

Pregledni rad

UDK 821.163.42.09Hektorović P.

Ante TOPČIĆ (Zadar)

Sveučilište u Zadru

atopcic@unizd.hr

**SOLOMON'S GLASS IN *ŽITJE KONSTANTINOVO* AND
HEKTOROVIC'S GOBBLET IN *FISHING AND
FISHERMEN'S CONVERSATIONS (PAGINIRAT)***

This paper is based on the hypothesis that Solomon's cup, described in the 13th chapter of *Žitje Konstantinovo* significantly influenced on Petar Hektorovic who presented his cup from which he drank wine during a three – day voyage in the company of two simple fishermen as an extremely important subject that needs to be constantly taken care of and must by no means be forgotten and lost. The problem is approached with the conviction that Hektorovic deliberately made his cup vague and that through the description of that cup he actually said that it would be lost if its true and hidden meaning was not revealed. Hektorovic's cup should therefore be approached with philosophical reflection and a view of life as the one of the Greek missionary, the apostle among the Slavs, Constantine-Cyril, who managed to read and interpret the inscription on the Solomon's cup kept in the Church of St. Sofia. The intention is to come to the conclusion derived from the hypothesis that the phenomenon of mysterious, unusual and artistically refined glass has been present in the Slavic literature since the beginning of their literacy in their own language and that it is the bearer of a universal idea of life that will strongly occupy the thought of a Renaissance, secular and thinking man.

Key words: *glass, inscription, prophecy, celebration, sacrifice*

Introduction

The essence of the problem we are faced with in this paper is presented in two different looking vessels, but equal at least according to their basic purpose: they are both made to toast and drink from them. However, this is not the only purpose for which they are made. According to the descriptions offered

about them and by which we manage to create such a clear idea of how they looked, which material they were made from and who they were intended for, we notice a great effort and care of their masters to make them seem works of art worth of admiration, somewhat astonishing and above all enigmatic and mysterious. As previously mentioned, it is about the vessels used to drink a beverage, most often wine, with the emphasis that one of them is called *the cup* and the second *the gobblet*. However, both of these terms, even though they are not quite completely related to the common synonym of *the chalice*, are certainly in the closest semantic relation to that noun. The name for *the chalice* originates from the Latin name *calix*, and in English the noun has the shape of *a chalice*. In addition to this, in English we will also find the terms *cup*, *gobblet* or *bowl*, and the Croatian equivalent to those terms are *rečicaš/pehar* and *vrč/krčag*. The origin of the noun *chalice*, whether used in Latin, Croatian, or English, is recognized in the Indo-European root *kal* which means to cover, and since the meaning of both vessels we are dealing with in this work have long been covered/hidden, we have a reason to call them both *a chalice*. Although that reason is not irrelevant, we will also highlight other important factors in the paper that state that both vessels can be best understood by that term.

The first one that draws attention in this paper is the chalice whose detailed description was offered by the author of *Žitje*, Constantine Cyril¹, and for which we argue that it was used as a literary template for describing the second chalice represented and prominent among other vessels listed by Petar Hektorovic in his most significant literary work, *Fishing and Fishermen's Conversations*. Although from the very beginning of the journey Hektorovic went on with his fellow islanders, two fishermen, Paskoje and Nikola, who managed the boat, the cup or the chalice we are interested in was among the other things that these passengers, sailors carried with them, and although they served wine to each other, Hektorovic spoke about his artistic appearance only at the moment when he realized that the item was lost. However, it was soon found. The fishermen remembered that it remained on the shore of the island of Brač, where they used it to serve a shepherd from Brač who they spent short time with. They returned to that place and found the lost cup and the other bowl, the chaff (*buklija*), which they forgot to get into the boat together with the cup. We will hardly believe that this really happened², but we are

¹ That *Žitje* was written immediately after the death of St. Cyril, probably in Pannonia. Data on Konstantin Cyril was given by his brother Methodius, but he was not the author of *Žitje*, but it was most likely that Climent of Ohrid, with the participation of other students (Bratulić 1992: 16), (Damjanović 2012: 31–32).

² Though science has long insisted on proving that Hektorović's *Fishing and Fisherman's*

convinced that Hektorovic had made such an accident very carefully to warn of the value of one of the pots he drank from and which was quasi accidentally forgotten. In dealing with the problem and the things with the consciousness that constantly reminds us that coincidence does not exist, but that there is only a human misunderstanding of the causes of existence or events related to certain things, in this paper we will try to identify and explain the causes of certain events or the existence of particular objects, to make their comparison, to emphasize their similarity and differences, and to make new and interesting theoretical conclusions on the basis of such observations. We will begin the analysis with the glass which King Solomon made according to the tradition.

Solomon's work

In the thirteenth chapter of *Žitje Konstantinovo* (Constantine Cyril's Biography) in which Constantine's report of his acquaintance with the emperor is presented in the shortest possible way using the Glagolitic form *vidjevši se* (while meeting), the effort of the author to show how much Constantine was fleeing from the reputable life he lived in the Emperor's Court is clearly visible, and how his desire was to live in the peace and quiet of the house of God, which was the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. It was a grand building, the second largest in that city which was destroyed several years after the Turks in 1453 won the Constantinople. This beautiful building which preserved some of its shapes and construction styles was considered a pattern³ in the sacral building had a terrible fate of destruction identical to that of the magnificent temple built by the third king of Israel and Judah, the son of King David, King Salomon. His temple was first devastated by the Babylonians during the siege of Jerusalem in the year of 586 AD. After the fall of Babylon, the king of Persia, King Kiri the Great had renewed the Temple and after almost six centuries of the existence of the renewed Second Temple, the place where it was re-emerged became a great ruin. In the 70's, the temple

Conversations is a description of a real event from the author's life, the credibility of the topography and a fisherman represented in Hektorović's work has been proved. Encouraged by the thoughts of Tragalc za smislo of S. and Z. Sambunjak in their monography, we believe that Fishing is a poetic and deep metaphorical work that has only such a metaphorical, platonic and philosophical relationship to reality. It is the original author and poetry idea of life that he manages to achieve perfectly in the literature, but not in the real world.

³ Church of the St. apostle in Constantinople was built at the same time as St. Sofia, but it was of another type. Its base was in the form of a Greek cross and with five identical dome that were above the central part and over the cross arms. The Church of St. Mark in Venice and St. Front in Perigueux (Ružić, 1963: 22). Such is also the Church of the Virgin Mary in the Constantinople (Rice, 1968: 59).

was completely destroyed by Vespasian's son and army leader Tit Flavius. So ended the former glorious building of wise King Solomon.

But he did not seem to be just a great builder. He showed equal talent in those areas of art that arose from architecture and construction. The first arts encouraged by construction were painting and sculpture. When we talk about Solomon, we should not miss those areas that lie at the very boundary between science and art such as alchemy, astrology and magic⁴. Let us also remind immediately that the images of the both glasses we are talking about in this paper would not be complete or considerably damaged if we would not involve the occult segments of thoughts of the previously mentioned marginal areas of philosophizing. So, no matter how validly we talk about the marginality of these skills, we must also speak about their firm attachment and thematic incorporation into the contemporary Antique and Renaissance system of thought. Such ways of thinking have striven for the kind of spiritualization of the world. The magic that was perceived as the highest power of natural sciences and the one we observe here is not the one that has its base in the cult of the demon but it is that of M. Ficin's interest which consists of the exploration of secret powers of nature (Mass.: 179). The very phenomenon of search and

⁴ We give these skills because we know that the cup that is claimed to be Solomon's work is made of precious stone which alchemists cannot reach. Solomon's name according to some esoteric interpretations is related to the moon and the stars. It is made up of two parts of sol = sun and mon = moon, in so called Chaldean language. Further, the six-pointed star, or the geometric hexagram is Solomon's seal and patron sign.

„In Hebrew there is a name *magen David* = David's shield. This name also appeared in the Talmud. Initially, that sign had nothing to do with Judaism. Sometimes it appeared in synagogues and on various objects, but only as a decorative element, similar to Roman buildings and Christian churches... The sign of hexagram and later the star was attributed with the magical meaning. The star of David is often engraved on stamped rings and seals, and so is attributed with the power of liberation and protection from evil spirits. The Arabs also attach the magical meaning to that symbol by calling it 'Solomon's seal'“ (Tilah, 1980: 281). Solomon's seal, a hexagram, is a powerful talisman: it protects travelers from evil occult influences. Tradition wants it to be a decoration of Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem. Almost every religion attached to him some meaning. The triangle with the top up has always been a symbol of love, fidelity and wisdom (Villiers, 1989: 332).

When Solomon began building the temple, he hired the ingenious master Hiram, for whom was believed to have been referred to some miraculous master secrets. He was killed by three calfs who wanted to get the master's secrets. It is believed that because of that the temple was left unfinished and that the masons were working on its permanent completion, seeking the lost master's secret (Secret Society? 111) In connection with this last one, it is worth highlighting the fact that the builder of the Temple of Jerusalem, the prophet Solomon, in the Byzantine Art Circle can show himself as a figure of a king wearing an open scroll with an inscription about the construction of the Temple of Premonstrator. That is how he is depicted in the frescoes in Sopoc, that is, with the scroll on which it is inscribed: Wisdom creates a temple for itself and establishes it on seven pillars (Sambunjak, 1998: 67).

research assumes and points to the existence of rich sites. Nature is full of sites that hide raw and untreated material that is to be treated, transformed and demised to the upcoming times and generations by the finder (Čvrljak, 2008: 245). It is worth asking if Solomon, who was thought to be related to some of the mysteries of nature and taught by a demonic being of extraordinary power and supernatural mental abilities, Centaur⁵, with the help of that knowledge made also a cup that was profoundly revealed by Constantine.

