

MAJA BRKLJAČIĆ

Central European University, Budapest

TITO'S BODIES IN WORD AND IMAGE¹

According to Milovan Đilas, already during the years of World War Two, Josip Broz Tito was perceived as standing for the constitutive concept (brotherhood and unity) of the second Yugoslavia, then only a state-to-be. Ultimately though he came to personify the country itself. In order to understand what this means and what the consequence of such developments were, the author uses the concept of the king's two bodies as explained by Ernst Kantorowicz: king's Body Natural and thus mortal and king's super-body or his Body Politic. The working hypothesis of this article is that Tito stood with his body natural for the body politic of Yugoslavia. There is a strong case to be made that he was the only truly Yugoslav institution. But this was not body made incorporeal, quite the contrary: it was Tito's real, natural body that was not only the embodiment of central power, but that, paradoxically, was the name and the face of what was supposed to be the continuous Yugoslav social body. Using Louis Marin's theory of representations, the author investigates Tito's representations in several shorter narrative segments and one pictorial image (a relief by Želimir Janež).

Keywords: Josip Broz Tito, history of socialism, symbolic anthropology

The moment that the news about the death of Josip Broz Tito was announced was a very traumatic one for the majority of the inhabitants of former Yugoslavia. As the news was read out at the packed football stadium in Split, a city on the Croatian coast, the crowd's turbulent cheering was first replaced by complete silence, only to be followed by an even more tumultuous sound, the song sung by the entire stadium, the lines of which were "Comrade Tito, to you we swear, from your path never to stray". Pictures from the stadium show players lying on the ground and crying, others hiding their faces from the cameras. According to the news

¹ I would like to thank Reana Senjković and Ivo Žanić for their critical remarks, which have helped me to reinforce my arguments. Sandra Prlenda and Dario Novaković offered inspiration, when it was most needed.

stories from the period, reactions throughout the country were similar. Such reactions should not have come as a surprise to anyone more familiar with the Yugoslav internal affairs. Ever since the end of the World War II, Tito had been celebrated in Yugoslavia as

the symbol of survival of this country. Notwithstanding what may happen, he will continue to lead us. We cannot betray Tito and his work, for this would mean betraying ourselves at the same time (*Bilo je časno* 1980:32).

This begs the question: what happens when the symbol is no longer there in its *physical form* to guarantee the continuity of the country?

The Yugoslavs were aware of the problem, at least to a certain degree, as can be seen by focusing on the events immediately preceding Tito's death. He was brought to the hospital in Ljubljana on January 12, 1980 with very severe health problems. During the course of his treatment, Yugoslavs from all over the country, as well as from abroad, started sending letters to Tito with best wishes for his speedy recovery. The tradition of letter-writing to Tito had been carefully nurtured and maintained throughout his lifetime. From Kragujevac, a medium-sized city in Serbia that experienced a disastrous Nazi-pogrom during World War II, 120,000 letters were written (later published in seventy-five volumes) and sent to Ljubljana. The letters were signed by individuals, adults and children alike, families, companies, Tito's war-comrades, schools, and sport-clubs.

Tito was entombed in his mausoleum in Belgrade several days after his death, on May 8, 1980. The following two days rounded up the official period of mourning. Thus, we could say that his burial lasted for one week. He was entombed in a very complicated and extremely elaborate funerary ritual. According Robert Hertz, the purpose of the funeral as a social act is to divorce the body of the dead from the living, and, in the process, to extract the promise of life for posterity. In other words, the funeral is intended to seal the void that emerges in the community when one of its members dies (Hertz 1907). In cases when the funeral process is very detailed, long-lasting and appears to be highly painful for the community performing it, this signals that the dead person occupied a very important position in the community of mourners that has been left behind. Tito's funeral exhibited all those features.² Burying him was, indeed, very difficult and his funeral was an extremely elaborated and complicated event. But the real question is – why? Why was it so difficult to bury an 88-year-old statesman who had lived a full and happy life and finally died of illness? The purpose of this paper is to try to provide a part of the answer to this intriguing question. The paper will explicate both on the theoretical and concrete plane what it was that kept Tito's body so tightly connected to his community – Yugoslavia – and why his final

² For a minute analysis of Tito's funeral, please consult Brkljačić 2001.

physical departure was predestined to cause the identity crisis in the country.³

The country without the ruler

The fact that the destiny of Tito and of communist Yugoslavia had something in common has been sensed by almost all scholars who have studied recent Yugoslav history. Listing different approaches to the study of the collapse of Yugoslavia in recent literature, Dejan Jović enumerates "the role of personality" argument as one of the seven major types of arguments to explain the disintegration of Yugoslavia. In Jović's words,

the attempts to explain the collapse of Yugoslavia focusing on Tito's personality emphasize that Tito was the only real decision-maker, the real sovereign in Yugoslavia. He identified the State with himself, and concentrated all real power in his hands (Jović 2000:112).

According to these accounts, Yugoslavia broke up because Tito's dictatorship was no longer there to hold it together.

Another stream of the advanced arguments explaining the failure of Yugoslavia to survive the decade beyond Tito's death focuses on

the inability of the Titoist personality cult to transfer authority and legitimacy to Tito's heirs (Seroka 1992:172).

The crux of this argument relies less on Tito as the real decision-maker, and more on the importance of Tito's charisma that could not translocate to the collective presidency that succeeded him. The fact that the eight-member collective presidency of Yugoslavia was called "Snow-white and the seven dwarves" from Tito's death until the demise of the country demonstrates the depth of popular distrust in Tito's legal successors. Gradually, distrust enhanced the erosion of the legitimacy of the country's institutions and constitutional order (Seroka 1992:172). The proponents of this theory hold that the crisis of legitimacy and authority that ultimately suffocated Yugoslavia was provoked by the physical departure of the only truly Yugoslav institution – Tito.⁴

In his study on Tito's changing attitudes toward the problem of national and Yugoslav identity, Predrag Marković draws together the two faces of Tito – the ruler and the charismatic all-Yugoslav leader – and states that Josip Broz Tito was not only the ruler of Yugoslavia, but that, in

³ It goes without saying that I do not want to blame the dissolution of Yugoslavia solely on Tito's departure. The break-up of the country was part of the complex historical process that was taking place against the backdrop of the fall of Communism in Eastern Europe.

⁴ This introduces another, also very important issue, namely, the non-existence of the federal Yugoslav mechanisms and institutions (other than Tito) that could have effectively absorbed Tito's heavily loaded identity that served as the foundation stone of the State and the system.

the course of time, he became the personification and the symbol of the State and the social system (Marković, manuscript:1).⁵ As early as in 1944, Milovan Đilas wrote that

Tito was the first leader who was loved equally by all the peoples of Yugoslavia. The Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians and Montenegrins had all had their national heroes. But this was the first time they had gathered around one man, because he stood for the great idea of the brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav peoples (Zilliacus 1952:283).

However, even if that one man may have at the beginning stood for the constitutive concept of the State (brotherhood and unity), he ultimately came to personify, as we have seen from Marković, the country itself. Tito became the Yugoslav State. By studying the notion of representations and how it worked in Tito's case, we can understand what the consequences of such development were. The paper will now provide the historical and theoretical context on the development of bodily representations of the rulers (kings) and how they matter for a semiotic analysis of the representation of the State.

The two bodies of a king

In his pivotal study on the king's two bodies, Ernst Kantorowicz demonstrates that the notion of representations has been decisively affected by the Medieval developments of theological doctrines and legal studies, to which the institutional controversies between Church and State were added. The concept, as Kantorowicz calls it, of the king's two bodies, emerges from this complex discursive field, in which theology, political philosophy and legal reasoning profoundly influenced each other. The king had two bodies: his body natural and thus mortal, and his super-body or his Body Politic which comprised the Office, Government, and Royal Majesty (Kantorowicz 1997:9). The Body Politic of the king was incorporated with his subjects as they were with him, thus forming a composite body:

The Prince is in the *respublica*, and the *respublica* is in the Prince (Kantorowicz 1997:438-439).

