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Abstract

This dissertation examines the marriage alliances of the Riurikids, the Orthodox rulers of Kyivan Rus’, with western-rite (Latin Christian / Catholic) rulers. Using both narrative and legal sources, it considers the process by which the brides in these marriages acculturated to the environment of their husbands’ courts, and the degree to which they were able to maintain ties with the culture of their birth. Through the prism of these women’s lives, the dissertation adds to our understanding of the social history of Orthodox-Catholic interaction among lay elites from the early eleventh century to 1204. While individual clerics such as Metropolitan Ioann of Kyiv disapproved of Orthodox-Catholic marriages in the 1080s, such condemnation was an extreme position for its time, and was rooted in concerns with preserving the ritual purity of Orthodox believers.

Beginning in the late twelfth century, some western lay persons and clerics also may have disapproved of ties with Rus’, but their views remained in the minority. The dissertation confirms previous findings that the so-called Church Schism of 1054 was not an essential factor in the formation of these marriages until the thirteenth century. It demonstrates that brides in these inter-rite marriages did not experience a complete conversion to the religious tradition of
their husbands nor rigidly maintain their allegiance to the culture of their birth; rather, they were able to keep some aspects of their former confessional and cultural identity, depending also on the specific court culture in which they found themselves. Cultural continuity with Rus’ was especially strong when brides were sent to areas of so-called “New Europe” (neighbouring Scandinavia, Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary). The dissertation concludes that marriages between the Riurikids and western-rite dynasties contributed to a cosmopolitan court culture among medieval elites at a time when barriers between Orthodoxy and Catholicism still remained porous.
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A Note on Transliteration, Names, Titles, and Dates

The rendering of medieval Eastern European names for a contemporary English audience poses challenges: either intelligibility or accuracy ends up being sacrificed. Dimitri Obolensky once commented, “There is no way known to me of achieving consistency in this thankless task without breaking the rules of common sense or falling into pedantry.”

This dissertation employs a modified version of the Library of Congress Romanization (transliteration) system for Greek, Old Church Slavonic, Russian, and Ukrainian names. The modifications are intended to make non-familiar names as accessible to English readers as possible, and omits ligatures and most diacritical marks. Drawing on the approach of Serge A. Zenkovsky, the soft vowels ю and я are transliterated as “Yu” and “Ya” at the beginning of words (for example, “Yaroslav” which is far less daunting to an English eye than the cluster of vowels in “Iaroslav”). These soft vowels have been transliterated, however, as “iu” and “ia” in the middle of words (“Sviatoslav” rather than “Svyatoslav”). Characters in Old Church Slavonic, Old East Slavic, and pre-Petrine Russian orthography have been romanized and normalized according to the Library of Congress’s Old Church Slavonic transliteration table, even where nasalization may not have occurred in the East Slavic recension. Diacritical marks are retained where they normally occur in Polish and Czech Latin alphabets. In direct citations of English translations of Slavonic texts, the transliteration system used by the author of the cited text has been retained.

For personal names, the dissertation attempts to balance accessibility to an English-speaking audience with recognition of European linguistic diversity. It follows the approach of recent works on Central European history, including the Cambridge Medieval Textbooks series, in using the modern vernacular variants of each name; thus the German emperor “Henricus” is

rendered as Heinrich IV of Germany, but the French king by this name as Henri I.3 The names of royal brides are more difficult to standardize as they moved between boundaries, and their names might have been pronounced differently in their natal land than in their husband’s land. To simplify matters, the names of princesses given to them at birth have been used throughout (for instance, the twelfth-century Rus’ princess who became the wife of Bolesław III Wrymouth of Poland is referred to in the dissertation as “Sbyslava,” rather than by the Polish form of her name, “Zbysława”). Names of Greek origin, however, retain their original Greek form: for instance, “Euphrosyne” rather than its Slavic version, “Evfrosinia.” Sobriquets of rulers are given in English (Yaroslav the Wise, Bolesław III Wrymouth). For the title “kniaz’,” held by the rulers of Kyivan Rus’, the dissertation follows Andrzej Poppe in translating it as “prince” in the general sense of a “sovereign ruler.”4

Place-names have changed radically in Eastern Europe over the centuries. For the most part contemporary place names are used with major alternatives noted in brackets, as, for example, Wrocław (German: Breslau). The main exception to this rule is in the use of medieval names for the city of Constantinople and Rus’ for the medieval territory stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, whose political centre and ecclesiastical centre lay in Kyiv (Kiev).5 Greek chronicles

---


5 The toponym “Kievan Rus’” or “Kyivan Rus’” was first coined by historians in the nineteenth century, and, since the twentieth century, is used concurrently with the terms “pre-Mongol Rus’” and “early Rus’,” Leontii Voitovych, Kniazha doba na Rusi: portrety elity (Bila Tserkva, Ukraine: O. V. Pshonkivskii, 2006), 11. Nicholas V. Riasanovsky and Mark D. Steinberg note that, “Most scholars now prefer the archaic term ‘Rus’ to the more modern ‘Russia,’ not only because Rus’ was the historical term, but also because it is a matter of intense dispute whether the Kievan state represents the early history of a continuous history of ‘Russia’ or one of many separate histories of...

xv
first used the term *Rhōs* as an ethnonym to describe a Scandinavian people they encountered around the year 838 and, beginning in the tenth century, applied the term *Rhōsia* for the territory of this people.\(^6\) Up to the fourteenth century, however, native Rus’ chronicles themselves referred to their own territory as “Rus’” or the “land of the Rus’” (*ruskaia zemlia*), using this term to refer especially to the centre of the realm encompassing present-day Kyiv (Kiev), Chernihiv (Chernigov), and Pereiaslav (Pereiaslav).\(^7\) In Donald Ostrowski’s words, especially from the twelfth century onward when greater political fragmentation occurred, “the term Rus’ was equated [...] only with the towns whose princes were in the line of succession to the throne of Kiev.”\(^8\) For the sake of simplicity, however, the term “Rus’” will be used to describe the entirety of the territory under control of the ruling Riurikid dynasty (on this family, see the introduction below).

Finally, for ease of readership, Byzantine and Rus’ *Anno Mundi* dates are converted to western *Anno Domini* (Common Era) dates. Constantinopolitan chronology, adopted by the Rus’ in the process of Christianization, calculated that the world began in the year 5508.\(^9\) The Byzantines, however, considered that the year began in September, while the Rus’ counted the beginning of the year either from the first of March (“March dating”, Russian: *martovsky*) or on the first of March of the subsequent year (“Ultra-March” dating, Russian: *ul'tramartovsky*).\(^10\) To obtain the correct *Anno Domini* year beginning in January, 5508 has to be subtracted from the *Anno Mundi* year when March Dating was used by the chronicle and 5509 when Ultra-March dating was used.
by the chronicle.\textsuperscript{11} The matter is further complicated by the fact that Rus’ chroniclers sometimes used a combination of both systems, though the Primary Chronicle generally uses March dating.\textsuperscript{12} As a result, when converting Anno Mundi dates to Anno Domini dates, sometimes two possibilities for the Anno Domini dates are given in brackets (for instance: 988/989).


Introduction: 
Rus’ Between East and West

Recent studies on medieval relations between today’s Byzantine Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism have moved away from using the macroscopic models of a mutually opposed “East” and “West,” which have traditionally defined the Greek Byzantine and Slavic world on the one hand, and the Latin Christian world on the other. Rather, several studies have focused on individual encounters between members of these two cultures. The study of individuals allows scholars to understand the process of cross-cultural interaction, because cultural contacts in the Middle Ages required the physical presence of travelers from one land to another. The importance of personal mediation as an aid to ongoing cultural ties between Orthodoxy and Latin Christianity (Catholicism) has long been acknowledged in the case of royal brides. Through their journeys to marry in a foreign court, royal women helped circulate books, physical objects, and ideas from one culture to another. For example, several studies have focused on the role of the Byzantine princess Theophano, who became the wife of Emperor Otto II in 972, in introducing Byzantine imperial titles, forms of art, textiles, eastern saints, and even the


15 For the sake of convenience, *faute de mieux*, this dissertation uses the contemporary term “Catholic” and the more neutral “western-rite” or “Latin rite”/“Latin Christian / Christianity” as synonyms (and, vice versa, “eastern-rite” and “Orthodox / Orthodoxy” as synonyms). Neither absolute division between these two branches of Christianity nor liturgical homogeneity within each tradition is implied by the use of these contemporary terms. The use of these terms and their shortcomings are discussed in further detail below.

architectural feature of the women’s gallery (Frauenempore) to German churches.\textsuperscript{17} Marriages between elite families thus could be particularly fruitful settings for encounters between different cultures and religious traditions.\textsuperscript{18}

Almost entirely missing from studies of brides in medieval Orthodox-Catholic marriages, however, are women who came from early Rus’, the medieval ancestor state of Ukraine, Russia, and Belarus’. This vast territory was ruled by a single clan, known in fifteenth-century sources onward as the Riurikids (the Riurikovichi) after the semi-legendary ninth-century Varangian (Viking) leader Riurik (Scandinavian: Hrorikr).\textsuperscript{19} Indeed, despite the fact that the Riurikid dynasty which ruled over Rus’ officially converted to Byzantine Orthodoxy under Prince Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015) in 988/989, the majority of the dynasty’s marriages alliances were concluded with western Christian rulers.\textsuperscript{20} As Simon Franklin writes, although the Riurikids had numerous cultural and ecclesiastical ties with Byzantium,

\[\ldots\] Byzantium was geographically remote, very rarely did any Rus’ prince come face to face with Byzantium by necessity, and no Byzantine military force ever entered or contested Rus’ lands. In contrast, more trade routes linked the lands of the Rus’ with different parts of Western Europe than with Byzantium, and several Western European peoples and polities shared substantial

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Moore, \textit{Exchanges in Exoticism}, 9.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19} The appearance of the term “Riurikovichi” to describe the ruling clan of this territory and the creation (and invention) of extended royal genealogies in the fifteenth century is described in Ostrowski, “Systems of Succession”: 30 and 36.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
and periodically contested border zones with the Rus’ dynasty. For many of the dynasty political dealings with Byzantium were an option, political dealings with one or more lands of Western Europe were a necessity.  

This dissertation’s conservative list places the number of these inter-rite marriage alliances between the Riurikids and western-rite Christian dynasties in the years 1000 to 1204 at thirty-nine, with an additional seventeen possible marriages.

The many marriages concluded between the Riurikids and western Christian dynasties during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries occurred at the same time as Christian ritual, canon law, and theology began to diverge into what is now Orthodoxy and Catholicism. The history of this divergence, commonly called the Church Schism, usually is approached from the point of view of theological and intellectual history. Studies of the dynamics of Orthodox-Catholic relations, with some exceptions such as the work of Bernard Leib, however, often do not include Rus’. Rather, their focus has been largely on the binary of Greek / Latin interaction. The place of Rus’ and Riurikid brides in this history therefore is still little known.

This lack of consideration of Rus’ as an independent actor in Orthodox-Catholic relations may be due to the fact that Kyivan Rus’ in historiography is often treated as an extension of Byzantium, and as a polity which has maintained a negative and / or aloof attitude toward Latin Christendom. In Anglo-American scholarship especially, Kyivan Rus’ has been treated largely as

21 Simon Franklin, “Kievan Rus’ (1015-1125),” in The Cambridge History of Russia, vol. I.: From Early Rus’ to 1689, ed. Maureen Perrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 91. For further discussion on reasons why the Riurikids concluded more marriage alliances with Latin Christian rulers rather than with the Byzantine Empire, see also Chapter One.

22 See the genealogical appendices.


24 Sophia Senyk, an eastern Catholic historian, has provided an overview of some of the historiography on medieval Orthodox-Catholic relations in her work, A History of the Church in Ukraine, vol. 1: To the End of the Thirteenth Century (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 1993), 299-300.
a cultural sub-set of Byzantium, due to Dimitri Obolensky’s influential concept of Rus’ as belonging to the “Byzantine Commonwealth.”

Along similar lines, Riccardo Picchio grouped Rus’ apart from Western Europe and joined together to Serbia and Bulgaria within his concept of a medieval Slavia Orthodoxa. In his view, these lands had in common the use of the liturgical and literary language of Old Church Slavonic and were thus culturally different from Slavia Romana (or Latina). This conceptual division has been nuanced by Henrik Birnbaum, who noted that Old Church Slavonic was, at one time or another, the liturgical language both of medieval Slavic lands who accepted their church hierarchy from Rome (Bohemia, Croatia) and those who accepted their church hierarchy from Constantinople (Bulgaria, Rus’, Serbia).

In Slavic scholarship, the idea that Russia, identified with Rus’, has always maintained close ties with Byzantium and has rejected western Christian influence has remained a powerful one. It was promoted particularly in the nineteenth century by the myth of “Holy Russia,” which stressed the supposed perpetual purity of Orthodox faith in this land. An important consequence of this approach to the past has been the diminution of the role of Scandinavians in early Rus’ history in the so-called “Normanist Controversy,” a key debate that has raged in Russian scholarship since the eighteenth century. During the twentieth century, with some important exceptions such as Leo Klejn, the majority of Soviet scholars were firm “Anti-

---


28 According to Wil van den Bercken, the term “holy Russia” (“sviatorusskaia zemlia”) is used for the first time in 1564 in the correspondence of Prince Andrei Kurbsky with Tsar Ivan IV, in which the prince criticizes Ivan IV’s bloodthirsty reign for ruining the “holy Russian land,” as cited in idem, *Holy Russia and Christian Europe: East and West in the Religious Ideology of Russia*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1999), 155-156.

Normanists,” that is to say, among other related issues, they denied or minimized the role of Scandinavians in the formation of Kyivan Rus’ as a polity in the early ninth century. Today, most Russian scholars widely acknowledge the presence and importance of Scandinavians merchants, mercenaries, and settlers in early Rus’ history. At the same time, however, researchers are now more aware of the multi-ethnic composition of early Rus’, which comprised not only Scandinavians and East Slavs, but also Finno-Ugric and Turkic peoples.

More recently, scholars recognize that although Rus’, like Byzantium, accepted the patriarch of Constantinople as the head of its church, at the same time its rulers and inhabitants maintained their own direct ties to what is now Western Europe in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. Sophia Senyk and Michele Colucci, among others, have argued that, as a newly Christian land, Rus’ had no reasons to share the same antagonisms toward western Christians as Byzantium did. Nonetheless, the inter-rite marriages of the Riurikids, and in particular the experiences of women within these marriages, are largely missing from the historiography of the Schism.


33 In North America, the most important researcher on ties between early Rus’ and Latin Christian Europe has been Christian Raffensperger. See his works: Reimagining Europe, and idem, “Reimagining Europe: Discussing Rus’ in a Wider Context,” in Russian History, vol. 42.2 (2015): 204-216.

Rather than being incorporated into the wider history of relations between today’s Orthodoxy and Catholicism, these inter-rite marriages have been treated primarily in genealogical studies as well as in studies on Rus’ foreign relations. In the latter, these inter-rite marriages are listed alongside other forms of interaction with western lands such as military alliances and trading ties.\(^{35}\) Although scholars justifiably have studied how marriages played a crucial role in cementing military and personal alliances between rulers, this approach poses certain limitations. Focusing mainly on the usefulness of marriage alliances for foreign relations imposes an artificially rigid boundary between secular and sacred spheres in the Middle Ages, and ignores the question of the interaction of gender and power.\(^{36}\)

In fact, marriages between medieval elites did not take place in a secular vacuum or in an exclusively male sphere of influence.\(^{37}\) The institution of medieval marriage linked the clerical and the secular: in the East, it had been subject to ecclesiastical control since the ninth century, while in the West, the theology of marriage as a sacrament developed over the course of the twelfth century.\(^{38}\) As Christian rulers, elite families shared responsibility with bishops and

---


\(^{37}\) Janet L. Nelson rightly warns that one should avoid adopting for the Middle Ages “a rationalist view of politics as calculation operating in an autonomous secular sphere,” in eadem, Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 290.

\(^{38}\) Novel 79 of Emperor Leo VI the Wise in the ninth century stated that marriages which were concluded without ecclesiastical blessing were to be held as invalid. Most recent edition: Les Nouvelles de Léon VI le Sage, trans. and eds., Pierre Noailles and Alphonse Dain (Paris: Les Belles Letters, 1944), 294-297. Scholarship on marriage in Byzantium is still in nascent phases compared to scholarship on western marriage. A prominent scholar in the field is Angeliki E. Laiou. See for instance, his Mariage, amour, et parenté à Byzance aux Xle-XIIIe siècles (Paris: De Boccard, 1992). The scholarship on the development of marriage in the West is vast. Two classic studies on the topic are: Christopher Brooke, The Medieval Idea of Marriage (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) and Georges
clergy for the maintenance of religion. Riurikid princesses, like royal women in Latin Christian lands, were not only marriage partners who helped cement peace or prevent conflict between their male relatives and their husbands, but also important patrons of Christian institutions such as churches and monasteries. Viewing dynastic marriages solely as a form of foreign relations therefore does not allow sufficient scope to discuss these religious, cultural, and gendered contexts in which these marriages took place.

Furthermore, approaching the Riurikids’ marriages with western-rite rulers through the lens of foreign relations often has ignored the bride’s life after her marriage has been concluded, and has not examined her subsequent responsibilities as a Christian queen or noblewoman. A Christian queen’s roles and responsibilities have been the subject of the ever-growing field of medieval queenship studies. Scholars working in this field have looked beyond the usefulness of aristocratic daughters for their fathers’ dynastic alliances to examine the roles these daughters played after their marriages were concluded, namely as co-rulers with their husbands, intercessors in royal charters, patrons of art, founders of monasteries, preservers of family memory, and sometimes as regents for their young sons.

Christian Raffensperger was among the first to apply this methodology of queenship studies to the Riurikids’ marriages with western countries, arguing that Rus’ women who married western dynasts continued to identify as members of their natal family while playing important roles at the courts in which they arrived. He deliberately excluded from his study, however,

---


39 For some examples of the patronage of Rus’ princesses see Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 299-300.


consideration of how these marriages can help us understand the social history of the Schism between today’s Orthodoxy and Catholicism, since his work focused rather on deconstructing the pervasive historiographical myth in Anglo-American scholarship that Rus’ was politically and religiously separate from the rest of medieval Europe. 43 This dissertation fundamentally agrees with Raffensperger’s conclusion that Rus’ was an integral part of economic and dynastic networks of medieval Europe. It builds on his work to focus on how the experiences of acculturation and cultural continuity of individual brides in the inter-rite marriages of the Riurikid dynasty can illuminate the social aspect of the state of Orthodox-Catholic relations among medieval elites by delving into a further range of narrative, legal, and visual sources unexamined in Raffensperger’s work. Moreover, such an investigation is necessary, because the pervasive historiographical framework of the Schism continues to exclude consideration of Riurikid women in our understanding of the social dimensions of church history.

While similar questions about the experiences of acculturation and cultural continuity have been asked about Byzantine brides in today’s Western Europe, the place of Riurikid brides in the formation of European court cultures and Christian identities still remains relatively unexplored, particularly in English-language scholarship. Fundamental to the dissertation’s approach is the assumption that the social identity / identities of Riurikid women were tied not only to their status as members of a ruling family, but also to their position as Christian believers. As well as being the children of their princely fathers, princesses were also the spiritual children of their bishop, members of his flock. By the turn of the first millennium, profession of Christianity was a key source of the legitimacy for most ruling houses of medieval Europe, suggesting that religious affiliation formed an integral part of elites’ social and personal identities. 44

Elisabeth van Houts recently has begun to approach this difficult question of the social identities of medieval aristocratic women who married across cultural boundaries, taking her case-studies

43 Raffensperger confined himself to the following remarks: “… schism between the Constantinopolitan- and Roman-based churches…is not the focus of this book,” Reimagining Europe, 2.

from the Anglo-Norman world. Van Houts argued that royal women who married (and often re-married) far from their place of birth could hold simultaneous personal and cultural identities, but at the same time she suggested that two factors, rank and parentage, would remain constant points of reference in the social identities of noblewomen. As she puts it, “Aristocratic women were identified first of all as daughters […] Unlike the identity as wife or widow, the identity as daughter never changed. One had only one father and one mother.” Van Houts’ observation that an aristocratic woman’s birth place and natal family played an important role in the formation of her social identity leads one to consider further to what degree Rus’ princesses who married abroad maintained cultural continuity with their Orthodox homeland while ruling other western Christian subjects and, vice versa, to what degree Catholic princesses who came to Kyivan Rus’ as dynastic brides maintained their western religious-cultural identities.

To address this gap, the dissertation studies Rus’ princesses who married western rulers and, to a lesser extent, western princesses who married into the Riurikids, combining the research questions asked by historians of medieval queenship with those asked by historians of relations between eastern and western Christianity, today’s Orthodoxy and Catholicism. These questions include: did these women adapt to the cultural norms of the courts into which they married and, if so, how? Is there evidence that these women were able to maintain a degree of continuity with the culture of their birth-place? To what extent could they act as bridges between cultures? To what extent did they maintain their “otherness” or “foreignness” (Fremdartigkeit) in the new cultural context in which they found themselves? What role, if any, did the Church Schism have in the reception of these foreign brides at their new courts or in their ability to maintain contact with the Christian culture of their birth?

46 Ibid., 221-241.
Terminology, Methodological, and Chronological Framework

Before proceeding further, a few words clarifying the conceptual framework and terminology employed by the dissertation may be helpful in order to avoid any misunderstandings. The term “culture,” though widely invoked by both anthropologists and historians, is notoriously difficult to define, precisely because its exact meaning often has been contested over time.\(^{49}\) While recognizing the dangers of using “culture” as a blanket term that can lead to generalizations about social groups, the dissertation nonetheless employs the term since “culture is simply a useful way to think about the beliefs and shared understandings that make it possible for humans to understand their world.”\(^ {50}\) Following Peter Burke’s definition, “culture” is understood here in a general sense as encompassing a social group’s “attitudes, mentalities, and values and their expression, embodiment or symbolization in artefacts, practices, and representations.”\(^ {51}\) Moving away from “essentialising” categories, however, scholars no longer conceive of a person’s “identity” and / or “culture” as stable reference points, but rather consider them as fluid conceptions, in which the boundary between one cultural group and another is not clear-cut, but always shifting and in need of re-definition.\(^ {52}\) Such “boundary markers” between social groups can include material culture, for instance dress which serves to indicate one’s social status and membership in a particular group.\(^ {53}\) Both culture and identity are therefore not objective realities, but rather are phenomena that are constructed in relation to self and others.

The cultural context in which one has been raised is also a fundamental factor in the formation of individual identity. The latter is shaped by such determinants as religious affiliation, the concept


\(^ {51}\) Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Pres, 2009), 5.


\(^ {53}\) Florin Curta, “Medieval Archaeology and Ethnicity: Where are We?” in *History Compass* 9.7 (2011): 538.
of gender in one’s culture, and social status (within one’s culture), as well as relationships to other individuals and groups. However, individual cultural-social identity is difficult to define, perhaps especially so in a pre-modern context.\textsuperscript{54} “Social identity” is used in the dissertation to refer to the ways in which a person could define himself / herself, as well as the ways in which he / she was defined by others or in relations to others: for example, a Riurikid princess could be defined in terms of her status as wife, mother, daughter, Christian, or queen of a specific land, or any simultaneous combination of these categories.\textsuperscript{55} The dissertation therefore will consider how the religious affiliation of a Riurikid princess intersected with other elements of her social-cultural identity, such as her gender and social status. These three forms of identity (religious affiliation / gender / social status) were intimately linked since, by virtue of her marriage, a Riurikid princess became a western queen or duchess. By co-rulership with her husband or son, she occupied a position of authority over western Christian peoples.\textsuperscript{56} Her position at her husband’s court also enmeshed her in patronage networks of Christian church institutions and brought her into personal contact with bishops and other high-ranking clerics, members of the institutional church.

Applying this awareness of the fluidity of culture and identity to our understanding of medieval Orthodox-Catholic relations, Dionysios Strathakopoulos notes that it is misleading to view “true identities [as…] set in stone; that deep down one was a Byzantine or a Latin at heart.”\textsuperscript{57} For instance, he notes that Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos, the restorer of the Byzantine Empire in 1261, pursued church union with Latin-rite Christians and employed persons of mixed Greek / Latin parentage in his navy, but was still “hailed as the defender of Orthodoxy and New

\textsuperscript{54} Moore, \textit{Exchanges in Exoticism}, 6, 11-12.


\textsuperscript{57} Strathakopoulos, “Conclusions,” in \textit{Liquid & Multiple}, eds. Saint-Guillain and Stathakopoulos, 260.
Likewise Sally McKee’s analysis of Venetian-Greek relations in fourteenth-century Crete has questioned whether one can speak of ethnic homogeneity or religious affiliation as a valid construct of Byzantine or Latin identity. McKee’s analysis of notarial documents from Candia, the capital city of Crete under Venetian rule, demonstrated that intermarriage between cultural groups as well as the ways in which the Venetian population absorbed aspects of Greek language and customs reduce firm definitions of “collective sentiments and ethnic identity” to “shifting beds of sand.” Divisions between cultural groups based on language, religious affiliation, and culture, break down when examined up-close, even if categories of reference such as religious or cultural affiliation are used as general reference points.

The dissertation therefore uses the term “Orthodox” in a general sense to refer to those churches and rulers, including the Riurikids of Rus’, who received their church hierarchy from the patriarch of Constantinople, and whose priests followed the Byzantine (eastern) rite, encompassing, in Father Robert Taft’s words, the entire panoply of “liturgical symbolism (ritual celebration), liturgical setting (architecture/iconography), and liturgical interpretation (mystagogy)” in this tradition. Similarly, the term “Latin Christian” / western-rite / Catholic is used here as an accepted term of convenience to refer to those churches who nominally were under the leadership of the pope of Rome and followed the Latin rite (broadly interpreted, as above), but with the important caveat that during the eleventh to twelfth centuries, the idea of a unified Latin Christian world as opposed to a Byzantine one was not yet fixed.

Indeed, Christian Raffensperger, drawing on the term coined by Peter Brown, has called the period up to the late eleventh century the age of “micro-Christendoms” when there was no clear

58 Ibid, 260.
60 Ibid., 3.
idea of a monolithic Latin Christianity opposed to a Byzantine Christianity. Beginning in the eleventh century and gaining currency in the early thirteenth century under the energetic reign of Pope Innocent III (r. 1198-1215), the meaning of the word *Christianitas* only gradually changed from “the Christian faith” to “Latin Christendom,” that is to say, a homogeneous political, territorial, and spiritual unit obedient to the leadership of the Pope. Throughout the period covered by the dissertation, as will be illustrated by the dissertation itself, medieval elites did not necessarily embrace a fixed “Latin Christian” identity that was incompatible with the faith of the Orthodox Rus’.

What terms therefore should be used for discussing Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, when the two churches were constantly in dialogue? Donald MacGillivray Nicol, who wrote a frequently-cited article on the topic, used the term “mixed marriages.” The term “mixed marriages,” however, first appears in nineteenth-century Catholic canon law to refer to “the marriages of Catholics with members of heretical or schismatic sects.” The term therefore seems to imply too strict a boundary between eastern and western Christianity to describe adequately medieval relations between these two confessions. Nicholas de Baumgarten referred to the marriages of the Riurikids with Latin Christian rulers as “western

---


marriages” (“mariages occidentaux”), but this formulation is also problematic, since there was no unified concept of the “West” in medieval texts or maps.66

Instead, the dissertation prefers the term “inter-rite marriage” to describe marriages between Latin Christians and Orthodox Christians. This term rite (Latin: *ritus*) first originated in the early thirteenth century in papal legislation for the Latin Empire, when Byzantine Greeks and Latin Christians were living side-by-side.67 It is used here in its broadest definition, encompassing “not only the outward aspects of the Church’s prayer and organization—gestures, vestments and insignia, regulations; it includes also everything ‘to do with the sacred liturgy and the hierarchical Orders and with the other aspects of Christian life.’”68

All these terms therefore are terms of convenience and are used with the conscious acknowledgment that both “Orthodoxy” and “Catholicism” inter-penetrated each other during the time covered by this dissertation, while inter-marriage between dynasties also broke down the homogeneity of ethnic groups. Prior to her marriage to a Latin ruler, a Riurikid princess would have encountered elements of “Latin” culture in Kyivan Rus’, for instance from her western-rite mother, while Latin Christian culture also contained shared elements with Orthodoxy such as a common basis in the culture of Late Antiquity. Furthermore, neither culture was static, but rather shaped by the ongoing social and political changes of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries.

With these caveats in mind, in order to understand the means by which a Riurikid bride adjusted to the culture of her husband’s court, this dissertation employs the anthropological concepts of “acculturation” and “cultural transfer.” Anthropology offers a useful theoretical lexicon for
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67 David Heith-Stade, “‘Receiving the non-Orthodox: A Historical Study of Greek Orthodox Canon Law’ in *Studia Canonica*, 44. 2 (2010): n. 8, 401.

grappling with these questions of socio-cultural identity and adaptation by a group or individual to a different culture, as questions of cultural interaction and adaptation between individuals and groups of different backgrounds have long been present in this field. The term “acculturation” was first coined in the late nineteenth century to describe the process by which indigenous groups in the United States adapted to the culture of white settlers.\(^69\) The concept refers to a mutual process in which cultural change occurs when an individual or a group directly encounters an individual or a group from another culture.\(^70\) It can also be used to describe the process by which an individual becomes integrated into a new cultural environment.\(^71\) Acculturation thus refers to the process of cultural encounter, while assimilation describes one possible end result of such interaction.\(^72\) The former has been recently employed in the field of early Rus’ history, namely in investigations of the ways in which Scandinavians acculturated to the Slavic and Finno-Ugric environment in what became Rus’ during the eighth to eleventh centuries.\(^73\)

For the purposes of the dissertation, the concept of acculturation with its emphasis on cultural encounter as a process rather than as an end result therefore is a more useful tool than assimilation to examine the religious experiences of women in inter-rite marriages. “Acculturation” has the advantage of helping us understand direct cultural encounters not simply as the one-time transformation or conversion of a bride from an “Orthodox” to a “Latin Christian” identity or vice versa, but rather as a development. The term helps us consider concrete ways in which a woman adapted to the culture of her husband’s court and in the ways in

\(^{69}\) Burke, Cultural Hybridity, 41; Dictionaire de l’altérité, eds. Ferréol and Guy Jucquois, s. v. “Acculturation,” 1.


\(^{71}\) Dictionaire de l’altérité, eds. Ferréol and Guy Jucquois, s. v. “Acculturation,” 1 with further literature.


which she maintained ties to her parents. The dissertation uses evidence such as retention of Slavonic language and Cyrillic script, choice of children’s names, religious patronage, and ability to meet physically with natal family members as evidence for a Riurikid princess’s ability to retain a sense of her natal social-cultural identity after her marriage. Using the model of acculturation (with its emphasis on cultural encounter as a two-way process) also serves to underline that not only did a Riurikid bride encounter the cultural practices of her husband through her marriage, but she also impacted her husband. Moreover, thinking about cultural encounters as a process in time helps us to conceive of Orthodox and Catholic identities themselves as malleable constructs subject also to change and mutual influence.

Together with “acculturation”, “cultural transfer” (or “cultural exchange”) is another useful concept to examine the impact of the Riurikids’ inter-rite marriages on their participants, and on the courts in which these women found themselves. These terms emphasize the effect that these women could have had in their new courts by acting as bridges between cultures. Notions of “cultural transfer” have fruitfully been used by early modern historians in their examination of the impact of brides from dynasties such as the Habsburgs and Bourbons on their husband’s courts in the circulation of material objects or in the creation of a transnational elite culture.74 Medievalists have also used the term to describe the process of various interactions between individuals and groups.75 By studying these processes of acculturation and cultural transfer in the marriage alliances of the Riurikids with western dynasts, the dissertation seeks more broadly to shed light on the role played by women in cross-cultural interactions of the Rus’ and Latin Christian dynasties, and the development of European Christian identities.

Using both acculturation and cultural transfer as its terms of analysis, therefore, this dissertation addresses three key issues. First, it examines the lived reality of the Church Schism as reflected


in the experiences of individual women from the Orthodox Riurikid dynasty who married Catholic rulers and Catholic brides who became part of this Orthodox dynasty. It therefore approaches the history of the Church Schism between Orthodoxy and Catholicism from the point of view of social history rather than from the perspectives of theology and / or intellectual history. Second, as part of this approach, the dissertation seeks to put women involved in Riurikid Orthodox-Catholic marriages at the heart of its analysis. It strives to understand how these brides adapted to the new cultural and religious context of the courts into which they married, as seen, for instance, in their patronage of ecclesiastical institutions. In other words, the dissertation examines the process by which these new brides acculturated to their new post-marriage environment where language, forms of worship, and ecclesiastical hierarchy differed from their place of origin. It argues that there was no complete “conversion” to the religious tradition of their husbands, but rather, that brides in these inter-rite marriages were able to keep some aspects of their former confessional and cultural identity, with variations depending also on the court culture in which they found themselves.

Third and finally, by studying Rus’ brides who married Catholic rulers and vice versa, the dissertation strives to understand how theological and liturgical controversies which originated in Rome and Constantinople were received by elites outside these political and religious centres. While studies on the development of the Church Schism often focus on the binary relations of Byzantium and Europe, the dissertation contributes to this discussion by looking at Rus’ as an additional player, as a Slavic land that accepted its ecclesiastical hierarchy, canon law, and theology from Byzantium, but which continued to have unmediated contact with its Catholic neighbours. In this way, the dissertation also contributes to recent discussions of exchanges between centres and peripheries of political power in the Middle Ages. It will argue that it was in these peripheries, including Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary, that Riurikid princesses were especially able to maintain cultural and religious contact with Orthodoxy.

Helpful for picturing the religio-cultural connections of Rus’ with other “peripheral” lands of Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary is the conceptualization by Jerzy Kloczowski of the European continent as divided into “Old” and “New” or “Young Europe,” rather than the more anachronistic Western and Eastern Europe. According to this schema, “Old Europe,” roughly comprised the lands that made up the Carolingian Empire, while the lands of “New Europe” were those which adopted Christianity around the turn of the first millennium. This conceptualization draws attention to the fact that, despite differences in liturgy and canon law, the Riurikids of Rus’ also shared many cultural similarities with western-rite dynasties of “New Europe,” such as Scandinavia, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, and Hungary, who were also “latecomers” to Christianity and to the classical cultural inheritance of the Roman Empire, a “world order that had existed for centuries” in Oleksiy Tolochko’s words. Using a similar metaphor, Alexandr Musin and Marcin Woloszyn group medieval Scandinavia, East Central and Eastern Europe together as “newly-converted Europe.”

The high degree of inter-confessional interaction in these regions outside the heartland of the old Carolingian Empire may be helpful for understanding why Rus’ princesses who were sent to these lands as dynastic brides were seemingly able to maintain better connections with their Orthodox roots than those who were sent to areas where local Christian traditions had been entrenched far longer. In others words, the ability of a Rus’ princess to maintain links to her natal


land did not simply depend on her individual choices, but also on the wider cultural context in which she found herself and the degree to which it was open to Orthodox traditions.

Chronologically, the dissertation spans from the early 1000s, when the first generation to grow up after the official Christianization of Rus’ in 988/989 began to marry Latin rulers, up to 1204 in which a new period in the history of Byzantine/Catholic relations began. The year 1204 provides a convenient ending point for the dissertation for several reasons. At least since Bernard Leib in the 1920s scholars have argued that the mutual excommunications of Cardinal Humbert (d. 1061), legate of Pope Leo IX (1049-1054), and Patriarch Michael I Kerularios of Constantinople (r. 1043-1058) in 1054 have been exaggerated in significance. Rather, in the mid twentieth century, Steven Runciman made widespread the idea that it was not so much the events of 1054 that led to schism, but rather the sack of Constantinople by the participants of the Fourth Crusade in 1204 and its aftermath with the establishment of the Latin Empire (1204-1261).

In Rus’, other important changes took place after 1204 that affected the status of Orthodox-Catholic relations. The second quarter of the thirteenth century saw the beginnings of papal-sponsored missions led by Franciscans and Dominicans which aimed to convert the Riurikids to Latin Christianity. In the north, the Baltic Crusades and the creation of the settlement of Riga in 1201/1202 by its missionary bishop, Albert of Buxhövden (r. 1199-1229), created a new dynamic between the Catholic colonists and the Orthodox Rus’ who for centuries had exacted


tribute from the Finno-Ugric tribes in this area. In the western Rus’ principality of Galicia-Volhynia, fierce competition took place between Polish, Hungarian, and Riurikid princes in which religious identity also played a role in claims to political legitimacy. These complex inter-racial relations in Galicia-Volhynia and the numerous Orthodox-Catholic marriages that resulted from them, particularly under the rule of prince Daniil (Danylo) Romanovich (r., with interruptions, 1211-1264), are beyond the scope of this dissertation. Finally in 1223 the Mongols made their first invasion of Rus’. Their defeat of the Rus’-steppe nomad coalition at the Battle of the Kalka River in this year foreshadowed the success of the second Mongol invasion of 1237-1240/1241, which would destroy Kyiv and inaugurate an era of new geopolitical and cultural realities. As Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson put it, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, ritual and theological differences between what would become Byzantine Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism still seemed repairable; after 1204 such was not the case.

**Sources**

Assessing the process of acculturation and cultural exchange that accompanied brides who married into the Riurikid dynasty or who left Rus’ to become western queens is challenging due to the fragmentary nature of surviving evidence. In order to pursue these research questions, the dissertation makes use of comparative sources wherever possible including narrative texts, charters, visual sources, and material objects. Narrative sources, in particular, pose special interpretative difficulties.
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85 For Rus’ in the thirteenth century, see, for instance, John Fennell, *The Crisis of Medieval Russia 1200-1304* (London: Longman, 1983). For the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see, for example, Meyendorff, *Byzantino-Russian Relations*.

Not only are narrative accounts that give any detail on medieval Rus’ women brief in nature, but also sources from medieval “New Europe” only survive in very late manuscript copies, centuries removed from the events in question, making it difficult to judge the experiences of brides. Using narrative sources poses a number of methodological problems in itself, not least the problem of how to approach the historical “truth” about the lives of queens and noblewomen when the sources about them are grounded in the literary rhetorical conventions of their day, portraying women as ideal types or moral exempla to be imitated or avoided by readers.  

The essential narrative source for the history of Rus’ is the Old East Slavic Primary Chronicle, also known from its opening lines as The Tale of Bygone Years (Povĕst vremennykh lĕt). It covers the years 852 to 1110, though it begins with an earlier prehistory about the origins of the Rus’, claiming that they descended from Japheth, one of the sons of Noah. Since the nineteenth century the Primary Chronicle is also popularly known as Nestor’s Chronicle, following an interpolation in the sixteenth-century Khlebnikov (or Ostroz’kyi) manuscript (RNB, F.IV. 230) that ascribes the chronicle’s authorship to a monk of this name at the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves. There is no critical edition of the Primary Chronicle, although Donald Ostrowski has published a multi-volume interlinear collation and paradosis (best reading) of the Chronicle’s text based on its five most important independent manuscript witnesses and previously published
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88 For the “prehistorical” section of the chronicle see PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.1, 1-91, esp. 1-21 (for the story of the Rus’ descent from Japheth).

editions. Of these manuscript witnesses, the most important are the “Laurentian” and the “Hypatian,” which also represent the two major branches of the chronicle’s redactions, the northern and the southern one, respectively.

The standard editions of these chronicles are found in the Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles Series (Polnoe sobranie russikh letopisei). The Laurentian redaction is represented first and foremost by the Laurentian Codex (RNB, F. p. IV. No. 2), dating to 1377, and is the oldest surviving copy of the Primary Chronicle. Its colophon indicates that the monk Silvester finished this work at Saint Michael’s Monastery in Vydubychi, just outside of Kyiv, in 1116. The Hypatian redaction is represented by the Hypatian Codex, paleographically dated to the early fifteenth century (St. Petersburg, Biblioteka Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, 16.4.4), as well as by later sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuscripts, which sometimes preserve more accurate readings.

Although there are long-standing debates on the number of its previous redactions, the broad scholarly consensus is that the Primary Chronicle was completed in 1110 under the reign of Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125). In all the manuscript copies, the text of the Primary Chronicle
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90 Ostrowski explains his editorial principles of the Primary Chronicle in “Introduction,” PVL, vol. 10.1, xix-lxv.
92 The Laurentian Codex receives its name from its copyist, the monk Lavrentii (Laurence), who records his name and the date of copying (1377) at the end of the manuscript, PSRL, vol.1, 487-488; Timothy Valentinovich Guimon, “Laurentian Chronicle of 1377,” in Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle, vol. 2, ed. Dunphy, 998; Ostrowski, “Introduction,” xx.
95 Alan Timberlake, “Redactions of the Primary Chronicle,” in Russkii yazyk nauchnom osveschenii 1.1 (2001): 201; Alexandr Rukavishnikov, “Tale of Bygone Years: the Russian Primary Chronicle as a Family Chronicle,” in Early Medieval Europe 12.1 (2003): 57. There is a vast body of scholarship on the text of the Primary Chronicle and several attempts to reconstruct its archetype. In 1908, the Russian philologist A. A. Shakhmatov (1865-1920) proposed the influential theory that there were three major redactions of the Primary Chronicle. Though subject to debate, Shakhmatov’s hypothetical reconstructions continue to influence scholarship to this day, Cross and
is directly continued by local Rus’ chronicles whose narratives focus on regional events and on the inner dynastic struggles of the Riurikid princes. The appearance of local chronicles in the second half of the twelfth century reflects the political fragmentation of Kyivan Rus’ at this time. Of these local chronicles, the Kyivan Chronicle in the Hypatian Codex, tracing events from the late 1110s to 1200, is one of the most important native Rus’ narrative sources for the purposes of this dissertation, since it provides key evidence for the Riurikids’ marriage alliances with Hungarian and Polish rulers, and sometimes supplies unique details. The Kyivan Chronicle is directly followed in the Hypatian Codex by the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, which describes events from 1205 to 1292, and also provides rich information on the marriage alliances of the Rus’ princes in these south-western Rus’ principalities with neighbouring Latin rulers.

Due to the importance placed by Rus’ chronicles on the succession struggles of male princes, however, they rarely mention women at all. Because wives and widows could not inherit the dynastic patrimony (“otchina”) of the various branches of the Riurikid dynasty, they did not play an important role in the system of lateral succession in Rus’ and therefore were not of interest to
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99 Rosalind McKenzie has surveyed the image of women in medieval Russian literature from the eleventh to seventeenth century, noting the often negative view of women prevalent in Kyivan sources. Classical Graeco-Roman literature known in Byzantium was not translated into Slavonic in Kyivan Rus’, so that “Rus’ was provided only with a very specific ecclesiastical model for female characters,” “Women’s Image in Russian Medieval Literature,” in A History of Women’s Writing in Russia, eds. Adele Marie Barker and Jehanne M. Gheith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 19.
the chroniclers.\textsuperscript{100} The names of these princesses are even often omitted in the chroniclers’ texts and instead they are referred to by their title (“princess”) or by their relationship to Rus’ princes as their mothers or wives.\textsuperscript{101}

Due to the lack of information on women in native Rus’ chronicles, the majority of the evidence for Orthodox-Catholic marriage alliances of the Rus’ dynasty consequently comes from external narrative sources.\textsuperscript{102} Even before the Rus’ officially adopted Christianity in 988/989, Latin annals and chronicles, particularly from Germany, increasingly made mention of the Rus’ from the tenth century onward.\textsuperscript{103} This phenomenon can at least be partly explained by contact between Latin Christian and the Rus’ merchants, especially via a western trading route that went through Prague and Kraków, as well as through commercial exchanges in the Baltic Sea region.\textsuperscript{104}

Among the most important Latin narrative sources for marriage alliances between the Riurikids and Latin Christian rulers in the eleventh century are Books Seven and Eight of the \textit{Chronicon} by the Saxon bishop Thietmar of Merseburg (d. 1018), which cover the last years of Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s reign (1011-1015), and the \textit{History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen} by Adam, canon of Bremen Cathedral, written around 1076-1080.\textsuperscript{105} Adam’s history also contains a
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number of notes (called scholia), some added by Adam himself as he continued to revise his manuscript over the course of his lifetime, and others added after his death in 1081 by his continuators in the Bremen cathedral chapter during the 1080s. These scholia include important and sometimes unique records of Rus’-Latin Christian inter-marriage. Adam of Bremen served as an important source for two twelfth-century Latin chronicles, Helmhold of Bosau’s Chronicle of the Slavs and the chronicle of the Saxon Annalist (Annalista Saxo), which include additional information on Rus’-Catholic inter-marriage, particularly with Scandinavians.

By 1200, native historical writing both in the vernacular and in Latin was well established in Scandinavia. Among the latter, Saxo Grammaticus’ Gesta Danorum, an epic Latin history of the Danes written at Lund Cathedral and tracing events to the year 1285, is particular relevant for its information on the Riurikids’ marriages with Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians. Old Norse sources on Rus’ princesses largely belong to the genre known as “kings’ sagas” (konungasǫgur) which recount the exploits of mainly Norwegian kings from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries. Much has been written about the literary qualities of the portrayal of women in these
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 Nonetheless, read in comparison with other sources, the sagas provide valuable information on royal brides whose very names otherwise would be completely unknown to historical record. Moreover, the sagas’ information on Riurikid-Scandinavian inter-marriage can sometimes be corroborated with information that appears in Latin annals and charters, as well as in Rus’ chronicles.\footnote{112} Approached with caution, sagas can be useful historical sources not only for Scandinavian-Riurikid inter-marriage, but also because they are indicative of social values of medieval elites, including the wider ecumenical attitude that still prevailed among the lands of “New Europe.”\footnote{113} Scandinavian sources are particularly notable for their lack of confessional hostility toward the Orthodox Rus’ and to Byzantium up to the end of the thirteenth century.\footnote{114}

The source base for Rus’ immediate neighbours Bohemia, Poland and Hungary, is much thinner compared to sources from further west or north. Brief mentions of the Riurikids’ marriages with Bohemian and Moravian elites occur in the Chronicle of Cosmas of Prague (d. 1125), written around 1110-1120 and its continuators, Vincentius of Prague and the Annals of Prague Cathedral.\footnote{115} The first native Polish chronicle, the Deeds of the Princes of the Poles, whose author is commonly known in historiography as “Gallus Anonymous,” appears only in the period between 1112 and before 1117/1118.\footnote{116} Although “Gallus Anonymous” makes mention of

\footnote{111}{Old Norse portrayals of women have been studied in the works of Jenny Jochens, including eadem, “Old Norse Sources,” 155-188, and, more recently, in Jóhanna Katrín Friðriksdóttir, Women in Old Norse Literature: Bodies, Words, and Power (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), esp. 11, 79-105.}
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\footnote{116}{The author of the Deeds of the Princes of the Poles is conventionally known in historiography as the “Gallus Anonymous” from the thesis put forward by the sixteenth-century historian Bishop Marcin Kromer (d. 1589) that}
frequent inter-marriages between the Piast dynasty of Poland and the Riurikids of Rus’, he provides few details. Information on Rus’- Hungarian marriages in native Hungarian narrative texts likewise comes only from a chronologically late collection of sources. Besides the semi-legendary *Deeds of the Hungarians* by the anonymous “Magister P.” of circa 1200 which deals with the settlement of the Carpathian Basin in the ninth century by the Hungarians, among the earliest of Hungarian sources are the *Gesta* of Master Simon of Kéza written sometime before 1285.117

For the history of Eastern and Central Europe, the twelve books of the Latin *Annals of Poland* by the canon of Kraków, royal diplomat, and historian Jan Długosz (lived 1415 to 1480) remains essential reading, though it has been used here with great caution. Such caution is merited since Długosz wrote centuries removed from the events in question, confused the chronology of the events and the genealogical relations of the persons, and introduced obvious anachronisms into his narrative.118 Moreover, his presentation of Orthodox-Catholic relations was coloured by the fact that he was writing after the incorporation of the former western Rus’ lands of Galicia-Volhynia into the Kingdom of Poland in 1349 by Kazimierz III of Poland (r. 1333-1370).119 For all his problematic and anachronistic treatment of Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage, however, Długosz remains indispensable. He is often the only source for many of the names of Rus’


princesses or even the existence of some Polish-Rus’ marriages. His appointment as tutor to
King Kazimierz III’s children in 1467 gave him access to the royal library and thus allowed him
to incorporate information in his chronicle from older Latin chronicles and Rus’ sources, some of
which subsequently have been lost.\footnote{120}

Apart from the negative image in Długosz’s later chronicle, in general narrative sources (whether
in Rus’ or elsewhere) present Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage between the Rus’ and western
elites either seemingly neutrally, without any comment, or else with positive connotations,
praising the nobility of the match. These narrative sources also do not differentiate the children
of these Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriages from children born of nobles couples who were of
the same religious confession. Nor do sources dwell on cultural or “ethnic” differences. In this
way, the narrative sources describing Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage with the Rus’ differ from
later thirteenth century records describing Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage among Greeks and
Latins in the Aegean. For example, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, the term
“Gasmoulos” (plural: “Gasmouloi”) was used to describe the children of a mixed Greek-Latin
intermarriage, usually those with a Latin father and a Greek mother.\footnote{121}

In order to supplement information from narrative sources and especially to investigate the
religious patronage of brides in Orthodox-Catholic marriages, the dissertation also makes use of
charters. These sources entail interpretative difficulties, however, especially because the
formulaic character of their legalese rarely allows for insights on the motives of any given
donation. Moreover, one also has to contend with the fact that charters mentioning Rus’
princesses are scarce and medieval charters in general from “New Europe” survive in only very
small numbers. For example, in Kyivan Rus’ there are only two charters which survive in the

\footnote{120} Długosz’s “lost sources” are in the minority of the sources that the fifteenth-century historian employs, however. Most of his genealogical information can be corroborated with outside sources, see Kazimierz Jasiński, “Annales Poloniae Jana Długosza jako źródło do genealogii Piastów,” in Dlugossiana, ed. Gawęda, vol. 1, 204-223; Maria Koczerska, “Jan Długosz devant ses sources et leurs silences,” in L’historiographie médiévale en Europe: actes du colloque organisé par la Fondation européenne de la science au Centre de recherches historiques et juridiques de l’Université Paris I du 29 mars au 1er avril 1989 (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1991, distributed by Presses du CNRS), 95.

original from the twelfth century and only ten in total in later manuscript copies. Charters issued prior to the thirteenth century in Poland and Hungary, where Rus’ brides were most often sent, are also few. To balance the limitations posed by narrative and legal sources, the following chapters therefore draw on additional insights from manuscript illustrations and from material objects, where these are available. There are manifold advantages to using material culture for the study of royal women. Most importantly, visual sources can provide important evidence for elite women’s patronage and the expression of their personal piety unattested by written records. Material culture, therefore, constitutes a neglected source of information on the ways in which brides in the inter-rite marriages of the Orthodox-Catholic dynasty acculturated to their new environments, and the ways in which they could act as agents of cultural transfer.

Summary of Dissertation Chapters

This investigation of the Riurikids’ marriages with Latin rulers is divided into three major thematic sections. The first part, “The Ecclesiastical Context,” sets the scene for understanding case-studies of Orthodox-Catholic marriage that are discussed in the two subsequent sections. It lays the groundwork for the investigation by discussing how the Riurikids’ Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriages were treated in canon law and perceived by Rus’ clerics. It is divided into two chapters. Chapter One, “Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv’s Censure of Orthodox-Catholic Marriage and Fears of Ritual Pollution,” examines the status of Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage in Rus’ canon law, since Latin canon law does not discuss inter-rite marriage before the thirteenth

---


123 In Hungary, there are 198 extant royal charters from the eleventh to twelfth centuries, while 4,221 charters survive for the thirteenth, see Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe, 487. In Poland, there are only seventy-one known charters before the year 1200 of which thirty, or almost half, are of debated authenticity. Among the charters that are incontestably authentic before 1200, there are only ten royal charters. After circa 1200, hundreds of charters survive per year, Anna Adamska, “‘From Memory to Written Record’ in the Periphery of Medieval Latinitas: the Case of Poland in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries,” in Charters and the Use of the Written World in Medieval Society, ed. Karl Heidecker (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 86-87, 99.

124 On the importance of including material culture for investigating medieval queenship see Christopher Mielke, “‘Out Flies the Web and Floats Wide’: Multi-Disciplinary Possibilities in Queenship Studies,” in Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU 19 (2013): 209. See also the remarks of Florin Curta, “What symbols are chosen at what moment, and by whom, is always a matter of power relations. Material culture cannot therefore be treated as a passive reflection of [...] identity, but as an active element in its negotiation,” “Medieval Archaeology”: 538.
century. The chapter focuses on the surprisingly early criticism of the marriages of Riurikid princesses to western rulers made in the 1080s by the Greek-born metropolitan of Kyiv, Ioann II Prodomos (r. circa 1076/1077-1089). The chapter argues that Ioann’s condemnation of these marriages represents a hardline view and that his statement cannot be taken as representative of all Orthodox clerics in Rus’. In particular, it situates Ioann II’s comments within his wider concern for ritual purity, for avoiding customs that are “unclean.” It argues that this concern likely did not reflect either the views of all clerics in Rus’ or even of many Byzantine churchmen, but rather was shared by a narrow group of Byzantine clerics and secular elites whom Paul Magdalino has dubbed the “guardians of Orthodoxy.”¹²⁵ Such clerics considered any departure from Byzantine practices to be not only incorrect, but potentially heretical, and that contact with divergent practices was full of polluting danger for Orthodox Christians. The chapter argues that throughout the period covered by the dissertation, objections to the Riurikids’ marriage with Latin Christians in Rus’ came largely from certain Greek clerics residing in Rus’, rather than from the princely court or from native Rus’ clerics themselves, who continued to maintain a largely receptive attitude toward their western-rite counterparts.

In contrast to the early censure of Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage in Kyivan Rus’ by Metropolitan Ioann II in the 1080s, a similar condemnation of such mixed marriages only occurred in western canon law in the thirteenth century due to a new emphasis on unified adherence to the Latin rite. A major justification in papal letters condemning Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage during the thirteenth century was the accusation that the Riurikid dynasty re-baptized Latin brides. This complex issue is examined in Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina: Re-Examining the Evidence for Re-Baptism and Renaming of Brides in the Inter-rite Marriages of the Riurikid Dynasty.”

The chapter proposes two possible solutions to explain the attribution of one or more names to western-rite brides who married Riurikid princes. First, it adopts a careful approach when weighing the accusations made in Latin sources that the Rus’ baptized anew foreign brides since rituals, especially when observed and described by outsiders to a culture, can be subject to

misinterpretation. It argues instead that these Latin sources may, in fact, be describing the Orthodox Christian ritual of chrismation (anointing) rather than re-baptism, although it is not known whether chrismation of western-rite brides occurred in Rus’ as a matter of course. Second, the chapter suggests that the custom of using double-names in Rus’ must be taken into account when assessing whether or not a bride’s name was changed upon her marriage to the Riurikid dynasty. It was common for women from both Rus’ as well as from other dynasties of “New Europe” to bear two names at the same time: one a secular dynastic name and the other, a saint’s name. Before concluding, therefore, that any woman in “New Europe” was renamed by her husband’s family, it is important to consider whether or not she might have been given two names at birth and that consequently she could appear with both names in the sources. The custom of “double-names” among the Riurikids could have then enabled western brides to keep their natal name after their marriage. In connection with this possible usage of double-names by foreign brides, the chapter challenges Andrzej Poppe’s hypothesis that brides who married into the Riurikid dynasty were renamed after Riurikid princesses who left the dynasty. Without rejecting this thesis outright, the chapter argues that there is insufficiently clear evidence to accept it without reservations. A bride who came to Rus’ may have been given a new and/or additional name to fit into the dynastic naming customs of the Riurikids, but the motivation for this action (when it occurred) was more related to concerns over establishing the foreign bride’s membership in the Riurikid dynasty than to concerns over religious conversion.

After establishing the ecclesiastical context in which Orthodox-Catholic marriage alliances took place, the dissertation proceeds to examine specific case studies of the processes of the religious-cultural acculturation of western noblewomen who came to Rus’ as brides and Rus’-born princesses who became the wives of western rulers. Since Rus’ sources provide little information about women in general, only one case is considered regarding the former. Section Two, “The Prayer-Book of Gertruda: a Case Study in the Patronage and Religious Experience of Western-rite Brides in Rus’ (c. 1078-1086)” is devoted to a detailed case-study of one western-rite bride who came to Kyivan Rus’. Its chapter explores the devotional life of the Polish princess Gertruda (d. 1107/8?), the widow of the Rus’ prince Iziaslav Varoslavich (r. 1054-1078) and the mother of prince Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1086/1087), as seen through her prayer-book, known as the Codex Gertrudianus (Cividale del Friuli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, cod. 136). It argues that the Codex Gertrudianus is rooted in personal lay devotion of both eastern and western
traditions, as reflected by Gertrude’s use of the earlier part of the Codex, a tenth-century Psalter originating from Trier, as well as her commissioning of both Latin prayers and Byzantine-style miniatures. The combination of these elements suggests that Gertruda’s spiritual life reflected her experiences of cosmopolitan courts in Kraków, Cologne, and Kyiv. The chapter concludes by putting Gertruda’s prayer-book in context through a comparison with other Greek-Latin hybrid psalters belonging to queens, and also compares Gertruda’s ecclesiastical patronage to the scantier information available on the religious-cultural patronage of other Catholic princesses in Rus’. Limited evidence suggests that Gertruda’s contemporaries, as well as other queens who ruled Orthodox-Catholic lands, likewise could move between the boundaries of western and eastern-rite Christianity.

The third and final section of the dissertation, “Rus’ Women in Western-rite Lands: Selected Case Studies,” draws on the more abundant source material available on Rus’ princesses in western lands in two chapters, one focused on eleventh-century case-studies, the other on twelfth-century examples. This section shows that Rus’-born queens acculturated to the cultural and religious environment of their husbands’ families as evidenced by their patronage of local ecclesiastical institutions made in conjunction with their husband and children. Evidence for Rus’ princesses’ cultural continuity with the Orthodox culture of Rus’ after their marriage is more difficult to see in the sources. Nonetheless, it appears in their choice of children’s names, commissioning of devotional objects, retention of Slavonic language and Cyrillic script, religious patronage as well as with their continued personal contact with relatives in Rus’. The chapter argues that the courts of the more recently converted lands of “New Europe” outside the Carolingian Empire— including Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, and Scandinavia— were settings in which Rus’ women were particularly well able to maintain ties to their natal Orthodoxy.

At the same time, the section destabilizes the notions of “Orthodoxy” and Catholicism / “Latin Christianity” as exclusive identities. Instead, it notes that there was still much mutual influence between these two branches of Christianity in the eleventh to early thirteenth centuries as can be seen, for instance, in the common veneration of saints or in shared monastic practices of eremitism. By the late twelfth century, when elites in “New Europe” began to participate in the Baltic Crusades, the cultural openness of medieval elites toward the religious practices of Christians of a different confession began to come under stress, though cultural exchanges continued well into the thirteenth century.
The dissertation’s conclusion sums up the findings of the five chapters and places the inter-rite marriages of the Riurikid dynasty within the wider context of the social and religious identity of medieval elites. It argues that the case studies examined in the dissertation give insight into the cosmopolitan nature of elites, especially of noblewomen who moved across confessional and physical boundaries, and argues that it is not appropriate to speak about the “conversion” of brides in inter-rite marriages during the eleventh to early thirteenth centuries. The conclusion contrasts the more fluid construction of Christian identity seen in the pre-Mongol period of Kyivan Rus’ with later Orthodox-Catholic marriages in the fourteenth century in which confessional divisions had hardened.

In the appendix to the dissertation is a detailed genealogical guide to the Riurikids’ inter-rite marriages. This appendix supplements and modifies the list found in Nicholas de Baumgarten’s classic and still-cited study from 1927 of Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage in Kyivan Rus’ by including new findings by genealogists and reviews the primary sources used by the researcher. It extends the more recent genealogical work of Christian Raffensperger, which ends in 1146, by examining marriages after this date up to the year 1204. Furthermore, as much as the extant sources permit, the genealogical appendix adds information on the material lines of both the bride and groom in each inter-rite marriage in order to provide a more complete image of ties between Orthodox and Catholic laity. It also lists any known children of these inter-rite marriages. The result is a list of fifty-six marriages between the Riurikids and Catholic neighbours in the period from the eleventh to mid-thirteenth century, of which seventeen are considered contested or doubtful in historiography. By revisiting key sources and summarizing genealogical debates, the appendix will provide a foundation for further research on the marriage alliances between the Riurikids and the ruling dynasties of Latin Christendom.
Part I

Chapter 1: Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv’s Censure of Orthodox-Catholic Marriage and Fears of Ritual Pollution

In Latin canon law, ecclesiastical censure of inter-rite marriage occurs relatively late.\(^{126}\) It was only under the pontificate of Pope Martin IV (r. 1281-1285), after the Greeks had formally renounced the terms of the reunificatory Council of Lyon in 1274, that the necessity to obtain a dispensation in order to marry an Orthodox person was finally formalized in western canon law.\(^{127}\) Up to the late fourteenth century, a formal prohibition against marriage with “Latins” likewise did not exist in Byzantine canon law.\(^{128}\) No canon of the Byzantine church in the Byzantine Empire proper forbade marriages with Latins, because no ecumenical council had condemned Catholic beliefs and therefore declared them to be heretics.\(^{129}\) As far as is known, this guiding principle was also followed in Rus’, although for the pre-Mongol period, there is no extant record of legislative activity of any local episcopal synods in Rus’.\(^{130}\) Nonetheless before the late thirteenth century, the censure of inter-rite marriage emerged in Rus’ in the context not of canonical collections, but rather in canonical commentaries.

In the absence of formal ecclesiastical legislation on the subject, it is striking to find as early as the 1080s that the Greek-born Metropolitan of Kyiv, Ioann II Prodomos (r. circa 1076/1077-1089), censured the Rus’ princes for marrying their daughters to Latin Christian rulers: “To give the daughters of the noblest ruler [as] brides to nations who partake of azymes [unleavened bread] is unworthy and very unseemly,” he wrote in Greek, “For being pious by the grace of God

\(^{126}\) The term “mixed marriage” (“matrimonia mixta”, “nuptiae mixtae”) appears in the Latin vocabulary of the Roman Catholic Church for the first time only in the nineteenth century to indicate the marriages of Catholics with heretics and schismatics.


\(^{129}\) Nicol, “Mixed Marriages,” 172.

\(^{130}\) The only synods of bishops mentioned in the Rus’ chronicles are those which elect bishops. While bishops may have discussed ecclesiastical matters at the consecration of monasteries or on other occasions when they gathered together, we have no written sources on their juridical activities, Senyk, History of the Church, vol. 1, 164.
and most Orthodox, if they make such marriages of their own children, they will be ecclesiastically punished.”

Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv’s opinion on the issue of the propriety of Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage formed part of a larger work that survives in both the original Greek and in a later Slavonic version, known as the “Canonical Answers” (Greek: *apokriseis kanonikai*, Slavonic: *kanonicheski otvieti*). After the synod of Vladimir in 1273/1274, when a new Serbian Slavonic translation of the *nomokanon*, the Byzantine corpus of canon law, was introduced in Rus’, the “Canonical Answers” were inserted in Rus’ canonical manuscripts. The “Canonical Answers,” however, were not themselves a text of canon law (i.e. a list of canons with the force of law of conciliar decisions). Rather they served as a non-binding guide of conduct for both


clergy and laity based on the author’s interpretation of the canons, especially in matters in which the canons themselves did not offer a clear answer.134

At an unknown date, a Slavonic translation of the “Canonical Answers” was made, which included major textual additions to the original Greek text, and about seventeen additional replies for which no Greek original is known.135 Because the dating of the Slavonic translation is uncertain, the chapter will focus its analysis primarily on the original Greek of the marriage prohibition, which Ioann wrote in the 1080s. The relatively early date of Ioann’s original Greek text, condemning Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage thirty years after the mutual excommunications of 1054, has provoked much discussion among scholars. His negative opinion on Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage has been commented upon by virtually every scholar working on the history of the Orthodox church in Rus’, who have struggled to understand why the Metropolitan was so against such marriages. For Louis Bréhier, who considered the schism of 1054 to be a “final” breach between eastern and western Christianity, Ioann’s response was proof of the “hatred which the Russians have had from the beginning of their history for the neighbours in the West.”136

Since Bréhier’s categorical assessment, other scholars have proposed very wide-ranging interpretations of what Ioann meant exactly by his words, ranging from Metropolitan Makarii Bulgakov (d. 1882) of Moscow’s opinion in the mid nineteenth century that Ioann’s ruling was a “strict prohibition” (“strogoe zapreshchenie”) to Vladimir Vodoff, who, writing in the 1980s, considered the response to be actually relatively tolerant towards Latin Christians.137 This wide


137 Bulgakov, Istoriya russkoi tserkvi, Book 2, n. 452, 489, writes: “Strogoe zapreshchenie nashego mitropolita mozhno ob’iasniat’ tem, chto toto pravoslavnykh, esli oni otdavalis’ zamuzh v iniu stranu— latinskuiu, zastaviali prinimata Latinstvo” [“The strict prohibition of our metropolitan can be explained by the fact that, at the time, if
range of reactions to Ioann’s prohibition of inter-rite marriage highlights how further investigation is necessary on the ways in which the marriages of the Riurikids with western-rite rulers were seen in clerical eyes and how these inter-rite marriages were treated in canon law.

This chapter will situate Ioann’s censure of Orthodox-Catholic marriage within his larger concerns for maintaining ritual purity and avoiding ritual pollution, a connection first suggested by George Fedotov. Tia Kolbaba has also noted the theme of avoidance of ritual pollution from contact with non-believers found in Ioann’s work and in other anti-Latin polemics written by Greek clerics. Not only did Ioann disapprove of the marriage of Riurikid princesses to western-rite Christians, he also disapproved of any form of social and sexual intercourse between Orthodox Christians and those whom he considered non-Orthodox: both western-rite Christians and pagans. For example, he censured Orthodox Christians of Rus’ for sharing meals with western-rite Christians and with pagans. By attempting to regulate the behaviour of the Riurikid princes, Ioann tried to draw a strict line between correct and incorrect social and ritual practices, which, in his mind, were linked to correct and incorrect beliefs, that is to say with Orthodoxy and non-Orthodoxy. The novelty of his censure lay not in his accusations levied against western-rite Christians, which repeated charges found in earlier Greek anti-Latin polemics, but rather in the link that he made to marriage.

Orthodox women were given in marriage in a foreign country, namely a Latin country, they were forced to accept Latin customs”). By contrast, Vladimir Vodoff considers the prohibition to be relatively tolerant: “Le métropolite Jean II, dans ses Réponses canoniques, fait encore preuve d’une certaine tolérance […] ils commentent seulement une action ‘indigne et inconvenante pour les adeptes de la vrai Foi’,” Naissance de la chrétienté russe: la conversion du prince Vladimir de Kiev (988) et ses conséquences (Xle-XIIIe siècles) (Paris: Fayard, 1988), 13.

138 George P. Fedotov, The Russian Religious Mind, vol. 1: Kievan Christianity. The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries (New York: Harper TorchBooks/The Cloister Library, 1946, reprint. 1960), 188. Fedotov’s attempt to characterize ritual purity as the product of a “national character” is a dated approach to the issue, but his work still contains useful illustrative examples of concern with ritual purity in Rus’ canonical texts. The importance attached to ritual purity in Kyivan Rus’ texts is also noted in Peter A. Rolland, “Ritual purity or blaison populaire in the Literature of Kyjevan Rus’,” unpublished paper, personal correspondence, February 1st 2011, 2.


It was perhaps precisely the fact that the Riurikids had many marriage alliances with Latin Christians rulers at the close of the eleventh century that provoked Ioann’s reprimand, as will be demonstrated in this chapter. Ioann’s fears of ritual pollution came from an anxiety that social interactions between individuals, such as shared meals or marriages, threatened the boundaries between Orthodox and non-Orthodox persons. As R. I. Moore puts it, Ioann’s fear that the practices of Latin Christians could “pollute” the majority by their deviant beliefs could reflect the fact that “the boundaries which the prohibitions in question protect are threatened or thought to be.”141 Similarly, anthropologist Mary Douglas in her classic study *Purity and Danger* argues that ideas of pollution, when present in a given culture, reflect fears associated with the blurring of boundaries, when categories that should be distinct are brought into conjunction.142 The princely court, to which foreign brides brought different language and customs, could be a centre in which boundaries between religious and cultural groups threatened to meld.143

Before discussing Ioann’s censure in light of his fears of ritual pollution in further detail, therefore, the chapter will first situate them within the general social-cultural context of the church and princely court in Rus’, which, though dependent on Byzantium for its clerical hierarchy, nonetheless also maintained its own direct contacts with Latin Christendom. Its use of Old Church Slavonic, rather than Greek, in its ecclesiastical services, helped to bring the church hierarchy in Rus’ into contact with ideas coming from western-rite Bohemia, while trading and dynastic connections helped introduce cults of saints from Scandinavia and other western-rite lands. It was these very connections that Ioann found so threatening.

As this chapter will demonstrate, although Ioann’s concerns with ritual purity were echoed by later twelfth-century Greek metropolitans of Rus’ and even elaborated upon by some native Rus’ clerics, they did not reflect the views of the Riurikid princely dynasty. They may not have reflected the views of the majority of Rus’ clerics, either, since evidence of adoption of Latin

---

saint cults and feast-days suggest that Rus’ clerics were open to practices of their Latin Christian colleagues. Instead, this chapter argues that Ioann’s views reflected those of a narrow segment of Greek clergy who were particularly concerned with maintaining purity of belief. Only gradually did clergy in Rus’ accept the idea that an uncrossable divide existed between Orthodox and non-Orthodox Christians, but this idea was not widely accepted until the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

The Church in Kyivan Rus’: the Social-Cultural Context of Ioann II’s Censure

Following Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s baptism in 988/989 at the hands of Byzantine priests and his marriage to the Byzantine princess Anna, the metropolitanate of Rhōsia was established as an ecclesiastical province of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The exact nature of the establishment of this metropolitan see is controversial, however, since for the first fifty years of its official existence, there are hardly any primary sources on it.\textsuperscript{144} The first metropolitan to be mentioned by the twelfth-century \textit{Primary Chronicle} is the Greek cleric Theopemptos under the year 6547 (1039), so that the metropolinate was in existence at least by this date, when Vladimir’s successor, Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054) was on the throne and had built the new stone cathedral of Saint Sophia.\textsuperscript{145} Regardless of when precisely the first known metropolitan arrived in Rus’, it is significant nonetheless significant that, with only three exceptions before the year 1300, all known metropolitans of Rus’ were Greek men chosen in Constantinople by the patriarchal synod.\textsuperscript{146} Initially, during Vladimir’s reign, Greek may have been the liturgical language, but its

\textsuperscript{144} For a discussion of historiographic controversies on the establishment of the metropolinate in Rus’, see for example, Vladimir Vodoff, \textit{Naissance de la chrétienté russe : la conversion du prince Vladimir de Kiev (988) et ses conséquence (Xle-XIIIe siècles)} (Paris: Fayard, 1988), 81-82; Senyk, \textit{A History of the Church}, vol. 1, 82-97; John John Fennell, \textit{A History of the Russian Church to 1448} (London: Longman, 1995), 39-41.

\textsuperscript{145} PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1214-1215. According to Greek and Armenian sources, the first metropolitan of Rus’ was a Greek man, Theophylaktos, transferred to Rus’ already by 987, just prior to Vladimir’s baptism and marriage to Anna, Vodoff, Naissance; 85-87; Fennell, \textit{Russian Church}, 40; Andrzej Poppe, “The Christianization and Ecclesiastical Structure of Kyivan Rus’ to 1300,” in \textit{HUS}. 21. 3/4 (December 1997): 338-339, reprint. in Poppe, \textit{Christian Russia in the Making}, V 338-339.

\textsuperscript{146} The only native Kyivan Rus’ metropolitans before 1300 were Ilarion (Hilarion, r. 1051-1055), Klim (Clement, r. 1047), and, probably also, Kyril (Cyril, r. 1224-1233). Andrzej Poppe compiled a list of Rus’ metropolitans and the widely accepted facts about their lives in “Die Metropoliten und Fürsten,” in Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 283-301.
use must have been brief. Sometime between Vladimir’s death in 1015 and circa 1040, during the reign of his son Yaroslav the Wise, it was replaced by Old Church Slavonic, which was closer to the vernacular of the newly converted land. 147 Simon Franklin thus characterizes the reception of Byzantine culture in Rus’ not only as a process of direct importation of Greek clergy, books, and ideas, but also of adaptation of Byzantine norms to local use in which translation played an important mediating and often creative role. 148

Invented in 863 by two brothers from Thessaloniki, Constantine-Cyril (d. 869) and Methodios (d. 885), for use in preaching to the Slavs of Moravia, Old Church Slavonic both mediated Byzantine texts in Rus’ and also served as the literary conduit for religious influences in Rus’ from places other than Byzantium. 149 Bulgaria in particular, which received Constantine-Cyril’s and Methodios’ disciples in the ninth century, was an important source for Old Church Slavonic texts imported into Rus’. 150

Rus’ clerics also imported Old Church Slavonic texts from Bohemia, which in the eleventh century was experiencing a renaissance of Cyrillo-Methodian learning. Although Bohemia had accepted the western form of Christianity, Benedictine monasticism, and a Latin church hierarchy, Old Church Slavonic was used in its church services together with Latin until the implementation of the so-called Gregorian reforms in the late eleventh century (after which, until


the fourteenth century, only Latin was permitted).\footnote{Francis Dvornik, “Les Bénédictins et la christianisation de la Russie,” in 1054-1954. L’église et les églises: neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l’Orient et l’Occident. Études et travaux sur l’unité chrétienne offerts à Dom Lambert Beauduin, Collection Irénnikon, vol. 1 (Namur: Éditions de Chevetogne, 1954), 323-349; idem, The Making of Central and Eastern Europe, 2nd ed. with new introduction and notes (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1974), 233 and 247; and idem, Constantine-Cyril and Methodius, 206-223, 226-228; Julia Verkholansev, The Slavic Letters of St. Jerome. The History of the Legend and its Legacy, or, How the Translator of the Vulgate Became an Apostle of the Slavs (Kalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2014), 27-28.} Old Church Slavonic served as one key linguistic medium by which Rus’ clerics became familiar with Latin Christian feast-days and saints. For example, the Old Church Slavonic *vita* of the Czech king Václav (“Good King Wenceslas” in English), written shortly after his death in 929, was circulated in both Bohemia and Rus’\footnote{Norman W. Ingham, “The Martyred Prince and the Question of Slavic Cultural Continuity in the Early Middle Ages,” in Medieval Russian Culture, eds. Henrik Birnbaum and Michael S. Flier, California Slavic Studies, vol. 12 (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 31-53; discussed in Gail Lenhoff, The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-Cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1989), 13, 81-82.}. Since both the princely dynasty and ecclesiastical authorities were responsible for the patronage and promotion of saints’ cults in early Rus’, the veneration of Latin Christian saints must have received some official support by these authorities.\footnote{On the Riurikid dynasty’s role in promoting saints’ cults see Monica White, “Relics and the Princely Clan in Rus,”” in Byzantium and the Viking World, eds. Fedir Androshchuk, Jonathan Shepard and Monica White (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis 2016), 391-408.}

Rus’ clerics’ encounters with Latin Christian practices were not limited to texts brought by the intermediary influence of Old Church Slavonic. The Rus’ met Latin Christians directly through trading, military alliances, and marriages with their close neighbours in Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary, and also through the presence of western-rite merchants in Rus’.\footnote{Rus’ trade with Byzantium declined in the course of the mid eleventh and twelfth centuries due to the increased production of local goods, while trade with Rus’ immediate neighbours increased, Franklin, “Kievan Rus’,” 90-91.} Even prior to the official conversion of Rus’ in 988/989, some Scandinavians living in Rus’ had already adopted Latin forms of Christianity.\footnote{In its entry for 6453 (945), the Primary Chronicle mentions the Church of Saint Elias in Kyiv as a parish church belonging to Christian Varangians living in the city: PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.1, 323-324.} In Novgorod, by the twelfth century, Scandinavian and German traders had their own quarters in the city, complete with their own Latin-rite churches which may
have been attended by the local Slavic population as well.\textsuperscript{156} The close contact between Scandinavians and Slavs in Rus’, particularly in the Baltic region, also led to mutual religious influences, for instance, in the production of stylistically similar enkolpia (pectorals crosses) during the tenth to twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{157} Up to the thirteenth century, archeological evidence suggests that the Rus’ also imported liturgical vessels and implements from Western Europe, which were unproblematically used in the Byzantine Liturgy.\textsuperscript{158} According to Alexandr Musin, these included enamels and religious images from Limoges, stained glass windows, metal candlesticks, ciboria (vessels for communion bread), reliquaries, and aquamanilia (vessels for ritual liturgical hand-washing).\textsuperscript{159} The Rus’, meanwhile, exported church bells to Western Europe, some of which were produced in Rus’ with Latin inscriptions.\textsuperscript{160}

Scholars have long noted the so-called “Latinizing” influence in Rus’, which resulted in the fact that the Rus’ calendar of saints’ Lives (Greek: \textit{menologion}, Slavonic: \textit{mesiatseslov}) included some feasts that conformed to western, rather than to Constantinopolitan, custom.\textsuperscript{161} For instance, the Rus’ church calendar included the feast-day of Saint Benedict of Nursia on March

\textsuperscript{156} Tatjana N. Jackson, “The cult of St. Olaf and Early Novgorod,” in \textit{Saints and their Lives}, eds. Antonsson and Garipzanov, 147-167; Raffensperger, \textit{Reimagining Rus’}, 131; Jukka Korpela, “Les relations diplomatiques et commerciales entre Novgorod et les pays nordiques,” in \textit{Novgorod ou la Russie oubliée : une république commerçante : XIIe-XVe siècles}, eds. Philippe Frison and Olga Sevastyanova, preface by Florand Mouchard (Charenton-Le-Pont: Ver à soie, 2015), 52. There were also Latin-rite churches in Polatsk (Polotsk) and Vitsebsk, and around 1159 a Benedictine Monastery, Saint Mary’s, was also founded in Kyiv, Senyk, \textit{History of the Church}, vol. 1, 161 and 310. See also the following chapter.


\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Ibid.}, 288.

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Ibid.}, 288.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Ibid.}, 288.

\textsuperscript{161} Jackson, “St. Olaf,” 165; Ol’ga Vikorovna Loseva, \textit{Russkie metsiaslovyi XI-XIV vekov} (Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2001), 63.
21st, following Latin custom. Another example of divergent custom from Byzantine usage is the fact that Rus’ church calendars also included the feast of the Translation of the relics of Saint Nicholas from Byzantine-held Myra to Italian Bari in 1087 (May 9th). While Byzantine clerics looked on the theft of Saint Nicholas’ body as an outrage, those in Rus’ seemed to have considered it positively as a sacrum furtum, a God-sanctioned “holy theft,” since they deemed it worthy of formal liturgical commemoration.

The early Riurikid rulers even looked to western-rite Christians to help carry out missionary efforts in their land. The first member of the Riurikid dynasty to convert to Christianity, Vladimir’s grandmother, Ol’ga (Scandinavian form: Helga, d. 969) had travelled to Constantinople to be baptized in 957. It seems likely that she asked for a missionary bishop to be sent to Rus’ at this time and when one was not forthcoming, around 959-960/961, she turned to Otto I to request a Latin bishop to come preach in Rus’. The short-lived missionary efforts of the German titular bishop in Rus’ ended in failure, but his invitation by Ol’ga indicates that

---

162 The feast of Saint Benedict of Nursia is included twice in the twelfth-century menologion of the Mstislav Gospel, once under March 14th (Byzantine calendar) and one under March 21st (Roman tradition), Ibid., 67 and 73.

163 The story of the transfer of Saint Nicholas’ relics to Bari is told in the late eleventh-century Slovo o perenesenii moshchei svyatitelia Nikolaia (“The Discourse on the Translation of the Relics of Nicholas the Wondermaker”), in Bulgakov, Istorii russkoi tserkvi, appendix 7, 555-557.


166 Otto I initially intended to send the monk Libutius of Mainz to come to Rus’, but then, for some reason, sent the monk Adalbert of Trier instead. Adalbert’s mission at Ol’ga’s request to preach to the Rus’ is known from several Latin chronicles: Reginonis abbatis prumiensis Chronicon, cum continuatione treverensi, ed. Fridericus Kurze, Scripores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historiccis recusi (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani 1890), sub anno 959, 170; Georgius D. Waitz, ed., Annales Hildesheimenses, Scripores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historiccis Recusi, vol. 8 (Hannover, 1878; reprint. [n.p.], 1947), sub anno 960, 21-22; Georgius Heinricus Pertz, ed., Annales Ottenburani, MGH, vol 5, sub anno 960, 4.
she was willing to embrace either Byzantine or Latin forms of Christianity and did not seem to see any inherent conflict between them.\footnote{167}

In the year 1008, her grandson Vladimir, after making Byzantine Christianity the official religion of Kyivan Rus’, cordially received the Saxon missionary Bruno of Querfurt in Kyiv during Bruno’s journey to preach to the pagan Pechenegs on the steppe (where he was later martyred by them).\footnote{168} Particularly telling of the good relations that existed at Vladimir’s court toward western-rite Christians is the fact that one of Bruno’s companions was consecrated as bishop during the stay of the Saxon party in Kyiv: meaning that eastern-rite clergy may have participated in a western-rite ceremony or that a Saxon missionary at this time did not object to being consecrated according to the eastern rite.\footnote{169} Such interaction between eastern and western-rite clergy following Vladimir’s baptism indicates that the early Riuirkids expressed an openness or ambivalence to Christianity’s different eastern- and western-rite forms.\footnote{170}

The openness to western Christianity expressed by the Riurikid princes can be seen furthermore in the fact that the ecclesiastical statutes (\textit{ustavy}) that they issued did not discriminate against Latin customs.\footnote{171} Like the Byzantine Emperor, the Riurikid prince was considered in canon law


\footnote{168 Bruno of Querfurt’s stay with Vladimir is known from a letter sent by Bruno to Emperor Heinrich II just before his martyrdom in the steppe later in the year 1008. The letter is preserved in a contemporary eleventh-century manuscript (Kassel, Landesbibliothek, 4, MS. Philo. I, folia 151v-153v). See \textit{List Brunona do króla Henryka / Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum Regem}, ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska, MPH S. N. vol. 4.3, 98-99.}

\footnote{169 “consecravimusque nos episcopum de nostris […] in terrę medium; et facta est ad maiorem gloriam et laudem salvatoris Dei christianæ lex, in pessimo et crudelissimo populo qui sunt super terram omnium paganorum,” \textit{Ibid.}, 100, discussed in Poppe, “Ecclesiastical Structure,” V 339-340. Bruno’s text makes a clear distinction between Christians and pagans, but is completely indifferent to differences between eastern and western rites of Christianity.}

\footnote{170 Older scholarship even hypothesized that Vladimir even married a German princess after his wife Anna’s death in 1011. For details on the debate concerning this possible German marriage and the debate over Anna of Byzantium’s death-date see Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 1.}

\footnote{171 On \textit{ustavy} and their extant manuscript copies (the oldest date to the fifteenth century), see Ya. N. Schchapov, \textit{Kniazheskie ustavy i tserkov drevnei Rusi XI-XIV vv.} (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), and Daniel Kaiser, \textit{The Growth of the Law in Medieval Russia} (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 54-57.}
to have the God-given authority to issue such statutes.\footnote{On the Rus’ prince’s authority to govern the church, see Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 39; Poppe, “Le prince et l’église,” IX 107-109; and idem, “Rurikid Dynasty,” I 5.} The church statute attributed to Yaroslav the Wise, but dated by the majority of scholars to the twelfth century, did not condemn Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage, but rather restricted itself to prohibiting marriage with non-Christian groups: Muslims, Jews, and pagans.\footnote{Kaiser, trans. and ed., \textit{The Laws of Rus’}, article 20, 47.} Moreover, general condemnation of Latin practices is absent from church legislation issued by the Riurikid princes themselves, in contrast to the statements made by Greek clerics such as Metropolitan Ioann.

This fact is not surprising because the Riurikids themselves were originally a Scandinavian clan, and because they both took Latin Christian women as their brides and married their daughters to Latin Christian rulers. Yaroslav the Wise, who succeeded to the throne of Kyiv in 1019 after a bloody succession contest, was the son of Vladimir Sviatoslavich by a Scandinavian woman, Rogned (or Ragnheid, d. 1000), who was Vladimir’s lawful wife before his marriage to the Byzantine princess Anna.\footnote{PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 574-575 and 1014.} Yaroslav himself married also a Scandinavian woman, Ingigerd, the daughter of King Olaf Skötkonung of Sweden (r. 995-1022).\footnote{For Ingigerd’s marriage to Yaroslav see, for example: \textit{Adami Bremensis Gesta Pontificum}, ed. Trillmich, 274. See also Chapter Four and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 4.} Their children and grandchildren continued to marry with western-rite rulers.\footnote{Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 23-76; Chapter Four, and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 4, 6-11.} As will be shown later in this chapter, such marriages alliances were not exceptional but rather took place frequently.

As Christian Raffensperger has argued, in addition to the necessity of forming military alliances, cultural similarities between the Riurikids and their neighbours might have been an additional reason why the Riurikids had so many inter-marriages with Latin Christians. As itinerant rulers who travelled on horseback and headed a military retinue (druzhina), the Riurikids were in many ways more similar to their Scandinavian relatives and to the other dynasties of “New Europe” than to the remote Byzantine emperors and to the urban, highly bureaucratic Byzantine court.\footnote{Raffensperger, \textit{Reimagining Europe}, 52.}
For example, the *Ruskaia Pravda*, the law-code first issued by Yaroslav the Wise and then expanded upon by his successors, bears closer resemblance to contemporary Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Scandinavian, and Hungarian law-codes than to Byzantium law.  

In sum, it seems that in the early centuries of Rus’ Christianity, Latin Christians were still viewed as brothers in faith at least by the Riurikid rulers and perhaps also by many of the lower orders of the clergy, who adopted Latin feast-days and saints together with those that they received from Byzantium. This openness to Latin customs testified by Rus’ ecclesiastical calendars and collections of saints’ *Lives* contrasts greatly with the discourse of hardliner clerics such as Metropolitan Ioann, who present a more black-and-white division between “believers” and “non-believers” in the world. Fear of incorrect customs “contaminating” true believers underlay Ioann’s anxieties about ritual pollution probably as a result of the frequent Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriages.

**Metropolitan Ioann II’s Censure of Orthodox-Catholic Marriage and Ritual Purity**

Preaching in a land where Christianity was relatively new, Greek metropolitans had to convince the Rus’ princes that practices that diverged from the teachings of the Byzantine Orthodox church were incorrect. Metropolitan Ioann’s main objection to the Riurikids’ inter-marriage with Latin Christians was the latter’s use of unleavened bread, or azymes, in the Eucharist: “To give the daughters of the noblest ruler [as] brides to nations who partake of azymes [unleavened bread] is unworthy and very unseemly.”  

The Latin Christians’ use of azymes had emerged as a new topic for criticism in mid eleventh-century Byzantine polemics. Due to increased


numbers of Latin Christian pilgrims to Constantinople in the 1050s as a result of relative peace in the Mediterranean, the clerical elite of this city became more aware of this ritual practice which diverged from their own custom of using leavened bread.\textsuperscript{181} Around 1052, Patriarch Michael Kerularios may even have closed Latin churches in Constantinople which refused to abandon the use of unleavened bread.\textsuperscript{182} Since the only source for this action, however, is a letter of Kerularios’ enemy, Cardinal Humbert, whether or not these church closures really took place remains debated.\textsuperscript{183}

Mahlon H. Smith III, whose views were later developed by Tia Kolbaba, demonstrated that Greek polemics against unleavened bread were first directed in the early eleventh century against Armenians in the Empire, who were non-Chalcedonian Christians (Monophysite heretics in Byzantine eyes).\textsuperscript{184} Armenian political rebellion, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, Byzantine pressure to get the Armenians to accept Chalcedonian Christianity resulted in violent tensions in the 1050s and 1060s.\textsuperscript{185} These political and cultural tensions, in turn, heightened


\textsuperscript{182} Shepard, “Aspects”; 94-95; Nichols, Rome and the Eastern Churches, 234.

\textsuperscript{183} Humberti Cardinalis Dialogus, ed. Cornelius Will, in Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant [...], ed. Cornelius Will (Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), 126. Tia Kolbaba argued that Patriarch Kerularios did not close down Latin churches in Constantinople and that Cardinal Humbert’s accusation that this took place was made up, in her article, “On the Closing of the Churches and the Re-Baptism of Latins: Greek Perfidy or Latin Slander?” in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 29.1 (2005): 39-51. Her article was criticized in J. R. Ryder, “Changing perspectives on 1054,” Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 35.1 (2011): 20–37 who believed that western-rite churches using unleavened bread were indeed shut down (but he did not provide further sources). Kolbaba defended herself, while acknowledging that a careful critical re-reading and perhaps also re-editing of all the relevant sources for the events of 1054 are necessary; “1054 revisited: response to Ryder,” in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 35.1 (2011): 38–44. Thanks to Nicholas Kamas for drawing my attention to this exchange.


Byzantine concern for liturgical and theological uniformity in the empire, particularly among the clerics who objected to Byzantine emperors’ accommodation of “heretical” Armenians.  

Leaven, which symbolically gave life to bread, was compared by Byzantine theologians to the soul which gives life to the body. As a result, Byzantine polemicists accused those who did not use leavened bread of denying the full reality of the Incarnation and of sharing in the heresy of the fourth-century bishop Apollinarios of Laodikeia, who denied that Christ had a human soul. The eating of the Eucharist bread in its leavened form was directly connected in the minds of Byzantine theologians to the profession of correct Christological belief.

