



SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS

JOVAN DUČIĆ: LIFE, WORK, TIMES

Publisher

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Knez Mihailova 35, Belgrade

Acting publisher

Academician Vladimir S. Kostić

Editor-in-chief

Academician Zoran Knežević

Editors

Academician Ljubodrag Dimić
SASA Corresponding Member Jovan Delić

Cover design

Dragana Lacmanović-Lekić

English translation

Jelena Mitrić
Tatjana Čosović
Tatjana Ružin Ivanović

Proofreading and editing

Jelena Mitrić

Expert consultants

Marina Ninić
Miroslav Jovanović

Prepress

Dosije Studio, Belgrade

Printing

Planeta print, Belgrade

Print run: 300 copies

ISBN 978-86-7025-918-8

© Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2021.

The publication was financially supported by Dunav Insurance Company, Telekom Serbia and the Serbian Business Club “Privrednik”.

JOVAN DUČIĆ
LIFE, WORK, TIMES



SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS

CONTENTS

7 | Editor's Foreword

JOVAN DUČIĆ: BIOGRAPHY

13 | Jovan Delić, *Biography of Jovan Dučić*

JOVAN DUČIĆ: DIPLOMACY

57 | Miladin Milošević and Ljubodrag Dimić, *Jovan Dučić – A Diplomatic Career*

JOVAN DUČIĆ'S LITERARY WORKS

101 | Jovan Delić, *From Personal Pain to Metaphysical Visions*

151 | Mina M. Đurić, *Companions on a Path by the Road: Dučić's Views on Serbian Literature in the Context of World Art and Culture*

175 | Vladimir Gvozden, *Cultural Transfer, Literary System and the Figure of a (Travel) Writer in Jovan Dučić's Cities and Chimeras*

199 | Aleksandar M. Milanović, *The Contribution of Dučić's Travelogues to the Modernization of the Serbian Poetic and Standard Language*

217 | Nedeljka Bjelanović, *Dučić's Abatement: Leutar Mornings*

225 | Vladan Bajčeta, *Dučić's Praise of Folly: King Radovan's Treasure*

245 | Jovan Delić, *Dučić's Historical Portrait of an Ancestor and Alter Ego*

JOVAN DUČIĆ AND THE ACADEMY

281 | Zlata Bojović, *Jovan Dučić in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts*

305 | Endnotes

323 | Abbreviations

JOVAN DUČIĆ: BIBLIOGRAPHY

327 | Dragana Krstić Lukić and Svetlana Simonović Mandić, *Jovan Dučić's Bibliography*

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Praised and commended from the highest and most meritorious place as the greatest Serbian lyric poet (Bogdan Popović, Slobodan Jovanović), and later disputed by avant-garde poets, and posthumously ideologically discredited, one hundred and fifty years after his birth Jovan Dučić still emerges as one of the greatest lyric poets that we have ever had. In about three and a half decades of his diplomatic service, he gained a reputation as one of the most prominent Serbian and Yugoslav diplomats, and was the first one among the heads of the legations of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to be granted the title of ambassador. Therefore, it is quite natural that the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts dedicated the year 2021 and this monograph to him.

He said for himself that he knew neither the day nor the year when he was born, but that he perfectly well knew why he was born. From an orphan fathered by a war insurgent from Podglivlje, Hrupjel, and Trebinje he managed to rise to prominence and became the most distinguished poet and one of the most distinguished diplomatic figures of his time, he met the most influential, most powerful and most talented people of his time: kings, presidents and prime ministers, military leaders, diplomats, sages, poets, writers, critics, journalists, ladies... He travelled a great deal and amassed a wealth of knowledge and experience. He was buried three times on two different continents and in two different millennia, and therefore not only does Dučić's biography portray a rich, exciting, often dramatic, fulfilled and accomplished life, but also his three funerals, that is, his posthumous return to Crkvina above Trebinje. Dučić's biography covers the time span of over one hundred and thirty years.

Special emphasis has been given to Dučić's all-out diplomatic efforts. Owing to the fact that Dučić's *Diplomatski spisi (Diplomatic Documents)* (by Miladin Milošević) came off the press, favorable conditions have been met for this extremely important Dučić's pursuit to be more precisely viewed and evaluated. His assessments of the fascist threat and his justified early fears of genocide against the Serbs, and his premonitions about the genocide, proved to be extremely accurate.

The greatest attention has been devoted to Dučić's poetry. It has been typologically classified into "lyrical circles", but it has also been looked into in reference to its "development", thus making the synchronic and diachronic perspectives intertwined in the process of reflecting on Dučić's poetry.

Given that Dučić believed that poetry was the highest degree of metaphysics, special attention has been devoted to metaphysical qualities of his poetry.

Dučić's contribution to travel writing genre, which has been enormously important for Serbian literature from its very beginnings, is exceptional. Dučić's travelogues can be considered as travel essays, and the travel writer himself described this genre as "a novel of one heart and one mind".

This monograph emphasizes Dučić's huge contribution to the development of essays in Serbian literature. Strong impetus came from French literature, primarily from Montaigne. For Dučić, the essay is a genre of human self-searching, introspection, self-overcoming, self-awareness and self-knowledge. The essay is at the core his travel writing prose (*Cities and Chimeras*), contemplative prose (*Leutar Mornings* and *King Radovan's Treasure*), literary criticism and autopoetic prose (*A Path by the Road* and *My Companions*). Even nowadays, a large number of Dučić's literary criticisms is as relevant as ever, as well as statements on his understanding of the nature of criticism. In this monograph, Dučić's essayistic output has also been viewed in a comparative context.

Miladin Milošević pointed out that history was Dučić's obsession, which is a point of resemblance with Ivo Andrić. By far Dučić's book *Count Sava Vladislavić* ranks among the most original and unusual historiographical works, written as a biography of probably the greatest diplomat among the Serbs, but in the service of the Russian Empire, and as a work on the writer's ancestor and his alter ego.

We tried to present Dučić's oeuvre in its entirety, respecting the individuality of each work. Thus, the reader will get a fuller picture of Jovan Dučić as a poet, diplomat, travel writer, essayist, literary critic and historian, in addition to each of his works individually.

Special attention has been devoted to the academician Jovan Dučić, that is, Jovan Dučić as a fellow of the Serbian Royal Academy. Many documents and findings have been made known to the general scientific public for the first time.

Dučić's bibliography has been necessarily selective. The work on this monograph only showed how much the complete and all-round Dučić's bibliography has actually been lacking.

This monograph was created during the pandemic: much to our regret, two authors were forced to cancel their contributions to the monograph. We are all the more grateful to all the authors for working under difficult conditions. Despite the pandemic, only in part have we managed to repay our debt to the great poet and diplomat Jovan Dučić.

Ljubodrag Dimić and Jovan Delić



CULTURAL TRANSFER, LITERARY SYSTEM AND THE FIGURE OF A (TRAVEL) WRITER IN JOVAN DUČIĆ'S *CITIES AND CHIMERAS*

Vladimir GVOZDEN

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad

Jovan Dučić holds pride of place in the canon of Serbian culture, and his work is part and parcel of our literary classics. Dučić was such a kind of a poet and artist that constantly polished his work, his verse, travelogues, essays – and this seems to have been recognized by the readership, who held him in particularly high esteem on that account. He is regarded as “a worshipper of culture” who has a “highly refined sense of history” and retrieves from the past “the rustle of precious antique brocade” (Савић-Ребац 1988, 374), but one who does so not out of some form of escapism or retreat, but as being actively involved in his own contemporaneity, assimilating knowledge and skills from the very fountainheads of European culture. His poetry is, as Anica Savić-Rebac wrote, “the poetry of culture, and the course of his education was such that he arrived at the very fountainheads of culture only gradually and considerably late. And it was only then that his entire artistic personality began to emerge” (1988, 373).

The literary work of Jovan Dučić was realized within various genres, but it is notable that the attention of scholars was directed primarily to his poetry. The rationale behind this lies not only in the accepted hierarchy of literary genres, but also in the idea that his verse really surpasses everything else that he wrote, as in the words of Milan Kašanin: “the prestige and brilliance of Dučić’s verse made him be





Jovan Dučić during his escape to nature
(ASASA 15068–660)

discussed exclusively, or at least predominantly, as a poet” (Кашанин 1968, 347). Dučić, as pointed out by Predrag Palavestra in *The History of Modern Serbian Literature*, “was granted the highest merit for improving the poetic expression of modern Serbian lyric and for the development of Serbian verse” (Палавестра 1986, 253). Literary critics ceaselessly shower greatest honours and accolades upon this poet. For instance, Slobodan Vitanović asserts that Jovan Dučić is “one of the greatest and most brilliant monuments to a grand era of Serbian literature” (Витановић 1994, XII), while Slavko Leovac in the text entitled “The Position of Jovan Dučić in Serbian Literature” wrote: “Jovan Dučić is a remarkable occurrence in Serbian culture [...] In Dučić’s works lyricism is of primary importance in his poems and travelogues, even in his essays [...] In that respect we speak of Dučić as a remarkable occurrence on a par with Laza Kostić” (Леовац 1996, 9). This list can certainly be continued with names of other renowned authors. However, these quotations are only to serve the purpose of conjuring up the prevailing image of Dučić as a poet. It is beyond any doubt that we know a lot about Dučić as a poet and great stylist, and much less about him as an intellectual, travel writer and essayist.

But without travelogues and essays it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand the extraordinary figure of Dučić as a man of letters and intellectual and his role in enriching the potential of Serbian literature, whose important element represents what goes by the name of Serbian travel literature in the interwar period (see Гвозден 2011). Dučić was a globe-trotter (see Гвозден 2003), not only as a student or diplomat, but also as a singular, intellectual traveller, who travelled in the imaginary world of books just as much as he did in the actual world – what bears testimony to this is not only immediate evidence in his writings, but also a remarkably vast library boasting over five thousand books that is situated in Trebinje. His horizon, broadened by his extensive travels, spilled over into his writing as well. His travel prose works, letters from Switzerland, France, Greece, Italy,

Spain, Palestine and Egypt, first published in the magazines *Zora (Dawn)* from Mostar, *Srpski književni glasnik (Serbian Literary Herald)* and newspaper *Politika* from Belgrade, collected during his lifetime in two editions entitled *Gradovi i himere (Cities and Chimeras)*,¹⁶⁹ were largely neglected or only mentioned in passing, and up until the 1980's and 1990's there had been a noticeable lack of in-depth scientific studies (for an overview of critical literature see Гвозден 2005). However, since the 1980's the relationship of the science of literature towards travel writing shifted with the insight that travels and travel accounts had opened up new perspectives for modern literature concerning the issues of perception of space and time, geography and history. It transpired that, historically speaking, the experience of a travelogue emphasizes and proves the unreal and transitional character of the forms of reality over time, as well as that it produces the experience of otherness and reinforces and challenges one's own self-knowledge (Bassnet 1995, 92–94).

Nevertheless, as early as in the interwar period some critics, discussing *Cities and Chimeras*, duly placed the main emphasis on its innovativeness and the role it had played in stabilizing the genre in the system of Serbian literature (Мирковић 1936: 335). In an idealized and one-sided discourse in favour of modernization (as a set of particular universal potentialities and their realizations), Dučić could be said to have introduced certain horizons through his travel writings – not so much geographical as stylistic, and even ideological – that had been missing in Serbian literature. In that sense, it seems as if *Cities and Chimeras* signify both “youth” and “old age” – they undoubtedly contain numerous traces of European culture in a factographical and culturological sense, but there is also an assumption that they enter into an active dialogue with the travelogue genre, not only in the form of mechanical references, but also at a deeper level of authentic assimilation of what could be defined as a humanistic tradition of (travel) writing (as well as the contradictions that it entails).

What throws this assumption about the power of cultural transfer into even sharper relief is the realization that Jovan Dučić had been acquainted with the key ideas of literary travel writing even before the much praised official meeting with the West (see Gvozden 2009), which can best be seen in his review of a travelogue by Marko Car that was released in 1898. This short review contains decisive support of the conception of a literary travelogue that would not deal with “long-winded descriptions [...] of luncheons, dinners, sufferings in the helter-skelter of railway routes” (Дучић 19696, 197), and it especially stresses the importance of two travel writers, Ljubomir Nenadović, because of his “vivacious and rare brand of humour”, and Milan Jovanović, because of his “scholarly observations” (Дучић 19696, 197–198). There are two types of travelogues evaluated here or, in other words, the emphasis is here placed on the choice between two types of travel writing that were predominant in the nineteenth century: either to write a Romantic travelogue bearing the stamp of one's own personality, or to write a scholarly, positivistic travelogue. Marko Car, naturally, fell within the first group as “a man of broad and solid intelligence, a man of letters by instinct”. At the same time, a critical stance was proclaimed that is relevant to the understanding of *Cities and Chimeras*: “[...] Mr Car is not known to be some kind of an amateurish absolutist, who oftentimes purposefully evades both patterns and rules, only so as to note down more faithfully his impressions, his memories, his comforts and discomforts, his fancy, etc.” (Дучић 19696, 198). Therefore, the individuality of the author does not allow him to act completely at his own



Marko Car (1859–1953)

discretion – there are conventions and he is obliged to comply with them; failing that, he would leave an impression of an amateur who passes judgement too easily without giving the issue at hand due consideration.

Developing a singular economy of intellectual exchange in Serbian literature, Jovan Dučić devoted the final pages of his essay on Isidora Sekulić to her literary travelogue *Letters from Norway*. He insists here on “the experience of having lived through something”, and not just of any sort, but the one that is both emotional and intellectual, on something that has been experienced “with shrewd eyes and a deep soul” (Дучић 1969б, 112). Here again, as in the case of Marko Car, Dučić makes an immediate and fundamental distinction between literary travelogues and “travel feuilletons”. The former are “works of philosophical synthesis and poetic capacity to distinguish and synthesize” since, as it is pointed out, “it is not enough to be a writer and travel to another country in order to write a book” (Дучић 1969б, 112). He goes on to give counsel as to how it should be done, bringing forth in several sentences a set of poetic prerequisites for literary travel writing as a genre, as well as for his *Cities and Chimeras*:

“One should go there ready to notice, absorb, distinguish, compare, get to feel, and come to love or hate everything. One does not describe cities but visions, not nations but racial geniuses, not works of art but artistic prospects, not cults but their impact, not events but higher motives, not the history of nations but the history of the spirit and soul. There is no genre more difficult than travel writing, for there is no study more comprehensive than the study of the genius of a race; nor perhaps a greater skill than to provide through a seemingly naive art what is a subject of personal study and erudition. But also, there is no poetic sensibility more personal than the one brought into contact with a foreign country” (Дучић 1969б: 112-113).

He reiterated here his thesis on the fusion of sensibility and reason – a travelogue should be a combination of knowledge and feelings, emotions and reason, as a didactic genre it has an educational function, but at the same time presents the experience of its author, inevitably bearing the stamp of his personality. This opposition represents an aspect of the age-old alternative between classical and romantic tastes, as well as between intelligibility and sensibility as the supreme values in acquiring knowledge about the world.

A travelogue, as Dučić points out, cannot be written by a “literary tourist”, but only by someone who stays in a country, that is, someone who is focused on its “essences”, such as the genius of a race, artistic prospects, the higher motives of its history, the spirit and soul of a nation, and the like. A travelogue, apart from containing the personal dimension of a

poet, is always a scientific work as well, in which one could immediately “spot a charlatan”; but a travelogue is also “invariably a novel about the self”, so that one could immediately “recognize idle talk” (Дучић 19696, 113); and, finally, “a good travelogue” (i.e. the literary one) “requires great artistic and stylistic devices”, so that one could immediately “recognize a non-poet” (Дучић 19696: 113–114). The very last sentence of the essay on Isidora Sekulić re-emphasizes the duality in the genre of travel writing, which, according to Dučić, represents “an autobiography of a heart and mind” (Дучић 19696, 114).

Dučić integrated in his text the “sediment of knowledge”, an abundant world of texts and intertexts, but he also, viewed in the context of Serbian literature, expressed facts and observations which had already been made by other authors, while contributing to the consolidation and, occasionally, opposition to certain perspectives.¹⁷⁰ A quick overview of the layers of traditions and conventions of European travel writing, along with focusing much more on the “literary transfer” (Doležel 1991, 217; Giljen 1982, 61) than on individual influences, is required in order to put into broader perspective the thesis that Jovan Dučić stands at the end of one line of development of European literary tradition.

Description is a component of meaning of the word ‘travelogue’, with a note that one has to bear in mind that through description, knowledge and evaluation circulate through the text. Description is not a mere ornament or decoration, the parergon here breaks through the system of the meaning of the text. A travelogue is in many ways a didactic text, a means of conveying various information. Additionally, it is always, at least as a very distant echo, a guidebook. But a travelogue – as Dučić knew so well – always has a character of an attempt, it is always a chimera, either as an incomplete picture of an undefined and elusive reality, or as a symbolistic monster of individual inspiration which “falsifies” reality. Apart from the abovementioned tensions, Adrien Pasquali successfully singled out conflicting, opposing forces governing two fundamental literary activities, reading and writing travelogues, without which *Cities and Chimeras* would be unimaginable:

“a) a traveller that is writing – a writer that is travelling: a straightforward and naive perception of reality – a mediated vision; a simple and transparent style – literarization that disguises; b) a traveller – a drawing-room polymath: experience – bookish knowledge; a direct, honest word – a marked word, quote or plagiarism; a witness – a manipulator, forger; c) a traveller – a tourist: discovering the world – a traveller pressed for time; exchange, dialogue between cultures – looting, theft” (Pasquali 1994, 31).

