

KRIŽANIC AND ENGLAND

Until the end of the sixteenth century England, though she had become a rich and powerful state, had not been closely involved in European affairs. Politically as well as geographically she was on the periphery of Europe. But at the beginning of the seventeenth century she suddenly assumed a leading role in the intellectual struggles of its first two decades, struggles in which religion and politics were of foremost importance — and inextricably interwoven. With England's sudden entry, at the beginning of the century, into the European arena as a vigorous combatant, the Vatican became interested, indeed involved, in English affairs; and this is not irrelevant for the study of Križanić.

In 1599 King James VI of Scotland published a small private edition of a book, *Basilikon Doron*, written as a last will and testament for his son, since he believed his own death to be imminent. James did not die at that time. But Queen Elizabeth I of England did (in 1603). James ascended the English throne as Elizabeth's successor, becoming James I of England as well as remaining James VI of Scotland. He thus united his small, turbulent, undeveloped native country (in these respects not unlike the then Croatian lands) with another much richer and more powerful one (more akin to Russia) whose people were nevertheless both of the same ethnic origin and spoke variants of a common (British) language.

In the *Basilikon Doron* James instructed his son in the rights and the personal qualities needed for it. He had thus, by chance, written upon a subject — the role of kingship — which had for some time been a highly controversial issue in Europe and of considerable concern to the Vatican. A year before publication of *Basilikon Doron* James had also published, but anonymously, a treatise entitled *The True Law of Free Monarchies* dealing with the political aspects of kingship. This was now acknowledged by James to be his work, came to be regarded as a part of *Basilikon Doron* and was subsequently generally published together with it.

The *Basilikon Doron* caused a furore in Europe since James had written not only on a subject already of so much concern to it, but had done so just before ascending the English throne. What kind of person the new English monarch was and, in particular, what was his intellectual stance with regard to the then religio-political struggles, were of great concern to Europe. What were his principles of statecraft, especially with regard to foreign powers? Europe demanded copies of the *Basilikon*

Doron. A second much larger public edition (which introduced a considerable number of changes and modifications) came out in London in 1603 immediately after James's accession. Even before this the French Ambassador had informed Henri IV about it. The book now excited as much interest in France as in England, and a French translation came out in the same year as the first public edition (1603). Two more French translations came out in Paris, in 1604, as well as pirated editions in Rouen and Lyon (1603), Poitiers and Hanau (1604) and yet another in 1646. Two Dutch translations appeared in Amsterdam in 1603. In 1604 a Latin version came out in London and a German one at Spire. The same year an edition began to appear in Welsh but was not completed. Two years later a Swedish version was published in Stockholm. Italian and Spanish translations were made — the former by Florio, renowned translator of Shakespeare — but these remained in manuscript. A Hungarian translation also appeared. After the English edition of 1603 many pirated editions were quick to meet the continuing demand for copies. The work was re-printed in the folio editions of James's *Complete Works* in 1616 and 1620.¹

Almost immediately after its appearance a copy of the first private edition of 1599 reached Rome. The Pope heard of it from an English Jesuit there, Parsons, and requested a translation to be made for him personally. The Pontiff hoped to use James's accession to the English throne as a means of shepherding England back from her heretical Anglican Church into the Catholic fold. James had acquired (justifiably) a reputation for much greater religious tolerance than Elizabeth. Wishing to inform himself more reliably on this point the Pope instructed his Nuncio in Paris to send him a copy of the Latin version in which, as he had heard, James had made changes.

After the uncovering of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605, when English Papists attempted to assassinate both King and Parliament, James was obliged to take action against Catholics. He promulgated the Act of Allegiance whereby all English Catholics were required to declare their faith and to swear allegiance to the English Crown. This precipitated a direct confrontation. Whose was the ultimate authority, a King's or the Pope's? The Pope (now Paul V) issued a Breve ordering English Catholics under no circumstances to take the oath. There was consternation among them, and many nevertheless did so, among them the Archbishop George Blackwell, Head of English Catholics. James replied to Paul V in a pamphlet known as *An Apology for the Oath of Allegiance*, attacking the Pope for commanding Catholics to refuse to profess their natural obedience to

¹ See: *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI*. With an Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossary ed. J. Craigie, Edinburgh and London, Vol. I (1944), Vol. II (1950); II, pp. 26—28. A more recent edition, from which all references in this article are given, is included in *The Political Works of James I*. With an Introduction ed. C. H. McIlwain, New York, 1965. The Latin translation made by Parsons is in the Vatican Library (Fondo Borghese, IV, 95). It differs from the published Latin translation of the English edition of 1603, by which knowledge of the *Basilikon Doron* was the most widely diffused among James's contemporaries. See also G. Albiion, «Charles I and the Papacy», *Royal Stuart Papers*, 1974, Published by the Royal Stuart Society.

