



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI PADOVA

Sede amministrativa: Università degli Studi di Padova
Dipartimento di Filosofia, Sociologia, Pedagogia e Psicologia Applicata

Scuola di dottorato di ricerca in Filosofia
Indirizzo: Filosofia e storia delle idee
Ciclo XXIV

**The Cultural Project of Krastyo Peykich (1666-1730):
A ‘Spiritual Weapon’ for the Catholic Undertaking
in Eighteenth-Century East Central Europe**

Direttore della Scuola: ch.^{mo} prof. Giovanni Fiaschi _____

Coordinatore d’indirizzo: prof. Fabio Grigenti _____

Supervisore: ch.^{mo} prof. Gregorio Piaia _____

Dottorando: Iva Manova

SUMMARY

Krastyo Peykich (1666-1730) was an early modern author, Bulgarian by birth, Roman and Venetian by education, active as a Catholic missionary in central and east-central Europe in the decades around the very end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, whose polemical works dealt with controversialist theology and political and juridical issues. This study discloses his cultural project and the historical relevance of the latter, by means of a reading of his works and an analysis of a number of published and unpublished sources.

Peykich was born into a Catholic family in the small town of Chiprovtsi, in north-west present-day Bulgaria, at the time well within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. After the failure of the Chiprovtsi uprising against the Ottoman rule in 1688, Peykich fled to Italy. After a sojourn in Venice, in 1689 he became a student at the *Collegio Urbano* of the Holy Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* in Rome. He remained there until 1698, when he left the College – without however obtaining a degree – in order to become a missionary in Transylvania and Wallachia. From 1704 to 1709 he was prefect of the *Pia Casa dei Catecumeni* in Venice. In the following years, he worked once again as a missionary, parish priest and canon in Hungary, Transylvania, Wallachia and Croatia. He died most probably in 1730 in Vienna.

Peykich was the author of four books. For the purposes of the present study, we can divide them in two groups. The first group concerns the question of the schism between Eastern and Western Churches and consists of three publications: *Zarcalo istine*, *Speculum veritatis* and *Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium*. *Zarcalo istine* (Venice 1716) was Peykich's first publication and was written in a variant of Southern Slavic

(“Illyrian”) language. *Speculum veritatis* (Venice 1725) was an enlarged version of the *Zarcalo* in Latin. *Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium* (Trnava 1730) was a closer examination of an aspect of the question. All three are designed according to the literary genre of controversistic theology, yet seem animated by a concordistic spirit, aiming to promote the reunification of the Eastern and Western Churches. The second “group” of works actually consists in only one publication: the *Mahometanus in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus* (Trnava 1717), a “catechism” for Catholic missionaries carrying out their activity among Muslims.

A first objective of the present study consists in offering a new, significantly enriched biography of our author. As a result of our research, we are now able to trace Peykich’s life in much greater detail than before, especially as far as his missionary activity and editorial projects are concerned. We uncover, to give an example, Krastyo Peykich’s exact date of birth: 14th September, 1666.

However, our main objective is to disclose Peykich’s cultural project. For this purpose, we have described the cultural and political context of his activity, placing it within the wider perspective of the Hapsburg’s policy: a policy aimed at the religious integration of their subjects and the consolidation of Catholicism as the “state religion” in their Empire.

Within this context, Peykich’s books had to serve the cause of the union of the “schismatic” Orthodox Church with the Catholic Church and of converting Lutheran and Calvinist “heretics” and Muslim “infidels” to Catholicism. Through this direct purpose, our author aimed at a final, supreme end. It consisted in the “liberation” of all Christian peoples – Peykich’s Bulgarian compatriots among them – from the Ottoman domination. According to Peykich’s view, the European Powers were to join forces under the leadership of the Catholic emperor in order to form a Christian front united against the Ottoman Empire. The project of our author as a missionary and a man of letters was to contribute to the fulfillment of that end by providing the *militia christiana* with the “spiritual weapon” of his polemical works.

This “spiritual weapon” was actually two-edged. It had a conceptual – religious and political – aspect, on one side, and a linguistic one, on the other.

In the present study, we have tried to disclose both of them. Peykich's polemical book against the Muslims and his works on the schism and the union of the Church are analysed – with regard to their context, sources, intentions and content – in two distinct chapters. A further chapter is dedicated to his linguistic endeavour.

Our study of the *Mahometanus* improves the previous current knowledge of its sources and shows that it was designed with a view to a possible audience of Muslims: if not to be read directly by them, at least to be applied on the occasion of their proselytization and in the process of their catechization. This is a significant difference with respect to the standard medieval and early modern Christian anti-Muslim polemical treatises addressed to a Christian audience.

Our analysis of Peykich's works on the schism and the union of the Church illustrates his cultural project for the conversion of all Orthodox Slavic peoples in the Balkans to Catholicism and his political ideal of an all-embracing Christian alliance to triumph over the Ottoman Empire. Among the results of our researches we can mention the discovery of an autograph of Peykich's *Speculum veritatis*.

Still in the context of the project for the conversion of all Orthodox Slavic peoples in the Balkans to Catholicism, was Peykich's attempt to reach a broader audience among diverse, and not necessarily highly or "classically" educated, social strata by writing a work in a variant of a Southern Slavic idiom. In his eyes, this language had to be an instrument for religious unification, which in turn was interpreted as the necessary basis for the political unification of Southern Slavs with other Catholic nations under the Catholic Emperor.

Zarcalo istine was the first book on Orthodox-Catholic theological controversy ever written in a Southern Slavic language. A standardised technical apparatus for translating the Latin terms was lacking; there were no models to follow when writing on theoretical or abstract matters. Although Peykich was not able to elaborate "Illyrian" counterparts for the whole range of technical terms applied in trinitarian theology, his attempt to create a

theological and philosophical “Illiric” terminology is still memorable. Our contribution to the study of this topic is principally a table of the equivalences of theological, philosophical and ecclesiological lexemes and syntagmata in *Zarcalo* and in *Speculum*, which we offer in chapter four of the present dissertation.

With regard to his books, Peyklich never tired of insisting that they were the fruit of his practical experience and were in point of fact meant to be used in practice. In accordance with his own statements, our analysis gives an account of Peyklich’s polemical works as a manifestation and a revealing example both of post-Tridentine Catholic expansion in eastern Europe and of the Hapsburg’s policy towards religious minorities in the borderlands of the Empire.

RIASSUNTO

Krastyo Peykich (1666-1730) fu uno scrittore vissuto in età moderna. Bulgaro di nascita, di formazione romana e veneziana, attivo come missionario cattolico in Europa centrale e centro-orientale negli ultimi anni del secolo XVII e nei primi decenni del secolo XVIII, fu autore di opere di teologia controversistica ricche di elementi politici e giuridici. Il presente studio disvela ed esamina il suo progetto culturale e la rilevanza storica di quest'ultimo, attraverso un'analisi delle opere del nostro autore e di fonti edite e inedite che lo concernono.

Peykich nacque in una famiglia cattolica a Chiprovtsi, nell'attuale Bulgaria nord-occidentale, all'epoca ben all'interno dell'Impero Ottomano. A seguito del fallimento dell'insurrezione del 1688 dei cattolici di Chiprovtsi contro il dominio turco, Peykich fuggì in Italia. Dopo un soggiorno di alcuni mesi a Venezia, nel 1689 divenne studente nel Collegio "Urbano" della Congregazione *de Propaganda Fide*, in Roma. Qui rimase fino al 1698, quando lasciò il Collegio – senza però conseguire la laurea in teologia – al fine di recarsi come missionario in Transilvania e in Valacchia. Dal 1704 al 1709 fu priore della Pia Casa dei Catecumeni a Venezia. Nei venti anni che seguirono fu di nuovo missionario, parroco e canonico in Ungheria, Transilvania, Valacchia e Croazia. Alcuni dati documentali inducono a ritenere che sia morto a Vienna nel 1730.

Peykich fu autore di quattro opere. Ai fini del presente studio, esse possono essere ripartite in due classi. La prima classe concerne la questione dello scisma tra la Chiesa Orientale e quella Occidentale. Essa è composta da tre testi: lo *Zarcalo istine*, lo *Speculum veritatis* e la *Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium*. Lo *Zarcalo istine* (Venezia 1716) fu la

prima pubblicazione di Peykich; essa è scritta in una forma di lingua slava meridionale che potremmo definire “illirica”. Lo *Speculum veritatis* (Venezia 1725) è una versione ampliata e in lingua latina dello *Zarcalo*. La *Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium* (Trnava 1730) approfondisce un aspetto della questione. Le tre opere rientrano nel genere letterario della teologia controversistica, tuttavia sono animate da uno spirito concordistico, finalizzato ad agevolare il ricongiungimento della Chiesa Orientale con quella Occidentale. La seconda classe di opere è costituita, in realtà, da una sola pubblicazione: il *Mahometanus in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus* (Trnava 1717); una sorta di catechismo per i missionari cattolici che avessero svolto la propria attività tra i musulmani.

Un primo obiettivo del presente studio consiste nell’offrire una biografia del nostro autore più accurata e documentata di quelle fino a ora disponibili. Come risultato della nostra ricerca, siamo ora in grado di ricostruire la vita e le attività di Peykich con un buon grado di precisione, soprattutto per quanto concerne la sua attività missionaria e i suoi progetti editoriali. Tra i dati che abbiamo potuto appurare vi è anche la data di nascita di Peykich: il 14 settembre 1666.

Tuttavia, il nostro obiettivo principale consiste nell’esaminare il progetto culturale di Peykich. A questo scopo, abbiamo definito il quadro culturale e politico entro il quale si svolse l’attività del nostro autore, collocandola e interpretandola nel contesto di alcuni aspetti della politica degli Asburgo a cavallo tra XVII e XVIII secolo: una politica mirante all’uniformità religiosa dei sudditi e al consolidamento del cattolicesimo come religione dello stato.

In questa prospettiva, i libri di Peykich avevano l’intento di favorire l’unione della Chiesa “scismatica” Ortodossa con la Chiesa Cattolica e di convertire al cattolicesimo gli “eretici”, ossia i luterani e i calvinisti, e gli “infedeli”, ossia i musulmani. Per il tramite di questo obiettivo immediato, il nostro autore mirava a uno scopo ulteriore e ultimo: la “liberazione” di tutti i popoli cristiani sottoposti al dominio Ottomano. Secondo questo progetto, le grandi potenze europee avrebbero dovuto allearsi sotto la guida dell’imperatore cattolico, ossia degli Asburgo, per creare un fronte cristiano

unito contro l'Impero Ottomano. Il fine esplicito dell'attività letteraria del nostro autore fu precisamente il contribuire alla realizzazione di questo progetto fornendo alla *militia christiana* l'"arma spirituale" delle proprie opere polemiche.

Specificamente, si trattava di un'arma "a doppia lama". Essa aveva sia un aspetto concettuale – religioso e politico –, sia un aspetto linguistico. Nel presente studio abbiamo inteso descrivere le caratteristiche di entrambi questi aspetti. Il testo polemico di Peykich contro l'Islam e le sue opere dedicate al tema dello scisma e dell'unione delle Chiese vengono analizzati – quanto al loro contesto, fonti, contenuti e intenzioni – nel secondo e nel terzo capitolo del presente saggio. Un ulteriore e ultimo capitolo è riservato all'aspetto "linguistico" del progetto del nostro autore.

Lo studio sul *Mahometanus* migliora le conoscenze fino a oggi disponibili circa le fonti dell'opera e dimostra che essa fu progettata in vista di un possibile pubblico di musulmani; se non per esser letta direttamente da essi, almeno per essere utilizzata ai fini di un'opera di proselitismo tra essi e della loro catechizzazione. È questa una differenza significativa rispetto ai trattati medievali e della prima età moderna contro l'Islam, i quali erano diretti principalmente a un pubblico già cristiano.

Lo studio delle opere di Peykich dedicate allo scisma e all'unione della Chiesa porta alla luce, come già abbiamo accennato, il progetto culturale del nostro autore, volto al ricongiungimento degli ortodossi con la Chiesa cattolica, e la sua aspirazione alla costituzione di un'alleanza cristiana finalizzata al trionfo sull'impero Ottomano. Tra i risultati delle nostre ricerche possiamo menzionare la scoperta di un autografo dello *Speculum veritatis* di Peykich.

Nel contesto del progetto della conversione dei slavi meridionali al cattolicesimo si colloca anche il tentativo di Peykich di raggiungere anche un pubblico di lettori o uditori non colti, o almeno non istruiti nella lingua latina: la stesura di un'opera scritta in una forma di slavo meridionale. Agli occhi del nostro autore, questa lingua avrebbe dovuto costituire uno strumento per l'unificazione religiosa, a sua volta da lui interpretata come la base necessaria

per l'unificazione politica, sotto il dominio dell'imperatore cattolico, dei popoli slavi meridionali.

Il frutto di questo tentativo è precisamente lo *Zarcalo istine*. Si tratta del primo libro dedicato alle controversie teologiche tra cattolici e ortodossi scritto in una lingua slavo-meridionale. Al tempo in cui Peykich elaborò il testo non era disponibile alcun precedente modello per la traduzione del lessico filosofico e teologico latino in termini slavi. Sebbene il nostro autore non sia stato in grado di elaborare omologhi "illirici" per l'intera gamma della terminologia latina relativa alla teologia trinitaria, il suo tentativo di creare un lessico teologico e filosofico in "illirico" resta tuttavia storicamente memorabile. Il nostro principale contributo allo studio di questo tema risiede nella tabella di equivalenze di lessemi e sintagmi teologici, filosofici ed ecclesiologici utilizzati nello *Zarcalo* e nello *Speculum*; tabella che mettiamo a disposizione del lettore nel quarto capitolo del presente saggio.

Peykich non cessò in alcun momento di presentare le proprie opere come frutto della propria esperienza e di sottolineare che esse erano effettivamente destinate ad essere utilizzati nella pratica controversistica e catechetica. Seguendo le esplicite dichiarazioni del nostro autore, l'analisi qui condotta fornisce un'interpretazione delle sue opere polemiche nei termini di una manifestazione e di un'efficace esemplificazione sia dell'espansionismo cattolico post-tridentino in Europa orientale, sia della politica degli Asburgo nei confronti delle minoranze religiose nelle terre di confine del loro impero.

NOTICE

1. TRANSLITERATION OF THE BULGARIAN ALPHABET IN LATIN LETTERS¹

1.1 *Transliteration of the simple graphemes*

А	а	A	a	К	к	K	k	Ф	ф	F	f
Б	б	B	b	Л	л	L	l	Х	х	H	h
В	в	V	v	М	м	M	m	Ц	ц	Ts	ts
Г	г	G	g	Н	н	N	n	Ч	ч	Ch	ch
Д	д	D	d	О	о	O	o	Ш	ш	Sh	sh
Е	е	E	e	П	п	P	p	Щ	щ	Sht	sht
Ж	ж	Zh	zh	Р	р	R	r	Ъ	ъ	A	a
З	з	Z	z	С	с	S	s	Ь	ь	Y	y
И	и	I	i	Т	т	T	t	Ю	ю	Yu	yu
Й	й	Y	y	У	у	U	u	Я	я	Ya	ya

1.2 *Transliteration of the composite graphemes*

Дж	дж	Dzh	dzh
Дз	дз	Dzh	dzh
	ьо		yo
Йо	йо	Yo	yo
	ия		ia

¹ Transliteration follows the Bulgarian Law for Transliteration (2009).

2. TRANSLITERATION OF THE GRAPHEMS USED IN PEYKICH'S WORK *ZARCALO*
ISTINE IN PRESENT DAY CROATIAN LATIN LETTERS

а	a	А	a	О	o	О	o
Ѡ	Ѡ	В	b	Ѡ̂	Ѡ ²	О	o
П	п	В	v	П	п	Р	p
У	г	Г	g	Р	p	Р	r
Ѡ	Ѡ	Д	d	С	c	С	s
Е	e	Е	e	Т	т	Т	t
Ж	ж	Ž	ž	Ѡ̂	Ѡ̂	У	u
З	з	З	z	Ф	ф	Ф	f
Н	н	И	i	Х	x	Н	h
К	к	К	k	У	ц	С	c
Л	л	Л	l	У	v	Č	č
М	м	М	m	Ш	ш	Š	š
Н	н	Н	n	Ш	ш	Št	št

⌘ ⌘ This grapheme is polyfunctional.

If used autonomously, it can be equivalent to two present day Croatian Latin graphemes: *Ć, ć* and *Đ, đ*.

In combination with 'л' or 'н', it is respectively equivalent to the following present day Croatian Latin composite graphemes: *Lj, lj* [denoting the phoneme *ɫ*] and *Nj, nj* [denoting the phoneme *ɲ*].

² This grapheme is used rarely, specifically in the following declined forms – maybe a relic of archaic abbreviated forms – of 'otac' (meaning 'father'): 'Ѡца' (*oca*), 'ѠцѠ' (*ocu*), 'Ѡци' (*oci*), 'Ѡце' (*oce*).

3. ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Additamentum</i>	CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, <i>Additamentum ad Speculum veritatis</i> , Tyrnaviae(?): s.e., 1727(?).
APF	Città del Vaticano, Archivio Storico della Sacra Congregazione <i>de Propaganda Fide</i> .
APF, Acta	APF, Fund “Acta Sacrae Congregationis”.
APF, Lettere	APF, Fund “Lettere e decreti della Santa Congregazione”.
APF, SC	APF, Fund “Scritture riferiti nei Congressi”.
APF, SOCG	APF, Fund “Scritture originali riferite nelle Congregazioni generali”.
BAN	Sofia, Българска академия на науките [Bulgarian Academy of Sciencies].
<i>Catechismus</i>	<i>Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini</i> , Lipsiae: ex Officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1856 (editio stereotypa quinta).
<i>Concordia</i>	CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, <i>Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium in eadem veritate, de Spiritus Sancti processione ab utroque, ad amussim convenientium: ex commentariis Gennadii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani excerpta...</i> , Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis per Fridericum Gall, 1730.
IRE, Catecumeni	Venezia, Archivio delle Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, Fund “Catecumeni”.
IVANOVA	Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], <i>Кръстьо Пейкич в южнославянските книжно-езикови контакти от началото на 18 век</i> [Krastyo Peykich in the Southern Slav Linguistic Contacts in the Eighteenth Century], Sofia: [pro manuscripto], 1990.

- Mahometanus* CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Mahometanus dogmatice, et catechetice in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus*, Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis per Fridericum Gall, 1717.
- METZLER J. METZLER (ed.), *Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide memoria rerum*, 3 vol., Rom et al.: Herder, 1971-1976.
- PG MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca*.
- Speculum* CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Speculum veritatis inter Orientalem et Occidentalem Ecclesias refulgens*, Venetiis: Typis Societatis Albrizianae, 1725.
- TURČINOVIĆ J. TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja Krsto Pejkić (1665-1731)*, Zagreb: Kršanska sadašnjost, 1973.
- Zarcalo* KARST PEIKIČ, *Zarcalo istine med Carkve Istočne i Zapadnje*, u Mnecie: po Nikoli Peccanu, 1716.

INTRODUCTION

Krastyo Peykich (1666-1730) was an early modern author, Bulgarian by birth, Roman and Venetian by education, active as a Catholic missionary in central and east-central Europe in the decades around the very end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, whose polemical works dealt with controversialist theology and political/cultural issues. This study aims to disclose his cultural project and the historical relevance of the latter, by means of a reading of his works and an analysis of a number of published and unpublished sources.

1. SOME HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS

Almost thirty years ago, the Italian Slavistic scholar Emanuela Sgambati said of our author

Karsto Pejkič è un personaggio pochissimo conosciuto che la storiografia civile, religiosa e soprattutto culturale della Bulgaria tra Sei e Settecento deve recuperare e porre nel posto che gli compete.¹

Despite this and other similar exhortations, the polemical, philosophical and devotional writings of Krastyo Peykich, Petar Bogdan Bakshev² and other

¹ E. SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione europea di un missionario patriota bulgaro: Karsto Pejkič*, in *Atti dell'VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 1983, pp. 281-301, quotation from p. 281.

² Petar Bogdan Bakshev (1601-1674) was Catholic archbishop of Sofia and a distinguished Bulgarian Catholic writer.

Early Modern Bulgarian Catholic authors have hitherto rarely been studied. There are two reasons for this and we shall try to outline them.

The most evident, and undoubtedly the most important, reason for the scarcity of studies on authors like Krastyo Peykich lies in some aspects of the Bulgarian historiographical tradition. Bulgarian philosophical and cultural historiography considers these authors as marginal, somehow extraneous to, and insignificant for, the “true” national Bulgarian culture, which is seen as exclusively Greek Orthodox. This view was developed during the so-called “Bulgarian national revival,”³ it has been dominant during the twentieth century and it is still generally accepted. In a recent contribution, for example, the historian Alexander Nikolov made the following evaluation of the historical significance of the above-mentioned archbishop of Sofia, Petar Bogdan Bakshev:

The patriotism of Peter Bogdan, however, was deeply connected to his Catholic faith, and he totally ignored the reality of the predominantly Orthodox traditions of the Bulgarian medieval past. [...] His writings, however, remained popular only among a very narrow circle of educated men from the Catholic community, and they did not affect at all the ideological world of the Bulgarian revival in the next century.⁴

This historiographical conception can be disputed from two sides. First, the studies on the historical consequences of the activities of seventeenth- and eighteenth century Bulgarian Catholics are so limited that no one can have certitudes about the extent of their influence. Second, we might think that

³ J.L. HOPKINS, *The Bulgarian Orthodox Church: A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Evolving Relationship Between Church, Nation and State in Bulgaria*, Boulder: East European Monographs 2009, is a well-informed account of the history of the national formation in Bulgaria and of how the religious aspect, i.e. affiliation to the Orthodox Church, was established as an essential part of the Bulgarian national identity.

⁴ A. NIKOLOV, *The Contexts of Paisij Hilendarski*, in B. TRENCSENYI - M. ZÁSZKALICZKY (eds.), *Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 611-628, quotation from p. 627.

cultural narrative should embrace any work of literature, philosophy or theology as far as it is a product of a cultural, historical and political milieu, even in case it has no direct impact on, or offers very little contribution to, any specific “national revival”.

As a clue both of the need to find a new approach in this field, and of the difficulties involved therein, one could refer to the following “confession” by Petar Dinekov, an authoritative twentieth-century historian of Bulgarian literature:

The Catholic literature in Bulgaria has not been established bibliographically; the single writers and works have not been examined; the issue of the place that should be assigned to Catholic literature in the whole system of Bulgarian literature has not yet been solved. In determining this place, one was guided by one fact – the paucity of Bulgarian Catholics and their isolation from the rest of the population. For this reason, as I myself wrote in the academic *History of Bulgarian Literature*, <it was believed that> ‘the cultural and educational life of Bulgarian Catholics bears absolutely no relation to the development of the common Bulgarian culture and literature.’⁵ It is time for this opinion to be corrected. The number of the Bulgarian Catholics cannot be a criterion for the evaluation of Bulgarian Catholic literature.⁶

⁵ Dinekov quotes from *История на българската литература* [History of Bulgarian Literature], 4 vol., Sofia: BAN, 1962-1966, vol. 1, p. 407.

⁶ “Католическата литература в България не е установена библиографски, не са проучени отделните писатели и съчинения, не е изяснен въпросът за мястото на католическата литература в цялостната система на българската национална литература. При определянето на това място се изхождаше преди всичко от един факт – малочислеността на българските католици и тяхната изолираност от останалото население, поради което – както самият аз писах в академическата *История на българската литература* – ‘просветният и книжовен живот на католиците няма никакво отношение към развитието на общата българска култура и литература’. Време е това схващане да се коригира. Броят на българските католици не може да бъде критерий при оценката на българската католическа литература.” – П. ДИНЕКОВ [P. DINEKOV], “Българската литература през XVII в.” [Bulgarian Literature in the Seventeenth Century], *Литературна мисъл* [Literary Thought], 20 (1977), pp. 5-15, quotation from p. 10.

These lines were written in 1977. Decades later, and in spite of the great changes that have taken place in Bulgarian political, social and academic reality in the meantime, Dinekov's words sound as if they were penned with the very purpose of describing the present state of the question.

In sum, the lack of scholarly studies on Krastyo Peykich and other Bulgarian Catholic writers is the main and most grievous consequence of the prevalence among Bulgarian scholars of the "classical" interpretation of the role played by Catholic intellectuals in the progress of the national culture. It has, however, a further important consequence: the scarce international dissemination and the general inaccessibility (mainly for linguistic reasons) of the results of the research that, despite the adverse cultural tendencies, has been conducted.

In his renowned *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Jozef Ijsewijn dedicates some attention also to Bulgarian Catholic writers of the 17th century. He quotes the opening sentences of Petar Bogdan Bakshev's *History of Bulgaria* and declares: "These few lines clearly show the elegance of Bogdan's prose style and his work certainly deserves to be better known."⁷ Concluding his analysis, he laments the fact that "scholarly works from that part of the world [i.e. Bulgaria], now mostly written in minor Slav languages, are completely inaccessible to the interested scholars of other countries."⁸ Paradoxically, Ijsewijn gives a demonstration of this statement by omitting to include the name of Krastyo Peykich in his account of the Bulgarian Catholic writers from the Early Modern Period; obviously, he and his collaborators had no access to any sources referring to this author.

If we now shift our attention from Bulgarian historiography and its approach towards Peykich as a representative of a national intellectual élite, and look instead at Church historiography, we have to recognize that, also in

⁷ J. IJSEWIJN, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 1: *Part I: History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, Leuven: Leuven University Press - Peeters, 1990², p. 92.

⁸ Ibid.

this case, he falls within a class of authors to some extent neglected by scholarship.

Church historians have clearly established that at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries both the Roman Curia and the local ecclesiastical authorities were ensuring the implementation of the Tridentine reform, which, after two hundred years of fierce controversies and religious wars, had achieved the chance to be fully applied; as Ulrich L. Lehner has recently written, “the spirit of Trent was <at the time> in full force.”⁹ In that context, an intercultural and interreligious “dialogue” took place, in particular in the borderlands of the Christian world, and a specific trend in political thought developed; a trend that the alumni of the pontifical and Jesuit educational institutions were expected to propagate.¹⁰ This trend, or school, of thought gradually came to lose importance in the following decades, but at Peykich’s time it was still rather influential, in general, and of exclusive importance in central-European political life, in particular.¹¹

⁹ Cf. U.L. LEHNER, *The Many Facets of the Catholic Enlightenment*, in U.L. LEHNER - M. PRINTY (eds.), *A Companion to the Catholic Enlightenment in Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 1-61; quotation from p. 18.

¹⁰ Cf. P. BROGGIO, *La teologia e la politica. Controversie dottrinali, Curia romana e Monarchia spagnola tra Cinque e Seicento*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2009: “Se è vero che è da Roma che determinati indirizzi dottrinali dovevano essere irradiati nel resto della cattolicità, è pur sempre a Roma che, sotto il controllo degli organismi di Curia, i dibattiti avevano luogo e il sapere veniva trasmesso a dei discenti che sempre più avrebbero avuto il compito di difendere ovunque nel mondo le prerogative della Santa Sede. Ci si chiede allora se, nella misura in cui è esistita una «formazione romana» per un clero missionario, [...] sia esistita anche una «teologia romana», una teologia concepita a Roma, insegnata a Roma, sui cui sviluppi Roma potesse esercitare un controllo preponderante e che non fosse in forma generale e generica identificabile con la Scolastica.” – quotation from pp. xiv-xv.

¹¹ This statement is substantiated by statistics: “Tra il 1637 e il 1799 le persone che ricoprirono successivamente la carica di arcivescovo di Strigonium [i.e. Esztergom, the seat of the Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary] furono 10, e 6 di loro avevano compiuto gli studi nel *Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum* [...]. La proporzione non diventa minore nemmeno nel caso dei vescovi. [...] Tra il 1625 e il 1799 nella sede vescovile di Agria si succedettero 15 persone, di cui 12 avevano terminato gli studi nel Collegio Romano, il che equivale a più dell’80%. Nel caso delle altre sedi

Peykich, together with a number of other early modern religious authors, was undoubtedly a participant in that “dialogue” and a spokesman for the aforementioned trend; nonetheless, his writings – as the writings of the group of authors he belongs – have not been studied comprehensively. The reasons for this state of affairs have been pointed out by Thomas Michel in an article devoted to *Jesuit Writings on Islam* and some of his considerations can apply to the case of Peykich’s works as well. In this essay Michel remarks the dissatisfactory level of studies on Christian and Muslim polemical texts of the early modern period. According to this scholar, the main reason for, as he calls it, the “sixteenth- and seventeenth-century hiatus” in the studies on the history of Christian-Muslim relations, is the scholarship tradition, which gives pride of place to the study of manuscripts, “whose restoration through critical editions and textual analysis is easily recognized as a worthwhile academic project.” “By contrast,” says Michel, “those writings composed after the advent of printing seem already ‘available’ and, because of their very accessibility, modern.” Our modern aversion to the scholastic way of argumentation is pointed out by Michel as another important reason for the scholarly disregard of Early Modern interconfessional polemical writings. Michel laments the fact that, as a result of this aversion, “the care which the apologists took to translate the subtleties of patristic and scholastic trinitarian formulations into apologetic arguments in everyday speech and simple metaphors” is lost for the contemporary reader.¹²

vescovili questa proporzione si riduce leggermente, ma tutto sommato si può affermare che in Ungheria, nei secoli XVII-XVIII, il 60% circa di tutte le nomine alle alte cariche ecclesiastiche spettava ad ex alunni romani. Ciò significa che il gruppo dirigente del clero ungherese, in posizione chiave sia nella vita politica sia in quella culturale, si era formato nel Collegio Germanico Ungarico di Roma, e un più attento esame del ruolo svolto dagli ex alunni romani nella storia ungherese può essere rivelatore.” – I. BITSKEY, *Il Collegio Germanico-Ungarico di Roma. Contributo alla storia della cultura ungherese in età barocca*, Roma: Viella, 1996, pp. 127-128.

¹² T. MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings on Islam in the Seventeenth Century,” *Islamochristiana*, 15 (1989), pp. 57-85, quotations from pp. 58-59. In the same vein is the opinion expressed by E. COLOMBO, *Gesuitomania. Studi recenti sulle missioni gesuitiche (1540-1773)*, in M.

In the the present study, we hope to show that Krastyo Peykich's works do not lack a certain historical and cultural value and do not deserve to be excluded from the Bulgarian and – as we shall try to demonstrate – European historical and cultural narratives. We take the liberty to extend to our author the vivid stance recently expressed by the Slavistic scholar Janja Jerkov on a chapter of the religious history of eighteenth century Bulgaria:

La correzione di prospettiva rispetto alla tipologia di interesse mostrato negli ultimi decenni dai ricercatori non solo permette di avviare la ricostruzione di un capitolo di storia religiosa bulgara non ancora affrontato per sé, ma – aiutando a colmare una vistosa lacuna della storiografia occidentale specialistica (quasi esclusivamente assorbita, oltre dalle proprie vicende ecclesiastiche, da quelle dell'America e dell'Estremo Oriente piuttosto che dell'Europa orientale) – restituisce un significativo tassello del processo culturale europeo del quale la Bulgaria è parte integrante.¹³

2. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE STUDIES ON KRASTYO PEYKICH

Peykich is the author of five printed works, which he published during the last fifteen years of his life. The following shortly lists them.

Zarcalo istine med Carkve Istočne i Zapadnje [The Mirror of the Truth in the Eastern and Western Churches], u Mnecie [in Venice] 1716.

Mahometanus dogmatice, et catechetice in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus, Tyrnaviae 1717.

CATTO - G. MONGINI - S. MOSTACCIO, *Evangelizzazione e globalizzazione. Le missioni gesuitiche nell'età moderna tra storia e storiografia*, Roma: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 2010, pp. 31-59.

¹³ J. JERKOV, "Le relazioni delle visite apostoliche fra i pauliciani bulgari del XVIII secolo," *Ricerche slavistiche*. Nuova serie, 4 (2006), pp. 85-205 (quotation from p. 86).

Speculum veritatis inter Orientalem et Occidentalem Ecclesias refulgens
(Latin translation, corrected and extended, of the *Zarcalo*), Venetiis 1725.

Additamentum ad Speculum veritatis, Tyrnaviae(?) 1727(?).

Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium in eadem veritate, de Spiritus Sancti processione ab utroque, ad amussim convenientium: ex commentariis Gennadii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Excerpta..., Tyrnaviae 1730.

The *Speculum* and the *Concordia* were reprinted together in Tyrnava in 1730 and again in 1731. The *Concordia* was also reprinted separately in 1745 (Claudiopolis, that is Cluj-Napoca in the northwestern part of contemporary Romania) and in 1765 (Tyrnava).

The main studies on Peykich are the monograph, in Croatian, by Josip Turčinović, a well-founded study on Peykich's life and on the history and dissemination of his works,¹⁴ and the monograph, in Bulgarian, by Nayda Ivanova, an accurate philological analysis of the *Zarcalo*, Peykich's "Illyrian" book of 1716.¹⁵ All the publications concerning Peykich in languages other than Bulgarian and Croatian are merely three: an article by the Hungarian scholar Andreas Angyal; the article, already mentioned, by Emanuela Sgambati; an article by the Croatian scholar Sanja Vulić.¹⁶

All the editions of Peykich's works – with one exception – are known to Turčinović and bibliologically described by him.¹⁷ The only exception is the

¹⁴ J. TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja Krsto Pejkić (1665-1731)*, Zagreb: Kršanska sadašnjost, 1973.

¹⁵ Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], *Кръстьо Пейкич в южнославянските книжно-езикови контакти от началото на 18 век* [Krastyo Peykich in the Southern Slav Linguistic Contacts in the Eighteenth Century], Sofia: [pro manuscripto], 1990.

¹⁶ A. ANGYAL, "Krstju Pejkić, ein bulgarischer Schriftsteller der Barokzeit," *Slavica*, 7 (1967), pp. 129-135; SGAMBATI, *Cultura*; S. VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, in F. PETRONIO (ed.), *Plurilingvizem v Evropi 18. stoletja*, Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor, 2002, pp. 179-189.

¹⁷ TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 75-77, 97-98, 102-103, 118-119, 127-131, 132-133, 151-153.

1745 edition of *Concordia*, which has been communicated by Emanuela Sgambati.¹⁸ Apparently, *Additamentum* has been printed separately: nonetheless, all the extant copies are bounded either with copies of the 1730 edition of *Speculum* or with some copies of the 1725 edition of the same work.¹⁹ As we shall see, thanks to some archival documents we can now say more about his publications and editorial projects.

The “Illyrian” *Zarcalo istine* is known to international Slavistic scholars for its linguistic peculiarities; we shall present this topic in the fourth chapter of this work. By contrast, Peykich’s theological and philosophical doctrines have been object, by far, only of a group of studies the Bulgarian scholar Bozhidar Peychev published in Bulgarian between 1969 and 1973. Due to both the historical importance and the problematic character of these studies, we shall dedicate to them the rest of this introduction.

After having published several articles and book chapters on Peykich,²⁰ in

¹⁸ SGAMBATI, *Cultura*, p. 283.

¹⁹ In relation to the uncertainties concerning the exact date and place of the publishing of *Additamentum* and its presence in some copies of the *Speculum* of 1725, see TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 103-105.

²⁰ As early as 1969 Peychev published a “programmatic article” entitled “Krastyo Peykich: An Important Task for Our Bulgarian-Language Studies” (Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ, “Кръстьо Пейкич – Важна задача на нашата българистика,” *Език и литература* [Language and Literature], 24/3 [1969], pp. 74-78), which was in fact a review of Angyal’s note “Krstju Pejkić.” The subsequent publications by Peychev are: Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ, “Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи на Кръстьо Пейкич” [Krastyo Peykich’s Philosophical-Theological and Political Views], *БАН. Известия на института по философия* [BAN. Notices of the Institute of Philosophy], 17 (1969), pp. 217-238; *Философските и политическите възгледи на Кръстьо Пейкич (1665-1730)* [The Philosophical and Political Views of Krastyo Peykich (1665-1730)], in М. БЪЧВАРОВ - К. АНДРЕЕВ [M. BACHVAROV - K. ANDREEV] (eds.), *История на философската мисъл в България* [History of Philosophical Thought in Bulgaria], 4 vol., Sofia: BAN, 1970-1984, vol. 1, pp. 121-132; *Съчиненията на Пейчевичи и Кръстьо Пейкич* [The Writings of the Peychevichs and of Krastyo Peykich], in *Чипровци 1688-1968. Материали от научна сесия по случай 280-годишнината на Чипровското въстание* [Chiprovtsi 1688-1968. Proceedings of a Scientific Conference], Sofia: BAN, 1971, pp. 101-104; *Кръстьо Пейкич (1665-1731)* [Krastyo Peykich (1665-1731)], in М. БЪЧВАРОВ [M. BACHVAROV] (ed.),

1973 Peychev defended a doctoral thesis on the following topic: *Католическият схоластицизъм в историята на българската философска мисъл – XVIII век* [Catholic Scholasticism in the History of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought: Eighteenth Century]. We have not yet been able to consult this work.²¹ In the National Library of Bulgaria, at Sofia, we were allowed to consult only a booklet with a thirty-page version (synopsis) of the thesis prepared by the author himself. Our critical presentation of Peychev's historical research on Peykich is based on this synopsis and on the articles and book chapters quoted above at footnote 20.

Peychev's thesis consists of two chapters. The first chapter is dedicated to Jacob (1681-1738)²² and Franz Xavier (1707-1781) Peyachevich,²³ who were

Антология на българската философска мисъл [Antology of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought], 3 vol., Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1973, vol. 1, pp. 143-145 (pp. 145-149 contain passages from *Mahometanus* in Bulgarian translation by Peychev).

²¹ In Bulgaria, copies of doctoral theses are all preserved at the National Library only. Access to this material is provided once a year, in August and the early autumn, under certain conditions. Interested users have to present a request to the director of the National Library and to attach to it a letter signed by the author of the thesis to be consulted and containing an explicit declaration on the part of the author that he does not object to the user's access to his dissertation. Bozhidar Peychev left Bulgaria for Germany in the mid-1980s and, despite my efforts, I have not yet been able to contact him. As I was not able to procure such a letter, I was denied access to Peychev's dissertation.

²² Jacob Peyachevich was educated in Italy and later taught rhetoric, natural philosophy and practical theology; he was the author of *Veteris et novae geographiae compendiosa congeries seu compendiosa expositio geographica Europae, Asiae, Africae, Americaeque, Zagabriae* 1714.

²³ Franz Xavier Peyachevich taught philosophy, theology and canon law in Graz, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Vienna etc. He was the author of a number of books, among which: *Controversiae ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis de primatu et additione ad symbolum, dialogo inter Graecum et Latinum propositae*, Graecii 1752; *De sacramentis in genere et de baptismo et confirmatione in specie*, Graecii 1754; *Tractatus de SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento*, Graecii 1754; *Theologicorum dogmatum de fontibus theologicis et Deo uno ac trino libri septem*, Graecii 1757; *De Deo incarnato*, Graecii 1757; *Tractatus de gratia et merito*, Graecii 1757; *Historia Serviae, seu colloquia XIII de statu regni et religionis Serviae ab exordio ad finem, sive a seculo VII ad XVII*, Colocae 1797.

descendants of families originating from Chiprovtsi (in the northwestern part of contemporary Bulgaria) and younger contemporaries of Peykich. They were both Jesuits and lecturers in different colleges of their Order within the Hapsburg territory. The second chapter of Peychev's thesis presents a historico-philosophical study of Krastyo Peykich's writings. *Zarcalo istine* and *Mahometanus* are examined in separate sections.

The analysis of *Zarcalo istine* (with no particular attention paid to the extended Latin version of the same work, i.e. the *Speculum*) is expounded in a section entitled "Възгледите на Пейкич за същността на историческия процес" [Peykich's views of the nature of the historical process].²⁴ The historian maintains that in the *Zarcalo* Peykich "introduces his concept of the objective laws and the main content of the historical process."²⁵ According to this concept, ascribed by Peychev to Peykich, "historical events are generated and led by the intentions, actions, plans and desires of single persons."²⁶

In *Zarcalo istine*, the masses with their leanings, inclinations and initiatives are not brought forward as the chief mover of the historical process. The main factor in historical progress is fidelity to the Scripture and Tradition shown to greater or lesser extent by the religious prelates of the different peoples. Second in significance stand the plans and actions of political figures like emperors, kings, courtiers and so on.²⁷

²⁴ Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], *Католическият схоластицизъм в историята на българската философска мисъл – XVIII век. Автореферат* [The Catholic Scholasticism in the History of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought: Eighteenth Century. Synopsis], Sofia: BAN - Институт по философия, 1972, p. 21.

²⁵ "...запознава читателите си с концепцията си за закономерностите и главното съдържание на общоисторическия процес" – Ibid, p. 22.

²⁶ "историческите събития се пораждат и направляват от намерения, действия, замисли или желаниа на отделни личности" – Ibid.

²⁷ "Масите с техните тежнениа, настроения и инициативи не са изтъкнати в *Зарцало истине* като основен двигател на историческия процес. Основен фактор за историческия напредък, който безусловно съществува според автора на книгата, е верността към писанието и преданието, изразена по-добре или по-зле от религиозните първенци на различните народи. На второ място по значение идват замислите и

An attempt at a more careful analysis is made in the section dedicated to *Mahometanus in lege Christi [...] instructus*. The analysis of the *Mahometanus* is carried out in a section entitled “Конверсионна полемика с мохамеданската идеология” [Conversionist polemic with Mohammedan ideology]. Here the historian seeks to underline the novelty of Peykich’s polemical method and to demonstrate the theory that “this author indubitably belonged to the sphere of late scholasticism.”²⁸

As for Peykich’s polemical method,²⁹ Peychev calls it a “conversionist method” (конверсионен метод)³⁰ and an “innovative method for theologico-philosophical polemic, or conversion, as it was called at the time.”³¹ These formulas, together with the formula “conversionist polemic” from the title of the section, give the impression that Peychev was unable to distinguish between “conversion” (*conversio*) and “controversy” (*controversia*). However, in the absence of the complete text of his dissertation, it is not possible to reach a definitive confirmation or rejection of this suspicion.

Furthermore, Peychev makes the rather questionable claim that our author was a “Franciscan philosopher” on the grounds of presumed “antirationalist views” shared by Peykich: “And so, Peykich assumes the *faith* as a fundamental category in his philosophical conceptions and he combats in all

действията на ръководните политически фигури – императори, царе, царедворци и т.н.” – Ibi, pp. 22-23.

²⁸ “несъмнената принадлежност на този автор към сферата на късния схоластицизъм” – Ibi, quotation from p. 25. Cf. ПЕЙЧЕВ, *Философските и политическите възгледи*, p. 126; ID., “Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи,” pp. 229, 231.

²⁹ Peykich speaks about his polemical method on the introductory pages (pp. 2-3) of his *Mahometanus*. More about it, see further in the present study.

³⁰ ПЕЙЧЕВ, *Автореферат*, p. 24. Cf. also ID., *Философските и политическите възгледи*, p. 124.

³¹ “новаторски метод за философско-богословска полемика или така наречената тогава конверсия (обръщане)” – ПЕЙЧЕВ, “Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи,” p. 224.

possible ways theological *rationalism*.”³² Peychev’s conviction that faith played the role of a “fundamental category in the philosophical conceptions” of our author rests on statements concerning religious belief expressed in the first chapter of the *Mahometanus*.³³ However, his conviction does not appear to be well-founded. In exposing these theses, the author of the *Mahometanus* did not aim at declaring theoretical principles but at citing some axioms of faith, which did not even have the nature of individual views insofar as they had been sanctioned by the Council of Trent and were included in the *Roman Catechism* drawn up under the command of the fathers of the Council and eventually approved by them.

That said, we have to add that any account of Bozhidar Peychev’s historico-philosophical views must take into consideration the fact that he worked during the 1960s and 1970s, when technology was not as advanced as it is today and when the opportunities for Bulgarian scholars to travel abroad were very limited. Peychev had to overcome many difficulties in order to find the writings of Krastyo Peykich, and any attempt to establish his sources probably proved to be an even greater problem.³⁴ This is why Peychev often saw

³² “И така Пейкич приема *вярата* като основна категория на философските си построения и по всякакъв начин воюва срещу теологическия *рационализъм*.” – *Философските и политическите възгледи*, pp. 128-129.

³³ Cf. for example the following statement: “We must fully and in every way believe in what the divine faith reveals, because it is an obscure knowledge, based on God’s evidence, although we do not understand, nor can we understand, what was revealed to us through divine faith.” (“Fides divina, cum sit cognitio obscura fundata in testimonio Dei, quidquid nobis revelat, debemus absolute, et omnimode credere; quamvis non intelligamus, nec intelligere possimus ea, quae nobis fide divina mediante revelata sunt.”) – *Mahometanus*, p. 6.

³⁴ In 1971 (in *Съчиненията на Пейчевичи и Кръстю Пейкич*) Bozhidar Peychev informed readers that the *Mahometanus* was the only work by Peykich extant in Bulgaria. It seems that at that time he had not yet seen the “Illyrian” *Zarcalo*, for he cited it (cf. ibi, p. 103; “Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи,” p. 218, note 6) after Б. ЦОНЕВ [B. TZONEV], “Кирилски ръкописи и старопечатни книги в Загреб” [Cyrillic Manuscripts and Early Printed Books in Zagreb], *Сборник на Българската Академия на Науките* [Collection of BAN], 1 (1913), pp. 1-54. Also in that year, in Budapest, the

originality where an eye more familiar with the tradition Peykich belonged to would see a conventional method or opinion.

In sum, Peychev was able neither to place Peykich adequately within the tradition of the interconfessional polemic, nor to identify what was really specific to his thought and distinguished him from similar authors. Admittedly, he was able to include Krastyo Peykich and other Catholic authors as actors into the great narrative, the great history of the development of the philosophical thought in Bulgaria, nevertheless he could do it only emphasizing their role as enemies of the Ottoman power and as its ideological opponents. In actual fact, this justification became the only possible path for their inclusion in Bulgarian cultural history; however, besides constituting a justification, it became also the main and almost sole prism through which their literary work was considered and interpreted.³⁵

historian had the chance to consult the *Concordia* (the 1730 Tyrnava edition, which also includes the *Speculum*). As for the *Speculum*, Peychev considers it “actually a translation of the *Zarcalo*” (“всъщност превод на *Заркало*”) and mentions nothing about its essential differences (described later by TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 105-114) with the “Illyrian” version, which is understandable given that he was probably not acquainted with the latter. Peychev mentions nothing about the *Additamentum* to the *Speculum* either, although the edition consulted by him in Budapest must have contained it. By contrast, vol. 1 of *Антология на българската философска мисъл* [Antology of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought] contains facsimile reproductions of the title pages of *Zarcalo istine* and *Concordia*, as well as of single pages of these two books. It is specified that the originals belonged to Bozhidar Peychev, who apparently had meanwhile purchased copies of these two works. In the introduction to his dissertation (*Автореферат*, p. 5), he states that he was able to procure Peykich’s books abroad.

