

DIMITRIJE MITRINOVIĆ IN THE
QUEST FOR GNOSIS. FROM NATIONAL
TO COSMOPOLITAN IDENTITY¹

Faculty of Political Science
University of Belgrade

Abstract: The paper follows the development of Mitrinović's identity from local Serbian and then Yugoslav, to cosmopolitan. The change to a supranational identity already began during his Rome (1911-1913) and Munich periods (1913-1914), and was completed during the Great War, which he spent in London where he had moved in 1914. During the Great War his concepts became increasingly focused on universal ideas connected to Christianity. In London, Mitrinović launched a series of initiatives, some of which were religiously based while others were more secular. The recollections of his contemporaries and disciples are contradictory. While early followers of Mitrinović who were with him during the Great War, in the 1920s and in the early 1930s (Graham, Mairet, Davis, Watt, etc.) describe a mystical Mitrinović, his later followers, who gathered in the New Atlantis Foundation, left recollections of a more rational and secular Mitrinović. This is explained by two streams of his thought and his followers. The paper identifies the core of Mitrinović's teaching as belonging to the Judeo-Christian tradition with the influence of Gnostic Christianity being particularly prominent.

Keywords: Dimitrije Mitrinović, Gnosticism, social club, cosmopolitan identity, Eric Gutkind

Dimitrije Mitrinović has been described in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* by his most diligent student in the West as a “philosopher and social critic” (Rigby 2008). The leading Serbian biographical publication defines him in the following way: “writer, national revolutionary and publicist” (Popović 2014: 787). Henry LeRoy Finch, thanks to whom Mitrinović's articles from *The New Age* and *New Britain* were republished in English, calls him “a Christian theosophist” (LeRoy Finch 1969: 12). The editor of his collected papers in Serbian, Predrag Palavestra, entitled two chapters of his book on him, dealing with the two periods of his life (Bosnian and British), in the following way: “a conspirator or a preacher”, and “an unrecognised prophet” (Palavestra 2003: 5, 279). Most recently, Dušan Pajin called him “one of the visionaries of the 20th century” (Pajin 2016: 7). Could one man be all of this: a philosopher, a social critic, a writer, a national revolutionary, a theosophist, a preacher and a prophet?

¹ Some parts of this paper were presented at the round table on Dimitrije Mitrinović organised by Dr. Nemanja Radulović and Dr. Aleksandar Jerkov. The round table was held on December 10, 2013, at the University Library in Belgrade.

It is obviously difficult to capture this peculiar personality in just two or three words. Mitrinović spent the last 39 years of his life in London and its vicinity (1914–1953), and after his death a foundation, the New Atlantis, was established and was dedicated to the dissemination of his ideas, as well as studying thinkers who Mitrinović held in high esteem. In 1987, Mitrinović's ideas became available in English when one of his followers collected his newspaper articles, published papers, and edited notes from his lectures (Rutherford 1987). What becomes clear from various comments on Mitrinović is that there are at least two distinctive groups of his commentators. His followers from the late 1930s and the 1940s described him in rather practical terms, insisting on his plans for social reform and the creation of European and world federations. However, his early British disciples from the period of the Great War and the 1920s had depicted him in a different manner. For them he was a theosophist, a guru, even a black magician. This paper re-examines particularly the first group of his British followers in an effort to at least partially decode the neglected layers of Mitrinović's thought. It also endeavours to find continuity in Mitrinović's ideas.

Dimitrije Mitrinović as a Yugoslav Nationalist and Ideologue of the Young Bosnia

Dimitrije Mitrinović was born in 1887 in a village in Herzegovina to a family of ethnic Serbs. Nine years earlier Austria-Hungary had been given a mandate by the Treaty of Berlin to occupy and administer the former Ottoman provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This act caused substantial dissatisfaction in the provinces among their two biggest ethnic and religious groups: the Christian Orthodox Serbs and the Bosnian Slav Muslims. By the end of the century the situation was further complicated by the penetration of two national movements into Bosnia: the Serbian and the Croatian. Under such conditions the unilateral annexation of the provinces by Austria-Hungary in 1908 was bound to cause further dissatisfaction, strengthened by emerging local nationalisms. It was precisely in this period that, in addition to the Serbian and Croatian national movements, a third movement also emerged: the Serbo-Croat or Yugoslav movement.

At the beginning of the 20th century, many Bosnian high school pupils and students studying in Vienna, Zagreb, Belgrade and Prague, turned into devoted advocates of Yugoslav, Serbian or Croatian national ideologies. In the period between the Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary and the outbreak of the Great War (1908–1914), every year Bosnian high school youths tended to get progressively more radical and increasingly pro-Yugoslav. Mitrinović was already influenced by the emerging Serbian nationalism while attending the gymnasium in Mostar (from 1899 to 1907). At the very beginning of the 20th century only 30

natives of Bosnia and Herzegovina held university degrees (Dedijer 1967: 176). Therefore, the local gymnasia (grammar schools) played a much bigger intellectual role than in other areas of Europe. Under local circumstances gymnasia pupils became leading intellectuals not infrequently while still in their teens. Literary circles in gymnasia easily turned into political cultural clubs, often imbued with radical political ideas. Austro-Hungarians were eager to modernise Bosnia and Herzegovina, and this included the implementation of a modern education system. Ironically, this effort only encouraged the anti-Austrian feelings among the local high school pupils influenced by the emerging nationalisms.

One such educational institution established by the Austro-Hungarian authorities was the Mostar Gymnasium, founded in 1893. Student associations were not officially permitted in the gymnasia of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Consequently, various informal and covert associations consisting of high school pupils emerged and flourished. Thus, in 1904, Mitrinović formed the “Secret Library”, which was soon transformed into a secret literary society called “Matica”. Already in this period he was a staunch Yugoslav (Dedijer 1967: 177). The work in the “Secret Library” made him inclined to secret societies and he soon joined another one, “Sloboda” (Liberty), which acted under the leadership of a kindred spirit, Bogdan Žerajić. Although some members of this society advocated primarily Serbian views, Mitrinović insisted on Yugoslav unity and on finding ways for Serbs and Croats to come closer through culture and literature (Palavestra 1991: 24). In his Yugoslav orientation Mitrinović was several years ahead of other Young Bosnians. The Mostar Gymnasium became one of the centres of the so-called Young Bosnians, a loosely connected group of secret youth literary societies with the political aim of liberating Bosnia and Herzegovina from Austro-Hungarian rule (Dedijer 1967: 175). At least three different streams may be identified among them: 1) Serbian and Yugoslav (Serbo-Croat) nationalism; 2) revolutionary zeal to create socially more just societies, and 3) ideas on the ethical improvement of man.