Naturally, these pairs can overlap depending on the course of a discussion and positions taken by the participants. Most frequently, as can be seen from the criticism of Dučić’s travelogues, the discussions are conducted regarding the relative status of a traveller/tourist, traveller/drawing-room polymath and, of course, between the “direct” and “marked” words. It is clear that every travelogue carries the signals of other travelogues, that is to say, the signals of what might be called a “travel writing tradition”. It is not a set of mechanical influences, but the assimilation of poetic and ideological assumptions which dominate the tradition of (European) travel writing.¹⁷¹

There is a vast array of elements of modern travel writing culture that are noticeable in Dučić’s writings on various levels, ranging from analogies, references and quotations to entire ideological structures.¹⁷² The book *Cities and Chimeras* as a “hybrid literary genre”, as Milan

Kašanin long since called it (Кашанин 1968, 348), entails different methods of writing and areas of knowledge. In this travelogue, unlike for instance in Dučić's diplomatic reports, we can trace the presence, already apparent in Horace's *Journey to Brundisium*, of the autobiographical dimension, the horizon of a culturological analysis, ethnogeographical observations, literary references, as well as the essayistic method of writing. The close relationship between the essay and the literary travelogue found its best expression in Dučić's case in the words of Slavko Leovac, who entitled the chapter of the book *Jovan Dučić: Literary Opus* devoted to *Cities and Chimeras* as "A Travel Essay". However, a literary travelogue would be unimaginable without that essayistic component, which in the *Cities and Chimeras* is largely based on the French tradition originated by Montaigne, who regarded travel as an exercise of the spirit, but who also introduced into the essay genre the generalizations in the form of simple inductions, that is, adding examples together, which was to become a basic strategy adopted by his numerous followers (see Гвозден 2017).

It was long since revealed that both essay and travelogue defy any sort of clear-cut categorization and stand out as super-genre systems including different modes of writing. "Vagueness" and "elusiveness" are part of their character, as well as paradoxes that stem from the ambiguous position of the thinking subject and the subject of thinking. The thought moves "outwardly", into the world, and the subject assumes the position of authority, as somebody who views the world sideways – hence the thought is brought back to the subject, as in the case of "I" that concludes *Cities and Chimeras*.¹⁷³ This is what represents a part of the culturological process of "essayization" of other forms of writing (Епштејн 1997, 57–58; Berger 1964, 203; Bogosavljević 1983, 6) and in fact stands at the beginning of a process that was later to include the novel and story in Serbian literature. Both the essay and the literary travelogue had emerged as an attempt at establishing universality in a world of diversity – both genres represent one of the elementary forms of manifestation of the "humanistic mythology" about the unique human subject. Finally, the literary travelogue inherited from the essay "the energy of mutual obstacles, friction and clashing of the mutually incongruous parts" (Епштејн 1997, 76), which are rooted in "authorship", in a powerful assurance of an individual testimony of "general" issues.

Dučić also inherited the ambiguous relationship of the literary travelogue towards reality – constant oscillations of the genre between extreme subjectivity and fictionalization: "[...] the travel writer's relationship to reality has never been a question of objectivity as opposed to subjectivity, but a question of the right to reinterpret reality through the medium of personal experience. Only after this right had been fully acknowledged did the travelogue acquire the potential to become a literary genre in its own right" (Bogosavljević 1983, 7). The travelogue, as Dučić used to point out in his autopoetic texts, is invariably an expression of personal experience, yet the writer cannot completely ignore reality, because in that case he would overstep the boundaries of the genre. In the simple yet precise metaphorical terms contained in the very title of the book, the writer keeps hovering between the "cities" (as something "real") and "chimeras" (as the stuff of legends or fantasies about the "real", in constant danger of becoming too far removed from what is "real").

Nevertheless, it seems that the basic tension within *Cities and Chimeras* is precisely the one singled out by Dučić himself in the case of Marko Car and Isidora Sekulić: to strike a balance between the informative (intellectual) and aesthetic (poetic) function of the travelogue, to describe



A panorama of Bucharest (AY-377, PC)

cities and at the same time create chimeras. Strictly speaking, symbolism is at odds with travel writing, that is, with its intellectual and informative aspect, because it deploys the raw material of reality for an autonomous structure; a travelogue can never be separated from reality without losing its identity in terms of its genre – hence we find numerous elements from other types of discourse (Bogosavljević 1983, 228). Consequently, the conflict between pronounced aestheticism and symbolism and traditional travel writing creates a specific source of tension in *Cities and Chimeras*.

The principle of selection mentioned above can very easily be noticed on the plane of the countries and peoples described in Dučić's work. Vojislav Maksimović reproved the poet for “a peculiar and tendentious selection. Thus, he did not give his impressions from some of the cities in which he had stayed for a prolonged period of time – like Bucharest, Budapest, Constantinople and Sofia – which is a clear indication of a certain type of affinity” (Максимовић 1969, 257). This might be a matter of his personal affinity, just as much as it could be a matter of functioning within the framework of the political and cultural maps of the first half of the twentieth century. However, this is more likely to be a question of Dučić's debt to the European tradition of travel writing. Namely, the cities and regions described in *Cities and Chimeras* had long since been privileged sites for literary and educational travels. It is by all means evident that Dučić's selection is “tendentious” in the sense that he favours the “Southern cultures” (in the best tradition of the “Grand Tour”) over the “coldness of the North” – a polarity which, irrespective

of whether a negative or positive connotation is assigned to either side, can be traced back from Tacitus' *Germania*, across the divide between the Protestant and Catholic Europe, to the ideology of the Napoleonic wars and the book *De l'Allemagne (Germany)* by Madame de Staël.

Cities and Chimeras contain two converging and often even conflicting traditions of literary travels, or at least their ideal types – the Enlightenment and Romanticism. Once again we are faced with the convergence of the traditional contrasting pairs, such as heart/mind, emotions/reason. As Dučić said, a travel writer has the emotional task to “get to feel, come to love or hate”, but also the rational task to “absorb, distinguish and compare” (Дучић 1969б, 112). In *Cities and Chimeras* knowledge is organized, put in order, and classified, essences are being searched for, and the main tool of the Enlightenment used for treating a subject is that of abstraction (Horkheimer, Adorno 1989, 26). Dučić says that he “wrote those pieces, which were not so much observations about the country itself, as they were intended to refer to what is fundamental and of paramount importance, and that is the genius of a race” (Дучић 1932). On the one hand, there is the essentialist quest in the spirit of scientific positivism of the late nineteenth century, in the way the poet understood and deployed it, while on the other, there is lyricism, so typical of Dučić, notably in the descriptions of nature (the Alps, the Ionian sea, Chaeronea, Palestine), which presuppose the blending of the experiencing subject and the object being described.

Dučić the travel writer thought it possible to represent a culture (scientifically) as a set of unchanging values, while simultaneously encapsulating ethnic psychology (artistically) in a single metaphor. In one interview, he even expressed disagreement with the fact that his accounts of the countries in which he had “lived”, to use his own words, are labelled as “travelogues”, insisting on such (vague) significations as “true reflections on genius” or “testimonies of history”, contrasting the deep insights and reflections on cultures with the superficial impressions of travel writers (Дучић 1932, 442).

The poet himself, certainly, assimilated a great number of traditions of travel writing inherited from the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Thus, in one of the passages from *Cities and Chimeras*, he extols the tradition of an “armchair travel writer”, having primarily de Maistre in mind: “It is best to give an account of one’s travel as the French do, since they do not travel, but stay at home, and yet they write the most beautiful travelogues” (Дучић 1940, 275).¹⁷⁴ At the same time, in the statement quoted by Meša Selimović in the Note on the edition of *Cities and Chimeras* of 1969, he builds upon the tradition of a writer-diplomat: “For, those were no travelogues; I have always been trying to grasp the essence of the inward and spiritual life of a nation, dwelling equally on what is of eternal value and what is characteristic of the people in question. In such an endeavour one is involved not only as a man of letters, but also as a diplomat, who is obliged to have a thorough knowledge of national characteristics” (Дучић 1969, 333). The resistance that Dučić exhibited towards contemporaneity, favouring the quest for “eternal values” and “national characteristics” paradoxically blends the Enlightenment tradition of objective knowledge about “man” with a parallel tradition of national characterization, which, relying on the ideas of Montesquieu, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer and (notably) Herder, became united (also paradoxically) at the turn of the twentieth century in characterological endeavours of Taine, Le Bon, Wundt, Dilthey, Cvijić and Dvorniković, and even allowed for the possibility of two types of characterology – the impressionistic and scientific one (Дворниковић 1939, 124).

Jovan Dučić's passport while he served as secretary of the Legation of the Kingdom of Serbia in Athens, 18/31 February 1917 (ASASA 15068–633)



Furthermore, Dučić inherited something from each of the three main types of travel: pilgrimage, travel (in a strict sense) and tourism (Pageaux 1994, 31). Apart from the journey to Palestine, *Cities and Chimeras* inherited from pilgrimage a general tendency to avoid talking about the mundane life, about its volatility, as well as striving to talk about essences. From travel in the strict sense it inherited the character of an individual act and personal decision, interest in certain worldly sights, as well as the aforementioned character of the “Grand Tour” for the sake of personal improvement and assimilation of European culturological patterns, an instance of optimistic faith in the possibility of grasping the otherness, as writing a travel account is a very optimistic and positive act – it means saying “yes” to things – which repeatedly talks about the opportunity and willingness of a traveller to perceive the space and time of other people so as to understand the unity of human spirit and plurality of societies and forms of collective life. A traveller sees himself as one of the key interpreters of the world and its history, which is the reason why he usually possesses wisdom or the philosophical spirit (Pageaux 1994, 32). And, finally, Dučić is also a bit of a tourist, even though he is critical of tourism in *Cities and Chimeras*. For, what are hikes along the Alpine slopes or a boat ride along the Nile if not instances of tourist itineraries of that time. A man of the modern age is in haste, but Dučić – who never parted from his automobile named the “Egyptian”¹⁷⁵ – is desperate for slowdown, reflecting, like other travel writers of the interwar period, “the experiences and testimonies collected in a world that is definitely torn to pieces, fragmented, chaotic” (Pageaux 1994, 34; Bauman 1996).

A typology that Tzvetan Todorov established in the case of French travelogues might prove to be useful for understanding the pattern of travel and travellers, to which the narrator

of *Cities and Chimeras* belongs. Namely, in the section “Portraits of Travellers” in the book *On Human Diversity*, this author identifies ten categories of travellers: the assimilator, the profiteer, the tourist, the impressionist, the assimilated, the outsider, the exile, the allegorist, the disenchanted, the philosopher (Тодоров 1994, 328-336). If we were to pose the question as to which of these types can Dučić be identified with, it is immediately clear that he does not by any means fall within the group of assimilators, who describe other cultures in terms of their shortcomings when compared with their own culture; he is not a profiteer either, a traveller who travels mainly for business purposes; he himself refuses to be a tourist (though it has to be acknowledged that in his time tourist travel stood at the forefront of every journey); he is not one of the assimilated – he does not get to know others in order to live with them, but to understand them better; nor is he an exile, just as for the most part he is not a disenchanted one, but on many occasions, quite the contrary, an enchanted traveller.

Therefore, the types of travellers that blend to a greatest extent in the personality of the narrator of *Cities and Chimeras* are the impressionist, the allegorist and the philosopher. As an impressionist, Dučić is, in Todorov’s words, a “very complete tourist” (Тодоров 1994, 330), who has a lot more time on his hands than a common tourist and who does not bring traditional souvenirs from his travels, but a draft of a future literary work. Dučić the impressionist presents various experiences, outstanding landscapes, subjective remarks on other people’s customs, erotic encounters (a Polish and Dutch woman), auditory perceptions. Despite the fact that he aspires to “scientific” insights into the eternal nature of peoples and cultures in his autopoetic statements, he has an implicit attitude of an impressionist, according to whom an individual has an inviolable right to experience the world around him after his own fashion. However, the impressionist and scientist, at odds with each other, cloak themselves in the robes of the allegorist, who oftentimes speaks about a foreign nation in order to discuss utopistically his own culture. By writing a travelogue, Dučić the allegorist quite certainly wants to profit on a symbolic plane. All this leads us to the figure of a philosopher/travel writer, who wants to reach a generality by observing the differences among peoples, and that generality, as we shall demonstrate, represents literature as a peculiar type of knowledge that addresses “man”.

Finally, Dučić also inevitably reflects the paradox of tradition: its charms depend on the sediment that it transmits as its own ideology, but if we were to stop purifying this sediment, all movement would be halted – writing utopistically abolishes the very thing that gives meaning to it. His prose is not simply descriptive, it is also revelatory – a revelation of oneself and others. Simultaneously, he is a writer that comes long after the “age of discovery” of cultures he writes about, the age that is in Serbian literature associated with Dositej Obradović and his time, and in European one with the so-called “imperialism of the imagination”. For this reason, he presents himself as a man of vast experience intent on becoming a classic, on adding his own iron ring to the chain of European literary tradition. At the time of writing his travelogue, he was in many respects superior to his contemporaries: according to his literary merit, position, success, material wealth; all this resulted in a tendency towards the “aristocratization” of his own status, towards an escape from “some kind of an amateurish absolutist”, against whom he stood out himself in the early text in which he praised the travelogues of Marko Car.

As all other travelogues, *Cities and Chimeras* include claims, assumptions, and views that have an ideological character, that is, that express convictions about particular sets of culturological, social and political facts, relations, values and power. Since the text was produced in a particular social and material environment, it cannot escape expressing some ideological (pre)suppositions, although a rule is separated from its application, excluded from the experience of language in the very ideology of presentation. It is only the language of criticism – only metaphorically called “metalanguage” – that can seek out this rule or a set of rules. The aim of this search is to deny the validity of one-sided generalization of knowledge and homogenization of the experience of reading *Cities and Chimeras* and to draw due attention to the clashes between meanings and attitudes within the text, as well as to stress the importance of space in this writing, issues to do with addressing, and a variety of the patterns of “reality” and/or “chimeras”.

Cities and Chimeras bear testimony to a peculiar type of symbolism, to a belief that history that rests on unique moments in time can be generalized in an almost theoretical discourse that searches for the essences. The images of ancient Greece, Rome, Spain, France or his own nation bring a reconciliation of different historical planes, giving an impression of transcendence.¹⁷⁶ The escape into an indefinite time period is a flip side of symbolistic, Gautieresque recoil from the banal, which testifies to the interest in searching for that which is essential and most fundamental:

“I did not finish any of my “travelogues”, as you call them, in any country in which I had lived. In almost all of my travelogues I spoke of travel in a sense other than spiritual. Wherever I was, I wanted to learn the history and language of the people in whose country I had lived for years. It was only afterwards that I wrote those pieces, which were to a lesser extent observations about the country itself, and which, on the contrary, were related to that which is essential and most fundamental, that is to say, the genius of a race. Thus I wrote about the genius of the ancient Greeks, the French, the Spanish, etc., therefore, much rather than about the country and the ephemera of everyday life [...] My ambitions far surpassed the impressions of a travel writer” (Дучић 1932, 442).

The dimension of searching for the essences primarily concerns exposing the national characteristics in the sense of differences between people seen through a special kind of lens, whose aim seems to be that of bringing a system to the diversity of the world, which Dučić finds fascinating in many passages – from a hotel in the Alps that looks like a transatlantic ship, across the variegation of travellers on a voyage across the Ionian sea, to the hullabaloo of the Levantine melting-pot.



Jovan Dučić in company
with Milorad Drašković, Voja
Marinković, Mika Živaljević, one
officer and an unknown person on
the Acropolis (ASASA 15068–675)

The reasons related to the “national characteristics”, which are indispensable for the travelogue, the poet named “psychic reasons” in his *Diplomatic Letters* and he considered them important for a “politician just as much as for a historian and philosopher, and especially for the political life of a nation” (Дучић 1991, 259; Bucharest, 30 March 1938). In an interview for a Budapest monthly *Literature* (the issue of March 1933), the poet-diplomat also stressed the fact that diplomats have to build economic and political connections, but that they are also obliged to be active at the cultural and moral front, “and if they are endowed with an ethical soul, they cannot let this matter become neglected” (Дучић 1991, 31). We are, thus, faced with the idea of the ethics of writing whereby it is presented as an addition to political work, as a passage into the realm of stable and permanent relations and aspirations. In truth, Dučić resolved the issue of the relationship between history and literature in a simple manner: a literary work, such as *Cities and Chimeras*, is supposed to enter into the realm of universal relations. Hence the contemporaneity – which is put into the background by strategies of essentialism – appears mainly in the form of an anecdote or a marginal experience from travels or else as fragmented through particular, seemingly universal, but in fact essentially historical ideological attitudes or binary oppositions.

Dučić was of the opinion that the experience gained by living in different countries in turn for prolonged periods of time is more complete than the one gained by living in one and the same country. But, then again, does not every travel writer think so? It is understood that travel brings a wealth of international topics, as well as that the movement itself represents a privileged method of learning: “Nowhere can man learn more about people than on his travels” (Дучић 1940, 275).¹⁷⁷ Simultaneously, a travelogue always implies the marking of boundaries, an inevitable reduction of cultural diversity. And the said marking of boundaries in turn brings into question the universality of knowledge. How are then the two outlooks to be reconciled: the universality of faith in the “national spirit” and differences among cultures?

Nineteenth-century Europe saw all individual cultures take part in the race for their own national identity, and the struggle for the existence of culture had been more pressing than the struggle for nation-building, since the former was a necessary precondition for the latter, that is, for the emergence of nationality – the hierarchy of cultures and marking the boundaries of one’s own culture (much more importantly than those of its territory) had been given the task of establishing the national identity (Дуринг 2001, 41). That is the reason why the imperialist nations considered themselves as world-historical cultures and were perceived by others as such – as the case of Dučić’s image of France and England nicely illustrates. It is the very stereotypes of cultures produced by the “greats” that brought about the theory of culture, with its inherent “difficulty of imagining other people” (Skeri 1999), since “our behaviour towards other people is determined [...] by the manner in which we are imagining them” (Skeri 1999, 121). According to an excerpt from *Leutar Mornings*, Dučić was aware of the ideology of discrimination that reigned over Europe at the time: “People hate not only those who are better or worse than they, but also the men who are different – never, thus, lacking a cause for odium. For, difference signifies mystery, and ambiguity, which, in their eyes, means deviousness, and danger to them personally” (Dučić 2017, 308).¹⁷⁸ Foreignness is a result of alterity that can lead to irrationality, and the ambiguous ethnic stereotypes are not only literary in character, nor is their function exclusively

literary. As Elaine Scarry argues, the ability of imagining other people has a powerful force precisely in canonical literature, which conveys through its impact not only artistic but political ideology as well. Hence Dučić embarks on an old literary and intellectual adventure in which the images certain nations form about others, as well as about their language, customs, behaviour, tradition, are an indivisible part of the culture of European nations. In that sense, the travel writer in *Cities and Chimeras* comes across unambiguously as a representative of the “Western civilization”, whose reality is associated with nation-states.

