

my [*Dating the translation. The historical context of its creation*](p. 146–158), Slavova presents current theories concerning date when the Slavic version of the text was created, and – on the basis of her own analysis of the linguistic characteristics, she presents convincing arguments that date the text no earlier than the late fourteenth century⁵.

Chapter six (*Принципи на издаване на текста* [*Principles of text publication*], p. 159–160) presents the rules of text edition adopted by the author. On the subsequent several dozen pages, one will find an edition of the letter itself (chapter seventh, *Издание на текста* [*Publication of the text*], p. 161–245), which became the basis for the above-cited manuscript РГБ, Ф. 178, № 3112, supplemented by lections of the other 7 full copies and the old print. Irregularities noted in the body text and/or lections are commented by quoting the Greek original based on the edition by Laourdas and Westerink.

In chapter eight (*Речник-индекс на словоформите* [*Glossary-Index of words*], p. 246–325), the author provides an alphabetical list of 2,075 lexical units (excluding pronouns, numerals, conjunctions, prepositions, and particles) attested in the Slavic translation of the letter by Photios. Each dictionary entry from the source contains a semantic definition, all word forms attested in the primary copy, along with their

location (card and verse), and their Greek counterparts (according to the critical edition by Laourdas and Westerink).

The latest publication by Tatiana Slavova is an excellent addition to her research on textology and history of language she has been conducting for many years (with particular emphasis on lexicology)⁶ and certainly can be a valuable and reliable source of information for researchers in many fields. Not to be underestimated is also the author's contribution in the dissemination of knowledge about the ancient history of the southern Slavs and their relationship with the Byzantine culture. The critical edition of the text, which usually poses many problems of varying nature at the development stage (such as selecting texts, comparison thereof, and the necessity to resolve the problems of spelling), is extremely transparent conceptually (and thus readable), and probably will often serve as a valuable material for further research.

Translated by Katarzyna Gucio
Agata Kawecka (Łódź)

⁵ According to certain researchers the Slavic translation of the letter by Photios dated back to the tenth century, or even the late ninth century a cf. p. 146 of the monograph.

⁶ Cf. e.g.: Т. СЛАВОВА, *Владетел и администрация през ранното Средновековие в България. Филологически аспекти*, София 2010; *Тълковната паля в контекста на старобългарската книжнина*, София 2002; *Речник на словоформите в Архангелското евангелие от 1092 г.*, София 1994; *Преславска редакция на Кирило-Методиевия старобългарски евангелски превод*, КМС 6, 1989, p. 15–129; *Помагало по българска историческа лексикология*, София 1986 et al.

IZABELA LIS-WIELGOSZ, *O trwałości znaczeń. Siedemnastowieczna literatura serbska w służbie tradycji* [On Permanence of Meaning. The Serbian Literature of the Seventeenth Century in Service with Tradition], Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2013, pp. 336.

From the research point of view, the description of the seventeenth century cultural space phenomena in the Balkan Peninsula is quite complicated and multifaceted. This is due to primarily the dynamics of the events of that era, as well as rich and yet extremely diverse source material, which has survived into modern times. For this reason, some researchers consider this age an

important time of change, which often results in the overestimation of the events of this period. On the other hand, some other scholars marginalize this century and do not see it as anything groundbreaking. There is no doubt, however, that many publications in the academic literature, on both philological, and historical aspects of the seventeenth century Serbian culture were

developed. However, the publications are so far, a bit outdated and need to be supplemented with new research findings¹.

Recognizing the existing gap in the academic literature, Izabela Lis-Wielgosz² in her book *O trwałości znaczeń. Siedemnastowieczna literatura serbska w służbie tradycji* [On Permanence of Meaning. The Serbian Literature of the Seventeenth Century in Service with Tradition] has made attempts to capture the basic shape of Serbian culture and literature in the seventeenth century. The author has also made an in-depth exploration of selected and important Serbian cultural texts of the seventeenth century, often putting them in a broader context.

The work of I. Lis-Wielgosz consists of five chapters, as well as an extensive introduction and conclusion. The author also has not forgotten about posting a rich bibliography that shows the extent of the source database used. The work also includes two abstracts, one in Serbian and the other in English.

The introduction consists of two parts (p. 7–28). In the first one, the author outlines the range of her research. She draws attention to how greatly underestimated in the academic literature is the seventeenth century. She stresses, however, that this is due to the extent and disorder of the sizeable material. She also shows the time frame of her work, noting however that dates given by her are merely contractual. The second part of the introduction entitled *Średniowieczna czy barokowa?*

Siedemnastowieczna literatura serbska w porządku periodycznym [Medieval or Baroque? A seventeenth-century Serbian literature in periodic order] (p. 15–28) presents several research positions on the attitudes of scientists to the seventeenth century. The author wonders whether the century in question should be considered as the final phase of the Serbian medieval or whether the beginning of the Baroque period. She also reflects on the thesis of those researchers who consider this period as a *time of transition*.

In the first chapter, entitled *Pod znakiem patriarchatu w Peći* [Under the sign of the Patriarchate in Peć] (p. 29–48) the author draws attention to the function of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the life of the Serbian community. Undoubtedly a significant role at that time (since 1557) was played by Patriarchy in Peć, which not only held the religious leadership, but also the tradition of the Serbian state and Serbian consciousness. This, not only led to a deep process of ethnicization of religion, but also to the development of Serbian culture in the medieval and traditional shape. I. Lis-Wielgosz rightly observes that *this marked return to the past is natural in the course of the great restoration, reproduction and reconstruction of all creations – spiritual and material* (p. 41).

