



Citation:

Detrez, R. (2017). Partenij Pavlovič – the “wandering monk” as a networker. *Slavia Meridionalis*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.1311>

Raymond Detrez

Universiteit Gent

Partenij Pavlovič – the “Wandering Monk” as a Networker

Historians studying the spread of ideas tend to show a predilection for the period of Enlightenment and early (cultural) nationalism. The transition to modernity and the emergence of national consciousness appear to be imposing historical phenomena with, in addition, a strong patriotic appeal. The preceding period – which tellingly is not even deemed worthy of a particular name – is often treated as a transitional or introductory period, which is interesting insofar as it ushers in the great era of national awakening. This hindsight view should not avert us, though, from dealing with the pre-national Balkan eighteenth century as a historical period in its own right.

The premodern Balkan society was not void of ideas. However, these were not the kind of ideas historians are able smoothly to include into a national narrative. What was characteristic of the premodern Balkans – and certainly not solely of the Balkans – is the predominance of religious and not ethnic, let alone national collective self-identification (Detrez, 2010, 2013; Дерез, 2015). The majority of the population in the Balkans confessed Orthodox Christianity

This work was supported by Ghent University and the Katholieke Universiteit van Leuven, Belgium.

Competing interests: the author is a member of the Editorial Team of this journal.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2017.

and the religious community they felt to belong to was the Orthodox Church. The basic doctrines and moral principles of Orthodox Christianity did not need to be spread any more. They were rooted deeply in the people’s minds and hearts. However, the clergy considered that they needed to be constantly strengthened and reaffirmed in face of the thread of Catholic and Muslim proselytism. In fact, in the Ottoman period the hostile attitude of the Orthodox Church toward Catholicism was chiefly a legacy from the times of the Great Schism and the Crusades, since the actual influence of the Roman Church among the Orthodox flock in the sultan’s realm was limited. By the end of the seventeenth century, however, after Serbs had massively emigrated to the Hapsburg lands, the Catholic presence among Orthodox Christians became more powerful. Although the Serbian immigrants were granted religious freedom and many privileges by the Austrian rulers, in daily life they felt discriminated against and pressured to join the Catholic or at least the Uniate Church.

The arguments used in the “propaganda war” of the Orthodox Christians against the Catholics constituted a substantial part of the “ideas” circulating in the 18th century Balkans. These ideas were disseminated mainly by the clergy who made use of the hierarchically organized and thoroughly institutionalized “network” represented by the church. A crucial part in this network was played by the so-called “wandering monk” who constantly travelled around, transmitting information and “ideas” from one audience of readers or listeners to another. The wandering monk was first described by Carole Rogel (1977) who – without mentioning his name – very much relied on the information provided by the wandering monk we intend to deal with in this contribution – Partenij Pavlovič.

There is relatively little written about Partenij Pavlovič, a Bulgarian who made a career for himself in the Serbian church hierarchy. His curious *Autobiography* and other documents bearing his name were published by Dimitrije Ruvarac (1903, 1905a, 1905b, 1905c, 1905d, 1905e) and others. In Bulgaria, Vasil Kiselkov (Киселков, 1956), Boŋjo St. Angelov (Ангелов, 1964), and, most elaborately, Pirin Bojadžiev (Бояджиев, 1988) have commented on his life and work, presenting him mainly as a forerunner of Enlightenment and an early fighter for South Slav national liberation. Recently, Vassilis Maragos (2010) portrayed Partenij more plausibly as a typical representative of a Balkan supra-ethnic Orthodox Christian community.

In this contribution, we intend to shed some light on Partenij as a “networker” and on the nature of the ideas his network conveyed.

The Formative Years

Partenij Pavlovič was born around 1700 in Silistra – then still usually called Dorostol – an Ottoman fortified town on the Danube in Bulgaria. In his “fatherland Silistra” (*въ моемъ отечествѣ Доростолѣ*), he studied “grammar” with Paleologos of Constantinople and learned to read the Octoechos, the Psalms and the Acts of the Apostles in Greek with Tetradhis, “a pilgrim to the Holy Sepulchre” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 201). It seems probable that both teachers, about whom we know nothing more, were invited to Silistra by the learned metropolitan bishop Hierotheos, author – under his baptismal name Ioannis Komninos – of a travel guide for pilgrims to the Holy Mountain (Komninos, 1745). It is not excluded that the same Hierotheos “launched” the career of the studious and gifted Partenij, encouraging him to continue his studies at the Princely Saint Sava Academy in Bucharest, one of the most famous schools for Orthodox Christian youngsters in the Ottoman Empire at that time. The Academy was founded in 1694 by *voievod* (prince) Constantin Brâncoveanu of Wallachia, an Ottoman vassal, who was executed in Istanbul in 1714 on the allegation that he had participated in a conspiracy with the Russian tsar Peter the Great against the Ottomans during the Russian-Ottoman war of 1710–1711. He was succeeded by Ștefan Cantacuzino, who was replaced by Nicolae Mavrocordato in 1716. Partenij was a student in Bucharest when these events took place. He studied rhetoric with Georgios Chrysogonos of Trebizond and philosophy with the eminent director of the Academy Markos Porphyropoulos of Cyprus. (Camariano-Cioran, 1974, pp. 373–380, 381; Rovithis et al., 2013, pp. 40–41) The language of instruction at the Academy was archaizing “scholarly” Greek, whence Partenij makes mention of his “Hellenic education” (*учение еллинское*). It is not obvious where Partenij mastered Church Slavonic – the language in which he wrote all of his works. If he had not acquired some knowledge of that language already in Silistra, it seems plausible that he did so at the Academy in Bucharest, where Church Slavonic appears to have been one of the subjects. (Drace-Francis, 2006, p. 49). He might also have visited the school at the Church of St. George the Old in Bucharest, where Church Slavonic was taught (Бояджиев, 1988, p. 11). It transpires from his biography that already at an early age he also knew Latin, Romanian and Italian. Later, he acquired a command of German as well.