The key term of the European writing of the nation, the “spirit of a nation”, is deployed in Dučić’s essay “On Patriotism”, under the direct influence of Renan’s lecture entitled “What is a Nation?": “The collective spirit of a nation is the product of a common past and history, and shared happiness, misfortune, victory and defeat. It is therefore manifest both in the moral and the material sphere, that is, in the human losses suffered for common ideals and principles” (Dučić 2017, 361).¹⁷⁹ Following Renan and joining him in adopting a voluntaristic definition of a nation which dates back to the French revolution, Dučić in his “Letter from Egypt” argues as follows: “A nation – it does not imply a common land, common name, not even a common language, but a collective spirit, or better still, a collective soul” (Дучић 1940, 307). And if the national identity is an entity related to the spirit, and not, according to the allegedly opposite deterministic model, to the blood and soil, then there is nothing more natural than to try to understand and describe that collective spirit, which is conditioned by the will of its subjects, as well as their common tradition (Woolf 1996, 14; Bilefeld 1998, ch. “Citizen – nation – state”). It might therefore be said that the problem of the individuation of a nation in *Cities and Chimeras* is set as a question of narrative continuity, that is, the production and reproduction of narratives underlying a national idea.

However, the roots of these narratives bring us back again to the importance of the soil for the emergence and upholding of a nation and its identity, so it turns out that “contradictory” Dučić argues in his travelogue for the importance of both bases for modelling a modern nation, both the nation of the will and nation of the soil. The latter discourse primarily includes a great number of anthropogeographic remarks, according to which man’s spiritual and cultural development depends on his geographical surroundings: “All beings that were born on the same soil are affected by the colour and atmosphere of the soil on which they were born [...]” (Дучић 1940, 266). In the spirit of this twofold tradition in *Cities and Chimeras*, the spirit of a nation determines its concealed historical destiny, every nation should confirm its existence, individuality or “soul”, coming onto the historical stage. Peoples and nations as political entities are particular in that they are different, but owing to the unifying force of narration itself they are set within the framework of permanence and universality (Хобсбаум 1996, 12).

In accordance with this view of Europe as a Hegelian domain of national states defined through their emergence as political affiliation, Dučić’s time is also marked by attempts to found characterology of a people on a scientific, psychological basis. Following the model of numerous works within greater European cultures, such an endeavour encompassing the then Yugoslav area was undertaken by Vladimir Dvorniković,¹⁸⁰ who on the very first pages of the voluminous *Characterology of the Yugoslavs* stated the objective of scientific psychological characterology: “to develop in a conscious and systematic manner the tools and methods for the spiritual portraits of both

individual men and a people as a whole” (Дворниковић 1939, 18). It can be seen from his account that writings of this kind were ubiquitous in the first decades of the last century in European nations, as well as that they represented some sort of a scientific trend.¹⁸¹ The chapter entitled “The Characterology of a People”, which includes a history and tenets of that discipline, is also significant for understanding the position of the narrator of *Cities and Chimeras*. Dvorniković points to the existence of two types of characterologies. The “impressionistic characterology”, as he calls it, cannot shed light on “the whole interior in all its dimensions” (Дворниковић 1939, 124), although he argues that it is not amiss to note that “even a pedantic thinker such as Kant tried to impressionistically characterize whole nations and lands with a single word” (Дворниковић 1939, 124). Dvorniković claims that such impressions, types, “basic elements” can only be a point of departure for a scientific characterology, posing a key question that also hovers over Dučić’s travelogue:

“For, what is the character of a whole nation? What are the “English”, “German”, “Russian”, “French”, as spiritual types and independent character structures? Do they represent a sum, an “average pattern” established on the basis of the biggest possible number of members of that nation, or an ideal type with which only the great representatives of those nations can more or less be identified? And, finally, which course to take in order to discover both the “pattern” and “ideal type”, which would contain all the relevant character traits of a nation? What does it take for us to “encapsulate” the character of an individual – let alone the character of a whole nation *à travers les siècles!*” (Дворниковић 1939, 126)

After commenting on various endeavours in search of an epistemological basis of the discipline, Dvorniković emphasizes that the first outlines and ideas of modern characterology were given by Montesquieu, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer and Herder, but that notably from Dilthey “one can speak of real beginnings and scientific foundations of the psychology and characterology of a nation” (Дворниковић 1939, 131). Dilthey in his *Introduction to the Human Sciences* (1883) came up with the notion of a nation as an “individualizing living whole” and regarded “characterology of a nation as the key and essential condition for the psychological understanding of history, collective phenomena of culture, art, social life – just as much as for great spiritual artists as individualized personalities” (Дворниковић 1939, 132). Consequently, Dvorniković maintains, regardless of the fact that his characterologies may now seem too bold and “impressionistic”, that he can be classified within the “scientific” group of scholars testifying to the difficulty of establishing the discipline itself, as well as to the difficulty of defining generalized national character



Madame de Staël (1766–1817)

types. However, it is noticeable that Dučić – irrespective of the fact that he wants to present his own activity as descending into “depths” – was keener to present the national characteristics with nonchalance, than to engage in any sort of discussion about their epistemological validity.

Hence for him the aforementioned scientific foundations are not so important as the active process of mutually ascribed opinions, convictions, intentions and meanings of the representatives of a nation about other nations, which is present in European literary tradition in general, and travel writing in particular, and which falls within what Jacques le Goff calls “mentalities”.¹⁸² And yet, it seems that in Dučić’s case, as we pointed out before, the name of Madame de Staël, who is regarded by some of her contemporaries as the founder of the science of national characterization, holds special significance. In imaginary Europe, created in her book *De l’Allemagne*, this female writer conjured up Europe of organic national cultures, giving a completely new meaning and intensity to the etiology of national characterization which modern science approaches with circumspection, but which were obviously very important for the emergence of modern Europe in the form of individual nation-states.

Apart from that, as far as “scientific characterization” is concerned, the epistemological foundation that in 1813 lent it validity is reflected in its aim, which complied with Newton’s inductive scientific method – to draw valid general conclusions from a set of perceived data. Among thinkers akin to Dučić, the best-known advocate of the lightness of characterization was Gustave le Bon. Unlike the majority of psychologists who, on the one hand, talked about the difficulties of presenting national characterization, and on the other, still gave such characterization lightly, le Bon spoke openly about the lightness of characterizing. According to him, the entire national characters can be described with a number of features, applying a procedure that can also be seen in numerous excerpts from *Cities and Chimeras* presented here.¹⁸³

No matter how incomplete and subject to criticism, the presentation of other cultures represents a fundamental human activity, as well as an important element of the literary system. After all, cultural nationalism is thought to be a reliable means of counteracting cultural homogenization, for values can be envisioned only through differences. One of the contemporary interpreters of Dučić’s work, Eugen Simion, expresses the duality of his writing style that oscillates between a “high level of improvisation” and “defining the style of a culture”:

“When one reads it nowadays, one gets the impression of a high level of improvisation, as in all essays of this type: general philosophical knowledge, good orientation in the subject matter, rich imagination,



Gustave Le Bon (1841–1931)

power of expression, and lastly, an ambition to read the psychology of a people and through a set of apt metaphors define the style of a culture, or, as the existentialists would later say, its manner of finding out its place in the world” (Симион 2000, 14).

The same author, continuing to express unconsciously the said duality, testifies to the fact that such intellectual musings are not held in high regard at the present day, so that, from the perspective of contemporary humanities, Dučić might appear outdated, “a lyrical dreamer deeply believing that culture represents a sum of unchanging values and that ethnic psychology can be encapsulated in a single metaphor”. However, he also underlines Dučić’s conviction that “the European man can be saved by his culture” (Симион 2000, 14), which brings us back to the question of national culture as the guardian of identity and authenticity. Escalating social polarity is vital for the making of the modern world, and Dučić, both witnessing and participating in modernization, endeavours to salvage ontological unity in the form of a “national spirit”, which is supposed to be a representative of unique forms of consciousness through which a national identity is presented as a national personality (“A Frenchman is ...”, “A German is ...”, “A Russian is ...”).

Slavko Leovac, speaking of Dučić as a poet, pointed to the “transcendental ease of making poetry in little lyrical forms about the principal questions of the relationship between man and the world” (Леовац 1985, 293). In the same vein, we could say the following regarding *Cities and Chimeras*: even if one might talk about the “transcendental ease” in writing a travelogue, it is more apt to define ‘writing the nation’ as the product of “transcendental facilitation” which enables us to live in the world of culture (or, more precisely, cultures). Hence, far-reaching generalizations cannot be disregarded, since they are not to be found on the margins of travelogues, but at the root of literary writing as such. National character, as an embodiment of the idea of a homogenous national culture, consensual and incessant transmission of historical traditions or ‘organic’ ethnic communities, was the basis for comparing cultures, and writing itself was not exclusively reflective, but constitutive as well. Dučić’s characterizations of nations, which represent the subject of this study, reflect the duality of a nation as such: firstly, nation as a priori historically present; and secondly, nation constructed in narration which takes place here and now, marked by the repetition and pulsation of national signals. The image of this or that nation is a shadow lingering between people as an “image” and its meaning as a differentiating sign of the self, different from the other and external. Viewed from today’s perspective, a fundamental problem of presenting national characterizations is to do with the twofold nature of defining them. How are they to be understood, in essentialist or conventionalist terms? Dučić understood them in essentialist terms, as an a priori set of moral and mental properties that differentiate individuals or races perceived as homogenous wholes, while nowadays there is a preference for viewing them from the conventionalist perspective, thereby allowing for the possibility that they are in fact reports on character, that is to say, reviews in which character is a matter of reputation rather than identity (Leersen 1991, 169).

There are a great many other ambivalences, as well. We are facing here an internally divided nation, with problems regarding the articulation of heterogeneity within one nation – Dučić generalizes on the one hand, and “fragments”, on the other (as in the case of the image of his own nation). Simultaneously, he also expresses the paradox of a nation that mediates between the teleology of progress and linear time, entering the discourse of halted or cyclical time. Apart from

that, each analysis of a characterization must answer the question posed by Dvorniković: “In which period of the historical development or ‘age’ do nations have ‘the highest forms of character’, in their cultural youth or at a higher level of culture and civilization?” (Дворниковић 1939, 142) In the case of *Cities and Chimeras* there is no universal answer: in the case of Greeks it was more appropriate to investigate the early history of the people, in the case of the Spanish or English the focus was on the pinnacle of exhibiting their imagined character (the Middle Ages and nineteenth century, respectively), in the case of Serbs a number of fixed historical images ... Dučić’s characterizations seem to be governed in turn by a synchronic and diachronic principle.

As we have pointed out before, the contradictions in *Cities and Chimeras* have been much discussed, but a conclusion that imposes itself is that it is not Dučić himself that is contradictory (as a result of some kind of an intentional misconception), but that it is in fact writing the nation that is contradictory in itself. A contemporary scholar of “nation as narration” Homi Bhabha asserts in his volume *The Location of Culture* that “the conceptual ambivalence of modern society becomes the site of *writing the nation*” (Bhabha 1994, 146), and suggests that we need “another time of writing that will be able to inscribe the ambivalent and chiasmatic intersections of time and place that constitute the problematic of ‘modern’ experience of the Western nation” (Bhabha 1994, 141). This means that what is required for a better understanding of images of other nations are more complex strategies of cultural identification and discursive convention that function “in the name of ‘the people’ or ‘the nation’ and make them the immanent subjects of a range of social and literary narratives” (Bhabha 1994, 140). As the contemporary German sociologist Ulrich Bielefeld notes: “a foreigner makes it clear that fiction and reality do not represent a pair of opposites”, for a foreigner always manifests himself as the personification of a foreigner (Bielefeld 1998, 15).

The narrative strategy of writing the nation as an apparatus of symbolic power “produces a continual slippage of categories, like sexuality, class affiliation, territorial paranoia, or ‘cultural difference’” (Bhabha 1994, 140). In the literary image of a foreigner social history (ideology) and individual life history (utopia) are mixed as a history of separation and boundary marking. It is not only the literary foreignness that is a figment of imagination, the foreign as such that is understood as a priori never loses that feature. In truth, it is precisely in national characterizations that the tendencies of literature towards subjectivism and objectivism that marked the late nineteenth century became united. This is primarily related to the influential views of Renan who, as Skerlić pointed



Jovan Dučić on one of his walks (ASASA 15068–661)

out in “The Scientific Method of Literary History”, demanded from historians to be as objective as possible, while he encouraged the critics to be subjective, heralding the mixture of positivism and impressionism that was to follow (Скерлић 1977, 600).

Dučić, as a follower of the intellectual achievements of the “great nations”¹⁸⁴, aspired to reconcile the universal values of the Enlightenment and humanism with the relative traits of individual national characters. For Dučić, as for many other “great minds” of his time, culture was synonymous with “validity” and “value”. He regards culture as universal and it is all but completely hidden that in *Cities and Chimeras* it is mainly bound up with time. Although, strictly speaking, “all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated and unmonolithic” (Said 1993, xxix), culture is above all the awareness of the other and the different. Voltaire believed that a man is constricted by the law and that this universal being is cast into the mold that varies from one state to another – that is, that the universal turns into the particular, because the other always abides by a different set of laws: “These little adventures occasioned me to make some observations, which of course were very ingenious and profound, upon the subject of laws; and I easily perceived that it was with them as it is with our garments: I must wear a doliman at Constantinople, and a coat at Paris” (Voltaire 1901, VI, 96, *Laws*). This view of Voltaire’s, related to the universality of “man” as opposed to the relativity of the laws, is cited here because it directly refers to the conception of literature that underlies the writing of *Cities and Chimeras*.

Actually, it is the imagological aspects, elements of the image of the other in *Cities and Chimeras* that are most directly conducive to a deeper understanding of the concept of literature cultivated by Dučić. It was presented by the poet in several turns, but its most explicit articulation can be found in his statement given to the Romanian poet Virgil Carianopol:

“I think that true literature must be tied to great subjects, eternal ones, to subjects that interest us, as human beings, which connect us to one another and make us better people, strengthening the mutual relationships that pave the way for society to live free from turmoil. People have a need to read, in books, about their own joys and sufferings, and it makes them happy to feel that others suffer for them. That which is written should go deep, reaching even the darkest depths, much beneath the depth of an average man. I would like to add, to complement this idea, that the one who writes must identify himself with all humanity, that is to say, in him all factors must converge independent of the milieu or country that he originated from. Namely, I would like to say that it depends on the writer himself whether he will continue to live or die” (Карианопол 1987, 119–20).

Dučić here supports a humanistic definition of literature, as a special kind of knowledge, different from philosophical and scientific knowledge, but at the same time very close to it. This refers to the humanistic pattern according to which there is a particular type of knowledge about the world and humanity that is derived from literary experience, a type of knowledge furnished by literary experience. This concept of literature was accused of idealism and elitism, as a world-view pertaining to a particular social class, which had privatized its own place of reading and interpreting the world. Literature is viewed from the standpoint of its function of preserving art, of its acting as a bulwark against barbarity and the advent of materialistic society, being reputed to have political and social shrewdness that is found to be lacking in all other practices (Компањон

2001, 40). Apart from that, Dučić as a poet, as it is widely known, exhibited the Romantic refinement of the concept of literature through placing a high value on lyrical poetry. Imagination, instead of reason, became a legitimate path towards the higher truth, and imagination exerts its utmost power in poetry. And therefore poetry needs to be regarded as the ultimate tool of gaining knowledge about the world (Eichner 1982, 18).¹⁸⁵

If to this is added Dučić's repudiation of categorizing *Cities and Chimeras* as belonging to the genre of travel literature, stated in the magazine *Pregled (Overview)*, the sense of his absolutization of literature as a learning tool becomes much clearer. Through his identification with the object, Dučić in the course of a textual process comes to the crux at a fundamental level – a text of this kind cannot be labelled as belonging to any genre, so that it could simply be classified as literature (Lacoue-Labarthe 1978, 11). Contemporaneity, culture, the “spirit of the era” are all bad, universals are good; but they are, according to the poet, likely to be reached only through a laborious process of work and reflection: “For that reason I have not written about Egypt or Ptolemaic Alexandria yet, because I need time, a lot of time at that, to write about the subject a mere score of pages that would be true reflections on genius and my testimonies of history” (Дучић 1932, 442). The highlights of culture are a thing of the past, and contemporary culture is worthless. Being much more solid, the universal “national spirit” is juxtaposed to the transient “spirit of the era”.

Dučić's classicistic elitism is closely linked with the middle-class conception of literature which he cultivated in various forms, whose manifest was the “Inaugural Lecture on the History of World Literature” by Bogdan Popović (1894), in which literature is regarded as a human activity of vital importance. It is actually about a literary absolute, which Dučić was to formulate in a conversation with the Romanian poet in an almost identical manner:

“What is the most important and most intriguing for a man, what concerns him the most, is described and discussed in literature. More than with anything else in the world, man is still concerned with man; and a man, a whole man, in all facets of his life and work, with all his sentiments, hopes, wishes, worldviews, thoughts about his mission and place in the world, in a word, with his entire inner and social life – represents the subject of literature. [...] Literature can give us something that we cannot obtain from material possessions, it gives us knowledge about ourselves, inner life, a source of worldly wisdom and a pledge of continued pleasure” (Поповић 2001, 4, 6).

