

AUTOREFERAT

1. **Name:** Monika Ożóg

2. University degrees:

- Doctor's degree in History, specialization: Ancient History, at the Faculty of History, Institute of History, University of Gdańsk (6 June 2008);
- M.A. in Art History, specialization: Museology, Cataloguing, Education, at the Faculty of Humanities, Institute of History, Catholic University of Lublin (9 June 2005);
- M.A. in History, specialization: Education and Archive Studies, at the Faculty of Humanities, Institute of Art History, Catholic University of Lublin (28 May 2003).

3. Academic employment:

- since 2009: adiunkt, Department of Medieval History, Institute of History, University of Opole;
- 2007 – 2010: assistant, Institute of Humanities (in the field of culture studies), State Higher Vocational School in Głogów;
- 2004 – 2007: history teacher, Pallottine Grammar School in Lublin (*Pallotyńskie Gimnazjum i Liceum im. Stefana Batorego w Lublinie*).

4. Achievements (pursuant to Article 16, section 2, of the March 14, 2003 Law on Academic Degrees and Titles):

- a) and b) Monograph: *Inter duas potestates. The Religious Policy of Theoderic the Great*], Kraków: WAM 2012, 313 pages, ISBN 978-83-7767-817-6 (academic review: prof. dr hab. Jerzy Strzelczyk).
- c) The academic objective of the monograph "*Inter duas potestates. The Religious Policy of Theoderic the Great*".

Theoderic the Great (ca. 452/453-526), a member of the Amal family, was a ruler whose years of political activity coincided with the advent of a new era and were marked by features of the two distinct civilizations. He was born in ca. 452/3. His father was Tiudimer and his mother's name was Ereulieva. At the age of 8, he was sent to the Constantinopolitan court of Leo I, where he would spend an entire decade, gaining knowledge and experience. He considered the acquisition of his first domain, the city of Singidunum (Belgrade), as the beginning of his rule, yet he would officially come to rule over the state of the Ostrogoths only upon the death of his father in 474. His conquest of Ravenna and the subsequent

assassination of Odoacer (493) marked the beginning of a new period – the Ostrogoth rule in Italy. Theoderic died on 26 August 526, at Ravenna. The grand mausoleum erected in his honour housed his tomb only for a short time (provided that it had ever served as his tomb at all).

From the political and cultural viewpoint, Theoderic stood at the boundary between the Roman tradition and his Germanic origin. He attempted to stay true to his own ethnic group, simultaneously adopting Roman laws and civic virtues. He was clearly impressed by being a Roman.

From the religious perspective, when he came to power in Italy at the Emperor's behest, he found himself amid the conflict embroiling Rome and Constantinople at that time. It was the so-called *Acacian schism* centred around the issue of the recognition of the Council of Chalcedon (451) with its teaching on the two natures in Christ as well as the acknowledgement of Constantinople as the principal see of the Church in the East. Also, a significant circumstance was Theoderic's Arian faith, which allowed him to keep equal distance from the two sees involved in the dispute.

Another ecclesiastical, and strictly Roman, problem noted in the *Liber Pontificalis* is the *Laurentian schism*, named after Lawrence, who was elected Pope on the same day as Symmachus (the latter recognized as legitimate Bishop of Rome by the king). Despite that initial recognition, it was to continue until at least 507, i.e., for less than a decade, because, among other things, the king had deftly manoeuvred his support from one to the other candidate, depending on what he and the notables of Rome (whom he could not afford to ignore) regarded as expedient.

In order to examine Theoderic's religious policy, I have chosen to rely on the text of the *Liber Pontificalis*, analyzing the biographies of the popes from the period of his reign and seeking any mentions or clues referring to him. The authors of this work, composed shortly after Theoderic's death, had been certainly well-informed, even though their accounts may not have been impartial. They were primarily concerned for representing the merits of the Bishops of Rome and the superiority of the Roman orthodoxy. Therefore, if they depict any positive aspects of the Arian ruler's reign, it is definitely worth taking note of.

