

Matúš KUČERA, Král Svatopluk [King Svatopluk]. Martin: Matica slovenská 2010. 158 S., ISBN 978-80-7090-965-2, € **XXX**

The second half of the 19th century witnessed the spread of the “nation” concept in the Hungarian Kingdom as well as in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. It was for this reason that historians and literary scholars were looking for their own national heroes. The Slovak intellectuals particularly emphasized the history of (Magna) Moravia. They regarded this state as the kingdom of Slovakia. Accordingly, they considered prince Svatopluk to be the king of Slovakia (e.g. Ján Hollý: Svatopluk). After Czechoslovakia was founded in 1918, (Magna) Moravia was presented as the first common state of the Czechs and Slovaks (the attempted accentuation of the Slovaks within this common state failed). The accentuation of the Slovaks had come to the fore following the foundation of the fascist Slovak state. František Hrušovský described the magnamorian Svatopluk and the magnamorian population as Slovaks. When a common Slovak and Czech state was re-established following the Second World War, the ideology changed again. In 1993 the two nations split up for the second time. After the fall of communism, the morale of nationalism started to spread. Last year (2010) the situation culminated with the ceremonial dedication of the statue of Svatopluk in the yard of Bratislava Castle. With Slovakia’s Prime Minister and head of state in attendance, a sign was placed under the statue. It read, “Svatopluk the King of the old-Slovaks”. The book mentioned above confirms the theory that a new nationalism is on the rise in Slovakia. Matúš Kučera – the writer – used to teach at one of the best universities of Slovakia. He became a politician during the mečiarism, serving as Minister of Education. He was, therefore, able to set his theories to the actual ideologies. For example, in 1985,¹ he discussed the Magna Moravian princes, whose origin he changed to Slovakian in a 2002 work.² In his book “Svatopluk” the people of Magna Moravia were described as Slovaks.

In order to make this claim, Matúš Kučera refers to a charter written by Pope Stephan V. That refers to Svatopluk as the king of Slavs (“Stephanus episcopus servus servorum Dei Zventopolco regi Sclavorum [...]”³). Svatopluk is called king in two different charters. In addition to the one mentioned above, he is also described as King in the chronicle of Regino in both 890 (“Arnulfus rex concessit Zuendibolch Marahensium Sclavorum regi ducatum Behemensium [...]”⁴) and 894 (“Circa haec etiam tempora Zuentdibolch rex Marahensium Sclavorum [...]”⁵). Despite these references, the historiography has used the title “prince” (dux) to describe Svatopluk.

The statue of Svatopluk has, therefore, been hotly debated. Some of the historians do not agree with the exterior shape of the statue, because the sculptor used textbook fascist style and placed the hashmark in the hands of Svatopluk. Many historians also disagree with the sign under the statue. A committee led by the historian Marina Zavacká made criticisms of the statue (R. Holec, V. Turčan, J. Steinhübel, etc.). On the basis of their criticisms, the hashmark has been removed from Svatopluk’s shield and the sign under the statue has been changed.

The golden-age of the Slovaks within the state of Magna Moravia has come to the forefront again. Historians, including Kučera, consider the nation to have been very unified at that time – just as it is today.

In contrast with a novelist, a historian should not take fictive events or fictive heroes into account. The historian's statements should be confirmed with sources, so that they will be authentic and acceptable for readers. The historian should not be influenced by political expectations or other manipulative intentions.

I strongly hope that in the future, historians will act against myths and work to create accounts of history that are free from these theories.

Bratislava

Beata Pintér

¹ Matúš KUČERA, Slovensko v dobách stredovekých. Bratislava 1985, 104.

² EADEM, Stredoveké Slovensko. Bratislava 2002, 75.

³ Magna Moraviae Fontes Historici. Vol. 3. Brno 1969, 217.

⁴ Magna Moraviae Fontes Historici. Vol. 1. Praha, Brno 1966, 137f.

⁵ Ibidem, 139.

Dubravko LOVRENOVIĆ, Stećci. Bosansko i humsko mramorje srednjeg vijeka [Stećak-Grabdenkmäler. Die Marmorwelt von Bosnien und Hum]. Sarajevo: Rabic 2009. 331 S., zahlr. Abb., ISBN 978-9958-33-007-0.

Wenn man nach *lieux de mémoire* für das mittelalterliche Bosnien fragt, so dürften die Grabkultur der *stećci* und die Bosnische Kirche an erster Stelle zu nennen sein. In der älteren Forschung hat man sie sogar in Parallele gesehen, die *stećci* seien ein Spezifikum für die Bogomilen in Bosnien. Inzwischen gilt jedoch für die Mehrheit der Forschung als längst gesichert, dass keine genetische Verbindung zwischen den bulgarischen Bogomilen und der bosnischen Kirche besteht und dass es nicht legitim ist, den in den Quellen zur bosnischen Kirche gar nicht belegten Namen der Bogomilen auf Bosnien zu übertragen. Durch die neuere Forschung hat sich immer klarer gezeigt, dass die landesspezifische Grabkultur allen drei Konfessionen eigen war: Katholiken, Orthodoxen und der bosnischen Kirche.

Die Stellung der bosnischen Kirche wird allerdings noch immer kontrovers diskutiert: Zahlreiche außerhalb Bosniens entstandene westkirchliche Quellen lassen darauf schließen, dass die bosnische Kirche ähnlich wie die Bogumilen und die Katharer eine dualistische Dogmatik vertrat; vor einigen Jahren hat Franjo Šanjek sie noch einmal so verortet.¹ Doch keine einzige Quelle aus Bosnien selbst gibt einen Anhalt für die Zuordnung zu den dualistischen Sonderbewegungen, und so müssen es andere Gründe sein, warum die bosnische Kirche der Westkirche so ein Dorn im Auge war. Dubravko Lovrenović zufolge ging es um die Autokephalie der bosnischen Kirche, um deren Weigerung, sich in die westkirchliche Hierarchie einzubinden. Die von Ungarn betriebene Verlegung des bosnischen Bistums Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts von Vrhbosna ins slawonische Đakovo war dabei nicht die Folge, sondern die Ursache für die Entfaltung der bosnischen Kirche. Die ungarische Krone wollte sich mit der Verlegung Patronatsrechte über dieses Bistum sichern. Erst das Vakuum der fehlenden Kirchenorganisation schuf den Freiraum für die Entstehung der stark monastisch