Introduction

The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Literary Memory Mediations and Mnemonic Migration

'I am not going back down the steps of my memory, I'm going down into a cellar, it's only a cellar …
This is where a soldier passed the butt of his rifle
over the posts of the banisters,
clack-clack-clack-clack-clack.
It's only a cellar.'

—Saša Stanišić *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*[1]

'Fiction keeps memory about the war alive'

—Reader, Manchester[2]

'I guess it was a nasty war'

—Reader, Manchester[3]

'It's real, 100%'

—Reader, Sarajevo[4]

'Stanišić wants to say that the war has left us with consequences, that we've lost parts of ourselves in a way, and that we will have to live with the same sense of incompleteness as he's done all his life.'

—Reader, Banja Luka[5]

The novel *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone* by Saša Stanišić tells the story of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992–1995 from the perspective of a young boy. In many ways, the narrative mirrors the experiences of the

author himself, who fled from the war as a child, to settle in Germany with his family.[6] As the quote above from the novel shows, Stanišić describes the brutal events of the war as immediate experiences in the imaginative and winding language of a dreamy child who does not quite grasp the meaning of what he sees. In this way, he transmits a poetic and challenging memory of what the Bosnian War was like and what it did to people, to his readers.

How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone is a successful novel, translated from German into more than thirty languages, and presumably read by a large number of people across the world. The novel conveys Stanišić's Bosnian war memories to readers, who perhaps knew little about events in Bosnia-Herzegovina and who realize for the first time that this was indeed 'a nasty war', as was suggested by a respondent in one of the focus groups we interviewed to find out how actual readers might respond to the book. While some readers in these focus groups were alienated by the style of the novel, others appreciated it, became emotionally engaged in the narrative and saw the fictional qualities of the account as a strength that would keep 'memory about the war alive', as a reader in Manchester phrased it. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, where events of the Bosnian War are well known but highly disputed, readers such as the ones quoted above mirrored their own experiences in Stanišić's memory narrative, or saw the story as an important reminder of loss shared by Bosnians across the political divisions.

Thus, Stanišić's novel ensures that memory of the Bosnian War travels across Europe. How readers engage with it, we argue, depends on a number of factors: their preferences in literary style, obviously, but also their knowledge and preconceptions, their personal experiences and the interpretative patterns they are socialized within; what we may call their social frameworks of memory. This book is about these processes. It studies how memories of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina are transmitted in literary works by Stanišić and other authors with a background in Yugoslavia, how these memories travel across Europe and how readers in Germany, Denmark, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina engage with these memories and respond to them, picking up, perhaps, the literary accounts of the war as their own 'prosthetic memory', as Alison Landsberg would phrase it.[7]

The war in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992–1995 was characterized by war crimes, ethnic cleansing and genocide. More than 100,000 people were killed, many of them civilians, and more than a million were forced to abandon their homes.[8] Many thousands of these refugees settled abroad in Western Europe and North America. The Dayton Peace Agreement that ended the war in 1995 still defines the political structure of Bosnia-Herzegovina, where war memory remains a dominant part of the public sphere, and different memory regimes tend to follow the political divisions.[9] One political entity, the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which consists

of cantons with majority populations of Bosniaks and Croats, struggles with how to commemorate and come to terms with the many war deaths, the victims and survivors of prison camps and systematic torture, and the genocide in Srebrenica. Political representatives of the other entity, Republika Srpska, where the majority population is Serb, publicly question the war memory of the Federation by celebrating convicted war criminals and denying the genocide in Srebrenica.[10]

In the rest of Europe, however, the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, not yet thirty years after its ending, is much less present in public memory. Yet, authors with a background in the former Yugoslavia have written highly acclaimed novels transmitting and translating Bosnian War memories to audiences in their new home countries. These literary memory mediations contribute to bringing memory from the cultural context of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the destroyed former Yugoslavia into new memory frameworks, thus constituting an act of what we want to call 'mnemonic migration'. We understand mnemonic migration as processes through which literary representations of ideas and narratives about the past travel from one sociocultural context into another through the migration of humans and works of literature and through the reception of these works in the new contexts. For the literary memory mediations to really make memory migrate, for them to have an actual influence on cultural memory in their authors' new home countries, abroad and even when returning to Bosnia-Herzegovina, they would have to be picked up by audiences, to be circulated in the public sphere and actively engaged in memory practices, and to make an impact on their readers. We base our understanding of mnemonic migration on a series of theoretical propositions within memory studies, primarily the ideas of *memory-making novels*, *social frameworks of memory*, *travelling memory, rhetoric of collective memory,* and *prosthetic memory*, which we will discuss in more detail below.

This book explores mnemonic migration of Bosnian War memory by tracing the processes of memory mediation, circulation and reception within European memory culture, focusing on Germany, Denmark, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Firstly, we investigate how memory of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina is mediated in literary works by Saša Stanišić, Aleksandar Hemon, Nicol Ljubić and Alen Mešković, all migrant authors with a background in the former Yugoslavia. In essence, these memory mediations are already migrated, as they are written by people who have moved from one memory culture to another, and who strive to present and translate their war narratives to members of the mnemonic community of their new country of residence and in the language of their new country. Secondly, we study how the literary memory mediations of the Bosnian War are circulated, remediated and made present in the public spheres, and thus, perhaps, have the potential to become part of public memory in

Germany, Denmark, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina. And thirdly, drawing on reception studies combined with focus group interviews, we analyse how the literary works are received and discussed by readers in these four countries, and how readings and discussions interact with the readers' established frameworks of memory and preconceived understandings of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Based on our readers' emotional engagement with the mediations and narratives of memory, and on their positionality in relation to war remembering, we argue that literary memory mediations may indeed make memory migrate by contributing to the creation of prosthetic and shared memory across political and cultural borders, thus expanding the readers' frameworks of memory. Moreover, we claim that the degree of agency that literature can have in the processes of mnemonic migration depends not only on the kind of memory mediation employed, but also on the degree and quality of circulation.

In studying how the works of Stanišić, Ljubić, Hemon and Mešković may contribute to the migration and sharing of Bosnian War memory across Europe, we are inspired by Ann Rigney's idea that 'the translation of narratives from one European zone to another can create a new memory at the point of destination', and thus, as Vlad Beronja and Stijn Vervaet propose, partake in 'the building of Europe's shared cultural memory and transnational identity'.[11] As Rigney points out, Europe is both a transnational and confined space, in which 'images of European unity hit off against the memory of conflict and the reality of linguistic differences'.[12] It is also characterized by distinct and overlapping national, local and regional memory cultures. And though the Bosnian War took place in the middle of Europe and was a central concern of European and American foreign and security politics, it is not widely commemorated across the European continent. It is at the centre of our interest to explore whether the painful memories of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Balkans, as a space that is often perceived as semi-oriental – as 'Europe, but not quite Europe'[13] – can travel to other, Northern and Western zones of European memory culture via the medium of literature.

The four European countries we study, Germany, Denmark, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina, have different, and in the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina highly disputed and difficult, relations to Bosnian War memory. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, we investigate what we think of as the recirculations of the literary memory mediations in their Bosnian translations to readers, who are exposed to different memory political regimes, but to whom war memory is very present. Germany, Denmark and the UK represent different relationships to the former Yugoslavia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, based, among other things, on the widespread German tourism to the region and the presence of Yugoslav guest workers, and on Danish and British military involvement in

the Bosnian War. Moreover, the national memory traditions in these three countries are different, not least regarding the Second World War, which is a frequent reference point among Northwest European readers. Whereas Germany is characterized by a dense and difficult memory of the Second World War and the Holocaust, which also influences its foreign politics in the Balkans, Denmark's war memory is focused on national unity in the face of occupation, while war memory in the UK seems to concentrate on heroic resistance and the Blitz.[14] By analysing and comparing patterns of circulation and readers' reactions in these diverse European settings, we show how frameworks of remembering, preconceptions and established knowledge influence circulation and reception of memory.

Bosnian War Memory in Literature: Corpus and Field

The four authors whose writings are the subject of our investigation, Saša Stanišić, Aleksandar Hemon, Nicol Ljubić and Alen Mešković, either left Bosnia-Herzegovina as a direct consequence of the war (Stanišić, Mešković), migrated immediately before the war broke out (Hemon), or descend from guest workers from the former Yugoslavia (Ljubić). They are all successful, having received awards and prizes, their works are translated, and Stanišić and Hemon in particular are internationally renowned. Moreover, writings by Stanišić, Mešković and Hemon are also published in Bosnian. We argue that the works we study all belong to memory-making literature about the Bosnian War, and they were all originally published outside Bosnia-Herzegovina in the languages of the authors' new countries of residence. Saša Stanišić's *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert* (*How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*) and Nicol Ljubić's novel *Meeresstille* (*Stillness of the Sea*) were published in German in 2006 and 2010, respectively.[15] Alen Mešković's novel *Ukulele Jam*, written in Danish, is from 2011.[16] And Aleksandar Hemon's short story 'A Coin' is part of the collection *The Question of Bruno*, which was published in English in 2000, though the story had already appeared in both English and Bosnian journals in 1997.[17] Thus, authors as well as texts are examples of what we think of as mnemonic migration.

Our prime case of analysis is Saša Stanišić's successful debut novel *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, which we chose due to its wide international dissemination: its translation into thirty-three languages speaks both for its transcultural impact and for its compelling representation of the Bosnian War. The novel has received broad academic attention: while Špela Virant perceives it as representative of a 'multicultural' and migration novel, others have focused on Stanišić's complex play with language, arguing that this allows him to write about trauma in a humoristic way or even

express the failure of language to represent the war.[18] Pointing primarily to its representation of memory, Stijn Vervaet sees *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone* as an example of a body of Bosnian literature that both witnesses 'the horror of the Bosnian war' and turns the 'historical events into "sites of memory" '.[19]

We compare the memory mediation in Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone* with three other literary war memories, all of which are seen as outstanding and widely praised in the countries and languages in which they were first published. The first of these is Nicol Ljubić's award-winning novel *Meeresstille* (*Stillness of the Sea*), which we selected both because of its success within the German literary world and because we argue that it quite specifically addresses a German memory culture, not least through numerous references to Second World War and Holocaust memory. Anna Zimmer has emphasized how Ljubić, by drawing parallels between the Bosnian War and the Second World War, creates tensions between 'familial memories and official histories' and questions interrelations between the official histories of the Holocaust and the Bosnian War in the German public.[20] Other researchers have focused on Ljubić's novel as a critique of public forgetting and amnesia or as a mediation of tragic memory, not least through its use of intertextual references to works such as Shakespeare's *King Lear*.[21]

For a memory of the Bosnian War written in English, we chose the Bosnian-American author Aleksandar Hemon's short story 'A Coin' from his debut collection of short stories *A Question of Bruno*, published twice by British agencies and widely disseminated in the UK. Hemon is among the most internationally recognized Bosnian authors, and though he is not UK-based, his writing addresses an English-reading international audience. The memory mediation in 'A Coin' has been widely recognized and analysed by literary scholars, who refer to it as a 'traumascape' or suggest it may contribute to restorative justice and healing.[22] Others have underlined how Hemon blends storytelling and historical truth, and that he writes in the 'border zone between the fictional and the documentary, between autobiography and regional history'.[23] According to Stijn Vervaet, Hemon reinscribes traces of forgotten history into 'public memory'.[24] Una Tanović, like Vervaet, also points to Hemon's foregrounding of the exile's displacement and estrangement as he witnesses the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.[25]

As an example of a Bosnian War memory written in Danish, we selected Alen Mešković's novel *Ukulele Jam*, as it was quite successful in Denmark, and because Mešković is acknowledged as one of Denmark's prime migrant authors and is often asked by Danish media to comment on events in Bosnia-Herzegovina. According to Una Tanović, Mešković's writing can be seen as a kind of translation that 'provides an insight into how memory travels across and beyond borders'.[26]