In this organological concept, the king was the head and the subjects were the members: together they formed the Body Politic of the realm. More importantly though,

⁵ In order to support such conclusion, Marković remarks that Tito's name made up one fifth of all personal names mentioned in all Yugoslav secondary school history textbooks for the period of the twentieth century. This, however, is insufficient to sustain his somewhat heavy-handed conclusion. Nevertheless, Marković's statement is important, as it reveals the close connection between Tito's *persona* and the Yugoslav State.

the king's body natural was 'neither divided by itself nor distinct from his office or the royal Dignity' but they were a Body Natural and a Body Politic, together and indivisible; and (...) these two Bodies are incorporated in one Person, and make one Body and not divers, that is, the Body Corporate in the Body Natural, *et a contra* the Body Natural in the Body Corporate (Kantorowicz 1997:438).

The king's two bodies were not distinct but united and acted as one body. The super-body of the king was not subject to natural forces; rather, upon death of the body natural, the two bodies separated, and the super-body was removed and transferred from one body natural to another in order to preserve the continuity of the office or king's dignity. The king's subjects, on the other hand, the *universitas*, was seen as an imaginary "represented person" (*persona representata*) or a "fictitious person" (*persona ficta*) that united "a plurality of individuals juristically as one person": those from the present with those from the past and the future (Kantorowicz 1997:306). This is, pure and simple, the corner-stone of the idea behind continuity. The king's body, as visible and corporeal, has to stand for, has to represent this corporate person (the King incorporated with the *universitas*) of the State.

In the Yugoslav case, the task of uniting the plurality of individuals was made especially difficult by the historical circumstances of World War II, which for the inhabitants of the country was a devastating civil war, as well as being a struggle against the German, Italian, Hungarian and other invaders. The civil war raged in practically all corners of Yugoslavia. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia that organised the Yugoslav Partisan army worked from the very beginning of the war on the creation of the new unity by labeling its opponents indiscriminately as "foreign occupiers and domestic traitors": the true representatives of each Yugoslav nation fought in this story together with the Partisans. Marshal Tito stood at the head of the Partisan army, serving as the strongest blending force. Already during the war, he became or was turned into the unifying figure of the Yugoslav Partisan Movement. In the books used by the Partisans during World War II to teach children and adults to read and write, the first letters that pupils learned to spell were I, O and T. The first word they learned to write was TITO.

The emergence of the second Yugoslav State was indeed a difficult historical process. This is all the more so when we consider two facts. Firstly, the idea of a common Yugoslav nation-state was discredited by the poor performance of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia for all the nations involved, except for the Serbs. Secondly, the total number of Yugoslav war losses in World War II was enormous for all communities, but what is more important, more death was inflicted

by other Yugoslavs from other national communities, than by the Axis occupiers (Rusinow 1985:379-380).

However, even during the fratricidal war, the foundation stone for the new state was being laid. In November 1942, the Antifascist Council of the People's Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ), basically a Partisan parliament organised by the Communist high command of the National Liberation Struggle, declared itself the legitimate representative of the Yugoslav peoples. When these legitimate representatives came together for the second time, in Jajce on 29-30 November 1943, they proclaimed AVNOJ, the provisional government of a new and federal Yugoslav state. As the declaration from Jajce drafted at the moment of foundation of the new Yugoslav state stipulated, the Yugoslav nations did not decide to set up a new Yugoslavia based on some unclear principle of Slavic cohesion or based on a belief that Serbs and Croats were one nation. Quite to the contrary, national distinctiveness was clearly admitted, and the new State was created on the basis of a principle of the shared past: the antifascist struggle against, as the discourse went, foreign occupiers and domestic traitors. This means that the founding myth of the new Yugoslav state was the story of the National Liberation Struggle and World War II. At the heart of this myth, as we know, there was one person: as Vladimir Nazor wrote in his poem, "Tito rides at the head of his troops".

Immediately following the war, the new State (from March to November 1945, called Democratic Federal Yugoslavia; and from November 1945 until 1963, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia) was organised as a federation of six republics. Each of these, with the exception of Bosnia-Herzegovina,

was considered a nation-state in the sense that it served as a rough equivalent of the homeland of the dominant nationality within its boundaries (Shoup 1968:115).

But what about the umbrella of the state that was supposed to connect all these *homelands*?

Andrew Wachtel's study of cultural politics in Yugoslavia confirms that the Communist attempt to create a supranational Yugoslav culture ("national in form, socialist in content") quickly became abortive. The educational system was split into separate republic dominions immediately following Second World II: the 1946 Constitution abolished the federal Ministry of Education but left intact its republic versions. In the same year, the Yugoslav republics acquired the right to print separate textbooks in the crucial disciplines of literature and history, a decision that would remain standing until 1990 (Lampe 1996:233).⁶ Finally, after 1963, the

project of creating a single national culture (...) was definitively abandoned (Wachtel 1998:229).

⁶ For a more thorough analysis of the Yugoslav identity made at the level of historiography and literary studies for both the Yugoslav states, please consult Wachtel 1998.

Relinquishing cultural nation-building, the political and cultural elites of Yugoslavia instead stimulated the separate Yugoslav nations to exercise

the right of every people and nationality in Yugoslavia to free development and their own cultural identity (Wachtel 1998:229).

The notion of shared cultural identity was thus abandoned, and the only remaining idea symbolically to connect the Yugoslavs had to focus on Tito. The image of Tito's face and his body became the bearer of the Yugoslav founding myth and of the fiction of the continuity of the Yugoslav community (i.e. the social body of Yugoslavs). But this was not a body made incorporeal, quite to the contrary. His real, natural body was not only the embodiment of central power; paradoxically, it was the name and the face of what was supposed to be the continuous social body of the Yugoslav State.

In this respect, Yugoslavia was, for obvious reasons, an exception to the rest of the Communist bloc in Europe. The centralised regimes of the East tried "to inscribe in the memory of their subjects the fiction that [they were] capable and determined to be everywhere at all times". The agent that was acting on behalf of the regime was the Communist Party – it had neither physical nor theoretical boundaries, only its historic mission, which entitled the Party to claim power over the entire realm.⁷ In order to entertain the relationship with all individuals of the realm, the centre of this power had to be anthropomorphised: rendered in an embodied fashion. The Party, both the concrete and abstract agent of history, stood at the centre of power embodied in the person of the General Secretary. In the Yugoslav case, the personification of the social order was not the anthropomorphised body of the Communist Party. In Yugoslavia, the bearer of the *master fiction* of the order was none other than Tito's body. A collection of stories, rites, and insignia, that focused on Tito, worked to justify the existence of the State. It was not Party which needed to be present everywhere in the most direct possible way to maintain the existing power relations; rather, it was the face of Tito that was the embodiment of the centre that was equated with power.⁸

The power of representation

Accordingly, the key to understanding the secret behind the importance and power of the king's bodily representation lies in decoding the working mechanisms of the process of representation: how does the mechanism of representation function to create power? The French scholar Louis Marin

⁷ For a lucid study on the importance of the Communist Party for the Communist state, see Jović 2003.

⁸ I am indebted for this discussion to István Rév, though I need to point out that his work on the subject of how power operated in East and Central Europe under the Communist regime is much more sophisticated than my small summary of one of its points could capture.

relies for his conclusions on this issue on the prefix "RE-". He identifies two denotations of the term representation: substitution and duplication. In the first case, "to re-present" means "to present anew" (in time), or "in the place of" (space). The substitution operates at the place of something that was present but is no longer – instead, it operates with a double of this other in its place. The substitution does not then produce presence but rather the effect of presence (Marin 1988:5). In the second case, "to re-present" signifies the action "to show", "to intensify a presence". However, the duplication has the effect of constituting its own representational subject by reflecting the representational framework onto itself. As a result,

it is as if there were neither world nor reality except for and through a subject, the center of that world (Marin 1988:6).

Let us try to clarify this with the help of Marin's own examples. For the purposes of my argument, it will be useful to approach Marin's work by dividing it into the discussion of the visual and verbal representations. Both can, and indeed do, achieve the two previously delineated effects of representation. But they do so in a somewhat different way. The portrait, the visual, is constitutive of the very being of the king, since the king is accessible to his subjects only through his qualities that are exhibited in his portrait.⁹

The king is himself figured in his visible portrait whose incessant epiphany, in all places and at all times, celebrates the multiple presence (Marin 1988:209).

