

A Visionary, a Victim and a Co-Traveller. Juraj Križanić in the Literary Writings of Ivan Golub

Kolar, Mario; Tkalec, Gordana

Source / Izvornik: **Studi Slavistici**, 2020, 17, 37 - 52

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

https://doi.org/10.13128/Studi_Slavis-8052

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:559851>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 4.0 International](#)/[Imenovanje 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-17**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



Mario Kolar
Gordana Tkalec

A Visionary, a Victim and a Co-Traveller. Juraj Križanić in the Literary Writings of Ivan Golub

1. Introduction

Juraj Križanić (1618-1683) was a famous and unique character who lived during the period of the European Baroque. This Croatian Catholic priest and a polyhistorian¹ was ahead of his times primarily due to his proto-ecumenic ideas. He believed all the Slavic nations to pertain to a single ethnic family of peoples and dreamed of unity between the Catholic and the Orthodox Slavs. He also nurtured hopes for their political unity and saw Russia as a potential helper to other Slavs on their path to liberation from foreign, mainly Turkish or German, occupation (Golub 1993a). To serve such a cause, he even undertook the task of creating a common Slavic language (Golub 1993b). Inspired by such ideas, Križanić defied the will of Pope Alexander VII and took off for Moscow, but due to somewhat unclear circumstances, ended up exiled in Tobolsk, Siberia, where he spent 15 years of his life. During that time, he completed or initiated work on some of his most important manuscripts in different areas of human thought (economy, politics, theology, linguistics, musicology, history)².

The varied, extensive, and visionary written opus, as well as the deeds of Juraj Križanić, represent a heritage that is of interest to scholars from different fields of study³. He was particularly noticed by Russian and Croatian researchers, and, more recently, by a Croatian Catholic priest, theologian, and a man of letters, Ivan Golub (1930-2018)⁴. Golub's interest in Križanić dates from the days of his youth when he still attended the so-called gymnasium. In 1963, Golub obtained his doctoral degree of Križanić's (ecumenic) ecclesiology at the Pontifical Gregorian University (Golub 1964) and continued to take interest in different aspects of Križanić's life until his death. His first book on Križanić was dedicated to Križanić's work in musicology (Golub 1981), and his book on Križanić's ideas on Slavism (Golub 1983a, English translation Golub 1993a) received a lot of attention. His third book on Križanić encompassed a lot of archival material from the Vatican, Rome, Moscow, Madrid, and Copenhagen, accompanied by commentary and interpretation (1983b). Besides

¹ On Križanić's life, see more in Jagić 1917 and Golub 1987.

² Detailed bibliography in Gol'dberg, Golub 1976.

³ Detailed bibliography in Gol'dberg, Golub 1976 and Golub 1993a: 5-8, as well as in footnotes.

⁴ On Golub's life and work, see Perić 1991 and Ferluga-Petronio 2015.

the aforementioned books, Golub also published some fifty articles on various Križanić's activities, which were published in international proceedings and journals, in different languages⁵. He also held lectures at prestigious international universities (Yale, Columbia, Harvard, Heidelberg, Vienna, Milan, etc.), as well as at the Russian Academy of Science in Leningrad (1981), becoming the first Catholic priest after the October Revolution to do so. He was affiliated with the Catholic Faculty of Theology in Zagreb where he lectured on Križanić, but he also held a position at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome where he engaged in the same field of interest. The array of activities he engaged in to keep the memory of his famous co-national alive also included the organization of conferences on Križanić, as well as active publishing of Križanić's work and the work of other authors on Križanić. He also undertook initiatives to ensure public display of memorial tablets and moments, etc. All this earned him the title of one of the most relevant Croatian 'Križanićologists' of the contemporary period (Banac 1991: 117, Paščenko 2015: 25).

However, Križanić was not only a topic of scientific interest for Golub but also a literary inspiration. Golub wrote an epic poem, entitled *Strastni život* ('*A Life of Passion*', Golub 1983c), several lyrical poems dedicated to Križanić, and a libretto, *Svi su tokovi jedno* ('*All the Flows are One*', Golub 1986). He also wrote a literary biography, *Križanić* (Golub 1987) and a screenplay used in the documentary film *Svi odlasci Jurja Križanića* ('*All the Departures of Juraj Križanić*', Golub 1997). He also referred to Križanić in numerous essays, and even in his autobiography *Običan čovjek* ('*An Ordinary Man*', Golub 2014). This paper will target that part of Golub's opus, with special emphasis on the relations between the documentary and fictional representation, i.e. on the objective and subjective techniques that Golub used in his depiction of the historical character.

2. *Passion and Anguish*

The epic poem *Strastni život* ('*A Life of Passion*'), with a subtitle *Pjesan u smrt Jurja Križanića 1683.-1983.* ('*A Chant into Death of Juraj Križanić 1683-1983*'), was published in 1983 (Golub 1983c), as a part of a visual and literary map consisting of his poem and illustrations signed by the famous Croatian visual and graphic artist, Ivan Lacković Croata⁶. The poem was originally written in the Croatian language, but in the previously mentioned edition, it was delivered with simultaneous translations into Russian by Radinur Venturin. The poem is written in free verse and is divided into two main parts: *Za sunca* ('*The Time of the Sun*') and *Za mjeseca* ('*The Time of the Moon*'). The verses are grouped into clusters of unequal length, ranging from single verse to eleven-verse strophes. The manuscript is 20 pages long, and each part is 10 pages long.

