

Miroslav Krleža's Assessment of Frane Petrić

DAVOR BALIĆ

*Department of Philosophy,
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek
davor.balic@kc.t-com.hr*

UDK 821.163.42-4 Krleža, M.
821.163.42.09 Petrić, F.
1(091)(497.5)"19"
Original scientific paper
Received: 24. 10. 2017.
Accepted: 20. 2. 2018.

Summary

Opus of Miroslav Krleža (1893–1981) contains his knowledge and assessment of Frane Petrić (1529–1597) and the characteristics of his works, and it also points out the sources of Krleža's knowledge of Petrić. Krleža revealed his knowledge of the characteristics of Petrić's writings in four of his texts written in the period from 1940 to 1953.

First of them was the essay "O poeziji" ("On Poetry"), which Krleža wrote in 1940, but published it as late as 1967. Relying on claims from Croce's *Estetica*, he presented the characteristics of Petrić's understanding of poetry, with special regard to Petrić's critique of Aristotle's doctrine on subject matters of poetry, and the reasons why Petrić criticized Aristotle's attitude that imitation is the source of poetry.

The second text in which Krleža expressed his views on Petrić and the characteristics of his opus was "O našem dramskom répertoireu" ("On Our Drama Repertoire") from 1948. In that text, Krleža took over or paraphrased records on Petrić which he found out from two sources: from an entry on Petrić written by Emilij Laszowsky for the work *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati* (*The Eminent and Deserving Croats*) from 1925, and from an article "Filozofija u Hrvatskoj" ("Philosophy in Croatia") from 1943, written by Kruno Krstić. However, the article "On Our Drama Repertoire" contains Krleža's own statements regarding Petrić. He emphasized that Petrić was "the most universal name of our literary Cinquecento," that he was "a polyhistor and an omniscient person," that he was not satisfied "with the Christianization of Greek thought, done by the Church, when it baptized Aristotle using Saint Thomas," but Krleža also misjudged Petrić being "an apologist of the medieval right-wing."

In the third text, which is actually a manuscript, “Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću” (“Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić”) from 1950, Krleža stressed that Petrić’s writings exalted him to be “our loudest Name of Cinquecento,” while in the essay “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije” (“On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia”) from 1953 he considered Petrić one of the “great names”.

Krleža’s texts in which he mentioned Petrić also increase the number of bibliographic units on Petrić. Previous bibliographies on Petrić do not contain a single bibliographic unit from which it is possible to find out that Krleža ever wrote anything regarding that Croatian Renaissance philosopher. This paper proves that there should have been at least four bibliographic units.

Key words: Miroslav Krleža, Frane Petrić, Benedetto Croce, Emilij Laszowsky, Kruno Krstić, poetry, philosophy, aesthetics, poetics

1. Introduction

Miroslav Krleža (1893–1981) was a Croatian writer of a rich and manifold opus, who has, thus far, most frequently been analyzed from a literary perspective. In doing so, Croatian literary historians and literary critics have determined Krleža as, for example, the greatest Croatian writer of the 20th century (Šicel, Bogišić, Pavličić), as a classic of Croatian literature (Flaker, Lauer), as a writer “whose work has marked, in the full sense of the word, a century of Croatian literature” (Šicel) and who was “the greatest literary figure of the whole Croatian history” (Frangješ), as well as a writer “of great literary, spiritual and moral expression and undeniable aesthetic authority” (Donat), and as “the central figure of Croatian literature” (Visković).¹ Besides, the exceptional value of Krleža’s

¹ Miroslav Šicel, “Predgovor,” in Ivan Grabar and Denis Peričić, *Zavičajnost Miroslava Krleže* (Zagreb – Varaždin: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zavod za znanstveni rad Varaždin, 2007), p. 15; Vlaho Bogišić, “Predgovor,” in Miroslav Krleža, *Marginalije: 1000 izabranih komentara o tekstovima za enciklopedije JLZ*, priredio Vlaho Bogišić (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2011), pp. 5–14, on p. 5; Pavao Pavličić, “Krleža i žene,” *Forum: mjesečnik Razreda za književnost Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 52/7–9 (Zagreb, 2013), pp. 792–805, on p. 795; Aleksandar Flaker, “Poziv na novo čitanje,” speech on the occasion of the publishing first seven books of *Djela Miroslava Krleže* (*Works of Miroslav Krleža*), *Vijenac: novine Matice hrvatske za književnost, umjetnost i znanost* 8 (Zagreb, 2000), br. 162 (18. svibnja 2000), p. 2c; Reinhard Lauer, *Miroslav Krleža – hrvatski klasik*, from German into Croatian translated by Ružica Ruklić (Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2013), pp. 15–16; Miroslav Šicel, “Krležino djelo kao obilježje epohe,” *Revija: časopis za književnost, kulturu i društvena pitanja* 22/1 (Osijek, 1982), pp. 3–6, on p. 3; Ivo Frangješ, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske; Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1987), p. 284; Branimir Donat, “Ljevoruka gnjavaža,” in Branimir Donat, *O Miroslavu Krleži još i opet: studije i eseji* (Zagreb: Dora Krupičeva, 2002), pp. 374–380, on p. 378; Velimir Visković, “Krležina politička esejistika,” in *Dani Hvarškoga*

literary work has already been noted in 1942 by the Italian literary historian and translator Luigi Salvini (1911–1957), who pointed out in the introduction to the anthology *Poeti croati moderni* (*Modern Croatian Poets*) that because of his poetry, as well as his novels, novellas, essays and dramas, Krleža “remains in the center of Croatian literature,” whereat it needs to be added that the Italian literate and translator Silvio Ferrari, who was preoccupied with the translation of Krleža’s works into Italian, emphasized in the introduction to the Italian translation of Krleža’s collection of novellas *Hrvatski bog Mars* (*Croatian God Mars*) from 1982 that Krleža is “the most important author of the 20th-century Yugoslav literature.”²

However, Krleža’s opus, especially his essays, polemics and diaries, contains numerous thoughts on the social, cultural and political events which have defined Croatian and European identity, as well as thoughts on persons who have, in different time periods and circumstances, shaped Croatian and European culture, politics, history, music, medicine, and many other fields of humanities, as well as social and art sciences. Furthermore, Krleža made writings of philosophical nature, as well as ones regarding individual philosophers. Two of such writings need to be singled out. One of them is “Marginalia na temu o spoznajnoteorijskoj magiji” (“Marginalia regarding Epistemological Magic”), in which Krleža expressed his views on the epistemological stances by Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Leibniz, Kant and Fichte, while the other “O dvestogodišnjici rođenja Imanuela Kanta” (“On the Occasion of the Bicentenary of Immanuel Kant’s Birth”), in which Krleža paid tribute to Kant’s courage in opting for antimilitarism and declaring himself to be a Republican in his work *Zum ewigen Frieden* (*Perpetual Peace*) despite the Prussian wars of his time, but in which he also criticized Kant’s thoughts on God, considering them to be marked by Medieval approach, stating that “that and such Kant smells like alchemical sulfur and magic.”³ Few articles and book chapters have

kazališta [XXX]: *Hrvatska književnost, kazalište i avangarda dvadesetih godina 20. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti; Split: Književni krug, 2004), pp. 29–46, on p. 30.

² Luigi Salvini, “Prefazione,” in Luigi Salvini (a cura di), *Poeti croati moderni* (Milano: Garzanti, 1942), pp. V–XLIII, on pp. XXIX–XXX: “La figura maggiore di questo periodo che dall’ immediato dopoguerra si spinge fino al 25–26, non è l’ Ujevic’, <...> bensì un nuovo nome che per alcuni anni resta al centro delle lettere croate, e non colla sola poesia, ma col romanzo, colla novella, col saggio e col teatro: Miroslav Krleža.”; Silvio Ferrari, “Presentazione,” in Miroslav Krleža, *Il dio Marte croato. Due racconti*, traduzione di Silvio Ferrari (Pordenone: Studio Tesi, 1982), pp. IX–XIII, on p. XI: “Krleža è il più importante autore della letteratura jugoslava del ventesimo secolo.”

³ Miroslav Krleža, “Marginalia na temu o spoznajnoteorijskoj magiji (Fragmenti dnevnika oktobra godine 1942),” *Delo: mesečni književni časopis* 2/11 (Beograd, 1956), pp. 1363–1437;

been published thus far regarding the presence of the philosophical component and philosophical disciplines in Krleža's opus. Those indicating the presence of aesthetics (Magdić, Posavac), ethics and aesthetics (Šegvić), philosophy of history (Žmegač), as well as those indicating, as their authors report in titles of their articles, fundamental or some philosophical aspects of Krleža's opus (Grlić, Jeremić), should be highlighted.⁴

Krleža's opus contains his accounts on Croatian philosophers, as well as accounts regarding the characteristics of their writings. Unfortunately, that segment of Krleža's opus has not yet received appropriate attention. In fact, Krleža expressed his views on Croatian philosophers from the 15th and 16th century, for example on Ivan Stojković (c. 1395–1443), Marko Marulić (1450–1524) and Matija Vlačić Ilirik the Elder (1520–1575), then on those from the 17th and 18th century, for example on Juraj Križanić (1617 or 1618–1673) and Ruđer Josip Bošković (1711–1787), then on those from the 19th century, for example on Ante Starčević (1823–1896), as well as on his contemporaries, for example on Đuro Arnold (1853–1941) and Vladimir Dvorniković (1888–1956).⁵

Nevertheless, Krleža also expressed his views on the Croatian Renaissance philosopher Frane Petrić from Cres (Latin: Franciscus Patricius / Patritius; Italian: Francesco Patrizi / Patrizzi / Patrici / Patricio / Patritio, 1529–1597). One is to be reminded that Petrić, as follows from the statements chosen for their impressiveness, was a tenacious adversary of Aristotle, that he considered

M.[iroslav] K.[rleža], "O dvestogodišnjici rođenja Imanuela Kanta," *Književna republika: mesečnik za sve kulturne probleme* 2/8 (Zagreb, jul 1924), pp. 334–336, on pp. 335–336.

⁴ Milivoj Magdić, "Krležina estetika (Povodom knjige: Miroslav Krleža – Eseji – knjiga prva. Zagreb 1932. Izdanje Minerva)," *Socijalna misao* 6/3 (Zagreb, 1933), pp. 65–71; K.[erubin] Šegvić, "Glembajevi u svjetlu etike i estetike," *Hrvatska smotra za književnost, umjetnost i društveni život* 1/6 (Zagreb, 1933), pp. 244–255; Danko Grlić, "O nekim filozofskim aspektima Krležinog djela," *Naše teme: časopis za društvena i omladinska pitanja* 7/5(53) (Zagreb, 1963), pp. 609–634; Zlatko Posavac, "Estetika Miroslava Krleže," *Kolo: časopis Matice hrvatske za kulturu i umjetnost*, nova serija 6(126)/7 (Zagreb, 1968), pp. 3–35; Dragan M. Jeremić, "Osnovne filozofske teze u književnom delu Miroslava Krleže," *Letopis Matice srpske* 149, knjiga 412, sveska 1 (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1973), pp. 1–15; Viktor Žmegač, "Krležino shvaćanje povijesti u europskom filozofskom kontekstu," in Viktor Žmegač, *Krležini europski obzori: djelo u komparativnom kontekstu* (Zagreb: Znanje, 2001), pp. 273–295.

⁵ Only two articles completely dedicated to Krleža's knowledge and assessment of some Croatian philosopher and the characteristics of their opera have been published thus far. One of them considers Krleža's knowledge and assessment of Đuro Arnold, and the other of Marko Marulić. See Davor Balić, "Prosudbe o Đuri Arnoldu iz perspektive marginalija Miroslava Krleže," *Fluminensia: časopis za filološka istraživanja* 25/2 (Rijeka, 2013), pp. 69–85; Davor Balić, "Krležini iskazi o Maruliću i njegovu opusu," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 42/2(84) (Zagreb, 2016), pp. 353–419.

Platonism a teaching which is compatible with Christianity and considered his own teaching to be perfectly adapted for the conversion of heretics (Copleston), then that he was one of those Renaissance philosophers of nature who paved the way to new science and new philosophy of the 17th century (Kristeller), that he was a philosophy historian and an excellent connoisseur, as well as, especially in *Discussiones peripateticae* (*Peripatetic Discussions*), a harsh critic of the Aristotelian teaching (Muccillo),⁶ that he built a peculiar philosophy of nature within his philosophical system (Martinović), that he was a philosopher, erudite, polyhistor, scientist, poet, visionary, Hellenist, Latinist, historian, theoretician of literature, poetry and music, whose works are embedded in the foundations of Croatian and European philosophy and science (Schiffler), and that he was one of the most significant Croatian philosophers, moreover, one of the most significant Renaissance philosophers in general (Girardi-Karšulin, Banić-Pajnić).⁷

⁶ Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy III. Ockham to Suárez* (Tunbridge Wells, England: Search Press Limited; Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1953), p. 254: "A determined enemy of Aristotle, he [Patrizzi] considered that Platonism was far more compatible with Christianity and that his own system was eminently adapted for winning heretics back to the Church."; Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Patrizi," in Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), pp. 110–126, on p. 110: "So there are good reasons for grouping Patrizi, along with Telesio and a number of other Italian and European thinkers of the sixteenth century, among the Renaissance philosophers of nature, who were unattached to the classical traditions of Western thought and prepared the way for the new science and the new philosophy of the seventeenth century and modern times."; Maria Muccillo, "La vita e le opere di Aristotele nelle 'Discussiones peripateticae' di Francesco Patrizi da Cherso," *Rinascimento: rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento*, seconda serie. Volume 21 (Firenze, 1981), pp. 53–119, on p. 58: "Le *Discussiones peripateticae* testimoniano così di un altro aspetto della ricca e complessa personalità del Patrizi, che si presenta qui nella veste del filologo, dell'erudito, dello storico della filosofia, del profondo conoscitore e insieme del severo critico delle dottrine aristoteliche."

⁷ Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, *Hrvatski renesansni aristotelizam* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, 1993), p. 225: "Frane Petrić is one of the most significant Croatian philosophers and certainly one of the most significant Renaissance philosophers in general."; Ivica Martinović, "Petrićeva prosudba Aristotelove prirodne filozofije," *Obnovljeni život: časopis za religioznu kulturu* 52/1 (Zagreb, 1997), pp. 3–20, on p. 3: "Working as a professor of Platonic philosophy at the University of Ferrara during a long period of time, i.e. from 1577 to 1592, Frane Petrić has been building his own philosophical system, within which he had built a peculiar philosophy of nature."; Ljerka Schiffler, *Frane Petrić / Franciscus Patricius. Od škole mišljenja do slobode mišljenja* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 1997), p. 9; [Erna Banić-Pajnić], "Predgovor," in Franciscus Patricius, *Zoroaster et eius CCCXX Oracula chaldaica / Frane Petrić, Zoroaster i njegovih tristo i dvadeset Kaldejskih proroštava* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2011), pp. 7–9, on p. 7: "Frane Petrić (1529–1597) is one of the most significant Croatian Renaissance philosophers, a representative of Renaissance Neoplatonism."

The sources of Krleža's knowledge, as well as Krleža's assessment of Petrić and his opus will be indicated in the chapters that follow. The context of the emergence of texts which shaped Krleža's knowledge on Petrić, and Krleža's attitudes towards the authors of those texts will also be pointed out. This will provide full insight into Krleža's knowledge on Petrić, and simultaneously, for the first time, provide a more detailed insight into Krleža's thoughts on two philosophers Benedetto Croce and Kruno Krstić, from whose texts he took over or paraphrased information on Petrić.

2. Krleža's essay "O poeziji" from 1940: the decisive influence of Croce's *Estetica*

Krleža revealed his knowledge of the characteristics of Petrić's opus for the first time in his essay "O poeziji" ("On Poetry"⁸). Although he claimed that he wrote it in autumn of 1940, he published it in 1967 as one of five texts or as one of, as he points out, five variations connected by quotations of "numerous philosophical writers" which were published under the common title "Zapisi jeseni 1940" ("Records from Autumn of 1940").⁹ As stated in "Napomena" ("Annotation") which concludes the 27th volume of *Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže* (*Collected Works of Miroslav Krleža*) by the publishing house Zora, hence the volume printed in 1972 under the title *Djetinjstvo 1902–03 i drugi zapisi* (*Childhood 1902–1903 and Other Records*), the essay "On Poetry" contains "variations of reading B. Croce,"¹⁰ as the Croatian literary historian, critic and essayist Zoran Kravar (1948–2013) also pointed out in *Krležijana* (*Krležiana*), claiming that Krleža's records in that essay are largely due to his "reading of Croce's *Aesthetic*".¹¹ Essay "On Poetry" is indeed largely based on the contents of Croce's *Estetica* (*Aesthetic*). In fact, Krleža started it by paraphrasing and taking over records from the fifth chapter of the historical part of Croce's *Aesthetic*. The very first sentence contains his paraphrase of Croce's thoughts on

⁸ Hereafter: Krleža, "On Poetry," (1967).

⁹ Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi jeseni 1940," *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967), pp. 301–355, on p. 301. Under the title "Zapisi jeseni 1940" ("Records from Autumn of 1940") Krleža published the following five texts in 1967: "Magistra vitae", pp. 301–322; "O poeziji" ("On Poetry"), pp. 323–340; "Varijacije na temu o subjektu" ("Variations on the Topic of Subject"), pp. 340–345; "Lichtenbergov *praeter nos*" ("Lichtenberg's *praeter nos*"), pp. 345–349; "Misao kao takva po sebi i o sebi" ("Thought as Such by and in Itself"), pp. 350–355.