In the biography of Pope Felix III (483-492), Theoderic's name is used only as a chronological pointer, appearing only in the second edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*. It is not surprising at all, considering the fact that Theoderic had just begun his rule in Italy at the time of Felix III's pontificate. Although scholars believe that there had not elapsed much time between the first and the second edition of the *LP* (see Introduction), this annotation can be found in the second one only, as if the authors had wished to state the fact that – at least to some people – might not have been very obvious anymore.

The biography of Gelasius (492-496) mentions Theoderic alongside the Emperor Zeno, dating his pontificate to the time of the reigns of the two rulers, Theoderic in the West, Zeno in the East. The *LP* made use of the initially ordinary Roman method of determining chronology by stating the names of emperors and consuls. It was continued until as late as Pope Liberius (352-366). Further on, it simply recorded the duration of the pontificates in years, months, and days, with no specific reference to figures of authority. I have noted that the second edition of the biography of Pope Felix III makes a mention of Theoderic's rule, while the authors of this particular biography revert to the previous practice, by mentioning

the names of Theoderic and Zeno, as if on a par, and omitting the consuls' names. It seems to imply, which one may assume only tentatively, that the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis* viewed Theoderic as the one who had ascended to the position formerly occupied by the emperors in the Western Roman Empire. The biography also makes another allusive reference to Theoderic, which is fairly vague without recourse to other relevant sources. It can be seen, e.g., in the statement that he *rescued Rome from the threat of famine*, which is somewhat less enigmatic only in the context of the correspondence between Gelasius and Theoderic's mother, where the Pope asks her to intercede with the king on this matter.

The dating in the biography of Pope Anastasius II (496-498) appears to be even more noteworthy, as it makes a mention of Theoderic only, with no reference to the Emperor at Constantinople. It may have been caused by the Emperor Anastasius' support for Monophysitism, even though the names of those emperors who were responsible for persecutions would not have been omitted.

Following the brief pontificate of Anastasius II, the biography of Pope Symmachus (498-514) offers much more information concerning Theoderic. As regards the dating, the name of the king is mentioned in the first place, followed by the Emperor Anastasius. This biography portrays Theoderic as the ruler who pronounces his just and immediate verdict in recognition of Symmachus' election. The *Liber Pontificalis* goes on to take note of his further involvement in the *Laurentian schism* and appointment of an inspector of the Holy See. We do not know why the authors passed over Theoderic's *adventus* in Rome and his role in summoning a synod to resolve the question of the accusations against the Pope. More information relating to this subject is provided by the author of the edition known as the *Fragmentum Laurentianum* (critical of Pope Symmachus), who states that Theoderic had ultimately granted all the titular churches of Rome to Symmachus. The *Liber Pontificalis* also fails to mention the king in connection with the disturbances in the city at that time, as if the authors had wanted to divert any suspicion of the king's complicity in the unrest.

The biography of Hormisdas (514-523) is concerned with the resolution of the *Acacian schism*; it takes note of the Pope's consultation with the king, their joint delegation sent to the East, as well as of the jointly prepared policy in response to the civil conflict in the East caused by Vitalianus. According to the authors of the *LP*, the co-operation between the king and the Pope was so obvious that the Emperor Justin would dispatch one and the same delegation to the king and the Pope in anticipation of their concerted decision. Indeed, such concerted action did take place, which is clearly depicted, in particular, in the second edition. After the death of Anastasius and upon Justin's accession to the throne, the Pope continued to consult the king on the matter of negotiating with the Emperor. This particular point underscores Theoderic's role in bringing an end to the schism, although, to which I refer in my work on a number of occasions, some other sources make it appear as if the whole situation had been actually working to his advantage *inter duas potestates*. Apparently, another token of a somewhat more sympathetic view of Theoderic is the information concerning the gifts donated to St. Peter's Basilica. It says that Clovis, king of the Franks, who had just been baptized in the Catholic faith, donated a crown adorned with precious stones, which is immediately followed by the information that king Theoderic donated a gift of two silver chandeliers, 70 lbs each, an offering no worse than that presented by the Catholic king of the Franks. During Hormisdas' episcopate, several interventions were

undertaken by the king in connection with the Jews, but our main source does not make any mention of it.

