

From Genius to Bohemian. Authorship Figures at the Turn of the 20th Century

Protrka Štimec, Marina

Source / Izvornik: Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu : Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2021, 53, 193 - 206

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.17234/RadoviZHP.53.33>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:131:825340>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-06-28**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



From Genius to Bohemian Authorship Figures at the Turn of the 20th Century

Using some well-known examples in European and Croatian literary history, this paper analyses modalities in conceptualising authorship in the latter half of the 19th and the first decades of 20th century. When comparing dominant cultural practices and theoretical approaches at the beginning and end of this period, it becomes obvious that the Romantic concept of genius that Kant defined as “a talent for producing that for which no definite rule can be given,” genuine as nature, also determines modernist and avant-garde practices in the early 20th century. The presupposed integrity of art and life, politics and aesthetics in the artistic movements of the time generates the concept of artist/author who was expelled from the normative forces of society: outcasts, bohemians, *poète maudits*, etc. Dedicated to art and in long-lasting (internal) exile in the European semi/periphery, they often function as cultural intermediaries and exemplars of symbolic value that will be fully capitalised posthumously.

As a changing phenomenon throughout cultural and literary history, author maintains its original meaning of an originator, a creator, an authority approving of something made or written. In some languages, there is a clear difference between the author in the broader sense of the word, such as the German *Urheber*, and the literary “author” who is a “writer” (*écrivain*, *Schriftsteller*, *scrittore*, *писатель*, etc., vs. *auteur*, *author*, *autore*, *автор*). My principal interest in this paper is to determine moments in history that were crucial for a change in the concept and for the establishment of modern forms of authorship – in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries.¹ This period saw a simultaneous rise of the modern concepts of literary canon, national and world literature.

Earlier in history, in the Roman period, the writer was solely a *scribe* (“scribes”) and then, following the Greek name, a *poeta*, meaning “a maker, creator” in the artistic sense primarily, but already charged with a religious undertone (Badura, Möller 2019: 65). Their idea of “sanctified author is captured in the notion of a *poetic vates*, a ‘herald’ of prophecies encountered in Roman divination practice,

¹ This paper is part of ongoing research project European Origins of Modern Croatia: Transfer of Ideas on Political and Cultural Fields in the 18th and 19th Centuries, funded by Croatian Science Foundation (EuKor, IP-2018-01-2539).

(...) a ‘seer’ who has privileged access to truth and the gods by way of their and the Muses’ inspiration.”² (ibid.) As an *auctor* here and later on – he is described as “someone possessing *auctoritas*, vouching for a truth or an object,” a person who “sanctions, approves, *authenticates*” (ibid.: 71).

However, in earlier periods, this kind of authentication or name-guarantee of the truth was, according to Foucault (1992), usual in the natural sciences, but not in literature. This completely changed in the modern episteme (Foucault 1992: 305).

“Texts, however, that we now call ‘scientific’ (dealing with cosmology and the heavens, medicine or illness, the natural sciences or geography) were only considered truthful during the Middle Ages if the name of the author was indicated. Statements on the order of ‘Hippocrates said...’ or ‘Pliny tells us that...’ were not merely formulas for an argument based on authority; they marked a proven discourse. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a totally new conception was developed when scientific texts were accepted on their own merits and positioned within an anonymous and coherent conceptual system of established truths and methods of verification. Authentication no longer required reference to the individual who had produced them; the role of the author disappeared as an index of truthfulness and where it remained as an inventor’s name, it was merely to denote a specific theorem or proposition, a strange effect, a property, a body, a group of elements, or pathological syndrome.” (ibid.)

Around 1700, a complete change of authentication in the literary field occurred with the modernist, humanist episteme, which also altered the understanding of creativity and individuality, and connected authorship to subjectivity. In Romanticism, poetry was considered a genuine art, and the true poet was understood as a genius or a ‘sage’. The genius discourse spread in Europe at around 1800. The genius, usually imagined in the masculine form as a father, is a divine creator who creates his work of art not by imitation but rather emulation. According to Immanuel Kant (1952: 181), the genius is “the exemplary originality of the natural endowments of an individual in the free employment of his cognitive faculties.” Like forces of nature, he creates from within himself, not by following rules of aesthetics, but rather by making them for others. The author-genius mediates between the celestial and the human spheres, encouraging other geniuses to create exceptional works of art.

² According to Christian Badura and Melanie Möller (2019: 65), the concept of a poetic vates, herald or seer was used by Ennius in the proem to book seven of his *Annales* to deride his predecessor Naevius (c. 265–201 BCE). Subsequently, beginning with Virgil, it was employed affirmatively for authorial self-descriptions. In Ovid’s poetry, a “communicative stance of a self-confident, yet at times also fractured poetical ego prevails throughout. He is variously found acting as poeta, vates (‘seer’), or magister (‘teacher’), who not only presents his opus (‘work’), liber (‘book’), or carmen (‘poem’) to the reader, but also enters into a dialogue with it” (ibid.: 69).

