

**THE POLEMICAL POPULAR LITERARY
EDIFYING TEXT BY ANTUN KANIŽLIĆ
ABOUT FOCIUS AS THE CAUSE
OF THE CHURCH SCHISM, IN THE BOOK:
*THE REAL STUMBLING-BLOCK OF GREAT
DISCORD* (OSIK 1780)**

**Religious Polemics Between the Eastern
and Western Church (Part II)**

DIVNA ZEČEVIĆ

Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb

The research of religious polemics between the Eastern and Western Church emerged from the study of Croatian popular sermons from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In his book published in 1780 Antun Kanižlić shows that Focius, the Eastern Church's Patriarch, was the main originator of the Church schism, and pictures him as a negative saint. Kanižlić narrates *exempla*, the Mother of God's miracles, visions, and describes a "blasphemous" theatrical show. The motif of Faust appears at the very root of the Church schism (1054); a Jew as an enemy of Christianity plays Mephisto's role: he presents Focius with knowledge and wisdom.

Approach to research into religious polemics

Doing research at the end of the 20th century into religious polemics between the Eastern and Western Church subsequent to the schism in 1054, requires, of course, a quite different approach from prior studies; not only in the individual differences which are always present in dealing with a theme and in the manner of writing, but in the very point of departure in historical, postmodern times. It should be borne in mind that Focius (or Fotius, c. 820–898) is a saint and Father of the Eastern Church.

Interest in religious polemics between the Eastern and the Western Church is defined primarily by the intention to study popular literary material - popular texts of polemical nature in this case - intended not only for a narrow circle of ecclesiastics, but through them by oral sermonising and Christian teaching, for the broadest strata of society. Along with having popular literary character, the texts are equally polemical, edifying, and entertaining, so the research also has a culturo-anthropological character similar to the research I have done into Croatian popular sermons of the 18th and 19th centuries (Zečević 1993).

From the distance of contemporary times, the religious polemics of the 18th century prove to be interesting in this very pious literary-edifying and entertaining aspect by which an effort is made, as in all polemics, to disqualify the opponent. Unlike the modern manner of conducting polemics, the 18th century opponent was shown as an enemy of Christianity, a Satan (*satana* in Hebrew means enemy). As in 18th century sermons, Antun Kanižlić preached the *exempla*, the miracles of the Virgin Mary, the visions, and gave examples as arguments through which he would show the reader - and the listener - and convince them, of the authenticity of the opinions he supported in the name of the Church. In the current aura of ecumenism, there is a fundamentally different approach to the question of the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.

In the broader culturo-anthropological sense, the emphasis in the modern world is for all the planet's religions to draw closer together. On this point, Carl Freidrich von Weizsäcker, the physicist and philosopher, expressed his ideas in a 1986 conversation about the encounter between religions:

But I believe that the encounter between religions is one of the most important future spiritual events of Humankind. And time will show what will follow. Because we all must know that the way in which religions interpret themselves is still provincial (C. F. von Weizsäcker 1988: 16).

Both from the perspective of planetary drawing together of religions, and from the contemporary postmodern period, the religious polemics conducted in the 18th and 19th centuries concerning the Eastern Schism (along with the matter of the Schism to the present day), seems to be local in character, despite the number of members of both the Churches, to paraphrase the above opinion in which a similar denotation appears: provincial.

In that context, research into religious polemics may be non-polemic and/or outside of the polemics which have survived to the present day. The absence of a polemic quality does not derive only from the nature of scientific research into literary texts; in other words, a human being does not have to become a fish in order to be able to do research into fish. It is not my intention to take a stance between the religious polemicists; by profession and my work on popular literary texts my place is among literary historians and researchers of literary mythology. Still, with its method of dealing with polemics characteristic to the popular literary Baroque, this paper also becomes a contribution to controversial theology.

In religious polemics, particularly during the 19th century, myths came to the foreground of attention, and polemical argumentation was built up upon myths.

The literary function of the aspiration towards a united Church in polemical texts and decasyllabic poems, appears as an analogous desire for the lost Eden; the same role is played by the emphasis on the fact that the *first* Christians were at the same time morally irreproachable i.e. *real* Christians. From its very beginnings, the history of Christianity shows that the Church was never united, nor an ideal community, but rather a battlefield of conflict and persecution of various sects and heresies which derived from various interpretations of the Trinity and the Holy Bible.¹

¹ In her conclusion, Elaine Pagels writes that Christian tradition survived thanks to its organisation and the theological environment which the new Church developed. If Christianity had remained disparate, it probably would have disappeared from history, and gone the way of many rival religious cults. She rightly emphasises that modern man today still asks the same ancient original questions which were so aggressively debated at the beginning of the Christian era, for example: How should the Resurrection be understood? Contemporary man cannot rely exclusively on the authority of Saint Peter, the Apostles and the Church without examining the process of how that authority was formed.

The author does not support a return to Gnosticism as against Christian teaching, because, in her opinion, the task of historians is not to take sides, but to investigate the facts and try to provide answers on how Christianity came into being as a faith (Pagels 1981).

The early days of Christianity are always idealised in 18th century Croatian sermons; the concept of the ideal, honest, moral and God-fearing original and *real* Christians represents a mythical picture indivisible from the desire for the lost Eden, the model with which preachers compared their contemporaries. The result of this comparison, for example in Bernardo Zuzorić's sermons, represents a drastic image of the morally corrupt reality of his contemporaries (Zečević 1993:86–89).

Mythical concepts, literary argumentation

At the end of the 19th century, Father Ivan Marković, D. D., a Franciscan, wrote in his two-volume book, *Caesarism and Byzantinism in the History of the Eastern Schism*, that the spirit of Focius floated after his death over "the entire Christian East", while his name "remained a symbol of the Byzantine Church" (Marković 1891).

Although the floating spirit conjures up associations with the spirit which floated over the waters, this is a negative spirit by which the author imprints the "East" (the Greeks), unlike the "West" (the Latins). The division which will follow is part of popular, polemic characterisation of peoples and worlds (civilisations) and is still used today as an argument in social and political conflicts. The roots of the schism are buried deeply in prior centuries, but the polemics speak primarily of the time in which they appeared and are thus particularly interesting to researchers of popular literary and literary-historical mythology.

In the introduction to his book *The Real Stumbling-Block of Great Discord* written in the 18th century in answer to the appearance of Ilija Menijata's polemical book, Antun Kanižlić names the Devil as the initiator of all heresies and schisms, calling him: "the covetous father of disharmony, the spirit from Hell", while the immediate cause of the ecclesiastic schism, Focius, is the instrument of that spirit: "a great stumbling-block, who inflicted great sadness and a great wound not only on the Church of Rome but also on the Greek [Church]" (Kanižlić 1780:5).