The king is where his portrait is, or, the portrait is where the king is: *Le portrait de César, c'est César*. The portrait circumscribes the place and time

of the absolute present outside of which all others, in the past and future, will have been or will be absent (Marin 1988:209).

The portrait of the king is the infinite representation of his name and his body. The portrait has a properly metonymic role.

The king constitutes himself in his image and institutes himself as his portrait of the king of the world, because the world of the king is delivered up to the infinity of the representation of each of his parts and of each of his places. (...) The infinite reflection of representation produces the king as the 'virtual' image – that of absolute monarch (Marin 1988:205).

As Marin's analysis already demonstrates, the visual currencies not only define the time and space of the absolute present, but they also serve to

⁹ It does not matter then, as Marin observes, that the King's body continues to exist in its own nature – our senses register the *image* of the body, and through this we, as subjects, become united among ourselves in the same political body. Marin 1988: 209.

constitute the subject of representation in his image, that is, to conceive him *as* his image.

We observe something similar in the case of the written discourses, most notably, in the king's narrative. If we would need to encapsulate the essence of the king's narrative and how it should properly be written, we could say that the only true historiographical representation of the king is the one that represents the king's *Geschichte* as the *Historie*:

Louis XIV makes history, but it is history that is made in what he does, and at the same time his historian, by writing what he does, writes what must be written (Marin 1988:41-42).¹⁰

If we have only one, singular and particular, agent of history (that is, therefore, not made by a plurality of other agents but only by his sole hands), then this absolute agent (or subject of history) at the same time produces history's temporality, and that temporality can be none other than his own. Not only should all other characters in the king's narrative converge toward the vanishing point, that being the center occupied by the king's body, but they can be visible in the first place only thanks to the light emanating out of that same center: the center (king) is the Sun and is the only source of the light in the narrative. He thus not only creates History, he is the condition of all the history,

since there is no historical narrative that is not his own history (Marin 1988:67).

The King's narrative thus defines again all the time and place, the universal space of History, of which he is the sole Ur-agent. He is omnipresent where his narrative is,¹¹ authenticating the present and the future by the narrated past presence; through the latter, other figures of history become who they are, for he is the source of light, life and movement.

If we bring Kantorowicz and Marin together, we see that representation of king's body in word and image thus serves the purpose of creating the collective identity of the members of the *realm* by projecting the image of the king onto the bodies of the citizens. The image of the king comes to signify the presence of the state: *L'état, c'est moi*. Representation of his body, body being the personification of the active centre of the social order, is required to produce visibly the transgenerational *we* of the state. For the purpose of this article, we will show how Tito's narrative operated in word and image as a mechanism for the horizontal and vertical creation of Yugoslavs: how it was used to provide the essence of the story of the Yugoslav community. As will

¹⁰ This obviously turns a singular narrative into a universal, general model of representation.

¹¹ "Through its writing, which will always follow the present moment of the act, absolute power, in the fictive position that it gives itself in its simulacrum, reveals and writes itself, makes itself known in the future perfect: it will act, say, and think as having acted, said, and thought." Marin 1988: 74.

become quickly obvious, the article will devote more space to the visual currency, not because the verbal is less important, but for a very simple practical reason. The multiplicity of meanings that is inherent in visual representations can be controlled only by a strict and rigorous iconographical analysis of the artistic product. I will thus proceed slowly to describe minutely the iconography of the chosen example of Tito's visual representations. As this is an article and not a book format, it is not possible to include and analyse in a similar detailed way a large number of paintings. Thus, it seems better to focus on one single piece and study it painstakingly (as the source, by its type, commands such a very detailed approach) than to hurry over a larger number of paintings and sculptures, as their more substantial treatment would not in these circumstances be a reasonable possibility.

Tito's narrative in word...

In Yugoslavia, the King's narrative displayed and developed all its representational powers. Let us focus on one small excerpt.

Tito has become the living guard of our independence and freedom, he is our optimism, our dignity (...). The idea of independence, equality, and freedom cannot be detached from our, from Tito's name, but this idea did not remain only our, only His thought – this idea today has a value of a general need, the force of a universal aspiration, will and dream, it has the attraction of a great cause. (...) In the heart of the past storms, he personified our centennial desire for the proud independence and freedom; in the same way, today he personifies all our vigorous bravery and perseverance, with which we uphold and nurture that desire, carry it throughout time and realise it in space. It is thus no empty phrase, when we say today that our people, that Tito will not be distracted from the road that we have chosen – that our people, that Tito knows of no side-tracks and turning back. (...) In a world that does not cease to tremble but that at the same time hopes, His word will be a new rainbow of peacefulness, a new signal of encouragement (*Josip Broz Tito* 1981:386).

This text was written in May 1955, at the moment when the Non-aligned Movement was about to be born. Tito had already had his first meetings with the president of India, Nehru, on December 22, 1954, and with the president of Egypt, Nasser, on February 5, 1955. The three of them are considered to be the founding fathers of the Non-aligned Movement. This is the origin of the last sentence of the somewhat longer quotation: in 1955, in the world divided by the Cold War, the third camp that was about to emerge seemed to represent a possibility for true peace.

But there is more one can read from the quotation. On the one hand, we notice that Tito was perceived as a guard, as a living guarantor of Yugoslavia's freedom and independence; the question begging to be asked is that if this is really true, what happens when the guard will no longer be

living? As we know from history, this problem did, indeed, plague the country once the guard physically left this world. On the other hand, the quotation is marked by the constant shift between "us" and Tito: "from our, from Tito's name", "only our, only His thought", "that our people, that Tito will not be distracted". Tito is "us", and "we" are Tito. He personifies our desires, our thoughts are his thoughts, our name is his name. "The State is Tito" instead of "The State is me". The basic difference between the two declarations is that the first is uttered by the body politic, whereas the second is uttered by the King (the centre of power) himself.

And yet, we could also say that this basic difference does not really exist: for if the thoughts of the body politic are the thoughts of Tito, then it matters little whether the real words are uttered by the former or by the latter. The two are one. Relying on Louis Marin's elaboration of the Sun King's formula, we could say that the essence of the Yugoslav State was, in the narrative that proclaims "The State is Tito", defined as none other than the proper name (Tito) of the I (body politic) that utters "The State is Tito" (Marin 1988:9). Tito is represented here as both body local and translocal. It is his name, his body, that is singular in time and space and thus local; but, because he is one with the State, his body is everywhere, where universal power of the State is, at all times and in all places (Marin 1988:10). This has to work in both directions: if he is present where the State is, the State is present where his body is. As the poet Manojle Gavrilović put it,

There is a wonderful country, and it is called TITO (Gavrilović
1987:197).

Once this body (Tito) perishes and becomes absent, it will be difficult, if not downright impossible, to locate the presence of that wonderful country.

... and image

When we try to tell the pictorial story, more attention to detail is needed. We will scrutinise a relief by Želimir Janeš, sculptor and a member of the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences, made in 1967 (see the illustration). The relief was owned by the high military eschalons in Belgrade: it belonged to the office of Marshalate. Since the relief was made in 1967, it can be reasonably conjectured that the piece was commissioned, as the year 1967 was celebrated as the thirtieth anniversary of Tito's appointment as the head of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

The following words appear at the top of the relief: "Josip Broz – Tito. The Builder of Socialism and the Fighter for Peace and Co-existence". The catalogued reproduction spells out the title: "Tito's Paths of Peace" (*Josip Broz Tito* 1981:78, 388). If we are to connect the title of the relief with the inscription at its top, we do not have to look very far for a text that may help us. We know, and this can be corroborated, for

example, by another piece of writing about Tito, that Capitalism was thought by contemporaries in the Communist countries, to be incompatible with world peace: with its unjust and unequal distribution of wealth and power, it was seen as an obstacle to the harmony of the world. Tito thus fought for peace, as we read in 1977, not only by arguing in the name of common sense and moral excellence, but also by suggesting the concepts for the redistribution of the existing material goods and the rearrangement of economic relations (*Josip Broz Tito* 1981:330). Socialism can then be seen as yet another path to peace.

