

Književnokritičko razumijevanje Šantićeve “mitske” slave uz prilog pregleda arhivske zbirke Alekse Šantića u Nacionalnoj i univerzitetskoj biblioteci Bosne i Hercegovine

Literary critical understanding of Šantić's “mythical” fame with a contribution to the review of the Archive collection of Aleksa Šantić in the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Muamera Smajić¹, Ahmed Isanović²

¹ Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka BiH, Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina / National and University Library of B&H, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, muamera.smajic@nub.ba

² Islamski pedagoški fakultet Univerziteta u Zenici, Zenica, Bosna i Hercegovina / The Islamic Pedagogical Faculty, University of Zenica, Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina, ahmed.isanovic@unze.ba

Informacije o članku / Article Info

Primljen / Received 11. 9. 2023.

Prihvaćen / Accepted 12. 10. 2023.

Dostupan online / Available online: 10. 12. 2023.

Gljučne riječi / Keywords

Aleksa Šantić, književna kritika, književnohistorijski pregled, Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine, specijalne zbirke, arhivske zbirke, rukopisne zbirke, korespondencija, porodični arhivi

Aleksa Šantić, literary criticism, literary-historical review, National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina, special collections, archival collections, manuscript collections, correspondence, family archives

Sažetak / Abstract

Rad se sastoji iz dva, metodološki i analitički zasebna dijela, kojima je zajednički lik i djelo Alekse Šantića. Prvi dio nastoji, kroz pregled kritičke valorizacije, književnokritički razumjeti cjelokupno pjesničko stvaralaštvo Alekse Šantića, postavljajući temeljno istraživačko pitanje zašto se Šantić smatra velikim pjesnikom, iako se njegovo pjesništvo, uzevši u cjelini, posmatrano iz estetske perspektive, ne može kvalificirati kao “veliko”. Prevedhodno, na osnovu uvida kritike u promišljanje estetske vrijednosti Šantićevog pjesništva i zaključaka proisteklih iz komparacije već postojećih i vlastitih refleksija, na navedeno pitanje se odgovara hipotezom da je Šantićeva “mitska” veličina rezultat “običnosti” njegovog pjesništva i sposobnosti davanja toj “običnosti” uzvišenog smisla “toposima” duhovne zaokupljenosti, na semantičkom, a na sintaksičkom planu izraženih jednostavnim stilom i frazama bliskim kognitivnim potrebama narodne svijesti.

Drugi dio rada predstavlja dokumentarno-historijski i arhivsko-bibliotečki doprinos u istraživanju lika i djela Alekse Šantića, te se pojavljuje kao zaseban pregled ostavštine rukopisne građe koju baštini Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine unutar Odjeljenja specijalnih zbirki. Ostavština se sastoji od pisama, prepiski, korespondencija, fotografija, dopisnica i razglednica. Ovi biografski i historijski dokumenti služe kao izvor za faktografsko upoznavanje jednog dijela Šantićevog života i djelovanja.

Rad je rezultat istraživanja koje je provedeno na osnovu projekta “Objedinjavanje građe o kulturnohistorijskom naslijeđu Alekse Šantića” finansiranog od strane Federalnog ministarstva obrazovanja i nauke.

The paper consists of two, methodological and analytical, separate parts, which share the character and work of Aleksa Šantić. The first part tries, through an overview of critical valorisation, to literary critically understand the entire poetic creation of Aleksa Šantić, posing the fundamental research question of why Šantić is considered a great poet, even though his poetry, taken as a whole, viewed from an aesthetic perspective, cannot be qualified as “great”. Above all, based on the insight of criticism into the consideration of the aesthetic value of Šantić's poetry and the conclusions derived from the comparison of already existing and own reflections, the above question is answered with the hypothesis that Šantić's “mythical” greatness is the result of the “ordinariness” of his poetry and the ability to give that “ordinariness” a sublime sense of the “topos” of spiritual preoccupation, on the semantic level, and on the syntactic level, expressed in a simple style and phrases close to the cognitive needs of the peoples' consciousness.

The second part of the paper presents a documentary-historical and archival-library contribution to the research of the character and works of Aleksa Šantić, and appears as a separate review of the legacy of manuscript material kept by the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the Department of Special Collections. The legacy consists of letters, correspondence, photographs, letter cards, and postcards. These biographical and historical documents serve as a source for a factual introduction to a part of Šantić's life and activities.

The work is the result of research conducted on the basis of the project “Unification of materials on the cultural and historical heritage of Aleksa Šantić” financed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Science.

Uvod

Primarni izazov u pripremi ovog rada bio je kako pristupiti temi stvaralaštva Alekse Šantića iz perspektive koja bi objedinila unutarnji (imanentno književni) i vanjski (kontekstualni, društveno-historijski i biografski) pristup, a da pritom ne zapadnemo u puku reprodukciju i mimikriju prijašnjih istraživanja koja su obimna, iscrpna i temeljita.

Drugi izazov, ujedno i istraživačko usmjerenje, javio se kao potreba da se o Šantićevom liku i djelu govori što je moguće objektivnije, odnosno da se ne zapadne u čestu zamku romantiziranja i idealiziranja. Prema tome, ovaj rad nema namjeru slijepo i apologetski afirmirati Šantićevo stvaralaštvo, niti ponuditi samo dokumentarističko-deskriptivni pregled građe koju baštini Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine, već, prije svega, ponuditi kritički osvrt na Šantićevo književno stvaralaštvo.

Pokušaj da se uspješno odgovori na pomenute izazove pronašli smo u sljedećem pitanju. Naime, uzevši u obzir činjenicu da je, na jednoj strani, Šantić kulturni i pjesnički fenomen, trajni simbol jednog vremena i jednog mjesta, da je među najpriznatijim i najpominjanijim književnim figurama u Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji, dok je, na drugoj strani, gledajući estetsku vrijednost cjelokupnog stvaralaštva, Šantić, u čemu je veći dio kritike usaglašen, “prosječan” pjesnik, postavlja se pitanje nesrazmjera između Šantićeve kanonske slave i artističkih dometa njegove književnosti. Dakle, osnovno pitanje kritičkog dijela ovog rada – zvuči pomalo banalno, ali je vrlo analitički potentno i opravdano – jeste zašto se Šantić smatra velikim pjesnikom, iako se njegovo pjesništvo, uzevši u cjelini, na što veći dio kritike upućuje, ne može kvalificirati kao veliko.

Ovo pitanje je iznimno složeno i zahtijeva dosta temeljitiju analizu recepcijskog učinka Šantićeve poezije i znatno obimniju imanentnu analizu od one koju nam je dozvoljeno ovdje ponuditi. Upravo, cilj ovog rada jeste otvoriti, naznačiti, ukazati na određeni problem – o kojem se, prema našim uvidima, nije fokusirano i sistematično pisalo, ali je svakako prisutan – i ponuditi neke pretpostavke i opservacije kao poticaj koji bi mogao dovesti do sistematičnije i obimnije analize pomenutog istraživačkog pitanja.

Dakle, da rezimirano, osnovna hipoteza ovog rada jeste da je poezija Alekse Šantića estetski “prosječna” ili, bolje rečeno, “obična” te, velikim

Introduction

The primary challenge in the preparation of this paper was how to approach the subject of Aleksa Šantić's work from a perspective that would combine the internal (immanently literary) and external (contextual, socio-historical, and biographical) approaches, without falling into mere reproduction and mimicry of previous researches that are extensive, exhaustive and thorough.

The second challenge, at the same time, also the research orientation, arose as a need to talk about Šantić's character and work as objectively as possible, that is, not to fall into the frequent trap of romanticizing and idealizing. Therefore, this work does not intend to blindly and apologetically affirm Šantić's work, nor to offer only a documentary-descriptive overview of the material that is kept in the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but, above all, to offer a critical review of Šantić's literary work.

We found an attempt to successfully respond to the mentioned challenges in the following question.

Namely, taking into account the fact that, on the one hand, Šantić is a cultural and poetic phenomenon, a permanent symbol of a time and a place, he is among the most recognized and mentioned literary figures in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, while, on the other hand, looking at the aesthetic value of the entire creation, Šantić, in which most of the critics agree, is an “average” poet, the question of disproportion between Šantić's canonical fame and the artistic reach of his literature arises. So, the basic question of the critical part of this work – it sounds a bit frivolous, but it is very analytically potent and justified – is why Šantić is considered a great poet, even though his poetry, taken as a whole, to which most of the criticism refers, cannot be qualified as great.

This question is exceptionally complex and requires a much more thorough analysis of the reception effect of Šantić's poetry and a much more comprehensive immanent analysis than the one we are allowed to offer here. Precisely, the goal of this paper is to open up, indicate, and point out a certain problem – which, according to our insights, has not been written about in a focused and systematic way, but is certainly present – and to offer some assumptions and observations as an incentive that could lead to a more systematic and more extensive analysis of the mentioned research question.

To summarize, the basic hypothesis of this paper is that the poetry of Aleksa Šantić is aesthetically

dijelom zbog svoje “običnosti”, tako dobro i široko prihvaćena.¹

Metodološki, istraživačkom pitanju i hipotezi pristupa se, prije svega, pregledom vrijednosnih sudova kritike o Šantićevoj poetici, koja se od početka do danas kreće od negativne, preko umjerene ili konstruktivne, koja preovladava, do pozitivne.² Svrha ovog pregleda jeste ukazati na nesrazmjer između kanonskog statusa pjesnika i estetskih sudova o njemu, te njihovom sintezom pokušati ponuditi vlastiti komentar na pitanje zašto je Šantić “veliki” pjesnik, iako je kritika pretežno osporavala artistske domete njegovog stvaralaštva. Dakle, na temelju kritičkih opservacija, nastoji se, koliko je moguće, ukazati na pomenuti nesklad i ponuditi smjer u kojem se ovo pitanje može detaljnije problematizirati na temelju pretpostavke da je Šantićev status široke prihvaćenosti određen pjesničkom sposobnošću davanja uzvišenog smisla “običnim” “toposima” duhovne zaokupljenosti, na semantičkom, a na sintaksičkom planu izraženih jednostavnim stilom i frazama bliskim kognitivnim potrebama narodne svijesti, što se može zaključiti ukoliko uzmemo u obzir cjelokupno Šantićevo stvaralaštvo.

Drugi dio rada predstavlja dokumentarno-historijski i arhivsko-bibliotečki doprinos u istraživanju lika i djela Alekse Šantića, te se pojavljuje kao pregled ostavštine rukopisne građe koju baštini Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine unutar Odjeljenja specijalnih zbirki koje je 2020. godine proglašeno nacionalnim spomenikom Bosne i Hercegovine.