In 19th century Croatian literature, called Illyrian at the time, the first canonised author – imagined as a representative, national poet – was Ivan Gundulić (1589-1638). Discovered from the ashes of history, his work and his personality symbolised a new perspective for the young nation on its emancipatory historical route. Enthroned as the people’s ‘poet king’, as presented on Vlaho Bukovac’s canvas *The Croatian National Revival* (1895; functioning as a festive curtain in the Croatian National Theatre in Zagreb), Gundulić was called a classical writer, the ‘Illyrian Homer/Virgil/Ovid’, one who demonstrates the greatness and eternity of human spirit overcoming the ages. The entire process of his canonisation and collective identification (national appropriation) throughout the 19th century follows a recognizable pattern of creating and empowering the “usable past” (Smith 1997: 36-59) that gathers precious symbolic value, imagined as a development following a linear progressive historical line. Great authors were presented as a valuable part of the glorious past, which all together has to be present in concrete everyday life through different symbolic practices organised in the public space (Protrka 2019: 28-41). Public celebrations enable the manifestation of common values, beliefs and emotions, by means of which abstract ideas of the nation and identity are bodily perceived and thus form concrete policies of remembrance. Similar to that, authorship – be it contemporary or historical – closely relates the lives of authors to their work, making them closely connected, perceived and valued. According to Svetlana Boym (1991: 1), the author as a discursive function of the text should be analysed in mutual relationship with his social and cultural production.³

Authorship, therefore, relies on textual and bodily integrated practices that are produced and perceived as part of a broader dynamic in the field of culture (Bourdieu 1993: 163). Romanticism, as Boym (ibid.) suggests, started with “a conscientious work on self-stylization, cultivating a limited repertoire of stock characters—from a demonic Byronesque type to a melancholic ‘sensitive man’.” They also created “a new iconography, a new repertoire of images, the indispensable element of which is the connection between art and life—making life poetic while making art autobiographical.”

This connection between art and life is demonstrated in Friedrich Schiller’s *Aesthetic Letters* (*Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen*, 1794) wherein he defines art as a genuine way of fulfilling man’s human potential. For him, the aesthetic is the genuine way to overcome human incompleteness. On the other hand, as Bennett (170) claims, aesthetic education

³ Svetlana Boym (1991: 1) is generally interested in a “reconsideration of the relationship between a literary *persona*, a biographical *person*, and a cultural *personage*” with the idea of elaborating “cultural mythologies of the life of a modern poet and the connections between the making of poetry and the making of self.”

helps the subject to overcome ethical division within oneself and, thereby, “prefiguring a situation in which man’s lost wholeness, alienated through the division of labour, will be restored to him.” Therefore, the aesthetic functions as “the locus of a mediation between two contradictory tendencies in the constitution of the subject: the transcendental and the empirical” (ibid). This connection was explicated even further a few years later in Friedrich Schlegel’s 116th *Athenaeum-Fragment* (1798), in which he characterises Romantic poetry as a “progressive universal poetry,” stressing: “Its goal and destination are not only to unify all the separated genres of poetry and to bring poetry in contact with philosophy and rhetoric. It also will and shall once mingle or once melt together poetry and prose, geniality and critic, poetry of the arts and poetry of the nature. It will and shall make poetry living and social, and life and society poetic.” Although some poetry of social life emerged in the public commemorative practices that established canonical writers as popular cultural saints (Dović 2012: 71-86; Leerssen, Rigney 2014: 15), this process developed and led to the avant-garde performing arts and further to related artistic practices.

Loneliness of a Cultural Saint vs. Banishment of the Accursed

As seen in the aforementioned painting *The Croatian National Revival* (1895) by Vlaho Bukovac, a Muse or a fairy whispers divine verses to the author-genius to convey them to the assembled community. In the painting, Gundulić is separated as the ‘poet king’, he is alone on the throne, connecting the estates, times and places: noblemen and peasants, the Baroque and Romanticism, Zagreb and Dubrovnik. Detached and privileged in such a way, the genius-author as a cultural saint in 19th century iconography becomes a factor of connection and homogenisation, a privileged subject who is simultaneously in the centre of the joint being and beyond its determination in space and time. This detachment, exceptionalism and loneliness can be seen in the descriptions of this writer as a bearer of the “Promethean life-giving flame” (Protrka 2008: 128). This was indicated at a ceremony held in St. Catherine’s Church in Zagreb on 20 December 1838 to mark the occasion of two hundred years since Gundulić’s death, especially in the speech that Pavao Štoos delivered there (*Danica ilirska* (IV (1838): 51: 201), cf. Protrka Štimec 2019: 30-31). In the speech, Gundulić’s genius was presented as a symbol of the permanence of spirit that immortally surpasses the decay of the body and history. Both then and later, until the end of the 19th century, the genius of the writer was connected to the idealisation of his life and work, making him appear almost like a saint. Similarly, the genius of the author was commented in other cultures as well that praised their “rational, intellectual, and creative powers by association with the qualities of so-called ‘great men of history’ (‘große