The use of unleavened bread in Communion was also associated in the minds of zealous Byzantine clerics with Jewish matzo bread. Jews were a constant presence in the urbanized Byzantine world, and Byzantine clerics repeatedly issued legislation preventing Christians from adopting Jewish religious practices. Consequently, polemics against the use of unleavened bread also accused Armenians of “Judaizing” practices, which in itself was considered heretical in Byzantium. In this view, since Latins, like Armenians and Jews, used unleavened bread, they too were both “heretics” and “Judaizers.”

---

186 Kolbaba, “Byzantines, Armenians, and Latins,” 52. Particularly intriguing for understanding Metropolitan Ioann II’s mindset is the fact that some Constantinopolitan clerics objected to Greek-Armenian inter-marriage in Anatolia on the basis that it threatened the Byzantine Empire’s Orthodoxy purity, Ibid, 54. On the suppression of local rites in the Byzantine Empire in favour of liturgical uniformity see Avvakumov, “Sacramental Ritual,” 10-11 with further bibliography.


189 Erickson, “Leavened and unleavened”: 161.

190 Kolbaba, Byzantine Lists, 38; Avvakumov, “Sacramental Ritual,” 12.


192 The “Judaizing” practices of the Armenians included “restriction of the priesthood to those of priestly descent,” Erickson, “Leavened and unleavened”: 166; Hussey, Orthodox Church, 26. Kolbaba suggests that a Jewish revolt against Byzantine rule in Bari in 1051 may have heightened concerns over Jews as a dangerous presence in the Empire at the time, “Byzantines, Armenians, and Latins”: 55.

193 Ibid.: 55. R. I. Moore describes how Jews and heretics, in the minds of Latin clergy, became interchangeable “enemies of Christ” over the course of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, Persecuting Society, esp. 98-
In 1052/1053 Leo of Ohrid, the Byzantine archbishop of Bulgaria, in a letter to Archbishop Ioannes of Trani in Byzantine Apulia, claimed that Latin Christians, in fact, were neither true Christians nor true Jews, because of their mixed practices: “[...] those who celebrate the Sabbath with unleavened bread and who say that they are Christian, are neither pure Jews nor pure Christians, but are like the hide of a leopard, whose hair is neither completely dark nor completely fair, as Basil the Great says.”\(^{194}\) Both Leo of Ohrid and Metropolitan Ioann of Kyiv seemed to express what Mary Douglas has called fear of ritual pollution from “that which should be joined or the joining of that which should be separate.”\(^{195}\) In these polemical works, the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist is considered an abhorrent contradiction, neither Jewish nor Christian.

The Slavonic version of the “Canonical Answers” links the “incorrect” (in Byzantine eyes) practice of using unleavened bread in communion with other ritual food impurities, warning princes against sending “[... ] where [...] they do not renounce unclean/foul food.”\(^{196}\) This concern with ritual impurity from eating food uncleanly prepared is found in other parts of the “Canonical Answers” as well. In both Greek and Slavic versions of the “Canonical Answers” Metropolitan Ioann forbids the eating of “animals caught by hounds and eagles or other birds[...] if they are not slaughtered by men[... ] For you should observe the same concerning both things caught by wild beasts and strangled things.”\(^{197}\) The situation seems to refer to animals caught in

---

99. This association between heresy and Judaism, however, had existed a century earlier in Byzantium, a fact not taken into account by Moore.


195 Douglas, Purity and Danger, 113


hunting and hawking, favourite princely activities, which suggests it is likely this prohibition was not followed by the elite laity.\textsuperscript{198}

The condemnation of the practice of eating animals killed by strangulation requires additional explanation. Talmudic law forbade inter-marriage of Jews and Gentiles, fraternizing with Gentiles, including eating food prepared by them, and socializing with Gentiles while they were engaged in “idol worship.”\textsuperscript{199} The Byzantine Orthodox church continued to maintain this idea of segregation from non-believers, as well as the idea that certain foods were ritually unclean on the basis of Acts 15:29, which prohibited eating food sacrificed to idols, drinking blood, eating the meat of animals killed by strangulation (\textit{pniktoi}), and sexual immorality.\textsuperscript{200} This rule, originally meant to separate the new Christian community from the practices of pagans (since it associated incorrect eating with idol-worship and sexual transgression), was reaffirmed in canon 67 of the Quinisext Council in 691/692 (the Council \textit{in Trullo}).\textsuperscript{201}

With this answer, Ioann II was trying to impose the prohibition on eating of strangled animals prescribed by the Council \textit{in Trullo} on the customs of the Riurikids and the Rus’ nobility. That such a prohibition was likely to be ignored by male nobles is suggested by the fact that Metropolitan Ioann finds it necessary to add the following injunction: “Therefore attend more to strictness [\textit{akribeia}] [in compliance to canon law] than to the custom of the land.”\textsuperscript{202} In another

\begin{flushleft}
198 The fact that hunting and hawking were princely pursuits in Rus’ can be seen in, for instance, Vladimir Monomakh’s twelfth-century account of his exploits in these fields in his autobiographical “Instruction” (\textit{Pouchenie}), inserted in the Laurentian Chronicle under the year 1096: PSRL, vol. 1, 251. For sources, editions and commentary on this text see John Fennell and Antony Stokes, \textit{Early Russian Literature} (London: Faber and Faber, 1974), 64-79; and Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 215-217.


200 Actual dietary practices of parts of the Byzantine Empire could be at variance with canon law. Despite the canonical prohibition against drinking blood, for example, blood sausages and blood broth were enjoyed in some parts of the Byzantine world; Kolbaba, \textit{Byzantine Lists}, 36.

201 Heinz Ohme, trans. and intro., \textit{Concilium Quinisextum / Das Konzil Quinisextum} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), canon 67, “Peri tou apechesthai haimatos kai pniktou” [“Concerning avoidance of blood and the strangled”], 258-260, discussed in Fedotov, \textit{Russian Religious Mind}, 184. The canon provides unspecified ecclesiastical penalties for the laity and deposition for the clergy if they drink the blood of an animal or eat an animal that has been strangled.

\end{flushleft}
section of the text, Ioann states that clergy can participate in lay banquets before dancing or “games” begin, again suggesting that the princely court did not act in accordance with the metropolitan’s austere expectations of behaviour.203

Metropolitan Ioann II applies his concerns with ritual impurity in another “Answer” dealing with the question as to whether it is permissible to eat with western-rite Christians. He replies that, “It is not permitted to have fellowship with and co-celebrate with those who celebrate communion with azymes and eat meat in Cheesefare as well as blood and strangled things.”204 This answer is found in both the Greek and Slavonic versions of the text and clearly refers to Latin practices. Once again, Ioann links “incorrect” Eucharistic celebration with ritual impurity in eating.

Mary Douglas suggests that “food is not likely to be polluting at all unless the external boundaries of the social system are under pressure.”205 In other words, it is precisely because the Riurikids were socializing, eating with, and marrying western-rite Christians that worried Ioann. In this case, sharing a meal with those who hold incorrect beliefs in his eyes presupposes an elision of social and spiritual boundaries: to eat with someone is to share fellowship with him or her. Ioann does soften his stance a little, adding that sharing a meal with Latin Christians is permitted in the case of necessity and from charity (Greek: *agapē*), but insists that such an activity remains full of spiritual danger.206

---

203 Slavonic text only: “Izhe skhodiashche k mir’skim [pirom] i p’iut’, iierĕisku chinu povelĕvaiut’ sviatii ottsi blagoobraznĕ i s blagosloveniem priimati predlezhashchaia; igranyie i pliasanyie i gunedyie vkhodiashchim, v”ystati sim, da ne oskverniat’ chiuv’stva vidĕnyiem i slyshan ’iem po otech’sku povelĕnii; ili otinud’ omĕtatisia tĕkh pirov, ili v to vremia okhoditi, asche budet’ sblazn velik i vrazhda nesmirena ischevan’nyie mniit’sia,” Answer 16, RIB, 8-9; PDRKP, comment. Goetz, 144; Answer 17 in Kormchaia, vol. 2, ed. Beneshevich, 84, which alone gives also a Greek parallel text.


205 Douglas, Purity and Danger, 126.

Ioann does not explain why he deems eating with Latin to be so dangerous. Such fear of ritual contamination, however, may be found in the eleventh canon of the Council in Trullo, which forbids both laity and clergy from eating Jewish matzo bread (unleavened bread), to take medicine from the Jews, or to bathe with them. Mahlon H. Smith III has shown that this canon was in turn applied by Byzantine polemical texts against social intercourse with Armenians whose beliefs Byzantines considers heretical. Ioann II’s linkage of the same Latin infractions of celebrating the Eucharist with unleavened bread and eating strangled meat suggests that he also followed the same line of thought, in which those who adhere to the Latin rite are condemned both as Jews and as heretics. The danger of ritual pollution existed where social and sexual intercourse threatened the boundaries between Orthodox and Latin Christians.

The concern with ritual purity also appears in Ioann II’s other known work, an undated letter written sometime around 1084/1085-1089 in response to one sent by Anti-Pope Clement III, an appointee of Emperor Heinrich IV. Clement III (Archbishop Wibert of Ravenna, r. 1080-1110) and Gregory VII (r. 1073-1085), followed later by Urban II (r. 1088-1099), had competing claims as to who was the rightful pope. Both sides sought to get eastern churchmen to recognize the legitimacy of their position and negotiated for church union with Patriarch Nikolaos III.

207 Ohme, trans. and ed., Concilium Quinisextum, canon 11, 196-197; “Let none of those enrolled in the priestly orders, or a layman, eat the matzos of the Jews, or be associated with them, or call on (their) sick, or take medicine from them, or wash at the same time with (them) in a bath. But if anyone should seek to do this, let him be deposed, if a cleric; excommunicated, if a layman,” English trans. in Smith III, And taking bread, 69.

208 The application of canon 11 of the Quinisext Council to the Armenians is made by the so-called “Dialexis-Antidialogue” by the eleventh-century Byzantine theologian Niketas Stethatos and in the text “The Sixth Heresy of the Armenians,” Smith III, And taking bread, 69-70; Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology, 95-96.

209 The mutual excommunications of 1054 had reached Kyiv almost immediately, if Cardinal Humbert’s report is to be believed that Rus’ envoys sent back to Constantinople a copy of the excommunication to Emperor Monomachos which had not be “falsified” by Patriarch Kerularios, “Verum imperator post nuntios Romanos directis suis, exemplar excommunicationis verissimum a civitate Russorum remissum sibi accepit, civibusque exhibuit, ac tandem Michaelem falsasse chartam legatorum comperit atque convicit,” Humbertus Cardinalis, Brevis et succinta commemoratio in Acta et scripta, ed. Will, 152.

210 Ioann’s letter is not dated, but most scholars consider that Ioann wrote it in the last year of his life, in 1089, which was the year that Emperor Heinrich IV married the Rus’ princess Eupraxia Vsevolodna, and that Pope Urban II (d.1099) was negotiating for church union with Emperor Alexius Komnenos (r. 1081-1118). See the summary of older literature in R. G. Pikhoia, “Vizantiiiskii monakh — russkii mitropolit Ioann II kak kanonist i diplomat,” in Antichnaia drevnost’ i srednie veka 11 (1975): 133-134. Both Pikhoia and Nazarenko, however, date the letter earlier, to 1084/1085, when Clement III was enthroned in Rome and Alexios I Komennos and Heinrich IV concluded an alliance against the Normans in Apulia, resulting in a joint Byzantine-German campaign in 1084. Pikhoia, “Kanonist i diplomat”: 135-141; Nazarenko Drevniaia Rus’, 544-547.
Grammatikos of Constantinople (r. 1084-1111). While Clement III’s original letter to Metropolitan Ioann does not survive, we have Ioann’s response in both its Greek original and its later Slavonic translation (the earliest manuscript of the latter dates to the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries).

Many scholars have drawn attention to the softness of tone or restraint found in Ioann’s letter to Clement III in contrast to the former’s harsh attitude towards Catholics in his “Canonical Answers.” A close reading of the contents of the letter, however, suggest that while Metropolitan Ioann was still open to dialogue with the papacy through diplomatic exchange, he saw the errors of the Latins as grave ones. Ioann addressed flattering words to Clement III at the beginning of his letter, and a humility *topos* to describe himself. These words should not be read at face-value. As an educated member of the clerical elite, Ioann knew how to employ the rhetorical device of an *exordium* (*captatio benevolentiae*) to capture the good-will of his addressee. In the body of the text, Ioann’s tone changes, and he condemns six Catholic errors found in many Byzantine anti-Latin polemics going back to the list of errors compiled by Patriarch Photios in 867 and by Patriarch Michael Kerularios in 1054. Ioann considers the

---


212 An edition of the letter of Ioann II to Clement III — on which subsequent scholars base their discussion — was completed by A. Pavlov in the late nineteenth century, on the basis of two fourteenth-century manuscripts for both the Greek and Slavic versions with variants given from previous printed editions: “Ioannou métropolitou Rhōsias epistolē pros Klēmenta papan tēn presbuteras Rhōmes,” ed. A. S. Pavlov in idem, *Kriticheskie opyty po istorii drevneishei greko-russkoi polemiki protiv latian* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1878), 169-186.


216 Ioann enumerates six errors of the Latin Church drawn from the list found in Patriarch Photios’ 866/867 encyclical and Patriarch Michael Kerularios’ letter to Patriarch Petros II of Antioch in 1054. These are: fasting on Saturday, shortening Lent on its first week, forcing priests to separate from their lawful wives (i.e. imposing clerical celibacy), performing confirmation by bishops as a rite separate from baptism, using unleavened bread (“azymes”) in the celebration of the Eucharist, and adding the *filioque* to the Creed; *Kriticheskie opyty*, ed. Pavlov, 61;
most serious faults to be the western-rite use of unleavened bread (“azymes”) in the Eucharist and the Latin addition of the phrase *Filioque* to the Creed, calling it heretical and blasphemous. Ioann II adds that, “We wished to write to you also about strangled and unclean animals, and about monks eating meat, but in the future, you will be corrected in such things and similar things to them, and, if God grants it, greater things.” Ioann advises Clement III “to write to our most holy patriarch of Constantinople and to the holy metropolitans there, ‘who are holding forth the word of life’ [Philippians 2:16], shining like stars in the world, and they are capable by the grace of God to discuss these things with you and correct [them].” His promise to write further to Clement III about the eating of “strangled and unclean animals” reflects the same concern against ritual impurity found in the Slavic version of the “Canonical Answers.” Fear of ritual contamination and as well the spread of heretical and blasphemous belief thus underline Ioann II’s prohibition against inter-rite marriage in the “Canonical Answers.” To share a meal with someone or to give a daughter in marriage to someone enable friendship and alliance and consequently threatens to break down social separation between those who are Orthodox, i.e. right believing, and those who are non-Orthodox.

Metropolitan Ioann II and Clement III were in correspondence in the late 1080s at the same time that Eupraxia Vsevolodna, the daughter of the reigning prince of Kyiv, Vsevolod Yaroslavich (r.

---

217 According to Ioann, following Kerularios, the use of azymes in the Eucharist is a Jewish practice: by this custom (in his view) Catholics fall into manichaeism and monothelitism like those heretics who opposed the Orthodox at the sixth Ecumenical Council: “For the devil inspired all these men similarly and one heresy is similar to all.” And as for the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son, the western teaching is “blasphemy” which differs from the “faith of the 318 holy fathers” at Nicaea and what is taught “from limits unto the limits of the inhabited world [oikoumenē] in all the churches of Christians” (the translation is my own). Greek text in *Kriticheskie opyty*, ed. Pavlov, 181-183. For Kerularios’ arguments on unleavened bread, see also Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 95.  

218 “Ebiulomēn kai peri tōn pniktōn kai tōn akathartōn zōōn grapšai soi, kai peri tōn esthiontōn to kreas monachōn; alla taut’ es hustepon kai ta homoa toutois, anper dōē Theos, kai ta meizona diorthōsē,” *Kriticheskie opyty*, ed. Pavlov, 185. Pikhoia interprets Ioann’s refusal to discuss the eating customs of Catholics as a delicate gesture on the part of the metropolitan to avoid exacerbating Orthodox-Catholic differences by raising minor points, “Kanonist i diplomat”: 136. Ioann’s suggestion to discuss the issue in any possible future correspondence, however, shows again that the issue of ritual impurity was important to him.  

was married first to Margrave Heinrich of the Northmark, the count of Stade, in circa 1082-1085 and then second, after his death in 1087, the Emperor Heinrich IV in 1089. It is unlikely that Metropolitan Ioann, living in the centre of Kyiv, could have been ignorant of such high-profile marriages. Ioann may therefore well have had Eupraxia and her father Vsevolod in mind in penning an injunction against princes who marry their daughters to those who celebrate communion with unleavened bread.

Far from rejoicing at the marriage of a Kyivan princess with an emperor, the head of the Rus’ hierarchy considered such a match to be unsuitable, because of his disapproval of “unclean” customs and heretical belief in Latin countries. His condemnation of activities favoured by the lay elite such as hawking and hunting due to fear of ritual impurity suggest that Ioann II’s disapproving voice was not much listened to at the court of the Kyivan princes. Certainly Eupraxia’s father, Vsevolod had many family connections to many western rulers, as R. G. Prokhoia notes: Vsevolod counted as his brothers-in-law King Henri I of France (married to his sister Anna Yaroslavna), Ándrás I of Hungary (married to his sister Anastasia Yaroslavna), and Harald Hardrada of Norway (married to his sister Elizabeth Yaroslavna). Through the two marriages of his daughter Eupraxia, Vsevolod was the father-in-law first of the Saxon Margrave Heinrich of Stade, and then of Emperor Heinrich IV; through the marriage of his son Vladimir Monomakh (prince of Kyiv from 1113-1125), he was also the father-in-law of the Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha.

Latin Christian women were the wives and mothers of Riurikid princes, and Latin rulers were the brothers- and fathers-in-law of Riurikid princes, threatening the black-and-white separation between the two faith traditions made by Ioann II. Indeed, Following Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s marriage to the Byzantine princess Anna in 988/989, the Riurikid dynasty did not conclude

---


221 Pashuto accepts as a fact that Ioann wrote his “Canonical Answers” directly in response to Eupraxia’s marriage, Vneshniaia politika, 125. Pikhoia, however, believes that Ioann II’s condemnation is of a general theoretical character, rather than having a specific marriage in mind. He notes that Eupraxia was a widow at the time of her marriage to Heinrich IV in 1089 and that she had already adopted western-rite Christian customs upon her first marriage to Heinrich of Stade (d. 1087), “Kanonist i diplomat”: 139.

222 Ibid.: 139. On these marriages see Chapter Four and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 7-9,12, 14-15.
another marriage alliance with the Byzantines for the next sixty years. Geography may have played its part: the dangerous steppe, home to nomadic Turkic groups, separated the Rus’ from the Byzantines, while shared borders with their Latin Christian neighbours made marriage alliances a frequent peace-making necessity. Whatever the role of geographic obstacles, such choices in marriages by the Riurikid elite are telling of their inter-confessional closeness with western-rite dynasties.

Metropolitan Ioann II has sometimes been described as a moderate in his attitude toward the Latin Christian church. Despite the polite niceties at the beginning of his letter to (Anti-)Pope Clement III, his writings linking marriage prohibitions with fear of ritual pollution from the “unclean” practices of western Christians reveal him rather to be a zealot. Ioann’s views against Latin Christians were not shared, however, by the Riurikid princes or even by his superiors in Constantinople at the time. Indeed, Ioann II’s response was out of step with a decision taken regarding (temporary) church union by the Patriarch of Constantinople and Emperor Alexios Komnenos. From about 1081 to around 1087 Komnenos had been allied with Emperor Heinrich IV against the Norman Counts of Southern Italy and their ally, Pope Urban II, but from about 1087 onward he began to support Urban II, perhaps, in Walther Holtzmann’s theory, in the hopes that Urban would keep his Norman allies from attacking the Empire. Whether or not this was Alexios’ true motivation, in September of 1089 Alexios summoned an assembly of bishops, the so-called “permanent synod” of Constantinople, to respond to a letter of Pope Urban II.

________________________

223 Raffensperger, Reimagining Europe, 51-53.
224 Cross, “Contacts with the West,” 139; Franklin, “Kievan Rus’,” 91; Raffensperger, Reimagining Europe, 53. The latter also notes that, for their part, the Byzantines also inter-married more frequently with Latin Christian dynasties than with the Rus’, Ibid, 53.
225 Kolbaba calls Ioann a “moderate” in Byzantine Lists, 40.
226 Holtzmann, “Der Unionverhandlungen”: 87-88, 90-91. The ecclesiastical negotiations between Pope Urban II and Emperor Alexios Komnenos are well known and have been commented upon by many scholars. See Runciman, Eastern Schism, 75-76.
The official protocol from this synod survives in a twelfth-century copy (BL Add. 34060, folia 570v-571r). At the Byzantine emperor’s insistence, the assembled bishops in Constantinople resolved to reinstate formal commemoration of Urban II in the Divine Liturgy if he would submit a systatic letter (a letter of introduction; sustatikon) containing his profession of faith as well as a statement saying that he accepted the teachings of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and of the Church Fathers. Until the early eleventh century, it had been customary for the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch, and the pope of Rome to send each other such systatic letters, announcing that they had taken office and professing their common faith. The bishops at the synod of Constantinople in 1089 expected Pope Urban II to act no differently, treating him as a primes inter pares, among other patriarchs. In other words, full union would be restored if Urban II would only give clear proof of his Orthodoxy. Moreover, in eighteen months, the pope or his representative should come for a synod to resolve any outstanding points of canonical contention between the Greek and Latin churches; an abortive attempt was made at the subsequent Council of Melfi later in 1089.

---

227 The text of the protocol from the synod in Constantinople concerning church union in 1089 was discovered and edited by Holtzmann, “Der Unionverhandlungen”: no. 2: 99-100. The mixed content manuscript in which this protocol is preserved is the same one which contains the oldest copies of Metropolitan Ioann II’s Canonical Answers.

228 Ibid, no. 2: 100. Formal liturgical commemoration refers to Urban II’s request to be commemorated in the diptychs (Greek: ta dipytcha). In the Byzantine rite this technical term refers not to a classical writing tablet, but rather to a “liturgical unit,” in Robert Taft’s words, in which, during the Divine Liturgy, the deacon formally commemorates persons by name, including church hierarchs. The term originated in the physical lists of persons, originally both dead and living, that was read aloud (usually before the anaphora). See idem, A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, vol. 4: The Diptychs (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991). As Taft writes, “[…] praying for also implies whose side one is on. So liturgical diptychs were an important factor in the political-ecclesial relations between East and West,” Ibid, xxvii.

229 Hussey, Orthodox Church, 73, 168-169. Runciman notes that the last pope to send a systatic letter to Constantinople announcing his election was Sergius IV (r. 1009-1012). Since he included the filioque in his profession of faith, however, Sergius’ commemoration in the liturgical diptychs was refused in Constantinople, idem, Eastern Schism, 45.

230 Hussey, Orthodox Church, 169.

231 Holtzmann, “Der Unionverhandlungen”: no. 2: 100. On the Council of Melfi, see, for instance, Chadwick, East and West, 222.
Among the clerics listed by hierarchical dignity of their sees that approved the decisions of the synod of Constantinople there appears the “metropolitan of Rus’.” Since Ioann II probably died in Kyiv in 1089, the metropolitan of Rus’ who appears in the protocol of the synod must have been his immediate successor, Ioann III the Eunuch (r. 1089-1090). According to the Rus’ Primary Chronicle, in 1089, prince Vsevolod Yaroslavich sent one of his daughters, the nun Yanka, to travel to Constantinople and to bring back the metropolitan to Kyiv with her. Ioann II’s immediate successor therefore, as a participant to the synod of September 1089 (before he departed for Kyiv), instituted a significantly different and more positive attitude toward the Latin church than his predecessor. If there is any significance in Vsevolod sending his own daughter to receive the metropolitan already in Constantinople, then presumably Ioann III was also much closer to the Riurikid princely family and shared their more accepting views toward Latin Christians. As a participant in the synod of Constantinople, he had approved, at least formally, of (re)union with Pope Urban II. Metropolitan Ioann III of Kyiv’s participation in the reunificatory synod of Constantinople of 1089 and his journey to Rus’ in the company of princess Yanka, suggests that not all Greek Metropolitans set themselves in opposition to the policies of the Riurikid princes vis-à-vis the Latin church.

Moreover and maybe even more significantly, in 1091, papal envoys from Urban II arrived in Kyiv and shortly afterwards the Feast of the Translation of the Relics of Saint Nicholas to Bari was adopted by the Rus’ church. The metropolitanate of Kyiv was vacant at the time. Acting without the guidance of a zealous Greek metropolitan, the Rus’ clergy adopted this feast into their local calendar. This action, in turn, suggests that the majority of Rus’ clergy were still receptive to Latin Christianity. They did not share the “hardline” views that contact with representatives of western-rite Christianity was wrong or polluting.

---

235 Fennell suggests that Vsevolod Yaroslavich may have helped influence the Constantinopolitan synod in their choice of Ioann III as metropolitan of Kyiv, Russian Church, 48.
236 Raffensperger, Reimagining Europe, 182.
Later Fears of Ritual Pollution

The attitude of medieval Greek clergy toward their Latin counterparts in Byzantium and beyond was neither static nor homogeneous, and some were far more open to the western-rite Christians than the supposedly moderate Ioann II.²³⁷ Others shared in his extremist views. Anti-Latin polemics increased in number in Byzantium in the twelfth century, and some of these continued to be imported into Rus’.²³⁸ Paul Magdalino has ascribed the authorship of such twelfth-century works to a group of noble-born and well-educated Byzantine secular clerics, monks, and even lay officials, but especially cathedral clergy, whom he termed “the guardians of Orthodoxy.”²³⁹ These “guardians of Orthodoxy” were concerned with the “enemy within.”²⁴⁰ For it was precisely during the twelfth century that marriage alliances with Latin Christians at the Komnenian court, the presence of western-rite Christians in the service of the Byzantine emperor and “pro-Latin” Greek clerics (interested in, for example, scholastic debates) increased in Constantinople.²⁴¹ The fears of pollution from western-rite customs reflected, in fact, the close state of relations with the western church at this time.

The situation was similar in Rus’, where marriages with Latin Christians continued in the twelfth century, although anti-Latin polemics remained the work of Greek authorship. After Metropolitan Ioann II’s reprimand in the 1080s, no other surviving text by the metropolitans of Kyiv explicitly complained about the Riurikids marrying off their daughters to Latin Christian rulers. Tracts on the polluting practices of Latin Christians in general continued to be issued, however. In particular, eating with Latin Christians and their use of unclean food were condemned by the Greek-born Metropolitan Nikephoros I of Kyiv (r. 1103/1104-1121), who wrote three letters to various Rus’ princes on this subject: one addressed to Vladimir Monomakh

---

²³⁸ Magdalino, Empire of Manuel I, 320.
²³⁹ Ibid., 320 and 388.
²⁴⁰ Ibid., 386-387.
²⁴¹ Ibid., 386-387.
(d. 1125), another to Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113), or his son Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123), and the third to Yaroslav Sviatoslavich of Murom (d. 1129). These letters are known only from late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Slavonic manuscript witnesses, but they were presumably originally written in Greek. Condemnation of unleavened bread was also inserted into the Primary Chronicle’s early twelfth-century account of Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s conversion to Byzantine Christianity in 988/989: a Greek philosopher (“filosof”) is said to have taught him that it is wrong to celebrate the Eucharist with azymes.

The most wide-spread anti-Latin polemic in Rus’ which also includes a condemnation of marriage is, however, attributed in all manuscript copies to a native Rus’ man, Saint Theodosios (Feodosii), the second igumen (abbot) of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves (d. May 3 1074). This text on the “Latin” or “Varangian” faith was supposedly written by him in reply to questions asked by Prince Iziaslav Yaroslavovich (d. 1078). While Theodosios’ authorship of this anti-Latin polemic is still accepted by some scholars, it has been contested since the late

---

242 “Poslanie ot Nikifora mitropolita kievskogo k Vladimiru kniaziu Vseia Rusi [o vere latinskoi],” in Mitropolit Nikifor, eds., Russian trans. and commentary, A. I. Makarov et al. in Pamiatniki drevnerusskoi mysl: issledovaniia i teksty, vol. 5 (Saint Petersburg: Mir, 2007), 281-343; “[Poslanie neizvestnomu kniaziu] mitropolita Nikifora o latinakh,” in Ibid, 379-409; “Poslanie ot Nikifora, mitropolita kievskogo [i] vsei russkoi zemli, napisanie na latinu k Yaroslavu kniaziu Muromskomu,” in Ibid, 410-487. For Nikephoros’ biography, see Poppe, “Die Metropoliten,” 287. All of the princely addressees of these letters were related to westen-rite rulers: Vladimir Monomakh was the husband of the English princess Gytha, Sviatopolk’s daughter Sbyslava married Bolesław III of Poland, Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich was married to a Polish princess, and Yaroslav Sviatoslavich of Murom was the son of the German noblewoman Oda; Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 11, 12, 19.

243 The list of manuscripts of Nikephoros’ anti-Latin letters are given in: Mitropolit Nikifor, ed. and commentary Makarov et al., 285-286, 381, 412.

244 PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.1, sub anno 6494 (985/986), 637-640; English trans. in PC, 98: “[The Philosopher said.] We likewise heard how men came from Rome to convert you to their faith. It differs but little from ours, for they commune with wafers, called oplatki, which God did not give them, for he ordained that they should commune with bread. [...] They do not so act, for they have modified the faith.”

nineteenth century. According to one influential alternative attribution, the “Discourse” against the Latin faith was written by another igumen Theodosios, not the eleventh-century Rus’ saint, but a twelfth-century monk of the Caves Monastery known as Theodosios the Greek (d. 1156). As his name indicates, Theodosios could either have been a Greek monk living in Rus’, a Bulgarian monk who knew Greek well, or a Rus’ monk who had gone to Byzantium to study.

If one accepts this attribution to Theodosios the Greek, then the addressee of his letter would not be prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078), but rather prince Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1154), whose sister Euphrosyne Mstislavna was married to King Géza II of Hungary, and who maintained very close ties to the Hungarian court, as Chapter Five will demonstrate. If it was indeed another Byzantine hierarch who wrote the text, then marriage prohibitions against Latins can be interpreted as another Greek polemic written in Rus’ rather than a specifically local Rus’ concern. The only certain work of Theodosios the Greek’s authorship, however, is the translation he made around 1142 into Old Slavonic of a Greek letter sent by Pope Leo I to Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople in 451 condemning the Monophysite heresy. This text is the only Slavonic translation from Greek in Kyivan Rus’ whose authorship is attributed to a

---


248 Franklin, “Greek in Kievan Rus’,” XII 72.

249 Paterik, trans. Heppell, n. 664, 211; Podskalsky, Literatur, 180; Ponyrko, Epistoliarne nasledie, 10-11; Alexandrov, “To zhe i s latiny”; 103.

250 Ibid.: 103.

specific individual. With only one known work written by Theodosios the Greek, there is limited evidence on which to confirm or firmly deny his authorship of the “Letter on the Latins.”

The text of Theodosios’ “Letter on the Latins” has a complicated history. In 1462, Kasian, a monk and choir-master of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves, incorporated it into his second edition of the *Paterik*, a collection of stories about the monks and holy men associated with his monastery. In this popular so-called “Second Kasian redaction” of the *Paterik*, representing the second major redaction of the text, the “Discourse of Saint Theodosios the igumen of the Monastery of the Caves concerning the Christian and Latin Faiths,” survives in many manuscript copies. Muriel Heppell has suggested, however, that since this anti-Latin discourse is not found in redactions of the *Paterik* of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves prior to 1462, the inclusion of this text in the *Paterik* perhaps came from strong Anti-Latin reaction after the unionist Council of Florence of 1439.

In this Second Kasian redaction, Theodosios specifies that it is “Christians” who “should not give their daughters to them [Latins] in marriage, nor receive them in their own homes, nor swear any oath of brotherhood with them, nor have them as godparents, nor exchange kisses with

---


253 Ponyrko, *Epistoliarne nasledie*, 12. For linguistic and stylistic reasons, Kostromin considers it more likely that Theodosios the Greek rather than Saint Theodosios of the Caves wrote the “Letter on the Latins”, but acknowledges that the question of attribution remains open, partly because so little is known of Theodosios the Greek’s biography, “Problema atributsii”: 88-89.

254 The main kernel of the stories in the *Paterik* was written in the thirteenth century by Bishop Simon of Vladimir and Suzdal (r. 1214-1226), formerly a monk of the monastery, and by his contemporary, the monk Polikarp. Further stories were added in the fifteenth century, when the entire work received its title (*Pecherski Paternik*), Dmytro Abramovych, “Vstep” in *Paterik*, ed. Abramovych, ix-xxii; Muriel Heppell, “Introduction,” in *Paterik*, trans. Heppell, xvii-lii; L. A. Olshevskaia, “Paterik Kievo-Pecherskii” in SKKDR, n.p. The letter of circa 1142 is part of the later additions.


them, nor eat with them, nor drink from any single vessel.” In all versions, if a Catholic should ask an Orthodox person to eat, the Orthodox Christian should give food to the Catholic in the Catholic person’s own dish, but if this is not possible, “give him something in your dish, then wash it and say a prayer.” Thus, like the “Canonical Answers” of Ioann II and Ioann’s letter to Clement III, the “Discourse” condemns the ritual pollution resulting from social interaction with Catholics.

It is unlikely that Iziaslav Yaroslavich would have actually asked Saint Theodosios to tell him about western-rite customs circa 1070. As will be discussed in Chapter Three, Iziaslav Yaroslavich’s wife was the Polish princess Gertruda, and Iziaslav himself spent many years in exile in Poland and Germany (in 1068-1069 and 1073-1077) where he was able to observe Latin ritual firsthand. His son Yaropolk was married to a German noblewoman, Kunegunda, the daughter of Otto of Meissen (d. 1067), and Alexander Nazarenko has speculated that the first wife of his other son, Sviatopolk, may have been a Czech princess. Iziaslav’s mother, Ingigerd (d. 1050), was a Swedish princess and his siblings were also married to western-rite rulers.

Thus, although the authorship of the “Discourse concerning the Christian and Latin Faiths” remains disputed, the internal evidence of the text makes it unlikely that it was written in the eleventh, and perhaps even in the twelfth century. The condemnation not only of giving away daughters in marriage to western-rite countries, but also receiving them in marriage in Rus’ makes no sense if it is assumed that these western-rite women will adopt Orthodox customs of their husbands upon their arrival and marriage in Rus’. In the eleventh century, as Steven

257 “Khristianom zhe svoikh dshcherei ne dostoit davati za nikh, ni bratisia s nimi, ni kumitia, ni tsëlovania s nimi imëti, i ne yasti s nimi, ni piti iz edinogo ssuda,” Pateryk, ed. Abramovych, 190; Paterik, trans. Heppell, 212.
259 Alexandrov, “To zhe i s latinu,” 102.
260 The fact that Iziaslav Yaroslavich had no actual need to ask Theodosios about Latin customs is discussed by Nazarenko, “Mezhkonfessionalnye braki na Rusi,” 277. Iziaslav and Gertrude’s marriage will be discussed in more detail in the third chapter. See also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 6.
261 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 524-528; discussed also in Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 13 and Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 6.
262 Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 4, 6-11.
Runciman points out, Metropolitan Ioann censured only the Rus’ princesses who left Rus’ to marry western-rite rulers. Ioann thus implied that western-rite princesses who came to Rus’ would participate in the Orthodox liturgy, in which they would receive communion with leavened bread “and so raised no problem.”²⁶³ A later dating seems for Theodosios’s discourse thus seems more likely than an eleventh-century one. By the fifteenth century, when the Second Kassian redaction of the Paterik was compiled, ordinary Rus’ clerics had absorbed Byzantine teaching on maintaining purity of faith.

Conclusions

The concern with ritual pollution among the Greek hierarchs of Kyivan Rus’ came first of all from their attempts to impose a clear separation between correct and incorrect beliefs and practices among the newly converted Rus’. This attempt to impose a social boundary between “correct” Christian beliefs and other practices can be seen in Metropolitan Ioann’s censure of marriages with Latin Christians and his disapproval of eating both with Latin Christians and with pagans. The numerous social bonds that the Riurikid princes formed with Latin Christians threatened his neat divisions of society into right believers and non-believers, the Orthodox and the non-Orthodox. Twelfth-century Greek elites whom Magdalino calls the “guardians of Orthodoxy” in Constantinople shared a similar anxiety.²⁶⁴ These clerics emphasized orthodoxia (right-belief) only in the form of orthopraxia (right-practice), also at a time of increasing contacts between Latin Christians and Byzantine clerics.²⁶⁵

Ioann II’s anxieties about inter-marriage, moreover, were embedded in still larger concerns with preserving ritual purity by avoiding pollution from unclean food and habits. This fear of ritual pollution may be found in Ioann’s “Canonical Answers” as well as in his written reply to Anti-Pope Clement III. In some cases, such as the prohibition of eating meat obtained by hawking, it is clear that these concerns had no resonance whatsoever with lay Riurikid princes

²⁶³ Runciman, Eastern Schism, 85.
²⁶⁴ Magdalino, Empire of Manuel I, 386-387.
Anti-Latin texts which originated as a form of foreign Greek literature in Kyivan Rus’ were indeed disconnected from the mores of the courts of the Riurikid princes. The most widely disseminated anti-Latin tract condemning marriages with Catholics, the “Discourse” of Saint Theodosios remains of debated dating, but likely was not written in the eleventh century, and maybe not even in the twelfth. Additions to the “Canonical Answers” in early modern Slavonic manuscripts and the later circulation of Slavonic anti-Latin polemics suggest that opposition to inter-marriage with Catholics certainly increased among Orthodox clergy in Rus’ over time, perhaps as they themselves came to identify more strongly with a Byzantine-oriented cultural identity and acculturated to Byzantine norms.

Despite the vicious, though relatively rare, condemnation of Orthodox-Catholic marriages in anti-Latin polemics, it is worth highlighting that inter-marriage between the Orthodox Rus’ and their Latin neighbours was never formally prohibited in Kyivan Rus’ in a) ecclesiastical statutes issued by native Rus’ princes, b) Byzantine civil legislation or c) synodal legislation (church canons). Canon law itself remained open to inter-rite marriage in the period from 1000 to 1204. Throughout this period, the letter of the law stated that only marriages with non-Christian faiths and with heretics were prohibited and held as invalid. Such heretical groups were narrowly defined in the canons as those whose views had been condemned formally by Ecumenical Councils.

The interpretation by exceptionally zealous clerics such as Ioann II that Latins were heretics in the sense of holding incorrect beliefs about the Trinity was not universally accepted, nor did their extremist position on this issue, written in Greek, reach a wide clerical audience in Rus’. The adoption of new Latin feasts in the late eleventh century, such as the Feast of the Translation of Saint Nicholas’ relics to Bari, suggest that Rus’ clerics were still open to Latin Christianity. In the eleventh century it was the predominantly foreigner Greek-born clergy, like Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv, who opposed the marriages of the Rus’ princely family with Catholic rulers. Only gradually did these views seem to have spread to the Slavic majority of clerics in Rus’, as can be seen in the Slavonic anti-Latin polemic inserted in the story of Vladimir’s conversion in the Rus’ twelfth-century Primary Chronicle or in the polemic attributed to the eleventh-century Saint Theodosios of the Monastery of the Caves, but in fact probably dating to the twelfth or even fifteenth century.
Metropolitan Ioann II’s condemnation of the Riurikids’ marriages with Catholics targeted Riurikid princesses who left Rus’ to become Latin queen consorts; he also implied that those who came to Rus’ would be expected to abandon their “Latin ways.” The process by which a bride in an inter-rite marriage was expected to adapt to her new cultural-ecclesiastical environment will be examined in the following chapters, but the break between a bride’s old social-cultural identity and the new one assumed at her marriage was not as drastic as Metropolitan Ioann would have liked it to be. One important aspect of this cultural acculturation and its ecclesiastical implications will be examined in the next chapter: the alleged frequency of re-naming of brides and its purported connection to religious conversion.
In 1233, hearing reports from Dominican missionaries in Kyiv that Catholic women who married Orthodox men in Rus’ were being re-baptized, Pope Gregory IX (r. 1227-1241) reacted with outrage: “[the Rus’] make Catholic women whom they sometimes take as their wives be baptized a second time according to their own rite in contempt of the Christian faith and [they make their wives] observe their damnable errors.”

It was for this reason that Gregory IX wrote to the clergy of Poland, to forbid marriage between western-rite Christians and the Rus’, becoming the first pope to do so. He based his prohibition on the grounds that, by re-baptizing brides, the Rus’ insulted the Latin-rite sacrament. Accusations by Latin authors that Orthodox clerics in both Rus’ and Byzantium disrespected the Latin baptismal rite by re-baptizing western-rite Christians went back to Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida who in his excommunication bull of 1054 first accused Patriarch Michael Kerularios of this matter.

On the basis of Latin texts such as papal bulls of the thirteenth century as well as Byzantine imperial practice of renaming brides, the view has dominated in older scholarship that Catholic princesses marrying into the Riurikid dynasty had to convert to the faith of their spouse and

---


therefore be re-baptized and also re-named.\textsuperscript{269} Baptism, the most important Christian initiation rite, was strongly linked with the bestowal of a name. Whether the priest said, “I baptize you N.,” as in the western rite, or the “The servant of God, N. is baptized,” as in the eastern rite, the ritual included the solemn pronunciation of the name by which the baptismal candidate, whether an infant or an adult convert, was reborn into the life of the Christian community.\textsuperscript{270} Latin and Orthodox baptismal rites, however, had diverged approximately by the late sixth century.\textsuperscript{271} Consequently, the taking on of a new name by a princess has been interpreted as evidence of her re-baptism and “conversion” into the religious confession of her husband.\textsuperscript{272}

Can one conclude therefore that Latin brides were renamed and re-baptized into Orthodoxy when they came to Rus’? This chapter will re-examine the links made between renaming, re-baptism, conversion, and “rituals of incorporation” of western Christian women sent as brides to Kyivan Rus’.\textsuperscript{273} Name-change of Riurikid brides in Western Europe will be examined in more detail in Chapter Four. This chapter will propose two possible solutions to the question of whether or not


\textsuperscript{270} Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology, 194. For the association between naming and baptism in the western medieval rites (Roman, Mozarabic, and Ambrosian), see J. D. C. Fisher, “Appendix II. Baptism and the Giving of the Name,” in idem, Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West. A Study in the Disintegration of the Primitive Rite of Initiation (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), 149-157, esp. 151-152: “[…] in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when it began to be customary for all infants […] to be baptized very soon after birth […] in the eyes of ordinary parents the first formal using of their child’s name would seem to take place at his baptism.” For the eastern rite see, for instance, John Anthony McGuckin, who notes that, “An adult will choose a new name, of a saint, or angel, by which they will ever after be known in the church. Those baptized as infants will celebrate their baptismal saint as their festal name-day, their spiritual birthday, in preference to their calendrical name day, which latter custom is regarded in the church as a residual pagan influence,” The Orthodox Church. An Introduction to its History, Doctrine, and Spiritual Culture (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), n. 61, 368.


\textsuperscript{273} The idea of a “ritual of incorporation” was first formulated in Arnold van Gennep’s classic 1908 study on the rites of passage. In such a ceremony, an individual becomes part of a new community. See the discussion of this anthropological term in Edward Muir, “Rites of Passage,” in idem, Ritual in Early Modern Europe, 2nd. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 21.
western-rite brides were renamed and/or re-baptized on their arrival in Rus’. First, brides who married into the Riurikid dynasty might have received an additional name of an Orthodox saint through the Orthodox ritual of anointing (chrismation), although there is no way of knowing if this ceremony was performed on a regular basis, due to a lack of both normative and narrative source on this topic. The potential for the eastern-rite ritual of chrismation to be misinterpreted by western-rite Christian observers as re-baptism is one possible explanation for Latin accusations that re-baptism of brides took place in Rus’.

The difficulty, if not the impossibility, of reconstructing medieval rituals on the basis of their description in written sources has long been appreciated by historians.274 The same ritual can be recorded, described, and understood differently even by medieval contemporaries.275 Although the repetition of accusations in Latin texts that re-baptism of brides occurred in Rus’ does not allow one to exclude completely the possibility that uneducated clerics might have performed this ritual, it is more likely in consideration of the generally open state of relations between western-rite and eastern-rite rulers and canon law itself that western-rite observers simply misunderstood the ritual of chrismation as re-baptism.

The second possible explanation that this chapter will consider is that brides in Rus’ retained two names: an acceptable Orthodox saint’s name and their own native name, which would fit with the existing custom in the Riurikid dynasty of giving double-names to members of the dynasty. The practice of giving a woman two names at birth in the lands of “New Europe” (Rus’, Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary) could also explain why a woman appears in our sources with more than one name.

Finally, this chapter agrees with recent studies that the purpose of calling a foreign bride by an additional name was to link the bride more closely to her new family, that of her husband, rather

274 Phillippe Buc, The Dangers of Ritual Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001). Buc famously outlines the problems the historian encounters when taking textual description of rituals at face value, discussing invented solemnities for power politics and ecclesiastical instructions, forgeries, and the medieval Christian notion of “Truth,” which appeals more often to what ought to happen, rather than describing what did happen. See also Muir, “Rites of Passage,” 6-14 with extensive bibliographic references.

275 Zbigniew Dalewski, Ritual and Politics. Writing the History of a Dynastic Conflict in Medieval Poland (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 9 with further bibliography.
than to mark her religious conversion. In both Western Europe and in Rus’, names among nobility and aristocracy were markers of family identity and continuity.276 Most commonly, the chosen heir to the throne in a royal dynasty would be named after an ancestor who had ruled previously, thereby cementing his claim to the throne and his right to rule.277 By receiving a new name that fit into the existing naming traditions in her husband’s family, a bride from a foreign dynasty could be symbolically incorporated into her husband’s family. If such was the case, renaming seems to have been motivated more by concerns over ensuring dynastic legitimacy (a person’s membership in the Riurikid dynasty was demonstrated by having an appropriately Riurikid name) rather than by religious conversion. Nonetheless, one should leave open the possibility that a bride could have retained her natal name “privately” together with the new “official” dynastic name given to her after marriage.

Keeping the limitations of our primary sources in mind, this chapter will explore the complex topic of re-baptism and renaming first by consider prescriptive texts, looking at whether or not re-baptism was even permissible in the context of relevant eastern canon law. Second, it will re-examine the narrative sources cited in secondary literature on whose basis claims have been made about individual cases of renaming brides.

Before discussing specific case-studies of brides said to be renamed and re-baptized in Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriages, it is helpful to summarize how scholarly understanding of this question has changed over time. By looking at the issue of renaming in a wider European comparative context, recent scholarship has largely rejected the idea that religious grounds were the reason for renaming among Orthodox and Catholic marriage partners. One reason for rejecting the link between renaming and re-baptism and/or conversion is that many examples


277 Régine Le Jan, “Personal Names and the Transformation of Kinship in Early Medieval Society (Sixth to Tenth Centuries),” in Personal names studies, eds. Beech et al., 45; Fedor Uspenskii [=Fjodor Uspenskij], Imia i Vlast’: Vybor imeni kak instrument dinasticheskoi borby v srednevekovoi skandinavii (Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2001), 9-10.
may be found of princesses and noblewomen who changed their names after marriage within the same confessional tradition in the tenth to thirteenth centuries. A well-documented example is that of Emma (d. 1052), the daughter of Duke Richard I of Normandy (d. 996), who was renamed Ælgilfu when she became the second wife of the Anglo-Saxon King Æthelred II in 1002 and then was known as Emma again when, at Æthelred’s death, she remarried in 1017 with King Knud the Great of Denmark (d. 1035). Both of the queen’s names were remembered by chronicles. For example, the twelfth-century *Abingdon Chronicle* calls Queen Emma-Ælgifu “*regina binomia*” or the “double-named” queen. The concept that a royal bride could have more than one name, that she could indeed be “double-named,” is a key idea that this chapter will explore as an explanation of the renaming of brides in Rus’.

Gertrud Thoma has carried out the most detailed and wide-ranging comparative study of renaming customs in medieval Europe to date. Thoma’s study concluded that only in the case of women marrying into the Byzantine imperial family did a change of name take place regularly, while in Western Europe name change occurred on an *ad hoc* basis. Thoma rejected, however, the suggestion that this regular occurrence of name-change in Byzantium was a result of re-baptism of western-rite brides. Her rejection of this hypothesis is based on her observation that Orthodox Christian brides were also re-named when they married into the imperial family. For example: Anastaso, the daughter of a Byzantine innkeeper or wine merchant, was renamed “Theophano” upon her marriage around 956 to Emperor Romanos II (d.

---


281 Thoma, *Namensänderungen*, 217 and Table 1, n. p.

after 976) and Kyratzas, the daughter of the Bulgarian tsar Ivan Alexander, was renamed “Maria” after her marriage to the Emperor Andronikos IV in 1356.283

Rather than ascribing name change to re-baptism, Thoma instead proposed that women who married into the Byzantine imperial family had to take on the names of previously reigning empresses.284 Thus foreign-born brides who already bore names of previous Byzantine empresses were not required to change their names.285 In her view, a Roman (i.e. Byzantine) empress was not permitted to have a “barbarian” name and should instead adopt an acceptable name from among those of her predecessors in imperial office.286 Gudrun Schmalzbauer accepted Thoma’s idea that renaming in Byzantium was not linked to religious conversion. She provided, though, the alternative suggestion that foreign brides who married into the Byzantine imperial family needed to change their name if their original name was not present in the Byzantine liturgical calendar, because it then could not fit into court ceremonial that accompanied this calendar (for instance, ritual acclamations of the empress’ name).287

Gertrud Thoma’s study was important in separating the ritual of renaming of brides in Byzantium from notions of religious conversion. Her thesis cannot be used to explain the motivation behind renaming of brides in Rus’, however, because the Riurikid princes did not possess the same claims of ideological superiority over other ruling families as the Byzantine

283 Ibid., 174-175, 187-190. 
284 Ibid., 189 and 219. 
285 Examples of foreign-born brides not required to change their names upon marriage to a Byzantine emperor were: Maria of Alania (the wife of Michael VII), Maria of Antioch (wife of Manuel I), Maria of Courtenay (the wife of Theodore I), Helena of Bulgaria (the wife of Theodore II), Anna of Hungary (the wife of Andronikos II), Anna Anna Vasilievna of Moscow and Sophia of Montferrat (the successive wives of Ioann VIII Palaiologos); Ibid, 189-190. 
286 Ibid., 190. 
emperors did. Likewise, Schmalzbauer’s theory is not entirely satisfactory as an explanation for name-change of Latin brides in Rus’, because there is no evidence of the use of ritual acclamations of princesses in Rus’ before the Muscovite period when many Byzantine court customs were adopted.

If conversion and re-baptism must be rejected as grounds for the name change of brides marrying into the Riurikid dynasty, then what reason or reasons can be given for this practice? In answer to this question, Andrzej Poppe devised the intriguing hypothesis that women who married into the Rus’ dynasty were named after Rus’-born princesses who had recently been married “out” and who had left for foreign lands. Thus, in his view, new daughters-in-law were symbolically renamed after absent daughters who had left the dynasty. Put more directly in the words of Grzegorz Pac, according to Poppe’s thesis: “a woman who left her dynasty was symbolically replaced, through her name, by the woman who entered into the dynasty.”

Poppe’s thesis seems to offer an elegant alternative explanation for renaming of foreign brides who came to Rus’, but this chapter will demonstrate that there are insufficient primary sources to support the theory that this symbolic renaming of brides after absent daughters consistently took place in Rus’. Moreover, his thesis is challenged or at least complicated by the custom of the Riurikid dynasty to avoid naming persons after living members of the dynasty.

---


289 The chronicle sources speak only of the ritual acclamations of princes (not princesses) when they entered in a Rus’ city to take power. See Alexandra Vukovich, “The Ritualisation of Political Power in Early Rus’ (10th-12th centuries),” Ph.D. Diss., Cambridge University, 2015, esp. 31, 135.


292 “In Rus’ nephews were, however, sometimes named in honour of living uncles in two very specific situations: first, if a young orphaned nephew was placed under the protection of his uncle, or, second, if parents wished to stress the hereditary claims of a prince over his uncle, Anna Litvina, and Fiodor Uspenskii, Vybor imeni u russikh kniazei v X-XVI vv.: dinasticheskaia istoriia skvoz prizmu antroponimiki (Moscow: Indrik, 2006), 71-110, 266, 452-453.
Poppe’s thesis does accord, however, with one observations made by Anna Litvina and Fiodor Upsenskii on the internal naming practices of the Riurikid dynasty, namely that following an initial period of absorption of names of both Scandinavian and Slavic origin in the second half of the tenth century, the corpus of available secular names for the Riurikids soon became closed to new influences.\textsuperscript{293} In Rus’, the repetition of the names like Yaroslav or Sviatoslav for men or Ol’ga or Predslava for women marked their bearers as members of the Riurikid dynasty who had the right to rule in Rus’.\textsuperscript{294} In this way, the name of a Rus’ princess played a similar function as the name of a Byzantine empress: there was a tendency to name a woman of a ruling dynasty after her predecessor in rulership. As a result of the fact that there soon formed a “closed corpus” of names, Riurikid names tend to repeat themselves over generations.

Placed in a larger context, therefore, the renaming of brides in the Riurikid dynasty seems to fit with a European practice of symbolically incorporating a bride into her husband’s family by giving her one of the family’s traditional female names. This narrative of ritual incorporation, however, is complicated by the custom of double-names. The usage of double names—a “secular” name and a Christian baptismal name—means that is not always absolutely certain from the extant sources whether or not a given individual took a new name upon marriage or whether she had already been given two names in her native land. Such double names were used by the Riurikids from the eleventh to the early seventeenth centuries, but the practice was also employed by elites in Poland, Scandinavia, Croatia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Bohemia during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{295} Members of these newly-Christian dynasties combined their dynastic (“secular” or “clan”) name of pagan origin with the name of a Christian saint or Biblical

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{293} The influx of new names in the Riurikid dynasty in the tenth century coincided with the period in which the (originally Scandinavian) Riurikid dynasty established itself over the Slavic population of Rus’, \textit{Ibid.}, 257.
\item \textsuperscript{294} \textit{Ibid.}, 238-256, 265-266, English summary, 448-449, 452.
\end{itemize}
The first “dynastic” name indicated a person’s membership and standing within a ruling dynasty, since dynastic names were repeated from generation to generation. The second name, the Christian one bestowed in baptism, linked the ruler with a particular patron saint who acted as his spiritual protector. This custom of double-naming crossed confessional lines and illustrates also how the Riurikid dynasty of Rus’ in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was culturally similar to other neophyte dynasties in “New Europe.”

A famous example of a Rus’ prince who had multiple names was Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125). In his autobiographical Pouchenie (known in English as the Testament or Instruction), written in the early twelfth century, Vladimir Monomakh says explicitly that he received the name of Saint Basil (Slavonic: Vasilii) in baptism, while his grandfather Yaroslav gave him the Slavic name Vladimir, and, finally, his mother and father gave him the additional family name of “Monomakh” (Greek: “Monomachos”).

Evidence for women having double-names in Rus’ is scantier, due to the fact that sources rarely record the births and baptisms of daughters, and the first time that these women appear in narrative sources is often only after their marriages in a foreign land. In fact, up until the mid twelfth century, Rus’ chronicles rarely name women by their personal names at all. Only the

---

296 Examples of male double-names among non-Rus’ elites that combine an originally pagan name with a saint’s name include: King Knud Lambert of Denmark, King Vaik Stephan of Hungary, King Béla Adelbert of Hungary, King Zvonimir Demetrius of Croatia, Saint Vojich Adalbert of Prague, Bishop Jaromir Gebhard of Prague, King Mieszko II Lambert of Poland, and Duke Wladyslaw Herman of Poland, Hertel, Imiennictwo, 67-176; Kętrzyński, “O imionach,” 597-598; Thoma, Namensänderungen, 32-55 and 218. Double-naming in Rus’ is treated in detail in the works of Fjodor Uspenskii and Anna Litvina. See, for example, Uspenskii, “Dynastic Names,” 17, Litvina, and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni 111-174, idem, “The Prince and His Names,” 346-364, esp. n. 3, 347 and 362-363. As discussed further below in this chapter, examples of female double-names are more difficult to determine. Two such examples from Poland include Wierzchosława Ludmiła, daughter of Duke Mieszko III, and Judith Maria, wife of Władysław Herman, Hertel, Imiennictwo, 174, and Kętrzyński, “O imionach,” 600. Some Scandinavian examples of royal women with double-names are given below.

297 Hertel, Imiennictwo, 175-176.

298 Ibid., 179-180; Thoma, Namensänderungen, 218.


301 As will be discussed in Chapter Five, from the mid twelfth century on, internal marriage alliances among the branches of the Riurikid dynasty became more frequent. Therefore, the chronicles mention women more often since
daughters of Rus’ princes, those born on Rus’ soil, are mentioned by name in thechronicles, as Małgorzata Smorąg-Różycka correctly pointed out. As mentioned in thegeneral introduction, with two exceptions, the foreign wives of Rus’ princes are referred to innative chronicles solely by their title as “princess” (*knęgini*, variant spelling: *kniaginia*). When Rus’ chronicles mention the marriages of Rus’ princesses to foreign rulers at all, they do so in a briefannalistic style without any commentary, giving no sense of the process by which aRus’ woman became acculturated to her new home and vice versa. For instance, the *KyivanChronicle* says only the following about the marriage of the Rus’ princess SbyslavaSviatopolkovna, “In this same year, Sviatopolk’s daughter, Sbyslava, was led to the Poles to[take her as her husband] Boleslaw in the month of November, on the sixteenth day.” The same impersonal narration is employed by the *Kyivan Chronicle* when describing the arrival ofLatin-rite women in Rus’, as, for example, in the following description of the marriage between aPolish princess and Vsevolod Davidovich, prince of Murom, in 1123/1124: “In that year a Polishwoman was brought to Murom as [a wife for] Vsevolod Davidovich.” Despite the smaller number of examples available for the study of women’s names in Rus’, thereis some evidence that Riurikid women also had double-names. The earliest such example of a woman with a double-name is the first member of the dynasty to convert to Christianity, theprincess Ol’ga / Helga, who around 957 took the baptismal name “Helena.” Another example
is Sbyslava, the daughter of prince Vsevolod “Big Nest” (“Bolshoe Gnezdo,” d. 1212), who at her birth on October 26th 1178 received the baptismal name “Pelagia,” after the feast of the three saint Pelagias that fell close to her birthday, on October seventh and eighth (the Pelagias of Antioch, Palestine, and Tarsus). As Anna Litvina and Fiodor Uspenskii have convincingly demonstrated, however, the choice of baptismal name for a Riurikid prince or princess initially did not depend on the ecclesiastical calendar. Prior to the later half of the twelfth century, Riurikid princes and princesses were given baptismal names of saints that were considered to be important divine helpers within the dynasty or within a given branch of the dynasty. It was only in the late twelfth century, as the Rus’ acculturated to Byzantine ecclesiastical norms, that the Riurikids began to be named after the patron-saint whose feast-day coincided with or occurred in close temporal proximity to their birthday. Up until the late twelfth century, therefore, there may have been some flexibility as to which Christian name a princess would adopt together with her secular name.

In Rus’ chronicles and charters of the pre-Mongol period, the dynastic, non-baptismal name appears most often in chronicles to designate individual princes. This name functioned as the “public” name of the prince, while the baptismal name remained a “private” one used in prayer. The use of two names by the same individual should also be taken into account as a factor when discussing whether or not specific women were re-named upon their marriage. The double-naming system in Rus’ in particular also raises the possibility that a bride could adopt a

---

1992), lxxxi and xci and Memorial and Encomium for Prince Volodimer of Rus’ in Ibid., 170. The dating of this hagiographical text praising Olga and her grandson Vladimir is highly debated with suggested dates ranging from the late eleventh to late thirteenth centuries.

307 “Togo zhe l[e]tĕ do Dmitrova d[н]и родиcь u velikogo Vsevoloda chetvertaia dchĭ i narekosha imë vo st[iat]om kr[e]shchnii Polagiia a kn[iia]żë Sbyslava” [“In that year on Saint Demetrius’ Day, i.e. October 26, Vsevolod the Great’s fourth daughter was born and she was given the name ‘Pelagia’ in holy baptism and ‘Sbyslava’ as a princely name.”], PSRL, vol. 2, sub anno 6686 (1178), 613, discussed in: Litvina and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni, 183 and 604; Voitovych, Kniazha doba, 552.

308 Litvina and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni, 185.

309 The custom (of giving a child a baptismal name according to the saint’s feast-day which coincided with the child’s birthday) only become widespread in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Ibid., 182, 208-212.

310 Ibid, 214.

name upon marriage suitable for membership in the Riurikid dynasty, while maintaining her own name, as it were, “in private.”

Canon Law

The attitude of western canon law to re-baptism is clear: since the third century, western canon law had prohibited re-baptism as it asserted the sacrament should only be taken once. Pope Stephen I (r. 254-257) stated that even repentant heretics could not be re-baptized if they had already received baptism in the name of the Trinity. When there was any doubt as to whether or not a person was baptized, the practice was to baptize the person using a conditional formula. Thanks in large part to the writings of Saint Augustine, western canon law recognized the validity of baptism performed in the name of the Trinity, regardless of whether that baptism was performed by a heretical priest or not.

Thus the western church asserted that so long as a person was baptized in the name of the Trinity, the baptism was considered valid. At least one exception is known. In the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, re-baptism of Byzantine Orthodox Christians was advocated by local Catholic synodal legislation in Poland as the realm incorporated the Orthodox population of what


is now Ukraine and Lithuania into its territory.\textsuperscript{316} A definite end to this practice came only at the Council of Trent, whose statutes were first accepted in a provincial synod held in Lviv (Polish: Lwów) in 1564.\textsuperscript{317}

In contrast to western canon law which in general prohibited re-baptism (local practice in early modern Poland aside), a much greater range of opinions on re-baptism existed in eastern canon law from the third century onward in cases where the orthodoxy, the theological correctness, of the original baptism was suspect.\textsuperscript{318} For example, regarding the re-baptism of heretics, Byzantine writers differed on whether or not Armenians needed to be re-baptized, since the Armenians as non-Chalcedonian Christians did not share the same definition of Christ’s human and divine natures (they being, in Byzantine eyes, Monophysite heretics).\textsuperscript{319}

The western charge that eastern-rite clerics re-baptized Latin Christians was not merely directed against the Greeks, but also the Rus’. In Byzantium, however, canonists, theologians, and patriarchs did not actively advocate the re-baptism of Latins, even though they condemned the Latin practice of single rather than triple immersion in baptism as a grievous error.\textsuperscript{320} For example, the major Greek canonists of the twelfth century, Theodore Balsamon and Ioann Zonaras, considered only that non-Chalcedonian Christians (Nestorians, Armenians, Jacobites) needed to be re-baptized, not Latin Christians.\textsuperscript{321} Only in the fifteenth century did the Council of Constantinople (1484) proclaim a standard rite for receiving Catholics into the Orthodox church. It is important to underline, however, that it did not include re-baptism but rather only

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[317]{Sawicki, “Rebaptisatio,” 71-72.}
\footnotetext[318]{The various writings of eastern Church Fathers on the validity or not of re-baptism (and in what circumstances this practice was permissible) are gathered in Palmieri, “La rebaptisation”, 630-632; Herman, “Baptême en Orient,” 178-180.}
\footnotetext[319]{Palmieri, “La rebaptisation”, 632.}
\footnotetext[320]{\textit{Ibid.}, 632-646; Herman “Baptême en Orient,” 186.}
\footnotetext[321]{Palmieri, “La rebaptisation,” 634-635; Herman “Baptême en Orient,” 186; Chadwick, East and West, 236.}
\end{footnotes}
chrismation with holy oil (Greek: *myron*) of the person entering the Orthodox church.\(^\text{322}\) Chrismation was added to compensate for the perceived deficiency of Latin baptism which did not include this conferral of the “‘seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.’”\(^\text{323}\)

This chapter began by highlighting how difficult it can be to interpret medieval rituals through written sources. Eye-witnesses, rather than participants of rituals, can misinterpret the meaning of rituals while recording them. Chrismation could look like re-baptism in Latin eyes, as noted by the Premonstratensian monk and bishop of Havelsberg, Anselm (d. 1158), who journeyed to Constantinople in 1136 as an envoy of Emperor Lothar III.\(^\text{324}\) While in the Queen of Cities, Anselm engaged in two public theological debates with Archbishop Niketas of Nikomedia, the confessor of the princess and historian Anna Komnena. In the final section of Anselm’s literary retelling of this debate, *The Book of Antitheses* (*Antikeimenon*; also known as *The Dialogues*) written down some fifteen years later, the German asked his Greek debating partner:

As I understand it, your custom is that when a Greek wishes to marry a Latin wife, as happens frequently—especially among persons of imperial rank—first you anoint the woman with holy oil poured into a vessel, then you bathe her whole body with it. Finally when she has thus crossed over into your rite and law, you conclude her marriage. But I would like to know exactly why you do this, if in fact you do, for it seems some form of re-baptism.\(^\text{325}\)


\(^{323}\) Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 195.


Anselm’s opponent’s, Archbishop Niketas’, detailed refutation is worth citing in full, because the Greek archbishop strongly denies that anointing is the same as re-baptism, and highlights the ways in which rituals can be misinterpreted by outside observers:

If the Latins fully understood the rites of the Greeks they would not slander us so easily, nor be so easily scandalized concerning them. But it is no surprise that they judge incorrectly, since they do not know the truth about this rite. May we Greeks, orthodox in our faith, never accept that any Christian be baptized a second time in the name of the Holy Trinity! To do this or preach that it should be done is to fall into heresy. In truth, however, we do have certain rituals of purification by unction with sacred oil. When foreigners come to us—whether they are men or women wishing to pass over into our rite and our society—we anoint them with sacred oil because we do not know if they have earlier received the sacrament of unction. But by no means do we re-baptize those who we are aware have already been baptized, nor do we even anoint those who, we have no doubt, have already been anointed.\(^{326}\)

The debate thus ends in a positive message of ecumenism: Anselm acknowledges that his reproach of Greek custom was based on ignorance, and both Niketas and Anselm express the hope that a future church council will end separation between the Greek and Latin churches.\(^ {327}\)

Although the debate as recorded in *The Book of Antitheses* is a literary presentation of the event complete with a “happy ending” of mutual reconciliation, rather than an accurate transcription of Anselm’s experiences in 1136, it does seem to contain some genuine paraphrases of Greek


\(^{327}\) *Anselmi Havelbergensis Dialogi*, PL 188, 1247-1248; *Anselm of Havelberg, Anticimenon*, trans. Criste and Neel, 210-211.
theological reasoning.\textsuperscript{328} The text gives us some insight on how medieval western-rite contemporary churchmen might have misunderstood the rituals surrounding the incorporation of a western-rite bride into the Orthodox church, seeing a re-baptism where there was anointment.

The custom of anointing is also described in the twelfth-century “Questions of Kirik” (\textit{Voproshanie Kirika}), which is the only surviving pre-Mongol Rus’ normative source describing the process for admitting a person born in the western rite into Orthodoxy. As the title suggests, the source is made up of a set of questions and answers relating to good conduct by both clergy (monastic and secular) as well as laity.\textsuperscript{329} The answers are attributed by scholars to Bishop Nifont of Novgorod (r. 1130/1131-1156), who, however, appears by name in the text simply as “lord,” and who is addressed by three questioners: Kirik, Savva (Saba), and Il’ia (Elijah). The first was a monk-priest (hieromonk) while the latter two were secular clerics.\textsuperscript{330} These “Questions of Kirik” survive in late copies included in collections of canon law in Rus’ known as \textit{Kormchie Knigi}; the earliest manuscript with the inclusion of the “Questions” dates to the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{331}

When asked by Kirik what to do about “some person both baptized in the Latin faith and who wants to come to us?” Bishop Nifont replies:

\begin{quote}
Let him go to the church for seven days, and first give him a name, and then say four prayers over him on the day, which are spoken ten times each. (But do not give him meat [to eat] nor milk [to
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
328 Kolbaba, “Latin slander?,” 43-44.
329 For the text see: “1130-1156 g. Voprosy Kirika, Savvy i Ilii, s otvētami Nifonta,” ed. in RIB, 21-61; PDRKP, comment. Goetz, 223-224; \textit{Kormchaia}, vol. 2, ed. Beneshevich et al., 90-94. The majority of the questions deal with the secular clergy and the sacraments, the rest with licit and illicit sexual practices, ritual purity, abortion, homicide, and illicit “pagan” practices such as love potions: Andrzej Poppe, “Pytania Kirkowe,” in SSS, vol. 4, 424-426; Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 187-189; Giraudo, “Voprošanie Kirikovo”: 752-753.
330 The majority of scholars consider that Kirik was a hieromonk at the Monastery of St. Anthony (Antoniev) in Novgorod, Poppe, “Pytania Kirikowe”, 425; Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 187. Kirik asks one hundred and one questions (explaining why the collection bears his name), Savva twenty-four, and Il’ia twenty-eight, Fennell, \textit{Russian Church}, 74.
331 Giraudo, “Voprošanie Kirikovo”: 748.
\end{footnotes}
drink] and [treat him] like catechumens.\textsuperscript{332} And thus on the eighth day, let him wash himself and come to you and pray over him in accordance with custom and clothe him in clean outer garments or let him clothe himself, and put on [him] the garments of baptism and a wreath and thus anoint [him] also with holy \textit{myron} and give him a candle. And during the Liturgy, give him communion and thus hold [him] as a newly-baptized person, if possible, also up to the eighth day.\textsuperscript{333}

Although Metropolitan Nifont calls for the person wishing to join the Orthodox community to be treated as a catechumen, he does not actually advocate re-baptism, but merely anointing with \textit{myron}. His allusion to the Catholic person receiving a “name” likely refers to a saint’s name since a commonplace of anti-Latin polemics in Rus’ was that “Latins” do not baptize with the names of saints.\textsuperscript{334} For example, Metropolitan Nikephoros of Kyiv (d. 1121) makes this accusation is a letter sent to prince Yaroslav of Murom claiming that Catholics “in baptizing do not use a saint’s name, but animal names: ‘Lion’, ‘Leopard’, and other animals.”\textsuperscript{335} By making this accusation, Nikephoros was not drawing on any text of theology or canon law, but rather simply implying that Latin Christians were uncivilized barbarians who did not give proper names

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{332} Pavlov believes that the section given in brackets here is a later addition to the text, PDRKP, comment. Goetz, 223-224.

\textsuperscript{333} “Ozhe budet’ kyi chelověk i kreshchen v latinskuiu věru, i v’schoshchet’ pristupiti k nam? —At khodit’ v tserkov’ po 7 dni, a ty pervěie narek yemu imiia, tazhe 4 molitvy stvariai yemu na den’, izhe-to po 10 zhdy, molviat’sia, a miasa ne dai, ni moloka, i o oglashenykh. I tako osmyi den’ izmyietsia i pridet’ k toh, i stvori yemu molityvy po obychaiu, i oblecheshi I v porty chisty, ili sam sia, i nadezhesi rizhy krestnyia i vĕnets’, a tako pomazheshi i sviatym miurom, i dai yemu svĕshchiu. A na liturgii dasi yemu prichastyie, i tako derzhishi, yako i novokreshchenago, ashche moshi’chno, i do osmago dni […].” RIB, question 10, 26-27; PDRKP, comment. Goetz, question 10, 223. The question is not present in the edition of Kirik’s questions found in \textit{Kormchaia}, vol. 2.ed. Beneshcevich et al., 90-94.


\textsuperscript{335} “A kr[e]stĕshimsę ne narichiut’ imen [ye]tykh, no zvĕrina imena narichiut’ [,] lev, pardus i prochikh zvĕrei,” “Nikifora, mitropolita vsea Rusiiskiai zemli, napisanie na latinu ko kniaziu,” in \textit{Mitropolit Nikifor}, eds. and commentary Makarov et al., 442.
to their children. As the previous chapter has argued, however, not all clerics in Rus’ shared such a hardline view of their Latin Christian neighbours.

On the contrary, there is evidence that Latin Christians and Orthodox Christians co-existed in twelfth-century Novgorod and perhaps even visited each others’ churches. Medieval Novgorod was a flourishing trading center where western and eastern Christians encountered each other on a daily basis. Likewise, as noted in the previous chapter, the city had a western-rite merchant church for Scandinavian traders, which was established in the late eleventh century or early twelfth century (Saint Olaf’s), and, later in 1192, also had a church for German traders (Saint Peter’s). Another of the “Questions of Kirik” asks, “What should be done if there are people who would take their children to the ‘Varangian priest’?” Some scholars consider that the “Varangians priests” refer to “magicians” or to people practicing a mixture of pagan and Christian rites. Jackson and Alexandr Musin, however, convincingly argue that the term “Varangian priests” literally refers to Scandinavian priests whose services were attended not only by western-rite merchants residing in Novgorod, but also by local Novgorodians. On the basis of the “Questions of Kirik” it seems then that ordinary people attended church services of both eastern and western rites in Novgorod, without need for special ceremonials marking their entrance from one rite to the other. Bishop Nifont described such persons as being

336 Kolbaba makes the point that several anti-Latin Byzantine polemics conflate “barbaroi and heretics,” including the early twelfth century polemic of the otherwise obscure Bishop Ioannes of Claudiopolis (fl. 1112-1115). The latter’s text, like Metropolitan Nikephoros’ letters, also accuses Latin Christians of not using proper baptismal names, Byzantine Lists, 135; 185.

337 There is a large bibliography on medieval Novgorod and its trade relations with Western Europe. See, for example, Birnbaum, “Novgorod,” 15-40.


340 Fennell, History, 76; Giraudo, “Voproshanie Kirikovo”: n. 8, 745 and 757.


“dvoërtsi,” persons holding dual beliefs. This local context of bi-ritualism or perhaps even hybridity of pagan-Christian practices by the population of a merchant city leads one to question whether the “Questions of Kirik” can be used to understand the ritual that a princess would have undergone when entering Kyivan Rus’.

Indeed, it seems unlikely that Nifont had royal persons such as foreign brides in mind when describing the series of rituals a person must go through who wants to join an Orthodox community of worship. Instead, it seems more likely that his response tried to regulate the situation in his local see in which bi-ritualism or even pagan survivals were present. It was precisely at the time that Nifont was writing that different church hierarchies were being more firmly established in the Baltic Region, contributing to a stricter attempt by church authorities to separate clearly eastern and western-rite Christianity. As Alexandr Musin has argued, Novgorod was elevated to an eastern-rite archbishopric around the same time as western-rite archbishoprics were established in Lund in 1104, Trondheim in 1152, and Uppsala in 1164. Prior to this time, a less dense network of parishes in the Baltic region allowed not only the continuation of pagan practices, but also greater exchange between eastern and western forms of Christianity.

Even after the twelfth century, there is evidence that northern Rus’ continued to share cultural commonalities in ritual practice with western-rite Christianity, rather than with Constantinopolitan custom. In the twelfth century in this region eastern-rite priests baptized by infusion (pouring water) rather than triple immersion. This was probably due to the cold climate but, in doing so, they followed an emergent Latin practice, rather than the Greek form of the

---

343 “6 neděl’ opitemie, reche, zanezhe, aky dvoërsti sut’,” PDRKP, comment. Goetz, question 16, 335; Jackson, “St. Olaf”, 160. Since the nineteenth century, the medieval term “dvoeverie” (“double-faith”) was understood by scholars as describing the supposed continued co-existence of pagan and Christian religions in Rus’, Colucci, “Image”: 586 and Giraudo, “Voprošanie Kirikovo”: n. 4, 744. This interpretation of the word has come under recent criticism, however: Musin and Wołoszyn, “Digging In,” 694; Stella Rock, Popular Religion in Russia. ‘Double Belief’ and the Making of an Academic Myth (New York: Routledge, 2007), esp. 75-76, in which she argues that dvoeverie in the Questions of Kirik refers to a mixture of Catholic-Orthodox beliefs. More generally, Rock’s book demonstrates that the term dvoeverie was used in medieval texts to refer to doubt, uncertainty, or hypocrisy in faith, rather than to pagan-Christian syncretism, Ibid, 158.

344 Musin, “Two Churches,” 289.

345 Ibid., 287 and 289.
baptism ritual.\textsuperscript{346} Since they may have been using the same baptismal custom as western-rite priests, it is unlikely that all local Rus’ priests saw western-rite baptism as inherently defective. Bishop Ilia (r. 1165-1186) of Novgorod forbade baptism by infusion, but one can wonder how effective this prohibition was, since it was repeated at the synod of Vladimir in 1274, again by Metropolitan Cyprian (1390-1405) and Photios (1409-1431) in letters sent to the northern cities of Novgorod and Pskov, and once again in 1551 at the great Muscovite synod known as the “Stoglav” (“the Hundred Chapters”).\textsuperscript{347} Re-baptism of Latin converts to Orthodoxy only became officially adopted by Muscovite canon law in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{348}

Since some Rus’ clerics themselves used the same ritual of baptism as their Latin counterparts, it is difficult to believe that they would have seen a pressing need for re-baptism. Yet the constant repetition in Latin sources that Rus’ clerics re-baptized Catholic women makes it impossible to wholly dismiss this claim. The earliest of these accusations is contained in a letter supposedly written by Bishop Mateusz (Matthew) of Kraków and count palatine (comes) Piotr Włostowic to Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, which will be discussed more fully in Chapter Four.\textsuperscript{349} The letter has no date, but, if authentic, its composition must have occurred between the year 1143/1144, when Mateusz became bishop of Kraków, and the year 1153, when Saint Bernard died.\textsuperscript{350} It is known only from an eighteenth-century printed edition made from a now lost manuscript originating in

\footnotesize{

347 Russian liturgical books (trebniks) of the early seventeenth century still continue to use the western-rite form of infusion for baptism, \textit{Ibid.}, 184.


}
the Premonstratensian monastery of Windberg in Bavaria (diocese of Regensburg). Nonetheless, it is generally held to be genuine by most scholars, due to its rhetoric and use of quotations from classical authors and Biblical texts which seem to accord with the twelfth-century cathedral of Kraków as its milieu of composition.

According to their letter, Bishop Mateusz and count Piotr asked Bernard to come preach to the Rus’, because:

That Rus’ nation, however, comparable to an innumerable multitude or to stars, does not preserve the rule of the Orthodox faith or decrees of true religion, not paying attention to [the fact that] there is no place of true sacrifice [sacrificium] outside the Catholic Church [Augustine]. It [the Rus’ nation] is known to be deficient shamefully not only in the offering of the Lord’s Body, but in repudiating spouses and in re-baptizing spouses and in other ecclesiastical sacraments.

Piotr Włostowic, the co-issuer of the letter, was presumably familiar with Rus’ practices. As will be discussed further in Chapter Four, he could observe them firsthand during his various stays in Rus’ and because he was married to a certain Maria who was probably of Rus’ origin. The

351 Ibid., n. 3, 123; Kürbis, “Cysterci w kulturze,” n. 5, 22.3.


negativity of the letter toward the Orthodox Rus’ is therefore surprising and anomalous for the 1140s. It is significant for our understanding of Orthodox-Catholic relations, however, to note that his letter does not condemn the eastern formula of baptism nor attacks Orthodoxy in general. Rather it criticizes the Rus’ for differing in practice from both Greek and Latin usage, perhaps reflecting disapproval of local Rus’ customs or of the use of the Cyrillo-Methodian (Slavonic) liturgy. 355 If Piotr’s letter is authentic, it would confirm that the Rus’ priests did indeed anoint western-rite brides with chrism, which Piotr probably misunderstood as re-baptism (a more likely interpretation than actual re-baptism taking place, which, as seen above, was contrary to the Orthodox church canons). Despite the fact that re-baptism of Latin Christians was not allowed in eastern canon law, accusations that the Rus’ re-baptized Catholics continued to be repeated by Popes Honorius III and Gregory IX in the thirteenth century. 356 Presumably these sources also were based on a misinterpretation of a ritual of chrismation. Nonetheless, these Latin sources do not tell us whether or not chrismation and/or renaming was the usual ritual by which a western-rite bride began her marriage to a Riurikid prince.

One way to see whether or not western-rite brides regularly were given new names taken from the Orthodox calendar of saints is to examine narrative sources concerning individual women who left their Latin Christian environment to marry Riurikid princes. Despite the occasional charge found in such Latin texts that Rus’ clerics re-baptized western-rite brides and despite the fact that Orthodox anti-Latin polemics condemned Latin baptismal names as unsuitable, there are, in fact, very few known specific examples of western-rite women who were renamed upon their marriage in Rus’. In secondary literature only five individual princesses, born in the western rite, appear as such examples. In roughly chronological order these are: Estrid/Margaret (d. c. 1050s), Ingigerd/Irena (d. 1050), Gytha/Anna (d. 1107), Gertruda/Olisava of Poland (d. c. 1108), and Kunegunda/Irena (d. after d. 1140). Of these, source evidence for renaming is clearest only in the case of Ingigerd/Irene, but even in her case, this chapter proposes that the possibility

should be taken into account that she had a double name at birth rather than was given a new name after her marriage in Rus’.

**Estrid/Margaret**

A scholium (note) added in the 1080s to Adam of Bremen’s *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*, begun a decade earlier, mentions that the King of Denmark and England, Knud the Great (d. 1035), “gave his sister Estrid in marriage to the son of the King of Rus’.”357 Alexandr Nazarenko, who is followed in this view by Leontii Voitovych, suggests that this unknown Rus’ prince could have been Prince II’ia Yaroslavich of Novgorod (d. 1020), Yaroslav the Wise’s son by a mistress or by his first unknown wife (named Anna in seventeenth-century sources).358 The marriage lasted only proximately from 1019 to 1020, when II’ia died and Estrid returned to Denmark to remarry. Despite the brevity and uniqueness of Adam of Bremen’s information, it has been taken seriously by scholars, since one of his informants was none other than King Sven Estridsen of Denmark (r. 1047-1074), Estrid’s own son through her subsequent marriage to the Danish jarl Ulf Thorgilsson (d. 1025).359 Danish sources, including Adam of Bremen himself, name Estrid interchangeably Estrid and Margaret.360

---


358 The *First Novgorod Chronicle* gives only the most brief summary of II’ia Yaroslavich’s life: “I rodisia v Yaroslava syn Il’ia, i posadi v Novégorodé i umre,” *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’* in PSRL, vol. 3: *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’ starshego i mladshego izvodov*, ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2000), 161 (“And Ilia, a son, was born to Yaroslav and he was placed as a ruler over Novgorod and he died”). For a further discussion of II’ia’s genealogy see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 3.


names among the Danish elite in the eleventh century probably meant rather that Estrid was the lady’s pagan name and Margaret the name that she bore in baptism. Her brother, Knud, for example, had the second Christian name “Lambert” and her son Sven was also called “Magnus.” It is therefore likely that Estrid’s second name was not related to any renaming during the brief months she spent in Rus’ or to re-baptism following her marriage to Il’ia. Rather, the use of double-names together with intermarriage between the Riurikids and Scandinavian elites at this time testifies to the close links between these dynasties that transcended newly-established confessional lines.

**Ingigerd/Irena**

With the exception of the twelfth-century *History of Norway* which erroneously names her “Margaret,” all Scandinavian sources, both Latin and vernacular, refer to the second wife of prince Yaroslav the Wise by the name of Ingigerd (d. 1050). Scholarly literature often suggests that this Swedish princess, the daughter of King Olof Skötkonung (d. c. 1024), was renamed “Irina” (“Irene”) in Rus’. This hypothesis is due primarily to one line in the *Sermon on Law and Grace* delivered before the family of Yaroslav the Wise in the late 1040s by the Rus’ monk Ilarion (Hilarion), who soon after became the first native Rus’ (i.e. non-Greek) metropolitan of Kyiv (r. 1051-1055). Near the end of his sermon Ilarion addresses an oration

---

362 Ibid., 36-39.
363 “[…] Óláfr of Norway was then betrothed to the sister of Óláfr of Sweden, Margaret by name, whom he had long esteemed with the favour of deep affection becomingly reciprocated. But this came to nothing, for she was forced by her brother to marry King Jaroslav of Russia against her will.” *A History of Norway and the Passion and Miracles of the Blessed Óláfr*, trans. Devra Kunin, ed. with intro and notes Carl Phelpstead (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2001), 25. Phelpstead suggests that the author of the twelfth-century *History of Norway* has confused Ingigerd with the sister of King Knud of Denmark whose Christian name, as mentioned above, was Margaret, *Ibid*, n. 25/22, 99-1000. Upsenskii suggests instead that the same *History of Norway* accidentally confuses Ingigerd with her half-sister Astrid (Estrid), who also had the second Christian name “Margaret,” “Dynastic names,” 35-36. The name “Anna” is also sometimes mistakenly attributed to Ingigerd. On this issue, see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 3-4.
364 Hazzard Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor believe that Ingigerd was called “Irena” upon marriage, *PC*, n. 138, 254. On “Irena” as Ingigerd’s baptismal name, see, for example, Pushkareva, *Women in Russian History*, 12.
of praise (encomium) to the deceased Prince Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015), the Rus’ prince who made Christianity the official religion of Rus’, adding the words “Behold your devout daughter-in-law Irina!” Corroboration of Ingigerd’s connection to Saint Irene is also found in the entry of the Rus’ Primary Chronicle for the year 1037 which states that Yaroslav the Wise founded “the monastery of St. George and the convent of St. Irene” (probably built later, around 1049/1050). Consequently, scholars believe the church of Saint George was named after Yaroslav’s patron saint, while the church of Saint Irene is said to be consecrated to Ingigerd’s patron saint.

The use of the Sermon on Law and Grace to argue for the practice of re-baptizing western-rite princesses is contradicted, however, by the fact that Ilarion’s sermon is generally positive toward western-rite Christianity. In contrast to later anti-Latin polemical works, Ilarion’s sermon places Rus’ within the context of universal Christian salvific history, in which the age of grace has brought light to every nation, to Rome and Rus’ alike:

Rome, with the voices of praise, praises Peter and Paul, for through Peter and Paul Rome came to believe in Jesus Christ, Son of God. Asia and Ephesus and Patmos praise John the Theologian. India praises Thomas, Egypt praises Mark: every land and every city and every nation honors and glorifies its teacher that taught it the

---

366 “K semuzhe viizhd’ i blagověrnuiu snokhu tvoiu Erinu,” “Slovo o zakoně i blagodati,” ed. Müller, 125; Slovo o zakone i blagodati, ed. Moldovan, 98; English trans. in Franklin, Sermons and Rhetoric, 24.


368 Poppe “Building,” IV, 46.
Orthodox faith. We too, therefore, let us praise to the best of our strength […] Volodimer […]

The main conceit of the sermon, the antithesis of the age of Law (Judaism) with the age of Grace (Christianity), stresses the universality of the latter. As Wil van den Bercken has noted, here Rome is mentioned first in the list of nations, in “neutral-positive terms.” The sermon includes a western liturgical formula, further underlining how in Ilarion’s sermon there is no sense of confessional hostility. Ilarion’s words therefore certainly do not imply any distrust of the princess born into the Latin-rite or necessity for re-baptism.

“Irene” could, however, have been part of Ingigerd’s double-name, the name which links her with her patron saint. One possibility is that this supplementary name was given to her during a ritual of anointment when she entered Rus’. This possibility is suggested by the fact that the sermon also refers to other Rus’ princes by their non-secular names: Vladimir Sviatoslavich is also referred to in Ilarion’s sermon also by his baptismal name of “Vasili (Basil)” and Ingigerd’s...


371 van den Bercken, *Holy Russia*, 56.

372 Ilarion exclaims, “Khristos pobëdi, Khristos odolë, Khristos vtsarisia, Khristos proslavisia!,” “Slovo o zakonë i blagodati,” ed. Müller, 106-107; Slovo o zakone i blagodati, ed. Moldovan, 94; “Christ conquered, Christ overcame, Christ became king, Christ was glorified!”; English trans. in *Sermons and Rhetoric*, trans. Franklin, 20. Ludolf Müller argues that this liturgical formula is taken partly from the words “Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat,” used in the Carolingian Laudes regiae which was sung during French coronations. For this reason he suggests that either that Ilarion accompanied Yaroslav the Wise’s daughter Anna Yaroslavna upon her marriage to King Henri I in 1050/1051 or that he heard the liturgical expression in Kyiv used by the western clerical delegation sent by Henri I to take Anna to France, idem, *Die Werke des Metropolitan Ilarion* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971), 80-86, esp. 85. Since there is no record in western sources of Ilarion travelling to Reims, another possibility is that Ilarion may have encountered the Latin formula from his own readings, particularly from the works of St. Augustine, without the need for a French intermediary; Franklin, “Introduction,” in *Sermons and Rhetoric*, trans. and notes Franklin, xliii; van den Bercken, *Holy Russia*, 57; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 325.
husband, Yaroslav, is called by his baptismal name of “Georgii” (George). These two pairs of princely names (Vladimir/Vasilii and Yaroslav/George) were thus used to refer to their bearers simultaneously: one name did not replace the other. If such had been the case, Ingigerd would have continued to be the Swedish princess’ secular name, while “Irene” could have been her saint’s name.

It is also possible that Ingigerd had the second name “Irene” from childhood, while still in Sweden. Her own brother, Anund Jacob of Sweden (r. 1022-1050), bore two names, as Adam of Bremen reported in the 1070s: “Anund […] received a second name of faith and grace, James [or Jacob].” Once again, the practice of double-naming, common among the elites of “New Europe,” could explain the appearance of Ingigerd’s two names in the sources.

Gytha/Anna

Poppe and Nazarenko proposed that the Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha was renamed “Anna” after she became the wife of prince Vladimir Monomakh in circa 1074. While Andrzej Poppe does not explain his reasoning, Nazarenko sees evidence for this name change in a collection of miracle stories connected with an icon of Saint Nicholas, namely, “The Miracle of our holy father Nicholas of Myra in Lycia, the Wonder-worker and Archbishop, which occurred in Novgorod the Great….” The oldest manuscript copy of this narrative dates to the late 11th century.