Antun Kanižlić, as he wrote, "adopted" the title of Ilija Menijata's book: *The Stumbling-Block or the Account of the Beginning and Cause of the Division of the Two Churches, Eastern and Western*, like a victor's booty and used it to "embellish" the polemic response in his own book.²

² "... having found the real stumbling-block, and in that way overcome Menijata's writings, I have been so bold as to adopt the title of his book and use it to embellish the title of my book in which will be found the true cause of the discord or the real story of

As I will show, the Devil, the 18th century Spirit from Hell, appears in Kanižlić in one *exemplum* as Beliar (Antichrist) or Lebufas ("the sorcerers' apprentice"), and this spirit, in the later popular literary fashion of the 19th century, mythically marks not only the aftermath of the schism but also the "Greeks" in its broadest sense i.e. members of the Eastern Church. Ivan Marković sought and found causes of the conflict as far back as the pre-Christian era, and developed the popular literary characterisations - "Greek" and "Latin" - in the function of explaining the assumed permanent intolerance between East and West.

In fact Ivan Marković registers and summarises in Chapter 1 of *Caesarism and Byzantinism...* (Marković 1891) the mythical viewpoints which he found connected with the schism theme, not only in the 19th and in the 18th centuries; and this is where the importance of his book lies, written after he gained familiarity with the extensive literature from which he quoted facts and opinions, of course, in the spirit of his own times.

The myth about the "arrogant and mendacious" Greeks is a foundation for discourse about the schism, and the schism is regarded as a well-founded and "natural" event i.e. part of the people's nature. Relying on the authority of the "Eighth Synod", Kanižlić mentions that Focius, "an amazing hypocrite", was: "a man who thought one thing, and said another; able to dissemble that there was not, nor would there be, such a man" (Kanižlić 1780:47). He also wrote "just as he thought one thing, and spoke another, so he did one thing, and wrote another" (Kanižlić 1780:51). Kanižlić denotes Focius not only as a participant in the Eastern Schism, but as the "beginning and source of all discords" (Kanižlić 1780:65).

There is also a strong link with Ivan Marković's explanation of what is understood by the term "Constantinople's Caesarism" and "Byzantinism": the history of Constantinople's Caesarism is identified with: "not only immeasurable hautiness, all faults, all ugliness, all evil, all shame (...) cunning, deviousness, hypocrisy, doubt, unfaithfulness, shameless and licentious impurity, bestial lack of mercy, and atheism".

After utilisation of the preceding negative qualifications, *Byzantinism* is defined as the summary of the history of Constantinople's Caesarism: "the most servile, fawning enslavement to state authority, coupled with the greatest hypocrisy" (Marković 1891: Vol. I, 32–33).³

the beginning and cause of the separation of the Eastern Church from the Western Church" (Kanižlić 1780:5).

³ The examples describing the behaviour of the emperors in Constantinople are told as entertaining stories, moral and edifying historical tales, scandalous chronicles, or novels in instalments. I am mentioning only an example recounted in detail (in Vol. II) about the love story of Empress Zoe who was returned to the throne: "Her first concern was to find a handsome man to marry, and she was already sixty-two (...)" She married

Differences in human nature are presented as being eternal, mythical, and existing prior to Christianity:

Inborn hatred and mutual abhorrence has divided the Greeks from the Latins from time immemorial. Even in the pre-Christian era the two peoples looked on each other with suspicion. And the first reason for that lay in the *difference in nature and national quality*. Despite all the cultural heights reached by the Greek people, despite all the education they were so proud of, which made them accustomed to regarding all other peoples as barbarians, not even excluding the Romans and regarding everyone as nothing, *the Greek is mainly frivolous and inconstant, insincere and mendacious, parsimonious and malicious, boasting and arrogant*. The Roman is the very opposite of the Greek character. *The Roman is serious in thought, constant and immovable in endeavour, basically practical, sincere, but very reasonable in words, honest, religious and God-fearing*. The Greek and the Roman could not in any way be compatible. (...) (Marković 1891: Vol. II, 6).

From the 18th century and Kačić's poems (the first edition of *Razgovor ugodni... [Pleasant Conversation...]*, Venice 1756) through Kanižlić's *The Real Stumbling-Block of Great Discord* (1780), it was also taught later, in the 19th century, that the Turkish yoke was a sign of God's punishment, "God's justice gives everyone what he deserves" (Kanižlić); it was *the Scourge of God* for the Constantinople schismatics, wrote Antun Kanižlić in the introduction to his book:

The Greeks also mourn and they mourn bitterly, but not because they are parts of a body separated from its head, but not because they abandoned their old mother like degenerate sons and daughters (...). The Greeks mourn and have already spent more than three hundred and twenty-seven years sadly whining under the Turkish yoke and with all that, oh sadness even greater, they still do not remember that this is the *Scourge of the angry justice of God*, for their forebear outlaws with their petrified *hautiness* servilely threw themselves down at the feet of

Constantine IX Monomak (1042–1054) who had been exiled from Lesbos; he was a widower: "but he lived with a young, rich and very beautiful widow called Sklerana who gave up for him her reputation, honour, soul, and property (...) When the old basilea [empress] married him it was as though he had put a spell upon her, and she herself convinced Monomak to invite Sklerana to Constantinople, and soon allowed him to bring her into the imperial palace. In addition, she conferred on her the honours of an augusta (empress) and Sklerana had to be addressed in the same way she was, as 'Mistress'. When Monomak appeared in court, Zoe was at his right side, and Sklerana at his left, until finally the people could no longer bear such immoral impudence, brought to [the level] of extreme cynicism. So the people rebelled (...). The scenes of this rebellion had such a powerful affect on Sklerana, that she suddenly died of great fright" (Marković 1891: Vol II, 58–59).

infidels and hostile heads of those who *hautily* separated from the head of all Christendom appointed by Jesus Christ with the purpose of raising it up even further (Kanižlić 1780, Introduction, without page numbers).

Antun Kanižlić, however, thanks to the idea of Illyria and Illyrian descent, clearly differentiates the *Greeks* from the Slavs ("such as the Slavonians, the Serbs, the Rošnjaci⁴ and Russians"), whom he does not want to equate with the Greeks, much less to offend them:

My beloved brothers, you are not the Greeks I am writing to, neither by birth, nor language, nor nature, but you are the noble compatriots of the glorious Illyrian mountains. Far be it from my pen to count you with those Greeks who seduced you, or to dare to offend you. I now remember those words which I heard from one of you: May God strike down the one who separated us! (Kanižlić 1780:10).