Männer der Geschichte'), 'eminences' ('Eminenzen'), 'superlatives of mankind' ('Superlative der Menschheit'), 'exceptional individuals' ('Ausnahmemenschen'), 'intellectual leaders' ('geistige Führer'), 'male heroes' ('Männerhelden'), and the like" (Köhne 2016: 118). As demonstrated in the text, these quasi-religious descriptions of the genius would change toward the end of the 19th century with the works of Moreau de Tours and Cesare Lombroso, who associated 'genius' with mental instability, unworldliness, loneliness, melancholy, degeneration, and insanity (ibid.: 118). The feminisation of genius and linking genius to mental disorders would bring about the redefinition of the concept of genius and the subsequent formation of the authorial figures such as the accursed poet. The place of these figures in society was no longer external in terms of their metaphysical mission, and central in terms of their activity and position within the community, as this was with the national bard, genius – the cultural saint of the 19th century. Now, the figure of the accursed poet is positioned on the periphery or outside the centre of social lines of forces and production of power within the community. As an outcast or the accursed, the modern genius is deprived of distribution of power, expelled to the margin of society, subsequently often in the figure of an exile who, in the solitude of his existence and language, deliberates upon the hierarchy and language from which he has been dislocated.

Croatian literature of the late 19th century questioned the national bard, the poet as a genius. In his poem "Mojsije" (Moses, 1893), Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević depicts the Biblical prophet who becomes a victim of his own beliefs and clashes with the low-minded masses who fail to understand him. The rise of the masses, capitalism and technological shifts influenced the situation in literature and art in general. "The development of technology, the flourishing of newspapers and journals, and the birth of photography (later film) influenced the status of art or text, conditioned a new perception and new habits of reception, and threatened to extinguish the figure of the '*homme de lettres*,' encyclopaedic writer, and poet-prophet and turn them into mere specialists. With the decline of the patronage system and a shift toward the new market, artists were forced to fashion themselves as small businesspeople who were encouraged to produce original and creative work in exchange for fame and money. The fragmentation and separation of spheres of experience, and pluralisation of worldviews and social discourses, further consolidated the alienation and isolation of artists. Their repertoire of cultural roles changed: the genius was challenged by the engineer and scientist; the artist was threatened by the photographer; and the poet was superseded by the professional politician, professional writer, and professional journalist. The poet became an almost anachronistic figure—an alienated martyr of writing, an apolitical dandy, or an antisocial bohemian" (Boym 1991: 8).

Bohemians merged life and art just as artists did in Romanticism. However,

unlike in the previous period, they lost the ability or wish to speak from an imagined summit of the community or from its very centre. Being economically deprived, they also ceased to advocate universal or eternal truths. Unlike the *poeta-vates* or national bard, the modern author is on the way to becoming an outcast, *poète maudit*, like Baudelaire, Verlaine or Mallarmé, searching for his authentic artistic existence. Authenticity and modernity – in the authorship of A. G. Matoš and Tin Ujević – differ from acting and writing in the public and in front of official politics and declared social values. Both present themselves as individuals, both were considered part of the “inventory” of cafés and loud bohemian groups.

In such a public manifestation, they act subversively on at least three levels: political, social and aesthetic. Thereby, they become part of the art and culture of Central European modernism, which is focused on the revaluation and reorganisation of existing social and aesthetic norms and values. Politically, both authors acted at the time when the intelligentsia, especially young people, strongly resisted neo-absolutist rule and Magyarization within the Monarchy, and then, in Ujević’s time, repression against the youth, mainly students and pupils. The young Matoš deserted from the army in 1894 and spent the following eleven years beyond Croatia’s borders. He could officially and legally return to Zagreb only after his pardon in 1908. His stays in Belgrade and Paris were at the same time searches for a new homeland in exile – with the former functioning as his political and the latter as his spiritual homeland. In his subsequent dispatches from Paris, Matoš deliberated on the political, economic and cultural consequences of Magyarization and absolutism and supported the endeavours of the progressive youth, from which the young Tin Ujević emerged at that time (Bačmaga 2017: 67). In late 1911, Ujević separated from the *Napredna omladina* (Progressive Youth) organisation together with Krešimir Kovačić in order to clearly side with the idea of Croatian-Serbian national unity, establishing links with Yugoslav nationalist youth (Gross, 1968-69: 102-103, 121-124, 127-129). As a member of and collaborator with progressive youth organisations, Ujević was imprisoned twice in 1912. Later, in his Belgrade bohemian days, he would be imprisoned several times, first of all for disrupting social norms.