Early 1719 Partenij left for Italy, a country Wallachia at that time had very close economic ties with, presumably to continue his education there.

Due to his rabid antipathy of Catholics, he soon got into trouble and decided to leave. Via Zadar, Partenij travelled to Corfu and from Corfu further to Kastoria. He might have heard about the famous school in Kastoria already in Bucharest since it was co-founded by Markos Porphyropoulos of Cyprus, one of his teachers. In Kastoria he studied logic and mathematics with the famed Methodios Anthrakitis. He followed Methodios to Siatista, when the latter was forced to leave Kastoria over allegations of heresy. According to Partenij, Methodios taught Cartesian philosophy to his pupils. In 1721, Methodios was summoned to Constantinople and in 1723 he was convicted by the Holy Synod as a follower of the heretic teachings of the Spanish mystic Miguel de Molinos (Kitromilidis, 2007, pp. 28–31). Partenij does not share his opinion on Methodios's views – he himself obviously did not follow the courses of Cartesian philosophy – but the fact that he accompanied Methodios from Kastoria to Siatista indicates that he was at least interested.

Maragos (2010, p. 89) supposes that Partenij left Siatista when Methodios left for Constantinople, which sounds plausible. Via Vlorë in Albania he travelled to Ohrid, the see of the autocephalous archbishopric. He visited the nearby monastery of Saint Naum and the Vlach city of Moscopole (now Voskopojë in Albania), where a well-known high school, founded in 1700 and transformed into an Academy in 1744, was located. There he met Gerasimos Konstantinidhis, one of the teachers at the high school and author of an *Akolouthia ton agion eptarithmon* (Divine Service for the Seven-Fold Saints), one of the fourteen books that were published between 1731 and 1760 by the famous Moscopole printing house – the second in importance within the borders of the Ottoman Empire after that of the Patriarchate (Peyfuss, 1986, pp. 129–132). Gerasimos eventually became bishop Grigorij of Durrës in Albania. Obviously, Partenij was not only eager to learn, but had a nose for places of particular educational and scholarly interest.

Subsequently, he established himself in the village of Risan in the Bay of Kotor, at that moment a Venetian possession, where he worked as a teacher for one year. There, he took monastic vows in the nearby Orthodox Monastery of the Holy Assumption, also known as Savina Monastery, because of the small church located outside the monastery, dedicated to its founder, Saint Sava, the patron saint of the Serbs. After he was made deacon by the Serbian Orthodox metropolitan bishop of Dalmatia Stevan Ljubibratić, Partenij embarked on an impressive career at the service of the Serbian church.

The Wandering Monk

As a monk, Partenij continued his wandering life. After a new conflict with the Catholic authorities in Dalmatia, he went to Sarajevo where he celebrated Christmas together with the metropolitan of Dabar-Bosna Melentije Umiljenović. Then he visited Mojsije, patriarch of the Serbian Church, in Peć. On his way, in Novi Sad, however, it came across his mind to go to Russia and visit Peter the Great, “the emperor of All-Russia, the Orthodox monarch”. However, “when the Hagarenes [Muslims, Turks – R. D.], learned about this, they wanted to kill us. Therefore, we were forced to travel elsewhere” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 199).

The direct cause of his wish to go the Russia might have been the proclamation of Peter as “emperor” in 1721, after he defeated Sweden. His *Autobiography* includes an ode to Peter, which for a long time was thought to be an original creation by Partenij, but has turned out to be the translation of a – rather clumsy – Russian ode, the first preserved copies of which date from 1724 (Ангелов, 1964, p. 47). Anyhow, the poem bears witness to the sincere admiration Partenij nourished for Peter. Partenij’s cancelled journey to Russia actually was a first attempt to make contact with the Russians and thus to expand the modest network of clerical and intellectual contacts he had established so far beyond the Balkans.

Partenij then went to Belgrade, most probably accompanying Mojsije, who had entered a conflict with the metropolitan bishop of Karlovci regarding the eparchy of Belgrade, which in execution of the 1718 Treaty of Passarowitz had been transferred from the Ottoman to the Hapsburg Empire and was claimed by both the Patriarchate of Peć and the Archbishopric of Karlovci¹. Together with Mojsije, Partenij travelled to Vienna. On their way back, in Karlovci, Partenij was ordained to priesthood – together with his friend Pavle Nenadović, who in 1749 became archbishop of Karlovci and would play an important role in Partenij’s life.

