

[講演]

What is Naš? Conceptions of “the Other” in the Prose of Ivo Andrić

「私たち」とは何か？

イヴォ・アンドリッチの散文における「他者」の概念

ロネル・アレグザンダー

【解説】

本原稿は、2012年11月9日(金)、立教大学池袋キャンパス12号館第1会議室で開催された、ロネル・アレグザンダー教授(カリフォルニア大学バークレー校)による講演の記録である。

アレグザンダー教授の専門分野は幅広く、セルビア・クロアチア語のアクセント論、ブルガリア方言研究、バルカン言語学、また旧ユーゴスラヴィアを題材とした社会言語学的研究の研究者として広く知られている。言語学の枠にとどまらず、南スラヴの文学やフォークロア研究においても大きな業績を上げておられるが、女史の単著「ヴァスコ・ポパの詩作品の構造」(1986)は特に高く評価され、セルビア本国でも翻訳が刊行されている。

今回の講演では、旧ユーゴスラヴィアのノーベル賞作家イヴォ・アンドリッチの三作品『ドリナの橋』、『トラヴニク年代記』(邦題：『ボスニア物語』)、『呪われた庭』の読解を通して、「私たち」そして「他者」の関係について綿密な考察が行われている。「私たち」という所有形容詞が何を対象とし、いかなる「他者」を想定するのかという問いかけは、言語学的な問題であると同時に、文学研究においてもきわめて重要な課題である。そのため、本論は、アンドリッチ研究として優れた論考であるのみならず、言語学と文学の両領域に跨って活躍しているアレグザンダー教授ならではの多面的な刺激を与える論考となっている。

今回、立教大学で行なわれた講演は、科学研究費・基盤研究(B)「東欧文学における「東」のイメージに関する研究」(代表：阿部賢一)と北海道大学グローバルCOEプログラム「境界研究の拠点形成」(代表：岩下明裕)との共催で開催された。なお、本講演会は「南スラヴの言語と文化に関する連続講義」の1回として設定され、もともとの題目は「ユーゴスラヴィア崩壊後の境界とアイデンティティ：イヴォ・アンドリッチはまだ意味を持つか」であったが、講演会後の様々な議論を踏まえ、本稿は大幅に改定されていることを付言したい。また、残りの2回の講義も日本スラヴ学研究会との共催で行われた。題目は「南スラヴ諸語におけるアクセント変化：アクセント位置後退の意味」(11月5日、於：北海道大学)、「ブルガリア語方言研究：デジタル世紀における生きた伝統」(11月10日、於：東京大学)であった。最後に、招聘にあたって尽力された野町素己氏(北海道大学スラブ研究センター)に深く感謝したい。

(阿部賢一)

What is Naš? Conceptions of “the Other” in the Prose of Ivo Andrić

Ronelle Alexander

Introduction

Throughout Yugoslavia’s seven-decade history, only one of its writers was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature. This was Ivo Andrić, and the award consolidated his status as Yugoslavia’s premier cultural icon. Not only was he a firm believer in the Yugoslav ideal, but he was also an ideal exemplar of a “Yugoslav”, with identities grounded in all three of its major areas. He was a Croat in that he was born into a Croatian Catholic family and began both his university studies and his artistic career in Zagreb. He was a Bosnian in that he spent his first two decades in Bosnia and made Bosnia the central focus of the majority of his prose works. Finally he was a Serb in that he settled in Belgrade after the formation of Yugoslavia, lived the remainder of his life there, and referred to himself more than once as a “Serbian writer”.

At the time of his death in 1975, Yugoslavia was still a functioning country though in retrospect one could say that certain cracks in the structure were visible even then. Over the next two decades the country was torn apart by ever more virulent nationalism, as nationalist politicians on all sides fomented the fear and distrust of the Other which culminated in the violent breakup of Yugoslavia. The multiculturalism that characterized Yugoslavia at its best was replaced by highly charged ethnic nationalism, requiring all-or-nothing allegiance. In such an atmosphere, nationalists from all three warring sides – Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks – began to treat Andrić in pointedly ethnic terms. Serbs and Croats each promoted him as the exclusive property of their side and bitterly denounced the other side’s claim to him, whereas Bosniaks attacked him sharply for what they perceived as a strong anti-Muslim attitude.

But these facts should by no means cause one to consign Ivo Andrić to the past, and conclude that he is no longer relevant in the post-breakup world. To the contrary, his works are more relevant than ever, especially as concerns the idea of identity (which, of course, is the basis for defining oneself against “the Other”). Andrić was a keen observer of the human condition, as well as a consummate artist, and his works continue to yield great insight. My goal in what follows is to demonstrate how his writing functions to increase our awareness, both at the conscious and at the subconscious levels, of the human tendency to perceive

identity in terms of in-groups and out-groups. The three works which I will examine here are, like the vast majority of Andrić's prose, set in pre-modern Bosnia. Two were written while he was in seclusion in Belgrade during World War II and published immediately after the conclusion of the war in 1945, and the third was published nearly a decade later, in 1954.

Synopses of the three novels

The first is perhaps his best-known work, *Na Drini ćuprija*.¹ This novel, set in the town of Višegrad where Andrić grew up, covers a 400-year span of that town's history, from 1516 to 1914. It is concerned first with the building of the famous bridge of the title, and then with the life of the town as seen from the vantage point of the bridge. The first third of the book covers the bridge's creation, including the harsh treatment of peasant workers and the execution of one who opposed the building of the bridge, the dedication of the finished bridge in 1571, and the life of the town from then till the entry of the Austrians in 1878. The second third follows the life of the town from 1878 to the annexation in 1908, describing the gradual mutual adjustment of the town's natives and the Habsburg newcomers to one another. The final third covers the tumultuous years between the annexation and the outbreak of World War I in 1914. The narrative voice vacillates between a semi-omniscient detached observer, and a grounded, attached inhabitant of the town. There is a strong focus throughout on the tales passed from one generation of townsmen to the next, and the narration in the final sections of the book is particularly vivid, as if told by an eyewitness. Since Andrić spent his childhood years in Višegrad and returned there frequently during the years of his secondary education in Sarajevo,² it is reasonable to assume that the vividness, both of the tales and of the eyewitness-like narration, comes from his own personal experience.

The second novel, *Travnička hronika: Konsulska vremena*,³ is set in the city of Andrić's birth, Travnik, and covers a very short period of that city's history, from 1806 to 1814. These are critical years, the time of Napoleon's short-lived province in the Balkans, and the years when both France and Austria sent consuls to Travnik, then the capital of Bosnia. The novel's central character is the French consul; the action proper begins with his arrival in Travnik in early 1807 and concludes with his departure in 1814. The other major characters comprise the two consuls sent by Austria during this period, the three Viziers posted by the Porte during this period, the families of the two primary consuls (the French consul Daville and the first Austrian consul von Mitterer), and the attachés and assistants of all these officials. The narrative is not so much of Travnik itself as of the interactions of these several characters with one another against the backdrop of Travnik. The narrative voice here is also a mix of a semi-omniscient detached observer and a more grounded, more personal voice. Here, though,

the grounding of this voice is less clear: it is clearly associated with the town only in a few instances. This detachment with respect to place may represent Andrić's less direct historical connection with Travnik (he was born in a neighboring village but taken to Sarajevo when he was still an infant). It is known that the historical detail in the book is based on research he did during his diplomatic posting to France, where he studied in detail the reports of the French consul to Travnik. Despite the fact that the character in the novel is given a different name, it is clearly drawn to life, based on the actual historical personage.

The third novel, *Prokleta avlija*,⁴ seems to concern Bosnia less directly in that it is set in a prison yard in Istanbul sometime in the eighteenth century. The main character is a Bosnian Franciscan, Fra Petar, who has been imprisoned simply for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. While confined in prison he befriends Ćamil, a young Muslim of mixed ancestry (born of a Turkish father and a Greek mother) who has been imprisoned because of his interest in and obsession with Cem Sultan, a real historical personage who lived at the end of the fifteenth century. The tale begins and ends in Bosnia, in Fra Petar's monastery, but the story itself consists of Fra Petar's reminiscences of his time in prison, of his friendship with Ćamil, and of the tragedy of Ćamil's inability to keep his own identity separate from that of the historical figure whose life has become so real to him. The tale is narrated by a young monk who, looking out the monastery window at the grave where Fra Petar had been buried three days earlier, recalls the vivid stories Fra Petar had told on his deathbed. Except for the novel's prologue and epilogue (where the narrative voice is that of the nameless young monk) and the central chapter relating the historically accurate facts of Cem Sultan's life (where the narrative voice is the academic third person), the actual narrative voice is primarily that of Fra Petar. It is complicated, however, by the fact that at least two other characters, Ćamil and the Jew Haim, also take over the narration at certain points.

