobodan Novak in our time. Ivo Andrić occupies a prominent place among the South Slavic realists, with his novels and with stories like “Ćilim” (The rug), “Bife Titanik” (The bar Titanic), “Razaranje” (Destruction), “Zeko” (Bunny), and “Na drugi dan Božića” (The day after Christmas). It is not hard to find short stories with

different themes and plots but a similar method of description and narration in the works of (for example) Josip Kosor and Josip Kozarac in Croatia or Iovkov and Karaliichev in Bulgaria. The psychological realism in Andrić's stories from an urban, "bourgeois" milieu (like, for example, "Porodična slika" [Family portrait], "Zeko," or even the novel *Gospodjica* [The woman from Sarajevo]) can be juxtaposed with stories and novellas by such late nineteenth-century authors as Kozarac, Sima Matavulj, and Todor Vlaikov and contemporaries such as Branimir Ćosić and Vladan Desnica. Andrić's prose has been compared by Bulgarian critics to that of the Bulgarian realist-novelist Emiliiian Stanev (1907–79).<sup>1</sup> In this connection I might mention the story "Brak gospodina načelnika" (The marriage of Mr. Chief), by another Bosnian, Sead Fatihagić (born 1935), predominantly a short story writer. In it he depicts a "softy," a henpecked husband dominated by a formidable wife—very much like Andrić's Zeko.

Andrić's fame, nationally and internationally, rests largely upon his stories and novels about old Bosnia, in a sometimes specific, often not specified, period of Bosnian history, usually in the nineteenth or early twentieth century, in a few cases in a more remote past. In this prose he evokes a half oriental and somewhat mysterious, sometimes even sultry atmosphere that is considered typically Andrićian, an ambience in which dark passions bubble under the surface and violence may suddenly erupt. In an essay by Isidora Sekulić in 1923, this oriental character is discussed for the first time.<sup>2</sup> This Bosnian setting and atmosphere is not exclusively Andrićian. A Bosnian-Herzegovinian literary tradition had developed in the course of the nineteenth century, mainly in centers like Sarajevo and Mostar. (Similar literary activity can be observed at that time in other larger Balkan administrative, economic, and cultural centers.) However, there is no doubt that Andrić was the one who lifted it out of its limited regional confines to an international height.

The first storyteller from Bosnia and about Bosnia was Petar Kočić, whose stories appeared in the first fifteen years of this century (he died in 1916, not yet forty years old). Many of his works were politically inspired, anti-Austrian, and satirical. Yet he focuses, like Andrić, on the warm-blooded, temperamental Bosnian people, their poverty, and the political oppression under which they lived, as well as their life in harmony with nature. Kočić has a series of stories about a Simeun Djak and the tall tales he tells in a monastery yard

while he and a few other men—among them the abbot (*iguman*) of the monastery—are attending the distilling of *rakija*. The scene reminds us of Andrić's story "Kod kazana" (By the brandy still). In both cases, a Turk appears at the fire, only Kočić does not finish his story as dramatically as does Andrić, who lets the Turk kill the main character, Fra Marko. And Kočić's heroine Mrguda (from the eponymous story) with her fiery temperament and stubbornness brings to mind Andrićian female characters like Anika from "Anikina vremena" (Anika's times) and the women in "Napast" (Ill fortune), "Kod kazana," and others. However, although some parallels can be drawn and both writers may be designated as realists, there is quite a difference between Kočić and Andrić in the style, "message," and atmosphere of their works.

Closer to Andrić are two contemporaries from Bosnia, Hamza Humo and Isak Samokovlija. The former, a native of Mostar (Hercegovina) and a Muslim, was—like Andrić—arrested and interned as a young man at the beginning of World War I. He too started his career as a poet, then shifted to short stories, but apart from one short novel, he never ventured out of the short story genre. In most of his works Humo paints the Islamic world of Bosnia-Hercegovina—*hadžis* and *hodžas*, *muftijas* and *agas*, and the simple people in the *kasaba*. In his attitude toward the world of Muslim monks and clergy one detects at times a slightly mocking, ironic tone, similar to the tone in Andrić's stories about Catholic monks. (I do not mean a derisive, but a benignly smiling attitude.) Humo writes in a racy, eloquent style. At times he has an epic tone, and he evokes a somewhat sultry, voluptuous, erotic atmosphere similar to that of at least some of Andrić's Bosnian stories. I am referring to stories like "Džigit" (Horsemanship), "Sevdalijina ljubav" (Sevdalija's love), and "Ašikovanje" (Courting). Like Andrić, Humo turned to a more realistic manner of writing and to other, nonregional themes in his later work; also like Andrić, he wrote some pro-partisan stories that came out immediately after World War II.

Samokovlija was the painter of Jewish life in Bosnia (in particular that of the poor Jews), an author of short stories and plays, and a gifted storyteller; realistic, he does not indulge in lyrical or rhetorical expatiations. His first story, "Rafina avlija" (Rafo's courtyard), depicts the life and death of a destitute Jew, a beggar, Rafo, who bears some resemblance to Andrić's Ibro Solak in "Snopići" (Bunches), but

he is even more pitiful. Much later he created a similar hero from the world of the underprivileged in Sarajevo, "Nosačc Samuel" (The porter Samuel). One of Samokovlija's best known stories, "Hanka," is an exception—not about Jews, but about a gypsy girl; it could almost be one of Andrić's tales, relating the tragic life story of a girl in old Bosnia.

Some other writers have also staged their stories mainly in Bosnia. Chronologically the first is Hasan Kikić (1905–42), from an Islamic background in the Posavina in northern Bosnia. In a large part of his oeuvre (consisting of short stories and novels) he displays a somewhat pretentious, expressive, and partly expressionistic style and an inclination toward romantic folklore; thematically much of what he wrote takes place during World War I, and most of it is set among the rural Bosnian Muslim population. As a writer, Kikić is different from Andrić. Closer to him is Novak Simić (1906–81), who during the interwar period was an exponent of the so-called "social literature." Politically leftist, Simić was from the Catholic segment of the Bosnian population (like Andrić) but later settled in Zagreb and became part of the Croatian literary establishment, whereas Andrić went to Belgrade and opted for the Serbian literary establishment.

Not all of Simić's works (among them several novels) are enacted in Bosnia, but the older and best known works take us back to the author's childhood and youth there. In these largely autobiographical stories we often find an atmosphere and thematic orientation reminiscent of Andrić. Among his heroes there is much unrequited love, a melancholy mood, and an element of oriental fatalism. Most of his writings have erotic undertones or overtones. Simić reminds us of Andrić with his occasional gnomic utterances. For example:

silom prilika; onim nenaslućenim koje nas često navede na nešto što nismo nikako željeli i od čega, evo, na sve moguće načine bježimo i uklanjamo mu se, a to što ga zovemo slučaj ili sudbina postavi nas licem u lice: iznenadnim zavijutkom puta.

(by the force of circumstances; what we call accident or fate, at an unexpected turn of the road, puts us face to face with that unsuspected force that often induces us to do something we had never wanted to do and that we, as a matter of fact, try to avoid and shun at all costs.)<sup>3</sup>



Simić, like Andrić, started out as a poet, as did Humo and Samokovlija. This poetical start, soon followed by a total dedication to prose, seems to be a fairly common pattern.

An important writer from Bosnia, considered by some second only to Andrić, is Meša Selimović (1910–82). His early prose, published in the 1950s and early 1960s, did not draw very much attention, but he became famous with his 1966 novel *Derviš i smrt* (The dervish and death). The dervish-hero lives in Sarajevo in the eighteenth century; however, his life and peripeteia are less absorbing than the views he expresses on life and the world, society, and the individual; they are expounded in the form of a personal confession in which, as Jovan Deretić put it, “ancient wisdom is combined with modern unrest of the mind.”<sup>4</sup> Notably, it is the inevitability of suffering and fear that haunts the dervish, and in that respect we might draw parallels with various personages in Andrić’s work: consul Daville in *Travnička hronika* (Bosnian chronicle); gazda-Jevrem in “Nemirna godina” (A turbulent year) and his thoughts about the transitoriness of beauty and human life; Alidede in “Smrt u Sinanovoj tekiji” (Death in Sinan’s Monastery);\* and the consul-general in “Na drugi dan Božića,” whom “fear and shuddering do not leave.”<sup>5</sup> There is also the main character and title hero of “Djordje Djordjević,” in whom “All caution, all considerations and anxieties coalesced into one single big . . . fear. Fear of changes in the weather, of bacteria, of pickpockets, of burglary, bad encounters, wrong steps or even an incautiously uttered word.”<sup>6</sup> Zeko, in the story of that name, is also worried: in the tense situation of war and occupation, he feels fear, “not so much of the police and the responsibilities he had taken, but fear because of the unusualness of his actions, of his movements and changes.”<sup>7</sup> Later, in notes collected in *Znakovi pored puta* (Signs by the roadside), Andrić wrote:

From conversations with people one can clearly see, or notice shamefully, how much everybody suffers, worries, and is alarmed. Fear is everywhere and insomnia generic. Few people know what they are afraid of, and in most cases the apprehension is unjustified or exaggerated, but nonetheless, people walk around with a haggard look, they choose back streets, at night they tremble before they finally fall asleep.<sup>8</sup>

\*Also cited in this volume as “Death in Sinan’s Tekke.”

For the Bosnian writers after Andrić, we point to Ćamil Sijarić, slightly younger than Selimović. Born in 1913—not in Bosnia, but in the Sandzak area—he lived and worked for a large part of his life in Sarajevo and is claimed by the Bosnian literati as one of theirs. Like Humo and Selimović, in a great number of short stories and novels Sijarić mainly painted the Muslim milieu from which he originated. Again, the setting of his works, the general climate, and even the style remind us of Andrić's Bosnian works. His language is, in the words of Slavko Leovac, "stylized à la Andrić."<sup>9</sup> Like Andrić, he does not aim at presenting a realistic picture of the world he evokes, but hints at the mysteriousness of that world—an essence that we can only surmise or feel but not fathom. His images, portraits, figures of speech, symbols, comparisons, metaphors, and expressions of gnomic wisdom are at times no less striking than those in Andrić's work. Here and there, Sijarić evokes the sensual, erotic atmosphere that we find in some of Andrić's stories (see, for example, Sijarić's "Kad djevojka spava, to je kao da mirišu jabuke" [When a girl sleeps, it is as if the apples smell] and "Udovica" [The widow]). The following sentence from a story by Sijarić could have come from Andrić's pen:

It is not important whether what is being told is true, so that it teaches us, or whether it is thought up, so that it amuses us; what is important is that, listening to stories and telling them, we live twice.<sup>10</sup>

Branko Ćopić (1915–78) must be left out of consideration here. He is another great Bosnian storyteller, novelist, and dramatist, also a poet initially, extremely productive and popular throughout Yugoslavia in his time. However, being primarily a humorist and satirist, he differs widely from Andrić, with whom he can be compared only in the geographical sense as a painter of the same landscape, dealing with the same nation, and of course writing in the same language.

More similarity to Andrić may be found in the work of Derviš Sušić (born 1925), a Bosnian prose writer and at least as much a dramatist and author of film scenarios. His novels and short stories often deal with World War II, but also with various older periods of Bosnian history. Sušić is a successor to Andrić in his lively and detailed reproduction of the Bosnian past—the distant past in his novel *Uhode* (Spies), the Austrian period in *Hodža Strah* (Hodzha Fear), and other works. There are pages in the latter novel which could have

come out of *Na Drini ćuprija* (The bridge on the Drina) or one of Andrić's Bosnian stories. But more often Sušić's style is different, less quiet, less restrained than Andrić's, more ebullient, with a great deal of lively dialogue and stylistic or graphic devices (for example, putting a series of single words [nouns] or short, elliptical sentences each on a separate line). In his impassioned manner Sušić offers detailed descriptions of battles, which Andrić seems to avoid, and cruel, bloody scenes. He is also more crude and unrestrained in his word usage than Andrić.

Thus far we have focused on the younger contemporaries of Ivo Andrić among the Bosnian writers, who to a certain extent followed him in their treatment of Bosnian themes. But similar themes—notably from the Turkish past on the Balkan peninsula—were tackled by some others. Milorad Pavić, for example (born 1929), one of the most prominent Serbian literati, in a short story, "Borba petlova" (Cock fighting), deals with the Turkish recapture of Belgrade in 1739 after more than twenty years of "German" (i.e., Habsburg) occupation. The story, replete with old wisdom, old habits, and old ways of thinking, is reminiscent of Andrić's Bosnian works, even though Pavić's story is longer and more detailed than most of Andrić's. In particular, there is a certain similarity to "Most na Žepi" (The bridge on the Žepa); not a bridge, but two towers are constructed by order of the Turkish commandant.

When we look across the eastern border, we note that in the 1920s, when Andrić wrote his early Bosnian stories, the Bulgarian Elin Pelin (1878–1949) was at the height of his creative power. Among his stories of this period is "Izkushenie" (The seduction), the story of a priest and a sexton. The priest loves to drink, and he has finished all the wine destined for the eucharist; fortunately for him, the sexton manages to find a bottle of wine in the house of one of the villagers; the priest drinks from it during the service. The situation and the characters bring similar stories by Andrić to mind, in particular his monks' stories. In another story, "Napast bozhia" (God's punishment), a Bulgarian village is struck first by a deadly infectious disease, then by drought—one calamity after the other, realistically depicted by Pelin. The priest leads church services and prays but cannot do much more. The local schoolteacher, however, closes the well, which he considers the source of the epidemic; the priest is against it and protests. The struggle between the teacher and the priest ends

in favor of the former when the villagers turn away from the church because God has not shown his benevolence. The scene is somewhat reminiscent of episodes in *Na Drini ćuprija* where people try to sabotage the work on the bridge.

Jordan Iovkov (1880–1937), another foremost Bulgarian storyteller in the early decades of this century, wrote *Staroplaninski legendi*, a collection of short stories which take place in the times of Turkish domination, of oppression and cruelty, of *hajduci* and robbers. “Nai-viarnata strazha” (The most faithful guard) from this collection is about a monastery which is being destroyed by a Tatar sultan (not a Turkish one in this case), hadzhi Emin. One of the monks, Dragota, is in love with the daughter of the village head and takes her to the ruins of the monastery, where they spend the night. But a fire breaks out in which Dragota perishes. Emin forces the girl to become his bride. The setting, the characters, the events, and even the style—all have much in common with a large part of Andrić’s works. In a cycle of stories by Iovkov called *Večeri v Antimovskiia khan* (Evenings in the Antimov Tavern), from the same years, a tavern is the central meeting place, the hub of most of the stories. It reminds one of the beginning of Andrić’s story “Put Alije Djerzeleza” (The journey of Alia Djerzelez), with the subtitle “Djerzelez u hanu” (Djerzelez in the tavern).<sup>11</sup>

A younger Bulgarian prose writer, Angel Karaliichev (1902–72), wrote modernistic stories in his early career that have little in common with Andrić’s prose. However, among his later very abundant oeuvre there are village stories in the traditional realistic style (he even produced stories in a socialist-realist vein), as well as fairy tales, fantastic stories, and tales from Bulgaria’s past. Among these is, for example, “Khan Tatar” (The Tatar ruler), a story that, *mutatis mutandis*, by replacing the Tatars with Turks, could have been one of Andrić’s stories. It tells us about a young woman who escapes with her child from a brutal Tatar; later she drowns herself and the child. (According to the legend, up to this day sometimes during the night a young woman can be seen at the site, carrying a dead child in her arms.) In the works of Karaliichev there are more such points of agreement with the spirit of Andrić’s stories. The same is true of those by Nikolai Rainov (1889–1954).

Thus far we have first explored the peasant theme in Andrić’s short stories and those of other South Slavic writers. Then we moved

to Andrić in the general context of the realistic mainstream in South Slavic prose, with particular reference to urban themes. Then we analyzed the historical and legendary Bosnian component of his work as compared to that of other South Slavic authors. A fourth theme we might pursue is Andrić's depiction of the years of war and occupation (1941–45), comparing it to a number of writers in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. However, so many authors came to prominence in the postwar period and the war theme was so abundantly present in the South Slavic literatures of those years that it would be too extensive a subtheme for this paper. Rather, let us look briefly at two other aspects of Andrić's work in a wider context—namely, the prose poem (or lyrical prose) and the unreal, fantastic element.

When I refer to Andrić's lyrical prose, I mainly have in mind his two early small volumes, *Ex Ponto* and *Nemiri* (Unrest). The idea of such contemplative texts, focusing on the author's inner world, lyrical in language and tone, was not completely new when the young Andrić wrote these books—the first while confined to his cell in Maribor (published in 1918), the second published in 1920. It has been pointed out that Kierkegaard (whose book *Either/Or* was the only one Andrić had with him during the first months of his confinement) inspired and influenced him. However, it seems likely that at least to some extent Antun Gustav Matoš (1873–1914), with his prose texts collected in the volumes *Iverje* (Shavings, 1899), *Novo iverje* (New shavings, 1900), and *Umorne priče* (Tired tales, written between 1902 and 1909), was another source of inspiration. The character and spirit of Matoš's works are not identical with Andrić's, but there are certain similarities. Andrić, under the impact of the bitter lot that had befallen him—and probably of Kierkegaard's writings—is more pessimistic than Matoš, deeply melancholic, complaining about his terrible loneliness, and also writing here for the first time about that fear and anxiety that I mentioned above—that “hair-raising, unreasonable, often totally baseless, but real, deep fear [that is] the main, the only stimulus of human action.”<sup>12</sup> Matoš, the poet, tends to use a more poetical language than Andrić, with alliterations and rhythmical passages, chiasmi, and other rhetorical figures:

O, kako pada melem na mladu mekanu dušu kad čujem . . . na prozoru zvuke zagrebačkih zvona! Vjetar donosi, vjetar odnosi te sjetne, sretne, suzne zvukove, zvukove zvona zagrebačkih.<sup>13</sup>

Andrić must have been familiar with Matoš, who at that time was a central figure in Croatian cultural life. As a fiction writer, Andrić was not a direct follower of Matoš, but the tone of Matoš's contemplative passages is related to that of *Ex Ponto* and *Nemiri*:

O, sve, sve sam ja, sve je puno mene i mojih teških kaosa. Ja sam pitanje svih pitanja. . . . O, kako je mučno čovjeku bježati od čovjeka! Jer tražim njega, i nema ga. Jer tražim dušu, i nema je. . . . Jer idem iz mraka, tapam u mraku i umirem u mraku. Mračna staza mraka u mrakove.

(O, I am everything, everything is full of me and my oppressive chaoses. I am the question of all questions. . . . Oh, how painful it is for a human being to flee from another human being! Because I am searching for him, but he is not there. Because I am searching for a soul, but it is not there. . . . Because I am walking out of the dark, groping in the dark and dying in the dark. A sinister path of darkness into the dark.)<sup>14</sup>

The young Andrić seems also at times to feel hope or, as he writes, "a streak of light . . . on which my hope is germinating."<sup>15</sup> Yet overall his text is somber; he complains that he is overcome by despair and even contemplates suicide. There are no meditative texts in the South Slavic literatures known to me that are as despairing and despondent as are these early Andrić books. (In passing, note Matoš's frequent exclamatory "O[hs]!" at the beginning of sentences, which is typical of this kind of lyrical and contemplative writing in the modernist period. It can be found in French and German modernism and was taken over by the Slavs. Andrić exclaims "O" repeatedly in his two books of meditative prose.)

In this genre, there is some similarity with Ivan Cankar's lyrical prose in Slovenia—for example, his prose poem "Večerne sence" (Evening shadows) and some of his *Vinjete* (Vignettes, written in 1897–99), such as "Mrtvi nočejo" (In the dead of night), manifesting a mood similar to Andrić's. Whereas it is more than plausible that Andrić knew Matoš's work, it is doubtful that he read Cankar; therefore, a direct influence seems improbable. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the greatest Slovene writer of modern times and the greatest twentieth-century writer in Serbo-Croatian have certain traits in common and have worked in the same genre. In this context,

we might also compare the lyrical prose of Isidora Sekulić (1877–1958) in Serbian literature. I will not dwell on her works in detail here, but consider a few individual sketches in her first book, *Saputnici* (Fellow travelers, 1913): “Samoća” (Loneliness), “Nostalgija,” “Umor” (Tiredness), “Tuga” (Sorrow), “Mučenje” (Torment). Even closer to Andrić in age and in the character of his work was Miloš Crnjanski (1893–1977), whose *Dnevnik o Čarnojeviću* (Diary about Čarnojević), was published in 1920. It is full of “Andrićian” sentences and passages:

Tuga me je rano našla. Niko me nije pitao kud idem i niko me nije dočekivao kad sam se vraćao kući.

(Sorrow came over me at an early age. Nobody asked me where I was going, and nobody ever welcomed me when I came home.)

Niti sam čiji, niti imam koga.

(I am nobody’s, nor do I have anybody.)<sup>16</sup>

The early writings of Andrić resemble in character and tone not only those of the first South Slavic modernists (Cankar, Matoš, Sekulić), but also another Serbian, Milutin Uskoković (1884–1915) in his *Vitae fragmenta* and other *crtime* (sketches). In Bulgaria, Elin Pelin and several other writers of this period also wrote this type of speculative texts. In Slovenian, Srečko Kosovel (1904–26) and Miran Jarc (1900–42) wrote prose poems, but in a more experimental, avant-garde form. The *later* meditative texts by Andrić (*Znakovi pored puta*, *Staze* [Paths], *Lica* [Faces], and the extensive notes collected in his *Sveske* [Notebooks]) are different, or at least most of them are. After all, *Ex Ponto* and *Nemiri* came into being under unusual circumstances: they were the product of special conditions and of a young, impressionable mind and of Andrić’s recent readings.

Finally, we turn briefly to a perhaps somewhat unexpected side of Andrić’s oeuvre: the fantastic—i.e., tales with a supernatural plot or at least with unreal elements. The question of reality and fantasy in Andrić’s prose is complex, and it would be impossible to go into it in depth in this paper. What is the proportion of reality and of the imagined, of the legendary, the fabulous, mythical, fantastic in his Bosnian stories? Sometimes the author indicates openly that he is

presenting a legend, like in the introduction to “Priča o vezirovom slonu” (The story of the vizier’s elephant):

The Bosnian *kasabas* and towns are full of stories. In those, mostly *invented*, stories, under the cover of unbelievable happenings and behind the mask of often invented names, is hidden the *real* and unrecognized history of that area, of living people as well as of generations long dead. Those are the oriental lies of which the Turkish proverb says they are “more true than any truth.”<sup>17</sup>

In “Razgovor sa Gojom” (Conversation with Goya), Andrić stresses the significance of legends: “In fables lies the real history of mankind,” says Goya.<sup>18</sup> Many of Andrić’s stories—including those that form part of *Na Drini ćuprija*—are legends or are based on legends, and the question of how true or trustworthy they are is of only secondary importance.

Andrić also uses the device of the dream to tell supernatural stories. In the early twentieth century numerous European authors, partly influenced by Sigmund Freud’s writings and investigations, turned to the dream. In the works of Andrić’s great Croatian contemporary, Miroslav Krleža (1893–1981), for example, it is frequently utilized. Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić was another Croatian writer in whose works dreams play a role. Among Andrić’s dream stories are “Izlet” (The outing), “Ekskurzija” (The excursion), and in a way “Panorama.” The title of “San i java pod Grabićem” (Dreaming and waking under the Grabić) is eloquent, although the dream occupies only a relatively small part of the story. A dream constitutes the major element of “Na drugi dan Božića” and the short text “San bega Karčića” (Beg Karčić’s dream). In addition, there are stories that do not reproduce dreams but contain hallucinations—like “Jelena, žena koje nema” (Jelena, the woman who does not exist)\*—or that proceed perfectly normally but have a mysterious, irreal finish—like “Letovanje na jugu” (A vacation in the south). A story that definitely belongs to the genre of fantastic literature is one of Andrić’s last works, “Kod lekara” (At the doctor’s, 1964).

This is not a full list of examples in which the irrational or irreal plays a role in Andrić’s prose, but it is enough to demonstrate that he belonged among the twentieth-century writers for whom the fan-

\*Also cited in this volume as “Jelena, [the] Woman Who Is Not.”



tastic is an essential element. Among the South Slavic authors of his time and of a younger generation there were (and are) quite a number of them. Crnjanski, one of the most prominent Serbian prose writers and a staunch realist in most of his works, in his early years wrote the fantastic “Vrt blagoslovenih žena” (Garden of blessed women, 1922). Miodrag Bulatović, Dobrica Ćosić, Borislav Pekić, and Filip David are among Andrić’s younger contemporaries in Serbian literature who occasionally indulged in supernatural stories, novellas, or even entire novels. In Croatia, Krleža produced such novellas as “Hodorlohomor Veliki” (Hodorlohomor the Great, 1919) and “Kako je dr. Gregor prvi put u životu sreo nečastivoga” (How Dr. Gregor for the first time in his life met the devil, 1928). Vladan Desnica (1905–67) wrote “Delta,” in which a man suddenly disappears; it has something in common with Andrić’s “Letovanje na jugu.” Ranko Marinković, Ivan Raos, Pavao Pavličić, Dubravka Ugrešić, and several other Croatian writers—probably the majority of the better known contemporary prose writers—devoted themselves at least in part to the supernatural story. In the 1960s and 1970s this was something of a wave among the Zagreb writers.

In Bulgaria there have been similar waves: in the 1920s and 1930s the fantastic story was quite popular. Writers like Georgi Raichev, Svetoslav Minkov, Vladimir Polianov, and several others wrote in this so-called “diabolic” genre. It then lost its attraction for several decades, but in the 1960s and 1970s a younger group of Bulgarian prose writers rediscovered the fantasy world and turned to supernatural themes (Pavel Vezhinov, Liuben Dilov, Iordan Radichkov, and others)—sometimes also to science fiction. I do not claim that these works were very close to Andrić’s unreal stories, but one can find similarities—after all, the scope of supernatural themes and plots is limited. For example, the hero of Emilijan Stanev’s story (or rather legend) “Lazar i Isus” (1977), the half-wit Lazar, has, as a type, much in common with Andrić’s Ćorkan, who figures in the story “Ćorkan i Švabica” (Ćorkan and the German girl) and in *Na Drini ćuprija*.

The fairy tale can be considered a subdivision of the fantastic. In particular, see Andrić’s “Aska i vuk” (Aska and the wolf), his beautiful “Beauty and the Beast” story. That he decided to write and publish a fairy tale (we might also call it an extensive fable; it is, in a way, a rewriting of the Scheherazade motif) is, again, not so un-

usual, as numerous South Slavic authors of his time went in this direction.<sup>19</sup> I do not include here those authors who were also children's book writers; the fairy tales I have in mind were written in a serious (or sometimes satirical) vein and primarily meant for an adult audience—for example, Crnjanski's "Pustinjak i medenica" (The hermit and the copper bell) and other tales in the style and language of old fairy tales or legends. In Bulgaria, where, as I mentioned, the fantastic or semifantastic genre is especially well represented, Nikolai Rainov, Andrić's coeval, wrote legends (the *Bogomilski legendi*), as well as fairy tales, among them *Slănchevi prikazki* (Sun-fairy tales), set in the Middle East. Karaliichev and Minkov are other fairy tale authors from the interwar period. Often these fairy tales had a symbolic, allegorical, sometimes satirical tendency. Partly satirical but partly more philosophical are Georgi Velichkov's *Prikazki za men i za vas* (Fairy tales for me and for you), mostly on contemporary themes. The survival, or resurgence, of the fairy tale genre can be at least partly explained by the rich and strong Slavic traditions of oral literature.

In conclusion, Ivo Andrić as a writer was a child of his times and the culture in his part of Europe, notwithstanding (and of course without derogation to) his exceptional talents and achievements.<sup>20</sup>

## NOTES

1. See Encho Mutafov, "Razkaz i ese vāv vzaimno nabliudenie," in *Slavianskite literaturi v Bălgariia: Problemi na retseptsiata* (Sofia: Univ. Izd-vo Kliment Okhridski, 1988), p. 336.

2. Isidora Sekulić, "Istok u pripovetkama Iva Andrića," *Srpski književni glasnik* 10, 7 (Belgrade, 1923).

3. Novak Simić, "Zakoni i ognjevi," *Nepoznata Bosna i druge pripovijetke; Izabrana djela*, I (Zagreb: Mladost-GZH-MH-Znanje, 1978), pp. 93–94. All translations in this contribution are mine.

4. Jovan Deretić, *Istorija srpske književnosti* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1983), p. 628.

5. Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, 2d ed. (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1965), vol. 6, p. 226.

6. *Ibid.*, vol. 8, p. 73.

7. *Ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 311.

8. Ivo Andrić, *Znakovi pored puta* (Belgrade: Rad, 1980), p. 17.
9. Slavko Leovac, "Introduction to Ćamil Sijarić," *Bihorci*, 2d ed. (Titograd: Grafički Zavod, 1966), p. 13.
10. Quoted by Nikola Kovač, *Ćamil Sijarić kao pripovjedač* (Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1983), p. 49.
11. Andrić worked at the Yugoslav embassy in Bucharest from 1921 to 1922, Iovkov at the Bulgarian embassy in the same city from 1920 to 1927; I did not find any documentation that they ever met or knew about each other.
12. Quoted from Marko S. Marković, *Tausendundeine Nacht des Ivo Andrić* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 1962), p. 56.
13. Antun G. Matoš, *Pjesme, pripovijesti, autobiografija* (Zagreb: MH-Zora, 1967), p. 215. Series *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti*.
14. Quoted from S. Vučetić, "Afterword," in *ibid.*, p. 273.
15. Quoted from Marković, p. 47.
16. Miloš Crnjanski, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 5: *Proza* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1966), pp. 12, 23.
17. Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 5 (1965), p. 41.
18. *Ibid.*, vol. 10, p. 140.
19. On "Aska i vuk," see Felicity Rosslyn, "The Short Stories of Ivo Andrić: Autobiography and the Chain of Proof," *Slavonic and East European Review* 67, 1 (January 1989): 29–41, esp. 39.
20. On Andrić's style, see Dragiša Živković, "Nekoliko stilskih odlika proze Ive Andrića," *Od Vuka do Andrića* (Belgrade: Društvo za srpskohrvatski jezik i književnost SR Srbije, 1965), pp. 121–40.

## **EX PONTO AND UNREST: VICTIMIZATION AND “ETERNAL ART”**

**Gordana P. Crnković**

Ivo Andrić's early works, *Ex Ponto* (1918) and *Unrest* (Nemiri, 1920) are often considered less artistically successful and interesting than his later acclaimed historical novels, *The Bridge on the Drina* (Na Drini ćuprija, 1945) and *Bosnian Chronicle* (Travnička hronika, 1945).<sup>1</sup> *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest* might indeed at times cause aversion in the contemporary reader with their exalted neoromantic tone, hypertrophied subjectivity, and archaic pathos. However, despite these perhaps initially alienating aspects, here I shall argue that the two early works “surpass” Andrić's celebrated later novels when viewed with regard to the articulation of a dynamic between individual victimization and the minimizing of this victimization through the soothing realms of “eternal art.”

*Ex Ponto* and *Unrest*—short, fragmentary, and poetic pieces commonly described as poems in prose—were written during or immediately after World War I. *The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle* were written during World War II.<sup>2</sup> These two groups of works, early and late, differ in their artistic responses to the myriad of individual victimizations of the world wars and to the question of how literature relates to these victimizations.

### **“ABOVE THE VICTORIES” IN *THE BRIDGE ON THE DRINA* AND *BOSNIAN CHRONICLE***

In a part of *Unrest* entitled “Above the Victories,” Andrić writes: God holds his hand on the crown of the head of those who are conquered, and the victor is alone and his mirth burns and goes

out. All the hope, comfort, and beauty in the world is revealed to the eyes of those who are won over; the victors are blind; they tremble and burn and have nothing other than their wild flaming mirth, which leaves ashes behind. . . .

The winds travel and the rains go, good and fertile, always the same, and the flags slowly disintegrate and tear; and colors get pale and everything is forgotten, but a man remains always the same, bent under the pain and persevering in work; wreaths wither and the flags rot and what remains is a man who sows and works and the rain which helps him. Who will win over a man?<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, who will win over a man? By constructing a sphere of lasting humanity (“what remains is a man who sows and works”), Andrić’s text articulates a space “above the victories.” In this space, specific historical “victories”—such as the ones in the war, which cause the victimization of numerous individuals—lose their weight, finality, and reality (“the flags rot”). When these victories cease being the only reality that exists, the victimization of those who are won over by these victories is also diminished. With the emphasis on a space in which a man—as humanity—is invincible, the destruction and victimization of many individual human beings becomes less important. They might cease to exist, yet humanity itself remains. The history of particular events, of “victories” in which some ascend to power while others die, becomes less urgent when viewed from the standpoint of the eternity of humanity.

While the above fragment from *Unrest* explicitly displaces particular individual victimizations through the sphere of persisting humanity, *Unrest* as a whole (as will be argued below) is characterized precisely by the opposite thrust of asserting the urgency of individual victimizations and refusing the consolation of the immortality of humanity or art. The poetics of displacing and minimizing the victimizations of particular individuals by the creation of a space of everlasting humanity or community, however, shapes *The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle*. In the former, specific destinies and tragedies, narrated in detail, lose their weight under the sheer scope of the historical novel. The span of four centuries turns any individual existence into solely one of the many elements of the persisting life of the *kasaba* (small city), thus depriving this existence of the urgency and importance of unrepeatable and unique life:

Life [is] an incomprehensible marvel, since it was incessantly wasted and spent, yet nonetheless it lasted and endured "like the bridge on the Drina."<sup>4</sup>

The continuing life of community, this "incomprehensible marvel [which] last[s] and endure[s]," a life intertwined with and also symbolized by the persistence of a functional work of art (the bridge), receives primacy over the specific lives that constitute this one life "in general" and which themselves "waste" and "[get] spent." These particular individual lives become the building blocks of the enduring life of community or humanity, and thus the horror of individuals' passing away is diluted by a repeated assertion of the persistence of life in general and of the immortal work of art, the bridge:

Thus the generations renewed themselves beside the bridge and the bridge shook from itself, like dust, all the traces which transient human events had left on it and remained, when all was over, unchanged and unchangable.<sup>5</sup>

But misfortunes do not last forever (this they have in common with joys) but pass away or are at least diminished and become lost in oblivion. Life on the *kapia* [part of the bridge] always renews itself despite everything and the bridge does not change with the years or with the centuries or with the most painful turns in human affairs. All these pass over it, even as the unquiet waters pass beneath its smooth and perfect arches.<sup>6</sup>

Andrić's calm and unperturbed realist narrative, moving onward systematically and forcefully regardless of the tragedies and individual victimizations that are being recounted, is the main device of articulation of this life "in general," which goes on ineluctably and victoriously. The very title of this novel is coined from part of a folk proverb, "Ostade kao na Drini ćuprija" (It has remained like the bridge on the Drina), which refers to something persistent and invincible.

Andrić ends *The Bridge on the Drina* with the thoughts of the dying Alihodja, who, after seeing the bridge wrecked by an explosive, thinks:

So be it. . . . If they destroy here, then somewhere else someone else is building. Surely there are still peaceful countries and men

of good sense who know of God's love? If God had abandoned this unlucky town on the Drina, he had surely not abandoned the whole world that was beneath the skies? They would not do this for ever. But who knows? . . . Anything might happen. But one thing could not happen; it could not be that great and wise men of exalted soul who would raise lasting buildings for the love of God, so that the world should be more beautiful and man live in it better and more easily, should everywhere and for all time vanish from this earth. Should they too vanish, it would mean that the love of God was extinguished and had disappeared from the world. That could not be.<sup>7</sup>

The bridge is destroyed, and Alihodja dies. But this victimization of one man, ending *The Bridge on the Drina*, is carried onto the plane of humanity and creation in general, in which the final victory of destruction or death simply does not exist: "That could not be."

Although narrated in detail and providing the theme and body of *Bosnian Chronicle* (1945), specific events in the Bosnian city of Travnik (events connected with the rise and fall of Napoleon), as well as individuals acting in, experiencing, and verbalizing these events, are all finally displaced and minimized by the "persisting life of community" in this novel as well. Sorting out his old papers, for example, Daville, the French consul in Travnik and a main character of the novel, finds

a sheaf of those encomiums and verse letters penned on various gala occasions and celebrating various men and regimes. Poor orphaned verses, dedicated to lost causes and personalities who today meant less than the dead.<sup>8</sup>

Given a large enough scope of the narrative, all the personalities who shaped and ruled the world yesterday would of course "today [mean] less than the dead." Specific history, although chronicled and recorded in detail, eventually loses out in front of the ahistorical persisting community, in which, as Andrić put it in *Unrest*, "flags rot and what remains is a man who sows and works." Thus in the epilogue of *Bosnian Chronicle*, Travnik's oldest and most respected bey, Hamdi Beg, reflects on the life which will be the same as it has always been before Napoleon's intrusion into these parts of Europe:

"Seven years, eh?" Hamdi Beg said thoughtfully, drawling a little. "Seven years! And do you remember what a hue and cry there was over these consuls and over that . . . that Bonaparte! Bonaparte here, Bonaparte there. He was going to do this, he was going to do that. The world was too small for him. His strength was boundless, no one could match him. So this infidel rabble of ours lifted up their heads like some cobless corn. Some hung onto the coat tails of the French Consul, others to the Austrian, and the third lot waited for a Russian. The rayah went plain off their heads and ran amuck. Well, that was that and it's over. The emperors got together and smashed Bonaparte. Travnik is sweeping out the consuls. The people will talk about them another year or two. The children will play at consuls and kavasses down by the river, riding on wooden sticks, and afterwards they too will forget them as if they'd never existed. And everything will be the same again, just as, by the will of Allah, it has always been."

Hamdi Beg stopped, as his breath gave out, and the others remained silent in case he had anything more to say. And as they drew on their pipes, they enjoyed their relaxed, victory-scented silence.<sup>9</sup>

*The Bridge on the Drina* ends with the destruction of the bridge and the turmoil of war, and *Bosnian Chronicle* with the establishment of the "old ways" in which "everything will be the same again, just as . . . it has always been." But despite these two thematically different endings of two historical narratives, in both of them the plane of eternity—of the community (in *Bosnian Chronicle*) or humanity and art (in *The Bridge on the Drina*)—asserts its primacy over the specific contingent instances of history. Specific historical realities and concrete individual destinies and victimizations are thus displaced and minimized by the poetic articulation and even explicit assertion of the consoling eternity of humanity, community, and art.

### EX PONTO

If we now return to *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest*, we see that in them art (as storytelling) and eternal humanity are not yet asserted as harmo-



nizing forms that narrate or contain, but at the same time transcend and thus minimize specific individual existence. In these two works, there is an uneasy tension between the outcry of individual destiny and victimization, on one hand, and the consoling eternity of humanity, community, or art on the other.

*Ex Ponto* is divided into three parts, consisting of short poetic prose fragments, each fragment a few paragraphs long. Andrić wrote the first part of *Ex Ponto* while imprisoned in Maribor at the beginning of World War I for suspected political activity against the state. As opposed to *The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle*, *Ex Ponto* is not written from the point of view of an external omniscient narrator. Rather, the fragments are written by a first-person narrator, and they take as their theme the reflections and various subjective states of the poetic “I” of the text:

Last night it was particularly cold. I could not fall asleep, a kind of rage at myself overtook me and I—thought about suicide.

I was ashamed and I repented at the same moment, but I thought vividly and for a long time. With some black ecstasy I thought about death, which is something wonderful, easy, and beautiful, but something that should not be. . . .

When I woke up, it seemed to me like I was reborn. That was the hardest night in solitary confinement.<sup>10</sup>

The fragments of *Ex Ponto* are connected by the same subject of speech and by the dominant thematic concerns, tone, and (especially in the first part) the context of writing. (This part, written in Maribor, can be read as the diary entries of a young inmate.) However, these fragments do not constitute a unified text. The space between consecutive fragments emphasizes their relative independence, confirmed by the fragments’ variety of motives, which do not connect to create a single unified narrative. For instance, one fragment in the first part takes as its theme the writer’s reminiscences of home—a kitchen with freshly baked bread and a mother who was growing older; the next fragment focuses on the writer’s (inmate’s) recurrent dreams of traveling; a third fragment depicts the clash between resignation and rebellion in the writer’s mind, and the following fragment dwells on a woman from the writer’s past: “Koga li ljubi sada

ona mlada žena?" (Whom does that young woman love [Whom is she kissing] now?).<sup>11</sup>

By such a lack of unity and fragmentation, *Ex Ponto* creates the broken speech of the victim himself, rather than the narration that not only tells of victimization but also cancels it by existing above and independently from the victim's "I," as a realm in itself which cannot be affected (changed, ruptured, or stopped) by any of its tragic contents. The speech of *Ex Ponto's* "I" does not create the unperturbed progress of the calm narration of the grand historical novel. It is not founded on—and itself does not create—the certainty and comfort of the persistence of narration or community. Rather, this is an "unfounded" speech, made by one "under whose feet the ground is slipping away."<sup>12</sup>

The fragmentary and open form of *Ex Ponto* articulates the "I's" individual life very differently from the epic narration that shapes—and transcends—the individual lives in *The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle*. The text of *Ex Ponto* does not create the organic unity and wholeness of the work of art that transcend the specific parts of the work or particular thematic motifs (such as concrete individual victimization). Such motifs are here not "smoothed out" by the harmonizing wholeness of the work of art. For example, a fragment about the funeral of a peasant, Nikola Balta (p. 49 of the text), is placed between a fragment which contains reflections on the nature of a melancholic person (p. 48) and one about the soul's unrest at night (p. 49). The funeral thus stands out, not connected to anything, therefore not a part of something larger than itself that could minimize the gravity and importance of this individual life and victimization ("He was only 54 years old") by making it only a part of a larger continuum:

The flags were not put at half staff, nor were the drums beating covered with black fabric . . . nor did the bell ring, because we have not had a bell since the fall; everything was ordinary and calm when the peasant Nikola Balta died.

His wife, taciturn and old before her time, cried the whole night and the next day until afternoon, listening to how they hewed boards in front of the house, and when they lifted the dead man and took him along to the graveyard, she swooned and two

women stayed with her to rub her with apple vinegar and consecrated salt.

The funeral was going up the hill and slowly, because the old people who carried the coffin were weak, and there were few of them so they could not alternate. The priest, a solicitous and sickly man, dragged his boots with difficulty, but he sang the psalms beautifully and loudly. The women prayed the rosary.

They carried him on the village road, on the side of which the fruit trees blossomed and bent their branches equally mercifully above each passerby.

They buried him quickly and dispersed, and right after that a fine and plentiful spring rain fell; on the grave earth spilled off and settled, the earth with which he had battled and dealt his whole lifetime.

Thus they buried the peasant Nikola Balta.