¹ The Serbian Archbishopric (or Metropolitanate) of Krušedol, from 1713 on called Archbishopric of Karlovci, was established in 1708 on behalf of the ca. 200.000 Serbs that had fled from Serbia proper to the Hapsburg lands. From 1717 to 1739, the see was located in Belgrade, which was then a part of the Hapsburg Empire. The Archbishopric of Karlovci existed alongside the Patriarchate of Peć until the abolishment of the latter in 1766. In 1848, the Archbishopric was elevated to the rank of patriarchate. Previously, only Arsenije III (1674–1706) and Arsenije IV (1725–1748), who had both been patriarchs of Peć, had after their flight, respectively in 1691 and 1737, also officially been recognized as patriarchs of Karlovci by the Austrian authorities.

In addition to Belgrade, new bishoprics were organized in Timișoară and Caransebeș in the Banat, and in Râmnicu (Vâlcea) in West-Oltenia – both newly acquired by Austria following the Treaty of Passarowitz. Partenij attended the “*inștalacija*” of the bishop of Râmnicu and on that occasion also visited Bucharest, where he had an interview with the learned Khrysanthos Notaras, patriarch of Jerusalem. Partenij might have been introduced to him during his stay in Bucharest as a student at the Princely Academy: Khrysanthos had lived in the Wallachian capital at that time already as a protégé of *voievod* Constantin Brâncoveanu. Partenij obviously moved in Wallachian “high society”, since he was invited to deliver a sermon in Romanian to the daughters of the executed Constantin Brâncoveanu. However, as their husbands had complained with the Sublime Porte against the incumbent *voievod* Nicolae Mavrocordato, Partenij became suspect and was interned in a monastery, to be released only after the mediation of Mojsije. His contacts with the Wallachian ruling class obviously had turned against him.

Partenij returned to Belgrade in 1726, where he attended the Serbian National Church Council, dealing with issues of church administration. One issue that was successfully solved was the union of the Belgrade eparchy to the Archbishopric of Karlovci. When Mojsije died in 1730, Partenij became the assistant of his successor, Vikentije Jovanović². In 1731, Partenij spent three months in Karlovy Vary, where Vikentije took a cure. Out of curiosity or intending to establish contacts there too, Partenij wanted to make an excursion to Saxony to visit the Academy and the university in Leipzig, but Vikentije did not let him go. Vikentije, who had organized a hussar regiment, apparently was a soldier rather than a scholar and had little affinity with Academies. After the cure, both returned to Vienna.

From Vienna Partenij traveled to Peć, where he would spend the next five years working as a *protosyngellos* – a secretary or chancellor – of Patriarch Arsenije IV. Those years too, he was constantly on his way. He visited, among many other places, Niš, Sofia and Plovdiv; in 1733 he stayed at the Monastery of Čerepiš and in 1734 and 1735 he spent three months at the Monastery of Rila (Ангелов, 1964, pp. 25–30).

In 1737, Austria joined Russia in a war against the Ottoman Empire that had broken out two years earlier. At variance with what happened before,

² On the activities of Mojsej Petrovič and Vikentije Jovanović as leaders and reformers of the Serbian Church in the Hapsburg Empire, see Radić, 2016, pp. 193 ff.

Austria now suffered a number of defeats. Again thousands of Serbs who, instigated by the Austrians, had taken up arms against the Ottomans, fled to the Hapsburg Vojvodina. Partenij was in Peć when the Ottomans began their retaliation. In a printed book, found in Karlovci, Partenij wrote a short but vivid account of his headlong flight to Belgrade (Ангелов, 1964, pp. 209–210). In 1739, the Treaty of Belgrade returned Belgrade to the Ottoman Empire and Eastern Oltenia to Wallachia. Arsenije IV, who had led the uprising and the subsequent flight, was deposed by the Ottomans after the outbreak of the insurgence and replaced by another patriarch (of Greek origin). Arsenije now succeeded metropolitan Vikentije, who had died in 1737. Until 1748, he would remain the head of the Serbian Church in the Austrian Empire, holding the title of patriarch. From then until his death, Partenij would work exclusively for the Serbian Church of Karlovci.

Bishop Partenij

In 1741, Partenij was sent to Vienna to serve as a parish priest in the Greek Chapel. Maybe he owed this appointment to his former teacher Georgios of Trebizond who was one of the co-founders of the chapel (Maragos, 2010, p. 93). In 1742, Partenij spent some time in the Hungarian city of Eger. From there, on April 10, on his own initiative, he sent a letter to Tsarina Jelizaveta Petrovna and one to the Russian Holy Synod in Saint Petersburg (Ангелов, 1964, pp. 20–22). In both letters, Partenij described the deplorable conditions in which the Serbs had to live in the Ottoman and the Hapsburg empires, “either embittered and oppressed by the Ottomans, or elsewhere devastated and offended” (*иными от отомановъ озлобляемый и утѣснѣмый, иными инудѣ уничижаемый и поношаемый*) (Ангелов, 1964, p. 20). Partenij implored the Russian state and church authorities to support their Serbian co-religionists. If Russia would not send liturgical books, Partenij warned, the Serbs in the Hapsburg Empire might turn their backs to Orthodoxy and become members of the “God-Displeasing Uniate Church” (*богомерское униятство*). Cautiously, Partenij did not complain about the treatment of the Serb Orthodox Christians by the Austrians. According to him, under Maria Teresa Serbs enjoyed all kinds of freedoms and privileges. The local authorities, however, discriminated against the Serbs and prevented them from buying property and starting businesses. We ignore

the direct result of Partenij’s letters, but we know that the Russians abundantly provided the monasteries in Fruška Gora, the Serbian “Holy Mountain”, with all kinds of religious publications (Rogel, 1977, pp. 19–20).