These texts could equally fit into the category of migrant literature as proposed by researchers such as Brigit Haines, who argues that the fall of the Soviet Union and the wars in Yugoslavia in the 1990s led to a wave of westward-migrating authors who express the huge impact of these major historical events, often with the aim of enlightening Western readers.[27] Both Stanišić and Ljubić received the Adalbert von Chamisso Prize, awarded to distinguished German-writing authors with a mother tongue other than German, and were thereby singled out as not exactly German authors, while Alen Mešković has been referred to as one of Denmark's very few 'migrant' authors.[28] Yet, we avoid the concept of migrant literature, not only because of its problematic aspects,[29] but also because our aim in this book is different. Our study shows that authors, even though they are concerned with similar topics related to the Bosnian War, use entirely different modes, narratological means and 'rhetoric of collective memory' in representing the past. Moreover, our authors deal differently with the experience of entering a new culture and employ various techniques for addressing an audience that are unfamiliar with the memories they express. Studying and comparing the authors' different styles and strategies as well as readers' reactions to these will enable us to draw conclusions about the extent to which the authors' mode of expression and the readers' reception are affected by their respective 'social frameworks of memory', their 'collected' as well as their 'collective' memories.[30]

The importance of literature as a way of confronting or enquiring into the devastating reality of the wars in Yugoslavia is reflected in the many literary projects addressing these events, and in the number of scholarly investigations of Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav war literature.[31] Researchers have studied how the wars of the 1990s are depicted in literature by authors in and from the Yugoslav area, how ethics and values within arts and aesthetics are communicated in wartime writing, and how authors use particular strategies and subversive effects in literary witnessing.[32] Edited volumes and numerous chapters and articles have pointed to the role of literature and other creative arts in mediating recent Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav memory, underlining the pertinence of this topic.[33]

The number of literary works addressing the experience of the Yugoslav wars and their aftermaths is impressive and telling of their shattering impact. Lots of memory-making literature about Yugoslavia and the Bosnian War has been written, both by authors from the Yugoslav region who live abroad and write in the languages of their new countries of residence and by authors who write in the languages of the region, and whose works are translated, making them available for an international audience. In the present study, we focus on fictional or auto-fictional texts written by authors with a background in the former Yugoslavia and representing the war in

Bosnia-Herzegovina from an individual point of view and in the language of the authors' new home countries. Yet, the works we study are part of and examples of a wider literary field that we would generally think of as projects of mnemonic migration.

Several highly successful novels engage with issues of war, exile, loss and uprooted lives caused by the Yugoslav wars. One of the most powerful voices of post-Yugoslav and migrant memory is Dubravka Ugrešić, whose novel *The Ministry of Pain*, depicts a group of refugees from Yugoslavia trying to find their way through their wounded lives in Amsterdam. The novel was written in Croatian in 2004, but given Ugrešić's international renown it was quickly made available in numerous languages. Another example is Alexander Hemon's first novel, *Nowhere Man*, about a Bosnian man, stranded in the USA during the war in his home country. Among the most successful and prizewinning examples from the German language area is Melinda Nadj Abonij's novel *Tauben fliegen auf* (*Fly Away, Pigeon*), which tells the story of a family that migrates to Switzerland and struggles with the difficulties of integration.[34] Marica Bodrožić's trilogy *Das Gedächtnis der Libellen* (*The Memory of Dragonfly*), *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle* (*A Cherrywood Table*), and *Das Wasser unserer Träume* (*The Water of Our Dreams*) is a multifaceted literary fictionalization of the traumatic effects of war from the individual perspectives of three figures whose roads cross in their various exiles in the USA, France and Germany.[35] In its complexity, the Bodrožić trilogy resembles Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*. While these works focus primarily on the experiences of loss, flight and exile, the texts we are analysing, especially Hemon's 'A Coin', Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, and Ljubić's *Stillness of the Sea*, make more explicit attempts to represent and interpret the Bosnian War.

A number of fictional and more or less autobiographical novels depict the events of war from a child's perspective.[36] Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone* and Mešković's *Ukulele Jam* belong to this group, as they both fictionalize events that they experienced themselves. Experiences of growing up in war and having to flee have also been described in childhood memoirs, most famously *Zlata's Diary*, written by a young girl living through the siege of Sarajevo.[37] There is a lot of mnemonic value in this genre, which was obvious also with the massive popularity of Lea Ypi's *Free*, which recounts her childhood in Communist Albania.[38] Yet, memoirs as such are not included in our study, since one of our main aims is to explore the impact of literary mediations and fictionalized memory.

The destruction of Yugoslavia and the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina have also been addressed in collections of essays and short stories. For essays, the most well-known examples are probably Dubravka Ugrešić's *The Culture of Lies* and Slavenka Drakulić's *Balkan Express. Fragments From the Other Side*

of the War.[39] Among short stories, Miljenko Jergović's collection *Sarajevo Marlboro* stands out, as well as Aleksandar Hemon's *The Question of Bruno*. Like Jergović's accounts, Hemon's short story 'A Coin' depicts life and the fight for survival in besieged Sarajevo, though Hemon also pertinently addresses issues of exile and the role of mediation.[40]

Yet, before we start exploring how literature remembers and makes memory migrate, we need to consider the complex and painful past that is commemorated in the literary works of Stanišić, Hemon, Ljubić and Mešković. Inevitably, by narrating events that were part of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the authors create particular interpretations of that war and thus also certain versions of what is to be remembered and how. We need to take these events into account to be able to grasp what kinds of choices and selections have been made in the literary memory mediations and what that may convey to their readers.

The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992–1995

Bosnia-Herzegovina was the most multinational of the Yugoslav federal republics. It had been part of first the Ottoman and then the Habsburg multinational empires, before becoming part of the multinational Yugoslav state in 1918.[41] In 1945, after the victory of the Communist-led Partisan army in the Second World War, Yugoslavia was re-established as a Socialist Federation, and Bosnia-Herzegovina became one of Yugoslavia's six federal republics.[42]

The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was a one-party state, headed by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.[43] Following its expulsion from the Soviet-led East European Communist bloc in 1948, Yugoslavia gradually developed in a more liberal political and economic direction than other East European states.[44] From the mid-1950s, Yugoslavia was involved in the nonaligned movement with India and Indonesia, pursuing a foreign policy that balanced between East and West.[45] Beginning in the 1960s, Yugoslavia's borders were open for tourists and migrant workers, and the country boasted a vibrant pop-cultural scene with significant inspiration from the West.[46] Living standards for the working population were comparatively high in relation to neighbouring countries.[47] At the same time, the state ideology was massively present in the life of its citizens. Every school pupil was made a member of the youth pioneer organization, and a cult of personality surrounded Josip Broz Tito, head of Yugoslavia's Communist Party, leader of the Partisan army during the Second World War, and president of the federation until his death in 1980.[48] In the books of both Saša Stanišić and Alen Mešković, the ideological education and the presence of Tito and party

politics, as well as fairly everyday activities, feature as part of the young protagonists' childhood lives before the war in the 1990s tore their country apart. As such, these descriptions also function as a contrast to the painful wartime memories.

Bosnia-Herzegovina was the only one of Socialist Yugoslavia's federal republics with no majority national group. The three largest groups were Serbs, Croats and Muslim Bosnians, later referred to as Bosniaks, who spoke what was then called Serbo-Croatian, but did not feel they belonged to either Serbian or Croatian nationality. During the 1960s, the term Muslim became publicly accepted as a national denomination, and it appeared as one of the options in the Yugoslav national census of 1971.[49] Indeed, as many Bosnian Muslims were quite secular, being Muslim was more of a cultural than a religious identification.

The outbreak of war in Bosnia-Herzegovina was part of a chain of events that constituted the violent destruction of Yugoslavia, famously referred to by Dennison Rusinow as an 'avoidable catastrophe'.[50] During the late 1980s, Yugoslavia was hit by both political and economic crises, which put the state system under pressure. The Socialist federation's ideological legitimacy, which used to be based also on its fairly liberal Socialist system, its open borders and comparatively high living standards, was further undermined by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the sudden liberal democratic revolutions in the formerly Communist countries of Eastern Europe.[51] In January 1990, one of the main pillars of the Yugoslav state, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, disintegrated when the Slovenian and Croatian delegates walked out of the party congress after their demands for reforms were voted down. During 1990, multiparty elections were held in all federal republics; in Slovenia and Croatia, elections in the spring were won by national and anti-Communist parties aiming for more autonomy from the Yugoslav federation. In the following year, relations between the federal republics deteriorated and polarized. Serbs in Croatian Krajina, the border region towards Bosnia-Herzegovina, rose in protests against the new Croatian government. When in the summer of 1991, Slovenia and Croatia declared independence from Yugoslavia, war broke out in these two countries.[52] It was brief in Slovenia, where the Serb-dominated Yugoslav National Army, JNA, quickly abandoned the fight against the local territorial defence. In Croatia, Serbs in the Krajina regions established autonomous areas and demanded the right to remain within Yugoslavia, supported by the Serbian government in Belgrade, the JNA and paramilitary units from Serbia.[53] The initial fighting was most intense during 1991–1992, though the war was to last four years, during which the JNA and local Serb insurgents controlled nearly one-third of the territory of the Croatian republic, until the Croatian army took control of Krajina in the summer of 1995, making most Serbs

from the area flee to Serbia. The war in Croatia became known for the heavy shelling of the city of Vukovar and for paramilitary violence against civilians. It cost the lives of approximately 20,000 people.[54]

Surrounded by the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the wars in Slovenia and Croatia from the summer of 1991, the future of the Bosnian republic was in question; was it to become an independent state or remain as a part of the rump Yugoslavia that was now dominated by an authoritarian nationalist Serbia?[55] The first parliamentary elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina in November 1990 were won by nationalist parties, which seem to have captured most of the anti-Communist votes. The nationalist parties initially attempted power-sharing, while they also strived to consolidate their own positions by replacing former Communists in the state administration with their own representatives, leading to increased polarization.[56] On 9 January 1992, with reference to a separate referendum held in the mainly Serbian parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serb politicians declared these parts independent under the name Republika Srpska (the Serbian Republic). In early March 1992, a referendum, which was boycotted by the Serb politicians, showed that 62.8 per cent of the electorate, roughly equal to the Croatian and Muslim parts of the population, favoured Bosnian independence.[57] On 3 March 1992, Alija Izetbegović, president of Bosnia-Herzegovina and head of the Muslim nationalist party, declared the state's independence. Fighting broke out between armed groups in various regions. In early April 1992, as the European Community and the USA recognized the independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the violence escalated to full-scale war.

In 1991, at the eve of the war, the national composition of the population in Bosnia-Herzegovina consisted of 43.7 per cent Muslims, 31.4 per cent Serbs, and 17.3 per cent Croats, along with Jewish, Roma, Sinti and many other minorities, including 5.5 per cent self-declared Yugoslavs, supposedly people who identified with the federal state rather than with any one of its ethnic or national groups.[58] While there was obviously no national majority in Bosnia-Herzegovina, people of different nationalities lived geographically mixed in complex patterns. Though some local regions were dominated by one group, others had villages populated by more than one group or villages dominated by different groups next to each other. Often urban centres were nationally mixed, and this was also where most Yugoslavs lived. Thus, one may argue that the population and geography of Bosnia-Herzegovina were extremely ill-suited for political projects that aimed to sort power and territory according to people's national identification. Trying to align territory and nationality would demand drastic changes of people and borders. These nationalist principles were eventually attempted and realized through politics of ethnic cleansing and genocidal violence that came to characterize the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

One of the first large campaigns of ethnic cleansing began in Eastern Bosnia in April 1992, as part of a Serb military offensive. Bosnian Serb forces, supported by conventional and paramilitary units from Serbia and criminal mobs, attacked and seized Muslim-dominated villages and towns, including Zvornik, Višegrad and Foča. The Muslim population was terrorized to flee from areas under Serb military control. Women and children were deported, while men and young boys were captured. Many were killed immediately or later during their incarceration in detention camps.[59] Similar campaigns of ethnic cleansing took place in other regions of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Some of the most infamous concentration camps, including Omarska, Keraterm and Trnopolje, were established by Serb forces in the Krajina region in the northwest of Bosnia-Herzegovina.[60]

Rape and sexual violence happened on a large scale and in a systematic manner during the Bosnian War.[61] In some cases, Muslim women were held in camps and repeatedly raped by Serb forces. Serb and Croat women were targeted as well, though not to the same extent, as were captured men on all sides.[62] Though exact numbers cannot be established, it has been estimated that at least 20,000 people were victims of rape and sexual violence during the war.[63]

