

SOPHIA SENYK

KRIŽANIĆ AND UKRAINE

The two ideals of church union and Slavic solidarity shine through all the vicissitudes of Križanić's life. In his writings and in his activity alternately one or the other predominates. For that reason those who have dedicated studies to him have considered him predominately church unionist or a Slavic patriot. In fact, he was both. For him the two ideals, so far from being mutually exclusive or even antagonistic, were bound together into one. He would have considered the realization of one ideal without the other but an incomplete fulfillment of his desires.

Križanić's attitude to Ukraine and to contemporary Ukrainian affairs must be viewed in the light of both those ideals if it is to be understood. His judgment of political events was colored by his hopes—more wishful than well-grounded, one must admit—of religious union between the Slavic, in particular the Muscovite Orthodox Church and Rome. His appraisal of the position of Ukraine—what it was and what it should be—depended also on his conception of the respective roles Poland and Russia were to play in the future of Slavdom.

In a number of his writings Križanić expresses his opinions with regard to Ukraine. These opinions were founded on the necessities of his own plan as well as on his personal contacts and observations. This paper, therefore, will be concerned with setting the background for the maturation of Križanić's opinions about Ukraine. It is hoped that in this way a contribution may be made to a better understanding of his writings.

Terlec'kyj and Križanić

The first contact of Križanić with Ukraine came about in the person of Methodius Terlec'kyj. It will therefore not be out of place to say something about this man and to comment on his contacts with Križanić.

Though various historians have written about Terlec'kyj,¹ much of what they have said about him needs to be corrected in the light of newly found and published documents from Roman archives.

¹ A. S. Petruševič, *Xolmskaja eparxija i svjätiteli eja po 1866 god.* (L'vov 1867), p. 41—54, bases his account almost exclusively on the mss of Leo Kyška, which cannot be properly understood without additional materials and which in any case contain errors concerning Terlec'kyj. V. M. Ploščanskij, *Prošloe Xolmskoj Rusi*, 2 (Vil'na 1901):3—52, at times repeats the errors of Petruševyč, at others misinterprets documents (e. g., note on p. 3—the sense of the letter is diametrically opposed to what he asserts).

We can accept, however, the information that Methodius Terlec'kyj came from the Xolm region—the voevodship of Belz in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—and belonged to one branch of the Ruthenian Terlec'kyj family which was prominent in those parts and which gave many members to ecclesiastical service. He entered the newly reformed Basilians and was ordained a priest before 1626.

From 1626 we have the first certain documentary notice about him. A register of the students at the seminary in Vienna reported that he, already a priest of the Greek rite, arrived at the beginning of November 1626 to study logic. He stayed in Vienna a second year, 1627—1628, during which he took courses of theology.² It does not appear that he received a degree, as some writers assert.

In 1628 the Catholic metropolitan of Kiev Joseph Veljamyn Rutskyj (1613—1637) was due to make an *ad limina* visit to Rome, but felt that he could not leave his metropolitanate for the rather lengthy period of time such a trip would entail, both in the journey itself and in treating of his affairs in Rome. Instead, he entrusted Methodius Terlec'kyj with bringing the report on the Ruthenian Church to Rome.³

Terlec'kyj, however, did not go directly from Vienna to Rome. He was to prepare another report, this time from his own observations.

In the early seventeenth century the Uskoki of Zumberak (who appear in documents of the period as the Vallacchi of Monte Feletrio) came in contact with the Catholic Church. Their bishop Simeon visited Rome in 1611 and their church officially entered into union with the Apostolic See. The mountains of Zumberak are not easy of access. Little was known in Rome of the Uskoki to begin with, and not much more was gleaned in the next decade or so—in fact, it seems that what little was known was forgotten. In 1628, then, the nuncio in Vienna, Charles Caraffa, was asked to provide an updated report. As the territory of the Uskoki was under Austrian rule, such data, it was believed, would be easy to come by in the imperial city. The nuncio, however, was able to gather in Vienna only vague and historically shaky notices. To obtain more reliable information he decided to send someone to them with that specific task; this appeared as the best possible solution to the request from Rome. In Vienna there was already a student at the pontifical seminary who could understand the language of the Uskoki, was of the same rite as they, and was a person to be relied on. That he was already supposed to go to Rome on an assignment of his metropolitan fitted in with the nuncio's plans. Terlec'kyj could make a side trip to Zumberak, carefully observe the religious situation there, and report on that as well when he got to Rome.⁴

² Archivio Propaganda Fide, *Scritture riferite nei Congressi, Collegi e Visite*, 5:138; 6:182.