Janeš' relief is made of silver. It is 75 centimeters high, and since it has the form of a shield, the lower part (29 centimeters) is somewhat narrower than the upper part (43 centimeters); roughly, it could be said that the upper part is one and a half times wider than the lower. The scenes on the relief, which form the basis of the narrative of the whole piece, run in two parallel vertical rows with five pictures in each row; between them, there is a third row, composed of a different type of items. This middle row, at least visually, brings the two streams of the story together. While the scenes in the two rows depict motifs with real people, the middle row is comprised entirely of symbols. It commences with the hammer and sickle, followed by the stylised Yugoslav coat-of-arms, in the middle of which is Tito's left profile. Beyond it, we observe the coats-of-arms of all the Yugoslav republics: Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Bosnian, Macedonian and Montenegrin. At the top of the relief, the sculptor has put six torches; originally, the six torches stand for the six Yugoslav republics, and they should be placed in the centre of the Yugoslav coat of arms. But here on the relief, instead of the torches forming a unified Yugoslav flame, we see the face of Tito.

The scenes on the relief tell a real story of history, and it is possible to reconstruct the concrete historical circumstances that could have served as the artistic inspiration. The first picture shows a group of people, wearing what appear to be the uniforms of the Yugoslav Partisans, gathered around a table on the frontal side of which there is a big star. The central figure in the picture, presumably Tito himself, is standing and reading from a piece of paper. In the background, we read the Partisan motto: "Death to Fascism, liberty to the people". The scene depicts the first meeting of the Anti-Fascist Liberation Movement for Yugoslavia (AVNOJ) on November 26, 1942, in the small town of Bihać, the beginning of the process whereby the second Yugoslavia would be created.

The second scene is more enigmatic. It depicts six women wearing Partisan caps; the one turning her back to us has a rifle. The first woman on the left carries a banner, and in the background of the picture we read yet another motto that was often proclaimed on the Yugoslav territory in the course of the World War II and after it: "Brotherhood and Unity". Tito does not appear in the picture. The women display joy and happiness. They appear to be dancing, celebrating under the slogan of "brotherhood

and unity", a formula that was used as a cornerstone of the new Yugoslav, post-war State.

If we move to the third picture, we notice that Tito has returned to the scene, staying there until the end. No longer in uniform, he can be seen putting his arms on the shoulder of a child before him. Another child, a little girl carrying a small flower bouquet, runs in his direction from the right corner of the picture. As she is approaching Tito, her arms are wide open. And the episode is again all too familiar for the substance to be missed. The charismatic leader surrounded by the children of his people was a picture often encountered in Yugoslavia, where Tito's special and deep relationship with children and the young comprised an important part of his image: representations of leaders with children in general are used to emphasise the leader's human side and his kindness.¹² The devotion of Tito's little Pioneers to their much older comrade was constantly underlined by their birthday wishes to him, with lines such as

Dear Tito, I would give you a half of my life, so you could live longer
(*Josip Broz Tito* 1971).¹³

But we know that such images have a more profound, Christological resonance. For it was the Ur-Messiah who declared that his deepest feelings of love were reserved for the very youngest.

In the next image, Tito has again put on his uniform. It is the uniform with a long military overcoat, the one we know from what was probably the most famous statue of Tito in Yugoslavia: his statue, made by Antun Augustinčić, positioned in front of the house where he was born. On the relief, Marshal Tito is placed in the centre of the picture, facing a group of soldiers on the left who salute him. The Marshal is surrounded by his Army. In Tito's Yugoslavia, the Army played an important political role. It was supposed to

defend the achievements of the revolution, brotherhood and unity of our peoples, and to guard the peaceful work and development of the people
(*Josip Broz Tito* 1971).

The fifth scene shows a uniformed Tito laying a wreath in front of the Lenin's mausoleum in Moscow. Once Tito leaves the uniformed escort, on the next picture he appears in a suit. The sixth image is remarkable for the fact that even though his figure occupies a very visible position in the right corner, he is nevertheless slightly pushed to the background. The foreground is occupied by two workers performing an obviously difficult job. Behind them we see a blast furnace; this would signal that the scene could have been taken from a heavy-industry factory – a plausible conclusion if we bear in mind that, much like other communist countries,

¹² I am grateful to Reana Senjković for pointing this out to me.

¹³ The monograph does not have any page numbers which is why I cannot reproduce them here either.

Yugoslavia embarked after 1945 on the massive programme of industrialisation that in its first phase gave the advantage to the heavy industry. Tito's figure in the factory, his silent presence, is nothing surprising, as we have many photographs from different periods of the Yugoslav history that show Tito (sometimes with his wife Jovanka) with factory-workers, miners, and construction-builders. Up until his death, he made a great effort to travel often around Yugoslavia to visit schools, factories, and sport facilities. It was not only his picture, his portrait, that stood on the walls of gas-stations, firms and kindergartens: his body local was in the most literal meaning of the word made translocal, because it was existent in the flesh in very many corners of the country. His body was where the State was.

On the seventh scene, it is Tito the Politician who stands there before us, and, while we may not be familiar with the purpose of the meeting Želimir Janež portrayed, we can nevertheless maintain that it surely does not take place in a small and insignificant environment. The abstraction of the environment is also repeated, even though in a different way, in the next picture. There Tito in uniform stands on a podium, facing a large crowd of people of whom we see only small heads. The spectators carry a number of banners, none of which can be identified. On the podium, Tito is joined by another uniformed man; while the latter stands still, Tito greets the crowd by raising his left arm. In terms of the story that the picture tells, we know that it is a celebratory occasion, during which Tito is represented almost as if standing on the top of the ordinary spectators. Their heads, in close proximity to his boots, are small and indistinguishable – moreover, in their anonymity, they are reduced to simple circles, resembling somewhat a heap of round stones. It is the leader whom we observe on the picture, the leader greeting and being greeted by the people. If, following Alberti, we propose to look at the picture in terms of the hierarchy of bodies,¹⁴ we can say that the surrounding figures are dwarfed by Tito's presence for the first time on Janež' relief. Only his body is shown in total (even the military person next to him is partially hidden behind Tito's uniform), while the commoners in the multitude lose their bodies and are signified only by an elementary allusion to the shape of their heads. Their bodies do not seem to count, especially not when confronted by the extraordinary body on the podium. It is their devotion to that special body that we decipher from the image.

Having parted from the numerous but not so weighty company, Tito embarks on a trip in the next picture. We see him standing at the prow of a ship – most probably his sea-going craft *Galeb* (the Seagull). We notice a sphinx, a building shaped in the Oriental fashion, an Egyptian pyramid, a tall and elegant minaret, and other, obviously non-European, buildings beside the sea he is sailing upon. He is depicted in the walking position that strongly suggests motion and movement; if read against the

¹⁴ This is elaborated in more detail in Baxandall 1985.

background of the picture, we are compelled to devise that he walks across the continents, i.e., that he is the world traveler. Tito did indeed make numerous states visits on the *Seagull*, and the ship seemed to remain one of his preferred means of transportation. On the last picture, Janeš puts Tito in the main hall of the building of the Organisation of the United Nations (OUN) in New York. We see Tito delivering a speech behind the speaker's stand, bearing the official sign of the OUN.

Imaging embodied truth

We should now step back from the relief and take a look at the bigger picture. As Michael Baxandall has demonstrated, our optical act, when observing a picture, has a rather routine pace. The first look serves quickly to gain a sense of the whole: within the first few seconds, we form an impression of the whole field of a picture. After that, we move the eye over the picture and scan it with a succession of rapid fixations. The result is sharpening of details, establishing the relations and the perception of order (Baxandall 1985:3-4). A look for the first time at Janeš' relief would, due to the extraordinary attraction of the faces, most probably focus on Tito's left profile in the Yugoslav coat-of-arms that is placed at the centre of the upper half of the relief. Since it can be assumed that all Yugoslav spectators would notice the absence of the torches in the coat of arms, the formed impression could not be very far from the idea that Tito stands here for the united Yugoslav torches/peoples. Tito represents with his face the body politic of the state. The impression is additionally enhanced by the six little national coats-of-arms of each Yugoslav republic that appear to be originating from the main, Yugoslav symbol – that being both Tito and the Yugoslav coat-of-arms.