³⁵ The mechanism described can be seen in the following quotation borrowed from an authoritative “History of Bulgarian literature” by И. БОГДАНОВ [I. BOGDANOV], *Кратка история на българската литература в две части* [Brief History of Bulgarian Literature], vol. 1: *Стара българска литература и литература на Възраждането* [Old Bulgarian Literature and Literature from the Period of the National Revival], Sofia: Народна просвета, 1969, pp. 175-176: “Bulgarian Catholic writers’ activity is inseparable from their effort to take part in the fight against the oppressors. Some authors regarded their work as merely religious prapaganda” – here Bogdanov cites the following title: Н. МИЛЕВ [N. MILEV], *Католишката пропаганда в България през XVII век* [Catholic Propaganda in Bulgaria

The studies of Bozhidar Peychev, as he himself declared in the synopsis of his thesis, must be viewed within the context of the major research project on the history of philosophical culture in Bulgaria carried out in the late 60s and the early 70s of the last century.³⁶ Within this framework, Bozhidar Peychev made the first, and so far only, systematic, yet utterly inadequate, attempt to explore the work of the “Bulgarian Scholastic authors” and ultimately to incorporate them in the national cultural history. Despite this attempt at a “rehabilitation”, Krastyo Peykich, an exile (as we shall see) from the Bulgarian lands after the failure of the Chiprovtsi uprising, still remains today, three centuries later, an exile from Bulgarian culture.

during the Seventeenth Century], Sofia: Царска придворна печатница, 1914 – “but this view is not correct. It springs from religious prejudices. The patriotism of the Bulgarian seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Catholics is beyond doubt.” (“Дейността на българо-католишките книжовници е неотделима от усилието им да вземат участие в борбата им с поробителя. На тяхната дейност някои гледаха само като на верска пропаганда, но този възглед не е правилен. Той има за извор верски предразсъдъци. Патриотизмът на българо-католиците от XVII-XVIII век не подлежи на съмнение.”).

³⁶ The most important results of this project were the publication of the *История на философската мисъл в България* [History of Philosophical Thought in Bulgaria] in four volumes and the *Антология на българската философска мисъл* [Antology of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought] in three volumes.

CHAPTER 1

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF KRASTYO PEYKICH

“[...] io credo, non esser più preziose queste <anime> dell’Indie, per le quali tanti mezzi dalla s. Sede si procurano, che queste che periscono avanti li nostri occhi in Europa.”¹

In Peykich’s writings, as in a mirror, one can observe the reflection of Peykich’s times, and they were times of turbulence and dramatic change, especially in his field of activity. Furthermore, one can observe the spiritual and political circles in which he moved and the audience for whom he composed his treatises, together with the intellectual tradition that had been transmitted to him. And if such a statement is, to a greater or lesser degree, applicable to almost any author of philosophy or literature, it is particularly valid in the case of our author, who never tired of insisting that his works were the fruit of his practical experience and were in point of fact meant to be used in practice. This explains why the study of Peykich’s writings has to be preceded by a short historical and biographical introduction, without which any adequate analysis of his texts would be virtually impossible.

The battle on September 12th, 1683, which put an end to the Ottoman siege of Vienna and brought to the Polish King Jan Sobieski and his men fame as the rescuers of Europe, was a highly decisive historical event with long-lasting and far-reaching consequences. The war, which began with the siege of Vienna and ended with the Peace of Karlowitz (1699), resulted in considerable changes in the political borderlines and the balance of powers in central

¹ From a letter by Krastyo Peykich published in E. FERMENDŽIN, *Acta Bulgariae ecclesiastica ab a. 1565 usque ad a. 1799, Zagabriae*: JAZU, 1887, p. 327.

Europe, but it also had its effects on individuals. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that it was this war that spurred Peykich to abandon the obscurity and anonymity in which otherwise he would probably have remained and to make his appearance on the stage of history, where light would then be cast on him. It was this war that made him stand out from all the people who are merely born and die, leaving no trace of themselves on Earth. In fact, at least as far as I am able to determine, Peykich's name first appears in documents of 1689 when, along with thousands of his compatriots, he was already an exile from his homeland. At that time he was twenty-three years old and, despite speculations on the part of different historians, nothing certain is known about his life before that date. Thus it was the war that gave birth historically to Peykich by setting him on the road to exile that we are about to follow in this chapter and which would never bring him back to his place of departure, that is to say, his native Chiprovtsi.

In the following narrative, the siege of Vienna will symbolize the intersection of great history with the minor history of our protagonist. It will act as a point of reference for the description of the military, political and ideological conflicts which formed the context of Peykich's missionary and literary activity. Accordingly, the present chapter will be structured as follows. First, the political and confessional situation in the Balkans and in central Europe before the War of the Holy League (1683-1699) will be presented. Second, an attempt will be made to outline the consequences of the above-mentioned conflict and the changes introduced by it to vast territories in central Europe. Only at that point, having set the historical scene, shall we give our author his cue to enter the stage in order to move on to tell the story of his life.

1. PEYKICH'S TIMES

In 1683, when the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa started his march northwards at the head of an immense army with the secret plan to attack Vienna, the Ottoman Empire exercised unrivalled hegemony in central and south-eastern

Europe.² A few years earlier it had substantially expanded its territory north-eastwards as a result of the successful Polish-Ottoman War (1672-1676). The whole region of the Balkans was under Ottoman dominion with the sole exception of the vassal republic of Ragusa (Dubrovnik) and the Adriatic coast of Dalmatia. Southern Hungary, with the old capital of Buda, had been part of the Empire since 1526, and the so-called Danubian principalities of Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia were its vassals.

In their vast Empire, the Ottomans had been ruling the subordinated non-Muslim populations according to the Islamic law for centuries.³ The *millet*-system, already established by earlier Muslim rulers,⁴ treated non-Muslim populations as *millets*, or, nations, each of which represented before the central government by its respective religious head called *milletbaşı*.⁵ There were

² See the masterly history of the J. STOYE, *L'assedio di Vienna*, tr. E. Ivetic, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2009. By the same author, see also *Marsigli's Europe, 1680-1730: The Life and Times of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, Soldier and Virtuoso*, New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1994.

³ A useful introduction to the topic of Islamic law and the legislation concerning Christians, in particular, is the chapter by D.M. FREIDENREICH, *Christians in Early and Classical Sunnī Law*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 1, D. THOMAS - B. ROGGEMA (eds.), Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009, pp. 99-114, which includes selected bibliography on the theme; M. AYOUB, "Religious Freedom and the Law of Apostasy in Islam," *Islamochristiana*, 20 (1994), pp. 75-91. For Christians living under Muslim overlords, see also S. GRIFFITH, *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

⁴ Islamic law normally treats Christians as *dhimmīs* or protected people who accept Muslim authority. The *dhimmīs* status was connected with certain rights and obligations. Besides being protected by Muslims, *dhimmīs* were allowed to exercise their religion in private. In turn, Christians and other non-Muslim subjects alike had to pay to their landlords an annual poll-tax, called *jizya*. They also had to respect some restrictions: they were not allowed to construct or repair their churches; if against Muslims, their testimonies were not accepted by the juridical authorities, etc. It was not possible for converts from Islam to Christianity to be granted the *dhimmīs* status. – I have summarized here some of the norms described by FREIDENREICH, *Christians in Early and Classical Sunnī Law*, pp. 101-108.

⁵ Cf. S. RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*,

basically three nations in the Ottoman Empire: the *Rum*, which embraced all the different Orthodox peoples and was put under the authority of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, the Armenian one and the Hebrew one.⁶ Officially, the Patriarch of Constantinople had no authority over the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria, but since he had a privileged position in the capital of the Empire “he tended to act as their agent before the Sultan and could largely control them.”⁷

The autonomous Patriarchates of Bulgaria and Serbia had been suppressed when the two kingdoms were annexed by the Turks in 1393 and 1459 respectively. But while the abolition of the Bulgarian Patriarchate proved to be definitive, and the Bulgarians for the next five centuries remained subject to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which was inevitably Greek, the Serbian Orthodox Church regained its independence and succeeded in retaining it for a considerable period of time. The Patriarchate of Peć (Ipek) in Kosovo was restored in 1557 as a result of the political ability and the efforts of Sokollu Mehmed, at the time Grand Vizier of the Empire, who was of Serbian origin. In 1766, it was definitively abolished by the Ottoman government but for approximately two centuries before that date the Patriarch of Peć had played the role of Serbian *milletbaşı* endowed with the same authority over his people as the one that the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised over the Greek *millet*.⁸ Thus Greeks and Serbians had in the face of their Patriarch their own representative and protector of their interests, as well as a reference point for their linguistic and cultural traditions, while Bulgarians were denied such a

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968, p. 167.

⁶ M. KEPPLER, *I greci e i Balcani tra Ottomani, Asburgo e ortodossia*, in R. SIMONATO (ed.), *Marco d'Aviano e il suo tempo. Un cappuccino del Seicento, gli Ottomani e l'Impero. Atti del convegno storico internazionale, Pordenone 12-13 novembre 1993*, Pordenone: Concordia sette, 1993, pp. 96-124, in part. p. 99.

⁷ Cf. RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*, p. 381.

⁸ Cf. S. GRACIOTTI, *Serbia e Bulgaria: due storie vicine e lontane*, in L. VACCARO (ed.), *Storia religiosa di Serbia e Bulgaria*, Milano: Centro Ambrosiano, 2008, pp. 13-28, in part. p. 18.

privilege: the consequences of this difference were soon to become clearly visible on the lower levels of Bulgarian spiritual and cultural life.⁹ During this period, a considerable number of Bulgarians were under the jurisdiction of the archiepiscopal seat of Ohrid (in present-day Republic of Macedonia), which continued to exist independently until 1767. However, this fact did not bring much change or improvement to their condition.¹⁰

Along with Bulgarians and other Orthodox but linguistically and ethnically non-Greek peoples, there were other communities who had reasons to be discontented with the state of affairs, i.e. with their legal status within the Empire. This was the case of the members of other Christian denominations and sects who had happened to become Ottoman subjects. In theory, all Christians in the Empire, no matter whether they were Greek Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant, were part of the *millet*-system and should have been allowed to live according to their traditions provided they paid a poll tax for being non-Muslims. In reality, Catholics had no part in the *millet*-system in the Ottoman Empire. It is true that since 1535 France had enjoyed the right of protectorate over Catholics in the Empire, and after 1583 Jesuits were to be found in Constantinople.¹¹ However, only the interests of Catholics who were

⁹ This difference, to give just one example, has been noted and emphasized by S. GRACIOTTI, “Chiese ortodosse e Chiesa Cattolica nel Balcano slavo sottomesso all’Islam ottomano,” *Europa orientalis*, 26 (2007), pp. 47-71, in part. p. 52.

¹⁰ Concerning the history of the archiepiscopal seat of Ohrid, the best study is still И. СНЕГАРОВ [I. SNEGAROV], *История на Охридската архиепископия* [History of Ohrid Archbishopric], <vol. 1:> *От основаването ѝ до завладяването на Балканския полуостров от турците* [From Its Foundation to the Turkish Conquest of the Balkans], Sofia: Гутенберг, 1924; vol. 2: *От падането ѝ под турците до нейното унищожение (1394-1767)* [From Its Fall under the Turks until Its Abolition (1394-1767)], Sofia: Македонски научен институт - Издателство на Богословски факултет, 1932. Although this book is laden with Bulgarian nationalistic ideas, there is no doubt as to its scholarly value.

¹¹ Cf. M. DMITRIEV, *Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy*, in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, R. PO-CHIA HSIA (ed.), vol. 6: *Reform and Expansion 1500-1660*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 321-342, in part. pp. 321-322.

foreign subjects were protected by the French ambassador in Constantinople. On the contrary, local Catholic communities composed of subjects of the Sultan were in want both of spiritual care and of political protection.

It was only after the Council of Trent that the Catholic Church took systematic steps to provide for the spiritual needs of Catholics living in the Ottoman Empire by “dispatching apostolic, or papal, visitors, then by sending missionaries, and, finally, by appointing missionary bishops.”¹²

The post-Tridentine revival of missionary activity is the context in which Bulgarian scholarship unanimously places the rise of Catholicism in Bulgarian territory during the seventeenth century.¹³ As early as 1565, an apostolic visitor reported on the Catholic communities of Ragusean merchants living in various Bulgarian towns, such as that in Sofia, and on local Catholic populations concentrated in and around the town of Chiprovtsi.¹⁴ In the following decades, several such visits were made, until in 1601 Bulgarian

¹² I.G. TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy: Protestants and Catholics in South-Eastern Europe*, in *The Cambridge History*, vol. 6, pp. 536-557, quotation from p. 545.

¹³ Вж. Н. МИЛЕВ, *Католишката пропаганда*, p. 10; И. ДУЙЧЕВ [I. DUICHEV], *Софийската католичка архиепископия през XVII век. Изучаване и документи* [The Catholic Archbishopric of Sofia in the Seventeenth Century], Български Археологически Институт, Sofia 1939, p. 1; I.D. SPISSAREVSKA, *L'intelligenza bulgara nel XVII secolo e l'Italia*, in *Atti dell'VIII congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 3-6 novembre 1981), Spoleto: Centro di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1983, pp. 303-317, in part. p. 307.

¹⁴ There are two hypotheses concerning the origin of the Bulgarian Catholics from the region of Chiprovtsi. According to the first hypothesis, which is the commonly accepted one, the Catholic population of Chiprovtsi were successors of Saxon settlers who had migrated there during the High Middle Ages in order to work in the mining and the metalwork industries flourishing in that zone. The second possible explanation argues that the native population of north-western Bulgaria accepted Catholicism under Hungarian political and cultural influence at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century. See more about the second hypothesis in ДУЙЧЕВ, *Софийската католичка архиепископия*, p. 57; Б. ДИМИТРОВ [B. DIMITROV], *Петър Богдан Бакиев: български политик и историк от XVII век* [Petar Bogdan Bakshev: A Bulgarian Politician and Historian of the Seventeenth Century], Sofia: s.e., 2001², pp. 21-23.

Catholics were assigned their own bishop. The first bishop of Sofia was the Bosnian Observant Franciscan Peter Solinatus, who had arrived there in 1595 at the head of a small mission of his fellow brothers according to the wish of Pope Clement VIII. In 1642, the Episcopal seat was raised to the dignity of archbishopric.

To be granted an archiepiscopal seat was not the only achievement of the Bulgarian Catholic mission. As stated above, those who founded this mission in 1595 were Bosnian Observant Franciscan friars. In a short time, they saw the fruits of their labour. The Bulgarian Franciscans grew so rapidly in number and importance that they became independent of the Bosnian Franciscan Province. In 1624, Bulgaria became first a Custody and then, in 1676, a Province of the Order. Together with the Bosnian Observant Franciscans, the Bulgarians became important missionaries themselves, and, as has recently been shown by István G. Tóth, operated in Turkish Hungary and in the vassal states of Wallachia and Transylvania.¹⁵

Within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, missionaries were not allowed to proselytize Catholicism either to Muslims or to the Orthodox. Hence, the Bulgarian Franciscans devoted their zeal to the conversion of Paulician heretics, members of a dualist Middle Eastern sect, who during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries lived in two main areas, one south of the chain of the Balkan mountain near Plovdiv (*Philipopolis*) and the other in the north by the river of Osam. Thanks to the conversion of the Paulicians, the number of Catholics in Bulgaria grew considerably. Yet, the rise of Bulgarian Catholicism came to an abrupt end as a consequence of the Chiprovtsy uprising of 1688.¹⁶

¹⁵ Cf. TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*, p. 542. By the same author, see also И.Д. ТОТ [I.G. TÓTH], *Българско участие в католически мисии из Унгария и Трансилвания през XVII-XVIII в. Документи от Архива на Светата конгрегация за разпространение на вярата, Ватикана 1637-1716 г.* [Bulgarian Participation in Catholic Missions in Hungary and Transylvania in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries], Sofia: Академично изд. “Проф. Марин Дирнов”, 2008.

¹⁶ In connection with the history of the archdiocese of Sofia and the diocese of Nicopol

Bosnian Franciscans, who had founded the Catholic mission in Bulgarian lands, were the protagonists of a remarkable missionary expansion in the Balkan and in the central-European territories of the Ottoman Empire. By the middle of the seventeenth century, Bosnian Franciscans were operating in Bulgaria, as well as in Moldavia, Transylvania, and Hungary.¹⁷ The extension of their missions is explained by the fact that there were more favourable conditions for the Catholic Church, and above all for the Franciscan Order, in Bosnia than in the rest of the European territories of the Empire.¹⁸ Their advantageous state is eloquently described by István G. Tóth as follows. “Similar to Bosnian merchants, for whom the Turkish advance meant the creation of a uniform commercial territory without frontiers stretching from Buda to Istanbul, the Bosnian Franciscans – as members of the only Catholic institution in the Balkans that was recognized by the Turks – were also able to extend their influence under Turkish rule.”¹⁹

The Bosnian Observant Franciscans’ vigorous progress would begin to decline only after the treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718), when the territory administered by the *Bosna Argentina* Province of the Franciscan order was separated and divided among three states: the Ottoman and Hapsburg Empires and the Republic of Venice.²⁰ Where there had

after 1688, see P. TOCĂNEL, *Assestamento delle Missioni in Bulgaria, Valachia, Transilvania e Moldavia*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 722-741, in part. pp. 722-727; see also the rich collection of documents from the Historical Archive of *de Propaganda Fide* Congregation published by JERKOV, “Le relazioni delle visite apostoliche.”

¹⁷ Cf. TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*, p. 556.

¹⁸ Cf. DMITRIEV, *Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy*, p. 325; TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*, pp. 543-544.

¹⁹ TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*. I quote from p. 550.

²⁰ More about the destiny of the Franciscans who remained under Ottoman power is reported in B. PANDŽIĆ, *L’opera della S. Congregazione per le popolazioni della penisola Balcanica Centrale*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 706-722. With regard to the destiny of their province *Bosna Argentina*, see *ibid.*, p. 709. A collection of studies regarding the division of the central European territories after the treaties of 1699 and 1718 are offered in the volume E. IVETIC - D. ROKSANDIĆ (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance on the Triplex Confinium:*

previously been an uninterrupted territory, there was now a *Triplex confinium*. Moreover, the Catholic bishops, supported and stimulated by secular authorities, started to take up residence and administrate their dioceses in the newly liberated territories. Albeit reluctantly, the Bosnian friars were forced to retreat and to abandon one after another the parishes in their possession.²¹ However, all this would occur later: during the 17th century they were still at the height of their prosperity. Their enterprise in Ottoman Hungary, for instance, was flourishing.

Ottoman Hungary covered the southern part and approximately one third of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom (the other two thirds being Hapsburg Hungary and Transylvania), and had been conquered by the Turks in the first half of the sixteenth century. Unlike the other European provinces of the Empire, Ottoman Hungary was not, strictly speaking, considered missionary territory, at least not by its Catholic bishops, who continued to be chosen by the Hapsburg Emperor and were living ‘in exile’ in Hapsburg territory.²² Those bishops had no particularly fervent desire to reside in their dioceses on the other side of the border, and, in any case, they would not have been welcomed by the local Ottoman governors if they had tried to do so. In this situation of a lack of ecclesiastical authority, Bosnian Franciscans gradually expanded their mission, often depriving local secular priests of their parishes. István G. Tóth outlines two main reasons for their success. On the one hand, the Ottoman

Approaching the “Other” on the Borderlands of Eastern Adriatic and beyond 1500-1800, Padova: CLEUP, 2007.

²¹ Concerning the struggle for supremacy between the Catholic bishops and the Franciscans in the newly-acquired territories, see D. KOKŠA, *Tensioni in Croazia e Dalmazia*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 688-705, in part. pp. 689-690. For recent studies on the conflicts between Catholics and Orthodox in the western Balkans, one might consult E. IVETIC - G. GULLINNO (eds.), *Geografie confessionali: cattolici e ortodossi nel crepuscolo della Repubblica di Venezia (1718-1797)*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2009.

²² For a discussion on this question, see I.G. TÓTH, *Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania*, in R. PO-CHIA HSIA (ed.), *A Companion to the Reformation World*, Malden et al.: Blackwell, 2004, pp. 205-220, in part. p. 219.

government preferred them to bishops directly chosen by the Hapsburg Emperor and to missionaries sent by the Pope. On the other, the Bosnian Franciscans were able to maintain good relations with the local Ottoman governors and to gain their support when needed.²³

Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia, the so-called Danubian principalities, were Christian vassal states of the sultan. In the second half of the seventeenth century, both the very few Catholics in Wallachia and the more important Catholic communities in Moldavia were placed under the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian mission. The archbishop of Sofia administered Wallachia as apostolic vicar, and the archbishop of Marcianopolis (a historical location in the northeast of Bulgaria) spread his authority over Moldavia.²⁴

Much more complex was the situation in the third of the Danubian principalities, Transylvania. In the seventeenth century, it was a world of its own being ethnically, linguistically and confessionally varied and divided. There were Lutheran Saxons, both Calvinist (the majority) and Catholic (the minority) Hungarians, Orthodox Romanians, as well as Antitrinitarians. Transylvanian laws recognized four denominations to be politically relevant. These were Calvinism, Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Antitrinitarianism, of which Calvinism was the most influential, a *de facto* state religion.²⁵ As a consequence of the fact that the Greek Orthodox Church was not included in this list, the ethnic Romanians or Wallachs, who accounted for over a third of the population,²⁶ were not recognized as one of the *nationes* and thus were, as Paul Shore well expressed it, “politically silenced.”²⁷

²³ Cf. ТОТ, *Българско участие*, pp. 26-27.

²⁴ ΤÓΤΗ, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*, p. 556.

²⁵ Cf. *ibi*, p. 545.

²⁶ This datum was published by Á.R. VÁRKONYI, *The Last decades of the Independent Principality (1660-1711)*, in B. KÖPECZI *et al.* (eds.), *History of Transylvania*, 3 vols., Boulder - Highland Lakes: Hungarian Research Institute of Canada - Social Science Monographs - Atlantic Research and Publications, 2001-2002, vol. 2: *From 1606 to 1830*, pp. 233-512, in part. p. 385.

²⁷ P. SHORE, *Jesuits and the Politics of Religious Pluralism in Eighteenth-Century*

In very general terms, this was the political and confessional situation in the European lands and the vassal principalities of the Ottoman Empire on the eve of the unsuccessful Ottoman siege of Viena in 1683. In the months following the Viennese crisis, Pope Innocent XI spared no efforts and used all his political influence to establish a new Holy League, which became a fact in 1684 and was joined by Russia in 1686.

The Holy League won the war and forced the Turks to sign the Peace of Karlowitz (1699). Under the terms of this treaty, the Ottomans ceded most of Hungary, Transylvania and Slavonia to the Hapsburg Empire but retained Belgrade, which in 1688 had been conquered by the Hapsburgs only to fall back into the hands of the Turks after a few months. Venice obtained the Morea (the Peloponnesus peninsula) and new dominions in Dalmatia, while Poland recovered Podolia which had been in Ottoman possession since 1672.

From Vienna in 1683 to Buda in 1686, victories succeeded one after another tracing the course that led the strategic interests of the Hapsburgs towards the east. It was becoming increasingly clear that it was eastwards that Emperor Leopold I was looking. In those years, he did not oppose Louis XIV's annexation of Strasbourg and Luxembourg and concentrated almost all his political, diplomatic and military potential on the creation of what John Stoye calls "a new Hungarian Empire."²⁸

In order to achieve stability and political consolidation in the newly-conquered Hungary, Transylvania and Slavonia, a process of a systematic reinstatement of Catholicism was initiated, along with other centralization policies. One aspect of the process of re-Catholization can be seen in the continual attempt on the part of the Catholic clergy, the Jesuits in particular, to impose on the Orthodox Church in Transylvania a union with Rome. The union of the Churches was indeed accepted by the Greek Orthodox episcopacy on the occasion of the Synod held in Alba Iulia in 1697, and a resulting new

Transylvania: Culture, Politics and Religion, 1693-1773, Aldershot *et al.*: Ashgate - Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2007, p. 3.

²⁸ STOYE, *L'assedio di Vienna*, p. 266.

Transylvanian Greek Catholic Church appeared. The expectation of the status of “accepted nation” to be granted to the Romanian Orthodox population was probably one of the reasons why the Orthodox bishops of Transylvania took this step.²⁹ They may well have had in mind the precedent of the Slavonian Orthodox Vlachs, who in 1630 accepted the supremacy of Rome and were granted a special status (the so called *Statuta Valachorum*) in return. If so, these hopes were to be bitterly dashed: in spite of the fact that many parishes joined the Transylvanian Greek Catholic Church, Romanians in Transylvania had to wait a long time before receiving any political recognition from the Viennese government.³⁰

Consolidation through re-Catholization seemed to be the order of the day in Hungary, too. That country was devastated by a civil war which exploded in 1703 under the leadership of the Transylvanian Prince Ferenc Rákóczi, and ended only in 1711. As if the war were not enough, in southern Hungary another reason for destabilization appeared. The mass influx of Orthodox Slavic refugees from the Ottoman territory caused a significant change in the ethnic structure and the confessional proportions in the area. This process had been in progress for a long time, but it reached its climax in the period between 1690, when the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević and some 40 thousand families retreated with the Hapsburg armies into Croatia and southern Hungary, and 1739, when according to the conditions of the Treaty of Belgrade the Hapsburgs had to cede Belgrade together with their Kingdom of Serbia to the Ottomans. In 1690, on the occasion of the Serbian migration, Emperor Leopold I issued an open letter addressed to all Christian nations in the Balkans inviting them to find shelter and a new home in his state. Of

²⁹ See N. ŠTEFANEC, *Tolerance and Intolerance in the Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom at the Turn of the 17th Century. Contest for Gomirje*, in IVETIC - ROKSANDIĆ (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance*, pp. 125-151.

³⁰ Cf. SHORE, *Jesuits and the Politics*, p. 55. Paul Shore brings to our notice that the complete text of the Act of the Union appears in W. DE VRIES, “L’Unione dei Rumeni (1697-1701),” *Transylvanian review*, 6/1 (1997), p. 18.

course, such “guests” would be settled in the border areas of the Empire and destined to revive the lands depopulated by the wars. Again in 1690, and thanks to Patriarch Arsenije III’s political ability, the Serbs in the Hapsburg Empire were given privileges and recognized as a separate political entity. In addition to this, Arsenije III obtained a diploma of protection for the Serbs from possible (and real) attempts of the Catholic clergy to convert them. He also struggled to be granted jurisdiction over all Serbians within the Hapsburg borders but did not succeed in this since both the Serbian Catholic bishops and the Latin bishop of Zagreb resisted such an eventuality.³¹ Although Arsenije III left Serbia and became Orthodox bishop of Szentendre in Hungary, he never ceased to be Patriarch of Serbia, nor did the Patriarchate of Peć cease to exist. After Arsenije’s death in 1706, a new Patriarch of Peć was chosen with the approval of the Sultan. In 1708, the new Patriarch officially acknowledged the legitimacy of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Austria with the Episcopal seat of Szentendre as its centre. In 1737, Empress Maria Theresa allowed her Serbian subjects to settle in the town of Karlowitz and to establish the metropolitan seat of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Austria there.³²

Besides the Ottoman and the Hapsburg Empires, there was another power with strategic interests in central and south-eastern Europe in the last decades of the seventeenth century and the first decades of the eighteenth. This was the Republic of Venice. The so-called “new acquisition,” or the lands in Dalmatia and Morea assigned to the *Serenissima* by the treaty of Karlowitz, were traditionally inhabited by Orthodox communities.³³ The relations between Venice and its new Greek and Serbian subjects were problematic throughout

³¹ Cf. C.A. FRAZEE, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire (1453-1923)*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1983, p. 167.

³² Cf. G. FEDALTO, *I rapporti di serbi e bulgari con Costantinopoli e con la sede di Roma durante il periodo turco (sec. XV-XIX)*, in VACCARO (ed.), *Storia religiosa di Serbia e Bulgaria*, pp. 249-268, in part. 256-257.

³³ Cf. E. IVETIC, *Cattolici e ortodossi nell’Adriatico orientale veneto, 1699-1797*, in GULLINO - IVETIC (eds.), *Geografie confessionali*, pp. 49-119, in part. p. 50.

the eighteenth century. This was partly due to the sudden reforms introduced into those territories, and partly to the lack of any dialogue between the Catholic clergy, on the one hand, and the Orthodox clergy and people, on the other. Unlike the Hapsburgs, the Venetians were far more uncompromising in carrying out their plans for confessional uniformity in the Dalmatian hinterland and Morea.³⁴ Yet it has to be admitted that the Catholic bishops of Dalmatia themselves were most fervent propagators of their faith and that the religious zeal and hostility towards the Orthodox shown by persons such as Vincenzo Zmajević (1670-1745), archbishop of Zara, and his successor Mate Karaman (1700-1771) went far beyond the capacities of any member of the Venetian administration.³⁵

As can be observed both in the case of Venice and of the Hapsburg Monarchy, the early modern states cooperated with the Catholic Church in a kind of symbiosis which allowed each of the partners to achieve its specific aims. In her exemplary analysis of what she calls early modern *symbolic*

³⁴ Ibi, p. 95.

³⁵ About Venetian Dalmatia and the interconfessional conflict there, see the still authoritative M. BOGOVIĆ, *Katolička crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji za vrijeme mletačke vladavine*, now in a new edition, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost - Školska knjiga, 1993; one might also consult D. KOKŠA, *Tensioni in Croazia e Dalmazia*. For an historical overview of this conflict and a bibliography on the subject, see IVETIĆ, *Cattolici e ortodossi*. As regards Zmajević and Karaman in particular, see in BOGOVIĆ, *Katolička crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji*, pp. 111-117. On Karaman's linguistic experiments, there is the study by S. GRACIOTTI, "Il problema della lingua letteraria croata e la polemica tra Karaman e Rosa," *Ricerche slavistiche*, 13 (1965), pp. 120-162; E. SGAMBATI, *Il ruolo dei Ruteni nelle edizioni seicentesche dei libri liturgici glagolitico-croati*, in V. BRANCA - S. GRACIOTTI (eds.), *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del sud*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1983, pp. 431-451; B. LOMAGISTRO, *Lingua e ortodossia nel pensiero di Matteo Karaman*, in F. ESVAN (ed.), *Contributi italiani al XII congresso internazionale degli slavisti* (Cracovia 26 agosto - 3 settembre), Napoli 1998: Associazione Italiana degli Slavisti, pp. 419-464. V. KRALJEVIĆ, *Gli ortodossi negli scritti di Vincenzo Zmajević (1670-1745)*, diss. Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Roma 1996, is a doctoral thesis and the only monographic study on Zmajević so far. Zmajević was an implacable and most fervent opponent of the Dalmatian Orthodox clergy and the author of various polemical treatises and epistles where he exposed his extreme views.

politics, Zrinka Blažević describes the partnership and rivalry between the Catholic Church and the early modern (absolutist) state as follows:

Notwithstanding the occasional conflicts between the Catholic Church and the early modern state, they were naturally oriented towards one another with the aim to realizing their own universalistic and hegemonist claims. In Southeast Europe these tendencies manifested themselves in the form of two key political issues: the anti-Ottoman war and confessional unification. The profit on both sides was indisputable: by expelling the Ottomans, the Catholic Church would spread its spiritual, and the Catholic monarchy its political, jurisdiction over the newly liberated territories, while the ecclesiastic unity, imagined as the return of the schismatics to the bosom of the Church and conversion of the Muslim infidels, would serve as an additional cohesive and integrative factor, as well as a guarantee of political stability.³⁶

To spread its spiritual jurisdiction over new or recently recovered territories, to pursue the unity with both Protestant heretics and Orthodox schismatics, and to proselytize among Muslims and other infidels were three of the main vows which the Catholic Church pledged at the beginning of the Counter-Reformation. Although as result of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) the Roman Church had gained dogmatic consolidation and accepted a plan for disciplinary reforms, it was only after the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) that the proselytizing aspect of the program of the Counter-Reformation could finally be given priority.

The proselytizing aspect within the program for reform of the Catholic Church, as it was designed by the Council of Trent, is closely related to the topic of the present study and it forms the direct context of the story of Peykich's life. The ambition of the Papacy to carry out a systematic conversion of schismatics and infidels, having Christianization of the "infidels" throughout the world as its final aim, was a function of the reformed

³⁶ Z. BLAŽEVIĆ, *Indetermi-Nation: Narrative Identity and Symbolic Politics in Early Modern Illyrism*, in B. TRENCSENYI - M. ZÁSZKALICZKY (eds.), *Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 202-223, quotation from pp. 204-205.

pastoral zeal of Rome. A decisive moment in this history is the foundation in 1622 of the *Propaganda fide* Congregation. While before its foundation Catholic missions, particularly those overseas, had been organized by the religious orders and promoted by the great naval powers Spain and Portugal,³⁷ now, thanks to Pope Gregory XV's creation, missionary work was placed under the direct control of the Papacy. It became an exclusive competence of the new congregation "to help souls that are not on the true path of salvation as a result of schism, heresy, or, finally, infidelity."³⁸ In connection with the broad authority awarded to the *Propaganda*, Josef Metzler, the historian of the Congregation *par excellence*, says as follows: "The tasks assigned to the new Congregation were, in a word, overpowering. They consisted in doing nothing less than everything that could help in spreading the (Catholic) faith."³⁹ In theory, its mission was to evangelize the whole world, but in reality, in the course of the seventeenth century, the *Propaganda* gradually set limitations to its universal mission and concentrated on south-eastern Europe and the Middle East, where the missionaries had to face Orthodox and other Christian Churches and sects, along with Islam.⁴⁰

³⁷ Cf. E. PECORAIO, *Preambolo*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. VII-XI.

³⁸ Circular letter to all the Bishops of February 18, 1623. APF, Lettere, 2 (1622-1623), ff. 57r-58r. I quote it after J. METZLER, *Foundation of the Congregation "de Propaganda Fide" by Gregory XV*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 79-111, in part. p. 95. According to Metzler, this triple concept of mission gradually proved to be too heavy a burden for the Congregation. See Id., *Foundation of the Congregation*, p. 96. In connection with the foundation of the new Congregation and specifically the aims that it had to achieve, see also G. PIZZORUSSO, *Agli antipodi di Babele. Propaganda Fide tra immagine cosmopolita e orizzonti romani (XVII-XIX secolo)*, in L. FIORANI - A. PROSPERI (eds.), *Roma la città del papa. Vita civile e religiosa dal giubileo di Bonifacio VIII al giubileo di papa Wojtyła*, Torino: Einaudi, 2000, pp. 477-518.

³⁹ METZLER, *Foundation of the Congregation*, quotation from p. 95.

⁴⁰ Cf. G. PIZZORUSSO, "I satelliti di Propaganda fide: Il Collegio Urbano e la Tipografia Poliglotta. Note di ricerca su due istituzioni culturali romane nel XVII secolo," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée*, 116 (2004), pp. 471-498, in part. pp. 495-496.

From the second half of the sixteenth century, various national colleges (English, Irish, Swiss, Greek, etc.) appeared both in Rome and farther afield after the example of the German College established in 1552 by Pope Julius III and entrusted to the Jesuits. The scope of these national or Pontifical colleges, as they are generally called since many of them were subsidized directly by the Papacy, was to train candidates for the priesthood from those countries where Catholicism was endangered and prepare them for becoming promoters of the Tridentine theology and fearless soldiers of the Church. Graduates were expected to form, after the image coined by Antonio Possevino, “a wreath of young princes” (“corona di giovani Principi”) which was to serve as a “defensive wall against the enemies of Christianity” (“antimurale contro i nemici della Christianità”).⁴¹ The foundation of the *Propaganda Fide* Congregation provided an impetus to the progress of the Pontifical Colleges too. By 1622, i.e. the very same year as the foundation of the new Congregation, all Pontifical Colleges on both sides of the Alps passed under its jurisdiction.⁴² By 1627, a true and proper college of the *Propaganda* was set up in Rome by Pope Urban VIII, the *Collegio Urbano* named after its founder, where youths from all over the world were educated religiously and taught the Catholic doctrine as it was formulated in the decrees of Trent and by the authoritative theologians of the Catholic reformation, such as Roberto Bellarmino.

⁴¹ ANTONIO POSSEVINO, *Il soldato Cristiano con nuove aggiunte et la forma di un vero Principe e Principessa*, Venezia 1604. I quote after A. BIONDI, *La Bibliotheca selecta di Antonio Possevino. Un progetto di egemonia culturale*, in G.P. BRIZZI (ed.), *La «Ratio Studiorum»: Modelli culturali e pratiche educative dei Gesuiti in Italia tra Cinque e Seicento*, Roma: Bulzoni, 1981, pp. 43-75, quotation from p. 44.

⁴² R.M. WILTGEN, *Propaganda is Placed in Charge of the Pontifical Colleges*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 483-505. Also in this regard, see P. BROGGIO, “L’Urbs e il mondo. Note sulla presenza degli stranieri nel Collegio Romano e sugli orizzonti geografici della «formazione romana» tra XVI e XVII secolo,” *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, 56 (2002), pp. 81-120.

It was just one step from the foundation of national colleges to the acceptance of the idea of using national languages for the dissemination of faith, especially with the Protestant advance in Europe. Neither did it take long for the Cardinals of the Congregation to realize the importance of another instrument for the propagation of faith and for the recovery of the lost territories, that is the printed book, which was the only “media” known in that epoch. Soon Catholic reformers came to share the opinion that both the missionaries and their books should speak the language of the common people to whom they wanted to preach. Thus in 1626 a printing office was set up at the *Propaganda Fide* Congregation. It was rightly called the ‘Polyglot Printing Press’ since only one year later it had 15 kinds of type at its disposal.⁴³ By the middle of the 1640s the Polyglot Printing Press had already published books in 23 languages.⁴⁴

The preparation of the editions printed or sponsored by the *Propaganda* required the assistance of a polyglot team of scholars and in this way it contributed to a notable development in linguistics (the so-called missionary linguistics)⁴⁵ in the circles of experts which arose around the printing office

⁴³ These data are reported in W. HENKEL, *The Polyglot Printing-office of the Congregation: The Press apostolate as an Important Means for Communicating the Faith*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 335-350, on p. 335. A discussion on the parallel foundation and development, and the interrelation between the two filial structures of the *Propaganda* (*Collegio Urbano* and the Printing Office) is offered by G. PIZZORUSSO, “I satelliti di Propaganda fide.”

⁴⁴ Cf. HENKEL, *The Polyglot Printing-office*, p. 347.

⁴⁵ A useful introduction to the topic is: J. DE CLERCQ - P. SWIGGERS - L. VAN TONGERLOO, *The Linguistic Contribution of the Congregation De Propaganda Fide*, in M. TAVONI (ed.), *Italy and Europe in Renaissance Linguistics: Comparison and Relations*. Proceedings of the International Conference, Ferrara 20-24 March 1991, Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1991, vol. 2: *Italy and Non-Romance Europe. The Oriental Languages*, pp. 439-458. The authors of this article, on p. 440, retain it a significant fact that the only comprehensive study on missionary linguistics is still one from the 19th century (J. DAHLMANN S.J., *Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der ältern katolischen Missionsthätigkeit (1500-1800)*, Freiburg im Breisgau et al.: Herder, 1891). Furthermore, Dahlmann’s contribution covers the missionary activity in India, China,

and to an increasing interest in old and new languages. There are over 40 titles on the list of linguistically relevant publications realized at the expense of the *Propaganda* between 1627 and 1677, and the list includes, among others, dictionaries and grammars of Armenian, Syrian, Georgian, Chaldean (Ethiopian or Abyssinian), Japanese, Coptian, Turkish, Slavic and Persian.⁴⁶

Among other interests in the linguistic field, a question which retained its importance for centuries was the one of the so-called “Illyrian” language. At that time, “Illyrian” was a rather vague term used to denote any South Slavic language, be it written in Latin, Cyrillic or Glagolitic letters, whether old or recent, literary or not, ideal or real.⁴⁷ Catholic missionaries of Southern Slavic origin were encouraged by the Propaganda to seek a language that would be comprehensible to all Slavic populations in the Balkans: a common language had either to be chosen from the existing South Slavic languages and idioms or to be invented. Its elaboration would facilitate the implementation of a further task, that is, to win the Balkan Orthodox Slavic population over to the Catholic Church.⁴⁸

In the context of the seventeenth-century political situation, the concept of an “Illyrian language” also had a strongly ideological dimension. In that period, the hope that a united Christian front could be formed against the Ottoman Empire and that the Turks might be defeated once and for all was still alive. This hope assumed different forms throughout the centuries, but during

Japan, South and Nord America and the Philippines, while it leaves aside Nord Africa, the Middle East and central, eastern and south-eastern Europe.

⁴⁶ The list may be consulted in DE CLERCQ - SWIGGERS - VAN TONGERLOO, *The Linguistic Contribution*, pp. 443-448.

⁴⁷ For a comprehensive discussion on this subject, see the study, a milestone in this field, by M.S. IOVINE, *The “Illyrian Language” and the Language Question among the Southern Slavs in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, in R. PICCHIO - H. GOLDBLATT (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, 4 vol., New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 1984, vol. 1: *Church Slavonic - South Slavic - West Slavic*, pp. 101-156.

⁴⁸ Cf. IOVINE, *The “Illyrian Language”*, p. 109.

the seventeenth century it appeared as the expectation of a crusade undertaken by all the Western nations under the leadership of the Catholic Emperor. It involved the idea of a restored unity of the Christian world, a unity symbolized and guaranteed by the Pope. Thus, the plans for the liberation of the Southern Slavs were inevitably connected with the Catholic ambition to convert Orthodox populations. One could hardly imagine a more devoted adept of such political thinking than Krastyo Peykich, who explicitly set his books within the context of the project for the liberation of all Christian peoples from Turkish domination and considered his own polemical works a “spiritual weapon” to be adopted together with material arms in the struggle against the greatest enemy of the whole of Christianity, namely the Turks.

2. PEYKICH’S LIFE

One objective of this work is to offer a new, significantly enriched biography of our protagonist. In order to achieve this objective, Turčinović’s study is taken as a starting point. It outlines the main events in Peykich’s life yet still leaves a number of unanswered questions and unsolved mysteries. Notwithstanding the new facts published by Turčinović, of which there are many, whole periods of Peykich’s life continue to remain obscure.

We are to able trace Peykich’s life today in far greater detail than ever before, especially as far as his literary and missionary activity is concerned. Some uncertainties remain concerning his early years (from his birth to the autumn of 1689, when he was given shelter in the *Pia Casa dei Catecumeni* in Venice), together with those of the precise place and date of his death. We now know, however, Krastyo Peykich’s exact day of birth, 14th September, 1666.⁴⁹ All the previously unknown details about his life, which will be presented here, are based on material preserved in the Historical Archive of the *Propaganda*

⁴⁹ In a letter of September 30, 1729, Peykich wrote that on the fourteenth of the same month he had accomplished 63 years. – APF, SOCG, vol. 666, f. 83r-v.

Fide Congregation in Rome. From December, 1689, to 31st. March, 1730, the date on which Peykich sent to the Cardinals of the Holy Congregation the last of his letters found in the Archive and shortly after which he probably died, he maintained a regular correspondence with the Congregation. The complete sequence of Peykich's letters, together with other kinds of material kept in the Archive, for instance the annals of the regular meetings of the Cardinals and outgoing documents from the chancellery of the Congregation (such as reference letters on behalf of Peykich), etc. leave almost no doubt concerning the general course of our author's life and career.

Krastyo Peykich (*Christoforo Peichich, Christophorus Peichich, Карсты Пеукуч*)⁵⁰ was born in 1666, most probably into a Catholic family in the small town of Chiprovtsi, situated in a remote and naturally-defended valley hidden in the hills of the Balkan mountains in north-west Bulgaria, well within the borders of the Ottoman Empire.⁵¹ Chiprovtsi was the centre of Bulgarian

⁵⁰ 'Krastyo Peykich' is the transliteration, in compliance with the Bulgarian Transliteration Law from 2009, of our author's name according to the form circulating nowadays in Bulgarian scholarly literature (*Кръстѣо Пеѹкуч*). Peykich normally signs his Italian letters with *Christoforo* or *Cristoforo Peichich* (sometimes *Pechich*); in his Latin works his name appears as *Christophorus Peichich* while in his "Illyrian" *Zarcalo* it appears as *Karst Peikič* (*Карст Пеукуч*).

⁵¹ The birthplace of our author has been widely debated. Bozhidar Peychev maintained that Peykich was born in Thessaloniki (ПЕЙЧЕВ, "Философските и политическите възгледи," p. 122; ID., *Автореферат*, p. 18) but it is not clear what evidence there is to support his assertion. I suppose he had provided some proof in his dissertation, which I could not consult, while in his publications he simply made the statement as if it were a proven fact. It is, however, possible to speculate that his sources might be P. AIGL, *Historia brevis venerabilis capituli cathedralis ecclesiae Quinque-Ecclesiensis a prima eiusdem origine usque finem anni 1838*, Quinque-Ecclesiis: Typis Lycei Episcopalis, 1838, p. 89, and J. BRÜSZTLE, *Recensio universi cleri dioecesis Quinque-Ecclesiensis*, Quinque-Ecclesiis: Typis Lycei Episcopalis, 1876, pp. 420-421 (the relevant passages can also be found as appendices XIV and XV in TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 191-192). These two ecclesiastical historians narrate that Krastyo Peykich belonged to an Orthodox Greek family in Thessaloniki and he had converted to Catholicism after his arrival in Venice. This version is at least theoretically possible. One piece of evidence to sustain this assertion is provided by Karol Telbizov (Карол Телбизов), who reported the absence of the family name "Peykich" in the extant lists

Catholicism at that time, and the archbishop of Sofia held his seat in the Franciscan monastery there, in preference to the city of Sofia. In all probability, Peykich attended the school run by Observant Franciscan friars in his home town,⁵² where he received early instruction in Latin grammar, as can be deduced on the basis of the information about him contained in the enrolment register of the College of *de Propaganda Fide* in Rome. The entry under his name indicates that at the moment of his enrolment, in 1689, he knew “a little grammar” and could “read and write a little” (“Sa un poco la Grammatica, e sa un poco leggere e scrivere”), presumably in Latin. He is also said to know “Illyrian”, Albanian and Turkish (“sa la lingua Illirica, l’Albanese e la Turchesca”).⁵³

In 1688, as a part of the Balkan campaign in the War of the Holy League, imperial troops captured Belgrade and marched further south-eastwards. Hoping for a victorious outcome of the campaign and expecting the imperial troops to arrive at any moment, the Catholics from Chiprovtsi organized an uprising in support of the Hapsburgs. Yet, the imperial army did not cross the Danube and was instead forced to withdraw. Therefore, the uprising failed and was followed by fierce revenge, respecting the wishes of the Ottoman government which saw this insurrection as a disgraceful betrayal on the part of its subjects. The rebel forces of Imre Thököly, joined by brigands and regular Ottoman troops, destroyed the town and its surroundings, together with the convent of the Observant Franciscans, and left the region devastated and depopulated for generations to come. The Archbishop of Sofia of the time, Stefano Conti (Стефан Кнежевич), followed by many of the Catholic faithful

of the names of the 1688 Chiprovtsi immigrants in Wallachia and Transylvania (К. ТЕЛБИЗОВ [K. TELBIZOV], “Към биографията на Кръстю Пейкич (1665-1730)” [About Krastyo Peykich’s Biography (1665-1730)], *Векове* [Centuries], 9/1 (1980), p. 26-35, in part. p. 26).