The biography of Pope John I (523-526) makes a note of the measures undertaken by the king, outraged at the action of the Emperor Justin, who had ordered the seizure of the Arian churches along with their members. It says that he told the Pope to go to Constantinople in order to persuade the Emperor to change his decision. At the same time, he warned that he would seek revenge on the Catholics in Italy if the Pope's mission ended in failure. According to the *Liber Pontificalis* (but contrary to other sources), the Emperor agreed to return the churches to the Arians in order to spare the blood of the Roman faithful. It is however difficult to determine the actual facts; the author goes on to say that Theoderic was dissatisfied with the results of John's mission and the senatorial delegation. Upon their return, the envoys had to face the king's discontent and eventual incarceration. The *Liber Pontificalis* also notes that the king had Boetius and Symmachus imprisoned and sentenced to death. The Pope died in prison, and Theoderic would die only three months later, which the second version records without any further comment, while the *epitome K* suggests that Theoderic's sudden death caused by a lightning be regarded as divine retribution. Let us note that according to other sources, Theoderic's death was caused by a digestive disorder.

The biography of Felix IV (526-530) makes use of the previous manner of dating, as it mentions Theoderic and Justin as the reigning rulers as well as the two consulship dates. One of the *Liber Pontificalis* editions – *epitome K* – notes that Felix had been elected pope at the behest of king Theoderic. The absence of this detail in the second edition allows us to assume that the authors had preferred to keep silent on the issue. Other sources should be consulted for more details, while as far as our source is concerned, this is most likely the last time it refers to the king's interference in the church affairs.

On account of the bias of our primary source, it was necessary to keep referring to a number of other sources, which are not very impartial, either, notably the so-called *Excerpta Valesiana*, Cassiodorus' *Variae*, Jordanes' *Getica*, Ennodius' *Panegyric* and *Epistles*. Chronicles of the fifth- and sixth centuries are of fundamental importance as well. The *Edict of Theoderic* is taken into consideration, albeit its authorship remains a matter of dispute. Nonetheless, the legal provisions contained therein have much in common with the king's decrees known from other sources.

Our research reveals an image of a prudent ruler, capable of taking advantage of the existing conflict situations. It is best exemplified by the above-mentioned two schisms, *Acacian* and *Laurentian*. In the case of the former schism, it seems that Theoderic had no intention to act in favour of a reunification of the Churches at the two capital cities of the Empire in order to prevent any possible action by the united and consolidated orthodox Church against the Arians (as if following the Roman tradition of *divide et impera*). It would become reality after the year 519, when the schism had come to an end primarily thanks to the efforts of the Emperor Justin. Possibly, Theoderic may have been somewhat consoled by the fact that the Emperor wished to co-opt the king's son-in-law Eutharic as a co-consul during the first year of Justin's reign.

It can be seen that the Arian – Catholic relations had assumed certain “national” traits. In Theoderic's view, the Arians are Goths, the Catholics are Romans, whereas conversions from one confession to another acquires a taste of national treason. He even goes so far as to

use the names of the confessions and the nations interchangeably. It leads him to undertake some political manoeuvring in an attempt to establish an Arian alliance of Germanic peoples inhabiting the Western Mediterranean, centred around the idea of consolidating forces able to counterpoise the power of the Byzantine Empire rather than the opposition to the Catholicism itself. At the same time, however, he makes a pilgrimage to Rome, is received with honours by the Pope, gives donations to Rome's churches, and he acts, as one of the sources puts it, "as if he were a Catholic". Still, shortly after his return to Ravenna, it does not prevent him from giving credence to those who make accusations against the Pope and eventually supporting the antipope Laurentius.

It is notable that his conduct towards Jews did not depart from the laws enacted by Roman emperors. Theoderic retained their privileges, yet insisted on maintaining respect for the law. In order to be a fair and just ruler, he would punish any acts of hostility against the Jews.

Such a policy was apparently guided by the ideal of religious tolerance and it is often described in that particular vein. It seems, however, that his actions had been motivated by his political pragmatism moderated by the ideal of *romanitatis* rather than respect for religion itself.