He was only 54 years old.<sup>13</sup>

The fragmentary and ruptured text of *Ex Ponto* creates a tension between (on one hand) individual fragments that assert their relative independence from the larger unity of the text and (on the other hand) the text as a whole, marking the realm which transcends the individual fragments. This structural dynamic can be seen as articulating a tension between untranscended, victimized, and desiring individual life (“this always thirsty ‘I’”) and the larger realms of narration, immortal art, divinity, or humanity:

All the painful exertions to elevate oneself above oneself and outside of oneself are not but one torment. They—woe to me—mix with the unsatisfied demands of life and create one unbearable chaos.<sup>14</sup>

Thus the attempt to participate in the nonindividual realms above and outside of oneself is mixed with the opposite thrust of the individual life and its “unsatisfied demands.” There is no resolution offered to this conflict, which leads to “unbearable chaos.” The text goes back and forth between the two opposites.

The comforting presence of divinity is invoked in reflections such as “In God there is the end of a thought which to us disappears

in desperate infinity."<sup>15</sup> *Ex Ponto's* "I" also goes through moments of exalted demands to be "delivered from oneself":

Let this pain sent from God burn up everything *mine* in me, let it consume by fire the blazing *I* as a wound, and let it heal me from stumbling on the road of wishes and imaginings.

Everything, everything that fetters me and that is called: *mine*, let it disappear so that I be pure, strong and free.<sup>16</sup>

Individual victimization is displaced in reflections such as: "I know that God bestows horrors on us when He becomes grievous over our soul and when He decides to rescue it."<sup>17</sup> The horrors are actually God's gift of compassion, rescuing the lost soul. Or:

And this fall, with the ring I shall never lose, with the pain of a victim, fate tied me to humanity, which through suffering goes to meet truth and goodness.<sup>18</sup>

Truth and goodness are asserted as the aim, or *telos*, of victimization, which is not only minimized, but also justified as a necessary step in the process of attaining this final goodness. Victimization and suffering themselves are thus presented as good because they lead to the achievement of this certain and good result:

All who suffer and die for their truths are one with God and humanity and are the inheritors of the eternity which exists only for those who believe and suffer; they are the cornerstone of the future building of a new humanity which will, after all the toil and delusions, nevertheless realize itself as God's thought on earth.

Why do we need this life of fifty years (and one harder from another!) if one sacred truth does not give it the strength and beauty and does not prolong it into one shining eternity?<sup>19</sup>

An individual life is meaningless without its "sacred truth": the purpose of life is not in life itself, but in that which transcends this life and "prolong[s] it into one shining eternity." The horror that some "suffer and die for their truths" is mitigated by the assertion that this suffering is not just a suffering, a victimization that cannot be undone, a final end followed only by the emptiness and nonex-

istence of the one who died. The individuals do not die in vain: they create a “future building of a new humanity” and are “one with God and humanity.”

When life is victimization, reality is characterized by “weight and bitterness.” But instead of attempting to change this reality, one can completely renounce it:

All that is lost is in my consciousness, only without the weight and bitterness of earthly things; I have again everything that I lost, transformed and beautified—in memory. And more: I have the great freedom of one who has nothing and the peace of one who grieved and finally took leave.<sup>20</sup>

*Ex Ponto* fragments that explicitly emphasize the comforting notion of the eternity of humanity, community, or art are opposed by fragments whose theme is the importance of individual lives and victims:

Do people ever think what the night is like of a mother who knows that her only son is captured by iron and by the stranger’s merciless hand? . . .

In the room in which I was—in the wrong moment!—born, You wake and pray and in the humility of your heart ask: “Jesus, is it for tears that our children are given to us?”<sup>21</sup>

In a scene in which the inmate’s (“I’s”) mother prays for her jailed son, her presence and pain outweigh the certainty of the presence of God. The mother is addressed as “You,” written in upper case, and thus equated with “God,” written the same way. The simple statement, “I am sorry for my mother and for her futile pains, torments and hopes,”<sup>22</sup> refuses the consolation of a possible higher purpose of this suffering. The mother’s pain is futile.

In a few “socialist realist” passages in *Ex Ponto* individual victimization is rather sharply emphasized—for example, the funeral of the peasant Nikola Balta (mentioned above), a disastrous drought in a village (p. 64), the waking of a hungry child at night (p. 91), and a conversation between two tired soldiers (p. 96). These sparse and brief narrations bring out hardship, poverty, and exploitation. God—as a symbol of any possible transcendence of these victimized existences—is depicted as absent in these narratives: after she has

managed to put her hungry child to sleep, a mother grabs her rosary and starts to pray, quickly moving her lips. The pain of the hungry child subverts the presence of God, and this "departure" of God from (and thus the absence of the transcendental sphere in) the victimized world resounds even more in a room filled with desperate and hurried prayer. "It is certain that many people during their entire lives do not even surmise the existence of such vastly unhappy people in the world,"<sup>23</sup> states the narrator, concluding his brief account of a chance encounter with a passenger in a train. The statement ends the anecdote, not leading anywhere, as a bare fact not mitigated by the assertions that (for example) its sheer saying helps or that the unhappiness of these people leads to some higher future goal.

Specific individual life is not realized by its "indirect preservation" within the realm of eternal humanity or by its being narrated or transformed into art. The fragment depicting the jailed writer's reminiscences of home, for instance, creates "home" as a brief narration: "As I sit leaning on the window, I have a vision. . . . Mother has, like every Saturday. . . ." <sup>24</sup> But this fragment also creates a sharp contrast between writing, in which home exists, and reality, in which home is taken away. There is no reconciliation by which thinking and narrating about home makes its absence any the less painful. Andrić also writes:

And when life is over, silence, a good mother, will put her pale hands on my eyes and this whole wretched story will be drawn into darkness, as the short and incomprehensible sound dies in silence.<sup>25</sup>

The image of the end of the poetic "I" (the writer's "I") is not that of a continued existence through eternal writing, which stays after the "I," but rather that of a temporal sound—symbolizing "I's" unique real-life existence—which disappears completely in the silence of "I's" nonbeing. Therefore, the most important thing is to simply live: "The sheer fact that I live bestows on me calm happiness."<sup>26</sup>

In the constant tension between eternity (transcendent divinity or immortal humanity or art), on one hand, and the unique individual life on the other, each side displaces and unbalances the other. Consecutive fragments of *Ex Ponto* verbalize the primacy of one or the other. The tension is present on all levels of the text: not only

among the fragments, but also within them, and even within many single sentences (e.g., “Oh, God, for what is all this torment of the eternally thirsty and eternally conscious: I?”)<sup>27</sup>

The tension between individual victimization and general salvation in the eternity of humanity or art is also present in the contrast of two brief statements about history. In one, all human history seems “as a slaughter of the innocent, as the black chest whose key is thrown into the sea”<sup>28</sup>—that is, like the ongoing repetition of senseless victimization of individual human beings. In the other, humanity “goes through suffering to meet truth and goodness,”<sup>29</sup> so individual suffering is transcended and neutralized by its telos, its leading to final salvation.

Working through the tension between the two opposites, *Ex Ponto* at the end affirms the primacy of individual lives and victimizations over the soothing eternal realms. The epilogue poses the opposition between “strong earth” and “eternal sky,” on one hand, and “weak and short-lived” man on the other. Choosing between these two sides, the “I” of the text resolutely affirms his allegiance to a unique individual life, thus explicitly confirming its primary importance, an importance articulated by the fragmentary and ruptured textual form itself:

“What did you see, my son, in the summer day?”

I saw that this life is a painful affair which consists of an unequal exchange of sin and unhappiness, that to live means to pile illusion on illusion.

“Do you wish to sleep, my son?”

No, father, I am going out to *live*.<sup>30</sup>

### **UNREST**

*Unrest* can be read as relating (among other things) precisely to the unrest resulting from the tension between individual mortality and the eternity of divinity (or community or art): “Flickers the unrest of all the worlds in which a man once thought for the first time about God.”<sup>31</sup> In this work one finds a more direct articulation of this

tension, as well as a stronger endorsement of unrepeatable human existence.

The tripartite structure of *Unrest* takes as its direct theme the tension marking Andrić's two early works. In the first part, "Unrest of Eternity," Andrić specifically reflects on the existence of God and questions of eternity; the second part, "Unrest of the Day," gives very short narrations of specific individual victimizations; the third part, "The Hills," asserts the primacy of passing mortal life, of a "beautiful human face with its desire for happiness,"<sup>32</sup> over the eternities of words or gods.

In the first part, a divinity that is reflected upon "ripens" and radically changes:

You are not the same in the morning and in the evening; with the minutes Your form ripens; in vain I knew You yesterday, because You grow, and they say different things about You every day.<sup>33</sup>

At the beginning, God takes one away from the world ("And that was You wanting to wean me away from the world as one-year-old children are weaned from the breast") and puts his "invisible hand" between "me and the world." The writer is God's and is thus separated from the world; God is an obstruction which "hurts and consecrates."<sup>34</sup>

As the reflections progress, the certainty and comfort of the existence of divinity gradually disappear: "He keeps silent so well that one already thinks he does not exist."<sup>35</sup> One searches but does not find the consolation of divinity. God is fast asleep: "I have to get up at night, to look for You and ask. . . . How weak are human hands and how fast God can sleep."<sup>36</sup> At the end of the first part, eternity and divinity have completely departed: "The sun and the thought about God have set and left me alone."<sup>37</sup>

In the second part of *Unrest*, Andrić posits the tension between the soothing realm of persisting humanity and the outcry of individual victimization and asserts the primacy of the latter. Fragments of this part are titled (e.g., "A Night on a Train," "Children")—they are not titled anywhere else in *Unrest* (or in *Ex Ponto*)—pointing to the attention given to specificity. For example, even though the above-mentioned fragment, "Above the Victories," neutralizes specific victimizations, the fragment titled "Children," immediately following



"Above the Victories," with its detailed description of starving children, erases any consolation that the notion of the eternity of humanity might have produced:

The small city teemed with children. They waded the brook passing in front of the military slaughterhouse and hunted for the little pieces of bowel and entrails that were thrown into the water; they gathered the pits of dry plums, beat them on the cobble pavement and ate their bitter core; on the garbage piles behind the officers' kitchens the children seized thrown away empty cans, washed them with hot water and drank that; to trick the hunger, the children chewed on the elder's marrow until the blood gushed forth from behind the teeth; they tasted the primrose's leaf and the fern's bread; at night they crept into newly tilled gardens and with their fingers dug out the potatoes sown yesterday from the soft garden beds; they asked alms, stole, took by force, but all of that was not enough to get full and stay alive.<sup>38</sup>

"Children" begins and ends with the mention of a specific time period, "April of the year 1917," and asserts that "It is hard to forget these children for those who saw them even only once."<sup>39</sup> In this way, a reader is called upon to remember these very specific victims, and the remembrance should not be softened by considerations of eternal humanity, which, after all, continues to exist.

Another fragment from the second part, "Funeral Poem," briefly describes the killing of a burglar:

He was killed by one who was stronger than he was—and the stronger ones have the right!—he was shot by one of those who serve the power, and they shoot well.<sup>40</sup>

The fragment is a "poem" about injustice ("And above him [the killed burglar] my poem burns in indignation and pity"),<sup>41</sup> but there are no reflections on the immortality of poetry in general, or this poem in particular, that would make this specific injustice (the killing of a man who resorted to burglary as a last means of survival) seem smaller. Nor does "Funeral Poem" have any reflections on the potential consolation that could come from pondering upon the immortality of humanity. On the contrary, those who survive and perpetuate this "immortal humanity" are themselves victimizers: those "who [are] stronger," "who serve the power," "[who] shoot well."

Thus, as we read in "The Hills" (the third part of *Unrest*), "There is no truth but one: pain, and no other reality but that of suffering, pain and suffering."<sup>42</sup> There is no transcendent realm such as art, which could record but also at the same time minimize the pain as the only truth of individual existence.

In "Unrest of the Day," specific individual destinies and specific subjects' victimizations claim their primacy over and over again. In the fragment entitled "A Night on a Train," for example, Andrić depicts the transportation of prisoners (himself among them) in an overcrowded train traveling by the seaside.\* Glued to a window, the writer sees in the sea "all the new shine and new colors" and a "beauty which [he] never surmised." This eternal beauty allows him to "[forget] what is behind [him]."<sup>43</sup> However, in this fragment it is not beauty, art, or eternity that assert their presence beyond an individual's life or death. The fragment ends with the approach of night and falling darkness that prevents a passenger from seeing the enchanting beauty of the sea. In the light of the lamp the writer ("I") now sees his own face on the window:

I saw, on the glass behind which lies the night, my face—and nothing else but my very own face! . . . In vain I closed my eyes; I was condemned and had to always again look into my eyes.<sup>44</sup>

Beauty does not transcend individual life. Rather, it is the individual life that, not realized by that which transcends it, comes back to claim its own. Victimization and pain are "like a stone": hard, unchanging, and the sole reality: "I *dream* that a pain passed away. . . . And when I wake up, look, yesterday's pain is in its place, like a stone."<sup>45</sup>

The third part of *Unrest* reconfirms the nonexistence of a comforting and persisting humanity, art, or divinity:

I, who have no Gods. . . . stopped for a moment and was small and alone with the unspeakable sadness of the bright short days known only to a man. God and the world kept quiet.<sup>46</sup>

Big world. Big burden and big exhaustion. Deep night. And a lone man.<sup>47</sup>

\*Andrić was arrested in July 1914 in Split and taken up the Adriatic coast to Šibenik and then Rijeka. From Rijeka he was taken to Maribor and was there until March 1915. Later on he was interned in the village of Ovcarevo (near Travnik) and in Zenica (see Hawkesworth for an extensive biographical outline of the writer).

The temple of God, of eternity and divinity or of eternal art or lasting humanity, is empty. Now the most specific and passing things—"the lines of the houses . . . tram tracks . . . calm trees, the arch of the eyebrow of some unknown woman, one male profile"—create a "temple of swaying and transitory shapes."<sup>48</sup>

The moment of eternity is not fully erased from the last part of *Unrest*. One reads, for example, "that there is one tide of creation, and we grow, we grow!"<sup>49</sup> As noted, however, in the tension between the soothing realms of eternity and the victimization of mortal and unique individuals, the text finally asserts the primacy of the latter:

But I have never forgotten a human face, a beautiful human face lit up with the shine of reason and with only human sadness because of what is seen.

Behind all my bitter words hides, in the end, always a human face with its desire for happiness.<sup>50</sup>

Behind the words is the beautiful human face with its desire for happiness. These words, as literature or storytelling, are one of the expressions of immortal humanity that keeps existing regardless of the disappearance of any particular individual. But these words are not a goal in themselves. Rather, they are one of the ways in which an individual seeks happiness, fulfillment, and life. The image created here is that of an individual life that attempts to be realized with the help of words and literature, and not that of transcendent literature or eternal humanity that displace and neutralize the sense of individual victimizations or unfulfillment.

## ADDENDUM

While *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest* respond to the carnage of World War I by stressing the victimization of numerous individuals, Andrić's *The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle* respond to World War II by creating a realm above and outside the wars ("above the victories"), a realm in which both victimizations and those victimized lose much of their weight and importance. Celebrating Andrić, it is important to remember the early works' notion of the importance and urgency of the present individual lives, and not just of the life of

humanity in general or of eternal storytelling, including Andrić's own. Let us not see history ("that black chest whose key is thrown into the sea") as something we can only record, celebrating that which has always—so far—remained: this recording itself in a lasting narration, art, and humanity in general.

The tension of Andrić's early works between the individual's mortal reality and the eternity of humanity or art should not be lost. We should not only embrace the latter moment of this duality and say that "we have all we lost, transformed and beautified—in the memory," or that "we have the great freedom of the one who has nothing and peace of the one who grieved and finally took leave." While honoring the memory of a great writer and his work, let us not disregard the cries of those all too mortal victims of the terror which is at this very moment destroying the Bosnia that Andrić wrote about. Let us not allow our sense of gratitude for the preservation of lives and culture in Andrić's work to "smooth out" our sense of urgency of struggle against the current destruction of lives and victimization of real individuals, those unique and unrepeatable "I"s, that are now vanishing into silence.

#### NOTES

1. *Ex Ponto* was originally published by Književni jug (Zagreb) and *Nemiri* by Naklada St. Kugli (Zagreb). In both cases I shall cite the 1975 edition published by Svjetlost (Sarajevo). Translators and scholars have used both *Anxieties* and *Unrest* for Andrić's title *Nemiri*. I prefer *Unrest* because it seems to me that it better captures Andrić's meaning(s) even though it loses the plural of the original which is preserved in *Anxieties*.

2. *The Bridge on the Drina* was "written quickly, between July 1942 and December 1943" (Celia Hawkesworth, *Ivo Andrić: Bridge between East and West* [London: Athlone Press, 1984], p. 124). While most of *Bosnian Chronicle* was also written during the war, "Andrić began work on this, his first novel, in 1924, seeing it as a study of contacts between East and West" (*ibid.*, p. 142).

3. Ivo Andrić, *Ex Ponto. Nemiri* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1975), p. 123. As noted, citations from both *Ex Ponto* and *Unrest* will be taken from this edition. Unless stated otherwise, translations from these two works are mine.

4. Ivo Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*, trans. Lovett F. Edwards (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 81.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 313.
8. Ivo Andrić, *Bosnian Chronicle*, trans. Joseph Hitrec (New York: Arcade Publishing, 1993), p. 424.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 429.
10. Andrić, *Ex Ponto. Nemiri*, p. 26.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 28–29.
12. Hawkesworth, quoting *Ex Ponto*, p. 54.
13. Andrić, *Ex Ponto. Nemiri*, p. 49.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 126.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 128.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 121–22.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 135 and 137.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 144.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

## IMAGINING YUGOSLAVIA: THE HISTORICAL ARCHEOLOGY OF IVO ANDRIĆ

Andrew Wachtel

The anthropologist Benedict Anderson has suggested that nations be understood as “imagined political communities.”<sup>1</sup> This definition has had many implications for research on the subject, but I would like to pause on one of them: that people choose the nation to which they belong and that therefore members of what seems to be a single nation can, under altered historical circumstances, begin to imagine themselves part of different nations, or vice versa. It is particularly appropriate to keep this in mind when we consider the case of the Balkan region today, where questions of how political community is to be imagined have literally taken on life and death importance. At the moment, it appears almost inevitable that nation is imagined in ethnic/religious terms and that ever smaller groups will imagine themselves to be nations, distinct from those that surround them, in a process that might be likened to the fissioning of unstable uranium atoms. In my view, however, this analogy is incomplete; for while uranium atoms must inevitably break down into smaller (more stable) units, there is no reason to believe that national fission is inevitable, even if it does seem to be the rule currently.

In the Balkans, at least, such fissioning represents a reverse swing of the pendulum away from the more inclusive imagined communities characteristic for South Slav nationalist thought in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. What drove at least one central branch of nationalist thought in the Balkans in the previous hundred years was a pan-South Slavic and sometimes even a general pan-Slavic ideology, one that eventually led to the formation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes after World War I and to the former Yugoslavia after World War II.

Now what, it may be asked, do questions of South Slav nationalism have to do with the work of Ivo Andrić? First of all, a few

biographical facts are in order. We know that as a youth Andrić took active part in the *Mlada Bosna* movement. As has been pointed out frequently, most recently in Vanita Singh Mukerji's biography of the writer, the groups to which he belonged "were in tune with the new type of liberal popular socialism whose assumptions were international solidarity, hostility to insular nationalism and the unitarian unity of the Yugoslav peoples."<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, Andrić occupied a succession of important posts in the interwar Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After the war Andrić participated in a number of literary/political bodies whose collective goal was to help strengthen an imagined community that would include all the peoples (or at least all the Slavic peoples) living on the territory of the Yugoslav state. Finally, as his Nobel Prize acceptance speech indicates, Andrić identified himself first and foremost as a representative of Yugoslav literature.<sup>3</sup> Thus if we were to base our conclusions on his extraliterary activities and statements, we could be sure that Andrić was a lifelong proponent of an inclusive Yugoslav nationalism—that is, his imagined national community was far different from the ones being proposed today.

However, if Andrić were of significance solely for his political biography, it is doubtful that conferences, symposia, and the like would be organized in his honor. We care about Andrić the writer, and there is no obvious reason why his political sympathies should be directly reflected in his major literary texts; indeed automatically imputing a "Yugoslav" message to his fiction is clearly dangerous and probably unproductive. On the other hand, it would be somewhat surprising if Andrić's literary work failed in any way to reflect his lifelong personal concerns. Of course, the imputation of a national perspective to Andrić has been standard practice among scholars, and by now it is something of a cliché to call Andrić the Yugoslav writer par excellence. But except for relatively vague hand-wavings in the direction of his overall thematics, or his attempt to bridge East and West (in which capacity he stands metonymically for the country as a whole),<sup>4</sup> surprisingly few serious attempts have been made to determine whether and how his major literary texts actually function to create the imagined community that was Yugoslavia.

I would submit that like many of the most powerful nation-imaginings, Andrić conjures his nation by an appeal to the specificity of its historical experience. What is more, he makes his strongest



historical arguments precisely in works of imaginative literature, for it is here that he gives his imagining facility its freest reign. History, as Andrić understood it, is of importance precisely because it allows for the imagining of worlds, not just past worlds, but present and future ones as well. He expressed this belief most succinctly in a little article describing the Jewish cemetery in Sarajevo:

A groblja imaju značenja ukoliko govore o životu sveta kom su pripadali oni koji u njima leže, i istorija grobalja ima smisla i opravdanja ukoliko baca svetlost na put sadašnjih ili budućih naraštaja.

(Cemeteries have meaning insofar as they speak about the life of the world in which the people who lie in them lived, and the history of cemeteries has meaning and justification insofar as it throws light on the fate of today's or tomorrow's generations.)<sup>5</sup>

The topic of history in the works of Andrić has of course become a popular subject in recent years, and much interesting work has been done in sketching out both his methods of using historical material and his general philosophical approach to the subject.<sup>6</sup> But the question of the relationship between Andrić's view of history and his view of Yugoslavia has not been proposed precisely, and that is the main subject of this essay. My task here will be to delineate the basic structure of Andrić's historical conception and then move to a consideration of how it functioned to create the imagined community that was Yugoslavia.

The first thing that must strike any reader of Andrić is the wide variety of fictional forms he used to treat his nation's past: novels, chronicles, short stories, essays. Each one of these has, to use Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, its own chronotope, and at first it seems almost hopeless to find common ground among them. Indeed if on the level of syntax Andrić seems a very traditional writer, the multiple chronotopes he employed in his literary/historical work mark him as a modernist experimenter par excellence. The question that interests me first then is whether these multiple chronotopes can be understood as fitting into a larger structure, and, if so, what kind?

In a passage from "Razgovor sa Gojom" that has been noted by a number of scholars as crucial for an understanding of Andrić's art, the spirit of Goya observes:

Ima nekoliko tačaka ljudske aktivnosti oko kojih se kroz sva vremena, sporo i u finim naslagama, stvaraju legende. Zbunjivan dugo onim što se neposredno dešavalo oko mene, ja sam u drugoj polovini svoga života došao do zaključka: da je uzaludno i pogrešno tražiti smisao u beznačajnim i prividno tako važnim događajima koji se dešavaju oko nas, nego da ga treba tražiti u onim naslagama koje stoleća stvaraju oko nekoliko glavnijih legendi čovečanstva.

(There are several points of human activity around which legends appear through all time, slowly and in fine layers. Long perplexed by what was taking place directly around me, in the latter part of my life I came to a conclusion: that it is useless and wrong to seek for meaning in the insignificant yet seemingly important events that take place around us. Rather we should seek it in those layers which the centuries have built up around a few of the central legends of humanity.)<sup>7</sup>

Two basic claims are made in this passage. The first is that human history is best understood by analogy to archeology. The “fine layers” that Goya’s spirit describes sound much like the strata of an archeological site, and consequently the historian working with such material must presumably labor like the archeologist to remove the dust of time from whatever he uncovers. The second assumption is that the best way to study human history is through a vertical examination that would cut through the various strata, revealing only the core (mythic) events. These two points are both powerful, but there is certainly no need either to accept them both or to believe that Andrić himself endorsed them. While I am convinced and will attempt to show that Andrić did indeed believe that archeological metaphors were appropriate for understanding history, his literary practice indicates that he did not share “Goya’s” views as to the proper method for exploring the subject. Indeed as we will see, his chronotopic profligacy actually flies in the face of “Goya’s” assertion.

Before continuing, I would like to point out a couple of passages from Andrić’s novel *Travnička hronika* that indicate the centrality of archeology for his understanding of Yugoslav history. Des Fosses, the young French vice-consul and a character who clearly has the narrator’s sympathy, describes a local archeological find in a conversation with his bored and unappreciative superior, Daville:<sup>8</sup>

U dubini od šest lakata otprilike mogli su se videti, kao geološke naslage, sve jedan iznad drugog, tragovi ranijih puteva koji su tom istom dolinom prolazili. Na dnu su bile teške ploče, ostaci rimske ceste, tri lakta iznad njih ostaci kaldrme srednjovekovnog drumu i, najposle, šljunak i nasip sadašnjeg turskog puta kojim mi gazimo. Tako su mi se u slučajnom preseku ukazale dve hiljade godina ljudske istorije.

(At a depth of about six yards, one on top of another, like geological strata, you could see the traces of the earlier roads that went through this valley. At the bottom were heavy slabs, the remains of the old Roman way. Three yards above them were the remains of the cobblestones of the medieval road and, last of all, the pebbles and gravel of the Turkish road on which we walk today. And so this accidental cross-section showed me two thousand years of human history.)<sup>9</sup>

A bit later in the novel, the Levantine doctor, Cologna, makes a further discovery which underlies the importance of the archeological approach for understanding Bosnian history. He describes this discovery to des Fosses, the only person in Travnik capable of appreciating it:

Kad prodjete čaršiju, zadržite se kod Jeni džamije. Oko celog zemljišta je visok zid. Unutra, pod ogromnim drvećem, grobovi za koje niko više ne zna čiji su. Za tu džamiju se zna u narodu da je nekad, pre dolaska Turaka, bila crkva Svete Katarine. . . . A kad pogledate malo bolje kamenje u tom starinskom zidu, videćete da ono potiče od rimskih ruševina i nadgrobnih spomenika. I na kamenu koji leži uzidan u toj džamskoj ogradi vi možete lepo pročitati mirna i pravilna rimska slova nekog izlomljenog teksta "Marco Flavio . . . optimo. . . ." A duboko ispod toga, u nevidljivim temeljima leže veliki blokovi crvenog granita, ostaci jednog mnogo starijeg kulta, negdašnjeg svetišta boga Mitre.

(When you pass through the marketplace, pause by the Yeni mosque. There is a high wall surrounding the whole lot. Inside, beneath a gigantic tree, there are graves, no one knows whose they are. The people know that once upon a time, before the Turks came, that mosque was the Church of St. Catherine. . . . And if you look at the stone in that ancient wall a bit more closely, you will see that it comes from Roman ruins and grave markers. And on a rock

which is immured inside that enclosure you can clearly read the tranquil and symmetrical Roman letters of some kind of broken text “Marco Flavio . . . optimo. . .” And deep beneath that, in the invisible foundations lie huge blocks of red granite, the remains of a much older cult, once the holy place of the god Mithra.)<sup>10</sup>

For now, I will hold off discussing the meaning of the particular archeological site that is Yugoslavia for Andrić. Instead I will take up the second of “Goya’s” assumptions—that archeological/historical sites are best explored through a vertical cut. The problem with this method of dealing with history/archeology is that the existence of an archeological site (actual or metaphorical) implies not one but three different potential methods of excavation. One possibility is for the archeologist to excavate fully one particular layer, to work laterally along a horizontal plane. In this way, the complex synchronic interrelations of various people living at a single time can be revealed. An example of such a dig would be Pompeii, where archeologists have chosen to explore the city as it was on one fateful day in A.D. 79 rather than digging down deeper to discover what may have been on the same site a couple of hundred years earlier.

In the realm of fiction, the classic historical novel represents an analogue to this approach. While this method is specifically rejected by “Goya,” it is the one that structures Andrić’s *Travnička hronika*. As any reader will recall, that work focuses on Bosnia during a relatively circumscribed period—the so-called years of the consuls: 1806–13. Andrić’s narrative glance ranges widely, however, to include Travnik insiders from among the Muslims, the Orthodox, the Roman Catholics, and the Jews, as well as outsiders like the viziers and the European consular officials and their families. Of course in the telling of his story, Andrić occasionally alludes to events from before these years. But he does so fleetingly, while concentrating on the intricate political and social climate of the period in question.

The result is, in effect, a cross-sectional portrait of Yugoslav life at a particular point in history. This is because, to use Bakhtinian terms again, the chronotopic assumptions of the historical novel force the writer to move primarily along horizontal narrative planes. If a novelist wished to provide a comprehensive portrait of his nation using this genre, he would in theory have to produce a series of longitudinal slices of this type (that was, after all, what Walter Scott

did in the Waverley novels). But achieving full coverage this way is obviously an impossible dream, one that even Scott with all his graphomaniac energy was unable to accomplish. Unlike Scott and his imitators, however, Andrić tried to escape the chronotopic limitations of the historical novel not by the brute force method of writing more and more of them, but rather by attempting an entirely different line of attack on his nation's history in his most famous work, *Na Drini ćuprija*.<sup>11</sup>

Andrić, like "Goya," understood that the historian/archeologist can also and with equal justification choose to explore history diachronically, through a vertical examination of a society's *longue durée*. An example of this kind of archeological dig would be the reconstruction of the succession of cities on the site of Troy by Heinrich Schliemann and his successors. Interestingly enough, although this approach, the one recommended by "Goya's" shade, was fairly common among archeologists, it had never to my knowledge been realized on an extensive scale in fictional form before. In any case, it is certainly not an approach that can be accommodated by the chronotope of the traditional historical novel.

In *Na Drini ćuprija* Andrić boldly extends his temporal focus to cover more than four hundred years. But Andrić's avoidance of the temporal limitations that bind the classic historical novel provides not full creative freedom, but only a different set of chronotopic constraints on space and character. To accommodate the book's *longue durée*, Andrić narrows his spatial focus, describing only events that take place on or about the bridge itself. What is more, he by necessity does not provide nuanced and detailed portraits of each of the historical periods he covers. Instead each one is sketched lightly, through a focus on a single, almost anecdotal event or person from a chosen period. The separate sections are for the most part unrelated to one another, except through their shared contiguity to the bridge. The resulting fictional structure is analogous to the archeologist's core sample. By digging straight down through all the layers in a specific place, we get a deep feeling for the various temporal layers of local development, exactly the opposite effect from the one produced by the broad but temporally shallow approach of the historical novel. It is significant that Andrić wrote his vertically oriented and his horizontally oriented treatments of history at approximately the same time, for this implies that he realized the

two works could and should augment each other. Indeed one might say that with their two opposing but complementary approaches, *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija* imply a dialogic attitude to history, even as each seems to assert its own, monologic attitude.<sup>12</sup>

There is, however, one drawback that these two approaches share: both are ultimately closed structures, overdetermined, as it were, one by time and the other by space. The same thing can be said of the two archeological methods described above. But the archeologist has one more choice: he can dig into the site at random spots along the vertical and horizontal planes in an attempt to avoid being bound by either the purely synchronic or purely diachronic approach. Such a "random" sampling could conceivably allow for a recognition of patterns that might otherwise remain hidden. I believe that we can discover in an embryonic state a literary analogue of this technique in Andrić's unfinished and posthumously published collection, *Kućca na osami*. This work is generically unclassifiable, although historical meditations might be the most appropriate. The conceit of the eleven finished short stories is that each represents the narrator's imagined recreation of the life and times of a particular individual. The spirits of these individuals come by turn into the writer's isolated house, but they are entirely unrelated socially, economically, or ethnically. Thus each segment represents a kind of random slice of life related to the others solely by its shared place in the writer's consciousness and the fact that the spirit had once upon a time inhabited the area around Sarajevo. Of course the choice of stories is not really random; it is certainly possible in theory to find various reasons for Andrić's inclusion of these particular stories and not other ones. Nevertheless, especially in comparison to Andrić's more tightly structured novels, this collection produces an impression of randomness, of openness.<sup>13</sup> The author limits himself to only a few stories, but the implication is that there could be an infinite number:

Nude se, bude me i zbunjuju. I posle, kak se spremim i sednem za posao, ne prestaju da navaljuju lica iz priča i odlomci njihovih razgovora, razmišljanja i postupaka, sa množinom jasno određenih pojedinosti. Sad ja moram da se branim i krijem od njih, hvatajući što više pojedinosti i bacajući što god mogu na spremljenu hartiju.

(They offer themselves, waken me and disturb me. And later, when I am dressed and sit down to work, characters from these stories and fragments of their conversations, reflections and actions do not cease to beset me, with a mass of clearly delineated detail. Now I have to defend myself from them and hide, grasping as many details as I can and throwing whatever I can down on to the waiting paper.)<sup>14</sup>

As was the case with Andrić's two previously mentioned masterpieces, this work also suggests, although it cannot achieve, the goal of complete historical coverage. Here, to present a comprehensive picture, one would need the life story of every individual who ever lived in the nation, just as one would need to examine every possible period in a series of horizontal historical novels, and every spatial point in a series of vertically oriented books like *Na Drini ćuprija*. Taken together, however, the three works I have sketchily discussed here exploit all of the possibilities inherent in the archeological metaphor: they point to, although by definition they cannot encompass, the possibility of a full exposition of every story at every historical moment—a God's eye view of history, as it were. Thus Andrić's rich chronotopic experiment creates in his readers' minds the illusion of a vast depth and breadth of historical coverage, the feeling that the full spectrum of national experience has been tapped.

But what holds these three structures together other than their collective realization of the potentials inherent in the archeological metaphor itself? What allows us to see them as not merely three separate entities, but as a kind of unity illustrating the various ways in which a Yugoslav nation could be imagined? In order to answer these questions, we must turn from the chronotopic features that made each work distinctive to the elements that remain constant despite the differences. For we must assume that if some things are found on every level of our archeological site, throughout its breadth and depth, these must be of central importance to that culture; they may indeed be the distinctive features that define it as a nation.

What first springs to mind is the shared (and unusual) relationship of the narrator to his material in each of these works. In the majority of fiction writing, the narrative perspective is either from the inside (some form of first-person narration) or the outside (third person). Andrić, however, manages to blur the line between these

types of narration, often by presenting his stories through an inclusive first-person plural narrator.<sup>15</sup> Andrić's narrator in all three historical imaginings is a part of the land and people he describes, the sum total of the Yugoslav historical process, even as he stands outside their lives.

In *Na Drini ćuprija*, for example, while the narrator places himself within the polis of Višegrad, he is careful not to identify himself with any single group. The life of Višegrad, the separate lives of its Turkish and Christian inhabitants in their various interrelationships over almost four hundred years, are fathomable only because the narrator is one of them. They pass before his eyes less as subjects for description and more as fellow citizens with a shared destiny:

Koliko ima vezira ili bogataša na svetu koji mogu svoju radost ili brigu, ili svoj ćeif i dokolicu da iznesu na ovakvo mesto? Malo, vrlo malo. A koliko je *naših*, u toku stoleća i nizu naraštaja, presedelo ovde zoru ili akšam ili noćne časove kad se neprimetno pomera ceo zvezdani svod nad glavom! Mnogi i mnogi od *nas* sedeo je tu, podnmljen i naslonjen na tesan, gladak kamen, i pri večitoj igri svetlosti na planinama i oblaka na nebu, razmršivao večno iste a uvek na drugi način zamršene konce *naših* kasabalijskih sudbina.

(How many Vezirs or rich men are there in the world who could indulge their joys or their cares, their moods or their delights in such a spot? Few, very few. But how many of *our* townsmen have, in the course of centuries and the passage of generations, sat here in the dawn or twilight or evening hours and unconsciously measured the whole starry vault above! Many and many of *us* have sat there, head in hands, leaning on the well-cut smooth stone, watching the eternal play of light on the mountains and the clouds in the sky, and have unravelled the threads of *our* small-town destinies.<sup>16</sup>

By extension, any Yugoslav reader of Andrić could have felt part of the polis imagined here, for while the Višegrad *kapija* may have been unique, the kinds of people and relationships described in *Na Drini ćuprija* were undoubtedly well known to most of the country's inhabitants.

In *Travnička hronika* the narrator is not quite as closely identified with the inhabitants of Travnik as is the narrator of *Na Drini ćuprija*



with the population of Višegrad. Nevertheless, he is not entirely an outsider, as his comment on the riots in town suggests: "Tako izgleda, tipično uzevši, postanak, razvoj i svršetak uzbuna po našim varošima" (This is what the genesis, development, and conclusion of a typical riot in our villages looks like).<sup>17</sup> Once again, the group of people included by the "we" here is far larger than the inhabitants of Travnik itself. It could theoretically include any of Andrić's readers who had come across anything like this, and that certainly included a good portion of Yugoslavia's residents.

Equally important, however, is the narrator's emphasis on his connection to the townspeople (both lifelong and temporary) in his role as chronicler, the synthesizer and ultimate repository of the collective memory that organizes the life of the town. Each group and character in the novel is dominated by a particular historical consciousness, beginning in the first lines of the novel's prologue with the Turks who gather at the Cafe Lutvo:

Toga prvog sopstvenika kafane Lutve, ne sećaju se ni najstariji ljudi . . . ali svi idu kod Lutve na kafu i njegovo se ime pamti i izgovara tamo gde su zaboravljena imena tolikih sultana, vezira, i begova.

(Even the oldest people do not recall Lutvo, the first owner of the cafe . . . but everyone goes to Lutvo's for coffee and his name is remembered and pronounced where the names of so many sultans, viziers, and beys have been forgotten.)<sup>18</sup>

The narrator is a supra-individual storyteller, the modern-day incarnation of the *guslar* (bard), perhaps, and it should not be forgotten that *guslari* were to be found among both Christians and Muslims.

In *Kuća na osami* history can exist only insofar as the narrating voice is included because historical significance in this work is defined in terms of a character's success in capturing the narrator's attention, engaging his sympathetic ear. Thus Andrić begins the story "Ljubavi" as follows:

Nisu samo pojedine ličnosti ili grupe lica koje dolaze pred moju kuću ili upadaju u moju sobu, traže od mene nešto, oduzimaju mi vreme, menjaju pravac mojih misli i okreću moja raspoloženja po svojoj volji. Čitavi predeli ili gradovi, ulice ili ljudski stanovi do-

leću, kao lake vazdušaste vizije nošene sećanjem, u želji da ovde, na mojoj hartiji, nadju svoj konačni oblik i svoje pravo značenje i objašnjenje.

(It is not just separate individuals or groups who appear before my house or descend on my room, requesting something of me, taking up my time and changing the direction of my thoughts. Entire regions or cities, streets and apartments fly in, like light airy visions wafted on memory, and they all want to discover their final form, their proper meaning and explanation here in my manuscript.)<sup>19</sup>

If the first unifying condition that allows for the imagining of a nation in the three books I have been considering rests in the nature of the archeologist, the second rests in the nature of the archeological material itself. We must recognize that however universal the thrust of Andrić's historical concerns may be, they grow out of the historical experience of his own country and should be first understood in that context. Clearly any national unity that Andrić might have imagined for his country could not have been based on fully shared social, religious, ethnic, or political bases since none of these existed. Instead it is founded on a shared attitude toward the particularities of the national history, a shared world view across time, space, and ethnic groups in which stasis is conceived of as the norm despite all outward appearances to the contrary and in which change, when it occurs, is assimilated in such a way as to be folded back into a new stasis. The unifying feature in Bosnian and Yugoslav history that Andrić's novels uncover (or perhaps create) is the paradox that on a territory that has been characterized both vertically and horizontally by a continuous and radical mix of civilizations and influences, the inhabitants are convinced that nothing ever changes. The tension—or dialectic, if you will—between constant change and the constant denial of change drives Andrić's historical narratives and forms a basis for shared nationhood. It goes without saying that the resulting cultural and national richness cannot be perceived by any individual or group within this society, nor can it be fully understood by an outsider. And it is this fact of national culture that helps to explain why Andrić's narrator must be both inside and outside his narratives simultaneously. He must be inside to understand the feeling of solidity and permanence that colors the perceptions of his

countrymen, yet he must be outside in order to perceive that the only true permanence rests in the inevitability of change.

With this paradox in mind, let us return now to the specific details of the archeological discoveries made by des Fosses and Cologna (in the excerpts on p. 86 above), for they can help us recognize the peculiar historical dialectic of the nation as Andrić imagined it.

On the one hand, we note the dizzying array of civilizations that have dominated the region—what is more, by the time Andrić's public was reading the novel, this list had been augmented a few more times. Nevertheless, it is significant that for all the changes, the site was and remains a road. One civilization built directly on top of the other, changing the surface forms but leaving inner relationships intact. Thus depending on how one chooses to interpret the site, it could be seen as an example of either radical discontinuity or of remarkable continuity. The same holds for Cologna's discovery. The site he describes went from being a pagan altar to a Roman ritual place to a church to a mosque. Again, the dominant civilization changed, but the meaning of the place remained the same.

Despite the evidence surrounding them, the residents of Travnik at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Muslim, Christian, and Jewish) all choose to interpret the world as static. The rich local Muslims, for example, see themselves as outside the historical process, a force for permanence in a world that is constantly seeking something new. Their historical wisdom is summed up by the influential and wealthy Hamdi-beg:

Mi smo ovdje na svome, a svaki drugi koji dodje na tudjem je i nema mu duga stanka. . . . Mnogi je ovdje došao da ostane, ali mi smo svakome dosada u ledja pogledali.

(We're on our own ground here, and anyone who comes in is on foreign territory and won't last long. . . . Many have come to stay here, but until now we've always seen them turn tail.)<sup>20</sup>

The outside world can offer them nothing but change, and change, in their view, is always for the worse. Therefore, history—at least history as a record of so-called important people, dates, and events—is useless to them. All they ask for is “bog da nas sačuva od slave, od krupnih gostiju i velikih događaja” (God save us from glory, important guests, and great events).<sup>21</sup>

It is not only the local Muslims who view history with suspicion and pretend that change does not occur. The attitude of Travnik's Jews is strikingly similar. Toward the end of the novel the wealthiest of them, Salomon Atijas, offers to lend money to the departing French consul, Daville, in recognition of the consul's humane conduct toward the Jews. Daville knows that the vizier recently boasted of having extorted all of the Jews' money, so he expresses amazement that there is anything left to lend. Salomon's answer is imbued with the hard-won wisdom of a people whose historical consciousness lies deep within an insular tradition:

Vezir je zaista oštar, oštar i težak gospodin. Ali on jedanput ima posla sa Jevrejima, a mi smo preturili desetine vezira. Veziri se menjaju i odlaze. . . . Odlaze veziri, zaboravljaju što su radili i kako su postupali, dolaze novi i svaki počinje iznova. A mi ostajemo—pamtimo, beležimo sve što smo podneli, kako smo se branili i spasavali i—predajemo od oca na sina to skupo plaćeno iskustvo.

