



Public power in Europe : studies in historical transformations / edited by James S. Amelang, Siegfried Beer
(Thematic work group. States, legislation, institutions ; 1)

320.94 (21.)

1. Società e Stato - Europa 2. Europa - Storiografia I. Amelang, James S. II Beer, Siegfried

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published, thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-00164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Volumes published (2006)

I. Thematic Work Groups

- I. Public Power in Europe: Studies in Historical Transformations
- II. Power and Culture: Hegemony, Interaction and Dissent
- III. Religion, Ritual and Mythology. Aspects of Identity Formation in Europe
- IV. Professions and Social Identity. New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society
- V. Frontiers and Identities: Mapping the Research Field
- VI. Europe and the World in European Historiography

II. Transversal Theme

- I. Citizenship in Historical Perspective

III. Doctoral Dissertations

- I. F. Peyrou, La Comunidad de Ciudadanos. El Discurso Democrático-Republicano en España, 1840-1868

Cover: *Imaginary Architecture*, fresco, 1st Century B.C., Villa di Poppea, Oplontis, Italy © 2003 Photo Scala, Florence - Ministry Beni e Attività Culturali.



© Copyright 2006 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

info-plus@edizioniplus.it

www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

ISBN 88-8492-401-4

Manager

Claudia Napolitano

Editing

Francesca Petrucci

Informatic assistance

Michele Gasparello

The 'Nation' during the First Bulgarian Risorgimento: a Discussion of Paisij Hilendarski and Spiridon Palauzov

GIACOMO BRUCCIANI

University of Pisa

Nel contesto intellettuale balcanico di fine Settecento inizio Ottocento, trova spazio nella comunità etnica bulgara una interessante produzione storiografica nella quale si riflette soprattutto sulla storicità dei bulgari.

La storiografia contemporanea sull'argomento ha già abbastanza insistito sul posto assegnato ai bulgari all'interno dell'Impero Ottomano come comunità inquadrata nel millet ortodosso gestito da Costantinopoli. E conseguentemente di come la vicinanza al centro del potere abbia potuto segnare in modo più accentuato la sottomissione dei bulgari all'impero. Sebbene il contesto a cui ci si riferiva sopra sia parte integrante della ricerca storica, si è scelto di concentrarsi sui testi per studiare da vicino la produzione storiografica della nascente intelligencija bulgara.

L'appartenenza etnica si ritrova sviluppata nell'opera di Paisij Hilendarski. Monaco del Monte Athos, compila nel 1762 un'opera storiografica che sino ad oggi è considerata il testo con il quale ha inizio il Vázraždane – Risorgimento (o Rinascita), la Istorija Slavenobolgarskajja [Storia slavo-bulgara]. Paisij, cercando le radici e le origini della storia del suo popolo, fa risalire i bulgari dalla stirpe di Noè. E per enfatizzare il diritto storico ad esistere, sebbene oramai da secoli sotto il "giogo" turco, concentra la sua Storia sul periodo medievale durante il quale i bulgari ebbero grandi e potenti imperi, con la loro chiesa e la loro potenza militare: oltre a questo, uno degli aspetti più sottolineati da Paisij è la cristianizzazione dei bulgari che avvenne prima rispetto a tutti gli altri popoli slavi. Se il monaco bulgaro si riferisce al medioevo, evidentemente ha in mente di sottolineare uno tipo di potere politico e religioso che fa necessariamente riferimento ad un modello statale che gli stessi bulgari ereditarono dai bizantini. Ed infatti, lo Stato per Paisij è il potere che ha reso grande la Bulgaria nel passato e dovrebbe essere il potere che ristabilisce la gloria dei bulgari ora.

Se nell'opera di Paisij Hilendarski c'è un recupero del modello statale bizantino, evidentemente assorbito e rimodellato dai sovrani bulgari medievali, nelle ricerche di Spiridon Palauzov si riscontra un'altra intenzione che parte comunque dal recupero dell'epoca medievale. Spiridon Palauzov è un intellettuale che scrive nella prima metà dell'Ottocento, educato in Russia nella scuola della nascente slavistica, il quale con i suoi scritti contribuirà a fondare la medievistica bulgara. La costante con l'opera di Paisij è il recupero del passato,

come passato dimenticato e quindi non perduto del tutto nell'oblio della storia. Se di passato si parla anche negli scritti di Palauzov, lo si fa in questo caso con gli occhi rivolti al presente. Il diritto storico di un popolo di vivere su un territorio è l'aspetto fondamentale per definirne l'“essenza”. L'essenza di un popolo, o meglio di una Nazione è costituita, come del resto sottolineava anche Paisij, dalla lingua comune, storia comune, e fede comune. Oltre agli scritti dedicati al medioevo, Palauzov dedica riflessioni oltremodo interessanti alla situazione delle minoranza etniche slave inserite nell'Impero Asburgico comparando la loro situazione con quella degli slavi dell'Impero Ottomano. Ed è proprio in questi ultimi scritti che ci si può confrontare apertamente con il concetto di “nazione” che Palauzov cerca di spiegare. In questo senso, si ha un passo in avanti rispetto alle posizioni di Paisij. Se prima l'appartenenza e la “nazione” erano considerati come concetti imperniati in una concezione della storia di stampo umanistico, ora con Palauzov siamo di fronte ad una riflessione più approfondita e rivolta al presente. Lo Stato, immaginato, rimane comunque la struttura di potere che sarà formata e basata sulla Nazione, quest'ultima preesistente oppure comunque data storicamente.

INTRODUCTION

At first glance a study of observations on the Nation in the Bulgarian intellectual context between the end of the 18th century and the first decades of the 19th century may not seem very rewarding if one considers that, after the arrival of the Ottoman Turks, Bulgaria and the Bulgarians disappeared from the geo-political map of Europe, as did so many other Balkan countries and peoples. In addition to this, the Bulgarian population, included in the orthodox millet of the Ottoman Empire, became much more subject to the control of the central power on account of its vicinity to the capital, Constantinople (Istanbul). Over the centuries of Ottoman subjection, the Bulgarian elite, both clergy and laity, gradually died out. The lay elite disappeared immediately following the Ottoman conquest, while the clergy remained until 1767, the year the Bulgarian patriarchy of Ohrid was suppressed at the insistence of the Porte, in support of the Greek-Phanariot hierarchy “to have greater control over Orthodox Christian subjects”. Although these suppositions obscure the Bulgarians' socio-economic and intellectual state, a latent “ethnic” knowledge belonging to the Medieval period was kept alive thanks to the monks and clergy. Evidence of this is the development of Southern Slav national historiography, which from the 18th century was mainly composed of works compiled by monks or, in any event, by members of the clergy. This confirms the role of the Orthodox Church, particularly in the monasteries, in keeping languages and national memories alive, this being a historical legacy that was later to be politicised by the various 19th-century national movements. This clearly contrasted with the line of thought upheld in that period by Stavrianos¹ and Kitromilides², according to which the Orthodox Church, although it helped to maintain a collective identity by safeguarding the distinction between Muslims and Christians, rooted this distinction in religious, not national, criteria.