Hence the aristocratism of the figure of an author in Dučić's opus has its roots in literature rather than anything else, because the members of Serbian elite of the time had risen through the ranks owing to their education and not their descent. In order to elevate culture over politics – to put a man before the citizen – means that politics must move within a deeper ethical dimension, drawing on the resources of education and forming individuals into suitably well-tempered, responsible citizens (Eagleton 2000, 7).

As a member of literary and political elite, Dučić in many parts of *Cities and Chimeras* reflects the ideological orientation of the modernizing Serbian elite, that is, in the sense of the political will, Serbian society as a whole. For Dučić, travelling to Europe never meant going abroad, but staying in his natural environment. The question of knowledge is to do with the shaping of authority, and the voice of the narrator of *Cities and Chimeras* is the voice of a “privileged member of society”: the voice of a university student in Switzerland and France, a



Bogdan Popović
(LSASA, F-263/1)

traveller-diplomat who traverses the same roads along which once sailed “Frisian ships with two rows of paddles”, a Mediterranean swimming in the bays of Dubrovnik, a companion of interesting women, rich tourists and English archeologists.

Dučić, undoubtedly, entirely belongs to the Western discourse of presenting a nation as something particular addressed by the rhetoric of the universal. His writing contains all the problems that Homi Bhabha referred to as the “Third Space of Enunciation”, which invariably makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process, since it destroys the process of representation in which cultural knowledge usually manifests itself as an integrated, open-ended and expansive code (Bhabha 1994, 37). All cultural enunciations and systems are constructed in the ambivalent space of enunciation, as the space of “definiteness” is ambivalent by the sheer fact that it cannot be a single one. Thus, for example, Dučić in *Cities and Chimeras* continually mixes two levels of representations of “reality”: the reality of a given moment or period in the past and the atemporal reality of civilizational achievements in general. Besides, this travelogue confirms that the images of peoples are largely transnational, which makes them a potential site of world literature or, rather still, of the humanistic conception of literature. One cannot escape noticing that Bogdan Popović in his lecture, as well as Dučić in his autopoetic statements and prose writings, speak about “man” whom literature addresses. In his book *On Human Diversity*, Tzvetan Todorov has convincingly shown that “man”, who wants to portray himself as universal, is inevitably determined by a cultural and linguistic horizon. It is clear that a national identity and the image of a nation are not posited as having an empirical, natural and absolutely singular character, but the one that always addresses the universal man as well: “Self-representation or self-identification of a nation invariably takes the form of a philosophy which, though better represented by this or that nation, yet has a particular relationship towards philosophical

universality” (Дерида 2002, 46). If we here replace “philosophical” with “literary”, we come to the paradox of literature itself that in Dučić’s time (much more than today) as a form of high culture established direct movement between the individual and universal, thereby circumventing all arbitrary particularities. The artistic canon is invariably a collection of individual and unclassifiable writings, whose very uniqueness serves to assert the common spirit of mankind. Such conception of literature has its parallel in the ethics of liberal humanism, according to which the “self” is at its peak when it rises above prosaic particularities (Eagleton 2000, 55).

The transformative power of art brings with it a pattern of elevation towards universal humanity. According to the concept of literature as an absolute, the spirit of mankind exists only in its individual incarnations, whose other name is poetry. Just as literature represents the artistic correlative of the unity of the universal and the individual, the political correlative of that unity is known as the nation-state. To rise above time contingencies and attain the status of an absolute necessity, nations require the universalizing medium of the state. Thus, in Terry Eagleton’s words, the hyphen in the term ‘nation-state’ signifies a link between culture and politics: “Cultures are now becoming the basis of the nation-state, but a nation-state which nevertheless transcends them” (Eagleton 2000, 57-58). In the ideology of national humanism the universal is compatible with the national. Writing the nation is Janus-faced “where meanings may be partial because they are *in medias res*; and history may be half-made because it is in the process of being made; and the image of cultural authority may be ambivalent because it is caught [...] in the act of ‘composing’ its powerful image” (Bhabha 1990, 3). Thus the best response to the literary presence of the nation is analytical pluralism as a form of critical attention required for the interpretation of the cultural impact of nationhood. Narrating the nation is ambivalent because, upholding culture at its highest plane, it is represented as “subordination, fracturing, diffusing, reproducing, as much as producing, creating, forcing, guiding” (Said 1983, 171). In that context, the ambivalence of narrating the images of other cultures in *Cities and Chimeras*, on the one hand, fixes the boundaries between nations, while on the other, recognizes nations as the threshold of meaning that has to be crossed, eliminated and transcended in the process of unified cultural and literary production.

The conclusion that thus presents itself is that *Cities and Chimeras* simultaneously represent a product and part of the humanistic discourse in which the very concept of the national identity found its basis in the potential of its literary expression. In that sense, the images of other cultures stand in the centre rather than on some distant, unfortified and forsaken borderlines of a travelogue. As Isidora Sekulić used to say, in Dučić the national fertilized by the foreign brought forth a higher culture (1964, 264-265). Characterized by the original duality expressed in the very title, *Cities and Chimeras* bring into balance the heated discursive complexity that marked the first decades of the twentieth century, heralding a new potential of Serbian prose. Times and standards are changing, but the model of the relationship towards the literary system, culture and its traces that Dučić had developed is, unfortunately, rarely to be found even at the present day – which, of course, makes him all the more important and, overall, stresses the need for a new, different interpretation and assessment of this invaluable author.

Translated by Tatjana Ružin Ivanović

REFERENCES

- Bassnet, Susan (1995), *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*, Blackwell, Oxford (UK), Cambridge (USA).
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1996), "From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity", u: *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ur. Stuart Hall, Paul Du Gay, Sage Publications, London, str. 18–36.
- Бахтин, Михаил (1997), „Смелије се користити могућностима”, прев. Никола Грдинић, *Домейни*, Сомбор, год. 24, 90–91, стр. 43–50.
- Berger, B. (1964), *Der Essay. Form und Geschichte*, Francke, Bern und Munich.
- Bogosavljević, Srđan (1983), *German Literary Travelogues Around the Turn of the Century, 1890–1914*, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ph.D (rukopis).
- Bilefeld, Ulrich (1998), *Stranci: prijatelji ili neprijatelji*, prev. Drinka Gojković, Bibl. XX vek, Beograd.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1995), *The Location of Culture*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Витановић, Слободан (1994), *Јован Дучић у знаку Ајолона и Диониса (Књижевни поједи и поетика)*, Београд: Посебна издања САНУ.
- Волтер (1990), *Филозофски речник*, прев. Ђорђе Димитријевић, Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- Wolff, Larry (1994), *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Gvozden, Vladimir (2009), "Writing Difference/Claiming General Validity: Jovan Dučić's *Cities and Chimaeras* and the West". *Balkan Departures: Travel Writing from Southeastern Europe*, ed. Wendy Bracewell, Alex Drace-Francis, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009, 75–86.
- Гвозден, Владимир (2017), „Есејиста Јован Дучић”, *Научни сасијанак славистија у Вукове дане*, 46/2, Београд, 2017, 174–184.
- Гвозден, Владимир (2003), *Јован Дучић њујоркисац: ојед из имајолоије*, Нови Сад: Светови.
- Гвозден, Владимир (2005), „Књижевна критика о путописима Јована Дучића”, *Свеске Мајице српске*, св. 12 (43), стр. 55–69.
- Гвозден, Владимир (2006), „Књижевна путовања, књижевни посредници и компаративна књижевност”, *Теоријско-историјски њујоркисац: њујоркисац њујоркисац код Срба*, ур. Бојана Стојановић-Пантовић, Београд: Књижевно друштво „Свети Сава”, 2006, стр. 119–136.
- Гвозден, Владимир (2011), *Српска њујоркиса култура 1914–1940*, Београд: Службени гласник.
- Giljen, Claudio (1982), *Književnost kao sistem*, prev. Tihomir Vučković, Beograd: Nolit.
- Дворниковић, Владимир (1939), *Каракџеролоија Јујословена*, Београд: Космос.
- Дерида, Жак (2002), „Онто-теологија национал-хуманизма”, прев. Петар Вујичин, *Злајна прега*, Нови Сад, 4–5, стр. 43–52.
- Doležel, Lubomir (1991), *Poetike Zapada: poglavlja iz istraživačke tradicije*, prev. Radmila Popović, Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Дуринг, Сајмон (2001), „Књижевност – другост национализма: случај за ревизију”, прев. Јована Калаузов и Наташа Исајловић, *Злајна прега*, Нови Сад, бр. 1, стр. 41–49.
- Дучић, Јован (1940), *Градови и химере*, Београд: Српска књижевна задруга.
- Дучић, Јован (1969), *Градови и химере, Сабрана дела књ. 2*, прир. М. Селимовић, Сарајево: Свјетлост.
- Дучић, Јован (1991), *Дипломатски списи*, прир. Миладин Милошевић, Београд: Просвета.
- Дучић, Јован (1932), „Јован Дучић о својим путописима”, *Прејед*, Сарајево, бр. 97, стр. 442.
- Дучић, Јован (1969а), *Јујора са Леујара; Сјаза њоред њуја; Прилози (књижевно време, умјетност, њублицистика)*, прир. Ж. Стојковић, Сарајево: Свјетлост, 1969.

- Дучић, Јован (1969), *Моји сајућници, Прилози (кријишке, чланци, белешке), Сабрана дела*, књ. 4, прир. Ж. Стојковић, Сарајево: Свјетлост.
- Дучић, Јован (1963), „Писма из Женеви и Париза”, прир. Боривоје Маринковић, *Савременик*, књ. 17, св. 4 (стр. 355–366) и св. 5 (стр. 474–488).
- Eagleton, Terry (2000), *The Idea of Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eichner, Hans (1982), “The rise of modern science and the genesis of Romanticism”, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, no. 97, str. 8–31.
- Епштејн, Михаил (1998), *Есеј*, прев. Радмила Мечанин, Београд: Алфа, Народна књига.
- Карианолопол, Вирђил (1987), „Из букурештанских дана Јована Дучића”, прев. Илеана Урсу, *Лейоис Мајице српске*, јануар, год. 163, књ. 439, св. 1, стр. 115–126.
- Кашанин, Милан (1968), „Усамљеник (Јован Дучић)”, *Судбине и људи*, Београд: Просвета, стр. 326–355.
- Компањон, Антоан (2001), *Демон теорије*, прев. Милица Козић, Владимир Капор, Бранко Ракић, Нови Сад: Светови.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe; Nancy, Jean-Luc (1978), *L’Absolu littéraire*, Paris: Seuil.
- Ле Бон, Густав (1920), *Мишљења и веровања*, прев. Благоје Марковић, Загреб: Књижара Телап и Поповац.
- Ле Гоф, Жак (2002), „Менталитети: двосмислена историја”, прев. Младен Шукало, *Крајина*, Бања Лука, год. 2, бр. 2, стр. 9–26.
- Leersen, Joep (1991), “Mimesis and stereotype”, u: *National Identity: Symbol and Representation*, priр. J. Leersen, M. Spiering, Rodopi, Amsterdam (Yearbook of European Studies 4), str. 165–175.
- Леовац, Славко (1985), *Јован Дучић, књижевно дело*, Свјетлост: Сарајево.
- Леовац, Славко (1996), „Место Јована Дучића у српској књижевности”, *О Јовану Дучићу њоводом њедесећојодишњице смрћи: зборник радова САНУ*, ур. Предраг Палавестра, Београд, стр. 11–14.
- Максимовић, Војислав (1969), „Дучићеви одласци у свијет”, *Израз*, Сарајево, бр. 8–9, стр. 252–257.
- Мирковић, Никола (1936), „Јован Дучић”, *Српски књижевни гласник*, Београд, књ. 48, св. 5, стр. 334–344; св. 6, стр. 424–433.
- Павловић, Коста Ст. (1967), *Јован Дучић*, Милано.
- Палавестра, Предраг (1986), *Историја модерне српске књижевности: Златно доба 1892–1918*, Београд: СКЗ.
- Pasquali, Adrien (1994), *Le Tour des horizons. Critique et récits de voyages*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Pageaux, Daniel-Henri (1994), *La littérature générale et comparée*, Paris: Armand Colin.
- Пековић, Слободанка (1996), „Путописи Јована Дучића”, *О Јовану Дучићу њоводом њедесећојодишњице смрћи: зборник радова*, ур. Предраг Палавестра, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, стр. 233–240.
- Поповић, Богдан (2001), „О књижевности (Приступно предавање из историје светске књижевности, 12. фебруара 1894)”, *Књижевна теорија и естетика*, прир. Иво Тартаља, Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, стр. 1–20.
- Ренап, Ернест (1883), *Шта је народ?*, прев. Миленко Сандић, Београд: Штампарија „Св. Сава”.
- Савић-Ребац, Аница (1988), „О Јовану Дучићу”, *Студије и ојпеди I–II*, Нови Сад: Књижевна заједница Новог Сада, стр. 373–378.
- Said, Edward V. (1983), *The World, The Text and The Critic*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Симион, Еуђен (2000), „Јован Дучић – изразити моралиста”, прев. Вероника Јова, *Књижевне новине*, Београд, бр. 1007–1008, стр. 14.

- Skerti, Elejn (1999), „Teškoća da se zamisle drugi ljudi”, *Za ljubav domovine: rasprava o granicama patriotizma*, прир. Marta K. Nusbaum, Džoшua Koen, прев. Drinka Gojković, Slavica Miletić, XX век, Београд, стр. 123–135.
- Скерлић, Јован (1977), *Кријички радови*, прир. Предраг Палавестра, Нови Сад: Матица српска, Београд: Институт за књижевност и уметност.
- Стојановић, И. (1932), „Јован Дучић: Градови и химере”, *Венац*, Београд, 1932/33, књ. 18, 4/5, стр. 366–369.
- Тодоров, Цветан (1994), *Ми и друји: француска мисао о људској разноликости*, прев. Б. Јелић, М. Перић и М. Здравковић, Београд: Библи. XX век.
- Херодот (1959), *Херодотова историја*, прев. Милан Арсенић, Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- Хобсбаум, Ерик (1996), *Нације и национализам од 1780: упројам, мити, стварности*, прев. Светлана Николић, Београд: „Филип Вишњић”.
- Horkheimer, Max; Adorno, Theodor (1989), *Dijalektika prosvetiteljstva: filozofijski fragmenti*, прев. Nadežda Čaćinović-Puhovski, Sarajevo: „Veselin Masleša”.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Translated by Vasa D. Mihailovich.
- 2 П. Каровић, *Дефиниција дигломације*, Дипломатија, Зборник радова (приредио др Ђорђе Н. Лопичић), Београд 2006, 80.
- 3 *Истѿо*, 80–82.
- 4 *Сабрана дела Јована Дучића*, књига VI, *О Јовану Дучићу 1900–1989*, Београд–Сарајево 1990, 102.
- 5 К. Ст. Павловић, *Јован Дучић*, Милано 1967, 11–17, 161.
Radovan Popović, one of Dučić's biographers, also mentions the year 1874 as the most credible one.
- 6 In his letter of 12 July 1899, sent to Milan Savić, Matica Srpska secretary, Dučić notified him that he had arrived in Geneva a few weeks ago, which refutes the opinion of Kosta St. Pavlović that he started his studies three years earlier, in 1896 (See Р. Поповић, *нав. дело*, 21).
- 7 The Archives of Serbia (AS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Serbia (MFF KS), PP, 1907, row 165.
- 8 The Archives of Yugoslavia (AY), Jovan Jovanović Pižon's Collection (80), box 35, sheet 180.
- 9 Kosta St. Pavlović noted down that Dučić's friends Jovan Skerlić and Slobodan Jovanović put in a word for him to be given his first diplomatic post. In the certificate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, issued at the request of J. Dučić, No. 3,754, of 28 October 1924, it was stated that Jovan Dučić was a non-accredited official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Serbia from 1 June 1907 to 1 May 1910, when he was appointed an accredited clerk.
К. Ст. Павловић, *нав. дело*, 36–38; AY, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (MFA KY) – Administrative Department – Human Resources Section (AD – HRS), 1924, f. V, Jovan Dučić's file.
- 10 А. Митровић, *Дучићев опис краља Фердинанда*, *Историјски часопис*, volume XIX, 1972, 320–325; AY, Jovan Jovanović Pižon's Collection (80), J. Dučić – to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sofia 27 January/9 February 1911.
- 11 Р. Поповић, *нав. дело*, 76–77, Dučić's letter to Jovanović of 19 April/1 May 1911.
- 12 AS, MFA KS, PO, 1913, P/2–1, f. IV.
- 13 AY, Jovan Jovanović Pižon's Collection (80), box-35, sheet-182, Jovan Dučić – to Jovan M. Jovanović, Rome, 2 October 1912.
- 14 *Документи о сѿлној ѿолијици Краљевине Србије* (hereinafter *Документи*) 1903–1914, 1913, књ. VI, св. 2, док. бр. 174, the report of the charge d'affaires from Rome of 28 April/11 May 1913, 257–258.
- 15 *Документи*, 1913, књ. VI, св. 3, document no. 324, Dučić's telegram from Rome of 13/26 September 1913, 366; document no. 333, *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram from Rome of 15/28 September 1913, 375–375; document no. 534. The report of the charge d'affaires from Rome Lj. Mihailović of 22 November/5 December 1913, 547–548.
- 16 The Archives of Serbia, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Serbia, PP, 1913, f-24, no. 304, Rome 22 December 1913, Dučić – to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgrade.
- 17 *Документи*, 1913, књ. VI, св. 3, document no. 565, Dučić's telegram from Rome of 28 December 1913/10 January 1914, 575.
- 18 *Документи*, 1914, књ. VII, св. 1, document no. 30, the report of charge d'affaires Lj. Mihailović of 7/20 January 1914, 145–147.
- 19 *Документи*, 1914, књ. VII, св. 1, document no. 162, 291.
- 20 Р. Поповић, *нав. дело*, 89.