⁵² This school was founded in 1624 (Turčinović) or 1625 (Duychev) and functioned until the end of the seventeenth century. Cf. TURČINOVIĆ, p. 15; ДУЙЧЕВ, *Софийската католичка архиепископия*, p. 67.

⁵³ Archivio del Collegio di *Propaganda Fide*, Registro I, p. 177. – I quote after TURČINOVIĆ, appendix II, p. 177.

and the surviving Observant friars, fled to Wallachia.⁵⁴ For them, it was merely the beginning of a peregrination throughout Wallachia and Transylvania that was to last for decades.⁵⁵

In the autumn of 1689, an year after the failure of the Chiprovtsi uprising, we find Krastyo Peykich in the *Pia Casa dei Catecumeni* in Venice, and this is the earliest certain fact that we have about him. The prior of the Holy House of the time, Vincenzo Matevich, wrote to the Cardinals of the Propaganda requesting that the young man should be accepted for training at the Urban College.⁵⁶ Matevich presented the youth as a refugee from Chiprovtsi and

⁵⁴ According to the relation sent by Conti on October 20, 1688 from his refuge in Wallachia. – APF, SOCG, vol. 503, ff. 178r-179v. A Bulgarian translation of this document was published as appendix VI in Й.Д. СПИСАРЕВСКА [I.D. SPISSAREVSKA], *Чипровското въстание и европейският свят* [Chiprovtsi Uprising and the European World], Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1988, pp. 198-200. “Thereafter”, says István G. Tóth, “the mission to the Bulgarians of Transylvania constituted an important task for the Holy Congregation” – ТÓТН, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy*, p. 550. On the contrary, Petru Tocănel sustains that the Congregation does not seem to be much concerned about their destiny. Cf. ТОСĂNEL, *Assestamento delle Missioni...*, p. 732.

⁵⁵ For an account of the history of the Bulgarian expatriates’ peregrinations in Wallachia and Transylvania, see В. ТРАЙКОВ [V. TRAYKOV], *Съдбата на населението от чипровския край след въстанието от 1688 г.* [The Destiny of the Population from the Chiprovtsi Region after the Uprising of 1688], in *300 години Чипровско въстание. Принос към историята на българите през XVII в.* [300 Years since the Chiprovtsi Uprising], Sofia: BAN, 1988, pp. 292-302; М. ШИПКОВ [M. SHIPKOV], *Културно-просветното дело на банатските българи* [The Cultural and Educational Work of the Bulgarians in Banat], in Г. НЕШЕВ [G. NESHEV] et al. (eds.), *Ренесансът и България - Il Rinascimento e la Bulgaria*, Sofia: Геа либрис, 1995, pp. 377-384; Л. МИЛЕТИЧ [L. MILETICH], “Седмиградските българи” [The Transylvanian Bulgarians], *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* (henceforth *СБНУНК*) [Collection of Folklore, Knowledge and Letters], 13 (1896), pp. 153-256; ID., “Заселението на католишките българи в Седмиградско и Банат” [The Settling of the Catholic Bulgarians in Transylvania and Banat], *СБНУНК*, 14 (1897), pp. 284-543; ID., “Нови документи по миналото на нашите павликяни” [New Documents Concerning the Past of Our Paulicians], *СБНУК*, 21 (1905), pp. 1-155 – these and other contributions by Luybomir Miletich have been reprinted in a single volume under the title ID., *Изследвания за българите в Седмиградско и Банат* [Studies on the Bulgarians in Transylvania and Banat], Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1987.

⁵⁶ APF, Acta, vol. 59 (1689), p. 251.

informed the Cardinals that he had arrived at the Casa several months before that date and was making an effort to improve in his studies (probably in Latin and Italian). Matevich praises his language skills saying that he speaks his mother-tongue (“Illyrian”), Turkish and Albanian. From the autumn of that same year, there is another letter, this time signed by Peykich himself, where he makes a similar request on his own behalf.⁵⁷

Therefore, on December 25th, 1689 Krastyo Peykich was enrolled in The Urban College in Rome and would remain there for nine years, following and passing almost the whole course of studies.

According to the entry under his name in the College enrolment register, when he entered the institution Peykich was twenty years old (“è in età di anni 20”) and a Catholic like his parents, the spouses Petar Peykich and Catherine from Chiprovtsi.⁵⁸ In actual fact, at the moment of his immatriculation he must have been twenty three, not twenty. In any event, his admission was in violation of the rules of the College, which prescribed that newly admitted students should be aged between 14 and 18.⁵⁹ It is likely that in view of this requirement the applicant who was too old tried to “rejuvenate” himself a little. Interestingly enough, when a few years later on the occasion of his entering the priesthood Peykich was asked to confirm his age, he declared that he was unable to do so by claiming that his parish baptismal register had been burnt during the tumults that followed the insurrection in his native town.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ APF, SOCG, vol. 505, f. 59r (the letter is not written in his hand). A facsimile of this document (Table 46) was published in the catalogue to the exhibition *Bulgaria e la storia bulgara negli Archivi Vaticani e nella Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (secc. XV-XVIII). In occasione del 300° anniversario dell'insurrezione di Čiprovec del 1688*, Sofia: Sofia Presse, 1988.

⁵⁸ “Christoforo di Pietro Peichich e di Caterina Ambi Coniugi della Città di Ciprovatz in Bulgaria è stato ricevuto in Collegio il dì 25. Dicembre 1689. è Cattholico, come anche li suoi parenti di Rito latino.” – Archivio del Collegio di *Propaganda Fide*, Registro I, p. 177. – I quote from TURČINOVIĆ, appendix II, p. 177.

⁵⁹ M. JEZERNIK, *Il Collegio Urbano*, in METZLER, vol 1/1, p. 465-482, in part. pp. 469.

⁶⁰ APF, Acta, vol. 65 (1695), p. 17.

Peykich remained in the College until 1698, when he left without obtaining a degree after the end of second of the three years stipulated for the course of theology. He nevertheless asked to be awarded the doctoral degree but his request met with a firm refusal.⁶¹ The precise reasons why Peykich interrupted his studies are not known. He justified his decision by claiming poor health (*indisposizione*).⁶²

During his stay at the Urban College, Peykich had to take the standard oath by which each and every student at any Pontifical college was bound.⁶³ The original document signed by Peykich was conserved and can still be found in the Archive of the College.⁶⁴ The text of the oath contains five articles corresponding to the five vows taken by the student. First, the student promises to observe the regulations of his educational institution. Second, he pledges not to join any religious order or congregation of regulars without explicit permission from the *de Propaganda Fide* Congregation. Third, he agrees, if this is the wish of the Congregation, to be ordained to the priesthood. Fourth, he accepts the obligation, after he has left the College and when he has

⁶¹ The Cardinals invoked a rule introduced in 1657 during the reforms of the Urban College regulations conducted by Pope Alexander VII. This rule expressly forbids the title to be awarded to persons who have not completed the full course of studies.

⁶² APF, Acta, vol. 68 (1698), pp. 31 and 253. It also seems that in the last two years of his studies Peykich did not attend lessons with any regularity. – TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 26-27. In the entry under Peykich's name in the enrolment register there is a record concerning his departure, too: "Havendo chiesta la sua licenza alla Sacra Congregazione l'ha ottenuta, ed è partito verso Germania li 9. Settembre 1698. dopo essere stato ordinato Sacerdote, e finiti due anni di Teologia: egli non ha cattivo fondo, ma è testa gagliarda, querulo, e si lascia spesso predominare dalla melanconia, che lo rende grave a se, ed agli altri, che però si è agevolato di permettergli d'andarsene prima di terminare i studij." – Archivio del Collegio di *Propaganda Fide*, Registro I, p. 177. – I quote from TURČINOVIĆ, appendix II, p. 177.

⁶³ JEZERNIK, *Il Collegio Urbano*, p. 477. The text of the oath is published in *Collectanea S. Congregationis De Prop. Fide seu Decreta Instructiones rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus*, 2 vol., Roma: Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Prop. Fide, 1907, vol. 1, p. 46, n. 143.

⁶⁴ It was published by TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 175-176 as appendix I. The original is held in the Archive of the *de Propaganda Fide* College, Iuramentum, p. 145.

arrived at his destination and taken up his predetermined mission, to send reports on his life and activities, and on the general situation in the place and the land of his mission, each year (if his destination is in Europe) or every two years (if it is outside Europe). Fifth, he swears to go back to his homeland to operate *pro salute animarum* when he has concluded his education. Some of the obligations of this oath (in particular, the second and the last one) caused Peykich difficulties later in life.

As we have said, after the end of the 1697-1698 academic year, Peykich dropped out the College with the intention of setting off for Germany. Here “Germany” is used in very broad sense: on that occasion, it is recorded in the Acts of the regular meetings of the Cardinals of the Congregation that the young Bulgarian was going to take up a mission in Transylvania, obeying the wish in this sense expressed by Cardinal Kollonisc.⁶⁵ According to the note in the register, Peykich left on 9th September, 1698. His letters then trace his way to Transylvania via Venice⁶⁶ and Vienna.⁶⁷ It was not until the summer of 1699, when the Fifteen Years’ War was over, that Peykich set off from Vienna for Sibiu, which was at the time the capital of the Principality of Transylvania. On this journey, he was a member of the entourage of Princess Rabutin,⁶⁸ being employed as tutor of her children.⁶⁹ The Princess was the consort of General

⁶⁵ APF, Acta, vol 68 (1698), p. 253. Leopold Karl Graf von Kollonisc (1631-1707), from 1695 archbishop of Esztergom and primate of Hungary.

⁶⁶ APF, SC. Collegio Urbano, vol. 2, ff. 663r-664v (Venice, September 28, 1698).

⁶⁷ APF, SC. Collegio Urbano, vol. 2, ff. 667r-v (Vienna, October 18, 1698); 672r-673v (Vienna, October 25, 1698); 677r-678v (Vienna, November, 1698).

⁶⁸ Dorothea-Elisabeth, duchess of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Wiesenburg (1645-1725).

⁶⁹ APF, SC. Collegio Urbano, vol. 2, f. 707r-v (Vienna, August 1, 1699), which is a letter by the Nuncio in Vienna, Andrea Santa Croce (1655-1712); cc. 713r-714v (Sibiu, September 23, 1699), which is a letter from Peykich.

Jean-Louis de Bussy-Rabutin (1641-1716), who had recently been named military commander of Transylvania.⁷⁰

Early in 1700, Peikich was still in Sibiu, whence he sent a letter to the Propaganda. In it, he already defined himself as a “missionary among the Bulgarian Catholics, scattered throughout Hungary, Wallachia and Transylvania.”⁷¹ In the autumn of that year the Bulgarian colony of Sibiu left the town and settled in Alvinc (now the town of Vințu de Jos in Romania), to where Peykich followed his parishioners.⁷²

In 1703, the revolt of the Transylvanian Prince, Ferenc Rákóczi, and his supporters against the Hapsburgs broke out in Hungary and Transylvania; it became a civil war and did not end until 1711, when the Hungarians were defeated. The fugitives from Chiprovtsi, who had previously settled in Alvinc, were forced to flee from the advance of Rákóczi’s troops; they left Transylvania and withdrew to Wallachia, where they dispersed into small groups scattered around various places. Krastyo Peykich also moved to Wallachia and found temporary shelter with his former acquaintance General Rabutin.⁷³ By moving to Wallachia, Peykich’s parishioners from Alvinc automatically came under the spiritual care of the Bulgarian Observant Franciscans, who would not permit a lay priest to serve the refugees. Therefore, Peykich had either to seek a new appointment or to accept the invitation to join the Franciscan Order.⁷⁴ He entered the novitiate (for which

⁷⁰ See VÁRKONYI, *The Last decades*, p. 380. The general Jean-Louis de Bussy-Rabutin was a cousin of the famous writer Roger de Rabutin, count de Bussy (1618-1693).

⁷¹ APF, Acta, vol. 70 (1700), p. 294.

⁷² ТРАЙКОВ, *Съдбата на населението*, p. 295.

⁷³ APF, Acta, vol. 74 (1704), p. 36.

⁷⁴ Peykich’s letters to the Holy Congregation from the period between 1704-1705 have been published as follows: FERMENDŽIN, *Acta Bulgariae ecclesiastica*, pp. 325-327 (Tirgoviste in Wallachia, June 4, 1704); TURČINOVIĆ, appendix IV, p. 180 (Tirgoviste, October 30, 1704); appendix V, pp. 181-183 (Bucharest, November 22, 1704, and Venice, February 21, 1705); appendix VII, p. 185 (Venice, February 21, 1705); I. MOGA, “Stiri

he was given permission by the Propaganda) but only a few months later he changed his mind, abandoned the Franciscan cassock and made his way back to Italy.

Peykich reached Venice in the very days when his earlier patron Vincenzo Matevich, Prior of the Holy House of the Catechumens, departed this world.⁷⁵ In the spring of 1705, the nuncio in Venice, Agostino Cusani, wrote to the *Propaganda* to say that Peykich had been elected as the new Prior of the Catechumens and to present the Bulgarian's request for authorization to maintain this service. Peykich obtained permission to hold that position.⁷⁶ A query in the administrative and accounting archive of the *Pia Casa* records the name of Peykich in the register of priors between the names of Vincenzo Matevich and Nicola Drazhich from Split.⁷⁷ In the same Archive (in the *Libro delle Terminazioni*), one can find the date on which Peykich's election took place, 16th March, 1705.⁷⁸

Having renounced his position as prior⁷⁹ and in search of a new appointment, in the spring of 1709 Peykich travelled to Vienna via Venice.⁸⁰ From Vienna, after much hesitation, he went to Pest and remained there until the summer of 1711, living in the convent of the Dominicans and being

despre Bulgarii din Ardeal,” *Annuarul Institutului de istorie natională a Univ. Cluj*, 5 (1929-1930), pp. 513-519, the letter is on pp. 518-519 (Tirgoviste, April 15, 1704).

⁷⁵ APF, SOCG, vol. 550, ff. 371r-372v (Bucharest, November 22, 1704 and Venice, February 21, 1705) – in TURČINOVIĆ, p. 183.

⁷⁶ APF, Acta, vol. 75 (1705), p. 180.

⁷⁷ IRE, Catecumeni, G: *Atti miscellanei*, vol. 3/1, f. 1: *Serie de' Priori del Pio Luogo de' Catecumeni* (21 giugno 1558 - 15 aprile 1788).

⁷⁸ IRE, Catecumeni, B: *Terminazioni*, vol. 16: *6 marzo 1703 - 28 febbraio 1707*, f. 66r.

⁷⁹ IRE, Catecumeni, B: *Terminazioni*, vol. 17: *6 marzo 1708 - settembre 1711*, f. 34v: “per ordine della Congregazione di Propaganda Fide torna alle sue Missioni.”

⁸⁰ The letters in which Peykich asked for the blessing of the Propaganda are of April 6, 1709 (APF, SOCG, vol. 566, f. 333r-v – from Venice) and May 11, 1709 (vol. 567, f. 328r – from Vienna).

responsible for the spiritual care of their parishioners.⁸¹ It seems that later that year he spent several months as a parish priest in Draž, in south-eastern Baranya (now in Croatia).⁸²

On the 15th of October in the same year, 1711, Peykich wrote from Pécs, an Episcopal see, the administrative and cultural center of the medieval southern Hungarian county of Baranya, and informed the *Propaganda* that he was responsible for serving six parishes in the surrounding villages.⁸³ In a letter written in August, 1716, he signed himself as canon of the cathedral of Pécs,⁸⁴ and another letter of the same year shows that he had received an abbey as a benefice from the Emperor.⁸⁵ Peykich remained in Pécs until 1718.

In a letter dated July 20th, 1718, and sent from Ormož (Slovenia), our protagonist signed himself as “brother Lodovico formerly Cristoforo Peichich” (“Fra Lodovico olim Cristoforo Peichich”).⁸⁶ Here he narrates how he had

⁸¹ Acta, vol. 79 (1709), p. 396.

⁸² As far as I was able to understand, Turčinović made this statement on the basis of the biographical notice dedicated to Peykich left by Brüztle in his *Recensio universi cleri diocesis Quinque-Ecclesiensis*.

⁸³ APF, Acta, vol. 81 (1711), p. 649. According to Karol Telbizov, in 1712 Peykich returned to Alvinc. His version is based on the fact that from March 23, 1712, Peykich’s name is found in the *Liber baptizorum* of the former Bulgarian Catholic community in Alvinc. – ТЕЛБИЗОВ, “Към биографията,” p. 29, footnote 12.

⁸⁴ APF, SC. Ungheria, vol. 4, f. 203r (Turnava, August 9, 1716) – published by ТОТ, *Българското участие*, pp. 432-433. Peykich signs as a canon of the cathedral of Pécs also in the *Зарцало истине* of 1716.

⁸⁵ APF, SOCG, vol. 612, f. 122r-v (Pécs, February 6, 1718). According to Karol Telbizov, the title of “Abbot of St. George in Cenad” was an honorary one (ТЕЛБИЗОВ, “Към биографията,” p. 34). Turčinović made an assertion in the same sense, that this was a “bare title” with neither obligations nor income (TURČINOVIĆ, p. 61). In 1728, in a request presented by Peykich to the “Committee for the the newly-acquired territories” (*Neoaquistica Comissio*), it was stated that he received no income from that parish. Paykich asked to be granted either the income of the parish or a life-long pension. For more about this request, see in M. KOSTIĆ, “Biobibliografski prilozi za Krstu Pejkića,” *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 12/1 (1932), pp. 83-85; Turčinović included Kostić’s notice as Appendix XVI (pp. 192-193) in his book.

⁸⁶ APF, SOCG, vol. 615, ff. 174r-175v (Ormož, July 20, 1718).

come into conflict with the bishop of Pécs,⁸⁷ and how, in fear of the Bishop's revenge, he had fled from Pécs. He had travelled by night to Vienna, then returned to Hungary, and from Hungary had entered Croatia, where he had found a cordial welcome on the part of the Franciscan brothers, who sent him to Ormož. Peykich had taken all these steps without informing the Propaganda and he was now asking for permission to stay in Ormož and continue the procedure for entering the Franciscan Order.

Once again Peykich received permission from the Congregation to enter the Franciscan Order.⁸⁸ Once again Peikich soon renounced the idea. We do not know when, how and why, or whether he left before or after having taken a vow, but it is more than likely that he had not taken one because he did not remain in Ormož very long. Over the next two years, until early in 1720, he served as parish priest in Deva, presumably for the Bulgarian community.⁸⁹ By the end of 1720, he had a new office: by order of the bishop of Transylvania, he became parish priest of the settlement of Chiprovtsi refugees in Alvinc, which was then beginning to be revived.⁹⁰

Peykich remained in Alvinc until 1725, when the brothers of the Bulgarian Franciscan Province obtained the parish; therefore, Peykich had to relinquish his office and to march on in search of a new position and, if fortune allowed it, a quiet haven after long years of wandering.

The date and the circumstances surrounding the death of Krastyo Peykich are not known. In the Archive of *Propaganda*, only a few letters from the several final years of Peykich's life, when he lived in Vienna, are preserved.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Wilhelm Franz Johann Bertrand von Nesselrode, Bishop of Pécs between 1710 and 1732.

⁸⁸ APF, Acta, vol. 88 (1718), p. 482.

⁸⁹ APF, SOCG, vol. 624, ff. 69r-70r (Deva, February 2, 1720).

⁹⁰ APF, SOCG, vol. 628, f. 345r-v (Vienna, December 22, 1720).

⁹¹ APF, SOCG, vol. 649, ff. 411r-414v (Vienna, July 7, 1725; only a copy of the original letter is extant); vol. 661, ff. 272r-273v (Vienna, April 20, 1728); vol. 666, f. 83r-v (Vienna, September 30, 1729).

The last news of him is from early spring, 1730. Peikich was still seeking to achieve a respectable status in society and was developing ambitious projects. In a letter written in the spring of 1730, he reported that the previous winter he had been very ill in bed; that the long-awaited letter of permission for him to move to Trieste had arrived;⁹² that the Viennese court intended to give him a canonicate in Belgrade; that the Viennese government demanded coverage of the expense for a new edition of his *Concordia*; that it would dispose additional funds for translating and publishing the treatise in the “Slavic language and alphabet” (“lingua e caratteri dei rosciani”). In his last letter, dated March 31st., 1730, Peykich speaks about his plans to accomplish a new Slavic translation of the *Speculum* to be published with the financial support of the Viennese government and of the Austrian Province of the Jesuit Order.⁹³ Krastyo Peykich failed to carry out these plans. After this final letter his voice faded away and was heard no more.

⁹² The decision was taken on December 5, 1729. Cf. APF, Acta, vol. 99 (1729), p. 499.

⁹³ The two letters were sent together. APF, SOCG, vol. 668, ff. 191r-192v (Vienna, February 18, 1730; Vienna, March 31, 1730).

CHAPTER 2

PEYKICH'S WORK ON THE CONVERSION OF MUSLIMS TO CATHOLICISM

Tuctan: Eh bien! mon ami Karpos, tu vends cher tes légumes; mais ils sont bons... De quelle religion es-tu à présent? *Karpos*: Ma foi, mon bacha, j'aurais bien de la peine à vous le dire. Quand notre petite île de Samos appartenait aux Grecs, je me souviens que l'on me faisait dire que l'*agion pneuma* n'était produit que du *tou patrou*; on me faisait prier Dieu tout droit sur mes deux jambes, les mains croisées: on me défendait de manger du lait en carême. Les Vénitiens sont venus, alors mon curé vénitien m'a fait dire qu'*agion pneuma* venait du *tou patrou* et du *tou viou*, m'a permis de manger du lait, et m'a fait prier Dieu à genoux. Les Grecs sont revenus, et ont chassé les Vénitiens alors il a fallu renoncer au *tou viou* et à la crème. Vous avez enfin chassé les Grecs, je vous entends crier *Alla illa Alla* de toutes vos forces. Je ne sais plus trop ce que je suis; j'aime Dieu de tout mon coeur, et je vends mes légumes fort raisonnablement.¹

This chapter opens with a quotation from Voltaire's *Philosophical Dictionary*, published in 1764, because Karpos the gardener, with his erratic history, symbolizes the "ideal" audience for our author's polemical writings in general, and in particular for the *Mahometanus*, which will be the first text analyzed here. In fact, what will be stated in the present chapter and in the following ones, is that the audience that Peykich had in mind when he wrote his treatises was composed of the populations living in the territories gained either by Venice or by the Hapsburgs under the terms of the peace treaties of 1699 and 1718, as well as by those *figli* of the *Pia casa* in Venice who came

¹ FRANÇOIS-MARIE AROUET VOLTAIRE, *Dictionnaire philosophique, Catéchisme du jardinier ou Entretien du bacha Tuctan et du jardinier Karpos*.

from the Balkans and from the islands in the Aegean sea. These were all individuals and peoples suffering an erratic fate: they had seen different overlords coming and going and had experienced the effects of the application of the *cuius regio, eius religio* principle. For them, to make the choice between accepting the religion of the ruling élite or, on the contrary, persisting in the religion of the community to which they belonged, which would guarantee the interests of its individual members, was if not necessarily a matter of physical survival, at least a matter of a chance for better security and a better social status. Furthermore, one must bear in mind that the diversity of religious denominations in central Europe during the early modern period was even greater than that on the island of Samos so wittily depicted by Voltaire: besides Islam, Greek Orthodoxy and Catholicism, Calvinism, Unitarianism (the Unitarian Church) and, from the end of the 17th century, the Greek Catholic Church United with Rome were also represented there.

By 1716, the year in which Peykich published his first book, he had already been serving as canon of the cathedral of Pécs for several years. Pécs, the political and cultural centre of Baranya, was captured by the imperial army and annexed to the Hapsburg Empire in 1686. A union between the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches (the so-called Union of Pécs) had been established in 1690, and an active process of a return to Catholicism and religious consolidation was taking place there. These were the historical and political circumstances in which Peykich was living and working when, in merely two consecutive years, he published his *Zarcalo* and *Mahometanus*. Although we can rely on no specific data concerning the immediate occasion of these publications, the Hapsburgs' policy aimed at the religious integration of their subjects, and the consolidation of Catholicism as the "state religion" is the context in which both the *Zarcalo* and the *Mahometanus* should be placed, together with Peykich's other works.

Our author's works can be divided into two groups. To the first belong the *Speculum*, both in its "Illyrian" edition (that is the *Zarcalo*), and in the Latin one, the relative *Additamentum* and the *Concordia*. They belong to the literary genre of controversistic theology, yet seem animated by a concordistic spirit,

aiming at promoting the reunification of the Eastern and Western Churches. The second group consists in only one work, the *Mahometanus*, the catechism for Catholic missionaries carrying out their activity among Muslims. While all Peykich's later writings were reprinted several times and were widely disseminated (copies of these books are extant in numerous Italian and Central European libraries), his two earlier works had no further editions.²

Apart from Bozhivar Peychev's study, which is discussed in the introduction to the present work, Peykich's *Mahometanus* has hitherto never been a subject of scholarly interest and investigation.³ This is why it is given pride of place here: it is the first of Peykich's books we shall analyse, although it was not the first to be published, and it will be the one most thoroughly and extensively examined. In the following chapter, there will be an account of the *corpus* dedicated to the Catholic-Orthodox polemic.

Krastyo Peykich's *Mahometanus dogmaticae, et catecheticae in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus* ("The Mohammedan Educated, with the Corroboration of the Koran, in Dogmatics and Catechism according to the Law of Christ") was printed by the Academic Printing House in Trnava (Slovakia) for the publisher Fridericus Gall in 1717. The only extant document casting some light on the event of this publication is a letter by Peykich, where he says: "Here [i.e. in Trnava] at the academic printer's I have left a book composed by myself for it to be printed against the Turks and their abominable sect."⁴

² This is only partly true as far as the "Illyrian" *Zarcalo istine* is concerned, for, under the name of another author and with a different title, it enjoyed considerable popularity in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Croatia. – See TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 138-150 and chapter 4 here. On the success of Peykich's *Zarcalo* in Croatia, see especially TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 138-150.

³ For a bibliographical description and a short summary of *Mahometanus*, see *ibi*, pp. 97-101. Turčinović also provides references to such descriptions in other historians.

⁴ APF, SC. Ungheria, vol. 4, f. 203r. Krastyo Peykich to the Secretary of the Holy Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, in ТОТ, *Българско участие*, pp. 432-433.

The *Mahometanus* takes the form of a catechism and is regarded by its author as a handbook to be consulted by those Catholic missionaries who carry out their activity among Muslims. Peykich presents his work as a “spiritual weapon” to be adopted together with material ones in the struggle against the Ottoman Turks, the Hapsburgs' and the whole of Christianity's greatest foe. At the same time, Peykich also recommends the *Mahometanus* as a useful guide to preaching the Catholic faith to schismatics and heretics, thereby placing it within the wider perspective of the Hapsburg's policy of the consolidation of Catholicism as the “state religion.” In line with Peykich's own statements, the following analysis is meant to give an account of the *Mahometanus* as a manifestation and a revealing example both of post-Tridentine Catholic expansion in Eastern Europe and of the Hapsburg's policy towards religious minorities in the borderlands of the Empire.

In carrying out this analysis, we attempt to dedicate attention to two further aspects. On the one hand, the *Mahometanus* is interpreted as being representative of its genre, that is the genre of handbooks for Catholic missionaries among Muslims, and as such is the product of a (broadly speaking) theological and educational tradition that offers a certain intellectual source of commonplaces, models of thinking and view of the world. On the other hand, it is also seen as a product of the intellectual endeavour and, to some extent, of the efforts of its author throughout his life; as such, it is seen as conditioned both by the personality, the intellectual and literary capability of the author, and by the time and place in which it was written, to which it testifies.

In other words, what is meant here is to offer an insight into this work, with regard to its context, content, sources, how it was to function according to the author's intentions and its peculiarities compared to other writings in the same field. With this purpose in mind, the analysis of the *Mahometanus* will be preceded by a critical examination of the main uses of the theme ‘Islam’ in the philosophical and political discourses of the eighteenth century in Europe, and by a brief account of the long tradition of the Christian-Muslim polemic, outlining only its principal features.

1. HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM POLEMIC AND INSTRUMENTAL USES OF THE THEME OF 'ISLAM'

1.1. *The presence of the theme of 'Islam' in eighteenth-century philosophical and political thought.*

The catechism of the gardener, his *credo* or, as one calls it nowadays, his “philosophy,” is that of common sense, which commands him to love God with all his heart and to sell his vegetables at a reasonable price, that is to live by his labour, without cheating his customers. Under the dictate of common sense, Karpos the gardener simply wants to be left alone, and it is this dictate that makes Voltaire oppose any form of fanaticism, by ridiculing it. And ‘fanaticism’ stands in the French Enlightenment thinker for ‘Church’ or, more generically, for any religion, be it that of the Greeks, the Venetians or the Turks.⁵ Islam, its Prophet, its laws, the customs of the Muslims, exemplified by the manners of the Turks and the Sultan’s court, are all topics that are fairly common in the works of Voltaire, to which he returns in other chapters of the *Philosophical Dictionary* (“Alcoran,” “Mahométans” and others), as well as in his *Essai sur les mœurs* (1756). Voltaire returns time and time again to these themes with the purpose of criticizing religious fanaticism, condemning moral wickedness but also of amusing the audience and gaining popularity.

Both aspects of eighteenth-century interest in Islam and the Orient were equally present in Voltaire’s works. On the one hand, Enlightenment philosophers’ interest in Islam and the legal system in Islamic countries, the Ottoman Empire in particular, was stimulated by discussions about the most crucial concept of the political philosophy of the day, i.e. the concept of

⁵ The most famous case is that of Voltaire’s tragedy *Fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète* (1739-1742), which Voltaire sent to Pope Benedict XIV referring to him as a “vicario ed imitatore d’un Dio di verità e di mansuetudine.” In it, the monstrous image of the Prophet depicted by Voltaire is just an odious and fearsome mask disguising every fanaticism in general and that of the Catholic Church in particular.

toleration.⁶ *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) by John Locke and *Treatise on Toleration* (*Traité sur la Tolérance*, 1763) by Voltaire were devoted explicitly to this theme and were the two most prominent texts of several devoted to the same question. On the other hand, Enlightenment philosophers' interest in oriental cultures, customs and religions was aroused by the popular passion for exoticism, by the taste for (and fashion of) orientalisms and arabesques that spread throughout the western world during the eighteenth century. It is in this context that the delectable stories told by Voltaire, mostly related to the role of women in Turkish society, must be viewed. And it is in this context that Antoine Galland (1646-1715) translated the *Thousand and One Nights* (1704-1717).

It is easy to guess that such an almost frivolous attitude towards this subject, as well as the, so to speak, instrumental use of the polemic against Islam, which was employed in discussions about toleration, became more and more frequent and turned into a standard cultural attitude in the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, only after the victory at Vienna and the conclusion of the war of the Holy League (1699), i.e. after the Turkish retreat.⁷ This statement is particularly true of the taste for exoticism, and true, with some restrictions, of the instrumental use of the attack on Islam, in so far as a classic example of such a use had already appeared during the period of the Reformation. At that time, representatives of the Catholic Church on one side, and of different Reformed Churches on the other, habitually accused each other of confessing a religion similar to that established by Muhammad.

⁶ With reference to the use of the example of the Islamic states in the context of philosophical discussions about toleration, see the study by R. MINUTI, *Orientalismo e idee di tolleranza nella cultura francese del primo '700*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2006, p. ix in particular.

⁷ See for instance A. HAMILTON, *A Lutheran Translator for the Quran. A Late Seventeenth-Century Quest*, in A. HAMILTON - M.H. VAN DEN BOOGERT - B. WESTERWEEL (eds.), *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2005, pp. 197-221, according to whom after the 1683 defeat of the Turks "western Europeans could approach Islam in a more dispassionate frame of mind" (p. 200).

William Rainolds, an English Catholic exile, who was a Professor of Theology at the English College in Reims, first coined the term *Calvinoturkism*. His *Calvino Turcismus id est Calvinisticae perfidiae cum Mahumetana collatio* (1597) strongly criticized Protestants and their treatment of Catholics and attracted the anger of his ideological opponents. A direct response to Rainolds' *Calvino Turcismus* was Matthew Sutcliffe's *De turco-papismo* (1604).

A novelty compared to this precedent of the instrumental use of the 'Islam' theme is the practice, introduced by eighteenth-century philosophical and political thinkers, of referring to the Oriental example as a model of religious toleration on the part of a certain state towards the different religious communities to which its subjects might belong. Another novelty is the custom, invented by Voltaire, of using an attack on Islam as an attack against religion in general.⁸

In this respect, one step behind Voltaire were the English deists, among whom John Toland (1670-1722). As the rebuttal of Islam in Voltaire did not end in itself, because its purpose was not to show the defectiveness only of Islam but the defectiveness of any religion in general, so the deists' "praise" of Muhammad and the 'sect' established by him pursued if not a total denial of religion, at least a denial of "institutionalized" religion in the name of a "natural" one.⁹ The English deists used the theme of 'Islam' for their attempts to discredit the ecclesiastical institutions and to denounce as unfounded the claims of Christianity to be the Religion of Revelation. John Toland, who was an exact contemporary of Krastyo Peykich, was the author of books which encountered a strong reaction, such as *Christianity Non Mysterious* (1696) and *Nazarenus, or Jewish, Gentile and Mahometan Christianity* (1718), where Islam was portrayed as an attempt to restore monotheism (which had been destroyed by Christians) and as a religion that kept intact its relationship with

⁸ Cf. N. DANIEL, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Oxford: Oneworld, 1993², p. 312.

⁹ *Ibi*, p. 309. Cf. MINUTI, *Orientalismo*, pp. 186-187.

“natural” religion (to which Christianity had, on the contrary, stood at a distance throughout its history).¹⁰

It is only natural to expect an instrumental use of the anti-Islamic polemic in response to the deists by their opponents. A particularly good example of such a use is Humphrey Prideaux’s *The True Nature of Imposture Fully Display’d in the Life of Mahomet. With a Discourse annex’d for the Vindication of Christianity from this Charge. Offered to the Consideration of the Deist of the Present Age* (1697), which gained considerable popularity, was reprinted many times and presented a largely fantastic account, based on hardly any authoritative sources of Muhammad’s life (from our contemporary point of view).¹¹

Modern scholars often criticize authors like Prideaux or Voltaire for their unjust accusations of Muhammad and his teaching, and attribute their deficiency to their malevolence, prejudice and, above all, their poor knowledge of Islam and Islamic culture as a result of their refusal to assimilate the accomplishments of their contemporary scholarship: during the seventeenth century, generations of professional Arabists and orientalists contributed to a significant growth of the objective knowledge about Islam and oriental science, philosophy and culture, and made many sources on these topics available. In reality, such criticisms are only apparently well-founded. Although there can be no doubt with regard to the fact that authors like Prideaux or even Voltaire were not well acquainted with much of the very rich source material concerning Islam extant at that time in Europe, and although they might be guilty of bias and inaccuracy, it must be also admitted that they *did not need* any deep and accurate knowledge in Islam since *it was not Islam* they were interested in. In actual fact, they were using the theme only instrumentally and their works reveal their disinterest in the third Abrahamic religion in itself.

¹⁰ Ibi, p. 186.

¹¹ Cf. DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, p. 309; MINUTI, *Orientalismo*, p. 187.

This is the reason why a comparison, on the basis of a criterion of “objectivity,” between a work like Prideaux’s *The True Nature of Imposture Fully Display’d* with, for instance, Adriaan Reeland’s *De religione Mohammedica* (1705)¹² seems to be inappropriate, since the two books differ considerably in both context and aim. Such a comparison was made by Norman Daniel in the following passage (which, by the way, is also a good example of his powerful rhetorical style) from his renowned *Islam and the West*:

Reland’s *De religione Mohammedica* (1705) is certainly the most important of several books that helped to clear away legend and substitute fact, and only fact; it can be studied with profit today. Nonsense that had deceived the learned and indulged the ignorant for so long was not just now temporarily pushed aside by a few authors, but finally excluded from the canon of credibilia acceptable to scholars. Prideaux’s book (1697) was perhaps the last exception; between his and Reland’s there is as great a chasm as there can be between contemporaries.¹³

In the view of the present study, it would appear that there was at least one more exception: our Krastyo Peykich with his *Mohametanus* (1717) would be certainly excluded from the respectable scholars’ Parnassus as designed by Daniel. But it is our belief that a historian should not apply the same measure both to *scholars* on one side and *polemicists* on the other, even when they belong to more or less the same social and cultural context (while making different choices of material and different uses even of the same material), or (in our case even more importantly) to contemporaries active in different parts of the European continent. To be sure, in the early eighteenth century, times were very different in Paris, London or Amsterdam on the one hand, and Sibiu and Trnava on the other.

¹² ADRIANUS RELANDUS, *De Religione mohammedica libri duo, quorum prior exhibet compendium theologiae mohammedicae, posterior examinat nonnulla quae falso Mohammedanis tribuuntur*, Ultrajecti 1705 (1717²). On David Durand’s French translation of the same work (1721), see MINUTI, *Orientalismo*, pp. 181-185.

¹³ DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, p. 318.

Be that as it may, the point here is that scholarly studies on Oriental languages and on the Islamic religion and culture made considerable progress in the course of the seventeenth century, so that, to quote Norman Daniel once more, “much more authentic information became available than had been made so since the thirteenth century.”¹⁴

1.2. *The seventeenth-century rise of Arabic studies and the flourishing of “Baroque writings on Islam”*

An important contribution to providing this authentic information was made by the schools for the study of the Arabic language of some religious orders, operating in the Apennine Peninsula, especially in Rome.¹⁵ Of these orders, that of the Clerics Regular Minor (*Chierici Regolari Minori*, also called *Caracciolini* after the name of one of its founders, St. Francesco Caracciolo) specialized particularly in the study of Oriental languages. Within this Order, linguistic learning was initially fostered for the sake of biblical exegesis but gradually the training in languages acquired the function of a preparation for missionaries in the Middle East.¹⁶ Filippo Guadagnoli (1596-1656), a professor of Arabic at *La Sapienza* University and famous as one of the greatest Roman Arabists of his age, was a member of that Order.

Guadagnoli was the author of a very successful *Apologia pro Christiana religione* (1631). As suggested by the subtitle of the work (*Apologia pro Christiana religione qua a r.p. Philippo Guadagnolo respondetur ad obiectiones Ahmed Filii Zin Alabedin, Persae Asphahensis, contentans in libro*

¹⁴ Ibi, p. 317.

¹⁵ G. PIZZORUSSO, *La preparazione linguistica e controversistica dei missionari per l'Oriente islamico: scuole, testi, insegnanti a Roma e in Italia*, in B. HEYBERGER et al. (eds.), *L'Islam visto dall'Occidente: Cultura e religione del Seicento europeo di fronte all'Islam*. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Milano, 17-18 ottobre 2007), Milano - Genova: Marietti, 2009, pp. 253-288, in part. p. 253.

¹⁶ PIZZORUSSO, *La preparazione linguistica*, pp. 257-258.

inscripto Politor speculi), this was not an apology of Christianity “in principle” but a response to a polemical text, *Politor speculi*, written by the Persian Ahmad b. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn (d. c. 1651), an Islamic scholar of great erudition and polemical force. In translation, the complete title of the latter treatise reads ‘The Cleaner for the Brightening and Polishing of the Truth-Showing Mirror’.¹⁷ Besides offering a very strong and convincing argumentation, *Politor speculi*, which was brought to Rome by a Carmelite friar in 1625,¹⁸ also revealed its author’s excellent knowledge of the doctrine of Christianity.¹⁹ It was written as a refutation of an earlier polemical work by a Christian writer, Jerome Xavier’s *The Truth-Showing Mirror*,²⁰ where the Jesuit author and head of the Jesuit mission at the Moghul Emperor’s tried to confute and denounce as unfair the accusation of forgery of the Bible, of which the Islamic polemicists traditionally accused Christians. Jerome Xavier’s treatise was composed in about 1600, originally in Spanish, but the version which Ahmad b. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn came to read in 1622 was an abbreviation of it in Persian.

Guadagnoli, besides being the author of the influential *Apologia pro Christiana religione*, was also an Arabist and a biblical scholar who took part in the project for a translation of the Bible into Arabic, which after many vicissitudes and interruptions and more than a half a century after it had been started, was accomplished only in 1671.²¹ Guadagnoli’s successor to the chair of the Arabic language at *La Sapienza*, Ludovico Marracci, the most excellent

¹⁷ I follow the translation given by N. MALCOLM, “Comenius, the Conversion of the Turks, and the Muslim-Christian Debate on the Corruption of Scripture,” *Church History and Religious Culture*, 87 (2007), pp. 477-508 and 504.

¹⁸ For a detailed account of this story, see MALCOLM, “Comenius, the Conversion of the Turks...,” pp. 502-505.

¹⁹ *Ibi*, p. 504.

²⁰ *Ibi*, p. 503. Cf. also MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings,” p. 62.

²¹ G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, “Ludovico Marracci e la sua opera negli studi islamici,” in *ID.*, *Aneddoti e svaghi arabi e non arabi*, Milano-Napoli: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1959, pp. 198-199.

Arabist of the seventeenth century, was mainly responsible for the revision of the Arabic Bible.

Ludovico Marracci (1612-1700) was a cleric in the Order of the Clerics Regular of the Mother of God (*Chierici regolari della Madre di Dio*), and Pope Innocent XI's confessor. He is most famous for being the editor of a printed edition of the Arabic text of the *Koran*, complete with annotations, a commentary and a Latin version, which was highly appreciated by his contemporaries and immediate successors and is still appreciated by Orientalists today.²² Marracci's translation of the *Koran* was the standard one used throughout the entire eighteenth century.²³ It was published in 1698 by the typography founded by Cardinal Barbarigo of the Seminary in Padua. This edition also included Marracci's famous refutation of the *Koran* (*Prodromus Alcorani*), which had first been published separately several years earlier, in 1691, in Rome.

Even though Guadagnoli and Marracci were not directly involved in missions, their contributions to the field of Arabic studies are to be seen in the context of the renewed evangelical zeal of the reformed Catholic Church. In Italy, the intensification of studies in Oriental languages during the seventeenth century was closely connected to the mission-oriented politics of the Papacy.²⁴ Still conditioned by policies aiming to promote missions, and

²² According to C.A. NALLINO, *Le fonti arabe manoscritte dell'opera di Ludovico Marracci sul Corano*, in ID., *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti*, ed. M. Nallino, Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1940, vol. 2, pp. 90-134, on p. 90, Marracci's translation was of great use for George Sale, who in 1734 published his outstanding English version of the *Koran*. In connection to the evaluation of Marracci's translation and confutation of the *Koran* by Leibniz, cf. HAMILTON, *A Lutheran Translator*, pp. 198-199. Hamilton also describes a boom of interest in the field on the part of European intellectuals and reports a long list of late seventeenth-century full, or more frequently partial, translations of the *Koran*, among which André Du Ryer's French version (1647), which was the first vernacular translation of the *Koran* ever made directly from Arabic. *Ibi*, p. 197.

²³ LEVI DELLA VIDA, *Aneddoti e svaghi*, pp. 193-194.

²⁴ Cf. "Nel secolo XVII in Italia le pubblicazioni d'argomento arabistico diventano monopolio di sacerdoti e frati, il cui interesse non è più rivolto alle scienze profane, ma solo

parallel to the progress in linguistic studies and the introduction of increasingly authentic material on Islam, was the literary production by, or serving the needs of, the missionaries who were caring spiritually for Catholic communities living within the political boundaries of Islamic states. The late seventeenth century was the “golden age” of this genre of writings, “Baroque writings on Islam” as Thomas Michel calls them,²⁵ a considerable number of which were composed by members of the Jesuit Order.

Part of that heritage is discussed in a programme article by Emanuele Colombo.²⁶ He directs his attention to polemical anti-Islamic treatises by several Jesuit authors, among whom such a long-experienced missionary as the Frenchman Michael Nau (d. 1683),²⁷ and such a scholar as Nicolò Maria Pallavicino (1621-1692), professor of philosophy and theology at the Roman Jesuit College, counselor and personal theologian of Christina, Queen of Sweden, who in 1688 published his famous *Le moderne prosperità della Chiesa Cattolica contro il Maccomettismo*.²⁸ The overview of this literature offered by Colombo shows that in the 1680s and the 1690s it was influenced both by fear in the face of the Turkish threat and advance in Europe and by the rejoicing after the victory of Vienna.²⁹ According to Colombo, these writings

alla preparazione di mezzi per lo studio della lingua araba in vista delle missioni ed alla pubblicazione di libri da servire ai bisogni religiosi e di filosofia elementare dei Cristiani di lingua araba, oppure alla polemica contro i Musulmani od ance contro Protestanti che si valevano d'interpretazioni inesatte di testi storici arabi per attaccare il Papato.” – NALLINO, *Le fonti arabe manoscritte*, pp. 126-127.

²⁵ MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings.”

²⁶ E. COLOMBO, *Jesuits and Islam in Seventeenth-Century Europe: War, Preaching and Conversions*, in HEYBERGER, *L'Islam visto dall'Occidente*, pp. 289-314.

²⁷ MICHAEL NAU, *Religio Christiana contra Alcoranum per Alcoranum pacifice defensa ac probata*, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1680. Three of these authors (Michel Nau, Tirso González de Santalla, Emmanuel Sanz) are also discussed in the earlier article by MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings.”

²⁸ NICOLÒ MARIA PALLAVICINO, *Le moderne prosperità della Chiesa Cattolica contro il Maccomettismo*, Roma 1688.

²⁹ COLOMBO, *Jesuits and Islam*, p. 318.

reveal several points of difference compared to the medieval Christian anti-Islamic polemic. The differences are formulated by Colombo as follows: first, although these writings recycled the old polemical arguments that had been developed during the Middle Ages, they placed them in a new context, namely that of the “triumphs of the Church” manifested both by the military victories over the Turks, putting an end to their expansion on the European continent (which had been relentless until the end of the 1670s), and by the advance of the Counter-Reformation, which effectively opposed the rapid spread of Protestantism and Calvinism;³⁰ the second difference is the use in these books, when compared to their medieval counterparts, of much more authentic information about Islam;³¹ the third and final dissimilarity that Colombo sees between seventeenth-century writings on Islam and the earlier ones is the significance that later authors ascribed to “personal experience.” They told stories in the first-person and proposed argumentative strategies allegedly tested in their own apostolic practice among infidels.³² Of the three characteristics, peculiar, Colombo says, to late seventeenth-century Christian anti-Muslim polemical writings, the third does not perhaps express a real qualitative but possibly only a quantitative change, as references to personal experience are also frequently found in works by medieval controversialists, especially by those who were involved in the missionary enterprise. Be that as it may, all three peculiarities outlined by Colombo also occur in Peykich’s *Mahometanus*.