The eye of the observer moves from Tito's face to scan the ten scenes that have so far been described. At this point, we notice that our entire analysis has one very serious error, i.e. that it can be said how none of the previously explicated pictures depict what I have claimed they do. Why? Because the figures on the pictures are too small to be identified with precision. And yet, even though we cannot recognise him from the depicted scenes, we know that the person before our eyes is, indeed, Tito. We know this from the title of the relief, but, more importantly, we know it based on the visual information obtained in the course of the first scanning of the relief, when our attention was immediately captured by the face. Once we identify the face in the Yugoslav coat-of-arms as Tito, we transfer this identification/authentication to the remaining pictures. In other words, the second scanning of the relief is heavily influenced by the identification of Tito's face. In order to tell the true story of the art-piece, we first need to recognise Tito in the coat-of-arms.

The two-step scanning can be said to have a very serious consequence for deciphering what Erwin Panofsky has called the intrinsic

meaning of the relief (Panofsky 1993:55). If we read the depiction of the face in the Yugoslav coat-of-arms as the intention of the artist to say that Tito's body natural (his face) represents the body politic of Yugoslavia, we are forced to ask ourselves whose history (or, alternatively, whose paths of peace) is then represented in the pictures we discover in the course of the second scanning of the relief: Tito's or Yugoslavia's? But then, perhaps the question does not make much sense, anyway. If Tito represents/stands for/is Yugoslavia, and if this also applies vice versa, it seems that the quest for the tentative separateness of their histories is not particularly meaningful. Meaningful or not, it is worth trying to look for an answer, because, as I will claim later, it is the narration of the king's history in his portrait (the portrait being defined, following Marin, as a semiotic sacramental body of the king that is really present in the visual and written currencies) that makes the spectator apprehend the union of the subjects in the corporate *universitas* of the realm (Marin 1988:13).

In our quest for understanding the cause and the effect of representing Tito in the Yugoslav coat-of-arms, we can turn to the useful two-fold distinction in representational modes, the doctrinal formalism vs. the historical narrative, as developed by Stephen Greenblatt. According to Greenblatt, the doctrinal formalism (as the representational mode) serves to represent in structural terms Truth and not History, it moves from narrative toward ideology by reducing the presence of the stories to which it alludes (Greenblatt 2000:78-80). The representational mode of the historical narrative, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with events unfolding in time, it

lays emphasis on event rather than institution, on process rather than structure (Greenblatt 2000:92).

With the help of these notions, we can describe the depiction of Tito's face in the coat-of-arms as being executed by the means of doctrinal formalism. Even though the story on which the doctrine is based can be discerned in the background of the picture (i.e. the spectator is most probably familiar with the story), the emblem of the doctrine clearly strives to picture the idea: the idea of Tito's body natural being identified/identical with the Yugoslav body politic.

The ten scenes on the relief would be best described as a historical narrative. There is a story that unfolds in time represented there. Somewhat simplified, it is a story of an embattled and shattered country and its leader, Tito, that started to recover its pieces in the course of the war (picture one). Freedom, that was won under the banner of brotherhood and unity (picture two), was brought by the true messiah (picture three) – Marshal Tito (picture four) who inherited the legacy of Lenin (picture five).¹⁵

¹⁵ There are very few references to Communism in the entire relief; the legacy of Lenin and hammer and sickle in the upper part of the relief are the two most significant "communist" representations.

Under his careful eye, the people of the country work (picture six), he cares for their future by pursuing higher politics (picture seven), and people readily express their love and devotion to him (picture eight). He is, however, more than a provider for his own country. He sails the seas and crosses the continents (picture nine) to bring peace to the entire world (picture ten).¹⁶

A fairly strong case could be made to support the claim that the ten scenes are executed in the representational mode of doctrinal formalism. Almost each picture, if taken out of its place in the historical narrative, could be described as a depiction of Truth in structural terms, with the flow of time suppressed: Tito the Marshal, Tito the messiah, Tito the communist revolutionary, etc. This, however, would not be a justified interpretative procedure, because we know from Baxandall that the explanation of a work of art requires us to comprehend the organisation of the piece: relations among different parts of the work of art and the perception of the internal order (Baxandall 1985:4). The internal order of the relief imposes on us firstly to recognise the doctrine: Tito's face in the Yugoslav coat-of-arms. Since we read the ten scenes with the emblem of the doctrine on our minds, since the correct reading of the scenes *presupposes* that we adopt the doctrine, it can be even further claimed that the events in the historical narrative are depicted as fulfilling a doctrinal design. It is not that the doctrine precedes narrative, then, but rather, the narrative manifests the doctrinal design. The narrative is the proof of the validity of Truth.¹⁷

If this is so, then the relief by Janeš narrates Tito's history in Tito's portrait. On the one hand, it is a representation of an absent man: his visible portrait is a memorial of history. In Marin's words, his sacramental body (portrait) makes his historical body visible as represented – absence becomes presence in the image (Marin 1988:13). However, this is only one half of the story. For we know that the historical body, precisely as the memorial of history (being present) defines

the place and time of the absolute present (Marin 1988:209).

This memorial of history (Tito's historical body as represented in the relief) makes it possible for the spectators to identify with his name. The sacramentary mystery of the portrait inscribes the historical body of Tito in the body politic that is thus created: the social body of Yugoslavia is created at the moment it looks at Tito's portrait. To substantiate this by the original voice of a Yugoslav poet:

¹⁶ I am sure though that this is but one possible story that could be deciphered from Janes' pictures, but I do not feel that the absence of a very firm and univocal tale is something that sets debilitating limits to my proposed plot. The story as advocated does display an internal consistency that enables me to claim a certain dosage of probability for my intentional account when judged against another.

¹⁷ This debate is informed and influenced by Greenblatt 2000.

Whatever we say about Tito (...), he is for us, for nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia, only this – the one and only word that says everything: Tito. When we say Tito, we see our misery, the dark slavery of our historical destiny, from which he has taken us towards our contemporary achievements, meanings and glowing in the world. When we say Tito, we see all battles to which he has led us, when we say Tito we see all crossroads of our history (Franičević-Pločar 1980:346).

His name is our past, our present and our future, his name is who we are.

A fleshy ghost

Several days after Tito's funeral, the Union of Socialist Youth of Yugoslavia organised on May 25, 1980 the celebration of Tito's birthday and of Youth Day. The president of the Union, Vasil Tupurkovski, exclaimed on the occasion at the end of his speech:

Yugoslavia, youth, knows that Tito has stayed with us forever, that his blood runs in our veins and that his heart beats in ours (*Bilo je časno* 1980:306).

We can understand this excerpt only if we accept the claim that Tito's two bodies, his body natural and thus mortal and his body politic (or symbolical), did indeed merge into one. The story of continuity may be a fiction, but someone is needed to act it out. For continuity to be guaranteed, something needs to be standing there. The Yugoslav body politic did not have this *something*, this body, anymore. As if to prove this point, at the end of the speech by Tupurkovski, the assembled youth at the stadium in Belgrade formed with their bodies the Yugoslav flag: the symbol of the country that no longer had a body to show.

Amidst all these warm, bleeding hearts, it should not surprise us that Tito has returned in a non-corporeal form to torment the inhabitants of his former country. I do not find it quite accidental that among arguably the best products of the Serbian and Croatian film industry in the 1990s, two pieces occupy a special place, and both of them play with the idea of Tito's return from the other world. In Želimir Žilnik's semi-documentary, semi-fiction film, the director dresses his main actor in Tito's uniform. The actor walks through the streets of Belgrade. The reactions of the people who did or did not believe that this was indeed the real thing (Tito) are amazing, as they addressed him directly, started complaining about their present lives and asked for concrete help. On the Croatian side, the director Vinko Brešan made the movie "Marshall", in which the *spiritus movens* of the whole story is indeed a spirit, or, better said, the ghost of Tito which returns to a small Dalmatian town.

Finally, Tito reappeared on the streets of Zagreb several months ago on a number of posters. In contrast to all the non-corporeal adventures his body underwent, this time it is a real fleshy picture that the viewers of

posters can observe. His face namely has been used in a campaign of one of the most famous Croatian producers of meat products. On his yacht "The Seagull", Tito's face advertises nothing more or less but a plain salami.

