

SUZANA MARJANIĆ

Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research

Zagreb, Zvonimirova 17

TWO OF KRLEŽA'S POETICAL/ETHICAL SUBVERSIONS IN *BYGONE DAYS*

The first part of the article gives a brief review of Krleža's historical and anthropological contextualisation in *Bygone Days* in which he reveals the cynical power strategy of Đuro Basariček and Josip Šilović's human(itarian)ism and the *kynical Odysseiad* of Croatian soldiers and the *Penelopeiad* of Croatian war widows from World War I. The second part of the article deals with Krleža's subversive treatment of the (re)mythologisation of the *Kosovo myth* as the *Yugo-Mythus* which also served as a mytho-poetic matrix of the artistic discourse of Croatian Yugoslav integrationists.

Keywords: Croatian literature - history, Miroslav Krleža, diary, memoir

Subversion of the discourse of human(itarian)ism: the *Odysseiad* of Croatian soldiers and the *Penelopeiad* of Croatian war widows

Krleža's diary-memoirist entries in the war-time and *post-war* diary *Davni dani* [Bygone Days] span the historical horizon between 1914 and 1921/1922, and are regarded as being part of the corpus of *the testimonial literature* about the war.¹ In the effort to include the macro-context of the World War I abattoir in which "all that happened was that

¹ *Bygone Days*, Krleža's diary-memoirist entries subtitled *Notes 1914-1921*, was published in 1956 as the 11th and 12th volume of his *Collected Works*, and in the volumes (*Diary*, 1-2) of the 1977 Sarajevo second edition, *The Jubilee Edition on the Occasion of the 85th Anniversary of the Author's Birth*. Here *the historical and political horizon* was expanded to cover 1922. The original title (*Bygone Days*) was given the role of a subtitle in the second edition (*Diary 1914-1917; Bygone Days I, Diary 1918-1922; Bygone Days II*).

someone sold somebody else as a human corpse, sorted in a black casket, with white perforated crêpe paper, like a name-day cake" (Krleža 1977:302-303), apart from being an introspectively oriented narrator, the *I* in the diary also reveals himself to be a *extrospective*, memoir-oriented chronicler (cf. Zlatar 1996:232). In so doing, in addition to testifying about himself, Krleža also includes the level of testimony of the *Other*, noting down testimony provided by other people (cf. Laub 1992:75).

From October 1917 to October 1918, Krleža worked as a civilian clerk in Dr. Josip Šilović's *Ured za pomoć postradalima u ratu* [Bureau for Assistance to War Victims] where he came into contact with *Those* behind the scenes of the war who were condemned to survival strategies; while from October to December, 1917 he contributed to the official weekly, *Narodna zaštita* [National Protection] which was published by the *Središnji Zemaljski odbor za zaštitu porodica mobilizovanih i u ratu poginulih vojnika iz Kraljevine Hrvatske i Slavonije* [Central Territorial Committee for Care of Families of Mobilised Soldiers and Fallen Soldiers from the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia] and the *Zemaljski odbor za liječenje i naobrazbu hrvatsko-slavonskih ratnih invalida* [Territorial Committee for Medical Treatment and Education of Croatian and Slavonian War Invalids], of which Đuro Basariček was editor-in-chief (cf. Lasić 1982:135). According to the attribution in its sub-title, the above-mentioned weekly was intended for *those enfeebled by war and for orphans*, and in the same year (on November 8, 1917) it published Krleža's article *Kako stanuje sirotinja u Zagrebu* [How are the poor accommodated in Zagreb?] (Krleža 1977a:403-408). This article prompted Countess Elvira Kulmer to make a gift to the *Most Honoured* of 20 000 crowns (1977a:133).² In this article Krleža used zoo-ontologemes to metaphorize the "raging, wretched, beastly suffering" of thousands of the indigent — "sick beasts" who lived in kitchen-shanties (1977a:404). Krleža concluded his article with a prophetic warning that the time had come "to heed the moans of those sick and hungry thousands" (1977a:408), *Those who do not have the right to their own truth*.

² "That, Madame Countess, is really "touching", but to "touch" the heart of a Radivoj H. (Radivoj Hafner, S. M.'s note) is already somewhat problematical. He has bought Kalinovica and Kerestinec, put to work an entire group of English racehorse trainers (prisoners of war), his English horses are winning in Vienna and Pest, and the entire Vienna band of generals dines at his home" (Krleža 1977a:133). In his diary entry of February 12, 1918, as the symbol of famous men *of our time* (1977a:56) Krleža takes Radivoj Hafner, a Karlovac butcher, "who creates History for the immortal pages of the Golden Book of the Croatian Nation."

Krleža's second article about the poor — *Narod koji gladuje* [The Starving Nation] — was to have appeared in *Hrvatska njiva* [Tilled Croatian Field] (1977a:409-413),³ and dealt with the theme of deeply moving examples of survival strategies among the Herzegovinians who, struggling with the needs of their own *starving bodies*, were forced to eat sorghum (1977a:133). Krleža framed the beginning and end of the article with the perlocutory admonition like the testament of *Those* who are dying of hunger — "Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Lika, the Littoral and Istria are starving to death!" (1977a:409, 413), which he directs as a corrective ethical slap in the face to the *ethos* of feigned human(itarian)ism of the Zagreb "aviation-minded intelligentsia" (1977a:410), thus revealing (*larvatus prodeo*) the capital of the Tripartite Kingdom to be a *monstrous Potemkin village* (1977a:409). In contrast to the sociological analyses of that time whose human(itarian)e strategy satisfied itself with asking *questions* about sociological schemes (cf. 1977a:117), Krleža's voice was raised as that of conscience and existential alliance with the impoverished *behind the scenes of war*, imperatively demanding human(itarian)e action from the moral perspective of *now*, *at this very moment* (cf. 1977a:410). For: "(...) when the cows in Herzegovina had already grazed on all the straw eaves as far as they could reach, our people decided to try the taste of all the *behaerarske* [or *B-H-country* (Bosnian-Herzegovinian)] brooms" (1977a:123). In these newspaper articles⁴ Krleža subverts by the mytheme of the white city of Zagreb — *oh terribly white city of Zagreb* (1977a:404) — its *burgher* indifferent ethic "So, what! Everything will be alright!" (1977a:410). The depth and sincerity of his feelings for the victims *behind the scenes of war* is shown by the fact he once again made current the issue of World War I

³ J. Splivalo-Rusan (*Krležijana* 2, in print) notes that the article "was to have been published in *Hrvatska njiva*, 1917, 39. The censors prevented the printing of the article when the newspaper was already at the printers and had been type-set, so a blank white space appeared in its place, and the annual contents of *Hrvatska njiva* listed: "Miroslav Krleža: Confiscated (...) In the atmosphere of October [the Russian Revolution] messages articulated in this way were understood as a call to revolt, so for that reason they invoked the reaction of the censors."

⁴ Viktor Žmegač mentioned that it was sufficient to compare *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918* with the two newspaper articles mentioned — Krleža added the articles in the Supplement to *Bygone Days* — "which contain exactly the same material, only in a more conventional journalistic structure. These are, in fact, variants of the intentional text, which may be supposed" (1988:43).

human(itarian)e cynicism in his memoirist entry *Iza kulisa godine 1918*⁵ [Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918], counterpointing the discourse of the families of mobilised soldiers and of those killed with the discourse on the *cynicism of power in government* (cf. Sloterdijk 1992a) of the *Gentleman Boss* Đuro Basariček, for whom all people "who do not believe in Stipe (Stjepan Radić, S. M.) — are futurists" (Krleža 1977:291). By speaking about *cynicism* Krleža enters *the old edifice of ideological criticism* through a new door (cf. Sloterdijk 1992a:19). The current mentality of the hierarchy of the clerical humanitarian consciousness, in front of whose doors stood *They* who were located *radically below*, lead him to consideration of the phenomenon of cynicism. The edifice of ideology is populated with the peaks of State consciousness, while the clerical Hermes consciousness is their legislature.

