Rajžaliteratur – A Journey Across the Shifting Words of Traumatic Narratives

Aaron Carpenter

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2024

Reading Committee:

Jason Groves, Chair

Annegret Oehme

Richard Block

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

German Studies

University of Washington

Abstract

Rajžaliteratur – A Journey Through the Shifting Words of Traumatic Narratives

Aaron Carpenter

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Jason Groves
Department of German Studies

The authors in this dissertation all write against a national narrative in their respective countries that exposes where their communities' experiences are left out or disregarded. They do so by using various strategies and this dissertation will focus on their use of loanwords to fight against nationalistic impulses. As a foreign element within society, loanwords can be an explosive force that represents different perspectives on issues where multiple groups do not see concerns or events the same way. The explosive force of these loanwords also leads them to create profane narratives, which counter national narratives that can take on an almost theological quality. Maja Haderlap activates this force most directly with *Rajža* and the history of how her grandmother, like other oppressed or resented ethnic Slovenes in Carinthia, was sent to a concentration camp by Austrian authorities under the Nazi government, a role Austria long

denied playing. Saša Stanišić also disrupts nationalist narratives, specifically of former Yugoslavia, in his writing for an audience in Germany where he explains how describing inter-ethnic relations is not as simple as either love or hate between the different groups. Marica Bodrožić critiques a trend in now-independent Croatia to remove loanwords from the language, arguing that the resulting language is artificial and does not help the speaker communicate effectively. The project of Nicol Ljubić's protagonist, Robert, begins when he does not understand the meaning of the loanword *bonaca*, which his girlfriend, the Bosnian-Serb Ana teaches him. He must translate and deconstruct its German equivalent, *Meeresstille*, to understand how she is still affected by the trauma of the war.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents Mike and Lucy for all their love and support through this long process. My aunt and uncle Joan and John for giving me a respite from the hectic university life and the wonderful meals, as well as their dogs, Dixie, Buddy, and now also Peppy. As well as to my committee chair Dr. Jason Groves for all his guidance and suggestions as well as Dr. Annegret Oehme and Dr. Richard Block for his help with several chapters. Finally, I would also like to thank Dr. Bojan Belic for his courses on BCMS and the history of language and nationalism in former Yugoslavia and Dr. Gordana Crnkovic for her feedback and encouragement.

Introduction: Going to the Dogs: Distorting Words to Visually Represent a Profane History in the Public Sphere

The topic for this study was partly inspired by the t-shirt label *Vajtundbrajt*, created by Serbian-Viennese artist, activist, and teacher Goran Novaković. An article about the label in the Austrian newspaper *Der Standard* titled "Feš und falsch," playfully refers to two of the main themes of the label: While the t-shirts are fashionable, *feš* (Fesch), the words on the t-shirts are written falsely, *falsch*, as they are transcribed using BCMS[1] and Turkish spelling rules. The fashion label features t-shirts with transcribed German words such as *Bite Hohdojč* (Bitte, Hochdeutsch; German, please), *feš* (fesch, fashionable), *integracionsvillig* (Integrationswillig, willing to integrate), *şön* (schön, beautiful), and *ferštendnisfol* (Verständnisvoll, understandable). One of Novaković's stated goals was to show the diversity and multilingual nature of the people of Vienna (Feš). Novaković's work teaching German to immigrants inspired the idea for this translingual approach to writing. He rewrote German words to help students recognize how to pronounce them using a spelling system with which they were already familiar. Through the t-shirts, he uses transcriptions to promote what he calls the "Drang nach fremdem Klang" (An urge for a foreign sound): "dass TürkInnen oder Ex-JugoslawInnen mit wenig Ausbildung tadellos Goethe, Schiller, Kafka lesen können. Und dass ein Österreicher unsere oder türkische Dichter im Original vortragen kann"[2] (Feš)., In order to illustrate how this works, he has excerpts of works on his website by several famous German-language writers such as Goethe, Schiller, Kafka, and Rilke written using the Turkish or BCMS spelling systems as well as segments of poem by Turkish and Bosnian-Serb poets written in the German spelling system (Novaković,

[1] Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian
[2] That Turks or ex-Yugoslavs with little education can flawlessly read Goethe, Schiller, Kafka

Der Drang). The accompanying video, which is no longer available on the website but can be found on YouTube, features several people reading these excerpts with an accompanying subtitle explaining that they do not speak the language they are reading in (Die Rückkehr). In creating this alternative spelling system, Novaković makes use of how German loanwords and names are rewritten or assimilated in written forms of BCMS today, especially in Serbia. The words from the *Vajtundbrajt* t-shirts are visual representations of how someone from Turkey or former Yugoslavia pronounces German words, promoting communication between both immigrants and autochthonous Austrians. They represent a form of assimilation–but on the immigrant's terms–and in a way that also implants their influence onto Austrian society. A feature that crosses several of Novaković's works is a new image of who is a citizen of Vienna, one that includes those with immigrant backgrounds as well as ethnic-German Austrians, and he calls for both immigrants and natives to understand one another and not just the need for immigrants to understand the natives.

In their transcribed forms, the words are not always recognizable as German. This *Verfremdungseffekt* hints at a way of reading the shirts as lines immigrants speak to native, German-speaking Austrians, rather than the opposite. Not only are the assumptions and social status of the speakers changed as a result, but the narrative the speakers want to tell is also transformed. In her book *Writing Outside the Nation*, Azade Seyhan begins a line of inquiry that opens the door for the topic of this study, when she observes that the language of the majority "is inflected by a sense of self-alienation [when spoken by a minority group] that questions its representational certainty" (24). Members of a minority group must change the language of the majority in some way to express aspects of their experiences or worldviews and push back against negative perceptions of them. In picking up a similar line of thought, Novaković states in

an interview: “Ideologically, I’m for subversion and provocation[,] because only when you shake people, can they realize there are problems.” (Ilić). Switching who speaks these lines in German brings to the forefront the societal roles and expectations of immigrants and autochthonous Austrians, provoking people and prompting them to question those assumptions. The conservative newspaper *Die Krone Zeitung* rose to the provocation when it criticized the project as a "Verhunzung unserer Sprache"[3] (Buzic). The noun *Verhunzung* (adulteration) comes from the verb *verhunzen* (to butcher), which translates literally as “to make a dog” (zu Hund) and is used today almost exclusively regarding language (Duden 1701). For critics, Novaković’s project represents a capitulation to the immigrant: the language is going to the dogs, as they do not have to learn German or adapt properly to German culture. Their use of the pronoun *unser* (our) also implies that the German language does not belong to someone like Novaković or his students. This framing of the German language as something exclusive that is now sullied ignores the purpose of the transcription as a teaching tool and is precisely what Novaković wants to avoid. Many scholars have commented on how exophonic writers have adapted the German language to tell their narratives. However, that scholarship overlooks the practice wherein German loanwords, whose spelling has been altered in the receiving language, are used in a German language text in their assimilated form. This study focuses on how these returned loanwords name a narrative that counters that of the majority, whether that might be the majority in Germany, Austria, or former Yugoslavia. They represent outside ideas that often express inconvenient truths about a society, which those in power do not wish to acknowledge.

[3] “Adulteration of our language” (my translation)

Two Twentieth-Century Translingual Turns in German Studies

That members of a minority group must alter the language of the majority to express their point of view has its theoretical basis in German Jewish Studies and Turkish-German studies. Emerging from the smoke of the Holocaust and the Second World War, German Jewish studies looks at how a minority group adjusts the language of a majority to meet their needs, express their view of the world, and work against nationalist thinking. "German-Jewish studies offers an example of how to critically examine the internal diversity and tensions that have long existed within European societies" (Wallach and Elyada 2). German-Jewish writers post-Holocaust also had to contend with how to write in German in the aftermath, an act Theodor Adorno, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, calls barbaric if that writing attempts to beautify or obscure the horrors that occurred.

Writing well before World War II, Czech, German-Jewish writer Franz Kafka felt that those in the majority would not recognize his place in the language or even his status as a native speaker of German, so he made a home for himself in German by placing Hebrew or Jewish culture underneath German. For Kafka, the German language carries a Christian cultural connotation, which he initially did not know how to get around. In a diary entry from October 24th, 1911, Kafka writes that he was not able to love his Jewish mother fully because he was using the German-Christian word *Mutter* to describe her. Kafka writes that a *Mutter* is someone who has "christliche Glanz" (Christian gloss) but also "christliche Kälte" (Christian coldness); characteristics which Kafka argues do not apply to his Jewish mother (Tagebücher 102). Several years later, in a letter to Max Brod, Kafka expresses frustration that the larger population could deny that works by German-speaking Jews are properly German, and that they were already seen as speaking a distorted or, as he writes, "stolen" German (Kafka, Briefe 337). Kafka writes about the impossibility for a German Jew to write in German as a native speaker, but also of writing in

any other language (Kafka, Briefe 337). His solution is to steal the baby from its crib and make it walk the tightrope, playing on an antisemitic stereotype of stealing babies and adding the detail of turning it into a circus performer (Kafka, Briefe 337). Kafka describes a process of profaning German by adjusting it to describe his experiences as a Jew. However, because of the perception of Jews as already speaking a deformed variety of German, *mauscheln*, he does not make this obvious. He then argues that in a German otherwise devoid of meaning, German Jews can bring a *Scheinleben* (artificial life) to German "dass überlebendige Judenhände sie durchwühlen" (Kafka, Briefe 337). For Kafka, German written by Jews is one where they try to leave the Judaism of their fathers behind. Still, they straddle both Judaism and the Christian German world, never able to fully separate from either, raking the coals or stirring the pot. Kafka's solution was to include meanings from Yiddish or Hebrew to words underneath the German, which did not directly reference antisemitism or ideas from Yiddish society (c.f. Adelson, Suchoff, Beck). In Kafka's short story "Forschungen eines Hundes" (1922), a group of dogs who are artists are referred to as *Lufthund*, *air-dogs*. This plays on the Yiddish term *Luftmensch*, *air-person*, a term "often used by assimilated Jews to designate, and denigrate, lesser-integrated artists from Eastern Europe" (Kager 174-75). These attempts to reinvent or bring new life to the German language took on a greater intensity after the Holocaust.

After World War II, the German culture and literature that Kafka–and many other German-Jewish writers such as Victor Klemperer, Paul Celan, and Nelly Sachs–loved was seen as corrupted and appropriated by the Nazis. A distrust of the German language and a need to reappropriate it emerged for both Jewish and non-Jewish German writers, particularly the members of Gruppe 47. Victor Klemperer, a German professor of French literature, in his book The Language of the Third Reich (1947), analyzes "how the Nazis transformed the German

language as part of their ideological socialization" and how this affected the "everyday lives of Germans during the Third Reich" (xxv) and in the immediate post-war period. Klemperer charts a *Bedeutungsverschiebung* (shift of meaning) in several words in German that corrupted the language and persisted after the war.

Paul Celan changes the meanings of certain words in his poetry about the Holocaust through metaphor and paradox to draw "attention to the corruption of language" (Dillon 36). After his poetry collection *Die Niemandsrose*, "every poem generates its own language and becomes a unique example of its self-created idiom" (Moses 718). Though Paul Celan's writing style can border on incomprehensible, obscuring the baggage of these words carry. Peter Szondi adds: "Wer Celans Schrift zu 'lesen' gelernt hat, weiß, dass es nicht darum geht, sich für eine verschiedenen Bedeutungen zu entscheiden, sondern zu begreifen, dass sie nicht geschieden sind, sondern eins" (389). In his Bremen prize speech, Celan describes how poets such as himself can use how Nazis changed the German language to draw attention to atrocities they committed during World War II, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.

Nelly Sachs was called a poet of reconciliation, a role she never wanted but didn't refute. Jennifer M. Hoyer argues that "[t]he hybrid 'archaic and avant-garde' nature of her work shows, in fact, that she was neither forgiving nor healing" (2). Especially in the immediate post-war period, Sachs wrote poems with "sobs and sighs that mark inarticulable moments" about wounds that will never heal (Hoyer 2-3). Sachs' later poems do find articulation and create new meanings for words within each poem. Sachs felt that the meanings of words were not fixed and renegotiated meaning in each poem (Hoyer 3, Dillon 36). Sachs gave voice to what could not be expressed in a corrupted language (Diesen 144). Sachs creates new meaning in German by resisting "giv[ing] in to a linguistically dominant power" and losing her sense of self (Hoyer 7).

She does this through unconventional metaphors and pairings of imagery to describe the Holocaust, such as in her poem "O die Wohnung des Todes," which pairs through repetition "O ihr Finger" and "O die Schorsteine" linking fingers (people) with the chimneys of Auschwitz, thereby blurring the boundary between life and death (Dillon 43). This play with language to name what cannot be easily expressed in the language of the majority, which might be corrupted, is a theme that occurs in all the works examined in this study.

My examination of how many German and non-German authors use German to narrate their experiences in creative ways continues with Leslie Adelson and her groundbreaking approach to Turkish-German Studies. Immigrants from Turkey and their descendants make use of and change German to talk about their experiences. In doing so, they reveal how people who cross national boundaries touch and merge multiple cultures in interesting ways to create their own narratives as the authors of these texts often resist simplistic binaries. To tell their perspectives on historical events, which often run counter to the majority's narrative, these authors disrupt how the majority sees the language and culture of the Other.

In her book *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature*, Leslie Adelson promoted viewing works by Turkish-German authors not through the lens of how they reflect the culture which they come from, but rather how they use the German language in creative ways to tell a unique story. Authors of immigrant backgrounds are not just adopting the German language, but also working creatively with it in ways that need to be analyzed seriously. This study jumps off of Adelson's approach to analyze how these authors make creative use of language to tell narratives that contradict those in power within their respective countries. The

authors must modify or distort the language to tell a story usually of a traumatic event,[4] and how they came to be where they are. This leads to the "sense of self-alienation" and questioning of "representational certainty" that Seyhan noted, as mentioned above (24). Using narration in exile to create a new national narrative, to explain why a group or individual has emigrated, can be seen in the works of Turkish-German writer Emine Sevgi Özdamar. In her oeuvre, Özdamar narrates her experiences in Turkey of police oppression and persecution of communists and socialists under the military government in the 1970s to explain why she decided to emigrate to Germany and visit former East Germany. Seyhan argues that (auto)biography for Turkish women writers in exile serves to create a new national literature that is free of the patriarchal and nationalistic tones of the home country (150).

As part of creating this new narrative, Özdamar tells the story of how modern Turkey came to be in her award-winning novel *Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei* (Life is a Caravanserai), starting from the last Ottoman sultan to Ataturk and his reforms. While critics of the book feel that Özdamar relies on exotifying Turkish society and culture, others point to the interesting literary devices she uses to tell her story. In the opening chapter, her grandfather's beard weaves itself into a narrative tapestry for Turkey as he speaks: "Großvater sprach, und sein unrasierter Bart wuchs auf seinem Gesicht, und der Bart fing an, einen Teppich zu weben" (Özdamar, Karawanserei 38). She then spends the rest of the novel undermining this narrative as she continues it after Ataturk. As part of telling her narrative, she exotifies or distorts German by literal translations of many colloquial Turkish expressions into German. In her short story

[4] In her book *Code-Switching*, Penelope Garnder-Chloros states: "Switching to an L2 [second language] may serve a distancing function […] or allow the speaker to avoid anxiety-provoking material" (123). Roger Frie in an article on his own bilingual counseling sessions with a German-English speaker notes that the client's second language creates "a safety barrier against emotions, sensations, and affects, in which the mother tongue is deeply rooted and embedded" (14).

"Mutterzunge," Özdamar also literally translates expressions from Turkish to describe incidents of police torture and violence that she did not personally witness: "man hat ihnen die Milch, die sie aus ihren Müttern getrunken haben, aus ihrer Nase rausgeholt" (Mutterzunge 16). This expression sounds particularly savage through its direct translation and serves as a graphic description of the police brutality to which she is referring (Yildiz 159). Those whom the police and military tortured are unable to bear witness; the narrator tells their stories as a second- or third-hand witness, removed from the events in question, and passes their narrations on to the reader. In telling of police torture and persecution, writers such as Özdamar contradict the established narrative of Turkey and retell it for their purposes; in this case, to explain how she came to Germany and is working through trauma. While Turkish-German writer Feridun Zaimoğlu, who came to Germany as a young boy in 1967, also exotifies the language spoken by Turkish Germans, he takes a very different approach from Özdamar.

In his book *Kanak Sprak* (1995), Zaimoğlu gives voice to young, Turkish-German males whom he claims to have interviewed about their feelings of being marginalized and stereotyped in German society. Adelson critiques the speech in *Kanak Sprak* as "incoherence at the crossroads of affect and speech," though she notes that "Zaimoğlu regards the incoherence of 'Kanak speak' as powerful rather than powerless" (98). Zaimoğlu avoids switching between Turkish and German and making mistakes in German, celebrated by fans of multiculturalism, as an "enrichment" of the language (12). A sentiment Saša Stanišić will echo 20 years later. Instead, he creates a third language that Tom Cheesman calls a "pseudo-ethnicity" (83) based on Turkish-German youth culture. This creates a stylized ethnolect for young Turkish-German men that critiques German society because it conforms to some of its stereotypes. The characters in these monologues speak defiantly about German society and the racism they notice in daily life.

Though the characters in Zaimoğlu's book conform to some stereotypes of masculinity, they break these boundaries linguistically by employing various registers of and forms of German– archaic, neologisms, colloquial, and dialectic–in their speech that is not normally associated with them. While he does include some phrases that mix expressions from Turkish and German, most of the phrases do not translate easily into Turkish. Yildiz shows how *Jungblutbengel* (young blood rascal) draws both on the Turkish word for young man, *delikanlı (*crazy-blooded), and the German *junges Blut* (young blood) (183). While the text can be hard to read in this stylized vernacular, the words that Zaimoğlu chooses to use do take on sharp critiques at times and deserve analysis of their rhetorical effect.

Zaimoğlu also occasionally uses Yiddish loanwords to hint at a longer past and racialization of another community and connect it to contemporary issues. Some of these instances are ironic, such as when the Islamist states: "[ich] esse koscheres, geschächtetes fleisch" (141), rather than using the Turkish equivalent (halal). In doing so, Zaimoğlu blurs the boundaries between Turkish and Jewish citizens in Germany (Yildiz 193). In the protocol given by a psychiatric patient, this takes on a more overt criticism. The patient describes himself as "ein Schwein unkoscheren dreck" (Zaimoğlu 57). In contrast to Celan and Sachs, who put together contradictory elements (schwarze Milch), the German *dreck* (dirt, trash, or shit) and the Yiddish *unkosher* (unclean) is a tautology the patient uses to compare himself with German Jews. However, as Adelson states, it is unclear in this chapter how the Turkish-Germans and German Jews connect in this chapter (100). This comparison becomes sharper to the point of equating both groups when read together with another protocol interlaced with reference to the Holocaust and German Jews. In this narrative, a gigolo talks about a session with a German client, the "christenlady" (71), who calls him "mein schöner jude" (70), marking his value as

exotified because of his circumcised penis. Adelson reads the German woman as living out a forbidden fantasy that "stems from extensive knowledge about the Holocaust, not ignorance of it" (102), which the man feels he has to protect his soul from, i.e. keep it clean (Zaimoğlu 72). Yildiz reads this scene as pointing to "unresolved national histories" (192) surrounding the Holocaust. The Turkish-German man rails against this legacy being connected with the history of Turkish migration to Germany (Adelson 96) and fights for being recognized on his own terms as part of a third culture that has developed from the course of migration.

Adelson's work on Turkish-German literature provides a helpful jumping-off point to analyze experiences and themes in the works of authors from Eastern and Southeastern Europe, or whose parents are from there. The writers from former Yugoslavia examined in this study reference and undermine the longer history of the region, which spans multiple empires. Through their stories of migration and the intermixing of cultures and languages, they resist adhering to one identity and work to bridge divides between countries. They also resist binaries and fixed locations with a national culture or literature (Haines, The Eastern 135). These authors make creative use of the German language through literary devices, wordplay, and literary styles to tell these stories of trauma, which is not simply mixing languages, and which deserves analysis. Knowledge of the history and culture of the region is also essential to understand the background of many of these stories.

A common topic for writers from former Yugoslavia is the brutal civil war and ethnic cleansing that resulted in the breakup of the country. Some people who experienced atrocities such as the ethnic cleansing in Srebrenica or Višegrad cannot bear witness to these events as they did not survive and those that did survive can either only bear partial witness to what happened or cannot talk about it. Agamben also addresses this issue with the dichotomy of the survivor and

the *Musselman* from Auschwitz: only the survivor, who did not fully experience the horrors of Auschwitz, can tell what happened, but not the *Musselman*, a prisoner of the concentration camp who fully experienced the horrors but who has lost the will to live and cannot communicate. This is also a question that the authors of this study take up, who offer different solutions for how to narrate traumatic events that they did not experience or to show their effects on those affected in the present. Many authors represent this inability to witness through literary devices such as modernist poetry or writing in a magical realist style.

Reborrowing is a phenomenon that few scholars have looked at in literature; a word that another language borrows and is then borrowed again in the first language in its assimilated form. For example, *cosplay* is a combination of the English words *costume* and *play* in Japanese that English speakers have adopted in its assimilated form. The term I use in this study *returned loanword* jumps off from *reborrowing* to refer to a loanword that a second language has assimilated and then brought back into the language of origin in its altered form but has not been used widely by speakers of the first language. The assimilated loanword distorts the act of bearing witness. It makes the word used to name or describe the event illegible and often tells a narrative that those in power want to mask or hide as it puts their side in a bad light. As part of the process to bring these counter histories to light, I use translation to highlight how the meanings and etymologies of different parts of a loanword reveal where majority and minority groups view an issue differently. All of the authors in this study also use translation to show how they understand the meaning of a keyword that represents a different view of history.

Loanwords and Translation as transporting and transforming meaning

Translation plays an important role in my research, both within the texts themselves and in my analysis of them. The authors provide words and sentences to varying degrees in either

BCMS or Slovenian and often provide translations for these words or sentences within the text itself. These translations into German often bring in or leave out aspects of the Slavic words or sentences. For example, in Haderlap's *Engel des Vergessens*, the narrator's translation of the first line of the grandmother's diary contains grammatical errors, while the Slovenian text only contains spelling errors. I, therefore, provide my own translations of certain words and sentences as part of my analysis of the text in order to tease apart meanings and subtleties for words in German, including returned loanwords, in all the chapters of the study. Many of the loanwords contain meanings that are not contained in their German or Slavic form. Yoko Tawada's essay on Paul Celan's poetry translated into Japanese examines how the multiple instances of *kanji* with the *Tor* (gate) radical suggest new associations and meanings to stanzas in the poem, connected with crossing boundaries that do not appear in the German original. I also take inspiration from Jacques Derrida and his essay "What is a relevant translation," where he explains why he adjusts the translation of the verb "to season" in the line "Mercy seasons justice" to mean enhancing existing flavors rather than adding new flavors. This translation better suits his reading of William Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* from which the line originates. My approach, which I explain in more detail in Chapter 4, jumps off from both these philosophers by comparing the meanings of words in their original Slavic language, German, or sometimes, English translation to tease apart subtleties in meanings. Several authors offer German translations of words in BCMS and Slovenian that are not literal, but whose alternative translations are more relevant to what they are trying to say.

Creating and undermining masks of history: The Case of Loanwords in South Slavic Writers in German

What a society chooses to remember and forget about its history helps to create a society's national narrative. Individuals and societies will also use imagery from history for their

uses in the present, often changing how they and society understand a historical event, which they use for inspiration in the present. When we treat history as a science, with events and dates and the lessons of those events learned by rote, we create a mask for the past. For German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, there are two kinds of masks: the mask that covers the historical event and the mask of the person who blindly accepts the prescribed version of history. For Nietzsche, people who mask themselves as scholars, poets, serious historians, or politicians try to portray themselves in the best light while also ignoring negative aspects of history to further their agenda. The official version of historical events serves the needs of the state or those in power, and when people learn the prescribed meaning of history without questioning it, they do not engage critically with history and therefore continue the status quo. They should examine the masks that people put on historical events, in order to remove and interrogate the ornamentation and see what lies underneath. For Seyhan, "History as a form of public and institutional memory not so much speaks for the past but rather presses the present into the service of an officially sanctioned version of the past" (31). To actively engage with history, the individual or society must understand their own current needs and look back on history in that light. Then they will interpret historical events according to their needs and values. If we interrogate these masks, we reveal them to be a "Possenspiel"[5] made up of "Lumpen und bunte Flicken"[6] rather than as something we need to take seriously (Nietzsche, Nutzen 276). When we interrogate what is underneath the mask of a historical narrative, we are forced to reexamine what happened and create a new narrative that meets our needs of today, bringing in the need to introduce what Yildiz calls profane interpretations of history. For Yildiz, the naming of an event or people puts them into a mythological framework, bordering on theological, which supports those in power;

[5] Burlesque (my translation; "puppet play" (Uses and Disadvantages, 84)
[6] "Rags and [colorful] tatters" (Uses and Disadvantages, 84, translation modified)

Fremdwörter or loanwords introduce profane interpretations of the mythology that undermine the narrative of those in power (80-85). Reinterpreting and re-engaging with history can reveal inconvenient truths and create profane narratives that challenge established ways of thinking and allow marginal voices to express themselves. Loanwords are one way that minority groups can represent outside ideas that challenge the majority. As I discuss more in Chapter 2, for Adorno loanwords visually represent ideas that originate outside of a country and that represent a counter point of view on larger societal issues in which the majority and a minority disagree, allowing the loanwords to name or describe an alternative point of view to undermine authority. In this study, loanwords are the main—but not exclusive—examples of what I am arguing the authors are trying to do rhetorically.

Writers from the south-Slavic region who write in German are an ideal source for examining how German loanwords in their respective languages can represent points of view that challenge conventional histories or ideas about World War II or the Civil War in Bosnia. BCMS and Slovenian contain many German loanwords due to the long history of interactions between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and what is now Germany, with the Yugoslav successor states (c.f. Alanović, Schaller). Thus, they create an interesting case study for how authors who speak these languages use German loanwords from these Slavic languages in a German-language text. The different spelling of these returned loanwords visually distorts their appearance in the original language, representing the counter narrative to a German audience, who might not otherwise recognize these points of view as legitimate alternatives to a dominant narrative. One result of the breakup and inter-ethnic conflict in former Yugoslavia was the successor states'

language policies that sought to distinguish their versions of BCMS[7] from each other, especially to differentiate their version from that spoken in Serbia. Croatia in particular has worked to remove loanwords from its variety of BCMS, which I discuss more in Chapter 3.

BCMS is the general term for the South Slavic language spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia. While the variants of this language spoken in these countries can be mutually unintelligible, the question of whether these are separate languages is often individual and political. *Naš jezik* (our language) is a common, neutral way for a native BCMS speaker to refer to the language they speak. I discuss the history of Yugoslavia and efforts to unify BCMS more in Chapters 2 and 3. I use BCMS when referring to the general language group and when speaking about the authors or a character in their books, I use the name of the language they use in the book. Bosnian for Stanišić, Serbian for Ana in Ljubić's *Meerestille*, Croatian or the Dalmatian dialect for Bodrožić.

The authors examined in this study deal primarily with masks for two multi-ethnic states, Austria, part of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, which has now broken into Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia. The narratives that these authors dissect stem from General Tito's guerilla war against the Nazi troops in former Yugoslavia and Carinthia, Austria. Politicians in all these countries masked the complex nature of the partisans to further political agendas. In his narrative, Tito externalized the fascist enemy and portrayed the different ethnic groups as working together during World War II despite a civil war between Croatian fascists, Serbian nationalists, and communist guerillas (Radonić 167). The peaceful coexistence between

[7] In this study, I use the term BCMS (Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian) to name the wider south Slavic language group, while I use Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian to name the varieties of BCMS spoken in the countries of origin, or heritage, of the writers or characters in their books.

Bosniaks, Croats, and Serbs, is itself part of a propaganda campaign that began with the Tito era, which simply masked over and ignored people's lived experiences and memories of inter-ethnic strife. As Ilana R. Bet-El notes this is part of the "principle of 'Brotherhood and Unity' (BCMS: Bratstvo i jedinstvo) upon which the Titoist state was founded" (211). Persecution of people who told counter-narratives relegated such stories to the family sphere, but they exploded into the public sphere in the 1980s during the nationalization of the successor states (Bet-El 208-09). After the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, stories of inter-ethnic unity and peace after 1945 were in turn discouraged.

In Austria, right-wing politicians and *Heimatvereinen* used the image of Carinthian Slovenes as partisans supporting Tito's Yugoslavia to justify their oppression after World War II. In Austria, Germans Carinthians portrayed themselves as protecting Austria against communist Yugoslavia, while downplaying Austria's role in atrocities committed by the Nazis. While there were skirmishes with former Yugoslavia over control of Austria at the end of both world wars, this feeling of needing to defend Carinthia ignores the fact that many ethnic Slovenes voted to remain with Austria in the aftermath of World War I (Gully 6). As will be discussed in Chapter 1, Haderlap also argues that the Carinthian Slovenes were deeply religious and largely did not join Tito's partisans out of political allegiance, but from the need to defend themselves against the Nazis. For an example of working against a narrative using words, let us return to Goran Novaković's t-shirts. These transcribed words also visually represent a different point of view and bring the foreign into the familiar as the returned loanwords discussed in this study without being loanwords themselves.

Distorting the language to encourage dialogue: The Case of Loanwords in South Slavic Writers in German

While Novaković does not claim to describe incidents of trauma with his t-shirts nor with his larger project in his oeuvre, he does use transcription like assimilated loanwords to visually represent counter-narratives and name difficult experiences related to immigration into a new, sometimes hostile culture. He uses the transcribed words to challenge the established narrative of how the majority sees itself. Novaković describes himself "as an old Viennese"[8] (Novaković, Beč), but he also notes that not all residents of Vienna share this point of view. In his online book *Beč za Naše* (Vienna for Us) he argues that the definition of who is "Viennese" needs to expand. He explains that the Viennese slogan "Wir sind wir"[9] refers to the Viennese (we) as a historical group: "They do not mean only "we" of today, but also include previous generations[10]" (Novaković, Beč). To be Viennese you not only have to be born in Vienna, but your ancestors must also have been born in Vienna (Novaković, Beč). This is opposed to the foreigner who now lives in Vienna, and even naturalized citizens "will forever remain foreigners" (zauvek ostati stranci). Novaković argues that because the number of foreign-born citizens of Vienna is increasing every year, so much so that the percentage of residents with historical roots in Vienna is in the minority, which can also include second- or third-generation immigrants, they should be considered "real Viennese" (prave Bečlije) rather than "fake Austrians" (lažne Austrijance) (Beč).

Novaković's statement about the growing number of residents in Vienna with immigrant backgrounds is supported by statistics from the *Stadt Wien* website. In 2023, over 180,000 people from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Montenegro, and Northern

[8] i meni kao već starom Bečliji
[9] Viennese "Mir san mir"; Engl. "We are us"; BCMS "Mi smo mi")
[10] "Oni pritom ne misle samo na današnje 'mi,' već ono obuhvata i prethodne generacije" (Novaković, Beč)

Macedonia live in Vienna (Wiener Bevölkerung 2023). This is a 10th of the population of Vienna (Jakiša and Tyran 9). Many of these early immigrants from then-Yugoslavia arrived as guest workers and were not expected to stay, though many eventually did. According to sociologist Ana Mijić from the University of Vienna "(t)he first phase of immigration from Yugoslavia to Austria took place between the mid-1960s and the early 1970s and was initiated by the Agreement on Labor Recruitment with the former Yugoslavia in 1966" with a second wave in the 1990s due to the civil war in Yugoslavia (1074-75). Vienna is indeed a diverse city. Novaković promotes a *we* that is inclusive of immigrants and the (grand)children of immigrants.

A significant aspect of Novaković's work involves helping immigrants, particularly those from former Yugoslavia, integrate into Viennese society, a process that requires both sides to adapt to each other. He challenges what he sees as the conventional understanding of *Anpassung* (adaptation) in Vienna as well as the older understanding of what it means to be Viennese. He also emphasizes what he terms *inteRgration*: not only do the immigrants need to learn German, but natives also need to learn to adapt and get used to the immigrants (Ilić). Novaković promotes mutual understanding and adaptation, what he calls in his video manifesto, *Die Rückkehr des Hatschecks*, a peaceful coexistence (friedliches Miteinander). In an interview, Novaković responds to a hypothetical Austrian who says immigrants should learn German so that they understand Austrians by asking: "They (understand) us (Austrians) or we each other[11]" (Kücüktekin), which emphasizes not a dichotomy of *they* must make themselves understandable to *us*, but a communal *we* that must work together to understand one another. A dialogue between both sides as equals is needed.

[11] Oni nas ili mi jedni druge? (Kücüktekin)

The t-shirts are a visual representation of linguistic diversity. They change who the assumed speaker of German is and promote mutual communication between autochthonous Austrians and immigrants. This performs something similar to French philosopher Jacques Derrida's method of deconstruction with the word *différance*, in that who we imagine the speaker of German to be is now from a minority rather than the majority group. Along with an identical pronunciation for both spellings (*differance and différance*), the words also represent a change of perspective and connotations.

To help immigrants, especially those from former Yugoslavia and Turkey, learn to pronounce written German, Novaković makes use of the system of transcribing words from German in BCMS for his t-shirts. On the VAJTUNDBRAJT website's page, "Wozu die Neuen Lautschriften?"[12] (Why the New Phonetic Spelling?), Novaković points to the problem of learning to pronounce words in a new language if you have not had much previous education or have never learned a foreign language. He shows the different sounds the letter "s" represents in German writing and how these different sounds are each graphically represented using the BCMS and Turkish spelling systems. Though he does not reference the history of adapting and transcribing German words into the Serbian variety in BCMS, his system uses it as well. In his video manifesto *Die Rückkehr des Hatscheks*, Novaković shows how this also works to help people pronounce words in Turkish or BCMS. Part of the video features people whom the viewer is told have not previously learned the corresponding language read lines in BCMS, Turkish, and German. The man reading German reads a line from Kafka's "Der Prozess." While he does have an accent, his pronunciation of German is understandable, at least to the writer. Novaković speaks of a "Drang nach Fremden Klang" (An urge for a foreign sound) as part of this project.

[12] This page is still available online but is no longer linked to on the homepage.

In the *Die Rückkehr des Hatscheks* video, Novaković calls his t-shirts "Die Verschriftlichung der Vermischtheit," a textualization or visual representation of mixing and diversity. *Vermischtheit*, contains both positive and negative meanings, LEO translates the word as *promiscuity*, but when read as the noun form of the verb *vermischen* "to mix or blend" or the adjective *vermischt* (mixed) it means diversity or mixing in a population. Novaković's t-shirts visually represent that immigrants can also speak German and will integrate into and adapt to Austrian society on their terms, which he portrays as a positive rather than a negative as *Die Krone Zeitung* depicted it. Integration in the form of the immigrant fully conforming to Austrian or German culture is not always successful or realistic. As part of mutual adaptation to one another, when the autochthonous Austrian does not understand the t-shirt, they must ask the wearer of the shirt what it means, which opens the possibility for dialogue.

The phrases *Bite Hohdojč* (Bitte Hochdeutsch), *paralelgezelsafterin* (Parralellgeselschafterin, member of a parallel society), *feršiden* (verschieden, various), and *ferštendnisfol* (verständnisvoll, understanding) are phrases and concepts connected with a multicultural society. In this script, the native Austrian (we/us) asks the immigrant (they/them) to speak in proper German. *They* must understand *us*. It maintains the meaning of *we*, who is Austrian or Viennese, as native, German-speaking Austrians who have lived in Vienna for many generations. With the t-shirt, the ethnic German is estranged from their language and must now ask the wearer of the shirt what the word means. This highlights the cultural and ethnic diversity of Vienna, draws attention to negative stereotypes against immigrants, and calls for removing this stereotype. The German language in this script no longer simply belongs to native Austrians, but to anyone who has lived in Vienna for a long time and identifies as Viennese. Now the *we* designating who is Austrian or Viennese is broadened to include those who have immigrated or

are 2nd or 3rd generation immigrants. This creates a more inclusive rather than exclusionary *us* and the potential for dialogue, where *we* now consist of different races and ethnicities who must understand *each other*. The t-shirts serve as props in a performance piece that make the viewer or audience question and consider what it means to be a German speaker or citizen of Vienna. The wearer of the t-shirt asks the native (ethnic German) Austrian to try to both understand, and be understanding of, them and not to impose their ideas on integration or language on the wearer of the t-shirt.

Chapter Breakdown

A central question for this study is why a nation remembers or forgets certain aspects of its past, especially narratives of traumatic events, and how minority groups tell counter-narratives to resist the national narrative. How can a minority group tell their narrative to gain recognition? Finally, how can loanwords from the language of the majority in the language of a minority group represent a profane historical narrative? Both Austria (formerly part of Austro-Hungary) and the Yugoslav-successor states represent multiethnic states that experienced inter-ethnic conflict before, during, and after the breakup. In the corresponding successor states, a government created a national narrative that excluded contradicting narratives, which were relegated to the local or family spheres only to explode out later with violent results in the case of Yugoslavia. How can returned loanwords represent each group's competing narrative?

Chapter 1

The first chapter examines how Maja Haderlap challenges the *Opfernarrativ* in post-World War II Austria which denied that the country took part in the atrocities of the war and ignored the role of the ethnic Slovenes in fighting against the Nazis. This narrative lasted much longer in Carinthia than in the rest of Austria because more was at stake there, according to

Haderlap. In her book and several speeches, Haderlap deconstructs the history of Carinthia and the meaning of terms such as *Abwehrkampf* (defensive fight) and shows how after the war politicians reproduced language from the Nazi period such as *Nacht und Nebel* in ways that ignored how policies of discrimination against ethnic-Slovenes continued into the 1970s and beyond, as exemplified in the *Ortstafelstreit*. In her book, *Engel des Vergessens*, Haderlap tells the story of her grandmother's trip to and from the Ravensbrück concentration camp using a German loanword in Slovenian and transcribed German place names for the locations she went through. The name for the journey and the altered place names create counter road signs that help her tell her community's story to a wider audience and that publicly place a visual reminder of what politicians in Carinthia sought to obscure.

Chapter 2

The narrator of Stanišić's first novel *Wie der Soldat das Gramafon repariert* in part wants to explain to his readers, native Germans, and immigrants from former Yugoslavia, why the situation became so violent and brutal during the war. But the inter-ethnic relations are complicated, and the narrator ultimately cannot fully explain what happened. Through intertextual references to Bosnian-Serb author Aleksa Šantić's poem "Emina," a poem about a Muslim man who falls in love with a Muslim woman, the narrator can only show the complexities of inter-ethnic relations before and during the war inter-ethnic relations before and during the war. But there are aspects of the war that Aleks cannot explain, such as why Serb soldiers commit acts of ethnic cleansing. I read Stanisic's efforts to define the situation through what cannot be known as represented in the narrator's descriptions of his grandmother's *Špajz*, the pantry, as a location that represents Hegel's concept of *Aufhebung*, everything is stored there and becomes something greater than its parts. After the war, the *Špajz* becomes a place that represents the narrator's efforts to understand how his hometown has changed, while recognizing

that there are parts he will never comprehend, such as why a police officer took part in ethnic cleansing.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 delves into what happens when those in power work to remove loanwords and foreign influences from the language. In Marica Bodrožić's German-language novel *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*, the character Mateo expresses a fundamental tension between language and nation by working to rid the Croatian language of loanwords, which he calls linguistic invaders. The protagonist, Arjeta, stands in opposition to Mateo's goal of creating a purified Croatian, arguing that the etymology of a word teaches you something about the history of a country. This chapter charts the conflict between Mateo and Arjeta and how it reflects a larger debate about language and its origins rooted in the German Romantic period and how these ideas found new expression in former Yugoslavia. German Romantic-era philosophers were influential in the area that would become Yugoslavia starting in the 1860s. Johann Gottlieb Fichte is essential for understanding the connection between language and an imagined nation as it relates to nationalism. After a summary of the history of language debates in former Yugoslavia, I compare Bodrožić's and Arjeta's criticism of the creation of neologisms in Croatia to replace existing words with Bodrožić's creation of new word pairings in her own writing. While Mateo does succeed in creating a Croatian free of loanwords, the result is words and phrases that Arjeta paints as strange and incomprehensible in this German-language novel.

