UDK: 342:821.163.41-1
https://doi.org/10.2298/FID2104662B
Original Scientific Article
Received 22.09.2021. Accepted 17.11.2021.

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIETY
VOL. 32, NO. 4, 499–774

To cite text:
Bojanić, Petar; Djordjević, Edward (2021), "The Messiness of Victory and Heroism: A Brief Response to Carl Schmitt", *Philosophy and Society* 32 (4): 662–673.

Petar Bojanić and Edward Djordjević

THE MESSINESS OF VICTORY AND HEROISM: A BRIEF RESPONSE TO CARL SCHMITT[1]

ABSTRACT
The article focuses on a passage from Carl Schmitt's *Ex Captivitate Salus* – a book famously written in a Nurnberg prison in 1946 – in which he draws, from memory, on a story derived from Serbian epic poetry, to justify his understanding of historiography, victory, and the figure of the hero. Analyzing the entire Serbian epic poem from which Schmitt extracts the vignette in question, we show how the text of the poem presents a significantly more complicated and messy picture of the figures of victor, victory, and hero, heroism. The anonymous Serbian poet, addressing himself to his contemporary audience, with which he is intimately familiar, really subverts simplistic expectations regarding the heroism and victory of the Serbian hero, Marko Kraljević. Finally, the article contrasts these complex and at times paradoxical figures of victory and the hero in the poem with their presentation in Carl Schmitt's writing.

KEYWORDS
Carl Schmitt, *Ex Captivitate Salus*, Serbian epic poetry, victory, hero.

Chapter 3, "*Historiographia in nuce:* Alexis de Tcoqueville" of Carl Schmitt's *Ex Captivitate Salus* – which he wrote in a Nurnberg prison in the summer of 1946 – is ostensibly a musing on historiography. In it, Tocqueville is himself a kind of Medieval knight or narrative tragic hero within history, helping Schmitt to think through the question of whether "*history is written by the victor*", and then what at all is victory (Schmitt 2017: 25, emphasis in the original). In the last, fifth section of the chapter, Schmitt suddenly shifts registers by introducing a personal recollection of being re-told part of the plot of Serbian medieval epic poem, before once again returning to Tocqueville for a last,

1 This article was realized with the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, according to the Agreement on the realization and financing of scientific research.

Petar Bojanić: Principal Research Fellow, University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory; bojanic@instifdt.bg.ac.rs.
Edward Djordjević: Research Assistant, University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory; edvard.djordjevic@instifdt.bg.ac.rs.

brief comment to close the chapter. The German jurist was familiar with this (somewhat obscure) canon of literature because two of his wives were Serbian, as well as through his friendship with the noted writer Ivo Andrić, who was ambassador to Germany before World War II, and would go on to win the Nobel Literature Prize in 1961. Curiously, Schmitt refers to Andrić in the passage in question as a poet and completely ignores his official post as ambassador.

Our intention in this article is to probe and offer a commentary sketch on Carl Schmitt's concepts of victory and heroism as they appear in the passage in question of *Ex Captivitate Salus*. Through a more careful look at the poem and its various figures, we would like to show that victory and heroism are rather more vague and messy concepts than Schmitt would have them, indeed that he rather sanitized both the plot of the Serbian epic and the concepts in question.

I Schmitt's Moral Victory

Before we consider the section in question, it is worth noting that in a text allegedly about historiography, Schmitt reaches for poetry and myth to help support and elucidate his point about heroes and victory. Not only that, but also the poetic reference is wrapped in the inviolability of a highly personal anecdote (from "the Serbian poet Ivo Andrić, whom I love very much", Schmitt 2017: 30), a recollection of a story he was told at a dinner party six years prior. Schmitt introduces the personal memory as having taken place in the autumn of 1940, "as France lay defeated on the ground" (ibid.) a conspicuous reminder to the reader of a (transient, to be sure) moment when Germany was the victor. In other words, from a seeming position of defeat at the moment of writing (summer of 1946), Schmitt appears to be textually taking refuge in recollecting a moment of victory.