Krleža legitimised the documentary nature of his own testimony about the cynicism of human(itarian)ism *behind the scenes of war* by interpolation of the life stories of "ordinary people". Life on the home-front, behind the scenes of war was reduced for the families of the "legendary heroes" to *survival tactics* and depended on the decision of representatives of the *Imperial and territorial* governments whose authority rested on juggling with existing resources. And while the propagators of the war-time *theatrum mundi* churned out belligerent and saintly slogans about the heroic *ascensus* on the battlefield, on the ascent through heroic exploits to the domain of "legendary heroes", they tried at the same time to conceal the *descensus* of their families, the descent of *death into life*. In the manner of an anthropologist and micro-historian Krleža observes the individual cases of the *life of horror* and creates a picture of the entirety behind the 1918 war-time scenes. Witnessing to the *everyday life* of the World War I "home front" which had become extraordinary, *non-everyday*, dislocated, equal to a life of *horror*, brought Krleža face-to-face with a poetical and ethical dilemma, and he wrote about the same cases in his journalistic notes and diary-memoirist entries, and transposed their historiographic material into his literary discourse.

The way in which he tried to solve the relationship between the macro-historical and the micro-historical approach to history still intrigues historians today. Krleža confronts the macro-historical

⁵ Krleža introduced *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918* (Republika, 1967, 7-8) into the second edition of *Bygone Days*.

dimensions of history, which concentrate on the social structure of power and processes, and the individual dimensions of history which articulate the individual human actions of *Those* standing outside the doors of state institutions for whom *kynicism* (cf. Sloterdijk 1992a) represents the most frequent form of the attitude toward the *cynicism of power*. Still to come is research into Krleža's diary-memoirist entries with the aim of denoting Krleža as a pleader for *history from below*, which would indicate the *subversive aura* (cf. Sharpe 1996:38) of micro-history in relation to the corrective pedagogical imperative⁶ mainstream of Croatian political historiography.

By micro-contextualisation of the fourth year of war (1917) and its *backdrops* on the outskirts of Zagreb where the poor lived, Krleža "drew women into history" (cf. Gross 1994:19), women who "suffer in a terrible silence!" (Krleža 1977a:405). Silence has been the discourse of despair *in absentia* of all suffering righteous people from the time of the Old Testament exemplum of Job's silence, which designates the passage through all suffering.

And there are women whose children are mentally retarded, and women who in desperation have drunk all they owned, and women who only cry, and women who become enraged and beat their children's spines, and women who do nothing but wait in some sort of Asiatic impotence for something which must be coming (Krleža 1977a:407).

The case of Barbara (Barica) Bogović who "for the eighth time already is appealing to the Glorious Community Authority to raise her state assistance from 63 to at least 90 filirs a day, because she simply cannot support her two children, her parents (her mother and father), and finally herself, with 63 filirs, when half a kilo of flour cost 10 forints", from the aspect of humanitarian cynicism cannot be decided in her favour "because it has to be checked whether her husband, the infantryman Mija Bogović, really did fall on the legendary 'field of glory' or not, and as pensions are not being paid for soldiers missing in action until the end of the war, the question remains open as to what to do with Barica Bogović". The cynicism of "the letter of the Law" in the sense of the then-current legal provisions according to which pensions were not

⁶ Ian Hunter's term *the corrective pedagogical imperative* (cf. Biti 1994:197) is applied to *mainstream* legitimate historiography in cases in which the individual historiographic codes are pedagogically *tamed*.

paid out until the end of the war for missing soldiers concealed the actual truth: the State "does not have funds foreseen for this purpose" (Krleža 1977a:109).

And as History always *nonetheless* (*Eppur*) repeats itself — *and everything remains the same and the World still turns* (Krleža 1919:101; S. M.'s Italics) — so today, too, "care for the wounded and the those fallen ill"⁷ is obviously analogous historically and morphologically, in the meaning of the morphological periodisation of Oswald Spengler, through individual *gestures* of the *Gentleman Doctor* Đuro Basariček, for whom every person who "wants any application whatsoever to be decided upon in a period of twenty-four hours is a 'pseudo-futurist'" (Krleža 1977a:110).

Krleža sets in opposition the application submitted by the wife of Daniel Klivanich for her prescribed pension as the widow of a prisoner of war and the cynicism of the community authorities who advise "that the wife of Daniel Klivanich is a fundamentally suspicious person politically, that she has been sentenced because of her frivolous life, that she reviles the state authorities whenever she gets the chance, albeit when intoxicated, but since no-one has ever seen her sober, that means, so to say, that the hag curses the state authority twenty-four hours a day".⁸ The cynicism of Daniel Klivanich's wife, a woman whose identity is attributed by her marital state, a woman whose own name is taken away from her in the bureaucratic reply, reveals in her response to the "Most Honoured Addressee" the mechanism of the faulty consciousness of *the ruling*,

⁷ Taken from the title of an open letter (an epistle of *unhappy consciousness*) from members of the *Klub veterana invalida Domovinskog rata* [Club of Disabled Veterans of the Homeland War] and the *Klub branitelja liječenih od posttraumatskog stresnog poremećaja* [Club of Defenders Treated for Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome] sent to Mr. Marinko Liović, President of HVIDR (Croatian Disabled Veterans of the Homeland War) "in connection with the process of revision of military invalids of the Homeland War and the status of members of the HVIDR League who became disabled through illness", because, among other things, the strategies of human(itarian)ism of the powers-that-be is questionable — I would suggest that you read the letter in question — "the entire process of revision was carried out in a *witch-hunt* atmosphere, in which cases were solved by perusal of the medical documentation, often superficially, and that *the invalids themselves were not called before* the Revision Committee *so that many of them were penalised*" (*Večernji list*, Year XLII, Issue No. 12344, Saturday, Zagreb, January 31, 1998, p. 60; S. M.'s Italics).

⁸ See *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918* for remaining examples of applications and the "care" strategy.

enlightened authorities which rests on the decisions of individual *clerical* consciousness.

(...) *what's the sense in me accusing the clerk of being a crook, that's true enough, but one can assume that he is not the State, if our highest authorities have more faith in Ferdo Veselič, a crook and an outsider, than in her, then we have sunk to čiganske grane [the level of Gypsies] and our ultimate end cannot be far away* (Krleža 1977a:113).⁹

Krleža uncovers the dichotomy between the national stories-myths as a unanimous discourse in which "those out there [abroad]" are doing battle "as our legendary heroes" (1977a:109) and the polyphony of the oral testimonies of *Those* who have no right to learn the *Truth* about the war. He sees the two as "the possession of historical truth with two differing modes of its expression in words — the monologues opposed to the dialogue" (Jambrešić 1995:27). He gives the floor to *Those who have lost faith in the power of giving testimony*, and seek for the *kynical physiognomy* as the only remaining, and sometimes auto-destructive, response to the cynical performative decisions of *Those* in power. As an example of the *psychosomatic spirit of the time* (cf. Sloterdijk 1992a:145-146), Krleža emphasizes the "pee-pee" physiognomy which was implemented in the letter from Đukić's wife Marica as a reply to "His Majesty". This example of "existential anti-politics" (Sloterdijk 1992a:173) was realised as a dangerous and auto-destructive *kynical offensive* of the *political animal*.

An enquiry was conducted: Đukić's wife Marica, née Tomac, *wrote a letter in red ink to His Majesty the King-Emperor* through the Red Cross in Zagreb, *in the name of four thousand similar families applying for support*, and already waiting for a decision for two years, that she, may the Red Cross forgive her, *makes pee-pee on His Majesty's head*, and when she dared to write that and sign it as a self-styled mandatory, *and that in red ink*, it seems that an exemplary penalty would be completely justified (Krleža 1977a:115, S. M.'s Italics).

The physiognomical language whose repertoire is largely taken from folk tradition, is the sole common factor of the *kynicism* of the victims and the *cynicism* of the authorities, so that the *Gentleman Boss* Đuro Basariček

⁹ Krleža quotes the mentioned application. Working in Šilović's Bureau, he had access to the applications of *Those* who were condemned to the *strategy of survival*.

arrogantly replies in direct contact with his clients with the cynical physiognomics of the "arse-hole".¹⁰

Agitated voices from the *Gentleman Boss's* room: 'Go to the Governor, go to the superintendent, kiss me Father, you know where, but not even Franz Joseph nor his late son will return the fallen heroes to this world' (Krleža 1977a:115).