Muslims, Croats and Serbs were all victims of ethnic cleansing, and armed forces connected to all three national groups were perpetrators. Yet, Serb ethnic cleansing was particularly devastating in its impact, and Muslims constituted the largest victim group.[64]

Paramilitary forces, understood as irregular armed groups in some form of collaboration with the conventional military, played a central role in the ethnic cleansing campaigns in Bosnia-Herzegovina. They were used by state agents seeking to avoid responsibility for illegal actions, and often delivered chaotic brutality beyond the control of local authorities.[65] A main point of the paramilitary violence was to terrorize unwanted groups of civilians to flee from territories that the military wanted to control. While some of these paramilitary groups were cruel and efficient professionals with connections to state administration, others were disorganized brutal amateurs or criminals, sometimes engaged in practices of excessive violence that were deliberately and publicly displayed.[66] Some of the Serbian paramilitaries would refer to themselves as 'Chetniks' and use Chetnik insignia, thus drawing on a romanticized Serbian tradition of guerrilla warfare while also referring to the Serbian nationalist and conservative resistance groups during the Second World War. Highly traditionalist and in line with the guerrilla and bandit custom, the Chetniks were known for their long hair and beards.[67] Though the Chetniks were ill-famed outside Serbia for their extensive record of mass crimes against civilians committed during the Second World War, it was this tradition that Serb paramilitary groups of the 1990s

were evoking with their choice of names, military symbolism and often also long beards.[68]

The events in east and northwest Bosnia and the campaigns of ethnic cleansing are part of the memory narratives in several of the literary works that we study in this book. Both Saša Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone* and Nicol Ljubić's *Stillness of the Sea* are partly set in Višegrad, where some of the most infamous paramilitary violence took place. Iva Vukušić has described Višegrad in the early summer of 1992 as an 'extremely brutal place' where a local Serb paramilitary group murdered people in broad daylight, sometimes at the banks of the Drina river or on the town's old Ottoman bridge. They also abducted, beat up and abused people, and imprisoned, raped and tortured women. These paramilitaries would move around very publicly, wearing camouflage and displaying Chetnik symbols, sometimes with music blasting from their cars.[69] In *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, Stanišić's young protagonist observes the actions of these gang members without quite comprehending what is happening. The same paramilitary group was behind a particularly horrible set of crimes, the intentional burning of two houses with prisoners locked inside, which killed at least 120 civilians in June 1992.[70] The first of these burnings, named after the street, Pionirska, where the house was situated, is a crucial part of the plot in Ljubić's *Stillness of the Sea*. In *Ukulele Jam*, Alen Mešković describes how families are forced to flee from ethnically cleansed areas, fearing for the destiny of family members, who may be interned or murdered in concentration camps in northwestern Bosnia-Herzegovina. Rape and sexual violence, or the fear of it, are part of the stories in Stanišić's novel and in Hemon's short story 'A Coin', and constitute a main theme in Ljubić's novel.

In early April 1992, Serb forces started shelling Bosnia-Herzegovina's capital, Sarajevo, which was multiethnic, but had a Muslim majority and became part of the Bosniak side in the war. The shelling of the city from the surrounding hills and snipers targeting people in the streets continued throughout the war, resulting in heavy civilian casualties.[71] On 27 May 1992, a line of people queuing for bread was hit. Grenade attacks hit Sarajevo's marketplace, Markale, in February 1994 and in August 1995, killing and wounding hundreds of civilians. The cruelty of the shelling was massively documented by foreign journalists who lived in and reported from the city.[72] The widespread international media coverage made Sarajevo the lens through which most of the world learned about the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and it turned world opinion decisively and permanently against the Serbs.[73] It also made media images of Sarajevo under siege and the suffering of Sarajevans core elements of the international memory of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Fierce fighting between Bosniak and Serb forces took place just outside Sarajevo on mount Igman and other surrounding mountains and hills. The struggle for

survival in Sarajevo, and the constant fear of snipers, as well as the strangely powerful position of international media in deciding the images representing it, are the main topics of Hemon's 'A Coin'.

The war in Bosnia-Herzegovina continued until the autumn of 1995, with varying intensity, but with constant fighting. The international community intervened half-heartedly by trying to negotiate ceasefires and by sending in lightly armed United Nations (UN) soldiers, who were at times even held hostages by Serb forces. In April 1993, a new Serb offensive in eastern Bosnia led the UN to declare the town of Srebrenica along with several other Bosniak enclaves as 'safe zones', and the UN installed a lightly armed battalion in Srebrenica, which meant that tens of thousands of Bosniak refugees fled to the town for protection.[74] In July 1995, the Bosnian Serb army took over the town of Srebrenica from the UN soldiers who were supposed to protect the 40,000 refugees seeking shelter there. Women and children were deported to areas controlled by the Bosniak and Croat forces, while more than 8,000 Muslim men and boys were murdered by members of the Bosnian Serb army, supported by units from Serbia.[75] For this, Bosnian Serb military and political leaders were convicted for genocide at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY).[76] Ultimately, more than 100,000 people were killed in the Bosnian War. More than a third of these were civilians.[77]

In November 1995, the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement signalled the end of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The peace agreement reorganized the country in a complex structure that territorially reflected the results of the war and ethnic cleansing, and through its political system institutionalized nationalist divisions.[78] Bosnia-Herzegovina became one state, but divided into two entities, a Bosnian Serb unit, Republika Srpska, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, consisting of ten cantons dominated by Bosniaks and Croats.

The war has devastating and long-lasting consequences for people and societies in Bosnia-Herzegovina, both those directly affected by war and subsequent generations. War memory is highly present in public sphere, but also deeply politicized, disputed and strictly divided along political lines. The fossilized state structure of the Dayton Peace Agreement affirms the nationalist division of Bosnian politics and contributes to maintaining different national memory regimes for each of the largest national groups, the Serbs, Bosniaks and Croats.[79] Put very simply, political discourse in Republika Srpska describes the conflict in the 1990s as a civil war and Republika Srpska as a legitimate outcome of a Serbian fight for self-defence. Bosniak politicians in the federation focus on the defensive fight against primarily Serbian, but also Croatian, aggression and the genocide committed against Bosniaks. Croat politicians in the federation tend to replicate

Croatia's national narrative of the 'Homeland War', focusing on Croat self-defence against aggression from the two other groups.[80] We clearly saw these divisions and disagreements reflected among Bosnian readers of the literary works by Saša Stanišić and Aleksandar Hemon.

Though war memory and the consequences of war are dominantly present in the public spheres of Bosnia-Herzegovina, this is much less the case in the rest of Europe or in North America, even though the European Union (EU) and the USA were deeply involved in the war through the UN and NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), and countries in the EU and North America became homelands for many thousands of refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina. War crimes and genocide committed during the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina have been the topic of high-profile cases at the ICTY. Especially in the Netherlands, the Bosnian War, and the Srebrenica genocide in particular, had direct political impacts, as it was soldiers of a Dutch battalion who were posted in Srebrenica in July 1995, and who failed to protect the Muslim refugees. Following a report that held Dutch politicians partly responsible for the events in Srebrenica, the Dutch government resigned in 2002, and in 2022 the Dutch government officially offered its 'deepest apologies' for the lack of action from the international community to prevent the genocide in Srebrenica.[81] Also within the UN, efforts are made to keep the genocide in Srebrenica and the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina present in international memory. In May 2024, the UN's general assembly adopted a resolution designating 11 July as the international 'Day of Reflection and Commemoration of the 1995 Genocide in Srebrenica', to be observed annually.[82]

Nevertheless, the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina has not become a formalized part of European memory culture. Though many Northern and Western Europeans old enough to have experienced the live media coverage of the siege of Sarajevo and the fall of the Srebrenica safe zone do have vivid memories of these media images, those who grew up after 1995 have little or no recollection of what the war was about, unless they have deliberately studied it or have some personal connection to it. Perhaps this absence of memory explains why, when Russia initiated its full-scale invasion of Ukraine in the spring of 2022, Denmark's Minister of Defence Morten Bødskov could claim, 'There is war in Europe for the first time in 70 years,' apparently forgetting what happened in Yugoslavia twenty-seven years earlier.[83] Thus, European memory of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina remains fragmented and vague in many places.

In the following chapters, we study the roles that literary mediations of Bosnian War memories and the readings of them may play in shaping European cultural memory. What kinds of war memory do these acclaimed works of literature transmit? How do they interact with other memories? May they be able to influence memory cultures across Europe? In essence, these are also questions about how literature functions as a medium of memory.

Literature and Prosthetic Memory

The field of memory studies concerns itself with what we humans are doing with the past and what the past is doing to us. Astrid Erll has proposed to define cultural memory broadly as 'the interplay of present and past in sociocultural contexts'.[84] In this understanding, cultural memory refers to ways in which we share stories, ideas and images about our pasts, create identity, community and understanding of ourselves and the world in the present, and form expectations for the future.[85] A lot of this takes place within 'the symbolic order, the media, institutions and practices by which social groups construct a shared past'.[86] As Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney underline, we should understand cultural memory as a dynamic process 'in which individuals and groups continue to reconfigure their relationship to the past'.[87] A prolific 'medium of cultural memory', literature is one of the ways in which understandings of the past are being (re)configured and shared.[88]

Whereas memory studies have often focused on memory media and representations as such, we analyse the literary mediations of Bosnian War memories in combination with investigations of circulation and reception of these memories. We investigate how literature as memory medium circulates in the public realm and how it potentially affects individual readers' personal memory through what Rigney calls 'virtual contact with the singular experience of individuals in another zone' of Europe.[89]

We adhere to Astrid Erll's idea that literature 'is characterized by its ability – and indeed tendency – to refer to the forgotten and repressed as well as the unnoticed, unconscious, and unintentional aspects of our dealings with the past'. Erll suggests that 'literature actualizes elements which previously were not – or could not be perceived, articulated, and remembered in the social sphere'.[90] Similarly, Ann Rigney states that 'creative arts can be seen as a catalyst in creating new memories, supplementing what has been documented with imaginative power and creatively using cultural forms to generate vibrant (if not always literally true) stories that may be picked up and reworked in other disciplines'.[91] That does not mean that literature necessarily affects the collective level of memory, but that literary texts have '*potential* memorial power', which allows readers to actualize and remediate the expressed memories, but which just as likely can be disregarded. Whereas Aleida Assmann understands literature as 'storage medium of cultural memory' (cultural texts), Erll understands literature more as a dynamic 'vehicle for envisioning the past' creating, circulating and shaping contents of 'cultural memory' (collective texts).[92] In both cases, literature's capacity to serve as a medium of cultural memory is first and foremost a 'phenomenon of reception'.[93] That means that it is not the *content* of the text itself that turns literature into important cultural texts, but varying *reading*

practices that either read the text as literary and fictional or cultural and reliable texts that convey a certain mnemonic community, to which the reader feels related.[94] This underlines the importance of exploring both the texts' 'potential memorial power'[95] and the reception practices that actualize the transmitted memories in different ways.

Even though reception has been identified as 'one of the key issues within memory studies', it is still an understudied field.[96] This is surprising since 'no mediation of memory can have an impact on memory culture if it is not "received" – seen, heard, appropriated, made sense of, taken as an inspiration – by a group of people'.[97] Numerous scholars have touched on this question, proposing theories about reception and impact of memory mediations in films, literature and exhibitions. Alison Landsberg suggests that affective mass mediation of past events can create personal embodied experiences that may stay with the audience as a 'prosthetic memory'.[98] She writes: 'In the process I am describing, the person does not simply apprehend a historical narrative but takes in a more personal, deeply felt memory of a past event through which he or she did not live. The resulting prosthetic memory has the ability to shape that person's subjectivity and politics.'[99]

According to Landsberg's influential work, memory travels due to the capability of mass mediations such as films or museum exhibitions to create empathy with the experiences and suffering of others.[100] Ann Rigney suggests that prosthetic memory may also derive from encounters with literary writings because 'they invite voluntary participation in a story and offer aesthetic and emotional rewards'.[101] Presupposing a distinct reception and effect of transmitted memories, Rigney employs the term prosthetic memory to explain the power of literature to stage 'a virtual contact' with the singular experiences of individuals in distant areas.[102] Literature's ability to transmit the past more effectively than historiography and documentaries, she argues, is partly owed to its capacity of inventing a language for discursifying experiences that have been marginalized or completely forgotten, making memories 'important and sayable' – and thereby receptable – in new contexts.[103] Indeed, events can only be remembered collectively if a given social community owns an appropriate language that can organize the events and turn them into memorable narratives.[104] Our research sets out to investigate both what language our chosen literary works invent for making the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina 'memorable' and how readers in different social frameworks of memory receive the represented memories and perhaps even adopt them as prosthetic memory.

