

THE REPRESENTATION OF VLADISLAV MENČETIĆ AND HIS POEM *TRUBLJA SLOVINSKA* IN CROATIAN AND SERBIAN LITERARY HISTORIES

Abstract

Croatian Baroque literature includes many valuable authors, a lot of whom have distinguished themselves over the years, which is why they are nowadays included in the canon of Croatian literature. Vladislav Menčetić is one of the famous Dubrovnik poets and authors of the 17th century, even though his literary works became so popular only after his death despite his social status during his lifetime. His most valuable work, *Trublja slovinska*, is a panegyric dedicated to Petar Zrinski, who is a symbol of heroism, Croatian nation in general and the Christian fight against the Turks. The aim of this paper is to analyze different histories of Croatian literature and investigate the ways in which Vladislav Menčetić and his poem *Trublja slovinska* are showcased and represented in them. However, considering the Serbian appropriation of Croatian, and especially Dubrovnik, Renaissance and Baroque literature, Menčetić's name can also be found in the reviews of literature written by Serbian literary historians. It is worth investigating whether literary historians exalt Menčetić and his already mentioned poem, that is, whether they recognize the true value of this epic, or whether they disparage the author's efforts to write a panegyric dedicated to Croatian/Slavic heroism, and if so, what are the possible reasons. For the purposes of this paper, nineteen literary histories were analyzed, thirteen written by Croatian literary historians and six by Serbian literary historians. The methods used in this paper include methods of description, analysis, comparison, and synthesis.

Keywords: Baroque, literary history, literary canon, *Trublja slovinska*, Vladislav Menčetić.

JOSIP RADOVAN *

UDK:

821.163.42"16/17"

821.163.42Menčetić V.

Pregledni članak

Review article

DOI 10.47960/2831-0322.

2025.1-2.29.138

* Josip Radovan, mag. educ. philol. croat. et angl., University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Republika Hrvatska, jradovan@ffst.hr

Introduction

Literary studies is a discipline that systematically and comprehensively examines literature and is primarily divided into literary theory, literary history, and, in some approaches, literary criticism. The literary history studies literary works in historical chronology, it systematically traces the emergence of literature, describes, and evaluates individual works in relation to their literary and cultural contexts, and collects knowledge and experiences about literature within specific historical periods. The history of any national literature deals with the study of the development, changes that occurred over time and the details of some national literature, so, for example, the history of Croatian literature talks about the beginnings of Croatian literature, its most important epochs and periods, but also tries to determine the place of many literary works, writers and/or directions, as well as their meaning, in the overall overview of Croatian literature, bearing in mind the details that characterize certain periods of Croatian literature and, of course, Croatian literature in general.¹⁶

Croatian Renaissance literature, much like Baroque literature, introduced an abundance of prolific and valuable authors, many of whom have been included in the canon of Croatian literature over the years, even if that canon is sometimes described peripheral. Vladislav Menčetić is one of the Dubrovnik authors of the 17th century, who enjoyed good social status but, if we look at the value of his literary work *Trublja slovinska*¹⁷, he gained importance only a few centuries later. *Trublja* is a laudatory epic poem that talks about the Battle of Sziget¹⁸ and Nikola Šubić Zrinski, to whom he gives the ‘body’ of his contemporary, Ban¹⁹ Petar Zrinski, to whom he dedicated this poem. This particular Menčetić’s poem was chosen because, at least at the time it was released, it was quite underrated, and people did not understand its true aesthetic value. It is also regrettable that it still does not have a firmly established place in the literary canon, even though it is discussed about in both the Croatian and Serbian reviews of literature, albeit for different reasons).

¹⁶ For more information about these terms cf. Solar, Milivoj. 2005. *Teorija književnosti*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

¹⁷ The translation of the Croatian title would be *The Slavic Trumpet*. In this paper, the shortened form *Trublja* will often be used.

¹⁸ In Hungarian, the original city’s name is Szigetvár. In the Battle of Sziget which occurred in 1566, an extremely outnumbered Croatian-Hungarian army attempted to resist a Turkish invasion. The battle came to an end when Ban Nikola Šubić Zrinski’s forces, being greatly exhausted, left the fortress walls in a famous charge. Even though Nikola Šubić Zrinski lost his life during that exit, the Turkish victory was pyrrhic – exceedingly weakened, Turks gave up on the planned march on Vienna.

¹⁹ Ban was a former Hungarian title which denoted a governor of a military district (known as ‘banat’) and was later used to describe a local ruler or representative of the Hungarian king in several states in Central and Southeastern Europe – most commonly Croatia and Bosnia. The title Ban was used with interruptions between the 7th century and the 20th century.

The aim of this paper is to examine how Vladislav Menčetić and his poem *Trublja slovinska* are treated within Croatian literary historiography, with particular attention to their representation in different histories of Croatian literature. Bearing in mind the Serbian appropriation of Croatian, and particularly Dubrovnik, Renaissance and Baroque authors (and literature in general), Menčetić's name also appears in literary reviews by Serbian historians. It remains to be seen whether these literary historians exalt Menčetić and *Trublja slovinska*, recognizing the poem's true value and aesthetic scope, or, on the other hand, disparage Menčetić's efforts to compose a hymn to Croatian/Slavic heroism, and if so, what the potential reasons for such disparagement might be. The methods of description, analysis, comparison, and synthesis were used in the paper.

There are already some papers and books that deal with the different treatment of Menčetić's opus and *Trublja Slovinska* in Croatian and Serbian literary historiographies, while also digging into the aesthetic value of Menčetić's mentioned poem, as well as the question of its cultural status in the national literary historiography.²⁰ However, this paper will make a contribution by being the first to provide a thorough analysis of a large number of literary histories, examining them chronologically in order to draw specific conclusions.

For the purposes of this paper, nineteen literary histories written by Croatian and Serbian literary historians (thirteen of which are Croatian and six Serbian) were analyzed. The authors are, in chronological order: Stojan Novaković, Đuro Šurmin, Jovan Grčić, Jovan Skerlić, Branko Vodnik, David Bogdanović, Franjo Poljanec, Slavko Ježić, Mihovil Kombol²¹, Antun Barac, Miroslav Pantić, Krešimir Georgijević, Milorad Pavić, Franjo Švelec²², Zoran Kravar, Jovan Deretić, Ivo Frangeš, Dubravko Jelčić and Slobodan Prosperov Novak.

1. Literary canon

The term 'canon' comes from the ancient Greek word *κανών*, which means 'standard' or 'rule'. From the Middle Ages until the 18th century, this term was

²⁰ In chronological order: Radulović-Stipčević, Svetlana. 1973. *Vladislav Menčetić, dubrovački pesnik XVII. veka: život i delo*. Beograd: Institut za književnost i umetnost; Kravar, Zoran. 1991. *Das Barock in der kroatischen Literatur*. Köln - Weimar - Wien: Böhlau; Novak, Slobodan Prosperov. 1999. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti: Od Gundulićeva poroda od tmine do Kačićeva Razgovora ugodnog naroda slovinskoga iz 1756* (knj. 3). Zagreb: Antibarbarus; Brković, Ivana. 2012. "Semantika prostora u *Trublji slovinskoj* Vladislava Menčetića". *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 50, 259–280.

²¹ Two editions of the book are covered here: Kombol's independent (2nd edition from 1961), but also the later, supplemented edition by Slobodan Prosperov Novak, which was published in 1995, purely for the sake of comparison, in order to see whether Novak over time 'changed Kombol's opinion'.