In 1907, upon graduating from the Mostar Gymnasium, Mitrinović became a student in Zagreb, where he studied philosophy, psychology and logic. He occasionally attended some lectures in Belgrade, and from 1909 he studied in Zagreb and Vienna. He remained committed to literary efforts in Bosnia and contributed to the literary journal *Bosanska Vila*. His contributions to this journal in 1908–1913 made him famous among the South Slavs and he gradually became one of the spiritual leaders of the literary movement of Young Bosnia. From the end of 1909, he put in a lot of effort into launching a new journal called *Zora*. In the first issue of this Vienna-based journal (with the editorial board in Zagreb), he defined its programme consisting of two principles: socio-political and democratic-Yugoslav. He advocated co-operation not only between Serbs and Croats, but also with other Slavs, particularly with “our great Russia”,

“with our Czech brethren who are the closest to us in terms of cultural influence”, but also with the Poles, “who are so close to us by their national misfortune.” He ended his programme by proclaiming the new motto of “personal, modern Serbian culture” (SDDM, 1991: vol. 2, 165–167).

On June 15, 1910, his close friend Žerajić committed suicide after his attempt at life of the Governor of Bosnia and Herzegovina, General Marijan Varešanin, failed. Prior to this Žerajić had even contemplated assassinating Emperor Franz Joseph during his visit to Bosnia, two weeks earlier. Mitrinović was compromised by Žerajić’s action, and an anonymous letter was sent to the Sarajevo police by someone in Zagreb, but since the police found no compromising material in his apartment in Zagreb, Mitrinović was only briefly detained.

Starting in the spring of 1910 Mitrinović became a great advocate of the art of the Croatian sculptor Ivan Meštrović. He viewed him as a symbol of the emerging Serbo-Croat or Yugoslav nation. He had contacts with and the support of some semi-official circles in Belgrade, but no one has ever been able to clarify the exact nature of these contacts, although some links suggest that he may have co-operated with the nationalist Belgrade organisation “Narodna Odbrana” (National Defence). In Belgrade, Mitrinović was seen as a good promoter of the Yugoslav idea and for this purpose he did receive some funding. However, throughout his student years he proved capable of finding support through personal contacts. Scarce sources, however, preclude the identification of those Maecenas. Judging by his London years, one is tempted to conclude that he was very popular among women. He was encouraged by his contacts in Belgrade to go to Rome and to report from there to the Serbian press. At the beginning of 1911 he moved to Rome, and stayed there till the beginning of 1913, when he moved to Munich. In the same period, he also made visits to Sarajevo and Belgrade and was instrumental in connecting various pro-Yugoslav cultural groups (SDDM, 1991: vol. 1, 42–42, 47–53).

From Futurism to Utopian Universalism

What happened to Mitrinović’s inner world in Rome is not something that his friends from Sarajevo or Belgrade expected or hoped for. They wanted to have a pro-Yugoslav and a pro-Serbian propagandist and activist. He, however, came into contact with the futurist movement, witnessed the development of avant-garde art and was immediately absorbed by it. The best specialist on Mitrinović and the editor of his collected works in Serbian (Serbo-Croat), Predrag Palavestra, described this Rome transformation in the following way: “Mitrinović’s critical and aesthetic thought, imbued with moral principles and theological justifications, abruptly turned, in contact with the futurist programme, to the future and to utopia. The secular character of that utopia came closer to the es-

oteric philosophy of new man and to his messianic role in coming times as pure revival of poetic forebodings” (SDDM, 1991: vol. 1, 45). A literary testimony of these futurist and utopian strivings appeared in the *Bosanska Vila* in 1913, in 10 instalments published from February to October under the title “Estetičke kontemplacije” (Aesthetic Contemplations) (SDDM, 1991: vol. 2, 91-138).² The editor of Mitrinović’s works and lecture notes in English, Henry Christian Rutherford, assesses these essays as “the guiding principles which marked the rest of his own life and work” (Rutherford 1987: 1).

He came to Munich to study art under the supervision of Heinrich Wölfflin. His interest in cosmopolitan rather than Yugoslav affairs became even more prominent in the Bavarian capital, where he “turned his previous revolutionary dogma into a chiliastic vision” (Palavestra 1991: 53–54). A clear shift is seen in his essay on Benedetto Croce’s philosophy completed at the end of 1913, and this essay “had almost no connection to the national idea” (Palavestra 1991: 54). Palavestra considers Mitrinović’s article “For Yugoslavia”, written in Munich in the spring of 1914, as his “final farewell to his life up to that moment, and his farewell to the ideas of Yugoslav unity” (Palavestra 1991: 57). In this article, published in the Zagreb journal *Vihor* in May 1914, he made an appeal: “Serbo-Croats with Slovenes, unite your hearts into an uncreated nation, and do not lose your spirit!” (SDDM, 1991: vol 2, 205). His decision to leave his native land and to dedicate his efforts to universal rather than national ideas certainly disappointed many of his former associates. His brother Čedomilj still remembered in 1954 that Dimitrije: “simply disappeared and vanished from the public life of his country. He went away from Serbia and stayed in Rome, Munich, Tübingen. To his fellow country-men at home it seemed that he had become dead and feelingless towards his own country” (Rigby 2006: 20, 22).

In his novel *St. Vitus Day*, the British author Stephen Graham offers an imaginary conversation between Mitrinović and Bogdan Žerajić in the presence of a schoolboy named Miloš. He presents them as two personalities characteristic of the youth movement who “made the neighbouring town of Mostar into a cultural centre radiating beyond Bosnia” (Graham 1931: 21). Since he was Mitrinović’s friend and even a disciple for a time, he is very likely to have been provided with some elements of the conversation by Mitrinović himself. The dialogue is supposed to have happened in Sarajevo in 1910, some time before Žerajić made his (in)famous assassination attempt on Varešanin. In the novel Žerajić says that since 1908, in other words since the annexation of Bosnia, “we have all become nationalists.” The musician “Mitya Mitrinovitch”³ replies to this remark in the following way:

² An abridged version of “Aesthetic Contemplations” in English was published in H. C. Rutherford, *Certainly Future*, pp. 17–43.

³ Mita is a common nickname in Serbo-Croat for Dimitrije.

Nationalists for the sake of Socialism. Nationalism is only wrong when it forgets the larger ideal, the brotherhood of Man. The consciousness of unity progresses by stages. The Austrians are pleased to call us Bosniaks, but we know we are Serbs. The King of the Serbs freed us from the Turks. And Serbs, with Bulgars and Croats, are all Yugoslavs. In Yugoslavia we might have a nucleus for a new civilisation. We shared death in the fourteenth century, and reconstruction in the nineteenth. Our priest is the sculptor Mestrovitch who, through art, unites us consciously with our great past. But Serbia does not rise for Serbia's sake, but for the sake of man as a whole. Our unity, if we achieve it, must be a cell in a greater unity (Graham 1931: 32–33).

A few paragraphs down, Mitrinović insists that he is against violence and that his only violence was “the violence of our printing press at Mostar”, adding that war is not his *métier* (Graham 1931: 24, 26). There is no doubt that Mitrinović had espoused precisely these ideas in the period between 1910 and 1914, and the lines attributed to him aptly reflect the gradual transformation of his Yugoslav nationalism into a universalist cosmopolitanism, a process that was fully completed during the Great War.