The theme of “the Other” in *Na Drini ćuprija* and *Travnička hronika*

How do each of these novels deal with the issue of identity, and of the identification of “one's own” group vs. the Other? The first thing to note is that Andrić writes more about the perception of identity than he does about identity itself. For instance, *Na Drini ćuprija* begins by setting up a seeming conflict between Turk and Christian, especially in the harrowing execution scene. But in fact the villain in that section is the cruel master who has been ordered by the Ottomans to force the local Bosnian “Turks” (native Slavs who had converted to Islam) to carry out his oppressive measures against the local Bosnian Christians (who in this part of Bosnia were Serbs). After this section, the inhabitants of the town – Serbs, Turks, and Jews – are seen as separate but co-existent, each with their own worldview and customs, but all living

together and, in time of need such as during a flood, helping each other. Indeed, the theme of the Other really only comes to the fore when the Austrians enter the town and take over its administration: all the locals are now pitted against the newcomers. Gradually even these newcomers come to be part of the town, though each of the separate subgroups still carries its own definition. In the final chapters, after the assassination in Sarajevo, Serbs are singled out and persecuted, but this persecution is presented as a clear and direct result of that one political act. Critics differ as to the ultimate message of the book. Most, however, view it as a concrete description of multiculturalism, a situation in which differences are palpable and always potentially problematic, but in which a group of individuals can live together if each practices tolerance.

Travnička hronika is concerned much more directly with the idea of the Other, but not in a directly confrontational sense. Although the novel's title suggests that it will be about the city of Travnik, Andrić in fact pays very little attention to the actual Bosnian inhabitants of Travnik. Instead, nearly all his attention is devoted to the outsiders who come to Travnik and never manage to assimilate. These are not just the consuls representing France and Austria, but also each of the Viziers representing Ottoman Turkey. The rift between them and the townspeople is presented as a total one, such that these several outsiders often seem to share more with one another than differ from one another. As noted above, these outsiders are the main characters of the novel. The only other characters of note are the four doctors of the region – one a Franciscan from an outlying village, one a Jew from the town, and two individuals whose heritage is so mixed that one cannot put a clear ethnic label on either one. The essential message of this book, therefore, is that in Bosnia everyone is an outsider.

Both these two Bosnian novels could be described in terms of sets of binary oppositions, which surface in order throughout the novel in question. In *Na Drini ćuprija* the first opposition, very clearly drawn in the early chapters where the Ottomans are forcibly taking young boys from their families and pressing locals into work brigades to build the bridge, would be that of “Ottoman overlord vs. Višegrad native”. Once the bridge is constructed and relative peace returns to the town, the second would be the religious and cultural opposition “Turk vs. Serb” (with Jews thrown in every now and then). As the narration enters the modern era of the Protectorate, the third opposition would be “locals vs. Austrians”; and finally, in the scenes following the assassination in Sarajevo the opposition would be “non-Serbs vs. Serbs”. In *Travnička hronika* the several oppositions also follow the course of the narrative. The first, seen clearly with the entry of the French consul into Travnik, is “consuls vs. locals”. The second, seen in the negotiations between the French consul and the Ottoman vizier, is “East [Turkey]” vs. West [Europe]”. The third, seen on the entry of a second European consul into

Travnik, is “France vs. Austria”. As the narrative draws to a close, and as the central character, the French consul Daville, must acknowledge not only the defeat of his idol Napoleon but also the failure of his own mission, the opposition is that of “single individual vs. the rest of the world”.

The theme of identity in *Prokleta avlija*

But these oppositions are definitely secondary in both *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija*, both of which take as their primary focus the complex scope of history. By contrast, binary oppositions constitute the central focus of the novella *Prokleta avlija*. At first glance, one might think that the central opposition is that of “Christian vs. Turk”, embodied in the two main characters, the Franciscan Fra Petar and the Ottoman scholar Ćamil. In fact, however, the bond of friendship between these two is the one real positive thing about the novel. The central opposition is rather that between “imprisonment vs. freedom”, where the prison metaphor takes several forms. At the most concrete level, the idea of “prison” refers to the actual prison where nearly all the narrated action takes place. Since the narrative is a deathbed confession, however, this metaphor also refers to the prison of the grave which faces us all. But its primary meaning, and the real theme of the book, is the prison of madness resulting from the inability to separate illusion and reality. This theme comes dramatically to the fore through the fact of Ćamil’s obsession with the historical character of Cem-Sultan. Indeed, the climactic moment of the entire book is the moment in which Fra Petar realizes that Ćamil has stopped speaking of Cem-Sultan in the third person and has shifted to first person. Here is this critical passage:⁵

- (1) Fra Petar se nije pravo ni sećao kad je u stvari počela ta priča bez reda i kraja. Isto tako nije odmah ni pravo primetio trenutak, teški i odlučni trenutak, u kom je Ćamil jasno i prvi put sa posrednog pričanja tuđe sudbine prešao na ton lične ispovesti i stao da govori u prvom licu.

(Ja – Teška reč, koja u očima onih pred kojima je kazana određuje naše mesto, kobno i nepromenljivo, često daleko ispred ili iza onog što mi o sebi znamo, izvan naše volje i iznad naših snaga. Strašna reč koja nas, jednom izgovorena, zauvek vezuje i poistovećuje sa svim onim što smo zamislili i rekli i sa čim nikad nismo ni pomišljajli da se poistovetimo, a u stvari smo, u sebi, već odavno jedno.) [PA 91-92]

- (1a) Fra Petar could not quite remember when this tale without order or end had actually begun. Nor could he recall the exact moment, the grave and crucial moment, when Kamil first moved from the indirect narration of another’s destiny to a tone of personal confession and began to speak in the first person.

(I! – potent word, which in the eyes of those before whom it is spoken determines our place, fatefully and immutably, often far beyond or behind what we know about ourselves, beyond our will and above our strength. A terrible word which, once spoken, links us and identifies us with all that we have imagined and said, with which we have never dreamed of identifying ourselves, but with which we have in fact, in ourselves, long been one.) [TDY199]

This is a very complex passage, and a very important one. The first half is directly part of the narrative of the relationship between Fra Petar and Ćamil: it communicates first Fra Petar's realization that Ćamil has made the all-important switch from the detached third person to the confessional first person, and then the fact that he (Fra Petar) could not recall exactly when that happened. But it is the second half of the passage which draws the reader's attention. The passage is of particular interest not just because it concerns a fact of language – the pronoun which names ego (first-person single speaker) – but because of the many first-person plural forms which pull the listener/reader into the emotional scope of the narration. The central assertion is a very powerful one: to speak in the first person is a terrible and frightening thing, because by doing so one takes full responsibility and there is no going back. Even more powerful, though, is the explicit reminder that this is true of us all. That which conveys this reminder, of course, are the several first-person plural forms, namely:

određuje <i>naše</i> mesto	determines <i>our</i> place
što <i>mi</i> o <i>sebi</i> <i>znamo</i>	what <i>we know</i> about <i>ourselves</i>
izvan <i>naše</i> volje	beyond <i>our</i> will
iznad <i>naših</i> snaga	above <i>our</i> strength
koja <i>nas</i> ... vezuje i poistovećuje	which ... links <i>us</i> and identifies <i>us</i>
što <i>smo</i> zamislili i rekli	that <i>we have imagined</i> and <i>said</i>
nikad <i>nismo</i> ni <i>pomišljali</i>	<i>we have never dreamed</i>
da <i>se</i> poistovetimo	of <i>identifying ourselves</i>
a ... <i>smo</i> , u <i>sebi</i> ...	but ... <i>we have</i> ... in <i>ourselves</i> ... <i>been</i>

Thus, although Andrić's explicit focus in this passage is the word "I", and the heavy responsibility of speaking in first person, his implicit focus is on the words marked in italics above – the possessive pronoun "our", the pronominal forms "we" and "us", and the verb forms marked for first person plural (as well as the reflexive form translated "ourselves"). These words are used to great effect by Andrić, and it is this usage which will be my focus in the remainder of this contribution.⁶

First-person plural forms and their implication

The meaning of these words seems obvious. In fact, however, they are very subtle. When a speaker says “we”, he refers to a group which includes himself and at least one other person. But what is the composition of this group? In particular, is the person (or persons) to whom the speech is addressed part of that group? Some languages have two different sets of pronouns and verbs to express the idea of first-person plural. If the speaker intends the addressee to be part of the group denoted as “we”, the form called “inclusive we” must be used; but if the intended group does not include the addressee, the form called “exclusive we” must be used. Most languages, however, including all European languages, have only one such pronoun. It is the context of the speech situation which conveys the information as to whether or not the addressee is included in the group indicated to which this pronoun refers.

This fact about language usually goes unnoticed by its speakers. But it is a very significant fact, especially in the Balkans. Anyone with experience in former Yugoslavia will have noticed the frequency of the word *naš*, and will probably also have marveled at its subtle effectiveness in identifying a group without actually naming that group. To take only one example, the phrase *naš jezik* “our language” can be used to mean Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin, the complex of Serbian and Montenegrin, the complex of Bosnian and Croatian, the overall complex which used to be called Serbo-Croatian, or any subsidiary of any of these. The speaker does not need to add the ethnically marked adjective; rather, he leaves the interpretation up to the listener in the clear expectation that both speaker and listener are in agreement as to the identity of the in-group in question.