thir sovereign».² The quarrel extended into all Christendom. Open polemics started between James and Cardinal Bellarmine, beginning a controversy in which many of the most eminent theologians in Europe participated. This turned upon the point as to whose was the ultimate authority. James claimed that »upon the one hand our Cardinal (Bellarmine) will have all Kings and Monarchs to be the Pope's vassals and yet will not on the other side allow the meanest of the Pope's vassals to be subject to any Christian Prince».³ Bellarmine's arguments, he declared, were an argument in favour of sedition. An erudite, extremely well — read man and no mean theologian, James believed himself elected to Kingship by God and responsible only to God. In the *Basilikon Doron* and *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* he forcefully elaborated his doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and his conviction of the patriarchal nature of kingship, both of which were fundamental to and characteristic of the thinking of all the Stuarts.

In 1605 both the *Basilikon Doron* and *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* were placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.⁴

Križanić read the *Basilikon Doron* and, most probably, the *True Law of Free Monarchies* and other writings of James. He was clearly impressed by what he read. He himself wrote in *Politika*: »Jakov, engleski kralj, napisao je knjigu pouka i u njoj piše sinu: 'Sine, nemoj se bogatiti, opterećujući ljude novim i teškim dancima, već smatraj blago svojih podanika najsigurnijom svojom imovinom'«.⁵ Since this is an exact translation from the *Basilikon Doron* it may be assumed that a copy of it was accessible to Križanić in Tobolsk. Perhaps he possessed a copy of it himself. He may well first have heard of the controversy between James and Bellarmine while in Rome and perhaps, even, saw a copy of the *Basilikon Doron* there. During his travels in Europe, where it was still very widely read, he could easily have acquired it for himself. In any case it is clear that at the time of writing *Politika* he was familiar with James's writings and ideas. A similarity not only of some of the main ideas but even of the expression of them in *Politika* and *Basilikon Doron* is striking.

In James, we read, for example: »By the Law of Nature the King becomes a natural Father to all his Lieges at his coronation. And as the Father of his fatherly duty is bound to care for the nourishing, education and virtuous government of his children; even so is the King bound to care for all his subjects».⁶ In Križanić we have: »Что есть челяный отец или господар во своему дому то мораст быть краль по своему кралесгву. И в истине бо кралство несть ничто ню неже народное Домо-

² McIlwain, p. 72. The full title of the work is »*Triplici Nodo, Triplex Cuneus. Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance. Against the Two Breves of Pope Paulus Quintus, and the Late Letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwell the Arch-Priest.*

³ *In A Premonition to all Most Mightie Monarchies, Kings, Free Princes and States of Christendom*, McIlwain, p. 152.

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Venice 1603—1607*, p. 306. Entry for 24 December 1605.

⁵ Quoted from J. Križanić, *Politika ili Razgovori o vladalaštvu*. Preveo s ruskog Mate Malinar, Zagreb, 1947, p. 198. All further references to *Politika* are taken from this translation.

⁶ *The True Law of Free Monarchies*, McIlwain, p. 55.

стройство. Яко бо всякий отецъ есть долженъ своей челяде промыслить корм, одежду и наукъ потребен; тако краль есть повиненъ своимъ поданикамъ промыслить телесную и душную блаженство.⁷

James writes of monarchy as »the form of government« which »approacheth nearest to perfection«⁸ while in Križanić we read that »монархия остається всегда лучше всехъ другихъ способъ правления.«⁹ Two themes which frequently recur in the thought of both the King of England and Scotland and the Croatian priest in Tobolsk exile are the over-riding need for good laws and acceptance of the belief that a king is responsible only to God. James believed that »a good king . . . employeth all his study and pains to preserve and maintain, by the making and execution of good laws, the welfare and peace of his people.«¹⁰ Križanić believes that »dobri su zakoni sredstvo za dobar i sretan život . . . i sve dobro, koje može postići onaj narod i ona država«; »gdje su dobri zakoni, ondje vole živjeti i domaći podanici, a i stranci dolaze rado«; »kralj koji želi da bude i poslije svoje smrti narodnim dobročincem . . . mora biti ne samo lično dobar, već mora izdati i dobre zakone.«¹¹ James argues that »kings are ever at God's disposition and in that case we are but lieu-renters, (it) lying no more in the King's nor people's hands to dispossess the righteous heirs.«¹² For Križanić: »Kralj je božji namjesnik i živi zakon, i nije podvrgen nijednomu do božjem zakonu, on je iznad svih čovječijih zakona; »nema nitko do jedinoga Boga pravo osnivati kraljevstva i postaviti kraljeve«; »kralj je božji lik i živi zakon i podložan je samo božjim zakonima, a od ljudskih zakona je viši«; »kralj nije podređen nikakovim ljudskim zapovijedima i nitko ga ne može ni osuditi ni kazniti.«¹³ A detailed examination reveals other similarities. There are striking similarities also of subjects dealt with — such as trade, commerce, national currency, craftsmen, merchants, attitudes to foreigners.