So, immediately after that brief report on Constantine's acquaintance with the emperor in the previously mentioned part of *Žitje* (Bibliography), we go to the motive of Solomon's Glass in which we have the following text:

There is in St Sophia a glass made of precious stone, the work of Solomon with verses written in Jewish and Samaritan letters which no one could read or explain. Taking it, the Philosopher reads and explains. The first verse is this: „*My cup, my cup! Prophecy as long as the star is! Be used for drinking by the Lord, the first one that is awake in the night!*“ Another verse follows: „*The one used for tasting by the Lord is made of another tree. Drink and get drunk with cheerfulness and cleric Hallelujah!*“ And then the third verse: „*Here is the prince and all the congregation with King David among them will see his glory.*“ After that a number 909 is written. Precisely calculating, the Philosopher discovered that since the twelfth year of King Solomon's rule until the birth of Christ 909 years passed. And it is a prophecy about Christ (Bratulić, 1992: 68–69).

The first thing that comes to mind here is that the mysterious Solomon's cup is kept in the Church of St. Sophia, and not in the Church of the Holy Apostles, which is highlighted as the desired place of residence and expression of the prayer of Constantine the Philosopher. This fact although not irrelevant is equally important in terms of the maker of the glass, Solomon, and in terms of Constantine, which was able to read and interpret the inscription. Although the Church of St. Sophia is so important, a masterpiece of Byzantine architecture of Justinian's era, and although its architectural solutions in many respects coincide with those of the Church of the Holy Apostles⁶, at this moment we are much more interested in her patron in whose glory it has been raised than into her impressive architecture⁷. So, this church was built with the

⁵ According to the story of Solomon and Kitovras, Solomon used craftiness and with the help of his friend managed to catch Kitovras who lived in a remote desert. Kitovras revealed his demonic wisdom to Solomon: he showed him he can carve stones without iron for construction of the Temple of Jerusalem. Thanks to his help, Solomon came to the secret means, a precious stone, a diamond called *almaz*, which was in the nest of a bird, on a high rocky mountain, in a remote desert. Thanks to this knowledge, Solomon managed to solve his heavy task. Look at the detail story The history of Solomon and Kitovras at (Milidragović, 1976: 40).

⁶ It is assumed that both were built by the same craftsmen.

⁷ The tradition claims that Justinian cried out when he saw the glorious beauty of St. Sophia:

intention of glorifying St. Wisdom, one that takes a very prominent place in the world of theological teaching and represents, at least for that time, the ultimate range of philosophy⁸. God's Wisdom, which existed before the world, in God, in his word that made the world, can only be perceived by the word that is directed to God. Considering the dedication that the authorship of some biblical books, and especially the Books of the Wise Sayings and the Book of Wisdom attributed to the wise Solomon, it is unnecessary to emphasize here how many words Solomon dedicated to the Wisdom and how did the Wisdom determine his personality and work. It is enough to emphasize that she was personified and anthropomorphized with Solomon, and she was a constant accompaniment to his life⁹. However, it is more important to note that Solomon was a life-giving model, and his wisdom was the desired goal of Constantine the Philosopher¹⁰. Already as a seven-year-old boy, he had a visionary dream of choosing a personified Wisdom¹¹ for his life companion. And in a state of complete consciousness, Constantine was equally eager for the Wisdom. The author of *Žitje* reports that when he went to school to Constantinople, he was kneeling in the way and pronounced Solomon's prayer by which he had been asking for wisdom from God¹². Truly, there is no need for a deeper search for the realization that the Sacred Wisdom was a gift from God received by Solomon and Constantine. It is not surprising that the Church of St Sophia /

„Solomon, I surpassed you, thinking of Solomon's building of the Temple of Jerusalem“ (Bloch, 1981: 842).

⁸ At that time, the understanding of philosophy was identified with spirituality, ie, prodigal to the Holy Spirit, while philosophy, love of wisdom, was identified with God's Wisdom (Knežević, 1988: 184). Constantine Philosopher also defines philosophy as knowing God's and human wisdom and as a way for man to approach God and to teach a man to be a copy of his Creator (Bratulić, 1992: 35).

⁹ That is why I have decided to bring her as a life companion, knowing that she will be my counselor in good fortune and comforter in my worries and sadness (Mt 8: 9); or I have loved and longed of her the love of her since my youth; and I tried to make her my fiancé and I fell in love with her beauty (Mt 8: 2).

¹⁰ The name of the Philosopher he granted himself when he arrived at Constantinople and became an archivist and a librarian in the Church of St. Sophia.

¹¹ In the seventh year the boy dreamed and told his father and mother: „The duke gathered all the girls of our city and said to me: Choose one of them, which you want as your bride and aide. So, I looked at and considered all of them, and I saw one more beautiful of all with a bright face and very decorated with gold jewelry and pearls, and with her beauty, named Sofia, which means Wisdom. That is who I chose“ (Bratulić, 1992: 30–31).

¹² „The God of our fathers, and of the Lord of grace, you who created all with your word and wisdom, and having made a man to rule over the creatures that you have created, give me the wisdom that dwells beside your throne to know what is pleasing to you and to be saved. I am your servant and the son of your maidservant.“ After saying that and all the prayer of Solomon, he stood and said, Amen (Bratulić, 1992: 33–34).

Wisdom is a place of encounter of these persons from different times and the item kept in it is the one they both tested their gift of Wisdom on. So, no matter how wisely Solomon made a famous cup, according to a report that testifies about it, it seems that Constantine overcame Solomon himself and was able to expose his secret, entrusted to their common patron, St. Sophia.

Glass and grail

If we did not have any information about the material from which the glass was made, it would be easy to believe that the Divine Wisdom is present only in the cup, the one that accomplished its mission in the Son, the incarnated Word of God and whose prophecy was expressed by the glass. It is a beloved stone, a substance that alchemists have been chasing for centuries and believed it will enable them to convert unprocessed metals into gold and make the elixirs of life or eternal youth. The alchemy, magic, and astrology, the preaching knowledge of Arabs and Jews from ancient times transmitted to Europe were dealt with by wizards, magicians and the most popular people. We recall, for Solomon there is a story that he was educated about these knowledges by Centurus, and *Žitje* testifies that Konstantin the Philosopher in Constantinople, that at that time had a developed school with a high range in all ancient knowledge and skills at incredible speed and easily learned everything¹³. Solomon's glass is burdened with pagan and Christian meaning. It is strange, vague, and specific. As such, it contains the essential characteristics of the grail, it seems the most mysterious, it seems, the mythical object that was always chased especially in the Middle Ages. It is in its deepest connection to the political, religious, literary and historical tradition of that era. Its shape is indefinite. Sometimes it appears as a book, sometimes as a spear, sometimes as a sacred blood, uterus or the vessel in which this blood is found. Furthermore, it appears sometimes as a tray with the cut off head of John the Baptist, sometimes as a canvas in which the killed Jesus Christ was wrapped but yet it is best understood as a chalice, a goblet of Christ's blood. The essential properties of the grail are to nourish, heal, restore power, and provide immortality to the one who suffers. But a few people achieve that because the characteristic of the grail is its unrecognizability. It is present but invisible. Equally important is the inscription, the most interesting and the most

¹³ When he arrived to Constantinople, he was handed over to the teachers to be taught. And after three months he passed the grammar and started other sciences. He studied Homer and Geometry, and dialectics and all philosophical teachings at Lav and Foti, including rhetorics and arithmetics, astronomy and music, and all other Hellenic arts. In that way he learned everything as if only he learned one of them (Bratulić, 1992: 34–35).

distinguishing feature of Solomon's glass. It was properly read by the gifted Constantine.

Solomon's cup confirms that the grail can be a stone and a cup because it coincides with that cup that was carved in a precious stone that had fell out of Lucifer's forehead during his fall and was linked to a stone that according to Jewish tradition followed the Jews in desert and from which flowed the water they drank (Sambunjak, 2007: 182). Precious stones are a symbol of opaque, translucent, vague and invisible transmutation into clear and visible. Probably because Salomon made a glass of precious stone, Constantine managed to understand the meaning of its inscription. When he read its verses, he found that it was a prophetic, proclaiming Christ as the descendant of King David. In one of the stories that speaks of the great Zion stone, it is mentioned that David spoke of a stone and on that stone, received a promise that Jesus would be born of his kin. (Wesselofsky, 1882: 41–42) A precious stone is a symbol of spiritual perfection¹⁴. The power of precious stones cannot always be separated from their nature and form, and sometimes it is expressed only in the hands of the right person. We see, therefore, that the grail and the graceful stone are the terms that can be put in close relation, because some of their characteristics are equated: they require a hard pursuit, are not available to everyone, and they have the supernatural power to heal and provide the drink of immortality. So, no matter how much the precious stones and the grail remained in the shadow of the mythical tradition, they are also present in the Christian tradition.

A symbol of precious stone, a glittering diamond, could be Christ Himself. Indeed, the Hermetics that form the basis of alchemical science speak of the Christ as a true philosophical stone (Guenon, 1984: 249). The link between the Christ and the stones in the Gospels is so obvious that we can conclude without plunging into the Hermetic Philosophy that He represents Himself as God's hand-treated stone that is sent from heaven to earth. He was strongly opposed to any kind of earthly stones that people have always held to have power for their immutability and durability¹⁵. The only stone that He sets up will be the stone of the keystone, a stone on which He will base the Church that symbolizes faith. When tempted in the desert to turn stones into bread, Christ

¹⁴ In John's Apocalypse, the Holy Spirit is described as a stone and a green jewel: „And he who sat there had the appearance of jasper and carnelian, and around the throne was a rainbow that had the appearance of an emerald“ (Rev. 4: 3).

