

Aleksandra Pavićević

Institute of Ethnography SASA
aleksandra.pavicevic@ei.sanu.ac.rs

Why Was the Writer Cremated? Thanato – Anthropological Aspects of Death and Funeral of Yugoslav Literate Ivo Andrić¹

The author discusses the funeral of Yugoslav writer, Ivo Andrić, with a particular focus on his wish to be incinerated. This wish is analyzed from several aspects: through the concept of celebrating great people in the time of socialism and from the standpoint of Andrić's delicate political position and his

Key words: Ivo Andrić, death, funeral, religiosity, mason dossier, theosophy, cremation

consistent attempts to avoid alignment inside offered ideological, intellectual and national frames. On the other hand, his will to be cremated was analyzed from the aspect of Andrić's attitude towards religion and death, which are visible in his works. Additional light on Andrić's, already well researched biography, sheds his mason dossier and defining his religiosity and philosophical attitudes as theosophical.

Largely blundered in reading critics and polemics, media reports, essays and scientific papers and cluttered by numerous other writings about Andrić, I have realized that the bite I have taken is probably too big for one scientific article. At the same time, I realized that it is too late to give it up: an increased amount of information and decreased competence to talk about the topic were not in accordance with my wish to discover the thin line between other lines, the fine third line which was invisible to other researchers.

So, I am writing about Ivo Andrić, the biggest Yugoslav, Balkan, Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian... literate. I write with the arrogance of one who is no more familiar with his writing than any properly educated high school pupil, but both with deep respect and recognizing universal messages that this writing still reflects towards a dedicated reader.

¹ This paper is outcome of a project 177028, financed by Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia

Ivo Andrić (1892–1975) lived long enough to testify the turn of centuries, kingdoms and states, a change of ideas and ideologies, epochs and their spirits. His life was also marked by changes – from shifting geographical coordinates he lived in, jobs he did, to different art expressions which characterized different phases of his creativity. However, in his voyage through this world one invariable can be found, marked by a continuous search for human and personal identity, for place or *non place* which suits to the artist who, more than anything else, wished to be less present/involved, but at the same time, remain an engaged witness of the mystical meeting of historical and meta historical in human life.

And we can say that Ivo Andrić made it due to discovering interspaces between offered, but also very often imposed national corpuses and cultural paradigms (Škvorc, Lujanović 2010), identifying himself with his writing, which, belonging to no one in particular belonged to everyone.

Brief review of the biography

Andrić's life route connects more than dozen European, world and Balkan cities in which he resided and worked. He was born in Travnik, grew up in Višegrad and Sarajevo.² His political engagement began in the organization Srpsko-hrvatska napredna omladina (Serbo-Croatian Advanced Youth), which is considered to precede the Mlada Bosna organization (Jandrić 1982: 18). Ideas of national liberation and federation of Yugoslav people which were central in these organizations, remained Andrić's political ideals till the end of his life (Ђурђевић 1995: 21). In socialist Yugoslavia this ideal at the same time confirmed and problematized Andrić's national, ideological and political status.

The beginnings of the literary creativity of Ivo Andrić are also related to Bosnia. Namely, in 1911 in "Bosanska Vila" magazine, he published his first poems and translations of foreign writers. In 1912 he began his studies at The University of Zagreb and soon after, continued in Vienna and Krakow. On the eve of the First World War, that is, after receiving news about the assassination of Franc Ferdinand, Andrić returned to Zagreb, from where he continued his traveling towards Split, but got arrested and imprisoned, first in Rijeka and then in Maribor. First significant affirmations Andrić received as a poet, within the Croatian literary scape, thus in 1914 six of his poems were included in the anthology "Hrvatska mlada lirika" (Константини 1995:198; Jandrić 1982:19,20). In Zagreb, during 1917 – 18, after he was acquitted, Ivo Andrić began to prepare the first Yugoslav oriented literary journal "Književni jug". He also published his first book "Ex Ponto". Moving to Belgrade in 1919 was the beginning of intensive political and diplomatic engagement of Andrić, which lasted until 1941. During this period, he was officiating different diplomatic functions in Vatican, Rome, Bucharest, Trieste, Graz, Belgrade, Marseille, Paris, Madrid, Brussels and Geneva. In 1937, Andrić became deputy minister of foreign affairs and, thus, second person of Yugoslavian diplomacy. Two years later, in 1939, he was named minister of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Berlin, where he remained until 1941, when severance of diplomatic relations between the two states happened. This was the end of Andrić's diplomatic career (Jandrić 1982: 19, 22; Милошевић 1992). Parallel with diplomatic engagement, his literary work evolved, as well as his cooperation with political – literary magazines: with Zagreb magazine "Nova Evropa" (Јуричић