In his search for a *moral bath* which would enable him to negate life which was reduced to a *struggle for survival*, to the "fear of tamed animals who fear the consequences" of revolt "against the discipline of the menagerie" (Krleža 1977a:128), to the diagnosis "Why kill [yourself] when man can kill [others]", Krleža suggests two possibilities for ways out of the life of horror: "to kill oneself like Hieronymus Cardanus or loftily and cold-bloodedly to observe like Leonardo" (1977a:127).¹¹ The first choice is morphologically analogous to Krleža's intersubjective archetype to *preserve the crystal vessel of one's own purity*,¹² within the archetypal dual opposition between the *I* and the *chrono-hyster/historical Other*. On January 3, 1918 he writes in his diary entry that in the dramatic individual shift from cairotic chrono-hysteria as the *sole* person worthy to develop himself there remains "the stormy dramatic clash with everything that exists" (1977a:23).

Krleža identified the *Odysseiad* of the Croatian soldiers and the *Penelopeiad* of their widows, who were well aware that their Ulysses would not be returned wearing a crown of laurel (1977a:132), as the only

¹⁰ Along with Sloterdijk's examples (1992a:153-156) in which the "arse hole" dominates as the elementary kynical organ there is the *counter-example* of its use in the "service" of the cynicism of the powers-that-be.

¹¹ Krleža wrote an essay called *O Paracelzu* [About Paracelzo] about the case of Hieronymus Cardanus, as a case from "the time of Paracelzo", who believed in the reality of his own hallucinations (noted down in the biography *De vita propria*). The ruling cynical consciousness shrunk from the idea of publishing Cardanus's prophecies. "He believed that one great doctor was born in each millennium, and regarded himself as the Seventh from the Creation of the World" (Krleža 1962:52-53). This was followed by an accusation of his being against the Church, while the reality of his hallucinations was accounted for as being the result of the role of the Prince of Darkness. *The diabolisation which comes from above*, from the clergy, grew from their desire to maintain their exclusive hold on the prophetic role, from fear that they lose some of their flock.

¹² "I preserve the crystal vessel of my purity. I carry it in both my hands like a chalice, while I feel how its grows murkier with each passing day. Increasingly insipid filth drops into my purity from day to day and I become turbid and unclean" (Krleža 1977:86).

worthwhile theme for the literature of that period. At the same time, he refuted the poetics and the sense of impressionistic occasionalism of the Rabbi's (A. G. Matoš) *student-scribblers*, "a tapeworm which has crawled as far as our time, right up to Donadini and to Ujević" (1977a:135). He sees his own poetics as the *coniunctio* of the expressionist cacophony of *Kraljevo* (a one-act play written in 1915 as is mentioned in *Bygone Days*) and the *cursed home-guard counterpoint*, as a literature of fact about the "mangy masses of the common man" on their home-guard Calvary, who were the victims of the "frontiersmen cretinism of Slavko Štancer and company" (1977:158), poetics which would mimetise the *arbafterhilfskompanijska* [auxiliary working troops] reality, "our damned eternal Žabno"¹³.

In Šilović's Bureau, Krleža met up with the concept of human(itarian)ism within the framework of which "one hundred and fifty children in Čapljina" could die of hunger. In his diary entry of February 6, 1918 he ironically notes down the results of the meeting of the *Odbor za spas hercegovačke djece of gladi* [Committee for Saving Herzegovinian Children from Hunger], at which Father Dane made a symbolic donation of 10 forints, invoking the "Heart of the Nation" which is set alight "nobly and readily", while the representative of the Roman Catholic Chapter, with an introductory speech in an anti-Semitic tone, donated 5 000 crowns on behalf of His Eminence. The logic of administrative evaluation in Basariček's humanitarian concept allowed for the possibility of the counterpointing of the life of the home-guard war invalid, the country teacher who *was wounded three times* — at a value of 67 crowns a month — against the market value of a cow which stood at 3 000 forints (Krleža 1977a:114).

Krleža allegorically intertextualised psychogenes of this type of human(itarian)ism in the titular psychemic narrative figure appearing in the story called *Veliki meštar sviju hulja* [The Grand Master of All Scoundrels] (published in instalments in *Plamen* magazine in 1919).¹⁴ Contrary to the mentality of the cynical Đuro Basariček who *in the top-*

¹³ *Žabno*, in metaphorical context of a "frog perspective, mentality", has the sociologemic and ontologemic connotations of the Croatia of Krleža's time.

¹⁴ I wrote in my master's thesis *Kontekstualnost Krležinih "Davnih dana"* [The Contextuality of Krleža's "*Bygone Days*"] (University of Zagreb - Faculty of Philosophy, 1997, MS IEF 1619) about the anagogic contextualisation of Krleža's novella *Veliki meštar sviju hulja* [The Grand Master of All Scoundrels].

-down perspective¹⁵ explains "on a daily basis to all hags and war widows that Lenin is in the wrong" (1977:347-348), Krleža speaks out as the voice of conscience which is concerned for the wretched consciousness of the *Odysseiad* of the Croatian soldiers and the *Penelopeiad* of Croatian war widows who are *perishing miserably* (1977a:122) in human suffering. With the publishing of his memoirist entry, *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918* (*Republika*, 1967, 7-8), Krleža once again made current the *Acheron* of the socially deprived, and in so doing implicitly pointed out the corrective pedagogical imperative of *mainstream* Croatian historiography.¹⁶ As a fairly recent example of this type of corrective I quote below the text-book glorification of the *Croatian patriots*, Dr. J. Šilović and Dr. D. Basariček:

(...) In order to help the starving children from the threatened regions not only of Dalmatia and Istria but also from Slovenia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, a drive was set in motion in Banal Croatia to save the children. This drive was managed in Zagreb by the Territorial Committee for Protection of the Families of Mobilised Soldiers, and the Croatian patriots, Dr. Josip Šilović and Dr. Đuro Basariček were particularly prominent in its activities. The children from regions where hunger had taken hold were brought as colonists to fertile parts of the Banal Croatia, where they were taken in by village families who cared for them *as they cared for their very own children*. Between July 1917 and September 1918, 16 394 children were provided for in this manner (Perić 1995:40; Italics S. M.).

¹⁵ Cf. Paul Stubbs's criticism of the discourse of "humanitarian aid" and "psycho-social support" during the Homeland War. "(...) both discourses are "top-down" in the sense that they involve things being done to people by people who know best" (1996:34).

¹⁶ We find an example of the historical pedagogical imperative about the humanitarian roles of Đuro Basariček and Josip Šilović in the book *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati 925-1925*. [Famous and Meritorious Croats 925-1925]. It is significant that the title itself already indicates the history of famous men making a subjective assessment of Basariček's and Šilović's charity activity.

"(...) Intensively (Đ. Basariček, S. M.'s note) dedicated himself to charity work in the *Savez dobrotvornih društava* [League of Charitable Associations], where as the secretary of the league and editor of the paper *Narodna zaštita* [National Protection] he gained much credit for his work for national social well-being. He was also outstanding as one of the leaders of the Peasants Party. He wrote a large number of national articles on economic and charity issues" (1925:20).

"(...) More recently (J. Šilović, S. M.'s note) has been intensively and practically engaged in saving youth, and he is at the head of many charitable institutions. (...)" (1925:254).

Krleža not only perceived the mechanisms of the historiographic pedagogical corrective but also anticipated the framework of the postmodern discourse on the relativism of history, which raises the question of history as the practice of production of knowledge. In his memoirist entry *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918* from the "four-year retrospective", which comprises the deictic indication that the writings in question *nonetheless* are part of diary and chronological notes from *Bygone Days*, Krleža notes down the autothematic duodrama between the Nazarene and the Pharisee commenting on his own *Legend* (1914), and then says "how it actually should have been written". Referring to Ezekiel's prophecy, the biblical chronotope of *Gethsemane* where Christ's Passion began, the Nazarene postulates the metonymy of the chism between the Eastern and Western Christian churches. Juraj Križanić tries to bring these poles together in peace, while the Pharisee responds to his historiographic positivism about history — meaning only a bloody scheme for sacrifice on the altar of wars of conquest and defence — with arguments near to postmodern relativism according to which history is only the *idée fixe* of weak men of letters (1977a:132).¹⁷

**The subversion of the discourse of (re)mythologisation
of the *Kosovo myth* as the *Yugo-mythus*:
phantoms of the *Vidovdan* (St. Vitus Day) epic/ethic**

Detecting the potential danger from the Yugoslav-Royalist *emerging state*, Krleža demythologised in his diary-memoirist entries, two basic and politically productive props of Yugo-mythology, *the mythic historical matrix* which "feeds" on the mythic revival of the Battle on Kosovo Field (on St. Vitus's Day 1389), and the sublimations of the realised metaphor of the *Kingdom of the Heavenly Emperor Lazar*,¹⁸ and the *folklore*

¹⁷ The Pharisee appears as a supporter of (absolute) relativism. "History, consequently, would not be able to differentiate the truth from the erroneous and the false" (Gross 1996:337), because it is only one of the forms of creating fiction (the narrative nature of history).