¹⁵ When many discussed the beauty of the Temple, Jesus joined in with the words: „As for what you see here, the time will come when not one stone will be left on another; every one of them will be thrown down“ (Lk 21, 6). He spoke of spiritual rocks when he expelled temple traders and when the Jews sought to show them a sign: „Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.“ (John 2:19).

refused because he did not want to be inconsistent with his own words: „I am the living bread that came down from heaven. He who is eating this bread will live forever. The bread I will give is the body of mine for the life of the world“ (John 6: 51). Speaking about the link between bread and rocks, it is worth pointing out that the term *betil* of Semitic origin and in Hebrew language signifies the house of God, in fact represents sacred stones which, as an expression of God's presence were worshiped by the Arabs before the Prophet. We can also think of *betil* as a stone pot in which God's power is located¹⁶. The house of God (Beth-el) is also Bethlehem¹⁷, which has the meaning of house of bread, the place where Jesus Christ was born, whose symbolism, among other things, is expressed with bread and stone. The stone and the grail are equally related to Christ. The characteristic of the grail is in the closest motive relation to the bread and fish that Christ used to feed the multitude. It is also related to Christ's transformation of water into wine at a wedding in Cana Galilee, as well as in connection with the host which in the sacrament of communion represents physical and spiritual food. The host during the Mass stands on paten, a metallic and most often gilded bowl, a plate used to cover a chalice after a rite. This lid symbolizes the great stone that closed the grave of Jesus, where, Joseph and Nicodemus, had laid him down after being removed from the cross¹⁸. However, Christ had torn this stone three days later, went to heaven and returned to the apostles who recognized him only after the breaking of bread. Christ was like the grail among the apostles, and they did not recognize His presence. With this remark we have strengthened the link between Christ, bread, and stone, but we also added the importance of the grail.

But the grail, as we mentioned, is best understood as a glass, and it is an inevitable altar object. Its content is transformed during the blessing, and for the Christians who taste it makes it possible to unite with Christ. In the New Testament texts, two glasses are linked to Christ's life. Both are of destiny, therefore also prophetic, but one seems to have a greater emphasis on the suffering and bitterness, and the other on pleasure and glory. The cup of bitterness can be considered as the glass Christ tried to avoid with his prayer in the Gethsemane Garden. It's a symbolic glass, and Christ drank its bitterness through the suffering he endured during his torturing death. The other cup is real and that is

¹⁶ James was sleeping with his head on the stone and in his dream, he received a revelation about the destiny that God has destined to his progeny. This place formerly called Luz, Jacob renamed into Betel (cf. Genesis, 28, 10–19).

¹⁷ We need to keep in mind that the Hebrew language as a part of Semitic group of languages well as all other Semitic languages rarely uses vocals in word writing. The words are formulated on the basis of consonant schemes.

¹⁸ We find such symbolism in the notary of a pastor who served on the island of Silba, Antun Garofal (see Sambunjak, 2004: 23).

the cup from the Last Supper, prophetic because it proclaimed the effusion of Christ's blood, but also glorious because it equates to the Eucharist inspired by the glory of Christ who overcame death. This cup from the Last Supper became one of the most famous Christian relics. It is probably the same cup in which during the crucifixion Christ's blood was collected. According to the legends about the collection of Christ's blood, it is sometimes done by Mary Magdalene, and sometimes by Joseph of Arimathea. These people are also related to the transfer of this vessel from Palestine to the west coast of the Mediterranean. They are going through a lot of trouble and angels are helping them, and so the cup is connected or equalized with the grail. That is how the grail becomes a Christian object that is hidden and disclosed, so faithfully kept by the Templars and their heirs. It is believed that this is also the chalice that St. Lovro smuggled with the escort of two soldiers from Rome into Spain and that stayed for a long time in the Valencian Cathedral. It seems that it is always about the same mythical cup that once used to be in heaven, then became the property of King David and his son Solomon, and in the course of history changed the owners and the space in which it was kept. Let us leave this matter as previously interpreted. Sometimes things are interpreted sometimes, but our task is to bring Solomon's glass and the grail into connection with Hektorovic's cup.

Hektorovic and the toast

During a three-day trip in the company of two of his acquaintances and friends, Petar Hektorovic in his *Fishing* many times recorded the events during which one of them drank wine from different vessels that they brought with them. The first and for us the most important episode concerning the wineglass is the one where he offered it as a reward to the younger fisherman Nikola, if he manages to find a solution to the riddle made by the older fisherman Paskoje¹⁹. And when Hektorovic heard the riddle Paskoje said, amazed with the gravity of its solution, he added two more goblets of wine to the prize, if Nikola managed to give the correct answer by the end of the day²⁰. Thus, go-

¹⁹ Paskoj: Mož' li se domislit, / povij mi jeda znaš, // da prij htij razmislit / neg mi odgovor daš: // Nigdi se tužio / vele biše jedan, // da je čudnu imio / nesriću na svoj stan, // bogatac budući / pun svega iman'ja; // jer ga obstupili / zlohotnici bihu, // oružjem strašili, / ko s sobom imihu; // i da mu ujde van / hiža kroz prozore, // on osta savezan, / jer ujti ne more. // Što ti se sad vidi, / može li biti toj / istina, besidi, / ali je laž ovoj?
Nikola: Ako ti ja budu / povidit, toj što je, // ča ćeš da dobuđu, / moj družu Paskoje?
Paskoj: Pehar muškatala / znaj da ćeš dobiti // sladka i sazrila, / kim ti ću služiti. (*Fishing*: 119–134).

²⁰ Ja rekoh: Ne jedan, / da još mu dva daruj, // ako ti po vas dan / izreče pritač tuj! (*Fishing*: 137–138).

blets filled with wine at Hektorovic represent a prize win. Similar was the case in Ancient Greece, where it was customary to award winners of the Olympic Games with an olive oil amphora. Although we are not entirely sure, we suppose that this was the event of origin of a custom that even today, at various sports competitions, the winners will be presented with a prize in the form of a cup. However, in Hektorovic the cup does not require physical but mental effort, and that is why we already have one justification for comparing his cup with Solomon's glass, which gained its true value only after Constantine the Philosopher discovered its meaning through his mental effort. Just like Solomon's glass, Paskoje's riddle had a profound and allegorical meaning, and to the great astonishment of both men who promised him a reward, Nikola interpreted it in detail²¹. Although Hektorovic remained amazed with the way the riddle was set up, as well as with the ability and speed of Nikola's thinking²², Nikola was hurt because he did not receive the promised reward at the time, he was supposed to receive it²³. Hektorovic recognizes the mistake and orders Paskoje to pour three glasses of wine to Nikola from the smaller court. Nikola tells them that he is happy with one, and that he gives the other two to them who promised to give him a reward²⁴. When the first goblet was poured and all three of them were drinking from it, Nicholas commanded that a toast and an honor should be given to the master²⁵.

In old feudal social relationships, it was a common custom for a servant to sing or recite certain verses for every occasion in his master's life. In honor of Hektorovic the fishermen sang an old folk song named after its first verse,

²¹ Nikola: O tome dobitju / ja ću se minuti // i o tome pitju; / da sliš', ako ć' čuti: // Znaš, tko je bogatac, / pun blaga zadosti? // Oni ozubatac, / komu ti ne prosti! // Ako ć' znat, jel toj, / ča ti kazuju, // pošad mu lustre zbroj, / ke srebro minuju! // Ribam da je more / dom, toj mož' viditi, // na suhu ne more nijedna živiti. // Ribam zlohotnici, / ki jih obstupaju, // jesu svi lovnici, / koji jih hitaju. // S koga riba gine, / oružje jest onoj: // pritnji i travine / i pobuci tokoj. // Od prozori, bud znan, / oka su u mriži, // ku kad iztegnu van, / kroz nje more biži. (*Fishing*: 139–152).

²² Kada ja poslušah / tej stvari, u taj čas // začudivši se stah / ne malo smućen vas. // I rekoh: Bratjo ma, svaki vas ufan stoj, // da vam sam sasvima / obezan čuvši toj. // Odkle dojdoh na svit / i po njem putuju // (od sedamdeset lit / daleć se ne čuju, // ka mi starost daše) / i ne znam otkuda, // prid mnom ne gataše / nigdar se taj čuda. // G atku izrečenu / ja bolje na svit saj // ni lipje odrišenu / ne slušah, neg je taj! (Ribanje: 153–162).

²³ Nikola misleć sta, / hoće l' reć al neće, // kakono nevista, / ka želi odveće, // a reć se ujma / neg tretom pitana, // da muža vazima, / li s pomnjom iskana. // Nikoko mučavši / sam sebe izmori, // a pak se ustavši / istom progovori: Nikola: Svaki vas me zabi; / zašto mi ne daste? // Nu, recite, kamo bi / ča mi obećaste? // Gdi mi je dobitje, / ko s trudom misleći // najdoh, ali pitje, / ko dobih jidreći? (Ribanje: 203–212).

²⁴ Rih: Pasko, poteci, / tri daj, kako rismo; // već riči ne reci, // nehote zgrišismo! // Iz manjega suda / počni mu točiti; // veći hrani onuda, / kud ćemo hoditi. // Nikola: Dosta mi će jedan, / neka znate, biti; // nisam toli žedan, / da ću tri popiti. (*Fishing*: 213–218)

²⁵ Učinimo zdravicu / ovde mi na staru, // recmo počasnicu / oba gospodaru (*Fishing*: 221–222)

Naš gospodin poljem jizdi (Our Lord rides the fields²⁶). When the honors were sung, wine from the cups was drunk. However, Hektorovic, who thanked the fishermen for cheering him up with this song, does not drink the wine. He just tasted it, as if he did it only for the sake of politeness trying not to offend the fishermen. The fishermen did not miss it, each was amazed, but they nevertheless drank the goblet offered to them by Hektorovic, who had the honor of drinking first²⁷. But Hektorovic did not want to drink wine. The fishermen probably expected that he would drink his cup, and that their other two, which they had previously agreed to drink, would follow. Due to Hektorovic's act, they were amazed, they drank the wine from the goblet, but because of their courtesy and respect for their master, they did not dare to pour the other two goblets of wine, as they usually did²⁸. Considering that a miracle exists only for those people who do not understand things and events, we will try to explain Hektorovic's surprising act. We will agree with the already existing reasoning that Hektorovic did not drink wine because he realized that the honorary song was not sung in order to celebrate any nobles, especially not him, but it is a song of mythological character that celebrates the deity and spirit of the Moon (Sambunjak, 2009: 86). In that poem, the planet of the Moon is hidden in an allegorical and enigmatic way, just like a toothpick from Paskoje's riddle. The Moon was conceived and chanted as a traveler, a horseman riding the sky showed as a field. The companionship, which is shown in the honorary song as the golden books, should be understood as golden stars scattered throughout the sky. The mistress who weighed his gold wreath is actually Moon's mythical companion, the star called Danica (morning star). Heroic jumps from stone to stone²⁹ are to be

