

tsbücher in den Schulen im Hinblick auf ihre serbischen Elemente.

Die nächste große Artikelgruppe in diesem Werk wurde ganz den intellektuellen Beziehungen zwischen den Serben und Slowaken im XIX. Jh. gewidmet. Der Leser sollte besonders seine Aufmerksamkeit auf den Text von Dejan Mikavica richten, dem Inhaber des Lehrstuhls für Geschichte an der Universität in Novi Sad (p. 69–75). Er beschreibt die Rechte und die politische Lage des slowakischen Volkes gemäß der national bestimmten Ideologie von Svetozar Miletić (1826–1901). Der Serbische Historiker richtet sein Interesse vor allem auf die politischen Faktoren, die zu einer solchen Wahrnehmung der Slowaken durch einen der größten nationalen Ideologen Serbiens führten. Der Autor versucht auch, das Problem der Multiethnizität im Kontext der Habsburgermonarchie aufzuzeigen.

Ebenfalls sehr interessant sind die Texte der Geisteswissenschaftler aus Bratislava zum Thema der serbischen Anwesenheit auf slowakischem Boden. Nennenswert ist an dieser Stelle auch die Arbeit von Michala Mračka (p. 47–56), über die Benennung der Straßen in der Hauptstadt der Slowakei, die sehr an die Gestalten und Ereignisse aus der Geschichte der Serben anspielen. Die Autorin schrieb ihre Arbeit auf der Basis eines sehr umfangreichen sprachwissenschaftlichen Materials. Alica Ku-

lihová hingegen befasste sich mit dem Problem der Übersetzung der Arbeiten von Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787–1864). Sie analysierte verschiedene Arbeiten des serbischen Wissenschaftlers. Der Text enthält viele Zitate, die ihre Thesen reich illustrieren (p. 57–68).

Das Buch *Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov* beinhaltet auch biographische Skizzen zweier serbischen und slowakischer Forscher. Die erste dieser Skizzen, verfasst von Nebojša Kuzmanović, befasst sich mit dem Leben und Schaffen von Risto Kovijanić (1895–1990), die zweite hingegen von Miroslav Daniš beschreibt die diplomatische Tätigkeit von Josef Belaj (1911–2005) in Jugoslawien (p. 122–133).

Darüber hinaus sollte auch beachtet werden, dass am Schluss des Buches auch einige Rezensionen verschiedener Bücher zu finden sind.

Das vorliegende Buch *Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov* wird mit Sicherheit unser Wissen im Bereich der serbischen und slowakischen Beziehungen bereichern. Dieses Buch ist trotz seiner vielen Autoren sehr übersichtlich. Es ist nicht nur für Spezialisten der Geschichte der Balkanhalbinsel und Ostmitteleuropas empfehlenswert, sondern auch für Geisteswissenschaftler, die sich für die Beziehungen zwischen den slawischen Völkern interessieren.

Piotr Kręzel (Łódź)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.03.23>

MONIKA OŻÓG, *Inter duas potestas. Polityka religijna Teoderyka Wielkiego [The Religious Policy of Theoderic the Great]*, Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków 2012, pp. 314.

The figure of Theoderic the Great, king of the Ostrogoths, ruler of a state which had its territorial core in Italy, the cradle of the Roman state, has long been fascinating scholars. The result of this interest is a large number of works devoted to various aspects of his life, as well as the history of the state he ruled. Not all aspects of his rule, however, became a focus of a thorough study. Theoderic's religious policy can be count-

ed among those, and it is that subject to which this work is devoted. It was written by Monika Ożóg, an academic teacher of the Institute of History of the University of Opole, her Ph.D. being *Kościół starożytny wobec świątyń oraz posągów bóstw [Attitudes of the Ancient Church towards temples and statues of deities]*, Kraków 2009, pp. 220.

Theoderic the Great and the Ostrogoths he ruled were, from a religious viewpoint, Ar-

ians. By Constantinople and Rome – the titular *potestas*, not mentioned by name – they were regarded as heretics. The Polish Scholar offers us an opportunity to examine how this heretical ruler was shaping the relationship with his Catholic subjects and, in particular, with the bishops of Rome. I think it is in this way that the position of the bishop of the Eternal City towards the Gothic ruler should be defined, hence I have some doubt as to the adequacy of the first part of the book's title to the nature of relations between Theoderic and the Roman Shepherd. The other major relations with the Byzantine Emperors are also examined; it is worth recalling that it was probably on the initiative of one of them – Zeno – that Theoderic arrived on the Apennine Peninsula, taking over the power from Odoacer.

