WHO IS TALKING IN IVAN GOLUB'S *KALNOVEČKI RAZGOVORI* (*KALNOVEC DISCUSSIONS*)? THE ANALYSIS OF SPEAKERS AND LYRIC POLYPHONY

TKO RAZGOVARA U »KALNOVEČKIM RAZGOVORIMA« IVANA GOLUBA? ANALIZA NOSITELJA ISKAZA I LIRSKOG VIŠEGLASJA

Mario KOLAR
University of Rijeka
Faculty of humanities and social sciences
Department of Croatian language and literature
Sveučilišna avenija 4, Rijeka
mario.kolar@uniri.hr

Primljeno / Received: 15. 9. 2019.
Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 15. 11. 2019.
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Original scientific paper
UDK / UDC: 821.163.42.09Golub, I.
821.163.42'28-1

Gordana TKALEC
University North
Department of communicology, media and journalism
Trg dr. Žarka Dolinara 1, Koprivnica
gordana.tkalec@unin.hr

SUMMARY

Ivan Golub's Kalnovečki razgovori (Kalnovec discussions) (1979) are a comprehensive poetic structure composed mainly of monologues and dialogues. The speakers can be detected only from certain parts of expressions. To a large extent it is little Ivica, who presents childhood memories from his native village of Kalinovac (in Kajkavian dialect: Kalnovec) in Podravina region. Certain members of his close family, along with some neighbours and villagers can also be identified as speakers of certain statements. However, for a large number of statements it is not at all clear who articulated them. Therefore, after reconstruction of those speakers, for whose identity there are more or less reliable indicators, there is an attempt on one side to figure out who could be the speakers, where there are no such indicators, and on the other side to explain why the identity of the speakers was not mentioned.

Key words: speaker, lyric subject, lyric dialogue, lyric monologue, polyphony
Ključne riječi: nositelj iskaza, lirski subjekt, lirski dijalog, lirski monolog, višeglasje

INTRODUCTION

Ivan Golub's *Kalnovec discussions* are a lengthy poetic structure that resists traditional genealogical classifications. The work comprises one hundred and sixty untitled numbered verse groups[1], i.e. more

[1] Numbering of verse groups (from two to several tens per group) was conducted by the author in the last authorized edition of *Kalnovečki razgovori* (*Kalnovec discussions*) during his life time, published in the book of selected verses from the entire opus under the title a *Pohod milosti* (*The quest of mercy*) (2013), to which we also refer in this paper (see Ivan GOLUB: Kalnovečki razgovori (Kalnovec discussions). In: *Pohod milosti: izabrane pjesme* (*The quest of mercy: selected poems*). Poems selected and afterword written by Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Školska knjiga – Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2013. pp. [5]-73).

than one thousand verses. Since they were first published in the *Forum*[2] magazine, and subsequently as a book[3], they are frequently marked as cycle, i.e.as collection of poems. However, none of the two expressions are suitable for *Kalnovec discussions* because they are not a series of mutually unconnected poems, but a closed coherent whole, and therefore the afore mentioned numbered groups would sooner make a sequence of one whole, than each of them one separate poem. In a certain sense, those sequences represent what stanzas represent in a poem. However, due to their extensive scope *Kalnovec discussions* can not be classified as lyric poem. What is more, they resist such classification considering the fact that they don't contain a unique lyric subject or narrator and that we can identify many speakers in them. Genealogical label that would be appropriate for *Kalnovec discussions* considering their scope would be an epic or a long poem, but unlike that long versed literary genre, Golub's work does not possess narrative technique and a plot as its main foundation. For that same reason genealogical label of epis poem as a somewhat shorter versed structure compared to epic and long poem would also not be suitable for *Kalnovec discussions*, and they differ from those genres since they are not written in uniform verse – they contain verses of different lengths along with bound and unbound verse[4]. Genealogical label that would probably be best suited for *Kalnovec discussions* might be a poem, as classified by Joža Skok[5], and the author himself[6]. However, this label is primarily used to denote »a versed genre of middle length«[7], which *Kalnovec discussions* to a great extent surpass with their great scope[8]. Considering shortly presented difficulties regarding the selection of classification label from the repertoire of literary theory, individual researchers resorted to genre labels from other art forms. For example, Tonko Maroević named *Kalnovec discussions* a coral symphony[9], Aleksandar Flaker oratorio[10], Božica Jelušić[11] chronicle etc.

And whilst due to its extensive scope it is complicated to define its genealogical label, it gets even more complicated once we take into account the structure and topic of the work. In terms of structure, the work consists of four parts named after the seasons of the year[12], which is a procedure that can be

---

2 Ivan GOLUB: *Kalnovečki razgovori* (*Kalnovec discussions*). *Forum*, 17 (1978.), nr. 10-11, pp. 712-761.

3 Ivan GOLUB: *Kalnovečki razgovori* (*Kalnovec discussions*). Zagreb, own publishing, 1979.

4 More about characteristics of epic, epic poem and epic poetry in general can be found in: Milivoj SOLAR: *Književni leksikon: pisci, djela, pojmovi* (*Literary lexicon: writers, works, notions*). Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2011. pp. 137 and 140.

5 Joža SKOK: Kajkavski solilokvij Ivana Goluba (Kajkavian soliloquy of Ivan Golub). In: *Homo imago et amicus Dei: miscellanea in honorem Ioannis Golub* / Čovjek *slika i prijatelj Božji: zbornik u* čast *Ivana Goluba* (*Man image and friend of God: proceedings in the honour of Ivan Golub*). Rome, Pontifical Croatian College of St. Jerome, 1991. pp. 621-625.

6 Ivan GOLUB: *Običan* čovjek (*Ordinary man*). Second extended edition. Zagreb, Naklada Ljevak, 2014. pp 40 and elsewhere.

7 M. Solar, *Književni leksikon* (*Literary lexicon*), pp. 370.

8 For the purpose of comparison, one of the best known long poems of more recent Croatian literature, *Jama* (*The Pit*) written by Ivan Goran Kovačić, is comprised of four hundred verses, which is half the number of verses in *Kalnovec discussions*.

9 Tonko MAROEVIĆ: Učenik i hodočasnik: pjesnik; zapis o pjesništvu Ivana Goluba (The student and the pilgrim: the poet; records about Ivan Golub's poetry). In: Ivan GOLUB: *Pohod milosti: izabrane pjesme* (*The quest of mercy: selected poems*). Poems selected and afterword written by Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Školska knjiga – Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2013. pp. 802.