COMMENTS

Ivo Žanić, Assist. Prof.

Faculty of Political Science, Zagreb

Together with the article published in *Limen* 1/2001, this article by Maja Brkljačić makes up part of a broadly based study (her doctoral dissertation) on the personality cult of Josip Broz Tito. With that in mind, I would like to point out that the comments that follow probably do not stem from the weaknesses of the whole, but from the unpolished methodology by which its parts (chapters) are set apart for independent publication.

The major flaw that derives from that fact is the absence of synchronic and diachronic perspectives. In other words, on the one hand, the theme is not placed in a comparative relation to analogous processes in societies more or less categorically equivalent to the Yugoslav, and, on the other, in a comparative or, more precisely, a contrasting relation with former social formations. As a result, the analysis of the Želimir Janež relief as a focal part of the article remains hanging in the air to a considerable extent, while the theoretical and interpretative model adopted from Kantorowicz determines too forcefully the entire narration.

I am not familiar with Kantorowicz's study, but on the basis of the detailed presentation of its premises in M. Brkljačić's article, it can be seen to be undoubtedly stimulating and productive in research of this type, that is, its methodological process and theoretical framework are also open to the analysis of material from later, necessarily different historical and political formations. The author has proved this by adopting the category of the *body natural*, which is mortal, and the *super-body* and/or the *body politic*, which is passed on to heirs, thus ensuring the continuity of sovereign power and dignity. One aspect of the personality cult in modern society is well illuminated in this way. However, it is an oversight that the *otherness of historical reality* is not included in the analysis. Namely, there is no question that modern politics resorts to a series of sacralising processes, both in relation to the representative personalities, and in relation to specific localities, decision-making procedures and events. However, they are not, at the same time, identical with "theologisation" procedures, since modern society participates neither quantitatively nor

qualitatively in the type of piety in which pre-modern man participated. This is quite conspicuous here since Kantorowicz concentrates on the analysis of the symbolic representation of royal power in France, while it is precisely the French bourgeois revolution in 1789, at least in the European context, that is taken by consensus as the point of severance from the old and the beginning of the new, modern paradigm in that aspect, too. The redefinition of the fundamental concept of the bearer of sovereignty testifies sufficiently to the depth of that rupture: it is no longer the monarch who rules by the Grace of God but the common man, the *demos*; he is the one from whom authority emanates and he is the one who has the natural and inalienable right to change that authority (that is why the king was not only deposed and/or exiled, as had already occurred a host of times throughout European history, but was ritually guillotined and humiliated to such a degree so as to abolish his "Divinity" and leave no trace of it, so as to clearly show that he was, indeed, "subject to natural forces". By that alone, Kantorowicz's key thesis on the transfer of the "super-body" "from one body natural to another in order to preserve the continuity of the office" loses its applicability in the analysis of emerging political systems and/or demands a crucial methodological categorical and conceptual extension.

I shall mention only one of a series of questions opened up by the fundamental change in the political paradigm: it would be unthinkable that the body of Louisa XIV should *descend among the common* people, for example, for him to visit a village and shake hands with the serfs, since that would have destroyed him in his royal dignity. However, for Tito as a modern authoritarian ruler, that *descent* was not only a customary but also a necessary form of symbolic legitimisation. This difference cannot be explained exclusively by Kantorowicz's analytical apparatus. It does not function for modern monarchies either, not just the European (Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, and Spain) where the sovereign – even though his/her formal and legal, and political legitimacy is ensured – is expected by such procedures to attain and/or maintain overall social and moral legitimacy. Nor does it any longer function for a country like Japan, where, for example, the public openly discusses the pregnancy of the Empress.

No difference has been made between the unavoidably standard activities, set largely by protocol, of all statesmen in the political life of every country (visiting building sites and factories, having photographs taken with members of the public, particularly children, travelling around the country) and the element in such activities – once again in the corresponding ideological framework – that becomes the basis of the personality cult. With those differences, the comment on the physical omnipresence of the sovereign's "body natural" lacks sense, since what is in question is simply a fact in the political life of every country. The same also holds for the comment on the "very complicated and extremely elaborated funeral ritual". Any funeral for a head of State, particularly if

he/she should die while in office, is, by definition, an exceptional event for the society in question, and is planned in detail that implies a series of ceremonial and symbol-creating contents.

What occurred at the Split Stadium at the moment that Tito's death was announced is rightly included in the discussion, but it cannot be correctly and fully understood without mention being made that this was a soccer match between *Hajduk* and *Crvena Zvezda*. That very fact, that this was a match played between *Croats* and *Serbs* and that the teams were the symbolic representatives of the two nations, who mixed together and hugged each other after the match was discontinued, made possible reading off meaning within the desirable and mobilising framework of Brotherhood and Unity and elevated those photographs to a high symbolic level.

The question presents itself of the extent to which the citizens of Yugoslavia, under conditions of atheistic indoctrination and reduction in religious life, who, independently of their personal faith, were deprived of many insights into the cultural and historical life of Christianity, possessed the cognitive assumptions to be able to recognise the otherwise unquestionably Christological elements in Tito's personality cult. There is even the question of how aware the manufacturers of the cult themselves were that those elements were Christological; or whether they simply saw them as conventional formulae and universal mechanisms of interpretation and promotion of an "ideal life fable", both in the struggle for their own legitimacy as the political elite, and in the conflicts about the distribution of power within that self same elite. It should not be overlooked that, unlike the homogenous, Roman Catholic France of Louis XIV, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had a religiously mixed population: not only were more than half its inhabitants of the Eastern Christian (Christian Orthodox) denomination, which also seems important in this context, but more than a fifth belonged to the Islamic cultural and historical tradition, who did, nonetheless, participate with equal intensity in the Tito cult. For its part, that could mean that the cult's Christian eschatological and soteriological and/or Christological elements were not experienced as such, neither in origins nor in meaning, but rather as being universal and extra-religious, that is, as being generally Messianic.

Naturally enough, the question cannot be solved in a paper of this scope, but it would be advisable to note that the problem does exist and that unless Kantorowitz's theory, however applicable to one aspect, cannot in itself explain the entirety, then it even becomes counter-productive.

Just one more comment on the legal and political context: the body at the Second Session of AVNOJ [the Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia] held in Jajce in November, 1943 was not pronounced the "provisional government" but was constituted as a Parliament, that is, the supreme representative body, which went on with

that status to found the National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia (NKOJ) as its organ, that is in fact, its Government.

**Reana Senjković, Senior Research Associate
Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb**

Josip Broz Tito, president for life of the country that he lead out from World War II onto the geopolitical map of the world, calling on "the masses, betrayed and abandoned (...) to join in the battle against the occupying forces and domestic traitors, in the struggle for national and social liberation",¹⁸ was the symbol of Yugoslavia to the peoples and nationalities he rallied and brought together into a State community. His death, therefore, brought about a fatal identity crisis in the country. To prove this (hypo)thesis (once again), Maja Brkljačić makes her analysis, primarily, on the basis of Kantorowicz's dichotomy of the *body politic* / the *body natural* that was explicated in the classic Mediaevalist book *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, which, after its publication in 1957, was read mainly by historians, and has recently been actualised again in the very popular *Anthropology of the Body*.

The text model for the author's analysis is a fragment written in May, 1955 and published in the 1981 monograph *Josip Broz Tito*; it seemed paradigmatic to her not only because it successfully supports the thesis of the *king's narrative* that Louis Marin derived from analysis of the representations of King Louis XIV of France, but also because of the recurring stylistic/semantic insistence on equating "us" and "Tito": "our" name and Tito's name, "our" thoughts and Tito's thoughts, and, finally, "our nation" and Tito, which, for its part, is comparable with Kantorowicz's thesis on the complexity of the (Mediaeval) "body of the sovereign" ("The Prince is in the *respublica*, and the *respublica* is in the Prince"). However, this textual model is far less important and less telling to the author than the visual manifestation: the relief of the sculptor Želimir Janež dating from 1967, since then the property of the High Command of the Yugoslavian Army in Belgrade. The relief is a triptych whose lateral fields tell the story of Tito's "historical journey" in ten images, while the central panel depicts and also interprets referential symbols: a crossed hammer and sickle, the six coats-of-arms of the Yugoslavian republics and, particularly indicative to the author, the coat-of-arms of Yugoslavia with Tito's profile in the centre instead of the prescribed six torches. In order to comprehend the reasons for such a "departure", the author resorts to the distinction between *doctrinal formalism* and the *historical narrative*, based on the proposal put forward by one of the best-known representatives of

¹⁸ Encyclopaedia of the Lexicographical Institute of the Federal National Republic of Yugoslavia

New Historicism, Stephen Greenblatt. To Greenblatt, doctrinal formalism is that representational mode that strips narrative down to ideology because of the absence of the story to which it pertains; to the author, Tito's profile that replaces the six prescribed torches is both an indicator and the product of that mode of understanding visual representational practice.