- 21 AY, King's Office (KO), f-1, no. 533, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Legation of the Kingdom of Serbia in Greece, 14 July 1917 (according to the new calendar); AY, KO, f-2, document no. 605, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Legation in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 16 August 1917 (according to the new calendar).
- 22 AY, KO, f-2, no. 606, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Legation in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 17 August 1917 (according to the new calendar).
- 23 AY, KO, f-2, no. 604 and 607, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Legation in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 7/ 21 August 1917.
- 24 AY, KO, f-2, document no number, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Consulate in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 29 August 1917 (according to the new calendar).
- 25 AY, KO, f-2, document no. 603, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Consulate in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 19 August 1917 (according to the new calendar); AY, KO, f-2, document no. 625 and document no number, Secretary of the Legation J. Dučić – to the Serbian Royal General Consulate in Thessaloniki (for Jurišić), 29 and 30 August 1917 (according to the new calendar).
- 26 AY, MFA KY AD – decrees of 1918, f. 1
- 27 AY, MFA KY AD – decrees of 1918, f. 1.
- 28 The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was proclaimed on 1 December 1918 in Belgrade with the consent of the legitimate representatives of the internationally recognized Kingdom of Serbia and the internationally unrecognized State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs. The new state encompassed the administrative territories of the Kingdom of Serbia, the Kingdom of Montenegro, Dalmatia and Slovenia, which were Austrian imperial possessions, Croatia, Slavonia, Vojvodina and Srem, which were for centuries under the Hungarian crown, Bosnia and Herzegovina, which after the annexation had the status of Austro-Hungarian state property. Different historical experiences had left a strong imprint in the minds of citizens who in 1918 began living together in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.
- 29 Over 20,000,000 people were killed in battle or died in the war, and the same number of individuals was wounded or permanently disabled. About 8,000,000 people experienced the horrors of the camp or prison. France lost 16.8% of its population in the war, Germany 15.4%, Great Britain 12.5%, Russia 11.5%, Italy 10.5%, and the United States 2%. Serbia lost over 25% of its total population.
- 30 AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in France, no. 294 of 14 February 1919, Deciphered telegram forwarded to the Delegation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes at the Paris Peace Conference; AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in France, no. 202 of 3 March 1919, Deciphered telegram forwarded to the Delegation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes at the Paris Peace Conference.
- 31 AY, MFA KY AD – decrees of 1919, Political Department no 6384, of 22 May 1919, f. I.
- 32 AY, MFA KY AD – telegram from Madrid no. 234, of 17 April 1921, f. VII, Madrid Legation file.
- 33 AY, MFA KY AD – Human Resources Section (HRS), no. 3,308, of 19 August 1922, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 34 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram from San Sebastian of 15 August 1922, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 35 *Ibidem*, no. 3,333 of 20 August 1922, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 36 *Ibidem*, the telegram from Madrid no. 207 of 12 October 1922, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 37 *Ibidem*, no. 4,844 of 7 November 1922 and no. 5,040 of 17 November 1922, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 38 *Ibidem*, the act issued by the Political Department no. 910 of 7 March 1923, the decree no. 860, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 39 Jovan Dučić's Library (JDL), Trebinje, the telegram of the Legation in Athens of 1 September 1923, X-B-1.
- 40 AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in France, no. 44 of 25 January 1924, f-X, Dučić's report drafted at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and submitted to the Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Paris.
- 41 AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Bucharest, f-XI, Dučić's report submitted to the Minister of Foreign Affairs M. Ninčić, 21 January 1924.
- 42 This was the third government led by Lj. Davidović, which lasted from 27 July to early November 1924.
- 43 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 3,432 of 22 October 1924, f. V, Dučić's file; *Ibidem*, 1922 Envoy Marković's report from Athens, no. 855 of 26 September and no. 797 of 7 November 1924, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 44 *Ibidem*, 1922, f. IV, Milutin Jovanović's file.
- 45 *Ibidem*, Dučić's request of 25 October, no. 1,605 of 8 November 1924, f. XXI, file 19.

- 46 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram no. 10 of 3 January 1925, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 47 AY, the Permanent Delegation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the League of Nations (Delegation), the 1925 register, the telegram of 15 January 1925 sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- 48 The decision to establish the League of Nations was made in January 1919 at the first plenary session of the Paris Peace Conference. The organization began its activities in January 1920. Its seat was in Geneva. The main task of the organization was to preserve world peace, and its main goal was to encourage peaceful international cooperation. The League employed the principles of "collective security". Thus, each member of the League was obligated and responsible for the safety and security of all other members. The establishment of the League of Nations, one of the founders of which was the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, was the first attempt to create a system of collective security in Europe and the world.
- 49 Jovan Dučić's Library, Trebinje (JDL), H – B – 2, Our situation in the League of Nations, Geneva, 20 April 1925.
- 50 Momčilo Ninčić again served as the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the governments led by Nikola Pašić – the eighth one of 6 December 1924, the ninth one of 29 April 1925 and the tenth one of 18 July 1925, and then in the first and the second government led by Nikola Uzunović from 8 April to December 1926.
- 51 Jovan Dučić's Library, Dučić's letter to Ninčić; the letter sent by the most famous Swiss lawyer, a member of Parliament; letters sent by prominent Yugoslav citizens from Geneva, X–B–3: On the same see K. Ст. Павловић, *нав. дело*, 50–51.
- 52 AY, Delegation, the 1925 registry, Dučić's telegram no. 57 of 10 August 1925.
- 53 AY, MFA KY AD – 1925 decrees, f. 1.
- 54 *Ibidem*, AD – PD, decision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs no. 4,653 of 10 December 1925, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 55 AY, MFA KY AD, no. 844 of 16 March 1926, f. XVI, Dučić's file.
- 56 *Ibidem*, consul Grupčević's telegram, f. XVI, Dučić's file.
- 57 *Ibidem*, no. 1,175 of 21 April 1926, f. V, Dučić's file. Under the decree no. 1,057 of 30 March 1926 the Consulate General was abolished, and the Legation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was established. Under the decree no. 1,060 of 30 March 1926 Dučić was appointed counselor to the Legation as a chargé d'affaires. By the way, diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Serbia and Egypt were established on 1 February 1908 when the Diplomatic Agency was set up in Cairo, which was for a time raised to the rank of consulate, and then regained the status of agency, which was definitively abolished on 4 October 1922 when the Consulate General was established. The first diplomatic agent of the Kingdom of Serbia in Cairo was Boško Čolak Antić, who later became the Minister of the Court.
- 58 AY, MFA KY AD, no. 8 of 31 August 1927. – In his explanation of 2 August Dučić says that the conflict with M. Jovanović dates back to the time of his appointment as a permanent delegate to the League of Nations. According to Dučić, envoy Jovanović wanted to prevent this appointment at all costs, because it put an end to "numerous and large-scale chicaneries unprecedented in the history of our missions abroad". Having wanted to keep the posting of the delegate, Jovanović engaged in numerous intrigues that culminated in a fabricated affair with a failed girl and her illegitimate child. In these dishonorable actions, Jovanović also had the support of two clerks from his Legation in Bern (Spiro Mijić and Dragoljub Miletić), who were tasked to deliver "some kind of compromising material", directed against Dučić, to the addresses of some prominent personalities and editorial boards of newspapers in the country and abroad. Dučić explained the fight in the following manner: "when I unexpectedly happened to meet Mr. Milutin Jovanović for the first time, I could not refrain from expressing that indignation in the way I least wanted". Miloš Crnjanski made a reference to the fight at the Ministry (*Ембахаге*, I–III, 381–382.)
- 59 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 3,799 of 8 September 1927, f. III, Dučić's file.
Upon learning of the punishment that ensued, Dučić wrote a letter to Assistant Minister S. Pavlović in which he attributed the blame for the whole affair to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its lack of diligence to, despite the fact that it was aware of envoy Jovanović's dishonorable actions, restrain his activities, which also damaged the reputation of the state. Insulted for receiving the same treatment as Jovanović, Dučić finished his letter as follows: "But as a public figure, I have to declare that the laws of my homeland will not be obeyed as long as they are not preceded by the laws of conscience in our lives".
K. Ст. Павловић, *нав. дело*, 57–61. R. Popović quoted an excerpt from the letter in the aforementioned book, 111–113.

- 60 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 5,060 of 13 December 1927, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 61 K. Павловић, *нав. дело*, 62.
- 62 Jovan Dučić's Library, a translation into the Serbo-Croatian language: "The Hungarians about Jovan Dučić – a visit to Jovan Dučić, the greatest Serbian poet", Cairo, February 1927, X–B–5.
- 63 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 4,732 of 7 December 1929, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 64 *Ibidem*, no. 553 of 14 February 1930, Dučić's telegram from Cairo, no. 10, of 10 February 1930, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 65 The New York Stock Exchange crash, which occurred in October 1929, further dramatized the already smoldering economic crisis. The interconnection among the global capital, the economy and the market made the sudden fall of the shares on the New York Stock Exchange produce a chain collapse of the world banking system. In Europe, Germany was most affected by the crisis. The collapse was first experienced by saving banks, credit unions and then banks, which were closed one after another. In a short period of time, industrial production, which there was no one to finance, fell in the leading industrialized countries by over 50%. The number of unemployed ranged between 20 and 30 million. The standard of living dropped dramatically. The economic depression changed people's perceptions of the economy but also of politics.
- 66 AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in London (LL), no. 648, of 14 July 1930, f. I, file I-11
- 67 AY, LL, no. 627 of 26 July 1930, f-I, file I-11; no. 702 of 7 August 1930, f-I, file I-11 and no. 749 of 11 November 1930, f-I, file I-11.
- 68 AY, LL, no. 767 of 22 September 1930, f-I, file I-11; AY, LL, no. 328 of 7 July 1931, f-I, file I-11.
- 69 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 1932, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 70 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, Dučić's telegram from Budapest no. 78 of 16 February 1932 in which he informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that he assumed the duty on 15 February 1932, f. V, Dučić's file. Dučić returned from Egypt in December 1931, and on 17 December 1931, he asked the Ministry to grant him a two-month sick leave, at doctor's suggestion, which was approved – no. 450 of 1 February 1932, f. V. Due to the urgency of taking office in Budapest, according to the decision of the Deputy Minister (No. 515 of 8 February 1932, f. V, Dučić's file), he did not travel to Cairo to hand over his duty.
- 71 *Ibidem*, Dučić held a briefing at the Ministry from 13 to 19 March, No. 136 of 28 May up to 13 June, No. 322 of 27 November, f. V, Dučić's file, then in 1933 from 21 March to 4 April, No. 1,432 from 7 up to 12 May V, No. 2,147, 1933, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 72 Jovan Dučić's Library, H-V-7, Hungarian pessimism about Yugoslavia, Lawlessness of Serbia as a barbaric country, Jovan Dučić's report sent from Budapest to Minister of Foreign Affairs B. Jevtić, 13 July 1932.
- 73 AY, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, f-31, Jovan Dučić's report submitted to the Minister of Foreign Affairs B. Jevtić, 8 September 1932.
- 74 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, Dučić was on leave from 15 July to 1 September 1932, in Vienna in the period 14–20 October, no. 588, on sick leave from late November to 20 December 1932, f. V, Dučić's file, attended the congress of the Pen Club in Dubrovnik from 21 May to 12 June 1933, no. 2,535, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 75 *Ibidem*, "Protocol on the handover of duties at the Royal Legation in Budapest", no. 750/33 of 30 July 1933, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 76 *Ibidem*, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 77 Андреј Митровић, „Дучићев опис краља Фердинанда Кобуршког и прилика у Бугарској почетком 1911. године”, *Историјски часопис*, књ. XIX, 1972, 318–319.
Dučić left the following memory about von Hassell, who served in Belgrade after Budapest, and after that in Rome: "An ambassador who carries a French bullet in one part of his heart. A great man, husband, father, German and a European. A sincere friend of Yugoslavia, which he got to know through the heroism of Serbia and the kindness of Belgrade, where he served as a German ambassador for two years before he was transferred to Rome. Both he in Rome and we in Belgrade do not miss the chance to express our mutual affection..."
Јован Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 4 February 1937.
- 78 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, Dučić's telegram from Rome, no. 1,444, in which he informed the Ministry that he assumed the duty on 1 October 1933, f. V, Dučić's file.

- 79 AY, Permanent Delegation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the League of Nations in Geneva (Delegation), no. 15, f-22, file 10, What did Italy know about Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nation, 18 October 1933; *Ibidem*, no. 139, f-22, file 10, Conversation with undersecretary of state for foreign affairs Suvich and his impressions from Berlin.
- 80 AY, Delegation, no. 20, f-22, file 10, Conversation with the Turkish ambassador on Litvinov's visit to Mussolini, 7 December 1933.
- 81 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-18, Italian press about His Majesty's visit to Zagreb and my letter to Mr. Suvich, 30 December 1933; AY, Aleksandar Cincar Marković's collection, f-2, a copy, My response to Suvich regarding the latest events in the Balkans, Rome, 2 January 1934.
- 82 AY, Legation in London, no. 269 of 25 March 1934, f-I, file I-2; *Ibidem*, no. 276 of 28 March 1934, f-I, file I-2; *Ibidem*, no. 286 of 31 March 1934, f-I, file I-6; *Ibidem*, no. 394 of 28 January 1934, f-I, file I-2; *Ibidem*, no. 448 of 17 May 1934, f-I, file I-10; AY, Delegation, no. 461 of 12 June 1934, f-22, file I-10;
- 83 AY, Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Turkey, f-22, no. 2,522, Report submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 24 December 1934.
- 84 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-14, Jovan Dučić's encrypted letter sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, no. 1,171 of 11 June 1934; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Report sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, no. 1,197 of 12 June 1934; *Ibidem*, H-B-31, Encrypted telegram sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, no. 1,513 of 13 July 1934; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Italian commentary on the Eastern Pact and why they agree to it, no. 1,515 of 14 July 1934; AY, Legation in London, no. 564 of 1 August 1934, f-I, file I-2;
- 85 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, Report sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, no. 1,559 of 17 July 1934; AY, Legation in London, no. 1,004 of 11 December 1934, f-I, file I-2; *Ibidem*, no. 207 of 9 March 1935, f-I, file I-9;
- 86 AY, Delegation, f-22, no. 32/II, Italy – encrypted letter of 5 July 1935, no. 16,341; AY, Legation in London, no. 632 of 20 August 1935, f-I, file I-2; AY, Delegation, no. 1,348 of 31 December 1935, f-47, file 22, France-Italy relations, 15 November 1935.
- 87 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, My visit to Mussolini – talks on the rapprochement and terrorists, no. 729 of 24 March 1935.
- 88 AY, Delegation, no. 1,386 of 31 December 1935, f-47, file 22, Talks with Suvich on Abyssinia of 27 August 1935; AY, Legation in London, no. 912 of 8 November 1935, f-I, file I-2, Talks on the British-Italian war held on 16 October 1935;
- 89 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-15, Dučić's report on his first talks with Count Ciano in the Palace of Chigi, 29 October 1936.
- 90 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, Political Department's act no. 3,030 of 1 November, by which Dučić was ordered to come to Belgrade. Dučić spent some time in Belgrade from 2 to 15 November, when he returned to Rome. No. 6,049 of 29 December 1936, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 91 *Ibidem*, decree, 1936, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 92 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-15, New message of the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr Galeazzo Ciano after receiving the response of the Prime Minister M. Stojadinović, 18 November 1936.
- 93 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-15, Dučić's second meeting with Ciano held on 20 November 1936.
- 94 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-15, Dučić's letter sent to M. Stojadinović of 21 November 1936.
- 95 M. Стојадиновић, Ни рат ни пакт, Ријека 1970, 412–417.
- 96 Jovan Dučić's library, Rome Diary (*Diary*), dated 17 May, H–A–34. Some excerpts from the Diary were published in P. Поповић, *нав. дело*, 157–181 and Слободан Витановић, *Јован Дучић у знаку ероса*, Београд 1990, 306–311.
- 97 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, telegram from Bucharest no. 520 of 20 May 1937 in which envoy D. Kasidolac informed the Ministry that the agrément was given; f. II, Dučić's file.
- 98 *Ibidem*, a decree, 1937, f. II, Dučić's file.
- 99 *Ibidem*, a letter of 15 June 1937, f. II, Dučić's file.