Among the polemics between members of the Eastern and Western Churches who were his contemporaries, Antun Kanižlić also noted down something which he probably arrived at in conversation. It was a popularly naive and grotesque threat to members of the Eastern Church, in the event that they crossed over to the Western Church:

I cannot pass in silence over this craziness by which they frighten the common folk, that if anyone crosses over into the embrace of our holy mother the Church of Rome, they will not be able to pass water. Which holy father teaches this? Where is this written? Oh, delirium! So many thousands in Hungary and Erdelj joined the Roman Church and it has never been heard of that this happened to anyone: the blind lead the blind into ruin (Kanižlić 1780:229).

The threat, although naive and grotesque - there were those among the members of the Eastern church, of course, who called such threats *foolish lies*⁵ - emerged as an effort to maintain the identity of the community. Immediately after the popularly naive threat, we learn the serious information that "thousands" in Hungary and Erdelj have joined the Western Church.

Antun Kanižlić polemically registers the popular texts which came from the members of the Eastern Church, presenting *The Story of the Golden Beard*, with the announcement:

⁴ Rošnjaci = Ukrainians, Little Russians, Russians

⁵ "I know that these teachings do not belong to the reasonable Greeks, nor the Russians, nor the Ukrainians, indeed, they are even very ashamed that anyone of theirs should tell such stupid lies, who tried their hand at theology following after goats, regarding themselves as writers, only if they can read anything in Russian, although they do not understand what they read" (Kanižlić 1780:229).

I wanted to finish this chapter, but here, by chance, I came upon a manuscript in the Russian language about the golden beard, compiled to insult the Pope and the Roman Church. I thought that there was room here for an attachment or a beard to this chapter, therefore I am presenting the manuscript in question, not all of it but only a part, translated into our language (Kanižlić 1780:227).

The text of Kanižlić's *Story of the Golden Beard* is included in the Material attached to this paper.

The tale of the golden beard is a literary and polemic paper of the Eastern Church, as Kanižlić writes "I left out more than I put in", in which it states that, from the viewpoint of the Eastern side: "Rome or the Church of Rome fell away from the Holy and Orthodox Church in the year 904". Kanižlić systematically refutes point by point everything that "was compiled by an ass" (Kanižlić 1780:228). He disputes the authenticity of the fiction and the main characters of the legend or written pamphlet about Pope Jermon of Rome having "had his golden beard and moustache shaved off" because this was the wish of a young woman of Rome, with whom he had fallen in love. The polemic story - in fact a scandalous chronicle conducted by both sides - speaks of "proof" of the truth of Jeremiah's prophecy "that Rome will fall away from the Orthodox Church because of a young girl" (Kanižlić 1780:227). As Kanižlić does not present the entire polemical, fictional text, one element of the story remains interesting:

This girl was married to the pope by Saint Basil, wrote a hundred letters and ordered her family to mount one hundred horses and proclaim that Pope Jermon shaved off his golden beard and golden moustache (Kanižlić 1780:227).

Religious polemic as a literary genre used other literary genres and adapted them to new, polemic functions: there are stories, legends (Kanižlić writes of the legend of the miracle of the Virgin Mary), verses, pamphlets, theatre productions and/or *reports* about such shows, letters and sermons so as to "prove" literary, consequently, fictional *authenticity*, in contrast to the other side in the polemics which also moved in a similar circle of literary means available for "argumentation".

The negative saint

The literary role and importance of Focius's character in Kanižlić's book *The Real Stumbling-Block of Great Discord*, is that of the negative saint!

Focius is spoken of as the embodiment of the opposite, dark side of saintliness in the sense of the Latin word *sacer* which in addition to meaning 1. *Holy*; also means *damned*. 2. *damned*: "consecrated to a

subterranean deity, ordained and sentenced to ruin, to death, damned"; it is shown how the name Focius futilely means *light* in Greek; in one place, Kanižlić refers to him as "dark Focius" (Kanižlić 1780:45).

One word contains two opposite meanings: holy and damned. Kanižlić speaks about Focius and foretells his life as an apostate in the manner in which the lives of the saints are told, with prenatal signs of their future sanctity; in this case it means that they have a negative denominator. The fact which is stressed by Kanižlić, who quotes data about Focius from "old" and barely accessible books, has the function of emphasising the significance of hidden truths, a portend of "evil omens" which are given significance by the very fact that they are given as authentic quotations by which - Kanižlić says - "readers can learn who he (Focius) was, and what he was like":

The title of one book is: *Yearbooks Since the Creation of the World*, while another is: *Yearbooks from Leon the Armenian to Nicefor Foca*.

This second book was brought to the light of day by translation from the Greek language into the Latin language at the Royal Printing House in the year 1685. There is discord because of this book, because in it Simeon wrote about the Emperor Michael and the Empress Theodora, and also wrote about Focius, presenting some strange bad omens about him by which the parents of Focius could have doubted with good reason who he would be and what he would be like, while the readers could learn who he was and what he was like.

And it is in this way that Simeon Logothete wrote about him. *It once happened that some priest called Mihail Sinadenski, a friend of Sergei's, Focius's father, came to visit him when he saw that Irene, his wife, was pregnant and, as though angry, he raised his staff saying: Oh, if someone could be found who could kill her and the child that she is carrying! For I do see that a second Eve is carrying a snake and male child in her womb. I see, with the permission of God, that he will become the Patriarch and besmirch the holy cross of all deserved honesty; and that he too will go the way of evil and lead many into heresy and in diverse ways turn them away from Heaven with his masteries. When the servant of God, as if inspired by the Spirit, said these words, Sergei said: My dear friend, my priest, if that is what he is to become, I shall kill him with his mother. But Mihail replied: It will not be possible to do what God has forbidden, so, take care.*

And on note 30, the following is written: When Focius was born, his mother Irene called for Jacob, the Prior of the Maximina monastery, and covered in terrible tears, begged that the child be baptised and said, sighing: *Oh, my holy father, when, woe is me, I was still pregnant, I saw in a dream that a dragon came forth from my slashed womb. And let me, woe is me, tell you something else. Hilarion, the holy confessor from the Dalmota monastery, told me that I was carrying in my womb Satan clothed in a [human] body.*

Baptising the child, Jacob gave him the name Focius, and finally said words of comfort to her: *It could be that God's wrath will evade him.* The parents showed great respect to the priests, trusting particularly in their powers of prayer. For that reason Sergei took the still small Focius with him up to the mountain of Olympus to Saint Joanicus, a famous hermit, to pray for him. Seeing Focius, Joanicus said: *Focius will not allow himself to follow the ways of the Lord.* Sergei replied: *What have you said to me at this bad time, my holy elder?* Joanicus the old man answered him: *I am foretelling to you what he will do.* And Sergei was totally confused, and, sprinkling himself with ash, he sadly descended from the mountain.