¹⁰ [s. n.], "Napomena," in Miroslav Krleža, *Djetinjstvo 1902–03 i drugi zapisi*, *Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže*, sv. 27. (Zagreb: Zora, 1972), pp. 615–616, on p. 616.

¹¹ Zo.[ran] Kr.[avar], "O poeziji," entry in *Krležijana* 2, M - Ž, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod *Miroslav Krleža*, 1999), p. 123a.

the nature of poetry,¹² and immediately after that he took over sentences already taken over by Croce from *Scienza nuova* (*The New Science*) by Giambattista Vico.¹³ Apart from those from the fifth chapter, Krleža also paraphrased or took over sentences from the first four chapters of the historical part of *Aesthetic*, especially from the second chapter, thus from the chapter in which Croce elaborated upon aesthetical topics of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. However,

¹² Miroslav Krleža, "O poeziji," pp. 323–340, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi jeseni 1940," pp. 301–355, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967), on p. 323: "Is poetry a rational phenomenon or not, spiritual or corporeal, i.e. human, in a higher, noble sense, or brutally bestial, and if it is spiritual, if it should be separated from science and history, what is its essential characteristic?"

Cf. Benedetto Croce, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic*, translated from the Italian by Douglas Ainslie, second edition (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1922), pp. 220–221: "<...> is poetry rational or irrational, spiritual or brutal? and, if spiritual, what is its special nature and what distinguishes it from history and science?"

Also see Benedetto Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: I. Teoria. II. Storia*. (Milano-Palermo-Napoli: Remo Sandron, 1902), p. 229: "È la poesia un fatto razionale o irrazionale, spirituale o brutale? E, se è spirituale, qual'è la propria indole della poesia e come essa si distingue dalla storia e dalla scienza?"

¹³ Krleža, "O poeziji," p. 323: "*First of all, humans feel without perceiving, and if they happen to perceive something, they usually notice it using their 'perturbed soul', confusingly, so that they can then reflect upon their impression with their 'pure spirit', intellectually. This sequence is the principle of all poetic sentences, which are made with the help of or with the interference of passions or sensations (affections), unlike philosophical sentences, which are born after rational conclusion based on reflection; therefore, philosophical sentences are closer to the truth as they exalt themselves to the level of universal ideas, whereas poetic ones are more trustworthy as they get closer to details, i.e. to the 'particular'.*" Italicized by Krleža.

Cf. Croce, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (1922), p. 221: "Men at first feel without being aware; next they become aware with a perturbed and agitated soul; finally they reflect with an undisturbed mind. This Aphorism is the Principle of poetical sentences which are formed by the sense of passions and affections; differing thereby from philosophical sentences which are formed by reflexion through ratiocination; whence the latter approach more nearly to truth the more they rise towards the universal, while the former have more of certainty the more they approach the individual."

Also see Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: I. Teoria. II. Storia*. (1902), p. 229: "Gli uomini prima *sentono* senz'avvertire: da poi *avvertiscono* con animo perturbato e commosso: finalmente *riflettono* con mente pura. Questa Dignità è il *Principio delle sentenze Poetiche*, che sono formate con sensi di *passioni* e di *affetti*, a differenza delle *sentenze filosofiche*, che si formano dalla *riflessione* con *raziocinio*: onde *queste* più s'appressano al *vero*, quanto più s'inalzano agli *universalis*; e quelle son più certe quanto più s'approssimano a' *particolari*." Italicized by Croce.

Cf. *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, translated from the third edition (1744) by Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1948), pp. 67–68. Also see Giambattista Vico, *De' principj d'una scienza nuova* (In Napoli: A spese di Felice Mosca, 1730), pp. 149–150.

Krleža used several occasions to refer to or to remind of his attitudes presented in his earlier texts. For example, after claiming that the past “achievements in fiction did not succeed in reflecting the man in the midst of this chaos,” he said that the literary works made in the second half of the 1940 can be considered as “an anticipation of all the later post-existentialist theories,” which will be “transformed into aesthetical canons of the so-called contemporary literature,” and later referred to his work *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza* (*The Return of Philip Latinovicz*) from 1932, precisely on the conversations led between Philip Latinovicz and Sergei Kirilovitch Kyriales.¹⁴ In addition, when he indicated the thoughts on beauty expressed by, as he calls them, “aesthetical propagandists (left-wing and right-wing),” he stressed that the “mass movements, such as this totalized madness today, is a most serious matter,” and then reminded that he has already expressed his views on that in 1933 in the foreword to *Podravski motivi* (*Podravina Motifs*), i.e. the collection of drawings by the Croatian painter Krsto Hegedušić (1901–1975).¹⁵

In the essay “On Poetry” Krleža also wrote on Petrić’s understanding of poetry. In doing so, he based his knowledge on the records taken over by Croce from the fourth and the eighth book of *La decia disputata* (*The Disputative Decade*), which Petrić, as well as *La decia istoriale* (*The Historical Decade*), published in 1586 as parts of his synthesis *Della poetica* (*On Poetics*). By the way, Petrić has in *La decia disputata*, as noted by the Croatian philosopher Ljerkka Schiffler (1941–2016) in an article “Patritiusov razračun s Aristotelom” (“Patritius’ Confrontation with Aristotle”) published in 1969, “conducted an analysis of Aristotle’s conceptions of poetry in a brilliant, systematical and rather critical manner,” while he most intensely criticized and disproved of “Aristotle’s consideration of poetry as imitation”.¹⁶ While writing the review of Petrić’s work *Della poetica*, Croce aimed exactly on Petrić’s critique of Aristotle’s considerations on the subject matter of poetry, and afterwards on Petrić’s critique of Aristotle’s considerations of poetry as the art of imitation (μίμησις).

¹⁴ Krleža, “O poeziji,” p. 331. See footnote 7 on the same page. For the contents of the conversations led between Latinovicz and Kyriales, see Miroslav Krleža, *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1932), pp. 150–170.

¹⁵ Krleža, “O poeziji,” p. 332. Also see M.[iroslav] K.[rleža], [“Predgovor Podravskim motivima Krste Hegedušića,”] in Krsto Hegedušić, *Podravski motivi*, 34 crteža, s predgovorom Miroslava Krleže (Zagreb: Minerva, 1933), pp. 3–24, especially on pp. 5–17.

¹⁶ Ljerkka Šifler-Premec, “Patritiusov razračun s Aristotelom,” *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 8/9 (Zagreb, 1969), pp. 458–474, on p. 462 and 466.

Since he relied on Croce's *Aesthetic*, Krleža also based his assessment of Petrić's *Della poetica* on Petrić's critique of Aristotle's understanding of poetry. In the first part of his review, Krleža drew attention to Petrić's disapproval of Aristotle's teaching on the subject matters of poetry. This is evidenced by Krleža's sentence in which he paraphrased a quotation which Croce, with a remark that Aristotle writes like that in many places in his *Περὶ ποιητικῆς* (*On Poetics*¹⁷), took over from the eighth book of Petrić's *La deca disputata*, so it is possible to find out from Krleža's essay that Patrizio's, as Krleža addresses Petrić, opinion on Aristotle's attitudes regarding the subject matters of poetry was as follows:

“Poetry is, according to that [Aristotle], retelling of fairy tales and stories, different novellas and novelettes, beliefs and duties, kindness and possibility, but also of impossibility, probability and improbability, therefore poetry is imitation of all things without any order, but rather of how they present themselves in nature.”¹⁸

In the second part of the review, Krleža informed of reasons why Petrić harshly criticized Aristotle's attitude on poetry as imitation, taught by Aristotle at the beginning of his *On Poetics*.¹⁹ On that occasion, Krleža strived to be

¹⁷ Hereafter: Aristotle, *On Poetics* (1898).

¹⁸ Krleža, “O poeziji,” p. 335: “Poezija je, prema tome [prema Aristotelovu mišljenju], prepričavanje bajki i fabula, raznih novela i noveleta, vjerovanja i dužnosti, dobrote i mogućnosti, ali isto tako i nemogućnosti, vjerojatnosti i nevjerojatnosti, dakle poezija je imitacija sviju stvari bez nekog reda, već kako se javljaju u naravi.”

Cf. Croce, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (1922), p. 187: “<...> since Aristotle in several passages says that poetry may comprise ‘fable, actual occurrences, belief of others, duty, the best, necessity, the possible, the probable, the credible, the incredible, the suitable’ as well as ‘all things worldly.’” Also see Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: I. Teoria. II. Storia.* (1902), p. 191: “<...> raccogliendosi dai varii luoghi di Aristotile che la poesia abbracci la favola, la cosa avvenuta, la credenza altrui, il dovere, il migliore, il necessario, il possibile, il verisimile, il credibile, l' incredibile e il conveniente, ossia ‘tutte le mondane cose’.”

Cf. *Della Poetica di Francesco Patrici, La Deca Disputata.* (In Ferrara: Per Vittorio Baldini Stampator Ducale, 1586), pp. 175–176: “E sono le [poetiche materie] seguenti, comunque, o da lui [Aristotile], o da loro [seguaci di Aristotile] sieno state intese. La favola. La cosa avvenuta. La cosa presente. Ciò che la fama porta. La credenza altrui. Il dovere. Quale debba essere. Il migliore. Il necessario. Il possibile. Lo' mpossibile. Il contingente. Il verisimile eikos. Il credibile πιθανόν. Lo incredibile. E il convenevole. <...> E per conseguente tutte le mondane cose, di mente di Aristotile potranno dar materia da poetare.”

¹⁹ Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς 1147a 13–16: Ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας ποίησις ἔτι δὲ κωμῳδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς ἀλληλικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι τυγχάνουσιν οὔσαι μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον, <...>. Cf. *The Poetics of Aristotle*, edited with critical notes and a translation by S.[amuel] H.[enry] Butcher. Second edition revised (London: Macmillan

guided by records from Croce's *Aesthetic* once again. In it Croce cited Petrić's attitudes from the fourth book of *La deca disputata*, which reveal that Aristotle was mistaken when he defined poetry as imitation, then that the definition of the characteristics of poetry has not yet been brought to light (*posta in luce*), and that it still lies unrevealed (*sta in occulto*).²⁰ In the essay "On Poetry," Krleža wrote the following:

"In one word: it is not quite right to think of poetry as simple imitation, for if it is nothing but accidental imitation, then it would not only belong to poets, and that is exactly why poetry is not 'accidental imitation', 'lucky imitation', but an entirely different sort of imitation, therefore it should not be regarded according to Aristotle's definition, nor someone else's, since poetry does not belong among 'imitations' we have so far considered as such, among those which happen entirely by accident, and have not yet been brought to light by no one but rather lie unrevealed in the dark."²¹

Krleža did not carefully read or maybe even misunderstood Petrić's views cited by Croce in his *Aesthetic*. In fact, in his argumentation Petrić did not even

and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898), p. 7: "Epic poetry and Tragedy, Comedy also and dithyrambic poetry, and the music of the flute and of the lyre in most of their forms, are all in their general conception modes of imitation."

²⁰ Croce, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (1922), pp. 187–188: "<...> Patrizzi comes to the conclusion that 'there is no truth in the dogma that poetry is wholly imitation; and even if it be imitation at all, it belongs not to poets alone, nor is it mere imitation of any kind, but something else not mentioned by Aristotle nor pointed out by any one else, nor yet borne into the mind of man. The discovery may possibly be made in course of time, or some one may hit upon the truth and bring it to light'; but up to the present 'such discovery has not been made.'" Also see Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: I. Teoria. II. Storia*. (1902), p. 191: "<...> il Patrizio concludeva: 'che non sia vero il dogma che la poesia tutta sia imitazione, e, se pure imitazione è, sarà non propria de' poeti soli, e alla ventura, ma sarà alcuna altra nè da Aristotile detta nè da altrui mostrata nè ora venutaci in pensiero: la quale per avventura potrebbeci venire o d'alcuno essere ritrovata e posta in luce', mentre ora 'ella si sta in occulto'." Italicized by Croce.

Cf. *Della Poetica di Francesco Patrici, La Deca Disputata*, p. 92: "Ed in somma noi diciamo, che non sia vero il dogma, che la poesia tutta sia imitazione. E se pure imitazione è, sarà non propria de poeti soli; e allavventura, ella sarà alcun'altra ne da Aristotile detta, ne da altrui mostrata, ne ora venutaci in penna, o in pensiero. La quale peravventura potrebbeci venire, o d'alcuno essere ritrovata, e posta in luce. Ma mentre ella si stà in occulto; <...>".

²¹ Krleža, "O poeziji," pp. 335–336: "U jednu riječ: da je poezija samo imitacija, ne će biti da je posvema ispravno mišljenje, jer ako je isključivo samo slučajna imitacija, onda ne bi trebala da bude samo pjesnicima svojstvena, a upravo zato, jer poezija nije 'slučajna imitacija', 'imitacija na sreću', nego neka posve druga vrsta imitacije, ona, prema tome, nije takva kao što ju je bio odredio Aristotel, a niti netko drugi, jer poezija ne spada među 'imitacije' kakve smo mi dosada sebi predstavljali kao takve, koje se javljaju potpuno slučajno, a nisu još osvijetljene ni po kome nože neotkrivene u tmini."

mention “accidental” nor “lucky” imitation, nor did he advocate the attitude that poetry is, as Krleža writes, “an entirely different sort of imitation”. It needs to be reminded of and repeated that Petrić criticized Aristotle’s definition of poetry as imitation. When he considered the characteristics of poetry, Petrić never used the term “imitation,” moreover he rejected it and did not relate it to poetry. That can be evidenced by one more sentence from the fourth book of *La decem disputata*: “Therefore, poetry is not made by imitation, but by something else which is not yet apparent.”²² After all, Petrić did not claim that, as Krleža states, poetry is “an entirely different sort of imitation,” but rather that a different or new definition of poetry needs to be found, and it still lies unrevealed.

In any case, Krleža left the first written mark of his knowledge of Petrić in the essay “On Poetry,” referring to Petrić’s thoughts on poetry in his *La decem disputata*. In doing so, he entirely based his knowledge on one of the editions of Croce’s *Aesthetic* published in the Italian original. Although he could have read the Serbian translation of that Croce’s work,²³ it is certain that he did not use it at all: Krleža’s translation of Croce’s claims largely differs from the translation offered in the Serbian edition of *Aesthetic*. For example, this is evidenced by comparison of the translation of Croce’s sentence which summarizes the claims of the Italian physician, philosopher of nature, and poet Girolamo Fracastoro (1478–1553) on the task of poets and the distinction between a poet and a historian,²⁴ which Krleža put in quotation marks, meaning that he cited Croce.²⁵

²² *Della Poetica di Francesco Patrici, La Decem Disputata*, p. 88: “E così non la imitazione, fa la poesia, ma altra cosa per ancora non palese.”

²³ Benedeto Kroče, *Estetika kao nauka o izrazu i opšta lingvistika*, preveo s italijanskog i predgovor napisao Vinko Vitezica (Beograd: Kosmos, 1934).

²⁴ Croce, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (1922), p. 185: “The poet’s task is to represent or to imitate, and he differs from the historian, not in the matter, but in the manner of representation.”

Also see Benedetto Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell’espressione e linguistica generale: Teoria e Storia*, terza edizione riveduta (Bari: Gius.[eppe] Laterza & Figli, 1908), p. 208: “Al poeta spetta rappresentare o imitare; e differisce dallo storico, non già nella materia, sì bene nel modo della rappresentazione.”

Cf. Hieronymus Fracastorius, “Naugerius sive De poetica Dialogus,.” in Hieronymus Fracastorius Veronensis, *Opera omnia*, in unum proxime post illius mortem collecta. (Venetiis: Apud Iuntas, 1555), ff. 153r–164v, on f. 157v: “Postremo dentur tibi omnia, & prodesse per imitationem sit poetę finis aliquis, nondum tamen expressum est, quod per se & proprium est poetę, per quod ab alijs differt. nam & alij quoque id præstant, sicuti Historicus. cum ergo diversa sit imitatio poetę, & diversa historici, id assignare oportet, quo differt poeta ab historico, & siqui alij idem faciunt. magis autem oportebit hoc assignare, si nulla materia propria poetę sit, & omne, quod quocumque docetur modo, imitatio dicatur. quapropter nullo pacto ponere possumus à materia sola sumi poetę finem.”

²⁵ Krleža, “O poeziji,” p. 335: ““A poet presents specific events and describes them, and differs from a historian only in the manner of his representation.””

Since the Serbian translation of Croce's aesthetical synthesis was published for the first time as late as 1934, it does not surprise that in 1912, hence in the same year in which Croce already published the fourth edition of his *Aesthetic*, the Croatian classical philologist Martin Kuzmić (1868–1945) did not even mention Croce in his study published in the Zagreb edition of the translation of Aristotle's *On Poetics*, considering two German thinkers “‘the pioneers’ of aesthetics today”: Theodor Lipps (1851–1914) and Johannes Immanuel Volkelt (1848–1930).²⁶ However, several Croatian thinkers, first and foremost aestheticians and literary historians, were well acquainted with Croce's aesthetical thought already in the first two decades of the 20th century. Papers written by Zlatko Posavac and Katarina Hraste in the last thirty years bear witness to the early reception of Croce's aesthetical thought in Croatia.²⁷ In fact, familiarity with the contents of Croce's *Aesthetic* is already noticeable in as many as three papers published in 1906: in a paper written by the art historian, painter and politician Isidor (Iso, Izidor) Kršnjavi (1845–1927), then in a paper written by the literate, literary and theater critic Branimir Wiesner Livadić (1871–1949), and in a paper written by the literary historian and literary critic Dragutin Prohaska (1881–1964).²⁸ Six years later, hence in 1912, the philosopher Albert

Cf. Kroče, *Estetika kao nauka o izrazu i opšta lingvistika*, p. 267: “A poet should represent or imitate, and differs from a historian not by in the matter he represents, but in the manner of his representation.”