¹⁸ After *Vidovdanska etika* [Vidovdan Ethics] (Zagreb, 1914) Miloš Gjurić wrote about *Vidovdan philosophy* in his "literary-philosophical study" *Smrt majke Jugovića* [The Death of the Mother of the Jugovići] (Zagreb, 1918), in which he prefigures the biblical Lazar with Prince Lazar Hrebjanović. "It (Vidovdan philosophy, S. M.'s note) means to give precedence to celestial values rather than earthly values, to submit carnal forces to spiritual forces; it means *the value of male fire and heroic death in order to achieve gigantic resurrection*; the value of individual self-sacrifice for the sake of the better good of the latter collective; *the need for martyrdom for white*

matrix (cf. Žanić 1993) with *Kraljević Marko* [Prince Marko] as the *Superstar* of that time (cf. Žanić 1986:190-224). Krleža unmasked the myth-forming ideologemes of the matrices mentioned which supported the state-forming concept of the Greater Serbian hegemonic programme, which had the aim of shaping and creating the *imagined political community* (cf. Anderson 1994). The trimorphic name of the newly creating Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes proclaimed a state with one nation and three recognised *tribes* which are regarded as nations, in which the Macedonians and Montenegrins were not given the right to a *tribal* and *national* name, but were considered to be Serbs, while the Bosnian Muslims were *tribally* treated as Croats or Serbs of the Islamic faith (cf. Čubelić-Pavličević 1985:44). This traditional Serbian state-forming concept of the renewal of *Dušan's Empire* now served the Yugoslav royalists as an *ethnomyth* (cf. Čolović 1997) so as to implement the idea of the Kingdom of United *Tribes* with its epicentre in Serbia as *Piemonte*.

As a *cultural and historical document* and example of expository historiography, Krleža wrote his chronicle essayist text *Stiže pramaljeće godine 1922. Po kalendarskom zapisu iz iste godine* [The Spring of 1922 is Arriving. Based on diary notes in the same year] (1977a:355-367), in which he detects how the royal line of the Karadorđević family, or, more precisely, the Greater Serbian hegemony of Alexandre I, was entrenching itself as the neomythic prefiguration of the *Kingdom of the Heavenly Emperor Lazar*, and in this was paradoxically surviving after World War I after which other royal dynasties were dying out.¹⁹ Parallely, he uncovered the role of the *sexual* policy of the dynastic kingdom, which he designated with the metonymy *Carnival-Wedding*, and speaks of the nuptials of Alexandre I and the Romanian Princess Maria who was from the house of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, and, in so doing, unmasks the myth-forming role of historiography which saw its role in the justification of royal sexual politics. He cited part of the article, *Rodbinske sveze naše buduće kraljice sa Zrinskim i Frankopanima* [The Kinship Connections

dawns which descendants will turn red; the beauty of working, the fertility of the sacrifice and the sound thinking for the sake of roses which will bloom for later generations" (Gjuric 1918:88; S. M.'s Italics).

¹⁹ "The First World War brought the age of high dynasticism to an end. By 1922, Habsburgs, Hohenzollerns, Romanovs and Ottomans were gone. (...) From this time on, the legitimate international norm was the nation-state, so that in the League even the surviving imperial powers came dressed in national costume rather than imperial uniform" (Anderson 1994:113).

of Our Future Queen with the Zrinskis and the Frankopans] by "the well-known Croatian scholar of history and heraldry, head of the Royal State Archives"²⁰ Ivan von Bojničić of Knin, who mentioned "how the exalted Princess, our royal Fiancée and future Queen has direct genealogical connections with the Zrinskis and the Frankopans" (1977a:355). The marriage of the Romanian Princess Maria and Alexandre I also came about as a *marital-bed* charter of the *Petit Entente* (the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Czechoslovakia and Romania). When Alexandre Karadorđević came to the throne and with the creation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes the constitutional and parliamentary rule of King Peter I — about whose reign Krleža said that it was "progressively democratic, and even republican", which is supported by the King's translation of John Stuart Mill's *On Freedom* (1977a:363) — was transposed into Greater Serbian unitarianism.

In his article *Prividenja*²¹ [Illusions], Krleža mentioned the phantasmagoric *Trinity* of the Yugo-mythological Pantheon: Lazar (the synecdoche of Serbian Christian Orthodoxy); Miloš (the synecdoche of Serbian heroism); and, Marko (the synecdoche of the Yugoslavian *Superstar*), whose mythic irrationality was an inherent threat that the political idea of *Yugoslavianism* would be realised (1977a:417). He also points out the paradoxical nature of their role in oral literary epic poetry stemming from the opposition between historical memory (*historia rerum gestarum*) and folk memory (oral tradition):

It is significant that our people through the words of those unnamed blind *gusle*-players expressed Lazar's mighty crisis, the crisis of all enlighteners, the crisis of light and darkness in one sole poem of forty verses, while they merely outlined Miloš's act, but sang their

²⁰ Krleža gives the full text in *Bygone Days* (1977a:448-451) of the article by Ivan von Bojničić of Knin *The Kinship Connections of Our Future Queen with the Zrinskis and the Frankopans* (*Jutarnji list*, January 22, 1922, No. 3585, p. 5) and the article *The Genealogy of the Future Yugoslavian Queen* (*Jutarnji list*, January 15, 1922, No. 3578, p. 7).

Krleža mentions (1977a:356) that Bojničić's "the Princess's Genealogy" appeared in print on January 20, 1922 on the "Day of Saint Sebastian, a Roman cavalry general, who, as is known from the world of paintings, was sentenced by our countryman, the Emperor Diocletian from Split, to be shot full of arrows" and was published in *Jutarnji list* on January 22, 1922 (as is mentioned in the Newspaper Attachments to *Bygone Days*).

²¹ Krleža included the article in the Supplement to *Bygone Days* [*Obzor*, LVIII/1918 (March 21), No. 64, p. 2 (Krleža 1977a:417-422)].

odes to Marko in poems which were both fervent and endless (Krleža 1977a:417).²²

Through the poetical/ethical fact that *Miloš's gesture* is only "outlined" in epic poetry, although he was the knight who killed Sultan Murat on Kosovo Field, and whose hand, encased in silver, was hung on Murat's grave near Banja Brusa (Mavro Orbin(i), *Il Regno degli Slavi*, 1601, quoted from Mihaljčić 1984:354) Krleža subverted the legitimacy of its ethical and historical authenticity. Apart from the abyss between the historical and folk memory in the case of Miloš's gesture, Krleža points out the paradoxical clash between his place in the Yugo-mythological Pantheon and his significance in the epic poems of the Kosovo Polje cycle. And while Miloš was allocated a role within the *Trinity* of national heroes, folk memory did not poeticise his gesture in a separate cycle of oral epic poems.

It was really surprising to Krleža that the attributes of Prince Marko (Vukašinović) — who openly aided Murat, and the Turks who crossed his territory around Prilep in western Macedonia and made unhindered incursions into neighbouring lands (cf. Mihaljčić 1984:319, 305-306) — were altered in folk memory into the traits of an *exemplary* hero and *celebrated man*, thus making him the best known hero sung about with the most love in oral literary epics. Stepping outside the national borders of his Prilep, he was awarded the most outstanding role in the *Trinity* of the *supranationalistic* Pantheon of the *Yugo-mythus*.²³ In his diary entry of November 19, 1917 Krleža designates the *folklore matrix* with Marko Kraljević *Superstar* at its epicentre as the *synecdoche* of the *demonic (earthly)* Balkan mentality.²⁴

²² In 1912, when the finale of the struggle for liberation from the Ottoman Empire was in progress at Kumanovo, under *collective psychosis*, "an entire Serbian brigade saw [Prince] Marko Kraljević leading the assault on the city of Prilep, which had belonged to this national hero so many centuries earlier: (...)" (Eliade 1972:269).