²⁶ Naš gospodin poljem jizdi, / jizda da mu je. // Na glavi mu svilan klobuk, / sinca da mu je, // u ruci mu zlatne knjige, / družba da mu je, // prid njim sluga pisan poje, / na čast da mu je. // Majka mu je lipo ime dila / svitla sunca gledajući, // ljuba mu je zlatom venčac vila / uz konjica potičići. // Lipo ti je, brajo, pogledati / lipa skoka junačkoga, // gdi mi junak poskakuje / od kamenka do kamenka, // bila ličca pokazuje // iza ščitka perenoga, // iza ščitka perenoga. (*Fishing*: 228–238)

²⁷ Tad ja okusivši, / svaki se začudi, // a oni popivši: Hvala vam rih, budi, // ki tako pojući / mene veselite, // razgovor dajući / službu mi činite! (*Fishing*: 239–242)

²⁸ Meni je ovoj dosti / po nauku momu; // niktor vas ne prosti / tomu ni ovomu, // sve je toj pečeno, / ne da se povrati, // i na plav sneseno, / ner da se potratiti! // Videć da ne ću ja, / ni oni ne htiše, // neg da za drugovja / hrane odliučše. (*Fishing*: 197–202)

²⁹ And in our oral tradition, the belief that has its roots in the ancient civilizations of the East is preserved that the heavenly sun-carriages are pulled by horses of different possibilities through the ecliptic. On one side of the carriage there is a fast horse of low endurance – a racing horse, and on the other a slow horse of great endurance – a working horse. The horses take the initiative in turns, pulling the carriage with different speed and power. The carriage cannot move in a straight line, but the path is winding (this is seen in the song as rock-to-rock jumps). A more durable and slow horse leads in the summer, which makes the day long and the Sun warms very much, while the fast horse pulls the carriage at high speed across

understood as the real image of the wind-borne clouds behind or above which the Moon hides and appears, and they are also its feathered shield, which is mentioned in the honorary song (cf. Sambunjak, 2009: 88–89).

That it is indeed the Moon whose real essence Hektorovic has enigmatically and poetically concealed perfectly, and that the drinking of wineglasses in *Fishing* is made in the glory of the Moon's celestial night light, are convincingly demonstrated by previous interpretations. However, we will try to show that Hektorovic had the artistic impulse and the idea to speak about the Moon in such a mysterious way and to show that the Moon deserves to be toasted with a wine cup, had in a glass that was owned by King Solomon. Let's recall that in the first verse of Solomon's glass, Constantine recognized that it was a prophetic cup and that its prophecy should go up to the stars' sky. The glass should therefore be interpreted as an encrypted astronomical and astrological record. The beginnings of astronomy as the oldest natural science date back to the time before the first great civilizations and its roots are deep in ancient mythologies and religions. Along with astronomy, an astrological practice has evolved that has followed it through the centuries. The astrology similar to the present one has its origins in the Old Babylonian State. The Sumerians were the first to worship the Moon, the Sun and Venus. Much later in Greece, astronomy and astrology will receive their scientific method. The astronomy was considered a special branch of mathematics in Greece. Greek astronomy spread to all centers of Hellenistic culture and reached its apogee in Alexandria, where Ptolemy lived, who had collected almost all astrological knowledge in *Tetrabiblos* up to that time. Solomon's glass was written in Jewish letters, and the starry sky was of great interest to Jews in whom gematria referred to calculating the calendars. For the deeper knowledge of the stars, the Jews used the knowledge of their neighbors the Greeks and Babylonians. It is to the Jews that the invaluable merits of restoring the old mystical teachings belong, because they are the mediators through which the Arab Renaissance reached Europe. Although the development of Christianity stopped the spread of astrology, the Bible, especially John's New Testament section, demonstrated a high level of astronomical and astrological knowledge. It is sufficient now to point out only the fact that in the New Testament we come across a text that confirms that the sign of a star understood by magicians from the east proclaimed the birth of Christ³⁰.

the sky in winter, thus shortening the day and cooling the Sun (Utrobičić, 2014: 110–111). We assume that what is true of the Sun is equally true of the Moon that is under its influence and that receives its light from the Sun.

³⁰ After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem and asked, „Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews? We saw his star when it rose and have come to worship him“ (Matthew, 2: 1–2).

But, nor Solomon's glass, therefore, or even the cup of wine which Hektorovic did not want to drink, are intended to be toasted with in the glory of the birth of Christ, or is this glass intended to be used by Christ. This cup was first and foremost aimed to toast to the celestial Moon, which is also called the Lord on the cup of Solomon. In her first verse, after noting that she prophesies to the stars, she also commands her to be a drink for the Lord, the firstborn who watches at night. Not even on the cup of Solomon is this Lord named, but He is great and deserves a toast. However, on the glass, in the inscription, in the further explanation, separated by a comma, and therefore underlined, we undoubtedly suspect that it is the Moon, and Hektorovic also sensed it. If the glass was made with the intention of observing the starry sky and interpreting the constellations, its creator Solomon, whose name refers to the sky lights, thought that the one watching the starry sky would be most impressed by the reflection of sunlight reflected on the Moon. The Moon is the Lord among the stars, the firstborn who shines and watches at night³¹. The Moon has been the source of many myths and stories and has played a significant role in the afterlife in many ancient cultures. In Egyptian culture, the god of the Moon is Tot, who is pictured as the sunset and the appearance of the Moon that illuminates the night. In Osiris' death court, Tot assessed the deceased's righteousness and sinfulness. The Moon's goddess of the ancient Greeks was Selena, and of the ancient Romans Luna. In the Old Testament, the Moon became a symbol of the Jews as the nomads after leaving Egypt. The Jews especially worshiped the young Moon and this is confirmed by the prophet Isaiah³². The Moon also had special respect in the Islamic religion in which religious practices were adapted according to his changes. With the advent of the young Moon in the sky after his three-day disappearance in the underworld, Allah strengthened the belief in the resurrection of the human race. The adjustment of religious rites according to the lunar cycle is also characteristic of some Christian rites and moving holidays. The Moon is the most common metaphor for death because it is most commonly associated with the souls of the deceased as their residence. The oral folk tradition has preserved a number of beliefs about the kin relations between the celestial bodies of the Sun, the Moon and star Danica. Hektorovic also noted this belief in a song that seems to celebrate the Moon's marriage, we assume with the Danica star. But that was not the main reason why Hektorovic's company drank the wine from goblets. Hektorovic was primarily concerned with the immortality of his soul,

³¹ And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also (Book of Genesis 1,17).

³² From new moon to new moon, and from Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh shall come to worship before me, declares the Lord (Isaiah, 66: 23).

but also with the immortality of his poetic work which he was creating at that moment. As it was not over yet, Hektorovic did not want to drink the wine from the goblet, but he wanted to drink from it as soon as he noticed that the fishermen had stopped thinking about the goblet that had served Hektorovic as a means of expressing a different and sublime reality.

Solomon's glass also referred to another reality, with the inscription that stood out as her second verse. This verse reveals the existence of another glass, precisely the one intended to be used by Christ and from which he drank wine at his last supper. The one that is meant for the Lord to taste is made of some other wood. We suppose that the wooden cup used by Christ was made by his breadwinner and stepfather Joseph, who was a fine carpenter. But as Solomon's glass inscription indicates, it is not made of the usual wood that Joseph used every day to process. It is made of some other wood. This means that it had to be made of some specific wood that best suits the purpose of the object made of it. Since the inscription giving the information about this glass is Solomon's, we have a reason to believe that this glass was made of wood that, according to some apocryphal texts³³, came out from paradise and which King Solomon, because of its strange and supernatural properties, failed to use in the construction of his temple, so it was later used by the Jews³⁴. One part

³³ In the Glagolitic Tkon Collection we have the Apocrypha about Adam's death, and part of this text is as follows: „I tako Adam učini, imi sina komu bi ime / Sit. Adam kada imi .z. (9) sat let i .j. (30) otnemo / re i bi mu kako umreti i prizva k sebi svoga / sina Sita i reče: 'Sinu moi, poidi k vrat rač / k Mihovilu arhanj(e)lu i povij nemu vsu nemoć / moju i on tebi da pomasti kimi isceliju!' I kada pride Sit prid vrat rač sa umilaniem ve/likim i poče prositi likarie ocu svome plač / uči se gorko, reče nemu Mihovil: 'Otac tvoji umrl e(st6) / i ne prime isceleniš dokle ne mine .dč. (5000) let!' I to / rek zatvori vrata raju, a Sit stoje pri vra / teh slze poče izlivati očima svoima. / Tada anj(e)l prinese nemu ednu šibicu i reče / emu: 'Idi i vsadi ju v gori Maslinskoi i kada učini plod, tada isceli otac tvoji!'/ I nahačemo vjednoj ištarii grčkoi da ta šiba vzeta e ot driva kim Adam prel/aščen bi. I kada vrati se Sit i naide oca svoga mrtva i pokopana i vs / adi tu šibu pri glavi Adamovi. / I vsaeni biši nei, raste do vrime Da / vida c(ěsa)ra. Od sina nega, Solomuna c(ěsa)ra”“ (*Tkonski zbornik* 43r – 49v).

³⁴ The Apocrypha on the baptismal tree reports the following events related to that tree: „I kad Solomun crikav zidaše ki mu biše Bog zapovidal zidati, tada ono drvo za lipotu njega učini posici i hoti ž njega teg učiniti crikvi. I vsi meštri nigdare ne mogaše toga driva pripraviti v teg, jere nigda biše dlgo a nigda kratko. A oni za sramotu toga driva včiniše v njem most na jednoj potoci pred Jerusolimom kuda ljudi hojahu i dobitak. I kada pride Saba kraljica viditi mudrosti Solomunje i govorivši s njim vrati se ot Solomuna. I mimo hodeći po onom drivu i po svetom Duhu zvidi i pozna da je vele moćno plemenito drivo tere malo odšadši posla k Solomunu rekući: 'Dam ti vidjeti da drivo ko v takoi mesti (v) vašćini stoji da po njem vse kraljevstvo židovsko ima poginuti.' Cesar Solomun slišav to, vze drivo to tere je v tretom obzidi pokopa globoko v zemlju. I potom onde lokva se učini vrhu onoga driva pred pristriškom Solomunjim tere sta onde dari do jatja Gospodina. A kada bi zajutra v veliki petak, tada drivo zišlo biše van iz zemlje tere plavaše po vodi. I tadaj Židove prokleti vzeše ono drivo i ž njega učiniše Gospodinu križ na kom ga raspeše. I tada isplni se rič an'jelova

was used by Joseph for a glass, and from the rest a cross was made on which Christ was crucified. The wood from which, according to our belief, the cup of Christ was made, was also prophetic. It foretold the doom of the Jewish kingdom and proclaimed Christ as the savior from the death, the deliverer from the darkness and the king of the light. The cup of Christ is sacrificial and celebratory. It is a glass whose fulfillment Christ paid for with his sacrifice on the cross, but it is also a glass that Christians should happily drink from and sing Hallelujah, because that imperative is written in the second verse of Solomon's glass.