In the meantime, Partenij sustained contacts with the princely court in Bucharest, but this time too, he got into trouble. In 1746, he translated the testament of Princess Păuna Greceanu from Romanian into Latin. She was the spouse of Ștefan Cantacuzino, the successor or Constantin Brâncoveanu and the predecessor of Nicolae Mavrocordato. Together with his father, Ștefan had leaked the correspondence between Constantin Brâncoveanu and the Hapsburgs to the Ottomans, which resulted in the abovementioned arrest and execution of Constantin in 1714. That same year Ștefan Cantacuzino was appointed *voievod* of Wallachia. However, in 1716, when the Ottoman-Austrian war resumed, he as well sided with the Austrians. He was arrested by the Ottomans and shared the deplorable fate of his predecessor. His possessions were confiscated, as a result of which his widow was sentenced to beggary. For that reason, the testament was of particular importance. Besides, the princess had pleaded for financial support in Vienna as well. In 1749, Partenij was invited to Bucharest by Nicolae Mavrocordato’s son and successor, Constantin Mavrocordato, to solve some financial issues. However, on his way, in Mehadia, he was arrested on the allegation of being involved in a conspiracy against the *voievod*. Maragos (2010, p. 93) supposes that his relations with the widow of the former *voievod* were the reason. Bojadžiev (Бояджиев, 1988, pp. 27–29) argues that Arsenije IV, who was a pivotal figure in the preparation of a large anti-Ottoman uprising, made Partenij the scapegoat. Under convoy, Partenij was returned to Vienna, where he spent sixteen months in prison, until his innocence was proven.

After these peripeties Partenij served as a parish priest in Buda. There, in 1749, he was promoted to the rank of archimandrite by his former fellow-priest, now the new archbishop of Karlovci, Pavle Nenadović. The same year, in June, on the occasion of Pavle Nenadović’s investiture, Partenij was received in audience “by the emperor and the queen”, that is the German Emperor Francis Stephen and his wife, Maria Teresa, Queen of Hungary and Bohemia (Ангелов, 1964, p. 197). On September 4, 1751, he was consecrated bishop. He actually became a vicar bishop, charged by Archbishop Pavle with important and confidential tasks. Thus, in 1753, he headed a special commission that visited the Serbian Orthodox monasteries in Fruška Gora and compiled detailed surveys of the monasteries’ movable and immovable properties, the number of monks, their

origin and education, the books in the libraries, *etcetera*. Partenij’s *Opis srpskih fruškogorskih manastira* (*Description of the Serbian monasteries in Fruška Gora*) ran up to more than 400 pages (in Ruvarac’s publication) and is a precious source of information on Serbian monasticism at that time (Ruvarac, 1903). Rogel’s assessment of the presence of Russian books in the Fruška Gora monasteries is based primarily on Partenij’s *Opis*.

Except for his *Troparion and kantakion for the Martyr Stefan from Hercegovina*, written in 1732–1733, and his *Celebration of the Serbian Kings*, dated explicitly 1733, most of Partenij’s major literary works, the *Breviary*, the *Liturgy for the Apostle James* and the *Ode to the Second Coming of Christ* were written in the 1750s, when Partenij’s peregrinations had come to an end and his life obviously had become more tranquil. Only the *Troparion and kantakion* and the *Celebration* are original works; the others are translations from Greek into Church Slavonic. In 1757, three years before his death, he wrote his *Autobiography* (also in Church Slavonic), as a part of an (auto)biography of Arsenije IV, written by Partenij (Ангелов, 1964, pp. 32–33). It is a rather puzzling account, which does not respect the chronological order of events and contains many digressions about the Catholic-Orthodox discord that have little or nothing to do with Partenij’s biography as such. Nevertheless, it offers an revealing insight in the subject that interests us here.

The Networker

In his *Autobiography*, Partenij meticulously mentions most of the places he visited during his incessant travels. Angelov (Ангелов, 1964, p. 41) counted no less than sixty such locations. In all of these places, Partenij must have made new acquaintances or refreshed old ones. His *Autobiography* contains the names of about twenty people he knew personally or whom he had contacts with or tried to get in touch with, but their total number must have been much larger. We know that he had close ties with Zaharije Orfelin, whose name is missing in the *Autobiography*. Taken as a whole, these people constitute an impressive network that covers almost the entire Balkan Orthodox world, outlining the territory inhabited by whom Maragos (2010) rightly calls “a nation of faith”.

Of course, as a cleric, Partenij was occupationally incorporated in the enormous network that represented the Orthodox clergy in the Ottoman Empire.

Although that clergy was divided over various churches – the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Autecephalous Archbishopric of Ohrid, the Serbian Churches of Peć and Karlovci –, it represented not only a spiritual, but to a great extent also an organizational unity. There was a frequent exchange of bishops, archbishops, and even patriarchs between them (Тодорова, 1997, pp. 76–77, 265). From the late seventeenth century, after Arsenije III had left Serbia, the Patriarchate of Peć was actually run by Constantinople. The successors of the dismissed Serbian patriarchs Arsenije III and Arsenije IV were Kallinikos and Joannikios respectively, appointed by the Patriarchate. In the eighteenth century, collaboration grew even tighter when the annexation of the jurisdictions of Ohrid and Peć by the Patriarchate of Constantinople was looming. In 1766, the Patriarchate of Peć would be abolished and integrated by that of Constantinople.

