

## HISTORICO-PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES ON KRASTYO PEYKICH OF CHIPROVTSI (1666-1730): AN OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND SOME CRITICAL REMARKS

IVA MANOVA

Krastyo Peykich (1666-1730), together with Filip Stanislavov, Petar Parchevich and Petar Bogdan Bakshev, to mention just the most widely-known names, was a representative of the so-called Bulgarian Catholic intelligentsia of the early modern period. Bulgarian by birth and “Roman” by education, Peykich was 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, and was the author of several polemical works, which dealt with controversialist theology and political and juridical issues.

This article aims to present an overview of the scholarly studies on Peykich’s works and to highlight some problematic aspects in the historiographical interpretations of the role played by Bulgarian Catholic authors, and by Krastyo Peykich in particular, in Bulgarian national culture.

Peykich was born in 1666 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 that, for the purposes of the present study, we can divide in two groups. The first group concerns the question of the schism between Eastern and Western Churches and consists of three publications: *Zarcalo istine med Carkve Istočne i Zapadnje* (“The Mirror of the Truth in the Eastern and Western Churches”), *Speculum veritatis inter Orientalem et Occidentalem Ecclesias refulgens* and

*Concordia orthodoxorum Patrum orientalium et occidentalium* (“The Concord of the Orthodox Eastern and Western Fathers”). *Zarcalo istine* (Venice 1716) was Peyklich’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 dogmaticæ, et catechicæ in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus* (“The Mohameddan educated, with the Corroboration of the Koran, in Dogmatics and Catechism according to the Law of Christ”, Trnava 1717), a “catechism” for Catholic missionaries carrying out their activity among Muslims. The *Speculum* and the *Concordia* were reprinted together in Trnava 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 (Trnava).

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. They 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. This places them within the perspective of the post-Tridentine Catholic expansion in eastern Europe and the one of the Hapsburg’s policy towards religious minorities in the borderlands of their Empire: a policy aimed at the religious integration of their subjects and the consolidation of Catholicism as the “state religion” in their dominions. Beyond its direct function within the so-defined historical context, our author’s polemics also aimed at a final, supreme end. It consisted in the “liberation” of all Christian peoples – Peyklich’s Bulgarian compatriots among them – from the Ottoman control. According to Peyklich’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 Ottomans. 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. The latter consisted in Peykich’s attempt to reach a broader audience among diverse, and not necessarily highly or “classically” educated, social strata by writing his *Zarcalo istine* 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. In point of fact, *Zarcalo istine* was the first book on Orthodox-Catholic theological controversy ever written in a Southern Slavic language.

### 1. Some historiographical problems

Almost thirty years ago, the Italian Slavistic scholar Emanuela Sgambati said of our author: “Karsto Pejkič is a little known figure that civil, religious, and especially cultural historiography of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bulgaria has to recover and put in his due place.”<sup>1</sup> Despite this and other similar exhortations, the polemical, philosophical and devotional writings of Krastyo Peykich, Petar Bogdan Bakshev<sup>2</sup> and other Early Modern Bulgarian Catholic authors have hitherto rarely been studied. We shall try to outline two reasons for this state of the question.

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,”<sup>3</sup> it has been

---

<sup>1</sup> “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.” – 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.

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

<sup>3</sup> 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. 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.”<sup>4</sup>

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 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

---

published in Bulgarian translation: Дж. ХОПКИНС, *Църква, народ и държава. Опит за социоисторически анализ на отношенията в България*, София: Омофор, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

the development of the common Bulgarian culture and literature.”<sup>5</sup> 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.”<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>7</sup>

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.

<sup>5</sup> Dinekov quotes from *История на българската литература* [History of Bulgarian Literature], 4 vol., Sofia: Българска Академия на Науките [Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, hereafter: BAN], 1962-1966, vol. 1, p. 407.

<sup>6</sup> “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.

<sup>7</sup> Although we must admit that, in recent years, Bulgarian Slavistic scholar Krassimir Stantchev has dedicated several studies to Bulgarian Catholic intelligentsia and its historical importance. – Cf. for example К. СТАНЧЕВ/K. STANTCHEV, *Православието през погледа на българите-католици от XVII век* [Orthodoxy through the Eyes of Seventeenth-Century Bulgarian Catholics], in M. WALCZAK-MIKOLAJCZAKOWA (ed.), *Religijna mozaika Balkanów*, Gniezno: Collegium Europaeum Gnesnense, 2008, pp. 55-61; ID., *Francesco Soimirovic: un protagonista poco noto della cultura bulgara dell’età barocca*, in M. DI SALVO – G. MORACCI – G. SIEDINA (a cura di), *Nel mondo degli Slavi. Incontri e dialoghi tra le culture. Studi in onore di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff*, Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2008, vol. 2, pp. 601-613; ID., *I francescani e il Cattolicesimo in Bulgaria fino al secolo XIX*, in V. NOSILIA – M. SCARPA (a cura di), *I francescani nella storia dei popoli balcanici nell’8. centenario della fondazione dell’Ordine*, Venezia: ArchetipoLibri, 2011, pp. 135-186.