Chapter 4

The previous three chapters examine how people from the minority change and adjust language to meet their needs of expression through loanwords. Nicol Ljubić's novel *Meeresstille* examines the perspective of someone from the majority culture who uses the language and perspective of the minority to adjust their way of thinking about an incident of trauma. A central

topic of the book is how Germany's lingering guilt over World War II influences the country's understanding of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ana does not want to talk about her experiences and feels that the German media simplifies the war and sees her as guilty by association with Serb war criminals because of her ethnicity. Robert, in contrast, insists that Ana talks about her traumatic experiences based on the well-intentioned idea that talking would help her. These contrasting points of view lead to arguments that end in silence rather than understanding. It is only after they have broken up that Robert can reflect on what Ana told him about her and her family. Through translating phrases such as *bonaca, zlatko,* and *živeli* and analyzing their meaning across BCMS and German Robert can tease apart meanings and nuances in the words that he could not have done through German alone, allowing him to consider concepts and events more closely from Ana's point of view, growing up in Višegrad, rather than through his perspective, which is based on growing up in Germany.

Chapter 1: Sharpening My Words against the Debris of History: Examining Maja Haderlap's Use of Loanwords to Tell Her Community's Counter Narrative

In 1970, over 20 years after they were constitutionally mandated by the new Austrian constitution, bilingual road signs were installed in parts of Carinthia, Austria with a significant Slovenian-speaking population, only to be torn down overnight by a vigilante group of German Carinthians. The *Ortstafelstreit*, or fight over bilingual road signs, is the name of the resistance by ethnic Germans and *Heimatvereinen* (homeland organizations) to the Slovenian-German road signs. These signs serve as a visual reminder of a Slovene-speaking minority, whose existence and experiences during World War II challenged the unity of Carinthia. The road signs served as visible, public reminders of a history of resistance against and persecution from the Nazis during World War II, something many ethnic Germans preferred to forget. This conflict appears in Slovene-Austrian writer Maja Haderlap's *Engel des Vergessens* (2011), in which she describes a fight between the narrator's mother and father over sending their daughter away for school:

> Wozu sei es notwendig gewesen, das Mädchen in die Schule zu schicken, was müsse man jetzt, wo in Kärnten, die zweisprachige Ortstafeln abgerissen werden, nach Klagenfurt zu gehen. Aber nein, sie müsse sich immer durchsetzen und mit dem Kopf durch die Wand. Er sei auch nur ein Mensch, er habe auch ein Wort mitzureden. Ich bin ein Mensch, schreit Vater auf Deutsch (Engel 138)

While the father is directing his anger at the mother for ignoring his wishes, he is also referencing the larger political environment in the Austrian state of Carinthia in the 1970s, which worked to silence and ignore his voice and the Carinthian Slovene community. The frustration at not having his voice heard leads the narrator to report the father saying, now in German, "Er sei auch nur ein Mensch, er habe auch ein Wort mitzureden" (Engel 138), signaling for him that the larger society does not recognize his humanity. In both her novel and speeches, Haderlap writes about her struggle to tell her community's story to the larger population in a context in which the

public use of Slovenian and telling the history of the Slovene community in Carinthia was so politically contentious. Political euphemisms and Austria's narrative of having been the victim of Hitler and the Allies made it easy for people to ignore the experiences of the ethnic Slovenes.

Adjusting Czech-German writer Franz Kafka's four impossibilities for writing as a German-speaking Jew to Haderlap's situation creates a helpful framework for understanding her position of writing in German about the Carinthian Slovenes during World War II. The story of the ethnic-Slovene resistance against the Nazis is impossible to tell for two reasons. First, it contradicts Austria's narrative that it was the first of the Nazis and not a participant in the atrocities. Second, her relatives and community members are reluctant to tell their stories. On the one hand, they are still traumatized by the events and are sometimes unable to directly talk about what happened, on the other they are unwilling to break the taboo of Austrian history, since to do so could result in violence. Haderlap cannot tell the story in Slovenian, due to the relatively small population of Slovenian speakers in Carinthia, and, in addition, because those she most wants to hear the story generally do not speak Slovenian (Haderlap and Kerbler 1:35 – 1:45). Also, the German-speaking population might assume they know what she is trying to say if it is in Slovene. The impossibility of writing in German is vaguer. Haderlap questions whether it is possible to freely choose the language of writing in a space where language is so politically fraught and where German is the language of those who oppressed her community during and after the war (Im Licht 3). Despite the seeming impossibilities, Haderlap wants to tell the story of her community because it has not received widespread public attention and she sees her relatives and community as being oppressed. How does she tell this story? Her narrator's eventual solution is to stand in the river Styx and let her words, the echoes of voices of the past, smash against the historical debris of time, sharpening them so that she can cut through the ethnic

German population's resistance to hearing her community's story. Through the use of historically loaded words in German, she speaks directly to German-speaking audiences to show how Germans and Slovenes see the same issues differently. The narrator uses distorted language to tell the grandmother's story of surviving the Ravensbrück concentration camp, thus breaking a taboo and walking into danger. It is a story many prefer not to tell, and one many in Austria do not want to hear. The author uses words that reveal a Slovenian influence on the German language, to counteract the German influence on the ethnic Slovene population.

This chapter sets out to explore how Haderlap tells a story about Austria to which many ethnic Germans were resistant. To do this, the chapter first provides an overview of Austrian history starting from the end of World War I, in order to better understand how Haderlap works against this narrative. I then develop a framework to understand why it is important to directly confront the horrors of the past and to demonstrate how words can carry multiple historical meanings using the philosopher Theodor Adorno and poet Paul Celan. Haderlap disagrees with Celan and moves beyond his argument by showing that people can ignore the negative meaning behind words to conform to their preconceived ideas. The chapter then moves on to examine Haderlap's novel *Engel des Vergessens* and how using historically enriched words in Celan's sense leads to conflict and not dialog between ethnic Germans and Slovenes in Carinthia. I then conclude with an example of how Haderlap uses poetic and distorted language to tell the story of her grandmother's internment in the Ravensbrück concentration camp. This includes code-switching, defined by Penelope Gardner-Chloros as "the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by bilingual people" (4). The narrator includes her own commentary on what the grandmother is not directly saying, as well as German words that are

distorted (transcribed) using Slovenian to name the journey home and the places she passed through.

Maja Haderlap was born on March 8th, 1961, in Eisenkappel-Vellach, Austria, and has a Ph.D. in *Theaterwissenschaft* from the University of Vienna. Haderlap has published several poetry collections in Slovenian. Her first book in German, *Engel des Vergessens*, published in 2011, received numerous awards including the Bachman Literature Prize. In her Bachmann Prize speech, Haderlap asks: "Ist es überhaupt möglich, vor dem Hintergrund des Kärntner Sprachenkonflikts, als Schriftstellerin frei über die Wahl der Sprache zu entscheiden?" (Im Licht 3). In Carinthia, choosing the language that one writes in can be a political decision. She states that she originally wrote in Slovenian not only to conquer and explore her first tongue, but also to stop its backward movement in Carinthia, and to give the language meaning again (Haderlap, Im Licht 4). She justifies her decision to write in German in four ways: 1) she can write about the history of discrimination of the Slovene-Carinthians without the preconceptions and prejudices that come with writing in Slovenian getting in the way; 2) German allows her to reach a wider audience; 3) the German language provides an emotional barrier to protect herself when discussing such an emotional topic, and; 4) German literature has a tradition of writing about memory,[13] which does not exist in Slovenian (Haderlap and Kerbler 0:18 - 0:59). Her work is the

[13] Haderlap takes issue with the expressions: "Schreiben zwischen den Sprachen" and "Schreiben zwischen den Kulturen" (Im Licht 5) and argues that when an author writes in a second language, they do not mix literary traditions but draw alternately on one or the other within one work. However, several different literary traditions appear in *Engel des Vergessens*. Haderlap taps into themes from another Carinthian Slovene writer Florjan Lipuš, who was her grade-school teacher. Werner Wintersteiner writes that in his novels such as The *Errors of Young Tjaž* (1972) and *Boštjan's Flight* (2003), "Lipuš' heroes may be rebels, but they are not resistance fighters" and notes that a common motive is "an individual whose autonomy is menaced by society" (12-13). Haderlap adds to this theme by depicting a minority group that the majority does not listen to in that "[she] clearly develops the narration from the screaming to the arguing, whereas Lipuš presents the (heroic) screaming" (Wintersteiner 13). Haderlap states that German literature has a tradition of writing about memory that she could use which does not exist in Slovenian (Haderlap and Kerbler 0:59). She also references German Jewish writers such as Walter Benjamin and Scholem Ash to reference memory. In an interview, Haderlap states that she read a lot of Holocaust survival testimony (Erinnerungsliteratur), which deeply influenced her writing (Vansant 98). Haderlap's depictions of the communist

first novel in Carinthia about the partisans and the Slovene community to receive wide public attention (Siller, 198), though this might also be partially attributed to a resolution to the road sign debate, as will be discussed in the history section below.

Engel des Vergessens starts when the narrator is a young child in the 1960s and ends as she enters her 40s. In an interview, Haderlap maintains that while the overall story is real, she fictionalized the details: "Das Faktische sind die Mosaiksteinchen, die dem Text zugrunde liegen. Was ich über Verwandte und Nachbarn erzähle, ist tatsächlich passiert. Alles andere aber ist Literatur, eine Inszenierung, Zuspitzung. Insofern bewegt sich der Roman über das autobiografische Erinnern weit hinaus" (Vansant 94). In the first half of the novel, the narrator observes and records her family and friends' recollections of persecution by the Nazis during World War II, in particular those of her father and grandmother. The grandmother tells the narrator about life in the Ravensbrück concentration camp and how she returned home after the war. The second half of the novel starts when the narrator's mother sends her to Klagenfurt to attend high school. At this point, she is separated from her rural, Slovenian-speaking community for the first time and is placed in the larger, German-speaking environment of Austria. The narrator now begins to reflect on the unequal relationship between ethnic Germans and Slovenes in Austria. She notes the first time she has this realization is when she sees a placard: "Wähle Deutsch, wenn du kein Slowene sein willst! Das Slowenische ist also etwas Unerwünschtes im Land, denke ich und entscheide mich für das öffentlich Geringgeschätzte" (Haderlap, Engel 143). After seeing the sign, the narrator gains an increasingly astute understanding of the hierarchy between ethnic Germans and Slovenes, what it means to be part of a minority group in

partisans as desperately trying to survive and resist the Nazis are reminiscent of Charlotte Delbo's trilogy *Auschwitz et après*, which emphasizes the victim aspect of the French resistance and concentration camp survivors, as people just trying to survive a horrific experience, rather than as heroes actively resisting (Thatcher 43).

Carinthia, and how that prejudice has affected her family members. As she grows older, the narrator more directly confronts the Slovene community's feeling that the Austrian government ignores their history and experiences during World War II, and in general does not respect their rights as a minority. A summary of Austria's self-narrative after World War I is essential to understanding how Haderlap works against the popular narrative in Austria: that they were the victims of the Nazis, and unwilling participants in their actions, particularly in the state of Carinthia.

Overwhelmed by an unacknowledged history

With the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the aftermath of World War 1, the Allies intended for the region that became Austria to be ethnically German (Gully 2). However, there were, and still are, several autochthonous minority groups within the territory, including a significant population of ethnic Slovenes in the southern part of Carinthia, who have been there since at least 700AD (Weichselbraun 425). In the immediate aftermath of World War I, Austria fought against the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes to maintain control of Carinthia. These battles, the *Abwehrkampf*, served as a founding myth of the modern State of Carinthia[14] (Barker 113; Weichselbraun 426) and led to greater mistrust between ethnic Slovenes and Germans. During World War II, the increased persecution and arrests of ethnic Slovenes led some to join the communist partisans under Tito in Yugoslavia, forming one of the most successful anti-Nazi resistance groups in Austria (Wintersteiner 3). As Werner Wintersteiner details in his article on Haderlap, both the Allies in "The Moscow Declaration on Austria" (1943) and Austria itself labeled the country as the "first victim of the Nazis," while ignoring the

[14] In a footnote, Gully notes that the line "Wo man mit Blut die Grenze schrieb" (We draw the border with blood) was even added to the official Carinthian anthem after the *Abwehrkampf* (12).

country's role in the atrocities of the war (2-3). Wintersteiner also points out that while politicians briefly used the Carinthian-Slovenes resistance as an example of Austrian resistance in the immediate aftermath of the war, they primarily ignored them afterward (3). Haderlap argues that although the taboo against talking about Austria's complicity during World War II ended for most of Austria in 1986, after revelations about then-presidential candidate Kurt Waldheim's time in the Nazi Party and his work in a concentration camp in the former Yugoslavia (c.f. Embacher), the taboo did not end in Carinthia[15] (Wirklichkeit 6). This resistance against the Carinthian-Slovenes is best exemplified by the *Ortstafelsturm*, the storming of the road signs. The constitution of the Second Austrian Republic requires the government to put up bilingual road signs in areas with a significant ethnic Slovene population in Carinthia. These were finally put up in 1972 after a long delay and then taken down overnight in an act of vandalism by *Deutschkärntner* (German Carinthians) (Gully 5-6). In his article on the *Ortstafelsturm*, in which he reports on interviews conducted with participants, historian Peter Gstettner argues that the action was not spontaneous as journalists reported at the time but was organized from above (90). The *Deutschkärntners'* hostility to the physical signs is in part a reaction to efforts by the ethnic Slovene population to push for the implementation of the minority rights granted them under the post-World War II Austrian constitution. The road signs also served as a visual representation of a multiethnic and multilingual environment (Gully 1), which many *Deutschkärntner* wanted to remove from the public in part due to historical hostilities between Austria and Yugoslavia over control of Carinthia after World War I. Some ethnic Germans questioned the loyalty of the ethnic Slovenes to Austria and Carinthia. Even as

[15] The narrator describes going between both Carinthia and Vienna as going back and forth between parallel "periods and versions of history": "The closer I get to my hometown, the stronger the feeling grows that I'm traveling into the past, and the further away I am, the faster hours and days speed by" (Angel 183).

late as 2006, then-governor of Carinthia Jörg Haider's (FPÖ) party "ran ads in the regional newspapers announcing that "Carinthia will become monolingual'" in opposition to the bilingual street signs (Weichselbraun 427). The Austrian government reached an agreement to put up the road signs again on April 1st, 2011, around the time Haderlap's book was published, in "villages and towns in which Slovene Carinthians make up at least 17.5% of the population" (Gully 12). The road signs have been up since then, though some vandalism and defacement of several signs occurred in 2021 (Urban). With this background, we can now examine how Haderlap works against this narrative and shows the effect this avalanche of history has on her community in her first German-language novel *Engel des Vergessens* (2011).

The title of the book gives a clue to Haderlap's approach to history and memory. Tess Lewis translated the title as *Angel of Oblivion*. *Vergessen* also commonly translates as *forgetting*. This is the translation of an angel's name from Jewish writer Scholem Asch's novel *Nazarene*. As Barbara Siller points out in her analysis, "In [Scholem] Asch's novel, the angel of forgetfulness helps the human soul to cross the sea of forgetfulness while moving on to another body, thereby making it the angel's task to erase traces of memory" (201). The angel forgets or is unable to erase these traumatic memories, so they come back as echoes and nightmares, as they do for Haderlap's narrator. Only instead of her memories, she takes those of her family. These memories initially overwhelm the narrator when she is exposed to them as a young girl. Dreams with imagery depicting history as mountains, that create landslides and debris appear throughout the novel. For example, just before the father's funeral, the narrator dreams that the family house in the mountains is flooded and covered the mud and debris.

> Später höre ich von unten aus dem Graben ein immer lauter werdendes Rauschen heranbrausen und sehe plötzlich das Wasser steigen. […] Wir beobachten, wie sich das Haus mit Wasser füllt, hören den Erzkörper tief unten in der Masse des Berges zusammenbrechen. Die Lagerstätten sind gelöscht, nichts wird mehr aufgefahren, die

> Stollen sind abgesoffen. Dann fließt das Wasser ab, und wir kehren in unsere Wohnräume zurück. An den Wänden zeichnen sich Wasserränder und Erdschlieren ab, die Überflutung hat sich an die Wand gemalt. Die Fenster sind geschlossen und die Scheiben unversehrt (Engel 273)

After the flood, the narrator tells her brother they must clean up everything, signaling both a desire for domestic cleanliness and a feeling of being overwhelmed by her community's messy past and the need to distance herself from it. The debris symbolizes the narrator's and her community's sense that their history is both ignored or suppressed in Austria. The narrator has two choices for how to clean up the debris of history, which she grapples with throughout the novel: 1) continue adhering to the official, Austrian version of history that ignores and suppresses her family's experiences, or 2) tell her community's counter-narrative. It is only toward the end of the novel that the narrator finds a vocabulary and writing style to talk about the past to a larger audience. Adorno and Celan provide a useful framework to understand why it is important to directly acknowledge an atrocity like the Holocaust and how individual words can directly represent these dark periods.

Pulling words through history to name what has no name

In his essay *Kulturkritik* (1949) Adorno speaks out against a trend in post-war German culture to ignore or erase the history of National Socialism from the German language, as well as the act of beautifying discussion of the Holocaust through rhyming poetry rather than confronting the horrors directly. Adorno not only criticizes poetry for beautifying the Holocaust through rhyme but also German culture in general for not engaging with the horrors of Nazi crimes in the immediate post-War period when he wrote: "[N]ach Auschwitz ein Gedicht zu schreiben, ist barbarisch, und das frisst auch die Erkenntnis an, die ausspricht, warum es unmöglich war, heute Gedichte zu schreiben" (*Kulturkritik* 34). This is not to suggest that Adorno argues that poetry is impossible in German after Auschwitz as some claim, but that

poetry must not obscure the horror of what happened. Adorno clarifies that people who put the Holocaust into rhyme have an "Affinität zur Barbarei," as they "das Ganze wie mit einem Schwamm wegwischen wollen" (Kulturkritik 26), meaning they want to wipe away, or ignore, the horror of what happened by beautifying the image. For Adorno in the face of "Verzweiflung und unmäßiges Leiden" and "der Verfall der Norm" the cultural critic is tempted to ignore the depths to which humankind can sink or pretend that the problem has been resolved and maintain the status quo rather than confront it (Adorno, Kulturkritik 7 - 8). Instead, people need to actively engage with and think about history and what led up to these events. Criticism seeks "dies Wissen in die Kraft der Betrachtung der Sache selbst umzusetzen" (Adorno, Kulturkritik 27). However, Adorno also recognizes that even though it might seem impossible to write poetry in German after Auschwitz, people must write poetry that references Auschwitz or the Holocaust, and the shifted meanings of language under the Nazis, so that it has a chance to be recognized and dealt with in the future allowing the status quo to be overturned.

In *Engel des Vergessens*, the narrator develops a skepticism towards rhyming poetry similar to Adorno. When Haderlap's narrator starts school, the mother learns Slovenian poetry with her, which idealizes nature:

> Wir kommen zur Erkenntnis, dass die Natur mit Versen behängt werden müsste und die Blumen zu Kränzen geflochten werden sollten. Reime lassen uns von Strophe zu Strophe springen wie Schmetterlinge von Blumenkelch zu Blumenkelch, ohne Angst davor abzustürzen. Sie bringen alles an ein gutes Ende, sie verwandeln Weinen in Lachen und Schweigen in Schwelgen (Engel 24-25)

These poems teach the narrator that everything should be beautified through rhyme as all problems will be solved in the end and danger will be avoided. This image is rejected by the grandmother, a concentration camp survivor, who dismisses the poems as "Lied-Larifari und den unnützen Geschichten" (Engel 31). For the grandmother, actions and reasons to celebrate are important. For example, she taught the women to dance when they left the concentration camp

(Engel 32). Rhyme is not absent for the grandmother, however. When the narrator gets a stye in her eye, the grandmother recites "Ječmen, žanjem" (Barley, I'm reaping) while mimicking cutting the stye, to which the narrator has to respond with "Ne verujem" (I don't believe) (Haderlap, Engel 28-29). In her response, the narrator acknowledges her lack of inner faith in this process, rather than performing it while not believing. Another reason for the grandmother's rejection of the school poems is their idealization of nature. For the grandmother and father, the forests around their home are full of the dead and memories of battle. When the father takes the narrator across the Austrian–Slovenian border, he points out the places where he had been or where battles had been fought during the war (Haderlap, Engl 80-81). Upon returning home, a friend of the father recalls where the Nazis shot a fellow partisan: "Die Deutsch Patrouille sei an ihm vorbeigegangen, ohne ihn zu bemerken. Aber dann habe der letzte Mann hingeschaut und ihn erschossen. Die Jekl – Leute mussten ihn Neben der Strasse begraben. / Ich weiss, sagt mein Vater, ich kenne die Stelle" (Haderlap, Engel 84). For the grandmother as well, the forest is full of memories and reminders of those who had died during the war, or in the years following. The narrator begins to adapt this view early on, rejecting the previous view promoted by her children's poetry and her mother. The narrator rejects the power of poetry or of beautifying an image as the horrors around her are at first overwhelming.

Another significant break from this pattern comes from the father. Early in the novel, the father expresses disinterest in narratives or stories about the war; he is more interested in what happened. Nevertheless, the father creates his song, or poem, about being tortured by the police. He never wrote the poem down and the only line he can remember near the end of his life is a rhyming verse about being hung in a tree when the grandmother was arrested: "*Ko pasel sem jaz kravce, je prišel policist, v oreh me je obesil in mislil, da sem list*. Als ich die Kühe auf die

Weide trieb, kam ein Polizist, hängte mich auf dem Nussbaum auf, dachte ich sei Laub" (Haderlap, Engel 268, emphasis in the original). Similar to Celan's one rhyming line in "Todesfuge" that narrates his beloved mother being killed by a bullet in a concentration camp, the rhyme narrates a moment of being tortured. Placing the words *policist* (policeman) and *list* (leaf) at the end of each section of this sentence connects them through rhyme and narrates a traumatic event that emotionally affected him well into adulthood. While the narrator shows skepticism towards rhyming poetry, which is similar to Adorno, she does not abandon rhyme as a means to talk about traumatic events especially if the speaker has internal conviction about what they are saying. Paul Celan in his own poetry moved away from rhyme in his mature phase and provides another template for Haderlap to follow to connect history and place in words.

Paul Celan, writing as a Jew who survived the Holocaust but whose parents did not, takes a similar position to Adorno[16] in his mature writing believing the horrors of the Holocaust needed to be referred to without the use of rhyme or by otherwise beautifying language. He promotes using words in his poems enriched by history, particularly from World War II, to give them multiple meanings, which the word can hold simultaneously. In his literature prize speech in Bremen, Celan uses the term *angereichert* to refer to how the German language has been Nazified through history:

> Sie, die Sprache, blieb unverloren, ja, trotz allem. Aber sie mußte nun hindurchgehen durch ihre eigenen Antwortlosigkeiten, hindurchgehen durch furchtbares Verstummen, hindurchgehen durch die tausend Finsternisse todbringender Rede. Sie ging hindurch und gab keine Worte her für das, was geschah, aber sie ging durch dieses Geschehen. Ging hindurch und durfte wieder zutage treten, "angereichert" von all dem (Celan, Ansprache 185).

[16] Paul Celan never directly responds to Adorno's statement about poetry, (c.f. Mayer); however, his ideas on poetry do agree with and offer a solution to Adorno's idea.

The language remained accessible, not lost (unverloren). It had to go through (hindurchgehen) its inability to provide an answer (Antwortlosigkeit) of the horrors of the Holocaust and World War II, terrible events that the German language does not have names for, only terrifying silences (furchtbares Verstummen) of the horrors of the Holocaust and World War II, through the darkness of death-bringing speeches (todbringende Rede), when the language used by Nazi officials and others brought death to the victims. An enriched, or historically loaded word is one that reemerged into the light (zutage treten) through resistance to naming something that was not namable, either due to trauma or political resistance against the naming of it. On the one hand, this is resistance against the way members of National Socialism shifted the meanings of some words (Bedeutungsverschiebung) (c.f. Klemperer). On the other hand, witnesses of the Holocaust often could not talk directly about what they experienced (c.f. Levi, Agamben). As John Zilcosky writes in his in-depth analysis of Celan's speech: "Precisely through the hindrances that try to stifle it does poetic language comes to itself" (684). These words show areas of tension between segments of society who view the same events from different points of view.

A word can also be enriched through its parts, which can reference a dark period in history. *Angereichert* itself is a good example of this. *Reich* can translate as *rich*, such as *enrichment*, to make something rich in something else, but it also refers to the Nazi government, the Third *Reich*. Words that are *enriched* are *enriched* through this association with the Third Reich. The English translation *enriched* does not have this association with the Third Reich nor does it have the negative connotation that the German original does. *Words with baggage* or *loaded words* is closer to how Celan uses the term. Through these *historically loaded* words, Celan adds profane meanings to these words within the German language, referencing a history

the majority would rather ignore. Rather than forcing a confrontation with an alternate meaning or point of view, Celan's poems allow the reader to see both or only one, depending on how they read the poem or understand the word and if they know what to look for.

The limits of historically loaded words to narrate history

In her *Kakanien – Neue Heimat* speech "Die Wirklichkeit der Schatten" (2013), Haderlap echoes Adorno's fears when she argues that by not directly confronting Austria's role in World War II, the country pushed its fears onto a new enemy – in this case communism – and ignored its own role in promoting National Socialism, retaining many politicians from that period in public office: "dass es in Österreich keinen staatsbürgerlichen Lernprozess gegeben hat, der die Folgen des Nationalsozialismus aufgearbeitet hätte, und dass der Antikommunismus sehr bald den Antifaschismus als Legitimationsgrundlage der Regierungspolitik ablöste" (Haderlap, Wirklicheki 7). While Austria did eventually move away from the status quo of the *Opfernarrativ*, this process was slower in Carinthia. In the novel, the narrator describes how going between both Carinthia and Vienna felt like going back and forth through time, where Vienna lives in the present and Carinthia adheres to an older narrative of World War II (Haderlap, Engel 185). The resistance to contradicting the *Opfernarrativ* in Carinthia meant that this direct reckoning with the past was not possible while Haderlap was growing up. In a place with a history as fraught as Carinthia's, language and images can create a path "auf dem es sich hin und her gehen oder spazieren lässt, ohne Angst davor, sofort aus der Bahn zu geraten oder in die Irre zu gehen" (Haderlap, Wirklichkeit 11). To go astray, or to go off this path, can be dangerous as it breaks a taboo, which can unleash the furies on the breaker. In her speech, and in the book, Haderlap provides a summary of Carinthian history in which she uses words that are historically loaded in Celan's sense, but which are euphemisms that help the speaker hide how

they are continuing ideas or policies that discriminate against certain groups of people in the present, reframing themselves as the ones needing to defend or protect themselves. Haderlap argues such terms can be "verdächtig[], angezweifelt[], fragil[]" (Wirklichkeit 1); they are weighed down by history, but the indignation or righteousness behind them no longer applies, as they are now used to conceal how the user of these words also persecutes other groups. We can use language to unmask the narratives behind these historically loaded words.

In "Die Wirklichkeit der Schatten," Haderlap provides her summary of Carinthian history. She argues the distrust of Carinthian Slovenes that emerged in the aftermath of World War I continued in the mindset of many *Deutschkärntner* after World War II. The *Abwehrkampf* (defensive fight) against the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, which took place following World War I, continued after World War II and was applied to the Carinthian Slovenes whom the *Deutschkärntner* saw as being protected by Yugoslavia (Wirklichkeit 7-8). Though she does not mention this, in reaction to the news about the plan to put up bilingual road signs on April 22, 1972, then-governor of Carinthia, Siegfried Sames' call for a new *Abwehrkampf* at the *Jahresversammlung des Kärntner Abwehrkämpferbundes* supports her claim: "Wir sind wieder in einen Abwehrkampf, wenn auch mit geistigen Waffen, eingetreten" (Gstettner 87). For Haderlap, this led to an imaginary *Kriegeszustand* (state of war) in Carinthia against its own citizens (Wirklichkeit 8). The Carinthian Slovenes use of Slovenian and association with Yugoslavia put into question the sense of unity and loyalty to Carinthia. Haderlap claims those in power in Carinthia associated the Carinthian partisans with the Yugoslav People's Army's *Vergeltungsaktionen* (acts of retaliation) at the end of World War II, in which 92 Carinthians

were killed (Haderlap, Wirklichkeit 7)[17]. This led to a *Verratsgeschichte* (Story of Betrayal), because of which *Deutschkärntner* felt they needed to protect Carinthia against the Carinthian Slovenes (Haderlap, Wirklichkeit 8). Haderlap sees this mentality of being in a constant state of war against perceived traitors as influencing every discussion about the rights of the Carinthian Slovenes (Wirklichkeit 8). Such beliefs led to events like the *Ortstafelsturm* of 1972.

In her speech, Haderlap refers to the tearing down of the bilingual road signs (Ortstafelsturm) by a mob of *Deutschkärntner* as a *Nacht- und Nebelaktion* (Wirklichkeit 8). This references a directive from Adolf Hitler, later referred to as the *Nacht-und-Nebel Erlass*[18] calling for the arrest and deportation to Germany people suspected of resistance in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Norway. While it is not clear if this term referred to such activities in Austria at the time, the historian Thomas Barker describes the first rounds of Nazi deportation of ultra-Nationalist Slovenes in 1941 (Aktion W) as a *Nacht- und Nebelaktion* (200). The *Duden* Dictionary defines "Nacht- und Nebel" as "ganz Heimlich [u. bei Nacht]" (1187). It can also be translated into English as "night and fog" or "cloak and dagger." Interestingly, Gstettner notes that critics of the bilingual road signs also called the political decision to put up the road signs *a Nacht- und Nebelaktion*[19] describing it as a surprise order from Vienna that went against the will of the people in Carinthia (87), despite the fact that the Constitution required them, hence creating what Haderlap would call an artificial or illegitimate uproar (Wirklichkeit 1). Gstettner describes how "Kärnten fühlt sich im Abwehrkampf gegen den slowenischen Nachbarn von der Bundesregierung in Wien und von der übrigen Welt verlassen"

[17] Barker also notes an incident of mutual retaliation on both sides when the Yugoslav People's Army, the German army and their Croatian fascist allies, and the British were coming into Klagenfurt where the Partisans already were. The resulting incriminations on both sides led to many people being killed and had a lasting impact on how German Carinthians viewed the ethnic Slovenes (205-06).
[18] This also references the title of Alain Resnais film: *Nuit Et Brouillard* (Night and Fog) (1955).
[19] "Von einer ‚überfallsartigen Nacht- und Nebelaktion' gemeint ist dabei immer, die politische Entscheidung, mit dem Aufstellen der zweisprachigen Ortstafeln zu beginnen - kann deshalb nicht gesprochen werden" (Gstettner 87).

(82). Detractors imply that the erection of the road signs was a nefarious action to work against the State rather than implementing something required by the new constitution, creating what Haderlap calls an artificial or illegitimate uproar.

In the final example, Haderlap takes language directly from a speech made by Austrian, Nazi-official Alois Maier-Kaibitsch in 1942 after General Tito retook control of Yugoslavia from the Nazis and in my reading applies it to contemporary politics:

> Ein paar Jahre zuvor galt es ja noch, mit der sogenannten slowenischen Minderheit im Gebiet nördlich der Karawanken "Schluss zu machen," wie der Leiter des Gauhauptamtes für Volkstumsfragen, SS Obersturmbannführer Alois Maier-Kaibitsch nach dem Überfall Hitlerdeutschlands auf das Königreich Jugoslawien verkündet hatte[20] (Wirklichkeit 6).

In this excerpt *Schluss zu machen* euphemistically refers to the forced relocation, arrest, and internment of ethnic Slovenes[21] during the war; it reflects a desire to be done with, or to break up with, the Slovenian minority in Carinthia. These deportations had already been taking place and had increased in response to Carinthian Slovenes joining the communist partisans, due to retaliation by the Nazis. The phrase *Schluss zu machen* is commonly used today to mean *to be done with, to break up with* without any association with National Socialism or hate against minority groups.

While "ein paar Jahre zuvor" could refer to a few years before Maier-Kaibitsch's speech, it is also possible that this refers to "a few years before" Haderlap wrote her 2013 speech, after representatives from Vienna, Klagenfurt, and Slovenia reached an agreement in 2011 to again install the bilingual road signs in Carinthia. When then-Austrian president Heinz Fischer took a State trip to Ljubljana, on April 19th of that year, the *Verband der Volksdeutschen Landsmannschaften Österreichs* (VLÖ) a *Heimatverein* called on the president to pressure the

[20] "Die Ereignisse auf dem Balkan […] geben uns die Handhabe, im Gebiet nördlich der Karawanken mit der sogenannten slowenischen Minderheit Schluß zu machen"[20] (Elste 119).
[21] "Die während der Nazizeit gewaltsam ausgesiedelten Slowenen" (Wirklichkeit 6).

Slovenian government to recognize the German minority there, writing in a press statement: "Die slowenische Regierung ist aufgefordert, mit ihrer minderheitenfeindlichen Politik endlich *Schluss zu machen*, ehe man in der Kärntner Ortstafelfrage große Ansprüche erhebt" (VLÖ, 2011/010, emphasis added). Then-FPÖ-Chief Heinz-Christian Strache also reacted to the trip, stating: "Es kann nicht sein, dass Kärnten in der Minderheitenfrage vorbildliche Arbeit leistet und Slowenien im Gegenzug, das Problem im eigenen Land nicht einmal ignoriert" (Pink). The VLÖ and Strache are reacting to the situation of the Gottscheer Germans[22] in Slovenia (c.f. Krazj, Panagiotidis), a minority group that, at the time of this writing, is not constitutionally protected in Slovenia and who were relocated by the Nazis during World War II before Tito expelled them from Slovenia after he gained control of Yugoslavia.

The VLÖ uses *Schluss zu machen* to criticize Slovenia for not recognizing a historical wrong done to its German minority, who had been forced out of the country after WWII. While this is tragic and should be acknowledged, the VLÖ uses this issue of constitutional protections to at best ignore and at worst distract from their own country's oppression of a constitutionally protected minority group, equating two issues that have different current significances. While reaching an agreement on what percentage of ethnic Slovenes an area must have to get bilingual road signs is a positive development, it occurred over 50 years after they were first required by the new Austrian constitution and against resistance from politicians and *Heimatvereinen* who

[22] During World War II, the Gottscheer were coerced or convinced to leave their original homes in Slovenia, where they had been for 600 years, to a new one in Nazi-control Slovenia during WWII at the expense of ethnic Slovenes, who were force-relocated and were finally forced out of Slovenia when Tito and the communists took control of then-Yugoslavia. According to section 15 of the 2002 census for Slovenia, there were a total of 499 ethnic Germans (0.03% of the total population) (Popis 2002). Slovenia recognizes three autochthonous minorities: Italians, Hungarians, and Roma this grants these groups more protections than minority groups that are not recognized (Trbovich 423 - 24). In an earlier press release that same day, the VLÖ called upon the Slovenian government to add Germans to the list of autochthonous minorities so that they could get more protections (VLÖ 2011/009). This is an issue which the Austrian government had not addressed. On August 31st 2013, Austrian President Heinz Fischer went on a State visit to Slovenia to meet with President Borut Pahor. As part of this visit, he also visited with representatives of the Gottscheer German minority in southeastern Slovenia (Fischer).

were in power in Carinthia for much of the post-War period. Hardly *vorbildliche Arbeit* (exceptional work) as Strache called it. Strache and the VLÖ's statements are self-serving and one-sided as they ignore Austria's—and particularly Carinthia's—own role in protracting the conflict over the road signs and in suppressing the minority rights of ethnic Slovenes. They use a historically loaded term to name a legitimate issue, while also covering another legitimate issue they are instigating. Haderlap recognizes that these nuances in a historical narrative can become lost, especially in polarizing issues where people can choose to accept the meaning that conforms to their preconceived notions.

Later in her speech, Haderlap describes an incident when a reporter for the Italian newspaper, *Il Giornale*, oversimplified Haderlap's words in her article to portray Haderlap as stating that all the stereotypes about Carinthia were true and that antisemitism and longing for National Socialism still exist in the province. While Haderlap distanced herself from the article and dismissed it as "unserious journalism," she was still attacked by some members of the public, who were understandably enraged by the comments in the newspaper. For Haderlap, the finer point she was trying to make was lost, in part because of the journalist not taking care in writing the article, but also because many in the larger public assumed they knew what Haderlap meant to say: "Es ging zu keinem Zeitpunkt darum, was ich der Journalistin gesagt haben könnte und was nicht, es ging vor allem um Projektionen und darum, was man glaubte, dass ich gesagt haben müsse" (Haderlap, Wirklichkeit 9). When a historically enriched word has multiple meanings on a polarizing issue people assume they know which meaning the speaker intends. When the topic breaks a taboo, this can lead to danger for the breaker of the taboo. This is illustrated in an event from *Engel des Vergessens* when the father and his friends go astray (in die Irre gehen) in a bar and inadvertently step into an ambush (in einem Hinterhalt geraten) when

a group ethnic Germans, who were on opposite sides during the war, find themselves repeating talking points from the war in a bar in the 1970s; the use of similar talking points shows the danger of the "double reality" when two opposing sides do not agree on the meaning behind historically enriched words.

On one occasion, when visiting her family from university in Vienna over Christmas break, the narrator finds her father in a bar, the Bošti, where he and several friends are telling war stories. Tine, formerly a company leader with the partisans, was asked about what had happened at the Peršman farm near the end of the war. In the night an SS unit approached the farm where a group of partisans was resting, and the Peršman family was killed in the ensuing fight. At the neighboring table, a group of ethnic Germans overhear the conversation, and one accuses the former partisans of killing the family, causing both sides to engage in mutual name-calling. One of the ethnic Germans also says to the narrator's father: "[du] warst auch nichts anderes als ein Spitzel, […]. Für mich bist du ein Bandit wie alle anderen" to which to father replies: "ich bin ein Bandit und du bist ein Trottel!" (Engel 179-80). The fight only ends when the waitress threatens to call the police after an ethnic Slovene man threatens to get his gun. On the way home, the father, who is enraged by the fight, falls into the snow, and refuses to get up. The narrator starts doing a Hitler impersonation singing partisan songs, which the father finds funny, and so he follows her back to the tractor. They return home without further incident (Engel 176 - 85).

This scene shows the danger of publicly expressing a historical narrative from an ethnic Slovene point of view that contradicts the *Opfernarrativ* in Carinthia. During the fight in the bar, the narrator states: "Für einen Augenblick erreicht uns der Nachhall des Krieges. Die Gaststube verwandelt sich in einen Kampfplatz, auf dem die Gegner ihre Stellungen einzunehmen

beginnen" (Engel, 179). The *Nachhall* (echoes, reverberant sound) refers to the Angel of Oblivion, who cannot or does not remove the memories of those who have died, so the memories return as echoes and nightmares in the present. Tine describes the forms these echoes take in the argument when he states: "Zur Nazizeit falle den Menschen nach so vielen Jahren nicht anderes ein, als ihre Propaganda zu wiederholen, nach so vielen Jahren" (Engel 179). The narrator refers to propaganda that takes the form of historically loaded words that carry different meanings for both groups. The two parties in this debate are falling back on their interpretation of the war and their understanding of terms from that time.

Both sides have radically different understandings of *Heimat* and whether they were fighting for Nazi Germany or only for Austria. The ethnic German states: "Ihr habt doch nichts anderes getan, als die heimat-treue Bevölkerung zu terrorisieren" (Engel 178). It is not entirely clear whether the ethnic German is referring to only Carinthia, Austria in general, or Austria as part of Nazi Germany. Tine, however, labels those same people as *reichstreu*[23] (loyal to the Reich) and firmly associates them as willing participants with Nazi Germany (Engel 178). In Tine's view, those who joined or supported the Nazis were not fighting for Austria, but rather for Germany's interests, while he depicts himself as fighting to save his community from an authority that was oppressing and persecuting them. Though he does not use the term *Heimat*, it is now a smaller community unit. This leads into the second part of the argument, for whom each side was fighting: "Für Jugoslawien habt ihr gekämpft. Ihr seid schlicht und einfach Heimatverräter" (Engel 178). The ethnic German accuses the ethnic Slovenes of being loyal to the communist partisans and of being against Austria. When he calls the ethnic Slovenes *Heimatverräter*, and *Banditen* he at best ignores the fact that ethnic Slovenes led one of the only,

[23] "Du meinst wohl die reichstreue Bevölkerung terrorisiert" (Engel 178).

and certainly the most successful, anti-Nazi campaigns in Austria during World War II he argues instead that they fought for the interests of General Tito rather than for Austria, though how much he connects the interests of Austria and the Nazi government is unknown. Tine does not frame Austria as independent at the time: "Ihr glaubt noch immer, dass man unter Hitlerdeutschland für Österreich gekämpft hat. Für den deutschen Lebensraum schon, aber nicht für Österreich!" (Engel 178). Tine connects *Heimat* here with Germany under Hitler and the greater Germany that the Nazis wanted to create. Tine argues that Austrian soldiers fought for the Nazi party in Germany but not for Austria; he then questions whether the ethnic Germans are still loyal to the "German Reich" rather than to Austria.