² <http://www.ivoandric.org.rs/html/biografija.html>

1986:268)³, and with Belgrade journal “Misao” in which he published a cycle of poems titled “Šta sanjam i šta mi se događa”. After moving to Belgrade in 1919, he finished “Nemiri” (published in Zagreb) and prominent Belgrade publishers published his first anthology of stories (Jandrić 1982: 20). It is considered that a thematic and stylistic turning point in Andrić’s creativity was his facing historical documents, related to his work on his doctoral thesis: “Razvoj duhovnog zivota u Bosni pod uticajem turske vladavine” (The Development of spiritual Life in Bosnia under the Influence of Turkish Rule), defended in 1924 at the University of Graz (Ђићјанг 2010:36; Škvorc 2010:71). In this period, a temporary but long lasting genre reorientation happened as well, and lasted until the end of 1930’s. Andrić was intensively writing and publishing stories and essays (Деретић 1983: 560). Deretić considers that during this second phase of Andrić’s work, a kind of transformation of his creativity happened: “national – transition from Croatian to Serbian letters and inauguration in its (Serbian) central, Belgrade’s circle; linguistic- transition from ijekavski speech and orthography to ekavski; stylistic – from modern prose expression with impressionistic and expressionistic elements towards modernized realism achieved on historical background” (Деретић 1983: 560).

Nevertheless, Andrić’s novels do not represent the end of his inquiry. As Deretić continues, in them a turn towards realism happened, “while new stories (1960) bring new slew from realistic-psychological to poetic prose” (Деретић 1983: 560).

This specific *return* to poetic expression, as well as Andrić’s continuous wondering about philosophical questions of life and human destiny, which is certainly the core of his poetic thinking mode, confirm observations that Andrić was primarily a poet throughout the entirety of his literary creativity (Палавестра 1986). Anyhow, Andrić’s collections of stories won many awards, and high social confirmation of his literal work may be also recognized in the elections –first for the associate (1926) and then for the regular member (1939) of Serbian Royal Academy (Jandrić 1982:22).

As an envoy of the Kingdom, Andrić was present on the act of Tripartite Pact signing, in Vienna, in 1941. However, his requests to be recalled from Berlin Deputation and everything that happened after this, testify that Andrić was bitter because of the choice made by the Yugoslav government at that time. Namely, after Germany attacked Yugoslavia, on April 6th, whole deputation was returned to Belgrade in which Andrić refused to sign *quisling appeal* to Serbian people. He also refused to receive pension and started to live as subtenant, almost completely isolated from public life (Николић 2012: 16; Jandrić 1982: 23). His problematic political position and pressure that he suffered, first from the side of Milan Nedić’s Occupational Government (Петровић 2005:18-21), and later from the side of new Yugoslavia *liberation* authorities, did not prevent Andrić from writing his greatest novels in this period: “Na Drini ćuprija”, “Travnička hronika”, and “Gospodica”. Published in 1945, these pieces announced the time of full literal affirmation of Ivo Andrić, who reached the very peak of Yugoslav, but also of world literature of the 20th century.

Very soon after publishing in Yugoslavia, the Andrić’s novels were translated into Hungarian, Czech and Bulgarian and soon after, into many other languages.

³ Journal “НоваЕвропа” (“New Europe”) was published in Zagreb, printed both in Cyrillic and Latin letter and was meant to spread the idea and “thoughts about unity, tolerance and mutual respect among Yugoslav people and about peaceful settlement of disputes that new community faced with, after the new state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians was constituted in 1918” (Јуричић 1986:268).

Besides writing, Andrić was performing various social and public activities: he was the president of Writers association, a counselor of Antifascist Council of Bosnia and Hercegovina, a deputy in Council of the National Assembly of FNRJ and a member of Federation Council. At this time he also won a number of valued awards (Jandrić 1982: 23,24). However, what sets him apart from other significant Yugoslav writers of the time is the fact that, in 1961 Andrić received the Nobel committee prize for literature. This definitely brought him among giants of history and culture of south Slavic people.

Andrić died in hospital in Belgrade on March 13th 1975, at the age of 83. On the following day, a seeing off was organized for the great writer, whose mortal remains were, according to his wish, incinerated.

Death and funeral of Ivo Andrić

The fact that Andrić's mortal remains were cremated and not standardly buried, calls our attention and opens variety of questions. Though in the 1970s, cremation was accepted, but not prevalent way of taking care of dead bodies in Serbia, as for in Belgrade, it was certainly not *representative* burial mode (Павићевић 2006: 300). By the rule, the later belonged to public figures (not to all of them!) and implied high degree of symbolization and aestheticization of the ceremony. The whole rhetoric around representative funeral was meant to provide a burial that was worthy of remembering and to create a gravesite as an important *place of memory*. In its bases, thorough ideological principles of actual political organization should have been inbuilt. In such a concept, preserving of corporal integrity was assumed because it suggested lasting in eternity and not perishing which was hypertrophied by the act of cremation. Mona Ozouf also writes about the fact that incinerated remains hardly fit into the scene design of the ceremony which should celebrate deceased and idea that he symbolizes. Describing the solemn funeral of French Revolution youth heroes who deigned to rest inside of National Pantheon, this French historian points that, contrary to detailed scenarios that took place in front of the temple, it was quite unclear what was done inside of it. It is possible that this incompleteness was related to the fact that ceremony was about placing urns, and not coffins with mortal remains, so it was not precisely thought in advance who, where and how should perform this final act of funeral ritual (Ozouf 2006:129).