In addition to the imperative, while pointing to the verse that belonged to Christ, this verse, with its placement on the plan of the stylistic composition of the inscription on Solomon's glass, conveys another message. It is its central verse, so it symbolically talks about Christ's sojourn and the glass he used while he served on earth. The first verse symbolically represents Christ who came down from heaven and returned to heaven again. It represents the glory of Christ who dwells in the light in heaven. It reveals Solomon's and Constantine's, and later Hector's conviction that Christ brings revelation through celestial bodies like the sun, moon and stars. The last and third verse of Solomon's glass refers to Christ's three-day abode in the underground. It refers to it with its composition, as the last and lowest verse on the glass, but also with the words that it is made up of. Let's recall, these words mention a prince whose glory is to be seen by all the congregation of people, among whom King David, the father of Solomon, is particularly prominent. An extremely valuable contribution to the interpretation of this verse is the one which recognized its treatment in the fine arts of Constantine's time. Those are the icons that depict Christ's descent into hell. One fresco with this theme is in the Church of Sts. Clement in Rome from 9th c. in which according to Method's wish his brother Constantine, the discoverer of the meaning of Solomon's cup, and the discoverer of the sunken body of the Christian martyr St. Clement was buried. This fresco depicts Christ surrounded by glory, with a cross in one hand, a weapon that he triumphs over the demon under his feet, and the other hand extends to Adam to get him out of hell. There are many such icons called Descending to Hell and Rising from the Dead from the 14th, 15th and 16th Century and all of them depict Christ breaking down the gates of hell and extending a hand to Adam with the intention of helping him get out of hell, and around him is a congregation of people among whom Solomon is identified with a crown on his head and David with a harp in his hand (cf. Sambuniak 2007: 237).

ku biše rekal Situ: Kada to drivo plod učini, tada tvoj otac zdrav bude. A Gospodin naš umrv na križi i pojde k paklu i izvede ot tuda Adama i oce svete iz tamnice i postavi je v svetlost večnu, amen" (*PSH* 1, 1969: 160).

Undoubtedly, the glass that heralds Christ's victory over death is celebratory. Drinking the wine from that glass is prayerful and celebratory. It is prayerful because at the last supper of Christ, when He raised his glass, He warned those present to drink from it, because it is the glass of His blood that will be shed for the forgiveness of sins. The ancient people sacrificed their gods with the blood of humans and more often with the blood of animals. They thought that the wine was the blood of the god Dionysus, by whom he had drunk his followers. The Jews also sacrificed to God with blood and wine. The daily sacrifice to the Old Testament God was a mixture of wheat flour, oil and wine. But before the glory of God appeared in the Mount of Sinai, Moses ordered the slaughter of one calf, of which he poured half the blood on the altar and sprinkled the other half over the people. Therefore Christ, on the Last supper, established the substitution of blood, in His case human, by wine. For this reason, drinking wine from a glass referring to Christ is prayerful, it is drunk to save one's own soul and in the glory of Christ, the victor of death and the deliverer of souls from their sufferings in hell. As far as Hektorovic was aware of the fact of death, which turns out to be the final threat to man and everything that man made for his life, and how he understood the message from Solomon's glass, we are about to check.

In the first encounter with Hektorovic's cup we did not receive any information about its appearance. All we learned was that it was intended to be toasted in honor of the great gentleman, even though it was a toothpick whose lordship was represented by his scales³⁵ or the moon being the lord and lord of the night sky, or Hektorovic himself whom his fishermen regarded as a respectable gentleman. We also know that on this occasion, Hektorovic did not drink the wine from the goblet, considering that he was not the gentleman to whom the honorary song was sung. However, in the central part of *Fishing*, Hektorovic expresses a strong desire to drink the wine, allegedly because of a great thirst for which he does not know the cause³⁶. When the fishermen wanted to serve him with the wine, a quarrel ensued between them, because there was no small bowl (*kupica*) or goblet from which their master needed to drink³⁷. Hektorovic was served in another bowl, a cup that had been taken for the fishermen to drink from. Slightly smaller than the goblet, this cup was

³⁵ Znaš tko je bogatac, / pun blaga zadosti? // Oni zubatac, / komu ti ne prosti! // Ako ć' znat, je li toj, / ča ti ja kazuju, // pošad mu lustre zbroj, / ke srebro minuju! (*Fishing*: 141–144).

³⁶ Oni jur svoziše/ sežanj dvi hil'jade, // kad, ne znam ča biše, / žeja me napade; // al bihu kopita / uzrok, al ježine, // al vručina lita, / al ke stvari ine. // Riħ: Žeja me tira, / nu mi dajte piti; // nije toj zamira, / navlastito liti! (*Fishing*: 805–810).

³⁷ Kad oni da dadu / i da služe htiše, // vidih velu svadu: / ričmi se snitiše, // jer ne bi buklije / onde ni pehara; // jedan mre od jije, / a drugi se stara. // Pak su se svidili / (stid ih biše reći), // da su toj zabili / pastiru služeći. (*Fishing*: 811–816).

handcrafted in an antique fashion way, made of excellent silver, and had a gilding along the edges³⁸. The cup is not unworthy to be drunk from by any gentleman. Therefore, fishermen should not, therefore, be ashamed of themselves if they were brought a cup to drink exclusively from it. It seems that it had the same value as the lost Hektorovic's goblet, since while drinking from the cup said that he was not so sorry for the goblet itself, as much as the memory of a friend from Damascus who had once gifted it to him³⁹. It is hard to believe the truth of Hektorovic's indifference towards the lost goblet. Had he not been truly chased by the fear of losing the item, Hektorovic would not have needed to talk about it further, and would not have allowed the fishermen to turn the boat around and go back in search of it. This cup had a great meaning for Hektorovic. Hektorovic leaves the strongest artistic impression of this goblet in the words that begin his description: *Kada u njem staše / vince al vodica, // na dnu mu se sjaše / s Misecom Danica* (own translation *When there was / wine or water, // at the bottom of it / the Moon glittered with star Danica*). We further learn that this goblet also had an inscription on it as his imperative to cheer society wherever he was present. This inscription was inscribed in Moriscian lettering, engraved before the goblet was gilded, giving it a perfect and radiant glow⁴⁰.

It is difficult to assess Hektorovic's competencies for translating some Semitic, perhaps Persian, as well as Turkish, that is, Ural-Altai text, written in Arabic using those few Moors who, after their expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula, managed to keep some of their own old cultures. Philip III. he issued an order banning all Hispano-Arabs in 1609 and since then there has been no way for them to be bona fide Spaniards. Some still lived in Spain and had to hide their Muslim identity, so they also used cryptography to preserve their classical literature (cf. Barolt, 2004: 181–295). Because of their small size, these were called the Moriscians – the little Moors. The Moriscians were, therefore, chroniclers of a disappearing world and those writers who sought to save their old cultural treasures in a new and unfavorable environment for them. It is not necessary to question Hektorovic's knowledge of that old language, because we must also observe Hektorovic's text as a poetic expression that does not respect the proper boundaries of a language. It is much more important to understand that Hektorovic refers to the Moriscian letter only

³⁸ Meni tuj služiše / vinca razvodnjena // kupicom, ka biše / za njih ponesena, // po krajih zlaćena, / srebra izvarsnoga, // tegom napravljena, / načina staroga. (*Fishing*: 817–820).

³⁹ Malo t' me griziše / taj škoda takova, // neg ča mi drag biše / ki mi ga darova. // Od Damaška strane / doni ga znanac moj // meu stvari izbrane, / kojim ne biše broj (*Fishing*: 823–826).

⁴⁰ Meštar na nj pisat ht i/ ovu rič ne inu: // „Gdi godi budeš ti, / veseli družinu!“ // Moriškimi slovi / toj hti upisati, // pri ner ga gotovi / i zlatom pozlati (*Fishing*: 829–832).

because of the fact that the letter conveyed secret messages accessible only to those who were instructed in the methods of encoding such messages. We believe that Hektorovic offered a deeper and hidden message in the inscription that he testified to be present on his cup, and he designed it and wrote it down in *Fishing*. We will talk about its possible meaning later. It is important to know now that the Hektorovic goblet also had an inscription, and the inscription is an indispensable characteristic of the grail and something that has long functioned as a puzzle on Solomon's glass.

The differences on the lexical plan in the inscription of Hektorovic's cup and that part of the inscription of Solomon's glass which speaks of her drinking are minimal. The inscription on Hektorovic's cup cannot be interpreted without its contextual involvement in Hektorovic's artistic speech about the appearance of the cup. In this description, Hektorovic tries to present the image of the goblet with a completely natural, yet strange, connection between wine and water, and the Moon and Danica star. These motifs bring Hektorovic's cup closer to Solomon's cup, but in the semantic field, Hektorovic's cup might make a little richer sense. Like Solomon's glass, which speaks of Christ, the savior from the death, Hektorovic's description of the cup is none other than his talk of life and death. Hektorovic longs for life, dedicating his *Fishing* to the life of the common man, and yet he drinks death like wine⁴¹. Christ turned water into wine at a wedding in Galilee, and Peter Hektorovic will speak about that event in a poetic and philosophical way. Until then, no philosopher⁴² or poet has expressed, in a more lucid and romantic way, this life-long puzzle about the boundaries of life and death. Hektorovic despises death, wants his literary and life work to be immortal⁴³, so for the first time he refuses to drink wine as a reward. We said that he saw that he was not glorified or his work. Hektorovic want to secure as much mortality to his creative work as to his soul⁴⁴. His strong desire to drink wine from the goblet that was lost represents his concern for his own soul. The lost goblet represented an apparent death, as it was later found and returned to its owner. Hektorovic does not

⁴¹ Wine and water are solar and lunar, two great cosmic powers: they represent a blending of divine and human nature, divinity mixed with humanity.