10 Aleksandar FLAKER: Kalnovečki razgovori: intermedijalni (Kalnovec discussions: intermedial). In: *Medij hrvatske književnosti 20. stoljeća: zbornik radova III. znanstvenog skupa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem, Zagreb, 28. XI. - 29. XI. 2003.* (*Medium of the Croatian literature of the 20th century: proceedings of the III. international scientific meeting, Zagreb, 28. XI. - 29. XI. 2003*) (editor in chief Branimir Bošnjak). Zagreb, Altagama, 2004. pp. 182.

11 Božica JELUŠIĆ: Zavičajno gnijezdo. (Native nest) In: Ivan GOLUB: *Kalnovečki razgovori* (*Kalnovec discussions*). Reprint. Kalinovac, Municipality of Kalinovac, 2007. pp. 84.

12 In the first independent edition of *Kalnovec discussions* (1979) individual parts were not titled with words, but bordered with illustrations of Ivan Lacković Croata, depicting typical landscape motifs for each season of the year in rural areas. Besides the illustrations, at the beginning of each part there was a short poem about a typi-

encountered in any literary genre, and it is therefore irrelevant for us in this context. However, our attention has to be oriented towards organisation of verses into the afore mentioned numbered sequences which don't emerge one from another in terms of content, but each starts its own theme or elaborate on its own motif which is not firmly connected with the motif of the preceding or the following sequence. What combines the sequences within the individual of the four parts in one whole is the fact that that they are all in one way or the other related to the season of the year which is the topic of a certain part, but without strong succession between them in terms of theme and motif.

Regarding the structure of *Kalnovec discussions*, one should also pay attention to the list of seventy-two persons placed at the beginning of the work for several reasons. Firstly, although the list literally outlines male and female persons[13], it is significant because it is not their names that are listed next to their family names (i.e. possessive adjectives derived from family names) but their nicknames that tell us something about their occupation, social status, character etc. Among the listed individuals we find »Bogek Matičin« and »Baraba Bazijančev«, where the first one could be good, honest and religious man (*Bogek* is Kajkavian diminutive from the word *Bog* meaning God), and the second one his exact opposite (*baraba* in Croatian language stands for a rough, vulgar and violent man). The importance of this will be explained in more detail in further sections of this work, and before that, our attention should be given to the sentence found at the end of the list, i.e., the sentence that, separated by an empty line, stands at the end of that list - »they are talking«. It is, therefore, a list of people that take part in the conversation in this work, i.e. a list that would in a drama play correspond to the list of characters that will appear in the play. In this respect, this work on a structural level resembles drama plays that begin with the list of *dramatis personae*. Besides the list of actors/characters/voices at their beginning, the similarity of *Kalnovec discussions* with drama plays is reflected in the fact that, just like in drama plays, dialogue is one of their main structural principles. In this case it is the lyrical dialogue. However, the way in which these dialogues are presented within the work differs significantly in comparison with drama plays. Since the method of structuring dialogues in *Kalnovec discussions* is strongly connected with their topic, before we explain how the dialogues in *Discussions* differ from those in drama plays, we have to briefly reflect on their thematic layer.

When it comes to the topic of *Kalnovec discussions*, to put it in simple words, the work consists of a series of reminiscences of childhood in the village of Kalinovec in Podravina in the period preceding World War II, primarily presenting people from family circle, neighbours and other fellow villagers, along with the atmosphere, activities and customs in the homeland region. As evident from the title itself, the work is written in the local Kajkavian dialect of the village of Kalinovac, locally called the village of *Kalnovec*. In this respect the indicative homeland topic corresponds to the regional homeland dialogue. However, through describing the seemingly common topic (evocation of persons, events and customs related to childhood in rural homeland), the work still presents a very complex problem area, or we could say an overall life philosophy which gives answers to the most important questions, like the ones of life and death. Due to such »layered simplicity«, or in other words »simple depth«[14] *Kalnovec discussions* indeed deserve great attention for their shortly presented intergenre affiliation, as well as for their rarely seen multipart harmony, or wide »spectrum of variable speech actions«[15] found in them, which will be the primary topic of this paper.

---

cal motif for each season of the year. Those poems were located at the back of the page with the illustration, and were placed at the bottom of the page, which emphasized their detachment from other verses presented in continuity. Those introductory poems were kept in later editions as well. However, in the first selection of Golub's entire work opus (*Sabrana blizina / Collected whole*, 2003) parts of *Kalnovec discussions* for the first time obtained their titles with words, *Prolet*, *Leto*, *Jesen* and *Zima* (*Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter*), but the illustrations were omitted. In the edition of Golub's selected poems (*Pohod milosti / The quest of mercy*, 2013) certain parts of *Kalnovec discussions* were marked with both titles and illustrations.

13 In his autobiographical book the author stated that the persons he mentioned in the list are real people from his native Kalinovac. Compare I. Golub, *Običan* čovjek (*Ordinary man*), pp. 471.

14 T. Maroević: *Učenik i hodočasnik: pjesnik* (*The student and the pilgrim: the poet*) pp. 802.

15 Cvjetko MILANJA: *Hrvatsko pjesništvo 1950. – 2000.* (*Croatian poetry 1950 – 2000*) Part IV. Book 1. Zagreb, Altagama, 2012. pp. 288.

Evocation of childhood is expressed through statements of different voices / actors, or in other words through different types of statements, including the impersonal ones. Some speakers are clearly marked, whereas for some other statements it remains unclear who uttered them. With reference to the list of characters at the beginning of the work it is evident that the speakers are the persons from that list, but it remains unclear who said what. In any case, the fact that the statements are not linked with their speakers is one of the main reasons why the *Kalnovec discussions* most surely don't represent a drama piece – in such pieces, which also consist of a series of statements and/or dialogues, it is always marked who is speaking, and if it is not, it can be inferred from the replies of other characters, or from stage directions. In *Kalnovec discussions* it is not the case and therefore in this paper we will try to recognize who is telling what and to whom, i.e. who are the speakers in this work.