As we mentioned before, the cremation was what Andrić had wanted, so it seems unnecessary to wonder why was he cremated (Ком 1982: 314, 315). However, questions appear, even on two levels: on the level of individual choice and on the level of creating collective notions through the specific concept of farewell and funeral. Later is related to another inquiry and that is, why was Andrić's urn placed in the Alley of the Greats? Namely, beside the wish concerning cremation, Andrić's will contained the explicit demand to place the urn with his mortal remains next to the urn with ashes of his late wife, Milica Babić who died in 1968. (Палавестра 2003: 64). Next, did authority's approval to cremation of giant (because, at that time, everything could have been revised due to common, social and state *benefit*) and then disregarding second part of Andrić's will, represented the way to lessen symbolic power of Andrić's character and work and reduce it to the *right measure*, so to provide specific intervention on collective memories techniques? Was the writer's wish to be cremated only the reflex of his consistent national and ideological *non- belonging tactic* or does it reveal some understatements related to his religiosity and philosophical attitudes, to his conceiving of death or to some less known facts from his rich biography?

At the time of Andrić's death, a state-organized-funeral, still belonged mostly to those public figures who were celebrated by combat merits during the Second World War and by consistent political and ideological engagement in the process of creating the new, socialist state and society. Thus, few days before Andrić died, the funeral of national hero, Veljko Vlahović was organized in Belgrade. Veljko Vlahović was seen off with a day of mourning announcement, highest state honors and with the presence of SFRY president, Josip Broz Tito (Политика 1975, 9. март: 1–3). On the other side, though socialist social organization implied full support to artistic creativity, art, interpreted through a Marxist prism, was taken only as a means of propagating ideological *truths* and beliefs, irreversibly determined by social and economic relations of the epoch (Николић 2012:2,19). According to this, the same as in ancient times of anonymous artists, *sacredness* almost exclusively belonged to rulers and not to artists whose task was to celebrate them. However, Andrić was not an *ordinary* artist. He was the only Yugoslav Nobel prize winner and, what was probably more important, he was a specific symbol of Yugoslavian- hood, which provided him with a funeral at state level. The biggest problem with this was the fact that Andrić had refused to be a “state writer”, but his work made him kind of a “public monument”, whose post mortal destiny had to pass through a dense ideological sieve (Палавестра 2003:54).⁴

Preparation and organization of Ivo Andrić's send-off evolved unusually fast and efficiently. Andrić died on 13th and was buried on 14th of March, thus the media simultaneously reported about his yesterday's death and today's funeral (Политика 14. март 1975:1). The fact that his end was expected does not seem to be persuasive enough to explain such a quick intervention. It is possible that this was solution that helped avoiding expected inter-republic's polemics, about where and how Andrić should have been buried (Ком 1982:314). Initial agreement happened in Petar Stambolić office, where, on March 13th, Rodoljub Čolaković, Kiro Gligorov and Erih Koš met. Predrag Palavestra claims that Funeral Board, composed of 45 members: academicians, writers, political and other public figures were gathered even before Andrić's death (Палавестра 2003:62). However, on March 14th Funeral Board meeting was held and allegedly, details about the funeral were arranged (Политика 14. март 1975:1).

Unlike national hero Veljko Vlahović whose send-off was organized from the aula of Federal Parliament, the coffin with Andrić's mortal remains was exposed in Belgrade City Hall, from which red flags flew at half- mast (Ibid). From this we could conclude that Veljko Vlahović was a Yugoslav hero more than Andrić was its greatest writer, but it is more likely that this choice was influenced by the other reasons. On the one hand, it represented specific compromise in relation with public funeral's concept and concept of the greats of that time, which we mentioned earlier in the text. Namely, though he was not a national hero or politician, Andrić deserved the epithet of great which, at that time, did not belong to any other Yugoslav artist. That is why his send-off was performed in a public space which corresponded to his figure and work.⁵ Still, Federal Parliament would have made huge precedent in relation with Andrić's profession, thus City Hall appeared as more moderate solution. However, it is possible

⁴ *Monumental* character of the figure of Ivo Andrić and his literature was also testified in Skender Kulenović oration, where he explicitly used word *monument* to describe the importance of the writer in Yugoslav culture. (Политика 1975, 15 март: 1)

