

SOME FORMATIVE INFLUENCES ON KRIZANIĆ'S IDEALS

Križanić's ambitious projects, his unionism and his slavism, cannot be understood apart from the surroundings and milieu in which he spent his formative years, in particular his studies in the Jesuit Colleges. Križanić's Muscovite mission too cannot be regarded in isolation from the missionary movement of his generation. Here we can offer not an exhaustive study of the influences on Križanić, but only a few items of information that may contribute to explain his methods, plans and yearnings.

Zagreb

In contradistinction to Bohemia and other territories of the Habsburg monarchy, Croatia was free from strong anticatholic opposition, so that the growing vitality of the old faith was not hindered. As one consequence, from the beginning a good number of candidates entered the Jesuit order. Since colleges of the Society were international, emphasis was placed on Latin as a living tongue. The College of Zagreb was frequented by 300 pupils and more, the majority of whom, about 60 per cent, were Croatians, while the rest were of German, Slovenian, Hungarian and Italian background.¹

Križanić studied in Zagreb from 1629 to 1635. There were no academic courses at that time.² The first step in that direction was made by Francis Ergeljski, bishop of Zagreb, who in 1633 donated 1000 francs for that purpose. From the interest on this sum a professor of moral theology (*casus*), the most basic course for priests, was to be maintained.³

The College was a center of education and of pastoral activity as well. All the doings of the Jesuits were followed with interest by both

¹ M. Vanino, *Isusovci i hrvatski narod*, I, Zagreb 1969.

² This article had already been transmitted to the Yugoslav Academy for printing, when my attention was drawn to short commentary in the *Historijski Zbornik*, godina XXVII—XXVIII (1974—1975) entitled: Juraj Križanić — dak ljubljanske isusovačke gimnazije. Even if Križanić completed all or a part of his humanistic studies in Ljubljana, some material of my chapter entitled «Zagreb» is still of use.

³ Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus (ARSJ), later this indication omitted, when clear from the context; Austr. 136, p. 118.

town and students. In 1633 a group of Jesuits visited the garrisons stationed in Karlovac, Križevci, and Koprivnica, heard confessions, imparted sacraments, and encouraged the soldiers.³ On other occasions they visited the parishes near the Turkish border.

In the same year a man escaped from Turkey to Christian territory, received instruction in the Christian faith, and was baptized in St. Stephen's cathedral. »A huge crowd of people attended the ceremony« note the Jesuit records.⁴

Such events and the ever present Turkish danger could not leave Križanić indifferent.

A good part of the dynamism that characterized Križanić during his years of formation and even during his whole life was due to his membership and training in the Sodality of Our Lady. It was established in every College and residence of the Jesuits. There exists a distorted picture about sodalities and their work in the centuries of Catholic reformation. They were primarily founded for men. The Manual of a Sodalist published in 1601 states: »The first aim of a Sodality must be the cultivation of a more perfect life modelled on the life of Jesus«. Thus they were not merely associations of pious prayer. The spirit of the Sodality was rooted in the Spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius: in promoting the salvation of souls to the greater glory of God, in helping the needy, in a holy restlessness to realize greater and greater deeds in the service of Christ. The Sodality was an elite organization, new members being admitted selectively.

In Križanić's time there was one Sodality in the College, another in the town for the citizens. In Graz there were five Sodalities: three in the Academy — one for the students of grammar and syntax, another for the students of rhetoric and poetics, and a third for philosophers and theologians. Križanić was a member of the third. His membership in the sodalities of Zagreb and Graz can be deduced from his early rise to assistant and then prefect of the Sodality in the Greek College.⁵ This is unthinkable without previous participation in the life of a sodality.

The sodalities were not subject directly to the General of the Society, nor did they form an organized body, though identical ideals gave them a remarkable unity. In 1584 Gregory XIII gave to the first Congregation in Rome — *Prima primaria* — some privileges, though without jurisdiction over other sodalities. The *Prima primaria* in Rome became a vehicle of favours granted to all sodalities, and for that reason they were expressly aggregated to the first Sodality in Rome.

³ Ibid., p. 117.