LYRIC DIALOGUE OF LITTLE IVICA WITH HIS FATHER AND MOTHER

After the list comprising seventy-two people, *Kalnovec discussions* begin with a lyric dialogue (sequence number 2) from which it is easy to infer its participants:

»Papo! Oj?	(Dad! Oi?
A kaj to delate? Kolje podaštram.	What are you doing? I'm sharpening the stakes.
A kaj bute s koljem delali? Bum je v gorice vozil, na Šargi.	And what are you going do with the stakes? I'll drive them to the vineyard, On Šarga.
(...)	(…)
A kaj bute tam s kolcom delali? Bum ga nakolil nuz trs.	And what are you gonna do with the stake there? I'll stake it Next to the vine.
A zakaj? Kaj bu loza po njem puzala.	And why? So the vine can crawl on it.
A zakaj bu puzala? Kaj bu mogla grozdje na sebi držati, kaj bu Ivica imal kaj zobati.	And why will it crawl? So it can keep grapes on itself, So that Ivica can have something to nibble on.
A je l' bum i vino pil? Dok budeš veliki...«	And will I drink wine? When you're older…)*

It is evident that this lyric dialogue begins with addressing the father (*papa* in some Kajkavian variants, among which also the variant spoken in Kalinovac, means *father*) and asking him what he was doing. Since he is calling him father, it is clear that he is addressed by his son, which is also substantiated by the fact that his son addresses him with *Sir,* which was an old custom for children addressing parents in Kajkavian speaking regions. The fact that the other expressed subject is a child is evident for

* Considering the fact that there is no official translation of *Kalnovec discussions* into the English language, in this paper we resorted to our own translation which is of illustrative nature. Its primary objective is to show what the verses are about, whereas its artistic aspect is of secondary importance.

the father's answer stating that he will be able to drink wine once he grows up (»Dok budeš veliki« - When you're older), whereas the other father's reply reveals that his son's name is – Ivica. After initial address of the son, this sequence is followed by eleven questions asked by the son and the same number of father's answers, after which there is the son's concluding sentence which is not followed by father's reply. The last question in which the son asks if he could go to the vineyard with the father, the father answers that he can go if he will be good, to which the son replies: »Budem! Kak trn f peti« (I will be good! Like a thorn in a heel!). The author used the short version of the phrase »Kak trn f peti« (the full phrase in the standard language would read: *Biti dobar kao trn u peti / Be good like a thorn in a heel*) which means to be bad, and therefore it is more probable that the son did not day that out loud, but that he thought that to himself. Since he wanted to go to the vineyard with the father, which is evident from the content of the sequence, Ivica would most surely not convey that he intends to behave badly there because he is aware that in that case the father would not take him along. Therefore, it is more probable that is merely his thought and not something that he said out loud in front of his father.

In this respect, this sequence consists from the lyric dialogue between father and son and the son's final *hidden* statement, which tells us that the son is what in the theory of narration we would call a focaliser. In other words, the reader does not *see* what the father thinks, but only what the son thinks, which implies that the dialogue is presented from the son's perspective. Similar procedure is used through the entire work, which makes Ivica a lyric focaliser of the large extent of what is presented in this work. This was also Skok's opinion, who thought that *Kalnovec discussions* »deal with the perspective of the adults from the position of child's experience nurtured by its curiosity and in wide spectrum of his experiences registering everything that is going on in the rich panorama of life«[16].

Ivica has lyric dialogues with his father in sequences number 22, 24, 81, 121 and 155, all of them very short except for sequence 121 (they consist of a short question asked by the son and a short reply of the father), whereas in the longer one (nr. 121) Ivica, similar to sequence nr. 2, asks his father in more detail what they are going to do at the fair held in another town, where they will soon go. One of the last sequences (nr. 157) depicts the father addressing his son, and it is a kind of premortem farewell, in which he bequeathed him the family estate stating that he will have to take care of it (»Ivina, Ivina, buš gazda!« - Ivina, Ivina, you will be the master! etc.). Here we can also see the change in the way how the father addresses his son – in the dialogue from sequence 2 he calls him »Ivica«, since he is not allowed to drink wine because he is just a child, whereas in sequence number 121 he is no longer a child for him because he has to take over the estate, and therefore he no longer addresses him as a child, but as a grown man - »Ivina« (augmentative from Ivan).

Besides with his father, Ivica has most of his dialogues with his mother (sequences nr. 16, 58, 76, 92, 124, 133, 142 and 153). The most interesting is sequence nr. 92 in which mother reproaches Ivica because she heard that he had been punished at school. However, he has his own justification and explains the entire situation:

»Ivina, Ivina,	(Ivina, Ivina,
Jantunina mi je povedal	Jantunina told me
da si denes za pločom stal.	That you were standing in front of the blackboard.
Na remence te zesečem.	I'll beat the breaks off you.
Vučitelka su nas terali	The teacher made us
kaj bi po gospocki govorili.	talk gentlemen-like.
Ivina Mlinjaričev, Naco Grkčev,	Ivina Mlinjaričev, Naco Grkčev,
Štefina Goričkov i Ruža z Gred,	Štefina Goričkov and Ruža from Grede,
Bara Karlovčanova i dečoki Matičini	Bara Karlovčanova and Matičina's boys
došli su pred vučitelku i prosili:	Came to the teacher and asked her:
'Molim, gospođo, pisalicu!'	'Please, madam, a chalk!'
Dok sem ja došel pred vučitelku rekel sem:	When I came to the teacher I said:

[16] J. Skok, *Kajkavski solilokvij Ivana Goluba* (*Kajkavian soliloquy of Ivan Golub*), pp. 624.

'Ja ne bum nigda po gospocki govoril!'
Nesu mi dali pisalicu,
sterali su me za ploču stat;
nek se predomislim.
Si su čarajskali s pisalicom po pločicaj,
vučitelka su s kredom po ploči cvileli,
ja sem fort za pločom stal.
Majka, najte me biti, noge me bole!«

'I'll never speak gentlemen-like!'
I didn't get a chalk,
Was made to stand in front of the blackboard;
To think about it.
Everyone was scribbling with chalks on their boards,
The teacher's chalk was yelping on the blackboard,
And I kept standing in front of the blackboard,
Mother, don't hit me, my legs hurt!)

In this sequence Ivica on one side expresses his contempt for the standard language and his attachment to his native dialect and asks his mother, not to punish him for it. He was punished at school, but it remains unclear whether his mother punished him as well. His mother addresses him unilaterally in sequence number 59: »Odi k mami na krilo: / O Ivica majkin sin, / buš mi čuval troje svinj... (Come to your mother's lap: / Oh, Ivica, you are your mom's son / you will guard my three pigs).