²² This particular literary history (the 3rd book in that series) is written by Marin Franičević, Franjo Švelec and Rafo Bogišić, but it is known that Švelec is responsible for the literary-historical synthesis of Croatian literature of the XVII century (the 2nd chapter in the book).

mainly associated with religious holy scriptures²³. In art, it is thus a standard model that serves as a model for other works of the same kind, while in the sense of literary theory, it mainly connotes an established list of authors who are considered to be literary worthy. Protrka (2008, p. 25) talks about the different meanings the the word 'canon' took up, which, throughout the time, represented a group of literary works to which (most commonly) an academic institution has attributed central importance for a certain cultural community.

Within the social system, the term 'literary' serves a demarcating function, distinguishing 'literary' literature from the 'non-literary'. This has led to the development of new classification criteria that separate the 'poetic' and the 'aesthetic', differentiating what conforms to the laws of formal or autonomous aesthetics from what falls outside these frameworks. "Criteria are formed according to the conventions of autonomous aesthetics, evaluation of the work, 'intrinsic value' which are connected with the projection of the durability of the work, its universality and temporal and spatial unlimitedness."²⁴ (Protrka, 2008, p. 31)

The literary canon thus represents a collection of works that is considered representative of the period in which it was created or the genre to which it belongs. The literary works of certain writers are attributed to the canon most often because of the style in which they were written, which in some way influenced other writers, but also because of the very aspects of the genre to which they belong.

However, the criteria for classifying such literary works have continually changed over time. Before, the term 'writing for eternity' was widely used because the authors strove for their works to be considered as and classified among the best, eternal ones – the so-called 'classics'. Such writing implied that the literary work does not adapt to the prevailing literary and social trends of its time, but instead aspires to values that transcend them. In the past centuries, the primary value criterion was innovation – the authors constantly tried to bring out something new in their work, something that had not been seen before and that people had not yet encountered, in one sense or another. From the thematic point of view, the literary works did not deal with topics that were considered important at that moment but worked to discover some completely new topics that were still unexplored. However, over time the saturation occurred even in that field – innovation wore off, that is, everyone introduced and presented novelties to such an extent that at one point there were a handful of novelties in literary works. It is logical to conclude that novelties simply began to lose their value and a sudden switch occurred, that is, a

²³ In the Middle Ages, 'canon' meant church dogma, that is, a clearly defined set of rules that were established by the Church Council. In terms of church rules, the term 'canon' was first used to denote the corpus of biblical scriptures and texts, approved by institutions, which the church considered authentic and gave them a kind of divine and legislative-religious legitimacy.

²⁴ Originally: "Oblikuju se kriteriji prema konvencijama autonomne estetike, vrednovanja djela, 'unutarknjiževne vrijednosti' koje se povezuju s projekcijom trajnosti djela, njegove univerzalnosti i vremenske i prostorne neomeđenosti."

return to things that had already been written about earlier and were important (Pavličić, 2018, pp. 11-20). The point is that the criteria are not permanent, they change over time, just like literary criticism and reception change as well.

The shaping of the canon in Croatian literary periodicals is, according to Protrka (2008, p. 277), primarily seen as a consequence of a historically determined process which is dependent on a series of cultural and social factors. That is why the canon is not viewed exclusively as a final and predetermined list of certain works of undeniable value, but the focus is on the social, political and ethical effects of their selection.

Therefore, the term *canon* cannot be considered a solid term either.²⁵ This is precisely why there are quite a few works that have a ‘permanent place’ in the literary canon. Likewise, as time goes on, it is also possible that certain works begin to lose their importance, that is, lose their place in the canon due to the appearance of younger, more modern colleagues and their works. Namely, it is important to note that certain writers and their literary works gained recognition only posthumously, they were not particularly appreciated during their own time, in which they lived and created, but over time, sometimes even after centuries, their work became part of the literary canon.

2. The Baroque and baroque literature

The word ‘baroque’ comes from the Spanish word *baruecco*, that is, the Portuguese *barocco*, which means ‘an irregular or imperfectly shaped pearl’²⁶ (Bogišić, 1998, p. 19). Also, in literature one can find that the mentioned word can have the meaning “ornate, pompous, rich, decorated, sumptuous, pathetic, representative” (Dragić, 2006, p. 43). Such a style is actually characteristic of the Baroque, both in literature and in other types of art. It is a literary period that, in time at least, continues the Renaissance, although it opposes it in many ways. Since the Baroque was created during the Counter-Reformation²⁷, a period in which a strong reaction to Protestantism was felt in most areas, it is not surprising that a strong note of religiosity²⁸ was woven into Baroque literature as well. From literary authors that were active in the Baroque period, we can expect emphatic decoration and excessive expression, which is actually the complete opposite of the renaissance efforts to make presentations clear and the composition harmonious (Solar, 2005, p. 155).

In world literature, the Baroque began in the second half of the 16th century and came to an end in the second half of the 17th century. To some extent, both in

²⁵ For more information about this cf. Brebanović 2018.

²⁶ Given that the Baroque is the period that follows the Renaissance (and corresponds to it in a way), it should be emphasized that the name is contradictory since the Renaissance was considered the so-called ‘perfect pearl’.

²⁷ Also known as the Catholic Reformation or the Catholic Restoration.

²⁸ In the Renaissance, for example, in contrast to the Baroque, secularity was emphasized.

Europe and in Croatia, Baroque overlapped with the period of the Counter-Reformation. After the Council of Trent, which was held several times in the period from 1545 to 1563²⁹, and the ecclesiastical reforms brought about by it, literary activity took off in Croatia. Even though some parts of Croatia were under the Venetians, others under the Turks, there were still authors who picked up their pens and took up writing. This in particular was a sign of exceptional vitality, but also of cultural will in Croats (Kombol & Novak, 1995, p. 185). With regard to Baroque composition, it is worth noting the uneven structure of individual poems, as well as the sudden prominence of certain genres, such as tragicomedies, religious poetry, and chivalric-historical epics (Bogišić, 1998, p. 20).

It is not surprising, therefore, that during the Baroque, Christian devotional and didactic literature was created, intended for the general public. The writers of such literature were the first to raise the issue of the Croatian literary language, and they paved the way for the general development of such a language that occurred later on. Equally, it is important to mention the echoes of the anti-Turkish themes – patriotism and national self-awareness were encouraged, about which numerous authors of this literary period wrote. In the conflicts with the Turks, among other things, the national consciousness, that is, the consciousness of one's own national community, grew stronger. That being said, in such literary works, terms like *Slavic*, *Illyrian* and *Croatian* were often used interchangeably, or equated, when they did not denote all the people of Slavic origin.