⁵ It is interesting to mention that mortal remains of Miroslav Krleža, great Yugoslav writer, who died in Zagreb in 1981, were exposed in Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (JAZU) in Zagreb (Политика 1981, 11. децембар: 11).

that this important point of the capital should have suggested certain arbitrages of actual polemics about national belonging of the writer. Namely, Andrić himself, as convinced and consistent Yugoslav and cosmopolitan and above all, humanist and devotee of muses, was completely restrained on the issue of belonging to any of the Yugoslav nations. Despite this, usurpations by those who tried to glorify their national/nationalistic corpuses using Andrić's great work were quite usual at that time, and still are today (Тутњевић 1993/94: 450; Dautović 2001). That is why it is possible that send-off from Belgrade City Hall should have suggested Andrić's final belonging to Serbian literature.

And while on the occasion of the death of Veljko Vlahović, a day of mourning was announced in the whole state and in the case of death of Miroslav Krleža in 1981, a day of mourning was announced in Croatia, the death of Ivo Andrić was not considered as cause for public lamentation (Bazdulj 2012). Admittedly, on the commemorative meeting in Travnik Municipality, it was decided to cancel all public manifestations and performances in this town and to open a book of condolences in the birth house of Ivo Andrić.⁶

The coffin with Andrić's mortal remains was displayed in Belgrade City Hall from 8–12 AM. During this period, tens of thousands of citizens paid their last respects to the beloved writer. Around the coffin, covered by a flag with the five-pointed star in the middle, guards of honor were rotating, composed of public and culture workers, pupils, students and delegations from Travnik and Višegrad (Политика 1975, 14. март:1). The president of the country wasn't personally present. He participated in collective mourning through a telegram of condolence sent to the Writer's Guild and published on the cover page of daily newspapers "Politika". Beside this, Cvijetin Mijatović laid a wreath in Tito's name (Политика 15. март 1975:10). After the procession was over, the coffin was transported to the New Graveyard, where, in the chapel for sending-off for cremation, second part of the ceremony took place. The funeral oration was held by Pavle Savić, president of SASA, Rodoljub Čolaković, member of Federation Council and Kiro Gligorov, president of Federal Parliament. Last words to great writer came from actor, Ljuba Tadić who recited kind of Andrić's life path credo from his writings "Staze" ("Paths").⁷

It is interesting to note that specific poetical inspiration was shining from the majority of public and media speeches and discourses. It looked like a deep and a bit melancholic tone of the writer's words was revived and flooded into public space, dressing the moment of separation in clothes of poetry. Thus, the journalist who described Andrić's last moments among his citizens wrote: "While memories of the beginning and hard path in Andrić's homeland, which took him winding and cliffy towards undreamed spaces, beauty and riches of the world, were conjured up by the solemn and calm voice of artist Ljuba Tadić, as the sound of a flute spread through the

⁶ <http://www.znanje.org/lektire/i26/06iv04/06iv0423/ekt/smrt.htm>

⁷ "...And, few times during a day, using every standstill in life, every breather in conversation, I was passing one part of that road, I should have never get down from. So, till the end of my life, I will get along destined length of Višegrad path, invisibly and secretly. And then, it will be ended along with the end of life. Lost in the place where all paths complete, where roads and vastness disappear, where there is no walk nor efforts, where all earthly rides ravel in senseless hank and burn like a spark of salvation in our eyes which themselves dim, cause they brought us to the aim and truth" (Jandrić 1982:457).

hall, discrete, thin and noble as was the man whom they were sending off, the coffin with the body disappeared into the depth” (Оташевић 1975:11).

It is quite logical that the journalist did not have inquiries concerning what really happened with the coffin when it disappeared *into the depth*, which is, by the way, about as deep as the coffin itself, but, for our topic it is important to say that the urn with Andrić’s ashes was placed in a single rosaries in Alley of the Greats at Belgrade’s New Graveyard on April 24th 1975, 40 days after the send-off ceremony (Јандрић 1982:456,457; Škvorc 2010:41). The urn was made of soil brought from Andrić’s homeland and his final placing was attended by around a hundred people: state and republic officials, writers and admirers (Политика 1975, 25. април: 9).

Why did Andrić choose cremation?

This question can be analyzed from several, mutually connected aspects: from the standpoint of his personal, philosophical and religious orientations and opinion, from the aspect of his, aforementioned tactics of not belonging and in the end, from the standpoint of some less known details of his biography which potentially connect all other groups of possible explanations.