These words are historically loaded and take on opposing meanings for each group, with each side only recognizing their own versions. The ethnic Germans see the ethnic Slovenes as fighting for Yugoslavia while they themselves are fighting for Austria; at the same time, the ethnic Slovenes felt they were fighting for Austria, hoping to survive the Nazis. The ethnic Germans ignore the ethnic Slovene Partisans' role in helping to liberate Austria from the Nazis. In addition, whether Austria could be viewed separately from Nazi Germany during the war is also something upon which they cannot agree. The ethnic Slovenes also falls back on the argument that the Austrians were fighting only for Hitler and the Nazis, ignoring that the Austrians and Carinthians might have had other motivations, though these could have aligned with those of the Nazis.[24] It is not clear what the ethnic German means by *Heimat*, but Tine assumes he is referring to Greater Germany envisioned under the Nazis, while he could just as

[24] In a perverse way, Austria's designation as the first victim of the Nazis is supported by the persecution and ousting of Austro-Fascist leaders by the Nazis. The Nazi government did not accept the home-grown Austro-Fascist party and even before the *Anschluss*: "In July 1934, Chancellor Dollfuss was murdered during an attempted National Socialist Putsch" (Embacher 646). After the *Anschluss* many leaders of the Austro-Fascist party were sent to Dachau (Embacher 647).

easily be referring to Carinthia, which has quite a different, though still exclusionary, connotation.

Both groups live near one another, and may see each other regularly, even during the war. Though the conversation between the ethnic Slovenes is probably in Slovenian initially it is not clear what language(s) was or were used when the ethnic Germans joined in. It is possible that at least some of them knew enough Slovenian to speak and understand that language. The father related a story from World War II about how the police interrogate and tortured him to find out whether his father had joined the partisans, and at least one police officer, ostensibly an ethnic German, spoke some Slovenian[25] (Engel 154) This leads to another loaded word and concept that is not mentioned, yet appears implicitly: that of the victim, *Opfer*. After the war, ethnic Germans both saw and portrayed themselves as victims of the Nazis and the Allies, while the ethnic Slovenes saw themselves as the victims of the Nazis and their Austrian collaborators. There is no recognition from either side that they caused harm to the other. Though, the power imbalance should be acknowledged; the ethnic Germans were in a position of power, and actively oppressed the ethnic Slovenes, who defended themselves. Despite the imbalance, the unwillingness from either side to acknowledge harm to the other only fuels the argument.

During the trip home from the bar in the father's tractor, the father drunkenly falls into the snow and refuses to get up when told to by the narrator. To get him up and moving, the narrator decides if everyone else is "acting crazy" (Verrückt spielen) she would, too (Engel 183); she starts yelling at him to march while doing a Hitler impression, ordering him to get up as she gives a Nazi salute (Hitlergruss). The father laughs, "das sich anhört wie Schreien" stands up,

[25] "Ein Polizist habe Slowenisch mit ihnen gesprochen und gesagt, dass sie beide noch ärger prügeln werden [...]" (Engel 154).

and returns the salute; the narrator goose-steps back to the tractor while singing a partisan song[26] (Engel 183 - 84). The father follows, laughing: “Heil Hitler, Heil Hitler, *ta je pa dobra*, das ist gut, das ist wirklich gut” (Haderlap, Engel 184, emphasis in the original). The narrator’s sudden mixing of Nazi and communist partisan elements, to “act crazy” like everyone else, as she says, is unexpected and is taken as a joke by the father. It is only at this point that he can overcome being triggered by the ethnic Germans and he states: “wir beide, wir sind die wahren Trottel, wir sind die Kämpfer for für Freiheit und Brot!” (Engel 184). The father enjoys this so much that he even makes the *Hitlergruss* into a secret greeting with the narrator and enjoys the stunned reactions of those around him (Angel 205).

The act is not simply equating both Nazis and communists, but mixing two elements that are not seen as compatible. The narrator is repurposing and mixing National Socialism with being a partisan, two enemies ironically coming together. By mixing Nazi and Partisan imagery, the Hitler impersonation and the Partisan song, the narrator uses mockery to lessen a potentially triggering memory, which distracts the father from his anger and PTSD following the encounter in the bar. This use of language is more successful than the use of language in the bar earlier in the evening, it does more than simply repeat historical talking points as the narrator uses it in a subversive way, to get her father to do what she wants. Mixing German and Slovenian elements prefigures how the narrator will be able in the end to tell her community’s story to the larger world; specifically, the story of her grandmother’s time in the Ravensbrück concentration camp, which directly conflicts with Austria’s *Opfernarrativ*.

[26] This scene is an echo from earlier in the novel, when the narrator describes walking home with her father for the first time, after he had drunk too much at a hunting celebration. When he falls down a hill, he falls asleep in the dark forest at night. The narrator, still a young girl, starts crying. When the father wakes up, he says: "weißt du, wenn man im Wald Angst hat, muss man Partisanenlieder singen. Er habe das oft gemacht und es habe immer geholfen" (Engel 91). Here it is the father who sings to calm them both down, but only after he recognizes through her that he has to keep going.

Publicly telling a profane history with distorted words

In her Bachmann prize speech, "Im Licht der Sprache," Haderlap provides a solution to the problem of people not agreeing on history that also appears in *Engel des Vergessens*. She depicts the space between the two historical narratives of Carinthia, what she calls a *Niemandsland* (no man's land), as a corridor full of pieces of the past from both her languages, which she can select from as desired without being bothered (5-6): "Ich halte mein persönliches Scherbengericht über die Konfliktgeschichte, die meine eigene ist und übe mich in der Kunst der Verknüpfung. Die Verbindungsbände, die ich um meine Sprachen und Kulturen gezogen habe, sind das Netz, das mich hält und sichert" (Haderlap, Im Licht 6). The individual parts of *Scherbengericht* translate as "court of shards." The phrase *Gericht halten über etwas* means "to pass judgment on something." In this context, it seems to suggest that Haderlap, as the court of shards, passes judgment on the history of conflict and binds together pieces, or shards, from different narratives. The edges of the shards can also be sharp, which suggests there is a cutting action as well as a *Verknüpfung* (binding) that Haderlap wants to practice. Binding together the shards that make up different historical narratives from different points of view makes something new, working against what came before and allowing her to cut through resistance in the telling of her narrative. Because Haderlap is making these connections out of the public eye, she can work without being disturbed. Haderlap ends her description with the haunting image of the voices of ghosts reverberating down the corridor. These voices function "als Nachklang aus Ängsten, Gewalterfahrungen und Befürchtungen" (Haderlap, Im Licht 6). But this time, there is a successful dialogue between the sides as Haderlap combines both narratives so neither is ignored. "Im Korridor lege ich alles Bezeichnende und Bezeichnete ab, werde frei von Zuschreibungen" (Im Licht 6). It suggests, in the light of public discourse, that because she is writing in German, her message that combines elements of both sides can cut through any

resistance and reach her audience without preconceived notions obscuring her message. This cutting action and the sharp edges of history add to the scene at the end of *Engel des Vergessens,* where the image of the sharpness of the shards or debris from history hit or bump against the narrator's words sharpening them (Haderlap, Engel 286-87), and giving her the power to cut through to the larger public with her community's story. At the end of her novel, Haderlap describes how a landslide from Walter Benjamin's Angel of History could have led to the creation of the environment in which Haderlap could create the tunnels to find the words in order to tell her story.

In a section before the one mentioned above, the narrator poetically writes: "Die Geschichte zu Bruckstücken zerfallen" (Engel 240), which is followed by a list of members of the Slovene-Carinthian community and the tragic events that befell them under the Nazis during World War II. The pieces of history make up the mountain of catastrophe that the Angel of History sees and is unable to prevent. At the end of Haderlap's novel, the narrator accepts her family's history and takes on the responsibility of passing it down. Late in the novel, when the narrator visits the Ravensbrück concentration camp where her grandmother had been interned, she hears Walther Benjamin's Angel of History fly overhead (Haderlap, Engel 286; Angel 287). The pattern of the oppression of ethnic Slovenes started in Carinthia even before World War I, intensified during the period of National Socialism, and after the war, many of these anti-Slovene sentiments didn't go away. The mountain of catastrophe is made up of the tragedies and suppression of her community before, during, and after World War II.

Then narrator describes herself as having escaped time: "Für einen Moment fühlte ich mich wie ein Kind, das der Zeit davon gelaufen ist" (Engel 286). Now she no longer runs back and forth between Vienna (the present) and Carinthia (the past), and time becomes a glacier, "die

alles, was unverrückbar schien, unter sich begräbt, zermalmt und zerriebt" (Engel 286). She has now found her voice, which at first seems like the voice of a stranger before it slowly becomes recognizable: "[ich] kann meine Stimme vernehmen, die Stimme einer Bekannten, die aus dem Wirrwarr der Sätze lange nicht aufgetaucht ist, die sich verborgen hielt" (Engel 286). This voice has changed and gained confidence because it has been battered by history but is no longer overwhelmed by it. The titular Angel of Oblivion (Forgetting)[27] leads the narrator through a river of glacial debris. Rather than forgetting the past or being overwhelmed by the echoes or nightmares of the past, the narrator's words are hit by the past: "Er hat meine Sätze auf dahintreibende Trümmer und Scherben prallen lassen, damit sie sich verletzen, damit sie sich schärfen" (Engel 286-87). Now, rather than being inundated by this flood of history as in the previous dream, the flood is sent downriver, and not towards her house. The narrator is now able to separate herself from history and find her voice. She no longer wants to forget her community's history but instead uses words sharpened by history to break the taboo of telling her community's story. Instead of simply using historically loaded words, the narrator takes words with meaning from both the ethnic German and Slovene sides to tell the story of her grandmother in a way that makes it harder to misconstrue or misunderstand the language.

A major family narrative in *Engel des Vergessens* is the grandmother's survival of the Ravensbrück Concentration Camp, which contradicts Austria's narrative of itself as not an active participant in the Nazis' atrocities. The narrator summarizes her grandmother's journey home from Ravensbrück from both her oral accounts and her Slovenian-language journal. Part of this summary includes her name for the journey: the German loanword, *rajža*, as well as several

[27] The first mention of the *Engel des Vergessens* is his book *The Nazarene* Scholem Asch translates it from Yiddish as *Angel of Forgetfulness*. It can also be translated back into English, as Tess Lewis choose, as *Angel of Oblivion* for her translation to emphasize the wiping out of memory.

transcribed German-language place names of cities she passed through. The narrator also includes many examples of Slovenian words that the grandmother uses in telling her own story. The Slovenian words, the transcribed place names, and the name for the journey itself serve as road signs, subtly reverse who has the power to name and describe the event in public, break the taboo, and tell a profane narrative from the perspective of someone from the Slovene minority to people who are reluctant to listen.

Throughout the novel, the grandmother is strongly associated with the power of the spoken word. "[S]he tries to come to terms with her traumatic experiences by telling her memories over and over again" (Siller 204). Despite needing to talk, the grandmother is unable to directly name and describe her experiences. In one of the grandmother's first oral stories, she states: "[*J*]*e bilo čudno*, es war befremdend" (Haderlap, Engel 10, emphasis in the original). The young narrator comments that the grandmother "meint, es war schrecklich, aber *grozno* fällt ihr nicht ein" (Haderlap, Engel 10, emphasis in the original). The grandmother substitutes *čudno* (strange) for *grozno* (terrible) again later when talking about the doctors in the camp: "Was diese Ärztin den Frauen angetan habe, *čudno, čudno*, sagt Großmutter und meinte wieder furchtbar, wenn sie sonderbar sagt" (Haderlap, Engel 119, emphasis in the original). The doctors' acts included giving injections into the women's vaginas, leading to the grandmother's later health problems. Haderlap suggests that the spontaneous substitution of words in the grandmother's speech reflects a psychological barrier in communication. The grandmother cannot outright state that life in the camp was *terrible*. The narrator's comment on its absence illustrates that more clearly than if it was included.

The grandmother's camp journal (Germ. *Lagerbuch* (camp book); Slov. *knjiga od zapora* (the prison book)) was given to her by another inmate on the way home. Though it was not

written while she was in the camp, it illustrates some of the trauma that the grandmother still carries with her. The narrator only provides the opening and closing lines in the "original" Slovenian along with translations and summarizes the rest. Because it is not clear whether the grandmother's diary is based on a real document, the Slovenian words that the narrator includes from it are worth examining. Upon reading the first line of the journal, the narrator comments: "Großmutter schreibt anfangs in einer gefassten Schrift, ihre Wörter sind unbeholfen, nicht für das Aufschreiben gedacht, sondern für das Erzählen" (Haderlap, Engel 276). While the narrator notes the grandmother at first writes in a firm, calm hand (*gefasste Schrift*), this outer appearance betrays an inner anxiety that is shown in the first line:

> *Je bilo u tork opoldne 12 Oktober je locitev od hise in od temalih Sinov Tonček in Zdravko. Toje bilo hudo zamene ker jas nisem kriva nic*. Es war Dienstag Mittag 12 Oktober, da war die Trennung von Haus und von den kleinen Söhnen Tonček und Zdravko. Das war schlimm für mich, weil ich hab keine Schuld [sic!], schreibt Großmutter. (Haderlap, Engel 276, emphasis in the original)

This inner anxiety for her and her family's safety and her defiant knowledge that she has not broken any laws but is being arrested anyway is reflected in the grammatically incorrect line: "weil ich hab keine Schuld," though the Slovenian version does not contain grammatical errors, only spelling errors.[28] The writer's anxiety increases over the course of the journal and reaches its zenith on the return home, with the final, broken line in Slovenian and German: "zu Haus das war Angst ja oder nein, *doma toje blo strah jabol ne*" (Haderlap, Engel 278, emphasis in the original). While the Slovenian language comes back at the end of Haderlap's summary of the journal, it returns as a fragmentary, almost incomprehensible sentence that insinuates the

[28] The Slovenian line contains only slight spelling errors: she writes *jas* rather than *jaz* (I) and *nic* should be spelled with a diacritic *nič* (nothing), but it is grammatically correct. The narrator adds in the error in grammar and phrasing. Because the sentence stars with *weil* the conjugated noun needs to go to the end of the sentence. The correct phrase is probably "ich bin an nichts schuld" (I am responsible for nothing) or "ich bin nicht schuldig" (I am not guilty). The expression "Ich habe keine Schulden" means "I have no debts".

grandmother's language has broken down entirely. The line only makes sense from an moment earlier in the novel, when the grandmother provides an oral account of coming home and of her overwhelming worry that her husband and children will not accept her back (Haderlap, Engel 58 - 60). While these instances of literary code-switching illustrate that this is the experience of someone from the ethnic Slovene community, more is needed to bring home that a German-speaking power imposed this experience. To do this the narrator includes a German loanword to name the journey and transcribed German place names for the stops along the way.

The journey to and from the concentration camp is filled with strange place names. The narrator notes that the longer this strange journey lasts, the stranger the names of the towns and villages become (Haderlap, Engel 278). This journey is conveyed primarily through lists of several German-language place names of cities that she enters, as well as brief descriptions of what happens in each place. From Austria to Ravensbrück, she passes through *Ven* (Germ: Wien, Engl: Vienna) rather than the Slovenian *Dunaj*, and *Prak* (Germ: Prag, Engl: Prague), among others (Haderlap, Engel 277). Both German place names are written by someone without much education, who is more comfortable writing in Slovenian than in German, though familiar with both languages. The grandmother also includes the transcribed German place names of the cities she passes through on the journey home. Dresden is spelled *Tresten*, and Belgrade is spelled *Belkad* (Engel 278), rather than the Slovenian *Beograd*. The names only switch to standard Slovenian when the grandmother reaches the Slovenian-speaking areas of Yugoslavia and Carinthia at the end of her journey: Vellenje und Slovenkrac (Slovenj Gradec), Hrevelje (Hrevelnik-Anwesen) (Haderlap, Engel 278). Even then, the names are transcribed. But the grandmother does not just name the places that she passes through in German; she also uses a German loanword in Slovenian to name the whole journey.

"[D]ann schreibt sie *rajža*, die Reise, am 28. April, und meint den Beginn der Irrfahrt, die sie Monate später nach Lepena brachte" (Haderlap 277, emphasis in the original). *Rajža* is an antiquated colloquial or dialect term in Slovenian. The *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* dictionary lists it as an older form of *potovanje* (travel) and states that it comes from the German *Reise,* (journey or odyssey) (1106), which reflects its status as a loanword from German in Slovenian and has now been placed back within a German-language text. *Rajža* is used in oral communication in northern Slovenia and Carinthia, so the grandmother could have used this word in everyday conversation. Haderlap decided to insert the assimilated German loanword into the German-language text rather than using the standard German word, *Reise,* or the standard Slovenian word, *potovanje*. With that in mind, we need to understand the significance of this word. Because of the strange spelling, *rajža*, a German-speaking reader could simply view it as a Slovenian word; however, the German origins of the word can be discovered if the word is sounded out. Rather than the German imposing on the Slovenian, as in a German-speaking authority imposing internment in a concentration camp on the grandmother, *rajža* and the transcribed German place names impose the Slovenian spelling and meaning onto German.

This is indeed a strange word to name a strange journey and the grandmother's descriptions contain several contradictory adjectives associated with it. When the grandmother first reads the passage about leaving the camp aloud to the narrator as a young girl, she uses the word *čudovita* (wonderful) to describe the journey home after the guards lead the prisoners out of the camp: "Am 28 April trieben sie uns aus dem Lager, die Reise war wunderbar, liest sie [Grossmutter] vor, *čudovita*, weil ihr das slowenische Wort für furchtbar wieder nicht eingefallen war" (Haderlap, Engel 120, emphasis in the original). The narrator once more wonders whether she had again meant to say *terrible,* as the grandmother also makes this substitution when she

goes to Ravensbrück and describes being spit on by children.[29] The journey out of the camps probably starts as a death march with the guards to escape the incoming Red Army.[30] The grandmother also had to be carried by another prisoner, who pushed her in a wheelbarrow as she was too sick to walk at the beginning of the journey (Haderlap, Engel 120). The journey took several months to complete, which leads the grandmother to describe the journey as an *Irrfahrt* (odyssey, wandering (aimlessly)) when she first tells the story orally (Haderlap, Engel 58) and the narrator replicates this later when reading the *Lagerbuch* as an adult (Haderlap, Engel 277). She and the other survivors arrive back in Carinthia via Germany, Hungary, then-Czechoslovakia, and the then-Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. This translation also connects to the phrase *In die Irre gehen* (to go astray) from Haderlap's *Kakanien* speech. The grandmother's odyssey puts her in danger of straying from the narrative path that Austria and Carinthia will lay out after the war through the very act of taking it and stepping into a taboo simply by existing.

Haderlap's novel tells the story of a community the majority in Austria did not want to acknowledge after the war. It should be mentioned, however, that this history of the Carinthian Slovenes has now received greater attention since the novel was published. To tell their story, Haderlap needed more direct language than historically loaded words. The distorted place names and the name of the grandmother's journey label a specific experience that can directly name Austria's role in the atrocities of World War II, breaking a taboo; it is a role many in Carinthia and Austria want to ignore. As the *Deutschkärntner* tore down the bilingual road signs in

[29] "Es war wunderbar, *čudovito*, schreibt sie, wie uns die Kinder auf der Straße anspuckten und fürchterlich schrien[29]" (Haderlap, Engel 277, emphasis in the original).
[30] According to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, in late April the guards evacuated the remains prisoners from the camp on a forced march and the Red Army liberated Ravensbrück on April 30th, 1945 (Liberation).

Carinthia during the *Ortstafelstreit* to remove symbols of the Slovenian language from public spaces, so Haderlap makes her own road signs and names for the route the grandmother took. This flips the power dynamic of who gets to publicly name the event. Through these transcribed words and the returned loanword in Slovenian within a German text, Haderlap places a Slovenian influence on an event that a German-speaking power imposed on a Slovenian minority. She directly names her grandmother's experience and brings her story to a wider audience, making their counter perspective harder to ignore.

Chapter 2: The Explosive Force of Space: How Loanwords Reveal Societal Complexity in Saša Stanišić's *Wie der Soldat das Gramafon repariert*

In the middle of Saša Stanišić's novel *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert* (hereafter Grammofon), the narrator Aleks, who is now living in Germany explains in a letter to his friend Asija in Višegrad, Bosnia and Herzegovina how people in Germany call everyone from the Balkans "Jugos," because it's easier: "Hier nennt man uns Jugos, auch die Albaner und die Bulgaren nennt man Jugos, das ist einfacher für alle" (Grammofon 139). The perception of the area of the Balkans, which includes former Yugoslavia, that Aleks is referring to is that of an area with constantly warring groups, with names and countries constantly changing.[31] For Aleks too it is hard to answer the question of where he is from, as he says the country in which he was born no longer exists (Grammofon 139). Aleks describes Germans as having an over-simplified understanding of the Balkans. He expands on this opinion with some bitterness when he later writes that his parents moved to Florida, in the USA, because otherwise, the German government would have sent them back to Bosnia and Herzegovina: "Wenn meine Eltern nicht ausgewandert wären, hätte man sie nach Bosnien zurückgeschickt. Freiwillige Rückkehr nennt sich das" (Grammofon 151). He explains the irony of a mandatory (Verordnetes) and voluntary (Freiwillige) return from Germany to a country (Bosnia and Herzegovina) that is completely

[31] The image of the people of the Balkans as always fighting has been around for several hundred years according to Maria Todorova in her seminal work *Imagining the Balkans*. Especially after the war of the 1990s, countries such as the US and Germany portrayed Serbia as the worst of them, while ignoring that there were external factors for some of the conflicts. The historian Ilana R. Bet-El notes that many of the conflicts in the area that would be Yugoslavia were often conflicts between the Ottoman and Habsburg empires, with other Great Powers occasionally interfering (214). As Marie-Janine Calić writes in A History of Yugoslavia, "The only thing that could guarantee Yugoslavia's independence against Western influence was a strategy of equidistance to both [Eastern and Western] blocs" (186). While people in Yugoslavia tended to distance themselves from other countries in the Balkans, such as Bulgaria and Romania, they became "we down there," i.e. the Balkans with the breakup of Yugoslavia" (Todorova 53). "In a way, this is exactly how they are perceived by the West, as the dark side within a collective Europe. For the former Yugoslavs too, Balkanness serves to sustain their Croatianness, Serbianness, Macedonianness, and so on pure and innocent, or at least salvageable, while enabling them to externalize their darker side" (53).

different from the one they left. Aleks' parents could not return to where they came from because that country no longer exists in a recognizable form. Aleks experiences this dislocation as well when he visits Višegrad, after fleeing seven years earlier. He does not fully recognize his hometown and his attempts to compare and understand the past with the present are often unsuccessful or yield unexpected results. In his novel, Stanišić, through his narrator, attempts to portray the complexity of the social and political situation of pre- and post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina to a German audience, but Aleks ultimately recognizes that he cannot explain or fully portray the situation in its entire complexity because he does not fully understand it himself.

Stanišić is not telling a national narrative, but showing both his fellow immigrants from former Yugoslavia and the German public how they came to be where they are, though he acknowledges that he does not understand all of the story. In *Writing Outside the Nation*, Azade Seyhan argues that women writers from Turkey like Emine Sevgi Özdamar create their narratives of events in Turkey in their German works primarily for audiences in the Turkish diaspora and secondly for a German audience, which subverts authority over the national narrative of Turkey (148 - 49). Stanišić also critically narrates events in Bosnia and Herzegovina leading up to, during, and after the civil war and the breakup of Yugoslavia. The narrative of "brotherhood and unity" promoted under Tito led many people to see themselves as part of Yugoslavia, a mix, which ignored historical tensions between ethnic groups. The conflict of the 1990s led to an emphasis on ethnic strife and distrust, which in turn downplayed stories of interethnic harmony. Neither narrative fully encompasses former Yugoslavia. Aleks tries to show what Yugoslavia is like through what he leaves unsaid about he cannot explain only show.

Stanišić, through the narrator Aleks, shows his German readers the complexity of interethnic relations in pre- and post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. Still, he cannot fully explain

the situation, such as why some people committed acts of genocide against other ethnic groups. Because there are elements that he cannot explain and that are left out of the competing narratives that emphasize interethnic harmony and conflict in pre- and post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina respectively, he includes examples from his friends and family that do not align neatly with either narrative in his novel. The *Špajz* (Engl. pantry) in his grandmother's kitchen, which contains many interesting and contradictory items, and which represents Hegel's concept of *Aufhebung*, becomes a visual for Stanisic's novel, which contains many contradictory elements, and which evolves into something closer to German philosopher Theodor Adorno's negative dialectics after the war, where what is left out is used to represent the whole. I read these elements as creating an explosive force, similar to what Adorno describes loanwords doing, as they highlight where different groups in society see elements differently. To explain how Aleks tries to show the complexity of the situation in former Yugoslavia and how he uses loanwords to do this, I first analyze how Alek's grandfather Slavko uses loanwords in BCMS to describe interethnic relations in former Yugoslavia and compare this depiction with how Adorno defines loanwords and how they reveal differences in opinion and points of tension between members of society. To show the source of some of the tension depicted in the novel, I provide a brief historical overview of how tensions between ethnic groups developed and seethed in post-World War II Yugoslavia. To demonstrate how the narrator Aleks depicts the complexity and explosive forces in society in Bosnia and Herzegovina, I first analyze the complex interethnic relationships between Bosniaks[32] and ethnic Serbs presented in Aleksa Šantić's poem "Emina" and as embodied by the Šantić himself. The use of loanwords in the poem provides clues to the ethnic identity of the narrator, which opens up new readings of how Stanisic depicts interethnic

[32] I use the terms Bosnian and Bosniak separately. Bosnian refers to any citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina while Bosniak refers to a Bosnian Muslim, or whose ancestors were Muslim.

relations in the novel. I analyze the two scenes where Stanišić references Šantić's poem, in a party scene, where the poem is directly quoted, and in three scenes between an ethnic Serb soldier and a Bosniak woman he has a relationship with during the war. When read in comparison with the poem, these two examples reveal that interethnic relationships in Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot be easily labeled as either hate or love, as these mix even within one character. In the final example, I move on to Aleksandar's depiction of two men in post-war Višegrad, the policeman Mr. Pokor and his uncle Miki. Aleks cannot understand or explain to the reader what could have led both of these men to commit war crimes or whether the rumors and accusations are true. He can only show the effect of the war on both men.

In *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert*, Stanišić, the youngest person to win the now-closed Adelbert von Chamisso Prize[33], describes the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina of the early 1990s from the perspective of the 14-year-old narrator, Aleksandar (Aleks) Krsmanović. The first part of the novel starts before the outbreak of war and ends with his family fleeing their home in Višegrad and eventually settling in Germany. The middle part of the novel, written in Germany, is a mix of Aleks' letters to Asija, a young Bosniak girl he befriends in Višegrad during the war, and his reflections about life in Bosnia and Germany. In the last third of the novel, Aleks returns to his hometown of Višegrad seven years after he and his family fled the fighting and ethnic cleansing that took place there. As part of his efforts to understand how the city has changed from how he remembers it, Aleks speaks with family and old friends as well as visits places he remembers and compares how they are now with how they were before the war.

Aleks uses intertextual references and wordplay to comment on and illustrate the complexity of the situation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990s and 2000s, which he

[33] This prize was awarded to writers in German who are not native speakers of German.

cannot fully explain. Birgid Haines mentions several intertextual references in the novel, including Paul Celan's poem "Todesfuge," Bosnian works by the poet Mak Dizdar, the poem "Emina" by Aleksa Šantić, and the writer Nobel-Prize-winning author Ivo Andrić's novel *The Bridge over the Drina* (Saša 114). This mixing of literary styles and traditions from two different cultures helps Aleks to illustrate how interethnic relations before, during, and after the war intermix love and hate. Besides intertextual references, Stanišić makes inventive use of wordplay and seeming misunderstandings of what other people are trying to say to comment on social and political situations. Didem Uca refers to these as "hybrid utterances" in Stanišić's writing (191). One example is when he weaves the famous Bosnian song "Emina" in the original BCMS into a scene that takes place at his great-grandparents' party. In another scene, Aleksandar misunderstands his teacher's request that they no longer address him as *Genosse Leher* after the death of Tito, and instead addresses him as "Nicht-mehr-Genosse-Lehrer" instead of "Herr Fazlagić" (Uca 193 - 94). These examples show a high level of awareness both of what the narrator's interlocutors are trying to say and how the narrator's seeming misunderstandings comment on the political situation after Tito's death. This wordplay also occurs in bilingual situations in the text, but Stanišić does not make the language "exotic" simply for the sake of exoticism: "I am very suspicious when, in terms of literary quality, the fact that an author writes in his second or even third language leads to a more favorable critical judgment, even when it is an 'uncommon' use of linguistic constructs that are highlighted, with 'exotic' figures and a 'rich' vocabulary"[34] (Stanišić, Three Myths). Rather, Stanišić argues that neologisms and wordplay are

[34] In a talk together with the translator of his novel *Herkunft*, Stanišić notes that when narrating events that happened in Bosnia, he uses expressions from that country and tries to bring the word order in German closer to that of BCMS where he could in several sections of dialogue which makes the text "exotic" or "closer to the original" (Third Place 25:45-26:50). Stanišić specifically mentions an expression involving the *Poskok* (horned viper) that his grandmother used to say: " Poskok. Springt dir an den Hals und spritzt dir Gift ins Auge " (Herkunft 43).

worthy of examination only when they are done with a purpose, which his narrator Aleks does throughout the novel on various levels.

An example of his wordplay and seeming misunderstanding of context in multilingual situations occurs when Aleks explains a play on the meaning of the German word *Essen* that was the topic for a class essay in a letter to his friend Asija: "Essen, ich habe dich gern" (Stanišić, Grammafon 139). He explains in BCMS that Essen is both the name of the city where he lives and the word for *food* in German, which he translates into BCMS as *hrana*. Uca argues that the humor hinges upon a seeming error, Aleks acts like he misunderstood the meaning of Essen in the prompt, but "Aleksander claims to have understood the appropriate use in the context of the assignment" in his letter to Asija (197). Indeed, Aleks shows that he understood the appropriate meaning in his explanation to Asija. Rather than talking about what he likes about the city of Essen, he claims to not like anything, he describes his favorite food, *Essen*: burek. The word *burek* and the food item came to BCMS and the region through the Ottoman Turks (Školska 120). This pastry can be filled with different items, but Aleks fills it with ground meat, *Hackfleisch*, which gains the interest of other students from Croatia who had only had burek filled with cheese and spinach. An item that came from the Ottoman Turks spread across the region to become a beloved food with many variations. Thus, Aleks' essay has multiple audiences, the German speakers who find humor in his seeming misunderstanding, his compatriots who are unfamiliar with his family variation on a common regional dish, and Asija to whom he explains his pun.

Loanwords create an explosive force that can reveal "fragments of truth"

In Stanišić's novel, the narrator's grandfather Slavko explaines that BCMS took on loanwords from Ottoman Turkish to show that when different groups come together, there is

harmony. However, this is revealed to be a fairytale that ignores the uneasy mixing of tensions and harmony between ethnic groups in Yugoslavia. The chapter "Wie sich Schachspiel zu Weltpolitik verhält, warum Opa Slavko weiß, dass morgen die Revolutionen kommen und wie es sein kann, dass manchmal etwas so schwer zu sagen ist" (hereafter: the chess dream) is a dream sequence that takes place while Aleks has tonsillitis and is heavily sedated (Grammofon 186-87). It is in the section after Aleks flees Višegrad with his family and he describes from Germany how life there was before the war. In the dream, after playing chess, Aleks and Slavko float down the river Drina into their home and make a bed out of objects with names coming from Ottoman Turkish (Turzismen):

> Die Stimme (der Drina) fließt so kalt aus meiner Hand, dass Opa und ich ins warme Haus schwimmen und ein Bett mit Turzismen beziehen: "jastuk," "jorgan," "čaršaf" – Kissen, Decken, Laken. Die Türken haben ihre Sprache zu uns gebracht, sagt Opa und winkt Marica Popović zu, die vor dem Fenster vorbeifliegt, und wenn man viel Zeit miteinander verbringt, redet man irgendwann ähnlich (Stanišić, Grammofon 187).

There is a pronounced Turkish influence on BCMS, particularly among the Muslim population in Bosnia and Herzegovina for words associated with religion, family, and culture; the Serbian variety of BCMS also contains many Turkish loanwords. Slavko's narration contains no animosity towards the Turks. The Ottomans brought their language and the local Slavs started to use some words from Ottoman Turkish to create a shared vocabulary, to sound similar to each other, though the two groups spoke different languages. This effort to "sound like each other" also exists for BCMS as there have been efforts since the 1850s to create a single unified language from the varieties spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia (c.f. Alexander, Brozović). Slavko's narrative with the Turkish loanwords mirrors Tito's narrative of the multi-ethnic state that was Yugoslavia, in which Slavko served as a communist official, consisting of different ethnic groups coming together.

Adorno describes a very different relationship between loanwords from Latin in German. For opponents of loanwords, especially from Latin, as they never sounded natural in German, because Roman civilization never achieved dominance in what became Germany: "Daran erinnern im Deutschen die Fremdwörter: daß keine pax romana geschlossen ward, daß das Ungebändigte überlebte" (Adorno, Wörter 201). These two people, Romans and Germans, lived together and exchanged vocabulary, though this mixing was not as seamless and without tension in Adorno's narration as it is in Slavko's depiction. Adorno defines loanwords as words "denen man den fremden Ursprung nicht mehr anhört; eingebürgerte, die nach dem Gesetz der herrschenden Sprache sich modelten, gelten als geschichtliche Vermittlungen" (Über 621). Here, Adorno lines up with two types of borrowed words as defined by Joachim Grzega, though he focuses on pronunciation while Grzega focuses on spelling: unassimilated words, whose spelling is not changed in the receiving language (Spanish: *hippie*); and assimilated words, whose spelling has changed (Spanish: *jipi*) (26). The unassimilated word's foreignness remains intact in the receiving language and its meaning's significance comes from an outside source, either a foreign or a minority group within the State. According to the *Rječnik Stranih Riječi Bosanskog Jezika* dictionary, *jorgan* comes from the Turkish *yorgan* (576), *jastuk* comes from the Turkish *yastik* (572), and *čaršaf* comes from the Persian *çarsaf* or *čardešeb* (166). Whether these words look or sound foreign to a BCMS-speaker is subjective, but for some the foreign sound or spelling of a loanword represents a foreign element and can stand in for different points of view or tensions within a society. Adorno argues that the writer can use this tension between the foreign sound of a word, or its spelling in Stanišić's case, and the concept it is trying to convey to show "was von der schlechten Allgemeinheit des Sprachgebrauchs zugedeckt wird," to interrupt conformity through language and express a truth (Wörter 202) which often points to

some problem or tension in society. Adorno reasons, "wären die Sachen an ihrer rechten Stelle, folgten ihnen vor anderen Worten die fremden am ehesten dahin nach" (Über 624). Because issues of language in different varieties of BCMS are often reflections of ethnic relations and politics in Yugoslavia, it is important to have a general understanding of Yugoslav history during and after World War II, which Stanišić also references in this chapter.

A complete history of the events of World War II in what would become the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia is beyond the scope of this study; however, several events are important to illustrate the relationships between the ethnic groups in former Yugoslavia and the memories of these different relationships during and after World War II. Tito partly founded socialist Yugoslavia under the slogan "Brotherhood and Unity" (BCMS: bratstvo i jedinstvo), which emphasized the different ethnic groups of Yugoslavia coming together to fight an external enemy: the German fascists (c.f. Banjeglav, Bet-El, Calić, Radonić). Dejan Jović argues that beyond prescribing a fixed, nationalist narrative, authoritarian or totalitarian regimes force people to forget certain memories of interethnic and political conflicts. In the case of former Yugoslavia, the battles between Tito's multi-ethnic but primarily Serb communist partisans, and the Serb Chetniks, Croatian Ustaša, and other non-Tito aligned communist or socialist organizations.[35] With this narrative, Tito tried to unite the different ethnic groups in Yugoslavia and it was the only narrative allowed until his death, with contradicting narratives of interethnic strife and resentment relegated to the family sphere (Bet-El 211). After Tito's death, nationalist elements in Yugoslavia gained power and those private stories grew and gained political and

[35] As a counterpoint, Kolstø points out that under Tito, the number of victims at Jasenovac was highly exaggerated and that "some Serbian publicists present evils of the Ustaša as proof of an alleged genocidal character of the Croatian people" (1154).

public prominence.[36] The memory of the peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups gradually became more taboo in the lead-up to and during the breakup of Yugoslavia (Bet-El 212-13).

The chess dream chapter in *Grammofon* depicts something of the complexity of this history. It begins with a chess match between the narrator and his grandfather Slavko, in which a queen, we aren't told which color, runs off with a black pawn on a white knight to Bulgaria, which is associated with the black side. Slavko states that "Propaganda ist der Name einer Märchenerzählerin" (Grammofon 186). Propaganda thus depicts things as much simpler (black and white) than they are; rather, as with the chess pieces, politics is mixed, and things are not black and white. The dream sequence with its black and white chess pieces working together and undermining each other mirrors broadly the history of Yugoslavia during World War II. By framing propaganda as someone who tells fairytales, Aleks makes the connection that the story of Yugoslavia as a peaceful, multiethnic state with multiple varieties of a language, then called Serbo-Croatian[37], shows itself to be, or have been a fairy tale. Rather than follow the mythology of Tito's propaganda that the ethnic groups live together purely harmoniously, Slavko calls this narrative a fairy tale, preferring to acknowledge the complications of interethnic mixing in these relationships. In Yugoslavia, the various ethnic groups, especially the Serbs and Croats, expressed feelings that the other groups were imposing on them, including on the issue of developing a linguistic standard for BCMS, which mirrors and fuels the interethnic tensions that resulted in the breakup of Yugoslavia.

[36] Bet-El sites former Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic's speech to Serbs in (present-day Kosovo) on April 24th, 1987, when he urged ethnic Serbs to fight (probably against the Albanian Kosovars) "as the point after which a unified Yugoslavia could be no more" (207 - 08). Kosovo is the site of a historically significant battle between Serbs and the Ottoman Turks, which is seen as a founding event for the country of Serbia.

[37] This excludes Slovenia, Macedonia, and Kosovo, most of whose citizens do not speak BCMS at home, though it was taught in schools.

In “Wörter aus der Fremde,” written after World War II, Adorno points out that loanwords such as *humanism* were taken as something imposed upon the Germans when the concept was introduced (201). Adorno reasons that criticism of some of his speeches was directed more toward the "foreignness" of his ideas rather than any loanwords he might have used. However, the criticism occurred more strongly when he used *Fremdwörter* in his writings. After gaining independence, politicians and linguists in Croatia strove to rid their variety of BCMS of perceived foreign influences, especially from Serbia. This was also done to a lesser extent in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the lead-up to, and after the breakup of Yugoslavia, distrust among the ethnic groups especially resentment against the political dominance of ethnic Serbs and Serbia led to each ethnic group and successor state wanting to reestablish their historical identity separate from Yugoslavia and to dismiss stories of interethnic harmony or a feeling of all the ethnic groups being one under Yugoslavia. This distrust bled over into the politics of linguistics. Because Serbs were the largest minority and they promoted one version of a standard Serbo-Croatian language, Croatia, took steps to differentiate their official standard of BCMS. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, efforts increased in the BCMS-speaking successor states to differentiate their version of the language from the standard of the unified Yugoslav state associated with Serbia, i.e., they no longer want to sound like each other. It should also be noted that since the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially groups associated with Islam want to make Turkish loanwords standard in the Bosnian and Herzegovinian variety of BCMS, though non-Muslim groups in the country protest this (c.f. Mønnesland).