Mitrinović, Gutkind and Kandinsky

On the eve of the Great War, in the late spring and early summer of 1914, Dimitrije Mitrinović put all his efforts into publishing an ambitiously envisaged annual, 500 pages in length, entitled *The Aryan Europe or Foundations of the Future (Die arische Europa oder Grundlage der Zukunft)*. The annual was to lead to the establishment of an international movement “Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe” (*Zur Menschheit der Zukunft durch das arysche Europa*) (UB – SC, NAF, 1.4.1).⁴ He wrote from Munich to Wassily Kandinsky, Russian painter and theorist, that political action was necessary. Kandinsky seems to have believed that mankind was approaching the Third Age, an epoch that Joachim of Flora announced, at the beginning of the 13th century, as the new age of the Spirit. For Kandinsky his abstract painting “was the gospel of this new age” (Kermode 1985: 96). In these ideas he also was under the influence of Dmitrii Merezhkovsky (Behr 1992: 83). In preparing the *Yearbook* Mitrinović exploited the concept of an élite group that would spiritually lead the world, and he mentioned in a letter to Eric Gutkind, in June 1914, an “organization for a pan-human little brotherhood of the most world-worthy bearers of present-day culture” (Behr 1992: 85). The original idea for the *Yearbook* came to Mitrinović through the mediation of Kandinsky and Giovanni Papini, who was an Italian futurist at that time. Previously, Eric Gutkind and Frederik van Eeden had already

⁴ “Draft of a letter of Mitrinović to Erich Gutkind”, June 27, 1914. The letter was translated into English by the members of the New Atlantis Foundation (NAF), and was also published in Serbian translation in: SDDM.

discussed attracting “chosen spirits”. They called their fraternity “Blutbund” (the Blood Brotherhood) and Mitrinović obviously adopted their idea (Rutherford 1987: 7–8).

He had already been inspired by Russian spirituality and therefore easily found a common ground with Kandinsky, who had similar preferences. It was Kandinsky who connected Mitrinović with another person sympathetic to mysticism, Eric (Erich) Gutkind (1877–1965). In 1910 the latter published a book entitled *Die Siderische Geburt* (Sideral Birth). Upon reading this book Mitrinović became fascinated with it. In June 1914 he wrote to Kandinsky: “it seems to me that *Die Siderische Geburt* is worthy to be the true religion of a pan-Europe” (UB – SC, NAF, 1.3.3).⁵ Two days later he admits to Gutkind that *Sideral Birth* has become “a book which supports and uplifts me, next to the most important things through which I support and defend myself” (UB - SC, NAF, 1.4.1, SDDM 1991: vol. 2, 236).⁶ From June 1914 he considered it as “the main fundamental book for developing our cultural philosophy of pan-Aryandom”. In his letter to Gutkind he states: “We should like to entrust to you the guidance of the religion of pan-Europe” (UB – SC, NAF, 1.4.1, SDDM 1991: vol. 2, 238–239).⁷

In the first chapter of his book entitled “Thou, Thou End of the World” Gutkind explained his basic concepts. The current civilisation could not progress forever, “the world must come to an end, but this can no longer frighten us”. In accordance with Gnostic and certain other esoteric teachings, Gutkind saw a huge divine potential in humans: “In holy poverty we shall renounce the limitations of our little personality, this merely mechanical, as yet lifeless ego in order to gain our higher seraphic self, which is not subject to death, but partakes of all that is divine and will redeem the silent depths” (Gutkind 1969: 180). As Henry LeRoy Finch has noted, *Sideral Birth* was under the influence of German Romanticism and of authors like Novalis, Schelling, Boehme and Nietzsche. LeRoy Finch has clearly noticed: “Its apocalyptic theme is expressed in terms more Gnostic and Christian than Jewish” (LeRoy Finch 1969: 13–14). However, he neglected another possibility: that of Jewish Gnosticism, which might have influenced Gutkind (Scholem 1946).

The Gospel of Philip, a Gnostic text found in 1945, teaches that one who achieves *gnosis* is “no longer a Christian, but a Christ” (Pagels 1986: 140). In other words, there is potential in humans to reach the consciousness of God. Gutkind’s sideral birth is equivalent to the Gnostic discovery of *gnosis* within oneself. Or as he put it: “The transcendence we speak of is Sideral Birth... And the realm to which we seek to rise, which is

5 Mitrinović to Kaninsky, Munich, June 25, 1914 (the file includes the original letters in German and English translations typed by someone from NAF. The quote is from the NAF translation).

6 “Draft of a letter of Mitrinović to Erich Gutkind”, June 27, 1914.

7 Ibid.

the consummation of ‘word’ we will call, making free use of a gnostic term – Pleroma”. Or as he stated even more openly: “Now everything must be imbued with this: that from now on we rise to sidereal birth in which we ourselves become God” (Rutherford 1975: 15–16). From 1914 Mitrinović’s quest for gnosis had two aims. One was his own spiritual perfection, and the other was to find other people in search of *gnosis* and organise them into a group.

The fusion of the earlier revolutionary zeal and futurist activism with Gutkind’s teaching led Mitrinović to postulate a need for the unity of Aryan peoples: Germanic, Latin, Anglo-Saxon and Slavic. They would create a nucleus that would later unite with India and the Ancient East. In that unity the revelations of Judeo-Christian traditions would be connected with the revelation of India. This was a big and resolute turn for Mitrinović, both in terms of ideas and geography. He shifted his geographic interests from the Balkans to Indo-Europe and the world, and in terms of ideas he directed his attention to the concept of Pan-Humanity. The turn in 1914 had a religious basis: a new syncretic religion of humanity with a (Judeo-) Christian Gnostic basis. This shift to religious inspiration stood in sharp contrast with his previous association with the Young Bosnia literary circles, which were deeply secular and viewed religion as an obstacle for the unity of Yugoslavs, who were desperately separated into three, often antagonistic, religious groups.

As noted above, Mitrinović became an ideologue of the movement of Young Bosnia in the 1910–1914 period. The movement was, in some aspects, even anti-religious, and in ideological terms very close to certain aspects of anarchism and socialism. And yet, it was precisely in that same period in which he fascinated so many pro-Yugoslav secularists (1912–1914) that he defined the basics of his chiliastic and utopian teachings in which Yugoslavism was only a small step in his search for the global unity of mankind. These teachings were in sharp contrast with the secular ideology of Yugoslavism, which found its clearest expression in the works of the most influential literary critic in Belgrade, Jovan Skerlić. He had a very high opinion of Mitrinović’s pro-Yugoslav and modernist contributions, but died too early (in May 1914) to recognise Mitrinović’s transformation.

Towards European and Universal Identity

Mitrinović was lucky enough to escape from Germany on the very eve of the Great War, just a few days before the German police attempted to interrogate him in connection with the fact that the Sarajevo conspirators led by Gavrilo Princip were ideologically connected to the literary circles in which Mitrinović was held in the highest esteem. Discussing the destiny of the Sarajevo plotters, primarily of Gavrilo Princip and Nedeljko Čabrinović, Rebecca West was prompted to remark:

What these youths did was abominable, precisely as abominable as the tyranny they destroyed. Yet it need not be denied that they might have grown to be good men, and perhaps great men, if the Austrian Empire had not crashed down on them in its collapse. But the monstrous frailty of empire involves such losses (West 1993: 379).