(The vizier is truly a harsh man, harsh and difficult. But he has only dealt with Jews once, while we have lived through dozens of viziers. Viziers are replaced and go away. . . . Viziers go away; they forget what they did and how they acted. New ones come and each one starts over again. But we remain—we remember and keep track of everything that we have borne, how we defended and saved ourselves—and we pass this dearly bought experience down from father to son.)<sup>22</sup>

At the same time, Andrić calls the adequacy of this antihistorical view into question in his novel. In the "prologue" he describes the local beys and their conviction that Travnik is immune to change. At the end of the novel, Hamdi-beg pronounces the townspeople's last word on the eight-year incursion of history:

Konzuli će očistiti Travnik. Pominjaće se još koju godinu. Djeca će se na jaliji igrati konzula i kavaza, jašući na drvenim pritkama, pa će se i oni zaboraviti ko da nikad nisu ni bili. I sve će opet biti kao što je, po božjoj volji, oduvijek bilo.

(The consuls will clear out of Travnik. They'll be mentioned for a few more years. On the embankment the children will ride on bean poles playing consuls and couriers, and then they'll be for-

gotten as if they were never here. And everything will again be as, by God's will, it has always been.)<sup>23</sup>

Since these are the last words spoken in the novel, it might appear that the local population was correct. In fact, however, Hamdi-beg's pronouncement does not mark the absolute ending of the work. Immediately after the last lines of the novel proper we read, "U Beogradu, aprila meseca 1942 god" (In Belgrade, April 1942). This final statement, in the voice of the author, both indicates the temporal distance separating the author from the period described and shows how incorrect the beys (and the rest of the townspeople) ultimately were. As Andrić's readers certainly knew, history eventually caught up with Travnik. The Napoleonic upheaval marked the beginning of the end of the Turkish way of life in Bosnia, and the insular traditions of the Bosnians proved to be no match for the forces of change. Nevertheless, the evidence of the archeological site reminds us that at another level, the local inhabitants might not have been entirely incorrect. For while external forces may and do change, we do not know how or whether these changes are registered by the local population. Ultimately, we cannot learn this in the framework of a historical novel, for it can only show perceptions at a specific time. If we wish to explore how change and stasis work themselves out over time, we must turn instead to a book whose concern is society's *longue durée*.

In *Na Drini ćuprija* the tension between stasis and change is, not surprisingly, filtered through varying attitudes toward the bridge itself, for as the narrator tells us, "Stoga je priča o postanju i sudbini mosta u isto vreme i priča o životu kasabe i njenih ljudi, iz naraštaja u naraštaj" (The story of the foundation and destiny of the bridge is at the same time the story of the life of the town and of its people, from generation to generation).<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, the implied history of the town itself is by no means limited to the time frame of the novel, long as it may be. As was the case in *Travnička hronika*, archeology reveals the inevitability of change:

Na desnoj obali reke, navrh strmog brega, gde su sada ruševine, bio je dobro sačuvan Stari grad, razgranato utvrđenje, još iz doba cvata bosanskog kraljevstva.

(On the right bank of the river, on the crest of a precipitous hill, where now there are ruins, rose the well preserved Old Fortress, with widespread fortifications dating from the time of the flowering of the Bosnian kingdom.)<sup>25</sup>

Despite the visible ruins of the once mighty fortress which stare them daily in the face, reminding them of the transitory existence of even stone things, the townspeople (and the narrator as well, it would seem) imagine the bridge as a structure outside of time. Rather than perceiving the bridge as a product of man, everyone chooses to see it as a fact of nature, a part of the landscape:

A smisao i suština njegovog postojanja kao da su bili u njegovoj stalnosti. Njegova svetla linija u sklopu kasabe nije se menjala kao ni profil okolnih planina na nebu.

(And the significance and substance of its existence were, so to speak, in its permanence. Its shining line in the composition of the town did not change, any more than the outlines of the mountains against the sky.)<sup>26</sup>

The inhabitants of Višegrad, as if infected by the permanence of the bridge, seem equally immune to change, despite the various governments and empires that nominally control their destiny. For example, one of the biggest jolts in the town's existence should have been the cession of Bosnia to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but as the narrator notes with a tinge of irony,

Tako se veliki preokret u životu kasabe kraj mosta desio bez drugih žrtava osim Alihodžinog stradanja. Već posle nekoliko dana život je krenuo ponovo i izgledao je u suštini nepromenjen.

(Thus the great change in the life of the town beside the bridge took place without sacrifices other than the martyrdom of Alihodja. After a few days life went on again as before and seemed essentially unchanged.)<sup>27</sup>

As opposed to the characters, however, the narrator realizes that no change does not really mean no change; it simply means that people choose not to notice how different things are:

I onaj isti svet koji je u svojim kućama zadržavao u svemu stari red i nije pomišljao da ga menja mirio se uglavnom lako sa tim

promenama u varoši i primao ih posle kraćeg ili dužeg čudjenja i gundjanja. Naravno da je i tu, kao što uvek i svuda biva u sličnim prilikama, nov život značio u stvari mešavinu starog i novog. Stara shvatanja i stare vrednosti sudarali su se sa novima, mešali medju sobom ili živeli uporedo, kao da čekaju ko će koga nadživeti.

(Those same people, who in their own homes maintained the old order in every detail and did not even dream of changing anything, became for the most part easily reconciled to the changes in the town and after a longer or shorter period of wonder and grumbling accepted them. Naturally here, as always and everywhere in similar circumstances, the new life meant in actual fact a mingling of the old and the new. Old ideas and old values clashed with the new ones, merged with them or existed side by side, as if waiting to see which would outlive which.)<sup>28</sup>

Ultimately in Višegrad, as in Travnik and Sarajevo, and as in Andrić's own Yugoslavia, the only truly permanent force was the constant interchange among the different peoples who lived on this same, contested territory. This is what makes up the country's peculiar historical value. And these interrelationships are complicated, irrational, and maddeningly permanent. The imagined community of Yugoslavia can exist only by including these competing, inimical, yet closely related groups, and it is ultimately the passion of their static yet ever-evolving relationships that appears in all of Andrić's work, cutting across the chronotopic lines of his fictions.

Andrić puts the raw and dangerous side of this relationship most starkly in a work that is not, strictly speaking, historical—the novel *The Woman from Sarajevo*:

Pripadnici triju glavnih vera, oni se mrze medjusobno, od rođenja pa do smrti, bezumno i duboko, prenoseći tu mržnju i na zagrobni svet koji zamišljaju kao svoju slavu i pobedu a poraz i sramotu komšije inoverca. Radjaju se, rastu i umiru u toj mržnji, toj stvarno fizičkoj odvratnosti prema susedu druge vere, često im i ceo vek prodje a da im se ne pruži prilika da tu mržnju ispolje u svoj njenoj sili i strahoti; ali kad god se povodom nekog krupnog događaja pokoleba ustavljeni red stvari i razum i zakon budu suspendovani za nekoliko sati ili nekoliko dana, onda se ta rulja, odnosno jedan njen deo, našavsi najposle valjan povod, izliva na ovu varoš,

poznatu inače zbog svoje ugladjene ljubaznosti u društvenom životu i slatke reči u govoru.

(Adherents of the three main faiths, they hate each other, from birth to death, senselessly and profoundly, carrying that hatred even into the afterlife, which they imagine as glory and triumph for themselves, and shame and defeat for their infidel neighbor. They are born, grow and die in this hatred, this truly physical revulsion for their neighbor of different faith, frequently their whole life passes without their having an opportunity to express their hatred in its full force and horror; but whenever the established order of things is shaken by some important event, and reason and the law are suspended for a few hours or days, then this mob, or rather a section of it, finding at last an adequate motive, overflows into the town, which is otherwise known for the polished cordiality of its social life and its polite speech.)<sup>29</sup>

Lest one think that riot was the only type of interaction Andrić could imagine, one should recall his description of Višegrad during one of the great floods:

Izmešani Turci, hrišćani i Jevreji. Snaga stihije i teret zajedničke nesreće približili su ove ljude i premostili bar za večeras onaj jaz koji deli i jednu veru od druge.

(Turks, Christians and Jews mingled together. The force of the elements and the weight of the common misfortune brought all these men together and bridged, at least for this one evening, the gulf that divided one faith from the other.)<sup>30</sup>

Always each group believes that its way of doing things at a particular time and place is as permanent and as "natural" as the Višegrad bridge. But as all of Andrić's historical narratives show, the only permanent thing is their constant conflict, interaction, and interrelationship. No matter how much they may hate each other, no matter how much they may wish to shut themselves off from the various others who surround them, this proves to be impossible. Just as pagan civilization was folded into Roman, as Roman ways were incorporated by the Bosnian or Serbian kingdoms, as the Slavs became part of the Turkish empire, so Andrić imagined a Yugoslav nation that would be unified through its common legacy of change and stasis. Hatred and rivalry would always play important roles,



as would cooperation and intermingling. So it had been at every depth and across every width of the archeological site that was Yugoslavia. So it was in the very language Andrić employed, with its extravagant Turkisms and frequently used German terms grafted onto an artificially unified Serbo-Croatian. Recognizing the full difficulty of the situation, Andrić could still imagine a nation created from its history, one in which Cologne's prayer toward the end of *Travnička hronika* might apply. Having described the different archeological layers underneath the mosque, Cologne adds:

Vi razumite, sve je to jedno u drugom, povezano, a samo naoko izgleda izgubljeno i zaboravljeno, rastureno, bez plana. Sve to ide, i ne sluteći, ka jednoj meti, kao konvergentni zraci dalekom, nepoznatom zarištu. Ne treba zaboraviti da u Kuranu stoji izrično: "Možda će Bog jednog dana izmiriti vas i vaše protivnike i između vas vaspostaviti prijateljstvo."

(You understand, this is all linked one thing to another, and it only seems lost and forgotten, broken up, without a plan. Without suspecting it, everything is going toward a single target, like convergent rays on a distant unknown focal point. One shouldn't forget that in the Koran it says: "It may be that one day God will reconcile you and your enemy and will restore friendship between you.")<sup>31</sup>

## NOTES

1. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983), p. 15.
2. Vanita Singh Mukerji, *Ivo Andrić: A Critical Biography* (Jefferson, N.C., 1990), p. 15.
3. "My homeland is truly 'a small country between worlds' as one of our writers has put it, and it is a country which is trying in all fields, including culture, at the price of great sacrifices and exceptional energy to compensate rapidly for all that its unusually stormy and difficult past has denied it. . . . Your recognition of one writer from that country undoubtedly means encouragement for that endeavor" (quoted in Celia Hawkesworth, *Ivo Andrić: Bridge between East and West* [London, 1984], p. 6). The entire text of the speech, entitled "O priči i pričanju," can be found in Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, 17 vols. (Sarajevo, 1984), vol. 12, pp. 66–70. All references to the works of Andrić in Serbo-Croatian

are taken from this edition and will be identified by volume and page number from it. Translations are mine unless noted otherwise.

4. Mukerji, for example, notes that “the themes and paradoxes Andrić projects in his writings are intrinsically linked with facets of Balkan consciousness and the complexities of progress and coexistence” (p. ix), but his analysis tends mainly to assume a too direct connection between Andrić’s life and his work. Hawkesworth develops the bridge metonym, but she chooses not to go very far below the surface of Andrić’s texts, perhaps because there is more than enough material on that level to fill an excellent book.

5. “Na jevrejskom groblju u Sarajevu,” in Andrić, vol. 10, p. 176.

6. Most notably, one should mention Dragan Nedeljković, ed., *Reflets de l’histoire européenne dans l’oeuvre d’ Ivo Andrić* (Nancy, 1987). I will refer to some of the contributions to this book below.

7. Original in Andrić, vol. 12, p. 23. It is somewhat surprising that sophisticated literary scholars have been so quick to identify “Goya” with his creator, yet this is unquestionably the case. Mukerji, for example, believes that these views correspond directly to Andrić’s own: “The ideas which contoured Andrić’s creative thought surface in the monologue attributed to Goya’s resurrected shade” (p. 30). Hawkesworth too finds this passage to be of central importance, claiming that “these words can be read as Andrić’s own personal statement” (p. 5). Predrag Palavestra claims that “the heart of Andrić’s philosophy of history is contained in this knowledge” (“Ivo Andrić’s Historical Thought,” in Nedeljković, ed., p. 49).

8. The belief that des Fosses is a character with whom Andrić has a great deal of sympathy is accepted (for good reason, I think) by most scholars. For only one example, see Nedeljković’s own article from his collection: “Le Véritable messenger d’Andrić dans *La Chronique de Travnik* est le jeune Français Chaumette des Fosses” (p. 206).

9. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 148.

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 332–33.

11. It should be noted, incidentally, that later in life Andrić returned to the longitudinal approach in his unfinished final novel, *Omer Pasha Latas*.

12. For a detailed discussion of how dialogic approaches to history can come from the juxtaposition of monologic works by the same author, see Andrew Wachtel, *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past* (Stanford, 1993).

13. It is possible that the open structure of *Kuća na osami* represents a conscious attempt by Andrić to retrieve something of the openness that had characterized his earliest works, *Ex Ponto* and *Nemiri*, but that had largely been lost in his middle period. For a discussion of the differences between Andrić’s early and middle periods in this context, see the article by Gordana Crnković in this collection.

14. Andrić, vol. 14, p. 12; translation from Hawkesworth, p. 114.

15. He may have learned this technique from Tolstoy, who uses it from time to time in *War and Peace*, most notably on the first pages, when describing the discourse of Prince Vasilii: "He spoke in that elaborately choice French, in which our forefathers not only spoke but thought" (Leo Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, trans. Constance Garnett [New York: Modern Library, n.d., p. 1). For a more nuanced study of the first-person plural voice in Andrić, see the contribution by Ronelle Alexander in this volume.
16. Andrić, vol. 1, p. 18; translation from Ivo Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*; trans. Lovett F. Edwards (Chicago, 1977), p. 20; emphasis mine.
17. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 183.
18. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 9.
19. Andrić, vol. 14, p. 104.
20. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 12.
21. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 18.
22. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 519.
23. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 532.
24. Andrić, vol. 1, p. 20; Edwards translation, p. 21.
25. Andrić, vol. 1, pp. 21–22.; Edwards translation, p. 22.
26. Andrić, vol. 1, p. 80; Edwards translation, p. 71.
27. Andrić, vol. 1, p. 161; Edwards translation, p. 134.
28. Andrić, vol. 1, pp. 163–64; Edwards translation, p. 136.
29. Andrić, vol. 3, p. 86; translation in Hawkesworth, p. 165.
30. Andrić, vol. 1, p. 88; Edwards translation, p. 77.
31. Andrić, vol. 2, p. 333.

## IVO ANDRIĆ AND THE SARCOPHAGUS OF HISTORY

### Dragan Kujundžić

There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism.

– Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History”

When accepting the Andrić Prize for his *Encyclopaedia of the Dead*, Danilo Kiš chose to speak about history as the most important aspect of Andrić’s work:

[Andrić] experiences history as the “sound and the fury,” as a result of his disappointment with political struggles. As a writer, Andrić juxtaposes to the chaos of history “law, measure, work, order and asceticism.” His poetics, which springs from a belief that fantasy is a sister of lying and therefore dangerous, leads him to dismiss “superficial imagination as a deception without dignity.” “To know truth and to tell truth” becomes his poetic ideal and literary program.

Having turned away from the experience of history, however, Andrić returned to history as fiction: instead of experimenting with language, Andrić sought law, order and measure in the material of history.<sup>1</sup>

This dual relationship to history allowed Andrić to open “European prose towards new possibilities and topics.”<sup>2</sup> By “returning to history,” Andrić returns history as fiction, through his work, to his readers. This return to history, as Kiš reminds us, involves a certain disgust with history and simultaneously an acceptance of history as a realm of law, order, and measure which structures Andrić’s narrative. Inasmuch as Andrić returns to history by turning away from it, history obsessively returns to Andrić and haunts his writing. Actu-

ally, Andrić's entire oeuvre—from *Ex Ponto* (1918) and *Unrest* (1920), through the Bosnian stories ("The Journey of Alija Djerzelez" [1920], "Mustafa Madžar" [1924], and "The Bridge on the Žepa" [1931]), his reflective prose "Bridges" (1933), his mature novels (*The Bridge on the Drina* and *Bosnian Chronicle* [1945]), to his unfinished work *Omer Pasha Latas* (1977)—oscillates between this disgust with history and the desire to return to it.

The privileged metaphor that in Andrić's work represents and connects these two radically opposed movements of the historical is that of the bridge. A bridge both divides these two opposing forces and binds them with the power of an "unusual thought lost in the wilderness."<sup>3</sup> These two forces induced by history, one of disgust and one of recuperation and preservation, can also be called the forces of forgetting and remembering of the historical. Andrić's work thus may be seen as an attempt to negotiate or to bridge (and yet keep open) the abyss between the desire to forget the catastrophe of history and its preservation and commemoration. History thus may be seen in Andrić's writing as the Nietzschean "eternal recurrence" (*Ewige Wiederkunft*), which appears in his texts only inasmuch as Andrić desires to erase it, repress it, and repetitively forget it. (In that respect it also has all the qualities of the Freudian *Wiederholungszwang*, of compulsive, neurotic repetition.)<sup>4</sup>

But what is there in the bridge that so persistently offers itself to a reflection on history, remembrance, and forgetting? Why does Andrić choose the bridge as a privileged space of and for his writing? What kind of "space" is the bridge? Before turning to Andrić, we will try to find the answers to these questions from the foremost philosopher of bridges, Martin Heidegger.<sup>5</sup>

The bridge, Heidegger teaches us, is in itself an antithetical construction that both binds and divides, gathers and differentiates, connects and juxtaposes, preserves and obliterates. In that sense, the bridge is a structure of "pure contradiction" (Rilke), set on the borderline between life and death, earth and sky:

The bridge swings over the stream with "ease and power." It does not just connect banks that are already there. The banks emerge as banks only as the bridge crosses the stream. The bridge by design causes them to lie across from each other. One side is set off against the other by the bridge.<sup>6</sup>

The bridge reinforces the abyss it was built to cross, a point of division. This antithetical binding, a double bind between two banks both divided and connected, constitutes any bridge. The bridge serves our daily purposes, our work, and facilitates our presence here on earth, “hastening men to and fro, so that they may get to other banks.”<sup>7</sup> But this “gathering” quality is only one aspect of its purpose. The other is much more important, as it connects men with their mortality—that is, their death:

Now in a high arch, now in a low, the bridge vaults over glen and stream—whether mortals keep in mind this vaulting of the bridge’s course or forget that they [are] *always themselves on their way to the last bridge*.<sup>8</sup>

For Heidegger too the bridge connects memory (“keep in mind”) and forgetting (“mortals . . . forget”), and he relates them to the fundamental property of the bridge. To cross the bridge means to always strive for that “last bridge.” As Heidegger has it, we can cross the bridge only insofar as we are mortals, those destined to die. This destination of mortals is reconstituted every time we cross the bridge or when we are, as Heidegger puts it, escorted by the bridge. The memory of this passage is the truth of the bridge.

The bridge connects and divides life from death, memory and forgetting, presence and transcendence. We build bridges to both confirm our presence here on earth and to mark it as profoundly passing, temporal, and evasive. To cross a river over the bridge is to cross Lethe, the river of death and forgetting, but also to be confronted with truth and remembrance, Aletheia, commemorated by the bridge. The bridge is thus always a tombstone of sorts, its vaults and arches keeping us within themselves as a sarcophagus keeps and eats away the bodily remains. Indeed, Heidegger himself likens the bridge to a coffin, the “Totenbaum . . . designed for the different generations . . . their journey through time.”<sup>9</sup> The bridge designs (that is, constructs) both the earthly destination and the passage of time for mortals, for it commemorates the fact that earthly time always ends in the messianic, apocalyptic time of death. This balance between life and death, which marks the passage of time for the generations (and is therefore constitutive of the historical as well), is what we call “the bridge.”<sup>10</sup>

At the end of “The Bridge on the Žepa,” the narrator returns from the mountain and rests on the bridge on a warm summer evening:

When he leaned on the stone, he felt that it was still warm from the summer heat. The man was sweating, and the cold wind was blowing from the Drina; pleasant and fascinating was the touch of the warm, carved stone. It is then that he decided to write its *history*.<sup>11</sup>

The story thus ends with the beginning of history. What is the history of the bridge on the Žepa? Is it the same as its story? Andrić tells us that in the fourth year of his rule, the Grand Vizier Yusuf fell into disgrace as a victim of a dangerous intrigue. The struggle lasted through the winter until May, when Yusuf finally won. The victory was not a joyous one; the victorious vizier retained a silent and reflective memory of his initial fall, suffering, and pain. Yusuf was left with the feeling that “between life and death and glory and disaster there was but a step.”<sup>12</sup> It is this memory of near death that reminded the grand vizier of his childhood: “He remembered Bosnia and the village Žepa, from which he was taken when he was nine.”<sup>13</sup> This made him also remember his parents, and he ordered white tombstones to be built on their graves. This memory of his childhood and the death of his parents makes him decide to build the bridge.

Andrić’s narrative is very laconic here. When he says that the vizier was taken from Žepa at the age of nine, Andrić means that Yusuf was forcibly taken by the Janissary Corps, in fulfillment of a blood tribute, and converted to Islam from Christianity in Istanbul. Building the bridge reconnects the vizier with the place of his birth. The bridge thus may be seen as the umbilical cord that both ties him to his childhood and marks the point of violent separation. In *The Bridge on the Drina* Andrić will tell us that Mehmed Pasha Sokolović shared the same destiny and that his choice of a place for the bridge in Višegrad was guided by the desire to mark the place where he last saw his mother. The metaphorical substitution of the bridge for the umbilical cord is made explicit by the narrative. After the bridge on the Žepa was built,

People started gathering from the surrounding villages to see the bridge. From Višegrad and Rogatica townspeople were coming to

see it and marveled at it, regretting that it was in this wilderness and not in their city. "One should give birth to a vizier," the villagers of Žepa would answer, and slapped the stone wall, which was straight and sharply edged, as if it were cut in cheese and not carved in stone.<sup>14</sup>

That the vizier was born in Žepa makes it the proper place for the bridge. Andrić also subtly suggests that the material used for the bridge is that of milk (i.e., "cheese"), which reinforces the metaphor of the bridge as the umbilical cord and the site of birth and separation from the mother. In *The Bridge on the Drina* Andrić develops this laconically formulated metaphor and builds it into the bridge as its foundation. As the building of the bridge over the Drina was hampered by ghostly forces, as the myth recounted by Andrić has it, it was decided that newly born twins should be built into it:

At last the guards found such twins, still at the breast, in a distant village and the Vezir's men took them away by force; but when they were taking them away, their mother would not be parted from them and, weeping and wailing, insensible to blows and to curses, stumbled after them as far as Višegrad itself, where she succeeded in forcing her way to Rade the Mason.

The children were walled into the pier, for it could not be otherwise, but Rade, they say, had pity on them and left openings in the pier through which the unhappy mother could feed her sacrificed children. Those are the finely carved blind windows, narrow as loopholes, in which the wild doves now nest. In memory of that, the mother's milk has flowed from those walls for hundreds of years. That is the thin white stream which, at certain times of year, flows from that faultless masonry and leaves an indelible mark on the stone. (The idea of woman's milk stirs in the childish mind a feeling at once too intimate and too close, yet at the same time vague and mysterious like Vezirs and masons, which disturbs and repulses them.) Men scrape those milky traces off the piers and sell them as medicinal powder to women who have no milk after giving birth.<sup>15</sup>

The bridge is not only a source of nourishment, fertility, a breast of sorts, a giant mother, but also the site of a violent, deadly separation, a sarcophagus for the newly born walled into the bridge to die.



The stone of which the bridge was made is thus both milk on which the generations will subsequently nourish themselves, a digestible stone which can be appropriated and consumed, and a stone which in turn kills, erases, bleeds, and devours.<sup>16</sup> The bridge therefore keeps the traces of both the mother and the tombstone. The bridge is made possible by the separation and sacrifice built into its foundation, yet its monumental beauty hides the catastrophe of its origin. To paraphrase René Girard, it is for Andrić the space of both the violent and the sacred, innocence and sacrifice, a birthplace which commemorates the site of death. For the bridge is meant to connect what it irretrievably and unrecuperably separates: a mother from her children, who are destined to die. The whiteness of the bridge and the milky marks flowing from the masonry are the traces of an immeasurable loss, traces of mourning and melancholia for the dead children, metaphorical tears for the separation and division built by the bridge. Andrić's bridge sets the abyss between the banks and constitutes a dramatic, deadly, and violent rift, beyond any possible reconciliation, at the very site of bridging and connection.

In "The Bridge on the Žepa" the choice to build the bridge and not some other structure was at first also guided by the need of the villagers, who had only a wooden bridge over the river connecting them with the outside world. Their daily labor, trade, and transport were always in danger from the unpredictable river Žepa:

The village is on the hill near the place where the Žepa flows into the Drina, and the only road to Višegrad leads over the Žepa, some fifty yards above the juncture. Whatever wooden bridge they make, it is destroyed by the river. Either the Žepa overflows its banks, suddenly as all mountain rivers, destroying and washing away the beams, or the level of the Drina rises, thus backing up the flow of the Žepa, which washes away the bridge as if it never existed. And in winter the ice catches on the wooden beams, so that both cattle and people break their necks. Whoever would build the bridge there would do them the greatest service.<sup>17</sup>

The bridge was thus meant to facilitate the daily gathering, to help the villagers in their daily labor and routine, to escort them from the fields and to Višegrad, "so that they may come and go from shore to shore. Always and ever differently the bridge escorts the

lingering and hastening ways of men to and fro," and in that sense the bridge on the Žepa served the purpose of daily gathering and passing, "leading in many ways."<sup>18</sup>

This beneficial aspect of the bridge, as Heidegger has it, is only one aspect of the bridge, which has "much else besides. . . . The bridge, if it is a true bridge, is never first of all a mere bridge, and then afterward a symbol."<sup>19</sup> Very soon after the bridge over the Žepa was built, it started to emanate its true and equally important nature, that of the passage of mortals, whom it escorts to death. The first victim of the bridge was its architect and main engineer, who left Žepa without having a last look at the bridge and then just two days' ride from Istanbul died of the black plague. The news of his death reached the Grand Vizier Yusuf the next day, together with the plans of the bridge that the architect carried to Istanbul. Two years after his return to power, Yusuf had grown pensive, melancholic, and depressed:

As time went by, he—instead of forgetting—more and more often in his memory recalled the prison cell. And if he could forget about it during the day, he could not escape his dreams. The prison cell started to haunt his dreams, and from his nightmares an unspeakable horror moved into his life to poison his days. . . . The victorious vizier became scared of life. He thus entered that phase which is the first stage of dying. . . . This evil tormented him . . . and when that evil finished its work, people would say simply: death.<sup>20</sup>

The completion of the bridge is inseparable from two deaths: that of the architect and of the grand vizier himself. The bridge, which is at the beginning of the story related to the vizier's birthplace as a site of nourishment, now becomes a sarcophagus, a prison cell of memory that eats the vizier alive. Instead of connecting the vizier with Bosnia ("He thought of the distant hilly and dark land of Bosnia—a thought of Bosnia always had for him something dark!"),<sup>21</sup> the bridge reinforces the rift and distance between Yusuf and his birthplace. The loss is all the more profound and devastating since it is represented by the geometrically perfect bridge. The contrast in its "fearful symmetry" underscores the terrible emptiness that the bridge opens in the grand vizier. But if the bridge only augments the distance between the vizier and Bosnia, it brings him nearer to death and escorts him to the other side, as a sarcophagus

or a tombstone welcomes those who are laid in them. It is as if the bridge demands its toll from the man who built it, as if it opens up the void which calls the vizier forth into emptiness and death. The bridge, as Maurice Blanchot puts it, is “the stone and the tomb which not only withhold the cadaverous void which is to be animated; they constitute the presence . . . of what is to appear.”<sup>22</sup>

As the news of the architect’s death reached the vizier, a chronogram with an inscription for the bridge written by a young poet was sent to him. It was meant to commemorate the public structure donated by Yusuf to the villagers of Žepa. The inscription contained a poem praising the vizier; his seal, which contained his name, Yusuf Ibrahim, the Devoted Servant of God; and his logo, In Silence Is Safety (U ćutanju je sigurnost). The vizier deliberated for a long time over the inscription and then deleted the poem and his name. Only his logo was left, and he erased it as well. Thus “The bridge was left without name and sign.”<sup>23</sup> The vizier erased the identity of the bridge, leaving only whiteness, blank space, and emptiness, “the white arch” of the bridge without signature.<sup>24</sup> The vizier not only deletes his name from the bridge (thus cutting the patrimonial, genealogical connection with the bridge as well), but, by erasing the word “silence,” also produces a *double silence*, a silence and emptiness beyond healing. (He literally silences silence.) The erasure also anticipates the ultimate blankness that any life reaches at the other side of the bridge. Thus Andrić’s story originates from the history of the bridge, which echoes with this double silence. In the last scene, the lonely traveller comes to the bridge and decides to write its history. The story narrates this “history,” all the while erasing it.

This initial erasure or whiteness, which devours representation and writing cast onto or into it, appears in Andrić’s prose at crucial, we could almost say “fundamental,” junctures in his work. We will mention just one example, in which the erasure of history and its reconstitution in the narrative function as the major rhetorical force shaping the text. One of the most melancholic scenes in which this all-consuming whiteness appears is the beginning of *The Devil’s Yard* (Prokleta avlija, 1954), which starts with the snow falling over the newly dug grave of Fra Petar:

It is winter, and the snow has fallen over everything up to the house entrance; it has taken away from everything its real shape,

and has given it one color and one appearance. This whiteness covers the small graveyard as well, of which only the highest crosses sticking from the deep snow are visible. The only trace in this whiteness is a narrow path leading through the virginal snow; the path had been beaten during Fra Petar's funeral. At the end of the path this narrow line widens into a circle, and the snow around it has the reddish color of the wet earth, and everything looks like a fresh wound in this all-pervading whiteness, which stretches into infinity and disappears invisibly into the gray desert of sky still full of snow.<sup>25</sup>

The story continues with the description of Fra Petar's cell, now emptied and cleaned after his death, and the two monks counting the things left by the deceased. (This accounting of the things left is the proper frame of Andrić's historical sensibility since the things depict the material remains as melancholy signs of the passed, deceased existence.) The story that follows fills in the whiteness of the opening scene, as if from an open wound. Needless to say, the story concerns the "history" of a single building, the prison-house called the Devil's Yard. (Interestingly, the Devil's Yard is also likened to a bridge, and people confined to it to the "slow, muddy river flowing through it.")<sup>26</sup> A deranged scholar was arrested and then murdered for his work on Džem-sultan, the brother of Sultan Bajazit. Having so strongly identified himself with the historical subject of his research (and living the identificatory phantasm that he actually *was* Džem-sultan himself), the scholar was suspected of having political pretensions to the current throne. The scholar's phantasm was enough to land him in the Devil's Yard and to have him killed. The yard thus possesses the same destructive power as that represented by the bridge. Its walls literally eat people alive. With this terrifying story commemorating both the manipulated Džem-sultan and the mad scholar (all the while depicting the horrors of politics and history), Andrić again juxtaposes a scene which erases all traces of the Devil's Yard. In the end, says Andrić, there is nothing—just Fra Petar's grave among other graves, lost in the snow:

The snow turns everything in the cold desert without *name and sign*. . . . Only the snow is left, and the simple fact that we die and go under the ground.<sup>27</sup>

Andrić finishes his account of the two histories—that of the Devil’s Yard and that of the Žepa bridge—with an identical erasure of “names and signs.”<sup>28</sup> Both narratives thus flow from the wound opened up by history, and the erasure at their ends underscores the violence of history recounted by the narrative. This wound on the whiteness—of snow, of time, of writing paper—is the bleeding away, the irretrievable loss that is called history and that engenders Andrić’s writing.

In *The Bridge on the Drina* the whiteness of the bridge is explicitly depicted as that of paper: “This stone has acquired with time the shining whiteness of parchment and glows in the dark as if lit up from within.”<sup>29</sup> The whiteness of the bridge is the whiteness of the paper on which Andrić writes the story of the bridge. The bridge is thus both the object of Andrić’s writing and the welcoming host space on which Andrić puts the description of the bridge and his signature. *The Bridge on the Drina* is like graffiti on the bridge over the Drina.

In a similar way, the whiteness opened up by Yusuf Ibrahim’s erasure of his signature on the bridge over the Žepa provides the space on which the story of the bridge will be written. In that sense, the history of the bridge needs to be erased in order for the story to take place, and vice versa. The bridge is like a Möbius strip, the erasure of history being the reverse side, the condition of the story, one supplementing the other yet producing each other’s silence and erasure. The story supports and remembers the monument, the remains of history left over from the past, and mends the catastrophe of its origin. The history is a point of disgust which needs to be erased by the story, but this disgust is the necessary impetus of Andrić’s writing.

In his “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” Walter Benjamin pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees only one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly forces him into the future to which his back is turned,

while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress.<sup>30</sup>

If we appropriate this picture of the angel of history from Benjamin, we could say that for Andrić history is equally a “single catastrophe,” but instead of wreckages, it piles up geometric figures, monuments, and beautiful bridges that serve as founding stones of Andrić’s narrative. His narrator, leaning against the wall of the bridge, reflects on the history of this perfect monument. But the story behind this perfection is that of a catastrophic loss produced by history and silenced by the stone without sign or name. The origin of this historical monument is no less catastrophic than the one seen by Benjamin’s *Angelus Novus*. The price paid for its beauty is too high to be voiced. The silence of the stone reverberates with the muteness one feels facing horror, destruction, and death.

In a fragment entitled “Faces,” Andrić describes that catastrophic force of history as being able to silence even the inscriptions made in stones, erasing “the last traces of the relief, and attaining what the interior of the stone was inclined to for ages: to become what it used to be, stone among stone.” Andrić likens this self-consuming force to that of an “equally ancient sarcophagus.”<sup>31</sup> The historic monuments are flesh-eating stones. Everything commemorated by the monument rings with the silence that devours any movement or presence, like a sarcophagus. That is why “the stone is so eternal and so close to disappearing.”<sup>32</sup>

As much as the bridge on the Žepa is contained by its (hi)story, it also contains the story as the blankness of the paper contains writing, or as the white sheet contains the corpse in Muslim funerals. The warm stone placed on the threshold between the hot summer day and the cold wind coming from the Drina commemorates the body of its builder, his dying and death, a cooling body turning into stone. The two whitenesses, that of milk and that of the tombstone, of birth and death, meet, doubled and folded over each other, as if greeting each other, on the bridge.

In *The Bridge on the Drina*, Andrić explored all the dimensions of the bridge outlined in his shorter works. As we have seen, the bridge is from the beginning of the novel depicted as both the origin of life and a sarcophagus, its stone walls holding and eating the twins alive. Andrić also tells us that during the building of the

bridge, a huge stone block fell on one of the workers, a young Arab (apprentice of master Antonio, the head engineer), cutting him in half and forever burying his legs in the foundation of the highest and strongest of the supporting vaults. The stone block fell right into its place and was therefore not removed to take out the remains of the young Arab, who died soon after the incident and could not be helped anyway:

All the Muslim men came to bid farewell and for a few steps carry his *tabut* [coffin], in which only half of his body lay since the other half of him was left under the stone block.<sup>33</sup>

The bridge literally bites off the flesh of men building it and keeps it in its walls as a material that perfectly seals its foundation.

Another body taken by the bridge is that of the peasant Radisav, caught destroying the bridge during its construction. His sacrifice by impaling is the most violent scene in Andrić's work and is also relevant for understanding Andrić's views of the encounter between the Muslim and Christian cultures. During the impaling,

For a moment the hammering ceased. Merdjan [the impaler] now saw that close to the right shoulder muscles the skin was stretched and swollen. He went forward quickly and cut the swollen place with two cuts *in the shape of a cross*.<sup>34</sup>

The sacrifice of Radisav in effect works as an offering to the bridge, after which construction continues without incident. But Radisav's body is also symbolically built into the bridge and remains its indelible part. Before his body is taken from the pale (and buried secretly by the Christians, who made a deal with the executioner), it is left for a day tied to the bridge:

Naked to the waist, with arms and legs bound, his head thrown back against the stake, that figure no longer seemed to bear any likeness to a human body which grows and then rots away, but seemed to be raised on high, hard and imperishable as a statue which would remain there forever.<sup>35</sup>

Radisav's impaling is depicted by Andrić as sacrifice. After his death, women say prayers for him and burn votive candles, mentioning Radisav as the "martyr chosen by God and called to Him as if he has built the greatest church."<sup>36</sup> That sacrifice also requires silence.

Mothers tell their sons: "Be silent, my soul, be silent. Listen to your mother and beware, as long as you are alive, the accursed Turk."<sup>37</sup> The sacrifice of Radisav's body ties it to the building of the bridge, to commemoration, to building the church, of which his stone body (*pétra*) is a foundation, and to Christ. The symbolic statue into which his corpse is transformed after his death binds forever the sacrifice, pain, agony, and suffering and the eternal silence of the stone bridge.

The finishing of the bridge is followed by a feast that lasts several days. Immediately after the celebration, the novel quite predictably depicts the death of the Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha Sokolović. The beginning of life for the bridge inevitably means the end for its creator:

All this, as the bridge itself, was the bequest of the Grand Vezir, Mehmed Pasha, who had been born more than sixty years before up there behind the mountains in the hillside village of Sokolovići, and who in his childhood had been taken away with a crowd of other Serbian peasant boys as blood tribute to Stambul. . . .

Thus many troubles and inconveniences disappeared with the erection of the bridge. There disappeared too that strange pain which the Vezir in his childhood had brought from Bosnia, from the Višegrad ferry; those dark shooting pains which from time to time had seemed to cut his breast in two. But it was not fated that Mehmed Pasha should live without those pangs or long enjoy in his thoughts his Višegrad bequest. Shortly after the final completion of the work, just when the caravanserai had begun to work properly and the bridge to become known to the world, Mehmed Pasha once again felt the "black knife" in his breast. And that for the last time.<sup>38</sup>

The creator of the bridge over the Drina, the Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha Sokolović, a man who ruled the Ottoman Empire, is slaughtered by a mad dervish one day as he enters a mosque. The party opposing Mehmed Pasha's reforms finally succeeds in killing him. So the bridge becomes a tombstone for its creator—white, beautiful, and eternal.

The bridge appears throughout the novel, usually at the end of a chapter. Its whiteness erases the previous history and opens the space for a new narrative. The narrative flow is thus systematically



produced and suspended by the metaphor of the bridge. The appearance of the bridge marks the end of the time depicted and an opening for the new story. The bridge thus cuts into the body of the text, bites into the text, in the same way as it cut and mutilated the bodies of the Arab and Radisav.

Andrić finishes the novel by depicting the destruction of the bridge in 1914. Along with the destruction of the bridge (mined by Austro-Hungarian troops at the beginning of World War I), Andrić depicts the death of Alihodja, one of the Višegrad old-timers. His death in close proximity to the demolished bridge marks the end of the whole era of Ottoman rule, as well as the end of the bridge as the unalterable, eternal presence marking the passage of time.<sup>39</sup> At the end of the novel, the corpse of Alihodja, by contiguity, resembles the corpse of the bridge, and vice versa. The mining of the bridge represents the final gasps of the whole era.

In a way that can only be called uncanny, the first material victim of the current war in Bosnia was the monument to Ivo Andrić next to the bridge in Višegrad, destroyed by Muslim nationalists even before the war had started. Andrić is thus the only Nobel Prize laureate who received a gift from Nobel twice: first in the form of the prize, and second in the form of dynamite. The bridge continues to emanate violence and did not even spare the creator of *The Bridge on the Drina* himself. Was this violence inscribed in *The Bridge on the Drina* predicted or announced in Andrić's works?

It seems that throughout his life Ivo Andrić wrote one and the same book, a book about the bridge over the Drina. All of his writings commemorate the pain and violence of history and vindicate it through the reinscription of the beautiful monument left over at the shores of historical agonies. One more thing leads me to believe that Andrić profoundly lived the bridge and felt it both as the point of attraction to Višegrad and as the point of rift, fall, and separation. It is Andrić's anagrammatic inscription of his surname into the title of the novel. *Na Drini ćuprija* is a thinly veiled anagram of Andrić (*Na = An; Drini = dri; ćuprija = ć = Andrić*). In the whiteness of the bridge commemorating Mehmed Pasha's violent separation from his mother, Andrić was time and again inscribing his own name and his own pain. The nameless bridges, white and beautiful, were depicted by Andrić in order to receive the inscription of their creator, revealed and hidden, inscribed and erased, exposed and silenced simultane-

ously. As Andrić's official biographer Radovan Popović tells us, in 1894, after the death of his father, Andrić's mother took him to Višegrad, where he was adopted by his uncle and aunt. "They lived in a house on the banks of the Drina, in the closest proximity to the bridge of Mehmed Pasha Sokolović."<sup>40</sup> In this house next to the bridge, Andrić was separated from his mother. The bridge is thus for Andrić the source of separation and pain, binding him with the point of rupture and suffering, as much as it was for the creator of the bridge, who last saw his mother from the Višegrad ferry (and where he decides later to build the bridge to "erase the memory of that ferry on the distant Drina")<sup>41</sup> some four hundred years before:

With their naked breasts, disheveled hair, oblivious of everything around them, crying as if mourning the dead, screaming as if their womb were torn by birth pangs, asking the soldiers: "Where are you taking him? Where are you taking my son?", some mothers were trying to call their boy, as if to give him for the last time a piece of themselves: "Rade, son, don't forget your mother!" . . . Here, at the Višegrad ferry, even the most stubborn ones had to stop. There they waited as if *turned into stone* until for one more time they saw the horses and the horsemen on the other side of the river disappearing towards Dobrun, and for one more time sensing their child, now dying in their eyes.<sup>42</sup>

This is the catastrophe commemorated and silenced by Andrić's and Mehmed Pasha's bridge.<sup>43</sup>

In his essay "Language," Martin Heidegger comments upon a line by Trakl: "Pain has turned the threshold to stone." The pain, Heidegger teaches us, is the point of rupture and rift. "Pain indeed tears asunder and separates." Yet at the same time pain gathers the body with itself, reminds the body of its presence with itself and within itself: "Pain is the joining of the rift."<sup>44</sup> Pain turns the threshold, a place of separation, into stone, and the silence of the stone gathers and commemorates the rift, pain, and suffering. This pain commemorated by the stone is positioned "outside and inside, penetrating each other."<sup>45</sup>

In the work of Ivo Andrić, the pain has turned the threshold into a stone bridge. Set on the borderline between the two worlds, Ottoman and Christian; between two or three cultures always at war with one another; and between Andrić and the world, the bridge is

the memory of painful separation. The stone, the bridge, like a sarcophagus, silently keeps within it the memory of this catastrophe. In his fragment entitled "Bridges," Andrić says:

In the end everything by which this life of ours expresses itself—thoughts, efforts, glances, smiles, words, sighs—all of it is striving towards another shore, to which it is directed as to its aim, and on which it gains its true meaning. All that has something to conquer and bridge: chaos, death, or senselessness. For everything is a transition, a bridge, the ends of which are lost in eternity, and compared to which all our earthly bridges seem like toys, bleak symbols. And all our hopes are on the other side.<sup>46</sup>

#### NOTES

1. Danilo Kiš, "Istinitost fiktivne tvorevine: Reč prilikom dodele Andrićeve nagrade za *Enciklopediju mrtvih*," *NIN*, 22 October 1989, p. 38. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Ivo Andrić, *Pripovetke* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1965), p. 98.