Slavism, already familiar to Croatian medieval culture, developed and represented in the Renaissance, experienced its heyday in the Baroque period. Croatian baroque Slavism was very strongly expressed in the 17th century, which is one of the peculiarities of Croatian culture in comparison with other Slavic literatures. Baroque writers continued previous traditions, shaping them with new stylistic expressions. The peculiarities of Renaissance Slavism continue, they get a special expression in that work in Baroque style, such as the glorification of Slavic heroism, hyperbolizing the geographical factor, actualizing the historical aspect... All those united in a kind of ode to Slavism created on the basis of Dubrovnik's Slavism. (Paščenko, 2015, p. 60)

Unlike other Slavic peoples, this trait has been constantly expressed in Croats, since the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and especially in the Baroque period. The motif of Slavism developed especially dynamically in Baroque culture due to the dramatic circumstances in which the consciousness of the Croatian man of

²⁹ The Council of Trent was officially opened on December 13, 1545, in the Cathedral of St. Vigil in Trent (or Trento). Two years later, in March 1547, they moved it to Bologna due to the fear of the plague, and in mid-September 1549, they decided to postpone it indefinitely. It was reopened on May 1, 1551, in Trento, but was already discontinued the following year. Finally, at the beginning of 1562, the parliament was reconvened for the last time, and the sessions finally came to an end at the beginning of December 1563. The two primary goals of the Council of Trent were to resolve the issue of Protestantism and to encourage internal church renewal.

the 17th century was formed. Developing in the immediate vicinity of the epicenter of European Baroque, representing a national type, a regional variant of Baroque style and consciousness, the Croatian literary Baroque appeared through Slavism as an important theme of the culture of the 17th century. As a result, Croatian writers contributed to their national culture not as a peripheral reflection of general European motifs, but as a center for articulating specific, in this case, Slavic ideas. They were heard far and wide, from the West to the East, which confirms a number of peculiarities of the Croatian Baroque. (Paščenko, 2015, pp. 66–68)

The Baroque in Croatian literature is a fertile period during which the literary works of writers such as Ivan Gundulić, Junije Palmotić and Ivan Bunić Vučić stand out, for whom literary historians and literary theorists believe that, in terms of value, their works can be put on an equal footing with the most valued works of the best Baroque writers belonging to other European literatures.

2.1. Vladislav Menčetić

Vladislav Menčetić is a Croatian poet who was born in a noble family in Dubrovnik in 1617³⁰, and died in the same place almost fifty years later, in 1666, that is, a year before the Great Dubrovnik Earthquake³¹. He continued in the footsteps of numerous authors and poets who were active before him (mostly in the same period), so he wrote bucolic poetry following the example of Ivan Bunić Vučić, occasional poetry under the influence of the grandiose Ivan Gundulić, and a mock-epic poem in the footsteps of Stijepo Đurđević (or Đorđić³²). Menčetić also tried his hand at translation, albeit a loose type of translation, which is why it can be said that he actually reworked Giambattista Marino's comic idyll, the eclogue *Uzdasi Ergastovi* (originally, *I sospiri d'Ergasto*), under the title *Radmilova tužba cijec Zorke vile* (Novak, 2003, pp. 100–101).

One of Menčetić's more successful works, at least in the time in which it was written, is *Radonja*, which is of the same type as the widely known *Derviš* by aforementioned Stijepo Đurđević – humorous poetry, that is, a comedic monologue including a funny character. That funny character is usually a peasant who uses simple, unsophisticated and informal language, which actually makes the reader laugh, since it was something that was new at the time. The only difference between those two literary works is that the character Radonja is somewhat suffering, which is caused by his love Milava because she is constantly beating and scolding him until he has had enough of it which makes him turn the tables, while Đurđević's

³⁰ Although the exact year cannot be said with certainty, a good number of sources mention this very year.

³¹ This earthquake is considered to be one of the most dramatic moments in Dubrovnik's history, as well as one of the biggest and most devastating earthquakes to hit the area now known as Croatia. To learn more about the historic background cf. Kunčević and Madunić, 2015, pp. 7–56.

³² Both versions of his surname can be found in the sources.

Dedo is in trouble because of his infatuation (Kombol & Novak, 1995, p. 271). How much Menčetić's *Radonja* was appreciated in the 18th century is also shown by the fact that it was twice translated into Latin (Novak, 2003, p. 101). In addition to this, he also wrote an epistolary poem called *Knjiga Marojice Kaboge*, and there is an unfinished drama work called *Justina mučenica*, which was lost, but also attributed to him, as well as twenty-three anonymous poems preserved in the manuscript of Luka Pavlović from the 19th century.

Vladislav Menčetić's most valuable and best-known literary work is certainly the praise poem, the panegyric *Trublja slovinska*, dedicated to Ban Petar Zrinski. Even at the beginning of the poem, the author explained that the people of *the Dubrovnik area*³³ have already heard about Petar Zrinski's *Adrijanskoga mora Sirena*, a poem published in Venice in 1660. In all that praise, Menčetić exaggerates a bit, especially if one considers that this literary work by Petar Zrinski serves as, not exactly a translation, but a reworking of the Hungarian original which was written by his brother Nikola Zrinski. However, it should still be said that *Sirena* really aroused great interest in Dubrovnik, which at that time was known for closely following the literary events in other parts of Croatia, especially when it came to the Zrinski family, who participated in numerous bloody battles (Kombol & Novak, 1995, p. 271). When Petar Zrinski arrived in the Republic of Ragusa in 1654³⁴ and gave them the saber from Vuk Zmaj Ognjeni³⁵ as a gift, the people received it with enthusiasm. "Those people, who in Gundulić's time considered King Vladislav as a representative of the Christian fight against the Turks, now looked with the same confidence in the famous hero Petar Zrinski" (Novak, 2003, p. 101).

All this was reflected in Menčetić's panegyric, in which he puts Petar Zrinski on a pedestal, calling him *the northern star*,³⁶ and celebrating him not only as a poet, but also as a great hero and warrior. Menčetić also remembers the great Nikola Šubić Zrinski (also known as the Sziget Nikola), Petar's ancestor, and writes about the Sziget myth. *Trublja slovinska* has quite a symbolic name – in Zrinski, Vladislav Menčetić sees the famous *Slavic trumpet*, that is, he considers him to be the main Christian hero in the fight against the Turks. This literary work has a distinct greatness precisely because of this patriotic feature, the celebration of Croatian heroism, but also the Catholic fight against the Muslim Turks (the theme that corresponded to the period of the Catholic Restoration). With this poem, Menčetić shows that he sympathizes with the sufferings of the common people, their fate, while also giving a vision of liberation and picturing a better future for the

³³ The parts like this, that are written in italics, are the lines cited from the poem. This part, in particular, was originally "dubrovački kraji" in the Croatian version of *Trublja slovinska*.

³⁴ Even though that fact is still not historically confirmed.

³⁵ Vuk Grgurević Branković, best known as Vuk Zmaj Ognjeni, was a Serbian nobleman who lived in the 15th century. He was the titular despot of Serbia in the period from 1471 until his death which happened in 1485. He is known in Serbian epic poetry for his bravery and heroism. His nickname 'Zmaj Ognjeni' translates as 'the Fiery Dragon'.

³⁶ Originally "sjeverna zvijezda".

Croatian people and Croatia in general, which contributes to such a great value of this literary work.

3. Theoretical and methodological approaches of analyzed Croatian literary historians

Already from the first readings of the literary histories analyzed for the purposes of this paper, it is noticeable that, more or less, all the aforementioned literary historians use a positivistic approach in their writing. The positivist approach implies, as stated by Solar (2005, p. 258), “that the meaning of a literary work can be determined objectively on the basis of knowledge of facts from the author’s life”. And that is why this approach is often called biographical, since it involves a close study of the biographies of certain authors. In more recent approaches, however, there are changes in the study of the literary text, since the emphasis is no longer on the author, but on the literary work itself. Thus, Vodnik stands out from previous historians, such as Đuro Šurmin and Vatroslav Jagić, since his methodological approach, in addition to being positivistic, was also from the aesthetic side (when interpreting some literary phenomena, he introduced certain aesthetic criteria). In such an approach, the emphasis is placed on the ‘receptor’ of literary texts – the reader, which is extremely important, since “without an appropriate audience, who reads and understands literary works precisely and only as literature, there is no literature” (Solar, 2005, p. 281). According to reception theorists, a literary work contains “places of indeterminacy” that are ultimately concretized by the reader. Thus, the reader moves from a passive role of an observer to a person who actually shapes the meaning of a literary work, creating a meaningful whole that, after all, is called a literary work.