Morduhovič maintains that for Križanić a king (»gosudar'») »является наместником бога, починяясь ему, а не духовной власти, как учила средновековая церковь.«¹⁴ This view of kingship held by Križanić was not original, as Morduhovič appears to imply. It was inherent in the Stuart doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings which Križanić must have encountered when reading *Basilikon Doron* and is likely to have heard discussed at the time of the trial of Charles I in 1649.

There were many precedents for the literary genre used by both James and Križanić — of advice to a monarch or future monarch. But it is interesting to observe that their approach is not only similar but new. Both adopt a moral and ethical approach based squarely on religion while at the same time being eminently practical. They both attend to worldly and godly matters alike. And both do so in simple, direct language of

⁷ Quoted from J. Križanić, *Russkoye Gosudarstvo v polovine XVII veka*. Ot-kryl i izdal P. Bezsonov, Moskva, 1860, II, p. 55.

⁸ McIlwain, p. 53.

⁹ J. Križanić, *Russkoye Gosudarstvo* . . . p. 45.

¹⁰ *Basilikon Doron*, McIlwain, p. 18.

¹¹ *Politika*, pp. 306, 63, 211.

¹² *Basilikon Doron*, McIlwain, p. 37.

¹³ *Politika*, pp. 19, 224, 190.

¹⁴ L. M. Morduhovič, »Iz rukopisnoga naslegstva J. Križanića«, *Istoričeski Arhiv*, I, 157.

their own vernacular. James had written not in Latin nor even Southern English but in the Scots English which he spoke. Although Križanić, as we know, did not take from James the idea of writing in his own »Križanića«, he is likely to have been encouraged in applying himself to that task when he read in *Basilikon Doron*, not long after the passage quoted by him in *Politika*: »in your language be plain, honest, natural, comely, clean, short . . . as well as not using book-language and ink-horn terms«. ¹⁵ Elsewhere James enjoins: »I would advise you to write in your own language; for there is nothing left to be said in Greek and Latin; and enough of poor scholars would match you in these languages; and besides that, it best becometh a king to purify and make famous his own tongue«. ¹⁶

*

Križanić was impressed by England's achievements in trade and commerce. His visit to Istanbul prompted the comment (in *Politika*) that »Francuzi, Englezi i Brabanci trguju po čitavom turskom carstvu i (da) sklapaju vrlo velike poslove. U Carigradu imaju toliko svojih trgovačkih lađa, da se čini kao da je okružen gustom šumom«. ¹⁷ Just to take note of so many boats was not enough for Križanić. With his wonderfully vigorous and enquiring mind he wanted to know why these particular countries were so successful commercially. He found an answer insofar as the English were concerned. »Englezi«, he explains »ne dozvoljavaju holandskim pomorcima uvesti u svoju državu ništa drugo do ono, što rodi u njihovoj zemlji . . . Englezi ne dozvoljavaju nijednomu trgovcu (iz drugih zemalja) da kupuju njihovu domaću robu za preprodaju. Dozvole mu da kupi nekoliko komada sukna za vlastitu potrebu, ali mu ne dozvole da robom natovari lađu. Uza sve to dolaze k njima mnogo trgovci«. ¹⁸ This means that Križanić had informed himself of the Navigation Act passed in England in 1651, whereby English goods might not be carried in foreign boats. The year 1651 was precisely the year of Križanić's visit to Istanbul and the Navigation Act must surely have been a topic of conversation there among seamen and merchants, from whom he could have gained the information. Equally, there were many Englishmen in those parts of Europe which he visited as well as in Russia — both Moscow and Tobolsk — who would have known of the Act. For although until the 17th. century England had not played a major part in European affairs, she had enjoyed a particularly close relationship with Russia, especially during the reign of Elizabeth, due to the rapid growth of Anglo-Russian trade following the creation of the Muscovy Company in 1533. By the 1580's Russia had become the one foreign power whose relations with England were close and continuous and during the second half of the 16th. century England had become the best informed of all European

¹⁵ *Basilikon Doron*, McIlwain, p. 46.

¹⁶ *True Law of Free Monarchies*, McIlwain, p. 48.

¹⁷ *Politika*, p. 75.

