

Cultural Politics, Nation Building and Literary Imagery

Towards a Post-colonial Reading of the Literature(s) of Bosnia-Herzegovina 1878–1918

by Stijn Vervaet (Ghent)

Acknowledgement: This article was written as the result of research undertaken with the help of a grant from the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO – Vlaanderen). The author would like to thank Raymond Detrez, Wolfgang Müller-Funk, Ursula Reber, Diana Reynolds, and Clemens Ruthner for their useful comments on earlier versions of this paper, which was originally written in 2005 for the workshop *Wechselwirkungen: The Political, Social and Cultural Impact of the Austro-Hungarian Occupation on Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1878–1918*.

Introduction

Post-colonial studies connected with cultural and literary theories¹ that see literature (or: “narrative”, “culture”) as a phenomenon intertwining with power,² can also provide an interesting approach for the study of literary and other intercultural contacts in the Balkans. In this article on Bosnian literary and cultural life between 1878–1918, I will attempt to show why post-colonial studies can be inspiring for the study of cultural relations between Austria-Hungary and Bosnia and Herzegovina, esp. when doing research about the interweaving of power, culture/literature and the construction of national or other collective identities. In addition, I consider it to be an approach that should be developed in accordance with the (historical) context, which constantly urges us to make corrections to post-colonial claims concerning the (study of the) Balkans.

Many historians consider that the Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia was very similar to colonial rule in British India. Some of them describe the Bosnian politics of the Dual Monarchy, labeling it without hesitating as “Habsburg colonialism”.³ Some evidence for such a contention on a symbolic level can be found in Austrian ethnological and travel literature on Bosnia, and probably even in *belles lettres*, in which a discourse of power, of “civilizing the wild” and an exotic picture of the Other can be revealed.⁴ As apparently some of these authors tend to essentialize Bosnia as the Other, depicting it as an abstract East and implicitly perceiving Austria-Hungary as an abstract West. Hence, is it then justified to describe contemporary Bosnian literary life and press as merely peripheral or even colonial, oppressed by an imperial center?⁵ I will attempt to point out the discourses/narratives of the center, as well as of the periphery, the narrative of power/domination and the counter-narrative of the subordinated or colonized. Of course, this does not mean that the cultural and literary history of Bosnia during the period of Austro-Hungarian occupation should be thought of insimplified, binary oppositions. Instead, I prefer to avoid the binary opposition, suggested by the definition of an “imperial center” and a “colonized periphery”, of the Austrians and Croats as “pro-Western” cultural actors (i.e. the self-defined heirs of the “European legacy”) and the Serbs and Muslims as “anti-Western” ones (i.e. the so-called heirs of the “Ottoman legacy”). The kind of “transitional” character of the Balkans, and their status between East and West, writes Todorova, “invoked the image of a bridge or a crossroads. [...] The Balkans are also a bridge between stages of growth, and this invokes labels such as semi-developed, semi-colonial, semi-civilized, semi-oriental.”⁶ The incorporation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Dual Monarchy seems to have caused the same effect on authors of travelogues and (quasi-)journalistic forms in the Dual Monarchy, inspiring them to impose a kind of semi-colonial rhetoric on those former Ottoman provinces.⁷ This attitude did not differ essentially from that of Western Europe vis-à-vis the Balkans.

This case study explicitly wants to avoid the danger of reducing an *in se* heterogeneous world “through the single category of colonialism.”⁸ Therefore, “center” and “periphery” should be understood in this context rather as imaginary geographies and used in a dynamic way, not as monolithic geographical entities or essentialist vectors, although these divisions may well have their historical roots and are not merely invoked by the seemingly conceptual or methodological insufficiency of a postcolonial approach. As Elleke Boehmer reminds us,

[...] postcolonial discussion has by and large confined itself to sophisticated theoretical commentary which, though often insightful, can tend to be rather general, or indeed generalizing, in its scope. Because of this generalizing reach, and the emphasis on textual resistance specifically, there is also a tendency in some postcolonial criticism for historical and political context to be neglected. This is paradoxical given that both colonial and postcolonial literatures find their defining parameters in history.⁹

In our context, the dialogue between (the Austrian) center and (the Bosnian) periphery can be revealed by an analysis of the cultural policy of the Dual Monarchy in Bosnia, compared to the literary and (often also national-colored) program of Bosnian newspapers and periodicals (other than those published by the Austro-Hungarian *Landesregierung* itself). A second

strategy consists in examining the various imageries of the Austro-Hungarian center; the various narratives of its rule in the literature of the Bosnian periphery. I will illustrate this encounter with two examples, the first situated at the intersection of power, culture and nation building 1878–1918, and the second in the field of imageries.

1. Cultural Politics, Canonization of Epic Literature, Literary Reviews and Cultural Identity

One of the major issues in the entanglement of centers of power, cultural politics/literature and developing (in both the “transitive” and the “intransitive” meaning) national consciousness is the process of canon formation. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the canonization of epic oral literature began at the time when the first newspapers and literary periodicals were founded. The first Bosnian literary magazine, *Bosanski prijatelj* (*The Bosnian Friend*), was edited in 1850 by the Franciscan friar Ivan Frano Jukić, but printed in Zagreb. The first Bosnian press was founded only in 1866, when Osman-pasha Topal invited the Zemun printer Ignjat Sopron to open a printing firm in Sarajevo.¹⁰ Under the Austro-Hungarian occupation, the amount of newspapers and literary periodicals increased, although rigorously censored by the provincial government. Enormously popular at that time in Bosnia was the collecting and editing of folk songs. Austria-Hungary took part in it as a power that had the material possibilities to do so. For example, the Austro-Hungarian official Kosta Hörmann collected and edited *Folk Songs of the Bosnian Muslims*,¹¹ an undertaking that turned out to be of crucial importance to the developing national consciousness of the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It seems that Austria had, as an imperial power, mainly political goals in mind: increasing the Austrian government’s popularity among the (Muslim) community, as the correspondence between *Civiladlatus* (*Chef der Landesregierung*) Appel and Joint Minister of Finances Benjamin Kállay reveals. In 1888 Appel asks Kállay for permission to print the collection of Hörmann in the provincial print shop (*Landesdruckerei*), at the expense of the provincial budget, stressing that such an undertaking would make a good impression on the population.¹² Although by initiating the creation of a Bosniak¹³ literary canon the Austrians pursued a typically colonial cultural policy (like the British encouraging Indian studies and consulting Hindu sacred texts to establish a legal system for British India), at the same time this policy continued a tradition which had existed already in Serbia and Croatia for many years. This is even more or less explicitly stated by Kállay in his answer to Appel, in which he suggests that Hörmann could write an introduction to the collection of songs. Here Hörmann should give some main characteristics of the collection, and explain why mainly songs of the Muslims were published: most of the songs of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Christians had already been made public in other famous collections, but those of their Muslim compatriots had not.¹⁴ In the same letter, Kállay advised Hörmann to make clear that those songs are “all the more interesting, as they, due to the Bosnian descent of those groups of the population and their conversion to Islam, present a peculiar mix of old Bosnian traditions/customs and Muslim habits.”¹⁵ Hence, one might argue that the Austro-Hungarian authorities did not envisage the creation of a Bosniak literary canon in the way the Croats and the Serbs did (in the framework of the construction of a national identity, the more so as the Austro-Hungarians actually aimed at the establishment of a Bosnian, and not a Bosniak national consciousness); but eventually their policy in this respect undoubtedly contributed to the canonization of Bosniak oral literature and, ultimately, to the establishment of a Bosniak national identity.

In the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the process of canonization, in which centers of power are always and unavoidably involved,¹⁶ was influenced from two or even three sides: Vienna and both “home centers”, Belgrade and Zagreb. Of course, editors in each location emphasized the national belonging of the songs to a particular ethnic group, which sometimes resulted in heated discussions in the national press about who claimed whose folk songs or had „stolen“ them: the Serbs from the Muslims or the Croats and the Muslims from the Serbs.¹⁷ Polemics on canonization of oral folk songs in the South Slav lands in general had existed already, and, as Wachtel writes: “orally transmitted folk songs became a bone of contention between those who were propagating separate South Slav nationalisms and those who strove for South Slavic integration.”¹⁸ In Bosnia, those quarrels had been provoked rather by diverging perceptions of nation and nationality than by the involvement of the Austrians in

such matters. Thus, editing folk songs can be regarded as a kind of creating and confirming the first national literary corpuses of Serbian/Croatian/Bosniak literature, but it was not an undertaking initiated by the Austrians to introduce the Bosnians to their own literary heritage: one might argue that in fact they used the popularity of folk songs and the collections of folk songs for their own political purposes. However, this does not mean that the cultural consequences of that kind of cultural politics were harmful to the South-Slav folk songs or to Bosnian cultural life in general. Since its publication in 1888/89, the collection of Kosta Hörmann has been both extensively praised for its scientific merits and criticized for nationalist reasons.¹⁹

From its very beginnings Hörmann's collection of folk songs has been regarded by Muslim critics as the first collection that gave the Bosniak nation the status it deserved. According to them, for the first time in literary history the Bosniak/Muslim songs were not regarded as Serb or Croat, but as belonging to a genuine, distinct Bosniak/Muslim culture and ethnos. At any rate, as maintained by the same Bosniak literary historians, no edition of the songs in which the latter were called by their proper name – Bosniak folk songs – was published before 2001.²⁰ Their interpretation indicates on the one hand that a national canon/cultural tradition is indeed always created retrospectively by searching for common features of a national culture in the past. On the other hand, their appreciation of the role and influence of the Austrian cultural policy in Bosnia is illustrative of the nationalist discourse that has characterized Bosniak historiography and literary criticism since the 1990s.²¹ It is clear that the Austro-Hungarian authorities, although initially striving to create a Bosnian nation by editing the folk songs stood at the very beginnings of the making of that nation, of the “inventing of tradition” relevant to its eventual emergence. Today, when the national (political, cultural, and literary) history of the Bosniaks is being canonized,²² the dominant narrative about the cultural policy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in Bosnia seems to be appropriated to nationalist purposes. This is probably the reason why Buturović, much later, stresses that Hörmann's collection supplies us with the historical evidence for his endorsement of the existence of a separate Bosniak nation. But, whether Hörmann was “aware” of the fact that the epic songs he collected were “the specific particularity of a well-defined ethnos”,²³ as Buturović states, remains an open question.

