

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF
JOVAN CVIJIĆ'S BIRTH



SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS

SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS / BOOK CLXII

PRESIDENCY | BOOK 10 / VOLUME I

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOVAN CVIJIĆ'S BIRTH

Proceedings of the International Conference
held at the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts,
October 12–14, 2015

Editors

VIDOJKO JOVIĆ
ANA M. PETROVIĆ

BELGRADE 2016



Publisher
Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Belgrade, Knez Mihailova 35, Republic of Serbia

Technical Editor
Mira Zebić

Translator
Homework Translation Agency, Belgrade

Cover design
Dragana Lacmanović

Design
Raša Hindawi

Print run
500

Printed by
Colorgrafx

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Prof. Dr. Etienne Piguet, *Institute of Geography at the University of Neuchatel, Switzerland*

Dr. Gaëlle Hallair, *CNRS UMR Geographie-Cites, Paris, France*

Prof. Dr. Christine Embleton-Hamann, *Department of Geography and Regional Research, University of Vienna, Austria*

Dr. Lukas Plan, *Natural History Museum Vienna (Karst and Cave Department), Austria*

Dr. Johannes Mattes, *Department of History, University of Vienna, Austria*

Prof. Dr. Yaroslav Vykylyuk, *Vice rector for science and international cooperation, Bukovinian University, Ukraine*

Dr. Andrej Mihevc, *Karst Research Institute of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Postojna, Slovenia*

Dr. Vladimir Tolmachev, *JSC Karst-control and bank protection, Nizhni Novgorod, Russia*

Prof. Dr. Anatoly Yamashkin, *Faculty of Geography, N.P. Ogarev Mordovia State University, Saransk, Russia*

Dr. Mariyana Nikolova, *National Institute of Geophysics, Geodesy and Geography, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria*

Dr. Jana Pospíšilová, *Institute of Ethnology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic*

Prof. Dr. Jakub Langhammer, *Geographical Institute, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic*

Prof. Dr. Celâl Şengör, *Istanbul Technical University, Turkey*

Prof. Dr. Mirko Grčić, *Faculty of Geography, University of Belgrade*

Prof. Dr. Slobodan Marković, *Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Faculty of Sciences, University of Novi Sad*

Dr. Marko Petrović, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*, Dr. Boško Milovanović, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

Dr. Ana Milanović Pešić, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE

Academician Vidojko Jović, *SASA, president of the Committee*

Academician Zoran Popović, *vice-president of the SASA*

Academician Aleksandar Loma, *SASA*

Academician Dušan Otašević, *director of the Gallery of SASA*

Academician Danilo Basta, *SASA*

Prof. Dr. Aleksandar Kostić, *corresponding member of the SASA*

Prof. Dr. Ljubomir Dimić, *corresponding member of the SASA*

Prof. Dr. Vladica Cvetković, *corresponding member of the SASA*

Prof. Dr. Dragan Stanić, *president of the Matica Srpska*
Tatjana Korićanac, *Belgrade City Museum*

Dr. Milan Radovanović, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

Dr. Jelena Čalić, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

Dr. Ana Petrović, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

Jovana Todorić, *MSc, Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

Dr. Milan Milenković, *Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*

ETHNOLOGY



JOVAN CVIJIĆ'S PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOUTHERN SLAVS AND "ETHNOPSCHOLOGY" IN SERBIA*

*Ivana S. Bašić*** [xeliot@gmail.com]

ABSTRACT: The chosen subject of our analysis is Cvijić's key anthropological and ethnological study "Psychological Characteristics of Southern Slavs". The research focuses on Jovan Cvijić's not only explicitly stated, but also implied scientific views. One part of the analysis reveals the dominant scientific paradigm of Cvijić's age – the prevailing ethnological theory and the methodology of scientific research, as well as stylistic features of scientific expounding, including the misconceptions of science of his day, prejudices or manners shared by Cvijić and his contemporaries, all of which were, to a certain degree, conditioned both by the social occurrences and the dominant ideology of that period. It also recognizes Cvijić's original contribution and insights later reached by cultural and psychological anthropologies. Additionally, this paper analyses the reception of Cvijić's ethnological work, thereby reaching the conclusion that determining the contextualization and intertextuality of the scientific text represents a way to render a more objective evaluation of Cvijić's ethnopsychological research. The conclusion is reached that the reception of Cvijić's work by the subsequent generations of ethnologists and anthropologists has been conditioned by the role of Cvijić as a "triple symbol" of its own kind, thus diminishing the possibility of making a more objective appraisal of his role and significance.

Key words: Jovan Cvijić, ethnopsychology, psychological and cultural anthropology, scientific discourse, reception of scientific work.