Right to discuss this matter at all is given us, to a certain extent, by the unquestionable fact that Andrić was a religious person of Christian provenances and generally speaking, cremation was not the ideal model of Christian burial, regardless of the fact that it was accepted first by the Protestant and then Catholic Church.⁸ At that time, in Belgrade, cremation was usually related to atheist world views what was supported by cremation association “Oganj” (Павићевић 2006: 299).⁹ However, accepting this way of treating the dead also reflected the penetration of liberal ideology and wishes to brake with traditional forms. Thus, among the cremated of that time were plenty of artists who had been generally considered as main promoters of new spiritual views and freedom. Inscriptions of names and professions at rosaries and columbaria in the Alley of the Greats at Belgrade’s New Graveyard testify to this spirit of the epoch. The Sign of a cross carved on a certain number of these *gravestones* shows that this was a time when a new relation towards the world was emerging; it was not necessarily atheist, but it primarily implied ideological and ritual individualization of the post mortem act (Павићевић 2011: 64).

The need to avoid the spectacularization of the funeral, “dishonest obituaries” and other things that follow the post mortem destiny of public figures, completely fit into Andrić’s life style, described by his biographers, contemporaries and friends.¹⁰ There are even opinions that Andrić wanted to be incinerated specifically in order to avoid burial in the Alley of the Greats, but he obviously did not succeed. In that

⁸ From the very beginnings of cremation advertising, Catholic Church was opposing such a way of treating mortal remains. However, in 1966, compromise was found, according to which Catholic priests were allowed to perform religious service for deceased who were going to be cremated, but service had to be performed out of hall for sending off for cremation. (Огањ 1974/1:11).

⁹ After the Second World War, editorial of “Oganj” journal, an organ of Cremation Association, accepted and advertised atheistic world views, as additional to its primary ecological and economical justifications of mortal remains cremation (Павићевић 2006: 299).

¹⁰ It is considered that, before he died, writer left note in his tablet, in which he expressed resignation towards funerals of public figures: “Thought of death causes fear in humans. In writers and in every public servant there is also aversion to stupid and disingenuous necrologies that wait for us”. However, this information should be taken with caution, because Andrić was in coma two months before he died, so it is possible to date this note in earlier period (<http://glassrbije.org/kultura/%C4%8Dlanak/guglov-logo-u-%C4%8Dast-godi%C5%A1njice-andri%C4%87evog-ro%C4%91enja>)

historical moment, a *public monument* (which Andrić was in a certain sense) could not have been set down in some remote corner of public space and left to uncontrolled collective memory activities. Nevertheless, the question remains how Andrić's wish corresponded to his religiosity?

Religiosity, relationship to death and mason dossier of Ivo Andrić

A significant part of the literary work of Ivo Andrić was shaped by deep, contemplative writings, in which the author was directly calling upon God, and thinking about man and his destiny in eschatological frames.¹¹ However, Andrić's religious credo was never explicitly expressed (Kupareo 1978). It is undisputed that Andrić's poetry, as well as thoughts from "Znakovi pored puta", which represent kind of his literary diary, contain honest, God - seeking tones, inspired by feeling of God's care and close presence (Деретић 1983: 561). But, there is also often and intensive doubt in the possibility of establishing balance and a *satisfying agreement* between cosmic forces and human intervention in history (Кољевић 1996: 229). Zjelinjski thinks that for Andrić "God is the only certainty in which all thirds of dispersed life texture get together", but neither does such a God "bring relief from life pains nor joy to one who believes in Him" (Зјелињски 1985: 260). Beside this, Andrić puts God out of history (Ibid: 266) and his contemplation about post mortem human destiny exudes more in resignation, even in cynicism, then in convinced faith, which, to a certain extent, brings into question his attitudes towards Christian theology (Ibid:266).

Most of the authors who dealt with this issue, marked Andrić's religiosity as pantheist, as those who sees deification of both material and spiritual world and thus feels God's presence in everything (Škvorc 2010:44; Зјелињски 1985: 259). Zjelinjski writes that "Andrić's pantheism dissolves God in the Universe. It unites the world of nature and the world of spirit [...] Pantheism is not a symptom of the destruction of religious consciousness, but [...] an expression of belief that everything is subject to deification, considering that it is a little part of God"(Зјелињски 1985: 259).

Analogically to Andrić's cosmopolitanism, as an ideal measure of one's belonging, his God is also universal, a God of all (Škvorc 2010: 44;Kupareo), thus the writer searches for his own way to Him. His searching represents a subjectivization and individualization of religious experience and evolves out of given historical, theological and institutional frames. It can be said that such a concept of a God-searching road is completely in harmony with Andrić's choice of cremation as a potentially de-ritualized funeral ritual. However, was that choice conditioned only with the wish to avoid the form?