Although characterized by such novelties, late seventeenth-century Jesuit writings on Islam were still entirely in accordance with the millennium-long tradition of the Christian-Muslim polemic and, indeed, represented its final and conclusive stage.³³ As stated above, Krastyo Peykich was one of the exponents of the last stage of this tradition, possibly even the very last known

³⁰ Ibi, p. 325.

³¹ Ibi, p. 326.

³² Ibi, p. 327.

³³ MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings,” p. 59.

one.³⁴ Therefore, the following brief description of the history and development of this tradition and an overview of its contents seems to be called for here.

1.3 A brief account on the history of the Christian-Muslim polemic

a) *The birth of the polemic and the early centuries of its development*

The millennium-long history of the Christian-Muslim polemic originates, in a certain sense, in the sacred book of the Muslims, the *Koran*, itself.³⁵ The attitude towards Christians, their teaching and their manners found in the *Koran* is complex and to some degree ambivalent.³⁶ It does not necessarily disapprove of Christianity or mock Christian practices. Nevertheless, the *Koran* explicitly and unequivocally rebuts two principal teachings of Christianity: the doctrine of the Trinity and that of the Incarnation.³⁷ In fact,

³⁴ В. БЕХИНЬОВА [V. BENINYOVA], “Барокът и литературата на българските католици” [The Baroque Age and Bulgarian Catholics’ Literature], *Литературна мисъл* [Literary Thought], 2 (1975), pp. 82-97, also includes Peykich among the Baroque writers.

³⁵ For a bibliography on the history of Christian-Muslim relations, see R. CASPAR *et al.*, “Bibliographie du dialogue islamo-chrétien,” *Islamochristiana*, 1 (1975), pp. 125-181; 2 (1976), pp. 187-249; 3 (1977), pp. 255-286; 4 (1978), pp. 247-267; 5 (1979), pp. 299-317; 6 (1980), pp. 259-299; 7 (1981), pp. 299-307; 10 (1984), pp. 273-292; 13 (1987), pp. 173-180; 15 (1989), pp. 169-174. We now have an excellent new instrument for the study of this extensive literature: *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, 3 vol., Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009-2011.

³⁶ Although, as Thomas Michel makes quite clear in his article, it is by no means “an odd hotchpotch.” It “rather makes very good sense within the patterns of the Qur’anic understanding of God and humanity and against the backdrop of Muhammad’s developing relationship with the various groups which he addresses.” – MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings,” p. 24. In this connection see also J. HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, *Christians and Christianity in the Qur’ān*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 21-30.

³⁷ As affirmed by S.H. GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret: Christian Apologetics in the World of Islam*, in J.J. VAN GINKEL *et al.* (eds.), *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, Peeters - Departement Oosterse Studies, Leuven *et al.* 2005, pp. 92-126, in part. pp. 91 and 113.

the doctrine of the Incarnation is rarely attacked directly. For instance, in *sūra* 3 the central issue is the Jewish refusal to recognize Muhammad as a Prophet, and it is only in this context that the story of Jesus' birth from Mary and his life as God's messenger is told, so that this story works as a kind of precedent for Jewish unbelief in God's prophets.³⁸ Similar references are present in *sūras* 4 and 61.³⁹ Jesus, son of the righteous virgin Mary, is described in the *Koran* as one in the long sequence of prophets like Noah, Abraham, Moses and others; this sequence is completed and finalized by Muhammad and the revelation of the *Koran*, which stands in continuity with, and is the culmination and the finalization of, all earlier revelations.⁴⁰

The latter statement, however, immediately creates a problem, which David Marshall has thus formulated: If what Muhammad teaches is a continuation and an affirmation of previous scriptures (the Tora and the Gospel), why do Jews and Christians (the so called 'People of the Book') not accept it? This issue is addressed for instance in *sūra* 5. In the *Koran*, one can already find (for example, in *sūra* 2) a suggestion for the course that would later be followed by Muslim polemicists in order to solve this question. Although no definitive answer is offered, either a deliberate misreading of certain texts on the part of the 'People of the Book', or a possible loss of some parts or passages of the Scripture due to their lack of care of it, or, finally, an active corruption of the sacred texts by Jews or Christians, were suggested as possible explanations for the phenomenon of the disbelief of the 'People of the Book' in Muhammad's prophecy.⁴¹

³⁸ D. MARSHALL, *Christianity in the Qur'an*, in L. RIDGEON (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations of Christianity*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000, pp. 3-29, makes this reference to *sūra* 3 and comments on it on pp. 12-13.

³⁹ *Ibi*, pp. 14-15.

⁴⁰ *Ibi*, pp. 4-6. About *Koranic* passages where the Gospel is affirmed as a precursor of the latest revelation received through Muhammad, see *ibi*, pp. 18-19.

⁴¹ MARSHALL, *Christianity in the Qur'an*, pp. 19-20. Cf. "In so far as the Biblical text now known to us is inconsistent with the Qur'an, Muslims believe, sometimes that the latter abrogates the earlier revelations, sometimes that Jews and Christians understand the text

After the death of Muhammad in 632, the second half of the seventh century saw a further advance in Muslim Arabs' conquests. They extended their rule over North Africa, Spain and the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire with the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria. In accordance with their religious code,⁴² the new landlords in the former Byzantine provinces allowed Jews and Christians to continue following their own religious laws, thus both tolerating their faith and practices and obliging them to isolate themselves from the ("progressive") rest of society and to stay enclosed within their own communities.⁴³ At the same time, for mainly sociological reasons, a process of assimilation was taking place in those territories, since, after Norman Daniel's brief and impressive formula, "to the ruling race, assimilation was easy."⁴⁴

It seems that initially the Oriental Christian communities paid no particular attention to their new overlords' religion but this situation changed in the

perversely, and sometimes that the exiting text does not faithfully represent the revelations actually made to Jews and Christians in turn. These were committed to human care, without being verbally guaranteed as the Qur'an was." – DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, p. 67.

⁴² "The impulse to bring Christians into Islam is revealed in the political and military policy of the earliest Muslim conquerors, as they applied the Qur'anic injunction to call on unbelievers to surrender, and if they did not submit they should be forcibly subdued until peace should reign and the true religion of Islam prevail" (Qur'an: 8:38, 39). This policy was attenuated in the early days of Islam by offering unbelievers (including Christians and Jews) one of three choices: accept Islam; refuse to accept Islam, thereby adopting the status of *dhimmī*, or protected minority carrying the obligation to pay a poll tax (*jizya*); or thirdly refuse both of the above and be obliged to defend themselves against the armed might of the Muslims." – M. SPEIGHT, *Christians in the Hadīth Literature*, in RIDGEON (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations*, pp. 30-53, quotation from pp. 35-36.

⁴³ In connection with this paradoxical effect of the politics of religious toleration in medieval Islamic states, cf. N. DANIEL, *Islam and Europe*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966, pp. 3-4.

⁴⁴ Ibi, p. 3. For a comprehensive overview of some sociological aspects of the progress made by Islam in the process of its diffusion and becoming a world religion, see A. MINKOV, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kisve Bahasi Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2004, pp. 9-28, who also provides an extensive bibliography of works on the topic.

eighth century, when the first Christian apologetics were written.⁴⁵ Sidney H. Griffith calls our attention to the fact that Christian polemicists who lived under Muslim rule used to write in Syrian and Arabic and to produce mainly apologetic literature, while texts in Greek were to be produced only within the boundaries of the Byzantine Empire and were normally much more aggressive in style.⁴⁶ According to Griffith, chapter 100 of John of Damascus' († before 754) *On Heresies* was the sole exception to this rule.⁴⁷ It was the only text in the Christian-Muslim polemic written in Greek within the world of Islam and it, furthermore, moulded the topical agenda of Christian apologetics in the Greek language for centuries to come.⁴⁸

In Christian writings in Arabic dating from the eighth century, a certain set of themes, which was to become standard in the apologetic tradition, was already proposed. Notwithstanding this, in the following centuries, the topical agenda was enriched, new themes and new arguments being added. On the one hand, there was the challenge on the part of Muslim polemicists who took cues from the *Koran* in order to accuse Christians of having adulterated the authentic Gospel of Christ. They developed these hints into a distinctly

⁴⁵ I owe this information to GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret*, pp. 92 and 95.

⁴⁶ GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret*, p. 95.

⁴⁷ *On Heresies* is the second of the three parts of John of Damascus's best known work, the *Fount of Knowledge*. As far as chapter 100 in it is concerned, the entry *John of Damascus* by R.F. GLEI, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 295-301 is an appropriate introduction. For an initial bibliography on John of Damascus with regard to his anti-Muslim polemic, see the same entry. D.J. SAHAS, *John of Damascus on Islam. The "Heresy of the Ishmaelites"*, Leiden: Brill, 1972 is the classical study on the subject.

⁴⁸ Cf. GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret*, p. 95. Reinhold F. Gleis appraisal of this brief treatise of John of Damascus is similar: "It formed the image of Islam, at least in the Greek world, for many centuries, and exerted wider influence among Christian readers. [...] With regard to apologetics, the main themes treated are the Trinity, Christology, and soteriology. With regard to polemics, the person of Muhammad, the nature and composition of the Qur'an, and the supposed inclination of Muslims to bodily desires (including the rather 'earthly' eschatology) remained important topics in Christian-Muslim disputation." – GLEI, *John of Damascus*, quotation from p. 299.

polemical strategy to attack Christians and their religion. Consequently, the defence of the genuineness of the Scriptures grew to be the central topic on the Christian apologetic agenda. It continued to be so even in the seventeenth century. To give just one example, in Filippo Guadagnoli's *Apologia pro Christiana religione*, the defence of the authenticity of the canonical Gospels is the central issue to which all other arguments are subordinated. In his response to Sayyed Ahmad's *Politor speculi*, Guadagnoli even placed this issue first (before the theoretical discussion about the Trinity and the Incarnation, and the moral and historical discussion concerning Muhammad), although in *Politor speculi* the order was inverted and the authenticity of the Scriptures was the last of the four points discussed.⁴⁹

On the other hand, several important and authoritative *Lives* of Muhammad appeared in the Muslim world during the eighth century, which contributed significantly to the consolidation of the legend about him but also gave the Arabic Christian controversialists a direct and easy target for their attacks on Islam.⁵⁰ As is frequently the case in history, the confrontation between two rival religions or religious denominations at the same time stimulated a more precise definition and a further elaboration of their own doctrines.⁵¹

b) *The sources of knowledge about Islam in the West*

The Christian apologetic tradition in Arabic, established between the eighth and the ninth century within the world of Islam, was brought to Europe, where it retained both its topical agenda and its general bipartite frame transmitting, on the one hand, arguments in defence of the Christian doctrine against the

⁴⁹ MALCOLM, "Comenius, the Conversion of the Turks...", p. 505.

⁵⁰ The first systematic efforts to define the life of Muhammad date from the middle of the eighth century, and by the 830s the 'canonical' narrative of the prophet's life was established. – GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret*, pp. 112-113.

⁵¹ Ibi, pp. 96, 112-113, 125-126. On this process of "sharing and of boundary setting," see also D. THOMAS, *Introduction*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 1-19, quotation from p. 19.

traditional Muslim attacks, and, on the other, an attack on Muhammad's life and teaching.

By far the most famous case of such a transmission was the translation of the treatise known as the *Apology of al-Kindī*, drawn up in about 830. It is fashioned as two epistles, where in the first Islam is defended as the superior religion, and a very generic description of its doctrine is offered, while the second is a wide-ranging apology of Christian articles of faith and religious practices, as well as a critical discussion of the *Koran*, Muhammad's personality and Islamic law and customs.⁵² The two epistles were signed by two real or fictional authors, 'Abd Allāh ibn Ismā'īl al-Hāshimī for the exposition of the Islamic doctrine, and 'Abd al-Masīh ibn Ishāq al-Kindī for the Christian apology.⁵³ The treatise was translated from the original Arabic into Latin in 1142 by Peter of Toledo and was one of the basic sources of Islamic studies both for medieval and for early modern European controversialists.⁵⁴

Peter of Toledo translated the *Apology of al-Kindī* in response to the request of Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny (d. 1156). It thus became part of the

⁵² GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret*, p. 106.

⁵³ About the controversy among scholars concerning the mysterious authorship of the text, see P.S. VAN KONINGSVELD, *The Apology of Al-Kindi*, in T.L. HETTEMA - A. VAN DER KOOIJ (eds.), *Religious polemics in context: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR)*. Leiden, 27-28 April, 2000, Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2004, pp. 69-92, in part. p. 69. For a comprehensive discussion on the manuscript tradition – both Latin and Arabic – of the *Apology*, see *ibi*, as well as M.-Th. D'ALVERNY, "Deux Traductions latines du Coran au moyen-âge," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge*, 22-23 (1947-1948), pp. 69-98. As for modern editions of the text, one may consult a translation in Italian in AL-KINDI, *Apologia del cristianesimo*, ed. and tr. L. Bottini, Milano: Jaca Book, 1998; or in English in N.A. NEWMAN (ed.), *The Early Christian-Muslim Dialogue: A Collection of Documents from the First Three Islamic Centuries (632-900 AD). Translations with Commentary*, Hatfield: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1993, pp. 355-545.

⁵⁴ VAN KONINGSVELD, *The Apology of Al-Kindi*, p. 69; cf. K.M. SETTON, *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1992, p. 48.

collection of sources usually referred to as *Corpus Cluniacense*, the Corpus of Cluny. The texts of this corpus were all collected and translated into Latin by order of Peter. They include most notably the first Latin translation of the *Koran* (*Lex Mahumet pseudoprophete*, “Law of Muhammad the false prophet”), carried out by Robert of Ketton (d. c. 1160) in 1143; then two translations by Hermann the Dalmatian (d. c. 1160) and known under the Latin titles *De generatione Mahumet* and *Doctrina Mahumet*; and Peter the Venerable’s own *Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum* and *Liber contra sectam sive haeresim Saracenorum*.⁵⁵ The texts included in the *Corpus Cluniacense* represented the primary source of information about Islam for a period which lasted until the outset of the thirteenth-century wave of translations from Arabic.⁵⁶

Robert of Ketton’s translation of the *Koran* is strongly criticized by contemporary scholars for not being faithful to the Arabic original and for being “more paraphrase than translation.”⁵⁷ Another medieval Latin version of the *Koran* existed, made by Marc who, along with Peter, the translator of the *Apology of al-Kindī*, was another representative of the School of Toledo. Unlike Robert of Ketton, Marc of Toledo aimed to prepare a literal translation.⁵⁸ His version, however, was not awarded the vast circulation and popularity of Robert of Ketton’s, which remained the standard one during the Middle Ages and even later.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ VAN KONINGSVELD, *The Apology of Al-Kindi*, p. 70.

⁵⁶ DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, p. 22.

⁵⁷ Ibi, p. 41.

⁵⁸ Ibi, pp. 41, 44 etc. For all Daniel’s observations on, and the comparison between, the two translations, see the entire discussion on pp. 35-99 (Chapter I: *Revelation: Christian Understanding of Islamic Belief* and Chapter II: *Revelation: The Christian Attack upon ‘Pseudoprophecy’*).

⁵⁹ In 1543, in Basel, Robert of Ketton’s Latin version of the *Koran* was published in print by Theodor Buchmann ‘Bibliander’ (1504-1564). It was edited, together with the other texts of the *Corpus Cluniacense*, in two volumes entitled *Machumetis Sarracenorum Principis vita ac doctrina omnis, quae at Ismahelitarum lex et Alcoranum dicitur*. Bibliander himself

By the end of the thirteenth century, as Norman Daniels's survey revealed, the Christian attitude towards Islam as well as the main motifs in the Christian anti-Muslim polemic, were compiled into one more or less complete and stable corpus of ideas.⁶⁰ For the formation of that corpus, the most important authors were Pedro Pascual (d. 1300), a Spanish saint who suffered death as a martyr; the distinguished logician and philosopher Ramón Lull (1232-1315), also venerated as martyr; and Riccoldo da Montecroce (d. 1320), who was a Dominican and a missionary in the Middle East. Riccoldo da Montecroce's *Refutatio Alcorani*, which was printed in Seville in 1500, was still highly influential during the sixteenth century. In 1511 the French Humanist and translator of the New Testament into French (1523) Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (c. 1455-1536) already published a French translation of Riccoldo's treatise,⁶¹ and in 1542 Martin Luther published a German translation of it.⁶²

When, in the fifteenth century, Nicholas of Cusa wrote his dialogue on the agreement among different religions (*De pace fidei*, 1453) and his treatise on "sifting" or "screening" the *Koran*, that is to say separating chaff from grain in the sacred book of Muslims (*Cribratio Alkorani*, 1461), he relied on the very same sources to increase his own knowledge about Islam and the *Koran*. Therefore, the points of comparison between the doctrines of Christianity and Islam that he faced and the weapon of polemical arguments applied would appear to be very traditional, although he arranged them in a concordistic

wrote an apology to his edition and Martin Luther added a 'Forewarning' (*Praemonitio*) to the reader. For a bibliography on the complicated story of this publication, consult J. KRITZECK, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964, pp. vii-viii. In 1547, in Venice, Andrea Arrivabene published his Italian translation of the *Koran*, which was heavily dependent (as argued by SETTON, *Western Hostility to Islam*, p. 49) on Robert of Ketton's.

⁶⁰ DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, pp. 11 and 16.

⁶¹ The latter piece of information is reported by A. MALVEZZI, *L'Islamismo e la cultura europea*, Sansoni, Firenze 1956, p. 216.

⁶² K.M. SETTON, "Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril," *Balkan Studies*, 3 (1962), pp. 133-168, in part. p. 161.

perspective and aimed to show the possibility of, and need for, a constructive inter-religious dialogue.⁶³

c) *The themes of medieval anti-Muslim polemic*

As has been pointed out, the Middle Ages witnessed the elaboration of the Europeans' canon of ideas and knowledge about Islam together with the elaboration of the main points in the Christian anti-Muslim polemic. Speaking very generically, this standard topical agenda may be divided into two groups: defensive or apologetic arguments, and offensive or critical arguments.

The former include the defence of the doctrine of Christ as Son of God and related themes concerning the Incarnation and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, as well as the dispute concerning the authenticity of the Gospels. The other subject considered herein is the traditional Muslim accusation of Christians of idolatry.

To the second group belongs the issue concerning the nature of the *Koran*: whether it is a divine revelation or a product of imposture and “pseudoprophecy.”⁶⁴ The “genre” of comparing the moral code and the laws

⁶³ Cf. DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, pp. 177-278; N. BISAHA, *Creating East and West. Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006, p. 146. For a more detailed analysis of these works and a critical evaluation of the (presumed) originality and innovations of Cusanus's approach, see for instance J.E. BIECHLER, “Christian Humanism Confronts Islam: Sifting the Qur'an with Nicholas of Cusa,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 13 (1976), pp. 1-14; J. HOPKINS, *The Role of pia interpretatio in Nicholas of Cusa's Hermeneutical Approach to the Koran*, in G. PIAIA (ed.), *Concordia discors. Studi su Niccolò Cusano e l'Umanesimo europeo offerti a Giovanni Santinello*, Antenore, Padova 1993, pp. 251-273. The Latin text of the treatises is in NICOLAUS DE CUSA, *Opera omnia*, vol. 7: *De pace fidei*, ed. R. Klibansky - H. Bascour, Hamburg: F. Meiner Verlag, 1970 and in NICOLAUS DE CUSA, *Opera omnia*, vol. 8: *Cribratio Alkorani*, ed. L. Hagemann, Hamburg: F. Meiner Verlag, 1986, respectively. An English translation is given in J. HOPKINS (ed.), *Nicholas of Cusa's De pace fidei and Cribratio Alkorani. Translation and Analysis*, Minneapolis: Arthur Banning, 1990.

⁶⁴ DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, pp. 67-99 (Chapter II: *Revelation: The Christian Attack upon 'Pseudoprophecy'*).

imposed in each of the two religions, where those of the Muslims are invariably denounced as deceptive and inciting moral corruption, is also included in this group. The same category contains the favourite topic of Christian polemicists of all times, that is the story of Muhammad's life and manners, which they traditionally drew on in order to prove that Muhammad had contrived a religion suited to himself, thanks to which he and his friends could satisfy their most contemptible desires.

Together with the afore-mentioned issues, which formed the main body of the Christian-Muslim polemic, there were also others that offered an inexhaustible source of inspiration for the imagination and eloquence of Christian controversialists. Among them was, for instance, the Koranic idea of paradise. A typical approach used by medieval polemicists was to compare the Muslim image of paradise as a garden of corporeal delights (a highly agreeable climate, rippling brooks and the company of wide-eyed maidens) with the Catholic teaching of the beatific vision of God as a reward reserved for the saints He has elected.⁶⁵ The definition of the Muslim idea of the afterlife in heaven as a "bestial paradise" is another *locus communis* in anti-Muslim polemical treatises.

The institution of marriage in Islam was one of the most sensitive questions for Christian polemicists. Together with polygamy, another scandal in their eyes was the possibility for Muslim men and women to divorce, which was seen as glaring contradiction with the concept of marriage as such. Moreover, from the point of view of the Catholic moral code, the practice of consecutive divorces and remarriages was interpreted as polygamy extended in time.⁶⁶ For Christian controversialists, a further contentious aspect of the Muslim marital laws were temporary marriages, when the sides negotiated to cohabit for a certain preliminarily defined period of time.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Ibi, p. 172.

⁶⁶ Ibi, pp. 158-160.

⁶⁷ Ibi, p. 161-162.

d) *The social function of anti-Muslim polemic during the Renaissance and the early modern period*

Insofar as the institution of matrimony and thus the Christian family was considered to be the basis of Christian society, the criticism of Muslim customs in this regard had an important social aspect, which became increasingly important from the moment when the Ottomans firmly established themselves as the preeminent power in southeastern Europe and the Mediterranean. Islamic marital law not only stimulated Christian polemicists' imagination but was also considered to be a very dangerous temptation and a potential reason for subjects of Christian states to renounce their religion and become Muslims, for which, by custom, they would be rewarded with new clothing, money, gifts and even women.⁶⁸

Besides looking for the immediate reward offered by conversion, another motive for changing one's religion was that such a step often proved to be a ready way to solve marital problems.⁶⁹ In reality, such sociological motives,

⁶⁸ Ibi, p. 160. Friars and priests were the most notorious apostates. The most famous case of a clergyman who converted to Islam was that of the Franciscan Anselm Turmeda (c. 1355 - c. 1423), against whom his former fellow monks raised the accusation that he had taken the decision to abandon their faith merely for his wish to have a wife. The autobiographical account of Anselm Turmeda actually ends with the communication that, having been rewarded with clothes and gifts on the occasion of his conversion and having received, from the Sultan of Tunis, a good position in the state administration, he took a wife, who later gave him a son. L. ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco. Esperienze ed immagini dell'Islam nell'Italia moderna*, Roma: Istituto per l'oriente C.A. Nallino, 1983, p. 79. An English translation of his autobiography is consultable in D.F. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001, pp. 196-20. Tijana Krstić makes a very interesting analysis of the phenomenon (and the literary trope in Ottoman conversion narratives) of the conversion of Christian clergymen in the Ottoman Empire in early modern times. – T. KRSTIĆ, *Contested Conversions to Islam. Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011, pp. 68-76.

⁶⁹ Cf. in this connection E. DURSTELER, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, p. 107.

together, and often in correlation with, economic ones, were the main stimuli for conversion in early modern times. In contrast, the drive to escape from the restrictions imposed by Christian moral norms on eating or on the satisfaction of sexual desire were, as stated by Lucia Rostagno, more legendary than any true spur to conversion.⁷⁰ Or, as Eric R. Dursteler puts it, “Poverty, ignorance, oppression, and the hope of better socioeconomic conditions, all were powerful motivations for religious nomadism.”⁷¹

The phenomenon of apostasy in Early Modern Europe is documented, and it was not a rare occurrence.⁷² The exact number of converts from Christianity, whether of Catholic or another denomination, during the early-modern era is not known and is difficult to determine. Scholars estimate them at tens, even hundreds, of thousands.⁷³ To combat the phenomenon of apostasy, which, among others, also had an economic dimension for Christian states since it deprived them of part of their workforce, was arguably the most important mission of anti-Muslim propaganda in the Early Modern Age.

⁷⁰ ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco*, pp. 3 and 63-64.

⁷¹ DURSTELER, *Venetians in Constantinople*, quotation from p. 113.

⁷² Historical studies show that between the sixteenth and the seventeenth century a continuous stream of emigrants fled from the South of Italy to the Ottoman Empire. Cf. for instance L. ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco*, p. 26: “I dati segnalano per lungo tempo, sino a tutto il '700, una forte spinta alla fuga in Nord Africa.” On the conversion to Islam in the early modern period, see also MINKOV, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans* and T. KRSTIĆ, *Contested Conversions to Islam*.

⁷³ DURSTELER, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p. 112. In her *Rinnegati: Per una storia dell'identità occidentale*, Roma: Laterza, 1993, p. 4, Lucetta Scaraffia speaks about 300,000 renegades for the period between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and some several thousands more for the eighteenth century. Detailed statistic data concerning apostasy and a subsequent return to Catholicism in early modern Europe was compiled and published by B. BENNASSAR - L. BENNASSAR, *Los cristianos de Alá. La fascinante aventura de los renegados*, tr. J.L.G. Aristu, Madrid: Nerea, 1989.

e) *Two further contributions to the anti-Muslim polemic:
the humanists and Martin Luther*

The co-existence of the two worlds on the Mediterranean Sea and in eastern and central Europe inevitably caused the appearance of some new aspects in the Christian polemic with Islam. Some of these new aspects appeared as early as in the 15th century in the aftermath of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and the fall of the Byzantine Empire. In her studies on Humanist reactions to the Ottoman advance, Nancy Bisaha has shown Renaissance thinkers' original contribution to the anti-Muslim polemic, most notably by the means of their use of classical exempla,⁷⁴ the practice which permitted them, for the first time in the history of this polemic, to adopt a secular tone in their discussions.⁷⁵ As James Hankins has already shown, the Italian Quattrocento humanists produced a vast corpus of crusade propaganda texts. Even if they applied the anti-Muslim polemic in their writings, the religious motives for undertaking a crusade were attributed a less important place in their strategy of persuasion. Instead, they favoured arguments based on the principle of "necessity" or "ease."⁷⁶

In contrast to the Italian *Quattrocento* humanists, Martin Luther developed a religiously motivated anti-Muslim polemic in an apocalyptic key. After the battle of Mohács (1526), and particularly after the first Ottoman siege of Vienna (1529), Luther became concerned about the Ottoman advance in

⁷⁴ BISAHA, *Creating East and West*, p. 13.

⁷⁵ Ibi, p. 43. On p. 44 Nancy Bisaha criticizes Normal Daniel for having overlooked the originality of the humanist treatments of the Turks. While this criticism may be justified as far as Daniel's *Islam and the West* (1960) is concerned, it is certainly unfair with regard to his *Islam and Europe* (1966), where he states as follows: "To the European store of ideas about Islam much that was new was added in the period of Ottoman greatness. [...] The old theological view of Christians was little changed, but a new secular image overlaid it at every point." – DANIEL, *Islam and Europe*, pp. 22-23.

⁷⁶ J. HANKINS, "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 49 (1995), pp. 111-208. In connection with the topics of 'necessity' and 'ease' see p. 120 in particular.

Europe and remained so for the rest of his life.⁷⁷ At the same time, he was opposed to the idea of a crusade or any war headed by the Pope and was of the opinion that the war against the Turks had to be a secular, not a religious, one – a *Türkenkrieg* (Turkish war) and not a *Kreuzzug* (Crusade) – and had to be waged by the secular princes. He composed three works,⁷⁸ where he called the attention of his compatriots to the Turkish peril and affirmed that the Turks were coming according to the will of God to chastise and punish Christians for their impiety.⁷⁹

The apocalyptic excitement and eschatological fervour that characterized the intellectual reaction after the first Ottoman siege of Vienna were, as it has been pointed out, missing in the polemical works which appeared after the second siege of 1683. Peykich was a contemporary of the second and ultimate siege and shared the optimism of the authors of that period.⁸⁰ At the same time, his *Mahometanus* was to some degree extraneous to the exemplary specimens of the genre of the handbooks for the conversion of Mohammedans. Arguably, part of its peculiarities depended on its author's experience and on the fact that the *Mahometanus* was not only published in Transylvania but probably also written there, although it is possible that part of the work had already been carried out in 1705 and in 1709 in Venice. As we move on to start our analysis of the book, we have to bear in mind that the spiritual atmosphere of eighteenth-century Transylvania had almost nothing in common with that

⁷⁷ SETTON, "Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril," p. 147.

⁷⁸ Ibi, p. 149. The three works are: *Vom Kriege widder die Türken* (1529), *Eine Heerpredigt widder den Türken* (1529), and *Vermanunge zum Gebet wider den Türken* (1541), all of which published in Wittenberg.

⁷⁹ SETTON, "Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril," p. 160.

⁸⁰ Peykich's *Mahometanus* is also interesting and noteworthy merely for fact of having come down to us. Several decades of similar works, most of them authored by Jesuits, were lost after the Order's suspension in 1774. Thomas Michel gives an impressive list of such titles dating from the seventeenth century (in Latin as well as in various modern European languages including Polish and Hungarian), which did not come down to us. – MICHEL, "Jesuit Writings," pp. 63-64.

reigning in Parisian salons. It was a missionary destination that was geographically not so remote, but still considered by the missionaries there as a kind of little-known central-European India.

2. ANALYSIS OF THE *MAHOMETANUS IN LEGE CHRISTI INSTRUCTUS* (1717)

2.1 *Structure*

As one might expect from its title, *Mahometanus dogmaticæ, et catechetice in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus* opens with responses to the classical Muslim challenges and criticisms to Christian faith. After this apologetic-polemical section, the work also has a “positive” one where the Catholic doctrine is expounded for the benefit of Muslims who show a tendency towards conversion.

The work consists in a dedicatory letter, a preface and ten chapters. The first chapter is a kind of axiomatic one, where Peykich makes several statements which he retains as a necessary basis in order to continue reading the book. These all concern the nature of religious faith. Peykich draws a distinction between “human” and “divine” faith in order to state in chapter two that Catholic dogmas are a product of revelation received through divine faith, which guarantees their veracity.

In chapters three to six, Peykich deals with some classical points of controversy between Muslims and Christians, such as the accusation according to which Christians have presumably falsified the revealed Scripture so that it should accord with their religion.

The next four chapters, from Seven to Ten, make up 160 of the total 195 pages of the book. Chapter seven is entitled “On Faith and the Creed” and is divided into sections, each of which presents a different topic. A discussion on basic Christian concepts (such as faith, the symbol of the cross, the mystery of the Trinity, the mystery of Incarnation) is followed by one on the presentation of, and commentary on, the single Articles of the Catholic Creed.

Chapter eight is dedicated to Hope as a theological virtue and the Lord's Prayer, and the discussion follows the same logic as in the previous chapter: the single petitions are examined in different sections. Again, according to the same logic of the presentation of the material, in the next chapter we have a discussion on Charity and on the Decalogue with its individual commandments. The last chapter examines the sacraments and the sacramentals. The book closes with a corollary in which Christian and Muslim laws are compared to each other, and a conclusion.

Here is the index of the work.

Cap. I. *Praenotantur aliqua scitu necessaria*

Cap. II. *Omnia dogmata Christianorum Catholicorum sunt fide divina mediante revelata*

Cap. III. *Effugia Mahometanorum proposita, et resoluta*

Cap. IV. *Evidenter probatur vetus, ac novum Testamentum non esse corrupta, sed neque potuisse corrumpi*

Cap. V. *Nec Pentateuchus per Evangelium, nec Evangelium per Alcoranum abrogata sunt, aut dici possunt, exceptis solis praeceptis caeremonialibus, et judicialibus in Pentateucho contentis*

Cap. VI. *Aliquae observationes, quibus praecedentia magis stabiliuntur*

Cap. VII. *De fide, et Symbolo fidei*

Doctr. I. *De fide*

Doctr. II. *De signo crucis, et mysterijs in illo contentis, et fructibus, ex eosigno in nos provenientibus*

Doctr. III. *De mysterio Sanctissimae Trinitatis*

Conclusio hujus doctrinae

Doctr. IV. *De mysterio Incarnationis, passionis, et ortis Christi Domini*

Doctr. V. *De Symbolo Apostolorum, ejusque articulo primo*

Doctr. VI. *De secundo Symboli Apostolorum articulo*

Doctr. VII. *De tertio Symboli articulo*

Doctr. VIII. *De quarto Symboli articulo*

Doctr. IX. *De quinto Symboli articulo*

Doctr. X. *De sexto Symboli articulo*

Doctr. XI. *De septimo Symboli articulo*

Doctr. XII. *De octavo Symboli articulo*

Doctr. XIII. *De nono Symboli articulo*

Doctr. XIV. *De decimo Symboli articulo*

- Doctr. XV. *De undecimo Symboli articulo*
 Doctr. XVI. *De duodecimo, et ultimo Symboli articulo*
 Cap. VIII. *De spe, et Oratione Dominica*
 Doctr. I. *De spe*
 Doctr. II. *De Oratione Dominica, orationisque in communi necessitate, ac utilitate*
 Doctr. III. *De Orationis Dominicae partibus, et duabus primis in ea petitionibus*
 Doctr. IV. *De tertia, et quarta Orationis Dominicae petitione*
 Doctr. Unica. *De Salutatione Angelica*
 Cap. IX. *De charitate, et Decalogo. Ubi etiam per occasionem de praeceptis Ecclesiae*
 Doctr. I. *De charitate, et lege*
 Doctr. II. *De Decalogo*
 Doctr. III. *De primo Decalogi praecepto, et cultu sacrarum imaginum*
 Doctr. IV. *De II. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. V. *De III. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. VI. *De IV. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. VII. *De V. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. VIII. *De VI. et IX. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. IX. *De VII. et X. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. X. *De VIII. Decalogi praecepto*
 Doctr. XI. *et unica, de praeceptis Ecclesiae*
 Cap. X. *De sacramentis, et brevissime de sacramentalibus*
 Doctr. I. *De sacramentis in communi*
 Doctr. II. *De baptismi sacramento, et circumcissione contra Mahometanus*
 Doctr. III. *De confirmationis sacramento*
 Doctr. IV. *De sacramento eucharistiae, et missae sacrificio*
 Doctr. V. *De sacramento poenitentiae*
 Doctr. VI. *De sacramento extremae unctionis*
 Doctr. VII. *De sacramento ordinis*
 Doctr. VIII. *De sacramento matrimonij, de repudio, ac polygamia*
 Doctr. IX. *De sacramentalibus*
 Corollarium. *In quo comparantur inter se leges religionis Christianae, et sectae Mahometanae*
 Conclusio totius operis

As has already been specified, the last four chapters of the *Mahometanus* are not strictly polemical, but rather descriptive, if not to say didactic. Nevertheless, this educational discourse is frequently interrupted by polemical passages in which Peykich either criticizes Muslim practices or refutes their opinions on certain questions. Here are some examples: as suggested by the title, chapter ten, section eight (“De sacramento matrimonii, de repudio, ac polygamia,” p. 163), Muslim practices concerning divorce and polygamy are subject to criticism and confutation. In section 16 of chapter eight (pp. 74-77), Peykich expounds the Catholic doctrine of eternal life, dedicating most attention to the beatific vision of God reserved for the blessed. In opposition to this image, there is the depiction of the Muslim paradise as presented in the *Koran*. Peykich quotes several Koranic *sūras* and comments that by placing the final bliss in corporeal pleasures Muslims, unfortunately, behave like good students of Epicure and imagine for themselves an animal paradise.⁸¹ With reference to the first of the Ten Commandments, Peykich offers a lengthy and rather philosophical insight into the veneration of religious images and defends this practice against the accusations of idolatry (pp. 103-111). The sacrament of baptism is examined alongside the ceremony of circumcision (chapter ten, section two, “De baptismi sacramento et circumcissione contra Mahometanos,” pp. 137-142).⁸² In accordance with the official Counter-Reformation politics of the non-contestation of religious rituals and local customs,⁸³ Peykich concludes this discussion with the statement that the

⁸¹ “Mahometani etenim, Epicuri boni discipuli vitam aeternam, quae est summum bonum, in corporeis voluptatibus ipso Mahometo duce reponunt.” – *Mahometanus*, p. 74.

⁸² “Verum communis sententia est, Mahometum, et Mahometanos, retinuisse usum circumcissionis, quem jam invenerant, inter Arabes ethnicos, ab Ismaëlis posteris derivatum: quidquid sit, certum est, circumcissionem apud Arabes non esse alicuius Sacramentum, vel aliud pertinens ad fundamentum religionis, sed signum distinctivum ipsorum ab alijs gentibus, atque etiam a Judaëis.” – *Mahometanus*, p. 140.

⁸³ For example, in an instruction to its missionaries issued in 1699, the *Propaganda fide* ordered that the ritual of the Orthodox Church should not be challenged and no measures to modify it should be taken. – Cf. SHORE, *Jesuits and the Politics*, p. 32, footnote 20. In

circumcision ceremony is not a religious one and, therefore, for Muslims it has neither the function nor the importance that sacraments have for Christians; circumcision, Peykich states, is merely the principle of certain peoples (for example, Arabs and Hebrews: “signum distinctivum ipsorum ab alijs gentibus”) of differentiating themselves from others, and, as such, it can be tolerated by Catholic missionaries.⁸⁴ These examples hopefully suffice to present the argumentative style of Peykich’s *Mahometanus*.

The four entirely apologetic-polemical chapters (chapters three to six) will now be closely examined. As far as the doctrinal and instructive part of the *Mohametanus* is concerned, we shall focus only on the most significant passages of interconfessional controversy found in it. However, we shall first present the content of the letter of dedication to the Emperor and of the Preface to the Reader. These two texts provide the key to interpreting the rest of the treatise; they help to reveal who its intended audience was, as well as how the treatise was to be used as intended by its author. In addition, they introduce the reader to the polemical method applied by the author, and give some information that proves useful in order to establish, at least in general terms, his sources.

connection specifically to circumcision, the first article of Pope Benedict XIV’s Constitution *Pro Regno Serviae aliisque finitimis regionibus* (issued on 2 February 1744) reads as follows: “...ideoque si circumcisionem susceperint, sciant, quod Christus ipsis, Apostolo attestante, nihil proderit” (so that if they receive circumcision, let them know, that, as the Apostle testifies, Christ shall profit them nothing). The instruction alludes to the apostle Paul’s words in his Epistle to the Galatians (5:2): “Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.” – *Collectanea S. Congregationis De Prop Fide seu ecreta instructiones, rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus*, Roma: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Prop. Fide, 1907, vol. 1, p. 149, n. 345.

⁸⁴ “Verum communis sententia est, Mahometum, et Mahometanos, retinuisse usum circumcisionis, quem jam invenerant, inter Arabes ethnicos, ab Ismaëlis posteris derivatum: quidquid sit, certum est, circumcisionem apud Arabes non esse alicuius Sacramentum, vel aliud pertinens ad fundamentum religionis, sed signum distinctivum ipsorum ab alijs gentibus, atque etiam a Judaeis.” – *Mahometanus*, p. 140.

2.2 Letter of dedication: general aims of the work

It opens with an ardent eulogy of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, whose accession to the throne in 1711 is retained by Peykich to have been eagerly awaited by all of Germany and the entire Christian world.⁸⁵ Our author sees “a defender of the whole flock of Christ” (“propugnator totius Christi gregis”) in the person of Charles VI.

After this greeting and eulogy, Peykich exhorts the Emperor to fulfil what his reign seems to be destined to do: chase “Muhammad’s superstition” out of Europe. His father Leopold had not succeeded in this enterprise, although he had led the same struggle for sixty years and received help from a number of European princes. It is the opinion of many, Peykich argues, that it seems that it is for Charles that God has reserved this glory (“tibi haec gloria Augustissime Caesar, iudicio omnium servata a Deo videtur”). The Ottoman Empire, he continues, is the only remaining buttress of “Muhammad’s superstition,” and Christian heroes are already uniting in a holy alliance against it. “Our Most Blessed Father Clement XI,” who fosters and will foster the Holy War until the final destruction of the Turks (“sacrum bellum fovet, et fovebit, in Turcarum extremam perniciem”) is also one of them.

Furthermore, our Peykich would also like to take part in this holy war, by fighting on the spiritual front with the spiritual sword of his book in hand.⁸⁶ The “sole” aim of his little book, he claims, is to defeat Muhammad, the *Koran*, the Hagarenians’ sect, and to propagate everywhere the sole saving

⁸⁵ Charles VI ascended the imperial throne after the end of his elder brother Joseph I’s short reign. Joseph had succeeded their father Leopold after his death in 1705.

⁸⁶ The stylization of the author as a warrior of the Christian faith is also a classical *topos* in anti-Islamic literature. In particular, Ludovico Marracci attributes to the military imagery a special role in his refutation of the *Koran*: cf. for instance, G. RIZZARDI, *Il modello controversistico di Ludovico Marracci*, in G. ZATTI (a cura di), *Il Corano. Traduzioni, traduttori e lettori in Italia*, Milano: IPL, 2000, pp. 81-109, in part. p. 85.

doctrine of Christ, our Lord.⁸⁷ (“Unicus quippe illus scopus est, Mahometum, Alcoranum, Agarenicam Sectam debellare, et unice Salvificam Christi Domini doctrinam ubique propagare.”). This is why he believes that his book can be useful to any defender of Christianity and hopes that the Emperor will accept and remember it with benevolence, and will have it translated and published in Turkish.⁸⁸ (“Opusculum hocce meum, [...] lingua, caracteribusque Turcicis, Te jubente, imprimendum spero.”). The fact that Peykich planned to publish a Turkish translation of the *Mahometanus*, however vague the project might be, is an indication that our author was seriously considering the possibility of using it for the conversion of Turkish-speaking Muslims.

The letter of dedication clearly refers to the new Austro-Turkish War (1716-1718), which was in progress at the time when the book was published. It seems highly likely, therefore, that Josip Turčinović’s guess was correct, namely that Peykich chose to publish the *Mahometanus* in 1717 because he considered the war period to be a good opportunity for attracting more interest in the book. Turčinović also speculates that the book was written before 1709, during Peykich’s stay in Venice and that the letter of dedication was written and added exclusively on the occasion of its publication.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ The Catholic doctrine of “no salvation outside the Church” (*extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*), which is what is probably meant by the expression “the sole salvaging doctrine of Christ” was proclaimed at the IV Lateran Council (1215) and again at the Council of Florence. – S. PAGANO, “L’ospizio dei convertendi di Roma fra carisma missionario e regolamentazione ecclesiastica (1671-1700),” *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma. Studi, documenti, inventari*, 10 (1998), pp. 313-369, in part. p. 332.

⁸⁸ Peykich also mentions this hope, or project, of his in the aforesaid letter of August 9, 1716. There he communicates that the book is dedicated to the Emperor and that he was hoping to receive a subsidy for its translation into Turkish and then to publish it in the Polyglot Printing Press of the *Propaganda*.

⁸⁹ TURČINOVIĆ, p. 99, n. 10.

2.3 The “*Praefatio ad lectorem*”

The text of the preface is extremely curious and gives us an opportunity to discuss several questions concerning the argumentative approach and the specific purpose of the book, the sources of Peykich and the field of application of his work.

a) *Argumentative method and specific purpose of the book*

In his “Preface to the Reader,” Peykich explicitly states what he retains to be the innovative aspect of his book: unlike any of his predecessors, whether ancient or recent, who had participated in the inter-religious dispute, he would borrow arguments from the Muslims themselves and would make an attempt to defeat their religion by revealing its inner defects. In his book, he does not intend to insist and prove that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, whose advent had been foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament. Indeed, the Muslims already share this belief; but they do not acknowledge Christ’s divinity. Neither would he try to propose erudite and extensive demonstrations such as those commonly used by Catholic apologists attempting to convince the Muslims that the Gospel is the Word of God, for the Muslims reject and ridicule such attempts. Instead, he would attack them with their own weapons borrowing from Muslim’s own, commonly believed teaching; he would use obvious arguments, which are both comprehensible to the simplest of Muslims and fully convincing even for the most intelligent of them. Then he would proceed by expounding the Catholic doctrine in all its parts. By choosing this argumentative approach, Peykich seeks to show that, for the most part, the two religious doctrines generally agree with each other. The Muslims must be led to the truth and they must be shown their errors, but the best way to overcome the differences is to start from commonly shared principles.

Despite Peykich’s insistence to the contrary, his approach as he posts it is rather traditional: Peter the Venerable had already promoted an acquaintance and better knowledge of Islam in order to confute it in the twelfth century.

Tirso González de Santalla (1624-1705), Peykich's main model, Ludovico Marracci, tried in his very successful "Handbook for the Conversion of Mohammedans" (*Manuductio ad conversionem mahumetanorum*, Matriti 1687) to demonstrate "the falsity of *Koran* through the *Koran* itself." Moreover, in his preface to the first part of *Alcorani textus universus*, i.e. the *Vita* of Muhammad, Ludovico Marracci says that he utilizes Muslim authors, "not because I value them sincere, but because when we act against the enemies of religion, we attack them more easily with their arms than with ours, and (thus) more happily overcome them."⁹⁰

The whole argumentation developed in the *Mahometanus* conforms to one final aim, that is, to demonstrate the authenticity of the evangelical texts, which for their part must be sufficient to prove of the veracity of Christian doctrine.

Several considerations must be made with regard to Peykich's argumentative approach here. The first is the observation that he quite rightly perceived that the issue concerning the authenticity of the Scriptures had become the major and most pressing one for Christian apologists. Secondly, he has to be given his dues for having managed to formulate this problem very clearly: Muslims themselves acknowledge the validity of Christian doctrine, in the sense that the *Koran* confirms the Gospels in the same way in which the Gospels confirm the law of Moses. Notwithstanding this, they deny that this doctrine, in the way in which it is present in the Christian communities of their day, is identical to the one Christ had transmitted to the Apostles. What

⁹⁰ Here I quote the English translation (I have altered it only very slightly) offered by DANIEL in *Islam and the West*, on p. 322. The original Latin text reads: "Quamorbem iis, quae a nostris scribuntur, praetermissis, vel ad lectoris notitiam tantummodo indicatis: illos in caeteris sequi decrevi. Non quod Mahumetanorum fidem synceram existimem sed quod, cum contra hostes religionis agimus, eosdem suis ipsorum armis facilius quam nostris oppugnamus, et felicius superamus." – LUDOVICUS MARRACCIUS, *Alcorani textus universus [...] appositis unicuique capiti notis, atque refutatione...*, Patavii: Ex Typographia Seminarii, 1698, *Mahumeti auctoris Alcorani vitae rerumque gestarum synopsis*, Praefatio, p. 9.