Of course, ethnic groups are not the only sort of in-groups, and the pronoun “we” is ubiquitous in speech. Nevertheless, the fact that the meaning of “we”, “us” and “our” must be determined by the context of speech makes this narrative device worthy of closer examination, especially in an area such as the Balkans where the issue of in-groups and ethnic identity is so fraught. With this in mind, let us examine Andrić’s use of this narrative device in the three works described above. The mode of narration in each one seems straightforward on the surface, but in fact it is quite complex. In particular, although the majority of the narration in all three novels is the neutral third-person, there are a significant number of shifts into first-person plural. Even more significant is the fact that these shifts are not predictable, and that they are neither sufficiently frequent nor sufficiently consistent as to allow us to identify the speaker with any certainty. Similarly, although the contextual cues that identify first-person plural as inclusive or exclusive seem clear in most instances, there is considerable ambiguity in others. Combining these two factors, we may make a preliminary typology of first-person plural usage in Andrić’s prose, and identify an **insider’s voice**, an **authorial voice**, and a

universal voice. Each of these three voices takes a stance which allows us to tell whether the spoken pronoun “we” is inclusive or exclusive. But, as we shall see, there are also a number of instances which are ambiguous, which may be read as either inclusive or exclusive.

The three first-person plural narrative voices in Andrić’s prose

The basic stance of the **insider’s voice** would be “I speak of my specific closed group: I freely give you information about it but we both know that you are not part of it”. In Andrić’s Bosnian novels, this voice almost always represents the inhabitants of the town where the narration is set; in linguistic terms, it is the “exclusive we”. Here are two examples, one each from the early chapters of *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija*:⁷

- (2) Vesti o dolasku stranih konzula, kao sve vesti u *našim* krajevima, javljale su se iznenada, rasle do fantastičnih razmera, a zatim nestajale odjedno, da bi se posle nekoliko nedelja opet pojavile novom snagom i u novom obliku. [TH 19]
- (2a) Reports of the arrival of the foreign consults, like all news in *our* lands, sprang up suddenly, grew to fantastic proportions and then disappeared all at once, only to re-emerge some weeks later with new force and in a new form. [DC 10]
- (3) Šta je bilo dalje od toga dečaka u sepetu to kazuju sve istorije na svima jezicima, i to se bolje zna u širokom svetu nego ovde kod *nas*. [NDC 24]
- (3a) What this boy in the pannier was later to become has been told in all histories in all languages and is better known in the world outside than it is amongst *us*. [TBD 25]

The basic stance of the **authorial voice**, that of the speaker telling the tale, would be “I remind you that I’m in control of the transmission of information: if you feel involved enough in the reception, then feel free to consider yourself part of the process of ‘seeing’ that which I see”. One might assume that this speaker is also an inhabitant of the place in question, but there is no obvious basis for this assumption. The choice of whether this “we” is inclusive or exclusive depends on the listener/reader, but there is little ambiguity since most readers of tales narrated in this manner will set their attitudes in advance (either consciously or not) as to whether or not they are “included”. Here are examples of this narrative voice, one each from the early chapters of *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija*:

- (4) Domaći Turci su bili, kao što *smo videli*, zabrinuti i zlovoljno su pominjali mogućnost

dolaska konzulâ. [TH 18]

(4a) As *we have seen*, the local Turks were anxious and they alluded sullenly to the possibility of the consuls' arrival. [DC 9]

(5) Na mostu i njegovoj kapiji, oko njega ili u vezi sa njim, teče i razvija se, kao što *ćemo videti*, život čoveka iz kasabe. [NDC 11]

(5a) On the bridge and its kapia, about it or in connection with it, flowed and developed, as *we shall see*, the life of the townsmen. [TBD 15]

Finally, the basic stance of the **universal voice** would be “I speak of the general human condition of which you are by definition a part, and I take it for granted that you view it this way as well”; this of course would be the “inclusive we”. Here, the identity of the speaker varies, and it is the content of the speech which determines the stance of inclusivity. The passage quoted above from *Prokleta avlija* as (1) is a clear example. Here are two more, one each from *Travnička hronika* and *Na Drini ćuprija*:

(6) Godina 1808. nije održala ni jedno od onih nejasnih obećanja lepe prošle jeseni koja je Davil čuo dok je jahao iznad Kupila. Zaista, ništa ne može tako da *nas* prevari kao *naše* rođeno osećanje smirenosti i prijatnog zadovoljstva sa tokom stvari. [TH 152]

(6a) The year 1808 did not fulfill any of the beautiful autumn's vague promises, which Daville had sensed as he rode above Kupilo. In fact, nothing can mislead *us* so much as *our* own sense of tranquility and agreeable contentment with the flow of things. [DC 125]

(7) To su one velike smelosti koje *činimo* samo u snovima. Kad se devojka opet izgubila na drugoj obali, mladić je zadrhtao od straha. [NDC 179]

(7a) Only in dreams do *we dare* so much. When the girl was once more lost to sight on the farther bank, the young man shivered with fright. [TBD 160]

The narrative potential of first-person plural speech

All three of the above types seem fairly clear: the *we* of the insider's voice excludes the reader; the *we* of the universal voice includes the reader; and the *we* of the authorial voice allows each reader to make a decision which will remain consistent throughout the text in question. But the most interesting instances are those which are ambiguous, which allow either the insider's (exclusive) or the universal (inclusive) reading. Sometimes the ambiguity is reinforced by the presence of a word which has more than one meaning. For instance, the

meaning of the following passage from *Prokleta avlija* turns upon the fact that the noun *vreme* can denote either “weather” or “time”, and consequently that the “change” in the phrase *menja se vreme* can refer either to the shifting seasons in any one year or to the advancement of time.

- (8) Rečeno je napred, i istina je, da se život u Avliji stvarno ne menja. Ali menja se vreme i s vremenom slika života pred svakim od *nas*. Počinje da se smrkava ranije. Javlja se strepnja od pomisli na jesen i zimu, na duge noći ili kišovite, hladne dane. [PA 110]

One might think that the more concrete references in the subsequent sentence – to encroaching darkness and the approach of autumn and winter – require the reading “weather”. However, these references could just as easily be taken as metaphorical representations of the process of aging.

But the reason this ambiguity is so interesting is because it affects the reader’s interpretation of the pronoun *nas* in the phrase *slika života pred svakim od nas* “the picture of life before each of us”. The more concrete reference, to seasons of the year, would suggest the insider’s voice: the narrator would be an inhabitant of the prison and would be speaking for a group of which we readers are obviously not a part, in which case the pronoun *nas* would be an instance of “exclusive *we*”. But the more abstract reference, to the passage of time, would suggest the universal voice: the narrator would be some unidentified speaker who is stating a fact true of us all, in which case the pronoun *nas* would be an instance of “inclusive *we*”. The overall force of this passage is immeasurably strengthened by this ambiguity, by the fact that both readings are possible.

Of course, because English cannot reproduce this ambiguity of “time ~ weather”, a translator of this passage is forced to choose one of the two meanings. It is interesting that the more recent translation, quoted below as (8a), uses the universal voice, implying the inclusive reading; while the earlier translation, quoted below as (8b), uses the insider’s voice, implying the exclusive reading. Indeed, this second reading is exclusive to the extent of omitting altogether the idea of the change in “the picture of life before each of us”.

- (8a) It was said earlier, and it is true, that life in the Courtyard did not ever really change. But time changes and with time so does the picture of life before each of *us*. It begins to get dark earlier. One begins to fear the approach of autumn and winter, the long nights and the cold, rainy days. [TDY 212]

- (8b) It has been said before, and it is true, that life in the Yard never changes. But the seasons change and with the seasons some aspects of its life change. It begins to get dark earlier. A

shudder is felt at the thought of autumn and winter, of the long nights and the cold, damp days. [DY 126]

The device of first-person plural speech, therefore, is a multilayered narrative technique which Andrić utilizes with great subtlety. His primary mode of narration is the detached, near-gnomic third person. But every now and then this narrative voice switches, without warning, into the more direct first-person plural. By definition, this voice establishes the presence of a group of which the narrator is a member, and of which the listener/reader may or may not be a member. Because of the nature of Andrić's native tongue (and of English as well), it is the listener/reader who must make the interpretation, on the basis of the contextual cues provided by the narrator in any one instance of speech. Sometimes the contextual cues make it clear whether the form is exclusive (the insider's voice) or inclusive (the universal voice). Sometimes, however, they leave the field open, and it is completely up to the listener/reader to make his own decision about the nature of the particular group. Further, the distribution of these several different first-person plural voices throughout the three novels discussed herein is not random. Rather, each of the novels is distinguished by a unique patterning of these distinctive voices, a patterning which is directly related to the overall meaning of the novel in question. The fact that readers of the novels must participate actively in assigning certain aspects of these meanings is certainly not accidental.