Arhiv Šantića koji Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka BiH posjeduje nema osnova da tretira pitanje vrijednosti Šantićevog stvaralaštva. Arhiv prije svega daje uvid u jedan dio Šantićevog života i djelovanja koji ima dokumentarno-historijski značaj vezan za biografiju, historijski kontekst i društveni angažman Šantića. Međutim, iako ove dvije cjeline rada funkcionišu kao zasebne i ne komentiraju jedna drugu u smislu refleksija arhivskih dokumenata na Šantićev književni doprinos (koji je na temelju

“average” or, rather, “ordinary”, and, in large part, because of its “ordinariness” it is so well and widely accepted.¹

Methodologically, the research question and hypothesis are approached, first of all, by reviewing the value judgments of critics on Šantić’s poetics, which, from the beginning to the present day, ranges from negative, through moderate or constructive, prevails, to positive.² The purpose of this review is to point out the disproportion between the poet’s canonical status and aesthetic judgments about him, and with their synthesis, try to offer our own commentary to the question of why Šantić is a “great” poet, even though criticism has mostly challenged the artistic scope of his work. On the basis of critical observations, it is attempted, as far as possible, to point out the mentioned discrepancy and offer a direction in which this issue can be more thoroughly problematized based on the assumption that Šantić’s status of wide acceptance is determined by the poet’s ability to give sublime meaning to “ordinary” “topos” of spiritual preoccupation, on the semantic level, and on the syntactic level, expressed in a simple style and phrases close to the cognitive needs of the people’s consciousness, which can be concluded if we take into account Šantić’s entire work.

The second part of the work presents a documentary-historical and archival-library contribution to the research of the character and works of Aleksa Šantić, and appears as an overview of the legacy of manuscript material kept by the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the Department of Special Collections, which was declared a national monument of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2020.

The Archive of Aleksa Šantić, which the National and University Library of BiH owns, has no basis to deal with the question of the value of Šantić’s work. The archive, first of all, gives an insight into one part of Šantić’s life and activities, which has a documentary-historical significance related to the biography, historical context, and social engagement of Šantić. However, although these two parts of the

¹ Napominjemo da kao korpus analize uzimamo poeziju, jer se Aleksa Šantić ostvario kao pjesnik, i to izuzetno plodonosan. Njegove prozne i dramske tekstove kritika ne uzima ozbiljno. U proznoj formi se nije ostvario (tek nekoliko priča nezapažene estetske vrijednosti), napisao je četiri dramska teksta lirskog karaktera (*Pod maglom, Hasanaginica, Anđelija i Sunce*), koja imaju stanovitu lirsku vrijednost, ali ne i dramsku. Književne zasluge Šantić je stekao isključivo kroz poeziju, objavivši osam zbirki pjesama (*Pjesme* 1891, 1895, 1900. i 1908, *Pjesme* 1911, *Na starim ognjištima* 1913, *Pesme* 1918. i *Pesme* 1924).

² Izbor iz kritike ponajviše je vršen na osnovu kompatibilnosti sa navedenim istraživačkim pitanjem i hipotezom.

¹ Note, that poetry is taken as the corpus of analysis because Aleksa Šantić is accomplished as a poet, an exceptionally fruitful one. His prose and dramatic texts, critic does not take seriously. He wasn’t accomplished in prose form (only a few stories of unnoticed aesthetic value), he wrote four dramatic texts (*Pod maglom, Hasanaginica, Anđelija and Sunce*) of a lyrical character that has a certain lyrical value, but not a dramatic one. Šantić acquired his literary merits exclusively through poetry, publishing eight collections of poems (*Pjesme* 1891, 1895, 1900, and 1908, *Pjesme* 1911, *Na starim ognjištima* 1913, *Pesme* 1918, and *Pesme* 1924).

² The choice from the criticism was mostly made on the basis of compatibility with the stated research question and hypothesis.

materijala koje posjeduje NUBBiH teško uspostaviti), ipak smatramo primjerenim postaviti pitanje Šantićeve “mitske” slave i vrijednosti njegove poezije, s obzirom na to da je poezija osnov Šantićeve prepoznatljivosti i ono zbog čega, na koncu, smatramo važnim prezentirati njegovu ostavštinu. Prema tome, rad stavlja veću pažnju na književnokritički negoli na arhivski pregled.

Rad je rezultat istraživanja koje je provedeno na osnovu projekta “Objedinjavanje građe o kulturno-historijskom naslijeđu Alekse Šantića” finansiranog od strane Federalnog ministarstva obrazovanja i nauke.

1. Pjesništvo Alekse Šantića između “običnosti” i slave

Jovan Skerlić navodi, i to je sva kasnija kritika usvojila, da Šantić ima dvije omiljene teme:

1. “intimna osećanja melanholije mladosti koja prolazi”, što je primarno određeno gubitkom mnogih članova porodice (sestre Zorice i Stake, braće Jeftana i Jakova, majke Mare) i neostvarene prave ljubavi i
2. “žarke ljubavi prema narodu” (Skerlić, 1962: 249).

Prema tome, možemo reći da se Šantićeva lirika dijeli na dvije velike tematske i motivno-idejne grupe: patriotsko-socijalnu i intimnu liriku. Unutar ovih grupa, Šantića okupiraju ona mjesta koja nose najveći emotivno-simbolički kapital, odnosno ona pitanja prema kojima čovjek ostvaruje najmanji emotivno-sentimentalni otklon: narod, nacija, domovina, grad, vjera, Bog, ljubav itd. Ovim semantičkim poljima ili Šantićevim semantičkim okupacijama pjesnik prilazi zaneseno, nefiltriranim patosom, povišenim impulsom osjećajnosti, te sintaksički jednostavno, koristeći ustaljene, poznate, prihvaćene jezičke konstrukcije, čime se na stilskoj ili semantičko-sintaksičkoj ravni dobivaju slike i figure koje odgovaraju perceptivnim potrebama šireg recepcijskog prostora. Šantić se nije zagledao u neotkrivene i skrivene slojeve ljudskih htijenja i stanja, nije otvarao zatvorena vrata ljudske duhovnosti, već je potpirivao i osnaživao već dobro poznata stanja pristupajući im afektivno.

U početku, Šantić stvara na onome što mu je jedino blisko poznato, a to je tradicija narodne poezije i na njoj nastalo srpsko romantičarsko stvaralaštvo. Skromne formalne naobrazbe,³ Šantić se profilirao

work function as separate ones and do not comment on each other in terms of the reflections of archival documents on Šantić’s literary contribution (which is difficult to establish based on the material owned by the NULB&H), we still consider it appropriate to raise the question of Šantić’s “mythical” fame and the value of his of poetry, given that poetry is the basis of Šantić’s recognition and the reason why, in the end, we consider it important to present his legacy. Therefore, the paper pays more attention to the literary-critical rather than to the archival review.

The paper is the result of research carried out on the basis of the project “Unification of materials on the cultural and historical heritage of Aleksa Šantić” financed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Science.

1. Aleksa Šantić’s poetry between “ordinariness” and fame

Jovan Skerlić states and all subsequent criticism has adopted this, that Šantić has two favourite themes:

1. “intimate feelings of the melancholy of passing youth” which is primarily determined by the loss of many family members (sisters Zorica and Staka, brothers Jeftan and Jakov, mother Mara) and unrealized true love, and
2. “ardent love for the people” (Skerlić, 1962: 249).

Therefore, we can say that Šantić’s lyrical poetry is divided into two large thematic and motive-ideal groups: patriotic-social and intimate lyrical poetry. Within these groups, Šantić is engaged by those places that carry the greatest emotional-symbolic capital, i.e., those issues towards which a person has the least emotional-sentimental deviation: people, nation, homeland, city, religion, God, love, etc. The poet approaches these semantic fields or Šantić’s semantic engagement rapturously, with unfiltered pathos, a heightened impulse of sensitivity, and syntactically simply, using established, known, accepted language constructions, which results in images and figures on a stylistic or semantic-syntactic level that corresponds to the perceptive needs of a wider audience of the reception area. Šantić did not look into the undiscovered and hidden layers of human desires and conditions, he did not open the closed doors of human spirituality but fuelled and strengthened already well-known conditions by approaching them sentimentally.

In the beginning, Šantić creates with what he is only intimately familiar with, the tradition of folk poetry

³ “Za sistemski rad nije imao ni volje ni smisla, niti kao pučkoškolar, niti docnije poznati i ugledni pjesnik. Iz dva sačuvana pisma, napi-

i stasavao na osnovama narodnog pjesništva. “Za nepune četiri godine (1887–1891), od prve objavljene pjesme do prve knjige pjesama [...] Aleksa je napisao oko 130 pjesama i postao saradnik mnogih listova i časopisa” (Lešić, 1990: 110). Povodom prve zbirke pjesama *Pjesme*, objavljene 1891. godine u Mostaru, izlaze i prve kritike od kojih je, kako navodi Lešić (1990), posebno značajna, zbog afirmativnog vrednovanja, kritika Milana Savića u *Bosanskoj vili* (1892), hvaleći “na prvom mjestu njegovo iskreno rodoljublje”, ali pominje i pjesme “intimno-ljubavnog sadržaja” (Lešić, 1990), koje su inspirisane Ankom Tomlinović, “Latinkom”, Šantićevom zaručnicom i nesuđenom suprugom zbog snažnog stričevog, a naročito majčinog protivljenja “tuđinskoj” snahi. Rastanak s Ankom bitno utiče na Šantićevu stvaralačku produktivnost, pa je 1893. godine “napisao samo 13 pjesama (a objavio 9), i većinom govore o porušenim nadama, o samoći, o snovima” (Lešić, 1990: 123). Period resigniranosti i stvaralačkog zatišja neće trajati dugo, pa će 1895. godine objaviti drugu zbirku pjesama, pod istim nazivom *Pjesme*, koja će kod kritike proći jedva zapaženo, i to poprilično negativno, zamjerajući mu (Andra Gavrilović) predanost jakom uticaju Vojislava Ilića i slijeđenje pomodnih pjesničkih kalupa. Također, u pomenutoj zbirci dolazi do izražaja pomalo napadna glorifikacija kolektivnih sentimenata, pa mu pjesme imaju karakter “himne i panegiričke pjesme” (Lešić, 1990: 125). Sličan je slučaj i sa trećom Šantićevom zbirkom, također nazvanom *Pjesme*, izdatom 1901. godine, koju Kranjčević najavljuje poprilično negativnim osvrtom govoreći o prekomjernom uticaju Hajnea i Vojislava Ilića i nedostatku sopstvenog, individualnog kreativnog impulsa (Lešić, 1990). Lešić (1990) navodi da je Šantića najviše pogodila kritika Bogdana Popovića “O pesmama A. Šantića”, objavljena u tri nastavka u *Srpskom književnom glasniku* 1901. godine, iz razloga što je Bogdan Popović bio izuzetno uvažavan od strane svih mostarskih pisaca.⁴

sana 1877. stricu Mihi u Trst, više je nego očigledno da se on bori sa osnovnom pismenošću” (Lešić, 1990). U pismu koje Aleksa iz Ljubljane šalje roditeljima u Mostar 1881. godine, primjećuje dalje Lešić (1990), iako je petnaestogodišnjak, ipak su vidljivi veliki stilski i gramatički izražajni problemi, rečenica je neuredna, koristi se otrcanim frazama te je primjetno da piše s naporom. “U Ljubljani će on dopisivanje sa roditeljima prepustiti vještijem i praktičnijem bratu Peri, izvlačeći se redovno kako nema vremena da piše ‘zato što za sutra ima dosta da uči’” (Lešić, 1990).