²⁶ [Martin Kuzmić], “Dodatak.,” in *Aristotelova Poetika*, s prijevodom i komentarom izdao Martin Kuzmić (Zagreb: Kr.[aljevska] hrv.[atsko]-slav.[onsko]-dalm.[atinska] zemaljska vlada, 1912), pp. 233–273, on p. 235.

²⁷ Zlatko Posavac, *Estetika u Hrvata: istraživanja i studije* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1986), p. 164 and 184; Zlatko Posavac, *Novija hrvatska estetika: studije i eseji* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, 1991), p. 124, 168, 226, 227, 235, 260, 271, 315, 317, 318 and 320; Zlatko Posavac, “Pogovor: Zapis uz ‘Estetiku’ Benedetto Crocea,” in Benedetto Croce, *Estetika kao znanost izraza i opća lingvistika: Teorija i historija*, prijevod s talijanskog Sanja Roić (Zagreb: Globus, 1991), pp. 421–427, on p. 424 and 425; Zlatko Posavac, “Rana recepcija estetike Benedetto Crocea u Hrvatskoj,” *Filozofska istraživanja* 13/3 (Zagreb, 1993), pp. 675–684; Katarina Hraste, “Benedetto Croce, mi i drugi,” *Mogućnosti* 48/4–6 (Split, 2001), pp. 25–45, on p. 25, 29, 33 and 34.

²⁸ I. [Isidor, Iso, Izidor] Kršnjavi, “Popratno slovo,” *Kolo hrvatskih umjetnika* 1 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 1–4, on p. 1a: “Benedetto Croce: (Estetica. 1902) offers a good overview of the history of aesthetical issues and develops his own theory of the psychology of beauty, <...>”; Branimir Livadić, “Vjenceslav Novak,” predavanje pročitano na komemoraciji 19. listopada 1905. godine, *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 25–30, on p. 25a: “The famous Italian aesthetician Benedetto Goce [Croce] says in his aesthetics that we are living in an illusion of the richness of our imagination and our thoughts.”; p. 30a–b: “If what the Italian thinker Benedet[t]o Croce claims is true, that beauty is expression – then we really must be fond of what the great soul offers from the abundance of its emotions and thoughts.”; D.[ragutin] Prohaska,

Bazala (1877–1947) published the third volume of his *Povijest filozofije* (*A History of Philosophy*), in which he exposed Croce's philosophy,²⁹ while two papers entirely devoted to Croce and his thoughts on aesthetics were printed in 1918 and 1920: the art historian, archeologist and priest Ivan (Ivo) Delalle (1892–1962) published an article "Benedetto Croce" in 1918, while the aesthetician and literary historian Albert Haler (1883–1945) published a review "O esteticici Benedetta Croce" ("On the Aesthetics of Benedetto Croce") in 1920.³⁰

Nevertheless, Krleža's opus also bears witness to the early reception of Croce's thought by Croatian thinkers. One can find out from it that Krleža was very well acquainted with the characteristics of Croce's thoughts on aesthetics and philosophy of history. This is evidenced by the statements Krleža made in his essays, polemics, dialogues, diary records, speeches, conversations, marginalia alongside the entries which were meant to be published in the editions of the Encyclopedia of the Yugoslav Institute of Lexicography, and in the manuscript entitled *Croce. Koncepti* (*Croce. Drafts*³¹). In spite of that, Krleža's attitude towards Croce and his doctrine has not been systematically examined nor analysed until the present day, what has at least inspired the making of the appendix "Popis bibliografskih jedinica koje sadrže Krležine iskaze o Croceu i njegovu nauku" ("The List of Bibliographic Units Containing Krleža's Records on Croce and His Doctrine"³²) located at the end of this paper. According to current findings, the number of those bibliographic units is as high as 16.

"Dr. Jozo Dujmušić: Nauka o pjesništvu," *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 1/4 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 369–370, on p. 369a: "It [Jozo Dujmušić's *Nauka o pjesništvu* (*The Science of Poetry*)] is in many of its basic characteristics different from contemporary poetics, such as the one recently elaborated upon by the Italian (B.[enedetto] Croce) <...>".

²⁹ Albert Bazala, *Povijest filozofije*, svezak III. *Povijest filozofije najnovijega doba* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1912), p. 326: "Hegel's doctrine is represented by A.[ugusto] *Vera* and *Bertr. [ando] Spaventa*, and B.[enedetto] *Croce*, widely known as an aesthetician, is also under its influence."; p. 346: "<...> its [modern aesthetics] main representatives are <...> B.[enedetto] *Croce*, <...>"; p. 365: "An extensive bibliographic list of works on Hegel's life, work and teaching is offered by B.[enedetto] *Croce*: *Lebendiges und Totes in Hegels Philosophie*. Heidelberg 1909."; p. 365, footnote 4: "Cf. [Hegel], *Logik*, W.[erke] VI. p. 151. and further. A harsh critique of the synthesis of contradiction can be found in B.[enedetto] *Croce*."; p. 393: "Apart from Lipps', Volkelt's and Cohen's aesthetics, valuable works in this field are the following: <...> B.[enedetto] *Croce*: *Estetica* 1902." Italicized by Bazala.

³⁰ Ivan Delalle, "Benedetto Croce," *Hrvatska prosvjeta* 5/1 (Zagreb, 1918), pp. 13–16; Albert Haler, "O esteticici Benedetta Croce," *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 15, knjige II–III (Zagreb, 1920), pp. 122–125.

³¹ Hereafter: Krleža, *Croce. Drafts* (c. 1930).

³² Hereafter: Balić, "The List of Bibliographic Units Containing Krleža's Records on Croce and His Doctrine," (2017).

Krleža's earliest records on Croce's doctrine will be presented in the following part of this chapter, proving that Krleža should also be listed as one of those Croatian thinkers who had been acquainted with the characteristics of Croce's thought already during the first two decades of the 20th century. A number of other records, which should be regarded as the most vivid representants of Krleža's attitudes towards Croce and his doctrine, will be presented as well.

The earliest Krleža's mention of Croce can be found in two of his diary records. First of them dates from 7 November 1917. On that day, Krleža emphasized that some artists, especially the devotees of *Sturm* (*The Storm*) and *Der Blaue Reiter* (*The Blue Rider*), often used "blurry notions" as the preconditions for artistic creation, and concluded that when he expressed his views on the precondition for artistic creation "Croce was not clear in his exposure".³³ A diary record dating from 8 August 1921 also bears witness to Krleža's early reception of Croce's doctrine. On that day, Krleža exposed the list of books and authors he read and used as "aspirins in cases of having severe headaches," listing Croce as one of the authors.³⁴ Krleža incorporated his knowledge of Croce's teaching, which he acquired in the second half of the 1910s, in at least two essays written in 1940. One of them was the essay "On poetry," which was, as it has already been emphasized and presented, largely based on the first five chapters of the historical part of Croce's *Aesthetic*, while the other was "Magistra vitae," which contains, according to Zoran Kravar, "an abundance of comments on Croce, whose philosophical works had obviously inspired most of Krleža's thoughts found in the essay".³⁵ In fact, Krleža presented his knowledge of Croce's attitudes concerning philosophy of history in the text "Magistra vitae". For example, he wrote that "Croce claims that there are no

³³ Miroslav Krleža, diary entries: "7. XI 1917," pp. 157–159, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinačetnaeste, petnaeste i sedamnaeste," pp. 130–159, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/2–3 (Zagreb, 1954), on p. 158: "Franz von Stuck, Matisse, Van Gogh, Paul Klee, Walden, Sturm, Marès, Franz Marc, Der Blaue Reiter, Kandinsky, all of these are propedeutical variants for the big, virtuosic move over everything. <...> For all the blurry notions, these artists use intuition, talent, gift, ingenuity and ability, as the preconditions for artistic creation. (Even Croce was not clear in his exposure)."

³⁴ Miroslav Krleža, diary entries: "8 kolovoza 1921," pp. 293–294, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinašesnaeste, devetnaeste, dvadesete, dvadesetprve i tridesetitreće," pp. 269–304, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/4 (Zagreb, 1954), on p. 294: "<...> even with the books (Bergson, Hume, Berkeley), which I read as aspirins in cases of having severe headaches after this violence from November of 1918 until today – it is impossible to accomplish anything. <...> Mach: Analyse der Empfindungen, Berkeley: Principien der Erkenntnis, Mach: Erkenntnis und Irrtum, Engels: Herrn E. D. Umwälzung der Wissenschaften, Poincaré: La valeur de la science, Bergson, Croce, Ostwald, Hume, Haeckel, Hartmann <...>".

³⁵ Zo.[ran] Kr.[avar], "'Magistra vitae'," entry in *Krležijana* 2, M - Ž, p. 5b.

laws of history,” since he thought that every historical event happens only once, completely accidentally, instantaneously and individually.³⁶ By the way, Krleža repeated, in the dialogue “Sociologija i socijalizam” (“Sociology and Socialism”) written in 1942, but published in 1957, that Croce was convinced that “there are no laws in history, there are only tendencies, only probabilities, and no certainty at all”.³⁷

Therefore, Krleža, as Zlatko Posavac perceives, “sometimes accepts, and sometimes vehemently denies” Croce’s attitudes.³⁸ However, Krleža’s opus contains records in which a harsh critique of Croce and his thoughts on aesthetical topics is noticeable. For example, in the polemic “Rasulo pameti” (“The Ruin of Reason”) from 1939, in which he confronted the publicist and translator Stjepan Markuš (1899–1973), as well as the aforementioned aesthetician Albert Haler, Krleža announced that he will analyse Haler’s and Markuš’s accomplishments in aesthetics one day, self-consciously concluding that after his analysis of the “baptized (Croceized) Halerian and Markušian cabbage” there will be “no Croce nor mark nor haler” left.³⁹ Besides that, in the essay “Književnost danas” (“Literature Today”), which he published in 1945, he thought that Croce has “blurred the notions,”⁴⁰ while he was the harshest in his article “Govor Svetoga Oca na Uskrs devetstotinačetdesetosme” (“The Speech of the Holy Father on Easter Day of 1948”):

“Benedetto Croce, the head of the international aesthetical masonry, retired in complete solipsism and stated that he felt as a sleepwalker among people while being a minister of the newly established Italian cabinet in 1943. He was living in the moonlight in Sorrento, and he returned to the moonlight in Sorrento!”⁴¹

³⁶ Miroslav Krleža, “Magistra vitae,” pp. 301–322, in Miroslav Krleža, “Zapisi jeseni 1940,” pp. 301–355, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967), on p. 314.

³⁷ Miroslav Krleža, “Sociologija i socijalizam,” pp. 36–56, in Miroslav Krleža, “Razgovor o istini o historiji o socijalizmu o idejama i o posljednjim stvarima: Fragmenti iz dnevnika godine 1942,” pp. 18–66, *Literatura: časopis za književnost i kulturne probleme* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1957), on p. 50.

³⁸ Z.[latko] Pć. [Posavac], “Estetika,” entry in *Krležijana* 1, A - Lj, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod “Miroslav Krleža,” 1993), pp. 243b–246b, on p. 244a.

³⁹ M.[iroslav] Krleža, “Rasulo pameti. Nekoliko riječi uz Symposion gospodina profesora S. Markuša,” *Pečat: književni mjesečnik za umjetnost, nauku i sve kulturne probleme* 1/10–12 (Zagreb, 1939), pp. 301–352, on p. 350.

⁴⁰ M.[iroslav] Krleža, “Književnost danas,” *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost, umjetnost i javni život* 1/1–2 (Zagreb, 1945), pp. 139–160, on p. 152.

⁴¹ Miroslav Krleža, “Govor Svetoga Oca na Uskrs devetstotinačetdesetosme,” *Književne novine: organ Saveza književnika Jugoslavije* 1 (Beograd, 1948), br. 8 (6. aprila 1948), pp. 3–4, on p. 4b: “Benedetto Croce, šef međunarodne estetske masonerije, odbio se u potpuni solipsizam

What proves that Krleža's political worldview was decisive for his attitude towards Croce and his approach to aesthetical issues are the records from his two texts written in 1952. In those texts Krleža singled out two Italian Marxists Antonio Labriola (1843–1904) and Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), who, at least according to Krleža's judgment, interpreted Croce's thoughts on aesthetics the right way. In fact, in his speech at the Writers' Congress in Ljubljana in 1952, Krleža claimed that "our literature" should be perceived in its totality, and the "individual work of Labriola or Gramsci compared to the aesthetics of Benedetto Croce" should be used as a paradigm,⁴² while he said in the introduction to the journal *Danas 1952 (Today 1952)* that the journal should critically keep track of everything that "boils in the consciousness of the confused man of the present," and that the journal should accomplish that mission "as an observer like Labriola or Gramsci in the discussions regarding aesthetical issues of Benedetto Croce."⁴³

Finally, six pages of a manuscript entitled *Croce. Drafts* also give evidence of Krleža's interest and familiarity with Croce's aesthetics.⁴⁴ It contains Krleža's paraphrases, interpretations or comments regarding specific statements from the theoretical part of Croce's *Aesthetic*, because it seems that he intended to write a text which would include his assessment of the validity of Croce's thoughts regarding aesthetical issues. For example, the second leaf of his manuscript (Figure 1) contains a statement that Croce defined expressive cognition as the clairvoyant cognition, and also as the cognition which is above all functions of the reason, as well as above both the experience and sensation. The same leaf contains a sentence which is important for an approximate determination of time he made the manuscript: "Brains and brain membranes are often more impenetrable than crocodile skin (response to Meixner)". That sentence makes it possible to conclude that the manuscript was most probably written in 1930. Namely, Krleža polemicized with the literary and art critic Rudolf Maixner

i sam je izjavio godine 1943., da se kao ministar novoosnovanog talijanskog kabineta među ljudima osjeća kao mjesečar. Živio je u Sorrentu na mjesečini i vratio se na mjesečinu u Sorrento!"

⁴² Miroslav Krleža, "Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani," *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 8/10–11 (Zagreb, 1952), pp. 205–243, on p. 241.

⁴³ Miroslav Krleža, "Uvodna riječ za časopis 'Danas 1952'," *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 1/5 (Zagreb, 1962), pp. 776–788, on p. 784.

⁴⁴ Miroslav Krleža, *Croce. Koncepti.* – (Bez mj. i god.), 6 l., anopistograf, vel: 21,2 x 34,3 cm, tekst hrv., autograf, paginacija inkontinuirana. The Collection of Old books and Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Zagreb, signature R 7970/A/1143.

Also see *Rukopisna ostavština Miroslava Krleže: katalog*, glavni urednik: Ivan Kosić (Zagreb: Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, 2003), p. 91, n. 143.

(1901–1972) during the second half of 1930,⁴⁵ and he would have continued to polemicize in 1931 if he had not been, as he reveals, expelled from the journal *Književnik* (*The Literate*) once again.⁴⁶

In conclusion, this chapter not only contains knowledge of Petrić's understanding of poetry which Krleža exposed in the essay "On Poetry," written in 1940, and published in 1967, but also contains his knowledge and assessment which he was formulating from 1917 until 1972 on Croce and the characteristics of his opus. A short revision of the reasons for reviewing Krleža's knowledge and assessment of Croce will be given on this occasion. The first and the most important reason was that Krleža wrote on some characteristics of Petrić's understanding of poetry in his essay "On Poetry," which he found out from the historical part of Croce's *Aesthetic*. The second reason imposed itself as a consequence of neglecting or mere mentioning of Krleža in the papers published so far dealing with the earliest reception of Croce's aesthetics by Croatian thinkers: the contents of this chapter undoubtedly proves that Krleža was one of few Croatian intellectuals who were already acquainted with Croce's aesthetics during the first two decades of the 20th century, as well as with his attitudes regarding political philosophy. The third reason is closely connected with the previous one. To be more precise, Krleža mentioned Croce and the characteristics of his opus for at least 16 times from 1917 until 1972, what consequently means that Krleža definitely belongs among those Croatian thinkers with the most numerous accounts of Croce and his doctrine. The fourth and the last reason was the discovery of Krleža's drafts on Croce's aesthetics, what also vividly proves that Krleža was acquainted with Croce's doctrine, but also reveals that he was not indifferent towards it. Thereby Krleža's contribution to the reception of Croce's thought in Croatia was shown, and some of Krleža's claims which reveal his attitude towards Croce and his doctrine were presented. The appendix entitled "The List of Bibliographic Units Containing Krleža's Records on Croce and His Doctrine" was made and enclosed in this paper, and it certainly supplements the previous bibliography on the Croatian reception of Croce.

3. Krleža's essay "O našem dramskom répertoireu" (1948)

Eight years after writing the essay "On Poetry," Krleža presented his knowledge of Petrić and his opus once more. Therefore, he did it in 1948 in

⁴⁵ Miroslav Krleža, "Slučaj gospodina Rudolfa Meixnera," *Književnik: hrvatski književni mjesečnik* 3/11 (Zagreb, 1930), pp. 481–502; M.[iroslav] Krleža, "O pameti gospodina Rudolfa Ivanovića Meixnera," *Književnik: hrvatski književni mjesečnik* 3/12 (Zagreb, 1930), pp. 554–557.