Indeed, many a great man emerged from the ranks of Serbo-Croat (Yugoslav) secret youth associations and literary clubs that existed in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the eve of the Great War and that were later commonly known under the name of Young Bosnia. One of them, Ivo Andrić, became a diplomat of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and a writer. He was the first president of the Serbo-Croat Progressive Youth (also known as Yugoslav Progressive Youth), a Serbo-Croat union of grammar school pupils in Sarajevo, founded at the end of 1911 (Glišović 2012: 19–23) (a club that admitted Gavrilo Princip into its ranks). In the final year of the gymnasium Andrić was strongly influenced by Mitrinović and his broad culture. Čabrinović and Princip died in Austro-Hungarian prisons. Andrić was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1961. Mitrinović escaped from continental Europe just before the outbreak of the war and became the initiator of many social movements in Britain. The two Young Bosnians who survived made a broad intellectual impact and their contemplations reached far beyond their early focus on Serbian, Serbo-Croat and South-Slav nationalisms.

Coming to Britain in August 1914 Mitrinović had to make his efforts all over again and in the beginning he had few followers. He was associated with the Serbian Legation in London throughout the war, and survived the war by receiving some money from it. Since he was admitted to work for the Legation thanks to his connections with pro-Yugoslav and pro-Serbian circles in Bosnia and Croatia, he had to demonstrate his commitment to Yugoslav propaganda during the Great War, although this may not have been his highest priority by that time. His thoughts and strivings seemed to have been redirected to more global affairs.

His inner spiritual circle in London consisted of the Serbian theologian and priest Nikolai Velimirovich⁸ (at that point also very much imbued with the ideas of Christian unity and under some influence of the traditions of the India), the British writer Stephen Graham, who had in British terms unusual sympathies for Russia, and himself. Stephen Graham came into contact with Velimirovich and Mitrinović in the winter of 1915. Both left a deep impression on him. Graham described Velimirovich in the following way: “In the spiritual anxiety of the war, with Christians arrayed against Christians, there was a singularly attractive quality of Fr Nikolai. He was gentle, persuasive and original, like a page of the Gospel read for the first time. The Spirit of Truth was pilgrimaging

⁸ The form of spelling “Nikolai Velimirovich” is the one that he himself used when he signed his affidavit following the Second World War. Previously he used several different transcriptions of his name into English.

among us” (Graham 1964: 103). Although he had the highest appreciation for Nikolai Velimirovich, Graham came under the spell of Mitrinović. The Rector of St. Margaret’s Church, Westminster, Canon Carnegie, organized a reception at his home. It was there that Graham met Mitrinović. As he himself confesses: “Dating from that evening I came strongly under his influence and while I was in London we were much together” (Graham 1964: 102).

Graham described what was in Mitrinović’s heart at the time. “For him the young Christendom which he planned had to be a secret society. We must operate from the invisible towards the visible, from an initiated few to the many who were as yet unaware of the movement” (Graham 1964: 121). Graham also quoted what Mitrinović said to him and Fr. Nikolai in the early stages of their friendship: “We are secretly committed to giving our lives to the realization of the Kingdom of Heaven upon Earth and all we do will be directed to that purpose. We will cautiously seek allies and persuade them to join us and form a Christianly conscious nucleus. All in secret, all below ground. The more secret we are, the greater spiritual strength we draw, till we are ready to break surface and grow to be a mighty tree” (Graham 1964: 121). That tree never grew high. Among others, Mitrinović tried to draw in the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, an Anglo-Catholic, and the leading spirit of the Church of England committed to co-operation with Christian Orthodox Churches. Fynes-Clinton had very high opinion of Velimirovich but did not subscribe to Mitrinović’s ideas.

Graham was so impressed by Mitrinović that he described him in his book *The Quest of the Face*. In the introduction Graham expresses his hope that for his future readers the book “may be an invitation to become builders of the City in which Dushan and I have been active spiritual masons” (Graham 1918)⁹. Dushan, as Graham explained later, was actually Mitrinović, a man whom he did not choose to be the protagonist of his book. Rather, it was Dushan who chose Stephen Graham. Mitrinović’s identity formation was explained in the novel. This new identity was framed in Rome, Munich and Berlin (1911–1914), and was completed in London during the course of the Great War. Dushan was described in the following way: “He is a Southern Slav, a representative of one of the ruined peoples of the Balkans. His country, Serbia, is lost. He tells me he has ceased to be a Serb, because Serbia is not any more and cannot be again what it was, even if it should rise from death. He calls himself a European, and pleads that all should obtain, in addition of consciousness of nationality, the higher consciousness of being Europeans”. Dushan also offered to Graham a scheme of individual progress: Infant – Individual – National – Group-National – Universal (Graham 1918: 75). Indeed, Mitrinović impressed his British friend so much that he was led to write the following: “There is something of this nature about Dushan, that is

⁹ See prefatory note to the book.

why I have called him a mystical fraction, a phrase that I thought rightly applied to Christ" (Graham 1918: 78). To Graham, Mitrinović became, during the war, precisely what a Gnostic would find the highest purpose of life: he became Godlike.

It is interesting that already in his letter to Gutkind, composed on the very eve of the Great War, Mitrinović expressed his desire to deliver four lectures in Berlin. The second lecture was to be dedicated, among other things, to "antipatriotic movements", and in connection with the future of mankind (SDDM 1991: vol. 2, p. 237)¹⁰. His full shift from Yugoslav nationalism to universalism obviously took place between 1913 and 1915. Mitrinović found in England a fertile ground for his universalist ideas packed into a pan-Christian framework. His universalism clearly stemmed from Christianity, but in his version, Christianity was blended with esoteric phenomena and was seen as a personal revelation. This made him closer to Gnostic rather than literalist interpretations of Christianity.

During the war he was expected to demonstrate his commitment to the Yugoslav idea. He found a way to combine Yugoslavism and his newly developed universalist ideas by proclaiming the pro-Serbian and pro-Yugoslav Croatian sculptor Ivan Meštrović an expression of a universal spirit. A Slovene émigré in London during the Great War, Dr. Bogumil Vošnjak, described a meeting, held probably in February 1917, in a London Indian restaurant. It was attended by father Nikolai Velimirovich, Josip Kosor, George Bell, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mitrinović, and himself. At the meeting Mitrinović said "that every Yugoslav statesman should know that Yugoslavs are a mixture of great Eastern and Western peoples. He claimed that Meštrović was a complete Assyrian" (Vošnjak 1928: 182). At another meeting, held in 1916, Mitrinović, "a well-known Christian aesthete", was to speak about Yugoslav ethics. "But they began teasing him that he spoke at some lecture on Assyrians and Egyptians while Meštrović, a Dalmatian peasant, sat next to him, and that he did not understand a single word that was said about his own art" (Vošnjak 1928: 187). It is characteristic that by 1917 Mitrinović, who had belonged to the very secular cultural movement of Young Bosnia, had already earned a reputation among Yugoslav émigrés of "a well-known Christian aesthete".