⁵ On Golub's bibliography on Križanić, and other works, see Tamarut 1991.

⁶ The map has a textual and a graphic part, totalling 76 pages, unnumbered. The textual part (56 pages, 28 in Croatian and 28 in Russian) are dedicated to the poem. The bibliographical references on Križanić and the impressum were also written by Golub. The graphical part spans across 20 pages featuring copper graphics by Ivan Lacković Croata.

Content-wise, the poem follows a thread that depicts the life of Juraj Križanić and uses the character's viewpoint. For the largest part, the text is presented as spoken by Križanić himself, while his speech is announced and commented on by a separate lyrical entity.

Križanić is introduced into the poem at a mature age, during the period of his Siberian exile. He is not only old and powerless but also lacking in *élan vital* and doubting his life-long ideals (the unity of the church, the Slavic unity). The trigger that leads to an evocation of his past is the sun in the first part of the poem, and the moon in the second. As he watches the sunset, and as he later watches the rise of the moon over the river Irtysh in Tobolsk, he ponders on the same sun and the moon overlooking not only the river Irtysh but also other rivers that he once used to observe as well. After such an initial set-up, the voice is that of Križanić himself, who remembers people and events from his past. The reminiscing passages, though built from citations and paraphrases, are directly pronounced by Križanić, and the presence of sources is not signaled by punctuation or in any other way. However, it can be traced across all relevant documents.

For example, in the first part of the poem, the text introduces a citation from an actual 1676 confessional letter written by Križanić and addressed to his liberator, the Russian Tsar Fëdor Alekseevič (Belokurov 1902: 261). In this letter, Križanić begs the Tsar to permit him to leave Russia, on the grounds of his old age and state of helplessness, while also lamenting over his squandered "passionate life":

From my childhood, I threw myself
with my whole heart in the search for wisdom
and the correction of our corrupted language
and in that I, poor and unfortunate man,
spent my whole passionate life⁷

(Golub 1983c: [3]).

The citations are accompanied by Križanić's memories which are not quoted from any direct source, but are given in a free literary style, though they can be traced to documented events: "And in the church of Svetice my mother lays / I had no chance to bid her good-bye / as I rushed to Moscow / forgive me / mother" (Golub 1983c: [5])⁸. However, the citations and the literary paraphrases are also mixed with purely fictional utterances, that cannot be confirmed by any documented source. An illustrative example of the latter is Križanić's contemplation on rivers which run through the spaces which had marked his life, that constitutes the contemplative peak of the entire poem:

⁷ Here and afterwards, unless otherwise indicated, the translation is ours (MK, GT). In the original: "A ja bo ot detinstva svojego udalsja jesm / vsim srcem na jedino mudrostno iskanje / i na nešego skaženoga jazika izpravljanje / i na to jesm bedni i nesrečni človek / ves svoj strastni život iztrošil".

⁸ These verses refer to Križanić's letter to Rafael Levaković from 1647, in which he states that he regrets leaving to Russia without saying goodbye to his mother (Belokurov 1902: 200-201 [*Priloženija*]).

And the waters only flow
 who knows where
 Moskva is Irtysh
 Irtysh is Tiber
 Tiber is Sava
 Sava is Kupa
 Kupa is Obrh

All the flows are one⁹

(Golub 1983c: [10]).

Hence, while observing the sunset over the river Irtysh in Tobolsk, Križanić is reminded of all the ‘waters’ of his life¹⁰, which triggers associations, and leads him to the conclusion that all the courses of all the ‘waters’ blend into a common course. The metaphor highlights his well-known ideas on the Slavic (and even human) unity: all the rivers are one, all the religions are one, all the Slavs are one; according to him, all the people ought to be one.

In the second part of the poem, *Za mjeseca* (*The Time of the Moon*), on a sleepless night, Križanić’s thoughts *travel* with the moon. Apart from visiting his homeland, he also *visits* new places. For example, apart from the castle and the brook Obrh that he recalls from his homeland, he also remembers the town of Ozalj, and praises the language spoken there¹¹:

The bells are not a song
 A song is not a song
 The speech around the river Kupa in the area of Dubovac and Ozalj and the castle Ribnik
 That’s a song¹²

(Golub 1983c: [16]).

New motifs appear in contemplative sections about Rome. In his thoughts, he visits numerous historical persons whom he had previously met. The second part is predominantly about people, i.e. Križanić’s contemporaries, who played important roles in his life.

⁹ In the original: “A vode plave plove / tko zna kamo / Moskva je Irliš / Irliš je Tiber / Tiber je Sava / Sava je Kupa / Kupa je Obrh // Svi su tokovi jedno”.

¹⁰ The river Irtysh, that runs through Tobolsk, and the river Moscow join into the same course that runs through the Russian capital. The river Sava runs through the Croatian capital, Zagreb. Obrh is a brook, a small stream that runs in Križanić’s native land.

¹¹ While the Croatian contemporary linguistic standard inherits the base of the so-called *štokavian* dialect, the 17th century writers pertaining to the Ozalj circle used combined all three Croatian dialects in their writings – *čakavian*, *kajkavian* and *štokavian* (*ča*, *kaj* and *što* standing for the pronoun *what*, and each representing an outstanding distinctive feature of the corresponding dialect, cfr. Katičić 2013: 122-125).