In her interpretation of the concept of representation as proposed by Louis Marin in his book *Portrait of the King*, the author also finds corroboration of Kantorowicz's dichotomy. To Marin, the concept of representation denotes twofold meaning: substitution, a replacement of the real, and duplication, a reinforcement of the real.

In addition to Kantorowicz and Marin, the writers mentioned, the author serves in the building up of her thesis with information from the book *Patterns of Intention. On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* by Michael Baxandall, an art historian who deals largely with interpretation of works from the so-called Late Gothic and the Renaissance.

Although it is interesting and well postulated, this type of theoretical "network" does not, however, examine and actualise the example that the author has selected to be her analytical framework, and does not thus answer the key theoretical (and methodological) question: in other words, it is possible simply to nestle against a much younger "social history", history that has been encumbered by certain other completely different assumptions, and cognisance that has sprung from pondering upon Mediaeval political theology, from semiotic analysis of representations of the Sun King of France and, finally, from interpretation of works of high art from the late 14th, 15th and 16th centuries? If so, the author's competent analysis of points of contact, instead of excessively detailed depictions of the key theories of Kantorowicz, Marin and Baxandall, would be a welcome contribution to Croatian scholarship. In addition, the sovereign-like personage of Josip Broz Tito, and particularly the creation and understanding of this and other similar personalities would need to be compared with the creation and understand of Broz's contemporary sovereign-like personages in the countries of totalitarian Socialism, and also in the democratic countries. In that way, the theoretical model upon which the article is based could be examined and built upon. Namely, Stephen Greenblatt himself insisted that the formal aspect of a text on culture should be understood within the social determinants of the time in which it was written; nor did Michael Baxandall set apart his (iconographic) interpretations from the time contemporary to the text being analysed.

Additionally, although Janeš's relief is indeed a well selected example, if the intention is only to give the picture of Kantorowicz's thesis on the unified nature of the body politic and the body natural in re-presentation (and imagining) of the sovereign, it still will not be able to speak in the name of the representational practice and imagining that relates to the theme in the title of the article. At the same time, more

attention should be paid to the photographs, pictures, reproductions of pictures and sculptures that were much more accessible to the public than Janeš's relief and which, due to their omnipresence, contributed in a major way to the shaping and maintenance of Tito's charisma. Although huge, that body demonstrates a small repertoire of iconographic themes and variants that can be counted, and it would necessary, from the aspect of methodology, to establish a link between them and the chosen relief, either as a "typical representative" or as an "exception". I find it difficult here to agree with the author's assertion that such an approach requires demanding elaboration that would go beyond the format of a scholarly article.

It would also be interesting, for example, to analyse the enormous body of the 120 000 letters mentioned by the author at the very beginning of the article. Otherwise, it would seem to be necessary to at least explain the claim that the letters in question were very significant for the Yugoslavian community.

I also believe that the "disintegration of Yugoslavia" should be observed not only as the consequence of the identity crisis that emerged after Tito's death, but, in a much broader context, as the consequence of political and social turmoil, primarily in the countries of European Socialism.

**Maja Brkljačić, PhD candidate Central European University
Central European University, Budapest**

Due to the very strict editorial restrictions regarding the length of this reply, I am unable to offer an intelligible response to a number of questions rightfully posed by Senjković und Žanić. I will thus list a few ideas on why a historically seemingly distant situation may nevertheless be interesting for a study in contemporary history.

Let me first say that I do not believe that we can *compare* the situation in the former Yugoslavia with the one reconstructed for the Medieval period. This was not my intention in the text either. Instead, in the literature quoted I identify a particular mechanism of representing the body of the King, and then, focusing on several shorter narrative segments and one pictorial image (a relief by Želimir Janeš), I examine how that mechanism worked in Tito's Yugoslavia. "King" with the capital K has here the meaning of the *symbolic* body standing, as Edward Shils would have it, in the active centre of the social order. Each social order has a centre, and in each effective centre something/someone must be standing. Thus, it makes no difference whether we are talking about modern or premodern societies, they are all characterised by their various "master fictions" and they all have someone/something playing those fictions out.

The question how accessible the relief by Janeš was to the wider Yugoslav population bears no connection to the representability of the relief for the practices of the imagination of the ruler. Moreover, the fact that it was kept in the highest military command room in the country points to the fact that it must have been considered as perfectly representable of the ruling system of truth: can we really believe that the Yugoslav Marshalcy would have kept on its walls a portrait of its supreme and favourite leader and founding father if it had been believed even for a second that the portrait somehow did not correspond to the prevailing Yugoslav dogma about Tito?¹⁹

This brings me to a series of Žanić's remarks on signifying practices which appear to be of Christian and theological origins in a society that is clearly marked by the application of the atheistic indoctrination, as Žanić puts it. I do believe that Christian and/or Christological practices and concepts were familiar even in the Yugoslav socialist society. The Yugoslav communist revolution did not try to present itself as a clean break with the past, quite to the contrary, it maintained a very firm connection to the earlier periods, in endless cumbersome efforts to differentiate between "progressive" and "regressive" historical and cultural tradition. Artists such as Želimir Janeš received at art academies practically the same education as did their colleagues prior to 1945.²⁰ Thus, along with other academically educated producers of Tito's images, he must have been very well acquainted with Christological and sacred motives. Something similar can also be said for so-called ordinary people. All "ideological indoctrination" and diverse religious-cultural traditions notwithstanding, the citizens of Yugoslavia did not live in a country surrounded by a solid brick wall, which would have temporally and spatially removed them from their geographical and cultural surrounding – and there, Christological motifs had a long and powerful history and influence extending into the present day.²¹ Perhaps even more importantly, we should remember Geertz's

¹⁹ Finally, it should also be plainly stated that the choice of the quantity of the material analysed is also simply a matter of the taste of the researcher herself. While Reana Senjković bases her book on visual propaganda in Croatia in the 1990s on a large number of sources and documents, in the wish that the material itself will "carry the book", my preference in this article and most of my other work is somewhat different. I am more inclined to choose a more modest section of sources and study them into the smallest details, extracting as much as I am able to from one sentence, one book, or one image. I do not find that either of these two approaches in itself is better than the other, and we know of the work of great scholars who have used them both. Michel Foucault, for one, liked to switch between the two, depending on how it suited his arguments (see, for example, how he proceeds in *The Order of Things*). The fact remains though that scholars dealing with the so-called high-brow art (and this is, presumably, where Janeš's relief would belong) tend to employ detailed analysis, at the cost of the quantity of material. For Senjković's approach, see Senjković 2002:54.

²⁰ I deal with the continuities and discontinuities at the institutions of higher learning in post-1945 situations, most notably with the University of Zagreb, in Brkljačić 1997.

²¹ Equally, we cannot assume that because the communist regime wanted to introduce separation between the population and religious practice, that this resulted in people's

argument that the central authority always enjoys inherent sacredness and that there is a numinous aspect to sovereign power. No matter how much contemporary political process appears banal and mundane, Geertz reminds us that "[t]he extraordinary has not gone out of modern politics" – and this holds true for "religious" as well as "atheistic" societies (Geertz 1999:30). The apparent sacred aspect of the central power should not be denied to the communist societies either.