Since his teens he had believed he possessed a certain knowledge into which he should initiate those who were selected. It was already in his student years in Zagreb that he invented a password to be used for the mutual recognition of devotees. His secret was gradually transformed and from 1914 it was related not only to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbs, Croats and Yugoslav peoples, but became connected with the future of mankind. In its essence, it was an expression of the optimistic stream within the avant-garde movement, the stream which believed in the vast

¹⁰ Mitrinović to Gutkind, June 27, 1914. The Letter was published in Serbian translation.

possibilities of improving the world. To understand the fusion of science and religious teachings that Mitrinović attempted to make, one needs to look at the atmosphere that existed in London in the circles that were of interest to Mitrinović.

Efforts to make a Universalist Society

During the 19th century Christianity faced a great crisis in Britain, especially in intellectual circles. There was a general belief that the Victorian age was the age of profound belief in God. However, the Victorian age ushered in new lines of thought in Britain: those of atheism and unconventional faith. Mitrinović subscribed to the latter. It wasn't just philosophers, writers and priests, but politicians as well, who began to feel that the Victorian Age was the age of deep doubts about established church canons. This means that, in intellectual circles, the 19th century undermined the significance that Christianity had enjoyed in the Western world in everyday life. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to state that it was the era "of religious seriousness than of faith" (Vidler 1974: 112). The crisis of institutional religion among intellectual élites opened up new avenues of thinking. On the margins of this crisis emerged the need to connect faith with science, a fusion that had various outcomes. One was to identify a secret science, teachings that were left to modern men by older civilisations. Another effort was to reconcile science and religion, which appeared in the very popular form of spiritism. Finally, in an effort to connect faith with secret teachings, occultism also emerged. All these phenomena were very much alive and present in the British society at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

The Theosophical Society of Madame Blavatsky was founded in 1875 in New York. Madame Petrovna Blavatsky (1831–1891) moved to London in 1887, and lived there until the end of her life four years later. During the course of her last four years she succeeded in spreading Theosophy around Britain to a surprising degree. She believed that evolution was headed by "a chosen elect", by "a brotherhood of hidden masters". This brotherhood revealed its hidden truth from its seat in Himalayas, and Blavatsky was supposed to be one of their instruments. The British Theosophical Society had existed since 1878, and therefore it was able to distribute Madame Blavatsky's book *The Secret Doctrine* (Blavatsky 1888). It was as early as 1887 that a person as prominent as W. B. Yeats joined Blavatsky's lodge. Theosophy later attracted such celebrities such as Oscar Wilde, Thomas Edison and artists Mondrian and Kandinsky (Coverley 2008: 77–82). The journalist A. R. Orage, who would become Mitrinović's chief propagator after the Great War, was also a member of the Theosophical Society, and an admirer of Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* (Mairet 1966: 16–17).

The Theosophical Society had a competitor in The Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn founded in 1888 when the Order established its first

temple of Isis-Urania in London. Among the prominent persons who soon joined the Order there was W. B. Yeats again. In the 1890s, some of the leading personalities of Victorian London's cultural life joined the Order (Coverley 2008: 82–87).

Besides Stephen Graham and Fr. Nikolai Velimirovich, Mitrinović attracted several more disciples during the Great War. One of them was the writer and journalist Philip Mairet (1886–1975). He mentions that he became “Mitrinović's most intimate disciple by 1917” (Mairet 1966: xi, 16). Another was Alfred Richard Orage (1873–1934) who earned a substantial reputation as the editor of *The New Age* (1907–1922), a British literary and modernist journal. *The New Age* was open for radical political thought and it advocated schemes of Guild Socialism and Social Credit. Orage was a student of Plato, Plotinus and Eastern teachings, as well as a committed theosophist, and Mairet provides an explanation of what his encounter with Mitrinović meant to him. The latter appeared “out of the center of what one feared was now the flaming wreck of European civilization, proclaiming a gospel of world salvation inspired by the perennial philosophy and the Christian revelation. He spoke like a prophet with a mission to convict the nations of sin and call them to righteousness, preaching in the language of transcendental idealism to which Orage's mind was well attuned” (Mairet 1966: x–xi).

Orage was so impressed by Mitrinović that he offered him a chance to address the wider public in Britain through his journal. His contributions to *The New Age: A Socialist Review of Religion, Science, and Art* were written under the pseudonym M. M. Cosmoi, and they include 54 pieces for the section World Affairs in the period from August 1920 to October 1921. In 1920, these pieces were actually co-authored by him and Orage. “M. M.” refers to “Mitya Mitrinović”, while Cosmoi could be a plural of the Hellenic noun *cosmos*, and is partially explained in the essay from April 1921 where he states: “for the Cosmos of Man is the galaxy of free worlds; each person within the race being an indefinite living universe” (Cosmoi 1921b: 293). Cosmoi would then be humans with their indefinite possibilities, multiple persons with endless potentials who M. M. already contained in himself. At the same time Cosmoi were the persons whom he wanted to address through these articles and who might progress in their possibilities by reading them. There is again something Gnostic in it, since he himself is obviously a person with “indefinite possibilities” addressing others with the same potential.

The language of the contributions is very peculiar, often mystical, strangely combining the terminology of social sciences and theology with overtones of the esoteric and mystical. For instance, on March 24, 1921, in an essay published in *The New Age*, Mitrinović writes of the gnosis of Christ and Sophia as: “the central and anthropocentric, human, panhuman gnosis of the world. *Vedanta Advaita*, the sacred apophysis of India, is the end, the periphery of panhuman cognisance. Except the miracle

and the apophasis of the embodiment of Sophia itself, except the absolute apophasis of pan-human organisation itself, of the Pleroma of the future Kingdom, a greater and more infinite revelation has never been given to Universal Man, to the Geon” (Cosmoi 1921a: 242).

At least some of his ideas obviously stem from ancient Gnosticism. When Mitrinović assembled his first circle of followers, Graham tried to recruit persons who were interested in similar matters. One of them was Georg Robert Stowe Mead (1863–1933), a member of the Theosophical Society and a very diligent researcher of Gnostic and Hermetic texts¹¹. He was probably the best-informed person on Gnostic texts and traditions in Britain. Yet, Mead did not join Mitrinović’s circle, but certainly inspired him to read his texts. That he was acquainted with Gnosticism may be clearly seen from an account provided by Mairet, who once happened to visit the British Museum with Mitrinović and Orage. The visit took place soon after their first meeting in 1914, but Mairet did not state when exactly. Mitrinović explained the Archaic Greek and Egyptian sculptures to them. Mairet then states: “and I do not know whether it was the Gnostic perspective of world history to which he related all this, or his power of communicating aesthetic understanding that first began to attach me to him as the man who knew all I wanted to know” (Mairet 1966: x).