³ Two letters of Rutskyj to Rome announcing this, both dated 30 August 1628, are in *Epistolae Josephi Velamin Rutskyj*, ed. Theodosius T. Haluščynskyj and Athanasius G. Welykyj (Romae 1956), p. 210—211.

⁴ The nuncio's letter to Rome, in which he announces that he is sending Terlec'kyj to the Vallacchi, dated 30 September 1628, is in *Litterae episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes*, ed. Athanasius G. Welykyj, 1 (Romae 1972):174—175.

By early February 1629 Methodius Terlec'kyj was already in Rome.⁵ Both the thoroughness of his observations and the multitude of the errors of the Uskoki impressed the cardinals of the Propaganda, and they decided to send Terlec'kyj anew to Zumberak as apostolic missionary.⁶ Terlec'kyj, who knew that metropolitan Rutskyj was anxiously awaiting his return, at first hesitated in accepting this charge. Already in 1628 the metropolitan had named Terlec'kyj bishop of Kolm. Until his return Rutskyj himself had to administer that eparchy as well as his own, much more extensive one, to speak nothing of his cares for the entire Ruthenian Church. But missionary zeal overcame whatever scruples Terlec'kyj had on the score of going off to Croatia and Slovenia without Rutskyj's knowledge.⁷

Probably in the summer of 1629 Terlec'kyj again set off to the Uskoki, among whom he stayed several months. One feels that he would have liked to stay longer, but his presence was needed in the eparchy of which he was bishop. He did not intend his return to Kolm, however, to be the end of his mission. Terlec'kyj was not one to see his mission among the Uskoki as a passing assignment; he took their religious lot to heart. His plan, since he could not remain among them personally, was to send some fellow Basilians who would found a monastery with strict monastic life and who would likewise conduct a seminary there. Thus they would be able to train both regular and secular clergy—which at the moment he found woefully lacking in culture among the Uskoki, who would eventually carry on the task themselves. Of these plans, however, for reasons beyond his control, nothing came to be.⁸

Over the next decade reference is made in letters to Rome by Rutskyj and Terlec'kyj to the *Vallacchi*, and whenever matters pertaining to them are discussed in Rome Terlec'kyj's reports are brought in as testimony. But the next direct contact between Terlec'kyj and the Uskoki, a contact that will also introduce him to Križanić came only in 1643.

In late 1642 Terlec'kyj set out for Rome to treat there of matters concerning his Kolm diocese. Around New Year's 1643 he left Warsaw.⁹ His interest and concern for the Uskoki had remained unabated over the years; thus he did not travel to Rome directly. He took this opportunity to go again by way of Croatia and Slovenia, to see for himself how the church was thriving among the Uskoki. On arriving in Rome he prepared a report on what he saw and proposed means of helping the Uskoki, some of which means he intended to carry out when he would be again passing among them on his way home. In this report we find also the first

⁵ An anonymous report on the Uskoki of 13 February 1629 mentions him as already in Rome, *Monumenta Ucrainae historica*, 2 (Romae 1965):87—88.

⁶ The decision of the Propaganda of 23 March 1629 is recorded in the *Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarussiae spectantia*, ed. Athanasius G. Welkyj, 1 (Romae 1953):73.

⁷ The Propaganda wrote to Rutskyj explaining Terlec'kyj's mission, *Litterae S. C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarussiae spectantia*, 1 (Romae 1954):85—86 (14 April 1629).

⁸ See the letter of Rutskyj, who heartily seconded Terlec'kyj's missionary work, of 1 February 1632, *Epistolae Rutskyj*, p. 257; cf. his letter of 1635, p. 329—330.

⁹ *MUH*, 11:316 (nuncio Mario Filonardi writes on 2 January 1643 that Terlec'kyj has already left).

reference to his meeting with Juraj Križanić. Terlec'kyj has the following to say: »George Križanić, a Latin priest, wishes to go to Rus' to learn the ceremonies and the language and to change his rite, that he might the better minister to the conversion of souls.«¹⁰

Part of the request was not new to the Propaganda. Križanić, when he was in Rome in 1641—1642, had himself asked for permission to celebrate in the Greek rite. As reasons for this, however, he had given his desire to be a missionary in Zumberak or in Muscovy.¹¹