Ježić’s history of literature is the first complete review of Croatian literature, containing precise and quite exhaustive data that the author contextualized in terms of cultural and political history.

It can be said that Mihovil Kombol abandons the biographical and philological methods of his predecessors (such as Medini, Šurmin, Ljubić) and starts using the comparatist model, while at the same time complementing Vodnik’s methodological approach because he uses Benedetto Croce’s aesthetic understanding of literature, that is, when studying literary works, he used the classical historical-cultural criterion, which he opposed to the aesthetic one (e.g. liveness of the topic, poetic individuality, but also the contemporary vitality of the literary work itself). When we talk about the liveness of the topic, the most important thing is, as stated by Beker (1999, p. 90), the so-called “horizon of expectation”, which he considers to be a key term of Jauss’ doctrine, that is, the aesthetics of reception, and which signifies “readiness for literary procedures within the mental vision of an individual reader”. When reading a new text, the reader remembers things from the horizon of expectations already known to him, which, in this way, is actually changed, that is,

upgraded. Thus, the reader should, most importantly, see the particularities of a certain text that distinguish that text from other literary texts (Beker, 1999, p. 94).

Antun Barac had an extremely developed literary-historical method, so he applied methodological procedures ranging all the way from the positivist to aesthetic evaluation. Almost a quarter of a century after Ježić, Georgijević also presents the material in an overview, but returns to the systematic positivist method and analytical approach. Another historian of literature, Zoran Kravar, who closely dealt with the period of the Croatian Baroque in literature, remains on such a path, the path of analyticity.

It can be said that only Frangeš, among the already mentioned literary historians, is somewhat more stylistically refined because he has a broader theoretical point of view. He was the only figure in Croatian literary studies to begin engaging systematically with stylistic criticism and interpretative methods, and his critical discourse is characterized by remarkable linguistic skill and a pronounced essayistic style. Therefore, he adheres to the thesis that, just as every critic chooses his writer, every writer in one way chooses or 'summons' his literary critic. He is one of the first to allow subjectivity in the interpretation of literary works, but also to give great importance to taste. In addition to continuing Croce's aesthetics, which were also followed by Livadić and Kombol in Croatian literary history, he equates artistic expression with linguistic expression.

Dubravko Jelčić, on the other hand, reaffirmed the biographical method in literary history, thus returning to the beginnings about which more was already said earlier on, so his studies are based on exhaustive bibliographic research, and his style is characterized by analytical reflection on the authors covered. Slobodan Prosperov Novak is known for his authorial approach to the material he works on, his skill in separating the important things from the unimportant ones, but also for his ability to condense a large volume of material to a sufficient measure. His review of the history of Croatian literature can be considered the most exhaustive, giving attention to all authors, whether in extensive or shorter textual forms, while consistently employing the methodology of chronological sequencing.

4. The Representation of Menčetić and his poem *Trublja slovinska* in literary histories

4.1. An analysis of Croatian literary histories

Regarding the histories of Croatian literature analyzed for this paper, the earliest mention of Vladislav Menčetić and his poem *Trublja slovinska* appears in the work of Đuro Šurmin (1898, p. 97), who, being largely positivistically oriented, noted that Menčetić's poems *Zorka* and *Radonja* received much greater acclaim, while he attributed little importance to *Trublja slovinska*.

It can be said that Branko Vodnik even glorifies Menčetić and his literary works, that is, he has only positive epithets and words of praise for each of his

works, and such is the case for *Trublja slovinska*, too. First of all, Vodnik emphasizes the importance and greatness of the main character to whom the mentioned work is dedicated: “Those people, who in Gundulić’s time considered king Vladislav as a representative of the Christian fight against the Turks, now looked with the same confidence in the famous hero Petar Zrinski” (Vodnik, 1913, p. 257). After Zrinski published his work *Adrijanskoga mora sirena* in 1660, five years later Menčetić wrote and published his eulogy, “calling him *the northern star* and glorifying him as a hero and poet, *the Slavic Apollo*³⁷ and Mars, whose name alone *intimidates the east*³⁸, and he would be worthy *to rule the world*³⁹”. Here, the author creates a contrast using the quotations from the poem, mentioning first the north (which in this case refers to Croatia, that was then separated from the Republic of Ragusa), and then the east, potentially alluding to the then-current Serbian appropriation of Dubrovnik authors, especially since Serbia is located northeast of Dubrovnik. The literary historian then immediately emphasizes the *Croatian* heroism, along with the aforementioned famous lines from Menčetić’s literary work: *if the Ottoman Sea did not crash against Croatian shores*. Furthermore, Vodnik classifies this work within what he calls the “golden age of Dubrovnik poetry,” which, according to him, is distinguished not only by its most beautiful diction but also by its greatest originality, from which the highest degree of imitation subsequently follows (Vodnik, 1913, pp. 257-258).

In the lines from *Osman* “Shine, oh, shine, bright Sun, in the brightness of the east, drive the Moon to the darkness of the night, let the day dawn from your eye!”⁴⁰, Gundulić alludes to Vladislav (*bright Sun*) leading the Turks (*Moon from the east*) to the ruin (*to the darkness of the night*). In his *Trublja*, Menčetić draws a very similar scene: *I see how the Turkish moon sets in deathly paleness (...) the sun of Zrinski forces it to perish in the east*⁴¹, making it clear that *the moon from the east* is a symbol for the Turks, and *the sun*, of course, is Petar Zrinski. By comparing similarly outlined motifs in *Osman* and *Trublja slovinska*, we come to the so-called question of originality, since Vodnik subtly dictated that this work can be considered as Gundulić’s imitation. This example shows how the question of originality is often used for negative evaluations, and not just for praise. Vodnik, however, sees this ‘imitation’ in a positive sense because he says that even an imitation, especially if it is a good one (like this one, as Vodnik says), can be of high value. We can confirm this claim to some extent, since the work, thematically and in terms of motifs, follows Ivan Gundulić’s path and his *Osman*, but at the same time brings something new, and that is the character of Petar Zrinski, who is a symbol of heroism, the

³⁷ Originally “slovinski Apolon”.

³⁸ Originally “trepti istok”.

³⁹ Originally “kraljevat svijet”.

⁴⁰ Originally “Svijetlo Sunce, sini, sini/ u vedrinah od istoka,/ tjeraj Mjesec k noćnoj tmuni,/ dan da svane s tvoga oka!”.

⁴¹ Originally “Vidim smrtnom u bijedilu/ turski mjesec gdje zapada,/ (...) Zrinsko sunce njega tjera, u istoku da pogine...”.

Catholic fight, but also of the whole Croatian nation which has gone through so much, but is still very combative.

David Bogdanović (1918, p. 241) mentions Vladislav Menčetić only when he talks about the character and work of Petar Zrinski, using Menčetić's descriptions of his hero, firstly quotes from the preface, and then the descriptions used in the poem itself. Bogdanović uses quotations from the text similar to those that Vodnik used as well in his description and evaluation of Menčetić's work. Bogdanović puts emphasis on motifs such as *the sun wheel of the Slavs*⁴² and *the Slavic Apollo*, which highlights the so-called pan-Slavism, and then, using the famous lines and *Croatian shores*, he practically equates this same Slavism with Croatism.