First-person plural narration in *Prokleta avlija*

Of the three, *Prokleta avlija* is the most straightforward, in that nearly all the instances of this voice are of the universal type; furthermore, whereas in the other two novels they are scattered throughout, here they appear in large "runs", in just four different segments. The first of these occurs at the point when Fra Peter makes the initial acquaintance of Ćamil:

(9) Misleći o njemu docnije, mnogo puta, fra Petar nije mogao nikako da se tačno seti ni sata kad je došao, ni kako je došao, tražeći malo mesta, ni šta je pri tom rekao. – Kod ljudi koji *nam* postanu bliski *mi* sve te pojedinosti prvog dodira sa njima obično *zaboravljamo*; izgleda *nam* kao da *smo* ih vazda *znali* i kao da su oduvek sa *nama* bili. Od svega toga u sećanju iskrnsne ponekad samo neka nepovezana slika. [PA 43-44]

(9a) Thinking about him later, often, Fra Petar could not remember exactly either the time when he had arrived, or how he had come, looking for a little space, nor what he had said. With people *we grow* close to *we* usually *forget* these details of *our* first contact with them; it seems as though *we have* always *known* them and they have been with *us* forever. All that

remains are a few unconnected images that sometimes come into our memory. [TDY 168]

The second occurs soon after this, as part of Fra Petar's internal reaction to the inconsequential tales told by prisoners in the yard. The passage in question is unusually long, but is worth quoting since it is frequently cited in discussions of Andrić's general views about literature.

(10) A tu gde se završavalo jedno počinjalo je drugo pričanje. Kraja nije bilo.

(*Mi smo* uvek manje ili više skloni da *osudimo* one koji mnogo govore, naročito o stvarima koje ih se ne tiču neposredno, čak i da sa prezirom *govorimo* o tim ljudima kao o brbljivcima i dosadnim pričalima. A pritom ne *mislimo* da ta ljudska, toliko ljudska i tako česta mana ima i svoje dobre strane. Jer, šta *bismo mi znali* o tuđim dušama i mislima, o drugim ljudima, pa prema tome i o *sebi*, o drugim sredinama i predelima koje *nismo* nikad *videli* niti *ćemo imati* prilike da ih *vidimo* da nema takvih ljudi koji imaju potrebu da usmeno ili pismeno kazuju ono što su videli i čuli, i što su s tim u vezi doživeli ili mislili? Malo, vrlo malo. A što su njihova kazivanja nesavršena, obojena ličnim strastima i potrebama, ili čak netačna, zato *imamo* razum i iskustvo i *možemo* da ih *prosudujemo* i *upoređujemo* jedne s drugima, da ih *primamo* i *odbacujemo*, delimično ili u celosti. Tako, nešto od ljudske istine ostane uvek za one koji ih strpljivo slušaju i čitaju.)

Tako je mislio u sebi fra Petar, slušajući opširno i zaobilazno pričanje Haimovo. [PA 53-54]

(10a) And where one story stopped, the next began. There was no end.

(*We are* always more or less inclined to judge those who talk a lot, particularly about things that do not affect them directly, *we even speak* with contempt of such people as tedious chatterboxes. But as *we do* so, *we do not think* that this human, so human and so common a failing has its good sides. For what *would we know* about other people's souls and thoughts, about other people and consequently about *ourselves*, about other places and regions *we have* never *seen* nor *will have* the opportunity of *seeing*, if there were not people like this who have the need to describe in speech or writing what they have seen and heard, and what they have experienced and thought in that connection? Little, very little. And if their accounts are imperfect, coloured with personal passions and needs, or even inaccurate, *we have* reason and experience and *can judge* them and *compare* them one with another, *accept* or *reject* them, partially or completely. In this way, something of human truth is always left for those who listen or read patiently.)

That was what Fra Petar thought to himself as he listened to Haim's wide-ranging, roundabout account. [TDY 174]

The third, given below as (11), occurs after a sizeable interval, and is once again connected with a meeting between Fra Petar and Ćamil. The fourth and final segment, which was quoted earlier as (1), occurs at the critical and dramatic highpoint of the novel.

(11) I opet je pala neka kratka i nerazumljiva reč koja je izazvala gromki smeh. Fra Petar se trže iz misli i pođe da sedne malo podalje. Diže se, ali odmah zastade iznenađen. Sa zbunjrenom i tihom pozdravom pred njega je stao Ćamil.

Tako obično biva. Oni koje *želimo* da *vidimo* ne dolaze u časovima kad na njih *mislimo* i kad ih najviše *očekujemo*, a pojavljuju se u nekom trenutku kad *smo* mislima najdalje od njih. I *našoj* radosti zbog ponovnog viđenja treba tada vremena da se dignu sa dna, gde je potisnuta, i pojavi na površini. [PA 73]

(11a) And again came the short, unintelligible word that provoked loud laughter. Fra Petar roused himself from his thoughts and decided to go and sit down a little further off. He rose, but then stopped in surprise. In front of him, with a quiet, embarrassed word of greeting, stood Kamil.

That is how it usually is. Those *we wish to see* do not come at the time when *we are thinking* of them and when *we most expect* them, but appear at a moment when *our* thoughts are far from them. And *our* joy at seeing them takes a little time to surface from the depths, where it has been suppressed. [TDY 187]

All of the above instances of the universal voice seem to be Fra Petar's voice in internal monologue; that in (10) is explicitly identified as such. There is thus a sharp contrast between this mode of first-person narration and the two final instances – the only other ones in the entire book. One of these is the authorial voice, quoted below as (12), and the other is the ambiguous comment about changes associated with changes in time (or weather, depending on the interpretation), which was quoted above as excerpt (8).

(12) (A ludaci, i sve ono što je u vezi sa njima, ulivali su Karadozu sujeveran strah i nagonu odvratnost.) Ali odbiti ga nije mogao. Tako je Ćamil zatvoren u jedan od zajedničkih ćelija, gde je, kako *smo videli*, našao svoje mesto za prva dva dana. [PA 67]

(12a) (Madmen, and everything connected with them, filled Karagöz with a superstitious fear and instinctive revulsion.) But he could not refuse to take him. So Kamil was put into one of the communal cells, where, as *we have seen*, he found a place for the first two days. [TDY 183]

In terms of placement, this single instance of the authorial voice occurs halfway

between the second and the third instances of the universal voice (excerpts (9) and (10) above). As for the one ambiguous instance – the one containing the word which means both “time” and “weather” – it is the last instance of first-person plural narration in the book. What is so striking about *Prokleta avlija*, especially in comparison with the other two works to be discussed, is not only its compactness but also the clear distribution of narrative voices. Whereas in the other two books the first-person plural voices are distributed among the three types (insider’s, authorial, universal), here it is the universal voice which is overwhelmingly predominant: there are 42 instances of it as opposed to only one instance of the authorial voice and one instance which could be either the insider’s or the universal voice.⁸ Furthermore, one gets the clear sense not only that this universal voice is that of Fra Petar, but also that Fra Petar is a character with whom Andrić feels a strong emotional identification, trusting him enough (so to speak) that he speaks through him about the writer’s tools, as in excerpt (1), and the writer’s trade, as in excerpt (10).

The usage of first-person plural in *Prokleta avlija*, therefore, seems to have relatively little to do with ethnic identity and the articulation of one’s own group vs. the Other. Instead, its message concerns the human condition, and the inner conflict between reality and illusion that potentially takes place within each one of us. The repeated occurrence of the universal voice reassures us (if that is the word) that we are included in the story. But are we? The final instance of first-person plural is intentionally ambiguous, and serves to remind us that we must always make conscious decisions whenever we hear words marked for first-person plural. What does the speaker mean by “we” and “us”? Are we included in that group or not? What is the nature of that group, and where are the borders? By the placement of this significantly ambiguous pronoun near the end of the *Prokleta avlija*, Andrić reminds us that in the final analysis, the responsibility for interpretation has always been on our shoulders.

Comparison of first-person plural narration in the two “historical” novels

The narration in the two other novels, which are more directly concerned with issues of identity in Bosnia, is much more complex. Not only are there multiple instances of all three of the voices mentioned above – the **authorial voice** (which comments upon the narrative process and includes us if we wish), the **insider’s voice** (which represents the local population and would seem specifically to exclude us), and the **universal voice** (which speaks to the general human condition and would seem specifically to include us) – but there are also differences between the two books with respect to the ways in which these voices are implemented. Finally, there are several instances which allow for either the exclusive or the inclusive interpretation, but in a much more subtle manner than in the example quoted above.

If we look purely at frequency of usage, the numerical results are striking. *Travnička hronika* contains 23 instances of the authorial voice, five instances of the insider's voice, and 53 instances of the universal voice. By contrast, *Na Drini ćuprija* contains 16 instances of the authorial voice, 40 of the insider's voice, and seven of the universal voice. This overall distribution seems clearly correlated with each book's basic world view: the paucity of the insider's voice in *Travnička hronika* underscores that book's message that everyone in Bosnia is an outsider, whereas the predominance of the insider's voice in *Na Drini ćuprija* underscores that book's message that multiculturalism within any one social unit is possible in Bosnia but that it requires tolerance. By contrast, the authorial voice seems relatively consistent between the two books.