Andrić's conceiving of historical time as process of circular repetition and renewal (Палавестра 1986: 247), and indirectly related to this, conceiving of death, shed additional light to the question. In Andrić's lyrical prose, Zjelinjski even recognizes traces of the *cyclical catastrophism* idea, which implies that "history evolves between catastrophes. Determinism of their flowing excludes alert God's or ratio existence" (Зјелињски 1985: 266). But, though he gives the chance for salvation from this awkward circling and for "human triumph over frailty" through "building new reality which is born in the spirit" (Палавестра 1986:247), Andrić's view is not in accordance with Christian theology and dogma about universal resurrection and final encounter of time and eternity coordinates. His philosophy was far more close to

¹¹ See in: Andrić 1976 (Znakovi: 15, 17), Андрић 1976 (Штасањам...:116), Andrić 1984 (Ex Ponto...:32)

theosophical views, which are characterized by a pantheist worldview and basic relying on Oriental religions. This aspect of Andrić's thought is testified by some of his contemplations of death. They consistently move from resigned, but also indifferent accepting of finiteness of human life, towards hope in some form of prolongation of spiritual existence (Јуричић 1986: 261).¹² However, eventual post mortem existence Andrić did not see as an individual salvation act. For him, new birth possibility "does not consist of preservation of our individuality, but in the consciousness about the huge flow of reality in which our present life is only a quick moment" (Ibid:262). Thus, when he says: "... let everything that binds me and that is called *mine*, disappear, so to be clean, strong and free..." (1984, Ex Ponto:61), it seems that he is admitting to certain self-abolition, giving in to the thoughts which are balancing between discharging individuality and procreation of a new man. In relation to this, it is interesting to mention that Marcus Aurelius' philosophy had a significant influence on Andrić's philosophical attitudes (Prošić 2012). Koš even writes that the work of this Roman emperor "Misli" (Thoughts) was the last thing Andrić read, having taken it to the hospital. Describing impressions that he had when facing insensate Andrić, who had brain stroke in the hospital, Koš discovers details about Andrić's fascination with work of Aurelius: "It was for the first time that he was truly free and completely independent. He was not even limiting himself anymore, free from his own passions and weaknesses, doubts and hopes, finally reaching the level of self-control and renunciation about which Marcus Aurelius was writing about in the book that Andrić appreciated very much and which was based on oriental teaching about nirvana as highest level of perfection!" (Кош 1982: 316).

According to all aforementioned, we can conclude that both Andrić's religiosity and his concept of death could have been in line with wish for cremation. That means that a choice was not conditioned just with the need to personalize the funeral ritual or with a wish to avoid a necrophilic grab of the deceased. It seems that its primary inspiration was a specific ideological-philosophical-religious matrix which was in the bases of cremation movement pioneer ideas in 18th and 19th century, along with hygienic views. It implied a kind of worship of nature and natural elements, dualistic separation of spiritual and material principles and a belief about the endless circling of substance that universe is made from. In accordance to this is also what Juričić observes, that "from all elements we find in Andrić's storytelling, the Sun plays a central role [...] it is the source of life and power" (Јуричић 1986: 260).

In this whole set of circumstances it is not surprising that specific Sun worship and its equalization with fire, which has purifying and life-giving power, can be found in advertising material and works of first significant Serbian cremationists (Kujundžić 1940: 126; Павићевић 2006a: 995, 996). But the information that Andrić was in a direct contact with Serbian cremation movement pioneer and founder of Cremation association "Oganj", looks like discovering a little, hidden piece in the puzzle of Andrić's life (Петровић 2005).

It is certain that Andrić was a member of some masonic lodges, which were active in Serbia during first half of 20th century. According to the *Document about removing nationally disputable officers from public services (Уредба о уклањању национално непоузданих службеника из јавне службе)*, Milan Asimović

¹² Andrić 1984 Nemiri: 89; See also the end of novel: "Prokleta avlija" (Damned Yard) and tale: "Mila I Prelac".

Commissary Administration from 1941 established a questionnaire with questions related to an eventual membership in some freemason organizations. From the questionnaire fulfilled by Andrić himself, in April 1942, we learn that he accessed “Preporodaj” (“Renascence”) lodge, founded by Kujundžić.¹³ In the following year, he allegedly resigned and did not have any further contacts with this or any other mason brotherhood (Петровић 2005:18-21). However, Petrović proves that Andrić moved from “Renascence” lodge to “Dositej Obradovic” lodge, a fact that he concealed due to an oath about keeping mason secrets (Ibid:26).

It is also interesting to mention that in Ex Ponto, therefore in writings created exactly in the period of Andrić’s acquaintance with Kujundzic, *flame* appears as frequent motif through various metaphors: *eternal flame* (Ex Ponto:43), *flaming sun* (Ex Ponto: 50), *flaming me* (Ex Ponto:61).

And that is the point where our disclosing secrets ends, leaving us with the assumptions about the possible influence that this segment of Andrić’s biography had on his life and the choices he made. Nevertheless, Petrović’s comments about possible implications that Andrić’s freemason’s experience had on his social and political position, take us back from the metaphysical track to the track of “reality”, though they were obviously constantly interwoven in the life of the writer.