The task to make Bosnian wartime memories relevant for Northwestern European readers is challenging because this memory is often not part of these readers' collected memories beforehand.[105] Some readers know the area as a holiday destination, others have seen TV transmissions about the war, which

does not necessarily have a lasting impact on people's memories. Indeed, not least because of the complexity of the war, and often-repeated stereotypical perceptions of the Balkans as backwards or inherently violent, one can presuppose that it is a marginalized past that has not become part of the 'social framework of memories' of many Northwestern European societies.

Maurice Halbwachs' essential term 'social frameworks of memories' (*cadre sociaux de la mémoire*) encompasses two sub-theories. Firstly, he posits that individual memories are governed by collective memories that exist and are constructed by the communities within which we live, interact and communicate. Social frameworks of memory that, for example, exist in national, religious or familial groups both facilitate and limit our capacity to form individual memory. Secondly, our collective relations to the past are crucial for the formation of these groups' identity – or rather, a group's identity is formed by distinct past events, myths or heroes, which are selected and represented in various media (e.g. books, statues, museums, rites) in order to affirm the identity of the present community.[106]

Referring to the former meaning, Astrid Erll defines social frameworks of memory as collective symbolic orders or 'thought patterns, cognitive schemata that guide our perception and memory in particular directions'. Thus, social frameworks 'form the all-encompassing horizon in which our perception and memory is embedded'.[107] These cognitive schemata also involve what Erll elsewhere calls 'premediation', earlier representations and narrative structures that shape the expectations and interpretative patterns that individuals draw on when making sense of memory mediations.[108] Thus, Erll explains, literature influences individual memory by circulating and recreating cultural schemata that 'pre-form experience (of war and revolutions, but also of graduation and marriage) and guide recall into certain paths'.[109] Thus, social frameworks of memory facilitate certain patterns and templates of representation that both influence the 'memory producers' and the 'memory consumers or (prosumers), whose reception is shaped by their own cultural schemata'.[110] We aim to trace these processes in relation to the representation and reception of Bosnian wartime literature.

Referring to the second meaning of Halbwachs' term, Rigney points out that social frameworks help communities to 'define the relevance of certain topics' and draw up 'a dividing line between what is forgettable and what is valuable for those doing the remembering'.[111] She suggests that literature has the capability to extend and amend this dividing line by reshaping the 'cognitive schemata' prevailing in a community. Often, literature does so by 'representing less familiar events through the lens of a more familiar one'.[112] However, literature can also 'integrate memories into existing schemata' through the opposite practice of 'defamiliarization … that disrupt our usual habits of identification and understanding of what is memorable'.[113]

Nonetheless, Rigney's assumptions about the readers' perception and reaction to literary texts can only be seen as potential readings, for, as we will explain in more depth below, the actual reader has several options for decoding a text. Furthermore, even though there do exist examples of single books or waves of literary works that have determined whole generations' perceptions of past events, it is difficult – if not impossible – to predict which events are made memorable collectively; that is, which texts are read as 'cultural texts' that represent reliable versions of the cultural memory.[114] Even though literature and films *can* set the agenda 'for future acts of remembrance within society', what decides which memories make it into the public realm remains an open question.[115] It is broadly accepted that 'the limited number of things that are said about the world' have to make sense in the present for a given community in order to make it from merely archived knowledge (Aleida Assmann's *Speichergedächtnis*) into 'working memory' (Assmann's *Funktions-Gedächtnis*).[116] The question of which events make it into the working memory of a community is even more pertinent in cases of memories of events originating outside a given social context. Indeed, when the Bosnian War is represented in literature by refugees and migrants from the former Yugoslavia, we have to do with a 'deterritorialized transmission' of memories, accounts of events that are transmitted across national, ethnic and linguistic boundaries and may therefore not be seen as valuable or relevant within a receiving memory community. Precisely the question of how travelled or deterritorialized memories become important in different contexts and are remembered collectively has been discussed increasingly since 2010 when the 'third phase' of memory studies emerged.[117]

Deterritorialized and Travelling Memory

With the third phase of memory studies, the field's focus of attention moves beyond 'methodological nationalism', which previously linked research in cultural memory to the nation state, assuming a nexus between nation, culture and collective memory. Reflecting the increasing heterogeneity of populations, ever more political and cultural interconnections between nations, and extensive flow of information across boundaries,[118] memory studies has shifted towards concepts dealing with unbound, moving, entangled and heterogeneous memory formations. This has brought forth terms such as cosmopolitan, multidirectional and transcultural memory.[119] In their anthology *Memory Unbound*, Lucy Bond, Stef Craps and Pieter Vermeulen point out how memories transgress cultural, familial, medial and disciplinary frameworks, but that they are still characterized by 'important particularities that attend local and generational articulations of memory and continue to do

so even in a globalized and digitized world'.[120] The Holocaust, described by Aleida Assmann as a 'globalized memory', has been seen by Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider as a source of transnational 'cosmopolitan' memory cultures with 'the potential to become the cultural foundation for global human rights politics'.[121] Proposing a similarly worldwide and dynamic approach, Michael Rothberg suggests that we understand collective memory as a malleable mnemonic space in which major transnational memories such as colonialism, slavery and the Holocaust coexist and may actually strengthen each other rather than necessarily compete or appear as mutually exclusive.[122]

Aiming to capture cultural memory's dynamic character and mobility between scales and communities, Erll has proposed 'transcultural memory' as a perspective that directs memory research towards 'mnemonic processes unfolding *across* and *beyond* cultures'.[123] Erll emphasizes that '*all* cultural memory *must* "travel", be kept in motion, in order to "stay alive", to have an impact both in individual minds and social formations'.[124] However, travelling memory is more than that. It is 'the ongoing exchange of information between individuals and the motion between minds and media, which first of all generate what Halbwachs termed collective memory'.[125] Conceptualizing this new perception of collective memory, Erll points out five ways in which memories travel: migration, media, contents, practices and forms. In this book, we will concentrate on the first two dimensions of travelling memory: firstly, the travel of memory with people who migrate, flee or are expelled, carrying along mnemonic forms, rituals, and contents. This travelling via 'human carriers' who bring their heritage, memories and traumas with them into new social constellations and political contexts has also been emphasized by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad.[126]

Secondly, Erll defines media as the most significant means by which memories travel. Media is a complex dimension and Erll identifies three different ways in which memories travel in media: firstly, myths and foundation stories travel through various media techniques via remediation; secondly, media technologies such as writing, photography and film travel around the world enabling the representation of memories in different ways; and thirdly, media such as books, movies and TV transmissions disseminate memories across the globe, thereby creating deterritorialized memories.[127]

Indeed, media as the precondition for creating collective memory are of central concern in cultural memory studies.[128] The very concept of cultural memory is premised on the idea that 'memory can only become collective as a part of continuous process whereby memories are shared with the help of symbolic artefacts that mediate between individuals and, in the process, create communality across both space and time'.[129] However, the third phase of memory studies has entailed a change in attention from fixed and confined 'media technologies', such as monuments, museums, national *lieux de*

memoire and curricula that promote a specific point of view on the past, to media technologies that can bring memories into motion. Rigney encapsulates this change of emphasis by referring to works of literature as 'portable monuments' that move 'across time, space, media, and imaginations even as the original text remain(s) unchanged'.[130] This brings us back to the issue of the Bosnian War as deterritorialized memory, which travels into new context via human carriers and mediated transmissions, in our case fictional works of literature.

Mnemonic Migration

The precondition for a deterritorialized memory to become part of 'working memory' in new social contexts is the idea that fictional narratives have the ability not only to change the schemata of particular 'social frames', but also to facilitate 'the cultural transfer of memories from one community to another' and the building of 'imaginative bridges between communities through the workings of prosthetic memory', as Ann Rigney suggests.[131]

In this book, we explore to what extent the transfer of Bosnian wartime memory into new contexts takes place, if readers actually get a closer or 'prosthetic' relationship to events in a different part of Europe through the act of reading, and which narrative and mnemonic forms most successfully make memories of the Bosnian War travel. We suggest that the travelling of Bosnian wartime memories is facilitated both by the medium of 'human carriers', the tens of thousands of Bosnians forced to abandon their homes and settle abroad in Western Europe and North America, and by these migrants' transmission of their own or fictional memories in various artistic media, including literature.

With the term *mnemonic migration*, we encapsulate three stages of memory transfer; that is, the travelling via human 'carriers of memories', the travelling of memories via the medium of literature, and the reception of memories at their place of destination. We base our understanding of these processes on the third wave of memory studies and Astrid Erll's idea of the travelling of memories, but simultaneously we posit the persistent existence of national, generational, familial, subcultural and other social frameworks of memory. Though such frameworks are dynamic and malleable, they are also highly durable and influence both the mediation and the reception of literary texts. The term mnemonic migration implies the idea that migration not only involves the (voluntary or forced) displacement of people into a foreign environment, but also the entrance into a new social framework of memory. In the new social framework of memory, events that might have been irrelevant in the original homeland of the migrant are perceived as

valuable, while at the same time the new framework may be ignorant of the individual and collective memories that the migrant carries along. The new social framework of memory also creates a dissimilar language and vocabulary for expressing the past, thus both opening new modes for representing own experiences and also building up new boundaries. As mentioned earlier, every social framework of memory involves a certain media culture, which creates a 'pre-life of stories', premediations that limit and facilitate what can be said and in what ways.[132] Hence, the authors who enter a new media culture have to decide to what extent they adapt to it or try to alter and renew it, perhaps with the risk of making literary productions less understandable for a local readership.

We investigate how our authors, who either migrated from the former Yugoslavia and thus have their own memories from the Bosnian War, or who feel related to the Bosnian War through ethical or family connections, actively use the medium of literature to transmit deterritorialized memories of the Bosnian War into the social framework of memory they have entered. Explicitly or implicitly, their autobiographic, auto-fictional or fictional writings challenge the framework of memory of their *expected readers* by urging them to adopt memories from a different area and framework.[133]

We are especially interested in the third step of mnemonic migration, namely the arrival of the memories at their points of destination: the critics and the lay readers who may or may not coincide with the authors' expected readers. By reading literature on Bosnian wartime memories written outside of Bosnia-Herzegovina, readers in both Northwestern Europe and in Bosnia-Herzegovina are potentially confronted with unhabitual modes of mnemonic representation, more or less unknown events and collective memories, which are presumably not part of their socially framed personal and collective memories.

The reception of memory mediations, including deterritorialized memories, is still an understudied problem. This is the more surprising since reception is an indispensable part of transcultural and transnational memory transmissions. As Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll express it: 'If all memory "travels" (Erll), is constantly "on the move" (Rigney), then it clearly must move *somewhere,* towards a (however transitory) destination. Successful memory transmission entails reception … For transcultural memory to actually come into existence, deterritorialized transmission must be followed by localized reception.'[134]

In order to investigate all three pillars of mnemonic migration, it is necessary to combine different methods and research fields. Focusing on the mnemonic value of literature, we will analyse literature about the Bosnian War as 'memory-making novels' (*Gedächnissromane*) by employing Erll's

ideas about the 'rhetoric of collective memory' and narrative modes of representing memories.[135] In order to investigate the intended memory transfer and reception, we will consider how authors more or less consciously expect distinct readers and inscribe them in their text. We explore the expected reader of the novels and the ways the authors address a specific media culture by using Gerard Prince's term of the narratee. Furthermore, in order to analyse the active reader participation in the actualization of deterritorialized memories, we use Wolfgang Iser's approach to reception studies and idea of gaps of indeterminacy. Moreover, we study the public circulation and professional receptions by analysing publication numbers, availability and reviews of the literary memory works. Finally, we investigate readers' responses through a series of focus group interviews with lay readers of the works we study. The qualitative analyses of these interviews explore if and how memory-making literature succeeds in transporting new memories and perhaps even prosthetic memory to the readers, to which extent the actual readers correspond with the authors' expected readers, and how readings differ in the social contexts of Berlin, Manchester, Copenhagen and in two Bosnian cities positioned within different frameworks of memory: Sarajevo, with a dominantly Bosniak population, and Banja Luka, which has a dominantly Bosnian Serb population.

