

Pavol Száz

Faculty of Art  
Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava  
[szaz2@uniba.sk](mailto:szaz2@uniba.sk)

## Ivo Andrić: Bosnian and Serbian Nationalism

Book review: Zoran Milutinović, *Bitka za prošlost. Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2018. 384 pp.  
ISBN: 978-86-6145-296-3

Zoran Milutinović, *Fantom u biblioteci. Postoji li srpski nacionalistički diskurs o Ivi Andriću?*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2022. 256 pp. ISBN: 978-86-6145-388-5

### Abstract

The double review deals with two books by Zoran Milutinović. *Bitka za prošlost* [The Battle for the Past] (2018) explores the Bosnian nationalist reception of Ivo Andrić in the form of an in-depth discourse analysis. Milutinović points out the biases of this discourse, the unsoundness of its arguments and the unprofessionalism of its reading. Notable among the reactions to the book was a study by Nenad Veličković, in which he argued that the Bosnian nationalist reception was merely a reaction to Andrić's Serbian nationalist reception. Milutinović has devoted his book *Fantom u biblioteci* Phantom in the Library (2022) to a thorough examination of this claim, in which he takes stock of the critical reception and points out its unfoundedness.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Editor-in-chief: Jolanta Sujecka

Conception and academic editing: Wojciech Sajkowski

**Keywords:** Yugoslav literature, Ivo Andrić, discourse analysis, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Since the fragmentation of Yugoslavia and the cruel war which it generated in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the reception of the oeuvre of Ivo Andrić, the only Nobel laureate of the fallen state, has also been divided. Andrić, a prominent member of both national canons, the Serbian and the Croatian, is also part of Bosnian literature – but his Bosniak reception seems to be especially contradictory, although most of Andrić's stories are laid in Bosnia, generally in the Ottoman times. Some authors consider his imagery to be false, claiming that the depiction of the Muslims is purely negative, blaming the writer for his alleged hatred of Islam, for lying about the historical reality of the Ottoman Empire and culture. These claims appeared even before Andrić won the Nobel Prize, and over time they were supplemented by others, while nowadays there is a complete set of arguments against the writer. In his comprehensive book *Bitka za prošlost. Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*, Zoran Milutinović undertook the major and difficult task of mapping, critically analysing and revising the Bosniak nationalist discourse about Andrić.

Milutinović examined this discourse's cardinal phrases in a diachronic view with a careful contextual analysis, erudite argumentation, and no lack of witty irony. By the end of the first chapters any reader with some experience of the nature of fiction would ask whether it is necessary to analyse a discourse full of dilettantism and trumped-up arguments in which the writer's thoughts are often interchanged with those of his fictive characters. Although it soon becomes clear that the nature of the Bosniak nationalist discourse is political and ideological rather than aesthetic, over the last decades it was legitimised by scholars with an academic or institutional background. Michel Foucault showed that power means fighting for control and domination of the discourse as the object of its desire, and his *sociétés de discours* can be understood as institutionalised mechanisms of this control. From this angle the above-mentioned question does not even emerge: it is necessary to define the anomalies of this discourse by the means and methods of literary criticism.

Milutinović begins his book with a parallel that at first glance seems exaggerated: Salman Rushdie and the Islamist reaction to his *Satanic Verses*. In 1991 Andrić's bust on the Višegrad bridge was destroyed by the businessman Murat Šabanović, who was ordered by the SDA (Party

of Democratic Action) and motivated – besides financial benefits – with the argument that “[Andrić was a] cultural hater of the Muslim nation” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 14). Moreover, Šabanović stated that recording his deed was essential, because “after that they would be going throughout the Arab world with the videotape when they were collecting money, and showing them how the Bosniaks demolished their Salman Rushdie” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 13). As Milutinović remarks, there are no common points between the two writers except the similar fanatic reactions. Moreover, Andrić did not even write about the Quran or the Prophet (at most he only mentioned them in passing) – in contrast to Rushdie’s satire. So, where did the criticism of Andrić’s supposed anti-Islamic views come from?