⁴⁶ Miroslav Krleža, "O pameti gospodina Rudolfa Ivanovića Meixnera," in Miroslav Krleža, *Moj obračun s njima* (Zagreb: Naklada piščeva, 1932), pp. 56–62, on p. 62.

an essay published under the title “O našem dramskom répertoireu” (“On Our Drama Repertoire”⁴⁷). He wrote it on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of the premieres of *Pomet* and *Tirena*, two works by a Croatian dramatist Marin Držić (1508–1567). Apart from being convinced that Držić is “one of the greatest names of our literature” and that it is not possible to acquire a complete insight into the “South Slavic repertoire” of the scenic production without his opus “as an overture,” Krleža thought that Držić was unlike most 16th-century Croatian thinkers, of whom he said that they were “under the protection of the Inquisition and under the patronage of the Society of Jesus,” and that they moved in “a closed Thomistic circle,” that they wrote against heretics and worked on synthesizing Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas.⁴⁸ According to Krleža’s judgment, Držić stood out of the “dense Savonarolian, Aquinian, anti-Hellenic Scholastic sky of our literary panorama,” as a:

“<...> character of a cheerful and exalted monument on a requiem scene, where choirs of Dominicans, Jesuits and Franciscans burn pagan books in bonfires as ‘spawn of darkness,’ and where there is not one of our renowned poets, who did not end as a penitent in a sackcloth, as a convert or as a hermit.”⁴⁹

Krleža considered Držić an antipode to Petrić, whom he determined and assessed many times in the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire”. In doing so, Krleža acquired his knowledge from Laszowsky’s entry “Patričić (Patrizio Dalmatino) Franjo” printed in 1925 in *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati* (*The Eminent and Deserving Croats*⁵⁰) and from the article “Filozofija u Hrvatskoj” (“Philosophy in Croatia”⁵¹), published in 1943 by a Croatian philosopher and lexicographer Kruno Krstić (1905–1987). When the records based on the knowledge from those two sources are added to those based on Krleža’s own assessment, it turns out that the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire” contains data on Petrić and his opus which can be considered from three perspectives.

⁴⁷ Hereafter: Krleža, “On Our Drama Repertoire,” (1948).

⁴⁸ Miroslav Krleža, “O našem dramskom répertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držićeve ‘Tirene’,” *Djelo: časopis za politička, ekonomska i kulturna pitanja* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1948), pp. 34–40, on p. 34.

⁴⁹ Krleža, “O našem dramskom répertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držićeve ‘Tirene’,” p. 35a: “<...> lik vedra i uzvišena spomenika na rekvijemskoj sceni, gdje korovi dominikanaca, isusovaca i fratarara pale poganske knjige na lomačama kao ‘porod od tmine’ i gdje nema ni jednog našeg glasnijeg pjesničkog imena, koje nije svršilo kao pokajnik u kostrijeti, kao obraćenik ili kao remeta.”

⁵⁰ Hereafter: Laszowsky (ed.), *The Eminent and Deserving Croats* (1925).

⁵¹ Hereafter: Krstić, “Philosophy in Croatia,” (1943).

3.1. *The information Krleža found out from The Eminent and Deserving Croats*

On the occasion of the celebration of the 1000th anniversary of the Kingdom of Croatia in 1925, the work *The Eminent and Deserving Croats* was published, which deals with, as it says on its title page, “noteworthy persons of the Croatian history” in the period from 925 until 1925. It contains an entry on Petrić, written by the Croatian historian, archivist and editor of the work Emilij Laszowsky (1868–1949), from which Krleža took over or paraphrased the following data:

- (1) the Croatian version of Petrić’s name and surname: Franjo Patričić; besides that version, Krleža offered one more Croatian version of Petrić surname in the essay: Patris;
- (2) the place and year of Petrić’s birth, and the year of his death: Krleža emphasized that Petrić was “from Cres by birth (1529 until 1597);”
- (3) the information regarding Petrić’s versatility: Krleža wrote down that Petrić was “a philosopher, mathematician, architect, musicologist, poet, natural scientist;”
- (4) the claims regarding Petrić’s friendship with influential persons of his time: Krleža also reported that Petrić was “a friend of popes Clement VIII and Gregory XIV, and cardinals Scipione Gonzaga and Girolamo della Rovere;”
- (5) the topics which occupied Petrić in his works: Krleža pointed out that Petrić “writes on the building of harbors, on Ancient Greek metrics.”⁵²

⁵² Krleža, “O našem dramskom répertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držićeve ‘Tirene,’” p. 35a.

Cf. E.[milij] L.[aszowsky], “Patričić (Patrizio Dalmatino) Franjo,” entry in [Emilij Laszowsky (ur.)], *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati te pomena vrijedna lica u hrvatskoj povijesti od 925-1925*, sa pregledom povijesti Hrvatske, Bosne i Istre, hrvatske književnosti i razvitka hrvatskog jezika, te hrv.[atskih] vladara, hercega, banova i biskupa, kao uvodom. Sa 9 zasebnih slika, te 421. slikom u tekstu (Zagreb: Odbor za izdanje knjige “Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati,” [1925]), p. 208a: “Patričić (Patrizio Dalmatino) Franjo, filozof, matematik, prirodoslovac, povjesničar, govornik, pjesnik, muzikolog i graditelj. Rodio se na otoku Cresu g. 1529. Živio je u Rimu, prijatelj pape Klementa VIII. i Grgura XIV., kardinala Augustina Valerija, Scipiona Gonzage, Jeronima della Rovere i Alfonza vojvode od Ferare. <...> Tamo [u Rimu] je umro 7. II. 1597. <...> Pisao je o pjevanju starih Grka i o muzici uopće. Pisao je i o načinu uređivanja rijeka i gradnji luka.”

Cf. this quotation in English: “Patričić (Patrizio Dalmatino) Franjo, a philosopher, mathematician, natural scientist, historian, orator, poet, musicologist and architect. Born on the island of Cres in 1529. Lived in Rome, a friend of popes Clement VIII and Gregory XIV, cardinals Agostino Valerio, Scipione Gonzaga, Girolamo della Rovere and Alfonso the Duke of Ferrara.



From Laszowsky's entry Krleža did not take over the following facts:

- (1) Petrić often travelled across "Italy, Spain, France and the Kingdom of Cyprus;"
- (2) "in 1569" he became the member of "the Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome;"
- (3) the Italian writers "praise him as the most erudite man of their time;"
- (4) he wrote "many scholarly works in 'Deca supra la poetica' and 'De regno et regis institutione'."⁵³

Laszowsky, on the other hand, found out and took over the information for his entry from the entry "Patricius Franjo," compiled by the Croatian historian, literate and politician Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski (1816–1889), and published in 1860 in the fourth volume of the *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih* (*The Dictionary of Yugoslav Artists*).⁵⁴ However, when one compares the records from the two entries, it is noticeable that there is one piece of information in Laszowsky's entry which is inadvertently not identical to the one in Kukuljević's entry: instead of the correct information offered by Kukuljević about 1596 being the year in which Petrić was chosen to the Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome, Laszowsky's entry contains the information that Petrić became a member of that confraternity in 1569.⁵⁵ Convinced that he took over correct information from Kukuljević, Laszowsky also wrote down incorrect information in the entry on Petrić. The biggest mistake is definitely the one considering Petrić's authorship of the work *De regno et regis institutione* (*On Kingdom and the Institution of the King*). As it is known, the author of that work is not the philosopher Frane Petrić

<...> Died there [in Rome] on 7 February 1597. <...> Wrote on the singing of ancient Greeks and on music in general. Also wrote on the ways of river maintenance and building of harbors."

Hereafter: Laszowsky, "Patričić, Franjo," (1925).

⁵³ Laszowsky, "Patričić, Franjo," (1925), p. 208a: "Mnogo je [Patričić] putovao po Italiji, Španiji, Francuskoj i ciparskom kraljevstvu. God.[ine] 1569 izabran je članom svetojeron.[imskog] zbora u Rimu. Talij.[anski] ga pisci slave kao najučenijega muža svoga vremena. Napisao je mnoga učena djela u 'Deca supra la poetica' i 'De regno et regis institutione'".

Cf. this quotation in English: "He [Patričić] often travelled across Italy, Spain, France and the Kingdom of Cyprus. In 1569 he was elected for a member of the Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome. Italian writers praise him as the most erudite man of their time. He wrote many scholarly works in 'Deca supra la poetica' and 'De regno et regis institutione'".

⁵⁴ Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih*, svezak IV (Zagreb: Tiskom narodne tiskarne dra. Ljudevita Gaja, 1860), s. v. "Patricius Franjo," pp. 337–338.

⁵⁵ Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih*, svezak IV, s. v. "Patricius Franjo," p. 338: "On 13th October in 1596 he [Petrić] was chosen in Rome by his countrymen to be the member of the Illyrian Confraternity of St. Jerome, <...>".

Cf. Laszowsky, "Patričić, Franjo," (1925), p. 208a: "In 1569 he [Petrić] was chosen to be the member of the Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome."

from Cres, but Francesco Patrizi from Siena (Franciscus Patricius Senensis), who lived and worked during the 15th century (1413–1494) and was a bishop of Gaeta, and the work was first published in 1519 in Paris.⁵⁶ It is quite surprising that Kukuljević ascribed the work *De regno et regis institutione* to Petrić from Cres, because his entry contains reference to the sources which offer the information that the work was written by Patrizi from Siena, or to the sources in which Patrizi from Siena and Petrić from Cres are distinguished, or to those which contain reviews of the works of Petrić from Cres. He could have found out that information from the works written by, for example, the Italian authors Giambattista Capasso (1683–1735) and Gerolamo Tiraboschi (1731–1794), the Croatian writer Radoš Antun Michieli Vitturi (1752–1822), and the Belgian musicologist François-Joseph Fétis (1784–1871),⁵⁷ while it needs to be added that he took the information that Petrić wrote the work entitled *Deca sopra la poetica* from Michieli Vitturi.⁵⁸ But, one of Kukuljević's sources was also *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler (Historical and Biographical Lexicon of Musicians)*, made by the German composer Ernst Ludwig Gerber (1746–1819). Kukuljević, in fact, took over the incorrect information of Petrić's authorship of the work *De regno et regis institutione* exactly from that *Lexicon*.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *Francisci Patricii Senensis pontificis Caietani Enneas de regno, & regis institutione* (Parrhisiis: Impensis vero Galioti a Prato, 1519).

⁵⁷ Joh.[ann] Baptista Capasso, *Historiae philosophiae synopsis* (Neapoli: Typis Felicis Muscae, 1728), pp. 280–282; Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, tomo settimo, parte prima (In Modena: Presso la Società tipografica, 1777), pp. 359–365, p. 419 and 444; Rados Antonio Michieli Vitturi, "Sagio sopra Francesco Patrizio Dalmatino," in *Opuscoli del Signor Rados Antonio Michieli Vitturi* (Ragusa: Presso Antonio Martechini, 1811), pp. 26–37, in *Opuscoli riguardanti la storia degli uomini illustri di Spalato, e di parecchi altri Dalmati, raccolti da D. Andrea Ciccarelli* (Ragusa: Presso Antonio Martechini, 1811), Privez 1, on p. 26; F.[rançois] J.[oseph] Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*, tome septième. NA-RY (Bruxelles: Meline, Cans et compagnie, 1841), s. v. "Patrizi (François)," pp. 172b–173a.

⁵⁸ Kukuljević Sackinski, *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih*, svezak IV, s. v. "Patricius Franjo," p. 337. Cf. Michieli Vitturi, "Sagio sopra Francesco Patrizio Dalmatino," p. 28. For the analysis of the records on Petrić's life and work published by Michieli Vitturi in the essay "Sagio sopra Francesco Patrizio Dalmatino" ("An Essay on Frane Petrić the Dalmatian") from 1811, and in the work *Saggio sopra l' antica Città di Salona (Essay on the Ancient City of Salona)* from 1779, see Ivica Martinović, "Rane hrvatske prouke Petrićeva djela (1624.–1811.): Dominis, Baglivi, Michieli Vitturi," *Dubrovnik: časopis za književnost i znanost*, nova serija 8/1–3 (Dubrovnik, 1997), pp. 212–247, on pp. 225–237.

⁵⁹ Ernst Ludwig Gerber, *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler*, Zweiter Theil, N–Z (Leipzig: Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, 1792), s. v. "Patricio (Francesco)," cc. 83–84, on c. 84: "Walther giebt noch ein lateinisches Werk: *De Regno et Regis institutione*, von diesem Verfasser [Patricio] an, dessen 15ter Titel des 2ten Buchs von der Musik handeln soll."

Finally, Kukuljević informed us that Petrić “wrote a lot on music in general,” and that he “gladly enjoyed himself” with it.⁶⁰

In any case, Krleža took over correct information from Laszowsky's entry on Petrić. It needs to be added that it would not be surprising if someone decided to discuss the validity of Krleža's usage of the Croatian version of Petrić's name and surname (Franjo Patričić, Patris), and strengthened their possible arguments with the fact that a different version (Franjo Petriš) could have been taken from Krstić's text. However, if it is known that quite many researchers of Croatian philosophical heritage discussed the Croatian version of Petrić's name and surname in the last several decades, and that they offered different versions, often polemicizing with those who, while offering different solutions, wrote on the same topic,⁶¹ and if it is known that none of the versions was unanimously

Gerber found out the information on the work *De regno et regis institutione* from the German composer Johann Gottfried Walther (1684–1748), precisely from Walther's *Lexicon* published in 1732. However, Walther did not write on Petrić from Cres in his *Lexicon*, but on Patrizi from Siena: Johann Gottfried Walther, *Musicalisches Lexicon* (Leipzig: Wolfgang Deer, 1732), s. v. “Patricius (Franciscus),” p. 466a: “Patricius (Franciscus) ein wegen seiner Gelehrsamkeit berühmter Bischoff zu Gaeta (Pontifex Cajetanus) von Siena, oder, nach andern, von Clissa einem Dorffe in Istrien gebürtig, welcher nach dem 1480 [sic!] Jahre verstorben, hat unter andern auch einen aus 9 Büchern bestehenden lateinischen Tractat: *de Regno & Regis institutione*, geschrieben, und solchen dem berühmten Calabrischen Hertzoge, Alphonso Aragonio, dediciret. Im 15ten Titul des zweiten Buchs handeln nicht drei Octav-Blätter von der Music.”

Gerber did not repeat his claim that Petrić from Cres is the author of the work *De regno et regis institutione* in the entry “Patricio (Francesco)” published in the third volume of the *Novi historijsko-biografski leksikon glazbenikā* (*The New Historical and Biographical Lexicon of Musicians*) from 1813, but he rather wrote the entry “Patricius (Franciscus),” in which he ascribed that work to Patrizi from Siena who was, as Gerber found out from Walther's *Lexicon*, a bishop of the city of Gaeta and who has, as Gerber again takes over the incorrect information from Walther's *Lexicon*, died in 1480: Ernst Ludwig Gerber, *Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler*, Dritter Theil. K–R (Leipzig: Bei A.[mbrosius] Kühnel, 1813), s. v. “Patricio (Francesco),” c. 663: “Patricio (Francesco) – In diesem Artikel sind zwei verschiedene Schriftsteller dieses Namens vermenget worden. Dieser, der Philosoph, geb. 1529, war der Verf. der Schrift: *Della Poetica* etc. von 1586, und starb 1597.”; s. v. “Patricius (Franciscus),” c. 663: “Patricius (Franciscus) – Dies ist nach Walther der Bischof zu Gaeta, geb. zu Siena, welcher *de regno et regis institutione* schrieb, und 1480 starb.”

⁶⁰ Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih*, svezak IV, s. v. “Patricius Franjo,” p. 337.

⁶¹ For attitudes on Croatian versions of Petrić's name and surname, for example, see Šime Jurić, “De auctore [Francisco Patricio] huius operis,” na latinski preveo Augustin Šimun Pavlović / “Nekoliko riječi o piscu [Frani Petriću],” in Frane Petrić, *Nova sveopća filozofija*, prijevod s latinskog Tomislav Ladan i Serafin Hrkač, priredio i pogovor napisao Vladimir Filipović (Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, 1979). Jurić's text contains 16 unnumbered pages. Especially see the first six pages.

accepted, then it is questionable if there is the need to discuss the validity of Krleža's usage of the version Franjo Patričić in 1948, because a discussion of that kind could be led after Krleža's usage of any other version.