¹² In the original: “Zvona nisu pjesma / Ni pjesma nije pjesma / Govorenje okolo Kupi riki vo ujezdu Dubovca i Ozlja i Ribnika ostrogov / to je pjesma”.

Some of them are Tsar Alexei, Pope Alexander VII, and his friend Vergilius Spada, who was also a builder, Dionisio Massari, the secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and his friend Luka Holsetenius, the librarian of the Vatican and Barberini's libraries. Again, some completely fictional utterances can also be encountered. Križanić repeats the river motif, but also talks of his psychological and physical state:

The moon fell on a dried-out branch
 Why am I evoking branches, days, dreams and basics
 Leave the tree to the birds
 The birds sing their tune and a man cries below the branch
 Every man under every branch
 Every man in this country other than a stranger
 So many years do I cry
 Under the branch that's drier and drier¹³

(Golub 1983c: [15]).

Križanić's tears and crying capture attention. Except for the lamentation, that he depicts as a general human state ("a man cries below the branch / Everyman under every branch"), he more specifically cries over the motifs that he might not ever see again and over the fact that his ideas will probably never come to life. He compares such thoughts to birds that "sing their tune" while "a man cries below the branch", which is why he says to himself to "leave the tree to the birds". The metaphorical transposition of Križanić's state of mind is also supported by the motif of the dying branch, which is a reference to his own psychological and physical self, and to his lost enthusiasm¹⁴. This is further underlined by the signature "Father Jurko Križanić of Nebluj, The Lamenter" (Golub 1983c: [20]). He thereby calls himself "The Lamenter", whereas the Croatian word even more strongly suggests the intensity of his weepy lament. He also uses the nickname "Javkanica" ("The One Who Laments"), one that he had previously in another work, *De Providentia Dei* (['On Divine Providence'], 1666-1667) (Jagić 1917: 159).

Observed as a whole, Golub's poem provides insight into Križanić's life but also sheds light on his main ideas. However, the front plane is occupied by Križanić himself and by his personality. Golub seems to understand how Križanić had felt and what he might have thought during his years of exile. He is careful not to overstep the boundaries of the documented content on Križanić's life, which is why he often quotes or paraphrases him, show-

¹³ In the original: "Mjesec je pao na prosuhu granu / Što ja to snatrim grane, dane, snove i osnove / Pusti stablo pticama / Ptice pjevuje svoje a čovjek plače pod granom / svaki čovjek pod svakom granom / svaki čovjek u ovoj zemlji osim tuđina / Koliko godina plačem ono / pod granom ovom što se vani suši".

¹⁴ These verses refer to Križanić's letter to the Russian Tsar Fëdor Alekseevič from 1676, in which he witnesses the loss of not only the enthusiasm for his own ideas, but also *élan vital* (Belokurov 1902: 263).

ing a tendency to lean on authentic documents. However, he does move beyond, even if not often, and tries to put himself in Križanić's shoes and to unveil his state of mind, his doubts – the solitude, the futile endeavors, the nostalgia for his homeland. It was Tonko Maroević who pointed this out in a booklet that accompanied the exhibition of the graphic map which included the poem. Maroević points out that Golub

talked in a most personal tone of voice and with a very specific investment. He identified with the sufferer, the dreamer and the visionary, and depicted the trajectory between delight and defeat, between the upsurge and the downfall (Maroević 1988: [10]).

In any case, the poem represents a complex structure, packed with citations and references from the documentary material available on Križanić. Concerning this, it also brings together different languages: besides the Croatian contemporary standard language, some parts uttered by Križanić are also written in *his* 'pan-Slavic' language, but also in the language of his homeland, which encompasses elements of all three Croatian dialects, as well as elements of the Old Slavonic language which was still used in ecclesiastic rituals in Križanić's time (Golub 1993a: 28). Besides the pan-Slavic and Croatian koiné, some of the verses (mainly quotations) also appear in Russian, Latin, or Greek. In that sense, *Strastni život* ('*A Life of Passion*') constitutes a rare example of a documented biographical literary text in the context of Croatian literature. Milka Car pointed out how rare examples like these are, stating that poetry is more narrowly focused on language and tends to stray away from the facts of reality (Car 2016: 303-304). It is especially rare to come across a combination of documented and fictional content, delivered in a traditional mode of writing. The factual content is not used to question the boundary between fiction and reality, as in the case of postmodern literature (Car 2016: 13-19, 76-88), but rather to provide a firmer connection between the poem and the reality that Križanić would have been a part of.

3. *A Crying Voice in the Desert*

Besides the epic poem *Strastni život* ('*A Life of Passion*'), Golub dedicated several other lyrical texts to Križanić. By selecting and mildly modifying certain verses extracted from the second part of the poem, he collaged a new poem, *Svi su tokovi jedno* ('*All the Flows are One*'), which was transposed into music by the Croatian composer and conductor Boris Papandopulo (Golub 1986). This text does not aspire to depict the course of Križanić's life but rather focuses on his tragedy and the lament over his destiny, and over the destiny of Slavic peoples. That part of the text certainly reveals a more intense lyrical quality, with less reference to the documentary content.