- 100 J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 29 July 1937.
- 101 J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 20 and 22 September 1937.
- 102 АУ, МФА КУ АД – ПД, no. 4,601 of 14 September 1937, f. II, Dučić's file; АУ, МФА КУ АД – ПД, the telegram from Rome no. 1,402 of 25 September 1937, f. II, Dučić's file.
- 103 J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 25 and 28 September.
- 104 М. Стојадиновић, *нав. дело*, 417.
- 105 Проф Галеацо Ђано, *Дневник 1937–1938*, Загреб 1954, 19.
- 106 J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 20 September 1937.
- 107 *Истио*, dated 1 September 1937.
- 108 *Истио*, dated 29 July 1937.
- 109 *Ibidem*, dated 7 October 1937.
- 110 АУ, МФА КУ АД – ПД, Dučić's telegram no. 636 of 15 November 1937, f. II, Dučić's file.
- 111 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram no. 1,240 of 12 November 1937, f. II, Dučić's file; Dučić noted down in his Diary that he delivered his diplomatic credentials on 5 November 1937.
- 112 АУ, Legation in London, no. 1,993 of 28 December 1937, f-I, file I-7.
- 113 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, Dučić's report from Bucharest sent on 7 January 1938 to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs M. Stojadinović; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, conversation with Italian envoy on the situation in Romania of 22 January 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-29, Dučić's report sent on 22 January 1938 to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the difficult situation of O. Goga's government; *Ibidem*, H-V-29, Dučić's report sent on 23 January 1938 to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the difficult situation of O. Goga's government; *Ibidem*, H-V-29, Dučić's report sent on 28 January 1938 about the odds of O. Goga's government, 28 January 1938; The diary entry of 30 December 1937, in which he provided a vivid description of the new Prime Minister Octavian Goga and his future tasks, bore witness to the then situation in Romania: "By nature very temperament, sanguine, a violent type, brawler, but also a warrior. He now has to save the corrupt Romania in the way that Mussolini saved the degenerated Italy and Hitler the overrun and communist Reich..."
- J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 30 December 1937.
- 114 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-29, Jewish uprising and the signs of xenophobia, 26 January 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Talks with the Minister of Interior Călinescu, that is of the Romanian Jews, 4 February 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Internal situation in Romania. Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 17 April 1938.
- 115 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, Romania's views towards fascism and Nazism, 9 February 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, On the new government and patriarch's position, 13 February 1938.
- 116 *Ibidem*, H-V-31, A view of the head of the Liberal Party Mr. D. Brătianu on the new government led by Patriarch Miron and on the dictatorship, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović of 4 April 1938.
- 117 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović of 13 March 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Current Romanian foreign policy, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović of 23 March 1938.
- 118 *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Internal situation in Romania, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 17 April 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-29, The discovery of Codreanu's preparations for the uprising and assault on Bucharest, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 17 April 1938; *Ibidem*, H-B-31, Dučić's conversation with German envoy Fabricius, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 14 May 1938; *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Talks with Interior Minister Călinescu about the Codreanu's trial and German participation, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 2 June 1938.
- 119 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, On the treaty negotiations between Hungary and Romania, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 30 March 1938.
- 120 *Ibidem*, H-V-31, Conversation with Italian envoy regarding the negotiations between Italy and England, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 13 March 1938.
- 121 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-31, On the treaty negotiations between Hungary and Romania, Dučić's report sent to M. Stojadinović, 30 March 1938.
- 122 *Ibidem*.
- 123 J. Дучић, *Дневник*, dated 24 January 1937.
- 124 Jovan Dučić's library, H-V-29, Codreanu's escape and the collapse of the "Iron Guard", Dučić's report sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 28 February 1938.

- 125 K. St. Pavloviћ, *нав. дело*, 289.
- 126 K. St. Pavloviћ, *нав. дело*, 276–285.
- 127 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 524 of 8 February 1939, f. III, Dučić's file.
- 128 The issue of raising diplomatic relations between Romania and Yugoslavia to a higher level was resolved at the Conference of the Little Entente on 5 May 1938. By a decree of 17 December, as of 1 January 1939, Romania raised its legation in Belgrade to the level of embassy, whereas the Kingdom of Yugoslavia did the same by issuing a decree of 22 December 1938.
- 129 The ambitions of Germany, Italy and Japan to become great states in the territorial and political sense, to annul the provisions of the peace treaties concluded at the end of the First World War and to impose their “new world order”, resulted in military alliances. The “Anti-Comintern Pact”, concluded in November 1936, was the result of the political and military rapprochement of Germany and Japan. In 1937, Italy joined the Pact. That is how the alliance of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis was formed. A few years later, when the war had already begun, those countries strengthened their alliance in Berlin on 20 September 1940, by concluding a military alliance known as the “Tripartite Pact”. With this pact, Japan acknowledged the right of Germany and Italy to make decisions “when establishing a new order in Europe”. At the same time, Germany and Italy acknowledged “Japan's leadership in the establishment of a new order in Greater Asia”. The pact would provide for the accession of other states. Thus, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia acceded to the Tripartite Pact in 1940, whereas Bulgaria acceded in March 1941, as well as Yugoslavia.
- 130 K. Pavloviћ, *нав. дело*, 220–221, a facsimile of letter from A. Cincar Marković to Dučić.
- 131 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, by the same decree, the royal envoy in Madrid, Aleksandar Avakumović (who a year earlier served as a counselor of the Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Bucharest and was transferred at Dučić's request), was appointed the new ambassador to Bucharest in 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 132 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram from Bucharest, no. 753 of 31 May 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 133 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram from Madrid, no. 431 of 3 June 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 134 AY, Legation in London, no. 1,409 of 16 October 1940, f-I, file I-10, Situation in Spain, Dučić's report sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs A. Cincar-Marković; AY, Ministerial Council of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (138), f-4, AY 22, Situation in Spain and its view on the war, Dučić's report sent to A. Cincar-Marković, 25 July 1940; AY, Ministerial Council of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (138), f-4, AY 22, the Portuguese-Spanish Treaty. Dučić's report sent to A. Cincar-Marković, 4 August 1940.
- 135 *Ibidem*.
- 136 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram from Madrid, no. 498 of 9 July 1940, f. V, Dučić's file; AY, Ministerial Council of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, MFA's Political Department's act, no number, 138–4–22.
- 137 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, no. 5,579 of 30 October 1940, f. XXV.
- 138 *Ibidem*, no. 6,566 of 24 December 1940, f. XXV.
- 139 *Ibidem*.
- 140 *Ibidem*, 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 141 *Ibidem*, Dučić's report of 5 November, no. 30,765 of 7 November 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 142 *Ibidem*, Dučić's telegram no. 920 of 20 December 1940, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 143 *Ibidem*, Dučić to Ninčić, no. 227 of 6 May 1941, f. V, Dučić's file; The royal government left the country on 15 April and set out to Egypt via Greece, and thence to Jerusalem, where it arrived on 18 April 1941.
- 144 AY, Government in exile, (103), f- 63, AY 283, Dučić's report sent to Minister Ninčić, 18 June 1941.
- 145 AY, MFA KY in London, AD, no. 5,236 of 28 July 1941, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 146 AY, Government in exile, (103) Madrid Legation's report, no. 142/41 of 5 July 1941 to Minister Ninčić, who was based in London, f. 63–283. The report reads that “the head of the diplomatic cabinet of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain announced at a press conference that the Spanish government *de iure* recognized the new Kingdom of Croatia on 26 June 1941”. A month later, on 1 August, Franco appointed his envoy in Zagreb, Don Vicente González Arnao and de Amar de la Torre; the report of the charge d'affaires in Madrid no. 156/41 of 31 August 1941, 103–63–283. The following year, on 4 February, the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs requested the closure of the offices of the Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to Madrid and the honorary consulates in Barcelona and Valencia; the report of the charge d'affaires from Madrid no. 9/42 of 10 February 1942, 103–63–283.

- 147 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, the telegram from Madrid no. 280/41 of 2 July 1941, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 148 At the government session held in Jerusalem on 16 May 1941, it was decided that a certain number of ministers was to be deployed to the United States and Canada on a propaganda mission. In addition, it was decided that the seat of the government was to be in London. (See: Б. Кризман, *Југословенске владе у избеглиштву 1941–1943*, Загреб 1985, 134–135)
- 149 AY, MFA KY AD – PD, Ninčić's letter of 9 July 1940, no. 5,236, f. V, Dučić's file.
- 150 AY, MFA KY in London, the report of the press attaché of the Legation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Lisbon M. Popović addressed to Deputy Prime Minister Miha Krek, no. 2,538 of 16 August 1942, f. III.
- 151 Пеђа Милосављевић, „Био сам Дучићев секретар”, in: *Сабрана дела...*, VI, 489.
- 152 Перо Слијепчевић, „Јован Дучић”, in: *Сабрана дела Јована Дучића*, књ. VI, Београд–Сарајево 1999, 108.
- 153 Милан Стојадиновић, *Ни рай ни пакл*, Ријека 1970; Милан Грол, *Лондонски дневник 1941–1945*, Београд 1990; Гроф Галеацо Ђано, *Дневник 1937–1938*, Загреб 1954; *Тајни архиви грофа Ђана (1936–1942)*, Загреб 1952; Милош Црњански, *Ембахаде*, Београд 1983.
- 154 Богдан Кризман, *Вањска пољитика југословенске државе 1918–1941*, Загреб 1975; Вук Винавер, *Југославија и Мађарска 1918–1933*, Београд 1979; *Југославија и Мађарска 1933–1941*, Београд 1976; Милан Ванку, *Мала Анђанија 1920–1935*, Титово Ужице 1969; Глигор Попи, *Југословенско-румунски односи 1918–1941*, Вршац 1984, Енес Милак, *Италија и Југославија 1931–1937*, Београд 1987 etc.
- Radovan Samardžić defines Dučić as follows: “Without expressing the slightest repugnance for the entire Serbian peasant nation, in whose history, beliefs, morals and mentality he found features worthy of ancient peoples, a poet of brilliant expression and refined feelings who wrote the most beautiful essays on Petar Kočić and Borisav Stanković, writers who undoubtedly were not cut from the same cloth as him, being dignifiedly benevolent towards individuals and movements he otherwise would not have to concur with, Jovan Dučić, the first ambassador in the history of Yugoslav diplomacy, proud of his origin, prodigal as a cosmopolitan scholar, above all a man who knew how to carry himself, for decades left the impression of vain attitude and gallant elegance in his appearance. But it wasn't just his appearance. The nature of his soul was also exquisite.”
- Р. Самарџић, „Сој Јована Дучића”, in: *Сабрана дела...*, VI, 510.
- 155 Р. Поповић, *Истина о Дучићу*, Београд 1982; Р. Поповић, *Жудња за фракком*, Београд 1985. Authors who wrote about the literary endeavours of Jovan Dučić, only incidentally wrote about his service in Yugoslav diplomacy (*Сабрана дела Јована Дучића*, *О делу Јована Дучића 1900–1989*, Додатак издању, Перо Слијепчевић, Славко Леовац, Радован Самарџић).
- 156 Dučić's published diplomatic reports can be found in: „Историјски гласник”, књ. XIX, 1972, 317–325, „Дучићев извештај из Софије 1911”, приредио Андреј Митровић; „Документа о спољној политици Краљевине Србије 1912”, књ. V, св. 3, 1913, књ. VI, св. 2, 1914, књ. VII, св. 1 (in which several Dučić's reports were published, whereas in several others some references to his reports have been made); „Књижевност” 1–2, 1991, 108–129, „Дипломатски извештаји – Јован Дучић”, приредио Миладин Милошевић; Богдан Кризман, *Југословенске владе у избеглиштву 1941–1943*, Загреб 1985, 134–135 (a Madrid report from 1941). М. Милошевић, *Јован Дучић, Дипломатски списи*, Београд 2015. Some excerpts from reports appear in the book by R. Popović *Истина о Дучићу*.
- 157 On Dučić's views expressed in his books of essays *Blago cara Radovana: knjiga o sudbini* (*King Radovan's Treasure: a Book on Fate*) and/or *Jutra sa Leutara: misli o čoveku* (*Leutar Mornings: Musings on Man*) and the possibilities for their comparative and interdisciplinary contextualizations within the framework of world cultural heritage see for example, Коларић 2001: 17–23; Јовановић 2008: 18–31; Гвозден 2017: 175–184 etc. On the prospects of comparative approaches within the framework of Dučić's travelogue-essayistic writings see for example, Леовац 1990: 375–399; Делић 2001: 119–167; Gvozden 2003 etc. On the status of the examined topics of works *My Companions: Literary Forms* or *A Path by the Road: Essays and Articles* within Jovan Dučić's entire oeuvre see for example, Panić 2007: 79–87; Стакић Савковић 2012: 255–266; Стакић Савковић 2016: 493–510. On the prospects of different types of research of Dučić's essays see for example, Милићевић 1965: 229–243; Витановић 1994; Егерић 2000: 215–220; Иванишевић 2009; Радуловић 2009: 39–67 etc.
- 158 To a certain extent, at times somewhat similar critical strongholds of Jovan Dučić and Jovan Skerlić could be looked into. It seems as if Skerlić's essay “Tri mlada pisca” (“Three Young Writers”), whose first part is dedicated to Miličević's work *Bespuće* (*Middle of Nowhere*), the second one to *Pripovetke* (*The Stories*) authored by

Nikola Janković, and the third one to *Priče koje su izgubile ravnotežu* (*The Stories That Have Lost Their Balance*) by Stanislav Vinaver (cf. Skerlić 1922: 137–149), in terms of its title, is a continuation of Dučić's essay "Naši najmlađi pisci" ("Our Youngest Writers"), published in 1908, and in part dedicated to Veljko Miličević (Дучић 1908a: 3; Дучић 2008b: 215–222). The extent to which Skerlić's essays directly rely on Dučić's observations is also reflected in the fact concerning, for example, their similar formation of insights regarding "the youngest generation of writers" which "has a penchant for pessimism" (Дучић 1908a; Дучић 2008a: 215), which Dučić made mention of in his essay from 1908, by saying the following: "Their books bear the following incredibly sinister titles: *Bespuće* (*Middle of Nowhere*), *Pod životom* (*Under Life*), *Živi mrtvaci* (*The Living Dead*), *Golgota* (*Golgotha*), *Pod žrvnjem* (*Under the Grindstone*), and all these books tend to embody one great tragedy of demolition and desolation, and one desperate poetry of powerlessness and nirvana. The verses authored by our youngest writers, wherein, unfortunately, there is not as much art and talent as in some of the above mentioned books bearing the above titles, complement that dark tone, and indeed quite meticulously do so" (Дучић 1908a; Дучић 2008a: 215). It seems as if Skerlić's perception of Pandurović's collection *Posmrtna počasti* (*Posthumous Honors*) in his article "Jedna književna zaraza" ("A Literary Contagion") is a direct continuation of Dučić's previous comments: "In Serbian literature, we have lately become quite accustomed to come across titles that seem as if being copied from tombstones, and book covers that bear some semblance to the blackness of obituaries or depict a wreath of thorns with blood tears dripping beneath. Our youngest generation of poets sings songs whose titles speak volumes about their contents: *Jedan plač* (*A Cry*), *Rani uvelak* (*Early Withered Away*), *Tužne pesme* (*Sad Songs*), *Tužan dan* (*A Sad Day*), *Na groblju* (*At the Cemetery*), *Mračno je i pusto* (*It is Dark and Desolate*), *Plač* (*Cry*), *Pogreb* (*A Burial*), *Suze* (*Tears*), *Nirvana*, *De Profundis*, and there is almost no younger poet who does not have his *Finale*" (Скерлић 1909: 97–98). Such parallels also raise the question regarding the extent to which, in fact, Dučić's view of the canonical in Serbian literature from the beginning of the 20th century was considered a stronghold of Skerlić's literary critical decisions and his literary historical choices. By the way, it is in the period 1908–1909 that Dučić spoke very highly of Skerlić's approach while he worked on his book *Srpska književnost u XVIII veku* (*Serbian Literature in the 18th Century*) and the fourth volume of the book *Pisci i knjige* (*Writers and Books*) (Дучић 1908b: 3; Дучић 1909; Дучић 2008b: 115–119).

159 Cf. Дучић 2008a: 166.

160 Cf. Дучић 2008b: 140.

161 Cf. Дучић 2008a: 124, 125.

162 Cf. Дучић 2008a: 152.

163 Дучић 2008b: 80.

164 Cf. Дучић 1929: 4; Дучић 2008b: 152.

165 See: <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/lists/all-nobel-prizes-in-literature/>; the website last accessed on 4 June 2021.

166 See: <https://www.nobelprize.org/nomination/archive/list.php?prize=4&year=1901>; the website last accessed on 4 June 2021.

167 See: <https://www.nobelprize.org/nomination/archive/list.php?prize=4&year=1903>; the website last accessed on 4 June 2021.

168 Dučić provides almost identical observations in his essay "The Culture of our Peasant" (Дучић 1930: 530–532; Дучић 2008b: 252).

169 First published in 1930 as the fifth volume of the *Collected Works* by Narodna prosveta from Belgrade, and secondly as an independent and expanded edition, published in 1940 by Srpska književna zadruga.

170 In the words of Slobodanka Peković, "the entire textual corpus of Dučić's travelogues is some sort of a decadent intertext of a structurally defined and long-lived tradition of the genre" (Пековић 2001: 23).

171 In this matter we rely on Bakhtin: "An especially important meaning of genres. Genres (literary and speech genres) have been accumulating for centuries the forms of visions and ideas of certain countries of the world. For an author-artist genre serves as an external pattern, but a great artist, however, triggers its semantic potential" (Бахтин 1997: 48). A travelogue that transposes literary traditions and activates their semantic potential represents a dialogue between cultures to a much greater extent than a monologue of the members of one culture (Бахтин 1997: 59).