In order to understand the development of thought on ‘Being’ and ‘Nation’ (*nacija* in Bulgarian, but Paisij for example uses the term *rod*, *pleme* or *narod*; referred to Paisij,

'nation' is a historiographical assertion) in the Bulgarian intellectual context, given the uniqueness of the Balkan region, it is absolutely vital to start with works written after the mid 18th century. With the benefit of hindsight, the national position that arises from it requires an inter-textual method of study. Hence the need to consider what was produced on the broadest southern-Slav intellectual scene. Ilija Konev in *Balgarskoto Vázražđane i Prosvěštenieto* [The Bulgarian Risorgimento and the Enlightenment]³, shows a map with names and dates referring to historians from various regions of the Balkans who, during the 18th century, wrote historiographical works about their respective countries. These include Pavao Riter Vitezović, the Croatian writer and historian who wrote *Croatia rediviva regnante Leopoldo Magno cesare* (1700) and *Stematografija* [Collection of armorial bearings] (1701); Đorđe Branković, a Serb from the Banat who wrote *Slaveno-srbska hronika* [Slavonic-Serbian Chronicle] in 1705; Hristofor Žefarović who wrote *Stematografija* [Collection of armorial bearings] in 1741; the Vladika from Montenegro, Vassilije Petrović, who wrote *Istorija o Černoj Gor'I* [History of Montenegro], published in St.Petersburg in 1754; Andrija Kačić-Miošić who in 1756 wrote *Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga* [Pleasurable conversation on the Slav people]; A.T.Linhart, the Slav Austrian subject from Carniola who published a history of Slovenians in Vienna in 1788, *Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und den übrigen Ländern der südlichen Slaven Oesterreichs* [An essay for a history of Carniola and the other countries of the southern Slavs of Austria]; the Serb from the Hungarian Sirmio, Jovan Raijć, who in 1794-1795 published *Istorija raznih slavenskih narodov naipače Bolgar, Horvatov i Serbov* [History of different Slavic people. In particular of the Bulgarians, Croatians and Serbians], in Vienna; and the Uniate Rumanian priest from Transylvania Samuel Micu, who, together with Gheorghe Șincai, Petru Maior and Budai Deleanu formed part of the "Transylvania Latinist school"⁴, wrote *Brevis historica notitia originis et progressus nationis Daco-Romanæ* [A concise history on the origins and development of the Daco-Romanian's nation](1778) and *Scurta conoștință a istoriei rominilor* [A concise history of the Romenians](1800). This short list reveals an intellectual context that was slowly but gradually changing, in the area of historiographical and historical studies too, which however still clung mainly to the subjects of folklore only in the case of Miošić. We have described the new historiographical trend starting in the second half of the 18th century in the Balkans, a watershed in popular history, following the approach of Pitassio who heads a paragraph of his last volume, *Dalle rivendicazioni dinastiche a quelle in nome dei popoli*⁵ [From dynastic claims to those in the name of the people]. A new historiography was being born; it abandoned the ideas of the past – such as that of the patrimonial state with the prince at the centre – for new ideas that gave the people the central role. The celebration of Medieval princes and saints persists but is now almost peripherally to the lives of the people.

Indeed the historiography we are confronting may be divided into two typologies: one about asserting historical rights by means of Imperial lineages that we call "dynastic historiography", and the other committed to researching the historical right of a people to a country, only to later re-establish it by searching for connections with Biblical

stories for its authority. The work of the Bulgarian monk Paisij Hilendarski, *Istorija slavenobolgarskaja* (1762), falls into this latter type of historiography. Paisij was not the only one to attempt to research his people's past in order to project it, by informing it, into a future national awakening.

While at the end of the 18th century a new period of historiographical production began that had the triumphs of the Medieval past as its object, the first half of the 19th century saw a development that led Bulgarian historiography to compare itself, through analysis, with European methodological trends and to study the situation of subjects in the Ottoman-Balkan area more closely by comparison with that of the Hapsburg one. However, the Middle Ages remains the starting point for 19th-century historiography. Should we wish to situate everything along the continuous line of historical development, a further step forward can be noted in the works of one author in particular, Spiridon Palauzov, who wrote detailed studies on Western feudalism comparing it with the administrative and socio-economic situation in the Balkans.

BIBLICAL ORIGINS AND MODERN LIFE: THE 'NATION' OF THE SLAVONIC-BULGARIAN HISTORY OF PAISIJ HILENDARSKI

Istorija Slavenobolgarskaja [Slavonic-Bulgarian History], the monk Paisij Hilendarski's only work⁶, is fundamental for Bulgarian history. It is one of the first attempts to write history from a purely Bulgarian viewpoint. Current historiography dates the beginning of the *Vāzraždane* [national revival]⁷ to coincide with Paisij's work. As we shall see this attempt was extremely successful, insofar as *rodnata istorija* [national history]⁸ became the focus of works by authors such as Spiridon Palauzov. If we follow Picchio's approach, and then broaden our focus to Paisij, from Bulgarian context to the more general one of Orthodox Slav area, we see that "[...] rather than being the result of particular local creativity, the text of *Storia slavobulgara* is the product of a gradual overlap of various elements, transferred in various ways from one Slav area to another and finally brought together in a single work according to sophisticated criteria from the entire Slav-Orthodox world in the centuries that – adopting Russian historiographical terminology – can be called 'antique'. We are not refuting the novelty of certain of the patriot monk's publicist attitudes, nor do we wish to challenge the legitimacy of their interpretation in a Bulgarian 'national' sense"⁹. This quotation is especially useful in order to place the author critically as regards the method he used in writing the work. Moreover, we could with hindsight define the historical technique the monk used as being hypothetical, borrowing from Kant, who writes "To include suppositions while history is *in progress* to fill the gaps in the archives is certainly permissible [...]. But, what should not be attempted during the development of the history of mankind may well be attempted at its *very beginning* by means of hypothesis, insofar as it is the work of *nature*"¹⁰.

Paisij's history is almost entirely devoted to the historical study of the making of the Bulgarian nation, to the history of its kings and saints, with a very interesting part

devoted to Slav teachers and another for Serb kings. It ends with an epilogue. This can already be deduced from the title, in this case a thematic one: *Slavijanobălgarska istorija za bălgarskija narod, care I svetii I za vsički bălgarski dejaniija I săbitija săbra I naredi Paisij jeromonah, kojto ziveeše v Sveta Gora Atonska I beše došāl tam ot Samokovskata eparhija v 1745 godina, a săbra taja istorija v 1762 godina za polza na bălgarskija rod* [Slavo-Bulgarian history about the Bulgarian nation, the Tzars, saints and all the Bulgarian triumphs and events collected and ordered by the hiermonk Paisij who lived on Mount Atos and who arrived there from the eparch of Samokov in 1745, and who wrote this history in 1762 for the benefit of the Bulgarian people].

One of the first questions that Paisij asks and tries to answer is, what are the Bulgarians' roots?¹¹ By utilizing Humanist historiographical tradition that in turn follows the typical Medieval pattern, Paisij goes back to the division of the world among Noah's sons after the Flood. Following this idea, passed down from Pribevo to Orbini¹², he demonstrates how Europe with Constantinople, Moscow, Vienna, Rome, Brandenburg and the entire Slav population fell to one of these sons. Continuing this historiographical tradition, he comes to the divine punishment following man's attempt to get to heaven with the Tower of Babel from which arises the confusion of languages. At this point God further separates Noah's three sons and their offspring: Japheth's children are divided into 15 nations who cross the Black Sea and the White Sea and settle in Europe.

Japheth had a son and he called him Mosco. From his house descended a nation too and our Slav language had its origins in him and took the name of its people and language from Mosco. The people who spoke this tongue went north to what is now Russia, and they called the river, where they first settled, and later the town, Moscow, after their ancestor Mosco. Gradually it became a city and the capital of the Empire was established there; this is why to this day they are all called Muscovites¹³.

As Robinson observes, the use of Biblical references was necessary to strengthen Slav national consciousness. During the 17th and 18th centuries the idea of Slav unity cannot be sustained without accordance with the Scriptures¹⁴. Moreover, it should be added that Paisij's theological historicism is also dictated by a good dose of historical realism – he is seeking divine backing for the Bulgarians' historical rights because he is aware that the simple narration of the Medieval past is insufficient for the debate he proposes to develop¹⁵.