LYRIC DIALOGUES OF UNKNOWN ACTORS

Unlike the stated lyric dialogues where it is clear who is participating in conversation, i.e. who is the speaker, *Kalnovec discussions* have a large number of lyric communication exchanges based on which it is possible to identify only one or even none of the speakers.

As for the dialogues where we can identify at least one of the speakers, we can use sequence nr. 78 as an example:

»Vido, nemrem s kol dole!
Stolca mi daj!
Grebena ti donesem.

Vido, pokrij me!
Oču, z branom.«

(Vida, I can't get off the cart!
Give me a chair!
I'll bring you hackle.

Vida, cover me!
I shall, with plough.)

In this lyric communication exchange unnamed subject is addressing the female subject named Vida asking a favour to help him get off the cart (in three-line stanza) and to cover him (in two-line stanza), to which Vida gives ironic replies, clearly having no intention to meet his requirements. Considering the content of the dialogue, the speakers could be the spouses who had an argument (for example, the husband got drunk and can not get off the cart on his own, and neither can he cover himself), but the lack of their names and family names prevent us from finding out who they really are – we only know that the female subject's name is Vida. In the list of actors / persons at the beginning of the work no person named Vida is mentioned.

Sequence nr. 95. also discloses only one part of interlocutors in the dialogue:

»Iva gliva
rit pišliva.
Sofa kofa,
sofa kofa.
Maturica putrica
v grabu skočil,
tura smočil.
Druga deca idu spat,
a Matura tura prat.[17]

[17] This is a nursery rhyme used for teasing and mocking and it is not possible to translate it because they use personal names Iva, Sofa and Maturica and words related to them.

To se ne sme zdevati
- bu vas Bogek karal.
Mene ne bu karal
ja nesem zdevala.«

(You shouldn't mock
- God will punish you.
I won't be punished,
I wasn't mocking anyone.)

What can be inferred without any doubt is that in this sequence three children are teasing one another Iva (this could be a female name Iva, but also a derivative of a male name Ivan), Sofa (this could be a derivative from a female name Sofija) and Maturica (diminutive of Matura, which is an augmentative of Mato). As witnessed by sequence nr. 66 in which the majority of Ivica's family members are mentioned, the name of one of Ivica's sisters is Sofa, so these could be siblings teasing one another. However, whether we are dealing with brotherly and sisterly teasing or not, it remains unclear who is communicating in the last two two-line stanzas – the first subject is warning the children that they should not mock others, and the female subject from the last two-line stanza justifies herself by saying that she was not mocking anybody. The subject that is warning the children could be an older person (for example father, mother, grandmother or grandfather), but it could be a child that does not like mocking. The female subject that justified herself that she was not mocking anybody could be a child standing on the side and observing Iva, Sofa and Maturica teasing one another, but also some of them who thought that what they were saying was not mocking (»zdevanje«).

Just like in sequence nr. 157 the father bequeathed Ivica to take over his work, in sequence nr. 104. the female subject (obviously the mother) is addressing Jana (apparently her daughter) to take over her work (cleaning the house, cooking)[18]. However, it could be some other Jana. Similar situation is found in sequence nr. 62. in which the female subject, apparently on deathbed, is saying her final goodbyes: »Naj se žalostiti dok mene ne bu / Stareši se moraju mlajšema mekivati (Don't be sad when I am gone / The older need to make room for the young ones). Another dialogue in which at least one actor is known is found in sequence nr. 108 in which the female subject is unilaterally addressing Bara (this is, by the way, the name f Ivica's mother, which was confirmed in several parts of the work, but it could also be some other Bara) »Baro, ja te navčim: / dok sem ja kaj kriva, / ja čoveka na vrate špotom dočekam« (Bara, I will teach you: / When I make a mistake, / I scold the man right at the doorstep).

And whilst some parts of lyric dialogues reveal the identity (name, family name or nickname) of at least one of the interlocutors, in a large number of dialogue sequences it is not possible to discern the identity of either of the interlocutors. The only thing that can be inferred is their gender, age or relation to the other interlocutor (relatives, friends, enemies). Sequence number 52 can serve as an example:

»Koja su vam leta bila najtežeša?
Mulčeva leta!

A koja su to mulčeva leta?
Okraj četrdeset, pedeset.
Tu je čoveku najbolje,
tu si čovek najviše zla zaželi –
i smrt si čovek zaželi.

A zakaj?
Ne znam zakaj,
a ne moram ni znati.
Da i znam – ne moram povedati.
Nigda naj se reči kaj je vu tebi!
Ako se rečeš, onda si

(Which years were the hardest for you?
Fool's years.

And which are the fool's years?
Around forty, fifty,
That's when things are the best for a man,
It's when one wishes the worst for oneself –
Including death.

Why?
I don't know why,
And I don't need to know.
Even if I did know – I wouldn't have to tell you.
Never say everything that's inside you!
If you tell it all, then you are

[18] This is probably Ivica's mother addressing her daughter, since, as witnessed by sequence nr. 66, Ivica's sister is called Jana.

kak vojnik koji pušku sprazni.
Moraš imati svoju tajnu
i pred ženom i pred decom
i pred jocom i pred sebom,«

Like a soldier emptying his rifle.
You need to have a secret
In front of your wife and your children
And your father and yourself.)

This lyric dialogue presents a conversation of two unknown subjects, in which one subject asks the questions and the other one answers them. It is evident that the subject answering the questions in a certain way sends some kind of messages to the subject asking the questions, from which it could be implied that we are dealing with the dialogue between a younger and an older person, potentially between a child and a parent or a child and a grandmother or a grandfather. And whilst we could discern their age, or event he type of their relation, their gender remains unclear. The only help are some line sin which the subject answering the questions tells the subject asking the questions that they should keep secrets, among others, »i pred ženom i pred decom« (from his wife and children), which could imply that the subject answering the questions is male and is speaking from his own perspective (everybody should have secrets like he does from his wife) or that the subject he is talking to is male, so he is talking from his perspective (telling him that he should keep secrets from his (future) wife).

Very scarce determinants of speakers' identity are present in sequences nr. 17, 23, 25, 28, 36, 38, 43, 61, 64, 65, 73, 84, 89, 103, 105, 114, 135, 136, 137, 138, 143, 144, 146 and 148. Some of them provide so little information about the interlocutors that it is difficult to infer anything about them, even age or gender. An example of this is sequence nr. 105:

»Gda bo sudni den?
Saki den je nekomu sudni den.«

(When's the Judgement Day?
Every day is the Judgement Day for someone.)