But we must take these all these numbers as approximate, since several of the instances admit of more than one interpretation. As we shall see below, these are the most interesting ones in terms of the expressive power of this particular narrative device. Furthermore, even when a particular instance can be clearly identified as one of the three basic voice types, we shall see that there are potentially significant differences within each type. Unfortunately, space does not permit discussion of each of these instances; we can discuss only selected examples.

The “authorial voice” in the two historical novels

Let us look first at the **authorial voice**, which on the surface seems the most straightforward. This is the voice which both asserts control over the narrative process and invites the reader to be part of this narrative process. As illustrated in examples (4), (5) and (12) above, the verb usually associated with this voice is “see”, and the utterance is one which easily allows the reader to feel included at an equal level if he so wishes. But there are also instances when the authorial voice appears to take greater control over the narration. Here the most frequently used verb is “say”; and since this is an action reserved to the person telling a tale, the implication is that the reader is excluded.

There is but a single instance of this “exclusive” authorial voice in *Na Drini ćuprija*, and it is noteworthy in at least two ways. First, it is followed directly by the single instance in the book of direct address to the reader, which would seem to cancel out the implied message of exclusivity.⁹ Second, the entire sequence apparently had a strongly “exclusive” effect on the translator, since he omitted it altogether from his translation.¹⁰

- (13) Jedni su išli pravo i polako, drugi krivudali i posrtali. Iz glasnih šala moglo se razabirati da dolaze “ispod topola”.

U toku ranijeg pričanja *zaboravili smo* da *kažemo* za još jednu novinu u kasabi. (Izvesno

ste i vi primetili kako čovek lako zaboravlja da kaže ono o čem ne voli da govori.)

Ima više od petnaest godina, još pre nego što je počelo građenje pruge, doselio se u kasabu neki Mađar sa ženom. [NDC 291]

- (13a) From their noisy jests it could be concluded that they had come from “Under the Poplars”. **

More than fifteen years earlier, even before the building of the railway had begun, a certain Hungarian and his wife had settled in the town. [TBD 254]

[** > In the narration till now *we have forgotten to speak* of one more innovation in the town. (You too have certainly noticed how a person easily forgets to say things about which he does not wish to speak.)]

In *Travnička hronika*, by contrast, the authorial voice takes this level of control in fully half of the instances, and makes no effort to draw the reader in: the contrast between excerpts (13) and (14) in this regard is instructive. Indeed, at one point, illustrated in (15), this voice even uses the possessive pronoun to assert yet greater control over both the process of storytelling and the tale itself:

- (14) Sad se vidi da *smo se prevarili* kad *smo tvrdili* da se od sve četvorice travničkih lekara najmanje može se kazati o Mordi Atijasu. [TH 248]

- (14a) Now it is clear that *we were mistaken* when *we said* that of the four Travnik doctors there was least to say about Mordo Atijas. [DC 208]

- (15) Dugo bi i izlišno bilo pričati redom te konzulske bure u čaši vode i sve njihove borbe i smicalice od kojih su mnoge bili smešne, neke žalosne, a većina nepotrebna i beznačajna. Mnoge od njih i tako *nećemo moći zaobići* u toku *našeg* pričanja. [TH 102]

- (15a) It would be a lengthy and superfluous process to recount all those consular storms in a teacup and all their battles and schemes, many of which were comic, some pitiful and the majority trivial and pointless. *We shall not be able to avoid* many of them in the course of *our* story in any case. [DC 82]

The two novels differ clearly therefore with respect to this voice. In *Na Drini ćuprija* the authorial voice consistently invites the reader to be included (if only implicitly). But *Travnička hronika* is inconsistent in this regard: some instances offer the invitation, while numerous others function to set this previously inclusive narrative voice off as an Other of sorts.

Who is this tale teller? Is he an inhabitant of the region in question, is he the author's

alter ego (albeit unidentified), or is he some third voice (also unidentified)? Andrić never says, but the ways in which the voice shifts offers some clues. Consider the following passage from *Travnička hronika*, which appears clearly to be in the universal voice:

(16) Ovde je bila u pitanju jedna od onih životnih sila koje kruže u *nama* i oko *nas*, koje *nas* dižu, gone napred, zaustavljaju ili obaraju. Ta sila, koju *mi* skraćeni izrazom *nazivamo* ljubav, naterala je i Salka berberina da se vere i cepa po šipražju u Hafizadića ogradi ... [TH 188]

(16a) What was at work here was one of those life forces around and within *us*, which can lift and drive *us*, stop *us* still or knock *us* down. That force, which *we call* ‘love’ for short, drove Salko the barber to clamber over the bushes in Hafizadić’s hedge ... [DC 156]

Twice in the ensuing eight pages, however, we learn that this “universal” voice is in fact the “authorial” voice of *Travnička hronika* (the verb which the translator renders below as “refer” in fact is the direct verb meaning “speak”):

(17) Ali ona sila o kojoj *smo* na početku *govorili* javljala se, kao podzemna voda, neslućeno i neočekivano i na drugima mestima i pod drukčijim prilikama, nastojeći da uhvati što više maha i zavlada što većim brojem ljudskih bića oba pola. [TH 193]

(17a) But that force which *we referred to* at the beginning sprang up, like underground water, unpredictably and unexpectedly in other places and different circumstances, striving to gain as much ground as possible and overwhelm the greatest number of human beings of both sexes. [DC 160]

(18) Sila o kojoj ovde celo vreme *govorimo* nije poštedela ni Francuski konzulat na drugoj obali Lašve, jer ona ne gleda na grb ni zastavu. [TH 196]

(18a) The force to which *we have been referring* all this time did not spare the French Consulate on the other side of the Lašva either, because it respects neither coats of arms nor flags. [DC 163]

Again, the authorial voice in *Travnička hronika* asserts its control. Now, however, a reader might assess things differently. Having felt explicitly included in passage (16), the reader might exert the metaphorical effort to cross the boundary of “otherness” and include himself in the subsequent passages.

The authorial voice of *Na Drini ćuprija* also shifts into the universal voice at one point,

but in a very different way. The passage seems to begin in the authorial voice, with a verb related to the current act of storytelling (the verb “mention”, rendered by the translator as “recall”). It then shifts clearly into the universal voice, expanding the focus both in time and space and introducing an optimism which we in that future to which he refers now respond to with anguish (as Andrić clearly means us to). At the conclusion of the passage it shifts again. Now the voice could be a return of the authorial, but it could also be the insider’s voice. The inclusion of the spatial adverb *ovde* “here”, grounding the narration once again in the town of Višegrad, supports the latter reading. But the power of the passage comes not just from its painfully beautiful eloquence, but also from the fact that all three voices are contained in it, in a manner which requires the reader to make his own decisions, at each point in the passage, as to the degree to which he is included.

(19) Ali sve su to stvari koje samo uzgred *napominjemo* i koje će pesnici i naučnici idućih epoha ispitivati, tumačiti, i vaskrsavati sredstvima i načinima koje *mi* ne *slutimo*, a sa vedrinom, slobodom i smelošću duha koji će biti daleko iznad *našega*. Njima će verovatno poći za rukom da i za ovu čudnu godinu nađu objašnjenje i da joj odrede pravo mesto u istoriji sveta i razvoju čovečanstva. Ovde, ona je za *nas* jedino i pre svega godina koja je bila sudbonosna po most na Drini. [NDC 305]

(19a) But these are all things which *we recall* only in passing and which poets and scientists of coming ages will investigate, interpret and resurrect by methods and manners which *we do not suspect* and with a serenity, freedom and boldness of spirit which will be far above *ours*. Probably they will succeed in finding an explanation even for that strange year and will give it its true place in the history of the world and the development of humanity. But here it is unique for *us*, for above all that was the fatal year for the bridge on the Drina. [TBD 266]

The “insider’s voice” in the two historical novels

Let us shift now to the **insider’s voice**. As noted above, there are very few instances of this voice in *Travnička hronika*; indeed, since the novel is concerned almost exclusively with the inability of outsiders to understand (let alone become part of) the Travnik milieu, it is surprising to hear this voice at all. By contrast, since the town of Višegrad itself is the central focus of *Na Drini ćuprija*, it is natural that this voice should be ubiquitous. Andrić’s most frequent use of this voice is to represent the town as a self-contained in-group, which is clearly the “exclusive we”. It is interesting that in fully two-thirds of these instances, the translator appears affected by the message of exclusion, such that he either omits the first-

person reference altogether or substitutes a more neutral expression; it is also interesting that this voice surfaces as first-person plural in English at all only in the first third of the book.