Among the rest of Golub's poetic texts on Križanić, the poem *Juraj Križanić – glas vapijućega u pustinji* ('*Juraj Križanić – A Crying Voice in the Desert*'), written in 2008 and published the following year as part of a collection of poetry named *Nasmijani Bog* ('*The Laughing God*'), Golub 2009: 116-119), stands out. As the syntagma used in the title suggests, Križanić is compared to John the Baptist, who was the predecessor of Christ and a predeces-

sor to the idea of the unity of Slavic faith. Much like in the previous examples, the poem begins with the motif of Križanić who finds himself in the Siberian log cabin, not watching the river but merely sitting there, reading and translating an evening prayer dedicated to John the Baptist into *his* pan-Slavic language. In the fourth verse, the subject anticipates that he might meet his end in a way that is likely to resemble the death of John the Baptist:

A predecessor. You wanted to be a predecessor.
As in John the Baptist, the predecessor.
And now you are
“The crying voice in the desert
The Siberian desert
Vox clamatis in deserto”
Just like John in Judea¹⁵

(Golub 2009: 117).

However, in the poem, Križanić also *hears* voices, namely the voices of those who would study his work in the future. He first *hears* the voice of the German historian Aleksander Brückner, saying how tragic it was that nobody, at Križanić’s time, ever knew of his ideas. He also hears comforting words of the Russian historian Petar Bezsonov, saying that mankind would appreciate Križanić’s love for his people, for Russia and the Slavs, and that this appreciation would grow “more and more as the time goes by”. In this part, paragraphs from scholarly works on Križanić, signed by Brückner (1891: 296) and Bezsonov (1882: 3), are quoted. The poem ends with a reference to Križanić as a “prophet of the messianism of culture” (Golub 2009: 119). Much like in the previous poetic texts, Golub quotes from an actual Križanić’s letter to Rafael Levaković from 1647 (Belokurov 1902: 176), in which Križanić states: “As the path leading to a discussion on matters of faith was laid out for the holy fathers by the education of the pagan philosophers in Latin and Greek, so, too, though to a far lesser degree, literary education in our language, if it pleases God’s mercy to select me, an unworthy one, for this task, may represent a precursor of conversion among this people”¹⁶ (Golub 2009: 117). However, the lyrical subject yet retains the distance by adding commentaries on Križanić, depicting him as a visionary and comparing him to John the Baptist, who had also paved the road for future outcomes¹⁷.

¹⁵ In the original: “Preteča. Htio si biti preteča. / Kao ono Ivan Krstitelj preteča. / A sad si gle / ‘Glas vapijućega u pustinji / sibirske pustinji / Vox clamantis in deserto’ / kao ono Ivan u Judeji”.

¹⁶ In the original: “Kao što je književnom izobrazbom poganskih filozofa na latinskom i grčkom jeziku bio utrt put svetim ocima za raspravljanje o stvarima vjere, tako bi se također, u nejednakom razmjeru, književnom izobrazbom u našem jeziku, ako se Božjem Veličanstvu sviđa mene nevrijedna za to izabrati, mogla postaviti prethodnica obraćenja u tom narodu” (translation from Golub 1993a: 106).

¹⁷ This refers to Križanić’s letter to Rafael Levaković from 1647, in which Križanić compares himself to John the Baptist (Belokurov 1902: 185).

4. *Searching for Face*

In the preface to his book *Križanić* (Golub 1987), Golub stated that its publishing marked 25 years of his “companionship with Juraj. And during a quarter of a century friends get rather well acquainted” (Golub 1987: 5), thus clearly announcing that this book would not be just another scientific biography. In the *Preface*, he says that he would be engaged in exploring Juraj’s personality, i.e. not limiting himself only to the biographically relevant facts.

This atypical, subjective approach is also revealed by the book’s structure. After the first chapter (*Biography*) in which he lays out the facts on Križanić’s life, the chapters that follow are *Križanić on Himself*, *Križanić by Others*, *Križanić with Others* and *Križanić within Himself*. In these chapters, Golub, therefore, speaks of what Križanić had written about himself, but also of what had been written about him by others, including references to what was known about Križanić from his relationships with other people. The final sub-chapters correspond to the aforementioned chapters, the titles being *The Eyes of Križanić*, *The Eyes of the Contemporaries* and *Križanić’s Face*. The approach is conceptual rather than scientific, and as such, also literary.

As far as the content goes, Križanić’s life-path is paved and his main ideas are presented. The facts are carved out with precision and are referenced in detail via published and archival sources, which makes the book a synthesis of Golub’s research on Križanić’s life and work. Therefore, the book undoubtedly fulfills its scientific task and is indeed a biographical study. However, it doesn’t end there, since Golub adds a *substructure* that he builds from subjective and literary elements, which makes this book both objective and subjective, both scientific and literary.

As far as the subjective layer goes, it is not limited to the *Preface* but can be traced throughout the book. Golub does not sustain from his interpretations of parts of Križanić’s life and on how he acted in certain situations. While analyzing Križanić’s letters and writings, and the annotations on him made by others, Golub reaches numerous conclusions on what kind of Križanić’s character. He is specifically focused on this topic in the closing chapter (*Križanić within Himself*), which is also the most subjectively written part of the book, albeit elements of such an approach can be found in all chapters.