Social subversion was part of public artistic life in the late 19th century when Matoš and his group of adherents in Zagreb established the café as a space for creative networking. Being among them and occasionally scandalising citizens, Ujević developed this ability in his later bohemian days, especially in Belgrade. Even today, it is possible to hear and read anecdotes about him bucking official norms and conduct. He was detained by the police several times for disturbing public peace and order and finally deported in 1925 for offending the Yugoslav royal family.

The political and social subversion generated by the revolutionary youth (Horvat 2006: 9, 97, 119), writers, artists and bohemians in the late 19th century, was part of a broader rebellion and changes that were also reflected in the third mentioned manner: aesthetic. This one is the most significant for the history of culture and the arts, since it points to the formal and thematic changes that occur in the field of literature (formal and thematic changes, explicit statements about heritage, norms and goals in culture and literature.) Matoš presented his critical and poetic views, thus declaring his own alignment with the changes brought by the modern age. He made these changes explicit in his poems, such as in “Mladoj Hrvatskoj” (To Young Croatia), where he emphasised that “our taste chooses only a rare impression,” and then in his critiques and reviews. In them, he demonstrated his commitment to modernism, *inter alia*, through his own poetics of compression and his tendency toward short prose. He emphasised them in the titles of his collections *Iverje* (Chips) and *Novo iverje* (New Chips), which point to something that is incidental and redundant – chips, small pieces of wood that come from a larger block of wood. The same is done in his feuilletons, in which he described and presented the practice of strolling as an authentic expression of the modern subject. For this reason, in these texts and practices, Aleksandar Flaker (1982: 43-53) recognises an authentic expression of the process of de-hierarchisation of art, which appears in the early 20th century. As I have emphasised elsewhere (Protrka Štimec 2019: 59), this is the so-called “nomadism of beauty” also connected to the barbaric in art and denoting the search for an authentic artistic expression in different situations and scenes that are often traditionally understood as “non-aesthetic.” Matoš finds such an authentic artistic expression in linking the “non-artistic” feuilleton with his typical “grumbling,” popular inconsiderate satire and daily scenes and situations. He writes in congruence with “the modern needs of speed, light reading and intense emotion” (Matoš 1973: XVI. 72), creating short narrative forms, feuilletons and reports. “Taking the concept of beauty out of museums and drawing-rooms to the streets, squares and working-class neighbourhoods – or – out of the Illyrian Biedermeier dancing hall to the inn, Matoš would positively rate Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec’s caricature and sketch. Matoš called Toulouse-Lautrec an elegant and truthful chronicler of Paris and created a literary expression analogous to Lautrec’s painting method in his own feuilletons and short stories” (ibid.). Moreover, in his auto-poetic writings and literary procedures, Matoš created an image of his own authorship that aligned with the understanding of modern authorship (Protrka Štimec ibid.: 52-66). Thus, e.g., in his letter to Milčinović in 1903, he underscored: “I am the first in this country who turned his life into a novel, a work of art, as if I painted myself” (Matoš: XIX. 375).

Stepping out of the framework of this cultural field, which was pre-determined by Matoš’s work and activities on several levels, Tin Ujević followed in clearer

heretical footsteps. From his poem “Oproštaj” (‘Valediction’) written in his youthful days and published in 1914 in the collection *Hrvatska mlada lirika* (Young Croatian Lyrics), through his first collections of poems *Kolajna* (The Necklace) and *Lelek sebra* (Cry of a Slave), which he placed in the avant-garde context, Ujević appeared as a writer of revolutionary force. The collection of papers entitled *Ja kao svoja slika. Diskurzivnost i koncepti autorstva Tina Ujevića* (Protrka Štimec, Ryznar 2020) points to the individual aspects of his novelties in poetry and prose in particular. Two among them need to be highlighted on this occasion: the revision of Ujević’s anti-autobiographism and pseudo-autobiographism, the modernist character of his prose writings, which places these works in the recent context of the development of the European novel and poetic views which are, in the broadest sense of the word, analogous to the theoretical understanding of hybridity, dialogism and non-subjectivity in modern literature.

These and similar changes in the early 20th century and later were partly conditioned by the development of technology to which Svetlana Boym (1991: 8) refers in her aforementioned citation, as well as Walter Benjamin in his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1936). In contrast to technologisation and reproductivity of production, art preserves an area of freedom, uniqueness and creativity, so that the true artist is opposed to the bourgeois. “The latter possesses power and money, but not prestige: a bourgeois career is something that one can try to achieve, but hardly something that everyone dreams of. There is indeed a tension between artistic heroism and mercantilism, between ‘the heroic creators’ self-image and the impersonal commercialization of the market,” as the American historian Cesar Graña stated in his analysis of the opposition between “bohemian and bourgeois,” stressing that this became a “social phenomenon” (Heinich 2016: 30).