²³ However, for the very reason that he transcended national borders, Prince Marko could not embody the Serbian nation in the *Serbian ethnonational Pantheon*. And instead of the *Trinity* on which the *Yugo-mythus* was founded — Lazar, Miloš and Marko — the Serbian ethnonationalist Pantheon established a new iconic *Trinity* — Saint Sava, Emperor Lazar and Miloš Obilić (cf. Čolović 1997:60-61).

²⁴ See Rihtman-Augustin on Krleža's anthropology of Balkan characters and mentality, based on the example of *Zastave* [Flags]. In an aphoristic entry, *Jugomesijanizam* [Yugo-Messianism], which appeared in a collection of aphorisms called *Mnogo pa ništa* [A Lot — But Nothing], Krleža's note for May 19, 1916 published in *Bygone Days* paraphrases Stirner: »*Ich habe meine Sache auf Nichts gestellt*« (1977:169), and he

Marko is some sort of neo-pro-Hungarian, a follower of Count Tisza István. He has a suite at the "English Queen" in Budapest. An eternal compromiser. A drunk. A rake. *Regierungsfahig*, an exporter, cynic. He couldn't give a damn. In any case, Marko is a doctor of laws, a people's deputy, an advocate, a department head *in spe*, and possibly a future minister. That's what's called the *demonic, the earthly in Marko*. (...) *Wherever Marko goes, sevđalinka songs resound, Gypsies play, bottles are broken, the lamps are turned down in taverns, Marko is carousing. Marko is a bridegroom for the thirty-third time, Marko is feasting and Marko is waging war*, Marko has good social connections, all solely first-class Pest and Vienna telephone numbers. A few Hungarian blue-blooded aristocrats and a few archimandrites at the wedding of a drunken vagabond, that is the motif of our thoroughbred ballet which if shown on the stage would at that very moment become high treason against everything which in our Yugo-variant is believed in as ideal (Krleža 1977:334-335; Italics S. M.).²⁵

Krleža's diary entry on December 20, 1917 universalises the stereotype of Balkan mentality as the cairotic component of world history of the occurrence of bloody, military celebrations, placing Prince Marko as its synecdoche which is "as ubiquitous as the tetanus bacillus", and "permanently drunk", and, as such, "lives on all the world's latitudes and longitudes", and "is in no way a Yugo-specific" (1977:360). The year in which World War I commenced, which was also the year in which Krleža started *Bygone Days*, was designated by Krleža with its key zoo-metaphor of man as "a monkey" which always nibbles its own tail, because at the moment when it learns to fly, *it throws bombs with poison gas on other monkeys* (1977a:21). This is Krleža's metaphoric transformation of the alchemical mandala of the *ouroboros*, "the tail-eater" — *serpens* or *draco* which, starting from their tails, devour themselves — the symbol for "cyclical-aeonic" time, for ideal Eternity, for the eternal Aeon, by which

attributes the warrior ethic of the Yugo-messianic discourse to the *Vengeful Rage of Prince Marko* (1977:183).

²⁵ See Trifunović (1986:219) on the *primitive glorification* of the Kosovo Myth in the world of the "spiritually primitive" Socialist Republic of Serbia (and the SFR of Yugoslavia): "The Vidovdan ideology disintegrated before the onslaught of the Partisan brigades although the Kosovo legend did not disappear with it. In the deep inertia of society towards the Serbian national past and the official ban on it, it fell into the hands of [those whose] mentality sees in Serbia's past the possibility for *srbovanje* [playing the Great Serb] in a primitive way fitting for the tavern, to *tamburitza-music, meat off the charcoal grill and broken glasses*" (S. M.'s Italics).

he presents his own philosophical conception of history as an eternal recurrence of the Same Human Stupidity.

Again in his article *Illusions*, Krleža alludes to the domestic variant of the egalitarian ethics of political liberalism (cf. Stirner 1976) and zoo-metaphoric statements about anthropo-gregariousness; "The flock never speaks about itself, because each individual in the flock has the characteristics of zero, while the size of a number is borne by its first digit. And that is why all the zeroes in the flock always try to elevate the first digit as high as they possibly can. In that way, their value also rises" (1977a:418). He directs criticism at the *myth-making* role of the artistic discourse of the Croatian Yugo-integrationists, Ivan Meštrović and Vladimir Nazor, as "our first two torchbearers" in the *Yugoslavian Parnassus* (1977a:419). Sarcastically attributing the syntagm "a decasyllabic in plaster" to Meštrović's wooden *Model of the Vidovdan Temple* (1907-1912),²⁶ Krleža interpreted it as a myth-making combination of Miloš and Prince Marko joined "in one figure", which gives birth to the image of "a defiant, contemplative, tough warrior" (1977a:417). He also drew attention to Meštrović's ideological shift from the "combined issue of Miloš and Marko" to the figure of Lazar in which he "seeks the solution and creates Christ" (1977a:419), which favoured the Serbian variant of the *Yugo-mythus*. In *Behind the Scenes in the Year 1918*, Krleža subverts the poetic and ethical shift from impressionistic occasionalism towards the idealistic aesthetic of the *cult of national energy* in the artistic discourse of the Croatian Yugo-integrationists. Autothematically drawing from his own literature of fact in *Hrvatska rapsodija* [Croatian Rhapsody] (1917), by which he documented "the damnation of our eternal Žabno", Krleža subverts Meštrović's folklore mythomania with Prince Marko as its epicentre:

They used to copy texts from A. G. M. [Matoš], while today they rave about the "Yugo-mythus" (the transition from Matoš's aestheticism to the idealistic aesthetic of the *cult of national energy*, S. M.), and that on the theme of Ivan Meštrović and his Prince Marko (*Croatian Rhapsody*). If a symbol exists for this half-drunk *Tartuffism* of ours, it is this neo-Mycenaean idiot on Meštrović's horse, a bully, and then, when he becomes the *ferry-*

²⁶ Wanting to distance himself from the politically *Radical Other* (Austro-Hungary) at the International Art Exhibition in Rome in 1911, Ivan Meštrović exhibited in the Kingdom of Serbia's pavilion fragments of the *Vidovdan Cycle* which included the horseman sculpture of Prince Marko (cf. Gago 1987; Meštrović 1969:16-19).

-man one day, he will collect tribute in the Vilayet [after-life],
because there is nothing more brutal than members of the masses
who affect the gentleman! (Krleža 1977a:131).

He carries out the subversion of Nator's *Messianism* on the example of the poem *Pravi glas* [The Right Voice],²⁷ with the amplification of how Meštrović's and Nator's art is shown from the position of the art-for-art's-sake *poetic I*, not admitting "that the People with their characteristics, are the — *I* problem!" (1977a:422).²⁸ The "thoroughbred, anarcho-individual, idealistic aesthetics" by which Krleža qualifies the artistic discourse of the *Yugo-mythus*, which has at its centre the allegory of the white marble Myth-Temple,²⁹ transformed Bergson's *élan vital* into the futuristic *activistic élan of the will* and the *cult of force* (cf. Vučković 1979:60-63). This is myth-forming poetics which renewed itself on *purebred* literary tradition and thus offered cause for shrinking from documentary poetics which would use artistic words to bear witness to the life of horror of the *vulgus profanum*. Krleža meta-descriptively parodied his comments on this chasm between poetics and ideology, using the patriotic and tendentious poetics of August Šenoa and Ibsen's political range which revolutionised *only* Man as an individual in resistance to the *pillars of society*.

²⁷ Nator's poem *Pravi glas* [The Right Voice] was published in a collection called *Pjesme u šikari, iz močvare i nad usjevima* (1915-1920) [Poems in the Underbrush, From the Swamp and Above the Crops (1915/1920)], Zagreb 1931. Krleža took this poem as an example of a poem of time (*Zeitgedichte*) in which the "egotism" of the *Poetical I* is manifested, the hush of a voice "which burns like guilt or shame"; but that muffled hush is realised in the sounds of "the poem of my soul".