⁴ Ibid., p. 118.

⁵ Križanić entered the Greek College in the spring of 1641; at the meeting of the members of the Sodality on 29 September of the same year he was elected Assistant, the first dignity after the Prefect. On 18 December 1641 he was elected Secretary, on 6 April 1642 he was given the charge of Consultor, on 20 July 1642 he was elected Prefect of the Sodality in the Greek College. These indications are preserved in the notebook of the Sodality of the Greek College, kept today in the Archives of the Roman Province. The respective codex contains the years 1592—1647; Križanić is mentioned on foll.: 125v, 126v, 128v, 129v.

When a member of a Sodality moved to another place, he could ask for *litterae patentes* (credentials). Such credentials issued by the Sodality of the Greek College in favour of Križanić were published by Belokurov.⁶

Small details scattered in his writings testify about Križanić's attachment to the Sodality. Soon after his entrance into St. Athanasius College he addressed to Francesco Ingoli a Memorandum on the Muscovite apostolaté. At the beginning of this writing are placed two abbreviated *nomina sacra* (Jesus — Maria: IHS — MRA),⁷ as was customary among Jesuits and sodalists. The founder of the Order assumed the abbreviated Greek name of Jesus as an emblem for the seal of the Company and it is still in use. The Memorandum is closed with two brief words — *Laus Deo*, another formula current among the Jesuit and those who were influenced by their spirituality. Fr. Paul Pierling comments: »In his mouth and under his pen this was not an empty word«.⁸

Dramatic performances were highly regarded in Jesuit colleges for their educational and moral value. When Križanić was attending the Zagreb gymnasium, in 1635, the play 'Trebellius, rex Bulgarorum' was performed. The text has not been preserved, but its short content is known. The play really portrays tsar Boris (852—889) and his sons Vladimir and Simeon and represents the struggle between paganism and Christianity in Bulgaria of those times.⁹

Križanić was aware of the impact that dramatic performances exert on the spectator. He gained more experience in them while staying in Graz. In the above mentioned Memorandum to Ingoli he stressed a way to gain the favour of the Grand duke of Muscovy and his nobles: »To present sometimes on the stage some feats of their saints and dukes«.¹⁰

Graz

Križanić concluded the *humaniora* in Zagreb in the summer of 1635 and towards the end of the same year he went to the University of Graz, founded as a Jesuit institution by the archduke Charles on 1 January 1585. The official documents of the Academy, as far as they are preserved, contain three short notes about Križanić.

The catalogue of the Ferdinandeum states that he entered the residence on 19 December 1635.¹¹

⁶ *Ctenija v Imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej Rossijskix pri Moskovskom universitete* (COIDR), 1903, 3, p. 219.

⁷ Reedited by A. Kadić in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (JbGO), 12 (1964), p. 331—349 (336).

⁸ COIDR, 1907, 3, p. 55.

⁹ J. Müller S. J., *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge vom Anfang (1555) bis zum Hochbarock (1665)*, 2. Band, Augsburg 1930, p. 32—34. Fančev Franjo, *Grada za povijest školskog i književnog rada isusovačkog kolegija u Zagrebu (1606—1772)*, *Starine* 37 (1934), p. 57.

¹⁰ JbGO, 12 (1964), p. 348.

¹¹ Georgius Krisanizh, Croatia, Ozalliensis, Annor. 19, Logicus, commendatus a Domino Hizing, ingressus 19. Decembris, solvit 45 fl. See Johann Andritsch, *Die Matrikeln der Universität Graz*, Band 2 (1630—1662), p. 248. For Burckhardt Hi-

In the Promotion book of the University it is noted that Križanić became a bachelor of philosophy ('primam Philosophiae lauream consecutus est') on 11 May 1637 and was in the eighth place among 52 candidates.¹²

He concluded his studies in Graz with a doctorate of philosophy on 5 August 1638, obtaining the sixth place among 30 *doctorandi*.¹³

In 1636 there were at the University of Graz about 140 Jesuits, of whom 84 were scholastics, that is, students of theology and philosophy. Most of them came from the German Jesuit provinces; they took refuge in Graz because of the furious warfare in Germany. In the residence of the Holy Spirit there were about 60 students, in the Ferdinandeum over 100.¹⁴ The vast majority of students, several hundred, attended the grammar and *humaniora* classes. All students together numbered over 1200.