4. The relationship between Andrić and Nietzsche (regarding the bridge) was suggested by Petar Džadžić in 1962 but has unfortunately never been explored at length: "The white silhouette of the bridge appears usually at the end of each chapter, thus signifying the *end of a historical episode* . . . but also adding to the ever changing new stream of events an old element. In that we can find something that reminds us of Nietzsche's eternal recurrence or Kierkegaard's 'eternal return'" (see Petar Džadžić, ed., *Kritičari o Ivi Andriću* [Belgrade: Nolit, 1962], p. xli; my emphasis). The bridge serves as both a point of historical erasure and the point of recollection, of resistance to oblivion and forgetting.

5. Connecting Andrić and Heidegger might be surprising to some. Andrić's documented interests in philosophy were directed to existentialism and Kierkegaard's *Either/Or*, which he read during his incarceration during World War I (a fact mentioned by Andrić's friend, the Dubrovnik writer Ivo Vojnović). He also read Marcus Aurelius, Goethe, and Camus. But nothing seems to indicate that he read Heidegger. Recently I have done an extensive search for any reference to Heidegger in Andrić's work. The reasons for trying to establish an explicit connection between Andrić and Heidegger seem obvious, at least in their obsession with bridges. In his essay "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" (*Bauen, Wohnen, Denken*), written in 1951, Heidegger gives the bridge the most prominent place; it is the privileged metaphor for explaining the nature of human

destiny, in both its philosophical and physical senses. And few writers have dedicated so many fascinating pages to bridges as did Ivo Andrić. Heidegger is briefly mentioned in relation to Andrić by Karlo Ostojić in 1962, the only mention of the two writers together of which I am aware (see Karlo Ostojić, "Život i apsurd kod Ive Andrića," in Džadžić, ed.). Also, Andrić lived in Berlin from 1939 until 1941, serving as minister to Germany. He could not have failed to hear of a prominent university's rector, appointed by Goebbels, nor of the nation's foremost philosopher. After the war Andrić held high offices in the Communist government, and this reclusive and politically cautious man probably avoided referring to Heidegger in his notes or keeping his works in his library.

I have contacted several scholars and critics closely related to Andrić and his work. Professor Ivo Tartalja of the Department of Comparative Literature in Belgrade, who is also the editor of Andrić's collected works, found no mention of Heidegger in Andrić's work, published or unpublished. Neither did Radovan Popović, Andrić's biographer. Erih Koš, the president of the Andrić Foundation in Belgrade, wrote the following:

Unfortunately, Ivo Tartalja and Radovan Popović were right: there is no Heidegger in Andrić, neither in his library, nor in his notes, as far as we know now, but whether there are ideas in his texts which are close to those of Heidegger is a matter for further research and interpretation. Andrić's interest in philosophy practically did not go further than the Stoics, Marcus Aurelius, and Epictetus, and only marginally touched upon Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche, while for more modern ones—Althusser, Derrida, Husserl, or Marcuse—he had little interest. But since he lived at the same time as some of them, maybe some of their ideas could have been transmitted by air, leaving a trace in his writing. For example, in the latest issue of *Književnost* [a Belgrade journal], numbers 8, 9, 10, Radoman Kordić mentions Heidegger on page 1192, footnote 2, in relation to Andrić (personal communication).

I will draw some possible parallels between Ivo Andrić and Martin Heidegger, not in order to "Heideggerize" Andrić, but to show that his literature contains a philosophy of building and history that is complex and fascinating, in addition to having preceded the most prominent philosopher of "building, dwelling, thinking" by two decades.

6. Martin Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, tr. A. Hofstadter (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 152.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 152–53.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 153; my emphasis.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 160.

10. I am reminded here of Walter Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History," where he argues that the truly historical time "establishes a conception of the present as 'the time of now' which is shot through with chips of Messianic time" (Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, tr. H. Zohn [New York: Schocken Books, 1969], p. 263).

11. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 98; my emphasis.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
15. Ivo Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1965). Translation by Lovett F. Edwards, *The Bridge on the Drina* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 16.
16. Andrić here makes use of the myth recounted in "The Building of Scutari" (Zidanje Skadra), a folk ballad that Vuk Karadžić considered, in his *Srpske narodne pjesme*, to be one of the oldest Serbo-Croat songs, itself in many of its aspects a reworking of the Greek "Bridge of Arta" (as noted by William J. Entwistle in *The European Balladry*), a Cappadocian ballad narrating a similar myth of sacrifice of the builder's wife. See the note to "The Building of Scutari" in Thomas Butler, ed., *Monumenta Serbocroatica* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1980), p. 429. Let us also note here that the title of Andrić's novel, *Na Drini ćuprija*, could be seen as derived from a Muslim folksong, "The Building of the Bridge at Višegrad" (Zidanje ćuprije u Višegradu), which, not unlike Andrić's novel, praises Mehmed Pasha Sokolović for his "charitable works throughout Bosnia" ("Hoću gradit po Bosni hajire, / Najnaprijed na Drini ćupriju") and for his decision "To build a bridge over the Drina" (Da sagradiš na Drini ćupriju) (Butler, p. 443). Andrić is indebted to this Muslim folk ballad, from which he borrows the "formulaic expression" (as Lord would call it) "na Drini ćuprija" for the title of his novel.
17. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 92.
18. Heidegger, p. 152.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
20. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 97.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Maurice Blanchot, *The Space of Literature*, tr. A. Smock (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), p. 195.
23. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 98.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Ivo Andrić, *Prokleta avlija* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1963), p. 9.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
28. The identical ends of the two stories have not to my knowledge been noticed in Andrić criticism.
29. Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*, p. 75.
30. Benjamin, pp. 257–58.
31. Ivo Andrić, *Staze, lica, predeli* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1991), p. 65.
32. *Ibid.*

33. Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*, p. 63.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 48; Edwards translation, p. 49; my modification and emphasis.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 53; Edwards translation, pp. 54–55.
36. Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*, p. 53.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, p. 70; Edwards translation, pp. 69–70.
39. The character of Alihodja is related to a metaphorical reversal that repeats the scene of impaling and, like an eternal recurrence, the violence of history. Only this time it is the Christians who are represented as a force that avenges, and the symbol of the cross comes to haunt Alihodja throughout his life, like a ghost. Karamanli, a Turkish officer, after a quarrel with Alihodja, hammers a nail through Alihodja's ear and nails him to a wooden beam in the center of the bridge—at the very place where the impaling of Radisav took place and where the incision in the shape of a cross was made by Merdjan on Radisav's skin swollen by the protruding stake, some four hundred years before. Alihodja is therefore the first Turk to witness the advance of the Austro-Hungarian forces into Višegrad: "Only when a hospital orderly arrived did they find a pair of pliers, and carefully extracted the nail, one of those used for shoeing horses, and released Alihodja. . . . Through his tears the *hodja* as if in a strange dream looked at the broad white band on the soldier's left arm and on it a large regular cross in red material. Only in a fever could such a repulsive and terrible sight be seen. This cross swam and danced before his eyes and filled his whole horizon like a nightmare. . . . He did not even notice that the Austrian red-cross man accompanied him. . . . Beside him walked some soldiers. Amongst them he saw that fat, mocking face of the man with a red cross on his arm who had taken out the nail." Several years later, Alihodja is still haunted by the ghostly memory of the red cross: "Alihodja felt his right ear tingling . . . the red cross swam before his eyes filled with tears, while the Austrian soldier carefully extracted the nail" (Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*; Edwards translation, slightly modified, pp. 121, 123, 218; my emphasis).
40. Radovan Popović, "Ivo Andrić: Biografija"; in Andrić, *Staze, lica, predeli*, p. 205.
41. Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*, p. 23.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 21; my emphasis.
43. It is thus mothers, women, who in Andrić's prose symbolize an opening, a human possibility, however melancholy, in history, produced by the violence and power of men. (The phallic symbolism of impaling should not remain unnoticed.) This may be read as a profound modernist, materialist, and in the final instance feminist reversal of the optimistic mystical chorus of mothers at the end of Goethe's *Faust* (he was Andrić's favorite writer). In Andrić, however, there is no mystical ecstasy, but the mourning and melancholia of women weeping over the loss produced by the forces of history, commemorated by the stone bridge.

44. Heidegger, p. 203.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 204.

46. Andrić, *Staze, lica, predeli*, pp. 134–35.

## EAST WITHIN THE WEST: BOSNIAN CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE WORKS OF IVO ANDRIĆ

Tomislav Z. Longinović

There are two worlds, between which there cannot be any real contact nor the possibility of agreement; two terrible worlds doomed to an eternal war in a thousand various forms.

– Ivo Andrić, *Prokleta avlija*<sup>1</sup>

The “two terrible worlds” in perpetual confrontation which Ivo Andrić envisages within Bosnia are the theme which underlies almost all of his literary and scholarly works. Although he devoted his life’s work to the mutual understanding of those conflicting worlds in Bosnia in particular and Yugoslavia in general, Andrić’s texts reveal the depth of the trauma caused by foreign occupations and colonizations. The confrontation that has taken place between the civilizations of defeated Christianity and conquering Islam since 1463 informs most of his attempts to imagine a community of Bosnians.

The problem of the identity and origin of Bosnian conflicts obsessed Andrić from his doctoral dissertation, “The Development of Spiritual Life in Bosnia under the Influence of Turkish Rule” (1924), to his masterpiece, *The Bridge on the Drina*, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1961. Most of his narratives develop against the backdrop of desolate and unmerciful geography and climate, with protagonists struggling to survive the strangeness and divisiveness of Bosnian history and politics. Andrić views the clash of invading Islamic civilization with the two varieties of Christianity (Catholic and Orthodox) as the crucial factor that contributes to the riddle of Bosnian cultural identity. In his doctoral dissertation Andrić singles out the Turkish rule as a conspicuous factor that introduces a set of cultural values incompatible with medieval Christianity:



The fact of decisive importance for Bosnia was that it was, at the most critical stage of its spiritual development, at the time when the fermentation of its spiritual forces had reached a culmination, invaded by an Asian warrior people whose social institutions and customs meant the negation of Christian culture and whose faith—created under different climatic and social conditions and unfit for any kind of adjustment—interrupted the spiritual life of a country, degenerated it and created something quite strange out of it.<sup>2</sup>

This statement, infused with Herderian visions of the nation, has definite echoes of what Edward W. Said has termed “Orientalism,” a prevalent tendency of Western cultures to construct “an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery and vocabulary that have given it [i.e., the Orient] reality and presence in and for the West.”<sup>3</sup> This construct of the Orient and Orientals in mainly British and French cultures functions as a representation of an alien “other” world and people that need to be restructured, dominated, and colonized in order for European culture to gain its sense of identity and strength “by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self.”<sup>4</sup>

The Orientalist dimension in Andrić’s writing is quite different from this definition since the main historical and political condition of Said’s “Orientalism” is European colonial domination over the East. In Bosnia, the Turkish colonial domination over the Slavic population produced “something quite strange” indeed, a hybrid culture where clear distinctions between the Eastern and Western elements gradually became indistinguishable. While the two religions (which later defined national alliances) drifted apart, the two cultures were imperceptibly blended together. Andrić quotes a legend about the origin of colored candles that the Bosnian Muslims use during the celebration of Bairam.<sup>5</sup> These candles, which are not used by any other Islamic nation, are presumably a substitute for the eggs the Christian population colored before conversion to Islam. The two elements of religious practice were blended together, creating a specifically Bosnian cultural artifact. But while the cultures imperceptibly hybridized each other, Bosnians continued to live in an isolation brought about by the rugged terrain and lack of roads, as parts of two opposed civilizations steeped in mutual contempt, intolerance, and

hatred fueled by religious differences. Religion was the foundation upon which national identity was built, serving as rationalization and justification for the continuous struggle between the two worlds:

It so happened that both the [Muslim] master and the [Christian] slave, as the antagonism between them grew stronger and stronger, sank deeper into the darkness of his deformed religious life. Indeed, only *heaven* could provide the strength for such a struggle and such a life.<sup>6</sup>

Heaven, which Muslims, Serbs, and Croats imagined according to the teachings of their respective religious leaders, was perceived as a source of divine justice that sanctioned their actions on earth. Both the Islamic masters and their Christian subjects drew strength from this imagined source of justice—Muslims in an attempt to assimilate and eradicate the Slavs, and Christians in an attempt to survive by preserving their culture. The marginal geographic position of the Balkans creates a unique possibility for the study of the effects of colonization by an Asian power on the formation of cultural identity in small European nations. The reversal in the usual colonial roles creates conditions for a specific subspecies of “Orientalism,” conceived from the point of view of the Westerners who are being colonized by an Eastern power. The Oriental is therefore portrayed as a conqueror whose culture and religion are perceived as alien, inferior, and degrading.

Zoran Konstantinović believes that Andrić’s sympathies for *Mlada Bosna* are the key to the puzzle of his “Orientalist” attitudes. The Yugoslavism of the Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim students and intellectuals gathered by this revolutionary movement called for the abolition of the religious divisions as the only way for Bosnians to overcome their backwardness and isolation.<sup>7</sup> If we understand “Orientalism” within this specific historical context as a way of overcoming the legacy of five centuries of Turkish colonial rule by uniting the progressive elements of Muslim, Catholic, and Orthodox Bosnian youth in their fight for the Yugoslav idea, then Andrić’s opus articulates his deep dissatisfaction with the tripartite structure of Bosnian religious, political, and cultural life instituted by foreign influences from Rome, Byzantium, and the Orient. Colonialism in any form, and particularly the Turkish one, was perceived as a force detrimental to the development of domestic self-determined cultural

and political identity. That is why Andrić in a footnote to his doctoral dissertation has a disclaimer about his treatment of the Ottomans and their culture outside of Europe:

This part, as well as any other part of this discussion which refers to the influence of Turkish rule should not be understood as a critique of Islamic culture as such, but only as a critique of the consequences of its transmission to a Christian, Slavic country.<sup>8</sup>

In other words, Islamic culture has its value and authenticity before it imposes itself on the values of the peoples it is trying to subjugate and conquer.

This trend is not new in South Slavic literatures, and Andrić has by far the most profound and subtle approach to the theme of Turkish colonization. Starting with the popular heroic songs that played a significant cultural role in nineteenth-century Serbian uprisings against the Ottoman imperial rule by reviving “the Kosovo myth,” through such canonical works as the Croatian *Smrt Smail-age Čengića* (The death of Smail-aga Čengić), by Ivan Mažuranić, and the Montenegrin *Gorski vijenac* (Mountain wreath), by Petar Petrović Njegoš, the Asian invaders and the domestic Muslim population were transformed into the archenemy of Christianity, Slavdom, and Europe. Njegoš’s work is about the extermination of the Islamic converts (*istraga poturića*), while Mažuranić represents his protagonist, Smail-aga, as a tyrant whose bloodthirsty behavior calls for the annihilation of all Turks. Andrić himself warned against the exaggerations to which the Turks and their domestic counterparts were subjected in South Slavic literary works:

Our traditional and written literature has made the Turks into a wrath of God, into a kind of scarecrow that could be painted only with dark and bloody colors, something that could not be quietly talked about or coolly thought about.<sup>9</sup>

The examination of these literary and cultural constructs of “otherness” is especially important today, when the violent conflict in Bosnia brings to the fore malignant calls for ethnic or religious purity in the name of which thousands of innocents are sacrificed on the ash heap of the Yugoslav idea.

### ORIENTALIST RECEPTION

Andrić scholars, from the early essay of Isidora Sekulić to the latest studies of Bogusław Zieliński, have noted the devotion of the Nobel laureate to the understanding of the Eastern dimension of Bosnian cultural identity. While most critics rightfully point to Andrić's fascination with the process of "Islamization" of the Christian Slavic cultural heritage, they expose their own "Orientalist" attitudes in the process. Sekulić, for example, claims that "people in the East believe in the miraculous and have proofs for the existence of the supernatural."<sup>10</sup> In her 1923 essay devoted to the analysis of Eastern elements in the prose of Ivo Andrić, Sekulić claims that his stories are affected by the East mainly on the formal level. First of all, Andrić borrows a mode of narration that resembles oral storytelling, which is episodic, rich in detail, and often given in motion, using the form of a travelogue:

The Eastern story, even when it is a modernist one, is above all a silent weaving, an incantation, fantasy and richly colored image; heaven or hell, wailing and blood-letting, or the whispering of deeply concealed secrets.<sup>11</sup>

Sekulić definitely treats the invading Islamic element in Bosnia as an alien force that contributes to the degeneration of native culture and is responsible "for all those primitive, cruel, terrifying and, besides that, mysterious and colorful types, from that ancient, Turkish period of Bosnia."<sup>12</sup> Again, Muslims are seen as "types," not as individuals, who are cruel yet colorful, but definitely responsible for Bosnia's backwardness and isolation.

A second Eastern characteristic according to Sekulić is the absence of Western bourgeois life from Andrić's fictional universe. Since the interiors of Muslim houses are hidden from the reader's gaze by the impenetrable walls, most of his stories take place on the streets, in *khans* (roadside guesthouses) and *mehanas* (Turkish cafés). The narrator has no access to life deeply concealed behind tiny windows and tall walls and is forced to take life on the street, populated by bloodthirsty heroes, holy fools, cripples, and perverts, as the norm of Bosnian reality. This reality is bared to the bone and functions as the mirror image of the one hidden from view, reflecting the

violence and instinctual hunger of those who are deprived, lonely, or cast out from the mainstream of city life.

Sekulić also notices that women are hidden in this Eastern world; they are never fully developed as literary characters, but act only as forces which motivate the male protagonists. She exposes some of the misogynist attitudes present in the early Andrić, while obviously convinced that she is contributing to the understanding of the “Easternness” of his stories:

Primitive, lustful, monotonous, the woman is there only to be chased, enticed, hunted down, and possessed by the man; or to inflict some kind of suffering that will in turn awaken a real or mean heroism, making the man “glad that the time has come for force to speak.”<sup>13</sup>

The passivity and manipulative nature of Andrić’s women are seen by Sekulić as “Oriental” characteristics, as are the mad and blind desire of the male protagonists like Djerzelez or Mameledžija to conquer and possess them. Orientalism operates here as the displacement of everything that is connected with sexuality and desire onto the Bosnian Muslims or Turks, who are ready to become violent any time their passions are frustrated, rejoicing in the fact that the “time has come for force to speak.” Besides the embodiment of sexual lust and aggressive heroism, the two basic Freudian instincts, these male protagonists are also prone to *sevdah*, which could be best described as a Bosnian variety of the blues. *Sevdah*, a feeling of sweet yet painful sorrow, afflicts Bosnians who are mourning for the days of their youth, for the beloved that has gone to someone else, or simply for a happier life that is impossible to achieve in these borderlands torn by centuries of religious and ethnic strife. Not unlike the *dert* of Bora Stanković, another writer who described the effects of Turkish rule on the population of southern Serbia, *sevdah* is most evident in the cafés, where men smoke and drink plum brandy while female singers and dancers rouse and comfort their blues at the same time. Andrić is, according to Sekulić, critical of this “Oriental” heritage, of its cheap sentimentalism and the effect that idleness and the unfulfilled instinctual life had on the destruction of Western cultural values in Bosnia.

The most important formal quality in Andrić’s prose that Sekulić ascribes to “Easternness” is his use of suggestion while developing a story, rather than “Western analysis”:

No, no, that was a kind of life that does not know anything about consequences. And that is why it is impossible to *think* about that kind of life. Instead of thought, there is imagination, love of adventure, concrete and suggestive expression. And something else: the nameless and mysterious quality hidden in every child of the East, and especially in the artist. The Eastern quality that one can possess or transmit to others only if one was born where the sun rises.<sup>14</sup>

Sekulić's exaltation of "thoughtlessness" is influenced by her own neoromantic modernism, which treats the East as an exotic, mystical, and instinctual realm. One has only to remember that analytic thought flourished in the East and was actually imported to the West through translations from Arabic in the Middle Ages to see how unfounded these observations are.<sup>15</sup> There is also a perceived excess of meaning that resides in everything Eastern, an irreducible "quality that one can possess or transmit to others only if one was born where the sun rises." Sekulić qualifies this as a product of imagination that is prevalent in the East, as the imagination that "does not know anything about consequences" and is guided solely by emotion and passion. What Andrić considered a corrupting influence on the European legacy of Bosnia Sekulić seems to exalt and aestheticize by "orientalizing" his narrative technique. By juxtaposing Andrić's suggestive style with the tradition of "Western analysis," she frames and restricts his literary talent to a dimension that favors images and sentiments while excluding thoughts and ideas. In fact, most Andrić scholars point to the opposite: Andrić was not only an incredibly acute observer of Bosnians and their habits, but also a diligent reader and student of the history and culture of the region.<sup>16</sup> His picturesque style is apparently the product of a long and sustained contemplation of the cultural complexities inherent in the highly sedimented historical legacy of Bosnia.

## IDENTITY AND COLONIZATION

Andrić presents Muslim feudal rule over the Christian *rayah* as an effort to colonize them through religious conversion, punitive taxes, compulsory bribes, and such horrifying practices as *Acemî*

*Ođlans* (blood tribute).<sup>17</sup> This type of feudal tribute, so movingly depicted in *The Bridge on the Drina*, is perhaps the best illustration of the way in which Turkish administrators managed to divide the Slavic community from the inside. Every seventh year, the sultan's men would come and abduct the strongest and brightest Christian boys and take them to Istanbul, the center of the Ottoman Empire. The boys were circumcised, given a Muslim name, and thus transformed into Muslims who were then trained to become janissaries or administrators within the empire. Andrić tells the story of Mehmed Pasha Sokolović, one of those conscripted boys who rose to the highest ranks within the empire and then returned to his native Bosnia to build the bridge over the Drina. The reader is told that the vizier suffers from attacks of anxiety that cut across his chest like a "dark blade." This pain is in fact all he has retained from his origin in the village of Sokolovići, the original pain of separation from the Christian community. Andrić uses this pain of separation as a kind of sentimental adhesive that links the old identity of a Christian boy with the new identity of a Turkish vizier:

Somewhere within himself he felt a sharp stabbing pain which from time to time seemed suddenly to cut his chest in two and hurt terribly, which was always associated with the memory of that place where the road broke off, where desolation and despair were extinguished and remained on the stony banks of the river, across which the passage was so difficult, so expensive and so unsafe.<sup>18</sup>

Mehmed Pasha's psyche is divided in two by the pain of initial separation from the place of his origin, and the only thing that remains is the memory that gradually fades until the only thing that is left is the pain itself and his desire to build a bridge. The problem of Bosnian cultural identity is projected into Mehmed Pasha's interior, where he will always be himself and an "other" at the same time. The pain reminds him of the existence of that "other" within himself. His desire to build a bridge across the river that separates the country of his origin from the country of his destiny is an attempt to bridge the gap between two parts of himself which are the products of conflict between the two religions and two cultures. The complexity of Mehmed Pasha's identity is representative of Bosnian culture in general, where the three religious communities live next to each other divided by the painful knowledge that their common

Slavic origin has been appropriated and transformed by their allegiances to external forces. Although they share a common language, the division between Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Islam forces them to imagine themselves in regard to the “others” on the basis of religious divisions.

Probably the most significant literary meditations on Bosnian cultural identity are to be found in *Travnička hronika*, a work written from the point of view of two Westerners who arrive in Travnik at the beginning of the nineteenth century to promote the political influence of their countries in these godforsaken provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Jean Daville, the French consul, and Josef von Mitterer, his Austrian counterpart, both write Bosnia off as the image of the Orient, inhabited by people, customs, and events that are completely alien to them. Andrić skillfully exploits the perspective of the two newcomers to portray the East’s corrupting influence on Western values:

The foreigner, thrown into that unfair and difficult battle, gets completely submerged by it and loses his real personality. He spends his entire life in the East, but gets acquainted with it in a superficial and one-sided manner, only from a standpoint of usefulness or harm of the struggle he is doomed to wage. Those foreigners, who like D’Avenat remain to live in the East, in most cases take on from the Turks only the bad, lower traits of their character, incapable of noticing and accepting any of their good, higher characteristics and habits.<sup>19</sup>

The sense of erasure and loss of proper identity in the encounter with the East is something that almost all Westerners experience in *Travnička hronika*. The East appears as a culture that is indecipherable for the foreigner, who gets exhausted by the perpetual failure to read its signs. This failure results in depersonalization and the inability to notice the “good, higher characteristics” of the Muslim population. D’Avenat, a French doctor who acts as adviser and interpreter for Daville, gradually overcomes his “[loss of] real personality” and accepts the “lower traits” of the “Oriental” character:

Infinitely humble and servile in front of the powerful, influential, and rich, he was arrogant, cruel, and heartless with everyone who was weak, poor, and imperfect.<sup>20</sup>



The East is imagined as a force that destroys one's ethical standards by imposing a master/slave dichotomy in conduct with others on the basis of their perceived power and social position. The Westerner, uprooted from the familiar context, encounters Bosnian cultural peculiarities as the absence of reality, as a vacuum that gets quickly filled with negative emotional charges. Andrić sees both consuls in *Travnička hronika* developing the same ailment as their encounter with the East evolves over the years of service:

Both of them had to live in the same oriental whistle stop, without any company or convenience, without comfort and often without even the bare necessities, to live among the wild mountains and crude population and fight suspicion, negligence, disease, dirt, and trouble of every kind. In short, they had to live in an environment that first wrecks the Westerner, then makes him pathologically irritable, and finally, during the course of many years, completely changes him, bends him, and finally kills him with silent indifference long before he actually dies.<sup>21</sup>

Bosnia is represented not only as a zone of clash between cultures, but also as a fatal sickness that infects the Westerner and gradually wears down his rational and enlightened identity, transforming him from a respectable citizen into a monstrous hybrid that ends up belonging to neither world. The imponderable Eastern plague that affects the foreigner in Bosnia is a powerful metaphor for the negative cultural influence of Turkish rule. Andrić suggests with his narrative strategy that the cure for this Oriental disease can be imagined by the oppressed domestic Christians and the diplomatic representatives of France and Austria as a part of the joint effort to "civilize" Bosnia by expelling the Islamic invaders. But this imagined community (to use Benedict Anderson's term) is not as homogeneous as it seems at first sight. The Austrian consul gains the support of the Franciscan monks and the domestic Catholic population, leaving the French one without much local support because of his country's revolutionary sins against the Church. The Orthodox hope for the arrival of the Russian consul, while the Turkish administrators clash with domestic Muslim feudalists over primacy of power in the province.

### THE SILENCE OF THE NATION

External and internal divisions create a life of anxiety and uncertainty for the population, which hides behind the facade of silence. But if the causes of Bosnia's silent suffering grow more apparent throughout the chronicle, the question of Bosnia's cultural identity becomes even more entangled in the web of historical, political, and psychological differences among its constituent communities. While describing the journey of young consular aide des Fosses from Split to Travnik, Andrić uses the metaphor of silence to characterize Bosnia as a land of paralysis and tension. The young Frenchman is stricken by the "unknown silence of a new world" and has a foreboding of "Bosnia, the silent land," whose air is filled with "icy suffering without words and visible causes."<sup>22</sup> Andrić invokes silence to define the cultural space of Bosnia, the deathly silence shared by all three religious communities. In *The Bridge on the Drina*, the response of the audience that watches as the peasant Radisav is being impaled by Abidaga's men is also silence: "The silence on both sides of the river was such that one could hear each blow and its echo somewhere on the steep bank."<sup>23</sup> Unity among the religious communities is achieved at this moment of silent and violent sacrifice, and it seems that Andrić envisioned this common experience of victimization as the prototype for both the Bosnian and the Yugoslav identity. If every individual recognized the destiny of his particular community in the silent suffering of the man on the stake, this experience could serve as a starting point for the building of a bridge among the divided communities. Compassion for the victim of the torture is represented as the foundation for the construction of the bridge, which could unite the Bosnians after centuries of divisions directed from the outside.

At the same time, however, the building of the bridge is symbolic of the Ottoman Empire, which prevents the bridging of cultural differences through violence. The torture of the peasant ordered by the Turkish master serves as a powerful image for the oppressed Serbs in the construction of their own national identity. During the horrendous spectacle, Radisav is gradually transformed into a Christ-like figure, a martyr who enables the Serbian Orthodox community to articulate its experience of historical victimization by the Turks:

Straight and naked to the waist, hands and legs tied, with head thrown back against the stake, that figure no longer looked like a human body that grows and decays, but seemed more like an erect, hard, and timeless statue that would remain there forever.<sup>24</sup>

No longer subject to the laws of nature, Radisav becomes the symbol of a nation destined to repeat the passion of Christ. This depersonalization is present from the beginning of the torture scene as Radisav loses his name and is referred to by the narrator as "the body." The body is tortured in the name of the empire, as a token sacrifice for the future, and a reminder of a tyranny "which would remain there forever." Suffering is timeless and monumental as it consumes the earthly Radisav and transforms him into "that figure," which could also represent the destiny of the entire nation. His martyrdom is the reworking of the Kosovo legacy, where the glorious defeat on the battlefield is transformed into a founding myth of the Serbian nation. The victim of history develops a national identity based on loss and suffering, around a story of victimization that can be invoked as a sort of political alibi during struggles with its internal and external "others." These two possible readings of the silence surrounding Radisav's torture are at the root of the confrontations that are currently plaguing the borderlands of the Balkans.

The multicultural space of both Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia championed by Ivo Andrić throughout his career has been turned into a battlefield of competing nationalist discourses, unearthed from the reservoir of history to reopen old wounds and enable ruthless and irresponsible political leaders to manipulate their respective peoples. Half a century of Titoist rule has left a legacy of power-hungry, destructive politicians, used to rule by decree and manipulation, ready to latch onto any discourse that will enable them to come to power and stay in power. The discourse of the nation is the most available one since it operates on the level that is perceived as somehow transcending ideology after decades of one-party rule.

The result of this process is the manufacturing of national, religious, and political "others" who are dehumanized and turned into objects that deserve to be killed, tortured, raped, or expelled. The present-day tragedy of the Bosnian Muslims should be read within this context, as a Freudian return of the repressed that is built into the discourse of Serbian nationalism. As Andrić observed, since the

nineteenth century, the Muslim has played the role of the “scarecrow” for the Serbian popular imagination. World War II only brought this image into sharper focus since Muslims often collaborated with the Croatian Ustashe in their programmed extermination of the Krajina Serbs in Croatia, Bosnia, and Hercegovina. Slobodan Milošević unleashed the fear and enhanced the perceived threat to Serbdom by exploiting these established historical facts. The victim once more felt justified in his revenge, this time well armed and ready to implement preventive measures. The discourse of historical revenge was paired with a redefinition of the Serbs as the “heavenly nation.”\* Again, heaven emerged as the sanctioning instance, absolving them of their individual conscience and placing them beyond secular laws, straight into the mission of that horrible justice of the nation that sees no human qualities in its “others.” As Andrić had noted, it was the “darkness of their deformed religious life” that provided motivation for “such a struggle and such a life.”<sup>25</sup>

### ON THE BORDER

Andrić’s opus is universally appealing exactly because it develops on the border of the Eastern and Western cultural influences, where these two civilizations become so intermingled that it is extremely difficult for an outside observer to distinguish them, while at the same time they are indispensable to the local population, which continues to imagine itself as a part of two worlds “between which there cannot be any real contact nor the possibility of agreement.”<sup>26</sup> Andrić’s novelistic poetics are perhaps best formulated by characters like Doctor Cologna from *Travnička hronika*—characters

\*Enriko Josif, a popular Serbian Jewish composer, is credited with resurrecting the Kosovo image of Serbian nationalism as a heavenly construct. It would be interesting to analyze the convergence of Serbian and Israeli constructions of national identity in connection with this “messianic” component. The nations singled out for extermination by the German Nazi Holocaust (1939–45) share a common burden of unresolved grief and survival guilt. Since revenge feels fully justified to the historically victimized nation, it reserves the full right for itself to get back at the past aggressors, but at the same time it has a tendency to victimize the “others.” In both the Serbian and the Israeli case, the “other” is the Muslim.

who are forced to live a borderline existence surrounded by a multitude of languages, religions, and civilizations among which they have difficulty choosing. One can almost hear Andrić's own voice lamenting in Cologna's monologue addressed to des Fosses:

No one knows what it is like to be born and live on the border between two worlds, to know and understand both of them and to be unable to do anything to help them to come closer and understand each other, to love and hate both of those worlds, to doubt and hesitate all life long, to have two homelands and to have none, to be everywhere at home and remain forever a stranger; in short: to live as if one were crucified, as a victim and a torturer at the same time.<sup>27</sup>

This lament captures some of the conspicuous facts from Andrić's own biography; it is a reflection of all the problems inherent in Bosnian cultural identity. Andrić was born to a Serbian family that had been converted to Roman Catholicism and grew up speaking the *ijekavski* variant of Serbo-Croatian. His first poems were written in the same variant, but when he moved to Belgrade in the 1920s, he started writing his prose in the *ekavski* variant used in Serbia proper. In addition to this vacillation between his Serbian national identity and Croatian religious affiliation, he devoted most of his writings to the life of Bosnian Muslims. His life is clearly a reflection of that doubt and hesitation about one's own identity that Doctor Cologna talks about in his monologue. To choose one identity over the other presupposes a loss of the other one. The love of one community requires the hate of the other one—a choice a humanist like Andrić could not make. This is also one of the reasons he found the answers to the dilemma of identity in *Mlada Bosna*, which fought for the unification of all the Southern Slavs, regardless of their national origin or religious affiliation. The struggle for Yugoslav identity made the restricting and dehumanizing choice among particular national identities unnecessary.

Those who are not quick to choose their national identity, or those who are perceived as Yugoslavs and therefore as anational, are victims of abuse from all sides. Due to the fact that he belonged to the latter group, Ivo Andrić has posthumously suffered more than any other writer in the former Yugoslavia: his monument in Višegrad has been dynamited by Muslim extremists, his works have been

banned from Croatian school programs, and his foundation in Belgrade has been robbed of its assets by Serbian politicians. Locked within the xenophobic universe of their emergent cultures and busy with the invention and reinvention of cultural “others,” the guardians of nationalist culture are quick to forget and silence those who remind them of their common Slavic origin and the fratricidal nature of the war they are waging. Andrić, who devoted his life to the task of bridge-building among the nations, religions, and cultures of the Balkan Slavs, is today a victim of the hatred and intolerance that has broken up the unique cultural space of what once was Yugoslavia.

#### NOTES

1. “Postoje dva sveta, između kojih nema i ne može biti ni pravog dodira ni mogućnosti sporazuma, dva strašna sveta osudjena na večiti rat u hiljadu oblika” (Ivo Andrić, *Prokleta avlija* [Belgrade: Prosveta-BIGZ-SKZ-Nolit, 1991], p. 75; originally published by Matica srpska [Novi Sad] in 1954). This and all other translations from Serbo-Croatian in this contribution are mine.

2. Ivo Andrić, “Razvoj duhovnog života u Bosni pod uticajem turske vladavine” (The development of spiritual life in Bosnia under the influence of Turkish rule), *Sveske zadužbine Ive Andrića*, no. 1 (Belgrade, 1982), p. 51.

3. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979), p. 5. For another excellent presentation of Orientalist themes in the political and cultural discourse of the former Yugoslavia, see Milica Bakić-Hayden and Robert Hayden, “Orientalist Variations on the Theme ‘Balkans’: Symbolic Geography in Recent Yugoslav Cultural Politics,” *Slavic Review* 51, 1 (1992): 1–15. While the Haydens discuss the ideology of Orientalism in the Slovene and Croatian treatment of the Serbs, I intend to move the argument a step backward (or eastward) and show how the Muslim figures in the construction of Serbian national identity.

4. Said, p. 3.

5. Andrić, “Razvoj duhovnog života,” p. 255.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

7. Zoran Konstantinović, “O Andrićevom doktoratu,” *Sveske zadužbine Ive Andrića*, no. 1 (Belgrade, 1982), pp. 257–76.

8. Andrić, “Razvoj duhovnog života,” p. 201.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 253.

10. Isidora Sekulić, “Istok u pripovetkama Iva Andrića,” in *Kritičari o Andriću* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1962), p. 57. The original essay was published in *Srpski*

*književni glasnik* in 1923 (vol. 10). For the role of the Kosovo myth in Andrić's opus, see also Bogusław Zieliński, "Bosna između Istoka i Zapada (od kosovskog mita u ideologiji Mlade Bosne do romana Ive Andrića *Travnička hronika*)," *Sveske zadužbine Ive Andrića*, no. 6 (Belgrade, 1989), pp. 277–87.

11. Sekulić, p. 58.

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 69; emphasis mine.

15. For more information on the analytic quality of Eastern civilizations, see Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Islamic Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).

16. See Ivo Tartalja, *Put pored znakova* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1991), especially the chapter entitled "Pisac kao čitalac i čitalac kao pisac" (The writer as reader and the reader as writer), pp. 58–74.

17. It is obvious that Andrić came in contact with the historical sources about Acemî Oğlans while doing research for his dissertation; see Andrić, "Razvoj duhovnog života," pp. 63–67.

18. Ivo Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1945), pp. 119–20.

19. Ivo Andrić, *Travnička hronika* (Belgrade: Državni zavod Jugoslavije, 1945), p. 36.

20. *Ibid.*

21. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

23. Andrić, *Na Drini ćuprija*, p. 145.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

25. Andrić, "Razvoj duhovnog života," p. 254

26. Andrić, *Prokleta avlija*, p. 75.

27. Andrić, *Travnička hronika*, p. 270.

## GRIEF, SHAME, AND THE SMALL MAN IN THE WORKS OF IVO ANDRIĆ

Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover

Ivo Andrić's literary career began on the eve of World War I. He made his literary debut at almost the same time as Miloš Crnjanski and Miroslav Krleža. Together, these three Yugoslav writers, who all survived World War II to become part of the postwar Yugoslav literary scene, were, in retrospect, most readily identified as the triumvirate of Yugoslav Modernism. Together they were perceived as teachers to and as a major literary influence on the postwar generations of Yugoslav writers. Although there was a plethora of writers, among both Croats and Serbs, who made up the so-called literature between the two wars (*medjuratna književnost*), many had not survived the 1930s while others were virtually repressed or at least ignored in the new postwar Yugoslavia, which began with its own Stalinist period in the 1940s and 1950s. Poets and writers, such as Milutin Bojić (who died as a war correspondent at the front in 1917), Momčilo Nastasijević (who died in 1936), Rastko Petrović (who lived in Washington, D.C. from 1935 until his death in 1949), and Jovan Dučić (who emigrated to the United States in 1941 and died in Gary, Indiana, in 1943) were among this lost generation of between-the-wars writers—to mention only a few of the Serbian Modernists.

Ivo Andrić's literary roots are in the Zagreb, Sarajevo, and Vienna of the last years of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in which the Secessionist artists were giving expression to the fin-de-siècle cultural decadence and pessimism, with its apocalyptic visions of the end of the West; its mystical quest for the exoticism of past ages or remote, primitive cultures; and its near-fatalistic belief in the irrational forces of the human psyche or the Unconscious.

An acknowledged influence on the young Andrić is the precursor of European Existentialism, Søren Kierkegaard, whose



*Either/Or* Andrić bought in Vienna (in a German edition) in 1913 and read during his internment in Maribor in 1915. Another known influence is the early American Modernist Walt Whitman, whom Andrić described in 1919 as “a poet of the soul and of the body, of freedom, joy, struggle, energy, a poet of a virgin land and a healthy, good and courageous people, a poet of democracy, love and religion.”<sup>1</sup> The writers of Young Poland ( *Młoda Polska* ), like the satanist Stanisław Przybyszewski, whose literary reputation, if not the man himself, Andrić could not have walked past during his stay in Cracow in 1914 as a student enrolled at the Jagiellonian University, are less well publicized and researched as possible and probable influences on the young Andrić.<sup>2</sup> Yet it was Przybyszewski who in 1899, while living in Cracow and editing the journal *Życie*, published the manifesto of Polish Modernism in the form of his article, “Confiteor.”<sup>3</sup> Although somewhat disgraced in Cracow since 1901 because of his affair with Jadwiga Kasprowicz, Przybyszewski wrote prolifically and was read eagerly all over Central and Eastern Europe, particularly Russia, where his works were translated almost as soon as he had written them in German or his native Polish. Przybyszewski’s portrayal of pathological states of the soul and his elevation of the “naked soul” (*naga dusza*) as the only worthwhile and possible subject of art, has affinities with the Expressionist art of Edvard Munch and taps into the same philosophical roots as Strindberg’s morbid bourgeois plays—namely, the Danish proto-Existentialist Kierkegaard.

As early as 1912, Andrić had published his translation of a fragment of Strindberg’s 1907 novel *Black Banners* (*Svarta fanor*) in *Bosanska vila*.<sup>4</sup> This fragment was for Andrić equivalent to an artistic manifesto.<sup>5</sup> And with this the circle of early artistic and philosophical influences, actual or potential, on Andrić’s writing can be considered drawn in outline.

The artistic principles which found expression in Przybyszewski’s “Confiteor” and the philosophical discussion of emotional states or affects, such as grief, in Kierkegaard’s writings are reflected in both the subject matter and the narrative style of Andrić’s first published book, the prose poem *Ex Ponto*, which came out in Zagreb in 1918. Together with his second book, *Nemiri*, which came out in Zagreb in 1920, *Ex Ponto* stands out from Andrić’s short stories, which started to appear in miscellaneous books and journals

in the 1920s, not only through its different genre, but with its obvious absence of historicity.