²⁸ In his diary entry of November 19, 1917 Krleža opposes the art of the purebred *Yugo-mythus* and the *literature of fact* through the micro-history of Jana Komušar, the widow of a fallen soldier, "who is dying of tuberculosis and is asking the *National Protection* organisation to bury her at the expense of the state, because she does not have the money for her own funeral" (1977:334-335). Krleža noted down the case of Jana Komušar in his diary entry of *November 15, 1917 at five-thirty in the afternoon* in which he muses on the need to write his novella *Domobran Jambrek* [Jambrek the Homeguardsman] (*Kritika*, 1921, 5) for "the boards" [the theatre]. "*Jana Komušar, and Cafuk and Jambrek the homeguardsmen, are entitled to their own poets. By the same principle that Phaedra, Cassandra, El Cid or Roland are. These people here all lament for our motifs, but when you write Cadavers for them, then they are disgusted [and say] that is not "about us"* (1977:315; S. M.'s Italics).

²⁹ (...) in connection with his exhibition dedicated to the *Vidovdan Temple* (in 1915), he gave a lecture in which he designated his work as a 'temple to the religion of ultimate sacrifice, the religion of Emperor Lazar'" (Jovičić, Petrović, Jovičić 1988:588).

Oh, be your own man (Šenoa), you are strongest when you are alone (Ibsen), consequently, to be your own man and be strong, be alone, that is fight for the people "on the crag of loneliness", *in your clean purebred ecumenical purity*, in such a way that you vote for Count Tisza's 1918 war-time budget, because that is the only way you can remain a national aristocrat and royalist, if you hate the profane crowd, because the *vulgus profanum* means socialism, *while our people have chosen the spiritual, rather than the corporal empire* (Krleža 1977:409-410; Italics S. M.).

Artists who subordinated poetic ideals to the ideological promotion of the ideas of the *Yugo-mythus* and used the mythical and historical matrix about the *Heavenly Kingdom of Emperor Lazar* were exemplary for the ideals of the national prophets, the Messianic ideologists, the *mythomoteurs*³⁰ of the official nationalism of the Yugo-Royalist State. During the period of the implementation of the *imagined* tripartite national community, the mythic historical matrix showed itself as the *legitimisation of the system* (Žanić 1993:60) by which the ethno-myth of *Piemonte Serbia* was evoked. The artistic discourse connected with Meštrović's wooden *Model of the Vidovdan Temple*, Vojnović's play *Smrt majke Jugovića* [The Death of Mother of the Jugovići] (1907), which he augmented by new verse dedicated to the "Serbian Army of liberators", and *Lazarovo vaskrsenje* [Lazar's Resurrection] (1913), the *titanistic glorification* of the Superman in Čerina's experience of Vladimir Nazor as "*the Poet of our tomorrows*"³¹ (re)mythologised the mythic and historical matrix of the *Kosovo Battle* in such a way that it stressed primarily the warrior ethics of the Messianistic *Yugo-mythus*.³² The *Messianistic discourse* which requires a *religious matrix* superstructure (cf. Žanić 1993), with which Ivan Meštrović "infected" the Balkan *Judea* (cf. Krleža 1977:367), is effective in setting in motion the nation-*phantom* towards the mechanism of sacrifice — because departure to voluntary

³⁰ "(...) the keepers of the ideas of a community, the mythomoteurs as Anthony Smith calls them" (cf. A. D. Smith: *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1986) (Katunarić 1994:22).

³¹ Čerina ends his program article *The Poet of Our Tomorrows* (*Savremenik*, 1914, 6-7) with an ethnocentric vision: "After Ivan Meštrović, here we have yet another great artist from our Nation with whom old debt to Humanity should be repaid and the Slavensisation and Yugoslavensisation of Europe should begin!" (Čerina 1977:487).

³² Maja Bošković-Stulli (1984) takes the example of Krleža and examines the author's subversion of the ideological interpretation of the *Kosovo mytho-psychologemes* and the cult of decasyllabic lyricism.

death in *The Name of the Nation*, confers on the powers-that-be the saintly metaphysical dimension of resurrection *in death*. In his diary entry of July 24, 1917 Krleža gave an ironic diagnosis of the illusion of the Vidovdan phantoms (cf. Krleža 1977:181, an aphoristic entry *Vidovdanski fantomi* [The Vidovdan phantoms]):

They are shooting at Nevski, and we have Ivan Meštrović as comfort with his Mycaenean steed in my carriage for Kapela Batrina. We have our Prophet (of Vidovdan) to face the Anglo-Saxon elite, our future is safe. Ivan Meštrović is taking care of the cares of our national future (Krleža 1977:263).

Krleža's descriptions of the mytho-political and Messianistic components in the works by Croatian Yugo-integrationists show that what is in question is a hybrid synthesis of *romantic nationalism* as conceived by Vladimir Lunaček who "thinks that spinning wheels and weaving looms and national costumes belong among our national 'Eternal Values'", while "he is at the same time convinced that he is a cosmopolitan" (1977:182); and the *cultured, intellectual nationalism* (cf. Gjurgjan 1995:60) "the Renan, bourgeois, legitimistic formula: 'A society needs a Government which originates in the distant past, from the supernatural beyond-the-grave distance...'" (Krleža 1977:404). In his diary entry *Početak oktobra 1917* [At the Beginning of October 1917] Krleža reveals the (re)mythologisation of the *Kosovo myth* as the *Yugo-mythus* to be a religious matrix put in place by Serbian Christian Orthodoxy, giving it the role of political and religious homogenisation of the *Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian tribes*, while "the Lazar symbolic (dying for the Kingdom of Heaven)" of *our supernatural ethical balms* (1977:277) favoured the mythomoteurs of official nationalism:

The sweet Orthodox candy-water around our intellectual pulpits as the sole romantic solace that we have *nevertheless in spite of non-heroic times*³³ — *raised to the heavens* Tresić Pavičić³⁴ or Niko Bartulović³⁵ or I. Vojnović (Krleža 1977:277; S. M.'s Italics).

³³ In 1910 in Zagreb Ivan Meštrović together with Mirko Rački exhibited for the first time his *Vidovdanski ciklus* [Vidovdan Cycle], at the *Nejunakom vremenu u prkos* [In Spite of Non-Heroic Times] exhibition.

³⁴ Ante Tresić Pavičić had in 1913 published a collection of verse called *Tko ne dođe na boj na Kosovo* [Whoever Fails To Appear at the Kosovo Battle] with a reference from the *Kneževa kletva* [Prince's Curse] as its title.

The *Kosovo myth* transformed into the *Vidovdan cult* when the Serbian Army was defeated in the war against the Turks in 1876, and later again in 1877,³⁶ having "set out [with the pretext, S.M.'s note] to liberate Bosnia and Kosovo" (Ćorović 1924:93). The *Kosovo myth* inoculated with the *Vidovdan cult* became the "warrior myth of a warrior tribe, finally, in its ultimate distorted forms, transformed into a war cry of war-like tribal chieftains" (Mišić 1987:205).³⁷ With the political objective of penetrating towards the south and conquering Kosovo, the *Vidovdan cult* from the 1876-1877-1878 (Berlin Congress) period until 1912 (the Battle of Kumanovo), acquired the meaning of Serbian revenge "arousing warlike instincts and igniting primordial hatred" "towards everything which was Turkish, and Muslim" (Popović 1976:128, 130).³⁸ During that period Meštrović's wooden *Model of the Vidovdan Temple* appeared as an authentic artistic visualised concept of the *Kosovo myth* with the political sub-text of the royalist *Yugo-mythus*.³⁹ A new factor in the metamorphosis of this myth appeared in 1912, after the Battle of Kumanovo, when it became "a state-building myth of a state-forming (*imagined*, S. M.'s note) nation, to transform into the hegemonistic programme of one class" (Mišić 1987:205). The materialisation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was inoculated with monarchist ideology by this myth, and the Orthodox celebration of the *Vidovdan myth* was then imposed (cf. Maroević 1982:129).