Mitrinović had another Gnostic encounter through the works of the Russian theologian and philosopher Vladimir Solovyov, who was himself under the influence of Valentin, one of the founders of Gnosticism. He specifically quoted other sources of his ideas, including Friedrich Nietzsche, “a prophet of the Seraphimic or Seraphic dispensation of the world”; Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, who glorified “Humanity Universal and the eternal Christness of Man”; and Vladimir Solovyov, “the last of the fathers of Christendom and the prophet of the Sofian Christianity”. After this, Mitrinović gives us the interpretative key to what he has said: “The universal socialism of humanity is Sophia herself, and the birth of the Superman is the meaning of evolution”. In the same article he ends this list with the author who influenced him more than anyone else. “Eric Gutkind is the name of the Superman of our own hour, of the Aryan by spirit and fire, of the Socialist of the ascension and of the earthquake who proclaimed Pleroma in his seraphic scripture. This Semitic call to Prometheus and to the Grail at the same time is proclaimed in the first Christian deed, in the first superhuman act of a Jew after the deeds of Paul the Apostle. The name of this Deed is Cosmic Rebirth” (Cosmoi 1921c: 87–88). In this essay Mitrinović clearly demonstrated a fusion of the ideals of the Young Bosnians: social justice and ethical improvement of man. His socialism became religious with an aim that the religion of humanity could become socialist.

¹¹ His books are numerous and include: *Simon Magus*, 1892; *Pistis Sophia*, 1896; *Thrice Greatest Hermes*, in 3 volumes, 1906, and a series in 11 volumes entitled *Echoes from the Gnosis* (1906–07).

Mitrinović's associates later interpreted his ideas expressed in *The New Age* primarily in pacifist terms: "In these articles he maintained that real peace could never be achieved so long as the races, nations, religions and all other separate groupings of mankind each fought in an isolated way for domination in what they considered to be their own particular interest. He saw as the only solution to this problem the conception of the world as an organic whole with every race, nation, religion or other grouping recognised as a function within this world-whole" (*Principles* 1981: 10). There is no doubt that in these texts Mitrinović indeed expressed such ideas, as well as ideas on the transformation of Europe and its unification. What, however, always needs to be taken into consideration is that his basis for all these initiatives was the (Judeo-)Christian revelation as defined in the works of Solovyov and Gutkind.

Edwin Muir (1887–1959), the British poet and translator, was a friend of Orage's and met Mitrinović through him. Writing for *The New Age* at the time when Mitrinović was also one of its contributors, Muir made some observations about him. "He [Mitrinović] was the man for whom only the vast processes of time existed. He did not look a few centuries ahead like Shaw and Wells, but to distant millenniums, which to his apocalyptic mind were as near and vivid as tomorrow. He flung out the widest and deepest thoughts pell-mell, seeing whole tracts of history in a flash, the flash of the axe with which he hewed a way for himself through them, sending dynasties and civilizations flying". He also described the content of his discussions with Mitrinović, or rather the latter's monologues on the universe, "the creation of animals, Adam Kadmon, the influence of the stars..." (Muir 1940: 174–175).

Muir missed some of the more secular points in Mitrinović's contributions, but his description gives a very good testimony of the impression that Mitrinović's ideas and style of his texts left even on benevolent readers and collocutors. There was a sense of something chaotic and disconnected in his contributions, of something too distant and too apocalyptic to be given proper consideration. Yet, at the same time, it was something exotic and attractive. Unsurprisingly, Orage faced serious opposition about Cosmoi's articles and their publication inconveniently corresponded with a serious drop in the circulation of *The New Age*. Some were quick to accuse the unconventional style of Cosmoi's articles for this.

From Mysticism to Adler and Jung

Orage was very interested in the psychological teachings of Freud, Adler and Jung. In 1921, he made a study group that included Mitrinović. The task of the group was to analyse these teachings and to assess the possibility of their interaction with religion and morality. Yet, in the spring of 1922, Orage abandoned all of his activities in Britain and went to France to join a new guru called George Ivanovich Gurdjieff (c. 1870–1949), a

Greek-Armenian from Armenia, a spiritual leader who impressed many Brits of that age. The loss of Orage was a great shock to Mitrinović, but by 1922 he had already established his reputation of a person very knowledgeable regarding mystical and occult matters. Many artists and writers of that time in London were inclined to these very concerns.

It seems that in the early 1920s Mitrinović began to sketch his own synthesis, strongly influenced by Indian religious concepts, but other activities prevented him from finishing his plan (Palavestra, 2003: 337). After losing Orage's protection he developed a new circle around Valerie Cooper. The circle met at her studio and became a place where Mitrinović could exert his influence on her friends, discussing matters of philosophy, occultism, religion, psychology and philosophy. In 1926, Alfred Adler visited London, and Mitrinović met him at Valerie Cooper's studio. The practical result was that Mitrinović formed the British branch of the International Society for Individual Psychology, which became operational in March 1927, and he invested a lot of energy into developing the Society. He turned its London branch into a movement and, in the period 1927–1932, personally delivered over 50 lectures at the premises of the Society, in Gower Street. The premises included his basement study.

The Society in London attracted doctors specializing in psychiatry, but also a vast circle of intellectuals interested in new psychological schools. Adler and Freud faced similar problems. They both established international associations of their followers and wished to include among their followers not only doctors but also a wide range of intellectuals. Yet, in both cases doctors preferred to medicalise the movement. Within the Adler London Society Mitrinović co-opted the Chandos group within Society's sociological group. The Chandos group, whose many members had previously been associated with *The New Age*, was interested in economic and social reforms in Britain, and it shared some socialist ideas, but blended them with the concept of Christian compassion. The Medical group of the Society did not look favourably on the social orientation of some of their colleagues. The Society soon became bitterly divided, but ultimately survived the rift. The chairman of the Society, Philip Mairet, had to announce a reorganisation of the Society in June 1931. It was to restrict its activities to psychology. This obviously did not work, and Adler, who was determined to keep his individual psychology outside of the realm of politics, personally asked his London Society to become independent at the end of 1933. Yet, by that time the Society was very much reduced in its activities (Palavestra 2003: 337–339; Mairet 1966: xxvi; Rigby 2006: 91–106).

As an eclectic, Mitrinović could not really restrict his attention to the teachings of any single school. By the end of the 1920s he had adopted some Jungian concepts as well. It was in the 1926–1929 period that he gradually reached the concept according to which Freud was a thesis, Adler an antithesis and Jung a synthesis, to put it in Hegelian terms, which he

was fond of using. Almost all historians of Gnosticism who have followed the development of this line of thought in modernity consider people like Jakob Boehme (1575–1624) and Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961) to be followers of Gnostic traditions (Hoeller 1982: 44–58; Quispel 1993: 574)¹². It is to be remembered that the first hermetic author who Mitrinović admired, Eric Gutkind, was also under the influence of Jakob Boehme. In this way a revolutionary from a peripheral Austro-Hungarian province became a modern chiliastic utopian and a Gnostic, connecting old-age Gnosticism and European millennial traditions with the teachings of E. Gutkind and C. G. Jung.