*Ex Ponto* is an extended dialogue with the soul. In the words of Niko Bartulović, who wrote the preface to the first edition, the voice in these conversations is

not the voice of lament of a just man, nor the curse of hopeless despair. . . . Beside the flashes of ecstasy and crystal-clear, serene thoughts, which seem to come from heaven, these conversations with the soul are above all a sincere confession of a sinner who never pretended to be either better or worse than the rest; this confession reveals the most archaic stirrings of the soul, the most intimate experiences, the burden and bitterness of suffering, true compassion with adversity, not as a gesture which wounds, but as a spontaneous expression of light in the soul.<sup>6</sup>

With this early poem in prose, Andrić affirms his ties with European Modernism and charts the main course of his future artistic quest. A key to this quest and to Andrić's poetics will be the profile of the poetic hero taking shape in *Ex Ponto*. This lyrical hero, in essence only a voice, will determine the structure not only of all the characters of Andrić's fiction, but also the very content of his fictional universe. Andrić's *lyrical hero*, or *hero-voice*, is described by Bartulović as "neither better nor worse" than the next man. This is because, measured against the endlessness of the Soul, the lyrical hero can be neither great, nor larger than life, nor exceptional. Thus Andrić's hero, who is placed in a dialogic relationship with this infinity, can only manifest himself as a *small man*. But he is small not in relation to other men. The Soul is egalitarian in its absoluteness. Before the Soul, there are no great men or tragic heroes whose misfortune comes about because they have fallen from their lofty social position. Unlike the poetics of Greek tragedy, Andrić's poetics does not tolerate the *great man*. All men in Andrić's poetic universe are small men because even if their worldly eminence is acknowledged, it is passed over quickly as an insignificant moment in the narrative or as one among many details of equal factographic merit, filling out the background to the *real* story.

Andrić's lyrical hero is small in the same sense that the rational part of the psyche is thought to be only a small part of that larger and submerged part of consciousness, which is the *irrational*, and

which is subject to the laws of *instincts* and *drives*, those “most archaic stirrings of the soul,” as put by Bartulović.

The Soul is an all-enveloping, all-sustaining entity, representing the source of the lyrical hero's existence and the prime mover of his actions in the world. The Soul, which, with the Modernists, we can equate with the Unconscious, has no identifiable beginning, and because it is absolute, it can have no foreseeable end. It is simply *present* with consciousness, manifest in *states of soul* or states of affect. These affects can be of various kinds: they can be in the zone of elative experiences, ecstasy, and transfiguration (Bartulović's “spontaneous expression of light in the soul”) or, at the other extreme, as grief (Bartulović's “bitterness of suffering”). The lyrical hero's access to the Soul of another is through an affective state, such as compassion. But there are other, pathological affective states which also lead to the soul of another: *violence*, expressed in the abuse of another's body and soul. The Self or Ego, which is the repository of Soul or consciousness, expresses itself through the affect of *shame*.

Affects are defined as:

empirical human universals, inborn in every healthy specimen of our species. They are expressive, in facial expressions, in intonations, in the modulation of the voice, in gestures. [They] are not acquired. They are communicative. They are feeling-responses to fairly complex structures of stimuli and change over time. . . . Among affects are the following: fear . . . , shame . . . , and rage, disgust, curiosity, gaiety, sadness. . . . Although bodily pain is not an affect proper, it belongs to the same family. Darwin, who made a comprehensive study of affects, defined them as the remnants of instincts.<sup>7</sup>

This anthropologico-psychoanalytic model of affects could, with only slight editing, be adopted as the model of Andrić's poetics of the small man. The model could be elaborated, on the one hand, against the background of Kierkegaard's philosophical tract *Either/Or*, which in large part deals with affective states such as grief, or on the other hand, by Henri Bergson's vitalistic philosophy of “*pure perception*,” of “*pure duration*,” of his theory of memory and of instinct as intuition. After Kierkegaard, Bergson was the most influential European philosopher of the turn of the century in relation to the aesthetics of Modernism.

We shall now apply this model, with some elaboration from the above-mentioned additions, to Andrić's stories, limiting our choice of stories to those written before World War II, thus enabling us to remain within the Modernist paradigm even in stricter chronological terms.

Without exception, Andrić's stories have as their *sujets* not exceptional events—although many of them deal with great historical upheavals—and not remarkable human biographies—although the majority of stories relate such biographies—but states of soul. For according to Andrić's poetics, as for Przybyszewski before him, the life of the Soul or of the Unconscious forms the only possible and true content of a man's existence and hence the subject of artistic representation. Andrić's entire fictional universe consists of a succession of states of soul, which pass before the reader in endlessly embedded narratives, with no virtual beginning and no end.<sup>8</sup> That is the reason why the ground tone of Andrić's prose can be defined as *melancholy*. The melancholy makes visible, like a palpable symbol or ideograph, the reality of the Unconscious, which is nevertheless in its essence elusive and inaccessible. This ground tone of melancholy can be compared with Kierkegaard's *reflective grief*, which the philosopher thought could not be represented artistically "partly because it never is, but is always in the process of becoming, and partly it is indifferent to and unconcerned with the external and the visible."<sup>9</sup>

Even though reflective grief cannot be "represented artistically," it is precisely this grief which the author of *Either/Or* proposes to "bring before" his reader, in that he will "render [it] visible . . . as far as possible . . . by means of some pictures."<sup>10</sup> These pictures or "sketches" of grief will be analogous to shadowgraphs in that their content—the "darker side of life"—will be conjured up only as projections (one is almost tempted to say holograms and to equate Kierkegaard's pictures of reflective grief with the hyperreal image of the simulacra which dominate postmodern aesthetics). The object of the shadowgraph sketches is to "discover that inner picture . . . too delicately drawn to be outwardly visible, woven as it is of the tenderest moods of the soul."<sup>11</sup> And using an analogy which points forward to Freud's comparison of the psychic mechanism to the children's parlor game of the mystic writing pad,<sup>12</sup> the author of *Either/Or* specifies the artistic technique which will allow the "darker

side" of the soul, or its "tenderest moods" or its "inward picture" to "become perceptible . . . through the external":

If I look at a sheet of paper, there may seem to be nothing remarkable about it, but when I hold it up to the light and look through it, then I discover the delicate inner inscriptions, too ethereal, as it were, to be perceived directly.<sup>13</sup>

Thus grief becomes, in Kierkegaard's philosophical poetics, the symbol of affectivity as such. And this affectivity will be the object of his artistic and/or philosophical quest:

Our choice is made: we love only grief, grief alone is the object of our search, and everywhere we find its footprints, there we follow after them, intrepidly, immovably, until grief reveals itself.<sup>14</sup>

Kierkegaard's grief-affect is expressive; it, like the grief in Agnes Heller's model, manifests itself in gestures, facial expressions, intonation, and body language:

But sometimes grief succeeds even better in hiding itself . . . until by chance one day a look, a word, a sigh, a quaver in the voice, a glance of the eye, a trembling of the lips, or a convulsive hand-clasp, treacherously betrays the carefully guarded secret.<sup>15</sup>

The author of *Either/Or*, who has made the stalking of this secret grief into a passion of his life, deems his pursuit of the signs of grief more than mere curiosity. For what motivates him in this quest is a "sympathetic dread" which "searches the reins and the hidden thoughts of the heart; it evokes things secret by means of magic and incantation, even when death has buried them from our view."<sup>16</sup>

These passages from the fragment of *Either/Or* entitled "Shadowgraphs—Psychological Pastime. Lecture Delivered Before the Symparanekromenoi," which offer an amplification of Agnes Heller's model of affects, could also be regarded as the equivalent of a manifesto of Andrić's poetics, for they offer the key to the reading of Andrić's short stories.

Kierkegaard's reflective grief is literally and programmatically enacted in the story "Mara milosnica" (translated by Joseph Hitrec as "The pasha's concubine").<sup>17</sup> Although the story appears to deal with the fall from grace of Mara, the beautiful sixteen-year-old baker's daughter from Travnik who was sold into concubinage to the

Veli Pasha, commander-in-chief of the Turkish armies in Bosnia on the eve of the Austrian annexation, Mara's destiny does not constitute a linear plot action. Her story peters out after she takes the decision to "go to Fra Gregory. To do what is most difficult and most terrifying, and in this way to forestall every other evil."<sup>18</sup> In fact, Mara does not forestall "every other evil" by this seemingly deliberate and determined action. On the contrary, this action leads nowhere for Mara, for she goes out of her mind, gives birth to a premature baby, and then dies. Moreover, her deliberate action does not appear to have any causal relation to the development of her story. Her story just *is*, and notwithstanding the progression of the story line in tandem with the decline of Mara's beauty and sanity, Mara's story remains essentially static because Mara's actions are nonreferential. They are not anchored to causal principles outside Mara's psyche. Indeed Mara is portrayed in a permanent, timeless state of affect, which only changes in intensity and quality—that is, Mara is always in a daze, a state in which she "does not know" and "does not understand anything."

In particular, the spoken word has the power to transport Mara into these affective states, in which she can exercise no rational control. As Fra Gregory, who is also subject to and wholly determined by affect, thunders, with appropriate affective gesturing, about damnation and penance, Mara "looks upon him and listens to him as if through a haze."<sup>19</sup> From this trancelike state, the priest jolts Mara by "lashing her with words" and by "darting around her,"

with his clenched knuckles rapping the breviary, his spreading arms and agitated whipping of his white waist cord and heavy rosary, and his eyes boring into her, brown, cutting, implacable, beneath his thick brows.<sup>20</sup>

Under the impact of the priest's glance and words, Mara loses her corporeality—that is, her so beautiful and desirable body shrinks into a black point in her consciousness. This point is concentrated shame.

But this moment in the plot—if such it is—is tautological. It only reiterates what has been the essence of Mara's dramatic role in the "action" of plot ever since that earlier moment when the pain of the pasha's penetration subsided and Mara was left with "heavy thoughts of sin and shame."<sup>21</sup> Before that moment of self-conscious-

ness, Mara is “not herself” from pain—that is, she is in an affect-related state, which is lower down on the evolutionary scale of the development of consciousness, in a preconscious or proto-conscious state:

In the first days after they brought her from Travnik, she could not regain her presence of mind. The physical pain overwhelmed her completely.<sup>22</sup>

Earlier still, in the first sighting of Mara by the pasha and the reader—in her first on-stage appearance, as it were—Mara is a mere frieze or a still, a voluptuous gesture frozen in time and space:

On her knees and propped on the counter with one arm, she had stretched out the other for a platter on the shelf underneath. . . . She lifted her head and the Pasha, seeing her outstretched like this and prone on the counter, fell in love with her.<sup>23</sup>

Mara in fact becomes the object of the pasha’s desire at this incipient moment of plot (the inner and true plot of the narrative as opposed to the external frame plot couched in ostensibly historical time referents). In its combination of innocence and voluptuousness, Mara’s body *is* the lack, which is the form desire takes and which is the precondition for the narrative to begin moving forward. The movement of the narrative from this moment on is a movement toward the satisfaction of desire, viewed from the *outside* as an impersonal and intransigent force of the narrative, represented by the pasha, and of the simultaneous dramatization of the state of consciousness, which is coextensive with desire and which is its facilitating amneotic fluid, as it were. Consciousness, represented by Mara as subject and viewed from the *inside*, is in turn symbolized by the affect of shame.

Mara’s shame is not realistically motivated. If Mara’s disgrace were to be read in a social context, it would have to be taken on trust, for the ethnographic social fact about the position of a Bosnian Christian woman who is taken into Turkish concubinage against her will is never explained in the text. If the reader is to accept Mara’s shame as a realistic, ethnographic, social, and historical given, he or she needs extratextual knowledge in order to read the story’s message successfully. To read the story according to the text alone, Mara’s acutely felt shame has to be viewed outside the social context in

which it appears to be motivated. Mara's shame should then be read as a symbol of the affect of shame, which by a further substitution becomes the symbol of Mara's consciousness as such. Yet this consciousness is not represented as static and in isolation from other consciousnesses. The essence of the affect of shame is that it represents "the eye of another" turned upon the subject, the "I." Shame, then, is not only a symbol of an individual consciousness, but of that consciousness in a perpetual dialogic relationship with another.

Mara's relationship with society does not end after the pasha discards her. She is received by a supportive social network, not only of outcasts like herself (the gypsy Hamsha, baba Anusha), but also of the household of the rich Pamuković family. It is in this family that shame similar to Mara's also lurks and has been lurking for generations. It is the secret and hidden shame of the Pamuković family which is identified with secret evil or secret grief.

At this point in the circular narrative, the connection is made between shame and grief. Mara's story is intertwined with that of Nevenka, the youngest Pamuković daughter-in-law. It is in fact the story of Nevenka and the Pamuković clan which represents the heart of this circular narrative, in which events turn around the seasons (the weather) and the coming and going of armies of occupation. This slow, ponderous epic rhythm is punctuated by vignettes of violence, of which Mara's seduction by the Veli Pasha is epically the most extended and as such made to accommodate a series of embedded vignettes, like the rape of baba Anusha's ten-year-old granddaughter, the sight of the corpse of a Turkish officer, the secret beatings of Nevenka by her husband, and the marching of the chained Turkish patricians to be executed by the Austrians at the end of the narrative.

The Pamuković family is portrayed in Nevenka's story, which is embedded in Mara's story, as the repository of secret evil, while Nevenka's entry into that world of concealed shame and pathological deviations as *fatum*. Nevenka also experiences acute shame upon entering the Pamuković family as a bride because she feels a sense of inferiority in the face of the Pamuković wealth, social superiority, and power:

Kao kroz tamu gazila je kroz to njihovo zlo i nije mogla da mu vidi kraja, ni smisla, ni razloga. Samo: zlo.



A na kraju tih misli, koje je umjela da izazove i razvije ali ne i da ih rasplete i riješi, uvijek je zastajala i padala satrvena i nemoćna pred pomišlju da se nikad neće pokazati ni objaviti njihova zloća i rugoba, nego da će do vijeka i na svakom mjestu oni ostati ovakvi, ugldeni, moćni, nesalomljivi.

– Niko im ništa ne može!

(She waded through this evil of theirs as through darkness, and could not see the end of it, nor the sense, nor the reason for it. Evil: pure and simple.

And when she was through thinking such thoughts, which she was adept at starting and expanding but not at disentangling and solving, she would slump helpless and crushed before the realization that the Pamukovich depravity and ugliness would never be denounced and made public, but that they would remain like this, respectable, powerful, redoubtable, each in his place, till the end of time.

“No one can ever touch them!”<sup>24</sup>

The Pamuković family, with this unrelieved hidden evil, which is self-procreating and which engulfs Nevenka, who also shares in it through unmitigated hatred of the Pamuković clan and unabating shame before them, becomes a symbol not of social evil, but of the relentless Will or Ego, which is the power of consciousness and the libidinal force of the psyche. Evil is in fact the affective ground tone—the equivalent of the reflective grief of Kierkegaard—that allows the portrayal of the psyche as a state of affairs, which is otherwise difficult to locate in time and space, and which is therefore self-referential in the same way in which the Pamuković clan is totally self-sufficient. The state of consciousness, which is a state of affairs equivalent to the form of the psyche, is activated by a supreme and absolute Will or Ego, which is relentless and all-powerful since the Will can never stop willing. This Will is masked in Andrić’s narrative by the garb of historical violence. But history, which appears to determine the lives of the small men and women in Andrić’s stories, is not the true force determining human destiny. The psyche, which *is* this true force, is ahistorical.

In the introductory essay to his translations of Andrić's stories, written over twenty years ago, Joseph Hitrec makes many observations about the structure and poetics of Andrić's stories which have stood the test of time. One of these is his claim that

whatever epic spirit plays over these tales, it has nothing to do with the historicity of the material. . . . It owes very little to the devices of canvas-painting associated with historical fiction, such as pageantry, local color, exoticism for its own sake. Its presence is almost incidental—a cumulative by-product, as it were, of the range and variety of human case-histories Andrić has included in his purview.<sup>25</sup>

In his essential ahistoricity, Andrić is true to the poetics of Modernism. Essentially a *l'art pour l'art* poetics, it is not concerned with representing life as it is in keeping with a positivistic view of history as a given and an absolute. The only absolute in the universe of Andrić's small man (and woman) is the Soul.

What Andrić extracts from the exotica of his native settings are not lessons to be learned from the turbulent history of his native Bosnia and the Balkans. History repeats itself, as the Mullah Suleiman Jakubović well knows when he says to Veli Pasha the Circassian, departing before the Austrian occupying forces:

Svi vi odoste! A kome ostavljate ovo veselo Sarajevo, i nas u ovom kazanu? Vi se rasturate kud koji, i Bog će milostivi dati pa će vam dobro biti, i vama i svem turskom uhu, ali mi ovdje teško da više dobra vidimo. Ispoganili se i iskrvili izmedju se, i sad čekamo ko će doći iz bijela svijeta da nas uredi i pokrsti.

(All of you are leaving! And in whose hands are you leaving this happy Sarajevo, and all of us in this cauldron? You are all scattering with the wind, and merciful God will grant that things will turn out well for you, for you and for the whole of your Turkish progeny. But those of us who are staying here cannot see the good any longer. We have defiled the faith of our fathers and have entered into bloody conflict among ourselves, and now are waiting to see who will come to us from God knows where in the big wide world to set our house in order for us and to convert us once more.)<sup>26</sup>

The exotic, primitive milieu in which Andrić's small man originates is for both Andrić and his small man hero or heroine the *locus*

*mysticum* or that somewhat strange, forbidding and alienating territory of the Psyche in which the “archaic layers of the soul” are prized open through seemingly historically determined violence, to become revelation. But the causal chain in Andrić’s stories is in fact the reverse of what it appears to be on the surface. History does not determine the small man; the latter’s Psyche expands to fill the dimensions of the narrative and to oust history. The backward and primitive *homo bosniensis*, who has been bypassed by the culture of civilized Europe, based on rational and scientific principles, is a suitable medium for the representation of the Psyche, which in its essence is a primitive and archaic mechanism, dominated by dark, unrepresentable forces and all-powerful archaic drives and instincts. That is why the small man hero or heroine in Andrić’s stories always reacts violently and melodramatically, with operatic gestures, sudden physical reactions which are visible on his or her face, and extremes of affect. In its overall effect, Andrić’s characterization is operatic and close to that of his contemporary, Momčilo Nastasijević, in his Wagnerian lyrical dramas, like *Kod “Večite slavine”* (At “The Eternal Tap”).

*Sympathetic dread* is what is needed to fathom Andrić’s small man hero’s hidden psychic contents. This sympathetic dread is experienced by Mara when she eavesdrops or peeps through keyholes or fences into the secret lives of others. In this way she witnesses the lonely night side of Veli Pasha’s Soul, or his secret grief, when she peers through the keyhole into his room:

Seeing him so glum and stiff, with the string of beads, the knife, and the mirror beside him, she felt as though he were performing an inexplicable rite and making an offering to something arcane, horrible and utterly evil. She would shudder and grit her teeth.<sup>27</sup>

Mara often has the sense that people whose secret grief she observes are worshipping something which she identifies as evil. As she watches baba Anusha praying in the middle of the night, Mara

felt that something ugly and dreadful was being done here; it was again as if a rite were being offered to something that was evil, something that struck numbness and terror into one.<sup>28</sup>

Similarly, the Christian Fra Gregory and the Englishman whom Mara watches over the fence of the Pamuković house also seem to

worship mysterious deities. And although Mara finds Fra Gregory's rite of prayer "less unfamiliar and less dreadful"<sup>29</sup> because it is culturally close to her own rite of prayer and going to church, she nevertheless experiences it as *the dire*, by which her Soul is dominated and crushed.

The apotheosis of dread is for Mara the appearance of Shimun. Although Shimun does not ravage Mara, his wife's contemptuous throwaway line, directed not at Mara but at Shimun, does:

Ovamo dolazi, nesretni sine. Treba ti turska milosnica!

(Come here, you miserable creature. What do you want with a Turkish concubine!)

After hearing this word, Mara "reeled under it as under a final blow."<sup>30</sup> From here on, her madness is triggered *by association* with Shimun's attempted suicide. Although the two characters have not been linked in the *sujet* of the story until this point, and although at this point their link is momentary and almost insignificant, Mara nevertheless identifies completely with Shimun's destiny, which the Devil had taken over. Thus the link between Mara and Shimun is mystical, belonging to the dark subterranean zone of those dark forces of the Soul to which all the people Mara had secretly observed had seemed to pay homage. Ultimately, Mara succumbs to the same deity when she enters the zone of "apparitions and hallucinations." On the symbolic level of the story, Shimun, who is also said to have attacks in which he hallucinates being pursued by a Turk, embodies *the other*. It is significant that both Shimun and Mara perish because of a Turk (Mara is that "child" who has been "wrecked by a Turk" (to izludjelo dijete koje je "satro Turčin," kako je Jela govorila).<sup>31</sup> The Turk here referred to is Veli Pasha, but in a larger context, the Turk is a symbol of *the other* in Andrić's story. This *other* is the picture of the unfathomable and unrepresentable layers of the soul, which Kierkegaard had made into the target of his philosophical research into grief.

It is possible to say, in conclusion, that Andrić's portrayal of the small man or woman is not in keeping with the poetics of Naturalism sometimes narrowly understood as an extension of the nineteenth-century poetics of Realism. It is in keeping with the poetics of Naturalism understood as a part of European Modernism and manifest

in works such as Strindberg's *Dreamplay*, Hauptmann's *Hanneles Himmelfahrt*, or Przybyszewski's *Homo Sapiens* and *Snow* (Śnieg). For Andrić is not in the first instance a student of history, even if his fiction appears to derive its settings from the exotic and colorful regions of his native Bosnia. Like the Modernist generation of European and transatlantic poets to which he belonged, Andrić is a student of the Soul through its symbolic manifestations in grief and shame. Andrić's stories are in the final analysis not models of Bosnian history, even if they appear to chronicle it. Andrić's stories are models of perception that announce the major epistemological shift from the positivist to the postmodern paradigm in European aesthetics and philosophy. As such, these stories still have not run the full course of their reception among Andrić's national and international reading public.

#### NOTES

1. Quoted in Predrag Palavestra, *Kritika i avangarda u modernoj srpskoj književnosti* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1979), p. 303. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

2. For the biographical details on Andrić's literary beginnings, see the monograph by Miroslav Karaulac, *Rani Andrić* (Belgrade: Prosveta; Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1980). In Chapter 6, in which he discusses Andrić's "excursion" to Poland, Karaulac claims that Andrić discovered Słowacki, Krasziński, and Mickiewicz, but does not mention any of the contemporary Polish writers, such as Jan Kasprowicz, Zenon Przesmycki-Miriam, or Przybyszewski.

3. For a translation of the manifesto, see Richard Sokolski, "Stanisław Przybyszewski's 'Confiteor,'" *Polish Review* 29, 1–2 (1984): 39–45.

4. Compare Karaulac, p. 108.

5. This is a plausible claim by Karaulac, p. 109.

6. Bartulović's preface, "Razgovori s dušom" (Dialogues with the soul), in Ivo Andrić, *Ex Ponto* (Zagreb: Izdanje Književnog juga, 1918), pp. 7–8. (Reprint—Belgrade: Univerzitetska biblioteka Sv. Marković i Knjizevna zajednica Petar Kočić, 1975.)

7. Agnes Heller, *The Power of Shame* (Department of Sociology, La Trobe University Series, paper no. 55, November 1980), p. 1.

8. The principle of embedded narratives, as well as the circularity of the tale's structure, as Andrić's artistic dominants has been skillfully argued by Anita Lekić-Trbojević in her excellent analysis, "Narrator and Narrative in

Andrić's *Prokleta avlija* [The devil's yard]," *Serbian Studies* 4, 3 (Spring 1988): 83–91.

9. Søren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or*, vol. 1 (first published Copenhagen, 1843); trans. D. F. Swenson and L. M. Swenson, with revision and foreword by H. A. Johnson (Princeton, 1971), p. 170.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 171.

11. *Ibid.*

12. See Sigmund Freud, "Notiz über den 'Wunderblock'" (1925 [1924]), in Sigmund Freud, *Psychologie des Unbewussten*, *Studienausgabe*, vol. 3, ed. Alexander Mitscherlich et al. (Frankfurt-am-Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1982), pp. 363–69.

13. Kierkegaard, p. 171.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 173.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

17. Ivo Andrić, *The Pasha's Concubine and Other Tales*, trans. Joseph Hitrec (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969). Further references to the Hitrec translations will be cited under Hitrec.

18. Ivo Andrić, "Mara milosnica," in *Jelena, žena koje nema: Sabrana djela Ivo Andrića*, vol. 7 (Sarajevo: Svjetlost; Zagreb: Mladost; Belgrade: Prosveta; Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije; Skopje: Mislja, 1976), p. 133.

19. Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 134.

20. Hitrec, p. 157.

21. Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 100.

22. Hitrec, p. 124, and Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 105 (my adaptation of the Hitrec translation).

23. Hitrec, p. 124 (my adaptation).

24. Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 149; Hitrec translation, p. 171.

25. Hitrec, p. xiii.

26. Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 123.

27. Hitrec, p. 129.

28. Hitrec, p. 155.

29. Hitrec, p. 158.

30. Hitrec, p. 182.

31. Andrić, *Sabrana djela*, vol. 7, p. 166.

## WOMEN IN ANDRIĆ'S WRITING

Radmila Gorup

Andrić's short stories and novels are populated with extraordinary women characters. Women are on equal terms with men in Andrić's writing. Juxtaposed with his famous male characters—for example, Djerzelez, Mustafa the Hungarian, Fra Peter, Ćamil, Ćorkan, Karadjoz, Karas, Alidede—there are women like Mara, Anika, Fata, the German girl, Lotika, Rajka, Saida, Rifka, and many more, named or unnamed. The titles of Andrić's works often reflect his preoccupation with women: "Anika's Times," "The Pasha's Concubine," "Woman on the Rock," "Ćorkan and the German Girl," "Jelena, the Woman Who Is Not,"\* "Mila and Prelac," and *The Woman from Sarajevo* (among others).

Most of Andrić's prose works unfold in the exotic setting of Ottoman Bosnia, a place "between the two worlds of Islam and the West, belonging to both yet ambiguously remote from either one."<sup>1</sup> Both the male and female protagonists of these works are Bosnian Muslims (ethnically Slavs) who converted to Islam to protect their families and property, Orthodox Serbs, Catholic Croats, and Sephardic Jews. However, although Andrić's works are imbued with a sense of history, their subject matter has a universality which is not reducible to simple time and space.

Both male and female characters in Andrić's works are psychological studies in miniature. In Andrić's stories the drama of man's destiny unfolds on this plane rather than in its historical and temporal perspective. The author penetrates and explores the inner world of his characters, their conscious and subconscious, their dreams and nightmares, their fears and obsessions. This inner aspect of their existence is the true subject of Andrić's stories.

\*Also cited in this volume as "Jelena, the Woman Who Does Not Exist."

Andrić depicts both the good and the bad in his characters as entirely human attributes, reflecting the universal order in which he saw both evil and good coexisting side by side, with evil tipping the balance. This evil surfaces in Andrić's characters as suffering, violence, grief, fear, and isolation, which both men and women experience in everyday life. The characters exhibit a broad spectrum of human emotions. Often, a character, after experiencing a trauma, becomes mentally unbalanced and ends up with a distorted view of reality. Many characters in Andrić's prose are subject to some obsessive behavior.

There have been attempts to classify the rich kaleidoscope of Andrić's female characters into two, three, and even up to seven different types. However, as has been pointed out by Dragan Jeremić and others offering these classifications, character types often overlap, as many characters span more than one category.<sup>2</sup> A more fruitful approach than such a classification of types is to explore the dynamics of male-female relationships in Andrić's stories. An exploration into the ways in which male and female characters interact and affect each other will also reflect the major themes as well as the poetics of Andrić's works.

In Andrić's stories, woman is in the forefront, always stirring a powerful reaction in men. Alidede, the central character in "Death in Sinan's Tekke,"\* expresses this just before his death:

Zaboravio sam da žena stoji, kao kapija, na izlazu kao i na ulazu ovoga sveta.

(I forgot that woman, just like a gate, stands both at the entrance and at the exit of this world.)<sup>3</sup>

In his first published work, *Ex Ponto* (1918), Andrić describes woman:

ulomak jednog ljepšeg neba koje je sjalo nad srećnijim stvorovima no što smo mi i za neke strahovite kataklizme prslo u parćad.

(a fragment of a once beautiful firmament which illuminated a then happier humanity, which in some cataclysm burst into pieces).<sup>4</sup>

\*Also cited in this volume as "Death in Sinan's Monastery."



Men, for Andrić, are constantly striving to collect and put these pieces together.

In the mind of Andrić's male characters, woman is often an idea, something beautiful that gives meaning to man's life. In "Jelena, the Woman Who Is Not," woman is a metaphor for happiness. She appears to the first-person narrator suddenly and without any warning, and even though he cannot see her, he feels her presence intensely:

A ja satima živim u svesti o njenom prisustvu što je mnogo više od svega što mogu da daju oči i usi i sva sirota cula.

(For hours I exist conscious of her presence, a feeling more intense than eyes, ears, or all that the inadequate senses could provide.)<sup>5</sup>

He wakes up before dawn and waits for her. His longing is real and powerful. Jelena's appearance takes different forms. She appears most frequently from April until November and is usually associated with sunlight. Only once does the narrator dare address the apparition:

Zaboravio sam se i prekinuo za sekund ćutanje, tek toliko da joj sa pola reči kažem kako sam neizmerno srećniji od svih ljudi na zemlji, koji svoj dan i svoju noć, svoj hleb i svoj log dele sa avetima, a ne kao ja, sa istinskom ženom savršenog bica i lika.

(I forgot myself and broke the silence, for a second, to tell her how immensely happy I was, happier than all the men in the world who share their days and nights, their bed and bread with apparitions and not, like I, with a real woman, a perfect and beautiful creature.)<sup>6</sup>

Thus the female is portrayed as a platonic idea, perceived by the narrator in a dream-like or hallucinatory state, but with such intensity of feeling that she becomes more tangible for him than any reality. In other words, the woman, who is virtual reality, is the only reality.

Perceiving reality in dreams is a standard procedure for Andrić's characters. For them, things exist and do not exist at the same time. The moment of reality becomes blurred and spills over its bounds when man realizes that life is not exhausted in the visible and concrete. When the narrator, no longer a young man, doubts that

Jelena will manifest herself to his dull senses, he nevertheless wants the feeling of expectation to persist. He wants his dreams to last and he abandons himself to the beauty of the spring:

Opet proleće. Bogat sam i miran, i mogu da čekam. Da, ničeg nije bilo i ničeg nema, jasnog i sigurnog, ali ništa nije ni izgubljeno ili isključeno, nepovratno i potpuno. Znam da u svetu ima mnogo napola otvorenih prozora u koje kuca prolećni vetrić, sunčanih odblesaka na metalu ili vodi. . . . Znam da se svuda i svagda može javiti Jelena, žena koje nema. Samo da ne prestanem da je iščekujem.

(Now it is spring again. I feel rich, at peace and capable of waiting. True, there is not and there has never been anything clear and certain and yet at the same time, nothing has been lost or become out of question, completely and irretrievably either. I know that in this world, there are many half-open windows at which the spring breeze taps, reflections of the sunlight on the metal and water. . . . I know that Jelena, the woman who is not, could appear any time, any place. I only wish not to stop expecting her.)<sup>7</sup>

Other male characters dream about woman along similar lines as the narrator of "Jelena, the Woman Who Is Not." The narrator in "The Ivory Woman" literally dreams that the ivory figurine he purchased from a Chinese merchant is transformed into a woman. Zaim in *The Devil's Yard*, shutting out the reality of his prison life, constantly changes his story while he is retelling, over and over again, the imaginary story of his marriages, every time to an ideal woman who made his life full and happy. Although there is not a single female character in the story, most of the prisoners in *The Devil's Yard* dream about women who thus become a strong presence and a virtual reality in the story.

Andrić's female characters are not only products of dreams, however. They are also women of flesh and blood, often fully aware of the power they hold over men. But even as full-blooded, live creatures, they often remain unattainable. Woman is experienced by Andrić's male characters as an uncontrollable force which takes over their destinies. Whether they are young or old, rich or poor, monks or ruffians, this force guides them and often destroys them.

When Andrić's characters catch sight of a beautiful woman, they completely lose sense of themselves and their reality. With their

hands outstretched, they grope toward the object of their desire, becoming ridiculous and pathetic in their effort. Andrić developed this theme in his first Bosnian story, "The Journey of Alija Djerzelez," which he wrote in 1918. In it, a flood had temporarily obstructed the crossing over the Drina. A motley group of travelers had to interrupt their journey and lodge in the old khan. Alija Djerzelez, the legendary hero of Muslim heroic ballads, arrives at the khan with his splendid retinue. Once he dismounts from his horse, he is seen to be short and ungainly, presenting a very different picture from the one people have of an epic hero. Soon afterwards, Djerzelez reveals his obsessive nature when he catches sight of an anonymous beautiful woman from Venice. The desire for this woman turns into an overriding passion:

Djerzelez je planuo. . . . Bol mu je zadavala ta nježnost i ljepota u njegovoj blizini. Djerzelez se zanio i, naravno, postao smiješan.

(He seemed to take fire. . . . He felt something akin to pain at all that softness and beauty so close at hand. He went into rapture and he became ridiculous.)<sup>8</sup>

Noticing this, the other travelers start to make fun of him. Djerzelez accepts a wager to win the beautiful foreigner with his prowess. When he realizes that it was all a practical joke,

Bijesno i neodoljivo zažele kaurkinju, da je vidi, da je ima, da zna na čemu je ili inače da pobije i polomi sve oko sebe.

(He felt a savage and fierce desire for the infidel girl—to see her, possess her, to settle this thing once and for all, or else to smash and break everything around him.)<sup>9</sup>

At that same moment, he catches a glimpse of the Venetian woman, whose sight elicits from him a groan and leaves him in an affect, "dahnući vas znojem i muškom snagom" (sweating profusely and exuding male force).<sup>10</sup>

In the other two episodes of the trilogy, Djerzelez dismally fails to reach his goal. In the second episode, the object of his desire is the playful gypsy woman Zemka. Trying to reach her, Djerzelez literally falls into a ravine. In the third, the young girl Katinka, "about whose beauty songs were sung all over Bosnia," is spirited away by her parents and hidden. In each of these instances,

On izgubi u tili čas svaki račun o vremenu i istinskim odnosima, i svako razumevanje za stvarnost koja rastavlja ljude jedne od drugih.

(He loses all sense of time and proportion, as well as all understanding of the reality that separated people one from another.)<sup>11</sup>

Djerzelez never doubts that just wishing for these women gives him the right to possess them. After each failed attempt he feels wrath and misery. Like Andrić's other characters who yearn for the impossible, Djerzelez lives in the world of illusion.

Ćorkan is another of Andrić's colorful heroes who experiences rapture before the beauty of a woman. A bastard son of a local gypsy and an Austrian soldier, Ćorkan becomes enthralled with a German girl, a circus tightrope dancer. Like Djerzelez, Ćorkan loses himself in dreams in which he idealizes this stranger. Ćorkan possesses an inner existence, independent of an outward life filled with pain and humiliation, which he endures as everyone's errand boy in the marketplace:

Čim se napije, on, zaljubljen, vidi sebe "u srcu" i "kakav jest," i onog drugog Ćorkana što kopa kanale i grobove i sahranjuje sve što uginu u varoši, što svaki dan igra i tambura nasred čaršije za veselje i zabavu dućandžija. I ta ogromna razlika između ta dva Ćorkana to je njegov bol.

(Whenever enamoured Ćorkan gets drunk, he sees his inner ego, "the way he is," but he also sees that other Ćorkan who digs ditches and graves and buries all that dies in the town, who every day dances and plays his tamburitza in the middle of town to cheer and entertain town merchants. And the huge gap between the two Ćorkans produces an unbearable pain.)<sup>12</sup>

Many other male characters experience woman in the same way as the simple Ćorkan—for example, Salko, the young barber apprentice in *Bosnian Chronicle*. While he observed the daughter of the Austrian consul,

Salko je zaboravljao potpuno svet i gubio osećanje o vremenu, mestu, i srazmerama svoga rođenog tela.

(Salko forgot the world utterly, lost all sense of time, and the existence of his own body.)<sup>13</sup>

He is punished by his master, but he is unable to control his dreams. In "Mila and Prelac," the young boy finds contentment and happiness in the presence of his young and proud aunt and has difficulty understanding her feelings for the vagabond stranger. In "Woman on the Rock," the old hired hand Matija is dazzled by the beauty of a young girl.

Woman for these men represents a higher idea of beauty, grace, and harmony. From the tragicomical hero Djerzelez to the poor old Matija, they are all passionate admirers of woman's beauty. Entangled in a net of dreams and illusions, so different from their everyday existence, they strive to fulfill a longing that is tearing them apart. They love and feel elation and believe that they were made for a better world than the one in which they live.

Monks experience women as an unsettling influence, almost as an evil. When Fra Marko is asked to thrash a Christian girl who insists on converting to Islam in order to marry her lover, he accidentally touches and feels her breasts. This immediately causes uneasiness and doubt in him. His well-ordered world of custom and dogma collapses, and he is no longer able to act. Another young monk appears in *Bosnian Chronicle*, a frail, nearsighted man given to daydreaming:

A mladi fratar je gledao u nju kao u prividjenje, neočekivano i divno, suviše lepo i veliko da bi mogao bez bola da mu se raduje. Uska, bela čipka oko vrata . . . sjala je kao da je od svetlosne materije i zasenjivala zenice koje se nisu usudjivale da pravo gledaju u ženino lice. U njenom prisustvu kapelan je ceptio kao u groznici.

(The young monk gazed at her [Anna Maria, the wife of the Austrian consul], as if she were a marvelous and unexpected vision, too exalted and dazzling to be experienced without some pain. The narrow band of white lace around her neck . . . shone as if it were made of light itself; to pupils who never dared to look a woman straight in the face, it was blinding stuff. In her presence, the young monk shivered as if in fever.)<sup>14</sup>

In "Death in Sinan's Tekke," at the moment of his death, the dervish Alidede, who never experienced carnal pleasure, feels a restlessness never known before. The last things the dervish recalls be-

fore he dies are two seemingly unimportant incidents of his life, both involving women. These two experiences sum up his life. Alidede is afraid of women. On both occasions when he encounters women, he fails to act. This ultimately means that his life is an existential failure because despite his life of learning and teaching, it remains without substance.

In Andrić's poetic universe, sensual love plays the most important role in men's lives. That is why woman appears to hold the central position in Andrić's fiction. All men in Andrić's stories have to consider their relationship with women at some point:

Žene, vaša sjena leži na uspavanoj želji asketa i besanoj žudnji razvratnika.

(Women, your shadow falls over the dormant desire of ascetics and the sleepless longing of libertines.)<sup>15</sup>

In addition to experiencing women as esoteric creatures, out of reach for the men who pursue them, Andrić also portrays them as mothers, wives, daughters, and lovers. In everyday life, the fate of Andrić's heroines is predestined by the time and circumstances in which they live and which presuppose women's suffering. They are viewed as objects or possessions to be used and abused, physically and mentally. They are victims of society, their families, and husbands. An important attribute of all female characters in Andrić's writing is their intense suffering.

Hopeless or unhappy love is a theme which recurs in Andrić's works. In Andrić's poetic universe love does not have any rational foundation. It is a powerful force which is in and around us, which dazzles and destroys us. It arises in places where it does not have any perspective, between people of different religions, nationalities, and values:

Javljala se, kao podzemna voda, neslućeno i neočekivano i nastojeći da uhvati sve više maha i zavlada što većim brojem ljudskih bića oba pola. Tako je iskršavala i tamo gde joj nije bilo mesta i gde se, zbog otpora na koji je morala naići, nije nikako mogla održati.

(It kept breaking into the surface like an underground stream, unbidden and unsuspected . . . testing its power on an ever greater number of human beings of both sexes. And so it erupted

even in places where there was no room for it and where, because of the resistance it was bound to meet, it could not possibly maintain its hold.)<sup>16</sup>

Love causes a powerful and short elation, but then like a disease without cure, it brings disillusionment, pain, death, or prolonged dying.

Whereas male characters stricken with infatuation or love seek solace in drink and easy women, women follow their hearts blindly and are ready to die for love. Rifka in "Love in the Casbah" chooses to die when she can no longer meet with Ledenik. Fata in *The Bridge on the Drina*, unhappy with her father's choice of husband, jumps from the bridge right after the wedding ceremony. She thus fulfills both her father's promise to give her in marriage and a promise to herself not to live with a man she does not love. The young Christian girl in "By the Brandy Still" falls in love with a local Turk. She is determined to convert to Islam in spite of threats by her family and the clergy. Even when Fra Peter is summoned to try to change her mind,

A ona je svaki put dizala očne kapke i svojim svijetlim, mladim pogledom gledala netremice i smjelo dobričinu Fra Petra u oči.

(She raised her lids and fixed her bright young gaze, boldly and without flinching, on the eyes of the blustering yet at heart good-natured Fra Peter.)<sup>17</sup>

In Andrić's prose, the idea of beauty, in art as well as in nature, is always present as a counterpoint to the presence of desire. In the face of beauty all fades. Beauty fills life with happiness. The physical beauty of woman causes pleasure, elation, rapture. Andrić's beautiful women vary in age and origin. They make up many successful portraits of beautiful women. These are not, however, detailed descriptions, but rather broad outlines that provoke a feeling rather than a visual image. Andrić, the artist, captures the particular feature a girl possesses when a man first gets a glimpse of her and she becomes his obsession. Everything happens in a flash. In "The Pasha's Concubine," Veli Pasha becomes infatuated with Mara when he glances through the window of a bakery and first sees just an outstretched arm and then the childish face and the merry eyes of young Mara Grgić. The pasha is not disappointed:

Bilo joj je nepunih šesnaest godina. Imala je velike oči golubinje boje, ugašena porculanskog sjaja, koje su se polagano kretale. Imala je sasvim svijetlu, tešku i tvrdu kosu. . . . I lice i ruke su joj bili obrasli, kao maškom, sitnim svijetlim maljama, koje su samo na suncu mogle da se vide.

(She was not quite sixteen. She had big eyes of a dovelike shade and muted porcelain luster, which moved languidly. Her hair was quite fair, heavy and thick. . . . Both her face and her arms were covered with a fine, light down, that was noticeable only in sunlight.)<sup>18</sup>

While the description of Mara is quite extensive, other women in Andrić's stories are often portrayed in one sentence. Rifka in "Love in the Casbah," also not yet sixteen, cannot pass the marketplace without being noticed:

Ma kako udešavala hod, sve na njoj trepti, igra i drhti: haljina, grudi, kosa.

(However she tried to adjust her walk, all trembles, quivers, shakes: her dress, her breasts, her hair.)<sup>19</sup>

Anika, of "Anika's Times," who wreaks havoc in the town and ruins men and families, is also very briefly described. The reader is just told that one spring she showed herself to the townsfolk, completely transformed from an ugly duckling into a beautiful young woman:

Pogled joj se oslobodi, tamne oči dobiše ljubičast ton, koža postajaše belja, pokreti sporiji i prirodni.