In Note 31, he describes this event. When Focius had grown, his parents sent him to be educated. During this time of his schooling, he met a Jewish sorcerer who told him: *Young man, what will you give me if I make it so that your mouth holds the knowledge of all the Greeks and that you exceed everyone in wisdom and knowledge.* To which the young pupil replied joyfully: *My father will give you half of all his goods.*

To which the Jew replied: *I have no need for goods, nor for your money, nor do I want your father to know anything about this, but, come with me and deny the sign we lifted Christ upon, and I shall make a gift to you of a figure by which your life will be lead in joy and happiness, be full of fortune, and exceed and overcome everyone in wisdom and knowledge.*

Hearing this Focius did everything the sorcerer asked of him. From that time onwards, he never ceased to read various wicked books. According to the praiseworthy Simeon.

I am prevented here from continuing the portrait, not only by the followers of Focius but also by others, saying that from this only the icon of a monster could emerge, and not a man and that is why a quarrel about this book started, from which I give here a short extract (Kanižlić 1780:6–8).

Just as in the lives of the saints, Focius's birth was foretold two-fold: in the vision of the monk and of the mother, who tells of the scene in her dream when a dragon emerges from her womb. By this, Focius's life would definitely be marked. Focius was not only a popular literary negative character and negative saint; Focius was also Faust (the Faust motif came to J.W. Goethe from popular literature). Although Focius i.e. Faust, shows intellectual gifts, he is not sufficiently wise until he makes a pact with Mephisto. Kanižlić also introduces the Faust motif into the polemic argumentation.

The entirety of the negative definition of Focius's character (appropriate to popular literature and religious polemics) is achieved through the introduction of the Jewish *sorcerer*. (In the Croatian Academy's dictionary, the original word *čaratar* is given two meanings: 1. a magician and 2. a sorcerer). In the context of the narrative about the

negative saint, Focius, the Jewish sorcerer is given the role of Mephisto, the enemy of Christianity. Mephisto, Jewish in this case, gives the gift of absolute wisdom and knowledge, and in return does not seek Focius's money or property, but his soul, so that he has to "deny the sign upon which we placed the Christ". The peculiarity of the statement in the first person is in fact an "admission" by the Jew that they (i.e. we) crucified Christ. (In the original, the name of Christ is printed as *Hrist*, in the Eastern manner.)

As the popular manner of narration leaves no conclusions to be drawn on the part of the reader, it is clearly stated that "Focius did everything as this sorcerer willed it", denied the sign of the cross and followed this by reading "various and wicked books".

Consequently, the Eastern Schism is shown to have been aided by the part played by the Jews who, in the teachings of popular literature, first crucified Christ, and then participated in the *crucifixion* of the Christian Church into Eastern and Western! The lesson is given both directly and indirectly: the enemy never sleeps.

In the same chapter, Kanižlić also mentions the writings of other authors, in addition to Simeon Logothete, as proof that Focius was:

that serpent which showed itself at night to Focius's mother as being borne in her womb; and that it poisoned not only that country, but almost the entire East. (...) And she was so frightened by these prophecies that she wanted to kill herself and the child, but God's servant and her husband forbade her to, warning her to give herself up to God's providence (Kanižlić 1780: 10).

Narrating an edifying and polemic construction, Antun Kanižlić mentions books which he refers to as "old and barely accessible", while the age of the books is meant to indicate the authenticity of their statements; the quotations are indivisible, composite parts of his manner of narration. At the end of the book, Kanižlić mentions in prose, but also in the edifying and polemic verses on a tombstone, that Focius was cursed by nine Roman popes and: "rotted in damnation for forty-five years" (Kanižlić 1789:424); the number nine serves the function of mystical and maximum damnation:

From nine Roman popes struck by a curse,
He did not feel even one blow;
It's not surprising, he was a stone.

Focius's tombstone commences with the admonition:

Halt, Traveller! Under this stone lies a greater stone,
Focius, the stumbling-block of great discord.
(Kanižlić 1780:426, 428)

A characteristic of popular edifying texts is that they were written in a mixture of prose and verse; the literary form of the "tombstone" is in fact a popular literary summary of Kanižlić's polemic book. Just as the saints after death act benevolently towards those who appeal to them for help, so Focius, too, acts, but with an opposing denominator: "Buried here, he still confuses and poisons: What is that?" This points to the danger of the transformation and the indestructible nature of evil, the possibility of the appearance of a Phoenix, not a bird in this case but a snake:

Is he once again in the embrace of our Mother Earth
Transforming into a great snake? Traveller!
Cross yourself against this monster and flee
So it does not poison you.

(Kanižlić 1780:428)

The hellish sign of the "great snake" also appears during Focius's officiating of the mass, which could only be seen by a man, a monk who led a holy type of life. Today, too, we encounter the belief among the people that phenomena from the other world can only be seen by people who lead "a pure life", as well as the fact that a man can protect himself and repel the forces of evil (which are usually active at night) by making the sign of the cross. This is seen in the *exemplum* about Beliar⁶ who loses his evil powers when faced with the sign of the cross.

The *exemplum*⁷ - a literary genre with an edifying example, often found particularly in 18th century sermon polemics - was also used by Kanižlić, as when he told the story of the *exemplum* about the miracle of the Virgin Mary who saved Constantinople.⁸

He writes (Simeon Logothete, author's note) that on some holy feast day Focius was elevating the cross at the altar when a nearby monk, who lead a holy life, saw a great snake wound around the holy cross and Focius's arm. Terrified by this sight he called out: Kyrie eleison!

The clergy standing near him were also frightened, and asked: Father! God be with you! What is it? He later told them what he had seen and why he had been frightened. And then they also said to him: Father, beloved of God, let us tell you something too. As you know we serve mass with him, we have never heard him say anything about the feast day being celebrated, but he would say just anything, God

⁶ The name for the Devil: "I am the powerful *Beliar*, my name is *Lebufas*" (Antun Kanižlić 1880:113). "Jewry's later name for the Devil was *Belial* and *Beelzebub*, they call him the Prince of Darkness and the Chief of the Fallen Angels." *Biblijski leksikon* 1988.