What, then, is the mythological passage into which Schmitt retreats from both his present condition and his discussion of Tocqueville and historiography? He writes:

> *The Serb told me the following story from the mythology of his people: Marko Kraljević, the hero of the Serbian saga, fought for an entire day with a powerful Turk and laid him out after a hard struggle. As he killed the defeated enemy, a serpent that had been sleeping upon the heart of the dead man awoke and spoke to Marko: You were lucky that I slept through your battle. Then the hero cried out: Woe is me! I killed a man who was stronger than me!* (Schmitt 2017: 30)

What is remarkable in this retelling is that despite a number of elements rendered imprecisely, despite some problematic translation choices (lapses which could have been either Andrić's in the retelling or Schmitt's own in the writing six years after the fact), and despite even the poem overall being heavily stripped down into prose and to one particular moment of its plot – Schmitt does indeed focus on the crucial, climactic moment, the two lines that upend the entire epic poem: the realization of the hero, Marko, that he has slain a better/stronger/nobler rival/opponent/knight than himself.

Such a retelling of the story suits all too well Schmitt's situation at the moment of writing: as the defeated, identifying with the defeated Tocqueville, his rendering of the story of Marko Kraljević, the Serbian hero, allows Schmitt to diminish the victory of his own captors: "it was clear to us that the victors of today do not allow themselves to be impressed by such medieval stories" (Schmitt 2017: 31). Moreover, it opens space for him to reclaim some victory, by being the one who writes the history and historiography of the moment in which he finds himself. The victor does not always write the history, and, given the opportunity (pen and paper), the story of these victors – who they are, what their victory is like – will be written by Carl Schmitt. And (in comparison to the idealized medieval Serbian hero) they will not come off well.

II Of Knights and Knaves

What was it about this poem that so "deeply impressed" Schmitt (and, according to him, also Ernst Jünger and others)? Or better, what kind of a victor is this Marko hero that makes him so much better than "the victors of today?" The poem "*Marko Kraljević i Musa Kesedžija*" (translated by Goeffrey N. W. Locke as "Marko Kralyevich and Musa the Highwayman", 2011) belongs to the Serbian tradition of oral epic poetry and was written down in the nineteenth century by the progenitor of the modern Serbian language, Vuk Karadžić (Pavlović 2019). It is worth noting that the act of writing the poem down marks an enormous cultural shift: in the oral tradition, the poem is passed down from one generation to the next, sung in fact, and naturally, altered to fit the historical moment. Oral epic poems are therefore in a sense their own historiographical record. If Marko is the Serbian hero, Musa, the antagonist, has clearly undergone changes in identity to suit the enemy of the moment. In the opening line, the poet calls Musa of the 'Arbanasi', the old Serbian name for Albanians; but a few lines later, he is referred to as a Turk (which is how Schmitt refers to him). Since the poem was written down at a time when the Serbian nation was just coming into view, and was being carved out in antagonism to the "Turks" of the Ottoman Empire, Marko's antagonist remains a Turk in the popular imagination; which is why it came down to Schmitt as such.

However, not only is it clear in the poem that Musa is not Turkish, but Albanian (with the ethnic tensions between Serbs and Albanians only beginning after the time the poem was written down, Pavlović 2019), the relationship between Marko and Musa is too complicated to be encapsulated by a clear friend/enemy relation. The two knights share a past service to the Sultan, for example, and when the two finally meet face to face for their fateful duel, Musa describes Marko's childhood in a way that implies familiarity rather more than enmity. Marko's motivation for fighting Musa remains unclear, nor are we told anything about the circumstances that led to his imprisonment for three years (at the moment when we encounter him). Moreover, if we exclude the reader's or listener's familiarity with Serbian epic poems, there is little in this poem specifically that recommends Marko as a positive, valiant hero: he is the Sultan's

prisoner who seems to make unreasonable demands when he is called upon to help; he appears only to be fighting for the Sultan in exchange for his freedom and for a lot of money; he cuts off the arm of the blacksmith after the craftsman tells him that he produced a better sword for Musa; he rejects Musa's last-minute call to abandon the fight; even his guardian angel, when she shows up, chastises him for fighting on a Sunday (which he ought not do as a Christian).