Besides being important for understanding the choices Paisij makes in situating Bulgarian nation historically, the passage quoted from the *Istorija* is significant because it contains a short but important phrase used elsewhere in the work. With reference to the Muscovites, Paisij uses the phrase 'to the present day' to give a sense of continuity with the past. Indeed, as the historian Danova has observed, "to understand all of the Bulgarian monk's works, it is necessary to dwell on this latter expression, which symbolizes a *historiographical bridge* between the past and the present, in order to have a faithful idea of the text, free from instrumental interpretations"¹⁶.

In the Moscovian lands there was a part called Skandavia [...] and those who lived in this country were called 'Skandavlans'. After a long time these Skandavlans went west and found land there near the sea. This sea they called the Baltic or Pomeranian. And these Skandavlans settled there near to Brandeburg, and the Skandavlans later called this Slav race by this name, to the present day. They were converted by Saints Cyril and Methodius and for this reason they called our books, race and language Slav. They spoke perfect Slav [...]. The Romans subjected them to the power and faith of the Pope. These Slavs are of the same race and language as the Bulgarians¹⁷.

Later one part of the Slavs went east again and had to face a war with the Muscovites:

Here the Slavs who had come into that country won the war and settled on the banks of that great river Bolg [...]. Those Slavs were called Bulgarians after the river, as they are to the present day, and they stayed in that country for many years until 328 A.D.¹⁸.

From the area of the River Bolga–Volga, the Bulgarians then had the Emperor Valente's permission to cross the Danube and to settle in that area, with the task of defending the Greeks from the Tartars and Magyars. But the Bulgarians who were strong, courageous and ferocious never submitted to the Emperor:

This is how the Bulgarians were at the beginning, courageous and strong. In the first part [of the work] by Baronio, page 567, it is written: the Bulgarians are feared all over the world, a small but unconquerable country.

Paisij continues the narrative by emphasising how, by the will of God, the Bulgarians united forces with the Goths, and rebelling against the Emperor Valente, defeated and killed him. Having thus now become independent in the eparchs (dioceses) of Târnovo, Vidin and Niš, they later spread into the region of Tracia, Macedonia and part of Illyria. The Greeks accused the Emperor Valente of having allowed the Bulgarians to settle on the Danube:

But it was by the will of God that the Slav-Bulgarian people settled in this area. And God made the Bulgarian empire strong against the Greeks and God made this small and simple Bulgarian nation humiliate the latter many times over. [...] Only look at their feats, oh readers, to see the truth.

Paisij established the origins of his people once and for all by placing it within the system of Biblical and in particular Old Testament references, starting with Noah and his sons, in order to seek connections with Christian civilisation. The Bulgarian monk's choice of method, using the geo-ethnographic lexicon (of which the entry 'nation' was part for works written in Western Europe up to the mid 18th century) are a clear example of inter-textuality with Baronio's¹⁹ and Orbini's work. Indeed, these two works are of great importance as has been proved in the past by the studies by Cronia²⁰, Velčev²¹, Picchio and Dell'Agata²². Two converging theories on the origins of the Bulgarian nation derive from them: the first derived from Orbini, called the "Vandal" theory, has the Bulgarians descend from Scandinavia whence they arrived in Thrace (this theory is also similar to that of Miošić²³); the second, derived from Baronio, called the "Sarmatian" theory, says they descended from the area of the River Volga that gave them their name²⁴.

Paisij now adds a new element: the Bulgarians who defeated the Emperor by "the will of God" are presented as executors of divine punishment against the Greeks who had become too proud, having neglected one of the qualities dearest to God, simplicity.

The national position therefore emerges like a thread between the people and God as on the occasion of the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity at the time of Murtagon. He promised God he would convert following a famine and plague:

And he was immediately heard. Soon after the Divine wrath had struck Bulgaria, it ceased. So Murtagon sent some messengers to Rome to the Roman Pope Niccolò, and did the same with the Empress Teodora. Teodora was the first to act and sent a bishop who baptised him during the night because he was afraid of his boyars. But the latter knew he had been baptised and took up arms against him. He took hold of the holy cross as if it were a lance and was victorious. Many of those who saw this miracle became Christians, attracted to the faith because of the strength of the holy cross.

It should be clarified, as Pitassio quite rightly does, that the nocturnal Christening of the Bulgarian king, of his family and of some of the Bulgarian aristocracy took place in 865 with Boris I taking the Christian name Michael²⁵. The conversion of the Bulgarians marks a watershed in history because a still closer connection with God emerges, which seems to favour the "elect nation". Moreover, the Bulgarians were the first holy Slavs to pray in the Bulgarian language. Indeed, in the third part of the history, *Za slavijanskite učiteli* [For the Slav masters], Paisij recounts the lives of Saints Cyril and Methodius²⁶ and how they were the first to codify Old Church Slavonic. The two brothers who were to be elevated to the rank of bishops were called apostles in as much as they accepted the task of converting the Bulgarians and the other Slavonic nations to Christianity. Moreover, they were the first to translate the Scriptures from Greek into Old Church Slavonic, starting with St. John's Gospel. The story of Cyril and Methodius, who undertook evangelising missions in Moravia and created their own school²⁷, is dear to the heart of the Bulgarian people: as a result the historical right over the Slav language and the Slav orthodox faith gained authority and would be indissolubly connected to the Bulgarian people:

And this is how they collected the best and most suitable words from amongst those of the Bulgarians, Serbs, Russians, Muscovites, Slovenes and Poles. They spent a long time gathering together the words of these nations until they wrote the psalter, the gospels and other books. At first they were given to the Bulgarians and the books were called Bulgarian. [...] everyone talked about Bulgarian or *vulgari* and not Serb or Slav books. [...] Then of all the Slav races it was the Bulgarians who first received an alphabet, books and holy baptism.

The antiquity of the language is instrumental in order to uphold the Bulgarians' *dignitas* with respect to the Greeks but also to the other Slav races. This point is very interesting since the distinction between Paisij's work and the historiographical works written in Serbian or Croatian is apparent: while in the latter, as in Rajić and Miošić, a pan-Balkan view that was Orthodox or Catholic prevailed, in Paisij we perceive the sole desire to glorify Bulgarian culture. Probably the idealisation of the past, a common feature of the modern historiography of the south Slavs, can be traced back to the influence of German historic thought brought into the region by the Serbs.

Moreover, to strengthen further the Bulgarians' historical right based on the Slav language and liturgy, Paisij subsequently connects the language to the Bulgarian autocephalous archbishopric in the city of Ohrida, which had been the capital of the Empire since the time of the "Holy King Trivelija" (that is, during the gradual conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity). As has already been shown, the theme of language is closely connected to that of faith. As the Bulgarians were the first to have a written codified language and therefore the chance also of organising a liturgy, it follows that they were the first to have a patriarch, at Ohrid. Paisij places particular emphasis on the Christianisation of the Bulgarian nation because it occurred before that of the other Slav nations. We might even call this kind of writing *Messianic*, or almost civilizing.

In order to understand how Paisij perceives the relation between language and faith that is necessarily provided and presupposed by history which is none other than history connected to God, the following should be born in mind: the Bulgarian monk says that now (in 1761-62) Bulgaria has been conquered by the Turks who by their oppression do not give the Bulgarians any opportunity to develop their erudite experience. A little further on he explains how the Russians and the Muscovites, including the Serbs, living in the 'Germanic state' are able to read, write and publish Slav books because they have freedom on account of their church. While for Rajić the church together with ecclesiastical power derives directly from God, for Paisij it is the institution on earth that keeps the culture of a nation alive insofar as it is historical memory and guardian of the language.