The contrasting juxtaposition of bohemian and bourgeois is placed in an economic setting, as a social phenomenon, as well as an investment for the institutionalisation of art. Antun Gustav Matoš and Tin Ujević pointed to both aspects in their writings and actions. The two authors experienced both sides of modern bohemianism in their lives and works.

The Bohemian King Condemns Bohemia

Both of them, especially Ujević, who was known in the public as “the king of bohemians” (*kralj boema*), considered bohemianism a common social phenomenon, stressing its economic background, its social marginalisation and indispensable artistic excellency. Ujević also referred to its political potential for reframing the prevailing trend of technologisation and mercantilisation of art. Both of them spent the years of their youth living bohemian lives in Paris, “being happier as

a hungry man in Paris than one with a full belly in Zagreb” (Matoš), feeling at home in Paris “as if I had been born there” (Ujević). For Matoš, bohemianism is a worldwide phenomenon, part of western cultural history. In Croatia, “the history of our bohemianism is a history of our literature” (Matoš 1973. XV. 83). For Ujević, bohemians are no social class, because they are declassified. As a “spiritual avant-garde”, they are workers “who process substance (*materija* in Croatian), data, experience and knowledge” (Ujević 1965. VI. 191). Explaining that, he clearly pointed to “false bohemians,” uninvited and deceived bohemians, lazy individuals, copycats and “parasites on the body of the common economy” (ibid. 197) distinguishing them from real workers, who are engaged and agile in the arts and literature. Their work is a mode of resistance: it is defence of the spirit and its protection from industrialisation and commodity fetishism (Ujević 1966. XIV. 200).

Explaining the relationship between bohemianism and modern art in the paper entitled “Bohemianism and Modern Art,” Ujević referred to a possible “elite prose” of the bohemian and to the quality of work as a distinguishing category. Bohemians should be a “spiritual avant-garde” (1965a. VII. 403), and the true bohemian distinguishes himself through his genuine achievements and is “a man whose spirit liberates him from the obligation to work” (1965. VI. 190). Intellectual work and freedom from “the obligation to work” is what distinguishes the artist from the producer, be it intellectual or manual work. Thus, creativity becomes an artistic topic as well as the strategy of separation from mechanical reproductivity and conversion of art into a commodity. In his article with a slightly tabloidesque title “Don’t Misunderstand Me: I Condemn Bohemianism” (“Ne razumijte me krivo: ja osuđujem boemstvo”) published in *Savremenik* (XXVIII, book I, no. 7: 212-218) in 1940, Ujević emphasised that the concepts of ‘social’, ‘democratic’ and ‘aristocratic’ in art are separated from the meaning they have in daily language or political parlance. As he claimed, today, in an era of “a mechanised crowd” (ibid: 169), aristocracy understood as “spiritual fertility and creativity” had become extinct. On the other hand, the idea of a “chief” has appeared, one who has a greater direct influence on these “mechanised crowds” than any historical fossils of aristocracy. In this modern movement, bohemianism is, for Ujević, an investment in the future, an individual contribution that can be marked by “non-acceptance of life” (ibid: 175). Also in this article, Ujević’s dialectical thought proceeds from a statement, a certain position and then elaborates it in several directions, leaving them disentangled in an inconclusive conclusion. In this case, personal “condemnation of bohemianism” can also mean understanding, since bohemianism is “a previous contribution to something better in the future” (ibid). At the same time, a reference to bohemianism is inevitably a reference to art and society, to the possibility of recognising dynamism in their relationship, a specific

rhythm of pulsation of the spirit. Therefore, art opens the possibility of greater vigilance, subtlety and awareness in the feelings that will bring about greater details in writing, analysis and criticism. According to Ujević, these details are sought by the writer himself because they differentiate him, and he is followed by criticism and then society pursuing the same goal.

“The details” (*tančine*) were here and elsewhere, for Ujević, a prerequisite for thinking and writing, for being in the present and for lasting in the future. It is to them that he subordinates his narrative procedure, his rhetoric and turns in argumentation, in which he often gives up apodictism. In his article entitled “Osjećajna involucija sinteza književne epohe” (Emotional Involution – A Synthesis of the Literary Epoch), he emphasised: “To me, the best article is the one that is an article in the least sense of the word, since it records and stipulates, but definitely states – nothing” (Ujević 1966: 199). He would use the same principle for understanding poetry in which, as emphasised by Tomislav Brlek (2020: 48), the expression of the poet’s voice does not convey any other message apart from itself.

The “messages” (*poruke*) conveyed by the voices of modern writers, in this case of those who made the literary field recognisable in the early 20th century, are marked by the concepts of authorship and creativity of their time. At that time, they were under the influence of the public image of the author as a bohemian who has not adapted to society and is dedicated to art.