Cf. Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, *Srpske narodne pjesme* [Serbian Folk Poems], Vol. II, Belgrade 1932., No. 49. *Komadi od razliĉnijeh K(k)osovskih pjesama*. [Fragments from Various Kosovo Poems].

³⁵ *Književni jug* [The Literary South], the literary bulletin of Yugoslavian nationalist youth, began publication in 1918, under the editorship of Branko Mašić and Niko Bartulović.

³⁶ After the defeat of the Ottomans near Vienna in 1683 which was the beginning of Turkish withdrawal, the *Kosovo legend* developed into the *Vidovdan ideology*, in which the (apocryphal) *betrayal motif* (betrayal by Vuk Branković) became increasingly evident as the time of the wars of national liberation approached (cf. Mihaljević 1984:322-323).

³⁷ "Earlier, in the era of the Romanticists, the *Kosovo myth*, as it had been in folk poetry, was enrolled in the service of the national-liberation concept" (Popović 1976:129).

³⁸ After the Battle of Kumanovo, *Vidovdan* (St. Vitus's Day) entered in 1914 the calendar of the Kingdom of Serbia "as one of the main ancient holidays which is officially celebrated every year" (Popović 1976:122).

³⁹ I wrote in *Zor* magazine (cf. Marjanic 1996) about Krleža's finding (*larvatus prodeo*) attributes of the Viennese Secession [Art Nouveau] style trend from Metzner's statues for the *Battle of the Nation* monument in Leipzig and Bourdelle's sculptures in Meštrović's *Myth-Temple* (1906-1913).

In an imaginary polemical dialogue realised as a duodrama, noted down in the diary entry of November 16, 1917 in which Krleža is accused by an unnamed antithetical voice for making a mockery of all the symbols of "our national Myth" (1977:324), Krleža subverts the ideologisation of mythology and the mythologisation of ideology on the example of the mythical and historical matrix of the *Heavenly Kingdom of Emperor Lazar*, which is anticlerical "when the Latin saints are in question" while "we have to light wax candles for the Greek saints" (1977:326). Krleža opens up the *taboo-theme* within the *Kosovo myth* through the subversion of the *decasyllabic myth* — reminding us of the historical role of Lazar's consort Milica who saw the sole possible way out of the consequences of the Kosovo Battle in submitting to a vassal relationship with the Ottomans, and, on the advice of the Patriarch, giving her youngest daughter Olivera in marriage to Sultan Bayazit — and the *taboo-theme of the myth of betrayal* which was historically and *apocryphically* first linked by Mavro Orbin(i) with Lazar's son-in-law, Vuk Branković (cf. Mihaljčić 1984:284, 304-305). The mytheme of betrayal in the *cult* of the Vidovdan phantom acquires the synecdoche of national homogenisation, because the *new* betrayal by a *new* Vuk Branković would call into question the materialisation of the *tribal* Trinity.

Tell anyone that the "merry widow" [an allusion to Franz Lehár's *The Merry Widow* remains as Krleža's satirical metonymy for the Agram (Zagreb) *ethos* during World War I, S. M.'s note] of our Kosovo torch-bearer happily married off her daughters to Turkish pashas and viziers and that her sons and sons-in-law, grandsons and great-grandsons victoriously did battle as generals under the banner of the Crescent Moon, they will declare you to be a Bolshevik. They write completely and hopelessly melancholy verses for futile consolation, *while every Vidovdan scribbler today has on the tip of his tongue that anyone who thinks in the European way, is, shame on him, some sort of internationalistic Vuk Branković* (Krleža 1977:324; Italics S. M.).

My intention in this brief review has been to examine how Krleža used historical and anthropological contextualisation in his diary-memoirist entries to uncover the *power strategies* concealed in the cynical discourse of the human(itarian)ism of Basariček and Šilović, which manifested a series of perilous consequences for the actors *behind the scenes of war* and for Croatian society in the *cauldrons* of the World War I macro-historical cataclysm. Equally correctively, Krleža warns of the political consequences of the artistic discourse which is presented as the promoter

of 20th century Europe's poetic trends, while at the same time idealising the mythological elements of the ever-present *folklorism* in the context of political manipulation with the *Yugo-mythus*.

In his diary-memoirist entries, Krleža created the *connecting space* of communications in the autobiographical and historiographical discourse, the narrative space of the *historified autobiography* (cf. Velčić 1991:128). For: the horizon of the *Other* penetrates into the *I* and *strong* history inscribes itself in the *weak* history of the *I* in the diary.⁴⁰ Writing down his own history, Krleža submerges his own *historified autobiography* into the political and historical horizon of the 1914-1921/22 period, not in search of the umbrella of *strong history*, but with pretensions to the status of the radical discourse of knowledge (cf. Velčić 1991:125-126). *Bygone Days* is written as a radical subversion of the discourse of socially certified history which would canonise the Basariček-Šilović concept of the human(itarian)e in the care discourse, and as a subversion of the mytho-poetic motif of "purebred, anarchic-individual, idealistic aesthetics" which toadied to the political discourse of the *Yugo-mythus*. I was prompted to carry out this examination by Krleža's censured article *The Starving Nation* in which he explicitly demonstrated the chasm between the grotesquely conflicting halves of Croatian reality of that time; in which the Yugo-Messianistic concept of the awaited "*Promised Land*" — *which is called Yugoslavia* in which all our *aesthetic sects shall raise their voices in song in that particular (Vidovdan) temple* — is crumbling in everyday history, which should show that "we are living in a terrible stable flowing with dung and that we are drowning in the bog and in the mud — in Croatian mud" (1977a:410). Aware that his *daily-nightly writing* (the "*daily entries*" as "*nightly entries*"; cf. Zlatar 1989:117) are part of *weak history*, because, in any case, *strong history* will note down the *gesture* of the "gentlemen cannibals" (1977a:56), Krleža transposed his *radical memoirist-diary*⁴¹ into a *narrative* about the limitations on narrating one's own existence (cf. Velčić 1991:128). For: even after Krleža's *asymptote of*

⁴⁰ "From the division of history into weak and strong as put forward by Paul Veyne, one could further derive the dependency of the autobiographic and the historiographic" (Velčić 1991:117).

⁴¹ I have not constructed the term *radical memoirist-diary* in the meaning of Peter Sloterdijk's term *radical autobiographies* (1992:43). By the *unfortunate* and hybrid terminological neologism *memoirist-diary* I am denoting Krleža's structure of introspective and extrospective visions — strategy by which memoirist entries are subsequently incorporated into the diary text.

consciousness as the medium which directs us "to cleanse ourselves of the stench and filth of reality (1977a:56) nevertheless "everything remains the same and the world still spins" (Krleža 1919:101) and *no-one has an insight into the amount of suffering* (cf. Krleža 1977a:57). This shows Krleža's constant Kierkegaardian dilemma *either to write or to croak without a sign* which *after all* solves the matter through choice of artistic imprints in the history of wars and evil.

How empty the conceit which drives a man to scribble these imaginary lines which yearn to be some posthumous, in all ways it seems, letter of farewell. To whom? There is no-one. Would it not be more dignified to croak without a sign? (Krleža 1977:126; S. M.'s emphasis).

(Translated by Nina H. Antoljak)

REFERENCES CITED

- Anderson, Benedict. 1994. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London - New York: Verso [Revised Edition].
- Biti, Vladimir. 1994. *Upletanje nerečenog (Književnost/povijest/teorija)*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Bošković-Stulli, Maja. 1984. "Usmeno pjesništvo u Krležinu obzorju". In *Usmeno pjesništvo u obzorju književnosti*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske [First edition: *Forum* 21, 1982., No. 10-12].
- Čerina, Vladimir. 1977. "Pjesnik nas sutrašnjih". In *Pjesme, proza, članci, eseji i zapisi*. Split: Čakavski sabor.
- Čolović, Ivan. 1997. *Politika simbola: ogledi o političkoj antropologiji*. Beograd: Radio B92.
- Čubelić, Tomo & Dragutin Pavličević. 1985. *Povijest 2: udžbenik za srednje škole*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Ćorović, Vladimir. 1924. *Velika Srbija*. Beograd: Uprava i administracija Narodnoga dela.
- Eliade, Mircea. 1972. "Mitovi i istorija". In *Delo: Mit, tradicija, savremenost*. Beograd: Nolit, 265-276.
- Gagro, Božidar. 1987. *Ivan Meštrović*. Zagreb: Globus.