373 “[…] Your devotion is well witnessed and faithfully proved by Georgij, your son, […]”, Ilarion, “Sermon on law and grace”, in Sermons and Rhetoric, trans. Franklin, 23; “Slovo o zakone i blagodati,” ed. Müller, 121; ‘Slovo o zakone i blagodati’, ed. Moldovan, 97.

374 Uspenskii and Litvina, Vybor imeni, 567.

375 “Anund […] cognomento fidei et gratiae dictus est Iacobus […]”, Adami Bremensis Gesta Pontificum, ed. Trillmich, 298. For all extant saga and chronicle sources on Anund Jacob’s names see Uspenskii, Imia i vlast, 57-64 and 77. Uspenskii argues that Jacob was the Swedish dynast’s original birth name and that Jacob only received the second name Anund when he was elected king at the Ting (assembly) of circa 1020.

376 The erroneous belief that Ingigerd also bore the name “Anna” in Rus’ (the result of a possible confused identification of Ingigerd with Yaroslav’s first wife) is discussed in Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 4.


378 “Chiudo izhe vo sviatiikh otsia nashego Nikolaa, Mir Likiiskikh chudotvorstsiia i archiepiskopa sotvorisheesia v Velikom Novegrade […],” as cited in Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 608; Podskalsky, Literatur, n. 597, 133; Vodoff,
seventeenth/early eighteenth century, although its language suggests that it is much earlier in
dating (twelfth century, according to Vladimir Vodoff). This text describes the foundation of
the church of Saint Nicholas in the prince’s court in the commercial district of Novgorod by a
non-existent person, “Mstislav Sviatoslavich, the grandson of Yaroslav Vladimirovich.” He
was healed of an illness by a miraculous icon of Saint Nicholas through the prayers of his
“grandmother, the blessed princess Anna.”

The genealogical confusion of this text is clarified through a comparison with the parallel
chronicle accounts of this foundation which state that in the year 1112/1113 (Anno Mundi dating:
6621): “Mstislav founded a stone church to Saint Nicholas in the prince’s court in the
commercial quarter of Novgorod.” This church, later completed in 1136, is still standing.
The only “Mstislav” who ruled as prince of Novgorod during this time (from 1095-1094 and
again from 1096 to 1117) was Mstislav Vladimirovich (d. 1132). He was the son of the
Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha (d. 1107) and Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125), the son of Vsevolod
Yaroslavich (d 1093), who was, in turn, the son of Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054, Yaroslav
Vladimirovich). The miracle-story has possibly confused Vladimir Monomakh with his father

\[\text{Naissance, 316. The edition of this text is not accessible to me: N. K. Nikolskii, Materialy dlia istorii}
\]
379 Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 608-609.
380 \textit{Ibid.}, 610. Podskalsky comments on the confused genealogy of the “Miracle” text: “Aufgrund der zeitlich
eindeutigen Bezeugung der Kirche in den Chroniken […] muss es sich bei dem Text genannten ‘Mstislav
Sviatoslavich, Enkel des Jaroslav Vladimirović […]’ um eine Namensverwechslung handeln […]”, \textit{Literatur}, n. 597,
133.
381 “[…] i baba ego, blagovernia kniaagnia Anna”, as cited in Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 610. The text is also
discussed in Podskalsky, \textit{Literatur}, 132-133.
These sources are discussed in Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 610. Novgorod is divided in half by the Volkhof River
into the Saint Sophia quarter, belonging to the cathedral and the bishop, and the commercial quarter. For a map see,
383 Hubert Faensen and Vladimir Ivanov, \textit{Early Russian Architecture}, trans. Mary Whittall, photographs by Klaus
Vsevolod whose second wife was called Anna, or with the first wife of Yaroslav the Wise, who resided in Novgorod and who, according to fifteenth century sources, was also possibly called Anna.  

Gytha’s own grandson, Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1154), founded a monastery in Novgorod in 1134-1155, but it was dedicated not to Saint Nicholas, but rather to Saint Pantelemon, Iziaslav’s patron-saint and his baptismal namesake. In light of the complete genealogical and chronological confusion of the Miracle Story, is difficult to agree with Nazarenko and Poppe that this text can be used to suggest that Gytha had the additional Orthodox name “Anna.”  

Gertruda/Olisava

In his widely-cited article on the subject, Vladimir L. Yanin claimed that Princess Gertruda of Poland changed her name to “Olisava,” a form of Elizabeth, upon her marriage to Prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich. The date of this marriage is not clear from the sources: most scholars assume that it took place either in 1039 or 1043, at the same time that Gertruda’s brother Kazimierz married Maria Dobroniega. Yanin based his evidence for Gertruda’s name-change on a graffito in the Kyivan Cathedral of Saint Sophia, which reads: “Lord, help thy servant Olisava, Princess of Rus’, Sviatopolk’s mother.” The Soviet scholar came to his conclusion based on the following

386 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’,* 611-612.


388 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’,* 614; Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisawa,” 580. Nazarenko accepts the fact that Gytha had the Orthodox name “Anna” as a hypothesis only and in the appendix of his book she appears listed as “Gida (Anna?),” *Drevniaia Rus’*, 740.


390 On the debate concerning the date of Gertruda’s marriage, see the following chapter and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 6. Górski, for reasons discussed below, places the marriage of Iziaslav and Gertruda shortly before 1050, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?”: 74 and 76.

391 “G[ospod]i pomozi rabě svoei Olisavě S[viat]topolchi materi rusk’skyi kniągyni. A az to p[i]s[av] syn s’chii [expanded by Yanin as Sviatopolchii?]”; “Lord help your handmaiden, Olisava, the mother of Sviatopolk, the Rus’ princess. And I have written this, the son of Sviatopolk”; discussed in Yanin, “Olisava-Gertruda”: 142-143.
premises. He assumed that a) “Sviatopolk” in the graffito must refer to Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (r. Kyiv 1093-1113), the son of Iziaslav Yaroslavich (r. Kyiv, intermittently, 1054-1078) and that b) Gertruda of Poland, the wife of Iziaslav, was therefore also Sviatopolk’s mother and the person who is mentioned in the graffito.

Yanin also claimed to furnish additional evidence that Gertruda had the second name “Olisava”: namely, a lead seal that depicts on the observe the bust of Saint Elizabeth holding a small cross and on the reverse the standing figure of the archangel Gabriel holding a scepter in his right hand and an orb in his left. Two exemplars of this seal have survived. According to Yanin, the first was found in Kyiv in 1909 (24 mm). In the body of his text, Yanin stated that the second exemplar (22 mm) came from “western Ukraine,” but in his appendix he gave the place and date of the same seal’s discovery as “unknown” (“ne izvestno”). Perhaps on the basis of this geographic distribution Yanin hypothesized that the seal must have belonged to Gertruda who, at the time of her widowhood, was living with her second son, Yaropolk Iziaslavich, in the western Rus’ principality of Volhynia between the years 1078 and 1086.

In order to support the connection of this seal to the person of Gertruda, Yanin was obliged to propose that “Gabriel” was Yaropolk’s Orthodox baptismal name, even though from other sources (Rus’ and Latin chronicle entries, as well as coinage) Yaropolk’s baptismal name is known to have been Peter. Yanin tried to solve this discrepancy by arguing that Yaropolk only

Malewicz and Kürbis suggest that the transcription of the graffito contains an error and that “Olisava” should be read as “Elisava”, seeing a cross-bar in the inscription over the “O”, Liber Precum, 75-76.

392 Yanin, Aktovye pechati, vol. 1, 210, 268, 311, table 20, no. 226 (drawing of the seal), table 63, no. 226. 1-2 (photographs of the two exemplars of the seal). The poor quality of the small, grainy black-and-white photographs makes it difficult to verify independently all the details that Yanin observes.


394 “Nanonets, proikhodiaschei iz Zapadnoi Ukrainy i Kieva pechati s izobrazheniem sviatykh Gavriila i Olisavy,” Ibid, 130 [“Finally, coming from western Ukraine and Kyiv are seals with the figures of saints Gabriel and Elizabeth.”]. Later in the same book (Ibid., 210), however, the place of excavation and date of the second exemplar simply are listed as “ne izvestno” (“unknown”).

395 Yanin, Aktovye pechati, 130 and 210.

received the name “Peter” in Catholic baptism, while in exile in 1073-1077, and then reverted to using the name “Gabriel.” This solution is not possible, however, because re-baptism of eastern-rite Christians was not practiced in the western canon law, as has been discussed above. Moreover, as Anna Litvina and Fiodor Uspenskii suggest, Yaropolk could have been given the baptismal name “Peter” at birth in Rus’ in order to link him genealogically with the previous Rus’ prince who had intermarried with the Polish Piast house: Yaropolk Iziaslavich was the grand-nephew of Sviatopolk-Peter “the Accursed” (d. c. after 1019), who had married a daughter of King Bolesław I the Brave of Poland. The choice of “Peter” as a baptismal name at birth might also have been given to Yaropolk to celebrate his maternal kin. This hypothesis is suggested by the fact that one of Yaropolk-Peter’s maternal uncles, Herman, was Archbishop of Cologne, and the Cathedral of Cologne was (and is to this day) dedicated to Saint Peter. Likewise, the female monasteries of Vilich and Dietkirchen, where Gertruda’s aunt Mathilda was abbess and where Gertruda may have spent part of her childhood, were also dedicated to Saint Peter. In other words, as Ildar Garipzanov writes, the choice of “Peter” as the baptismal name of Prince Yaropolk Iziaslavich was “the result of a compromise. Saint Peter, who was venerated in both western and eastern churches, must have been a good choice for both parents.” It is therefore unlikely that Yaropolk had the third name “Gabriel.”

Moreover, the identification of Gertruda with Olisava/Elizabeth (on which the claim of her re-baptism is based) hinges on the well-accepted thesis that Gertruda is identical to “the mother of Sviatopolk” mentioned in the graffito. Andrzej Poppe had initially rejected the identification of

---

397 Yanin, Aktovye pechaty, 130.
398 Litvina and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni, n. 44, 252. For the marriage of Sviatopolk-Peter the “Accursed” and a Polish princess, see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” No. 1.
Gertruda with “Olisava.” Later, however, according to his theory that foreign-born daughters-in-law in Rus’ were named after Rus’ princesses who married out of the dynasty, he made the claim that Gertruda was renamed “Olisava” (Elizabeth) by Yaroslav the Wise after Yaroslav’s daughter Elizabeth, who around 1044 recently left Rus’ to marry the Norwegian adventurer and king, Harald Hardrada (d. 1066). Poppe saw confirmation of Gertruda’s adoption of the name “Olisava” in another graffito, a twelfth-century one again found in Kyiv’s Saint Sophia, which records the purchase of “Boiian’s land” by Princess Maria (d. 1179), the widow of Prince Vsevolod Olgovich (d. 1146). The transaction was done “among priests” and among the witnesses of the transaction is one called “Michael Elisavinich.” In Poppe’s opinion, this man was a priest who served the monastery of “Elisav,” which he interprets as meaning “Olisava’s monastery,” and considers it to be a monastery founded in Kyiv by Gertruda / Olisava.

The idea that the Polish-born Gertruda founded a female monastery, however, is only based on one line in the Life of Saint Theodosios, igumen of Kyivan Monastery of the Caves. This Life, written in the 1080s, circulated as an independent text and also was incorporated from the thirteenth century onward into all extant copies of the Paterik of the Kyivan Caves Monastery. According to this Life, Theodosios’s mother, after unsuccessfully using all means at her disposal (from persuasion to violence) to convince her son to abandon the monastic life, gave up and

---


403 Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisawa,” 579; discussed in Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, 494.

404 Dimnik, Chernigov 1054-1146, 397; Pevny, “Dethroning the Prince, 75. Princess Maria’s foundation of the Church of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, in Kyiv, is discussed in detail in Pevny’s article, Ibid, 61-108.

405 Dimnik, Chernigov 1054-1146, 397; Pevny, “Dethroning the Prince”, 75; Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisawa,” 589.


408 The Life of Saint Theodosios was included in the late thirteenth-century compilation of monastic stories, the Paterik (as Discourse Eight), as well as in one independent witness in a twelfth / thirteenth century hagiographical manuscript, the Uspenskii Sbornik (GIM, Synod. 1063/1064, folia 26r-67v), Hollingsworth, “Introduction” in Hagiography, trans. Hollingsworth, lviii-lx, and The Life of Our Venerable Father Feodosij, Superior of the Caves Monastery in Ibid, n. 77, 33; Heppell, “Introduction,” in Paterik, trans. Heppell, xxii.
entered a female monastery herself, which was dedicated to Saint Nicholas. She did so after the founder of the Monastery of the Caves had obtained the permission of an unnamed princess. According to Poppe, this princess would have been Gertruda and the female monastery was her foundation. This identification is uncertain, however, given the fact that Gertruda is mentioned in other parts of the Paterik (see the following chapter), but is not explicitly identified with this princess in this passage.

The most important biographical source on Gertruda’s life, her personal prayer-book, the Codex Gertrudianus, does not provide any corroboration to these various hypotheses of renaming. This still-extant manuscript includes prayers which Gertruda commissioned over the late eleventh to early twelfth and five miniatures made at her orders, probably from a Kyivan scriptorium. Gertruda’s prayer-book will be analyzed in further detail in the following chapter, while this section will focus only on this manuscript as evidence for Gertruda’s purported name change and re-baptism. For this discussion, it is significant that the prayer-book gives her son Yaropolk the baptismal name of Peter, not Gabriel, and that Gertruda twice in this text refers to Yaropolk as “my only son” (“unicus filius meus”), suggesting that Sviatopolk was

---

409 Paterik, ed. Abramovych, 31; Paterik, trans. Heppell, 35.
not her son.\textsuperscript{414} Moreover, Saint Elizabeth does not appear in the Codex Gertrudianus either in the miniatures or as an addressee of Gertruda’s prayers, as one would expect if she were Gertruda’s patron-saint and baptismal namesake.\textsuperscript{415} Poppe explains this discrepancy by suggesting that the name used in a prayer-book would be a person’s original, baptismal name, and therefore that the Polish princess does not refer to herself by the new name that she received in Rus’ in her own prayer-book.\textsuperscript{416} While intriguing, this hypothesis is difficult to corroborate in the absence of any similar prayer-book belonging to another western-rite woman who then married a Rus’ prince. If Gertruda was renamed and/or re-baptised as “Olisava” this name should have appeared in her prayer-book’s texts or at least in the miniatures in it, which were made in Rus’.

On the basis of one listing in the eleventh-century calendar of the Codex Gertrudianus and three prayers in this same prayer-book addressed to Saint Helena, mother of Constantine, A. V. Nazarenko, proposed the alternative suggestion that Gertrude could have been renamed “Helena” in Rus’ (without, however, accepting any need for re-baptism).\textsuperscript{417} The strongest argument in favour of this view is the fact that, in the calendar in the Codex, the feast of Saint Helena is recorded on May twenty-first (folio 3r), following Orthodox practice, rather than August eighteenth, according to Catholic practice, suggesting that Helena might have had some special significance for Gertruda, the commissioner of the Codex.\textsuperscript{418} While intriguing, there is still no direct evidence to confirm this thesis. Other scholars suggest the solution that “Gertruda/Olisava

---

\textsuperscript{414} “Sancta Maria UIRGO perpetua, per dilectionem filii dei qui te dilexit, […] exaudi me et ora pro unico filio meo PETRO. […] Inde confugio sub tuam protectionem et commendo in tuam fidem animam et corpus unici filii mei PETRI”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folia 206v-208r; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 161-162. Some scholars argue, however, that “unicus” can also be used as an adjective to express particular affection toward someone, rather than singularity, so that Gertruda’s reference to Yaropolk as “unicus filius meus” would mean “my beloved son”, rather than “my only son.” See Manuscriptum Gertrudae, ed. Meysztowicz, n. 16, 111-112; Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisava,” 576. Górski suggests that the literal meaning of “unicus” is to be preferred over its metaphoric one, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?:” 75-76.

\textsuperscript{415} Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 567-568.

\textsuperscript{416} Poppe states that in both Rus’ and Byzantium a person’s baptismal name would be used for prayers, but he does not provide any supporting examples or citations, “Gertruda-Olisava,” n. 10, 578.

\textsuperscript{417} Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 569 and idem “Mezhkonfessionalnye braki,” 281. The hypothesis that Gertruda might have been called “Helena” in Rus’ is tentatively accepted (with a question mark) in Smirnova, “Miniatures,” 10.

\textsuperscript{418} “Elenę matris constantini imp[e]r[atoris]”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 3r; Liber precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 104; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 569.
“Elizabeth)” might have been the princess’ original double-name while still in Poland, since the Polish Piast dynasty also employed double-names.\(^{419}\) This hypothesis also seems doubtful, however: a double-name, such as the saints’ names “Helena” or “Olisava/Elizabeth,” would only be used if a birth name was Slavic and of purely pagan origin. “Gertruda”, however, is not a pagan Slavic name, but a saint’s name: the Polish princess was likely named after Saint Gertrude (d. 659), whose cult centre was in Nivelles where Gertruda’s maternal aunt, Adelaide, was abbess.\(^{420}\) Therefore there was no need for her to employ a second saint’s name.

Another solution to the problem of Olisava’s identity is the suggestion that she was a different person from Gertruda and that, consequently, Sviatopolk Iziaslavich was Prince Iziaslav’s son by another woman. Sviatopolk was born in 1049/1050, according to the brief entry in the First Novgorod Chronicle.\(^{421}\) If Gertruda married Iziaslav in 1039 and the prayer-book which she commissioned is dated to the late 1070s-1080s, she was obviously still alive when Sviatopolk was born in 1049/1050. Therefore it is unlikely that Sviatopolk could be Iziaslav’s son by a second wife: it could be instead that Sviatopolk may have been his son by a concubine.\(^{422}\) On the other hand, Poppe has pointed out that the title “princess” in the graffito could only refer to a legitimate wife of a prince, not to a mistress.\(^{423}\) Karol Górski has tried to resolve this problem by suggesting that Iziaslav Yaroslavich was twice married: once in 1039 with a princess called Olisava of unknown origin who gave him his son Sviatopolk and his son Mstislav, who died as a child, and a second time around 1050 with Gertruda.\(^{424}\) Not only would this solution explain why Gertruda refers to Yaropolk as “her only son”, but also it would explain why, after her husband’s death in 1078, she is next recorded in Rus’ chronicles as living at the court of her son Yaropolk.

\(^{419}\) Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 75-76; Górski, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?”: 75.
\(^{420}\) Hertel, Imięńictwo, 143; Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisawa,” 578.
\(^{421}\) PSRL, vol. 3, sub anno 6558 (1049/1050), 16. On the dating of this portion of the chronicle to the thirteenth century see “PREDISLOVIE,” in Ibid., 5.
\(^{422}\) Poppe, “La naissance;” n. 47, VI, 41.
\(^{423}\) Poppe, “Gertruda-Olisawa,” 576.
\(^{424}\) Górski, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?”: 74-76.
rather than with Sviatopolk. Yaropolk’s and Mstislav’s birth-dates are not recorded in the Rus’ chronicles, however, and therefore it is not possible to ascertain whether or not they were older or younger than Sviatopolk. The exact genealogy of Iziaslav Yaroslavich’s family thus remains uncertain. Nonetheless, the claims that Gertruda was renamed “Olisava” and thus perhaps re-baptized remain also doubtful because it is not certain that these two women were one and the same.

Kunegunda/Irena

Another princess said to have been renamed “Irena” in Rus’ was Kunegunda (d. 1140), probably the wife of prince Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1086), who was the son of prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078) and the aforementioned Polish princess Gertruda (d. c. 1108?). In Poppe’s opinion, Kunegunda was renamed after Yaroslav the Wise’s wife, Ingigerd-Irena.

Only German chronicles record information on the life of Kunegunda, who was the daughter of Otto of Orlamünde and of Meissen (d. 1067) and of Adele of Liège, as well as the stepdaughter of Adele’s second husband, Margrave Dedi of Meissen (d. 1075). The Annalista Saxo states that “Kunegunda married a king of the Rus’[…].” Because the family of Iziaslav Yaroslavich were hosted by Margrave Dedi in 1074 after they were exiled from Kyiv, most scholars have identified this “king of the Rus’” with Iziaslav’s son, Yaropolk.


426 See, for instance, genealogical table 5 in Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 224-225.


429 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 527-528.

430 “Cunigunda nupsit regi Ruzorum, genuitque filiam […]” Annalista Saxo, ed. Georgius D. Waitz, in MGH, vol. 6, sub anno 1062, 693. Kunegunda’s marriage is discussed in Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 125, Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 524-525 with genealogical table on 525.

431 See the following chapter and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 13.
Evidence for Kunegunda’s name-change to “Irena”, however, is not based on written evidence, but rather is hypothesized on the basis of two miniatures in the aforementioned personal prayer-book belonging to her Polish mother-in-law Gertruda, the Codex Gertrudianus. The first of these “Gertrudian” miniatures of the manuscript, made sometime between 1078 and 1086/1087, found on folio 5v, depicts three persons in rich robes at the feet of a gigantic Saint Peter: a prince who is labeled in Greek and Cyrillic as “the righteous Yaropolk” (ho dikaios Yaropolk), Gertruda, who is labeled in Greek and Cyrillic letters as “the mother of Yaropolk” (mētēr yarop’[cha]), and to the far right of the composition, an unnamed female figure standing beside Yaropolk (Plate 1). On folio 10v of the same manuscript, Christ is depicted enthroned in Majesty, crowning a man and a woman in heaven (Plate 3). The man is wearing almost the exact same costume as Yaropolk on folio 5v and is introduced to Christ by Saint Peter. The woman with Yaropolk is again not labeled, but she is being introduced to Christ by Saint Irene, who is identified by a Greek titulus (I A GIA IRHNI rather than the more usual HAGIA EIRENE) and who is wearing the same blue robe as the unnamed figure on folio 10v. Thus, the unnamed women on folia 5v and 10v are frequently assumed to be Yaropolk’s wife Kunegunda, who (on the basis of the miniature on folio 10v) is said to have taken the name “Irene” in Rus’. V. L. Yanin also identifies lead seals inscribed with the image of Saint Irene as belonging to Yaropolk’s wife on the basis of the identification of Kunegunda and Saint Irene in these two miniatures.

432 *Psalterium Egherti*, vol. 2, fol. 5v. See also Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 6.

433 *Psalterium Egherti*, vol. 2, fol. 10v; Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 12.


The relationship between the unnamed woman on folio 5v and Saint Irene on folio 10v is not at all clear, however, and their identities are not absolutely certain. The figure in the miniature on folio 10v resembles Yaropolk’s mother Gertruda on folio 5v, not his wife. Both Gertruda and the woman wear the same head covering and the same red dress. Moreover, the figure said to be Saint Irene does not wear the attributes usually associated with the Thessalonikan martyr-saint of this name. Instead, she wears an imperial costume that suggests that she should be identified as the iconophile Empress Irene (r. 797-802), who (temporarily) restored icon veneration at the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 (later permanently restored in 843).

Nazar Kozak has even suggested that the proximity of the unnamed female figure in folio 5v to Yaropolk’s titulus “dikaios,” “the righteous,” and Yaropolk’s gesture of prayer with arms uplifted, marks her as an allegorical representation of the hope of his prayer, a representation of righteousness. Virtues in Byzantine art are often personified as courtly ladies. For example, the figure of Righteousness (labeled as hē dikaiosunē) appears thus personified next to Christ in a near-contemporary Byzantine Gospel-book (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Urb. Gr. 2, folio 19v). A contemporary collection of the homilies of Saint John Chrysostom made in Byzantium in the years 1078-1081 similarly depicts Emperor Nikephoros III Botaniates flanked by female representations of Truth (Aletheia) and, again, Righteousness (hē dikaiosunē) (BNF, Coislin 79, folio 2r).

In sum, the visual evidence from the two miniatures on folia 5v and 10v is not sufficiently clear to postulate a direct link between Kunegunda and the baptismal name “Irene” or to go farther and...

---

437 Spatharakis suggests that perhaps Saint Irene is the woman represented on folio 5v, her halo would have been omitted because of lack of space, Portrait, 43. This suggestion does not explain why she is of the same size as Yaropolk and not as large as St. Peter or why she has no titulus.


439 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 93-95.

440 Ibid, 95.

441 Ibid, 95.

suggest, as Poppe has, that she was named after the baptismal name of the Swedish princess Ingigerd. The finds of seals attributed to Kunegunda are not independent witnesses to her name-change since their connections to Kunegunda are solely on the link made between the anonymous woman and Saint Irene in the miniatures of the Codex Gertrudianus.

Renaming of Western-Rite Women in Rus’: General Conclusions

Lack of narrative sources greatly hampers the ability of scholars to determine whether or not western-rite women were renamed upon their marriage into the Riurikid dynasty and, if so, what the reason was for this renaming. Indeed, not a single medieval Rus’, Latin, or Scandinavian narrative source directly states that any princess marrying into the Riurikid dynasty had to be renamed or describes this process. An argument from silence is always methodologically dangerous, but it is noteworthy that the argument for re-baptism of western-rite brides is also made ex silentio. Only Latin sources directly state that western princesses were re-baptized when they came to Rus’. These Latin sources could have been based on secondhand information or on an inadvertent misunderstanding of the Orthodox rite of chrismation.

The similarity of the eastern rite of anointing (chrismation) to re-baptism was noted by Anselm of Havelberg in the twelfth century, and it could have given rise to Latin accusations that the Rus’ practiced re-baptism of Latin Christians. Anointing did not mandate renaming, but as a replacement for, or perhaps more likely in addition to, her secular name, a bride in Rus’ could have received the name of a saint who appeared in the Byzantine church calendar. As such, she also received a recognized protector in heaven, whose feast-day was celebrated in Rus’ churches, and whose veneration was sanctioned by Orthodox clergy. Certainly, the rituals of anointing and renaming could serve the same social function as baptism: to incorporate better a bride into the ecclesiastical and cultural world of her husband by helping to erasing her “foreignness.” With a name that fit into the onomastic customs of the Riurikids, the new bride became a full-fledged member of the dynasty.

443 Baumgarten also suggests that “Kunegunda” might have had a double-name (“Kunegunda/Irene”) since the first saint by the name of Kunegunda, the German empress and wife of Emperor Heinrich II (d. 1014), was not canonized until the year 1200, and therefore might not have been an appropriately “Christian” baptismal name prior to that date, “Cunegonde”: 166.
Indeed, we know that some Rus’ clerics strongly objected to western names as unsuitable. In the twelfth century Nifont of Novgorod prescribed renaming and re-anointing for Latin Christians wishing to join the Orthodox church, at least in his own diocese, where bi-ritualism was present. Since his answer is directed to ordinary, plebian Christians in Novgorod, it seems doubtful, however, that he had the elite brides of princes in mind. Supposing, nevertheless, that the practice of chrismation with renaming existed for the western brides, it would not have meant automatically the erasure of their previous identities. Given the use of double-names among the Riurikids in Rus’, a western bride could probably have maintained her own birth name in “private” while using an acceptable name for the Orthodox church calendar in public, later recorded in Rus’ chronicles written by Rus’ Orthodox monks. Such a situation would have permitted ongoing continuity with her natal social and cultural identity. Lack of sources do not permit, though, one to further explore this hypothesis.

For Michael Angold, the practice of name change of both Greek and Latin brides during the period of the Latin Empire (1204-1261) was “indicative of the social gulf” between these cultures. Angold described a later situation in which renaming was linked to confessional tensions in Byzantium in the latter thirteenth century (after the period covered by the dissertation). Such a “social gulf” did not seem to exist between elites who inter-married with the Riurikid dynasty, however. Although anointing with myron and renaming of Latin brides could have occurred in Rus’, as repeated Latin accusations suggest, there is little evidence of re-baptism. Indeed, it is surprisingly difficult to find concrete examples linking a specific bride with re-baptism. Scanty sources may be to blame, but the possibility that renaming did not always occur (and therefore that re-baptism definitively did not take place) should also be considered. The widespread use of double-names or of two variants of the same name, which spanned the western-rite / eastern-rite divide, could also be responsible for a woman appearing in the sources with more than one name. The use of such double-names also suggests the intriguing possibility of simultaneously held social identities: one name that identified a person in relation to the community of patron saints, the other, a name that identified them with a given kin group, perhaps including maternal relatives.

A bride could be renamed into the dynasty in which she married, regardless of whether she was a Catholic woman marrying an Orthodox man, an Orthodox lady marrying a Catholic man, or a bride marrying within her own religious rite. It is significant, however, that we have neither eastern nor western narrative or normative sources describing when and in what circumstances such renaming took place. This lack of normative sources suggests that when renaming did occur it was on an individual, ad hoc basis. Only in the Byzantine imperial family does the cumulative weight of evidence suggest that renaming of brides was systematically carried out.

To the extent that renaming could help incorporate a foreign woman into the religious-cultural life and dynastic traditions of her husband’s family, renaming could constitute a form of conversion. But it was not a “conversion” in terms of a change of inner spiritual life. Rather, receiving a new name at a new court could form part of the process of acculturation by which a new bride was incorporated into the Christian society of her husband. Conversion understood in this sense is not a single event marked by a ritual, such as baptism, or by a sudden change in inner conviction, but rather a process by stages in which new beliefs are adapted and grafted onto pre-existing ones. Receiving a new name could be one way in which a western bride began to adopt the cultural norms of her Orthodox husband’s court or vice versa.

But it did not mean a complete break with her natal Christian traditions. As we will see in the following chapters, the fact that names originating in the Riurikid dynasty were given to the children of Orthodox-Catholic marriages in Latin countries suggests that the Rus’ maternal ancestors of these children were remembered and honoured in the next generation. A woman’s spiritual practices could also reflect continued ties to the form of Christianity known to her in childhood. As the next chapter will explore, the eleventh-century personal prayer-book of Gertruda, the Polish wife of Prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich, contains elements of both western and eastern spiritual traditions, suggesting that her spiritual life was marked by syncretic elements.

---

Part II

Chapter 3: The Prayer-Book of Gertruda: a Case Study in the Patronage and Religious Experience of Western-rite Brides in Rus’ (c. 1078-1086).

The Codex Gertrudianus (Cividale, Museo Nazionale Archeologico, codex 136) offers a rare glimpse into the individual experience of a western-rite princess who came to Rus’ as a foreign bride, acculturated to the religious traditions of her husband’s land, and also was able to maintain ties with her natal family. This manuscript originally consisted of a tenth-century Psalter made for Archbishop Egbert of Trier (r. 977-993). By the last quarter of the eleventh century, however, the manuscript had come into the possession of the Polish princess Gertruda (d. c. 1108?), the widow of the Rus’ prince Iziaslav-Demetrius Yaroslavich (d. 1078) and mother of Yaropolk-Peter Iziaslavich (d. 1086/1087), prince of Volhynia and Turov. She had either received it from her German mother Richeza as part of her dowry or she obtained it in the late 1070s. Principally during her widowhood and prior to the murder of her son Yaropolk in 1086/1087, Gertruda commissioned ninety-five additional Latin prayers to be added to Egbert’s Psalter for her personal use, as well as five miniatures, including the donor portrait and coronation image discussed briefly in the previous chapter.

---

446 Charles Reginald Dodwell, The Pictorial Arts of the West, 800-1200 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 134-136, 141; Thomas Head, “Art and Artifice in Ottonian Trier,” in Gesta 36.1 (1997): 65-82. For the printed facsimile and editions of the Codex Gertrudianus, see the citations in the previous chapter. Citations here follow the facsimile as well as the edition of the manuscript by Malewicz and Kürbis in Liber precum, unless otherwise noted.


448 The number of prayers in Gertruda’s prayer-book varies depending on various opinions on where one prayer ends and another begins. Malewicz and Kürbis provide a concordance table between their divisions of Gertruda’s prayers (95 by their count) and Meysztowicz’s (93 by his division of the text), Liber precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 173-176. The dating of the prayers and miniatures is controversial in historiography, and is discussed in further detail in this chapter below.
Gertruda’s ownership of this manuscript is suggested by its donor portrait on folio 5v— a woman kneeling at the feet of Saint Peter whose Cyrillic *titulus* labels her as the “mother of Yaropolk,”— and by the use of the personalized phrase “ego Gertruda.” Gertruda’s personal name appears on folia 8r, 231v, and 232v of the manuscript.  

Małgorzata Malewicz’s analysis of the syntax, vocabulary, and orthography of the Latin of the prayers shows the same features throughout, suggesting that only one person was responsible for the creation of these prayers. While earlier scholarship considered the manuscript to be an autograph copy, today many scholars believe that the prayers were commissioned by Gertruda from a chaplain explicitly for her use, as testified by the use of feminine forms of adjectives throughout the prayers (with occasional exceptions).

This manuscript has amassed a rich historiography, beginning with the first critical study in 1901, but the bulk of research has concentrated on the Ottonian illustrations which accompany the tenth-century Psalter. In the last decades especially, however, ground-breaking work on our understanding of the eleventh-century portion of the manuscript has been carried out by Teresa Michałowska, Brygida Kürbis, and Małgorzata Malewicz.

Teresa Michałowska was the first scholar to show in detail that Gertruda’s manuscript was not a unique work of literature, but rather in its form belonged to the western Christian tradition of *libelli precum* (“little books of prayers”), collections of prayers for private (i.e. non-communal)

---


452 The historiography of the manuscript is treated in detail in: Leśniewska, “Kodeks Gertrudy”: 141-170, updated online: eadem, “Badania,” n. p.
devotions that circulated in manuscripts from the ninth to the twelfth centuries, often within Psalters. Indeed, she demonstrates that Gertruda’s prayers on folia 14r to 20r bear nearly verbatim resemblance to prayers in other eleventh-century *libelli precum*. Such prayer-books made for private devotions focused especially on the theme of penitence. Not only monks, nuns, or kings, but also elite lay women were the owners and commissioners of such “little books of prayers,” as evidenced, for instance, by the *libellus precum* contemporaneous with Gertruda’s life that was owned by Queen Sancha of León (d. 1067). In commissioning her prayer-book Gertruda acted not as an original author by present-day standards, but rather as a compiler, in Dorota Leśniewska’s words, “one who in combining other people’s texts, created something new.”

Like other *libelli precum* made for specific owners, Gertruda’s prayer-book was nonetheless highly individualized, since the prayers were chosen, arranged, and modified for her personal use. Where her name is inserted as the supplicant, the prayers are especially personal. Thus, as Susan Boynton writes, “each *libellus precum* represents both an integral part of a broader textual corpus and a historically specific collection with implications for understanding the life of [...] the individuals who used it.” The Codex Gertrudianus therefore is a manuscript that is


454 The prayer on folia 14r to 20r closely parallel prayers found in the following eleventh century *libelli precum*: Vatican Library sygn. Barber. Latin 497, folia 12r-v and Vatican Library, sygn. Chigi D VI 79, folia 196v-197r and 199v-200r. For a detailed comparison see *Ego Gertruda*, 48, 55-65, 249-251.


456 Queen Sancha of León’s prayer-book is housed at the University of Salamanca (BU MS 2668), discussed in Pick, “Liturgical Renewal”: 27-66.


458 Boynton, “*Libelli precum*,” 266.

459 Wiszewski, *Domus Bolezlai*, 79.

460 *Ibid.*, 266.
both representative of more general devotional practices shared by Gertruda’s eleventh-century contemporaries and also reflective of her individual life experiences.

According to Michałowska, a characteristic of *libelli precum* that have miniatures is the fact their iconographic program closely corresponds to their written prayers.⁴⁶¹ Because of their combination of both Byzantine and Romanesque features, the place of origin of the miniatures in the Codex Gertrudianus has engendered some historiographical debate with suggested locations including Germany, Rome, Rus’, or Poland.⁴⁶² However, the two most recent iconographical studies have re-established Rus’ in general, and most likely Kyiv, as their most probable place of origin.⁴⁶³ The Codex Gertrudianus therefore combines Latin prayers drawing on a western devotional tradition with miniatures corresponding to the theological and devotional conventions of Byzantine iconography.

Drawing on previous findings, this chapter examines what the Codex Gertrudianus can suggest to us about Gertruda’s devotional practices. Although the chapter will consider the wider political context in which Gertruda lived, its principal aim is to examine what this manuscript can tell us about the religious life of one western-rite bride of a Riurikid prince and her process of acculturation. The chapter argues that, although the core of the Codex Gertrudianus is a western *libellus precum*, the manuscript also draws on both eastern and western traditions of lay devotions, reflecting Gertruda’s Rus’ surroundings. Moreover, since she was raised in Poland, part of “New Europe,” and in Cologne, which in the early eleventh century was a contact zone between Byzantine and Latin spiritual traditions, Gertruda likely was open to eastern-rite Christianity even prior to her marriage to Iziaslav Yaroslavich of Rus’. Indeed, her prayer-book is marked by frequent hybridity— that is to say, syncretism or “cultural melding”— of

---


⁴⁶² Of all the theories suggesting a non-Rus’ origin for the miniatures in the Codex Gertrudianus, the strongest arguments have been advanced for Irish monastery of Saint James in Regensburg, where V. L. Yanin suggests that Gertruda and Iziaslav may have stayed in 1075, “Olisava-Gertruda”: 157. His findings are accepted, for example, by Fulvia Sforza Vattovani, “Il Salterio di Egberto e le miniature gertrudiane,” in *Miniatura in Friuli crocevia di Civiltà, Atti Convegno, 1985*, ed. Luigi Menegazzi, intro. Gian Carlo Menis (Udine: Grafiche Editoriali Artistiche Pordenonesi, 1987), 13-20. Saint James, however, was only built in 1089/1090, at which point (as discussed below) Gertruda was in Rus’, Kozak, *Obraz i vlada*, 82; Leśniewska, “Badania,” n. p.

devotional practices and artistic conventions, sometimes making it difficult to ascribe particular elements found in it to specifically “western” or “eastern” traditions. Gertruda’s prayers often seem to indicate a strong connection to her maternal kin, but the influence of her married life in Rus’ is also present in the content of her prayer-book, particularly in the Byzantine-style miniatures which she commissioned. The interaction of the Latin text with the Byzantine images of the manuscript speaks to the hybridity of Gertruda’s personal devotions, which combined a western Christian spiritual tradition embodied mainly in the text (though itself subject to mutual cross-cultural influence) with Byzantine theology embodied mainly in its images.

Before delving into a detailed analysis of Gertruda’s prayer-book as a reflection of her devotional life, it is worth stressing the rarity of information available on other western-rite brides in Rus’ and thus the exceptional source that this *libellus* represents. The Codex Gertrudianus is the only identifiable personal possession belonging to a western-rite bride that has survived from pre-Mongol Rus’. As a result, Gertruda’s prayer-book is one of the most, if not the most, direct sources for the lives of western-rite wives of Rus’ princes because evidence of the activities of foreign brides, even Orthodox ones, in Rus’ is generally very limited. For example, Rus’ chronicles are even silent about the post-marriage activities of Anna Porphyrogenita, the sister of Byzantine Emperor Basil II, although her marriage to prince Vladimir Sviatoslavich in 988/989 was arguably the most high-ranking and prestigious alliance ever contracted by the Riurikid dynasty.

As a point of comparison, one might consider the little information available about other western brides of Rus’ princes, who were Gertruda’s contemporaries. For instance, Scandinavian vernacular sagas and Latin histories represent Gertruda’s mother-in-law, Ingigerd of Sweden, as

---

464 On the notion of “hybridity” as one result of cultural encounters see Moore, *Exchanges in Exoticism*, 22 and Burke, *Cultural Hybridity*.

465 Dimnik, “Princesses”: 163.

a counsellor to her husband Yaroslav the Wise, but Rus’ chronicles say nothing on the issue.\footnote{\textit{Theodoricus Monachus, Historia de Antiquitate regum Norwagiensium. An Account of the Ancient History of the Norwegian Kings}, trans. and annotated David and Ian McDougall, intro. by Peter Foote (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1998), 34; \textit{Morkinskinna: The Earliest Icelandic Chronicle of the Norwegian Kings (1030-1157)}, trans., intro, notes Theodore M. Andersson and Kari Ellen Gade (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 89-90; \textit{Vikings in Russia: Yngvar’s Saga and Eymund’s Saga}, trans. and intro, Hermann Palsson and Paul Edwards (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1989), 45-47 and 85-89.} Since native Rus’ chronicle entries are silent on the lives of foreign brides in Rus’, evidence of their patronage and activities in Rus’ have to be mined from a variety of other sources such as external (non-Rus’) chronicles, artwork, or simply on the basis of informed guesswork.

Another example is telling. Although much has been written about the role of Gertruda’s niece by marriage, Gytha Haroldsdaunder (d. 1107), in maintaining contact with Latin Christianity after her marriage in Rus’, the evidence in support of this view is indirect and circumstantial. This Anglo-Saxon princess was first wife of Prince Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125), who was the son of Gertruda’s brother-in-law, Vsevolod Yaroslavivich (d. 1093). As an indication that Gytha’s Anglo-Saxon royal origins were remembered in Rus’, scholars have pointed out that Vladimir and Gytha’s son, known in Rus’ sources as Mstislav Vladimirovich (d. 1132), is called in thirteenth-century Scandinavian sagas and in one twelfth-century Latin text by the name of “Harald.”\footnote{M. P. Alekseev, “Anglo-sakonskaia parallel’ k Poucheniu Vladimira Monomakha,” in \textit{Trudy otdela drevne-russkoj literatury Instituta russkoi literatury Akademii Nauk SSSR} 2 (1935): 77; Pashuto, \textit{Vneshniaia politika}, 135 and 146; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 589; Raffensperger, \textit{Reimagining Europe}, 109; Ildar H. Garipzanov, “Novgorod and the Veneration of Saints in Eleventh-Century Rus’: A Comparative View,” in \textit{Saints and their Lives}, eds. Antonsson and Garipzanov, 139-140; Litvina and Uspenskii, \textit{Vybor imeni}, 185, 450, 581-582.} \footnote{Raffensperger, \textit{Reimagining Europe}, 109.} This name may have been given to Mstislav by Gytha in honour of her own father (Mstislav’s maternal grandfather), Harald Godwineson, the last Anglo-Saxon king (d. 1066). \footnote{The following sagas all name Mstislav the Great “Harold” and note his descent from the Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha: \textit{Fagrskinna, a Catalogue of the Kings of Norway}, trans. Alison Finlay (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 236; \textit{Morkinskinna}, trans. Andersson and Gade, 328; Snorri Strulson, \textit{Heimskringla}, trans. and notes, Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes, 2nd ed., vol. 3 (London: Viking Society for Northern Research; University College London, 2015) 157 and 234.} But Mstislav’s additional name of “Harald” is only mentioned in non-Rus’ sources, not in native Rus’ chronicles. \footnote{Raffensperger, \textit{Reimagining Europe}, 109.} In Mstislav’s own surviving twelfth-century aprakos or Gospel lectionary (GIM, synod. Ms. no. 1203), the prince is commemorated by his secular name of Mstislav as
well as his baptismal name of “Fedor” (Theodore).\footnote{Litvina and Uspenskii, \textit{Vybor imeni}, 581; Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mścisławowiczów}, 73-74.} If Mstislaw did use the name “Harold” in Rus’, then it remained an additional, private name used only within his family, to commemorate his noble maternal relatives.\footnote{Litvina and Uspenskii, \textit{Vybor imeni}, 450. On the custom of double-naming in Rus’, see the previous chapter.}

More recently, A. V. Nazarenko has suggested that Gytha promoted the cult of the healer-saint Pantaleon of Nikomedeia (today: İzmit) within Rus’ while also sending donations from Rus’ to the Irish Benedictine monastery of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne.\footnote{Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 585-616, and 631-632.} Nazarenko’s argument is based primarily on Gytha’s appearance in a twelfth-century collection of posthumous miracle stories of Saint Pantaleon which tells of the saint's healing of “King Harold of the Rus’ people” from a hunting-wound given to him by a bear.\footnote{“Aroldus rex gentis Russorum qui dum hoc scribimus adhuc superstes est, urso in se insiliente preventus scisso ventre […],” \textit{Miracula S. Pantaleonis Martyris, Auctore Anonymo in Acta Sanctorum}, ed. Société des Bollandistes vol. 6, \textit{Iulii Dies} 27, 422A-422C, last accessed May 15th 2015, <http://acta.chadwyck.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/> , discussed in Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 586; “Un sermon inconnu de Rupert, abbé de Deutz, sur S. Pantaléon,” ed. and commentary Maurice Coens, in \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 55 (1937): 265. For a further discussion of these texts and their dating, see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 12.} The Rus’ king, convincingly identified as Gytha’s son Mstislaw Vladimirovich, is healed by Saint Pantaleon in a vision after Gytha prays to the saint.\footnote{“At illa [important variant: “At mater Gida nomine’] iam dudum Pantaleonis et nomen et meritum agnoverat et eius, que in honore illius Colonie XPo servit, sancte congregationis soror ut esset, liberaliter promeruerat,” “Un sermon inconnu,” ed. Coens : 266; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 587.} This miracle-story describes Gytha as a “sister of the congregation of Cologne,” probably meaning that she was a donor and spiritual member of the monastery’s confraternity \textit{(confraternitas)}.\footnote{“VI. Id. Marc. Palatini et Firmiani confessorum […] Gida regina,” “Un sermon”, ed. Coens: 252; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 596, both citing \textit{Necrologium Sanctis Pantaleonis in Memorienkalender A und B}, \textit{Rheinische Urbare: Sammlung von Urbaren und anderen Quellen zur rheinischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte}, vol 1.: \textit{Die Urbare von Pantaleon in Köln}, ed. Benno Hilliger (Bon: Behrendt, 1902), 18. I was unable to consult this text directly. A second copy of the same necrology dates to the end of the thirteenth/early fourteenth century. See Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 597.} Her patronage of the monastery is also confirmed by her listing under March 10\textsuperscript{th} as “Queen Gytha” in the thirteenth-century necrology of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne.\footnote{I was unable to consult this text directly. A second copy of the same necrology dates to the end of the thirteenth/early fourteenth century. See Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 597.} These sources seem to suggest that Gytha continued to patronize Latin Christian institutions after

\footnote{471 Litvina and Uspenskii, \textit{Vybor imeni}, 581; Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mścisławowiczów}, 73-74.}
her marriage to an Orthodox Rus’ prince. Unfortunately, little else can be said about Gytha’s religious beliefs and patronage. The activities of individual women as bridges between Rus’ and Latin Christendom remain obscure. Still less do we know about how a woman raised in a western Christian setting acculturated to her new Orthodox home after her marriage to a Riurikid prince.

Gertruda’s personal prayer-book, by contrast, offers the closest view of the experiences of an individual woman, raised in a western-rite setting, who married into the Orthodox Rus’ dynasty. For this reason, it merits a detailed case-study as nearly the only source to offer some insight into the experiences of a woman in this position. To analyze this experience, the chapter will set Gertruda’s prayer-book in its historical context by providing a brief sketch of her life. It will then describe the manuscript in question, before proceeding to a discussion of the commonality of western and eastern devotional forms in Gertruda’s manuscript, which reflected her connections both to her maternal kin in western-rite countries, the Christian traditions that she encountered in Rus’, and her individual life experiences of several periods of exile.

This chapter will conclude by noting the presence of the *filioque* in the Codex Gertrudianus and by examining the content of a small minority of prayers—two out of approximately ninety-five—which suggest that Gertruda was aware of increased Orthodox / Catholic estrangement in the mid eleventh and early twelfth century. This estrangement, however, did not seem to have had a great impact on her ability to move between confessional boundaries. Instead, the general

478 There is one more possible clue as to Gytha’s role after her marriage to Vladimir. In 1935, M. P. Alekseev proposed the still influential theory that Vladimir Monomakh’s didactic *Pochenie (Instruction)* was shaped in its content and form by an eighth-century Anglo-Saxon text of instructions of father to sons, the *Faeder Larcwidas*. This book was donated to the Cathedral of Exeter by Leofric, bishop of that city (r. 1050-1072) and chaplain to King Edward the Confessor. Alekseev suggested that the *Faeder Larcwidas* was perhaps known to Gytha, since, in 1068 before escaping to Rus’ (via Flanders, then Sweden), she took refuge with her family in Exeter following the Battle of Hastings, idem, “Anglo-sakonskaia parallel,” 59-80. Vladimir’s *Pochenie*, however, reflects a long western European as well as Byzantine textual tradition of “wisdom literature” and “mirrors for princes” that cannot be ascribed to a single geographical area. Hence the creation of Vladimir’s text cannot be attributed to the sole influence of his western wife, Dvornik, “Kiev State,” 23; Podskalsky, *Litteratur*, 214.

479 More detailed biographies of Gertruda may be found in the works of Stanisław Kętrzyński, Teresa Michałowska, Brygida Kürbis, and Andrzej Poppe. Michałowska’s work is the most thorough, as it discusses and assembles all extant German, Polish and Rus’ sources for Gertruda’s life, that of her sons, and her husband. See Stanisław Kętrzyński, “Gertruda,” in PSB, vol. 7, 405-406; Michałowska, *Ego Gertruda*; Brygida Kürbis, “Gerturda—Historia jej życia,” in *Na progach Historii*, vol. 2, 283-298; Poppe, “Gertruda-olisawa,” 575-591.
impression that her prayer-book presents to its reader is that of continued close interchange between Orthodox and Catholic spirituality in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

Gertruda: a Biographical Sketch

Gertruda’s life was one of travel between eastern and western-rite Christian traditions. Consequently, her spiritual life shows influence of both cultural worlds of the Salian emperors and of the Riurikid princes of Rus’. Born around 1025, Gertruda was the daughter of King Mieszko-Lambert II of Poland (d. 1034) and Richeza (d. 1061).\(^{480}\) Richeza, in turn, was the daughter of Count Palatine Erenfried Ezzo of the Rhine (d. 1034) and Mathilda (d. circa 979-1025), the youngest daughter of Emperor Otto II and the Byzantine princess Theophano.\(^{481}\) This genealogical information is important for understanding Gertruda’s devotional life, because her maternal relatives would play an important role in shaping her spiritual upbringing.

Gertruda’s earliest years were spent in a polylingual liturgical environment in Poland, part of “New Europe” that served as a contact zone between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. A letter sent to Gertruda’s father, King Mieszko, around 1025-1027 by his ally Countess Mathilda of Swabia claims that the Polish king could praise God in Slavonic, Latin, and Greek.\(^{482}\) This enigmatic statement could refer to the fact that Mieszko II knew how to pray or sing the psalms in multiple languages or it could be interpreted to mean that both eastern and western-rite liturgies were celebrated at the Polish royal court.\(^{483}\) Greek prayers may have come to the Polish court due to contacts with the diocese of Cologne (where, in turn, Greek education had been established

\(^{480}\) For Gertruda’s genealogy, see for instance: Kętrzyński, “Gertruda,” 405; Ennen, “Die sieben Töchter,” 160-161, Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 63; Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 95 and 105.


during the reign of Empress Theophano).\(^{484}\) Old Church Slavonic liturgical or devotional texts at the Polish court may be explained by influence from neighbouring Bohemia, where the Latin rite was celebrated in Slavonic as well as in Latin until the end of the eleventh century (when it was outlawed by supporters of so-called Gregorian reforms).\(^{485}\) Even before her marriage to a Rus’ prince, Gertruda therefore may have been exposed to both Latin and Old Church Slavonic liturgical practices, which could have facilitated her openness to Orthodox practices and her acculturation to her Rus’ environment.

Due to a maelstrom of external invasions and court intrigues, however, Gertruda was forced to flee Poland in 1031 and/or 1032 together with her mother and siblings.\(^{486}\) She thus left the Slavonic poly-lingual liturgical environment of Poland to spend the rest of her childhood among her mother’s relatives in the Rhineland. Consequently, Gertruda remained in Germany for the remainder of her childhood where she was raised among her maternal relatives, members of the powerful Ezzonid family.\(^{487}\) Gertruda’s maternal grandfather Erenfried Ezzo had died in 1034 and her mother Richeza inherited land on the family’s proprietary monastery in Brauweiler dedicated to Saints Nicholas and Medard.\(^{488}\) The family also had close ties to the metropolis of Cologne where one of Gertruda’s maternal uncles sat on the episcopal throne as Archbishop Herman II (r. 1036-1056).\(^{489}\)

---

\(^{484}\) Codex Mathildis, ed. Kürbis et al., 80.

\(^{485}\) Codex Mathildis, ed. Kürbis et al., 80-81; Dvornik, The Making, 233 and 247; and idem, Byzantine Missions, 206-223, 226-228; Berend, Urbańczyk, and Wiszewski, Central Europe, 117; Verkholantsev, Slavic Letters, 27-28. Old Church Slavonic was revived as a liturgical language in Bohemia in the fourteenth century by Charles IV, see Ibid., 66-67 and elsewhere.


\(^{489}\) Gertruda’s second uncle, Otto, was count palatine of Lotharingia / Lorraine (from 1034) and later Duke of Swabia (from 1045 to 1047). Gertruda’s third uncle, Ludolf, provost of the family monastery of Brauweiler, had
Gertruda’s last years of childhood were likely spent in the diocese of Cologne at the archiepiscopal court of her uncle or at one of the monasteries where her surviving maternal aunts were abbesses: Theophanu (d. 1056) at the imperial abbeys of Essen and Gerresheim, Heylewig at the monastery of Saint Quirin in Neuss (d. 1076), Mathilda (d. ?) in Dietkirchen (now part of Bonn) and Vilich (both dedicated to Saint Peter), and Ida (d. 1060) at Saint Mary’s in Gandersheim (later, from about 1049 also abbess of Saint Mary’s on the Capitol in Cologne). All of these women presented Gertruda with strong models of female patronage of ecclesiastical building projects, books, and luxury devotional objects. Due to the patronage of Empress Theophano in the tenth century, Cologne and the Rhineland, however, like Poland, were also “contact zones” of Orthodoxy and Catholicism in the eleventh century. It is possible that Gertruda would also have encountered the Byzantine liturgy in the Rhineland monasteries of her aunts, who may have been familiar with it through their grandmother, the Byzantine princess and western Empress Theophano.

Around 1039 (according to the twelfth-century Annalista Saxo), or 1042/1043 (according to the twelfth-century Rus’ Primary Chronicle), Gertruda became the wife of the prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich. As seen in the previous chapter, Gertruda’s maternity of princes Mstislav Iziaslavich (d. 1069) and Sviatopolk-Michael Iziaslavich (d. 1113) is disputed. Latin sources only mention Yaropolk-Peter as Gertruda’s son. For this reason, as discussed in the previous chapter, Karol Górski has suggested as a possible solution that Iziaslav Yaroslavich only married Gertruda in 1050 and that Sviatopolk and Mstislav were Iziaslav’s sons by an otherwise


492 Malewicz, “Analiza filologiczna,” 37. See also Codex Mathildis, ed., Kürbis et al., 80.


494 See the list of sources on Iziaslav Yaroslavich’s sons in Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 100-101.
unknown first wife called Olisava. According to the most widely accepted theory of transmission, it was at the time of her marriage that Gertrude received the tenth-century Psalter of Archbishop Egbert from her mother Richeza. Her maternal grandfather Ezzo had ransacked Trier Cathedral in the early eleventh century and perhaps then seized the luxury Codex for his family. His daughter Richeza would have then given the codex to her own daughter Gertruda, as part of Gertruda’s dowry.

As is usual, little is recorded of Gertruda’s life as princess of Kyiv, but Rus’ sources remember her as a supporter of the Orthodox monks of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves and its church of the Dormition of the Mother of God (built 1073-1077; consecrated in 1089), endowed by her husband Iziaslav. She is portrayed positively as an intercessor with her husband on behalf of the Orthodox monks of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves in the monk Nestor’s Life of the igumen Saint Theodosios (d. 1074), probably written in the 1080s. Gertruda’s protection of the monastery is told again in the thirteenth-century Paterik’s story of “the Venerable Moisei [Moses] the Hungarian.” This version refers to Gertruda as a Polish woman (“Liakhovitsa”) and again portrays her as a merciful intercessor on behalf of the monastery.

As evidence for Gertruda’s devotional life it is notable that one line in the Life of Saint Theodosios states in passing that Theodosios’s mother entered into a female monastery dedicated to Saint Nicholas, after obtaining the permission of an unnamed princess of Kyiv. Several

495 Görski, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?”: 74-76. See also the discussion in the previous chapter on the issue of the renaming of Gertruda in Rus’.
496 Malewicz, “Un livre d’une princesse”: 249.
scholars have assumed that this princess of Kyiv must have been Gertruda.  

On the one hand, the founding of an Orthodox monastery by Gertruda would suggest that she had indeed acculturated to her Orthodox Christian environment. On the other hand, it could also indicate that Gertruda was continuing her family’s veneration of Saint Nicholas, since her family’s proprietary monastery in Brauweiler was dedicated to this saint and because her mother Richeza had also established churches dedicated to Saint Nicholas in Kraków.  

Gertruda’s possible foundation of an Orthodox monastery therefore did not entail complete assimilation into religious-cultural world of her husband, but rather could equally have reflected cultural continuity with models of devotion established by her parents.

Due to political turmoil, Gertruda spent two periods of exile with her husband in Poland and Germany from 1068 to 1069 and 1073-1077. During the second, longer period of exile, Gertruda and her husband unsuccessfully solicited aid, first from Gertruda’s nephew, Boleslaw II, and then from Emperor Heinrich IV.  

In response to the pleas of the exiled family, in January of 1075 Heinrich IV sent Burchard-Poppo, the provost of the monastery of Saint Simeon in Trier, as an ambassador to prince Sviatoslav Yaroslavich in Kyiv to try to convince him to restore Iziaslav to the throne. Burchard was chosen for the embassy because he was also Sviatoslav’s brother-in-law: Burchard’s sister Oda was Sviatoslav’s wife; an incident which also testifies to the ability of western-rite brides to maintain ties with their natal family in Rus’.

---

502 Ibid., 381-382.
503 Ibid., 382-383 and idem, Kobiety, 202-236.
Sviatoslav, however, had no trouble in bribing his brother-in-law to return to Germany with rich gifts and to convince the Emperor to abandon his support of Iziaslav.508

As a result of the failure of imperial support for their cause, Gertruda and her family turned from the Emperor to the Pope. In 1075, they sent their son Yaropolk-Peter to Rome to ask for help from Pope Gregory VII (r. 1073-1085). Gregory’s response is known from two letters.509 In the first, dated to April 17th 1075, the pope took Rus’ under the symbolic protection of Saint Peter and conferred the rule of Rus’ onto Yaropolk.510 Because this letter was addressed both to Iziaslav (whom Gregory calls by his Orthodox baptismal name of “Demetrius”) and to Gertruda (called simply Demetrius’ “queen”), several scholars suggested that Gertruda played a role in persuading her husband to turn to papal help for his cause.511

In the second letter, dated three days later (April 20th 1075), Pope Gregory VII interceded for Iziaslav with Bolesław II, entreatyng the Polish ruler to return Iziaslav’s riches.512 As Adolf Ziegler has shown, Gregory VII’s intervention did not result any feudal agreement of vassalage between Iziaslav, Yaropolk and Gregory VII, but rather the extension of a relationship of protection, the *Patrocinium Petri*.513 Believing Iziaslav’s cause to be just and believing equally

---

508 Dimnik, “Princesses”: 166; Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence*, 258.


512 *Correspondence*, trans. Emerton, 78; *Register*, trans. Cowdrey, 2.73, 169.

513 Ziegler bases his conclusions that the agreement between Iziaslav, Yaropolk and Pope Gregory VII was a relationship of protection based on the comparison of the letters of Gregory VII to Iziaslav with contemporary vassalage agreements made between Pope Gregory VII and Richard of Capua (1073), Svonimir Demetrius of Croatia (1076), Salomon of Hungary (1074) and Robert Guiscard of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily (1080). In these
in his right to intervene in temporal disputes, Gregory VII took the princely family under the protection of Saint Peter, and commanded Bolesław II to help them.\footnote{Arrignon, “À propos de la lettre”: 6-8; Ziegler, “Gregor VII,” 396-402.} As John Meyendorff notes, Iziaslav’s appeal to the pope only seems problematic if one accepts that the year 1054 represented a final breach between eastern-rite and western-rite forms of Christianity.\footnote{Meyendorff, Byzantino-Russian Relations, 26.}

In the end, Iziaslav’s exile resolved itself in 1076 when his brother and rival for the throne, Sviatoslav, died the next year “from the cutting of a sore.”\footnote{“V sezhe lĕto prestavi sia Sviatoslav syn Yaroslav mĕsiatsa dekabria 27, ot rĕzaniia zhelve,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, 10.3, 1602-1603; PC, sub anno 6584 (1076), 164.} Iziaslav and Gertruda came back to Poland, after Gertruda’s nephew Bolesław II had agreed to help them to return to Rus’ under papal pressure. During this stay in Poland or during the previous one of 1068-1069, Iziaslav donated an archbishop’s \textit{pallium} (or perhaps its Orthodox equivalent, an \textit{ōmophorion}) to Poland’s patron-saint, Wojciech (Adalbert).\footnote{Anatol Lewicki, “Napis na palliuszu z XI wieku,” in Kwartalnik Historczny 7 (1893): 447-448; Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Mediæ Aevi Bibliothecae Cornicensis / Katalog rękopisów średniowiecznych Biblioteki Kórnickiej, ed. Jerzy Zathey (Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1968), no. 802, 474-486 (description of the entire manuscript), esp. 477 (the \textit{pallium} note); Kętrzyński, “Gertruda,” 406.} The precious cloth, no longer extant, was embroidered with the following Latin prayer, whose words are recorded in a fifteenth-century manuscript originating from Kraków (Kórnik, Kórnik Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences, MS 802, \textit{olim} 43, folio 15v): “By the prayers of Saint Demetrius, Almighty [God], may You grant many years to your servant Iziaslav, duke of Rus’, for the remissions of his sins and rule of the Heavenly Kingdom. May this be done, o Lord, in your name.”\footnote{“Textus in pallio Sancti Adalberti descriptus. Oracionibus sancti Demetrii concedas omnipotens multos annos servo tuo Izaslaw, duci Russia, ob remissionem peccaminum et Regni celestis Imperium. Amen. Fiat domine in nomine tuo,” Lewicki, “Napis na palliuszu”: 447; Catalogus, ed. Zathey, no. 802, 477; Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 96.}

The prayer unproblematically links an appeal to Iziaslav’s heavenly patron, the Orthodox warrior-saint of Thessaloniki, Demetrius, together with the “Catholic” martyr-saint of Poland,
Wojciech.\textsuperscript{519} There did not seem to be any sense of conflict or contradiction here between Orthodoxy and Catholicism for the princely family. Instead, the embroidered \textit{pallium} suggests that not only did “Catholic” Gertruda adapt to the “Orthodox” religious culture of her husband (a culture to some degree already familiar to her in Germany and Poland) after her marriage, but that her Orthodox husband, during his exile, patronized the “Catholic” cults of his wife. The prayer on the embroidered pallium, as preserved in the fifteenth-century manuscript record, therefore serves as an example of the way in which acculturation in the inter-rite marriages of the Riurikids could be a two-way process, affecting both husband and wife as a result of direct cultural contact.

With Sviatoslav dead, Iziaslav returned to Kyiv in 1077 and regained the throne with Boleslaw II’s forces once again supplying military backing.\textsuperscript{520} Another possibility is that Gertruda received the tenth-century psalter during this period: it could have been brought to Kyiv by Burchard-Poppe originally as a present for Gertruda’s sister-in-law Oda and later appropriated by Gertruda after 1077, or it was brought directly to Rus’ by Gertruda from Trier in 1075 (in which case, as Dorota Leśniewska notes, the psalter had remained in Trier up to that point).\textsuperscript{521}

A year after the return of the princely family to Rus’, however, Iziaslav died in battle against a coalition of his nephews and steppe nomads on October 3rd 1078.\textsuperscript{522} In accordance with the Rus’ practice of lateral succession, his son Yaropolk-Peter did not inherit the throne. Rather, Iziaslav was succeeded in Kyiv by his younger brother, Vsevolod, who moved Gertruda’s son Yaropolk-Peter to the western cities of Volodymyr (Vladimir-in-Volhynia) and Turov.\textsuperscript{523} Coins issued by Yaropolk-Peter at this time show the image of Saint Peter labeled in Greek \textit{Petros} on the reverse together with the Latin title of \textit{rex}, given in Slavonic as \textit{RHGA} (from Greek \textit{rēgas}),

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{519} On the veneration of Saint Demetrius in Rus’ see Monica White, \textit{Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus’, 900-1200} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 99-103, 115, 124, 127-128, 130.
\item \textsuperscript{520} \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 1604; \textit{PC, sub anno 6585} (1077), 165.
\item \textsuperscript{521} Leśniewska, “Kodeks Getrudy,” 142.
\item \textsuperscript{522} \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 1622-1623.
\item \textsuperscript{523} \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 1639-1640.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
instead of the usual Slavonic title of kniaz (prince).\textsuperscript{524} The coins suggest that Yaropolk-Peter publicly cultivated his connection to his patron saint and perhaps also that Gregory VII had bestowed a royal title upon him.\textsuperscript{525} Yaropolk-Peter, it seems, did not accept the lateral system of succession in Rus’ and may have had political ambitions to rule in Kyiv. According to the \textit{Primary Chronicle}, in 1085, “Incited by evil advisers, Yaropolk planned an attack upon [his uncle] Vsevolod” who was ruling in Kyiv.\textsuperscript{526} As a result Vsevolod sent his son Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125) to attack Yaropolk-Peter.\textsuperscript{527}

Gertruda was presumably living with her son Yaropolk-Peter in western Rus’ at this time. One of the last certain references to her in the Rus’ chronicles tells how in 1085 Yaropolk-Peter abandoned her during a siege of the western city of Lutsk by Prince Vladimir Monomakh, the son of Prince Vsevolod Yaroslavich. Vladimir captured Lutsk and took Gertruda as a hostage back to Kyiv with him.\textsuperscript{528} Perhaps she was soon freed from captivity, because the Rus’ chronicles recount that in the following year, 1086, her son Yaropolk returned from Poland, made peace with Vsevolod Yaroslavich, and was able to rule again in Volhynia.\textsuperscript{529}

The peace was a ruse, however, because shortly after his return Yaropolk was killed by a hired assassin in 1086/1087.\textsuperscript{530} As will be discussed further below, Yaropolk-Peter’s body was brought to Kyiv, and buried in the Church of the Holy Apostle Peter, which he had begun building within the monastery of Saint Demetrius built by his father, Iziaslav, in honour of his own patron saint.\textsuperscript{531} It is a matter of some scholarly debate whether Gertruda was the mother or


\textsuperscript{527} \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 1650.

\textsuperscript{528} \textit{Ibid.}, vol. 10.3, 1650-1651.

\textsuperscript{529} \textit{Ibid.}, vol. 10.3, 1653.

\textsuperscript{530} \textit{Ibid.}, vol. 10.3, 1653-1654.

stepmother of Sviatopolk-Michael Iziaslavich and hence whether the Rus’ chronicler’s notice under the year 1108, that “On January 4 of this year, the Princess, Sviatopolk’s mother, passed away,” refers to her. If so, this notice is the last reference in the sources to her. She would have spent over thirty years as a widow in Kyivan Rus’, dying in her eighties.

As indicated by the twelfth-century necrological notes added to its eleventh-century calendar, the Codex Gertrudianus was returned to Poland after Gertruda’s death, probably by her (step)granddaughter Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna who married King Bolesław III Wry-mouth in 1103. At Sbyslava’s death, the manuscript was donated to the Swabian monastery of Zwiefalten. From Zwiefalten, it came into the possession of Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia (1207-1231), who likely received the manuscript from her mother, Gertruda of Andech, descended from the counts of Andech and Berg, patrons of Zwiefalten monastery. In 1229, Elizabeth donated the manuscript to the chapter-house of Cividale, and the manuscript has remained in this Italian city to the present day.

Manuscript Description

When precisely Gertruda started assembling the texts and miniatures of her remains debated. The problem is complicated by the fact that is not clear when Gertruda came into possession of the tenth-century psalter, which could have been either at the time of her marriage in circa 1039-
1050 or later in the 1070s, during or right after her second period of exile from Rus’.

Although some portions of the prayer-book seem to have been compiled earlier, several clues in the manuscript, however, have led to a general scholarly consensus that Gertruda commissioned most of her prayers and miniatures during her widowhood, but prior to her son Yaropolk’s death, i.e. from 1078 to 1086/1087. Before further analyzing the Codex Gertrudianus as a source on Gertruda’s devotional life in Rus’ and her acculturation to the religious-cultural surroundings after her marriage, it is first useful to survey the contents of the manuscript itself.

The Codex Gertrudianus comprises three major parts: the original tenth-century psalter that had belonged to Bishop Egbert (the Psalterium Egberti), found on folia 16r-208v, additions made in Trier at the end of the tenth century and found in folia 209r-233v (prior to the time in which the manuscript as a whole came into Gertruda’s possession), and, finally, the so-called Folia Gertrudiana, that is folia 2r-15v, which were added at the beginning of the manuscript in the late eleventh century. The pencil foliation dates to the twentieth century and is continuous, without accounting for loss of folia.

The Folia Gertrudiana are made up of four gatherings. Gathering I consists of one bifolio to which a third folio has been glued (folia 2r-4v). It contains an eleventh-century calendar probably made in Kraków with necrological notes added in the later eleventh and twelfth centuries in Zwiefalten Abbey. Gathering II comprises folia 5v and 6v. Folio 5v is adorned
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537 Leśniewska, “Kodeks Getrudy”: 142.
538 Smirnovna, “Miniatures”: 5; Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 75.
540 Pani, “Aspetti codicologici,” n. 23, 47.
541 Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 45-48; Pani, “Aspetti codicologici,” 47; Malewicz, “Problemé edycji,” n. p. See also the diagram of the gatherings in Smorąg Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, ill. 1, 12.
by a miniature depicting Saint Peter, labelled in Greek as “Hagios Petros,” surrounded by
Gertruda, her son-Yaropolk-Peter, identified by Greek and Cyrillic tituli, and an unidentified
woman, perhaps Yaropolk’s wife or a personification of the virtue of righteousness (Plate 1).
Latin prayers are written on either side of the image. Following folio 6v, two folia are missing in
this gathering.

Gathering III is preserved in its entirety, and spans folia 7r-10v. It begins with Latin prayers on
the top of folio 7r and contains three full page Byzantine-style miniatures. The miniature on
folio 9v depicts the Nativity of Christ framed within a domed Byzantine-style church (Plate 2). It
faces the miniature on folio 10r, which depicts the Crucifixion miniature with misspelled Greek
titulus I STAUROSS [“The Cross”] (rather than HO STAuros), enclosed in a quatrefoil frame
(Plate 2). The frame is surrounded by medallions of the four Evangelists holding open Gospel
books on whose pages their names are written in Greek. The miniature on folio 10v depicts
Christ in Majesty seated on a throne crowning a richly-dressed man and a woman introduced to
him by Saints Peter and Irene; Christ and the saints are labelled in Greek or Cyrillic (Plate 3).
Above the scene are the haloed symbols of the Evangelists, offering their Gospel books while
orders of angels hover below the main figures (seraphim, cherubim and thrones). Both Gathering
II and Gathering III are of the same quality of parchment: thicker and poorer than those in
Gathering I and IV.

Gathering IV, the final gathering of the Folia Gertrudiana, also is completely preserved. Its
parchment quality is the same as that of Gathering I. Gathering IV begins on folia 11r-11v
with a speculum astrologicum, that is divinations of dreams, and prognostications of weather
conditions for the year based on the day of the week the Kalends of January fall on (folia 11v-
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Psalterium Egherti, vol. 1, ed. Barberi, 109-110. The necrological notes indicate that the Codex Gertrudianus ended
up in Zwiefalten monastery prior to 1160, Malewicz, “Problemy edycji,” n.p.

543  For a more detailed discussion of the unnamed woman in the miniature on folio 5v see the previous chapter.

544  Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 48; Smorąg Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 11-13.

545  Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 48; Smorąg-Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 11-13.
12r). These two divinatory texts are written in the same hand as the calendar, but in a different hand from the one ascribed to Gertruda or her chaplain. According to Laura Pani, the *speculum astrologicum* (11r-12v) currently facing the miniature of Christ in Majesty (10v) is out of place. The first seven lines of the weather prognostications on the top of folio 12r have been copied out from a folio originally detached from the external bifolio of Gathering I.

Gertruda’s prayers begin again mid-way down folio 12r, and fill the rest of the Gathering IV. Beginning on folio 14r, below an ornamental band of interwoven blue, red, and gold lines that divides the folio in half prayers in this section are copied from pre-existing *libelli precum*. The section copied from an existing *libellus precum* continues into the blank folia belonging to the tenth-century psalter, ending on the bottom of folio 20r with a golden ornamental knot. They are continued by Gertruda’s own prayers throughout the rest of the codex which do not have such close parallels to other *libelli precum*.

Folia 16r-208v comprise Archbishop Egbert’s original tenth-century psalter, and includes psalms, canticles, the Lord’s Prayer, the Apostles’ Creed and the *Fides catholica* (also known as the Athanasian Creed or *Quicumque vult*). Double facing-page Ottonian miniatures adorn the psalter at every tenth psalm. These Ottonian miniatures include a set of donation images: one showing the monk Ruodprecht offering the codex to Egbert (folio 16v-17r), and the other depicting Egbert offering the codex to Saint Peter (folio 18v-19r). It is followed by miniatures

---


547 Michałowska, *Ego Gertruda*, 52-53; Smorag Różyczka, *Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury*, 13. Laura Pani believes that the prayers attributed to Gertruda are all written in one hand with the exception of fourteen lines on folio 115r, “Aspetti codicologici e palaeografici del manoscritto,” *Psalterium Egberti*, vol. 1, 43, 45 and 51. Michałowska also attributes to one person (either Gertruda herself or a scribe writing at her orders) all the “Gertrudian” prayers, *Ego Gertruda*, 52-53. Malewicz, however, distinguishes two closely related hands, which she calls Hand IA and IIA. She argues that the letters of Hand IA are larger, thicker and more clearly separated from each other than in Hand IIA. Hand IA uses a different final *s* than Hand IIA, in which the final *s* of a word resembles a modern *f*. The pen of Hand IIA is cut more thickly. Both hands use the same ligatures (for example, for *ct*, *st*). For details, see Malewicz, “Problemy edycji,” n. p.

548 Ibid., 48.

549 Ibid., 48.

depicting King David (fol. 20v), and fourteen bishops of Trier, Egbert’s predecessors in office, facing fourteen full-page decorative initials. Smaller decorative initials begin each psalm. Gertruda’s prayers are inscribed in the available blank spaces of the psalter. One Rus’ miniature on folio 41r depicts the Mother of God sitting on a lyre-backed throne and holding the Christ child on her lap, labelled in Greek, Meter Theou (“Mother of God”, Plate 4). Folio 182r contains a prayer against poison, De nociuis rebus timendis, in the same hand as the calendar.

Folia 209r to 233v comprise slightly later tenth-century additions made for the clergy of Trier Cathedral. These include on folia 214r-228v a litany of All Saints written in double columns with Gertruda’s prayer on the margin of folio 213v. Folia 214ra-228v contain formulas of confession and penitential prayers for use of the clergy in Trier. Gertruda’s prayers are found in this section on the margins of folia 223v-224r and folia 227vb-228v. Finally, folia 229r-232v contain Ordinationes (recommendations for how to pray the Liturgy of the Hours) made in Trier with Gertruda’s prayers on folia 230v-232v.

At some point before 1494, when the Codex Gertrudianus’ incipit was described in detail in the Cividale Cathedral inventory, the manuscript underwent re-collation that led to minor errors in
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551 In the folia of Egbert’s Psalter, Gertruda’s prayers can be found on 16r, 17v-18r, 19v-20r, 30r, 40v, 51v-52r, 65v-66r, 86r, 98v-99r, 115r, 127r, 150v-151r, 159v-160r, 168r, 172v-173r, 182r, 187v, 194r, and 205v-208r.
552 Malewicz, “Problemy edycji,” n. p.
553 Malewicz notes that the Trier provenance of the litany is suggested by names of twenty-five local saints listed in it, including the fourteenth bishops of Trier who are depicted in the miniatures of the psalter. Ibid, n. p. For an edition of the litany in this manuscript see, “Anciennes litanies des saints,” ed. Maurice Coens, Analecta Bollandiana 59 (1941): 285-290. Coens has noted that the litany is not an original work and is similar to other litanies from Reichenau and Trier.
554 The texts of the Trier prayers are edited in Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 177-186. The first of these prayers has the incipit, “Confiteor Tibi domine pater caeli” (folio 214r). Jonathan Black notes that model confessions beginning with this phrase may be found in many western liturgical manuscripts. See Idem, “Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin’s Confessio Peccatorum Pura and the Seven Penitential Psalms (Use 1),” in Medieval Studies 65 (2003): n. 28, 10. For specific examples see, for instance, Victor Leroquais, Les psautiers, manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France, vol 1 (Mâcon: Protat freres, 1940-1941), 22-23, 43, 46, 255, 276, 291.
555 The title and first two lines of Gertruda’s prayer to Mary Magdalene begins on folio 227r, not 228r as indicated in Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 166.
the order of the folia. In the late eleventh century, when Gertruda possessed the manuscript and added the first fourteen folia to the psalter, the manuscript would have begun with the blank folio 5r, which protects the miniature of Saint Peter on its verso side. The calendar and the divinatory texts would originally have followed one another.

As can be seen from this brief description, throughout her ownership of the codex, Gertruda added prayers in stages. They are spread throughout the entire manuscript, in the free spaces of the Psalter and on fourteen folia added to the beginning. Longer prayers are written on the blank sides of the fourteen double facing-page Ottonian miniatures. Shorter prayers are squeezed into the margins of the psalms and in the margins of the above-mentioned late tenth-century portion of the manuscript shortly after the lifetime of the original ownership of the Codex, Egbert.

Thus Gertruda was familiar with and used all portions of the manuscript, personalizing it for her use by her prayers and the miniatures she commissioned. It is not known whether Gertruda first made a *libellus precum* for herself out of four gatherings and then joined it to the psalter or whether, on the contrary, she first filled the blank folia and margins of the tenth-century Psalter with her prayers in the 1070s, and then added the *folia*.
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557 There are other minor changes to the current collation. For instance, according to Pani’s hypothesis, the current position of folia 7r-8v should be switched with folia 9r to 10v, so that the third gathering would have originally begun with a blank folio 9r featuring the Nativity miniature on its verso side, just like the previous gathering which also opens with a blank folio (5r) with a miniature of Saint Peter on its verso side (5v), Pani, “Aspetti codicologici,” 48-49.


559 The tenth-century additions include the Trier Litany of All Saints, the formulas of confession, and the recommendations on praying the Liturgy of the Hours.


561 Michałowska believes that Gertruda first wrote in the *Folia Gertrudiana* and only then in the psalter, Michałowska *Ego Gertruda*, 49. Malewicz and Smorąg Różyczka, however, believe that that Gertruda first made use of the blank areas of the tenth-century psalter for her prayers, and only then added new folia to the beginning of the manuscript: Malewicz, “Un livre d’une princesse”: 250 (she later changed her mind, however: “Problemy edycji,” n. p.), and Smorąg Różyczka, *Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury*, 13.
Nonetheless the manuscript’s contents give some indications as to when Gertruda might have begun to transform the tenth-century Psalter into her personal prayer-book, which was shaped also by her acculturation to her environment in Rus’. Firstly, it is notable that Gertruda is referred to in the donation miniature on folio 5v of her prayer-book not as the wife of Iziaslav Yaroslavich, but rather as “the mother of Yaropolk,” which suggests that Iziaslav was deceased at the time this miniature was made. As this chapter will analyze in detail below, the contents of the prayers on folio 5v and 6r surrounding this miniature bear a close relationship to its iconography of the miniature, suggesting that text and image were commissioned around the same time, i.e. after 1078 when Iziaslav had died.

Yaropolk Iziaslavich, however, appears as a living person both on the donation miniature on folio 5v, and in the coronation scene on folio 10v, while Gertruda’s husband Iziaslav is absent from both of these images. Iziaslav’s name is not mentioned in the prayers, while Gertruda prays for her son Yaropolk as a living person, both in the folia Gertrudiana, and in the prayers written in the margins of tenth-century psalter. This evidence suggests that at least many of the prayers were written after 1078 but before 1086/1087, when Yaropolk was killed. Several of the prayers seem to evoke a time when Gertruda, in older age, was worried about her son Yaropolk and seeking God’s forgiveness and mercy, which could reflect her concerns over the political rivalries between her son Yaropolk-Peter and his first cousin Vladimir Monomakh that took place in the 1078-1086/1087 period. Gertruda’s prayers for son Peter’s physical and spiritual wellbeing appear in both the psalter part of the manuscript and in the additional Folia Gertrudiana (the name of her son “Peter” occurs on folia 7v, 8r, 12v, 30r, 206r, 206v, 207v, 208v, 213v, 232r, 232v), again suggesting that the majority of the prayers in the libellus precum were written down at a time when Gertruda was particularly concerned for Yaropolk-Peter’s safety.

If Gertruda possessed the psalter from her wedding-day onward, then it seems that at first she contented herself with reciting the psalms in it, without adding any of her own prayers. During
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563 Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 5
one of her two periods of exile in Kraków, in 1068/1069 or 1073-1077, by which point the manuscript was certainly in her possession, Gertruda had the calendar (Gathering I), prognostications (Gathering IV), and prayer against poison added to the psalter (folio 182r). She also had a cleric copy out prayers from a pre-existing *libellus precum* during her stays in Poland or Germany, and began filling the available blank spaces in her psalter. In the period between 1078 to 1086/1087, after her husband Iziaslav’s death, she continued adding prayers to the psalter and commissioned a Rus’ workshop to begin the miniatures in Gatherings II and III, to which she or a cleric in her entourage added the associated prayers. For stylistic reasons, discussed further below, it is likely that she also added the miniature of the Mother of God and the Christ-Child on folio 41r of the psalter after her return from exile, sometime between 1078-1086/1086. This miniature is of debated dating: it was made either in the twelfth century or to the mid to late eleventh century. Stylistic evidence, however, points toward the latter. These prayers and miniatures made in Rus’ deserve now will be analyzed more closely.

The Codex Gertrudianus as a Window onto Gertruda’s Devotional Life

In order to examine how the Codex Gertrudianus can serve as a window onto the experience of one western-rite bride in Rus’, this section will focus its analysis mainly on Gatherings II and III
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566 André Grabar and Engelina Smirnova (followed by Schmitt) date the miniature of the Mother of God to the early twelfth century and thus to the end of Gertruda’s life, André Grabar, *L’art du Moyen Age en Europe orientale* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1968), 150; Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 14; Schmitt, “Circulation et appropriation,” 1290. Michałowska dates it to the 1080s or the early eleventh century, *Ego Gertruda*, 52. Kozak dates the entire miniature program to Gertruda’s time as a hostage in Kyiv from 1085-1086, *Obraz i vlada*, 79. In the view of these four scholars, the miniature would have been the last one commissioned by Gertruda. Smorąg-Różycka, however, prefers an earlier eleventh-century dating, meaning that this miniature would have been the first one that Gertruda commissioned in her manuscript. Małgorzata Smorąg-Różycka, “Wizerunek Matki Boskiej Kyriotissy w Kodeksie Gertrudy: palladium rodu Izjasławowiczów?” in *Gertruda Mieszkówna i jej modlitwy / Getruda, Daughter of Mieszko and her Prayers*, eds. Bożena Listkowska and Artur Andrzejuk (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefan Wyszyńskiego, 2010), 90-91 and eadem, *Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury*, 13. Her conclusions are supported by the research of Anthony Cutler, who finds that, after the mid eleventh century, there are few examples of the Mother of God seated on a lyre-backed throne in Byzantine art, “The Lyre-Backed Throne,” in idem, *Transfigurations. Studies in the Dynamics of Byzantine Iconography* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 1975), 28.
of the manuscript, which were certainly assembled in Rus’. It will analyse the place of the three most important saintly addressees of Gertruda’s devotions (Peter, Michael, and Helena) found in this portion of the Codex made in Rus’, as well as the relationship between the Latin prayers and the Byzantine-style miniatures which Gertruda commissioned, and the devotional function of the illustrations. As this examination will demonstrate, these elements of the prayer-book suggest that Gertruda’s spirituality was shaped by devotional practices stemming from her maternal kin in Poland and Germany and from Rus’. The hybrid elements in Gertruda’s devotions reflect not only her personal situation of exile and travel between western and eastern-rite Christian lands, but also the wider social context in which she lived, in which there was frequent interchange between eastern- and western-rite Christianity, particularly in the contact zones of Cologne and Poland, part of “New Europe.” The section will end by considering points of friction between eastern and western-rite Christianity as reflected in the Gertruda’s manuscript. It will argue, however, that these are relatively minor elements in the prayer-book considered as a whole.

Although Gertruda was likely aware of emergent tensions between these two branches of Christianity, she more often experienced experience openness and exchange between western and eastern-rite Christianity than conflict between the two.

In order to understand Gertruda’s devotions, the first point to consider is whether previous scholars are corrected in reading the great importance given to Saint Peter, said to be the first pope of Rome, in the manuscript’s miniature program and in Gertruda’s prayers as reflecting Gertruda’s exclusive “Catholic” identity. The first element of Gertruda’s prayer-book was indeed a dedication miniature to Saint Peter now found on folio 5v, after the calendar. In this image, Gertruda lies on the ground in the posture of prostratio (or in Greek: proskynēsis), holding one of Peter’s feet. Her son Yaropolk stands with his hands raised up in prayer off on Saint Peter’s right side next to a young woman, either his wife or the personification of his righteousness (Plate 1). On folio 10v a young prince (unlabelled), who is similar in appearance to Yaropolk depicted in the miniature on folio 5v, is introduced to Christ by Saint Peter (Plate 3).

The presence of Saint Peter with Gertrude’s son Yaropolk-Peter in these two miniatures has been interpreted by some scholars, notably by V. L. Yanin and Teresa Michałowska, as a reference to
the journey to Rome by Yaropolk-Peter in 1075. Yanin further considers that the illustration shows Yaropolk’s supposed “conversion” to Roman Catholicism at this time. His view reflects his belief that the miniature and prayers written on folio 5v were made in Regensburg. According to him, the image of Saint Peter reflected Gertruda’s “Catholic identity” since, Yanin argued, it would have been impermissible for a western-rite princess to use a Latin prayer-book in Rus’. Teresa Michałowska also dated the beginnings of the prayers and miniatures to the winter and spring 1075, believing that Gertruda was inspired to begin her manuscript with a miniature of Saint Peter after her son Yaropolk’s journey to Rome in that year.

Since the publication of Yanin’s article, however, the purely “Roman” meaning of the miniature of folio 5v has been put into question on numerous fronts. Malewicz and Kürbis point out, for instance, that if the miniature reflects Prince Iziaslav’s submission to Rome, made on his behalf by his son Yaropolk, then it is strange that Iziaslav himself is missing from it. Moreover, the more recent analysis by art historians ascribing the creation of the miniature of Saint Peter to a Rus’ workshop means that the meaning has to be reconsidered and the place of its creation shifted from 1075 to 1078, after Gertruda returned to Rus’ and after her husband Iziaslav died. In the miniature on folio 5v, Saint Peter not only is identified by a Greek titulus, but also in his dress and attributes is depicted in accordance with Orthodox iconography.

567 Yanin, “Gertruda-Olisava,” ; Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 49-50, 257.
568 Yanin, “Gertruda-Olisava”: 156; followed by N. Shchaveleva, “Polski zheny russkich kniazei (XI-seredina XIII v.),” in Drevneisie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR 1987 god, ed. ed. V. T. Pashuto (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), 54. For a further discussion of Yanin’s arguments for Yaropolk’s supposed conversion to Roman Catholicism, see also Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina,” under “Gertruda/Olisava.”
570 Teresa Michałowska believed that the prayer-book was assembled over a period of twelve years: first in 1075 in Germany (perhaps Meissen) and then in Rus’ from 1077 to 1086. She explained the lack of reference to Iziaslav by later erasures in the manuscript on folio 8v, and by the missing folia by which she estimates some 144-276 lines of text have been lost. This theory does not address why, if Iziaslav was still alive at the time, he is missing from the miniatures on folio 5v and 10v, however, Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 49-53; 209; 255-257; discussed in Leśniewska, “Badania,” n. p.
571 Spatharakis, Portrait, 43; Liber precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 52.
572 Spatharakis, Portrait, 39-40; Smorąg Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 21-22.
As other scholars have suggested, the primary association that Saint Peter held for Gertruda was not with the papacy. Rather, he had personal significance for her as a saint of repentance and as the patron-saint both of many of her relatives and of her son, Yaropolk. Moreover, the particular way in which Gertruda depicts herself as venerating Saint Peter in the miniature, namely her pose of prostration, suggests that her spirituality was not purely “Catholic,” but rather also reflected aspects of Orthodox devotional practice.

Jean-Claude Schmitt convincingly argues that by inserting a miniature to Saint Peter at the beginning of her codex, Gertruda was first of all claiming ownership of the precious Codex, which was already dedicated to Saint Peter when Gertrude came into its possession. Peter was the patron-saint of Trier Cathedral and the tenth-century dedication miniatures on folia 18v-19r depict this saint receiving a golden book (clearly the manuscript itself) from Archbishop Egbert in return for the forgiveness of Egbert’s sins (the inscription reads: “Qui tibi data munus / Dele sibi Petre reatus”). But in commissioning a new miniature Gertruda also offered the book anew to Saint Peter. Therefore, she replaced Archbishop Egbert as the donor by adding folia to the beginning of the manuscript that put her donation first, before his. In this way, Gertruda claimed ownership of the manuscript at the same as she offered the book anew to Peter.