⁷ Rudolf Schenda provided the best, comprehensive definition of the *exemplum*, relying on the old Ciceronian definition: "*Das Exemplum ist eine didaktische Proposition mit moralisierender Tendenz. Oder etwas deutscher: Das Exemplum ist ein unterhaltsam vorgetragenes Lehrstück, das die Sittlichkeit fördern will*" (Schenda 1969:81).

⁸ Kanižlić's text is printed on p. 195 in this book.

himself knows what empty phrases he mumbled. And let us tell you something more, may Your Sacredness forgive us, he would spew profanity and stench under the altar, how should we say, vomit. This happened in the second year of Focius's unlawful patriarchy. Simeon wrote nothing about what the vision meant, did the cross give a sign about the dignity of the patriarchy which Focius held with the help of a snake from hell, or of what the monk explained to those servants of God (Kanižlić 1780:112–113).

The sign of the snake is not sufficient, but the satanised image is augmented by the "vomit" which Focius, *a servant of Hell* (as opposed to *a servant of God*) in the popular naive conception, spews under the altar. In the tombstone at the end of the book, Kanižlić will say that Focius was patriarch before he was a sheep i.e. a believer, a member of the Christian flock.

In Kanižlić's book, Focius does not have only the role of the enemy of Christianity, that of a negative saint, but also a negative hero susceptible to all vices. The Byzantine Emperor Michael - the nickname *the drunk* is mentioned - invited Focius to a drinking binge where there was to be a contest who could drink the most; Focius was the inescapable winner in evil, the worst of the worst; while the emperor drank fifty glasses, Focius emptied (Kanižlić: *drained*) sixty! In body, soul, and spirit, Focius is the popular literary negative character on whose popular naive, augmentative disqualification, as if on his shoulders, lie the causes of the ecclesiastic schism into the Eastern and Western Church.

The popular literary disqualification of Focius continues with the introduction of a report about a theatre production; the report shows that Kanižlić was well acquainted with the activities of acting companies and the comedy *dell'arte*. In the imperial palace of the schismatics, a theatre production follows the drinking party. The emperor has his own court acting company; the *grillo* character appears, and Kanižlić calls the actors "players" and "madmen" whose task is to make the emperor "happy with their craziness".

Just as the Church condemned Carnival costumes and masks, it also condemned all types of costume disguises and thus the change of costume in theatre productions, unless they were under the direct supervision of the Church.⁹ The emperor's favourite actor, a eunuch (*hadum*) named

⁹ The contradiction is seen in the fact that the Church organised school productions, of course, with an edifying purpose; the performers were men only, thus excluding the threat of moral degeneracy of society i.e. mixing the genders as in Carnival fancy dress. Tomo Matić mentions the fact that A. Kanižlić as a young professor at the Zagreb grammar school 1721/1722 led the student theatre: "In that year Kanižlić's class (*principia*) put on a play for a special occasion: *Pro Deo et Rege, sive Croatiae semper integra in Deum fides fidelitas pro domo Austriaca*, (...) it is probable that he (i.e.

Theophil (Kanižlić mentions that he is also called *grillo*)¹⁰ takes the role of the patriarch; apart from dialogue, the imagined production also has the character of a pantomime, because the actors speak *by waving their arms* imitating the movements of a priest during a church ritual, which in character belongs to a dramatic genre such as *mime* (Batušić 1995:191); the name of the production is *prikaza* (a show), but also "the play of a jesting mind"; Kanižlić directly describes the production as "blasphemous":

Thus fools played this show in front of the emperor, Focius, Bardo and others. Dressed in ecclesiastic robes, they all acted the fool blasphemously, *with wicked words and waving of arms*, presenting the holy church service which the patriarch and the priests usually officiate (Kanižlić 1780:112).

However, Focius did not condemn the blasphemy of the production. In the political idiom of times recently passed, we would say: *he did not disassociate himself* from the events, but rather: "laughing, he showed that the play was to his liking, saying that it was the work of *the play of a jesting mind* to make the emperor happy" while the previous and rightful Patriarch, Ignatius "condemned the jokes" (Kanižlić 1780:112).

The *exemplum* about the "terrible Arab" i.e. Beliar the Antichrist, is also connected with Focius, told also by borrowing the authority of Simeon Logothete's name, so as to emphasise the authenticity of the *exemplum* and the edifying message; the narrator is "a hermit by the name of Joan, gifted with the spirit of prophecy"; two elders of a monastery complained to him that Focius was persecuting them:

What happened the next night? Before sleep took hold of me, a terrible Arab stood before me and held out his hand to strangle me, I made the sign of the cross, freed myself and said: Who are you? What is your name? Who sent you and why? He replied:

I am powerful Beliar, my name is Lebufas, the sorcerers' apprentice, friend of Focius. I was sent by my master to revenge him for those

Kanižlić) took part in producing the drama, and it could be that he wrote it himself. The following year his class (*syntaxis*) played the drama: *Exilium Melancholiae ex Utopia*, while in 1723/24 his students in the first class of *humaniora* (*poesis*) presented five declamations in the school theatre, of course, under the leadership of Master Kanižlić. The language of the plays and declamations was, in the custom of that time, Latin" (Matić 1940:XVIII).

¹⁰ "The Emperor was very impressed by a hadum named Theophil or as some call him *grillo*, whom the emperor selected and ordained as a mock patriarch" (Kanižlić 1780:112). *Grillo* - *one of the captain types in the commedia dell'arte*. (The word *grillo* means: empty-headed.) I am grateful to Ivan Lozica, PhD, who does research into the popular theatre at the Zagreb Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, for the information on *grillo*; he directed me to the appropriate literature and lent me the book on *commedia dell'arte* (Esrig 1985:191, 199, 206).

words which you spewed against him last night and to convince you to repent and to accept him and give up God, which he has already done. But, using the weapon of the cross, you have weakened me. I then again made the sign of the cross, pushed him away, and he disappeared in front of my eyes (Kanižlić 1780:113).

Beliar is the Antichrist who is introduced as Focius's friend, and on the next page it says: "How could God hearken to Focius, a worshipper of Lebufas¹¹ from Hell?"; the *exemplum* has the function of the popular literary *argument* of Focius's origins from Hell and its activity.¹²

In the polemical tombstone, Kanižlić also summarises the dispute about the teachings of the *Philioque* concerning the source of the Holy Spirit being the Father and the Son, which was rejected by Focius:

He presented a new and infamous error
That each man has two souls.
Did he know that he would lose his only soul?
And even if he had two,
He would lose them both
Having lost them in innumerable apostasies.
(Kanižlić 1780:427)

From both sides - East and West - polemics arose and arguments of literary imagination, scandalous stories which had their place in literary black chronicles were refuted, while some of the oral narratives are still encountered today. These are examples of oral legends as a literary genre.