- (20) Gledajući sve to, iz dana u dan, iz godine u godinu, *naš* svet je počeo da gubi račun o vremenu i stvarnim namerama graditelja. [NDC 66]
- (20a) Watching all this, day after day, year after year, the townspeople* began to lose count of time and of the real intentions of the builders. [TBD 62]
[*the townspeople > our world/folk]
- (21) Tako je, za *naš* svet potpuno neočekivano, došao red i na rabatni i zapušteni karavan-seraj, koji je još i takav činio celinu sa mostom, isto kao i pre tri stotine godine. [NDC 155]
- (21a) Thus unexpectedly and quickly* came the turn of the dilapidated and abandoned caravanserai, which was always regarded as an integral part of the bridge, even as it had been 300 years before. [TBD 139]
[*unexpectedly and quickly > completely unexpected by our world/folk]

But Andrić also uses the voice to identify different subgroups within the town. Sometimes the members of the subgroups are explicitly identified, as in the following excerpts. The translator has in each case replaced the possessive pronoun “our” by the adjective “local”, as in example (22); in (23) he has also simplified the reference to remove the distinction between the Christian and Muslim subgroups.

- (22) Istina je da je *naš* svet, naročito hrišćani i Jevreji, počeo u odevanju i ophođenju da liči sve više na strance koje je dovela okupacija, ali i stranci nisu ostajali nepromenjeni i nedirnuti od sredine u kojoj su morali da žive. [NDC 197]
- (22a) It is true that the local people*, especially the Christians and Jews, began to look more and more like the newcomers in dress and behavior, but the newcomers themselves did not remain unchanged or untouched by the milieu in which they had to live. [TBD 174]
[*local people > our world/folk]
- (23) Ili je dočekivao veče sa *našim* gazdama i begovima kod akšamluka, na nekoj zelenoj uzvisini, sa strukom bosioka pred sobom, i pri sporom razgovoru bez težine i naročitog smisla, ispijao polagano i mezetio retko, kao što umeju samo ljudi iz kasabe. [NDC 197]
- (23a) [O]r they would sit and wait for supper with the local notables* on some green hillock, with plum brandy and snacks and a little bouquet of basil before them, conversing leisurely about

trivialities or drinking slowly and occasionally munching a snack as the townsmen knew how to do so well. [TBD 175]

[*local notables > our landlords and beys]

More frequently, the subgroups are not explicitly identified. Here the notion of “inclusive” and “exclusive” becomes much more subtle, in that the reader must determine for himself the identity of the particular in-group. In such instances the translator either inserts his own identification, or else avoids the issue altogether. Thus, in the case of (24) and (25), the insider voice speaks only for the Serbian segment of the population; the translator uses that ethnonym in (24) but only the demonstrative “these” in (25). But in (26), the insider voice speaks for the entire town, explicitly stating that those who had chosen Islam (“become Turkish”) nevertheless were still considered native sons of the region. By rendering the phrase simply as “local renegades”, the translator has missed the subtle force of this first-person usage.

(24) (*Naše žene su se krstile u tami i plakale od nerazumljivog ganuća, a u suzama su im se lomile ove ustaničke vatre kao oni avetinjski plamenovi koji su nekad padali na Radisavljev grob i koje su njihove šukunbabe, pre gotovo tri veka, isto ovako kroz suze nazirale, sa ovog istog Mejdana.*) [NDC 90]

(24a) The Serbian women* crossed themselves in the darkness and wept from inexplicable emotion, but in their tears they saw reflected those fires of insurrection even as those ghostly flames which had once fallen on Radisav’s grave and which their ancestors almost three centuries before had also seen through their tears from that same Mejdan. [TBD 83]

[*The Serbian women > Our women]

(25) Srbi su molili boga da taj spasonosni plamen, koji je istovetan sa onim koji oni oduvek nose i brižljivo sakrivaju u duši, proširi i ovamo na *naša* brda, a Turci su molili boga da ga zaustavi, suzbije i pogasi, kako bi se osujetile prevratničke namere nevernika i zavladao opet stari red i dobri mir prave vere. [NDC 90]

(25a) The Serbs prayed to God that these saving flames, like those which they had always carried in their hearts and carefully concealed, should spread to these mountains* while the Turks prayed to Allah to halt their progress and extinguish them, to frustrate the seditious designs of the infidel and restore the old order and the peace of the true faith. [TBD 83]

[*these mountains > our hills]

(26) Sejmeni, sve poturčenjački sinovi iz *naših* krajeva, vikali su gore svi u jedan glas; u tami su

se ukrštali njihovi isprekidani i nerazumljivi povici. [NDC 40-41]

(26a) The guards, local renegades*, were all shouting at once; they fell over one another in the darkness in a medley of broken and incomprehensible cries. [TBD 40]

[*local renegades > all sons of our regions, gone over to the Turkish way]

The insider's voice, therefore, identifies the speaker as a native of the Bosnian space and time being described, as part of a well-defined group from which the reader is clearly excluded. Sometimes, however, a broader interpretation is possible: the context clearly indicates that the voice is that of the local inhabitants, but what is being said carries much more universal meaning. Here, it appears that Andrić is giving his reader the choice to identify with the speakers, and to include himself into the group.

The only such instance in *Travnička hronika* occurs at the very beginning of the book. The speaker appears to be an insider, since he states that he and those like him do not want foreigners to intrude. Yet his speech is phrased in such a way as to allow anyone who wants to set up a barrier between himself and the Other to identify with it. The choice, which is not a trivial one, is left up to the reader. In this regard it is interesting that the more recent translation (that quoted throughout herein) has responded quite broadly to the “inclusive” invitation, rendering what are impersonal phrases in the original as first-person verbs in English. By contrast, both earlier translations give a more literal rendering of the original, losing something of the flavor in the process.¹¹

(27) Ukratko, danas dobra nema. Nego ovo hleba i ovo dana, što je kome ostalo, da se pojede i da se poživi na miru, u ovom najgospodskijem gradu na zemlji, a Bog da *nas* sačuva od slave, od krupnih gostiju i velikih događaja. [TH 15]

(27a) In a word, there was no good anywhere these days. So *let's eat up* the crust of bread *we have* and *live out* in peace what few days remain to each of *us*, in this noblest city on earth, and God preserve *us* from glory, important visitors and major events. [DC 7]

(27b) In short, things were not too promising nowadays. It was better by far to eat one's bread and live one's days in peace — as much as one had left of either — in this the noblest of all cities on earth, and may the good Lord save *us* from glory, from important visitors, and from great events. [BC 10]

There are many more such instances in *Na Drini ćuprija*. For instance, the very beginning of the book first states a fact about the bridge: the voice is presumably that of the insider, since the narrator is speaking of the way in which that one bridge links the two sides

of the town Višegrad. But the way in which he phrases the observation about the function of bridges clearly opens the door to a more inclusive reading, especially since the noun subject is *mi ljudi* “we men” and not the more frequent insider phrase *naš svet* “our folk”. Strangely enough, however, the translator does not accept the invitation.

(28) Tako most, sastavljaajući dva kraja sarajevskog druma, veže kasabu sa njenim predgrađem.

Upravo, kad se kaže “veže”, to je isto toliko tačno kao kad se kaže: sunce izlazi izjutra da *bismo mi ljudi mogli* da *vidimo* oko *sebe* i da *svršavamo* potrebne poslove, a zalazi predveče da *bismo mogli* da *spavamo* i da *se odmorimo* od dnevnog napora. [NDC 10]

(28a) Thus the bridge, uniting the two parts of the Sarajevo road, linked the town with its surrounding villages.

Actually, to say “linked” was just as true as to say that the sun rises in the morning so that men may see around them and finish* their daily tasks, and sets in the evening that they** may be able to sleep and rest from the labours of the day. [TBD 13-14]

[*so that men may see around them and finish > so that we men may see around ourselves and finish] [** they > we]

In another such passage, the voice is even more ambiguous. The description is of life in the town, and the speaker carries no other identification; yet the truth stated in first-person plural is so much a part of the human condition that it is hard not to read it as inclusive. Yet again the translator does not follow Andrić’s cue. The only such passage in which the ambiguity between the insider’s voice and the universal voice is rendered by an English first-person plural is that quoted above as excerpt (19).

(29) Sve se više pokazuje da zarada i lakši život koji ona donosi imaju svoje naličje, da su i novac i onaj ko ga ima samo ulog u nekoj velikoj čudljivoj igri kojoj niko ne zna sva pravila i ne može da predvidi ishod. I ne *sluteći*, svi *mi* u toj igri *igramo*, neko sa manjim neko sa većim ulogom, ali svi sa stalnim rizikom. [NDC 240]

(29a) It became more and more evident that the good profits and easier life which they had brought had their counterpart and were only pieces in some great and mysterious game of which no one knew all the rules and none could foresee the outcome. And yet everyone played his part in this game*, some with a smaller some with a greater role, but all with permanent risk. [TBD 211]

[*everyone played his part in this game > unaware, we all play this game]

In sum, the insider's voice in *Na Drini ćuprija* does not simply identify the in-group of "townspeople". Rather, it is much more subtle, and it is this subtlety which makes the novel so powerful and still so very relevant. We are the ones who must make the choice as to whether such statements refer to us, and if so, then in exactly in what way. Right at the beginning of the book, Andrić throws out the challenge. Namely, do we see the inhabitants of Višegrad only as the Other, the Bosnian orient, or could we ever visualize that world as ours as well? Throughout the book, he issues a similar challenge not just to us but also to Bosnians: can they see both Christian and Muslim as part of the same group, native sons all? Or can these two worlds only be seen separately?