If anything, it is Musa who is a valiant knight, and the whole poem would better fit the narrative of an epic and tragic Serbian heroic poem if the roles of Marko and Musa were reversed: Musa is a presumably an honest servant to the Sultan who has not been paid for his nine years of service, so he takes matters into his own hands (which should have appealed to nineteenth-century Serbian sensibilities); he swats away with ease all the mercenaries the Sultan sends (before Marko) to break his rebellion; he initially asks Marko to join him in his rebellion against the Sultan and then fights him fair and square when his offer is rebuffed, losing only due to Marko's treachery; and even dead, he frightens the Sultan when his head is presented. Perhaps unwittingly, but so impressed is the poet/singer with Musa, that the Albanian both opens and closes the poem. If we remove blind nationalist allegiance, there is every reason to hear/read this poem as being about a tragic hero named Musa who is unfairly killed by a mercenary criminal named Marko.

This reading is, naturally, impossible: the poem was sung in Serbian, to a nationalist Serbian audience, it was written down by the father of the modern Serbian language, and it is clear that the reader's sympathies are expected to be with Marko. This is in line with an understanding of epic poetry that sees the text not as object to be studied, but a response: the singer/author is not telling a new tale, but is continuing one already familiar to his audience, with any number of epic tropes already well established, among which the hero of the epic (Foley 2009). This is at least in part the reason that when the plot of the poem is retold (as Andrić did to Schmitt in France in 1940), it is difficult not to simply omit all the aspects of the story that call into question Marko's character as hero. However else the poem is read, in whatever way the puzzling elements and figures in it are arranged, the one certainty of the poem is that Marko must be a hero. Marko is simply *our guy*.

III Better/Stronger

Let us look at the two lines of the poem that Schmitt too zoomed in on as crucial. In the original, they read:

> *'Jaoh mene do boga miloga,*
> *đe pogubih od sebe boljega!'* (Đurić 1987: 327)

Schmitt, as mentioned, renders this (into prose) as

> *"Woe is me! I killed a man who was stronger than me!"*
> *[Weh mir, ich habe einen Mann getötet, der stärker war als ich!]* (Schmitt 2017: 30)

While Locke translates the verses into English as

'Dear God!' he cried, 'Have mercy on my soul!
For I have slain a better man than me!'. (Locke 2011: 201)

Now, while Schmitt's 'woe is me' exclamation is certainly in the spirit of the Serbian expression, Locke's translation shows us an additional layer present in the original, in which Marko is not just remorseful, but explicitly invoking God, seeking absolution even, putting Marko's realization into a theological register. In fact, we could pursue this line even further to explore a connection between God and victory in the Serbian tradition. Namely, given the preposition '*do*', meaning 'to', the line could also be read as Marko saying that his victory was *due to* God, or more idiomatically, 'there, but for the grace of God'. Invoking God in the context of victory and turning over responsibility for victory to God is a prominent (if not the most prominent) theme in Serbian epic poetry. The myth surrounding the battle and defeat at Kosovo in 1389 is that to the Serbs in that conflict, admittance into the kingdom of heaven was of greater importance than victory. Yet Marko, the hero of the overall Serbian saga, bucks this trend: he does not place his fate in God's hands (like the heroes of Kosovo) – and lives to regret the decision. Does this not already begin to shade Marko's character and victory away from the valiant knight that Schmitt needs him to be (to set up the contrast with 'victors of today')?