Putting together the sources from before and from after the first meeting between Terlec'kyj and Križanić—since we have no direct source on the meeting itself—we can easily imagine how it must have taken place. Terlec'kyj came to Croatia with a desire to help, and one of his projects of helping was to provide a proper training and education for the Uskoki clergy. A decade earlier he had thought to provide them with a seminary on the spot. He still favored that solution, but as there were obstacles in its way, he also suggested another remedy. He hoped to find some able and willing youths whom he could take with him to Xolm for instruction in his seminary there. Somehow a meeting with Križanić came about. The reasons for Terlec'kyj's visit must have been known to Križanić, if not before, then during this meeting. Križanić was not one to let golden opportunities for bringing him closer to his heart's desire slip by. Upon hearing that the bishop was looking for candidates for missionaries to take with himself to Xolm—all that much closer to Muscovy—Križanić's heart must have leapt at this heaven-sent occasion. Here was his chance to let his prosaic post as canon go and to embark on the missionary career to which, he never doubted, he was called. Even Križanić at times understood that zeal was not incompatible with prudence, hence that it would not do to divulge all his dreams at once (he may have begun to realize that his enthusiasms were far from contagious). No doubt Križanić emphasized in his talks with Terlec'kyj those aspects of his plans with which the bishop could be fully sympathetic: his desire to learn the Greek rite and the Slavic, that is, the Church Slavonic language well, and his own appointment as a missionary to the Uskoki.¹²

Terlec'kyj must have been both impressed and heartened. But since Križanić was a Latin priest permission had to be obtained in Rome for his passage to the Greek rite. This request was not a novelty for Rome. Križanić had himself made the same request, early in 1642.¹³ The permission was to enable him to minister to the *Vallacchi* for three or four years while he prepared himself for his life's mission in Muscovy. The request was remanded to the Holy Office. Since the archives of this congregation are not open, we do not have the decision. But it appears that

¹⁰ The report, or rather an abstract of it, is in *Supplicationes Ecclesiae unitae Ucrainae et Bielarusiae*, ed. Athanasius G. Welykyj, 1 (Romae 1960):128

¹¹ Cf. *Acta SCPF*, 1:182 (Križanić's petition of 20 May 1642).

¹² This appointment came before Križanić left Rome in 1642, see the decree of Propaganda in S. A. Belokurov, »Jurij Križanić v Rossii«, *Čtenija v imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijski pri Moskovskom universitete*, 1903, 3: :129.

¹³ See the pertinent documents in Belokurov, *COIDR*, 1909, 2:11—14.

the permission to celebrate according to the Greek rite was granted for Križanić's mission to the Uskoki.¹⁴

The reply to Terlec'kyj only confirmed this permission, and upon receiving it the bishop immediately communicated it to Križanić. Križanić, however, received it only several months later, in January 1644. He sent a reply, but that time Terlec'kyj was on his way to Croatia again.¹⁵

Terlec'kyj left Rome in late January 1644; in Croatia he again spent several months and again had an opportunity to meet with Križanić. His talks with and his impressions of the young enthusiast he records in a letter of 5 April 1644 from Varaždin to Philip Borovyk, Ruthenian procurator in Rome. Križanić's ways appeared decidedly odd to his countrymen and invited comment, which reached also the ears of Terlec'kyj. But Terlec'kyj's own impressions were favorable, and he promised Križanić to aid him in his resolve. Križanić, for his part, recounted that he had to pay off debts and provide for his mother, but within two years at the most would rejoin Terlec'kyj in Xolm.¹⁶

For almost two years we hear nothing more of the Terlec'kyj-Križanić project. But the bishop kept in contact with Križanić by letter and encouraged him to carry out what he felt was his vocation. This we can gather from the letters Križanić wrote to Ingoli on 7 July 1645 and 28 February 1646. In them Križanić speaks of his difficulties, principally financial, as well as of the incentive he finds in the words of the bishop of Xolm. In the last letter he tells Ingoli of his decision to start out for Xolm in May 1646¹⁷.

After a careful perusal of both Terlec'kyj's and Križanić's letters from this period one feels confident in believing that Križanić had kept silent on one point in his dealings with the bishop of Xolm. He spoke of his missionary desires, of desires to work for church union, of his wish to embrace the Greek rite and learn Church Slavonic, of coming with or to Terlec'kyj. But he appears never to have mentioned to the bishop that

¹⁴ Cf. Belokurov, *COIDR*, 1903, 3:129—130 (letters to Križanić of 12 September and 8 October 1642).

¹⁵ Cf. Križanić's letter to Ingoli, in Belokurov, *COIDR*, 1909, 2:20.