At that time, cafés and streets became the stage of politics, of matters of public interest. Bohemianism took part in redefining the public image of the role of the intellectual who – as a stranger, *maudit*, outcast, a cursed one, a person in exile – maintains his critical attitude. Authorship is therefore a coin with two sides: one is gift and dedication, while the other is curse and scarification, as symbolised in Baudelaire’s poem “Albatross”: “Le Poète est semblable au prince des nuées/ Qui hante la tempête et se rit de l’archer;/ Exilé sur le sol au milieu des huées, / Ses ailes de géant l’empêchent de marcher” (“The Poet is like the prince of the clouds,/ Haunting the tempest and laughing at the archer;/ Exiled on earth amongst the shouting people,/ His giant’s wings hinder him from walking”) (Baudelaire 1974).

An outcast writer is cursed for “his giant’s wings” that “hinder him from walking” and, at the same time, he is exceptional since he is the last one able to communicate the grief and loss of the world in constant movement.⁴ Modern authors, therefore, abandon a universalist or “eternal” position and preserve their

⁴ At the same time, around 1859, Baudelaire wrote a poem entitled “The Swan,” which was also published as part of the collection *The Flowers of Evil*, in which he again uses allegory. Here too, the swan is a bird of freedom and beauty when it is in its natural element, in this case water. However, when it is on the land and imprisoned as the prey of merchants, it is “poor,” “strange and fatal,” a tragic sign of disappearance of some past time. Significantly, he dedicated the poem to Victor Hugo.

ability to emphasise the perspective of being and living in the present, following the world in constant change. For this reason, modern poetry that arises from these circumstances is not biographical and does not serve the purpose of being an expression of the author's heart, but is abstract and close to mathematics. According to Hugo Friedrich (1974: 8-9), we could say that it is defined most of all by the qualities of "disorientation, disintegration of the familiar, loss of order, *dissonance* and *abnormality*."

Thus, the integrity of art and life, politics and aesthetics that had been defined in Romanticism gained new forms in new political movements, which were aligned with changes in the field of culture and the author's inherent image. The figure of the bohemian, among others that appeared at that time, refers to criticism of capitalism, economic and political relations, as well as cultural and artistic production that became mechanical. The artist as an exile on the edge of society on the European semi-periphery often gained the role of a cultural intermediary who re-values tradition and creates something new. His symbolic value in such constellations would be capitalised only in the time ahead that, paradoxically, accepted him as a sign of the inherited symbolic capital and tradition.

Bibliography

- Bačmaga, Ivan. 2017. Matošev pogled preko Drave: Kako je Antun Gustav Matoš vidio Ugarsku, Mađare i mađarsko-hrvatske odnose. *Historijski zbornik*. Vol. 70, No. 1: 61-86
- Badura, Christian, Melanie Möller. 2019. Authorship in Classical Rome. *The Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship*. Ed. Ingo Berensmeyer, Gert Buelens, Marysa Demoor. Cambridge University Press: 64-80
- Baudelaire, Charles. 1974. *Selected Poems*. Trans. Geoffrey Wagner. NY: Grove Press.
- Baudelaire, Charles. 1975. *Oeuvres completes*. Ed. Claude Pichois. Paris: Gallimard: Éditions de la Pléiade.
- Bennett, Tony 1995. *Outside Literature*. London: Routledge
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*. Ur. R. Johnson. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Boym, Svetlana. 1991. *Death in Quotation Marks. Cultural Myths of the Modern Poet*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brek, Tomislav. 2020. Proza pjesnika Ujevića. *Ja kao svoja slika. Diskurzivnost i koncepti autorstva Tina Ujevića*. Ed. Marina Protrka Štimec, Anera Ryznar. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada: 25-52.
- Dović, Marijan. 2012. Model kanonizacije evropskih kulturnih svetnikova. *Primerjalna književnost* 35 3 (2012): 71–86.
- Flaker, Aleksandar. 1982. *Poetika osporavanja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Foucault, Michel. 1992. "What Is the Author?" (1969). In *Modernity and its Discontents*, edited by James L. Marsh, John D. Caputo and Merold Westphal, 299–314. https://www.open.edu/openlearn/ocw/pluginfile.php/624849/mod_resource/content/1/a840_1_michel_foucault.pdf
- Friedrich, Hugo. 1974. *The Structure of Modern Poetry*. Evanston. Northwestern University Press.
- Gross, Mirjana. 1968/69. Nacionalne ideje studentske omladine u Hrvatskoj uoči I. svjetskog rata. *Historijski zbornik XXI-XXII*: 75-142.
- Heinich, Nathalie. 2016. Genius versus Democracy: Excellence and Singularity in Postrevolutionary France. *Genealogies of Genius*. Eds. Joyce E. Chaplin, Darrin M. McMahon: 29-41.
- Horvat, Josip. 2006. *Pobuna omladine 1911-1914*. Prir. Branko Matan. Zagreb: SKD Prosvjeta, Gordogan.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1952. *The Critique of Judgment*. Translated by James Creed Meredith. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Köhne, Julia Barbara. 2016. The Cult of the Genius in Germany and Austria at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century. *Genealogies of Genius*. Ed. Darrin McMahon, Joyce E. Chaplin. Basingstoke Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan: 115-134.
- Leersen, Joep; Rigney, Anne (ed.). 2014. *Commemorating Writers in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Nation-Building and Centenary Fever. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