⁴ “Pa ipak, od svega negativnog što je povodom njegovih pjesama u kritici izrečeno, intimno [...] najviše ga je pogađalo Popovićevo naglašeno upoređivanje sa Dučićevim ‘lepim, nežnim i mislenim pesmama’. Ljubomorno je reagovao na sve one pohvale koje je kritičar upućivao ‘našem Dučiću’ i njegovim ‘izrednim’ stihovima, dok je za njegovu ljubavnu liriku rekao da ‘brblja’ koješta, jer nema šta da kaže, pa nemoćno muca, gubeći se u maglama ‘kitnjastog stila’” (Lešić, 1990: 179).

and the Serbian romantic creativity that arose from it. With a modest formal education,³ Šantić profiled and developed on the basis of folk poetry. “In less than four years (1887–1891), from the first published poem to the first book of poems [...] Aleksa wrote around 130 poems and became a contributor to many newspapers and journals” (Lešić, 1990: 110). On the occasion of the first collection of poems *Pjesme* (Poems), published in 1891 in Mostar, the first reviews were published, of which, as stated by Lešić (1990), Milan Savić’s criticism, in *Bosanska vila* (1892), is particularly significant, due to its affirmative evaluation, praising “in the first place, his sincere patriotism”, but he also mentions poems with “intimate-love content” (Lešić, 1990), which were inspired by Anka Tomlinović, “Latinka” (Latin/Catholic girl), Šantić’s fiancée and former intended wife due to his uncle’s, and especially his mother’s, strong opposition to an “outsider” daughter-in-law. Parting with Anka significantly affected Šantić’s creative productivity, so in 1893 he “wrote only 13 poems (and published 9), and most of them are about dashed hopes, about loneliness, about dreams” (Lešić, 1990: 123). The period of resignation and creative lull did not last long, so in 1895 he published a second collection of poems, under the same name *Pjesme* (Poems), which was hardly noticed by critics, and quite negatively, reproaching him (Andra Gavrilović) for his dedication to the strong influence of Vojislav Ilić and following fashionable poetic patterns. Also, in the mentioned collection, a somewhat glaringly glorification of collective sentiments comes to the fore, so his poems have the character of “hymns and panegyric poems” (Lešić, 1990: 125). The same is the case with Šantić’s third collection, also called *Pjesme* (Poems), published in 1901, which Kranjčević announces with a rather negative review, talking about the excessive influence of Heine and Vojislav Ilić and the lack of his own, individual creative impulse (Lešić, 1990). Lešić (1990) states that Šantić was most affected by Bogdan Popović’s criticism “O pesmama A. Šantića” (About the poems of A. Šantić), published in three sequels in

³ “He had neither the will nor the sense for systematic work, neither as an elementary school student, nor later a well-known and respected poet. From two preserved letters, written in 1877 to his uncle Miha in Trieste, it is more than obvious that he struggles with basic literacy” (Lešić, 1990). In the letter that Aleksa from Ljubljana sends to his parents in Mostar in 1881, Lešić (1990) further observes that even though he is fifteen years old, major stylistic and grammatical expressive problems are visible, the sentence is sloppy, he uses corny phrases and it is noticeable that he writes with effort. “In Ljubljana, he will leave the correspondence with his parents to his more skilled and practical brother Pero, regularly excusing that he does not have time to write ‘because he has a lot to study for tomorrow’” (Lešić, 1990).

Naravno, bilo je i onih koji su stali na stranu Šantića, poput Marka Cara, koji je, braneći ga, objavio polemički tekst “Kritika ili šikaniranje” u *Brankovom kolu* 1901. godine. Kasnije će Šantić samokritično prihvatiti Popovićeve primjedbe govoreći: “Kamo sreće, da mi je onakva kritika bila upućena ranije, da mi uštedi uzaludno lutanje” (Lešić, 1990: 181), što će rezultirati da Popović uvrsti Šantića u *Antologiju novije srpske lirike* (1911), s pjesmama: “Ne vjeruj”, “Proljeće”, “Moja noć”, “Jesen”, “Gospođici”, “Jedna suza”, “Pretprazničko veče”, “Emina”, “Ostajte ovdje”, “Veče na školju”, i “Sijači”, a u drugom izdanju iz 1912. godine dodana je i pjesma “Boka”.

Još je jedna kritika naročito pogodila Šantićevu lako povredivu dušu. Riječ je o, navodi Lešić (1990), kritici Vase Stajića (1912) u *Letopisu Matice srpske*, koja je išla dotle da kaže kako Šantićevi stihovi proizvode “iluziju pesništva onde, gde ga nema”. Tako se Šantićev talent sve vrijeme kreće od pokuda do pohvala, a vjerovatno su najtačnije one umjerene pokude/pohvale poput Slijepčevićeve i Skerlićeve.

Velike pohvalne kritike Šantić je dobio nakon izdavanja zbirke pjesama *Pjesme*, objavljene 1911. godine u izdanju Srpske književne zadruge. Pored pozitivnih kritika Petra Kočića u *Otadžbini*, Veljka Milićevića u *Narodu*, najupečatljivija je, svakako, Jovana Skerlića u *Srpskom književnom glasniku* koja, čini se, otkriva suštinu Šantićeve općeprihvaćenosti među narodom, a ona se, tragom Skerlića, najprije nalazi u otvorenoj iskrenosti i neposrednim osjećanjima “koji više govore našem srcu i onom što je najintimnije u našoj duši” (Skerlić, 1962: 250). Skerlić također piše da Šantić ne pjeva kao “pesnički zanatlija”, već prirodno, neposredno, iskreno, doživljeno i vlastitim iskustvom potvrđeno, ali pomalo i naivno, posebno onda kada euforično vjeruje u ostvarenje patriotskih i narodnih ideala.

Negativnih kritika Šantićeve književnosti bilo je mnogo. Jedna od najoštrijih je ona anonimnog autora u *Brankovom kolu* (1898) povodom ciklusa pjesama objavljenih u *Ljetopisu Matice Srpske*. Ovaj anonimni kritičar ocjenjuje Šantićeve stihove kao slabe, ispunjene najobičnijim frazama (Lešić, 1990). Ono što je kritika, od početka do danas, ponajviše zamjerila Šantiću jeste: jednostavan, poezije nedostojan jezik; kitnjasti stil; izlizane i potrošene fraze; prenaplašena sentimentalnost; himničnost; eksklamativnost; recitativnost; prigodno pjevanje; patrijarhalnost; etičnost ispred estetskog. Ali, upravo zbog svih ovih karakteristika, koje je Šantić znao iskoristiti na vješt i dopadljiv način, usmjeravajući ih i prilagođavajući potrebama naroda, više prirod-

the *Srpski književni glasnik* in 1901, for the reason that Bogdan Popović was extremely respected by all writers from Mostar.⁴ Of course, there were those who sided with Šantić, such as Marko Car, who, defending him, published a polemical text “Kritika ili šikani- ranje” (Criticism or chicanery) in *Brankovo kolo* in 1901. Later, Šantić will self-critically accept Popović’s remarks saying: “If only such a criticism had been addressed to me earlier, to save me from wandering in vain” (Lešić, 1990: 181), which will result in Popović including Šantić in *Antologija novije srpske lirike* (1911) (An anthology of recent Serbian lyric pems), with poems: “Ne vjeruj” (Have no faith), “Proljeće” (Spring), “Moja noć” (My night), “Jesen” (Autumn), “Gospođici” (To miss), “Jedna suza” (One tear), “Pretprazničko veče” (Pre-holiday Eve), “Emina”, “Ostajte ovdje” (Stay here), “Veče na školju” (Evening on the Isles), and “Sijači” (Sowers), and in the second edition from 1912, a poem “Boka” was added.

Another criticism particularly hit Šantić’s easily hurt soul. According to Lešić (1990), it is a criticism of Vasa Stajić (1912) in *Letopis Matice srpske*, which went so far as to say that Šantić’s verses produce “the illusion of poetry where there is none”. Thus, Šantić’s talent constantly moves from criticism to praise, and moderate criticism/praise such as Slijepčević’s and Skerlić’s are probably the most accurate.

Šantić received great praise after publishing the collection of poems *Pjesme*, published in 1911 in the edition of Srpska književna zadruge. In addition to the positive criticisms of Petar Kočić in *Otadžbina*, Veljko Milićević in *Narod*, the most impressive is, certainly, Jovan Skerlić’s in *Srpski književni glasnik*, which seems to reveal the essence of Šantić’s general acceptance among the people, which, following Skerlić’s trace, is first found in open sincerity and immediate feelings “that speak more to our heart and what is most intimate in our soul” (Skerlić, 1962: 250). Skerlić also writes that Šantić does not write as a “poetic craftsman”, but naturally, directly, sincerely, experienced and confirmed by his own experience, but somewhat naive, especially when he euphorically believes in the realization of patriotic and national ideals.

⁴ “And yet, of all the negative things that have been said about his poems in criticism, intimately [...] he was most affected by Popović’s emphatic comparison with Dučić’s ‘beautiful, gentle and thoughtful poems’. He reacted jealously to all those praises that the critic gave to ‘our Dučić’ and his ‘extraordinary’ lyrics, while he said about his love lyrical poems that he is ‘babbling’ because he has nothing to say, so he stutters helplessly, getting lost in the mists of ‘ornate style’” (Lešić, 1990: 179).

no i instinktivno nego namjerno, Šantić “će živeti, ne kažem kao veliki pesnik ali kao pesnik ljubak, mio, koji je iskreno pevao ono što je osećao, i pisao ‘od srca srcu’” (Popović, 1920: 3-4).

Bez obzira na raznorazne negativne kritike, Šantiću je ostala važna jedna stvar koje se nije mogao i nije želio odreći do kraja i kojoj je podredio i život i umijeće. Šantić je osjećao da mora biti bard svoga naroda, odnosno pjevač koji će slaviti svoj narod i podsticati ga na moral i dostojanstvo, te ga zato Ujević i Slijepčević nazivaju etičkim, a ne estetskim tipom pjesnika. U tom smislu, Šantić narodnu dušu vidi duž cijele vertikale koja polazi od puke egzistencije i uspinje se do visina esencije, nalazeći u narodu stvaralački poticaj u kojem vidi “lica bez laži i maske” (“Hajdemo, Muzo”).

Ideja koja se prožima od početka do kraja Šantićevog pjesništva jeste nacionalnooslobodilačka ideja, uzimajući “na se ulogu pesnika borca, rekli bismo narodnog pesnika. U suštini je to ona ista uloga koju su u XVII i XVIII veku i na početku XIX veka imali guslari” (Đurić, 1963: 10), a Slijepčević će zaključiti: “Da se rodio na selu, G. Šantić bio bi valjda guslar” (Popović & Slepčević, 1920: 9).⁵

Kao čovjek koji je, po prirodi, u sebi nosio narodni duh, utjelovljujući narodnu svijest i predstavljajući čisti, nepatvoreni i iskreni glas pučkog doživljaja i pogleda na svijet, Šantić, kojem je, čini se, predodređeno da poetski zastupa svoj narod, da njemu i o njemu pjeva, nije mogao (niti je želio) postati išta drugo doli narodni pjesnik: *Mene sve rane moga roda bole, / I moja duša s njim pati i grca.* (“Moja otadžbina”).