- 172 On literary travels and literary travellers see Гвозден 2006.
- 173 “Besides, I could hear the river Nile, which does not make the slightest sound, everywhere in Egypt where there was above me even one palm-leaf fan, or a dark twig of sycamore. This means that the Nile also flows in the air like music, while on land it flows like the light” (Дучић 1940: 313).
- 174 In the same passage, Dučić wrote that Chateaubriand “had never seen the Mississippi, whose waterfalls he described in his eternal account” (Дучић 1940: 275). It is common knowledge, however, that the French author stayed in the United States and had an opportunity to see the Mississippi river.
- 175 “He had a car, which he dubbed ‘my Egyptian’, and which always had Egyptian license plates” (Павловић 1967: 64).
- 176 Dučić’s approach to history was outlined by I. Stojanović in a short review of *Cities and Chimeras*: “All things emanate the spirit of the centuries, the scent of sacred apparitions and despair of old fame, which appeals to us due to our innate curiosity about the things of the past. The writer speaks about the present only in so far as he mentions a nice area, the sky, the east and sunsets, the poetry of a wonderful day” (Стојановић 1932: 366).
- 177 Stressing the importance of travel as a higher form of learning occurs as early as in Herodotus’ *History*. Solon set out upon his travels, in the course of which he came to the immensely rich Croesus, who addressed this question to him: “Stranger of Athens, we have heard much of thy wisdom and of thy travels through many lands, from love of knowledge and a wish to see the world. I am curious therefore to inquire of thee, whom, of all the men that thou hast seen, thou deemest the most happy?” (Herodotus 1996: I, 30)
- 178 Citations of this work of Jovan Dučić are given according to its English edition (see Dučić 2017; translator’s note).
- 179 “The nation, like the individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavours, sacrifice, and devotion [...] To have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present [...] – these are the essential conditions for being a people. One loves in proportion to the sacrifices to which one has consented and in proportion to the ills that one has suffered” (Renan 1990: 19).
- 180 The relation between these two authors was first indicated by Nikola Mirković, noting that Dučić’s account of the characteristics of the national temperament is completely in accordance with its exquisite presentation given by Vladimir Dvorniković in the book *The Psychology of Yugoslav Melancholy*, published in 1925 (Мирковић 1936: 340).
- 181 It can be safely assumed that Dučić knew many of them in person (Le Bon and Taine above all), but it is certain that in the text “Literary Cosmopolitanism” he referred to Wundt, who had created the “psychology of races” (Дучић 1969б: 260).
- 182 According to le Goff, in the history of mentalities the crucial role is not played, as in the history of ideas, by the ideas of individual thinkers, but by a “mental fog in which the distorted echos of their doctrines, the impoverished remnants of a failed word devoid of context played a certain role” (Ле Гоф 2002: 24).
- 183 “A nation does not need a great many principal character traits. Soundly fixed, they chart its destiny. Let us look at the English, for instance. The elements that determine their history can be summarized in a few strokes: the cult of persevering effort that prevents one from desisting before a hurdle and thinking that some misfortune is impossible to overcome; a religious observance of customs and all other time-honoured things; the urge to act and contempt of weakness and vacuous mental speculations; a very heightened sense of duty; self-control, which is considered to be the supreme quality and which is carefully maintained by a particular style of upbringing” (Ле Бон 1920: 53).
- 184 In the text “On Literary Education” dating from 1908 Dučić asserts that literary education, in the case of reading public and authors alike, is acquired by reading acclaimed writers, and first of all the foreign ones (Дучић 1969а: 249–252). A similar view had been aired by Dučić before in a letter to Milan Savić from Geneva: “I am definitely in favour of translation, extensive, universal translation, an era of translation, to refine our taste, or, at least, regenerate it” (1963: 478; Geneva, 2 May 1900).
- 185 It is in *Cities and Chimeras* that Dučić wrote: “A poet is always an island unto himself; among people, he is invariably just a precursor and harbinger of another age” (Дучић 1940: 132).
- 186 Cf. also the viewpoint on Dučić’s language in the context of the interpretation of his travelogues: “Dučić’s literary language was evolving in line with the best traditions of the Belgrade language style of nurtured spirituality, headed by Jovan Skerlić and Slobodan Jovanović” (Магарашевић 1996: 251).

- 187 Jovan Delić also published his essay on Dučić's travelogues in the book *O poeziji i poetici srpske moderne* (*On the Poetry and Poetics of Serbian Moderna*), with a comment placed in the footnote that the essay was included in the book "because it sheds precious light on Dučić's poetry and poetics" (Делић 2008: 101). In the same book, he provided a detailed reference list, pointing at the connection between Dučić's poems and travelogues. In the recent literature, this connection is recognized in *lyricism*: "In Dučić's works, lyricism primarily appears in poems, and in travelogues, and even in his essays." (Леовац 1996: 9). Pavle Zorić (1996: 178) points at an *ecstatic tone* as a feature which links Dučić's poetic expression and his prose expression in travelogues: "The ecstatic tone is expressed in prose form, but we experience it as a song whose language, with its supreme, final tranquility, its mature beauty, which heralds a flash of a single moment of happiness – encourages our joyful excitement".
- 188 The 1940 edition served as a base for another edition from which the material for this paper was excerpted. Despite the shortcomings of the editorial procedure (Dučić's spelling and even his punctuation were changed), we opted for the 2008 edition, because it is easily accessible to modern readers due to its large circulation and year of publication.
- 189 Unfortunately, the descriptions of the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of Dučić's work often contain insufficiently precise formulations, and literary criticism and history did not leave too many illustrations for the presented standpoints. Thus, for example, it is stated that the "ornate style" of Dučić's early poetry was taken from Vojislav Ilić's poetry (Деретић 2007: 946), but without stating any examples or pointing at any features of such a style. At the same time, more concrete descriptions of the language of Dučić's poems appear: "One can constantly feel Dučić's effort to be up to the task he set himself, to sing about great things like the great poets sing. Hence, there is a certain tension in his poetic language" (Деретић 2007: 949). The aforementioned accurate and well-argued viewpoint about "tension" also fully applies to the language of Dučić's travelogues. Dučić's poetry also puts an emphasis on the "aspirations towards a sublime style and a solemn, pathetic diction" (Деретић 2007: 949), which also correlates with the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the poet's travelogues.
- 190 We concur with the view of Jovan Delić (2008: 102) when he commented Boško Novaković's assessment, who saw the travel writer Dučić as "a poet and a causeur, a witty author who writes with ease": "It can't be true that Dučić was just a mere 'author who writes with ease,' as he seemed to Novaković." On the contrary, one can notice Dučić's great effort, in terms of his vocabulary and syntax, to bring every sentence, but also the text as a whole, to linguistic and stylistic perfection through their numerous revisions.
- 191 Cf. a good description of Dučić's poetic vocabulary: "With his polished language and exquisite vocabulary, the poet systematically eliminates all stylistic 'scratches,' such as brutisms, dialectisms, provincialisms, archaisms, Turkisms in particular, and all the traces of the East in the Serbian language and culture" (Нерришорац 2009: 19).
- 192 The context in which the lexeme *soldat* appears is also interesting: Spartanci su bili soldati (GH, 160), Hristos je bio strašni soldat svoje crkve (GH, 290). It can be seen from the example that there is no specific actualization of this Germanism in them, nor any pejorative connotation.
- 193 The low frequency of Slavicisms was probably influenced by the fact that Dučić was "very little attracted to Serbian literature written before the second half of the 19th century" (Витановић 1996: 51).
- 194 Naturally, verbs ending with competing suffixes also appear in the language of Dučić's travelogues, *-isa* (karminisanim GH, 108, psihologisati GH, 220, spirituališe GH, 247, dokumentariše GH, 256 etc.) and *-ova* (diskutovali GH, 237 etc.).
- 195 It is possible that Dučić introduced the word form *pedanterija* in the second example, to avoid two lexemes formed with the suffix *-izam* (*još više pedantizma i konceptizma) to be in direct contact and side-by-side relation. By the way, derivatives with the abovementioned suffix are not rare in Dučić's travelogues (pedantizma GH, 84, konceptizma GH, 85, rigorizam GH, 149, doktrinizam GH, 220).
- 196 It is interesting that in his travelogues there is no today's word form *penzioner*, although two nouns ending with this suffix have been found, *vizioner* (vizioneri GH, 102) and *misioner* (misioneri GH, 121, 139). The lexeme *milionar* (milionare GH, 317) in Dučić's travelogues also illustrates the interesting distribution of the suffixes *-er* and *-ar*.
- 197 Milan Radulović (2009: 61–62) provided an excellent description and interpretation of Dučić's understanding of poetic language and his attitude towards syntax.

- 198 Variations in attribute placement are not regular. Examples with consistent postposition of attributes are not uncommon either: sa očima zelenim kao lišće lovorovo (GH, 56); onih koje nam daje doba cezarsko i onih iz doba papskog (GH, 153) etc.
- 199 Cf.: Ako siđem u doline koje su ovde tako duboke, meni se čini da sam utonuo (GH, 6).
- 200 In the description of Dučić's essay on happiness, Miron Flašar (1996: 24) notes that examples are "not only mentioned and cited as testimonies, but are also coming one after another in a series – almost to say: like in a catalogue", creating a "string or chain" and connecting this stylistic characteristic with ancient rhetorical means.
- 201 Dučić most gladly repeated and thus highlighted the attribute *svoj*: Ne treba mnogo govoriti, ni govoriti o sebi: o svojoj ličnosti, svojim ukusima, svojim navikama, svojim opažanjima (GH, 89); i koji daje svakoj našoj strasti svoje magije i svoje istine (GH, 138); To duhovno carstvo i kad je gubilo svoju snagu, nije gubilo svoj kontinuitet (GH, 139); Ima drugih zemalja koje su čuvene zbog svojih šuma, svojih snegova, svoga cveća ili svojih životinja (GH, 178); da je ona za svagda duboko paganska, i po svojim reljefima i po svojem blistanju (GH, 178); ispunila sve svoje besanice i sve svoje namere (GH, 210); pokazujući nam svoje katastrofe i svoje trijumfe, svoja građenja i razgrađivanja, svoje oblake što sve pobiju gradom a ožive suncem; svoju neprekidnu igru smrti i života (GH, 230), etc.
- 202 Special attention here is drawn to a different example, in which in three parallel constructions of variations, i.e. the introduction of a synonymous preposition, intersects with the repetition of a newly introduced word: Učimo zbog društva, bogatimo se radi društva, ženimo se radi društva (GH, 122).
- 203 Dučić also uses the pronoun *to* to achieve the multi-word subject doubling: Zagonetnost njene ličnosti, dvosmislenost njene prave unutrašnje egzistencije, to je ono što nju prati do kraja mladosti (GH, 212); Prostor i samoća, to su često dve utopije (GH, 309). However, the first example can also be interpreted as an example with an apposition.
- 204 "Dučić purified and ennobled the Serbian literary language, freed its inner and hidden, unused semantic fields, restored its liveliness, fullness, picturesqueness and acoustic lightness" (Палавестра 1996: 2).
- 205 Kašanin wrote about Dučić, among other things, that he was a "mixture of a child and a seasoned diplomat", as well as that "as a man he took everything life had to offer, just like as a writer he took everything words had to offer" (Кашанин 2004: 225).
- 206 Vladimir Gvozden rightly noticed, and illustrated with quotations selected from relevant literature, that Dučić is even in our expert public perceived mostly as a poet, the reason for which lies "in the idea expressed early on that his verse surpasses everything else that he wrote" (Гвозден 2006: 88). Even though we generally tend to agree with this assessment long since made, that does not entail that Dučić's work, versatile in terms of style, is unworthy of scientific study – in the first place, at least because of the valid context that seeing the whole picture can provide. Secondly, we maintain that the benefit for the history of literature is not the sole purpose of the renewed critical analysis of Dučić's, often highly lyrical, meditative-reflective prose writings. Confronting Dučić's poetics with that of his contemporaries, examining his traditional-poetic choices and his persistence in applying them breathes new life into already vivid images of the cultural context of our literature, particularly that of the interwar period. Apart from that, it also strengthens Dučić's position, which tends to be overlooked, with respect to his improving and modernizing our language in the modern age, subsequent to Vuk Karadžić's language reform, and continuing to have an evident impact even in the second half of the twentieth century and to the present day.
- 207 "It is not ruled out that Dučić with 'A Path by the Roadside' encouraged Andrić to write reflective vignettes entitled 'Signs by the Roadside', as it is also probable that both of them had merely been building upon the moralistic tradition of the renowned French essayists and Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy's 'Path of Life'" (Коларић 1995: 515). We could hardly agree with this statement completely. First of all, it seems as an offhand claim that the lines of our authors are a *mere continuation of the French and Tolstoy's moralistic tradition*. Even the most superficial glance at the topics, as well as at the development of lines of thought or argumentation, shows that both authors are undeniably anchored in personal and collective tradition of their own nation, which refutes the said view. Furthermore – in our view – Andrić would, according to the character of his meditative thought, already apparent in his early works – *Ex Ponto (From the Bridge)* and *Nemiri (Unrest)*, quite certainly come up with this form

without any direct stimulus. This, of course, does not exclude some sort of an indirect impact, a subtle influence of the older writer on the younger, especially in view of the fact that the two of them were known to have been exchanging books. Nevertheless, the *form* of the presented writings of the two authors is distinctly different. Andrić presents his reflections in the form of notes, sometimes reduced to a gnome; whereas all of Dučić's essays – let us call them so for want of a better term – are diversified, and in both collections carefully considered. While *King Radovan's Treasure* and *Leutar Mornings* could not be labelled as “fragmentary” and “cursory”, in the case of Andrić's *Signs by the Roadside* these labels have become part and parcel of the language of criticism. In brief, just for the sake of argument, this branch of Andrić's opus resembles far more M. Nastasijević's journal entries, aphoristic and reflective (as well as very fragmentary) notes from the fourth volume of his *Collected Works – Eseji, beleške, misli (Essays, Notes, Thoughts)*. A serious assumption has been made that Andrić could have been familiar with these writings of Nastasijević, considering the (earlier) Vinaver's edition of Nastasijević's collected works, as well as at least one occasion in which Andrić took part in the discussion regarding Nastasijević's work. However, whether these writings of Nastasijević had a direct impact on Andrić's poetics – represents a question for further study.

- 208 The equivalent poetic impulse is identifiable in Andrić's *Signs by the Roadside*. Striking a balance, but also an occasional imbalance, unmitigated tension between broadly envisaged topics and micropoints are the features apparent in both works. However, even though their respective lines of reasoning are identical, they move in opposite directions: Dučić writes in order to step out of himself, to deduce, to pierce through the bubble of individuality so as to reach the impulse of the universal, whereas Andrić, starting from the perceived patterns, potential generalized truths, strives to get closer to his core, to get as close as possible to his inner existential vibration, to examine it and interpret (for himself). If we are inclined to pronounce all three books (*Treasure, Mornings, Signs*) as reflective-meditative pieces, we are under the impression that the former contain more reflection, while the latter more meditation. In other words, Dučić spreads his word like a preacher, and Andrić like a hermit-sage.
- What holds great significance in relation to this is a seemingly cursory note made by Novica Petković regarding the similarity of principles underlying Dučić's and Andrić's sentences, as well as regarding the far-reaching consequences and importance of the changes that they both had introduced in our linguistic culture and its accelerated modernization, particularly after the World War One. Petković noted: “It [Dučić's sentence; noted by N. B.] can already be said to represent a linguistic legacy that is broader than the poetic one, since it participated in stabilizing more elaborate syntactic structures, just like Andrić's sentence did some time later and in a different manner” (Петковић 2007: 82).
- 209 Despite the fact that in *Leutar Mornings* we come across the sophists, Socrates, Homer, wise Solomon, Peter the Apostle, Nemanjić dynasty, Borgias, Voltaire, Rousseau, Pushkin, Goethe, Hugo, Heine, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, French and German kings, Obrenović dynasty, etc., their characters are not overly striking, they do not demand our attention so loudly and unconditionally as in the earlier volume. In *Mornings*, namely, they are reduced to a dynamic illustration, and as such they represent a very functional element of the book's composition.
- 210 Other essays are devoted to calm, dance, patriotism, character and civility.
- 211 Milan Kašanin and Meša Selimović share the impression concerning the direction of Dučić's travel writing, essayistic and in part philosophical thought. Writing about various editions of *Cities and Chimeras*, Meša noted that Dučić turns more expansive, humorous, generous, provides the digressive passages about the classical authors and history on a smaller scale (Селимовић 1969: 334), whereas Kašanin, comparing the older and more recent collection of essays, wrote: “Regarding the style of writing, there is a notable difference between the two volumes. *Leutar Mornings* contain fewer quotations and demonstrations of erudition, and more original thoughts and personal experience. The text, unencumbered by examples and anecdotes from antiquity, is a calm weave of short and simple sentences, without superfluous comparisons and elevated tone” (Кашанин 2004: 242).
- 212 Using the method of random selection, since both *Treasure* and *Mornings* are replete with such passages, let us quote an excerpt from the essay “On Hate”. Dučić noted: “People do not hate unless afraid, and that is why fear and hate go together. If, on the other hand, men have no fear of their opponents they just despise them. That is why haters are usually cowards, possessed of a feminine sensibility, whereas the brave are manly and proud” (Dučić 2017: 305). Moreover, this is not the only passage which could represent the point of focus for those

scholars who tend to accuse Dučić of subtly concealed misogyny, especially regarding his essays. In the essay “On Character”, where the power of indignation is explicitly linked with moral chastity and health, Dučić would say the following: “It is the women who usually feel no indignation, only insult, being vain rather than proud, and valuing the formal rather than the crucial. Therefore, the feeling of indignation is predominantly male” (2017: 373). Nevertheless, here, as well as in the passages where Dučić is wont to make bold generalizations (as when he passes judgement on the English, Bulgarians, Croats) the question from the beginning of the text comes back around – how deeply did inherent, compositional irony as a principle penetrate across all layers of the text under consideration?