The primary source for the Author of the book discussed here is the *Book of the Bishops of Rome (Liber Pontificalis)*. This work, created relatively soon after the time of Theoderic, forms not only the most important source of information (enriched, of course, by other texts, of both Latin and Greek provenance), but also the basis for the development of the structure of the book. The text is divided into nine chapters, seven of which are delimited by the pontificates of the bishops of Rome, who held the dignity at the time when Italy was under Theoderic's rule. They were Felix III, 483–492 (chapter II, p. 53–70), Gelasius, 492–496 (chapter III, p. 71–77), Anastasius II, 496–498 (chapter IV, p. 79–81), Symmachus, 498–514 (chapter V, p. 83–135), Hormisdas, 514–523 (chapter VI, p. 137–178), John I, 523–526 (chapter VII, p. 179–189) and Felix IV, 526–530 (chapter VIII, p. 191–193). The aforementioned chapters are complemented by: chapter I, *The Arian Church of the Goths* (p. 31–52), chapter IX, *Religious matters in the Edict of Theoderic* (p. 195–231), an *Introduction* (p. 7–29), *Conclusions* (p. 233–237), a summary in English (p. 239–243), a list of abbreviations (p. 245–248), bibliography (p. 249–289) and indexes of people (p. 292–299), places and geographical names (p. 301–304) and quoted primary sources (p. 305–314). In the chap-

ters based on the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Author analyses passages on specific popes in the context of their relations with Theoderic. Information taken from this source is juxtaposed with others, such as *Excerpta Valesiana*, *Varia* of Casiodorus and *Getica* of Jordanes.

In the first chapter, Monika Ozóg presents Arianism in its Gothic version, defining it as a “national” religion. In chapter IX she takes on the issues of the religious themes in the *Edict of Theoderic* in the context of the authorship of this text (Theoderic the Great or Theoderic II, king of the Visigoths). The Scholar found new arguments in favour of associating the *Edict* with Theoderic the Great.

The structure adopted has its advantages: among them, potentially greater ease in capturing a specific issue in a particular historical context; however, as was rightly observed by the Author herself, this solution also has its disadvantages, the most serious of which is the relatively frequent repetition of information. Despite the emphasis on the information from *Liber Pontificalis*, Monika Ozóg does not lose sight of other sources, which she confronts with her main source. The bibliography includes many important titles, although it might also be worth reaching for several other works, such as: an article by Jonathan Shepard¹, devoted to such matters as Theoderic's stay in Constantinople (his education and attitude to Roman culture); and two monographs focused on the reign of Anastasius², important not only for understanding the relations between that Emperor with Theoderic and the bishops of Rome, but also for explaining the nature of the formal relations between Ravenna and Constantinople. It is also worth

¹ J. SHEPARD, *Manners maketh Romans? Young barbarians at the emperor's court*, [in:] *Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilization. In Honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. E. JEFFREYS, Cambridge 2006, p. 135–158.

² F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge 2006; M. MEIER, *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart 2009.

referring to the classic work of A.A. Vasiliev on the reign of Justin I³.

On the pages of her book the Author presents Theoderic as a capable player who skilfully managed religious matters. She points out that the ruler had to deal with important issues such as the Laurentian Schism, which was tearing apart the Church in Rome, or the Acacian schism, which determined the nature of relations between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. It is significant that Theoderic was able to use both schisms for his own purposes.

³ A.A. VASILIEV, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge 1950.

The Scholar points out that for the majority of his rule, Theoderic managed to preserve stable, peaceful relations between the Arians and the Catholics. Only during the final years of his rule did Theoderic take steps against the latter group, as a consequence of the anti-Arian policy of Emperor Justin I. This step however should not obscure the thirty years during which the king of the Goths earned the reputation of a ruler who could bring about religious peace in his country.

*Translated by Michal Zytka
Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)*

VLADIMÍR VAVŘÍNEK, *Cyril a Metoděj mezi Konstantinopolí a Římem* [Cyril and Methodius between Constantinople and Rome], Vyšehrad 2013, pp. 375.

The book discussed here was written by Vladimír Vavřínek, an outstanding Czech Slavist and Byzantinologist¹, a scholar who for many years now has worked on the so-called Cyril-Methodius question, and is a renowned expert in the field. The book is, it seems, something of a summary of the many years of research performed by its author and an attempt at sharing his conclusions – on the subject of the activity of the “Solun [Thessalonican] Brothers” that was so important in the history of mediaeval Europe – with a wider audience (hence its popular science character).

V. Vavřínek begins the tale about the life and activity of Constantine and Methodius from the moment of the arrival of the messengers of the prince of Great Moravia to Constantinople – which became a pretext for

presenting the capital of the Byzantine Empire (*Příchod Moravanů do Konstantinopole* [The arrival of the Moravians to Constantinople], p. 7–18), and subsequently of the main aspects of the history of Byzantium, with an added emphasis on religious matters, from 4th century until the time of the arrival of the Moravian envoys. This part of the work is entitled *Byzanc* [Byzantium] – p. 19–49. In the following section (*Soluňští bratři před odchodem z Byzance* [Solun Brothers prior to departure from Byzantium], p. 50–88), the Author examines the fortunes of Methodius and Constantine up to the point when they were designated by the emperor Michael III and the patriarch Photius to undertake missionary activity in the Great Moravian state.

The subsequent part of the book (... *rudis adhuc christianitas gentis Maravensium*, p. 89–115) was devoted to the beginnings of the Great Moravian state, with an emphasis on the presence of Christianity (prior to the arrival of the Solun Brothers) among the local populace. It is a starting point for characterising the activity of Constantine and Methodius in the Great Moravian state during Rostislav's reign in the following part (*U Rostislava*

¹ He authored many works, among them: *La révolte d'Aristonico*, Praha 1957; *Staroslověnské životy Konstantina a Metoděje*, Praha 1963; *Církevní misie v dějinách Velké Moravy*, Praha 1963; *Dějiny Byzance*, Praha 1992, 1994 (co-author); *Encyklopedie Byzance*, Praha 2011 (in cooperation with P. BALCÁREK).