For Adorno, these fairy tales of propaganda tell partial truths that should not be ignored precisely because their strangeness and the foreign concepts they represent create an explosive force that can reveal “hidden” or “fragments of truth” (Über 623) and counter nationalism. The

different fragments reveal other truths from the perspective of minority groups, which enrich the country through their expression. In using words from another language to name concepts and objects, Adorno argues that loanwords can be used to resist "der Druck der vorschriftsmäßigen Gesinnung" (Wörter 199-200) to help resist thinking along nationalist lines. But this resistance has its opponents. For Katja Garloff, the resentments of the "petit bourgeois" who lash out against the counter-narratives of the "weakest members of society," in Adorno's case the Jews, are reactions against undermining the status quo (27-28). Yildiz argues that the status quo is a mythology that borders on the theological and that *Fremdwörter* undermines it through a profane interpretation of that mythology, which goes against a narrative that supports those in power (80 - 85). Besides the pleasure of being subversive, Adorno also focuses on the attractiveness of loanwords, which he compares with foreign or exotic girls (Wörter 200). The explosive force of stories of people or groups being disenfranchised when Tito's communists came to power or afterward coming into the public sphere clashed with stories of different groups working together, as with Aleks' parents (his mother is Bosniak, and his father is ethnic Serb). Both sides told part of a larger truth, but both narratives were promoted while dismissing the other. The force of these stories exploded into war because neither side wanted to listen to the other. When Stanišić's narrator Aleks returns to Višegrad after the war, he recognizes that he cannot understand or explain how the city has changed. He can only describe the gestures and statements of people he knew before the war to create his narrative of what Višegrad has become.

In the following section I will focus on how Aleks uses a returned loanword from German in BCMS,[38] *Špajz*, to name a space that encompasses what the dominant pre- and post-war narratives leave out and what he cannot explain. This includes the tensions that broiled just under the surface of society during the war and the violence that occurred during the war, as well as the hate and resentment that remained after the war. An intertextual reading of two scenes in the book with the famous poem "Emina" show these elements that Aleks cannot explain and illustrate the complexity of interethnic relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina (standing in for former Yugoslavia as a whole). The Ottoman Turkish loanwords that Aleks provides in Stanišić's novel - *jastuk*, *jorgan*, and *čaršaf* - are common words associated with the bedroom or living room and related to the private or family sphere. They are not philosophical and technical terms and they do not represent counter-historical narratives, but rather a culture that is increasingly not wanted by the Serb majority in parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This foreign origin and sound of the word is what Adorno argues should be used to highlight differences between groups. In the following example, Stanišić repurposes the German loanword *Špajz* to stand in for a philosophical space in his novel, a meaning it does not usually carry in BCMS or German

The *Špajz*: A semi-magical place that highlights Bosnia's linguistic and cultural diversity

In the chapter titled "Es gibt keine Partisanen mehr" (Stanišić, Grammofon 169-70), which also takes place before the war, Aleks makes winding comparisons between seemingly unrelated items in daily life in pre-Civil War Bosnia and Herzegovina and describes how the

[38] I refer to these as returned loanwords as opposed to the linguistic term reborrowing, which implies that the original culture is taking the loanword and changing its meaning again. An example of this is cosplay, which is a reborrowing from the Japanese loanword, which is a combination of costume and play. A returned loanword is one that the writer uses from one language that they speak and puts it in a text in another language that they are writing in. The language and culture do not necessarily widely adopt it as with a reborrowing.

dominant narrative of Yugoslavia as a peaceful, multiethnic state is being replaced by a more nationalistic one as older, underlying social tensions become more prominent. “Es gibt keine Partisanen mehr. Es gibt Kommissare. Es gibt Uniformen und Soldaten darin und Maschinengewehre davor und Generäle” (Stanišić, Grammofon 169). The partisans who fought against the Nazis in World War II under Tito and were central to and legitimized his rise to power no longer exist, there are now political officers (commissars) instead. The *Volksbefreiungskampf* is celebrated with parades and songs, but people take it for granted, and there are also social problems such as bread lines (Stanišić, Grammofon 169). The partisans are connected with his grandfather, who is not named though is probably Slavko, who worked with the partisans to free the rather mythological everything possible and impossible (Stanišić, Grammofon 169). There is also the gas cylinder in his grandmother’s kitchen that is used for basketball as well as for cooking (Stanišić, Grammofon 169). “Es gibt heimlich gemalte Hakenkreuze, so verboten, dass jede gehakenkreuzte Papier zerknüllt wird und im Müll landet” (Stanišić, Grammofon 169). The growing interethnic and nationalist tensions that had been suppressed in Tito’s Yugoslavia and that would soon boil over into war are represented by the secretly drawn swastikas that are thrown away as soon as they are drawn. The focus then shifts back to the family sphere and Aleks describes how his grandmother doesn’t throw any plastic bags away, but rather: “sie verwahrt sie in einem bodenlosen Raum namens *Špajz*” (Stanišić, Grammofon 170, emphasis in the original). The chapter ends with the narrator sitting behind a gravestone with a girl who shows him “wie der Unterschied zwischen mir und ihr aussieht. / Er sieht nicht gut aus” (Stanišić, Grammofon 170). Boy and girl in this case are stand-ins for the different ethnic groups and show the opposite of Adorno comparing loanwords to foreign girls, the attraction to the opposite sex ends in disillusionment just as the multi-ethnic state dissolved

amid mutual distrust and resentment. What is foreign or subversive is no longer attractive, and each side doesn't want to sound like the other. On the gravestone, there is a picture of a partisan. The closing line "Aber Partisanen gibt es keine mehr" (Stanišić, Grammofon 170) signals that General Tito, his partisan, and his narrative of an external enemy for all of Yugoslavia to come together against are now gone.

Neither the narrative of the peaceful, multiethnic state nor that of the rising nationalism and ethnic tensions fully captures the nature of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s, with its mix of ethnic groups and religions. The grandmother takes all these pieces and stores them in her bottomless *Špajz*; which resembles a void, where different parts come together to create something greater. "Meine Oma wirft keine Plastiktüte weg, sie wäscht sie aus, wenn Schafskäsewasser ausgelaufen ist, sie verwahrt sie in einem bodenlosen Raum namens *Špajz*. Sie hebt alles auf, sie sagt: man weiß nie welche Zeiten kommen" (Stanišić, Grammofon 170). The grandmother does not throw anything away (wegwerfen) but stores (verwahren) it in the bottomless space (bodenloser Raum) called the *Špajz*. Stanišić states the grandmother "hebt alles auf," which can translate as "she sets everything aside" or "she keeps everything." If read as a reference to Hegel's *Aufhebung* (Sublation), this line can be read as "she sublates everything" or "makes everything void." She takes all the individual parts of society, or in this case of her shopping trip, and lifts them into the bottomless *Špajz* where they become part of a greater whole. The *Špajz,* as a loanword from German, represents societal diversity. The *Bosnian – English Dictionary* translates the word as *pantry* or *larder* and notes that it stems from the *German Speisekammer*,[39] which means the same thing. However, there is also a recognition that

[39] Špajza – (špajza; G -e; mn G špajza) Razg – smočnica (U mojoj špajzi uvijek ima pekmeza) (pantry (There is always jam in my pantry)) (Školska)
Špajz – (njem Speis), ostava, prostorija za hrano pored kuhinje (Rjecnik 1044)

there are parts of the *Špajz* that will not fit the greater whole or will be left out, such as the liquid from the goat cheese. Narratives or sentiments of animosities between different ethnic groups during World War II, that contradicted those offered by Tito and are represented by the secretly drawn swastikas, were simmering beneath the surface and are now spilling over, as shown during the party earlier in the novel. This image will be added again after the war. As with the Ottoman Turkish loanwords, the *Špajz* is depicted as a semi-magical place that highlights the linguistic diversity of the language and culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but this diversity of ethnicities and opinions also creates an explosive force of contrasting opinions and animosities. The grandmother's prediction that difficult times are coming is proven true with the outbreak of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

When Aleks returns to visit Višegrad after the war seven years later, he visits old friends and relatives. While going to a bar with his childhood friend Zoran, Aleks in an aside explains his intentions for coming back to Višegrad after the war: "Ich [Alek] spreche zur Seite: ich will nur meine Erinnerung mit dem Jetzt vergleichen" (Stanišić, Grammofon 277). This suggests that Aleks' visit is an exercise in mapping the constellation of how things are now with the way they were before the war without putting a larger label on the city and people. In Germany, Aleks makes lists of what he remembers of Višegrad, and he tries to compare what he remembers with how things are now. He also meets old friends and other people he knows to see how they have changed.

During his visit, Aleks stays at his grandmother's apartment. He brings a jar of marmalade for diabetics as a gift, which the grandmother at first good-naturedly rejects, saying "ich esse keine Marmelade, die ich nicht selbst gekocht habe!" (Stanišić, Grammofon 263); however, she does ultimately ask him to put it into the *Špajz*:

> [Oma Katarina] wickelt das Glas [Marmelade] wieder ein und bittet mich, es im Špajz abzustellen. / Liste der Geruchsort. Keller: Erbseneintopf und Kohlen (…). Špajz, die Speisekammer: Sauerteig und morsches Holz – darin der Brotkasten, die Konserven, der Zucker, das Mehl, die Tüten in Tüten, die Motten, die unergründlichen Schachteln und die verrostete Mausefalle (Stanišić 263)

Instead of being a bottomless space, the *Špajz* is filled with interesting smells and objects that Oma Katarina has collected over the years, such as sugar, flour, the previously mentioned bags, moths, rusty mousetraps, and boxes. Now the boxes are unfathomable or unsearchable rather than the whole space being bottomless. The *Špajz* also smells like sourdough and rotten wood. Aleks compares this smell with that of the cellar (Keller), where he spent the beginning of the war, which smells like pea soup and coal. The various items and smells in the *Špajz* create the image of a familiar, comforting space that is associated with his grandmother, with whom he was close before fleeing to Germany. All the items in the *Špajz* are associated with the household and are used for keeping a kitchen sanitary, but also with the note that many of these things are rotting away and past their prime, much like the multiethnic state. Here, the *Špajz* resembles Adorno's idea of a negative dialectic, where the parts of the whole that are left out of a narrative help to better define what that thing is. But Stanišić leaves open the question of whether all the missing parts can be identified or pieced together to tell something about the concept. He does not initially investigate the fathomless boxes. The *Špajz* ultimately is a space where contradictions, multi-ethnicity and secretly drawn swastikas (nationalism), occupy the same space. Neither the tensions between the two nor either part individually can be ignored for the space to be understood, though a complete understanding will never be possible.

During these visits, Aleks realizes that he is now disconnected and estranged from the people and city he once knew. This is powerfully depicted in a conversation Zoran, who has become embittered after witnessing many atrocities committed during the war and is both angry and glad that Aleks left. Zoran angrily rejects Aleks' attempts to understand the city and to feel

part of it again: “Kennst du hier irgendjemand? Du kennst ja noch nicht mal mich! Du bist ein Fremder, Aleksandar!” (Stanišić, Grammofon 277). For Zoran, Aleks’ project will not succeed, because he cannot understand how Višegrad changed during and after the war as he was not there to see the events firsthand. Aleks observes and visits his former friends and neighbors and discovers what he can for himself. Aleks also realizes that he is estranged from his former home and that there are parts that he cannot understand or explain to his readers. The contents of the *Špajz* are now partly visible to him, only individual boxes that are unsearchable and whose contents are incomprehensible, which represent aspects of the war and how the city has changed that Aleks cannot understand. The narrative is broken up by lists that Aleks makes of Višegrad, with which he slowly compares his memories of the city to the present. Aleks has a better understanding of what the city is like from his internet research on the atrocities that were committed during the war, but there is still more that remains unknown. Aleks cannot explain the incomprehensible boxes in his grandmother’s *Špajz* to the German reader, he can only show them and let the unanswered explanation for why things happened represent the whole. This is represented in the novel partly through two intertextual references to the poem “Emina” a poem written by a Bosnian Serb about a beautiful Muslim woman. The narrator also describes two people, his uncle Miki and the policeman Mr. Pokol, who were accused of committing war crimes, though he cannot explain what would lead them to commit these crimes.

Using “Emina” to comment on the nationalism and violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnian Serb poet Aleksa Šantić’s “Emina” is a poem written in the style of a *Sevdalinka* love song, which figures prominently at several points in Stanišić’s novel. The *Sevdalinka* love song originated and developed in the cities of 16th Century Bosnia and Herzegovina (Efendić). In the poem, the narrator tells how on his way home from a Turkish bath, he sees Emina in a garden

and is captivated by her beauty. Though he greets her, she does not respond, and the narrator complains that she is haughty and that though she is seducing him, she ignores him. The titular Emina is connected with Emina Koluder (née Sefić) (Uca 193), a Bosniak from Mostar where Šantić lived. The significance of a Bosnian Serb writing a poem about a beautiful Bosniak leads some scholars to call the poem a "Relikt einer panslawischen Utopie vom Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts" (Bühler-Dietrich 5). However, upon examination of loanwords and cultural signifiers in the poem, the work highlights not a utopia, but rather the complexity of interethnic relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina during Hapsburg rule, which Stanišić plays with in his narratives of events before and during the war in then-Yugoslavia. The poem was first published in the literary journal *Kolo* and was later changed when Šantić published it in a book of poems (Vešović). Emina is exotified as emblematic of a beautiful Bosniak, but the Other is not looked at with fear or derision, rather with fascination and desire. Because the titular Emina is connected to someone Šantić knew, the narrator may be the poet himself (Uca 193); however, Marko Vešović argues that because of the prominence of Turkish loanwords[40] in the first stanza the poem's narrative voice is not that of Šantić, but of a Bosniak narrator he is imitating.

Loanwords were not used exclusively by one community in Mostar. Bosniaks and Serbs lived close together in the cities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the varieties of BCMS spoken in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina both contain many Turkish and Arabic loanwords. Vešović's argument for who the poetic narrator is is based solely on the presence of loanwords is therefore not sufficient. A stronger argument for the narrator being a Bosniak is the use of certain

[40] In the first stanza several Ottoman Turkish loanwords are in the prominent, rhyming position (*hamama, imama, jasmina,* Emina). The narrator sees Emina while coming back from the *hamam*, the Turkish bath. After Emina ignores the narrator's greeting (another Ottoman Turkish loanword: *selam*), he exclaims "by my *din*" an Arabic word that has connotations with region and faith. Marko Vešović points out that Šantić replaces the Croatian *kondir* (vessel) in the original *Kolo* publication, with the Ottoman Turkish loanword *ibrik* in the collection.

loanwords related to Ottoman Turkish culture and the Muslim religion. The use of Ottoman Turkish loanwords that refer to cultural aspects, such as the Turkish baths and religion, more strongly suggests a Bosniak narrator. Though, Šantić, an Orthodox, ethnic Serb, adds an element of exotification to the poem, he was familiar enough with the popular *Sevdalinka* song to write a poem in that style, adding his own flourishes while using loanword from Ottoman Turkish. While Šantić is attracted to an exotic woman, she is not necessarily foreign. The poem does not suggest that using Turkish loanwords and referencing Turkish culture was necessarily subversive for Šantić, but it plays into the complicated question of whether religion determines ethnicity that Greenberg points out and which ethnicity belongs in a certain city or country.[41] Šantić suggests his stance related to ethnicity and belonging in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the poem "Ostajte ovdje" (Stay Here), where he portrays both ethnic Serbs and Bosniaks as part of Mostar and pleads with them not to leave the city as their migration was considered a demographic and racial loss for all Serbs (Dostović 95-97) after the Hapsburg's conquered Bosnia and Herzegovina.

"Emina" appears twice in Stanišić's novel and both times the song itself and the reference to its titular character are used to comment on the nationalism and violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The first reference is in the second chapter as a song sung at a party put on by Aleks' great-grandparents to distract a nationalist, ethnic Serb who is threatening the band. Haines states that while the scene "plays with bucolic Balkan stereotypes" it is "crafted to show that the hatred of the other that emerged with frightening speed at this period came from tensions that had always been present" (Saša 108). At the beginning of the scene, older stories about the

[41] While Maria Todorova points to religion as being more important than the country someone s born in to determine their ethnicity or identity, Robert Greenberg points to the difficulty of using religion as a factor for determining ethnicity in former Yugoslavia, it is not sufficient, as different groups, while predominantly one religion, will have members of other religions (Language 8).

Battle of Kosovo[42] (1389) appear. Aleks' Great-Grandfather sings while drunk on his new in-door toilet about how Prince Marko came to town and slaughtered Turks (Stanišić, Grammofon 39). This long-standing animosity towards the Ottoman Turks influences the great-grandparent's neighbor's anti-Bosniak sentiment: the Pešićs (ethnic Serbs) did not come to Aleks' baptism because his mother is Bosniak, even though it is traditional for the two families to go to each other's baptisms (Stanišić, Grammofon 38). The memories of interethnic conflict during World War II, that Bet-El mentions do not appear until Kamenko, who is a friend of the narrator's uncle Miki shoots one of the band members in the ear playing the narrator's great-grandfather's party for singing "Zigeunern Ustaschalieder und Türkengeheule […]! Ich will für unseren Miki unsere Musik! Lieder aus der ruhmreichen Zeit, die war und die wieder kommen wird!" (Stanišić, Grammofon 49). This is followed by a rant about how his grandfather fought in World War II against the Ustaša, who are currently plundering the country, presumably Bosnia and Herzegovina again (Stanišić, Grammofon 48-49). The Ustaša reference the Nazi-backed fascist regime in then-independent Croatia during WWII. At this point, the great-grandfather, having fallen asleep drunk, wakes up and begins singing the poem "Emina" from the second verse. Aleks describes his great-grandfather throwing his arms wide and throwing his head back at one point in the song and depicts him as almost falling in love with Emina herself "Eminas Hyazinthenhaar bringt meinen verliebten Ur-Opa völlig durcheinander" (Grammofon 50). The grandfather's soaring emotions, evocative of singing in the *Sevdalinka* style, distracts Kamenko, allowing the narrator's father and several other men to disarm him, after which the party resumes (Stanišić, Grammofon 50-52).

[42] A founding myth of Serbia, when Serbia fought and lost against the Ottoman Turks, leading to Ottoman rule over Serbia.

Uca suggests that "the sound of the great-grandfather's voice soaring above the tumult in an expression of interethnic desire can be read as a voice of dissent against the conflict" (193). While the great-grandfather and the others at the party are against conflict, this is not a utopian setting where all ethnic groups live in absolute harmony. Especially in light of the lingering feelings of animosity rooted in deep history emerge through the great-grandfather singing about Prince Marko killing Turks and the mild prejudices the Pešićs show towards Aleks' mother. Through references to historical tensions, Aleks shows the deep historical roots of the interethnic conflict, but the violence against non-Serbs that Kamenko instigates is unwelcome. The great-grandparents might not mind that their grandson married a Bosniak while their neighbors do, but both are against physical violence represented by Kamenko whose prejudices and nationalist views have similar roots. The lyrics of the song intermixed with the action of the men distracting and then disarming Kamenko carry no significance, rather it is the emotional singing about interethnic desire used to distract against ethnic hate that has a touch of fitting irony.

The second reference to "Emina" is a story between a Bosniak woman, Aleks' neighbor Amela, and an ethnic Serb soldier that takes place while Višegrad is under siege. Amela shares many characteristics with Emina and her relationship with the Serb soldier does not fit neatly into the frames of interethnic harmony or hate that were promoted before and after Tito. Like Emina, Amela is also a Turkish name used in Bosnia and Herzegovina.[43] Amela is described as having long, black braids like Emina and is twice called Emina by the soldier (Stanišić; Grammofon 111, 117), which opens up contrasts between these two characters in Stanišić's book

[43] Tragically, it is through these Ottoman Turkish loanwords and personal names that many of Aleks' Bosniak neighbors are identified and targeted during the war. The title Čika is a term of Turkish origin that refers to any older male, sometimes translated as uncle, regardless of whether they are related to you. Aleks refers to his Bosniak neighbors by this term, Čika Sead and Čika Hasan, both of whom are either killed or commit suicide during the war. Aleks protects Asija, a young Bosniak girl whose family had been killed before meeting Aleks, by telling the Serb soldiers that her name is Katarina (Stanišić, Grammafon 113), the name of his ethnic Serb grandmother. Even in this moment of heightened interethnic tensions and violence, the lines of division are not black and white.

and Šantić's poem. The narration of the story of Amela and the soldier moves from Aleks purely observing what is happening around him to the soldier taking over telling and his own narrative. When ethnic Serb soldiers raid and terrorize the residents of Aleks' apartment block, one with a gold tooth takes an interest in Amela as she is making bread. The soldier sticks his finger into the dough she is kneading and then takes her into her apartment and closes the door. When the soldier emerges later from Amela's room, she is described as crying behind him suggesting that the soldier raped her (Stanišić, Grammofon 117 - 20). Later, on a bridge, the soldier talks about the massacres, past and present, that occurred on the bridge with Musa, another Bosniak neighbor whom the soldier forced to help him: "Mädchen habe ich viele umgeworfen, sagt der Soldat, nur eines davon, Emina, ließ ich ungeküsst" (Stanišić, Grammofon 126). The soldier also denies that Amela is his Emina (Stanišić, Grammofon 125). The soldier is now portrayed as very war-weary and wonders aloud how many wars have taken place in Višegrad up to that time. He compares how horses and men both die like flies in this and the previous wars, before taking out some bread that Aleks claims Amela made and forcing Musa to eat some of it (Stanišić, Grammofon 125). In the next chapter, after the narrator and his family flee Višegrad, the narrator records a story by a former soldier who is introduced with a golden tooth and as having dough under his fingernails from kneading, suggesting that this is the soldier from the previous two scenes. The soldier tells the narrator how he carried his dead lover, whom he calls Emina, through her village as it was being attacked, trying to get supplies for a wedding for the two of them (Stanišić, Grammofon 129-30). While the woman is not named, he describes her as having black hair (Stanišić, Grammofon 129); he also calls her "meine schönste Zigeunerin," even though the soldier refers to her as Roma, the dead woman is probably Amela. Another soldier

called the soldier with the gold tooth mad (Wahnsinniger) for wanting to stay with the dead woman (Stanišić, Grammofon 130).

The soldier is far from a simple character motivated by hatred of the Other. While he takes part in atrocities, he later shows some remorse for his actions and reflects on the many deaths of animals and people during past and present wars. In Šantić's "Emina," whether the narrative voice is that of a Serb or Bosniak, the eroticism and exotification of the Other remain on the level of sensual attraction and the male gaze. The barrier between them does not allow the narrator to go over to Emina after she ignores his greeting. He can only stare at her from behind. In contrast, in Stanišić's novel the Serb soldier does not greet Amela but orders her, and other women there, to make bread for him and the other soldiers. There is no barrier to stop the soldier in the heat of battle: he puts his hands on Amela's hips, pushes her hands into the dough, making it an erotic act, and then rapes her in her apartment. In the subsequent scenes, the soldier is always named with the synecdoches of the gold tooth and removing the dough from under his fingernails. The act of cleaning his fingernails suggests the soldier's desire to eradicate all physical traces of his guilt. It bears similarity to Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth, who tries to wash imagined blood off her fingers as a manifestation of her own feelings of guilt. The soldier also does not distinguish between Roma and Bosniak when he states that men need a "Zigeunerin" to enjoy life (119 - 20). Aleks can see Amina on the ground behind the soldier with her wet hair veiling her face. Emina is not described as wearing a veil in the poem, instead her long hair is described as flowing freely. The veil (Schleier) associated with women of the Muslim faith is transformed in Stanišić's novel into wet, strings of hair that cover Amela's face, which the narrator can see behind the Serb soldier when he emerges from her room.

The scene in which the soldier talks remorsefully about taking part in genocide on the bridge suggests that while he sexually molested or abused women before killing them, he would not do so to Emina. Here he ignores his sexual encounter with Amela, whom he now denies but then later acknowledges to be his Emina. The description of throwing Bosniaks off the bridge suggests that this is the titular bridge of Ivo Adric's *Bridge on the Drina*, which was the site of mass slaughter during the civil war of the 1990s. Zoran, one of Aleks' childhood friends, in a winding, angry telephone call narrates seeing women being taken away in trucks over that same bridge: "Ich hasse Lastwägen voller Mädchen und Frauen, die zum Vilina Vlas und zum Bikavac fahren" (Grammofon 145), two locations that Ed Vullamy of the Guardian notes were rape camps (Vullamy). The soldier's remorse culminates in the final scene, narrated in the voice of the soldier, as his war-weariness has given way to what his comrades call madness as he desperately tries to find bridal clothes for a dead woman, who is probably Amela and whom he now calls his Emina. By letting the soldier narrate his own story in the end, Aleks illustrates to an audience this complex interethnic relationship that is in dialogue with another text and that he cannot fully understand or explain.

Pokolj – What Aleks cannot understand after the war

Aleks comments that many of the perpetrators of ethnic cleansing in Višegrad were able to walk free after the war (Stanišić, Grammofon 280). The linguistic and ethnic homogenization as well as the nationalism and intolerance that led to the ethnic cleansing is represented by the policeman Mr. Pokor, who is nicknamed Mr. Pokolj (Germ: Herr Gemetzel; Engl: Mr. Massacre). Before the war, Mr. Pokor was shown as a shabby and ineffectual policeman (Stanišić, Grammofon 64-65). After the war, the narrator sees Mr. Pokor attempting to stuff bags of onions into the back of his car which is already stuffed full of onions (Stanišić, Grammofon

280-82). In contrast to the bottomless space of the *Špajz* and its varied contents, Mr. Pokor is trying to stuff a large amount of a single item into a small space. Read along the lines of Adorno telling multiple narratives with loanwords to guard against nationalism and the Nazis who promote a single narrative, Mr. Pokor is trying to make a single item or narrative fit where it does not or only tell the narrative of one group (his) and avoiding the explosive force of the narrative of the Other. Aleks never says specifically what the policeman is accused of doing. He only states Mr. Pokor was the leader of a group of *Freischärler* (irregular soldiers) (Stanišić, Grammofon 280) and hints that he took part in the ethnic cleansing of Bosniaks in Višegrad, quoting others that "es gab dafür genug Zeugen" (Stanišić, Grammofon 281). Mr. Pokor shows that he has an excellent memory and can recall the narrator's and his mother's name after the narrator provides the name of his father when pressed, though he deliberately mistranslates the meaning of his mother's name from Turkish into BCMS (Stanišić, Grammofon 281). Aleks is shaken not to be able to defend his mother against Mr. Pokor, who would have been a potential victim of any ethnic cleansing of Bosniaks. Mr. Pokor also asks if Aleks' uncle Miki is in town, suggesting a connection between the two.

Miki is introduced early in *Grammofon* as about the join the army just before war breaks out in Bosnia and Herzegovina and he fights about politics with the narrator's father (Stanišić, Grammofon 34). He is rumored to have been in the previously mentioned Hotel Bikavac, which was infamous as a site where Bosniak women and girls were violently raped and abused: "Leute hätten Miki schon '92 in Višegrad gesehen. / Im Hotel Bikavac? hob Vater die Stimmer, auf keinen Fall!" (Stanišić, Grammofon 147). After the war, Miki is the only brother still living in Višegrad and he takes care of his and his brothers' aging mother. Before Aleks goes with Miki and his grandmother to the family cemetery during his visit, Miki takes him for a ride through

town. They go over the bridge where thousands of Bosniaks were shot, then to the Bikavac and Vilina Vlas hotels. During these stops at locations of carnage, Miki doesn't say anything though Aleks tries to engage him in conversation. When Miki visits Mr. Pokor in the police station, Mr. Pokor shows him respect and gives him the keys to jail without asking for a reason (Stanišić, Grammofon 304). Finally, in a fire station, Miki says to Alek: "Dein Vater und Bora halten es nicht für nötig, sagt er […], ihre eigene Mutter zu besuchen. Vielleicht meinen sie, Geld schicken, das reicht schon. Es reicht aber nicht. Sie ist unsere Mutter und wäre ohne mich allein. […] Dein Vater und Bora haben mit mir ein Problem. Das ist eine Sache unter uns, das hat mit unserer Mutter nichts zu tun" (Stanišić, Grammofon 305). While talking with Miki, Aleks' comments: "Ich bin überragend im Beschreiben von Gesten" (Grammofon 306), which aptly describes his approach of showing gestures or statements that illustrate his perception of someone, without having to explain what they are doing or why. Similar to his statement earlier that he only wants to compare the past with the present, he also just wants to describe what is there, without trying to fully explain what he sees in his negative dialectical project. As a soldier, Miki possibly committed horrible crimes during the war; but he also stays in Višegrad to take care of the grandmother. He understands how the city has changed in a way that his brothers, who were in Germany during the war, either from the start or after the fighting started do not. They decide not to return because they no longer recognize the city where they used to live. Aleks cannot understand what could have led Miki to commit horrible acts, whether the accusations are true, and he does not hide that Miki now takes care of his mother. He can only show the effects of the war on his uncle through his actions and the burst of anger toward his brothers. Aleks can only describe what he sees in Mr. Pokor and Miki and the city after the war,

of which he is an insightful observer, to show the audience how they have changed and remain affected by their experiences.

Though Aleks wants to explain to his German-speaking audience how Višegrad has changed due to the war of the 1990s, he is unable to fully explain the reasons, because he did not personally experience some of the events he narrates in the voice of other characters, and because he does not understand what causes some people to commit acts such as genocide. While Zoran's angry statement that Aleks is now a stranger in Višegrad is true, it does not mean that Aleks cannot learn about the changes to the city or understand what those changes are, even if he can't always understand the reasons for changes in people. Instead of explaining why someone became what they are or why they committed an act, he shows through examples what people did and how these events still affect them in the present. He also uses intertextual references, that make use of loanwords in BCMS, to underscore the complicated interethnic relations that existed before, during, and after the war. Exemplified in his Uncle Miki, the beloved uncle suspected of war crimes but who takes care of his aging mother, and through Amela and the soldier. Aleks puts all of these examples into the metaphorical *Špajz*, which holds contradictory images of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The loanword *Špajz* does not represent a counter-narrative that resists nationalistic thinking in the audience, but it describes a more complicated, counter-understanding of Bosnia and Herzegovina, than what Aleks views his German classmates as having. The *Špajz* contains the elements that represent explosive forces in Yugoslav society, this is what Aleks can only show, not explain to his audience, and which complicates his readers' view of Yugoslavia.

Chapter 3: Can Chickens Cry?: Traversing Marica Bodrožić's Critique of Post-War Croatia's Language Policy

"Wenn wir über die Geschichte nichts außer der Entwicklung von Sprachen wüssten, … hätten wir eine Geschichtswissenschaft, die möglicherweise sogar präziser wäre als die, die wir kennen"

Olga Martynova, "Good-bye, America, oh."

In Marica Bodrožić's German-language novel *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*[44] (2012), the character Mateo expresses the fundamental tension between language and nation that underwrites chapter six of the novel: "Da sollte ihnen nur einer wieder mit diesen fremdsprachigen Elementen kommen und versuche, ihre schöne, selbständige und in sich – von NATUR AUS! – vollkommene Sprache anzutasten" (*Kirschholz* 178). Mateo creates a fixed narrative that the Croatian language was once pure, was then corrupted by a foreign power, and needs to be made pure again. For Mateo power and language are inextricably connected, thus foreign words signal a foreign occupation of a country and language. To free his country (unnamed but probably Croatia as he is from Istria) and its language from its past occupiers and establish something pure, he argues for retaining only those words that move toward restoring what he considers to be a pure Croatian, uncontaminated by what he calls the enemy, probably Serbia. Contesting virtually all of Mateo's claims is the novel's protagonist Arjeta, who states: "So unnötig wie ein vom Latein abgeleitetes Wort, *avis*, der alte Wort-Vogel, der ihnen etwas hätte beibringen können, musste getötet werden" (*Kirschholz* 79). She argues that loanwords tell their own story, one deeply embedded in the singularities of Croatian history, and which one can reveal through etymology. Rather than a fixed narrative, Arjeta prefers throughlines of small pieces of history, such as words, to let the reader actively engage with history. Arjeta reasons

[44] Hereafter referred to as *Kirschholz*.

that a language is incomplete by itself, and loanwords help fill in the gaps and represent something of a country's history.

This chapter charts the conflict between Mateo and Arjeta and how it reflects a larger debate about language and how it represents a people. Following Chapters 1 and 2, which lay out a theoretical framework for understanding how a minority group can adjust the meanings of loanwords to meet their rhetorical needs, this chapter examines why a majority would seek to take these loanwords away. What is the relationship between the population of a country and the language(s) it speaks? How does language embody and communicate a nation's history and values? Addressing these questions requires remembering and understanding that nothing is new in principle about this debate. Efforts to "purify" a language have a long history and are hardly restricted to one people. Particularly instructive in this respect is the work of the German Romantic and idealist philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte. His push for an *Urdeutsch* has productive resonances for the language debates in post-independence Croatia that occupy a central position in the sixth chapter of Bodrožić's novel. This stands to reason, given that she wrote the novel in German, reflecting as it were the invasions and appropriations of that language. After examining how Fichte and the history of Croatia inform events in the novel and how they inform both Mateo's and Arjeta's approaches to language, this chapter will analyze three examples of Croatian that Mateo uses, one before and two after the war, and how Arjeta reacts to them. The post-war examples have strict views on language and how it relates to history. In the end, these positions are themselves contradictory. What makes a language "pure" and how it reflects a country and its history is often up to the individual user, and their interpretation of language is necessarily always already informed by politics.

Mateo and Fichte connect a language with a country and a people

In his book detailing the linguistic situation in former Yugoslavia before and after the breakup, Robert Greenberg argues that Johann Gottfried von Herder and his insistence that a nation can only claim to be such if it has a language of its own was embraced by many in what would become Yugoslavia (9). Before the formation of what would become Yugoslavia, the Serbs and Croats especially developed distinct literary and language traditions. The connection between language and the state was central for many Croatian linguists early on. As Greenberg argues, the struggle for Croats to prove that Serbian and Croatian are separate languages is "characterized by the struggle of the Croatian nation for independence and sovereignty" (109). This purist understanding of language was not without dire political consequences as dreams of a language purified of foreign elements can be said to have contributed to the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s insofar as ethnicity and language are closely tied. According to Greenburg, these contentious aims to speak a pure language go back to the area that will be Yugoslavia's fascination among many with German Romantics' ideas about language. Yildiz cites Herder's insistence "on the need to maintain the distinctness of […] national languages lest they lose their authenticity and rootedness in their respective nations" (Yildiz 7). While Herder is arguably less univocal on these matters, the claim is explicit in Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation*.[45]

Fichte's thoughts on loanwords and the nation are essential to understanding Mateo's approaches to language and history in the novel. Comparing the concept of the nation from Fichte's time[46] with how the nation is understood today is fraught. Fichte was writing at a time

[45] Hereafter referred to as *Reden*.
[46] There is no scholarly consensus as to how the Nation was understood in Herder and Fichte's time. For an overview of different theories, please see: Anderson, Gellner, Hirschi, Hobsbawm, Koselleck, Weber.

when Germany did not exist but was comprised of multiple, smaller German-speaking principalities; Bodrožić, on the other hand, is writing about the breakup of a multiethnic nation, Yugoslavia, into smaller states dominated by a single ethnic group. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a notable exception. Nonetheless, Fichte's ideas find purchase for a reason: he lays out the critical role of language for the nation before the nation exists, mirroring the situations of both what became Yugoslavia after World War I and Croatia's push for independence in the 1990s.

For Fichte languages are distinct from one another and express vastly different worldviews. A "foreign" language is not equipped to represent the views of another culture, thereby foreclosing the possibility of translation or cross-cultural communication. In *Reden*, written during Napoleon's invasion and occupation of the German-speaking lands in the early 1800s, Fichte rails against loanwords in German. For Fichte, it is not enough to explain the meanings of foreign words to someone. For someone to fully understand the meaning of a word, they must live the experiences or ideas embedded in that idiom. The relationship between a word and the *Sinnbild* (supersensual concept) it represents is made clear to the listener if they and the speaker grow up speaking the same language and sharing a culture. As Fichte writes, "Das Sinnbild ist ihm klar, und drückt ihm das Verhältnis des Begriffenen zum geistigen Werkzeuge vollkommen verständlich aus, denn dieses Verhältnis wird ihm erklärt durch ein andres unmittelbar lebendiges Verhältnis zu seinem sinnlichen Werkzeuge" (Reden 63). This does not mean that languages do not change over time, but that a people's language will persist in meeting the needs of its speakers through continual use (Fichte, Reden 65-67). Two unrelated languages or two languages that have evolved separately, will not meet the first group's need for expression. Because the Franks were a Germanic group that adopted Latin which developed into

French, they adopted a language that forced a supersensuous view of the world on them that they did not understand. The language developed further from a dead center:

> Das Höchste, was sie [die Leute, die die neue Sprache annehmen] hierbei tun können, ist, daß sie das Sinnbild und die geistige Bedeutung derselben sich erklären lassen, wodurch sie die flache und tote Geschichte einer fremden Bildung, keineswegs aber eigne Bildung erhalten und Bilder bekommen, die für sie weder unmittelbar klar, noch auch lebenanregend sind, sondern völlig also willkürlich erscheinen müssen, wie der sinnliche Teil der Sprache (Fichte, Reden 66)

By this Fichte means that the people are forced to discard the worldview the old language expressed and to continue with the worldview the new language expresses, which the speakers can only have explained to them, but which they will not fully understand. Fichte denies the speakers the ability to learn or internalize a new concept from a foreign culture, though he does admit that this happened earlier with Christianity. People can only fully understand a new concept from a foreign culture after that concept has become part of their lived experience.

Bodrožić takes the opposite position from Fichte. She "alludes to the possibility of finding a home in [the German] language" (Förster 238), a language she did not begin speaking until moving to Germany at age 11, by making connections and relationships between words that the reader might not otherwise consider. This allows her to create new words to name and represent thoughts and feelings about ethnic tensions in former Yugoslavia. In her autobiographical book *Sterne erben, Sterne färben. Meine Ankunft in Wörtern*[47] (2007), Bodrožić states that she does not relinquish her South Slavic heritage, though she prefers to write in German:

> Die Selbstverständlichkeit, mit der die Wälder des Slawischen in mir liegen, wird mir erst im *Schreibengehen* bewusst. Dieses Unterpfand, das immer aus der ersten Sprache herauftönt und mich endlich zu jemand macht, der etwas von sich *sagen* kann. Aber erst in der deutschen Sprache wird mein eigenes Zuhause für mich selbst hörbar (Sterne 9, emphasis in the original)

[47] Hereafter referred to as *Sterne*.

Bodrožić notes that her first language, BCMS,[48] influences her writing and that the potential for individual expression in that language helps her to find her authorial voice in another language. Bodrožić creates what she calls a "new German" (Craith 89), by adapting the German language to her needs through wordplay to express her supersensual view of the world. This new German takes the form of compound nouns that create surprising and even contradictory relationships between the parts that surprise readers (c.f. Vinci). An example of Bodrožić's new German from the above quote is *Schreibengehen*, which McMahon translates as "coming to write" but it also implies writing while walking and that the person will reach their destination through writing. At first, the forests of the Slavic language (BCMS) influence and surround Bodrožić's view and use of language, but it remains on the margins or the outside, the wilderness. Some scholars argue that Croatian underlies her writing in German (Rădulescu 99; Förster 238); however, Bodrožić rejects the claim that she simply thinks in BCMS and then translates her words into German. Bodrožić notes that "my Croatian translator does not find it easy to translate my German phrases into Croatian […] It's because it has been created in German" and argues that you cannot betray the language you are writing in (Craith 89-90). Bodrožić creates a "new German" by adapting the German language to her needs through wordplay and games to express her supersensuous view of the world.

An example of Bodrožić's use of word games to express a supersensuous view of post-independence Croatia occurs when she describes standing in line to get her new passport. Upon hearing people saying they are proud to call themselves Croatians, Bodrožić responds: "ja, natürlich, dachte ich, jetzt sind wir das geworden, was schon immer in uns gelauert hat" (Sterne 41). This ironic line critiques the feeling that Croats are only Croatians when they are separate

[48] Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian

from Yugoslavia, though for Bodrožić this ethnic identity is separate from a national identity. She juxtaposes the national pride represented by the new passports with sights of soldiers returning home with amputations and dissects the costs and value of identity politics with the poetic line: "Kroate, Granate, Granatapfel, Apfelsine, Cinematograph – die Welt wurde austauschbar" (Sterne 41). This word chain, a children's word game, creates relationships between otherwise unrelated words, which she uses to comment on and critique ethnic distrust in former Yugoslavia. She first pairs *Kroate* (Croat) with *Granate* (grenade). The similar-sounding words connect the ethnic group with war. Then, *Granate* turns into *Granatapfel* (pomegranate), taking a weapon of war and turning into a less dangerous fruit. This word chain continues with *Apfelsine* (orange). Both *Granatapfel* and *Apfelsine* contain the word *Apfel* (apple) within them, but neither is an apple; signaling that while they are two different fruits, they both share some commonalities, much like Croats and Serbs. The string of words ends with *Cinematograph*, which is a combination of *cine*, which is pronounced the same as the *sine* in *Apfelsine*, and *-graph*, which starts in a similar fashion to *Granate* or *Kroate*, signaling a combination of two unrelated pairs that combine to make something new, much like how in Yugoslavia different ethnic groups came together to make one new country. The line ends with "die Welt wurde austauschbar" signaling that not only the words, but also people's national identities, are exchangeable and reject stable forms of identity. Bodrožić emphasizes both sharing culture and language across a broad, disparate region,[49] as well as emphasizing the importance of loanwords in showing the history of a country.