Memory-Making Novels: Modes and Narratives

We analyse the literary works by Saša Stanišić, Nicol Ljubić, Aleksandar Hemon and Alen Mešković as 'memory-making novels' (*Gedächtnisromane*); that is, as media of collective memory in the specific sense that they not only represent but also produce memory, thereby making the Bosnian War 'memorable' in new social contexts.[136] They are 'collective texts' (Erll) or 'portable monuments' (Rigney) that are vehicles for the circulation of memories and for shaping new contents of cultural memory.[137] According to Astrid Erll, fiction can become a collective memory-making text when it is composed by using distinct 'literary strategies', which she calls 'rhetoric of collective memory'.[138] The rhetoric of collective memory constitutes the 'mnemonic potentials for literature to transmit versions of a socially shared past'.[139] Put otherwise, it encompasses the narratological means by which a text enacts its function as a model of collective memory, possibly invoking new cognitive schemata that can provoke the reader to reflect about those schemata that govern their collective memories. The rhetoric of collective memory is not one specific style of expression, but manifests itself in distinct modes characterized by certain narratological means. According to Erll, literary works represent the past in varying combinations of experiential,

monumental, antagonistic, historicizing, and reflexive modes. These modes are constructed through 'clusters of narrative features whose interplay may contribute to a certain memory effect'.[140]

We draw on Erll's work to identify which clusters of narrative features our chosen texts employ, because the clusters show not only *what* is remembered but also *how* the events are reconstructed and represented. This is important because 'changes in the form of representation may effect changes in the kind of memory we retain of the past', and therefore also influence the memories readers retain from the books.[141] It is one of our main aims to explore how the different modes of remembering affect readers' reception of Bosnian wartime memories. In the following, we introduce these modes, three of which are dominant in the texts we analyse, namely the experiential, the antagonistic and the reflexive modes.

Erll describes *the experiential mode* of memory as a contrast to the *monumental mode*. Whereas the former is closely related to communicative memory, the latter is related to cultural memory. In one of the founding books of memory studies, Jan Assmann defines communicative memory as shared memories created in everyday communication. They are embodied memories, often transmitted orally or in short-lasting media, only last three to four generations and everyone is equally competent in 'remembering and interpreting the common past'.[143] Cultural memories, on the other hand, are memories commonly accepted by a community. They contain (mythical) events that often (but not always) happened a long time ago and are decisive for a community's identity. Cultural memory is typically transmitted by lasting media such as statues, museums, curricula and rites that 'transports a fixed set of contents and meaning, which are maintained and interpreted by trained specialists'.

Both these registers of memory have a close affinity to literature. Most often literature represents individual experiences that are reminiscent of communicative memory. At the same time, literature itself can be understood as a lasting artefact that constitutes cultural memory. As already mentioned, it is primarily the framework of reading that decides whether a text is read as a 'cultural text' that contains reliable information about the past, or as a fictional, less reliable text that rather transmits a subjective perspective.[144]

Certain narratological clusters of expression make some texts show more affinity to either the communicative or the cultural register of memory. Literature written in the monumental mode is often told by an omniscient narrator, whereas texts written in the experiential mode tend to be told by the personal voice of a first-person narrator in the present tense.[145] Whereas cultural memory is dominantly expressed in the monumental mode and conveys the 'distant horizon of the cultural tradition', the communicative mode transmits specific, embodied experiences.[146] While the monumental

mode is forged by employing intertexts from classical texts or by representing figures, events or topics as part of cultural memory, the experiential mode tends to express detailed presentations of everyday life. The narrator typically describes a 'seemingly immediate experience' and has a distinct internal point of view, thus creating an I-as-a-witness perspective.[147] This means that the narrator has a limited knowledge, for, as Erll notes, 'you cannot remember what you yourself have not experienced' and 'you cannot recall what you have not heard, read, or seen'.[148] The *historicizing* mode resembles the monumental mode in that it is used for representing generally acknowledged elements of cultural memory. Whereas both the experiential and the monumental mode are part of the 'autobiographic memory of a culture',[149] in the historicizing mode the past is represented as part of the 'cultural knowledge system' and is most often used in historical novels. Furthermore, 'historicizing modes convey literary events and persons as if they were objects of scholarly historiography'.[150] The past is represented as concluded, whereas both the monumental and the experiential mode represent the past as something that is relevant for the present.

Most literary texts contain traces of both communicative and cultural memory. A representation of both registers can contribute to mitigating the limited point of view of the first-person narrator. This happens when either the collectively remembered event (the Bosnian War in our case) is told by means of an individual impression, thus enriching the distant cultural realm with embodied experiences, or when communicative memory contributes to renegotiating how an event is remembered in the cultural realm.[151] Most literary texts switch between the communicative and the cultural registers. Often, this happens when the personal narrator is given authority to represent his or her experience as paradigmatic for the overall historic event. In other cases, an omniscient narrator extensively focuses on the inner world and the individual experiences of one or several figures in a manner reminiscent of communicative memory.[152] Hence, even though the experiential mode is predominantly connected to communicative memory and the monumental mode predominantly to the distant realm of cultural memory, traces of both modes can appear in one and the same literary text and be expressed by both an omnipresent and a first-person narrator. As we will show, the weakness of a strictly experiential mode, which is dominant in large parts of Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, is the complete lack of explanation or comment that could induce some sense into the chaotic events that the naive child narrator is experiencing.[153]

In addition to the experiential mode, which dominates in three of our cases (the works of Stanišić, Hemon and Mešković), in the case of Ljubić's *Stillness of the Sea* we identify an *antagonistic* memory representation, which is characterized by a contest between memories, in which one version of

the past is promoted and other versions are rejected. Novels written in the antagonistic mode represent distinct social or cultural formations and simultaneously deconstruct those of other groups.[154] This is often done by 'negative stereotyping' of those representing a rejected perception of the past.[155] In other cases, novels represent 'biased perspective structures: Only the memories of a certain group are presented as true, while those versions articulated by members of conflicting memory cultures are deconstructed as false'.[156] In this kind of text, figures are representatives of distinct perspectives, values and norms, forming a kind of 'we' narration. However, according to Erll, these novels are seldom genuinely polyphone; even though they represent different perspectives, one is often represented as more true than the others.[157] Our analysis of Ljubić's novel *Stillness of the Sea* discusses his attempt to create a polyphone antagonistic narration of the Bosnian War and suggests the problematic aspects of not indicating when one version is a more truthful representation than the others.

Whereas neither Ljubić nor Mešković provide reflections about memory, both Stanišić and Hemon have passages written in the *reflexive mode.* In contrast to the other modes, the reflexive mode is not a construction of memory, but predominantly a second-order observation that 'gives us the illusion of glimpsing the past' and undertakes a 'critical reflection upon such processes of representation' at the meta level.[158] It is a way of underlining the selection and reconstruction of mnemonic material, observing the process of remembering and questioning it.[159] This is done, for example, by 'explicit narrational comments on the workings of memory, the juxtaposition of different versions of the past (narrated or focalized), or … by highly experimental narrative forms'.[160] Whereas the reflexive mode is prevalent only in the second part of Stanišić's novel, Hemon in his short story 'A Coin' reflects extensively about Bosnian War memory as produced in the news coverage of international media.

Imagining Readers, Facilitating Mnemonic Migration

As explained above, the term *mnemonic migration* implies entering into a community characterized by a different social framework of memory, which means that the majority population in the community might be ignorant of the particular framework of the migrant, and in our case that of the collective and individual memories of the (auto)fictional migrants who the authors describe. We argue that the authors we explore aspire, through their literary works, to introduce new memories of the Bosnian War in the setting of the target country in question, and thus widen the mnemonic horizon of their readers. A part of the process of mnemonic migration lies in the authors' efforts to accommodate their imagined readers by easing their

understanding of the text and its mnemonic content. Since the memory-making texts we study are published in Western Europe or North America, and therefore presumably directed at a Western readership, we suggest that the works are written with a reader in mind who has limited knowledge of the events described or at most partial knowledge acquired through media consumption.

Apart from studying the mediation and mnemonic content, our analyses of the literary texts aim to explore ways in which one or several kinds of reader implied in the texts are imagined. This investigation explores a primarily intentional aspect of the texts' function as mnemonic media. To this end, we draw on the concept of the 'narratee', or the 'virtual reader'. All literary narration has one or several fictional readers, someone the narrator more or less explicitly addresses. However, the concept of the narrator has been investigated in much more depth than that of the narratee. Gérard Genette's definition of the narratee is closely related to his differentiated understanding of the narrator, which he divides in four different types: an *intradiegetic narrator*, who is present as a figure in the story and tells their own story (as is the case in the texts of Stanišić and Mešković, and partly so in Ljubić's), or is present in the story, but tells the story of someone else (partly the case with Hemon's narrator); and an *extradiegetic narrator*, who is not present as a figure in the story but tells their own story (partly Ljubić's narrator), or who is not present in the story and tells someone else's story. While the first type of extradiegetic narrator creates a third-person narration closely related to one figure, the second type resembles an omnipresent narrator that is not represented in our cases.

The narratees, which Genette prefers to call virtual readers, can be uncovered through a number of indications that imply or designate them.[161] An intradiegetic narrator necessarily has an intradiegetic narratee – a fictive figure within the text who hears the story. Whenever the narrator speaks to a figure who is part of the plot, the 'virtual reader', according to Genette, will be difficult if not impossible to differentiate from this listening figure.[162] An extradiegetic narrator, however, addresses an extradiegetic narratee. This extradiegetic narratee is the virtual reader, with whom the real reader can identify.[163]

Genette does not come any closer to explaining how we can identify or characterize the virtual reader. Gerald Prince argues that the virtual reader is a 'type of reader' that the author 'bestows with certain qualities, faculties, and inclinations according to his opinion of men in general (or in particular) and according to the obligations he feels should be respected'.[164] However, Prince develops the concept of the narratee, which is much more differentiated. He suggests that the narratee is distinctly definable in the text. The narratee is addressed explicitly when the narrator imagines the reading situation, describes the reader or addresses the narratee as 'reader', 'my dear' or

'my friend'. More often, the portrait of the narratee is implicit; for example, when the narratee is included in a common 'we', 'us' or spoken to as 'you' that is presumed to have a certain knowledge.[165]

Most interesting for our purposes are the cases in which the narratee appears when the narrator refers to an extra-textual experience, such as the Bosnian War, known both to the narrator and to different extents also to the narratee. Here one can discern what the narrator expects the narratee to know or not know. Furthermore, comparisons or metaphors are useful for portraying the narratee, because tropes compare something unfamiliar with something familiar. Thus, the narratee is supposedly familiar with the second part of the trope, which tells us something about their environment, social status or age. This is, for example, the case in the novel by Ljubić, who extensively draws references to the Second World War when he describes the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In what Prince calls over-justifications, the narrator may give the narratee some explanations that are necessary to understand the events, which discloses what the narratee does not know. We could add that the narrator may omit information that the narratee, then, is expected to know. This can create discrepancies with the actual reader, who may lack the needed information. The narrator may also indicate that certain feelings or events are difficult to describe, indicating that the narratee is assumed to never have experienced such feelings.

Even though the narratee is not identical to the actual reader, indirect descriptions of the narratee are highly useful in order to find out what type of readership is imagined. Thus, analysing the texts' narratee give us a key to understanding what we will call the *expected readers* of a text. This allows us to find out if the expected (Western) reader is someone who is to be informed, as Brigid Haines has proposed,[166] and to compare the texts' narratees with their actual readers. Investigating this, we must also take into consideration that the author might construct a broad, diverse and thus blurred narratee, which would relate the book closer to the concept of 'world literature'.[167] Finally, we ask what happens when the narratee differs considerably from the actual reader, and whether the reader's successful identification with the narratee might guide the interpretation of the text in a distinct direction, perhaps encouraging the reader to establish a deeper emotional relation to the described events.