* The text is a result of the work on the project No. 47016: *Interdisciplinary Research of the Cultural and Linguistic Heritage of Serbia. Creation of Multimedia Web Portal "The Lexicon of Serbian Culture"*, financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

** *Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute of Ethnography, Belgrade, Serbia.*

INTRODUCTION

Especially nurture within you repugnance for political trifles and infamies
(Jovan Cvijić in his letter to Petar Kočić of August the 16 1909)

664

Cvijić's extensive scientific oeuvre was marked by an interdisciplinary approach. Apart from the geographical research of the Balkan Peninsula, Cvijić carried out the ethnological study of the Balkan population, migration, settlements, economic activities, and made an attempt to determine the cultural belts and psychological types and varieties of Southern Slavs, all of which make an important part of his scientific work. He also played the key role in establishing ethnology as an academic discipline in Serbia¹, and can be considered the founder of science-based ethnographic description. Cvijić is credited with founding our anthropogeography and introducing fresh methodological procedures. Owing to him, *Serbian Ethnographic Journal*, a collection of ethnographic descriptions and ethnological essays, was started (Prelić, 2014; Radojičić, 2014). However, Cvijić's anthropogeographical school was extinguished, whereas the evaluation of his scientific oeuvre became, to put it mildly, ambivalent. His key work *The Balkan Peninsula (La Peninsule Balkanique: Geographie Humaine)*, which contains the determination of the cultural belts and the classification of psychological types of Southern Slavs, emerged as the subject of re-evaluation of not only Cvijić's role and significance, but also the directions of the development of Serbian ethnology and anthropology, thus becoming the battlefield of scientific-ideological confrontation.

In accordance with the stance that scientific theory and methodology, as well as the dominant language and style of a scientific text, are products of history, and which, apart from being scientific input in their own right, reflect dominant social discourses representing at the same time an integral part of a world view of a certain epoch, our reading of Cvijić's *Psychological Characteristics of Southern Slavs* seeks to establish the historical context of the work's emergence and perception, in order to avoid the dangers of interpretative anachronism and the ideologization of

1 The assertion that Cvijić is *the founder of Serbian science of peoples*, stated by Jovan Erdeljanović (Erdeljanović, 1927) could also have its justification in the fact that Cvijić founded the Department of Ethnology in 1906. Numerous significant ethnographers and ethnologists, such as Jovan Erdeljanović and Tihomir Đorđević, stemmed from Cvijić's anthropogeographical school; from the ethnography course Cvijić held at Belgrade Higher School, ethnology started its development as a scientific and academic discipline in Serbia.

science, and come to a realistic assessment of Cvijić's contribution to the development of ethnology and ethnopsychological topics in Serbia.

The determination of contextualism and intertextuality of the scientific text represents a way to a more objective assessment of Cvijić's ethnopsychological research – which includes the recognition of those features representing the common properties of scientific discourse of his age, that is – the ethnological/anthropological theory and methodology of scientific research of that time, along with stylistic features of scientific expounding, including the misconceptions of science, prejudices or manners shared by Cvijić and his contemporaries, and his original scientific input. Comparing scientific texts to the system of values and beliefs of one era, and perceiving the correspondence between them and certain social and political theories is a legitimate way of their analysis and evaluation, but in doing so one should separate the scientific from wide-ranging social activity of the author. Reading elements of the author's private ideology into his scientific work, or elements of the ideology of his time, even of his extensive social engagement² where they are neither explicitly nor implicitly present, cannot be considered an acceptable way of interpreting his scientific work.

THE RECEPTION OF CVIJIĆ'S ETHNOLOGICAL STUDY

After World War Two, Cvijić's anthropogeographical research was almost completely marginalized, especially his ethnopsychological work (Jovanović, 1992: 15–18). The Bulgarians A. Beshkov, Lj. Dinev & Z. Borisov called Cvijić "the flaunting Greater Serbian chauvinist", whereas Dinko Tomašević in his book *Political Development of Croats* refers to Cvijić as "a prominent theorist of Serbian expansionism" who is trying to prove the superiority of the Dinaric race. H. Islami and R. Ismaili, critics from Kosovo, considered Cvijić preoccupied with political interests of Greater Serbian bourgeoisie. The condemnations of Cvijić's "Psychological Types" came from the communist circles as well: since there was not any class framework in his typology, he was accused to have written from "the bourgeois stance". Cvijić was castigated for racism and chauvinism, although Dvorniković held it against him that "the Dinaric type is not racially determined" and Gezeman set out

2 In addition to acknowledging Cvijić's scientific input, Bojan Jovanović also describes Cvijić as a geopolitician: "The founder of our ethnopsychology and the scholar of South Slavic psychological types was also a geopolitician and an architect of a new psychological type within the framework of the idea and concept of Yugoslavism (Jovanović, 2008: 54).

to prove that Cvijić's "Dinaric type" did not have a racial meaning, but that it was primarily "a sociological and socio-psychological notion" (for more, Džadžić, 1988, 192–261). In the period after the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Cvijić was criticized for sacrificing scientific objectivity for the sake of a political agenda, Greater Serbia ideas were imputed to him, and his ethnological work was considered as an attempt to justify Serbian claims on the Vardar Macedonia (White, 1999, 237–242), despite the fact that Cvijić advocated the thesis of the existence of the Macedonian people. Even today, especially among "the third generation" of Serbian anthropologists, there are views that Cvijić's ethnology is ethnocentric and "fundamentally concerned with the questions of ethnic borders, the origin and migrations of population, therefore, almost completely designed to study 'Serbs outside Serbia'" (Milenković, 2010, 64). From time to time, distancing oneself from Cvijić takes the form of a manifesto, while Cvijić's legacy is implicitly assessed as essentialist, nationalistic and racist.³