The diachronic historical narration is interrupted by the arrival of the Ottoman Turks. But the history narrated up to that narrated moment is the history of Bulgaria during the period when a Bulgarian State (*dāržava*) existed. The community's past is closely and exclusively linked to the existence of a *State reality*. This aspect is very important since it shows how Paisij's historical thought is based on a clear model: the Bulgarians have the right to exist only inasmuch as they have created a state during the Middle Ages. It must also be made clear that when the concept of 'state' is mentioned in the Slav-Bulgarian *Istorija*, Paisij made a comparison between the Byzantine state organisation and a verticality of power inserted in a world view that was clearly religious, and not influenced by the Enlightenment as historiography has often held. Paisij's debt in reconstructing Bulgarian history is divided between Orbin and Baronio. "As concerns Orbin we know that the Bulgarian author followed the text of *Il Regno degli Slavi* quite closely until the 11th century [...], after the 11th century the *Annali* (by Baronio) no longer contain interesting facts about the Bulgarians and in any case the narration continues only to the 12th century [...] Paisij continued up until the fall of Bulgaria and then of Byzantium under Turk domination (1453)"²⁸. The construction of Bulgarian identity is based on a state whose ethnic origin often, as in this case, is traced back – using an almost mythical collection of facts – to the distant past. The fact that Paisij combines the Vandal and Sarmatic theories by fusing them to give his nation greater *dignitas* demonstrates this: the Bulgarians whose name derives from the River Volga, are thereafter descended from Skandinavia, whose inhabitants were called Skandavlani,

hence the name *Slavjani*, insofar as they belong to the Slav community. As Pitassio points out, "even the Serb, Rajić, always turns to Medieval history, the basis of separation for the modern south Slav races; another example is that of Slovakian intellectuals between the 17th and 18th centuries intent on avenging the integrity of their own ethnic grouping in relation to the Germans and Magyars"²⁹. We are faced therefore with what might be called a representation of the past or rather an explanation in national tones of the lack of a state. The absence/lack is vital to arouse popular feeling.

In addition, in order to understand the place of Paisij's history correctly it should be added that,

the Bulgarian intelligentsia of the 18th century did not refute the age-old Bulgarian tradition, although Medieval. It does not depart from it but, on the contrary, returns to it with new interest – insofar as it was the period of state independence, of cultural flowering. Above all, in the age-old Bulgarian Medieval tradition of the state and the Church, legal and moral bases are sought for the historical rights of Bulgarians to be a free nation state³⁰

As has been mentioned, the nation, the founding subject, was to be the focus of Rajić's *Histories* and of late 18th-century Transylvanian historians. In particular the emphasis on the nation that could fall into oblivion and therefore be forgotten can be seen even from the title of Rajić's work – a concern that a few years previously had been the main preoccupation in Spiridon's work³¹. Historicism, traditions and the system of myths Paisij uses are the basis of the *Istoriya* as founding factors of a new national symbology.

BETWEEN THE SUBJECTS OF THE EMPIRES: SPIRIDON PALAUZOV AND THE NATION

As has already been mentioned, the *rodnata istorija* [national history] saw extremely interesting developments particularly in the works by Spiridon Palauzov, rightly considered the founder of Bulgarian Medieval studies. Born in 1818 into one of the most important families of the Bulgarian Risorgimento, Spiridon had a polyhedric education. He studied Greek from an early age and during his adolescence he came into contact with scholars such as M. Solovčev and V. Grigorev at Odessa, important figures in the field of Balkan Slav history. In 1840, encouraged by his father and V. Aprilov, he went to Western Europe to finish his study of history. It was mainly in Germany at the Universities of Bonn, Heidelberg and Munich that he followed courses and was influenced by the German historical school through the works of Wilmfelding and Frank, Herder, Ranke and Wolff. Having graduated in economy in 1843, he went back to Russia to specialise, following courses in Slav philology and history as well as law, at the Universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In 1852 he completed the speciality in Slav studies with his thesis *Vek bolgarskogo carja Simeona* [The epoch of the Bulgarian Tsar Simeon]³². The thesis that was published the same year and received 6 encouraging reviews, was Palauzov's second work. In fact he had already published a study with the title *Rostislav Michajlovič, russkij udeln'j knjaz na Dunae v XIII veke* [Rostislav Michajlovič

Russian prince of the Danube during the 13th century]³³ the previous year, 1851. It is precisely with these two early works that an enormous leap forward can be observed in the development of Bulgarian historiography. While with Paisij we see an author who turned to Biblical justifications for his nation's authority and in an attempt to rid it of the so-called Greek and Turkish 'double yoke', with Palauzov we have a historian with a much broader and more 'modern' education who bases his research on documentary sources and studies of the country. Moreover, although he studied Medieval chronicles written and transcribed by monks as Paisij had also done, he thought of them just as sources to be examined for their possible authority. Needless to say the intellectual contexts in which the two writers worked were extremely different both chronologically and contextually.

Until his death in 1872³⁴, Palauzov wrote historiographical works of considerable historical and philological range. Good examples are *Jan Hunyadi*, *Četiri uvodni statii po bǎlgarskija cǎrkoven vǎpros* [Four introduction articles about the Bulgarian church question], *Istorija na balkanskite narodi* [History of the Balkan people] and *Istorija na Avstrija i Ungarija* [History of Austria and Hungary]³⁵. It is the latter that will be the subject of our analysis. In this work, written following the Crimean War, Palauzov deals in particular with the socio-economic and legal condition of Slav races included in the Hapsburg Empire. This problem is included in the broader Eastern Question³⁶ of which the Bulgarians formed part. The work is divided into five parts that range from the political situation in Austria after 1848, the political and ethnographical situation of nationalities in Austria, the reformation and Catholic reaction in Hungary, Hungary and her relations with Austria, with a short note on the Hungarian poet and revolutionary, Petöfi. The golden thread running through these five parts is the 'national question', an arm against the feudal order that in Palauzov's view still existed in the Hapsburg Empire. The national question for the Bulgarian historian is essentially based on the right of races included in the Empire to have an independent cultural and political life in order to achieve equality between nationalities and races. He is deeply convinced that each nation has the natural right to be free to follow its own traditions and customs. And since he is considering the condition of Slav subjects he adds a further political argument supported by historical proof. Indeed, Palauzov observes that the racial proximity of Russia with most of the Balkan and Central European countries and the religious affinity of Orthodoxy indicates that Russia should have the role of protector in relation to these countries.

In the second part of this work, entitled *Političesko i etnografsko sǎstojanie na narodnostite v Avstrija* [The political and ethnographic situation of the peoples in Austria]³⁷, Palauzov maintains that such a complex situation as that of the Hapsburg Empire is not present in any other European country. By comparing the Hapsburg Empire with the Byzantine one and searching for causes of a possible collapse (which the author hopes to find) he maintains that the Ottoman Empire is also suffering from the same ills. In all three of these empires there are many variations in conditions and internal constitution that result in numerous internal inconsistencies. The inconsistencies are evident

if the ethnographic, political and historical relations of the races with the dominant power are considered. The ethnographical essence of a nation is that which comes before the other two mentioned since "an ethnographical nation is produced by nature, while the political and historical essences are formed under the influence of social circumstances"³⁸. In another passage Palauzov follows up his introduction to the problem by explaining what he means by essence of a nation, and precisely what he means by ethnographic, historical and political essence. "First and foremost, if it is political, a nation belongs to the sphere of the present and is mainly established by unnatural circumstances, while if we examine a historical nation we will notice that this is a legacy or event of the past, originating from chronicles and traditions. Finally, if the nation is ethnographic we would see that it clearly brings with it the embryos of the future and represents the inceptions in flesh and blood [...] All the revolutions of our day bring with them the signs of these inceptions"³⁹. Although Palauzov expresses valuable opinions on possible solutions following which the Hapsburg Empire could continue to exist, he emphasises yet again that if individual national traditions are not respected and above all if a nation's historical right to existence is not recognised, the Imperial structure, both Austrian and Ottoman, is destined to collapse. The question of historical right, as can now be seen was also at the heart of Paisij's *Istorija*.