The first chapters of the book outline the formation of this discourse. Its origin can be traced to Šukrija Kurtović’s article in *Bosanski pogledi* with a foreword by his publisher, Adil Zulfikarpašić, written before Andrić won the Nobel Prize, followed by articles by Muhamed Hadžijahić and Muhamed Filipović. According to Kurtović, Andrić’s hatred of Islam inspires his characters, who are all “idiots, degenerated, extremely intolerant, insidious” etc. (Milutinović, 2018, p. 22). He claims that Andrić was a servant of the Milan Nedić regime (a German-occupied puppet state) and its Greater Serbian ideology, and inspired by the nationalist movement. Even his usage of the designation “Turks” for ethnic Bosniaks is a sign of hate. Milutinović shows that these claims are unfounded, not just because they are negatively biased, but due to Kurtović’s total ignorance of the nature of fiction. Reading these pages, the question arises: could Andrić have become a classic of the highest rank if his fictive universe had been created in accordance with the idealised world in which Muslims or Bosniaks are one-sidedly positive? This kind of idealised ideology is laid down in the essay by Muhamed Filipović, “Bosanski duh u književnosti, sta to je” (The Bosnian Spirit in Literature; 1967), claiming that Andrić – motivated by Serbian nationalism – depicted Bosnia falsely. Milutinović describes the range of Filipović’s ideas, with their lack of rational and comprehensible arguments, as philosophical dadaism (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 43–54).

The next phase of this discourse is represented by Muhsin Rizvić’s final book, written during the war years and published posthumously in 1995. This extensive work is the first in the Bosniak nationalist discourse written by a literary critic, although according to Milutinović his analysis, based on a kind of (pseudo)psychoanalysis, is blatantly arbitrary and rests on misinterpretation. Rizvić’s starting point is the supposition that all of the writer’s characters are mere projections of its creator, so the perverted,

gloomy, sadistic, etc. characters are a testament to Andrić's complexes, aversions or desires. Considering the characters themselves, Rizvić interchanges his psychologising interpretation with a diagnosis of psychosis. Through this reading Andrić is demonstrated as a psychotic personality full of sadomasochistic desire who built his career on political opportunism, and who is also a renegade who became a Serb. Mapping the formation of identities and national identifications, Milutinović also clarifies the usage of the designation "Turk", along with the national identification of Andrić's Muslim characters (as they are not all Bosniaks or even South Slavs!).

Alongside a distorted view of literature and misinterpretations, in this discourse one encounters cheap gossip (e.g. that Andrić was the love child of a Muslim man) and probable forgery (a hateful anti-Islamic sentence allegedly written in a letter to a friend). "Džamijska avlija" (the mosque court), as Milutinović puts it, is an appropriate comparison because of the blind and biased statements in this discourse reflecting a clerical background and lack of knowledge of the works being discussed (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 88–108).

The central "hero" of Milutinović's survey is Rusmir Mahmutćehajić, whose monograph *Andrićevstvo. Protiv etike sjećanja* (2015) is directly discussed for almost a quarter of the book. Considering that the monograph displays all external signs of scholarly discourse, an analysis of its view of Andrić is highly necessary. After going through Mahmutćehajić's interpretations and refuting his statements, Milutinović introduces the concept of non sequitur hermeneutics, referring to the lack of logical argumentation behind his statements, the direct misinterpretation of texts afflicted by presuppositions, and, finally, the failure of the book as an academic study. Milutinović dedicates full pages to re-examining the philosophers and critics referenced in the book in a mostly arbitrary, amateurish and dilettantish way. Most of Mahmutćehajić's judgements are derived from the earlier discourse and its negative depictions of Turks, Muslims, and Bosniaks. Examining the ethnic identity of Andrić's Muslim characters, Milutinović offers raw generalisations familiar from the previous discourse mentioned above. Using socialist realism as a model, Milutinović introduces the witty aesthetic category of *Musrealism*, i.e. Muslim realism. "The Muslim realist, or *Musrealist*, must show the reality of the Muslims not as he sees it, but in the way the Muslim believer idealises it: not as it is, or precisely as he thinks it is, but as it should be" (Milutinović, 2018, p. 152). Following this logic, not just Andrić but anyone who depicts Muslims out of this idealised model could easily be blamed for "racist ideology". One of the most prominent points of Milutinović's discourse

analysis is the deliberate contextual examination of the theoreticians cited by Mahmutćehajić, who uses a vague pseudoscientific pastiche with total misunderstanding of Frederic Jameson's Marxist theory and misuse of Edward Said's term "Orientalism". Among other things, the reappraisal and critical treatment of Said's theory is illuminating because the notion of Orientalism could easily be incorporated into almost every non-Islamic discourse about Islamic culture. As we can see, for Mahmutćehajić even the Foucauldian notion of discourse – the basis of Orientalism – is unclear. The notion of race, which was understood differently in Andrić's age than it is today, also requires recontextualisation (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 171–189).