Šantić nije politički, već socijalni ili narodni pjesnik ili socijalno-narodni pjesnik koji pjeva “glasom miliona”. Šantić je pisao poeziju s kojom je obični, narodni čovjek mogao ostvariti najveći stepen identifikacije i to je jedan od glavnih razloga njegove omiljenosti, “čvrsto vezan za patrijarhalnu sredinu Mostara, od kojeg se nikad nije odvajao, Šantić je bio omiljen pesnik ponositih, duhovno uzdignutih i nacionalno krajnje osjetljivih Mostaraca, podjednako Srba i Muslimana, čija su se istorijska osećanja u velikoj meri poklopila s njegovim podignutim,

⁵ “Prateći rodoljubivu poeziju Alekse Šantića u njenom hronološkom nastajanju, gotovo da se može pratiti i neka vrsta stihovane historije onog vremena u neposrednosti njenog zbivanja od ranih vapaja za slobodom i ekstatičnih poziva u boj (‘Orao’, ‘Kletva’, ‘Srpska vila’...), potom dnevnčkih praćenja pečalbarskih i drugih seoba na raskršću dva vijeka (‘Ostajte ovdje’, ‘Seoba’, ‘Hljeb’...), balkanskih i Prvog svjetskog rata (‘Prizrene stari, vrata otvori’, ‘Jutro na Kosovu’, ‘Kosovka’, ‘Pred Bitoljem’...), sve do nazdravičarskih stihova i vidovdanskih himni-pobjednica u poslijeratnoj fazi njegova stvaralaštva (‘Vojvodi Stepi’, ‘Kajmakčalan’, ‘Pesma jedinstva’, ‘Vidovdan’...)” (Duraković, 1988: 16).

There were many negative criticisms of Šantić’s literature. One of the harshest was of the anonymous author in *Brankovo kolo* (1898) on the occasion of the cycle of poems published in *Ljetopis Matice Srpske*. This anonymous critic evaluates Šantić’s verses as weak, filled with the most ordinary phrases (Lešić, 1990). From the beginning to the present day, what criticism has resented Šantić is a simple, unworthy language of poetry; ornate style; threadbare and worn-out phrases; exaggerated sentimentality; hymnic; exclamation; recitative; commemorative singing; patriarchy; ethics before aesthetics. But precisely because of all these characteristics, which Šantić knew how to use in a skillful and appealing way, directing and adapting them to the needs of the people, more naturally and instinctively than intentionally, Šantić “will live, I’m not saying like a great poet, but as a lovely and dear poet, who sincerely wrote what he felt, and wrote ‘from the heart to the heart’” (Popović, 1920: 3-4).

Regardless of the various negative criticisms, one thing remained important to Šantić, which he could not and did not want to give up until the end, and to which he subordinated both his life and his art. Šantić felt that he had to be the bard of his people, i.e. a singer who would glorify his people and encourage them to morality and in this sense, Šantić sees the people’s soul along the entire vertical, which starts from mere existence and ascends to the heights of essence, finding in the people a creative stimulus in which he sees “faces without lies and masks” (“Hajdemo, Muzo” / Let’s go, Muse).

The idea that pervades from the beginning to the end of Šantić’s poetry is the idea of national liberation, assuming “the role of a fighter poet, we would say a national poet. In essence, it is the same role played by *guslars* (Balkan singers/fiddlers) in the 17th and 18th centuries and at the beginning of the 19th century” (Đurić, 1963: 10), and Slijepčević will conclude: “If he had been born in the countryside, Mr. Šantić would probably have been a *guslar*” (Popović & Slepčević, 1920: 9).⁵

⁵ “Following Aleksa Šantić’s patriotic poetry in its chronological formation, one can almost follow a kind of versed history of that time in the immediacy of its events from the early cries for freedom and ecstatic calls to battle (‘Orao’ / Eagle, ‘Kletva’ / Curse, ‘Srpska vila’ / Serbian faery...), then diary tracking of guest-workers and other migrations at the crossroads of two centuries (‘Ostajte ovdje’ / Stay here, ‘Seoba’ / Migration, ‘Hljeb’ / Bread...), the Balkans and the First World War (‘Prizrene stari, vrata otvori’ / Old Prizren, open the door, ‘Jutro na Kosovu’ / Morning in Kosovo, ‘Kosovka’ / Kosovo girl, ‘Pred Bitoljem’ / In front of Bitola...), all the way to toasting verses and Vidovdan anthems-winners in the post-war phase of his creativity (‘Vojvodi Stepi’ / To vojvoda Stepo, ‘Kajmakčalan’ / Kamakchalan, ‘Pesma jedinstva’ / Song of unity, ‘Vidovdan’...)” (Duraković, 1988: 16).

patetično-retoričkim stihovima” (Palavestra, 2013: 125). Uz to, nastavlja Palavestra, Šantić je bio pjesnik “jasnog i gipkog stiha koji se lako pamti” (Palavestra, 2013: 124), jednostavnih misli i emocija, filozofski rudimentaran, ali “emotivno misaon” (Bogdanović, 1979).

Šantićeve estetski vrijedne pjesme, kojih ima određeni broj – ali neznatan u kontekstu cjelokupnog pjesničkog stvaralaštva koje broji preko 700 pjesama – u kojima se “oslobodio artificijelnosti naučenog i slabosti prigodnog pjevanja” (Duraković, 1988: 35), jesu one koje spušta sa apstraktnih visina nacionalnog zanosa na “nisku” socijalnu svakodnevicu neposredno je promatrajući i doživljavajući u ogoljenom i čistom životnom iskustvu, prisnog i intimnog lirskog poistovjećivanja sa narodom i njihovim realnim egzistencijalnim situacijama.⁶ Duraković (1988) će iznijeti tezu da je Šantić u svojim najboljim pjesmama bio pjesnik trenutka.

Takva pjesma je, zasigurno, “Veče na školju”, gdje vidimo jednog drugačijeg Šantića, “pjesnika trenutka”, u kojoj je ćutanje “najglasnije” ili najbolje poetsko mjesto. Ako je osobina i prednost poezije da na što manjem kvantitativnom prostoru proizvede što je moguće veći kvalitet značenja, onda je ova pjesma najveće kvalitete. Ovdje Šantić nije deskriptivan, što prava poezija ne trpi, već sugestivna: *I jeca zvono / Bono, / Po kršu dršće zvuk; / S uzdahom tuge / Duge / Ubogi moli puk. // Kleče kosturi / Suri / Pred likom boga svog – / Ištu. No tamo / Samo / Ćuti raspeti bog.*

U mnogim pjesmama socijalnog karaktera, Šantić će dati prednost socijalnom naspram nacionalnog pokazujući kako običnog čovjeka i radnika “mnogo više i u svakom slučaju mnogo neposrednije muči i pritiskuje društvena nepravda negoli nacionalna potištenost, gorki smisao za umor i glad negoli patriotska stanja” (Bogdanović, 1979). Šantić jeste žudio za prošlošću, za patrijarhalnom toplinom “pretprazničke večeri” i sigurnošću jasnih društvenih uloga i narodnim, primordijalnim vrijednostima

As a man who, by nature, carried the spirit of the people, embodying the people’s consciousness and representing the pure, genuine, and sincere voice of the people’s experience and view of the world, Šantić, seems destined to poetically represent his people, to write/sing to them and about them, he could not (nor did he want to) become anything other than a folk poet: *All the wounds of my kin hurt me, / And my soul suffers and sobs with them.* (“Moja otadžbina” / My homeland).

Šantić is not political, but a social or folk poet or a social-folk poet who sings “with the voice of millions”. Šantić wrote poetry with which an ordinary, common man could achieve the highest degree of identification and this is one of the main reasons for his popularity, “firmly tied to the patriarchal environment of Mostar, from which he never separated, Šantić was a favourite poet of proud, spiritually elevated and the nationally extremely sensitive people of Mostar, both Serbs, and Muslims, whose historical feelings coincided to a large extent with his raised, pathetic-rhetorical verses” (Palavestra, 2013: 125). In addition, Palavestra continues, Šantić was a poet with “clear and flexible verse that is easy to remember” (Palavestra, 2013: 124), of simple thoughts and emotions, philosophically rudimentary, but “emotionally thoughtful” (Bogdanović, 1979).

Šantić’s aesthetically valuable poems, of which there is a certain number – but insignificant in the context of his entire poetic creation, which numbers over 700 poems – in which he “freed himself from the artificiality learned and from the weakness of occasional singing” (Duraković, 1988: 35), are those descended from the abstract heights of national enthusiasm to the “low” social everyday life by directly observing and experiencing it in a stripped-down and pure life experience, intimate and intimate lyrical identification with the people and their real existential situations.⁶ Duraković (1988) will present the thesis that Šantić was the poet of the moment in his best poems.

⁶ “Njegovo srce zatreperi ljubavlju za narod ne kada peva Dušanove vojske koje polaze na Carigrad, no kada vidi nevoljne težake da za hlebom idu u Ameriku [...] Izvjesno je: to je drukčiji, razumniji dublji i bolji patriotizam no što je sva ona emfaza i retorika, sa kojom smo se navikli sretati u bezbrojnim patriotskim pjesmama našim” (Skerlić, 1920).

“Sva je intimna poezija Alekse Šantića bolno ispovijedna, evokativno elegična slika nekadašnje topline i ljepote svijeta zatvorenog u punoći prvotnih i univerzalnih vrijednosti i porodičnog i ljubavnog kosmosa, a surovo razorenih tragizmom prolaznosti života. I kao što je epska narodna pjesma i rodoljubiva poezija srpskih romantičara bila osnova na kojoj je on izgradio vlastitu poetiku patriotsko-socijalne pjesme, tako je narodna lirski pjesma, a prije svega sevdalinka [...] bila inspirativna tradicija na kojoj je Šantić sazdao svoj svijet ljubavnog i intimno-porodičnog mita” (Duraković, 1988: 21).

⁶ “His heart flutters with love for the people, not when he sings about Dušan’s armies leaving for Constantinople, but when he sees the unwilling poor looking for a better life are going to America. [...] It is certain: it is a different, more reasonable, deeper and better patriotism than all that emphasis and rhetoric, which we are used to encounter in countless of our patriotic songs” (Skerlić, 1920).

“All of Aleksa Šantić’s intimate poetry is a painfully confessional, evocatively elegiac image of the former warmth and beauty of a world closed in the fullness of initial and universal values and the family and love cosmos, and cruelly destroyed by the tragedy of the transitoriness of life. And just as the epic folk song and the patriotic poetry of the Serbian romantics was the basis on which he built his own poetics of patriotic-social song, so is the folk lyrical song, and above all Sevdalinka [...] was an inspiring tradition on which Šantić created his world of love and intimate family myth” (Duraković, 1988: 21).

kolektivnog blagostanja okupljenog oko tradicijom definiranih duhovnih koordinata, ali sadržaj svoje poezije crpi iz sadašnjosti, ponajviše u slici onih društveno i politički potlačenih, “uvodeći u poeziju ribare, ugljare, kiridžije, pečalbare, sejače, kopače, žeteoce” (Đurić, 1963: 10). Preko ugnjetenih masa, Šantić je provlačio duh nacionalnog oslobođenja, vjerujući da nacionalno oslobođenje ujedno znači i socijalno. Međutim, i nakon što je Srbija oslobođena stranog tutorstva, “mučenici nisu skinuti sa krsta, s ruku nisu spali ‘lanci zveri slepe’ [...] U stvari, ništa se nije promenilo, bedni život nastavljao je svoj odvratni tok” (Đurić, 1963: 18-19).