Menijata tells of a story described by Kanižlić as having inspired many authors (Bellarmin, Baronia, Gotti, Scherer), in which "just as worms emerge from old rotten, whipped skin, so lies fall out from tales" (Kanižlić 1780:86). This is the "discovery" motif; children, murdered and buried just after birth, are discovered in secret places in convents and outside convent walls. I was told a legend with the same motif by a craftsman, a decorator, who went to Dubrovnik from Zagreb to work on the interior decorating of a new hotel; he returned with the story about a secret passage which connected a monastery and a nunnery in Dubrovnik - male and female; according to the narrator, they loaded a lorryful of children's bones from that passage-way.

Antun Kanižlić presents a "story" he had read in literature, connected with the name of Pope Gregory the Great who demanded that priests maintain purity. However, he was forced to withdraw his demand:

¹¹ Lebufas or Lebufa - the name indicates Palestinian origin; in the concordance of biblical names, there is mention of a place called: Lebo-Hamat, somewhere on the outskirts of David's kingdom.

¹² Epistle II to the Corinthians 6, 15–16. "How would a compact be possible between Christ and Beliar? What community exists between believers and non-believers?"

... because of an unexpected and completely unheard of event. He ordered that fish be caught in his fish pond. And then came the grief! The fishermen pulled out six thousand skulls of children born of secret adultery and debauchery by the clergy (Kanižlić 1780:86–87).

The nature of transmission and notation of oral tradition can be seen in the variants of numbers: instead of six thousand, one "wrote down three thousand" while one scribe "judging that three thousand was also too many, said only three hundred. In this way they each tried to lie more wisely than the other" (Kanižlić 1780:87–88). To enter into the polemical proving of the truth i.e. the untruths of the literary genre of oral legend, means to enter into the metanarration of oral (written or noted down) legend, which Kanižlić does, not only in a polemical manner but in the literary genre of polemic, to which his book entirely belongs.

Kanižlić proves that the legend is a lie and refuting the literary, fictional truth, mentions further variants known to him within which he locates the legends: how can there be a fish pond in Rome, he asks, when:

... there are no such ponds in Rome (...). That is why others who followed after said that the pond was some eight miles from Rome, and another that it was in Germany, and one mentioned Bavaria; unanimous witnesses like those old men with Daniel in Chapter 13 (Kanižlić 1780:87).

The locations mentioned in connection with the oral legend provide examples of the characteristic linking of one motif with a number of places, joined, of course, with the mentioned oral narration of the legend from Dubrovnik and the undefined, but huge, pile of children's bones (in the lorry).

Polemical narration about the character of the apostate Focius shows his impure connections with all the forces of hell and the earth as dishonourable and immoral connections. His alliance with Bardo is not friendship, but a foul compact between the similar interests of two negative characters: "Both of them are extremely covetous, Bardo of the emperor's throne, and Focius of the throne of the Patriarch". Bardo is an *adulterer* (he lives with the bride of another man's whom he has driven away), in all respects he is "the *festering wound* of Constantinople", "deaf to all teachings, warnings, pleas and threats, he does not allow himself to be turned away from the impure mire" (Kanižlić 1780:34).

In keeping with the 18th century tendency in sermons and *exempla*, sinners are harshly punished, the body - unlike the immortal and imperishable soul - is regarded as a *sack of stench* (Filip Grabovac). Ignatius has the role of the righteous man who treats Bardo, the *stinking wound of lust*, "with acid vinegar and if it should be necessary, with the red-hot iron of ecclesiastical punishment" (Kanižlić 1780:34). Ignatius

forbids Bardo "an obvious and infamous adulterer and commiter of incest" "to partake of the holy Body of the innocent lamb".

The theme of the fall of Constantinople is linked primarily with the Eastern Schism, and the *Greek hautiness*, which was a theme in the poetry of Andrija Kačić Miošić (Kačić Miošić 1983:188):

Humbly the Pope replies to him,
Soaking the white book with his tears:
It is not the time, Emperor Constantine,
To call for help from the Germans and the Latins,
Because you have tried God's patience extremely
And sorely cheated the Latins.
The Holy Spirit is not within you,
It's as it should be that Constantinople falls.

The same theme is found in Kanižlić's book registered as an edifying example of the miracle of the Virgin Mary, who saves the city. The legend shows that by the will of God, if *hautiness* had not prevailed, Constantinople could have been saved, thanks to the miracle of the Virgin Mary. Various legends tell of the Virgin saving the city in diverse ways, but Kanižlić's motif of dipping the hem of the Virgin's robe into the sea is not known elsewhere in literature about Mary's miracles. When her hem dips into the sea, huge waves appear which sink two hundred (Russian) enemy ships in the year 865:

The same emperor, Focius, the courtiers and the common folk went to the Church of Blakvernen of the Holy Virgin. There with great devotion to God and faith they took the clothes of the Holy Virgin, formed a procession praying for the Virgin's intervention for God's help, and carried it to the sea.

And God heard their prayers: when the Holy Virgin's hem dipped into the sea, a great miracle! The sky which had been fine before was covered with clouds, the sea boiled and great waves rose, strong winds blew which threw around the Russian ships, some smashed to pieces, some sank, and some retreated far from Constantinople. Everyone came to know the miraculous help of God (Kanižlić 1780:113–114).

I am not providing the entire text of the legend which commences with Kanižlić's explanation that the legends about the miracles of the Virgin Mary cannot be ignored (*cannot be left [aside]*), in order to refute the opinions of the opposite polemical side which assigns the credit for divine intervention to Focius himself.

The introductory text to the legend about the saving of Constantinople and the commentary which follows belong to the genre of polemical metanarration of the legend, which can be disseminated first orally, and then by means of written texts. However, the reverse order is

also possible, especially when oral legends are involved which derive from written sources i.e. sermon *exempla* about the miracles of the Virgin Mary.

Some said that God did this miracle in answer to Focius's prayer. And who were they? There were foreigners and his toadies, but even to the present day some do not believe it, saying: How would God hearken to Focius, a worshipper of Lebufas from hell? Is it not more fitting to say that God wanted the Russians to punish Constantinople, because of the discord he [Focius] caused and the many blasphemous pacts with his foreigners that he did not fear to enter? He [God] showed mercy for no other reason than the intercession of the Virgin whom the common folk called on for help that the city built in her honour be saved along with the citizens who lived there.