Gertruda’s image of donation, and in particular her pose at Saint Peter’s feet, suggests her acculturation to Orthodox models of devotion, since she commissioned the artist to depict her in this way. Yanin’s “Roman” interpretation of this pose ignores the devotional practices of prostratio/proskynēsis current in Gertrude’s time and the tradition of its visual depiction in Byzantine and Ottonian art. It was a gesture rich in meaning, conveying at once penitence, donation to a heavenly figure, supplication, and veneration. Depictions of rulers in the pose

---

573 Libcr precurn, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 52.
577 On the history of the posture of proskynēsis in classical, Biblical, and Byzantine usage, see Iohannis Spatharakis, “The Proskynesis in Byzantine Art: A Study in Connection with a Nomisma of Andronicus II
of *proskynēsis* are found also in western eleventh-century images of rulers, but their iconography are derived from Carolingian artistic conventions, which themselves were based ultimately on Byzantine models. For instance, it was precisely in this pose that Gertruda’s aunt Theophanu, the abbess of Essen, had depicted herself on the golden and ivory front cover of the Gospel Book she (Theophanu) commissioned around 1039-1058.

As a gesture of donation, the image of Gertruda in *proskynēsis* on folio 5v parallels numerous analogous donor portraits often found at the beginning of Byzantine aristocratic Psalters. In such images, men as well as women crouch at the feet of saints or Christ Himself, sometimes even touching the foot of the holy figure. Nancy Ševčenko has shown that in cases where the image itself is the gift offered up to a saintly figure, we have precisely a scene such as the one on folio 5v: a crouching figure at the feet of a towering saint.

Michałowska had been puzzled by Gertruda’s choice to begin her additional folio to the manuscript with prayers and an image of Saint Peter, since most *libelli precum* of the eleventh century begin instead with prayers structured hierarchically: addressed first to the Trinity, then to...
Mary, and only then to various saints. Gertruda’s choice to begin her prayer-book by addressing Saint Peter and to represent herself in proskynēsis before this saint, unusual for western libelli precum, therefore suggests that she had become acculturated to contemporary conventions of Orthodox devotion, which she encountered in Rus’, or even earlier through her maternal kin. For example, a Byzantine psalter made in circa 1105, and thus near-contemporary with Gertruda’s life, contains a similar image of a donor crouched low in proskynēsis at the feet of an elongated Christ, who is flanked by King David, the Mother of God, and John the Baptist (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS. gr. 3, folio 8v).

The decision to commission an image of herself in the pose of proskynēsis could have been a means by which Gertruda illustrated the ideas present in the two Latin prayers that frame the miniature on folio 5v. These prayers are not isolated elements, but rather connect the Byzantine-style miniature to the penitential devotional practices of the rest of the Codex. These two prayers, written in two columns on either side of the miniature’s irregular frame, are, in essence, Gertrude’s speech to Saint Peter. Gertruda’s pose of proskynēsis in the miniature emphasizes that she is supplicating Saint Peter with the words of her prayers. In support of this view, Nazar Kozak notes the analogous iconography of Byzantine icons that depict Mary and Martha in this posture when asking Christ to raise their brother Lazarus from the dead.

Both prayers begin with a golden illuminated initial and are prefaced by a golden rubric: “To Saint Peter” (“Ad S[anctu]m Petrum”). The first prayer, written to the right of Saint Peter (the left of the viewer), begs God to grant the grace of sincere tears, repeating almost verbatim the

582 Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 49-50.
585 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 91.
586 The editors of the Codex Gertrudianus believe this rubric relates only to the first prayer, even though this prayer is addressed to God, not Saint Peter; see Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 1, 118.
text of the votive Mass, “For the Gift of Tears,” written by Alcuin of York (d. 804) for the monks of Fulda, that afterward became widespread in the Latin church. 587 The prayer begins by invoking God’s forgiveness of Saint Peter’s triple denial of Christ after Saint Peter had wept penitently. 588 The second prayer written to the left of Saint Peter (the viewer’s right) and continuing on the facing folio (5v-6r) is addressed not to God, but to Peter: “O Saint Peter, prince of the Apostles, who holds the keys of the kingdom of heaven; through that love by which You loved and love the Lord, and through His sweetest mercy by which God mercifully looked down on you as you wept bitterly over your triple denial, mercifully look upon me the unworthy handmaiden of Christ; absolve the bonds of all my vices and crimes […]” 589

In this second prayer Saint Peter is portrayed as the gate-keeper of heaven, the “prince of the Apostles” who has the power of absolution. The text speaks of Saint Peter as the one who “holds the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” thus directly describing the miniature in which Saint Peter holds three keys on a ring in one hand. The other hand of Saint Peter is raised in a Greek gesture of blessing: he has heard Gertruda’s prayer. 590 At the same time, the prayer also makes reference a second time to Saint Peter’s triple denial, the saint’s bitter tears and God’s forgiveness of Peter though divine “sweetest mercy.” The two elements brought together in these two prayers suggest that even in his guise as gate-keeper of heaven, Saint Peter remains above all, a patron-saint of


589 “Sancte Petre, princeps apostolorum, qui tenes clauae regni celorum, per illum amorem quo tu dominum amasti et amas, et per suuissimam misericordiam suam qua te deus per trinam negationem amare flement misericorditer respexit, [fol. 6r] in me, indignam famanulam Christi, clementer respice cuctororumque scelerum et crinimum unicula meorum absolue […]”; Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folia 5v-6r, Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 2, 119-120.

590 Smorąg-Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 21-22.
repentance. The dual role of Peter as patron-saint of repentance and door keeper of heaven may also be found in other contemporary eleventh-century prayer-books. 591

Peter the tearful repentant is evoked three more times in the prayer-book, making it the main way in which he is represented in the manuscript. Indeed, on folio 30v, Gertruda prays to God: “You who called the Canaanite woman and the publican to penance and who received weeping Peter, deign to receive my prayer […]” 592 Likewise, on folio 115v, Gertruda addresses God: “If You were angry against me […] remember, o Lord, that You called the Canaanite woman and the publican to penitence and that You received weeping Peter. Thus also receive my prayers, o merciful Lord, and dismiss all my sins.” 593 On folio 159v, Saint Peter is connected by Gertruda with all those to whom God granted the mercy of repentance: “[…] O Lord Jesus Christ […] I seek your forgiveness, which I do not deserve, but You, extend the hand of your mercy, You who opened the door of Paradise to the dying confessing thief, to Mary weeping, to Peter crying, to the publican…” 594

It is true that, since her son visited Gregory VII at Rome (perhaps at her instigation), Gertruda cannot have been ignorant of papal claims to be the successor of Saint Peter. In her prayer for her son, “To Saint Peter for Peter” (“Ad S[anc]t[um] Petrum P[ro] Petro”) this connection is explicit:

591 Jean Lecleq has edited the following prayer to Saint Peter found in a late eleventh-century *libellus precum* from Saint-Gall (Zentralbibliothek Zürich MS C. 171) which invokes Saint Peter both as door-keeper of heaven and as a model of tearful repentence: “Sancte Petre, princeps apostolorum, aperi mihi ianuam celestis regni, absolue uincula peccatorum meorum potestate tibi a Deo tradita, pete mihi a Deo uere penitentie compunctionem, quam tunc habuisti cum amare fleres post negationem,” idem, “Un témoin de la dévotion médiévale envers S. Pierre et les Apôtres,” in *Gregorianum* 49.1 (1968): 141.


593 “Si iratus fueris aduersum me […] Memento Domine, quod cananeam et publicanum uocasti ad penitentiam, et petrum lacrimantem suscepisti; sic et preces meas suscipe misericordia domine, et dimite omnia peccata mea […]”, *Psalterium Egberti*, vol. 2, fol. 115r; *Liber Precum*, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 71, 154. The “M” of “Memento” is in gold. At the top of the folio is the rubric “Pro peccatis” in gold.

594 Mary weeping is probably the repentant Mary Magdalene. “…domine Ihesu Christe…ueniam peto, quam non mereor, sed tu manum misericordiq tuę mihi porrige, qui lapso latroni confitenti, marię flenti, petro lacrimanti, publicano paradysi ianum aperuisti”; *Psalterium Egberti*, vol. 2, fol. 159v; *Liber Precum*, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 76, 155.
Gertruda addresses Saint Peter by the papal title of *Summe Pontifex*.\(^{595}\) The power of binding and loosing, however, was attributed to all the Apostles by Gertruda.\(^{596}\) She therefore did not venerate Saint Peter solely for his connection to the power of the popes of Rome.\(^{597}\)

Indeed, Saint Peter was also not exclusively associated in Rus’ with papal claims as can be seen from the fact that Yaropolk-Peter did not alienate Orthodox clergy by his veneration of this saint. The church which he began building to his patron saint prior to his death was located within the walls of the Orthodox monastery founded by his father Iziaslav (dedicated to Saint Demetrius), and there is no evidence that the Orthodox monks objected to having a church dedicated to Saint Peter within its walls.\(^{598}\) If they did, construction on the church dedicated to this apostle could have ceased after Yaropolk’s assassination. In fact, however, the church was consecrated by Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv (r. 1077/8-1089) who, as we have seen in Chapter One, took a strong stance against western-rite Christians in general.\(^{599}\)

Gertruda’s special veneration of Saint Peter could be explained by the fact that he was the patron-saint of her son and also of many of her family-members. Her maternal uncle, Herman of Cologne had among his relics, a staff that had supposedly belonged to Saint Peter. In the Trier miniature on folio 19r in her manuscript, Gertruda could see Saint Peter depicted prominently holding this miraculous golden staff.\(^{600}\) According to a tenth-century text commissioned by


\(^{597}\) For a comprehensive view of Saint Peter in Orthodox theology up to the fifteenth century, see John Meyendorff, “St. Peter in Byzantine Theology,” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 4.2-3 (1960): 26-48, and more briefly idem, *Byzantine Theology*, 97-98.

\(^{598}\) *Ibid.*, 569. On the Church of Saint Peter, see Yu S. Aseev, *Arkhiitektura drevnego Kieva* (Kiev: Budivelnkyk, 1982), 94. Arrignon provides examples to show that although it is more common in Orthodoxy for churches to be dedicated to both Saint Peter and Paul, there are examples of churches dedicated to Saint Peter alone both in Rus’ and in Byzantium. Consequently, the building of a church dedicated solely to Peter is not by itself a “Catholic” characteristic. A church dedicated to Saint Peter in Moscow in 1329, for example, obviously expresses no “Catholic” leanings, “À propos de la lettre”: 14 and 16; Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 568-569.

\(^{599}\) Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 569.

\(^{600}\) In the Ottonian miniature, however, the theme of penitence is not emphasized in contrast to the address of Gertruda to Saint Peter on folio 5v.
Archbishop Egbert, the original owner of Gertruda’s manuscript, the church of Trier was founded by a disciple of Saint Peter, Eucharius. It was from Saint Peter that Eucharius supposedly had received a miraculous staff. In 980 Egbert commissioned a still-extant six-foot long golden covering for this relic, encasing the staff in gold, gems, and enamel plaques.

Cologne Cathedral, dedicated to Mary and Saint Peter, however, had a rival claim to the possession of Saint Peter’s staff since the reign of Archbishop Bruno (d. 965). Although the Cologne staff of Saint Peter is no longer extant, its existence is still attested in 1075, when it was used in a public procession by Archbishop Anno. Gertruda may have well have seen this staff in person when it was held by her uncle Archbishop Herman, Anno’s predecessor in office. Likewise, Saint Peter was the patron-saint closely associated with her other family members. The female monasteries of Vilich and Dietkirchen, where Gertruda’s aunt Mathilda was abbess and where Gertruda may have spent part of her childhood, were also dedicated to Saint Peter.

Finally, the entire realm of Poland had been dedicated to Saint Peter by Gertruda’s paternal great-great grandfather Duke Mieszko I in 991/992. Peter, therefore, was not associated only in Gertruda’s mind with Rome in particular, but in general with penitence and with the patronage of her family.

The cult of Saint Michael the Archangel represents a further ecumenical aspect of Gertruda’s devotions in her prayer-book, which likewise reflected her ties to both her maternal kin and to

603 Ibid., fig. 1, 66 and 65, 71-73 and n. 83, 80; Schmitt, “Circulation et appropriation,” 1292.
604 Either Cologne’s staff was part of the one held in Trier, or Archbishop Egbert later “invented” a similar relic to bolster the claims of his see to primacy over Cologne, Head, “Art and Artifice”: n. 73, 80; Kluger, “Propter claritatem generis,” 223.
605 Head, “Art and Artifice”: n. 73, 80.
606 Ennen, “Die sieben Töchter,” 166.
607 The donation of Poland to Saint Peter by Mieszko I, called from its incipit the “Dagome iudex,” is preserved in a canonical collection compiled in 1084-1086/1087 by Cardinal Deusdedit, in which Deusdedit summarized the donation which he apparently found recorded in another book. The reason why Mieszko I refers to himself in the text by the name of “Dagome” is unclear. See Wiszewski, Domus Bolezlai, 3-11.
Rus’. The third prayer in the Codex, on folio 6r, starting with the rubric “At the beginning” (Ad introitum), introduces this new theme: a series of prayers to Saint Michael and the angels. It is followed by a golden rubric: “To Saint Michael” at the centre of folio 6r. Gertruda begs Michael to intercede for her before the Lord and to intercede for all her debtors living and dead, referring to him as the one who has the power to open the gate of paradise. Engelina Smirnova points out that such an epithet recalls the Byzantine conception of Saint Michael as a *psychopompos*, a guide who leads souls up to the gates of heaven. This prayer is followed by one addressed “to all angels and archangels.”

The veneration of Saint Michael the Archangel could reflect Gertruda’s upbringing in Poland and Germany. Saint Michael was particularly honoured by Gertruda’s natal family. Her great-grandmother Theophano had introduced the cult of the Archangel to Germany. Her father

608 “Ad portas ecclesie tuæ confugio et ad pignora sanctorum tuorum prostrata indulgentiam peto; precor et supplico dulcisissimam pietatem tuam, ueneranda trinitas: ut, amended by Malewicz and Kürbis from et] per intercessionem sanctæ marıæ et sancti michaelis atque omnium sanctorum et propter immensam pietatem tuam mihi indigne concedere digneris in die exitus mei de hac presenti uita, et in illa hora quando anima egressura erit a corpore meo, rectum sensum, rectam fidem, rectam mentem, ut cum sanctis et electis tuis tecum gaudere merear sine fine, misericordissime domine. Qui uuius et dominaris in secula”; Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 6r; Liber Precum, ed. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 3, 120.


610 “Obsecro te, sanctissime archangele Christi michael: intercedere digneris pro me peccatrice ad dominum, et pro cunctis debitoribus meis uuius et defunctis, ut remissionem peccarum in hac uita ualeam recipere […] Princes noster, sancte michaele archangel[e], esto mihi misere propitius omni tempore ut me ære sine fine, misericordissime domine. Qui uuius et dominaris in secula”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folia 6r-6v; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 4, 120-121.

611 Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 7. At least into the twelfth century in western theology Saint Michael competed with Saint Peter for the position of gate-keeper of heaven, David Keck, *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 67. When precisely Saint Peter was seen in Latin theology as the sole gate-keeper of heaven needs further study.


614 The monastery of Saint Michael in Hildesheim was founded by Bishop Bernward (993-1020) and was patronized by the imperial family. In the year 999 Otto III famously went on pilgrimage to the shrine of Saint
Mieszko II made a large donation to the monastery of Saint Michael the Archangel in Bamberg, built on Michelsberg Mountain in 1021, and some scholars have suggested that Mieszko II may have been present at its consecration in that year. As a result of his patronage, Mieszko II was commemorated as a “brother” of the monastery in its necrology. Indeed, in Gertruda’s calendar the “feast of the dedication of Saint Michael the Archangel’s [church]” falls on the traditional western date of September 29th (Michaelmas). As the careful analysis of Tomasz Stepien has shown, the hierarchy of angels listed in Gertruda’s prayer on folio 12v also reflects its origin in a western source, the ninth-century Officia per ferias of Pseudo-Alcuin, rather than the order of angels in the Greek (and universal) Saint Dionysios the Areopagite.

At the same time, veneration of angels found in Gertruda’s prayer-book reflects more generally a universal form of Christian devotion. The cult of the Archangel Michael in particular grew in importance in Kyiv toward the end of Gertruda’s life. Although Saint Michael was prominently represented in the decorative program of Kyiv’s Cathedral of Saint Sophia (1037-1046), it was only in the late eleventh century and early twelfth century that churches solely
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615 Ibid., 261-262.
618 Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 12r; Liber precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 22, 130; Tomasz Stepien, “Problem kolejności chórów anieliskich w Modlitewniku Gertrudy Mieszkówny,” in Gertruda Mieszkówna i jej modlitwy, eds. Listkowska and Andrzejuk, 75-84. According to David Keck, the study of Pseudo-Dionysius in Western Europe did not become widespread until the twelfth century, Angelology, 54-55.
dedicated to him arose in the Rus’ metropolis. In 1069/1070, around the time that Gertruda returned to Kyiv from her first exile, her brother-in-law Vsevolod Yaroslavich founded the church and monastery of Archangel Michael in Vydubychi near the prince’s palace, just south of Kyiv. It was consecrated by Metropolitan Ioann II in 1087/1088, and became an important monastic centre where the Primary Chronicle was redacted and written.

But the most famous monastic church of Archangel Michael associated with Kyiv is known as Saint Michael the Golden-domed (Ukrainian: Zolotoverkhyi, Russian: Zlatover kho-Mikhailovsky). It was founded in 1108 by Gertruda’s son (or stepson), Sviatopolk-Michael Iziaslavich within the monastery complex of Saint Demetrius founded by his father Iziaslav and near the church of Saint Peter founded by his (half) brother Yaropolk-Peter. Andrzej Poppe believes that Gertruda may have played a role in the founding of this monastery as patron or donor, continuing the dedication to Saint Michael of her parents. There is no specific written documentation for the church of Saint Michael until the fourteenth century, however, and so while this hypothesis is plausible, it is impossible to verify for certain.

Peter and Michael therefore are the first two heavenly intercessors to whom Gertruda prays on the opening folia of her prayer-book. Both are “princes”: Gertruda calls Peter the prince of the Apostles (“princeps apostolorum”), and Michael, the prince of the angels (“[P]rinceps noster,

---


622 PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, p. 1397. This foundation is discussed in, for example: Yuri S. Asieiev, Arkhitektura Kyivskoi Rusi (Kyiv: Budivelnyk, 1969), 82-84; White, Military Saints, Appendix 4, 210; Tereriatnikov, “Devotional Image,” 31.


626 Lazarev, Murals and Mosaics, 67-68.
sancte michaele archangel[le]). In Byzantium, Rus’, Poland, and Germany, Michael was the
special protector of rulers and warriors. “Peter” and “Michael” were also the two baptismal
names of Gertruda’s sons (or son and stepson), Yaropol and Sviatopolk, reinforcing the idea
that the ordering of her prayer-book was not accidental but specifically made for Gertruda’s
needs. The prominent choice of Saint Peter and Archangel Michael were appropriate as special
“princely” patrons of her sons. They also served as heavenly intercessors with connections to the
patronage and culture of Gertruda’s birth family. Saint Peter, in particular, appeared in the
prayer-book in his older guise as patron-saint of repentance, a role attributed to him in both
western and eastern Christianity.

The ecumenical and personal aspects of Gertruda’s prayer-book is also suggested by the prayers
in the next gathering (folio 7v-7r) which call upon the intercession of the Virgin Mary and of two
saints connected with the Invention of the Holy Cross: Saint Helena and Saint Cyriacus Judas, a
converted Jew who supposedly led Helena to the site of the buried cross. Three prayers are
directly addressed to Saint Helena (folio 7v-8r), who is thus the third most prominent saint to
whom Gertruda’s prayers are addressed. Helena was venerated in Trier, a city closely
associated with her son Constantine, which lay within the land belonging to Gertruda’s mother
Richeza, as well as in Byzantium and Rus’. In the latter, Helena had particular importance for
the Riurikid dynasty since Ol’ga (d. 969), the first Riurikid to convert to Christianity, chose
“Helen” as her baptismal name. As discussed in Chapter Two, Helena’s feast-day on May

627 Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folio 6r; Liber precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, nos. 2 and 4, 119-120.
628 Keck, Angelology, 38; Tereriatnikov, “Devotional Image,” 32-34; Pleszczyński, Birth of a Stereotype, 257.
629 “nec non per merita sancti quiriaci martyris tui et per illam gratiam quam mirabiliter et misericorditer super eum
ostendisti, cum ante baptismis eius cor spiritus sancti gracia illuminasti, et eius oratione lignum preciosissimum […]
ab eoque inueniri concessisti […] et per intercessionem sanctae marie genitricisque tuæ et sanctæ helenæ […]”,
630 Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folia 7v-8r; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, nos. 16-17, 126-127.
631 Hollingsworth, “Introduction,” in idem, Hagiography of Kievan Rus’, lxxxi and xci; Michalowska, Ego
Gertruda, 164 and 257; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 81.
632 “Introduction,” Hollingsworth, lxxxi and xci. Metropolitan Ilarion’s mention of Saint Helena’s invention of the
True Cross in his “Sermon on Law and Grace” also testifies to the existence of her cult in eleventh-century Rus’,
Teresa Michalowska, Ego Gertruda, 164 and 257.
twenty-first is the only Orthodox feast included in the calendar of the Codex Gertrudianus, which suggests that Helena’s eastern cult must have had an important impact on Gertruda’s devotions. Due to this prominence, Alexandr Nazarenko has also suggested that “Helena” might have been an appropriate Orthodox saint’s name given to Gertruda in Rus’ upon her marriage to Iziaslav.

Perhaps Saint Helena had a further personal significance for Gertruda. Like Gertruda, Helena was a ruler’s mother and a royal woman. Gertruda addresses Helena in these terms as “the most Christian queen” who merited finding the True Cross, and who, as a mother, successfully pleaded to God to send an angel to her son Constantine in order to convert him. In the final prayer asking for Saint Helena’s intercession before God, Gertruda mentions both herself by name and her son [Yaropolk-]Peter by name. She begs Saint Helena “so that he may not neglect [God] through the persuasion of some malevolent person, but always cling to charity and kindness, by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ.” This personalized prayer may suggest a particularly intense devotional connection between Gertruda and Helena. All three main saints to whom Gertruda prays, therefore,— Peter, Michael, and Helena— demonstrate that her spiritual life in the late eleventh century was shaped by both western and eastern traditions, and by a

---

633 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 569.

634 Ibid., 569; Smirnova, “Miniatures,” 10.

635 “Sancta helena quę dominum rogasti quod angelum suum mitteret filio tuo constantino et eum admoneret […] Santa helena, christianaissima regina, quę apud dominum impetraveraus ut angelum suum mitteret ad Constantinum [ut] illum tui ammonere[t]; te oro humiliter per inuentionem sanctę crucis […] Sancta helena, moribus castis, operibus iusta deoque digna, per illam clementiam mirabilem et innumerabilem, quam Christus Ihesus tibi ostendit, cum […] lignum sanctissimum in quo peendit mundi spes et refugium diligenter querer […] cum cor constantini filii tui ad te clementer et amabiliter conuertit […]”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, folia 7v-8r, Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, nos. 16-18, 126-127.

636 “intercede pro me, famula tua Gertruda, ad dominum deum, ut per crucem sanctam domini nostris eiusque genitricis intercessionem sanctorumque omnium […] mihi famulum tuum petruum omnenque faciat secum […]erasure] propicium eorumque corda cum misericordia ad me convertat,” Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 8r; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 18, 127.

637 “[…] ne per ullius maliuolentis suasionem derelinquat, sed semper cum caritate et benignitate inhereat prestante domino nostro Ihesu Christo,” Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 8r; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 18, 127.
devotion focused specially on the heavenly patrons associated with both her natal kin and with her children.  

The Orthodox aspect of Gertruda’s devotional life is most strongly evident, however, in the Byzantine-style miniatures which she commissioned and inserted into her Latin libellus precum. Folia 9v and 10r are filled by two facing page miniatures of the Nativity and Crucifixion (Plate 2). These miniatures were probably made by the same artist, and are linked both stylistically and in terms of theological content. In terms of style, both miniatures are similar in that they are enclosed within densely ornamented frames, which recall colourful cloisonné enamels. Such enamelwork was popular among Rus’ elites, and so Gertruda therefore adopted a luxurious aesthetic favoured by the upper social strata of Rus’ into her personal prayer-book.

The Nativity scene’s frame is in the shape of a five-domed Byzantine church, resembling a church-shaped enameled reliquary. Such a church-shaped frame may also be found in other Byzantine miniatures of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as well as in Rus’ examples. The closest iconographical parallels to the church frame in Gertruda’s prayer-book, however, are two miniatures in her brother-in-law Prince Sviatoslav Yaroslavich’s Izbornik (Miscellany) of 1073, in which church-frames enclose assemblies of bearded and haloed Church Fathers on folia 3r, 3v.

---

638 Malewicz and Kürbis see a “royal” theme in the opening folia of the prayer-book, Ibid, 92.

639 Smorąg Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 129 and 161.

640 Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 12.


642 Spatharakis, Portrait, 39.

For this reason, it is likely that this miniature in the Codex Gertrudianus was made in a Kyivan scriptorium.

In terms of iconographical content, both the Nativity and Crucifixion conform to contemporary Byzantine norms of illustrating these scenes. Pictorial details in the miniature such as the setting in a cave (rather than a stable) and Mary’s reclining pose following her painless delivery form part of the usual Byzantine depiction of this scene. Likewise following Byzantine conventions, the miniature depicts baby Jesus twice: first swaddled in the manger in the mid-ground and second bathed in the foreground by two midwives, who are mentioned as present at the Nativity by the apocryphal Protoevangelion of James. These midwives first appear in Byzantine art as washing the Christ child already in the sixth or seventh centuries. Although this scene is occasionally represented in western art, it did not become part of the standard depiction of the Nativity, as in the East.

Byzantine conventions are also followed in the Crucifixion scene. The depiction of Christ dead on the cross with His eyes closed and head drooping, instead of alive and triumphal,
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644 Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 goda: Faksimilnoe izdanie (Moscow: Kniga, 1983), folia 3r, 3v, 128r, and 128v; Lichačeva, “Miniatures,” 232-233; Pevny, “Kievan Rus’,” 282; Popova, Russian Illuminated Manuscripts, plate 6, Smorag Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, ills. 197-199, 216.

645 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 81-82.


649 In Byzantine art the bathing of the Christ-child reinforced the dogma of the Incarnation (just like an ordinary infant, Christ Incarnate has a human body that needs to be bathed), Lafontaine-Dosogne, “Cycle,” 212; Deshman, “Servants” 33-46; Cavarnos, Byzantine Iconography, 136-140.

650 Smorag-Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 143-159.
originated in Byzantium in the mid ninth century, but became widespread in the mid eleventh century, that is, contemporaneous with Gertruda’s manuscript.\(^{651}\) Despite the fact that the depiction of the dead Christ existed already in Carolingian art, this portrayal was still rare enough that in 1054 it shocked Cardinal Humbert in Constantinople to see Christ in the “image of a dying man.”\(^{652}\) These stylistic details suggest again that Gertruda commissioned the miniature from a Rus’ workshop which closely followed the conventions of contemporary Constantinopolitan devotional art.

Together, the combination of Nativity and the Crucifixion miniatures on a facing-page form a kind of Orthodox theological diptych, illustrating the link between Christ’s Incarnation (in the Nativity miniature) and His Sacrifice (in the Crucifixion) in God’s plan for the salvation of humankind.\(^{653}\) The combination of an iconographical program on these folia of Byzantine iconographic content within a Latin *libellus precum* speaks to the hybridity of Gertruda’s devotional life, influenced by her many years spent in both Catholic and Orthodox religious settings.

The last miniature in this gathering depicts Christ seated on a jewelled throne while crowning a prince and a princess who are introduced to Him by saints Peter and Irene, respectively (folio 10v, Plate 4). As discussed in the previous chapter, these figures are probably Gertruda’s son Yaropolk-Peter and his wife Kunegunda. The woman’s identity is not absolutely clear, however, since her costume closely resembles that of Gertruda on folio 5v. Several scholars have connected the meaning of this miniature with Yaropolk-Peter’s journey to Rome on behalf of his father in 1075, and Pope Gregory VII’s approval of Iziaslav and Yaropolk’s claims to the throne.\(^{654}\) Others, noting the absence of Iziaslav from the miniature, more convincingly have


\(^{654}\) See the discussion of the meaning of the coronation miniature in Smorąg-Różycka, *Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury*, 127.
dated the miniature’s commissioning to the period between Iziaslav’s death in 1078 and Yaropolk-Peter’s assassination in 1086.  

The depiction of the joint coronation of a couple by Christ (or sometimes by another spiritual being such as an angel) originated in Byzantium, but had also been absorbed into Ottonian art by the tenth century. Despite elements of western art in this Gertrudian miniature, however, according to the latest art historical analysis it was made in Rus’. There are reasons to doubt that the miniature represents a literal coronation, however, because neither coronation nor anointment was used in the ritual by which Rus’ princes assumed power. Instead, Riurikid princes took their office through an enthronement ritual in which, according to the chronicles’ formulaic depiction of this event, they “sat on the throne of their fathers.” Moreover, the miniature does not depict the pope or Saint Peter giving Yaropolk a crown, as one would expect if it were illustrating a purely historical scene, but rather shows Christ in majesty crowning Yaropolk and an unnamed woman in heaven, surrounded by saints (Peter and Irene), orders of angels, and the symbols of the Evangelists: in short, an otherworldly space.

---

655 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 75.

656 An example of the joint coronation of an imperial couple by Christ can be seen in the famous ivory plaque depicting the crowning of Empress Theophano and Otto II by Christ made around 982-983 (Paris, Musée national du Moyen-Âge et des Thermes de l’hôtel de Cluny, Cl. 392). Its iconographical model seems to have been an earlier ivory plaque made in the 940s showing Christ crowning Emperor Romanos II and Bertha-Eudoxia (BNF, Cabinet des médailles, inv.55.300). Interestingly, both of these ivory plaques likely originally served as Psalter cover ornaments, Ibid., ill. 67, 100 and ill. 49, 85; William D Wixom, “Byzantine Art and the Latin West,” in Glory of Byzantium, eds. Evans and Wixom, 499-500. Further research needs to be done on the inclusion of this imagery in psalters made for elite owners.

657 See, for instance, Smorąg Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 223 and 274. She notes, for instance, in the miniature of the coronation of Yaropolk-Peter and his wife, for instance, the ox and lion, symbols of the Evangelists Luke and Mark, are not depicted with wings. This choice is in accordance with Orthodox custom, while in Carolingian and Ottonian art they are always winged, Ibid., 95, ills. 63-66, and 96.

658 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 99.

659 Alexandra Vukovich, “Enthronement Rituals of the Princes of Rus’ (Twelfth-Thirteenth Centuries),” in FORUM: University of Edinburgh Postgraduate Journal of Culture and the Arts 17 (2013): 1-11, accessed February 20, 2016, <www.forumjournal.org>. The sole Riurikid prince who was crowned in the pre-Mongol period was Daniil Romanovych in 1253, who obtained a crown from Pope Innocent IV. His was an exceptional case, however, Tolochko, “Problems,” 263.

660 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 100.
For this reason, the miniature cannot be interpreted only as the conferral of God-given political authority upon Yaropolk-Peter. Instead, it is significant that the miniature represents Yaropolk-Peter’s coronation as taking place in heaven, presenting the ultimate hope of an earthly ruler to gain eternal salvation and the “crown of heavenly glory.”

Although the meaning of the miniature remains not entirely understood, in the context of its Rus’ setting and Gertruda’s history, the conferral of crowns by Christ in heaven suggests the basic meaning of a triumph. As such, the miniature expresses not only divine approval for Yaropolk’s aspirations to rule Kyiv, but also Gertruda’s eschatological hopes for her son Yaropolk-Peter’s salvation, echoing the pleas made in her prayers.

Christ in the miniature, through the intercession of Saints Peter and Irene, blesses the members of Gertruda’s family, perhaps confirming their right to rule in the face of competing claims from Vsevolod Yaroslavich and his son Vladimir Monomakh.

The fifth and final miniature was painted on the recto side of the tenth-century miniature of Saint Valerius of Trier, on folio 41v that originally had been left blank (Plate 4). This miniature depicts the Mother of God sitting en face on a lyre-shaped throne against a brilliant gold background. She holds the Christ-Child on her lap, who in turn holds a little scroll, which symbolizes His becoming the Incarnate Word (Logos).

The draperies of Mary’s garments are criss-crossed by vivid golden lines (chrysography) similar to those that accentuate the drapery of Saint Peter on folio 5v, suggesting that these two images were made at the same Rus’ scriptorium.

Perhaps reflecting the fact that it was inserted into the available blank space in the tenth-century psalter, the image of Mary and the Christ-Child on folio 41r bears no obvious relation either to the psalm 21 (20) that precedes it or to psalm 22 (21) follows it, or to the text of Gertruda’s

---

661 Smorag Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 77 and 127.
662 Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 101.
663 Ibid., 110-111.
prayer squeezed immediately below it.\textsuperscript{666} Probably for this reason, scholars have looked to other sources of inspiration for the miniature than the texts surrounding it. Several researchers have suggested that this miniature might reproduce an icon, today lost, of the Mother of God found in the Kyivan Caves Monastery, patronized by Iziaslav, Gertruda, and their children.\textsuperscript{667} According to a miracle story in the thirteenth-century \textit{Paterik} of the Caves, the Mother of God herself appeared in a vision to four master craftsmen and instructed that her icon be brought from the Blachernai church in Constantinople to Kyiv, where the craftsman began to build a church dedicated to her (the Church of the Dormition) in 1073.\textsuperscript{668} An icon made in 1288 (now in Moscow, Tretiakov State Gallery, inventory no. 12323) is believed to be a copy of this work.\textsuperscript{669} It contains some iconographic divergences, however, from the image of the miniature of folio 41r.\textsuperscript{670} Despite lack of corroborative detail, Smirnova accepts the connection between the miniature on folio 41r and an icon in the Monastery of the Caves tentatively, adding that it suggests that “the miniature might have been ordered in memory of prince Iziaslav, who, when alive, was famous for his patronage of the cloister.”\textsuperscript{671}

\textsuperscript{666} The prayer which begins on fol. 40v with a golden initial “D” and which concludes below the miniature of Mary on fol. 41r is addressed to Christ and asks him to send a guardian angel from heaven to protect Gertruda from visible and invisible enemies and to keep her on the true path, \textit{Psalterium Egberti}, vol. 2, folia 40v-41r; \textit{Liber Precum}, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 62, 149.

\textsuperscript{667} Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 14. See also the discussion of this thesis in Kozak, \textit{Obraz i vlada}, 80-81.


\textsuperscript{669} According to a sixteenth-century legend, in 1288 prince Roman of Briansk brought an icon from the Monastery of the Caves to his principality in order to restore his lost sight. Despite the clear hagiographical trope of this story of sight restored by faith, scholars have accepted the veracity of this tale and identify the icon with the one now in the Tretiakov Gallery. It is also called the “Svenskaia” icon, after the Svenskii Monastery in which it was housed before its transfer to the Tretiakov Gallery, Kozak, \textit{Obraz i vlada}, n. 353 with further bibliography; Tereriatnikov, “Devotional Image,” 36; Smorąg Różyczka, \textit{Bizantyjsko-ruskie miniatury}, ill. 135. Kozak dates the icon to the eleventh or twelfth century, while Tereriatnikov and Smorąg Różyczka date it to 1288.

\textsuperscript{670} In the icon of the Tretiakov Gallery, both of the infant Christ’s arms are raised in blessing while Mary is flanked by the saintly founders of the Monastery of the Cave, Anthony and Theodosios; Smorąg-Różyczka, \textit{Bizantyjsko-ruskie miniatury}, 169, ill. 135, 173 and 272; Tereriatnikov, “Devotional Image,” fig 27.

\textsuperscript{671} Smirnova, “Miniatures”: 14. The Klov (Klovskii) monastery founded on a hill of Kyiv around 1078 by a certain Stefan, former igumen of the Caves monastery, had a competing claim to possess an icon of the Mother of God from Blachernai, but neither this icon nor the monastery has survived, so that not much can be determined about its
More convincing is the thesis of Smorąg-Różycka, who, rather than seeing in the image an indirect memorial of Iziaslav, prefers to interpret the image of the Mother of God on folio 41r as a kind of protective image (palladion) of Iziaslav’s family and of Kyiv, paralleling the contemporary use of Mary as protector of the Byzantine emperors and of the city of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{672} The idea that Mary was a source of protection for Gertruda merits further consideration. It was during the reign of Gertruda’s father-in-law Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054) that Kyiv was rebuilt as a second Constantinople.\textsuperscript{673} Like the imperial city, from the eleventh century onwards Kyiv also claimed the Mother of God as its special protectress.\textsuperscript{674}

Emblematic of this protection was the image of the Mother of God prominently featured in the apse mosaics both of Saint Sophia in Constantinople and of Saint Sophia in Kyiv.\textsuperscript{675} The imposing Kyivan mosaic of the Mother of God (5.5 m in height) is surrounded by a triumphal arch with a Greek inscription taken from Psalm 45 (46):5: “God is in the Midst of her; She shall not be moved: God will help Her from earliest morning.”\textsuperscript{676} “She” in the psalm refers to the feminine noun for the city of God (“hē polis”), identified in the mosaic with Constantinople/Kyiv, both protected by the Mother of God.\textsuperscript{677} The princely gallery in Kyiv directly faced this mosaic apse of the Mother of God, so that when Gertruda attended the Divine iconography as a source for the miniature on folio 41r., Smorąg-Różycka, “Wizerunek,” 99-100; Kozak, \textit{Obraz i vlada}, 80-81.


\textsuperscript{676} “+ HO TH(EO)S [EN MESŌ AUTÊS KAI OU] SÂLEUTHÊSETAI BOÊTH[ÊSEI AUTÊ O TH(EO)S TO PROS PRÓI PRÓI],” Kozak, \textit{Obraz i vlada}, ill. 18 and 27; Boeck, “Hippodrome”: 286 and n. 49, 297.

\textsuperscript{677} Pentcheva, \textit{Icons and Power}, 76.
Liturgy in Kyiv’s cathedral she would be directly facing this icon of protection and intercession for Kyiv and its ruling clan. 678

The Kyivan apse depicts the Mother of God as Orans, however, that is, standing with hands lifted up in prayer, not seated on a throne as in the miniature of the Codex Gertruvianus. 679 According to the report of the Syrian archdeacon Paul of Aleppo, who visited Kyiv in the seventeenth century, the Orans iconographical type also adorned the mosaic of the Mother of God (no longer surviving) made between 1084 and 1089 in the central apse of the church of the Dormition in the Monastery of the Caves. 680 The Orans iconographic type therefore was the most dominant image of the Mother of God which Gertruda certainly would have seen in Kyiv since it occupied a central place in the cathedral of the city and in the church of its most important monastery, the Monastery of the Caves. It seems that there is no extant Kyivan mosaic or icon image depicting the Mother of God enthroned that could have served as the direct model for the image in the Codex Gertruvianus.

But while no known models in Kyivan monumental art (mosaics or frescoes) might have survived for the image of Mary enthroned in Gertruda’s prayer-book, several can be found instead in miniatures adorning contemporary Byzantine psalters. Coinciding with an increasing interest in private devotions among Byzantine elites, it is precisely in the eleventh century that full-page miniatures of Mary holding the Christ Child unconnected with any apparent textual references appear in Byzantine psalters. 681 Analogous examples to the image on folio 41r in the Codex Gertruvianus in eleventh-century Byzantine psalters include a very similar image of Mary sitting en face on a lyre-shaped throne with the Christ-Child on her lap (Mount Athos, Lavra Ms A 9, folio 1v), or on a backless throne holding the Christ child (Kyiv, National Academy of

678 Boeck, “Hippodrome”: 286.
680 Smorag-Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 166 and eadem, “Wizerunek,” 94-96; Kozak, Obraz i vlada, 81. On the building of the Dormition Church of the Monastery of the Caves, see Asieiev, Arkhitektura Kyivskoi Rusi, 76-78. It was destroyed in 1941.
In fact, the closest contemporary extant image similar to the one in the Codex Gertrudianus is that in a Byzantine Psalter dating to 1077, made in a Constantinopolitan workshop for the monastery of Saint Gereon in Cologne (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cod. theolog. gr. 336, folio 16v). Based on these comparanda, it seems likely therefore that the miniature was either commissioned by Gertruda either immediately during her return from her second exile in 1077-1078 (in which case the miniature was the first one to adorn her prayer-book) or in 1085-1086 when she was brought as a hostage to Kyiv by Vladimir Monomakh. It is probable that Rus’ artists working in a scriptorium in Kyiv produced the miniature on folio 41r by closely following contemporary Byzantine models for book production. Such was certainly the case, for instance, with the Kyivan miniatures in the Izbornik of 1073 which also closely follow contemporary Byzantine conventions in their illuminations.

Georgi Parpulov and Annemarie Weyl Carr have suggested that such full-page miniatures of the Mother of God in Byzantine psalters served a particular focus for the devotions of their readers. “By contrast,” Parpulov writes, “the vast majority of [Byzantine] Psalter illustrations were intended to divide, embellish, or explain the text and are, thus, linked to the book’s contents rather than to its function.”

The framed manuscript miniature acted like an icon, serving as “a

682 Ibid., fig. 1 and 9, 7, and 15.

683 John Lowden, “The Luxury Book as Diplomatic Gift,” in Byzantine Diplomacy, eds. Shepard and Franklin, 253-256; Herbert Hunger and Wolfgang Lackner, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, vol. 3: Codices theologici (Vienna: Hollinek, 1992), no. 336, 477-480; Cutler, “Lyre-Backed Throne,” 26 and fig. 28 and idem, The Aristocratic Psalters in Byzantium, preface by André Grabar (Paris: Picard, 1984), no. 50, 89-91, ill. 314; Smorag-Różycka, Bizantyńsko-ruskie miniatury, 166 and 169, ill. 132, 173 and idem, “Wizerunek”, 97; Ševčenko, “Mother of God,” n. 20, 164. The Byzantine psalter was sent to the Church of Saint Gereon in Cologne, patronized by Gertruda’s parents, who also built a church to Saint Gereon on the grounds of the royal castle on Kraków’s Wawel Hill, Ennen, “Die sieben Töchter,” 163; Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 123. It is tempting to consider whether this image could have served as a model for the image of the Mother of God in Gertruda’s psalter. Since the manuscript was still in Constantinople in 1077, however, it probably arrived in Cologne after Gertruda’s return to Rus’.


686 Parpulov, “Psalters,” 93.
merciful image of the one to whom the devotions exercised through the Psalms were directed.\footnote{Carr, “Gospel Frontpieces”: 7.} In the Codex Gertrudianus, the image of Mary and the Christ-Child is framed by a thick rectangular border (imitating the dimensions of those which frame the Trier miniatures), which reinforces its similarity to a self-standing icon.\footnote{See the remarks of Ševčenko, “Mother of God,” 163: “[…] under the growing influence of icons in general, and of icons of the Virgin in particular, images of the Virgin and Child, even in psalters came to be presented more as icons, even if not always framed as such.”} If she was indeed the commissioner of this image, Gertruda acted in accordance with contemporary spiritual practices among Orthodox elites.

Gertruda’s devotion to Mary can also be seen in a prayer addressed to her in the psalter portion of the Codex, which is structured as a long series of acclamations to Mary, which itself is modelled on the Greek liturgical hymn \textit{Akathistos}.\footnote{\textit{Liber Precum}, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 89 and n. 1, 160.} It includes the following praises which Gertruda offers to Mary: “Hail, you who merited to bear the Son of God from your innermost body; Hail, you who swaddled the Son of God in the cradle; Hail, you who sent the Son of God into the bath. Hail, you who placed the Son of God in the manger…\footnote{The “A” of each “Aue” is in gold: “Aue que filium dei ex tuis uisceribus meruisti generare. Aue que filium dei in cunabulis reuin[is]t[i] [Meysztowicz suggests: “circumvinxisti”]. Aue que filium dei in balneu misisti. Aue quę filium dei in presepium declinasti […],” \textit{Psalterium Egberti}, vol. 2, folia 206r-206v, \textit{Liber Precum}, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 86, 160.} This hymn is another example of ecumenical devotion in the prayer-book.\footnote{In the Byzantine rite, the first four parts of the \textit{Akathistos} hymn are sung at compline during the first four Fridays in Lent, with the whole sung in the Friday of the fifth week of Lent. Gertruda would have encountered the \textit{Akathistos} in Rus’, but she also may have encountered it earlier, as it was available in Latin translation from circa 800 on, \textit{Ibid.}, 89 and n. 1, p. 160. The text of this hymn is printed in \textit{Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica}, ed. C. A. Trypanis (Vienna: Hermann Böhlau, 1968), 29-39, English trans. in \textit{The Great Horologion or Book of Hours}, trans. Holy Transfiguration Monastery (Boston, MA: The Monastery, 1997), 733-743.}

Having examined some ways in which Gertruda’s prayer-book included elements of both ecumenical devotion and conformed to trends among Orthodox elites, this chapter concludes by turning to potential elements of tension between western and eastern-rite Christianity attested in the prayer-book. First are a series of prayers and excerpts drawn heavily from the Roman Mass that occupy folia 12v to 13v of the Codex Gertrudianus. For instance, a prayer on folio 12v
begins by addressing God as “O Lord omnipotent God, King of angels and King of kings, caretaker of all orphans” and then changes direction, evidently addressing a priest or chaplain: “Offer to God a sacrifice of praise [Ps. 49:14]. May the Lord hear you, praying for us. Amen. May the lord God be in your heart and in your speech and may He take up the sacrifice from Himself accepted from your hands for the salvation of us all.”

The second prayer which immediately follows refers more generally to a priest celebrating the Eucharist, serving as a request for forgiveness, ending with two recitations of the Lord’s Prayer.

Excerpts from the Roman Mass exist in other eleventh- and twelfth-century prayer-books besides the Codex Gertrudianus. The function of such material in *libelli precum* is not well understood, because it seems more suitable for the public worship of a wider community rather than for the private prayer of an individual. In Gertruda’s case, it may be that the formulas of the Roman Mass entered the Codex Gertrudianus prayer-book indirectly, through the use of other *libelli precum* that served as source texts for her manuscript. Moreover, it is possible that these particular prayers were written during Gertruda’s lengthy stays in Poland and Germany. In Rus’ she may have recited them privately. Her role as intercessor on behalf of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves and her commissioning of miniatures for her manuscript that conformed

---


695 *Ibid.*: 904-905.


to contemporary devotional practices among Orthodox elites suggest that she did not isolate herself from the Orthodox Divine Liturgy.

Indeed, though dominated by liturgical phrases from the Roman Mass, Gertruda’s manuscript also contains possible hints of the Byzantine liturgical formulas. In particular, Gertruda twice includes in her prayers a translation of the Trisagion hymn (i.e. the Thrice-Holy Hymn: “Holy God, Holy Mighty One, Holy Immortal One”), on folia 12v and 230v. The Trisagion was common to western and eastern devotions. It was recited in Greek and Latin as part of the western Good Friday liturgy, so that Gertruda would have encountered this prayer already in Poland or Germany. More frequently, however, it was sung on a weekly basis as part of the Byzantine Liturgy of John Chrysostom, which Gertruda would have heard in Rus’ or possibly already during her childhood in Poland or in the Rhineland monasteries. It is impossible to say for certain whether the inclusion of this formula in Gertruda’s prayer-book comes from a western or eastern liturgical environment, testifying to the hybrid nature of her devotional book.

Overt tension between Catholic and Orthodox viewpoints is present in the Codex Gertrudianus, but this tension strikes a minor note in the manuscript’s overall symphony. The first instance of

698 “Sanctus deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis.” The Trisagion occurs in Gertruda’s prayers at folia 12r and 230v; Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, nos. 23, 92, 131 and 166.

699 “Pro papa nostro, et pro principe nostro, et pro imperatore nostro […]”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 230v. The pope at the time was Gregory VII (1073-1085) who corresponded with Gertruda, while the German Emperor was probably Heinrich IV (1056-1106), who, as discussed above, met Gertruda’s husband and probably Gertruda herself, Ibid., n. 1 and 3, 155. The prayers for pope, emperor, and local ruler also recall the Solemn Prayers (Orationes Sollemnes) in the Roman rite for Good Friday; John Walton Tyrer, Historical Survey of Holy Week: its Services and Ceremonial (Oxford: Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1932), 124.


this tension is suggested by Gertruda’s inclusion of the Latin recension of the Creed on folio 13v, which is ornamented in the Codex by an elaborate horizontal band of curving golden vines directly above it. The Creed includes the divisive addition of the phrase *filioque*: “[I believe…] in the Holy Spirit, the Giver of Life who proceeds from the Father and the Son […]”  

Two other Creeds exist among the older tenth-century folia of the manuscript. One, the so-called Creed of the Apostles (“Symboolum Apostolorum”), does not contain the *filioque* (folia 203r-203v). The other, the *fides catholica* (also known as the Athasasian Creed or the “Quicumque vult”), does include the statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son (folia 203v-205v).

Gertruda’s prayer-book thus contained versions of the Creed according to Franco-Roman usage that were unacceptable to the Orthodox clerics of Kyiv and could not have been copied in Kyiv. Indeed, the *filioque* was one of the main points which Patriarch Photios had condemned in his encyclical letters to eastern bishops in 866/867, and was one of the issues which Patriarch Michael Kerularios and Cardinal Humbert had argued over in 1054. In the 1080s Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv’s two main objections to the hope of church reunification expressed in a letter sent by him to Anti-Pope Clement III, were precisely the Roman usage of unleavened bread for communion (“azymes”) and the addition of the *filioque* to the Creed. Since Gertruda was living in Rus’ in the 1080s, and moreover taken as a hostage to Kyiv at this time, it seems unlikely that she was unaware of the strong condemnation of the *filioque* by the head of the Kyiv’s church hierarchy. The presence of different Creeds in the Codex Gertrudianus—two with

---

703 “[…] et in spiritum sanctum et uiuificantem qui ex patre filioque procedit […]”; *Psalterium Egberti*, vol. 2, fol. 13v; *Liber Precum*, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 32, 134.


707 On Metropolitan Ioann’s negotiations with Anti-Pope Clement III and Ioann’s view of inter-marriage between Orthodox Christians and Catholics, see Chapter One.
and one without the *filioque*— also comments on rising tension between these two Christian confessions in the late eleventh century. These conflicting versions exist unreconciled together in the same manuscript. If Gertruda recited the *filioque*, it is likely that she would have done so privately.

The fact that Gertruda was probably aware that the *filioque* was a source of growing contention during her lifetime is suggested by her use of a prayer, taken from the vespers service for the octave of Pentecost in the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary. Gertruda’s prayer could be interpreted as asking God that Christians might come to an agreement on the “truth of divine origin.” Her use of the word *substantia* in the prayer can be understood as a technical term relating to the Persons of the Trinity. Gertruda would have encountered the use of this term in the Athanasian Creed (folio 203v): “For the Catholic Faith is this: that we should worship unity in Trinity, Trinity in unity, neither confusing Persons nor separating substance [*substantiam*].” Christ is “God from the substance [*ex substantia*] of the Father, begotten before the ages and man from the substance of His mother [...].” If one does not hold correct Trinitarian belief, one cannot be saved, the

---

708 See *Orationes ad Vesperos infra Octavas Pentecosten* in *The Gelasian Sacramentary / Liber Sancramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*, ed. H. A. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 124. Meysztowicz considered that the sense of this passage was not entirely clear, while in the opinion of Malewicz and Kürbis, it came from some theological or school text, although they were unable to locate an exact source, *Manuscriptum*, ed. Meysztowicz, n. 1, 150, *Liber Precum*, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, 87 and n. 1,157. I am grateful to Father Allan Smith for identifying the correct source for this prayer.


Athanasian Creed declares. No wonder, then, that Gertruda, likely would want to be assured that she held the correct view on the Holy Spirit’s procession.

The second meditation on Orthodox/Catholic disunity is enclosed within a long prayer to Mary in which Gertruda’s personal petitions for her son Yaropolk-Peter are interwoven with Marian praises and universal petitions for all of Christendom. At one moment Gertruda asks Mary to “Intercede for the peace and unity of the Holy Church […]” Although Ziegler sees here echoes of western Good Friday prayers, it is difficult not to interpret this phrase in the context of Gertruda’s own experience in which divisions were emerging between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. A personal interpretation of this prayer is suggested by the fact that this general prayer for Christian unity is immediately linked with a prayer relating to personal events in Gertruda’s life, specifically fears for the safety of her son: “[…] and for all the army of my only son PETER, and for all his household/family [familia], and for your servant himself, for the safety of all the holy relics.” The sense of immediate threat suggests a compositional time frame of the 1080s when Yaropolk-Peter was struggling for the throne; perhaps more specifically, during his flight to Poland that left Gertruda in the besieged city of Lutsk. Besides her fears for her son, Gertruda had cause to be alarmed at growing divisions in Christendom, but such tensions did not immediately prevent her from including both eastern and western devotional practices in her personal prayer-book.

---


713 “[…] intecede pro pace et unitate ecclesię sanctę […]”, Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 208v; Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 87, 163.

714 Ziegler, “Gregor VII,” 395. Ziegler does not specify what parallels he sees between Gertruda’s prayer and the prayers of Good Friday. It seems likely, however, that he is referring to the Solemn Prayers in the Roman rite for Good Friday which included prayers for the pope, the Church, as well as heretics, schismatics, Jews, pagans and others “in error,” Tyrer, Historical Survey, 123-124.

715 “[…] intecede pro pace et unitate ecclesię sanctę, et pro omni populo christiano, et pro omni exercitu PETRI [in gold] unici filii mei, et pro omni familia sua, et pro ipso famulo tuo. Pro uniuersorum incolumitate sanctarum reliquiarum[…]”; Psalterium Egberti, vol. 2, fol. 208v, Liber Precum, eds. Malewicz and Kürbis, no. 87, 163-164. The use of the masculine form here, famulus rather than the feminine famula, could confirm that the prayers were written for Gertruda by a male scribe or cleric, see Wiszewski, Domus Bolezlai, n. 237, 78-79. Meysztoicz suggests that exercitus could be a Latin translation of the Slavic term druzhina, the military retinue that surrounded the prince and was personally loyal to him. Thus the prayer would not necessarily refer to a time of active war, Manuscriptum, n. 13, 153. On the druzhina, see Franklin, “Kievan Rus’,” 81-82.
General Conclusions

What can the Codex Gertrudianus tell us about the fate of western-rite brides of Rus’ princes and in particular about their religious devotions? On the one hand, the manuscript is a unique monument in the literal sense: not only is it the only personal prayer-book of a Catholic-born bride to survive from the pre-Mongol Rus’, it is the only such prayer-book to survive of any Riurikid princess from the pre-Mongol period, Rus’-born or not. The composition of the manuscript was directly impacted by long periods of exile in which Gertruda travelled in Germany and Poland, when she incorporated Latin texts into her manuscript. These considerations clearly limit the degree to which the Codex Gertrudianus can be used as a source from which to generalize on the religious life of Catholic brides within Rus’.

It is difficult due to the paucity of sources to judge if Gertruda’s aptitude for retaining her Latin Christian culture and embracing that of her husband’s at the same time was extraordinary or typical of the experience of Catholic women in Rus’. However, other examples of Byzantine / Latin psalters owned by queens are extant which demonstrate a similar combination of eastern and western Christian elements. These include the twelfth-century Psalter (BL, ms. Egerton 1139) made for Queen Melisende of Jerusalem (d. 1161) and the bilingual Greek and Latin “Hamilton Psalter” made around 1300 (Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett, Ms. 78 A 9), later owned by Charlotte of Lusignan, Queen of Cyprus (d. 1487).716 The miniatures of Melisende’s Psalter, for instance, follow Byzantine conventions, but also include “western” details such as two angels in the Anastasis (Harrowing of Hell) miniature (fol. 9v) holding standards bearing the Latin “S” for “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus.”717 Although further research is needed on this question, the combination of western and eastern Christian elements is striking.

716 Ownership of the Hamilton Psalter by Queen Charlotte is known by her ex libris on fol. 1v. She was the daughter of Theodore II Palaeologos, despot of Morea (r. 1407-1443). According to the detailed analysis of Christine Havice, the Psalter itself was made in a provincial bilingual area of the Byzantine world (probably Cyprus), Helmut Boese, Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrossowitz, 1966), no. 119, 66-68; Christine Havice, “The Marginal Miniatures in the Hamilton Psalter (Kupferstichkabinett 78 A 9)” in Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 26 (1984): 79-142. See also Spatharakis, Portrait, 45-48.

features in these personal psalters owed by queens suggests that the devotions of royal women who ruled over a mixed population of Orthodox and Latin-rite Christians might also have been marked by syncretism between the two.

In light of the silence of other sources, the Codex Gertrudianus serves as an important witness to one woman’s particular experience at the intersection of two confessional traditions. The manuscript has at its core a western tenth-century psalter as well as eleventh-century Latin texts in the western *libellus precum* devotional tradition. Despite the presence of the divisive *filioque*, the prayer-book captures a moment in time in which the spirituality of lay aristocrats in Rus’ and in Western Europe was similar and it was possible to move easily across confessional boundaries.

In this way, Gertruda’s life is similar to that of her contemporaries such as Gytha, the Anglo-Saxon wife of Vladimir Monomakh, or Oda, the German-born wife of Sviatoslav Yaroslavich. Gytha seems to have patronized the monastery of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne after she became a Rus’ princess. Oda was visited by her brother Burchard-Poppo of Trier after her marriage to Sviatoslav, who, although he was a western-rite cleric, had no qualms about staying at the court of Oda’s Orthodox husband. The lives of these three women, Gytha, Oda and Gertruda, suggest also that certain geographical locations were particularly concentrated sites of exchanges between Orthodox and Catholic religious devotions that enabled noble women to move more easily across confessional boundaries. Cologne, the Rhineland, and Poland, part of “New Europe,” seem to have acted as contact zones in which devotional practices could circulate from East to West and vice versa. Moreover, in Gertruda’s particular case, her family background may have helped her acculturate to the religious environment of Rus’, since she may have encountered the Byzantine liturgy already prior to her marriage. Her father, for example, may have known both Greek and Old Church Slavonic.

When Gertruda and her husband appealed to the pope for aid in 1075 during their exile, they did not feel that they were abandoning Orthodoxy. Gertrude’s patronage of Rus’ miniaturists, her support of the monks of the Monastery of the Caves, and her possible founding of an Orthodox monastery in Kyiv dedicated to Saint Nicholas, suggest a full engagement with the religious life of the culture into which she married. Ecumenical aspects of her prayer-book include first and foremost the interaction between the Orthodox iconographic content of its miniatures and the
Latin prayers. It can also be seen in Gertruda’s decision to begin her prayer-book by addressing Saint Peter, the Archangel Michael, and Saint Helena. Reflecting her family history, these holy figures had equal significance for her natal kin and for the Riurikid dynasty. Her prayer-book reflects common lay devotional practices both in Rus’ and in Poland such as the use of prostrations, and the veneration of Mary. Gertruda interweaves her hopes for her son’s political succession and ultimate salvation into the miniatures of salvation history.

In Rus’ Gertruda was remembered as a friend of the monks of the Monastery of the Caves. In Poland, her husband Iziaslav was commemorated for his gift of a precious textile to Saint Wojciech. The patronage of Gertruda and her family, despite the extraordinary circumstances of exile and displacement, still testify to a sense of Christian unity between East and West in the later half of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries.
Part III

Rus’ Women in Western-rite Lands.

Introduction

In contrast to the ephemeral traces left in the sources by western-rite brides in Rus’, we are relatively better informed about the lives of Rus’ princesses who contracted dynastic marriages with Latin Christian rulers. Western sources record more about women in general than do Rus’ chronicles, though sometimes they only consider worthy of note the bare fact that a marriage took place and the male children who resulted from it. Nonetheless, the greater number of extant Latin sources allows one to examine in closer detail the lives of Rus’ brides who, though raised as Orthodox Christians, became the consorts of Catholic rulers.

Not surprisingly, as it would have been difficult for them to do otherwise, the majority of these Rus’ princesses patronized western religious institutions, thereby suggesting that they became at least partly acculturated to the religious-cultural world of their husbands. In other cases, however, Rus’-born brides were able to maintain contact with their natal kin and with Orthodoxy and to serve as cultural mediators between Orthodoxy and Latin Christianity. More so than their married counterparts, evidence suggests that that Rus’ princesses who became widows or repudiated wives, whether from simple necessity or from greater personal agency in the absence of a husband, could maintain closer contact with their natal families. One possible reading of the return of a Riurikid princess to Rus’ after spending years in Latin Christendom is that it indicates the fluidity of individual identity in the Middle Ages: after being “a Latin Christian” for years, a woman once again became “Orthodox.”

718 For a discussion of the term “acculturation,” see the general introduction.


For instance, recent studies have re-evaluated the impact of the Second Crusade on Polish elites of the twelfth century, concluding that Polish nobles did indeed participate in the Crusade to a greater degree than was previously believed, including in the local so-called Wendish Crusade of 1147 against pagan Slavs on the Baltic littoral.\(^{721}\) As this section will explore, this increased militant expansion of Latin Christendom, in turn, set the stage for a more heightened awareness of confessional differences that may have influenced negatively some Polish elites’ relations with their Riurikid neighbours by the close of the twelfth century.

Finally, this section engages with the geographical aspects of Orthodox/Latin cultural contacts. The strongest evidence for Rus’ princesses maintaining ties to their natal land comes from cases of marriages with the dynasties ruling the contact zones of Hungary, Poland as well as Scandinavia. As Kłoczowski’s framework of “New Europe” suggests, the Árpáds of Hungary and the Piasts of Poland were relatively “new” Christian dynasties, among whom a hardening of opinion toward the eastern-rite neighbours did not occur before the mid to late thirteenth century.\(^{722}\)

Hungary had numerous territorial, cultural, and dynastic connections with the Orthodox world, including with Serbia, Bulgaria, Rus’, and Byzantium itself. Out of all the western-rite dynasties into which Rus’ princesses married, only the Hungarian Árpáds both supported a Latin church hierarchy, and patronized eastern-rite monasteries well into the thirteenth century.\(^{723}\) Due to geographic proximity and perhaps also ease of linguistic contact through belonging to the Slavic family of languages, the Piast dynasty of Poland was frequently allied with the Riurikids. Consequently, Rus’ women who married into the Árpád dynasty of Hungary or the Piast dynasty...
of Poland seemed to have been better able to maintain connections with their natal land than other women—at least as far as the extant sources allow one to judge. As first discussed in the general introduction, these findings suggest that a bride’s ability to maintain ties to her natal family were not simply questions of individual volition, but also a reflection of wider cultural attitudes toward Orthodoxy in the lands in which she found herself.

The selection of case-studies examined in this section is based on both the relatively fuller source material available on these specific Rus’ women who married west, as well as the fact that their lives illustrate varied and complex responses to Orthodox/Catholic relations in the period under examination. In Chapter Four of this third part, three examples of Riurikid brides sent to different regions (France, Hungary, Saxony) illustrate Orthodox/Catholic interaction in the eleventh century: Anna Yaroslavna (d. around 1075), her sister Anastasia Yaroslavna (d. before 1090), and their niece Eupraxia Vsevolodna (d. 1109). In Chapter Five of this third part, three twelfth century case-studies are taken from Rus’ women who were sent as brides to Poland, Scandinavia, and Hungary: Maria Sviatopolkovna or Volodarivna (d. 1160s), Ingeborg Mstislavna (d. after 1131), and her younger half-sister Euphrosyne Mstislavna (d. 1180s). These six case studies are examined both in rough chronological order and in terms of geography, moving from West to East. The section thus begins with the princess who was sent farthest from Rus’ and ends with those who married just beyond Rus’s western border. Both eleventh and twelfth century case-studies are prefaced by a brief introduction, setting forth the political context in Rus’ in which these marriages took place.

Drawing conclusions on the basis of specific case studies, however, presents the methodological danger of making generalizations based on a relatively small data set, namely on the basis of women who happened to have left a greater imprint in western sources than their other relations. Poor survival of sources makes it difficult to state how “typical” the case studies examined in these two chapters were, or, in other words, how representational they were of the “average” fate of a Rus’ bride in Western Europe. In order to mitigate as far as possible the inherent bias dictated by the chance survival of source, further context on Rus’ princesses who married Latin rulers is provided in the attached appendices. The case studies presented in this section, however, allow one to see the range of outcomes that emerged from the marriages of Rus’ princesses to Latin Christian rulers: varying from a high degree of acculturation to their Latin Christian surroundings to ongoing personal communication and even return to Orthodox Rus’.

Likewise,
these case-studies present a range of clerical reactions to these inter-rite marriages from positive to negative assessments. In this way, these encounters between individuals allow one to assess the impact of developing Orthodox/Catholic estrangement on lay elites.
Chapter 4: Selected Case Studies From the Eleventh Century

The eleventh century in general and the reign of Yaroslav Vladimirovich “the Wise” (sole ruler 1036-1054) in particular, has long been considered a “golden age” of early Rus’.\(^{724}\) Characterized by relative political stability and prosperity, the eleventh century was also a time when the Riurikids concluded the most geographically expansive network of marriage alliances extending all the way to ties with Anglo-Saxon and French royal households.\(^{725}\) As previous chapters have discussed, although Yaroslav the Wise began an extensive building program in Kyiv to remake the main Rus’ city in the mold of Constantinople, he also continued to maintain amicable ties with neighbouring western rulers through military and marriage alliances.\(^{726}\) At his death, his three eldest surviving sons, Iziaslav Yaroslavich, Sviatoslav Yaroslavich, and Vsevolod Yaroslavich continued to make frequent marriage alliances with western-rite Christian rulers.\(^{727}\) Medieval French *chansons de geste* and German chronicles from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries depicted Rus’ as a land of great wealth, suggesting that ties with Rus’ were viewed positively at this time in Western European sources.\(^{728}\)

This chapter will focus on three case studies of Rus’ princesses who, in course of the eleventh century, left Rus’ to become queen consorts in Latin Christian Europe: Anna Yaroslavna (d. around 1075) who married King Henri I of France (d. 1060), her sister Anastasia Yaroslavna (d. before 1090) who married King András I of Hungary (also d. 1060), and their niece Eupraxia Vsevolodna (d. 1109), who married Emperor Heinrich IV of Germany (d. 1106). The chapter will not delve into all the political events that took place during these women’s reigns. Rather, it

\(^{724}\) Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 244; Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 77.

\(^{725}\) An overview of eleventh-century Riurikid marriages can be found in, for instance: Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance*, 143-178; Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 23-76. Although many of its details have since been corrected and it is dated in its approach to Orthodox-Catholic relations, the classic study of Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, still offers a useful general overview of the Riurikids’ matrimonial and commercial ties with external lands in the eleventh century: see especially *Ibid.*, 19-142.

\(^{726}\) On Yaroslav the Wise’s marriage alliances see, for example, Hellmann, “Die Heiratspolitik,” 7-25. For Yaroslav’s rebuilding of Kyiv on the model of Constantinople, see the previous chapter.

\(^{727}\) Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 505-558.

will examine the degree to which these women acculturated to the socio-religious world of their respective husbands, as seen, for instance, in their religious patronage and relations with western clerics, as well as the degree to which these women maintained ties with Rus’, thus enabling them to act as vectors for cultural exchanges. As far as the extant sources allow us to see, such complex responses seem to have been the norm for Riurikid brides: their reigns in Western Europe indicate neither complete rejection nor complete acculturation to one religious confession to the detriment of the other.

Anna Yaroslavna (d. around 1075)\textsuperscript{729}

The most famous marriage among Yaroslav the Wise’s daughters in historiography is that of Anna Yaroslavna to King Henri I of France (r. 1031-1060).\textsuperscript{730} This chapter will not recapitulate Anna’s entire reign or political career, however, but rather will focus on its religious context, analyzing Anna’s acculturation to the religious-cultural environment of France and evidence of her cultural continuity with Rus’.\textsuperscript{731} Her early years as queen seemed to have been focused on providing her husband with much-needed heirs as well as patronizing local ecclesiastical institutions in the Île-de-France. She subsequently remained in France after her first widowhood, taking part in the regency council of her son Philippe I (r. 1060-1108) and refounding the ruined church of Saint-Vincent in the royal city of Senlis as a house of regular canons. The appearance of Anna’s name in Cyrillic script on a witness-list in a charter of 1063, extant in the original, testifies to the fact that she maintained a sense of her natal religio-cultural identity in far-off places.


\textsuperscript{731} For a more general scholarly overview of Anna’s reign as queen of France the best article remains Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev”: 299-323.
France (Plate 5). Her reign as a whole shows one individual’s complex response to the dynamic of Orthodox-Catholic relations around the time of the so-called Schism of 1054.

As is typical, Rus’ chronicles do not record Anna’s birth or that of her sisters: only her brothers’ births merit entry. She may have been born between 1024 and 1032, and therefore have been between the ages of nineteen and twenty-seven at the time of her marriage to Henri in 1051. Her relatively late age at marriage may be explained by the fact that she was born during a time of civil war, and her father Yaroslav was not able to become the undisputed sole ruler of Rus’ until 1035/1036. Perhaps he only began to arrange his daughters’ marriages after he consolidated his power. Though Rus’ sources also say nothing about Anna’s childhood or youth, we know from Latin chronicles and Old Norse sagas that Anna grew up in a multi-cultural, multi-lingual court in Novgorod and Kyiv that included the presence of western-rite Christians. The fact that she encountered western-rite Christians from childhood on could help to explain, at least partly, the ease with which she seems to have acculturated to western-rite Christian customs after her marriage. Anna’s mother was the Swedish princess Ingigerd (d. 1050). Scandinavian sagas and Latin chronicles record that in 1029, Anna’s father Yaroslav the Wise offered shelter to the Saint Olaf Haraldsson of Norway and to Olaf’s illegitimate son, Magnus Olafsson, who were fleeing from their defeat at the hands of Knud of Denmark (d. 1035). Following Olaf Haraldsson’s unsuccessful bid to regain his kingdom and his death at the Battle of Striklestad on August 31, 1030 against Knud’s forces, Yaroslav also received at his court Olaf’s step-son, Harald Sigurdsson “Hard-ruler” (or “Resolute-ruler;” “Hardrada”). After participating in

733 PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, sub anno 6544 (1035/1036), 1192
734 Snorri Sturluson, Heimskringla, trans. Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes, vol. 2 (London: Viking Society for Northern Research; University College London, 2015), 95. For a full list of sources on Ingigerd see Chapter Two.
Yaroslav’s tribute-gathering and in campaigns against pagan steppe nomads, Harald went to Byzantium around 1034 to serve as a mercenary, and returned to Rus’ around 1044 to marry one of Yaroslav’s daughters, Elizabeth. The eleventh-century chronicle of Adam of Bremen lists the illustrious marriages made by Yaroslav the Wise’s daughters, all to western-rite rulers: “When Harald, the King of Norway, returned from Greece, he accepted as his wife a daughter of the King of Rus’, Gerzlef [Yaroslav]. András, the King of the Hungarians, took another [in marriage], from whom was born Solomon. The King of the Franks, Henri, married the third, who bore him Philippe.”

There may also have been a fourth sister, Agafia (Agatha). This woman, whose genealogy is hotly debated, became the wife of the Anglo-Saxon prince Edward the Exile (d. 1057). According to a scholium in Adam of Bremen as well as the twelfth-century Estoire des Engleis written by a certain Anglo-Norman author called Geffrei Gaimar, Edward the Exile and Edmund, the sons of King Edmund Ironside (d. 1016), had fled from their attempted assassination by the Danish King Knud the Great and came to Rus’ around 1028. Edward may have married a daughter of Yaroslav the Wise while taking refuge there.

Anna, therefore, was raised at a court where nobles from Scandinavia, Hungary, and Anglo-Saxon England were present together with Slavic priests and Greek church hierarchs (the stay of András of Hungary in Kyiv is discussed further below). Some of these exiles married Anna.

---


739 Agatha’s (Agafia’s) genealogy is debated since the twelfth-century sources on her origins are obscure or contradictory: she was either German, Hungarian, or Rus’. For the various arguments and summaries of the debate see Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 4.

Yaroslavna’s sisters while two of her brothers, Iziaslav and Sviatoslav, also took western-rite brides discussed in the previous chapter (Gertruda of Poland and Oda of Stade, respectively). These dynastic ties criss-crossed the confessional borders of Latin and Byzantine Christianity in the eleventh century. They challenge our conception of Rus’ merely as part of the “Byzantine Commonwealth” or of Riccardo Picchio’s vision of Rus’ as part of Slavia orthodoxa, a separate religio-cultural entity from Slavia romana. The Riurikids had strong ties to the Latin lands, especially the northern Scandinavian world, as well as to Byzantium in the eleventh century. Far from growing up in a monocultural or monolingual environment, Anna had already met with adherents to Latin Christianity before her marriage to King Henri, starting with her own mother Ingigerd.

Primary sources do not directly discuss why Henri wanted to marry Anna, so this question is open to speculation. Most scholars consider that Henri’s desire to comply with consanguinity regulations was the primary impetus, but this desire cannot have been the sole reason for the marriage. Anna Yaroslavna and Henri were, in fact, related by affinity: Oda of Stade, the niece of Henri’s previous wife, Matilda of Frisia (d. 1044), was married to Anna’s brother, Sviatoslav Yaroslavich. Political motivations, an alliance either against the German Empire or against William of Normandy, likely played an equal role. Finally, reasons of prestige were also important: Henri, only the third Capetian on the French throne since the election of his


743 Ward proposes that a marriage alliance with Rus’ against the German Empire was on Henri’s mind, eadem, “Anne of Kiev”: 437. Alexandr Musin suggested rather that Henri sought to ally himself Anna’s father Yaroslav the Wise, due to Yaroslav’s previous marriage alliance with Norway (through his daughter Elizabeth’s marriage to Harald Hadrada), in order to encircle William of Normandy, “Anna Kievskaia”: 157, 162-169, and idem, “La formation de la politique matrimoniale et la ‘diaspora normande’ en Europe au XIe siècle: l’exemple d’Anne de Kiev,” in 911-2011, Penser les mondes normands médiévaux: actes du colloque international de Caen et Cerisy (29 septembre-2 octobre 2011), eds. David Bates and Pierre Bauduin (Caen: Office universitaire d’études normandes (OUEN); Centre de recherches archéologiques et historiques anciennes et médiévales (CRAHAM); Université de Caen Normandie, 2016), 177-205, esp. 192-198.
grandfather Hugues Capet in 987, might have wanted to elevate his relatively newly-established dynasty by marriage with Yaroslav, who is called a “king” (rex) in Latin sources.  

Henri’s request for an eastern bride can be read as a continuation of his grandfather Hugues Capet’s desire to achieve legitimacy for a newly created royal dynasty by marrying solely with other royal, rather than comital families. In 988, Hugues Capet unsuccessfully had requested a Byzantine bride for his son Robert (Henri’s father) in order to ennable his own blood-line. In choosing his bride, the prestige of noble blood was more important for Henri than emergent differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism in the mid eleventh century.

There is no evidence that Latin bishops had any objection to bringing an Orthodox princess as a bride for their king. Indicative of this fact is that French bishops served as Henri’s ambassadors to Kyiv in 1049 to ask for Anna’s hand in marriage on the king’s behalf. This embassy is recorded in a late eleventh-century note in “Odalric’s Psalter” (Reims, BM Carnegie, Ms. 15, fol. 214v), named after the eponymous canon and provost of Reims Cathedral (d. 1076). According to this note, Henri sent Bishop Roger of Châlons-en-Champagne to Rus’ in 1049 to bring back Anna Yaroslavna as his wife. From the early twelfth-century Chronicle of Pseudo-


746 Musin, “Anne de Kiev,” 184-185. “The granting of Hugh’s request by the Eastern Empire would have meant for him the recognition by Constantinople of the legitimacy of his accession to the French throne, which [...] was still questioned by some neighboring feudal lords,” A. A. Vasiliev, “Hugh Capet of France and Byzantium,” in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 6 (1951): 231-232.

747 For the latest paleographical and codicological analysis of Odalric’s Psalter and the new dating of his death (from 1075 to 1076) see : Patrick Corbet et Patrick Demouy, eds., Un homme, un livre au XIème siècle : le prévôt Odalric et le manuscrit 15 de la bibliothèque municipale de Reims (Reims: Éditions de l’Académie nationale de Reims, 2015). I was able briefly to look at this manuscript in person in May 2013.

Clarius, compiled at the monastery of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif in Sens, we also learn that Bishop Gautier of Meaux was part of the embassy.\(^{749}\)

It is striking that the bishops’ arrival in Kyiv coincided with the arrival of Pope Leo IX (r. 1048-1054) in France to dedicate a new church to Saint-Rémi in Reims and to preside over a reforming council in the same city in 1049.\(^{750}\) Their absence contributed to the poor attendance of this council by French bishops.\(^{751}\) Henri himself did not attend the reforming Council, claiming that he had to punish unnamed “rebels” (“rebelles,” probably Normans).\(^{752}\) Later, in 1058, Henri was attacked viciously by Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, the same cleric who had excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople, for simony (Humbert compared Henri to the apocalyptic dragon in Rev. 12:4) suggesting that the French king offered no support to the

---


\(^{751}\) There were twenty-one bishops in total when the Council began on October 3\(^{rd}\) 1049. Four of these were travelling with Pope Leo’s own entourage (the Archbishops of Trier, Lyon, Besançon, and Porto). Present beside the Archbishop of Reims were nine bishops from France, five from Normandy, two from the German Empire (Metz and Verdun) and one from England (the bishop of Wells), Bur, “Léon IX et la France,” 245-247; Pontal, Les conciles, 156.

ideals advocated by the reform party of Pope Leo IX, a movement better known by the somewhat misleading term “Gregorian reform.”

Indeed, it took time for the goals of this reform movement (getting rid of simony and lay investiture of bishops, imposing clerical celibacy, and so on) to be accepted by the royal court and the French ecclesiastical hierarchy. These ideals were only fully embraced by the court in the early twelfth century under the reign of Anna Yaroslavna’s grandson Louis VI the Fat, who was married to the niece of Pope Calixtus II, and who was influenced by his minister Abbot Suger. The Archbishop of Reims, Gervais de Château-du-Loir (r. 1055-1067), for instance, attempted to implement the program of church reform, but his successor, Archbishop Manassès (r. 1069-1080) ultimately rejected it. Neither archbishop was canonically elected by the cathedral chapter, as per the ideal of the “Gregorian” reforms, but rather both were appointed by the royal court. In 1049, therefore, at the time of the marriage embassy to Kyiv, Henri and the other nobles of the French court did not ascribe to a clear-cut homogenous Latin Christian identity under the leadership of the pro-reform pope that could be set in opposition to Anna’s Orthodox Christian identity. On the contrary, Cardinal Humbert railed against both King Henri I,

---


755 Ibid., 272-273.


whom he compared to the dragon in the Book of the Apocalypse, and against Patriarch Michael Keroularios of Constantinople.\footnote{Cardinal Humbert, \textit{Adversus simoniacos}, 206.}

Common veneration of saints in both eleventh-century Rus’ and France could also have made it easier for Anna to acculturate to the culture of the French royal court. The account of the French embassy to Kyiv in Reims MS 15 focuses on telling the story of the translation of the relics of Saint Clement, a holy pope venerated equally in Latin, Byzantine, and Old Church Slavonic tradition.\footnote{Garipzanov, “Novgorod,”130-136; Pac, “Kult świętych,” 401-409; Arringnon, “Odalric,’ 173; White, “Relics,” 397.} It tells of how Odalric, the provost of Reims, when hearing that Bishop Roger of Châlons was about to set out to Rus’, begged him “if he would deign to inquire whether Cherson was in those parts, where Saint Clement is said to rest.”\footnote{“[…]deprecatus est Odalricus prepositus eundem episcopum quatinus inquirere dignaretur utrum in illis partibus Cersona esset, ubi sanctus Clemens requiescere legitur”, Reims, Ms. 15, fol. 214v; text printed in de Gaiffier, “Odalric de Reims,” 318, and Albrecht, “Odalric von Reims,” 157.} Odalric referred to the belief that this first-century pope had been exiled by the Emperor Trajan (d.117) to the Crimean city of Cherson (Greek: Chersones), where he was martyred.\footnote{On the various legends of Saint Clement, see Leonard Boyle, \textit{A Short Guide to Saint Clement’s} (Rome: n.p., 1989), 4-5; P. Duthilleul, “Les reliques de Clément de Rome,” in \textit{Revue des études byzantines} 16 (1958): 85-98.} According to the ninth-century Old Church Slavonic \textit{Life} of Saint Constantine-Cyril, Clement’s relics were rediscovered in Cherson in the year 861 by this “Apostle to the Slavs” and by his fellow missionary, his brother Saint Methodius.\footnote{The \textit{Life of Constantine} in \textit{Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes}, trans. and commentary Marvin Kantor, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, 1983), 43. Cyril-Constantine also wrote a \textit{Discourse on the Discovery and Translation of the Relics of Saint Clement}. Its Greek original is lost, but the work survives in Latin and Slavonic translations (titled \textit{Translatio sancti Clementis}, and \textit{Slovo na perenesenie mochtchem preslavnago Klimenta}, respectively). \textit{Ibid}, n. 36, 88; Duthilleul, “Les reliques”: 88-90.} Due to this association with the founder of Slavonic Christianity, Pope Clement was more venerated in Rus’ than in Byzantium. For instance, the Rus’ church calendar included the feast-day of Clement’s relics rediscovery by Cyril on January 30\textsuperscript{th}, a feast not known in Byzantine Greek tradition.\footnote{RNF, F. p. I. 5, \textit{Ostromirovo evangelie: faksimilnoe vosproizvedenie} (Leningrad: Avrora, 1988) [facsimile edition], folia 242v and 263v; Garipzanov, “Novgorod,” 133.}
The account in Reims, MS 15, however, unusually attributes the rediscovery of Clement’s relics not to the “Apostle to the Slavs” Saint Cyril, as is the tradition in ninth-century Old Church Slavonic vita of Saint Cyril, but rather to Pope Julius (d. 352). On the one hand, therefore, the tale of the French embassy to Kyiv in Reims, MS 15 indicates, as Louis Paris writes, that “the separation of the Russian church [sic] and the Latin church was not yet so great, since both envied and honoured the relics of the same saints.” Clement was indeed venerated in both France and Rus’. On the other hand, however, the account in Reims, MS 15 is also striking by the fact that it replaces the eastern inventor of Pope Clement’s relics, Constantine-Cyril, with that of a western saint, Pope Julius. The feast of Pope Julius I (April 12th) was not celebrated either among the Slavs or in Byzantium. Consequently, the openness of the French clerics to accepting an Orthodox woman as their queen did not extend to the veneration of saints from her homeland. Pope Clement was already venerated since at least the sixth century in Gaul, but Constantine-Cyril was a “foreign” saint, whose veneration was not adopted in France. The account of the French embassy to Kyiv for Anna Yaroslavna’s hand therefore illustrates the highly selective nature of the cultural contacts that resulted from her marriage to Henri.

It is not known if Anna brought back relics of Clement with her to France. Regardless or whether or not Anna and her entourage physically transported relics, Stefan Albrecht has suggested that there may have been an increase in the veneration of Saint Clement in France following Anna’s arrival. It was around this time that the cathedrals of Châlons-sur-Marne, Verdun, and Orléans all began to claim bishops consecrated by Saint Clement as their founders (Memmius, Sanctinus, and Evortius, respectively). Certainly, as Wladimir Bogomoletz observes, Anna’s dowry must

---

766 Francis Thomson, personal correspondence to the author, 23 May 2013.
767 Boyle, St Clement’s, Rome, 49-50.
768 Sociologists studying the process of transculturation have noted how only certain elements of culture are absorbed into another, Pratt, “Contact Zone”: 36.
have included some easily transportable objects, which could have included relics. The early twelfth-century chronicler Pseudo-Clarius mentions the “many gifts” that accompanied Anna on her long journey from Kyiv to Paris. Such physical objects would not only have served as Anna’s dowry, but also could have acted as aides-mémoires of her Orthodox homeland or what Elisabeth van Houts calls “pegs of memory,” providing a tangible connection to her natal land. Unfortunately, the story that Anna brought with her the so-called “Reims Gospel Book” or “Slavonic Gospel” (Reims, BM Carnegie, MS 255) on which French kings subsequently swore their coronation oaths is a nineteenth-century myth. In fact, this manuscript was deposited into the treasury of Reims Cathedral only in 1575 by Cardinal Charles of Lorraine (1524-1575), who perhaps picked it up during the course of his travels to the Council of Trent.

We only have only one source that mentions explicitly a specific object in Anna’s possession. In the 1140s, Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis (d. 1151) in his Deeds of Louis the Fat records that Anna’s grandson Louis VI (r. 1108-1137) donated to the abbey a “hyacinth” (a type of red-coloured gemstone) which had once belonged to his “grandmother, the daughter of the king of the Rus’.” Of course this red-coloured jewel might have been something Anna acquired when she was already in France, but it was also the sort of thing that could easily be transported over

---

770 Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev”: 306.
772 Elizabeth van Houts, Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe, 900-1200 (Houndmills, UK/ Hampshire: Macmillan, 1999), 107.
774 Inventaire des reliques, chasses, images, joyeaux....appartenant à l’église et fabrique de Notre-Dame de Reims, Reims, BM, Mss. 1794/1758, fol.126r as cited in Bibliothèque de Reims, “L’évangélaire slavon,” 2.
long distances and thus form part of her dowry.\textsuperscript{776} If this gem was an eastern treasure, it would have been eagerly received by Abbot Suger, who had heard from travelers of the magnificent riches in Constantinople’s Hagia Sophia and wanted to enrich Saint-Denis’ treasury to rival them.\textsuperscript{777}

Having arrived in France in 1050/1051, Anna was crowned in Reims Cathedral on Easter (March 31\textsuperscript{st}) or Pentecost (May 19\textsuperscript{th}) of 1051.\textsuperscript{778} According to the \textit{Life of Saint Liébert of Cambrai} written by the monk Raoul of Saint-Sépulchre around 1100, Anna Yaroslavna was the first queen of the Capetian dynasty to be married and crowned in this cathedral, which was (and still is) the seat of the primate of France.\textsuperscript{779} It was a ceremony attended by many clerics as the monk Raoul claims that Henri’s wedding with Anna took place simultaneously with Liébert’s consecration as bishop of Cambrai by the Archbishop of Reims, Gui de Soissons (r. 1033-1055).\textsuperscript{780} The French clerics present at Anna’s coronation seemed to be unaffected by the growing polemic in the Mediterranean basin between western and eastern churchmen on the used of leavened and unleavened bread in the Eucharist (see Chapter One). No surviving source records any objections on the part of the French clergy in accepting an Orthodox princess for their queen.

It is also unlikely that Anna was re-baptized and renamed “Agnes” at this time, a thesis first proposed by Labanoff de Rostoff in the nineteenth century, and still repeated in some secondary

\textsuperscript{776} Musin, “Anna Kievskaiia”: 145.


\textsuperscript{780} Patrick Demouy, \textit{Genèse d’une cathédrale: Les archévéques de Reims et leur église aux XIe et XIIe siècles} (Langres: Éditions Dominique Géniot, 2005), 607-608; \textit{Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier}, ed. Prou, xxi-xxii. The bishops of Cambrai were subordinated to the archbishops of Reims, but received their comital authority from the German emperors, John S. Ott, “‘Both Mary and Martha’: Bishop Liébert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100,” in \textit{The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages}, eds. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 137-138.
literature. In chronicles, this Rus’ princess is always called “Anna,” and this name is used also in the royal charters where her signature appears. Only one original charter survives which gives Anna’s name as “Agnes” (Paris, Archives nationales de France, K 20, n. 1), issued in the year 1060, but it appears in a genitive form in the witness-list (“Agnę reginę”). As the Vicomte de Saint-Aymour noted already in 1896, the correct genitive form of “Agnes” should in fact be Agnetis.

The use of “Agnę” could reflect the fact that the names “Anna” and “Agnes” were considered to be somehow equivalent to one another. The names “Anna” / “Agnes” alternate also among other noblewomen, though this phenomenon has yet to be explained satisfactorily. Schmalzburger notes that, interestingly, in the Byzantine synaxarion (collection of saints’ Lives for reading in the liturgy), the names “Agnę” and “Anna” are used interchangeably. In this way, the use of these two names as synonyms could indicate Anna’s cultural continuity with a norm she encountered in Rus’. Two other charters also use the name “Agnes” to refer to Anna, but since

---

781 Labanoff de Rostoff, Recueil des pièces historiques, viii and ix. Rostoff’s erroneous statement that Anna was re-baptized and its repetition in subsequent studies of Anna is discussed in Musin, “Anna Kievskaja”: 148.

782 For uses of the name “Anna” in chronicle and charter sources, see, for instance, Hallu, Anne de Kiev, pièces justificatives [henceforth PJ] nos. 5, 6, 7, 11, 54, 55 on 164-166, 185, 187-188.

783 Paris, Archives nationales de France, K 20, n. 1; Amédée, Comte de Caix de Saint-Aymour, Anne de Russie, Reine de France, et Comtesse de Valois au XIe siècle, 2nd ed (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1896), no. 10, 102; Rostoff, Recueil des pièces historiques, no. 9, 21 and end-leaf (no page, facsimile of charter); Recueil des actes de Philippe ler, ed. Prou, no. 4, 13 and n. 1, 15. For Rostoff, this original charter served as conclusive proof that Anna had to change her name after the Schism of 1054, Recueil des pièces historiques, v-vi.

784 Saint-Aymour, Anne de Russie, 79. The matter is not cleared up by the fact that in the text of the charter itself her name remains unexpanded (“per interventum matris meę A.”).

785 Anna of Châtillon (d. c. 1184), the daughter of prince Rainald of Antioch, became “Agnes” after she travelled with her spouse, King Béla III (r. 1172-1196), to Hungary from Constantinople (Béla’s stay in the imperial city is discussed further in the following chapter). Anna, the daughter of Michael II Angelos, the despot of Epirus, likewise changed her name to Agnes when she became the wife of William of Villehardouin in 1258. Conversely, Agnes of France, the daughter of King Louis VII, became “Anna” after her marriage to the future emperor Alexios II, son of Manuel I Komnenos; Thoma, Namensänderungen, 179-181, 198-199. Anna, the daughter of King Béla IV of Hungary and wife of the Rus’ prince Rostislav Mstislavich (d. 1263) also appears as “Agnau” in a letters of Pope Urban IV from 1264, see Mór Wertner, Az Arpádok családi története (Nagybecskereken [Zrenjanin], 1892, reprint. Budapest: Historissntik Könyvészáz Kiadó, 2010), 471.

they only survive in seventeenth-century copies, not in the original, their orthography is not reliable as a source on this issue. There is no strong foundation, therefore, to say Anna was re-baptized or renamed, since she continued to use the name “Anna” as her official name as queen.