Examining the Austrian situation in greater depth he explains:

The nation that wants to dominate others has a population of less than seven million, while the remainder, the foreign population of Austria has thirty five million. [...] the foreigners are different both by their language and race⁴⁰.

Palauzov tries to provide a map of all the races included in the Hapsburg Empire, whether Slav, Hungarian or Austrian, continuing to emphasise the "national rights of races". It is interesting to note how the Bulgarian historian shows the consequences of the historical and philosophical debate on the origins of the human races that developed in Western Europe in particular in France, Germany and England starting in the 19th century. Further on Palauzov adds that

Identifying the concept of "nationality" will never be clear until it is considered in one sense or another. From the historical, political or ethnographic point of view, "nationality" is a difficult knot that may only be untangled after many years' work. For some races these three types of nationality are found in close correspondence, for others they are more separate. For example, the Romanians of Transylvania may be simultaneously considered Romanians, Hungarians and Austrians. The state to which a race belongs expresses its political nationality. On the other hand, nations that do not have a single racial origin and speak different languages, but that have sometimes been in a state having the same history, even with the passage of time do not return to the same system, in spite of everything they retain their own historical essence, as for example, Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro, that are part of the Serb nation⁴¹.

As can be seen, by taking his research on the Hapsburg Empire as a starting point Palauzov often discusses national cases concerning countries that until a few years previously had been included in the Ottoman Empire, as in the case of the Serbs. This decision was politically motivated and served to maintain the interest, in particular of the Rus-

sians, in the Eastern Question and, especially, in the condition of the Bulgarians. In fact, at the time, he was in touch with modern Russian Slav studies, a field by now well established and especially interested in the Bulgarians from various scientific aspects thanks to figures such as Pogodin or Venelin. While on the one hand it was concerned with the language and the origins of the Slav languages, there was no lack of interesting, in-depth historical studies nor of detailed archaeological reports such as those by Tepljakov. And this is precisely why Palauzov's studies branch out into different directions, from history to ethnography to Imperial law to the study, although superficial, of languages. Indeed, the Bulgarian historian – who lived in Russia between St Petersburg and Moscow – emphasises again in more depth his view about “ethnographic nationality”, the most important kind, as has already been said:

The most important and most vital of the types of nationality is that which expresses the ethnographic unity of the individual nationalities, in the form of racial and linguistic unity. This fully defines the concept of ‘nation’ (from the verb *rodit’*, *narozdat’*, – to bear) and may have full right of citizenship in the political and social requirements of the century⁴².

After adding that the Italian movement for the unity of Italy is the clearest consequence of ethnographic nationality⁴³, Palauzov explains that “political nationality” is defined by the word “state”, the historical one being defined by the history of each people and nation. But when identifying a nation there are other problems to keep in mind. Each nation is identified by enduring factors such as race, customs and traditions, beliefs, faith, folk songs and language. They are the expression of its individuality. However, the factor that stands out from all the rest (in this case the influence of the German Romantic school of history is evident) is language:

Language is the main identifying feature of man, it represents the typical founding membership that distinguishes a given race from the others⁴⁴.

Having established the theoretical and methodological references by which to identify a nation and distinguish the forms of nationality, Palauzov proceeds to the detailed analysis of the Austrian case. He emphasises how the different nations came to be within the Hapsburg Empire for three main reasons: some are there because they are under the control of the Hapsburgs, others by their own free will, yet others as confederates and finally some because of military action. The Czechs for example, although part of the Empire, have retained their own national identity and some of their own institutions. The case of Dalmatia whose land crosses the “military border” that reaches Transylvania, is a little more problematic. Serbs and Croats live there, two races that are very similar. Transylvania is the country where Romanians, Hungarians and Austrians live together even though they have marked basic differences. Finally Valacchia and Moldavia: these two regions of the Empire are nearly entirely populated by Romanians who have the same faith, language, origins and are of the same race. Palauzov's list leads to further considerations of, we could say, a geopolitical type:

All things considered, according to statistics, the Slav race arrives at the considerable figure of 86 million and covers the eastern half of Europe. If one draws a straight line from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic, all that remains to the east of this line is mostly inhabited by the Slav race, with

the exception of small Romanian, Magyar, Greek and Albanian communities. We have made no mention of the Turks, Jews, and gypsies since not having important relations with the other races they merge into the large number of Slavs⁴⁵.

We might make many observations on this passage by Palauzov. Perhaps the only one we are inclined to make is this: the Bulgarian historian is obviously influenced by Russian politics in the European field due to economic and expansionistic interests as well as the Slavophile ideology. Besides, having studied in Western Europe and experienced a series of evolutionistic trends he is attempting to establish the characteristic features of the Slavs once and for all; in short he is basing his research on the studies of the Russian philological school. In fact, Palauzov continues,

This race [the Slavs] is divided into two branches as regards both its ethnographical and its philological relations. The first branch called North-Eastern Slavs, is made up of Great Russians, Little Russians, White Russians, and the Serbs and Bulgarians with their further ramifications fall into the South-Eastern part. The second branch is composed of Poles, Czechs, and *Vendi* or Serbs in the north. The majority of this second branch lives in Austria and carries the name of Western Slavs. Of this second branch the Czechs are very interesting since they are the ancestors of the old Bohemian kingdom and [...] their language is considered the oldest of all the Slav languages, with the exception of the old Slavonic or Church Slavonic⁴⁶.

Palauzov's philological training is apparent. To reinforce his arguments about the different Slav sub-families and to develop his debate on the Czechs he uses, as was apparent, Šafarik's studies, published in *Slovenske Narodopis*.

Finally Palauzov makes a brief analysis of the Slavs living on the 'Balkan-Illyrian' peninsula: the Bulgarians, Serbs and Slovenians. As regards the Bulgarians, Palauzov limits himself to showing the natural borders within which the Bulgarian nation is found: the Bulgarians according to him are spread from the western borders with the Serbs to the Black Sea and from the Danube to Salonico and Albania. For the Serbs, the Bulgarian historian lists all the regions in which the Serb community is present: Voevodina, Banat, Slovenia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria and following the 'military border'. He adds that although these communities are scattered over various regions, they practically represent a single nation. The literary language is almost the same and physically they are similar, although they do have some differences as regards faith and civilisation. This is determined by the fact that:

The orthodox Serbs use the Cyrillic alphabet for their sacred books, literature and for the press. The Croats and Dalmatians, who are mainly Roman Catholic, use the Latin alphabet. Recently the Croats have begun to use the Dalmatian language for their literature, in fact this started with the Republic of Dubrovnik and during its golden age when poets like Gundulić made their name. Their language [the Croats'] has been accepted by nearly all Catholic Slavs and is very similar to Serb literary language. The centres of Croatian culture are Zagabria, Rijeka and Karlovci, while Serb ones are Belgrade, Novi Sad, Karlovac, Pest and Vienna (Bec), the four last because of their press⁴⁷.