The Archbishopric of Karlovci sustained relations not only with the Patriarchate of Peć, but also with the other Orthodox Churches. Partenij himself is a good example of a cleric, originating from the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, who spends almost his entire life at the service of both the Patriarchate of Peć and the Archbishopric of Karlovci.

The interconnected and intermixing hierarchies of the Balkan Orthodox Churches constituted a network that was particularly suited for conveying opinions among the Orthodox clergy and flock all over the Ottoman Balkans. The aim, as we pointed out, was not to diffuse new ideas – new, Enlightenment ideas were diffused more often by the “wandering merchant” (Stoianovich, 1960) – but to transmit the basic teachings of the Orthodox Christian faith and to defend them against Islam and, in the Austrian Empire, against Catholicism. Diligent and zealous Partenij was not just a cog in the machine, but an important church official, second only to the archbishop himself.

To be sure, not all “wandering monks” were as adventurous and enterprising as Partenij was. His travels to Italy and Wallachia, his wish to go to Russia and Saxony, his letters to the rulers in Saint Petersburg – all this suggests that in addition to his occupational network, Partenij also worked for a network of his own that would equally serve the cause of the Orthodox church. However, Borivoje Marinković’s assessment that Partenij was a kind of restless and unbridled adventurer (quoted in Бояджиев, 1988, p. 18) and Kiselkov’s questions “why he went from one city to another, who supported him financially, and what were his goals (Киселков, 1956, p. 397) are rather improper. His behaviour did not differ from that of other “wandering monks”. In this

respect, Partenij perfectly resembles his younger contemporary, the well-known Greek “wandering monk” Constantine Dapontes, the Serb Dositej Obradović, the Bulgarians Sofronij of Vraca and Neofit of Rila (the latter in the nineteenth century) and many others who were constantly on their way as well (For Dapontes, see Kitromilides, 1996, pp. 172 ff.).

The Spread of Ideas

Finally, we have to dwell briefly on the question which ideas exactly Partenij was spreading through his network. Undoubtedly the ideas championed by the Orthodox Church, but interpreted, formulated and backed up with arguments by Partenij in a personal way.

First of all, to Partenij the almighty God decides the fate of individuals, entire communities and states. He regards, as did the Orthodox Church in general, the Ottoman domination as God’s punishment for the sins of the Orthodox Christians, more particularly for their preparedness to accept a reunion with Rome under the leadership of the pope. Partenij points out many instances of Orthodox Christians suffering due to the Muslims, but with God’s consent:

But today, as I saw with my own eyes, because of our sins, the monastery of Mileševo is destroyed and burnt and the relics of St. Sava (as is told) are burnt by the cursed Hagarenes [...] (Ангелов, 1964, p. 28).

The Muslims destroyed many of our churches, since they had God’s permission, because of our sins [...] (Ангелов, 1964, p. 198).

Not only the Orthodox Christians, but also the Catholics are punished for their sins:

Since they despised this commandment of Christ, not only in the West, but also in the East occurred many sorrowful events and catastrophes and incidents – on the one hand the Hagarenes’ yoke and harassment, on the other hand the Lutheran and Calvinist hostilities (Ангелов, 1964, p. 208).

According to Partenij, there is only one single religion appropriate to worship God and that is Orthodox Christianity. In this respect, Partenij appears to be rather fanatical. In dogmatic issues, especially as the question of the *filioque* is concerned, Partenij passionately defends the Orthodox views.

In his *Autobiography*, he mentions his frequent clashes with Catholics, most often provoked by himself:

In Italian Naples I was beaten and thrown out of the church because I had declared that *Non e vero pastore il Pontifice, ma e falso, perche e fato la schisma in chesa de Jesu Christu* [The pope is not a real priest, but a false one, because he has caused a schism in the church of Jezus Christ]. In Rome, Venice, Florence and Bari would have happened the same, if I had not rapidly crossed [the Adriatic] (Ангелов, 1964, p. 198).

The same occurred in Vienna:

In Vienna in the Stephen’s Dome I delivered in Latin a short sermon about peace, love and the seven ecumenical councils. As a result, they wanted to intern me as a lunatic (*яко изумленна*). I wanted to continue, but when I saw that they were impeding me and wanted to beat me up, I remained silent (Ангелов, 1964, p. 200).

His *Autobiography* contains lengthy digressions – taking up together about one third of the text – dealing with the Christological disputes at the ecumenical councils and with the Great Schism, for which according to Partenij only the Catholics are to blame:

Oh, if only the Roman Catholics would stick to the old calendar or *synaxarion*, there would not be such a rift between the Western and Eastern Christians. Oh, if the Roman Church would not have abandoned the lent, the vigils, the abstinence and the other traditions of the Western and Eastern saints, there would not be such a hostility between the Christians. Oh, would the Roman Church follow the example of the three youths thrown in the fiery flames and singing a spiritual song, and not resort to Jewish or Babylonian pagan music. [...]