While it did not include any ritual renaming, Anna’s coronation served as a ritual of incorporation, marking her change in status from foreign bride to God-anointed queen of the Franks. Anna may not have understood the Latin words spoken at the ceremony, but the ritual gestures of crowning and anointing could have helped to communicate to her the new roles and responsibilities the office of queenship included. These responsibilities included not only chastity and fertility in marriage, but also care for her Christian subjects, so that religious patronage was one of the activities expected of her.

At the same time as Anna was ritually installed as queen of the Franks, her Rus’ origins were not forgotten. These were commemorated in the Greek name given to her eldest son, Philippe, who was the first Capetian monarch with this name. The choice of name was unusual at the time and suggests cultural cross-pollination. Prior to 1052, when Philippe was born, the name was

787 A royal confirmation of the re-foundation of Sainte-Nicaise de Reims gives Anna’s name as “Agnes,” but the original text has not survived and it is only known through seventeenth-century references to its existence: “Epitome chronicon Celebris Monasterij S. Nicaisij Rem. Ordinis S. Benedicti…” in Guillaume Marlot, Metropolis Remensis historia, vol. 1: In Quo Remorum gentis origo, vetus dominium, Christianæ religionis per Proutinciam Belgicam initia... quatuor libros distincte referuntur (Lille: Ex Officinâ Nicolai de Rache, sub Biblijs aureis, 1666), 646, Frédéric Soehnée, Catalogue des Actes d’Henri Ier Roi de France (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1907), 106. Likewise, the second instance of Anna’s name as “Agnes” is in a charter in favour of the abbey of Marmoutier whose earliest copy dates to 1639. The other independent copies include a cartulary of the abbey of Marmoutier made in 1701-1800, and an eighteenth-century copy in the manuscript history of Dom Edmond Martène (1654-1739); Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 6, 17-20. Similarly to the appearance of “Agnes” in a charter surviving in the original (Paris, Archives nationales K. 20, n. 1), “Agnes” in this latter copies appears only in its genitive form: “Agnetis.”

788 On a queen’s coronation and anointing as a status-changing ritual, see Earenfight, Queenship, 84; Amalie Fössel, “The Political Traditions of Female Rulership in Medieval Europe,” in The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe, eds. Judith M. Bennett and Ruth Mazo Karras (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 70-71.


790 See Dunbabin, “What's in a Name?”: 949-968. For Anna’s other children, see also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no 9.
hardly known among French dynasts. Among the inspirations for the name which Jean Dunbabin suggests is the Apostle Philip, who was said to have converted the Scythians. As the day of Philippe’s birth is uncertain, he could have been born on the feast-day of the saint (the first of May in the Roman calendar or November fourteenth according to Constantinopolitan usage). Since French chronicles, like Byzantine ones, identified Rus’ with ancient Scythia, the name could have stressed connections between Rus’ and France. Thus, for example, the early twelfth-century Annales de Vendôme stated that Henri married a “Scythian and Rus’ wife.” Anna’s role in introducing the use of the name “Philippe” to the French court is also corroborated by the fact that this name also began to appear in the family of her second husband, Count Raoul de Crépy-en-Valois (d. 1074), whom she married in 1061/1062. The choice of Philippe’s name thus celebrated the newly-established marriage alliance between the Riurikids of Rus’ and the Capetians of France.

Charter evidence suggests that Anna fulfilled her duties as queen not only in giving birth to the heir to the throne, but also by participating in the royal court or council (curia regis). The coronation ceremony elevated her to the position of consort, a sharer in royal dignity. Historians have used the term “Capetian Trinity” to describe this household-based royal

---

792 Dunbabin, “What’s in a Name?”: 954; likewise Bautier, “Anne de Kiev”, 564.
794 Dunbabin, “What's in a Name?”: 952; Raffensperger, Reimaginging Europe, 94.
795 “MLI [1051]. Heinricus, Francorum rex, uxorem duxit Scithicam et Rufam,” RHGF, vol. 11, 29d; Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, n. 1, xix. “Rufa” means a “red-head”, but it is very easy for a scribe to mix up “f” and “s”, in which case it should read “Rusa”. The correction is made by Léopold Delisle in RHGF, vol. 11, 29 n. “b”.
796 Bautier, “Anne de Kiev,” 564; Raffensperger, Reimaginging Europe, 96.
797 Dunbabin, “What's in a Name?”: 952-954.
government, which existed since the reign of Robert the Pious, Henri’s father: royal authority (auctoritas) was exercised jointly by king, queen, and the heir to the throne. The court was itinerant and, wherever it travelled, laymen, secular clerics, and monks sought justice and the confirmation of privileges in the presence of both the king and queen.

During her husband’s lifetime Anna’s subscription appears in six charters for local Benedictine monasteries: Saint-Thierry (between 1050/1051 and October 1055), Sainte-Nicaise de Reims (between October 1055 to 4 August 1060), Saint-Maur-des-Fossés (c.1053-12 July 1058), Coulombs (before 1059), Saint-Philibert of Tournus (23 May 1059), and Saint-Remi de Sens (1059-1060). These grants established an ongoing social and spiritual relationship between Anna, the western-rite monks who were the beneficiaries of royal patronage, and, ultimately, the saints, which those monks served.

In addition, in the last year of Henri’s life, Anna and Henri I ceremoniously re-founded the monastery of Saint-Martin-des-Champs (1059/1060) outside the gates of Paris as a house of regular canons. This monastery had been in a state of ruin from Viking invasions. While older scholarship has linked the establishment of houses of regular canons with supporters of the


801 Saint-Aymour, Anne de Russie, no. 1, 92; Rostoff, Recueil, viii and ix, nos. 1, and. 4, 2, 10; Catalogue des Actes d’Henri Ier, ed. Soehnée, nos. 89, 102, 104, 120, 123, 93, 104-105, 123,125-126; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, PJ, no. 54, 185; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev,” 310-311. For details on all surviving sources available for the patronage of Anna during her husband’s lifetime and an in-depth discussion of their dating and contents, see Zajac, “Gloriosa,” 35-37 and “Charters of Queen Anna Yaroslavna,” in Ibid., 58-59.

802 For examples of Anna’s reciprocal relations with monks, see Ibid., 38.


804 “Porro, ante Parisiace urbis portam, in honore confessoris Christi Martini abbatia fuisse dignoscebatur, quam tyrannica rabie, quasi non fuerit, omnino deletam, ab integro ampliorem restituit […]”, Recueil, ed. Depoin, no. 6, 14.
so-called Gregorian reform movement, more recent works have suggested that houses of regular canons were also established already by the end of the tenth/beginning of the eleventh century by bishops and nobles.\textsuperscript{805} While endowing Saint-Martin-des-Champs with various lands and possessions, Henri and Anna kept the monastery under royal control.\textsuperscript{806} Evidently Anna continued this tradition of Capetian patronage when she re-founded the monastery of Saint-Vincent in Senlis sometime in the 1060s (before 1069) as a house of regular canons (as discussed further below). Like Saint-Martin-des-Champs, Saint-Vincent was located in a suburb of a royal city and was dependent for its privileges on Anna.\textsuperscript{807}

Anna’s patronage was praised by no less a person than Pope Nicholas II (r. 1059-1061) in a letter he sent in 1059 or 1060, though probably composed on his behalf by the monk and church reformer Peter Damian.\textsuperscript{808} Nicholas II’s letter was sent to Anna shortly before her husband’s death, suggesting that the pope had been informed that her husband was ill and that Anna was about to take a more active role in governing the kingdom during the minority of her son, Philippe. Since Henri I’s own relations with the popes were strained, this letter might have been sent to encourage Anna to support the papal reform program against simony and the royal appointment of bishops.\textsuperscript{809}

\textsuperscript{805} Yannick Veyrenche, “Quia vos estis qui sanctorum patrum vitam probabilem renovatis… Naissance des chanoines réguliers, jusqu’à Urbain II,” in Les chanoines réguliers. Émergence et expansion […], ed. Michel Parisse (Saint-Étienne: Publications de l’Université de Saint-Étienne, 2009), 32.

\textsuperscript{806} Hallam, Capetian France, 104; Lemarignier, Le gouvernement royal, 102. Pope Victor II (r. 1055-1057) apparently wanted to hold a second reforming council at Reims, encouraged by the support of Archbishop Gervais there, but did not do so for fear of King Henri, Bur, “Léon IX et la France,” 246.

\textsuperscript{807} Lemarignier, Le gouvernement royal, 102.


\textsuperscript{809} Pontal, Les conciles, 162; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev,” 309.
This interpretation is especially suggested by the figure of Abigail whom Damian presents to Anna as an example of a wise and pious woman to follow. If Abigail’s eloquence, writes Damian, saved her foolish (“stultus”) husband Nabal from King David’s anger (1 Samuel 25: 14-35), so much more will the influence of Anna’s “holy devotion” on her “most prudent husband” earn her merit.\(^{810}\) The letter also stresses the positive model of the Queen of Sheba as a woman who sought divine wisdom at Solomon’s court.\(^{811}\) The likening of Anna to the Queen of Sheba—an eastern queen who also made a long journey—is a particularly striking way to emphasize Anna’s eastern origins in positive terms. Nicholas II also presents to Anna the negative example of Michal, daughter of Saul, who mocked David for dancing before the Ark of the Covenant. In return, God punished Michal by depriving her of male children.\(^{812}\) Nicholas II contrasts Michal’s childlessness with Anna’s fertility, and counsels that Anna ought to instruct her children to follow the church’s teachings.\(^{813}\) It should be added that in no part of the papal letter—written several years after the events of 1054—is Anna’s upbringing in the eastern rite of the Byzantine church mentioned nor does it seem at all problematic in the images with which Nicholas flatters her as a pious queen.

After Henri’s death on 4 August 1060, Anna did not return to Rus’. Instead, she stayed in France and shared the regency for her eldest son Philippe I, now eight years old, with her brother-in-law, Count Baldwin V of Flanders (1067).\(^{814}\) Anna’s responsibility to care for her son bound her to

\(^{810}\) “Si enim eloquentia Abigail stultum Nabal ab irascentis David gladio servavit inlaesum, quanto magis sancta devotion tua prudentissimum virum tuum divinis reddet optutibus gratiosum?” “Petrus Damiani Epistolae, ed. Reinde, 226.

\(^{811}\) “Regina quippe Saba venit non videre divitias, sed audire sapientiam Salomonis, ” Ibid., 227. The Biblical story is told in 1 Kings 10:1-13 and in 2 Chronicles 9: 1-12.


\(^{813}\) “Tu, autem, gloriosa filia, quia fecunditatis donum divinitus meruisti, sic clarissimam instrue sobolem, ut inter ipsa lactantis infantiae rudimenta ad creatoris sui nutriatur amorem. Per te igitur discant cui potissimum debeat, et quod in regalis aulae solio sunt nobiles geniti, et quod in ecclesiae gremio longe nobilium per sancti spiritus gratiam sunt renati,” Ibid., 227.

\(^{814}\) For a detailed examination of Anna’s regency see Zajac, “Gloriosa,” 41-57, and Ward, “Maternal Power,” 435-453. Ward prefers to use the term “guardianship” rather than “regency” to describe Anna’s role during the minority of Philippe I, Ibid., 436. The term “regent” is used here in the sense of \textit{de facto} regent, since only in the fourteenth century were the queen’s powers of regency specified in French law, Félix Olivier-Martin, \textit{Les Régences et la Majorité des rois sous les Capétiens directs et les premiers Valois} (1060-1375) (Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1931),
her new land. Particularly from 1060 to 1061, that Anna was almost constantly at Philippe’s side. Helping to cement her son’s power in the first year after her husband’s death, she travelled with him throughout the Île-de-France and appears as co-actor, intercessor, corroborator, and head of the witness-list (in which she bore the title of queen) in eleven of thirteen extant royal charters from 1060 to 1061. Two examples of her royal patronage and exercise of royal justice during this time include, for instance, the donation of a manor to the royal abbey of Saint-Denis in 1060 and her intercession with her son to return a manor to the monks of Saint-Nicaise in Reims seized by Archbishop Gervais.

After 1062, Anna’s subscription to royal charters becomes rarer. In older historiography, this absence has been attributed to her “scandalous” second marriage to Count Raoul of Crépy and Valois in 1061 or 1062. Anna’s remarriage to Raoul could suggest that she remained to a certain degree a “foreigner” at the royal court. She may have felt the need to turn to a powerful local ally or protector since she was far from the support that her natal family could offer. This interpretation is suggested by the fact that, besides Anna, the only other Capetian widow in the tenth to eleventh centuries to re-marry was also a foreigner, Eadgifu (French: Ogive), the


Ibid., 440.

Anna’s donation to Saint-Denis in 1061 survives in a charter extant in the original: Paris, Archives nationales de France, K 20, n. 1. Her restoration of a manor to Saint-Nicaise survives from copies dating to the thirteenth century onward. For details see Zajac, “Gloriosa,” n. 75 and 79, 43 and 44.

Anna subscribes to one charter probably from 1063 which will be discussed at length below and three possibly from 1065. By the end of 1066 or early 1067, the regency ended as Philippe turned fourteen and attained his majority. Thereafter, she appears in one extant royal charter from 1067, one from sometime before 1069, one dated to 1075, and one dated sometime between 1060 and 1067, in addition to seigniorial charters issued as Countess of Valois, Zajac, “Gloriosa,” 61-63.

The precise date of Anna’s wedding to Raoul is not known but it must have been after the death of Pope Nicholas II on 27 July 1061; Fliche, Le règne de Philippe Ier, 20. For a complete list of sources on the marriage, see Zajac, “Gloriosa,” 46. Scholarly works which consider Anna’s remarriage as a great scandal are numerous. Some examples include Fliche, Le règne de Philippe Ier, 19; Louis Carolus-Barré, Le Comté de Valois jusqu’à l’avènement de Philippe de Valois au trône de France (X siècle-1328) (Châlons-en-Champagne: Paquez & Fils, 1998), 44; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev”, 313.

second wife of Charles III “the Simple”. After the death of her royal husband in 951, she also married a local nobleman, Herbert, the son of Herbert II of Vermandois. 821 Alternatively, Anna’s remarriage could indicate that she was well established in the upper social stratum of France and, now in her mid to late thirties, chose to remarry. Secondary literature previously has assumed that the marriage had a devastating effect on Anna’s status as queen, because Raoul was bigamous: Raoul’s second wife, Aliénor, whom he had married in 1053, was still alive. 822 It has been even suggested, based only on the testimony of the twelfth-century chronicle of Pseudo-Clarius, that Raoul was excommunicated for his remarriage with Anna. 823 Hugues of Fleury (d. circa 1130), by contrast, in his contemporary chronicle only states that “Anna, Henri’s widow, married Raoul, a noble and generous man.” 824

Recent scholarly reassessments have questioned the narrative established in secondary literature that Anna really was expelled from court following her second marriage and whether the excommunication of her husband took place. 825 No dated royal charter survives from the year 1062 or from the year 1064. 826 The editor of Philippe’s charters, Maurice Prou, lists only three royal charters for the year 1063: Anna’s subscription is missing from two of them, but, as Emily Ward highlights, this absence is hardly conclusive evidence of Anna’s political and social isolation. 827 Moreover, it is not always possible to establish the exact date when a charter was

---

821 Verdon, “Les veuves des rois,” 187-188. Louis Carolus-Barré notes that Adelaide, the widow of Louis the Fat, likewise remarried with a court noble after her husband’s death: in her case, it was Matthieu de Montmorency in 1137; Le Comté de Valois, 44.

822 Aliénor was a rich heiress to the lands of Montdidier and Péronne and a relative of the counts of Champagne, Fliche, Le règne de Philippe Ier, 19; Carolus-Barré, Le Comté de Valois, 44; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev”, 313.


824 “[...] Anna, Henrici relicta, nupsit Rodulfo comiti, viro nobili et generoso [...]” Hugonis liber qui modernuorum regeum francorum continent actus, ed. Georgius Waitz, MGH vol. 9, 389; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, PJ no. 32, 174; Luniak, Anna Ruska, 86-87; discussed in Musin, “Diaspora normande,” 204.


826 See the Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, 45-51.

issued during Philippe’s minority, and so it cannot be assumed categorically that Anna was banished from court following her second marriage in 1061/1062.  

One of three charters dated by Prou to 1063 (based on the date written on back of the charter in a later hand) indicates that by this year, both Anna and Raoul were once again at her son Philippe’s side. This document serves as a witness to both Anna’s acculturation to the culture of the French royal court and, at the same time, strong evidence that she continued to maintain ties with her native Rus’. In it, Anna’s signum appears in Cyrillic as ANA P’HNA (meaning roughly Anna regina, “Anna, queen”, Plate 6). The charter, issued by Philippe at the request of Bishop Hedon of Soissons, confirms the donation of the income from two shrines in Pernant and Colombes to Abbot Anse of Saint-Crépin-le-Grand in Soissons. The lord of the region was a vassal of Anna’s second husband, Count Raoul, and Raoul’s consent is noted in the charter along with that of Archbishop Gervais of Reims, Anna’s other son Robert, Count Baldwin, Bishop Hélinand of Laon, and unnamed others. Philippe and Anna are the only signatories. The charter seems to confirm that Raoul’s marriage to Anna was generally accepted by the royal court and local clergy. It is also significant that Anna continues to refer to herself as “queen” following her second marriage to Raoul, a title that she seems to have relinquished only after her

---

828 For a detailed description of the dating, contents, and all archival and printed editions of the charters issued during Anna’s co-regency, see Zajac, “Gloriosa,” 43-44 and 61.


830 Since the nineteenth century, the exact transcription of Anna’s signature is debated among linguists. The debate centers on phonetic reasons why she omitted the “g” in the Cyrillic “regina”, what is the exact phonetic value of the back yer (ъ) symbol, and whether Anna meant to write her title in Latin or Old French. See Andzrej and Danuta Poppe, ‘The Autograph of Anna of Rus’, Queen of France,” in Journal of Ukrainian Studies 33/34 (2008/2009): 401-406 and Zajac, “Gloriosa,” n. 103, 48-49 with further bibliography.

831 Soissons was under Raoul’s overlordship; Tomasini, Crépy-en-Valois: mille ans d’histoire, 21. Anna evidently patronized other churches and monasteries that formed part of her dominions as Countess of Valois. The obituary of the Soissons Cathedral records Anna’s death and the fact that she made a donation to repair the roof of the church; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev,” 320 citing J. Dufour, personal communication of a hitherto unpublished document. J. Dufour is since deceased and it has not been possible to find this document.

832 Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 16, 48; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, PJ no. 75, 196-197; discussed in Olivier-Martin, Les régences, 26.
son Philippe had married around 1072 and had a queen of his own.\textsuperscript{833} Her use of a Latin (or Old French) title to refer to her position suggests that she had indeed acculturated to the norms of the French court.

If Anna wrote the signature by her own hand, it indicates that, over a decade after her initial arrival in France, she had retained in her memory an excellent education obtained in Kyiv. Surviving Rus’ documents on birch-bark, whose earliest examples date from the mid-eleventh century, indicate that it was possible for lay women to be literate in Rus’, although these letters do not have the precision and symmetry of Anna’s carefully written signature on the 1063 document.\textsuperscript{834} Equally possible is that Anna maintained communication with her natal land after her marriage, or perhaps even that Rus’ members of her entourage remained with her in France after 1050/1051. Unfortunately, we have no further sources on who these members of her entourage could have been and whether or not they could have included literate clerics.

The other significant monument associated with Anna’s widowhood, but with no surviving charters signed by her, is her still-standing foundation or refoundation in Senlis, dedicated to Saint Vincent of Saragossa (d. 304).\textsuperscript{835} The city of Senlis was of special significance to the Capetians since it was here that the founder of the dynasty, Hugues the Great, Henri’s grandfather, had been elected king by the assembled magnates in 987.\textsuperscript{836} Only the adjoining territory of Crépy had been detached from the royal domain and had become part of the county of Valois, thus passing into the hands of Anna’s second husband, Count Raoul.\textsuperscript{837} It was a territory thus closely connected with Anna’s second marriage as well.

---

\textsuperscript{833} “S. Annę, matris Philippi regis,” \textit{Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier}, ed. Prou, no. 75, 191. On this charter see further below.


Anna’s refoundation, dating to around 1065, is known from two later confirmations by Philippe.\(^838\) The first is a late copy of Philippe I’s confirmation charter for Saint Vincent dating to 1069, which grants the same privileges to Saint Vincent as to three other royal churches: Saint-Frambourg de Senlis, as well as Saint-Martin and Saint-Geneviève close to Paris. In it, Philippe states that Anna made the foundation in memory of the soul of her first husband and for the salvation of her own soul.\(^839\) A second charter of Philippe I relating to Saint-Vincent de Senlis, made between 1072 and 1092, begins with a summary of the main terms of Anna’s original foundation charter.\(^840\)

Scholars have struggled to explain the Rus’-born Anna’s choice of a Spanish saint for her church. Roger Hallu suggested that her choice was due to the fact that Saint Vincent was the patron saint of winegrowers, and grape vines were in abundance at Senlis.\(^841\) A simple explanation for the choice of this patron saint may be that Anna probably restored a pre-existing church, which was already dedicated to Saint Vincent.\(^842\) Anna was familiar with Vincent’s cult, which had been established in France by the sixth century. Victor Saxer counts fifteen monasteries, eighty cities or villages, and four hundred parishes in France before the year 1000 that claimed to possess Vincent’s relics or which were named after this saint.\(^843\) Closest to Anna’s immediate environs, the Parisian abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, originally dedicated

---

\(^838\) Abbé Magne, superior of Saint-Vincent in the nineteenth century, gives the date of foundation as 29 October 1065, without indicating a source. He adds that the canons of Saint-Vincent celebrate yearly their foundation on October 29th. According to the same author, the first abbé of Saint Vincent was one Lietauld in 1065, *Ibid.*, note N, 123, no source given.


\(^841\) Hallu, *Anne de Kiev*, 87. Michael Walsh suggests that the association between St. Vincent and wine may have arisen “because of the similarity of the name Vincent with the French word for wine [vin],” *Butler’s Lives of Patron Saints*, ed. with additional material by Michael Walsh (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1987), 430.

\(^842\) There are no extant sources for Saint-Vincent of Senlis before 1065; nonetheless, Victor Saxer tentatively accepts that a church dedicated to this saint existed in this spot before the year 1000, since the cult of this saint was well established in the region of Paris by this time, *Saint Vincent diacre et martyr: Culte et légendes avant l’An Mil* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 2002), 42-43.

\(^843\) Places which possessed Saint Vincent’s relics include Paris, Poitou, Bessay, Orbigny, Conques, Mans, and Castres, *Ibid.*, 21. No data seems to be available on the original foundation date of the church in Senlis as Anna’s charter seems to be the first to mention its existence.
to Saint Vincent, claimed to possess a stole belonging to the Spanish saint, which King Childebert deposited there in 527. Anna was familiar with this Capetian royal veneration of Saint Vincent since, in 1061, Philippe and Anna’s donation of a manor to Saint-Germain-des-Prés was made to both dedicatees of the monastery, Saint Germain and Saint Vincent.

Unremarked by previous studies of Anna Yaroslavna, however, is the fact that in the eleventh-century Saint Vincent also was a universal saint, appearing (twice) in the synaxariôn (martyrology) of Constantinople, dating to the tenth or eleventh century, as well as in the eleventh-century Rus’ menologia (Slavonic: mesiatseslovy, saints’ Lives organized by month). Anna’s patronage of a house of regular canons dedicated to Saint Vincent could thus reflect both her Orthodox upbringing and the ecclesiastical environment of the French royal court. Although we are accustomed to give Saint Vincent of Saragossa “a western Christian” identity, he was also venerated among the “Orthodox” saints in eleventh-century Kyivan Rus’.

Furthermore, as Robert-Henri Bautier first indicated, in Anna’s foundation charter (as excerpted at the beginning of her son’s second charter dedicated to this community) Saint Vincent occupied only the fourth and last place in the church’s dedication to the “honour of the Holy Trinity and the pious Mother of God Mary and the Precursor of the Lord and the holy martyr Vincent.” Both Bautier and Vladimir Vodoff have argued that this formulation is more typical of the eastern church than the western. The naming of John the Baptist as the “Precursor of the Lord” (Preacursor Domini) is an eastern title, in Greek Prodromos. Can this inclusion of Orthodox theological formulations again suppose some sort of ongoing contact between Rus’ and France during Anna’s regency? Or could it have been written by a Rus’ cleric at the French court?

---

844 Hallu, “Histoire de Saint-Vincent,” 4; Saxer, Saint Vincent diacre et martyr, 34 and 37.
845 “[…] donavimus coenobio sancti Vincentii et sancti Germani quandam villam nostri juris nuncupatam Banniolis, sitam prope moenia Parisiacæ urbis […]”, Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 13, 41.
846 Saint Vincent has two feast days in the Constantinopolitan synaxariôn and likewise appears twice in Rus’ church calendars: under 22 January, as in the West, but also under 11 November together with Saints Victor and Menas; de Lacger, “Saint Vincent de Saragosse”, 309 with further citations, Loseva, Russkie mesiatseslovy, 99-200 (11 November) and 254 (22 January) with numerous manuscript examples.
848 Ibid., 561; Vodoff, Naissance, 249.
After Anna’s last extant subscription to a charter of 1075, she disappears from the records. Based on the fact that Philippe I issued a charter in memory of his parents in 1079 (making the church of Saint-Martin-des-Champs dependent on Cluny), Anna is believed to have died on 5 September, between 1075 and 1079. According to Abbé Magne, Anna’s memory was also preserved in her foundation at Senlis where the Abbey of Saint-Vincent celebrated an annual obit (memorial service) for her on 5 September until the French Revolution. Magne also writes that, after the Mass, dinner was given to three poor widows, suggesting a memorialization of Anna as a pious widow. Her Orthodox origins do not seem to have affected the memory of her reign as queen in France, which were still actively commemorated well into the eighteenth century.

Her current burial place remains unknown. She was buried neither beside her first husband, Henri I, in the royal necropolis of Saint-Denis nor beside her second husband, in the Benedictine monastic church of Saint-Arnoul de Crépy, located within the grounds of the castle of Crépy and serving as the necropolis of his family of counts. One medieval chronicle, the early twelfth-

850 Blois, Archives départementales du Loir-et-Cher, fonds de Pontlevoy, 17 H 1, no. 2; Rostoff, Recueil, no. 16, 37-41; Saint-Aymour, Anne de Russie, no. 20, 110; Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 75, 188-191; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, 102 and 113; PJ no. 55, 188.
851 “Facio autem hanc donationem pro remissione peccatorum meorum et genitoris gentricisque meę et omnium regum Francorum, antecessorum meorum […]”; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Lat. 10977, fol. 1r; Cartulaire générale de Paris: collections de documents, ed. Robert de Lasteyrie, vol. 1 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1887), no. 102, 130; Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 95, 247; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, 115; Luniak, Anna Ruska, 60 and 88.
853 “Fidèles à la reconnaissance, les chanoines de Saint-Vincent célébrèrent tous les ans, jusqu’à leur suppression, ‘un obit solennel’ au jour du décès de la reine Anne, qui est le lendemain de l’octave de la solennité de Saint-Augustin. Après la mess, ils donnaient à dîner à trois pauvres femmes veuves”, Abbé Magne, Abbaye royale de St. Vincent, no. 1, 10.
854 On the purported tomb of Anna “discovered” in the seventeenth century in France see also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” nos. 9-10.
855 Written references to the tombs of Anna’s two husbands make no mention of her burial alongside them: “[...] defunctus est rex sepedictus Henricus, et apud Sanctum Dyonisium tumulatus [...];” Hugues of Fleury, Liber qui modernorum regum Francorum continent actus, ed. Waizt, MGH vol. 9, 389; “[...] sepultusque est juxta patrem suum in Basilica S. Dionysii [...];”, Ex Abbreviatione Gestionem Franciae Regum in RHGF, vol. 11, 213b: “Ipse vero sequenti anno obiit; quique apud Dionysium est delatus, ibique tumulatus...”; Ex Historia Regum Francorum, RHGF, vol. 11, 319d. When Raoul’s son Simon transferred his father’s remains from the church of Montdidier into the monastery of Saint-Arnoul de Crépy in 1077, he buried his father next to his own mother, Adela: “...hoc anno parentis exuviar…Crispiacum in ecclesiam beati Arnulfi transulit, monasterio insignem, ubi illud as uxorem ejus, Simonis matrem sepeli...”; Rostoff, Recueil, no. 17, 41-42. King Philippe confirmed Simon’s donation of land to
century *Historia Franciae*, states that Anna Yaroslavna returned alone to Rus’ sometime after the death of her second husband, Raoul, in 1074.\textsuperscript{856} As the comparative example of Anna’s niece, Eupraxia Vsevolodna, indicates (discussed below), this outcome is not outside the realm of possibility. It would explain why Anna’s tomb has never been discovered and also why there is no tradition of her tomb at Senlis. On the other hand, as Wladimir Bogomoletz puts it, “[…]
after having spent about twenty-five years in France, first as queen regnant and then as queen mother, with two living sons […] why should an aging Anna undertake such a long and hazardous journey […]?”\textsuperscript{857}

An equally possible outcome was that, some time after her son Philippe’s marriage to Berthe of Holland in 1072 (she was repudiated in 1092) and her second widowhood, Anna spent the rest of her life in quiet retirement.\textsuperscript{858} Marion Facinger and other historians presume that Anna had dower lands, although the first explicit source reference to a queen of France possessing such lands dates only to 1193.\textsuperscript{859} The idea that Anna “retired” from her position at court following her eldest son’s marriage is based upon Anna’s last surviving endorsement, dating to 1075 and extant in the original, in which Philippe confirms the earlier foundation of the monastery of

\begin{flushright}
856 “Rege defuncto, Regina Anna Rodulfum Comitem in conjugio accepit. Quo mortuo, nativum repetit solum,” Excerptum Historiae Francicae [sic] in RHGF, vol. 11, 161; Luniak, Anna Ruska, 82.


858 The exact date of Philippe and Berthe’s marriage is not known; but it took place a few years after Philippe reached the age of majority in 1067, and likely after Philippe’s war with Berthe’s step-father, Robert of Flanders in 1071. The marriage of Berthe and Philippe probably helped to cement peace between the two parties in 1072, Fliche, *Le règne de Philippe ler*, 36-37.

859 The first clear reference to a queen’s dower in French royal charters occurs in 1193, in a charter of Philippe Augustus granting land to his estranged Queen, Ingeborg of Denmark; Facinger, “A Study of Medieval Queenship”: 20. The suggestion that Anna had dower land in Senlis is made in Magne, *Abbaye royale de St. Vincent*, 3-4 and Facinger, “A Study of Queenship”: 22.
Pontlevoy by Gelduin de Saumur and his family in 1035.\footnote{Blois, Archives départementales du Loir-et-Cher, fonds de Pontlevoy, 17 H 1, no. 2; Rostoff, Recueil, no. 16, 37-41; Saint-Aymour, Anne de Russie, no. 20, 110; Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 75, 188-191; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, 102 and 113, PJ no. 55, 188.} Anna’s title in the witness-list is now no longer “queen”, but rather only “Anna, mother of the king.”\footnote{“S. Annę, matris Philippi regis,” Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, no. 75, 191; Hallu, Anne de Kiev, PJ no. 55, 188; Luniak, Anna Ruska, 88.}

In sum, Anna spent the first few years of her widowhood actively participating in the governance of the kingdom, in both temporal and especially spiritual matters in which she acted together with powerful secular nobles and high-ranking bishops in the Île-de-France. Nonetheless, her speedy second marriage suggests that her status as a foreign queen might have left her vulnerable at least to a certain degree and in need of a male protector. Most of her subscriptions and issuing of charters are in favour of Benedictine monasteries and houses of regular canons, foremost among the latter her own foundation of Saint-Vincent de Senlis. The canons of this house as well as later chronicles remembered her primarily for her role in building this church. Her memory was also kept alive in other monasteries in France, where her son ensured that monks would continue to pray for her. At the same time, however, the memory of her burial-place was not preserved, and one chronicler considered that she had returned to Rus’. While Anna’s charters as a whole show her immersion in the “local” western church, possible Orthodox formulas in her charter for Saint-Vincent as well as the important evidence of her Cyrillic signature suggest continuing contact with the Orthodox culture of Rus’.

Anastasia Yaroslavna (d. after 1090)

The next case study focuses on Anastasia Yaroslavna, one of Anna Yaroslavna’s sisters, who married King András I of Hungary (r. 1046-1061). As is typical, Anastasia’s birth-date is not recorded in any Rus’ source. Even the fact that she was called “Anastasia” is somewhat doubtful, as it is only recorded in Jan Długosz’s fifteenth-century Latin chronicle.\footnote{Anastasia’s name is known only from Długosz’s entry for the year 1049: “Acceptit autem prefatus Andreas rex principis Russie filiam nomine Anastasiam, ex qua nati sunt ei duo filii, videlicet Salomon et Daud,” Ioannis Długosii Annales, sub anno 1049, 61.} Presumably this was the princess’ baptismal name, since “Anastasia” is the name of a first-century Greek saint, but
we do not know what her secular (Slavic) name could have been. Based on the approximately date of her wedding to András I around 1039-1046 and assuming also, that eldest daughters were married off in Rus’ before younger daughters, older scholarship has considered Anastasia to be Yaroslav’s middle daughter: younger than Elizabeth who married Harald Hardrada around 1044, but older than Anna who married Henri of France in 1051. According to a more recent genealogical reconstruction, however, based on the birth dates of her sons between 1052 and 1055, Anastasia was married in 1050, around the same time as Anna, and, therefore, it is not possible to establish which sister was the elder. Anastasia’s life exemplifies the intensity of Orthodox / Catholic interchange that occurred in the contact zone of Hungary, part of “New Europe,” which made it easier for her to maintain ties to her natal land.

Although several scholars have asserted that “Anastasia” Yaroslavna was renamed “Agmunda” upon her marriage to King András, there is no basis to this assertion. In the early 1900s, Mór Wertner had already shown that Anastasia was first mistakenly called “Agmunda” by Antonio Bonfini (1427/1434-1502), Florentine historian to the court of Hungarian King Matthias Corvinus (r. 1458-1490), in his Decades Rerum Ungarica Decades written around 1490-1496/7. Bonfini’s history was a “modern” reworking of medieval chronicles and the Italian historian did not hesitate to paraphrase, rather than transcribe carefully, as well as to “correct” the Latin of his sources. Despite these errors, Bonfini’s Hungarian history was widely

---


866 Examples of scholars who call “Anastasia” by the name of “Agmunda” include Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 52; Shternberg, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna”: 181, and most recently, A. V. Nazarenko, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna,” in DRSM, 25.

circulated due to the fact that it became available in German translation in 1545. Bonfini’s mistake derived from the last known place where Anastasia lived, the Benedictine Styrian monastery of Admont (in Latin: “Agmund”), discussed below, which the Italian historian turned into the Queen’s personal name (“Agmonda”/“Agmunda”). Evidence of cultural contact between Rus’, Hungary, and Byzantium during Anastasia’s reign, however, suggests that, on the contrary, it is unlikely that she would have been renamed upon her arrival in Hungary. In fact, her reign exemplifies a period of time in which the Hungarian court was particularly open to influences of eastern-rite Christianity, despite the presence of Latin bishops and monks.

Part of the openness of the Hungarian court to eastern-rite forms of Christianity may be ascribed to the recent presence of Christianity itself in eleventh-century Hungary. Despite the foundation of Latin church institutions in Hungary by the royal family around the turn of the first millennium, some members of the Hungarian elite had already converted to Byzantine Christianity in the 950s. A Greek diocese dependant upon Constantinople may have existed in Hungary as late as the twelfth century, although this point is controversial in historiography. While the existence of this Greek diocese is debated, confirmation of the continued presence of Orthodox Christianity in late tenth/early eleventh century Hungary can be found in a Greek charter issued by King István I in circa 1001 which founded a female monastery in Veszprémvölgy dedicated to the Theotokos, perhaps for an Orthodox female member of his household (his mother Sarolt, his sister, or his daughter-in-law). The charter is known from its confirmation by King Kálmán in 1109, suggesting that scribes at the Hungarian royal court a

869 Keene, Saint Margaret, 20.
century later were still capable of writing in Greek. Although the western rite therefore was the dominant form of Christianity in Hungary, Anastasia might also have encountered there the Greek rite familiar to her from her childhood.

Her husband King András was personally acquainted with both the East Slavic language and with Orthodoxy, having spent about ten years as an exile in Kyiv prior to his return to Hungary. The death of King István I of Hungary in 1038 had not only triggered a succession crisis but also a pagan rebellion. According to late Hungarian Latin chronicles dating to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, three of King István I’s cousins and potential successors, the brothers András, Béla, and Levente, were obliged to flee the country shortly thereafter in fear of their lives. András and Levente arrived as exiles in Rus’, while Béla stayed behind in Poland where he married a daughter of King Mieszko II. On the eve of Anastasia’s marriage to András I, therefore, the roots of Christianity in medieval Hungary were still fragile, and the differences between Christians and “pagans” must have been greater than the differences between Christians of different rites.

Important for assessing Anastasia’s ongoing contact with Orthodoxy after her marriage is the claim in secondary literature that her husband was baptized during his exile in Kyiv as an Orthodox Christian. This assertion is not directly stated by any medieval source, but often

872 Komjáthy notes that the Greek charter for Veszprémvölgy was verified by Bishop Simon of Pécs, who was also sent as King Kálmán’s emissary to the court of King Roger I of Sicily due to this Greek knowledge, Ibid., 369, Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima, vol. 1, ed. Gyöffy, 366.

873 Simon of Kéza, Gesta Hungarorum, eds. Veszprémy and Schauer, n. 1, 104.

874 Vazul or Basil, András, Béla, and Levente’s uncle (or, according to some sources, father), was the oldest male relative of the House of Árpád and hence had a claim to the throne on the principle of seniority. He was blinded by unknown parties to eliminate the possibility of his election or, according to some sources, because he had tried to take power from István I, Legenda s. Gerhardi Episcopi, ed. Emericus Madzsar in SRH, vol. 2, 501; Simon of Kéza, Gesta Hungarorum, 105 and 107; Chronicon Rhythmicum, ed. Domanovszky, 262; Chronicon Knauzianum et Chronica Minora Eidem Coniuncta, ed. Emma Bartoniek in SRH, vol. 2, 330; The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle/Chronica de gestis Hungarorum, ed. Dezső Dercsényi, essays by Dezső Dercsényi et al., Latin text trans. Alick West (Budapest: Corvina Press; New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1969), 107.

appears in secondary literature without any citation or explanation.\textsuperscript{876} It seems based on two main lines of reasoning. First, onomastic evidence is used as a confirmation of the fact that András I received his baptismal name in Kyiv: the king’s name “András” is supposed to have come from the Slavic form “Andrei” in reference to the Apostle Saint Andrew, who, according to a legend inserted into \textit{Primary Chronicle}, written in Kyiv in the twelfth century, travelled to the future site of the city of Kyiv and foretold its coming greatness.\textsuperscript{877} Second, and more convincingly, Hungarian chronicles state that András’ brother Levente returned to Hungary from Rus’ as a pagan, from which the assumption is made that András also must have originally been a pagan, though, unlike his brother, he would have undergone baptism in Rus’.\textsuperscript{878}

Although no primary source attests therefore that András was baptized while staying in Kyiv from approximately 1038 to 1046, he presumably participated in the Orthodox services of Yaroslav the Wise’s court during his stay there. In 1046, he returned to Hungary and defeated Peter Orseolo (r. 1038-1041, 1044-1046), the nephew of King István I whose rule of Hungary was supported by Emperor Heinrich III.\textsuperscript{879} If András was previously married, his first wife died shortly after his return and Anastasia joined him by about 1050.\textsuperscript{880} There is no direct indication, however, that András continued to participate in eastern-rite liturgies after his return to Hungary.

\textsuperscript{876} András’ baptism in Kyiv is stated as a fact without further citation or explanation in the influential study of Obolensky, \textit{Byzantine Commonwealth}, 159.


\textsuperscript{879} \begin{flushright} \textit{Anonymi Gesta Hungarorum}, eds. and trans. Rady and Veszprémy, 44-45. \end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{880} de Vajay, “Még egy Királynénk...?” 18.
Instead, he proceeded to re-establish the Latin church hierarchy “according to the statutes of Saint István [I]” in the words of two later fourteenth-century narrative accounts.  

Anastasia was probably crowned queen upon her arrival in Hungary in a western-rite liturgy. Details about coronation of Hungarian queens only survive in sources dating from the fourteenth century onward; however, the eleventh-century Greater Legend of Saint István (Legenda Maior) records that King István’s wife Gisella (d. 1060) was crowned and anointed around 996-1000, and there is no reason to suppose that other Hungarian queens were not also crowned.

Few primary sources survive from András’ and Anastasia’s reign. Fragmentary evidence nonetheless suggests that even though András restored the Latin church hierarchy upon his return to Hungary in 1046, he also continued to maintain diplomatic and cultural relations with both Byzantium and Rus’. Such a flexible attitude toward eastern-rite Christianity is characteristic of the lands of “New Europe” and could have made it easier for Anastasia to adapt to the religious-cultural life of the Hungarian court. Material evidence of these links can be found in the fragments of the so-called “Monomachos crown” (Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum), which might have been a crown belonging to Anastasia herself as Queen of Hungary.

The “Monomachos crown” consists of seven detached enamel plaques, including three that depict the Byzantine emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042-1055), his wife Empress Zoë (d. 1050) and her sister Theodora, and consequently dated to 1042-1050 when all three ruled, a period coinciding with the beginning of András’ reign.  

Because these plaques were

---


883 The other plaques of the “Monomachos crown” depict Saints Peter and Andrew, as well as allegorical female figures of Truth and Humility, depicted as courtly ladies, and two female dancers, Klaus Wessel, Byzantine Enamels
discovered loose, several reconstructions of how they were linked together are possible. For
instance, the enamel plaques might have made up a belt rather than a crown.\textsuperscript{884} The fact that the
enamel plaques are topped by rounded arches and have small holes enabling them to be fitted
onto leather or cloth, however, suggests that the most likely reconstruction is that these plaques
originally made up a man’s crown or a woman’s diadem.\textsuperscript{885}

It is probable that either András or Anastasia herself received these plaques as a diplomatic gift
from Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos.\textsuperscript{886} Anastasia had affinal ties to the
Constantinopolitan court through her brother Prince Vsevolod Yaroslavich (d.1093) who was
married to a Byzantine princess, a relative of Emperor Constantine Monomachos.\textsuperscript{887} In accepting
the “Monomachos crown” as a diplomatic gift from Constantine IX Monomachos, András and / or Anastasia tacitly acknowledged the Byzantine emperor’s authority over them since, in Klaus
Wessel’s blunt words, “anyone who wore the Emperor’s picture was regarded as being his
servant.”\textsuperscript{888} Since the sixth century, the emperor’s image served as a stand-in for the emperor
himself and wearing his image indicated a person’s loyalty to him.\textsuperscript{889} Consequently, the
“Monomachos crown” may have served as a permanent reminder of András and Anastasia’s
allegiance to the Byzantine court.\textsuperscript{890}

\textit{from the 5\textsuperscript{th} to the 13\textsuperscript{th} Century} (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1969), 9 and 96-104; Henry Maguire, “The Secular

\textsuperscript{884} \textit{Ibid.}, n. 19, 627.

\textsuperscript{885} For a detailed description of the placement of the holes in the “Monomachos Crown” and a discussion with comparative examples of such crowns see Maguire, “Secular World,” 210.


\textsuperscript{887} The marriage of Vsevolod to a Byzantine princess was concluded to bring peace after the last (failed)


\textsuperscript{889} \textit{Ibid.}, 617.

\textsuperscript{890} \textit{Ibid.}, 615-617.
Moreover, the existence of a Greek charter dating to Anno Mundi 6562 (1053/1054) issued in Calabria by one Cyril, an imperial official in charge of a corps of Hungarian soldiers (“spatharokandidatos kai domestikos tis paratagis tôn Hougron [sic]”), suggests that King András sent troops to maintain the Byzantine presence in southern Italy.891 The active diplomatic and cultural ties with Byzantium fostered at the royal Hungarian court in the reign of András I suggest therefore that, following her marriage around 1046-1050, Anastasia must not have experienced a disruptive change from an “Orthodox” to a “Catholic” religious environment necessitating her acculturation to the latter, but rather lived in a cosmopolitan court where messengers, soldiers, and clerics criss-crossed the boundaries between the courts of Hungary, Kyiv, and Constantinople.

The Hungarian court of the eleventh century was also multi-lingual and multi-ethnic and Anastasia would have encountered there other Slavic speakers. Evidence suggests for instance that the court also included the presence of Rus’ Varangian mercenaries, who served as part of the king’s royal guard.892 “Orosz” in Old Hungarian means both a person from Rus’ as well as “the porter of the king, shield-bearer, body guard.”893 Anastasia’s subjects also included Slavs who were already living in the Carpathian basin prior to the Hungarian migrations; Nora Berend even suggests that Slavs “may well have formed a majority of the population” of eleventh-century Hungary.894 The realm over which Anastasia ruled as queen, therefore, was definitely not a monocultural or monolingual environment, but rather one that might have offered some continuity with her place of birth.

The earliest surviving Hungarian chronicle, the anonymous Gesta Hungarorum (circa 1200), suggests that Anastasia was able to maintain contact with her birth family after marriage, given


893 Gyöffy, King Saint Stephen, 168.

that she enjoyed living on the royal estate close to Rus’. This chronicle claims that King András I took for himself this land “beside the Danube at the confluence of the Váh River […] from the nobles there […]” first, because it was suitable to kings for hunting; secondly, because his wife liked to dwell in those parts because they were closer to her native soil, as she was the daughter of the prince of the Rus’[…]” Attila Zsoldos identifies this region as the county of Zemplín (present-day Slovakia, Hungarian: Zemplén). According to thirteenth-century charters, most Hungarian queens owned lands “in medium regni,” namely in Székesfehérvár, Buda, and Esztergom. But if the story of the *Gesta Hungarorum* is to be believed, Anastasia preferred to live where she could be closer to her family in order to be closer to her family, a fact that has relatively received little scholarly attention.

Although as queen, Anastasia maintained ties to Rus’ and Byzantium, the recurrent claim in secondary literature that she founded “a number of Orthodox monasteries” in Hungary requires revisiting. The monasteries at Tihany and Visegrád are almost always cited as among her foundations, although no primary source evidence is provided for these claims. Despite the often-repeated claim in secondary literature linking Anastasia with these monasteries, no concrete medieval written source documents Anastasia’s involvement in their foundation. The evidence connecting her with Tihany is ambiguous at best and will be examined first.

The foundation of the monastery of Tihany in 1055 on a peninsula jutting into the north-east shore of Lake Balaton and its dedication to the Virgin Mary and to Saint Aignan are known first and foremost from its foundation charter. It is the oldest extant Hungarian royal charter and one

---

895 “[…] terram magnam iuxtra Danubium, ubi fluvius Wag descendit […] Attamen rex Andreas de posteris Ketel canbivit illum locum duabus de causis, unum quia utilis regibus erat ad venationes, secundum quia diligebat partes illas habitare uxor suo eo, quod proprius ad natale solum esset, quia erat filia ducis Ruthenorum […],” *Anonymi Gesta Hungarorum*, eds and trans. Rady and Veszprémy, 42-45. The original landowner, “Ketel,” referred to in this passage is a legendary figure from the time of the Hungarian conquest.


897 Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 31 with further literature.


899 One work ascribing the foundations of Tihany and Visegrád to Anastasia is Pashuto, *Vnesniaia politika*, 52.
of the oldest documents to preserve traces of the Hungarian vernacular (Panonhalma, ArchAbbey Archives, Tihany, fasc. 1, n.2). This Latin charter, however, names only King András as its founder, not Anastasia. Yet several scholars have claimed that Tihany was an Orthodox monastery of Greek or Rus’ monks introduced to Hungary by Anastasia. The foundation charter for Tihany, however, does not mention monks from Byzantium or Rus’. Anastasia does not appear in the witness-list or as an intercessor. It is not possible that later tradition omitted her participation given that we possess the charter in its original.

In fact, the only possible indication of Tihany’s connections with Rus’ appears in a mysterious property, “Petra” (Greek: “stone”), listed among the possessions given to Tihany in its 1055 foundation charter: “At the same lake [Balaton] there is a place called Petra that belongs here with others.” According to some scholars, based on nomenclature alone, the Greek toponym “Petra” could refer to a community of Greek-speaking eremitical monks who lived in the caves of Óvár on the north-west side of the peninsula, approximately two and a half kilometers from the monastery of Tihany. Archeological excavations have confirmed the presence of hermits’...
cells at this site. Since “Petra” is listed as belonging to Tihany’s possessions at the time of the latter’s founding in 1055, then the hermit-caves must have existed earlier; perhaps around 1050 at the beginning of András I’s reign. Other examples can be found in Europe of cenobitic monasteries that grew up in the eleventh and twelfth centuries around previously established individual hermits or hermitages. Investigation of the exact presence and religious confession of these hermits is limited, however, by the fact that they have not left behind any written documents.

After its initial mention in the 1055 charter, the toponym “Petra” disappears from the documentary sources. Several scholars plausibly suggest that this is due to the fact that the place-name “Petra” is referred to in subsequent charters by what seems to be its Hungarian vernacular synonym (first extant in a charter of King Béla III from 1184): “Oroszkő” (Latin: Urcuta), meaning the “Russian” or the “Rus’” stone (“kő”= stone, petra). As mentioned above, the word “Orosz” also could refer to a mercenary or member of the princely retinue. For this reason, archaeologist József Csemegi took the place-name “Oroszkő” to be a reference to a Rus’ soldier in Anastasia’s entourage, whom he considers as the founder of the eremitical community. While this hypothesis is intriguing for its suggested connection between the

---


907 For examples of various cenobitic communities that sprang up around an individual hermit or small groups of hermits see Giles Constable, “Eremitical Forms of Monastic Life” in idem, Monks, Hermits and Crusaders in Medieval Europe (London: Variorum Reprint, 1988), V 252-254.

908 Miladinov, Margins of Solitude, 159.

909 “Notum igitur sit…quod regnante illustri Hungarorum rege Bела…quosdam de villa, que vulgo Vrcuta dicitur, sevos scilicet ecclesię sancti Aniani que est in monte Tychon sita, ab eiusdem ecclesię servicio subtrahere et honeri sue servitutis subponere conati”; A tihany apátság törvénet, ed. Erdélyi, nr. 6, 501; Csemegi, “A tihanyi barlanglakások,” 406, Schternberg, “Anastasia Yaroslavna,” 183; Deed of Foundation of Tihany Abbey, ed. Érszegi, 4, Buzás and Eszes, “XI. századi görög monostor”, n. 8, 2; Komjáthy, “Quelques problèmes concernant Tihany”, 19-20.

eremitical community near Tihany and Rus’ established as a consequence of Queen Anastasia’s reign, it cannot be corroborated without further evidence.

The sources and secondary literature on the relationship between the eremitic community at Petra/Oroszkő and the cenobitic monastery of Tihany have been convincingly reviewed in a recent study by Marina Miladinov (2008). One possibility is that the hermits living in the caves were also western-rite monks like their neighbours in the coenobitic monastery of Tihany: the caves could have served as places where individual monks from the community could go for permanent or temporary retreats “into the desert” to attempt more difficult spiritual struggles. The other possibility is that the caves could have housed eastern-rite monks, either Greeks or Slavs, who lived side-by-side with western-rite monks in the nearby Latin monastery of Tihany. Such bi-ritual arrangements may have existed, for example, in the monastery of Saints Alexius and Boniface in Rome (founded in 977), from which missionaries had departed to “New” Europe in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The geological features of the caves at Óvár resemble similar caves used as monastic cells of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves and on Mount Athos, which thus may have served as models of sanctity that András and Anastasia wished to introduce to newly (re)Christianized Hungary.

According to the “Greater Legend” (Legenda Maior) of András’s contemporary, Bishop Gellért (Hungarian: Gerard; martyred in 1046), King András I also built a monastery “near” Visegrád.

---

911 For examples of monks in community who lived an eremitic life as a temporary spiritual retreat see Constable, “Eremitical Forms,” 254-261.
912 Important tenth-century missionaries to Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia stayed at the Roman monastery of Saints Alexius and Boniface, namely Wojciech (Czech: Vojtech; German: Adalbert), his half-brother Radim Gaudentius, and Bruno of Querfurt. Wojciech ended up martyred by Prussians, while his brother Radim Gaudentius became the first bishop of Gniewo in the year 1000. Bruno of Querfurt visited Esztergom in 1004, and then Kyiv and preached to the steppe nomads; Csemegi, “A tihanyi barlanglakások”, 407; Komjáthy, “Quelques problèmes concernant Tihany,” 22; Walter K. Hanak, “Saint Procopius, the Sázava Monastery, and the Byzantine-Slavonic Legacy: Some Reconsiderations,” in Byzantium and East Central Europe, eds. Günter Prinzing and Maciej Salamon with the assistance of Paul Stephenson (Kraków: “Historia Iagellonica”, Jagiellonian University, 2001), 78. Miladinov surveys the scholarly literature on the monastery of Saint Alexius and Boniface in Margins of Solitude, 37-38 and n. 592, 162.
914 “Ipse enim rex [Endre], pietate valde Christianus, duo monasteria construxit, Tychonium et iuxta Visegrad,” Legenda S. Gerhardi Episcopi, ed. Madzsar, 503. The Legenda Maior of Bishop Gellért dates to the fourteenth
This monastery was located in the diocese of Veszprém, which may have had particular significance for Anastasia since it was the bishop of Veszprém who had the privilege of crowning Hungarian queens.  

Archaeological excavations of 2001 and 2003 confirmed earlier findings of the presence of an eleventh-century coenobitic monastery at Visegrád located near the royal castle as well as a series of caves. These caves, located in the village of Zebegény, once again contained hermits’ cells. Not only does this arrangement of a cave containing hermit cells near a coenobitic monastery parallel the lay-out of Tihany, but the arrangement is also similar to the architecture of the Caves Monastery in Kyiv and to monasteries on Mount Athos. Some scholars have used the Slavic etymology of Visegrád (“high castle”) to argue for the presence of Slavic monks here, supposedly brought to the area by Anastasia.

Besides Bishop Gellért’s Legend, the only written source for Visegrád, however, is a bull of Pope Honorius III (r. 1216-1227) from April 21st 1221, which refers to the presence there of “Greek monks from ancient times” (“Graecos habet monachos, et habuit ab antiquo”). The bull was written in response to a request from the archbishop of Esztergom, the abbot of Pilis, and King András II (r. 1205-1235) to turn the Greek monastery, where few monks remained, into

---

917 Csemegi, “A tihanyi barlanglakások,” 406; Miladinov, Margins of Solitude, 158.
one of the Latin rite. Some scholars have interpreted the words “Greek monks” (Graeci monachi) in this letter to mean ethnically Greek monks while the majority of scholars suggest that it simply means monks following the Greek rite (who could be ethnically Slavic) in contrast to the Latini monachi, monks following the Latin rite. Followers of the Greek rite could therefore have included Slavic monks who hypothetically could have come from Anastasia’s entourage, but, once again, the certainty of this assertion has often been over-stated in secondary literature.

Nonetheless, Anastasia lived in the cultural milieu of “New Europe” in which confessional lines had not yet hardened nor had the Hungarian court adopted a uniform “Latin Christian” identity to the point of rejecting Slavonic traditions of Christianity. In 1055, according to the oldest native Czech chronicle, the work of Cosmas, a canon of Prague Cathedral (d. 1125), the Czech Duke Vratislav II (d. 1175) fled to the Hungarian court fearing that his brother, Duke Spytihněv II (r. 1055-1061), wanted to kill him. Cosmas adds that King András welcomed the exiled Czech nobleman to his court and even gave him his daughter Adelheid (Anastasia’s daughter or step-daughter) in marriage. Vratislav II was joined in his Hungarian exile by Slavic monks from the monastery of Sázava near Prague, whom Spytihněv II had expelled from the kingdom and replaced with German Benedictines. Some scholars have suggested that these monks came to

924 “Forte fuit huic regi [Andree] unica gnata [variant: nata] nomine Adleyta, iam thoro maritari tempestiva, valde formosa […] Hanc hospes ut vidit misere adamavit, quod rex bonus non recusavit, atque post dies matrimonio sibi eam copuvalit”, Cosmae Pragensis chronica Boerorum, ed. Bretholz, 107. Scholars disagree on whether or not Adelheid was Anastasia’s daughter or, as her German name suggests, the daughter of King András I and an otherwise unknown German woman. See also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 8.
925 Gründung des Klosters Sazawa, ed. Bertold Bretholz in MGH N. S, vol. 2, 247-248; Vita Procopii antiqua, in Středovĕké legendy prokopské. Jejich historický rozbor a texty, ed. Václav Chaloupecký with a critical apparatus by Bohumil Ryba (Prague: Nakladatelství Ceskoslovenské akademie věd, 1953), ed. Chaloupecký, 118. According to its twelfth-century anonymous chronicle as well as hagiographical sources, Sázava had been founded in the 1030s by the hermit Procopius (d. 1053, canonized in 1203/1204). The chronicle and his vitae state that Procopius was learned in Old Church Slavonic, leading to the hypothesis that Sázava was a centre of Old Church Slavonic literature and/or liturgy, although this view has come under recent criticism, Hanak, “Saint Procopius,” 72; David Kalhous,
Visegrád upon their exile. The sources, however, do not specify that the monks came to Visegrád in particular, but only that they went to Hungary in general (“in terram Hunorum”). The presence of exiled Slavic monks at the Hungarian court cannot be used therefore to argue that a Slavic presence was established by Anastasia in Visegrád, although it certainly indicates that the Hungarian court was welcoming to monks whose liturgies were sung in Old Church Slavonic, as well as in Latin.

We also know, however, that the monks of Sázava established their own direct ties to Rus’, although Anastasia’s mediation in this matter cannot be proven. Following the monks return to Sázava in the 1070s as a consequence of Duke Vratislav II’s restoration to power, their abbot Božetěch built a new church in which he placed, among other relics, those of the Rus’ princely martyr Saint Gleb and “his companion” (probably Gleb’s brother Boris or his Hungarian servant who was killed with him in 1015 during the succession struggle for the Kyivan throne). The installation of the relics could certainly have resulted from other Bohemian-Rus’ ties unconnected to Anastasia, of course, but the timing of the installation is intriguing, especially given that, as mentioned above, Anastasia’s daughter/step-daughter Adelheid was married to Vratislav II. Anastasia’s brothers had transferred the relics of their princely ancestors Boris and Gleb into a new stone church in 1072, and the exhumation might have provided a suitable occasion for “exporting” part of these relics to Bohemia. Even if these contemporary

---

926 Pashuto claims that the exiled Bohemian monks were received by Anastasia upon their arrival in Hungary, Vnesniaia politika, 52; followed by Shternberg, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna,” 183. There is no primary source to directly support this assertion, however, and it seems to rest on the assumption that Anastasia, as a Rus’ princess, would “naturally” support Slavic monks.
exchanges between Rus’ and Bohemia cannot be tied directly to Anastasia, they suggest that she lived at a time and place where there was still no uniform “Latin Christian” identity set in opposition to her Orthodox homeland.

Moreover, the monasteries at Tihany and Visegrád were founded by her husband András in the aftermath of a pagan rebellion and thus played an important role in re-establishing Christianity in the Hungarian kingdom. If Slavic monks were among those who lived in the caves near these monasteries, then Rus’ monks could have helped in rebuilding Christian institutions in Hungary. 930 All in all, it is certain that, in these areas of “New Europe,” the differences between paganism and Christianity were far more important than differences in rite. Indeed, as Catherine Keene notes, regarding Visegrád and Tihany “coenobitic and eremitic communities mingled, with members moving fluidly between them. Second, the Greek and the Latin traditions coexisted comfortably, a situation that extended beyond the schism of 1054 until as late as the first half of the thirteenth century.” 931

The dynamic image of cultural exchange at this period, therefore, challenges our understanding of Rus’ as belonging to a cultural sphere separate from its Latin neighbours, fitting solely into the “Byzantine Commonwealth” described eloquently by Dimitri Obolenski. As Norman Ingham writes, these numerous exchanges between Hungary, Bohemia and Rus’ also nuance Riccardo Picchio’s theoretic conception of Eastern Europe as divided between Slavia orthodoxa and Slavia romana. 932 Old Church Slavonic language and liturgy, eremitical practices, and diplomatic and dynastic ties transcended these religious boundaries. These connections were facilitated also by marriage alliances between ruling houses: by Anastasia’s marriage to András, by their daughter or step-daughter Adelheid’s marriage to Vratislav II of Bohemia, and by the marriage of Anastasia’s brother, Vsevolod, to a Byzantine princess.

---

930 Miladinov, Margins of Solitude, 157 and 161.
931 Keene, Saint Margaret, 21.
Like her sister Anna, Anastasia did not return to Rus’ in her widowhood, but instead stayed to support her eldest son Solomon’s claims to the throne against his uncle (and her brother-in-law), Béla I (r. 1060-1063). The latter had been designated as András’ successor before male children were born to András and Anastasia. When András I saw that it would come to open battle with his brother, he sent his wife Anastasia and his heir Solomon to take refuge at the court of the German Empress Agnes of Poitou, to whom he was connected by a marriage alliance: to cement peace between Hungary and the German Empire, Solomon had been betrothed to Agnes’ daughter, Judith-Sophia (d. before 1102). András himself died in 1060, either killed in battle against his brother Béla (according to the eleventh-century chronicles of Lampert of Hersfeld and the Annales Altahenses maiores) or subsequently from a fever (according to the near-contemporary Berthold of Reichenau).

With Anastasia’s help, Solomon was restored to the Hungarian throne in 1063 following the death of his uncle Béla I. Lampert of Hersfeld claims that Anastasia had given a precious sword to the Bavarian Count Otto II of Nordheim in thanks for the German magnate’s help in restoring her son Solomon in this year. The same source states that Otto gave then gave the sword to a certain royal favourite called Luitpold Merseburg, but after this nobleman suffered a fatal accident in 1071, the sword came into the hands of Emperor Heinrich IV and thus entered the imperial treasury. As first argued by Zoltán I. Tóth, this sword can probably be identified with the gilded tenth-century saber still held in the Viennese Schatzkammer, erroneously called “the saber of Charlemagne” since the fourteenth century (Vienna, Kunsthistorische Museum,


935 Lamperti Monachi Hersfeldensis Opera, ed. Holder-Egger, 78; Annales Altahenses maiores, eds. de Giesebrecht and Oefele, sub anno 1060, 810; Bertholdus Augiensis, Chronicon, ed. Robinson, sub anno 1060, 189.

936 Lamperti Monachi Hersfeldensis Opera, ed. Holder-Egger, 130.

937 Ibid., 130.
Schatzkammer, inventory number. WS XIII 5). There is no current scholarly consensus on whether this sword with a distinctive curved blade was made in Hungary, in southern Rus’, or elsewhere in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Its similarity to other contemporary Rus’ swords, however, suggests that it could have been one of the treasures originally brought to Hungary by Anastasia from Rus’ upon her marriage. Like dowry objects brought to France by her sister Anna Yaroslavna, precious gifts like this luxury sword could have served as visual aides-mémoires for Anastasia of her natal land.

The last mention of Anastasia’s whereabouts is in the Deeds of the Hungarians (Gesta Hungarorum) of Simon of Kéza written in circa 1282-1285, which states that she was placed for safety in the Benedictine monastery of Admont in Styria, while her son Solomon once again fought for the Hungarian throne. This event occurred around the time of the battle of Mogyoród in 1074, when her son Solomon was expelled from Hungary by his first cousins, Géza and the future King László (r. 1077-1095), the sons of Béla I. According to the fourteenth-century Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, László traveled to Rus’ with the aim of finding allies to fight Solomon, but the Rus’ princes refused to help him, forcing him to seek Czech allies instead—the Moravian prince Otto of Olomouc was married to László’s sister, a daughter of


Béla I. This refusal may be an indication that Anastasia’s Rus’ relatives remained loyal to her son, Solomon, and that ties between Anastasia and her relations were not cut off after her marriage, although other political factors could certainly have been a consideration in the princes’ refusal to help László.

Although it has been stated in secondary literature that Anastasia was buried at Admont, there is reason to doubt this statement. Anastasia is not mentioned in the monastery’s necrology. Moreover, Admont was founded in 1074 by Archbishop Gebhard of Salzburg (r. 1060-1088), originally as a male monastery (it later became a double-house between 1116 and 1120). Problematic is the fact that Gebhard was a prominent proponent of papal reforms and thus an enemy of Heinrich IV, Judith-Sophia’s brother and Anastasia’s protector in Germany, making it unlikely that he would have sheltered the latter’s allies.

In sum, Anastasia likely was able to maintain some degree of contact with her Rus’ relatives after her marriage. Her stays at the royal estate in Zemplén county near Rus’, for instance, could have allowed her to maintain close contact with her family. Material objects, such as the “Monomachos crown” or the “saber of Charlemagne” as would also serve as visual reminders of her natal land and her ties to Byzantium through her brother Vsevolod Yaroslavich, who had married into the Byzantine imperial Monomachos family. Finally, the openness of the Hungarian court to Orthodoxy and her husband’s time as an exile in Kyiv make it unlikely that she encountered any opposition to her Orthodox upbringing. She spent her widowhood attempting to

944 Péter Rokay, Salamón és Pola (Újvidék: [Novi Sad], Serbia: A Magyar Nyelv, Irodalom és Hungarológiai Kutatások Intézete, 1990), 27.
946 On Archbishop Gebhard as a proponent of church reform, see Beach, Women as Scribes, 67; Lutter, “Educated Brides,” 197.
restore and maintain her son Solomon on the Hungarian throne, for which reason she did not return to Rus’ after the death of her husband. Her relatives refused to support her son’s rival for the Hungarian throne, suggesting that they may have felt a continued sense of loyalty to Anastasia. Her patronage of Orthodox monasteries, often stated as an undisputable fact in secondary literature, however, has been exaggerated. At best, she supported and contributed to her husband’s foundations at Tihany and Visegrád, but it is not certain that the community of hermits found in these monasteries were eastern Christians in the eleventh century. Nonetheless, her reign as queen of Hungary saw continued close contact to the courts of Kyiv, Bohemia, and Byzantium that transcended boundaries between Latin, Old Church Slavonic, and Greek Christian traditions.

Eupraxia Vsevolodna (d. 1109)

The final case study from the eleventh century is that of Eupraxia Vsevolodna (d. 1109), who was the daughter of Vsevolod Yaroslavich (d. 1093, the brother of Anna and Anastasia) and his second wife, Anna (d. 1111), a Polovtsian princess, whom he married after 1067. Once again, Eupraxia’s birth-date is not recorded. S. P. Rozanov (followed by other scholars) suggested that she was born in 1069 or in 1071, based on the fact that her brother Rostislav was born from Vsevolod’s second wife in 1070 and it is not known whether or not Rostislav was younger or older than Eupraxia. Like her aunt Anna Yaroslavna, Eupraxia was twice married outside of Rus’, first to the Margrave Heinrich of the Northmark around 1085, when she was about fourteen or even younger, and the second time to Emperor Heinrich IV of Germany in 1089, when she was about eighteen. Eupraxia merits special consideration as a case-study since, through her marriage to this emperor, she attained the highest rank of any Riurikid bride sent to marry a western-rite ruler. It should be noted that although Eupraxia is sometimes called “empress” in


secondary literature, in fact her official title was Queen of the Romans and Germans. Either due to his sparring with Gregory VII which made such a ceremony impossible or, as discussed below, due to his animosity toward his new wife, Heinrich IV never arranged for Eupraxia to be crowned empress in Rome. Although Eupraxia acculturated to some of the ideals of behaviour expected of her as the emperor’s consort, she also was able to maintain contact with her natal land, to which she ultimately returned following the dissolution of her second marriage.

Like other Riurikid brides sent to marry western-rite rulers, such as her aunt Anna Yaroslavna, Eupraxia likely brought material objects with her as part of her dowry. A Latin German chronicle of the twelfth century, the *Chronicle* of Rosenfeld (today: Harsefeld), describes Eupraxia’s arrival in Saxony on occasion of her first marriage with Margrave Heinrich of the Northmark, the count of Stade (d. 1087). She came, the chronicler writes, “with great retinue, with camels carrying precious garments and gems, and infinite riches.” The chronicler’s description of Eupraxia’s arrival closely echoes the language used by the Vulgate to describe the arrival of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem (3 Kings 10: 2 [1 Kings 10:2] ). Eupraxia was compared positively to this eastern queen similar to the way in which her aunt, Anna Yaroslavna, had been portrayed in the letter of Nicholas I. But the description of Eupraxia’s riches cannot be completely dismissed as a Biblical topos. A similar description is also used to describe the riches brought up Theophano to Germany. In the latter case, actual surviving elements of

---

949 Coronation in a German cathedral crowned a woman queen of the Romans and Germans, while coronation in Rome at the hands of the pope was necessary at this time for a woman to become western empress. Fössel, “Political Traditions,” 71.


951 The parallel between the description of Eupraxia’s arrival in Saxony and the arrival of the Queen of Sheba was suggested to me in Christian Raffensperger, personal communication to the author, May 2nd 2016. The Biblical text in question is the following: “[…] sed et regina Saba audita fama Salomonis in nomine Domini venit tempatari eum in enigmatibus et ingressa Hierusalem multo comitatu et divitiis camelis portantibus aromata et aurum infinitum nimos et gemmas pretiosas,” *Biblia sacra: iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), eds. B. Fischer et al., 3 Kings 10: 2.

952 The eleventh-century chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg describes the arrival of the Byzantine princess Theophano in Italy in 972 as “cum magno exercitu et claris munieribus,” cited and discussed in Hiltrud Westmann-Angerhausen, “Spuren der Theophanu in der ottonischen Schatzkunst?” in *Kaiserin Theophanu: Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends: Gedenkschrift des Kölner Schnütgen-Museums zum*
Theophano’s dowry (though its exact contents remain debated) suggests that the chronicler’s description is indeed rooted in some external reality. The chronicler’s choice of words to describe the riches of Eupraxia conveys a sense of awe at the wealth brought by this Rus’ princess to Saxony. Moreover, the circulation of such material objects by Riurikid brides not only enhanced the cosmopolitanism of their husband’s courts, but also provided potential tangible links back to Rus’. By touching or looking at the gems and garments that she brought with her to her new land, Eupraxia would be reminded of her Rus’ origins.

Eupraxia’s brief marriage (from circa 1085 to 1087) to her first husband ended with his death, leaving her a childless widow. Apparently, she did not return to Rus’, but rather remained in Saxony, staying at the imperial abbey of Quedlinburg, where Emperor Heinrich IV’s sister Adelheid was abbess. Perhaps marriage negotiations between her father Vsevolod and Emperor Heinrich IV were soon underway, because she was already engaged to her second husband by the summer of 1088: six months after the death of Heinrich’s first wife Bertha and a year after the death of her first husband. S. P. Rozanov and Hartmut Rüss both hypothesized that Eupraxia’s stay in Quedlinburg under the supervision of the Emperor’s sister served to

——


953 For Theophanu’s possible dowry objects see, for instance, Ibid., 193-218.


“train” her for her future role as Heinrich’s wife. Although there is no primary source to directly support this assertion, Quedlinburg was famous as a centre for education of the female nobility and Abbess Adelheid would have been familiar with the customs of the German imperial court. It is not unlikely, therefore, that Eupraxia would have had the opportunity to learn about the duties expected of her prior to her marriage while staying in this environment.

Scholars have suggested various reasons for why Heinrich IV might have married Eupraxia. They range from Heinrich IV’s need for allies against the Poles and to gain recognition for his support of Anti-Pope Clement III (V. T. Pashuto, A. V. Nazarenko, Christian Raffensperger), to the emperor’s need to secure the loyalty of the rebellious Saxon nobility (I.S. Robinson), to his attraction to the prestige and wealth of the Riurikid dynasty (Raissa Bloch, Hartmut Rüss). V. T. Pashuto and Harmut Rüss also emphasize previous dynastic connections which could have facilitated the marriage, namely between the Stades, the German imperial house, and the Riurikids, through the mediation of the Saxon noblewomen Oda of Stade and/or Kunagunde of Orlamünde, who were related to all three families. As seen in the previous chapter, Heinrich IV had personal contact with Eupraxia’s family since, already in 1075, he had received Eupraxia’s exiled uncle, Iziaslav Yarolsavich, at his court in Mainz.

---

957 Rozanov, “Evpraksiia-Adelgeida,” 625; Rüss, “Eupraxia-Adelheid”: 495. Rozanov supposes that Eupraxia could have been sent to Quedlinburg even before her first marriage in order for her to learn German and Latin there, but, as Raffensperger notes, there is again no direct proof for this assumption, “Evpraksiia,” 25.

958 On Quedlinburg as a centre for the education of daughters of the nobility see, for example, van Winter, “Education,” 87-88. On its importance to the German imperial family see John William Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, c. 936-1075* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 138-149.


961 *Lamberti Annales*, ed. Hesse in *MGH*, vol. 5, *sub anno* 1075, 219-230. For a fuller discussion of Iziaslav’s exile in Germany see also the previous chapter.
Upon her marriage to the emperor in 1089, Eupraxia was given a new name: Adelheid. This is the only clear case in which a Rus’ princess was renamed upon her marriage to a Latin ruler. This renaming did not follow a re-baptism; rather, it could have arisen came from two equally plausible motivations. One possibility was that of incorporation: by giving her a new German name, Heinrich IV and his advisers wished to erase Eupraxia’s Rus’ origins by giving her a name held by female members of his own family. The theory that dynastic incorporation was the motivation for Eupraxia’s name change is suggested by the fact that many of Emperor Heinrich IV’s female relatives had the name “Adelheid”: besides the above-mentioned sister (sometimes called Abbess Adelheid II), there were also Heinrich’s paternal great-grandmother (the second wife of Otto I), his aunt, his mother-in-law from his first marriage with Bertha of Savoy (d. 1087), and as well as his daughter from his first marriage. A precedent was established by Heinrich IV’s father, Heinrich III, who had his first Danish wife Gunhild renamed “Kunegunda” upon their marriage in 1036. Since this previous marriage and renaming was one between two Christians of the same confessional tradition, it confirms that renaming was not linked to re-baptism.

The second possibility is that “Adelheid” was simply the literal German rendering of the Greek name “Eupraxia.” This possibility is suggested by the testimony of the twelfth-century *Annalista Saxo*, which says that, “[…] Heinrich succeeded […] to the March [the North March of Saxony]. This man had a wife, Eupraxia, the daughter of the king of Rus’,” who in our

---


language was called Adelheid, who afterward married Emperor Heinrich.”965 Eupraxia signifies “a doer of good deeds,” with the Greek “Eu” meaning “well”, roughly equivalent to Latin bene, and “praxis” signifying action.966 The literal meaning of “Adelheid” is similar: “Adel” signifies “noble family”, and the suffix “-heid” means “manner”, so that the name can mean one who is “of noble kind, of noble manner.”967 An analogous situation may be seen in the case of Rotrud, the daughter of Charlemagne, who was engaged to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VI in the 780s: in Greek sources, her name was “Erythro,” or “red”, a literal rendering in Greek of the meaning of her Germanic name.968 If this interpretation is correct, then Eupraxia’s name-change was not one of total erasure of her origins and assimilation into her husband’s culture. Rather, she was given a German equivalent of her original Rus’ name. Giving this Rus’ princess “Adelheid” would help in incorporating her into the ruling family by naming her after existing female members of the imperial family, while at the same time preserving the meaning of her natal name.

The Latin sources that mention the marriage do not comment at length on Eupraxia’s Rus’ descent. Nonetheless, the fact that they describe that the wedding took place in Cologne may indicate an indirect commemoration of her Orthodox origins at the German imperial court during this ceremony. According to Hartmut Rüss’ hypothesis, the marriage of Eupraxia and Heinrich could have taken place in the Benedictine monastic church of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne, the resting-place of the Byzantine princess Theophano, wife of Emperor Otto II.969 If his hypothesis is correct, the choice of location, due both to its Greek patron saint and to its association with a


previous highly prestigious Orthodox-Catholic imperial marriage alliance, served to highlight the positive manner in which Eupraxia’s marriage was seen by western clerics at this time. Cologne was also of personal significance for Heinrich IV: its cathedral was the site of his baptism and royal consecration.\textsuperscript{970} While it seems more likely that it was the cathedral rather than the monastic church of Saint Pantaleon that served as the site of the imperial wedding, it is nonetheless possible that the choice of location for Eupraxia’s marriage was meant to recall a previous eastern bride, Theophano.

The rituals of coronation, anointing, and, in Eupraxia’s unique case, renaming, served to transform Eupraxia into Adelheid, the \textit{consors regni}, or “associate in royal lordship”, a title that first appeared in the German chancellery in 962 in reference to her namesake, Empress Adelheid, the wife of Otto I.\textsuperscript{971} The only extant charter which contains Eupraxia’s intervention as \textit{consors regni} dates from August 14th 1089, a few months after her marriage to Heinrich IV (Plate 6).\textsuperscript{972} In it, the emperor grants to a certain Meinger, a ministerial (a “serf-knight” or unfree noble) attached to the Bamberg Cathedral, six royal hides (German: \textit{Köningshufen}, Latin: \textit{regales mansi}) in Ehrenbach “on the intervention and request of our spouse Queen Adelheid.”\textsuperscript{973} Intercession, tempering the king’s judgment and intervening on behalf of royal subjects, formed one the key duties of the western office of queenship, and this charter suggests that Eupraxia had begun to assume this role soon after her marriage.\textsuperscript{974} In this way, the charter suggests some of the ways in which Eupraxia had begun to acculturate to the duties expected of her.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[970] Kluger, \textit{“Propter claritatem generis,”} 225; Robinson, \textit{Henry IV}, 19 and 22.
\item[971] Fößel, “Political Traditions,” 73.
\item[973] “[...]ob interventum et petitionem coniugis nostræ Adalheit reginæ,” Bamberger Urkunden 142; \textit{Heinrici IV. Diplomata}, ed. Gladiss, no. 407, 538. Immediately following Adelheid’s name are the bishops who subscribed to the act, beginning with Archbishop Hartwig of Magdeburg.
\end{footnotes}
Eupraxia’s marriage to Heinrich IV and even her re-naming as “Adelheid” did not result in the end of the German court’s connections with Rus’, however. On the contrary, diplomatic exchanges between the two courts intensified at this time. As discussed in Chapter One, around the time of the emperor’s engagement to Eupraxia (1088), Heinrich IV’s protégé, Anti-Pope Clement III (Guibert of Ravenna), sent an embassy to Metropolitan Ioann II of Kyiv with the aim of negotiating church union.975 This fact indicates a desire among Heinrich’s allies to use the emperor’s marriage to Eupraxia to find further support among eastern clerics for Clement’s claims against Popes Gregory VII (r. 1077-1085) and Urban II (r. 1088-1099).976 The attempt at church (re)union came to naught, however. Ioann II’s reaction, as Chapter One has analyzed, was to refer the matter to the Patriarch of Constantinople and to condemn Latin practices in the strongest terms, especially the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, the addition of the *filioque* to the Creed, and the eating of animals killed by strangulation.977 Nonetheless, the exchange of letters indicates that neither side considered the events of 1054 to represent an unrepairable schism in Christendom.

By 1092 or 1094, however, things had gone terribly wrong in Eupraxia’s marriage: Heinrich imprisoned Eupraxia but she fled to his enemies, Countess Mathilda of Canossa (d. 1115), Mathilda’s husband Duke Welf V of Bavaria (1101-1119), and Pope Urban II.978 Many scholars caution that the sources on Eupraxia’s life at this time can only be approached with some reservations as they were written by polemical supporters of the pope against her second husband, the emperor.979

975 See Chapter One.

976 Rüss, “Eupraxia-Adelheid.” 493-494. Manfred Hellmann suggests two embassies to Kyiv around 1088/1089: one from Heinrich IV and one from Clement III, idem, “Die Heiratspolitik,” 24. However, one imperial envoy could easily serve to convey messages from both persons to Eupraxia’s father Vsevolod in Kyiv.


This is particularly true of sources that describe the life of Eupraxia during her separation from Heinrich IV, when she appeared at the Council of Piacenza in 1095 to accuse her husband of unspecified sexual crimes before Pope Urban II. The *Annales Stadenses*, for example, explain the rebellion of Konrad, Emperor Heinrich IV’s son by his first wife Bertha, by claiming that Heinrich used Eupraxia as a prostitute, offering her body to his court, and even to his son Konrad (Eupraxia’s step-son). Other anti-Henrican polemics gave even wilder versions of the accusations of sexual abuse. Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169)’s “Inquiry on the Antichrist” (*De Investigatione Antichristi*) claims that Heinrich IV belonged to the sect of Nicolaitans and forced Eupraxia to participate in orgies so that she became pregnant, but did not know who the father of her baby was. Weinfurter, among others, explains such stories as part of a polemicist’s depiction of Heinrich IV “as the incarnation of all evil and as the personification of the Antichrist. Godless acts and unnatural deeds were the very essence of evil men; they belonged to a general topology of evil.” R. I. Moore, similarly, draws attention to the fact that accusations of sexual immorality often went hand-in-hand with accusations of heresy as a means of stressing heresy’s diseased nature. Raffensperger cautions that pro-papal polemicists already accused Heinrich IV of sexually abusing his first wife Bertha in the 1070s, and Robinson is inclined to dismiss Eupraxia’s similar accusations entirely as fabrications written by Heinrich’s opponents.

On the other hand, however, Rüss points out that several pro-Henrican accounts mention his keeping of concubines. The fact that in 1073 Saxon magnates demanded that the emperor

---

983 Moore notes that in the twelfth century Tanchelm of Antwerp and Henry of Lausanne are portrayed as both heretics and as sexual immoral, as though sexual immorality were a dangerous characteristic of heresy itself, *Persecuting Society*, 94.
leave his mistresses and treat his first wife, Bertha, respectfully, suggests that there is likely some truth to the fact that Heinrich did not treat his wives well, however much they may have been exaggerated by his opponents.\textsuperscript{986} The purpose of this thesis, however, is not to analyze the truthfulness of such rumours at length but instead to draw on the more sober accounts to highlight the intriguing evidence they reveal of Eupraxia’s resumed contact with Rus’ following several years of living in Germany.

The early twelfth-century \textit{Annals of Corvey Abbey} state simply under the year 1094, “The divorce of the emperor and his wife Adelheid.”\textsuperscript{987} A contemporary eleventh-century Swabian monk, Bernold of St. Blasien, also known as Bernold of Constance (flourished to 1110), though firmly on the papal side in the Investiture Controversy, gives a fairly restrained account of the separation of Eupraxia and Heinrich IV in contrast to other pro-papal sources.\textsuperscript{988} Bernold writes that in 1094, Eupraxia escaped unspecified injuries at the hands of her husband, leading her to flee from him to Countess Matilda and her husband.\textsuperscript{989}

The early twelfth-century \textit{Life of Mathilda} by Abbot Donizo, specifies that Eupraxia was imprisoned by her husband in Verona whence she secretly sent messages to Countess Mathilda

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{986} “[principes Saxoniae…] postulant, ut […] abdicato grege concubinarum, quibus contra stra canonum attrito frontis rubore incubabat, reginam, quam sibi secundum ecclesiasticas traditiones thori sociam regnique consortem delegisset, coniugali loco haberet et diligeret […]”, \textit{Lamperti Annales}, ed. Hesse, \textit{sub anno} 1073, 196; discussed in Rüss, “Eupraxia-Adelheid,” 506-507.
\item \textsuperscript{988} Bernold had a close relationship with the reformed papacy and had met the future Pope Urban II when he was still a papal legate called Odo of Ostia. Odo had come to Constance in 1084 to consecrate a new pro-reform bishop, Gerhard III of Constance (1084-1100); during his sojourn, he also personally consecrated Bernold as a priest. By 1086, Bernold was a monk in the reformed monastery of All Saints at Schaffhausen in the Black Forest. I. S. Robinson, “Introduction,” in \textit{Eleventh-Century Germany: The Swabian Chronicles. Selected Sources} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 41-49; Robert Somerville, \textit{Pope Urban II’s Council of Piacenza: March 1 - 7, 1095} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 24.
\item \textsuperscript{989} “Uxor huius imperatoris iam diu multis iniuriis lacessita, multisque annis, ne aufugeret, custodita, tandem ad Welfonem ducem Italie aufugit; quae apud suos tot et tanta tamque inaudita mala se passam conquista est, ut etiam apud inimicos misericordiam se inventuram non dubitaret, nec in hac utique spe decepta est. Nam dux et uxor eius Mathildis gratanter eam susceperunt, et honorifice tracteverunt,” \textit{Bernoldi Chronicon} in \textit{MGH Scriptores}, vol. 5, ed. Georgius Pertz \textit{sub anno} 1094, 457; English trans. in \textit{Bernard of St. Blasien, Chronicle in Eleventh-Century Germany}, trans. Robinson, 317; discussed also in Raffensperger, “Missing Rusian Women,”75-76.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of Tuscany, who freed her. The abbot dedicates a versified chapter of his *Life* to this episode, titled, “Of the separation of Queen Praxedis from King Heinrich and of the coming of Pope Urban to Lombardy.” It is not known when or how Eupraxia’s family heard about her separation from the Emperor, but Abbot Donizo’s account hints that Matilda may have been rewarded by them in some form. He claims that the Rus’, as well as the Byzantine emperor, were among those allies who sent precious gifts and tokens of honour to Countess Matilda. Other than Eupraxia’s presence at her court, there does not seem to be any other obvious reason why Rus’ rulers would send messengers to a Tuscan countess. This passage therefore suggests that Eupraxia’s relatives in Kyiv could have rewarded Mathilda for rescuing Eupraxia from the abuses she had suffered at her husband’s hands.

It is also significant that Donizo does not once refer to Eupraxia by her new dynastic German name, “Adelheid”, but rather calls her by her original Rus’ name, Eupraxia, albeit in a Latinized form (“Praxedis”). This change suggests that Eupraxia resumed her original Rus’ name after her separation from Heinrich IV; this possibility is corroborated by the fact that her original Latinized name is also used by Bernold of St. Blasien in his report on the Council of Constance, in April 1094. Bernold was well informed about this council, since it had been attended by the abbot of his monastery, Siegfried. Bernold described how the “complaint of Queen Praxedis, who had left her husband a short time before and gone to Duke Welf [V] of Italy, reached the synod of Constance. She complained that she had suffered such great and such unheard-of acts of fornication at the hands of so many men that she very easily excused her flight even to her enemies and reconciled herself to all catholics, who were moved to compassion by such great injuries....” Bernold again uses Eupraxia’s Rus’ name when reporting that in the following

---

990 “Ast de regina Praxede tamen metra dicant./Sic timet ipsa virum, dentem vellut agna lupinum./Cumque timore tremuit, furtim munimina quaerit/Mathildis, poscens ut eam disiungat ab hoste./Aspiciens Debora nova, tempus inesse vel horam./Hunc ut prosternat Sisaram, clam quippe catervam/Veronam misit; regina manebat et illic/privatim venit, defertur, laeta recedit;/Regis eam servi perdunt strepitu sine belli,” *Donizonis vita Mathildis*, ed. Ludovicus Bethmann in MGH vol. 12, 394.


993 “Querimonia Praxedis reginae, quae dudum ad Welfonom ducem Italie a marito suo discessit, ad Constantiensem sinodum pervenit, quae se tantas tamque inauditas fornicationum spurcicias et a tantis passam fuisset
year, in March 1095, Eupraxia addressed the Council of Piacenza in Tuscany presided over by Pope Urban II. Donizo likewise records Eupraxia’s presence at this council. Eupraxia made a formal complaint about her husband’s behaviour in person and received full absolution. The presence of an Orthodox princess at a reforming church council might seem incongruous to twenty-first century observers. Urban II faithfully continued the program of church reform instituted by his predecessor Gregory VII, whose many tenets such as clerical celibacy or expanded claims of papal prerogatives were the very practices that further drove a wedge between western and eastern Christianity. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that a spirit of ecumenicalism prevailed during the pontificate of Urban II, when direct dialogue on the theme of church union was established not only between the pope and emperor Alexios I Komnenos, but also with the metropolitan of Kyiv. As noted in Chapter One, Metropolitan Ioann III the Eunuch (r. 1089-1090) was present at the synod of Constantinople in 1089 which restored the liturgical commemoration of Pope Urban II’s name. Moreover, Bernold of St. Blasien’s Chronicle provides the unique information that Byzantine legates were also present together with Eupraxia at the 1095 Council of Piacenza. This legation famously asked Pope Urban II for help against the Seljuk Turks, setting in motion Urban’s preaching of the First Crusade a few months

conquesta est, ut etiam apud inimicos fugam suam facillime excusaret, omnesque catholicos ad compassionem tantarum iniuriarum sibi conciliaret,” Bernoldi Chronicon, ed. Pertz, sub anno 1094, 458. Bernold is the earliest source to report on the events of the Council, Somerville, Piacenza, 24.

While Robinson believes that a statement on Eupraxia’s behalf would have been read out at the council, Christian Raffensperger sees no reason to doubt that she would have spoken publically herself, Robinson, Henry IV, 290 and Raffensperger, “Missing Rusian Women,” 77.