The second line poses no less of a problem for translation. It is worth noting first that Schmitt tells us that Marko has killed one stronger (*stärker*) than himself, but the Serbian is quite clear that the adjective is not stronger but better (as Locke has it). While it is entirely predictable and therefore excusable that an imprecision like this should creep into one's writing when remembering a dinner party anecdote from six years prior (as was the case with Schmitt), the distinction is, as we shall see, nevertheless important. Where Locke's and Schmitt's translations overlap is the introduction of the word 'man'; namely, Serbian grammar allows for greater ambiguity in meaning, as the adjective better (*boljega*) is gendered and as such no noun is needed after it. A more literal translation of "*pogubih od sebe boljega*", which would omit the subject and emphasize this absence of noun and therefore allow for openness of meaning, would be 'I have killed/slain one better than myself'. The ambiguity matters in that Marko acknowledges that Musa is better than him, but leaves vague at exactly what, in what way? Is he a better man, as Locke and Schmitt would have it? In that case, it would appear that Marko is concerned with his character, his values, himself as a person. Is he a better fighter? In which case, it is about his ability and skill in duel, etc. The two categories obviously overlap, and significantly so in the Middle Ages when this myth originates, but we would insist are nevertheless distinct. We would go so far as to say that Schmitt's change of 'better' into 'stronger' hints that Musa's advantage is in the domain of strength, fighting, dueling only, leaving their personalities, values, ethics aside. Once again, we see that Schmitt's use of this story runs into problems: if

his intention in 1946 is to construct for himself a moral standpoint from which he can deny the victory over himself and Germany, Marko's acknowledgement that he has beaten one not morally but physically stronger than himself – not a *better* knight but a *stronger* one – is a somewhat strange choice.

IV On (Marko's) Victory

Allow us now to put Schmitt aside briefly, and consider the poem and its relation to the concept of victory on its own. As we mentioned, there are a number of puzzling aspects to the poem (that it opens and ends with Musa, not Marko; the exact relation of the two knights; the reason Marko is in the Sultan's dungeon when we meet him, their relation; etc.), but perhaps none more than the manner of Marko's victory over Musa. Namely, Marko is (as Schmitt notes) the hero of the overall Serbian epic saga, he is the epitome of the Serbian struggle against the Turks, the defender of both Serbdom and Christendom. And he is, as we have mentioned, without a shadow of a doubt, the figure with whom the Serbian epic poet wants his Serbian listeners (and later readers) to identify in both the struggle against Musa in this poem and in the overall Serbian struggle against the 'Turk' – indeed, the struggle against Musa here is a synecdoche of Marko's/Serbia's overall struggle.

And yet the poem is clear – and herein lies a curious omission in Schmitt's retelling of the plot – that Marko wins his duel against Musa by underhanded means. In fact, Marko's famous remorseful cry that he has killed one better than himself, does not, as Schmitt would have it, simply come after having beaten Musa; rather, after their long and intense battle, it is Musa who knocks down Marko and sits on his chest:

Tad omanu Musa Kesedžija,
ud'ri Marka u zelenu travu,
pak mu sjede na prsi junačke. (Đurić 1987: 326)

Marko, well-nigh defeated, then calls to his guardian angel – a figure familiar to the listeners/readers of Serbian epic poetry: it is a female figure to whom Marko refers as his blood-sister. Surprisingly, the guardian angel, who returns the feeling of intimacy by referring to Marko as her brother, does not help right away: she first chides him for dueling on a Sunday (the Sabbath), then points out the unfairness of a struggle of two against one, but ultimately reminds him of his secret weapon, a knife, which she calls his "snake in the grass" (*guje iz potaje*). The poet is careful to keep the choice of how to fight squarely with Marko, as the guardian angel at no point actually helps except to remind him of his secret weapon. She merely presents him with the choice of either losing the duel or winning, but through conduct unbecoming of a hero knight. With Musa distracted by this voice (of the guardian angel) coming from the heavens, Marko draws his hidden knife and slays his adversary. Crucially, Marko expresses no remorse yet; he sees that Musa in his chest has three heroic

hearts, one of which has a sleeping serpent on it. Awaking (here Schmitt picks up the plot again), the serpent tells Marko that he was lucky it had been sleeping. Only then does Marko realize that he has slain "one better than himself".