Petrović thinks that, due to the membership in the freemason brotherhood, Ivo Andrić had mild treatment when in 1942, around 200 communists and masons were arrested by the order of Nedić’s government (Ibid: 21). With this, Petrović also explains the fact that, though he was high diplomat of the Kingdom, Andrić managed to squeeze through “the eye of a needle” in new, postwar ideology, as well to balance between its internal controversies. Andrić was convinced Yugoslav, but also an anticommunist and his personal *cosmopolitan religiosity* did not prevent him from being aware of tragic historical consequences and permanent risk of conflicts caused by confessional intolerance among Yugoslav peoples. His indirect pointing out at real situation did not fit into idealized picture of brotherhood and unity. His literature also didn’t correspond with the socialist concept of art, nor with ideological demands set upon artists, so Kosta Nikolić thinks that it is hard to explain the fact that Andrić’s works became “emblems of Yugoslavian-hood in the period after the war”(Николић 2012:2,16,19). Other authors think that the success of Andrić in avoiding purges which were conducted after 1945 among bourgeois intellectuals, can be explained by his honorable behavior during occupation and by loyalty that he showed to new authorities (Палавестра 2003: 52; Тутњевећ 1993/94: 445, 446). Palavestra writes that “for a certain time Andrić was considered the paradigm of vassal culture of consort, covered by a mask of loyalty – he was keeping silent about small and ephemeral things due to ability to talk about things that are huge and lasting. That was not classic kitman nor usual mimicry necessary in order to survive, but an attempt to keep balance in front of the abyss of historical insanity” (Палавестра 2003: 52). Regardless of everything, Andrić was never a minion of authorities. Palavestra writes that he lived very modestly and that he did not enjoy any privileges. Memories of Milovan Đilas confirm the distance that the writer had towards governing structures (Николић 2012: 18). Such a position is also testified by the fact that news about Andrić’s Nobel prize, was received in homeland quite

¹³ In 1911, Kujundzic himself, became member of Vienna Lodge of Uprising Sun (Kujundžić 1940:1). Due to his loyalty to cremation idea and also due to agility in its advertising, he was even nicknamed “Ognjeni”(Fiery).

restrainedly. Tito organized reception no sooner than a month after the award ceremony and Bećković claims that Andrić was criticized for not mentioning socialistic self-managing in his speech at the ceremony (Nedeljković 2001).

Beside the distrust by the authorities, Andrić was permanently the target of Croatian nationalistically oriented intellectuals as well as of a Muslim emigration, so Bećković thinks that the Nobel Prize practically saved Andrić from general political lynch (Ibid).

The Writer and his works as a bridge

In the light of these data, a consistent endeavor of Andrić to be independent both in life and afterwards seems quite reasonable. The trans-historical character of his novels is in accordance with his universalistic concept about relation between human and divine, between nature and spirit, micro and macro cosmos. A post mortem destiny of Andrić and a final seal by which authorities tried to mark his literature did not permanently disturb the image of relation between writer and his work. Andrić was and has remained identified with his work by which he succeeded in building a kind of bridge, this often fascination of his poetical voyages. Made of story and storytelling, Andrić's bridge is a bridge between past, present and future, a bridge for every walker and for all times, a bridge between coasts of this and the other world, a bridge whose mason dies after finishing the job, but taking away piece of a secret.

Whether it was caused by the desire to be close to his beloved wife in eternity, or by the need to resist the violence of history and obduracy of ideologies, whether it was inspired by the belief about connecting with universe, the writer's wish to be cremated still remains shrouded in mystery. It fills naive and curious readers with the illusion that they have penetrated the very core of the unknown.

References

- Andrić, Ivo. 1976. *Znakovi pored puta*. SabranadelaIveAndrića. Udruženiizdavači.
Андрић, Иво. 1976. *Шта сањам и шта ми се догађа*. Просвета.
Andrić, Ivo. 1984. *Ex Ponto, Nemiri, Lirika*. Sabrana dela Ive Andrića. Udruženi izdavači.
Bazdulj, Muharem. 2012. Krleža, trideset godina poslije. *Peščanik*. <http://pescanik.net/2012/01/krleza-trideset-godina-poslije/>Пристаупљено 3.01.2013.
Деретић, Јован. 1983. *Историја српске књижевности*. Београд: Полит
Ћихјанг, Ким. 2010. Андрићева докторска дисертација у светлу односа истока и запада. *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ* LVIII/1. Београд: 27–37.
Зјелињски, Богуслав. 1985. Историозофска мисао у *Ex Ponto* и *Немирима* Иве Андрића. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића*3: 247–266.
Jandrić, Ljubo. 1982. *Sa Ivom Andrićem*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
Јуричић, Желимир Боб. 1983. Салко Њоркани Андрићево гледање на смрт. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића*2: 249–265.
Јуричић, Желимир Боб. 1986. Иво Андрић и нова епоха. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 4:267–275
Кољевић, Светозар. 1986. Андрићево виђење зла. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 12: 227–231.
Константини, Лионело 1995. Иво Андрић у стогодишњици рођења. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 11: 194–199.