⁴² Hektorovic in his *Fishing* through Paskoje's mouth questions the meaning of Pythagoras' Golden Verses (*Fishing*: 1045–1064).

⁴³ Jere, gospodine, / mužu plemeniti, // jer ćeš imiti / u knjižici ovoj, // u kojoj ćeš vidjeti / i vas lov i put moj; // kojom ćeš živiti / pun slavna imena, // skončan'ja ne imiti / do duga vrimena: // dokle strana ova, / der do togaj vika; bude čtiti slova / našega jezika! // Toj ti će draže bit / ner moja lovina // (ke bi bil barzo sit) / al koja stvar ina. // Ja ću želit meni, / rodjače primili, // da bi mi taki dni / često dohodili! (*Fishing* 1674–1684).

⁴⁴ The *Fishing* is flooded with exposition of acts of mercy, truth, and justice that must be satisfied in life in order for man to attain to the heavenly life.

talk about death for the sake of dying, a necessary process of human life, but about dying for the sake of life. He also sees the seeds of wheat grain which must disappear in the earth to produce the fruit of life in the goblet, which, we have noted, is connected with the Grail and the Eucharistic chalice, the goblet which is lost for a short time⁴⁵.

The look into the goblet reflected Hektorovic's vague, when it came to wine and water, or quite clear and crystallized, when it came to the moon and Danica, an image of life and human destiny recorded somewhere among the stars. Hektorovic repeatedly points out that there are no boundaries between the things and phenomena that surround us in life. He saw that the opposite, bipolarity, is the basic principle of the existence of the world, and its sustainability hides, Hektorovic teaches, in the aspiration and tension of approaching of these opposites, to the extent that the opposite completely disappears. So when the opposite disappears, when the tension between things loses its vibrancy, when things and phenomena in life seem to have lost the meaning of their existence, with some mysterious and unfathomable forces of nature the true opposite is renewed just like day and night, sun and moon⁴⁶. The same is true of human life, Hektorovic was convinced. In the *Fishing*, it is showed how constant conflict leads the old age and the youth. Precisely because this conflict in *Fishing* that Hektorovic wanted to conceal⁴⁷, it becomes one of the most obvious things to think about. If life is visibly renewed at a young age and new generations, it is invisibly, renewed in the afterlife, which must be a reflection of the life that man lived on earth. In his goblet, which with its appearance, and two opposite and tightly coupled domes, reminded him of the grave and the firmament of heaven, Hektorovic had ample space to think about the pleasures of life like drinking wine, and at the same time knowing the bitter truth about its transience. As a man of earthly things, he is a poet of absolute human destiny. All human potencies and possibilities end in death. With all the joy of life, Hektorovic saw at one glance in his goblet his own and human's existential tragedy. However, his personal defeat was intended to be

⁴⁵ Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit (John, 12:24).

⁴⁶ The basic principle of alchemy is that it constantly emphasizes the division within man resulting from the loss of original unity. Its main symbol is hierogamy, a holy marriage between sulfur and mercury, spirit and soul, sun and moon, king and queen.

⁴⁷ Hector's company, in addition to the two fishermen, was made up of the son of the fisherman Paskoje, and was mentioned precisely in the episode with the lost goblet, when Paskoje reproached Nikola for his negligence resulting in the loss of the goblet. Hektorovic points out that Paskoje was reproaching Nikola for the purpose of teaching his son how careful he should be in life: „A to, ča mogu znat, / još veće činjaše // za sinu nauk dat, / ki ga slišaše“ (*Fishing*: 861–862).

replaced by poetic glory. While a man is alive, while his mind is pure – until wine and water mix, Hektorovic expressed himself poetically, he has the ability to discern what is good, useful and true, and has the capacity to achieve his goals.

That is how, in a seemingly simple yet stylistically sophisticated and philosophically thought-out formulation about his goblet, Hektorovic wants to show man's miserable littleness under the stars, but also the hope that good and humane human works will shine even when their creator no longer looks at the sun or when it stops heating him. Hektorovic takes a look at life by looking at it as an indestructible value and his belief is that a man dies only if his life and soul were dead and inactive and if he did not relate creatively to the world in which he lived. Hektorovic showed his creative attitude towards the world and things already well known in it with the example of his cup. As much as he successfully modeled his cup according to Solomon's glass and was strongly determined by it, Hektorovic was completely original in the inscription on his cup. Hektorovic showed his originality in the most incredible place, where the difference with the sample is minimized. The similarity between the inscription on Hektorovic's cup that says: *Gdi god budeš ti, veseli družinu* (own translation *Wherever you are, cheer the company*), and that verse on Solomon's glass that imperatively says: *Pij i napijaj se i s veseljem kliči Aleluja* (own translation *Drink and get drunk and cheerfully call Hallelujah*), is so obvious that there is no need to further strengthen that connection.

However, we have created an opportunity to say now that with his deep deliberation of the language and meanings produced by it beneath the surface of the visible message giving the order to be happy, Hektorovic concealed a completely opposite and frightening message that functions as a warning to fishermen and readers that each and every small thing in life you have to think seriously. Saying that the master wanted to type that word on the cup (referring to the message – words that were written on the cup) and not the other, Hektorovic warned in the most obvious and direct way that there was another message in the inscription besides the one explicitly printed. The inscription of Hektorovic's cup consists of twenty-seven graphs. For a more careful observer of this inscription, it is impossible not to notice the balance that Hektorovic has established between vocals and consonants. The inscription consists of twelve vocals and fifteen consonants, so it may seem that the consonants have a little dominance. However, we must take into account the fact that among the consonants that do not repeat in the inscription are phonemes *r* and *l*, which in Croatian can sometimes be infamous. In the inscription we can have the formula $12 + 2$ versus $15 - 2$ which means that we have a fairly uniform result. If we want to make the result even, the formula may look $12 +$

1 versus 15 - 2 or 12 + 2 versus 15 - 1. How accurate the result will be depends on how the message is read. We are certain of one thing, Hektorovic mixed the letters in the inscription in the manner and to the same extent that wine and water were mixed on the other side of the wall, that is, inside the goblet. Hektorovic said that wine and water were mixed to such an extent that enables the clarity of the Moon and Danica in the depth of view were directed into the goblet. Taking into account the fact that the Moon in some cultures, such as the Iranians, was seen as a vessel containing the drink of immortality and that Christ came into the world under the star sign, we assume that Hektorovic's inscription on the cup must point to death, Christ, and salvation.

That Hektorovic's inscription really points to something else, and that the other is very important, is confirmed with the artistic portrayal of the hand that shows such things with a gesture. In *Fishing*, at the place where Hektorovic quotes the goblet inscription, immediately before the inscription, there is an artistic depiction of a hand with a pointing finger pointing towards the quote of the inscription, and since the entire hand whose direction the extended index finger is following, is placed in relation to the verses an angle of approximately 45 degrees, it as much points to the inscription, as it also points to the sky. In the inscription, therefore, we will try to read the message concerning the sky. In doing so, we will use the method that Hektorovic gladly applied, which is the anagram method, the intermingling of voices within words in order to get a new meaning. Hektorovic mixed words in one place, and that was within the question concerning the meaning of Pythagoras' *Golden Verses*. Before quoting Pythagoras' verses, Hektorovic formulates the question: *Da ča je htíl reći?* (own translation *What did he want to say?*), and after numerous Pythagoras verses, he rephrased it into: *Da ča je reći htíl?* (own translation *What he wanted to say?*). As Hektorovic pointed to the method of tossing in this matter, some researchers went a step further than Hektorovic himself in studying this question. Shuffling the voices that make up the issue revealed the new meaning of such a Hektorovic play in language. It has been discovered that by means of the anagram method it is possible to create a meaningful admonition in which it says: *Hčí, daleče ti raj* (own translation *My daughter, far away is the paradise*). The graphemes remained the same, but the meaning was much different and richer⁴⁸. If at that point the message was referring to the unreachability of paradise, it is possible, and it is to be expected, that the inscription on the goblet would indicate its proximity and reach. Thus, by tossing the phonemes that make up the inscription: *Gdi god budeš ti, veseli*

⁴⁸ The term daughter refers to Mary Magdalen, who is sometimes considered a daughter of Zion, and who is related to the holy grail (Sambunjak, 2009: 368–371).

družinu (own translation *Wherever you are, cheer the company*), it is possible to get the message: *Usliši te Gdin i uvede gori* (own translation *The Lord has heard you and brought you up into heaven, into paradise*). Such a message fits well with the artistic gesture of the hand that preceded it and the message that was encoded in the question about the meaning of Pythagoras' words. But we are aware of its shortcomings. We have abbreviated the name Lord, and this could be justified by the *principle of nomine sacra*, which was ruled in the Old Slavic language, according to which the holy names were shortly spelled. However, we did not use all the graphs, so this is already a more serious problem. Of the twenty-seven we used twenty-two, with five remaining unused: four consonants *d*, *d*, *b*, *z* (Croatian letter *ž*) and vocal *u*. If we were to try to use these phonemes as well, and somehow incorporate them into the meaning of the message received, we could assume the Old Slavic and Chakavian word for rain, *dъždb*, and the remaining two phonemes *b* and *u* would be understood as the initial and abbreviated form for any face of the futur verb to be. We might as well have a continuation of the message that says that after the ascension into the sky man will be as pure as the rain, shine as a drop of dew, and blessed, because the rain and dew are a sign of God's blessing on earth. As the signs of rain can be recognized on the Moon, and the stars in the night sky are a sign that the rain will not fall, thus the new meaning of the inscription on the goblet, where, when it is full of wine and water, the Moon and Danica can be seen, becomes more significant.