Receiving the Bosnian War – The Implied Reader

Moving from the mediation of memory directed at the expected reader to the aspect of readers' reception, we draw on the idea of the *implied reader*, defined by Wolfgang Iser as the one who actualizes one of the potential

meanings of the text and thereby reshapes it. This part of our investigation concentrates on the 'gaps of indeterminacy', which the texts leave open for the reader to counterbalance. In contrast to Prince's narratee, Iser's implied reader is not a construction in the text but a conceptualization of the active participation of the reader in the transmission process. Iser suggests that a fictional text has two poles: an artistic pole, created by the author, and an aesthetic one that emerges through the actualization of the text by the reader. Thus, meaning in literary texts is not a quality hidden in the text, but the product of a complex interaction between the text and the implied reader. Fictional texts constitute the familiar world in an unfamiliar form, as it were, and are therefore 'never completely identified with our experiences'.[168] Thus, the reality of the text is necessarily constituted 'by the reader's participation and by the reader's response'.[169]

Nonetheless, the reader's actualization of the text is not completely free. On the contrary, the reader has to perceive and choose from among the perspectives on the world that the author has created.[170] The preconceptions and life world of the individual, geographically and historically situated reader makes the realization of the text inevitably selective. No reading can actualize all the potential meanings (*Sinnpotential*) of a text, but the empirical reader composes his or her reading by choosing from among several potential meanings (*Aktualisierungspotential*).[171]

This point of Iser's theory is especially important for our investigation, because it raises the question of how the readers' frameworks of memories influence the process of selecting which of the potential meanings different readers actualize. A second point of interest is Iser's suggestion that the act of reading causes a 'translation or transmission' of the perspectives on the world conveyed in the text into the pre-existing experiences of the reader. In the context of our investigation, this process of transmission could be compared to the adoption of new and distant memories and perhaps even the creation of prosthetic memory.

The third and most important point of interest is Iser's theory on the 'gaps of indeterminacy'. As Iser puts it, every reading reaches a point where the text denies verification of some aspects of the represented world so that a 'certain amount of indeterminacy' arises.[172] The different potential meanings of a text arise from the fact that authors leave open numerous of those 'gaps of indeterminacy' that require the reader to fill them in by supplying an imaginative combination of potential meanings and views for the text to make sense.[173] As Iser puts it:

> Generally, the reader will not even be aware of them [the gaps] … Nevertheless, they influence his reading, for the 'schematized views' are continually connected with each other by the reading process. This means that the reader fills

> in the remaining gaps. He removes them by a free play of meaning-projection and thus himself provides the unformulated connections between the particular views.[174]

We are interested in the ways readers within different national contexts and of different ages and genders manage to make the gaps of indeterminacy disappear. We suggest that a really immersed reading, potentially leading to prosthetic memory, can only emerge if the readers find an entrance into the text that enables them to counterbalance the gaps and to become active co-producers of the text.

Hans-Georg Gadamer argues that the interpretation of texts does not only depend on the narrative structures inherent in the text, but also on what he calls the reader's 'horizon of understanding', which is constituted by the prejudices readers bring with them.[175] In the hermeneutic situation of reading, readers continuously test their prejudices, and in this process a fusion of the horizons, that of the reader and that represented in the book, can take place.[176] Whereas Gadamer explores how this fusion enables readers to expand horizons of understanding that prevailed in the past, we investigate if and how readers can be familiarized with horizons of understanding represented in novels that describe distant geographical and social environments and events.

Relating Gadamer's ideas of horizons to Iser's reader-response theory, we propose that the readers' initial horizon of understanding is crucial for their way of filling in the 'gaps of indeterminacy'. Similar to Gadamer, Iser proposes that every interpretation depends on individual readers' 'free play of meaning projection', which differs from individual to individual and varies according to every person's circumstances.[177] According to Iser, readers use different strategies in order to close these gaps. One is to 'refer the text to external verifiable factors, in such a way that it appears to be nothing more than a mirror reflection of these factors'.[178] One can assume that readers with extensive knowledge about the historical circumstances in which the plot unfolds will be able to match the events in the text with relevant explanatory context to make sense of the story's development. Whereas Iser seems to be critical of such a reception, we assume that such a mimetic comparison to external factors is able to give aesthetic pleasure and immersion in the same way as other forms of perception. Indeed, our focus group interviews with readers showed that a text's lack of historical information may urge readers to search for information in official and unofficial archives in order to counterbalance the gaps of indeterminacy. Indeterminacy can also be compensated by the individual experience of the reader, as we observed in our Bosnian focus groups. Here the indeterminacy 'disappears when the subjective norms of the reader guide him through the text'.[179] For readers with little knowledge about the world represented in the fictional writing,

the indeterminacy of the text may be so resistant to counterbalancing that any identification with the world we live in is impossible. Then the world of the text establishes itself as being in competition with the familiar world, a competition that must inevitably have some repercussions on the familiar one. In this case, the text may tend to function as a criticism of life.[180]

When there is such strong competition between the represented world and the familiar one, memory transmission becomes more challenging. When the text fully contradicts the readers' preconceptions, this may lead to drastic reactions such as to 'throw the book away' or, in the other pole, to feel compelled to revise one's preconceptions and make indeterminacy disappear by connecting 'one's own experience with what the text wants to convey'.[181] As we show in the final part of this book, we observed these strategies of reception from the participants in our focus group interviews. Focusing on the readers' ways of filling in the 'gaps of indeterminacy' in the texts by Stanišić, Ljubić, Hemon and Mešković, and whether particular gaps hamper the ability of the texts to transmit their mnemonic content, will help us investigate how the readers' social frameworks of memory influence their reading.

Using Iser's approach is not without deficiencies. Kaisa Kaakinen has criticized Iser's neglect of the reader's historical situatedness.[182] Kaakinen points to Hans Robert Jauss' idea that readers always interpret literature in relation to their specific horizons of expectations (*Erwartungshorizont*), which change through time.[183] In a time of increasing globalization, she argues, the situatedness of the readers and 'questions of address and audience' become prevalent and make it crucial 'to distinguish between different kinds of historically situated reading positions and conditions of interpretation'.[184] A similar point has been made by Susannah Radstone, who underlines that processes of memory mediation may be exceedingly and increasingly transcultural, but reception is always situated and localized.[185]

The situatedness of the reader is also at the centre of our interest. Yet, we focus on readers' *mnemonic* situatedness and how they engage with the literary narratives' *mnemonic migration* between different frameworks of memory. Moreover, in line with Jauss' idea that literature can challenge readers' horizon of expectations, we suggest that the distant memories conveyed in the texts challenge the reader's social frameworks of memory understood as 'the all-encompassing horizon in which our perception and memory are embedded'.[186]

Mnemonic Migration and Public Circulation

Public circulation and remediation are crucial elements of mnemonic migration. As a medium of memory, literature is exceptional, according to Ann Rigney, because as a 'portable monument' it can move and be transported

while the text itself remains the same.[187] Thus, literature's way of providing easily transferable flexible mediations of memory constitutes an essential element of cultural memory. Yet, the portability of literature is perhaps also its vulnerability; unlike massive monuments, books are easily removable and therefore also avoidable. To become discernible in the public sphere – for the narratives to be transmitted at all – literary works must be distributed, promoted, recirculated, picked up and received by readers. Repeated media presentations and 'remediation', understood as reproductions, re-presentations, reviews of and comments about literary works are essential to the dynamics of cultural memory.[188] Processes of remediation keep memory narratives alive and present in what Aleida Assmann has referred to as the 'canon'; that is, the 'actively circulated memory that keeps the past present'.[189]

We argue that the roles of publishers, public media, book shops and various institutions, such as libraries, are crucial for the processes of distributing, promoting and remediating literary memory narratives. With the aim of exploring if and how literary memory narratives about the Bosnian War enter new social frameworks of memory, we study how the memory narratives are circulated and made present in the public spheres of Germany, the UK, Denmark and Bosnia-Herzegovina through publishing houses, debates and reviews. Where possible, we investigate publication numbers, the availability of the investigated literary works at booksellers and libraries, and we study how the books are announced, reviewed and discussed in main public media.

Reviews, we suggest, constitute a particularly important type of remediation of literature and literary memory narratives. They are one of the main channels through which a book enters and becomes known in the public sphere, via general news media or professional magazines directed towards audiences working with or interested in literature. Reviews introduce and promote a literary work to the public sphere, usually based on a selective and condensed take on the novel's form, content and overall quality. As part of specific media practices aimed at a large and yet specific audience, they can be presumed to address a certain social framework of memory that is familiar to the reviewer. Thus, we suggest that a review may be analysed as a particular type of remediation that says something about the way a literary work meets and relates to the social framework of memory it is being presented to. In the second part of the book, we analyse how our chosen literary mediations of Bosnian War memory as portable monuments are recirculated in the public spheres, and how they are being received and remediated in literary reviews. We will study the reviews both as somehow professional reception, looking at how the literary works are read by professionals in the field of contemporary literature production, and as important stages of remediation that contribute to the public presence of the works. A review, or a set of reviews, creates a premediation of a text that directs potential readers' expectations, reading strategies and, ultimately, interpretations.

Readers' Reception as Mnemonic Migration Through Focus Group Discussions

Memory transmissions and mnemonic migration are dependent on mediations being actually received and responded to. In addition to investigating memory remediations by professional readers, we study how lay readers experience and react to the literary memory narratives of Stanišić, Ljubić, Hemon and Mešković through a series of focus group discussions in Denmark, Germany, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Based on the group discussions, we ask to what extent reading literary texts about the Bosnian War cause emotional immersion and greater understanding of the experience of people who lived through and fled the Bosnian War, thus exploring whether the readers engage with the texts in ways that widen their mnemonic horizon.

Comparing readers' reactions to different texts, we investigate how the texts' rhetoric of collective memory influences the readers' immersion in the story, and thus how changes in the form of representation effect changes in the kind of memory we retain.[190] Moreover, we ask whether the distant content of the texts poses special challenges to some readers' ability to fill in the texts' 'gaps of indeterminacy' and hinder them in grasping the mnemonic content of the texts. By having readers from different contexts read the same texts, we investigate how frameworks of memory influence the ways in which they actualize the texts. Our research shows significant differences between the reactions to the texts among readers in different geographical locations, of different age and within different social groups, which, we argue, reflect the social frameworks of memory that our groups of readers are socialized in.

We organized focus group discussions with readers in five different cities: Copenhagen (Denmark), Manchester (UK), Berlin (Germany), and Banja Luka and Sarajevo (both in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but in different political entities). Each group was given a text four weeks prior to the discussion. To compare site-specific reactions,[191] we asked some of the focus groups in all the five cities to read Saša Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, originally published in German, but quickly translated into more than thirty other languages, including Danish, English and Bosnian. To find out whether readers reacted differently to texts supposedly written for their national and linguistic audience, two Danish groups read Alen Mešković's novel *Ukulele Jam*, two groups in Manchester read Aleksandar Hemon's short story 'A Coin', and three groups in Berlin read Nicol Ljubić's novel *Stillness of the Sea*.[192] In both Sarajevo and Banja Luka, we asked two groups to read *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone*, while two other groups read 'A Coin'.

We carried out the focus group discussions in Copenhagen, Manchester and Berlin (four in Copenhagen, four in Manchester and six in Berlin) in

the spring of 2020. In these three cities, ninety-six individuals aged 25–65 participated in the study. The eight focus group discussions in Bosnia-Herzegovina (four in Sarajevo and four in Banja Luka) were conducted in September 2020 and involved fifty-three respondents. The choice to organize four to six focus groups in each city was based on Morgan's suggestion that data saturation is reached at this number of groups.[193] Each group consisted of five to eight respondents, aiming at an equal number of men and women, with representation of both an older generation, which would be able to remember the time of the Bosnian War and its presence in international media, and a younger generation with presumably little memory of the war. We chose this heterogeneous composition in order to 'exploit differences in opinion or reaction', which, we hoped, would create a dynamic interaction and allow the readers to challenge each other, which, in turn, could potentially reveal more about the mnemonic mechanisms involved than a more homogeneous and consensual composition would.[194] Participants were expected to be lay readers with a regular reading habit, irrespective of particular interests or literary preferences. The groups were recruited by professional agencies in the five locations.