The atmosphere was more international than in Zagreb. Statistics are limited and go according to geographical origin, not according to the mother tongue. We may guess, however, that two thirds of the philosophy and theology students were German speaking, the rest were Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Croatians, Slovenians, Italians, and a good group of Poles. In the fall 1636 two sons of Prince Radziwill registered at the Academy, which the Jesuit compiler of the *Litterae Annuae* recorded with great satisfaction.¹⁵

The study of philosophy included logic, physics, and metaphysics. There was also a course of mathematics and of Greek, both rather elementary. James Durant, an excellent mathematician of the faculty held in 1636—1637 a 'collegium privatissimum' in mathematics, restricted to three Jesuits, that the Province might not be short of expert mathematicians in the future.¹⁶

Križanić in later years felt that his mathematical training, important for his mission, had been neglected. When after his first visit in Moscow he returned to Poland-Lithuania, he intended to remedy this insufficiency and planned to ask the Jesuit professor of the Vilna Academy to instruct him in applied mathematics, in particular in astronomy and in the reform of the calendar. He hoped in his next visit to Moscow to convince the tsar of the usefulness of the Gregorian reform.¹⁷

At the beginning of the school year 1636/7 the play 'Andronikos, Emperor of the East' was presented with great success. The text of it is not preserved.¹⁸

cing [Hietzing] see V. Jagić, *Život i rad Jurja Križanića*, Zagreb 1917, p. 228—231. The contribution of 45 florins is rather high; some students lived in the residence gratis. The Ferdinandeum was founded by archduke Ferdinand (later Ferdinand (later Ferdinand II.) in 1602.

¹² J. Andritsch, *op. cit.*, p. 142: No 8, Georgius Krisanich, Croata Obarbiensis, Nobilis, ex Ferdinandaco.

¹³ J. Andritsch, *op. cit.*, p. 148: No 6, Georgius Krisanich, Croata, Oberhiensis, Nobilis. Similar information in Križanić's letter to Levaković: COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 172.

¹⁴ *Litterae Annuae, Graecii*, Austr. 137, p. 46.

¹⁵ Austr. 136, p. 537; Austr. 137, p. 40.

¹⁶ Austr. 136, p. 536.

¹⁷ COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 173.

¹⁸ Austr. 136, p. 537. The play probably concerned Andronikos I Komnenos (1183—1185).

Only a few weeks before Križanić matriculated at the Academy of Graz, Juraj Habelić, a Jesuit scholar, finished there his philosophical studies. He became later a famous Croatian preacher and lexicographer. His main work *Dikcionar ili rečišlvenske z vekšega ukup zebrane* was published in Graz 1670, while Križanić was in Tobol'sk. We may presume that Križanić was acquainted with the activity of Habelić, because he himself regarded cultivation of the language the basis of any culture. Later he wrote to Levaković that he would like to proclaim in the presence of the tsar that he desires nothing as much as to perfect the status of the Slavic tongue.¹⁹

That he did not forsake a desire to improve the Croation and the tongue in general, can be deduced from several notes in his 'Politika'.²⁰

Both enthusiasts certainly met in Varaždin. Križanić moved there in May 1645 and stayed there till June 1646. Habelić was teaching in the Jesuit school of Varaždin from 1644 till 1647 with the exception of some months from the end of 1645 till the early summer of 1646 which he spent in the tertianship of Judenburg.²¹

On 3 October 1636 Philip Divinar, a professor of moral theology and of controversies died suddenly in Ljubljana, where he was sent to settle some matters. In the *Litterae Annuae* is an Elogium on the deceased: that he mastered several languages, that he cherished a great love for his brethren in the order and for suffering people. He also took part in the mission to Constantinople, as a companion of the Imperial Ambassador, the most illustrious Rudolph Puchheim.²² Possibly, Križanić envisaged already by this time a similar journey. It materialized in 1650, when he joined the suite of the Imperial Ambassador Rudolph Schmidt to Constantinople as his 'Italian secretary'.