Repent, do like your ancestors did and follow together with us the profession of faith. Renounce your blind leaders and your pernicious herds. [...] Obey the Holy Eastern Church that has changed none of the things the Holy Apostles and the God-Breathed fathers transmitted, but has preserved whole and unvarnished all the dogma of the Holy Orthodox Creed (Ангелов, 1964, pp. 206–207).

His small note to the *Life of St. Sava* in the Monastery of Rila contains an entire catalogue of the enemies of the Orthodox Church:

Other holy [monasteries] still today are intact and undestroyed as a confirmation of the rightness of our faith and to the disgrace of the unrighteous Hagarenes and the malicious heretics – the Latins, the Armenians, the Nestorians, and the other renegades and apostates [who broke away] from the ecumenical faith and the just dogma of the Eastern apostolic church (Ангелов, 1964, p. 28).

According to Partenij, God always punishes those who defy Orthodox Christianity. In his *Autobiography*, he gives three examples of catastrophes provoked by the intention of local administrators “to build a Latin altar in an Orthodox Church”: the lightning strike on the powder magazine in Corfu in 1719, the earthquake in Lisbon in 1755, and an explosion in the powder magazine in Buda “a few years ago” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 206).

To Partenij, the Orthodox Christians constitute one single religious community, within which ethnicity is of no importance. Jordan Ivanov rightly points out (in an unpublished note preserved in his archives) that “apparently, to Pavlovič, there are no Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, Vlachs and Russians, but only one Orthodox nation, whose enemies are Turks, Catholics and others” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 9). Partenij himself was a Bulgarian, but all his life he served the Serbian Church, to which he was absolutely loyal. Tellingly, he used to sign in Greek: Παρθένιος Παύλου. The Russians all always called “our co-religionists” (*наши едновѣрци*). Partenij rarely refers to the “Slavs” and never to the “South Slavs” – which renders the claims of his Bulgarian biographers that he was particularly committed to the liberation of the South Slavs from Ottoman dominance rather improbable.

Hardly anything seems to suggest that Partenij had kept a special bond with Bulgaria and the Bulgarians. As far as we know, he never visited “his fatherland” Silistra again after he left the city as a boy. In 1733 through 1735, he visited a number of Bulgarian monasteries and spent three months at the Monastery of Rila. Significantly, he only once (in a small autobiographical note in a manuscript in Rila, dating from 1733) mentions “the Bulgarian pious people” (*болгарскій блъгвѣрний народ*), invoking Saint Ivan of Rila “to protect [it] against various temptations and violations by demons and by the infidel Hagarene people, and to pray to the life-giving Holy Trinity for the whole universe” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 26). In a similar note dating from 1734, he explains that he copied a *chrysobull* issued by Tsar Ivan Šišman concerning the privileges of the monastery, however, without mentioning that Ivan Šišman was a Bulgarian tsar. Visiting these Bulgarian monasteries, he is almost exclusively interested in the icons and the relics and in their miraculous healing power in which he unreservedly believes.

The attention he pays in his *Autobiography* to the “Seven-Fold Saints” – Cyril and Methodius and their five disciples, about whom he seems to have learned from the abovementioned Greek book by Gerasimos Konstantinidhis – appears to be just the same inspired by religious, rather

than ethnic, considerations. After summing up the seven saints, mentioning laconically that Cyril “invented 40 letters for the Slavs, as is sufficiently explained in the Prologue”, he continues:

They lived a life pleasing to God, and they taught and instilled the Orthodox faith, and they tried to convince the Western countries to reflect on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, whence they were handcuffed and imprisoned. [...] They did not only instruct the nations, they also cured the sick from various illnesses, invoking the Holy and Life-Giving Trinity. They were endowed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit to such an extent (according to their hagiographer) that they were able to cure the ill only looking at them, without touching them with their hands (Ангелов, 1964, p. 201).

To Partenij the part the Seven-Fold Saints played in creating a Slav literate culture seems to be of minor or no importance. He focuses on the sufferings they went through because of their sticking to the Orthodox viewpoint regarding the question of the *filioque* and on the miracles they are told to have performed.

Partenij, following – as we saw – the Orthodox Church’s understanding of the Ottoman dominance as a punishment by God, consistently believed that the liberation of the Balkan Christians from the Ottomans would also be the result of divine intervention:

Peter the Great, may his memory live for ever, the All-Russian monarch, defeated the Swedish king Charles near Poltava with the help of God, Mary and all the saints praying [for him]. He [Charles] searched the protection of the Turks, while he [Peter] chased him. And therefore, after 28 years of warfare with the Swedish, a war with the Hagarenes broke out. And if Mazepa and Constantin Brâncoveanu, both princes and warriors, the former a Cossack, the latter a Wallachian, had not betrayed the tsar, I think he would have overthrown the Hagarenes. But as it is written: “For my power is made perfect in weakness”, the almighty God decided [to defeat the Ottomans] not through the emperor Peter, the defeater of the Swedish heretic. Some years later, when the Mohammedans again waged war against the pious Moscovians because of the offences of the infidel Tatars, He defeated, captured and put to shame the arrogant and infidel Hagarenes through Anna, may her memory live for ever, the All-Russian Empress” (Ангелов, 1964, p. 203).

Whether Partenij, his frame of reference being purely religious, was interested in national independence as pursued eventually by the representatives of the various Balkan national movements is highly questionable. As Victor Roudometof (1998, p. 18) pointed out, in the pre-national era “liberation was instead understood in the religious sense of salvation and redemption rather than in the political sense of national independence”. Most likely this was also Partenij’s way of thinking.