Marko Pišev, who also belongs to "the third generation", denotes Cvijić as the bearer of the Greater Serbia idea disguised as Yugoslavism, pointing out his political role and influence, and calling him a "double" and "triple insider", explaining that the crucial property of a double insider is the identification of a researcher with the studied subject (Pišev, 2010, 71). Particularly emphasizing that Cvijić accentuated as the three constituents of the Serbian soul "its traditional missionary character", "its double nature (hero / revolutionary, martyr / sufferer)", "its church" (Ibid.), without a more precise citing of facts which support his claim that Cvijić identifies himself with the studied subject, Pišev thinks that "we can suppose yet something else: namely, if missionary nature is a constituent of this collective soul, then Cvijić could also be represented as a scientist-missionary⁴, while his mission would, by the same token,

3 "Since I belong to the third generation of university professors who do not think that the primary goal of ethnology and anthropology is the search for pseudo-scientific evidence, it is my honour to confirm that there are already numerous generations of ethnology and anthropology students who do not learn, mostly do not believe, and, most importantly, in their public professional work, do not propagate ideas Jovan Cvijić once set for the discipline and, in general, for social studies and humanities in Serbia. [...] The analysis of the transformation of syllabuses indicates a stable turn towards anti-essentialism and anti-nationalism, therefore, a general anti-racist tendency [...]" (Milenković, 2010: 13–14).

4 In order to prove his thesis of Cvijić as a scientist-missionary, Pišev cites Cvijić's speeches and articles. The only bibliographic unit which contains Cvijić's quotations in this text is: Cvijić Jovan. 2000. *Sabrana dela 3* (vol.1), *Govori i članci*. Beograd SANU – Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. Making far-reaching conclusions about Cvijić's complete scientific achievement based on one segment of one of his works,

mean science in service of full realization of Serbian hegemonic agenda" (Ibid.)⁵

Ivan Kovačević's approach is much more objective. Kovačević chiefly criticizes Cvijić for the insufficient definition of the term "psychological type", yet, he notices that it does not correspond to the term "ethnic group", as M. Filipović tried to interpret it. Kovačević emphasizes that Cvijić and the representatives of the "culture and personality" movement, who used terms such as "group personality", "structural personality", "social character", "temperament", share the position that "psychological characteristics are possessed by individuals" (Kovačević, 1980, 24), but he argues that "according to Cvijić's point of view, those properties of an individual are the result of the life of the national soul", some kind of "individual character", which is decidedly renounced by the representatives of the aforementioned school of thought. As proof of such Cvijić's understanding of a "psychological type" Kovačević cites Cvijić's description of the psychological unity of Southern Slavs⁶, and opposes it to the position of modern anthropology which considers the individual to be the sole bearer of psychological characteristics, and that they are formed under the influence of certain cultural patterns (Ibid.). However, nothing in the citation quoted by Kovačević indicates that Cvijić really thought there was a sur-individual character – namely, Cvijić speaks of psychological traits observable in Serbo-Croats and Slovenians, of their changeability due to cultural and historical influence, and of "ethnic amalgam". The

followed by a series of suppositions often substantiated with the dominant political tendencies and attitudes of the period, and general romantic heritage, seems like a reduction uncommon to scientific objectivity.

- 5 Putting aside the supposition that Cvijić was a double insider, from which the supposition that Cvijić was a "scientist-missionary" may be inferred, we will reflect only on Cvijić's observations on the existence of the missionary idea, the concept of the hero-revolutionary and martyr-sufferer and the significant influence of the Orthodox Church. Numerous ethnological-anthropological, historical, even literary-artistic analyses can confirm that there has been a significant impact of the aforementioned concepts in the process of shaping the dominant social discourse in Serbia – even today, the idea of "Serbian mission" in confronting globalism, for instance, is markedly present in the public discourse, along with martyromanic and heroic ideas, in which Serbian Orthodox Church also plays an important part, along with the (ab)use of the Kosovo myth, which means that, although expressed in rhetorical language and terminology of his time, Cvijić's observations were actually true.
- 6 "Apart from the language, the basic psychological characteristics are the same in Serbo-Croats and Slovenians. They feature intellectual and moral sensitivity, by which they distinguish nuances, often most fine ones, great emotionality and a highly developed sense of empathy, which is at the base of the national soul of all Slavs" (Kovačević, 1980: 25).

mere usage of the term “national soul”, since it belongs to the customary discourse of Cvijić’s time, still does not prove that his understanding of psychological characteristics to be romantic. Kovačević also points up the pragmatic political motivation of Cvijić’s research, and the main objection to the ethnology in the manner of Cvijić is: “the determination of political borders or endeavor to change them on the basis of the distribution of ethnographic material has become one of the basic, although rarely explicitly expressed fields of our ethnology” (Kovačević, 2001, 23). Nevertheless, although Kovačević notices the shortcomings of Cvijić’s ethnopsychological work, which were also the common shortcomings of the ethnopsychology of that period, he concludes that certain methodological mistakes and inadequacies of Cvijić’s research need not mean that we should “completely discard the results Cvijić reached”; instead, “by checking his conclusions using more contemporary methods of social science, a higher degree of testability must be reached” (Kovačević, 1980, 26).

Mladena Prelić highlights the fact that Cvijić, although his opponents often emphasize his political and ideological engagement, “was not directly politically engaged, neither did he hold any state function”, although he, as a respectable intellectual, had influence on public opinion.⁷ Prelić also points up the fact that Cvijić did not think of himself as an ethnologist, despite the fact he highly regarded ethnology, and determines that the reason for the ambivalent interpretation could be that under Cvijić’s influence “ethnology was in a respect absorbed by anthropogeography” (Prelić, 2014, 92), and finally comes to the conclusion that, although Cvijić’s approach to ethnology may have become obsolete in the meantime, it has great historic value and we cannot deny its significance, neither can we deny what is still relevant – and that is its interdisciplinary quality (Ibid., 94).