One of the greatest challenges Golub had to tackle was his attempt to unveil one of the most intriguing and fatal undertakings of his object of study, i.e. Križanić’s departure for Moscow that led to his exile in Tobolsk. Golub notes that there is a lack of official data on the jurisdiction involved in Križanić’s deportation to Tobolsk (Golub 1987: 79). He allows himself to speculate and to offer his own interpretation of the event. He relies on Križanić’s own statement included in his 1676 letter to Russian Tsar Fëdor Alekseevič (Belokurov 1902: 261), i.e. to a reference on “some gentleman who had asked him a question on a certain matter, which Križanić had given much thought to in order to respond frankly and from the heart but had proven to be ‘some stupid word – nekoe glupo slovo’ which caused the gentleman to become suspicious of him,

and this led to fifteen years of his Siberian exile” (Golub 1987: 79). Golub introduces a biblical comparison on the simple-mindedness of a pigeon and the cunning nature of a snake, concluding that Križanić might have decided, at that moment, to play the role of a snake, which had proven to be wrong:

Who knows if Križanić would have made that ‘stupid utterance’ if he had given less thought to his answer, and if he had been more faithful to the biblical maxim ‘The very moment will give you the answer’. What occurred then was what occurs when people fear to make a mistake, and they end up erring due to that very fear... Overthinking is what got him into great trouble (Golub 1987: 80-81).

This interpretation may be subjective, which does not make it necessarily wrong. In any case, it can be accepted as a possible explanation. On more than one occasion, Golub expresses feelings of compassion for his “friend”, whom he also sees as a “sufferer” (Golub 1987: 110, 141), which is why he compares him to the biblical Job, who cried over himself, for his Siberian captivity and wrong decisions (Golub 1987:55). He also compares him to Jeremiah, who cried over his people under foreign rule (Golub 1987:85). He shows special empathy when reading Križanić’s appeal to be set free, addressed to the Russian Tsar in his aforementioned letter from 1676: “I can picture Jurko as he writes to the Tsar with tears in his eyes” (Golub 1987: 100). He uses a diminutive form of Križanić’s first name, calling him “Jurko”, on more than one occasion. He finishes the chapter with compassionate expressions as if in a poem: “Križanić is also a sufferer. / The lament is the song of his life” (Golub 1987: 110). And he also comments on Križanić’s loneliness, often outlined in Križanić’s writings: “My God, my God, / why did you condemn me / to suffer the distance from my close ones / and the proximity of the distant ones” (Golub 1987: 241).

These brief literary expressions are often presented across separated / interrupted lines of text, thus recalling the mode of writing in verses. Similar examples can be found throughout the book. However, the literary quality of Golub’s writing also comes through in the essential descriptions of Križanić’s personality. For example, when he examines Križanić’s thesis on Russia as the saviour to other Slavic nations, Golub refers to him as to a “prophet of Russian messianism” (Golub 1987: 38). His belief that he can prompt Russia through cultural activity (writing, translating tractates on politics, economy, theology, etc.) to take up that role, he states: “Križanić is a philosopher of language. He believes the words to be the key to wisdom. Words contain it all, and merely need to be unlocked” (Golub 1987: 99). Such sentences, short but condensed, sound almost like verses extracted from some poetic text. Golub believes that Križanić’s dedication to his mission in Moscow was guided both by his reason and by his heart, an idea which he expresses in the following way: “Križanić’s ship of enlightenment is sailed by his heart” (Golub 1987: 99). On Križanić’s perseverance, he says that “Križanić is not a Vestal that guards the fire in a temple. He guards the threatened spark in the restlessness of change and of the moving times. He knew: as long as there is a spark, there is hope for the fire” (Golub 1987: 100). On Križanić’s orientation towards

a better future, Golub is even more poetic: “Križanić is a man caught up pacing. His personality – a step behind. The steady foot is in the Baroque, the one that moves touches the coming era [...]. His arms are stretched forward” (Golub 1987: 206).

Golub’s subjectivity and his literary vocation are most clearly expressed in the final chapter, *Križanić within Himself*. He opens this chapter with the following statement: “No person ever really knows what’s within them, let alone others [...] To speak of someone, as they are within, implies the acceptance of limitations and partiality... Nevertheless, I embrace the limitations and the incompleteness and wish to speak out on what I see in Križanić” (Golub 1987: 209). And indeed he does, judging him to be a “polyphonic” and “multifaceted” person, a “universal personality” who took an active interest in many areas (politics, economy, philology, theology, history, music) (Golub 1987: 219). He sees harmony and intersection amongst and within various Križanić’s interests and talents, which he relates to his ideas and actions:

We do not know if Križanić may have actually composed music, but he very likely did – but all his life resembles a musical piece – a composition: he dedicates himself to a Slavic harmony, to harmony between Moscow and Rome, to a harmony between the outer world and the world within. Križanić’s personality is a Baroque polyphony (Golub 1987: 221).

Towards the end of this chapter, he adds more touches to his interpretation of Križanić’s personality. He believes that “Jurko” integrated, in a very unique way, “the priest and the scientist, the writer and the politician, the economist, and perhaps even the mystic, the military expert and the peace-maker” (Golub 1987: 227). Therefore, he believes that Križanić “cannot be expressed via exclusive categories, but rather, inclusively. He is a unionist and a Slavic scholar; he is equally dedicated to the unity of the Slavs and their national well-being. He is a dreamer of the language and a linguistic realist, both progressive and conservative” (Golub 1987: 228).