¹⁶ *LE*, 2:46: »Quoad D. num Krisanik, hic habet alta desideria sua, et non impossibilia, dummodo nolit esse inconstans prouti quidam in eo notant. De quo cum hic cum ipso fuissimè egissem, dedit rationes pro sua parte, quare huiusmodi proveniant ab adversariis illius. Ipse nihilominus omnimodè se praestitutum ad summum intra biennium, post debita persoluta, et matre sua constituta, sive provisiva, promittit: toto biennio se praeparando magis ad accersendo suo proposito, etc. Ego quoque omnem meam operam, illum hac in re adiuvando, promisi. Utinam aliquid boni saltem ex alienis, si nostri torpescunt, videamus. Unum tamen in illo displicet mihi: bibit video non male, hinc vereor ne ipsum crapula immutet in ipsius sanctis et piis propositis. Nihilò tamen minus omnia Dominus Deus tempore suo demonstrabit.« As no one else ever refers to Križanić overly imbibing, Terlec'kyj must have assumed to be a habit what he witnessed on one occasion or to have imagined the worst possible consequences from it—a not surprising alarm if one recalls the drinking habits of his countrymen (cf. what Križanić says on that score in his *Politika*, ed. V. V. Zelenin [Moskva 1965], p. 248 [Russ. tr., p. 590]). Križanić wrote of his arrangement with Terlec'kyj to the secretary of the Propaganda F. Ingoli, Belokurov, *COIDR*, 1907, 3:55—56, (Latin text); 1909, 2:21—22 (Russ. tr.).

¹⁷ Evsebije Fermeždin, »Prinos za životopis Gjurgja Križanića, svećenika i kanonika zagrebačke biskupije«, *Starine*, 18 (1886):219—224; Belokurov, 1903, 3:131—135.

all these were but means to or aspects of a mission to Muscovy. Had he mentioned Muscovy, an echo of it would have been heard in one of the letters. No doubt, Križanić realized that the very mention of a mission to Muscovy would stamp him in Terlec'kyj's opinion as an idealist dreamer—an opinion that had already filtered down to Terlec'kyj's ears and that Križanić had been at some pains to dissipate.

Križanić in Poland-Lithuania

Križanić did indeed start out as he said, but he never came to Xolm. This journey took him to Smolensk and then to his first visit to Muscovy. The Propaganda felt a missionary would be more useful in Smolensk than in Xolm. Križanić, for his part, saw the new direction of his mission as providential. Xolm was certainly a more exciting post than a canonicate in Croatia, and as long as no better prospects—better for his missionary yearnings—were in the offing, he was ready and willing to go there. But his real goal was Muscovy, and Xolm was still a long way off—and not only geographically—from the land of his desires. Smolensk fitted in so much better with his scheme. From there, he must have thought, it would be only a short step to Muscovy and his life's vocation.

Such unswerving commitment to his chose field of activity can be explained by the role Križanić felt called to play in the cause of both church and Slavic unity. Zumberak, while needing missionaries, was too narrow and too remote a field for a man of his limitless phantasy. Xolm was a broader field, but not for the purposes Križanić had in mind. The Ruthenian Church there, after all, was already united with the See of Peter. Nor was Xolm a likely place to launch a movement for Slavic unity.

Of nothing was Križanić more fully aware than the animosity between Poles and Muscovites. He states bluntly in 1659 in his »Besida ko Czfrkasom«: »Between Poles and Muscovy a permanent peace can never be hoped for«¹⁰. His deepest attraction was towards Muscovy, which attraction in itself would already influence his seeing Poland politically through Muscovite eyes. Later on, when he would elaborate his system, he would seek corroborating evidence to prop up his construction of Slavic *jednota*. To justify the exclusion of Poland from the Slavic Bund he would be compelled to dwell on the foreign dynasties that ruled Poland, due to which Poland fell away from Slavdom.¹⁰

I believe, however, that another consideration played an even more important role in determining Križanić's stance vis-a-vis Muscovy and Poland. A political unity, however he may have conceived it, was only a partial aspect of what Križanić desired; church unity was of even greater importance. Križanić could be remarkably realistic at times. He understood that whatever church union was effected through a participation of Poland—even if that participation lay only in being the body politic in which a union was effected, as was the case with the Ruthenian

¹⁰ »Sobranie sočinenij Jurija Križaniča«, pt 1, COIDR, 1890, 4:13.

¹⁰ Ibid.: »a nijakim sposobom nemožno, szo bi tam [in Poland] korolkował ani Liach, ani inszi naszego Słowanskogo naroda cołowik«.

Church — would inevitably rebuff Muscovy. That consideration in itself would exclude the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the field of his activity.

It should also be noted that Križanić was interested in states, not nations. He himself was a southern Slav, but the south Slavs had no states of their own. Ruthenians likewise had no state. The lands of this people therefore could not become a focal point for the unity Križanić desired.