Upravo, originalnost Šantićevog stvaralaštva, novo što donosi našoj poeziji, jeste, prema Đuriću, pored potpunog prikaza bijede narodnog života, to što “Do njega patriotsko osećanje nikad nije bilo u toj meri i socijalno. On je prvi širom otvorio vrata lirike znojavom narodu, njegovim teškim radovima i mukama” (Đurić, 1963: 22), zbog čega ga vjerovatno Skerlić u *Istoriji nove srpske književnosti* svrstava ne u romantičarske, već pjesnike realizma, iako je problematična tvrdnja da uopće postoji poezija realizma. Ali možda je najveći doprinos Šantićeve poezije ono što sjajno primjećuje Radomir Konstantinović, a to je da Šantić pravi sintezu romantičarskog, nacionalnog herojstva i herojstva seljaka ili žrtve.⁷ “Motiv preobražavalačkog, herojsko-samo-žrtvujućeg stradanja, kojim se čovek uzvišava, na putu ka apsolutnoj univerzalnosti kao apsolutnoj istini, u blesku njene lepote, jeste kod njega dosledno golgotsko-vaskrsni religijski motiv, koji će se izražavati i u njegovoj patetično stilizovanoj lirici romantičarskog patriotizma kao herojskog žrtvovanja za slobodu, ali i u njegovoj lirici posvećenoj seljaku, i, ne manje, u njegovoj najintimnijoj (neposredno ličnoj) lirici” (Konstantinović, 1983: 13).

⁷ “To jemči ‘jedinstvo’ njegovog sabranog pesničkog dela, u prvom redu jedinstvo njegove poezije romantičarskog patriotizma i poezije religijskog transcendentalizma posvećene seljaku. Otuda patriotska poezija ovog pesnika nije, kao u delu većine drugih srpskih pesnika ovog doba, protivurečna ostalim njegovim pesničkim tokovima (jedino romantičar zna za ovakvo jedinstvo, jer jedino je on uvek na istom ‘poslu’ traženja religijski nad-egzistencijalnog kao apsolutnog: apsolutne slobode, apsolutne ljubavi, apsolutne čistote), ali otuda je Šantić i produbio nacionalni romantizam ovim romantizmom seljaka. Za ovu sintezu romantičarskog heroja i herojskog (herojski-stradalničkog) seljaka ne zna ni jedan drugi pesnik srpske poezije zato što jedino Šantić u ‘hristovskoj mucu’ seljaka vidi svojevrsni oblik golgotsko-vaskrsnog religijskog mita, koji je i u samoj osnovi njegovog romantizma heroja: izvan ovakve, religijske svesti, ropski seljački (kmetovski) rad je samo ropstvo bez nagrade, a ne podvižništvo na putu vrhovne ‘žarke milošte’. (Zbog toga i jeste Šantić video seljaka kao objekta eksploatacije, bez oreola, u časovima svoje religijske krize, kao što su i ta otkrića bila, takode, jemstvo njegove religijske krize i onoga ‘gašenja’ svetlosti.)” (Konstantinović, 1983: 59).

Such a poem is certainly “Veče na školju” (Evening on the Isles) where we see a different Šantić, a “poet of the moment”, in which silence is the “loudest” or best poetic place. If the quality and advantage of poetry is to produce the highest possible quality of meaning in the smallest possible quantitative space, then this poem is of the highest quality. Here, Šantić is not descriptive, which true poetry cannot take, but suggestive: *There sounds the knell / of a bell, / the cliffs with it are loud / With sighs and moan / monotone / prays the humble crowd. / Their heads low bent / penitent / before their God they kneel / But he is mute, / absolute / deaf to their appeal.*⁷

In many poems of a social nature, Šantić will give priority to the social over the national, showing that the common man and worker “is much more and in any case much more directly tormented and pressured by social injustice than by national depression, by a bitter sense of fatigue and hunger than by patriotic conditions” (Bogdanović, 1979). Šantić longed for the past, for the patriarchal warmth of the “pre-holiday evening” and the certainty of clear social roles and the folk, primordial values of collective well-being gathered around the spiritual coordinates defined by tradition, but he draws the content of his poetry from the present, mostly in the image of those who are socially and politically oppressed, “introducing into poetry fishermen, coal miners, hire carriers of goods, guest-workers, sowers, diggers, reapers” (Đurić, 1963: 10). Through the oppressed masses, Šantić spread the spirit of national liberation, believing that national liberation also means social liberation. However, even after Serbia was freed from foreign tutelage, “the martyrs were not taken off the cross, the ‘chains of the blind beast’ did not fall from their hands [...] In fact, nothing changed, the miserable life continued its disgusting course” (Đurić, 1963: 18-19).

Precisely, the originality of Šantić’s creativity, the new thing he brings to our poetry, is, according to Đurić, in addition to the complete depiction of the misery of the people’s life, the fact that “Until him, patriotic feeling was never social to that extent. He was the first to open wide the door of lyricism to the sweaty people, their hard work and suffering” (Đurić, 1963: 22), which is probably why Skerlić in the *Istorija nove srpske književnosti* (History of New Serbian Literature) classifies him not as a romantic poet, but as a realist poet, although the claim that realist poetry exists at all is problematic. But perhaps the greatest contribution of Šantić’s poetry

⁷ Translated by Lenarčić, 2004: 133.

Čovjek se kod Šantića golgotski uzvisuje nad vlastitom egzistencijom. U slikanju ljudi sa dna i njihovoj teškoj svakodnevici, Šantić nije pesimista. Šantićev mrak je samo podstrek borbe za svjetlost, nesloboda podstrek za slobodu, nepravda podstrek za pravdu. Šantićev narod nije onaj koji kuka nad svojom sudbinom, već onaj koji je hoće promijeniti i koji u mucu vidi konačni nadzemaljski smisao: *S mučenim robljem mučenica budi / I s njime stupaj krstu i Golgoti!* (“Muzi”).

Šantić je veliki u Hristovom i kršćanskom smislu veličine, jer je pronašao smisao u patnji, u mucu. Šantić je sveštenik s perom pjesnika. On je pjesnički hrabrio, poput nekolicine vjerskih propovjednika, vjerskom, duboko emocionalno utvrđenom simbolikom, uobličenom u koliko-toliko uspješan lirski izraz. Bez obzira na sve, Šantiću se treba odati počast jer je znao pogoditi emotivnu žicu prostog čovjeka, znao je, kao i Hrist, šta čovjeku treba da bi cijenio sebe i bio zadovoljan sobom u pasionskoj egzistenciji: *Moj život nije protekao zaludu! / Plodove svoje teko sam u trudu, / I moje čelo mnogo trnje para.* (“Moj život”) ili *I znam: što oštro ralo dublje rije, / Sve ljepša klica na svjetlilo bije [...] Po ljutom kršu peo sam se bogu* (“Uz hridi života”). Uspinjajući ka esenciji Šantić ostvaruje pjesnički oblikujući svoje prepoznatljive “svjetionike utjehe i podstreka: domovinu, prirodu, majku, boga, Hrista” (Milanović, 1975: 28), na njima gradeći moralni svijet čvrstog oslonca utemeljenog na sentimentalno-metafizičkom odnosu prema stvarnosti.

Spojivši u neraskidiv čvor nacionalni ili narodni i religijski ili vjerski sentiment, kao samorazumljiv i prirodan odnos primordijalne datosti, Šantić je bio glasnogovornik jednog općeprihvaćenog, narodnog stanja duha koje jedino putem snažne kolektivne identifikacije sebe može smatrati bitnim dijelom stvarnosti.

Skoro svi srpski pisci u Bosni i Hercegovini bili su ujedinjeni oko ideje da tuđinska austrougarska vlast ugrožava vitalne interese srpskog naroda. Otpor tuđinskoj vlasti rezultirao je plodonosnim društveno-kulturnim djelovanjem⁸ kojem je primarni cilj bio

is what Radomir Konstantinović brilliantly notes, namely that Šantić creates a synthesis of romantic, national heroism and the heroism of a peasant or a victim.⁸ “The motif of transforming, heroic-self-sacrificing suffering, with which man exalts himself, on the way to absolute universality as absolute truth, in the flash of its beauty, for him is a consistently Golgotha-Resurrection religious motif, which will also be expressed in his pathetically stylized lyrics of romantic patriotism as a heroic sacrifice for freedom, but also in his lyrical poems dedicated to the peasant, and, no less, in his most intimate (directly personal) lyrical poems” (Konstantinović, 1983: 13).

A man, in Šantić’s poems, is exalting himself the same as in Golgotha, above his own existence. In painting people from the bottom and their difficult everyday lives, Šantić is not a pessimist. Šantić’s darkness is only an incentive to fight for light, unfreedom an incentive to freedom, injustice an incentive to justice. Šantić’s people are not those who cried over their misfortune, but those who want to change it and who see the ultimate supernatural meaning in their suffering: *With martyred slave be the martyr / And with him tread to the cross and Golgotha!* (“Muzi” / To the Muse).

Šantić is great in Christ’s and Christian sense of greatness because he found meaning in suffering, in torment. Šantić is a priest with a poet’s pen. He was poetically encouraging as a few religious preachers, with religious, deeply emotionally determined symbolism, shaped into a more or less successful lyrical expression. Regardless of everything, Šantić should be honoured because he knew how to strike the emotional chord of a simple person, he knew, like Christ, what a person needs in order to value himself and be satisfied with himself in a passionate existence: *My life has not passed in vain! / I have reaped the fruits*

⁸ *Zora* i “Gusle” pokretači su kulturno-duhovnog preporoda Mostara. Vjerovatno je najznačajniji trenutak Šantićevog pjesničkog profiliranja i razvoja nastanak časopisa *Zora*, koji Dučić, Corović i Šantić osnivaju 1896. godine u Mostaru, koji je koncem 19. stoljeća, u periodu nastajanja i jačanja kulturnih i nacionalnih pokreta, bio jedno od centralnih mjesta otpora protiv austrougarske vlasti. Zasluga “*Zora* nije samo u tome što je podigla i odnegovala nekoliko dobrih pisaca, nego što je čitavom jednom pokoljenju i jednom borbenom kraju omilila književnost, i to onu nacionalnu, što je književnost povezala sa savremenim političkim i socijalnim događajima i zbivanjima, i što je, najzad, uspjela da tu književnost potpuno stavi u službu svome narodu i prilagodi je njegovim težnjama i zadacima” (Radulović, 1953: 13-14). Slična je bila i uloga Srpskog pjevačkog i kulturno-

⁸ “This guarantees the ‘unity’ of his collected poetic work, primarily the unity of his poetry of romantic patriotism and the poetry of religious transcendentalism dedicated to the peasant. Hence, the patriotic poetry of this poet is not, as in the work of most other Serbian poets of this era, contradictory to his other poetic trends (only a romantic knows about this kind of unity, because only he is always on the same ‘job’ of seeking the religiously super-existential as absolute: absolute freedom, absolute love, absolute purity), but this is where Šantić deepened national romanticism with this peasant romanticism. No other poet of Serbian poetry knows about this synthesis of the romantic hero and the heroic (heroic-suffering) peasant, because only Šantić sees in the ‘Christ’s Passion’ of the peasant a kind of form of the Golgotha-Resurrection religious myth, which is in the very basis of his romanticism of the hero: beyond with this kind of religious consciousness, slave peasant (serf) work is only slavery without reward, not asceticism on the path of the supreme ‘ardent almsgiving’. (This is why Šantić saw the peasant as an object of exploitation, without a halo, in the hours of his religious crisis, just as these discoveries were also the guarantee of his religious crisis and that ‘extinguishing’ of light.)” (Konstantinović, 1983: 59).

probuditi i osvijestiti narodno i nacionalno pitanje i položaj, gdje se narodno i nacionalno oslobađanje poimalo kao uslov za socijalno blagostanje. I to je ponajviše, među svim drugim, primjetno upravo u lirici Šantića koji, u najvećem dijelu svoje socijalne lirike, stavlja znak jednakosti između socijalnog i nacionalnog, pa je tako seljak kod Šantića “simbol nacije, tako da je slava seljaka uvek i slava nacije” (Konstantinović, 1983: 58-59).