Conclusion

Just as his ideas, Partenij’s intellectual network as well was typical of the eighteenth century Balkans: it was limited to clerics – priests, monks, bishops – and representatives of the secular powers as far as they were involved in ecclesiastical affairs. It requires a lot of imagination to perceive Partenij as a proponent of Enlightenment or national thought. Partenij entirely belongs to the pre-national early eighteenth century, both through his ideas and through the means he relied on to transmit them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Camariano-Cioran, A. (1974). *Les Académies Princières de Bucharest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Detrez, R. (2010). Understanding the pre-national(ist) Balkans: the ‘Romaic’ community. In P. M. Kitromilides & A. Tabaki (Eds.), *Greek-Bulgarian relations in the age of national identity formation* (pp. 21–69). Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research.
- Detrez, R. (2013). Pre-national identities in the Balkans. In R. Daskalov & T. Marinov (Eds.), *Entangled histories of the Balkans* (Vol. 1, *National ideologies and language policies*, pp. 13–66). Leiden: Brill.
- Drace-Francis, A. (2006). *The making of modern Romanian culture: Literacy and the development of national identity*. London: Tauris.
- Kitromilides, P. M. (1996). ‘Balkan mentality’: History, legend, imagination. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2(2), 163–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1354-5078.1996.00163.x>
- Komninos, I. (1745). *Proskynitarion to Agiou Orou tou Athonos*. Venetia: N. Glykys.
- Maragos, V. (2010). The nation of Faith: Partenij Pavlovič and aspects of the Orthodox Commonwealth. In P. M. Kitromilides & A. Tabaki (Eds.), *Greek-Bulgarian relations in the age of national identity formation* (pp. 83–107). Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research.
- Peyfuss, M. D. (1986). *Die Druckerei von Moschopolis, 1731–1769: Buchdruck und Heiligenverehrung im Erzbistum Achrída*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Radić, R. (2016). Monasticism in Serbia in the modern period: Development, influence, importance. In A. Murzaku (Ed.), *Monasticism in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Republics* (pp. 190–217). New York: Routledge.
- Rogel, C. (1977). The Wandering Monk and the Balkan national awakening. In W. Haddad & W. Ochsenwald (Eds.), *Nationalism in a non-national state: Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire* (pp. 77–99). Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

- Roudometof, V. (1998). From *Rum Millet* to Greek nation: Enlightenment, secularization, and national identity in Ottoman Balkan society, 1453–1821. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 16(1), 11–48. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mgs.1998.0024>
- Rovithis, F. et al. (2013). Greek scholars at the Princely Academies in Bucharest and Jassy. *Romanian Astronomical Journal*, 23(1), 36–54.
- Ruvarac, D. (1903). *Opis srpskih Fruškogorskih manastira 1753 godine*. Sremski Karlovci: Srpska Manastirska Štamparija.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905a). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavlovića. *Srpski Sion*, (14), 369–399.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905b). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavlovića. *Srpski Sion*, (15), 430–432.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905c). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavlovića. *Srpski Sion*, (17), 493–495.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905d). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavlovića. *Srpski Sion*, (18), 526–528.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905e). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavlovića. *Srpski Sion*, (19), 553–556.
- Stoianovich, T. (1960). The conquering Balkan Orthodox merchant. *The Journal of Economic History*, 20(2), 234–313. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050700110447>
- Ангелов, Б. (1964). *Съвременници на Паусий* (Vol. 2). София: БАН.
- Бояджиев, П. (1988). *Партений Павлович*. София: Наука и изкуство.
- Детрез, Р. (2015). *Не търсят гърци, а ромеи да бъдат: Православната културна общност в Османската империя: XV – XIX в.* София: „Кралица Маб”.
- Киселков, В. (1956). *Проуки и очерти по старобългарска литература*. София: БАН.
- Китромилидис, П. М. (2007). *Епоха просвещения в Грeции*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя.
- Тодорова, О. (1997). *Православната църква и българите XV–XVIII век*. София: Марин Дринов.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

- Angelov, B. (1964). *Sŭvremennitsi na Paisii* (Vol. 2). Sofiia: BAN.
- Boiadzhiev, P. (1988). *Partenii Pavlovich*. Sofiia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Camariano-Cioran, A. (1974). *Les Académies Princières de Bucharest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Detrez, R. (2010). Understanding the pre-national(ist) Balkans: the ‘Romaic’ community. In P. M. Kitromilides & A. Tabaki (Eds.), *Greek-Bulgarian relations in the age of national identity formation* (pp. 21–69). Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research.
- Detrez, R. (2013). Pre-national identities in the Balkans. In R. Daskalov & T. Marinov (Eds.), *Entangled histories of the Balkans* (Vol. 1, *National ideologies and language policies*, pp. 13–66). Leiden: Brill.