Indeed, the plot of many songs is set in historical events (often battles) from the 15th till the 18th century, presenting those times as a heroic era for the Bosnian Muslims. Being put together into one collection, they opened ways to the Muslim population of Bosnia for the recognition of their own, collectively shared past, which is regarded to be crucial for the creation of national identity.²⁴

The song *Filip Madžarin i Gojeni Halil* (*Filip Madžarin and Gojeni Halil*) recalls the insurrection of the Krajina-beys against the Sublime Porte (1638) in an epic way. A certain part of the song tells about the discontent of the beys from the Bosnian Krajina with the decisions of the central power in Istanbul: one of them, Mustaj-bey from Lika (Mustaj-beg Lički), utters their grievances, refusing to obey the edict of the sultan and even announcing the possibility of revolt against the sultan: “On my faith and religion, / Mujo, I am already fed up with / The czar's edicts from Istanbul.' /.../ So the bey swore by his faith: / 'I will start a war against the czar,' [...]”²⁵ In *Džanan-buljuk baša i Rakocija* (*Džanan the buljuk-basha* [commander of a military company, SV] and *Rákóczy*) we meet a 12,000 man army of Bosnian Muslims fighting for the Sultan in Transylvania against a Christian coalition led by Duke Rákóczy.²⁶ Thanks to the bravery and shrewdness of the Bosnian battalion, the Ottomans win the battle and save this part of the empire. When Džanan, the commander of the Bosnians, is asked by Sultan Suleyman if he wants to receive Bosnia as his *pashalik*, he answers that he does not want the Pashalik of Bosnia, nor “any treasures without bill [confirmation]” (meaning that he neither longs for political power, nor does he seek an estate that he can own only temporarily), he further declares he is not made for *veziership*, and he and his Bosnians have enough treasures to keep at home. Therefore, he asks the Sultan to give the Bosnian landowners (*spahi's*) the right to issue a *tapija* on their conditional estates (*timars*), which means they could turn them into free holdings (permanent, heritable possessions), and to have their own *defter-hana*²⁷ in Bosnia. Further, he asks the sultan to acknowledge the special troops (*jerlikuls*) that protected fortified cities and grant local military commanders (*kapetans*) the right to receive their salary (*ulëfa*) in Bosnia, so they need not go to Istanbul.²⁸ These explicitly social wishes and strivings for class rights of the Bosnian aristocracy are expressed in the song, but never fulfilled in reality. The specific, at times cordial, at times strained relations between

Bosnian Muslim beys (esp. the ones from the Krajina) and the central Ottoman power, which was depicted in those (and many other) songs, would later come to be regarded by Bosniak nationalist ideologists and historians as a fundamental proof of the glorious and unique past of their nation. They regard(ed) the songs as an evidence of the historical continuity of the Bosniaks as a distinct ethnic group (not only in the Ottoman Empire in general but also in Bosnia), striving for its own, national, autonomy. Of course, such interpretations too easily forget that in the 17th to the 19th century in the Ottoman Empire religious determination and social status were of key importance, and that, amongst Bosnian Muslims, class needs and discontent with certain social conditions were motivating their strivings for autonomy, and not some supposed national or ethnic cohesion.

In many other songs half mythic, half historical Bosnian Muslim heroes play the main roles. Because Alija Đerzelez is one of the most popular epic heroes of Bosnian Muslim epic poetry, I will shortly focus on him: Similar to the Serbian epic hero Marko Kraljević, Alija has an extraordinary horse and a reputation as an undefeated warrior of almost magic proportions. He seems to be the epic pendant of several distinct historical figures (which in some instances are even blurred altogether into one figure): of Alibeg Podunavac, Sandžak-bey from Smederevo who lived in the second half of the 15th century, of the famous Turkish nobleman (*akindžija*) from the family Mihaloglu, or, as it is the case in the song *Đerzelez Alija i Vuk Jajčanin* (*Đerzelez Alija and Vuk Jajčanin*) of the legendary Turkish warrior Gürz Ilyas.²⁹ In this song Alija has a dream which forewarns him that Vuk Jajčanin has killed the Pasha of Sarajevo, slaughtered and enslaved the Muslims of the city, taken Alija's tower (*kula*) and kidnapped his sister. In the second part of the song we see him leaving from the mountain Avala (near Belgrade) and traveling to Sarajevo in order to take revenge on Vuk (an act which could be interpreted as saving the Muslims). At a given moment, Alija comes to the Drina river and, lacking time to go to Višegrad to cross the bridge there, he jumps on his extraordinary horse over the Drina.³⁰ One can imagine the immense popularity of these well-known songs about mythical heroes such as Đerzelez, with whom the large masses of Bosnian Muslims could identify at times they felt their identity to be endangered – after the 1878 Congress of Berlin.

A publication of the songs at the time when the Muslim population of Bosnia was still very confused by the changed geopolitical circumstances should undoubtedly have meant an important psychological encouragement to them. As Rizvić writes, it is sure that the epic content of many of these songs fed the national pride of the Bosnian Muslims and confirmed the values of their oral poetry in the folk language.³¹ Subsequently, Hörmann's songs, collected with the help of several Bosnian Muslims, were clearly one of the cultural stimuli that caused a new "vertical solidarity" (transcending social classes) among the Bosnian Muslims³² which, in the long run, would result in their national awakening. Relevant to my point of view is that Hörmann was a representative of an imperial power, and that, whether he wanted or not, he found himself in a privileged position to represent the Other. Nevertheless, although being an Austro-Hungarian official, he succeeded in approaching this Other. Due to its hybrid nature, Hörmann's work was of great significance for Bosnian cultural life and eventually transcended the pure political goals Kállay and Appel strove to achieve.

Other examples of this Austro-Hungarian cultural policy of "colonization by way of text"³³ are the cultural activities of both the *Landesmuseum* ("Regional Museum"/"Zemaljski muzej") along with its review (*Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja*),³⁴ and the literary magazine *Nada* (*Hope*).³⁵ The latter magazine was founded at the request of the Joint Minister of Finance, Benjamin Kállay, who specified the tasks of the review in his note to the government as follows:

Schon zur Zeit meines vorjährigen Aufenthaltes in Sarajevo habe ich der Landesregierung meinen Entschluss kundgegeben, eine illustrierte Zeitschrift belletristisch-belehrenden Inhaltes in bosnischer Sprache zu gründen, deren Aufgabe es sein soll, einerseits der einheimischen Leserkreisen eine ihrem Bildungsgrade angepasste geistig anregende Lektüre aus allen Gebieten des Wissens und der Bildung in volkstümlicher fesselnder Form zu bieten und andererseits *die Kenntniss der wahren Verhältnisse und der fortschreitenden Kulturentwicklung Bosniens und der Herzegovina in Wort und Bild* nach aussen hin in streng objektiver würdiger Form zu vermitteln.³⁶

As Kállay elucidated in his request to the provincial government, *Nada* was founded to serve political goals, more specifically to function as a counterpart to the popular Serbian and

Croatian literary magazines and the nationalist tendencies they spread.³⁷ However, it turned out to be much more than an exclusive means of political propaganda. Again, *Nada's* editor-in-chief Kosta Hörmann departed, with the support of the *Landesregierung*, from an already existing cultural fact: the popularity of literary magazines. Indicative is even the layout of the front page, on which, next to the newly invented Bosnian heraldic insignia (a shield with lilies and a dagger), figured a *guslar*, a South-Slav epic folksong singer, symbol of the collective memory of the people, playing the one-snared violin or *gusle*. The *gusle*-player is wearing a *čalma* (turban), and next to the name of the review figured a star and a half-moon, probably symbols of the Muslims. *Nada*, however, was not only created to function as the voice of the center of power (and was not only known as such by its readers and critics), but also significantly enriched the cultural life in Bosnia. Therefore, it was not merely an instrument of Austria's imperial policy-makers in Bosnia – whose goals it eventually failed to realize.

Nada could be identified as an example of what Eagleton labels “a link between power and culture”. “No political power”, he writes,

can survive satisfactorily by naked coercion. It will lose too much ideological credibility, and so prove dangerously vulnerable at times of crisis. [...] To govern successfully, it must therefore understand men and women in their secret desires and aversions, not just in their voting habits or social aspirations. If it is to regulate from the inside, it must also imagine them from the inside. And no cognitive form is more adroit at mapping the complexities of the heart than artistic culture.³⁸

To a great extent responding to the aesthetic views of the Croatian poet Silvije S. Kranjčević, who in fact edited the magazine,³⁹ *Nada* was for the literary life of Bosnia of those days an innovative and professionally managed literary review. It was received by the local population in different ways and, just as the *Folk Songs of the Bosnian Muslims*, the judgment of it very often depended on the national and political determination of the critique.