Kada govorimo o Šantiću kao romantičarskom pjesniku, prvo od čega moramo poći jeste romantičarski “paradoks”, primjetan i kod Šantića, da se na jednoj strani nalazi snažna potreba za pripadnošću, dok s druge strane imamo snažnu potrebu za intimizmom. Slijepčević će pisati da je Šantić “Krv junaka, duša devojačka [...] Peva narodni pesnik junacki od zore do mraka, ali devojački tuguje intimni pesnik od mraka do zore” (Slijepčević, 1934: 147-148). Dakle, intimni romantičar, kojeg će mnogi nazvati i jedinim pravim ili izvornim romantičarem, jeste onaj koji bježi od stvarnosti u visine i zvijezde, negirajući život i društvo, gdje se romantičarska ličnost osjeća tuđom, jer zemaljsko nije po njegovoj mjeri, pa čezne za beskrajnim visinama, dalekim prostranstvima, imaginarnim bivstvovanjima. Zato je romantičarski pjesnik usamljen u svijetu, jer je ovaj svijet negacija ideala lijepog i uzvišenog. S druge strane, možemo pratiti i onaj aspekt romantizma “restaurativne sklonosti”, koji je zainteresiran za kolektivnu prošlost temeljenu na krvnim i duhovnim vezama, gdje se u prvom planu ističu nacionalna, narodna, rasna i vjerska pripadnost.

Suštinu Šantićevog romantizma Konstantinović vidi u esencijalnom koje nadvisuje egzistencijalno. “Za ovog patrijarhalca, Sina i Brata, egzistencijalno je, kao i za romantičare, prljavo. Egzistencijalno je antiteza esencijalnom, koje je čisti sjaj, apsolutna visina, apsolutna svetlost apsolutne čistote. Romantizam njegov jeste upravo u toj čistoti nad-egzistencijalnom, u toj esencijalnosti koja je, kao apsolutna svetlost, samo na ‘visu’” (Konstantinović, 1983: 54). Težnja za beskonačnim i beskrajnim je opća karakteristika romantizma, a kako je beskrajan nemoć racionalno pojmiti, romantizam osnažuje osjećajni aspekt bića i odnosa prema stvarnosti, često

of my labour; / And my forehead thorns ripped plenty (“Moj život” / My life) or: *And I know: when the sharp plow burrows deeper; / Better looking sprout pounce to light [...] I climbed the rough karst to God* (“Uz hridi života” / Along the cliff of life). The ascent to the essence is achieved by Šantić poetically shaping his recognizable “lighthouses of comfort and encouragement: homeland, nature, mother, God, Christ” (Milanović, 1975: 28), on them, building a moral world of solid support based on a sentimental-metaphysical relationship to reality.

Connecting national or folk and religious or sacred sentiment into an unbreakable knot, as a self-evident and natural relationship of primordial givenness, Šantić was the spokesman for a generally accepted, people’s state of mind which can consider itself an essential part of reality only through a strong collective identification.

Almost all Serbian writers in Bosnia and Herzegovina were united around the idea that the foreign Austro-Hungarian rule threatened the vital interests of the Serbian people. Resistance to foreign rule resulted in fruitful socio-cultural activities⁹ whose primary goal was to awaken and raise awareness of the ethnical and national issues and positions, where ethnical and national liberation was seen as a condition for social well-being. This is most noticeable, among all others, precisely in Šantić’s lyrical poems, which, in the largest part of his social lyrical poems, puts a sign of equality between the social and the national, so in Šantić, the peasant is “a symbol of the nation, so, the glory of the peasant is always the glory of the nation” (Konstantinović, 1983: 58-59).

⁹ Zora and “Gusle” are the initiators of the cultural and spiritual revival of Mostar. Probably the most significant moment in Šantić’s poetic profiling and development is the creation of the journal *Zora*, which Dučić, Ćorović, and Šantić founded in 1896 in Mostar, at the end of the 19th century, during the period of formation and strengthening of cultural and national movements, was one of the central places of resistance against Austro-Hungarian rule. “Zora’s merit is not only in the fact that it raised and nourished several good writers, but also in the fact that literature became endearing to the entire generation and the one fighting region, especially the national literature, that connected literature to the contemporary political and social events and happenings, and that finally managed to put that literature completely at the service of its people and adapt it to their aspirations and tasks” (Radulović, 1953: 13-14).

The role of the Serbian singing, cultural and artistic society “Gusle” was similar, which “with its theatre, choirs, reading room, tamburitza orchestra, became not only a society for cultivating art but also a centre of resistance against the Austro-Hungarian administration, a centre ‘which under a shroud of art, dreamed and performed other folk feats’ [...] At the time when Šantić was president, a part of Mostar’s, Serbian-oriented Muslims, also approached the ‘Gusle’. This action of ‘fraternization’ has particularly worried the National Government, and it is carrying the thought of completely banning the work of the Society” (Lešić, 1990: 152-153). The complete ban came in 1901, which was preceded by major restrictions and bans on public activity.

umjetničkog društva “Gusle” koje “sa svojim pozorištem, pjevačkim horovima, čitaonicom, tamburaškim orkestrom, postaju ne samo društvo za njegovanje umjetnosti nego i središte otpora protiv austrougarske uprave, središte ‘koje pod plaštom umjetnosti, snevalo i izvodilo i druge narodne podvige’ [...] U vrijeme kada je Šantić bio predsjednik, ‘Guslama’ pristupa i jedan dio mostarskih muslimana, srpski orijentisanih. Ova akcija ‘bratimljenja’ naročito je zabrinula Zemaljsku vladu i ona se nosi mišlju da sasvim zabrani rad Društva” (Lešić, 1990: 152-153). Do potpune zabrane došlo je 1901. godine, čemu su prethodila velika ograničenja i zabrane javnog djelovanja.

posežući, poput Šantića, za kršćanskim emotivno-simboličkim kodom.

Novalis piše da, između ostalog, romantizovati znači banalnom dati uzvišen smisao. Upravo u tome slobodni smo prepoznati suštinu Šantićevog romantizma u kojem on daje metafizički smisao golgote i vaskrsenja onome “običnom” i “niskom”. I šta je potrebnije običnom čovjeku od vjere da njegovu “obično” bivstvoanje i djelovanje nije “obično” i da sadrži viši i neprolazni smisao.

Romantičarska umjetnost ili, bolje rečeno, romantičarski duh po mnogo čemu odgovara na potrebe narodnih kognitivno-afektivnih potreba i vrlo lahko može preći u pomodnost i populizam, naročito onda kada se čulno apsolutizira i podigne na razinu jedinog instrumenta spoznaje, dakle kada čulno u potpunosti postane neosviješteno i postane totalna emocija.

Iako je “pjevao o Srbadiji i srpstvu i zori koja će svanuti porobljenom narodu” (Lešić, 1990: 95) i bio pristrasan prema srpstvu i srpskim narodnim i nacionalnim interesima, Šantić nikad nije isključivao i poništavao onog drugog, osim ako taj drugi vrši otvorenu nepravdu (poput tuđinskih okupatora). Zanimljivo je da Šantića mnogi mostarski muslimani smatraju svojim pjesnikom, pa ne čudi što će Hamza Humo, pomalo šaljivo, zapisati da je Šantić najveći muslimanski pjesnik, a Skender Kulenović da su Šantića svojim pjesnikom smatrale muslimanske djevojke, hodže i hadžije. Ali nije Šantić bio nikakav “muslimanski pjesnik”. Šantić je samo prenosio atmosferu i impuls sredine za koju je bio fizički, duhovno i stvaralački vezan. Ako je Andrić pisac “sve Bosne”, onda je Šantić pisac sveg Mostara, onakvog kakav neposredno jeste u svim svojim unutarnjim i vanjskim konkretnim manifestacijama, ali i apstraktnim projekcijama. Šantić, kako navodi Ustamujić (2015), nije pjevao o Mostaru, nego je pjevao Mostar. Zbog toga je Šantića cijeli Mostar osjećao svojim, pa se opravdano ne zna “Kuda će sad Aleksa? U raj ili dženet.”

Aleksa Šantić je bio romantičarski pjesnik, ali se uglavnom i njegovom liku i djelu pristupalo romantičarski. Da je estetski kvalitet jedino mjerilo, Šantić bi ostao zapamćen tek po nekoliko antologijskih pjesama. Međutim, Šantićeva poezija nudila je sve potrebno onima koji u poeziji nisu tražili primarno estetski kvalitet, već jezički dopadljiv i razumljiv, ali prefinjen izraz vlastitih preokupacija i “svetih” mjesta, odnosno onih pitanja koja nose naj snažniji emocionalni i unutarnji kapital. Taj skladan odnos jezičke jednostavnosti (pretežno u pozitivnom smislu, dakle ne i banalnosti i trivijalnosti), sadržinske

When we talk about Šantić as a romantic poet, the first thing we have to start from is the romantic “paradox”, also noticeable in Šantić, that on the one hand there is a strong need for belonging, while on the other hand, we have a strong need for intimacy. Slijepčević will write that Šantić is “Blood of a hero, soul of a girl [...] A folk poet sings heroically from dawn to dusk, but an intimate poet mourns girlishly from dusk to dawn” (Slijepčević, 1934: 147-148). So, the intimate romantic, whom many will call the only true or original romantic, is the one who runs away from reality to the heights and stars, denying life and society where the romantic personality feels alienated because the earthly is not up to his standard, so he longs for endless heights, distant expanses, imaginary existences. That is why the romantic poet is lonely in the world because this world is the negation of the ideal of the beautiful and sublime. On the other hand, we can also follow that aspect of romanticism’s “restorative tendency” which is interested in the collective past based on blood and spiritual ties, where national, ethnic, racial, and religious affiliations stand out in the foreground.