“In hac sinodo Praxedis regina, iam dudum a Heinrico separata, super maritum suum domno apostolico et sanctae sinodo conquesta est de inauditis fornicationum spurgiciis, quas apud maritum passa est; cuius quarimoniam domnus papa cum sancta sinodo satis misericorditer suscepit, eo quod ipsam tantas spurgicias non tam commisisse, quam invitat pertulisse, pro certo cognoverit. Unde et de penitentia, pro hulmosodi flagiciis iniuendag illam clementer absolvit, quae et peccatum suum sponte et publice confiteri non erubuit,” Bernoldi Chronicon, ed. Pertz, sub anno 1095, 462.

On Urban II as a follower of Gregory VII see, for example, Somerville, Piacenza, 2 with further bibliography.

See Chapter One.

Hellmann, “Die Heiratspolitik,” 24 and Section One.
later at Clermont.\textsuperscript{1000} When Urban II legislated against “schismatics” at the Council of Piacenza, he had in mind Henrich IV and Guibert of Ravenna (Anti-Pope Clement III), not the Orthodox church.\textsuperscript{1001} The Byzantine imperial family at this time was linked by marriage to Eupraxia’s family: her father Vsevolod’s first wife had been a Byzantine princess of the house of Monomachos.\textsuperscript{1002}

Having left her husband, Eupraxia subsequently returned to Rus’ travelling through Hungary, according to Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who also suggests that her life was in danger.\textsuperscript{1003} Eupraxia stopped en route in Hungary at the court of King Kálmán the Learned (r. 1096-1116), to whom she was related through her step-son Konrad (Konrad’s wife Maximilla and Kálmán’s first wife were sisters).\textsuperscript{1004} The Hungarian court evidently kept in contact with Rus’, for later in 1113/114, Eupraxia’s niece, Euphemia Vladimorovna (d. 1139), became King Kálmán’s second wife.\textsuperscript{1005}

*The Primary Chronicle* states that after her return to Rus’ Eupraxia became a nun, recording under a brief commentless entry for December 1106 that “Eupraxia, the daughter of Vsevolod took the veil.”\textsuperscript{1006} Her return to her natal land and her entry into a monastery also is recorded in


\textsuperscript{1003} “Regina vero in proprio et mariti videlicet dimissi regno latendi securitatem non inveniens primo ad Ungaricum regnum, ubi quosdam parentes habebat, fuga devenit. Dumque et inde eam imperator missis nuntiis retrahere destinasset, in Ruteniam, ad patrium videlicet regnum, repedavit, ubi reliquum vitae tempus in sancta viduitate peregit,” Gerhohus, *De investigatione Antichristi*, 324; discussed in Rüss, “Eupraxia-Adelheid,” 511-512.

\textsuperscript{1004} Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 187. Rüss suggests that the latest date for Eupraxia’s return to Rus’ would be the year 1101 when her stepson Konrad died in Florence, “Eupraxia-Adelheid,” 511.

\textsuperscript{1005} PSRL, vol. 2, *sub anno* 6620 (1111/1112), 273. See also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 21.

\textsuperscript{1006} “V tozhe lĕto postrizhe sę Eupraksi, Vsevolozha dshchi, mesiatsa dekabria v 6,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 2135.
western sources. Albert of Stade writes under the year 1093 that, after appearing at the Council of Piacenza, “the queen returned to Rus’ and surrendered herself to a monastery and finally was made abbess,” while the *Annals of Disibodenberg* record it more doubtfully: “The queen returned to her land, and having entered into a monastery was made abbess, as some say.”

These Latin reports are striking because they suggest ongoing communication between the princely court of Kyiv and Eupraxia’s supporters in Germany, and because they are completely neutral or indifferent to the fact that she entered an Orthodox monastery.

The final source on Eupraxia’s life is an entry in the *Primary Chronicle* which records her death and burial in the year 1109, “Eupraxia, the daughter of Vsevolod, died in the month of July on the ninth day and was laid to rest in the Monastery of Caves by the southern door. And a chapel was built over her. And there her body lies.”

**1008** She was not therefore buried in the Monastery of Saint Andrew, as her mother Anna (d. 1111) and her stepsister Yanka (d. 1112) were, or in the Cathedral of St. Sophia, where her father Vsevolod was buried (d. 1093). The simplest explanation for the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves as her grave-site and the chapel built over her was that Eupraxia made a large donation to the monastery, perhaps with imperial wealth taken with her from Italy. A second possible explanation is that she may have become a nun at the Monastery of the Caves, because it was customary to bury a nun in the place where she had taken her vows. Although the Monastery of the Caves was a male monastery, it is possible that Eupraxia may have been enclosed there in her own cell or that she lived there in a female monastery attached to the main male monastic house.

---


1011 Dimnik, “Dynastic Burials,” 79.

1012 Seventeenth-century documents attest that a female monastery dedicated to the Ascension used to exist at the gates of the male Monastery of the Caves in Kyiv. This female community moved in 1712 to the Podil (Podol) neighbourhood of Kyiv where it joined the members of the female monastery dedicated to Saints Florus and Laurus.
Eupraxia’s return to Rus’ following a failed marriage to a Latin Christian ruler and her honourable burial in an Orthodox monastery were not unique. For example, the aforementioned Euphemia Vladimorovna, King Kálmán of Hungary’s second wife, likewise returned to Rus’ after being repudiated by her husband.\footnote{Cosmae chronica Boemorum canonici Wissegradensis continuatio, ed. D. Rudolfus Köpke, in MGH, vol. 9, 138; Chronici Hungarici Saeculi XIV, ed. Domanovszky, 429.} Without describing any intervening events, the Laurentian redaction of the Primary chronicle records under April 4, 1138/1139 that “In this year Euphemia Vladimirna died and was buried in Berestvo in Saint Saviour.”\footnote{“V to zhe lět[а] prestavišę Eufim’ia Volodimerna i polozhena byst[t] na Berestovĕm’ u s[via]togo Sp[a]sa,” PSRL, vol. 1, 305; “V lĕto 6647 prestavišę Volodimer’na Yefimiia m[e]st[a]sa aprile v 4 den v ponedĕlnik poroznoĕ nedĕle,” PSRL, vol. 2, 301 (under 6647 [1139]), discussed in Dimnik, “Dynastic Burials,” 83.} Martin Dimnik, in his analysis of dynastic burials of the Riurikids before 1240s, notes that members of Euphemia’s branch of the princely dynasty, the Monomashichi, were also buried in this monastery.\footnote{Euphemia’s stepmother (her father Vladimir Monomakh’s third wife) was probably already buried in the church of the Holy Saviour by 1127, Euphemia’s brother or half-brother Yuri Dologoruki was buried there in 1157, and her nephew Gleb (Yuri’s son) was also buried at the monastery in 1172, \textit{Ibid.} 82-83, 86-87, 94-95. Euphemia’s sister Maritsa who died in 1146 may also have been buried at the Church of the Holy Saviour, \textit{Ibid.}, 84.} Like her aunt Eupraxia Vsevolodna, Eufemia Vladimorovna was given an honourable burial in Rus’ after her repudiation, but both the physical place of her burial and her memory in the Rus’ chronicles identified her only in terms of her Rus’ blood-ties, not in terms of her status as a former queen of Hungary.

Several scholars (Rozanov, Pashuto, Rüss, Robinson, and Raffensperger) remark on the date of Eupraxia’s entry into a monastery, December 1106, four months after Heinrich IV died on August 7, 1106 in Liège.\footnote{Rozanov, “Evpraksiia-Adelgeida,” 644; Pashuto, \textit{Vneshniaia politika}, 127; Robinson, \textit{Henry IV}, 291; Raffensperger, “Missing Rusian Women,” 79; Rüss, “Eupraxia-Adelheid,” 512.} While Pushkareva explains Eupraxia’s entry into a monastery as due to her wish to “remain inconspicuous”, it is rather striking that by this action Eupraxia was acting in accordance with Ottonian and Salian ideal models of behaviour for widowed empresses.\footnote{For the statement that Eupraxia entered a monastery to hide away upon her return to Rus’: Pushkareva, \textit{Women in Russian History}, 15.} Michel Parisse has noted that two previous widowed empresses ended their days in monasteries:
the first was Empress Kunegunda (d. 1033), the wife of Heinrich II, who stayed until her death in her foundation of Kaufungen Abbey, and the second was Agnes of Poitiers, the wife of Heinrich III and mother of Eupraxia’s former husband, Heinrich IV. The record of Eupraxia’s entry into a Rus’ monastery, and the possible timing of this decision in connection with the death of her husband, suggest first that messengers bearing news continued to travel back and forth between Rus’ and the German Empire, from Kyiv to Liège. It also suggests that despite the failure of her marriage, she had become acculturated to some of the ideals of behaviour expected of western empresses.

Rüss interprets Eupraxia’s burial at the Monastery of the Caves as the desire of a “Kyivan princess returning to the bosom of the ‘Orthodox’ Church, who tried to forget her ‘Latin’ past and to bury it behind the Orthodox monastery’s walls.” Raffensperger takes the opposite view, seeing in this burial that Eupraxia “was not ostracized for marrying a ‘Latin’ Christian when she was a ‘Greek’ Christian. She was not a pariah for returning home [...]” Eupraxia’s own thoughts and understanding of her actions unfortunately remain unknown. Certainly, if the stories of Heinrich’s sexual abuse of her are true, then she may have looked forward to entering a cloister, embracing her vow of chastity as a relief from her past suffering. What is important, however, is that her entry into a Rus’ monastery was not connected to any process of re-conversion to Orthodoxy. On the contrary, the Latin accounts of her return present her movement between geographic and confessional boundaries as unproblematic. The Latin sources evoke the language of schism and heresy only in reference to her husband, Heinrich, never toward the Orthodox church.

The Rus’ chronicles, for their part, make no mention of the fact that Eupraxia ever was a western queen or had a second German name (Adelheid). Neither do they suggest that Eupraxia’s relatives instructed her to break off relations with her husband. They do not refer to her personal faith, but only identify her in relation to the ruling Riurikid dynasty, more specifically as the daughter of Vsevolod Yaroslavich. Despite the fact that Eupraxia attained the highest rank of any

Rus’ princess who married a western ruler, becoming an emperor’s wife, what matters in the Rus’ sources was her blood-ties to the ruling dynasty. In Rus’, Eupraxia was memorialized only as a Ruirikid. The fact that a chapel was built over her grave indicates that her memory at the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves was cultivated long after she had died: she was remembered as a Rus’ princess, and perhaps also a benefactor to the monastery, though not as a western emperor’s wife.

Eleventh-Century Case Studies: Conclusion

The Riurikid dynasty continued to form marriage alliances with Catholic rulers throughout the eleventh century, both before and after 1054. The three case studies of Rus’-born queen consorts examined in this chapter, Anna Yaroslavna, her sister Anastasia Yaroslavna, and their niece Eupraxia Vsevolodna, suggest some of the ways in which Riurikid brides at this time acculturated to their respective husbands’ lands during this time. Rituals such as their crowning served as means of formally marking the moment of transition in status from Riurikid princesses to queen consorts and hence their incorporation into their respective husbands’ court culture. For Anna and Anastasia, there is no evidence that this ritual of crowning was accompanied by name change. In Eupraxia’s case, however, this ritual of incorporation was strengthened by giving her a new name, “Adelheid.” Nonetheless, this name did not necessarily completely erase her Rus’ origins at the imperial court, because it may have been a literal German rendering of her name’s meaning in Greek (a “do-er of good deeds”). The choice of Cologne as the location for Eupraxia’s coronation could have reflected both an attempt to incorporate her into the dynastic traditions of the German Empire, since it was the city in which her second husband Heinrich IV had been anointed as king, while, at the same time, it could have referred to her Orthodox origins by associating Eupraxia with her eastern-rite predecessor as empress, Theophano, whose tomb was located in the city.

Patronage of Latin Christian institutions, intercession before the king, and involvement in local court politics indicates that Anna, Anastasia, and Eupraxia acculturated to a certain degree to the religious-cultural environment of their husband’s courts since they adapted to the behaviour expected of them as western queen-consorts. In Eupraxia’s case, her acculturation may have been aided by a period of education at Quedlinburg. New family bonds established through marriage helped link Rus’ princesses to their new lands. Both Anna and Anastasia chose to stay
in their husbands’ lands after they were coincidentally widowed in the same year (1060) in order to protect the interests of their minor sons, while Eupraxia seems to have been close to, or at least allied with, her step-son Konrad.

The process of acculturation for these women was aided by the great degree of exchange and openness that still existed between western- and eastern-rite Christianity as can be seen, for instance, in the mutual veneration of Pope Saint Clement and Vincent of Saragossa in both Rus’ and France, in the foundation of cave-dwelling eremitical communities in both Rus’ and Hungary, or in the veneration of Saints Boris and Gleb both in Rus’ and in Bohemia. Nonetheless, cultural contacts that resulted from these inter-rite marriages were selective in nature: for instance, while the veneration of Saint Clement may have increased in the royal domain following the French embassy to Kyiv in 1049, French clerics showed no interest in learning about Saints Cyril and Methodius. Only Bohemia with its own tradition of Old Church Slavonic adopted the cult of native Rus’ saints, those of the prince-matryrs Boris and Gleb.

Material objects belonging to Rus’ princesses such as Anna Yaroslavna’s hyacinth, the “Monomachos crown” possibly worn by Anastasia Yaroslavna, or the precious jewels and garments brought by Eupraxia Vsevolodna to Saxony were welcomed in Western Europe as valuable treasures. Such material objects provided a tangible link for these princesses to their homelands, becoming “pegs of memory” in van Houts’ words, by ensuring visual continuity with the court culture of their homeland. Moreover, the fact that Eupraxia Vsevolodna and possibly also Anna Yaroslavna returned to Rus’ years after marrying western rulers presupposes some kind of ongoing communication with their natal lands that would have facilitated such travel. While in Italy following her separation from her husband, Eupraxia publicly resumed her natal Rus’ name, abandoning her German name, “Adelheid.” Her aunt Anna Yaroslavna added her Cyrillic signature to a charter after a decade of living in France. Such actions suggest that Riurikid brides did not completely shed their natal social-cultural identity following their marriage, but rather could remember and resume it years after living in western-rite lands. For these women, “Orthodox” and “Catholic,” “eastern” and “western” were not fixed points of identity, therefore, but fluid conceptions. The three case-studies of Rus’ princesses examined here demonstrate that while these brides acculturated to their husband’s courts, they did not experience total assimilation or conversion.
Chapter 5: Selected Case Studies from the Twelfth Century

From the 1130s onward, Rus’ became more politically fragmented. Particularly after the death of Vladimir Monomakh’s son, Mstislav the Great, in 1132, succession struggles broke out between the different branches of the Riurikid dynasty with greater frequency. The political situation was also complicated by competition for the rule of regional principalities whose practical power, if not prestige, in the twelfth century began to rival that of Kyiv, particularly Vladimir-Suzdal in the north and Galicia-Volhynia in the west. The development of these regional centers led to the increased political importance of intra-dynastic marriage and military alliances between various branches of the Riurikids. Intra-dynastic marriages were facilitated by the fact that members of the Riurikid family were now sufficiently distantly related from each other by the mid twelfth century that they were able to intermarry in accordance with consanguinity regulations.

Moreover, the presence of steppe nomads also played an increased role in twelfth-century Rus’ politics: the Turkic Qipchaqs (also known as Cumans or Polovtsy) increasingly appear in the Rus’ chronicles both as raiding enemies and as allies supporting various contending Rus’ princes. By the end of the eleventh century, the Rus’ princes already had begun to form

1021 Martin, Medieval Russia, 124-125.
1022 Following the death of Iziaslav Yaroslavich’s grandson Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich in 1123, the Iziaslavich line was no longer an important contender for Kyiv. Instead, a particularly strong rivalry emerged between the Monomachichi, the descendants of Vsevolod Yaroslavich’s son Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1123) and grandson Mstislav (d. 1132), on the one hand, and the Ol’govichi of Chernihiv (Chernigov), descendants of Sviatoslav Yaroslavich’s son Oleg (d. 1115), on the other. Martin Dimnik has treated the rivalry between the Olgovichi and the Monomachichi in great detail. For the Olgovichi, see his, Chernigov, 1054-1146 and Chernigov, 1146-1246. For the Monomachichi, see idem, Power Politics.
1023 The twelfth-century political situation in Rus’ is too complex to examine in detail here. For general overviews see Martin Dimnik, “The Rus’ Principalities (1125-1246),” in History of Russia, vol. 1, ed. Perrie, 98-126; Martin, Medieval Russia, 90-104.
1024 Litvina and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni, 256-258 and 264.
1025 Dimnik, “Princesses”: 208.
marriage alliances with these steppe peoples.\textsuperscript{1027} All of these factors led to a marked decrease in long-distance marriage alliances between the court of Kyiv and western-rite countries. Nonetheless, more local marriage alliances with Catholic rulers continued over the course of the twelfth century, especially with Rus’s immediate neighbours in the lands of “New Europe”: Poland, Hungary, and Scandinavia.

This chapter will examine three case studies of Rus’ princesses who were sent as brides during the twelfth century in these lands of “New Europe”: Maria Sviatopolkovna (?) or Volodarivna (d. 1160s) who married the Silesian nobleman, count palatine Piotr Włostowic (i.e., “son of Wlast”, d. circa 1151/1153), Ingeborg Mstislavna (d. after 1131) who married Knud Lavard of Denmark (d. 1131), and her younger half-sister Euphrosyne Mstislavna (d. 1180s), who went to Hungary. All three were able to maintain contact with their natal families following their marriage, but also acculturated to the cultural-religious environment of their husband’s lands. Their reigns were both shaped by a continued openness on the part of the Latin Christian cultures (in which they found themselves) to Orthodoxy and, at the same time, were affected by an emergent more homogenous Latin Christian culture. Evidence suggests that during the twelfth century, Poland, Hungary and Scandinavia, were slowly beginning to adopt a more uniform Latin Christian identity that became consciously differentiated from the Orthodox faith of their Rus’ neighbours, although this process was by no means finalized during this time.

**Maria Sviatopolkovna (?) or Volodarivna (d. 1160s)**

Due to geographic proximity and perhaps also ease of linguistic contact through belonging to the Slavic family of languages, the Piast dynasty of Poland was frequently allied with the Riurikids up to the Mongol period. As both Rus’ and Poland became increasingly politically fragmented from the 1130s onward, marriage alliances between the two dynasties increased in frequency. Through such marriages, competing princes sought military support for their respective claims to the thrones of Kyiv, Kraków, and Halich (or Galich), a local power center in western Rus’.\textsuperscript{1028}

\textsuperscript{1027} *Ibid.*, 65.

\textsuperscript{1028} Twenty-five such Polish-Rus’ alliances were concluded during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Dariusz Dąbrowski, “Rurik Dynasty’s Matrimonial Policy,” in *Colloquia Russica*, series 1, vol. 2: *Principalities in Lands of Galicia and Volhynia in International Relations in 11th-14th Centuries*[sic]. *Publication after 2nd International*
Consequently, Rus’ women who married into the Piast dynasty of Poland seemed to have been better able to maintain connections with their natal land than other women—at least as far as the extant sources allow one to judge.

This period of close relations was inaugurated on March 25, 1103 by the marriage of Duke Bolesław III Wrymouth (“Kędzierzawy”, d. 1138) to Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna (d. before 1114). She was the daughter of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (r. 1093-1113), perhaps by a Greek noblewoman. Consequently she was the grand-daughter (or step grand-daughter) of the Polish princess Gertruda (d. 1108), who had married the Rus’ prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078) in the previous generation. In fact, Sbyslava and Bolesław were so closely related (in the third degree of consanguinity) that Bishop Baldwin of Kraków (r. 1102/4-1109) had to seek a dispensation for the marriage from Pope Pascal II (r. 1099-1118). It is indicative of the close state of relations between Orthodoxy and Catholicism at this time that Bishop Baldwin did not object to Sbyslava’s Orthodox upbringing, but only to her close blood-relationship to her groom. Though short-lived, the marriage would have important dynastic and political consequences for future marriage alliances between the two families.

After Sbyslava’s death, Bolesław III remarried with a German noblewoman, Salomea of Berg (d. 1144), with whom he had thirteen children. Many of Bolesław III’s children by both Sbyslava

---

1029 In 1076 Bolesław II received a royal crown from Pope Gregory VII against the wishes of the German Emperor, but he was the last Polish ruler to bear the title of “king” until the coronation of Władylaw the Elbow-High (Lokietek) in 1320. For the remainder of the period covered by the dissertation, male and female members of the ruling Piast dynasty of Poland bore the title of dukes and duchesses rather than kings and queens, Jerzy Wyrozumski, “Poland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries,” in The New Cambridge Medieval History Volume 4: c. 1024–c.1198, Part 2, eds. David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 281.

1030 Older scholarship claimed that Sbyslava’s mother was Barbara, the daughter of Byzantine Emperor Alexios Komnenos, Ortlieb Zwifaltensis Chronicon in MPH, vol. 2, ed. August Bielowski, vol. 2, n. 1, 2. Kazhdan has shown, however, that Alexius had no daughter by that name nor do Byzantine sources report such a marriage, “Rus’-Byzantine Marriages,” 419. On the debate on the number of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich’s marriages and the number of his wives see Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 76-78; Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 6.

1031 On the marriage of Gertruda and Iziaslav, see Chapter Two under “Gertruda/Olisava,” Chapter Three, and Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 6.

1032 GPP, 158-161.
and Salomea sought marriage alliances with the Rurikid dynasty, particularly as a rivalry emerged between Bolesław’s eldest son by his first marriage, Władysław II the Exile, the senior prince (senior princeps, d. 1159), and the so-called “junior princes,” Bolesław III’s sons by Salomea.\footnote{1033}

This rivalry was sparked by Bolesław III’s so-called “Testament of 1138”, a turning-point in medieval Polish history, which resulted in the decentralization of the Polish ducal power and the creation of smaller duchies.\footnote{1034} In this public act, Bolesław III implemented a system of lateral succession based on genealogical seniority, inspired either by contemporary Bohemian practice, or by the succession system of Kyivan Rus’ to which he had become acculturated through his wife, Sbyslava.\footnote{1035} It is clear, however, that Bolesław III gave his four eldest sons an inheritable domain within Poland.\footnote{1036} At the same time, the eldest son, Władysław II, was given the status as senior prince or duke (Latin: senior) and rule over Kraków which had become the most important Polish city in the second half of the eleventh century.\footnote{1037} The extra territory was supposed to ensure that the senior prince would be able to have more power over his brothers.

---


1034 Wyrozumski, “Poland,” 284-285. Bolesław’s “testament” itself has not survived and is only known from its report in later sources, such as the thirteenth-century Chronicle of Master Wincenty Kadłubek and the Chronicle of Greater Poland from the late thirteenth/early fourteenth centuries. See Mistrza Wincentego kronika polska [= Magistri Vincentii Chronicon Polonorum] in MPH, vol. 2, ed. August Bielowski, 363-364; Kronika Wielkopolska / Kronika Wielkopolska, ed. Brygdia Kürbis, in MPH S. N. vol. 8, 48. On this latter source, see also the notes below.


1036 “Qui [Boleslaus] […] vices virtutum et regni successionem quatuor filiis legat,” Wincentego Kronika Polska, ed. Bielowski, 363-364; see also Kronika Wielkopolska, ed. Kürbis, vol. 8, 48. Bolesław’s youngest son, Kazimierz the Just, did not receive a specific territory, either because he was born after Bolesław III’s death or because he was still a baby at the time of the territorial division, Barański, Dynastia Piastów, 219.

and maintain higher authority over them. At Władysław II’s death, Kraków should pass onto the next eldest brother, rather than to his sons. This system mirrored the “Testament” of Yaroslav the Wise in 1054 in which each of Yaroslav the Wise’s three eldest surviving sons (Iziaslav, Sviatoslav, Vsevolod) were eligible to rule Kyiv in the order of their genealogical seniority, but also were given patrimonies that they could pass down to their sons. Conflict between Władysław II the Exile and his younger half-brothers, the junior princes, broke out not long after Bolesław III’s death.

Inter-marriage between the Piasts and the Riurikids at the court of Bolesław III and his successors probably extended also to the higher nobility, whose members gained greater power in Poland as the former kingdom became increasingly politically fragmented. Between 1117 and 1123, the Rus’ princess Maria, one of Duchess Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna’s relatives, perhaps her illegitimate sister, came to Poland to become the wife of Piotr Włostowic (d. circa 1151/1153), the count palatine and count of Wrocław (German: Breslau) first under Bolesław III and then under Władysław II. Though they raise more questions than they give answers, the sources on the Rus’ princess Maria’s life provide intriguing glimpses not only on the close contacts between the Polish, German and Rus’ courts in the twelfth century but also on the subtle changes taking place in the way the Orthodox Rus’ were viewed by Latin Christians.

---

1038 Barański, Dynastia Piastów, 219.
1039 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 153; Magdalena Biniaś-Szkopek, Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy książę Mazowsza i princeps (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2009), 371.
1041 Wincenty Kadłubek and the authors of the Kronika Wielkopolska blame the pride of Władysław’s wife (known from other sources as Agnes, the sister of Emperor Konrad III) for convincing Władysław to be unsatisfied with only a part of Poland and to want to seize its whole, Wincentego kronika polska, ed. Bielowski, 365-369 and Kronika Wielkopolska, ed. Brygida Kürbis, MPH S. N. vol. 8, 49.
1043 For the suggestion that Maria was Sbyslava’s illegitimate sister: Bieniek, Piotr Włostowic, 45, and Stanislaw Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” in PSB, vol. 26, 355.
Maria’s exact genealogy is debated, but the majority of scholars consider Maria to be the illegitimate daughter of prince Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113) or the legitimate daughter of Oleg Sviatoslavich of Chernihiv (d. 1115). As will be discussed below, it is also possible that she was the daughter of Volodar Rostislavich (d. 1124), who ruled the city of Przemyśl (Premysl) close to the Rus’/Polish border (located within the boundaries of present-day Poland).

The details of Maria’s life are also bound up with those of her husband, Piotr Włostowic. He remains a controversial figure in Polish historiography due to the difficulty of separating legendary material on his life from factual events. By the twelfth or thirteenth century, his exploits already formed the subject of a now-lost song of deeds, called the Carmen Mauri, ascribed to the authorship of the Praemonstratensian Maurus, regular canon at Piotr’s own foundation of Saint Vincent in Wrocław (on this foundation, see further below).

Maria’s early life in the twelfth century suggests ongoing cultural contacts between Poland and Rus’, in which her Orthodox origins were seen in a positive light by Latin Christians. An example of cultural exchange that may have resulted from her marriage can be found in The Translation of the hand of Saint Stephen (Translatio manus sancti Stephani), a twelfth-century text which ascribes a key place to Maria (unnamed in the text) in the transmision of this relic to the Benedictine abbey of Zwiefalten in Swabia. The relic itself, supposedly the right hand of


1045 Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 743.

1046 For a general outline of Piotr’s life see Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 355-362. For a discussion of his genealogy see Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 10.

1047 Cronica Petri Comitis Poloniae wraz z Tzw. Carmen Mauri / Cronica Petri Comitis Poloniae accedunt Carminis Mauri Fragmenta, ed. Marian Plezia in MPH N. S., vol., 3, 35-46. The long-standing hypothesis that the Carmen Mauri was written at Saint Vincent’s in Wroclaw has been brought into question recently as based upon insufficient evidence, Dalewski, Ritual and Politics, 149-150.

1048 Zwiefalten Abbey was founded in 1089 by counts Kuno and Liutold of Achalm, Abbot Wilhelm of Hirsau, and Bishop Adalbero of Würzburg. For the history of the abbey see Wilfried Setzler, Kloster Zwiefalten. Eine schwäbische Benediktinerabtei zwischen Reichsfreiheit und Ländersässigkeit. Studien zu ihrer Rechts- und Verfassungsgeschichte (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1979), esp. 7-23 and idem, “Die Entwicklung vom ‘Römischen Kloster’ bis zum ‘Sonderfall’ im Reich (1089-1570),” in 900 Jahre Benediktinerabtei Zwiefalten, ed. Hermann Josef
the first Christian martyr (see Acts: 7:56), still survives in Zwiefalten in an early seventeenth-century reliquary.\textsuperscript{1049}

According to this \textit{Translation}, the monks received the relic in 1140 from Salomea of Berg, the widow of Bolesław III Wrymouth of Poland.\textsuperscript{1050} As several studies have shown, Salomea was a great patron of Zwiefalten abbey where her father and grandfather were buried.\textsuperscript{1051} The \textit{Translation} states that Salomea had obtained the relic from her husband, who had received it from a certain “Patricius,” identified by most scholars as Piotr Włostowich.\textsuperscript{1052} In turn, he received it from his unnamed Rus’ wife, who can be identified with Maria. According to the twelfth-century \textit{Translation}, Maria (unnamed in the text) supposedly received the relic of Saint Stephen’s hand at the time of her own marriage from her mother, whom the \textit{Translation} describes as a great Byzantine lady who married an unnamed “king of the Rus’” (perhaps

\textsuperscript{1049} Milan Wehnert and Melanie Prange, \textit{Dem Himmel ganz nah! Liturgische Schätze aus Zwiefalten im Diözesanmuseum Rottenburg} (Calbe: Jan Thorbecke, 2016), cat. item no. 6, 109-115.


\textsuperscript{1052} “[…] paranimphus quidam extitit ditissimus Boloniorum princeps nomine Patricius […],” \textit{Translatio}, ed. Wallach et al., 124.
Sviatopolk Iziaslavich). According to the *Translation*, the Greek lady’s dowry included precious garments and relics, as well as the hand of Saint Stephen.\(^{1053}\)

Her daughter became the wife of “Patricius” (Piotr) who had come to Rus’ as the marriage-broker (*paranimphus*) of his lord, but instead, according to this source, treacherously stole the bride for himself.\(^{1054}\) Some scholars have pointed out that it is unlikely that Bolesław III would have tolerated that his count palatine steal his intended bride. In order to make sense of *The Translation*’s tale of treachery, the suggestion has been made repeatedly that Maria originally was intended to be the bride of Piotr Włostowic’s predecessor in the office, count palatine Skarbimir, who was blinded by Duke Bolesław III in 1117/1118 after Skarbimir rebelled against him.\(^{1055}\) According to this theory, Skarbimir sought a Rus’ marriage alliance in order to have military support in his rebellion against his lord Bolesław III. When the rebellion failed, Skarbimir’s lands, his title as count palatine, and his intended bride, Maria, were given to his replacement in office, Piotr Włostowic in 1117/1118.\(^{1056}\)

Besides 1117/1118, a second possible date for Maria’s marriage to the magnate Piotr Włostowic is the year 1123, shortly after the failed Polish coalition to restore Sviatopolk Iziaslavich’s son Yaroslav to the throne of Volodymyr (Vladimir [in-Volhynia]), which ended in Yaroslav’s death and defeat.\(^{1057}\) If the theory that Maria was an illegitimate daughter of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich and hence the half-sister of Yaroslav is correct, then at the latter’s death she was now without

---

\(^{1053}\) *Translatio*, ed. Wallach et al., 124.


\(^{1056}\) Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 102.

\(^{1057}\) *PSRL*, vol. 1, *sub anno* 6631 (1123), 293; *PSRL*, vol. 2, *sub anno* 6631 (1123), 287. For Bolesław III’s support of the Iziaslavich line of Rus’ princes see Włodarski, “Ruś w planach”: 41–48, 52–53.
means of support in Rus’. Perhaps for this reason Bolesław III arranged for her to be married to his count palatine. 1058

*The Translation* goes on to say that Patricius / Piotr tried to expiate his sin of oath-breaking by making pious donations from his amassed wealth. 1059 As part of this expiation, according to *The Translation*, Piotr gave Bolesław III the relic of the hand of Saint Stephen that he had received from his wife. 1060 It was thus that Bolesław III’s widow was able to give the relic to the monks of Zwiefalten.

*The Translation* story leaves, of course, doubts as to the relic’s authenticity, especially as other cities also claimed to possess one or both hands of Saint Stephen. 1061 Indeed, the primary purpose of the *Translation* for the monks at Zwiefalten was to show that their relic was authentic by demonstrating its chain of transmission going back to Constantinople. 1062 Correlation does not imply causation, but it is interesting to note that Greek sources up to the mid twelfth century independently attest to the presence of Saint Stephen’s arm in Constantinople, where it was installed in its own special chapel in 421 by Aelia Pulcheria (408-453), sister of Emperor

1058 Trakowski, “Piotr Włostowiec,” 355-356.

1059 “Ob huiusmodi igitur et aliorum scelerum execrabiles nequitias a domno papa vel pontificibus terrae illius diu collectas iussus est pro Christo dispergere divitias. Inter alias enim atque alias largifluarum elemosinarum copias, peregrinorum, debilium, viduarum, pupillorum scilicet expletas inopias, LXX vel eo amplius [...] decreverunt eum fabricare de propriis sumptibus ecclesias [...],” *Translatio*, ed. Wallach et al., 124-126. Dalewski places Piotr’s actions in their social and religious context, discussing how perjury was conceived of as a sin in western canonical texts and how donations to ecclesiastical institutions could be seen as a form of public penance, *Ritual and Politics*, 169-172.


1061 The Cathedral of Halberstadt claimed to have obtained the hand of Saint Stephen from the sack of Constantinople in 1204, and beside Zwiefalten, Rome, Metz, and Auxerre also had competing claims to the relic’s possession. Rome claimed to possess both the right hand of Saint Stephen (at the Basilica of Saint Peter) and the left hand (at the Basilica of Saint Praxedes), Edina Bozóky, “Le trésor de reliques de l’Abbaye de Zwiefalten: un précieux témoignage des échanges culturels entre Orient et Occident,” in *Les Échanges culturels*, ed. Le Jan, 120-121; Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 747.

1062 Ibid., 747.
Theodosios II (r. 408-450).\textsuperscript{1063} Because the name Stephen (stephanos) means “crown” in Greek, the Chapel of Saint Stephen in the imperial palace was seen as the appropriate location for Byzantine imperial wedding ceremonies, which followed Orthodox practice in having a priest ritually crown the bride and groom (the ceremony itself is called “crowning,” stephanōma).\textsuperscript{1064} Saint Stephen’s hand or part of his hand might therefore have made a very appropriate wedding present for Maria’s mother, a Byzantine princess sent to marry a Rus’ prince.\textsuperscript{1065}

Regardless of the reliability of the elements of the \textit{Translation} story, it also shows that in the mid twelfth-century Rus’ could still be viewed positively in Latin sources as a place from which one could receive precious relics, which were authenticated in the eyes of Latin monks by their ultimate Byzantine origin. Second, as Florin Curta correctly notes, the story is striking for the important role assigned to noble women as links in the chain of transmission of relics from East to West.\textsuperscript{1066} In the narrative, Maria plays a pivotal role transferring the relic from her Byzantine mother to her Latin-rite husband.

While \textit{The Translation}’s account of how the hand of Saint Stephen came to Zwiefalten is not entirely trustworthy, its description of Patricius/Piotr’s journey to Rus’ linked to the conclusion of his marriage to Maria can be corroborated by a number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century German, Rus’, and Polish sources.\textsuperscript{1067} The sources concur that Piotr treacherously captured a Rus’ “king”—identified from the twelfth-century Kyivan Chronicle as Prince Volodar Rostislavich of Przemyśl (d. 1124) — took his wealth, and brought him to Poland as a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The body of Saint Stephen supposedly had been discovered in Jerusalem in 415, Bozóky, “Le trésor,” 120; Milan Wehnert and Prange, \textit{Dem Himmel ganz nah}, 109.
\item Bozóky, “Le trésor,” 120; Wehnert and Prange, \textit{Dem Himmel ganz nah}, 109-110.
\item Bozóky, “Le trésor,” 121.
\item Curta, “Gate to Byzantium”: 624-625.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
hostage. The sixteenth-century *Chronicle of Piotr* adds that Piotr Włostowic not only captured Volodar and took the Rus’ prince’s wealth, but also his daughter. While most scholars have dismissed this additional information in this late account, Krzysztof Benyskiewicz is inclined to accept it as at least a possibility. The fact that Volodar was forced to give his daughter in marriage to Piotr under duress would also explain why she was married to a mere count palatine rather than to the Polish duke or to another ruler of higher status.

The *Life of Bishop Otto of Bamberg* (d. 1139) by Herbord of Michaelsberg provides some further explanation for Piotr’s capture of Volodar. Written around 1159, it provides the unique information that some Rus’ princes were allied with the pagan Pomeranians. This fact is not surprising since various Rus’ princes frequently made military alliances with non-Christian steppe peoples, particularly during the Riurikid dynasty’s internecine struggles in the twelfth century. It was in order to break this Rus’-Pomeranian alliance that, with Bolesław III’s approval, Piotr came to Volodar pretending to flee from his lord, gained his trust, and then captured his Rus’ host while they were out hunting.

Herbord’s *Life* glorified Otto’s missionary work in Pomerania in 1124-1125 and 1127-1128, which was supported by Bolesław III’s conquest of the Baltic coastal area from 1102 to 1128. Probably due to the fact that the Rus’ were allied with the pagan Pomeranians, Herbord

---

1068 Volodar Rostislavich (d. 1024) was a descendant of Yaroslav the Wise’s eldest son Vladimir who had predeceased his father in 1052, Voitovich, *Kniazha doba*, 328-331.

1069 “Ipse itaque Petrus, iterum regem illum Ruthenorum sua magna audacia cepit et civitatem Gallaciam [=Halich/Galich] cum magna strage populorum delevit atque regi suo Boleslao vinctum duxit. Rex de inimico suo valde gavisus et Petri triumpho delectatus omnia, que erant praeftati Rutenorum regis, Petro tradit et filiam ipsius, nomine Mariam, valde pulchram tradidit in uxorem.” *Cronica Petri*, ed. Plezia, 7-8. This incident is accepted as undisputed fact in Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 151-152.

1070 Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 743.


1073 The main source for Bolesław III’s campaigns against the Pomeranians is the twelfth-century chronicle of “Gallus Anonymous”, *GPP*, 140-141, 150-153, 158-159, 166-175, 176-181, 192-193, 200-209, 221-227, 250-253, 280-287.
portrays the Rus’ mainly negatively, calling them a “cruel and rough people.”

Herbord’s mid-twelfth-century characterization of the Rus’ as rough barbarians and friends of pagans foreshadows the fact that that Latin eastern expansion into the Baltic Sea would result in direct confessional conflict with Orthodoxy in Rus’ in the following century.

Despite the emergence of a negative view of the Rus’ in twelfth-century works such as Herbord’s Life, other evidence suggests that ties with the Riurikids were still seen as prestigious in the eyes of Polish magnates. The names of Greek origin attributed to Piotr and Maria’s children in various chronicles suggest that the count palatine may have sought ways to commemorate his connections to the Riurikid dynasty, despite his condemnation of Orthodoxy, perhaps with the aim of ennobling his own blood-line. Maria and Piotr had two or three sons and one or (according to late sources) two daughters, namely Świętosław (Sviatoslav), Konstantin (Constantine), Idzi (or Giles / Latin. Egidius), Agafia (Agatha) and Beatrycze (Beatrice). Some scholars, trying to reconcile the different chronicle sources have suggested that Agafia and Beatrice may have been one and the same person, i.e. that this daughter had a double-name as was still common among the nobility of Rus’ and Poland in the twelfth century. The first name (Agafia), Greek in origin, reflected her mother’s Rus’ ties, while the second (Beatrycze) reflected western ones. Others have likewise suggested that Konstantin or Giles might have been Świętosław’s second name. The sources do not provide a clear answer. The somewhat unusual name “Giles” could have been given to their child in honour of Giles of Paris, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, who visited Kraków as the legate of Pope Callixtus II in circa 1123-1126.

---

1075 Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 358; Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 737. See also Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 10.
1076 On double names among the nobility see Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina.”
1077 Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 358; Mącewska-Pilch, Tympanon fundacyjny, 17, and Bieniek, Piotr Włostowic, 58.
1078 According to Kętrzyński, Świętosław had the second name Konstantin, “O imionach piastowskich,” 599. Trawkowski suggests that Gilles and Świętosław could have been the same person, “Piotr Włostowic,” 357-358.
shortly after the couple’s marriage.\textsuperscript{1079} It likewise could have been connected with the couple’s veneration for the sixth / seventh-century hermit Giles of Provence.\textsuperscript{1080}

This veneration is suggested by the fact that Pior’s and Maria’s names are listed in the obituary of the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Gilles in Provence (dated to the year 1129) under April 7\textsuperscript{th} and April 17\textsuperscript{th}, respectively.\textsuperscript{1081} The reason why Maria was commemorated in this necrology is probably due to the fact that she and her husband were donors to the far-off monastery. In return for their donation, the monks would remember Maria and Piotr in their prayers and consider them to be part of the monastic community. Contacts between this Provençal monastery and Poland had been established at the end of the eleventh century by Duke Władysław Herman and his first wife Judith of Bohemia.\textsuperscript{1082} Maria’s commemoration in the necrology of Saint-Gilles in Provence initially suggests that she and her husband followed the devotions to the saint of their overlord, Bolesław III Wrymouth and, in consequence, that she had acculturated to the Latin Christian world of her husband.

Further consideration, however, leads one to question whether Maria’s veneration of Saint Giles should be viewed solely as proof that she adopted the custom of venerating a “western” saint. In fact, there is some evidence that Riurikid princes in the mid twelfth century had also adopted the cult of Saint Gilles of Provence. The twelfth-century necrology of the monastery of Saint Giles also commemorates a “dux David,” who could potentially be identified with the Rus’ prince

\textsuperscript{1079} Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae, ed. Maleczyński, no. 11, 30-32. On Gilles’ visit to Poland and his role in establishing a diocesan structure for conquered Pomerania see von Güttner-Sporzyński, Poland, Holy War, 60-64.


\textsuperscript{1081} “April [is]. VII. Ob[ierunt...] comitissa poloniae maria [...] [ad] xv [Kal. Mai.] petrus comes,” Obituarium Abbatiæ S. Egidii, BL MS Add. 16979, folia 6r-6v. “Comitissa poloniae” is written in suprascript. The obituary is dated to 1129 from its colophon on fol. 62 which states that it was copied by the scribe Petrus Guillelmus at this time. See the digitized manuscript at: <http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Add_MS_16979> [last access 7 April 2017] with further bibliography. It has not been edited. The text is excerpted in Pierre David, “La Pologne dans l’obituaire de Saint-Gilles en Languedoc au XIIe siècle,” in Revue des études slaves 19 (1939), 223; Dunin-Wąsowicz, “Saint-Gilles et la Pologne,” 130-132, and Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria”, n. 4, 734, but without giving the folia. I am grateful to Andrew Dunning for his help regarding this manuscript.

\textsuperscript{1082} David, “La Pologne dans l’obituaire,” 221; Bieniek, Piotr Włostowi, 54; Wiszweski, Domus Bolezlaï, 520-521.
David Igorevich (d. 1112), perhaps married to a daughter of Władysław Herman. The Latin royal charter of King László I founding the monastery to Saint Giles in Somogyvár lists in its witness-list a “Yaroslav, the king’s son-in-law, the son of the king of the Rus.” This person is probably to be identified as prince Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123). Marriage alliances thus could have been the means by which this cult was introduced to Rus’.

Moreover, the recent discovery of a twelfth-century Cyrillic graffito on a pillar in the abbey of Saint-Gilles in Provence reading, “Lord help thy servant Semko son of Ninoslav” shows that Rus’ pilgrims also traveled across Europe to come to the saint’s shrine. Since this monastery was on the most southern of the major pilgrimage routes to Santiago de Compostela it is likely that this Rus’ traveler then continued on to this major “western” destination. The marriage of Maria to Piotr Włostowic may have been precisely one of the means by which Saint Giles’ cult was introduced to Rus’. His veneration by the Rurikid dynasty and the prayers for members


1085 The marriage of a daughter of King László I of Hungary and Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich has been long known and accepted in scholarship: Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux,” table 2, no. 11 and no. 11, 11; Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 53, n. 1, 331 and genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425.


of this dynasty by Latin monks are indicative of continued confessional openness and exchange between eastern and western churches in the twelfth century, likely facilitated by marriage alliances.  

Another necrological commemoration of Maria may also shed light on her religious patronage following her marriage. The necrology of the Abbey of Saint Vincent in Olbin (German: Elbing, today a suburb of Wrocław) commemorated “a countess Maria” on April 8th. This commemoration likely refers to Maria, since the abbey—initially Benedictine and then later (circa before 1193) Praemonstratensian—was founded by her husband Piotr Włostowic in 1139. Moreover, the day of death is almost the same as that given in the Saint-Gilles’ necrology (April 7th). Piotr himself is commemorated in this necrology under April 16th (April 17th in the Saint Gilles’ necrology). Among the extensive properties given to the church of Saint Vincent at its consecration was an estate in “Dobra” (perhaps Brochocin) by “Vlostonissa comitissa,” i.e. probably by Maria, Piotr Włostowic’s wife.

Her patronage of the monasteries of Saint Giles and Vincent might suggest that Maria had acculturated to Latin Christian culture through her veneration of saints made newly familiar to


1091 The earliest copy of the foundation charter for Saint Vincent, originally dedicated to the Virgin Mary, dates to 1487: Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae, ed. Maleczyński, vol. 1, no. 16, 41-43. The abbey of Saint Vincent was demolished in 1529, Ibid, n. 11, 43.


her, but in the winter of 1145 she returned to Rus’ and thus to an eastern-rite realm. According to Polish chronicles, Piotr was punished by imprisonment, blinding, having his tongue cut out and finally being sent into exile in this year because he slandered the chastity of the Duke Władysław II’s wife, Agnes.\textsuperscript{1094} Although not stated in the sources, some scholars have speculated that Piotr’s fall from favour rather could have due to the fact that Duke Władysław suspected him of transferring his allegiance to the junior princes, Władysław’s half-brothers.\textsuperscript{1095}

Polish sources do not specify his place of exile nor the fate of his wife. The twelfth-century \textit{Kyivan Chronicle}, however, provides additional information about Maria’s fate at this time and also reports on Piotr’s blinding and exile. It presents the count palatine’s torture and exile twenty years after his actions against the Rus’ prince Volodar Rostislavich as the result of just divine retribution:

That same winter Władysław [II] prince of the Poles captured his man Piotr, blinded him, and cut out his tongue and plundered his household. He exiled him with only his wife and children from his land. And he [Piotr] came to Rus’. As the Gospel says, ‘with the measure you use, it will be measured to you.’ [Matt 7:2]\textsuperscript{1096}

The \textit{Kyivan Chronicle} is the sole source to specify that Piotr, his wife, and children came to Rus’. This fact supports the idea that Maria had some family there that could be relied upon to take them in, a fact previously unremarked upon. Otherwise, it would be difficult to understand how Piotr, having attacked a member of the Riurikid family, could hope to shelter safely in Rus’ without fear of someone from the Riurikid dynasty taking revenge upon him. Presumably

\textsuperscript{1094} According to the \textit{Chronicle of Greater Poland}, Piotr was captured, blinded, and had his tongue cut out in Wrocław, during the celebration of his daughter Agafia’s wedding to the Sorbian Duke Jaksa of Köpenick in 1145/1146, \textit{Kronika Wielkopolska}, ed. Kürbis, 50. Piotr’s punishments are also related in the \textit{Kronika polska} in MPH vol. 3, 631 and \textit{Kronika szląska skrócona in Ibid}, vol. 3, 721-723, as well as in later sources. The \textit{Chronicle of Piotr} lays the blame entirely on Duchess Agnes and tells an elaborate story of Piotr’s betrayal, imprisonment and blinding. See \textit{Cronica Petri}, ed. Plezja, 9-30.

\textsuperscript{1095} Trakowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 356.

\textsuperscript{1096} “Toi zhe zimĕ Vladislav Lęd’skii kn[ia]z em muzha svoego Petrka islĕpi a yazyka emu urĕza i dom ego roz’grab[i]. Tokmo s zhenoiu i s dĕt’mi vygna iz zemli svoeia i ide v Rus’ yakozhe eouangskoe slovo gl[agol]et’ eiuzhe meroiu mĕrit’ v”zmĕrit’ tis ty,” PSRL, vol. 2, \textit{sub anno} 6653 (1144/1145), 319.
Maria’s remaining relations received her and gave her shelter.\(^{1097}\) By spring of 1146, however, the family was able to return to Poland when Duke Władysław II suffered a resounding defeat in battle against his half-brothers, the “junior princes.”\(^{1098}\) According to the late thirteenth-century *Silesian Chronicle*, Piotr lived five years after his return from exile, dying in 1151.\(^{1099}\)

As discussed in Chapter Two, it was perhaps shortly after his return to Poland that Piotr co-authored an undated letter along with Bishop Mateusz of Kraków asking Bernard of Clairvaux to come preach in Rus'.\(^{1100}\) In April 1147, following preaching by this famous Cistercian, Pope Eugenius III had declared Saxon, Danish, and Polish campaigns against the Wends, pagan Slavic tribes of the Baltic littoral, to be equally meritorious as the Second Crusade to recover Jerusalem.\(^{1101}\) Piotr and Bishop Mateusz’s letter may have been a direct response on the part of

---

\(^{1097}\) The *Kyivan Chronicle* does not specify to which Rus’ principality Maria came to or which members of the Riurikid dynasty took her in. Since her genealogy is uncertain, it is also unclear to which ruling Riurikid prince she would have been most closely related to and, consequently, who would have been most likely to give her refuge. If she was the daughter of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich, her closest Riurikid relative would have been her nephew, Yuri Yaroslavich (d. after 1166), the son of Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, who was still alive in 1145-1146 and ruling the city of Pinsk in present-day Belarus. The ruler of Galicia at this time of Maria’s exile was Vladimir Volodarevich (d. 1153), the son of Volodar Rostislavich. If Maria was Volodar’s daughter, she was consequently Vladimir’s sister. The ruler of Volhynia at this time was Iziaslaw Mstislavich (d. 1170), a more distant cousin. To the end of 1146, the prince of Kyiv was Vsevolod Olgovich, who could have been Maria’s brother, if one accepts the genealogical theory that Oleg Sviatoslavich (d. 1115) was Maria’s father. On the reigns of these princes in their respective cities in 1145-1146 see, for instance, Voitovych, *Kniazha doba*, 359, 397; “Kniazia krupneishikh kniazhestv,” in DRSM, 936, 939.

\(^{1098}\) Trakowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 356.

\(^{1099}\) “Vladislaus defunctus est. [...] Petrus vero in honorem pristinum reassumptus est; vixit V annis,” *Kronika polska*, ed. Ćwikliński, 633. The early sixteenth-century *Abbreviated Silesian Chronicle* gives Piotr’s death date as 1153, not 1151: “Vixit autem Petrus veniens ab exilio in Poloniam septem annos, et anno domini millesimo centesimo quinquagesimo tertio, decimo kalendas Martii obiit in domino,” *Chronica Silesiae abbreviata*, ed. Semkowicz, 723. Halina Manikowska, without stating the reason why, is inclined to believe the testimony of the latter, “*Princeps fundator* im vorrechtsstädtischen Breslau. Von Piotr Włostowic bis zu Heinrich dem Bärtigen.” in *Sakralstiftungen*, ed. Mühle, 300. Stanislaw Trakowski, however, points out that the day of Piotr’s death in the *Abbreviated Chronicle* does not accord with the days given in the contemporary necrologies (April 16-17), and so is inclined to consider the *Polish Chronicle* to be more accurate, “Piotr Włostowic,” 357.

\(^{1100}\) As noted earlier in Chapter Two, the letter from Bishop Mateusz and Piotr to Bernard of Clairvaux only survives in an eighteenth century printed copy, but is nonetheless held to be authentic by most scholars, Kürbis, “Cystersi w kulturze,” 224-227; *Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae*, ed. Maleczyński, no. 17, 44-46; Plezia, “List Biskupa Mateusza,” 124-128; “List Mateusza biskupa,” ed. Bielowski, 15-16.

the Polish clergy and nobility to Saint Bernard’s preaching of the Second Crusade. Written by a powerful magnate and a bishop at a time when the boundaries of Latin Christendom were being expanded by military means, the letter sees Orthodoxy in neighbouring Rus’ as a problem to be overcome with preaching, rather than as a different, though equally valid, form of Christianity.

If authentic, the letter suggests that despite—or because of—his direct familiarity with the customs of the Orthodox church in Rus’ through his wife Maria and through his own stays in Rus’ in 1123 and 1145-1146, Piotr remained firmly convinced of the superiority of Latin Christian practices over those of his Rus’ neighbours. Consequently, it would indicate that Piotr expected his Rus’-born wife Maria to acculturate completely into his religio-cultural world, since her native religious practices were not acceptable to him. Indeed, Maria lived during a time in which the Polish nobility and clergy were beginning to adopt a more uniform Latin Christian identity set in contrast to its Orthodox neighbours. To give one example, as Darius von Güttner-Sporzyński writes, by 1144 Bishop Alexander of Malonne completed the rebuilding of Płock Cathedral on the model of Liège Cathedral, which, “in effect propagated the religious models of Latin Christendom” in Poland.

Not all of Piotr’s contemporaries shared this negative view of Rus’, and cultural exchanges with Rus’ continued at the highest levels of the Polish nobility during Maria’s lifetime. By 1149, Piotr had reconciled with Duke Bolesław IV “the Curly” (d. 1173), the leader of the “junior princes,” who came to Wrocław in that year for the consecration of the completed church of Saint Vincent. Bolesław’s wife, whom he had married before 1140, was also a Rus’ princess, Verkhoslava Vsevolodna (d. c. 1160). One consequence of this marriage was that, according to the twelfth-century Annals of Magdeburg, around September 1147-January 1148 Rus’ troops

1102 Darius von Güttner-Sporzyński, “Poland and the Second Crusade,” in The Second Crusade, eds. Roche and Jensen, 137 and idem, Poland, Holy War, 180-181, citing further literature.
1103 Ibid., 70.
1104 Bolesław IV’s presence at the consecration of the church of Saint Vincent is known from his charter issued on the occasion, confirming the church’s possessions, Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae, ed. Maleczyński, no. 25, 59-66. The earliest copy of this charter dates to 1487.
1105 PSRL, vol. 2 sub anno 6645 (1137), 300; see also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 27.
participated in Duke Bolesław IV the Curly’s campaigns against pagan Prussians. Darius von Güttner-Sporzyński has recently made the argument that this campaign was a response by the Polish nobility to Saint Bernard’s preaching earlier in 1146-1147 and to Pope Eugenius III’s bull, *Divina dispensatio*, granting crusading privileges to the campaigns against the Wends, and consequently can be interpreted as part of the Second Crusade. In other words, the Orthodox Rus’ members of Bolesław IV’s forces were part of a local crusading force. But though the Rus’ fought alongside their Latin Christian counterparts, the compilers of the *Annals of Magdeburg* only half accept their presence calling them “lesser Catholics [minus catholici], but still having the character of the Christian name.” Rus’ was not yet the target of expanding Latin Christendom, but at least for the compiler of the *Annals of Magdeburg*, its rulers were not fully welcome among crusading armies.

After Piotr’s death around 1151/1153, probably in the 1160s-1170s, Maria completed the construction of a church called Our-Lady-on-the-Sand begun by her husband, which was situated in the middle of Sand Island on the river Odra (Oder) in Wrocław (today, the church is rebuilt in Gothic style). Our-Lady-on the-Sand housed a community of regular canons from Arrouaise whose arrival in Wrocław may have been supported by Bishop Gauthier of Wrocław (r. 1149-1169), who was originally from Malonne. The reason why scholars assume that this church was finished by Maria after Piotr’s death is due to the fact that the surviving foundation
tympanum of Our-Lady-on-the-Sand depicts only Maria and her son as its donors.\textsuperscript{1111} This theory is also supported by the fact that The Chronicle of Piotr considers Maria as the sole founder of the church.\textsuperscript{1112}

The relief sculpture on the tympanum of Our-Lady-on-the-Sand acted as a “visual charter,” as its iconography publicly proclaimed to everyone who passed by it that Maria and her son were the church’s founders.\textsuperscript{1113} It also stressed Maria’s personal piety and prestige in its composition, since it depicted the Rus’ princess in close proximity to her Biblical namesake. The Virgin Mary, crowned in a ducal mitre such as was worn by contemporary Polish dukes, is seated on a throne in the centre of the composition, holding the Christ child in her lap.\textsuperscript{1114} Maria stands on the Virgin Mary’s right-hand side, offering up to her a model of the church. On the other side of the Virgin Mary, Maria’s son Świętosław clasps his hands and genuflects before the Madonna and Child. The Latin inscription in leonine hexameter round the arc of the tympanum speaks of a great intimacy between the two women in the composition: “I offer these things to you, O Mother of kindness, Maria to Mary [\textit{Do Maria Mariae}]. Świętosław my child offers this church.”\textsuperscript{1115}

Some scholars have argued that the composition of the tympanum is Byzantine in style, reflecting Maria’s Rus’ origins and modeled ultimately on the tenth-century mosaic tympanum in the vestibule of Hagia Sophia, which depicts the Emperors Constantine and Justinian offering, on either side of the Virgin Mary, models of the city of Constantinople and the church of Hagia

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1112} “Hec Maria Rutenissa fertur fuisse fundatrix ecclesie Beate Marie Virginis extra muros Wratisl(avienses) in Arena, quam obtinent Canonici Regulares beati Augustini dicti Arroasienses;” \textit{Cronica Petri}, ed. Plezia, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{1113} Jamroziak, “Foundations”: 187.
\item \textsuperscript{1114} High resolution images of the tympanum can be found at Leszek Lubicki, “Tympanon z kościoła na Piasku we Wrocławiu,” in \textit{ARCHEOLOGIA – SERVIS. Muzea, zbiory, rezerwaty, zabytki, informacje}, last access April 22nd 2014, <http://www.archeo.udl.pl/skarby-sredniowiecza/tympanon-z-wroclawskiego-kosciola-nmp-na-piasku/>.
\item \textsuperscript{1115} “HAS MATRI VENIAE TIBI DO MARIA MARIAE HAS OFFERT AEDAS SWENTOSLAVS MEA PROLES,” Świechowski, \textit{Romanesque Art in Poland}, 48; ills. 130 and 131; Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria”, n. 17, 735; Jamroziak, “Foundations”, ill. 3, 189.
\end{itemize}
Sophia, respectively. As a more direct iconographical model, some have suggested that Maria would have been familiar with this donation composition in the Cathedral of Saint Sophia in Kyiv, derived from its Byzantine prototype.

Anna Rózycka Bryzek, however, has rejected convincingly theories that Maria would have sponsored Byzantine-influenced art in her foundation at Wrocław, arguing that its style is certainly Romanesque and adding that “similar traits in Eastern and Western realisations of the dedicatory themes only point to their common origins in late Antiquity [...]” Art historian Tadeusz Chrzanowski also sees the pose of the foundation tympanum as Byzantine in origin, but argues that it reflects a motif long absorbed into western art, rather than testifying to any direct Polish-Rus’-Byzantine links at the time of its creation. Maria’s depiction on the foundation tympanum for Our-Lady-on-the-Sand therefore speaks to the continued common visual language of pious donations, shared by both Latin and Orthodox Christianity. Rather than importing a Byzantine style into Wrocław, Maria commissioned her donor’s portrait to be done in a local western (Romanesque) style, although this local style still bore many commonalities with Orthodox iconography familiar to her in Rus’.

Another possible source of evidence for Maria’s ongoing cultural connection to Rus’ in her widowhood is the surviving foundation tympanum for the church of Saint Michael in Wrocław. This church was built only a few meters from Saint Vincent’s in the years 1146-

1117 Ibid., 363.
1120 The foundation tympanum of Saint Michael’s in Ołbin was discovered in 1962 and is currently in the Muzeum Architektury i Odbudowy [Museum of Architecture and Rebuilding] in Wrocław, Krystyna Maćkowska-Pilch, Tympanon fundacyjny z Ołbina na tle przedstawień o charakterze donacyjnym (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1973) with English summary, 143-148; Jamroziak, “Foundations,” 189-190; Chrzanowski, Sztuka w Polsce, 77; Świechowski,
1163 by Maria’s daughter Agafia and Maria’s son-in-law, the Sorbian (West Slavic) Duke Jaksa (German: Jaxa, fl. mid twelfth century).\textsuperscript{1121} The tympanum depicts Christ in the centre of the composition flanked on the right side by Duke Bolesław IV the Curly holding up a model church followed by his son Leszek and on the left side by Duke Jaksa with another model church, behind whom kneels a woman.\textsuperscript{1122} According to their inscriptions, Duke Jaksa offers up to Christ the church of Saint Michael’s in Wrocław, while Duke Bolesław IV offers up the church of Saint Margaret in Bytom (160 kilometres from Wrocław).\textsuperscript{1123} The kneeling woman’s name is indicated in a seemingly Cyrillic inscription above her head as AGAΠΗЯ (“Agapeitia”).\textsuperscript{1124}

Her identity hinges on the identification of the figure of Jaksa with Duke Jaksa of Köpenick (Kopanicy), who, according to the Chronicle of Greater Poland, married a daughter of Piotr Wlast in 1145.\textsuperscript{1125} Emilia Jamroziak notes that this “use of Cyrillic letters is often interpreted as a personal choice of Agafia, who wanted to indicate her attachment to her mother’s heritage […]”\textsuperscript{1126} An authentic Cyrillic inscription on a donation image in Silesia, that is to say, far from


\textsuperscript{1121} Jaksa’s exact identity is a subject of ongoing scholarly debate. For details, see Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 10.


\textsuperscript{1124} Mącewska-Pilch, \textit{Tympanon fundacyjny}, 17-18 and English summary 143-144; Świechowski, \textit{Romanesque Art in Poland}, 46; Jamroziak, “Foundations,” 190-191. In Bieniek’s opinion, the letters are Greek, not Cyrillic, Piotr Włostowic, 100.


any border and influence coming from Rus’, would be testimony indeed to Maria’s ability to pass on an awareness of her Rus’ culture to her children.

Anna Rózycka Bryzek has cast grave doubt on this theory. In her opinion, the origin of the Cyrillic “p” (П) is simply a Latin “T” with an extra stroke accidentally added to it. According to her, this additional stroke could have been added sometime in the turbulent history of the tympanum which, after Saint Michael’s demolition in 1529, was placed first in the walls of the church of All Saints in Wrocław, and then used as a stone in the Wrocław Arsenal built from 1769 to 1789. The “accident” theory, however, does not explain why only one letter in Agafia’s name should be damaged, while the rest of the inscription survived intact. Whether or not Maria was able to teach her children Cyrillic script thus remains undecided.

At her death, Maria was buried with her husband at his foundation Saint Vincent in Wroclaw, where, as mentioned above, the couple was commemorated in the monks’ necrology and in their chronicles. According to the Abbreviated Silesian Chronicle and the Chronicle of Peter, the tomb of Maria and Piotr was supported by four lions and located in the middle of the choir. An eighteenth-century drawing depicts the now lost tomb after it was reconstructed by Abbot Wilhelm III in the fourteenth century (Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytetu, MS 4, fol. 239r). At this time, it depicted Maria holding a church model next to her husband bearing a shield. While Piotr was commemorated as a warrior, Maria appeared at his side in the role of pious patron of the church.

---

1127 Bryzek, “Polish Medieval Art,” 362; Świechowski, Romanesque Art in Poland, 262; ills. 128 and 129. Nonetheless, Bryzek acknowledges that the Cyrillic inscription is maintained in Mącewska-Pilch, Tympanon fundacyjny, 17-18.

1128 Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 734.

1129 “Sepelitur in monasterio divi Vincentii extra Wratislaviam una cum uxore sua in medio chori, ut se pulchrum ipsius testatur”, Chronica Silesiae abbreviata, ed. Semkowicz, 723; “Sepelitur in monasterio sancti Vincentii extra muros Wratislavie, una cum uxore sua Maria in medio chori sub lapide quatuor leonum loratorum,” Cronica Petri, ed. Plezia, 29.

1130 David, Les sources, 231; Bieniek, Piotr Włostowic, 110; and Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria”, 736. The eighteenth-drawing of the tomb slab is reproduced in Bieniek, Piotr Włostowic, plate 17.

1131 Ibid., plate 17.
Maria thus emerges in written and visual sources as a powerful widow who continued her husband’s patronage of local churches in Wrocław. As Halina Manikowska has noted, together Maria and her husband played a key role in forming the “sacred topography” of Wrocław, filling the city with sacred relics and churches, and placing it under the heavenly protection of patron-saints. Maria possibly aided in the exchange of relics from East to West, acting as a cultural mediator between Rus’, Poland, and Germany. She did not completely assimilate into the culture of her husband, however. Maria returned to Rus’ in 1146, and possibly made her daughter Agafia familiar with Cyrillic script. At the same time she also lived in a transitional period when crusading ideals had begun to circulate among the Polish nobility and a more negative view of Rus’ and Orthodoxy was emerging in Latin Christendom. Her husband seems to have both valued his connections to the Riurikid dynasty and yet rejected the Orthodoxy which this dynasty practiced.

Ingeborg Mstislavna (d. after 1131)

The ruling dynasties of both Poland and Rus’ also intermarried with Scandinavian rulers in the twelfth century, and no examination of Rus’ princesses who married western rulers would be complete without mentioning this northern region. The descendants of Vladimir Monomakh and the Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha, the Monomachichi, in particular continued the links forged in the eleventh century between Scandinavian rulers and the Riurikids. Mstislav, Monomakh’s son, took as his wife the Swedish princess Kristin Ingesdottir (d. 1122) and married two of his daughters to Scandinavian rulers. One of these daughters, Malmfrid (or Malfrid) Mstislavna (d. after 1135), was married first to King Sigurd Jerusalem-Farer (“Jorsalfar”) of Norway (d. 1130) and then after his death to Erik II the Memorable (“Emune”) of Denmark (d. 1137). Her sister Ingeborg married Erik II’s half-brother, Knud Lavard. Unfortunately, we have far

1132 Manikowska, “Princeps fundator,” 305.

1133 For Kristin and Mstislav’s marriage see Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 77-78; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 85-87. The multi-generational marriage alliances of the Mstislavichi with Scandinavian rulers are surveyed in: Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 146 and genealogical table 2, no. 9, 421; John Lind, “Consequences of the Baltic Crusades in Target Areas: the Case of Karelia,” in Crusade and Conversion, ed. Murray, 134; Uspenksij, “Dynastic Names,” 28; Litvina, and Uspenskii, Vybor imeni, 246; Voitovych, Kniazha doba, no. 21/8, 461.

1134 For further discussion on variants of Malmfrid’s name, see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 22.
fewer pieces of surviving evidence for these women in comparison with other Ruirikid princesses who married western-rite, but we can nonetheless trace the network of dynastic connections to which they belonged. These connections, in turn, testify to an ongoing mutual influence between Orthodoxy and Catholicism facilitated by these marriages.

There is somewhat more information about Ingeborg than Malmfrid. Her name and her marriage are mentioned only in Scandinavian sources; Rus’ chronicles do not mention her existence. Based on the approximate date of her marriage, Dariusz Dąbrowski hypothesizes that she was born between 1079 and 1102. Her life exemplifies the ability of Rus’ women to move easily between the northern world of Scandinavia and Rus’ in the twelfth century. Trade between Rus’ and Denmark had, in fact, increased during this time, as Danish rulers shifted their focus eastward in the wake of the collapse of King Knud the Great’s “North Sea” empire over England, Normandy, and parts of the German Empire. In particular, the Danish duchy of Schleswig (Jutland) ruled since 1115 by Knud Lavard had close connections with Novgorod through the fur-trade, with merchant ships travelling to and from these two commercial emporia.

Knud Lavard was the only legitimate son of King Erik I the Good of Denmark (r. 1095-1103) and Bodil, a Danish noblewoman. The Danish prince was orphaned at a young age: both his

---

1136 Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 97, 100-101.
1137 Raffensperger, Reimagining Europe, 131.
parents died in Cyprus in 1103 on their return from a crusade to Jerusalem. Knud’s father, King Erik I, had enjoyed positive relations with the courts of Rus’ and Byzantium during his lifetime: according to the late twelfth-century history of Saxo Grammaticus, Erik journeyed to the Holy Land through Rus’ and stopped in Constantinople where he visited fellow Danes in the Varangian Guard. Indeed, Janus Møller Jensen argues that an obligatory stay in Constantinople might have been a unique aspect of Scandinavian participation in the crusades, which thus combined the Latin Christian idea of crusading with the older established practice of Scandinavian mercenary service for the Byzantine Emperor. Travel to Orthodox lands on the part of the Scandinavian elite and the tradition of serving the Byzantine emperor in the Varangian Guard helped to maintain a positive perception of Orthodoxy at the Danish court, in which differences in rite were still minor compared to differences between Christianity and “paganism.”

At his death, rule of the Kingdom of Denmark was taken over by King Erik’s brother, Niels Sveinsson (r. 1104-1134). Once Knud came of age, his uncle gave him the rule of the duchy of Jutland in 1115. Knud’s status soon increased in 1127 when, at the death of his maternal half-


1142 “Perhaps a special feature of the North Atlantic crusading experience was the close contact with Byzantium. In this context, it appears as if there was a choice between becoming a crusader and an imperial mercenary, yet all Levant-bound crusaders that we know of in the twelfth century made a stay in Constantinople. Perhaps then it was not a question of either/or but rather that the stop at Constantinople was simply an aspect of Scandinavian crusading,” Jensen, “Crusading in Scandinavia,” 181.

1143 Lind even suggests that Knud may have been allied with the neighbouring Pomeranian duke, Vartislav, a pagan, proposing that they found common ground in defending their territories against the German emperor and against Duke Boleslaw III of Poland’s ecclesiastical-military expansion into this region, “*Knes Kanutus,*” 119.

Danish/half Wendish cousin Henrik Gottskalksen, ruler of the Abodrites, Knud became king of this Western Slavic people on the Baltic Coast.\textsuperscript{1145} He paid homage to the future Emperor Lothar III, then Duke of Saxony, in 1129 for this position and received a royal crown.\textsuperscript{1146} Consequently, upon her marriage to Knud around 1115-1117, when she was around fifteen to twenty years old, Ingeborg not only ruled Jutland as duchess, but also, later on, as queen of a still mostly pagan Slavic people.\textsuperscript{1147} Once again, this fact suggests that Christianity was indeed still new in the region over which Ingeborg ruled as queen. Differences in rite between various Christian groups in the Baltic coast were still likely to have been of lesser importance than the basic difference between Christians and non-Christians at this time.

According to Saxo Grammaticus, Ingeborg’s marriage was arranged by Queen Margareta the Peace-Maiden (“Fredkulla”) of Denmark, who was Ingeborg’s maternal aunt, the sister of her mother Kristin, but also Knud’s aunt by marriage.\textsuperscript{1148} The mid thirteenth-century\textit{ Knytlinga Saga} provides a literary telling of the mission sent by Knud to Novgorod to convince Ingeborg’s father Mstislav (called by his Scandinavian name “Harald”) to let him marry his daughter. According to this saga, Knud sent one Vigaut, who is described as a merchant who spoke many languages and had no need of translators, to plead his case before Mstislav.\textsuperscript{1149} The marriage negotiations are described in entirely secular terms, with no clerical participation, and Vigaut himself is described

\begin{itemize}
\item[1145] Henrik, prince of the Abodrites, was the son of the Wendish prince Gottschalk (whose father, Pribignev, had converted to Christianity) and the Danish princess Sigrid, a daughter of Sven Estridsen (r. 1047-1076). Consequently, Henrik was a cousin of Knud Lavard, Saxo Grammaticus, \textit{Gesta Danorum}, ed. Friis-Jensen, trans. Fisher. vol. 1, 751, and \textit{Ibid}, vol. 2, 900-901, 914-915 and n. 20, 914. See also Lind, \textit{“Knes Kanutus,”} 108-119.
\item[1146] \textit{Helmoldi Chronica Slavorum}, ed. Schmeidler, 97; Jensen, \textit{“Sclavorum expugnator,”} 70; Lind, \textit{“Knes Kanutus,”} 115-116. Raffensperger suggests that Lothar appointed Knud King of the Abodrites in order to have an ally against the Poles, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 115.
\item[1147] Dąbrowski estimates that Ingeborg’s marriage took place while Mstislav was still prince in Novgorod and therefore before March of 1117 when Mstislav moved from Novgorod to Bilhorod (Belgorod), \textit{Genealogia Mściślawowiczów}, 99.
\item[1149] \textit{Knytlinga Saga}, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 128.
\end{itemize}
as a recent convert to Christianity. After Mstislav and his daughter Ingeborg gave their consent, Vigaut sailed back to Denmark to report the good news and begin the wedding preparations. The saga then concludes that “King Harald sent his daughter from Novgorod in the east with a splendid retinue. When she arrived in Denmark, the duke welcomed her warmly, as did everyone else, and celebrated their wedding in grand style.” While the saga cannot be taken as a literal description of Ingeborg’s marriage, it does give insight into the multi-lingual, cross-confessional and cosmopolitan attitude of the Danish court that welcomed an Orthodox bride. The saga’s representation of Ingeborg’s arrival in her new land together with a retinue is also likely in light of the high status of the match: royal brides would not arrive alone at a foreign court, but rather with gifts, servants, and retainers. Moreover, it is notable that the author of the Knytlinga Saga, writing in the thirteenth century, still recorded this inter-rite marriage without any trace of prejudice toward the “schismatic” origins of the princess.

Several scholars have speculated on Rus’-Scandinavian mutual religio-cultural influence that could have resulted from or been strengthened by Ingeborg’s marriage and the marriage of her sister Malmfrid. Much discussed in scholarship is a litany of “western” saints— Magnus, Knud, Olaf, Alban, Botulf, Martin—in a late eleventh- or twelfth-century Slavonic prayer to the Trinity. John Lind ascribes the veneration of these same saints in Rus’ to Scandinavian-Rus’

---

1153 Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, 63-64.
1154 “magnushe. Konute. […] venedikte. Albane. Olove [variant: alove]. Botulfe […] vsi stii muchenitsi molite boga za mia grĕshnago”, Norman W. Ingham, “The Litany of Saints in ‘Molitva sv. Troicĕ,’” in *Studies Presented to Professor Roman Jacobson by his Students*, ed. Charles E. Gribble (Cambridge, MA, Slavica, 1968), 125. Lind identifies magnuse in the litany as Saint Magnus of Orkeney (martyred 1115; relics translated 1135), kanute as the king Saint Knud (martyred 1086) or possibly Saint Knud Lavard, Ingeborg’s husband (martyred 1131). He identifies alove with Saint Olaf Haraldson (d. 1030), and albane with the Anglo-Saxon saint Saint Alban. It was in the Church of the Holy Martyr Alban in Odense, Denmark that King Knud was martyred together with his companion Saint Benedict in 1086. Lind identifies vendikte with the latter rather than Benedict of Nursia, which would explain the placement among the martyrs. Lind admits that butulve (Saint Botulf) is an Anglo-Saxon, rather than Scandinavian saint, but notes that his cult was also prevalent in Scandinavia, “Martyria of Odense,” 7, 9-14.
intermarriage in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{1155} In contrast, Francis Dvornik and Norman Ingham have argued that this litany of saints came to Rus’ via Czech mediation, partly because Czech monks were translating Latin texts into Old Church Slavonic into the late eleventh century.\textsuperscript{1156} The question remains open, but the existence of this litany demonstrates cultural exchanges between Latin Christianity and Orthodoxy in Rus’ that could have been aided by inter-rite marriage.

Another piece of evidence for mutual Scandinavian-Rus’ religious influence at this time is the spread of the cult of Saint Nicholas to Northern Europe. Ildar Garipzanov has made the detailed argument that dedications of churches to Saint Nicholas in twelfth-century Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, around the same time as a church was built to Saint Nicholas in Novgorod, could be attributable to “dynastic contacts between the two royal families.”\textsuperscript{1157} Ingeborg Mstislavna’s marriage and the travels of persons between Rus’ and Denmark that resulted from it could have been possible channels for the transmission of “western” saints’ cults into Rus’ and vice versa.

Finally, Ulla Haastrup and John Lind have discussed in detail the appearance of certain Byzantine features in frescoes found in Danish churches that date to the 1120s, which they argue stemmed from the connections to Byzantium and Rus’ established in the circle of Queen Margareta Fredkulla and her nieces Malmfrid and Ingeborg.\textsuperscript{1158} Examples include the donor fresco in the church in Vä (today in the province of Skåne, Sweden), the portrayal of the apostles in the church in Gundsømagle near Roskilde, and, perhaps most strikingly, the fresco of Christ in Majesty in the apse of the church in Sønder Jernløse, which dates to around 1125.\textsuperscript{1159} In His left hand, Christ holds a scroll, rather than a book as in the western tradition, while his right hand

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1155] Lind, “Martyria of Odense,”15-17 and n. 40, 14: “The absence of any of the royal Anglo-Saxon saints (Oswald, Edmund, Ethelred, Edward) in the prayer seems to confirm that SS Alban and Botulf came via Scandinavia and not directly from England.” See also item, “Consequences,”134.
\item[1157] Garipzanov, “Novgorod,” 140-141.
\item[1158] Ulla Haastrup and John H. Lind, “Royal Family Connections and the Byzantine Impact on Danish Romanesque Church Frescos. Queen Margareta Fredkulla and her Nieces,” in From Goths to Varangians, eds. Bjerg, Lind and Sindbaek, 381-411.
\item[1159] \textit{Ibid}, 384-411. Photographs of Danish church frescoes showing Byzantine iconographical features can be seen in \textit{Ibid}, figs. 1-14.
\end{footnotes}
blesses with thumb and index fingers touching and three fingers extended, again following Byzantine iconography, rather than western iconography. The appearance of such iconographical features could be due to artists or model books who accompanied Ingeborg or her sister Malmfrid to Scandinavia, or else who were commissioned by their husbands’ families as a result of their pilgrimages to the Holy Land and stays in Constantinople. Either way, Ingeborg’s marriage therefore did not represent a complete break with the traditions of worship she knew in her homeland, since members of the Danish court in the 1120s had direct knowledge of the Byzantine rite. Grzegorz Pac describes these cross-confessional ties as forming “communities of devotion” across the Baltic Sea that bridged the Orthodox/Catholic divide.

As was the case for other Rus’ princesses surveyed above, external circumstances forced Ingeborg Mstislavna to return to Rus’ after her marriage. She became a widow in 1131 after her husband was murdered in an ambush orchestrated by his first cousin, Prince Magnus, the son of his uncle, King Niels. Kingship in early twelfth-century Denmark, like in Rus’, seems to have been governed by principles of lateral succession and genealogical seniority. Magnus may have killed his cousin because he felt threatened by him politically, although it is not clear whether or not Knud actually aspired to become king of Denmark one day, and none of the surviving sources make this claim.

The extant sources give differing accounts of Ingeborg’s whereabouts when her husband was killed. Helmold of Bosau’s twelfth-century Chronicle of the Slavs suggests that Ingeborg was in

---

1160 Ibid, 394 and figure 7, 395. The ceiling beam in the nave of the Sønder Jerøse Church is dendrochronologically dated to 1125, which would give a rough date for the church’s wall frescoes as well, Ibid, 396.
1161 Ibid, 382, 396-397.
1162 Pac, “Communities of Devotion,” esp. 132.
1165 Ibid., 108.
Denmark at the time of the murder.\textsuperscript{1166} The mid thirteenth-century \textit{Knytlinga Saga} states, however, that Ingeborg was in Rus’, visiting her father.\textsuperscript{1167} If the latter account is correct, it would suggest that Ingeborg was able to maintain close contact with her natal family following her marriage.

Written records about her son’s life may provide some corroborating evidence that such contacts were possible. Both Saxo Grammaticus and \textit{Knytlinga Saga} agree that about a week after Knud’s murder Ingeborg gave birth to a son, Valdimar (Vladimir), the future Valdimar I the Great of Denmark (r. 1157-1182).\textsuperscript{1168} The former source states explicitly that Valdimar was named after his maternal grandfather, who was the Rus’ prince Vladimir Monomakh.\textsuperscript{1169} While civil war raged in Denmark, Ingeborg remained in Rus’ with Valdimar.\textsuperscript{1170} After several years in “Catholic” Denmark and Jutland, therefore, where her husband ruled over a Slavic people reluctantly subject to Latin missionary efforts, Ingeborg seemingly easily returned to the ecclesiastical culture of Rus’, suggesting the fluid nature of religious identity for brides in these inter-rite marriages.

The last written reference to Ingeborg is in connection with her return from Rus’ to Denmark around 1137 with her eight-year old son, following the end of civil war in Denmark.\textsuperscript{1171} Ingeborg’s brother-in-law, Erik Emune, who had married her widowed sister Malmfrid after her first marriage, had avenged Knud’s murder by defeating prince Magnus and his father King

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1166} In Helmold of Bosau’s \textit{Chronicle of the Slavs}, Ingeborg is warned of her husband’s murder in a dream and tries to prevent Knud from going to a private meeting with his cousin where he was killed in an ambush: \textit{Helmoldi Chronica Slavorum}, ed. Schmeidler, 99. Saxo Grammaticus also makes Ingeborg present in Denmark at the time of her husband’s murder, \textit{Gesta Danorum}, ed. Friis-Jensen, trans. Fisher, 934-935. As Friis-Jensen and Fisher note, however, foreshadowing and unheeded warnings before a murder are a stock plot device, and Ingeborg’s efforts to warn her husband need not be taken literally, \textit{Ibid}, n. 39, 934-935.
  \item \textsuperscript{1167} \textit{Knytlinga Saga}, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 135.
  \item \textsuperscript{1170} \textit{Knytlinga Saga}, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 136.
\end{itemize}
Niels in battle in 1134: Magnus was killed and Niels fled into exile to Jutland.\textsuperscript{1172} Indeed, Christian Raffensperger suggests that it was Malmfrid who was responsible for urging her second husband Eric Emune to avenge the murder of her sister’s husband.\textsuperscript{1173} At the conclusion of this war of vengence, Ingeborg’s son Valdimar was elected king by the assembled nobles, but in light of his young age, “with the consent of his mother,” they decided that his first cousin, Erik III, known as “the Lamb” or “the Wise” (r. 1137-1146), should rule until Valdimar came of age.\textsuperscript{1174} According to Saxo Grammaticus, however, Ingeborg so feared for the life of her young son that she made the nobles swear not to choose her son as king.\textsuperscript{1175} These passages suggest that like other Riurikid princesses such as Anna Yaroslavna or Anastasia Yaroslavna, Ingeborg Mstislavna acted on the regency council for her young son. Her place of death is not recorded, but presumably she stayed in Denmark watching over the interests of her young son. Dariusz Dąbrowski suggests that she may have been buried in the royal necropolis of Ringsted, the Benedictine monastery where her husband (and later her son Valdimar and his wife) were buried.\textsuperscript{1176}

Ingeborg’s children continued to maintain ties with their Rus’ relatives. Around 1131, her daughter Kristin was married off to her first cousin, Magnus of Norway, the son of King Sigurd of Norway and Ingeborg’s sister Malmfrid.\textsuperscript{1177} Another daughter, Katrin, was married “in the east,” that is to say in Rus’, though we do not know to what specific Rus’ prince.\textsuperscript{1178} Finally, Ingeborg’s son Valdimar continued to maintain ties with the Riurikid dynasty all his life, which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1172} Jensen, “Crusading in Scandinavia”, 173-174.
  \item \textsuperscript{1173} Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 114.
  \item \textsuperscript{1174} \textit{Knytinga Saga}, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 145 and genealogical diagram on 11; Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 118. Kings’ mothers are often portrayed as more important political decision makers than kings’ wives in the sagas, Friðriksdóttir, \textit{Women in Old Norse Literature}, 84-85.
  \item \textsuperscript{1176} Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mścisławowiczów}, 102. Ringsted Abbey was founded in 1136 by Knud’s half-brother, King Erik II Emune, Jensen, “Sclavorum expugnator,” 71.
  \item \textsuperscript{1177} \textit{Knytinga Saga}, trans. Pálsson and Edwards,135; Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 113-114.
\end{itemize}
is not surprising in light of the fact that he was raised in an Orthodox Christian environment.\footnote{Knytlinga Saga, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 136.}

Not only did Valdimar receive a Rus’ name but around 1154 he married a Rus’ princess: Sophia, who was the daughter of Ryksa of Poland and a Rus’ prince, probably Vladimir Vsevolodich (d. after 1140).\footnote{Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum, ed. Friis-Jensen, trans. Fisher, 1054-1055; Fagrskinna, trans., Finlay, 236; Knytlinga Saga, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 150; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 147; Bysted et al., Jerusalem in the North, 288. On the genealogical debates around Sophia’s father see Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 26.}


Knud Lavard’s cult later spread to Novgorod in the late twelfth century, serving as another example of cross-confessional links strengthened by inter-marriage between the Orthodox Riurikids and Latin Christian dynasties.\footnote{Lind, “Consequences,” 136. See also the discussion above on the “western” litany of saints in Rus’.}

Subsequently the memory of Ingeborg Mstislavna’s and Sophia’s Rus’ origins were preserved by Danish royal genealogies, which were used during the trial of Valdimar’s daughter, Ingegorg of Denmark, the repudiated wife of Philippe II Augustus of France (r. 1179-1206). In 1194 Valdimar sent Abbot William (d. 1203) of Æbelholt Abbey in Denmark to Pope Celestine III in Rome to demonstrate that Ingeborg and Philippe were not too closely related by consanguinity, as Philippe alleged.\footnote{For the genealogical relationship between Ingeborg and Philippe II Augustus see the diagram in Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mściśławowiczów, 168. On Abbot William’s life and career see, for instance, Nanna Damsholt, “Abbot William of Æbelholt: A Foreigner in Denmark,” in Medieval Spirituality in Scandinavia and Europe, ed. Lars Bisgaard et al. (Odense: Odense University Press, 2001), 3–19, esp. 12 (on William’s involvement in defending the status of Queen Ingeborg’s marriage in the 1190s).} The genealogy William produced showed a continued commemoration of
the extensive kinship network developed by Rus’ inter-marriage with western Christian royal families, in which differences of rite or ecclesiastical allegiance were not emphasized. 1184

Valdimar and Sophia’s wedding around 1157, however, was the last Scandinavian/Riurikid marriage alliance of the pre-Mongol period. 1185 Control over the coast of the Baltic Sea across which merchants, brides, and saints’ cults had travelled in the eleventh and twelfth centuries would become in the thirteenth century a source of conflict between the Ruirikids and Scandinavians. 1186 Future research should examine the process by which Scandinavians and Ruirikids no longer saw each other as desirable marriage partners in this century since conflict over territorial possessions alone cannot explain the end of these multi-generational marriage alliances. 1187

A possible avenue of this research should investigate the issue of whether or not there emerged a stricter identification of ethnic with religious identity in the Baltic region by the end of the twelfth century. At Valdimar’s death in 1182, he was buried under a lead tablet which proclaimed him the “first conqueror and lord of the Slavs” (“primus Sclauorum expugator et dominator”). 1188 Valdimar was the son of a Slavic mother and the husband of another Slavic woman. The “Slavs” in question on his tombstone were obviously the pagan Wends, whose fortress of Arkona Valdimar had conquered in 1169 and subjected to the ecclesiastical

1184 Abbot William ofÆbelholt, Genealogia Ingeburgis Reginae, ed. Waitz, 164-166.

1185 Bysted et al., Jerusalem in the North, 288; Dąbrowski, “Matrimonial Policy,” 215.

1186 Denmark ruled over Estonia from the thirteenth century to 1346, when the territory was sold to the Teutonic Knights, while in the 1240s Sweden fell into conflict with Novgorod as it began to convert and colonize Finno-Ugric tribes which had previously paid tribute to this Rus’ city. For an overview of these complex developments see Bysted et al., Jerusalem in the North, 274-332; Sven Ekdahl, “Crusade and Colonisation in the Baltic: A Historiographical Analysis,” in North-Eastern Frontiers, ed. Murray, 3-4 with further bibliography.

1187 Some historians have argued that Scandinavian-Rus’ marriages came to an end due to “the crusading movement’s increased hostility to the Orthodox,” Bysted et al., Jerusalem in the North, 288. Dąbrowski, on the other hand, suggests that the end of Scandinavian/Riurikid intermarriage is indicative of the end of “Varangian self-consciousness” among the Riurikids, who had originated as a Scandinavian dynasty, “Matrimonial Policy;” 215.

jurisdiction of the Danish bishop of Roskild. But on Valdimar’s tombstone, the Wends’
paganism is only obliquely alluded to by mention of their ethnicity. Sally McKee, has observed a
similar equation in fourteenth-century Crete in which Venetian documents (including laws and
Senate proclamations) used the label “Greek” to encompass religion, ethnicity, and lack of free
status. Whether or not a similar equation of ethnicity with religion (Slavi = pagani) was
made by crusaders in thirteenth-century attacks on Novgorod and Pskov deserves further
investigation.

Euphrosyne Mstislavna (died 1180s)

The final case study under examination here is the reign of Euphrosyne Mstislavna (d. circa
1193), wife of King Géza II of Hungary (r. 1141-1162) and the last Rus’-born queen of Hungary.
Her reign exemplifies a high degree of mobility that was still possible between Orthodoxy and
Catholicism in the mid to late twelfth century. Latin sources reveal that Euphrosyne Mstislavna
played a key role in establishing the Order of Hospitalers (the Order of Saint John) in Hungary.
Charter evidence also suggests that Euphrosyne promoted Gregorian church reform in Hungary
as a widow. She seems to have looked for allies among the clergy in order to help protect her son
István III’s right to the Hungarian throne against his uncles. Her promotion of western clerical
orders completely different from those familiar to her in Rus’ might suggest that Euphrosyne had
become thoroughly acculturated to her husband’s milieu, but, in fact, from the twelfth-century
Kyivan Chronicle we learn that she was able to maintain direct personal contact with her natal
family following her marriage. Local Jerusalem tradition recording her death in an Orthodox
monastery in the Holy Land suggests that Euphrosyne did not see herself as having abandoned
Orthodoxy earlier in her life to assume temporarily a Latin identity. Rather, she ruled at a time
when the Hungarian court still embraced a relatively “local” Christian identity that drew on both
eastern and western-rite traditions.