¹⁸ *Politika*, p. 80. Križanić was evidently also aware that the English Muscovy Company had exploited its permitted trading base at Archangel for portorage of Indian and Siberian goods. *Politika*, p. 71.

states about Russia.¹⁹ Many embassies had been sent from London to Moscow. Until 1649 English merchants enjoyed many privileges in Russia, including exemption from customs duties, and many Englishmen began living there as agents, factors, craftsmen, as well as a number of professional men. The Tsars had a series of Englishmen as personal physicians and the English ambassadors had their own chaplains.

Some of the English lived in Siberia — and not only those connected with trade and commerce. Samuel Collins, who was for nine years personal physician to Tsar Alexis and thus moved at the centre of the Muscovite Court, informs us in his book, *The Present State of Russia*, published in 1671, of a fellow countryman, William Barnsley »who was sent to Siberia for being suspected too familiar in his (B. J. Morozov's) houses«. Barnsley lived in Siberia »about twenty years and at last he returned to Russia and was richly married«.²⁰ Collins gives an interesting insight into the ways of the Russian Court. »The Czar«, he informs us, »has spies in every corner and nothing is done or said at any Feast, public Meeting, Burial or Wedding but he knows it. He has spies also attending the armies to watch their motions and give a true account of their actions. These spies are Gentlemen of small fortunes who depend on the Emperor's favour, and are sent into Armies along with Ambassadors and are present at all public occasions«.²¹ This makes more clear how the forthright, passionately committed and impetuous Križanić is likely to have come to grief (and Siberia) in such circles, even if it does not explain why.

It has been suggested that between 2 August 1648 and March 1650, the period when nothing definite is known about the »whereabouts of Križanić, he may have visited England. The hypothesis is based on the text of *Dialogus de Calumnias, de Convitiis de Adulationes et de Vana Gloria*. In this work, it is suggested, Križanić »повидимому сообщает некоторые автобиографические данные. Для придания живость уложения автор ведет повествование в форме диалога. Борис сообщает, что присоединяясь то к послам, то к кушам, он посетил ряд крупнейших городов Европы. 'Я ведь был в Париже, Лондоне, Венеции, Вене, Амстердаме и во многих известных городов Европы ... Я также удовлетворил свое желание узнать об обычаях, законах и подвигах тех народов, к которым я приезжал ... И вот я не щадил ни труда, ни расходов, чтобы изучить для этого как можно больше полезных вещей. Между прочим я видел так же большие библиотеки, содержащие по несколько тысяч книг ... Они (иностранцы) изображают и описывают нас с величайшей ненавистью: более позорно, чем татар, калмыков, цыган или неопытный и дикый народ.'«²²

Though this is only circumstantial evidence and not entirely convincing it could be valid. There is other circumstantial evidence. »Ali ono je

¹⁹ See M. S. Anderson, *Britain's Discovery of Russia 1553—1815*, London, 1958, Chapters 1 and 2, pp. 1—48 and, especially, the comprehensive study by I. Lubimenco, *Les relations commerciales de l'Angleterre avec la Russie avant Pierre le Grand*, Paris, 1933.

²⁰ S. Collins, *The Present State of Russia. In a Letter to a Friend in London. Written by an Eminent Person residing at the Great Tsar's Court at Moscow for the Space of Nine Years*, London, 1671, p. 140.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²² L. M. Morduhovič, *op. cit.*, pp. 171—172.

kraljevstvo najbogatije, najčuvanije i najjače», we read in *Politika*, »u kojemu vlada međusobno povjerenje, gdje su dobronamjerni i bistri ljudi, gdje ima dobrih i prikladnih pristaništa za lađe, gdje ima tržišta i gdje zbog toga cvatu raznovrsni zanati, ratarstvo i velika prekomorska trgovina, kako je u engleskoj i brabantskoj zemlji.«²³ Could he have spoken so confidently about these »prikladna pristaništa« and these »bistri ljudi«, of this »međusobno poverenje« if he had not personally seen the actual places and the people in them?

A similarity has been noticed by several scholars between a number of ideas of William Petty and Križanić. In doing so Morduhovič points out that in *Voprosy Kazni Križanić*, »опираясь на положение о труде как источнике богатства и развивая этот тезис применительно к деньгам, местами приближается к высказываниям В. Петти, содержащихся в его известной работе *Кое-что о деньгах* (1682).«²⁴

Unfortunately Morduhovič does not give in the original the title of the work which he translates as *Кое-что о деньгах*; but from the date given it must be assumed that it was the *Quantulumcunque Concerning Money*, the only work of Petty's published in 1682. This is of some importance since Morduhovič, apparently claiming for Križanić priority in the elucidation of certain ideas, points out that the *Quantulumcunque* »appeared twenty years after the Croatian scholar wrote *Politika*.«²⁵ Morduhovič does not appear to have noticed that as early as 1662 Petty had published his *Treatise on Taxes and Contributions* in which he puts forward the notion that price depends on the cost of labour necessary to produce it, recognizing the difference between the »political« and »real« cost of any commodity. This treatise of Petty appeared only a year after Križanić's arrival in Tobolsk and a year before he even began writing the *Politika*. It is not impossible for a copy of the *Treatise on Taxes and Contributions* to have reached Križanić in Tobolsk. The Muscovy Company had routes of communication between England and both Moscow and Siberia. If he did not see the book itself or its author, he could have heard Petty's ideas discussed during travels in Europe, especially if he was in Paris.