Poljanec (1937, pp. 313–314) speaks of *Trublja* as Menčetić's greatest work, but continues in Vodnik's footsteps, saying that the work was written under the influence of Gundulić: "Menčetić continues Gundulić's thought that the Slavs will save Europe from the Turkish attack; but while Gundulić sees salvation in Poland and King Vladislav, Menčetić assigns the role of the savior of Christian Europe to the South Slavs under the leadership of Zrinski". Although he mentions that this literary work is characterized by concise but eloquent diction, he states that it still lacks originality and depth, as well as some other significant poetic qualities, which departs from Vodnik's views because he believes that the literary work does not have any greater value, apart from the fact that, according to him, it was created by blindly following Gundulić and his *Osman*.

Ježić (1944, pp. 143-144) considers Menčetić to be a valuable writer, adding that *Trublja slovinska* is his most significant documentary work. Moreover, he first mentions Petar Zrinski as a great fighter against the Turks and talks about his endeavors, with which this literary historian actually justifies Menčetić's motivation to write a panegyric in Zrinski's honor, and at the same time confirms Ban's status among the people – the only one who can put an end to Turks and their power. Ježić also provides an overview of the work's content, doing so in a somewhat more detailed manner, particularly with regard to his use of quotations, without repeating the same passages cited by authors of earlier literary histories. It is interesting how the author here uses the quote *Above all the honors of this world; The Croatian people live and depend on your advice*⁴³ as an argument that Menčetić, at the expense of his prophecy about Petar Zrinski, wished that he would be exalted as a writer, again using nationality and Croatism. When speaking about the originality of the poem itself, Ježić, just as Vodnik and Poljanec did before him, compares it to Gundulić's *Osman*. The novelty, however, is that he compares the fates of Vladislav and Petar here, both ending their lives ingloriously.

Mihovil Kombol was among the first to mention Vladislav Menčetić primarily in connection with his humorous poetry, particularly the parody *Radonja*,

⁴² Originally "sunčano kolo Slava".

⁴³ Originally „Vrh svijeh časti svijeta ovoga;/ o tvom djelu diha i visi/ narod puka hrvatskoga“.

which at the time enjoyed a much greater reputation; only subsequently does he refer to *Trublja slovinska*, which he describes as having been written in accordance with the laudatory poetic conventions of the period. He also points out that Menčetić exaggerates a bit in all this praise, because in the poem, as Fran Kurelac said, “the fame was not spreading a little” (Kombol, 1961, p. 265). In the latest edition of Kombol’s history of literature, the value of *Trublja* is recognized especially because of the description of the heroism of the Croatian people through the character of Petar Zrinski, which also shows the significance that the Zrinski family once had throughout the entire, then unified, Croatian area. In his history of literature, he argues that the value of the literary work is enhanced by juxtaposing Menčetić’s hopes and visions with the Ban’s sorrowful and tragic fate, which would befall him six years after the publication of Menčetić’s work, and consequently with the tragic fate of the entire Zrinski family, with which the Croatian nation is also portrayed as perishing. (Kombol & Novak, 1995, p. 271).

Antun Barac (1963, p. 49), immediately after describing Menčetić as an interesting but sparsely productive writer, mentions him, like some other literary historians, solely in relation to his panegyric *Trublja slovinska*. Barac there continues in Kombol’s footsteps and says that in this work Menčetić talked about the position of the Croatian people in the defense of the West, which he describes as “tragic and magnificent” with the most famous lines, *if the Ottoman Sea did not crash against Croatian shores*. So, he is also one of those who confirm the thesis that Menčetić’s Slavism is actually equated with Croatism.

Krešimir Georgijević, who taught Croatian literature at a faculty in Belgrade, mentions Vladislav Menčetić only when writing about Petar Zrinski and his *Adrijanskoga mora sirena*, especially in the paragraph regarding the discrepancies between Nikola’s original, Hungarian version of the literary work and Petar’s Croatian adaptation. The aforementioned deviations mainly concern the verse, that is, the twelve-syllable verse with a double rhyme, which is carried out in four verses of the stanza – a skill used by Vladislav Menčetić, whom, among others, Georgijević (1969, p. 95) considers as one of the “better experts in verse creation” than Ban Zrinski himself, who we know was not overly prolific as a writer.

Since Franjo Švelec, in his review of the 17th Croatian literature, describes Menčetić as a follower of Gundulić, it is not surprising that he identifies *Trublja slovinska* as Menčetić’s primary literary work. He states that echoes of Gundulić’s *Osman* and the poem *U slavu Ferdinanda drugoga* from Gundulić’s collection of poems called *Pjesni pokorne kralja Davida* are felt in this Menčetić’s panegyric. Švelec emphasizes that Menčetić, along with several other authors, is a great celebrator of Slavism. Considering how he emphasizes that Petar Zrinski is a Croatian Ban, and in the poem *a Slavic Apollo*, he actually equates the terms *Croatian* and *Slavic* (Franičević et al., 1974, p. 232).

In his studies, Zoran Kravar mentions Menčetić scarcely, and only two times – the first time writing about *Trublja*, and the second time in the context of his other literary work, *Radmilova tužba*. *Trublja* is shown only as a literary work with which

he compares Marulić's *Judita* when he talks about war scenes in thematically similar works, but it should be pointed out that he picked *Trublja* as an 'exemplary' Baroque work addressing this theme. There, the author explains that Menčetić never confronts his hero with specific opponents. Moreover, his opponents are "marked as a 'multitude' that *the powerful Ban slaughtered, strangled, trampled*⁴⁴" (Kravar, 1975, p. 196).

In his historical review of Croatian literature, Ivo Frangeš writes about Vladislav Menčetić only in the context of his poem *Trublja slovinska*, without mentioning any of his other literary works. At the very beginning of the paragraph, Frangeš speaks about the so-called question of originality when he calls Ban Petar Zrinski, to whom Menčetić's *Trublja* is dedicated, "a stretched-out, unoriginal poet", alluding to his, mainly, translation and reworking of his brother's Hungarian original work, *Adriai tengernek Syrenaia*. Although he gives a short praise to Menčetić, considering the patriotic theme to be original for the time in which it was created, Frangeš also adheres to the now-popular opinion that Menčetić's *Trublja* is an imitation of Gundulić and his *Osman*, stating that *Trublja* is imbued with "quite mediocre exhortative verses with a Gundulić-like intonation" (Frangeš, 1987, p. 100). It is interesting how this literary historian here emphasizes that the poem gained importance only two hundred years after it had been published, which is actually what Beker talks about when he mentions the term *horizon of expectations*. Thus, we can say that this literary work had a specific content, that is, it contained something that the readers of that time "obviously were not prepared for, which therefore exceeded the horizon of their expectations" (Beker, 1999, p. 91). Having said that, Frangeš still gives a kind of praise to Menčetić, admitting that he did deal with a topic that was ahead of the time of the epoch in which he wrote and created (even if not necessarily the first in doing so, following Gundulić's footsteps), and only with Ivan Mažuranić's poem *Smrt Smail-age Čengića* which revived the topic of Turkish violence, using the same motifs ("The sun sets, the moon rises. (...) The sun from the west is already following it..."⁴⁵) about which Menčetić also sang and prophesied (*I see how the Turkish moon sets in deathly paleness (...) the sun of Zrinski forces it to perish in the east*), Menčetić's poem shined in its full glory (Frangeš, 1987, p. 100).