- Detrez, R. (2015). *Ne tūrsiat gūrtsi, a romei da būdat: Pravoslavnata kulturna obshtnost v Osmanskata imperiia: XV – XIX v. Sofiia: „Kralitsa Mab”.*
- Drace-Francis, A. (2006). *The making of modern Romanian culture: Literacy and the development of national identity.* London: Tauris.
- Kiselkov, V. (1956). *Prouki i ocherti po starobūlgarska literatura.* Sofiia: BAN.
- Kitromilides, P. M. (1996). ‘Balkan mentality’: History, legend, imagination. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2(2), 163–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1354-5078.1996.00163.x>
- Kitromilidis, P. M. (2007). *Epokha prosveshcheniia v Gretsii.* Sankt-Peterburg: Aletēia.
- Komninos, I. (1745). *Proskynitarion to Agiou Orous tou Athonos.* Venetia: N. Glykys.
- Maragos, V. (2010). The nation of Faith: Partenij Pavlovič and aspects of the Orthodox Commonwealth. In P. M. Kitromilides & A. Tabaki (Eds.), *Greek-Bulgarian relations in the age of national identity formation* (pp. 83–107). Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research.
- Peufuss, M. D. (1986). *Die Druckerei von Moschopolis, 1731–1769: Buchdruck und Heiligenverehrung im Erzbistum Achrida.* Wien: Böhlau.
- Radić, R. (2016). Monasticism in Serbia in the modern period: Development, influence, importance. In A. Murzaku (Ed.), *Monasticism in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Republics* (pp. 190–217). New York: Routledge.
- Rogel, C. (1977). The Wandering Monk and the Balkan national awakening. In W. Haddad & W. Ochsenwald (Eds.), *Nationalism in a non-national state: Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire* (pp. 77–99). Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Roudometof, V. (1998). From *Rum Millet* to Greek nation: Enlightenment, secularization, and national identity in Ottoman Balkan society, 1453–1821. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 16(1), 11–48. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mgs.1998.0024>
- Rovithis, F. et al. (2013). Greek scholars at the Princely Academies in Bucharest and Jassy. *Romanian Astronomical Journal*, 23(1), 36–54.
- Ruvarac, D. (1903). *Opis srpskih Fruškogorskih manastira 1753 godine.* Sremski Karlovci: Srpska Manastirska Štamparija.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905a). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavloviča. *Srpski Sion*, (14), 369–399.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905b). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavloviča. *Srpski Sion*, (15), 430–432.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905c). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavloviča. *Srpski Sion*, (17), 493–495.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905d). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavloviča. *Srpski Sion*, (18), 526–528.
- Ruvarac, D. (1905e). Avtobiografije Partenija Pavloviča. *Srpski Sion*, (19), 553–556.
- Stoianovich, T. (1960). The conquering Balkan Orthodox merchant. *The Journal of Economic History*, 20(2), 234–313. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050700110447>
- Todorova, O. (1997). *Pravoslavnata tsūrkvva i būlgarite XV–XVIII vek.* Sofiia: Marin Drinov.

Partenij Pavlovič – „wędrujący mnich” jako twórca sieci

Partenij Pavlovič był bułgarskim mnichem (ok. 1700–1760), który spędził całe swoje życie w służbie Serbskich Cerkwi Prawosławnych w Peći i Karłowicach. Wykorzystywał on sieć intelektualną stworzoną przez struktury kościelne i do pewnego stopnia stworzył osobistą sieć, która pomogła mu rozpowszechniać antymuzułmańskie i antykatolickie idee, propagowane przez ówczesny Kościół Prawosławny. Jako taki jest on w mniejszym stopniu prekursorem oświecenia bałkańskiego, niż to się zwykle twierdzi, był on raczej silnie zakorzeniony w średniowiecznym postrzeganiu świata.

Słowa kluczowe: Bułgaria, Serbia, prawosławie, oświecenie, sieć/sięciowość

Partenij Pavlovič – the “Wandering Monk” as a Networker

Partenij Pavlovič was a Bulgarian monk (ca. 1700–1760) who spent his entire active life in the service of the Serbian Orthodox Churches of Pec and Karlovci. He used the intellectual network created by the ecclesiastical structures and to some extent also created a personal network that helped him spread the anti-Muslim and anti-Catholic ideas the Orthodox church at that time stood for. As such, he is to a much lesser extent than is often assumed a forerunner of Balkan Enlightenment but appears to be strongly rooted in a rather medieval perception of the world.

Keywords: Bulgaria, Serbia, Orthodox Christianity, Enlightenment, networking

Notka o autorze

Raymond Detrez (Raymond.Detrez@Ugent.be) – em. prof. Uniwersytetu w Gandawie i Katolickiego Uniwersytetu w Leuven w Belgii w zakresie historii Europy Wschodniej i studiów nad Bałkanami. Autor książek: *Krivolicite na misälta* (2001), biografii Grigora Pärliceva; *Historical Dictionary of Bulgaria* (1997, 2006, 2015); *Kosovo – otloženata nezavisimost* (2008), *Ne tärsjat gärci, a romei da bädat* (2015). Zainteresowania naukowe: historia Bałkanów; etniczna, narodowa i religijna tożsamość kolektywna na Bałkanach.

Raymond Detrez, Prof. (Raymond.Detrez@Ugent.be) – Professor Emeritus of East European history and Balkan studies at the University of Ghent and the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium. Author of books: *Krivolicite na misālta* (2001), a biography of Grigor Pärlicev; *Historical Dictionary of Bulgaria* (1997, 2006, 2015); *Kosovo – otloženata nezavisimost* (2008), *Ne tårsjat gǎrci, a romei da bǎdat* (2015). Research interests: history of the Balkans; ethnic, national and religious collective identities in the Balkans.