Examples of a subversive (nationalist) counter-discourse towards the Austrian policy and another way of canonizing (oral) literature can be found by re-reading the *Bosanska vila* (*The Bosnian Fairy*), the main literary magazine of the Bosnian Serbs, in which we discern a fierce anti-Austrian line. Just as on the front page of *Nada*, the *gusle*-player also for many years figured on the front page. The need of its editors to stress the authenticity of their cultural identity and to contrast it with the one the Austrians proposed was fuelled by (Serbian) nationalism and could be in a way compared with a nationalist/nativist reaction of the colonized to the “imperial gaze”.

The editors of the *Fairy* very carefully selected the authors and texts they included in the magazine: as far as literature in Serbo-Croat was concerned, until 1904 they published exclusively Serbian authors or Muslim writers who declared themselves *Muslim Serbs* (*Srbi-Mohamedovci*). They also promoted what could be labelled the entire Bosnian pre-national Serbo-Croat “ethno-symbolic heritage” (oral folk songs) as exclusively Serbian, considering Muslim songs as Serbian. By doing so, they continued the tradition of essentialist nationalism, introduced by Vuk Karadžić, who had claimed that in Bosnia there is only one nation, the Serbian, divided into three religions. Thus, the *Bosnian Fairy* established an obvious dialogue – or even polemic – with the Austrian cultural politics.⁴⁰ One could argue that here, the cultural policy of the Austrian “center of power” – at least from the point of view of its national goals – accomplished the opposite effect, as it was completely rejected by a large part of the population, because it was perceived as anti-national (i.e. anti-Serbian or anti-Croatian). The role of literature in this process should not be underestimated, esp. given the fact that other modern means of communication were still lacking or not fully developed.

2. The Pen of the Censor and the Image of the Dual Monarchy in the Literature of Bosnia-Herzegovina

My second illustration of the diverse and complex cultural encounter and the ensuing dialogue between the Austro-Hungarian center(s) and the Bosnian periphery concerns the image of the Dual Monarchy in the literature(s) of Bosnia. I will first address the question of preventive censorship in Bosnia imposed on the press at the time, and then turn to some canonized literary works which deal with the Austro-Hungarian era. These examples will show that it is impossible to speak about one image or one narrative of the Double Monarchy in the literature(s) of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Because the period of Austro-Hungarian rule in

Bosnia coincides with the period of growing national consciousness of the Serb, Croat and Muslim communities, there exists a strong interconnection between the dominant nationalist discourse within each particular ethno-religious community and the image of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in a concrete (literary) text, published in a Serb, Bosniak or Croat journal.

Scrutinizing the reaction of several Bosnian writers and journalists to a particular event and the (im)possibility to express their opinion about it will tell us how the Austrian preventive censorship functioned and how Bosnian writers accommodated it. Two exemplary “key-events” are without any doubt the occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by the Austrian troops in 1878 and its subsequent 20th and 25th anniversaries. In the short story of Nikola Šumonja *Pod gvozdenim krstom. Pripovijetka iz prošlih dana (Under the Iron Cross. A Short Story from Past Days)*, the narrator depicts the collective suffering of law-abiding Bosnian Serbs during the military occupation of Bosnia by the Dual Monarchy. After the publication of the first episode of the story in *Bosanska vila (The Bosnian Fairy)* in 1886,⁴¹ the Austrian censor forbade its further publication, but a short time later it was resumed nevertheless in *Javor (The Maple Tree)* in Novi Sad,⁴² which at that time was also a part of Austria-Hungary.

This phenomenon, namely the unevenly strong censorship in different parts of the Monarchy and the sometimes unexpected “possibilities” it entailed for writers and publicists, was not typical for Bosnia only, but seems to have been characteristic of the Dual Monarchy as a whole, and was due to its political structure. The lack of centralism, inherent to Austro-Hungarian Dualism, thus opened a lot of opportunities to its citizens. Very important indeed for understanding the Bosnian “periphery” of those days is to acknowledge the role of other South-Slav “centers” both inside and outside of the Dual Monarchy: Zagreb, Novi Sad and Belgrade.

A second illustration – although not from Bosnia – is the case of Rijeka/Fiume.⁴³ Here, Croatian writers and politicians could more easily publish nationalist polemic literature that had been forbidden in Croatia. It seems that even Budapest fulfilled this function for anti-Habsburg Croat intellectuals.⁴⁴

Even after the rule of Kállay preventive censorship continued to exist.⁴⁵ An example taken from a (merely pro-regime) Serbian periodical is the introductory text *Kroz četvrt stoljeća Okupacije (Through 25 Years of Occupation)*, in the first number of the magazine *Dan (Day)*. The author explains in a footnote that “he had hastily to revise this text, to avoid the first issue of *Dan* not getting published on time because of this article, because the censor erased two entire pages.”⁴⁶ Actually, the author of the article (Savo Miladinović, co-editor of the magazine), his Serbian nationalist views notwithstanding, turns out to be overtly regime-inclined, and there are only a few passages in the text that are indicative of his critical attitude towards certain economic aspects of the Austro-Hungarian regime (in line with the social and political profile of the author): “Foreigners got concessions instead of us natives, several business consortia were founded, which exploited the land and forests, and edged us from our businesses and revenues.”⁴⁷ In 1906, when writing about the bloody crushing of the general strike in Sarajevo and Zenica, the editors are confronted with severe censorship, so they leave several rows blank. They explain the chaotic layout of the paper and the many blank sections in their newspaper as follows: “The censorship erased 491 rows in this issue, so we had to put advertisements on the empty pages, because we are not allowed to leave pages blank.”⁴⁸

Croat newspapers of that time were in the same situation, e.g. the *Hrvatski dnevnik (Croat Daily)* where we find small paragraphs in the middle of a page, entitled *Raboš preventivne cenzure (The Tally of Preventive Censorship)*, explaining to its readers exactly how many lines the censor wiped away, and in which texts. Sometimes, those paragraphs are even ironic about the role of the censor, as in the next example, taken from the *Croat Daily* of January 1906: “In the number of yesterday, the devoted pen of the censor took the most striking passages from different articles. Especially the introduction was butchered, as the basic thoughts, the reason why the article was confiscated, were extracted from it. All in all, yesterday 56 lines were sacrificed.”⁴⁹ Or, the editors even started mocking the censor: “Yesterday, we got off easily – It seems that the southern wind made the ice around the heart of the censor melt, because we had only 10 lines confiscated. This is anyway the ‘existential minimum’, which every fair man will allow him eagerly.”⁵⁰ Irony in newspaper texts and literary works thus often served as a form of resistance to censorship, as well as to Austro-Hungarian colonialism in general, as illustrate the satirical columns by Savo Skarić Zembilj⁵¹ in the

newspaper *Srpska riječ* (*The Serbian Word*) and Kočić's famous satire *Jazavac pred Sudom* (*The Badger in the Court*), to which I will turn later.

In 1914, a significant number of editors of well-known papers and magazines signed a petition demanding freedom of press, published in the Serbian oriented newspaper *Narod* (*The People*). In sharp tone, they "raise[d] their voice against the frequent harassing of the independent press by the governmental practice of law." They emphasized that

the frequent confiscations, which originate from the law on the press and the old-fashioned material penal law, the high fines, and the unprecedentedly strong sentences that are pronounced [...] make the existence of an independent press *impossible* and prevent it from its elevated role. Typographical guilt is passed judgment on as in the absolutist period, any criticism of the system or foreign politics is regarded to be a crime, which is punishable with 4-5 months of severe prison. [...] In accordance to the degree of freedom of press one can judge freedom in general in a country, and expulsion of the independent press means crushing the freedom of thought by force.⁵²

The editors turned with this petition to "all the liberal representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, demanding them to reveal this protest in the Sabor and to start working energetically in order to enforce a new, liberal law. Until then, this reactionary law should be implemented more liberally."⁵³

After these examples of censorship taken from the daily press, and apart from the above-mentioned less-known story of Nikola Šumonja, I now turn to some canonized examples from the literature from Bosnia which deals with the changing everyday life caused by the Austro-Hungarian occupation. Aleksa Šantić's patriotic song *Ostajte ovde* (*Stay Here*, 1896) was published on the front page of the first issue of the Serbian literary magazine *Zora* (*Dawn*) in Mostar. It is a pathetic-rhetorical appeal to the Herzegovinian Muslims not to leave their homeland, as thousands of them had already done. The first wave of emigration happened immediately after the occupation because Muslims did not want to live under an infidel administration (*kaurin/đaurin* indicating non-moslem); a second one occurred after the 1882 Conscription Law (*Wehrgesetz*) for Bosnia and Herzegovina was declared, for many Muslims were unwilling to serve in the army of an infidel tsar.⁵⁴ In the song, the lyric subject clearly calls onto them to stay, appealing to the love for their homeland: "Stay here! [...] The sun of a foreign sky / Won't warm you as it does here, / Bitter are the bites of bread there, / where no one of yours is, where you do not have a brother."⁵⁵ The homeland is compared to a mother: „Who would look for a mother, better than his own? / And your mother is this land here."⁵⁶ The reader's attention is turned to the stony landscape that is covered by "the graves of your forefathers," which "knew how to defend it [the land]," thus recalling the heroic past of the Herzegovinian Muslims: "Cast a glance at these rocks and fields / Everywhere are the graves of your ancestors. // They were giants to this country, / Shining examples that knew how to defend it, / Stay in this land you too, / And give the spring of your blood for it."⁵⁷ The romantic tone of the song made it widely popular.