For the nexus of modern psychology and esoteric teachings two key texts by Mitrinović are “The Significance of Jung”, published in *Purpose* magazine in 1929, and a text entitled “Three Revelations”, based on notes taken by his followers. In the text on Jung, Mitrinović defined culture as the “individual experience of objective values” (SWDM 1987: 332). Considering teachings of S. Freud, C. G. Jung and A. Adler, Mitrinović is led to conclude that culture is essentially Gnosis. That this is not only an accidental reference to Gnosticism is ascertained from the paragraph that follows: “The great Anthropos drives, inspires, breathes into all these various racial spirits, giving the impulse but not guidance” (SWDM 1987: 334).

The text on Jung together with the piece “Three Revelations” can be taken to represent the essence of Mitrinović’s teaching. Among the three revelations, he first discusses the pre-Christian revelation of ancient traditions and he takes the theosophist Rudolf Steiner as its modern exponent. Obviously under the influence of Jung, he states that the first revelation is about the archetypal man. The second revelation is the Christian one as the Russian thinker Vladimir Solovyov understood it; this is about the archetypal man in history. Finally, the third revelation is the post-Christian revelation; its prophet is Eric Gutkind and this revelation is about “Genius” and about “the cosmic rebirth of individuals”; it deals with the archetypal man “realized in individual consciousness”; it is about “Christ in you” (SWDM 1987: 439)¹³. In order to reach this third revelation, one should use what Mitrinović called the “creative critique” as “the only means of self-knowledge in the future”. Yet, at this point he abandons the usual element of various mystical movements, namely that *gnosis* is reserved for the *electi*. Self-knowledge “is not a luxury for the few” but “the duty of all”. Revelations will not come through great geniuses any more, and instead every man is a small genius (SWDM 1987: 445). In other words, all humans are *cosmoi*.

12 In 1916, C. G. Jung published in limited circulation his Gnostic visions entitled *Septem sermones ad mortuos* (“The Seven Sermons to the Dead”). For a detailed study of Jung’s Gnosticism see: Stephan A. Hoeller, *The Gnostic Jung and the Seven Sermons to the Dead* (London: Quest Book, 1982). The English translation of *Septem sermones* is included in Hoeller’s book: “VII Sermones ad Mortuos (Seven Sermons to the Dead).”

13 Mitrinović never published this essay. One of his British disciples, Winifred Gordon Fraser, took notes from his lectures and compiled them from various talks by Mitrinović.

On the surface, one would hardly find a connection between Mitrinović's revolutionary national activity in Bosnia, his idea of Pan-Humanity, his commitment to Adlerian and Jungian psychology, his dedication to reforming global affairs, his research of the occult and his close affiliation with Gnosticism and Hermetic thought. A careful analysis would, however, identify one key denominator common to all of Mitrinović's broad interests. That is a quest for synthesis, so typical of many thinkers of the first decades of the 20th century. He seemed to have believed that secret teachings might help him reach that synthesis. Moreover, Gnosticism had something very common to Mitrinović's own synthesis. Elaine Pagels noticed an important feature of many ancient Gnostics: "How – or where – is one to seek self-knowledge? Many Gnostics share with psychotherapy a second major premise: both agree – against Orthodox Christianity – that the psyche bears *within itself* the potential for liberation or destruction" (Pagels 1986: 135)¹⁴. Gnosticism demands finding the divine within an individual's most hidden layers of being. In other words, it requests introspection, a method that it shares with dynamic psychiatry. In addition to Gnosticism, Mitrinović was deeply interested in Indian religious philosophy. Certainly, some of his concepts were inspired by Indian religious tradition, but that part of his teachings is beyond the scope of this study.

His activities with the Adlerian society left a deep mark. He gained new experience that allowed him to inspire new groups and movements, and he acquired a command of certain psychological techniques. Philip Mairet was, for some time, the chairman of the Adlerian Society, whose real commander-in-chief was Mitrinović. Moreover, Mairet wrote *ABC of Adler's psychology* (Mairet 1930), and was therefore more than qualified to assess Mitrinović's methods in dealing with his disciples, both as his own former follower and as an authority in Adlerian psychology. He says that Mitrinović encouraged his followers to read Gnostic, Hermetic, theosophic, anthroposophic texts and Indian literature, as well as pieces by Gurdjieff. Thereafter, he would lead them to synthesis himself, through his own "inexhaustible flow of interpretative discourse, which was basically in the tradition of Eastern Christianity". In essence his characteristic method was: "to allow and even help the pupil to go on feeding his own favorite ego-ideal (despite warnings he would not heed) to the point at which it burst, and left him in a void with nothing but the ultimate resources of his own being. This was sometimes effective". Mairet adds that Mitrinović never refused anyone who was seeking help. "His compassion, his Dostoevskian panhumanity, inclined him to accept everybody who came to him, even to the serious waste of his own time and energy" (Mairet 1966: xxv). What has been neglected very often in analyses of Mitrinović's various endeavours is that in his Adlerian period he apparently acted for some time "as unpaid psychotherapist and counsellor to various individuals who sought his assistance" (Rigby 2006: 99). His psychother-

¹⁴ Original italics.

apeutic experience helped him to develop his own method. He seems to have continued using this method until the end of his life. However, he reframed it as a sort of group therapy, as will be seen later.

Experience of effectively heading a psychological society enabled him to connect psychotherapy with occult teachings. It also led him to work with people who were sceptical of religion, and put him in touch with fully secular individuals. This was not a very difficult task for someone who had been an ideologue of a very secular literary movement in his home region before 1914. In that way, he developed at least two parallel narratives. One, more secular and socially oriented, was intended for those of his followers who were not very inclined to mysticism. Another, the mystical line, followed his ideas developed since 1914.

This duality seems to have been prompted by his experience with the Adlerian society, where one had to keep together physicians who wanted psychology only, and others who were interested in wider social reforms. By having to deal with both groups Mitrinović developed his ability to keep different groups of his followers. The departure of Orage certainly made Mitrinović painfully aware that in the realm of mysticism his magnetism could easily evaporate with the arrival of other gurus. Doing some psychotherapy helped him to get better acquainted with the two parallel intellectual streams in Britain. This indeed seems to have given rise to some confusion, and therefore in the recollections of Philip Mairet or Alan Watts one sees only a mystical Mitrinović, while his later followers, connected with the New Atlantis Foundation, left recollections of a very rational Mitrinović and were more than ready to underestimate his mysticism.¹⁵

SOURCES

UB – SC, NAF, University of Bradford, Special Collections, New Atlantis Foundation

LITERATURE

Behr, Shulamith. “Wassily Kandinsky and Dimitrije Mitrinovic: Pan-Christian Universalism and the Yearbook ‘Towards the Mankind of the Future through Aryan Europe’”, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1992, pp. 81–88.

Blavatsky, Helena Petrovna. *The Secret Doctrine. The synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy*, in two vols., Theosophical Publishing Co., 1888.

¹⁵ I have analysed Mitrinović’s projects from the 1930s and the dilemmas of interpretation of his work in the paper entitled “Cosmopolitan projects of Dimitrije Mitrinović from the 1930s and the dilemmas of interpretation” that has been printed in this issue of *Književna istorija/The Literary History*.