All this led him to give up without hesitation — indeed with the greatest alacrity — all ideas of going to Xolm as soon as the prospects of drawing closer to Muscovy glimmered before him. He says it all in one phrase: »I shall go [to Smolensk] with a great deal more pleasure than to Xolm.«²⁰

As it turned out, however, his trip to and stay in Smolensk afforded Križanić precious little pleasure in itself, though it did grant him one boon: his first visit to Muscovy. There is no need to recall Križanić's tribulations when he set out to meet and serve the Latin bishop of Smolensk Peter Parczewski. With Križanić's own account as base²¹, we shall only draw attention to what directly concerns our topic.

Though Križanić did not go to Xolm, he kept up his contacts with Terlec'kyj, no doubt to Terlec'yj's death (7 June 1649). He met Terlec'kyj in Warsaw in 1646. Terlec'kyj at that time was able to mitigate Parczewski's harshness towards Križanić, but obviously saw it boded no good. Though the Propaganda has sent Križanić to Smolensk, motivating this by the uncertainty of a post for him in Xolm, bishop Terlec'kyj would have been only too happy to receive an additional collaborator. He tried to persuade Križanić both before the latter committed himself to Parczewski in Smolensk and after the fiasco there, to come to Xolm after all. Križanić was certainly grateful to the bishop for his continuing support and encouragement, but was not to be swayed. Xolm at most would have been for him only a temporary stop, for the purpose of preparing for the Moscow mission, just as Smolensk, as he makes clear, was only a preparatory step to Moscow proper. Križanić was extremely doubtful, however, that he *could* prepare himself in Xolm; he had heard that it lacked the books he might need.

In Smolensk Križanić did find a well-wisher, the Ruthenian archbishop Andrew Zlotyj-Kvasninskyj. This prelate too had warned him about Parczewski's service. In Smolensk Zlotyj was of great help to Križanić, finding a post for him after he had left Parczewski.

Whatever were Križanić's convictions concerning Slavic ethnic and religious unity, his experiences in Smolensk already confirmed the point of view regarding Ukrainian matters that he would express more fully a decade later in his »Pútno opisanie« and »Besída ko Czirkásom«. Already in 1647, in speaking of »our language« — the common Slavic tongue that he believed existed, if not actually, then potentially, in need only of the

²⁰ Belokurov, *COIDR*, 1903, 3:139 (in a letter to Ingoli of 29 June 1646).

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 143—235, the letter of Križanić to Raphael Levaković.

support of grammarians and practitioners²² — Križanić would have taken a dim view of modern grammarians for whom usage governs rule and not the other way around — he excludes Polish. He bemoans the printing of polemical works, so conspicuous a part of Ruthenian literary production of the first half of the seventeenth century, in Latin or Polish, neither understood by the people (not that he places a high value on these works in any case).

Even more than on linguistic grounds, Križanić excluded Polish, and by extension, Ruthenian participation in his union projects on state/political grounds. For the fulfillment of his project he needed a ruler guided by him, but of absolute power to carry out his designs. This Križanić stated in no unambiguous terms to his friend Levaković: one of the greatest sources of happiness for a people was to have an absolute monarch of its own blood²³. If he, a Croatian, writing to another Croatian, could speak of Muscovites as »gens nostra«, all the more he expected Ruthenians to feel as one with their closest Slavic brethren and to share his delight in seeing an absolute ruler of Slavic blood as well as his eagerness to serve that ruler.

Križanić in Ukraine

Alas, the refractory Cossack nation did not see things from the same perspectives of pan-Slavic unity and lacked his enthusiasm for the absolutism of the »tixejšij car'«, as he was to learn in the course of his second journey to Muscovy. It is strange that in 1646—1648, when he had the opportunity to meet with and observe Ruthenians, he failed to note the gulf that lay between the culture of Ruthenian lands and of Muscovy. As so many others before and after him, he saw the ethnic and religious ties and concluded from them if not the identity, then at least the brotherhood that should make of them one family. From hence it was but a step in his scheme to consider it a moral obligation of the Ruthenians to submit to the Muscovite tsar.

How well Križanić kept abreast of events in Ukraine in the eventful decade 1648—1658, epoch-making for eastern Europe, we can hardly judge. All Europe was full of the exploits of Xmel'nyč'kyj, thus there was no dearth of news; how accurate the news were is another matter. In the extant writings of Križanić from this period, however, there is no echo of Xmel'nyč'kyj's work. It is doubtful that Križanić had any deep understanding of or sympathy for all the smoldering elements that Xmel'nyč'kyj's revolt sparked into one sweeping blaze.