Objections on the insufficient development of the concept of culture in Cvijić’s scientific system, as well as the fact that since the second half of the XX century ethnology has developed as a science of culture, and claims that “to new generations of ethnologists, Cvijić’s concept seemed ‘narrow’ and insufficient as an explorative framework” (Ibid., 92), are still not ample explanation for certain assessments of Cvijić’s work, which sometimes go to the point of animosity. Although given as a footnote re-

7 “He was politically engaged only during World War One, by participating in diplomatic missions of Serbia, as well as in peace talks after the war, as the president of Historic-Ethnographic Section as a member of the delegation of Serbia at the Peace Conference in Paris, where he played a significant role in determining the borders of the new Yugoslav state” (Prelić, 2014: 84).

cently, the following assessment of the reception of Cvijić's work seems particularly precise and important: "Cvijić's work, as indeed any other, can by all means be interpreted critically; however, recent publications on the subject (Milenković, 2008; Pišev, 2010 and 2013) completely separate Cvijić from the concept of his epoch and seem to accuse him without enough arguments for (Serbian) nationalism, even racism. Moreover, Kovačević's critique of Cvijić as a romantic could also be re-examined (Kovačević, 2001, 27–44), considering the fact that it is questionable whether Cvijić's psychological types (which, in his opinion, are built by the correlation of man and his natural environment and do not necessarily correspond to ethnic groups) can be essentially identified with the romantic concept of the spirit of a nation. Today, Cvijić's work may be considered outdated on account of its positivism and its implicit or explicit Yugoslavism, proclaimed to be historical and scientific fallacy, rather than because of its alleged romanticism or Serbian nationalism." (Ibid., 94).

ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNOLOGICAL STUDY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENA IN SERBIA

At the end of the XIX and the beginning of XX centuries, ethnology was marked by the instrumentalization within the scope of national-state projects, and that was not the case only in the Balkans. In Cvijić's time, it was a tool of political strategies in entire Europe, characterized by positivist aspirations, as well as romantic nationalism and the belief in "the spirit of the nation". The influence of ethnopsychological school was also present in the period – from Lazarus and Steinthal, who in 1851 coined the name *Volkerpsychologie*, via Alfred Fouillée and his works *The Psychology of French People* (1898) and *The Psychological Draft of European Peoples* (1902), to Wilhelm Wundt and his *Volkerpsychologie* with which ethnopsychology was established. Later, owing to Ruth Benedict's research (*Patterns of Culture*) and Margaret Mead, the terms such as *psychological type* and *cultural pattern*, Kardiner's *basic personality*, or Cora DuBois' *modal personality* begin to appear. Starting from the position that basic psychological patterns are to be found in culture, psychoanalytical research identified the significance of ethnos for forming the psychological identity both of an individual and a group. Significant results were made by Anglo-Saxon and French anthropology and ethnology in the examination of characteristic personal traits of members of certain types of cultures – from the abovementioned Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, Malinowski, Boas, Durkheim, Mauss,

Levy-Bruhl to Levi-Strauss. Ethnopsychiatry, particularly developed in France, also gave important results, e.g. in the work of Georges Devereux. In like manner, sociological investigation dealt with the psychology of the collective – the understanding of the character structure common to the majority of members of a society as an important formative factor of the character of an individual is one of the crucial point of Fromm's analyses; furthermore, under the influence of psychoanalysis, social psychology and the psychology of culture lead to the development of cultural anthropology (more in Poirier, 1999 and Deliege, 2012). Although ethnopsychology as an academic discipline was abandoned in 1950's, on some fundamentals set by the pioneers of ethnopsychology, psychological and cultural anthropology developed in the world, as well as cognitive linguistics and ethnolinguistics.