In his renowned *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Jozef Ijsewijn dedicates some attention also to Bulgarian Catholic writers of the seventeenth 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."<sup>8</sup> 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."<sup>9</sup> 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 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."<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> This trend, or school, of thought gradually came to lose importance in the following decades,

---

<sup>8</sup> J. IJSEWIJN, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 1: *Part I: History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, Leuven: Leuven University Press - Peeters, 1990<sup>2</sup>, p. 92.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibi.*

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. P. BROGGIO, *La teologia e la politica. Controversie dottrinali, Curia romana e Monarchia spagnola tra Cinque e Seicento*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2009, in particular pp. xiv-xv.

but at Peykich's time it was still rather influential, in general, and of exclusive importance in central-European political life, in particular.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup>

## **2. The state of the question of the historico-philosophical studies on Krastyo Peykich**

The "Illyrian" *Zarcalo istine* is known to international Slavistic scholars for its linguistic peculiarities. In an important article, Michaela Iovine has placed the language

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. I. BITSKEY, *Il Collegio Germanico-Ungarico di Roma. Contributo alla storia della cultura ungherese in età barocca*, Roma: Viella, 1996, pp. 127-128, where this statement is substantiated by statistics.

<sup>13</sup> 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. 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.



of Peykich's *Zarcalo* in a very precise historical and cultural context,<sup>14</sup> and another philologist, Nayda Ivanova, has studied and described in a highly exhaustive manner the concrete characteristics of the "Illyrian literary model" and of the "mixed or composite literary norm" in Peykich's work. On the basis of her complete analysis of the language of the book, Ivanova draws the conclusion that the variable grammatic norm applied by Peykich in his *Zarcalo* has allowed him 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.<sup>15</sup>

By contrast, Peykich's theological and philosophical doctrines have been object, by far, only of Turčinović's *Misionar Podunavlja* (1973) and of a group of studies by the Bulgarian scholar Bozhidar Peychev published in Bulgarian between 1969 and 1973.

The monograph *Misionar Podunavlja*, in Croatian, by Josip Turčinović, a well-founded study on Peykich's life and on the history and dissemination of his works, remains the most important study on Peykich by now.<sup>16</sup> In his monograph, Turčinović has given a bibliological description of all works of our author and provided synopses of their contents.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, he has virtually established the main sources of the three

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> 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. The following articles also present discussions on the linguistic peculiarities in *Zarcalo* istine: S. VULIĆ, *The Multilingualism of Krsto Pejkić*, in F. PETRONIO (ed.), *Plurilingvizem v Evropi 18. stoletja*, Maribor: Slavistično društvo Maribor, 2002, pp. 179-189 and SGAMBATI, *Cultura e azione europea*.

<sup>16</sup> J. TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja Krsto Pejkić (1665-1731)*, Zagreb: Kršanska sadašnjost, 1973. Turčinović's study outlines the main events in Peykich's life yet still leaves a number of unanswered questions: notwithstanding the new facts published by Turčinović, of which there are many, whole periods of Peykich's life continue to remain obscure. We are able to trace Peykich's life today in far greater detail than ever before, especially as far as his literary and missionary activity is concerned. For a more detailed biography of Krastyo Peykich, may we take the liberty to refer the reader to the following study: И. МАНОВА [I. MANOVA], "Кръстьо Пейкич (1666-1730) и Мохамеданина, обучен в съгласие с Корана според Христовия закон (1717) – за автора и книгата" [Krastyo Peykich and his "The Mohammedan educated in the Law of Christ"], *Архив за средновековна философия и култура – Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur*, 18 (2012), pp. 193-235.