[49] Bodrožić also provides several examples of this shared culture in the form of popular music that was loved across all the successor states after the collapse of Yugoslavia. For example, she states expresses a feeling of shared culture when attending a concert by the Yugoslav rock band *Bijelo Dugme* in 2005: "Für diese drei Stunden, die das Konzert dauerte, hatte man das Gefühl, in seiner alten Heimat Jugoslawien zu sein, und es hat niemals einen Krieg gegeben" (Sterne 53). For more information on the role of musicians who were popular before the breakup of Yugoslavia giving concerts in the successor states in fostering a feeling of shared culture, please see Petrov.

In a later book, *Mein Weisser Frieden* (2014), Bodrožić expresses an interest in etymology: "Die Geschichte ist unsere Spracherzählerin, die Kontrolle wird nie schöner sein als die Freiheit der Sprache, weil sie die Freiheit und Bewegung des Menschen spiegelt, wie ganz nebenbei auch das Wirken des Venetischen beweist“ (73-74). She lists several examples of loanwords in the Dalmatian dialect: *plaža* (beach) comes from the French *la plage*, *šukara* (wheelbarrow) comes from the German (Austrian) *Schubkarren*, and the two words for *city* are the Hungarian *varoš* and the Croatian *grad* (Weisser 72-73). The etymology of a word mirrors not only where a word comes from and how people and words move within and between countries, but it also highlights the diversity within language and society currently. In *Sterne Erben, Sterne Färben*, Bodrožić describes her first language, the dialect spoken in Dalmatia, as a mix, a hybrid: “etwas durch und durch Unvollkommenes, aus Kreuzungen und Ahnungen bestehendes Gemisch” (106), and the crossings and ideas that come from different languages help speakers of the language to express themselves fully. By focusing on and highlighting the etymology of diverse words, Bodrožić emphasizes the different historical influences on the region and this diversity becomes part of the identity of the population. While there is not a complete overlap, Arjeta’s views that the etymology of a word can tell you about a country’s history and that a multilingual phrase can sometimes express a feeling more accurately than a monolingual phrase are similar to Bodrožić views on language and the nation.

Bodrožić expands this image of a shared language and culture to cover all varieties of BCMS and she reasons that these crossings are what connect the larger BCMS-speaking region. "[Z]udem hieß das Ganze Serbokroatisch, hielt größere Räume offen, verschiedene Wörter für *Zug* gab es, und wenn es das Glück gab, dann weil es *viele* Wörter für eine Sache gab” (Sterne 106, emphasis in the original). For Bodrožić the diversity of words across different regions in

Serbo-Croatian, now BCMS, connects the different regions of the country specifically because the language contains many words for one thing, which creates unity in diversity. Rather than a class difference leading to someone with less education not understanding a loanword, Bodrožić provides examples of words that are commonly used. This diversity is especially helpful for Bodrožić as different words have different emotional connotations, as she describes in her reflections on the two words for *train*:

> Als Kind gefiel mir sehr das serbische Wort *voz,* weil es mir durchweg schlüssig, ja gleich das fahren – *voziti se* – ankündigte. Das kroatische Wort *vlak* hingegen hatte eine sanftmütige Aura, für mich hört es sich an wie *mrak* und *mlad,* eine Mischung aus dem Wörtern *Dunkelheit* und *jung,* und so auch erlebte ich die erste Zugfahrt meines Lebens, in der Nacht, und jung war ich, gerade neun Jahre, als habe es diese Reise gebraucht, um das Wort mit meinem Körper und mit dem Gedächtnis selbst zu verstehen (Sterne 106).

Both words contain emotional connections to the word *train* and the concept of train travel. The Serbian word *voz,* announces that the person is going for a drive or a journey, not just taking the bus to work or driving around town. She assigns the Croatian word *vlak* a docile or "gentle aura" (sanftmütige Aura) and makes the unusual connection of train with the similar sounding words *mrak* (dark) and *mlad,* (young). She expands upon these new connections to describe her first experience on a train, which she took at night as a young girl. Both words for *train* have very different emotional connotations for the narrator. The wide regions that speak BCMS are also connected through a shared culture while part of Yugoslavia. Here, there is less overlap with the protagonist Arjeta, who criticizes the replacement of the word for plane, *avion*, with *zrakoplov.* While this was done for political purposes it introduced another word for the same object, and both words carry different connotations, things which Bodrožić appreciates. The issue of different words for the same thing or object reflects the history of Bosniaks, Croats, Montenegrins, and Serbs speaking a common language, that developed separately.

When efforts to create a unified language for what is now called BCMS began in 1850, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, and Serbia were separate countries, several of whom were or had been under foreign occupation: the Hapsburgs and the Ottomans. The first attempt at creating a standard unified language was the Vienna Literary Agreement of 1850 led by Vuk Karadžić, an ethnic Serb. Greenberg points out that the agreement was signed by men, who "shared the conviction that the Central Southern Slavs of the Catholic, Orthodox, and Islamic faiths were at that time 'one people' worthy of a single language" (Greenberg 9). But ethnic distrust endangered this unity from the start. Many in Croatia felt that Serbia, with its larger population, was trying to impose its standard of what is now called BCMS on everyone else (c.f. Alexander, Brozović). The 1954 Novi Sad Agreement, written under Tito's Yugoslavia, acknowledged this distrust and stated that there would be a standard language, called Serbo-Croatian, with two main centers Belgrade and Zagreb, and stated that both standard variations should be used in "its constituent parts," including both scripts (Cyrillic and Latin) (Greenberg 172 - 73). However, distrust between the different ethnic groups remained. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, the successor states worked to differentiate their variety of BCMS from the others. Linguists in post-independence Croatia, removed loanwords from their language to differentiate it from those spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Serbia. These words were often replaced with older Slavic words, though sometimes they resulted in neologisms. While language was probably an example to illustrate differences, rather than the main reason for Croatia to separate from Yugoslavia, Fichte had already drawn attention to the political ramifications for a people who do not speak the language of those in power: either they needed to adopt the language of power or revolt and form their own country (in which the foreign infiltrations of the language have been expunged). For Fichte a group who has lost their language

has also lost the right to rule themselves: “daß allenthalben, wo eine besondere Sprache angetroffen wird, auch eine besondere Nation vorhanden ist, die das Recht hat, selbständig ihre Angelegenheiten zu besorgen und sich selber zu regieren” (Reden 216). When the language of the rulers and the people are two separate languages there is tension for which Fichte proposes two solutions: either the leaders of a multiethnic, multilingual state, encourage everyone to learn the same language in school[50] (Fichte, Reden 217) or the native population must revolt and establish an independent state with their own language. While post-war Croatian linguistic policy contains some similarities to Fichte’s ideas about the nation and language, Croatia did not separate from then-Yugoslavia for linguistic, but political reasons, with ethnicity and language being pretexts, which is a primary expression of these differences.

Greenberg argues that "[f]or the Croats, language issues have gained prominence whenever they felt threatened by stronger or more numerous neighbors" (110). Croatia, under the reign of the Nazi-backed Ustaša fascist party, split from Yugoslavia during World War II, was no longer willing to be ruled by a Serb-led government from Belgrade. As Ljiljana Radonić has argued, it was after the wars that Croatia developed a victim narrative of itself starting from World War II up and continuing the events of the 1990s.[51] In the 1980s, the then-president of Croatia, Franjo Tudjman (also spelled Tuđman) framed both the Ustaša-run independent Croatia during World War II and the Homeland War of the 1990s as fights for an independent Croatia.[52] Tudjman also misleadingly conflated both the Ustaša-run Jasenovac concentration camp and the Battle in Bleiburg, when communist partisans killed Ustaša soldiers as they fled into Austria (c.f.

[50] “wird es Uebersetzungen der verstatteten Schulbücher in die Sprache der Barbaren geben [d.h. die ausländische Macht]” (Fichte, Rede 217).
[51] For a more detailed summary of the history and development of former Yugoslavia’s, and Croatia’s narrative of itself after World War II and the breakup of Yugoslavia please see: Banjeglav, Bet-El, Calić, Jović, Radonić.
[52] It should be noted that in the years since the war, these nationalist tendencies have lessened and presidents of Croatia since Tudjman have separated the Battle of Bleiburg and Jasenovac, including recognizing the role of Croatian fascists in the crimes committed there.

Rulitz et al, and Kolstø), as Croatian holocausts, despite evidence of the complicity of Croatian Ustaša fascists in the atrocities committed against ethnic Bosnians, Serbs, and others at the Jasenovac concentration camp and the Battle in Bleiburg (Radonić 169). This narrative quickly changed after Tudjman's death. In 2005 then-Croatian President Stipe Mesić made clear the role the Ustaša played in the crimes of Jasenovac and did not compare it with Bleiburg (Radonić 172). However, in 2009, Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader argued that the Homeland War was fought as a reaction against "Serb fascism"[53] (Radonić 175). Bodrožić is especially critical of the shift in narrative from Josip Broz Tito, discussed in chapter 2, to Franjo Tudjman, which replaced one narrow, existing nationalist narrative with another for identarian purposes and to shut down counter-narratives. In contrast, Arjeta shows a strong distrust of fixed narratives and argues that they say more about the speaker than about what they are talking about.

Throughlines allow for critical engagement with history

Throughout the novel, Arjeta's project is to find throughlines between historical events rather than create a fixed meaning for events; rather, she is comfortable with narrative gaps, which undermine passive reception in the audience. Arjeta states that she distrusts fixed or complete narratives: "ich misstraue der geordneten Abfolge meiner Erlebnisse. Die Zeit ist eine einzige große Lüge, sie stellt mich innerlich auf den Prüfstand und lässt mich fragen, wer ich denn ohne sie bin – ohne die beweisbaren Jahre und Etappen und Kreise meines Lebens" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 80-81). She shows this process with several other characters in the novel. For example, Silva, another woman from former Yugoslavia, whom Arjeta briefly befriends before Silva moves on to America. Arjeta recounts Silva telling her about escaping Yugoslavia:

[53] Radonić cites "universalization" and "Europeanization" of the Holocaust together with Croatia's bid to join the EU for creating this new narrative to fit with "European standards" of the war (177).

“Sie [Silva] sagte, sie erinnere sich an alles, es klang wie eine Warnung, keine weiteren Fragen zu stellen. Das tat ich auch nicht, ich hörte ihr nur zu, ohne die Lücken, die es in ihrer Geschichte gab, zum Thema zu machen“ (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 78). Silva does not tell Arjeta how she escaped being caught by a Serb militia group while they were committing war crimes. Her story breaks off when she sees one of the soldiers dump a pile of bodies into the Danube. As Mayr notes, “Bodrožić experiments with narrative silences and allusions in order to leave the represented past open for present and future renegotiation and to safeguard it from becoming coopted by identity politics” (Berlin’s 358). Such gaps play another role as well. We know Silva escapes, but we do not know why nor what the motivations or thinking of the militiamen she encounters are. This silence on the details and lack of an arc that determines a course of action in the story leaves the narrative open for interpretation by the audience. This matches the history Bodrožić tells through etymology as well, the words create a set of images with no narrative arc to link them. Rather than insisting that Silva tell her all the details, Arjeta lets the holes also become part of the narrative and represent something of Silva’s character as she comes to terms with what she experienced. Arjeta rejects any archive’s ability to give a complete picture of the subject, as it “wird nicht die ganze Wahrheit berühren und jede von uns gefundene Wahrheit wird eine andere verdecken” (Kirsch 216). The truth depicted in someone’s archive will merely hide another truth. In the end, Arjeta throws out all of Arik’s photos and she rejects Mateo’s project.

Arjeta describes a throughline that runs between individual images over time as a *leuchtender Faden* (glowing thread), that makes connections between different shards of reality. “Das vollständige Bild entzieht sich fast immer. Ich bin. Im Schlaf. Findet mich der Zusammenhang. Dort ist der Transitbereich zwischen zwei Scherben [Wirklichkeitssplitter].

Zum Hier. Bin ich einmal ganz. Der *leuchtende Faden*, der alles verbindet, ist über meinem Kopf. Ich muss ihn nur finden" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 81, emphasis added). This glowing thread that runs between shards of reality and connects them like a train or plane reveals patterns of development and change. Arjeta states that this string is overhead. She has to find it to make connections between events and get a complete picture of reality, but again the string remains elusive. The *leuchtender Faden* connects people as humans. This connection between her and Mateo is broken when she finds out he became a language purist and he imposes a fixed narrative on the nation and language.

Mateo and his friends establish an association called: "Schule für unsere vaterländische Sprache," which instructs people in "correct" history and protects the language from foreign influence (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177). In this school, they promote a victim narrative similar to the one President Tudjman promoted; that Croatia was continuously the victim of invaders, who invaded and terrorized not only the country but also the language (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 172). "Wie sehr sie die fremden Invasoren hassten! Und erste recht deren Sprache!" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177). Thus, in order for the country to be independent its language must also be kept pure of influences of the invader, the enemy. Mateo's association researches the *Opferfrage* (victim question): "Es kam bei ihren Recherchen heraus, dass in der Vergangenheit das eigene Volk, die eigene Sprache immer irgendetwas oder irgendjemandem zum Opfer gefallen waren!" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177). Rather than have *victim* be the label for those who suffered and were murdered under fascism in the fight for independence, as Tudjman and other politicians framed Croatian history post World War II, the victim becomes the people's language. In creating a unified standard language, nationalist linguists in Croatia felt that they made too many conciliations to the Serbia variety. The underlying assumption is that language was at some time

pure. A reliable and compelling vehicle for expressing the "Croatian" experience, this so-called pure language was then corrupted by outside invaders and can only be rescued by extirpating foreign traces.[54] A consequence of this, which is the focus of the remainder of this essay are the battlelines drawn for the removal or retention of loanwords from Croatian. Once again, Fichte proves instructive.

Mateo portrays loanwords as linguistic invaders

Adopting a loanword, according to Fichte, means that a person is adopting a different or foreign language and the worldview or concept it articulates. Its foreignness, however, also means it is fully comprehensible to the user. The German language can only explain, not embody, the significance of the loanword unless Germans can find a word with an equivalent meaning for that significance in their language or until the new word's meaning becomes part of their experience. Fichte explains the word *Humanität* to a hypothetical German, who only speaks German (Reden 67 - 68). The signifiers of the symbolism of this word do not translate from Latin to French into German. For example, translating *Humanität* with *Menschlichkeit* would simply convey the state of being a human as opposed to being an animal. A German would understand the concept embedded in the French word when it is translated as *Menschenfreundlichkeit* (friendliness to man) (Fichte, Reden 67-68). However, *Menschenfreund* is a loan translation of the Greek word *philanthropos* (Martyn 312). Loan translations or coinages, to be clear, are translations of words from one language into another or words that adopt a meaning from another language. Many German words are loan coinages or translations of foreign words, especially from Latin and Greek, including several key terms for Fichte, such

[54] Some Croatian linguists argue that there is a point of convergence after which developments in Croatian and Serbian " were united though never uniform"; however, "there is no agreement among them as to where this point is located in time" (Škiljan 71).

as *Vaterland* (patria). The prevalence of loan translations shows the extent to which the German language was influenced and arguably enriched by adopting or simply Germanizing foreign words. As David Martyn writes in "Borrowed Fatherland," loan coinages may be "German in construction but […] in all likelihood would never have been coined or would never have acquired their modern meaning were it not for the influence of a foreign model" (305). These loan coinages and transfers make it easy to hide or ignore the foreign roots of the term, which supposedly also makes it easier to integrate foreign concepts into the target language and continue the myth of linguistic purity.

In *Kirschholz,* Arjeta suggests that Mateo is engaging in a similar project as Fichte when she writes: "Alle möglichen Fremdwörter, besonders die aus dem Lateinischen, übersetzte er, wie er es sagte, in seine Sprache. Er wollte seine Ergebnisse in einem Buch der Öffentlichkeit – und damit meinte er: der neuen Nation – zur Verfügung stellen" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 172). Because Mateo translates loanwords from Latin into *his* language and makes them available to others in the new nation, his translations can be framed as integrating foreign ideas or concepts into Croatian culture, but this does not bring the language back to a previous, pure state. Arjeta draws on *zrakoplov* as an example. *Zrakoplov*, however, is not a translation of the Latin loanword *avion* it was replacing, but a loan translation of a German word. Linguists brought *zrakoplov* back into use after the war to replace *avion*, not to return to an "Ur-Croatian" but to remove traces of the enemy from the language and, as the Croatian linguist Franjo Tanocki justified the decision, to use an older Croatian loan translation. Once again Mateo seems to mouth Fichte in averring that loanwords only erode a people's loyalty to the state, dispersing such sentiments across linguistic borders.

In *Schriften zur Revolution*, Fichte argues against the idea of cross-cultural connection or different groups belonging together. Fichte's tract follows a typical anti-Jewish line that Jews undermine a nation, (in this case, the emergence of a German nation) because their religious devotion demands allegiance to Zion or a return to Zion[55] (114-15).[56] As Adorno would later remark with considerable irony: "Fremdwörter sind die Juden der Sprache" (*Minima* 200). With this aphorism, Yildiz argues that for Adorno: "alienation and foreignness blur into each other" (85-86). That is, equating Jews with loanwords suggests that both are meant to be seen as strangers who cannot be integrated into a society that does not want to acknowledge their part in it. As Fichte insisted the larger society ought to question the loyalty of both Jews and people who use loanwords as they represent ideas that come from outside. Loanwords undermine the purity of a language through their connection to another country. For a state to be strong and independent, the language spoken by its people must also be strong and independent.

This attitude is mirrored in Bodrožić's book when Arjeta's mother describes how Mateo is one of the people "die öffentlichen arme Buchhändler beschimpften, nur weil sie Bücher in kyrillischer Schrift verkauften" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 169). BCMS written in both the Cyrillic alphabets is associated primarily with Serbia. A person who writes in Cyrillic or who sells books written in Cyrillic shows loyalty to Serbia rather than to Croatia, a betrayal for Mateo that parallels Fichte's dislike of Jews. Because the Cyrillic alphabet, which is used in Serbia, shares some letters with the Latin one, it is similar but too visibly different to be integrated with the

[55] This was a standard canard against Jews, as exemplified in the forged *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, there is no secret plot for world domination and not all Jews are loyal to Zion or Israel (c.f. Goran, Mearsheimer and Walt, for a detailed history of the creation and effect of the Protocols, please see Hagemeister)

[56] "Fast durch alle Lander von Europa verbreitet sich ein mächtiger, feindselig gesinnter Staat, der mit allen übrigen im beständigen Kriege steht, und der in manchen fürchterlich schwer auf die Burger drückt; es ist das Judentum […] Fällt euch den hier nicht der begreifliche Gedanke ein, daß die Juden, welche ohne euch Bürger eines Staats sind, der fester und gewaltiger ist, als die eurigen alle, wenn ihr ihnen auch noch das Burgerrecht in euren Staaten gebt, eure übrigen Bürger völlig unter die Füße treten werden" (Zur Revolution 114-15).

Latin alphabet or Croatia, which sees itself as more Western than Serbia. Moreover, as Mateo and his association, the "Schule für unsere vaterländische Sprache," have a goal of becoming part of Western Europe, where the Cyrillic has no place: "wo bitteschön konnte man den irgendeinen kyrillischen Buchstaben sinnvoll im zivilisierten Europa einsetzen? Nirgendwo. Na bitte!" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177).

Mateo's rhetoric against loanwords, however, is more stringent than Fichte's; Mateo frames the threat in terms of combat: Loanwords are now linguistic invaders or words that came in uninvited and that need to be removed for the good of the language. "Nun, jeden fremde Spracheindringling würden sie schon in seine Schranken zu weisen wissen" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 178). Mateo and his association equate the language they speak with their country and correspondingly frame the loanwords as unwanted visitors that they should defend against, i.e., like foreign words or ideas: "Die eigene Sprache zu erhalten, sie zu lieben und vor fremden Einflüssen zu beschützen. Das war jetzt ihre wichtigste Aufgabe" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177). The rhetoric of defending their language against foreign influences becomes more violent as the group evolves: "Waffen hatten sie in ihren Kellern ja genug," which they are ready to use to defend their language (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 178). Mateo expresses his resistance to loanwords and the influence of outsiders on his language when he says: "Weg mit der Literatur der Feinde! Weg mit dem anderen Alphabet – Sie gehörten doch nicht zu Moskau und den Russen. Sie hatten alle in der Schule das bescheuerte kyrillische Alphabet lernen müssen, sagten sie sich" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 177). Mateo insists that the elements of the enemy, which through the reference to the Cyrillic alphabet is strongly suggested to be Serbia, weaken the bonds essential for the formation and maintenance of a nation by suggesting allegiance to another, foreign state,

even though Tito was the only communist state to successfully break with Stalin and the Soviet Union.

An exclusionary Croatian to counter an inclusive BCMS

Mateo experienced great trauma during the war and is irrevocably changed as a result. As Arjeta notes, "[e]r gehörte zu den zahnlosen Kriegsrückkehrern, die niemand mehr auf den ersten Blick erkannte" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 172). Mateo needs to make the suffering he endured worthwhile. In part he does this through working for the new state, this gives his life meaning. In her descriptions of Mateo, Arjeta's mother shows how the concept of the nation, people and language are all closely intertwined for Mateo: "Die [Sprache] ist sein Alles, sagte meine Mutter, und nichts lässt er auf seine hehre Nation kommen. Man hatte sie doch alle angegriffen. Ein ganzes Volk sei Opfer geworden. Und gewehrt habe es sich, weil es etwas zu verteidigen hatte" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 172). For Mateo, you cannot defend a nation without defending its language, and protecting the nation's language against foreign words is as essential as protecting the nation against foreign invaders. As with Fichte, Mateo is describing a nation that was invaded by another. For Fichte, this was the many German states that were invaded by Napoleon, for Mateo, Croatia was ruled from Belgrade, Serbia when both countries were part of former Yugoslavia. While Fichte encourages the German states to fight Napoleon's occupation, Mateo's Croatia resists and defends itself to become independent, because there was something worth defending: the language.

For Fichte, French and German are separate languages, though German contains many loanwords from French. The differences between the Croatian and Serbian varieties of BCMS are harder to prove linguistically. Many differences in vocabulary and grammar reflected differences in frequency of use between regions (Croatian: *volim moliti*, Serbian: *volim da*

molim, Engl. I like to pray); there are also differences in the meaning of certain words (*naučnik*, Croatian: apprentice, Serbian: scientist, scholar) (c.f. Brozović). As the linguist Ronelle Alexander points out, while linguists and politicians sometimes use regional differences in grammar or vocabulary as evidence that these are two separate languages, it merely shows areas of higher frequency of use by region and is not definitive proof of two separate languages (22-23). Linguists and politicians point to such differences to argue for either position that these varieties are (not) mutually intelligible and thus (not) variants of a common language. However, the question of whether two people who speak variations of a common language are mutually intelligible is subjective and almost impossible to prove on a large scale.

A clue to how this difficulty manifests appears when Mateo corrects the language of Arjeta's mother: "es war ihr unmöglich, mit Mateo ein normales Gespräch zu führen, weil er sie ständig belehrte, ihre Wortwahl und ihre Syntax kritisierte und ihr Hinweise gab, wie sie alles besser und richtiger ausdrücken konnte. Er kannte kein anderes Thema, es ging ihm nur um seine Sprache" (*Kirschholz* 172). Mateo is correcting Arjeta's mother's use of words and grammatical constructions that are associated more closely with Serbia and promoting using words and grammar associated with Croatia as "his" language needs to be protected and defended against outside influences. Mateo refers to the BCMS that he speaks as *seine Sprache* (his language) which is a play on the BCMS *naš jezik* (our language) and is an expression people in the BCMS-speaking regions sometimes use to name the language(s) they speak while avoiding giving it a specific ethnic name, which is often a political question. The pronoun *our* makes the term collective and refers to the varieties of this common language that multiple groups speak in the region. Turning this into *his* language, Mateo makes the language something individual and not to be shared. It is no longer a language that spans multiple countries and belongs to a collective

but to a single person or group. Immediately after, Mateo references a historically loaded phrase to make clear his exclusionary vision of language, people, and the nation in another interaction with Arjeta's mother:

> Das Eigene, meine Liebe, sagte Mateo dann zu meiner Mutter, die ihn schon als Kleinkind gekannt und mit Büchern aus Sarajevo versorgte hatte, das Eigene muss man mit allen Mitteln verteidigen. Was denn das Eigene sei, fragte meine Mutter ihn, worauf der etwas ratlos guckte und dann laut: ZUALLERERST DIE SPRACHE! (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 172)

The term *das Eigene,* translated into English as *our own,* probably references such expressions in BCMS as: "Mi smo svoji na svome[57]" (We are our own [people] on our own [land]). Even in former Yugoslavia today this phrase connotes an image of an ethnic group on their historic land or country, [58] i.e. Croats in Croatia. Whereas *naš* is collective, *svoji* is exclusionary. Bodrožić translates this phrase as *Eigene* or *our own* in English. Mateo's reference here would then change the reference from his land or nation to his language. Mateo takes a historically loaded phrase that connects the people to the land and repurposes it for his goal of purifying *his* language. Two examples of how Mateo creates and uses *his* new language after the war and how Arjeta opposes these changes show how they both adhere to two contradictory approaches to language, history, and the nation.

Mateo creates an Ur-Croatian with nonsensical phrases

Both Mateo and Bodrožić use the word *vollkommen* to describe their language (BCMS, specifically the Dalmatian dialect). Mateo describes the language as naturally complete by itself: " Da sollte ihnen nur einer nieder mit diesen fremdsprachigen Elementen kommen und

[57] Thank you to Prof. Michael Biggins for providing this reference. It should be noted that the Croatian translation of this line does not use the pronoun *svoj*, as it needs an animate referent in BCMS. Instead, it uses the standard word for *our* (naš): "Ono što je naše" (*Stol* 155) ("that which is ours," my translation).
[58] As a current example, the Patriarch of the Serb Orthodox Church uses a variation of the phrase to promote Serb unity with ethnic Albanians in Kosovo and referenced the Serbs' historic roots in that region "Na Kosovu smo svoji na svome" (In Kosovo, we are on our own land, my translation) (Patrijarh).

versuchen, ihre schön, selbstständig und in sich – von NATUR AUS! – vollkommene Sprache anzutasten" (*Kirschholz* 178). He compares loanwords, words that native speakers adapted and brought into the language to marauders who enter a country or place without invitation with the intention to commit violence. After bringing back a neologism to replace the loanword or linguistic invader for *airplane*, he and the other nationalist linguists argue that they as native speakers The language itself can accomplish what these invaders pretend to do: "Sie waren selbst in der Lage, ihre Sprache zu bereichern und einen eigenen kulturellen Raum für sich zu schaffen" (*Kirschholz* 179).

In contrast, the protagonist Arjeta defends loanwords: "So unnötig wie ein vom Latein abgeleitetes Wort, *avis*, der alte Wort-Vogel, der ihnen etwas hätte beibringen können, musste getötet werden" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 179). Arjeta expresses a sentiment similar to Bodrožić that the etymology of a word teaches you something about the history of a country or people. The "Word-Bird" traveled to Croatia from Latin via French and became one of the words for *plane* in BCMS. Though, because *avion* was associated with use in Serbia, it had to be removed from the BCMS spoken in Croatia, even though it was also a term used in "civilized Europe." Two interests collide for the linguistic nationalists here as well, though they want to be associated with Western Europe, because Serbia, their enemy uses the word, it must be replaced.

It is only through mixing and crossing with other languages that speakers of the language can express themselves fully. Before the war, Mateo wanted to study philosophy in Milan and taught Arjeta some phrases in Italian when she was a child: "ich verlangte, dass er [Mateo] mir Wörter beibrachte und mit mir italienisch redete" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 31-32). One phrase that Mateo explained is Arjeta is "con sordino i polako" (slowly and quietly) (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 31-32), which is a line from a song by Dubrovnik-born singer Tereza Ana Kesovija, a popular

singer in former Yugoslavia up to today, and is from her song "Con Sordino" from the album *Moja Posljednja i Prva Ljubavi* (1987). The song is about a woman listening to a man below her slowly playing the guitar so that they can enjoy this moment alone without waking the neighbors: "Con sordino tiho, tiše samo nježno dirni žice" (Con sordino quiet, quieter/Just gently touch the strings) and "Con sordino i polako/da ne probudiš skaline" (Con sordino and slowly/Not to wake the narrow streets) (Kesovija). This line mixes Italian and Slavic elements: *con sordino* is a musical direction in Italian for the musician to use a mute; *i polako* (and slow) is from BCMS. If we follow the idea that language provides a map of the history of a culture, the line is a linguistic representation of the close historic ties between Venice and Dalmatia (c.f. Mayhew, Greene).[59] Arjeta loves this phrase and connects it with the old people in the village who always repeat it whenever someone hurries down the street (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 31). She learns about *Bedachtsamkeit* (thoughtfulness) and *Behäbigkeit* (sluggishness) from them (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 31-32). Arjeta connects to the song lyrics on an emotional level, the slow, gentle playing of the song matching the slow rhythm of life in the summer on the Dalmatian coast. She tries to follow the prompt to take life slowly as an adult while living in Berlin, Germany. This mixture of languages expresses a concept that is a stereotypical part of life. The narrator shares a sense of the essence of the lazy days of summer with her friend Silva: "Auch Silva kannte dieses Zeitmaß, wer im Süden groß geworden ist, kennt die Langsamkeit, mit der sich unsere Körper in den Sommern bewegten, ganz besonders an den unter der prallen Sonne flimmernden Hundstagen […]" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 87). Reading Arjeta's affinity for this line using Bodrožić, the line expresses something of people's approach to life in Dalmatia during the hot summers directly because it mixes linguistic elements, not despite it.

[59] The Republic of Venice ruled Dalmatia from 1420 and 1797 as part of its State of the Sea (c.f. Mayhew).

Arjeta's mother's description of the attempt to expunge *avion* from Croatian offers another telling example of the contentious link between linguistic and national identity. The mother describes how a group of poets and thinkers decided during a conference to replace the existing word for airplane, *avion*, which is a loanword from Latin via French, with the older loanword *zrakoplov*:

> Von nun an benutzten sie nicht mehr das Wort *avion* für Flugzeug – dass *avion* von *avis*, dem lateinischen Wort für Vogel abgeleitet würde, wussten sie nicht, es störte sie nur, dass ihre Feinde das Wort benutzten und eine mehrköpfige Wortjury aus Dichtern und Denkern setzte sich zusammen, um einen Ersatz für das Fremdwort zu finden. Sie einigten sich einstimmig auf *Luftdurchsegelungsgerät* und waren glücklich (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 178-79)

The narrator does not say whether Mateo or his association was part of the conference that rejected the Serbian for *airplane avion* which comes from Latin and is used of course throughout "civilized Europe." As Arjeta quips, the conference attendees are not interested in learning the etymology of the word, as it points to the period when they were part of former Yugoslavia with Serbia and governed from Belgrade, Serbia. They eliminate the problem they attempt by replacing it with the compound noun: *Luftdurchsegelungsgerät* (device that sails through the air). This is probably Bodrožić's translation of *zrakoplov.*[60] which Tanocki justified replacing *avion* with as it first appeared in a German–Croatian dictionary in 1867[61] (Greenberg 120). It is a loan coinage (what they call a calque) of the German *Luftschiff* (Engl. airship) (Turk and Pavletić 268) and is made up of words of Slavic origin (zrak (air) and ploviti (to sail)) put together following standard rules in BCMS.

[60] On their website, Struna, an institute for Croatian Special Field Terminology, lists *zrakoplov* as the preferred term for airplane, with *avion* listed as an "allowed term" (Struna). This is also the word that Anda Bukvić Pažin uses in the Croatian translation of the book: "Jednoglasno su se odlučili za *zrakoplovilo* i bili su sretni" (*Stol* 161, emphasis added).

[61] In their survey of loan translations and loanwords that were brought back into Croatian in the 1990s, Turk and Pavletic state that *zrakoplov* came from the *Hrvatsko-njemacom-italijanskom rjeeniku znanstvenog nazivlja (1874-75)* (268).

As The linguist Ronelle Alexander emphasizes, efforts in Croatia to remove foreign words or loanwords from their variety of BCMS were based primarily upon removing words that sounded Serbian. This required bringing back words that had been used in the past but had gone out of use, often replaced by entirely new words (Alexander 17 - 21). The irony for Mateo is that though the BCMS *avion* (plane) comes from the Latin *avis* (bird), he insists on using a loan translation from German, *zrakoplov*, just as he insists on speaking a pure form of Croatian. He cannot follow the rules he espouses.

In another episode, Arjeta's mother describes how Mateo takes pains to tell people about how manly or useful he was as a soldier. He describes a soldier who cries while in a foxhole after learning that soldiers had accidentally killed his wife, leaving his young children alone at home. The soldier no longer wants to fight and talks about leaving, even emigrating out of the country. After the man dies from a gunshot shortly after, Mateo mocks him for being a coward and for not being patriotic: "Was für ein Vögelchen das war, sagte Mateo, das haben wir jetzt gesehen, was der Tote für ein Mann gewesen ist, ein Nichts von einem Mann, er hat in seiner letzten Lebensstunde geheult wie ein Hühnchen" (Bodrožić, Kirschholz 176). Here too, Mateo runs awry of his own project to create a pure Croatian. *Vögelchen* is not a neologism, it translates as *little bird*. It is also not an example of Bodrožić's "new German," but rather functions like a calque or loan translation from *chicken* in English and is used to remark that someone is acting like a coward or is too scared to do something. This association of *bird* and *coward* is not made in BCMS. In the Croatian translation, *Vögelchen* is changed to *šonjo*,[62] a sexist term for a self-identified male whom the other person sees as displaying weak or effeminate qualities. It carries no association with birds in BCMS. The connection is made clearer at the end of the sentence:

[62] "Kakav je to šonjo bio, rekao je Mateo" (*Stol* 158)

"er hat in seiner letzten Lebensstunde geheult wie ein Hühnchen." The soldier cried (geheult) like a chicken (Hühnchen). Chickens do not cry in English but *cluck*. Chickens can make a sound that resembles crying, but it is not in the human sense of crying: for instance, to express sadness. Calling someone a chicken, *kokoška*, can be an insult in BCMS as in many other languages, and the -ka suffix makes it diminutive. The strangeness of Mateo's line in German is not reflected in the Croatian translation of the novel. The translation conveys his sentiments in standard Croatian: it does not retain *chicken* or *cluck* but uses *to wail* (*zapomagati*) and *weakling* (slabić)[63] (*Stol* 158). The verb *zapomagati* has the connotation of *squawking* or *complaining*, so it would connect with chicken in BCMS, but this is not the standard expression. Mateo tries to coin a new expression to imply that a fellow soldier was acting cowardly, but in doing so, he creates a phrase that the narrator portrays as sounding strange and that could be expressed more clearly in other ways.

To answer the question posed in the title of this chapter: "do chickens cry?" we need to reflect on the results of Mateo's project to remove foreign elements from the BCMS spoken in Croatia. In the language he is establishing, Mateo is trying to go back to a pure form of Croatian but ends up proving the impossibility of his task. There is no pure Croatian to return to and the words and phrases that he and others either bring back to the language or create sound strange to the narrator. Mateo's attempt to strip the Croatian language of loanwords leads to an impasse, where the language is reduced to describing something that does not occur. Mateo's strange insult of his fellow soldier contrasts with the song lyric "con sordino i polako" from before the war, a phrase that combines Slavic and Italian elements and accurately conveys an approach to life that the narrator and her friend Silva can relate to.

[63] "to smo sada vidjeli, kakav je taj mrtvac čovjek bio, cista nula, u zadnjem satu svoga života zapomagao je kao neki slabić" (*Stol* 158)

Chapter 4: What is a Calm Ocean Called? Deconstructing Meaning Through Translation to understand an Outside Perspective in Nicol Ljubić's *Meeresstille*

Nicol Ljubić's novel *Meeresstille* (2010) starts with Ana and her boyfriend Robert enjoying a relaxing day on the beach when she asks what at face value is a simple question: "'Wie heißt das, wenn das Meer ruhig ist?', fragte sie. Er verstand nicht, was sie meinte. Wenn das Meer ruhig ist, ist es ruhig. Oder still. 'Habt ihr kein Wort dafür?', fragte sie. 'In meiner Sprache gibt es dafür ein Wort'. […] '*Bonaca*.' Das Wort hatte sich ihm eingeprägt. Meeresstille" (Meeresstille 11, emphasis in the original). While this exchange can be read as Ana pointing out that BCMS[64] has a specific term for a weather phenomenon, it expresses a fundamental misunderstanding between her and Robert's understanding how the Bosnian Civil War of the 1990 still affects her psychologically. Indeed, the word represents Ana's mental state, which Robert at first sees as calm, but contains a roiling ocean underneath due to the trauma she experienced from the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The ocean is quiet (still) but it is not calm (ruhig). Translating *bonaca* as *Meeresstille* is not enough, as Robert is unable to relate to this inner turmoil because he did not experience the war and the NATO bombing of Belgrade. The complexity of Ana's experiences becomes lost in Robert's initial passive acceptance of her German translation. Over the course of the novel, he must deconstruct the meaning of the German *Meeresstille* through what he knows of BCMS in order to understand how the word in BCMS represents Ana's experiences and to not just view them through a lens of German culture.

Chapter 4 departs from the first two chapters of this study in several ways and adds to arguments against the use of loanwords brought up by Fichte in the third chapter. Chapter 1 builds the theoretical foundation for my dissertation by showing how returned loanwords, words

[64] Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian

that are borrowed from German and assimilated into another and then placed back into a German-language text in its assimilated form, place a foreign or minority perspective on the main culture, which can counter the dominant national narrative of a country. Chapter 2 adds to this theoretical framework by bringing in Adorno's thoughts on loanwords and how, by bringing in a foreign perspective, they can counter nationalist influences. Saša Stanišić uses the loanword *Špajz* to name a space that represents a concept similar to Adorno's negative dialectics, in which what is left out of a definition helps to define the whole. He uses this definition to critique the narratives of Yugoslavia from both before and after its dissolution. The second part of this study examines and counters an argument against loanwords by Johann Gottlieb Fichte as articulated in the *Reden an die deutsche Nation*. Fichte argues in support of nationalist stirrings that the meaning of foreign words needs to be explained to someone who has not lived the experiences represented by the word. Chapter 3 looks at what happens when a country tries to remove loanwords from its official language, or words that retain a foreign sound. Marica Bodrožić argues that loanwords and linguistic diversity in language can better or more precisely name concepts and make emotional connections for different words for the same thing. She also portrays a language that is devoid of loanwords, such as that promoted by the character Mateo in *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*, as unable to clearly state what he is trying to say. In this final chapter, Ljubić shows that because Robert does not have the lived experiences of Ana, and thus cannot understand the meaning of the words she uses, loaned or otherwise, he has to explain the meanings of these words to himself through translation. This process helps him more precisely identify how the war has affected her.

This chapter charts Robert's development from first viewing the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina from a simplified perspective. He moves from passively accepting images of the

war both in German media and from Ana to questioning these images, Germany's role in the war, and thinking about Ana's continuing trauma. Despite Robert's desire to help Ana overcome the trauma she still suffers, they are not able to bridge their differences leading to several arguments about whether the wars of the past affect who people are in the present. Robert and Ana eventually break up after she reveals to him that her father is on trial for a war crime. Reflecting on their conversation, Robert reanalyzes what Ana says in light of new information and begins to question his initial assumptions about what several words that she taught him mean.