In any case, *Križanić* is not a typical biography, but rather a literary one that mixes subjective and objective elements: it reflects both the literary and the scientific endeavor of its author. This explains why Tonko Maroević included it in his selection of Golub’s literary texts (Golub 2003). In its preface, Maroević says that *Križanić* represents “an exceptionally successful example of transforming history into literature” (Maroević 2003: 12) and categorizes it as “a romanticized chronicle of a lyrical, meditatively charged biography” (Maroević 2003: 9). Maroević is right in pointing out that Golub identifies himself with Križanić as a traveler. Ante Stamać also recognized the intent to shed light on Križanić’s life “via reconstruction of his intimate dilemmas, some real and some possible, but also via sharp personal interpretations of Ivan Golub himself. Through interpretations of his self, which, not failing to deliver a successful self-portrait, blends in with the image of his great model” (Stamać 2003: 132).

5. *The Time for the Testament*

A documentary film, named *Svi odlasci Jurja Križanića* (‘*All the Departures of Juraj Križanić*’) and directed by Zlatko Sudović, was initially broadcasted by Zagreb Radiotele-

vision in 1987. The screenplay, written by Ivan Golub, was published 10 years later, in the journal *Forum* (Golub 1997).

This screenplay, much like other Golub's writings on the same topic, brings together documentary and fictional elements. The first part is notably shorter (*Prelude*), and it focuses on the testimonies of Križanić's contemporaries¹⁸ and the quotations on Križanić excerpted from scholarly and literary works dedicated to his life and activities¹⁹. Papandopulo's music for *Svi su tokovi jedno* ('*All the Flows are One*') was used as a musical background, while the camera shows documents being read, photographs of the authors of these texts, vistas of the cities in which some documents were discovered or where some authors had lived. In the second part (*The Play*), Križanić appears both as the narrator and as a character. In the first scene, he is depicted wearing Dominican garments, standing in Khalenberg, above Vienna, and observing the sunset over the river Danube. The date is September 11, 1683 – the eve of his death. As in *Strastni život* ('*The Life of Passion*'), Križanić's thoughts fly to the river Kupa, the Roman Tiber, the river Moscow and to the river Irtysh in Tobolsk – to all the rivers that touched his life. As the moon begins to rise across the rosy sky, he retreats into his tent and mystically concludes: "The time of my slaughter²⁰ is not far. This is the time for the testament. The time has come to write it" (Golub 1997: 1628). The second part of the script follows his testament, and he speaks of his life from birth to the night of his death. He narrates his life by biographical facts. The motif of the testament was borrowed by Golub from Križanić's autobiography, *Smertnyj razrjad*, that he had written during his 15-year long captivity, when he was aged, weakened and anticipating his death²¹.

After providing insight into the course of his life, Križanić – as scripted – "*drops the pen from his hand and lays it over the sheets of paper he had been writing on. He observes the candle as it runs down, burning. He suddenly gets up: (I will be slaughtered. / He runs to the east and observes the sunrise)*" (Golub 1997: 1639). After having been writing his testament all night, while the sun is rising, he chants a very similar poem to the one that he had composed once, when he observed the rise of the moon, alluding that he would recall all the important places of his life, and suggesting that he would never see them again. Differing from the poem at the beginning of the script, taken from *Strastni život* ('*The Life of Passion*'), this final poem is new and original and appears in the script for the first time. Križanić asks the sun to deliver his greetings to Obrh – his birthplace, Varaždin – where he had served as a vicar, and also to Zagreb – his city, to Rome ("greetings to Peter"), to Moscow ("the golden domes that guard Alexei's ashes" and Toobolsk ("cover in gold the traces of a fifteen years' long captivity") (Golub 1997: 1639). Upon this "*The trumpets of war can*

¹⁸ Francesco Ignoli, Tarquinio Galluzzi, Benedikt Vinković, Petar Parczewski, Andrija Zoloti-Kvasniaski, Dionizije Massari, Virgilije Spada, Pope Alexander VII, Juan Caramuel, etc.

¹⁹ Golub quotes works of Pjotr Bezsonov, Aleksandar Brückner, Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, Vatroslav Jagić and Miroslav Krleža.

²⁰ Križanić anticipated his death by slaughtering (Golub 1987: 95-96).

²¹ More on Križanić's testament in Gol'dberg 1975.

be heard / Križanić twitches” and pronounces his last words: “I am departing / for death / into the arms of the Eternal / I can feel the embrace of The Eternal” (Golub 1997: 1640).

6. *Co-traveller’s Adventures*

At a more mature age or, more precisely, five years before his death, Golub published his autobiography: *Običan čovjek* (*An Ordinary Man*, Golub 2013, second updated edition 2014). Golub borrowed the title from Križanić, who referred to himself by the same syn-agma in his 1641 letter to the secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Francesco Ignoli (Kadić 1964: 342). In his autobiography Golub dedicates entire subchapters to Križanić. In the introductory chapter, within the subchapter named *Juraj Križanić, a Priest and a Scholar; The Supporter of the Unity of the Churches and of the Slavic Unity*, he refers to Križanić as “his companion in travels”: “I am feeling an internal incentive to say more on Križanić’s life while writing of my own. Despite the centuries that divide us, we are, in a sense, travel companions” (Golub 2014: 219). He calls him his friend and refers to him by the first name, again, using the diminutive form “Jurko”. He even takes it to the physical plane in the essay *Ruska zima* (*The Russian Winter*), where he writes of his *adventures* across the Russian archives, where he even *shook hands* with Križanić:

My research on Juraj Križanić spans across half a century and it always provided not only scientific experience but also a deep inner involvement. I searched for Križanić in archives and libraries in different countries. On seeing his handwriting, I would place the palm of my hand onto the handwritten page. That’s how I shook hands with Križanić, as an ‘old friend’ (Golub 2012: 1172).