Konstantinović sees the gist of Šantić’s romanticism in the essential that transcends the existential. “For this patriarch, Son, and Brother, existential, as well as for romantics, is dirty. Existential is the antithesis of essential, which is pure brilliance, absolute height, and absolute light of absolute purity. His romanticism is precisely in that purity of the super-existential, in that essentiality which, like absolute light, is only ‘above’” (Konstantinović, 1983: 54). The aspiration for the infinite and the endless is a general characteristic of romanticism, and since infinity is impossible to understand rationally, romanticism strengthens the emotional aspect of being and the relationship to reality, often reaching, like Šantić, for the Christian emotional-symbolic code.

Novalis writes that, among other things, to romanticize means to give sublime meaning to the trivial. Precisely in this, we are free to recognize the essence of Šantić’s romanticism, in which he gives the metaphysical sense of Golgotha and resurrection to the “ordinary” and “low”. And what is more necessary for an ordinary person than faith that his “ordinary” existence and actions are not “ordinary” and that they contain a higher and timeless meaning.

Romantic art or, rather, the romantic spirit, in many ways, responds to the needs of the people’s cognitive-affective needs and can very easily pass into fashion and populism, especially when the sensuous

prigodnosti potrebama kolektiviteta i lirskog osjećanja totalne emocije, od Šantića je učinio “mit koji daleko premašuje snagu njegove poezije” (Konstantinović, 1983: 7).

2. Arhiv Alekse Šantića u Nacionalnoj i univerzitetskoj biblioteci Bosne i Hercegovine

Arhivsku građu Alekse Šantića koju baštini Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine unutar odjeljenja Specijalnih zbirki čine pisma, prepiske, korespondencije, fotografije, dopisnice i razglednice. Ovi biografski i historijski dokumenti služe kao izvor za faktografsko upoznavanje jednog dijela Šantićevo života i djelovanja.

Kvantitativno najznačajniji dio građe tiče se Aleksinih pisama upućenih Miletu Pavloviću Krpi,⁹ porodičnom prijatelju kod kojeg bi Aleksa boravio u Beogradu.¹⁰ U dva pisma, Šantić piše s kojim se sve problemima susretao sa “razuzdanim” i “nastranim” bratom Jakovom, te ga moli da se stara o njemu dok boravi u Beogradu.¹¹ Odani Aleksin prijatelj Milorad uzeo je na sebe brigu o Jakovu, ali nakon nepuna dva mjeseca Milorad piše Aleksi kako ne može da obuzda Jakova koji sve čini na svoju ruku. Jakov Šantić, Aleksin brat, također je bio pjesnik. Međutim, za razliku od Alekse, Jakov je bio avanturističkog duha, nepripitomljena i buntovna narav, boemska priroda koja je napustila ovaj svijet u 24. godini života. U arhivu se nalazi i nekoliko Jakovljevihih rukopisnih pjesama, priča i pisama.¹²

U pismima upućenim Miletu Pavloviću, između 1920. i 1923. godine, vidi se koliko je Šantić teško živio u zdravstvenom, a naročito materijalnom smislu, pišući kako nema dovoljno novaca ni za dolazak u Beograd. U jednom će pismu čak moliti Pavlovića da isposluje besplatnu željezničku kartu za Dalmaciju, za njega, njegovu sestru i sestričinu, jer sestričina Nadica treba savjet liječnika.

U finansijskoj krizi Šantić se, među ostalima, obraćao i Odboru Kola srpskih sestara u Banja Luci,¹³ koje je osnovano da pomaže Srbe u neoslobođenim krajevima, ali oni na njegove molbe odgovaraju kako nemaju novaca.

⁹ Milorad Pavlović Krpa ili Mile Pavlović Krpa (1865–1957) bio je veliki prijatelj Alekse i njegove porodice. To nam potvrđuje i brojčano značajna korespondencija između Alekse ili između porodice Šantić i Mileta. Mile Pavlović je bio srpski književnik, publicista i nacionalni djelatnik.

¹⁰ Ova pisma i dopisnice evidentirani su u inventarnoj knjizi arhiva pod brojevima Ms 527–Ms 555, Ms 599/1–3.

¹¹ Pismo pod brojem Ms 527 i Ms 528.

¹² Nalaze se pod brojevima: Ms 561, Ms 587, Ms 759, Ms 869.

¹³ Pismo se nalazi pod privremenim inventarnim brojem PB 69.

is absolutized and elevated to the level of the only instrument of cognition, that is when the sensuous in it becomes completely unconscious and becomes a total emotion.

Although he “sang about all Serbians and Serbdom and the dawn that will rise on the enslaved people” (Lešić, 1990: 95) and was biased towards Serbdom and Serbian ethnical and national interests, Šantić never excluded and annulled the other, unless the other committed open injustice (like foreign occupiers). It is interesting that many Mostar Muslims consider Šantić their poet, so it is not surprising that Hamza Humo, somewhat jokingly, will write that Šantić is the greatest Muslim poet, and Skender Kulenović that Muslim girls, khawajas and hajjis considered Šantić their poet. But Šantić was no “Muslim poet”. Šantić only transmitted the atmosphere and impulse of the environment to which he was physically, spiritually, and creatively bound. If Andrić is the writer of “all of Bosnia”, then Šantić is the writer of all of Mostar as it is in all its internal and external concrete manifestations, as well as abstract projections. Šantić as stated by Ustamujčić (2015), did not sing about Mostar, but he sang Mostar. Because of this, Šantić felt the whole of Mostar as his, so it is not justifiably known “Where will Aleksa go now? To Heaven or Jannah.”

Aleksa Šantić was a romantic poet, but his character and work were generally approached in a romantic way. If aesthetic quality were the only criterion, Šantić would be remembered only for a few anthology songs. However, Šantić’s poetry offered everything necessary to those who were not primarily looking for an aesthetic quality in poetry, but rather a linguistically appealing and comprehensible, but refined expression of their own preoccupations and “sacred” places, i.e., those issues that carry the strongest emotional and inner capital. This harmonious relationship between linguistic simplicity (predominantly in a positive sense, so not banality and triviality), the appropriateness of the content to the needs of the collective, and the lyrical feeling of total emotion, made of Šantić “a myth that far exceeds the power of his poetry” (Konstantinović, 1983: 7).

2. Archive of Aleksa Šantić in the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Aleksa Šantić’s archival material kept by the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the Department of Special Collections consists of letters, correspondence, photographs,

Također, značajan dio građe tiče se pisama upućenih od Pera Šantića, Aleksinog brata, Miletu Pavloviću Krpi. Među ovim pismima sačuvana su pisma u kojima brat Pera redovito i temeljito izvještava Milorada Pavlovića o Aleksinom stanju pred smrt koje je krajnje teško.¹⁴

Aleksa Šantić je bio bolešljive prirode te ćemo pronaći mnoga pisma u kojima se izvještava o zdravstvenom stanju. Ali ne samo Aleksa, već su mnogi Šantići lahko obolijevali, pa ćemo među građom pronaći i Aleksina pisma njegovoj nećakinji Radojki koja se liječila u Beču i Trstu. Radojka, s kojom je Aleksa imao prisan i skrbički odnos, kćerka je Aleksine najmlađe sestre Stake. Radojka je rano ostala bez oba roditelja, pa se o njoj ponajviše brinuo Aleksa. Tokom Prvog svjetskog rata, Radojku je Šantić poveo sa sobom u izgnanstvo, kada su mu policijske vlasti naredile da mora napustiti Mostar i odseliti u Konjic. U pismima Radojki, Šantić se pretežno zanima za njeno zdravstveno stanje i ponašanje. S obzirom na to da ju je smatrao svojim djetetom, jedno pismo potvrđuje kako joj je slao novac za izmirenje troškova liječenja i njenih dodatnih potreba.¹⁵

Unutar arhiva, značajno je pomenuti jedno pismo iz Trsta koje piše Lazar Aničić izvještavajući o napredovanju Alekse u učenju i odgoju.¹⁶ Aleksina majka Mara Aničić porijeklom je iz Trsta, gdje su živjela njena braća Todor i Lazar. Zahvaljujući braku Riste i Mare, uspostavljaju se trgovačke veze između dvije porodice. Godine 1879. u Trst, kod braće Aničića, na školovanje, putuju Pera i Aleksa, s ciljem da nauče trgovački posao, njemački i italijanski jezik, da vide svijeta te da se uljude. Za Aleksin odgoj u Trstu bio je odgovoran Lazar Aničić. Od sve nauke, Aleksa je posebne sklonosti pokazivao prema italijanskom jeziku.

¹⁴ Ova pisma i dopisnice evidentirani su u inventarnoj knjizi arhiva od broja Ms 406 do broja Ms 416. Ova pisma i dopisnice kupila je Narodna biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine (danas Nacionalna i univerzitetska biblioteka BiH) od Mile Pavlovića 1951. godine. Od otkupljenih dokumenata tu su još telegram Mili Pavloviću od Ljubice Šantić i djece, poslat iz Mostara u Beograd 16. 10. 1924. godine (Ms 417), u kojem saopštava da je "naš dragi tata Pero jutros preminuo". Od Mileta Pavlovića Narodna biblioteka BiH je u 1951. i 1952. godini otkupila još građe koja se nalazi evidentirana pod brojevima Ms 527–Ms 561, Ms 755–Ms 759, Ms 869 i Ms 871. Pored Mileta Pavlovića, arhivska građa vezana za život i djelo Alekse Šantića otkupljena je još od Perse Čorović 1951. godine (Ms 587–Ms 599), Radojke Petrašić (Ms 665–Ms 669), Branka Šantića 1952. godine (Ms 781–Ms 786) i Đure Vitkovića iz Sarajeva 1952. godine (Ms 898–Ms 901). Pismo pod brojem Ms 934 i jedna fotografija Ms 935 su nepoznatog porijekla, odnosno nije poznato na koji su način dospjeli u Biblioteku.

¹⁵ Pisma Alekse upućena Radojki evidentirana su kao Ms 667/1–4 i Ms 669/1–4 (ukupno osam pisama).

¹⁶ Pismo pod brojem Ms 783 Lazar Aničić šalje Peri Šantiću 1881. godine.

letter cards, and postcards. These biographical and historical documents serve as a source for a factual introduction to a part of Šantić's life and activities.

Quantitatively, the most significant part of the material concerns Aleksa's letters addressed to Mile Pavlović Krpa,¹⁰ a family friend with whom Aleksa would stay in Belgrade.¹¹ In two letters, Šantić writes about all the problems he encountered with his "wild" and "freakish" brother Jakov and asks him to take care of him while he stays in Belgrade.¹² Aleksa's loyal friend Milorad takes care of Jakov, but after less than two months, Milorad writes to Aleksa that he cannot restrain Jakov, who does everything on his own. Jakov Šantić, Aleksa's brother, was also a poet. However, unlike Aleksa, Jakov had an adventurous spirit, an untamed and rebellious nature, a bohemian nature that left this world at the age of 24. The archive also contains several of Jakov's handwritten poems, stories, and letters.¹³

In the letters sent to Mile Pavlović, between 1920 and 1923, it is clear how difficult Šantić's life was in terms of health, and especially material terms, writing that he did not have enough money even to come to Belgrade. In one letter, he even asked Pavlović to negotiate a free train ticket to Dalmatia for him, his sister, and his niece, because his niece Nadica needed a doctor's advice.