Before repeating the first strophe, Šantić stresses that blood-ties connect the inhabitants with their land: "Everything ties you to these rocks: / Name and language, brotherhood and holy blood."⁵⁸ They share the homeland that should be defended, the (Serbian) blood and name (on -ić) with the poetic subject that speaks from the song. The Serbian national ideology, also present in *Zora*, considered the Muslims to be "brothers of the same blood,"⁵⁹ which by historical chance changed faith, but allegedly never changed ethnos, name or language, which remained Serbian. At first glance this is a patriotic song, yet the historical context (1896) urges us to recognize that it had an unmistakably anti-Austrian message for its readers. Seen in the light of the political and cultural circumstances of the moment – it appeared in the era of the movement of the Serbs (1893–1903) and the Muslims (1899–1909) for religious and educational autonomy, which both began in Mostar⁶⁰ –, the song could allude that Serbs and Muslims as brothers share the same fate, both being forced to live under a foreign administration, against which they should defend their common homeland together. Notwithstanding the strong Austro-Hungarian censorship and its standing precondition not to publish texts of political content in literary reviews, Šantić's song was published by the editors of *Zora* nonetheless.

In Svetozar Ćorović's short story *Ibrahimbegov čošak* (*Ibrahim-bey's Balcony*, 1903)⁶¹ the narrator tells the story of an impoverished Muslim bey who cannot adapt to the modern capitalist institutions that made their entrance into Bosnia-Herzegovina with the arrival of

Austro-Hungarian rule. The old bey Ibrahim, descendant of a wealthy feudal Muslim family, lives very poorly as lamplighter and *čaršija*-cleaner. He still owns the house of his father, with its characteristic *čošak* (a covert balcony or gallery, typical of Ottoman architecture in Herzegovina) overlooking the marketplace. This balcony, with its almost sacral value, is the only thing that ties him to the glorious past of his family: The home is his patrimony (*babovina*), the only thing that distinguishes him from the other poor people. The engineer working at the city council, (to Ibrahim-bey the embodiment of Austro-Hungarian power) pressures him to sell it, because it is “ugly” and “disturbing.” As Ibrahim-bey does not want to sell it (“They’ll tell him that he sold his patrimony for a handful of coins to the Germans”⁶²), the engineer expropriates the property, only to tear down the home. Ibrahim-bey is forced to assist in demolishing his own house and dies during the works: in his absentmindedness he fails to notice the balcony falling down on him. The story is indicative of the new social hierarchies brought by Austrian-Hungarian rule. Ibrahim-bey is not only totally impoverished, but also deprived of social respect: Grgo, once a simple stableboy in his father’s household, is now working for the city and commanding Ibrahim in a very rude way. The emergence of modernity which, with its stress on rationality and functionality, introduces a new set of totally different values, is portrayed by the narrator of the story in a negative light.

Probably one of the strongest critics of Austro-Hungarian rule among the Serbian writers in Bosnia, Petar Kočić, was kept under surveillance by the foreign administration.⁶³ His play *Jazavac pred sudom* (*The Badger in the Court*, 1904) is a sharp satire on the Austro-Hungarian bureaucracy. The hero of the play is the Bosnian peasant David Štrbac, who arrives at the local court with a badger he has caught in his corn field. He wants the badger to be tried according to the very accurate Austrian laws. On the question of the judge, why did he bring the badger in court, and why he just did not kill it immediately after having caught it in the field, David answers:

I know the law, and I do not want out of it. I do not want out of it, even if you would kill me! [...] Some years ago, when I was not yet skilled in your laws, I killed a badger in that same field. It was probably the brother of this one. The emperor’s forester seized me and made me pay a fine of five forints. Having put the money in his pocket, he severely threatened me: ‘You may not do this anymore, because today’s law protects even a badger.’ So, when law is protecting it, let law judge it when it causes damage!⁶⁴

While the court clerk and the judge attempt to explain to him that the imperial laws can’t be implemented on badgers, David takes the occasion to tell them overtly what he thinks about the Goliath of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia. He cynically praises the occupier’s law system which has been so benevolent to him and his family that it has freed him from a lot of problems: when his son got conscripted into military service, where he soon died, the imperial army sent him three forints as compensation. David refused the money, and he and his family started crying from happiness, as “the empire freed them from the bad guy.”⁶⁵ Later, the tax collectors rid him of his cow, goats and pig, which were, according to David, always in the mood for mischief and therefore needlessly complicated David’s life, so he again started expressing „gratitude“ to the Empire for its generous help, and concludes:

I tell you that this glorious court has freed us, the peasants, of a lot of things. No more do the thick bulls roar from their shadowed resting places, nor do they butt our children; no longer do large herds of oxen rub our fences and crops like they used to do in the old foolish Turkish times. Today you won’t see the people having such fattened and bull-like cattle anymore. The cattle that the glorious court left us is quiet, tame and reasonable; it is true, a bit thin and weak, but we, stupid Bosnians, do not really deserve any better!⁶⁶

Kočić stresses not only David’s originality and cleverness, but also his highly-developed Serbian national awareness. The intensity of the patriotism David expresses was probably not really uttered by peasants at the time, yet his character connects widespread social discontent with nationalist grievances. Answering the question of the judge if the peasants are satisfied David replies:

Oh, we are satisfied! Something is well weighing us down from all sides; because of a kind of strong happiness, we’re deadened so we can hardly breathe. [...] But it is very hard for me that chiefs tell me I am not a Serb. Look at me, Sir, take a good look; I weighed myself on two imperial scales, on a Turkish one and on that of this

Emperor of yours, and both said not an ounce more or less than twenty-five *okas!*
But when the Serbian spirit in me starts to grow and expand, there is no imperial
scale in this world that could truly tell my weight.⁶⁷

The drama ends with the judge calling a doctor, who, after examining the peasant, while speaking a mix of German and Serbo-Croat, and measuring David's skull, declares him insane.

The Muslim writers are more complex (or: heterogeneous), regarding their reception of the Austro-Hungarian occupation. This is due to the fact that the Muslim community was politically highly disorientated and remained so even a long time after the Austrian occupation of Bosnia. This political disorientation could be one of the reasons why national awareness among Muslim writers and intellectuals was more diffuse than among the catholic or orthodox population⁶⁸ at the time: they were shifting between Serb, Croat or Bosniak national determination,⁶⁹ at times opting for a (pan)islamic cultural identity.

A telling example for this shifting national affiliation can be traced in the work of the poet Musa Ćazim Ćatić, generally considered to be the first modernist Bosniak poet. In his first patriotic poems, which he sent to the Bosnian-Serbian literary journal *Bosanska Vila* after his studies in Istanbul,⁷⁰ he claims to be a Serb: „I am a Serb, a Serbian child, / Clear is my Serbian conscience; / The glory of my forefathers / Shines like a burning sun.“ In the same poem, he mentions Serbian national (half-mythological and half-historical) heroes together with Muslim ones: he praises (Kraljević) Marko, Miloš (Obilić) and Đerzelez Alija.⁷¹ A few years later, he abandons this Serbian determination and writes poems, devoted either to Islam or patriotic verses about his *Bošnjaštvo* (Bosnianness).⁷² Later, during the Balkan wars (1912/13), he writes the poem *Osmanliji (To the Ottoman)*, a poem consisting of five sonnets in which he calls upon the Ottoman Empire to wake up and resist the four-headed demonic beast at its frontiers that wants to crush the glorious past of the Empire of the Crescent.⁷³ In the same period, explicit panislamic sympathies can be observed in the articles he wrote as the editor-in-chief of the Mostar literary review *Biser (The Pearl)*.

As for the way the occupation was reflected in the Muslim/Bosniak contemporary literature one can look at the example of Edhem Mulabdić's *Zelena busenje (The Green Lawn)*, first published in Zagreb in 1898. This text is, together with Osman-Aziz's *Bez nade (Without Hope, 1895)*, one of the first Bosniak novels ever to be published and as such is considered by Bosniak literary critics to be one of the cornerstones of the Muslim literary canon in those days.⁷⁴ It has elements of traditional narrative forms as well as of the didactic-realistic historical novel, which by its stress on mimesis tends to confirm the moralistic and political views of the author. The plot of the novel starts at the beginning of the occupation, with Austrian troops having crossed the river Sava and approaching Maglaj, a small town in central Bosnia. Parallel to this, the narrator tells the story of a Muslim family in Maglaj. Depicting the fates of the three sons and the widow of Omer-effendi, Mulabdić evokes the different views of the Muslim population in Bosnia of the Austrian occupation. Mehmed, the oldest son, works as a clerk in the town's court and acts in accordance with the orders of the sultan not to resist the Austrian troops. The second son, Ahmet, leaves his beloved Ajiša to join a small, disordered battalion of volunteers which will fight the Austrians. Ultimately, he gets killed in one of the battles near Maglaj. The youngest one, Alija, leaves with the female members of the family for the village Trnine. In fact, many (ethnic and social) stereotypes as depicted in Mulabdić's novel correspond with the political views of the class of rich Muslim landowners at the time: the battalion of volunteers is an unorganized pack of rogues, in the village of Trnine there are always some silly Vlachs⁷⁵ ready to cheat an honest Muslim out of his property by putting his house at fire; there is one 'good' christian *kmet*, Lazar, who, the change of government notwithstanding, continues to bring the third to his bey);⁷⁶ finally, the Austrian soldiers are all cultivated people with fine manners (with one shameful exception of Montenegrin origin).