5. Other academic and research achievements

They can be divided into several categories that are in close relation with the scope of my research work:

a) Publications related to Theoderic the Great:

In the course of my work on this book, I availed myself of the opportunity to present some individual conclusions at various conferences or in articles, in each case pointing out that they shall form part of a broader, more comprehensive, treatment:

1. *Theoderic the Great and the Laurentian Schism*, [in:] *Kościół starożytny – Królestwo Chrystusa i instytucja*, eds., Polihymnia Lublin 2010, 191-199.
2. *The Byzantine Emperors' Position on the Rule of Theoderic the Great in the West*, "Polonia Sacra" 29 (2011), 97- 111.
3. (with H. Pietras SJ) *Theoderic's Edict, Synodal Provisions, and the Right of Asylum*, "Polonia Sacra" 29 (2011), 85-96 (the co-author's statement enclosed).
4. *Veritas Imaginum. The Image of the Authority of Theoderic the Great as Exemplified by Some Selected Numismatic Specimens*, "Perspektywy Kultury" 5 (2/2011), 43-58.
5. *The Arianism of Theoderic the Great*, [in:] *The orthodoxy, heresy and schism in the ancient Church*, eds. F. Draczkowski, F. Pałucki, P. Szczur, Lublin: Polihymnia 2012, 105-121.
6. *Theoderic the Great and the Acacian Schism in the Light of the "Liber Pontificalis"*, "U Szyłku Starożytności" 11 (2012), 107-126.

The articles written in the course of the work on the above monograph are concerned primarily with the issues discussed in the book. I would like to add just a few words with reference to the article entitled “*Veritas imaginum. The Image of the Authority of Theoderic the Great as Exemplified by Some Selected Numismatic Specimens*”.

The article aimed to demonstrate to what extent, and if at all, the representations depicted on numismatic items linked with Theoderic had any connection with the contemporary political and religious situation of the state under his rule; moreover, to what extent he himself may have influenced the portrayals in question or how much he could have been compelled to take into consideration the opinion of the Eastern Roman emperor and to make use of the already established patterns. After some thorough study of the relevant literature, which I would like to continue in the future, it turns out that there is no certainty as to both the *mobilia* attributed to Theoderic and the Ostrogothic coinage itself. There is much evidence to the effect that they may have been attributed to him simply in the absence of any other potential candidate. There is also much doubt concerning the *multiplum* from Senigallia, of which only one specimen is known to have been found, and whose circumstances of origin are still open to conjecture.

b) Publications on the history of the Church in late Antiquity

1. *The Ancient Church in Relation to Temples and Statues of Deities*, WAM Kraków 2009, 220 pages. ISBN 978-83-7505-405-7

This book has been based on my doctoral dissertation entitled *Stosunek późnoantycznych chrześcijan do rzymsko-hellenistycznych świątyń i posągów bóstw* [“The Attitude of the Late-Antique Christians to Roman and Hellenistic Temples and Statues of Deities”].

It is concerned with questions relating to the Christian attitudes towards objects of pagan worship and makes an attempt to demonstrate the stance of the Church and the contemporary Christians towards pagan temples and statues (chapter 3). I have also concentrated on the views of the Church Fathers and early Christian authors as regards the representational art of the 2nd – 5th centuries (from the earliest accounts by Aristides and Athenagoras to the later works of Jerome and Augustine), including numerous arguments expressed by pagans and Christians in respect of the preservation and functioning of various objects of pagan worship (chapter 1). Another important aspect is connected with examining and interpreting the religious and imperial legislation in terms of the Christians’ attitudes towards objects of ancient pagan worship (Theodosian Code, Apostolic Constitutions, synodal decrees), which is discussed in chapter 2.