Jelčić (2004, pp. 93–94) continues to write about originality when it comes to Vladislav Menčetić, and he also points out the similarities his literary works have with the works of other authors, such as Ivan Gundulić, Ivan (Dživo) Bunić Vučić and Stijepo Đurđević, but he still considers Menčetić to be a great writer from Dubrovnik. Even though Jelčić says that the most popular among Menčetić's

⁴⁴ Originally "(...) ban oholi/ pokla, udavi, stupom spleša".

⁴⁵ The lines were taken from the online, pdf version of Ivan Mažuranić's *Smrt Smail-age Čengića*, available at: <http://www.os-vela-luka.skole.hr/upload/os-vela-luka/images/static3/855/File/Mazuranic-Smrt-Smail-age-Cengica.pdf>, pp. 4–6. Originally "Sunce zade, mjesec izade. (...) Već ga prati sa zapada sunce...".

contemporaries was his humorous poem *Radonja* (probably due to the horizon of expectations that was discussed in the previous paragraph), he still believes that *Trublja slovinska* is Menčetić's most valuable work, because the author, would have potentially been forgotten if he, at one point in his life, did not decide to engage in patriotism and put it into his works, which, as already established, was 'against' the poetic principles of the time. Furthermore, Jelčić also emphasizes Croatism when he talks about Menčetić, for example, Petar Zrinski is the *Croatian* Leonidas, *Trublja slovinska* is a panegyric dedicated, he says, to the *Croatian* star, and he also mentions the aforementioned *Croatian* shores. However, in the very next sentence, he also emphasizes his Dubrovnik origin – Menčetić is a *Dubrovnik* officer, defending the *Dubrovnik* territory from Turkish raids, which actually equates the two words, that is, he says that Dubrovnik is in fact Croatian. Jelčić (2004, pp. 95-96) also discusses Menčetić somewhat later in his review, when writing about Ignjat Đurđević, whom he argues achieved with his poetry what his fellow Dubrovnik author Menčetić had attempted, that is, a synthesis of the characteristics of Gundulić, Bunić, and Stijepo Đurđević, yet “on a higher artistic level than Menčetić,” thereby implicitly diminishing the value of Vladislav Menčetić as a versifier. However, it should be considered that Ignjat Đurđević started creating after more than 30 years had already passed since Menčetić's death, which allowed him to learn from other people's mistakes and omissions.

Already at the beginning of the paragraph which deals with Vladislav Menčetić and his life and career, Slobodan Prosperov Novak deservedly raises him to a pedestal, and also recognizes the importance of the poem *Trublja slovinska*, mostly emphasizing the modernization of the Sziget myth itself, which is the greatest 'virtue' of this work – the longevity of the content, i.e. the theme being revived, which we can also consider a praise in terms of the originality of the poem. At the same time, the myth of Sziget “was left without its halo of sanctity and became a political cry, a prophecy” for the first time. Although the text is written “in the already familiar rhythm of Gundulić,” Menčetić is not regarded as an imitator but rather as a follower of Gundulić. This interpretation distinguishes Novak from many other literary historians, as he offers a slightly different perspective. Novak is the first to argue that Menčetić adopts Gundulić's ideology while simultaneously building upon it, since “he added a new charge to Gundulić's solution to the Dubrovnik puzzle, its orientalism and its westernization.” Furthermore, Novak states that Menčetić is the first Dubrovnik writer who witnessed the Turkish power “repelling against the walls of Dubrovnik, without saying that Dubrovnik is in some neutral environment, that it is between the Lion and the Dragon”. It is interesting to see Novak emphasizing the *Dubrovnik* walls, although the *Dubrovnik walls* are not mentioned as such in *Trublja slovinska*. If he had written *Croatian* walls instead of *Dubrovnik* ones, one might think of a paraphrase of Menčetić's verses in which the Ottoman Sea crashes against Croatian shores, which would actually be completely referential, but not emphasized enough. The reasons why Novak wrote it like this should be sought precisely in the time of his writing this particular history of

literature. He wrote this exactly when Dubrovnik was attacked in the Homeland War⁴⁶. With such a sentence, he deliberately provokes all those, especially Serbian literary historians, who even today appropriate Dubrovnik and its literary history – that’s why he uses such a coldly polemical ideological, i.e. patriotic discourse. Novak thus says that there are no Eastern options for Menčetić because “for him, Slavism was first thought of as pan-Croatism”. It should be highlighted, however, that Prosperov Novak considers Menčetić’s parody *Radonja* to be his most popular work, both during his lifetime, and for a long time afterwards, which he says is “the younger brother of Držić’s *Stanac*⁴⁷”, which once again emphasizes the influence that Menčetić’s predecessors from Dubrovnik had on him. Ultimately, he calls Menčetić’s overall literary work a landscape that foreshadows some kind of a real earthquake and says that in it “all the most important themes and all the most important genres of Croatian literature are renewed” (Prosperov Novak, 2003, pp. 100–101).

4.2. An analysis of Serbian literary histories

When reviewing chronologically Serbian literary histories that were analyzed for the purposes of this paper, we first come across Menčetić’s name in the Serbian literary history, published in 1867, and written by Stojan Novaković, a prominent Serbian writer, linguist and politician who states that Menčetić is one of the names that evokes nice memories, and all that because of his poem *Trublja slovinska* (Novaković, 1867, p. 103). Novaković, as already mentioned, continued to carry out Vuk Karadžić’s reform of the Serbian literary language, and thus began the Serbian appropriation of Dubrovnik literature, guided by the ideas of his predecessor, mainly about how the Croatian and Serbian languages are actually identical, that is, those two languages actually being one – Serbian.

Almost forty years after Novaković, another Serbian writer and literary critic, Jovan Grčić, (barely) mentions Vladislav Menčetić among the valuable Dubrovnik poets of the 17th century, but it should be emphasized that among all his works he mentions only *Trublja slovinska*, obviously as the most valuable or, maybe, his only valuable literary work, in which the author writes about the heroism of Petar Zrinski (Grčić, 1906, p. 62).

Jovan Skerlić in his *Istorija*, first published in 1912, does not mention Vladislav Menčetić, but it is important to state that he does not classify Dubrovnik literature under Serbian, but Dalmatian literature, which he says had a great influence in the creation of modern Croatian literature. Therefore, he does not

⁴⁶ The Croatian War of Independence took place from 1991 to 1995 between Croatian forces that were loyal to the Government of Croatia, which had then declared independence from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), and the Serb-controlled Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and local Serbian forces.

⁴⁷ *Novela od Stanca* is a short comedy written by Marin Držić.

mention Serbian literature in this context at all, and he is the only analyzed Serbian literary historian who does not classify Dubrovnik literature as Serbian.

Although he says right at the beginning that he does not consider Vladislav Menčetić to be a great nor overly prolific writer, Miroslav Pantić (1968, pp. 219-220) still states that the author enriched the Dubrovnik literature of the time in many ways, emphasizing his Dubrovnik nationalism (“the Dubrovnik rebel”), while not mentioning Croatism in any part of the text. After praising the “extraordinarily successful” humorous poem *Radonja*, on the other hand, he calls Menčetić’s *Trublja slovinska* an “epic attempt” and the author a follower of Gundulić, that is, in some cases even a “mere epigone” – an imitator. He considers his other works more valuable than his panegyric *Trublja*. It is interesting that Pantić also calls Menčetić pliable when choosing topics (while not necessarily referring only to *Trublja*), saying that he mostly wrote his literary works complying to “the taste of the rulers of that era”. Furthermore, Pantić then states that nothing else was even expected from him, since Menčetić was not able, either because of his own or because of the ongoing problems, to visit the great European centers of culture, although “he could feel some of their heartbeats in his own City” (Pantić, 1968, pp. 219–220). We can conclude that when Pantić speaks of Menčetić with a certain disparagement, while emphasizing his affiliation with Dubrovnik, but, for instance, not with Croatia, he probably does so from an extremely ideological and political position, and by no means an aesthetic one.