In the next chapters, Milutinović undertakes a wider inquiry into Mahmutćehajić's political background and characterises the basic concepts of Bosniak nationalist thought applied to Andrić and his view of the Ottoman culture and history of Bosnia-Herzegovina. At this point, the problematic nationalist (mis)interpretation seems to be a symptom of an anomaly of cultural history formed by the post-Yugoslav and postwar divisions reflecting and determining the reception of the classics. In his previous writing, Mahmutćehajić similarly analysed Petar Petrović Njegoš's *Gorski vijenac* [The Mountain Wreath], through a misinterpretation of Andrić's essays about this work. His argument about the genocidal ideology found in Njegoš is refuted by Milutinović: Njegoš was not against Islam or Muslims, but against the division of the Yugoslav nations that was handing them over to foreign powers (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 225–244).

Milutinović further examines Andrić's statements or remarks presented out of context and often misused in this discourse. Andrić's sentence characterising his story collection "about the Turks and our people" is a good example. Mahmutćehajić used this sentence as evidence for his claim of Andrić's contempt and hatred towards the Bosniak people. As Milutinović shows, this sentence cannot be applied in a general way to Andrić's whole oeuvre, because he uses it only once in the foreword to his story collection (*Pripovetke*; 1924). Furthermore, "the Turks" can be understood not as a designation for Bosniak characters but also for Ottoman ones, according to Milutinović, who asks: "So what is 'anti-Bosniak' there?" (Milutinović, 2018, p. 158).

One of Andrić's most frequently misused texts in this discourse is the short story "Letter from 1920" describing the hostility between the four denominations of the Bosnian people, which is mentioned in accordance with the non sequitur hermeneutics mentioned above, without distinguishing the writer's thoughts from those of his narrator Max Levenfeld. The less than

complimentary judgements of Bosnia by the Europeans Cologna and Des Fossés in the novel *Bosnian Chronicle* (*Travnička hronika*) are also quoted as evidence of the writer's disdain.

In another chapter, Milutinović surveys Mahmutćehajić's previous works (e.g. *Dobra Bosna*) and his career as an electrical engineer and later as a politician: he was one of the founders of the SDA and the paramilitary group Patriotska liga. Milutinović also reconstructs the historical and political vision of *Andrićevstvo*, whose vague traditionalism he defines as an "antimodernist pastoral" (Milutinović, 2018, p. 271). Recounting historical idealisations or historical myths (e.g. the Bogumil hypothesis) and the victimisation of Muslims in the Balkans, Milutinović contests the arguments about the Ottoman Empire's tolerance towards other religions and the inherited genocidal anti-Islamism of the Christian civilisation. He also shows the clear influence of religious fundamentalism and investigates the connections of Bosniak nationalism with Islamist political ideologues such as Sayyid Qutb, and the "greater Muslim project" that aimed to reestablish the Bosniak dominance that was lost at the end of the Ottoman era in 1878 (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 248–253). Milutinović also examines Mahmutćehajić's philosophical background, discussing the popularity of the obscure authors of *philosophia perennis*, such as Julius Evola, Eric Voegelin, René Guenon, and Frithjof Schuon among fascist and Nazi circles, and their positive attitude towards Islam (the latter two mentioned above converted to Islam).

A prominent place is also given to Andrić's posthumously published doctoral dissertation about the cultural history of Bosnia. Although the author was never a practising historian, his works of fiction are regularly set in a historical context. The following question is interesting not only within the framework of this discourse, but in general: how could a marginal discursive-academic work influence the interpretation of an author's fictional works? Milutinović does not waste time with scholastic equivocation, but verifies Andrić's dissertation with a detached discourse analysis. He proves the value of the dissertation through a comparison with Safvet-beg Bašagić's similar thesis, written slightly earlier, and with historical data. The conclusion is that the Ottoman Empire did not actually leave a glorious legacy, implying that Andrić's view was not biased but simply realistic. It is more surprising that, despite the different attitudes to this question, the multiple ideologies and conceptions about the nations and the country, there existed a kind of consensus around the role of the Ottomans in the cultural development of Bosnia. Bašagić,

a prominent member of the Bosniak intelligentsia in the monarchic times, in whose case “it did not even cross his mind to deal with the culture of the *Kaurs* (non-Muslims) of Bosnia-Herzegovina” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 296), also concedes that the Ottoman Empire did have a negative effect on the authentic culture of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Milutinović, 2018, p. 299). “Bašagić was a convinced Ottoman patriot, but, like other cleverer members of his generation, he understood that personal, modern knowledge was more necessary to his nation and to himself than Quranic knowledge, and he chose Vienna for his education instead of Istanbul” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 295). So where does this sensibility and judicial blindness towards the Ottoman legacy in the contemporary Bosniak discourse came from?