3.2. *The information which Krleža found out from Krstić's article "Philosophy in Croatia"*

Krstić's article "Philosophy in Croatia" was published in 1943 in the first volume of the collected papers *Naša Domovina (Our Homeland)*⁶², intended by the administration of the so-called Independent State of Croatia to those, as it says in the "Predgovor" ("Foreword"), who were poor-spirited or suspicious towards the legitimacy of existence of the autonomous state of Croatia because they lacked knowledge of their homeland, so the collected papers contain "a brief and concise outline of everything that was created by the Croatian people over the centuries of its lifetime and what was offered by its land".⁶³ In that article, Krstić, firstly because of the structure of the book, but also because of, as he stresses at the beginning of the text, the previous unsystematic investigations and outlines of Croatian philosophical thought, as well as because of the lack of "very philosophical papers on the fundamental inclination and formational tendencies of the national spirit," offered a synthesis of Croatian philosophical heritage, emphasizing that the first prominent Croatian philosophers and theologians appeared in the second half of the 15th century, while he firstly elaborated upon the life and work of the Franciscan Juraj Dragišić (Georgius Benignus de Salviatis, c. 1445–1520), as well as he included the philosophical thought and works written by his contemporaries, such as Albert Bazala (1877–1947),

Cf. Petar Strčić, "Koje je pravo ime Franciscusa Patriciusa?," *Filozofska istraživanja* 15/1–2 (Zagreb, 1995), pp. 181–189; Ivica Martinović, "Kako je Dominis pisao Petrićevo prezime?," *Dubrovnik: časopis za književnost i znanost*, nova serija 8/1–3 (Dubrovnik, 1997), pp. 315–322; Petar Strčić, "O imenu i prezimenu Franje Petrisa (Franciscus Patricius)," in Andrija Mutnjaković (ur.), *Frano Petrić / Francesco Patritio 1597. - 1997.* (Zagreb: Družba "Braća Hrvatskoga Zmaja," 1999), pp. 100–132; Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, "Uvod," in Franciscus Patricius, *Discussionum peripateticarum tomus tertius / Frane Petrić, Peripatetičke rasprave*, svezak treći, preveli Tomislav Čepulić i Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, uvodna studija i bilješka Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, filološka redakтура Olga Perić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2009), pp. XI–XLI, especially on pp. XI–XII; Žarko Dadić, "O uporabi hrvatskog oblika prezimena znanstvenika i filozofa Patricija," *Folia onomastica Croatica* 19 (Zagreb, 2010), pp. 69–79.

⁶² Hereafter: Lukas (ed.), *Our Homeland* (1943).

⁶³ Blaž Lorković, "Predgovor," in Filip Lukas (gl. ur.), *Naša Domovina*, sv. 1. (Zagreb: Izdanje Glavnog ustaškog stana, 1943), on the second of three unnumbered pages of the "Foreword" published at the beginning of the book.

Stjepan Zimmermann (1884–1963), Vladimir Dvorniković (1888–1956), Pavao Vuk-Pavlović (1894–1976) and Vladimir Filipović (1906–1984).⁶⁴

In the article “Philosophy in Croatia”, Krstić expectedly wrote on Frane Petrić and on the characteristics of his works as well. On that occasion, he used the version Franjo Petriš as the Croatian version of Petrić's name and surname.⁶⁵ In the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire,” Krleža took over or paraphrased the following from Krstić's text:

- (1) the claim on Petrić's critique of peripatetic philosophy: Krleža stated that Petrić was “an anti-peripatetic in the Scholastic period;”
- (2) the insight of one of the topics discussed in Petrić's work: Krleža reported that Petrić thought on “the principle of perception based on experience;”
- (3) the conclusion on Petrić's discontent with the Christianization of Aristotle's philosophy: Krleža pointed out that Petrić “proves the obvious incompatibility of Aristotle's conception with Christianity.”⁶⁶

In doing so, Krleža offered incorrect information that Petrić lived and worked during the Scholastic period. However, that inaccuracy was not Krstić's but Krleža's fault, because he did not accurately take over Krstić's assertion that Petrić was an adversary of “the peripatetic orientation in Scholasticism”. In fact, Krstić took the information on Petrić from the paper “O Patricijevoj poetici” (“On the Poetics of Patricij”), written and published in 1892 by the classical

⁶⁴ Kruno Krstić, “Filozofija u Hrvatskoj,” in Lukas (gl. ur.), *Naša Domovina*, sv. 1., pp. 397–405, on p. 397a, on p. 398a–b and on pp. 402b–404a.

⁶⁵ Krstić, “Filozofija u Hrvatskoj,” p. 399a.

Besides the version Franjo Petriš, Krstić used the versions Franjo Petrišević, Franjo Petris, Franjo Petrišić, and Frane Petrić during the following years: K. [runo] Kć. [Krstić], “Petrišević (Petris, Petrić), Franjo,” entry in *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* 6, Maklj-Put (Zagreb: Izdanje i naklada Jugoslavenskog leksikografskog zavoda, 1965), pp. 479b–481a; Kruno Krstić, “Počeci filozofije u Hrvatskoj,” *Kolo: časopis Matice hrvatske za kulturu i umjetnost*, nova serija 6(126)/5 (Zagreb, 1968), pp. 325–332, on p. 332; Kruno Krstić, “Frane Petrić u svojoj korespondenciji,” *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 5 (Zagreb, 1979), pp. 319–323.

⁶⁶ Krleža, “O našem dramskom repertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držiceve ‘Tirene’,” p. 35a.

Cf. Krstić, “Filozofija u Hrvatskoj,” p. 399a: “Nepomirljiv protivnik [Petriš] peripatetskoga smjera u skolastici, <...> nastojeći dokazati, da se Aristotelova nauka ne može složiti s kršćanskom. <...> U području prirodnih znanosti Petriš je jedan od najjačih zagovornika nove opažajno-empiričke metode, <...>.”

Cf. this quotation in English: “An irreconcilable adversary [Petriš] of the peripatetic orientation in Scholasticism, <...> trying to prove that Aristotle's doctrine is not compatible with the Christian doctrine. <...> In the field of natural sciences, Petriš was one of the strongest proponents of the new perceptual and empirical method, <...>.”

philologist Milivoj Šrepel (1862–1905). It is possible to find out from that paper that during the 15th and 16th century the peripatetic teaching had many followers and that during the 16th century Petrić belonged among “the fiercest adversaries of this peripateticism,”⁶⁷ what Krstić synthesized in a sentence that Petrić was, once more, “an irreconcilable adversary of the peripatetic orientation in Scholasticism”. That Krstić largely took over claims on Petrić from Šrepel’s paper can, for example, also be confirmed by the claim that Petrić was, alongside Bernardino Telesio, Giordano Bruno and Tommaso Campanella, the main representative of the philosophy of nature in Italy, as well as by the claim that he anticipated that plants can be hermaphrodite.⁶⁸

Therefore, in the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire” from 1948, Krleža also paraphrased or took over the information on Petrić from Krstić’s article “Philosophy in Croatia” published in 1943, while he did not take over one Krstić’s assertion accurately enough. By the way, Krleža appreciated Krstić and his erudition very much. That can be confirmed by a sentence which he, as the Croatian journalist and lexicographer Josip Šentija discovers, said regarding Krstić in February of 1974: “a person of broad education, a Latinist and an Italianist and a polyglot”.⁶⁹ However, on the same occasion Krleža also said that Krstić “was not so gentle” towards him during the 1930s, because he “publicly ironized” his syntax from “the perspective of Croatian Catholic anti-Krležianism”.⁷⁰ Thereat he, of course, referred to Krstić’s text from 1935. In the edition of *Moderna socijalna kronika* (*Modern Social Chronicle*), which was edited and published by Hrvatsko katoličko akademsko društvo “Domagoj” (Croatian Catholic Academic Society “Domagoj”) and Zbor društva mladih Zagrepčana (Assembly of the Society of Young Zagrebians), and printed by Nadbiskupska tiskara Zagreb (Archdiocesan Printing House Zagreb), Krstić published a booklet entitled *Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža* (*How Does Mister M. Krleža Write*)⁷¹ in 1935 using a pseudonym Mark TWEEN (Figure 2). In it he wrote that Krleža is, among other things, an author of “a bunch of printed stuff

⁶⁷ Milivoj Šrepel, “O Patricijevoj poetici,” čitao u sjednici filologičko-historičkoga razreda jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti dne 2. srpnja 1891., *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*. Knjiga 108. Razredi filologičko-historički i filozofičko-juridički. 34. (Zagreb: [Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti], 1892), pp. 1–67, on p. 1.

⁶⁸ Krstić, “Filozofija u Hrvatskoj,” p. 399a. Cf. Šrepel, “O Patricijevoj poetici,” p. 3: “Alongside Telesio, Giordano Bruno and Campanella, our Patricij is a pillar of the Italian philosophy of nature, <...>”; p. 7: “<...> and it is possible to see that among other things he [Patricij] hinted the system of different gender in plants <...>”.

⁶⁹ Josip Šentija, *S Krležom poslije '71.: zapisi iz leksikografskog rokovnika* (Zagreb: Mas-medija, 2000), p. 58.

⁷⁰ Šentija, *S Krležom poslije '71.: zapisi iz leksikografskog rokovnika*, p. 58.

⁷¹ Hereafter: TWEEN [Krstić], *How Does Mister M. Krleža Write* (1935).



Figure 2. The cover of Krstić's booklet *How Does Mister M. Krleža Write*: Mark Twain [Kruno Krstić], *Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža* (Zagreb, 1935).

published here and there, this and that way and on this and that,” and because of that he reported that Krleža is “suffering from terrible megalomania,” then that Krleža makes fun of Croatianhood and Croatian literature in his texts, that he is “bluffing our intellectually innocent audience,” that he stated “complete nonsense” regarding Kant’s philosophy, that he imprecisely translates one sentence by Schopenhauer, that he is prevailed by “the ignorance of logic,” and that he has insufficient “knowledge of philosophy,” whereby he also disrespected Krleža’s stylistics and spelling, concluding that Krleža’s sentences were bad, if not even worse than the sentences of those writers he confronted in his texts.⁷² Reactions on Krstić’s text were twofold. Journals of Catholic orientation praised it unanimously,⁷³ while those belonging to a different worldview and prone to Krleža emphasized that the text is characterized by “unbelievable foolishness,” used by mossbacks to slander Krleža, “the biggest and the most talented Croatian literate until the present day”.⁷⁴

⁷² Mark Tween [Kruno Krstić], *Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža, MOSK (Moderna socijalna kronika)*, godište 2, sv. 15(3) (Zagreb: [Hrvatsko katoličko akademsko društvo “Domagoj” / Zbor društva mladih Zagrepčana], 1935), on p. 4, 5, 7, 22, 23, 26, 28 and 31.

⁷³ [s. n.], “Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža,” *Hrvatska straža* 7 (Zagreb, 1935), br. 79 (4. travnja 1935), p. 3: “First of all, it [the booklet] contains a presentation of his [Krleža’s] biography in his [Krleža’s] way of persiflage, and consisting of only *true* quotations, i.e. based on the information available to everyone. After that, there is a whole series of sentences by Mr. Krleža, which are commented immediately in order to show that Mr. Krleža limps in logic and that he does not know many things, although a gentleman who declares ‘the lie of Croatian literature’ should certainly know. As it can be noticed from these sentences, Mr. Krleža is no prophet, no intellectual, who is allowed to call our surroundings a provincial inn.”

Passer solitarius, “Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža. – (*La manière d’écrire du demi-savant socialiste M. Krleža*),” *Nova revija vjeri i nauci / Nouvelle revue de vie religieuse et intellectuelle* 14/2 (Makarska, 1935), pp. 120–121, on p. 121: “‘Moderna Socijalna Kronika’ [‘Modern Social Chronicle’] from Zagreb, therefore, did well when it reviewed his [Krleža’s] bunch of printed paper in a way that it exposed his ridiculous and self-centered writing to mockery in a short brochure vol. 15 under the title ‘How Does Mister M. Krleža Write,’ showing the vast emptiness of the contents of his works, the absurdity and contradiction of his claims, vulgarity of expression, in one word: the great spiritual poverty of Mr. Krleža as a writer.”

ff [Ferdo Heffler], “Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža,” *Kršćanska škola: glasilo Katehetskoga odsjeka Bratovštine kršćanskoga nauka* 39/6 (Zagreb, 1935), p. 72: “The stake, with which Mr. K.[rleža] writes, is considered from all sides, so a catastrophic weakness of the soul can be noticed in the one who waves it. And still he has so many epigones. Because of the depth of his thoughts? No, – for the sake of Marxism, second degree to Bolshevism. The world wants to be deceived. Read that brochure in order to be convinced once more that all you need for fatal demagogism is a bit of attic salt.”

⁷⁴ Vr., “Zbunjena brošura Moskva protiv Krleže,” *Pregled: list za nauku i društveni život* 2/6 (Zagreb, 1935), p. 4; Ivo Ladika, “Klerikalci o Miroslavu Krleži,” *Književni glas* 1/2 (Zagreb, 1935), pp. 2–4, on p. 2.

After the end of the World War II, the new administration, as the literate and literary historian Božidar Petrač reports, conducted an investigation and started a criminal procedure against Krstić because of his “engagement in the public cultural life from 1941 until 1945,” but the procedure was stopped in 1947 with an explanation that there is no basis for further criminal prosecution.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, Krstić has been marginalized and excluded from public life until 1951. Then Krleža, because he, as he says, “heard that he works in ‘Mesopromet’ in Zadar as a correspondent,”⁷⁶ although it is correct that Krstić had been working there from September 1948 until the end of 1949, and from January 1950 until October 1951 he had been working in the Croatian State Archives in Zagreb and Zadar,⁷⁷ summoned Krstić to the Institute of Lexicography of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, and Krstić accepted. Because Krleža hired Krstić, and because there were some other employees at the Institute who were engaged in the scientific, cultural and public life during the Ustashi government, an unsigned letter was printed in April 1952 in the newspaper of the Communist Party of Croatia *Naprijed* which says that some of the employees do not belong in the Institute because of their previous activities, and Krstić was also mentioned:

“Dr. Kruno Krstić is known for being a Frankian before the war. He is the creator of the Ustashi dictionary and of the ‘work’ ‘Razlike hrvatskog i srpskog jezika’ [‘Differences Between Croatian and Serbian Language’]. He collaborated with the Ustashi newspapers during the war. While he was a teaching assistant at the Faculty of Philosophy, he was a contributor of the *Croatian Encyclopedia* (published during NDH [Independent State of Croatia]).”⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Božidar Petrač, “Pogovor,” in Božidar Petrač (priredio), *Kruno Krstić: studije, rasprave i članci* (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža / Glas Koncila / Društvo hrvatskih književnika, 2015), pp. 337–350, on p. 338.

⁷⁶ Šentija, *S Krležom poslije '71.: zapisi iz leksikografskog rokovnika*, pp. 58–59.

⁷⁷ For example, see Mladen Švab, “Grada za bio-bibliografiju Krunoslava Krstića – u povodu 90-godišnjice rođenja,” *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 21 (Zagreb, 1995), pp. 315–334, on p. 319; Aleksandar Stipčević, “Kruno Krstić kao istraživač povijesti i jezika zadarskih Arbanasa,” in Aleksandar Stipčević (ur.), *Zbornik radova o Kruni Krstiću* (Zadar: Društvo zadarskih Arbanasa, 1998), pp. 77–85, on p. 77.

⁷⁸ [s. n.], “Da li je to moguće?,” *Naprijed: organ Komunističke partije Hrvatske* 9 (Zagreb, 1952), br. 16 (11. travnja 1952), p. 2: “Dr. Kruno Krstić poznat je prije rata kao frankovac. Tvorac je ustaškog rječnika i ‘djela’ ‘Razlike hrvatskog i srpskog jezika’. Za vrijeme rata surađivao je u ustaškim listovima. Kao asistent na Filozofskom fakultetu bio je saradnik Hrvatske enciklopedije (izdavane za NDH).”