Peykich would try to demonstrate is precisely that the two coincide.⁹¹ The third consideration is the declaration by Peykich that in the doctrinal section of his work he would not only expose the content of the Catholic doctrine but for each of its parts he would confirm that it is the Word of God.⁹²

The validity of this choice for the argumentative strategy that Peykich made is grounded in the presumption that “the first and foremost basis of the Christian religion is the doctrine of Christ Our Lord and Saviour.” In view of this, it is important to prove that this doctrine has come down to us intact. As soon as the authenticity of the Scriptures has been demonstrated, the truth of the message they contain is also guaranteed.⁹³

In order to justify this logical step from the authenticity of the text to the validity of its content, Peykich pleads the infallibility of its Author. That is, he makes the same move which turned out to be a commonplace in post-Tridentine anti-Muslim polemics and which is typically further bound to the necessity to believe Catholic dogmas even, and especially, when they are

⁹¹ “Primum fundamentum Religionis Christianae est doctrina Christi Domini Salvatoris nostri, quam Mahometani ipsi sub nomine Ingil, seu Evangelij, ut veram, et infallibilis Authoritatis admittunt; negant tamen ipsam Christi doctrinam, prout modo apud Christianos habetur, esse eandem cum illa, quam Christus Dominus Apostolis suis reliquit. Ideoque si ego divina gratia mediante, probavero eandem fuisse doctrinam a Christo traditam (...).” – *Mahometanus*, p. 1.

⁹² “Ideo, ego, amice lector, in hoc parvo opusculo, ut sit obvium cuivis, ut superius notavi, argumenta ab ipsis Mahometanis petita adhibeo, quibus clare constet, vetus simul, ac novum Testamentum, uti apud nos leguntur, esse verbum verum Dei; inde pergam explicare per omnes partes doctrinam Christianam, confirmando illam, ubi opus fuerit, verbo Dei...” – *Ibi*, p. 3.

⁹³ “Ideoque si ego divina gratia mediante, probavero eandem fuisse doctrinam a Christo traditam, ac eam, quae apud nos Christianos perseverat, de falsitate convincentur omnes Mahometani nostrae doctrinae, seu fidei oppositi, et convincentur vera esse dogmata, quae Christus Dominus mundo manifestavit; *Deus enim, ut est Christus, nec fallere, neque falli potest*: Unde postquam sufficienter constiterit, Deum aliquod Mysterium mundo revelasse, tenentur illud omnes firmiter credere.” – *Ibi*, p. 1.

beyond the reach of human understanding.⁹⁴ The latter requirement presents one of the fundamental statements in post-Tridentine theology which had been established in the *Roman Catechism*.⁹⁵

Peckich's last argument in this line of reasoning enunciates that, once convinced about the divine origin of the Christian Scripture, the Muslims, as rational creatures, must obey the infinite divine authority, confess and accept the Christian faith, for any rational creature is obliged to obey God both with his intellect and with his will: with the intellect, by firmly believing what God says; with the will, by observing the law that He gives. Therefore, if the Mohammedans do not want to suffer in eternity, it is in their interest to accept the Evangelical doctrine to the same extent as Christians do.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Cf., for instance, in González: "Christiani non credimus haec mysteria, quia illa intellectu nostro comprehendimus; sed quia *Deus, qui nec fallere, neque falli potest, illa nobis revelavi*. Deo ante loquenti credere debemus, quavis non intelligamus, quomodo esse possit id, quod ipse dicit." (*italics mine*) – THYRSUS GONZALEZ de SANTALLA, *Manuductio ad conversionem Mahumetanorum*, 2 vol., Matriti: Huan de Goyeneche, 1687, vol. 2, lib. 3, cap. 11, pp. 279-280. In González, the passage quoted here is part of an extensive discussion where the aim is to demonstrate that the fact of the impossibility of understanding the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation is not a sufficient reason for qualifying them as untrue.

⁹⁵ "Ea est humanae mentis et intelligentiae ratio, ut, quum alia multa, quae ad divinarum rerum cognitionem pertinent, ipsa per se magno adhibito labore et diligentia investigaverit ac cognoverit, maximam tamen illorum partem, quibus aeterna salus comparatur, cuius rei in primis causa homo conditus atque ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei creatus est, naturae lumine illustrata cognoscere aut cernere nunquam potuerit." – *Catechismus*, Prooemium, q. 1. And again: "Quum enim finis, qui ad beatitudinem homini propositus est, altior sit, quam ut humanae mentis acie perspici possit: necesse ei erat, ipsius a Deo cognitionem accipere. Haec vero cognitio nihil aliud est, nisi fides, cuius virtus efficit, ut id ratum habeamus, quod a Deo traditum esse sanctissimae matris ecclesiae auctoritas comprobavit. Nulla enim fidelibus potest accidere dubitatio in iis, quorum Deus auctor est, qui est ipsa veritas." – *Catechismus*, pars 1, cap. 1: *De fide et Symbolo fidei*, q. 1.

⁹⁶ "Infinita enim Dei Auctoritas obligat omnes creaturas rationales [...]. Tenetur enim creatura rationalis intellectum, et voluntatem Deo subicere: intellectum, firmiter credendo, quae dicit; voluntatem, prompte exequendo, quae praecipit. Unde Mahometani, si aeternum perire nolunt, cogentur admittere doctrinam Evangelicam aequae, ac nos." – *Mahometanus*, pp. 1-2. It is interesting that a similar argumentative strategy was also used by "the other

Thomas Michel recapitulates this way of proceeding that is commonly shared by Christian polemicists (including Peykich) by saying: “Presented with this unbroken chain of logical argument, an opponent’s refusal to accept the truth of Christianity and subsequently to enter the community of truth through baptism can only be due to worldly factors of stubborn pride, considerations of family or social position, or sentimental attachment to traditional beliefs.”⁹⁷

b) *Peykich’s sources*

In the *Mahometanus*, as in the rest of his works, Peykich does not normally indicate his sources. It is, however, possible to speculate what they might be.

As far as the exposition of Catholic doctrine in the *Mahometanus* is concerned, it is undoubtedly based on the *Roman Catechism* that was conceived by the Fathers of the Council of Trent and published in 1566 with the purpose of helping and guiding parish priests in the religious education of their congregation. Peykich quotes directly from the *Roman Catechism*, from the *Decrees* of the Council of Trent and from Roberto Bellarmino’s *Disputationes de controversiis Christianae fidei*.⁹⁸ There is yet more: one might say that, as regards the doctrinal aspect, Peykich’s book presents a compendium of the *Roman Catechism* adapted to the needs of missionaries operating among Muslims. This may be not surprising⁹⁹ but is nevertheless

side,” i.e. by Muslim theologians and polemicists. – Cf. KRSTIĆ, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, p. 98.

⁹⁷ MICHEL, “Jesuit Writings,” p. 60.

⁹⁸ Peykich quotes *tomus primus* of Bellarmino’s *Disputationes* on p. 25. A direct quotation (with the source indicated) from the *Roman Catechism* is found, for instance, on p. 138 – it is the formula for the definition of ‘baptism’. There are also some references to the *Decrees* of the Council of Trent: on p. 151, in connection with the definition of contrition, Peykich refers to Session (henceforth Sess.) 14, cap. 4; on p. 154 to Sess. 14, cap. 5; on p. 161 to Sess. 14, cap. 2; on p. 162 to Sess. 23, cap. 1.

⁹⁹ In a papal instruction of 1633 to the missionaries in Eastern India, the use of the *Roman Catechism* and Roberto Bellarmino’s *Dottrina cristiana breve* (1598) is recommended for

significant since it shows Peykich's *Mahometanus*, and likewise his other books, as having stemmed from the Catholic Reform and been placed at its service.

In the "Preface to the Reader," Peykich mentions the names of some authoritative Catholic authors who had studied the *Koran*, had debated with Muslims or had concerned themselves with confuting the latter's doctrines. Peykich divides them into two groups: John of Damascus, Peter the Venerable, Pedro Pascual and the Byzantine Emperor, John VI Cantacuzenus, belong to the first group, which is the one that lists further ancient authors. Of the recent ones, Peykich indicates three names: Philippo Guadagnolo, Ludovico Marracci and Tirso González de Santalla.¹⁰⁰

González, besides being a prominent professor of theology at the University of Salamanca and General of the Jesuit Order from 1687 until his death in 1705, was called 'the Apostle of Spain' for his work as a missionary among the *moriscos* in the south of Spain.¹⁰¹ In his *Manuductio ad conversionem*

the religious education of the people. – Constitutio *Ex debito* Urbani PP. VIII. 22 Febr. 1633. – *Collectanea*, vol. 1, p. 18, n. 72.

¹⁰⁰ "Licet sint multi, tum antiqui, tum recentiores, qui doctissime, aequae ac fundatissime contra Mahometanam superstitionem scripserunt: Ex antiquis: S. Joann. Damasc. S. Petr. Paschas, Petr. Abb. Cluniac. Joannes Cantacuzenus Imp. Constantinopol. Ex recentioribus P. Philippus Guadagnolus et Religione Clericorum Minorum Arabicae linguae in Romano Lycaeo Professor, et multi alij, inter quos principem locum vix non habent P. Ludovicus Marraccius et Congregatione Clericorum Regular. Matris Dei, Innoc. XI. Papae gloriosae memoriae, olim Confessarius, et linguae Arabicae peritiffimus: et P. Tyrus Gonzalez de Santalla, et Societate Jesu, olim in Salmantica Academia SS. Theolog. Professor emeritus, deinde ejusdem Societatis Jesu Praepositus Generalis dignissimus, qui tantae, ac tam praeclarae Societati praefuerit: et hi omnes, licet docte, profunde, ac prolixè scripserint, opera tamen illorum ad manus cujuscunque Mahometani pervenire non possunt." – *Mahometanus*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰¹ On Tirso González de Santalla's missionary activity, see, besides the already cited MICHEL, "Jesuit Writings" and COLOMBO'S *Jesuits and Islam*, the monograph, E. COLOMBO, *Convertire i musulmani. L'esperienza di un gesuita spagnolo del Seicento*, Milano: Mondadori, 2007, as well as by the same author ID., "La Compagnia di Gesù e l'evangelizzazione dei musulmani nella Spagna del Seicento: il caso González," *Revue Mabillon*, 20 (2009), pp. 203-227.

mahumetanorum (1687), of which many editions were published, he drew on many years of personal missionary experience. The first edition was dedicated to Pope Innocent XI, and in the letter of dedication González congratulated the Pope and all the princes of the powers which belonged to the Holy League, together with the whole of Europe, for the glorious victory at Vienna. In 1688-1689 the *Manuductio* was published in Dillingen on the initiative of the Upper German Jesuit Province and, like our Peykich's *Mahometanus*, this edition is dedicated to the much-praised Emperor, Leopold I.¹⁰²

It is true that, as he himself said, Peykich wanted to distinguish himself from these authors rather than present them as the sources he depended on. Nevertheless, there is sufficient evidence to prove that he relied on González and above all on Marracci. As for González' "Handbook for the Conversion of Mohammedans," Peykich explicitly said that this book was in his possession, and that he regarded it as indispensable for his missionary work.¹⁰³ As for Marracci, it seems almost impossible that Peykich had not come across his book with its refutation of the *Koran*. However, it is possible to rely on something other than a mere assumption. In my research only three names of Islamic theologians occur in the *Mahometanus*: a certain *Jahias*, a *Gelaleddinus* and a *Thalebiensis* were borrowed from Marracci's refutation of the sacred book of Islam published in Rome in 1691 and then included in his commented edition and translation of the *Koran* of 1698. There can be no doubt about this since Marracci is the only author in whom the transcription of the three names is identical to that in Peykich.¹⁰⁴ Besides this, the *Prodromus*

¹⁰² COLOMBO, *Convertire i musulmani*, p. 32.

¹⁰³ In his *Mahometanus* Peykich maintains that he had received this handbook as a gift from the author himself, who told him: "Vide fili mi, ut inventis pro tua experientia, dum vixiris, aliquid addas" (*Mahometanus*, p. 193).

¹⁰⁴ By the name of *Jahias filius Salam* or *Jahias Ebnosalam Bosrensis* Marracci cites Yahyā b. Sallām (d. 815) of Basra, who was presumed to be the author of an important comment on the Qu'ran. – See C. GILLIOT, "Kontinuität und Wandel in der klassischen islamischen Koranauslegung," *Der Islam*, 85 (2010), pp. 1-155, in part. pp. 26-17. By the name of *Gelaleddinus* Marracci cites the two authors (master and student) of a popular

seems to be the sole source for Peykich's quotations from the *Koran*. The text of the Koranic passages adduced in the *Mahometanus* is identical to that of certain quotations that Marracci adds in the course of his refutation of the Koranic teaching in his *Prodromus* but differs from the definitive variant of the same passages proposed by Marracci in the translation of the *Koran* published in 1698. This permits us to conclude that Peykich probably possessed the *Prodromus* of 1691, which moreover was published by the Typography of *Propaganda fide* in Rome so that Peykich had probably received a copy of it from the *Propaganda* during his studies at the Urban College. Peykich frequently copies entire passages from the *Prodromus* (without indicating his source): Koranic quotations along with Marracci's comments on them and his quotations from, or references to, authoritative commentators such as the above mentioned Yahyā b. Sallām of Basra, Ğalāl ad-Dīn al-Mahallī, Ğalāl ad-Dīn as-Suyūtī, al-Tha'labī and others. It is in these shorter or longer passages copied directly from the *Prodromus* where the names of the Muslim exegetes occur in the *Mahometanus*; they never occur independently. Peykich "plagiarizes" from Marracci, changing hardly anything, with the exception of the occasional minor linguistic (stylistic) variation. Although some of the copied passages are fairly long, some of them of nearly a whole page, the cases of these plagiarisms from Marracci seem to be relatively rare compared to the entire length of the book. I was able to identify about one dozen Koranic quotations found in the *Mahometanus*, half of which accompanied by the relevant commentary by Marracci.

To conclude, one can observe that when the Muslim doctrine and the *Koran* are involved, Peykich relies heavily on Marracci, who appears to be his only

comment on the Qu'ran: Ğalāl ad-Dīn al-Mahallī (d. 1459) and Ğalāl ad-Dīn as-Suyūtī (d. 1505). – See *ibi*, pp. 67-68. By the name of *Thalebiensis* Marracci cites another famous commentator of the *Koran*: al-Tha'labī (d. 1035). – GILLIOT, "Kontinuität und Wandel," pp. 48-49. Cf. RIZZARDI, *Il modello controversistico di Ludovico Marracci*, pp. 90-91. The sources of Marracci were determined for the first time by NALLINO, *Le fonti arabe manoscritte*, pp. 90-134.

source in this field in which our author does not seem to feel very confident. When it is a matter of setting out the standard Christian responses to the challenges of Islam and, above all, to expounding the Catholic doctrine of which he has firm knowledge and which he had been trained to master well, he is far more confident and moves more freely and independently.

c) *The field of application of the Mahometanus*

According to Peykich's own testimony offered in the "Introduction to the Reader," all the refutations of accusations and all the persuasive arguments contained in the book had been tested in practice when the author was working as a missionary in Transylvania (in Sibiu) between 1700 and 1703 and as Prior of the *Pia Casa dei Catechumeni* in Venice in 1705-1709.

I have used this art of persuasion of Muslims in Hermannopolis [i.e. Hermannstadt or Sibiu] in Transylvania, where there were often present Turks, who were sent there by the pasha, the Commandant of Timișoara, for various affairs,¹⁰⁵ and then in Venice from 1705 to 1709, where I held the office of Prior of the House of the Catechumens, almost every day exposing the motives of credibility (*motiva credibilitatis*) that I expose in this small book, and I have learned from my experience that this is the most proper way to remove the errors from Muslims' minds and to gradually admit into them the sole saving doctrine of Christ, our Lord.¹⁰⁶

This testimony gives us, albeit in very general terms, the geographical region in which the *Mahometanus* was to be disseminated and its

¹⁰⁵ In that period (1700-1703) Timișoara was within the borders of the Ottoman Empire; it was captured by the Hapsburgs in 1716.

¹⁰⁶ "Hac arte convincendi Mahometanus usus sum primo in Transylvania Hermannopoli, ubi frequentes aderant Turcae a Pascia Temeswarinensi Commendante varia ob negotia missi ab anno 1700. usque ad 1703. deinde Venetijs ab anno 1705. usque ad annum 1709. ubi piarum Catechumenorum domuum Prioris sustinui officium, ferme quotidie exponens motiva credibilitatis, quae hocce in libello expono, et experientia didici, hanc esse viam aptiorem ad expungendos ab animis Mahometanorum errores, sensimque Catholicam, et unice salvificam fidem Christi instillandam." – *Mahometanus*, p. 2.

argumentation eventually applied: apart from Venice, the region comprised the Eastern-Central European territories which had recently been conquered by the Hapsburgs.¹⁰⁷

As stated above, Christian anti-Muslim polemical treatises were destined for a Christian audience. This means both the “classical” medieval treatises and the numerous works which emerged during the “golden” age of the Seventeenth Century. It is true of works composed by learned scholars and of those produced by ardent missionaries. No doubt that Peykich also conceived his task in this traditional sense. But it appears likewise certain that the *Mahometanus* was also designed with a view to a possible audience of Muslims, if not to be read directly by them, at least to be applied on the occasion of their proselytization and in the process of their catechization.

The proselytization and catechization of converts, more than one half of whom came from “Muslims, mostly from the Ottoman Balkans,”¹⁰⁸ were Krastyo Peykich’s main duties as Prior of *the Pia Casa dei Catecumeni* in Venice between 1704 and 1709. In recent years, thanks to several excellent

¹⁰⁷ This hypothesis is attested by the fact that copies of Peykich’s *Mahometanus* are mainly available in Central European Libraries (Slovakia and Hungary). Alastair Hamilton, for instance, explains the broad popularity of the theme “Islam” in the late seventeenth-century European learned circles and writings with the acquisition, on the part of the Hapsburgs and Venice as a consequence of the War of the Holy League, of extensive territories largely populated by Muslims. Those territories were subject of the proselytizing zeal of the Catholic church and Hamilton compares this campaign to the one that took place after the Spanish *Reconquista* and which gave origin to the first significant wave of translations from Arabic and compositions of Latin anti-Muslim treatises. – HAMILTON, *A Lutheran Translator*, p. 200.

¹⁰⁸ This datum is provided by E.N. ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul: Trans-Imperial Subjects and Cultural Mediation in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, diss. University of Michigan 2006, p. 165. It has also been confirmed by P.I. ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri. Conversioni a Venezia e nel Friuli Veneto in età moderna*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2008, pp. 128-129. Pietro Zorattini, reports that 53 persons were baptized by Krastyo Peykich during the four years of his service as Prior of the House. At least the half of these 53 neophytes had come from Islam. – ibi, pp. 135 and 137.

studies,¹⁰⁹ we know much more about the functioning of this institution and the significant role it was ascribed in the internal and external policy of the Venetian state during the early modern period.¹¹⁰ It was founded in 1557 after the model of the first holy house of this genre instituted in 1543 in Rome by the Jesuits.¹¹¹ Candidate-converts and neophytes were sheltered there for longer or shorter periods of time, on average for about a couple of months, and were prepared to receive the baptism and, once baptized, to live as good Christians.

In keeping with the regulations of the institution, its Prior had to be an ordained priest no less than forty years of age who preferably knew either Greek, Hebrew or Turkish.¹¹² His main duty, as mentioned above, was to conduct the religious education of the charges of the House. He had to ensure that they recited their prayers every morning and evening, and to ensure that the neophytes who were still in the care of the House would confess at least once per month as well as on the occasion of all important holy days.¹¹³ The

¹⁰⁹ I refer to ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco*; ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*; ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri*.

¹¹⁰ See especially ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, pp. 155-210.

¹¹¹ Cf. ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, pp. 157-158. See also the bibliography on the Holy Houses reported there. In connection to the history of the *Pia Casa* in Rome, see especially D. ROCCILOLO, "Documenti sui catecumeni e neofiti a Roma nel Seicento e Settecento," *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma. Studi, documenti, inventari*, 10 (1998), pp. 391-451.

¹¹² ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, p. 160. On the occasion of Peykich's election as a Prior of the *Pia Casa*, it was also noted that he knew 'Illyrian' and Turkish. – IRE, *Catecumeni*, B: *Terminazioni*, vol. 16: *6 marzo 1703 - 28 febbraio 1707*, f. 66r.

¹¹³ ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, p. 163; ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri*, p. 80. The regulations of the House can be consulted in IRE, *Catecumeni*, A, vol. 1: *Capitoli, ed ordini per il buon governo delle Pie case de' Catecumeni di Venezia, a cognizione de' Signori Governatori delle medesime ristampati e raccolti dalli notatori della pia Congregazione, consacrati alla protezione di S. Giovanni Battista protettore del pio luogo*, Venezia: appresso Vincenzo Rizzi, 1802. Concerning this edition, Zorattini gives the following information: "Trattasi della quarta ristampa dei *Capitoli, ed ordini per il buon governo delle Pie case de' Catecumeni di Venezia*, che vennero stampati per la prima volta il 28 Maggio 1558." –

baptism of the flocks of the House was normally performed by the Prior (the Patriarch of Venice substituted him only exceptionally), who was responsible for guaranteeing that the catechumens were properly prepared for, and truly desirous of, receiving the sacrament.¹¹⁴ Once baptised, but before leaving the House, for the neophytes it was the moment of the mystagogy when they had to be initiated, once again by the Prior, into the meaning of the sacraments of Confession, Communion and Confirmation.¹¹⁵

In this context, the *Mahometanus* seems to be a unique record of the form and content of the religious education carried out in the *Pia Casa dei Catechumeni* in Venice. No sources concerning the precise content of the religious education undertaken by the *Casa's figli* was known until now, and this renders Pykich's book particularly worthy of note. In the regulations of an institution such as the *Ospizio dei Convertendi di Roma*, founded in 1673, there was an article advising the instruction of catechumens to be carried out, if possible, with the help of one single book, so that the charges of the Home did not risk being confused with conflicting accounts of their new creed and obligations. The manual generally used at that institution was *Catechismus maior* by the Jesuit Pietro Canisio (d. 1597).¹¹⁶

Along with the Sultan's subjects who wished to desert both their faith and their subjection to their state, and to acquire a new identity, the renegades who

ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri*, p. 75, footnote 47. In his book, Zorattini gives an extensive overview of these regulations.

¹¹⁴ Cf. ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, p. 163. ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri*, p. 80.

¹¹⁵ *Ibi*, pp. 82-83.

¹¹⁶ It had already had more than two hundreds editions during the author's lifetime. – PAGANO, "L'ospizio dei convertendi di Roma", p. 332. Pietro Zorattini reports that Giulio Antonio Santori's *Rituale*, which became the basis for Pope Paul V's *Rituale Romano* (1614), contained three treatises (*De recipiendis et instruendis catechumenis*, *De neophytis instruendis atque iuvandis*, *De infidelium conversione procuranda*) that would have not become part of the Pope's Ritual; nevertheless the former two represented "the first systematic treatises on the organisation of the catechumenate and on mystagogy." – ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri*, pp. 71-71.

wished to be reconciled with the Church were another concern of *Pia Casa dei Catecumeni* in Venice.¹¹⁷ The repentant apostates fell under the jurisdiction of the Holy Office and had to stand before its tribunal to respond to inquisitorial interrogations. Yet, on many occasions the *Pia Casa* was also involved in these trials, albeit not as institution but in the person of the Prior. In many cases the Priors were present at the trials in the capacity of interpreters but also spokesmen and defenders of the converts.¹¹⁸ Nancy Rothman, who has studied a series of depositions by reconciled renegades facing the Inquisition in seventeenth-century Venice, reports that the name of Girolamo Pastriccio, the then Prior of the House of Catechumens, is mentioned in the annals of several inquisitorial interrogations and that his influence on the form and content of the renegades' depositions was decisive. I have not had the opportunity to conduct a survey in the *Venetian State Archive* in order to verify whether Krastyo Peykich had also played the role of interpreter in such inquisitorial interrogations, however it seems it highly probable.

Besides renegades and former Ottoman Muslim subjects, with whom Peykich was in contact in Transylvania and later in Venice, another target group of his *Mahometanus* were Catholic Christians living within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, whom Peykich regarded as being at risk of losing their faith: "And finally, this little work, although it has been mostly put together in order to be useful for the conversion of Mohammedans, can be useful for the Christians themselves who are living on in Turkey and finally to those of ours who set out for there with the legations, among whom not few had famously become Mohammedans." All these Christians risked deserting their true, saving religion and embracing Islam for the sake of all those

¹¹⁷ Concerning the trials that preceded the apostate's reconciliation with the Church, see I. FOSI, *Convertire lo straniero. Forestieri e Inquisizione a Roma in età moderna*, Roma: Viella, 2011, which also contains an extensive bibliography on this theme. See also ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, pp. 121-127.

¹¹⁸ ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco*, p. 45. Cf. ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul*, p. 134.

illusions that seem good and valuable in people's eyes, such as the undeniable brilliance and magnificence of Muslim mosques, the great order reigning therein, the large amount of alms for the poor, the rare splendour of clothing, the frugal way of life and the power and greatness of the Ottoman Empire.¹¹⁹

2.4 *The contents of chapters one to six of the Mahometanus*

Before proceeding with the exposition of the Christian doctrine that must help “the Mohammedans converting to the saving faith,” Peykich believes it necessary to make some introductory, preliminary statements. Chapter one consists of four “notes” presenting an argumentative chain, which leads to the second chapter. The four notes have to demonstrate the harmony of Christianity with Islam as regards the nature of religious faith. First, it is stated that faith is absolutely indispensable for eternal salvation and that this is also fundamental for “Muhammad’s religion.” Second, Peykich draws a distinction between “human” faith, which is founded on human testimony or authority and is therefore fallible, and “divine” faith, which has its foundation in God’s testimony. The testimony of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, is absolutely certain, and Christians and Muslim all agree on this. The third note follows closely some passages from the *Roman Catechism* which have been quoted above:

What the divine faith reveals us, for it is a dark knowledge, based on God’s testimony, that we must completely and in every way believe, although we neither do nor could understand what has been revealed to us through it. The

¹¹⁹ “Tandem opusculum hocce, quamvis ad Mahometanorum conversionem velmaxime concinnatum sit, deservire tamen poterit etiam ipsis Christianis in Turcia degentibus, imo et nostris illuc cum Legationibus proficiscentibus, quorum non pauci Mahometanorum sat praeclara facta, magnificum scilicet Moschearum splendorem, et majestatem, summam in Moscheis compositionem, largam in pauperes eleemosynam, rarum vestium nitorem, victus frugalitatem, magnam imperij potentiam, et multa alia in conspectu hominum bona suspicientes, deserta vera et salutifera Christi fide, ad Mahometanam superstitionem amplectendam sese praecipitant.” – *Mahometanus*, pp. 3-4.

whole philosophy does not understand, neither could it understand how something can be created from nothing. Indeed it claims: *ex nihilo nihil fit*. Yet, the Turks believe together with us that God has created everything from nothing. So the sky, the earth, the seas and the rest. Similarly the whole philosophy, in line with the principle *de privatione ad habitum non datur regressus*, does not grasp, neither could it grasp the resurrection of dead.¹²⁰ Yet, together with us, the Mohammedans firmly believe in the future resurrection of our bodies.¹²¹

In note four, the conclusion is drawn that Christians and Muslims are in full agreement as far as the need to believe what has been revealed by divine faith is concerned. Dissent only concerns the content of the revelation.¹²²

This state of affairs prompts Peykich to tackle the theme of the second chapter. In it, it is his task to confirm that all the dogmas of the Catholic Church (the Trinity of persons in One God, God having a Son, Son of God's Incarnation, Christ's divinity and many others) have a divine origin, i.e. that they had been revealed through divine faith. This claim is based on the conviction, which is shared both by Christians and Muslims, that the two Testaments are divine books. Since the Muslims accept the divine nature of

¹²⁰ The fact of the Muslim's belief in the resurrection of the dead is a polemical argument also found in other authors. This is how, for instance, González speaks of it: "Et ut alia omittam, vos Mauri creditis corporum resurrectionem; et tamen dicursus naturalis noassequitur, quomodo corpus conversum in vermes, in hervas, vel in pisces (quando scilicet ab eis devoratur) possit resurgere." – GONZÁLEZ, *Manuductio*, vol. 2, lib. 3, cap. 11, p. 279.

¹²¹ "Fides divina, cum sit cognitio obscura fundata in testimonio Dei, quidquid nobis revelat, debemus absolute, et omnimode credere; quamvis non intelligamus, nec intelligere possimus ea, quae nobis fide divina mediante revelata sunt. Tota Philosophia non intelligit, nec intelligere potest, aliquid posse fieri ex nihilo, imo asserit: ex nihilo nihil fit, Turca tamen una nobiscum credit, Deum omnia ex nihilo creasse. Sic coelum, terram, maria, et reliqua. Similiter tota Philosophia nec capit, nec capere potest, mortuorum resurrectionem, juxta principium: *De privatione ad habitum non datur regressus*: Mahometanus tamen una nobiscum firmissime credit nostrorum corporum resurrectionem futuram." – *Mahometanus*, p. 6.

¹²² "Inter nos Christianos, et Mahometanos est summa concordia, et summus consensensus, ea omnia, quae fide divina revelata sunt, credi, et usque ad ultimum vitae halitum retineri oportere; non tamen conveniunt nobiscum Mahometani in punctis revelatis..." – *Mahometanus*, p. 6.

the Bible, they must necessarily acknowledge the articles of Christian faith contained in it as true and hence believe in them.¹²³ Furthermore, they would acknowledge them and would accept them as their own if they did not fall back on their *Koran* and did not believe it a sacred book sent down from Heaven, if they did not honour it and did not oppose themselves to the Holy Scripture of the Christians.

To summarize, the Muslims admit that the Christian sacred books are the Word of God; they believe they should obey this Word, they should accept God's commandments and therefore accept the dogmas transmitted by, and contained in, the revealed texts of the two Testaments. Yet they try to resist and to escape this obligation by using two escape routes which had been thought up by their theologians, which Peykich exposes in chapter three.

The first escape route is an argument applied by Muhammad himself claiming that the Gospels had been corrupted by the Christians, and the Tora by the Hebrews, and that some predictions, which had been found in those books by Muhammad's appearance, were then lost. Interestingly enough, Peykich gave an unusual version of this traditional Muslim accusation of Christians by locating the event of the corruption of the Scriptures *after* the advent of Muhammad, and not, as had been commonly narrated, in the early centuries of Christianity.

According to Peykich, the second escape route used by Muslim polemicists in their attempt to avoid the obligation to accept the truth of Christianity is to argue that the text of the New Testament is authentic and correct but that its doctrine has been substituted by the new law revealed through Muhammad, in the same way in which the law of Moses had been substituted by the law of Christ. The confutation of these two arguments is developed in the following chapters, from four to six, of the *Mahometanus*.

¹²³ Similar but more detailed is the argumentation in GONZÁLEZ *Manuductio*, vol. 2, lib. 3, cap. 1.

Among the whole succession of arguments adduced by Peykich in defense of the authenticity of the Hebrews' and Christians' Sacred Scriptures, there are two that are highly curious. The first reads as follows:

What great a multitude were the Arians once, how great was their power, there is none who does not know. [...] Therefore, if at that time when almost the whole world, together with the Emperors, was Arian, no harm could be done to the holy Scriptures that would conceal Christ's divinity; how was it done, or how could it be done, Muhammad's prophecies to be covered up and obliterated, especially in that time when Muhammad's name would hardly be heard outside Meca and Medina?¹²⁴

The next proof of the authenticity of Christian Scripture is, one may say, a "proof deriving from." It is a commonly known truth, Peykich says, that many nations who differ or disagree with respect to their customs, tastes, laws, and religion (*plures nationes inter se moribus, genio, lege, religione adverse, aut diverse*) worship the same Scripture. The mere fact that there are the Christians and the Hebrews who share their devotion for the Old Testament but are otherwise implacable enemies, or that among the Christians themselves there are many century-long conflicts and disagreements on what the correct interpretation of the Scriptures should be, is held by Peykich to be sufficient evidence for the genuineness of these so strongly contested texts. He further supports his statement by evoking an "exemplary" case of internal Christian conflict, the "Great Schism" and the debate about the procession of the Holy Ghost.¹²⁵ What can be deduced from the story of the schism is that, if the

¹²⁴ "Quanta olim Arianorum multitudo, quanta potentia fuerit, nemo est, qui ignoret. [...] Si ergo eo tempore, quo ferme totus orbis cum Imperatoribus Arianus erat, nulla potuit fieri corruptio in Sacris Scripturis ad obscurandam Christi Divinitatem; quomodo facta fuerit, aut fieri potuerit, ad occulendas, vel abolendas praedictiones de Mahometo, eo praesertim tempore, cum Mahometi nomen vix extra Meham, et Medinam audietur?" – *Mahometanus*, p. 13.

¹²⁵ "Unica dictio addita a Latinis in Symbolo fidei, non ad aliquid de veritate detrahendum, sed ad eandem veritatem magis explicandam, tam magnum inter eos, et Graecos attulit odium, ac diffidium; ut, quantumvis plures Graeci in generalibus Concilijs

alteration of one single word in the Creed can provoke such a violent, long-lasting and far-reaching conflict, a possible intervention in the text of the Sacred Scripture on the part of one Christian denomination or sect would be never tolerated by the others, each of whom claims moreover to be the only true inheritor of the message transmitted to the Apostles. If anything like this had ever happened, it would be impossible not to have at least heard about it.

2.5 *Further polemics in the Mahometanus*

It would be too lengthy and superfluous to give the details of the contents of every chapter in Peykich's *Mahometanus*. Here we shall instead consider only such discussions as may appear to be the most interesting.

a) *On the Holy Trinity*

In the doctrine of the Trinity, Peykich sees the “*lapis offensionis et petra scandali*” (Isaia 8:14; 1Peter 2:7), the stone that causes the ones who are disobedient to the Word of God to stumble. As stated by our author, this doctrine has always met with the most violent resistance and the most hostile disagreement on the part not only of Muslims but also of Jews and other people who are adverse to the true faith.¹²⁶ Peykich quotes (after Marracci)¹²⁷ two famous passages from the *Koran* where Muhammad directly challenges and disproves the doctrine of Trinity.¹²⁸ Together with other arguments in

additionem illam approbaverint, adhuc tamen inter eos, et Latinos scissura perseveret.” – *Mahometanus*, p. 13.

¹²⁶ *Ibi*, p. 30.

¹²⁷ MARRACCIUS, *Alcorani textus universus, Prodromi ad refutationem Alcorani Pars tertia*, p. 11.

¹²⁸ “Mahometus satis obscure de eo loquitur. Solum enim Sura 4. mulieres versu 170. monet Christianos his verbis: *O Scripturales, ne excedatis in Religione vestra; neque loquamini de Deo, nisi veritatem; ne dicatis: Tres: Abstinete ab hoc: nam melius erit vobis: quippe Deus, est Deus unus;* et Sura 5. mensa v. 79. *Infideles sunt illi, qui dicunt Deum esse*

defence of the doctrine of Trinity, he also adduces the one according to which the Sacred Scripture, to oppose the assertions of Muslim polemicists, includes texts which disclose and confirm this doctrine and he dedicates himself to preparing a long list of related passages from both the Old and the New Testament.¹²⁹ Towards the end of the discussion he also pleads the authority of the ecumenical and particular ecclesiastical councils.¹³⁰

b) *The accusation of idolatry*

“You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. You shall not worship them or serve them.” (Exodus 20: 3-5)

The presentation and explanation of the first of the Ten Commandments offers our author the chance to open a broad discussion in defence against the accusation of idolatry, with which Muslims traditionally charge Christians. Firstly, Peykich reminds his imaginary opponents that there are different ways or levels of worshipping and honouring: one for God himself, one for the Mother of God and one for the saints. Up to this point, Christians and Muslims do not disagree very much, for the Muslims also worship Muhammad and their reputed saints.¹³¹ It is far more difficult, Peykich maintains, to show them that it is right to venerate icons and religious images, something that they do not practise.

Peykich’s defence of the custom of the veneration of religious images seeks to demonstrate that this practice is in keeping both with natural law and with that of God.¹³²

tertium trium: nam non reperitur, nisi Deus unus. Quod si non abstinerint ab hoc modo loquendi, subibunt hujusmodi infideles poenam dolorificam.” – Mahometanus, p. 32.

¹²⁹ Ibi, p. 33-34.

¹³⁰ Ibi, p. 36.

¹³¹ Ibi, p. 106.

¹³² Ibi, p. 107.

As far as natural law is concerned, nothing in nature, Peykich says, would suggest that the use of images in divine worship should be rejected. Quite the contrary: we see man, along with other animals, to be naturally inclined to imitating, to reproducing his own image in further creations. Moreover, there are paintings, sculptures and other arts which consist in the observation and imitation of nature for the general good and they can in no way be judged to be wrong. Furthermore, it is a commonly known fact that since the world began all the peoples throughout the world have made statues of their illustrious and celebrated men and triumphant leaders. What is common to all peoples, Peykich states, cannot be something wrong and certainly originated in natural light. Finally, Peykich points out that nature itself, as if by chisel or by paintbrush, portrays in its works the most glorious attributes of God and assimilates the lower and earthly things to the superior and celestial ones.

As far as divine law is concerned, Peykich continues, it does not condemn the use of images either, and, what is more, it even approves of it. God himself had sanctioned the use of images by creating man in his own image and likeness.¹³³ Against this use, the Jewish and Muslim polemicists quote the first Commandment of the Decalogue.¹³⁴ But what is prohibited here, Peykich insists, is not the creation and the use of images but of idols. What God forbids are not icons and the sculptures but their illicit veneration. It is illicit to venerate them as gods. It is however not illicit to venerate them as far as they represent Jesus Christ Our Lord, Holy Mary, the Mother of God, and the saints whom we actually worship beyond the icons.¹³⁵ As for the other two persons of the Trinity, Peykich specifies that there are no representations of them in a strict sense. By convention, a picture of an old man stands for the person of God the Father and a dove for that of the Holy Spirit. These are symbols and hieroglyphs, Peykich says, which are exploited when the true image is

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibi, p. 108.

¹³⁵ Ibi, p. 109.

unknown, and the same operation is applied to the representation of intellectual substancies, i.e. angels.¹³⁶

The discussion then closes with the following curious autobiographical note:

Although the Mohammedans are so much adverse to the images, yet they have perserved till now in St. Sophia Church in Constantinople three images of Christ Our Lord, three of Mother of God, and one of St. John the Baptist together with several representations of the cross and some angels. [...] Once when about thirtty years ago I was in Constantinople, I heard the people who had seen it to talk about it and I myself saw it with my own eyes.¹³⁷

Peykich touches on the accusation of idolatry once more in his book as part of the discussion concerning the ninth article of the Catholic Creed, “credo in Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum Communionem.” In it, he quotes a Koranic verse (from *sūra* 9, although he refers to it erroneously as *sūra* 3), where Muhammad accuses the Christians of honoring their pontiffs and monks as lords alongside the only God.¹³⁸ Our author interprets this claims as another accusation of idolatry. In his response, he admits the fact that Christians hold their priests in high honour but insists that this is a “human” honour, which is distinct from the “divine” one, i.e. from the one that is kept only for God.¹³⁹

¹³⁶ Ibi, p. 110.

¹³⁷ “Quamvis autem Mahometani adeo ab imaginibus abhorreant, retinent tamen adhuc Constantinopoli in templo S. Sophiae tres imagines Christi Domini, tres deiparae Virginis, et unam S. Joannis Baptistae cum figuris aliquot crucum, et aliquorum angelorum. [...] Hoc ipsum, dum ipse Constantinopoli ante 30. circiter annos fuissem, ab iis, qui propriis oculis in dicto templo viderunt, narrari audivi, et propriis oculis vidissem.” – Ibi, p. 111.

¹³⁸ In Marracci, the passage reads as follows: “Acceperunt Judaei Pontifices suos et Chritiani Monachos suos in dominos praeter Deum; et Messiam filium Mariae.” – MARRACCIUS, *Alcorani textus universus, Refutationes in Suram IX. Alcorani*, p. 305, referring to *Koran*, 9:32.

¹³⁹ “Caeterum non negamus Christianos [...] honorare, semperque honorasse monachos, et multo magis episcopos, et antistites suos, et praesertim romanum pontificem, magno quidem honore, sed humano, non divino: neque illos ut dominos, vel Deos, sed ut Domini, ac Dei vicarios et ministros agnoscere [...]” – *Mahometanus*, p. 70.

c) *Matrimony, divorce, polygamy*

Peykich's definition of the sacrament of matrimony closely follows the definition found in the *Roman Catechism*: a legitimate union of man and woman, which obliges them to live together throughout their life and to have offspring who must be brought up in the Christian tradition.¹⁴⁰ On the basis of this view of marriage, according to which "vinculum matrimoniale manet semper, et usque ad mortem indissolubile,"¹⁴¹ Peykich tackles the possibility of divorce, of breaking this indissoluble union, which Islamic law foresees.¹⁴² Together with quotations of relevant biblical passages, Peykich's line of reasoning in the course of this discussion includes several more generic or, broadly speaking, philosophical arguments that are intended to demonstrate the unlawful nature of the institution of divorce. Peykich states that it is against natural law, that it harms the correct upbringing and education of children and that the marriage contract, by which each spouse concedes his or her own body to the other, cannot be infringed or terminated by any divine or human law. Of these arguments, Peykich accords preference to the one involving natural law.

Our author maintains that the example of many animal species who live in stable couples is one indication for the innate nature and naturalness of the idea of a permanent union between a man and a woman.¹⁴³ Peykich then adds the following objection he might expect to hear from his opponents: what is contrary to nature is denied and rejected by all peoples throughout the world; and yet, in many nations the practice of divorce is valued as something good. Peykich responds to this objection by saying that is not true that what is

¹⁴⁰ Ibi, p. 163. Cf. *Catechismus*, pars 2, cap. 8: *De sacramento matrimonii*, q. 3. Further in text (p. 165) Peykich refers to the *Decrees* of the Council of Trent as well and that is to the decrees of the twenty-fourth session when the Catholic doctrine of matrimony was treated.

¹⁴¹ *Mahometanus*, p. 164.

¹⁴² Cf. DANIEL, *Islam and the West*, p. 158: "The theology of the institution of marriage is the key to many related questions. It needs to be kept in mind that Latin Christians define the married relation as inherently indissoluble except by death."

¹⁴³ *Mahometanus*, p. 167.

opposite to nature is identified as something unlawful and avoided by all peoples. For there are very many peoples who practice simony or polygamy and even approve and esteem them as just and lawful.

In reality, he further claims, polygamy just like divorce, is contrary to natural law. This is evident in the fact that in the beginning God had created one man and one woman.¹⁴⁴ Polygamy is then *contra divinam institutionem* and contrary to natural law, against the good education of the children of the family and has an intensifying effect on the libido.

Peykich also warns the reader about another practical problem which appears when living in accordance with this custom of having many wives. The problem is that the man always prefers one of his wives, who becomes his favourite, and this unjust treatment of women becomes a source of temptation and disturbs domestic peace. Peykich quotes a line from the *Koran* where Muhammad maintains that the husband could never treat his wives equally, and he concludes that insofar as Muhammad was conscious of the insuperability of this inequality, he should simply have established the institution of a monogamous marriage and let every man remain with his favourite woman.¹⁴⁵

It is important to note that Peykich paid special attention to the criticism of the Islamic doctrine of matrimony, divorce and polygamy. He assigns it a central place in his line of argument and returns to it in the conclusion of the book. In all probability, this is due to the fact that to combat the Islamic view on this issue was of considerable practical importance.

¹⁴⁴ Ibi, p. 173.

¹⁴⁵ “*Et nullo modo poteritis aequitatem servare inter mulieres, etiamsi multum cupiatis, et studeatis; ita ut non inclinatis ulla propensione, ad unam plus quam ad alteram; atque ita relinquatis eam, quam plus amatis, sicut suspensam* (sura 5, v. 128). Reliqua omittens dico: si certum erat Mahometo, nullo modo posse virum cum pluribus uxoribus aequitatem servare, non erat, quod hic plures illis concederet, sed debebat absolute unam tantum illis praescribere.” – Ibi, p. 172.

2.6 Conclusion

It is Peykich's conviction that there cannot be better arguments than those connected to divorce and polygamy which will be of assistance in exposing the falsity of the *Koran* and its teachings.¹⁴⁶ "Utterly blind is," he says, "the one who does not see that this law" – here Peykich refers specifically to one norm concerning the divorce procedure – "is not only against divine law but also against any natural reasoning."¹⁴⁷ In the final pages of the *Mahometanus*, that is in the corollary and in the conclusion, it becomes clear why our author insists so much on demonstrating that the practices of divorce and polygamy are unnatural. It is because if it can be demonstrated that a certain practice is against natural law, it automatically follows from this that the law which permits such a practise cannot have a divine origin. In other words, if it is demonstrated that polygamy, for instance, which is sanctioned by the *Koran*, contradicts natural law, it means that the teaching of the *Koran*, together with the *Koran* itself, is a falsification.

Peykich maintains that the fact of this falsification is evident not only to Christians but also to Muslims although, being either seduced and blinded by Muhammad, or far too stubborn, they do not wish to admit it. However, they may perhaps one day want to rid themselves of their blindness, or they will be compelled to do so, which is more likely. Perhaps, by the grace of God, they will want to free themselves from the oppression of their tyrant and then be welcomed by the Christian princes, or they will be defeated by the Christian princes, which is more probable and is what our Peykich expects to be the outcome of Charles VI's reign. Once they are in the care of the Christian Emperor, they will find themselves freed from any oppression on their conscience, "they will not be afraid of fire or of the infamous gallows" (*neque ignem, neque infame lignum formidabunt*) and then they will open their eyes

¹⁴⁶ *Ibi*, p. 191.

¹⁴⁷ "Caeterum legem hanc esse non solum contra legem Divinam, sed etiam contra omnem rationem naturalem, coecus prorsus est, qui non videt." – *Ibi*, p. 187.

to the truth and their hearts to the only true religion.¹⁴⁸ Under the guidance of Peykich's *Mahometanus*, Muslims who come under the rule of the Hapsburgs will find their way to Christianity, accept baptism and become part of the Church, as well as good and loyal subjects of the Christian Empire. Such is the political context within which Peykich placed his book, a context, which was partly real, in which Peykich himself was already acting, and partly utopian. Be that as it may, he was very careful to show that his book was indispensable for religious consolidation in the newly conquered territories of the Hapsburgs.

Together with its direct aim, that is to say to provide a spiritual weapon for the war against the Turks by converting ex-Ottoman Muslim subjects to Catholicism and sustaining the religious loyalty of Catholic Ottoman subjects, Peykich's *Mahometanus* also had another final, utopian purpose. This was to contribute to the conversion of all the Muslims in the world. For this reason, Peykich believed that his book should be translated and printed in Turkish, Chaldean, Illyrian, Greek and Armenian.¹⁴⁹ This final aim agrees in some way with the final, ideal aim of the activity of the *Propaganda Fide* itself, that is to spread the Gospel throughout the world. Thus "The Mohammedan Educated in the Law of Christ," particular and curious reading as it is, at the same time maintains its due place in a long and important tradition of religious and political propaganda.