The development of ethnopsychology in Serbian science ceased after World War Two primarily because of its abuse within the scope of racist and Nazi theories, but also due to the domination of Marxist ideology and the marginalization of distinct national identities. Further development of ethnological examination of psychological phenomena, Kovačević observes, completely withdrew from 1945 on under the influence of Marxism, and social psychology, the psychology and sociology of morality and other sociological disciplines took their place (Kovačević, 1980, 29–30). The renewed interest for ethnopsychology in our country appears at the beginning of 1990's – but it did not have exclusively scientific, but again, political reasons and took place as a part of the national awakening of the former peoples of the SFRY, only this time it was essential to accentuate their distinctness and originality. After the disintegration of Yugoslavia, resistance towards ethnopsychological and similar examinations reappears, again for ideological reasons, since that the interest for national identities – unless its purpose was deconstruction of the notion of the nation and a critique of nationalistic and essentialist concepts – was often perceived as a potential danger of nationalism, which was the cause of suffering during the 1990's. By necessarily attributing to ethnopsychology an organicistic concept of nation and the national spirit or character as a fixed, stereotypical property, ethnology and anthropology in Serbia marginalized ethnological/anthropological research of psychological phenomena, in spite of their advancement in the world, thus causing certain wariness of this type of research. The mistakes of the growing discipline or fallacies shared by the pioneers of ethnopsychology in Serbia and their scientific contemporaries were made into one fixed, "character" trait of ethnopsychology, which prevented it from identifying aberrancies from the mainstream and their original contribution, as well as the value of ethnographic material gathered in the process of research.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES OF SOUTHERN SLAVS BETWEEN ETHNOPSICOLOGY AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Cvijić's ethnopsychological research was under the shadow of a doubt from the beginning – from questioning the mere method of ethnopsychology and its foundation in science, via objections on the bias in some of his observations, to problematization of the precision of the classification he made (Lukić, 2000, 7–10). Cvijić considered psychological characteristics of a nation to be the subject of anthropogeography. Apart from emphasizing geographical conditions as important factors in forming the psychological characteristics of the collective, he also emphasized historical, ethnic and social ones. He was aware of the difficulty of his task, because of the fluidity of the subject itself, and said that “the ideas and motives of human groups [...] are like a fluid running between your fingers and cannot be caught” (Cvijić, 2000, 326). Cvijić's understanding of psychology was to a certain degree in accordance with Wilhelm Wundt's ideas of the psychology of peoples⁸. Wundt points out the significance of Ratzel's anthropogeography and states that ethnology⁹ cannot deal only with the present behavior and characteristics of a people, but must also investigate their origin and the process of the generation of psychological and mental traits. Such Wundt's interdisciplinarity and perspectivism, coupled with the emphasis on the claim that psychology of peoples should not convey the characterization of a people, but rather the conjoining of the results of the research in the fields of language, religion and custom, as well as that individual psychology is conditioned by collective psychology are, as we shall see, close to Cvijić's attitudes.

Namely, at the beginning of *Psychological Characteristics of Southern Slavs*, Cvijić emphasizes that “the task of anthropogeography is the determination of psychological properties of population in various natural areas and highlighting the participation of geographical conditions in the for-

8 Namely, Wundt maintains that psychological development is conditioned by the spiritual environment of an individual – one's culture and influences whose investigation cannot be tested in an experiment; by spiritual environment he means the totality of psychological life and products of culture, especially emphasizing the influence of language, art, myth and custom (Wundt, 1916).

9 Wundt defines ethnology as a science which studies the origin and characteristics of a people, their distribution, and psychology has a somewhat subsidiary role in it (Wundt, 1916: 6). By the same token, he considers that ethnically connected people can, psychologically speaking, demonstrate different stages of mental culture. (Ibid.) Therefore, in order to fulfill its tasks, psychology of peoples must employ diverse methods (Ibid.).

mation of the psychological properties" (Cvijić, 2000, 326). In addition, Cvijić states that anthropogeography should neither neglect "historical, ethnic and social" conditions contributing to the formation of the mentality of a people which are intertwined with geographical factors (Ibid.), and underlines a "comparative or relative value" of the assessment of the psychology of "the mass of a nation", as well its variability (Ibid.). It is exactly these observations that distinguish Cvijić from the ethnopsychology based on romanticism. Although aware of every observer's potential partiality¹⁰, Cvijić will try to deal with this demanding subject by employing several methods – the methods of determination of psychological or ethnopsychological profiles by direct observation, which are in some respects similar to geologic or geomorphological profiles, while bearing the entirety in mind (Ibid., 326); the methods of noting the differences between the population of the native land and of the land colonized by the people of the same origin; and, finally, the methods of indirect observation, that is, drawing conclusions based on available ethnological, anthropogeographical and historical data. In doing so, Cvijić devoted special attention to clothes and dialects, and stressed "the national mindset regarding the meaning and value of human life" (Ibid., 327). It is exactly "the national mindset regarding the meaning and value of human life", or rather, the analysis of the concepts of culture, also conditioned by language, that indicates Cvijić's essentially close position to more recent attitudes of cultural and cognitive anthropology. Cvijić points out folklore as particularly important for discovering psychological facts: "But of all ethnological facts, folklore is the one most revealing of the psychological" (Ibid., 327). In observing historical and cultural relativity and the variability of psychological characteristics, as well as the meaning of folklore for psychological exploration, Cvijić's opinions were quite consistent with those of Franz Boas, who had indubitable significance not only for the development of cultural anthropology, but also for the development of folkloristics. Boas' idea was that, for ethnological research, the influence of psychological and physical features of people, which developed under the influence of environment, was of unquestionable importance. According to Boas, environment included not only social, but also geographical surroundings, as well as the history and religion of a people".¹¹

10 "(...)in everyone, the spirit, passions and prejudices of his age prevail more or less, so that it is almost impossible to be completely impartial" (ibid.: 325).

11 As the subject of ethnology and anthropology Boas, similarly to Cvijić, determines the following: "(...)the object of our science is to understand the phenomena called ethnological and anthropological, in the widest sense of the words, in their historical

Quite in the spirit of contemporary ethnolinguistics and cognitive linguistics, and similar to Wundt's observations of language as the most significant cultural-psychological product linked to psychological phenomena, Cvijić stresses the importance of language in understanding the differences between certain South Slavic groups and says: "Linguistic characteristics are unquestionably very instructive, especially the dialects. (...) The classification of Southern Slavs which we are trying to give is not a linguistic classification. It should be based on all psychological characteristics."(Cvijić, 2000, 328). This observation is undoubtedly true – since conceptualizations of the world, therefore, conceptualizations of emotions and emotional reactions, as well as typical behaviours of individuals, are under considerable influence of a linguistic image of the world. The same is evidenced by the contemporary ethnolinguistic and cognitive-linguistic research. However, Cvijić shows some caution here and adds: "In many cases ethnic groups with various dialects make one entirety in psychological respect" and "the population of the same dialect shows sometimes great psychological differences, by means of which clearly demonstrated psychological groups are discerned" (Ibid.), having in mind additional factors he previously spoke about – historical, geographical, religious and cultural influences.