When compared to the program of the nationalist Muslim newspaper *Bošnjak* (Bosniak),⁷⁷ of which Mulabdić was the editor between 1892 and 1894, Mulabdić's novel outlines the ideological point of view of the author and the upper class of Moslem beys on the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia: accepting the new system was by far the best option for the Moslem population. From the position of the all-knowing narrator and through the fates of the characters depicted, Mulabdić *de facto* promotes the idea that the Bosnian Muslims should accept the occupation and the new system it introduces. In other words, as the title

of the novel metaphorically suggests, this new system will replace and cover the old one like a green lawn.

The Croat literature in Bosnia has its roots in the old Franciscan literary tradition of chronicle writing. This tradition allows us to observe the complex relations of the Franciscans with the Ottomans as well as with the Catholic West, a position in-between that, in fact, foreshadows their complex relationship with the Austrians and the policy of aggressive catholic proselytism as preached by archbishop Stadler. As Ivan Lovrenović justly observed, most of the Franciscans awaited the occupation with optimistic feelings, but were quickly disappointed when Austria-Hungary did not resolve the agrarian question, one of the most crucial social and economic problems in Bosnia.⁷⁸ At the time of the Austrian occupation, the best educated Croat intellectuals were without any doubt the Franciscan monks who had great influence on the local population, not limited to the Catholics. At this juncture a misunderstanding of the Franciscans' appreciation of the Austrian rule in Bosnia should be pointed out. Many literary historians (mainly nationalist ones⁷⁹) conceive the Franciscans as one solid block that acted in favor of the Dual Monarchy. However, not all of them believed the occupation by Austria-Hungary to be the best solution for Bosnia: in the period of national awakening in the South Slav lands, some of them cherished Bosnian autonomist ideas.⁸⁰ To understand this, we should go back to the ideas of Father (*fra*) Ivan Frano Jukić (1818–1857). Though influenced by the Illyric movement, the national identity he promotes is a Bosnian one, which includes all the confessions in Bosnia. He promoted his views through the literary review he edited under the title *Bosanski prijatelj* (*The Bosnian Friend*).⁸¹ Father Grgo Martić (1822–1905), one of the most outstanding Franciscans at the time of the occupation, and a convinced Illyrian with overtly Serbian sympathies in his youth, turned to a political *Croatiannes* only in the 1860s, which indicates why he eventually favored the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia. At the end of his life he withdrew to the monastery of Kreševo and devoted himself to his literary activities. It is at this time that he wrote a poem in favor of general Filipović.⁸² The political and historical views of Father Antun Knežević (1834–1889) reveal him to be the real heir of Jukić more than Martić has been. His understanding of national identity as a kind of political *Bosnianness* (*bošnjaštvo*) clearly differed from Kállay's national project as well as from the ethnic nationalism of the Moslem upper class promoted by the newspaper *Bošnjak*. In a letter to a friend in 1885, he wrote: “we do not live in paradise, and except for our personal liberty, there's no difference between this slavery and the slavery under the Turkish administration. Our people have been brought to the lowest degree of poverty, due to the constant expulsions and high taxes [...]”⁸³ All these different views can be found in the Franciscan journals of that time.

Concluding remarks

Used critically and with awareness of the cultural setting and the historical background of the Balkans as different from 'real' (post-)colonial societies and the Dual Monarchy as different from 'real' colonizing empires, post-colonial studies could open new perspectives in describing Austrian-Bosnian contacts. Taking into consideration the following reservations, it seems justified to use a *modified* or *quasi* post-colonial approach to analyzing the Austrian-Bosnian relations in the period from 1878 to 1918:

- Although significant cultural differences between the post-Ottoman Bosnia and the Dual Habsburg Monarchy definitely existed, they did not cause the same gap that is normally created in 'real' colonial encounters (in Africa, Asia, America or Australia) between the colonizing and the colonized culture. Describing European-Balkan or Austrian-Bosnian cultural relations from a post-colonial perspective involves the danger of stigmatizing those regions and thereby putting them in the context of an even bigger economic and cultural periphery than it was really the case under Austro-Hungarian rule – or today – and of reducing the heterogeneous cultural and literary life that existed between 1878 and 1918. These power-relations were structured much less *asymmetrically* than in 'real' colonies. The structure of the Dual Habsburg Monarchy, with its lack of centralism, opened a manifold of opportunities for the citizens and could therefore also question the (often self-understood) “universality” of cultural repercussions, generated by *any* imperial system, as some post-colonial theorists tend to suggest.

- In the given context, “center” and “periphery” are understood rather as imaginary geographies and used in a dynamic way. Thus, the Bosnian ‘periphery’ did not appear to be a monolithic structure, but was characterized by its own, internal dynamics, different centers (Sarajevo, Mostar) and rivalries between competing Serbian, Croatian and Muslim/Bosniak national projects and their respective dominant discourses. Very important, too, for the understanding of the Bosnian ‘periphery’ of those days is to acknowledge the role of other, non-Austrian and non-Bosnian, but broader South-Slav “centers” such as Zagreb, Belgrade and Novi Sad.

Stijn Vervaeet (1980) received in 2007 a PhD in Slavic languages and cultures at Ghent University. His doctoral thesis examined the construction of national identity by the three main ethnic groups (the Orthodox, the Muslim and the Catholic) in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Austro-Hungarian epoch on the basis of literary texts. Currently he works as a post-doctoral research fellow of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen) on a project on the representation of the past and the construction of cultural memory in post-Yugoslav prose.

Contact: stijn.vervaeet@ugent.be

Notes

- 1 Cf. e.g. Veesser, Aram H. (Ed.): *The New Historicism Reader*. London, New York: Routledge. 1994; Hawthorn, Jeremy: *Cunning Passages. New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*. London et al.: Arnold 1996; Brannigan, John: *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Houndmills: MacMillan 1998; Baßler, Moritz (Ed.): *New Historicism. Literaturgeschichte als Poetik der Kultur*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer 1995; Glauser, Jürg/Heitmann, Annegret (Eds.): *Verhandlungen mit dem New Historicism. Das Text-Kontext-Problem in der Literaturwissenschaft*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 1999.
- 2 Cf. the pioneering works of Edward Said, who, inspired by Michel Foucault's notion of discourse and power, paid special attention to the relationship between knowledge and power. Cf. Said, Edward: *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon 1978; *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage 1993.
- 3 Cf. Donia, Robert J.: *Islam under the Double Eagle. The Muslims of Bosnia and the Herzegovina 1878-1918*. Boulder/Colo.: Social Science Monographs 1981 (East European monographs 78), pp. 9-36; Donia, R.J.: *The Proximate Colony. Bosnia-Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian Rule*. In: *Kakanien revisited*, <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/fallstudie/RDonia1.pdf>, 11.09.2007.
- 4 Cf. Ruthner, Clemens: 'k.(u.)k. postcolonial'? Für eine neue Lesart der österreichischen (und benachbarten) Literatur/en. In: *Kakanien revisited*, <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/CRuthner1.pdf> 27.03.2003; Müller-Funk, Wolfgang: *Kakanien revisited. Über das Verhältnis von Herrschaft und Kultur*. In: *Kakanien revisited*, <http://www.kakanien.ac.at/beitr/theorie/WMueller-Funk1.pdf>, 27.09.2002; both essays are also published in: Müller-Funk, Wolfgang/Plener, Peter/Ruthner, Clemens (Eds.): *Kakanien revisited. Das Eigene und das Fremde (in) der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie*. Tübingen, Basel: Francke 2002; Stachel, Peter: *Der koloniale Blick auf Bosnien-Herzegowina in der ethnographischen Populärliteratur der Habsburgermonarchie*. In: Feichtinger, Johannes/Prutsch, Ursula/Csáky, Moritz (Eds.): *Habsburg Postcolonial. Gedächtnis – Erinnerung – Identität*. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag 2003, pp. 259-275; Ruthner, Clemens: *Kakanien's kleiner Orient. Post/koloniale Lesarten der Peripherie Bosnien-Herzegowina 1878–1918*. In: Hárs, Endre/Müller-Funk, Wolfgang/Reber, Ursula/Ruthner, Clemens (Eds.): *Zentren, Peripherien und kollektive Identitäten in Österreich-Ungarn*. Tübingen, Basel: Francke 2006, pp. 255-283.
- 5 Austria-Hungary in a very ambiguous way influenced the development of literature and culture in general in Bosnia and Herzegovina (e.g. on the one hand hindered local initiatives, through censorship and several bureaucratic measures, but on the other hand created also a lot of opportunities by sponsoring certain cultural projects). The term “internal colonialism” (Michael Hechter) sounds very attractive in this context, esp. because it can be applied on less overtly colonial states as well, e.g. the position of the Baltic or Central Asian States in the Soviet Union, the position of Ireland in the former British empire, in totalitarian regimes the abuse of culture by the state apparatus (Stalin's and Hitler's “colonization” of literature, music or film for propaganda-purposes). However, our aim here is not to define whether the rule of Austria-Hungary was colonial, but to look at the effect of these historical conditions and to try to describe them adequately. Cf. Hechter, Michael: *Internal Colonialism. The Celtic fringe in British National Development 1536–1966*. Berkeley: California UP 1975. Ruthner, Clemens: *Central Europe Goes Post-colonial. New Approaches to the Habsburg Empire*. In: *Cultural Studies* 16/6 (2002), pp. 877-833.