After looking at Walter Benjamin and Yoko Tawada's ideas on translation and how Tawada creates a methodology to develop a third language through translation, the chapter analyzes Robert's project to understand Ana's perspective of the war and its effects. Robert at first uncritically accepts the narrative about Višegrad and her family that Ana paints when she shows him pictures of her mother and the family garden. This mirrors the biblical Garden of Eden. While the BCMS word for tomato is related to the word *Paradise* in English and German, it is ultimately not a paradise. Robert recognizes that the language he and Ana have been using to communicate is not communicating what he thought. He begins to critically examine what Ana said to him and uses translation to deconstruct the meanings of her words as he does with the verb *živeli* and the noun *zlatko*. This project continues with Robert's examination and translation of *bonaca* and *Meeresstille* on throughout the novel. Ultimately, Robert must go back and forth between German and BCMS several times as he considers how the war still affects Ana to reach a new definition of the word to name her psychological state. This also leads him to consider the word *Ruhe*, which he thought Ana exemplified, but upon reassessment of drinking and its role in

life both for Ana and people in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Robert concludes that Ana does not have *Ruhe* but apathy. He begins to translate experiences rather than just words.

Robert has an experience of people in his country or community not seeing him as one of them. When he is accosted by a group of Neo-Nazis, they accuse him of not being German, though he grew up in Germany. However, Robert does not connect his experience to Ana's. It is only when he goes to Višegrad and its famous bridge where Serb citizens murdered many of their Muslim neighbors that Robert begins to understand part of what Ana went through. Robert is now receptive to hearing about Bosnia from a Bosnian perspective and is now out of the Garden of Eden. He sees the rubble of history for what it is. Ultimately, though, Robert never fully realizes his project. He is the only one who uses the language he develops to understand Ana, and the story ends without him contacting her again. Robert also remains distanced from the events in Bosnia and Herzegovina, though he has moved away from his German-centric understanding.

The first three-quarters of *Meeresstille* switches between a love story between Ana, a Bosnian Serb from Višegrad, and Robert, a Ph.D. student of history in Berlin, and a trial in the Hague of Zlatko Šimić, Ana's father, a professor of Shakespeare,[65] who is accused of abetting a war crime that was committed during the Bosnian Civil War. The novel's final quarter follows Robert on his journey to Sarajevo and Višegrad where he sees the effect of the war on people in the present for himself. Ljubić uses Robert and Ana's relationship as an occasion to critique then-foreign minister Joschka Fischer's justification of Germany's role in NATO of bombing Serbia to prevent another Holocaust. Through this relationship, Ljubić also critiques the

[65] Several scholars have noted similarities between Šimić and the historical Nikola Koljević who also was a scholar of Shakespeare and was the vice president of Republika Srpska (1992 - 96) (Coleman 83; Mayr, Überwältigende 234; Zimmer 257).

simplification of the situation of the war in former Yugoslavia in common discourse in direct and sometimes heavy-handed ways. As Germany viewed the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina through the lens of its own history, so too did Robert's approach to Ana's trauma has its roots in the German movement to come to terms with its own past during the Nazi period: die *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (coming to terms with the past), which Ana disagrees with. At the beginning of their relationship, Ana argues that history has nothing to do with them and that the crimes of the father should not impact the children. Robert expresses skepticism of this and pushes Ana to talk about what happened during the war. Mayr and Zimmer both correctly point to Robert's myopic worldview as a cause for why he is unable to understand Ana during their relationship. In their final conversation, Robert tries to make amends by taking Ana's former point of view that people's past actions do not impact or reflect on their descendants in the present: "Ana, vielleicht können wir vergessen, was war" (Ljubić, Meeresstille 151). However, Ana has also adjusted her opinion and now recognizes that her father's actions and the actions of others during the war in Bosnia still impact her in the present: "Das ist das Problem, dass ich nicht vergessen kann" (Ljubić, Meeresstille 151). Robert tries again, but Ana once more rejects him: "'Ana, das hat doch alles nichts mit uns zu tun.' – 'Es hat mit mir zu tun, deshalb hat es auch mit uns zu tun'" (Meeresstille 151). Robert's inability to consider the Bosnian Civil War and Ana's relationship to it through another perspective not rooted in German traditions is part of what leads to their breakup. However, after this scene, Robert more closely aligns with Ana's understanding and sees the war closer to her perspective through translation and cross-linguistic interpretation of words in BCMS and German. However, it remains unclear if the two will ever reconcile.

Engaging a person with history rather than a person in history

The fault line of a difference in opinion regarding the civil war comes up early in their relationship after Ana wakes Robert with a muffled scream one night (Meeresstille 44). At that moment, he recognizes that she is having a nightmare and suffering from trauma. Robert expresses the opinion that talking about the war will help Ana deal with what she experienced during the war (Meeresstille 53). Robert makes well-intentioned efforts to help her work through this. Robert applies ideas about *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as well as ideas about confronting the crimes of the father, which originate with the 1968 student movement. Regardless of whether Ana is ready or even wants to do so, in order to make himself feel like a good partner. He does this rather than listening to what she says her needs are and helping her talk about her experiences. In doing so, Robert instrumentalizes Ana as a male telling a female what is best for her when he doesn't fully understand her situation. He is viewing the war and how to help Ana work through her trauma from a narcissistic view of the world rooted in the 1968 student movement in Germany, in which students questioned the role of their fathers, and sometimes mothers, during World War II and associated crimes of the past. As someone earning their Ph.D. in history, Robert treats Ana and her history as something to study (Mayr 235). Ana counters that she is not ready to talk about what happened through a story about her grandmother who never talked about being in the Jasenovac concentration camp: “Meine Großmutter war in Jasenovac, dem größten Vernichtungslager auf dem Balkan, und sie ist von dort aus nach Leipzig deportiert worden, wo sie Zwangsarbeiterin in einem Hotel war” (Meeresstille 73-74). Jasenovac was run during World War II in then-independent, Nazi-allied Croatia. Ana had to learn about it from her mother (Meeresstille 75). Ana argues against forcing someone to talk about traumatic elements in their past if they do not want to (Meeresstille 75), as they might not be ready psychologically to confront what happened to them or do not find it necessary or important to do so. Rather than

the impersonal object of study, Ana approaches lived history as something personal that affects people, especially those close to us. Robert treats Ana, former Yugoslavia, and the war in Bosnia as histories that are made up of a series of events, rather than seeing her as a person who has experienced history. As such, he does not consider the possibility that she has needs and views different from his own.

Robert's emphasis on the need to talk about the war and trauma comes from a form of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that developed in German society during the 1968 student movement, which emphasizes an obligation to talk about and acknowledge the crimes of the Nazis and the Holocaust, especially the role of family members. Such discussion was not always the case in the immediate aftermath of the war (c.f. Cosgrove and Fuchs, Zimmer, and Kundnani). Peter Fritzsche shows that there were discussions of the war in the immediate aftermath of World War II and that these discussions among Germans were usually to portray Germans as the victims and not to talk about Germany's crimes in persecuting and eliminating Jews. As discussed in Chapter 1, in his essay *Kulturkritik*, Theodor Adorno accuses post-war German society of both beautifying the Holocaust (i.e., by putting flowers around the gas chambers or making rhymes in poetry about the Holocaust) and not talking about the events of World War II and more specifically, the mass murder of Jews, Roma, and other groups. This changed after the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials (Dec. 1963 – Aug. 1965) and the 1968 student movement when the younger generation became interested in what their parents and grandparents did during the war and challenged the national silence about it. Hans Kundnani shows how the 1968 student movement had elements that viewed the German people as the perpetrators during World War II and other elements that saw the German people as the victims. *Väterliteratur* from the '70s and '80s also looks at the actions of the author's fathers during the

war and attempts "to reckon with the ways in which the parents' past shaped the child's identity" (Zimmer 256). In *Meeresstille*, Robert quotes part of the argument of then-foreign minister Joschka Fischer, who had earlier been a member of the 1968 student movement, for German intervention in Kosovo to stop Serbia from doing what it did in Bosnia as: "Nie wieder Auschwitz" (Meeresstille 76). It was not enough for Germany to stop the persecution of Albanians in Kosovo, it had to also prevent Serbia from creating another Holocaust in Kosovo.

Anna Zimmer connects Ana's negative reaction to having to talk about the war with the German media's comparison of Serbs with Nazis as the instigators of many of the atrocities and ethnic cleansing of Muslims during the war (262). Following the model that requires the acknowledgment of the crimes of the past means that Serbs (from Serbia or ethnic Serbs) must also acknowledge and reflect on the crimes of ethnic-Serb soldiers. Ana articulates several arguments against this approach: the crimes of a parent or grandparent do not reflect on you in the present (Meeresstille 74) and this oversimplification of ethnic groups that creates guilt by association erases her experiences as a victim and opponent of the war as well. As she argues:

> wenn ich mich hier als Serbin nicht zu meiner Schuld oder wenigstens zur Schuld meines Volkes bekenne, bin ich reaktionär. Ein Aber wird nicht geduldet. Das verletzt mich, weil es mir meine eigene Geschichte abspricht, eigene Erfahrungen, und dann fühle ich mich provoziert und verteidige etwas, was ich gar nicht verteidigen will (Meeresstille 163).

The blanket blaming of ethnic Serbs also leads her to defend people or actions that she does not want to defend, such as a Serbian man on trial for war crimes. She adds that Serbs can also be the victims of crimes as well and that the victims can also become perpetrators (Meeresstille 73), but that this is not talked about.

Ana uses the example that it was not important for her grandmother that her granddaughter knew she was interned at the Jasenovac concentration camp to support her claim that the past does not pertain to them in the present. However, there is an attempt to use Ana as a

model as someone who does not want to talk about traumatic events, because they are still too near. It is entirely possible that the grandmother simply never talked to Ana about her experiences, because they were still too painful. However, Ana also hints at this possibility when she asks rhetorically whether it is her responsibility to talk to her grandmother about her traumatic past if she does not want to (Meeresstille 75). Ana's blanket dismissal that the past is not important for today is also an oversimplification. She roots it in the theoretical framing that if two people who are from groups that have histories of animosity (Serbs and Bosnian Muslims, for example) did not know of this historical tension, they could easily be friends in the present. While this situation is possible and should be striven for, it ignores the effects of such conflicts on larger society, such as political and economic inequalities that affect different groups.

Ana argues that this simplified view of the war is the result of people in Germany not having experienced the war first-hand and that their information is based on a small group of images in the media. She points specifically to two famous images: "abgemagerte Männer hinter Stacheldraht, Menschen, die vor Heckenschützen fliehen" (Meeresstille 162). Ana is referring to a still photo taken from a BBC video of inmates at the Trnopolje concentration camp, which depicted the prisoners in a way reminiscent of prisoners in Auschwitz (c.f. Becirbegovic, Campbell, Kundnani). These simplified images result in a projection of the Holocaust and WWII onto the war in Bosnia in the 1990s. For several scholars, this represents a utilization of the Holocaust that makes Germany's intervention more about Germany righting the wrongs of the past than about helping Bosnia (c.f. Becirbegovic, Zimmer). However, it should be noted that the other image Ana mentions of people running from sharpshooters is representative of the war in Bosnia, especially the siege of Sarajevo, though not unique to it. This image is not as strongly associated with the Holocaust.

Robert questions the legitimacy of Joschka Fischer's justification for the bombing of Belgrade to prevent another Auschwitz. He asks rhetorically: "Was hatten sie [Ana und ihre Mutters] mit Auschwitz zu tun?" (Meeresstille 76). As discussed, Ana has two connections to Auschwitz. 1.) Her grandmother was interred at Jasenovac, a concentration camp run by the Croatian Ustaša, a group that would not have come to power without the support of the Nazis. 2.) Ana is in Germany on a scholarship for the descendants of victims of the Holocaust (Meeresstille 73-75). Ana and her mother may not have direct connections to Auschwitz, and they are not responsible for genocide, but their current situation is tied to the events of the Holocaust, of which Auschwitz was a part. These connections, however, do not justify NATO's bombing of Belgrade. They do point to Germany's feeling of responsibility to make sure genocide doesn't happen again, which they failed to do. While Ana is correct that NATO was breaking its own rules by bombing a sovereign nation, which Serbia was and still is, it was to force Serbia to come to the negotiating table and to stop its attacks on Kosovo.

The tension between instrumentalizing the Holocaust, simplifying the war in Bosnia to several pictures, and the desire to help comes to the surface when the bombings of Belgrade come up in an argument over the legitimacy of The Hague. Ana argues that "Wenn das Gericht so unvoreingenommen ist […], dann soll es Clinton und Schröder anklagen und all die anderen westlichen Politiker, die verantwortlich sind für die Bombardierung eines souveränen Staats. Das war Serbien nämlich" (Ljubic, Meeresstille 106). Robert cannot move beyond his ingrained modes of talking about the war and the world court at The Hague. This leads to a major argument between the two of them when Ana contends: "Weißt du, wie das war? Nein, das kannst du nicht wissen. Du hast nie erlebt, wie es ist, wenn Bomben auf deine Stadt fallen. Es ist anders als im Fernsehen" (Meeresstille 106). Ana denies that Robert could understand her

experience of the bombing because he had not lived through something similar; his knowledge is simplified based on images from the media. He thinks immediately afterward: "Es klang wie eine Anklage" (Meeresstille 107). Robert feels hurt, acts defensively, and ultimately brings the conversation back to himself (Mayr 234), rather than focusing on Ana and how she is finally talking about what happened to her, which he had wanted her to do. Robert reads this statement as Ana denying that he could express an opinion about the war, rather than as a statement of fact that he could not understand what he did not experience. Her fervent critique unbalances Robert and he feels implicated by association with NATO, which leads to Robert's defensive reaction: "Er sagte: 'Nur weil du einen Krieg erlebt hast, heißt das nicht, dass du anderen moralisch überlegen bist'" (Meeresstille 109). In reaction, overcome by anger, Ana is unable to articulate a response: "Sie sah ihn an, mit hartem Blick, aus der Bewegung ihrer Lippen schloss er, dass sie etwas sagen wollte, es dann aber sein ließ. Sie schüttelte ungläubig den Kopf, schaute aus dem Fenster und stand dann auf" (Meeresstille 109). This is one of two significant silences that end an argument, Ana is unable to produce the words, or any sound at all. Ana is unable to give voice to her internal feelings because the emotions are still so strong.

After visiting the Hague again and seeing Ana's father testify several months after their breakup, Robert feels that their time apart must allow him and Ana to find a common language: "sie müssten doch wieder eine Sprache für sich gefunden haben" (Ljubić, Meeresstille 151). He calls her a final time to try and mend their relationship. Ana and Robert, however, have switched positions on whether the past affects them in the present and they remain unable to find common ground. In a final effort, Robert asks Ana how she is:

> Er hörte, dass sie etwas sagen wollte, er hörte den Ton ihrer Stimme, die Hälfte einer Silbe. Hinterher versuchte er sich zu überlegen, welches Wort sie sagen wollte. Er spielte tausend Möglichkeiten durch, aber wenn er ehrlich war, konnte er nicht mal sagen, ob ihr

> Laut überhaupt bewusst artikuliert war, ob er wirklich der Anfang eines Wortes oder Satzes war (Meeresstille 152)

Over the telephone, Robert cannot see Ana's lips moving, but he hears that she makes a sound. The cut-off syllable is an audible representation of silence or the inability to speak. At the beginning of the conversation, they both agree that enough time has passed since the breakup, and they should talk (Meeresstille 151). Ana has distanced herself both physically and mentally between them and the emotions connected with him, but not from her memories about the war, which Robert brought up while they were together. She still cannot produce more than an inarticulate sound, and their conversation ends with her hanging up as Robert tries to figure out what she was trying to say. Ana's cut-off syllable is the closest the book gets to a direct articulation of Ana's deepest feelings and emotions. It is not the common language that Robert wants, as he does not understand it. Yet, this inarticulate sound speaks volumes about Ana's psychological state and her readiness or unreadiness to speak about traumatic events and their continuing after-effects. This language remains inaccessible to Robert. He must work to understand it, which he sets out to do through his reminiscences of their relationship.

Through daydreams and reflection, Robert recognizes that the words in BCMS and the situations Ana shared with him were not what he initially thought they were. This recalls Fichte's argument against loanwords in part because their meaning must be explained to the listener for them to understand, unless these words represent something of the borrower's lived experiences. It is precisely because Robert recognizes that he does not understand Ana's lived experiences and words, loaned or otherwise, that he works to explain them to himself that that he reaches a closer understanding of Ana. It is only through translation that Robert can grasp traces of Ana's feelings. This new language enables him to express his understanding of Ana's experiences.

To create this new, third language, Robert reflects on the information he has learned about Ana and her family. This leads him to discover new associations for words that Ana uses (such as *živeli*), with metatextual meaning beyond their literal translation from BCMS into German. He uses this knowledge to bring out meta-contextual information that lies beneath the text of what Ana is saying. While his goal is to create a language for them both to share, it is ultimately a language for him alone, as he never shares this language and new understanding with Ana during or after the events of the novel. The silence between Robert and Ana is a failure of translation to communicate emotion. If, as Japanese-German author Yoko Tawada argues contrary to Walter Benjamin's "Aufgabe des Übersetzers," there is no pure or original language, this is because language itself is already a translation of one's innermost feelings. The silence between Robert and Ana is a failure of translation to communicate emotion, but translation is a first step toward understanding and communication, which will be possible through the invention of a third language that has its basis in translation. Robert's method of creating a third language can be better understood by looking at Tawada's method of comparing meanings between words in two languages to see what doesn't overlap and what new meanings and associations between words are created through translation.

Tawada on Creating a Third Language through Translation

In her essay "Schrift einer Schildkröte oder das Problem der Übersetzung," Yoko Tawada rejects the idea of one "original" text and instead favors multiple original texts or third languages that are revealed through translations of a text into different languages or even into the same language but by different translators. "Vielmehr vermute ich, dass sein literarischer Text später seinen Originaltext finden kann, aus dem er übersetzt worden sein könnte. Meistens existieren mehrere Originaltexte, die gefunden und erfunden werden können" (33). A text finds its original

language through translation because the translation reveals something about the text that was not in the first language it was written in, the mixing of languages and cultures in the translation is what creates the third language. Tawada breaks from Walter Benjamin who wants to get back to a singular, allegorical "pure language" through translation that the combining of all the different languages of the world would achieve by showing the broader, underlying concept of a word.

Benjamin writes that translation is a form, which Douglas Robinson argues is a reference to the Platonic form, the perfect ideal of a shape or idea. Benjamin also uses the term *Ursprache*, original language. We get an idea of what this "pure language" is more clearly in an early essay by Benjamin, "Über Sprache überhaupt und über die Sprache des Menschen," in which he writes: "Der Mensch ist der Nennende, daran erkennen wir, daß aus ihm die reine Sprache spricht" (144). Because God breathed the "breath of life" into Adam, he speaks a "pure language" something close to the language of nature or possibly God in that he names the thing in itself. Translation allows the "original" or "pure language" to shine through by showing the original concept behind the cultural connotations that later languages have added on. "Die wahre Übersetzung ist durchscheinend, sie verdeckt nicht das Original, steht ihm nicht im Licht, sondern lasst die reine Sprache, wie verstärkt durch ihr eigenes Medium, nur um so voller aufs Original fallen" (Benjamin, Aufgabe 18). In "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers," Benjamin gives the example of the German *Brot* and the French *pain*, they both mean *bread*; their intended object is the same, but the *Art des Meinens* for each word is different (Benjamin Aufgabe 14). The cultural connotations for these words are different, but they both refer back to some original word and idea for bread. Benjamin is more interested in conveying information beyond simply the words of a sentence. However, the contextual information or associations of a word, what

Benjamin calls metatextual information for a word, is different in each language. In his lecture on Benjamin's essay, Paul de Man breaks down the cultural associations for bread in German, French, English, and Flemish: he associates the German *Brot und Wein* with Hölderlin whom Benjamin references in the essay (28). German bread is also generally darker and heavier than French bread. De Man also notes that the French *pain et vin* is "what you get for free in a [cheap] Restaurant" as well as the distinct types of French bread: *baguette, ficelle, bâtard* (28). The English *bread* has similar connotations to the German but with the added connotation of "money" in English slang, i.e., one's daily bread (28). Beer in English is sometimes called *liquid bread*. De Man notes a "quotidian" aspect to bread in German and English that for him is absent in French (28). All these languages have different cultural connotations with bread that come out when these words are compared with one another as well as areas where they all overlap, which gets closer to Benjamin's idea of a pure language of naming the original concept of *bread*, the thing in itself.

In contrast to Benjamin, Tawada rejects the idea of an original text as the "original" since she sees the "original" as already a translation of thoughts and images into words. To use Benjamin's terms, the original translates the *Ursprache*, the Adamic language, into human language.[66] If there is no original text, then the translation is open to creating new associations. Tawada takes another step from Benjamin: "Die Zeichnen lassen sich von den Nachkommen Adams lesen, fliehen aber immer wieder aus dem Sinn" (Schrifft 28). Instead of describing Adam in the Garden of Eden as the namer of things (der Nennende), she imagines a writer, a descendant of the first man and woman, whose words are meant to be read after they are written,

[66] Robinson brings Benjamin closer to Tawada's point of view that the original next does not exist when he analyses Benjamin as saying: "[A translation as] genre is simply the first earth-bound copy of the transcendental Form of that type of literature" (Robinson 24).

in other words with connotations. These words are still connected to the original language, but they have taken on extra connotations that will be read by people in the future, who perhaps speak a different language from developed from one different from the original writer. Instead of recreating an original language, the translation, when compared to the first one, creates a third language, which reveals aspects of the text that the first version couldn't show.

In her later essay "Das Tor des Übersetzers oder Celan liest Japanisch," Tawada offers two examples of this third text that is revealed through translation. Here, she shows the significance of Kanji which contain the *door* radical for creating interpretations of several poems by Paul Celan in Japanese translation. Tawada notes that the kanji for the verb *to hear* (聞) is made up of the radicals for *ear* (耳) and *gate* (門) (Das Tor 172). "Folgt man dem Zeichen, so bedeutet Hören, wie ein Ohr an der Schwelle zu Stehen" (Tawada, Das Tor 172). This influences her analysis of Celan's poem "Ich hörte sagen" from the collection *Von Schwelle zu Schwelle*, in which an image below the surface of the water is replicated above water, and these two scenes are connected by the branch of a tree. The connection of *hören* (to hear) and *Schwelle* (threshold, 閾) is made visible through their sharing of the gate (門) radical, and it suggests that to hear is to stand on the threshold to another realm and listen to what is on the other side. Because kanji (ideograms) consist of different radicals, Tawada argues that they represent an idea and are not necessarily written based on how they are spelled as are words that are alphabetic writing systems.[67] She makes connections to expressions in Japanese that support her interpretation of some characters as well (Tawada, Schrift 23). However, this is complicated by the fact that in

[67] There are some Kanji and Chinese ideograms that are pronounced based on one or more of the radicals that make up the ideogram.

languages such as German with compound nouns, the parts of the noun do not always logically correspond to their meaning from the perspective of another culture or language.

In her essay, Tawada interprets Celan's poems only in Japanese, she does not compare their German and Japanese versions, which is the step Susan C. Anderson takes in her analysis of one of Tawada's short stories. Anderson applies this method of interpretation in her analysis of Tawada's short story "Tintenfisch auf Reise" and combines the interpretation of what the German interpretation adds to the Japanese version. The German *Tintenfisch* is "evocative of ink, a writing material that can also veil the squid and make it enigmatic […]. The Japanese word *ika* emphasizes more the notion of defamiliarization" (Anderson 60). Neither association makes it into the English *squid*, which begins with the same sound and letter pairing as *squishy* and *squirt* and has a connotation of something that can slip through your fingers. Anderson brings the connotations of these words together to argue that the squid in the short story has characteristics that are present in both Japanese and German, but she goes a step further when she analyzes the words *Fersen* and *Verse*, in which the *v* and *f* are pronounced the same. The story follows a young, Japanese woman who finds her footing in a new country. The narrator initially feels unbalanced in her new home and shows that other characters believe that she does not have heels (Fersen), which references a Japanese association of being in a foreign country with being unbalanced as if one has no heels. Once the narrator is comfortable being unbalanced, she finds her footing and she can interrogate the new language to create her own *Verses*, which allow her to escape her husband and avoid being forced to assimilate into the new culture (60). Knowledge of both culture and languages is now needed for this interpretation. Both the connection of *Fersen* and *Verse*, which only comes through in German, and the connection of heels with being in a foreign country, which only comes through with knowledge of the Japanese language and

culture, are needed to understand this fundamental concept of the story. After the narrator finds her footing and regains her verses, she can overcome and escape her enigmatic husband, who is revealed to be a squid spirit. Anderson's analysis combines the method of comparing the connotation and the *Art des Meinens* from Benjamin's project with Tawada's idea of revealing new information about a text and creating a third language through translation.

Creating a third language through translation in *Meeresstille*

This method is something that Robert in Ljubić's *Meeresstille* will continue and expand on in his analysis of Ana when he seeks to understand several words in BCMS that she taught him by using German and BCMS to break down the meanings of the word in BCMS translated into German. In *Meeresstille,* Robert takes an approach to understanding Ana through translation that resembles Tawada's approach of creating or revealing new information through translation and cultural comparison. This approach recalls Anderson, who points out the different connotations behind words that denote the same thing in different languages in order to develop a more expansive definition of the word. Robert compares meanings in both BCMS and German, but then he adjusts the meaning of the German word, either adding or taking away meaning. The meanings of several words in German and BCMS alone do not fully convey or define what Robert observes; he must take parts of words and leave out others from both to create new meanings. Just as Tawada begins translating by viewing the German language and culture through the eyes of a Japanese narrator, Robert begins translating by taking the point of view of a Bosnian Serb, and seeing where his German perspective went wrong. Both Tawada and Robert up-end hierarchies of cultural dominance, but Robert is deconstructing the narrative from the inside. Robert also compares the meanings and connotations of words in German and BCMS to see where they differ and takes it a step further. Robert then takes the differences that are left

over from the connotations or meanings of a word in BCMS and German for the same thing and uses the differences to adjust the meaning of a German word to create his third language.

Robert initially takes Ana's words and images at face value, as when Ana shows him pictures from her home in Višegrad, Bosnia, "Meine Mutter im Garten. Im Sommer hatten wir immer Tomaten im Garten. Weißt du, dass Tomaten bei uns *paradajz* heißen?" (95, emphasis in the original). Robert has another association with the word: "weil es wie Paradies klang" (Meeresstille 95). The garden paradise suggests the Garden of Eden and Adam, who names the animals God brings before him, creating the *Ursprache*. However, rather than the silence or the inarticulate sound, which is closest to an original expression of Ana's inner feelings and which Robert doesn't understand, here Ana projects an idyllic image, which he fully and uncritically accepts. Ana teaches Robert words in BCMS throughout their relationship. In this sense, she, like Adam, names things. However, the scene immediately calls into question Robert's reading of the images and words Ana imparts. Ana creates a translation and associations of her world through the pictures and stories she tells, but she also omits important parts. She only tells Robert happy stories about growing up in Višegrad and of her father. Robert doesn't learn about her older brother, who was killed in a skiing accident, or about Šimić's alcohol addiction until he talks about it at his trial.

Robert gives additional connotations to the image Ana provides of her mother "im Garten" and the tomato (paradajz). While *paradajz* is a standard word for tomato in BCMS, Robert adds the connotation of *paradise* to both *garden* and *tomato*. The garden the mother is in and Ana's family home are now *paradise*.[68] Robert's association of tomato with paradise is supported by the etymology of *paradeiser*. According to the *Duden Deutsches*

[68] The word in BCMS for paradise is *raj*.

Universalwörterbuch, *Paradeiser* is the Austrian word for *tomato* and the red of the tomato was associated with the red apple in the Garden of Eden, paradise (Duden 1181).[69] However, this is a translation without an original and the setting of this scene would not be possible without the neologism *paradeiser* lining apples/tomatoes and the Garden of Eden. In the "Book of Genesis" in the *Old Testament*, the forbidden fruit is simply called fruit (3:3-12). The association of the forbidden fruit with an apple, came when the bible was translated into Latin. According to the *Cassell's Latin Dictionary: (Latin-English and English-Latin)*, the word for *evil* (642) and *apple* (688) are both *mālum*. The tomato comes from South and Central America and only came to Europe after the conquistadors conquered the Aztecs. Because both the tomato and apple are mostly red and round, the tomato was named after the place where the forbidden fruit is located, a fruit that is associated with an apple through the Latin translation of the Old Testament. When Robert envisions himself eating tomato slices in Ana's family garden, he imagines himself sitting in a paradise that is not paradise, literally eating a slice of paradise that is not paradise. He is buying into a fantasy that he largely creates, but also one that Ana supports with her selective stories. Robert knows about the breakup of Yugoslavia and the genocide that was committed in Višegrad and elsewhere, but he maintains this fantasy anyway.

Using translation to uncover subconscious clues

After Robert and Ana break up, Robert starts to recognize that his initial assumptions about Ana were incorrect. The novel has several scenes where Robert reflects on his conversations with Ana where he dissects her words with knowledge about her past that he did not find before and with knowledge that he has about BCMS that she taught him. One telling

[69] "[zu: Paradeis = altere nhd. Form von Paradies; nach dem Vergleich des kräftigen Rots mit der Schönheit der verbotenen Frucht im Paradies] (österr.): Tomate" (Duden 1181)

scene where Robert translates words and phrases in BCMS into German to bring out his new understanding of Ana comes early in their relationship. In this scene, Robert and Ana drink *šljivovica*, a liquor made from plums. Ana begins by placing on the table an unmarked bottle, whose contents Robert incorrectly assumes to know: "Sie hatte zwei Gläser auf den Tisch gestellt, dazu eine Flasche ohne Etikett. Er ahnte was es war" (Meeresstille 45). The unmarked bottle is full of meanings that Robert assumes he knows. While his initial assumptions about the contents of the bottle might have been correct, he later questions his understanding of the words Ana teaches him. At the time, Robert is happy as he has found the woman with whom he wants to spend the rest of his life. Looking back on this scene, Robert produces several additional translations for the words in BCMS based on Ana's suggested translations in German and the new information he learns about the crime her father is accused of committing. The triple and contradictory meanings of both *živeli* and *zlatko*, are revealed to the reader as Robert looks back on this scene with the knowledge of what Ana's father is accused of doing. The scene also reveals different opinions on the role or significance of drinking for Ana and Robert, to enjoy life or deal with pain, which are then expanded up and contrasted with other characters later in the novel.

At the beginning of this scene, the signifiers of the signified terms are not yet defined, as the bottle of liquor is unmarked, though Robert assumes he knows what is in the bottle. Ana begins by explaining that the word *šljiva* (plum), the first part of *šljivovica*, is the BCMS word for *plum*. Interestingly, she uses the southern German or Austrian word *Zwetschge* rather than the northern German *Pflaume*, a reference to former Yugoslavia's historic relationship with the Austro-Hungarian Empire.[70] Ana adds more details, but Robert's assumptions are not put into

[70] In the English translation, Anna Peterson replicates this alternative word by using *damson*, which is a specific kind of plum found in Great Britain.

question so far. Ana then teaches Robert another word with which he is already familiar and adds new information: “Sie hob ihr Glas und streckte es ihm entgegen. ‘*Živeli* heißt bei uns: ‘Lass uns leben.’ / ‘Schivili’, sagte er. / Sie lachte. / Es war das einzige Wort gewesen, das ihm geläufig war. Aber er hatte nicht gewusst, dass es vom Leben handelt. Er hatte gedacht, es bedeutet ‘Prost!’” (Meeresstille 45). Robert is correct in thinking that the expression *živeli* is the equivalent of *Prost*, the expression said before drinking. This is an expression that he probably heard from his father or during his few visits to his aunt in Croatia. However, the relationship of the word to the noun *život* (life) or the verb *živeti* (to live) was not known to him before this scene. During the scene, Robert simply associated the phrase with life with Ana being good (Meeresstille 46). Robert accepts Ana’s connection of the phrase to Yugoslav drinking culture and her admonition that people who do not drink are too inhibited to live life fully, though a later scene will complicate the meanings of these words. *Živeli* is the active participle of the verb *živeti* and is used in the perfect case (past tense), first-person plural form, while the German equivalent uses the second-person, singular imperative form of *lassen* plus the infinitive of *leben* to request someone live. When Ana says *živeli*, she is calling for people to enjoy life; however, Robert reflects on an additional connotation behind the word that appears in the German translation but is not in BCMS: “Damals war es eine Aufforderung, aber es konnte auch ein Flehen sein. In einer anderen Tonlage oder einer anderen Situation bekam das Wort eine andere Bedeutung” (Meeresstille 45). Depending on context, the phrase “lass uns leben” can either be a *prompt* to enjoy life or a *plea* to the listener not to harm the speaker or group. This plea becomes relevant in the context of complicity in the murder of 42 people[71] that Šimić is charged with.

[71] This darker connotation of the word in BCMS appears when the third person, plural auxiliary *su* is added: *živeli su* (they lived).

After a few drinks, Ana explains that there are two types of *šljivovica*: white and gold. Ana whispers in Robert's ear: "*Zlatko*.' / 'Weißt du, was das heißt?', fragte sie. / Er schüttelte den Kopf. 'Der Goldige" (Meeresstille 46). Ljubić assigns three meanings to this word in BCMS at play simultaneously in this scene and which do not translate fully into German or English with one word. The term *zlatko* and Ana's translation as *der Goldige* (the golden one), suggests a connection to her previous explanation with the two varieties of *šljivovica*. The narrator does not state what variety they are drinking, though it could be assumed that they are drinking the golden variety. At the same time, this is a very tender scene, Robert has just closed his eyes in a moment of bliss when Ana leans over the table, kisses him, and then whispers the word "Zlatko" in his ear (Meeresstille 45). This is reflected in Anna Peterson's translation of the line into English as "sweetheart" (Stillness 45). Though this word is not a commonly used term of endearment in BCMS, it appears later in the novel specifically as such when Ana calls Robert "moj zlatko" in response to him saying "ich liebe dich" (Meeresstille 68). The third meaning that complicates the scene is that *Zlatko* is also a proper first name. It is the name of Ana's father, another person dear to her and whom Robert views as an ersatz father figure, but who is also on trial for taking part in a war crime. This fact, leads Robert to never want to say the word again: "Wie könnte er jemals wieder diesen Vornamen aussprechen? Oder ihn auch nur hören?" (Meeresstille 46). Robert's disillusionment that the meanings of both *živeli* and *zlatko* are the opposite of his initial assumptions leads him to wonder: "ob Ana und er jemals wieder in der Lage sein könnten, der Sprache des anderen zu vertrauen" (Meeresstille 46). To translate a word that is key to naming Ana's psychological state, he must rely on and question words in both German and BCMS.

I return now to the example cited at the beginning of the chapter. A key term for understanding Ana's mental state and how the war still affects her is one that Robert must use his

knowledge of German and BCMS to define and it is one that he spends almost the whole novel contemplating. At the beginning of Nicol Ljubić's novel *Meeresstille*, the protagonists, Ana and Robert, are sitting on the beach together. The wind is blowing gently over a calm ocean surface: "'Wie heißt das, wenn das Meer ruhig ist?', fragte sie. Er verstand nicht, was sie meinte. Wenn das Meer ruhig ist, ist es ruhig. Oder still. 'Habt ihr kein Wort dafür?', fragte sie. 'In meiner Sprache gibt es dafür ein Wort'. […] '*Bonaca*.' Das Wort hatte sich ihm eingeprägt. Meeresstille" (Meeresstille 11, emphasis in the original). Ana is not translating from German, but merely explaining to Robert that there is a word in BCMS[72] for a calm ocean surface, with a light wind. Roberts's translation of *bonaca* immediately after as *Meeresstille*[73] connects the book to a poem by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe of the same name: "Meeresstille"[74]. Despite Robert's instance in the scene that a calm sea is simply calm, implying that there is no need to give it a special name or attribute special characteristics to it, the poem this scene references provides several vital clues to Ana's mental state and suggests several readings of Robert and Ana's relationship.

The first stanza of the poem describes a quiet ocean surface, a deep silence that is above and below the surface of the water. For Ana and Robert on the beach, a calm ocean is connected with a pleasant day; but for the sailor in Goethe's poem, a calm sea is connected with danger.

[72] Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian
[73] The German title is "Meeresstille," which the English title translates directly as *Stillness of the Sea*. The Bosnian title uses the word Ana suggests and adds on to it: Bonaca je tuga (Bonaca is sadness). The Bosnian poet Aleksa Šantić translated the poem into BCMS as "Morska tišina."
[74] Meeresstille
Tiefe Stille herrscht im Wasser,
Ohne Regung ruht das Meer,
Und bekümmert sieht der Schiffer
Glatte Fläche ringsumher.
Keine Luft von keiner Seite!
Todesstille fürchterlich!
In der ungeheuern Weite
Reget keine Welle sich. (Goethe, Sämtliche 666)

The realization of the danger is conveyed in the poem through the sailor in the next line, who "bekümmert sieht der Schiffer / Glatte Fläche rings umher" (Sämtliche 666) The silence or calm means that there is no movement (wind) to move his boat and he is stuck in place or at the mercy of the current. The second stance with the word *Todesstille* (deathly silence) increases a sense of danger and hints at the connection between stillness and possible death. In the beginning of "Glückliche Fahrt" the poem that "Meeresstille" was originally published with, a wind comes up and the people on the boat escape danger and find land. A May 14th, 1787, letter from Goethe's *Italienische Reise* describes a plausible inspiration for the poem. Goethe and his companion naively enjoy a view of beauty on the calm ocean surface before noticing the other passengers' concern, who then describe the danger of being led by the current they cannot fight to shallow rocks. Fortunately, a wind picks up and they avoid the rocks and get to shore (Italienische 338-43). The vast (*ungeheuern*) surface that the sailor is on references the ocean current that led Goethe and his fellow passengers towards the rocks. In this reading, the danger is external to the writer, Goethe, and the group he is with. The danger is a lack of motion from the outside environment.

There are three kinds of silence in "Meeresstille:" the titular *Meeresstille* as well as *Tiefe Stille* and *Todesstille*. Jacob and Wilhelm von Grimm define *Stille* in several ways, important for us are: "bewegungslosigkeit. Fast nur von wasser und wind" this definition is followed by a line from Goethe's "Meeresstille" (Vol. 18 2989). It is also connected with storms, especially the silence (together with *Ruhe*) beforehand: "wann nach dem ungewitter machst du still" (Stille 2990). He also connects it to human (inner and outer immobility) and silence: "die lautlosigkeit und das Schweigen" (Stille 2990). Finally, Grimm also defines *Stille* as "äussere und innere ruhe" (Stille 2991). The Grimm dictionary suggests that *Tiefe* implies more than just physical

depth and depth in content (not superficial) as well as something that is not discovered (Tiefe 488). Heinrich Poos connects *Tiefe* with the historical depth of nature, and the absence of triviality (37). This suggests that there is a more complicated and significant reason for the lack of wind that has not been discovered.

When reading the poem in connection with Goethe's *Italienische Reise,* the deeper meaning behind the danger. At first unknown in Goethe's ignorance, the other passengers have to make him aware of the unseen current leading the ship towards rocks and death. In the poem, the sailor is already aware of the danger. The *Todesstille* in the second stanza suggests a connection to literal death. Grimm defines *Todesstille* as the "gleich der todesstille vor einem sturme" (Todesstille 575). It can also mean a silence that resembles death. Lambert, reasoning that there is a lack of reason for fear in the poem, suggests that words like "'bekümmert,' 'todesstille,' 'fürchterlich,' and 'ungeheuern' take on the character of an existential outcry in the face of the abyss" (248). In the poem "Glückliche Fahrt," the boat moves towards land and there is a relief at the end: "Schon seh' ich das Land" (Sämtliche 666). Because the two poems were published together, the "Glückliche Fahrt" can be read as a journey after death, the movement is death in life. Heinrich Poos creates a reading based on connecting the poem with the Bible, in which *Meer* is connected with the sea in Genesis (Gen 1:10) and the creation story (Poos 37) and *Stille* is the period before life and *Luft* rather than wind is the "breath of life," which brings humanity closer to God. In Poos' reading, the switch from *Tiefe Stille* in the first stanza to *Todesstille* in the second and its invocation of death, does not represent life ending, but the period before life begins. According to Poos, when the wind blows in "Glückliche Fahrt" not only is the sailor brought to life but is also saved through being closer to God.