The early centuries of Christianity were marked, among other things, by different attitudes of the believers towards the cult objects of ancient pagan religions. The actual position would thus depend on the period as well as on individual rulers and their personal religious preferences. The relations between the Church and the pagan circles in the period of the existence of the official Roman state religion differed from those in the period following

the legitimization of the Christian faith. There is no doubt that the Church and its ardent believers would destroy objects connected with pagan religions, but they were not motivated by reasons such as aversion to works perceived as products of an alien civilization. In fact, their motivation stemmed from ideological beliefs, where simple adherents of the Christian faith set out to destroy idols that were regarded as seats of demons and evil spirits. Even though such acts of destruction were seen by many ordinary Christians as noble deeds, and even as something that they were obliged to do, it would be difficult to decide beyond any doubt whether the contemporary church and state authorities deemed such actions as commendable.

The expanse of the 4th-century Roman Empire experienced a variety of relations between the worshippers of ancient gods and Christians. There might have existed a glaring discrepancy between what the official imperial decrees provided for and the reality. The space between the legislative norm and the executive was occupied by the entire apparatus of state administration and therefore the law could have been interpreted differently. The imperial legislation on religious matters constituted a general directive which may have been followed to a greater or lesser extent.

It is obvious that the Old-Testament prohibition on making images and representations was applied in equal measure to Christian and pagan works. Religious arts, regardless of their actual themes, may have thus led to idolatry. The ancient Christendom had a negative view of such representations, which was caused by fears of resurgence of paganism and depravity of the Christian faithful. Nonetheless, as much as possible under the circumstances, it showed concern for such objects. It is best attested in various synodal decisions as well as re-adaptations of ancient temples and sculptures for the purposes of Christian worship.

The concern of the Church for the objects in question is reflected in the tendency to re-adapt the former pagan temples and statues. There are a number of examples where pagan shrines and sculptures were turned into Christian ones. On the one hand, statues were destroyed in various locations throughout the Empire; on the other, it is notable that there was a growing interest in collecting such objects (particularly in the age of Constantine I and Theodosius II). Some educated circles would strive to protect such buildings and objects, and they very frequently would do so for their aesthetical value. Temples and other objects of pagan worship would often fall into ruin over time, abandoned and left unattended. If such actions took place, they were relatively rare events, occurring mainly in the East and northern Africa, instigated by local bishops and their fanatical supporters.

As a matter of course, I have chosen to continue researching my doctoral dissertation subject further, especially in such areas of study as viewing and understanding art, beauty, and representation of in the ancient Church, as well as some selected episodes from the history of the Church in late Antiquity.

1. *Tertullian and his Views on Representational Art*, “Vox Patrum” 27 (2007) vol. 50-51, 313-318. (published in 2008)
2. *Christianity in Relation to the Classical Culture in the 4th century*, “Studia Humanistica Gedanensia” 1 (2008), 101-113.

3. *The Demolition of the Temple of Asclepius at Aigai in the Context of Constantine's Policy on Pagans*, "Vox Patrum" 28 (2008) vol. 52/2, 797-806. (in 2009)
4. *Religion and the Identity of a City as Exemplified by Constantinople in the 4th century*, [in:] *Człowiek. Religia. Tożsamość*, eds. G. Cyran, E. Skorupska-Raczyńska, vol. 2, Gorzów Wielkopolski 2008, 329-336.
5. *The Christian Takeover of the Maccabees martyrrium (synagogue) at Antioch*, "Przegląd Religioznawczy" 2 (2008), 3-12. (in 2010)
6. *The Legislation of Constantine, Constans, and Constantius on Objects of Pagan Worship*, [in:] *Romanitas i christianitas. Stanisław Płodzień (1913-1962) in memoriam*, eds. A. Dębiński, S. Józwiak, KUL Lublin 2009, 139-149.
7. *The Marriage Ceremony in the Writings of John Chrysostom*, "Vox Patrum" 29 (2009) vol. 53-54, 175-191.
8. *The Church and its influence on the representative art between 2nd and 4th century AD*, [in:] *Series Bizantina. Studia nad Sztuką Bizantyńską i Postbizantyńską*, eds. W. Deluga, M. Janocha, vol. VII, 2009, Warszawa 2009, 7-14. Polish version [in:] *Roczniki Naukowe IH PWSZ w Głogowie*, 1 (2009), eds. S. Lisewska, M. Ożóg, PWSZ Głogów 2009, 97-109.
9. *Did Libanius Have to Defend Pagan Temples? An Attempt to Answer the Question on the Basis of „Pros Theodosion ton basilea yper ton hieron”*, [in:] *Christianitas Antiqua II. Kapłaństwo i urząd*, ed. W. Gajewski, Gdańsk 2009, 220-230.
10. *The Asclepeion at Aigai in the 4th century AD*, [in:] *Artystyczne tradycje pozaeuropejskich kultur. Studia nad Sztuką Orientu*, eds. B. Łakomska, J. Malinowski, Warszawa 2009, 23-30.
11. *Constantinopolis dedicatur paene omnium urbium nuditate. Constantine the Great and Arts*, [in:] *Roczniki Naukowe IH PWSZ w Głogowie*, 2 (2010), eds. S. Lisewska, M. Ożóg, PWSZ Głogów 2010, 95-103 (published in 2011).