Krleža responded to the letter, and he, as the director of the Institute, decisively refuted the claims of the anonymous author, thus protecting the Institute and preventing possible further attacks on him, his employees and co-workers, especially on Krstić:

“I can not understand if the purpose of this letter [entitled ‘Da li je to moguće?’ (‘Is That Possible?’)] was to warn the administration of the Institute of Lexicography of the lack of political vigilance or its purpose was to divert the public attention that the Institute of Lexicography is an Ustashi brood? In both cases, the correspondent of your newspaper could have addressed the administration of the Institute of Lexicography and it would offer him the necessary information:

1. that dr. Kruno Krstić was not a Frankian; <...>;
3. that the best proof of the real existence of the mentioned differences between the Croatian and Serbian literary language is the fact that ‘Borba’ [a daily newspaper ‘Struggle’] publishes its Croatian edition on a daily basis precisely according to the instructions of those ‘Razlike’ [‘Differences’] by Kruno Krstić and Petar Guberina;
4. that it is not disgraceful to be one of the contributors of the Croatian Encyclopedia, because its authors, with a considerable number of Serbian and Slovenian authors, were more than 90% of culturally active Croatian workers at the present day, <...>;
5. that Croatian Encyclopedia was not published during NDH [Independent State of Croatia], but that it was also continuing its publication during NDH; <...>.”⁷⁹

By the way, during the second half of the 20th century Krstić entirely changed the views he advocated in 1935 in the booklet *How Does Mister M. Krleža Write*. For example, in 1963 he published a text, in which he noticed that the broadening of Krleža’s activity in making him an organizer of the encyclopedic editions of the Institute was “clearly a reflection of his specific ability to

⁷⁹ Miroslav Krleža, “Odgovor na pismo ‘Da li je to moguće,’” *Naprijed: organ Komunističke partije Hrvatske* 9 (Zagreb, 1952), br. 18 (25. travnja 1952), p. 2: “Nije mi jasno, da li je svrha ovoga dopisa [pisma naslovljenog »Da li je to moguće?«] bila, da se uprava Leksikografskog zavoda opomene zbog pomanjkanja političke budnosti ili se tim pismom želi skrenuti pažnja javnosti, da je Leksikografski zavod ustaško leglo? U oba slučaja mogao je dopisnik Vašeg lista da se obrati upravi Leksikografskog zavoda i ona bi mu dala potrebne informacije:

1. da dr. Kruno Krstić nije bio frankovac; <...>;
3. da te razlike hrvatskog i srpskog književnog jezika doista i postoje, najboljim je dokazom to, što ‘Borba’ [dnevni list] svakodnevno objavljuje svoje hrvatsko izdanje tačno po uputama ovih ‘Razlika’ Krune Krstića i Petra Guberine;
4. da nije sramota biti suradnikom Hrvatske Enciklopedije, jer je u njoj surađivalo, uz znatan broj suradnika Srba i Slovenaca, više od 90% danas kulturno aktivnih hrvatskih radnika, <...>;
5. da Hrvatska Enciklopedija nije izlazila za NDH, nego je produžila svoje izlaženje i za NDH; <...>.”

harshly review the cultural and historical situations and tasks imposed by those situations,” and after that he concluded:

“A man who has never been familiar with any doctrinarism and dogmatism, who always knew how to, in analyzing human events, extract the subtle evolution of man into humanity from the dense tracks of its animal atavisms, of naive and deliberate, sweet and cruel lies of his civilization, who knew how to separate the permanent from the ephemeral in a social chronicle, <...>.”⁸⁰

Besides, as witnessed by Velimir Visković, “if someone accidentally mentioned Krleža in one of our relaxed conversations, Krstić always got serious and spoke of his former literary and political opponent, and even enemy, with great respect.”⁸¹

3.3. Krleža's assessment of Petrić in the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire”

Records on Petrić in the essay “On Our Drama Repertoire” do not only rely on Krleža's taking over or paraphrasing information from Laszowsky's entry published in 1925 in the work *The Eminent and Deserving Croats*, and on those from Krstić's article “Philosophy in Croatia” published in 1943 in the first volume of the book of proceedings *Our Homeland*. It also contains Krleža's own assessment of Petrić:

- (1) Petrić was “the most universal name of our literary Cinquecento;”
- (2) Petrić was “a polyhistor and an omniscient person;”
- (3) Petrić was not satisfied “with the Christianization of Greek thought, done by the Church, when it baptized Aristotle using Saint Thomas;”
- (4) Petrić “critically analyzes, as an apologist of the medieval right-wing, which is righter than the St. Thomas-Aquinian the rightest right-wing, <...> the incompatibility of the Ancient Hellenic and Scholastic world-view <...>.”⁸²

⁸⁰ Kruno Krstić, “‘Krležina enciklopedija’,” *Vjesnik* 24 (Zagreb, 1963), br. 5884 (7. srpnja 1963), p. 7: “Čovjek kojemu je oduvijek strano svako doktrinarstvo i dogmatizam, koji je uvijek znao da u analizi ljudskih zbivanja izluči tanašnu evolutu čovjeka u čovječnost iz gustih tragova njegovih animalnih atavizama, naivnih i smišljenih, slatkih i okrutnih laži njegove civilizacije, koji je znao da u društvenoj kronici odijeli trajno od efemernoga, <...>.”

⁸¹ Velimir Visković, “Moj direktor Krleža,” *Globus: nacionalni tjednik* 24 (Zagreb, 2015), br. 1275 (15. svibnja 2015), pp. 104–109, on p. 106a.

⁸² Krleža, “O našem dramskom répertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držićeve ‘Tirene’,” p. 35a: “<...> najuniversalnije ime našeg književnog Cinquecenta. Franjo Patris Patričić, <...> polihistor i sveznadar, <...> nije zadovoljan crkvenim pokrštenjem grčke misli, što ga je crkva

Based on recent research, one is able to conclude that Krleža was wrong in the last of the four aforementioned claims in which he considered Petrić an apologist of the, as he calls it, “medieval right-wing,” and as a thinker who supports the views of “the rightest right-wing”. Although he was, indeed, pointing out the incompatibility of peripateticism with Christianity, Petrić did not do it because he was convinced that “the Ancient Hellenic and Scholastic worldview” were incompatible, but because he thought that Aristotle’s philosophy is characterized by, as he states in *Nova de universis philosophia*, “impious, addle-brained and tongue-tied teaching on God,” claiming that there are five pious philosophies in accordance with the Catholic faith: “his own philosophy, Zoroaster’s Chaldaean philosophy, Hermes Trismegistus’ Egyptian philosophy, mystical Egyptian philosophy, and Plato’s philosophy.”⁸³

4. Krleža’s manuscript from 1950 and the essay “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije” from 1953

Krleža expressed his knowledge and assessment of Petrić and the characteristics of his writings in two more texts. One of them is the manuscript “Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću” (“Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić”⁸⁴), and the other is “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije” (“On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia”⁸⁵).

izvršila, kada je sa Svetim Tomom baptizirala Aristotela. <...> Inkompatibilitet starohelenskog i skolastičkog pogleda na svijet on kritički analizira kao apolet sredovječne desnice, desnije od svetitomaquinske najdesnije desnice.”

Cf. this quotation in English: “<...> the most universal name of our literary Cinquecento. Franjo Patris Patričić, <...> a polyhistor and an omniscient person, <...> was not satisfied with the Christianization of Greek thought, done by the Church, when it baptized Aristotle using Saint Thomas. <...> He critically analyzes the incompatibility of the Ancient Hellenic and Scholastic worldview, as an apologist of the medieval right-wing, which is righter than the St. Thomas-Aquinian the rightest right-wing.”

⁸³ “Francisci Patricii *Panarchias*. Liber decimo [→ decimus]. De secundo, ac tertio principio.” ff. 20v–22r [ff. K3v–L1r] of the second foliation, in “Francisci Patricii *Panarchias*.” ff. 1r–48r [ff. F1r–R3r] of the second foliation, in Franciscus Patricius, *Nova de universis philosophia* (Ferrariae: Apud Benedictum Mammarelum, 1591), on f. 20va [f. K3va]: “<...> cuius [Aristotelis] impia, & confusa, & balba de Deo doctrina, <...>”; Franciscus Patricius, “Sanctiss. [imo] D.[omino] N.[ostro] Gregorio XIII. Pont.[ifice] Max.[imo] futurisque Romm.[anis] Pontt.[ificibus] Maxx.[imis],” in Patricius, *Nova de universis philosophia*, ff. a2r–a3v, on f. a2r: “Quinque hoc volumine, pias omnes, omnes Catholicae fidei consonas, Gregori Pater Beatiss. [imus] tibi afferimus philosophias. Nostram recens conditam, Chaldaicam Zoroastri, Hermetis Trismegisti Aegyptiam. Aegyptiam aliam Mysticam, & aliam Platonis propriam.”

⁸⁴ Hereafter: Krleža, “Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić,” (1950).

⁸⁵ Hereafter: Krleža, “On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia,” (1953).

The manuscript “Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić” was written by Krleža in 1950.⁸⁶ It was his reaction on the contents of the paper “Osnovi etičko-filozofske orijentacije Marka Marulića” (“The Principles of Ethic-philosophical Orientation of Marko Marulić”), which was published in the same year by the Croatian philosopher Vladimir Filipović in *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića 1450 – 1950* (*The Festschrift in Honor of the Fifth Centenary of the Birth of Marko Marulić, 1450 – 1950*).⁸⁷ In his manuscript Krleža relentlessly criticized Filipović’s claims, and it was most important to him to refute the claim that the literary, ethical and philosophical, as well as cultural orientation of Marko Marulić’s opus (1450–1524) was Christian, because that Croatian Renaissance thinker did not have the opportunity to choose from anything other than Christianity or Islam, since a third option did not exist (*tertium non datur*).⁸⁸ Krleža crowned his discordance with Filipović’s claims with the following sentence:

“When one decides to write a study on the foundations of the ethical and philosophical orientation of a poet from Cinquecento, then he is ought to really write on that topic, with the knowledge of matter, and it is completely redundant to write in the way of prof. Filipović, which is insufficient in any case.”⁸⁹

In the manuscript “Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić,” Krleža also mentioned Petrić. In doing so, he used the version Patričić as the Croatian version of

⁸⁶ Miroslav Krleža, [“Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,”] the draft of manuscript, ff. 1–6; Miroslav Krleža, [“Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,”] the final version of manuscript, ff. 1–10; Miroslav Krleža, [“Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,”] a typescript [two copies], ff. 1–9, in Miroslav Krleža, *Filipović: Osnovi filozofsko-etičke orijentacije Marka Marulića*. – (Bez mj. i god.), 33 l., anopistograf, listovni različite veličine, tekst hrv., rukopis i strojopis, paginacija inkontinuirana. The Collection of Old books and Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Zagreb, signature R 7970/A/1111.

⁸⁷ Vladimir Filipović, “Osnovi etičko-filozofske orijentacije Marka Marulića,” in Josip Badalić and Nikola Majnarić (ur.), *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića 1450 – 1950*, Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, knjiga 39. (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1950), pp. 279–298.

⁸⁸ Filipović, “Osnovi etičko-filozofske orijentacije Marka Marulića,” p. 286.

⁸⁹ Krleža, [“Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,”] the final version of manuscript, f. 9r: “Kada se piše studija o osnovima etičko filozofske orijentacije jednog cinquecentistickog poete onda valja pisati o toj temi stvarno, sa poznavanjem materije, a potpuno je suvišno da se piše na način prof. Filipovića koji je u svakom slučaju insuficijentan.”

For a more detailed review of Krleža’s manuscript “Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić,” see Davor Balić, “Krležini iskazi o Maruliću i njegovu opusu,” *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 42/2(84) (Zagreb, 2016), pp. 353–419, on pp. 375–379.

his surname. He wrote favorably of his opus in the text. In fact, he emphasized that Petrić's writings exalted him to be "our loudest Name of Cinquecento."⁹⁰

The text "On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia" was published in 1953. Krleža read that text on 27 January 1952 as an introduction at the first meeting of republic editorial boards of *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* (*Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia*⁹¹). As the main editor of the edition, he pointed out the reasons and the purpose of its publishing, as well as its program framework.⁹² Besides that, he said that *Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia* will also be focused on, as the Croatian philologist and lexicographer Igor Gostl (1938–1999) stresses, "determining the role of Slavs in the art of the Western Adriatic coast," and that "Socialist values will be affirmed" in it.⁹³ At the same time, with the *Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia* Krleža wanted to, as Josip Šentija emphasizes, accomplish the project which would be "a pendant of 'a politically realized plan'," which would present "the social and political revolution which occurred in the South Slavic region during World War II and immediately after it."⁹⁴

While presenting the reasons and the purpose of publishing *Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia*, Krleža mentioned Petrić two times. In doing so, he used the Latin and Croatian versions of his surname. In all issues of the text, he either used the

⁹⁰ Krleža, ["Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,"] the final version of manuscript, f. 10r.

⁹¹ Hereafter: Krleža, *Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia* (1955–1971).

⁹² Miroslav Krleža, "O nekim problemima Enciklopedije," uvodna riječ na prvome sastanku republičkih redakcija Enciklopedije, 27. januara 1952. u Zagrebu, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 9/2–3 (Zagreb, 1953), pp. 109–132, on p. 130: "Sakupiti svu političku, kulturnu i intelektualnu svijest o svojoj vlastitoj pojavi u prostoru i u vremenu, svijest danas dispersiranu i usitnjenu poslije vjekovnih poraza po mnogobrojnim i izolovanim regionalizimima, sabrati sve potrebne elemente u sintezi, koja ne će biti kult romantičnih fraza, nego istinit prikaz fakata, dati ogromnoj masi impozantne stvaralačke materije programatski okvir, objasniti i protumačiti svu tragičnost naših vlastitih raskola i uzajamnih negacija, to bi trebalo da bude našom osnovnom misijom."

Cf. this quotation in English: "To collect all political, cultural and intellectual consciousness of our own occurrence in space and time, the consciousness which is dispersed and fragmented today after being defeated over the centuries in numerous and isolated regionalisms, to collect all the necessary elements in a synthesis, which will not be a cult of romantic phrases, but rather a true presentation of facts, to offer a program framework to the enormous mass of impressive creative material, to explain and interpret all the tragedies of our own disruptions and mutual refutations, that should be our primary task."

⁹³ Ig. [or] G. [ostl], "O nekim problemima Enciklopedije," entry in *Krležijana* 2, M - Ž, p. 120, on p. 120a.

⁹⁴ Josip Šentija, "Predgovor: Iz Krležine baštine – Marginalije/primjedbe Miroslava Krleže uz tekstove za *Opću enciklopediju*, I. i III. izdanje," *Radovi Leksikografskoga zavoda Miroslav Krleža* 7 (Zagreb, 1998), pp. 11–21, on p. 12.

Latin version *Patricius*, or the Croatian versions *Petrišević* or *Petrišić*: in 1953 he used the version *Petrišević*, and in 1966 and 1972 he used the version *Petrišić*.⁹⁵

In the same text, Krleža mentioned Petrić for the first time when he compared the political, scientific and artistic achievements of Croatian thinkers who lived and worked in the period from 15th to 18th century to the achievements of Croatian thinkers who lived and worked during the 19th century. In doing so, he concluded that the Croatian “*Globus intellectualis*” in the period from 15th to 18th century was characterized by numerous “great names,” and he singled out Petrić, adding that the intellectual world of that period was “incomparably more interesting” from the one in the 19th century, while considering the final results of the endeavors conducted during the 19th century rather negative, even devastating.⁹⁶

In the text “On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia,” Krleža repeated the claim that Petrić should be considered one of the most important Croatian Renaissance thinkers, when he recapitulated the scientific, political, literary and cultural accomplishments of Croatian thinkers who lived and worked during 15th and 16th century. In doing so, he emphasized that Petar Pavao Vergerije the Younger (1497/8–1565), Matija Vlačić Ilirik the Elder (1520–1575), Marko Antun de Dominis (1560–1624) and Frane Petrić represented “the scientific, religious or antireligious ideas”.⁹⁷ He could be objected for being ambiguous and imprecise. Because he assigned four thinkers to three fields, and because he did not say which one excelled in which of those three fields, it is unclear if, for example, Petrić preceded with his scientific, or religious, or antireligious ideas.

5. Conclusion

Krleža exposed his knowledge of Petrić's biography and the characteristics of his works in four of his texts, which he wrote in the period from 1940 to 1953. In those texts, he used the Italian, Latin and Croatian versions of Petrić's name and surname: *Patrizio* / *Patricius* / *Franjo Patričić*, *Patris*, *Petrišević* and *Petrišić*.

Krleža left his first written mark on Petrić and his works in the essay “On Poetry,” which he wrote in 1940 and published in 1967. In that essay, Krleža

⁹⁵ The version *Petrišević* is in the following issue of the text: Krleža, “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije,” (1953), p. 114. The version *Petrišić* is in the following two issues of the text: Miroslav Krleža, “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije,” in Miroslav Krleža, *Eseji 5*, Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže, sv. 23. (Zagreb: Zora, 1966), pp. 149–203, on p. 162; Miroslav Krleža, “Prolegomena za Enciklopediju Jugoslavije,” in Miroslav Krleža, *99 varijacija: lexicographica – eseji i zapisi*, izbor, predgovor i redakcija Mate Lončar (Beograd: Duga, 1972), pp. 29–78, on p. 40.

⁹⁶ Krleža, “O nekim problemima Enciklopedije,” (1953), p. 114.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

presented the characteristics of Petrić's work *Della poetica*, precisely the characteristics of the fourth and the eighth book of *La deca disputata*, which was published by Petrić in 1586. In doing so, he pointed out Petrić's critique of Aristotle's doctrine of the subject matters of poetry, as well as reasons why Petrić criticized Aristotle's attitude that imitation (μίμησις) is the source of poetry: if poetry relied entirely on imitation, then it would not belong only to poets. In the essay "On Poetry," Krleža based his knowledge of Petrić's understanding of poetry on sentences which Benedetto Croce wrote in his *Aesthetic*. Krleža was, in fact, very well acquainted with Croce's thoughts on aesthetics and philosophy of history. Moreover, he belongs among few Croatian thinkers which were acquainted with Croce's opus already during the first two decades of the 20th century, and he also belongs among Croatian thinkers with the most numerous accounts on Croce and his doctrine. In the period from 1917 to 1972, there were 16 of those accounts, as witnessed by the appendix to this paper "The List of Bibliographic Units Containing Krleža's Records on Croce and His Doctrine," which supplements the previous bibliography on the Croatian reception of Croce.

The second time that Krleža expressed his knowledge and assessment of Petrić and his opus was in his essay "On Our Drama Repertoire," which he published in 1948. In that essay, he took over or paraphrased the information from two sources. One of them was an entry written by Emilij Laszowsky, and printed in 1925 in the work *The Eminent and Deserving Croats*. Krleža took over from it or paraphrased the information on Petrić's Croatian descent, and the years of his birth and death, then the information on Petrić's versatility (philosopher, poet, musicologist, mathematician, architect), after that the information regarding Petrić's friendship with influential persons of his time (popes Clement VIII and Gregory XIV, and cardinals Scipione Gonzaga i Girolamo della Rovere), as well as the information on the topics which occupied Petrić in his writings (building of harbors and Ancient Greek metrics). The second source from which Krleža took over or paraphrased the information on Petrić in his essay "On Our Drama Repertoire" was the article "Philosophy in Croatia," which was written and published by Kruno Krstić in 1943. From that article Krleža took over or paraphrased claims on Petrić's critique of peripatetic philosophy, then on the topic which occupied Petrić in his writings (Petrić thought of, as Krleža reports, "the principle of perception based on experience"), and on Petrić's discontent with the Christianization of Aristotle's philosophy. However, the essay "On Our Drama Repertoire" also contains Krleža's own assessment of Petrić. For example, he emphasized that Petrić was "the most universal name of our literary Cinquecento," then that he was "a polyhistor and an omniscient person," and

that he was not satisfied “with the Christianization of Greek thought, done by the Church, when it baptized Aristotle using Saint Thomas.”