1189 Ibid., 56-57.
Euphrosyne was the daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich the Great (d. 1132) and his second wife, the unnamed daughter of the Novgorod posadnik (prince’s lieutenant) Dmitrii Zavidovich. Around 1146 she became the wife of King Géza II, likely in the second half of that year. The date of the marriage is not recorded by any medieval source and is estimated on the basis of the baptism of Géza and Euphrosyne’s first son, István III, in July or August of 1147. At the time of Euphrosyne’s marriage, Hungary’s territorial expansion into Croatia and Dalmatia in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries resulted in military conflicts with Byzantium. As a result, Hungarian kings turned to neighbouring Slavic Orthodox rulers in both Serbia and Rus’ for alliances against Byzantium.

Upon arriving in Hungary, Euphrosyne’s adjustment to her new cultural environment may have been eased by the presence of another Orthodox Slavic woman: Géza’s mother, Ilona (variants: Helena/Jelena), the daughter of Urosh the veliki zhupan (duke) of Raška (present-day Serbia), who was still alive until the mid 1150s. Although no sources exist to describe their

---

1191 Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 113; Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni: Political Relations Between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th century*, trans. György Novák, rev. Maurice F. Cassidy, István Petrovics, and Pál Engel (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989), 41, and genealogical table, n.p. No primary source mentions Euphrosyne’s birth. The fact that her mother was the daughter of the Novgorod posadnik is surmised from chronological grounds: Mstislav’s first wife, Kristin, died in 1122, and, since, as discussed below, the Kyivan Chronicle states that Euphrosyne’s mother was still alive in the 1150s, it follows that Euphrosyne was born from Mstislav’s second wife.

1192 Wertner, *Az Árpádok családi története*, 312-313; Makk, *Árpáds and the Comneni*, 41.


relationship, the two women probably had to share the status of queen as well as the royal estates belonging to queens.  

Euphrosyne’s marriage to the king of Hungary did not entail loss of contact with her siblings. In 1148/1149, around a year or two after her marriage, her brother Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1154) was expelled from the throne of Kyiv by his paternal uncle Yuri the Long-Armed (Dolgorukii) of Suzdal. He fled to western Rus’ and sent messengers to his Latin Christian relatives by marriage, Géza II of Hungary, Bolesław IV the Curly of Poland, Mieszko III of Poland, and Vratislav of Bohemia to organize a military campaign against his uncle Yuri. As a result of his support of Iziaslav, Géza II’s armies fought a total of six times in Rus’ (from 1148 to 1152). Euphrosyne’s husband Géza personally took part in these campaigns twice, once in 1150 and the second time in 1152, against Yuri’s ally in Galicia, prince Vladimirko Volodarevich (d. 1153), the son of the aforementioned Volodar Rostislavich who was held hostage by palatine Piotr in 1123.

The Kyivan Chronicle portrays the family relations between Euphrosyne, her siblings, her husband, and even her mother as being very close during this time. Following the first campaign of 1150, the alliance between Géza II and Euphrosyne’s family was strengthened by a marriage between Géza’s first cousin (the daughter of his maternal uncle, Belush, brother of Urosh of Serbia) and Euphrosyne’s younger brother, Vladimir Mstislavich (d. 1171). The Kyivan Chronicle is the only source to mention this marriage alliance and adds that it took place after

---

1196 Zsoldos, Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 53.
1200 PSRL, vol. 1, sub annis 6658 (1150), 329 and 6660 (1152), 336; PSRL, vol. 2 sub annis 6658 (1150), 405-406 and 6660 (1152), 446-454. On the count palatine Piotr who captured prince Volodar, see the first part of this chapter.
Iziaslav consulted with both King Géza and Euphrosyne: “At this time Iziaslav, having consulted with his relative by marriage, the King [Géza II], and with his sister, the Queen […] [lacuna of eleven lines on bottom of folia 147v, top of 148r], gave the Ban’s daughter in marriage to Vladimir.”

“In 1155, the Kyivan Chronicle even records a visit to the Hungarian court by Euphrosyne’s mother, the only such recorded instance of a Rus’ princess visiting her daughter at a Latin court: “Then also Vladimir Mstislavich sent his mother, Mstislavna [i.e. wife of Mstislav] to the Hungarians, to her son-in-law, the King. The King gave much wealth to his mother-in-law.”

Personal visits from her family and exchange of material objects enabled Euphrosyne to remain in contact with her kin. Her marriage, then, did not mark an end to her social and cultural identity as a Rus’ princess and the abandonment of her kinship ties. The territory over which she ruled included Slavic-speakers in the Balkans, including Orthodox Christians.

Her husband and brother campaigned and feasted together, suggesting that twelfth-century Hungarian court

---


1204 In 1142, Belosh became ban of Croatia and Dalmatia, a title usually given to the king’s younger son, and in 1145 he became count palatine; Fine, *Early medieval Balkans*, 236; Dąbrowski, *Genealogia Mścisławowiczów*, 178.

1205 “korol’ zhe veliku ch[es]st’ stvori emu i sestra ego i muzhe eg[o] i tako odariv’she i vsękymi dari i otpustisha i k bratu svoemu Izęslavu,” PSRL, vol. 2, sub anno 6658 (1150), 407 (“the King did him [Vladimir] great honour, as did his sister [Euphrysone], and their men. And then, having given him various gifts, they sent him to his brother Iziaslav.”).

1206 “Togda zhe i Volodimer M’stislavich’ pusti mater’ svoiu M’stislavliu v Ugly ko korolevi zętevi svoemu. Korol’ zhe vda mnogo imenii teshchi svoei,” PSRL, vol. 2, sub anno 6663 (1155), 482-483. Pashuto notes that this visit took place after the death of Euphrosyne’s eldest brother Iziaslav Mstislavich, *Vneshniaia politika*, 178. The Hungarian court could thus perhaps offer material support to the widowed Rus’ princess who was now also bereft of the support of her eldest son.

1207 On the multi-cultural, multi-ethnic character of medieval Hungary, see Berend, *At the Gate*, esp. 40-41.
culture in which she lived continued to be multi-lingual and cosmopolitan where differences of rite were not so important.

Both Euphrosyne’s brother Iziaslav and her husband Géza were united in sharing a common enemy: Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (r.1143-1180). Euphrosyne’s married life was marked by intermittent Hungarian-Byzantine war, begun in 1149 when Géza II supported the revolt of Serbia against Byzantine rule. The events of this Hungarian/Byzantine conflict have been examined by both Byzantinists and Hungarian historians, and so only its Rus’ dimension will be highlighted here. By supporting his brother-in-law Iziaslav Mstislavich in Rus’, Géza II had entered into indirect conflict with Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, who was allied with Vladimirko of Galicia. Moreover, against Géza, Manuel Komnenos also supported the claim to the Hungarian throne of Boris, the son of Euphrosyne’s aunt, the Rus’ princess Euphemia, who was also the repudiated wife of King Kálmán of Hungary (r. 1095-1116). Finally, while Géza II and Iziaslav Mstislavich allied with King Roger II of Norman Sicily, the Rus’ prince Yuri the Long-Armed allied with Manuel Komnenos against the Normans.

This Byzantine/Rus’/Hungarian conflict had a religious aspect as well. On June 24th 1147, Euphrosyne’s brother, prince Iziaslav, appointed a native Rus’ monk, Klim (Clement) of Smolensk (d. 1155), to be metropolitan of Kyiv while the patriarchal throne of Constantinople

1208 The Serbian rebellion against Byzantine rule was also supported by the Normans of Sicily: “[…] the Germans and Serbs and Hungarians […] joined in alliance with one another to attack the Romans from the West”, Kinnamos, Deeds, 82; Font, “Emperor Manuel,” 226; Urbansky, Danube Frontier, 64; Paul Stephenson, “Manuel I. Comnenus and Géza II: A Revised Context and Chronology for Hungaro-Byzantine Relations, 1148-1155,” Byzantinoslavica 55 (1994): 255.
1209 See the bibliography in Font, “Emperor Manuel and the Hungarian Kingdom,” 223-235.
1210 Kinnamos, Deeds, 92; Urbansky, Danube Frontier, 64; Stephenson, “Revised Chronology,” 261.
was vacant.\textsuperscript{1213} The result of Klim’s controversial appointment was a twenty-year division between Kyiv and Constantinople, and disagreements between local Rus’ bishops as to whether or not Klim’s appointment was canonical.\textsuperscript{1214} Prince Yuri the Long-Armed supported the bishops who questioned the legality of Klim’s appointment, and twice evicted Klim from Kyiv when he occupied the city in 1149 and 1155.\textsuperscript{1215}

These conflicts show a much more complex dynamic between the courts of Rus’, Byzantium, and Hungary than is captured in Obolensky’s model of the “Byzantine Commonwealth” or Picchio’s \textit{Slavia Orthdoxa} since Rus’ princes do not uniformly appear as Byzantium’s allies in either the ecclesiastical, the family, or the military sphere as their marriage alliances did not support the territorial ambitions of the Byzantine imperial court. While we do not know how these wars affected Euphrosyne directly, they demonstrate that the allies and enemies of her family (both her husband’s and her brother’s) did not fit along confessional borders with Orthodox rulers in one camp and Latin rulers in another. More likely, Euphrosyne, her brother Iziaslav Mstislavich, and her husband Géza II shared the view that the court of Constantinople was hostile to their territorial ambitions and claims of rulership. Intermarriages and visits between family members to both courts reinforced these inter-rite links that transcended confessional boundaries. When war with Byzantium broke out again during Euphrosyne’s widowhood, she would once again seek allies against the Emperor’s armies.

Like her eleventh-century predecessor Anastasia, Queen Euphrosyne Mstislavna (d. 1180s) did not return to Rus’, but remained in Hungary at the death of her husband, King Géza II on May 31st 1162.\textsuperscript{1216} Similarly to the situation which Anastasia faced in eleventh-century Hungary, Euphrosyne’s widowhood was threatened by disagreement over the royal succession: whether it should be vertical (father to son) or lateral, based on seniority (succession passing to the eldest

\textsuperscript{1213} “To zhe lĕto postavi Izęslav mitropolitom Klima”, PSRL, vol. 2, \textit{sub anno} 6655 (1146/1147), 340.


\textsuperscript{1215} PSRL, vol. 2, \textit{sub annis} 6657 (1148/1149), 383 and \textit{Ibid.}, 6664 (1155/1156), 483.

\textsuperscript{1216} Zsoldos, \textit{Az Árpádok és asszonyaik}, 188.
male in the dynasty, often brother to brother). The right to rule of her eldest son, István III (b. 1147-d. 1172), who was approximately fifteen years old at the time, was immediately challenged by his two uncles, László (II; c. 1131-1163) and István (IV; c. 1133-1165), brothers of Géza II. As her subsequent actions would show, Euphrosyne headed the party in support of her son against the military forces of her brothers-in-law, who were backed by Emperor Manuel Komnenos.

In mid July 1162 László II had himself crowned by Archbishop Mikó of Kalocsa, the second primate of Hungary, since Archbishop Lukács Bánffy of Esztergom (r. 1158-1181) not only refused to take part in the coronation, but also excommunicated the usurper.\(^{1217}\) According to the near-contemporary *Annals of Bratislava* (Hungarian: Pozsony; written circa 1192-1195 and 1203, but believed to be based on older sources) István III, likely followed by his mother Euphrosyne, fled first to Austria, and then to Bratislava.\(^{1218}\) Six months later, László II died. He was succeeded by his brother who was crowned as István IV in January of 1163, most likely by the Archbishop of Kalocsa, since Archbishop Lukács of Esztergom once again refused to take part and excommunicated István IV and the archbishop of Kalocsa in turn.\(^{1219}\)

Meanwhile, Euphrosyne and her son István III hired mercenaries in Austria and with their help defeated István IV in battle near Székesfehérvár on June 19\(^{th}\) 1163.\(^{1220}\) As part of peace negotiations in 1163, Euphrosyne’s younger son Béla (the future Béla III), who was about thirteen or fifteen years old, was sent to Constantinople as an honourably kept hostage where he

---


received the high title of despotēs, assumed the name Alexios, and was engaged to Maria, Manuel’s daughter.\(^{1221}\) Claiming that he was acting to secure Dalmatia for Béla III (which technically was part of Béla’s duchy), Manuel Komnenos campaigned in person with Béla on the Sava river in 1164, attacking forces loyal to Euphrosyne’s eldest son, István III.\(^{1222}\)

After István III’s restoration to power, Euphrosyne continued to rule Hungary with her son, and to support the Latin church hierarchy. In 1163, in the Serbian town of Titel, they confirmed the donations and immunities that his father Géza II had granted to the Archbishopric of Split (Italian: Spalato) and all the parishes subject to it.\(^{1223}\) István III issued this charter “together with my lady, the Queen Mother” (“una cum domina regina matre mea”), who thus shared his royal authority.\(^{1224}\) The charter was drawn up jointly by the royal chancellor and Euphrosyne’s chaplain (whose identity is not further specified).\(^{1225}\) Another piece of evidence for Euphrosyne’s rule as co-regent for her son and her governance of the church in Hungary comes from an undated letter of Pope Alexander III (r. 1159-1181), surviving in a thirteenth-century decretal collection (BL, Cotton MS Vitellius E. XIII fols. 250r-250v).\(^{1226}\)


\(^{1224}\) “[...] Ego Stephanus domini regis Geize filius dei gratia Hungarie, Dalmatie, Chroatie, Rameque rex, una cum domina regina matre mea, et principibus meis, confirmo beato Domnio, et tibi Petro archiepiscopo fidei nostro, preceptionem et subiectionem, quam fecit illustris pater noster omnibus episcopis per Dalmatiam constitutis, et omnes parochias, quas predecessores tui tenuerunt […] auctoritate regia confirmamus […],” Smičklas, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus*, no. 93, 96; Fejér, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. 2, 167. Domnicus was the deacon of Kaštel (Istria, Croatia), Smičklas, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus*, 424, 487. It is not clear why the king calls him “blessed.”

\(^{1225}\) “Data per manum Stephani cancellarii et domine regine capellani in parochial Tituli, in presentia episcoporum […] the witness-list follows […] secondo anno nostri, anno incarnationis Christi millesimo centesimo sexagesimo tertio,” Smičklas, ed., *Codex Diplomaticus*, no. 93, 97.

Archbishop Kalocsa, Pope Alexander III reluctantly allowed the transfer of one bishop Prodanus to the church of “Kulpa” on the understanding that such transfers will be a rare occurrence in the future. The pope states that he has received the request of this transfer from “the letters of our dearest son in Christ, the illustrious king of the Hungarians, and his Queen Mother.” The fact that both Euphrosyne and her son István III are mentioned as sending a letter together strongly suggests Euphrosyne’s association with her son’s rule and her involvement in the affairs of the kingdom. If Walther Holtzmann’s identification of “Kulpa” with Zagreb is correct, then the letter also shows Euphrosyne’s rulership precisely in the Orthodox/Catholic border zone where the war with the Byzantine emperor Manuel Komnenos I was taking place. The see of Zagreb was subject to the archbishop of Kalocsa, and for this reason Alexander III had to get his agreement to Prodanus’ appointment to this see.

As a Prodanus is documented as bishop of Zagreb first in 1163/1164, his appointment would suggest that Euphrosyne and her son were eager to appoint a bishop who was loyal to them in territory recently taken from Byzantium. Once again, her actions belie any simple identification with Byzantium or Orthodoxy and shows instead that Euphrosyne acted to secure the appointment of prelates loyal to her family.

Czech sources also reveal Euphrosyne’s role in finding allies for her son’s cause by marriage alliance and gift-giving. Around 1157 Euphrosyne’s daughter Elisabeth had married the Czech prince Bedřich (r. 1172-1173; 1178-1189), the eldest son of Vladislav II of Bohemia, and around 1164 another of Euphrosyne’s daughters, Odola, was married to Svatopluk, another of Vladislav II’s sons. Euphrosyne also sent costly gifts to Vladislav II of Bohemia, who agreed to mediate

---

1227 Ibid., 141; Makk, The Árpáds and the Comneni, 105.


1229 The folio is badly damaged at the top by fire, so that Holtzmann states the place-name is difficult to read. He suggests that “Culpanen” is the Latin for the river called “Kupa” in Croatian and “Kolpa” in Slovene and thus refers to Zagreb by metonymy. He provides the analogy that the bishopric of Cenad (now in Romania, Hungarian: Csanád) is sometimes referred to as “ecclesia Moriensa” after the nearby river Mureș [Hungarian: Maros], Ibid, 142.

1230 Ibid, 146-147.

1231 The last reference to Prodanus’ predecessor, Bernard, dates to 1163, Ibid, 142.

1232 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 184; Kristó, Histoire de la Hongrie médiévale, vol. 1, 82 and genealogical table 3, on 199; Wertner, Az Árpádok családi története, 310, 344-345, 348-349, citing the passage in the next footnote.
between her son István III and Manuel Komnenos, as the contemporary *Annals* of Vincent of Prague (fl. 1140-1170) relate.\(^{1233}\) War with Byzantium finally came to an end in 1167, with the Byzantium Empire effectively gaining control of the Dalmatian coast and Bosnia, which it would hold until the 1180s.\(^{1234}\)

In early 1164, István III became engaged to an unnamed Rus’ princess, the daughter of Yaroslav Vladimirovich “The Eight-Minded” (“Osmomysl”) of Galicia (r. 1153-1187), so it is possible that Euphrosyne may have helped arrange this marriage.\(^{1235}\) Czech, Galician, and Austrian troops led by Vladislav II all helped repulse an attack by Manuel Komnenos in 1164 indicating that these marriage alliances successfully translated into military help for István III.\(^{1236}\) Nevertheless, by 1166, István had repudiated his Rus’ bride and married instead Agnes, the daughter of Duke Heinrich Jasomirgott of Austria.\(^{1237}\) This marriage was a strategic move since the latter, who had married Manuel Komnenos’ niece Theodora in 1148, had been chosen as Frederick Barbarossa’s ambassador to Byzantium in 1166 and had succeeded in obtaining an armistice in the Hungarian conflict.\(^{1238}\)


\(^{1234}\) See the detailed review of sources of Byzantium-Hungarian warfare in, for instance, Makk, *Árpáds and the Comneni*, 99-101.

\(^{1235}\) Kinnamos, *Deeds*, trans. Brand, 177; Makk, *Árpáds and the Comneni*, 89. Yaroslav Vladimirovich was the son of Vladimiroko Volodarevich, Géza II’s former enemy, who had died in 1153. After the death of Vladimiroko, however, Géza II resumed amicable relations with neighbouring Galicia, Font, “Emperor Manuel,” 229-230.


\(^{1238}\) Theodora was the daughter of Manuel’s brother Andronikos Komnenos. Duke Heinrich Jasomirgott of Austria married her during the time of the German Emperor Konrad III’s stay in Constantinople in 1148, during the Second Crusade. Frederick Barbarossa had allied with Emperor Manuel against Hungary; Kinnamos, *Deeds*, trans. Brand, n. 38, 254.
Despite the failure of a Rus’ marriage alliance for her son, a charter dating to around 1169 preserves evidence of Euphrosyne’s continuing role at court as queen mother.\textsuperscript{1239} During this time, Cardinal Manfred Lavagna (d. 1178) arrived in Hungary and successfully negotiated for the implementation of some aspects of papal reforms.\textsuperscript{1240} In the written agreement that followed this visit, drawn up around 1169, István III confirmed his father Géza II’s pledge to Pope Alexander III, that, among other things, he would give up the right to invest, depose, or transfer bishops or abbots without papal permission or to alienate church properties unless war or an emergency demanded it.\textsuperscript{1241} The charter concludes that the king made his decision: “by the counsel of our glorious queen mother, and of the archbishops, bishops, and all judges, and provosts of the realm, and abbots, counts, and all nobles and all the other leaders.”\textsuperscript{1242} Euphrosyne thus appears first in the list of lay advisers of the king in the role of promoting the papal reforms in Hungary.\textsuperscript{1243}

Another important aspect of Euphrosyne’s reign was her support of the Hospitallers. The Hospitallers, a so-called “crusading” order, followed a rule based on that of Saint Augustine for regular canons and had originated as a confraternity caring for pilgrims visiting Jerusalem, thus

\textsuperscript{1239} The text of the charter survives in two versions, which are nearly identical. The first is found in thirteenth-century copies (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 8486, fol. 145v, no. 205 and, in another hand, fols. 147r and 147v, and Vatican City, Archivo secreto Vat., Miscell. 15, no. 1, fols. 161v-162v and 164v), where it is part of an appendix written in 1236 to the \textit{Liber censum} of 1192 listing the revenues of the Holy See. The second version of the charter is in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Florence, Riccardi Library, MS Riccardianus 228, which likewise contains a copy of the \textit{Liber censuum}, as well as other papal bulls related to Hungary, Holtzmann, “Papst Alexander III und Ungarn”: n. 1, 160.

\textsuperscript{1240} A detailed discussion of dating is given in Holtzmann, who concludes that the date of 1169 should be used, \textit{Ibid.}: n. 1, 160. Holtzmann’s conclusions are accepted by subsequent scholars: \textit{Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae}, ed. Marsina, vol. 1, no. 91, 86-88; Makk, \textit{The Árpáds and the Comneni}, 105-106, and n. 104, 170.


\textsuperscript{1243} The royal decision to implement papal reforms in Hungary was perhaps influenced by Archbishop Lukács who, according to his own letter to Bishop Ebehard of Salzburg (r. 1147-1164) in 1161, had been responsible for getting Euphrosyne’s husband, Géza II, to recognize the legitimacy of Pope Alexander III over the imperial German candidate, Anti-Pope Victor IV. The full text of the letter is printed in \textit{Codex diplomaticus Hungariae}, ed. Fejér, vol. 2, 160-161.
their name. Scholars have traditionally stressed the role of the Second Crusade under the leadership of Louis VII of France and Konrad III of Germany passing through Hungary in 1147 as leading to the establishment of military orders in the country. The recent research of Zsolt Hunyadi, however, has challenged this view. Hunyadi, in his extensive treatment of the Hospitallers in Hungary, has convincingly demonstrated that in the twelfth century the Order of Saint John was still known primarily on the European Continent as a charitable institution that provided care for sick pilgrims, rather than as a military order.

It was Euphrosyne who was responsible for endowing the Hospitallers’ first preceptory (an ecclesiastical and administrative centre, also called a commandry) in Hungary, located outside the walls of the royal city of Székesfehérvár. Her original foundation charter has not survived, but her role in establishing the Hospitallers in Hungary is known from the confirmation charter issued in 1193 by her son, the future Béla III (r. 1172-1196). According to this confirmation charter, Euphrosyne completed the construction of a church in Székesfehérvár dedicated to Saint István I (d. 1038), which was begun originally by Archbishop Martirius of Esztergom (r. 1151-1157/1158). Sometime between the Archbishop’s death in 1157/1158

1244 Jonathan Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050-1310 (London: Macmillan, 1967), 46-49. Anthony Luttrell and Helen J. Nicholson draw attention to the fact that “Technically, however, the Hospitallers were not crusaders, since they were explicitly forbidden to take the crusading vow. Their holy war was a perpetual one and not the occasional and limited holy war of the crusade [...]” “Introduction: a Survey of Hospitaller Women in the Middle Ages,” in Hospitaller Women in the Middle Ages, eds. Anthony Luttrell and Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 4.

1245 Zsolt Hunyadi, The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary c. 1150-1387 (Budapest: Central European University, 2010), 24.

1246 Ibid., 15 and 24.

1247 The preceptory was “an administrative and economic unit as well as the community which incorporated the houses, hospitals, castles, and their dependencies,” Ibid., 17. Székesfehérvár was important as a royal city due to the fact that the Collegiate church of Our Lady within the basilica of the city served as the coronation church and necropolis of many Hungarian kings from the eleventh century onward, Piroska Biczó, “The Collegiate Church of Our Lady in Székesfehérvár,” in Europe’s Centre around AD 1000, vol. 1, eds. Alfréd Wieczorek, and Hans-Martin Hinz, English ed. Simon Burnell (Stuttgart: Theiss, 2000), 407; Spekner, “Buda Before Buda,” 75.


1249 “Martirius vir honestatis eximie, Strigoniensis ecclesie archiepiscopus, primos in prefata ecclesia lapides posuit, et eam fere ad medietatem usque perduxit; sed morte preventus, consummare non potuit,” Ibid., no. 936, 591.
and her own exile from Hungary in 1186 (discussed further below), Euphrosyne, called “our lady mother” in the charter, not only finished the church begun by the Archbishop, but made the decision to grant it to the Hospitallers. Since the confirmation charter of her son Béla III speaks of Euphrosyne making this donation “for the soul of her husband [...] King Géza of pious memory,” it is likely that this donation took place during her widowhood, perhaps after her return from Austrian exile in 1163. Her son’s confirmation charter of 1193 notes that she further augmented her foundation with an enormous gift of fifty-five estates to the Hospitallers. Euphrosyne’s donations to the order were confirmed by Pope Innocent IV in 1252 and again in 1253. The papal confirmation charter refers to Euphrosyne in glowing terms as a pious donor, ascribing to her a key role in the establishment of the Hospitallers.

Euphrosyne’s donations to a “crusading order” and her decision to institute it in Hungary may seem strange at first glance, as military orders did not exist in Orthodox monasticism and consequently this act of patronage seems wholly alien to the Orthodox ecclesiastical world of her upbringing. Her decision to support the Hospitallers probably was based on support for its

The original dedication of this church to a Hungarian royal saint was likely due to the fact that Székesfehérvár was Saint István’s burial place, Biczó, “Collegiate Church,” 407.


1252 Ibid, no. 936, 591-593.


1254 “[...] clarae memoriae Eufrosyna, regina Vngariae, diuine inspirationis instincctu, pro suorum, ac inclytae recordationis Geyse viri, et Belae nati, suorum, regum Vngariae remedio peccatorum, Archiepiscopi praedicti prosequeus pietatem, prefatam Ecclesiam compleuit, et variis possessionibus copiose dotauit [...]” Codex diplomaticus Hungariae, ed., Fejér, vol. 4.2, 125. Almost the same language with slightly different spelling is used verbatim in Innocent IV’s confirmation charter of 1253, Ibid., 175-176.

1255 Zsoldos, Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 177.
charitable activities rather than military zeal.\textsuperscript{1256} As mentioned above, though the Order began to be militarized in the 1160s, it still continued to maintain its hospital in Jerusalem and to care for the poor and sick.\textsuperscript{1257} As this section will discuss shortly below, Euphrosyne would spend the last years of her life in this Jerusalem hospital.

According to the chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck (d. c. 1211/1214), written around 1210, Euphrosyne’s son István III was poisoned and rumour pinned the blame on his younger brother Béla III.\textsuperscript{1258} Whether or not this was really the case, Euphrosyne’s eldest son died on March 4\textsuperscript{th} 1172 at the age of twenty-five.\textsuperscript{1259} His son, Béla, Euphrosyne’s grandson, had predeceased him in 1167.\textsuperscript{1260} The same chronicler reports that István’s wife, Agnes, was pregnant again at the time of her husband’s death.\textsuperscript{1261} Either she miscarried or the infant died, however, because according to the letter of Pope Alexander III to Lukács cited above, Archbishop Lukács and the nobles of Hungary invited Euphrosyne’s younger son Béla III to take the throne.\textsuperscript{1262}

Earlier, in 1169, a son had been born to Manuel I Komnenos and he had declared him his heir in 1171.\textsuperscript{1263} Consequently Manuel I had annulled the engagement of his daughter to Béla III-

\textsuperscript{1256} Little is recorded of care of the poor and sick that Euphrosyne would have encountered in Rus’. The Paterik of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves, provides some information on this topic by mentioning that Saint Theodosios (d. 1074) set up a house (dvor) near the Caves Monastery with its own church (dedicated to Saint Stephen the Protomartyr) for the ill, the blind, and the handicapped, \textit{Paterik}, ed. Abramovych, 57; \textit{Paterik}, trans. Heppell, 65; discussed in Senyk, \textit{History of the Church}, vol. 1, 288-289.

\textsuperscript{1257} The first reference to a brother-at-arms dates to 1148, but not until the 1160s are there written references to marshals (officers). Military vows were also introduced into the Order of the Hospital in the 1160s, Riley-Smith, \textit{Knights of St. John}, 53-54 and idem, \textit{Hospitallers. The History of the Order of Saint John} (London: Hambledon Press, 1999), 33-34.


\textsuperscript{1259} Walter Map, \textit{De Nugis Curialium}, ed. and trans. James, 144-145.


\textsuperscript{1262} “Insuper etiam, cum tu ipse et alii principes regni karissimum in Christo filium nostrum B(elan) illustrem Ungariorum regem elegistis comuniter ipsumque de Grecia ad culmen regni et regimen uocassetis […]”, Tortosa, Capital Library codex. 144, fol. 25r, transcribed in Holtzmann, “Papst Alexander III und Ungarn”, 144.

\textsuperscript{1263} Niketas Choniatēs, \textit{O City of Byzantium}, 96.
Alexios and lowered the Hungarian prince’s rank from despotēs to caesar. As the prince’s old uncle, István IV, had been poisoned in Zimony in April 1165, and István III, also poisoned, had left no known children, Euphrosyne’s younger son Béla III left the court of Constantinople in 1172 to claim his Hungarian inheritance.

Our information on Euphrosyne’s downfall from power around this time comes only from the late twelfth century/ early thirteenth century Annales Posonienses, which relate that Géza, Euphrosyne’s youngest remaining son, fled to Austria from captivity in Hungary in 1174-1175, while Euphrosyne herself was imprisoned:

1185. …Bela [III], educated in Greece, became king. 1186. Count Cumperdinus died. In that same year, Duke Géza leaving Hungary with Count Laurent and many others entered Austria and his sister married in Greece. But his mother [Euphrosyne] was held captive in Braničevo. 1187. Duke Géza traveled from Austria into Bohemia, whence he was recalled to Hungary by his brother. Count Wata was blinded. István the Bishop of Kolozsvár was deposed. At the same time the mother of the king [Euphrosyne] was sent into exile to Greece.

The annalist’s brief presentation of events means that the exact chronology of Euphrosyne’s fall from power is difficult to reconstruct. Attila Zsoldos argues that the juxtaposition in this narrative of Euphrosyne’s imprisonment and the flight of her youngest son Géza to Austria

1264 Kinannmos, Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus, trans. Brand, 214. Manuel Komnenos instead betrothed the Hungarian prince to his niece Agnes-Anna of Châtillon, who despite her French-sounding name, came from the Latin East as she was the daughter of Renaud of Châtillon, prince of Antioch, Moravcsik, Byzantium and the Magyars, 89-90; Makk, The Árpáds and the Comneni, 106; Kristó, Histoire de la Hongrie médiévale, vol. 1, 82; Engel, Realm of St Stephen, 53; Font, “Emperor Manuel,” 233.


suggests that Euphrosyne supported her younger son over the elder. If this was indeed the case, Euphrosyne’s actions constituted a rare instance in Hungarian history of a queen-mother attempting to change the succession by picking which of her sons should have the crown.\textsuperscript{1267} Ferenc Makk argues convincingly instead that Euphrosyne was in, fact, imprisoned already in 1177, in the wake of her son Géza’s capture at the court of Prince Soběslav in Bohemia, who then handed him over to Béla III.\textsuperscript{1268} Makk proposes that Euphrosyne’s exile then began in 1186 when the city of Braničëvo, located on the right bank of the lower Danube near the mouth of the river Mlava in Serbia, was ceded to the Byzantines.\textsuperscript{1269}

According to a charter issued by her daughter Elisabeth in 1186, at the end of her life Queen Euphrosyne became a Hospitaller nun.\textsuperscript{1270} On the basis of this evidence, scholars assume that Euphrosyne must have traveled on from Braničëvo in Serbia to Byzantium and then on to the Hospital of Saint John in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1271} It does not seem improbable that the widowed Euphrosyne who had made such generous grants to the Hospitallers would be welcomed thereafter at the hospital in Jerusalem, located south of the church of the Holy Sepulchre (established sometime before 1099).\textsuperscript{1272}

She would not have been the only traveler to come work in the hospital, since according to Jonathan Riley-Smith as late as the 1180s lay pilgrims were coming there to volunteer to care for

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1267} Zsoldos, Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 126.
\textsuperscript{1268} Makk, Árpáds and the Comneni, 109 and 111.
\textsuperscript{1269} Annales Posonienses, ed. Madzsar 127; Makk, Árpáds and the Comneni, n. 149, 177. On the fortifications built by the Byzantines in the twelfth century at Braničëvo see Stephenson, “Revised Chronology,” 271-274 and figure 2, 270.
\textsuperscript{1271} The charter is discussed in: Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 179; György Gyöffy, “Das Güterverzeichnis des griechischen Klösters zu Szávasantendemeter (Sremska Mitrovica) aus dem 12 Jh.,” in Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 5 (1959): 36; Makk, Árpáds and the Comneni, n. 149, 177; Hunyadi, Hospitallers, 25.
\textsuperscript{1272} Riley-Smith, Knights of St. John, 34-55, and idem, Hospitallers, 19 and 37.
\end{footnotes}
the sick and to work in the kitchen as a form of devotion. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the hospital of Saint John in Jerusalem had both male and female brothers and sisters, although the women seem to have been elderly and Jonathan Riley-Smith suggests that “perhaps the Hospital preferred to admit widows.” While the double-houses of the Hospital were slowly being segregated in Europe, Euphrosyne arrived in the last years of the mixed community at Jerusalem. Its patients came from both sexes and all faiths: the hospital admitted Jews, Muslims, and Christians; everyone except lepers (who were thought to be highly contagious and were cared for in the segregated hospital of Saint Lazarus).

György Gyöffy and V. T. Pashuto note that Euphrosyne could not have remained long at the Order of the Hospitallers, because crusading orders left Jerusalem after the city was captured by Salah al-Din (Saladin) on October 2nd 1187. Only non-Latin clergy were allowed to remain. Euphrosyne’s further fate is not entirely clear. The accepted view in historiography is that Euphrosyne died in circa 1193 in the Orthodox monastery of Mar Saba (dedicated to Saint Sabbas the Sanctified, d. 532), located 12.5 kilometers from Bethlehem in the Kidron Valley, and then was buried in the nearby Orthodox monastery of Saint Theodosios the Koinobiarches (located five kilometers from Mar Saba). The origin of this assertion can be traced to a 1919

1273 Ibid., 36.
1274 Ibid., 62.
1275 Scholars date the break-up of the double-house at the hospital in Jerusalem to the move of the Order’s headquarters to Acre after the Order was forced to leave Jerusalem in 1187, because a separate female community existed in Acre by 1219, Riley-Smith, Hospitallers, 63-64; Alan Forey, “Women and the Military Orders in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries,” in Hospitaller Women in the Middle Ages, eds., Lutrell and Nicholson, 47-48.
1276 Riley-Smith, Hospitallers, 22-25; Hunyadi, Hospitallers, 15.
1277 Pashuto, Vnesniaia politika, 179; Gyoffy, “Das Güterverzeichniss,” 36, Riley-Smith, Hospitallers, 41. In 1189, the Byzantine emperor Isaac Angelos continued to maintain the alliance with Salah al-Din forged by his predecessor Andronikos against the Normans of Sicily. Consequently, he tried to delay or hinder the Third Crusade, Charles Brand, Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180-1204 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 177-178.
1278 Gyoffy, “Das Güterverzeichniss,” 36; Pashuto, Vnesniaia politika, 180; Hunyadi, Hospitallers, 25; Mielke, “Multi-Disciplinary Possibilities”: 204. Mar Saba, is a lavra, a group of hermits’ caves of seclusion, connected by pathways, with a common church for Sunday services, while the monastery of Saint Theodosios the Koinobiarches is entirely cenobitic. Both were founded around the same time in 479. The monastery of Saint Theodosios was the larger of the two, founded supposedly on the site where the Magi had rested on their flight from Herod, Andrew Jotischky, “Orthodox Monks and Monasticism in the Holy Land,” in idem, The Perfection of Solitude: Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 65-100, esp. 74-77.
article that appeared in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* on the architecture and ornamentation of Saint Theodosios monastery by Edmund Weigand, who prefaced his art analysis by a brief overview of the monastery’s history.\(^{1279}\) Weigand, who stressed that he was unable to verify every assertion about the monastery’s history but only wished to give some general context for his archaeological analysis, stated that, “In the year 1173 the Rus’ princess Euphrosyne, who died in the Sabbas monastery, was buried in the narthex of the church of the Mother of God, like other noble women before her.”\(^{1280}\) György Gyöffy, Zsolt Hunyadi and Christopher Mielke identified this figure in Weigand’s article with King Géza II’s widow, but suggested that her death-date should be corrected to 1193.\(^{1281}\)

In seeming contradiction to the story of Euphrosyne’s burial outside of Jerusalem is a charter of King István V of Hungary (r. 1270–1272) granting immunity to the preceptory of Székesfehérvár in 1272; it clearly states that Euphrosyne was buried at the Hospitaller church in Hungary whose building she completed.\(^{1282}\) Several scholars offered a solution to this contradiction: they proposed that Queen Euphrosyne’s body was exhumed from Jerusalem and reburied in Hungary sometime before 1272 when Hungarian royal charters begin to refer to her body lying at the church of the Crusaders in Székesfehérvár.\(^{1283}\)

Raising doubts as to the veracity of the story of Queen Euphrosyne’s death in Mar Sabas, her burial in the Monastery of Saint Theodosios, and her exhumation is the fact that almost the exact

---


\(^{1280}\) “Im Jahre 1173 wird die russische Fürstin Euphrosyne, die im Sabbaskloster gestorben war, im Narthex der Theotokoskirche begraben, wie schon andere vornehme Frauen vor ihr […]” Weigand, “Das Theodosioskloster”: 169. Weigand’s source for this belief was a local history of the monastery: Kleopas M. Koikylidēs, *Hē kata tēn erēmon tēs Hagias tou Theou hemōn poleōs Laura Theodosiou tou koinoviarchou* (Jerusalem, 1901). It seems, however, that Koikylidēs’ work did not provide any footnotes for its assertion that Euphrosyne was buried there, as Weigand exclaims that “where this information comes from, is not known to me” (“woher die Nachricht stammt, ist mir unbekannt”), “Das Theodosioskloster”: n. 8, 169.


\(^{1282}\) “[...] ad salutandam Ecclesiam sancti Regis, quae est extra muros castri Albensis, in qua corpus Regiae Euphrasinae, matris inculti regis Belae, felicis recordationis, intumulatum est,” *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae*, ed. Georgius Fejér, ed vol. 5, part 1 (Buda: Typis Typographiae Regiae Universitatis Ungariae, 1829), 212.

same story is told about her namestake and rough contemporary, another Rus’ princess, Saint Euphrosyne Sviatoslavna (c. 1110-1167) of Polatsk (Russian: Polotsk). The life of Saint Euphrosyne, drawn up probably shortly after her death in the twelfth century, but surviving only in the sixteenth-century *Book of Royal Degrees* (*Stepennaia kniga*), describes how she journeyed to Jerusalem, died in Mar Saba, was buried in the Monastery of Saint Theodosius, but that her body was exhumed and taken, not to Hungary, but to Rus’, where it was buried in the Monastery of the Caves. Clearly, either it was the story of Queen Euphrosyne’s exile to Jerusalem and her empty tomb outside the city that created the legend about Saint Euphrosyne of Polatsk’s burial death at Mar Sabas and burial in Saint Theodosius as recounted by the Muscovite *Book of Royal Degrees*, or vice versa, it was Queen Euphrosyne’s further fate that became confused with that of her contemporary and namesake. All that can be said with certainty is that Queen Euphrosyne was in the Hospital of Jerusalem in 1186, when her daughter Elisabeth made a donation to the Hospitallers in remembrance of her mother, and that by the late thirteenth century, her body had been brought back to Hungary and buried in the preceptory outside Székesfehérvár.

Despite this lack of certainty, the idea that the Saint Theodosios Monastery was Queen Euphrosyne’s original burial place before her exhumation to Hungary may find some corroboration in the enormous donation made to Saint Theodosios by her son Béla III, between 1193 and 1196, indicating that the monastery had special significance for Hungarian royalty (and perhaps also an act of expiation for the guilt of exiling of his own mother?). The charter of this donation, originally made in Greek, survives in an abridged Latin version in two papal bulls of Pope Honorius III issued in 1216 and 1218, which confirm the possessions of the monastery after the establishment of the Latin Patriarchate following the Latin conquest of Constantinople.


1286 Gyöffy suggests that the legend of Saint Euphrosyne’s burial outside Jerusalem was spread by monks from Saint Theodosios who fled to Polotsk in the fifteenth century, “Das Güterverzeichnis,” n. 106, 36; Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 180.

in 1204. In this large donation, Béla III subordinated several institutions to the monastery of Saint Theodosios: the Greek monastery of Saint Demetrios in Sremska Mitrovica (Serbia), and, in Constantinople, the churches of Saint Julian and Saint John, together with a hospital, houses, and “pharmacies” (“apotéces”).

Finally, if Queen Euphrosyne did indeed spend her final days in Orthodox desert monasteries outside Jerusalem, it is worth noting that this decision could have been a result of the fact that she was exposed to the cult of Saint Theodosios the Kenobiarch and Saint Sabbas in Rus’. Not only were these saints held in high esteem throughout the Orthodox world, but so was the monastery of Mar Sabas itself, for its influential foundation charter (typikon), liturgy, and also because it was the home of important theologians such as the iconophile Saint John of Damascus (c. 676-749). It was a destination for Rus’ pilgrimage in the twelfth century, as is known from the account of the Rus’ igumen Daniil (Daniel), who stayed in Mar Saba for sixteen or eighteen months around 1106-1108. Daniil adds that he “inscribed the names of the Russian princes in the Laura [lavra] of Saint Saba, and their names are now remembered in the prayers [ektenia] with their wives and children.” Daniil’s account suggests that the Rus’ princes were henceforth regularly remembered in the prayers of the monks of Mar Saba, though he does not explain whether the monastery received any pious donations from princes in return. In any case, it is possible to state from Daniil’s pilgrimage guide that a relationship between the Rus’ princely dynasty and Mar Saba was established by the early twelfth century, which could provide some

---

1292 “I o sem pokhvaliu blagago Boga, yako spodobi miia khudago imena kniazei rusyikh napisati v lavrë u Sviatago Savy, i nynë pominaiaia imena ikh vo oktenii, s zhenami i s dëtami ikh,” *Khozhdenie*, eds. Dmitriev and Likhachev, 114; *Journey of Daniel*, trans. Wilkinson et al., 171.
explanation for why the Rus’ princess may have come there before her death, even if it is not possible to know the exact nature of this (patronage?) relationship in specific detail.

In sum, the events of Euphrosyne’s widowhood highlight the fluidity of Orthodox/Catholic identity still possible in the late twelfth century, and belie any simple personal identification with either confession. Born a Rus’ princess, Queen Euphrosyne promoted western church reform during her regency and established the Hospitallers (the Order of Saint John) in Hungary. She defended the rights of her son István III against the Byzantine emperor Manuel Komnenos, turning for help to relatives both in Rus’ and Bohemia. Her activities as widow included promoting Gregorian-style church reform, but also sending her son Béla III to be brought up in Constantinople. She spent her last days in Jerusalem, a city in which both Latin Christians and eastern-rite Christians co-existed, and which was surrounded by Orthodox desert monasteries, in which she may have stayed and died. In Hungary, however, where her remains were buried or reburied in the crusaders’ church in the Hungarian city of Székesfehérvár, she was once again remembered in charters as a pious queen by thirteenth-century Hungarian kings and popes.1293

This fluid interchange between Orthodoxy and Latin Christianity would not come so easily in the following century. In the 1180s, Euphrosyne’s son, Béla III, became the first Hungarian king to take the title “King of Galicia” (rex Galiciae), attempting to conquer his mother’s lands directly, rather than supporting his Rus’ uncles and cousins in their internal conflicts.1294 Béla probably legitimized his claim to Galicia through his mother, and his reign would usher in a new period of Hungarian military conquest in Rus’.1295 Hungarian rule was supported by some factions of Galician boyars and therefore as Simon Franklin writes, “periods of Hungarian rule cannot always fairly be called foreign occupation.”1296 Nonetheless, Hungarian attempts to incorporate western Rus’ principalities into their kingdom also had a confessional and not just political


1295 For the theory that Béla III legitimized his claim to Galicia through his mother see Font, “On the Frontiers”: 177.

aspect to them, particularly after 1215/1216 when Béla III’s son, András II, requested from Pope Innocent III that his son Kálmán be crowned “king of Galicia.” As a surviving letter attests, András II had requested this crown from the pope claiming that the people of Galicia desired church union.1297

Moreover, although Hungarian princesses continued to inter-marry with Riurikid princes in the thirteenth century, Euphrosyne was the last Rus’ princess to rule as queen of Hungary and, indeed, the last Rus’-born princess to rule over a Latin Christian kingdom.1298 She is therefore a fitting case-study to close the dissertation’s examination of Rus’ women who married western-rite rulers.

Conclusion: Twelfth-Century Cases

From the second half of the twelfth century onward, as the land of Rus’ became more politically decentralized, the number of external marriage alliances concluded by the Riurikids decreased and, at the same time, these external marriage alliances became geographically restricted to Rus’ immediate neighbours, especially Poland, Scandinavia, and Hungary. The three case studies of Riurikid women presented in this chapter, Maria Sviatopolkovna / Volodarivna, Ingeborg, and Europhrosyne Mstislavna, who were sent as brides to these areas of “New Europe” demonstrate the open dynamic of exchange that still existed at this time between eastern- and western-rite Christians. This dynamic can be seen, for example, in the transmission of saints’ cults by these women. The twelfth-century Transmission of the Hand of Saint Stephen, for instance, ascribes to Maria a key role in bringing the precious hand of the Protomartyr from Rus’ to Poland, while Ingeborg Mstislavna’s marriage to Knud Lavard may have facilitated the simultaneous dedications of churches to Saint Nicholas in Denmark and Novgorod. Physical proximitiy to Rus’ permitted Maria, Ingeborg, and Euphrosyne to keep in particularly close contact with their family members, and also to the ecclesiastical environment of Rus’’. Ingeborg, according to thirteenth-century sagas, spent time visiting Rus’ around 1131, Maria took shelter in Rus’ in


1145-1146, and Euphrosyne received her mother as a visitor at the Hungarian court in 1155. Euphrosyne’s brother, Iziaslav, campaigned together with her husband Géza II: their families seemed to have accepted one another primarily as Christian rulers of a compatible social status, and did not consider differences in religious customs as a major obstacle.

While western-rite elites had not yet embraced a more homogenous vision of Latin Christendom under the leadership of the pope, at the same time, however, there is some evidence that toward the end of the twelfth century, their attitudes toward the Riurikids were beginning to change. For example, if authentic, Piotr Włostowic’s letter to Bernard of Clairvaux asking him to come preach in Rus’, suggests that by the mid twelfth century some Latin Christians in both the clergy and the nobility actively sought to convert the Riurikids. Changing attitudes is also suggested by the sobriquet of King Valdimar I of Denmark, who despite being the son of the Riurikid princess Ingeborg Mstislavna and the husband of another (Sophia Vladimirovna), became known as the “conqueror of the Slavs” (“Sclauorum expugator”). Although the title referred to his conquest of the pagan Wends, a Western Slavic people, future research should consider whether or not there was a closer identification of faith and ethnicity by the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Finally, King Béla III was the first Hungarian ruler who began to consider western Rus’ not as a matrimonial and political ally, but as an area for conquest. Nonetheless, inter-marriages between the Riurikids and their neighbours continued up to, and beyond, the Mongol invasion of 1237-1240/1241. A more confrontational attitude to Orthodox-Catholic relations had not yet become widespread among medieval elites, particularly those in “New Europe.”
Conclusion: Women Between West and East

In the twelfth century the Byzantine canonist Theodore Balsamon (d. 1195) had tentatively applied legislation concerning marriage with heretics to Latin Christians. Balsamon commented on canon 14 of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which forbade the marriages of children of the lower clergy (lectors and cantors) to heretics, Jews, or pagans, if the non-Christian prospective spouse did not promise to convert before the marriage. Balsamon saw a potential parallel in this canon to cases of Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage, writing in a scholion (note) on the text that, “And mark that, according to the present canon, it seems the portion of the church compels Latins to forswear [their faith] who wish to take women as their wives from the land of the Romans [i.e. Byzantine women].” Balsamon only hesitatingly criticized the situation in which “Latin” men came to Byzantium and married Byzantine women; he did not yet criticize inter-rite marriages in general. Moreover, his opinion on the interpretation of this canon was not widely followed until the fourteenth century.

As Viktor Aleksandrov has pointed out, the fourteenth-century alphabetically-organized handbook of Byzantine canon and civil law by the theologian Matthew Blastares (d. 1349), the *Alphabetic Syntagma*, cited Balsamon’s commentary on canon 14 of Chalcedon, but omitted the key phrase “it seems” (*hōs eoiken*). It thus removed the element of doubt that prohibitions of marriage with heretics could be applied to marriages with Catholics. Moreover, Blastares did not clearly indicate where the text of canon 14 came to an end and where Balsamon’s

---

1299 Zhishman, *Das Eherecht*, 540-542.

1300 “[…] kai σήμειοισαί, hoti kata ton paronta kanona, hōs eoiken, anagkazei to meros tēs Ekklēsias tous Latinous exomnusthai, thelontas gunaikas labein ek tēs Rhōmanias,” Balsamon’s scholion to canon 14 of Chalcedon in *Suntagma tôn theiōn kai hierōn kanonōn […],* eds. G. A. Rhalles and M. Potles vol. 2, (Athens: 1852; reprint. Athens: Kassandra M. Grigoris, 1966), 253-254. For a discussion of how Balsamon derived this unprecedented interpretation of canon 14, based perhaps on his own broad definition of “heretic” simply as “un-Orthodox,” see Viktor Alexandrov, “To zhe i latiny”: 108-109. It is also important to underline that Balsamon was writing at a time of increased Orthodox-Catholic marriages alliances under the Komnenian emperors, Macrides, “Dynastic Marriages,” 270-273.


commentary began, so that poorly educated readers could infer mistakenly that there was a prohibition of Orthodox/Catholic intermarriage in a ruling of an Ecumenical Council. The *Alphabetic Syntagma* was translated into Old Church Slavonic soon after its issuing (probably in the Balkans, perhaps specifically on Mount Athos) and became widespread throughout the Orthodox Slavic world. The results of this new harsher assessment of Orthodox-Catholic intermarriage can be seen in a new episcopal oath introduced in 1423 in Muscovy, which bound bishops to refuse to celebrate an Orthodox-Catholic inter-marriage without prior permission from the Metropolitan.

Catholic theology from the fourteenth century on also looked upon Orthodox/Catholic intermarriages more harshly. At a synod in Bratislava on 10th November 1309, the papal legate to Hungary and Poland, an Italian Franciscan named Gentile di Montefiore, forbade Catholics to marry heretics or schismatics, “especially Ruthenians [i.e. the Rus’], Bulgarians, Serbians, Lithuanians remaining in their errors,” though his comments suggest that these marriages were still taking place. The punishment for such inter-rite marriages issued by this local synod was harsh: the person who gives away his daughter or female relative to an Orthodox man should be excommunicated, shunned by all in his diocese, and prohibited from being buried in a Catholic cemetery unless he repented.

Such condemnation of Orthodox-Catholic intermarriages represents a striking contrast to the inter-marriages of the Riurikids in pre-Mongol Rus’ studied in this dissertation, when the
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majority of their marriages were concluded with Latin rulers. Riurikid princesses could return to Rus’ after their marriages abroad, without any record of special rites to mark their return to Orthodoxy, and likewise “Catholic” princesses, brought up in the Latin ecclesiastical culture of the West, could return to their homeland after being widowed in Rus’. No diplomatic or narrative source from the pre-thirteenth century period preserves any negotiations as to the status of the bride’s faith after marriage, suggesting that eastern-rite and western-rite Christian customs were still viewed as belonging to one and the same Christian faith.

Rus’ princesses in the eleventh century seemed to have moved easily across confessional boundaries. Anna Yaroslavna, for instance, maintained her knowledge of Cyrillic after a decade spent in France, and may have returned to Rus’ at the end of her life. Anastasia Yaroslavna of Hungary ruled over a land that was receptive to both western and eastern forms of spirituality, such as cave eremiticism, at a time when institutions of the Christian church were being re-established by royal patronage in Hungary. Her husband András spent time as an exile in Kyiv. He seemingly saw no inherent contradiction between his diplomatic and family ties to Byzantium and Rus’, including his possible baptism in Kyiv, and his active support of Latin church institutions. Eupraxia Vsevoldna’s marriage to Emperor Heinrich IV in 1089 resulted in the sending of embassies from Germany to Kyiv with the aim of negotiating church union. She returned to Rus’ after the failure of her marriage, took vows as an Orthodox nun, and received an honourable burial in the Monastery of the Caves. It was also possible for twelfth-century women to move between confessional boundaries. Euphrosyne Mstislavna received visits from her Riurikid family members while promoting Gregorian church reform in Hungary. The Kyivan Chronicle does not portray such visits as problematic in any way. These case-studies paint a picture of individual cultural-religious identity which is not fixed to a mutual exclusive conception of Catholicism or Orthodoxy, but rather malleable and adaptive to different circumstances.

Despite evidence for continued contact with Orthodoxy, when sources provide fuller information on what happened to a Rus’ princess after her marriage to a western-rite ruler, by and large they suggest that she acculturated to the cultural and religious environs of her husband’s family. This interpretation is evidenced by Rus’ princesses’ support of Latin church institutions made in conjunction with their husbands and children such as patronage of Benedictines, regular canons, and Hospitallers. Rus’ princesses were either unable to import Orthodox institutions in their new
environments, or did not consider it necessary to do so. Claims that Rus’ princesses such as Anastasia Yaroslavna founded Orthodox monasteries after their marriage, for instance, do not hold up to critical examination. Rather, charters issued, co-issued, or subscribed to by Rus’-born princesses are wholly in support of local Latin church institutions. In this regard, special mention should be made of the support of Riurikid princesses such as Eupraxia Vsevolodna and Euphrosyne Mstisлавna for papal church reform; a surprising finding that requires further study.

Cultural continuity with Rus’ seems to have been more possible in the case of Rus’ princesses who came to rule over Hungary, Poland, and Scandinavia which were contact zones between Orthodoxy and Latin Christianity. These three regions were ruled by relatively newly Christianized dynasties, in which a hardening of opinion toward the eastern-rite neighbours did not occur until the mid to late thirteenth century. Their Christianity was not yet defined as a Latin Christian identity set in opposition to an Orthdoox one. Consequently, the social environment in which a Rus’ princess found herself in these regions could have facilitated her ability to maintain ties to Orthodoxy and to her family. According to the Gesta Hungarorum, for instance, Anastasia Yaroslavna, preferred to live on a royal estate that was closest to Rus’ and her relatives. During her reign as queen consort, her husband sent troops to support the Byzantine presence in Southern Italy and the Hungarian royal court gave refuge to Bohemian monks who celebrated the liturgy in Old Church Slavonic. In the twelfth century, Malmfrid Mstisлавна and her sister Ingeborg came to Norway and Denmark, respectively, at a time when Scandinavian rulers were still actively serving in the Varangian Guard in Constantinople. This openness to Byzantine traditions in the court culture in which they found themselves may be seen, for instance, in the use of Byzantine iconography in the twelfth-century church at Sønder Jernløse. In Poland, during the time when Verkhoslava Vsevolodna was Duchess of Mazovia, Rus’ troops served her husband Boleslaw IV against Wendish tribes in 1147. In these areas of “New Europe” the difference between Christian and pagan was still more important than differences between Christians of different rite.

Following her marriage, a princess could maintain links with her birth culture in her private devotions through the possession of material objects that could serve as “pegs of memory” of the religious tradition of her birth. The twelfth-century Chronicle of Pseudo-Clarius, for example, mentions that Anna Yaroslavna brought gifts and objects with her from Rus’ to France, while the Chronicle of Rosenfeld written at the same period specifies that Eupraxia Vsevolodna came to
Saxony with her garments, gems, and riches. A princess’ “public” support for the institutions of her husband’s religious confession may have been coupled with “private” devotions of her own natal tradition, though there is insufficient evidence to explore this idea further. Iziaslav Yaroslavich’s wife Gertruda, for instance, both supported the Orthodox monks of the Kyivan Caves Monastery and also used her eleventh-century Latin prayer-book. The combination of text and image in this manuscript also shows evidence of a hybridity of artistic tradition and even of Orthodox/Catholic spirituality. Other examples of artistic hybridity may include the foundation tympanum of Our-Lady-on-the-Sand in Wroclaw, commissioned by Maria Sviatopolkovna / Volodarivna, and the possible Cyrillic inscription on the church of Saint Michael in the same city.

The circulation of objects by royal brides in inter-rite marriages, moreover, suggests openness on the part of her husband’s court to the courtly and devotional culture of his wife. Examples include relics such as the hand of Saint Stephen transported by Maria Sviatpolkovna / Volodarivna to Poland in the 1120s, or the eleventh-century prayer-book of Gertruda, which was brought back to Poland in the subsequent generation (probably by her grand-daughter Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna) with the addition of the Byzantine-style miniatures that Gertruda had commissioned. The circulation of secular luxury objects also contributed to a cosmopolitan material culture shared by elite families of both Latin Christianity and Orthodoxy. The “Monomachos” crown of enameled plaques and the so-called “saber of Charlemagne,” for instance, are two material objects from Anastasia Yaroslavna’s reign that testify to such ongoing contact between Rus’, Byzantium, and Hungary. The chance record or physical survival of some of these material objects and visual sources emphasize the importance of engaging in comparative source-work as far as possible to form a complete picture of the Riurikids’ inter-rite marriages and their social and cultural consequences.

Thanks to inter-marriage not only material objects and artistic styles, but also dynastic names were exchanged from East to West: for instance, thanks to Anna Yaroslavna the Greek name “Philip” came into the Capetian dynasty, the Anglo-Saxon princess Gytha may have given her son Mstislav Vladimirovich the additional name of “Harald,” while his daughter Ingeborg Mstislavna gave her son the name “Valdimar,” a form of Vladimir. The naming of children born after a Rus’ princess’ maternal kin suggests commemoration of these dynastic links which were then passed on to subsequent generations. People, like goods, circulated too: from Rus’ to
Western Europe to Byzantium to Jerusalem. Maria Sviatopolkovna / Volodarivna, for example, returned to Rus’ as an exile in 1145-1146 and Ingeborg Mstislavna also came back to her father’s house after her husband’s assassination. This physical movement of people and objects between cultures helps nuance macroscopic concepts of medieval European cultural spheres such as the notions of “Latin Christendom,” “Byzantine Commonwealth”, Slavia Orthdoxa, or even of “Holy Russia” since Rus’ princesses, born in an Orthodox cultural environment, became queens of “Latin Christendom,” while Latin Christian brides were continually present at the courts of Riurikid princes throughout the pre-Mongol period.

Nonetheless, the diplomatic, military, and dynastic links forged by lays elites through the Riurikid dynasty’s inter-rite marriages did not necessarily translate into total openness among clerical elites to Christian beliefs and practices which differed from those with which they were familiar. The clerical reaction to these inter-rite marriages was indeed not always positive. The monks who copied and re-copied Rus’ chronicles, for instance, did not celebrate or commemorate the high status achieved by Rus’ princesses in Western Europe, even in the case of Eupraxia Vsevolodna who became the wife of the Western Emperor. On the contrary, during the time of her marriage in 1089, the Greek Metropolitan of Kyiv, Ioann II, criticized Rus’ princes for marrying their daughters into the lands where communion was celebrated with unleavened bread. His concern with ritual purity surmounted any fellow-feeling with western-rite Christians.

In turn, western chroniclers, while calling Rus’ women the daughters of kings and thus recognizing the high blood of the Riurikid dynasty, nevertheless show a curious lack of curiosity about the homeland of these brides. Despite travelling to the other end of Europe, the French bishops who came to claim Anna Yaroslavna as a bride for King Henri seemed only to want to record and absorb what was already known to them, namely the relics of the holy pope Clement, while ignoring Slavic saints that were new to them. The very occasional ritual of renaming brides might have been another means of “erasing” the foreign origins of a bride, though the possibility that a woman could have more than one name suggests that this process of assimilation was not total. Rather, women such as Anna Yaroslavna, occasionally called Agnes, or her mother Ingiburg-Irena, might have held two names simultaneously.

Taken as a whole, the evidence of material objects, and diplomatic and narrative sources speaks to both the acculturation of women in Orthodox/Catholic inter-marriages into the local
ecclesiastical culture of their husbands, and at the same time to an ongoing sense of a unity of Christendom where barriers between Orthodoxy and Catholicism still remained porous. Future research should focus on how wider developments in Orthodoxy and Latin Christendom— the development of crusading ideology, the missionary work of the Mendicant Orders, the formation of the Latin Empire, the possible closer identification of ethnic identity with religious affiliation—affected the ability of lay women to cross these boundaries.

Why does it matter? Studying the lives of Riurikid princesses who became consorts of Latin Christian lands leads us to a richer and fuller picture of medieval Europe. These lands were not monocultural or monolingual, but rather multicultural and polychronic, ruled by elites who had both Orthodox and Latin Christian relatives. Their courts were enriched by brides, travelers, and material culture from Rus’. Christianity, as practiced by these elites, could include elements that transcended confessional boundaries such as the veneration of the “western” Saints Vincent of Saragossa, Clement of Rome, Giles of Provence, and Knud of Denmark in Rus’. Consequently, this study challenges the Rankian division of European history into western and eastern halves that supposedly have little in common. Our modern cultural categories do not always intersect with, or reflect, medieval ones. Instead, the dissertation supports previous findings that indicate that elites participated in a cosmopolitan,—or “transnational”—culture, greatly facilitated by inter-marriage, travel, and exchange of material objects. They ruled over subjects that spoke a variety of languages and came from different geographic areas, challenging the strict division of Europe into homogeneous cultural blocks.

As brides, repudiated wives, and widows, Rus’ women crossed and sometimes re-crossed these boundaries of symbolic and confessional geography. Their physical presence in the courts of Latin Christendom permitted Latin Christian and Orthodox religio-cultural traditions to come into direct contact. Hence, the examination of the lives of Riurikid princesses serves as a litmus-test for the state of Orthodox-Catholic relations during the Middle Ages. It illustrates the problematic nature of dividing medieval Europe into two theoretically distinct cultural spheres, such as *Slavia Orthodoxa* and *Slavia Romana*. It demonstrates how people, objects, and places could serve as links between Orthodoxy and Latin Christendom. The ability of Riurikid
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princesses to move across confessional boundaries confirms the finding of previous scholars that prior to the Fourth Crusade of 1204 the Schism did not form a rigid barrier among aristocratic dynasties.
Select Bibliography

*Select archival and manuscript sources*

Amiens, Cartulaire I, Archives départementales de la Somme 4 G 2966.

Beauvais, Archives départementales de l’Oise, H 2348.

Beauvais, Archives départementales de l’Oise, H 946, 18 and 169.

Blois, Archives départementales de Loir-et-Cher 16 H 113.

Blois, Archives départementales de Loir-et-Cher, fonds de Pontlevoy, 17 H 1, no. 2.

London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius E. XIII.


London, British Library, MS Add. 34060.

Paris, Archives nationales de France, AE II 101; formerly K 19 no. 5/2.


Paris, Archives nationales de France, K 20, n. 2.


Paris, Archives nationales de France LL 1156 fols. 55v and 56r.

Paris, Archives nationales de France, LL 1157, fol. 26r.


Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Lat. 10977, fol. 1 r.


Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Lat. 5441, Roger Gaignières, *Chartularium Majoris Monasterii Turonensis ordinis S. Benedicti* [...].


Munich, Hauptstaatsarchiv Schultes Hist. Schr. 2, 350, n. 23.

Reims, Bibliothèque municipale Carnegie de Reims, MS. 15.

Stockholm, Riksarkivet, Svenskt Diplomatariums huvudkartotek (SDHK), No. 180.

Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodwa, MS. II. 3307.

*Printed Primary Sources*


Schippers, 1963.

Esztergom: Aegydius Horák, 1874.


Maciejowski, Waclaw Alexander, ed. Kronika Boguchwała i Godysława Paska [= Boguphali II episcopi posnaniensis Chronicon Poloniae cum continuatione Paskonis custodis


Meysztowicz, Walerian, ed. *Manuscriptum Gertrudae filiae Meseconis II regis Poloniae*. In Antemurale: Dissertationes in X internationali congressu scientiarum historicarum


Ryszczewski, Leon and Antonii Muczkowski, eds. Codex diplomaticus Poloniae quo continentur privilegia regum Poloniae, magnorum ducum Lituaniae, bullae pontificium nec non jura a privatis data [...] ab antiquissimis inde temporibus usque ad annum 1506/Kodex dyplomatyczny Polski obejmujący przywileje królów polskich, wielkich książąt litewskich, bulle papiezkie [...] Tomus Primus: notis adornatus usque ad nr CVII ab Antonio Sigismundo Helcel. Warsaw: Typis Stanislai Strąbski, 1847.

———, eds. Codex diplomaticus Poloniae quo continentur privilegia regum Poloniae, magnorum ducum Lituaniae, bullae pontificium nec non jura a privatis data... ab antiquissimis inde temporibus usque ad annum 1506/ Kodex dyplomatyczny Polski obejmujący przywileje królów polskich, wielkich książąt litewskich, bulle papiezkie [...] Tomus Secundus, Pars Prior. Warsaw: Typis Stanislai Strąbski, 1848.

———, eds. Codex diplomaticus Poloniae quo continentur privilegia regum Poloniae, magnorum ducum Lituaniae, bullae pontificium nec non jura a privatis data... ab antiquissimis inde temporibus usque ad annum 1506/ Kodex dyplomatyczny Polski obejmujący przywileje królów polskich, wielkich książąt litewskich, bulle papiezkie. Vol. 3. Ed. Julian Bartoszewicz. Warsaw: [s.n.], 1858.


   <http://acta.chadwyck.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/all/search>


*The Lives of the Holy Women Martyrs: an Orthodox Martyrologion of Spiritual Heroines Throughout the Year, According to the Church Calendar, Translated and Compiled from the Greek of The Great Synaxaristes of the Orthodox Church and other Sources*, 125-126. Buena Vista, CO: Holy Apostles Convent, 1991.


*Secondary Sources*


<http://apps.brepolis.net.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/DHGE/test/Default2.asp>


Cross, Samuel Hazzard. “Mediaeval Russian Contacts with the West.” *Speculum* 10.2 (April, 1935): 137-144.


———. “Medieval Archaeology and Ethnicity: Where are We?” *History Compass* 9.7 (2011): 537-548.


———. “Rurik Dynasty’s Matrimonial Policy.” In *Colloquia Russica*. Series 1, Vol. 2: *Principalities in the Lands of Galicia and Volhynia in International Relations in 11th-


———. Personal Communication to the Author. September 7th, 2012.


———. “Receiving the non-Orthodox: A Historical Study of Greek Orthodox Canon Law.” 
*Studia Canonica* 44.2 (2010): 399-426.

Heller, Peggy.  “The Russian Dawn: How Russia Contributed to the Emergence of ‘the West’ as

Hellmann, Manfred. “Die Heiratspolitik Jaroslavs des Weisen.” In *Forschungen zur
Osteuropäischen Geschichte*, eds. Mathias Bernath, Horst Jablonowski, and Werner

Herman, E. “Baptême en Orient.” In *Dictionnaire du droit canonique: contenant tous les termes
du droit canonique, avec un sommaire de l’histoire et des institutions et de l’état actuel de

Hertel, Jacek. *Imiennictwo Dynastii Piastowskiej we wcześnieszym średniowieczu*. Warsaw:

Hetherington, Paul. “Byzantine Cloisonné Enamel: Production, Survival, and Loss.” In *Enamels,

———.  “Byzantine Enamels for a Russian Prince: the Book-Covers of the Gospels of


———. “Theophano: Considerations on the Education of a Byzantine Princess.” In *The Empress


Hussey, J. M. The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire. New Foreword and Bibliographical Supplement by Andrew Louth.


———. “The Legacy of Humbert and Cerularius: The Tradition of the ‘Schism of 1054’ in Byzantine Texts and Manuscripts of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.” In *Porphyrogenita, Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in


———. “State Power and Ecclesiastical System in Eleventh Century Hungary (An Outline to the Dynamics of the Development of the Hungarian Christian Church).” In “In my spirit I remained a European of Hungarian origin”: Medieval Hungarian Studies in Memory of


———. “Regard sur l’art de la Russie prémongole. II. Le système de décoration murale de Saint-Sophie de Kiev.” *Cahiers de civilisation Médiévale Xe-XIIe siècles* 14 (1971) : 221-238.


—. Personal Communication to the Author. May 2nd 2016.


Rokay, Péter *Salamon és Pola. Újvidék: [Novi Sad], Serbia: A Magyar Nyelv, Irodalom és Hungarológiai Kutatások Intézete, 1990, with Serbo-Croatian, Italian, and German summaries.*


Rostkowski, Grzegorz. “Hungary Between Byzantium, Central and Eastern Europe (ca. 1118-


———. Personal Communication to the Author, 23 May 2013.


———. “The Ritualisation of Political Power in Early Rus’ (10th-12th centuries).” Ph.D. Diss., Cambridge University, 2015.


Appendix 1: List of the Riurikids’ Marriages with Latin Rulers, c. 1000-1204

Only marriages which are well-established in historiography are listed. Marriages which for genealogical reasons have been greatly debated in historiography are presented in a separate chart below. Women from Rus’ are marked in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Western-rite partner</th>
<th>Eastern-rite partner</th>
<th>Approximate year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>unnamed daughter of Boleslaw I the Brave of Poland</td>
<td>Sviatopolk Vladimirovich “the Accursed”</td>
<td>1013-1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Boleslaw I the Brave of Poland</td>
<td>Predislava</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Estrid-Margaret of Denmark</td>
<td>“son of the King of Rus’” (Il’ia Yaroslavich?)</td>
<td>c. 1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ingigerd of Sweden</td>
<td>Yaroslav the Wise</td>
<td>c. 1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kazimierz I the Restorer of Poland</td>
<td>Maria Dobroniega</td>
<td>c. 1039-1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gertruda of Poland, daughter of Mieszko II, sister of Kazimierz I</td>
<td>Iziaslav Yaroslavich</td>
<td>1039, 1043, or 1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Harald Hardrada Sigurdsson</td>
<td>Elizabeth (Ellisif) Yaroslavna</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>András I of Hungary</td>
<td>Anastasia Yaroslavna</td>
<td>c. 1046-1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Henri I of France</td>
<td>Anna Yaroslavna</td>
<td>1050/1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name and Titles</td>
<td>Spouse/Partner</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Raoul II, Count of Crépy and Valois</td>
<td>Anna Yaroslavna</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Anna’s second marriage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Oda of Stade</td>
<td>Sviatoslav Yaroslavich</td>
<td>before 1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Gytha (Gyða Haroldsdottir), daughter of Harold Godwinson of England</td>
<td>Vladimir Monomakh</td>
<td>Before 1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kunegunda, stepdaughter of the Margrave Dedi, of the Saxon Ostmark</td>
<td>Yaropolk Iziaslavich</td>
<td>c. 1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Heinrich “the Long” Markgrave of Nordmark</td>
<td>Eupraxia Vsevolodna</td>
<td>c. 1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Heinrich IV, the German Emperor</td>
<td>Eupraxia Vsevolodna</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Count Gunter of Schwartzberg</td>
<td>A daughter of Yaropolk Iziaslavich</td>
<td>c. 1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Unknown daughter of King László I of Hungary</td>
<td>Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich</td>
<td>Before 1091 (c. 1088?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kristin Ingesdotter of Sweden</td>
<td>Mstislav Harold “the Great” Vladimirovich</td>
<td>c. 1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Bolesław III of Poland</td>
<td>Sbyslava</td>
<td>16 November 1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of the Person</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Álmos of Hungary</td>
<td>Predslava</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>King Kálmán of Hungary</td>
<td>Euphemia Vladimirna</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>King Sigurd Jerusalem-Farer, King of Norway</td>
<td>Malmfrid Mstislavna</td>
<td>1111-1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>King Eric the Memorable of Denmark</td>
<td>Malmfrid Mstislavna’s second marriage</td>
<td>Circa 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Knud Lavard</td>
<td>Ingeborg Mstislavna</td>
<td>Before 1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Vratislav of Moravia, Markgrave of Brno</td>
<td>Unnamed Rus’ princess</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ryksa of Poland</td>
<td>Vladimir Vsevolodovich or Volodar Glebovich</td>
<td>c. 1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Bolesław IV the Curly of Poland</td>
<td>Verkhoslava Vsevolodna</td>
<td>Before c. 1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Bolesław the Tall</td>
<td>Zvenislava Vsevolodna</td>
<td>1141/1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>A Moravian princess (Euphemia?)</td>
<td>Sviatopolk Mstislavich</td>
<td>1142/1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>King Géza II of Hungary</td>
<td>Euphrosyne Mstislavna</td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Unnamed daughter of</td>
<td>Vladimir Mstislavich</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>Family Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ban Belush of Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Agnieszka of Poland</td>
<td>Mstislav Iziaslavich</td>
<td>1151 or 1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Valdemar I the Great, King of Denmark</td>
<td>Sophia of Rus</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Ludwig V, Landgrave of Thuringia</td>
<td>Sophia (second marriage)</td>
<td>after 1182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Odon Mieszkowic, a son of Mieszko III of Poland</td>
<td>A daughter of Yaroslav of Osmomysl (“Vyacheslava?”)</td>
<td>c. 1153-1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>King István III of Hungary</td>
<td>A princess of Galicia</td>
<td>c. 1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Daughter of Boleslaw IV the Curly</td>
<td>Vasil’ko Yaropolkovich</td>
<td>c. 1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Mieszko III “the Old” of Poland</td>
<td>Eudoxia Iziaslavna</td>
<td>Before 1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Anastasia, a daughter of Kazimierz II the Just</td>
<td>Vsevolod Sviatoslavich “The Red” (“Chermnyi”)</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Additional Debated or Doubtful Marriages between the Riurikids of Rus and Latin rulers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Western-rite partner</th>
<th>Eastern-rite partner</th>
<th>Approximate year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>daughter of Kuno von Öhningen</td>
<td>Vladimir Sviatoslavich</td>
<td>c. 1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(debated—see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bernard, margrave of the Saxon Nordmark</td>
<td>a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich</td>
<td>before 1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>László the Bald of Hungary</td>
<td>a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich (&quot;Premislava&quot;)</td>
<td>before 1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Edward the Exile of England</td>
<td>Agafiia (Agatha) Yaroslavna</td>
<td>Before 1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bolesław II the Bountiful of Poland</td>
<td>Vycheslava</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A Daughter of the Czech prince Spytihněv</td>
<td>Sviatopolk Iziaslavich</td>
<td>c. 1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mieszko Bolesławowic, son of Bolesław II</td>
<td>Eudoxia Sviatopolkovna (?)</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>An unnamed daughter</td>
<td>Yaroslav</td>
<td>c. 1101-1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Male Name</td>
<td>Female Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A daughter of King Kálmán of Hungary</td>
<td>Vladimirko Volodarevich</td>
<td>c. 1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Piotr Włostowic</td>
<td>Maria Sviatopolkovna or Volodarivna</td>
<td>c. 1117-1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>daughter of Bolesław Wrymouth III of Poland or count palatine Skarbimir</td>
<td>Vsevolod Davidovich</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Vsevolod Olgovich</td>
<td>c. 1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Prebyslava Yaroslavna</td>
<td>Ratibor of Pomerania</td>
<td>1140s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>a princess of Germany, “a relative of the Emperor Frederick”</td>
<td>Iziaslav Mstislavich</td>
<td>before 1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Bolesław IV the Curly</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>c. 1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kazimierz II the Just</td>
<td>Helena of Znojmo</td>
<td>c. 1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Miroslava</td>
<td>Bogusław II of Pomerania</td>
<td>c. 1209-1210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Genealogical Information on the Riurikids’ Inter-Rite Marriages

1. A daughter of Bolesław I the Brave and Sviatopolk Vladimirovich the “Accursed”, c. 1008-1013.

Father of bride: Bolesław I the Brave of Poland (d. 1025)

Mother of bride: Emnilda (d. 1017), daughter of the West Slavic prince Dobromir (fl. tenth century).

Father of groom: Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)

Mother of groom: captured Greek nun in Bulgaria (fl. tenth century)

Children: unknown

Comments:

The marriage is only known from one source, albeit a contemporary one, the chronicle of Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg: Vladimir the Great, writes Thietmar, had “three sons, to one of which he gave in marriage the daughter of Duke Bolesław, our persecutor. Reinbern the bishop of Kolberg was sent with her from the Poles.”¹ Based on this report, scholars have concluded that this unnamed Polish princess must have been born sometime between 991 and 1001 and married prince Sviatopolk Vladimirovich “the Accursed” prior to the death of Sviatopolk’s father Vladimir Sviatoslavich on July 15th 1015.² Researchers have therefore dated the marriage around 1013-1015.³ This Polish princess was the daughter of Bolesław I the Brave and his third


² Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 130-131; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 120-121; Meysztowicz, “L’union de Kiev,” 85; Voitovych, Kniazha doba, 248. The estimated date of her birth is based on the minimum possible age she could have had at marriage (twelve) and the spacing possible between her birth and that of her other known siblings (her brother Mieszko II’s birth is recorded in the year 990).

³ A marriage date of 1013 to 1014 is favoured in Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 131; followed by Voitovych, Kniazha doba, 248, dating between 1005 and 1012 in Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 121 (Jasiński favours a later
wife, Emnilda, herself the daughter of an obscure Western Slavic prince called Dobromir.\textsuperscript{4} For the sake of convenience, Polish scholarly literature sometimes calls this nameless daughter “Chrobrówna” (daughter of Boleslaw Chrobry, the Brave) while Russian scholarship refers to her as “Boleslavna” (daughter of Boleslaw).\textsuperscript{5}

Her husband Sviatopolk (b. circa 978/980, d. 1019) was prince of Turov at the time, an important western burg (city or fortress) of the Riurikids.\textsuperscript{6} He was the son of prince Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015) and his Greek concubine (a former nun), who had previously been the concubine of Vladimir’s slain brother Yaropolk Sviatoslavich (d. 980).\textsuperscript{7} The marriage of Bolesław the Brave’s daughter with Sviatopolk Vladimirovich is the first recorded marriage of a Rus’ prince and Polish princess.\textsuperscript{8}

Sometime after the marriage between the Polish princess and Sviatopolk took place, Vladimir Sviatoslavich suspected Sviatopolk—his own son—of plotting against him and imprisoned him together with his whole household.\textsuperscript{9} At Vladimir’s death in 1015, the unnamed daughter of

dating considering it unlikely that the Polish princess would have been married off at the absolute canonically minimum age). In favour of 1013: Pashuto, \textit{Vneshniaia politika}, 34-35 and genealogical table 1 no. 2, 419 and Meyszto\textwedge wicz, “L’un\textquotesingle{ion de Kiev,” 85-86; between 1008 and 1013: Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 51.


\textsuperscript{5} Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 51-52; Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 19. Meyszto\textwedge wicz attempts a French translation by calling her “Boleslaïde”, “L’un\textquotesingle{ion de Kiev,” 85.

\textsuperscript{6} Voitovych, \textit{Kniazha doba}, 249.

\textsuperscript{7} “Volodimer zhe zalezhe zhenu brat’niu, Gr’kyniu, i bë neprazd’na, ot neiazhe rodi Sviatopol”ka. Ot grëkhovynago bo korenе z”l plod byvaet, ponezhe byla bë mati ego chernitseiu, a v”toroe Volodimer zalezhe iu ne po braku; preliubodëichisch ubo byst’: tèm’ i otets’ ego ne liubëše, bë bo ot d’voiu otsiu, ot Yaropolka i ot Volodimera,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.1, 562-564. English trans. in \textit{PC}, 93: “Now Vladimir had intercourse with his brother’s wife, a Greek woman, and she became pregnant, and from her was born Svyatopol. From a sinful root evil fruit is produced, inasmuch as his mother had been a nun, and besides Vladimir had intercourse with her without having married her. Svyatopol was therefore born in adultery, and for this reason his father did not love him; for he had two fathers, Yaropolk and Vladimir.”

\textsuperscript{8} Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 50.

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Ibid.}, 51.
Bolesław the Brave found herself abandoned by her husband while he fled for aid to her father.\textsuperscript{10} A slightly different account of events is found in the Rus’ chronicles which record that in 1016, after Sviatopolk had murdered his half-brothers Boris and Gleb, his surviving half-brother Yaroslav the Wise fought against him for the inheritance of Rus’.\textsuperscript{11} After his defeat by Yaroslav’s forces at the Battle of Liubech in 1016 Sviatopolk “fled to the Liakhs [Poles].”\textsuperscript{12} He returned in 1018 with an army supported by his father-in-law Bolesław I and retook Kyiv.\textsuperscript{13} Thietmar of Merseburg seems to suggest that Bolesław’s daughter remained in Kyiv during this time since he reports that when Bolesław I had captured that city, he “sent the bishop of this city to Jaroslav [sic], to ask that his daughter be sent back to him. In return, he promised to send back Jaroslav’s wife, stepmother, and sisters.”\textsuperscript{14} Nothing further is known about the life of this Polish princess after Thietmar’s last mention concerning her in 1018.\textsuperscript{15} Sviatopolk died sometime after 1019 when he was defeated for a final time by Yaroslav.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} “Post haec rex ille plenus dierum obiit, integritatem hereditatis suae duobus relinquens filiis, tercio adhuc in carcere posito, qui postae elapsus, coniuge ibidem relicta, ad socerum fugit,” \textit{Thietmari Chronicon}, ed. Bielowski, vol. 1, 310.
\item \textsuperscript{11} PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.1, 1023-1129.
\item \textsuperscript{12} PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1134.
\item \textsuperscript{13} PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1136.
\item \textsuperscript{14} “Bolizlavus archiepiscopum praedictae [ecclesiae] ad Iarizlavum misit, qui ab eo filiam suimet reduci peteret, et uxorem suam cum noverca et consororibus reddi promitteret”, \textit{Thietmari Chronicon}, ed. Bielowski, 318.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny”, 52; Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód pierwszych Piastów}, 123; Voitovych, \textit{Kniazha doba}, 248.
\item \textsuperscript{16} PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1153.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
2. Bolesław I of Poland and Predislava, 1018

**Father of bride:** Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)

**Mother of bride:** Rogneda (Ragnhild) of Polotsk (d. 1000), daughter of Rogvolod, a Viking settler

**Father of groom:** King Mieszko I of Poland (d. after 992)

**Mother of groom:** Dobravka of Bohemia (d. 977)

**Children:** unknown

**Comments:**

The only grounds for counting the union of Predslava and Bolesław at all is in this list fact that the earliest source, Thietmar of Merseburg, calls Predislava Bolesław I’s wife, which can only be accepted if one views it as a case of marriage by abduction. According to Thietmar, after Bolesław’s capture of Kyiv in 1018 on behalf of his son-in-law prince Sviatopolk Vladimirovich, he also captured the nine daughters of Vladimir, and “the old fornicator Boleslaw wrongly married one of them, who was previously desired by him, while his own spouse was forgotten.” Bolesław was married at the time to Oda, the sister of margrave Herman of Meissen, who had became King Bolesław’s fourth wife earlier in 1018.

The twelfth-century Polish chronicler known traditionally as Gallus Anonymous, however, clearly states that Predislava was only Boleslaw’s victim and not his wife.

17 For a detailed discussion of the possible dating of this marriage, see Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 458-459.


20 “At Bolezlauus [...] evaginato gladio in auream portam percucientes, risu satis iocosus suis admirantibus, cur hoc fecisset, enodavit: Sicut, inquit, in hac hora aurea porta civitatis ab isto ense percutitur, sic in nocte sequenti soror regis ignavissimi mihi dari prohibita corrupptetur; nec tane Bolezlaouo thoro maritali, sed concubinali singulari vice tantum coniungetur, quatimus hoc facto nostril generis injuria vindicetur, et Ruthenis ad dedecus et ad ignominiam imputetur,” *GPP*, 42-43. In fact, the Golden Gate was not built until 1037, *Ibid*, n. 3, 42.
Later Rus’ sources also present Predslava as Bolesław’s concubine, not his wife, namely the fifteenth-century Fourth Novgorod Chronicle and the First Sophia Chronicle (sixteenth or early seventeenth century), as well other compilations based on these sources, which all repeat the following statement: “And then Bolesław put in [his] bed Predslava, the daughter of Vladimir, the sister of Yaroslav.” These sources also do not speak of a one-night rape, but rather state that Bolesław took Predslava back to Poland with him at the conclusion of his Rus’ campaign in 1018. Her further fate is unknown.

Polish historians have attempted to put Bolesław’s behavior toward Predslava in its historical context. Andrzej Pleszczyński notes that marriage was not yet conceived of as a sacrament in the western church and adds that Bolesław’s behaviour toward Predslava was part of the expected conduct of a ruler toward the conquered. Jacek Banaszkiewicz has argued one step further that Bolesław’s rape of Predslava and his taking her to Poland was a means of legitimizing his conquest of Kyiv.

---


22 “Boleslav zhe pobězhe is Kyeva, povolochiv Peredslavu, vzmě imenie i boliare Yaroslavlě i sestry ego[…]”, PSRL, vol. 4, part 1, sub anno 6526 (1017/1018), 108-109, PSRL, vol. 5, 89. See also PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1144, which mentions that Bolesław took two of Yaroslav’s sisters with him back to Poland (without giving their names). The full list of Rus’ chronicles discussing this incident is given in Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 457-458.

23 For the now debunked hypothesis that Predislava was taken to Ostrów Lednicki, see Musin and Wołoszyn, “Digging In,” n. 21, 686.

24 Pleszczyński, Birth of a Stereotype, 181.

3. Estrid-Margaret and a “son of the King of Rus’” (Il’ia Yaroslavich?) in c. 1019

**Father of bride:** King Sven Haraldsson II Forkbeard of Denmark (d. 1014)

**Mother of bride:** Sigrid Storrada “the Haughty” (d. after 1014)

**Father of groom:** Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054).

**Mother of groom:** An unknown woman, perhaps called Anna (d. before 1019)

**Children:** unknown and unlikely (see below).

**Comments:**

Estrid was the daughter of Svein II Forkbeard of Denmark and his second wife, Sigrid the Haughty, who herself was the daughter of the Polish King Mieszko I. Estrid seems to have been her Scandinavian (“pagan”) name; Margaret her Christian name. Estrid was married three times, although the chronology of her marriages is unclear. Her three husbands were Duke Robert I [or II] of Normandy (d. 1035), the father of William the Conqueror who had repudiated her around the year 1017, an unnamed Rus’ prince, now widely accepted as Il’ia Yaroslavich (d. 1020) of Novgorod, and Jarl Ulf Thorgilsson of Denmark who was murdered by her brother King Knud in 1025. With Jarl Ulf she had three sons, Jarl Björn (d. 1049), the future King Sven Estridson of Denmark (d. 1074), and Asbjörn (d. 1086).

As noted in Chapter Two, our only source for her Rus’ marriage is a very brief scholium found in the eleventh-century history of Adam of Bremen (d. circa 1076), which states that King Knud the

---


27 Adam of Bremen, History of the Archbishops, trans., intro, notes Tschan, n. 189, 92; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 476-477. See also Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina” under Estrid/Margaret.

28 Adami Bremensis Gesta Pontificum, ed. Trillmich, 292; Adam of Bremen, History of the Archbishops, trans., Tschan, n. 189, 92 (noting that Adam of Bremen mistakenly states that Edith’s first husband was Richard II of Normandy, instead of his son, Robert I); Campbell, “Appendix III. The Scandinavian Supporters of Knútr,” in Encomium Emmae Reginae, 85-85; Keynes, “Cnut’s earls,” 62-63.

Great of Denmark and England (d. 1035) “gave his sister Estrid in marriage to the son of the King of Rus’.”

V. T. Pashuto accepts the information about the marriage of Estrid with a “Rus’ king”, but does not attempt to identify him.

Alexandr Nazarenko suggests that this Rus’ prince could have been Il’ia Yaroslavich (d. 1020), Yaroslav the Wise’s son by an unknown woman and dates Estrid/Il’ia’s marriage to 1019, the year before Il’ia’s death in 1020. This woman could have been Yaroslav’s first wife, known in seventeenth-century Russian sources as Anna. Il’ia’s mother may have been the wife (“uxor”) of Yaroslav whom Thietmar mentions was in Kyiv in 1018, before Yaroslav’s marriage to Ingigerd in 1019 (on the latter marriage, see no. 4 below), or simply Yaroslav’s mistress. The Danish-Rus’ alliance that led to Il’ia’s marriage to Estrid-Margaret could have helped Yaroslav the Wise find Scandinavian allies in his quest for Kyiv following Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s death in 1015. This view has been widely accepted in scholarship. As Nazarenko supposes, it seems that Estrid-Margaret’s marriage to this Rus’ prince must have been of short duration and childless since it is not deemed worthy of record by any other chronicler except Adam.


33 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 490-491; Voitovych, *Kniazha doba*, 305.

34 “Ibi [in Kitavam] fuit noverca regis predicti [Yaroslavi], uxor […],” *Thietmari Chronicon*, ed. Bielowski, 317. For the view that Il’ia’s mother simply could have been a mistress of Yaroslav, see Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 25.

35 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 492.

36 Voitovych, *Kniazha doba*, 305.

37 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 477.
4. Ingigerd of Sweden and Yaroslav the Wise of Kyiv in c. 1019

**Father of bride:** Olof Eirikson Skötkonung (d. 1021/1022).

**Mother of bride:** captured Oborite woman Estrid

**Father of groom:** Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)

**Mother of groom:** Rogneda (Ragnhild) of Polotsk (d. 1000), daughter of Rogvolod, a Viking settler

**Children:** Vladimir (b. 1020-d. 1052), Iziaslav (b. 1024- d.1078), Sviatoslav (b. 1027-d. 1076), Vsevolod (b. 1030-d. 1093) Anna (d. circa 1075-1079), Elizabeth (d. after 1066), Anastasia (d. after 1074), possibly Agafia (see below, died after 1068), Igor (d. 1060), Viacheslav (b. 1036-d. 1057).