¹⁴⁸ "Ex hactenus dictis, nemo non videt, quam facile possent Mahometani de errore suo convinci, si ipsi convinci vellent. Sed volent, ut spero, aliquando Divina aspirante gratia, cum durissimum tyrannorum suorum jugum excusserint, et in Christianorum Principum tutelam sese sponte receperint, vel sub eorum potestatem victi (uti sub Augustissimo Romanorum Imperatore Carolo VI. futurum speramus) devenerint. Tunc vero cum libera erit eis Religionis electio, et neque ignem, neque infame lignum formidabunt; facile argumentis in hocce opere productis ad superstitionem suam deponendam, et ad religionem veram suscipiendam perducentur." – Ibi, p. 192.

¹⁴⁹ "Quibus omnibus sat provistum, si opusculum hoc non solum latinis, verum et turcicis, chaldaeis, illyricis, graecis, ac armenis characteribus, ac linguis impressum, vulgatumque fuerit, sicut eventurum, divina mediante gratia, non diffido." – *Mahometanus*, p. 4.

CHAPTER 3

PEYKICH'S WORKS ON SCHISM AND UNION OF THE CHURCH

Three thematically connected works by Krasyo Peykich are the subject of the present chapter. In the “Illirian” *Zarcalo istine* (1716), in the *Speculum veritatis* (1725) and in the *Concordia* (1730) Peykich examines the four Catholic doctrines, the respect of which was regarded by the early modern Catholic Church as a necessary and sufficient condition for the reunification of the Eastern Church with the Western one. These four doctrines are as follows: the procession of the Holy Spirit both from the Father and from the Son, the universal primacy of the pope, the existence of purgatory and the use of unleavened bread for the eucharist. In reality, in the *Concordia*, our author concentrates on only one of these points, that concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, which was held, and not only by Peykich, to be of the greatest theological importance and the very *lapis offensionis et petra scandali* for the reunification of the members of that divided body, of which Christ was the head.

These four Catholic doctrines correspond to four theological and ecclesiastical differences discussed on the occasion of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1439). The formulations agreed on by the fathers of this council were written down in the *Decree* signed on the 5th of July, 1439, by all the participants, albeit reluctantly by many members of the Greek delegation, with the exception of Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus, who opposed the formulations, and Joseph II, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had died less than a month before that date. While at the council, Georgius Scholarius was in support of union and signed the *Decree*. Only later, after the death of Mark Eugenicus in 1444, would he emerge as the leader of the anti-unionist

party in Constantinople, and later, in 1454, he was to become the first Patriarch of Constantinople under Ottoman rule. The Council of Florence and the respective *Decree* became exemplary for the all subsequent attempts of the Catholic Church to win over the Eastern Churches, and the conditions for later unions, such as those of Brest (1596) or of Alba Julia (1698) were modelled on them.¹

Accordingly, in his works dedicated to the Catholic-Orthodox polemic, Peykich addresses the four standard points of discord. Furthermore, in his examination, he strongly (though not exclusively) relies on the line of argument followed by the Latin spokesmen at the Council of Florence and on their treatment of the Biblical and patristic passages recalled during the discussions.²

The three works analysed here have been bibliographically described by Josip Turčinović. He has provided synopses of their contents, virtually established their sources and given an exhaustive description of the differences between the “Illyrian” and the Latin versions of the *Speculum* besides between the 1725 and the 1730 editions of the latter. Here, the structure and the content of these works will be illustrated only very briefly while greater attention will be paid to the way in which Peykich’s argumentation developed through the years, a process which was determined primarily by his gradual acquaintance with new sources.

1. THE *ZARCALO ISTINE MED CARKE ISTOČNE I ZAPADNJE* (1716)

Zarcalo istine med Carke Istočne i Zapadnje (“The Mirror of Truth in the Eastern and Western Churches”) is a short book where the history of the alienation and division, and the subsequent union between the Eastern and

¹ Cf. G. DE VIRES, “Il problema ecumenico alla luce delle unioni realizzate in Oriente,” *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, 27 (1961), pp. 64-81, in part. p. 73.

² In this connection, cf. the similar observations made by TURČINOVIĆ, p. 167.

Western Churches is narrated only in general terms and with respect to the most essential moments. It includes a dedicatory letter in Latin, a preface and ten chapters, all in “Illyrian.”

The letter of dedication to the Cardinals of the Propaganda is fairly concise and can be summarised in a few points. In ancient times, thus Peykich begins his history, the Eastern Church gave rise to as many *martyres, virgines, confessores, doctoresque christianis* as did the Western one, but in that epoch it already generated numerous heresies, which the Western Church promptly and efficiently eradicated. Yet, at the same time, the Eastern Roman Empire ruled nearly all the known world, and thus the Eastern Church ceased to obey the seat in Rome until the time came, says Peykich, when the Eastern Empire was conquered by the Ottomans and, by the just judgment of God, the Greek Church, too, fell into slavery.³

However, our author reminds his readers, that the eighteenth-century Eastern Church is not exclusively, and not even predominantly, Greek, but “Illyrian,” or, as one would say today, Slavic, in the sense that many Slavic-speaking nations (*idiomate utentes Illyro*) adhere to it.⁴ Peyckich says he has written his book in their “Illyrian” language for it to be beneficial to his Illyrian brothers, so that they might learn whence they had been torn away and whither they were expected to return.⁵

The Latin letter of dedication is followed by a preface to the reader in “Illyrian”; the first part repeats the opening lines of the dedication, i.e. it presents a picture of the ancient church before the schism. Then Peikich addresses the reader with a series of questions: How did the division of the Church occur? What caused it? How much does the Roman Church desire

³ *Zarcalo*, f. A3v (unnumbered leaf; in case of unnumbered leaves, here and henceforth we refer to the fascicle).

⁴ “Ecclesia Orientalis dicitur quidem, et esto titulo tali quali graeca, universaliori tamen si spectetur oculo nonnisi Illyra dicenda, et esse comprobatur.” – *Zarcalo*, f. A4v (unnumbered leaf).

⁵ Cf. *Zarcalo*, ff. A4r-A5r (unnumbered leaf).

unity? How many times, after achieving union, did the Greeks disrupt it? What would the best way to achieve unity again be? On all these issues, the sons of the Eastern Church think and do little. Our Orthodox brothers, continues Peykich, so dearly bought with the blood of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, so docile and obedient, have no master and are like sheep without a shepherd. And they know nothing about Christianity, except “to fast, fast and fast yet again.”⁶ What are God’s commandments? And how should one obey them? If a Christian violates any of these commandments, what can he do to repent? And finally, how does one prepare oneself to die as a Christian? No-one thinks about these questions, and no-one speaks about these matters to Orthodox Christians.⁷ Instead, they are warned against entering the Catholic Church and told that it is better to be slaves to the Turks than to converge with Rome. This is how the Greeks speak. For 250 years now, they who once ruled the world have been slaves to the Turks. And it will remain so, says our author, until they hear the voice of their mother calling them to return, just as the prodigal son returned to his family.⁸

Towards the end of his book, Peykich continues this line of reasoning. In paragraph six of the last chapter, which in the *Speculum* is developed into a separate Conclusion, Peykich blames the Greeks for the fact that their obstinacy not only condemns their own souls to death but also makes God listen rather to the false prayers of the Turk, who hopes there will never be peace among Christians.⁹

Only a minor part of *Zarcalo istine* is dedicated to a discussion of the four doctrinal differences between the Eastern and the Western Churches. It is mainly, instead, a “chronicle of the schism,” as it tracks the different stages in the destruction of the unity between the two Churches. The history begins with the genesis of the schism and reaches the moment when, according to Peykich,

⁶ *Zarcalo*, p. 2

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibi*, p. 3.

⁹ *Ibi*, p. 105.

its successful solution has been accomplished. The moment has come for his Orthodox brothers to take action and return to the truth, from which they have deviated not so much for religious reasons as for the twists of fate. As soon as the schism is overcome definitively, as soon as the controversy is settled and union achieved, there should be no need for further discussion.

The thesis of the *Zarcalo* is, ultimately, that the Council of Florence was fully legitimate and ecumenical and that to neglect its decisions means deceiving all believers and committing a sin. Therefore, Peikich does not dwell so much on dogmatic questions, merely focussing on retracing historical events and making it evident to anybody who is not blind or obstinate that “the cause of Church disunity are the Greeks, the cause of unity are the Latins.”¹⁰ From such a perspective, the general structure of the *Zarcalo*, as well as the disproportion between the chronicle and the final polemical section of the work, are fully justified.

The first historical event included by Peikich in his history of how the Eastern Church has fallen into a schism, is the Fourth Ecumenical Council, that of Chalcedon (451). The twenty-eighth canon approved by that council established the pentarchy of the five patriarchates in the following order of dignity: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, and granted equal privileges to the episcopal seats of Rome and Constantinople as the new Rome. Pope Leo, whose legates were not present when this canon was approved, did not ratify it and protested against the lesser honour conceded to Antioch and Alexandria. This episode, and the decades of conflicts between Rome and Constantinople that followed it, are depicted by Peikich as the first rebellion of the Church of Constantinople against the authority of the seat of St. Peter's.¹¹

The so-called schism of Photius is viewed in the *Zarcalo* as another key moment in the history of the division of the Church. Chapters four and five of

¹⁰ “[...] razdvoenia cerkvenoga uzrok garci iesu; iedinstva latini” – *Zarcalo*, p. 18.

¹¹ J. GILL, *Il concilio di Firenze*, tr. A. Orsi Battaglini, Firenze: G.C. Sansoni, 1967, p. 2.

the *Zarcalo* are dedicated to this episode, which was the occasion when the question of *filioque*, that is the Latin addition to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, was raised for the first time.¹² Peykich gives an account of all the twists and turns that complicated drama took between 858, when Patriarch Ignathius was dethroned and his place taken by Photius, and 880, the year of the last ‘Photius’ council’ in Constantinople. Chapter five, in particular, deals with the so-called ‘second Photius’ schism’, which allegedly took place after Photius’ second ascension to the Patriarchal throne in 878 and which has been revealed by modern historians to be a “historical mystification.”¹³ As might be expected from such a polemicist as Peykich, his narrative is interspersed with evaluations, comments, precepts and exhortations. To give just one example, in connection with the council of 869-870, at which Photius was condemned, he says as follows.

My dear reader, from these facts you can well understand that this council was summoned at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, while that of Photius against saint Ignathius [i.e. the fact of 861, when the dethronement of Ignathius was confirmed] at the suggestion of an evil spirit; this one proceeded with justice and mercy, that one, as we saw, proceeded with no justice and no mercy; at this one the sacred canons were observed, at that one the sacred canons were trampled on.¹⁴

Peykich also includes in his narrative the IV Lateran (1215) and the II Lyon (1274) Councils, where the definition of the procession of the Holy Spirit *ab*

¹² The polemic of Patriarch Photius on the addition to the Creed provided a certain set of themes and arguments that was to become standard reference point for the Orthodox theologians for centuries to come. – Cf. Г. КАПРИЕВ [G. KAPRIEV], *Византийската философия. Четири центъра на синтеза* [The Byzantine Philosophy. Four Centers of Synthesis], Sofia: Лик, 2001, p. 197.

¹³ КАПРИЕВ, p. 169. Cf. F. DVORNIK, *Lo scisma di Fozio. Storia e legenda*, tr. G. Pacchiani, Roma: Edizioni Paoline, 1953, pp. 232-270, where this mystification is exposed.

¹⁴ “Moi dragi štioče, od ovo činjenje moreš dobro poznati, da ovi sabor biaše skupen po duhu svetomu, a ona fociev protiva Svetoga Ignacie po duhu nečistomu, u ovomuse spravdom, i milosardiom hodi, u onomu, kako vidismo, brez pravdu, i brez milosardia; u ovomuse obslužuii, u onomu pogazuii sveti kanoni.” – *Zarcalo*, p. 37.

utroque was established as doctrine of the Catholic Church and the insertion of the clause '*filioque*' in the text of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed was confirmed.

Chapter nine is dedicated to the Council of Ferrara-Florence and it reports on the events that occurred in the period between the preparations for the organization of the council in 1437 and the conclusion of the union on July 6th, 1439. This chapter describes the events surrounding the arrival of the Greek mission led by Emperor John VIII and Patriarch Joseph II and the transfer of the council from Ferrara to Florence. It also narrates briefly the proceedings and the outcome of the most decisive sessions, and retells a part of the content of the discussions held between the spokesmen of the two missions: Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus, and Bessarion of Trebizond, Metropolitan of Nicae, on the one side, and Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, Juan de Torquemada, on the other side, just to mention some of the most important names. At the end of the chapter, the author adds a long quotation from the *Decree* of the council that contains the precise definitions of the doctrines, on which an agreement had been reached as a result of the debates. Respectively, in chapter ten the Catholic doctrine on these four questions is stated and supported with quotations from the Bible and the Greek Fathers.

In very generic terms, here is what was agreed at the council. It was decided that the bread used for the Eucharist might be leavened or unleavened and that in this respect each Church could follow its own tradition. Further, the Greeks admitted the Latin doctrine of purgatory. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the text of the *Decree* does not use the word '*purgatorium*'.¹⁵ The definition from the *Decree* says that if at the moment of one's departure from this world he or she is not perfectly pure, his/her soul is purified after death but no mention is made of the "place" where this purification happens. In connection to the supremacy of the Pope over the other Patriarchs, "the

¹⁵ DE VIRES, "Il problema ecumenico," pp. 64-81, in part. p. 78.

ultimate formula left much unsaid.”¹⁶ What it says, however, is that the Pope has supremacy over the whole world, that he is successor to Saint Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ and head of the whole Church. His complete doctrinal and disciplinary authority was recognised but his claim to have the exclusive right to summon ecumenical councils was not accepted by the Greeks. There was also a clause guaranteeing, albeit somewhat vaguely, “the privileges and rights” of the other patriarchs.¹⁷

The question of the procession of the Holy Spirit and its addition to the Creed was the one discussed at greatest length. The Latins tried to demonstrate that the insertion of the clause ‘*filioque*’ was purely explanatory, and they pleaded a similar addition to the Nicene Creed that was made at the Second Ecumenical Council, the one held in Constantinople.¹⁸ For their part, the Greeks saw it as their mission to preserve the unity of the cause of the Spirit. Moreover, the Greeks were concerned with the *cause*, the Latins with the *principle* of the procession of the Spirit.¹⁹ Ultimately, the definition in the *Decree* states that the addition of the clause ‘*filioque*’ is “necessary, lawful and in accordance with reason.” Regarding the Holy Spirit, it is affirmed that it proceeds both from the Father and the Son “*tanquam ab uno principio*.”²⁰

As indicated by Turčinović, the most probable source for chapters nine and ten of the *Zarcalo* is the *Greek Acta* of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, which were printed in Latin for the first time in 1638.²¹ Despite the fact that they are

¹⁶ RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*, quotation from p. 108.

¹⁷ “Definitio Concilii,” in *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini necnon descriptionis cuidam eiusdem*, ed. I. Gill, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953, pp. 459-465. Cf. also DE VIRES, “Il problema ecumenico,” pp. 64-81, in part. p. 72.

¹⁸ RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 106-107.

¹⁹ DE VIRES, “Il problema ecumenico,” pp. 64-81, in part. p. 78.

²⁰ Cf. “Definitio Concilii.”

²¹ *Acta Sacri Oecumenici Concilii Florentini*, ed. Horatius Iustinianus, Romae: Typis Sac. Congr. de Fide Propaganda, 1638. The first Greek edition of the *Greek Acta* was published in 1577. – Cf. GILL, *Il Concilio di Firenze*, p. xiii. The principal sources for the history of the

explicitly mentioned by Peykich only in the *Additamentum* of 1727,²² it is highly probable that the *Acts* were his source for drawing up the historical chapter nine and for the quotations from the Greek Fathers in the last chapter. As for the “chronicle of the schism” narrated in the first eight chapters of the *Zarcalo*, Turčinović hypothesises that it is based on notes Peykich had taken while following the course of controversial theology at the Urban College and carried with him on his travels.²³

The last hypothesis has still not been verified. We know the name of the professor who was reading the course of controversialist theology at the Urban College during the academic years 1696-1697 and 1697-1698.²⁴ He was Ivan Paštrić (Giovanni Pastrizio, 1636-1708), who took up the chair in 1669 and kept it for thirty consecutive years, until March 1700.²⁵ He was also president of the Academy of the Councils in Rome, a circle of scholars who met twice a month to discuss issues concerning controversialist theology, ecclesiastical history and canon law. One of the most learned men of his epoch, Paštrić left a voluminous corpus of manuscript works and notes preserved in various

council are three: the *Greek Acta*, the *Latin Acta* and the *Memoirs* of Silvester Siropulo, a member of the Greek delegation in Ferrara and Florence. The official *Latin Acta* have been lost so what is known by the name of *Latin Acta* is the account of one of the participants in the council, Andrea da Santa Croce. – Ibi, pp. xi-xiii.

²² *Additamentum*, p. 15.

²³ JEZERNIK, *Il Collegio Urbano*, pp. 476, reports the information that until the beginning of the 18th. century the pupils at the college had no textbooks for the various courses at their disposal but learnt from the notes they had to take during lessons and from an approximate list of the books that the pupils at the college had at their disposal in the second half of the 17th. century. Besides the *Decrees* of the Tridentine Council, the Roman Catechism and the decrees of the provincial and local councils, there were the works of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Bellarmino, together with other important authors of the Counter-Reformation.

²⁴ TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 26-27.

²⁵ T. MRKONJIĆ, *Il teologo Ivan Paštrić (Giovanni Pastrizio) (1636-1708). Vita. Opere. Concezione della teologia. Cristologia*, Pontificia facultas theologica “S. Bonaventurae”, Roma 1989, p. 49. On Pastrizio’s life and works one can consult also I. GOLUB, *Ivan Paštrić (Giovanni Pastrizio) – polihistor i teolog (1636-1708)*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1988.

libraries.²⁶ However, the size and the dispersion of his manuscript heritage hampers the verification of the above-mentioned hypothesis proposed by Turčinović.

There is yet another category of sources which Peykich may have used in drawing up the chronicle of the of the schism until the beginning of the Council of Florence. One would suggest that he made use of the decrees and other documents related to previous church councils, but we are still not in any condition to state it with certainty.

A three-language Latin-Greek-Slavic version of the *Decree* of Florence bearing the signatures of Eugenius IV and of eight Cardinals was drawn immediately after the conclusion of the union in 1439 and is still kept in the *Laurenziana* Library. Copies of this Slavic version were brought in Ruthenia where they gave origin to a manuscript tradition.²⁷ Yet, Peykich's translation of the text of the *Decree* (quoted at the end of chapter nine of the *Zarcalo*) does not seem to depend on the Florentine Slavic version of the same and there is not any evidence that Peykich knew about its existence.

²⁶ A list of his manuscript works has been published by MRKONJIĆ, *Il teologo Ivan Paštrić*, pp. 68-76.

²⁷ The Slavic sources on the Council of Florence have been published in *Acta Slavica Concilii Florentini*, ed. J. Krajcar, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1976. Concerning the Slavic version of the *Decree* and its fortune in the East, see M. GARZANITI, *Il Decreto di Unione del Concilio di Ferrara-Firenze e la sua versione slava*, in *Oriente ed Occidente a San Marco da Cosimo il Vecchio a Giorgio La Pira. Alla riscoperta della collezione di icone russe dei Lorena*, Firenze: Polistampa, 2004, pp. 35-40; Л.В. ЧЕРЕПНИН [L.V. CHEREPNIN], *К вопросу о русских источниках по истории Флорентийской унии* [On the Russian Sources Concerning the History of the Union of Florence], *Средние века* [Middle Ages], 25 (1964), pp. 176-187; Е.М. ЛОМИЗЕ [E.M. LOMIZE], “К вопросу о восприятии Ферраро-флорентийского собора русской делегацией: Анализ сведений Симеона Суздальского” [On the Impressions of the Russian Delegation from the Council of Ferrara-Florence], *Славяне и их соседи* [The Slavs and Their Neighbours], 6 (1996), pp. 140-152. For a linguistic analysis of the Slavic version of the *Decree*, see H. KEIPERT, *Der Weg des Russischen zur Weltsprache: das slavische Alternat der Konzilsbulle von Ferrara-Florenz vom 6. Juli 1439*, in G. FREIDHOF - P. KOSTA (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1986*. Referate des XII. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens (Frankfurt am Main/Riezelrn 16.-19.9.1986), München: Otto Sagner, 1987, pp. 233-276.

2. THE *SPECULUM VERITATIS INTER ORIENTALEM ET OCCIDENTALEM ECCLESIAS REFULGENS* (1725)

In a letter sent to the Propaganda on December 22nd, 1720, from Alvinc in Transylvania,²⁸ Krastyo Peykich announced that he had translated into Latin his book on the schism and union with the Greeks, which he had published in “Illyrian” a few years earlier. In this letter Peykich asked the Propaganda for permission to publish the book in Claudiopolis (Cluj-Napoca in present-day Romania) and for financial backing for the edition. In order to decide whether to finance its publication or not, the Cardinals had to have the manuscript assessed, so Peykich was instructed to forward it to them. The text was received in Rome in the summer of the following year, 1722, and the evaluation was assigned to Baltassarre di S. Filippo Neri,²⁹ at the time lecturer of *controversiae* at the Urban College.³⁰ Eventually, Peykich’s request for funding was rejected. At a meeting of the cardinals in April, 1722, the assessment of Peykich’s polemical work by the lecturer of *controversiae* was presented. Here it was stated that the work in question was not outstanding for any particularly elegant style, did not add anything new to the question of the division of the Churches, and since it could not be expected to be beneficial to the spiritual struggle, it did not deserve to be published.³¹

²⁸ APF, SOCG, vol. 628, f. 345r-v.

²⁹ At present, we have no any information about him. “Baltassarre di S. Filippo Neri” is how he signs in his written evaluation of Peychik’s treatise.

³⁰ The manuscript of *Speculum veritatis* is kept in APF, SOCG, vol. 634, ff. 629r-683v. It is anonymus and untitled. As fas as we were able to determine, the text of the manuscript is identical to the one of the printed book.

³¹ APF, Acta, vol. 92, p. 254: “La revisione dello Speculum fu commessa al lettore delle controversie il quale dopo aver fatto varie annotazioni dalle quali apparisce che alcune cose dovrebbero correggersi benché poi dica che ciò si potrebbe fare con facilità, nondimeno e di sentimento che non portandosi dall’autore alcuna cosa di nuovo, oltre quello, che hanno detto in questa materia moltissimi altri con maggior erudizione e miglior stile non è da sperarsi alcun’utile da quest’opera, e conseguentemente non esser in veruna maniera

It is not known whether Peyklich received a copy of the professor's assessment or not. It is more likely that he did not, yet he was undoubtedly aware of the decision taken by the Cardinals of the *Propaganda* not to finance an edition of *Speculum veritatis* and of the reasons for the rejection of his request. This can be deduced on the basis of an addition to the letter of dedication in the *Speculum*. This addition, together with the introduction of an explanation of why a Latin translation of the Illyrian version of the book was necessary and some minor stylistic changes, was in fact one of the differences between the dedicatory letter of the *Speculum* and that of the *Zarcalo*. It consists of several phrases that only apparently resemble the usual formulas occurring in similar epistles. In fact, the similarity with the standard formulas serves only to conceal the author's anger and feeling of being insulted by the denial of his request. Furthermore, his allusion to the judgement pronounced on his book has something of a challenge in it:

Yet, if I accomplished my work in a poor way and I was perhaps unable to fulfil your expectations, this must be ascribed to the poverty of my capacity, not to a lack of attention and diligence. In point of fact, in this little work I have had many men, eminent in both doctrine and learning, not as comrades but as commanders, not as companions but as masters. If I were to err with them, I would certainly suffer pain but I would not be ashamed.³²

The next sentence sounds like a direct response to the claim that his book is useless:

And I would not estimate it, if it were printed, useless and futile; since to my brethren, that is apostolic missionaries, who are occupied in the evangelical vineyard day and night, busy with labours and hindered from devoting time to

espediente di darla alle stampe.” The original of the assessment is kept in APF, SOCG, vol. 634, ff. 623r-628v.

³² Verum si infelici successu, et qui expectationi vestrae minus fortasse responderet, operam meam navavi, ingenii mei tenuitati, non attentionis, aut diligentiae defectui tribuendum est. Multos enim doctrina, ac eruditione insignes viros, non comilitones, sed duces, non socios, sed magistros in hoc opusculo habui. Si cum his errassem, dolerem profecto, sed non puderet. – *Speculum*, f. *3v (unnumbered leaf).

a longer reading, it could serve as a short and concise handbook and could work as a reminder of all those things that they have studied for long on this subject at school.³³

Now, if we shift our attention from the letter of dedication to the core part of the book, we shall realise that *Speculum veritatis* is not just a Latin translation of the *Zarcalo* but a modified and significantly amplified version of it. The differences between the two versions, in terms of content and form, have been thoroughly catalogued by Josip Turčinović.³⁴ The most important formal changes are the modification in the order of exposition of the four controversial questions in the doctrinal part of the work and the addition of a proper conclusion. With regard to the content, some minor changes, mainly abridgements, occur in chapters four, seven, eight and nine. The last chapter is substantially expanded: in the *Zarcalo* it takes up only twenty pages out of one hundred and nine, while in the *Speculum* it constitutes more than the half of the two hundred and thirty-five pages.

One can think about at least two possible reasons for this development of the text. On the one hand, it would appear that through the years our author somehow modified his approach. Initially he was convinced that by simply telling the story of the schism he would have made it clear to his readers that “the cause of Church disunity are the Greeks, the cause of unity are the Latins.” Later, he became convinced that this was not enough and that there was the need to expose and defend the Catholic doctrine more carefully.³⁵

On the other hand, it is immediately evident that our author mastered writing in Latin better than in “Illyrian.” However, this was only one side of what we shall call ‘the language question’ in Peykich. The other depended on

³³ Non enim illum inutilem, si impressus fuerit, ac otiosum fore existimo; cum fratribus meis, apostolicis videlicet missionariis, in evangelica vinea, diu, noctuque occupatis, a laboribus distentis, nec non longiori lectioni vacare praepeditis, tanquam memoriale quoddam breve, compendiarium, ac omnium, quae in scholis diuturno tempore fuse, in hac materia, didicerunt, revocatorium esse, ac servire possit.

³⁴ TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 114-116.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 157.

the fact that *Zarcalo istine* was the first book on Orthodox-Catholic theological controversy ever written in a Southern Slavic language. A standardised technical apparatus for translating the Latin terms was lacking; there were no models to follow when writing on theoretical or abstract matters. This situation inevitably restricted the author's ability to expose and examine the philosophical and theological depth of the doctrinal differences. In the *Zarcalo*, his language is in general less precise and more figurative. In the *Speculum*, it is far more technical and precise, permitting the author to carry out a correct treatment of the questions debated. The following juxtaposition of two corresponding sentences illustrate this point very eloquently. The sentence from the *Zarcalo* reads:

During those conferences, it was clearly and quickly declared that the Holy Spirit proceeds both from the Father and the Son.³⁶

This was "translated" into Latin as follows:³⁷

During them [i.e. those conferences] it was dealt in detail with the procession of the Holy Spirit from the both, with the divine persons and with the terms 'nature', 'essence', 'substance', 'subsistence' and 'hypostasis,' by distinctly pointing out their quiddity and difference.³⁸

Words did indeed make a difference in the debates on the procession of the Holy Spirit at the council, and a great many of the sessions in Florence were dedicated, albeit perhaps with a questionable outcome, explicitly to explaining and defining the terms trinitarian theology uses, coming to an agreement and establishing standards to be applied at the council for their translation from the Greek into Latin.³⁹ However, and not surprisingly, Peykich, was not able to

³⁶ "U ovieh pregovaraniah bi čisto, i bistro očitovano, da duh sveti izhodi od oca, i od Sina." – *Zarcalo*, p. 75.

³⁷ In both works the sentences quoted here occur in cap. 9, § 14.

³⁸ "In his diffuse actum de processione Spiritus Sancti ab utroque, de Personis Divinis, ac de vocibus, natura, essentia, substantia, subsistentia, ac hypostasi, distincte docendo quidditatem, et differentiam earum." – *Speculum*, p. 102.

³⁹ RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*, p. 106.

elaborate “Illyrian” counterparts, whether ordinary Slavic lexemes, neologisms, or transliterations, for the whole range of technical terms applied in trinitarian theology. Nevertheless, his attempt to translate the trinitarian terminology and to apply it to an exposition of the doctrine is still memorable. We shall return at greater length to this subject in the next chapter.

For the Conclusion to the *Speculum* Peykich draws on the text of the final paragraph of the last chapter of the *Zarcalo* but considerably expands on it. He returns to the topic of the Greeks’ persistence in the schism. He states that the Greeks are stubbornly persistent and unwilling to concede defeat, particularly when it is a matter of the disagreements about the procession of the Holy Spirit, and this is the true root of all evil; this is deepest cause of the division of the Churches. Here Peykich adds a few more historical or “sociological” arguments that prove the mistakes of the Greeks. He reminds his reader that since Photius’ schism the Greeks have held no general councils, their Church has been glorified by no saints and there have been too few truly learned men, while in the same period the Latins have organized eleven ecumenical councils, have founded religious orders and become famous for their knowledge. Moreover, the Latins have spread their religion all over the world, even in the East and the West Indies. As far as Luther and Calvin are concerned, although at first the Catholics ceded territories and faithful to the heretics, they later managed to regain many of them, whereas the Greek Church is constantly losing her offspring who embrace Islam.⁴⁰

Finally, several Roman popes, the most powerful Christian rulers Leopold I and Charles VI, along with the Russian Tsar, Peter, have all endeavoured to defeat the Turks and liberate the Greeks. How is it possible that they have not succeeded in this? There can be no other reason, Peykich claims, but that it is God’s punishment of the Greeks for their persistence in maintaining the schism provoked by Photius.⁴¹ In general, in this book Peykich places even

⁴⁰ Cf. *Speculum*, pp. 212-222.

⁴¹ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 223-224.

more importance on the historical role of Patriarch Photius than in the *Zarcalo*. As we shall see, the tendency to show him as the “man who has destroyed the unity of the Church”⁴² continues in our author’s later works.

3. THE *ADDITAMENTUM AD SPECULUM VERITATIS* (1727?)

The *Additamentum* is a supplement, an appendix, to *Speculum veritatis*. Neither the year, nor the place of its publication is known with any certainty. Regarding the year, on the basis of an assertion made by Peykich contained in the text itself, it can be deduced that the supplement was written (and then, perhaps, also published) in 1727, while the type of print suggests Trnava (Slovakia) as the place of publication.⁴³

It consists in several explanatory and complementary notes to the *Speculum* written in a highly polemical fashion. The first note serves to clarify that, although formally the entire Eastern Church has broken away from the West, in reality not all of its representatives, whether laymen or members of the clergy, are schismatics. Some of them, says our author, have already adopted most of the truths of the Catholic Church, others belong to the Greek Church only out of ignorance and would gladly embrace the Catholic truth, if only someone revealed it to them. Peykich insists that the real schismatics are in a minority in the Eastern Church and calls them ‘Photians’, that is “followers of Patriarch Photius.” This differentiation was arguably shaped and articulated under the influence of a new source, which had become known to Peykich in the meantime.

In the *Additamentum*, Peykich refers to the Greek Niccolò Comneno Papadopoli (1655-1740), a “recent, skilled and erudite” writer who was a

⁴² КАПРИЕВ, *Византийската философия*, p. 165.

⁴³ TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 103-105.

native of Crete and Professor of Canon Law at Padua university.⁴⁴ Peykich reports his name and his habit of using all means to defend his Greek compatriots while at the same time attacking and unmasking the ‘Photians’, the real schismatics among the Orthodox, whom he held responsible for the schism and for all the misfortunes and sufferings of the Greeks.⁴⁵

The reference to Papadopoli is set in the context of a general accusation that Peykich launches against the “Photians.” Following the well-paved paths of interconfessional polemics, he accuses them of having altered the text of the Creed, together with other texts approved by the ecumenical councils, and of having in this way caused, first, dissent and, finally, the schism in the Church. In reality, Peykich launches this accusation in an attempt to defend himself from the criticism he announces to have received on the part of unnamed and unspecified “Photians of our time.”⁴⁶ According to his adversaries, the teaching of the Oriental fathers was precisely the contrary to that presented by Peykich in his *Speculum veritatis*. They see the reason for Peykich’s error in the fact that his sources are in Latin and through Latin translations and editions one cannot come to know the true doctrine of the Greek fathers. This is because it is the custom in the Catholic world for anything that might contradict the Catholic doctrine to be either altered or omitted from the texts before publication.

⁴⁴ JACOBUS FACCIOLATUS, *Fasti Gymnasii Patavini*, Patavii: Typis Seminarii, 1757, pp. 84-85.

⁴⁵ “Similia habes apud plerosque bonae mentis Graecos: inter quos doctrina, ac eruditione non ultimum obtinet locum Nicolaus Comnenus, recens quidem, sed versatissimus scriptor, qui suos connationales Graecos meritò redarguit, summamque eorum stoliditatem, et crassissimam ignorantiam in singulis fere paginis exponit, et ad oculum demonstrat; tuetur interim, ubi potest, gentem suam, adversariorumque nimio in Graecos odio flagrantium audaciam compescit; quod feci, faciamque vita comite, et ego.” – *Additamentum*, pp. 15-16. The precise source of Peykich was the treatise by NICOLAUS COMNENUS PAPADOPOLI, *Praenotiones mystagogicae ex jure canonico*, Patavii: ex Typographia Seminarii, 1697. TURČINOVIĆ, p. 159, indicates several passages from Peykich’s *Additamentum* that seem “borrowed” from *Praenotiones mystagogicae*.

⁴⁶ “Illi libros corrumpunt, clamant Latinos hoc facere.” – *Additamentum*, p. 15.

As mentioned above, Peykich does not name his Orthodox critics. They may have been representatives of the Serbian Orthodox clergy active in the southern parts of the Hapsburg Empire and strongly opposed to the idea of being united with the Catholic Church. In actual fact, with however one important exception, we have no information about the reaction of Orthodox authors towards Peykich's *Zarcalo/Speculum*. The exception is a work whose author claims to have written it specifically to oppose the "version" of history offered in *Zarcalo istine*. This work is a manuscript book in "Serbian-Slavic" (the Serbian version of Old Church Slavonic) kept in the library of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Sremski Karlovci (Karlowitz). However, it lacks the title page and, consequently, both its title and the name of the author remain unknown.⁴⁷ The question of the reception of Peykich's writings, therefore, remains largely unanswered and may perhaps in future prove to be an area of study important for understanding the cultural processes and the development of cultural identities in central and south-eastern Europe in the eighteenth century.

Besides references to the names of Niccolò Machiavelli, Cornelius Jansen or Luis de Molina, in the *Additamentum* one can also find quotations from Roberto Bellarmino. While faithful to the original, these quotations present peculiarities. Peykich reports the book, the chapter and the page from which he quotes, but the passage in question, although actually found in the work indicated, is frequently in a completely different place in it. This probably means that while writing the *Additamentum*, Peykich did not have the works of Bellarmino at hand but quoted by heart or, possibly, employed the mediation of another text. It is worthwhile noting, however, that the *Additamentum* is the first of Peykich's works where he tries to provide precise indications of his sources.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ TURČINOVIĆ, p. 138, footnote 3. Turčinović cites from KOSTIĆ, "Biobibliografski prilozi za Krstu Pejkića."

⁴⁸ TURČINOVIĆ, p. 159.

Another aspect of this text is that here for the first time Peykich refers to a work that he considers important enough to use as the basic source for his latest book, the *Concordia*. This work is called *Apologia quinque capitum decreti Synodi Florentinae*, which at the time of Peykich was believed to have been written by Gennadius II (Georgius Scholarius). Probably, Peykich learnt about the *Apology* shortly before the composition of the supplement to the *Speculum* and after the publication of the main work. That is why the *Speculum* lacks references to this treatise.⁴⁹ Moreover, it appears that our author considered it necessary to spread immediately the welcome news of his discovery. In the *Additamentum* he merely announced the news, while later he would employ and adapt the *Apology* in the composition of his *Concordia*.

4. THE *CONCORDIA ORTHODOXORUM PATRUM ORIENTALIUM ET OCCIDENTALIUM* (1730)

In this work Peikich directly addresses the prelates, priests, monks and nuns of the Orthodox Church living in the land of the Emperor:

Read diligently everything that is contained in this little book and implement in practice in the most diligent way what you, from a conscientious reading, will receive from the Father of Light.⁵⁰

In his earlier book, the author admits, he has not examined in sufficient detail the most important question of the Catholic-Orthodox controversy, that is to say the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Thus, in this new book of his, Peykich will contribute to the elucidation of the question by giving an account of what Gennadius II, Patriarch of Constantinople had

⁴⁹ As claimed by Peykich in *Concordia*, ff. A3v-A4r (unnumbered leaf).

⁵⁰ Legite diligenter universa, quae hoc exiguo libello continentur, et quae a Patre luminum ex pia lectione hauseritis opere adimplete diligentissime. – *Concordia*, f. A3v (unnumbered leaf).

written on this topic, in an orthodox, erudite and intrepid manner (*orthodoxe, erudite, ac intrepide*).⁵¹

Together with his contemporaries, Peykich believed that the *Apologia quinque capitum decreti Synodi Florentinae*⁵² was written by the Gennadius II (Georgius Scholarius), which fact in itself was considered as extremely important. Georgius Scholarius, a man of great culture possessing an excellent knowledge of Latin theology, had attended the Council of Ferrara-Florence and after the death of Mark Eugenicus succeeded him as leader of the anti-unionist party in Constantinople. Precisely his well-known stand concerning the union was one of the reasons why Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror “enabled” him to become Patriarch.⁵³ Now, his *Apologia* re-emerges to show that the opponent of the union has finally recognized the validity of the Council of Ferrara-Florence and the truth of its final *Decree*.⁵⁴

However, we now know that the *Apologia* was composed after 1455 by Johannes Plousiadenus (1429?-1500), a priest from Crete who was a strong supporter and advocate of the agreement reached at the Council of Florence. At a certain point, called by the name Joseph, he became bishop of Methone in Peloponnese, and in 1500 was killed during the Turkish assault of the town.⁵⁵ It is assumed that at some point in time he was a scribe for Cardinal Bessarion and belonged to his intellectual circle.⁵⁶

⁵¹ *Concordia*, f. A3v (unnumbered leaf).

⁵² JOANNES PLUSIADENUS, *Expositio pro sancta et oecumenica synodo Florentina quod legitime congregata est, et defensio quinque capitum quae in decreto ejus continentur*, in PG, vol. 159, col. 1110-1394.

⁵³ Cf. RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 167-170.

⁵⁴ Cf. TURČINOVIĆ, p. 120.

⁵⁵ V. PERI, *Ricerche sull'editio princeps degli atti greci del Concilio di Firenze*, Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1975, p. 28. According to Peri, Johannes Plousiadenus died in 1504. However, 1500 seems more probable since it is the year when the Ottomans conquered Methone – Cf. K.M. SETTON, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571*, vol. 2: *The Fifteenth Century*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1978, p. 66, footnote 96.

⁵⁶ M. CANDAL, “La *Apologia* del Plusiadeno a favor del Concilio de Florencia,”

The *Apologia* was printed for the first time in the original Greek in Rome in 1577, while the Latin translation appeared in 1579.⁵⁷ By 1733, the year when the *Apologia* was attributed for the first time to Joseph Methonensis (as Johannes Plousiadenus was called after he became bishop), it was believed to be a work by Patriarch Gennadius.⁵⁸

The main source for Plousiadenus' *Apologia* were the *Greek Acta* of the Council of Florence. We can be certain about this thanks to an autobiographical note left by him, and to the fact that one of the most important manuscripts containing the *Greek Acta*, dated between 1463 and 1470 and kept in the *Biblioteca Laurenziana* in Florence, was copied and annotated by Johannes Plousiadenus himself.⁵⁹

As already stated in its title, *Apologia quinque capitum decreti Synodi Florentinae* is divided into five chapters, or treatises, one for each definition from Florence, where the doctrine of the beatific vision is treated separately from that of purgatory.⁶⁰ The first chapter, or treatise, which deals with the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, consists in an introduction, a doctrinal part divided into four sections (Greek Fathers, Latin Fathers, theological arguments, and responses), and an epilogue.⁶¹

Peykich gives his *Concordia* the following structure: first there is his own preface followed by Plousiadenus' preface to the *Apologia* (PG, vol. 159, col. 1109-1116), then an abridgement of the first chapter of the latter (col. 1118-1190), to which Peykich adds a final section of his own. It is interesting to

Orientalia Christiana periodica, 21 (1955), pp. 36-57, in part. p. 38.

⁵⁷ PERI, *Ricerche sull'editio princeps*, pp. 28-38.

⁵⁸ Cf. G.B. MIGNE, *Monitum editorum*, in PG, vol. 159, col. 1107-1108.

⁵⁹ CANDAL, "La *Apologia* del Plusiadenno," p. 38; I. GILL, "The Sources of the *Acta* of the Council of Florence," in ID., *Church Union: Rome and Byzantium (1204-1453)*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1979, n. X (the essay is from 1948), pp. 131-143, in particular pp. 131-132, 137, 142-143.

⁶⁰ CANDAL, "La *Apologia* del Plusiadenno," p. 39.

⁶¹ *Ibi*, p. 40.

note that the theological argumentation of Plousiadenus has not found a place in Peykich's adaptation of the treatise.⁶² In the final section of the *Concordia*, our author cites the definitions of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit formulated at three councils considered ecumenical by the Catholic Church: besides the definition from Florence, there are also those of the IV Lateran and the II Lyon Councils. Peykich exhorts the Orthodox bishops, priests, monks and ordinary faithful not to oppose the above-mentioned decisions since to oppose them is equally as grave an error as to challenge the canons of any of the first Seven Ecumenical Councils accepted by the Orthodox Church.⁶³

Our Krastyo Peykich was not the only one who saw the polemical power and possibly strong effect that the *Apologia quinque capitum decreti Synodi Florentinae*, especially bearing the name of 'Gennadius' as its author, might have for successfully effecting the union of Churches in the borderlands of the Catholic world. In view of the conclusion of the union of Brest (1596), Antonio Possevino wrote a divulgative book, a dialogue on the procession of the Holy Spirit, entitled *Interrogationes et Responsiones De processione Spiritus Sancti a Patre et Filio* and based, as Peykich's *Concordia* would later be, on the first chapter of the *Apologia*.⁶⁴ However, there are no indications that Peykich might have known of this work by Possevino. At any rate, with its five editions, the *Concordia* was by far the most successful of Peykich's books.

⁶² A juxtaposition of the content of the first chapter of the *Apologia* with its adaptation in the *Concordia* can be found in TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 122-124.

⁶³ *Concordia*, pp. 95-96.

⁶⁴ ANTONIUS POSSEVINUS, *Interrogationes et responsiones de processione Spiritus Sancti a Patre et Filio: Desumptae, ac breviori dilucidiori ordine digestae ex libro Genadii Scholarii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani in gratiam et utilitatem Rutenorum*, Ingolstadii: Ex Officina Wolfgangi Ederi, 1583. Cf. TURČINOVIĆ, pp. 120, footnote 11.

CHAPTER 4

PEYKICH'S LINGUISTIC ENDEAVOUR

What makes me weep even more, most eminent fathers, is that with so many most learned and equally saintly men who have written an immense quantity both in Greek and in Latin against the aforesaid separation of the Greeks, not one has written anything to this purpose, not even in the smallest book, in the Illyrian language and characters.¹

1. THE QUESTION OF THE "ILLYRIAN" LANGUAGE

There is still one aspect of Krastyo Peykich's cultural project that we have not yet discussed. It is the experimental nature of the language in which his first published book, *Zarcalo istine*, was written. In the context of his cultural project for the conversion of all Orthodox Slavic peoples in the Balkans to Catholicism and of his political ideal of an all-embracing Christian alliance to triumph over the Ottoman Empire, his choice of language for his *Zarcalo* had

¹ "Et quod me magis ad lacrymas compellit, Eminentissimi Patres, est, quod cum tot doctissimi aequae, ac sanctissimi viri adversus dictam Graecorum separationem immensa volumina Graeco, aut Latino sermone conscripserint, nullus ex professo Illyrico caractere, ac idiomate quidquam vel in minimo libello exaraverit." –*Zarcalo*, f. A4r (unnumbered leaf). In the dedication letter to the 1725 edition of the *Speculum*, this phrase is slightly (and prudently) altered: "Dolebam enim, Eminentissimi Patres, quod cum tot doctissimi aequae, ac sanctissimi viri, adversus Graecorum schisma immensa propemodum volumina Graeco, aut Latino sermone justissime conscripserint, nullus ex professo (quantum novi) Illyrico caractere, ac lingua quidquam vel in minimo exaraverit." – *Speculum*, f. *2v (unnumbered leaf). Note the substitution of "*Graecorum separatio*" with "*Graecorum schisma*."

both an instrumental and a symbolic function.² His attempt to reach a broader audience among different, and not necessarily highly or ‘classically’ educated, social strata of the Slavic population in the Balkans (including Hungary and Transylvania) by writing in a variant of a Southern Slavic idiom, constitutes the instrumental aspect of his use of language. The symbolic aspect of this use consists in the fact that Peykich strove to be understood by a wider audience not just with respect to “social strata” but also with respect to the linguistic unity of the Southern Slavic peoples. He thus adopted the rather vague and almost inevitably ideologically burdened concept of an “Illyrian” language. In Peykich’s eyes, the possibility of using a common “Illyrian” language was seen as an instrument for religious unification, which in turn was interpreted as the necessary basis for the political unification of Southern Slavs with other Catholic nations under the Catholic Emperor. Yet, the *idioma illyricum* was a ‘regulatory idea’ rather than a reality. Therefore, Peykich had to try to create his own language comprehensible to all Southern Slavic peoples. The result of his linguistic experiment, while not easily comprehensible, is rather curious.

In itself, the inspiration for such an experiment was by no means eccentric or unconventional in the early modern epoch. In searching for the golden fleece of the “Illyrian” language, our Krastyo Peykich was in a good company. More precisely, he was in the company of several generations of distinguished men of letters such as the Bosnian Jesuit Bartol Kašić (1575-1650), author of *Institutiones linguae illyricae* (1604), or the Croatian Franciscan Rafael Levaković (1597-1649). In 1626, the *Propaganda Fide*, in the person of its secretary Francesco Ignoli, gave Rafael Levaković the task of preparing the Slavic edition of the reformed version of the Catholic Missal and other liturgical books for the needs of Catholic communities in Dalmazia, Istria and Croatia.³ Together with several other experts, Levaković was also a member of

² Cf. IOVINE, *The “Illyrian Language”*, p. 139.