- 6 Todorova, Maria: *Imagining the Balkans*. New York, Oxford: Oxford UP 1997, p. 15f., p. 18; cf. Bjelić, Dušan: *Blowing Up the "Bridge"*. In: Bjelić, Dušan/Savić, Obrad (Eds.): *Balkan as Metaphor. Between Globalization and Fragmentation*. Cambridge/Mass., London: MIT 2002, pp. 1-22.
- 7 Cf. the titels mentioned in footnote 4. However, Haselsteiner indicates that not all Austrian newspapers did support the official discourse of the court and the military concerning the necessity of the occupation of Bosnia. He writes that some newspapers even criticized the official over-stressing of the so-called civilizing mission that the Dual Monarchy had to fulfill in these provinces. Cf. Haselsteiner, Horst: *Öffentliche Meinung oder Meinungspluralität? Zum Widerhall der Okkupation in der deutschsprachige Presse der Donaumonarchie*. In: Haselsteiner, H.: *Bosnien-Herzegovina. Orientkrise und Südslavische Frage*. Vienna, Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau 1996, pp. 49-73.
- 8 Cf. Gandhi, Leela: *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP 1998, pp. 171-172: "Postcolonialism semantically delivers the idea of a world historicized through the single category of colonialism. [...] the organisation of the immediate past under the rubric of colonialism tends to reduce the contingent and random diversity of cultural encounters and non-encounters within that past into a tired relationship of coercion and retaliation. [...] Seen as such, 'colonialism' supplies a category through which history becomes coherent, and therefore knowable, as a movement between imperial subordination and anti-colonial resistance."
- 9 Boehmer, Elleke: *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP 1995, p. 6f.
- 10 Kruševac, Todor: *Bosanskohercegovački listovi u XIX veku*. [Bosnian and Herzegovinian Journals and Newspapers in the 19th century] Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša 1978, pp. 9-13.
- 11 Cf. *Narodne pjesme Muhamedovaca u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sabrao Kosta Hörmann, savjetnik Zemaljske vlade za Bosnu i Hercegovinu. [Folk Songs of the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Collected by Kosta Hörmann, Adviser of the Provincial Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina] Sarajevo: Zemaljska štamparija 1888 (book I) and 1889 (book II).
- 12 "Für eine derartige Massnahme spricht auch der Umstand, dass unzweifelhaft nur der beste Eindruck bei der Bevölkerung dadurch hervorgerufen werden dürfte, wenn ein Organ der Landesregierung in solcher Weise sein Interesse für nationale Geistesprodukte und für die Förderung der Nationalliteratur bethätigt. Die Landes-Regierung erlaubt sich aus diesem Grunde den Antrag zu stellen, das hohe Ministerium geruhe dem Regierungsrath Hörmann die Drucklegung der von ihm veranstalteten Sammlung von Volksgedichten aus Bosnien und der Herzegovina zu bewilligen und weiters hochgeneigtest zu genehmigen, dass die hieraus erwachsenden Druckkosten auf Rechnung des Landesärars übernommen werden." [The letter is dated January 2, 1888.] The entire text is published in: Besarović, Risto (Ed.): *Kultura i umjetnost u Bosni i Hercegovini pod austrougarskom upravom*. Građa. [Culture and Art in Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian Government. Materials.] Sarajevo: Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine 1968, p. 246f. The archival documents collected in this book are preserved mainly in the Archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo, and partially in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna, the Archive of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Belgrade and the Archive of the city of Sarajevo.
- 13 I will use the adjective Bosnian as a regional indicator, to refer to the inhabitants, literature or culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole, and Bosniak as a national indicator, to refer to (the literature and culture of) the ethnic group that prior to the 1990s was called Bosnian Muslims.
- 14 Cf. Besarović 1968, p. 248.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 This is even today a very actual and sensitive topic in Bosnia. Cf. Kazaz, Enver: *Nacionalni književni kanon – mjesto moći*. [The National Literary Canon – A Place of Power] In: *Sarajevske sveske* [Sarajevo Notebook] 8-9 (2005), pp.123-133.
- 17 Cf. *Vienac* [The Wreath] 20/30-37 (1888); *Bosanska vila* [The Bosnian Fairy] 4/4 (1889), pp. 59-61; *Zora*[Dawn] 1898; *Stražilovo* [Stražilovo] 4/40 (1888), pp. 642-644.
- 18 Wachtel, Andrew Baruch: *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation. Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia*. Stanford: Stanford UP 1998, p. 32.
- 19 Buturović, Denana: *Studija o Hörmannovoj zbirci muslimanskih narodnih pjesama* [A Study of Hörmann's Collection of Muslim Folk Songs]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1976, pp. 57-73. Cf. Rizvić, Muhsin: *Književno stvaranje muslimanskih pisaca u Bosni i Hercegovini u doba austrougarske vladavine* [The Literary Creation of Muslim Writers in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Era of Austro-Hungarian Rule]. Sarajevo: ANU BiH 1973, I, pp. 99-102.
- 20 Buturović, Denana: *Narodne pjesme Bošnjaka u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sabrao Kosta Hörmann 1888-1889. Izbor i predgovor Denana Buturović. [Folk Songs of the Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Collected by Kosta Hörmann. Selected and introduced by Denana Buturović.] Sarajevo: Svjetlost 2001, p. ix: "U ovom izdanju bošnjačke usmene pjesme prvi put su nazvane vlastitim imenom: *Narodne pjesme Bošnjaka u Bosni i Hercegovini*." [In this edition, the Bosniak oral songs are for the first time called by their proper name: *Folk songs of the Bosniaks of Bosnia and Herzegovina*].
- 21 Or in fact even since the early 1970s, parallel with the public debate about the official recognition of the Bosnian Muslims as a separate nation, next to Serbs and Croats. This nationalist discourse does not at all differ from Croat or Serbian nationalist rhetoric that at this time, and especially during the 1990s used to be at its revival as well.
- 22 One of the most well-known and exemplary works of this kind of canonization of Bosniak history is Imamović, Mustafa: *Historija Bošnjaka*. [The History of the Bosniaks]. Sarajevo: Bošnjačka kulturna zajednica Preporod 1997, 21998.
- 23 Buturović 2001, p. x: "Međutim, Hörmann je znao da su epske pjesme koje je on godinama prikupljao i proučavao, rasprostranjena i specifična osobenost određenog etnosa, da je njihov izvor u narodu kome pripadaju." [But, Hörmann knew that the epic songs which he had been collecting and studying for years were the wide-spread and specific particularity of a well-defined ethnos, that their source is in the nation they are belonging to.]
- 24 Cf. Anderson, Benedict: *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso 1983.
- 25 Hörmann, Kosta: *Narodne pjesme Muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Knjiga I [Folk Songs of the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Book I]. Sarajevo: J. Kušan 21933, pp. 480, vs. 775-781: "Tako meni dina i imana, / Veće meni, Mujo, dojadiše / Iz Stambola carevi fermani. [...] / Pa se beže dinom kunijaše: / 'Sa carom ću sefer otvoriti, [...]."
- 26 The song refers to battles in Transylvania in 1658-1661.