Focus group interviews are inevitably influenced by social dynamics: participants respond to the interview questions, but they also query each other and explain themselves to each other, which may allow an open discussion and reveal more of the participants' points of view than a one-to-one interview.[195] The group interviews allowed us to study the ways in which our individual readers collectively made sense of the texts and constructed meaning about them.[196] Yet, the group settings also meant that discussions and interpretations were shaped by issues of power and legitimacy as a consensus was negotiated in the moment. Group interviews may help to 'illuminate the fluid space between the individual, the social and the cultural'.[197] These social and cultural aspects were important to us as reflections of the social frameworks of memory that would inform and surround the ways in which our individual readers understood the literary works.

The sessions were semi-structured, combining a small set of fixed but open-ended questions meant to inspire generative narratives grounded in the participants' own experiences, with the flexibility of ad hoc follow-ups.[198] In order to enable all participants to contribute to the discussion, the interviews were opened with a request of all respondents to write down and present individually the three most important aspects of the novel or short story they were given. We then asked the group collectively: (1) whether there was anything in the account that surprised them; (2) whether there was anything that touched them emotionally; (3) whether they would recommend the text to others. The aim was to probe the readers' points of emphasis in the reading, emotional engagement, preconceptions about the

war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the country's context in general, potential shifts in perspective after reading, and what they thought was the value of the text. We were particularly interested in finding out how they reacted to the memories transmitted in the texts, which memories they found most important and whether it meant something for them if the memories were deemed authentic or not.

We assume that the affective impact and the readers' emotional reactions are decisive for the potential adoption of memory. Studies based in cognitive sciences show that readers react emotionally to literary language.[199] Based on the observation that readers' 'emotional response is already likely to be formulated in part within the first 500 msec of encountering a word or phrase', David Miall suggests that the 'literariness' of texts causes experiences such as 'defamiliarization', alienation and conflicts of understanding, for instance, 'due to an unreliable narrator'.[200] Thus, readers' emotional reactions to literature are both results of the type of literary mediation, including the quality and style of narration, and the meeting of something new and unfamiliar. We explore these processes further in our focus group interviews, but rather than focusing on single features of a text, we observe the emotional reactions to entire literary works and investigate how defamiliarization and alienation influence the transmission of memories and the extent to which emotion can promote the engagement with the experience of others.

Outline of the Book

This book is divided into three parts. In Part I we investigate the literary memory mediations as mnemonic migration, focusing on types and styles of mediation, mnemonic modes, rhetoric of memory, implied and expected reader, memory narratives, and historical interpretations. The first chapter in this section analyses Stanišić's *How the Soldier Repairs the Gramophone.* In the following chapters we make comparative analyses of Ljubić's *Stillness of the Sea*, Hemon's 'A Coin', and Mešković's *Ukulele Jam*.

In Part II, we investigate the public circulation of these texts by exploring, where possible, publication numbers and public availability, as well as what we think of as public and professional reception in the forms of recognitions, awards, comments and literary reviews. All of this contributes to making the literary memory narratives present in the public sphere, and to premediating and framing how and where they are read.

Part III undertakes qualitative analyses of readers' receptions based on focus group discussions in Denmark, Germany, the UK and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Here we focus on readers' reactions to types and styles of memory mediation, emotional responses to the different types of mediation,

and how the readings engage with the readers' social frameworks of memory. In a brief final chapter, based on a series of short telephone interviews, we analyse our readers' relations to Bosnian War memories and the memory-making texts one year after reading them.

In conclusion, we point to the memory-making potential of our literary texts, arguing that they can and do challenge some readers' social frameworks of memory, transmitting new mnemonic content, and in some cases forge something like prosthetic memory. Yet, we argue, these processes are in plain practice conditioned upon readers meeting and engaging with the literature, which, though successful, may not reach many lay readers. Moreover, the readers' responses, the decoding of the texts and even their modes of reading, depend not only on the texts' style and mnemonic modes, but also on the readers' situated reception and their already existing frameworks of memory.

Notes

1. Stanišič, *How the Soldier Repairs*, 308 (*Wie der Soldat*, 283).
2. 'Charlie', focus group interview 3, Manchester, 13 February 2020.
3. 'Christine', focus group interview 2, Manchester, 12 February 2020.
4. 'Amara', focus group interview 4, Sarajevo, 15 September 2020.
5. 'Dušica', focus group interview 8, Banja Luka, 17 September 2020.
6. Originally published as Sasa Stanišić, *Wie der Soldat das Grammofon repariert.* Luchterhand. 2006.
7. Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory.*
8. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*.
9. Keil and Perry, 'Introduction', 1–13; Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia*; David, *The Past Can't Heal Us*, 96–97; Jansen, 'Remembering with a Difference', 193–208; Duijzings, 'Commemorating Srebrenica', 141–66; Moll, 'Fragmented Memories'.
10. Delauney, 'Bosnian Serbs Defy Top UN Official'; Barton Hronešova, 'Ethnopopulist Denial'; Sindbæk Andersen and Wierød Borčak, 'Memory Conflicts and Memory Grey Zones'; Božić, 'Diversity in Ethnicization'.
11. Rigney, 'Ongoing', 354; Beronja and Vervaet, *Post-Yugoslav Constellations*, 3.
12. Rigney, A. 'Ongoing', 350.
13. Mälksoo, 'The Memory Politics of Becoming European', 655.
14. See, for example, Levy and Sznaider, *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, 166–70; Bryld and Warring, *Besættelsestiden Som Kollektiv Erindring*; Bell, *London Was Ours*, 175–200.
15. Originally published as Nicol Ljubić. *Meeresstille.* Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 2010.
16. Originally published as Alen Mešković. *Ukulele Jam*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2011.
17. Hemon, Aleksandar. 'A Coin'. In *The Question of Bruno*. London: Picador, 2001. On Hemon, see Tanović and Tanović, Literary Translingualism in the Balkans'.
18. Virant, 'Der Weltensammler und der Welterfinder'; Uca, '"Grissgott" meets "Kung Fu"'; Michel, 'Identitätskonstruktionen und Essensdarstellungen'. On Stanišić's language, see also Rock, 'Überflüssige Anführungsstriche'; Biti, 'Remembering Nowhere';

Matthes and Williams, 'Displacement, Self-(Re)Construction, and Writing the Bosnian War'; Ludewig, 'Es darf, nein, es muss weiter geträumt werden'.

19. Vervaet, 'Writing War, Writing Memory', 2.
20. Zimmer, 'The Politics of Screen Memory', 256, 260.
21. Domínguez, 'Ich sitze hier, damit niemand vergessen kann'; Condin. 'Literarische Spiegelungen'.
22. Peinado-Abarrio, 'A Geography of the Soul'; Golden, 'Remaking the Record'. See also Debeljak, 'Bosna u Čikagu', 45–46.
23. Jung, 'Hemon, Aleksandar.' 3; Raudvere, 'Experience and Expression', 182.
24. Vervaet, 'Cosmopolitan Counter-Narratives', 244.
25. Tanović, 'Letters to Nowhere', 85–86.
26. Tanović, 'On Prosthetic Memories'. See also Tanović and Tanović 'Literary Translingualism in the Balkans'. For a discussion of Mešković's use of musical references, see Slouková, 'Musik i migrationslitteratur'.
27. Haines, 'Introduction', 138–39. See also Cornejo et.al., *Wie viele Sprachen spricht die Literatur?*; Bürger-Koftis, *Eine Sprache, viele Horizonte*; Ortner, *Transcultural Memory*; Dunker, Gerstner and Osthues, *'Migrationsvordergrund'*.
28. See, for example, Hindse, 'Bare Litteratur'; Sloukova, 'Musik i migrationslitteratur'.
29. The main problem is that the term migrant literature or migrant author singles out or ghettoizes a group of authors and their literature as 'other'. Furthermore, the term urges readers to undertake a biographical reading, which entails the risk of overlooking aesthetic qualities or more universal concerns expressed in the books. See, for example, Weinberger, ' "Ich bin genauso deutsch wie Kafka" '; Ortner, *Transcultural Memory*, 57–61; Schmitz and Kölling, 'Gibt es eine Literatur der Migration?'
30. Olick, 'Collective Memory'. The collected memory is the personal memory, which nonetheless is informed by the collective context, thus influencing individual remembering. See also Erll, 'Narratology', 218.
31. See also Haines, 'The Eastern Turn', 133–39; Haines, 'Introduction', 146.
32. See, for example, Messner, *Postjugoslawische Antikriegsprosa*; Obradović, *Writing the Yugoslav Wars*; Borčak, *A Children's Literature?*; Norris, *Haunted Serbia*; Crnković, *Post-Yugoslav Literature and Film.*
33. See, for example, Beronja and Vervaet. *Post-Yugoslav Constellations*; Zimmermann, *Balkan Memories*.
34. Abonji, *Tauben fliegen auf* (*Fly Away, Pigeon*); Ugrešić, *Ministartsvo boli* (English translation *The Ministry of Pain*, 2005); Hemon, *Nowhere Man*.
35. Bodrožić, *Das Gedächtnis der Libellen*; Bodrožić, *Kirschholz und alte Gefühle*; Bodrožić, *Das Wasser unserer Träume*.
36. See, for example, Abonji's novel *Schildkrötensoldat*; Kordić, *Wie ich mir Glück vorstelle*; Bodrožić, *Hotel Zagorje* (English translation *The Hotel Tito*, 2017). For a discussion of several such works published in the region, see Borčak, *A Children's Literature?*
37. Filipović, *Zlata's Diary*. Other examples include Maric, *Bluebird: A Memoir*; Kadribegović, *Jeg var et barn, det var krig*; Efendić, *Jag var precis som du*.
38. Ypi, *Free*.
39. Ugrešić, *Kultura Laži* (English translation *The Culture of Lies*, 1998); Drakulić, *Balkan Express*.
40. Jergović, *Sarajevski Marlboro* (English translation *Sarajevo Marlboro*).
41. Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*; Hoare, *The History of Bosnia*.
42. For good overviews of the history of Yugoslavia, see Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History*; Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias*; Calic, *A History of Yugoslavia*.

43. Pavlowitch, *Yugoslavia*.
44. Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment*.
45. Stopić, Niebuhr and Pickus, *Yugoslavia, Nonalignment and Cold War Globalism*.
46. Vučetić, *Coca-Cola Socialism*.
47. Patterson, *Bought and Sold*.
48. Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History*, 265–331. See also, Lilly, *Power and Persuasion*; Batinić, Radeka and Šušnjara, 'Today, as I Become a Pioneer'; Erdei, ' "The Happy Child" '.
49. Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism*, 177–82.
50. Rusinow, 'The Avoidable Catastrophe', 13–37.
51. Ramet, 'Apocalypse Culture and Social Change in Yugoslavia'; Ramet, *Balkan Babel*, 3–76.
52. On the breakup of Yugoslavia and the outbreak of war, see also Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia*; Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy*; Silber and Little. *The Death of Yugoslavia.*
53. Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias*, 363–411.
54. Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History*, 352–64.
55. On Serbia in the 1990s, see Pavlaković, 'Serbia Transformed?', 13–54, and Gordy, *The Culture of Power in Serbia.*
56. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 45–49, 62–69.
57. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 117.
58. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 27, 32.
59. Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia*, 54–61; Bećirević, *Genocide on the Drina River*, 81–143.
60. Karčić, *Torture, Humiliate, Kill*, 121–40. See also Gow, *The Serbian Project and its Adversaries*, 134–38.
61. Allen, *Rape Warfare*.
62. Helms, *Innocence and Victimhood*, 54–58; Clark, *Rape*, 39–49.
63. Clark, *Rape*, 39.
64. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 171–81; Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History*, 373.
65. Ron, 'Territoriality and Plausible Deniability,' 293–99. See also Gow, *The Serbian Project and its Adverseraries*, 79–85.
66. Vukušić, *Serbian Paramilitaries*, 140–57.
67. Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945*, 115–24, 192–93, 256–61.
68. Vukušić, *Serbian Paramilitaries*, 47–51. The Chetnik movement of the Second World War was gradually rehabilitated in Serbia after the fall of the Socialist regime. See Đureinović, *The Politics of Memory of the Second World War in Contemporary Serbia*; Sindbæk, 'The Fall and Rise of a National Hero', 47–59.
69. Vukušić, 'Masters of Life and Death', 75–80; Vukušić, *Serbian Paramilitaries*, 143–46.
70. Vukušić, 'Masters of Life and Death', 79–80.
71. Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography*, 287–384.
72. Morrison and Lowe, *Reporting the Siege of Sarajevo*, 2–3.
73. Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography*, 287; Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 131–33.
74. Burg and Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, 140–49, 324–25.
75. Nettelfield and Wagner, *Srebrenica*, 8–14; Honig and Both, *Srebrenica.*
76. See the judgement from the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia: ICTY, 'Appeals Chamber Judgement in the case the Prosecutor v Radislav Krstić', 19 April 2004; ICTY, 'Trial Judgement Summary for Radovan Karadžić', 24 March 2016; ICTY, 'Trial Judgement Summary for Ratko Mladić', 22 November 2017.