- Cosmoi, M. M. [Dimitrije Mitrinovic]. "World Affairs", *The New Age. A Socialist Review of Religion, Science and Arts*, no. 1489, March 24, 1921a, p. 242 b; no. 1493, April 21, 1921b, p. 293 a; no. 1502, June 23, 1921c, pp. 87 b, 88 a.
- Coverley, Merlin. *Occult London*, Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2008.
- Dedijer, Vladimir. *The Road to Sarajevo*, MacGibbon and Kee, 1967.
- Glišović, Dušan/Глишовић, Душан. *Иво Андрић, Краљевина Југославија и Трећу рајх 1939–1941* [Ivo Andrić, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Third Reich 1939-1941], Službeni glasnik, 2012.
- Graham, Stephen. *The Quest of the Face*, The Macmillan Co., 1918.
- Graham, Stephen. *St. Vitus Day*, D. Appleton and Company, 1931.
- Graham, Stephen. *Part of the Wonderful Scene. An Autobiography*, Collins, 1964.
- Gutkind, Eric. *The Body of God. First Steps Toward an Anti-Theology. The Collected Papers of Eric Gutkind*. Horizon Press, 1969.
- Hoeller, Stephan A. *The Gnostic Jung and the Seven Sermons to the Dead*, Quest Book, 1982.
- Kermode, Frank. "Apocalypse and the Modern", in Saul Friedländer, Gerald Holton, Leo Marx and Eugene Skolnikoff (eds.), *Visions of Apocalypse: End or Rebirth?*. Holmes and Meier, 1985, pp. 84-108.
- LeRoy Finch, Henry. "Introduction", in Eric Gutkind, *The Body of God. First Steps Toward an Anti-Theology. The Collected Papers of Eric Gutkind*. Horizon Press, 1969, pp. 7–20.
- Mairet, Philip. *A B C of Adler's Psychology*, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1930.
- Mairet, Philip. *A. R. Orage. A Memoir*, University Books, 1966 [1st ed. 1936].
- Mairet, Philip. "Reintroduction", in Idem, *A. R. Orage. A Memoir*, University Books, 1966, pp. v–xxx.
- Mitrinović, Dimitirje. *Certainly Future, Selected writings of Dimitrije Mitrinović* [SWDM], H. C. Rutherford (ed.), Boulder, 1987.
- Mitrinović Dimitrije/Митриновић, Димитрије, *Сабрана гјела* [Collected Works of Dimitrije Mitrinović – SDDM, P. Palavestra (ed.)], Svjetlost, 1991, in three volumes.
- Muir, Edwin. *An Autobiography*. Methuen, 1968 [1st ed. 1940].
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Gospels*, Penguin, 1986.
- Paјin, Dušan/Пајин, Душан. *За свечовечанску заједницу. Димитрије Митриновић (1887–1953)* [For a Panhuman Community. Dimitrije Mitrinović 1887-1953], Pešić i sinovi, 2016.
- Palavestra, Predrag/ Палвестра, Предраг. „Судбина и дело Димитрија Митриновића” [The Fate and Work of Dimitirje Mitrinović], in Idem (ed.), *Димитрије Митриновић, Сабрана гјела* [Idem (ed.), *Collected Works of Dimitrije Mitrinović*], Svjetlost, 1991, pp. 9–153.
- Palavestra, Predrag/Палавестра, Предраг. *Дојма и утопија Димитрија Митриновића* [Dogma and Utopia of Dimitrije Mitrinović]. Zavod za udžbenike, 2nd enl. ed., 2003 [1st ed. 1977].

- Popović, Bojana/Поповић, Бојана. S. v. „Митриновић, Димитрије”, *Српски биографски речник* [s. v. “Mitrinović, Dimitrije”, *Serbian Biographical Dictionary*], vol. 6, Matica srpska, 2014, pp. 787–788.
- Principles and Aims. New Atlantis Foundation, The New Atlantis Foundation, 1981.*
- Quispel, Gilles. “Gnosticism from the Middle Ages to the Present”, in Mircea Eliade (ed. in chief), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, Simon and Shuster Macmillan, 1993, vol. 5, pp. 566-574.
- Rigby, Andrew. *Dimitrije Mitrinović. A Biography*, William Sessions Ltd., 2006.
- Rigby, Andrew. S. v. “Dimitrije Mitrinović”, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/97877>, accessed 23 June 2016]
- Rutherford, H. C. “Erich Gutkind as Prophet of the New Age”, The New Atlantis Foundation, 1975.
- Rutherford, H. C. “General Introduction”, in Idem (ed.), *Certainly, Future. Selected writings of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, Boulder, 1987, pp. 1-16.
- Scholem, Gershom G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Schocken Books, 1946.
- Vidler, Alec R. *The Church in an Age of Revolution. 1789 to the present day*, The Pelican History of the Church, Penguin Books, 1974.
- Vošnjak, Bogumil. *U borbi za ujedinjenu narodnu državu. Utisci i opažanja iz doba svetskog rata i stvaranja naše države* [In the Struggle for a United National State. Impressions and Observations from the period of the World War and the Creation of our State], Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, 1928.
- West, Rebecca. *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon. A Journey through Yugoslavia*, Canongate Books, 1993.

ABBREVIATIONS

- SWDM - Mitrinović, Dimitirje. *Certainly Future, Selected writings of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, H. C. Rutherford (ed.), Boulder, 1987.
- SDDM - Mitrinović Dimitrije/Миџриновић, Димитрије, *Сабрана дјела* [Collected Works of Dimitrije Mitrinović, P. Palavestra (ed.)], Svjetlost, 1991, in three volumes.

*Димитрије Митриновић у слици за гносом.
Од националној ка космополијском идентитету*

Резиме

Чланак прати развој Митриновићевог идентитета од локалног српског и затим југословенског до космополитског. Промена ка наднационалном идентитету догодила се већ током његовог боравка у Риму (1911-1913) и Минхену (1913-1914), а заокружена је током Великог рата који је провео у Лондону у који се преселио 1914. Током Великог рата његови концепти били су све више усмерени на космополитске идеје повезане са хришћанством. У Лондону Митриновић је покренуо низ иницијатива од којих су неке имале религијску компоненту, а друге су биле више секуларне. Сећања његових савременика и ученика су противречна. Док рани следбеници Митриновића који су били са њим током Великог рата, 1920-их и у раним 1930-тим годинама (Грејем, Мере, Дејвис, Вот итд.), описују мистичног Митриновића, његови каснији следбеници који су се окупили око Фондације Нова Алантида оставили су сећања на Митриновића која га приказују у рационалнијем и секуларнијем светлу. Објашњење овакве противречности аутор налази у томе да су постојала два правца и у његовој мисли и међу његовим следбеницима. Текст идентификује као темељ Митриновићевог учења јудео-хришћанску традицију са истакнутим утицајем гностичког хришћанства.

Кључне речи: Димитрије Митриновић, гностицизам, друштвени клуб, космополитски идентитет, Ерик Гуткинд

Примљено: 15. 10. 2018

Прихваћено: 20. 12. 2019.