Cvijić's scientific caution and awareness of the difficulty and complexity of the task he undertook is seen at yet another point. He explicitly states that he does not want to write an ethnopsychological study, but wants to point to the fact he observed in the behaviour of the people which can indicate the *causes* of psychological characteristics: "Anthropological research in fact does not have anything to do with the studies whose purpose is to determine psychological characteristics, apart from some particularly noticeable facts which can arouse attention of the researcher. The research can be used only in so far as it relates to the causes of psychological characteristics. Even thus limited, the data of the research should be used with the utmost attention" (Ibid., 328). Explicitly rejecting the racist theories of peoples of Gobineau, Vacher de Lapouge and Chamberlain, and emphasizing that races, in an anthropological respect, do not correspond to ethnic groups, Cvijić still maintains that it is not true that anthropological features have "no influence on psychological ones". Emphasizing that the peoples of Europe are of mixed origin – by which he explicitly discards both organicistic and biological conceptions of peoples, characteristic for romanticism, Cvijić also considers that "when we put

development and geographical distribution, and their physiological and psychological foundation" (Boas, 1974: 63).

aside the influences of geographical environment, historical development and of civilizations, there remain some psychological differences, which we must assume to depend on their ethnic composition", but he does not explain that with "innateness" or similar romantic, or even racist categories, but "the oldness of ethnic amalgam" and cultural influences on it: "the younger an ethnic amalgam is, the less it has been processed by civilizations, the better the psychological features of its ethnic constituents can be discerned. The differences in ethnic composition already have significant effects on psychological characteristics of the French, English, Italian and German nations, which have been processed by civilization for centuries. The influences of ethnic composition on Southern Slavs can be felt even more so – they have been less transformed by civilization and are even today subject to instances of great ethnic blending." (Ibid., 329). Attention should be paid to the fact that Cvijić uses the term "ethnic amalgam" here – thus indicating combination and mixing of different ethnic groups, and not the "purity" and "common origin" of the nation, which is a commonplace of romantically oriented theories of peoples; he emphasizes the crucial role of civilization in shaping and changing of psychological characteristics, by which, he, in fact, declares his position on cultural conditioning of the behavior of both an individual and a group, and not on innate and fixed character traits or mentality of peoples.

Cvijić is aware of the insufficient theoretical and methodological foundation of his endeavor. Therefore he writes: "Besides, even if the anthropological facts gathered so far were rationally carried out, they are still insufficient for a proper anthropological characteristic of South Slavic groups: only some general results are valid, but they are also attainable by common observation." (Ibid., 329). Therefore, while being scientifically strict towards his own undertaking, aware of its defects and, at the same time, the complexity of the subject, Cvijić appeals to his future reader for a conditional acceptance of the given classification of Southern Slavs. He also stresses that peoples and ethnic groups differ in "almost unnoticeable nuances in the functioning of physiological life" which seem to "make the foundation of various feelings and various psychological aspirations", but points out that only a future development of "physiological and chemical method in examining human organism", [...] might "be able to provide information on some deeper differences between nations." (Ibid.). With this final sentence, Cvijić points to the possibilities of the development of physiological psychology, which started with Wundt's research (Wundt, 1902).

In pointing to common basic ethnic features of Southern Slavs, Cvijić par-

ticularly emphasizes the language – which is, after all, the conveyor of not only cultural, but also cognitive unity¹², and goes on to tackle historical and culturological *reasons* for the creation of awareness of that unity, and the history of the *creation* of the Yugoslav idea (Cvijić, 2000, 332–335), which, again, is not in accordance with the ideas of romanticism. Romanticism, starting from Herder's stances, sees the identity of a nation in its pre-determined and unchangeable common spirit. Although speaking about unity, Cvijić points to geographical, historical and cultural reasons for the emergence of different types, varieties and groups, and gives the psychological classification of Southern Slavs, yet draws attention to the fact that the types are not clearly separated: they "transfer to one another in transitional zones, whose populations can often be ascribed to either one of the types" (Ibid., 336). When he indicates certain psychological characteristics, such as "herd characteristics", "a brigand/insurgent mentality", "habits of tribal life", Cvijić speaks of them as "the psychological remnants of earlier times" (Ibid., 335) – therefore, he speaks of them as historical circumstances conditioned by models and types of behaviour, and not "innate" character traits. These very remarks indicate that Cvijić's stances are much closer to the future stances of cultural anthropology, than to those of romantically based ethnopsychology, although, in his time, he could use neither the terminology, nor methodology of this science.