The BCMS words *bonaca* and *mir* become essential in teasing apart the meaning of *Meeresstille* and moving from a purely German context. The *Školska knjiga veliki rečnik hrvatskoga* dictionary's definition of *bonaca* is fairly close to the Grimm's definitions for *Stille*: a "completely calm sea without waves and wind" or "when nothing significant happens in an inner circle [of people] or in public" [75] (102).[76] The entry also states that it comes from the Italian *bonaccia* (Školska 102). The *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* defines *Bonàccio* as "good-natured or docile."[77] The danger can now originate in the surrounding environment or from a group of people, but there is still the potential for danger or dangerous movement. A more radical change in his definition of *Meeresstille* takes place when he moves away from the loanword and at the BCMS translation of *Stille* itself. When Robert goes to the Hague for the second time to see Simic take the stand in his defense, his thoughts return to the question of whether Ana represents peace and stillness:

> Für ihn war sie (Ana) der Ausdruck einer Stille, eines inneren Friedens. Er muss an das serbische Wort *mir* denken, das 'Stille' heißt, aber auch 'Frieden.' Hatte er sich so getäuscht? Wie könnte er glauben, dass ein Mensch, der erlebt hat, was Ana erlebt hat, einen inneren Frieden haben könne (Meeresstille 171, emphasis in the original).

This bilingual word association game leads to a more nuanced understanding of *Stille* in *Meeresstille* that comes closer to reflecting Ana's point of view than Robert could have gotten through thinking about the word only in German. In the beginning, Ana epitomized an inner quiet (Ruhe). Robert recalls that the BCMS equivalent for *peace* (*mir*) has two translations in German: *Stille* (silence, quiet) and *Frieden* (peace). Robert now recognizes that Ana exhibited an outward calm and quiet (Stille) but does not have inner peace (innerer Frieden). This changes the

[75] "Bonaca – 1. MET potpuno mirno more bez valova I vjetra [Bonaca je kao ulje / led.] – utiha; 2. PREN mirno razdoblje, zatišje kad se u užem krugu ili u javnosti ništa značajno ne događa (E) tal" (Školska 102).
"Bonaca – 1. MET completely calm sea without waves and wind [Bonaca is like oil / ice.] – silence; 2. PREN peaceful period, lull when nothing significant happens in the inner circle or in public (E) tal."
[76] Unless otherwise mentioned, all translations are my own
[77] "Bonàccio (ant. Buonàccio), agg. Di buon carattere, docile, bonaccione" (303)

meaning of *Stille* to be just *quiet* or *calm* without *peace* (Frieden). This creates another interesting intersection with Grimm, who also defines *Stille* as "äussere und innere ruhe" (Stille 2991), which Robert also associates Ana as having. Rather than breathing life into an original language, Robert overlaps two terms to create a new language. In his dictionary, Grimm connects *Stille* with the calm before the storm, also with the word *Ruhe*, which Robert must also remove from his conception of *Meeresstille*.

When Robert first meets Ana, he is fascinated by what he sees as her inner peace, though he later questions this assessment: "Zum ersten Mal fragt er sich, woher Ana diese innere Ruhe hatte, die ihn schon bei der ersten Begegnung im Theater so faszinierte. Diesen inneren Frieden, wie er dachte" (Meeresstille 144-45). Throughout the book, Robert thinks back on these memories with knowledge about Ana and her family that he did not have back then, with the knowledge that his initial perceptions were wrong. When Robert reviews his conversations with the additional knowledge that he has gained, he realizes that the calm outer surface, which he initially mistakes as her "innere Ruhe" (inner calm), hides an inner turmoil within her, which Robert notices after Ana wakes him in the middle of the night when she yells from a nightmare:

> Einmal ist er aufgewacht, weil er einen erstickten Schrei gehört hatte und im Moment des Aufwachens nicht mehr sicher war, ob er ihn gehört oder geträumt hatte, es war still im Zimmer, Ana lag neben ihm, sie atmete schwer, unruhig, sie zuckte zusammen, als er seine Hand auf ihren Bauch legte, aber offenbar beruhigte seine Hand sie, und er schlief wieder ein. Wie oft mag sie neben ihm gelegen haben, voller Unruhe, ohne dass er es gemerkte hatte? (Meeresstille 44)

In contrast to the room, which is *ruhig* (still), Ana is *unruhig* (restless or disquieted) to such an extent that she cries out and breathes heavily, suggesting that she is reliving a traumatic or terrifying event. She flinches initially at his touch, but then is calmed by it. Suggesting that the threat from *Meeresstille* shifts again from an external action, as in the poem, to an internal threat to refer to Ana's emotional and psychological state as a trauma survivor.

Later, Robert begins to suspect what he notices is not *Ruhe* but tiredness. In one instance Ana explains that she did not leave Belgrade during the NATO bombings, because she was simply tired:

> Ich hätte Belgrad verlassen können, ja, aber ich hatte keine Lust. Das klingt vielleicht merkwürdig, aber es war so. Zu der Zeit in Belgrad zu leben war nicht ungefährlich, aber ich war müde, vielleicht ist es das, was es am besten trifft, ich war einfach müde, und ich dachte immer, das kann nicht allzu lange dauern, sonst wird es uns nicht mehr geben (Meeresstille 145)

What Ana describes as tiredness is closer to apathy, a lack of interest or concern, in this case during a difficult period when she was just trying to survive. The mental barriers a person puts up to cope with traumatic situations do not necessarily come down after the traumatic situation is over. Robert questions whether the inner calm that he saw in Ana while she read at the theater when they first met was not simply exhaustion from everything she had been through. "Oder war es [die Stille] am Ende kein Frieden, sondern Müdigkeit?" (Meeresstille 145). The use of energy to mentally process a stressful and traumatic situation can result in exhaustion in the survivor. *Meeresstille/bonaca* is now apathy that results from experiencing trauma. It appears outwardly calm but with a roiling sea below.

In the poem *Meeresstille*, the danger comes from a lack of movement on the surface, the danger is internal for Ana: she is slowly working through trauma from the war, worry about her father, and frustration at being grouped with other war criminals by many in Germany. Rather than observing a calm in a group of people or an environment that was suspected of being potentially dangerous, as with *bonaca*, or with the danger being a lack of movement in a landscape, as with *Meeresstille*, Ana's *bonaca* is an outer calm that hides a psychological disquiet. This is manifest through screams at night but also in arguments or disagreements with Robert about events she experienced. Like the wind, which blows in "Glückliche Fahrt" to allow the sailor to escape danger, the touch of Robert's hand calms Ana both on the surface and

underneath, at least temporarily. It is not a touch that brings life or a "pure language" as with Adam. It has the potential to lead to a new beginning after trauma and for Robert and Ana to find a shared language to communicate it, which remains unrealized throughout the book. While Robert recognizes that Ana experienced trauma during the war and wants to help her, he does so by using methods rooted in German history and culture that do not meet Ana's immediate needs. Robert fails to recognize that the trauma of the war is still too near for Ana when he pushes her to talk about her experiences. As a result, he is unprepared for her *Unruhe* and lashes out when she does talk about it, especially in ways that contradict his views.

In the drinking scene discussed previously, Ana states: "[…] dass Menschen, die nicht trinken, Angst hätten vor dem Leben, weil sie Angst hätten, loszulassen" (Meeresstille 45). When Robert easily becomes tipsy, she teases him that he needs to learn how to drink, "[w]eil es zum Leben dazugehört" (Meeresstille 46). Ana portrays drinking as a way to lower inhibitions (loslassen) and live or enjoy life fully. She is also encouraging Robert to drink, playing on a stereotype that southern and eastern Europeans enjoy life more than reserved, northern Europeans. This comes in part through Robert's observation that Ana enjoys going to various clubs in Berlin and dancing while he is more introspective and involved in research (Meeresstille 41).

Ana embodies two images of drinking as part of daily life, showing both negative and positive aspects of drinking in how she tries to enjoy life but also struggles with traumatic experiences. Aisha, a Bosnian Muslim, whom Robert meets at Šimić's trial, adds another level to the role drinking plays in daily life. She tells him how in Bosnia you can see seemingly contradictory images: in addition to seeing the remnants of destroyed houses, "du wirst aber auch Menschen sehen, die abends trinken und tagsüber zur Arbeit gehen, wie in jedem anderen Land

auch" (Meeresstille 170). Aisaha contrasts the destroyed houses, the remnants of war, with people seemingly leading normal lives, going to work during the day and drinking at night, but then she describes how people in Bosnia lead two lives: "Du musst wissen, dass es für die Menschen, die diesen Krieg erlebt haben, ein Leben gibt, das sie am Tag fuhren, aber es gibt noch ein anderes Leben, und das fängt an, wenn sie ins Bett gehen und zu schlafen versuchen" (Meeresstille 171). People drink to get to sleep at night, when their thoughts or memories of traumatic events cause them to not be able to sleep.

The image of Ana and her relationship to drinking is complicated by the dichotomy that while it is possible to drink to let go and have fun, one can also drink to not have to confront negative emotions or traumatic experiences. The narration does not associate Ana heavily with drinking; besides the above scene, Ana is depicted drinking red wine while reading a book at night (94). The only other scene where heavy drinking is suggested when she and Robert go to a club: Robert watches "wie sie (Ana) sich am Alkohol und an der Musik berauschte, in der Menge aus Tanzenden aufging. Er wünschte, ihm fiele die Ablenkung so leicht wie ihr" (Meeresstille 135). For Ana, who survived the bombing of Belgrade and is a possible rape victim, drinking could also serve a similar purpose. It is possible that she would have enjoyed dancing and going to clubs even if she had not experienced trauma during the war. Drinking for Ana may be a mask for going through life normally, but it also serves another purpose entirely when she tries to sleep at night. When she sometimes has nightmares that cause her to cry out. Ana's father also has his own struggles with trauma and drinking.

The night after listening to Šimić's testimony, Robert dreams Šimić enters his hotel room, talks to him, and then throws an empty liquor bottle against a wall after mentioning the death of his sons (Meeresstille 104). After he dreams about Šimić, when Robert admits to

himself that the Šimić of his fantasies is not who the person in reality is, Robert toasts to an imaginary Ana. It is the only instance where Robert drinks when Ana is not there: "Er schraubt den Verschluss ab und trinkt den Inhalt in einem Zug aus, ohne zu wissen, was er trinkt. Es brennt in seinem Hals. '*Živeli*', sagte sie. '*Živeli*', sagte er" (Meeresstille 104). When Robert toasts an imaginary Ana, it is not in the bliss of the earlier, drinking scene, but in a recognition of the disillusionment he feels that Šimić is accused of complicity in genocide. Robert's throat burns from the alcohol and the knowledge as a result. Robert has examples of perspectives different from his own that explain Ana's psychology, but he does not relate them to her experiences. One such event took place on the way to Lake Müritz when Robert and Ana encounter a group of Neo-Nazis who question Robert's self-identity as German, which brings ethnic tensions to Germany, similar to former Yugoslavia.

Robert decided to take Ana to Lake Müritz because it had positive connotations for him, and he wanted to show Ana something nice. In retrospect, Robert remembers that the name has Slavic roots: "Der Name kam aus dem Slawischen, *morcze*, kleines Meer; das hatte er mal gelesen" (Meeresstille 125). The trip ends badly, however, when a group Neo-Nazis, whom Robert had earlier inadvertently cut off, forces them to pull over. One of the Neo-Nazis questions Robert's nationalities and uses derogatory terms for people from Italy or former Yugoslavia. After Robert insists that he is German, both sides leave without further incident. This scene points to the rise of Neo-Nazis in Germany after World War II, a source of potential danger within a group. This is an unwelcome truth, as Zimmer points out: "While the screen memory of National Socialism is projected upon the Balkans, the legacy of this tainted past within Germany today is sometimes overlooked" (264). By bringing this up, Ljubić blurs the boundaries between former Yugoslavia and Germany.

Robert observes that the name, Müritz, comes from an ancient Slavic language. This points to a past diversity in the population when ethnic Slavs predominated before Germanic people came in. It also suggests attributing negative stereotypes of the Balkans to Germany. While the stereotype of the Balkans, as discussed in Todarova's work *Imagining the Balkans* portrays autochthonous ethnic and religious groups constantly fighting each other, in this scene, as Zimmer notes, the hatred is (mis)directed against immigrants and refugees (264). The Neo-Nazis accuse Robert of not being ethnic German, though he insists on being German, if only by nationality. He insists on belonging to the group that is attacking him. This experience is a small part of the ethnic tensions and fighting that took place in Yugoslavia and is similar in theme, though not on the same scale, to the ethnic tensions and hatred Ana would have seen around her leading up to, during, and after the war. Ana sees herself as a victim of ethnic tension and the NATO bombing of Belgrade; in Germany, however, she is seen as a member of the perpetrators, because of her Serb ethnicity. Remembering his encounter with the Neo-Nazis, Robert briefly recognizes intolerance for foreigners or immigrants in Germany, but he does not continue this line of thinking. He experiences something similar to the tensions between ethnic groups that exploded into violence and a possible personal violation that Ana experienced, though on a much smaller scale. However, Robert does not comment on this. It is only when he goes to Bosnia and Herzegovina, after he is now receptive to a different point of view, that Robert is able to recognize a perspective consistent with Ana.

Seeing the debris of history and not a reflection in the river DrinaWhen Robert and Ana first meet, he reads Ivo Andrić's *The Bridge on the Drina*. He imagines Ana standing on the bridge looking down at the river where a massacre occurred during the war of the 1990s and sees only the sun reflected off the surface (Meeresstille 53-54). Robert perceives the water's surface

only as a mirror reflecting his perspective (Mayr 236). He cannot translate Ana's view of the war to his and pushes her to talk about the war with the well-intentioned goal of helping her, but he ignores what she is ready or willing to do. In the final scene looking down from the bridge at the river Drina, Robert sees trash, debris, and fish in the water. This can be read as Robert looking at the debris of history floating down the river, as the effects of the war and the catastrophe of history, are still repeating in the present. In his "Über den Begriff der Geschichte," Walter Benjamin's Angel of History wants to stop the catastrophe of violence of history repeating itself but cannot. O.K. Werckmeister argues that the Angel of History, based on an earlier angel in Benjamin's writing, wants to revive the dead and their poetry, thus interfering with "the preordained course of history" and the Messiah's task of redemption, which is why he is cast out of Paradise by the wind (256-64). The angel is a Luciferian figure who was expelled from the garden for going against God's plan, however well-intentioned, much like Robert wanted to help Ana, but going against her wishes and only making things worse. Unlike Maja Haderlap's narrator in Chapter 1, who dreams of standing in the middle of another river surrounded by the debris of history so that her words can be sharpened by it, Robert is more distanced. Now he sees the debris from above. Rather than looking on with horror, Robert recognizes the debris for what it is, unlike in his dream in paradise, where he attributes false connotations to the words Ana was telling him. He has expelled himself from paradise and sees the chaos and its effects, but he is separated from it.

Robert's distance from the catastrophe of the breakup of Yugoslavia results in a receptiveness to hearing about the war from another point of view and not insisting on approaching events from his own perspective is evident when Robert goes to Sarajevo and meets Alija, who was a soldier during the war. Through Alija, Robert can see the effects of the war in

the present. He hears about the conflict from the perspective of someone who experienced it in that person's voice, which brings some surprises. One such surprise is Alija's use of humor, which Didem Uca (188) and Stijn Vervaet (8) argue is an essential part of Bosnian war literature. When Alija takes him to Višegrad and shows him the bridge over the Drina he points out that in the middle of the bridge, Bosnian Serb soldiers killed hundreds of Bosnian Muslims. Ailja shows that this took place next to the *kapija*, an Ottoman Turkish loanword that is translated in Ljubić's book as the stone sofa but is translated in Bosnian dictionaries as "the gate" (kapija 589). Moreover, the Bosnian refers to the wide, center portion of the bridge. This loanword, uncommented on by Robert or Alija, contains an important clue about the function of the bridge as a space where the community is both brought together and torn apart. Robert might have remembered the association from having read Ivo Andrić's *Bridge on the Drina*. In the book, the *kapija* is a location where the whole town comes together to talk and do business.[78] In Ljubić's novel, however, the bridge is the site of the unrecognized slaughter during the civil war which divides the town. Just as the Neo-Nazis' definition of "German" does not include Robert, even though he, like them, is a German citizen, so too did the Serbs exclude the Muslims of Višegrad from belonging in the city during the war. According to Ana's mother, Muslims excluded and attacked ethnic Serbs in retaliation during the war (Ljubić, Meeresstille 114), Alija asks Robert about the location: "Und siehst du irgendwas? Ein Mahnmal? Ein Schild? Sie tun, als wäre hier nie etwas geschehen" (Meeresstille 187). The lack of a plaque for the victims of the genocide and the rebuilt mosque that no one in the city uses leads Coleman to suggest that: "[t]he war is not over in Bosnia because perpetrators and bystanders do not acknowledge the crimes yet" (90).

[78] "Then every citizen could, at any time of day or night, go out to the kapia and sit on the sofa, or hang about it on business or in conversation. Suspended some fifteen metres above the green boisterous waters, this stone sofa floated in space over the water, with dark green hills on three sides, the heavens, filled with clouds or stars, above and the open view down river like a narrow amphitheatre bounded by the dark blue mountains behind" (Andrić 20)

In *Republika Srpska*, the majority Serb, autonomous region in Bosnia and Herzegovina where Višegrad and Srebrenica are located, the many acts of genocide that took place against Bosniaks remain largely unacknowledged even today.[79]

In closing, let us return to Ana's question from the beginning of the novel and also this chapter: "Wie heißt das, wenn das Meer ruhig ist?" (Meeresstille 11). To answer this question, we cannot use one word if we want to name how it describes Ana's mental state. We have to say that it is an ocean with a silent (Stille) or calm surface, but which is not calm (Ruhe haben) below. It does not have peace (Frieden) from what roils the ocean. Ana's peaceful ocean is the calm before the storm. In the end, Robert is able to create a small vocabulary that represents a point of view and perspective on the Bosnian Civil War that is removed from his initial understanding of the war. Those perceptions were based strictly on a German point of view. Instead, he approaches the war from a perspective that acknowledges Bosnia and Herzegovina and moves closer towards one that allows voices from this country to speak for themselves. Loanwords have an important, but not singular, role in bringing this change of perspective. Robert can rely on neither a knowledge of the German language nor a perspective rooted in German history to understand Ana. He has to use BCMS and German to unpack the words she is using to understand her situation. While he does share some experiences like his encounter with the neo-Nazis that in a small way reflect the social turmoil that led to Ana's trauma, he is not able to translate his experiences to hers. He must go to Sarajevo and Višegrad to see the effects of the war for himself. Only then will his understanding of both the war and Ana go beyond a German perspective and take his understanding to another level. Ultimately, however, this is a

[79] The Oscar-winning film *Quo vadis, Aida?*, about the genocide in Srebrenica, also located in *Republika Srpska*, was barred from being shown in Serbia and *Republika Srpska* as of a year after its release (c.f. Husaric).

language for Robert alone. One that Robert uses to explain what Ana was trying to tell him that he could not understand through German and BCMS alone.

Conclusion: The Long Train of Words Continues

> "Die Leute haben Angst vor allem, was sie nicht kennen, und mein dachgeschmücktes z und mein Vogellandeplatz des c in meinem Nachnamen macht die Menschen schon aus der Ferne schwitzen. Mehrfach sprachen sie den Namen beispielsweise vor meinen Lesungen richtig aus, Marica schien dabei das Leichteste zu sein"
>
> Bodrožić, *Sterne Erben, Sterne Färben*, 142–143

> "Und darum besinnen auch wir Serben uns auf den kleinsten gemeinsamen Nenner unserer Kultur. Und das ist: Hass. Also eh bisschen wie bei Ihnen (Österreicher) auch"
>
> Malarina, *Serben Sterben Langsam*

What is the relationship between the narrative a nation tells about itself and its language? In the context of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, former Yugoslavia, and their successor states (Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovenia, etc.), the governments and other institutions of power put masks on their nation's history to portray themselves in the best light. However, these relatively conservative societies all have narratives regarding World War II that portray one society as the victim and exclude other points of view, often to the detriment of those who are excluded. Individual words, as highly charged objects that reference past events from a counter point of view, have the capacity to highlight alternative perspectives to a national narrative. Theodor Adorno portrays loanwords as a means of pushing back against nationalist tendencies and subverting authority. This is achieved by introducing foreign ideas to create a profane narrative that challenges the mythologized national narrative accepted unquestioningly by the majority population (c.f. Garloff, Yildiz). When a minority group speaks the language of the majority it "is inflected by a sense of self-alienation" (Seyhan 24) as the minority has to adjust the language to tell their story. Returned loanwords, sometimes with diacritic marks above certain letters (ć, č, š, ž) in BCMS and Slovenian, visually represent an outside perspective, which is not welcome in the writer's society. As the quote from Marica Bodrožić at the top suggests, they have an uncanny effect on a language, making the familiar strange and imposing the outsider, the foreign or minority, onto a topic most everyone knows.

While the returned loanwords examined in this study are not the only ones, they are the main examples of how a minority group can undermine the dominant narrative of a country and show where minority and majority groups disagree on certain issues. While the returned loanwords examined in this study are not the only ones, they are the main examples of how a minority group can undermine the dominant narrative of a country and show where minority and majority groups disagree on certain issues.

All the authors in this study critique and complicate narratives of either the Second World War or the breakup of Yugoslavia that are told in either their country of origin or the country they moved to. They impose a point of view that is rooted in an outside (either foreign or minority) perspective onto the dominant narrative. As I have shown, this framework applies best to Slovene-Austrian writer Maja Haderlap, who in her novel *Engel des Vergessens* rejects Austria's narrative that it was the first victim of Hitler and that the state of Carinthia needed to protect itself against communist Yugoslavia and its own ethnic-Slovene minority after World War II. By retelling the grandmother's journey to and from the Ravensbrück concentration camp using *Rajža* and the transcribed place names, Haderlap creates and puts up her own road signs to replace the ones that were torn down in 1972. In this way, she insists upon a visual representation of the experiences of the Slovene community in Carinthia, Austria. In *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert*, Saša Stanišić pushes back on what he describes as a simplification–rather than mythologizing–in Germany of inter-ethnic relations in former Yugoslavia. Instead of subverting a Bosnian authority by telling a counter-narrative, the loanword *Špajz* names a space that contains multitudes as a stand-in for former Yugoslavia to a German-speaking audience. Stories and attitudes of inter-ethnic conflict and friendship come together in a space where one or the other is emphasized before and after the bloody breakup of

the country. The *Špajz* also contains parts that the narrator cannot see, understand, or explain, such as why the war became so violent along ethnic lines. Marica Bodrožić's novel, *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*, brings back a political critique, though the subject is not the government of the country in which she lives (Germany) but the place of her birth (Croatia). Through the narrator, Bodrožić disparages Croatia's efforts to remove loanwords from their version of BCMS and to mythologize a historical narrative that Croatia fought successfully to gain independence from Serbia. In *Sterne Erben, Sterne Färben*, Bodrožić expresses a sense of alienation from the language she grew up speaking, now devoid of the linguistic diversity she cherished. In contrast to the other authors, the audience for this critique is not necessarily a German or Austrian, but other immigrants or refugees from former Yugoslavia, especially Croatia. Bodrožić does not explain how they got to this point, merely showing the results. Nicol Ljubic's *Meeresstille* not so subtly questions the negative portrayal of ethnic Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina in German media as well as Germany's role in ending the conflict between Serbia and Kosovo. He counters Fischer's narrative that Germany is bombing Belgrade to prevent another Auschwitz, by arguing that Germany is acting out of self-interest to make up for World War II rather than wanting to help Bosnia and Kosovo for their own sakes. After the protagonist Robert and Ana, a Bosnian Serb, break up, he realizes that he was viewing the war and approaching how to deal with trauma from a point of view rooted in post-World War II German culture that did not match Ana's needs. To try and understand how Ana is still affected by trauma, Robert begins deconstructing the two parts of *Meeresstille* using BCMS and German to alter the meaning to better fit what he observes in her. The Italian loanword in BCMS *bonaca* also offers a slightly different definition that better suits Ana.

The authors in this study stand in contrast to Austrian writer Peter Handke, who, while speaking against the predominant narrative in German-speaking countries about the war in former Yugoslavia, also played into Serbia's narrative by ignoring its role in atrocities. Malta Herwig notes that Handke decided to attend jailed Serbian leader Slobodan Milošević's funeral in 2006 after he was lambasted in newspapers upon his death (248). Handke makes valid criticisms of comparing Milošević to Hitler, Serbia to Nazis, ignoring acts of revenge for Srebrenica against ethnic Serbs by Bosniaks in the media, and NATO's bombing of Belgrade (Am Ende). Where Handke fails is addressed trenchantly in his speech at Milošević's funeral when he stated "Ja znam da ne znam" (I know that I don't know) (Herwig 248), acknowledging the complexity of the situation. However, he also downplayed Serbia's and Bosnian Serb's roles in committing war crimes for which the leaders, such as Milošević, were rightly convicted. Handke's "rejection of obvious facts ('Ich kenne die Wahrheit nicht'), [opens] the door to 'alternative facts' in Handke's texts" (Vidulić 64). Handke's questioning of what he saw as simplistic and exaggerated narratives about Milošević and Serbia in German and French media gives way to full-throated historical revisionism by some politicians in Serbia and the majority Serb parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Handke's position is close to Ana's in Ljubic's *Meerestille*, a work by another author who did not grow up in former Yugoslavia but has family from there.[80] Ana defends other ethnic Serbs to people in Germany, though she, unlike Handke, acknowledges the crimes committed by ethnic Serbs.

[80] Nicol Ljubic's father, as stated in Chapter 4 is from Croatia. Peter Handke's mother was born in Slovenia, then part of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

Approaches to telling counter-narratives of traumatic events using loanwords

Ljubic's *Meeresstille* and Marica Bodrožić's *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle* both comment and push back on Johann Gottlieb Fichte's argument that loanwords need to be explained to the reader before they can understand their meaning in interesting ways. The protagonist Robert's project starts precisely with Fichte's argument that loanwords should not be used as their meaning has to be explained to the native speaker. Fichte also argues that cultures that use loanwords use words that have a dead center in them, because the word is not part of the receiving culture's lived experiences, they will thus never fully understand the word. While Robert has not experienced what Ana has, living through the bombing of your city or having the people in your hometown turn against you and having to flee, he does develop his own connection to those events and sees for himself how she is still affected by them, giving the word and the concept a living center. Robert might not fully understand Ana's point of view, but he doesn't have to, he has to come closer and realize the gap in his knowledge. Bodrožić provides an interesting counterexample to Fichte's citation of *Humanität* as a loanword that his hypothetical monolingual German would not understand. While he lists *Menschenfreundlichkeit* as term that successfully conveys the concept of showing friendliness to man in German this is also a loan translation of the Greek word *philanthropos*. Bodrožić uses the more everyday word for airplane, *avion*. While this word is not portrayed as difficult to understand in the novel, the linguistics in replace it with the loan translation *zrakoplov*, which through her literal translation back into German awkwardly conveys the concept of a device that flies. Loan translations perform the integration of a foreign idea or word that Fichte maintains needs to be integrated into a people's lived experiences before they can understand it, but *avion* was used in former Yugoslavia and was part of people's lived experience of flying for many decades, while *zrakoplov* is an older loan translation, whose original meaning is debated by linguistics.

Often, as with Haderlap and Ljubić the etymology of a loanword, *rajža* and *paradajz* respectively, will reflect relationships between characters or groups within the novel, such as how the BCMS *paradajz* (tomato) is named because it resembles an apple the fruit of paradise but is not one, reflects how the narrator images his girlfriend Ana's home to in Višegrad, Bosnia to be a paradise, which it is not. Haderlap's *rajža* reflects an inversion of power dynamics in Carinthia, Austria, where the Slovene-speaking minority takes the assimilated German loanword *rajža* in Slovenian, to name events when Austrians imposed on and persecuted ethnic Slovenes. Bodrožić shows how loanwords can permeate a language in ways that are difficult to identify without training and how efforts to replace these loanwords with local variants in an effort to purify a language can be difficult and lead to an incomprehensible language.

While all the authors undermine and question narratives about the nation that are popular in their respective countries, only Haderlap's returned loanword is a word that embodies a minority imposing its narrative on the majority. However, all the authors, or characters in their books, make use of translanguaging to some degree in their novels and each uses individual words to reflect, comment on larger social situations, and tell their community's counter-narratives. Haderlap and Stanišić argue against reading authors of migrant or minority background as only mixing languages or writing between languages, arguing like Bodrožić that you can't be unfaithful to the language you are writing in. In her speech, "Im Licht der Sprache," Haderlap insists that writers do not "write between languages," but rather they stay true to the language they are writing in. While in her novel *Engel des Vergessens*, Haderlap makes use of German literary figures such as Walter Benjamin and Paul Celan, she also takes inspiration from Slovenian and Yiddish writers such as Florjan Lipuš and Scholem Asch. Stanišić also references a line from Paul Celan's poem "Todesfuge" and adds to it to comment on the Civil War in

Bosnia and Herzegovina. He also includes a translation of a poem by the Bosnian Serb poet Mak Dizdar and intersperses Aleksa Šantić's poem "Emine," about an ethnic Serb who pines after a beautiful Muslim woman, between a description of how the men at a party disarm a Serb nationalist who threatens the band when they play Turkish music, which foreshadows the nationalist, ethnic hatred that would soon engulf the country and the relationship between a Serb soldier and Bosniak woman, which resists a simple binary of love or hate.

Bodrožić also works against Haderlap's statement somewhat. Bodrožić insists that her "new German," which consists of compound nouns, remains faithful to the German language and is difficult to translate into Croatian because the concepts it conveys do not originate in BCMS, but rather in German. The meanings of these nouns do not always match their parts (c.f. Vinci). She is not creating meaning based on Croatian, but she is modifying the German to meet her needs. However, her model is complicated in her novel *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*, where she provides German translations or equivalents of words and expressions in BCMS, which are usually not direct translations but often serve to provide her or her narrator's commentary. Bodrožić also makes several indirect references to popular culture in former Yugoslavia before and after the war. To tell their stories, none of these authors exotify the German language simply for its own sake, but to reflect something of the history and current culture of their country, and these literary devices should be analyzed as such. These authors call for intertextual readings of their stories and though some work has already been done on this topic, the conversations they create between German, Slovenian, and Yugoslavian literature need to be explored further.

All the authors in this study use translation to some degree in their novels to comment on and subvert narratives. Very often, these authors do not provide direct translations of words or expressions from BCMS or Slovenian into German but also color the translation to provide

commentary. For example, Stanišić translates expressions from BCMS into German which would be recognizable to a native speaker of BCMS when native BCMS speakers are talking in former Yugoslavia or commenting on events there. These expressions do not sound completely foreign to a German speaker. Haderlap translates a Slovenian phrase as “in den Wald gehen” (into the woods), a common expression in Slovenian and BCMS for joining the partisans, and then provides commentary that it implies, "hiding, ambushing" not simply "hunting for mushrooms" as a way to comment on the experiences of many Carinthian Slovenes in the partisan army (Engel 75). Bodrožić, despite arguing that BCMS does not influence her German, translates several BCMS words and expressions into German in *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*, but in a way that provides the narrator's thoughts and commentary on the post-war political situation in Croatia (for example, contrasting *seine Sprache* (which plays on the inclusive *naš jezik)* with *das Eigene* (the more exclusionary and nationalist *svoji*). Her translation of *zrakoplov* as the long noun string *Luftdurchsegelungsgerät* implies that the word, despite being put together using standard rules in BCMS sounds awkward, and hints at her disapproval of replacing *avion* (plane) with it. Rather than being unreliable narrators or translators, Bodrožić and the other authors in this study translate these words and phrases creatively into German to convey a point of view of someone from that region on local matters or to show the narrator’s stance on a position through the translation.

Ljubić, despite being the only non-native speaker of a Slavic language in this group, offers one of the more radical approaches to using translation in deconstructing meaning and narratives. Following a similar strategy to one proposed by Japanese-German author Yoko Tawada and scholars who analyze her texts, Ljubić’s protagonist Robert uses translation to compare the different connotations of German and Serbian translations of the same word to tease

apart how Ana understands trauma and the war differently from Robert and how she is coming to terms with trauma. Robert at first calls what he identifies as calm in Ana, *Meeresstille*. Over the course of the novel, he reconsiders this initial impression after learning more about her past and describes what he saw in her as a *bonaca*. While both terms mean a still ocean surface, through translation Robert decides that *Stille*, which can also be translated into Serbian as *Mir*, which in turn means both *peace* and *silence*, does not apply to Ana as she does not embody peace, due to her unresolved trauma. *Bonaca* shifts the meaning to a calm ocean surface with turmoil broiling underneath, which is closer to what Robert comes to identify as the remnant effects of trauma in Ana.

There has been some research done on how people who experience trauma and have a high level of proficiency in multiple languages show a greater propensity to speak about traumatic experiences in their second language (c.f. Gardner-Chloros, Frie, Ladegaard). These studies show that while a person's first language allows them to be more precise in expressing emotion, they switch to their second language to create an emotional distance to a difficult topic, such as a traumatic experience (Gardner-Chloros 123, Ladegaard 693). The returned loanwords in this study, overall, do not follow this pattern, and the authors generally create emotional distance from traumatic events in other ways. Haderlap is an exception as she states that she chose to write *Engel des Vergessens* in German in part because it would have been impossible to write about such a difficult and personal topic in Slovenian (Haderlap and Kerbler 0:18 - 0:59). While Ljubic's characters Ana and Robert come close in this respect, Ana uses the word *bonaca* to talk about the physical ocean and it is her boyfriend Robert who later makes the connection to her inner turmoil. Instead, the narrative shows Ana's inner turmoil through overreaction to Robert scaring her in the park at night, nightmares, and only sharing happy memories of her

father, who is on trial for war crimes. Haderlap's grandmother uses the German loanword *Rajža* to name the journey back home from the concentration camp. While at first glance using this loanword meets the criteria of using a loanword to name a traumatic event to create emotional distance, this is not the case, as this loanword has existed in Slovenian since the 15th Century. We also learn that the grandmother doesn't speak German well, she calls it the *Lagersprache* (the language of the camps) and even though a German-speaking Count is polite to her and is portrayed as trying to protect ethnic Slovenes during World War II, she is upset after talking with him in German even decades after the war. Haderlap as the author chose to put this word into the German language text for a specific effect, distinct from showing the grandmother's mental state, which she in turn shows through including other Slovenian words that the grandmother replaces when talking about difficult subjects.

Showing the need to acknowledge inconvenient historical truths today

Leslie Adelson's seminal work *The Turkish Turn in German Literature*, which influenced this study, argues that works by authors of migrant background should be analyzed based on how they use literary devices to tell their stories and not simply how the works reflect the history of the author's country of origin. While I agree that the works in this study should be analyzed based on their use of literary devices and wordplay, because the authors make subtle and intricate plays of meaning between different cultures, histories, and literary references, knowing how the returned loanword represents a story that works against the country's established, common narrative of their history is essential to understanding what the authors are trying to express in their novels and how they use literary devices to do this. Because the authors in this study tap into deeper histories that span the length of multiethnic and multilingual empires, it is all the more essential to know these events. Former Yugoslavia, its successor states, and Austria as a

successor state of the Austro-Hungarian Empire have histories that are connected both within and across these countries, but all these countries impose blanket narratives on events or issues that show only one side and actively exclude others which continue in some form today.

In Republika Srpska, the Serb-majority part of Bosnia and Herzegovina where in the last presidential elections the incumbent Serb president[81] Milorad Dodik, pressed Republika Srpska to secede from Bosnia and Herzegovina and denied that massacres of Bosniaks at the hands of ethnic Serbs happened in places like Srebrenica and Višegrad (BBC 0:50-1:10; Rahim), though he later acknowledged the killings, he again declined to call it a massacre (Arslanagic). Dodik's narrative ignores certain inter-ethnic violence that took place during the Bosnian civil war of the 1990s. During the breakup of Yugoslavia and in the decade that preceded it, narratives of interethnic conflict during World War II exploded out into the public sphere, after which stories of peaceful interethnic coexistence, was a foundational message of Tito's principle of "Brotherhood and Unity" (BCMS: Bratstvo i jedinstvo), were suppressed. In this narrative, the partisans were portrayed as heroic, multiethnic soldiers who joined out of political ideology and patriotism while the fascist enemy of World War II was externalized (Bet-El 211). The different ethnic groups coexisted peacefully despite a civil war between Croatian fascists, Serbian nationalists, and communist guerillas (Radonić 167). Ethnic Croats generally were blamed for the atrocities in Jasenovac as well (Kolstø 1154). One ethnic group blames the other(s) for any violence committed or for starting the violence and excuses any violence their group committed. One can see this pattern being repeated today. In interviews with BBC regarding Dodik and his statements, ethnic Serbs in Republika Srpska felt that they were still unfairly blamed for the violence and that their suffering was denied in the international press (BBC 4:15-4:55). While

[81] In the current political system in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the three major ethnic groups, Bosniaks (Muslim), Croats, and Serbs each have a president, who hold equal executive power.

ethnic Serbs and Bosnian Muslims carried out crimes and retaliations against each other during the war, Dodik ignored the genocide committed against Bosnian Muslims at the hands of ethnic Serbs. However, both Serbs and Bosniaks agreed that the rhetoric of denying what had happened and bringing this rhetoric up again would only tear the country further apart (BBC 4:55 - 5:10). While Dodik eventually won re-election after a recount,[82] the president's successful use of blatant ethnic fearmongering and denial of past atrocities to win support clearly shows the need to acknowledge these crimes and what led up to them in the present.

Another interesting development against nationalism in former Yugoslavia is the pushback against efforts in the successor states to establish individual standards for BCMS and to enforce which variety of BCMS children learn based on ethnicity. The *Deklaracija o Zajedničkom Jeziku* (Declaration on a Common Language) calls for eliminating the linking of language and national identity. It declares that the languages spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia are all variants of a single South Slavic language, BCMS. The writers of the declaration call for abolishing linguistic segregation and discrimination in educational and public institutions, ending costly and unnecessary translations, allowing for individual freedom of language choice, and no longer rigidly defining standard variants (Jezicinacionalizmi). Although none of the authors discuss this declaration, both Saša Stanišić and Marica Bodrožić have signed the online Excel form in support.

Events from World War II still affect relations between Slovenia and Austria in the present as well. The stalled issue of putting up bilingual (German and Slovenian) road signs in Carinthia was finally resolved in 2011 in part through negotiations between Austria and Slovenia, as discussed in Chapter 2. In separate reactions against this agreement, the VLÖ

[82] The irregularities were found to not be on a scale that would have changed the election result (Bosnia's Dodik).

homeland organization and then-FPÖ party chief H.C. Strache criticized Slovenia for interfering in Austria's internal affairs, which Strache claimed they handled excellently while ignoring the plight of the German minority in their own country. While the bilingual road sign issues were resolved, such statements ignored the VLÖ and FPÖ's own role in resisting the road signs for over 50 years. Such resistance had its roots in World War II, the partisans were seen as foreign invaders or Carinthian Slovenes who were disloyal to Austria and who terrorized patriotic Austrians, i.e., ethnic Germans, particularly in Carinthia, Austria. This narrative fell in line with Austria's post-war *Opfernarrativ*, whose self-contradictions Helga Embacher summarizes as follows: it was the duty of Austrians to serve in the *Wehrmacht*, a foreign army that occupied Austria against its will, despite a referendum overwhelmingly supporting the *Anschluss* and the sacrifices and suffering of these soldiers needs to be honored (651). Despite such xenophobic commentary from the FPÖ, the party received a large percentage of votes from the immigrant Serb community in Austria. Subverting Strache's depiction of the relationship between Serbia and Austria as two countries with a long historical friendship was the subject of a performance by Serbian-Austrian cabaret artist Marina Lacković whose performance "Serben Sterben Langsam," is a retelling of Austrian history from a point of view of someone from Serbia and applies many stereotypes of the Balkans to Austria.