- Кош, Ерих. 1982. Последњи Андрићеви дани. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 1: 301–317.
- Кужунџић, Војислав. 1940. *Slobodno-zidarska čitanka. Istina o slobodnom zidarstvu*. Београд.
- Купарео, Рајмунд. 1978. Представници религија у дјелима Иве Андрића. hrcak.srce.hr/file/84711
- Милошевић, Миладин (прир). 1992. *Иво Андрић, Дипломатски списи*. Београд: Архив Југославије
- Николић, Коста. 2012. *Српска књижевност и политика (1945–1991). Главни токови*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике
- Огањ 1974/1:11. Скинута забрана кремирања.
- Палавестра, Предраг. 1986. Андрићева историјска свест. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 4: 242–275.
- Палавестра, Предраг. 2003. *Некропоље*. Београд: Откровење.
- Павићевић, Александра. 2006. „Друштво Огањ за спаљивање мртваца у Београду“: развој, идеје, симболи. *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ* LIV: 289–303.
- Павићевић, Александра. 2006а. Огњено сахрањивање. Рана историја модерног спаљивања мртвих. *Ана Столић, Ненад Махуљевић (пр). Приватни живот код Срба у деветнаестом веку*. Београд: Клио.
- Павићевић, Александра. 2011. *Време (без) смрти*. Посебна издања Етнографског института САНУ 73. Етнографски институт САНУ.
- Петровић, Ненад. 2005. Масонски досије Иве Андрића из 1942. године. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 22: 13–34.
- Ozouf, Mona. 2006. Panteon – visoka škola mrtvih. U: Brkljačić, Maja, Sandra Prleuda. *Kultura pamćenja i historija*. Zagreb: Golden marketing–Техничка knjiga, 113–136.
- Тутњевић, Станиша. 1993/94. Политички статус Иве Андрића. *Свеске Задужбине Иве Андрића* 9-10: 441–459.
- Škvorc, Boris, Nebojša Lujanović. 2010. Andrić kao model izmještenog pisca. *Fluminensia*, god. 22, br.2. pp 37–52.

In Print

- Андрић и реч били су једно. *Политика* 15. март 1975:10
- Dautović, Sava. 2001. Čiji je Andrić. <http://www.nin.co.rs/2001-06/07/18267.html> Pristup 13.decembar 2012
- Ђурђевић, Даница. 1995. О Андрићевим тумачењима Балкана. *Политика* 11. март: 21
- Nedeljković, Violeta. 2011. Tito je bio ljut što je Andrić dobio Nobelovu nagradu. <http://www.pressonline.rs/info/politika/166556/tito-je-bio-ljut-sto-je-andric-dobio-nobelovu-nagradu.html> Pristup 20.12.2012.
- Опроштај од великана наше културе. *Политика* 15. март 1975:1.
- Оташевић, Б. 1975. Последња почаст Иви Андрићу. *Политика* 15. март:11.
- Положена урна Иве Андрића. *Политика* 25. април 1975: 9.
- После изненадне смрти револуционара, туга у целој земљи. *Политика* 9. март 1975:1.

Prošić, Luka. 2012. Andrići Hajdeger – znakovi pored puta. http://www.b92.net/kultura/art_durbin.php?nav_category=1209&nav_id=598840Pristup 20.12.2012

Сахрањен Вељко Влаховић. *Политика* 10. март 1975:1.

Умро Иво Андрић. *Политика* 14. март 1975:1.

Умро Мирослав Крлежа. *Политика* 30. децембар:1.

Александра Павићевић

Зашто је писац кремиран? Танатоантрополошки аспекти смрти и сахране југословенског књижевника Иве Андрића

У тексту се расправља о сахрани југословенског књижевника Иве Андрића, а са посебним освртом на његову жељу да буде кремиран. Ауторка покушава да анализира ту жељу са аспекта концепта прославе *великана* у доба социјализма, као и из угла Андрићеве шкакљиве политичке позиције, његових доследних настојања да избегне сврставање у понуђене идеолошке, интелектуалистичке и националистичке оквире. С друге стране, жеља за кремацијом анализирана је са аспекта Андрићевог односа према религији и смрти, који се чита кроз његово књижевнодело. Додатно светло на, већ доста истраживану и познату биографију и дело Иве Андрића, можда баца његов „Масонски досије“, те дефинисање његове религиозности и филозофије као теозофске.

Кључне речи: Иво Андрић, смрт, сахрана, религиозност, масонски досије, теозофија, кремација