Although Cvijić's *Psychological Characteristics of Southern Slavs* has been categorized as a work of romantically based ethnopsychology and discarded along with the entire discipline as an unreliable scientific creation, the point should be stressed that Cvijić does not refer to the psychology of the

12 From Humboldt's ideas of the spirit of language, which arises from the spirit of a nation (Humboldt, 1988: 148–149), the modern idea of the linguistic image of the world was created, which is usually defined as a naive (national) image, made up not only of individual prototypical concepts, but also of collective stereotypes, based on semantic and intuitively known encyclopedic information. Language is defined as the fixing of a particular way of seeing the world of a specific group; the closeness of naive images of the world is explained by being conditioned by the common tradition, culture, civilization and the historical experience of a people. Therefore, the essential internal semantic typology is concerned here, or rather, the characteristic ability to conceptualize the world in the languages of certain peoples. Arising from this conceptualization, typical conceptualization of emotions and behavior emerge. The theory of linguistic relativism, known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, was formed on these assumptions, which are the foundations of the modern ethnolinguistics and anthropological linguistics. Humboldt's definition of a nation as a spiritual form of humanity to some extent also corresponds to modern theories of nation and ethnicity as cultural and symbolic, and not forms of community tied by blood relations, i.e. it is the form which is based on a common culture and subjective conviction of belonging, rather than on the objectivity of a common origin (see more in Bart, 1997 and Anderson, 1990).

people, but creates the division into anthropogeographical zones, in a fashion which is in many respects corresponding with the cultural zones of the contemporary cultural anthropology. We can agree with Petar Džadžić that there are certain places in Cvijić's work which could be properly characterized as instances of "national romanticism in the manner of Herder", but they could also be considered as a commonplace of scientific discourse of that period and interpreted by understandable national enthusiasm in the period of the liberation wars and the forthcoming unification of Southern Slavs. Also justified is Džadžić's observation that Cvijić probably strived to present Southern Slavs as "vital, naturally intelligent and highly gifted people" precisely because his work was first published in French, at the moment when there was "a certain amount of scepticism and insufficient knowledge of Southern Slavs and the Balkans in European circles", which explains his "pedagogic-aprioristic tone" (Džadžić, 1988, 206–207). Furthermore, Džadžić's view that the objections generally referring to ethnopsychology could also be addressed to Cvijić's psychological types could be accepted as well. These objections are: "an unattained model of scientific completeness, the inability to test the results, possible randomness of conclusion and a 'literary' upgrade of the real" (Ibid., 206), all of which Cvijić was aware. Nevertheless, Cvijić cannot be denied a whole series of "critical observations of the psychological composition of the analyzed ethnic groups" (Ibid., 205). One should also highlight the qualities of a direct insight into the life of the people, quite a modern grasp of the influence of the acculturation processes in forming psychological characteristics, and accentuating the differences between urban and rural population. Reading of Cvijić's *Psychological Types* certainly demonstrates, as Džadžić also observes, that he did not assign to ethnos-nation the decisive importance in forming psychological types; instead he underlined the importance of geomorphological, climatic and historical factors, conditioning by a certain type of culture and civilizational influences, which undoubtedly sets him apart from the romantically based psychology of nations and brings him closer to the contemporary understanding of the problematics.

JOVAN CVIJIĆ AS A TRIPLE SYMBOL

Science, as we will all agree, cannot be an entirely objective description. That is the insight reached after a period of the domination of the positivist conception. The shift was caused, among other things, by the insights of linguistic-analytic philosophy, and it led to the study of science from the aspect of general semiotics and communication theory, to determining rhetorical features of scientific discourse which may appear both on the sur-

face – stylistic level and in its deep structures. The entire construction of a scientific text – including the notional apparatus, acceptance or rejection of certain scientific theories, semiotic and linguistic organization, the manner of argumentation, use or omission of certain literature, utilization of scientific apparatus – can be viewed as a rhetorical device (Gordić, 2007), which can also be a sign of implicitly or explicitly involved ideologies. The goals of scientific research also represent a rhetorical field of its own kind – be it the matter of strictly epistemological goals or their ethical, aesthetic, strategic, ideological and political implications. A scientific text is not only a mirror of personal intentions of an author, but also the reflection of the dominant scientific, and quite often of the ideological and political paradigm, which is particularly noticeable in social sciences and humanities, but is not necessarily restricted solely to them. Therefore, one must always bear in mind that the scientific theory, methodology, and the language of a scientific text are all products of history, subject to change; thus, they represent both the reflection and a part of a certain culture's image of the world, that is, the order of the discourse and the dominant episteme (Foucault, 2007). Contemporary science is not an exception. Hence, the interpretation of a certain scientific body of work aiming at elementary objectivity attainable to science and reason must take into account historical context. Otherwise, it can fall into interpretative anachronism and transform itself into a primarily ideological-rhetorical text which settles scores with its unwanted scientific predecessors, or can even turn into a panegyric of their achievements.

The starting idea of our study is that the determination of contextualism and intertextuality of the scientific text represents the way to an objective assessment of Cvijić's ethnological research. At the same time, it includes the comprehension of those characteristics of Cvijić's work which represent a common quality of scientific discourse of his epoch, application and acceptance of ethnological theories and methodology of the period, stylistic features of scientific expounding, and also observation of Cvijić's original scientific contribution. The reception of Cvijić's work after World War Two to the present day in certain respect reveals the reasons for the insufficient development of psychological anthropology and similar disciplines which had its beginnings in the former ethnopsychology. Serbian ethnology and anthropology have not kept pace with significant results concerning the investigation of psychological traits of members of certain types of culture, as were achieved e.g. in the works of Malinowski or within the framework of psychological and cultural anthropology, as presented in the works of authors such as Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, Boas, Durkheim, Mauss, Levy-Bruhl, or Levi-Strauss, neither did they pro-

duce works in the fields of ethnopsychiatry or cognitive anthropology. It is only recently that studies which follow contemporary trends in the field of cognitive linguistics and ethno- and psycholinguistics have started to appear; these studies also enter the domain of psychological research.