The "universal voice" in the two historical novels

Finally, let us look briefly at the **universal voice**. As in *Prokleta avlija*, the universal voice is usually associated with a particular character, one with whom Andrić seems to feel some sort of affinity. Only rarely, however, does the tone approach the emotional identification of that with Fra Petar. We may cite one instance from *Na Drini ćuprija*, where this voice is associated with Dauthodža Mutevelić, the man who took it on himself to maintain the bridge's caravanserai when the original bequest was no longer forthcoming (30), and one from *Travnička hronika*, where this voice is associated with the good doctor Fra Luka from the monastery of Dolac, Andrić's birthplace (31). Even these passages, however, convey a sense of futility and despair.

(30) Taj mudri i pobožni, tvrdoglavi i uporni čovek, koga je kasaba dugo pamtila, nije se ničim dao odvratiti od svog bezizglednog napora. Radeći predano on se odavno bio pomirio sa sazanjem da je *naša* sudbina na zemlji sva u borbi protiv kvara, smrti i nestajanja, i da je čovek dužan da istraje u toj borbi i onda kad je potpuno bezizgledna. [NDC 78-79]

(30a) This wise and godfearing, stubborn and obstinate man, whom the town long remembered, allowed no one to turn him from his vain effort. Working devotedly, he had long become reconciled to the idea that *our* destiny on this earth lies in the struggle against decay, death and dissolution, and that man must persevere in this struggle, even if it were completely in vain. [TBD 73]

(31) Posmatrajući iz dana u dan, iz godine u godinu, trave, rude i živa bića oko sebe i njihove promene i kretanja, fra Luka je sve jasnije otkrivao da u svetu, ovakvom kakvog ga *mi vidimo*, postoji samo dvoje rasteenje i opadanje, i to usko i nerazmrsivo povezani, večito i svuda u pokretu. Sve pojave oko *nas* samo su izdvojene faze te beskrajne, složene i večne plime i oseke, samo fikcije, prolazni trenuci koje *mi* proizvoljno *izdvajamo*, *označavamo* i

nazivamo utvrđenim imenima, kao što su zdravlje, bolest i umiranje. A sve to, naravno, ne postoji. [TH 237]

- (31a) As he observed, day after day, year after year, the herbs, minerals and living creatures around him, the changes in them and their movements, Brother Luka came to see increasingly clearly that there are only two things in the world as *we see* it: growth and decay, and they are everywhere closely and inextricably linked, in a constant state of flux. All the phenomena around *us* are simply isolated phases of this endless, complex and eternal ebb and flow, just fictions, passing moments which *we* arbitrarily *isolate, define* and *call* by fixed names, such as health, sickness and death. And none of that exists, of course. [DC 199]

But there are very few “universal voice” passages in *Na Drini ćuprija*. By contrast, this voice predominates in *Travnička hronika*. In most instances it is associated with the novel’s central character, the French consul Daville. But here too the tone is very different from the “universal” narration in *Prokleta avlija*. The first such passage conveys Andrić’s clear affinity with this character:

- (32) Jer dok je čovek u svom društvu i u redovnim prilikama, ti podaci iz njegovog curriculum vitae znače i za nega samog važne delove i značajne prekretnice njegovog života. Ali čim ga slučaj ili posao ili bolest izdvoje iz usame, ti podaci počinju odjednom da blede i gasnu, da se neverovatno brzo suše i raspadaju, kao beživotna maska od hartije i laka, koju je čovek jednom upotrebio. A ispod njih počne da se pomalja *naš* drugi, samo *nama* znani život, to jest “zaistinska” istorija *našeg* duha i *našeg* tela, koja nije nigde zabeležena, koju niko i ne naslućuje, koja ima vrlo malo veze sa *našim* društvenim uspesima, ali koja je za *nas* i za *naše* krajnje zlo i dobro jedina važna i jedina stvarna. [TH 26-27]

- (32a) For as long as a man is in his own society and normal circumstances, such facts from his curriculum vitae signify, even for him, the important stages and major turning points of his life. But as soon as chance, his work or sickness remove and isolate him, these facts begin to fade, to wither and disintegrate unbelievably fast, like a lifeless mask of paper and lacquer he had once used. And beneath them *our* other life begins to emerge, a life known only to *us*, the “true” history of *our* spirit and body, not recorded anywhere, and quite unsuspected. It has very little connection with *our* social successes, but for *us* and *our* ultimate good or ill, it is the only one that is important and real. [DC 17]

But as the narrative proceeds, it appears that the function of this “universal” voice is to

underscore Daville's inability to connect, either with individuals or with the Other that is the orient. The two segments of the following passage occur as Daville takes leave of the one Vizier with whom he felt he had developed rapport.

- (33) Davil je dobro znao da to što mu vezir govori nije i ne može biti sve i u celosti tačno, pa ipak ga je dirala svaka reč. Svaki rastanak izaziva u *nama* dvostruku iluziju. Čovek sa kojim *se praštamo*, i to ovako, manje-više zauvek, čini se mnogo vredniji i dostojniji *naše* pažnje, a *mi sami osećamo se* mnogo sposobniji za izdašno i nesebično prijateljstvo nego što u stvari *jesmo*.

....

Iznenaden i pomalo zburjen, Davil je ceremoniozno skinuo šešir, a konjanik je istom brzinom odjurio za vezirovom pratnjom koja je jahala snežnom ravnicom. U odnosu sa orijentalcima ima uvek tako pojedinosti koje *nas* prijatno iznenade i uzbude, iako *znamo* da nisu toliko znak naročite pažnje ni ličnog poštovanja koliko sastavni deo njihovog drevnog i neiscrpnog ceremonijala. [TH 156]

- (33a) Daville knew very well that what the Vizier was saying was not and could not be entirely accurate and yet every word touched him. Every parting arouses in *us* a double illusion. The person *we are parting from*, more or less forever, seems to *us* far worthier and more deserving of *our* attention, and *we ourselves feel* far more capable of generous and selfless friendship than *we* actually *are*.

....

Surprised and somewhat bewildered, Daville removed his hat ceremoniously, and the horseman galloped off at the same speed after the Vizier's retinue as they rode over the snowy plain. In one's dealings with Eastern peoples, there are always details like this which give *us* a pleasant surprise and a thrill, although *we know* they are not so much a mark of attention or personal respect as an integral part of their ancient, inexhaustible ceremonial. [DC 128]

It is significant that the "universal" voice is not used with respect to Daville's assistant, Des Fossés, who has much greater success in understanding and making contact with the local population. Instead, the voice again is used with respect to Daville himself, conveying an even greater gulf between himself and the Other:

- (34) (Istok, mislio je Davil sa onim nesvesno zlu radim ljudskim zadovoljstvom sa kojim kod drugih *otkrivamo* i *posmatramo* tragove bolesti koja i *nas* muči, Istok je prodro u krv ovom mladom čoveku i podrovaio ga, uznemirio i ozlojedio.) [TH 381]

- (34a) (The East, thought Daville, with that unconsciously malicious human satisfaction with which *we discover* and *observe* in others traces of the sickness that torments *ourselves*, the East had penetrated into the blood of this young man, undermining, upsetting and souring him.) [DC 319-320]

The final instance of this voice as it refers to Daville occurs as Daville departs Bosnia. Although it would appear that he has accomplished his mission to the best of his ability, his despair at the defeat of his idol, Napoleon, leaves him feeling utterly isolated. Now it is not just the incomprehensible Orient which remains on the other side of a gap he cannot bridge – it is now, or at least so it seems, everything else.

- (35) Znači da ne postoji srednji put, onaj pravi, koji vodi napred, u stalnost, u mir i dostojanstvo, nego da *se svi krećemo* u krugu uvek istim putem, koji vara, a samo se smenjuju ljudi i naraštaji koji putuju, stalno varani. ... Samo se putuje. A misao i dostojanstvo puta postaje samo ukoliko *umemo* da ih *nađemo sami sebi*. [TH 452]
- (35a) This meant that there could be no middle path, that true path leading forward, into stability, peace and dignity, but that *we were* all *travelling* in a circle, always along the same, deceptive path, and only the people and the generations change as they travel, constantly deceived. ... One just travels. And the road has meaning and dignity only in so far as *we are able to find* those qualities in *ourselves*. [DC 381]

The universal voice is that first-person voice which speaks to the general human condition and which, by definition, includes us readers in the group defined by the speaker. The primary function of that voice in these works by Andrić is to bring us into the narrative by experiencing directly the dilemmas of the characters whose stories are most relevant to the book's underlying meaning. At the same time, each of the other two voices, the authorial and the insider's, allows the universal reading at certain points. This very ambiguity – the question of whether or not the reader is included – adds immeasurably to the power of Andrić's writing.

The trajectory of first-person plural narration: surprises at the end

Let us in conclusion look at the trajectory of each of these three novels with respect to these several voices. *Prokleta avlija* is dominated by the universal voice associated with Fra Petar, through which Andrić himself appears to speak as openly as he ever does, as for example in excerpts (1) and (10) above. Yet the final occurrence of first-person plural in the novel is the intentionally ambiguous statement about change, seen in excerpt (8) above. Here, Andrić

pulls us back from the universality of what has preceded and reminds us that we must always consciously choose the extent to which we are included in any one statement addressed to us in first-person plural.