Finally there are the Slovenians that the Germans call by the name of southern *Vendi*. They live mainly in Stiria and Carinzia and their ethnographic frontier runs along the River Drava. Since 1848 they were further encouraged to become a single country

called Slovenia, as a consequence of the Austrian government's desire to make German the official language.

Again in 1848, the Austrian government when reviewing its stance declared that other languages than German could be used in administration. Indeed, for example, in Italy and in the Slav regions of the Adriatic Italian began to be used. However, Palauzov adds, the fact remains that the unrest that broke out in Austria in 1848-1849 had a three-fold nature, political, historical and ethnographical, and to be fully understood it must be studied in the light of the theoretical framework examined.

CONCLUSIONS

The Nation in the *Istorija slavenobolgarskaja* seems to be an ethnic community based on the sharing of name, language, myths, history and culture, a view that can be found in many other Slavo-Balkan historiographical works in the 18th century. Moreover, like a kinship community it bridges the past and present and becomes an objective reality when it is rooted in the struggle against oppressors in order to recount examples useful for the purpose of regaining the old religious, cultural and state liberties. The people-nation therefore is the hub around which Paisij's *Istorija* is organized, and the work, freeing itself from the old dynastic historiography, fits neatly into the new movement that we have called "a watershed in the history of the nation". Linked to the Nation is the State that in this case is the response to the Byzantine state model. It is based on three essential premises founding the Bulgarian Nation: the historicity of the Bulgarian nation; the Christian faith and the evangelising mission of the Bulgarian people, and, finally, language, which through the work of the clergy keeps memories of past splendours vivid.

Contrary to Paisij, and in a very different intellectual context, Spiridon Palauzov argues that the Nation is the product of nature and the evolution of mankind; it therefore has nothing to do with Biblical origins. The 19th-century historian states that there are three types of 'nationality' – political, historical and ethnographical. Ethnographical nationality is the most important insofar as it does not result from fortuitous causes but originates from nature and, Palauzov adds, contains within it the seeds of the future. This means that we are looking at a secular history that is faithfully rooted in evolutionism: man originates in nature and has the potential to progress along the evolutionary pathway that leads to the future. At the same time there are some human characteristics that endure and seem to form uniqueness by providing it with the basic stability to overcome the onslaught of time. These characteristics are race, customs and traditions, beliefs and, above all, language. If we were, with all due caution, to attempt to compare Palauzov's thinking with Giuseppe Mazzini's⁴⁸, we would see that there are no very great theoretical differences. Mazzini talks about the rediscovery of the nation: the communion of language and customs and membership of the same race: these elements provide the foundation on which to build the 'historical' nation starting from something pre-existent.

Thus we can answer a question that might arise naturally: why juxtapose by comparison two figures such as Paisij and Palauzov who lived and wrote in such different intellectual contexts? The reason is simple. If we take the discursive development of the Nation as a reference point by adopting diachronic parameters we will notice that within the Bulgarian intelligentsia of the late 18th and first half of the 19th century, a development of historical thought exists that, according to the historiography on the subject, shows the transition from Christian theological notions to "positive" concepts. If, on the other hand, we remain in the methodological field that we have chosen, studying individual works synchronically in detail, we observe how the Bulgarian Nation, having as its basis a structure firmly rooted in its own specificity, is considered an entity destined to be reborn.

NOTES

- ¹ L.S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453*, London 2000, pp. 146-153.
- ² P.M. Kitromilides, "Imagined communities" and the origins of the national question in the Balkans, in *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy. Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-Eastern Europe*, "Variorum", XI, 1994, pp. 149-192.
- ³ I. Konev, *Bălgarskoto Văzraždane i Prosvēštenieto I-II-III-IV*, Sofia 1983-1992, vol I.
- ⁴ On the Romanian nation, A. Pitassio (ed.), *L'intreccio perverso. Costruzione di identità nazionali e nazionalismi xenofobi nell'Europa Sud-orientale*, Perugia 2001, in particular the essay by M. Cuaz, *L'invenzione della Romania. Gli storici e la costruzione dell'identità nazionale rumena*, pp. 43-70.
- ⁵ A. Pitassio, *Balcani nel caos. Storie e memorie di Vassilije Petrović, Paisij Hilendarski, Sofronij Vračanski*, Napoli 2003, pp. LX-LXVII.
- ⁶ Paisij started writing the *Istorija* in the monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos in 1760 and finished it in 1762 in the monastery of Zograf.
- ⁷ The theoretic work which is used to date the *Văzraždane*, and which still prevails today in the overview of Bulgarian historiography, is the article by the historian M. Drinov, *Otec Paisij, negovoto vreme, negovata istorija i učenicitē mu*, "Periodičesko Spisanie na Bălgarskoto Kněžovno Družestvo", 1, 4, 1871, pp. 3-26. In this article Drinov holds that the Bulgarian Revival began in the 1760s and in particular with the writing of *Istorija Slavjanobolgarskajja* (Bulgarian – Slav History) by Paisij. According to Nikolaj Genčev, this theory that was to dominate Bulgarian historiography for more than a century is based on a Hegelian interpretation of history, therefore on the idea that during the course of history figures emerge that are so great (cosmo-historical) as to be able to influence its progress. In our opinion following this approach risks overestimating the so-called Paisij phenomenon, considering it unique. For Bulgarian historiography on the *Văzraždane* see R. Daskalov, *The Making of a Nation in the Balkans. Historiography of the Bulgarian Revival*, Budapest-New York 2004.
- ⁸ D. Canev, *Paisievata, Istorija v razvitiето na bălgarskata istoričeska knižnina prez pārvata polovina na XIX vek*, "Istoričeski pregled", 2, 1975, pp. 87-92; D. Canev, *Bălgarskata istoričeska knižnina prez Văzraždane. XVIII – pārvā polovina na XIX vek*, Sofia 1989, pp. 43-68.
- ⁹ R. Picchio, *La 'Istorija slavenobolgarskaja' sullo sfondo linguistico-culturale della Slavia ortodossa*, *Ricerche Slavistiche*, VI, 1958, pp. 103-104.
- ¹⁰ I. Kant, *Scritti di storia, politica e diritto*, (edited by F. Gonnelli), Bari 1995, p. 103.
- ¹¹ It is interesting to note how authors such as Rajić and Kleiner deal with the same problem. The former gives Chapter 1 of Vol. II, dedicated to the Bulgarian nation, the title "Za slavenskija proizhod na bolgarskija narod i ezik", while the latter entitles Chapter 1 of the first part "Za imeto, proizhod, npravite i religijata na

drevnite bálgari". There is an underlying difference between the two approaches, in the sense that the former immediately defines the Bulgarians as a Slav nation and because of this speaks also of the language, the latter on the other hand adopts a different method that leads him to study the Bulgarians before defining their ethnic affiliation. It must be remembered that the one is Orthodox whilst the other is Catholic.