Petty, who had been educated largely at the Jesuit College in Caen before serving for a short spell in the English navy, had returned to the Continent in 1643 where, between 1643 and 1646 he pursued his studies in Utrecht, Leyden, Amsterdam and Paris. In Paris he met Hobbes, with whom he quickly established a close relationship and by whom he was influenced in his political thinking. In much of his writing (including the *Treatise on Taxes and Contributions*) Petty sought to apply in practice what Hobbes taught in theory. Hobbes introduced Petty to Father Marin

²³ *Politika*, p. 64.

²⁴ L. M. Morduhovič, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

²⁵ L. M. Morduhovič, »Juraj Križanić, W. Petty and Ivan Pososkov«, *Juraj Križanić Russophile and Ecumenical Visionary* ed. T. Eekman and A. Kadić, The Hague-Paris, 1976, pp. 230—231.

Mersenne and into the circle of distinguished literary and scientific men whom Mersenne had attracted around himself in Paris.²⁶ It is known that by the time he wrote his *Asserta Musicalia* in 1658 Križanić was already familiar with Mersenne's *Harmonie Universelle*.²⁷ No evidence has so far come to light that Križanić ever met Mersenne, but if he did go to Paris during the period of his unknown whereabouts he could have sought him out there — or, after Mersenne's death in 1648, members of his circle. He could not have met Petty at this time, since Petty had returned to England a few months before Križanić left Russia for the first time in 1646. But Hobbes remained in Paris until 1651 and Petty's ideas were still, probably, talked about by his friends there.

In Paris Hobbes was engaged in the preparation of *The Leviathan* and his shorter work on the theory of government known as *De Cive* where Hobbes argued that in order to preserve social order and civic freedom the State, concerned to prevent the rise of an *imperium in imperio*, must not be afraid to assume the right, if necessary, to resist attempts from clerics of whatever religious persuasion, to interfere with the state and government. In this respect Hobbes thus accepted the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. A similarity between the ideas of Križanić and Hobbes has been noticed by several authors. Morduhovič suggests that Križanić shows himself to have reached a level of thought close to the thinking of Gassendi, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke and others when he writes, for instance in *De Providentia Dei*, that «Промысль божий . . . есть начало всех вещей, первая и господствующая причина, располагающая и управляющая всеми человеческими вещами» and God is «производящая действующая причина всех вещей». Morduhovič points out that in the *Leviathan* «Почти в тех же самых выражениях говорит о боге материалист Гоббс: . . . 'под богом мы понимаем причину мира'. Дальше он (Гоббс) поясняет, что 'когда мы приписывали богу волю, то это нужно понимать в отличие от разумной деятельности человека' лишь как силу, способную произвести все.»²⁸

Whether or not Križanić read *The Leviathan*, whether, indeed, Križanić ever met Hobbes personally, we do not at present know. It would certainly have been possible for the two have met if Križanić went to Paris, especially if he got into touch there with Mersenne and his circle. A close comparison of the writings and ideas of Hobbes and Križanić might prove rewarding.

²⁶ See E. Fitzmaurice, *The Life of Sir William Petty 1623—1687*, London, pp. 6—7. According to Fitzmaurice, Petty, who had divided his time between residence at Oxford and London (where he was appointed Professor of Music at Gresham's College) after his return from the Continent in 1646, obtained leave of absence in the spring of 1651 from Gresham's College, when «his exact occupation in the months that succeeded is doubtful. He was probably engaged in travel, but whatever his ultimate intentions may have been, they were suddenly diverted» (p. 21). We know that at some stage in his career Petty had travelled to Istanbul and Greece as agent for the Duke of Arundel, collecting manuscripts for him. Križanić's journey to Istanbul was from October 1650 to May 1651.

²⁷ I. Golub, *Juraj Križanić: Glazbeni teoretik 17. stoljeća*, Zagreb, 1981, p. 17.

²⁸ L. M. Morduhovič, «Filosofskie i sotsiologicheskiye vzglyady Yurija Križanića», *Iz Istorii mezhsylavjanskih svyazey*, 36, Moscow, 1963, pp. 62—63.

If Križanić did visit England the fact that no record of it has come to light is not surprising. Because of the religious and political situation in England he would have been obliged to remain incognito in view of his calling as a Catholic priest.