Once again we have a dialogue consisting of questions and answers, but it is very difficult to suggest its participants. When we look at the subject asking the question, we can see that it could be anybody, a child or an adult, both male and female, religious and non-religious person, educated or uneducated etc. We could more a bit more precisely define the person answering the questions because its answer contains a certain amount of wisdom, so it is probably an adult. But this is everything that one could infer, whereas gender, education level, whether the person is religious or not etc. remains unclear.

In all examples listed above the speakers spoke in their own name, but in sequence nr. 25. the speakers speak in the name of the group:

»Falem Isus i Marija,
domari čuvari,
koji ste doma čuvali.
Delimo Božega blagoslova
od svete meše.
Lepo zafalimo.
A kaj je bilo predečtvo?
Od nekakvoga čoveka,
koji je težake v gorice iskal.
A je l' je našel?
Je, i ž njema se posvadil.
A zakaj se v goricaj navek posvade?«

(God be with you,
Who stayed home
And guarded it.
We share with you God's blessing
From the holy mass.
We thank you most kindly.
And what was the homily about?
Some man
Looking for workers in a vineyard.
Did he find them?
Yes, and had an argument with them.
Why are there always arguments in vineyards?)

This lyric dialogue is initiated by the representative of the group who attended the holy mass and addresses the group whose members were not at the holy mass when coming to their, or possibly his own home. Representatives of both groups speak in the first person plural, in the name of the group:

»*Delimo* Božega blagoslova« (*We share* with you God's blessing), and not *delim* (*I share*) is uttered by the representative of those who attended the holy mass, and the representative of those who stayed at home replies »Lepo *zafalimo*« (We thank you most kindly), and not *zafalim* (I thank you). We could assume that this is a dialogue between household members, of whom one part attended the holy mass and the other part did not, but it is also possible that those who were not at the holy mass are visited by friends, neighbours or somebody else. In any case, it is not possible to establish a more precise identity of the interlocutors. Similar situation is found in sequence nr. 125, in which it is obvious that the speakers in the dialogue are children preparing to participate in a village tradition related to Catholic holiday of the Holy three kings, and say in the name of the group (»Pemo po zvezdarkaj... / Kupimo papera...« etc. - We will go at night…. / We will collect paper).

Dialogue elements are also found in statements in which one speaker is addressing another subject whose identity is not known and whose reply is not written. They have the form of some sort of elliptic dialogues which could also be called pseudodialogues, i.e. dialogue statements in which only the sender of the message is present, but the recipient is not. Some of those statements have a form of a question, for example sequence nr. 31:

»Dok čovek vmerne	(When one dies
da još oda po tem svetu.	Should it still walk on earth.
Je l' bum i ja tak morala?«	Will I have to do that as well?)

It is evident that the speaker is asking someone a question, but it is not clear who the speaker is, or who the question is addressed to. In addition, there is no reply to his question. Besides in the question form, such pseudodialogues are most frequently found in the form of giving orders or passing wisdom on others, for example in sequence nr. 122:

»Kam se žuriš?	(Why are you in a hurry?
Na špota navek doma dospeš!	It's never too late to get scolded at home!
Kak nepovrat	You always want to finish things on time
navek delaš i samo skrbiš.	And are always working and only earning.
Kam se žuriš?«	Why are you in a hurry?)

It can be seen that one subject is asking questions, but through those questions he is actually scolding the other subject. However, it remains completely unclear who is speaking and to whom is he addressing his scolding. From this two-line stanza is not possible to identify any identification determinants of neither the speaker or the person that the statement is addressed to. In sequence nr. 137 someone is addressing another person with a certain observation: »Meni neje ni za jelo ni za pilo / nego mi je za tvoju lepu reč« (I don't care about food and drinks / I just care about your kind words), and it is not known who is saying that and who is that observation intended for. Such unilateral pseudodialogues are also found in sequences nr. br. 7, 9, 11, 12, 18, 19, 60, 69, 74, 80, 88, 94, 102, 111, 114, 117, 118, 143, 144 and 148.

LYRIC MONOLOGUES OF KNOWN AND UNKNOWN SPEAKERS

Besides verse organised through dialogue or pseudodialogue form, in *Kalnovec discussions* there is a large number of verses which correspond to the form of a monologue. Those are poetic statements in which the denoted subject expresses his own thoughts, feelings etc. In some of them it is easy to discern who expressed them, whereas in some others it is more difficult. Just like in lyric dialogues and pseudodialogues, in these, let us call them according to analogy, lyric monologues, the speaker that occurs the most frequently is Ivica, in sequences nr. 26, 133 and 149. In the first one (nr. 26) the denoted subject is a male child speaking about how he got new clothes for Easter: »Dobil sem novu opravu. / Na Veliki četrtek su mi ju / mama v Đurđevcu kupili.« (I got new clothes. / Mom bought them for me in Đurđevac on Maundy Thursday). Apart from the fact that the lines are pronounced by a male child, sequence nr.

121, in which the parents promise Ivica that they will buy him new clothes for Easter at the fair, substantiates the fact that Ivica is the speaker of that statement. (»...kupimo Ivici opravu, / buš se štimal ž njom / na Vuzem« – Let's buy Ivica some new clothes, / he will look very fancy in them / on Easter day). It is even more apparent that Ivica is the subject that speaks in sequence nr. 133, since in that sequence he mentions his father and mother who explicitly address him. The sequence speaks about Christmas tradition in their family. Similar situation is found in sequence nr. 149 in which Ivica describes family dinner.

Regarding the fact that they are pronounced by an infantile male subject and considering their content, Ivica could also be the speaker in sequences nr. 20, 32 and 98. In the first one of them (nr. 20) he talks about tired household members coming back from the field, and the fact that they are members of Ivica's family is indicated by the name of the mare Šarga, which is mentioned in other sequences in the context of Ivica's family. However, it is possible that some other family also had a mare called Šarga. Just as likely, if the sequence deals with Ivica's family, the *story* could be presented by one of his brothers and not he himself. The content of sequence nr. 32 is even more general, and Ivica's voice even more doubtful – namely, the infantile subject (whose gender is not even marked) concludes that his father saw »kak dupleri odaju / med Crnema Jarke / na Batinskaj« (candles walking / through Crni Jarki / at Batinske). In other words, in that particular sequence some child concludes that his father saw a strange occurrence in a certain area (Crni Jarki are a part of forest, and Batinske is a small hamlet close to Kalinovac), and can therefore easily be attributed to Ivica. The same situation is found in sequence nr. 98, which depicts winter landscapes and behaviour of individual actors.