- ¹² The Ragusan Benedictine monk Mauro Orbini wrote *Il Regno degli Slavi, hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni* (Pesaro 1601). Its importance for southern Slav history and the suspicion they had for the Catholicism that runs through it can be found in other 18th-century works by southern Slav authors. Orbini is following the long established Adriatic tradition rather than the currents of thought linked to the Counter Reformation. His interest in the Slavs springs mainly from the work of Pribevo, who almost a century before him had, in *De origine successibusque Slavorum* (Venice 1532) expressed many of these concepts that later inspired the *Regno degli Slavi*. By identifying the Slavs with the Goths, for example, the historiographical tradition that makes the origin of a 'race' go back to the Flood and the descendants of Noah and his sons; the greatness of the Slavs has also been identified philologically with the term *Slava* (Glory) = *Slavi* (Glorious ones). These concepts were later to be taken up once more by Paisij Hilendarski as well as by Branković, Miošić and Rajić. Orbini's work in particular was to be one of the most important sources for Paisij and Rajić. Another characteristic of work by Orbini that would be continued by 18th-century Slav historians is pan-Slav glorification and the desire to create a past that would be considered important in comparison with that of other nations. This idea was brought to life by Orbini, as a consequence of the revaluation of the "barbarians" (in this instance the Slavs) that by this time were formed into "nationes" aware of their role within Europe, from the work by Guagnino *Sarmatiae europaeae descriptio*. Mauro Orbini's work was to gain importance and fame amongst Eastern and Western Slavs following the Russian edition of 1722 by Sava Vladislavič, *Knjiga istoriografija počatija imene, slavi i razširenija naroda slavjanskago*. Cfr. G. Dell'Agata, *La traduzione russa del Regno degli Slavi di Mauro Orbini*, in *Filologia e letteratura nei paesi slavi. Studi in onore di Sante Graciotti*, Roma, 1990 [also in Russian, "Руский перевод Carstva Slavjan M. Orbini", *Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie*, 1990, 5.].
- ¹³ P. Hilendarski, *Slavijanobálgarska istorija*, Sofia 2002. Paisij's *Istorija* has also been translated in Italian by A. Pitassio, *Balcani nel caos. Storie e memorie di Vasilije Petrović, Paisij Hilendarski, Sofronij Vračanski*, Perugia 2003, pp. 39-112.
- ¹⁴ A. Robinson, *Istoriografija slavjanskogo vozroždenie i Paisij Hilendarski*, Moscow 1963, pp. 100-101.
- ¹⁵ For more on this see, V. Smohovska-Petrova, *Dve knjige na naroda ("Slavijanobálgarska istorija" ot Paisij i "Knjige na naroda i polskoto piligrimstvo" ot Mickevič)*, "Literaturna Misál", 2, 1971, pp. 75-97.
- ¹⁶ N. Danova, *Problemát za nacionalna identičnost v učebnikarska knižnina, publicistikata i istoriografija prez XVIII-XIX vek*, in *Balkanskite identičnosti v bálgarskata kultura*, Sofia 2003, pp. 11-91.
- ¹⁷ Hilendarski, *Slavijanobálgarska istorija* cit., p. 24.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ Baronio's *Annales ecclesiastici* fits into the context of the struggle with the Roman Catholic Church against the Reformation. The ecclesiastical history that began as a weapon of Lutheranism finds its counterpart in Baronio, who conceived his work as an answer to Magdeburgo's *Centurie*. He had been devoted to the study of ecclesiastical history since his twenties, when Neri employed him to narrate the history of the Church for laypeople. A return to the chronicle writer's organisation is apparent in the work of Baronio, neglecting the historical progress of ideas and dogmas. This historiographical technique was imposed for laudatory reasons to show how every minute detail in the Catholic Church had remained unchanged from Christ's day onwards. The dissemination of the *Annales* throughout eastern Europe was made easier because of the relations Baronio established with exponents of the Polish clergy present for long periods in Rome, because of the intense relations between the Holy See and the *Congregazione di S. Filippo*. As a result of tremendous interest in Baronio's work it was decided to have it translated, in particular to re-write it and make it accessible for Polish readership. The job of preparing the book was entrusted to Piotr Skarga. Skarga wrote a summary from the great wealth of material, the second edition of which came out in 1607. Still in the 17th century the Polish edition of the *Annales* was recognised by the Russians. The monk Ignatij di Murom was employed by the metropolitan Iosif di Rjazan to translate the work into Russian in 1678. During the 18th century

- Baronio's work was distributed amongst Russian circles in particular amongst the *raskol'niki* (schismatics), who, with their interpretations of the work inspired a truly innovative apocryphal literature. And so, in 1719, the Muscovite synod decided to purify Baronio's work from all allusions contrary to the eastern Church by publishing the edition of it with the title *Dejanija cerkovn'ja i graždanskajja ot R. X do XIII st.* When printed the work was widely and quite rapidly distributed throughout southern and eastern Slav countries, so much so that it could be found for example in Mount Athos monasteries such as Zograf and Hilendar.
- ²⁰ A. Cronia, *Il Regno degli Slavi di Mauro Orbini e la Istorija Slavenobolgraskajja del monaco Paisij (1762)*, "Bulgaria", 1-2, 1939
- ²¹ V. Velčev, *Otec Paisij Hilendarski i Cesar Baronij*, Sofia 1943; *Paisij Hilendarski. Epoha, ličnost i delo*, Sofia 1987. The pages by Velčev written in 1943 are especially interesting for their view of the *Istorija*: it is argued that from this aspect too Baronio's influence is fundamental.
- ²² G. Dell'Agata, *Paisij Hilendarski i "Mavrobir" (Mavro Orbini)*, in *Studi po bǎlgaristika i slavistika*, Sofia 1999, pp. 165-176.
- ²³ For the historiographical relations between Paisij and Miošić see, *Bǎlgari i Hǎrvati prez vekovete. Andrija Kačić Miošić i bǎlgarite*, Sofia 2000.
- ²⁴ According to Robinson's study there are three theories of the ethnogenesis of the Slav nation. The first is called the 'Balkan theory', deriving from the writer from Kiev, Nestore, according to whom the route the Slavs took led them to migrate from Babylon to Illyria and from there into Slav regions. The second theory, called 'Sarmatian', supported by Italian Catholic historiographers and in Gizel's "Sinopsis" of Kiev, shows the Slavs 'journey from Babylon to Causacus' then to the River Don and, from there to Sarmatia to reach the Slav areas. A Bulgarian variation of this theory is that of Spiridon who has the Bulgarians derive directly from the areas along the River Volga from which they also get their name. The third theory called the 'Vandal', (that of Rajić and Branković's *Slaveno-srbska hronika*) derived from German historiographers, described the Slav migration thus: Babylon – Scandinavia – Sarmatia – Slav regions. During the 17th and 18th centuries these three original theories were re-written according to the individual historiographer's interests and inclination, nation by nation, bringing about a true regional separation. For example, the theory called 'Mosoh – Moskva', according to Robinson, rests on three arbitrary elements deriving from the first draft of a work by Flavius Josephus: from the assonance of the two terms; from Biblical assonances; from the Tower of Babel. Cf. Robinson, *Istoriografija* cit., pp. 100-107.
- ²⁵ Pitassio, *Balcani nel caos* cit., p. 56, note 43.
- ²⁶ Paisij was the first *buditel* Bulgarian who in order to research the history of the nation went back to Cyril and Methodius. This choice was to later become a real trend that would become part of the struggle for Bulgarian ecclesiastic autonomy respect to the Greek-Phanariot, and that would be developed for almost the entire 19th century. For the importance of the work of Cyril and Methodius, and in particular the essay by Tamborra it contains, see *Christianity among the Slavs. The Heritage of Saints Cyril and Methodius. Acts of the International Congres held on the Eleventh Centenary of the Death of St. Methodius*, Rome Pont. Istitutum 1988. A Bulgarian historiographical reading of the importance of the two brothers is given in D. Angelov, *Borba za deloto na Kiril i Metodii*, Sofia 1969.
- ²⁷ Right from Cyril and Methodius' first mission a true school of clergy developed in Moravia dedicated to the liturgy in the Slav language. Moving the centre of the Slav liturgy from Moravia to Bulgaria was justified not only by the fact that those who had followed the two brothers in their first Moravian mission were mostly of Slav - Balkan origin, but also in particular because of the ecclesiastical politics of the Bulgarian Tsar Boris. Cyril and Methodius' followers Clemente and Naum reached Bulgaria and took on the task of the new ecclesiastical organisation, with the later creation of the School of Ohrida.
- ²⁸ Picchio, *Gli Annali* cit., p. 230. In addition Picchio explains in later pages that "Paisij was able to draw knowledge from Orbini only for the political part of his work, *Storia dei Re* [...] On the contrary, Paisij drew in part on Baronio-Skarga for the religious part as well, that is the *Storia dei Santi*".
- ²⁹ A. Pitassio, *Soldato, contadino ed eletto dal signore. Alle origini dello stereotipo positivo del bulgaro in età moderna*, "Europa Orientalis", 8, 1989, pp. 71-89.