<sup>17</sup> All the editions of Peykich's works – with one exception – are known to Turčinović and bibliologically described by him. – TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja*, pp. 75-77, 97-98, 102-103, 118-119, 127-131, 132-133,



works of Peykich (*Zarcalo istine, Speculum veritatis, Concordia*), which concern the question of the schism and union of the Church, 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. In his *Misionar Podunavlja*, Josip Turčinović provides also 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.<sup>18</sup>

While the analysis in Turčinović covers *Zarcalo istine, Speculum veritatis* and the *Concordia* and is accomplished in a historical-theological perspective, Bozhivar Peychev concentrates on the *Mahometanus* and tries to carry out a historico-philosophical analysis. Apart from Bozhivar Peychev’s study, Peykich’s *Mahometanus* has hitherto never been a subject of scholarly interest and investigation.<sup>19</sup> Due to both the historical importance and the problematic character of these studies, we shall dedicate to them the rest of the present article.

After having published several articles and book chapters on Peykich,<sup>20</sup> in 1973 Peychev defended a doctoral thesis on the following topic: *Католическият*

---

151-153. The only exception is the 1745 edition of *Concordia*, which has been communicated by Emanuela Sgambati. – SGAMBATI, *Cultura*, p. 283.

<sup>18</sup> TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja*, pp. 138-144.

<sup>19</sup> 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. For preliminary results of our research on *Mahometanus*, see МАНОВА [I. MANOVA], “Кръстьо Пейкич (1666-1730) и Мохамеданина”.

<sup>20</sup> 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 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; *Кръстьо Пейкич (1665-1731)* [Krastyo Peykich (1665-1731)], in М. БЪЧВАРОВ [M. BACHVAROV] (ed.), *Антология на българската*

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.<sup>21</sup> 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)<sup>22</sup> and Franz Xavier (1707-1781) Peyachevich,<sup>23</sup> who were 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

---

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).

<sup>21</sup> 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 our efforts, we have not yet been able to contact him. As we were not able to procure such a letter, we were denied access to Peychev's dissertation.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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.

the nature of the historical process].<sup>24</sup> The historian maintains that in the *Zarcalo Peykich* “introduces his concept of the objective laws and the main content of the historical process.”<sup>25</sup> 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.”<sup>26</sup>

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.<sup>27</sup>

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.”<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> 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 [Institute of Philosophy], 1972, p. 21.

<sup>25</sup> “...запознава читателите си с концепцията си за закономерностите и главното съдържание на общоисторическия процес” – Ibi, p. 22.

<sup>26</sup> “историческите събития се пораждат и направляват от намерения, действия, замисли или желания на отделни личности” – Ibi.

<sup>27</sup> “Масите с техните тежнения, настроения и инициативи не са изтъкнати в *Zarcalo istine* 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 действията на ръководните политически фигури – императори, царе, царедворци и т.н.” – Ibi, pp. 22-23.

<sup>28</sup> “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.

As for Peykich's polemical method,<sup>29</sup> Psychev calls it a "conversionist method" (конверсионен метод)<sup>30</sup> and an "innovative method for theologico-philosophical polemic, or conversion, as it was called at the time."<sup>31</sup> These formulas, together with the formula "conversionist polemic" from the title of the section, give the impression that Psychev 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, Psychev 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 possible ways theological *rationalism*."<sup>32</sup> Psychev'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*.<sup>33</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> Peykich speaks about his polemical method on the introductory pages (pp. 2-3) of his *Mahometanus*.

<sup>30</sup> ПЕЙЧЕВ, *Автореферат*, р. 24. Cf. also ID., *Философските и политическите възгледи*, р. 124.

<sup>31</sup> "новаторски метод за философско-богословска полемика или така наречената тогава конверсия (обръщане)" – ПЕЙЧЕВ, "Богословско-философските и политическите възгледи," р. 224.

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

<sup>33</sup> 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.") – CHRISTOPHORUS PEICHICH, *Mahometanus dogmatice, et catechetice in lege Christi, Alcorano suffragante, instructus*, Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis per Fridericum Gall, 1717, p. 6.

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.<sup>34</sup>

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.<sup>35</sup> This

---

<sup>34</sup> 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 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.").

<sup>35</sup> In 1971 (in *Съчиненията на Пеячевичи и Кръстю Пейкич*) Bozhidar Peychev informed his 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, footnote 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,

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

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.<sup>36</sup> 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 from the Bulgarian lands after the failure of the Chiprovtsi uprising, still remains today, three centuries later, an exile from Bulgarian culture.

---

the historian had the chance to consult the *Concordia* (the 1730 Trnava edition, which also includes the *Speculum*). As for the *Speculum*, Peychev considers it “actually a translation of the *Zarcalo*” (“всъщност превод на *Зарцало*”) and mentions nothing about its essential differences (described later by TURČINOVIĆ, *Misionar Podunavlja*, 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.

<sup>36</sup> 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.