Let us be even more precise about what is happening here. The word *guja*, serpent, is used to describe both Marko's hidden knife (this is his "snake in the grass") and the sleeping heroism of Musa's third heart (the serpent slumbering upon it). Meaning that each has his respective secret or slumbering serpent, a metaphor for underhandedness. The difference between them is that Marko's snake is awoken in him by his guardian angel, who explicitly asks him "where is your secretive snake?" ("*đe su tebe guje iz potaje?*", Đurić: 327; in Locke's translation "– Forgettest thou the snake that, secret, strikes…", 2011: 199); Musa's snake awakes too late, only after Marko has cut open his whole abdomen. The poet is clear that both Marko and Musa *could* have fought unfairly, but that Marko *did in fact resort* to underhandedness. (We see again how Schmitt's omission of certain details shades the relation of the victor and the defeated. Namely, in Schmitt's version, Marko wins fair and square, and while the serpent on Musa's heart does indicate that he is the *stronger* man, the elision of Marko's 'serpent' leaves Marko's valor as a man, if not as a fighter, unblemished.)

How is it possible – this is the most puzzling thing in the poem – that *the* Serbian epic hero is presented in this way by a Serbian poet singing to a Serbian audience about the struggle for Serbian liberation? Why is Marko presented as winning in an underhanded manner, with no ambivalence left that he did in fact *choose* to fight unfairly? How can we understand both the fact that the poet leaves no ambivalence about who is the hero (the epitome of Serbdom) and no ambivalence about the treacherous nature of his victory? Could the Serbian epic poet be subtly subverting the expectations of his audience about who the good guy is, what it means to be a good man/guy/hero/knight, and whether this good guy can be victorious?

How do we address this paradox: that the poet presents Marko as the hero knight and also a treacherous knave? And what does this tell us about what is victory? Consider how Marko is first introduced in the poem: when his name is mentioned to the Sultan (and before we actually meet the hero), he winces:

Pogleda ga care poprijeko,
pa on proli suze od očiju:
„Prođi me se, hodža Ćupriliću!
Jer pominješ Kraljevića Marka? (Đurić 1987: 322)

(Locke:)

The Sultan looked at Chuprilich askance,
And tears came to his eyes; he wept, and said:
"O Chuprilich, this is but foolishness!
Why speak the name of Marko Kralyevich? (2011: 189)

Obviously, there is so little explanation as to why the Sultan would sheds tears at the very mention of Marko's name because the listener/reader of the lines is already familiar with what a great hero Marko is. Again, the nature of epic poetry is that it is a response to an already familiar contextual myth. Moreover, Marko stands for all the hopes and expectations of liberation and victory of all of Serbdom over the Turk. This liberation and victory will be so heroic and complete that the Sultan himself will cry salty tears! This is the expectation of both Marko and victory the poet encounters and confronts when he chooses to sing his verses to his Serbian audience.

Marko is indeed victorious, as we see; but at the cost of being degraded from valiant knight to treacherous knave. Victory is the middle term that resolves Marko's knight/knave paradox: it is through victory that the knight becomes the knave. Ordinarily, victory *leads to* status of knight, that is, by winning duels and undergoing ordeals one becomes a knight. But Marko is already a knight and hero, victory confers no greater status to him. Underhanded victory, on the other hand, should take away knighthood, but it does not seem to in the case of Marko. This seems to call into question not the status of the victor (allowing him to either become a knight or be degraded into a knave), but the concept of victory. Where the audience/readers might expect Marko's victory (over Musa, but also in general) to be sweeping and decisive, what we get here is a narrowing of potential of victory. We would like to insist that the poem is saying that victory in general is possible, just not as it is usually imagined (by the audience). Considering Marko's crying out to God, it would seem that sweeping, complete, valiant, heroic, and above all unrepentant victory is impossible. 'You will win', the poet says, 'but not in the way you imagine' or 'victory does not mean what you think it means'.

Nor are such notions of complete victory the exclusive preserve of Ottoman-occupied Serbs. In "Wars of Colonization", Bertrand Russell speaks of English fantasies of the destruction of Germany:

> *When the present war began, many people in England imagined that if the Allies were victorious Germany would cease to exist: Germany was to be "destroyed" or "smashed", and since these phrases sounded vigorous and cheering, people failed to see that they were totally devoid of meaning. There are some seventy million Germans; with great good fortune, we might, in a successful war, succeed in killing two millions of them. There would then still be sixty-eight million Germans, and in a few years the loss of population due to the war would be made good. Germany is not merely a State, but a nation, bound together by a common language, common traditions, and common ideals. Whatever the outcome of the war, this nation will still exist at the end of it, and its strength cannot be permanently impaired. But imagination is what pertains to war is still dominated by Homer and the Old Testament.* (Russell 1915: 135)