Bologna

For his theological studies Križanić chose Bologna, being attracted by the fame of its university. He found it convenient to live in the 'Collegium hungarico-illyricum', founded for clerics and lay students of Hungarian and Croatian nationality by Pavao Zondi, canon of Zagreb and Esztergom, in 1552.

He must have found out that theological studies in Bologna were unsatisfactory. There was one chair of scholastic theology, another of Sacred Scripture, and in 1637 a course of moral theology was added. The convents of religious offered more solid theological courses than the famous *studio Bolognese*.²³

¹⁹ COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 182.

²⁰ *Politika*, ed. V. V. Zelenin, M. 1965, p. 141—142.

²¹ Rotraud Stumpfohl, *Kroatische Jesuiten an der Grazer Universität 1585—1773*, Inauguraldissertation (Maschinenschrift), Graz 1976, p. 87—92 (88). Ladislav Lukács S. J., *Catalogi personarum et officiorum provinciae Austriae*, t. II, Romae 1982, p. 608, has a brief sketch of the life of Habelić, based on the catalogs of the province.

²² Austr. 136, p. 536.

²³ Luigi Simeoni, *Storia della università di Bologna*, vol. II, Bologna 1947, p. 90—91.

Did Križanić hope that the Jesuits would open a theological school of their own? In spite of opposition from the old University the Jesuits in 1627 opened their novitiate in the city. In the year 1635 they transferred the Studium of philosophy and theology for their scholastics from Parma to Bologna, but both the Rector of the Studium and General Muzio Viteleschi promised on 26 January 1636 that in Bologna no outsider, either secular or religious would be admitted to this College.²⁴ This school, therefore, was not open to Križanić.

Unsure of where to turn his energies next, Križanić took up Possesino's *Moscovia*. His vague dreams and uncertain longings at once took on a more concrete shape. He strongly felt called to become an apostle of Muscovy. To respond to this call he needed a preparation that could be obtained — he surmised — only in Rome.

Rome

He turned up in Rome at the beginning of December 1640.²⁵ He had from the very first a clear plan, a threefold task to be carried out in the Eternal City: to finish his theological studies, to become thoroughly acquainted with Controversies, and finally to master the Greek tongue, both classical and spoken (*lingua volgare, parlata*). Only in the Greek College — so it seemed to him — could he carry out his ambitious project.

He was, however, barred from entering that College by Constitution of Urban VIII that established that only Greeks, of Greek parents and of Greek rite, could be accepted as seminarians. A subterfuge was open, however. He could enter the College as a *convittore*, to whom the Urbanian regulation would not apply. But he would pay for his upkeep 6 scudi a month (Rome was an expensive city) and 12 scudi for his clothing a year. He would have his own room, would not be obliged to wear a cassock, would not take any oath, and hence would not be obliged to any service to the Propaganda. The state of a *convittore* seemed to be more in concordance with his status of a noble, a preoccupation that accompanied him his whole life.

But he was probably short of money (as he always was) and could not pay the full pension, about 84 scudi a year. He proposed to the Propaganda a compromise. He would pay only half, three scudi a month, retain the status of a *convittore*, but at the same time by taking the oath enter the service of the Propaganda. Similar arrangements were rare, and the Cardinals of the Propaganda discussed the matter on 26 February and on 11 March 1641. They ended by accepting the proposal, which the

²⁴ Natale Fabrini, *Lo studio pubblico di Bologna ed i gesuiti*. Bologna 1941, p. 18—19.

²⁵ A letter of Križanić to Vinković on 3 April 1641: 'Tandem itaque post quadrimestre intervallum morarum, quas Romae traxi, vix assecutus sum introitum in hoc Collegium.' Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Književnici u Hrvatah s ove strane Velebita, živivši u prvoj polovini XVII. vieka*, in *Arhiv za povjestnicu Jugoslavensku*, knj. X, Prilozi, p. 192.