Finally, Golub also delivers a rather elaborate biography of Križanić and includes numerous personal comments and thoughts. He pursues the duality through no less than 13 subchapters (Golub 2014: 280-297) in which he discusses his research, lectures, books, and events related to Križanić. The main novelty is the reference on what, how and who had commented on his work, what he planned to do in the future but never came round to, or may have been prevented to do, what were the problems that got in his way, who helped him and who obstructed him in his work, etc. In any case, all this material provides an interesting and, in many details previously unknown, insight into Golub’s companionship with Križanić that adds up to an “adventure” (Golub 2014: 218) of a rather unique kind. Križanić’s name reappears often and on many pages of Golub’s autobiography²², which is suggestive of having evolved beyond a mere object of research, becoming an actual ‘friend’ in his life.

²² The high frequency of references made to Križanić is revealed numerically in the table of personal names at the end of the book (Golub 2014: 1113).

7. Conclusion

Golub's life-long dedication to the life and work of Juraj Križanić resulted not only in important scientific input but also in notable literary achievements. These are, most directly, his epic poem *Strastni život* (The Life of Passion, 1983), libretto *Svi su tokovi jedno* (All the Flows are One, 1986) and the poem *Juraj Križanić – glas vapijućega u pustinji* (Juraj Križanić – A Crying Voice in the Desert, 2008). The screenplay *Svi odlasci Jurja Križanića* (All the Departures of Juraj Križanić – the film was broadcasted in 1987; the script was published in 1997), essay *Ruska zima* (The Russian Winter, 2012) and autobiography *Običan čovjek* (An Ordinary Man, 2013) also belong to that context. In all these writings, subjective elements blend with objective ones, literary inspiration blends with scientific factuality, documentary features are enriched by fictional ones. While in the hybrid genres, i.e. in his essays and his autobiography, such blends can be expected, that is not the case when it comes to other genres. Texts of a more purely poetic nature, such as poems, do not customarily lean on a documentary background. The opposite is even less expected since scientific texts or documentary genres (biography, the script for the documentary film) do not commonly allow poetical thought and motifs. However, although it may seem non-standard or uncommon, these components have proven to co-exist in harmony in Golub's texts, and even to benefit one from another²³.

As far as literary interventions into non-literary texts go, this feature primarily reveals the author's literary inclinations, his acceptance of the imaginative substructure, and his capacity for empathy. However, in such cases, the documentary prevails over the literary, and the subjective portraying is reserved for highlighting certain aspects of Križanić's life (parallels with Job, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, and likewise), or for strengthening the personal link between the author and his subject, the co-traveller. The latter aspects are mostly linked to their common religious and ecumenic feelings²⁴, while empathy applies to Križanić's suffering. The literary tendency is set loose in the fictional layers of the analyzed texts, in certain parts of the narrative, in the expressions of the lyrical subject, in the attempts to shape Križanić as a human being and voicing him. In *Križanić*, the extent of this is visible especially in the compressed judgments on Križanić's character.

As far as non-literary interventions into literary texts go, these are mainly related to biographical and contextual data on Križanić and his era, and to the quotations from authentic documents contributing to the authenticity of expression. Sometimes, the documentary input seems almost inevitable, since Golub aspires not only to poetic meaning

²³ The same features can be detected in other works written by Golub, such as biographical epic poem *Maximus in minimis* (1978) and literary theological study *Dar dana šestoga* (The Sixth Day's Gift, 1999).

²⁴ Ivan Golub was, among other things, one of the initiators and the first Editor in Chief of the ecumenic journal *Poslušni Duhu* (1966). He was also the founder and the first manager of the Institute for Economic Theology at the Catholic Theological Faculty at the University of Zagreb (1986); since 1997, thanks to Golub, this institution bears the name of Juraj Križanić.

but also to its historical and biographical grounding. The epic poem *Strastni život* ('*The Life of Passion*') is a clear example of that. However, the very archaic nature of the archival material, as well as the polylingual approach that includes two non-existent languages – Križanić's pan-Slavic language and the all-Croatian koiné of dialects, contribute to the literary effects of the final text.

In any case, and despite Golub's confirmed status of a 'Križanićologist', the texts we analyzed clearly show the author's literary merit and the need for the literary scholars to re-examine and elaborate on his work from a literary viewpoint. This is also a challenge to the theory of genres and styles, that poses the question of the added value that the literary dimension can produce within the scientific frame, and vice versa.