However, regarding their content and position within the structure of *Kalnovec discussions* Ivica is a more probable speaker in sequences nr. 39, 119 and 159, which close the parts *Prolet*, *Jesen* and *Zima* (Spring, Summer and Winter) and carry strong messages about the meaning of life and fundamental life values. Here is the ending of sequence nr. 39:

»Kruva imam,	(I've got enough to eat,
krova imam,	I've got a roof over my head,
delati imam.	I've got work to do.
Pod noč na poceku sedim.	I sit on the doorstep in the evening.
Kaj mi fali?	What am I missing?
Susede sem lepo.	I get along with my neighbours.
Mudrije ne teram.	I don't philosophize.
Gnoja sem zvozil.	I drove the manure away.
kaj mi fali?	What am I missing?
Lepo mi je s tebom	I like being with you
od denes do zutra	Every day
za stolom počkoma.	At the table in silence.
Sega bu, nas ne bu.«	Everything will remain except us.)

The speaker of this sequence is a village man / lad satisfied with his modest life and aware of ephemerality of everything, and primarily of his own life, which he emphasizes in the last line. However, we can not say with certainty that the speaker of this statement is Ivica, since there are no text signals to substantiate it. What we can establish on one side is that the speaker in this sequence, just like in sequence nr. 20, mentions that he sits on wooden doorstep (»pocek«), which indicates that both sequences are pronounced by the same speaker. On the other hand, life values that he mentions are identical to the ones mentioned in, apparently equally pragmatic, sequences nr. 119 and 159. This is sequence nr. 119:

»Kam se žurim?
Neču biti
cucek nuz drum.

A kaj oču?
Nikaj biti,
samo biti
denes zutra,
saki den.

Itak je najlepše
kaj se čovek
more menjati, kleti i moliti,
popevati i plakati.
Em se si zdojdemo –
jeden ovak, drugi onak,
jeden denes, drugi zutra.«

(Why am I in a hurry?
I don't want to be
Like a dog on a road.

And what do I want?
To be nothing,
Just to be,
Today tomorrow,
Every day.

The most beautiful thing anyway
Is that one
Can change, swear and pray,
Sing and cry.
We all die anyway –
One way or another,
Today or tomorrow.)

The speaker of this sequence speaks about his own modesty and awareness of the ephemerality, and these values are proclaimed as the most important ones by the speaker in sequence nr. 159:

»Nek puza na vrj što oče,
meni je lepše na zemli;
veter spune,
gran se ftrgne.

Neču biti
križno drevo
ni na drumu
ni na groblju
ničiji flajbaz
neču biti.

Kaj to oču biti?
Nikaj!
Nikaj ne lepše neg
nikaj!«

(Who wants to go on top can go,
I like it better on earth;
The wind blows,
A branch breaks.

I don't want to be
A crucifix
Either by the road
Or in the graveyard
I don't want to be
Anyone's pencil.

What do I want to be?
Nothing!
There's nothing more beautiful than
Nothing!)

All three sequences mentioned above (nr. 39, 119 and 159) proclaim modesty and awareness of ephemerality as leading thoughts and it is therefore possible that they are pronounced by the same subject. but is it Ivica? The fact that he pronounces them is supported by him being the *main character* of the entire work, and it is logical that it was him who was assigned to close the chapters and give some of the most significant messages presented in this literary work. However, since some sequences contain almost no signals indicating that they are pronounced by Ivica, this can not be established with great degree of certainty.

Certain members of Ivica's family could also be identified as speakers in some of the monologue sequences. For example, sequence nr. 154 is pronounced by Ivica's brother, who declares that himself: »(...) Nešče bu vmrl f Kalnovcu, / a kaj moj brat dela? / Piše, piše; (...) Bilo nas je petnajst, / sad smo samo on i ja.« (...) (Someone will die in Kalnovec, / what is my brother doing? / He is writing, he is

writing; (...) There were fifteen of us, / now it is only him and me« (...). The speaker of sequence nr. 152 could be Ivica's father, since he is describing Ivica sleeping, and it is evident that the speaker is an adult male person taking care of his family. When it comes to the other monologue sequences (nr. 15, 50, 68, 85, 110, 127, 129, 147, 151 and 158), their content by no means indicates who could be the speaker in them. It is only possible to discern that those are adults, some of them male and some female. Similar to dialogue sequences, some monologue sequences are also marked by a speaker speaking in the name of the group. For example, in sequence nr. 123 the speaker is the child speaking on behalf of other children that will take part in village tradition on the occasion of Saint Lucy's day (»Pemo po Lucijaj...« – We will go to Saint Lucy's day festivity). Monologue speaker speaking in plural is best expressed in sequence nr. 128:

»Sedimo do pol noči,	(We're sitting there until midnight,
menimo se od negdašnega sveta;	Talking about the past,
poteramo od turskoga rata,	Starting from the Ottoman wars,
oljenka čmiži nakraj stola.	An oil lamp smoulders at the end of the table.
(...)	(…)
Deca pospala na postelki,	The children are asleep on the bed,
nadrpala su se celi den.	They've played to the top of their bent all day long.
(...)«	(…)

This is clearly a description of an evening in some family after the children had fallen asleep and the adults are shortening their time involved in discussions. The subject is probably speaking on behalf of the awake part of the family, and those could be either the grandfather or the father (in one line he mentions that the mother/grandmother is moistening the hemp with saliva (»majka sline kudelu«), so they most certainly don't speak about themselves in the third person), or some of the older brothers or relatives that lived in the household (aunts, uncles etc.). However, this is also pure speculation.

IMPERSONAL STATEMENTS

Along with dialogues, pseudodialogues and monologues, in one part of sequences of *Kalnovec discussions* there is no mention of the subjectivity of the speaker, i.e. nobody is speaking in those sequences and nobody is pronouncing them in their own or someone else's behalf. A great extent of such impersonal sequences are descriptions of landscapes or interiors, or descriptions of some event, someone's conduct etc. For example, sequence nr. 113 speaks about the death of a women from the village and reactions of other fellow villagers related to that event:

»Cila Taušanova je vmrla.	(Cila Taušanova has died.
Majka nareču sega glasa:	The mother is wailing:
Ti buš tak mlada	You're so young
na groblju počivala,	And in a grave,
a ja tak stara	And I'm so old,
bum fort delala«.	Yet I need to work.)