Pope then approved.²⁶ This unusual agreement became later, after his return from Tobol'sk, a cause of misunderstanding. In Vilna he entered the Dominican order, though according to the oath of the Propaganda entering religious orders was forbidden without the permission of Church authorities. Otherwise the person's religious vows were null and void.

None of the papal colleges erected by Gregory XIII or his successors possessed a full course of philosophy or theology. The colleges were primarily residences and the pupils attended classes in the Roman College (what is today the *Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana*). Only modest courses were held in the residences.

In the Greek College the following subsidiary classes were taught: afternoon repetitions of the matter presented in the Roman College in the morning hours; courses of Latin for beginners; courses for Greek; and courses of Controversies.

Križanić attended theological classes probably in the Roman College. Shortly before the end of his studies he asked for a doctor's cap. He assured Levaković later that he took the doctorate to have greater authority in teaching the Muscovites.²⁷ In the Greek College the doctorate was obtained from the Roman College through its prefect of studies and two professors.²⁸

Križanić passed the petition to the Cardinals of the Propaganda to get the doctor's cap from the College of the Propaganda. This was granted to him on 12 September 1642.²⁹

The classes on Controversies were highly appreciated by scholarly Rome when they were taught in the Roman College by Robert Bellarmine 1577—1587. Križanić repeatedly declared that he would like to apply to the controversies with the Greeks the method of Bellarmine. In the forties of the 17th century the Controversies in the Greek College were taught by P. Luca Flisco, who was also Minister (Vice-rector) of the house. He was a native of Rome, born 18 October 1583, studied philosophy and theology before his entry into the Society, became a Jesuit on 25 January 1609. He took solemn vows on 18 May 1625.³⁰ In the catalogues of the time we read repeatedly: »bene versatus in controversiis Graecorum«. He liked the zeal of Križanić and more than once intervened before the Propaganda in favour of his student. He was certainly a good te-

²⁶ E. Smurlo, *Rossija i Italija*, t. III, Sanktpeterburg 1911, p. 72—73.

²⁷ COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 176.

²⁸ For a short description of the *addotoramento* in the Greek College see: Archives of the Greek College (ACGr) 2, ff 177v—179r.

²⁹ E. Smurlo, *Rossija i Italija*, t. III, p. 88. The petition of Križanić to the Pope for the *addotoramento* outside the Greek College: COIDR, 1909, 2, p. 13. There should not surprise us the words of Križanić to Levaković: »Et Romae in Sapientia ad doctoratum theologiae promotus sum«: COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 172. The concession to the Propaganda College to give doctorates was granted in 1627 and confirmed in 1641; the document refers to the privileges of the 'Studium Generale Urbis', called also 'Sapientia' up to our time. See: R. de Martinis, *Iuris Pontificii de Prop. Fide*, t. I, Romae 1888, p. 91.

³⁰ ARSJ, Rom. 56, f. 290v, f. 330; Rom. 57, f. 37, f. 175; Rom. 58, f. 35.

acher, but not a scholarly expert. No work on Controversies has come down from his pen. Carlos Sommervogel notes only a modest devotional book that Flisco translated from Spanish and that was published many years after his death.³¹

The Rector of the College was at that time Tarquinio Galluzzi (1574—1649), who administered the seminary from 1632 to 1645. Such a long term of rectorship was exceptional. He was an eminent classical scholar and for many years taught in the Roman College.³² He was persuaded that St. Athanasius should be reserved exclusively to the Greeks and that Ruthenians, monks of Grottaferrata, and Italo-Greeks had sufficient opportunities to be trained elsewhere. To Križanić Galluzzi was always kind and helpful.

The third task Križanić determined to realize in Rome was to master Greek, both classical and spoken. It was deplorable that no Jesuit priest was assigned to teach this language, though there were Jesuits of Greek origin in the Roman province and many more in the Sicilian province. The teaching of Greek was confined to older students who were finishing their studies. No academic level could be expected because the students entered the College without a serious preparation in their homeland. When Križanić started Greek together with young boys, he had already some previous knowledge of it. It was more difficult to master spoken Greek.