- Matoš, Antun Gustav. 1973. *Sabrana djela*. Sv. XV, XVI, XIX. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Liber/Mladost.
- Meltzer, Françoise. 2017. *A Question of Birds: Poe and Baudelaire. The edge of one of many circles: homenagem a Irene Ramalho Santos* Vol. Ed. Isabel Caldeira, Capinha Graça and Jacinta Matos. Coimbra University Press. 2017: 425-447 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/144048184.pdf#page=428>
- Protrka, Marina. 2008. *Stvaranje književne nacije. Oblikovanje kanona u hrvatskoj književnoj periodici 19. stoljeća*. Zagreb: FF-press.
- Protrka Štimec, Marina. 2019. *Politike autorstva. Kanon, zajednica i pamćenje u novijoj hrvatskoj književnosti*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Protrka Štimec, Marina, Anera Ryznar. 2020. *Ja kao svoja slika. Diskurzivnost i koncepti autorstva Tina Ujevića*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1997. *The Golden Age and National Renewal. Myths and Nationhood*. Ed. G. Hosking i G. Schöpfunglin. London: Hurst & Company: 36–59.
- Ujević, Tin. 1965. *Sabrana djela*. Sv. 6. *Ljudi za vratima gostionice, Skalpel kaosa*. Zagreb: Znanje.
- Ujević, Tin. 1965a. *Sabrana djela*. Sv. 7. *Kritike, prikazi, članci, polemike: o hrvatskoj i o srpskoj književnosti*. Zagreb: Znanje.
- Ujević, Tin. 1966. *Sabrana djela*. Sv. 14. *Autobiografski spisi, Pisma, Interviewi*. Zagreb: Znanje.

Od genija do boema – figure autorstva na prijelomu 20. stoljeća

Polazeći od nekoliko poznatih primjera iz povijesti književnosti (Ujević, Matoš, Baudelaire) u članku se analiziraju promjene u tipovima autorstva od druge polovice 19. do prvih desetljeća 20. stoljeća. Uzimaju se u obzir procesi stvaranja književnog polja, nacionalnog i svjetskog kanona književnosti koji, u kontekstu izgradnje identiteta, jezika i kulture malih nacija poput hrvatske, dobivaju šire društveno i kulturno značenje. U tom se kontekstu posebna pozornost pridaje razumijevanju uloge koju figura genija ima u početnim desetljećima navedenog razdoblja i u odabranim kulturnim procesima. Navodi se primjer kanonizacije Ivana Gundulića, baroknog pisca koji kroz 19. stoljeće, u procesima nacionalne integracije i stvaranja kulturnog polja, dobiva značajnu ulogu. Status genija, pjesnika kao vladara nacionalnog Parnasa, mijenja se krajem 19. stoljeća, što je moguće pratiti na razini javne percepcije izdvojenih autora poput Ivana Gundulića ili Ivana Mažuranića, ali i unutar književnog polja, autorefleksivnim postupcima, poetičkim i kritičkim iskazima. U članku se izdvojenost, povlaštenost i samoća uloge kulturnog svega kao nacionalnog genija uspoređuju s transformacijom u razumijevanju umjetnika kao kreativnog pojedinca, koja se zbiva na prijelomu stoljeća. Povezanost života i umjetnosti, koja je promovirana kroz romantizam,

primjerice, u *Pismima o estetskom odgoju čovjeka* Friedricha Schillera ili Schlegelovu *116. Athenaum fragmentu*, u proto/avangardnim pokretima dobiva novi kontekst. Umjetnik kao iznimni pojedinac sada dobiva obilježja izgnanika koji na društvenom rubu, u ulozi otpadnika, boema ili pjesnika prokletnika, postaje čuvar simboličkog kapitala zajednice. Takva autorska figura više ne funkcionira kao posrednik između ljudskog i božanskog, koja bi iz samog središta zajednice postavljala estetska i moralna pravila, već je vrsta korektiva promjenama koje se događaju s omasovljavanjem javnog života, proizvodnje i shvaćanja umjetnosti te reprodukcije ekonomskih i društvenih nejednakosti. Moderni pisac traži autentičan glas u subverziji i otporu estetskim, ekonomskim i društvenim normama, nudeći novi jezik i nove forme koje će udovoljiti, kako je isticao Matoš, zahtjevima modernog vremena. U članku se upućuje na trostruku subverziju koja se može čitati u djelovanju modernih autora: na društvenu, političku i estetsku, koje su prikazane upućivanjem na tekstove i aktivnosti A. G. Matoša i Tina Ujevića. Istaknuti autori moderne hrvatske književnosti umjetničkim i društvenim angažmanom djelovali su i kao kulturni medijatori. Povezujući pariške, zagrebačke i beogradske boemske kulturne krugove redefinirali su jezično, umjetničko i društveno naslijeđe, postavljajući svojim životom i djelom ulog sadašnjosti za budućnost.