The third proof of Krleža's interest in Petrić and his opus is offered in the manuscript “Filipović Vladimir on Marko Marulić” from 1950. In that manuscript, Krleža stressed that Petrić's writings exalted him to be “our loudest Name of the Cinquecento.”

The fourth and the last testimony of Krleža's knowledge and assessment of Petrić and his opus is offered in the programmatic essay “On Some Problems of the Encyclopedia” from 1953. In that essay, Krleža singled out Petrić as one of the most eminent Croatian thinkers or, as he calls them, “great names,” and after that he claimed that Petar Pavao Vergerije the Younger, Matija Vlačić Ilirik the Elder, Marko Antun de Dominis, and Frane Petrić are connected by the fact that they represented “the scientific, religious or antireligious ideas” during the 16th century.

Krleža's texts in which he mentioned Petrić also increase the number of bibliographic units on Petrić. Previous bibliographies on Petrić do not contain a single bibliographic unit from which it is possible to find out that Krleža ever wrote anything regarding that Croatian Renaissance philosopher. This paper proves that there should have been at least four bibliographic units.

6. Appendix

The List of Bibliographic Units Containing Krleža's
Records on Croce and His Doctrine

- Krleža, Miroslav. 1917. Diary entries: "7. XI 1917," pp. 157–159, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinačetnaeste, petnaeste i sedamnaeste," pp. 130–159, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/2–3 (Zagreb, 1954), on p. 158.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1921. Diary entries: "8 kolovoza 1921," pp. 293–294, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinašesnaeste, devetnaeste, dvadesete, dvadesetprve i tridesetitreće," pp. 269–304, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/4 (Zagreb, 1954), on p. 294.
- Krleža, Miroslav. c. 1930. *Croce. Koncepti*. – (Bez mj. i god.), 6 l., anopistograf, vel: 21,2 x 34,3 cm, tekst hrv., autograf, paginacija inkontinuirana.
The Collection of Old books and Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Zagreb, signature R 7970/A/1143.
- Krleža, M.[iroslav]. 1939. "Rasulo pameti. Nekoliko riječi uz Symposium gospodina profesora S. Markuša," *Pečat: književni mjesečnik za umjetnost, nauku i sve kulturne probleme* 1/10–12 (Zagreb, 1939), pp. 301–352, on p. 350.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1940. "Magistra vitae," pp. 301–322, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi jeseni 1940," pp. 301–355, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967), on p. 314.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1942. Diary entries: "9. VII 1942," pp. 910–915, in Miroslav Krleža, "Fragmenti dnevnika iz godine 1942," pp. 881–959, *Forum: časopis Razreda za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 11/12 (Zagreb, 1972), on p. 912.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1942. "Giovanni Papini: Rukopis iz 1942," pp. 385–402, in M.[iroslav] Krleža, "Iz galerije imena," pp. 361–408, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 2/2 (Zagreb, 1963), on p. 394.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1942. "Sociologija i socijalizam," pp. 36–56, in Miroslav Krleža, "Razgovor o istini o historiji o socijalizmu o idejama i o posljednjim stvarima: Fragmenti iz dnevnika godine 1942," pp. 18–66, *Literatura: časopis za književnost i kulturne probleme* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1957), on p. 50.
- Krleža, M.[iroslav]. 1945. "Književnost danas," *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost, umjetnost i javni život* 1/1–2 (Zagreb, 1945), pp. 139–160, on p. 152.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1948. "Govor Svetoga Oca na Uskrs devetstotinačetridesetosme," *Književne novine: organ Saveza književnika Jugoslavije* 1 (Beograd, 1948), br. 8 (6. aprila 1948), pp. 3–4, on p. 4b.

- Krleža, Miroslav. 1952. "Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani," *Republika: mjesecnik za književnost i umjetnost* 8/10–11 (Zagreb, 1952), pp. 205–243, on p. 241.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1952. "Uvodna riječ za časopis 'Danas 1952,'" *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 1/5 (Zagreb, 1962), pp. 776–788, on p. 784.
- Krleža, Miroslav. c. 1955. Marginalia "Borgese, Antonio Giuseppe," p. 199, in Josip Šentija (priredio), "Iz Krležine baštine – Marginalije uz tekstove za *Opću enciklopediju* [first part]," pp. 23–383, *Radovi Leksikografskoga zavoda Miroslav Krleža* 7 (Zagreb, 1998), on p. 199.
- Krleža, Miroslav. c. 1960. Marginalia "Hrvatska književna kritika," pp. 287–290, in [Domagoj Matizović, Sandra Gabrić Primorac i Vlaho Bogišić (priredili)], "Iz Krležine ostavštine. Marginalije. *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*. Izbor," pp. 7–510, *Kolo: časopis Matice hrvatske* 17/1 (Zagreb, 2007). The bottom of the impressum says: "Editing of this issue concluded on 20 January 2009.," on p. 289.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1961. "Razgovor o pedesetogodišnjici apstraktnog slikarstva (1911–1961)," a sequel of the text published in "Vjesnik" nr. 5016 from 29 January 1961, *Vjesnik* 22 (Zagreb, 1961), br. 5022 (5. veljače 1961), p. 6, on p. 6b.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1972. Conversation: "2. VII 1972.," in Enes Čengić, *S Krležom iz dana u dan (1956–1975): Balade o životu koji teče* (Zagreb: Globus, 1985), pp. 49–51, on p. 49.

7. Bibliography

7.1. Miroslav Krleža

- Krleža, Miroslav. 1917. Diary entries: "7. XI 1917," pp. 157–159, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinačetnaeste, petnaeste i sedamnaeste," pp. 130–159, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/2–3 (Zagreb, 1954).
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1921. Diary entries: "8 kolovoza 1921," pp. 293–294, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi iz godine tisućudevetstotinašesnaeste, devetnaeste, dvadesete, dvadesetprve i tridesetitreće," pp. 269–304, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 10/4 (Zagreb, 1954).
- K.[rleža], M.[iroslav]. 1924. "O dvestogodišnjici rođenja Imanuela Kanta," *Književna republika: mesečnik za sve kulturne probleme* 2/8 (Zagreb, jul 1924), pp. 334–336.
- Krleža, Miroslav. c. 1930. *Croce. Koncepti*. – (Bez mj. i god.), 6 l., anopistograf, vel: 21,2 x 34,3 cm, tekst hrv., autograf, paginacija inkontinuirana.
The Collection of Old books and Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Zagreb, signature R 7970/A/1143.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1930. "Slučaj gospodina Rudolfa Meixnera," *Književnik: hrvatski književni mjesečnik* 3/11 (Zagreb, 1930), pp. 481–502.
- Krleža, M.[iroslav]. 1930. "O pameti gospodina Rudolfa Ivanovića Meixnera," *Književnik: hrvatski književni mjesečnik* 3/12 (Zagreb, 1930), pp. 554–557.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1932. "O pameti gospodina Rudolfa Ivanovića Meixnera," in Miroslav Krleža, *Moj obračun s njima* (Zagreb: Naklada piščeva, 1932), pp. 56–62.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1932. *Povratak Filipa Latinovicza* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1932).
- K.[rleža], M.[iroslav]. 1933. ["Predgovor *Podravskim motivima* Krste Hegedušića,"] in Krsto Hegedušić, *Podravski motivi*, 34 crteža. S predgovorom Miroslava Krleže (Zagreb: Minerva, 1933), pp. 3–24.
- Krleža, M.[iroslav]. 1939. "Rasulo pameti. Nekoliko riječi uz Symposium gospodina profesora S. Markuša," *Pečat: književni mjesečnik za umjetnost, nauku i sve kulturne probleme* 1/10–12 (Zagreb, 1939), pp. 301–352.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1940. "Magistra vitae," pp. 301–322, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi jeseni 1940," pp. 301–355, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967).
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1940. "O poeziji," pp. 323–340, in Miroslav Krleža, "Zapisi jeseni 1940," pp. 301–355, *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6/3–4 (Zagreb, 1967).
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1942. "Marginalia na temu o spoznajnoteorijskoj magiji (Fragmenti dnevnika oktobra godine 1942)," *Delo: mesečni književni časopis* 2/11 (Beograd, 1956), pp. 1363–1437.

- Krleža, Miroslav. 1942. "Sociologija i socijalizam," pp. 36–56, in Miroslav Krleža, "Razgovor o istini o historiji o socijalizmu o idejama i o posljednjim stvarima: Fragmenti iz dnevnika godine 1942," pp. 18–66, *Literatura: časopis za književnost i kulturne probleme* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1957).
- Krleža, M.[iroslav]. 1945. "Književnost danas," *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost, umjetnost i javni život* 1/1–2 (Zagreb, 1945), pp. 139–160.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1948. "Govor Svetoga Oca na Uskrs devetstinačetdesetosme," *Književne novine: organ Saveza književnika Jugoslavije* 1 (Beograd, 1948), br. 8 (6. aprila 1948), pp. 3–4.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1948. "O našem dramskom répertoireu: povodom 400 godišnjice Držićeve 'Tirene,'" *Djelo: časopis za politička, ekonomska i kulturna pitanja* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1948), pp. 34–40.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1950. ["Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću,"] the draft of manuscript, ff. 1–6; the final version of manuscript, ff. 1–10; a typescript [two copies], ff. 1–9, in Miroslav Krleža, *Filipović: Osnovi filozofsko-etičke orijentacije Marka Marulića*. – (Bez mj. i god.), 33 l., anopistograf, listovi različite veličine, tekst hrv., rukopis i strojopis, paginacija inkontinuirana.
The Collection of Old books and Manuscripts of the National and University Library in Zagreb, signature R 7970/A/1111.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1952. "Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani," *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 8/10–11 (Zagreb, 1952), pp. 205–243.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1952. "Odgovor na pismo 'Da li je to moguće,'" *Naprijed: organ Komunističke partije Hrvatske* 9 (Zagreb, 1952), br. 18 (25. travnja 1952), p. 2.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1953. "O nekim problemima Enciklopedije," uvodna riječ na prvome sastanku republičkih redakcija Enciklopedije, 27. januara 1952. u Zagrebu, *Republika: mjesečnik za književnost i umjetnost* 9/2–3 (Zagreb, 1953), pp. 109–132.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1962. "Uvodna riječ za časopis 'Danas 1952,'" *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 1/5 (Zagreb, 1962), pp. 776–788.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1966. "O nekim problemima Enciklopedije," in Miroslav Krleža, *Eseji 5, Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže*, sv. 23. (Zagreb: Zora, 1966), pp. 149–203.
- Krleža, Miroslav. 1972. "Prolegomena za Enciklopediju Jugoslavije," in Miroslav Krleža, *99 varijacija: lexicographica – eseji i zapisi*, izbor, predgovor i redakcija Mate Lončar (Beograd: Duga, 1972), pp. 29–78.

7.2. Secondary Literature

- Aristotle. 1898. *The Poetics of Aristotle*, edited with critical notes and a translation by S.[amuel] H.[enry] Butcher. Second edition revised (London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898).

- Balić, Davor. 2013. "Prosudbe o Đuri Arnoldu iz perspektive marginalija Miroslava Krležu," *Fluminensia: časopis za filološka istraživanja* 25/2 (Rijeka, 2013), pp. 69–85.
- Balić, Davor. 2016. "Krležini iskazi o Maruliću i njegovu opusu," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 42/2(84) (Zagreb, 2016), pp. 353–419.
- [Banić-Pajnić, Erna]. 2011. "Predgovor," in Franciscus Patricius, *Zoroaster et eius CCCXX Oracula chaldaica* / Frane Petrić, *Zoroaster i njegovih tristo i dvadeset Kaldejskih proroštava*, preveo Ivan Kapec, uvodnu studiju i komentar napisala Erna Banić-Pajnić, uredila Erna Banić-Pajnić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2011), pp. 7–9.
- Bazala, Albert. 1912. *Povijest filozofije*, svezak III. Povijest filozofije najnovijega doba (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1912).
- Bogišić, Vlaho. 2011. "Predgovor," in Miroslav Krleža, *Marginalije: 1000 izabranih komentara o tekstovima za enciklopedije JLZ*, priredio Vlaho Bogišić (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2011), pp. 5–14.
- Capasso, Joh.[ann] Baptista. 1728. *Historiae philosophiae synopsis* (Neapoli: Typis Felicis Muscae, 1728).
- Copleston, Frederick. 1953. *A History of Philosophy III. Ockham to Suárez* (Tunbridge Wells, England: Search Press Limited; Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1953).
- Croce, Benedetto. 1902. *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: I. Teoria. II. Storia*. (Milano-Palermo-Napoli: Remo Sandron, 1902).
- Croce, Benedetto. 1908. *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale: Teoria e Storia*, terza edizione riveduta (Bari: Gius.[eppe] Laterza & Figli, 1908).
- Croce, Benedetto. 1922. *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic*, translated from the Italian by Douglas Ainslie, second edition (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1922).
- Dadić, Žarko. 2010. "O uporabi hrvatskog oblika prezimena znanstvenika i filozofa Patricija," *Folia onomastica Croatica* 19 (Zagreb, 2010), pp. 69–79.
- Delalle, Ivan. 1918. "Benedetto Croce," *Hrvatska prosvjeta* 5/1 (Zagreb, 1918), pp. 13–16.
- Donat, Branimir. 2002. "Ljevoruka gnjavaža," in Branimir Donat, *O Miroslavu Krleži još i opet: studije i eseji* (Zagreb: Dora Krupićeva, 2002), pp. 374–380.
- Ferrari, Silvio. 1982. "Presentazione," in Miroslav Krleža, *Il dio Marte croato. Due racconti*, traduzione di Silvio Ferrari (Pordenone: Studio Tesi, 1982), pp. IX–XIII.
- Fétis, F.[rançois] J.[oseph]. 1841. *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*, tome septième. NA-RY (Bruxelles: Meline, Cans et compagnie, 1841), s. v. "Patrizi (François)," pp. 172b–173a.
- Filipović, Vladimir. 1950. "Osnovi etičko-filozofske orijentacije Marka Marulića," in Josip Badalić and Nikola Majnarić (ur.), *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice*

- rođenja Marka Marulića 1450 – 1950, Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, knjiga 39. (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1950), pp. 279–298.
- Flaker, Aleksandar. 2000. "Poziv na novo čitanje," speech on the occasion of the publishing first seven books of *Djela Miroslava Krleže* (*Works of Miroslav Krleža*), *Vijenac: novine Matice hrvatske za književnost, umjetnost i znanost* 8 (Zagreb, 2000), br. 162 (18. svibnja 2000), p. 2.
- Fracastorius, Hieronymus. 1555. "Naugerius sive De poetica Dialogus.," in Hieronymus Fracastorius Veronensis, *Opera omnia*, in unum proxime post illius mortem collecta. (Venetiis: Apud Iuntas, 1555), ff. 153r–164v.
- Frangeš, Ivo. 1987. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske; Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1987).
- Gerber, Ernst Ludwig. 1792. *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler*, Zweiter Theil, N–Z (Leipzig: Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, 1792), s. v. "Patricio (Francesco)," cc. 83–84.
- Gerber, Ernst Ludwig. 1813. *Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler*, Dritter Theil. K–R (Leipzig: Bei A.[mbrosius] Kühnel, 1813), s. v. "Patricio (Francesco)," c. 663; s. v. "Patricius (Franciscus)," c. 663.
- Girardi-Karšulin, Mihaela. 1993. *Hrvatski renesansni aristotelizam* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, 1993).
- Girardi-Karšulin, Mihaela. 2009. "Uvod," in Franciscus Patricius, *Discussionum peripateticarum tomus tertius* / Frane Petrić, *Peripatetičke rasprave*, svezak treći, preveli Tomislav Čepulić i Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, uvodna studija i bilješka Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, filološka redakcija Olga Perić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2009), pp. XI–XLI.
- Grlić, Danko. 1963. "O nekim filozofskim aspektima Krležinog djela," *Naše teme: časopis za društvena i omladinska pitanja* 7/5(53) (Zagreb, 1963), pp. 609–634.
- G.[ostl], Ig.[or]. 1999. "'O nekim problemima Enciklopedije,'" entry in *Krležijana 2*, M - Ž, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 1999), p. 120.
- Haler, Albert. 1920. "O esteticima Benedetta Croce," *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 15, knjige II–III (Zagreb, 1920), pp. 122–125.
- ff [Heffler, Ferdo]. 1935. "Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža," *Kršćanska škola: glasilo Katehetskoga odsjeka Bratovštine kršćanskoga nauka* 39/6 (Zagreb, 1935), p. 72.
- Hraste, Katarina. 2001. "Benedetto Croce, mi i drugi," *Mogućnosti* 48/4–6 (Split, 2001), pp. 25–45.
- Jeremić, Dragan M. 1973. "Osnovne filozofske teze u književnom delu Miroslava Krleže," *Letopis Matice srpske* 149, knjiga 412, sveska 1 (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1973), pp. 1–15.