He could have received some help from Pantalaemon- Paisios Ligaridis, one of the best teachers the Greek College had. He was sent to the East in 1641, but soon returned again to Rome. He was then ordered peremptorily to leave Rome. He left the City about 28 May 1642; on 7 June we find already in Venice.³³ During his last months in the College he lectured on Greek rhetorics;³⁴ the course was presented in 'modern' Greek. More than for his teaching Ligaridis is known for his collaboration with Aleksej Mixajlovič in deposing Patriarch Nikon. Nikon was in contact with him from 1657. Ligaridis himself appeared in Moscow about 1661. Did he know the fate of Križanić? Had he any part in removing him to Tobol'sk? There was between Križanić and Ligaridis an exchange of letters soon after both left the College. Križanić asked for books and manuscripts on Controversies.³⁵ He probably did not obtain them.

The Moscow Mission

To a sober mind the dream of Križanić — the Union of Moscow with Rome and the liberation of the Slavs from the Turkish yoke by Muscovy — looks rather far-fetched. Scrutinizing it through the prism of time, we shall judge it more indulgently.

³¹ *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, t. III, Bruxelles-Paris, 1892, p. 790. L. Flisco died in Orvieto on 20 January 1622: ARSJ, *Hist. Soc.*, vol. 48, f. 94v.

³² For a short sketch of his life see: *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique*, v. XIX, Paris 1981, coll. 903—904.

³³ E. Šmurlo, *Paisij Ligarid v Rime i na grečeskom Vostoke*, in: *Trudy Vostočnoj Akademii*, t. I, Sofija 1932, p. 531—538 (554).

³⁴ E. Šmurlo, *Paisij Ligarid*, p. 552.

³⁵ E. Šmurlo, *Russija i Italija*, III, p. 89.

At the end of the sixteenth century the taste for travel and for exploration of distant countries took on still greater proportions. Portugal and Spain continued to explore their colonies, the Germans travelled as a matter of habit,³⁶ the Italians of the maritime cities did not lose their mobility of old. The Czech expert on Baroque literature Zdeněk Kalista pointed out the growth of travel and travel literature in Bohemia and neighbouring countries at that time, be that literature original descriptions of distant lands or translations of foreign works.³⁷

Adventurers and soldiers looked for gold, excitement, and exploitation aimed at spiritual riches. They hoped to conquer the new lands for Christ and felt nearer to God in distant horizons. They experienced the fundamental sensation of the age of Baroque of seeing God through this world.³⁸ They imagined to have discovered a virginal world, issued from the Creator's hands yesterday as it were, untouched and unspoiled.

All the territories discovered since the end of the 15th century were designated by the expression 'East and West Indies', or simply 'Indies'. All those who volunteered for spiritual work in these lands were called in the Jesuit order *Indipetae* (*Indias petunt*), since they used to send to the General Superior a petition to assign them to a mission overseas. All religious orders shared in the missionary enterprise, but Križanić was most acquainted with Jesuit missionary activity.

Križanić's India was Muscovy and this notion emerges already from the first words of the Memorandum he presented to Ingoli in the summer of 1641: »Though the multitude of the peoples of the Prince of Moscow became known later and received less prominence than the Indies ...»³⁹

The words said by God to Abraham (Gen. 12,1) by which a special mission was confided to the patriarch,⁴⁰ were often meditated by the *Indipetae*, and Križanić was not indifferent to them. When he heard them from the Bishop of Xolm Terlec'kyj, he was persuaded that they were told to him by God himself.⁴¹

On 28 February 1646 he wrote to Ingoli that to the divine call, continuous and insistent, he had already for 8 years hardened his heart and had resisted God.⁴²

To be sent to Muscovy was the same kind of privileged call as to be sent to the Indies. This can be illustrated by the attitude of two Czech Jesuit missionaries, George David (1647—1713) and his companion Tobias Tichavský (1651—1694). Both were *Indipetae*, both begged the General to send them to distant lands. George David wrote for the first time to the Superior General Charles Noyelle on 21 December 1682: »... offero me, integerrimo affectu suae A. R. Paternitati ad infima quaecumque in mundi oculis munia, missiones asperas ac remotissimas, quarumcum-

³⁶ Willi Fleming, *Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter des Barocks*, 2. Aufl., Konstanz 1960, p. 295—299.