Balkanizing Austria in the works of Cabaret Artist Malarina

Marina Lacković's performance "Serben sterben Langsam," which earned her the Salzburger Stier prize for cabaret in 2023, is an hour-long, comedic history lesson on the relationship between Serbia and Austria starting from the first world war to the present. Like the narratives discussed in the rest of this study, Lacković's performance uses a translingual word to telescope counter-narrative and cross-national stereotypes to work against a prominent Austrian

politician's narrative of the relationship between Serbia and Austria and larger perceptions of Serbia based on stereotypes in Austria generally. In the piece, Lacković plays Malarina, a right-wing figure who was born in Serbia and now lives in Vienna. The character voices support for right-wing policies in Austria and Serbia, which Lacković uses to mock them to the audience. Malarina speaks with a heavy Serbian accent, which Lacković does not have off-stage, uses German heavily influenced by BCMS, and is interspersed with English and BCMS phrases. The title of her program is a play on the phrase "Serbien muss sterbien" a battle cry from the First World War when Austro-Hungary first declared war on Serbia (Pirzl). In an interview, Lackovic states that she developed the idea for this performance when she learned that many Serbs in Austria voted for the far-right FPÖ party and H.C. Strache, despite their anti-immigrant policies and she wanted to argue against Strache's statement that Serbia had a long historical friendship with Austria (Akbaba 18:30-19:30). This followed a long campaign where H.C. Strache called himself a "Freund der Serben" and supported Kosovo remaining with Serbia (Cucujkić and Kravagna). Lacković believes some people from Serbia voted for FPÖ and H.C. Strache because they are racist and nationalist and points out that many former communist countries have voted for autocratic leaders (Akbaba 26:00-27:47). However, several Austro-Serbs cite Strache as the first politician who expressed interested in and support for them and their community, after years of demonization after the 90s, which Lacković acknowledges in her act (Lacković). However, they became disillusioned after Strache failed to keep many of his promises to them (Neuhold, Starkl, Stajić). For Lacković, the FPÖ represents a type of political party familiar to Serbs, both under and after communism, and which has many policies they can agree with. While Strache heralded the Austro-Serbs as Christians who assimilated into Austrian society and helped protect

Austria against Islam; Lacković reverses this framing to argue that the FPÖ, and Austria, are more similar to Serbia.

Stereotypes and exotification play an important role in this performance. Laković's Malarina speaks German with a heavy accent and uses incorrect grammar. She also exotifies Serbian culture. To close the performance, Malarina describes Serbian funeral customers, including what items people bury the dead with (a mirror, comb, cell phone, ID, money), and how people get very emotional and drink too much at the funeral to play up a sense of backwardness in the custom which is contrasted with the *fancy* and *chic* Austrian funerals (Lacković, Malarina 0:10 - 4:00). This exotification of Serbia, departs from the strategy of the authors in this study, including Novaković from the Introduction, who generally translated phrases from BCMS into German using a standard form of the language, unless they were going for a specific rhetorical effect. Though, Stanišić was criticized for exotifying and playing on bucolic stereotypes of Bosnia in *Wie der Soldat das Gramafon repariert* (Haines, Saša 108), Lacković plays on these stereotypes much more; however, with the rhetorical effect of then applying these stereotypes to Austria: "Sie (SerbInnen und ÖsterreicherInnen) haben tatsächlich sehr viel gemeinsam muss ich sagen. Beide schätzen Geschichtsrevisionismus und den Opferkomplex besonders" (Gemeinde 1:58-2:09). In her act, Lacković comments on negative features that Serbia and Austria share: "Und darum besinnen auch wir Serben uns auf den kleinsten gemeinsamen Nenner unserer Kultur. Und das ist: Hass. Also ein bisschen wie bei Ihnen (Österreich) auch" (Lacković, Malarina 0:40-0:50). By portraying both Austria and Serbia as sharing many commonalities that widely correspond with historical stereotypes about the Balkans (c.f. Todorova), Lacković balkanizes Austria, which is represented in the name she uses for Austrians themselves.

Lacković's on-stage alter ego Malarina describes how Serbs in Austria decided to assimilate into Austrian culture and this was successful: "Wir [waren] selber Schwabos plus Zwiebel minus Umlaute" (Lacković, Malarina 6:28-6:30). In the full performance, Malarina talks several times how immigrants from Serbia struggled to pronounce the German umlauts, especially *ü*. Lacković refers to ethnic-German Austrians as *Švabos*, which is a term from BCMS that comes from the German *Schwabe* (Swabian), which refers to the Germans from Swabia who immigrated to southeastern Europe and is a generic term for an ethnic German, though with some negative stereotypes attached (Švabo 914). She also refers to people from former Yugoslavia as *Jugos* or *Tschuschen*, which is a derogatory term in Austria for someone from southeastern Europe but is no longer commonly used in Vienna. By saying "Wir (Serben) sind *Švabos*" (ethnic Germans), Lacković is not only stating that Serbian immigrants integrated into Austrian society, but she portrays this society as sharing characteristics with Serbia and former Yugoslavia, specifically several negative stereotypes with people from former Yugoslavia. A *Švabo* is not simply an ethnic German in this narrative, but an ethnic German who embodies negative Serbian stereotypes, such as the hate she argues both sides share as a common denominator. Malarina provides an example when she reacts to people who ask why Serbs could support Strache and the SPÖ when they don't like immigrants and she replies that "Wir mögen Migranten ja selbst nicht" and that they make sure many don't come to Serbia they keep living standards low by means of corruption and in this "Die Österreicher haben sich da ein Beispiel an uns genommen" (Lacković, Malarina 7:24 - 7:40). Austria, or at least the FPÖ, thus takes on aspects of Serbia's approach to migration because both sides don't want migrants in their country in this telling. While there is still an "us" and "them" dichotomy between Serbs and Austrians, these boundaries become blurred and expose the hypocrisy of a right-wing, anti-immigration

politician who wants to side with immigrants to keep out other immigrants and takes on characteristics that would normally be associated with the "them," the Other.

Importance for today

The rise of nationalism across the world, including the US, and the Russian invasion of Ukraine show that old narratives and ethnic or racial grievances still have purchase in the world. When those in power must either give up or cede partial power to others, they often fail to acknowledge the reasons for the secession of power and instead cling to older narratives to repackage into grievances. Narratives that span countries and ethnic groups are complicated, and injuries do not only happen to one group in a conflict. It is important for all sides engaged in conflict to acknowledge that the narrative of the other side also exposes truths. This honest reckoning with the past takes time, but as this dissertation has shown listening to counter-narratives about the past is crucial. Returned loanwords focus attention on a counter-narrative of a nation that tells events the majority wishes to ignore or downplay but that the affected minority wishes to emphasize. The returned loanword imposes a foreign influence on the nation, by taking a loanword and imagery from the majority language in the minority language and placing it back into the majority language to focus on what was unsaid. These returned loanwords reference loaded, historical events but are not necessarily historically loaded in the sense of Paul Celan's enriched (angereichert) words as Celan. They form the basis for a more inclusive union that recognizes the perspective of a minority.

Works Cited

Aćimović, Ljiljana. “Hybride Identitäten bei Marica Bodrožić, Danjela Pilic und Anna Baar.” *Informatologia*. Vol. 54.1-2 (2021). 1-13. Print.

Adelson, Leslie. *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature: Toward a New Critical Grammar of Migration*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, (2005). Print.

Adorno, Theodor. “Cultural Criticism and Society.” *Prisms*. Cambridge: MIT Press (1983). Print.

---. “Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft.” *Prismen*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag. 1955. 7-31. Print.

---. *Minima Moralia: Reflexionen aus dem beschädigten Leben*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, (1951). Print.

---. *Negative Dialektik*. Frankfurt a. M.: Surhkamp Taschenbuch Verlag (1980). Print.

---. “Über den Gebrauch von Fremdwörtern.” *Gesammelte Schriften 2: Noten zur Literatur*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag (1974). Print.

---. “Wörter aus der Fremde.” *Gesammelte Schriften 2: Noten zur Literatur*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag (1974). Print.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. New York: Zone Books (1999). Print.

Akbaba, Eser. “Deutsche Sprache schwere Sprache mit Malarina.” *Simplecast*. https://deutsche-sprache-schwere-sprache.simplecast.com/episodes. Accessed on: 8/8/2023. Online.

Alanović, Milivoj. “Germanismen im Serbischen: von systemeigenen zu abweichenden morphosyntaktischen Eigenschaften.” *Slavic and German in Contact: Studies from Areal and Contrastive Linguistics*. Ed. Elżbieta Kaczmarska and Motoki Nomachi. Vol. 26 (2014). Print.

Alexander, Ronelle. “Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian: One Language or Three?” International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics. Vol. 44-45. 1-35. Print.

Anderson, C. Susan. “Surface Translations: Meaning and Difference in Yoko Tawada’s German Prose.” *seminar* Vol. 46:1 (2010). Print.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso (2006). Print.

André, James St. “Revisiting Walter Benjamin’s ‘The Task of the Translator’ in Light of His Concept of Criticism in German Romanticism.” *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction,* Vol. 24.1 (2011). Print.

Andrić, Ivo. *The Bridge on the Drina.* London: Allen & Unwin (1959) Print.

“Apple.” *Cassell’s Latin Dictionary: (Latin-English and English-Latin)*. Ed. J.R.V. Marchant and Joseph F. Charles. Rev. ed. London: Cassell and Company Ltd (1892). Print.

Apter, Emily. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006. Print.

Arendt, Hannah. “Gedanken zu Lessing: Von der Menschlichkeit in Finsteren Zeiten.” *Menschlichkeit in Finsteren Zeiten*. Ed. Ursula Ludz. München: Piper GmbH (1968). Print.

Arslanagic, Sabina (3 December 2010). “Dodik Again Denies Srebrenica Genocide.” Balkan Insight. http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/dodik-slams-international-community-for-referring-to-srebrenica-massacre-as-genocide. Accessed on April 26, 2023. Online.

Banjeglav, Tamara. “Conflicting Memories, Competing Narratives and Contested Histories in Croatia’s Post-war Commemorative Practices.” *Politička misao*, Vol. 49.5, (2012). Print.

Barker, Thomas Mack. *The Slovene Minority of Carinthia*. New York: Columbia University Press (1984). Print.

Becirbegovic, Amila. "Photographic (Re)Memory: The Holocaust and Post-World War II Memory in Yugoslavia." *German-Balkan Entangled Histories in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Mirna Zakic & Christopher A. Molnar. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press (2020). Print.

Beck, Evelyn Torton. *Kafka and the Yiddish Theater: Its Impact on His Work*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 1971. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "Über den Begriff der Geschichte." *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 1.2. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974. Print.

---: "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers." *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 4.1. Frankfurt am Main: Suhramp Verlag (1972). Print.

Bet-El, Ilana R. "Unimagined communities: the power of memory and the conflict in the former Yugoslavia." *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past*. Ed. Jan-Werner Müller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2002). Print.

Bodrožić, Marica. "Constellations." No Man's Land. Trans. Deirdre McMahon. https://www.no-mans-land.org/article/constellations/. Accessed on: 8/10/2023. Online.

---. *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*. Munich: Btb Verlag in der Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH. 2016. Print.

---. *Mein Weisser Frieden*. Munich: Luchterhand Literaturverlag. 2014. Print.

---. *Sterne erben, Sterne färben. Meine Ankunft in Wörtern*. Ed. 2. Munich: Btb Verlag in der Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH. 2016. Print.

---. *Stol od trešnjevine*. Trans. Anda Bukvić Pažin. Zaprešić: Fraktura. 2016. Print.

"Bonaca." *Školska Knjiga Veliki Rječnik Hrvatskoga Standardnog Jezika*. Ed. Ljiljana Jojić et al. Zagreb: Školska knjiga (2015). Print.

"Bonàccio." *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana.* Ed. Giorgio Bàrberi Squarotti. Vol. 2. Torino: Unione tipografico-editrice torinese. (1961) Print.

Boric, Gojko. "Wie kann es sein, dass ein und derselbe Mensch für die einen ein Held ist und für die anderen ein Kriegsverbrecher? – Interview mit Nicol Ljubić." *The Bridge Die Brücke Le pont Il Ponte*. Vol 3-4 (2010). Print.

"Bosnia's Dodik declared winner in disputed election after recount." Al Jazeera Balkans. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/10/27/bosnias-dodik-declared-winner-in-disputed-election-officials. Accessed on: 27 October 2022. Online.

Brandt. Bettina. "Collecting Childhood Memories of the Future: Arabic as Mediator Between Turkish and German in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's Mutterzunge." *The Germanic Review*. Vol. 79.4 (2004). Print.

Brozović, Dalibor. "Serbo-Croatian as a Pluricentric Language." *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Ed. Michael Clyne. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 2012. Print.

Bühler-Dietrich, Annette. "Verlusterfahrungen in Den Romanen Von Melinda Nadj Abonji Und Saša Stanišić." *Germanica*. Vol. 51 (2012). 35-46. Print.

Buzic, Ljubisa. "Die Rückkehr des Hatschek." https://www.wienerzeitung.at/nachrichten/politik/oesterreich/607755-Die-Rueckkehr-des-Hatschek.html?em_cnt_page=3. Accessed on: 4/19/2023. Online.Calić, Marie-Janine. *A History of Yugoslavia*. Trans. Dona Geyer. Ed. Charles W. Ingrao, et al. West Lafayette: Purdue University (2019). Print.

Campbell, David. “Atrocity, memory, photography: imaging the concentration camps of Bosnia – the case of ITN versus Living Marxism, Part 1.” *Journal of Human Rights*. Vol. 1.1 (2002). Print.

Celan, Paul. “Ansprache anlässlich der Entgegennahme des Literaturpreises der Freien Hansestadt Bremen.” *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhramp Verlag (1983). Print.

---. “Antwort auf eine Umfrage der Librairie Flinker, Paris (1961).” *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 3. Frankfurt am Main: Suhramp Verlag (1983). Print.

Cheesman, Tom. “Talking ‘Kanak’: Zaimoğlu contra Leitkultur.” *New German Critique*. Vol. 92 (2004). Print.

Claverie, Elisabeth. “Démasquer la guerre: Chronique d'un nettoyage ethnique Višegrad (Bosnie-Herzégovine), printemps 1992.” *Homme*. Vol. 203-204, (2012). 169-210. Print.

Coleman, Nicole. “Other Neighbors: Genocide as a Crime of Cultural Exclusion in Bernhard Schlink’s The Reader and Nicol Ljubić’s The Stillness of the Sea.” *The Right to Difference: Interculturality and Human Rights in Contemporary German Literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (2021). Print.

Conteh, Jean. “Translanguaging.” *ELT Journal*. Vol. 72.4 (2018). 445-47. Print.

Cosgrove, Mary and Fuchs, Anne. “Introduction: Germany’s Memory Contests and the Management of the Past.” *German Memory Contests: The Quest for Identity in Literature, Film, and Discourse since 1990*. Rochester: Boydell & Brewe (2006). Print.

Craith, Máiréad Nic. “‘Migrant’ Writing and the Re-Imagined Community - Discourses of Inclusion/Exclusion.” *German Politics and Society*. Vol. 33.1 (2015). 84-99. Print.

Cucujkić, Ivana; Kravagna, Simon. “Der Freund der Serben.” Kurier. https://web.archive.org/web/20080202075602/http:/www.kurier.at/nachrichten/128465.php. Accessed on: 8/11/2023. Online.

da Silva, Helena Gonçalves. “Trauma and Displacement as a Place of Identity in Saša Stanišić’s Novel How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone.” *Conflict, Memory Transfers and the Reshaping of Europe*. Ed. Helena Gonçalves da Silva, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (2010). 68-81. Print.

De Man, Paul. “‘Conclusions’ on Walter Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator.” *Yale French Studies*. Vol. 69 (1985). Print.

Deleuze, Giles and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature*. Trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1986. Print.

Diesen, Ruth. *Und Leben hat immer wie Abschied geschmeckt: frühe Gedichte und Prosa der Nelly Sachs*. Stuttgart: H.D. Heinz Akademischer Verlag (1987) Print.

Dillon, Sanda. "Audacious Rhetorical Devices in Paul Celan’s “Todesfuge” and Nelly Sachs’ “O die Schornsteine.” *Rocky Mountain Review*. Vol. 64.1 (2010) 32–46. Print.

Dostović, Nihad. “Aleksa Šantić: Stay Here.” *Modernism: The Creation of Nation-States*. Ed. Ahmet Ersoy, et al. Budapest: Central European University Press (2010). 94-98. Print.

Efendić, Nirha. “The Sevdalinka as Bosnian Intangible Cultural Heritage: Themes, Motifs, and Poetical Features.” *Narodna Umjetnost*. Vol. 52.1 (2015). Print.

Elste, Alfred. *Kärntens braune Elite*. Klagenfurt: Hermagoras/Mohorjeva. 1997. Print.

“Evil.” *Cassell’s Latin Dictionary: (Latin-English and English-Latin)*. Ed. J.R.V. Marchant and Joseph F. Charles. Rev. ed. London: Cassell and Company Ltd (1892). Print.

"Fears of new conflict as Bosnia-Herzegovina faces growing Serb nationalism - BBC News." BBC News. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=slnnVLGKeIM. Accessed on: 5/9/2023. Online.

"Feš und falsch." https://www.derstandard.at/story/1304552735304/fes-und-falsch. Accessed on: 5/3/2023. Online.

Feßmann, Meike. "Vom Aufbewahren der Erinnerungen - Über Marica Bodrožić." *Sinn und Form*. Vol. 65.5 (2013). 731-738. Print.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *Fichtes Reden an die deutsche Nation*. Leipzig: F. Insel Verlag. 1909. Print.

---. *Schriften zur Revolution*. Ed. Bernard Willms. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag (1967). Print.

Förster, Kristina. "Foreign or Familiar? Melinda Abonji's and Marica Bodrožić's Multicultural Literature." *German Life and Letters*. Vol 68.2 (2015). Print.

Frie, Roger. "Culture and Language: Bilingualism in the German-Jewish Experience and Across Contexts." *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 41.1 (2013): 11-19. Print.

Fritzsche, Peter. "What Exactly is Vergangenheitsbewältigung? Narrative and Its Insufficiency in Postwar Germany." German *Memory Contests: The Quest for Identity in Literature, Film, and Discourse since 1990*. Ed. Anne Fuchs, et al. London: Camden House (2006). Print.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. *Code Switching*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2009. Print.

Garloff, Katja. *Words from Abroad: Trauma and Displacement in Postwar German Jewish Writers*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 2005. Print.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nationalism*. New York: New York University Press (1997). Print.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Italienische* Reise. *Sämtliche Werke*. Ed. Friedmar Apel, et al. Vol. 15.1. Frankfurt a.M: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag (1993). Print.

---. "Glückliche Fahrt." *Sämtliche Werke*. Ed. Friedmar Apel, et al. Vol. 4.1 (1988). 666. Print.

---. "Meeresstille." *Sämtliche Werke*. Ed. Friedmar Apel, et al. Vol. 4.1 (1988). 666. Print.

Goni, Uki; Jelacic, Nerma. "The warlord of Visegrad." *The Guardian*. Accessed on 7/18/2022. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/aug/11/warcrimes.features11. Online.

Greenberg, Robert, D. *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc (2004). Print.

Greene, Carol. *Yugoslavia*. Chicago: Children's Press (1984). Print.

Grzega, Joachim. "Borrowing as a Word-Finding Process in Cognitive Historical Onomasiology." *Onomasiology*. Vol. 4 (2003). 22-42. Print.

Gstettner, Peter. "...wo alle Macht vom Volk ausgeht: Eine nachhaltige Verhinderung. Zur Mikropolitik rund um den 'Ortstafelsturm' in Kärnten. " *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, Vol. 33 (2004). 81-94. Print.

Gully, Jennifer M. "Bilingual Signs in Carinthia: International Treaties, the Ortstafelstreit, and the Spaces of German." *Transit*. 7.1 (2011): 1-14. Print.

Haderlap, Anton. *Graparji: So Haben Wir Gelebt: Erinnerungen eines Kärtner Slowenen an Frieden und Krieg*. Trans. Metka Wakounig and Klaus Aman. Klagenfurt: Drava. 2008. Print.

Haderlap, Maja; Kerbler, Michael. Sprache und Welt (2012.10.09). YouTube, uploaded by GoSchad. www.youtube.com/watch?v=GCw5_SXUkHk. Accessed on: Feb. 3rd, 2017. Online.

Haderlap, Maja. “Die Wirklichkeit der Schatten. Begegnungen mit einem österreichischen Taboo.” https://www.burgtheater.at/produktionen/wie-viel-zukunft-hat-unsere-vergangenheit. Accessed on March 9th, 2017. Online.

---. “Im Licht der Sprache.” http://archiv.bachmannpreis.orf.at/bachmannpreis.eu/presse.bachmannpreis.eu/d/11012-1/haderlap_rede.pdf. Accessed on July 11th, 2017. Online.

---. *Angel of Oblivion*. Trans. Tess Lewis. Brooklyn, NY: Archipelago Books. 2016. Print.

---. *Engel des Vergessens*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2011. Print.

Hagemeister, Michael. *The Perennial Conspiracy Theory: Reflections on the History of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. London: Routledge (2021). Print.

Haines, Brigid. “Saša Stanišić, Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert: Reinscribing Bosnia, or: Sad Things, Positively.” *Emerging German-Language Novelists of the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Lyn Marven, Stuart Taberner. Boydell & Brewer, Camden House. (2011). 105-18. Print.

---. “The Eastern Turn in Contemporary German, Swiss and Austrian Literature.” *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe*. Vol. 16.2 (2008). 135-149. Print.

Handke, Peter. “Am Ende ist fast nichts mehr zu verstehen.“ *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Trans. Anne Weber. Pub. May 19th 2010. https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/peter-handke-am-ende-ist-fast-nichts-mehr-zu-verstehen-1.879352. Accessed on: Jan. 22nd, 2024. Online.

Herwig, Malta. *Meister der Dämmerung: Peter Handke Eine Biographie*. Ed. 2. Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt (2010). Print.

Hirschi, Kaspar. *The Origins of Nationalism: An Alternative History from Ancient Rome to Early Modern Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2012). Print.

Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Empire: 1875 – 1914*. New York: Pantheon Books (1987). Print.

Hoyer, Jennifer M. *The Space of Words: Exile and Diaspora in the Works of Nelly Sachs*. New York: Camden House (2014). Print.

Husaric, Azra. "Award-Winning Srebrenica Film Barred from Serbs' Screens." Balkan Insight. https://balkaninsight.com/2022/06/07/award-winning-srebrenica-film-barred-from-serbs-screens/. Accessed on 10/4/2022. Online.

Ilić, Marija. "Serbian Families Living in Vienna.". https://metropole.at/serbian-families-living-in-vienna/. Accessed on: 4/19/2023. Online.

Jakiša, Miranda, Tyran, Katharina. "Das Südslawische Wien: Zur Sichtbarkeit und Präsenz südslawischer Sprachen und Kulturen im Wien der Gegenwart." Südsla*wisches Wien: Zur Sichtbarkeit und Präsenz südslawischer Sprachen und Kulturen im Wien der Gegenwart*. Ed. Miranda Jakiša und Katharina Tyran. Vienna: Bohlau Verlag (2022). Print.

"Jezicinacionalizmi." *Jezicinacionalizmi.com*. Accessed on: 5/22/2024, http://www.jezicinacionalizmi.com/. Online.

Jović, Dejan. "'Official Memories' in Post-Authoritarianism: An Analytical Framework." *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*. Vol. 6.2 (2004). Print.

Kafka, Franz. *Briefe, 1902-1924. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 8*. Ed. Max Brod. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1958. Print.

---. "Forschungen eines Hundes." *Nachgelassene Schriften und Fragmente II*. Ed. Jost Schillemeit. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer (1992) 423–482. Print.

---. *Tagebücher*. *Kritische Ausgabe* Vol. 8. Ed. Hans-Gerd Koch, Michael Müller, Malcolm Pasely. Frankfurt: Fischer. 1990. Print.

Kager, Maria. “The Pit of Babel: Franz Kafka’s Underground World of Yiddish.” *(M)Other Tongues: Literary Reflections on a Difficult Distinction*. Ed. Juliane Prade. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 2013. 165 – 77. Print.

“Kapija.” *Rječnik Stranih Riječi Bosanskog Jezika*. Ed. Ibrahim Čedić. Sarajevo: Institut za jezik (2011). Print.

Kesovija, Tereza. “Con sordino.” *Moja Posljednja i Prva Ljubavi*. Croatia Records (1987). Print.

Klemperer, Victor. *The Language of the Third Reich: LTI: Lingua Tertii Imperii*. Trans. Dr. Martin Brady. London: Continuum (2006). Print.

Kolstø, Pål. “Bleiburg: The Creation of a National Martyrology.” *Europe-Asia Studies*. Vol. 62.7 (2010). 1153-74. Print.

Koselleck, Reinhart. “Einleitung.” *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur Politisch-Sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Ed. Otto Brunner et al. 1st Ed. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta (1972). Print.

Kücüktekin, Naz. "Beč je već umoran od migracija i doseljenika.” *Kurier*. https://kurier.at/mehr-platz/goran-Novaković-wien-migration-zuwanderung-integration/401443069. Accessed on 3/22/2023. Online.

Kuka, Ermin, and Memišević, Hamza “Višegradski zločinački krvavi pirovi – jučer, danas, sutra.” *Historijski Pogledi*, Vol. 3. 4 (2020). 267-286. Print.

Lacković, Marina. *Serben Sterben Langsam*. May 14th, 2023. In Person.

Ladegaard, Hans J. “Codeswitching and emotional alignment: Talking about abuse in domestic migrant-worker returnee narratives.” *Language in Society*. Vol. 47 (2018). 693-714. Print.

Lambert, Sterling. “Franz Schubert and the Sea of Eternity.” *The Journal of Musicology*. Vol. 21.2 (2004). Print.

Ljubić, Nicol, et al. *Feuer, Lebenslust: Erzählungen deutscher Einwanderer*. Ed. Harald Leusmann. Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta’sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger GmbH (2003). Print.

Ljubić, Nicol. *Meeresstille*. 2nd Ed. Munich: Deutsch Taschenbuch Verlag. (2013). Print.

---. *Stillness of the Seas*. Trans. Anna Paterson. Glasgow: Vagabond Voices Publishing (2011). Print.

“Malarina mit "Serben sterben langsam" bei der Ybbsiade 2023.” *GemeindeTV - M4TV*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yOvnTPMDx4c&t=27s. Uploaded on April 26, 2023. Online.

“Malarina über Serben in Österreich - Usus am Wasser.” *Malarina*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4A0zuoANegw. Uploaded on Oct. 19, 2021. Online.

Martyn, David. “Borrowed Fatherland: Nationalism and Language Purism in Fichte's ‘Addresses to the German Nation’.” *The Germanic Review*. Vol 72.4 (1997). Print.

Martynova, Olga. “Good-bye America, Oh!” *Über die Dummheit der Stunde: Essays*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer (2018). Print.

Mayhew, Tea. *Dalmatia: between Ottoman and Venetian Rule: Contado di Zara* 1645-1718. Rome: Viella (2008). Print.

Mayr, Maria. “Berlin’s Futurity in Zafer Şenocak’s Gefährliche Verwandtschaft (1998) and Marica Bodrožic´’s Kirschholz und alte Gefühle (2012).” *Seminar*. Vol. 51.4 (2015). Print.

---. “Überwältigende Vergangenheit: Questioning European Identity in Contemporary German-Language Literature about the Former Yugoslavia.” *Re-forming the Nation in Literature and Film / Entwürfe zur Nation in Literatur und Film: The Patriotic Idea in*

Contemporary German-Language Culture / Die patriotische Idee in der deutschsprachigen Kultur und Gegenwart. Ed. Julian Preece. New York: Peter Lang (2014). Print.

Mearsheimer, John J.; Walt, Stephen M. "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy." *Middle East Policy*. Vol.13.3 (2006). Print.

Mijić, Ana. "Together divided–divided together: Intersections of symbolic boundaries in the context of ex-Yugoslavian immigrant communities in Vienna." *Ethnicities*. Vol. 20.6 (2020) 1071-1092. Print.

Mønnesland, Sven. "Is There a Bosnian Language?" *Languages in the Former Yugoslav Lands*. Ed. Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers (2004). Print.

Moses, Stephan. (Hgg.), Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture, 1096-1996." Ed. Sander L. Gilman andJack Zipes. New Haven: Yale University Press (2000): 716-21. Print.

"Nacht- und Nebel" *Duden: Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*. 6th Ed.; Berlin: Dudenverlag (2015). Print.

Nagy, Hajnalka. "Die Geschichte des/der Anderen: Zum Umgang mit dem österreichischen Täter-Opfer-Gedächtnis bei Maja Haderlap und Hamid Sadr." *Opfernarrative in transnationalen Kontexten*. Ed. Eva Binder et al. Vol. 3. Berlin: De Gruyter. 2020. Print.

Neuhold, Clemens. "Wer erbt die blauen Serben?" *Profil*. https://www.profil.at/oesterreich/wer-erbt-die-blauen-serben/400961525. Accessed on: 8/14/20223. Online.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. “Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben.“ *Nietzsche Werke – Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Vol. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1972. Print.

Novaković, Goran. “Der Drang nach Fremden Klang.” Vajt und Brajt. https://www.vajtundbrajt.com/der-drang-nach-fremdem-klang/. Accessed on: 5/9/2023. Online.

---. “Wozu Die Neuen Lautschriften?“ vajtundbrajt. https://www.vajtundbrajt.com/wozu-die-neuen-lautschriften/. Accessed on: 4/21/2022. Online.

---. Beč za Naše. http://beczanase.kratko-i-jasno.info/. Accessed on 4/12/2022. Online.

“o zajedničkom jeziku (одговори).” *Jezici i Nacionalizmi*. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/u/1/d/1XVGV5Z306SeDFzpdpUHhfeK-voAFdaakS48LqXfGozA/pubhtml. Accessed on: 7/26/2022. Online.

Özdamar, Emine Sevgi. *Das Leben Ist Eine Karawanserei: Hat Zwei Türen, Aus Einer Kam Ich Rein, Aus Der Anderen Ging Ich Raus*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch (2005). Print.

---. *Mutterzunge: Erzählungen*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch. 2nd Ed (2002). Print.

“Paradeiser.” *Duden: Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*. 6th Ed.; Berlin: Dudenverlag (2015). Print.

Petrov, Ana. “The Songs We Love to Sing and the History We Like to Remember: Tereza Kesovija’s Comeback in Serbia.” *Southeastern Europe*. Vol. 39 (20155) 192-214. Print.

Pink, Oliver. “Strache: Slowenien soll deutsche Minderheit anerkennen.” *Die Presse*. Published 04/19/2011. Accessed 3/11/2022. Online.

Pirzl, Katrin. “Es gibt genug Grund, mich zu hassen!” MeinBezirk.at. https://www.meinbezirk.at/baden/c-lokales/es-gibt-genug-grund-mich-zu-hassen_a5458207%23gallery=null. Accessed on: 7/11/2023. Online.

Poos, Heinrich, “Meeres Stille.” *Franz Schubert ‚Todesmusik‘*. Ed. Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn. München: Edition Text + Kritik (1997). Print.

Popis 2002. “15. Population by ethnic affiliation, age groups, and sex, Slovenia, Census 2002.” Statisticni Urad Republike Slovenije. https://www.stat.si/popis2002/en/rezultati/rezultati_red.asp?ter=SLO&st=7. Accessed on: 5/22/2023. Online.

Radonić, Ljiljana. “Transformation of Memory in Croatia: Removing Yugoslav Anti-Fascism.” *Dynamics of Memory and Identity in Contemporary Europe*. Ed. Eric Langenbacher, Bill Niven, and Ruth Wittlinger. New York: Berghahn (2012). 166-79. Print.

Rădulescu, Raluca. *Die Fremde als Ort der Begegnung: Untersuchungen zu deutschsprachigen südosteuropäischen Autoren mit Migrationshintergrund*. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre Verlag. 2013. Print.

Rahim, Zamira. Srebrenica massacre is ‘fabricated myth’, Bosnian Serb leader says.” Independent. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/srebrenica-massacre-genocide-milorad-dodik-bosnia-myth-a8869026.html. Accessed on: 5/15/2013. Online.

“Rajža.” *Slovar Slovenskega Knjižnega Jezika*. Ed. Anton Bajec et al. Ljubljana: DZS (1995).

Robinson, Douglas. *Translation as a Form: A Centennial Commentary on Walter Benjamin’s ‘The Task of the Translator*.’ New York: Routledge (2023). Print.

Rose, Marilyn Gaddis. “Walter Benjamin as Translation Theorist: A Reconsideration.” *Dispositio*, Vol. 7.19/21 (1982). Print.

Rosenberg, Goran, “Israel and Diaspora: from Solution to Problem.” *Turning the Kaleidoscope: Perspectives on European Jewry*. Ed. Sandra Lustig, Ian Leveson, New York: Berghahn Books (2008). Print.

Sachs, Nelly. „O die Schornsteine.“ *Twentieth Century German Poetry*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux (2005). 118. Print.

Šantić, Aleksa. “Emina.” *Izabrana Djela*. Vol. 2. Sarajevo: Svjetlost (1972). Print.

---. “Ostajte ovdje.” *Izabrana Djela*. Vol. 1. Sarajevo: Svjetlost (1972). Print.

---. *Izabrana Djela*. Vol. 3.; Sarajevo: Svjetlost (1972). Print.

“Saša Stanišić with Damion Searls and Jennifer Croft — Where You Come From” YouTube. Uploaded by: Third Place Books Events. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-nxGmh_g4W8. Print.

Schaller, Helmut Wilhelm. “The German Heritage in Balkan Languages.” *Slavia Meridionalis*. Vol. 15.15 (2015). Print.

Seyhan, Azade. *Writing Outside the Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2012. Print.

Siller, Barbara. “Contaminated Soulscapes and Landscapes in Maja Haderlap’s Engel des Vergessens/Angel of Oblivion.” *New German Critique*. Vol. 47.1 (2020). 197-215. Print.

Škiljan, Dubravko. “From Croato-Serbian to Croatian: Croatian Linguistic Identity.” *Language in the Former Yugoslav Lands*. Ed. Ranko Bugarksi and Celia Hawkesworth. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers. 67-83. Print.

Stajić, Olivera. “Serben und die FPÖ – das Ende einer Zweckbeziehung.” Der Standard https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000112028369/serben-und-die-fpoe-das-ende-einer-zweckbeziehung. Accessed on: 8/14/20223. Online.

Stanišić, Saša. “Three Myths of Immigrant Writing: A View from Germany.” Trans. Saša Stanišic. *Words Without Borders*. https://wordswithoutborders.org/. Accessed on: 6/21/2022. Online.

---. *Herkunft*. München: Luchterhand Literaturverlag (2019). Print.

---. *Wie der Soldat das Gramofon repariert*. München BtB Verlag (2008). Print.

Sterkl, Maria. “Serben in der FPÖ: Wenn der "große Politiker” Sliwowitz spendiert." *Der Standard*. https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000007364432/serben-in-der-fpoe-wenn-der-grosse-politiker-sliwowitz-spendiert. Accessed on: 8/14/2023. Online.

“Stille.” *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Ed. Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Vol. 21. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel (1999). Print.

Suchoff, David. *Kafka’s Jewish Languages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 2012. Print.

“Švabo.” *Rječnik Hrvatskoga Ili Srpskoga Jezika*. Ed. J. Jedvaj, et al. Vol. 71. Zagreb: U knížarnici L. Hartmana, (1976). Print.

Szondi, Peter. “Durch die Enge geführt. *Schriften II*. Ed. Jean Bollack. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp (1978). 345-389. Print.

Tawada, Yoko. “Das Tor des Übersetzers oder Celan liest Japanisch.” *Zeitschrift für Interkulturelle Germanistik*. Vol. 4.2 (2013). Print.

---. “Die zweite Vorlesung: Schrift einer Schildkröte oder das Problem der Übersetzung.” *Verwandlungen*. Tübingen: Konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke (2018). Print.

Tawada, Yoko. *Tintenfisch auf Reisen: 3 Geschichten*. Ed. 2. Tübingen: Konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke (1996) Print.

Thatcher, Nicole. “Charlotte Delbo's Voice: The Conscious and Unconscious Determinants of a Woman Writer” *L'Esprit Créateur,* Vol 40.2 (2000). 41-51. Print.

“The warlord of Visegrad.” *The Guardian*. Accessed on: 6/27/2022. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/aug/11/warcrimes.features11. Online.

“Tiara.” Oxford English Dictionary: The Definitive Record of the English Language. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/201691?rskey=uJec3x&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid. Accessed on Sept 7th, 2022. Online.

“Tiefe.” *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Ed. Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Vol. 19. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel (1999). Print.

“Todesstille.” *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Ed. Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Vol. 19. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel (1999). Print.

Trbovich, Ana. *A Legal Geography of Yugoslavia’s Disintegration*. New York: Oxford University Press (2008). Print.

Turk, Marija; Pavletic, Helena. “Kalkovi u Hrvatskim Dvojezicnim i Vesejezicnum Rjevnicima.” *Filoglogija*. Vol. 38-39 (2002). Print.

Uca, Didem “‘Grissgott’ meets ‘Kung Fu’: Multilingualism, Humor, and Trauma in Saša Stanišić’s Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert (2006).” *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures*. Vol. 73:3 (2019). 185-201. Print.

Uhl, Heidemarie. “From Victim Myth to Co-Responsibility Thesis.” *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. Ed. Richard Ned Lebow et al. New York: Duke University Press 2020. Print.

Urban, Simon. „Zweisprachige Ortstafeln beschmiert: Kein Respekt vor einer Minderheit.“ Der Standard. https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000123892471/zweisprachige-ortstafeln-beschmiert-kein-respekt-vor-einer-minderheit. Accessed on: 5/14/2014. Online.

VAJTUNDBRAJT.mov. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=beBa3RTfgdE. Uploaded by: Wolfgang Hähling. Accessed 05/01/2019. Online.

Vansant, Jacqueline. “‘Als Wildwuchs der Mehrheitssprache‘: Interview with Author Maja Haderlap.“ *Journal of Austrian Studies*. Vol. 47.3. (2014). Print.

“Verhunzung ” *Duden: Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*. 6th Ed.; Berlin: Dudenverlag (2015). Print.

Vervaet, Stijn. “Writing war, writing memory. The representation of the recent past and the construction of cultural memory in contemporary Bosnian prose.” *Neohelicon*. Vol. 38.1 (2011). Print.

Vešović, Marko. “‘Emina’: Tekst i kontekst pjesme,” Most. Trans. Omer Hadžiselimović. 102/xxiv, 1998. Print.

Vidulić, Svjetlan Lacko. “Jugoslawien von oben 25 Jahre Handke-Kontroverse – Versuch einer Bilanz.” *Austriaca*. Vol. 90 (2020). Print.

Vinci, Elisabetta. “Marica Bodrožić: Hybridity, Language, and Cultural Identity.” *Discourses and Nations and Identities*. Ed. Daniel Syrovy. Berlin: De Gruyter (2021). Print.

“Višegrad.” *Bosnian Genocide: The Essential Reference Guide*. Ed. Paul R Bartrop. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO (2016). 246-247. Print.

VLÖ-Pressemitteliung Nr.: 2011009. *Verband der deutschen altösterreichischen Landsmannschaften in Österreich (VLÖ)*. http://vloe.at/. Accessed on 5/22/2023. Online.

VLÖ- Pressemitteliung Nr.: 2011010. *Verband der deutschen altösterreichischen Landsmannschaften in Österreich (VLÖ)*. http://vloe.at/. Accessed on 5/22/2023. Online.

Vullamy, Ed, "The Warlord of Visegrad," The Guardian, www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/aug/11/warcrimes.features11. (accessed 31 March 2010). Online.

Wallach, Kerry and Elyada, Aya. "Introduction: German-Jewish Studies for the Twenty-First Century." German Jewish Studies: Next Generations. New York: Berghahn Book (2022). Print.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press (1976). Print.

Weichselbraun, Anna. "'People here speak five languages!': The Reindexicalization of Minority Language Practice Among Carinthian Slovenes in Vienna, Austria." *Language in Society*. Vol. 43 (2014). 421-444. Print.

Werkmeister, O.K. "Walter Benjamin's Angel of History, or the Transfiguration of the Revolutionary into the Historian." *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 22.2. 1996. 239-67. Print.

"Wiener Bevölkerung 2023: Daten und Fakten zu Migration und Integration." Stadt Wien. Wiener Bevölkerung - Staatsbürgerschaft, Herkunft, Zu- und Abwanderung. Accessed on 5/24/2024. Online.

Wintersteiner, Werner. "Angel of Oblivion. Literature and memory politics in Austria." *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*. Vol. 32.3 (2019). 385-401 Print.

Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012. Print.

Zaimoğlu, Feridun, *Kanak Sprak: 24 Mißtöne vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. 7th ed. Berlin Rotbuch Verlag (2007). Print.

Zilcosky, John. "Poetry after Auschwitz? Celan and Adorno Revisited." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte. Vol. 79.4 (2005). 670-91. Print.

Zimmer, Anna. "The Politics of Screen Memory in Nicol Ljubić's Stillness of the Sea." *German-Balkan Entangled Histories in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Mirna Zakic and Christopher A. Molnar. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburgh Press (2020). Print.

"Zrakoplov." *Struna: Hrvatska Strukovno Nazivije*. www.struna.ihjj.hr/en/naziv/zrakoplov/298/. Accessed on 8/2/2023. Online.