Similar descriptive sequences are sequences nr. 3, 6, 27, 29, 34, 35, 37, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 54, 63, 67, 71, 72, 79, 83, 90, 99, 115, 126, 130, 131, 132, 134, 140, 141, 145, 150 and 156.

Some sequences are not entirely dedicated to only one person from the thematised microcosmos of Kalinovac. They also speak about their conduct or characteristics that mark them distinctively. For example, sequence nr. 33 is dedicated to Ivica's father, nr. 66 to Ivica's mother, nr. 30 to Ivica's grandfather (»japoku Golubovu«), nr. 100. to Ivica's uncle (»Popevač Golubov), and nr. 109 to a certain »japok« (grandfather) Miter. It is not possible to discern from the other sequences of that type which person they depict (nr. 10, 57, 86, 96, 101 and 116). This is an example from sequence nr. 57:

»V goricaj je bil,
travu pokosil,
seno rastepel.
Najemput kiša.
Rasrdil se je,
f klet se pokupil,
kipe z stene zel,
na kišu je znel:
'Kad tebi neje
za moje seno,
neje ni meni
za tvoje svece'«.

(He was in a vineyard,
Mowed the lawn,
Spread the hay.
Suddenly it started to rain.
He got angry,
Went to the vineyard hut,
Took the paintings from the wall
Out in the rain:
'If you don't care
about my hay,
then I don't care
about your saints!')

This sequence most surely describes an adult village man who owns a vineyard and who is angry that it rained after he had mowed the hay. This could be Ivica's father, but there is no signal in any of the lines to substantiate this assumption. There are also on other signals that would point to some other person and it is difficult to guess who the speaker really is.

Sequences expressing folk proverbs or wisdoms are also included in impersonal statements in *Kalnovec discussions*. Such sequences are sequences nr. 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 21, 53, 55, 56, 70, 77, 82, 87, 91, 93, 97, 106, 107, 112, 139 and 160. Some of them are generally known, whereas a part of phrases and proverbs are known only in Podravina. Some are specific types of folk wisdom, some are number rhymes, riddles and mocking rhymes, and some are author's original creations. The most famous one is a two-line stanza that closes *Kalnovec discussions:*

»F Knigi piše da je Bog čoveka od zemle napravil.
Je, ali od one zemle na kojoj se čovek rodi«

(In the Book it is written that God made man of earth.
He did, but of that earth where he was born.)

CONCLUSION

Considering the criterion of the speaker, *Kalnovec discussions* consist of lyric dialogues, elliptical or pseudodialogues, monologues and impersonal statements. When speaking about the first three, although the subjectivity of the speaker is always visible, it is not always clear who the speaker really is. In this respect we could talk about two groups of statements. The first one would comprise verse structured in the form of (pseudo)dialogues and monologues, in which the speakers are clearly denoted. The character that could be denoted as the primary speaker is little Ivica, followed by his father and mother, and also by his brother and uncle, and finally by individual inhabitants of Kalinovac. The second group comprises dialogue and monologue sequences in which speakers are not clearly denoted and where we can only discern their gender and/or age, there occupation, or even none of it. It is clear that those speakers are some of the persons listed at the beginning of this literary work, but it remains unclear who the speakers of individual statements are. In sequences where we can discern only the gender of the speaker, the list of the seventy-two candidates can be narrowed down only to the persons of that gender, and this still leaves a great number of potential candidates. Also, considering the character-based nicknames of the persons from the list it is possible to try to reconstruct who the speakers of individual sequences are – it is more probable, for example, that mild and God-fearing statements are pronounced by Bogek Matičin rather than by Baraba Bazijančev, and vice versa. However, instead of trying to reconstruct the speakers, the attention should be directed to something else.

The fact that in the considerable amount of both dialogue and monologue sequences the speakers are not by far closely defined might point to the fact that it is not relevant who said what. In other words, the statements are more important than their speakers. Since *Kalnovec discussions* are to a large extent

structured as little Ivica's childhood memories, it is possible that he can't remember for certain who a certain statement belongs to, but he remembered its content and since he considers it important, he mentions it without mentioning precisely who he heard it from. This thesis is substantiated by a considerable number of impersonal statements (number rhymes, mocking rhymes, phrases, proverbs and other folk wisdoms). Sometimes those are very brief statements (two-line or three-line stanzas) which were carved in little Ivica's memory, but in his evocation off childhood he can no longer remember whom they belong to, so he mentions them without clear signals that would point to their speakers. The statements of his closest kin, his father, mother and relatives were carved in his memory more clearly, so he mentions them along with denting their speakers, but authors of numerous other proverbs and wisdoms that he took along to his life are no longer familiar to him, so he mentions them without stating precisely who their speakers are. It is also possible that he heard the same wisdom from several different people, i.e. that it belongs to his household members, his neighbours or his fellow villagers, and it would therefore not be fair to assign it to one specific speaker. It is therefore possible, that mentioning or not mentioning of the speakers was conditioned by the fact whether a certain life lesson – and this is what the verses of *Kalnovec discussions* are in their essentials belongs to a specific person, or whether it is common for the minority or majority of the inhabitants of the village of Kalnovec.

In any case, whatever the motives for mentioning or not mentioning the speakers might be, *Kalnovec discussions* represent a certain praise to individual persons on one side, primarily to father and mother, and to the group (homeland, Kalinovac related) on the other side, which marked, both one and another, Ivica's childhood and made him carry the lessons learned throughout his life. Despite the fact that Ivica's praise could be both individualised and collectivised, it is perhaps important to observe that it is about the praise of simple and common people, but at the same time to those, who, resembling some great philosophers and thinkers, gave answers to the most important life questions. Or we might be deceived that only philosophers and thinkers know the greatest truths? Whatever the case may be, *Kalnovec discussions*, among other things, are a great praise to the little ordinary people and folk wisdom in general.