³⁷ Zdeněk Kalista, *České baroko*, Praha 1941, p. 12—15.

³⁸ Ibid. p. 16. Z. Kalista, *Cesty ve znamení kříže*, Praha 1941, p. 7, 15.

³⁹ JbGO 12 (1964), p. 336.

⁴⁰ Yahweh said to Abram: 'Leave your country, your family and your father's house, for the land I will show you'.

⁴¹ COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 132 and p. 145 (in the letter to Levaković).

⁴² Ibid., p. 133.

que vel capax effici Dei auxilio potero . . .⁴³ When after three years of waiting he was told to set out for the Muscovite mission, he rejoiced at having his petition granted. Though not 'the most distant', it was probably 'the harshest mission', as David desired. He entered Moscow in 1686, 11 years after Križanić left Russia. Tichavský arrived in Moscow in February 1689.

The mission of David and Tichavský was not papal but imperial. They were sent to Moscow by Leopold, King of Bohemia and Emperor, in agreement with the Czech Provincial. Their pastoral work was limited to Catholic foreigners in Russian service and they were forbidden to mix with Russians. But already on 12 October 1689 the decree expelling both Jesuits from Russia was signed.⁴⁴

In India, Japan, and China the missionaries encountered old cultures that deeply permeated the life of the population. They realized that the Christian message grafted on the stock of ancient customs would yield fruit faster. In China the accomodation policy was to be applied to the ancestor cult and to Confucianism.

An analogous accommodating spirit animated Križanić. Yet, though the Russians were Christians, to apply the 'principle of cultural relevancy' was difficult. Križanić did not intend to preach a new faith. He had a deep affection for the Russian people, he highly regarded the Russian bishops. Was there anything to be found fault with in their way of life and in their teaching? O, yes, a lot. They had prejudices against Western Christianity, and Križanić took umbrage at the *Kirillova kniga* that was full of ridiculous attacks against the Western Church. But he found it hard to accuse his brethren of ignorance; were they not misguided by the Greeks? He did not finish his confutation of the *Kirillova kniga*, though he had plenty of time and the necessary books at hand. He was not in a hurry. Was he to accuse 'his nation' of ignorance and rude manners?

In his letter to Levaković Križanić reasons: Faith is propagated by means of miracles in a supernatural way or by natural means, such as embassies that enjoy inviolability, by discussions, erudition, in particular by mathematics. In this way those inconversant with these subjects become enthused. »It is well known what in this century is of importance in the Indies: the art through which one becomes useful to the pagans and loved by them.⁴⁵ Križanić was well informed about the situation of missionaries in China. All those who were experts in mathematics, music, geometry, and astronomy were in great demand.

The spirit of sacrifice must animate any missionary. The *Indipetae* in their letters assured the Superior General that they renounced with joy all the advantages of their home country, the 'pleasures of Europe'.⁴⁶ Križanić wrote to Levaković that by volunteering for the Muscovite mis-

⁴³ ARSJ, Fondo gesuitico, v. 756, f. 200.

⁴⁴ For the activity of Czech Jesuits in Russia see: Antonín V. Florovský, *Českí ješuité na Rusi*, Praha 1941.

⁴⁵ ČOISR, 1903, 3p. 178—179.