77. Zwierzchowski and Tabeau, 'The 1992–95 War in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Census-based Multiple System Estimation of Casualties' Undercount.' Paper presented at International Research Workshop, *The Global Cost of Conflict*, 1–2 February 2010, Berlin.
78. Keil and Perry, 'Introduction', 1–13; Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia*.
79. David, *The Past Can't Heal Us*, 96–97; Jansen, 'Remembering with a Difference', 193–208; Duijzings, 'Commemorating Srebrenica', 141–66; Moll, 'Fragmented Memories'. See also Sindbæk Andersen and Wierød Borčak, 'Memory Conflicts and Memory Grey Zones', 1517–31.
80. Božić, 'Diversity in Ethnicization', 412–32.
81. Osborn and Brown, 'Dutch Cabinet Resigns over Srebrenica Massacre'; Holligan, 'Srebrenica massacre'; Campenhout, 'Dutch Give 'Deepest Apologies for Role in Srebrenica Genocide'.
82. United Nations meetings coverage and press release, 'General Assembly Adopts Resolution on Srebrenica Genocide'.
83. 'Bødskov forventer øget russisk aktivitet i Østersøen', n.p.
84. Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 2.
85. See also Rüsen, *History*, 11.
86. Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 5.
87. Erll and Rigney, 'Introduction', 2.
88. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 144.
89. Rigney, 'Ongoing', 354.
90. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 153.
91. Rigney, 'Remaking Memory', 12.
92. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 163–64. She refers to A. Assmann, 'Was sind kulturelle Texte?'
93. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 160.
94. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 162.
95. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 158.
96. Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll, 'Introduction', 1–23.
97. Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll, 'Introduction', 3.
98. Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory.* See also Rigney, 'Ongoing', 354.
99. Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*, 2.
100. Landsberg's idea of prosthetic memory may be compared to what Ricoeur describes as 'a simple evocation' (Aristoteles mneme or memory as pathos), which is an 'affection' and not the result of a deliberate search. Like prosthetic memory, an affection (mneme) might (re)appear 'unexpected', triggered at different occasions as if it is something we have lived through ourselves. Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, 26.
101. Rigney, 'Ongoing', 353.
102. Rigney, 'Ongoing', 354.
103. Rigney, 'Ongoing', 353; Rigney, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 70.
104. Rigney, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 70.
105. Olick refers to individual memories that are influenced by social frameworks but rooted in biological and physical processes as 'collected memories'. In contrast, collective memories are the media, social practices and institutions that enable groups to share memories. Olick, 'Collective Memory', 333–48.
106. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*.
107. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 15.
108. Erll, 'Remembering Across Time, Space, and Cultures', 111–12. Elsewhere, in line with the idea of premediation and with reference to Paul Ricoeur, Erll points out how in

any case 'our experience of reality is symbolically pre-figured', because cultures create symbolic orders 'which include, among other aspects, value hierarchies and an understanding of temporal processes'. Every literary text is related to this 'extra-literary world' ($Mimesis_1$), which is then configured in literature 'restructure[ing] real and imaginary or remembering and forgetting' ($Mimesis_2$), and finally received and actualized by readers, thereby affecting cultural memory ($Mimesis_3$). Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 153–55, referring to Ricoeur *Time and Narrative*, 54–55. Similarly, according to Halbwachs, literature is a cadre medial; that is, 'a medium from which social frames of memory can be derived', and which thereby 'pre-forms our encounter with reality; and then helps re-shape experience into our most personal memories.

109. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 170.
110. Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll, 'Introduction', 10. The term premediation is among others developed in Erll, 'From District Six to District 9 and Back'; Erll and Rigney, 'Mediation,' 8.
111. Rigney, 'Fiction as a Mediator', 80.
112. Rigney, 'Remaking Memory', 13.
113. Rigney, 'Remaking Memory', 14.
114. Assmann, 'Was sind kulturelle Texte?'. One especially prevalent example is Rainer Maria Remarque's novel *Im Westen nichts Neues* (*All Quiet on the Western Front)* that has been adopted as an actual account of soldiers' experiences of the First World War for several generations.
115. Erll and Rigney. 'Introduction', 3.
116. Rigney, 'Plenitude', 17; Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume*, 18–22.
117. Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 9.
118. Assmann and Conrad. *Memory in a Global Age*, 8.
119. Cesari and Rigney, 'Introduction'.
120. Bond, Craps and Vermeulen, *Memory Unbound*, 21.
121. Assmann 'The Holocaust'; Levy and Sznaider, 'Memory Unbound', 88. See also Levy and Sznaider, *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, 132.
122. Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*.
123. Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 4–18, 9; italics in original. Worried that 'transcultural memory' as a study of the mobility and flow of memories may overlook the political and cultural factors that impede the circulation of memories, de Cesari and Rigney advocate the term transnational memory, turning attention to the interplay between 'state-operated institutions of memory and the flow of mediated narratives within and across state borders'. See de Cesari and Rigney, 'Introduction', 4. Yet, Erll does indeed point out that there are 'options of misuses, hijacking or distortion of transcultural memory – and, perhaps more often than we think, its "idle running": travel without effect'. See Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 15.
124. Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 11. Italics in original.
125. Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 12.
126. Assmann and Conrad, 'Introduction', 2.
127. Erll, 'Travelling Memory', 12–13. Moreover, Erll points out that iconic 'memory contents' such as apartheid, 9/11 and the Holocaust travel by generating a 'great centrifugal force'. A fourth kind of travelling that Erll identifies is that of 'memory practices', such as when several countries adopt to erect Tombs of the Unknown Soldier to commemorate those soldiers who never were identified and buried properly. Finally, iconic shorthands for complex historic events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall are diffused as condensed 'figures of remembering'.

128. Rigney, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 65.
129. Erll and Rigney, 'Introduction', 1.
130. Rigney, *The Afterlives*, 20.
131. Rigney, 'Cultural Memory Studies', 74. See also Rigney, 'Ongoing', 353.
132. Erll and Rigney, 'Mediation', 8.
133. For the term 'expected readers', see below. We draw on the concepts of the 'narratee' and the 'virtual reader'. See Genette *Die Erzählung*; Prince 'Introduction to the Study of the Narratee', 7–25.
134. Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll, 'Introduction', 3.
135. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 157; Erll, 'Narratology', 212–26. Törnquist-Plewa, Sindbæk Andersen and Erll 'Introduction', 9.
136. Erll, *Gedächtnisromane*; Rigney, 'Remaking Memory', 11.
137. In contrast to Assmann's cultural texts, collective texts are dynamic 'vehicle(s) for envisioning the past', creating, circulating and shaping contents of 'cultural memory,' Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 164; Assmann, 'Was sind kulturelle Texte?' On the idea of portable memory, see Rigney, *The Afterlives*, 20.
138. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 146; Erll, 'Narratology', 219.
139. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 157.
140. Erll, 'Narratology', 220.
141. Erll, 'Narratology', 220.
142. Assmann, J, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, 48–56; Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 28.
143. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 28.
144. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 160–63; Assmann, 'Was sind kulturelle Texte?'
145. Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 172. Erll modifies this, explaining that also omniscient narrators can represent communicative memory when they focus on individual experiences, and internal focalization can represent cultural memory when there is attached cultural value to their individual experiences. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 167.
146. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 165.
147. Erll, *Gedächtnisromane*, 165; Erll, 'Narratology', 220; Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 172–73.
148. Erll, 'Narratology', 215.
149. Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 177.
150. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 158.
151. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 152.
152. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 165–66.
153. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 164. Erll uses the term extrapresentional acts for those expressions that comment, describe and reflect. See also Lanser, *Fictions of Authority*, 16.
154. Erll, G*edächtnisromane*, 154–55.
155. Erll, 'Narratology', 221.
156. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 159.
157. Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 180–81.
158. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 159; Erll, *Gedächtnisromane*, 157–59.
159. Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 184.
160. Erll, 'Narratology', 221.
161. Genette, *Die Erzählung*, 169, 266–67.
162. Genette, *Die Erzählung*, 266. This is a suggestion that we find discussable, as the figure who is addressed can give a precise picture of the type of reader that the author wants to address.
163. Genette, *Die Erzählung*, 169–70. On virtual reader, see also page 260.

164. Prince, 'Introduction to the Study of the Narratee', 7–25, 9. This understanding resembles Wolff's idea of the intended reader that is 'the idea of the reader that forms in the author's mind', Wolff, 'Der intendierte Leser', 166. Prince both differentiates the narratee from the concept of the intended reader and rejects the understanding of the narratee as the 'ideal reader', stating that 'for a writer, an ideal reader would be one who would understand perfectly and would approve entirely the least of his words, the most subtle of his intention'. Neither can the narratee be identified with the actual reader because the former is fictive, whereas the latter is real.
165. See, for example, Petrowskaja's addressing of her reader in *Maybe Esther*, 194. For a discussion, see Ortner, *Transcultural Memory*, 113–14.
166. Haines suggests that the dissolution of the Iron Curtain as well as the breakup of Yugoslavia have led to a new wave of migrant writings and argues that the authors of these writings tend to have a common mission to enlighten and inform Western readers about their Eastern neighbours. Haines, 'The Eastern Turn', 139.
167. Damrosch, *What is World Literature?*
168. Iser. 'Indeterminacy', 3–33, 7.
169. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 7.
170. Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens*, 62.
171. Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens*, 53.
172. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 7.
173. Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens*, 284.
174. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 9–10.
175. Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke*, 280–81.
176. Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke* 1, 311.
177. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 9.
178. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 7.
179. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 8.
180. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 8.
181. Iser, 'Indeterminacy', 8.
182. Kaakinen, *Comparative Literature*, 6.
183. Kaakinen, *Comparative Literature*, 7; Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 18.
184. Kaakinen, *Comparative Literature*, 7.
185. Radstone, 'What Place Is This?' 117.
186. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, 15.
187. Rigney, *The Afterlives*, 20.
188. Erll and Rigney, 'Introduction', 5.
189. Assmann, 'Canon and Archive', 98.
190. Erll, 'Narratology', 220.
191. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, our interviews in Berlin, Banja Luka and Sarajevo were facilitated by a local consultant, while we participated online via Zoom.
192. To accommodate restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic, the focus groups in Berlin were divided into three so the required distance between the interviewees could be guaranteed.
193. Morgan, 'Focus Groups', 144.
194. Cyr, *Focus Groups*, 45.
195. Morgan, 'Focus Groups', 139,
196. Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, 502.
197. Coupland, 'Remembering Blaenavon', 281.

198. See also Galletta, *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview*, 48. Discussions lasted on average around ninety minutes. All sessions were recorded using audio and video equipment. In addition, detailed notes, including statements and interaction between participants, were taken by either one researcher (Manchester, Berlin, Sarajevo and Banja Luka) or two (Copenhagen).
199. Brosch, 'Introduction', 8. See also, for example, Miall, 'Literariness'; Miall, 'Towards an Empirical Model of Literariness'; Koopman, 'Effects of 'Literariness'; Otis, 'Affective Neuroscience'; Kövecses, 'Cognitive Linguistics'; Caracciolo, 'Cognitive Science'.
200. Miall, 'Literariness', 94.