Križanić, as can hardly be overemphasized, was singularly one — minded and judged the course of events according to how well they fitted in with his theories and plans. When he entered Ukraine in 1659 many things had combined to change the political situation drastically: Poland's loss of the Left Bank and Kiev, the Treaty of Perejaslav of 1654 which placed

²² »Causa vero tanti in nostrati lingua silentii, ego in linguae imperfectionem semper referebam, cum enim haec ab omnibus corrumpatur, a nemine autem excolatur« in his letter to Levaković, *ibid.*, p. 187.

²³ *Ibid.*

these territories under the protectorate of the tsar, the tsar's war against Poland that brought about the permanent loss of Smolensk and the occupation of the main centers of Belorussia, Vyhovs'kyj's opposition to the treaty of 1654, and the consequent fighting between rival forces in Ukraine.

In the midst of that fighting Križanić passed through Ukraine, unhappy with what he saw — unreasonableness and licence, according to him. In Nižyn, however, he found a man after his own heart, the protopop Maxim Fylymynovyč, at whose house he lodged²⁴.

Fylymynovyč was one of the most zealous proponents of pro-Moscow and pro-tsar policy in Ukraine at that time. Beginning with 1654 he performed many a good service for the Muscovite government. Not only Fylymynovyč's convictions, but his fate as well were similar to that of Križanić. In spite of his services he was arrested in 1668, tried in Moscow, his case dragging on without resolution, and imprisoned in a Moscow monastery, where he died in 1690. Though not deported to Siberia like Križanić, he nevertheless suffered many years of exile, never being permitted to return to his own land; Križanić knew of his fate.

It would be intriguing to know what effect the two men had on each other, especially how conversations with the protopop influenced Križanić's views on the Ukrainian situation and contributed to his two short memoranda: »Pútno opisanie ot Lewówa do Móskwi« and »Besída ko Czirkasom«. The aims both men had in view were the same: the firm establishment of the tsar's rule over the hetmanate. For both of them Vyhovs'kyj's victory at Konotop on 28 June 1659, when Križanić was staying in Nižyn, was a blow, and both did their utmost to minimize its effects, of abetting anti-Muscovite feeling among the population, as both were at pains later to remind the Muscovite government.

Fylymynovyč, however, does not appear to mention Križanić. But there can be no doubt that he favored and seconded Križanić's views. When Križanić left Nižyn on his way to Moscow with Cossak messengers, protopop Maxim accompanied him to Putivl'. His testimony to Križanić's good services and desires was so effective that Križanić was sent off to Moscow »in haste« — »na spex«, with a special courier.

Upon his arrival in Moscow Križanić submitted to the authorities two memoranda concerning Ukrainian affairs. The »Pútno opisanie« is his reflection on Ukrainians and Ukraine and his advice to the Muscovite authorities in dealing with them. The »Besída« is a program of the arguments that should be used to bring Ukrainians to reason²⁵.

Križanić, who gloried in the sole Slavic ruler who was not only free but also with unlimited authority, who saw in the tsar a symbol of Slav-

²⁴ Maxim Fylymynovyč (later bishop Methodius) receives full and particular treatment in Vitalij Ejnorn, »O snoženijax malorossijskogo duxovenstva s moskovskim pravitel'stvom v carstvovanie Alekseja Mixajloviča«, *COIDR*, 1893, 2:i—xiv, 1—370; 1894, 3:371—570.

²⁵ The text of both is in »Sobranie sočinenij Jurija Križaniča«, pt 1, *COIDR*, 1890, 4:1—16. A contemporary Russian translation of the »Pútno opisanie« is given by M. Popruženko, »Neskol'ko zamečanij o sočinenijah Jurija Križaniča«, *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoj Akademii nauk*, 2 (1897), no. 2:313—319.

dom free from Turkish and all other foreign oppression, as well as the only ruler who had the power (if only he had the will!) to effect Slavic ethnic and religious unity, could not be expected to look kindly upon any manifestation of Ukrainian particularism. Any other view it would be unreasonable to seek in Križanić. Still, one is rather taken aback by the vehemence to which Križanić's convictions lead him:

The Čerkasy, though they profess the Orthodox faith, are of beastly mores and customs. This is due, among other things, most of all to a heresy, not religious, but political. . . . This heresy is, that they took it into their heads and firmly hold the following: that to live under the most glorious Russian empire is to live under the worst of all oppressions, in subjection and slavery, worse than Turkish tyranny, worse than Pharaoh's service and Egyptian slavery.²⁶

Križanić, though he holds the Poles responsible for the propagation of such views, with a heavy heart—«s' veľkoiu nászeju žalostiu» — is forced to admit that a large portion of the blame must fall on ecclesiastics as well — Greek metropolitans and the Ukrainian clergy themselves. In his trip through Ukraine and during his stay in Nižyn he had ample opportunity to realize that Ukrainian churchmen were not on the whole enthusiastic about establishing closer bonds with Moscow. They were proud of their traditions and their submission to the patriarch.