(The expression of her eyes became freer, her eyes acquired a purple hue, her skin whiter and her moves slower and more natural.)<sup>20</sup>

However, unlike the beauty of art and other manmade objects, the beauty of Andrić's women is transient, and because of that, carries a germ of tragedy. Woman in "Woman on the Rock" is a metaphor of that finality. She is described as an opera singer, a middle-aged woman "bez sjaja i svežine, koju samo mladost daje" (without the radiance and freshness that only youth can give).<sup>21</sup>

For Andrić, woman possesses an almost metaphysical quality that transcends the physical and psychological of the pheno-



menological world. Whereas man is more in touch with manmade objects, woman is closer to nature and the primordial forces of existence. She is able to communicate with nature and discover its secrets. She is incorporated into the rhythm of nature, which includes the cycle of birth and death. In describing a woman's appearance, Andrić often likens her behavior to that of animals. In "The Pasha's Concubine," young Mara behaves like an animal in danger:

Pokatkad mu se činila kao zvjerka koja, pritjerana uz liticu, drhti a zjenice joj zapadaju.

(At times she appeared to him [the pasha] like a young animal which, driven to the edge of a precipice, quivers in her whole body, her pupils contracting.)<sup>22</sup>

The daughter of the Austrian consul is depicted as a playful young animal:

A djevojka je, uverena da je potpuno sama, obilazila cveće, zagledala koru po drveću, preskakala s jednog kraja puteljka na drugi. . . . (Tako i mlade životinje zastaju u igri, ne znajući više kud bi sa svojim telom.)

(The girl believing herself quite alone, walked among the flowers, studied the bark of trees, hopped from one side of the path to the other then paused. . . . [Much as young animals pause in the middle of their play, not knowing what to do with their bodies.])<sup>23</sup>

Andrić's women are also seen as part of the world of plants:

Njemu je ona izgledala kao deo toga bogatog vegetalnog sveta. . . . Onako rumena, nasmijana i stidljiva, obarajući svaki čas glavu kao cvet krunicu, ona je zaista u njegovim mislima bila vezana za cveće i voće.

([Jelka from Dolac] appeared to him [the young French consul] as an aspect—a distinct flesh-and-blood aspect—of that rich, pullulating world of plants and animals and trees. . . . With that rosy skin and bashful smile of hers, and that trick of hanging her head like a flower nodding in the wind, she did, indeed, become associated in his mind with flowers and fruits.)<sup>24</sup>

To him she is also "pliant as a reed," "a branch of a fruit tree," and "a sapling." In "Byron in Sintra" Andrić wrote:

Ništa nema uzbudljivije od usana ovih portugalskih žena! One imaju nešto i od vegetalnog i od mineralnog sveta.

(There is nothing more exciting than the lips of the women of Portugal. They have something from the world of vegetation and minerals.)<sup>25</sup>

Women's closeness to nature is also revealed in the manner they feel colors:

To su te žene koje imaju u najvećoj meri razvijeno, kao urodjeno, osećanje za boje i sklad boja. One, kao biljke, govore i žive bojama. . . . U stvari, one ih samo otkrivaju našim očima, koje inače ne bi umele da ih vide.

([The woman on the rock] is one of those women in whom the feeling for color and chromatic harmony is highly developed, as if inborn. Like plants, they live and they talk in colors. . . . Actually all they do is to uncover them to our eyes, which otherwise wouldn't know how to see them.)<sup>26</sup>

Because they are more in tune with nature, women bear losses somewhat more easily than men; they are more composed in the face of danger, and rather than follow what society dictates, they follow their instincts.

Beautiful women in Andrić do not profit much from their beauty. On the contrary, this quality carries the germ of their tragedy. Whether the woman gives in to the advances of her pursuer or not, she is doomed. Mara in "The Pasha's Concubine" reflects the tragedy of women's existence in Bosnia. Veli Pasha sees the innocent sixteen-year-old Mara and arranges to have her as his concubine. She submits to her fate and suffers her humiliation in silence. When the pasha has to leave Bosnia, Mara is left behind at the mercy of her countrymen. Even though she was placed in the position of a concubine through no fault of her own, the local folk cannot forgive her. The church itself, perhaps the only institution which could have provided some comfort to the innocent victim, rejects her. She is placed in the house of a rich Sarajevo family, where she continues to live a life of shame and humiliation and where she becomes the potential victim of further abuse. Mara feels completely cut off from other people and from her faith. Her mortification, her self-accusations, and the feeling of shame intensify progressively to a high

pitch. Her hallucinations of the terror of damnation are so strong that she loses her mind.

The institution of marriage provides an environment in which Andrić had plenty of opportunity to explore the theme of oppression. Once married, female characters in Andrić's stories lead an existence full of suffering. They live without love or understanding and most suffer in silence. While not limited to them, this is particularly true of the characters in Andrić's Bosnian stories because of the historical conditions under which Bosnian women lived. Nevenka Pamukovic, a poor Christian girl married to a rich merchant in "The Pasha's Concubine," suffers in her loveless marriage and is subjected to her husband's physical and mental abuse and his family's contempt. However, unlike Mara and other generally very submissive characters, Nevenka remains defiant, complains to her mother, and even physically defends herself when her husband beats her.

Other women are depicted as martyrs of a different kind. They are forced to live locked in their houses, enslaved, either to satisfy their husbands' physical desires or simply to be objects of possession. Such a character is Anica in "Tormenting," which takes place in modern times. Unlike other characters who are physically abused, Anica suffers largely from verbal abuse. When Andrija, a successful merchant, marries her, a young but poor girl, the townsfolk are sure that she has made an excellent match. However, she becomes just the crown of his worldly possessions. Without paying any attention to her needs, he soon starts to torment her regularly with his grand ideas and his pretensions, to which he forces her to listen day in and day out. When she leaves him, the local people are completely amazed. The young woman in "Olujaci" is married and brought from Mostar to a remote village with very crude inhabitants. Her husband keeps her isolated and torments her with his jealousy. In a jealous rage, he locks her in the house while her brother is visiting and burns them and the house down.

Another theme which recurs in Andrić is that of violence against women. Scenes of rape and masochistic behavior are striking and powerful. In "In the Camp," a girl from Trebinje who was kidnapped is rescued and is kept in the house of the local judge. The poor woman, traumatized by her experience, loses her ability to speak and sits in the corner of the room, her hands pressed between her knees. The judge waits for the pasha to send his men to escort

the girl. Mullah Yusuf is entrusted with that mission. The pasha knows that Mullah Yusuf has abused and even killed women and he does not particularly like him, but he finds him useful. Mullah Yusuf, who apparently enjoys inflicting pain, attacks the poor creature:

A djevojka je stajala kao izvan sebe i puštala sve tupim, teškim mirom koji bludniku vraćaše svijest i izazivaše želju da slast produži i pooštri, da izazove otpor i pokret.

(The girl stood there absently and permitted everything with an air of grave, dull apathy that brought the old lecher back to his senses and spurred a desire to prolong and sharpen the thrill, to draw forth some protest and movement.)<sup>27</sup>

He then attacks the girl with a razor blade and mutilates her.

The young granddaughter of baba Anusha in "The Pasha's Concubine" is violated. When people find the child,

Košulja joj je bila prebačena preko glave, a djetinje tijelo kao neka stvar, malena, izgubljena i zgažena, gubilo se medju oštrim sivim stijenama na suncu. Nad njim su zujale muhe.

(Her shirt was pulled back over her head, and her child's body, resembling a small object, squashed and lifeless, seemed of a piece with the sharp, near-white rocks basking in the sun. Above it the flies were buzzing.)<sup>28</sup>

In *Omer Pasha Latas*, soldiers find a young gypsy girl and gang rape her. She does not defend herself. When the commander finds the unit, he realizes what has happened:

Na zemlji je ležalo jadno, mršavo ženino telo u slabim trzajima, sa penom na usnama. Dimije i košulja na njoj bili su pocepani.

(On the ground lay the thin body of the woman quivering weakly, with foam on her lips. Her clothes were all torn apart.)<sup>29</sup>

The commander instructs the soldiers to cover the woman with a blanket and then orders them to move. Before they reach a certain distance, the unit can hear the woman screaming and cursing them and see her standing at the doorstep, covered with a blanket, under which her torn pantaloons can be seen, and bending like a scarecrow in the wind.

Even when they are no longer young and beautiful, evil pursues women and punishes them through their children, who pay for the sins of their fathers. Kata Bademic in "The Miracle at Olovo," gives birth to many children, but they all die. She brings her last remaining child, a feeble daughter, to a spa known for miraculous cures. She watches in terror as the imbecile smile of her husband appears on her daughter's face.

While the wife is usually the oppressed party, there are female characters in Andrić's stories who are shrews. They are cruel by nature. They rule their husbands and households, destroying their husbands' individuality. Such is Kobra in "Zeko," Natalija in "Family Portrait," and to some extent Agata in "The Bar Titanic."

A woman can be the instrument of man's downfall. In "Torso," the Syrian woman whose family was slaughtered by Ćelebi Hafiz revenges her family's death. Being the only person on whom the tyrant took pity, she survives to become his favorite. While she pretends to be loyal to him, she waits for an opportunity to pay him back in the most terrible way. When the opportunity arises, she mutilates his body and burns his face and eyes, leaving only a torso. Krstinica in "Anika's Times" kills her husband savagely with the help of her young lover.

Less frequently women in Andrić's stories are in their traditional benevolent roles of wives and mothers who are honest and hard-working, like Andja in "The Rug" or Madame Daville, the wife of the French consul in *Bosnian Chronicle*. Andja orders her son to throw away a rug he bought from an Austrian soldier who most probably took it as booty. The old lady does not want to profit from other people's misfortunes. Good and unselfish, Madame Daville strives to create a warm and comfortable atmosphere around herself and her family. She gives birth, she raises children, she works in the house, and she teaches the local Bosnian girls how to improve their surroundings. She seems at ease with her life, and she suffers in silence when she has to bury her baby.

Good women like Madame Daville were perhaps not challenging enough for Andrić, however. He dedicates much more space to women characters who somehow depart from their traditional roles. He seems to prefer as subjects women who suffer through the acts of society, women who choose to live without men, or women rebels who try to avenge themselves on men.

Andrić gives more space in *Bosnian Chronicle* to Anna Maria, the wife of the Austrian consul, than to the model wife and mother Madame Daville. Anna Maria is depicted as an exalted, eccentric woman who does not seem to care much for her husband or daughter, while she is at the same time oversensitive to the plight of animals. She gets involved in other people's problems; she meddles in the affairs of the church, and this causes embarrassment for her husband. The reader does not have too much sympathy for this woman, who is so preoccupied with herself. Yet Anna Maria is a rebel of a kind and therefore of more interest to Andrić as a character. She harbors in her character the yet unidentified revolt of a feminist, unhappy with her lot and the role society has imposed on her. Basically an unhappy woman, she is trying to raise herself above the ordinary; she is looking for something that will give more contentment to her life. The only path that she finds open to her is in her romantic fantasies. She flirts with men, but the moment a man expresses an interest in a physical relationship, she realizes that she is trapped again, which sends her into deep depression. Every attempt to find a way out ends in just another failure for Anna Maria.

A rebel of an entirely different kind is Anika of "Anika's Times." She is a renegade, waging war on the entire society. A beautiful woman, Anika realizes her power over men early in life. When the man she loves proves incapable of wooing her, Anika starts to sell her favors, using her body as an instrument of choice. She seduces men of the town and then rejects them. She destroys individuals and families and causes fights and hatred among people of the town. Anika's sexual prowess violates the moral order and disturbs society. To the townspeople, Anika is the personification of evil. An evil of this kind in Andrić's works can be removed only by death. The town is liberated from Anika and she herself finds peace only when her brother kills her.

Some of Andrić's female protagonists in more modern settings lead lives outside marriage. They work in generally male professions and they earn money. One example is Lotika, the manager of a new hotel built near the bridge in *The Bridge on the Drina*. An Austrian Jew, Lotika is a beautiful woman with "the heart of a man," as Andrić describes her. A tireless worker, Lotika is able to control the town's drunks, lustful and aggressive men, and to keep a distance from her clients in the bar. She is able to find the right words for each of her

guests. An unselfish woman, Lotika supports both numerous distant relatives throughout Eastern Europe and the local poor. Yet her personal life stays in the background and appears empty and without love.

Perhaps the most unorthodox role a female character can play in a largely male-oriented society is portrayed by the protagonist of *The Woman from Sarajevo* (Gospodjica), Rajka Radakovic. Set partly in Sarajevo and partly in Belgrade, the novel is the story of a human obsession par excellence. Rajka is the female Shylock of Andrić's novel, which is without parallel in world literature.

Embittered by his financial failure, Rajka's father prepares his daughter to be a successful businesswoman by advising her to economize, save, and never trust anyone. Following this advice, Rajka gradually becomes a compulsive miser. She lends money at high interest rates, and she shows no compassion for distressed clients. As her business prospers, Rajka cuts herself off from all the pleasures of life and becomes indifferent to worldly things. Her passion becomes an irrational force which governs her life. She neglects her house and even her health, and she ruins the last years of her mother's life. The only real pleasure she finds is in mending and saving.

Rajka's financial practices during World War I are so ruthless that she feels obliged to leave Sarajevo. She moves with her mother to Belgrade, where her obsession undergoes a qualitative change. Rajka no longer strives to acquire more money but does everything in her power to save the money she has and to protect all she owns against natural decay. Only for a brief period does she lose control, when out of affection she lends money to a young man who reminds her of her beloved uncle. After that, Rajka quickly sobers up to continue her frenzied activities of saving and "enduring." Rajka dies in her dilapidated house from a heart attack when she is frightened by the shadow of a coatrack, which she mistakes for a thief. The character of Rajka dominates the novel from beginning to end. Her self-denial has the zeal of religious devotion.

In conclusion, Andrić reveals through his female characters a world filled with evil, both hidden and exposed, which he sees not as the consequence of historical conditions but as something which exists in women and men. Andrić's prose depicts not only and not primarily the historical and social background in which his female

characters are shaped. It also deals with their inner lives. In his poetic universe woman is primarily the object of desire, mostly unattainable and elusive but of incredible force, which is the driving force in society. While women hold a peripheral position in the society Andrić depicts in his works, they have an important position in his opus. The author compensated for women's reduced social status by endowing their lives with poetic meaning.

#### NOTES

1. John Loud, "Between Two Worlds: Andrić the Storyteller," *Review of National Literatures* 5, 1 (1974): 113.
2. Dragan M. Jeremic, "Zena i ljubav u delu Ive Andrića," *Savremenik* 9, 18 (Belgrade, 1963): 327–36.
3. Ivo Andrić, *Odabrane pripovetke* (Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga XLVIII, 1954), vol. 326–27, p. 52. All translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.
4. Ivo Andrić, *Ex Ponto* (Belgrade: Izdanje S.B. Cvijanovica, 1920), p. 44.
5. Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, 2d ed. (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1965), vol. 7, p. 263.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 275.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 293.
8. Ivo Andrić, *Pripovetke* (Belgrade: Nolit, 1985), p. 39. Translated by Joseph Hitrec in *The Pasha's Concubine and Other Tales* by Ivo Andrić (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), p. 18.
9. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 41; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 22.
10. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 42; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 22.
11. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 51; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 35.
12. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, pp. 205–6.
13. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, 3d ed., vol. 2, p. 183. Translated by Joseph Hitrec in *Bosnian Chronicle* by Ivo Andrić (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 171.
14. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, p. 188; translation by Hitrec, *Bosnian Chronicle*, p. 175.
15. Andrić, *Ex Ponto*, p. 43.
16. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 2, p. 186; translation by Hitrec, *Bosnian Chronicle*, p. 174.
17. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 103; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 68.
18. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 103; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 124.



19. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 59.
20. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 30.
21. Andrić, *Pripovetke*, p. 219.
22. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 104; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 125.
23. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 2, p. 183; translation by Hitrec, *Bosnian Chronicle*, p. 170.
24. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 2, p. 192; translation by Hitrec, *Bosnian Chronicle*, p. 179.
25. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 256.
26. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 220; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 233.
27. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 5 (Zagreb: Mladost, 1963), p. 21; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 117.
28. Andrić, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 7, p. 137; translation by Hitrec, *The Pasha's Concubine*, p. 153.
29. Andrić, *Omer Pasha Latas*, in *Književnost* (Belgrade, 1976), vol. 5–6, p. 522.

## FOLK TRADITION IN THE STORYTELLING OF IVO ANDRIĆ

Tatyana Popović

I have come to the conclusion in the second half of my life that it is futile and wrong to seek a meaning in the insignificant but seemingly very important events happening around us, but to search for it in those layers created by the centuries around the few major legends of humanity.

– Andrić, "Conversation with Goya"

It is to these legends that the storyteller Ivo Andrić turned to look for the true meaning of life and human destiny. With a deep love of facts and truth, Andrić tracked them in the collective experience of old legends. In oral literature and in the oral tradition at large, he traced the values and customs that had survived from earlier stages of society and that represented the spirit of his people. In his 1935 essay, "Conversation with Goya," Andrić formulated his credo about the "grain of truth" hidden in "the few major legends of humanity." In accepting the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1961, Andrić expanded on this credo:

One might wonder whether the true history of mankind is not to be found in these stories, oral or written, and whether we might not at least dimly catch the meaning of that history. And it matters little whether the story is set in the present or in the past.<sup>1</sup>

Andrić is a complex writer whose works have been studied by literary critics on many different levels and in several dimensions. It is of particular interest to focus in this study on just one dimension, the interrelation of folklore and literature. The oral traditional epic captured an important place in the written works of Ivo Andrić, who became one of its most prominent spokesmen. Andrić very skillfully

shaped the world of ancient Bosnia, interlocking myth and fact, history and fiction. Andrić valued tradition, and there is a clear bond between his literary compositions and those of traditional oral poets.

The highly individualized and sophisticated art of Andrić's storytelling, which portrays subtle psychological human relations, seems to be in accord with the spirit of the collective art that flourished on the Balkan peninsula as sung by epic bards. The epic force of Ivo Andrić and the messages he pieced together from the past are based on oral accounts. The two worlds of folklore and literature are not as incompatible as they might look at first sight. Albert Lord discussed this issue in the first chapter of his last work, *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition*. He made "a distinction of quality among various expressions in words":

It is to that meaning of literature that I turn, for under it we can speak of both an oral and a written literature, products of verbal expression of high artistic quality. In sum, words heard, when set in the forms of art, are oral literature; words seen, when set in the forms of art, are written literature.<sup>2</sup>

As a master of narrative style, Andrić was so much influenced by folk literature that he built it into the foundation of his work, which at times became reminiscent of oral storytelling. Andrić achieved this in great part by his ability to select and formulate both his form and content, which he permeated with folklore. For Andrić one of the significant features of folklore was that it suggested the preservation of truth (legendary or historical or both), which he was trying to penetrate. Sifting through the narratives that were told and retold by the generations, Andrić sought the original myths and legends preserved within the boundaries of the epic world. This is the basic point of Karl Kroeber, who discussed at length why good stories "become more precious when reread or reheard."<sup>3</sup> The input of the audience and the feedback by a reader contribute "in the narrative exchange . . . to be more 'critical' [as opposed to being] passive recipients."<sup>4</sup> The point for Kroeber here was the better comprehension of a story and its integrity. For Andrić, however, it was paramount to explore and identify the folk wisdom in the unfolding layers of oral storytelling and to translate it into his superb literary structure.

In *Ivo Andrić o Vuku*, Andrić expressed great respect and fascination for the folklorist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić because he "pre-

sented to scholarly and literary circles our rich oral literature, our folklore, our history, and the entire potential—heretofore hidden—of the lush and distinct spiritual life of his people.”<sup>5</sup> Andrić’s personal interest in folk literature, which inspired him from his childhood, was reinforced by the role model of Karadžić, the most prominent collector and authority on popular culture.<sup>6</sup> Karadžić was for Andrić the man who could never be defeated: “A man of action and a man of contemplation, a destroyer and a creator, fused together in the same person.”<sup>7</sup>

In the preface to *Ivo Andrić o Vuku*, Golub Dobrašinović stated that Andrić “ennobled his narrative by using the epic serenity of a popular singer, as it was often noted.”<sup>8</sup> *Guslars* (epic singers) appear in the Andrić literary opus echoing the epic atmosphere characteristic of Karadžić and other collections of heroic poetry. They are employed in the short stories, and in *The Bridge on the Drina* Andrić portrayed the guslar describing the process of his preparation for chanting, the use of his instrument (*gusle*), and his interrelationship with his audience. Vladan Nedić analyzed Andrić’s portrayal of the guslar, which included detailed descriptions of facial expressions and gestures during a performance. Nedić also enumerated the epic as well as lyric songs, including the collections from which Andrić borrowed the verses.<sup>9</sup>

On Andrić’s “quest for permanent values,” Dragiša Živković commented as follows:

Andrić undoubtedly found, in the epic form of the legendary or mythical subjects, that type of artistic narration in which his literary potential would be most completely and most objectively realized.<sup>10</sup>

It has been emphasized that a disillusionment with contemporary events and people, expressed in *Ex Ponto* and *Nemiri*, both confessions from his younger days, contributed to Andrić’s affinity for the past and tradition. As a researcher Andrić thoroughly investigated the “layers created by the centuries,” hoping to recapture the glimpses of truth preserved by the generations. Živković convincingly pointed out that Andrić used his art as a medium for his investigation:

The world of concrete artistic facts had “self-generated” in the direction of its own most profound truth and universal impor-

tance, transforming, conversely, its creator-narrator into his [own] medium, in which it fully developed and blossomed.<sup>11</sup>

In a way Andrić the storyteller identified with the epic singers. Mateja Matejić commented:

Speaking figuratively, the chanting of the *guslar* inspired Andrić. He assumed the role of *guslar*, but instead of singing about the past suffering and glory of the Serbian people, he narrated it in his novel.<sup>12</sup>

The comparison of *guslars* with Andrić nicely demonstrates a bond between the two, and we can explore the similarities and differences that exist in regard to their respective roles, approaches to themes, and techniques in executing them.

In the first place Andrić often drew on the folklore of his native Bosnia or the Balkan territory at large, reconstructing the myths to embed them firmly in the stories he narrated:

In his artistic manner and tone, Andrić undoubtedly began from the epic singer. . . . Like the epic singer, he knew how to extend, almost imperceptibly, the temporal and spatial frames of his narrative.<sup>13</sup>

However, from that point on, Andrić's storytelling differs substantially from folk storytelling. Živković notes that the difference lies in "artistic refinement," as well as in the composition and symbolism of the Andrić stories:<sup>14</sup>

[Andrić] confronted events and actual scenes in such a manner that a strange, mysterious haze radiated, at times paradoxically, from their collision. [Andrić], interpreting those collisions of passages and sentences reflexively . . . created a seemingly very simple, but in truth highly complex, prose replete with deep and distant meditative and symbolic projections.<sup>15</sup>

A *guslar's* manifesto values tradition, and although the *guslar's* epic pursuits are more simplistic and different in their execution from the Andrić art, both express a collective feeling for the epic reality they create. For Andrić that collective spirit, which was achieved from one generation to another and based on tradition, represents a bridge between past and present:

A legend here is the most common vehicle for delivering concrete, vital material in the spirit of a collective experience. . . . Contemporary events, however, complicate the picture, and only those recollections would be preserved, as Andrić himself once said, which can be understood and can be transformed in the legend.<sup>16</sup>

Both Andrić and the epic singer draw heavily on history, and they chronicle it according to their narrative needs. Historical congruences and facts are exploited to the extent that the poet needs events and actions from the outer world to combine with other narrative ingredients. Miloš Bandić characterizes the continuity of history and tradition in *The Bridge on the Drina* as “Andrić’s bridge into the past”:

It is an attempt to establish and somewhat define that winding, uncertain, fogged course of historical ferment. The writer does not examine the past exclusively as it is, but strengthens what of it remained alive and permanent.<sup>17</sup>

Historical persons poured out of oral poetry into Andrić’s narratives, such as King Marko Vukašinović (known as the epic Marko Kraljević), Karadjordje, and especially Mehmed Pasha Sokolović, who was instrumental in the erection of the bridge on the Drina. Andrić embedded into the story the abduction of a little Christian boy by the janissaries, who were “collecting from the villages of eastern Bosnia the appointed number of Christian children for the blood tribute.”<sup>18</sup> The story blended historical facts with legend, collective fate with individual. Reflecting on this, Radovan Vučković noted that Andrić subordinated the tragedy of the individual to “the collective historical totality.”<sup>19</sup> The individual tragedy was lost, overtaken by larger historical events: “Individual suffering was tied to the historical time, which was here reshaped into an absolute time in which everything became counterbalanced.”<sup>20</sup>

Just as he drew heavily on history, Andrić turned often to characters from the folk tradition. Such was a prominent hero among the Balkan Muslims, Alija Djerzelez, who was the Muslim counterpart of the Christian epic hero Kraljević Marko.<sup>21</sup> “The Journey of Alija Djerzelez” is Andrić’s first short story inspired by legend which blended popular tradition with realistic depictions of the contemporary world.<sup>22</sup> Reflecting on Djerzelez in 1973, Andrić called him “a

well known popular and *my hero*," differentiating in that way between the two.<sup>23</sup> Heroic and funny at the same time, Djerzelez was brought from the epic world into a literary work where his actions and emotions are those of an ordinary man. As Petar Džadžić described him,

[He is] brave and funny, a Bosnian Don Quixote, coming from Andrić's mythical world. . . . Djerzelez, a hero "about whom songs were sung," for Andrić is actually not at all the embodiment of heroic and spiritual harmony which epic singers usually bestowed upon their folk heroes.<sup>24</sup>

What is unique in this short story is Andrić's process of characterization. In the opening scene Djerzelez is introduced with such attributes of the folk tradition as elaborate attire, an heroic horse, and the respect and admiration of the people:

He was heralded by his own voice, singing. Mounted on a white horse with bloodshot eyes, he rode up the level meadow in front of the khan; red tassels hung from the horse's forelock and bounced over his eyes, and the long sleeves of Djerzelez, embroidered with a thread of pure gold, flapped and glittered in the wind. His arrival was greeted by a silence heavy with awe and respect: he brought with him the fame of many battles and of a strength that inspired fear. They had all heard of him, although very few had actually seen him for he had spent his youth riding and fighting between Travnik and Istanbul.<sup>25</sup>

Although Djerzelez is described as physically unattractive, no other figure in South Slavic Muslim epic poetry can equal him in bravery and generosity. For Andrić it was important first to establish the affinity between Djerzelez and the folk milieu because he was consistent in searching for the truth in the "layers created by the centuries." Once he established Djerzelez's primary role as that of a legendary hero, he superimposed a man with human weaknesses, led by dreams, the love of women, gambling, drinking; a man who was victimized by people he met on his journeys. Andrić intentionally establishes this dichotomy to masterfully praise and at the same time mock the epic hero.

Andrić transmitted his own attitude toward the world, his feelings of personal isolation, suffering, pain, and fear—all so well

known from *Ex Ponto*—onto his Djerzelez. He showed how people who admired Djerzelez as a hero, once they met him “began to lose their awe and, recovering their sense of equality, attempted to engage him in conversation.”<sup>26</sup> By mixing with the khan’s guests, by drinking and sharing meals with them, and by not being a smooth talker, Djerzelez loses his epic prestige, and “the forbidding magic that surrounded his name was completely dispelled.”<sup>27</sup> The travelers “approached him with an unconscious desire to assert their equality with him, or even to make themselves superior in some way.”<sup>28</sup> This fine analysis emerged from Andrić’s philosophy, expressed in his statement that “in silence is safety.” This is probably a combination of Andrić’s personal disappointment in people who hurt him in his younger days, a quest to preserve his privacy in his golden years, and a strong Eastern influence.

In the course of telling Djerzelez’s story, Andrić offers some glimpses of his own intimate observations of people. In this way Djerzelez becomes real although he is coming from the depths of a legend. He is, according to Džadžić, “a transitional form, the first stage of disillusionment, an encounter with the real state of affairs.”<sup>29</sup> The individual drama of a man is put in the foreground of the narrative, but it is at the same time subordinated to and becomes a “part of collective consciousness.”<sup>30</sup>

The legendary reality that brings back dreams of distant epic heroes comes to light in *The Bridge on the Drina*. Andrić chose the very title of the novel from the Muslim epic songs collected by Kosta Hörmann.<sup>31</sup> Oral tradition echoes in the beliefs with which even children were familiar. When they played along the stony banks of the Drina River,

[They] knew that these were hoofprints of ancient days and long dead warriors. Great heroes lived on earth in those days, when the stone had not yet hardened and was soft as the earth and the horses, like the warriors, were of colossal growth.<sup>32</sup>

In this fine epic tapestry everything is possible, and the polarization of popular beliefs had been taking place along particular ethnic, religious, and cultural stands:

For the Serbian children these were the prints of the hooves of Šarac, the horse of Kraljević Marko, which had remained there from the time when Kraljević Marko himself was in prison up



there in the Old Fortress and escaped, flying down the slope and leaping the Drina, for at that time there was no bridge. But the Turkish children knew that it had not been Kraljević Marko, nor could it have been (for whence could a bastard Christian dog have had such strength or such a horse!) any but Djerzelez Alija on his winged charger which, as everyone knew, despised ferries and ferry-men and leapt over rivers as if they were watercourses.<sup>33</sup>

The children were so sure about the truthfulness of their respective oral traditions that they did not feel any need to fight among themselves to prove it:

They did not even squabble about this, so convinced were both sides in their own belief. And there was never an instance of any one of them being able to convince another, or that any one had changed his belief.<sup>34</sup>

“The common people easily make up fables and spread them quickly,” writes Andrić, “wherein reality is strangely and inextricably mixed and interwoven with legend.”<sup>35</sup> We can focus on several legends connected with the building of the bridge, which Andrić took from oral tradition and into which he injected reality. The theme of human sacrifice associated with the building of the bridge is introduced by Rade the Mason, who is known from the South Slavic epic song “The Building of Scutari.” The parallel between Andrić’s and the popular version is obvious. The search for the children Stoja and Stojan, the immured mother, her milk that flows from the walls, all of these epic elements fully correspond to the epic song in which the young wife of Gojko Mrnjavčević was walled into the foundation with an opening left for her by Rade the Mason to nurse her baby son Jovo.<sup>36</sup> However, the turning point in the presentation of this legend is that Andrić chose a simple-minded peasant girl, Ilinka, who gave birth to stillborn twins and wandered desperately around the bridge trying to find her children without understanding that they were buried. The peasants who gathered around the guslar who was singing at night and reviving the glorious past said that a *vila* (a supernatural creature) was destroying the work on the bridge. She demanded sacrifice, and many peasants swore that guards were searching for the twins. In the twilight between imagination and reality, the legend and the actual sabotage during the building of the

bridge, a new hero was born. He was not a sort of Kraljević Marko or even an Alija Džerzelez. He was “a certain Radisav from Unište, a small village” who found the courage to call the peasants to resist the hard labor imposed by the Turks:

Brother, we have had enough of this. We must defend ourselves. You can see for yourself that this building work will be the death of all of us; it will eat us all up. Even our children will have to do forced labour on the bridge.<sup>37</sup>

When caught by the Turkish guards, tortured, and impaled, Radisav became a hero not only of that place, but of wide epic proportions. His individual fate of suffering and sacrifice was incorporated into the collective existence of his people. The personal and collective dramas were unified. The fictional image of hero was transposed by Andrić into the factual one, freed from embellishment. The people who knew about Radisav’s heroic act of destroying the work on the building of the bridge were astonished

at the poor miserable appearance of the man they had imagined to be quite different. . . . He seemed to all those there too wretched and too insignificant to have done the deed which now brought him to execution.<sup>38</sup>

What is remarkable about Andrić’s storytelling in this case is his juxtaposition of an ordinary human being who was brought to the extreme of his misery and precisely through that act was resurrected into a true hero.

Andrić’s craftsmanship is evident in the course of the story, achieving balance, measure, and economy of expression. Sometimes he distances himself from the story, which is being told by an epic narrator, giving the impression that it is unfolding by itself. In some instances Andrić brings a second narrator on the scene who tells the stories that were told and retold by earlier generations. In such a way Andrić tightens the narrative flow, artistically integrating past events with present and the heroic world with the real one, which was unfolding day to day. All of these Andrić plays—or perhaps a better expression is “tunes”—on various time scales, which he sometimes expands to four centuries.

Andrić’s compositional procedure is like that of the epic singers: compact idiom, controlled emotions, crystal clear and precise lan-

guage, a simple and even monotonous flow of sentences. Andrić used popular language and style to such an extent that his written text gives the impression of an orally recited story. Isidora Sekulić points out that this is the case in all Andrić's short stories, but especially in "The Journey of Alija Djerzelez," "the story that a good reciter might chant as a kind of folk epic, and as from the popular epic it would retain traces of the life of one whole epoch."<sup>39</sup> Sekulić engagingly evokes Andrić's storytelling as "a silent weaving" without "gradation of effects," monotonous, as when "Djerzelez travels and travels."<sup>40</sup> She quotes a picturesque description from Andrić, simple and powerful at the same time: "Djerzelez raced on, looking shorter and shorter, as if his legs were being swallowed up by his body."<sup>41</sup>

Both compositional media, traditional and literary, have a wide application in Andrić, and they are jointly explored and employed by him. His linguistic form and the semantic core in all his layers is classical. "Regarding the artistic value of words," Dragiša Živković claimed, "Andrić was finding the existential essence of words and speech, seeking as condensed as possible a meaning for them."<sup>42</sup> In pursuing this objective, Andrić remained consistent throughout his literary work. He painstakingly tried to find the most appropriate idioms, and they satisfied him only if he was able to express his message with an economy of words. He is similar to Goya's Aunt Anunciata in his essay "Conversation with Goya," who advised that a weaver has to compress her weaving in order to achieve the most adequate form.<sup>43</sup>

Andrić argued that there is no such a thing as a writer having "his language," as literary critics maintained:

Language is like a river. All its tributaries join in one riverbed. That is why I am an adversary of the formula . . . "his language." What matters is how to use and arrange the words, and that is something quite different.<sup>44</sup>

With his affinity for an economy of language, Andrić built his literary structure, which became a monolithic architectural piece carved as if from stone. His favorite symbols, often utilized, were stone, bridges, and rivers, which represented for him the quest for permanence and enduring values in this world of constant change.

For Andrić it was of particular importance to select a characteristic detail that would conjure the reality of his characters and

descriptions. It did not matter whether it dealt with the topic or with the language, but it had to be the right detail, the right tool in his art. Andrić confirmed how seriously he took his work:

I approached my themes timidly and with fear, as to sacred things. Sometimes a detail was decisive in the determination and selection of the theme, an archival finding, an oral tradition or legend, often a piece of clothing.<sup>45</sup>

A characteristic detail depicted by a vivid picture or a suggestive metaphor using the crucial key words and phrases would conjure “the illusion of reality,” of which Andrić was a master. With such techniques he convinced his audience of the authenticity of the events he described. The action progressed smoothly, and everybody was under the spell of the narrator. He persuaded them that the myths and legends he narrated were as “real” as the characters who lived their intimate lives in front of the audience. Andrić interlocked specific details with the theme he typified by using “repetitive patterns.” Celia Hawkesworth reflected on this: “Throughout Andrić’s work a sense of patterns repeating themselves shifts the balance of his writing, despite the abundance of precise and special detail, away from the particular towards the universal.”<sup>46</sup>

Andrić can be considered an epic poet; he was rightly named “the Balkan Homer.” Živković pointed out that just that “Homeric feature of Andrić’s storytelling [which was] developed on a level of the modern sensibility, actually represents the initial and essential orientation for understanding his work.”<sup>47</sup> In his speech accepting the Nobel Prize, Andrić emphasized that in general, “The taste for telling and retelling a story remains the same” throughout the centuries.<sup>48</sup> Influenced by Eastern storytelling, Andrić referred to the *Arabian Nights* and “the legendary and eloquent Scheherazade [whose] story attempts to stave off the executioner, to suspend the ineluctable decree of the fate that threatens us, and to prolong the illusion of life and of time.”<sup>49</sup> Symbolically this was the role Andrić took upon himself—namely, to create “the illusion of life,” utilizing in his artistry a powerful Homeric tradition.

## NOTES

1. Ivo Andrić, "Razgovor sa Gojom," *Eseji i kritike*, selection and commentary by Ljubo Jandrić (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1976), p. 34.
2. Albert Lord, "Words Heard and Words Seen," in *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 15–18.
3. Karl Kroeber, *Retelling/Rereading: The Fate of Storytelling in Modern Times* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), p. 56.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Ivo Andrić, "Vukov primer," in *Ivo Andrić o Vuku* (Belgrade: Rad, 1977), p. 34.
6. Andrić was easily able to express himself in decasyllabic verses employed by popular singers. Andrić, strolling with Ljubo Jandrić in Belgrade in 1974, reacted on seeing a young motorcyclist speeding by with a blond companion: "Pa je baci za se na konjica, Tri puta je opasao pasom, I četvrtim od konja kajasom!" (See Ljubo Jandrić, *Sa Ivom Andrićem, 1968–1975* [Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1977], series 70, vol. 470, p. 374.)
7. Andrić, "Optimizam Vuka Karadžića," in *Ivo Andrić o Vuku*, p. 60.
8. Golub Dobrašinić, preface to *Ivo Andrić o Vuku*, p. 5.
9. Vladan Nedić "Ivo Andrić i narodna književnost," in *Ivo Andrić*, ed. V. Djurić (Belgrade: Privredni pregled, 1962); found in Institut za Teoriju Književnosti i Umetnosti, *Posebna izdanja*, vol. 1, pp. 223–34, esp. 227–28.
10. Dragiša Živković, *Od Vuka do Andrića* (Belgrade: Društvo za srpskohrvatski jezik i književnost SR Srbije, 1965), vol. 2, p. 146.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Mateja Matejić, "Elements of Folklore in Andrić's *Na Drini ćuprija*," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20, 3 (1978): 356–57.
13. Živković, p. 154.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 154–55.
16. Dragoljub Stojadinović, *Romani Iva Andrića* (Priština: Jedinstvo, 1970), pp. 53–55.
17. Miloš Bandić, *Ivo Andrić : Zagonetka vedrine* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1963), p. 237.
18. Ivo Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*, trans. Lovett F. Edwards (New York: Macmillan, 1959), p. 23.
19. Radovan Vučković, "Kolektiv i drama pojedinca u romanu *Na Drini ćuprija* Iva Andrića," in *Književne analize* (Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, 1972); found in Republički Prosvjetno-Pedagoški Zavod Sarajevo, *Nastavna biblioteka*, vol. 58, p. 36.
20. *Ibid.*

21. See more about the historical persons believed to be behind the epic figure of Alija Džerzelez in Jandrić, pp. 330–31. See also T. Popović, “A Moslem Counterpart of Marko,” in *Prince Marko : The Hero of South Slavic Epics*, pp. 163–68 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988). The research on the historical Alija Džerzelez has been extensive, but among the best sources are Stojan Novaković and A. Olesnicki. The latter based his report on the annals of an anonymous Turkish chronicler of the Bosnian warrior Gerz-Iljas which he discovered in 1934.
22. Once Jandrić bought in an antique bookstore the first collection of Andrić’s short stories, which was published in 1924. When Andrić saw the book, he commented, “‘The Journey of Alija Džerzelez’ is actually my first narrative [moj pripovedački prvenac]. . . . At that time it was harder to enter into the Srpska književna zadruga than into the heavenly empire. Otherwise Zadruga and myself are of the same age [vršnjaci]” (Jandrić, pp. 220–21).
23. On one occasion Andrić told Jandrić that the estate of Alija Džerzelez was at one time in the vicinity of Dobrun, referring to a historical/topographic component of his story. He noted two other components, one epic and the other artistic (*ibid.*), p. 330.
24. Petar Džadžić, *Ivo Andrić: Esej* (Belgrade: Savremena proza, 1957), pp. 144–47.
25. Ivo Andrić, “The Journey of Alija Džerzelez,” in *The Pasha’s Concubine and Other Tales*, trans. Joseph Hitrec (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1968), pp. 16–17.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*
29. Džadžić, p. 145. See also Vasa Mihailovich, who reflects on how the legendary Džerzelez “vacillates between reality and dream” (“The Basic World View in the Short Stories of Ivo Andrić,” *Slavic and East European Journal* 10, 2 [1966]: 173–77).
30. Vučković, p. 36.
31. “Veče hajde gradu Višegradu, Da se gradi na Drini ćuprija. Osta danas na Drini ćuprija, Osta danas, osta do vijeka” (from *Narodne pjesme muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini*, collected by Kosta Hörmann, 1888–89; 2d ed., vol. 1 [Sarajevo, 1933], p. 79, l. 41–42; p. 82, l. 142–43).
32. Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*, p. 17.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
36. For an excellent account on this subject, see Zora Devrnja Zimmerman, “Moral Vision in the Serbian Folk Epic: The Foundation Sacrifice of Skadar,” *Slavic and East European Journal* 23, 3 (1979): 371–80. Svetozar Koljević also extensively researched the legend of human sacrifice quoting passages from

the Bible. See "Ivo Andrić and Folk Literature," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 15 (1982): 132–39.

37. Andrić, *The Bridge on the Drina*, pp. 34–35.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

39. Isidora Sekulić, "Istok u pripovetkama Iva Andrića," in *Ogledi*, ed. Z. Stojković (Novi Sad and Belgrade: Budućnost, 1959); found in *Srpska književnost u sto knjiga*, vol. 67, pp. 83–94.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

41. Andrić, "The Journey of Alija Djerzelez," p. 20.

42. Dragiša Živković, "Epski i lirski stil Iva Andrića," in *Ivo Andrić*, ed. V. Djurić (Belgrade: Privredni pregled, 1962); found in Institut za Teoriju Književnosti i Umetnosti, *Posebna izdanja*, vol. 1, pp. 81–103.

43. Andrić characterized the creation of fine art through Goya, who tells about his Aunt Anunciata teaching her daughter to weave. She would yell, "Tighter! Tighter! Do it better! Do not hesitate! Weave tighter and stronger!" (see Andrić, "Razgovor sa Gojom," in *Eseji i kritike*, pp. 32–33).

44. Jandrić, p. 344.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 364.

46. Celia Hawkesworth, *Ivo Andrić: Bridge between East and West* (London: Athlone Press, 1984), p. 183.

47. Živković found out that the term "Balkan Homer" was used by a Munich journalist who coined it with the luck of journalistic intuition (Živković, "Andrićeva umetnost," in *Od Vuka do Andrića*, p. 174).