Ključne riječi: književno autorstvo, genij, boem, Tin Ujević, A. G. Matoš, modernizam
Keywords: literary authorship, genius, bohemian, Tin Ujević, A. G. Matoš, modernism

Marina Protrka Štimec
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Ivana Lučića 3
10000 Zagreb, Croatia
mprotrka@ffzg.hr

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
INSTITUTE OF CROATIAN HISTORY
INSTITUT FÜR KROATISCHE GESCHICHTE

RADOVI

53

BROJ 3

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

 FF press

ZAGREB 2021.

RADOVI ZAVODA ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

Knjiga 53, broj 3

Izdavač / Publisher
Zavod za hrvatsku povijest
Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
FF-press

Za izdavača / For Publisher
Domagoj Tončinić

Glavna urednica / Editor-in-Chief
Inga Vilogorac Brčić

Gostujući urednici / Guest Editors
Vlasta Švoger i Željko Dugac

Uredništvo / Editorial Board
Jasmina Osterman (stara povijest/ancient history), Trpimir Vedriš (srednji vijek/medieval history), Hrvoje Petrić (rani novi vijek/early modern history), Željko Holjevac (moderna povijest/modern history), Tvrtko Jakovina (suvremena povijest/contemporary history), Silvija Pisk (mikrohistorija i zavičajna povijest/microhistory and local history),
Zrinka Blažević (teorija i metodologija povijesti/theory and methodology of history)

Međunarodno uredničko vijeće / International Editorial Council
Denis Alimov (Sankt Peterburg), Živko Andrijašević (Nikšić), Csaba Békés (Budapest), Rajko Bratož (Ljubljana), Svetlozar Eldarov (Sofija), Toni Filiposki (Skopje), Aleksandar Fotić (Beograd), Vladan Gavrilović (Novi Sad), Alojz Ivanišević (Wien), Egidio Ivetić (Padova), Husnija Kamberović (Sarajevo), Karl Kaser (Graz), Irina Ognyanova (Sofija), Géza Pálffy (Budapest), Ioan-Aurel Pop (Cluj), Nade Proeva (Skopje), Alexios Savvides (Kalamata), Vlada Stanković (Beograd), Ludwig Steindorff (Kiel), Peter Štih (Ljubljana)

*Izvršni urednik za tuzemnu i inozemnu razmjenu /
Executive Editor for Publications Exchange*
Martin Previšić

Tajnik uredništva / Editorial Board Assistant
Dejan Zadro

Adresa uredništva/Editorial Board address
Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, Filozofski fakultet Zagreb,
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10 000, Zagreb
Tel. ++385 (0)1 6120191

Časopis izlazi jedanput godišnje / The Journal is published once a year

Časopis je u digitalnom obliku dostupan na / The Journal in digital form is accessible at
Portal znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske „Hrčak“
<http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>

Financijska potpora za tisak časopisa / The Journal is published with the support by
Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske

Časopis je indeksiran u sljedećim bazama / The Journal is indexed in the following databases:
Directory of Open Access Journals, EBSCO, SCOPUS, ERIH PLUS, Emerging Sources Citation
Index - Web of Science

Poseban broj
Proizvodnja i cirkulacija znanja

Special Issue
Production and Circulation of Knowledge

Naslovna stranica / Title page by

Marko Maraković

Grafičko oblikovanje i računalni slog / Graphic design and layout

Marko Maraković

Lektura / Language editors

Samanta Paronić (hrvatski / Croatian)

Edward Bosnar (engleski / English)

Tisak / Printed by

Tiskara Zelina d.d., Sveti Ivan Zelina

Naklada / Issued

200 primjeraka / 200 copies

Ilustracija na naslovnici

Muza Klio (Alexander S. Murray, *Manual of Mythology*, London 1898)

*Časopis je u digitalnom obliku dostupan na Portalu znanstvenih časopisa
Republike Hrvatske „Hrčak“ <http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>*

*The Journal is accessible in digital form at the Hrcak - Portal of scientific
journals of Croatia <http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>*