In the next chapter, Milutinović discusses this tendency of what he calls *ressentiment* criticism. Problems around the implementation of Orientalism in the Bosnian/South Slavic context reappeared along with the notion of Eurocentrism based on the (post)colonial context of Western European and Middle Eastern Islamic culture. Among others, Esad Duraković applied these notions to Andrić’s work. As Milutinović notes, “In the last two decades the pushy endeavour to gain the title of the Bosnian Edward Said is remarkable” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 320), and he discovers the mechanisms of victimisation of the Muslim people of Bosnia, which are characteristic features of all nationalism.

What makes both of Milutinović’s books valuable is his standpoint towards the issues under consideration. He does not want to construct the antipode of this discourse on an ideological basis, and does not even offer any statement revealing any conviction outside of literature. If Milutinović builds a counterbalance to the Bosniak nationalist discourse, he does so on the professional plane.

Objective, unbiased discourse analysis and interpretations resting on the norms of literary criticism are used against dilettantish, ideological and religiously narrow-minded misinterpretations. A sober, rational analysis flavoured with a provocative question, enriched with sarcastic humour and some great bon mots, give this book a real Voltairean spirit all the time referring to common sense against all kinds of fanaticism.

Four years after the publication of *Bitka za prošlost*, two things can be said unequivocally about its reception. Firstly, the book has reached a far wider readership than Mahmutćehajić’s “academic” book. Secondly, it forms a meta-discourse: a peculiar response to the Bosniak nationalist discourse on Andrić. The last pages of *Bitka za prošlost* are related to this meta-discourse, which continued after the publication of Milutinović’s book. He

remarks on Enver Kazaz's book *Subverzivne poetike* examining the Bosniak nationalist reading of Andrić and distinguishes two metanarratives about him. Milutinović criticises his dual terms of Ottoman-*philia* and Ottoman-*phobia*, referring to the two tendencies in the Bosniak reading (Milutinović, 2018, pp. 334–335). Although Kazaz (reacting to *Bitka za prošlost*) later defended his concept inspired by Hayden White's theory about the metanarratives of history, the turning point in this meta-discourse was his claim that the Bosniak nationalist discourse about Andrić was just a reaction to the so-called Greater Serbian one. Milutinović denies the actual existence of the Greater Serbian discourse, arguing that there is no evidence for it. He also refutes Kazaz's assertion, inspired by the *loci communis* of the Bosniak nationalist discourse, which claims that it is exclusively a reactive phenomenon, just responding to other nationalisms – such as the Greater Serbian discourse.

The exchange of views between Kazaz and Milutinović after the publication of *Bitka za prošlost* – which will not be discussed further here – came to a dead end. Milutinović's appeal to Kazaz to describe the Greater Serbian discourse was finally answered by another scholar, Nenad Veličković, in an article published in English and later in Bosnian. Veličković outlined the whole tradition of this discourse by defining its periods and prominent members such as Isidora Sekulić, Đorđe Jovanović, Milan Bogdanović, Zoran Konstantinović, Vladimir Dedijer, Predrag Palavestra, Petar Džadžić, Rade Lalović, Vuk Milatović, and Nikola Koljević.

Milutinović's second book, the bilingual *Fantom u biblioteci. Postoji li srpski nacionalistički diskurs o Ivi Andriću? / Phantom in the Library: Is There a Serbian Nationalist Discourse on Ivo Andrić?* also published by Geopoetika in Belgrade, examines the question in a similar way, through critical discourse analysis. In a book-length refutation of Veličković's article, Milutinović re-examines not only its theoretical basis, but also the context of the quoted authors. The need for this defence emerged from Kazaz's and Veličković's starting point: the nationalist Bosniak discourse redirecting its accusations "from Andrić to Serbian literary criticism" (Milutinović, 2022, p. 10).