48. "Acceptance Speech by Ivo Andrić," in *Nobel Prize Library* (New York: Helvetica Press, 1971), p. 122.

49. *Ibid.*

## ANDRIĆ ON BOSNIA: THE 1924 DISSERTATION

John F. Loud

In May 1924 Andrić submitted the results of his research into Bosnia's history to the University of Graz, a thesis written in German with the unwieldy title of "Die Entwicklung des geistigen Lebens in Bosnien unter der Einwirkung der türkischen Herrschaft" (The development of spiritual life in Bosnia under the influence of Turkish rule). He chose not to do anything further with his manuscript, and for nearly sixty years it lay undisturbed in the university library. Only after his death in 1975 was it finally published, first in a bilingual edition (German/Serbo-Croatian) by the Andrić Foundation (*Sveske I*, 1982) and more recently in an English translation published by Duke University Press (1990).

Andrić's reputation rests on his prose fiction, but it is generally recognized and indeed reasonable to assume that his historical research in the early 1920s fed that fiction in some way, coming as it did toward the beginning of a long series of stories set in Bosnia under the Ottoman Turks. The writer himself implied as much in his brief preface, when, after noting that he had focused on the circumstances (*Verhältnisse*) attendant on spiritual life rather than on individual literary works, he finished with the following simple statement:

Dem Inhalte und Grundgedanken nach, steht diese Abhandlung mit anderen Arbeiten in Zusammenhang, die ich in anderer Form und bei anderer Gelegenheit verfasst habe.

(In content and basic idea the present treatment is related to other works that I have composed in a different form and on a different occasion.)<sup>1</sup>

Before presenting "history," in other words, the author called attention to the fact that in "fiction" he had said the same thing in a different way. Perhaps in his own mind the two were fragments of



a larger whole and in that sense inextricable. Our task, however, in attaining a deeper understanding of Andrić's intent and working method is to separate the two. If in Shakespeare's words we have "the body of the age," as Andrić the historian saw his Bosnia, what light can such a discursive study shed on the "form and pressure" of Turkish times in his fiction?

Andrić looked at cultural history from the standpoint of the *rayah*, the non-Islamic populations under the Ottomans. It was the view from below. He devoted close attention to the many liabilities—legal, social, and economic—under which the *rayah* labored and suffered. Injustice was his theme. The dominant tone was controlled outrage, rising to such summary moral verdicts on the Turkish impact as "unmitigated evil" or "an absolute negative" (p. 38).

Andrić's points of reference were Bosnia's confessional groups, and he moved by chapters from Patarin (Bogomil) to Franciscan and finally to Serbian Orthodox. The medieval Patarin dualists, he argued, following Franjo Rački, the great nineteenth-century Croatian historian, were the progenitors of today's Bosnian Muslims.<sup>2</sup> But these native Muslims, in Andrić's opinion, had no intellectual life worth mentioning:

The part of Bosnia's population assimilating to Islam, which constituted a dominant warrior caste throughout Turkish rule, first directed its energies to conquest and then to the defense of property. This was a caste whose spiritual and intellectual life grew petrified in the twin molds of a foreign religion and an alien language. . . . The writing of these expatriate Bosnian Muslims has no place in the present discussion, however meaningful or even meritorious it may have been. For it belonged to another culture entirely (p. 67).

At another point, exalting the Franciscans while downplaying the Orthodox (who were under the "pernicious control" of Greek patriarchs), Andrić denigrated the culture of the Bosnian Muslims precisely because it was non-Western:

This left the sector of the population that had converted to Islam entirely dependent on literary productions in Turkish (Arabian and Persian, as the case may be), hence without access to the Serbo-Croatian linguistic sphere and Western culture (p. 46).

While not quite as dismissive of the intellectual culture of the Serbian Orthodox, Andrić felt that there was precious little of it in Bosnia. He briefly described what his meager sources could offer: the flow of printed works from Russia to some of the Orthodox monasteries (Žitomisljić is mentioned) from as early as 1637; the copying of books by hand in the eighteenth century; early stirrings of literary activity in the nineteenth century (Mostar); the work of the Orthodox clergy in founding schools between 1820 and 1830; etc. Earlier the point had been made that Catholicism in Bosnia was originally “spread by a foreign tongue, led by foreigners, and dependent upon foreign political and military might” (p. 7). The Serbian Orthodox Church, too, underwent long decades of outside supervision. For more than a century (1766–1880), a crucial century of cultural stimulation in the West, this confession was wholly subordinate to the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople. To the “baneful work” of its Greek bishops was attributed the fact that the Orthodox clergy in Bosnia performed no cultural labor of lasting importance and developed no literary activity whatever. Andrić, it seems, was not entirely in thrall to a narrow, nativistic perspective. When foreign influence was at issue, Rome enjoyed the benefit of the doubt.

His was an early attempt at writing cultural history. Yet a curious inconsistency of Andrić as cultural historian was that while he paid honor to popular wisdom—frequently quoting folk sayings, for example, when they served his purpose in belittling Turkish influence—he left out of account that the folk genres were shared by Muslims and non-Muslims alike and that to this extent the former must also have had a “spiritual life.” Andrić exalted book learning. In a gesture reminiscent of the preservation of such learning by the monasteries of the West during the Dark Ages, he noted that the Orthodox monks were given much more sympathy and respect by their co-religionists than were the local priests; and again, it was their monasteries that he characterized as “storage batteries” of popular energy over the whole period of Turkish rule. Andrić failed to explore, however, at least in his dissertation, exactly what they might be storing there.

Major space was assigned to the Franciscans (Chapter 4). By contrast to the Orthodox, the life of the Catholic clergy could be reconstructed from the monastery chronicles, the protocols of the Definitors (supervisors of ecclesiastical property), and especially the

detailed reports of the apostolic *visitatoren* and the bishops which were preserved in the Archive of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome (Congregatio de Propaganda Fide). Andrić not only furnished a full history of the Franciscans in Bosnia, but also weighted his long chapter with overt admiration for them. In another sense as well, his dissertation tilted noticeably in their direction, and that is the quality and amount of independent judgment in a work that elsewhere leans heavily on its sources for both facts and opinion.

Reasons for the centrality of the Franciscans are not hard to find. Here, as mentioned, was the richest trove of reference material in the Western languages Andrić commanded. As for his own language, in addition to the raw data obtained from manuscript sources, of all Andrić's citations the single most concentrated cluster consists of books about the Franciscans and by Franciscans (Batinić and Jelenić, two volumes apiece, also Jukić, Martić, and others). He simply was in a position to say the most about them. Perhaps a certain familiarity stemming from childhood played its role: Andrić's mother, a cook, took him along as a little boy on her various jobs at the *samostani*, the Franciscan monasteries (personal communication to author by the guardian at Kreševo). Again, when it came to dealing with the cultural and literary work of the Franciscans in Bosnia, this must naturally have appealed to one who was himself engaged in that prestigious activity. Above all, the whole orientation and training of the young Andrić pointed to the West, not to mention his experience as a consular officer in, for the most part, Western centers. He would naturally feel most at home with the great intellectual currents of Western Christendom: Reformation and Counter-Reformation, Enlightenment, Nationalism. Andrić was a man of letters—Western letters. Clearly, all this must have implications for his many stories and story cycles about Franciscan monks, westward-looking monks who were always falling afoul of the Turks.

Many a detail in the stories first shows up here. The history of bells in Bosnia, for instance, serves to illustrate the inexplicable, hence unnatural, ritual alienation of the Bosnian Muslims. When in 1870 the leading Catholic churchman of Sarajevo, Fra Grgo Martić, asked that a bell be permitted there as well (a bell had earlier been hung in Kreševo), the local Muslims argued that they would fall into sin simply by hearing it ring, to the point that in the local privy council (*divan*) "the dispute went on so long and became so vehe-

ment that a fanatic priest hit his opponent over the head *mit dem heiligen Buche*." This unnamed spiritual leader, along with his book, was carried over in toto to the 1926 novella "Mara, milosnica" (Hadži Hafiz Kaukdžić). The account books of the Sarajevo Sephardim, the *Pinakes* (used in the 1942 novel, *Travnička hronika* [Bosnian chronicle]), and of the Franciscan monasteries may serve as another example, for Andrić employed these sources extensively in his fiction. (Their use in his dissertation was a point of special commendation by his two readers in the spring of 1924.) Again, several pages in the dissertation were devoted to the unimaginable red tape involved in repairing church buildings. To rebuild Kreševo after it was leveled to the ground by fire in 1765–66, for example, required 3,313 groschen for labor and materials and 8,973 for bribes to pay for the building license. Andrić especially loved the pithy, laconic remarks entered alongside such money items by the monks and quoted them with relish ("Ut obturentur ora leonum"—to stop up the lions' mouths with a bribe). In 1762 a delegation of two monks undertook the long, hazardous trip to the Porte to seek permission to repair the roofs of all three monasteries still standing at that time, Fojnica, Kreševo, and Sutjeska (p. 28). In his short novel, *Prokleta avlija* (Devil's yard, 1962), seeking to condense centuries of vicissitudes into a moment outside time, Andrić cancelled the date and obscured the purpose ("owing to some troublesome, ticklish business") while at the same time naming the emissaries (Fra Tadija Ostrojić and Fra Petar; p. 12, 1963 edition). The decline of the endowments (*vakufe*) after the sixteenth century, the origin and destiny of the Višegrad bridge, the boy-tribute, the teeming swarm of lower officials at the vizier's residence in Travnik who were to reappear in *Bosnian Chronicle* eighteen years later—such are the stuff of fiction, the body of their time, the *Verhältnisse*, first materializing in the 1924 thesis. Instances could be multiplied.

Andrić minced no words:

The Turks could bring no cultural content or sense of higher historic mission, even to those South Slavs who accepted Islam; for their Christian subjects, their hegemony brutalized custom and meant a step to the rear in every respect (p. 38).

The venality of Turkish justice demoralized the rayah: "Krivo ne smijem od Boga, a pravo od Bega" (For fear of God I mustn't tell

lies, for fear of the beg I mustn't tell the truth; see p. 37). Here indeed Andrić dealt with the "geistigen Lebens" of his title in the sense of the moral and spiritual:

In this long drawn-out and unequal struggle the moral attributes of the rayah clarified, crystallized and became fixed, changing for the worse. As a result of Turkish rule the following maxim arose: "Lying is the poor man's stock in trade" [*laž je fukarska sermija*] (p. 38).

If Turkish rule turned the Bosnian peasant into an habitual liar, it also isolated him. The theme of spiritual isolation, so characteristic of Andrić, repeatedly recurs in his dissertation as a physical, even topographical motif. Not for nothing does the Franciscan monastery (samostan) in Bosnia remind one of another noun, *usamljenost* (solitude). The unconverted peasantry withdrew to the windowless mountains. The cloister at Tuzla, cramped in its narrow, dark ravine, "looked more like some prison den than a human habitation: candles had to be kept burning in broad daylight." Thus Andrić quotes Fra Paolo de Rovigno in 1640 (p. 29).

The problem of religious dualism (*bogomilstvo*) in Andrić has been an aspect of his doctoral work generating conjecture among Yugoslav scholars.<sup>3</sup> Andrić referred strictly to the Patarins; the term "Bogomil" was not used of the medieval Bosnian church until the eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> In his discussions of the Patarins, he paid less attention to their beliefs, beyond listing these, than to their customs and attitudes. Among the simple rituals of their faith he took care to mention their abhorrence of bells—"Devil's trumpets," as he calls them at one point (*Dämonische Posaunen*; see p. 14 of the original typescript). It seems that he was building a case for the easy transfer of their allegiance to Islam after the conquest of 1463. Andrić was chiefly interested, however, in the consequences for Bosnia of their struggle with Catholicism for hegemony:

What is most certain and, for us, most important is the fact that Patarins knew how to adjust to Bosnian conditions; the fact that their faith thus became the people's faith; and the fact that insofar as there did exist a criterion by which the country's internal organization could be judged or a palladium in Bosnia's struggle against foreign intervention, this faith carried weight. In their un-

equal, bitter fight with Catholicism, the Patarins had begun to erect that wall of stone [*Felsenwand*] between Bosnia and the Western world which in the course of time was to be enlarged still more by Islam and raised to such mighty heights that even today, although long since crumbled and fallen to pieces, it still produces the effect of a dark, demarcating line that one dare not step over without effort and danger (pp. 12–13).

Again, there is no evidence in the thesis that dualism as such caught the eye of Andrić; he was interested in the forms of belief, as indeed in the “forms of life,” only insofar as they were linked with life itself, because they manifested character.<sup>5</sup> National character and individual personality—both come into the dissertation. As regards the first, Andrić’s line of argument could be stated as follows: Opportunists from the start, insofar as the Patarins had any higher goal, it was to keep Bosnia independent of Catholics and Osmanlis alike by playing both ends against the middle, and this character trait—opportunism—emerged strongly after the fall of Jajce to the Turks (1528), when former Patarins “opted for the Kingdom of this world” (p. 19).

The figure of speech derived through oral epic from the dream of Lazar on the eve of Kosovo. And it was a well-chosen figure, for in the opinion of Andrić landed possession (*Grund und Boden*) was the mainspring (*Haupttriebfeder*), the driving force, of all Bosnian action, after the conquest as before.<sup>6</sup> The ideal of nobility was land on which they could sit undisturbed, he wrote. In an endnote the author described how the former Bosnian, now Muslim, nobles held onto their pre-conquest land deeds in secret, against the day when the Ottoman power might recede: “If pigmeat doesn’t stick in your throat, well, it won’t stick in mine,” he quotes Knežević (p. 77, n. 14), and, with approval, Njegoš: “The lions turned into tillers of the soil, /The cowardly and the covetous turned into Turks” (p. 20).

So it came about that down the middle of the South Slavic lands a line was etched, a line generally following the Danube, Sava, and Una rivers and the Dinaric Alps if we disregard strong fluctuations. This dividing wall [*Scheidewand*] split in two the Serbo-Croatian racial and linguistic complex, and its shadow, where four centuries of ghastly history were played out, was to lie heavy on the landscape to either side into the far distant future.

Therein we see the whole meaning of Turkish rule and Turkish influence on Bosnia's spiritual life.

By right of geographic position Bosnia should have linked the lands along the Danube with the Adriatic Sea, two peripheries of the Serbo-Croatian element and two different zones of European culture. Having fallen to Islam, it was in no position to fulfill this, its natural role, and to take part in the cultural development of Christian Europe, to which ethnographically and geographically it belonged. What is more, thanks to the domestic Islamized element Bosnia even became a mighty bulwark against the Christian West. And in that *unnatural posture* it was to stay for the entire duration of Turkish rule (p. 17; emphasis mine).

That, in idea and image, was the center of Andrić's dissertation: the recurrent image of the wall and the shadow; the idea of Bosnia warped in space, frustrated in its manifest destiny of brokering between East and West. To Andrić in 1924, Bosnia was a case of arrested development, denied its natural "posture," wrenched out of position to face the East and to turn its back on the West. The metaphor seems to have been an early illustration of the theory worked out in Andrić's "Razgovor sa Gojom" (1935) of a *zgušnjut* (compressed) vocabulary of gesture, motion, and posture. Here Andrić wanted to convey the image of a Bosnia "frozen in motion," to employ the later argument, a Bosnia reaching out but choked off, its spiritual energies stifled. (It might be noted parenthetically that the author ignored, if not overlooked, the later railroad line between Budapest and Rijeka, which would seem to undermine the bridge image in its geopolitical sense: had Bosnia not really become a bridge after all? Or would "stagnant pool" better suit?)

Andrić's early Bosnian stories were about anonymous people, for his object was to bring out the underlying features capable of generalizing an entire era, the noumena behind the phenomena, to suggest the dominant spirit of a period. That spirit of a "*most manqué*" was differently, obliquely expressed in the same year as the dissertation by "Most na Žepi," the story of a minor bridge spanning a small tributary of the Drina to the north of Višegrad (published in 1925).<sup>7</sup> However elegant in form, in function this bridge was lost, lost in the wilderness, bereft of purpose, a bridge to nowhere. Analogously, in the doctoral thesis written concurrently,

Bosnia enjoyed 150 years of relative care and solicitude by native-born viziers and governors. But then the land was left to its own devices and to the long, ensuing centuries of legalized lawlessness that Andrić described so bitinglly.

The bridge as symbol took its origin in the famous scene of Zemka swinging in "Djerzelez na putu" (Djerzelez on the road, 1919), section two of Andrić's first published story, "Put Alije Djerzeleza" (The journey of Alija Djerzelez). Thence it can be traced chronologically in a cluster of images which always turns up *qua* cluster in story after story. From the "swing" to the German woman's high wire ("Ćorkan i Švabica," 1921) to Fra Marko's vision of God's ship (*božja ladja*) in "U musafirhani" (1923) is all one straight development. The ideas associated with this development of the bridge symbol were, first, rest and repose, then harmony and grace, then the panoramic vision of the open sea. Imagery and idea in this writer worked by accretion, not cancellation. All this fed into "Most na Žepi," and to it was added the new idea of the lost link, Andrić's geopolitical (one might say) concept of Bosnia.

In terms of individual character, it is interesting to learn in the light of these passages what Andrić thought of Mehmed Pasha Sokolović twenty years before the Grand Vizier appeared in *The Bridge on the Drina*: profoundly Bosnian because—he was a typical representative of the Patarins! His proud motto (*devise*) is quoted:

Nek mi ne sudi Evropa,  
jer mogu na štetu njojzi  
dignut neprelazan zid  
po medji carstva sveg (p. 34).

(Let me not be provoked by Europe / For I can, to her sorrow, /  
Raise an insurmountable wall / All down the length of the imperial border.)

Andrić was obsessed by walls.

Here Andrić relied on the work of Safvet beg Bašagić, to which he usually referred in his dissertation as "Poviest Bosne."<sup>8</sup> According to Bašagić's modern editor, Muhsim Rizvić, it was he who developed the hypothesis that Bosnian Muslims are descendants of the Patarins (p. 100, bibliographic note). Discussing in his thesis the Bosnian Muslims, "those heirs of the Patarins," Andrić placed Sokolović



squarely in the context of their “unhealthy conservatism,” which could take such absurd forms as fear of church bells.

Readers of Andrić may recall here another vizier, Vizier Yusuf (in “Most na Žepi”), who *crossed out* his own motto, “U ćutanju je sigurnost” (In Silence Is Safety), impelled by a fear of life (“strah od života”) and the thought that every word, just as every deed, can lead to evil. (Andrić worked through opposites, turning tiny motifs inside out from one piece of writing to the next: the first vizier proclaims his motto, the next cancels his.)

One may read philosophical dualism in that attitude, possibly. In the dissertation, however, it was not the philosophy but the personality of a Bosnian Patarin that the author had in mind, traits incorporated in the figure of Fra Marko Krneta, the first of Andrić’s Franciscan monks and the subject of four stories between 1923 (the very year he was compiling materials for his dissertation) and 1928, when he killed him off.<sup>9</sup> These Bosnian Franciscans constituted an idiosyncratic, special type (so he argued in his dissertation), a personality type conditioned by four hundred years of working with (or better, under, or even against) the Turks, Bosnian and otherwise. Although their mission in Bosnia originally had been to put down the Patarin dualists, the Franciscans took on, in the course of this activity and later, features that strongly resembled those of their fellow countrymen and doctrinal opponents, “der guter Bosnier.” Those traits were “a thirst for spiritual autonomy, a tendency to be refractory, a certain exclusivity, a taste for xenophobia.” Self-denying to the point of martyrdom when defending the position of Rome in the Balkans, the author went on to say, when it came to defending the “rights” of their native Bosnia, the Franciscans ruthlessly opposed Roman bishops, Roman secular clergy, and Roman justice, “in a stiff-necked way that vividly recalls the struggles of the Bosnian Patarins” (p. 44).

Thus, paradoxically, Andrić associated Sokolović, stiff-necked “heir to the Patarins,” with the Bosnian Franciscans. Each embodied proud resistance to the West. Bosnia’s “unnatural posture” was thus determined ultimately by character, by the territoriality and provincialism of the Bosnian personality type, exemplified on the one hand by the Fra Markos and on the other by the Islamized element with its “Grund und Boden” ideal.

Sokolović may have been called typical, but the individual Bosnian actually characterized at some length in the dissertation was

the nineteenth-century Franciscan, Ivan Franjo Jukić, reformer, author, and founder of the influential magazine, *Bosanski prijatelj*. If only to judge by the space devoted to him (pp. 51–54), Jukić was to Andrić the most distinctive and interesting intellectual figure in Bosnia of the last century. What appealed to Andrić were Jukić's efforts to educate and enlighten his countrymen. With what warmth and admiration Andrić wrote of Jukić! The Bosnian Illyrian! A veritable lion on Christendom! Some, though not all, features of his personality again remind us of Fra Marko: Jukić was intractable, wayward, a "rough spirit," while at the same time inventive and persevering,

entirely given over to zeal on behalf of his people, as though filled by some apostolic mission. Intellectually gifted and physically strong, during his short life Jukić was steadily motivated by the thought of "bringing the simple people out of the darkness of ignorance into the light of truth" (p. 53).

Here was the fictional character of Fra Marko almost to the letter, again a Franciscan monk, though hardly "intellectually gifted." As mentioned above, however, Andrić covered his tracks. He was a craftsman in the sense that one work would unfold (so to speak) out of the last by the inversion of small details or characteristics. Thus the prison imagery and crawling skin sensations of his stories of madness and *izvan sebe* (beside oneself) developed directly out of the kinetic sensations and grand vistas of *zanos* (ecstasy) in the early stories. Developmentally, "Mustafa Madžar" and "U musafirhani," published the same year, 1923, are mirror images of each other. And both must lie behind the cryptic statement of his preface, "other forms, other occasions."

The dominant images in this dissertation were darkness and isolation: *mračna Bosna*, locked into self-imposed isolation, walled off from the sea. Travelers are *weisse Raben* (rare birds). A Muslim from Trebinje confided to Dr. Koetschet (Osman Pasha's private secretary and a Turcophile) in 1866 that never in his life had he been to Dubrovnik, only a few hours away (p. 83, n. 43). Monasteries are *Gefängnisse* (prisons) throughout. As a consular official and professional diplomat for two decades, Andrić himself incarnated the opposite virtues, mobility and sophistication, not to mention his postwar activity on an even broader stage than Western Europe. All interviews attest to this. And all readers of Andrić know the importance to him

of light visions, visions of the sea, of unimpeded, swift flight. One thinks of "Leteći nad morem" (Sea flight, 1932), of "Jelena, žena koje nema" (Jelena, woman who is not, conceived in 1919, first published 1934, completed 1962),\* of "Žena na kamenu" (Woman on the rock, 1954), whose touchstone scene had Martha L. sitting on a high wall of stone as a young girl, staring out to sea. There is the Felsenwand, there is the Scheidewand cutting Bosnia in two, descended from the 1924 dissertation. In that early year we already had both terms of the equation: on the one hand, prison and imprisonment, and on the other, the *Aufklärung*, the struggle toward the light, in the work of the Franciscans.

#### NOTES

1. For the English translation, see *The Development of Spiritual Life in Bosnia under the Influence of Turkish Rule*, ed. and trans. Želimir B. Juričić and John F. Loud (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 1. Unless otherwise noted, all citations from the dissertation are taken from this edition.

2. References to Rački numbered five monographs and articles, including "Bogomili i Patareni," from which Andrić explicitly took his facts. See page 9, "The Patarin Church," n. 38.

3. See, for example, Branko Milanović in his dissertation on Andrić's nonfiction.

4. See John V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Bosnian Church* (Boulder, 1975).

5. "Za njih je način života bio nerazdvojno i bezuslovno vezan sa životom samim" (*Na Drini ćuprija* [Belgrade, 1963], p. 145; English translation, *The Bridge on the Drina* [MacMillan, 1959], p. 136).

6. See the discussion of *Pleminita baština*, or "noble inheritance," on p. 18 of the translation.

7. My source for all dates of actual writing as opposed to publication is ultimately Vera Stojić, Andrić's secretary, whose complete list of *pripovetke* (stories) is provided in the 1977 Harvard dissertation on the development of the Bosnian stories by Vida Taranovski Johnson.

8. Safvet beg Bašagić, *Kratka uputa u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine (od god. 1463–1850)* (Sarajevo, 1900), p. 40 in Bašagić, according to the dissertation endnote. I was unable to inspect the actual book Andrić consulted, however,

\*Also cited in this volume as "Jelena, the Woman Who Does Not Exist."

cannot corroborate the accuracy of this important citation, and must rely on the modern edition edited by Muhsim Rizvić (Sarajevo, 1971).

9. "Kod kazana" was published in 1930 but written two years earlier. The last name of this early protagonist, Krneta, "kind of trumpet" (cornet), may now be explained in the spirit of *nomena qua homina* as a Catholic tag. Fra Marko, cursed with "demonic trumpets," was a Franciscan monk growing from Patarin roots.

## NARRATIVE VOICE AND LISTENER'S CHOICE IN THE PROSE OF IVO ANDRIĆ

Ronelle Alexander

Ivo Andrić's prose work covers a wide span of forms; it includes (but is not limited to) the short story, the novel, the novella, the chronicle, and the essay. It is characteristic of Andrić that he will utilize more than one of these forms to express the same basic message. A topic which recurs often in his prose, for instance, is that of storytelling. His message, that the stories men tell and retell are more real than the "truths" recounted in them, appears in numerous different guises.<sup>1</sup> Compare the following excerpts from Andrić's prose; the first is taken from the prologue to a novella, the second from a reflective piece masquerading as a short story, and the third from his best known work, the chronicle-novel *Na Drini ćuprija* (The bridge on the Drina):<sup>2</sup>

Bosanske kasabe i varoši pune su priča. U tim ponajčešće *izmišljenim* pričama krije se, pod vidom neverovatnih događaja i maskom često izmišljenih imena, *stvarna* i nepriznavana istorija toga kraja, živih ljudi i davno pomrlih naraštaja. To su one orijentalne laži za koje turska poslovice veli da su "istinitije od svake istine."

(The towns and villages of Bosnia are full of stories. Under the guise of improbable events masked by invented names, these tales, which are for the most part imaginary, conceal the true, unacknowledged history of the region, of living people and long-vanished generations. These are those Eastern lies which the Turkish proverb holds to be "truer than any truth.")<sup>3</sup>

---

Ima nekoliko tačaka ljudske aktivnosti oko kojih se kroz sva vremena, sporo i u finim naslagama, stvaraju legende. Zbunjivan

dugo onim što se neposredno dešavalo oko mene, ja sam u drugoj polovini svoga života došao do zaključka: da je uzaludno i pogrešno tražiti smisao u beznačajnim a prividno tako važnim događajima koji se dešavaju oko nas, nego da ga treba tražiti u onim naslagama koje stoleća stvaraju oko nekoliko glavnijih legendi čovečanstva.

(There are a few points of human activity around which legends have been gradually built up in thin layers over the years. For a long time I was bewildered by what was happening immediately around me, and in the second half of my life, I came to this conclusion: that it is useless and mistaken to look for sense in the seemingly important but meaningless events taking place around us, but that we should look for it in those layers which the centuries have built up around the few main legends of humanity.)<sup>4</sup>

---

Narod pamti i prepričava ono što može da shvati i što uspe da pretvori u legendu. Sve ostalo prolazi mimo njega bez dubljeg traga, sa nemom ravnodušnošću bezimernih i prirodnih pojava, ne dira njegovu maštu i ne ostaje u njegovom sećanju. Ovo mučno i dugo zidanje bilo je za njega tuđi rad o tuđem trošku. Tek kad je kao plod toga napora iskrasnio veliki most, ljudi su počeli da se sećaju pojedinosti i da postanak stvarnog, vešto zidanog i trajnog mosta kite maštarskim pričama koje su opet oni umeli vešto da grade i dugo da pamte.

(The common people remember and tell of what they are able to grasp and what they are able to transform into legend. Anything else passes them by without deeper trace, with the dumb indifference of nameless natural phenomena, which do not touch the imagination or remain in the memory. This hard and long building process was for them a foreign task undertaken at another's expense. Only when, as the fruit of this effort, the great bridge arose, men began to remember details and to embroider the creation of a real, skilfully built and lasting bridge with fabulous tales which they well knew how to weave and to remember.)<sup>5</sup>

This message is such a basic part of Andrić's oeuvre that it is central to some of his longest and most important works. Two of these are the novella *Prokleta avlija* (1954) and *Na Drini ćuprija*. In this

contribution, which presents an analysis of a particular characteristic of Andrić's narrative voice, I shall focus upon these two works.<sup>6</sup> The claims herein, however, are meant to apply to all of Andrić's narrative oeuvre and are intended to illuminate our understanding and appreciation of that oeuvre.

Many critics have noted the "gnomic" nature of Andrić's prose style, and have linked it to his "Balkan" origins. It has seemed quite appropriate that the land which produced such outstanding practitioners of oral traditional poetry (and especially heroic epic narrative) should also produce one of the world's greatest practitioners of a prose which is timeless and epic in nature but also eminently modern and focused in style. Miodrag Pavlović, for instance, views Andrić's prose as the perfect and complete union of the "creative logic" of both the oral and written styles of language (and connects this trait with his Balkan and South Slavic origin).<sup>7</sup> All critics agree that Andrić's narrative style is masterful and unique, and many attempts have been made to characterize this style. One of the most successful is that of Predrag Palavestra, who calls Andrić the "hidden poet."<sup>8</sup> Andrić's basic narrative mode, he argues, is that of the distant, withdrawn, "objective" narrator, who nevertheless allows glimpses of his hidden, intimate, "subjective" self through carefully managed nuances of tone and style.

In this contribution, I shall discuss one aspect of this "managed nuancing." My focus is the grammatical marker of person, especially that of the first-person plural; my claim is that a close study of this marker in Andrić's prose will lead to a better understanding of both Andrić's style in general and the specific meaning of each of the works in which it occurs. This element of Andrić's narrative voice is such that it functions both internally and externally. That is, it works both within each narrative to heighten, amplify, and render more precise that narrative's particular message, and independent of the narrative, as an indicator of the "message" contained within Andrić's overall style.

Both *Na Drini ćuprija* and *Prokleta avlija* are intimately concerned with historical events and with the manner in which the events themselves are less real than the stories told about these events. The tone of narration, however, differs strikingly between the two. *Na Drini ćuprija* is about the history of a single bridge and a single town, Višegrad. It is told in linear form by a chronicler who appears to have

first-hand knowledge of the town's history but who nevertheless as an identity tends to fade in and out of the story. He begins in the unidentified "present" and then takes us back to a time "when there was not even a thought of a bridge at that spot"—i.e., sometime prior to 1516—and tells the story of the bridge up to and including 1914. The chronicler is in full control of the narration, but he stays in the background. In essence, he chooses to function simply as the channel by which Višegrad itself tells its tale, which at the same time is a tale of all of Bosnia and of all of us everywhere. *Na Drini ćuprija* is both a "historical novel" in that it tells us "what happened," and a powerful commentary on the art of history writing in that it examines how we remember, and tell the story of, "what happened."

In many ways, the message of *Prokleta avlija* is similar. Its narrative structure is strikingly different, however: it moves from the present back through several layers of the past before returning us through these layers once more to the present. In similar manner, it moves through several different narrative voices in its journey from present to past and back to present again. The "present" is that of a Franciscan monastery in pre-modern Bosnia (probably of the eighteenth century), where the monk Fra Petar (Brother Peter) has just been buried. Another, unidentified monk gazes at the newly dug grave and reflects on the tales Fra Petar had told before he died. The scene shifts to the "damned yard" itself—a prison yard in Istanbul—and the narrative voice presumably shifts to that of Fra Petar, who presents himself as a listener to the tales of others. Primary among these other narrators are Haim, the Jew of Smyrna who knows (and tells) everything about everybody (and is equally good at telling that which he does not know), and Ćamil, a sensitive young scholar who lands in prison because the authorities cannot comprehend his scholarly obsession and therefore find it suspicious. Ćamil's obsession is with the (historically accurate) tale of Džem-sultan, the pretender to the Ottoman throne who became a pathetic pawn of Mediterranean and Near Eastern politics in the last two decades of the fifteenth century, from the death of his father Mehmet the Conqueror in 1481 until five years after his own death in 1494. Thus, although the narrative of *Prokleta avlija* begins and ends in Fra Petar's monastery in Bosnia, the kernel of the narrative is the "ageless tale of two brothers" in its manifestation as the tale of Džem-sultan and his brother Bajazit. The force of the narrative, though, is in



Ćamil and his obsession. Once within the “damned yard,” Ćamil becomes even further involved with his tale and begins to lose his sanity; gradually he reaches the point where he no longer can separate his own tale from that of Džem-sultan. In terms of the plot of the narrative of *Prokleta avlija*, the climactic scene is that in which Ćamil finally admits to his interrogators that he “is” Džem-sultan.

For the present analysis, however, the climactic scene is the moment when Fra Petar realizes the nature of his new friend’s obsession and the danger in which it places him. Andrić chooses this moment to include, in a parenthetical note, a passage which seems at first glance to explain why he has largely “hidden” his poetic self from us:

Fra Petar se nije pravo ni sećao kad je u stvari počela ta priča bez reda i kraja. Isto tako nije odmah ni pravo primetio trenutak, teški i odlučeni trenutak, u kom je Ćamil jasno i prvi put sa posrednog pričanja tuđe sudbine prešao na ton lične ispovesti i stao da govori u prvom licu.

(Ja!—Teška reč, koja u očima onih pred kojima je kazana određuje naše mesto, kobno i nepromenljivo, često daleko ispred ili iza onog što mi o sebi znamo, izvan naše volje i iznad naših snaga. Strašna reč koja nas, jednom izgovorena, zauvek vezuje i poistovetuje sa svim onim što smo zamislili i rekli i sa čim nikad nismo ni pomišljali da se poistovetimo, a u stvari smo, u sebi, već odavno jedno.)

(Fra Petar could not quite remember when this tale without order or end had actually begun. Nor could he recall the exact moment, the grave and crucial moment, when Kamil first moved from the indirect narration of another’s destiny to a tone of personal confession and began to speak in the first person.

[I!—potent word, which in the eyes of those before whom it is spoken determines our place, fatefully and immutably, often far beyond or behind what we know about ourselves, beyond our will and above our strength. A terrible word which, once spoken, links us and identifies us with all that we have imagined and said, with which we have never dreamed of identifying ourselves, but with which we have in fact, in ourselves, long been one.])<sup>9</sup>

That is, to speak in the first-person singular (to use the pronoun *ja*, I) is to place oneself on the line and to take full responsibility for one's speech. It is a terrifying act, for once one has committed oneself in this way, there is no way back. But although Andrić may also have been speaking of himself in this passage, it would be foolish to suppose that he would frame a point so elaborately merely in order to justify his own withdrawal into a more distant narrative voice. I submit rather that the purpose of this passage is multifold. The text-internal meaning of this passage was the subject of a previous study, which I shall summarize briefly here;<sup>10</sup> the broader message leads to the subject of the present work.

On the text-specific level, this passage acts as the pivot around which the entire text of *Prokleta avlija* is organized: it carries indexical, iconic, and referential meaning. As an index, it identifies the pronoun *ja* as the key to the text's central significance. As an icon, it states that the point in the text where the passage occurs is the point where that significance (of the pronoun *ja*) must begin to be sought. Once spoken, this pronoun cannot be unspoken; similarly, once its significance is identified, it cannot then retreat once more into insignificance. This iconic message suggested to me that a close study of the text of *Prokleta avlija* would be worthwhile; such a study, in turn, revealed that each instance of the pronoun *ja* which occurs prior to that point in the text is relatively insignificant, functioning only as part of tales that are told merely to pass time in the prison yard. Each instance which occurs after that point, however, is embedded in a passage that is central to the basic message of *Prokleta avlija*. Taken together, the several ways in which these instances of the pronoun *ja* contribute to this message constitute the "referential" meaning of the passage.

On a more general level, that of Andrić's oeuvre, this passage acts to both point out some crucial facts about language and give us insight into Andrić's awareness of their significance. Andrić states in this passage that to speak in the first-person singular is a powerful and terrifying act, both internally and externally. On the inner scale, it is terrifying because of the intimacy: one risks learning who one really is and facing the duality within oneself. On the outer scale, it is terrifying because the Others ("those before whom it is spoken") are thereby given a means to pin one down and hold one accountable.

What Andrić does in this passage, however, is to simultaneously terrify and console. He frightens his readers by convincing them of the terrible potential of the first-person singular, but he consoles them by the usage of the first-person plural. By multiple uses of the pronouns *nas* (us) and *naš* (our) and of verb forms marked for first-person plural, he reassures us that we are all in the same boat. First-person narration thus is not only the fatal and immutable first-person singular. It is also the ambiguous and subtle first-person plural. One's normal reaction to such a first-person plural narrative voice is to assume that the narrator has become for the moment "one of us" and to feel in this way included into the story line. This is not always the case, however. Just as the use of the first-person singular pronoun implies awesome responsibility for its speaker (of which its speaker usually remains blithely unaware), so does the use of the first-person plural pronoun place a large responsibility on its listener. This is because the pronouns "we" and "our" can be either inclusive or exclusive. In any one instance of such a pronoun's usage, the group connoted by it necessarily includes the speaker, but this group can either include or exclude the listener. The correct reading of the pronoun (inclusive or exclusive) in any one instance must be determined by the context in which it is spoken. In a language where verb forms are also marked for person and number, first-person marking is accomplished not only by pronouns but also by verbs.

This subtle fact about language is used to great effect by Andrić. Because his basic narrative stance is distanced, withdrawn, and objective, each usage of first-person marking is placed into high focus: each such instance seems to offer a momentary glimpse of a more subjective and intimate narrator. The glimpse is the more seductive since it seems to include "us," his audience, as well. A closer look, however, reveals that Andrić is well aware of the complexity of first-person plural forms: not all of them are inclusive. Thus not only does Andrić place these forms at significant points within the narrative, directing the reader's attention thereby to the added meaning of those points. He also forces readers to determine for themselves the status of the group referred to in each instance by words marked for first-person plural. In the case of *Prokleta avlija* and *Na Drini ćuprija*, both of which contain narratives about supposedly "true" events involving certain specific communities, the question of inclusiveness takes on even greater meaning.

Each of the two texts contains a relatively small number of first-person plural forms: there are thirty-seven in *Prokleta avlija* and fifty-three in *Na Drini ćuprija*.<sup>\*</sup> There is, however, a remarkable difference in frequency since the novel is almost exactly three times as long as the novella.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the pattern of distribution in the two texts is strikingly different. In *Prokleta avlija*, the forms in question occur within six passages. Two of these contain but one such form each; the remaining thirty-five are distributed among four key passages. By contrast, the fifty-three relevant forms in *Na Drini ćuprija* are distributed among thirty-six passages.

The greater frequency and greater concentration of these forms in *Prokleta avlija* bespeaks a greater intimacy: Andrić's poetic side seems to come more to the fore in this work. For all the distance in time and space (from a nameless eighteenth-century Bosnian monastery to an accursed prison in Istanbul to the spooky world of Ottoman power politics), the story is a universal one. Practically all the instances of first-person plural marking in *Prokleta avlija* are inclusive: they pull the reader clearly into the story. At the same time, they function to heighten the central emotional tie within the story: the bond of affection felt by the kindly Fra Petar for the helpless and innocent Ćamil. Finally, they form something of a frame within the narrative as Andrić has constructed it. The first of the six passages connects the later Fra Petar (from whose deathbed the entire tale is told to the nameless monk who then presumably tells it to us) with the time of his imprisonment, during which he encounters Ćamil. The final one occurs just before the narrative voice moves directly into Fra Petar's first-person voice. By this shift of voice, Andrić marks the shift from the prison yard timeframe back to that of Fra Petar's deathbed.

The first passage (in order of occurrence) is identified clearly as the voice of Fra Petar, by both the narrator and the dashes signifying internal dialogue:

Misleći o njemu, docnije, mnogo puta, fra Petar nije mogao nikako da se tačno seti ni sata kad je došao, ni kako je došao, tražeći malo mesta, ni šta je pri tom rekao. —Kod ljudi koji nam postanu bliski

<sup>\*</sup>This analysis counts only those forms that can be considered to be the voice of the narrator; first-person forms spoken within dialogue or otherwise marked as quoted speech are disregarded.

mi sve te pojedinosti prvog dodira sa njima obično zaboravljamo; izgleda nam kao da smo ih vazda znali i kao da su oduvek sa nama bili. Od svega toga u sećanju iskrsne ponekad samo neka nepovezana slika.

(Thinking about him later, often, Fra Petar could not remember exactly either the time when he had arrived, or how he had come, looking for a little space, nor what he had said. With people we grow close to we usually forget these details of our first contact with them; it seems as though we have always known them and they have been with us forever. All that remains are a few unconnected images that sometimes come into our memory.)<sup>12</sup>

Within the narrative, this passage occurs immediately after Ćamil's first appearance in the prison yard. The passage carries both specific and universal meaning: it emphasizes the depth of the emotion felt by Fra Petar for his new friend, and it depicts an emotional state which is common to all who have experienced deep friendship. The use of six first-person plural forms (three object pronouns, one subject pronoun, and two verbs) within a single sentence, all of which seem clearly to include the reader in their scope, implements this meaning particularly clearly.

The second passage contains thirteen first-person plural forms, the largest number of any of the passages.\* In addition, it carries the same graphic marking as the passage devoted to the first-person singular pronoun *ja*: it is enclosed in parentheses. By this means Andrić emphasizes yet further the shift from the objective, distanced narrator to the subjective, intimate one. In contrast to the previous passage, however, its place within the narrative is less clearly marked. That the thought is Fra Petar's is made clear only at the conclusion of the passage. Furthermore, Ćamil is not present; he is simply the topic of the story being told by Haim. Nevertheless, this is one of the most significant passages in the book (second only to that identifying the first-person singular pronoun):

A tu gde se završavalo jedno, počinjalo je drugo pričanje. Kraja nije bilo.

\*A fourteenth form would be the reflexive pronoun *sebi* (to oneself), which clearly has first-person plural meaning in the context. It is excluded from the calculations here purely on technical grounds (the absence of explicit first-person plural endings).

(Mi smo uvek manje ili više skloni da osudimo one koji mnogo govore, naročito o stvarima koje ih se ne tiču neposredno, čak i da sa prezirom govorimo o tim ljudima kao o brbljivcima i dosadnim pričalicima. A pritom ne mislimo da ta ljudska, toliko ljudska i tako česta mana ima i svoje dobre strane. Jer, šta bismo mi znali o tudjim dušama i mislima, o drugim ljudima, pa prema tome i o sebi, o drugim sredinama i predelima koje nismo nikad videli niti čemo imati prilike da ih vidimo, da nema takvih ljudi koji imaju potrebu da usmeno ili pismeno kazuju ono što su videli i čuli, i što su s tim u vezi doživeli ili mislili? Malo, vrlo malo. A što su njihova kazivanja nesavršena, obojena ličnim strastima i potrebama, ili čak netočna, zato imamo razum i iskustvo i možemo da ih prosudjujemo i uporedjujemo jedne s drugima, da ih primamo i odbacujemo, delimično ili u celosti. Tako, nešto od ljudske istine ostane uvek za one koji ih strpljivo slušaju ili čitaju.)