*

When Križanić left Croatia for Poland in 1646 the English Civil War between the opposing armies of King and Parliament was still being fought. There is an interesting letter in the Venetian State Papers from Contarini (Venetian Ambassador in Rome) to the Doge and Senate, informing them that when he suggested to the Pope that it was more urgent to help the Christians of Bosnia to defend themselves against the enemy of the Christian Church rather than the Irish Catholics (to whom the Pope, at the request of the English King's emissary in Rome, had promised financial aid) the Pope »with his eyes on the ground admitted that this was right but it was necessary to think . . . of arming Poland. Following this he has referred the matter to the Congregation De Propaganda Fide«. ²⁹ Contarini's letter was dated 6 October 1646.

The Pope was now deeply involved in attempts to save the English monarchy — and Catholicism — in England. Contarini had already reported on 22 September that the Resident in Rome of the King of England was returning there »to ask (the Pope) for money and this has been promised if they (the English) arrange to do certain things for the Catholic religion«. ³⁰ The English King, Charles I, had recently been taken prisoner by Cromwell's army (June 1646) and his Queen, Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henri IV (she had openly continued to practice her Catholic religion in England after her marriage) had escaped to France whence she had made energetic efforts on Charles's behalf. Charles had promised the Pope to exercise tolerance for all English Catholics if he would assist him to regain his throne.

By the time Križanić arrived for the first time in Moscow (October 1647) Tsar Alexei Mikhailovič and his Court was already very well informed about events in England. Following the accession of Alexis, an embassy led by Gerasim Semyonovič Dokhturov had been sent from Moscow to London to inform King Charles of the death of Mikhail and accession of Alexis, to review »the ancient alliance between the two countries which had long been established for navigation and trade« and to seek an audience with the King.³¹ But on arrival in London he had found the country already in the throes of civil war and Charles fled from his capital. Dokhturov was handsomely entertained, nevertheless, by English merchants of the Muscovy Company — all of Parliamentary persuasion, for no Royalist would have been safe there. Thus Dokhturov had observed English events exclusively through anti-royalist eye. When faced

²⁹ *Calendar of State Papers, Venice 1643—1647*, 27, p. 282.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 27, pp. 279—280.

³¹ M. P. Alekseyev, »Russko-angliyskiye literaturniye svyazi (XVIIIv. — pervoy poloviny XIX v.)«, *Literaturnoye Nasledstvo*, 91, Moscow, 1982, pp. 52—54. Chapter I of this extremely valuable volume (pp. 17—109) has provided most of the ensuing information used in this article on English-Russian contacts of this period.

with the task of composing his official report on his return to Moscow (9 August 1646) he needed to summon all his diplomatic skills. He ventured no personal judgment of his own but wrote only what he had heard through mouths of his English informants. After this the progress of the English Revolution was closely followed in Moscow through the various sources of information available: reports from foreign news-sheets and Russian emissaries abroad, from conversations with English merchants and others living permanently in Moscow and from the many English and Scottish mercenary soldiers then in Russian service. An official address brought back to Alexis from Cromwell's Parliament had been left unanswered. But when Cromwell's position and that of his Commonwealth had been stabilized, an embassy from him was received at the Russian Court. Meanwhile two embassies sent by the Prince of Wales (the future Charles II) in exile in Paris to the Tsar, petitioning him to send not only money but supplies of grain for the Royalist army, had both been received and Alexis had eventually complied with Charles's request.

One of Charles's emissaries, Luke Knightingale, had been instructed »раздать в Москве удостоверения о лояльности к королю тем жителям-строговавшим здесь англичанам, которые пожелали бы взять их от его полномочного представителя ... по ведомому, в отношении к английским торговым гостям в Московских правительских кругах особый различий между сторонниками Карла I и парламента не делалось, хотя приверженцы короля резко обозначались в то время и в Московской иноземной Слободе. И те и другие клеветали друг на друга.«²²

On this first visit to Moscow Krizanić had not yet attracted the Tsar's attention and did not move in Court circles. He must surely have heard about the situation in England and would probably have interested himself in the reasons for the divided loyalties then being so hotly disputed in the foreigners' Sloboda. His consistent championship in his writings of monarchy indicate very clearly where his sympathies would lie.