- 27 Bookkeeping department where the *defters* (Ottoman land and tax registers) were kept. The wish for an own *defterhana* indicates the demand for legal certainty: the accounts department would register their possessions and made them secure.
- 28 Hörmann ²1933, pp. 77, vs. 1676-1695: "sultan, care, svečevo koljeno / ja ti Bosne pašaluka neću, / a neću ti blaga brez hesaba, / jer ja, care, n'jesam za vezirstva, / a dosta sam zadobio blaga, / imam čime u Bosnu se vratit, / imam za što b'jele dvore zgradit, / a i moji ostali Bošnjaci; / nego hoću, care, od Stambola, / da ti dadeš bosanskim spahijam', / što imaju zemlju u timarim', / da na zemlju i tapiju daju, / i da im se digne teftershana / iz Stambola do Travnika b'jela. / I tvojijem, care, jerlikulim', / po gradovim' mladim kapetanim', / da s' ulefa sve u Bosni daje, / da ne idu do Stambola b'jela, / da ne idu i ne troše blago. – Sve car dade što zaiska Džano, [...]"
- 29 Cf. Krnjević, Hatidža: Derzelez Alija u usmenoj tradiciji i u pripoveci Ive Andrića. [Derzelez Alija in the Oral Tradition and in the Story by Ivo Andrić.] In: Naučni sastanak u Vukove dane 13-19. IX 1976. Beograd: Međunarodni Slavistički Centar, pp. 311-326; Buturović, Denana: Gerz Ilyas prema historijskim izvorima XV, XVI i XVII vijeka. [Gerz Ilyas according to Historical Sources from the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries.] In: Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor. Knj. XLI, sv. 3-4, pp. 172-186. Beograd: Filološki fakultet 1975.
- 30 Hörmann, Kosta: Narodne pjesme Muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini. Knjiga I [Folk Songs of the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Book I]. Sarajevo: J. Kušan 1933, pp. 89-90, vs. 246-266: "Kud god ide, Drini vodi side. / Drina došla mutna i krvava: / Izginuli Sarajlije Turci, / Kiša pade, krvcu sapirala. / Broda nije, a čuprije nema, / Daleko mu na Višegrad sići; [...] / Poletješe dva hrt Alina, / Preskočiše Drinu vodu hladnu. / Kad vidio Derzelez Alija – / Jer bijaše u Alije adet, / Gdje mu skaču hrti tankoviti, / Tu mu more dorat preskočiti – / Pa izmače debela dorata, [...] / Preskoči mu Drinu vodu hladnu, [...]"
- 31 Rizvić 1973, I, p. 102.
- 32 Cf. the very enthusiastic reception of the songs among the Muslim population: *ibid.*, I, p. 102f.
- 33 Cf. Boehmer 1995, p. 13.
- 34 Cf. Dautbegović, Almaz: Spomenica 100-godišnjice rada Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine 1888-1988. [Commemorative Volume on the Occasion of the 100th Anniversary of the Zemaljski Muzej of Bosnia and Herzegovina.] Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej 1988. Donia, Robert: Sarajevo. A Biography. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Pr. 2006, pp. 88-91.
- 35 For archival materials on the founding of the review, cf. Besarović 1968, pp. 74-133.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 91 [emphasis SV].
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 92: "Für diesen meinen Entschluss war aber auch die Erwägung massgebend, dass die Herausgabe einer bosnischen illustrierten Zeitschrift sich auch aus Gründen politischer Natur empfehle, weil bekanntermassen die hier in Betracht kommenden kroatischen und serbischen Blätter dieser Kategorie ausnahmslos auf ihre jeweiligen nationalen Tendenzen das Schwergewicht legen und eines ihrer Hauptziele darin erblicken, diese ihre Tendenzen in immer weitern Kreise zu tragen, respektive dort wo sie bereits Wurzel gefasst haben zu befestigen, und es endlich leider eine bekannte Tatsache ist, dass sie es in dieser Beziehung gerade auf unsere Bevölkerung derzeit – wie man wohl sagen kann in erster Linie abgesehen haben." [The letter is dated February 14, 1894.]
- 38 Eagleton, Terry: The Idea of Culture. London et al.: Blackwell 2000; 82005, p. 50.
- 39 Ćorić, Boris: Nada. Književnoistorijska monografija. Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1978.
- 40 Vervaeet, Stijn: *Bosanska vila* i Dvojna monarhija. Književni program bosanskohercegovačkih Srba i kulturna politika Austrougarske [The *Bosnian Fairy* and the Dual Monarchy. The Literary Program of the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Cultural Politics of Austria-Hungary]. In: Susret kultura. Zbornik radova (1954–2004). Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet 2006, pp. 659-669.
- 41 Šumonja, Nikola: Pod gvozdenim krstom. Pripovijetka iz prošlih dana [Under the Iron Cross. A Short Story from Past Days]. In: *Bosanska vila* 2/20 (1886), pp. 306-308. It ended with the simple comment: "the end is not printed".
- 42 Šumonja, N.: Pod gvozdenim krstom. Pripovijetka iz prošlih dana [Under the Iron Cross. A Short Story from Past Days]. In: *Javor* 14/34-36 (1887), p. 530, p. 545, p. 562.
- 43 The city, harbour and district of Rijeka were since the *Nagodba* (Agreement) between Croatia and the Hungarian half of the Monarchy (1868, 1 year after the *Ausgleich*) by decision of the Kaiser a *corpus separatum*, annexed directly to the Hungarian crown. On its autonomy, legislative and administrative relations, a consensus should be achieved later on by both the Hungarian and Croatian parliaments. As both parliaments could not agree, the Croatian parliament (*Sabor*) proposed Rijeka to be administrated by the Hungarian government. According to this decision, the Hungarian parliament proclaimed a temporary situation (*provisorium*), which was accepted by the *Sabor*. Like this, censorship in Rijeka did not come under the Croatian law, which was especially during the rule of Khuen-Héderváry more rigorous than in Hungary. Cf. Šidak, Jaroslav et al.: *Povijest hrvatskog naroda g. 1860–1914* [History of the Croatian People 1860–1914]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga 1968, p. 41f.
- 44 Cf. the nice "literarily recalled" illustration at the beginning of the novel *Flags* by Miroslav Krleža: *Zastave*. Sarajevo: Nišro/Oslobodjenje 1967, p. 8.
- 45 Cf. Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Herzegovina. Hg. v. k.u.k. gemeinsamen Finanzministerium. Vienna: Staatsdruckerei 1906, p. 663f.
- 46 Kroz četvrt stoljeća okupacije [Through 25 Years of Occupation]. In: *Dan* 1/1 (1905), p. 1: "Ovaj članak je morao pisac na brzu ruku da preradi kako 1. broj "Dana" ne bi radi ovog članka zakasnio, jer je cenzura zbrisala gotovo pune dvije stranice."
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 2f.: "Koncesije su dobivali stranci, mjesto nas urođenika, sklupala su se razna trgovačka konzorcija, koja su eksploatisala zemlju i šume, potiskivala naš obrt i našu trgovinu."
- 48 Krvavi događaji u Zenici [Bloody events in Zenica]. In: *Dan* 2/16 (1906) p. 374: "Cenzura nam je u ovom broju izbrisala 491 redak, radi toga smo morali na prazne strane umetnuti oglase, jer bijelo ne smijemo ostaviti."
- 49 Raboš preventivevne censure [The Tally of Preventive Censorship]. In: *Hrvatski Dnevnik* 6, 09.01.1906 p. 1: "U jučerašnjem nam je broju revna cenzorova olovka iz raznih članaka izvadila najmarkantnija mjesta. Osobito je osakaćen uvodnik, iz kog su izvadene temeljne misli, radi kojih je članak zaplijenjen. U svemu je jučer palo žrtvom 56 redaka."