Despite the solution found, we still retain a certain dose of criticality and fear that we have not completely destroyed the nerve of doubt. Fear is given to us by a hand that seems to threaten the reader and warns him that if he does not look closely at the matter, he will make a fatal mistake. With a refined look at the hand and the inscription it refers to, we find out, it seems to us, its true relation to the text in front of which it stands. That hand with the extended index finger explicitly indicates that one message is visible and clear, and the four other and folded fingers indicate that there are four other messages in the same place, unclear and obscure. As the hand is painted and placed in front of the observer in such a way that he looks at it from its outer, dorsal side, he fully sees the extended index finger, and from the next three fingers, middle, rings and little finger, sees only the first articles partially rotated in relation to the wrist. The thumb, as the dominant finger, is not accessible to the observer at all, since it remains hidden in the hand and under the other bent fingers. This means that Hektorovic hid the very first message that we had discovered recently and that would be an outstretched thumb, because in such a position it would point directly to the sky. To reach heaven, one has to travel a long way on earth, beware

of sins, harm, Hektorovic said⁴⁹, and endure many troubles with a sense of longing for happiness. This will be the true meaning of Hektorovic's *Fishing*, and it is precisely such a message that Hektorovic will display with his middle and longest finger on his hand, which if stretched out and directed horizontally, as the position of hand indicates the direction of man's necessary movement on earth, which is forward. The message that that finger symbolically conceals can be written like this: *Vedi! Sgrišni dugo budete žudili* (own translation *Know! You will long with sinners for a long time*). With this message, Hektorovic notes that every man is more or less sinful and will answer for his sins according to Christian eschatology, which Hektorovic is well aware of in the judgment of God, which will happen to him after his death.

Again, Hektorovic drank from the cup to save his soul, and his drinking was prayerful. That is why we will attach this message to the one we assume is hidden under the bent finger that follows the middle one, and with the previous message it will be meaningfully close. This message could be written like this: *Vedi tu žeđ. Grišni se dugo budili*. (own translation *Know that thirst! You will wake up for a long time as a sinner*). As also in the previous semantically related one, we could replace the vowels *i* and *e* that are in the imperative verb form and in the subject or adverb, *the sinner*. Then, instead of the imperative *vedi* (*know*), we would have the imperative *vidi* (*look, observe carefully*), and instead of the icavian, *grišni* (sinful), we would have the ekavian flock reflex and form *grešni* (sinful). Although there is such a possibility, nothing changes the message meaningfully. We had a reason to read the message so that its verb is *vedi* (*know*) rather than *vidi* (*look*), because Hektorovic gave clear signals in his *Fishing* that we should use that verb. When it came to the prize that Nicholas was to receive, and it referred to the wineglass, that is, the one with the inscription on it, Hektorovic used the syntagma with that verb⁵⁰. In the second place, when Hektorovic recounts his acquaintance whom they met at sea and was invited to his boat, he pretended not to remember him in front of the fishermen who asked him later about that friend. In his reply to Paskoje, he expressed regret, but also warned that he would think of why he did not ask the acquaintance *tko je taj* (who is that). However, in the answer, which we find in the text in parentheses as a prominent and important part of the answer, he made a note to Paskoje almost threatening him with the words *dobro znaj* (*know well*)⁵¹. This is the reason we assume we should use the imperative *znaj*

⁴⁹ Lahko ćeš doteći / gdi se tak ishode // s nepomnjom ne hteći // čuvat se od škode (*Fishing*: 857–858).

⁵⁰ Pehar muškati / znaj da ćeš dobiti // sladka i sazrila, / kim ću ti služiti (*Fishing*: 133–134).

⁵¹ I žal mi će biti, / kad smislim (dobro znaj) // da jih uprositi / ne mogoh, tko je taj (*Fishing*: 1213–1214).

(know), and now we can know that these two covert messages convey the same content that covertly was expressed in the third verse of Solomon's glass. This verse implicitly indicated the rising of the righteous and their awakening to a new life, the end of their suffering and longing for happiness. Hektorovic's covert inscription hides in himself Hektorovic's thirst, which he wants to quench in paradise sources. Traditionally, paradise is presented with four sources and there are four messages on Hektorovic's cup pointing towards paradise. Three are hidden in the same one explicitly written by Hektorovic: *Gdi god budeš veseli družinu* (own translation *Wherever you are, cheer the company*). And where else could a goblet be, if not in the paradise from which the Grail in that form came among men. To the two noteworthy messages we discovered recently, it seems interesting to add one more: *Vedi tu sudbu. Ego grišni dili žeđ*. (own translation *Know that fate. I sinfully share my thirst*). Hector's look at the goblet in which he saw wine and water, the moon and Danica could remind him of the torment that sinners suffer in hell⁵². One of them relates to the torment of thirst, and it is possible that such fear overwhelmed Hektorovic in his advanced life, when his death became a certain fact of life. However, we will reject such a message because we have forcibly read it, introduced elements of Latin into Hektorovic's old Croatian and Chakavian language.

Not wanting to disturb the beauty and harmony of the language in which Hektorovic wrote his *Fishing*, and in which Hektorovic managed to convey a message written in Moriscian letters for which he assures us that they were engraved on his cup, we will try to read the fifth message also. We think that this message has something to do with the little finger of the visual representation of the hand. We believe that this little finger represents the smallest and youngest person that Hektorovic has just mentioned in *Fishing*, and it could be that Hektorovic wrote the piece precisely because of that person, Paskoje's son, in order to provide him with the knowledge that will help him to master a great life lesson the easiest way. The fifth message is for Paskoje's son, who had to watch every little thing of the three-day trip in the company he sailed with with childish curiosity, and which had to make a strong impression on him. The most powerful impression on Paskoje's son had to be left by the accident and discomfort that had taken over the company when they realized that the master's goblet had been lost. For a long time, no one spoke a word, and then Paskoje began to blame Nicholas for his guilt. Hektorovic pretended not to be bitten by the

⁵² Thirst as a form of torture for sinners in the other world Hektorovic could have known from the Gospel parable about the rich man and the just and poor Lazarus, whose soul the rich man saw from afar in Abraham's bosom. The rich man asked Abraham to send him Lazarus, whom he begs to dip his finger in water and put a drop of water cool his tongue. Abraham did not have mercy on the sinner and left him to suffer in the fire of hell (see Luke 16: 19–25).

remorse⁵³ for such damage. We learned that Hektorovic should not be trusted in what he literally says, and we were convinced that we could expect exactly the opposite. That is why in the fifth message we will assume the word that makes the phonetic structure *grižnu* (bitter), because Hektorovic tried to hide it. From the phonetic structure of the goblet message, it is unquestionably feasible, and it is our task to reconfigure other phonemes to obtain a message that confirms our assumption. This message will say: *Vedi grižnu di bedu stigoše ludi* (own translation *Know the bitterness in the place where people came in misery*). The last noun of the message can also be understood in a way that would be appropriate for the current state of the Croatian language, and it could refer to people who act like crazy because they do not think about their actions and are very careless. The form of the noun could have had such meaning also in Hektorovic's language, which is completely irrelevant in this context.

It is important that we discovered Hektorovic's warning that, in *Fishing*, Paskoje wanted to imprint on his son. Pascoje's son needed to learn how necessary it is to be careful in life, because if he is careless in life, he will soon lose everything, first small things and then big and important things like home⁵⁴. When talking about home, habitat, Hektorovic thinks of paradise⁵⁵, so the same admonition that he first let Paskoje to say, will be repeated in the cup by which he wants to reach paradise. Hektorovic saw that many people were getting into misery and poverty in their lives, but he realized that a common cause was their carelessness and indulgence in the life course that carried them in an unwanted direction as they lounged and enjoyed reckless fun. Such people will already experience misery and grief on earth, the two devilish servants who rule the hell into which those who have lived with carelessness in their lives fall and thus lose their place in the paradise would go. It will be Hector's life lesson, equal to the one taught by Constantine the Philosopher on Solomon's glass hidden and in number 909, which heralds the

⁵³ Malo t' me griziše / taj škoda takova (*Fishing*: 823).

⁵⁴ Veće pomnju prudi / človiku imiti, // ner težeć ki trudi / i vele dobiti. // Istina bo je toj, / i pravo t' se reče // (pametuj svak ovoj): pomen kuću teče; nepomnja raztiče / stoke i velike, // kako kad iztiče / vodica iz rike. // Tojve si domodar / ne u zloj haljini, // sam sebi gospodar / i svojoj družini, // lahko ćeš doteći / gdi se tak ishode // s nepomnjom ne hteći / čuvat se od škode; // i znaj, da ćeš tvoj stan / skoro razčiniti // (i ne u vele dan) hteć tako živiti! (*Fishing*: 851–860).

⁵⁵ Zač ovdí dugo stan / ne može nam biti, // odkle do malo dan / tribuje otiti. // Zato mi išćimo / oni stan doteći, // koji nahodimo / od svih vikov veći; // ona pribivan'ja / da bi nas dopala, // gdi su ljubka stan'j / nada sva ostala, // koja su želile / na svitu ovomu // duše bogu mile / u dilu svakomu; // koja bog pripravi, / stvoritelj od svega, // u nebeskoj slavi / tim ki ljube njega; // a on ti ga ljubi, / i oni ga čtuje, // ki mu ne zagrubi / ki zakon spunjuje. // Njegovi zakoni / hvale su dostojni, // u kih su nasloni / mirmi i pokojni. // Rekal je: Ne tuži / nitkor; od zla se kaj, // zapovíed obsluži, / ter hod' k meni u raj! (*Fishing*: 1533–1548).

time of Christ's birth. Hektorovic does not mention the numbers on his cup so that should not bother us. Needless to say, if, when *Fishing* was read with as much attention as Hektorovic emphasized, and to the extent that Constantine needed to discover the meaning of Solomon's glass, then it is impossible not to notice that Hektorovic, in the 909 verse of *Fishing* notes Paskoje's question to Nikola about what is painful and what is easy in life. In Nikola's answer, Hektorovic says that it's hard to get to know yourself in life, to keep a secret, to have undisturbed thoughts, to use your time in life, etc.⁵⁶. It is also spoken of the greatest work in life, the resurrection of the body and the salvation of the soul⁵⁷, precisely what Hektorovic thought carefully about and what he secretly expressed when writing about his precious goblet.