The Serbian epic poet seems to agree with Russell about the impossibility of complete annihilation of the enemy. Namely, after his victory, Marko carries Musa's head to the Sultan, who is startled seeing it – even a remnant and

remnant of the defeated, the enemy is scary. Furthermore, the very last verse of the poem tells us that the rest of Musa's body remains in Kačanik, the area where the two knights fought. The defeated, thus, is still present, lying where he was slain. Complete victory is impossible because complete destruction and annihilation of the enemy is impossible, regardless of the manner of victory or even subsequent remorse.

V On (Marko's) Heroism: Can the Good Guys Win?

To further elaborate on our previous question of what the Serbian poet is saying (always keeping in mind that it is spoken to a particular and familiar audience) about whether the good guy can be victorious, let us bring in again the moment of Marko's self-reflection and Schmitt's altering of the adjective 'better' into 'stronger'. Marko does not seem to be bothered initially by his own use of underhanded means, his hidden knife, to win the duel; it is when he sees that Musa too has his own serpent, which happens to have slumbered through this contest, that Marko cries out to the heavens. In Schmitt's version, in which Marko has no 'snake' of his own, Musa's sleeping serpent seems to reveal to Marko that he, as it were, got lucky. Had the serpent not slept through their fight, the *stronger* man would have won. But if we include the figure of Marko's serpent, of which he was reminded by his guardian angel, it is not so clear that Musa is stronger; the two knights and heroes could be read as being of equal or comparable strength, of there being a certain symmetry between them. The difference is that Marko actually reached for his hidden weapon, while Musa's remained in wait. Then the issue becomes less one of strength and more, just as the poem has it, a matter of character: seeing the sleeping serpent, Marko realizes that Musa too could have resorted to unfair methods, but since he has not, Musa is indeed *the better man*.

Yet, there is still no question of diminishing Marko's status of hero. As we have mentioned, it would be impossible for the Serbian poet's Serbian audience to somehow think less of Marko or, God forbid, switch allegiance to Musa, the better man. This untouchability of heroic status is clear also when we consider that Marko's motivation for the duel with Musa remains rather vague. Ostensibly, he is doing it for the money (which he does get at the end) and his release from the Sultan's dungeon. But this would make Marko a mercenary, which is, again, an unacceptable view of the "hero of the Serbian saga" (as Schmitt puts it). Once more we encounter a paradox: Marko is and remains our (the listener's/reader's) hero, our guy, despite behaving so unheroically, that is, not being the good guy of the story. How is this possible? Just as in the case of victory, it would appear that the poet's intention is not to diminish Marko's status as heroic figure, but rather to call into question the audience's conception of the hero, perhaps even offering a heroic notion of a different kind.

What is this different notion of hero that is subtly proffered in lieu of a shining and valiant one the audience expects? To answer this, we would like to turn to an essay written by Michael Walzer in 1973, on the problem of dirty

hands. Drawing on Machiavelli, Walzer points out that men of politics and war must learn how not to be good (Walzer 1973). That is to say, it would be naïve to enter a political contest or war without knowing how to make use of, and thus ability to control, means that fall outside the ethical bounds of the contest or struggle. (And such means must be 'learned' because such knowledge does not come naturally.) Walzer transposes Machiavelli into contemporary language: "Even if they would like to act differently, they probably can not: for other men are all too ready to hustle and lie for power and glory, and it is the others who set the terms of the competition" (Walzer 1973: 163). Recall that, indeed, both Marko and Musa, the good guy and the bad guy, have their respective secret serpents, and for both of them the 'terms of competition' were set by someone else (in this case, the Sultan).