2. Publications connected with the source edition of Jerome's *Epistles*

For many years, various members of the Patristic circles have called for the preparation of a new translation of Jerome's letters. The collection is a valuable source concerning the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries in terms of both the wealth and weight of the information it contains.

The former translation, the work of Prof. Father Jan Czuj, which was published in the early 1950s, was not only outdated linguistically, and thus difficult to understand for the young reader, but it also had a serious doctrinal flaw. It is good from the perspective of philological considerations, yet in view of the fact that the translator was obliged, notably in the texts published with the necessary *imprimatur* of the Catholic Church, to use the officially approved text of the Bible, i.e., the Vulgate for the Latin version and the Jakub Wujek translation of the Bible for the Polish version. However, in his letters, especially those concerned with exegesis, Jerome examines various lections of the text, paying attention

to particular variants, making choices and emendations. He is the author of the Vulgate, even though it was not written at one time. It is even worse when it comes to the Polish translation, as in many instances to be found in his commentaries Jerome would refer to meanings other than those present in Jakub Wujek's rendition of the Bible.

In consequence, it became something of a necessity to re-edit the Polish text and that was exactly the proposal I received from the Publishing House WAM. Considering the fact that the publication is a bilingual (Latin and Polish) edition, the editing workload has been divided in two: prof. dr hab. Henryk Pietras SJ was responsible for the editing of the Latin text, while I was entrusted with the Polish one. The previously existing translation remained the basis for the present one; modifications comprised the use of new spelling and punctuation rules, and the replacement of the archaic expressions with those more intelligible to the modern reader. The most crucial of my tasks was the re-editing of Biblical citations in such a way that they could best reflect Jerome's sense. For this purpose, it was necessary to juxtapose them with the existing translations into other languages (the most recent Italian and English editions proved to be particularly helpful). I also contributed to this publication by editing the commentaries and writing a strictly informative introduction on the figure of Jerome. This five-volume edition has been provided with new indexes of persons and geographical names, subject and Biblical indexes, as well as a listing of the most important editions of Jerome's *Epistolarium*, its recipients, and a list of works cited by Jerome, complemented with the information on their Polish translations.

1. Jerome of Stridon, *Epistles*, vol. 1 (1-50), introduction and edition, on the basis of a translation by Father Jan Czuj - Monika Ożóg, the Latin text edited by Henryk Pietras SJ, *Źródła Myśli Teologicznej* 54, WAM Kraków 2010, pages XVI, 225+225*. ISBN 978-83-7505-586-3.
2. Jerome of Stridon, *Epistles*, vol. 2 (51-79), introduction and edition, on the basis of a translation by Father Jan Czuj - Monika Ożóg, the Latin text edited by Henryk Pietras SJ, *Źródła Myśli Teologicznej* 55, WAM Kraków 2010, pages 254+254*. ISBN 978-83-7505-735-5.
3. Jerome of Stridon, *Epistles*, vol. 3 (80-115), introduction and edition, on the basis of a translation by Father Jan Czuj - Monika Ożóg, the Latin text edited by Henryk Pietras SJ, *Źródła Myśli Teologicznej* 61, WAM Kraków 2011, pages 220+220*. ISBN 978-83-7505-889-5.
4. Jerome of Stridon, *Epistles*, vol. 4 (116-130), introduction and edition, on the basis of a translation by Father Jan Czuj - Monika Ożóg, the Latin text edited by Henryk Pietras SJ, *Źródła Myśli Teologicznej* 63, WAM Kraków 2011, pages 209+209*. ISBN 978-83-7767-028-6.
5. Jerome of Stridon, *Epistles*, vol. 4 (131-156), introduction and edition, on the basis of a translation by Father Jan Czuj - Monika Ożóg, the Latin text edited by Henryk Pietras SJ, *Źródła Myśli Teologicznej* 68, WAM Kraków 2013, pages 408. ISBN 978-83-7767-198-6.