Milorad Pavić (1970) does not mention Vladislav Menčetić at all in his overview of Serbian Baroque literature, although he mentions some other writers from Dubrovnik. Therefore, Dubrovnik literature is still being appropriated by the Serbs, but Pavić puts an emphasis mainly on ‘greater’, more prolific writers. By the very fact that it was left out, while the previous reviews of Serbian literature at least mentioned it, it is made clear that the reasons for this are extremely ideological and political, since it is Vladislav Menčetić who, specifically with this poem, *Trublja Slovinska*, celebrates Croatism/Slavism, that is, patriotism and nationalism in general.

Jovan Deretić is another Serbian literary historian who did not mention Vladislav Menčetić among the great names of the older Serbian/Dubrovnik literature. What he did mention was that the patriarchal poems inspired by Vuk flourished in the Bay of Kotor and Dubrovnik areas, which confirms that he also appropriated Dubrovnik literature as Serbian.

5. Serbian appropriation of Dubrovnik literature

Why does Vladislav Menčetić, along with numerous other Dubrovnik poets and writers, appear in the histories and reviews of Serbian literature? Grčević (2013, p. 8) conveyed the statements of Jovan Popov, who talked about how in the Middle Ages a large number of Dubrovnik’s inhabitants came precisely from the “Serbian lands”, and they brought customs and traditions, as well as the language, with them,

while stating his argument that the oldest preserved poetic fragment from the area of Dubrovnik, dating back to 1421, was written in Cyrillic. To all this, Grčević responds with the fact that there were no Catholic Serbs in the area of Dubrovnik until 1815, especially considering that the Republic of Ragusa was strictly Catholic from its beginnings, and that the name *Serb* denoted a person of the Orthodox religion. Also, it is important to emphasize that the Cyrillic script is not a Serbian script, but a Slavic one.

In 1907, in the magazine *Srd*, Pavle Popović (according to Czerwiński 2020) wrote about Dubrovnik as an area belonging to the Serbian region, saying that it once exuded wealth, culture and, most importantly, freedom, while other Serbian regions were deprived of all these things because of the Turkish attacks. Furthermore, he states that already at the end of the 15th century, literature written in the Serbian language began to develop in Dubrovnik, and that it lasted until the end of the 18th century, when, along with Dubrovnik's freedom and reputation, it began to wither (Czerwiński 2020: 82). Also, when Pavle Popović talks about Serbian and Dubrovnik Baroque traditions, the Serbian ones are mostly always connected to Dubrovnik (the glorification of Dubrovnik as part of the Serbian past), while the Croatian ones are more external, that is, they do not concern Dubrovnik at all (Menčetić, who dedicated a poem to the Croatian hero, Ban Petar Zrinski) (Czerwiński, 2020, p. 83).

Moreover, Grčević (2013, p. 9) discusses the national identity of the Dubrovnik population, which, both during the Renaissance and in later periods, was consistently Croatian. By dedicating his panegyric to Ban Zrinski, whom he refers to as the *Slavic trumpet*, Menčetić thereby linked Dubrovnik with the Croatian north and contributed to the construction of a unified Croatian identity. He flatters Zrinski with the compliment that he is the most vocal poet *of which the present people of the entire Slavic nation*,⁴⁸ and not only *the Dubrovnik states*,⁴⁹ are proud. Furthermore, he continues with identity synonyms, so in the verses *The Croatian people/ live and depend on your advice*⁵⁰ the people Menčetić is talking about are no longer just Slavic, but they are also Croatian – which is also confirmed by the most famous verses of the *Trublja* about the defensive Croatian shores: *From slavery, Italy would have sunk among the waves a long time ago if the Ottoman sea did not crash against Croatian shores*⁵¹. It should be concluded that Menčetić equates the terms *Slavic* and *Croatian*, while something belonging to *Dubrovnik* is only a sub-term of these two superior terms.

However, it is often overlooked that the Serbs began to intensively appropriate Dubrovnik literature only in the era of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, i.e.,

⁴⁸ Originally “kojim se diči sadašnji narod svega puka slovinskoga”.

⁴⁹ Originally “dubrovačkijeh država”.

⁵⁰ Originally “O tvom svijetu diha i visi/ narod puka hrvatskoga”.

⁵¹ Originally “Od robstva bi davno u valih/ potonula Italija/ o harvackieh da se žalih/ more otmansko ne razbija”.

after his linguistic and orthographic reform in the 19th century. After Vuk's death, one of the main followers of his ideas was Stojan Novaković, who is mentioned right at the beginning of the next chapter in the context of his review of the Serbian literary history. All of the above culminated relatively recently, at the beginning of 2022, with the adoption of the so-called "Law on Cultural Heritage" in the Republic of Serbia, by which the Serbs appropriated and arrogated all Dubrovnik writers until 1867.⁵²

Conclusion

Considering all the above, Vladislav Menčetić's *Trublja slovinska* apparently gained its status and found its place in the Croatian literary canon primarily because of its theme and dedication to Petar Zrinski, and only then as an aesthetic literary artifact. Attitudes and opinions of the Croatian literary historians towards Menčetić and his poem *Trublja slovinska* have changed over time, with Vodnik being the first to acknowledge him for the work he made, among others who at the time barely mentioned him. As the years went by, more and more Croatian literary historians mention and praise Menčetić for his *Trublja*, some for its aesthetic value, and some for the patriotic background to it. The last one, most recent was Prosperov Novak, who gave the best comments out of them all and writes about *Trublja's* place in the literary canon which, he thinks, is very well deserved. Regardless, more or less all Croatian literary historians remember and exalt Menčetić precisely because of *Trublja*, with which he created something new, even if that "new" was created under the influence of something already known and older, in this case Gundulić, but still somewhat upgraded. In their reviews of literature, Serbian literary historians regularly include Dubrovnik literature, which they consider their own, and Jovan Skerlić is the only Serbian literary historian among those analyzed for the purposes of this paper, who considers Dubrovnik literature a subspecies of Dalmatian or Croatian literature and does not connect it in any way with Serbian literature. It is interesting to point out that out of the analyzed six Serbian literary histories, three do not mention Vladislav Menčetić at all, and one barely mentions it, since Menčetić celebrates patriotism with this literary work, or more specifically, Croatism, which he equates in several places with the already mentioned Slavism. For the same reasons, such Serbian literary historians call Menčetić a mere imitator whose works have no value, and they do that with a certain disparagement. The reason for not recognizing and appreciating the poem's real value is probably of ideological-political nature. Croatian literary historians mainly react to this, highlighting the striking quotes from Menčetić's *Trublja* in which he

⁵² More about the mentioned event in the article on the online portal at the link: <https://hkm.hr/kultura/zasto-se-dubrovacka-knjizevnost-proglasava-srpskom/> (February 22, 2023).

celebrates Croatia and its nation, and often hiding messages in their sentences that aim to provoke all those, especially Serbian literary historians, who want to appropriate Dubrovnik literature.