In the financial crisis, Šantić, among others, addressed the Committee of Kolo srpskih sestara in Banja Luka,¹⁴ which was founded to help Serbs in unliberated areas, but they responded to his requests that they have no money.

Also, a significant part of the material concerns the letters of Pera Šantić, Aleksa's brother, addressed to Milan Pavlović Krpa. Among these letters, in preserved letters, brother Pera, regularly and thoroughly informs Milorad Pavlović about Aleksa's condition before his death, which is extremely difficult.¹⁵

¹⁰ Milorad Pavlović Krpa or Mile Pavlović Krpa (1865–1957) was a great friend of Aleksa and his family. This is confirmed by the significant number of correspondences between Aleksa and between the Šantić family and Mile. Mile Pavlović was a Serbian writer, publicist, and national worker.

¹¹ These letters and letter cards are recorded in the archive's inventory book under numbers Ms 527–Ms 555, Ms 599/1–3.

¹² Letters under numbers Ms 527 and Ms 528.

¹³ They are under the numbers: Ms 561, Ms 587, Ms 759, and Ms 869.

¹⁴ The letter is under a temporary inventory number PB 69.

¹⁵ These letters and letter cards are recorded in the inventory book of the archive from the number Ms 406–Ms 416. These letters and letter cards were bought by the National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina (today the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina) from Mile Pavlović in 1951. Among the purchased documents, there is also (Ms 417) a telegram to Mile Pavlović from Ljubica Šantić and children, sent from Mostar to Belgrade on Oc-

Upravo u pismu Pere upućenom ocu Risti Šantiću, iz Ljubljane 1881. godine, gdje su Pera i Aleksa boravili i školovali se za trgovački zanat, Pera javlja da Aleksa ide na kurs za učenje italijanskog jezika. U ovom pismu se Pera žali što otac ne odgovara na pisma.¹⁷

Značajan dio građe čini Aleksina korespondencija sa Jovom Šmitranom, urednikom lista *Zvono*, za kojeg se sumnjalo da je podržavao atentat na F. Ferdinanda, zbog čega biva interniran. Kako je poznavao češki jezik, prevodio je neke Šantićeve pjesme, a njihovo poznanstvo jača pojavom ilegalnih listova. Iz prepiske se vidi da Šmitran moli Šantića da prevede *Pesme roba* od Svatopluka Čeha na srpski jezik. U jednom pismu Šantić piše da je počeo prevoditi *Jutarnje pesme* od istog pisca. Također, u jednoj prepisci Šantić govori o socijalnoj situaciji pred kraj rata te kako se sprema objaviti knjigu socijalnih pjesama. Mnoga pisma govore i o Šantićevom lošem zdravstvenom stanju koje je pogoršano tokom rata.¹⁸

Arhiva sadrži i značajan broj fotografija na kojima se nalazi Aleksa sam ili zajedno sa porodicom i prijateljima. Ove fotografije su, pretpostavlja se, dio porodičnog arhiva jer su ih Biblioteci prodale Aleksina sestra i supruga Svetozara Ćorovića Persa Ćorović te Radojka Šantić, udata Petrašić.¹⁹

Treba napomenuti da ostavština Alekse Šantića u inventarnim knjigama nije hronološki zabilježena, već onako kako je pristizala u Biblioteku. Građa se ne nalazi na jednom mjestu, te nam je cilj da kroz izradu kataloga koji je u pripremi objedinimo, hronološki i detaljnije (p)opišemo i jasnije sistematiziramo ostavštinu Alekse Šantića koja se nalazi u Specijalnim zbirkama i ostalim fondovima NUBBiH. U cilju lakše dostupnosti i pristupa arhivu Alekse Šantića, digitalizirali smo sve dokumente iz njegove ostavštine.

Aleksa Šantić had a sickly nature, and many letters report on his state of health. But not only Aleksa, many members of the Šantić family got sick easily, so among the materials there are Aleksa's letters to his niece Radojka, who was treated in Vienna and Trieste. Radojka, with whom Aleksa had a close and protective relationship, is the daughter of Aleksa's youngest sister Staka. Radojka lost both parents at an early age, so Aleksa mostly took care of her. During the First World War, Šantić took Radojka into exile, when the police ordered him to leave Mostar and move to Konjic. In his letters to Radojka, Šantić is mostly interested in her state of health and behaviour. Since he considered her his child, one letter confirms that he sent her money to pay medical expenses and for her additional needs.¹⁶

Within the archive, it is important to mention a letter from Trieste written by Lazar Aničić, reporting on Aleksa's progress in learning and education.¹⁷ Aleksa's mother Mara Aničić was originally from Trieste, where her brothers Todor and Lazar lived. Thanks to the marriage of Risto and Mara, trade ties are established between the two families. In 1879, Pera and Aleksa travelled to Trieste, with the Aničić brothers, to study, with the goal of learning the trade, German and Italian languages, seeing the world, and becoming civilized. Lazar Aničić was responsible for Aleksa's education in Trieste. Of all the sciences, Aleksa showed a special preference for the Italian language. It is in Pera's letter addressed to father Risto Šantić, from Ljubljana in 1881, where Pera and Aleksa lived and studied trade, Pera reports that Aleksa is taking a course to learn the Italian language. In this letter, Pera complains that his father does not respond to letters.¹⁸

A significant part of the material is Aleksa's correspondence with Jova Šmitran, the editor of the periodical *Zvono*, who was suspected of supporting the assassination of F. Ferdinand, for which he is interned. Since he knew the Czech language, he trans-

¹⁷ Pismo pod brojem Ms 934.

¹⁸ Pod brojem Ms 898 nalazi se 31 jedinica koja se odnosi na korespondenciju sa Šmitranom, među kojima su i pjesme za objavljivanje u časopisu *Zvono* poput pjesama "Pesme zvona", "Podzemna pesma", "Na njivi" i "Pri kopanju".

¹⁹ Fotografije se nalaze pod brojevima: Ms 587, Ms 588, Ms 591, Ms 595, Ms 665, Ms 781 i Ms 935.

tober 16, 1924, in which she announces that "our dear dad Pero passed away this morning". In 1951 and 1952, the National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina bought more material from Mile Pavlović, which is recorded under numbers (Ms 527–Ms 561, Ms 755–Ms 759, Ms 869 and Ms 871). In addition to Mile Pavlović, archival material related to the life and work of Aleksa Šantić was purchased from Persa Ćorović in 1951 (Ms 587–Ms 599), Radojka Petrašić (Ms 665–Ms 669), Branko Šantić in 1952 (Ms 781–Ms 786) and Đuro Vitković from Sarajevo in 1952 (Ms 898–Ms 901). Letter under number Ms 934 and one photograph Ms 935 are of unknown origin, i.e., it is not known how they arrived at the Library.

¹⁶ Aleksa's letters to Radojka were recorded from Ms 667/1–4 and Ms 669/1–4 (a total of eight letters).

¹⁷ Letter with number Ms 783, Lazar Aničić sends to Pera Šantić in 1881.

¹⁸ Letter with number Ms 934.

lated some of Šantić's poems, and their acquaintance grew stronger with the appearance of illegal periodicals. From the correspondence, it can be seen that Šmitran asks Šantić to translate *Písně otroka* (Poems of the Slave) by Svatopluk Čech in the Serbian language. In one letter, Šantić writes that he started translating *Jitřní písňe* (Morning Poems) by the same writer. Also, in one correspondence, Šantić talks about the social situation before the end of the war and how he is preparing to publish a book of social poems. Many letters also talk about Šantić's poor health, which worsened during the war.¹⁹

The archive also contains a significant number of photos showing Aleksa alone or together with his family and friends. It is assumed that these photos are part of the family archive because they were sold

to the Library by Aleksa's sister and wife of Svetozar Ćorović – Persa Ćorović and Radojka Šantić, married Petrašić.²⁰

It should be noted that Aleksa Šantić's legacy is not recorded chronologically in the inventory books, but as it arrived at the Library. The materials are not located in one place, and the goal is to unify, chronologically and in more detail list, describe and more clearly systematize the legacy of Aleksa Šantić, which is in the Special Collections and other funds of the NULB&H, through the creation of a catalogue that is being prepared. In order to facilitate accessibility and access to the archive of Aleksa Šantić, all documents from his legacy are digitized.

¹⁹ Letter with number Ms 898. There are 31 items related to correspondence with Šmitran, among which are poems for publication in the journal *Zvono* such as "Pesme zvona" (Bell songs), "Podzemna pesma" (Underground song), "Na njivi" (In the field) and "Pri kopanju" (While digging)

²⁰ The photos are under the numbers: Ms 587, Ms 588, Ms 591, Ms 595, Ms 665, Ms 781, and Ms 935.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

- Bogdanović, M. (1979). *Kritički radovi Milana Bogdanovića*. Novi Sad – Beograd: Matica srpska – Institut za književnost i umetnost.
- Duraković, E. (1988). *Riječ i svijet: studije i eseji o bosanskohercegovačkim pjesnicima dvadesetog vijeka*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Đurić, V. (1963). *Aleksa Šantić*. Beograd: Rad.
- Konstantinović, R. (1983). *Biće i jezik: u iskustvu pesnika srpske kulture dvadesetog veka. Knj. 8*. Beograd – Novi Sad: Prosveta – Rad – Matica srpska.
- Lešić, J. (1990). *Aleksa Šantić: roman o pjesnikovom životu*. Sarajevo: “Veselin Masleša”.
- Milanović, B. (1988). Djelo Alekse Šantića. U: Šantić, A. *Izabrane pjesme*. (str. 5-37). Sarajevo: “Veselin Masleša”.
- Palavestra, P. (2013). *Istorija moderne srpske književnosti: zlatno doba: 1892–1918*. Službeni glasnik.
- Popović, P., & Slepčević, P. (1920). *O pedeset-godišnjici Alekse Šantića*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Radulović, J. (1953). Aleksa Šantić. U: Šantić, A. *Pesme*. (str. 7-27). Beograd: Znanje.
- Skerlić, J. (1920). *Pisci i knjige. 4*. Beograd: Knjižarnica Gece Kona.
- Skerlić, J. (1962). *Romantizam, realizam: iz “Istorije nove srpske književnosti”*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Slijepčević, P. (1974). Aleksa Šantić. U: Šantić, A. *Pretprazničko veče: izabrane pesme* (str. 5-14). Beograd: Prosveta.
- Slijepčević, P. (1934). *Ogledi*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Šantić, A. (2008). *Sabrana dela*. Beograd – Gacko: “Filip Višnjić” – DOB [i. e. Društvo za očuvanje baštine].
- Šantić, A. (2004). Evening on the Isles. *Serbian studies*, 18(1), 133.
- Ujević, T. (1974). Pjesme Alekse Šantića. U: Šantić, A. *Pretprazničko veče: izabrane pesme*. (str. 95-98). Beograd: Prosveta.
- Ustamujić, E. (2015). Šantićevi poetski identiteti. U: *Zbornik radova / Naučni skup Slovo o Aleksi Šantiću, Antunu Branku Šimiću i Zuki Džumhuru, Mostar, 24. i 25. april 2014. godine* (str. 9-20). Mostar – Sarajevo: Fakultet humanističkih nauka Univerziteta “Džemal Bijedić” – Institut za jezik Univerziteta u Sarajevu.