The second chapter: *Pomiędzy i ponad – patriarchat wobec Pierwszego i Trzeciego Rzymu* [Between and over – the Patriarchate in regards to the First and the Third Rome] (p. 49–104) is of a bipartite character. The first part describes the Serbian-Russian relations. The author tries to show how invigorating influence of the Serbian culture had continuous contacts with Moscow. The second part of this chapter was *in extenso* devoted to far more difficult relations between the Patriarchate of Peć and the Vatican. The seventeenth century brought about the deterioration of relations between the Catholics and the Orthodox, which was the result of increased activity of the Latin clergy (especially the Jesuits) and the activity in the South Slavic region of Sacra Congregation de propaganda fide, which wanted to establish to the union of the Serbian Patriarchate and the Holy See. In this part of her publication the author cites many examples of Catholic missions (eg. Francesco de Leonardis)

¹ D. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Istorija stare srpske književnosti*, Beograd 1980; M. PAVIĆ, *Istorija stare srpske književnosti baroknog doba*, Beograd 1970; Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, *Stara srpska književnost*, Beograd 1994.

² IZABELA LIS-WIELGOSZ is an employee of Slavic Philology Institute at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Her research focuses primarily on the cultural space of *Slaviae Orthodoxae*, both in the literary and paleoslavlic aspect. Her most important works include such publications as *Śmierć w literaturze staroserbskiej (XII–XIV wiek)*, Poznań 2003 and *Święci w kulturze duchowej i ideologii Słowian prawosławnych w średniowieczu (do XV w.)*, Kraków 2004.

among Orthodox Serbs, aimed at the conversion of the latter to Catholicism. In addition, she also draws attention to the issue of printing the Orthodox liturgical books in Catholic areas (mainly in Venice) and the consequences that arise for the one and the other party.

The next chapter is entitled *Kultura zapamiętana – Kultura pamięci* [Culture remembered – Culture of Memory] (p. 105–152). In this section I. Lis-Wielgosz mainly focuses on showing the continuity of medieval literary forms (hagiographies, hymnographies) in the seventeenth century. This fact is indicative of the consistency and high degree of homogeneity of the Serbian cultural model. The above-mentioned forms of literature are the author's specific transmission belts between the medieval past and seventeenth century's reality and in the future will be a cornerstone of the national consciousness for the Serbs.

The Fourth Chapter: *Kontynuacja tradycji. Przepisywanie ksiąg – zapisywanie rzeczywistości* [Continued tradition. Rewriting the books – saving reality] (p. 153–211) was devoted entirely to show the originality of seventeenth-century Serbian literature. In this section I. Lis-Wielgosz uses quotes from a very well developed set of source texts by Ljubomir Stojanović (1860–1930), entitled *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*³. Very valuable should also be considered the construction of a sort of *cultural-writing maps*, where the more significant Serbian publishing centres were listed. Showing the viability of the literature of this period is all the more justified as the forms, topoi and ideological structures saved in the seventeenth century can be found in later periods (eg. in the works of Zaharije Orfelin or Jovan Rajić).

In the last chapter entitled *Przeszłość–Historia–Historiografia* [Past–History–Historiography] (p. 212–288) Izabela Lis-Wielgosz focuses on the historical narrative in the monuments of Serbian literature of the seventeenth century. On numerous examples she shows long-term development of Old Serbian historical writing. She states quite rightly that in the analysed texts one can see a repetition of some historical themes well-known since the Middle Ages. However,

they have been adapted to the realities of the new political and cultural contexts of the seventeenth century.

Izabela Lis-Wielgosz used a lot of source texts, which attest numerous quotations in her publication. Undoubtedly, this reflects a vast erudition of the author, and also a very good orientation and identification of the source material explored. The drawback, however, is that the author cites most of the texts in the original language, which can be a problem for readers who do not know well the language of seventeenth century's Serbs. It should be therefore considered to translate the more important texts in the next edition of this book.

After a review of the most important works of medieval literature, the author summarizes the previously presented theses in the section entitled *Zakończenie bez końca* [Termination without End] (p. 289–302). On the basis of analysed texts and academic literature, the Polish Slavist unequivocally concludes that the seventeenth-century literature of Serbs should be regarded as the final phase of development of Old Serbian literature. This does not mean, however, that the author does not see signs of change, which at that time began to appear in the South Slavic culture. Therefore she notes quite rightly, that they were not strong enough to change the character of the Serbian medieval literature in the seventeenth century.

There is no doubt that Izabela Lis-Wielgosz has taken up a very difficult and pioneering task in the field of Polish humanities. The result of several years of work on her dissertation is admirable. Polish Slavist presented the audience with a systematic, well-structured and extremely valuable publication on the Serbian culture in the seventeenth century. In the preface the author modestly admits, that it is *merely an attempt to capture the shape of the seventeenth* [Serbian – P.K.] *literature and its culture-forming potential* (p. 10). No doubt this is a fully successful attempt, which can safely be treated as a monographic approach of the problems in question. *O trwałości znaczeń. Siedemnastowieczna literatura serbska w służbie tradycji* is a publication that every humanist interested in cultural changes in the area of *Slaviae Orthodoxae* in the early modern era, should have in their collection.

³ Љ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Стари српски записи и натписи*, Београд 1902–1924.