In the polemical context, legend becomes the vehicle of doubt which has to be settled: whose prayer did God hearken to?

Both sides - East and West - struggle for the particular legend; in the context of Kanižlić's religious polemical book it becomes clear that God could not have listened to Focius's prayer, the prayer of a negative character and negative saint who was in alliance with the forces of darkness. There is no doubt in the Virgin Mary's miracle, but in the side to which the "miracle" belongs as a polemical literary argument.

The answer to the question of whose prayer was heard is clear, and no doubt can be admitted: "... how could God hearken to Focius, a worshipper of Lebufas from Hell?" (Kanižlić 1780:114). The objective of the polemics is to discredit the opponent and refute his literary - in the case of Kanižlić's book - popular literary argument. Focius, regarded as the main cause of the Eastern Schism, is presented in the outspoken polemics as a wolf in sheep's clothing: "But he was unable, dressed in this sheep's clothing, to hide his bloody wolf's teeth..." (Kanižlić 1780:66).

And while, as Kanižlić writes, apostates and heretics "broke away" entire states and kingdoms from the Church, Focius broke away "a part of the world, sundering the seamless robe of Jesus Christ which could not be put together again in as many eras, even if the Greeks and Latins tried to do so." Kanižlić replies to Menijata that in defending Focius: "He washes the Arab. If Menijata used his domestic Morean sea [*Moreu* = = Peloponnese] and added that of Constantinople and poured it over Focius, washing him, he would never succeed in washing him [clean]" (Kanižlić 1780:67).

Kanižlić's polemical, religious and edifying popular literary text - *The Real Stumbling-Block of Great Discord* - is a product of its time, the

popular Baroque, from which the temperamental Croatian 18th century preachers also sprang. It should be borne in mind that the theological view of polemics cannot be separated from the popular literary, religious, edifying, and entertaining character of the book.

As from the pulpit, the sinner is immeasurably guilty and the punishment is also immeasurable, in proportion to the sin.

Concerning the grave of Focius, the theologian Lovanienski wrote: *I know of no other grave of Focius, other than the Eternal Fire* (Kanižlić 1780:426).

In religious polemics as a literary genre, Kanižlić used other literary genres which were (again literary) transformed in their new, polemic function: stories, legends, tombstone inscriptions, pamphlets, theatre productions i.e. polemical reports about them, letters, dreams and visions all appear, so as to "prove" the literary *truth*, and thus the fictional *truth* of the polemic, as opposed to the other side in the polemics which moved in circles of similar popular literary means, available for polemic literary argumentation.

MATERIAL

**Antun Kanižlić, *The Real Stumbling-Block of Great Discord*,
Osik 1780. Chapter 10. Focius's Fourth Insult:**

The Clergy Among the Latins Shave Their Beards (pp. 227–229).

I wanted to finish this chapter, but here, by chance, I came upon a manuscript in the Russian language about the golden beard, compiled to insult the Pope and the Roman Church. I thought that there was room here for an attachment, or a beard, to this chapter, therefore I am presenting the manuscript in question, not all of it but only a part, translated into our language.

The Tale of the Golden Beard

The title of this story is: The Tale of How Rome Fell Away from the Orthodox Christian Faith.

In this text or narration, some ass writes that Rome or the Roman Church fell away from the holy and Orthodox Church in the year nine hundred and four in the following way. Coming into church one day, the Pontiff of Rome by the name of Jermon who, as the story says, followed Gregory the Great at the Holy See, saw a girl of Rome and fell in love with her. But she did not want to marry him unless he shaved off his golden beard and golden moustache. The pope consented and because of his love of her he allowed his golden beard and moustache to be shaved off.

This girl was married to the pope by St Basil, wrote one hundred letters and ordered her family to mount one hundred horses and announce that Pope Jermon had shaved off his golden beard and golden moustache. At the same time, a certain Peter Gunjivi also wrote a letter that all members of the order of St Peter had to shave off

their beards, so that the Holy Body of Christ did not fall into their beards while they were taking communion.

And what did the miserable Jermon do then? He shut himself away in a secret palace, not daring to come out until his beard grew again. In the meantime, the choice fell on John the Chrysostomic and he became the Patriarch of Constantinople. He said to a student of St Basil:

Take care of your beard, because the prophet Jeremiah foretold that Rome would fall away from the Orthodox church because of a girl, and now it has done so.

The compiler of this text relates some other nonsense, for example, that seventy heresies or false beliefs occurred, that the other patriarchs were gathered at the general Seventh Synod to which the Pope was also invited, but as his beard had not grown in three years, he did not attend the Synod. Because of this the other patriarchs and bishops damned Pope Jermon together with the other false believers.

There in short, I left out more than I put in of what this story tells us, which some idiots really consider to be wisdom.

Now this golden beard should be combed or this narration investigated, in which so many lies are found, so to say, as there are hairs in the beard of the concoctor and compiler of this text, because it is only a long continuous lie.

It is a lie that any pope of Rome was called Jermon, or even a similar name. It is a lie that he followed Gregory the Great to the throne of Rome, because Gregory was followed by Pope Sabinian, St Gregory's deacon. It is a lie that any pope of that time had a beard, because the first pope to let his beard grow was Pope Julius II, who was raised to the papacy in 1503, and so it is a lie that this imaginary Jermon shaved off his golden beard because of some girl, and so it is a lie that Basil conducted Jermon's marriage ceremony, because according to this false story Jermon would have had to become pope in 604, as many as two hundred years earlier.

It is a lie that seventy heresies appeared in the Western Church at that time, nobody has ever said that yet about the Western Church. It is a lie that Jermon was invited to the Seventh Synod and could not attend because of his beard being shaved off, because the Synod was held in 787, and that false Jermon would have had to become pope in 604, and to have been twenty-five years old, and it follows that he was invited to the Synod when he was nearly two hundred years old. Everyone who has ever had anything to do with ecclesiastical history knows that the pope at that time was Hadrian I, and the Constantinople Patriarch Tarasio, and at that Synod persecutors of sacred icons were damned. Is not this text a multiple lie compiled by someone, and because we do not know his name, to put it clearly, by an ass.