Na Drini ćuprija and *Travnička hronika* are, as we have seen, dominated by the insider's and the universal voice, respectively. In the former, the insider's voice is associated most frequently with the town as a unit, and expresses the multifaceted unity of a town in which individual elements are bridged but never completely unified. In the latter, the universal voice is associated most frequently with the central character, the French consul Daville; it expresses the anguish felt by one who is always on the outside no matter how hard he may try to understand his surroundings. But the final occurrences of first-person plural in each of these two books shift the focus dramatically.

In *Na Drini ćuprija*, these final instances occur within the internal monologue of Alihodža Muteveliċ, the descendant of the caretaker whose voice we heard in excerpt (30), and the character whose death coincides with the bridge's destruction. It is universal in that it speaks to the human condition, yet it is so closely associated with the town and the bridge that we respond to it as if it were the insider's voice. At the same time, we have been conditioned to associate the insider's voice with the townspeople as a unit. By making this final instance of first-person plural voice neither one nor the other, and simultaneously both, Andrić leaves us with a clear challenge at the book's conclusion: where do we fit in the tale he has just concluded? The translator opted not to be included, but it is important to remember that his is only one reader's choice.

(36) Hodža ih je gledao kao pijane ljude koji ne znaju šta govore, i već je hteo da im odgovori da je ovde život već odavno u opasnosti i da *smo* svi ionako mrtvi, samo *se* redom *sahranjujemo*, ali se predomisli, pouĉen rđavim iskustvom poslednjih dana, i reĉe im mirno i prirodno da je došao samo da uzme nešto iz dućana i da se odmah vraća kući. [NDC 354]

(36a) The hodja looked at them as if they were drunk and did not know what they were saying. He wanted to reply that life had been dangerous for a long time past and that everyone was more or less dead already and only waiting his turn to be buried*, but he thought better of it, taught by the bad experience of the last few days, and merely told them calmly and naturally that he had only come to take something from the shop and would return home at once. [TBD 308]

[*everyone was more or less dead already and only waiting his turn to be buried
> we are all dead nonetheless and only being buried in turn]

- (37) Korača mutno i sporo, a pred očima mu je neprestano, kao da se kreće pred njim, ceo prizor sa razorenim mostom. Nije dovoljno jednoj stvari leđa okrenuti pa da prestane da *nas* goni i muči. I da sklopi oči, on bi samo to video. [NDC 360]
- (37a) He walked painfully and slowly and before his eyes, as if it moved along in front of him, was the whole scene with the ruined bridge. It was not enough to turn one's back on a thing for it to cease to goad and torment one*. Even when he shut his eyes he could still see it. [TBD 313] [*one > us]

The final instances of first-person plural in *Travnička hronika* also occur within internal monologue. But, significantly, it is not the monologue of Daville, to whom we have become accustomed as the channel of the universal voice. Instead, it is the monologue of the elderly Jewish merchant Salomon Atijas, who, although he is an important Travnik resident, has not been a major character in the story. But now he expresses, in universal terms, the quintessential insider's view that has been absent throughout the novel. Again Andrić concludes with a voice which is neither one nor the other and simultaneously both, and leaves us with a similar challenge: what is our own stance with respect to the Other?

- (38) Salomon ga je gledao svojim krupnim očima i jednako se znojio i teško disao; kao da mu je i samom sve to jasno i teško, isto toliko i teže nego Davilu, kao da razume i shvata potpuno kakva su muka i kakva opasnost svi ti carevi i kraljevi, veziri i ministri, čiji odlasci i dolasci ne zavise nimalo od *nas*, ali *nas* ipak dižu ili satire, *nas* i *naše* porodice i sve što *jesmo* i što *imamo*; kao da je uopšte srećan što je morao da napusti svoju mračnu magazdu i gomile koža i da se ispne na ovo uzvišeno i sunčano mesto i da sedi sa gospodom, na nenaviklim stolicama u raskošnim prostorijama. [TH 456-57]
- (38a) Salomon watched him with his large eyes, constantly perspiring and breathing heavily, as though this was all quite clear to him too, and difficult, just as difficult or even more so than for Daville, as though he fully understood what a torment and a danger all these emperors and kings, viziers and ministers were, whose departures and arrivals did not depend on *us* in the slightest, but who nevertheless raised *us* up and cast *us* down, *us* and *our* families, and everything *we were* and *possessed*. It seemed he was altogether unhappy that he had to leave his gloomy warehouse and its piles of hides, to clamber up to this high, sunny place and to sit with gentlemen, on unaccustomed chairs, in luxurious rooms. [DC 385]

Conclusion

The tool of a writer is language, and great writers (like all great artists) wield their tools with consummate skill. We are conscious of this artistry to a great extent. But some facets

of language are so deeply embedded that they normally pass by unnoticed. In particular, the fact that first-person plural defines a group which necessarily includes the speaker, and which may or may not include the hearer, is a fact about language we take for granted; we also take it for granted that the context makes it clear which of the two options are the case in any one instance.

The purpose of this exposition has been to bring to notice not only this fact, but also Andrić's skillful and powerful use of it in driving home a very important message. Whenever first-person plural is used, the listener must always make the choice as to whether or not he is included as an addressee. By introducing instances of first-person plural forms without warning, by placing them judiciously at significant points in the narrative, and by making a number of them provocatively ambiguous, Andrić forces us to become more aware of a critical fact about our lives – namely, that we are continually making choices with respect to the Other, and that these choices are usually unconscious. Now, when we have witnessed the tragic results of unleashed nationalism, it is more important than ever that we make these choices consciously for ourselves, and not let others make them for us. The overriding relevance of Andrić today is that his prose, when consciously approached, can help us remember to do this.

【Notes】

¹ Belgrade, 1945. The English translation by Lovett Edwards, *The Bridge on the Drina*, first appeared in 1959 (New York: Macmillan); since 1977 it has been kept in print by University of Chicago Press.

² He was born in 1892 in a village outside Travnik, was taken as an infant to Sarajevo, and, upon the death of his father in 1894, was sent to Višegrad to live with his aunt and uncle. After completing four grades of elementary school there, he was sent to Sarajevo for his secondary education.

³ Belgrade, 1945. There are three different translations of this novel. The first, *Bosnian Story* (by Kenneth Johnstone), appeared in 1958 (London: Lincoln Prager), and the second, *Bosnian Chronicle* (by Joseph Hitrec), appeared in 1962 (New York: Alfred Knopf). The third, *Days of the Consuls* (by Celia Hawkesworth in collaboration with Bogdan Rakić), appeared in 1992 (London and Boston: Forest Books). None of the three gives a full literal translation of Andrić's title, which would be *A Chronicle of Travnik: The Times of the Consuls*.

⁴ Belgrade, 1954. There are two translations of this book. The first, *Devil's Yard* (by Kenneth Johnstone), appeared in 1962 (New York: Grove Press), while the second, *The Damned Yard* (by Celia Hawkesworth), appeared in 1992 (London and Boston: Forest Books).

⁵ All quotes from *Prokleta avlija* [PA] are from volume 4 of Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana djela* (Zagreb, 1967). Unless otherwise stated, the English quotes are from *The Damned Yard* [TDY]. Page numbers given after each abbreviation are those of the volume in question. First-person plural forms are italicized in all subsequent quotes (the forms that are relevant for the current argument are, of course, those in Andrić's original; the English translation will not always have corresponding pronominal or verbal forms in the same places).

⁶ The basic insight, and certain of the examples to follow, form the core of an earlier article of mine, “Narrative Voice and Listener’s Choice in the Prose of Ivo Andrić” (in W. Vucinich, ed., *Ivo Andrić Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands*, Berkeley: International and Area Studies, 1995, pp. 200-230). The present contribution represents a significant expansion of that original idea.

⁷ All quotes from *Na Drini ćuprija* [NDC] and *Travnička hronika* [TH] are from volumes 1 and 2, respectively, of Ivo Andrić, *Sabrana djela* (Zagreb, 1967). For the former, English quotes are from *The Bridge on the Drina* [TBD]. For the latter, English quotes are from *Days of the Consuls* [DC] unless indicated otherwise. Page numbers given after each abbreviation are those of the volume in question.

⁸ An “instance” of first-person plural narration is defined as the occurrence of a verb form or a pronominal form (subject, object, or possessive) marked for first-person plural. Instances of reflexive pronouns are also counted if the intended meaning is clearly “ourselves”.

⁹ The second-person plural forms marking direct address are underlined.

¹⁰ In this and subsequent examples, asterisks in the English translation indicate omission of first-person plural forms. The bracketed material following the translation gives the literal translation for the segments indicated.

¹¹ The translation quoted in (27b) is from *Bosnian Chronicle*. That in *Bosnian Story* does not differ with respect to the issue of first-person plural vs. impersonal forms.