Unlike the assessment that Cvijić had the role of a “triple insider”, our assessment would rather be that Cvijić has in fact, in the course of time, acquired the role of *a triple symbol* – for Marxist-oriented post-World War Two intellectuals, he was a symbol of the monarchist and bourgeois Serbian science; for nationalistic-oriented intellectuals coming from various places, he became a symbol of the Yugoslav idea and/or Greater Serbian pretensions; finally, for the generation intellectually matured after the wars in the territory of the former SFRY, he became a symbol of the traditionalist-oriented ethnology¹³ and Serbian nationalism. However, this triple and in many ways contradicting symbolism is not so much representative of Cvijić’s work as much as it is revealing of the (in)ability of an objective appreciation of the significance and real understanding of predecessors. It is a testimony to our own ideological passions, political nightmare in which we live and – finally – our (both individual and collective) psychological characteristics. Therefore, we should at least in earnest embrace Cvijić’s warning to Kočić and guard ourselves from *political trifles and infamies*.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1990). *Nacija: Zamišljena zajednica: razmatranja o porijeklu i širenju nacionalizma*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bart, F. (1997). Etničke grupe i njihove granice. *Teorije o etnicitetu* (ur. Filip Putinja, Žoslin Stref-Fenar), Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, 211–259.
- Boas, F. (1974). *The principle of Ethnological Classification*. A Franz Boas Reader: The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883–1911, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cvijić, J. (2000). *Balkansko poluostrvo*. Beograd: SANU: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Delijež, R. (2012). *Istorija antropologije*. Beograd: XX vek.
- Džadžić, P. (1988). Jovan Cvijić i balkanski psihički tipovi u: Cvijić, Jovan/Andrić, Ivo. *O balkanskim psihičkim tipovima*. Beograd: Prosveta, 191–263.

13 If blind traditionalism is hindering the progress of science, strategies of presenting new scientific theories which neglect or completely disregard the significance of former generations of scientists and give their own achievements a revolutionary character damage the principles of scientific ethics, and are often a sign of the ideologization of science, because they signify an ideological-political encounter rather than objective scientific critiques and debates.

- Erdeljanović, J. (1927). Jovan Cvijić i naša nauka o narodu. *Cvijićeva knjiga: XV–XXXV*. Beograd: SKZ.
- Fuko, M. (2007). Poredak diskursa. Beograd: Karpos.
- Gordić, A. (2007). Retorika u naučnom istraživanju. *Theoria 3*, Beograd: Srpsko filozofsko društvo, 69–81.
- Humbolt, V. (1988). *Uvod u delo o kavi jeziku i drugi ogledi*, Novi Sad: Dnevnik.
- Jovanović, B. (1992). *Karakterologija Srba*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Jovanović, B. (2008). *Prkos i inat. Etnopsihološke studije*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Kovačević, I. (2001). *Istorija srpske etnologije II, pravci i odlomci*. Beograd: Etnološka biblioteka knj. 2.
- Kovačević, I. (1980). Etnološka proučavanja psihičkih pojava. Beograd: *Etnološke sveske (2)*, 23–33. <http://www.anthroserbia.org/Journals/Article/504>
- Lukić, R. D. (2000). Uvodna reč u: Cvijić, Jovan. 2000. *Balkansko poluostrvo*. Beograd: SANU:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 7–10.
- Milenković, M. (2008). O naučnom radu i našem univerzitetu (sto godina kasnije). *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja 72*, Beograd: Etnografski muzej u Beogradu, 41–50.
- Milenković, M. (2010). *Ka politici srpske antropologije za XXI vek*. Etnološka biblioteka, knjiga 48, Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar i Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
- Piše, M. (2010). Ko je ko u Kraljevini SHS: Formalna analiza Cvijićeve rasprave o jedinstvu Južnih Slovena. *Etnoantropološki problemi* n.s. god. 5, sv. 2. Beograd: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju, 55–79.
- Poarije, Ž. (1999). *Istorija etnologije*. Beograd: Plato, Zemun: XX vek.
- Prelić, M. (2014). Jovan Cvijić and the Beginnings of Establishing Ethnology as a Discipline in Serbia (Јован Цвијић и прве деценије формирања и институционализовање етнологије као науке Србији). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnography SASA 62(2)*, 83–97.
- Radojčić, D. (2014). Etnologija u obrazovnom i naučnom procesu od velike škole do danas. *Nauka i savremeno društvo 3. Istorijografija i savremeno društvo. Zbornik radova*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, 376–388.
- Vasović, M. (1994). *Jovan Cvijić: Naučnik – javni radnik – državnik*. Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- White, G. W. (1999). *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in South-eastern Europe*. Lanham, Maryland & Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Wilhelm, W. (1902). *Principles of Physiological Psychology* <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Wundt/Physio/>.
- Wundt, W. (1916). *Elements of Folk Psychology. Outlines of a Psychological History of the Development of Mankind*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, New York: The Macmillan company. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/44138/44138-h/44138-h.htm>