³ M. LACKO, *Il problema della lingua e della scrittura nelle secentesche edizioni slave di Propaganda fide*, in V. BRANCA - S. GRACIOTTI (eds.), *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del Sud*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1983, pp. 387-394, in part. p. 389.

a commission established by the *Propaganda* in that very year as a consultant body for the completion of these editions.⁴ This commission had to seek solutions concerning, on the one hand, the linguistic norm, and, on the other, the alphabet to be employed for this purpose. Its members had to take into consideration the fact that the Congregation's inspiration was to satisfy the needs of the Catholic bishops in Istria, Croatia and Dalmazia by means of these books, but at the same time the books had to be such as to be of use for Catholic communities in other Balkan regions as well, and possibly to be of use for the dissemination of the Catholic doctrine among the Slavic Orthodox Christians throughout the whole peninsula.⁵

As far as the question of an alphabet is concerned, four different graphic systems 'circulated' among Southern Slavs in the first half of the seventeenth century: Cyrillic, Latin, Glagolitic and the so-called *bosančika* or Bosnian Cyrillic script favoured by the Bosnian Franciscans.⁶ As for the choice of language, the revision of the liturgical texts had to be consistent either with the literary language or with the vernacular, where there were both distinct 'redactions' of the literary language and a range of 'dialects' of the vernacular.⁷ After almost two years' reasoning and discussion, it was decided that both a Glagolitic and a Latin edition of the reformed liturgical books had to be carried out.⁸ The Italian scholar Michele Lacko says in this regard: "Therefore, the reunification of the Slavs in the Balkans, at least in the script, was not obtained."⁹ If the unification of the graphic systems used by Southern Slavs was not created on that occasion, neither was a solution found for the

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibi, p. 390; cf. also A. CRONIA, *Storia della letteratura serbo-croata*, Milano: Nuova Accademia, 1963², pp. 101-102.

⁷ LACKO, *Il problema della lingua*, p. 390.

⁸ Ibi, p. 392.

⁹ "Così la riunificazione degli Slavi nei Balcani, almeno nella scrittura, non venne ottenuta." – Ibid.

question of the “Illyrian language,” or, more precisely, of the creation of a universal South Slavic literary language. The choice was made to edit the liturgical books in Church Slavonic, while for other books (including those on religious matters) the vernacular was also acceptable.¹⁰

In these conditions, Michaela Iovine says, “Since there was no fixed normative model of the Illyrian language, the Bulgarian Catholic missionaries were fairly free (and indeed expected) to devise an adequate linguistic tool for the dissemination of Catholic Propaganda. Thus Bulgarian Catholic writers began to conduct linguistic ‘experimentations’ based on their own notions of the ‘Illyrian’ language.”¹¹

If Michaela Iovine has placed the language of Peykich’s *Zarcalo* in a very precise historical and cultural context, it was another philologist, Nayda Ivanova, who studied and described in a highly exhaustive manner the concrete characteristics of the “mixed or composite literary norm” and of the “Illyrian literary model” in Peykich’s work.

2. NAYDA IVANOVA’S STUDY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE *ZARCALO*

As has been stated above, the result of his linguistic experiment is rather curious and not easy to read. It is little wonder, therefore, that generations of historians and historians of literature have been perplexed when tackling such a text. Nonetheless, Nayda Ivanova’s scrupulous research shows that although such a puzzled reaction is predictable and easy to explain, the many negative

¹⁰ Ibid.; cf. IOVINE, *The “Illyrian Language”*, p. 123; Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], “Илирикийският език на южните славяни в българското книжноразвитие през 17 в. Част I” [The Illyrian Language of the South Slavs and the Bulgarian Literary Development during the Seventeenth Century. Part I], *Годишник на Софийския Университет “Климент Охридски” Факултет по славянски филологии, книга I - Езикознание - Annuaire de L’Universite de Sofia “Kliment Ohridski”. Faculte des Philologies Slaves, livre 1 - Linguistique*, 78 (1984), pp. 34-93, in part. p. 38.

¹¹ IOVINE, *The “Illyrian Language”*, p. 133.

judgements of the language in *Zarcalo istine* are not really well-founded, or, to be more precise, these judgements usually rest on tacit and imprecise criteria.¹² What is more important, she says, none of the opinions expressed by previous scholars were based on a comprehensive study of the language of the work. Most of the authors, in evaluating the language of the *Zarcalo*, do not take into account the differences between the parallel or consecutive traditions in the “written practice” of the Serbo-Croatian language diasystem. They simply presuppose that it was the language of the Dubrovnik literary tradition that served as a model for Peykich, which is by no means obvious; or they even note in his linguistic use “deviations” from the norm or “errors” with respect to the modern normative system of the Serbo-Croatian (Croato-Serbian) literary language.¹³ While Nayda Ivanova expresses no doubt about the fact that Peykich’s Bulgarian origin influenced his choices in his writing, she has doubts about the possibility of explaining all the peculiarities of his style through this influence alone, and she is even more reluctant to accept opinions according to which Croatian was a language he did not master well, or that by 1716 he had already forgotten his mother tongue (i.e. Bulgarian).¹⁴

However, it is nevertheless true that in Peykich’s work the systems of different languages interact, and it is precisely this interaction that Nayda Ivanova denotes as the “Illyrian literary model in Peykich.” What she proposes is that rather than look for isolated examples of each of the different systems employed by Peykich, one should establish the results of their interaction.¹⁵ Therefore, the linguistic study of his experimental “mixed literary norm” requires an appropriate method designed to reveal its specific characteristics.¹⁶

According to Nayda Ivanova, in order to reveal the peculiar features of the “Illyrian literary language in Peykich,” one has to take the following steps. *i)*

¹² IVANOVA, pp. 24-25.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibi, p. 28.

¹⁶ ИВАНОВА, “Илирикийският език на южните славяни,” p. 43.

Describe its phonetic features, its orthography, morphology and morpho-syntax. *ii*) Determine the location of the language of the *Zarcalo* with respect to the coordinates of the Dubrovnik, the Dalmatian and the Bosnian literary norms and to establish the extent of the čakavian and kaikavian influence. *iii*) Discover the traces of the Latin and Italian influence. *iv*) Define the specific cases of a Bulgarian language interference.¹⁷

In the following, the conclusions of Nayda Ivanova's research on Krastyo Peykich's *Zarcalo istine* are presented and illustrated with the help of some examples.

As suggested by Nayda Ivanova's programme outlined above, the literary systems which are associated in Peykich's "Illyrian norm" are the different Serbo-Croatian literary traditions, as well as Italian, Latin and Bulgarian linguistic usages. Yet, one should recall, as far as the Bulgarian influence is concerned, that it was not the influence of any literary tradition but rather that of colloquial usage, for it is highly improbable that our author had had any chance to become acquainted with the rich Bulgarian medieval literary tradition. Or, if he had come across any great Bulgarian (Church Slavonic) literary works, it must have been purely fortuitous: if, as seems likely, he received his primary education in the Chiprovtsi school, the linguistic norm that he had acquired there had to be the štokavian Bosnean dialect of the Serbo-Croatian diasystem.

2.1 *Basic dialects in the Serbo-Croatian diasystem*

Croatian dialects, today as in Peykich's times, differ from one another in two main aspects. The first aspect is whether the word for the interrogative pronoun 'what' is 'što', 'ča' or 'kaj': with respect to this first aspect, there are štokavian, čakavian and kaikavian dialects. The role of a second aspect is played by the so-called reflex of the old Slavonic vowel *jat*', where it is

¹⁷ IVANOVA, p. 28.

presumed that the phonetic value of the old Slavonic *jat*’ had been that of a close ‘e’ (*ě*). In the distinct linguistic zones of the Serbo-Croatian language area its reflex is either ekavski (*e* < *ě*), or ikavski (*i* < *ě*) or jekavski (*je* or *ije* < *ě*); one distinguishes between the equivalent dialects on the basis of this.¹⁸

The štokavian dialect is the one most widely spoken in the Serbo-Croatian language area. While the Croats may be speakers of either štokavian, čakavian or kaikavian dialects, all the other peoples in the language area speak štokavian. Štokavian-ekavian is, for example, the Serbian variant of the Serbo-Croat literary language.¹⁹ Within this framework, which is only very generically presented here, Bosnian Franciscans created an important literary tradition in the štokavian dialect.²⁰

Nayda Ivanova’s study, in accordance with opinions expressed by other scholars,²¹ shows that Peykich follows the Bosnian, in particular the Bosnian Franciscans’, literary practice, characterised by applying the ikavski (*i* < *ě*) reflex of *jat*’ and a certain tendency to use archaic terms. At the same time, his experimental language represents a synthesis of the competitive literary traditions of the Serbo-Croatian language area.²² On the other hand, the peculiarity of Peykich’s prototype of *idioma illyricum* also depends on the combination of different elements from those traditions with the introduction of analytic forms.²³ The analytic forms in Peykich’s language are, according to

¹⁸ K. HORÁLEK, *An Introduction to the Study of the Slavonic Languages*, tr. P. Herrity, Nottingham: Astra Press, 1992, vol. 2, p. 448 and Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], *История на сръбския и хърватския книжовен език* [History of the Serbian and the Croatian Literary Language], Sofia 2000: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски”, pp. 7, 14.

¹⁹ HORÁLEK, *An Introduction*, p. 448 and ИВАНОВА, *История на сръбския и хърватския книжовен език*, p. 7.

²⁰ ИВАНОВА, *История на сръбския и хърватския книжовен език*, p. 175.

²¹ Cf. for instance the following estimation: “Il croato di Pejkič è štokavo-ikavo, come quello degli scrittori cattolici del suo tempo o precedenti a lui, ma non senza commistioni di čakavo e kajkavo.” – SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione*, p. 297. Emanuela Sgambati recognises the “composite nature” of Peykich’s language and its “ties with Italian.” – Cf. ibi, p. 299.

²² IVANOVA, pp. 281-282.

²³ Ibi, pp. 229 and 282.

Nayda Ivanova, a manifestation of both Romance and Bulgarian influence.²⁴ The Romance influence, Ivanova observes, can be seen on all linguistic levels: phonetic, morphological and, above all, syntactic.²⁵

2.2 *Graphic system in the Zarcalo*

As regards the graphic system employed in the *Zarcalo*, Peykich respects a tradition which had begun a century earlier in 1611 with the publication of *Nauk karstjanski* (“Christian Doctrine”) by Matija Divković (1563-1631) in Venice. Divković, who was a Bosnean Franciscan, elaborated a new Cyrillic script by revising the graphic system that was in use at that time in Bosnia. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Venetian printer Nicola Pezzano, with whom Peykich published his *Zarcalo*, still followed Divković’s tradition.²⁶ In the *Zarcalo*, Divković’s graphic system is further simplified and radicalised.²⁷

Some of Nayda Ivanova’s observations concerning the use of graphics in the *Zarcalo* deserve particular interest. She notices that some apparent graphic inconsistencies are in reality used in a fairly consistent way in order to mark the two semantic levels of the work, that is the chronical and the doctrinal one.²⁸ For instance, the word ‘*sin*’ (‘son’) appears with a small letter in the first eight chapters, with alternating small or capital letters in Chapter Nine and with a capital letter consistently in the last chapter. A similar pattern is followed for words such as ‘*izhotiti*’ (‘to proceed’), ‘*izhođenje*’ (‘procession’) etc.²⁹ In the doctrinal part of the book, the etymological orthography is

²⁴ Ibi, p. 282.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ IVANOVA, pp. 31-32; ИВАНОВА, *История на сръбския и хърватския книжовен език*, p. 178.

²⁷ IVANOVA, p. 80.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibi, p. 50.

respected more often than not, while elsewhere the phonetic orthography is preferred. Another specific feature of the graphics adopted in the doctrinal part of the *Zarcalo* is that the semantic aspect of the grapheme is given priority over the phonetic one. For example, figures rather than words are used for representing numbers; *nomina sacra* (like ‘*Otac*’, i.e. ‘God Father’) are given in their abbreviated form, etc. According to Nayda Ivanova, these examples show that in the *Zarcalo* the graphic solutions play an important role in the stylistic levels.³⁰

2.3 *Phonetic characteristics*

As has been said, Peykich followed the Bosnian and, in particular, the Bosnian Franciscans’ literary practice characterized by the application of the ikavski (*i* < *ě*) reflex of ‘*jat*’, that is by forms such as ‘*rič*’ or ‘*riič*’ (‘speech’) from <‘*rěč*’ or ‘*viira*’ (‘faith’), ‘*viiran*’ (‘faithful’) from the root <‘*-věr*’.³¹ Nevertheless, there are also some isolated cases where the reflex of ‘*jat*’ is ekavski or jekavski. More curious are the cases of ‘overexchange’ or writing ‘*i*’ instead of ‘*e*’ even where there is no etymological reflex from ‘*jat*’, as for instance in the word ‘righteous’, where Peykich with almost no exception writes ‘*pravidan*’ rather than ‘*pravedan*’.³²

³⁰ *Ibi*, pp. 80-81.

³¹ *Ibi*, p. 83.

³² *Ibi*, p. 99; however, cf. also S. VULIĆ, *Krsto Pejkić u hrvatskoj filologij*, in *Българи и хървати в Югоизточна Европа VII-XXI век. Материали от конференция, проведена в София (3-4 юни) 2005 г.* [Bulgarians and Croats in South-Eastern Europe], Sofia: Гутенберг, 2006, pp. 31-50, in part. p. 43 and SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione*, p. 297: “Oltre a ciò, la sua «ikavicità», di origine letteraria per lui bulgaro, dà luogo a fenomeni di ipercorrettismi, con *i* invece di *e* anche dove e non è riflesso dall’antico «*jat*» [...]”

2.4 *Phonetic adaptation of foreign words*

For the phonetic adaptation of foreign words, most of which are personal and geographical names, Peykich typically follows the Italian pronunciation, often through its presentation in Dalmatian written practice.³³ This principle is also valid almost without exception for words and names of Greek origin (such as ‘*Bezarion*’). An example of his faithfulness to the Dalmatian tradition in this respect is the transformation of ‘o’ in foreign words to ‘u’: ‘*Ruberto*’ < Roberto (*It.*).³⁴ A peculiar aspect of Peykich’s phonetic adaptation of foreign words is the fluctuation, albeit rare, in the pronunciation of the ‘s’ as ‘z’ or ‘ž’ (‘*herezia*’ and ‘*herežia*’),³⁵ or the fluctuation between the Latin or Italian version of certain names (‘*Fiorenca*’ and ‘*Florenca*’).³⁶ Needless to say, these are just a few examples taken from Nayda Ivanova’s otherwise very detailed study of the phenomenon of the phonetic adaptation of foreign words in Peykich.³⁷

2.5 *Comparison of adjectives*

In the *Zarcalo*, there are two alternative forms of the superlative degree of adjectives used in stylistically strictly differentiated ways.³⁸ The superlative formed by the particle ‘*naj*’ and the comparative (‘*naizločestia*’) or the positive (‘*nainaučeni*’) degree of the adjective has a neutral use and appears in various contexts, while the superlative formed by the prefix ‘*pri-*’ and the

³³ IVANOVA, p. 155; SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione*, p. 298.

³⁴ IVANOVA, p. 146.

³⁵ Ibi, p. 147.

³⁶ Ibi, p. 151.

³⁷ See the entire section ibi, pp. 142-153.

³⁸ Ibi, p. 196.

positive degree of the adjective is used when high-ranking and titled persons are addressed: “*priblaženi sveti Papa*” (“most blessed saint pope”).³⁹

2.6 Use of grammatical cases

Even a fleeting glance at the language of the *Zarcalo* reveals a tendency towards the introduction of analytic linguistic features as well as other signs of a departure from the Serbo-Croatian grammatical rules regulating the use of cases. Faced with this reality, Nayda Ivanova formulates and explores the hypothesis that the aforesaid departures from the norm do not occur at random and that there are regularities behind the apparent chaos.⁴⁰

She observes that the “irregularities” are used to distinguish between different constructions having different syntactic functions. The most stable seem to be non-prepositional forms indicating main syntactic functions such as subject, direct and indirect object, i.e. the most stable in Peykich’s speech are the nominative case, the accusative in function of the direct object and the dative in function of the indirect object. Much more variable prove to be prepositional constructions and constructions with an obligatory determiner, which functions as a semantic (not a syntactic) qualitative, quantitative or temporal object.⁴¹

Ivanova’s analysis reveals interestingly and convincingly how in the *Zarcalo* the “corrosion” of the grammatical rule with regard to cases serves as a “grammatical stylistic device,” which permits the same meaning “to be expressed using analytic, synthetic or hybrid forms and hence the stylistic differentiation of the variants.”⁴² For example, to indicate possession, Peykich

³⁹ *Ibi*, p. 197.

⁴⁰ *Ibi*, p. 229.

⁴¹ *Ibi*, pp. 277 and 283.

⁴² “Стига се до възможността едно и също значение да бъде предадено чрез синтетични, аналитични или хибридни формални средства, а оттук следва и стилистичната диференциализация на вариантите.” – *Ibi*, p. 283.

uses the synthetic, genitive non-prepositional form as stylistically neutral. The analytic one, formed by the preposition ‘*od*’ (‘of’) plus a genitive, is modelled after the Italian language and functions as a “baroque cliché formula” in the historical narrative in the first eight chapters of the book.⁴³ Forms marked by the possessive dative case occur exclusively in the dogmatic part,⁴⁴ where the Serbo-Croatian case system is observed much more rigorously.⁴⁵

2.7 Conclusions

On the basis of her complete analysis of the language of the *Zarcalo*, the Bulgarian philologist draws the conclusion that the variable grammatic norm allows Peykich to enrich the set of stylistic devices at his disposal by including graphic, phonetic and morphological devices along with the standard lexical and syntactic ones.⁴⁶

Even though Nayda Ivanova’s thesis is well supported, its validity can be questioned, at least as far as the graphic system and the morphology employed in the *Zarcalo* are concerned. Especially in view of a new piece of information, which our study of Peykich’s correspondence made stand out, one cannot be completely sure that what we have in the printed *Zarcalo* reflects precisely the graphical, orthographical and morphological peculiarities of the original manuscript. It appears that between Peykich and the printer Niccolò Pezzano, there was an intermediary who could have introduced series of alterations in Peykich’s language at all levels and above all, as it was stated, at the levels of graphic and morphology. In a letter dated February 6th, 1718, Peykich mentions a certain Marco Milich, a priest at the St. Leo church in Venice, to whom he had given the manuscript of the *Zarcalo* to take it to the printer. But because the printer found Peykich’s handwriting “too small” (“troppo

⁴³ Ibi, p. 284.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibi, p. 288.

⁴⁶ Ibi, p. 29.

minuta”), Milich copied all the book for him. Being inexperienced in this kind of work, though, Milich “introduced errors” and made the book unrecognisable even for its author.⁴⁷ This piece of information does not put under question Nayda Ivanova’s interpretation of the language of the *Zarcalo* in general but it warns as about the fact that we do not know and at present cannot know to what extent many of the specific features of this language described by Ivanova depend on deliberate choice on the part of Peykich or are accidental occurrences attributable to the interference of Milich.

3. LATIN VERSUS “ILLYRIAN”

It seems that its grammatical use, which is mixed and fluctuating, in combination with the *bosančika* script, which had already become unusual by that time, together with the alleged printer’s errors, have all contributed to making the *Zarcalo* difficult to read and may have hindered its diffusion.⁴⁸ Peykich himself was conscious of these problems to the point, as is it known, that he decided to translate his book into Latin. He might also have had other reasons for this decision. It may well be that for a certain period he was working in an area where there was no compact Slavic population and, therefore, there was a need for a Latin version of his concordistic history of the schism.⁴⁹ Or he may have hoped that a Latin version of the book would be

⁴⁷ APF, SOCG, vol. 612, f. 122r-v.

⁴⁸ S. VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, F.F. PETRONIO (ed.), *Plurilingvizem v Evropi 18. stoletja*, Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor, 2002, pp. 179-189, in part. p. 183.

⁴⁹ Thanks to the article by I.G. TÓTH, “Latin as a Spoken Language in Hungary during the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth centuries,” *CEU History Department Yearbook*, (1997-1998), pp. 93-111, we know that, although the extant testimonies might be sometimes rather controversial, Latin was a spoken language in Hungary during the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth centuries, especially in Upper Hungary where Germans, Hungarians and Slovaks lived together. Indeed, with the help of many examples, many of them coming from criminal law suits, Tóth illustrates how Latin was used as *lingua franca* even by common people for their bargains, during travels or even in quarells.

diffused more widely (and thus be more useful to his career). However, what we can be sure of is that Peykich recognised the unsuccessful outcome of his linguistic experiment and that at the same time, in translating his *Zarcalo*, he clearly intended to “internationalize” it:

In that first edition, there were so many errors that crept in <while in> the typography that I myself could hardly recognise my work. This very same book I converted into the Latin language and script so that any conscientious man was given an easy chance to render it not only in Illyrian but also in other languages and scripts.⁵⁰

If Peykich had doubts concerning the outcome of his linguistic experiment, this did not make him renounce the idea of translating the interconfessional polemic in a language comprehensible to the Slavic populations in the Balkans. As his letters reveal to us, he continued to promote this idea for the rest of his life, although he did not publish any other “Illyrian” book after the *Zarcalo*. As early as 1718, during his novitiate at the Croatian Franciscans, he declared his intention to translate his two books, that is the *Zarcalo* (1716) and the *Mohamedanus* (1717), and publish them in Croatian.⁵¹ Indeed, this declaration was something of an imposition since the *Zarcalo* was in no need of being “translated” but only linguistically improved.⁵² Be that as it may, in the following years he turned again and again to this point, i.e. to the need to prepare “Illyrian” versions of his own works. Although, as it has been told in the previous Chapter III, in 1722 the *Propaganda fide* Congregation had rejected Peykich’s supplication for funding for the publication of his *Speculum*, in 1728 he turned to the Congregation again. This time he asked to the

⁵⁰ “...in illa prima editione tot, ac tanti in typographia irrepserant errores, ut ipsemet opusculum meum vix agnoscere possem. [...] libellum eundem [...] verti in linguam, et characteres Latinos, quatenus cuique pio illum, tum in Illyricam, tum in alias linguas, ac characteres daretur transferendi obvia facultas.” – *Speculum*, f. *3r-v (unnumbered leaf).

⁵¹ APF, SOCG, vol. 615, ff. 174r-175r (Fridania [Ormož, Slovenia] 20th. July 1718, signed by “Fra Lodovico olim Cristoforo Peichich”; the letter is not an autograph).

⁵² Peykich’s specification that Croatian language is “somewhat different from Illyrian” (“Croato che è alquanto differente dall’Illirico”) only confirms this impression.

Cardinals to fund the translation and the printing of the *Speculum* in “Illyrian.” It seems that in 1730 he was commissioned by the Viennese government to accomplish translations of *Speculum veritatis* and of *Concordia* and that the publication of these translations would also be subsidised by the Jesuit Order.⁵³ As we have said, our author did not live long enough to carry out this last ambitious project of his.

4. A SUCCESS PREVIOUSLY UNNOTICED: EIGHTEENTH- AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY TRANSCRIPTIONS AND PLAGIARIST EDITIONS OF THE *ZARCALO*

Peykich did not accomplish his ambitious projects. Nevertheless, the story of his *Zarcalo istine* does not just end here: that is to say, it does not end with the unfortunate edition of 1716. In reality, Peykich’s *Zarcalo* was fairly popular, and the extent of this popularity probably went far beyond its author’s expectations.

The point is that what he states in the quotation used an introduction to the present chapter is, as far as I know, true: his *Zarcalo istine* was indeed the first work against the Greek schism ever written in “Illyrian” (or, a Southern-Slavic language or dialect).⁵⁴ In a sense, his *Zarcalo* was destined to be popular and to attract many followers, particularly, as has been pointed out by Josip Turčinović and reaffirmed by Sanja Vulić, in Catholic Croatia:

Bulgarian and Croatian literary historians credit Krsto Pejkić with being the first to write and publish a work of a controversial nature in the Croatian language, his *Zarcalo istine*, written in the Bosnian script and printed in Venice in 1716. He was the one to open the doors for scores of works of a similar genre in Croatian literature. Indeed, controversy with Orthodoxy represents the

⁵³ Peykich reports this information in his two last letters of 18th February and 31st March, 1730, respectively (APF, SOCG, vol. 668, ff. 191r-192v). The information is also confirmed in another source, a letter signed by Jerome, archbishop of Edessa (APF, SC. Ungheria e Transilvania, vol. 5, f. 43r-v: Vienna, 11? February 1730).

⁵⁴ TURČINOVIĆ, p. 138.

bulk of Croatian literary-theological production, particularly in the eighteenth century.⁵⁵

In his *Misionar Podunavlja*, Josip Turčinović provides an account of his discoveries concerning the manuscript fortune of Peykich's *Zarcalo*. He reports on three handwritten transcripts of the work that have come down to us and gives a bibliographic description of them. All three manuscripts contain almost the entire text of *Zarcalo* but present graphic and linguistic variations. In all three cases, the text is written according to the language habits of the respective copyists belonging to different subgroups of the Serbo-Croatian linguistic community.

The first of these is a fairly early transcription into Latin letters carried out by a certain Pavle Stošić. It dates from 1724 and is kept in the National Library in Zagreb. Stošić does not mention Peykich's name as the author of the treatise. Instead, he entitles the work *Zrcalo od razlučeya [!] zakona po mnogi filoxofi izkonponyene*, i.e. *A Mirror of the Division of the Faith Compounded after Many Philosophers*. Concerning the modification of the title with respect to the title of the original, Turčinović highlights the fact that it reflects a shift of emphasis from the *concordance* between the two Churches to their *division*.⁵⁶ In his transcript, Stošić omits the usual text of the permission from the Reformers of the University of Padua for the Venetian editions, the dedication to the Cardinals of *Propaganda Fide* and the Preface to the *Zarcalo*. He starts from Chapter One and transmits the entire content of the book with few changes that mainly affect the language. He creates a version "in our Croatian language" and tries to solve some obscure places in Peykich, though not always successfully.⁵⁷

Another handwritten transcription of the *Zarcalo*, a Glagolitic one, is kept in the Library of the Archive of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts

⁵⁵ VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, p. 181.

⁵⁶ TURČINOVIĆ, p. 140.

⁵⁷ Cf. the entire section in *ibi*, pp. 138-140.

(the former Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts) in Zagreb.⁵⁸ It dates from 1730 and is the work of Marco Kuzmićević from Zadar. The manuscript includes a letter of dedication to Vincenzo Zmajević (1670-1745), the archbishop of Zadar at the time, and the complete text of the *Zarcalo*, excluding the dedication to the Cardinals of the *Propaganda*, which is a reasonable omission. Besides being a Glagolitic transcription, Kuzmićević's text is also a linguistically edited and corrected version of the *Zarcalo*. Kuzmićević is careful to give the name of Krastyo Peykich as the author of the original. The choice of the Glagolitic script for the transcription, as well as the dedication of the work to archbishop Zmajević both indicate, according to Turčinović, that it was possibly prepared to be printed. Nevertheless, such a publication has never appeared.⁵⁹

Finally, there is one manuscript copy of the *Zarcalo* kept in the Zagreb Metropolitan Library.⁶⁰ It is an anonymous Latin transcription, which represents the second part of, or an appendix to, a work entitled *Dissertatio Historico-chronologico-Dogmatica*, dated 1744. It seems that this copy was made at the German-Hungarian college in Rome. It consists in the letter of dedication to the Cardinals, the preface and the ten chapters of the *Zarcalo*. The copyist cites the name of the author and the original title of the book (*Zarczalo Isztine med Czarkve Isztochne y zapadne od dom Karsztu Peichicha od Cziprovaz kanonika Pechuiskoga*) and adds a very interesting note in which he explains that the transcription is based on a copy of the book which was lent to him for a year by an unnamed student at the Urban College through the mediation of Giovanni Batista Nikolović, archbishop of Skopje, residing at that time in Rome. He also specifies that the Latin characters by which he transcribed the text of the book were those in common use in Dalmatia and Croatia at his time.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Ibi, p. 141.

⁵⁹ Ibi, pp. 141-143.

⁶⁰ Ibi, pp. 143-144.

⁶¹ Ibi, p. 144, footnote 27.

In 1745 the text of *Zarcalo istine* of Krastyo Peykich was reprinted in Latin letters. This transcription was published in Venice under a new title (*Ukazagnie Istine megiu Czarkvom Istočnom i Zapadgniom*), without any reference to the name of the author, by the Dalmatian Franciscan Stjepan Badrić. With regard to the contents, *Ukazagnie Istine*, was almost identical to the *Zarcalo*.⁶² It is interesting to note that the true authorship of *Ukazagnie Istine*, which was reprinted at least four times more until 1898, was disclosed by historiography only in 1888.⁶³

5. PHILOSOPHICAL-THEOLOGICAL VOCABULARY IN THE *ZARCALO*

5.1 *General remarks*

The history of the “second life” of Peykich’s *Zarcalo* highlights the fact that, in reality, his linguistic experiment was unsuccessful only to a certain extent. Since the experimental language of the *Zarcalo* was not a spoken one, it did not communicate efficiently. However, it was efficient enough to act as an intermediary between Latin and the Southern-Slavic languages and dialects. It was an efficient mediator for an introduction into these languages of a more abstract vocabulary. In this respect, the experiment was successful: it showed, that it was possible to narrate the history of the schism between the Western and the Eastern Churches and to present and discuss the related theological problems adequately in the languages of the Southern Slavs and it even paved the way for it.

In her study, Nayda Ivanova examines Peykich’s “Illyrian” work with regard to the graphics, the grammar and the style but she does not dedicate any particular attention to his vocabulary and comments on it only in connection

⁶² Ibi, p. 145.

⁶³ Ibid., footnote 4. Concerning the history of the editions of *Ukazagnie Istine*, see ibi, p. 149.

with other aspects of his language. Her references to the characteristics of Peykich's vocabulary will, however, be taken into consideration in the following.

In a later article, in which she offers a comparative analysis of the use of synonyms in three Bulgarian Catholic authors including Peykich, Ivanova touches on the question of the vocabulary found in the *Zarcalo*. In her opinion, despite some noteworthy exceptions, it mainly consists in "commonly used Southern Slavic lexemes."⁶⁴ Notwithstanding this general characteristic of the language of the *Zarcalo*, one can find in it theological, philosophical, ecclesiological and even juridical vocabulary as well.

Here we provide a short list of the most notable lexemes and expressions found in the *Zarcalo*, together with their Latin counterparts from the 1725 edition of Peykich's *Speculum*. The list includes theological, philosophical, ecclesiological and juridical terms. It contains Slavic words, old calques from Latin accepted by earlier authors, as well as cases of a simple transliteration from Latin or Italian. For some of the listed lexemes, for which Peykich had no Slavic counterparts he tried to provide an explanation of their meaning rather than a proper translation.

Before presenting our list, we must make comment on some of Peykich's linguistic decisions. For this critical evaluation of Peykich's abstract and technical lexicon, three 'period dictionaries' of the Croatian language have been used: Fausto Veranzio's (Faust Vrančić, c. 1551-1617) five-language dictionary, which was the first dictionary of 'Dalmatian' or Croatian (in its čakavian dialect) ever to be published, and two further ones by two of Peykich's contemporaries, the Illyrian-Latin dictionary of Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652-1713) and the Italian-Latin-Illyrian one of Ivan Tanzlingher Zanotti (1651-1732), both of which written during the first decade of the

⁶⁴ Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], "Контактни синоними в съчиненията на Петър Богдан Бакшич, Филип Станиславов и Кръстьо Пейкич" [Contact Synonyms in the Works of Peter Bogdan Bakshich, Filip Stanislavov and Krastyo Peykich], *Paleobulgarica - Старобългаристика*, 12/4 (1998), pp. 101-110, quotation from p. 109.

eighteenth century but which remained in manuscript form until very recently.⁶⁵

To begin with, as it has been stated above, when Peykich introduces foreign words of Romance origin, he usually follows the Italian pronunciation (example: *'filozof'* and *'filozofia'*). Moreover, as Nayda Ivanova argues, most of the words with Latin roots in his vocabulary do not come directly from Latin or Italian but from an earlier tradition. The use of *'cezar'* to denote the Latin *'imperator'*, for instance, illustrates this point well. This use was firmly established in the Dalmatian linguistic practice as early as in the fifteenth century⁶⁶ and is reflected in Fausto Veranzio's dictionary. As for the forms *'filozof'* and *'filozofia'*, neither of them seems to be Peykich's own invention, since they are found in Croatian literary works from the seventeenth and eighteenth century.⁶⁷

Secondly, as pointed out by Nayda Ivanova,⁶⁸ in some cases, Peykich explains to the reader the meaning of the words of foreign origin. She gives the following examples: "legatuš natus, toiest: vikariuš svetoga oca pape" ("*legatus natus*, that is a vicar of the Holy father, the Pope") (p. 6) and *'namisnici aliti vikariuši'* (substitutes or vicars) (p. 6). Sanja Vulić adds to this list *'purgator ali čistilo'* (p. 90) and specifies that such combinations of one imported and one non-imported word are one of the "specific lexical

⁶⁵ FAUSTUS VERANTIUS, *Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum europae linguarum, Latinae, Italicae, Germanicae, Dalmatiae et Ungaricae*, Venetiis: apud Nicolaum Morettum, 1595; PAVAO RITTER VITEZOVIĆ, *Lexicon latino-ilyricum. Svezak treći. Hrvatsko-Latinski rječnik*, ed. N. Vajs - Z. Meštrović, Zagreb: ArTresor Naklada - Institut za Hrvatski Jezik i Jezikoslovlje, 2009; GIOVANNI TANZLINGHER, *Vocabolario di tre nobilissimi linguaggi italiano, illirico, e latino con l'aggiunta di molt'erbe semplici, e termini militari*, ed. R. Benacchio et al., 2008 [<http://tanzlingher.filosofia.sns.it>].

⁶⁶ Cf. P. SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik Hrvatskoga ili Srpskoga jezika - Dictionnaire Etymologique de la langue Croate ou Serbe*, ed. M. Deanović - L. Jonke, 4 vol., Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademia Znatnosti i Umetnosti - Académie Yougoslave des Sciences et des Beaux-arts, 1971-1974.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ IVANOVA, p. 145.

peculiarities” originating in the Franciscan tradition of *Bosnia Argentina* found in Peykich.⁶⁹ The first occurrence of ‘iconoclastic heresy’ is also an interesting case in this context. The concept first appears in the form of a somewhat contorted transliteration (‘*herezia ikonoklatska*’, p. 23). On the following page, one finds ‘*herežia ikonomačka aliti ikonoborska*’, where Peykich gives a pair of synonymous adjectives to ‘heresy’, both of them presenting a possible variant for translation of ‘iconoclastic’ (p. 24). In the latter case, Peykich clearly gives the impression of someone who is “trying out” different variants for the same concept. Moreover, this concept is not found in any of the three ancient dictionaries that we have consulted.

On other occasions, Peykich tries out a different practice: for some foreign words that have no equivalent in the Southern Slavic languages he provides explanations instead of literal translations. This is his strategy when he transmits words and concepts such as ‘*rationabiliter*’, ‘*fides rivelata*’, ‘*consubstantialis*’, ‘*connaturalis*’. It is interesting to note that Peykich also decides to give a descriptive translation for ‘*consubstantialis*’ (‘*iedno bitie*’, ‘one being’), although a large number of compound words were extant in Southern Slavic dialects. For example, Tanzlingher Zanotti proposes “*yednosobstni, yednosob<o>glyeni, yednosobni, yednoučni, yednosobstueni*” as possible translations of ‘*consubstantialis*’, while in Pavao Ritter Vitezović one can find ‘*jedinosučanstvo*’ as meaning ‘*consubstantialitas*’.

In Peykich’s text there are also cases when the same lexeme may stand for more than one Latin concept. Perhaps the most noteworthy examples are those of ‘*bitie*’, which stands for both ‘*esse*’ and ‘*substantia*’, and of ‘*narav*’, which stands for ‘*essentia*’ and for ‘*natura*’. Both the meanings of ‘*bitie*’, i.e. ‘*esse*’ and ‘*substantia*’, are already found in Fausto Veranzio’s dictionary. In Tanzlingher Zanotti’s dictionary, ‘*bitie*’ is given as a possible translation of ‘*substantia*’ but also of ‘*essentia*’. Peykich consistently translates ‘*natura*’ with ‘*narav*’, not with ‘*priroda*’, which is sanctioned both in modern Croat

⁶⁹ VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, p. 187.

and in modern Bulgarian as the standard equivalent of *'natura'*. In making this choice Peykich followed a usage that was common at that time, as testified by Veranzio and later, for example, by Vitezović.

Another interesting aspect of the experimental language in the *Zarcalo* is the almost complete absence of loanwords from Turkish. *'Budala'* (18) and *'čifut'* (19) are the only two exceptions which we have been able to find.⁷⁰ In the *Zarcalo*, words with Greek (*'kaluger'* or *'kaluđer'*), or probably Hungarian or German origin (*'mešter'*), are also found.

It seems highly likely that it was in order to avoid any possible confusion and misunderstanding that Peykich chose to transliterate the Latin *'persona'* rather than translate it with the Slavic words *'lice'* or *'osoba'*. He made a similar choice in connection with another of the four doctrinal points of discord between the two Churches. That is to say, he preferred the loanword *'purgatorio'* to the one of Slavic root *'čistilo'*. Yet the two cases also present some differences: *'purgatorio'* is an "old" borrowing affirmed in Croatian linguistic practice.⁷¹ Moreover, in the *Zarcalo*, *'purgatorio'* and *'čistilo'* appear once together, while in the case of *'peršona'* Peykich is strictly consistent in using only this lexeme, giving no indication as to its definition or meaning. His decision is even more remarkable when compared to other writers: *'peršona'* is not found in Vitezović, in Tanzlingher Zanotti or in Veranzio.

At times Peykich favours transliterations and loanwords over non-imported ones, whereas at other times he chooses the contrary. Examples of a preference for the Slavic root are the words *'bogoslavstvo'* and *'bogoslavac'* which render 'theology' and 'theologian' respectively, although, bearing in mind the fact that Peykich was educated in Rome, transliterated versions of *'theologia'* and *'theologus'* might plausibly be expected. The same is true of the counterparts of 'schism' and 'union' used in the *Zarcalo*. In spite of the fact that the words *'šizmatik'* or *'šišmatik'* ('schismatic') do occur, the word 'schism' never occurs

⁷⁰ Concerning the etymology of these two Serbo-Croatian words, see A. ŠKALIJC, *Turcizmi u Srpskohrvatskom-Hrvatskosrpskom jeziku*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973³.

⁷¹ Cf. the entry *'purgati'* in SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik*.

in the *Zarcalo*. Instead, our author speaks of ‘*razlučenje*’ (‘separation’) and it may well be that the latter peculiarity is in line with the conciliatory spirit that dominates throughout the work.

5.2 Table of the equivalences of theological, philosophical and ecclesiological lexemes and syntagmata in *Zarcalo* and in *Speculum*⁷²

a) “*Illyrian*” to Latin

apolođia (101)	apologia, ae <i>f</i>
biscop (8)	episcopus, i <i>m</i>
bitie (79)	esse substantia, ae <i>f</i>
<i>Related expression:</i> iedno bitie (79)	<i>Related expression:</i> consubstantialis, e
blaženi (67)	beatus, a, o
<i>Related expression:</i> slava blaženeh (67)	<i>Related expression:</i> gloria beatorum
bogoslovac (67)	theologus, i <i>m</i>
bogoslovstvo (70)	theologia, ae <i>f</i>
božanstveni (77)	divinus, a, o
božanstvo (74)	divinitas, tatis <i>f</i>
budala (18)	plane stolidus, a, um
cesar (16)	imperator, oris <i>m</i>

⁷² We indicate only one of the pages – the first, as far as we have been able to see – where the lexeme or syntagma occurs; the page in question is specified within parentheses.

čifut (19)	judaeus, ei <i>m</i>
čistilo (90) <i>See also:</i> purgator, purgatorio	purgatorium, ii <i>n</i>
članak (69)	articulus, i <i>m</i>
daržati (36) <i>Related expression:</i> daržiti nauk svetieh otaca (36)	teneo, tenui, tentus 2 <i>Related expression:</i> tenere doctrinam sanctorum patrum
dišputati (46)	disputo 1
dokončati (81)	definitio 4
duh (36) <i>Related expression:</i> duh sveti (36)	spiritus, us <i>m</i> <i>Related expression:</i> Spiritus Sanctus
duša (82)	anima, ae <i>f</i>
filozof (96)	philosophus, i <i>m</i>
filozofia (70)	philosophia, ae <i>f</i>
grih (11) <i>See also:</i> sagrišenie	peccatum, i <i>n</i>
heretik (1)	haereticus, i <i>m</i>
herezia (23), herežia (24) <i>Related expressions:</i> herezia ikonoklatska (23), herežia ikonomačka aliti ikonoborska (24)	haeresis, is <i>f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> haeresis iconoclastarum
historia (44), hištorija (43) <i>See also:</i> istoria	historia, ae <i>f</i>
hristianin (19) <i>See also:</i> karstianin, karštianin	christianus, i <i>m</i>
iedinstvo (51) <i>See also:</i> siedinenie	unio, onis <i>m</i>

iskušenie (67)	discussio, onis <i>f</i>
iskušiti (67) <i>See also:</i> izkušiti (36)	iubeo, iussi, iussus 2
ispovidanie (17)	confessio, onis <i>f</i>
ispovidati (18)	confiteor, fessus sum 2
istina (83) <i>See also:</i> pravda	veritas, tatis <i>f</i>
istoria (83) <i>See also:</i> historia, hištoria	historia, ae <i>f</i>
izhodenie (66)	processio, onis <i>f</i> productio, onis <i>f</i> spiratio, onis <i>f</i>
izhoditi (85)	procedo, cessi, cessum 3
izkušiti (36) <i>See also:</i> iskušiti (67)	iubeo, iussi, iussus 2
kaluger (20), kaluđer (24)	monachus, i 2
kanon (37)	canon, is <i>m</i>
karstianin (7), karštianin (104) <i>See also:</i> hristianin	christianus, i <i>m</i>
karštianski (7), karštianski (103)	christianus, a, um
legatuš (6)	legatus, i <i>m</i>
lemozina (28)	eleemosyna, ae <i>f</i>
leturďia (103)	liturgia, ae <i>f</i>
mešter (19)	magister, stri <i>m</i>
milosardie (37)	charitas, atis <i>f</i>
mudar (20)	prudens, entis

namisnik (82) <i>See also:</i> vikariuš <i>Related expression:</i> namisnik Isukarstov (82)	vicarius, ii <i>m</i> <i>Related expression:</i> vicarius Christi
narav (5) <i>Related expressions:</i> iedan narav (79) dvi naravi (5)	natura, ae <i>f</i> essentia, ae <i>f</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> connaturalis, e duas naturas
naučitel (82)	doctor, oris <i>m</i>
naučiti (19)	doceo, docui, doctus 2
nauka (1)	doctrina, ae <i>f</i>
nepravda (21)	injustitia, ae <i>f</i>
nepravidan (14)	improbis, a, um
neviran (14)	impius, a, um
običaji carkveni (55)	ritus, us <i>m</i>
oblast (82)	potestas, atis <i>f</i>
očítovati (75)	declaro 1
oholost (21)	superbia, ae <i>f</i>
osuditi (5)	anathemo 1
otaž (16)	pater, ris <i>m</i>
pakao (82)	infernus, i <i>m</i>
peršona (36)	persona, ae <i>f</i>
početak (75)	principium, ii <i>n</i>
poglavar (79) <i>See also:</i> princip	princeps, principis <i>m</i>

poglavarstvo (19) <i>Related expression:</i> poglavarstvo pape (19)	primatus, us <i>m</i> <i>Related expression:</i> primatus papae
pokarati (21)	admoneo, monui, monitus 2
poklisar (6)	legatus, i <i>m</i>
pokora (35)	poenitentia, ae <i>f</i>
poslanie (86)	missio, onis <i>f</i>
posvetilište (79)	sacramentum, i <i>n</i>
prav (12) <i>Related expression:</i> prav katolik (12)	verus, a, um <i>Related expression:</i> verus catholicus
pravda (11) <i>See also:</i> istina <i>Related expressions:</i> brez pravdu (37) spravdom (37)	justitia, ae <i>f</i> veritas, tatis <i>f</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> adversus veritatem in veritate
pravidan (7)	justus, a, um
pregovaranie (67)	disceptatio, onis <i>f</i>
preštímavati (61)	aestimo 1
princip (50), prinčip (27) <i>See also:</i> poglavar	princeps, principis <i>m</i>
purgator (90), purgatorio (66) <i>See also:</i> čistilo	purgatorium, ii <i>n</i>
razdvoenje (55)	scisma, matis <i>n</i>
razlučenije (5)	separatio, onis <i>f</i>
razumiti (18)	intellego, lexi, lectus 3

rič (69), rijč (69)	verbum, i <i>m</i>
sagrišenie (82) <i>See also:</i> grih <i>Related expression:</i> smartnoe sagrišenie (82)	peccatum, i <i>n</i> <i>Related expression:</i> peccatum mortalis
siedinenie (14) <i>See also:</i> iedinstvo	unio, onis <i>m</i>
siediniti (49)	reconcilio 1
sin (76) <i>Related expressions:</i> od Sina (76) po Sina (76)	filius, ii <i>m</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> a Filium per Filium
šizmatik (77), šišmatik (70)	schismaticus, i <i>m</i>
skupština (67) <i>Related expression:</i> Skupština od rasplodenia viire	sessio, onis <i>f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> Congregatio de propaganda fide
slava (67) <i>Related expression:</i> slava blaženeh (67)	gloria, ae <i>f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> gloria beatorum
sram (38)	pudor, oris <i>m</i>
sudec (39)	judex, icis <i>m</i>
Troica (82) <i>See also:</i> Troistvo	Trinitas, atis <i>f</i>
Troistvo (83) <i>See also:</i> Troica	Trinitas, atis <i>f</i>
uutišitel (86)	Paraclitus, ti <i>m</i>
uzrok (75)	causa, ae <i>f</i>
viira (18)	fides, ei <i>f</i>

viiran (12), viran (98)	fidelis, e
<vik> (<i>word not occurring</i>)	
<i>Related expressions:</i>	<i>Related expressions:</i>
od vika (81)	aeternaliter
vikovicni (110)	in perpetuum
vikariuš (6)	vicarius, ii <i>m</i>
<i>See also:</i> namisnik	
virovanie (68)	Symbolum fidei
vladati (82)	guberno 1
zlamenie (39)	signum, i <i>n</i>
<i>Related expression:</i>	<i>Related expression:</i>
zlamenie patriarstva (39)	signum dignitatis patriarchalis

b) *Latin to "Illyrian"*

admoneo, monui, monitus 2	pokarati (21)
aestimo 1	preštímavati (61)
aeternaliter	od vika (81)
anathemo 1	osuditi (5)
anima, ae <i>f</i>	duša (82)
apologia, ae <i>f</i>	apolođia (101)
articulus, i <i>m</i>	članak (69)
beatus, a, o	blaženi (67)
<i>Related expression:</i>	<i>Related expression:</i>
gloria beatorum	slava blaženeh (67)
canon, is <i>m</i>	kanon (37)
causa, ae <i>f</i>	uzrok (75)

charitas, atis <i>f</i>	milosardie (37)
christianus, a, um	karstianski (7), karštianski (103)
christianus, i <i>m</i>	hristianin (19) karstianin (7), karštianin (104)
confessio, onis <i>f</i>	ispovidanie (17)
confiteor, fessus sum 2	ispovidati (18)
declaro 1	očítovati (75)
definio 4	dokončati (81)
disceptatio, onis <i>f</i>	pregovaranie (67)
discussio, onis <i>f</i>	iskušenje (67)
disputo 1	dišputati (46)
divinitas, tatis <i>f</i>	božanstvo (74)
divinus, a, o	božanstveni (77)
doceo, docui, doctus 2	naučiti (19)
doctor, oris <i>m</i>	naučitel (82)
doctrina, ae <i>f</i>	nauka (1)
eleemosyna, ae <i>f</i>	lemozina (28)
episcopus, i <i>m</i>	biscup (8)
esse	bitie (79)
<i>See also:</i> substantia, ae <i>f</i>	
essentia, ae <i>f</i>	narav (5)
<i>See also:</i> natura, ae <i>f</i>	
fidelis, e	viiran (12), viran (98)
fides, ei <i>f</i>	viira (18)

<p> <i>filius, ii m</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> a Filium per Filium </p>	<p> sin (76) <i>Related expressions:</i> od Sina (76) po Sina (76) </p>
<p> <i>gloria, ae f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> gloria beatorum </p>	<p> slava (67) <i>Related expression:</i> slava blaženeh (67) </p>
<p>gubernio 1</p>	<p>vladati (82)</p>
<p> <i>haeresis, is f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> haeresis iconoclastarum </p>	<p> herezia (23), herežia (24) <i>Related expressions:</i> herezia ikonoklatska (23), herežia ikonomačka aliti ikonoborska (24) </p>
<p><i>haereticus, i m</i></p>	<p>heretik (1)</p>
<p><i>historia, ae f</i></p>	<p> historia (44), hištorija (43) istoria (83) </p>
<p><i>imperator, oris m</i></p>	<p>cesar (16)</p>
<p><i>impius, a, um</i></p>	<p>neviran (14)</p>
<p><i>improbus, a, um</i></p>	<p>nepřavidan (14)</p>
<p><i>infernus, i m</i></p>	<p>pakao (82)</p>
<p><i>injustitia, ae f</i></p>	<p>nepřavda (21)</p>
<p>intellego, lexi, lectus 3</p>	<p>razumiti (18)</p>
<p>iubeo, iussi, iussus 2</p>	<p> iskušiti (67) izkušiti (36) </p>
<p><i>judaeus, ei m</i></p>	<p>čifut (19)</p>
<p><i>judex, icis m</i></p>	<p>sudec (39)</p>
<p><i>justitia, ae f</i></p>	<p>pravda (11)</p>
<p><i>justus, a, um</i></p>	<p>pravidan (7)</p>

legatus, i <i>m</i>	legatuš (6)
legatus, i <i>m</i>	poklisar (6)
liturgia, ae <i>f</i>	leturdia (103)
magister, stri <i>m</i>	mešter (19)
missio, onis <i>f</i>	poslanie (86)
monachus, i 2	kaluger (20), kaluđer (24)
natura, ae <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> essentia, ae <i>f</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> connaturalis, e duas naturas	narav (5) <i>Related expressions:</i> iedan narav (79) dvi naravi (5)
pater, ris <i>m</i>	otaž (16)
peccatum, i <i>n</i> <i>Related expression:</i> peccatum mortalis	sagrišenje (82) grih (11) <i>Related expression:</i> smartnoe sagrišenje (82)
<perpetuus> (<i>word not occurring</i>) <i>Related expression:</i> in perpetuum	<i>Related expression:</i> vikovicni (110)
persona, ae <i>f</i>	peršona (36)
philosophia, ae <i>f</i>	filozofia (70)
philosophus, i <i>m</i>	filozof (96)
poenitentia, ae <i>f</i>	pokora (35)
potestas, atis <i>f</i>	oblast (82)
primatus, us <i>m</i> <i>Related expression:</i> primatus papae	poglavarstvo (19) <i>Related expression:</i> poglavarstvo pape (19)

princeps, principis <i>m</i>	princip (50), prinčip (27) poglavar (79)
principium, ii <i>n</i>	početak (75)
procedo, cessi, cessum 3	izhoditi (85)
processio, onis <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> productio, onis <i>f</i> , spiratio, onis <i>f</i>	izhođenje (66)
productio, onis <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> processio, onis <i>f</i> , spiratio, onis <i>f</i>	izhođenje (66)
prudens, entis	mudar (20)
pudor, oris <i>m</i>	sram (38)
purgatorium, ii <i>n</i>	čistilo (90), purgator (90), purgatorio (66)
reconcilio 1	siediniti (49)
ritus, us <i>m</i>	običaj crkveni (55)
sacramentum, i <i>n</i>	posvetilište (79)
schismaticus, i <i>m</i>	šišmatik (70), šizmatik (77)
scisma, matis <i>n</i>	razdvoenje (55)
separatio, onis <i>f</i>	razlučenije (5)
sessio, onis <i>f</i> <i>Related expression:</i> Congregatio de propaganda fide	skupština (67) <i>Related expression:</i> Skupština od rasplodenja viire
signum, i <i>n</i> <i>Related expression:</i> signum dignitatis patriarchalis	zlamenie (39) <i>Related expression:</i> zlamenie patriarstva (39)

spiratio, onis <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> processio, onis <i>f</i> , productio, onis <i>f</i>	izhodenie (66)
spiritus, us <i>m</i> <i>Related expression:</i> Spiritus Sanctus	duh (36) <i>Related expression:</i> duh sveti (36)
stolidus a, um <i>Related expression:</i> plane stolidus	<i>Related expression:</i> budala (18)
substantia, ae <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> esse <i>Related expression:</i> consubstantialis, e	bitie (79) <i>Related expression:</i> iedno bitie (79)
superbia, ae <i>f</i>	oholost (21)
Symbolum fidei	virovanie (68)
teneo, tenui, tentus 2 <i>Related expression:</i> tenere doctrinam sanctorum patrum	daržati (36) <i>Related expression:</i> daržiti nauk svetieh otaca (36)
theologia, ae <i>f</i>	bogoslovstvo (70)
theologus, i <i>m</i>	bogoslovac (67)
Trinitas, atis <i>f</i>	Troica (82) Troistvo (83)
unio, onis <i>m</i>	iedinstvo (51) siedinenie (14)
verbum, i <i>m</i>	rič (69), rijč (69)
veritas, tatis <i>f</i> <i>See also:</i> justitia, ae <i>f</i> <i>Related expressions:</i> adversus veritatem in veritate	istina (83) pravda (11) <i>Related expressions:</i> brez pravdu (37) spravdom (37)

verus, a, um

Related expression:

verus catholicus

vicarius, ii m

Related expression:

vicarius Christi

prav (12)

Related expression:

prav katolik (12)

namisnik (82)

vikariuš (6)

Related expression:

namisnik Isukarstov (82)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. WORKS OF KRASTYO PEYKICH¹

KARST PEIKIČ, *Zarcalo istine med Carkve Istočne i Zapadnje* [The Mirror of the Truth in the Eastern and Western Churches], u Mnecie [in Venice]: po Nikoli Peccanu, 1716.

CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Mahometanus dogmatice, et catechetice in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus*, Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis per Fridericum Gall, 1717.

CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Speculum veritatis inter Orientalem et Occidentalem Ecclesias refulgens*, Venetiis: Typis Societatis Albrizianae, 1725.

CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Additamentum ad Speculum veritatis*, Tyrnaviae(?): s.e., 1727(?).

CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium in eadem veritate, de Spiritus Sancti processione ab utroque, ad amussim convenientium: ex commentariis Gennadii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani excerpta...*, Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis per Fridericum Gall, 1730.

¹ We describe – in a short way and chronological order – only of the archetypal editions of Peykich's works. Bibliological information on these editions and on the subsequent ones can be found in TURČINOVIĆ and SGAMBATI, *Cultura*, p. 283.

2. SOURCES

Acta Sacri Oecumenici Concilii Florentini, ed. Horatius Iustinianus, Romae: Typis Sac. Congr. de Fide Propaganda, 1638.

P. AIGL, *Historia brevis venerabilis capituli cathedralis ecclesiae Quinque-Ecclesiensis a prima eiusdem origine usque finem anni 1838*, Quinque-Ecclesiis: Typis Lycei Episcopalis, 1838.

Bulgaria e la storia bulgara negli Archivi Vaticani e nella Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (secc. XV-XVIII). In occasione del 300° anniversario dell'insurrezione di Čiprovec del 1688, Sofia: Sofia Presse, 1988.

J. BRÜSZTLE, *Recensio universi cleri dioecesis Quinque-Ecclesiensis*, Quinque-Ecclesiis: Typis Lycei Episcopalis, 1876.

Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, Lipsiae: ex Officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1856 (editio stereotypa quinta).

Collectanea S. Congregationis De Propaganda Fide seu decreta, instructiones, rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus, 2 vol., Roma: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Prop. Fide, 1907.

NICOLAUS COMNENUS PAPADOPOLI, *Praenotiones mystagogicae ex jure canonico*, Patavii: ex Typographia Seminarii, 1697.

Acta Graeca Concilii Florentini, v. *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini necnon descriptionis cuidam eiusdem*, ed. I. Gill, (*Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores*, B, 5), Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953.

Acta Slavica Concilii Florentini. Narrationes et documenta, ed. J. Krajcar, (*Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores*, A, 11), Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1976.

E. FERMENDŽIN, *Acta Bulgariae ecclesiastica ab a. 1565 usque ad a. 1799*, Zagabriae: JAZU, 1887.

[PSEUDO-]GENNADIUS SCHOLARIUS, v. JOANNES PLUSIADENUS.

- I. GOLUB, *Ivan Paštrić (Giovanni Pastrizio) - polihistor i teolog (1636-1708)*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1988.
- THYRSUS GONZALEZ de SANTALLA, *Manuductio ad conversionem Mahumetanorum*, 2 vol., Matriti: Huan de Goyeneche, 1687.
- J. HOPKINS (ed.), *Nicholas of Cusa's De pace fidei and Cribratio Alkorani. Translation and Analysis*, Minneapolis: Arthur Banning, 1990.
- J. JERKOV, "Le relazioni delle visite apostoliche fra i pauliciani bulgari del XVIII secolo," *Ricerche slavistiche*. Nuova serie, 4 (2006), pp. 85-205.
- J. JERKOV, "Le relazioni delle visite apostoliche fra i pauliciani bulgari del XVIII secolo. Seconda parte," *Ricerche slavistiche*. Nuova serie, 5 (2007), pp. 45-191.
- JOSEPHUS METHONENSIS, v. JOANNES PLUSIADENUS.
- AL-KINDI, *Apologia del cristianesimo*, ed. and tr. L. Bottini, Milano: Jaca Book, 1998.
- LUDOVICUS MARRACCIUS, *Alcorani textus universus [...] appositis unicuique capiti notis, atque refutatione....*, Patavii: Ex Typographia Seminarii, 1698.
- I. MOGA, "Stiri despre Bulgarii din Ardeal," *Annuarul Institutului de istorie natională a Univ. Cluj*, 5 (1929-1930), pp. 513-519.
- T. MRKONJIĆ, *Il teologo Ivan Paštrić (Giovanni Pastrizio) (1636-1708). Vita. Opere. Concezione della teologia. Cristologia*, Roma: Pontificia facultas theologica "S. Bonaventurae", 1989.
- N.A. NEWMAN (ed.), *The Early Christian-Muslim Dialogue: A Collection of Documents from the First Three Islamic Centuries (632-900 AD). Translations with Commentary*, Hatfield: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1993.
- NICOLAUS DE CUSA, *Opera omnia*, vol. 8: *Cribratio Alkorani*, ed. L. Hagemann, Hamburg: F. Meiner Verlag, 1986.
- NICOLAUS DE CUSA, *Opera omnia*, vol. 7: *De pace fidei*, ed. R. Klibansky - H. Bascour, Hamburg: F. Meiner Verlag, 1970.

NICOLAUS PAPADOPOLI, v. NICOLAUS COMNENUS PAPADOPOLI.

JOANNES PLUSIADENUS, *Expositio pro sancta et oecumenica synodo Florentina quod legitime congregata est, et defensio quinque capitum quae in decreto ejus continentur*, in PG, vol. 159, col. 1110-1349.

ANTONIUS POSSEVINUS, *Interrogationes et responsiones de processione Spiritus Sancti a Patre et Filio: Desumptae, ac breviori dilucidiori ordine digestae ex libro Genadii Scholarii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani in gratiam et utilitatem Rutenorum*, Ingolstadii: Ex Officina Wolfgangi Ederi, 1583.

Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini necnon descriptionis cuidam eiusdem, ed. I. Gill, (*Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores*, B, 5), Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953.

PAVAO RITTER VITEZOVIĆ, *Lexicon latino-ilyricum. Svezak treći. Hrvatsko-Latinski rječnik*, ed. N. Vajs - Z. Meštrović, Zagreb: ArTresor Naklada - Institut za Hrvatski Jezik i Jezikoslovlje, 2009.

A. ŠKALIJC, *Turcizmi u Srpskohrvatskom-Hrvatskosrpskom jeziku*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973³.

P. SKOK, *Etimologijski rječnik Hrvatskoga ili Srpskoga jezika - Dictionnaire Etymologique de la langue Croate ou Serbe*, ed. M. Deanović - L. Jonke, 4 vol., Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademia Znatnosti i Umetnosti - Académie Yougoslave des Sciences et des Beaux-arts, 1971-1974.

GIOVANNI TANZLINGHER, *Vocabolario di tre nobilissimi linguaggi italiano, illirico, e latino con l'aggiunta di molt'erbe semplici, e termini militari*, ed. R. Benacchio *et al.*, 2008 [<http://tanzlingher.filosofia.sns.it>].

FAUSTUS VERANTIUS, *Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum europae linguarum, Latinae, Italicae, Germanicae, Dalmatiae et Ungaricae*, Venetiis: apud Nicolaum Morettum, 1595.

И.Д. ТОТ [I.G. TÓTH], *Българско участие в католически мисии из Унгария и Трансилвания през XVII – XVIII в. Документи от Архива на Светата конгрегация за разпространение на вярата, Ватикана 1637-1716 г.* [Bulgarian Participation in Catholic Missions in Hungary and Transylvania in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Documents from the Archive of the Holy Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* in the Vatican, 1637-1716], Sofia: Академично изд. “Проф. Марин Дирнов”, 2008.

3. SECONDARY LITERATURE²

A. ANGYAL, “Krstju Pejkić, ein bulgarischer Schriftsteller der Barokzeit,” *Slavica*, 7 (1967), pp. 129-135.

M. AYOUB, “Religious Freedom and the Law of Apostasy in Islam,” *Islamochristiana* 20 (1994), pp. 75-91.

B. BENNASSAR - L. BENNASSAR, *Los cristianos de Alá. La fascinante aventura de los renegados*, tr. J.L.G. Aristu, Madrid: Nerea, 1989.

J.E. BIECHLER, “Christian Humanism Confronts Islam: Sifting the Qur’an with Nicholas of Cusa,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 13 (1976), pp. 1-14.

A. BIONDI, *La Bibliotheca selecta di Antonio Possevino. Un progetto di egemonia culturale*, in G.P. BRIZZI (ed.), *La «Ratio Studiorum»: Modelli culturali e pratiche educative dei Gesuiti in Italia tra Cinque e Seicento*, Roma: Bulzoni, 1981, pp. 43-75.

I. BITSKEY, *Il Collegio Germanico-Ungarico di Roma. Contributo alla storia della cultura ungherese in età barocca*, Roma: Viella, 1996.

Z. BLAŽEVIĆ, *Indetermi-Nation: Narrative Identity and Symbolic Politics in Early Modern Illyrism*, in B. TRENCSENYI - M. ZÁSZKALICZKY (eds.),

² Here we list only the works we actually utilize. Hence, this section does not offer a comprehensive list of all the articles and encyclopedic entries existing on Peykich.

- Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 202-223.
- M. BOGOVIĆ, *Katoliča crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji za vrijeme mletačke vladavine*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost - Školska knjiga, 1993².
- V. BRANCA - S. GRACIOTTI (eds.), *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del sud*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1983, pp. 431-451.
- P. BROGGIO, *La teologia e la politica. Controversie dottrinali, Curia romana e Monarchia spagnola tra Cinque e Seicento*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2009.
- P. BROGGIO, "L'Urbs e il mondo. Note sulla presenza degli stranieri nel Collegio Romano e sugli orizzonti geografici della «formazione romana» tra XVI e XVII secolo," *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, 56 (2002), pp. 81-120.
- The Cambridge History of Christianity*, R. PO-CHIA HSIA (ed.), vol. 6: *Reform and Expansion 1500-1660*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- M. CANDAL, "La Apologia del Plusiadenno a favor del Concilio de Florencia," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, 21 (1955), pp. 36-57.
- R. CASPAR *et al.*, "Bibliographie du dialogue islamo-chrétien," *Islamochristiana*, 1 (1975), pp. 125-181; 2 (1976), pp. 187-249; 3 (1977), pp. 255-286; 4 (1978), pp. 247-267; 5 (1979), pp. 299-317; 6 (1980), pp. 259-299; 7 (1981), pp. 299-307; 10 (1984), pp. 273-292; 13 (1987), pp. 173-180; 15 (1989), pp. 169-174.
- E. COLOMBO, "La Compagnia di Gesù e l'evangelizzazione dei musulmani nella Spagna del Seicento: il caso González," *Revue Mabillon*, 20 (2009), pp. 203-227.
- E. COLOMBO, *Convertire i musulmani. L'esperienza di un gesuita spagnolo del Seicento*, Milano: Mondadori, 2007.
- E. COLOMBO, *Gesuitomania. Studi recenti sulle missioni gesuitiche (1540-1773)*, in M. CATTO - G. MONGINI - S. MOSTACCIO, *Evangelizzazione e*

- globalizzazione. Le missioni gesuitiche nell'età moderna tra storia e storiografia*, Roma: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 2010, pp. 31-59.
- E. COLOMBO, *Jesuits and Islam in Seventeenth-Century Europe: War, Preaching and Conversions*, B. HEYBERGER *et al.* (eds.), *L'Islam visto dall'Occidente: Cultura e religione del Seicento europeo di fronte all'Islam*. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Milano, 17-18 ottobre 2007), Milano - Genova: Marietti, 2009, pp. 289-314.
- Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, 3 vol., Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009-2011: D. THOMAS - B. ROGGEMA (eds.), vol. 1: (600-900), 2009; D. THOMAS - A. MALLETT (eds.), vol. 2: (900-1050), 2010; ID. (eds.), vol. 3: (1050-1200), ed. 2011.
- A. CRONIA, *Storia della letteratura serbo-croata*, Milano: Nuova Accademia, 1963².
- J. DAHLMANN, *Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der ältern katolischen Missionsthätigkeit (1500-1800)*, Freiburg im Breisgau *et al.*: Herder, 1891.
- M.-Th. D'ALVERNY, "Deux Traductions latines du Coran au moyen-âge," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge*, 22-23 (1947-1948), pp. 69-98.
- N. DANIEL, *Islam and Europe*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.
- N. DANIEL, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Oxford: Oneworld, 1993².
- J. DE CLERCQ - P. SWIGGERS - L. VAN TONGERLOO, *The Linguistic Contribution of the Congregation De Propaganda Fide*, in M. TAVONI (ed.), *Italy and Europe in Renaissance Linguistics: Comparison and Relations*. Proceedings of the International Conference, Ferrara 20-24 March 1991, 2 vol., Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1991, vol. 2: *Italy and Non-Romance Europe. The Oriental Languages*, pp. 439-458.
- G. DE VIRES, "Il problema ecumenico alla luce delle unioni realizzate in Oriente," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, 27 (1961), pp. 64-81.

- M. DMITRIEV, *Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy*, in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 6, pp. 321-342.
- E. DURSTELER, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- F. DVORNIK, *Lo scisma di Fozio. Storia e legenda*, tr. G. Pacchiani, Roma: Edizioni Paoline, 1953.
- G. FEDALTO, *I rapporti di serbi e bulgari con Costantinopoli e con la sede di Roma durante il periodo turco (sec. XV-XIX)*, in L. VACCARO (ed.), *Storia religiosa di Serbia e Bulgaria*, Milano: Centro Ambrosiano, 2008, pp. 249-268.
- I. FOSI, *Convertire lo straniero. Forestieri e Inquisizione a Roma in età moderna*, Roma: Viella, 2011.
- C.A. FRAZEE, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire (1453-1923)*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- D.M. FREIDENREICH, *Christians in Early and Classical Sunnī Law*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 99-114.
- M. GARZANITI, *Il Decreto di Unione del Concilio di Ferrara-Firenze e la sua versione slava*, in *Oriente ed Occidente a San Marco da Cosimo il Vecchio a Giorgio La Pira. Alla riscoperta della collezione di icone russe dei Lorena*, Firenze: Polistampa, 2004, pp. 35-40.
- I. GILL, *Il Concilio di Firenze*, tr. A. Orsi Battaglini, Firenze: G.C. Sansoni, 1967.
- I. GILL, "The Sources of the *Acta* of the Council of Florence," in ID., *Church Union: Rome and Byzantium (1204-1453)*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1979, n. X (the essay is from 1948), pp. 131-143.
- C. GILLIOT, "Kontinuität und Wandel in der klassischen islamischen Koranauslegung," *Der Islam*, 85 (2010), pp. 1-155.

- R.F. GLEI, *John of Damascus*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 295-301.
- S. GRACIOTTI, “Chiese ortodosse e Chiesa Cattolica nel Balcano slavo sottomesso all’Islam ottomano,” *Europa orientalis*, 26 (2007), pp. 47-71.
- S. GRACIOTTI, “Il problema della lingua letteraria croata e la polemica tra Karaman e Rosa,” *Ricerche slavistiche*, 13 (1965), pp. 120-162.
- S. GRACIOTTI, *Serbia e Bulgaria: due storie vicine e lontane*, in L. VACCARO (ed.), *Storia religiosa di Serbia e Bulgaria*, Milano: Centro Ambrosiano, 2008, pp. 13-28.
- S.H. GRIFFITH, *Answering the Call of the Minaret: Christian Apologetics in the World of Islam*, in J.J. VAN GINKEL *et al.* (eds.), *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, Leuven *et al.*: Peeters - Departement Oosterse Studies, 2005, pp. 92-126.
- S. GRIFFITH, *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- J. HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, *Christians and Christianity in the Qur’ān*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 21-30.
- A. HAMILTON, *A Lutheran Translator for the Quran. A Late Seventeenth-Century Quest*, in A. HAMILTON - M.H. VAN DEN BOOGERT - B. WESTERWEEL (eds.), *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2005, pp. 197-221.
- J. HANKINS, “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 49 (1995), pp. 111-208.
- W. HENKEL, *The Polyglot Printing-office of the Congregation: The Press apostolate as an Important Means for Communicating the Faith*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 335-350.
- J. HOPKINS, *The Role of pia interpretatio in Nicholas of Cusa’s Hermeneutical Approach to the Koran*, in G. PIAIA (ed.), *Concordia discors. Studi su*

- Niccolò Cusano e l'Umanesimo europeo offerti a Giovanni Santinello*, Padova: Antenore, 1993, pp. 251-273.
- J.L. HOPKINS, *The Bulgarian Orthodox Church: A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Evolving Relationship Between Church, Nation and State in Bulgaria*, Boulder: East European Monographs, 2009.
- K. HORÁLEK, *An Introduction to the Study of the Slavonic Languages*, tr. P. Herry, Nottingham: Astra Press, 1992.
- J. IJSEWIJN, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 1: *Part I. History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, Leuven: Leuven University Press - Peeters, 1990².
- M.S. IOVINE, *The "Illyrian Language" and the Language Question among the Southern Slavs in the Seventeenth and Eighteen Centuries*, in R. PICCHIO - H. GOLDBLATT (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, 4 vol., New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 1984, vol. 1: *Church Slavonic - South Slavic - West Slavic*, pp. 101-156.
- E. IVETIC, *Cattolici e ortodossi nell'Adriatico orientale veneto, 1699-1797*, in G. GULLINO - E. IVETIC (eds.), *Geografie confessionali: cattolici e ortodossi nel crepuscolo della Repubblica di Venezia (1718-1797)*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2009, pp. 49-119.
- M. JEZERNIK, *Il Collegio Urbano*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 465-482.
- H. KEIPERT, *Der Weg des Russischen zur Weltsprache: das slavische Alternat der Konzilsbulle von Ferrara-Florenz vom 6. Juli 1439*, in G. FREIDHOF - P. KOSTA (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1986. Referate des XII. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens (Frankfurt am Main/Riezelrn 16.-19.9.1986)*, München: Otto Sagner, 1987, pp. 233-276.
- M. KEPPLER, *I greci e i Balcani tra Ottomani, Asburgo e ortodossia*, in R. SIMONATO (ed.), *Marco d'Aviano e il suo tempo. Un cappuccino del Seicento, gli Ottomani e l'Impero. Atti del convegno storico internazionale, Pordenone 12-13 novembre 1993*, Pordenone: Concordia sette, 1993, pp. 96-124.

- D. KOKŠA, *Tensioni in Croazia e Dalmazia*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 688-705.
- M. KOSTIĆ, “Biobibliografski prilozi za Krstu Pejkića,” *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 12/1 (1932), pp. 83-85.
- V. KRALJEVIĆ, *Gli ortodossi negli scritti di Vincenzo Zmajević (1670-1745)*, diss. Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Roma 1996.
- J. KRITZECK, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- T. KRSTIĆ, *Contested Conversions to Islam. Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- M. LACKO, *Il problema della lingua e della scrittura nelle secentesche edizioni slave di Propaganda fide*, in BRANCA - GRACIOTTI (eds.), *Barocco*, pp. 387-394.
- U.L. LEHNER, *The Many Facets of the Catholic Enlightenment*, in U.L. LEHNER - M. PRINTY (eds.), *A Companion to the Catholic Enlightenment in Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 1-61.
- G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *Aneddoti e svaghi arabi e non arabi*, Milano-Napoli: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1959.
- B. LOMAGISTRO, *Lingua e ortodossia nel pensiero di Matteo Karaman*, in F. ESVAN (ed.), *Contributi italiani al XII congresso internazionale degli slavisti* (Cracovia, 26 agosto - 3 settembre), Napoli: Associazione Italiana degli Slavisti, 1998, pp. 419-464.
- N. MALCOLM, “Comenius, the Conversion of the Turks, and the Muslim-Christian Debate on the Corruption of Scripture,” *Church History and Religious Culture*, 87 (2007), pp. 477-508.
- A. MALVEZZI, *L'Islamismo e la cultura europea*, Firenze: Sansoni, 1956.
- J. METZLER, *Foundation of the Congregation “de Propaganda Fide” by Gregory XV*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 79-111.

- J. METZLER (ed.), *Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide memoria rerum*, 3 vol., Herder, Rom *et al.* 1971-1976.
- T. MICHEL, "Jesuit Writings on Islam in the Seventeenth Century," *Islamochristiana*, 15 (1989), pp. 57-85.
- A. MINKOV, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kısve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004.
- R. MINUTI, *Orientalismo e idee di tolleranza nella cultura francese del primo '700*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2006.
- D. MARSHALL, *Christianity in the Qur'an*, in RIDGEON (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations*, pp. 3-29.
- C.A. NALLINO, *Le fonti arabe manoscritte dell'opera di Ludovico Marracci sul Corano*, in ID., *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti*, ed. M. Nallino, 2 vol., Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1940, vol. 2, pp. 90-134.
- A. NIKOLOV, *The Contexts of Paisij Hilendarski*, in B. TRENCSENYI - M. ZÁSZKALICZKY (eds.), *Whose Love of Which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2010, pp. 611-628.
- S. PAGANO, "L'ospizio dei convertendi di Roma fra carisma missionario e regolamentazione ecclesiastica (1671-1700)," *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma. Studi, documenti, inventari*, 10 (1998), pp. 313-369.
- B. PANDŽIĆ, *L'opera della S. Congregazione per le popolazioni della penisola Balcanica Centrale*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 706-722.
- E. PECORAIO, *Preambolo*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. VII-XI.
- V. PERI, *Ricerche sull'editio princeps degli atti greci del Concilio di Firenze*, Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1975.
- G. PIZZORUSSO, *Agli antipodi di Babele. Propaganda Fide tra immagine cosmopolita e orizzonti romani (XVII-XIX secolo)*, in L. FIORANI - A. PROSPERI (eds.), *Roma la città del papa. Vita civile e religiosa dal giubileo*

- di Bonifacio VIII al giubileo di papa Wojtyla*, Torino: Einaudi, 2000, pp. 477-518.
- G. PIZZORUSSO, *La preparazione linguistica e controversistica dei missionari per l'Oriente islamico: scuole, testi, insegnanti a Roma e in Italia*, in B. HEYBERGER *et al.* (eds.), *L'Islam visto dall'Occidente: Cultura e religione del Seicento europeo di fronte all'Islam*. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Milano, 17-18 ottobre 2007), Milano - Genova: Marietti, 2009, pp. 253-288.
- G. PIZZORUSSO, "I satelliti di Propaganda fide: Il Collegio Urbano e la Tipografia Poliglotta. Note di ricerca su due istituzioni culturali romane nel XVII secolo," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée*, 116 (2004), pp. 471-498.
- D.F. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- L. RIDGEON (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations of Christianity*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- G. RIZZARDI, *Il modello controversistico di Ludovico Marracci*, in G. ZATTI (a cura di), *Il Corano. Traduzioni, traduttori e lettori in Italia*, Milano: IPL, 2000, pp. 81-109.
- D. ROCCIOLO, "Documenti sui catecumeni e neofiti a Roma nel Seicento e Settecento," *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma. Studi, documenti, inventari*, 10 (1998), pp. 391-451.
- L. ROSTAGNO, *Mi faccio turco. Esperienze ed immagini dell'Islam nell'Italia moderna*, Roma: Istituto per l'oriente C.A. Nallino, 1983.
- E.N. ROTHMAN, *Between Venice and Istanbul: Trans-Imperial Subjects and Cultural Mediation in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, diss. University of Michigan 2006.
- S. RUNCIMAN, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

- L. SCARAFFIA, *Rinnegati: Per una storia dell'identità occidentale*, Roma: Laterza, 1993.
- E. SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione europea di un missionario patriota bulgaro: Karsto Pejkič*, in *Atti dell'VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1983, pp. 281-301.
- E. SGAMBATI, *Il ruolo dei Ruteni nelle edizioni seicentesche dei libri liturgici glagolitico-croati*, in BRANCA - GRACIOTTI (eds.), *Barocco in Italia*, pp. 431-451.
- K.M. SETTON, "Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril," *Balkan Studies*, 3 (1962), pp. 133-168.
- K.M. SETTON, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571*, vol. 2: *The Fifteenth Century*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1978.
- K.M. SETTON, *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1992.
- P. SHORE, *Jesuits and the Politics of Religious Pluralism in Eighteenth-Century Transylvania: Culture, Politics and Religion, 1693-1773*, Aldershot et al.: Ashgate - Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2007.
- M. SPEIGHT, *Christians in the Hadīth Literature*, in RIDGEON (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations*, pp. 30-53.
- I.D. SPISSAREVSKA, *L'intelligenza bulgara nel XVII secolo e l'Italia*, in *Atti dell'VIII congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 3-6 novembre 1981), Spoleto: Centro di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1983, pp. 303-317.
- N. ŠTEFANEC, *Tolerance and Intolerance in the Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom at the Turn of the 17th Century. Contest for Gomirje*, in E. IVETIC - D. ROKSANDIĆ (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance on the Triplex Confinium: Approaching the "Other" on the Borderlands of Eastern Adriatic and beyond 1500-1800*, Padova: CLEUP, 2007, pp. 125-151.

- J. STOYE, *L'assedio di Vienna*, tr. E. Ivetic, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2009.
- J. STOYE, *Marsigli's Europe, 1680-1730: The Life and Times of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, Soldier and Virtuoso*, New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1994.
- D. THOMAS, *Introduction*, in *Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 1, pp. 1-19.
- P. TOCĂNEL, *Assestamento delle Missioni in Bulgaria, Valachia, Transilvania e Moldavia*, in METZLER, vol. 2, pp. 722-741.
- I.G. TÓTH, *Between Islam and Orthodoxy: Protestants and Catholics in South-Eastern Europe*, in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 6, pp. 536-557.
- I.G. TÓTH, "Latin as a Spoken Language in Hungary during the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth centuries," *CEU History Department Yearbook*, (1997-1998), pp. 93-111.
- I.G. TÓTH, *Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania*, in R. PO-CHIA HSIA (ed.), *A Companion to the Reformation World*, Malden et al.: Blackwell, 2004, pp. 205-220.
- J. TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja Krsto Pejkić (1665-1731)*, Zagreb: Kršanska sadašnjost, 1973.
- P.S. VAN KONINGSVELD, *The Apology of Al-Kindi*, in T.L. HETTEMA - A. VAN DER KOOIJ (eds.), *Religious polemics in context: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR)*. Leiden, 27-28 April, 2000, Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2004, pp. 69-92.
- Á.R. VÁRKONYI, *The Last decades of the Independent Principality (1660-1711)*, in B. KÖPECZI et al. (eds.), *History of Transylvania*, 3 vols., Boulder - Highland Lakes: Hungarian Research Institute of Canada - Social Science Monographs - Atlantic Research and Publications, 2001-2002, vol. 2: *From 1606 to 1830*, pp. 233-512.

- P. VITI, *Firenze e il Concilio del 1439*, Convegno di studi (Firenze, 29 novembre - 2 dicembre 1989), Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1994.
- S. VULIĆ, *Krsto Pejkić u hrvatskoj filologiji*, in *Българи и хървати в Югоизточна Европа VII-XXI век. Материали от конференция, проведена в София (3-4 юни) 2005 г.* [Bulgarians and Croats in South-Eastern Europe], Sofia: Гутенберг, 2006, pp. 31-50.
- S. VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, in F. PETRONIO (ed.), *Plurilingvism v Evropi 18. stoletja*, Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor, 2002, pp. 179-189.
- R.M. WILTGEN, *Propaganda is Placed in Charge of the Pontifical Colleges*, in METZLER, vol. 1/1, pp. 483-505.
- P.I. ZORATTINI, *I nomi degli altri. Conversioni a Venezia e nel Friuli Veneto in età moderna*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2008.
- В. БЕХИНЬОВА [V. BENINYOVA], “Барокът и литературата на българските католици” [The Baroque Age and Bulgarian Catholics’ Literature], *Литературна мисъл* [Literary Thought], 2 (1975), pp. 82-97.
- И. БОГДАНОВ [I. BOGDANOV], *Кратка история на българската литература в две части* [Brief History of Bulgarian Literature], vol. 1: *Стара българска литература и литература на Възраждането* [Old Bulgarian Literature and Literature from the Period of the National Revival], Sofia: Народна просвета, 1969.
- Б. ДИМИТРОВ [B. DIMITROV], *Петър Богдан Бакиев: български политик и историк от XVII век* [Petar Bogdan Bakshev: A Bulgarian Politician and Historian of the Seventeenth Century], Sofia: s.e., 2001².
- П. ДИНЕКОВ [P. DINEKOV], “Българската литература през XVII в.” [Bulgarian Literature in the Seventeenth Century], *Литературна мисъл* [Literary Thought], 20 (1977), pp. 5-15.

- И. ДУЙЧЕВ [I. DUYSHEV], *Софийската католичка архиепископия през XVII век. Изучаване и документи* [*The Catholic Archbishopric of Sofia in the Seventeenth Century*], Sofia: Български Археологически Институт, 1939.
- Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], “Илирикийският език на южните славяни в българското книжноразвитие през 17 в. Част I” [The Illyrian Language of the South Slavs and the Bulgarian Literary Development during the Seventeenth Century. Part I], *Годишник на Софийския Университет “Климент Охридски” Факултет по славянски филологии, книга 1 - Езикознание – Annuaire de L’Universite de Sofia “Kliment Ohridski”. Faculte des Philologies Slaves, livre 1 - Linguistique*, 78 (1984), pp. 34-93.
- Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], *История на сръбския и хърватския книжовен език* [History of the Serbian and the Croatian Literary Language], Sofia: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски”, 2000.
- Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], “Контактни синоними в съчиненията на Петър Богдан Бакшич, Филип Станиславов и Кръстьо Пейкич” [Contact Synonyms in the Works of Peter Bogdan Bakshich, Filip Stanislavov and Krastyo Peykich], *Paleobulgaria - Старобългаристика*, 12/4 (1998).
- Н. ИВАНОВА [N. IVANOVA], *Кръстьо Пейкич в южнославянските книжноразвитие езикови контакти от началото на 18 век* [Krastyo Peykich in the Southern Slav Linguistic Contacts in the Eighteenth Century], Sofia: [pro manuscripto], 1990.
- История на българската литература* [History of Bulgarian Literature], 4 vol., Sofia: BAN, 1962-1966.
- Г. КАПРИЕВ [G. KAPRIEV], *Византийската философия. Четири центъра на синтеза* [The Byzantine Philosophy. Four Centers of Synthesis], Sofia: Лик, 2001.
- Е.М. ЛОМИЗЕ [E.M. LOMIZE], “К вопросу о восприятии Ферраро-флорентийского собора русской делегацией: Анализ сведений Симеона

- Суздальского” [On the Impressions of the Russian Delegation from the Council of Ferrara-Florence], *Славяне и их соседи* [The Slavs and Their Neighbours], 6 (1996), pp. 140-152.
- Н. МИЛЕВ [N. MILEV], *Католишката пропаганда в България през XVII век* [Catholic Propaganda in Bulgaria during the Seventeenth Century], Sofia: Царска придворна печатница, 1914.
- Л. МИЛЕТИЧ [L. MILETICH], “Заселението на католишките българи в Седмиградско и Банат” [The Settling of the Catholic Bulgarians in Transylvania and Banat], *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* [Collection of Folklore, Knowledge and Letters], 14 (1897), pp. 284-543.
- Л. МИЛЕТИЧ [L. MILETICH], *Изследвания за българите в Седмиградско и Банат* [Studies on the Bulgarians in Transylvania and Banat], Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1987.
- Л. МИЛЕТИЧ [L. MILETICH], “Нови документи по миналото на нашите павликяни” [New Documents Concerning the Past of Our Paulicians], *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* [Collection of Folklore, Knowledge and Letters], 21 (1905), pp. 1-155.
- Л. МИЛЕТИЧ [L. MILETICH], “Седмиградските българи” [The Transylvanian Bulgarians], *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* [Collection of Folklore, Knowledge and Letters], 13 (1896), pp. 153-256.
- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], “Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи на Кръстьо Пейкич” [Krastyo Peykich’s Philosophical-Theological and Political Views], *БАН. Известия на института по философия* [BAN. Notices of the Institute of Philosophy], 17 (1969), pp. 217-238.
- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], *Кръстьо Пейкич (1665-1731)* [Krastyo Peykich (1665-1731)], in М. БЪЧВАРОВ [M. BACHVAROV] (ed.), *Антология на българската философска мисъл* [Antology of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought], 3 vol., Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1973, vol. 1, pp. 143-145.

- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], *Католическият схоластицизъм в историята на българската философска мисъл – XVIII век. Автореферат* [The Catholic Scholasticism in the History of Bulgarian Philosophical Thought: Eighteenth Century. Synopsis], Sofia: BAN - Институт по философия, 1972.
- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], “Кръстьо Пейкич – Важна задача на нашата българистика” [Krastyo Peykich: An Important Task for Our Bulgarian-Language Studies], *Език и литература* [Language and Literature], 24/3 (1969), pp. 74-78.
- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], *Съчиненията на Пеячевичи и Кръстьо Пейкич*, [The Writings of the Peyachevichs and of Krastyo Peykich], in *Чипровци 1688-1968. Материали от научна сесия по случай 280-годишнината на Чипровското въстание* [Chiprovtsi 1688-1968. Proceedings of a Scientific Conference], Sofia: BAN, 1971, pp. 101-104.
- Б. ПЕЙЧЕВ [B. PEYCHEV], *Философските и политическите възгледи на Кръстьо Пейкич (1665-1730)* [The Philosophical and Political Views of Krastyo Peykich (1665-1730)], in М. БЪЧВАРОВ - К. АНДРЕЕВ [M. BACHVAROV - K. ANDREEV] (eds.), *История на философската мисъл в България* [History of Philosophical Thought in Bulgaria], 4 vol., Sofia: BAN, 1970-1984, vol. 1, pp. 121-132.
- И. СНЕГАРОВ [I. SNEGAROV], *История на Охридската архиепископия* [History of Ohrid Archbishopric], <vol. 1:> *От основаването ѝ до завладяването на Балканския полуостров от турците* [From Its Foundation to the Turkish Conquest of the Balkans], Sofia: Гутенберг, 1924.
- И. СНЕГАРОВ [I. SNEGAROV], *История на Охридската архиепископия* [History of Ohrid Archbishopric], vol. 2: *От падането ѝ под турците до нейното унищожение (1394-1767)* [From Its Fall under the Turks until Its Abolition (1394-1767)], Sofia: Македонски научен институт - Издателство на Богословски факултет, 1932.

- Й.Д. СПИСАРЕВСКА [I.D. SPISSAREVSKA], *Чипровското въстание и европейският свят* [The Chiprovtsi Uprising and the European World], Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1988.
- К. ТЕЛБИЗОВ [K. TELBIZOV], “Към биографията на Кръстю Пейкич (1665-1730)” [Concerning Krastyo Peukich’s Biography], *Векове* [Centuries], 9/1 (1980), p. 26-35.
- В. ТРАЙКОВ [V. TRAYKOV], *Съдбата на населението от чипровския край след въстанието от 1688 г.* [The Destiny of the Population from the Chiprovtsi Region after the Uprising of 1688], in *300 години Чипровско въстание. Принос към историята на българите през XVII в.* [300 Years since the Chiprovtsi Uprising], Sofia: BAN 1988, pp. 292-302.
- Б. ЦОНЕВ [B. TZONEV], “Кирилски ръкописи и старопечатни книги в Загреб” [Cyrillic Manuscripts and Early Printed Books in Zagreb], *Сборник на Българската Академия на Науките* [Collection of BAN], 1 (1913), pp. 1-54.
- Л.В. ЧЕРЕПНИН [L.V. CHEREPNIN], *К вопросу о русских источниках по истории Флорентийской унии* [On the Russian Sources Concerning the History of the Union of Florence], *Средние века* [Middle Ages], 25 (1964), pp. 176-187.
- М. ШИПКОВ [M. SHIPKOV], *Културно-просветното дело на банатските българи* [The Cultural and Educational Work of the Bulgarians in Banat], in Г. НЕШЕВ [G. NESHEV] *et al.* (eds.), *Ренесансът и България - II Rinascimento e la Bulgaria*, Sofia: Геа либрис, 1995, pp. 377-384.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
RIASSUNTO	7
NOTICE.....	11
1. TRANSLITERATION OF THE BULGARIAN ALPHABET IN LATIN LETTERS	11
1.1 <i>Transliteration of the simple graphemes</i>	11
1.2 <i>Transliteration of the composite graphemes</i>	11
2. TRANSLITERATION OF THE GRAPHEMS USED IN PEYKICH'S WORK <i>ZARCALO ISTINE</i> IN PRESENT DAY CROATIAN LATIN LETTERS	12
3. ABBREVIATIONS	13
INTRODUCTION.....	15
1. SOME HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS	15
2. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE STUDIES ON KRASTYO PEYKICH.....	21
CHAPTER 1	
THE LIFE AND TIMES OF KRASTYO PEYKICH	31
1. PEYKICH'S TIMES	32
2. PEYKICH'S LIFE.....	50
CHAPTER 2	
PEYKICH'S WORK ON THE CONVERSION OF MUSLIMS TO CATHOLICISM	63
1. HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM POLEMIC AND INSTRUMENTAL USES OF THE THEME OF 'ISLAM'	67
1.1 <i>The presence of the theme of 'Islam' in eighteenth-century philosophical and political thought.</i>	67

1.2. <i>The seventeenth-century rise of Arabic studies and the flourishing of “Baroque writings on Islam”</i>	72
1.3 <i>A brief account on the history of the Christian-Muslim polemic</i>	77
a) The birth of the polemic and the early centuries of its development	77
b) The sources of knowledge about Islam in the West	81
c) The themes of medieval anti-Muslim polemic	85
d) The social function of anti-Muslim polemic during the Renaissance and the early modern period	87
e) Two further contributions to the anti-Muslim polemic: the humanists and Martin Luther	89
2. ANALYSIS OF THE <i>MAHOMETANUS IN LEGE CHRISTI INSTRUCTUS</i> (1717)	91
2.1 <i>Structure</i>	91
2.2 <i>Letter of dedication: general aims of the work</i>	96
2.3 <i>The “Praefatio ad lectorem”</i>	98
a) Argumentative method and specific purpose of the book	98
b) Peykich’s sources	102
c) The field of application of the <i>Mahometanus</i>	106
2.4 <i>The contents of chapters one to six of the Mahometanus</i>	111
2.5 <i>Further polemics in the Mahometanus</i>	115
a) On the Holy Trinity	115
b) The accusation of idolatry	116
c) Matrimony, divorce, polygamy	119
2.6 <i>Conclusion</i>	121
CHAPTER 3	
PEYKICH’S WORKS ON SCHISM AND UNION OF THE CHURCH	123
1. THE <i>ZARCALO ISTINE MED CARKVE ISTOČNE I ZAPADNJE</i> (1716)	124
2. THE <i>SPECULUM VERITATIS INTER ORIENTALEM ET OCCIDENTALEM ECCLESIAS REFULGENS</i> (1725)	133
3. THE <i>ADDITAMENTUM AD SPECULUM VERITATIS</i> (1727?)	138
4. THE <i>CONCORDIA ORTHODOXORUM PATRUM ORIENTALIUM ET OCCIDENTALIUM</i> (1730)	141
CHAPTER 4	
PEYKICH’S LINGUISTIC ENDEAVOUR	145
1. THE QUESTION OF THE “ILLYRIAN” LANGUAGE	145
2. NAYDA IVANOVA’S STUDY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE <i>ZARCALO</i>	148
2.1 <i>Basic dialects in the Serbo-Croatian diasystem</i>	150

2.2	<i>Graphic system in the Zarcalo</i>	152
2.3	<i>Phonetic characteristics</i>	153
2.4	<i>Phonetic adaptation of foreign words</i>	154
2.5	<i>Comparison of adjectives</i>	154
2.6	<i>Use of grammatical cases</i>	155
2.7	<i>Conclusions</i>	156
3.	LATIN VERSUS “ILLYRIAN”	157
4.	A SUCCESS PREVIOUSLY UNNOTICED: EIGHTEENTH- AND NINETEENTH- CENTURY TRANSCRIPTIONS AND PLAGIARIST EDITIONS OF THE <i>ZARCALO</i>	159
5.	PHILOSOPHICAL-THEOLOGICAL VOCABULARY IN THE <i>ZARCALO</i>	162
5.1	<i>General remarks</i>	162
5.2	<i>Table of the equivalences of theological, philosophical and eccle- siological lexemes and syntagmata in Zarcalo and in Speculum</i>	167
	a) “Illyrian” to Latin	167
	b) Latin to “Illyrian”	173
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	181
1.	WORKS OF KRASTYO PEYKICH	181
2.	SOURCES	182
3.	SECONDARY LITERATURE	185