The unbiased reader should admit that Milutinović's critique is based on the norms of textual analysis and proper examination of the context of the quotes used in Veličković's study. If the reader is otherwise familiar with Veličković, who was often attacked from the nationalist side exactly, they might be not just confused but even distressed by the development of this meta-discourse. (Far more than after reading Mahmutćehajić's *Andrićevstvo*.) Veličković is not just an author of great short stories or other



fiction, but also wrote critical articles about the over-ideologised national curricula of the literatures of the nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Of course, it was unlikely that any of the authors of the Bosniak nationalist reception of Andrić criticised in *Bitka za proslost* would react to this book.

Following Veličković's arguments, Milutinović defines seven criteria to identify this alleged Serbian nationalist discourse, among them revisionism in relation to the position of Serbs in the Ottoman Empire, the so-called "genocide criterion" fed by collective trauma, and other presuppositions, e.g. Bosnia is the land of hatred, and the Bosniaks are degenerated by conversion to Islam (Milutinović, 2022, pp. 16–17). Among the seven criteria on this list, the most interesting are perhaps the first, revisionism, and the fifth, which he calls literature and the past, as in Veličković's "Reading Andrić as a reliable witness (more reliable than historians)" (Milutinović, 2022, p. 17). The fifth chapter examines the question of the representation of historical reality, the relation of the fictive to the real world, implying the notion of Andrić's "realism" used by Isidora Sekulić and Đorđe Jovanović (Milutinović, 2022, pp. 38–40). Vladimir Dedijer's assertion that Andrić "sheds light on the totality of the historical process more completely than many historians" (Milutinović, 2022, pp. 63–64) is also remarkable and not a unique opinion. Milutinović scrutinises the interrelationship of referentiality, fantasy, history and fictionality by recalling the theories of Frank Ankersmit, Richard Slotkin, Hayden White and others to nuance the simplified view of the real vs. fictional dichotomy. Andrić, himself a historian, in some cases used real historical testimonies in his historical fiction, as in the case of *Bosnian Chronicle*. The claim that Andrić falsified history is based on a simplistic understanding of the relation of historical reality to fiction. As Milutinović shows in his brief overview, this relation between literature and representations of the past has been more than a simple opposition since the times of Plato's concept of mimesis (Milutinović, 2022, pp. 64–69).

Undoubtedly, this problem is also interesting for literary theory itself. Milutinović stays within the framework of the discourse being examined, which lacks a consistent point of view. Vuk Milatović, for example, reads Andrić's works as just fiction, to which Milutinović alludes in his conclusion (Milutinović, 2022, p. 105). Through the analysis of literary critics whom Veličković (ab)uses, Milutinović reveals that he came close to Bosniak nationalist claims regarding Andrić's negative representation of the Ottoman era. Milutinović sheds light on the fundamental problem of reception: "the whole problem lies solely between Ivo Andrić and his Bosniak nationalist critics: either Andrić lied, and they are right in reproaching him

for maligning the Ottoman state with which they still identify; or he did not lie, *ergo* they are not right in maligning Andrić. Serbian literary criticism about Ivo Andrić, nationalist or otherwise, stands few chances of being able to intrude into this relationship: it can try to impute to Andrić's novels and stories 'facts' which are not really there, and to ascribe to Andrić something that he never maintained. The problem, it transpires, remains between Andrić and his Bosniak critics, and Enver Kazaz's and Nenad Veličković's attempt to divert our attention away from what really matters" (Milutinović, 2022, p. 105).

But let us return to Veličković's starting point, to the idea that the Serbian nationalist discourse of Andrić's work relies on a "revision of historiographical knowledge" motivated by collective trauma. Veličković follows the theory of Jeffrey C. Alexander, according to whom trauma "is not a collective experience of pain but a consequence of the work of opinion creators". After clarifying Alexander's notions, Milutinović shows that in fact Veličković does not and could not follow this concept of trauma in his essay. He further claims that if trauma is socially constructed through representations remembering the past, Veličković's arguments are based on a misinterpretation of Alexander's concept. From this angle, the whole Serbian literary tradition appears as "incapable of imposing the traumatic interpretation over the 'event' of Ottoman rule, and did Serbs have to wait for 'agents' – Isidora Sekulić and Milan Bogdanović in the 1920s – to re-interpret and re-remember their identity? Of course not, and Veličković ... slips back into what Alexander explicitly rejects: a lay understanding of trauma" (Milutinović, 2022, p. 21).