Literature

- Banac 1991: I. Banac, *Friendship with Križanić and Russia*, in: I. Golub, *The Slavic Vision of Juraj Križanić*, Zagreb-Dubrovnik 1991, pp. 117-121.
- Belokurov 1902: S.A. Belokurov, *Jurij Križanić v Rossii*, Moskva 1902.
- Bezsonov 1882: P. Bezsonov (red.), *Sobranie sočinenij Jurija Križaniča*, I, Moskva 1882.
- Brückner 1891: A. Brückner, *Ein Finanzpolitiker in Russland im XVII Jahrhundert*, "Russische Revue", I, 1891, pp. 292-333.
- Car 2016: M. Car, *Uvod u dokumentarnu književnost*, Zagreb 2016.
- Jagić 1917: V. Jagić, *Život i rad Jurja Križanića. O tristogodišnjici njegova rođenja*, Zagreb 1917.
- Ferluga-Petronio 2015: F. Ferluga-Petronio, *Per l'85° anniversario di Ivan Golub, sacerdote, teologo, storico, filologo, traduttore e poeta*, "Studi Slavistici", XII, 2015, pp. 369-375.
- Gol'dberg 1975: A.L. Gol'dberg, *O "Smertnom razrede" Jurija Križanića*, in: *Pamjatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytija*, Moskva 1975, pp. 95-106.
- Gol'dberg, Golub 1976: A.L. Gol'dberg, I. Golub, *Bibliography*, in: T. Eekman, A. Kadić (eds.), *Juraj Križanić (1618-1683), Russophile and Ecumenic Visionary. A Symposium*, The Hague-Paris 1976, pp. 329-352.
- Golub 1964: I. Golub, *De mente ecclesiologica Georgii Križanić. Excerpta ex dissertatione ad Lauream in Facultate Theologica Pontificae Universitatis Gregoriana*, Roma 1964.
- Golub 1981: I. Golub, *Juraj Križanić. Glazbeni teoretik 17. stoljeća*, Zagreb 1981.
- Golub 1983a: I. Golub, *Slavenstvo Jurja Križanića*, Zagreb 1983.
- Golub 1983b: I. Golub, *Juraj Križanić. Sabrana građa*, Zagreb 1983.

- Golub 1983c: I. Golub, *Strastni život. Pjesan u smrt Jurja Križanića 1683-1983*, in: I. Golub, I. Lacković Croatia, *Strastni život*, Zagreb 1983.
- Golub 1986: I. Golub, *Svi su tokovi jedno. Uspomeni Jurja Križanića (1683-1983)*, in: B. Papandopulo, *Zbirka zborova a cappella*, Zagreb-[Rijeka] 1986, pp. 58-89.
- Golub 1987: I. Golub, *Križanić*, Zagreb 1987.
- Golub 1993a: I. Golub, *The Slavic Vision of Juraj Križanić*, Zagreb-Dubrovnik 1993.
- Golub 1993b: I. Golub, *La lingua di Križanić. Protoslavo, paleoslavo, panslavo, neoslavo*, "Orientalia Christiana periodica", LIX, 1993, 2, pp. 465-482.
- Golub 1997: I. Golub, *Svi odlasci Jurja Križanića. Televizijski scenarij*, "Forum", XXXVI, 1997, 11-12, pp. 1622-1641.
- Golub 2003: I. Golub, *Sabrana blizina*, Zagreb 2003.
- Golub 2009: I. Golub, *Nasmijani Bog. Deus Ridens*, Zagreb 2009.
- Golub 2012: I. Golub, *Ruska zima. Tragom Jurja Križanića*, "Forum", LI, 2012, 10-12, pp. 1172-1202.
- Golub 2014: I. Golub, *Običan čovjek*, Zagreb 2014².
- Kadić 1964: A. Kadić, *Križanić's Memorandum*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Ost-europas", XII, 1964, 3, pp. 331-349.
- Katičić 2013: R. Katičić, *Hrvatski jezik*, Zagreb 2013.
- Maroević 1986: T. Maroević, *Odanost ishodištu*, in: I. Golub, I. Lacković Croatia, *Strastni život. Pjesan u smrt Jurja Križanića 1683-1983*. Zagreb 1986, pp. [9]-[11].
- Maroević 2003: T. Maroević, *O cjelovitosti opusa Ivana Goluba*, in: I. Golub, *Sabrana blizina*, Zagreb 2003, pp. 5-16.
- Paščenko 2015: J. Paščenko, *Juraj Križanić i Ukrajina. Graditelji europske kršćanske unije*, Zagreb 2015.
- Perić 1991: R. Perić (ed.), *Homo Imago et Amicus Dei. Miscellanea in honorem Ioannis Golub*, Roma 1991.
- Tamarut 1991: A. Tamarut, *Bibliografija radova Ivana Goluba (izbor)*, in: R. Perić (ed.), *Homo Imago et Amicus Dei. Miscellanea in honorem Ioannis Golub*, Roma 1991, pp. 14-26.
- Stamać 2003: A. Stamać, *Pjesništvo dubokih temelja*, "Republika", LIX, 2003, 12, pp. 131-134.

Abstract

Mario Kolar, Gordana Tkalec

A Visionary, a Victim and a Co-Traveller. Juraj Križanić in the Literary Writings of Ivan Golub

Juraj Križanić (1618-1683) was a Croatian polyhistorian and a proto-ecumenist. His life was extensively studied by the Croatian writer and theologian Ivan Golub (1930-2018). Golub's interest in Križanić was both academic and literary, the latter resulting in several poems dedicated to Križanić, in a literary biography of Križanić, and also a script which he wrote for a documentary film depicting his life and deeds. Golub also referred to Križanić in numerous essays, and even in his autobiography. This paper targets that part of Golub's opus, with special emphasis on the relationship between the documentary and fictional representation, i.e. on the objective and subjective techniques that Golub used in his depiction of the historical figure.

Keywords

Juraj Križanić; Ivan Golub; Documentary; Literary Biography; Citation; Autobiographical Discourse.