In the course of my work on the edition of the *Epistles* (in the years 2009-2012), I became interested in several questions concerning Jerome, which I discussed in the three articles mentioned below. The third one of these articles, on the travelling undertaken by monks and clergy, has already passed through review and is pending publication.

1. *Saint Jerome and "veritas hebraica" on the basis of the correspondence with Saint Augustine*, "Vox Patrum" 30 (2010), vol. 55, 159-173. (in 2011)
2. *The Old Age in Jerome's "Epistles"*, "Vox Patrum" 31 (2011), vol. 56, 327-348. (in 2012)
3. *Travels of Monks and Clergy at the Turn of the 4th and 5th Centuries in the Light of Jerome's Writings*, "Vox Patrum" 32 (2012), vol. 57 (forthcoming in 2013).

3. Publications devoted to the history and arts of Lublin and Głogów

In the years 2009-2012, I published several articles concerned with the history and arts of the former places of my residence, the cities of Lublin and Głogów. Owing to my education in art history and history, they constitute cross-sectional surveys of broad subjects (such as the most significant buildings in the history of each city) as well as some more specific studies of specific topics, e.g., the medieval architecture of the Dominican Order.

1. *The Characteristics of a Group of Martyrological-Themed Statues in Lublin*, [in:] *Rzeźba Polska* 13 (2009), 119-124.
2. *The History of the Jesuit Order in Głogów*, [in:] *Zakony i zgromadzenia zakonne na Ziemi Głogowskiej*, ed. M. R. Górniak, Głogów 2009, 103-117.
3. *The Romanesque St. Peter's Church in the Light of the Contemporary Monastic Guidelines*, [in:] *Glogovia Maior. Wielki Głogów między blaskiem dziejów i cieniem ruin*, eds. B. Czechowicz, M. Konopnicka, Głogów-Zielona Góra 2010, 345-354.
4. *One Thousand Years of History in the Architecture of Głogów*, [in:] *Dziedzictwo kulturowe Głogowa – wczoraj i dziś*, eds., Głogów 2010, 35-54.
5. *The Architecture of the Gothic Dominican Church in Lublin in the Light of the Available Sources*, "Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne Śląska Opolskiego" 32 (2012), 309-323.

4. Publications concerning magic practices in the ancient Church

It was during my thorough study of the issues connected with Theoderic the Great that I turned my attention to the question of the presence of magic practices in the Church in the course of the first millennium. My first work dealing with this particular subject was a review of the book by Paweł Wygralak, *Stanowisko Kościoła wobec idolatrii i magii na terenach*

Galii i Hiszpanii w późnej starożytności chrześcijańskiej (VI-VII w.), UAM Wydział Teologiczny, Poznań 2011, 322 pages, [in:] "Przegląd Piśmiennictwa Teologicznego" 2/34 (2011), 131-133. In spite of his encyclopaedia-style treatment of many relevant points, the author left a great deal of questions unexplained, which inspired me to do some further research on this topic. It allowed me to write several articles for the general public as well as to organize a conference on the magic practices in the early Church. I have also written an article on this subject (pending publication), entitled *Magic Practices in the Synodal Acts – Terminology Issues and an Outline of the Problem*.

Opele 8 w. 2013 r.

Wojciech Opat