Tako je mislio u sebi Fra Petar, slušajući opširno i zaobilazno pričanje Haimovo.

(And where one story stopped, the next began. There was no end.

[We are always more or less inclined to judge those who talk a lot, particularly about things that do not affect them directly, we even speak with contempt of such people as tedious chatterboxes. But as we do so, we do not think that this human, so human and so common a failing has its good sides. For, what would we know about other people's souls and thoughts, about other people and consequently about ourselves, about other places and regions we have never seen nor will have the opportunity of seeing, if there were not people like this who have the need to describe in speech or writing what they have seen and heard, and what they have experienced and thought in that connection? Little, very little. And if their accounts are imperfect, coloured with personal passions and needs, or even inaccurate, we have reason and experience and can judge them and compare them one with another, accept or reject them, partially or completely. In this way, something of human truth is always left for those who listen or read patiently.]

That was what Fra Petar thought to himself, as he listened to Haim's wide-ranging, roundabout account.)<sup>13</sup>

I have quoted this passage in full so that its significance to Andrić's oeuvre may be seen. In it, Andrić speaks directly of the action of storytelling, focusing not so much on the teller as on the *listener*. He acknowledges that storytellers (particularly those who are loquacious) do not always restrict themselves to "objective truth." Nevertheless, their tales are of great value, provided that the listener pays attention and knows how to interpret them. Within the text, this passage functions to emphasize Fra Petar's intense desire to understand correctly what is being said about his new friend. Independent of the text, this passage contains one of Andrić's clearest statements as to how he wishes his work to be read: the conjoined verbs "slušaju i čitaju" (listen *and* read) at the end of this passage make it clear that Andrić means the first-person plural forms in this passage to include his readers.<sup>14</sup> He has proclaimed throughout his oeuvre that the tale is more true than the events it narrates; now he invites his readers directly to partake with him in the process of listening, reading, and discerning the true kernel within a tale.

There are two more passages of this sort in *Prokleta avlija*. One occurs simultaneously with an appearance on the scene of Ćamil, which was unexpected by Fra Petar:

I opet je pala neka kratka i nerazumljiva reč koja je izazvala gromki smeh. Fra Petar se trže iz misli i podje da sedne malo podalje. Diže se, ali odmah zastade iznenadjen. Sa zbunjenom i tihom pozdravom pred njega je stao Ćamil.

Tako običeno biva. Oni koje šelim da vidimo ne dolaze u oasovima kad na njih mislimo i kad ih najviše očekujemo, a pojavljuju se u nekom trenutku kad smo mislima najdalje od njih. I našoj radosti zbog ponovnog vidjenja treba tada vremena da se digne sa dna, gde je potisnuta, i pojavi na površini.

(And again came the short, unintelligible word that provoked loud laughter. Fra Petar roused himself from his thoughts and decided to go and sit down a little further off. He rose, but then stopped in surprise. In front of him, with a quiet, embarrassed word of greeting, stood Kamil.

That is how it usually is. Those we wish to see do not come at the times when we are thinking of them and when we most expect them, but appear at a moment when our thoughts are far from

them. And our joy at seeing them takes a little time to surface from the depths, where it has been suppressed.)<sup>15</sup>

Like the first passage, this one functions both internally and externally. Within the text, it emphasizes Fra Petar's feeling of joy at the unexpected encounter; independent of the text, it underlines the universality of this emotion among humans.

The other is the passage about the pronoun *ja* quoted above, which appears at the point in the narrative where Fra Petar becomes aware that Ćamil has lost his identity (and sanity). Its function within the narrative is to heighten Fra Petar's sense of terror and awe at the fate that has befallen his friend; its function independent of the narrative is to involve us all in the awareness of the power of the first-person singular pronoun.

The above four passages account for thirty-five of the thirty-seven first-person plural forms in *Prokleta avlija*. All seem to be clearly marked as inclusive: we recognize ourselves immediately in Andrić's gnomic, universal statements, and it seems obvious that we are meant to. The final two passages are different, however, in that they carry much less emotional intimacy. One contains the so-called "authorial first-person plural": it comments upon the structuring of the narrative and includes us as readers in this comment:

(A ludaci, i sve ono što je u vezi sa njima, ulivali su Karadžozu sujeveran strah i nagonisku odvratnost.) Ali odbiti ga [i.e., Ćamil] nije mogao. Tako je Ćamil zatvoren u jednu od zajedničkih ćelija, gde je, kako smo videli, našao svoje mesto za prva dva dana.

([Madmen, and everything connected with them, filled Karagöz with a superstitious fear and instinctive revulsion.] But he could not refuse to take him. So Kamil was put into one of the communal cells, where, as we have seen, he found a place for the first two days.)<sup>16</sup>

Although the emotional force of this first-person pronoun is attenuated, the placement of this passage within the narrative is still marked in that it refers to the jailer Karadžoz's non-neutral reaction to Ćamil and to the fact that Ćamil has "found his place" (within both the prison yard and, presumably, Fra Petar's narrative consciousness).



The last passage occurs at a deceptively quiet point in the narration. Ćamil has finally disappeared from Fra Petar's view (one surmises that he has probably been put to death by the suspicious jailers, although nothing explicit is said), and Fra Petar's release from prison is imminent:

Rečeno je napred, i istina je, da se život u Avliji stvarno ne menja nikad. Ali menja se vreme i s vremenom slika života pred svakim od nas. Počinje da se smrkava ranije. Javlja se strepnja od pomisli na jesen i zimu, na duge noći ili kišovite, hladne dane.

(It was said earlier, and it is true, that life in the Courtyard did not ever really change. But time changes and with time so does the picture of life before each of us. It begins to get dark earlier. One begins to fear the approach of autumn and winter, the long nights and the cold, rainy days.)<sup>17</sup>

As the context makes clear, the reference is to seasonal and meteorological changes. At the same time, the single sentence in which the pronoun *nas* appears has a double meaning, turning on the double meaning of the noun *vreme* (weather, time). The first meaning remains within the present tense of the prison yard: life outdoors looks different when the weather changes. The second meaning connotes a shift in timeframe: life looks different when seen in retrospect. Although the translator was forced to choose one of these two meanings (and opted for the second), it seems clear from the placement of this passage within the narrative that Andrić intends both meanings. This passage occurs at a crucial point, leading directly into the narrative crescendo of the novella. It has been apparent from Fra Petar's narrative that his success in winning release from prison depended on his silence, on his ability to listen rather than speak. It is only on his return to his Bosnian monastery that he begins to tell tales, and only on his deathbed that he tells the tale we are now privileged to hear. More significantly, it is only at the conclusion of the novella that Andrić allows us to hear the conclusion of Fra Petar's tale spoken in directly quoted speech; this shift into direct quote begins immediately following this note of the change in time/weather.<sup>18</sup>

This final instance of first-person plural marking, therefore, is the most subtle and interesting one in that it is the only one which

makes explicit use of the ambiguity inherent in the inclusive/exclusive dichotomy. On one reading, Andrić intends Fra Petar to speak of the weather; in this case the pronoun *nas* would include only the inhabitants of the prison yard (or at most his listeners in the Bosnian monastery). On the other, he intends the narrative voice to be his own as well, using the double meaning of the noun *vreme* to presage the narrative shift, and allowing us as readers to share for a moment in his management of the narrative.<sup>19</sup>

First-person plural marking within *Prokleta avlija* therefore functions largely to underscore the universality of its very emotional message. This intimacy is the more striking in that it contrasts so sharply with the highly detached and objective inner structuring of the narrative into multiply embedded timeframes and narrative voices.

The function of first-person plural marking in *Na Drini ćuprija* is quite different and—at the outset at least—obvious. The chronicler-narrator makes it clear that he is a member of the community whose history he describes and uses this identity of “fellow citizen” to make that complex history more real and fathomable. All instances of first-person plural marking would appear to be exclusive, therefore, except for readers who happen themselves to be natives of Višegrad. The only question to be answered is why the narrator moves from the dominant third-person singular narration to the marked first-person plural narration at just the points he does.

On closer examination, it can be seen that Andrić utilizes the creative tension of the inclusive/exclusive ambiguity here as well. The most obvious instance is that of the authorial “we,” in which the narrator comments unemotionally on his structure of the narrative and includes us (if we wish) as listeners. This usage occurs eight times. All but three occur in the frame “as we will see/have seen” (*kao što ćemo videti/smo videli*). Two of the remaining three frame the narrative in that one occurs near its beginning and one near its end.

Sad nam se valja vratiti u vremena kad na ovom mestu nije bilo ni pomisli o mostu, pogotovu ne o ovakvom kao što je ovaj.

(Now we must go back to the time when there was not even a thought of a bridge at that spot, let alone such a bridge as this.)<sup>20</sup>

Ovaj Mujaga Mutapdžić, zvani Užičanin, doseljenik je u kasabi.  
(Malo niže videćemo zašto i kako.)

(This Mujaga Mutapdžić, known as “the man from Ušice,” was a recent comer to the town [we shall see a little later why and how].)<sup>21</sup>

The style of these two passages is straightforward, but their placement within the narrative is not accidental. The first introduces the sharp displacement in time which frames the entire novel (from the “timeless” present into the chronologically calibrated chronicle of past events). The second introduces the final of many characters in this long chronicle: his identity and his fate, described in a brief two pages, seem to encapsulate the entire complexity of the fateful events of 1914.

The other instance of this narrative style is noteworthy in that it explicitly excludes the audience. Here the narrator presents himself as a collective identity in control of the narration and follows it by a direct address (in second-person plural voice) to his readers:

U toku ranijeg pričanja zaboravili smo da kažemo za još jednu novinu u kasabi. (Izvesno ste i vi приметili kako čovek lako zaboravlja da kaže ono o čemu ne voli da govori.)

(In the course of the preceding narrative, we forgot to mention yet another innovation in the town. [You yourself have no doubt noticed how easy it is to forget to talk about something one does not wish to speak of.]<sup>22</sup>

This narrative device, a highly unusual one for Andrić, lends a more emotional tone to the authorial first-person: what the narrator has fastidiously “forgotten” to tell us about is the somewhat shameful fact of the brothel. By implicating his readers in such semi-intentional forgetfulness, he involves them even more directly than if the first-person plural form had been an inclusive one.

In the remaining instances, the narrator speaks as a member of the community. On the most literal level, these first-person plural forms are exclusive. It is clear to all Andrić’s readers, however, that the chronicle of Višegrad is meant to have both literal and metaphorical import. Višegrad represents not only itself, but also all of Bosnia; in turn Bosnia represents not only itself, but also all of Yugoslavia; and finally, the ill-fated union of Yugoslavia itself represents the entire historical convergence of East and West. It is up to

Andrić's readers to decide, at any one point in the narrative, when and to what extent they are included. In this regard, it is significant that Andrić uses first-person plural marking to develop a sense of community that only rarely carries national or ethnic identification. Thus it is possible in nearly every instance for his readers (especially those who are inhabitants of the former Yugoslavia) to choose to read him inclusively—if they so wish. Whereas in *Prokleta avlija* Andrić included his listener/reader through the emotional intimacy of expression, in *Na Drini ćuprija* he includes his listener by explicitly placing the burden of choice onto that listener/reader.

He does this in several different ways. One of these is to use the pronominal forms in fixed expressions that are both extremely frequent in everyday speech and highly resistant to exact translation. Two such are the prepositional phrase *kod nas* (literally, by us) and the noun phrase *naš svet* (literally, our world), each of which is used four times in *Na Drini ćuprija*. Three of the four instances of *kod nas* appear in the legendary tale of Fata Avdagina:

Pitanjem njene udaje bavi se kasaba i pomalo cela okolina. Oduvek je kod nas tako da po jedna devojka u svakom naraštaju udje u priču i u pesmu svojom lepotom, vrednoćom i gospodstvom.

(The whole town and to some extent even the whole district discussed the question of her marriage. It has always been the case with us that at least one girl in every generation passes into legend and song because of her beauty, her qualities and her nobility.)<sup>23</sup>

Jedan pogled pun bolnog iznenadjenja i onaj prkosni i samo njoj urodjeni pokret celog tela, a zatim nemo i gluvo pokoravanje očevoj volji, kako je svuda i oduvek kod nas bilo i biva. Kao u snu, ona je počela da provetrava, dopunjuje i slaže svoju devojačku spremu.

(One look filled with pained surprise and that proud and inborn movement of her whole body, and then mute submission to her father's wishes, as it was and still is everywhere and always amongst us. As if in a dream, she began to air, to complete and to arrange her trousseau.)<sup>24</sup>

Although the event recounted purports to be part of the history of Višegrad, it is significant that the narrator does not locate it tem-

porally, in face of the fact that nearly all other chapters devoted to past events are identified by temporal reference. The intentional timelessness of this event makes it even easier for listeners to decide whether to include themselves or not into the fairytale world Andrić has created.

The other instance of *kod nas* occurs in the narration of an event which is both grounded in real time and part of the timelessness of the bridge itself, the abduction of the young boy who will later build the great bridge:

Šta je bilo dalje od toga dečaka u sepetu to kazuju sve istorije na svima jezicima, i to se bolje zna u širokom svetu nego ovde kod nas.

(What this boy in the pannier was later to become has been told in all histories in all languages and is better known in the world outside than it is amongst us.)<sup>25</sup>

By contrast, the four instances of *naš svet* appear in passages with real-time reference. The first is dated to the sixteenth century (during the construction of the bridge), and the other three are dated to the years immediately following the Austrian occupation:

Gledajući sve to, iz dana u dan, iz godine u godinu, naš svet je počeo da gubi račun o vremenu i stvarnim namerama graditelja. Izgledalo im je da gradnja ne samo da ne odmiče napred nego da se sve više mrsi i zapliće u neke pomoćne i sporedne radove.

(Watching all this, day after day, year after year, the townspeople began to lose count of time and of the real intentions of the builders. It seemed to them that the construction had not moved an inch forward but was becoming more and more complicated and involved in auxiliary and subsidiary workings.)<sup>26</sup>

---

Tako je, na naš svet potpuno neočekivano, došao red i na rabatni i zapušteni karvan-seraj, koji je još i takav činio celinu sa mostom, isto kao i pre tri stotine godina.

(Thus unexpectedly and quickly came the turn of the dilapidated and abandoned caravanserai, which was always regarded as an integral part of the bridge, even as it had been 300 years before.)<sup>27</sup>

---

Ukoliko od našeg sveta zavisi, život na kapiji nastavio bi da teče bez promene. Primećivalo se samo da sada na kapiju dolaze i Srbi i Jevreji sve slobodnije, u sve većem broju i u svako doba dana, ne vodeći račun kao nekad, o Turcima i njihovim navikama i pravima. (As far as the local people were concerned, life on the *kapia* went its way as of old. Only it was noticed that now Serbs and Jews came more freely and in greater numbers to the *kapia* and at all times of day, paying no heed as they once had done to the habits and privileges of the Turks.)<sup>28</sup>

---

Istina je da je naš svet, naročito hrišćani i Jevreji, počeo u odevanju i ophodjenju da liči sve više na strance koje je dovela okupacija, ali i stranci nisu ostajali nepromenjeni i nedirnuti od sredine u kojoj su morali da žive.

(It is true that the local people, especially the Christians and Jews, began to look more and more like the newcomers in dress and behavior, but the newcomers themselves did not remain unchanged or untouched by the milieu in which they had to live.)<sup>29</sup>

Most would probably read these passages as exclusive. They would do this not because of the precise dating, however, but because of Andrić's wording. For example, in the first case the narrator shifts directly from the phrase *naš svet* to the third-person pronoun form *im* (them). (The English has leveled out this shift altogether by replacing the first-person "our world" with the third-person "the townspeople.") In the second and third instances, the wording is more subtle; in one case the English replaces the first-person phrase with the third-person "the local people," and in the other it omits it altogether. The final example is one of the rare instances where subgroups of the community are identified—in this case Christians and Jews. (Again, the English levels out this differentiation: "our world" becomes "the local people.")

Other instances of first-person plural forms also occur as parts of phrases identifying specific elements of the community. Only one of these refers to an ethnic subgroup, however; in addition, the very wording of the phrase functions to attenuate the differentiation:

Mnogi naš poturica koji, promenivši verom, nije našao ono što je očekivao, nego je i dalje sedao za tanku večeru i išao prodratih

laktova, slušao je i ponavljao sa uživanjem pričanju o velikom neuspehu i nalazio neko gorko zadovoljstvo u tome što ni veziri ne mogu da postignu i izvedu baš sve što naume.

(Many of the converted Turks who, in changing faith, had not found what they had hoped for, but had continued to sit down to a meagre supper and go about with patched elbows, heard the rumour and repeated with enjoyment the story of the great lack of success and found some sort of proud satisfaction in the thought that not even Vezirs could carry out everything they had a mind to do.)<sup>30</sup>

The original, "many a convert of ours," has been replaced by the phrase "many of the converted Turks."<sup>31</sup>

Other instances of specific identification include *naše žene* (our women), *naša brda* (our hills), *naše pesme* (our songs), *sa našim gazdama i begovima* (with our landlords and beys), *naše kasabe* (of our town) and *naše devojke* (our girls). Here are each of these in context:

(Naše žene su se krstile u tami i plakale od nerazumljivog ganuĆea, a u suzama im se lomile ove ustaniceke vatre kao oni avetinjski plamenovi koji su nekad padali na Radisavljev grob i koje su njihove ćukunbabe, pre gotovo tri veka, isto ovako kroz suze nazirale, sa ovog istog Mejdana.

(The Serbian women crossed themselves in the darkness and wept from inexplicable emotion, but in their tears they saw reflected those fires of insurrection even as those ghostly flames which had once fallen upon Radisav's grave and which their ancestors almost three centuries before had also seen through their tears from that same Mejdan.)<sup>32</sup>

---

Srbi su molili boga da taj spasonosni plamen, koji je istovetan sa onim koji oni oduvek nose i brižljivo sakrivaju u duši, proširi i ovamo na naša brda, a Turci su molili boga da ga zaustavi, suzbije i pogasi, kako bi se osujetile prevratničke namere nevernika i zavladao opet stari red i dobri mir prave vere.

(The Serbs prayed to God that these saving flames, like those which they had always carried in their hearts and carefully concealed, should spread to these mountains, while the Turks prayed to Allah to halt their progress and extinguish them, to frustrate

the seditious designs of the infidel and restore the old order and the peace of the true faith.)<sup>33</sup>

---

Njihova deca su donosila medju varošku decu strane izraze i tudja imena, i uvodila ispod mosta nove igre i pokazivala nove igračke, ali su isto tako brzo primala od domaće dece naše pesme, uzrečice i zakletve i starinske igre andžaiza, klisa i šuge.

(Their children introduced the children of the townspeople to strange phrases and foreign names, brought with them new games and toys, but equally they easily picked up from the local children the old songs, ways of speech, oaths and the traditional games of knucklebones, leap-frog and the like.)<sup>34</sup>

---

A već koju godinu docnije on je sedeo satima na kapiji, pušio na debeli ćilibarski cigarluk, i kao rodjeni kasabalija gledao kako se dim raspliće i gubi pod svetlim nebom, u nepomičnom vazduhu sumraka. Ili je dočekivao večer sa našim gazdama i begovima kod akšamluka, na nekoj zelenoj uzvisini, sa strukom bosioaka pred sobom i pri sporom razgovoru bez težine i naročitog smisla, ispijao polagano i mezetio retko, kao što umeju samo ljudi iz kasabe.

(Yet a year or so later they could be found sitting for hours on the *kapia*, smoking through thick amber cigarette-holders and, as if they had been born in the town, watching the smoke expand and vanish under the clear sky in the motionless air of dusk; or they would sit and wait for supper with the local notables on some green hillock, with plum brandy and snacks and a little bouquet of basil before them, conversing leisurely about trivialities or drinking slowly and occasionally munching a snack as the townsmen knew how to do so well.)<sup>35</sup>

---

Visoko mišljenje koje je uvek imao o samom sebi još je poraslo za ovih dvadeset godina. Uzgred budi rečeno, onaj sanduk knjiga, na kome počiva dobrim delom muderizov glas učena čoveka, još je neiscrpan i nepročitan, a njegova hronika naše kasabe porasla je u ovih dvadeset godina svega još za četiri dalje stranice, jer muderiz što biva stariji to sve više ceni sebe i svoju hroniku, a sve manje dogadjaje oko sebe.



(The high opinion which he had always had of himself had grown even greater in these last twenty years. It may be said in passing that the case of books on which his reputation as a learned man rested to a great extent was still largely unread, and his chronicle of the town had grown in these twenty years by four pages only, for the older the schoolmaster grew he esteemed himself and his chronicle more and more and the events around him less and less.)<sup>36</sup>

Upravo, to se šaputalo medju kasabalijskim devojkama, a stariji svet je, čim je prošla svaka opasnost i ukinute sve mere zbog epidemije, zaboravio i lekara i pukovnikovicu. Neiskusne i neškolvane naše devojke nisu znale tačno ni šta znači sanatorium, ali su znale dobro šta je to kad dvoje ljudi hodaju po stazama i obroncima onako kako su doskora hodali lekar i pukovnikova žena.

(This was the story current among the girls in the town; the older people, as soon as the danger had passed and the measures against the epidemic ceased, forgot both the doctor and the colonel's lady. Inexperienced and uneducated, the town girls did not know exactly what the word sanatorium meant, but they had known very well what it meant when two persons walked about the paths and foothills as the doctor and the colonel's wife had done until lately.)<sup>37</sup>

None of the above instances of first-person plural survives as such in Edwards's English translation of *Na Drini ćuprija*. Instead, "our women" becomes "the Serbian women"; "our hills" becomes "these mountains"; "our songs" becomes "the old songs"; "our landlords and beys" becomes "the town notables"; "our town" becomes "the town"; and "our girls" becomes "the town girls" (in addition to the shifts noted already for the three previous quotes).

As noted above, Andrić offers his reader a choice to read these first-person plural forms inclusively, exclusively, or as a creative double entendre. In each of these cases, it is clear that Edwards has made the "exclusive" choice.<sup>38</sup> Apparently, the more specifically defined the reference, the more likely Edwards was to choose the exclusive reading and render it with third-person forms in English. Other instances, which were also read as exclusive by him, seem to derive their specificity only in the narrative context:

U dalekim i nama nepoznatnim gradovima iz kojih se sada carevalo i upravljalo i ovim krajem, vladalo je tada—u poslednjoj četvrtini XIX veka—upravo jedno od takvih retkih i kratkih zatišja u ljudskim odnosima i društvenim zbivanjima.

(In the far-off cities unknown to the townsmen whence at that time the power and administration over these districts originated, there was—in the last quarter of the nineteenth century—one of those short and rare lulls in human relationships and social events.)<sup>39</sup>

---

Tako su tekle i poslednje godine XIX veka, godine bez uzbudjenja i krupnih događaja, kao što teče mirna i razlivena reka pred neizvesnim ušćem. Po njima sudeći izgledalo je kao da nestaje tragičnih akcenata i u životu evropskih naroda, pa i u kasabi pored mosta. A ukoliko bi se ponekad i javili negde u svetu, oni i nisu dopirali do nas ili su nama ovde bili daleki i nerazumljivi.

(The last years of the nineteenth century, years without upheavals or important events, flowed past like a broad calm river before reaching its unknown mouth. Judging from them, it seemed as if tragic moments had ceased to disturb the life of the European peoples or that of the town beside the bridge. In so far as they took place now and again in the world outside, they did not penetrate to Višegrad and were far-off and incomprehensible to its townspeople.)<sup>40</sup>

---

Sve se više pokazuje da zarada i lakši život koji ona donosi imaju svoje naličje, da su i novac i onaj ko ga ima samo ulog u nekoj čelikoj ćudljivoj igri kojoj niko ne zna sva pravila i ne može da predvidi ishod. I ne sluteći, svi mi u toj igri igramo, neko sa manjim neko sa većim ulogom, ali svi sa stalnim rizikom.

(It became more and more evident that the good profits and easier life which they had brought had their counterpart and were only pieces in some great and mysterious game of which no one knew all the rules and none could foresee the outcome. And yet everyone played his part in this game, some with a smaller some with a greater role, but all with permanent risk.)<sup>41</sup>

---

Korača mučno i sporo, a pred očima mu je neprestano, kao da se kreće pred njim, ceo prizor sa razorenim mostom. Nije dovoljno jednoj stvari ledja okrenuti pa da prestane da nas goni i muči. I da zaklopi oči, on bi samo to video.

(He walked painfully and slowly and before his eyes, as if it moved along in front of him, was the whole scene with the ruined bridge. It was not enough to turn one's back on a thing for it to cease to goad and torment one. Even when he shut his eyes he could still see it.)<sup>42</sup>

Kao što je bio slučaj u novcu i u trgovini, i u ovim najkrupnijim stvarima sve se dešava na daljinu i neshvatljivo brzo. Tamo negde daleko u svetu igra se kocka ili bije boj i tamo se rešava i sudbina svakoga od nas.

(As it had been with trade and money, so it was with those more important things also; everything happened far away and unbelievably quickly. Somewhere far away in the world the dice had been thrown, the battles fought, and it was there that the fate of each one of the townfolk was decided.)<sup>43</sup>

Each of the above references to the citizens of Višegrad is located within a specifically mentioned timeframe around the turn of the century and refers to a specific set of real-world events. This probably explains why they did not make it past Edwards's barrier of exclusivity and are rendered in the English third person (i.e., "unknown to us" becomes "unknown to the townsmen"; "penetrate to us" becomes "penetrate to Višegrad"; "incomprehensible to us" becomes "incomprehensible to its townspeople"; "all of us play in this game" becomes "everyone played his part in this game"; "to goad and torment us" becomes "to goad and torment one"; and "each of us" becomes "each one of the townfolk").

Despite the temporal grounding within the text, however, the last two examples are striking by their potentially universal phraseology: "Nije dovoljno jednoj stvari ledja okrenuti pa da prestane da nas goni i muči" (It is not sufficient to turn our backs on something for it to cease to goad and torment us) and "Tamo negde daleko . . . se rešava i sudbina svakoga od nas" (Somewhere far out there . . . the fate of each one of us is decided). Most readers of Andrić—even

those who are not Yugoslav—would probably find these phrases to ring true of their world experience as well and would give them a doubly exclusive-inclusive reading. The choice made by Edwards in these instances demonstrates the momentum that a particular narrative stance, once taken, can assume.

Another example of a phrase with potentially universal meaning which Edwards read as noninclusive is the following:

Ali s tim opet ne može trajno i istinski da se pomiri. (Ko se ikad s time potpuno pomirio?) Prirodni završetak svih tih unutrašnjih trzavica bila je misao o smrti koja vreba uvek na svima krajnjim izdancima svakog našeg sna o sreći.

(But she could not resign herself truly and lastingly to such a thought. [Who has ever been able to resign themselves completely to it?] The natural conclusion of all these internal conflicts was the thought of death which always lurks on the frontiers of every dream of happiness.)<sup>44</sup>

The most striking noncongruence (between Andrić's probable intent and Edwards's reading of it), however, occurs at the very outset of *Na Drini ćuprija*. In a passage devoid of specific phraseology or temporal marking, Andrić uses one first-person plural subject pronoun and six verb forms marked for first-person plural; Edwards renders all of these as third-person forms:

Upravo, kad se kaše "veše," to je isto toliko tačno kao kad se kaše: sunce izlazi izjutra da bismo mi ljudi mogli da vidimo oko sebe i da svršavamo potrebne poslove, a zalazi predveče da bismo mogli da spavamo i da se odmorimo od dnevnog napora.

(Actually, to say "linked" was just as true as to say that the sun rises in the morning so that men may see around them and finish their daily tasks, and sets in the evening that they may be able to sleep and rest from the labours of the day.)<sup>45</sup>

This is both the first instance of the narrator's use of first-person plural style and the least specific (i.e., most universally inclusive). The narrator is speaking in the universal present (prior to introducing the flashback that constitutes almost the entirety of the novel). Furthermore, he is presenting something as a universal truth: he

says that the meaning of the word “binds” in this context is as obvious as saying that the sun rises and sets so that *we*—humans all—may go about our business of living in the day and resting at night. By establishing this universal stance at the very outset of the novel, Andrić’s narrator firmly extends the hand of potential inclusivity to his reader. Subsequent choices are up to the reader, he seems to be saying, but he (the narrator) has clearly left the door open.

The remaining six passages that include first-person plural narration were rendered by Edwards with first-person plural forms in English as well (this does not mean he read them as inclusive, simply that he did not exclude that possibility entirely). Each of these passages carries a more emotionally intimate stance than those previously quoted. One is located within the timeless frame of the universal present (i.e., prior to the flashback) and expresses the love and attachment felt by the Višegrad citizens for the bridge. Metaphorically, since the bridge is presented as a symbol of that which binds humans rather than that which separates them, the passage has a universal (i.e., inclusive) reading as well:

Koliko ima vezira ili bogataša na svetu koji mogu svoju radost ili brigu, ili svoj čef i dokolicu da iznesu na ovakvo mesto? Malo, vrlo malo. A koliko je naših, u toku stoleća i nizu naraštaja, pre-sedelo ovde zoru ili akšam ili noćne časove kad se neprimetno pomera ceo zvezdani svod nad glavom! Mnogi i mnogi od nas sedeo je tu, podnimljen i naklonjen na tesan, gladak kamen, i pri večitoj igri svetlosti na planinama i oblaka na nebu, razmrsivao večne iste a uvek na drugi način zamršene konce naših kasabalijskih sudbina.

(How many Vezirs or rich men are there in the world who could indulge their joy or their cares, their moods or their delights in such a spot? Few, very few. But how many of our townsmen have, in the course of centuries and the passage of generations, sat here in the dawn or twilight or evening hours and unconsciously measured the whole starry vault above! Many and many of us have sat there, head in hands, leaning on the well-cut smooth stone, watching the eternal play of light on the mountains and the clouds in the sky, and have unravelled the threads of our small-town destinies, eternally the same, yet eternally tangled in some new manner.)<sup>46</sup>

Two others refer to individuals whose association with the bridge refers more to its "timeless" nature than to any particular event within its history. One of these is its founder, Mehmet Pasha Sokolović, and the other its caretaker, Dauthodja:

Za tih šezdeset i nekoliko godina služio je tri sultana, doživio i u dobru i u zlu što samo retki i odabrani doživljuju, i uzdigao se na nama nepoznate visine moći i vlasti, gde samo malo njih dolazi i ostaje. Taj novi čovek, koji je nastao u tudjem svetu, gde ni mišlju ne možemo da ga pratimo, morao je da zaboravi sve što je ostavio u kraju iz kojeg su ga nekad odveli.

(For these sixty odd years he served three Sultans, experienced both good and evil as only rare and chosen persons may experience them, and raised himself to heights of power and authority unknown to us, which few men reach and few men keep. This new man that he had become in a foreign world where we could not follow even in our thoughts, must have forgotten all that he had left behind in the country whence they had once brought him.)<sup>47</sup>

---

Taj mudri i pobožni, tvrdoglavi i uporni čovek, koga je kasaba dugo pamtila, nije se ničim dao odvratiti od svog bezizglednog napora. Radeći predano on se odavno bio pomirio sa saznanjem da je naša sudbina na zemlji sva u borbi protiv kvara, smrti i nestajanja, i da je čovek dužan da istraje u toj borbi i onda kad je potpuno bezizgledna.

(This wise and godfearing, stubborn and obstinate man, whom the town long remembered, allowed no one to turn him from his vain effort. Working devotedly, he had long become reconciled to the idea that our destiny on this earth lies in the struggle against decay, death and dissolution and that man must persevere in this struggle, even if it were completely in vain.)<sup>48</sup>

The fourth and fifth are embedded within particular narratives. One, the tale of Milan's card game with the devil, is told without explicit time reference and has the same legendary air about it as the tale of Fata Avdagina. The other, the tale of the *Streifkorps* soldier whose eye for a pretty girl was his downfall, is given a specific time reference. Both, however, speak to universal human concerns. The sec-

ond is particularly noteworthy since the first-person plural form is not the more frequent pronoun but the relatively rarely used verb:

Jer, u stvari, niko od njih ne veruje da djavo igra otuzbir i izvodi na kapiju onoga koga hoće da upropasti. Ali naši su doživljaji često tako zamršeni i teški da nije čudo što ih ljudi pravdaju učešćem samog Satane, nastojeći tako da ih objasne ili bar učine lakše podnošljivim.

(For none of them believed that the devil played *otuz bir* or that he would take anyone he wished to destroy to the *kapia*. But our experiences are often so heavy and clouded that it is no wonder that men justify themselves by the intervention of Satan himself, considering that this explains them or at least makes them more bearable.)<sup>49</sup>

---

Na povratku, devojčica gotovo zastade, gledajući pravo u oči štrafkoru, i on joj dobaci dve reči, nejasne i beznačajne, osećajući pri tome kako ga noge izdaju od uzbudjenja, i zaboravljajući potpuno mesto na kome je.

To su one velike smelosti koje činimo samo u snovima. Kad se devojka opet izgubila na drugoj obali, mladić je zadrhtao od straha.

(On the way back the girl seemed almost ready to stop, looked the *streifkorps* boy straight in the eyes while he muttered a couple of vague and unimportant words, feeling as he did so that his legs failed him through emotion and forgetting completely where he was.

Only in dreams do we dare so much. When the girl was once more lost to sight on the farther bank the young man shivered with fright.)<sup>50</sup>

Andrić's most powerful use of this narrative style occurs in Chapter 21. In terms of the history of Višegrad, this is "the beginning of the end"—the opening lines of Andrić's detailed and passionate account of the events of 1914:

Ali sve su to stvari koje samo uzgred napominjemo i koje će pesnici i naučnici idućih epoha ispitivati, tumačiti, i vaskrsavati sredstvima i načinima koje mi ne slutimo, a sa vedrinom, slobodom i

smelošću duha koje će biti daleko iznad našega. Njima će verovatno poći za rukom da i za ovu čudnu godinu nadju objašnjenje i da joj odrede pravo mesto u istoriji sveta i razvoju čovečanstva. Ovde, ona je za nas jedino i pre svega godina koja je bila sudbonosna po most na Drini.

(But these are all things which we recall only in passing and which poets and scientists of coming ages will investigate, interpret and resurrect by methods and manners which we do not suspect and with a serenity, freedom and boldness of spirit which will be far above ours. Probably they will succeed in finding an explanation even for that strange year and will give it its true place in the history of the world and the development of humanity. But here it is unique for us, for above all that was the fatal year for the bridge on the Drina.)<sup>51</sup>

On the most straightforward reading, the first-person plural voice here is first that of the narrator alone—he who mentions certain facts, who cannot guess what future generations will think, and who presumes that those of the future will possess greater clarity of vision than he—and next that of the citizen of Višegrad who is about to see his bridge (and his way of life) destroyed. Even the most literal reader, however, will probably interpret these understated lines with the empathy Andrić intended and choose to include himself among those who both feel the loss and wish they had a better explanation for it.

Read with the hindsight of the 1990s, these lines are immeasurably more powerful, and poignant, than when first written. No one who mourns the passing of Bosnia could fail to read these lines without feeling part of the loss. If Andrić could not by his writing have prevented the tragedy of the 1990s, he at least continues to remind us that each of us still has the choice whether to be included in his words or not.

Thus Andrić's message, that the stories men tell and retell are more real and true than the "truths" they convey, is not just something he states repeatedly. He exemplifies it throughout much of his own writing, by telling tales that are indeed more real than the events of which he speaks. One of the ways he achieves this sense of reality and truth is by his carefully crafted narrative style, in which a prevailing gnomic, detached wisdom is periodically illumi-



nated by flashes of intense intimacy. The intimacy comes not so much from what the poet tells us of himself, but in the way he invites us to make the choice to become one with him. Because such a union, even when we have the power to choose it, is necessarily fleeting and momentary, it is all the more powerful.

### NOTES

1. For an excellent English language survey of Andrić's work, including a detailed discussion of this particular aspect of it, see Celia Hawkesworth, *Ivo Andrić: Bridge between East and West* (London, 1984).
2. All quotes from Andrić's prose are from the edition of *Sabrana djela* published in Zagreb in 1967.
3. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 5, p. 41. From "Priča o vezirovom slonu" (first published 1947). English version: "The Story of the Vizier's Elephant," trans. Celia Hawkesworth, in *The Damned Yard and Other Stories*, ed. Celia Hawkesworth (London, 1992), p. 1. Italics in original.
4. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 10, p. 127. From "Razgovor sa Gojom" (first published 1935); the voice is presumably that of the painter Goya. English version: "Conversation with Goya," in *Conversation with Goya, Bridges, Signs*, trans. Celia Hawkesworth and Andrew Harvey (London, 1992), p. 16.
5. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 25–26. From *Na Drini ćuprija* (first published 1945). English version: *The Bridge on the Drina*, trans. Lovett Edwards (Chicago, 1977), p. 27.
6. The standard English translation of *Na Drini ćuprija* is by Lovett Edwards, from which all citations quoted herein will be taken. There are two translations of *Prokleta avlija*. One is *Devil's Yard*, by Kenneth Johnstone (New York, 1962), and the other is by Celia Hawkesworth in *The Damned Yard and Other Stories*. All citations quoted herein will be from the Hawkesworth translation.
7. Miodrag Pavlović, "Jedan pogled na Andrićevo delo," *Zbornik radova o Ivi Andriću*, ed. A. Isaković (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, odeljenje jezika i književnosti 30, 1977); special issue 55, pp. 203–8.
8. Predrag Palavestra, *Skriveni pesnik* (Belgrade, 1981).
9. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, pp. 91–92; Hawkesworth translation, p. 199.
10. Ronelle Alexander, "Linguistic Sub-Structures in the Prose of Ivo Andrić: *Prokleta avlija*," *Ivo Andrić, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies 10–12 July 1984*, ed. E. C. Hawkesworth (London, 1985), pp. 182–203. SSEES Occasional Papers 4.

11. In the 1967 edition, for instance, *Na Drini ćuprija* contains 361 pages to *Prokleta avlija*'s 120 pages.
12. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, pp. 43–44; Hawkesworth translation, p. 168. Here and in subsequent quotes I have underlined the forms which are explicitly marked in the original for first-person plural.
13. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, pp. 53–54; Hawkesworth translation, p. 174.
14. Italics mine; note also the shift at this point back into third person.
15. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, p. 73; Hawkesworth translation, p. 187.
16. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, p. 67; Hawkesworth translation, , p. 183.
17. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 4, p. 110; Hawkesworth translation, pp. 212–13.
18. The fact that it is a direct quote is clear from the ijekavian form of Fra Petar's Bosnian dialect, which stands in clear contrast to the ekavian form of the overall, distanced narration. See Alexander, p. 196. See also Ivo Tartalja, *Pripovedačeva estetika, prilog poznavanju Andrićeve poetike* (Belgrade, 1979), for an incisive analysis of the shifts of narrative voice within *Prokleta avlija*.
19. A telling indication of this ambiguity is the fact that the other translator of *Prokleta avlija*, Kenneth Johnstone, gives this passage the first (exclusive) reading, even omitting the pronoun *nas* altogether from the crucial sentence. His translation: "It has been said before, and it is true, that life in the Yard never changes. But the seasons change and with the seasons some aspects of its life change. It begins to get dark earlier. A shudder is felt at the thought of autumn and winter, of the long nights and the cold, damp days" (p. 126).
20. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 20; Edwards translation, p. 22.
21. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 335; Edwards translation, p. 291. The five instances of "as we shall see/have seen" are found on pp. 11, 16, 161, 260, and 337 of *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1 (and on pp. 15, 19, 145, 228, and 293 respectively of the Edwards translation).
22. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 291. This passage is also noteworthy in that Lovett Edwards chose to omit it entirely from his English translation of *Na Drini ćuprija*. The translation given here is my own.
23. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 114; Edwards translation, p. 104.
24. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 117; Edwards translation, p. 107. The third, which is very similar in tone, appears on p. 115 of the original and p. 105 of the Edwards translation.
25. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 24; Edwards translation, pp. 25–26.
26. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 66; Edwards translation, p. 62.
27. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 155; Edwards translation, p. 139.
28. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 156; Edwards translation, p. 140.
29. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 197; Edwards translation, p. 174.
30. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 35–36; Edwards translation, pp. 35–36.

31. The word in the original, *poturica*, means “Turkicized person” (convert to the Turkish way—i.e., Islam). Andrić’s more usual way of expressing this status, in both this novel and elsewhere in his work, is simply to say “Turk” (*turčin*), despite the fact that the individuals in question remain Slavs. Edwards has followed this general pattern in using the phrase “converted Turks.”
32. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 90; Edwards translation, p. 83.
33. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 90; Edwards translation, p. 83.
34. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 196–97; Edwards translation, p. 174.
35. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 197; Edwards translation, p. 175.
36. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 230; Edwards translation, p. 202.
37. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 311; Edwards translation, p. 271.
38. Of the fifty-three forms marked for first-person plural in the original, Edwards has rendered only twenty-five with English first-person plural forms. These are concentrated in sixteen of the thirty-six relevant passages. For comparison, the translation into another Germanic language, Dutch, reproduces all but three of Andrić’s first-person plural forms by Dutch first-person plural forms (a third-person form is used in the passage about the “converted Turks”; the first instance of “as we shall see” is omitted; and the final instance of *nas* is rendered by the impersonal “you”). This suggests that the high frequency of “exclusive” readings by Edwards is due more to his individual interpretation of the text than to the structural requirements of a Germanic language. I am indebted to Dr. G. J. M. Wouters of Groningen University for both suggesting the comparison and checking the Dutch translation (*De brug over de Drina*, tr. C. W. Sangster-Warnaars and K. Vermuelen-Dijamant [Amsterdam, 1994; first published 1961]).
39. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 195; Edwards translation, p. 173.
40. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 227; Edwards translation, p. 200.
41. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 240; Edwards translation, p. 211.
42. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 360; Edwards translation, p. 313.
43. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 259; Edwards translation, p. 227.
44. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 315; Edwards translation, p. 275.
45. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 10; Edwards translation, pp. 13–14.
46. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 17–18; Edwards translation, p. 20.
47. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 24–25; Edwards translation, p. 26.
48. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, pp. 78–79; Edwards translation, p. 73.
49. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 169; Edwards translation, p. 151.
50. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 179; Edwards translation, p. 160.
51. *Sabrana djela*, vol. 1, p. 305; Edwards translation, p. 266.