When Krizanić left Moscow in December 1647 events in England were moving to their tragic climax. The trial of King Charles began in January 1649. At his trial the King resolutely refused throughout to defend himself against Parliament, maintaining the Divine Right of Kings. He had been appointed by God, to whom alone he was responsible, was all he would say, and no man had the right to try him. His last words at the scaffold were: »You will never do right, nor will God ever prosper you, until you give him his due, the King his due ... and the people their due, by regulating rightly his Church (according to his Scripture) which is now out of order ... As for the King, the Laws of the Land will clearly instruct you ... As for the People — and truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whomsoever I must tell you that their liberty and freedom consist in having (from) Government those Laws by which their life and goods may be their own. It is not by having a share in Government — that does not pertain to them. A subjects and a sovereign are clean different things.«²³ Charles faced execution with great dig-

²² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

²³ *The Trial of Charles I* ed. R. Lockyer, London, 1974, p. 135.

nity. It was followed by an extraordinary revulsion of sympathy for the monarchy and Charles was popularly regarded by many as a martyr; his fate was compared with the Crucifixion and his trial and suffering with those of the Saviour.

While this was happening Križanić was somewhere unknown, *au large*. He may well have tried to see at first hand what was taking place across the Channel. He could have succeeded in this since the journey between Amsterdam and London was at that time easier than from many parts of England.³⁴ In any event, it seems inconceivable that, in view of his great concern for kings, government and their role, especially, as law-givers he should not have interested himself in English affairs at this time.

News of the execution of Charles quickly reached Alexis. By an Act of 1 June 1649 he expelled from Muscovy (except Archangel) all English merchants because «англичане всюю землею учинили большое злое дело, государя своего, Карлуса короля, убили до смерти: и за такое злое дело в Московском государстве вам быть не довелось.»³⁵

Following the execution of the King, Alexis broke off diplomatic relations with England. On becoming Lord Protector, Cromwell made strenuous efforts to restore the former privileged position. But for a whole decade after the execution translations of pamphlets on the English Revolution written (or purporting to have been written) by English Royalists or their sympathizers, as well as translations of works on contemporary English history (including a biography of Charles I) appeared in Moscow. There also circulated in Moscow a pamphlet in English claiming to be the translation of a Russian original entitled Декларация его императорского величества высочайшего и могущественного властителя Алексиса, государя России, великого князя Московского и проч.³⁶ The work, which has only recently been shown to have been a falsification written originally in English, is particularly useful as an indication both of the interest and of the intrigues in Moscow concerning English affairs.

There is no doubt that the Tsar's personal sympathies lay with the English monarchy which he had supported both financially and by supplying grain for the army. Yet at the same time his expulsion of all English merchants had really used the execution of the King as a pretext for getting rid of them; they had become too successful and too great a rival for his own merchants. In her exhaustive study of Anglo-Russian relations Lubimenko writes that Alexis «found it possible to receive the emissary of the Protector while still supporting the young Prince Charles clandestinely. It was in his own interest not to break contacts with the English conclusively. Since it was impossible to be certain in advance which of the two regimes would finally triumph, he looked favourably

³⁴ C. H. Wilson, *Holland and Britain*, London, n. d., p. 35. Wilson writes further that «easy communication helped to explain the continual flow of travellers which took place between Britain and the Netherlands — the ambassadors, politicians, soldiers, students, tourists, artists, merchants and spies who swelled the passenger lists of every ship that sailed between Harwich, Lynn, Yarmouth or London and the Low Countries.»

³⁵ M. P. Alekseyev, p. 58.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

on both . . . the sending of embassies from both sides became quite regular, but the negotiations, concluded by mediocre diplomats, were nothing but a succession of misunderstandings.³⁷

By the time of Križanić's second appearance in Moscow (September 1659) England was again in turmoil and the final outcome of the struggle between King and Parliament uncertain. Oliver Cromwell had died the previous year and the Commonwealth was in a state of collapse. At the end of May 1660 the Monarchy was restored. Tsar Alexis despatched an embassy to London to congratulate Charles II on the Restoration, quick, now, to support the King. It was in January 1661 that Križanić was sent to Tobolsk', just about the time when news of the Restoration would have reached Moscow and the English situation was no doubt hotly argued and disputed.

Moreover he had now attracted the ear of the Tsar and moved in Court circles where, as Collins has informed us, Alexis had his ubiquitous informers ready to report an incautious word, no doubt from both Royalist supporters and their enemies.

It is impossible to conclude with certainty on the basis of available evidence that incautious words to which Križanić himself attributed his exile concerned England; on the other hand it seems, from what has been said above, that it could well have been so.