- Gjurgjan, Ljiljana Ina. 1995. *Mit, nacija i književnost "kraja stoljeća": Vladimir Nazor i William Butler Yeats*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Gjurić, Miloš. 1918. *Smrt majke Jugovića (književno-filozofska studija)*. Zagreb: Izdanja Griča.
- Gross, Mirjana. 1994. "Mikrohistorija, dopuna ili suprotnost makrohistoriji?". *Otium* 2/1-2:18-35.
- Gross, Mirjana. 1996. *Suvremena historiografija: korijeni, postignuća, traganja*. Zagreb: Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Jambrešić, Renata. 1995. "Testimonial Discourse Between National Narrative and Ethnography as Socio-cultural Analysis". *Collegium Antropologicum* 19/1:17-27.
- Jovičić, Vladimir, Nenad Petrović & Olja Jovičić. 1988. *Kosovo u svesti i nadahnuću srpskoga naroda*. Šabac: Glasnik Podrinja.
- Katunarić, Vjeran. 1994. *Bogovi, elite, narodi (Studija)*. Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus.
- Koljević, Svetozar. 1974. *Naš junački ep*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1956. *Davni dani. Zapisi 1914-21*. (Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže. Vol. 11. i 12.). Zagreb: Zora.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1977. *Dnevnik 1914-17: Davni dani I*. Sarajevo: NIŠP Oslobođenje.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1977a. *Dnevnik 1918-22: Davni dani II*. Sarajevo: NIŠP Oslobođenje.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1919. "Eppur si muove!". *Plamen* 15:84-101.
- Krleža, Miroslav 1962 (1955). "O Paracelzu. Fragmenti dnevnika iz godine tisućudevetstotinačetridruga". In *Eseji II*. Zagreb: Zora, 9-89.
- Krležijana 1 A-LJ*. 1993. Velimir Visković, ed. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod "Miroslav Krleža".
- Krležijana 2 M-Ž*. In print.
- Lasić, Stanko. 1982. *Krleža: kronologija života i rada*. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske.
- Laub, Dori. 1992. "An Event Without a Witness: Truth, Testimony and Survival". In *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. Shoshana Felman & Dori Laub, M. D., eds. New York - London: Routledge, 75-92.

- Marjanić, Suzana. 1996. "Krležina knjiga aforizama 'Mnogo pa ništa' kao parafraza Stirnerova stvaralačkoga Ništa". *Zor* 4:59-81.
- Maroević, Tonko. 1982. "Krleža prema Meštroviću". *Život umjetnosti* 33-34:127-137.
- Meštrović, Ivan. 1969. *Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Mihaljčić, Rade. 1984. *Lazar Hrebljanović — istorija, kult, predanje*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Mišić, Zoran. 1987. "Šta je to kosovsko opredeljenje". In *Kosovska bitka: mit, legenda, stvarnost. Izbor tekstova: Ratko Peković*. Beograd: Književno-izdavačka zadruga Litera, 203-207. [First edition: NIN, No. 569, 3.XII.1961.].
- Popović, Miodrag. 1976. *Vidovdan i časni krst. Ogled iz književne arheologije*. Beograd: Slovo ljubve.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. 1997. "Zašto i otkad se grozimo Balkana?". *Erasmus* 19:27-35.
- Sharpe, Jim. 1995. "History from Below". In *New Perspective on Historical Writing*. Peter Burke, ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 24-41.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. 1992 (1988). *Doći u svijet, dospjeti u jezik*. Zagreb: Naklada MD.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. 1992a (1983). *Kritika ciničkoga uma*. Zagreb: Globus.
- Stirner, Max. 1976 (1844). *Jedini i njegovo vlasništvo*. Zagreb: Centar za kulturnu djelatnost SSO.
- Stubbs, Paul. 1996. "Creative Negotiations. Concepts and Practise of Integration of Refugees, Displaced People and Local Communities in Croatia". In *War, exile, everyday life: cultural perspectives*. Renata Jambrešić Kirin [et al.], eds. Zagreb: Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, 31-40.
- Trifunović, Lazar. 1987. "Likovni izraz kosovskog predanja". In *Kosovska bitka: mit, legenda, stvarnost. Izbor tekstova: Ratko Peković*. Beograd: Književno-izdavačka zadruga Litera, 215-223. [First edition: *Književne novine* 285, 27. II. 1971.].
- Velčić, Mirna. 1994. *Otisak priče. Intertekstualno proučavanje autobiografije*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Vučković, Radovan. 1979. *Poetika hrvatskog i srpskog ekspresionizma*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Zlatar, Andrea. 1989. *Istinито, lažno, izmišljeno: ogledi o fikcionalnosti*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo.

- Zlata, Andrea. 1996. "Od teorije autobiografije do dnevnickog istraživanja: Philippe Lejeune". *Umjetnost riječi* 2-3:225-237.
- Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati 925-1925. 1925. Zagreb: Odbor za izdanje knjige.
- Žanić, Ivo. 1986. *Mitologija inflacije: govor kriznog doba*. Zagreb: Globus.
- Žanić, Ivo. 1993. *Politički diskurs i folklorna matrica*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Zagreb. (IEF Ms. 1465).
- Žmegač, Viktor. 1988. "Krležina dnevnička proza". *Umjetnost riječi* 1:39-53.

DVIJE KRLEŽINE (PO)ETIČKE SUBVERZIJE U DAVNIM DANIMA

SAŽETAK

Krležini *Davni dani*, dnevničko-memoarski ratni i poratni zapisi s povijesnim horizontom 1914.-1921./22. upisuju se u korpus *literature svjedočenja* (*testimonial literature*) o ratu. Nastojeći prikazati makrokontekst *prvosvjetskog* ratnog homicida, *dnevničko Ja* osim kao introspektivni usmjeren pripovjedač očituje se i kao *ekstrospektivni*, memoarski usmjeren dnevničar. Pritom pored razine svjedočenja o sebi, Krleža uključuje i razinu svjedočenja *Drugog*, bilježenje tuđih svjedočanstava. Ozbiljujući *meduprostor* komunikacije između autobiografskoga i historiografskoga diskurza, Krleža svojom *opovješnom autobiografijom* uranja u politički i povijesni horizont razdoblja 1914.-1921./22., ali ne u potrazi za okriljem *jakih* povijesti, već htijenjem za statusom radikalnog diskurza *Znanja*.

Prvi dio rada kratak je prikaz Krležine historijsko-antropološke kontekstualizacije kojom, da uporabimo Sloterdijkove termine, razotkriva *ciničke* strategije moći human(itar)izma Đure Basarićeka i Josipa Šilovića te *kinizam*, kako ih Krleža atribuirao, *Odisejade* hrvatskih ratnika i *Penelopijade* hrvatskih ratnih udovica.

Drugi dio rada upućuje na Krležino subverzivno tretiranje (re)mitologizacije *kosovskoga mita* kao "Jugomitosa" koji je poslužio i kao mitopoetička matrica umjetničkom diskurzu hrvatskih jugointegralista. Detektirajući opasnost od jugorojalističke *države u nastajanju*, Krleža demitologizira dva osnovna i politički produktivna rekvizitarija *jugomitologije*, *mitsko-povijesnu matricu* koja se "hrani" ideologiziranom mitologijom bitke na Kosovu polju (Vidovdan 1389.) i sublimacijom oživotvorene metafore *Carstva Nebeskog cara Lazara*, te *folklornu matricu* s Kraljevićem Markom kao onodobnim "Superstarom". U razdoblju ozbiljenja *Trijadne SHS* "zamišljene zajednice" spomenuta mitsko-povijesna matrica očitovala se kao *legitimacijski sustav* kojim se evocirao etnomitem *pijemontska Srbija*.

Poticaj za provedena propitivanja pružio mi je Krležin (cenzurirani) članak *Narod koji gladije* koji postavlja u *kronohistorijski* sraz *descensus* "vulgi profani" i *ascensus* mesijaniističkoga diskurza o *Jugomitosu*.

Ključne riječi: hrvatska književnost - povijest, Miroslav Krleža, dnevnik, memoari