- ³⁰ N. Dragova, *Formirane na bälgarskite istorici prez XVIII v.*, "Studia balcanica", 14, 1979, pp. 127-141.
- ³¹ Robinson, *Istoriografija slavjanskogo cit.*, p. 35.
- ³² Canev, *Bälgarskata istoričeska knižnina cit.*, pp. 163-181.
- ³³ This study, like the previous one shown in the text, is the result of studies on feudalism that Palauzov did by comparing the conditions of Medieval Bulgaria with those of other Slav nations such as Russia and broadening the perspective to Western feudalism. Cfr., J. Nikolov, *Spiridon Palauzov kato istorik na Evropejskija feodalizâm (1818-1872)*, "Istoričeski pregled", XXVIII, 6, 1972, pp. 68-85
- ³⁴ Spiridon Palauzov's death was felt to be a great loss for the national cause by the Bulgarian intelligentsia. For example, in the columns of the newspaper "Svoboda", 2 September 1872 L. Karavelov wrote, "Bulgarian learning as that of Slav studies has lost yet another man of whom all nations could have been proud", "Svoboda", g. III, 1872, br. 10, s. 79.
- ³⁵ Works quoted by Palauzov are contained in V. Gjuzev-H. Kolarov-M. Veleva (eds.), *Spiridon Palauzov. Izbrani Trudove*, vols. I –II, Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo – Istoričesko nasledstvo, 1974-1977. Palauzov had various interests as is shown by his studies on the Reformation and Counter-Reformation in Hungary, historical studies on figures such as Hunyadi and Giovanni Minoto, works on Balkan history and the Hapsburg Empire. His works are interwoven with religious history, with institutional history and with interesting pages concerning linguistic and ethnographical studies. Undoubtedly his studies and his political work were influenced both by his education and by the friends he made in Russia; indeed, Palauzov was close friends with Nekrasov, Pisarev and Černyševskij. His studies on the Bulgarian Church were of interest among others to Petko Slavejkov and G. S. Rakovski with whom he established a very interesting correspondence. Finally it is necessary to emphasise that Palauzov, by studying the position of the Greek-Phanariot element in the Balkans, pushed historical analysis forward *za polza na Bälgarija* [for the use of Bulgaria]. In the above mentioned works on Palauzov biographical information can be found in vol. I, pp. 7-73 and Vol. II pp. 7-50; Cf. also, *100 godini ot smärtta na Spiridon Palauzov*, "IBID", 29, 1974, pp. 67-159; L.I. Rovnjakova, "S. N. Palauzov – Dejatel' bolgarskogo prosvješčenija", *Russkaja Literatura*, XV, 2, 1972, pp. 167-176; H. Kolarov - V. Gjuzev, *Spiridon N. Palauzov kato istorik na srednovekoovna Bälgarija*, "Vekove", I, 6, 1972, pp. 50-61.
- ³⁶ A.L. MacFie, *The Eastern Question 1774-1923*, London 1996.
- ³⁷ Gjuzev - Kolarov - Veleva (eds.), *Spiridon Palauzov cit.*, pp. 137-160. The original came out in the journal *Russkoe slovo* 1861, n. 4, with the title *Političeskoe etnografičeskoe sostojanie narodnostej Avstrii*. This study is part of a series that was published by Palauzov between 1859 and 1861. He published most of his works in journals such as *Severnaja pčela* and *Russkoe Slovo*, the organ for the populist stance.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 140.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 137.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 138-139.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- ⁴³ For the national problem in the works of Mazzini in relation also to Eastern Europe, see F. Guida, *Idea di nazione e questione delle nazionalità nel pensiero di Giuseppe Mazzini*, in *Cuadernos de historia contemporánea*, 28, Madrid 2001, pp. 161-175.
- ⁴⁴ V. Gjuzev, H. Kolarov, M. Veleva (ed.), *Spiridon Palauzov cit.*, p. 139.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 146.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 146-147.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 150.
- ⁴⁸ An interesting description of the ideas of Mazzini and the Bulgarian Risorgimento can be found in, L. Genova - K. Šarova, *Il movimento nazionale rivoluzionario bulgaro e le idee di Mazzini*, in G. Limiti (ed.), *Il mazzinianesimo nel mondo*, II, Pisa 1995-1996.

FURTHER READING

- Dogo M. - Franzinetti G., *Disrupting and Reshaping. Early Stages of Nation Building in the Balkans*, Ravenna 2002.
- Bianchini S. - Dogo M., *The Balkans. National Identities in a Historical Perspective*, Ravenna 1998.
- Jelavich B. - Jelavich Ch., *The Establishment of the Balkan National States 1804-1920*, Washington 1977.
- Jelavich B., *History of the Balkans I-II*, Cambridge 1983.
- Kann R.A., *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918*, Los Angeles 1974.
- Glenny M., *The Balkans*, New York 1999.
- Shaw J., *History of the Ottoman Empire I-II*, Cambridge 1976.
- Sugar P., *South eastern Europe under Ottoman Rule 1354-1804*, Seattle 1977.
- Sugar P., *Nationality and Society in Habsburg and Ottoman Europe*, New York 1977.
- Sugar P., *East European Nationalism, Politics and Religion*, New York 1999.

SOURCES

Да се познават случилите се по рано в тоя свят неща и делата на ония, които са живели на земята, е не само полезно но и твърде потребно, любомъдри читателю. ако навикнеш да прочиташ често тия неща, ще се обогатиш с разум, не ще бъдеш много неизкусен и ще отговаряш на малките деца и простите хора, когато при случай те запитат за станалите по рано в света деяния от черковната и гражданската история. и не по малко ще се срамуваш, когато нищо не можеш да отговориш за тях. отгде ще можеш да добиеш тия знания, ако от ония, които писаха историята на тоя свят и които, при все че не са живели дълго време, защото никому не се дарява дълъг живот, за дълго време оставиха писания за тия неща. сами от себе си да се научим не можеш, защото кратки са дните на нашия живот на земята. [...] историята дава разум не само на всеки човек, за да управлява себе си или своя дом, но и на големите владетели за добро властвуване [...].

To the reader desiring knowledge. To know what has happened in the past of this world, and the deeds of those who have lived on this earth, is not only useful, but absolutely necessary. If you become accustomed to read frequently about these things, you will enrich yourself with wisdom, you will not be inexperienced and will be able to answer little children and plain people if they should ask you about past events from the civil and religious history. And you will be quite ashamed if you cannot answer anything on the subject. Whence can you receive this knowledge, if not from those who have written the history of this world and who, albeit they have not had a long life, because it is not granted to anybody, have left writings on these subjects for the future generations. We cannot learn from ourselves, because the days of our life on earth are very brief. [...] History gives wisdom not only to every man, so he can rule himself and his house, but also to great kings so they can govern wisely.

From: P. Hilendarski, *Slavjanobălgarska istorija*, Sofia 2002, pp. 7-8.