References

- Barac, Antun. 1963. *Jugoslavenska književnost*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Beker, Miroslav. 1999. *Suvremene književne teorije*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Bogdanović, dr. David. 1918. *Pregled književnosti hrvatske i srpske: knjiga prva*. Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmana.
- Bogišić, Vlaho. 1998. *Leksikon hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Brebanović, Predrag. 2018. „Kanon i(li) kultura“. *Komparativna povijest hrvatske književnosti, zbornik radova XX.: Književni kanon*. Ed. Cvijeta Pavlović, Vinka Glunčić-Bužančić and Andrea Meyer-Fraatz. Split – Zagreb: Književni krug Split. pp. 21–30.
- Czerwiński, Maciej. 2020. „Jezično pitanje u časopisu Srba katolika Srđ (1902. – 1908.): teze, polemike, modeli argumentacije“. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 46, 1: 63–92.
- Deretić, Jovan. 1983. *Istorija srpske književnosti*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Dragić, Marko. 2006. *Književnost katoličke obnove i prvoga prosvjetiteljstva (Hrvatska barokna književnost)*. Split: Sveučilište u Splitu – Filozofski fakultet.
- Franičević, Marin, Franjo Švelec i Rafo Bogišić. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti 3: Od renesanse do prosvjetiteljstva*. Zagreb: Liber – Mladost.
- Frangeš, Ivo. 1987. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb – Ljubljana: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Georgijević, Krešimir. 1969. *Hrvatska književnost od XVI. do XVIII. stoljeća u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj i Bosni*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Grčević, Mario. 2013. „Dubrovačka književnost ni u kojem smislu nije sastavni dio srpske književnosti“. *Vijenac* 21, pp. 516–517: 8–9.
- Grčić, Jovan. 1906. *Istorija srpske književnosti: sa sto i četiri slike*. Novi Sad: Izdanje Srpske knjižare i štamparije braće M. Popovića.
- Jelčić, Dubravko. 2004. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti: Tisućljeće od Bašćanske ploče do postmoderne*. Zagreb: Naklada P.I.P. Pavičić.
- Ježić, Slavko. 1944. *Hrvatska književnost: od početka do danas (1100-1941)*. Zagreb: Naklada A. Velzek.
- Kombol, Mihovil. 1961. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do preporoda*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kombol, Mihovil & Prosperov Novak, Slobodan. 1995. *Hrvatska književnost do narodnog preporoda: priručnik za učenike, studente i učitelje književnosti (treće izdanje)*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

- Kunčević, Lovro & Domagoj Madunić. 2015. „Venice and Dubrovnik During the Great Earthquake of 1667“. *Dubrovnik annals* 19: pp. 7–56.
- Kravar, Zoran. 1975. *Studije o hrvatskom književnom baroku*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Novaković, Stojan. 1867. *Istorija srpske književnosti*. Beograd: Državna štamparija.
- Pantić, Miroslav. 1968. *Pesništvo renesanse i baroka: Dubrovnik, Dalmacija, Boka kotorska*. Beograd: Biblioteka Prosveta.
- Paščenko, Jevgenij. 2015. *Juraj Križanić i Ukrajina*. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.
- Pavić, Milorad. 1970. *Istorija srpske književnosti baroknog doba*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Pavličić, Pavao. 2018. „Koliko traje književna vječnost?“. *Komparativna povijest hrvatske književnosti, zbornik radova XX.: Književni kanon*. Ed. Cvijeta Pavlović, Vinka Glunčić-Bužančić and Andrea Meyer-Fraatz. Split – Zagreb: Književni krug Split. pp. 11–20.
- Poljanec, Franjo. 1937. *Historija stare i srednje jugoslovenske književnosti s pregledom narodne književnosti: za više razrede srednjih škola (II. prerađeno izdanje)*. Zagreb: Komisiona prodaja Knjižare Vasić (Vasić i Horvat).
- Prosperov Novak, Slobodan. 2003. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti: Od Bašćanske ploče do danas*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Protrka, Marina. 2008. *Stvaranje književne nacije: oblikovanje kanona u hrvatskoj književnoj periodici 19. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Periodica Croatica.
- Skerlić, Jovan. 1912. *Istorija nove srpske književnosti*. Beograd: Izdanje knjižare S. B. Cvijanovića.
- Solar, Milivoj. 2005. *Teorija književnosti*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Šurmin, Đuro. 1898. *Povjest književnosti hrvatske i srpske*. Zagreb: Tisak i naklada knjižare L. Hartmana, Kugli i Deutsch.
- Vodnik, Branko. 1913. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti: knjiga prva – od humanizma do potkraj XVIII. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Online sources

- Grčević, Mario, Marito Mihovil Letica, Stjepan Čosić i Davor Dijanović. 2022. „Zašto se dubrovačka književnost proglašava srpskom?“. *Hrvatska katolička mreža*. URL: <https://hkm.hr/kultura/zasto-se-dubrovačka-knjizevnost-proglasava-srpskom/> (July 5, 2023).

ZASTUPLJENOST VLADISLAVA MENČETIĆA I NJEGOVE TRUBLJE SLOVINSKE U POVIJESTIMA HRVATSKE I SRPSKE KNJIŽEVNOSTI

Sažetak

Hrvatskoj baroknoj književnosti pripada mnogo vrijednih autora, a dobar dio s godinama je uvršten u kanon hrvatske književnosti. Vladislav Menčetić jedan je od poznatih dubrovačkih pjesnika i autora 17. stoljeća koji je dobio na značaju tek posthumno. Njegovo najvrjednije djelo, *Trublja slovinska*, pohvalnički je spjev posvećen banu Petru Zrinskom koji je simbol junaštva, kršćanske borbe protiv Turaka te hrvatskoga naroda općenito. Cilj ovoga rada bio je istražiti odnos povijesti hrvatske književnosti prema Vladislavu Menčetiću i njegovu epu *Trublja slovinska*, kao i njihovu zastupljenost u različitim povijestima i pregledima književnosti. S obzirom na srpsko prisvajanje hrvatske, a naročito dubrovačke književnosti renesanse i baroka, Menčetićevo se ime može pronaći i u pregledima književnosti srpskih povjesničara književnosti. Za potrebe ovoga rada analizirano je devetnaest povijesti književnosti, i to trinaest pregleda hrvatskih autora te šest srpskih. U radu su korištene metode deskripcije, analize, komparacije te sinteze. Može se zaključiti kako je Vladislav Menčetić ipak pronašao svoje mjesto u hrvatskome kanonu, makar taj kanon bio rubni. Manje-više svi hrvatski povjesničari Menčetića pamte i uzdižu upravo zbog njegove panegiričke *Trublje slovinske*, dok Srbi očekivano u svoje preglede književnosti uključuju i dubrovačku književnost koju svojataju (Jovan Skerlić jedini je obrađeni srpski književni povjesničar koji dubrovačku književnost smatra podvrstom dalmatinske/hrvatske književnosti). Oni srpski književni povjesničari koji Menčetića jedva ili uopće ne spominju, to rade iz ideološko-političkih razloga, jer Menčetić ovim svojim djelom slavi domoljublje, odnosno slovinstvo, iako mnogi tumače kako je to slovinstvo na više mjesta izjednačeno s već spomenutim hrvatstvom.

Ključne riječi: barok, književni kanon, povijest književnosti, *Trublja slovinska*, Vladislav Menčetić.