Križanić, who placed all his hopes of his projects being fulfilled not on the will of the people, but on autocratic power, could only condemn the Ukrainians «who only cry Freedom, Freedom».²⁷ The Cossack movement, issuing from the masses, provoked in him deep mistrust. In his views on the aspirations of the Ukrainian populace of the mid-seventeenth century he appears as a precursor of the enlightened paternalistic views that were to flower a century later. He recommends not placing new burdens on the Ukrainian population, but this only for reasons of state — for the sake of having in constant vigilance and readiness a mighty force to protect at least one of the empire's boundaries²⁸.

One's times limit one's perspective. For Križanić not only his times, but infatuation with his own ideas limited his vision. In the «Besída ko Czirkasom» he states: «To remain (without being under compulsion or force) under a King of a foreign nation is a matter that goes clearly against the divine command», and he bolsters his statement with a biblical quotation. That a people had to remain under a monarch is Križanić's tribute to his times. That the most direct inference from his statement he overlooked Križanić owes to his own preconceived notions.

Yet Križanić did have an insight why the Cossacks wavered between Muscovy and Poland. Identifying himself with the forces that sent him to Tobol'sk he writes:

²⁶ «Sobranie sočinenij», COIDR, 1890, 4:7.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁸ This view is expressed especially clearly in his *Politika*, p. 235 (Russ. tr., p. 579). For an exposition of Križanić's political ideas as they concern Ukraine, see especially V. Val'denberg, *Gosudarstvennye idei Križanića* (S.-Peterburg, 1912), p. 315—323.

Every place is filled with taverns and monopolies and prohibitions and tax farmers and all kinds of tax-gatherers and customs officials and secret informers, so that people are everywhere and at all times bound and cannot do anything of their own will and cannot freely use what they have gained by their toil and sweat. But all of them must act and deal secretly and furtively, with fear and trembling, and with ruses and have to conceal themselves from those numerous servitors and robbers and thieves, or better, executioners.

Thus acted the Dnieper Cossacks recently, who, though of one tongue and faith with us, prefer to be under the authority of the Poles rather than under our authority, because of the deviousness of the government here.²⁹

While not inclined to see anything praiseworthy in Ukrainian peculiarities (even the Cossack *oseledec* comes in for its dole of criticism³⁰), Križanić nevertheless draws upon them when the ideas he is intent on propagating can benefit from them. This occurs when he turns from the political side of his projects to the religious. The first step in that field was to dispel the engrained Muscovite aversion to the Latins and their Latin ways. Here the Kievan theologians and churchmen, for Križanić so unsatisfactory politically, came in good stead.

One of the controversial questions that Križanić treated was, as is known, baptism, on which he wrote a work, »Ob Světom Krešćenju«. In defending the equal validity of baptism by infusion (as practiced by Latins) and immersion (as practiced by Muscovites), he found ample support in Ukrainian practice (generally infusion). It was indeed Ukrainian practice that already before he wrote his work had softened Muscovite rigidity on this question. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, as also earlier, Ukrainians who arrived in Muscovy were all required to undergo rebaptism according to the Russian mode. This was particularly applicable to ecclesiastics who intended to celebrate in Muscovy. It was no doubt under pressure of circumstances that the unbending stance of the Muscovite Church softened, and a breach was formed, as more and more Ukrainians arrived in the tsar's capital, and especially after 1654. One could not go about rebaptizing an entire populace, especially at a time when all the slogans proclaimed their identical faith. The matter, however, was formally settled only at the synod of 1667 in Moscow, at which Ukrainian churchmen were present.

Križanić cites a series of Kievan books and authorities to demonstrate that not only Latins, but Easterners themselves use and have always used baptism by infusion. He had studied these works and he was also aware which of them were especially well-known in Muscovy (Trebnyk of Mohyla, Patericon of the Kiev Lavra). Though by no means endorsing them fully, he used them when their arguments bolstered his own.³¹

²⁹ *Politika*, p. 244—245 (Russ. tr., p. 587).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 89 (Russ. tr., p. 443).

³¹ Cf. »Sobranie sočinenij«, *COIDR*, 1892, 3:50—53, 75 (»Ob Světom Krešćenju«); 1893, 2:104—105 (»Obličenje na Solovečskuju čelobitnu«).