Where this role of hero becomes even more complicated is precisely in the role of the audience in this whole question. Because, although the hero seeks personal glory, he is also necessarily the hero of the people. (Perhaps an epic poem could be sung about a hero in whom the audience has no investment and whose morality it could therefore judge objectively, but this would be completely uninteresting and is certainly not the case with Marko.) Our involvement with Marko's heroism, or the Serbian songs' audience involvement in it, also obligate Marko to win for us. Says Walzer: "He has purposes in mind, causes and projects that require the support and redound to the benefit, not of each of us individually, but of all of us together. He hustles, lies, and intrigues *for us*..." (1973: 162–163, emphasis in the original). Paradoxically perhaps, one kind of heroism comes at the expense of the other: Marko's diminishment as a valiant, albeit naïve knight is required so that he can be the victorious but flawed hero his people needs him to be.

VI The Hollowness of Schmitt's Victory

However, Marko's use of illicit means and his regret complicate significantly the concepts of victory and hero. Marko's inviolate heroic status with the poem's Serbian audience, paradoxically, entangles him in ways that make it impossible for him to remain the (kind of) hero he is at the outset or achieve the (kind of) victory sought or expected. It certainly complicates the figure of Marko unrecognizably from the one Carl Schmitt uses. The messiness of the concepts of victory and hero that emerges from the epic poem stands in contrast to the stylized and sanitized version presented by Schmitt. His lionizing of Tocqueville and Marko turns them into mere good guys of the story – in the case of Marko that is the story of the poem, and for Tocqueville, the story is history itself – a rhetorical move that allows Schmitt a kind of moral victory while he is in prison. But a close reading of the poem shows that Schmitt's (concepts of) hero and victory are rather hollow, manipulative even of his own reader and audience, and as such should be resisted.

References

Devrnja Zimmerman, Zora (1979), "The Changing Roles of the "Vila" in Serbian Traditional Literature", *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 16 (3): 167–175.
Đurić, Vojislav (1987). *Antologija narodnih junačkih pesama*, 10th ed., Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga.
Foley, John Miles (2009), "Tradition and the Collective Talent: Oral Epic, Textual Meaning, and Receptionalist Theory", *Cultural Anthropology* 1 (2): 203–222.
Locke, Geoffrey N. W. (2011), *The Serbian Epic Ballads. An Anthology*, Belgrade: Tanesi.
Pavlović, Aleksandar (2014), *Epika i politika* [*Epic and Politics*], Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.
—. (2019), *Imaginarni Albanac*, Belgrade: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju.
Russell, Bertrand (1915), "The Ethics of War", *The International Journal of Ethics* 25 (2): 127–142.
Schmitt, Carl (2017), *Ex Captivitate Salus. Experiences 1945-47*, (Hannah, M. trans.), London: Kalyvas, A. & Finchelstein, F. eds. Polity.
—. (1950), *Ex Captivitate Salus. Ehfahrungen der Zeit 1945/47*, Köln: Greven Verlag.
Walzer, Michael (1973), "Political Action: The Problem of Dirty Hands", *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 2 (2): 160–180.

Petar Bojanić i Edvard Đorđević

Neurednost pobede i junaštva. Kratak odgovor Karlu Šmitu

Apstrakt

U članku se dovodi u pitanje jedan pasus iz knjige *Ex Captivitate Salus*, Karla Šmita – knjige koja je, kao što je poznato, pisana u nirnberškom zatvoru u Nemačkoj, 1946. godine. U tom pasusu se Šmit oslanja na detalj iz srpske narodne epske pesme kako bi argumentovao svoje razumevanje istoriografije, pobede i figure junaka. Analizirajući celu pesmu Marko Kraljević i Musa Kesedžija, iz koje Šmit preuzima anegdotu o junaku Marku, u članku se ukazuje na to da su koncepti pobede, pobednika, junaka i junaštva u samoj pesmi znatno komplikovaniji i neuredniji od one koju Šmit predstavlja. Obraćajući se publici koju vrlo dobro poznaje, srpski pevač podriva pojednostavljena očekivanja o junaštvu i pobedi srpskog junaka, Marka Kraljevića. Članak zaključuje da je ova komplikovana slika iz same pesme daleko od pojednostavljene i manipulativne slike koju nudi Šmit.

Ključne reči: Karl Šmit, *Ex Captivitate Salus*, srpska epska poezija, pobeda, junak.