Here is how some, heated by hatred from Hell, try by telling lies to awake hatred of the Church of Rome among the common folk, and to insult it. When simple people hear that Pope Jermon shaved off his beard for the love of a girl, and that because of that the clergy of the Latins shave their beards, when they see that our priests do not have beards, they believe it all saying: It is really true what our priest says, that these priests do not have beards; it must be true that our holy water is natural human water in which the priests among the Latins put salt so that it does not smell.

Such fools do not know that the prophet Elisha, as we find in the Holy Bible, poured salt into water, purified it and removed its bitterness, they are blasphemously burping our holy water which in the same way we bless in prayers and the word of God, by which God has done so many miracles and still does so.

I cannot pass in silence over this craziness by which they frighten the common folk, that if anyone crosses over into the embrace of our holy mother the Church of Rome, they will not be able to pass water. Which holy father teaches this? Where is this written? Oh, delirium!

So many thousands in Hungary and Erdelj joined the Roman Church and it has never been heard of that this happened to anyone: the blind lead the blind into ruin. I know that these teachings do not belong to the reasonable Greeks, nor the Russians, nor the Ukrainians, indeed, they are even very ashamed that anyone of theirs should tell such stupid lies, who tried their hand at theology following after goats, regarding themselves as writers, only if they can read anything in Russian, although they do not understand what they read.

Whoever it was who told the story of the golden beard, is not even worth investigating. Whoever it was, here are words which suit him: to him whose head is empty and wisdom short, a long and full beard fits only as a laughing-stock. That is all about paying for the beard.

Material chosen by: Divna Zečević

(Translated by Nina H. Antoljak)

REFERENCES CITED

- Batušić, Nikola. 1995. "Drama i kazalište u Katančićevoj Knjižici o ilirskom pjesništvu izvedenoj po zakonima estetike." In *Zbornik radova: Ključevi raja. Hrvatski književni barok i slavonska književnost 18. stoljeća*. Julijana Matanović, ed. Zagreb: Meandar.
- Biblijski leksikon* 1988. III. ed. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Esrig, David. 1985. *Commedia dell'arte. Eine Bildgeschichte der Kunst des Spektakels*. David Esrig, ed. Mitarbeit von Evelin Kohl, Hans Jürgen Erintrop, Olympia Esrig. Ein Athanon-Buch. Delphi 1021. Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, Nördlingen.
- Kačić Miošić, Andrija. 1983. *Razgovor ugodni naroda Slovinskoga. Zbornik "Kačić"*. Split.
- Kanižlić, Antun. 1780. *Kamen pravi smutnye velike illiti pocsetak, i uzrok istiniti RASTAVLYENA cerkve istocsne od zapadne po mlogo posctovanomu gospodinu Antunu Kanishlichu nyihove excellencie prisvitloga gospod. biskupa zagrebacskoga svete stolice u Poxegi naregyene visce od dvadeset godinah consistorialu; nigdascnye pako druxbe Isusove misniku jurve pokoinomu za zivota obilato ispisan. S-blagodarnostjom pako uzviscene, i prisviti krallyevske magyarske komore na svitlo dan. U Osiku kod Ivana Martina Divalta. Godine MDCCLXXX*.
- Marković, Ivan. 1891. *Cesarizam i bizantinstvo u poviesti crkvenog raskola*. Knjiga I—II. Napisao Dr. Ivan Marković, franjevac Države presv. odkupitelja. Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke tiskare.

- Matić, Tomo, ed. 1940. "Život i rad Antuna Kanižlića". In *Stari pisci hrvatski*. Vol. XXVI. Pjesme Antuna Kanižlića, Antuna Ivanošića i Matije Petra Katančića. Zagreb.
- Pejgels, Elejn (Elaine Pagels). 1981. *Gnostička jevanđelja*. Edicija Pečat. Beograd: Rad.
- Schenda, Rudolf. 1969. "Stand und Aufgaben der Exemplarforschung." *Fabula. Zeitschrift für Erzählforschung* 10/1–3.
- von Weizsäcker, Carl Friedrich. 1988. "Istinska spoznaja uvijek je spoznaja s ljubavlju. Sa C. F. von Weizsäckerom razgovara E. Koller." *Odjek* 1 (1.–15.I.1988).
- Zečević, Divna. 1993. *Strah Božji. Hrvatske pučke propovijedi 18. stoljeća*. Mala teorijska biblioteka 43. Osijek: Izdavački centar Otvorenog sveučilišta Osijek.

POLEMIČKA PUČKA KNJIŽEVNA POUKA ANTUNA
KANIŽLIĆA O FOCIJU KAO UZROČNIKU CRKVENOG
RASKOLA, U KNJIZI: *KAMEN PRAVI SMUTNJE VELIKE*,
OSIK 1780.

Vjerske polemike između Istočne i Zapadne crkve. 18. stoljeće. (II. dio)

SAŽETAK

Zanimanje za vjerske polemike između Istočne i Zapadne crkve, posebice u 18. stoljeću, određeno je prije svega namjerom istraživanja pučkog književnog štiva, u ovom slučaju polemičkog karaktera, namijenjenog ne samo užem krugu crkvenih ljudi nego, putem njih, usmenim propovjedima i kršćanskim naučavanjem, najširim slojevima društva. Štivo nije samo na pučki književni način polemičko nego i poučno-zabavno. Istraživanje ima kulturno antropološki karakter poput onoga koji sam analizirala hrvatske pučke propovijedi 18. i 19. stoljeća.

Nije mi namjera da se uključim među vjerske polemičare, kontroverziste, jer vrstom zanimanja i rada pripadam među povjesničare književnosti i istraživače književne mitologije. U vjerskim polemikama 18. i 19. stoljeća mitovi dolaze u prvi plan pozornosti, na mitovima se, uz ostale književne vrste, izgrađuje polemička argumentacija.

U Kanižličevoj se knjizi protivnik Focije ukazuje kao negativni svetac, sa svim znakovima, prenatalnim i ostalim znacima tijekom života koji najavljuju slugu pakla, neprijatelja kršćanstva. Javlja se i motiv Fausta, dok ulogu Mefista dobija Židov koji Fociju poklanja znanje i mudrost i tako pomaže u "razapinjajnju" Crkve na Istočnu i Zapadnu; motiv je smješten u korijen Crkvenog raskola.

Antun Kanižlić u knjizi, poput svih propovjednika 18. stoljeća, pripovijeda egzemple, čuda Bogorodice, vizije, kao što opisuje i kazališnu svetogrđnu predstavu; knjigu završava oblikom nadgrobnice za Focija, sve u funkciji argumenta kojim će uvjeriti čitatelja u vjerodostojnost i ispravnost mišljenja o Fociju kao glavnom uzročniku raskola.