- 213 All citations of this work are presented according to its English edition (see Dučić 2017; translator’s note).
- 214 It is interesting to note, however, that regarding the issue of suffering and misery Dučić the Christian and Dučić the classicist do not see eye to eye, that is to say, the latter evidently prevails over the former. As a confirmed hedonist, Dučić does not lay great store by suffering, nor does he assert its power of catharsis. Corporeal health means almost as much to him as the spiritual one. The ideal of harmony, a lingering vision of kalokagathia, permeates, let us say, from Dučić’s note that “good-natured and great-hearted people generally live longer” (Dučić 2017: 376).
- 215 The essay “On Character” opens with one such saying. Surprises occasioned by Dučić go in two directions – they either lead to profound disagreements with the author or, quite unexpectedly, cause genuine reconsideration. Dučić’s almost cursory note that follows takes us in the latter direction. It reads: “One of the noblest human sentiments is indignation” (2017: 373). First of all, naturally, a question arises of itself from an evident paradox – why are bitterness, repudiation, scorn, indignation – proclaimed noble human sentiments? A little further, Dučić the inimitable stylist gradually reveals that the paradox is resolved at the level of binary oppositions – enthusiasm and disgust as complementary reactions indicate human beings ready for a noble endeavour, or reaction, people with an aspiration to make the world a better place. “Their power of outrage”, the essayist points out, “derives from their moral purity” (2017: 373).
- 216 And generally it is extremely interesting to witness how this composed and sensible character views almost with (aforementioned) indignation the heightened emotional states of love and passion. In the essay on disappointment Dučić wrote the following: “Most people are susceptible to disappointment by temperament rather than by intellect, for chagrin is always closer to our sentiment than mind. This may best be observed in *lovers inhabiting the realm of feverish fancy and wrought-up nerves*, seldom aware of the reasons for their exaltation” (2017: 355; underlined by N. B.).
- 217 It is widely known that not even goddesses are spared from being assaulted, let alone mortal women.
- 218 There is a characteristic note of the surrealist Đorđe Jovanović in the issue of the magazine *Nadrealizam danas i ovde (Surrealism Here and Now)* of 1932, concerning the first edition of Dučić’s collected works, in which remarkably negative criticism was levelled at the book *King Radovan’s Treasure*, which had just been released at the time: “The poetry of that gentleman (Mr Jovan Dučić) lingers on only at occasional St. Sava fiest day celebrations or as part of ‘concert music’ at some Serbian small-town entertainment. Those who used to be enthralled by Dučić now have children who read Crnjanski, Drainac or Dekobra [...] The talent which had begun to manifest itself with these short poems of mediocre provincial standard, was now (1926–1930) realized in a cumbersome cake made of stale cookies called *King Radovan’s Treasure*. Jovo Dučić of the previous century turned into Jovan Dučić of this century, and if by some miracle he were to transfer to the next century, he would become Ovan (‘ram’) Dučić, a poet yet again, a sparkling spirit and so on and so forth, without any other changes whatsoever” (Јовановић 1932: 41).
- 219 Jovan Deretić pointed to that fact in his *History of Serbian Literature*, highlighting specific features of Dučić as a prose writer: “Dučić’s prose, much more voluminous than his poetry (out of the five volumes of his collected works only one contains poems, while all others are prose works), remained nevertheless in its shadow. Although he had demonstrated narrative affinities in poetry, in prose he did not venture into the forms of fiction, he did not write stories or novels, he realized himself as a prose writer in marginal, non-functional forms: travelogues, philosophical maxims and essays, literary criticism and essay literature, history, art criticism, journalism. As an artist, in these genres he comes across as the same as in his poems: a patient and indefatigable worker, a

- craftsman who takes care that every detail is executed to perfection, that the whole is harmoniously composed, a perfectionist in matters of style, a jeweller. For that reason, he had been working for a long time on his main works, as well as on his poems” (Деретић 2002: 986).
- 220 Hence his book was justifiably said to be “a philosophical piece just as much as a literary one” (Кашанин 1990: 315).
- 221 “When it appeared, ceremoniously announced, as the sixth volume of the *Collected Works*, it caught the reading public and critics by surprise” (Леовац 1985: 212).
- 222 “As these are the musings of a meditative poet, and a prose work of our most prominent and greatest stylist, the Committee considered it an honor to take upon themselves the duty of distributing this work in the greatest circulation possible, it being a monumental piece of our literature” (Поповић 2009: 132).
- 223 Velibor Gligorić objected to this work because of its overly bookish philosophizing: “This book was written in one’s leisure among the scattered books about antiquity, after a prolonged melancholy gazing into the statue of Cupid, whose pointed arrow had been chipped by some naughty children” (*Ibid.*, 143); whereas Milovan Đilas criticized Dučić from his doctrinary Marxist perspective for his exclusion from real life: “Dučić is an unofficial thinker of a particular class of people. His themes are often salon-type coseries (On Love, On Women ..., on everything after all), rather than actual scientific and spiritual investigations. He looks at things through the framework of a salon; through the glass on its door or a silk curtain on its windows; as if the external world does not exist and as if there is no air that does not smell of perfume” (Ђилас 1932: 7). In a similar vein Meša Selimović would write twenty years later, commenting on his essays with a single sentence in his “Foreword” to Dučić’s selected *Verses and Prose* along the same lines: “In *King Radovan’s Treasure* and some other works, Dučić is an advocate of the bourgeoisie, their spokesman, a cynical representative of their interests” (Селимовић 1952: 13).
- 224 There are divergent terminological vacillations in relation to defining the type of discourse to which *King Radovan’s Treasure* belongs. An aesthetician Sveta Lukić produced, on the basis of the teachings of a Spanish philosopher Julián Marias, a theoretical overview of a peculiar and long-standing tradition of literary creation that he named *philosophical literature*. It is a current of reflective-artistic prose that ranges from classical dialogues, across medieval theological commentaries, Renaissance essays, French moralistic treatises and texts of most diverse types dating from the nineteenth century, to the works of authors of the first half of the twentieth century whose opus contains a dominant reflective component. It is the last of these phases that Lukić referred to as specific in relation to the earlier stages of development of the philosophical literature, labelling it as “essayistic or intellectual” (Лукић 1981: 218). The essay genre, in that respect, represents probably the most adequate terminological definition of this body of Dučić’s prose, which belongs to one of the main trends in Western European literature of the time.
- 225 There is an interesting piece of information concerning a surge of interest in *King Radovan’s Treasure* at the late twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century: “Searching the *online* catalogue of the Matica Srpska Library in Novi Sad (<http://bmsalf.ns.ac.yu/cobiss/>) in March 2002 has shown that more copies of particular Dučić’s works have been published over the last ten years than throughout the preceding period. Some publishers even boasted of having sold as many as 100,000 copies of *King Radovan’s Treasure*. Thus it would be no exaggeration to say that Dučić’s prose represented a bestseller of the last decade. It is, therefore, hardly the case that, at least as far as the readership is concerned, prose remained overshadowed by poetry” (Гвозден 2003: 11). The perennial readers’ interest in books of “wisdom”, handbooks of easily accessible knowledge and quotations suitable for every occasion undoubtedly made this work of Dučić’s more popular with the advent of new and affordable editions. This is not to be understood as a sign of its triviality of thought, but rather as an instance of the phenomenon that broad popularity may deprive such a book of a more scrupulous critical reception than the one it had previously merited.
- 226 It is with good reason assumed that this Dučić’s work influenced the similar in kind *Znakovi pored puta* (*Signs by the Roadside*) by Ivo Andrić: “It is not ruled out that Dučić himself, with his ‘A Path by the Roadside’ encouraged Andrić to write reflective vignettes entitled ‘Signs by the Roadside’, as it is also probable that both of them had merely been building upon the moralistic tradition of the renowned French essayists [...]” (Коларић 1995: 515).

- 227 The place of this work of Dučić in the said artistic area is appraised by the critics to be at the highest scale of merit: “Dučić’s meditations stand at the very summit of our meditative prose; what is more, they even surpass it in their inimitable elegance and paradoxical wittiness of its expression, conciseness of their intensity of thought, depth of anticipation and far-reaching recognition or creation of the patterns of thought for the world that was yet to come – that they impose as the standard and criterion for the meditative prose form” (Глушчевић 1990: 418).
- 228 The creation of the legend is related to a concrete geographical area, but all of its elements suggest that it is evidently a migratory motif, well-known in various traditions and cultures worldwide: “In the Timok Valley, thus in the eastern part of today’s Serbia, many men and women profess about a vast treasure of certain *King Radovan*. This treasure is said to be extraordinarily huge. But one cannot discover it until one finds a plant called *Laserwort*, and opens the locks and padlocks on the door behind which the treasure is kept. And that auspicious *Laserwort* is nowhere to be found” (Веснић 1894: 172).
- 229 The most obvious influence, long since confirmed in the studies to date, represents primarily the entire classical humanistic heritage: “Dučić is largely oriented towards the classical, ancient Greek and Roman heritage, Greek and Roman philosophy, literature, historiography” (Леовац 1985: 215). In the majority of texts – from early reviews to later studies – searching for individual models of Dučić’s philosophical-literary reflections, the name that quite justifiably appears most frequently is that of Michel de Montaigne, but there are also other authors that undoubtedly exerted their influence regarding some of the writer’s poetic preferences and directions of thought: “According to the subjects he focused on and his loosely connected narrative, as well as to the anecdotal form of presentation, Dučić’s work is greatly reminiscent of Montaigne’s *Essays*, only, while Montaigne had formed his worldview on his knowledge of classical culture, with which he was familiar to the last detail, our poet, who also knew it very well and devoted himself to studying it, especially during his stay in Athens and Cairo for a number of years, added to it the huge experience and knowledge of all the great minds since the Renaissance, when Montaigne lived, to the present day. Thus he was familiar with the teachings of Socrates, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Cicero and Seneca, just as much as with those of Montaigne, Rousseau, Locke, Carlyle, Emerson” (Лебл-Албала 1938: 271–272); “Dučić belongs to the tradition of the essayistic manner of writing that marks its true beginning with Montaigne in the 16th century, but its followers are to be found among writers much closer to Dučić in time, such as the American Ralph Waldo Emerson, author of the book *The Conduct of Life*; Maurice Maeterlinck, the writer of *Wisdom and Destiny*; or Carlyle with his essays on heroes” (Гвозден 2006: 89).
- 230 All further citations of *King Radovan’s Treasure* are only marked by the page number of this edition in parentheses (author’s note). Furthermore, all citations of this work are presented according to its English edition (see Dučić 2017; translator’s note).
- 231 Freud’s treatise “Beyond the Pleasure Principle” was published in 1920 and Dučić might have known of it. Cf. “In the psycho-analytical theory of the mind we take it for granted that the course of mental processes is automatically regulated by the ‘pleasure principle’: that is to say, we believe that any given process originates in an unpleasant state of tension and thereupon determines for itself such a path that its ultimate issue coincides with a relaxation of this tension, i.e. with avoidance of ‘pain’ or with production of pleasure” (Freud 1922: 1).
- 232 What stands completely in accordance with the foregoing remarks is an earlier attempt at outlining Dučić’s philosophical profile: “He is, if we may say so, a discrete Stoic and a mild Epicurean, who dreams about age-old Greek and Christian ideals, about grand ideas and truths” (Леовац 1985: 218).
- 233 Cf. “This synthesis of Christian philosophy and contemporary Christian pragmatics that Dučić made was executed quite naturally and plausibly, in the style of classical philosophers of characterological and moralistic orientation” (Глушчевић 1990: 425).
- 234 Its exponent is Saint Anselm, a medieval theologian who put forward the following argument: “The being than which nothing greater can be conceived to exist cannot be conceived not to exist” (Крешенцо 2003: 102). Dučić relied on the heritage of Christian thinkers in many of his considerations, drawn equally to the authors of Eastern and Western traditions.
- 235 “It should also be added that, considering the fact that it is based on personal experience in its principal inspiration, Dučić’s point of view is exclusively masculine. Even in the linguistic aspect, the pair of opposites in his texts is almost invariably that of woman – man, and not woman – (a) male. As in the most illustrious examples

- of courtly, platonic, utopian love, to which, as we shall see, Dučić frequently refers, admiring a woman is founded upon the objectivization of her personality; she is an object of admiration, but not a subject in that relationship. She might become a subject only in a sensual and earthly love game” (Витановић 1990: 24).
- 236 The title of one text speaks volumes about the degree of such analytical sharpening of tensions: “The Ideology of Misogyny in Dučić’s *King Radovan’s Treasure*” (Стефановић 2008).
- 237 It is an in-depth study of the linguistic corpus of Dučić’s work that suggested some of the presented hypotheses, largely ignored in favour of ideologically orientated interpretations: “The basic principle of Dučić’s essay is in the last analysis neither poetic nor scientific – but one that represents a principle of polarity. All the opposites contain one another when they refer to any significant entity. The structural and conceptual primacy of the philosophical system still has to be acknowledged. In the conception of scientific elements that affirm the common sense Dučić leaves compositional room for a rational spirit directing the course of events” (Јовановић 2008: 29).
- 238 Such exclusivism in promoting national historical and cultural legacy in Dučić’s opus is adequately noted in literature: “Dučić’s turning to ancient Slavic and Serbian mythology is incompatible with his ‘Mediterranean’ affiliation. In poetry, for instance, if he were to mention Serbian legends and historical facts, then he most frequently mentioned the legends and facts dating from the ‘imperial’ era, from the medieval feudal history” (Леовац 1985: 213).
- 239 Jung had by then already developed his theory of a number of central archetypes of the human psyche, among which the entity of *Anima* was to stand out in his view as the one that is energetically the most potent: “This image is the ‘mistress of spirits’ as Spitteler called it. I suggested the term *Anima*, because it was supposed to denote something concrete, for which the word ‘soul’ is too general and vague. The state of affairs that the concept of *Anima* underlies is an extremely dramatic unconscious content. It can be described in rational, scientific terms which, however, fall far short of expressing its nature” (Јунг 2006: 270).
- 240 Attention has already been drawn to that aspect in relation to his *Cities and Chimeras*: “Dučić could, nevertheless, also be reproached for his tendency towards stereotypes and platitudes” (Делић 2001: 164).
- 241 The influence of La Rochefoucauld, to whom the author explicitly refers once in the book, is undoubtedly present in Dučić’s essays. Apart from the affinity of key themes and the aphoristic way of elaborating on them, one aspect of Dučić’s thought, devoted to shedding light on the true nature of people’s spiritual impulses – genuine motivation of their “noble” acts – is eternally indebted to the philosopher obsessively brooding over the question of “the falseness of the traits we call virtues” (Ларошфукко 2020: 89). Many paragraphs of Dučić’s work look like the elaborations of particular *Maxims* of La Rochefoucauld.
- 242 “For this author, the subject of comparison is almost regularly an abstract concept or a phenomenon from the moral sphere” (Јовановић 2008: 20).
- 243 Founded upon a positivistic basis, a related observation on such an attitude of this writer is noted in literature: “As a subject of a regime in which wealth is the yardstick for many other values, Dučić expressed thoughts that show him at times to be conceited, non-democratic and narrow-mindedly ambitious, a man that turns his spiritual aristocratism into individualistically selfish aristocratism” (Леовац 1985: 218).
- 244 It is interesting to note that in the first out of the two novels presupposed at the beginning of the study to belong to a possible tradition derived from Dučić’s work – *The Springs of Ivan Galeb* – considerable room is given to this obsessive theme of Dučić’s: to Prometheus as one of the most universal and profound symbols of man’s imagination (Десница 1990: 82).
- 245 The other novel mentioned in the outlined tradition of prose relying on *King Radovan’s Treasure* – *Death and the Dervish* – represents an indicative example primarily as a work of profound religious doubt (Селимовић 1966). In the same sense, we also find illustrative what is now an almost forgotten novel *Ponornica (An Underground River)* by Skender Kulenović, which in the noted horizon also presents a characteristic battle of the hero caught between the “insensitive senses of religion and the religion of senses themselves” (Куленовић 1977: 24). Similar to the most significant literary interpreters of the Islamic world in Serbian literature, who naturally mostly originate from the regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina (like Andrić himself), Dučić also greatly contributed to the understanding of the areas of Serbian cultural-historical experience with Islamic component that are firmly rooted therein and constitute its manifoldly dynamic element.

- 246 The archival materials on Jovan Dučić housed at the SASA Archives, as well as those materials contained in Jovan Dučić's legacy, which reached the Archives in recent times (2007 and 2013), and therefore has hitherto been little used, was reviewed and expertly arranged by Mile Stanić.
- 247 Nikola J. Marinović Endowment archival materials are housed within the Административна архива СКА (SRA Archives); Дучићево писмо: р. бр. 193.
- 248 Even though works submitted to calls for submissions varied in their literary value and were mainly authored by lesser-known authors, the award retained its prominence in later years as well. After Dučić, there were several laureates who left a deep mark in Serbian literature – Milan Rakić for *New Poems*, Ivo Ćipiko for his writing *From the Salonica Fights*, again Jovan Dučić for his *Collected Works*; one of the laureates was August Krklec for his collection *Love of Birds*, published by S. Cvijanović.
- 249 This report was published in: *Реферати њ.др Владана Ђорђевића о њесмама Јована Дучића*, Ново време, Београд, 1911, VII, 3–9, 179–183.
- 250 Ljubomir Nikić was the first researcher to look into the entire material included in this edition. Based on the found Dučić's manuscript that the poet sent to Cvijanović and Cvijanović's corrections, he explained Dučić's act in detail, corrected inaccuracies and misconceptions that hitherto existed in the literature and critically published poems that the writer did not plan for shortlist. More on that see: Љ. Никић, *Интегрално издање Дучићевих њесма*, Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор, Београд, 1974, XL, 3–4, 249–267.
- 251 Архив САНУ (SASA Archives), 108341/3.
- 252 Српски књижевни гласник, *Јуџиро* (1902, V, 25), *Дубровачко вече* (VII, 187), *Сјаванье воде* (188), *Брачна њесма* (1903, IX, 594), *Свет* (1904, XII, 1060); *Бдење* (1902, VI, 832–833), *Прошлост* (1904, XI, 38).
- 253 Љ. Никић, *над. дело*, 159–176.
- 254 Архив САНУ (SASA Archives), 10831/4.
- 255 The Belgrade University Library, Isidora Sekulić's legacy... In addition to this copy, Nikić made a mention of two other copies housed in the National Library of Serbia and the Belgrade City Library.
- 256 Административна архива СКА (Administrative SRA Archives), 46/1922. The proposal was written by Slobodan Jovanović, with the signatures of both proposers.
- 257 Административна архива СКА (Administrative SRA Archives), 94/1924.
- 258 Административна архива СКА (Administrative SRA Archives), бр. 226, 339.
- 259 Административна архива СКА (Administrative SRA Archives), бр. 145/1930, 106/1930.
- 260 Out of nine candidates, who were proposed for new members of all departments of the Academy, besides Dučić, only Ivan Đaja won the required 15 votes.
- 261 Административна архива СКА (SRA Administrative Archives), бр. 1941/1937; 1056/1938.
- 262 *Ibidem*.
- 263 Политика, Belgrade, 8 March 1939, 6.
- 264 Административна архива СКА (SRA Administrative Archives), бр. 93/1942.
- 265 Годишњак, 1946, LI, 11941–1944, 240–241.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ASASA – Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
LSASA – Library of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
AY – Archives of Yugoslavia
AY, PC – Archives of Yugoslavia, Photographs Collection
ACCHPF – Archives of “The House of the Pavlović Family” Cultural Center