- Jurić, Šime. 1979. "De auctore [Francisco Patricio] huius operis," na latinski preveo Augustin Šimun Pavlović / "Nekoliko riječi o piscu [Frani Petriću]," in Frane Petrić, *Nova sveopća filozofija*, prijevod s latinskog Tomislav Ladan i Serafin Hrkač, priredio i pogovor napisao Vladimir Filipović (Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, 1979). The text consists of 16 unnumbered pages.
- Kr.[avar], Zo.[ran]. 1999. "'Magistra vitae'," entry in *Krležijana 2*, M - Ž, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 1999), p. 5b.
- Kr.[avar], Zo.[ran]. 1999. "'O poeziji'," entry in *Krležijana 2*, M - Ž, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 1999), p. 123a.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. 1964. *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), in the chapter "Patrizi," pp. 110–126.
- Kroče, Benedeto. 1934. *Estetika kao nauka o izrazu i opšta lingvistika*, preveo s italijanskog i predgovor napisao Vinko Vitezica (Beograd: Kosmos, 1934).
- Krstić, Kruno. 1935. → Tween, Mark. 1935.
- Krstić, Kruno. 1943. "Filozofija u Hrvatskoj," in Filip Lukas (gl. ur.), *Naša Domovina*, sv. 1. (Zagreb: Izdanje Glavnog ustaškog stana, 1943), pp. 397–405.
- Krstić, Kruno. 1963. "'Krležina enciklopedija'," *Vjesnik* 24 (Zagreb, 1963), br. 5884 (7. srpnja 1963), p. 7.
- Kć. [Krstić], K.[runo]. 1965. "Petrišević (Petris, Petrić), Franjo," entry in *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* 6, Maklj-Put (Zagreb: Izdanje i naklada Jugoslavenskog leksikografskog zavoda, 1965), pp. 479b–481a.
- Krstić, Kruno. 1968. "Počeci filozofije u Hrvatskoj," *Kolo: časopis Matice hrvatske za kulturu i umjetnost*, nova serija 6(126)/5 (Zagreb, 1968), pp. 325–332.
- Krstić, Kruno. 1979. "Frane Petrić u svojoj korespondenciji," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 5 (Zagreb, 1979), pp. 319–323.
- Kršnjavi, I. [Isidor, Iso, Izidor]. 1906. "Popratno slovo," *Kolo hrvatskih umjetnika* 1 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 1–4.
- Kukuljević Sakcinski, Ivan. 1860. *Slovník umjetnikah jugoslavenskih*, svezak IV (Zagreb: Tiskom narodne tiskarne dra. Ljudevita Gaja, 1860), s. v. "Patricius Franjo," pp. 337–338.
- [Kuzmić, Martin]. 1912. "Dodatak.," in *Aristotelova Poetika*, s prijevodom i komentarom izdao Martin Kuzmić (Zagreb: Kr.[aljevska] hrv.[atsko]-slav.[onsko]-dalm.[atinska] zemaljska vlada, 1912), pp. 233–273.
- Ladika, Ivo. 1935. "Klerikalci o Miroslavu Krleži," *Književni glas* 1/2 (Zagreb, 1935), pp. 2–4.
- L.[aszowsky], E.[milij]. 1925. "Patričić (Patrizio Dalmatino) Franjo," entry in [Emilij Laszowsky (ur.)], *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati te pomena vrijedna lica u hrvatskoj povijesti od 925-1925*, sa pregledom povijesti Hrvatske, Bosne i Istre, hrvatske književnosti i razvitka hrvatskog jezika, te hrv.[atskih] vladara, hercega, banova i

- biskupa, kao uvodom. Sa 9 zasebnih slika, te 421. slikom u tekstu (Zagreb: Odbor za izdanje knjige "Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati," [1925]), p. 208a.
- Lauer, Reinhard. 2013. *Miroslav Krleža – hrvatski klasik*, from German into Croatian translated by Ružica Ruklić (Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2013).
- Livadić, Branimir. 1906. "Vjenceslav Novak," predavanje pročitano na komemoraciji 19. listopada 1905. godine, *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 1/1 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 25–30.
- Lorković, Blaž. 1943. "Predgovor," in Filip Lukas (gl. ur.), *Naša Domovina*, sv. 1. (Zagreb: Izdanje Glavnog ustaškog stana, 1943). The foreword consists of three unnumbered pages printed at the beginning of the book.
- Magdić, Milivoj. 1933. "Krležina estetika (Povodom knjige: Miroslav Krleža – Eseji – knjiga prva. Zagreb 1932. Izdanje Minerva)," *Socijalna misao* 6/3 (Zagreb, 1933), pp. 65–71.
- Martinović, Ivica. 1997. "Kako je Dominis pisao Petrićevo prezime?," *Dubrovnik: časopis za književnost i znanost*, nova serija 8/1–3 (Dubrovnik, 1997), pp. 315–322.
- Martinović, Ivica. 1997. "Petrićeva prosudba Aristotelove prirodne filozofije," *Obnovljeni život: časopis za religioznu kulturu* 52/1 (Zagreb, 1997), pp. 3–20.
- Martinović, Ivica. 1997. "Rane hrvatske prouke Petrićeva djela (1624.–1811.): Dominis, Baglivi, Michieli Vitturi," *Dubrovnik: časopis za književnost i znanost*, nova serija 8/1–3 (Dubrovnik, 1997), pp. 212–247.
- Michieli Vitturi, Rados Antonio. 1811. "Sagio sopra Francesco Patrizio Dalmatino," in *Opuscoli del Signor Rados Antonio Michieli Vitturi* (Ragusa: Presso Antonio Martechini, 1811), pp. 26–37, in *Opuscoli riguardanti la storia degli uomini illustri di Spalato, e di parecchi altri Dalmati, raccolti da D. Andrea Ciccarelli* (Ragusa: Presso Antonio Martechini, 1811), Privez 1.
- Muccillo, Maria. 1981. "La vita e le opere di Aristotele nelle 'Discussiones peripateticæ' di Francesco Patrizi da Cherso," *Rinascimento: rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento*, seconda serie. Volume 21 (Firenze, 1981), pp. 53–119.
- Passer solitarius, "Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža. – (*La manière d'écrire du demi-savant socialiste M. Krleža*)," *Nova revija vjeri i nauci / Nouvelle revue de vie religieuse et intellectuelle* 14/2 (Makarska, 1935), pp. 120–121.
- Patrici, Francesco. 1586. *Della Poetica di Francesco Patrici, La Deca Disputata*. (In Ferrara: Per Vittorio Baldini Stampator Ducale, 1586).
- Patricius, Franciscus. 1591. "Sanctiss.[imo] D.[omino] N.[ostro] Gregorio XIII. Pont.[ifice] Max.[imo] futurisque Romm.[anis] Pontt.[ificibus] Maxx.[imis]," in Franciscus Patricius, *Nova de universis philosophia* (Ferrariae: Apud Benedictum Mammarelum, 1591), ff. a2r–a3v.
- Patricius, Franciscus. 1591. "Francisci Patricii *Panarchias*. Liber decimo [→ decimus]. De secundo, ac tertio principio." ff. 20v–22r of the second foliation, in "Francisci

- Patricii *Panarchias.*,” ff. 1r–48r of the second foliation, in Franciscus Patricius, *Nova de universis philosophia* (Ferrariae: Apud Benedictum Mammarelum, 1591).
- Patricius Senensis, Franciscus. 1519. *Francisci Patricii Senensis pontificis Caietani Enneas de regno, & regis institutione* (Parrhisiis: Impensis vero Galioti a Prato, 1519).
- Pavličić, Pavao. 2013. “Krlježa i žene,” *Forum: mjesečnik Razreda za književnost Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 52/7–9 (Zagreb, 2013), pp. 792–805.
- Petrač, Božidar. 2015. “Pogovor,” in Božidar Petrač (priredio), *Kruno Krstić: studije, rasprave i članci* (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža / Glas Koncila / Društvo hrvatskih književnika, 2015), pp. 337–350.
- Posavac, Zlatko. 1968. “Estetika Miroslava Krleže,” *Kolo: časopis Matice hrvatske za kulturu i umjetnost*, nova serija 6(126)/7 (Zagreb, 1968), pp. 3–35.
- Posavac, Zlatko. 1986. *Estetika u Hrvata: istraživanja i studije* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1986).
- Posavac, Zlatko. 1991. *Novija hrvatska estetika: studije i eseji* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, 1991).
- Posavac, Zlatko. 1991. “Pogovor: Zapis uz ‘Estetiku’ Benedetta Crocea,” in Benedetto Croce, *Estetika kao znanost izraza i opća lingvistika: Teorija i historija*, prijevod s talijanskog Sanja Roić (Zagreb: Globus, 1991), pp. 421–427.
- Pc. [Posavac], Z.[latko]. 1993. “Estetika,” entry in *Krležijana* 1, A - Lj, glavni urednik Velimir Visković (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod “Miroslav Krleža,” 1993), pp. 243b–246b.
- Posavac, Zlatko. 1993. “Rana recepcija estetike Benedetta Crocea u Hrvatskoj,” *Filozofska istraživanja* 13/3 (Zagreb, 1993), pp. 675–684.
- Prohaska, D.[ragutin]. 1906. “Dr. Jozo Dujmušić: Nauka o pjesništvu,” *Savremenik: Ljetopis Društva hrvatskih književnika* 1/4 (Zagreb, 1906), pp. 369–370.
- Rukopisna ostavština Miroslava Krleže: katalog*. 2003. Glavni urednik: Ivan Kosić (Zagreb: Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, 2003).
- [s. n.]. 1935. “Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža,” *Hrvatska straža* 7 (Zagreb, 1935), br. 79 (4. travnja 1935), p. 3.
- [s. n.]. 1952. “Da li je to moguće?,” *Naprijed: organ Komunističke partije Hrvatske* 9 (Zagreb, 1952), br. 16 (11. travnja 1952), p. 2.
- [s. n.]. 1972. “Napomena,” in Miroslav Krleža, *Djetinjstvo 1902–03 i drugi zapisi*, Sabrana djela Miroslava Krleže, sv. 27. (Zagreb: Zora, 1972), pp. 615–616.
- Salvini, Luigi. 1942. “Prefazione,” in Luigi Salvini (a cura di), *Poeti croati moderni* (Milano: Garzanti, 1942), pp. V–XLIII.
- Schiffler, Ljerka. 1997. *Frane Petrić / Franciscus Patricius. Od škole mišljenja do slobode mišljenja* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 1997).

- Stipčević, Aleksandar. 1988. "Kruno Krstić kao istraživač povijesti i jezika zadarskih Arbanasa," in Aleksandar Stipčević (ur.), *Zbornik radova o Kruni Krstiću* (Zadar: Društvo zadarskih Arbanasa, 1998), pp. 77–85.
- Strčić, Petar. 1995. "Koje je pravo ime Franciscusa Patriciusa?," *Filozofska istraživanja* 15/1–2 (Zagreb, 1995), pp. 181–189.
- Strčić, Petar. 1999. "O imenu i prezimenu Franje Petrisa (Franciscus Patricius)," in Andrija Mutnjaković (ur.), *Frano Petrić / Francesco Patritio 1597. - 1997.* (Zagreb: Družba "Braća Hrvatskoga Zmaja," 1999), pp. 100–132.
- Šegvić, K.[erubin]. 1933. "Glembajevi u svjetlu etike i estetike," *Hrvatska smotra za književnost, umjetnost i društveni život* 1/6 (Zagreb, 1933), pp. 244–255.
- Šentija, Josip. 1998. "Predgovor: Iz Krležine baštine – Marginalije/primjedbe Miroslava Krleže uz tekstove za *Opću enciklopediju*, I. i III. izdanje," *Radovi Leksikografskoga zavoda Miroslav Krleža* 7 (Zagreb, 1998), pp. 11–21.
- Šentija, Josip. 2000. *S Krležom poslije '71.: zapisi iz leksikografskog rokovnika* (Zagreb: Masmedija, 2000).
- Šicel, Miroslav. 1982. "Krležino djelo kao obilježje epohe," *Revija: časopis za književnost, kulturu i društvena pitanja* 22/1 (Osijek, 1982), pp. 3–6.
- Šicel, Miroslav. 2007. "Predgovor," in Ivan Grabar and Denis Peričić, *Zavičajnost Miroslava Krleže* (Zagreb – Varaždin: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zavod za znanstveni rad Varaždin, 2007), p. 15.
- Šifler-Premec, Ljerka. 1969. "Patritiusov razračun s Aristotelom," *Forum: časopis Odjela za suvremenu književnost Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 8/9 (Zagreb, 1969), pp. 458–474.
- Šrepel, Milivoj. 1892. "O Patricijevoj poetici," čitao u sjednici filologičko-historičkoga razreda jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti dne 2. srpnja 1891., *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*. Knjiga 108. Razredi filologičko-historički i filozofičko-juridički. 34. (Zagreb: [Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti], 1892), pp. 1–67.
- Švab, Mladen. 1995. "Građa za bio-bibliografiju Krunoslava Krstića – u povodu 90-godišnjice rođenja," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 21 (Zagreb, 1995), pp. 315–334.
- Tiraboschi, Girolamo. 1777. *Storia della letteratura italiana*, tomo settimo, parte prima (In Modena: Presso la Società tipografica, 1777).
- Tween, Mark [Krstić, Kruno]. 1935. *Kako piše gospodin M. Krleža, MOSK (Moderna socijalna kronika)*, godište 2, sv. 15(3) (Zagreb: [Hrvatsko katoličko akademsko društvo "Domagoj" / Zbor društva mladih Zagrepčana], 1935).
- Vico, Giambattista. 1730. *De' principj d'una scienza nuova* (In Napoli: A spese di Felice Mosca, 1730).

- Vico, Giambattista. 1948. *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, translated from the third edition (1744) by Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1948).
- Visković, Velimir. 2004. "Krležina politička esejistika," in *Dani Hrvarskoga kazališta [XXX]: Hrvatska književnost, kazalište i avangarda dvadesetih godina 20. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti; Split: Književni krug, 2004), pp. 29–46.
- Visković, Velimir. 2015. "Moj direktor Krleža," *Globus: nacionalni tjednik* 24 (Zagreb, 2015), br. 1275 (15. svibnja 2015), pp. 104–109.
- Vr. 1935. "Zbunjena brošura Moska protiv Krleže," *Pregled: list za nauku i društveni život* 2/6 (Zagreb, 1935), p. 4.
- Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1732. *Musicalisches Lexicon* (Leipzig: Wolfgang Deer, 1732), s. v. "Patricius (Franciscus)," p. 466a.
- Žmegač, Viktor. 2011. "Krležino shvaćanje povijesti u europskom filozofskom kontekstu," in Viktor Žmegač, *Krležini europski obzori: djelo u komparativnom kontekstu* (Zagreb: Znanje, 2001), pp. 273–295.

Prosudbe Miroslava Krleže o Frani Petriću

Sažetak

Opus Miroslava Krleže (1893–1981) sadrži spoznaje i prosudbe o Frani Petriću (1529–1597) i obilježjima njegovih djela te upućuje na izvore Krležinih spoznaja o Petriću. Svoju upućenost u Petrićevo djelo Krleža je razotkrio u četirima tekstovima nastalih u razdoblju od 1940. do 1953. godine.

Prvi je od njih esej »O poeziji«, koji je Krleža napisao 1940. godine, ali objavio tek 1967. godine. Oslonivši se na tvrdnje iz Croceove *Estetike*, u njemu je prikazao osobitosti Petrićeva razumijevanja pjesništva, pri čemu je posebice ukazao na Petrićevu kritiku Aristotelova nauka o predmetima kojima se bavi pjesništvo i na razloge zbog kojih je Petrić kritizirao Aristotelov stav o oponašanju kao izvoru pjesništva.

Drugi je od tekstova u kojima se Krleža očituje o Petriću i obilježjima njegova opusa esej »O našem dramskom répertoireu« iz 1948. godine. Krleža u njemu preuzima ili parafrazira zapise o Petriću koje je doznao iz dvaju izvora: iz natuknice Emilija Laszowskoga za djelo *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati* (1925) i iz članka »Filozofija u Hrvatskoj« (1943), koji je napisao Kruno Krstić. No, u članku »O našem dramskom répertoireu« Krleža je donio i nekoliko vlastitih tvrdnji o Petriću. Naglasio je da je Petrić bio »najuniversalnije ime našeg književnog Cinquecenta«, da je bio »polyhistor i sveznadar«, da je bio nezadovoljan »crkvenim pokrštenjem grčke misli, što ga je crkva izvršila, kada je sa Svetim Tomom baptizirala Aristotela«, ali je promašio stavom da je Petrić bio »apologet sredovječne desnice«.

U trećem tekstu, rukopisu »Filipović Vladimir o Marku Maruliću« iz 1950. godine, Krleža je istaknuo da se Petrić svojim spisima uzdigao do »najglasnijeg cin-kvecentističkog našeg Imena«, dok je 1953. godine u eseju »O nekim problemima Enciklopedije« smatrao da je Petrić bio jedno od velikih imena.

Krležini tekstovi u kojima se spominje Petrić povećavaju bibliografiju o Petriću. U dosadašnjim bibliografijama o Petriću nema nijedne bibliografske jedinice koja otkriva da je Krleža ikada pisao o tom hrvatskom renesansnom filozofu. Iz ovoga rada proizlazi da je trebao biti uvršten s barem četiri bibliografske jedinice.

Ključne riječi: Miroslav Krleža, Frane Petrić, Benedetto Croce, Emilij Laszowsky, Kruno Krstić, pjesništvo, filozofija, estetika, poetika