Through the almost 100 pages of deliberate re-contextualisation of all the quotations in Veličković's study, Milutinović's careful analysis refutes his hypothetic standpoint of the alleged Serbian nationalist manner of reading Andrić, and argues that there is not a single expression proving the so-called genocide criterion or maintaining that the Bosnian Muslims are degenerated due to conversion. Even the representation of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a land of hatred is a tendentious misinterpretation of Andrić's work. Some of the authors studied here had been members of national institutions (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts), but this does not automatically make them nationalist: Nikola Koljević "was a nationalist politician, but Veličković was not able to find anything remotely nationalist in his works on Andrić" (Milutinović, 2022, p. 112). Once the revisions of "evidence" in many cases based on "cherry-picked" sentences taken out of context are summed up, the basic concepts of Veličković's essay fail. The existence

of such Serbian nationalist discourse cannot be proven: Milutinović did not find any statement manifesting nationalist ideology. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the quoted authors constructed a tradition through their interrelations (Milutinović, 2022, pp. 115–117). The claim that the Bosniak nationalist discourse is a mere reaction to the Serbian one is invalid simply because of the lack of references to support it, or citations of these Serbian interpretations. The first and only nationalist reading of Andrić admitted by Milutinović, a chapter in a volume edited by a school inspector, Rade Lalović, was published in Višegrad in 2018, three years after Mahmutćehajić and half a century after the beginnings of the Bosniak nationalist discourse. Thus the Bosniak nationalist discourse simply could not react to something which did not exist at the time (Milutinović, 2022, p. 111).

It is not easy to draw conclusions from Milutinović's books, which are a remarkable turning point in the meta-discourse on the reception of Andrić's works. This demonstrates the somewhat distorted reception and biased (mis)interpretations of the vanished state's only Nobel laureate. Andrić's reception as demonstrated in these books shows a striking picture of the ex-Yugoslav social discourse, which simply places blame without regard for the basic norms of interpretation of literary texts, abuses identity politics and collective memory, and in some cases even latently evokes the topoi of interethnic hate speech. This is the reason why Milutinović's books can be valued not just as a revision based on disciplinary norms and the methods of critical discourse analysis, but also as a social diagnosis offering readers a political history of (ex-)Yugoslavia and a wider view of cultural, mental-historical interrelations in the Western Balkans.

However, it also needs pointing out what Milutinović does not say. The claim that Andrić's work – as allegedly representing the national narrative of the Kosovo myth – was abused by Serbian nationalist political discourse could hardly be challenged. Maybe there is no irrevocable evidence that Ratko Mladić handed out Andrić's short story "Letter from 1920" to foreign journalists in Pale during the civil war – as Milutinović notes – but this text was often abused for blaming Bosnia as a land of hatred, which is a frequent phrase of Serbian nationalist discourse. Milutinović does not say that such a discourse does not exist, but he examines strictly the field of literary discourse, and not political speech or social discourse. Readers need to be aware of this distinction. I can give you another vivid example. Besides taking part in other horrifying massacres, Milan Lukić, the mass murderer from Višegrad, killed some people on the famous bridge precisely, and revealed during his questioning before the Hague Court

of Justice that *The Bridge on the Drina* was his favourite book. Could this fact have influenced the interpretation of the novel itself? The question posed here is the very same that Milutinović asks in the case of “Letter from 1920” and Ratko Mladić. The idea that Andrić could have inspired them is wicked, but the effect simply cannot be replaced by the cause. Milutinović’s topic may sound very sombre, but his style does not exclude a sense of humour: his objective analysis also uses irony and sarcasm to refute dilettantish interpretations and biased standpoints, which makes his books more provocative. This provocative aspect also includes some raw reflections, e.g. when Milutinović mentions the massacre of eight Serbian JNA soldiers in Veliki Park in Sarajevo at the beginning of the war. Addressing the Muslim forces responsible for this killing, Milutinović alludes to the Srebrenica massacre: “That’s all they had. What would they do if they had eight thousand?” (Milutinović, 2018, p. 246). Although it was contested in the reactions to the book, the question is admittedly provocative or striking, but legitimate. Fortunately, no measuring of the number of victims, a frequent and perverted practice in traumatised discourses, took place.