*

Križanić has been better known and appreciated in England, than might be supposed. Exactly a century ago the first Professor of Slavonic Studies in England, W. R. Morfill, devoted a comparatively lengthy and well-informed passage in his book, *Slavonic Literature*, to »the first panslavist, Youri Krizhanich«. Morfill informed his readers that Križanić's »Critical Servian Grammar« is »still preserved in manuscript at Moscow. Very little is known of the life of Krizhanich. He was a Roman Catholic priest who, upon some accusation which had not been ascertained, was banished to Tobolsk in Siberia, where he finished his laborious work. He himself has placed at the end of the manuscript 'pisano v Sibiri' ('written in Siberia'). This obscure and unrecognized philologist showed a great deal of insight into the subject, and anticipated many of the ideas of Vuk Stephanovich. His curious work on the *Russian Empire* which constitutes his claim to be called the earliest advocate of Panslavistic doctrine, was edited by Bezsonov at Moscow in 1860. The picture drawn by the learned Serb of the condition of Russia is by no means flattering one . . .³⁸ Clearly Morfill regarded Križanić's importance for Russia as considerable: he allots more space to him than, for instance, to Simon Polotsky and most other writers. In his later *Russian Literature* he again writes of Križanić and after explaining once more that he was the first Panslavist, observes that »his works are full of interest and show great acuteness; he carried his enthusiasm so far that he believed in the possibility of a common slavonic language, which is about as possible as a common Teutonic

³⁷ Lubimenko, p. 279.

³⁸ W. R. Morfill, *Slavonic Literature*, London, 1883, p. 96. The same information is repeated in the later *Russia*, London, 1890, p. 109.

language ...»³⁹ Morfill himself possessed in his personal library »some of those (the works) of the Panslavist Krizanich«, a fact of which he was very proud.⁴⁰

Križanić also enjoys just recognition in the monumental thirteen-volumed *Cambridge Modern History*. Here the Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge wrote in 1907 of a »learned Servian, Yuri Krizhanich, an enthusiastic exponent of the idea of the solidarity of the Slavonic peoples, who set himself the task of furthering their peoples by the improvement of their language so as to render them as adequate as other European tongues to express general ideas and sought to vindicate slavs against foreign calumny and scorn. But the importance of this pioneer of Panslavism lay not in his Slavophil programme, but in what he did by exhibiting the backwardness of Russia, making war on the spirit of contempt for foreigners and inculcating the need of enlightenment ...«⁴¹

Today, the text-book written by David Ogg, one of our greatest authorities on seventeenth century Europe — his *Europe of the 17th. Century* read by many generations of English students has already run to eight editions and six additional reprints — opens the chapter on »Ottoman and Slav« by a quotation from »a seventeenth-century patriot, Yuri Krizhanich«. ⁴²

*

The subject of Križanić and England had never before been considered worthy of attention. But perhaps enough has been said here to suggest that further examination of the question might be rewarding, if only to extend our understanding of the historic, political and religious atmosphere in which Križanić lived, worked and thought.

³⁹ W. R. Morfill, *Russian Literature*, London, 1890, p. 319.

⁴⁰ Unpublished letter from Morfill to Bogišić of 1 November 1891, Bogišić archive, Cavtat.

⁴¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, 13 vols., Cambridge, 5, (*The Age of Louis XIV*», p. 516.

⁴² D. Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*, 8th. edition. Revised, London, p. 473.

MONICA PARTRIDGE

KRIŽANIĆ I ENGLSKA

Sažetak

Profesor L. M. Morduhovič pretpostavlja da je Križanić možda posjetio Englesku između 1648. i 1650. g. To je moguće, iako dokaz koji potkrepljuje tu hipotezu nije potpuno uvjerljiv. Križanić je sigurno bio upućen u suvremenu Englesku i u Engleze, naročito u pogledu politike i trgovine, kao što i sama »Politika« otkriva. Kako je stekao ovo znanje, pogotovo ako nije ni zakoračio u Englesku? Postoji direktan dokaz koji pokazuje da je čitao »Basilikon Doron« koji je napisao engleski kralj James I (još kao škotski kralj James VI) gdje James između ostalog svojata »božansko pravo« kraljeva. Knjiga, koju je napisao vladar koji je bio žarišna točka antikatolicizma u Evropi, bila je u ono vrijeme veoma značajna. Ambasadori su je smatrali dovoljno važnom da privuče pažnju njihovih vladara, tako da su je preveli na francuski, njemački, holandski, danski i latinski. Latinski primjerak poslali su osobno papi.

Mora da je Križanić susreo engleske trgovce u Moskvi i vjerojatno u Tobolsku. Ruska kompanija već je bila osnovana i redovito je slala predstavnike u Rusiju.

Križanić je živio — i bio neko vrijeme u Rusiji — za vrijeme engleskog građanskog rata, smaknuća Karla, Commonwealtha i restauracije monarhije. Zna se da je car Aleksej pažljivo pratio događaje u Engleskoj i reagirao na njih. »Glupe riječi«, krive za Križanićevo progonstvo, možda su bile posljedica razmimoilaženja između njega i cara u vezi s tim događajima.

Važnost Križanića kao prvog panslavena priznata je u Engleskoj od kraja prošlog stoljeća.