⁴⁶ 'Quitter l'Europe et ses délices', translation and commentary of some letters of the French *Indipetae*, in: *Christus*, Paris 1955, p. 532—545. Ed. G. Botte reau.

sion he gave up the comfortable life of a canon, a stay in the residences of Peter Zrinyi or of G. Frankopan, as well as the life of a tutor of the sons of Ivan Drašković in Vienna.⁴⁷

Any inclination to translate into Russian the works of scholastic theology, or even the catechisms of Canisius or Bellarmine was foreign to him. He recommended that books on politics and history be translated into Russian. From among religious books he recommended for translation only the *Imitatio Christi* ascribed to Thomas à Kempis, an admirable product of the *devotio moderna* in the 14th century.⁴⁸ We may surmise that he selected it not only because it was much read in the West, but primarily because it was a book of 'interdenominational nature' — as we would say today — and not an iota was to be changed before passing it on to the Russian reader. As a matter of fact, it was published in Slavonic in the same year 1647 in the Wallachian monastery Deal.⁴⁹ The next edition was in Počajiv in 1764.⁵⁰ In the 19th century there were several translations, the most successful by K. P. Pobedonoscev. His translation went through eight printings between 1869 and 1899. Križanić recommending the translation of the *Imitatio Christi* showed himself to be a man of insight.

The most revealing pages on Križanić's life and mission are found in his Memorandum to Francesco Ingoli. In the third part of it he unfolds the plan for his conquest of Moscow.⁵¹

The strategy of the 23 year-old student looks perfect: »One can set out for Russia through Ukraine, through Wallachia, or from Constantinople with the ambassador of the Duke or with a company of merchants. But I would not enter through any of these places the territory of the Duke without being first invited by him«.

And he goes on: »Because history is the most useful among literary works, it is for many reasons commendable and less subject to controversy. For that reason I would like, even when living in Rome, to compose a work *De Historia Christiana*. In it the history of other nations would be only alluded to, but I would describe the origins and progress, the faults and losses of Christian faith in the Slavic nations in detail«.

And so it goes, every sentence like a new bead put on a string. The text looks like a well thought-out treatise or lecture elaborated in detail. Everything is well prepared, so that the adversary cannot detect any loophole. At first each item looks like a solid block of a structure, then doubt and confusion assails the reader, finally sober and realistic details melt away into a fantasy. The project reads like an enticing, attractive fairytale. The reader realizes that what Križanić described concerned his promised land; he contemplated Muscovy always in a shining light. To Križanić religious union and political conquest appeared merged into one mirage.

⁴⁷ COIDR, 1903, 3, p. 177.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 174.

⁴⁹ This edition is described in: *Bibliografia Românească veche*, t. I, 1508—1716, ed. Joan Bianu și Nerva Hodos, București 903, p. 158—160.

⁵⁰ The edition is described in: Ilarion Sviencickij, *Kataloh knih cerkovno-slavjanskoji pečaty*, Zovkva 1908, p. 135—136.

⁵¹ JbGO, 12 (1964), p. 345—349.

For that reason it is difficult as well as unimportant to discuss the primacy of the motives by which Križanić was guided.²² Neither the opinion of Father Pierling, that the apostle had preponderance over the patriot, nor the judgment of E. Šmurlo that at least in later years his slavophilism comes to the fore and gives even to his missionary plan a particular colouring are adequate.

When Križanić returned to the West — a broken and old man — with his dreams dissipated, he abandoned Muscovy not without regret and certainly without hatred. A *magnanimitas*, proper to great spirits of the age of the Baroque enabled him to bear the failure of his dreams calmly, disdaining even a thought of revenge; he was ready for new sacrifices for worthy ideals.

²² On this problem see Ivan Golub, *Slavenstvo Jurja Križanića*, Zagreb 1963, pp. 78—98.

IAN KRAJCAR

NEKI UTJECAJI IZ DOBA KRIŽANIĆEVE FORMACIJE NA NJEGOVE IDEALE

Sažetak

Obrazovne i odgojne ustanove (Zagreb, Graz, Bologna, Rim) gotovo listom isusovačke, u kojima je mladi Križanić stjecao znanje i primao odgoj utjecale su na oblikovanje Križanićevih ideala. Predmeti koji su se na učilištima predavali, osobe s kojima je bilo kao s učiteljima ili odgojiteljima boravio doprinosile su Križanićevoj težnji da poradi u Moskvi na crkvenom jedinstvu i na protjerivanju Turaka iz Evrope od strane Rusije. Križanićeva misionarska spremnost za duga i teška putovanja te velikodušnost u nedaćama izrazito je pojavljenje baroknog Križanićevog vremena.