The sober analysis, the irony and the provocative tone in Milutinović’s work are features which could be recognised as a sign of the Voltairean spirit. But there are more concrete parallels: throughout his life Voltaire contested intolerance and (religious) fanaticism in his writings, whether literary (*Mahomet*) or philosophical (*Treatise on Tolerance*), as well as in his law practice (the Calas case). It is true, of course, that Voltaire lived in the 18th century, so, as the sad old proverb holds, *semper idem*.

## r e f e r e n c e s

- Milutinović, Z. (2018). *Bitka za prošlost: Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*. Geopoetika.
- Milutinović, Z. (2022). *Fantom u biblioteci: Postoji li srpski nacionalistički diskurs o Ivi Andriću?* Geopoetika.

---

---

## Ivo Andrić: bosniacký a srbský nacionalizmus

recenzija: Zoran Milutinović, *Bitka za prošlost. Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2018. 384 pp.

ISBN: 978-86-6145-296-3

Zoran Milutinović, *Fantom u biblioteci. Postoji li srpski nacionalistički diskurs o Ivi Andriću?*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2022. 256 pp.

ISBN: 978-86-6145-388-5

Recenzia mapuje dve monografické štúdie Zorana Milutinovića, ktoré venoval skúmaniu ideologizovanej recepcie Iva Andrića a nacionalistickej interpretácie jeho diela. Kniha *Bitka za prošlost* [Bitka za minulosť] (2018) odкрýva pôvod a sleduje formovanie bosniackého nacionalistického diskurzu o Andrićovi, až k jeho súčasným prejavom, ku ktorým patrí predovšetkým kniha Rusmira Mahmutćehajića: *Andrićevstvo*. Milutinovićova monografia mala silnú a búrlivú kritickú odozvu, na ktorú reagoval autor vo svojej ďalšej monografii, *Fantom u biblioteci* [Fantóm v knižnici 2022]. Táto publikácia skúma tvrdenie obhajcov bosniackej nacionalistickej interpretácie, konkrétne, že tento diskurz je reakciou na srbský nacionalistický diskurz, teda na tzv. veľkosrbské čítanie Andrića. Milutinovićove knihy k chúlостivým otázkam pristupujú veľkou obozretnosťou, pri dôkladnej analýze diskurzov však nechýba im ani erudovaná argumentácia, ani duchaplná irónia.

**Kľúčové slová:** juhoslovanská literatúra, Ivo Andrić, analýza diskurzu, Bosna a Hercegovina.



---

---

## Ivo Andrić: boszniacki i serbski nacjonalizm

recenzja: Zoran Milutinović, *Bitka za prošlost. Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2018. 384 ss.

ISBN: 978-86-6145-296-3

Zoran Milutinović, *Fantom u biblioteci. Postoji li srpski nacionalistički diskurs o Ivi Andriću?*, Beograd: Geopoetika, 2022. 256 ss.

ISBN: 978-86-6145-388-5

Recenzja przedstawia dwa monograficzne studia Zorana Milutinovicia, które poświęcił badaniu zideologizowanej recepcji Ivo Andrića i nacjonalistycznej interpretacji jego twórczości. *Bitka za prošlost* [Bitwa o przeszłość] (2018) odkrywa początki i śledzi formowanie się boszniackiego nacjonalistycznego dyskursu na temat Andrića, aż po jego współczesne przejawy, do których należy przede wszystkim książka Rasmira Mahmutćehajića *Andrićevstvo*. Monografia Milutinovicia spotkała się z silną i burzliwą reakcją krytyczną, na którą autor odpowiedział kolejną monografią, *Phantom u biblioteci* [Fantom w bibliotece] (2022). Ta ostatnia publikacja analizuje twierdzenie zwolenników boszniackiej interpretacji nacjonalistycznej, dla których nacjonalistyczny dyskurs boszniacki jest reakcją na serbski nacjonalizm, czyli na tzw. wielkoserbskie czytanie Andrića. Książki Milutinovicia podchodzą do drażliwych kwestii z dużą ostrożnością, ale nie brakuje im erudycyjnej argumentacji ani dowcipnej ironii w ich starannej analizie dyskursów.

**Słowa kluczowe:** literatura jugosłowiańska, Ivo Andrić, analiza dyskursu, Bośnia i Hercegowina.

### Note

Pavol Száz, Faculty of Art, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia.

szaz2@uniba.sk

The preparation of this article was self-funded by the author.

### Publication History

Received: 2022-21-25, Accepted: 2023-12-12, Published: 2023-12-23