Conclusion

Križanić's vision was concentrated on Muscovy and his appreciation of related matters derived from that. The force of that concentration moreover prevented him from looking for spirits kindred to his where was a chance of finding them. Church unity was achieved in Ruthenian lands, but Križanić passes it over lightly, as a fait accompli — he was looking for fields where he was to be pioneer, not one of many coworkers.

In Ukraine moreover he was struck by the presence of western culture. Too little acquainted with this territory, he failed to see the underlying pride in and attachment to their own traditions and even language, and not only their own, but the broadly Slavic which he himself championed. We may note at least one example. A Ukrainian by the name of Jakiv Sedovs'kyj happened to be in Venice in 1641 and there came upon a fellow-countryman from Lviv who had just acquired a doctorate from the university of Padua. Sedovs'kyj was moved to write a congratulatory panegyric in which patriotic pride swells into the baroque Slavic consciousness so prominent in Križanić. Sedovs'kyj writes in the introduction to his poem that it is meant for the use and enjoyment of people of the Slavic tongue, the extension of which equals the extension of the earth²², a phrase that would have been applauded by Križanić.

The interest in Križanić shown by Methodius Terlec'kyj likewise testifies to common ideals. The bishop of Xolm too was fired by visions of unity among the Slavs, but tempered them by realistic attention to practical needs and an awareness of what could be achieved. But at the period when Križanić knew Terlec'kyj and there was a chance of his going to Xolm a mission in Ukraine seemed insignificant to Križanić as Ukraine politically was still totally within the Polish state. The possibilities in Ukraine, with no broader political prospects, did not engage Križanić's interest. A religious union confined to the ecclesiastical sphere alone, such as had been effected in Ukraine half a century earlier, evidently did not impress him — or, should we say, could not serve his grandiose and all-embracing projects.

At his passage through Ukraine in 1659 the situation in Ukraine was not so neutrally inoffensive. Križanić must have rejoiced at the treaty of Perejaslav of 1654; it was a step towards the recognition of the tsar's hegemony that was so crucial to his plans. Now he became alarmed at Vyhovs'kyj's repudiation of the treaty as a check towards the realization of his own hopes. To Križanić these hopes never appeared futile.

Križanić's relations to Ukrainian matters, as indeed to everything outside his Muscovite mission, were only incidental.

²² Kyrylo Studyns'kyj, "Try panegyryky XVII viku", *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Sevčenko*, 12 (1896, 4):1-32. This contains the full text of Sedovs'kyj's panegyric, which was first printed in Venice in 1641.

JURAJ KRIZANIC I UKRAJINA

Sažetak

Juraj Križanić pokazuje stalnu usmjerenost prema svom idealu solidarnosti Slavena — i to vjerske i političke. Njegovi se osnovni stavovi jasno odražavaju u kontaktima s Ukrajinom i ukrajinskim zbivanjima, makar ti kontakti bili tek slučajni.

Do Križanićevog prvog direktnog kontakta s Ukrajinčima (ne uzmemo li u obzir onaj s mogućim sustudentima u Grčkom kolegiju (1641—1642. g.) došlo je preko Metodija Terleckyja, biskupa Holma. Njih dvojica sastali su se 1643. i 1644. g. u Hrvatskoj, za vrijeme putovanja Terleckyja u i iz Rima.

Nedavno objavljeni dokumenti omogućavaju nam da točnije slijedimo tok i prirodu njihova druženja i da bolje vidimo njegov karakter. Smatralo se da će Križanić postati Terleckyjev suradnik u Holmu, iako je za Križanića to bilo samo sredstvo za postizanje moguće misije u Rusiji. To da Križanić nikada nije stigao u Holm ima se zahvaliti njegovoj usmjerenosti prema tom cilju. Još se jednom sastao s Terleckim u Varšavi gdje mu je Terlecki povjerio neke poslove.

Križanićev boravak u Smolensku 1647. g. doveo ga je do upoznavanja reda bazilijanaca, koji, međutim, nisu privukli njegovo veće zanimanje, jer ga je više od svega zaokupljalo pronalaženje sredstava da stigne u Rusiju.

Tek za vrijeme svog drugog putovanja u Rusiju 1659. g. Križanić je stvarno putovao kroz Ukrajinu. Bio je na putu da ponudi svoje usluge caru pa je vidio prilike u Ukrajini — period burnog hetmanata Vyhovs'kija — u svijetlu potreba vlastitih planova. Kako je bio uvjeren da jedina nada za slavensko jedinstvo ovisi o Rusiji bilo mu je stalo da ukrajinski Kozaci prihvate njegov stav podložnosti caru.