Conclusion

The research we conducted is based on the hypothesis that Petar Hektorovic, describing his goblet which was the cause of numerous events translated into the verses of *Fishing* and the *Fisherman's Conversations*, depended heavily on Solomon's glass, described in Chapter 13 of *Žitje Konstantinovo*. In addition to its artistic value, Solomon's glass attracted the most attention with an inscription difficult to understand. The inscription from Solomon's glass was read and interpreted by the Greek missionary Constantine the Philosopher, who had a wide erudition and was well versed in hermetic philosophy. It is well known that Constantine applied such a philosophy to his greatest invention – a Glagolitic script whose letters are based on the symbolism of geometric figures. Solomon's glass, too, was laden with deep symbolic meaning, and Constantine discovered that her inscription had mysteriously preached Christ.

The same idea that the inscription engraved in the cup from which he at one point was anxiously trying to drink refers to Christ the Savior is also promoted by Petar Hektorovic. But before bringing Solomon's and Hektorovic's glass into real connection with Christ and the chalice, we showed that these drinking vessels correspond well with the literary and historical

⁵⁶ Paskoj: Rec' mi, mučno što je / i lahko, ako viš; // jer bih rad, oboje / toj meni da poviš.
Nikola: Svakomu mučno je / sama sebe znati, // a za tim lahko je / družih pokarati. // Mučno je i onoj / potajno daržati // ča ti prijatelj tvoj / bude povidati. I još stvar trudna je/ hteć pokojan biti // vrime, ko ostaje, // dobro razdiliti. // I psovke podniti, / ke budu rečene, // sarce ne imiti / ni misli smetene. // Mučno se još ima, / premda ćeš ne htiti, // licem i očima / zlobu ne odkriti (*Fishing*: 909–920).

⁵⁷ Paskoj: Je l' ko dilo veće / al može biti, / ner u grob ležeće / tilo uskrišiti?//
Nikola: Veće čini oni / od čuda takoga, // ki sebe ukloni / od griha smartnoga. // Tilu život dati / manje će toj biti, // jer će li nestati / i opet umriti. // Da tko dušu shrani / i grihom otima, // oni stvar obrani, / ka konca ne ima. (*Fishing*: 921–928).

treatment of the myth of the Grail. True, the hermetic impact on Constantine from the Solun and on Peter Hektorovic was enormous. This is illustrated by the connection between Žitje and Fishing to the myth of the Grail and its inscription, which functions as a cryptogram. But with all this connection of the enigmatic Solomon's glass read by Constantine and Hektorovic's precious goblet with pagan ideas, such as that about worshiping the Moon as a deity, attaching supernatural features to certain objects, etc., nevertheless, their deep Christian thought enabling them to immerse themselves deeply in the mystical experience of God continually erupts to the surface of things discussed by both great thinker. They both shared the same idea and the realization that God, that is, his Son, the Savior they longed for and whose doctrine they emphasized, is the easiest to discover by word, because according to Christian doctrine, the Son is the embodied Word of God. Therefore, we paid the utmost attention to the interpretation of the words contained in the inscriptions of the glasses which we put together.

Overlaps and similarities in motives and linguistic practices that conceal deeper meaning are the indicator of the existence of a common cultural and spiritual heritage preserved over a long period of time, thanks to rare writers who have been instructed in methods of covert message coding. Hektorovic's cup contained an explicit message that was well-matched to a single verse from Solomon's glass, suggesting a celebratory drink, we concluded, in honor of the celestial Moon, which played a significant role in the afterlife in various cultures. But the important finding is that Hektorovic's explicit message in his graphic composition contains a few more profound messages that reveal his fundamental thinking preoccupation which refers to the reward a person receives for the good deeds of a lifetime. Hector's drinking from goblets is not celebratory, because when a tribute to the Moon was sang, he did not drink wine from the goblet, he just tasted it. His drinking, we concluded, was prayerful through which he showed a concern for the salvation of his soul. The light that appears in the darkness at the bottom of the goblet and its source are the Moon and morning star, we have stated, is Hektorovic's most fervent longing.

The importance that Hektorovic attaches to light stems from his Christian belief that light is a source of paradise beauty that he hoped to enjoy after his earthly journey. Hektorovic manifested his religious belief as an expression of his artistic talent and as an expression of his knowledge of certain scientific and philosophical methods of access to language. With his original reflection on language possibilities, Hektorovic manifested himself as a religious genius, first and foremost as an artist who reaches a creative apogee at the border between science and art. Hektorovic's Fishing has, so far, been viewed as a realistic description of what happened on the poet's three-day sea trip, in whi-

ch Hektorovic recorded some important and interesting knowledge of fishing life. However, with this research we have uncovered some new, much deeper and more significant meanings, which Hektorovic hid with his extraordinary poetic actions beneath the loose surface of reality, which, he believed, pierces any creative human mind with ease. So, in addition to all the possibilities and achievements that a person with the knowledge acquired in life can achieve, Hektorovic emphasized with his poetic work that the science of man, of himself, is the basic and final science of his human knowledge and cognition.

Literature:

- *Biblija*, Sveto pismo Staroga i Novoga Zavjeta (2007). Zagreb: Hrvatsko biblijsko društvo.
- Bloch, Ernst (1981). *Princip nada*, 1–3, Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Guenon, René (1984). *Simboli della Scienza sacra*, Milano: Traduzione di Francesco Zambon, Adelphi Edizioni.
- Hektorović, Petar (1974). *Ribanje i ribarsko prigovaranje*, priredio Frano Čale, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Knežević, Anto (1988). *Filozofija i slavenski jezici*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo.
- López-Baralt, Luce (2004). Tajna književnost posljednjih muslimana Španije, *Znakovi vremena*, Vol. 7, br. 4, str. 180–205.
- Massetani, Guido (1987). *La filosofia cabalistica di Pico della Mirandola*, Empoli: Tipografi adi Edisso Traversari.
- Milidragović, Milica (1976). *Stara ruska književnost; Dodiri i veze sa srednjovjekovnom književnošću jugoslavenskih naroda*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti (PSHK)*, Knjiga I: *Hrvatska književnost srednjeg vijeka* (1969). Priredio Vjekoslav Štefanić, Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, Zora.
- *Religiozni obredi, običaji i simboli* (1980). prevela Biserka Rajčić, Beograd: Radnička štampa.
- Rice, David Talbot (1968). *Umetnost vizantijskog doba*, Beograd: Jugoslavija.
- Ružić, Milutin (1960). *Pregled istorije umetnosti*, Sv. II., Starokršćanska, vizantijska i islamska umetnost; Romanika; Naše srednjovekovne umetnosti, Sarajevo.
- Sambunjak, Slavomir (1998). *Gramatofija Konstantina Filozofa Solunskoga, Hipoteza o postanku i značenju glagoljice*, Zagreb: Demetra.
- Sambunjak, Slavomir (2004). *Libar glagoljaša don Antona od Silbe*, Zagreb: Demetra.

- Sambunjak, Slavomir i Zaneta (2009). *Tragalac za smislom. Zbiljsko i mit-sko u djelu Petra Hektorovića*, Zagreb: Demetra.
- Sambunjak, Zaneta (2007). *Heretičko bogoslovlje u strukturi srednjovisokojemačke književnosti i hrvatskih srednjovjekovnih apokrifa*, Zagreb: Demetra.
- *Tajna društva* (2006). Priredio Jean-Francois Signier, s francuskoga prevela Bojana Zeljko-Lipovšćak, Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak.
- *Tkonski zbornik: hrvatskoglagoljski tekstovi iz 16. st.* (2001). transliterirao i popratne tekstove napisao Slavomir Sambunjak, Tkon: Općina Tkon.
- Utrobičić Matko (2014). *Eklipse Ivanovog Otkrivenja*, Zagreb: Demetra.
- Villiers, Elizabet (1989). Amuleti, talismani e altre cose misteriose, Milano: Editore Ulrico Hoepli.
- Wesselofsky, Alexander. N. (1882). „Der „Stein Alaty“ in den Localsagen Palästians und der Legende vom Gral“ *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, VI (1882), str. 33–72.
- *Žitje Konstantina – Ćirila i Metodija i druga vrela* (1992). Preveo i protumačio Josip Bratulić, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost.

Ante TOPČIĆ

SOLOMONOVA ČAŠA U ŽITJU KONSTANTINOVU I HEKTOROVIĆEV PEHAR U RIBANJU I RIBARSKOM PRIGOVARANJU

Rad se zasniva na hipotezi da je Solomonova čaša opisana u 13. glavi *Žitja Konstantinova* znatno utjecala na to da i Petar Hektorović svoj pehar iz kojega je ispijao vino tijekom trodnevne plovidbe u društvu dvojice prostih ribara, predstavi kao jedan izuzetno važan predmet o kojem treba voditi neprestanu brigu i koji nipošto ne smije biti zaboravljen i izgubljen. Problemu se pristupa s uvjerenjem da je Hektorović svoj pehar namjerno učinio nejasnim i da je kroz opis toga pehara u stvari govorio kako će on biti izgubljen ako mu se ne otkrije pravi i skriveni smisao. Hektorovićevu peharu valja dakle pristupiti s filozofskim promišljanjem i pogledom na život kakav je imao grčki misionar, apostol među Slavenima, Konstantin – Ćiril koji je uspio pročitati i protumačiti natpis na Salamonovoj čaši čuvanoj u Crkvi Sv. Sofije. Intencija je doći do zaključka izvedenog iz postavljene hipoteze da je fenomen misteriozne, neobične i umjetnički profinjene čaše prisutan u slavenskim književnostima od početaka njihove pismenosti na svom jeziku i da je ona nosilac jedne univerzalne ideje o životu koja će snažno zaokupljati misao renesansnog, svjetovnog i mislećeg čovjeka.

Ključne riječi: *čaša, natpis, proročanstvo, slavlje, žrtva*