- 50 Raboš preventivne censure. In: Hrvatski Dnevnik 8, 11.01.1906, p. 5: "Jučer smo prošli vrlo jeftino-čini se, da je jugovina otopila led i oko srca cenzorova, jer nam je zaplijenio samo 10 redaka. To je svakako 'existenc-minimum' kog će mu svaki pravedan čovjek rado dozvoliti."
- 51 Cf. Skarić, Savo: Izabrana djela [Selected Works]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1982; Lešić, Zdenko: Pripovjedačka Bosna [Story-telling Bosnia]. 2 vols. Sarajevo: Institut za književnost/Svjetlost 1991, vol. 2, pp. 186-195.
- 52 Za slobodu štampe [For the freedom of press]. In: Narod 5/377 (1914), 05.(18).03.1914 [Till 1911, this newspaper indicated the date according to the Old Style, and from then on according to both the Julian and Gregorian calendars, giving the New Style in brackets.], p. 1: "Potpisani predstavnici bosansko-hercegovačkih listova podižu svoj glas protiv učestalih šikaniranja nezavisne štampe sa strane drž. odgovornosti. Česte zaplene, kojima je izvor u zakonu o štampi i zastarelom materijalnom kaznenom pravu, silne globe i nečuveno stroge kazne, koje su izrečene [...], onemogućuju opstanak nezavisne štampe i sprečavaju njenu uzvišenu ulogu. Štamparske krivice presuđuju se i danas kao u ap-solutističkom vremenu, svaka kritika sistema i spoljne politike smatra se 'zločinom', koje se kažnjava sa 4-5 meseci teške tamnice [...]. Prema stepenu slobode štampe prosuđuje se opšta sloboda u jednoj zemlji, a progonojenje nezavisne štampe znači nasilnički ugušivati slobodu misli." [emphasis i.o.]
- 53 Ibid., p. 1: "Potpisani predstavnici bosansko-hercegovačke štampe obraćaju se ovim na sve slobodoumne poslanike Bosne i Hercegovine i traže, da iznesu u saboru ovaj naš protest te da energično porade na tome, da se čim pre donese novi zakon o štampi u naprednom duhu, a dotle da se ovaj reakcionarni zakon o štampi liberalnije primenjuje." (emphasis i.o.) The newspaper *Narod* was forbidden for a while, and its editor Risto Radulović even imprisoned for his overtly criticizing Austro-Hungarian rule.
- 54 Later, during the 1890s, emigration continued because of the bad economic situation in Herzegovina, or because of big political changes, particularly in 1908 after the Annexation of Bosnia and again in 1918 after the First World War.
- 55 In: Zora 1/1 (1896), p. 1 (the song is published in all the collected or chosen works of Šantić, and even today taught in high schools in Serbia and Bosnia.) "Ostajte ovdje! Sunce tuđeg neba / Ne će vas grijati k'o što ovo grije, / Grki su tamo zalogaji hljeba, / De svoga nema i de brata nije..."
- 56 "Od svoje majke ko da traži bolju? / A majka vaša zemlja vam je ova, - [...]"
- 57 "Bacite pogled po kršu i polju / Svuda su groblja vaših pračedova. / Za ovu zemlju oni bjehu divi, / Uzori svjetli što je branit znaše, / U ovoj zemlji ostanite i vi, / I za nju dajte vrelo krvi vaše."
- 58 "Za ove krše sve vas silno veže: / Ime i jezik, bratstvo i krv sveta."
- 59 *Jednokrva naša braća muslimani*, an expression that is very frequent in the press of this time.
- 60 Madžar, Božo: Pokret Srba Bosne i Hercegovine za vjersko-prosvjetnu samoupravu. [The Movement of the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Religious and Educational Autonomy.] Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša 1982. Šehić, Nusret: Autonomni pokret Muslimana za vrijeme austro-ugarske uprave u Bosni i Hercegovini. [The Autonomy Movement of the Muslims in the Era of Austro-Hungarian Rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina.] Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1980; Skarić, Vladislav/Nuri-Hadžić, Osman/Stojanović, Nikola: Bosna i Hercegovina pod Austro-Ugarskom upravom [Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian Rule]. Beograd: Geca Kon 1932.
- 61 First printed in an anthology of Čorović's short stories: U časovima odmora. Knjiga I [In Hours of Rest. Book I]. Mostar: Paher & Kisić 1903, shortly before that published in Novi Sad in the review *Letopis Matice srpske* 218/2 (1903) pp. 92-102.
- 62 "Kazaće mu da je svoju starinu prodao Švabi za kesu groša [...]." In: Kazaz, Enver/Kovač, Nikola/Lovrenović, Ivan (Eds.): Antologija bosanskohercegovačke pripovijetke XX vijeka [Anthology of the 20th Century Bosnian Short Story]. Sarajevo: Alef 2000, p. 31. Cf. Čorović, Svetozar: Sabrana djela [Collected works]. Ed. by Branko Milanović. Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1967, vol. III, p. 52.
- 63 On Kočić's relations with the Austrian authorities cf. Kruševac, Todor: Petar Kočić. Studija [Petar Kočić. A Study]. Beograd: Prosveta 1951.
- 64 "[...] znam zakon, pa neću preko zakona. Neću preko zakona, pa ubij me! [...] Neke godine, dok još nisam bio svještio vašeg zakona, ubio sam u toj istoj njivici jednog jazavca. Biće valjda brat ovog lopova. Uvati me carski šumar i oglobi me s pet vorintri. Kad metnu pare u džep, oštro mi zaprijeti: 'Ne smiješ to više činiti, jeri jazavca današnji zakon brani.' E, kad ga brani, nek mu i sudi kad štetu počinili!" In: Kočić, P.: Sabrana djela [Coll. Works]. Banja Luka, Sarajevo: Glas/Svjetlost 1986, vol. II, p. 16.
- 65 Ibid., p. 18.
- 66 Ibid., pp. 20: "Nas je, seljaka, kažem vam, ovaj slavni sud od mnogo čega oslobodio. Ne riču nam više sa plandišta zadržigali bakovi niti nam bodu čeljadi; ne taru nam više silne volovanice plotova i usjeva kô u ono staro, blentavo tursko vrijeme. Danas ne mereš videti u svijeta žirovne i bakovite sermije. Što nam je slavni sud ostavio, to je mirno, čudavno, pametno; istina malo mršavo i slabo, ali za nas, blentave Bošnjake, i nije drugo!" [Translation partly based on a quotation by Moravcevič, Nicholas: The Village Story in Serbian Literature: The Peasant in the Prose of Petar Kocić. In: The Slavic and East European Journal 21/4 (Winter 1977), pp. 506-516.]
- 67 Ibid., p. 26f.: "O, mi smo zadovoljni! Pritisnulo nas dobro sa sviju strana; od nekakve smo se miline umrtvili pa jedva dišemo [...]. Ali mi je vrlo teško što mi gazde kažu da nijesam Srb. Pogledaj me, gospodine, dobro me pogledaj: mjerio sam se na dva carska kantara, na turskom kantar u i na kantar ovog vašeg cara, pa ni dram manje ni dram više od dvadeset i pet oka! A kad se Srb u meni napiri i nadme, nema tog carskog kantara na 'vom svijetu koji bi me mogô izmjeriti!" [English transl. partly taken from Moravcevič 1977.]
- 68 Džaja, Srećko: Bosnien-Herzegowina in der österreichisch-ungarischen Epoche (1878-1918). Die Intelligentsia zwischen Tradition und Ideologie. Munich: Oldenbourg 1994 (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 93), p. 217, claims that a Western (German, Croatian, Serbian) comprehension of national identity is not conveyable to the Islam as cultural system or 'Polis-Religion', in which the religious sphere covers the profane one, in contrast to the Western post-French Revolution comprehension of religion as a private sphere. This made the shifting national options of the Muslims understandable and unlogic to essentialist nationalist Serbs and Croats which wanted (want) them to choose explicitly for a Croat or Serb national identity.
- 69 Rizvić 1973, 2 vols.
- 70 Rizvić 1973, I, p. 190, states that the almost the whole Muslim emigration in Istanbul was of pro-Serbian orientation.

- 71 Oganj [Fire], part 2: Srpski ponos [Serbian Pride]: "Ja sam Srbin, srpsko d'jete, / Srpska mi je savjest čista; / Junačkih mi djeda slava / Ko sunašce žarko blista. [...] Slavim Marka i Miloša; / Slavim hrabrog Djerzeleza." In: Bosanska vila 26/8 (1899), p. 97. Cf. Čazim Čatić, Musa: Sabrana djela [Collected works]. Tešanj: Narodni univerzitet 1968, p. 4f.
- 72 Islamu [To Islam], 1902. In: Behar 3/1 (1902/03), p. 3. Reprint in: Collected works (1968), p. 9; Ja sam Bošnjak [I am a Bosniak]. In: Bošnjak 13/36 (1903), p. 3. Reprint in: Collected works (1968), p.15f.
- 73 Osmanliji [To the Ottoman]. In: Zeman 2/89 (1912), p. 2. Reprint in: Collected works (1968), pp. 164-167: "Osmanov sine, nepobjedni lave, / Preni se iz sna i otvori oči! / Na tvojoj eno granici se koči / Demonsko zvjere sa četiri glave. / I bjesomučno na te sada reži, / Podižuć pandžu okolo i smjelo; / Povijest tvoju satrti bi htjelo, / U krvav barjak zav"jena što leži... [...] Zar polumjesec da po prahu plazi, / Da barjak Bugar, Grk i Srb ti vrjeđa – / Zar sveti pepo junačkih ti pređa / Njihovih konja da kopita gazi?"
- 74 Rizvić, Muhsin: Panorama bošnjačke književnosti. Sarajevo: NIPP Ljiljan 1994, pp. 200-234.
- 75 The name Vlach is in the novel is used pejoratively to indicate the orthodox/Serbian population of Bosnia.
- 76 The figure of Lazar corresponds to the positive Christian stereotype, which enables the Muslim upper class to create a positive auto-stereotype of their own class, depicting the muslim landowner as being beloved by his christian *kmet*s.
- 77 The newspaper *Bošnjak* can be regarded as an example of cultural self-colonization, as its editors to a great extent appropriated the ideological postulates of the occupier in relation to the forthcoming development of a Bosnian nation. Similar to Kállays project of multi-confessional Bosnian nationalism, the editors of *Bošnjak* stressed the leading role of the Bosnian Muslims for the formation of the Bosnian nation. They did not only deny the Serbian and Croatian claims on Bosnia, but stressed the role of the Islam for this project and even went as far as denying the existence of a Serbian and Croatian nation in Bosnia, which caused hot discussions in the press in those days. As a matter of fact, the nationalism of *Bošnjak* was analogical to that of its Serbian and Croatian partner's counterparts – one could say that *Bošnjak* turned their thesis (of the non-existing of a separate Bosniak nation) upside down.
- 78 Lovrenović, Ivan: Bosanski Hrvati. Zagreb: Durieux 2002, p. 25.
- 79 Cf. e.g. Maksimović, Vojislav: Viđenja Bosne [Views of Bosnia]. Pljevlja: Međurepublička zajednica 1970.
- 80 Karamatić, Marko: Franjevci Bosne srebrene u vrijeme austrougarske uprave 1878–1914 [The Franciscans of the Franciscan Province 'Bosna srebrene' (Bosna Argentina) at the Time of the Austro-Hungarian Rule]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost riječi 1992, pp. 37-43; Hadžijahić, Muhamed: Od tradicije do identiteta [From Tradition to Identity]. Zagreb: Muslimanska naklada Putokaz 1990, pp. 31-35, Lovrenović 2002, p. 16ff.
- 81 The first issue appeared in 1850, the second in 1851, the third and the fourth posthumously in 1861, resp. 1870, by Antun Knežević. Cf. Jukić, Ivan Frano: Sabrana djela [Coll. Works]. Ed. by Boris Ćorić. Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1973.
- 82 *Uz Bosnu Filipović* [*Filipović Upstream the River Bosna*], originally published by Milena Mrazović in 1893.
- 83 "[...] ne živimo u raju, izuzev lične slobode, nema nikakve razlike između ovog robovanja i robovanja pod turskom upravom. Naš narod doveden je do najnižeg stupnja siromaštva radi stalnih progona, teških poreza [...]." Qutd. in: Kovačić, Slavko: Pogledi fra Antuna Kneževića na odnos Bosne prema Ugarskoj i Austro-Ugarskoj. [The Views of Friar Antun Knežević on the Relationship of Bosnia with Hungary and Austria-Hungary]. In: Nova et vetera 28/1-2 (1978), pp.197-212, qutd. p. 208.