Žanić says at the beginning of his review that my article on Tito is a part of a study of the *cult* of the leader. However, this is not quite correct. According to Nina Tumarkin, the cult is defined as "organised venerational worship" (Tumarkin 1983:xvi). That Tito was both worshipped and venerated, in a very organised manner, is beyond any doubt. But this is not the subject of my research. Instead, I operate with one particular mechanism for the production of the collective identity of the Yugoslav society: representation of Tito's body. As James Clifford has told us, the task of ethnography is to make the familiar seem strange, the exotic quotidian (Clifford 1986:2). And this, in part, is the idea behind my choice of the theoretical framework for the study of Tito. I believe that more can be seen in his real, both fleshy and represented, presence in Yugoslavia if we forego our modern tastes and instead of searching for the synchronic plane of comparison of Tito with other modern leaders, we employ the so-called morphological research approach and identify certain structures which, with important differences, can be proven to be in work on historically and geographically very diverse societies. What I did not mention in the article that could perhaps introduce some clarity, was written by Kantorowicz in his "medieval" book in reply to the very modern situations of the twentieth century: Germany of the 1930s and the United States of the 1950s. He wanted to investigate the emergence of some of the idols of modern political religions – the idols of nationalism. He wanted to understand how *regnum* as *patria* could become an object of political devotion and semi-religious emotion. And he found the answer in the concrete personifications of the image of the Fatherland. These images were embodiments of communities and symbols of their shared memories. With other words, Kantorowicz built on Maurice Halbwachs who was the first to take the metaphor of the social body at its face value. Kantorowicz followed this and investigated how this embodiment of the national community functions. He showed that real material, palpable essence is needed for a story of shared memories of a real and mythical communal past to function. This material kernel was provided in the centre of the social order by the physicalised representation of the body of the King. This made the representation imposing and enabled its almost sacred devotion. How important the embodied presence of the centre is, can be

unfamiliarity with and ignorance about religious routines, customs, and performances. Consider the Polish case, well documented by Jan Kubik, on how the Polish Communist Party tried and spectacularly failed to un-teach the Polish population about the aesthetics of the religious symbolism (see Kubik 1994).

easily showed again using the Yugoslav example. When the 1974 constitution was promulgated, the walls of the Parliament building in Belgrade were decorated with an unusually high number of his pictures. As scholars of Yugoslav history generally agree, that Constitution, the world's longest with 406 articles, pretty much rendered the Yugoslav state dysfunctional. At the moment when an obviously neuralgic point in the Yugoslav state politics was struck, a need was felt to cover up the fissure with the only segment of the Yugoslav collective identity: the body of Tito.²²

REFERENCES CITED

- Baxandall, Michael. 1985. *Patterns of Intention. On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven - London: Yale University Press.
- Bilo je časno živjeti s Titom*. 1980. Zagreb: RO Mladost - RO Prosvjeta.
- Brkljačić, Maja. 2001. "A Case of a Very Difficult Transition. The Ritual of the Funeral of Josip Broz Tito". *Limen* 1. at: http://limen.mi2.hr/limen1-2001/maja_brkljacic.html
- Buden, Boris. 2002. *Kaptolski kolodvor*. Beograd: Suvremena biblioteka.
- Clifford, James. 1986. "Introduction: Partial Truths". In *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. James Clifford & George E. Marcus, eds. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: University of California Press.
- Dickerman, Leah. 2001. "Lenin in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". In *Disturbing Remains. Memory, History, and Crisis in the Twentieth Century*. Michael S. Roth & Charles G. Salas, eds. Los Angeles: Getty Institute, 77-110.
- Falasca-Zamponi, Simonetta. 2000. *Fascist Spectacle. The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini's Italy*. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: University of California Press.
- Franičević-Pločar, Jure. 1980. *Drug Tito*. Zagreb - Rijeka - Ljubljana: Spektar - Otokar Keršovani - Partizanska knjiga 346.
- Gavrilović, Manojle. 1987. "Ima jedno u svetu sunce". In *Ime vječnosti. Poezija o Titu*. Nikšić: Univerzitetska riječ, 197.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1999. "Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power". In *Rites of Power. Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics Since the*

²² That I am not the only researcher using this theoretical framework when approaching modern societies should not be specially emphasised. See for further examples Falasca-Zamponi 2000, Dickerman 2001, Žižek 1995. Last but not the least, Galeria Centralis of the Open Society in Budapest opened an exhibition on March 3 2003, with the topic of Lenin's and Stalin's funerals: the entire project is based on Kantorowicz's notion of king's two bodies.

Middle Ages. Sean Wilentz, ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 13-40.

- Greenblatt, Stephen. 2000. "The Wound in the Wall". In *Practicing New Historicism*. Catherine Gallagher & Stephen Greenblatt, eds. Chicago - London: The University of Chicago Press, 75-109.
- Hertz, Robert. 1907. "A Contribution to the Study of the Collective Representation of Death". *Année Sociologique* 10:48-37.
- Josip Broz Tito, 1892-1980*. 1981. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Josip Broz Tito*. 1971. Zagreb: Spektar.
- Jović, Dejan. 2000. "The Disintegration of Yugoslavia. A Critical Review of Explanatory Approaches". *European Journal of Social Theory* 4/1:101-103.
- Jović, Dejan. 2003. "Communist Yugoslavia and Its 'Others'". In *Identity and Ideology and National Identity in the Twentieth Century Southeastern Europe*. John R. Lampe & Mark Mazower, eds. Budapest: CEU Press [in print].
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. 1997. *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kubik, Jan. 1994. *The Power of Symbols Against the Symbols of Power: The rise of Solidarity and the fall of state socialism in Poland*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lampe, John. 1996. *Yugoslavia as History. Twice there was a country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marin, Louis. 1988. *Portrait of the King*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marin, Louis. 1989. "The Narrative Trap. The Conquest of Power". In *Ideological Representation and Power in Social Relations*. Mike Gane, ed. London: Routledge.
- Panofsky, Erwin. 1993. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. London: Penguin Books.
- Rusinow, Dennison. 1995. "The Yugoslav Peoples". In *Eastern European Nationalism in the 20th Century*. Peter F. Sugar, ed. Washington: The American University Press, 305-411.
- Senjković, Reana. 2002. *Lica društva, likovi države*. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku.
- Seroka, Jim. 1992. "Variation in the Evolution of the Yugoslav Communist Parties". In *The Tragedy of Yugoslavia. The Failure of Democratic Transition*. Jim Seroka & Vukasin Pavlovic, eds. New York - London: M.E. Sharpe, 67-87.
- Shoup, Paul. 1968. *Communism and the Yugoslav National Question*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Štaubringer, Zvonko. [s.a.]. *Kumrovečka baklja. Titovo djetinjstvo i rodno Zagorje*. Zagreb.
- Tumarkin, Nina. 1983. *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge MA - London: Harvard University Press.

Wachtel, Andrew Baruch. 1998. *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zilliacus, Konstantin. 1952. *Tito of Yugoslavia*. London: Michael Joseph.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1995. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London - New York: Verso.

TITOVA TIJELA U RIJEČI I SLICI

SAŽETAK

Prema Milovanu Đilasu već se tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata smatralo da Josip Broz Tito predstavlja konstitutivni koncept (bratstvo i jedinstvo) druge Jugoslavije u nastajanju. Tito, u krajnoj liniji, postaje personifikacijom same države kao takve. Da bismo razumjeli što to znači i koje su bile posljedice takva razvoja, autorica rabi koncept Ernesta Kantorowicza o dvama tijelima kralja – prirodnom tijelu koje je smrtno i kraljevom nad-tijelu ili političkom tijelu. Radna je hipoteza članka da je Tito svojim prirodnim tijelom reprezentirao političko tijelo Jugoslavije. Postoje čvrsti argumenti da je Tito bio jedina prava jugoslavenska institucija. Ali to ne znači da je postao bestjelesan, upravo suprotno – Titovo stvarno, prirodno tijelo nije samo utjelovljivalo središnju moć već je, paradoksalno, predstavljalo ime i lice onoga što se smatralo međusobno povezanim jugoslavenskim društvenim tijelom. Primjenjujući teoriju prikazbe Louisa Marina, autorica istražuje prikazbe Tita u nekoliko kraćih pripovjednih tekstova i jednom kiparskom radu (reljefu Želimira Janeša).

Ključne riječi: Josip Broz Tito, povijest socijalizma, simbolička antropologija