When it comes to the speakers, the position of little Ivica as the most frequent and, we may say, the speaker and poetic focaliser of the entire work, is very interesting, since he does not assume the entire space, but shares it with others, even with those who he does not name. In this respect, considering the number of speakers in *Kalnovec discussions* we can say that we are dealing with pure polyphony. In this sense, as observed by Maroević, Ivica assumes the position of both »composer and conductor«[19] of this Kalinovec oratorio, as it would be called by Flaker[20]. Although he gives the others the opportunity to speak, it is little Ivica who chooses who will say what. However, his choice is not one-sided. *Kalnovec discussions* are not marked only by utterances of different actors/voices, but their statements are different in terms of ideas they express or otherwise, and they are frequently opposed to one another. In other words, Ivica not only gave room to other speakers, but also to different opinions. The abundance of speakers needn't necessarily imply great difference in attitudes. However, the polyphony of *Kalnovec discussions* comprises that dimension as well – the statements not only have different speakers, but those speakers express different attitudes. If the conceptual layer of the entire work is based on Catholic values, such as modesty, simplicity and piety[21], individual statements, frequently ironic, indicate that individual actors occasionally jump out of that framework, especially in the matter of piety. In this respect we can once again mention the cited sequence nr. 57 in which the unnamed fellow villager wishes to have *revenge* on God because he *sent* rain on his hay. In sequence nr. 146 someone warns their

---

19 T. Maroević, O cjelovitosti opusa Ivana Goluba (About integrity of Ivan Golub's opus). In: Ivan GOLUB: *Sabrana blizina* (*Collected whole*). Poems selected and foreword written by Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Mozaik knjiga, 2003, pp. 11.

20 A. Flaker, *Kalnovečki razgovori: intermedijalni* (*Kalnovec discussions: intermedial*), pp. 182.

21 Theological weft is characteristic for the overall work of Ivan Golub. Compare with Drago ŠIMUNDŽA: Književno-bogoslovne blizine Ivana Goluba (Literary-seminarian proximities of Ivan Golub). In: *Bog u djelima hrvatskih pisaca: vjera i nevjera u hrvatskoj književnosti 20. stoljeća* (*Good in works of Croatian authors: faith and unbelief in Croatian literature of the 20th century*). Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2005. pp. 639-668.

fellow villager that he should not curse so much, to which he replies Pak ja ne klenem - / ja se tak menim« (I don't curse - / This is how I speak). However, one of the best examples of the (self)ironic questioning of the idea and image of piety of the Kalinovec microcosmos is presented by the unnamed subject in sequence nr. 110 who openly admits: »Pobožno spim f cirkvi, / samo bedasto senjam« (I piously sleep in church, / but I have silly dreams). What everybody sees is the pious exterior, but nobody sees the »silly« interior of the Kalinovac world, to which Ivica gives the right to speak and those examples are numerous. Considering the aspect of piety, and also many others, Kalinovac microcosmos is not presented in order to idealise and trigger admiration. It also depicts its reverse side, primarily by giving voice to different actors and depicting different motifs. This resulted in achieving not only the maximum quantitative, but also the maximum qualitative polyphony, which was, as it seems, the main intention of little Ivica – to show that already as a child he had the opportunity to learn that life is not one-dimensional.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aleksandar FLAKER: Kalnovečki razgovori: intermedijalni. U: *Medij hrvatske književnosti 20. stoljeća: zbornik radova III. znanstvenog skupa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem, Zagreb, 28. XI. - 29. XI. 2003.* Glavni urednik Branimir Bošnjak. Zagreb, Altagama, 2004. Str. 179-184.
2. Ivan GOLUB: Kalnovečki razgovori. *Forum*, 17 (1978.), br. 10-11, str. 712-761.
3. Ivan GOLUB: *Kalnovečki razgovori.* Zagreb, vlastita naklada, 1979.
4. Ivan GOLUB: *Sabrana blizina.* Izbor i predgovor Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Mozaik knjiga, 2003.
5. Ivan GOLUB: *Pohod milosti: izabrane pjesme.* Izabrao i pogovorom popratio Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Školska knjiga – Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2013.
6. Ivan GOLUB: *Običan* čovjek. Drugo dopunjeno izdanje. Zagreb, Naklada Ljevak, 2014.
7. Božica JELUŠIĆ: Zavičajno gnijezdo. U: Ivan GOLUB: *Kalnovečki razgovori.* Pretisak. Kalinovac, Općina Kalinovac, 2007. Str. 83-92.
8. Tonko MAROEVIĆ: O cjelovitosti opusa Ivana Goluba. U: Ivan GOLUB: *Sabrana blizina.* Izbor i predgovor Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Mozaik knjiga, 2003. Str. 5-16.
9. Tonko MAROEVIĆ: Učenik i hodočasnik: pjesnik; zapis o pjesništvu Ivana Goluba. U: Ivan GOLUB: *Pohod milosti: izabrane pjesme.* Izabrao i pogovorom popratio Tonko Maroević. Zagreb, Školska knjiga – Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2013. Str. 799-813.
10. Cvjetko MILANJA: *Hrvatsko pjesništvo 1950. – 2000.* IV. dio. Knjiga 1. Zagreb, Altagama, 2012.
11. Jože SKOK: Kajkavski solilokvij Ivana Goluba. U: *Homo imago et amicus Dei: miscellanea in honorem Ioannis Golub /* Čovjek *slika i prijatelj Božji: zbornik u* čast *Ivana Goluba*. Rim, Papinski hrvatski zavod svetog Jeronima, 1991. Str. 621-625.
12. Milivoj SOLAR: *Književni leksikon: pisci, djela, pojmovi*. Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2011.
13. Drago ŠIMUNDŽA: Književno-bogoslovne blizine Ivana Goluba. U: *Bog u djelima hrvatskih pisaca: vjera i nevjera u hrvatskoj književnosti 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb, Matice hrvatska, 2005. Str. 639-668.

SAŽETAK

Kalnovečki razgovori (1979.) Ivana Goluba opsežna su pjesnička struktura, sačinjena uglavnom od dijaloških i monoloških iskaza. Pritom je tek iz dijela iskaza jasno vidljivo tko su njihovi nositelji. Najčešće je to mali Ivica koji u djelu iznosi svoje reminiscencije na djetinjstvo u rodom podravskom selu Kalinovcu. Kao nositelji pojedinih iskaza mogu se identificirati i pojedini članovi njegove uže obitelji te pojedini susjedi i mještani. No, u ne tako malom broju iskaza nije niti izdaleka jasno tko ih izgovara. S obzirom na to, nakon rekonstrukcije onih nositelja iskaza za čiji identitet postoje više ili manje pouzdani pokazatelji, pokušava se s jedne strane nazrijeti tko bi mogli biti nositelji onih iskaza u kojima takvih pokazatelja nema te s druge strane objasniti zašto se identitet nositelja tih iskaza ne navodi.