**Comments:**

The earliest surviving source for the marriage of Yaroslav and Ingigerd is the report of Adam of Bremen in the 1070s. Details of Yaroslav’s marriage negotiations for Ingigerd’s hand are recounted in Snorri Sturluson’s thirteenth-century *Heimskringla*. Other thirteenth-century Scandinavian sagas also record the marriage and present Ingigerd as a strong queen in Rus’, who played a role in mediating between Yaroslav and the other contenders for the throne of Kyiv. None of these primary sources, however, date the marriage of Yaroslav and Ingigerd to a specific year. The date of 1019, which is widely accepted in historiography, is highly likely, however, due to the political circumstances in which the marriage took place, and the fact that, by 1020,


39 Snorri Strulusion, *Heimskringla*, trans. Finlay and Faulkes, vol. 2, 93, 95. On the *Heimskringla’s* portrayal of Ingigerd’s limited agency in choosing her spouse see Friðriksdóttir, *Women in Old Norse Literature*, 97-100. Ingigerd can insist on marrying within her rank, but it is her father who ultimately chooses her spouse for her.

Yaroslav’s son Vladimir was born.\footnote{The birth of Vladimir is recorded using an impersonal construction, however, without mentioning the name of the wife: “A son was born to Yaroslav, and he called his name Vladimir,” \textit{PC}, 134; “Rodi sia u Yaroslava syn, i nareche imia emu Volodimir,” \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 2, 1161.} According to the \textit{Primary Chronicle}, Yaroslav was in Novgorod in the winter of 1018 or early 1019, seeking Varangian mercenaries to gain the throne of Kyiv following the death of his father Vladimir in 1015.\footnote{PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 2, sub anno 6526 (1018), 1142-1143.} The marriage alliance between the Swedish princess Ingigerd and Yaroslav the Wise would have helped strength this military alliance.\footnote{For a detailed discussion of the dating of Ingigerd’s and Yaroslav’s marriage in scholarly literature and an argument in favour of 1019 as the marriage date, see Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 492-495 and Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 25-26.}

As discussed further in Chapter Two, in the “Sermon on Law and Grace” delivered by the monk Ilarion (Hilarion), future metropolitan of Kyiv (d. 1055), Ingigerd is called “Irina” leading to the hypothesis that she was given the name “Irene” after her marriage to Yaroslav.\footnote{“K semuzhe viizhd i blagověrnuiu snokhu tvoiu Erinu,” “Slovo o zakoně i blagodati,” ed. Müller, 125; \textit{Slovo o zakone i blagodati}, ed. Moldovan, 98; English trans. in Franklin, \textit{Sermons and Rhetoric}, 24. On the issue of Ingigerd’s renaming see further Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina,” under “Ingigerd/Irena.”} Ingigerd’s death-date is recorded in the \textit{Primary Chronicle} under the year 6558 (1049/1050), but her name is not mentioned: “Yaroslav’s wife, the princess, died” (the Hypatian redaction adds “on February 10th.”)\footnote{“Predstavisę zhena Yaroslavę knęgyni”, \textit{PVL}, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1230. The Hypatian redaction adds that she died on February 10th, \textit{Ibid}, 1230.} Her image is painted in Kyiv’s Saint Sophia, in which she appears together with her husband and children as one of the Cathedral’s founders.\footnote{Unfortunately, the frescoes are badly damaged as Saint Sophia was in a state of half-ruin from the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries when its vaults collapsed and were poorly restored in the nineteenth century; Grabar, \textit{L’art du Moyen Age}, 144, Lazarev, \textit{Old Russian Murals and Mosaics}, 48. It is therefore not possible to determine by which name the fresco figure of Ingigerd was labelled originally.}

Finally, scholars have also suggested that Ingigerd bore in Rus’ the additional name of “Anna,” perhaps a monastic name which she would have taken before her death.\footnote{Leib, \textit{Rome, Kiev et Byzance}, 145-146; discussed in Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 491; Uspenskii and Litvina, \textit{Vybor imeni}, 567; Korpela, “Les relations,” 48.} This hypothesis was presented in order to reconcile Ingigerd’s name with a later Novgorodian tradition which held

---

\[\text{Footnotes}\]
that Yaroslav’s wife was a woman called Anna. The earliest record of this local cult is found in chronicle records under the year 1439 when archbishop Evfimii II of Novgorod (r. 1428/1434-1458) ordered inscriptions to be put upon the tombs of Vladimir Yaroslavich (d. 1052), a son of Yaroslav the Wise, and the tomb of Vladimir’s mother (name unspecified) in Novgorod’s Saint Sophia Cathedral. The first reference to the mother of Vladimir Yaroslavich by the name of “Anna,” however, appears only in 1556 in a charter of Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible, in which he commemorates his ancestors. As a result of this identification, later scholars beginning in the nineteenth century conflated Ingigerd and Anna and claimed that Yaroslav the Wise’s wife Ingigerd was renamed “Anna” in Rus’ (“Ingigerd-Anna”) or that this was Ingigerd’s monastic name. As Alexandr Nazarenko has convincingly demonstrated, however, this thesis is unlikely since Ingigerd predeceased Yaroslav (she died in 1050/1051 and he in 1054) and it was rare for Rus’ women to take monastic vows while their husbands were still alive. Furthermore the identification of a sarcophagus in Kyiv’s Saint Sophia Cathedral in 1939 as belonging to Ingigerd, means that she did not as a Novgorodian nun, but rather was buried in Kyiv next to her husband. Consequently, it is possible that if “Anna” did exist, she was Yaroslav the Wise’s first wife (the mother of his son Il’ia, not Vladimir), whom Yaroslav married before 1019.

---

48 The main sources on the tombs in Novgorod’s Saint Sophia Cathedral are the seventeenth-century Third Novgorod Chronicle’s entry for 1439/1340 and the “Short Chronicle of Novgorod Bishops” (Russian: Kratkii letopisets’ novgorodskikh vladyk). The latter also records the transfer of the tomb of the “blessed princess Anna” to the interior of the Novgorod cathedral on 13 August 1654 under Metropolitan Makarii (d. 1663). See Leib, Rome, Kiev et Byzance, 145-146; V. L. Yanin, Nekropol’ novgorodskogo Sofiiskogo sobora: tserkovnaiia traditsiia i istoricheskaiia kritika (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 135; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 490 and 612a; Voitovych, Kniazha doba, 260.

49 Yanin, Nekropol’, 138; Voitovych, Kniazha Doba, 260.

50 Uspenskii and Litvina, Vybor imeni, 566 give “Anna” as Ingigerd’s additional name with a question mark.

51 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 491.

52 Yanin, Nekropol’, 138-139; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 491.

53 Yanin, Nekropol’, 138-140; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus, 491 and 612; Uspenskii and Litvina, Vybor imeni, 567.
5. Maria Dobroniega, sister of Yaroslav the Wise, and Kazimierz I of Poland, c. 1039-1043

Father of bride: Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)

Mother of bride: Anna Porphyrogenita (d. 1011?) or a German princess (d. after 1015)

Father of groom: King Mieszko Lambert II of Poland (d. 1034)

Mother of groom: Queen Richeza of Lotharingia/Lorraine (d. 1063)

Children: King Bolesław II (b. 1039-d. 1081 or 1082), King Władysław I Herman I (b. 1040-d. 1102), Mieszko (b. 1045-d. 1065), Otto (b. 1046-d. 1048), Świętosława/ Svátavá (d. 1126)

Comments:

The marriage of King Kazimierz the Restorer of Poland (d. 1058) to a sister of Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054) took place in 1041-1043 according to Rus’ sources and 1038-1039 according to Saxon chronicles.54 Maria Dobroniega was probably one of the youngest of Vladimir’s children, though scholars debate who her mother could have been.55 Her name is also a source of controversy: scholars debate whether her name was “Maria”, “Dobroniega”, or “Maria Dobroniega.”56 The twelfth-century Chronicle of Gallus Anonymous, which is the oldest Polish source to report on the marriage, does not give a name to Kazimierz’s bride, but states her Rus’ origin: “Subsequently, he [Kazimierz] took as wife a Russian woman of noble family and great

54 The majority of Rus’ sources give the year 6551 (1042/1043) for the marriage: “V sizhe vremena v”dast’ Yaroslav sestru svoiu za Kazimira, i v”dast’ Kazimir za věno liudii 8 s”t, ezhe bě polonil Boleslav, pobědiv Yaroslava,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.2, 1223-1224, English trans., PC, 139: “At the same time Yaroslav married his sister to Kazimir, and as a wedding gift Kazimir surrendered eight hundred captives whom Boleslav had taken when he overcame Yaroslav.” The fifteenth-century Commission copy (“Komissiony spisok”) of the First Novgorod chronicle (Saint Petersburg, Institut rossiiskoi istorii, Rossiskaia akademiia nauk, Arkheograficheskaia komissiia, nr. 240) mentions the exchange of captives as a wedding present somewhat later: PSRL, vol. 3, sub anno 6555 (1046/1047), 181; “Hic temporibus Kazimer, filius Mesconis ducis Polonorum, reversus in patriam, a Polanis libenter suscipitur, duxitque uxorem regis Ruscie filiam, procreavitque duos filios Vladizlaum et Bolizlaum,” Annalista Saxo, ed. Waitz, sub anno 1039, 683. The marriage is also mentioned in GPP, 1.19, 80-81(no date, cited below) and discussed in Ibid., n. 1, 82. The Rocznik Krasinskiich places the birth of Maria Dobroniega’s oldest son, Boleslaw II, also under the year 1039, Rocznik Krasinskiich, ed. August Bielowski in MPH, vol. 3, 130.

55 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 28.

56 See Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, 505. On the issue of renaming of brides in general, see further Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina.” 
wealth, by whom he had four sons and a daughter who was to be the bride of the king of Bohemia. The names of his sons are Bolesław, Władysław, Mieszko, and Otto."\(^{57}\)

The double-name of “Maria Dobroniega” can only be found only in late sources beginning with the thirteenth-century redactions of the Life of St. Stanislaw (d. 1079), the Vita Maior and Vita Minor.\(^{58}\) According to the fifteenth-century history of Jan Długosz (d. 1480), this Riurikid princess’s original name was “Maria,” who then was renamed and re-baptised upon her marriage to Kazimierz I as “Dobroniega.”\(^{59}\) This view has been rejected by scholarship as anachronistic for the early eleventh century.\(^{60}\) Jacek Hertel considers that Dobroniega was the princess’ only name and notes that it was later given to her great-granddaughter, who had the double-name of Dobroniega Ludgarda.\(^{61}\) In favour of this view, he notes that “Dobroniega” is clearly a Slavic name, and proposes that its etymology stems from the Old Slavonic dobr (“good”) and nèga (“bliss”, “pleasure”).\(^{62}\)

More recently, Przemysław Wiszewski and Grzegorz Pac drew attention to another possible contemporary witness to Dobroniega’s use of the second name “Maria”, although they admitted that the evidence is inconclusive. The source in question is a half-erased note in the eleventh-century necrology of the monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg which contains commemorative notices of several members of Maria/Dobroniega’s married family including her


\(^{59}\) Ioannis Dlugossii Annales, ed. S. Budkowa et al., sub anno 1041, 36-37

\(^{60}\) Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 161-162; followed by Leib, Rome, Kiev et Byzance, Appendix II, 325-326; Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, n. 99, 506.

\(^{61}\) Hertel, Immienictwo, 149.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., 149.
husband, Kazimierz, and their sons Boleslaw and Mieszko. Under December 13th (folio 63r), the necrology contains the commemorative note “Maria dux”, followed by a half-erased note above the line reading “....?s...a....x”, which could be expanded as “ducis Gazmeri [=Kazmeri] uxor” (in Wiszewski’s view) or “duxissa uxor N.” (in Pac’s view). If the necrology does indeed refer to the wife of Kazimierz the Restorer, then it would be the earliest source to call her “Maria” and would thus confirm that she did indeed carry a double-name. Maria-Dobroniega would therefore have a double-name as was common in the Riurikid dynasty: “Maria” would then be her Christian baptismal name, while “Dobroniega” would be her Slavic name.

The Annual of the Chapter-House of Kraków Cathedral places her death in the year 1087, stating “Dobroniega, the wife of Casimir died.” Due to her commemoration in this source, it is likely that she died in Kraków and was buried in Kraków Cathedral.

Maria’s daughter, Świętosława, married the Czech duke (later king) Vratislav II (d. 1092) and was renamed Svátavá after her marriage. After her death, Vratislav II remarried with Adelheid, a daughter of King András I of Hungary either by his first unknown wife or by the Rus’ princess Anastasia, Maria’s niece.

---

63 Universitätsbibliothek Augsburg Codex I 2 2 8, olim Fürstlich Oettingen-Wallerstein’schen Bibliothek und Kunstatmlung zu Schloss Harburg. Das Martyrolog-Necrolog von St. Emmeram zu Regensburg, eds. Eckhard Freise, Dieter Geuenich, and Joachim Wollasch. MGH Libri Memoriales et Necrologia Nova Series, vol. 3 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1986), 205, 249, plates 8r, 16r, 18v, and 63r (photographs of the manuscript). The manuscript and its possible connections to princess Maria are discussed in Wiszewski, Domus Bolezljai, 503-504, and Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, 317-318.

64 Das Martyrolog-Necrolog von St. Emmeram zu Regensburg, 249 and photographic plate 63r. Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, 318. It is difficult to read the half-erased note of the manuscript in the black-and-white photograph.

65 Pac, Kobiety w dynastii Piastów, 504.


67 Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 277.

68 Cosmas of Prague, Chronicle of the Czechs, trans. Wolverton, 139; Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 195-196.

69 Ibid., 197. On the debated number of King András’ marriages, see below, Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 8.
6. *Iziaslav Yaroslavich and Gertruda, sister of Kazimierz I of Poland, 1039, 1043, or 1050*

**Father of bride:** King Mieszko II of Poland (d. 1034)

**Mother of bride:** Queen Richeza of Lotharingia/Lorraine (d. 1063)

**Father of groom:** Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054)

**Mother of groom:** Ingigerd of Sweden (d. 1050)

**Children:** Yaropolk-Peter Iziaslavich (d. 1086). Whether or not Gertruda was the mother of Sviatopolk Michael Izialavich (b. 1050-d. 1113) and Mstislav Izialavich (d. 1069) is debated.

**Comments:**

Gertruda was the daughter of Mieszko II (d. 1034) and Richeza of Lotharingia (d. 1063) and sister of Kazimierz I the Restorer.\(^70\) She is estimated to have been born sometime after 1016 (when her brother Kazimierz was born) and most likely around 1020 or 1025.\(^71\) Her father, according to Gallus Anonymous, was castrated by the Czechs in 1031 and obviously could not have children after that date (“uxorem ulterius non cognovit”).\(^72\)

Gertruda’s marriage to prince Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078) is variously dated from 1039 to 1050. Some scholars believe that the “sister exchange” of women may have occurred at the same time that Kazimierz married a sister of Iziaslav Yaroslavich (see no. 5 above) and consequently that Gertruda married the Rus’ prince Iziaslav Yaroslav in 1039 or 1043—the majority choose the later date.\(^73\) Only the early modern (sixteenth or early seventeenth century) *First Sofia Chronicle* explicitly states that in 1042/1043 Kazimierz also married his sister to Yaroslav’s son,


\(^71\) Jasiński, *Rodowód pierwszych Piastów*, 145.

\(^72\) *GPP*, 74-75; Jasiński, *Rodowód pierwszych Piastów*, n. 13, 146-147 who notes that scholars disagree on the veracity of this account of Mieszko II’s castration.

Iziaslav Yaroslavich: “Kazimierz gave his sister to Iziaslav, the son of Yaroslav.” Karol Górski made the suggestion that Iziaslav Yaroslavich married Gertruda in 1050, ascribing the births of Iziaslav’s sons Mstislav (d. 1069) and Sviatopolk-Michael (d. 1113) to a previous, otherwise unknown wife of Iziaslav called Olisava. Latin sources only mention Yaropolk-Peter (d. 1086/1087) as Gertruda’s son. Other scholars, most notably Vladimir Yanin, have argued on the basis of a graffito in Saint Sophia (“Lord, help thy servant Olisava, Princess of Rus’, Sviatopolk’s mother”) that Gertruda had the second name “Olisava” in Rus’. Based on evidence from her personal prayer-book, in which Saint Helena figures prominently, it is perhaps more likely that Gertruda had the second name “Helena” in Rus’. One of the last certain references to Gertruda in the Rus’ chronicles tells how in 1085 her son Yaropolk-Peter abandoned her in the city of Lutsk where Gertruda was captured and brought to Kyiv by the forces of Yaropolk’s rival, Prince Vladimir Monomakh. Since it is a matter of scholarly debate whether Gertruda was the mother or stepmother of Sviatopolk-Michael Iziaslavich it is not certain whether the Rus’ chronicle’s notice of 1107 that “On January 4 of this year, the Princess, Svyatopolk’s mother, passed away” refers to her.

75 Górski, “Gertruda czy Olisawa?” 74-76. On the issue of Gertruda’s re-naming, the names, and number of her sons see also Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina” under “Gertruda/Olisava” and Chapter Three, “The Prayer-Book of Gertruda.”
76 Michałowska, Ego Gertruda, 100-101.
78 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 569 and idem, “Mezhkonfessionalnye braki,” 281.
80 “v tozhe lěto prestavi sia kniagini, Sviatopolcha mati měsiatsa genvaria v 4 den’,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 2144; PC, 204.
7. Elizabeth Yaroslavna and Harald Hardrada in 1044

Father of bride: Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054)
Mother of bride: Ingigerd of Sweden (d. 1050)
Father of groom: Sigurd “the Pig” (“Syr”) Hálfdanarson (d. 1018)
Mother of groom: Åsta Gudbrandsdatter

Children: Maria (d. 1066) and Ingigerd (d. after 1096)

Comments:

The earliest source for the marriage of Elizabeth Yaroslavna, a daughter of Yaroslav the Wise and Ingigerd of Sweden, to Harald Hardrada of Norway (d. 1066) is a scholium in the late eleventh-century chronicle of Adam of Bremen: “After Harold returned from Greece he took a daughter of King Yaroslav of Rus’ as his wife.” Later thirteenth-century Scandinavian sagas such as Snorri Sturluson’s Heimskringla, written in circa 1230, also record Harald Hardrada’s stay in Rus’, his service as a Byzantine mercenary, and his subsequent return to Rus’ and marriage to Elizabeth Yaroslavna. Various Icelandic Annals place Harald’s return to Sweden (en route to reclaiming the Norwegian throne) to the year 1045, suggesting that he was married to Elizabeth in the previous year, 1044 or during the winter of 1043-1044. In Scandinavia, Elizabeth was known by a Norse equivalent of her name, “Ellisif.” She had two daughters with

---

81 Åsta was also the mother of Saint Olaf of Norway (Olaf Haraldsson, d. 1030) by her previous husband, Harald inn grenski (“the Greenlander”). See the entries in Phillip Pulsiano, ed., Medieval Scandinavia: an Encyclopedia (New York: Garland, 1993), 226 and 445


her husband, Maria and Ingigerd. Probably because Elizabeth Yaroslavna was unable to give Harald any sons, he bigamously married a certain Thora, daughter of the landowner Thornberg Árnason, who was able to fulfill this duty, giving him the sons Magnus and Olaf.

Harald and Elizabeth’s daughter Ingigerd subsequently married Oluf Hunger of Denmark (r. 1086-1096). Their other daughter, Maria, was engaged to a local landowner, Eystein Orri, son of Thornberg Árnason (and thus Maria’s step-brother), but she died in the Orkney Islands “on the same day and at the same hour as her father” (1066) before the marriage could be concluded. Elizabeth, together with her daughters had sailed to these Islands prior to the Battle of Stamford Bridge in 1066 in which Harold Hardada was killed fighting Harold Godwineson for the throne of England. The last certain mention of Elizabeth Yaroslavna is in 1066, when, after the death of her husband at the Battle of Stamford Bridge, her step-son Olaf sailed to the Orkney Islands to pick her up along with her surviving daughter Ingigerd. After this incident, there are no more reliable references to Elizabeth in the sagas.

The assertion in older historiography that Elizabeth Yaroslavna later became the wife of King Sven Estridsson of Denmark (r. c. 1047-1075/1076) after the death of her first husband in 1066 is no longer accepted by the majority of scholars. This claim is based on a confused reading of a scholium in Adam of Bremen’s chronicle which states that “He married the young Olaf’s mother.” It is not clear to whom the pronoun “he” refers to: whether it refers to King Sven of

87 Ibid., 66.
88 Inge Skovgaard-Petersen in collaboration with Nanna Damsholt, “Queenship in Medieval Denmark,” in Medieval Queenship, ed Parsons, 40; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 42 and 44.
90 Ibid., 108.
91 Ibid., 660; discussed in Dzhakson, “Yelisaveta Yaroslavna,” 66.
92 Ibid., 66; Nazarenko, Drewniaia Rus’, 523; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 44. The idea of Elizabeth’s second marriage is accepted in, for instance: Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 28 and 135 and Voitovich, Knitazha doba, 320.
93 “Iste accepit matrem Olavi iuvenis in matrimonio,” Adami Gesta Pontificum, ed. Trillmich, scholium 84 (85), 396.
Denmark, who is mentioned in the main text or King Haakon the Red of Sweden who is mentioned in the preceding scholium.\textsuperscript{94} In any case, the “Olaf” mentioned in the scholium was Olaf Kyrre of Norway (r. 1067-1083), who was the son of Harold Hardada; not by Elizabeth, however, but rather by Harold’s second wife, Tora, whom Harold had married bigamously.\textsuperscript{95}

Rus’ sources do not mention Elizabeth’s existence. She is, however, probably among Yaroslav the Wise’s daughters portrayed in the frescoes of Saint Sophia in Kyiv, painted in the late 1040s.\textsuperscript{96}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 396.
\textsuperscript{95} Dzhakson, “Yelisaveta Yaroslavna,” 66; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaiaia Rus’}, 523; Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 44.
\textsuperscript{96} Grabar, \textit{L’art du Moyen Age}, 144; Lazarev, \textit{Old Russian Murals and Mosaic}, 48.
\end{flushleft}
8. András I of Hungary and “Anastasia” Yaroslavna, c.1046-1050

Father of bride: Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054)

Mother of bride: Ingigerd of Sweden (d. 1050)

Father of groom: Vazul or László the Bald (fl. early eleventh century)

Mother of groom: unknown or “Premsislava” Vladimirna (fl. early eleventh century)

Children: Solomon (1053-1087), David (after 1053-after 1091), and possibly three daughters, Adelheid (d. 1062), Euphemia (d. 1111) and Sophia.

Comments:

Kazimierz Jasiński notes that historians assume that Anastasia married the future King András I of Hungary (d. 1060) around 1039, but the marriage date could also have been two or three years later, perhaps around 1046 when András I regained the throne in Hungary following a period of exile, as the sources do not give the marriage date precisely. According to another hypothesis based on the date of the birth of their eldest son Solomon, the marriage took place only in the 1050s.

The marriage and Anastasia’s existence are mentioned only in Latin sources, not in Rus’ ones. The earliest source is a scholium in the near-contemporary eleventh-century history of Adam of

97 Although the earliest surviving native Hungarian chronicle, Anonymous’ Gestá Hungarórum, written circa 1200-1210, states that András I was the son of László the Bald, most scholars believe that he was, in fact, the son of László’s brother, Vazul. Vazul was blinded at the orders of Saint István around 1031 forcing András and his brothers to flee into exile. Later chronicles wished to “distance the dynasty from an ignominiously blinded and maimed ancestor,” Anonymi Gestá Hungarórum, eds. and trans. Rady and Veszprémy, 42-43 and n. 4, 43.

98 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 1, no. 8; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 133; Shternberg, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna,” 181. See also Voitovych, Kniaža doba, 311.

99 Based on the marriage of King András I’s daughter, Adelheid, in 1056 to the Czech duke Vratislav and on the German origin of Adelheid’s name, as well as the later birth dates of the known children of Anastasia and András, Szabolcs de Vajay proposed the hypothesis that King András I was twice married: the first time in 1039 to a German princess (the daughter of Frisian prince, Liudolf of Braunschweig) and the second time in 1050 to the Rus’ princess Anastasia. Attila Zsoldos accepts Szabolcs de Vajay’s thesis and dates Anastasia’s marriage also to the year 1050. See Shternberg, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna,” 181; de Vajay, “Még egy Királynénk...?” 17-23; Zsoldos, Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 184 (translated by Anita Margetin).
Bremen, which identifies her as a daughter of Yaroslav the Wise and which lists her together with the illustrious marriages her sisters made.\textsuperscript{100}

However, Anastasia is likely among the members of Yaroslav the Wise’s family portrayed in the frescoes of Saint Sophia in Kyiv, painted in the 1040s.\textsuperscript{101} Anastasia’s name is known only from the fifteenth century chronicle of Jan Długosz in his entry for the year 1049.\textsuperscript{102} Most secondary literature refers to her by this name; A. V. Nazarenko, however, in his recent study of the external relations of Kyivan Rus’ uses her name with a question mark or refers to her simply as “Yaroslavna”, i.e. “daughter of Yaroslav.”\textsuperscript{103}

Anastasia had two known children with András: Solomon (b. 1053, d. 1088) and David (d. 1091). In addition, she may also have had three daughters: Adelheid, and Euphemia, and Sophia.\textsuperscript{104} Scholars debate whether Sophia, future wife of Count Poppo of Berg, was Anastasia’s daughter or granddaughter (a daughter of her son Solomon).\textsuperscript{105} Adelheid’s status is also open to debate: she may have been Anastasia’s daughter or stepdaughter, since while Solomon and David were born in the 1050s, already by 1055 Adelheid (d. 1062) was old enough to marry the Czech duke Vratislav II (d. 1092), suggesting she may have been King András’ daughter by a previous wife.\textsuperscript{106} After Adelheid’s death in 1062, her husband Vratislav married Świętosława,

\textsuperscript{100} Adamī Gesta Pontificum, ed. Trillmich, scholium 63 (63), 340.
\textsuperscript{101} Shternberg, “Anastasiia Yaroslavna,” 181; Grabar, L’art du Moyen Age, 144; Lazarev, Old Russian Murals and Mosaics, 48.
\textsuperscript{102} "Accepit autem prefatus Andreas rex principis Russie filiam nomine Anastasiam, ex qua nati sunt ei duo filii, videlicet Salomon et Dauid," Ioannis Dlugossii Annales, ed. Budkowa et al., sub anno 1049, 61.
\textsuperscript{103} Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 565-566, 572.
\textsuperscript{104} Zsoldos believes that Adelheid (1042-circa 1062) and Euphemia (?-1111) were András ’s daughters from his first marriage; Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 184. Wertner lists only Solomon, David, and Adeleheid, Az Árpádok családi története, 123-136. For the argument that Adelheid was Anastasia’s daughter, see Font, “Hongrois et Slaves,” 182 and Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 572.
\textsuperscript{105} See the discussion in Black,”Die Töchter,” n. 19, 39.
\textsuperscript{106} Cosmae pragensis chronica boemorum, ed. Bretholz, 107. For the argument that Adelheid came from a previous marriage of András see de Vajay, “Még egy Királynénk...? I. Endre első felesége”, 17-23 and Zsoldos, Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, 184.
the daughter of Kazimierz I of Poland and Maria Dobroniega, Anastasia’s aunt.\textsuperscript{107} Anastasia’s eldest son, Solomon, married Judith-Sophia (d. before 1102), daughter of Agnes of Poitou and Emperor Heinrich III.\textsuperscript{108} After his death in 1088, Judith-Sophia remarried with the Polish duke Władysław I Herman, whose mother was Anastasia’s own aunt, Maria Dobroniega.\textsuperscript{109}

The last source mention of Anastasia’s whereabouts is in the Deeds of the Hungarians (Gesta Hungarorum) of Simon of Kéza written in circa 1282-1285 which states that she was placed for safety in the Benedictine monastery of Admont in Styria, while her son Solomon fought for the Hungarian throne.\textsuperscript{110} This event occurred around the time of the battle of Mogyoród of 1074 when her son Solomon was expelled from Hungary by his first cousins, Géza and the future King László (r. 1077-1095).\textsuperscript{111} As argued in Section Three, although it has been stated in secondary literature that Anastasia was buried at Admont, there is reason to doubt this statement, because Anastasia is not mentioned in the monastery’s necrology.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{107} Cosmas of Prague, \textit{The chronicle of the Czechs}. trans. Wolverton, 139 and n. 135, 139.
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Kronika Polska}, ed. Ćwikliński, 621.
\textsuperscript{112} Rokay, \textit{Salamon és Pola}, 27; Lyon, “Letters of Princess Sophia”, 58; Beach, \textit{Women as Scribes}, 67. See also Section Three under “Anastasia.”

Father of bride: Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054)

Mother of bride: Ingigerd of Sweden (d. 1050)

Father of first husband: Robert II the Pious of France (d. 1031)

Mother of first husband: Constance of Arles (d. 1032)

Father of second husband: Raoul II of Valois (d. after 1035)\(^{113}\)

Mother of second husband: Alix (Ade, Adèle), daughter of Count Haudouin of Breteuil\(^{114}\)

Children (with first husband): Philippe I of France (b. 1052-d. 1108), Robert (d. ca. 1060s), Hugues the Great (b. 1057, d. 1101), possibly a daughter Emma or Edigna (fl. eleventh century).

Comments:

Anna’s marriage to King Henri I of France and her male children are listed are mentioned in several French Latin sources, but in no extant Rus’ sources.\(^{115}\) Anna is, however, likely among the members of Yaroslav the Wise’s family portrayed in the frescoes of Saint Sophia in Kyiv, painted in the 1040s.\(^{116}\) The marriage is also mentioned in the scholium in Adam of Bremen’s eleventh-century chronicle describing the marriages of Yaroslav the Wise’s daughters.\(^{117}\) Henri I

---

113 Raoul II died in Nicaea, sometime after 1035 when he left France to accompany Duke Robert of Normandy on pilgrimage. Carolus-Barré, Le Comté de Valois, 42.

114 Alix (Ade, Adèle)’s existence is mentioned only in seventeenth and eighteenth-century histories and genealogies of the counts of Valois, and her death-date is unknown, Ibid., 41.

115 Hugues of Fleury, Modernorum regum Francorum actus in Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, ed. Prou, n. 1, xv, item, ed. Waitz, MGH, vol. 9, 388, item, RHGF, vol. 11, 159d, Raoul Tortaire, Miracula sancti Benedicti: in RHGF, vol. 11, 486d.

116 Grabar, L’art du Moyen Age, 144; Lazarev, Old Russian Murals and Mosaics, 48; Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev,” n. 70, 322.

117 Adami Gesta Pontificum, ed. Trillmich, scholium 63 (63), 340.
sent an embassy for Anna Yaroslavna’s hand in 1049 according to an eleventh or early twelfth century note in “Odalric’s Psalter” named after its former owner, a provost of Reims Cathedral, who died in 1079 (Reims, BM Ms. 15, fol. 214v). The chronicle of *Pseudo-Clarius* of Sens, however, written around 1108-1109, dates this embassy instead to 1050.\(^{118}\) As a result, some historians have suggested that King Henri I sent two embassies to Rus’.\(^{119}\) Maurice Prou prefers the 1049 date of Odalric’s Psalter to what he calls the often imprecise chronology of *Pseudo-Clarius*’s chronicle and therefore suggests that there was but one embassy.\(^{120}\) Consequently, at the earliest Anna would have arrived in France between 1049-1050.\(^{121}\) The *Annales de Vendôme* report the marriage under the year 1051: “1051. Henry, the king of the Franks, married a Scythian and Rus’ woman.”\(^{122}\) Maurice Prou suggests on this basis that it is probable that Anna’s marriage did not take place right away after her arrival in France in 1049-1050.\(^{123}\) Anna’s coronation in Reims Cathedral in 1051 as Queen of France is recorded by the early twelfth-century *Life of Saint Lietbert of Cambrai (Vita sancti Lietberti)* written by the monk Raoul of Saint-Sépulchre.\(^{124}\)

Anna is known to have given birth to three sons: Philippe, Hugues, and Robert, as well as possibly a daughter named Emma.\(^{125}\) The existence of the latter is based on the testimony of William of Jumièges’ eleventh-century chronicle that King Henri had a daughter called Emma, as well as the *vitae* of Saint Emma or Edigna, which claim that this saint was a daughter of Henri

\(^{118}\) *Chronique de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif*, eds. Bautier and Gilles, 122.

\(^{119}\) *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier*, ed. Prou, n. 2, xviii.

\(^{120}\) *Ibid.*, xix.

\(^{121}\) *Ibid.*, n. 2, xix.


\(^{123}\) *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier*, ed. Prou, xix.


\(^{125}\) Bogomoletz, “Anna of Kiev”, 308.
I who fled to Bavaria to live a life of ascetic poverty. William of Jumièges, however, conflates Anna with King Henri’s previous wife Matilda of Frisia (d. 1044), suggesting that Emma might have Matilda’s rather than Anna’s daughter.

The precise date of Anna’s marriage to her second husband Count Raoul de Crépy-en-Valois is not known but it must have been after her first husband’s death on August 4th 1060 and after the death of Pope Nicholas II on 27 July 1061 as the latter makes no mention of it in his letter to Anna. Several Latin chronicles make general mention of the second marriage without giving it a precise date.

The Abbey of Saint-Vincent in Senlis which she re-founded from ruin, celebrated an annual obit (memorial service) for Anna on September 5th until the French Revolution. Based on the last charter in which she subscribes (1075) and a charter of Philippe I in which he gives a gift to Cluny in 1079 for the soul of his parents as well as the date of the obit, Anna must have died on September 5th, between 1075 and 1079.

In an article published on June 22nd in 1682 in the Journal des Savants, the Jesuit Claude-François Menestrier claimed to have discovered Anna’s tomb in the Abbey of Villiers, forty

---


128 Fliche, Le règne de Philippe Ier, 20.


131 Ibid., 321.
kilometers from Paris, in the town of Serni (Department of Essonne).\footnote{132} He alleged that the inscription on the tomb read, “Here lies the lady Agnes, once the wife of King Henri.”\footnote{133} An earlier description of the tomb noted by one Magdelon Theulier in 1642 refutes this theory, however, by proving that the key words “quae fuit uxor Henrici” (“who was the wife of Henri”) were added at some subsequent point after Theulier’s description in this year.\footnote{134} Thus, the tomb never contained the inscription (\textit{Hic jacet domina Agnes, uxor quondam Henrici regis}) claimed by Menestrier that would identify this tomb with Anna’s. One medieval chronicle, the early twelfth-century \textit{Historia Franciae}, states that Anna Yaroslavna returned alone to Rus’ after the death of her second husband, Raoul.\footnote{135} Her place of burial remains unknown.\footnote{136}


\footnote{134} de Rostoff, \textit{Recueil}, 45.

\footnote{135} “Rege defuncto, Regina Anna Rodulfum Comitem in conjugio accepit. Quo mortuo, nativum repetit solum,” \textit{Excerptum Historia Franciae} in RHGF, vol. 11, 161; Luniak, \textit{Anna Ruska}, 82.

\footnote{136} For a further discussion of Anna’s tomb in relation to the burial-places of her two husbands, see also Chapter Four under “Anna Yaroslavna.”
11. Sviatoslav Yaroslavich and Oda of Stade in 1070 (or before 1073)

Father of bride: Liupold of Stade (d. 1043) or Liupold Babenberg (d. 1043)\textsuperscript{137}

Mother of bride: Ida of Elstorpe (d. after 1085)

Father of groom: Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054)

Mother of groom: Ingigerd Olofsdotter of Sweden (d. 1050)

Children: Yaroslav Sviatoslavich of Murom (d. 1129) and possibly a daughter, perhaps the maternal grandmother of the Seljuq sultan of Rûm, Kilij Arslan II (r. 1156-11898/1192).

Comments:

The main information about the marriage between Oda of Stade and Sviatoslav Yaroslavich (d. 1076) comes from the thirteenth-century *Annales Stadenses* by Albert of Stade.\textsuperscript{138} This chronicle provides the information that Oda was the daughter of the German noblewoman Ida of Elstorpe and that Oda was originally intended to be a nun in the monastery of “Riteln” (probably Ringelheim near Goslar), but that instead she married a “the King of Rus’, to whom she born a son, “Warteslaw.”\textsuperscript{139} A key clue to the former’s identity is provided by the further statement of the *Annales Stadenses* that, “Ida’s son was also Burchard, the maior provost of Trier.”\textsuperscript{140} A. V.

\textsuperscript{137} The older assumption that Oda’s father was Count Liupold of Stade has also been challenged by genealogists, who have identified him instead as Liupold Babenberg (d. 1043), margrave of the Hungarian march, Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 512-514 and genealogical table 2, 513.

\textsuperscript{138} *Annales Stadenses*, ed. Lappenberg, *sub anno* 1112, 319.


\textsuperscript{140} “Item Idae filius fuit Burchardus, Treverensis maior praepositus […]”, *Annales Stadenses*, ed. Lappenberg, 320. Buchard-Poppo was the provost of the collegiate church of Saint-Simeon in Trier, not of Trier cathedral. Heyen, “Simeon und Buchard-Poppo,” 200-205 and Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 507-508 (who notes, however, that Heyer gives an incorrect genealogy for Oda).
Nazarenko also draws attention to a newly-discovered source on the marriage extant in one copy of Herman of Reichenau’s continuation of the chronicle of Saint-Gall, which gives the following report under the year 1072: “The King of the Rus’ married the daughter of Count Liupold and Lady Ida of Elstorpe at this time through the mediation of King Henry [IV].”\(^{141}\)

The identity of “Warteslaw” in the *Annales Stadenses* and the Rus’ prince whom Oda married had previously been a subject of scholarly debate.\(^{142}\) Nicholas de Baumgarten claimed Oda as the wife of Sviatoslav Yaroslavich’s eldest brother, Vladimir (d. 1052) and interpreted “Warteslaw” as “Rostislav.”\(^{143}\) This erroneous identification of Oda’s Rus’ husband has been subsequently disputed by a number of scholars, for instance (recently) Alexandr Nazarenko, who provides a detailed discussion and summary of previous genealogical studies.\(^{144}\) The fact that the “king of the Rus’” mentioned by the *Annales Stadenses* can be identified as Sviatoslav Yaroslavich is confirmed by a comparative reading of the *Annales Stadenses* with the eleventh-century contemporary chronicle of Lampert of Hersfeld, which mentions that Burchard was sent on embassy to Rus’ in 1075 to Sviatoslav, whose wife was Burchard’s sister.\(^{145}\)

\(^{141}\) “Rex Rittulorum filiam Luvpaldi comitis et domine Ite de Oterisburc his temporibus rege Heinrico mediante uxorem ducit,” as cited in *Ibid.*, 515 citing an early modern copy of Hermann of Reichenau (Herman the Lame’s) chronicle, *Hermanni Augiensis Continuatio Sangallensis* (no shelf mark or further details given), folia 17r-17v, as printed in an forthcoming edition of Alois Schütz, “whose publication now has been delayed indefinitely”! (“…nyne otlozheno na neopredelennnyi srok”). Nazarenko identifies “Rutili” as an ethnonym referring to the Rus’. Thanks to Dr. Horst Zimmerhackl at the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Personal Correspondance, May 19 2015), I have been able to ascertain that the manuscript in question is Augsburg 2o Codex 254. A full manuscript description may be found at: Wolf Gehrt, *Die Handschriften der Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg 2o Cod 251-400e*. Vol. 4: *Handschriftenkataloge der Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), digitized by *Manuscripta Mediaevalia*, last accessed May 19 2015. <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/kataloge/HSK0206.htm>. See also <http://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/archiv/k/K_00058.htm> for the future plans to published an edition of this manuscript.

\(^{142}\) Bloch, “Beziehungen,” 189-191, Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 506-512

\(^{143}\) Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux,” table 1, no. 22 and no. 22, 8-9.

\(^{144}\) Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 506-512. Prior to Baumgarten, other scholars beginning with N. M. Karamzin identified the “king of the Rus’” of the *Annales Stadenses* with Viacheslav Yaroslavich (d. 1057), a young son of Yaroslav the Wise, *Ibid.*, 508 with extensive further bibliography.

\(^{145}\) Burchard’s embassy to Trier took place after Iziaslav Yaroslavich complained to Emepror Heinrich IV at Mainz of being exiled by his brother, Sviatoslav: *Lamperti Monachi Hersfeldensis Opera*, ed. Holder-Egger, 202. The arrival of German envoys in Kyiv is also described in PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, 1599-1602.
A further piece of genealogical information concerning Oda’s and Sviatoslav’s marriage comes from the frontpiece miniature of Sviatoslav Yaroslavich’s *Izbornik* (miscellany) of 1073 (Moscow, GIM, Ms. Synod. 31-d, fol. 1v). Sviatoslav Yaroslavich stands to the very right of the image, holding a red codex, and offering it to Christ. To his left stands a woman labelled as “the princess” (“knęgyni”), with her arms around a little boy standing in front of her. Behind Sviatoslav are his four tall sons: three are visible while only the rounded fur cap of the fourth, standing behind the princess, can be seen. Each of them is carefully labelled: Gleb, Oleg, David, Roman. The miniature suggests that Sviatoslav Yaroslavich was twice married since it clearly distinguishes between the adult sons and the little boy standing by his second wife. According to this widely-accepted theory, Sviatoslav would have been twice married and Oda would have been his second wife.

The name of Sviatoslav’s first wife Kilikiia (“Cecilia”) is known its listing in a seventeenth-century necrology originating from the monastery of Saint Anthony in Liubech (near Chernihiv in present-day Ukraine), which is believed to be based on earlier sources. Kilikiia’s origins are debated and can only be guessed on her name. Martin Dimnik considers her to be a Greek woman, believing that her name to refer to the Byzantine province of Cilicia.

The little boy in the miniature, Oda of Stade’s son, can be identified with Yaroslav Sviatoslavich (d. 1129), who is mentioned in the Rus’ chronicles as Sviatoslav’s youngest son, and with

---

146 *Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 goda*, fol. 1v.

147 Gleb Sviatoslavich, the oldest son, was killed in 1078. Roman Sviatoslavich was killed the next year, in 1079. Oleg Sviatoslavich died in 1115, and David Sviatoslavich died in 1123; Bloch, “Beziehungen,” 191.


149 R. V Zotov, ed. and commentary, *O Chernigovskikh kniaziakh po Liubetskому sinodiku i o chernigovskom kniazhestve v Tatarskoe vremia* (Saint Petersburg: Izdanie Arkheograficheskoi komissii, 1892), 24; Bloch, “Beziehungen,” 190; Dimnik, *Chernigov* 1054-1146, xv and 37; Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus*’, 517. Although Narazenko has argued that “Kilikiia” was Oda’s Orthodox baptismal name (*Ibid.*, 517) this seems unlikely because the *Liubetskiy sinodik* makes no mention of Oda’s son Yaroslav while it does mention his sons from his first wife. The necrology therefore seems to have been made before Sviatoslav’s second marriage took place, Dimnik, *Chernigov* 1054-1146, 37.

“Warteslaw”, who according to the *Annales Stadenses* was Oda’s only son by the Rus’ king. An unclear reference in the chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck (d. 1211/1214) has led A. V. Nazarenko to hypothesize that Oda and Sviatoslav also had a daughter.

After Sviatoslav Yaroslavich’s death in 1076 Oda returned to her Saxon family along with her son Yaroslav. Oda’s Rus’ connections were not forgotten, however, since her son Yaroslav Sviatoslavich returned to Rus’ around 1096, supposedly recovering the treasure that his mother had left for him, and going on to rule the cities of Murom and, briefly, Chernihiv (Chernigov). After Sviatoslav’s death, Oda remarried in Saxony and had a daughter called Aliarina by her second (unknown) husband.

Oda’s death is recorded in the necrology of Hildersheim under July 2nd.

---


152 According to Arnold of Lübeck’s late twelfth/early thirteenth-century *Chronicles of the Slavs*, when the Saxon Duke Heinrich the Lion (1142-1180) came to Tarsus in 1172 on his return from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he was surprised to be welcomed as a kinsman by the Seljuq sultan Kilij Arslan II (r. 1156-1189/1192). Arslan kissed and embraced him, and told the Saxon duke that, “A certain noble matron from the land of the Germans married the king of the Rus’, who fathered from her a daughter, whose daughter came into our land, from whom I descended,”: “Dux autem illuc perveniens magnifice susceps est a Turcis et inde deductus est Axarat, ubi occurrit ei soldanus letissimus, amplexans et deosculans eum, dicens, eum consanguineum suum esse. Cunque dux perquereret consanguinitatis, ille respondit: ‘Quedam nobilis matrona de terra Theutonicorum nupsit regi Ruthenorum, qui genuit ex ea filiam, cuius filia devenit in terram nostram, de qua ego descendii,’” *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, ed. Lappenberg 24, discussed in Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 643. According to Nazarenko’s hypothesis, Kilij Arslan and Henry the Lion would be related through Oda’s mother, Ida of Elsdorf: See the genealogical table in Nazarenko, *Ibid.*, 646.


154 “Warteslaw autem revocatus in Ruziam pro patre regnavit,” *Ibid.*, *sub anno* 1112, 319. Yaroslav Sviatoslavich later (1097) ruled as prince of Murom and Riazan, becoming the founder of the ruling line of that region, but the identity of his wife (with whom he had three sons) is unknown. In 1123 he ruled in Chernihiv (Chernigov) but was driven out of the city by his nephew Vsevolod Olgevich in 1127 and was unable to regain it. From 1127 to his death in 1129, Yaroslav returned to Murom. His career as a Rus’ prince and the domains that he ruled are discussed in Dimnik, *Dynasty of Chernigov 1054-1146*, 188-189, 199, 202-203, 208, 212, 221, 238-239, 245, 265-267, 301, 303-305, 307-308, 311-312, 314-315, 319-321.


12. Vladimir Monomakh and Gytha of England, before 1076

Father of bride: Harald Godwineson (d. 1066)

Mother of bride: Edith Swanneck (also known as Eadgifu the Fair and Edith the Rich, d. circa after 1066) 157

Father of groom: Vsevolod Yaroslavich (d. 1093)

Mother of groom: a Byzantine princess of the House of Monomachos (d. 1067)

Children: Mstislav Harald Fedir Vladimirovich the Great (b. 1076-d. 1132) Iziaslav Vladimirovich (d. 1096), Sviatoslav Vladimirovich (d. 1114), Roman Vladimirovich (d. 1119), Yaropolk Vladimirovich (b. 1082-d. 1139), Viacheslav Vladimirovich (d. 1154), Euphemia Vladimirna (d. 1139), Agafia Vladimirna (fl. 1116), Yuri Vladimirovich the Long-Armed (“Dolgorukii,” b. 1090-d. 1157 by Gytha or a concubine), Andrei Vladimirovich “the Good” (b. 1102-d. 1142), Maria or Marina Vladimirna (d. 1147).

Comments:

Gytha was the daughter of Harold Godwineson (d. 1066), the last Anglo-Saxon king, and the English noblewoman Edith Swanneck (Swanneshals). 158 Her husband, Vladimir Monomakh (r. Kyiv, 1113-1125), was the son of Vsevolod Yaroslavich and a Byzantine noblewoman, often incorrectly said to be the daughter of Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos himself (who had no daughters). 159 The main source for her marriage to Vladimir Monomakh is found in the work of the thirteenth-century Danish chronicler Saxo Grammaticus. He records that after Harald


158 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 61.

Godwineson’s death at the Battle of Hastings in 1066 King Sven Estridsson (r. 1047-1075/1076) welcomed the exiled sons of Harold of England together with their sister and gave “the girl in marriage to the Russian king, Valdemar, who was also known as Yaroslav by his people.” A number of thirteenth-century vernacular Old Norse sagas also mention the marriage between Gytha and Vladimir. The date of Gytha’s marriage to Vladimir Monomakh is based primarily on the birth of their eldest son, Mstislaw in 1076, which is recorded in the Rus’ Primary Chronicle. They had ten other children together.

The sources give contradictory reports on the day and year of Gytha’s death. The Hypatian redaction of the Rus’ Primary Chronicle reports the death of an unnamed wife of Vladimir Monomakh died on May 7th 1106, while the Laurentian redaction reports the death in the following year, 1107. Most historians accept that this notice refers to Gytha. If the identification of the death-date of 1107 does refer to Gytha, she would have died in her fifties, a fact that is perhaps reflected in her Old Norse sobriquet, “Gytha the Old.”

———


162 PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, sub anno 6584 (1075/1076), 1603-1604. Baumgarten dates the marriage to circa 1070. Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux”, table 5, no. 1, and no. 1, 24. Pashuto dates it to around 1074 or 1075, Vnesheiaia politika, 135 and genealogical table 2, no. 1, 420. Dimitri Obolensky dates it to “before 1076—perhaps 1074 or 1075,” Six Byzantine Portraits, 89. Nazarenko dates it to between 1072 and 1074, arguing that the marriage alliance was connected with the military alliance of King Sven Estridsson of Denmark (r. 1047-1075/1076) and Emperor Heinrich IV against the Saxons, Czechs and Poles, which coincided with Vsevolod Yaroslavich’s desire to gain allies against the Polish King Boleslaw II who, in turn, was the ally of his exiled brother, Iziaslav, Drevniaia Rus’, 523-524. See also Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 62-63.

163 Voitovich, Kniaza doba, 459-460 and see the list above.

164 “V se zhe leto prestaviashia Volodimeriaia mesiastia maia v 7 den,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3 sub anno 6615 (1106/1107), 2137.

165 Historians who accept 1107 as referring to Gytha’s death include Pashuto, Vnesheiaia Rus’, 135; Obolensky, Six Byzantine Portraits, 90; Voitovich, Kniaza doba, 456; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 62.

166 Walker, Harold, n. 25, 234.
Nazarenko, however, has argued instead that the 1107 death-date refers not to Gytha, but a woman whom he considers to be Vladimir Monomakh’s second wife, the daughter (whose name is not known) of the Turkic steppe khan Aepa.\textsuperscript{167} As Christian Raffensperger clearly demonstrates, however, it was Monomakh’s son, Yuri (the future Yuri “the Long-Armed”, Dolgorukii, d. 1157), who married Aepa’s daughter, not Monomakh himself.\textsuperscript{168} Nazarenko proposes instead that Gytha had died on pilgrimage while journeying to Jerusalem in the wake of the First Crusade (1097-1099).\textsuperscript{169} His hypothesis is based on Gytha’s appearance in a twelfth-century collection of miracle stories from Cologne concerning Saint Pantaleon in which the saint heals a Rus’ king called “Harold” after the king’s mother Gytha prays to him.\textsuperscript{170} “Harold the king of the Rus’” can be identified with Mstislav Vladimirovich, who in Scandinavian sagas is also called Harold, probably after Gytha’s father, King Harold of England.\textsuperscript{171} According to this story, Gytha fulfilled a pilgrimage vow after her son was healed of his injury by Saint Pantaleon’s intercession. Moreover, she is commemorated in the thirteenth-century necrology of Saint Pantaleon Monastery in Cologne under the date of March 10th (though no year is given).\textsuperscript{172} This day does not coincide with the day reported in Rus’ sources. While the hagiographic story preserves important evidence of Gytha’s promotion of cult of Saint Pantaleon in Rus’, since it is a miracle story it cannot be used as a factual account of Gytha’s whereabouts.

\textsuperscript{167} Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 601.

\textsuperscript{168} Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 61.

\textsuperscript{169} Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 606-608 and 632.

\textsuperscript{170} The miracle story is preserved in two texts. The first comes from a sermon delivered by Abbot Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129/1131) on occasion of the Feast of St. Pantaleon. This text was written between 1125 and 1132 and is kept in Cologne (Historisches Archiv Köln, codex Wallraf 320, fols. 138v-139r). For the edition of this text see and commentary, “Un sermon inconnu,” ed. Coens, 244-267 (the Rus’ story is miracle no. 14, 265-266). The second manuscript, which includes the important mention of Gytha’s name, known as the “Liber Bibliothecae S. Pantaleonis,” was once kept in the Hauptstaatarchiv in Düsseldorf (the Rus’ story was on folia 34-50), but was destroyed during the Second World War. Its text luckily had been long known and transcribed before the manuscript’s destruction. The miracle-story of St. Panatelon healing the Rus’ king in this lost manuscript is published in \textit{Acta Sanctorum}, vol. 6, 422A-422C; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 585-589.

\textsuperscript{171} “Aroldus rex gentis Russorum qui dum hoc scribimus adhuc superstes est, urso in se insiliente preventus scisso ventre et usque ad terram profusis vitalibus pene exanimis sic iacebat, ut spes vivendi nulla superesset […]”, Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 586, “Un sermon inconnu”, ed. Coens, 265.

\textsuperscript{172} “VI. Id. Marc. Palatini et Firmiani confessorum […] Gida regina,” “Un sermon”, ed. Coens, 252; Nazarenko, \textit{Drevniaia Rus’}, 596, both citing \textit{Necrologium Sanctis Pantaleonis}, 18.
Finally, the “Instructions to his Children” (*Pouchenie*) written by Vladimir Monomakh in his old age (thus in the early twelfth century) and preserved only in the Laurentian redaction of the *Primary Chronicle*, mentions in passing the death of the mother of his son Yuri in the course of listing his own military exploits.\(^{173}\) It could be another reference to Gytha, who then would have died sometime after 1107.\(^{174}\) Since Vladimir merely refers to the death of this woman as the “mother of Yuri”, however, rather than giving her the title of “princess”, it is more likely that the “mother of Yuri” was simply a concubine.\(^{175}\)

Finally, Rus’ chronicles records the death of “Vladimir’s princess” on June 11th 6634 (1125/1126) in the Laurentian redaction or July 11th 6635 (1126/1127) in the Hypatian.\(^{176}\) This notice refers to Vladimir’s unknown second wife rather than to Gytha.\(^{177}\)


\(^{175}\) Voitovich, *Kniazha doba*, 456.


13. Kunegunda, daughter of Otto of Orlanmünde and a Rus’ prince, Yaropolk Iziaslavich, c. 1073

**Father of bride:** Otto of Orlanmünde and of Meissen (d. 1067)

**Mother of bride:** Adele of Liège

**Father of groom:** Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078)

**Mother of groom:** Gertruda of Poland (d. 1108?)

**Children:** a daughter of unknown name, the wife of Gunther of Thuringia, Yaroslav (d. 1102/1103), a daughter (perhaps called Anastasia?), wife of prince Gleb Vseslavich of Minsk (d. 1119), Viacheslav (d. 1104), a daughter (d. after 1093).

**Comments:**

All discussion of Kunegunda’s marriage is based on two sources: the *Annalista Saxo* and the miniatures of the eleventh-century Codex Gertrudianus which belonged to Kunegunda’s assumed mother-in-law, Gertruda of Poland (Cividale, Museo Nazionale Archeologio, Codex 136, folia 5v and 10v). The *Annalista Saxo* reports that the daughter of Adele of Liège and Otto of Orlanmünde:

> Kunegunda married a king of the Rus’, and bore him a daughter, whom afterwards a certain noble man of Thuringia called Gunter took in marriage and fathered Count Sizzo [of Käfernburg] from her. After his [the Rus’ king’s] death, she returned to her homeland [*patria*] and married Count Kuno of Bichling, the son of Duke Otto of Northeim, and bore him four daughters. And when he died, thirdly, Wipert the Elder married her.178

---

The identification of this “King of the Rus’” has been much debated, but the majority of scholars identify him as Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1086); other candidates include Yaroslav the Wise’s youngest son Igor (d. 1060). A woman depicted next to Yaropolk-Peter Izialavich on folia 5v and 10v of the Codex Gertrudianus is almost universally assumed to be Yaropolk’s wife, who then on the basis of the miniature on folio 10v, depicting her being led to Christ by Saint Irene, is said to have taken the name “Irene” in Rus’. The identity of the woman represented in the miniature is not clear, however.

From their marriage, Kunegunda and Yaropolk had at least two daughters and two sons, Yaroslav (d. 1102) and Viacheslav (d. 1104): the two sons and one daughter remained behind in Rus’ while the other daughter returned with their mother to Saxony during Kunegunda’s widowhood (1086). The daughter who remained in Rus’, perhaps called Anastasia, became an independent ruler of Minsk for forty years following the death of her husband Gleb Vseslavich in 1119. The Kyivan Chronicle mentions that this daughter died on January 3rd 1158 at 84 years of age: on this basis, Nazarenko assumes that the marriage between her parents, Kunegunda and Yaropolk, could not have taken place earlier than 1074. Since, however, in the summer of

---

Quo item defuncto, Wipertus senior tercius eam desponsavit [...]., Annalista Saxo, ed. Waitz, sub anno 1062, 693. The information on the marriage is repeated later in the chronicle: “Habuit Cono comes uxorem nomine Cunigundam, filiam Ottonis marchionis de Orlagemunde. Hec primum nupserat regi de Ruzia. Quo defuncto, reversa in patriam, nupsit huic Cononi. Filiam autem eius, quam habuit ex rege Ruzorum, quidam de principibus Thuringorum Gunterus nomine accepit, genuitque ex illa Sizonem comitem. [...]” in Ibid., sub anno 1103, 737. The political context of the marriage is discussed in Pashuto, Vneshsiaia politika, 125; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 524-525 with genealogical table on 525. Nazarenko notes that Otto of Northeim was briefly Count of Bavaria in the 1060s and that Wibert the Elder was margrave of Sorbia and Meissen in 1123-1124, Ibid, 524.

179 Scholarship on the identification of the “rex Ruscorum” of the Annalista Saxo from the nineteenth century to 2001 is summarized and listed in Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 526.

180 For a discussion of the evidence that Kunegunda was renamed “Irena” in Rus’, see Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina.”

181 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 526 and Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, genealogical table on 64.


1073 the Saxon rebellion broke out against Heinrich IV in which Dedi and Ekkbert II took part, Nazarenko assumes that the marriage alliance must have taken place earlier, around March of 1073, when Iziaslav was still prince of Kyiv and had not yet fled to Poland. Raffensperger considers that “the timeline for the marriage and consummation [would be] quite quick if the daughter was born in 1074,” but nonetheless accepts that it was possible that a marriage alliance between Iziaslav and Kunegunda’s step-father, Margrave Dedi could have been concluded sometime before Iziaslav’s exile from Rus’ in 1073. Kunegunda’s place of burial and death-date is unknown; Raffensperger estimates that she died after 1087.

184 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 528.
185 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 65.
186 Ibid., genealogical table on 64.
14. Eupraxia Vsevolodna and Heinrich of the Northmark, the count of Stade, c. 1086: 15.
Eupraxia (known in Germany as Adelheid) and Emperor Heinrich IV in 1089

**Father of bride:** Vsevolod Yaroslavich (d. 1093)

**Mother of bride:** Anna, a Qipchaq princess (d. 1111)

**Father of Henry of the Northmark:** Margrave Udo II of Stade (d. 1082)

**Mother of Henry of the Northmark:** Oda of Werl

**Father of Henry IV:** Heinrich III (d. 1056).

**Mother of Henry IV:** Agnes of Poitou (d. 1077)

**Children:** possibly one son, who died as a child.

**Comments:**

Based on Eupraxia’s minimum age at marriage she must have been born after the death of Vsevolod’s first wife and hence was the daughter of Vsevolod by his second wife, Anna, a Qipchaq princess (d. 1111). Only Latin sources discuss Eupraxia’s marriage, though they do not give it a precise date. The first source to do is the twelfth-century *Annalista Saxo*. When writing about the succession of Henry the Long to the northern march in May of 1082, the annalist states: “This man had a wife, Eupraxia, the daughter of the king of Rus’, who in our language is called Adelheid, who afterward married Emperor Heinrich.” The same information is given in the thirteenth-century genealogy of the Stade family.

---


Margrave Heinrich died on June 27th 1087.\textsuperscript{190} Several Latin sources mention Eupraxia’s subsequent marriage to Emperor Heinrich IV in Cologne in 1089.\textsuperscript{191} At her marriage to the emperor, Eupraxia was renamed “Adelheid.”\textsuperscript{192} V. T. Pashuto estimates her first marriage to Margrave Heinrich to June 1083.\textsuperscript{193} By contrast Alexandr Nazarenko dates her first marriage to Margrave Heinrich the Long to 1085/1086 in the period after the death of Iziaslav Yaroslavich in October 1078 (who was closely allied to Poland’s ruling house) when Eupraxia’s father, Vsevolod Yaroslavich became sole ruler of Kyiv.\textsuperscript{194} He argues that the alliance of Vsevolod Yaroslavich and Heinrich the Long, sealed by the marriage of Vsevolod’s daughter Eupraxia to Heinrich in 1085/1086, was directed against Poland, currently ruled by Władysaw-Herman (r. 1079-1102), with whom Yaropolk Iziaslavich, Vsevolod’s enemy, was allied.\textsuperscript{195}

Eupraxia had no children by her second husband. Donizo’s Life of Mathilda records that a son of Heinrich IV died in 1092 during the siege of Monteveglio; this little boy may have been a child of Heinrich’s by Eupraxia.\textsuperscript{196}

After her repudiation by Heinrich in 1092-1094, Eupraxia returned to Rus’ and became a nun in 1106.\textsuperscript{197} She died in 1109 and was buried in Kyiv’s Monastery of the Caves.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{190} Hucke, Die Grafen von Stade, 32.
\textsuperscript{191} De Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda, ed. Schwenkenberger, 248; Annales Augustani, ed. Pertz, \textit{sub anno} 1089, 133; Annales Stadenses, ed. Lappenderg, 316; Frutolf of Michelsberg, Chronica, eds. Schmale and Schamle-Ott, 104; Annales Sancti Iacobi Leodiensis, ed. Pertz, \textit{sub anno} 1089, 639; Annalista Saxo, ed. Waitz, \textit{sub anno} 1089, 726.
\textsuperscript{192} “Eupracciam, filiam regi Ruscie, que in nostra lingua vocabatur Adelheid, quam postea duxit Heinricus inperator,” \textit{Ibid.}, \textit{sub anno} 1082, 721; “Post illos autem dies [...] concelebranda est etiam Coloniae per eundem Hartvigum ordinatio Adelheidae reginae”; De Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda, ed. Schwenkenberger, 248.
\textsuperscript{193} Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 125. He gives 1086 in \textit{Ibid.}, genealogical table 2, no. 2, 420.
\textsuperscript{194} Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 539 and item, “Mezhkofessionalnye braki,” 273
\textsuperscript{195} Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 539-542, and item, “Mezhkofessionalnye braki,” 273.
\textsuperscript{197} “V tozhe lĕto postrizhesia Eupraksi, Vsevolozha dshchi, mesiatsa dekabria v 6,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, \textit{sub anno} 6614 (1105/1106), 2135; “Regina vero reversa est in Ruciam et monasterio se mancipavit et facta est tandem abbatissa”, Annales Stadenses, ed. Lappenderg, 317; “Regina autem reversa est in regionem suam, et
16. Count Gunther of Thuringia (d. after 1093) and a daughter of Yaropolk Sviatoslavich in c. 1087

**Father of bride:** Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1086)

**Mother of bride:** Kunegunda of Orlanmünde (d. after 1087)

**Father of the groom:** ?

**Mother of the groom?**

**Children:** Count Sizzo of Käfernburg

**Comments:**

The marriage of a daughter of Kunegunda of Orlanmünde and Yaropolk Sviatoslavich to Count Gunther of Thuringia is recorded only in one source, the *Annalista Saxo*, which also reports that their son was Count Sizzo.199

---


17. Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich and unnamed daughter of Saint László of Hungary before 1091(1088?)

**Father of bride:** King László I of Hungary (d. 1106)

**Mother of bride:** unknown first wife or second wife Adelaide of Rheinfelden (d. 1090)

**Father of groom:** Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113)

**Mother of groom:** a Byzantine, Qipchaq, or Bohemian princess.

**Children:** none known.

**Comments:**

The marriage between a daughter of King László I of Hungary and Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123) has long been known in scholarship. Knowledge of this marriage comes from only one source, though a very reliable one. It is a charter founding the monastery of Saint Giles at Somogyvár from 1091 in which Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich appears as the king’s son-in-law in its witness-list. The charter survives in its original and after the foundation charter of the monastery of Tihany (1055) is the second oldest surviving Hungarian charter.

Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich ruled Vladimir-in-Volhynia which neighboured with Hungary. His second wife may have been the daughter (also of unknown name) of the Polish King Władysław.

---

200 Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux”, table 2, no. 11 and no. 11, 11; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 53, n. 1, 331 and genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425.


203 Shchaveleva, “Polki-zheny,” 55.
Herman I, if one accepts that the vague statement of the twelfth-century “Gallus Anonymous” of a daughter of Władysław’s marrying “a man in Rus’” refers to Yaroslav (see below, Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 8). If this latter marriage did indeed take place, then the Hungarian princess, László’s daughter, must have died around 1106 before this second marriage was concluded.

Nazarenko dates the marriage of Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich and a daughter of King László to around 1088. He assumes that Yaroslav was in Hungary in 1091 for the same reason as later in 1099: to seek military help against his great-uncle Vsevolod Yaroslavich (d. 1093) and the latter’s son, Yaroslav’s cousin, Vladimir Monomakh, and David Igorevich in the conflict over the throne of Kyiv and rule over Volhynia. Hungarian sources describe the raid of nomad Qipchaqs sent to Hungary by an unnamed Rus’ prince in approximately 1091: Nazarenko suggests that this raid could only have been sent by Vsevolod Yaroslavich or his ally, David Igorevich to punish László for his support of Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich.

204 “[...] Wladislaus dux [...] sororem imperatoris tertii Henrici, uxorem prius Salemonis Vngariae regis, in matrimonium despensavit, de qua nullum filium sed tres filias procreavit. Una quaram in Rusia viro nupsit [...]”, GPP, 116; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 331 and genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425; Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55. For the theory that the “vir in Rusia” refers to Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich—based on the alliances between the Piast house and the line of Iziaslav Yaroslavich—see Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 224-225 and Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 8.

205 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425; Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55.

206 Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 552-553.

207 Ibid., 555-556.

208 “Post hec autem rex gloriosus invasit Rusciam, eo quod Kuni per consilium eorum Hungariam intraverunt,” Chronici Hungarici saeculi XIV, ed. Domanovszky, 414, Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, trans. West, 129. Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 555-556. The 1091 dating is based on the fact that László was in Croatia (“Sclavonia”) at the time of the Qipchaq invasion: his intervention in the Croatian succession crisis followed the childless death of King Zvonimir in 1089.
18. Kristin Ingesdotter and Mstislav Harald Fedor Vladimirovich called “the Great” in c. 1095

Father of bride: King Inge Stenkilsson of Sweden (d. 1110)

Mother of bride: Helena Torkelsdotter or Ragnhild

Father of groom: Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125)

Mother of groom: Gytha Haroldsdottir (d. 1107)

Children: Malmfrid (d. after 1135), Ingeborg (d. after 1137), Eupraxia, Vsevolod-Gabriel (d. 1137), Iziaslav-Pantalemon (d. 1154), Maria (d. 1181), Rostislav-Michael (d. 1167), Sviatopolk (d. 1154), Rogneda (d. after 1167), Ksenia (d. after 1127), daughter of unknown name (d. after 1118) who became the wife of Yaroslav Sviatopokovich, daughter of unknown name (perhaps “Irene”, d. after 1136), wife of a Byzantine nobleman.

Comments:

Kristin’s genealogy and her marriage to Mstislav Harald Fedor Vladimirovich (d. 1132) are known from a number of Scandinavian sagas and Latin sources. Her name is also recorded in the *Novgorod Chronicle*. The only source to give the marriage a fixed date, however, is the seventeenth-century *Russian History (Istoriia rossiskaia)* of Vasilii Nikitich Tatishchev (1686-1750), who places it in the year 1095. Although Tatishchev drew on genuine medieval material for his history (including some regional chronicles which have since been lost), he has

---

209 I have been unable to find concrete genealogical data on Kristin’s mother. She is listed in the genealogical appendix found in Philip Line, *Kingship and State Formation in Sweden, 1130-1290* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 564 and 590.


212 “И Владимир женился на Крестине, дочери посадника,” [And Vladimir married Mstislav to Kristin, the daughter of the governor”], V. N. Tatishchev, *Istoriia rossiskaia*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963), *sub anno* 1095, 104. Tatishchev here confuses Kristin with Mstislav’s second wife, who was the daughter of the Novgorod posadnik (prince’s governor). For the dating of Kristin and Mstislav’s marriage see also Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, 599, and Dąbrowski, *Genealogia Mścislawowiczów*, 78-79.
also become notorious for his subsequent additions, elaborations and “corrections” to his medieval sources. Consequently, some scholars simply give the years 1090-early 1096 as the possible range for the marriage, which corresponds to the period when Mstislaw Vladimiorivch ruled the northern city of Novgorod.

Kristin (identified simply as “Mstislaw’s princess”) died on January 17th 1121 according to the Hypatian redaction or January 18th 1122, according to the Laurentian redaction. The Novgorod Chronicle mentions her name when reporting her death also in the year 1122. The statement found in some secondary literature that Kristin was buried in Novgorod is a guess based probably on the notice of her death in the local chronicle of this city; her place of burial is unknown.

Kristin and Mstislaw had several children together. Their daughters Malmfrid and Ingeborg both married Scandinavian rulers, continuing the genealogical links established by their parents and grandparents between Scandinavian dynasties and the Riurikids. Malmfrid married King Sigurd Jerusalem-Farer and after his death, King Erik the Memorable of Denmark, while Ingiborg married King Knud Lavard of Denmark (see below, Nos. 22-24).

214 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 2, no. 3, 420; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, 607, Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 85; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 79.
217 Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 80.
218 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, genealogical table on 294-295, Voitovich, Kniazhia doba, 462-463, Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 82-166 and see list above.

Father of bride:  Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113)

Mother of bride:  a Byzantine noblewoman (fl. early twelfth century).

Father of groom:  Władyslaw I Herman (d. 1102)

Mother of groom:  Judith (d. 1088), daughter of Vratislav II of Bohemia

Children:  Władisław II the Exile (d. 1159), possibly also a son who died in infancy, and a daughter, possibly the wife of Vsevolod Davidovich (d. after 1124).

Comments:

The marriage of Sbyslava and Bolesław III Wrymouth in 1103 is recorded in a number of Rus’, Polish and German sources. They had one surviving son: Władysław II “the Exile,” who was born in 1105. Another son may have died in infancy (after circa 1109) while a daughter of unknown name may be identified, according to Oswald’s Balzer’s thesis, with a Polish princess who became the wife of the Rus’ prince Vsevolod Davidovich (d. after 1124, discussed below).

Other genealogical details of Sbyslava’s life are subject to historiographical debate. Firstly, there is the question of her relation to Bolesław III. The twelfth-century Polish chronicle traditionally attributed to Gallus Anonymous notes that Bolesław III and Sbyslava were related in the third


221  Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 246-249; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 5, no. 2, 424; Voitovich, Kniažha doba, 358. See also Appendix 4, “Additional Marriages,” no. 11.
degree of consanguinity and had to obtain a dispensation for their marriage. Most scholars believe that this genealogical connection was due to the fact that Sbyslava’s father, Sviatopolk, was the son of Gertruda, the sister of Boleslaw Wry-mouth’s grandfather and that as a result, Sbyslava and Bolesław indeed would be related to each other in the third degree of consanguinity.

A related issue is the question of the identity of Sbyslava’s mother. August Bielowski names her mother as Barbara, the daughter of Byzantine Emperor Alexios Komnenos. However, Alexios had no daughter by that name nor do Byzantine sources report such a marriage. Sbyslava’s mother was therefore an unknown, though prestigious Greek noblewoman.

Finally, there is some historiographical debate concerning the death-date of Sbyslava. The only source to give her precise date of death is the fifteenth-century Jan Długosz which places this event in the year 1108. The information from this late fifteenth-century chronicle is not considered reliable, however. Oswald Balzer gives a date range of 1109-1112 for Sbyslava’s death, basing himself on a twelfth-century source, The Life of Bishop Otto of Bamberg by Herbold of Michaelsberg, which suggests that the marriage of Sbyslava and Bolesław was of short duration. Jasiński argues, however, that Herbold is not reliable in this regard, because his vita was written a few decades after Sbyslava’s death, which he only mentions in a general way. He rather finds it significant that Sbyslava’s death is not mentioned in the chronicle of

---

222 GPP, 158-161.
224 Ibid, n. 1, 2.
225 Kazhdan, “Rus’-Byzantine Marriages,” 419.
227 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 220.
228 “Nam post annos paucos Ruthenissa uxor Bolizlai moritur, unum tantum ei filium reliquens[…],” Herbordi Dialogus de Vita Ottonis, ed. Wikarjak, 64-65, Bazler, Genealogia Piastów, 220.
229 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 189.
Gallus Anonymous, which was contemporaneous with the reign of her husband Bolesław III.\textsuperscript{230} Jasiński assumes that the chronicle was completed in 1115 and that Sbyslava died at the latest by 1114 since by 1115 Leszek, Bolesław’s son by his second wife Salomea of Berg, was born.\textsuperscript{231} Her place of burial is not known.\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{230} Ibid., 189.

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 189. Voitovich proposes Sbyslava’s death-date as 1113-1114, \textit{Kniazha doba}, 357.

\textsuperscript{232} Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód pierwszych Piastów}, 189.
20. Predslava, daughter of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich, and Álmos, prince of Hungary, 1104

**Father of bride**: Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113)

**Mother of bride**: a Byzantine, Bohemian, or Qipchaq princess, the daughter of the steppe nomad Turgorkhan (d. 1125)

**Father of groom**: Géza I (d. 1077)

**Mother of groom**: Sophia or Synadenē (d. circa. after 1079/1080)

**Children**: Adelheid (d. 1140), King Béla II the Blind (b. 1108-d. 1141), Sophia-Hedwig (d. after 1132).

**Comments:**

Predslava was the daughter of Sviatopolk (Michael) Iziaslavich (d. 1113). In 1104, she was married to Álmos, the son of King Géza I (r. 1074-1077). Her sister Sbyslava was also married to a western ruler: Bolesław III of Poland. No Hungarian sources mention Predslava’s marriage; it is known only from a reference in the *Primary Chronicle* under the year 6612 (1103/1104) which states that “On August 21, of the same year Predslava, the daughter of

---

233 The number of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich’s marriages and the identity of his brides are disputed. See the summary of historiography and the genealogical table in Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 76-78.

234 Genealogists are not agreed on the number of wives that King Géza I had. According to the majority, he had only one wife, Synadenē, a Byzantine princess. According to another view, however, before his coronation as king, Géza may have first been married to Sophia, who was related to the Count of Flanders. Since this first wife was never queen of Hungary, it may explain why her existence is not well established in the surviving sources. On this issue see Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyai*, n. 17, 185.


237 See above, no. 19.
Sviatopolk, was taken to Hungary to marry the king’s son [korolevich].”\textsuperscript{238} This one line is the only primary source which directly mentions her existence.

Álmos had been his uncle King László I’s preferred heir (László had no male issue), but after a power struggle, Álmos’ brother Kálmán became king instead in 1096.\textsuperscript{239} In 1105 to 1106, Álmos fled to the court of Heinrich IV after Kálmán seized several Dalmatian towns and islands and added to himself the title “King of Hungary, Dalmatia, and Croatia.”\textsuperscript{240} We do not know if Predslava accompanied him. Henry IV was too embroiled in his own conflict to help, so Álmos fled to Bolesław III who was his brother-in-law through Predslava (Bolesław III was married to Predslava’s sister, Sbyslava), but the Polish duke supported Kálmán after signing a peace treaty with the latter.\textsuperscript{241} Around 1107, Álmos (with Predslava?) took a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and in his absence, Kálmán seized Álmos’ territory, the ducatus.\textsuperscript{242}

Álmos (with Predslava?) reacted to this news by fleeing to Heinrich V in 1113 and attacking Hungary with him that same year.\textsuperscript{243} After this failed attempt to take the crown, Álmos was captured by his brother and blinded together with his and Predslava’s son, Béla, to make them ineligible for the kingship.\textsuperscript{244} After this event, Álmos, presumably with Predslava, initially was

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{238}“Tomzhe lĕt ĭvedena Peredslava, dhšchi Sviatopolcha, v Ugyr, za korolevich, avgusta v 21,” PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. 10.3, \textit{sub anno} 6612 (1103/1104), 2125-2126.
  \item \textsuperscript{239} Kálmán was originally intended to be a bishop, Makk, \textit{The Árpáds and the Comneni}, 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{240} \textit{Ibid}, 14.
  \item \textsuperscript{241} \textit{Ibid}, 14-15.
  \item \textsuperscript{242} \textit{Chronici Hungarici Saeculi XIV}, ed. Domanovszky, 427; \textit{Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle}, trans. West, 132; Makk, \textit{The Árpáds and the Comneni}, 15; Tuzson, \textit{István II}, 78. The ducatus (Hungarian: dukátus or hercegség) was a territorial division of Hungary (east of the Tisza River) which existed between the years 1047-1048, 1107, and 1162-1163 and was ruled by a member of the royal dynasty, usually the son of the king. The duke had extensive rights within the ducatus, including the right to mint his own coinage; János M. Bak, György Bónis, and James Ross Sweeney, eds. and trans., \textit{The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, 1000-1301}, (Bakersfield, CA: Charles Schlacks, 1989), 144-145.
  \item \textsuperscript{243} \textit{Chronici Hungarici Compositio Saeculi XIV}, ed. Domanovszky, 429-430; \textit{Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle}, trans. West, 133; Makk, \textit{The Árpáds and the Comneni}, 15.
\end{itemize}
kept captive at the Benedictine monastery of Saint Margaret of Antioch, which he had founded in 1107 in Dömös near Esztergom.\(^{245}\) In circa 1125-1127, however, after Kálmán’s son István II was crowned king, Álmos fled to Byzantium, to the court of Emperor Ioannos Komennos (1118-1143).\(^{246}\) Álmos was renamed Constantine and given the Macedonian town of Constantinia to rule.\(^{247}\) He died in Byzantium on September 1\(^{st}\), 1127.\(^{248}\) Presumably Predslava accompanied her husband into exile and also died in Byzantium, but primary sources do not record her fate.

Predslava had three children with her husband.\(^{249}\) Her eldest child, Adelheid, married Soběslav of Bohemia around 1122 or 1123, who came to power in 1125 and made peace with Kálmán in 1126.\(^{250}\) Her second child, Béla II the Blind, born in 1108 (d. 1141), likely remained in Hungary during his father’s exile, as he became King of Hungary on April 28\(^{th}\), 1131.\(^{251}\) Her third child, Hedwig, was born probably after 1108, and in 1132 married Adalbert of Austria.\(^{252}\)

\(^{245}\) “Ductus est autem dux Almus in monasterium suum in Demes,” Chronici Hungarici Saeculi XIV, ed. Domanovszky, 430; Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, trans. West, 133 and n. 441, 169; Tuzson, István II, 78.

\(^{246}\) “Dux Almus […] quamvis fuisset obcecatus, tamen mortem timens de rege Stephano fugierat in Greciam. Qui ab imperatore honorifice suspectus est,” Chronici Hungarici Saeculi XIV, ed. Domanovszky, 442; Makk, Árpáds and the Comneni, 22.

\(^{247}\) “Inposuit sibi nomen Constantinus; qui et ibi iam pridem edificaverat civitatem Constantinam in Machedonia,” Chronici Hungarici Saeculi XIV, ed. Domanovszky, 442-443.

\(^{248}\) Wertner, Árpádok családi, 256; Makk, The Árpáds and the Comneni, 22, Tuzson, István II, 78.

\(^{249}\) Wertner, Árpádok családi, 256: Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 89.

\(^{250}\) Wertner, Árpádok családi, 256; Makk, The Árpáds and the Comneni, 21.

\(^{251}\) Wertner, Árpádok családi, 256; Makk, The Árpáds and the Comneni, 29.

\(^{252}\) Wertner, Árpádok családi, 256.
21. King Kálmán of Hungary and Euphemia Vladimirna in 1112

**Father of bride:** Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125)

**Mother of bride:** Gytha of England (d. c. 1107)

**Father of groom:** King Géza I of Hungary (d. 1077)

**Mother of groom:** Sophia or Synadenē (d. circa. after 1079/1080)

**Children:** Boris (born around 1114, died around 1153/1154).

**Comments:**

The date of the marriage between King Kálmán of Hungary (d. 1114) and Euphemia Vladimirna is recorded in the *Kyivan Chronicle* in the year 1112: “In that year Ofemia [Euphemia] Volodimerna was led to Hungary to [marry] the king.”

Fourteenth-century Hungarian chronicle compilations also give the same year. As stated above, Kálmán’s brother Álmos earlier had married Predslava, the daughter of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich in 1104. In order to counter this marriage alliance, Kálmán, who was fighting his brother Álmos for land and power, sought a marriage alliance of his own with Rus’ after the death of his first wife. Beginning in 1097 and 1099 Kálmán had supported the prince of Kyiv, Sviatopolk Iziaslavich, militarily in western Rus’ against the princes Volodar Rostislavich and his brother Vasil’ko. By marrying Euphemia, however, Kálmán allied with another branch of the Riurikid dynasty, that of the line of Vladimir Monomakh. The marriage alliance did not last long, however, since already by 1113/1114, Euphemia was repudiated while pregnant and returned to Rus’, where she gave birth

---


255 Kálmán’s first wife was a Sicilian Norman princess, the daughter of Roger of Sicily. Her name is traditionally given in historiography as “Busilla”, however, this name is merely a rendering of Latin “puella” or French “pucelle” (a girl or virgin); Makk, *Árpáds and the Comneni*, 12-13; Tuzson, *István II*, 20-21, and Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 187.

to a son, Boris.\(^\text{257}\) Boris would spend the rest of his life fighting for his right to the Hungarian throne, soliciting aid from Ioann Komnenos in Byzantium, Boleslaw III in Poland, Konrad III of Germany, and Louis VII of France.\(^\text{258}\) Boris travelled to Ioann Komennos’ court, where he received the sobriquet “Kalamanos” (reflecting his claim to be the legitimate son of Kálmán) and married Ioann’s niece, Anna Dukaina in circa 1130.\(^\text{259}\) The son of this marriage, Constantine Kalamanos, played an important military-political role in the last years of Manuel I’s reign.\(^\text{260}\)

Euphemia remained in Rus’. The *Primary Chronicle* records under the year 1139 that “In this year Euphemia Volodmerna died and was buried in Berestvo in Saint Saviour.”\(^\text{261}\)


22. Sigurd Jerusalem-Farer, King of Norway (d. 1130) and Malmfrid of Kyiv in 1111-1116; 23.) Second marriage in circa 1130 of Malmfrid and Erik II the Memorable (r. 1134-1137), King of Denmark

**Father of bride:** Mstislav Harald Vladimirovich the Great (d. 1132)

**Mother of bride:** Kristin Ingesdotter (d. 1122).

**Father of Sigurd Jorsalafarer:** King Magnús III Barefoot of Sweden (d. 1103)

**Mother of Sigurd Jorsalafarer:** a concubine

**Father of Erik-Emune:** King Erik the Good (*Ejegod*) of Denmark

**Mother of Erik-Emune:** a mistress

**Children:** (by Sigurd Jorsalafarer) Kristin.

**Comments:**

As reported in a number of Scandinavian sagas, Malmfrid (variants: Malmfrida; Mál(m)fríðr) was the daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich (d. 1132) and Kristin of Sweden (d. 1122). Consequently, as royal genealogies found in sagas report, her maternal grandfather was King Ingi Steinkelsson I of Sweden (r. 1080-1112), while her paternal grandfather was Vladimir Monomakh. Her sister Ingeborg was married to Knud Lavard, son of King Erik I the Good (*Ejegod*) of Denmark (r. 1095-1103). Their paternal grandmother was Gytha, the Anglo-

---

262 Dzhakson, “Islandskie sagi,” 112.


Saxon princess.²⁶⁵ Malmfrid was first married to King Sigurd Jerusalem-Farer (“Jorsalfar”) of Norway (d. 1130) in 1111-1116.²⁶⁶

Only one source, the thirteenth-century Morkinskinna, reports that Sigurd repudiated Malmfrid shortly before his death in circa 1125-1128, and married a woman named Cecilia, the daughter of a local magnate, leading to conflict with the local bishop Magni.²⁶⁷ One possible interpretation is that Sigurd was bigamously married, as the church’s notion of marriage as a monogamous institution and Christian sacrament was not yet accepted by Scandinavian kings.²⁶⁸ A genealogy interpolated into the B-text of the Fagrskinna as well as Snorri Sturluson’s Heimskringla report that Sigurd and Malmfrid had one daughter, called Kristin, who married a local nobleman, Jarl Erling.²⁶⁹ She was probably named after Malmfrid’s mother, Kristin of Sweden.²⁷⁰ King Sigurd died in 1130 and was buried in St. Hallvard’s Cathedral (no longer standing) in Oslo.²⁷¹

After Sigurd’s death, in 1130 or 1131 Malmfrid married Erik II the “Memorable” (“Emune”) of Denmark (d. 1137).²⁷² He was the illegitimate son of King Erik the Good and consequently the half-brother of her brother-in-law, Knud Lavard, who was married to her sister Ingeborg.²⁷³ Once again, however, Malmfrid had to share the throne with a mistress, who gave Erik his son


²⁶⁶ Dąbrowski demonstrates on the basis of chronicle, charter, and saga evidence that Sigurd was still on crusade in December of 1110. Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, n. 263, 89-90. For chronological considerations of Malmfrid’s marriage see Ibid, 90-92.

²⁶⁷ Morkinskinna, trans., intro, notes Andersson and Gade, 357.

²⁶⁸ Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 113.


²⁷⁰ Ibid., 95.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 95.

²⁷² Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 461; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 113; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 97.

²⁷³ Fagrskinna, trans., Finlay, 236; Knýtlinga Saga, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 128; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 146; Skovgaard-Petersen with Damsholt, “Queenship in Denmark,” 40; Lind, “Consequences,” 134; Dzhakson, “Islandskie sagi,” 112; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 97.
and heir, the future Sven Grathe (r. 1147-1157). Malmfrid’s second husband was murdered on September 18 1137 by one Plov (Plough) the Black, whose father had been killed for speaking against King Erik in an assembly and for whose death King Erik had offered no compensation. King Erik was buried at Ribe Cathedral in Jutland, Denmark. Malmfrid’s place of burial and death-date is unknown.

275 Knytlinga Saga, trans. Pálsson and Edwards, 143-144; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 97.
276 Ibid., 97.
277 For speculation that Malmfrid died in the 1150s, see Ibid., 94.
24. Knud Lavard (d. 1131) and Ingeborg Mstislavna, circa 1120s (before 1131).

**Father of bride**: Mstislav Harald Vladimirovich the Great (d.1132)

**Mother of bride**: Kristin of Sweden (d. 1112)

**Father of groom**: Erik I the Good of Denmark (r. 1095-1103)

**Mother of groom**: Bothild

**Children**: Margaret, Kristin, Kathrin, and Valdemar (Vladimir) I (d. 1182)

**Comments**:

The marriage of Ingeborg to Knud Lavard (d. 1131), son of King Erik I Ejegod of Denmark (r. 1095-1103), and her genealogy is known from Old Norse sagas and Latin sources. Her husband was the only legitimate son of King Erik I the Good of Denmark (r. 1095-1103) and Bothild, a Danish noblewoman.

The sources do not explicitly discuss the date of Ingeborg’s marriage to Knud. Dariusz Dąbrowski estimates that Ingeborg’s marriage took place while her father Mstislav was still prince in Novgorod and therefore before March of 1117 when Mstislav moved from Novgorod to Bilhorod (Belgorod), around 1115-1117. Through her marriage, Ingeborg became the duchess of Jutland (“Schleswig”) and queen of the Obodrites, a mostly pagan Slavic people on the Baltic coast.

---


281 Ingeborg’s husband’s rule as King of the Obodrites is recorded in a number of sources, the oldest of which are Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, ed. Friis-Jensen, trans. Fisher, vol. 2, 908-909; *Helmoldi Presbyteri Bozoviensis Chronica Slavorum*, ed. Schmeidler, 96.
Her husband Knud Lavard was murdered in 1131 by his first cousin Prince Magnus, the son of King Niels Svendsen (r. 1104-1134). He was later canonized in 1169. The last written reference to Ingeborg as a living person is in connection with her return from Rus’ to Denmark around 1137 with her eight-year old son following the end of civil war in Denmark. Her date of death and place of burial are unknown. Dariusz Dąbrowski suggests that she may have been buried in the royal necropolis of Ringsted, the Benedictine monastery where her husband (and later her son Valdimar and his wife) were buried.

Knud and Ingeborg had four children. Their son was King Valdimar I the Great of Denmark (r. 1157-1182). He also married Sophia, a Rus’ princess (see below, no. 26). Their daughter Kristin was married off to her first cousin, Karl, the son of King Sigurd of Norway and Ingeborg’s sister Malmfrid. Another daughter, Katrin, was married “in the east”, that is to say in Rus’, though we do not know to what specific Rus’ prince. A third daughter, Margret, married one Stig White-Leather of Skaane.

---


285 Dąbrowski, *Genealogia Mścisławowiczów*, 102. Ringsted Abbey was founded in 1136 by Knud’s half brother, King Eric II the Memorable, Jensen, “*Sclavorum expugnator*,” 71.


25. Vratislav of Moravia, Markgrave of Brno (d. 1156) and an unnamed Rus’ princess in 1132.

**Father of bride (debated):** Vasil’ko Rostislavich (d. 1124)

**Mother of bride:** unknown

**Father of groom:** Oldřich

**Mother of groom:** ?

**Children?**

**Comments:**

Under the year 1132, the continuator of Cosmas of Prague’s *Chronicle* records the marriage of the prince of Brno, Vratislav (the son of prince Oldřich) and a Rus’ princess. The chronicle compares the beauty of the bride to Helen of Troy, and consequently some historians have assumed that her name was Helen, but this name is not established in the sources. V. T. Pashuto notes that no further reliable information about this marriage exists. In his genealogical table, however, Pashuto states that the princess’ father was Vasil’ko Rostislavich (d. 1124), prince of Terebovlia in western Rus’. The reason for this hypothesis is that Polish, Hungarian, and Czech mercenary troops are listed as defending Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, Volodar and Vasil’ko Rostislavich in Volhynia from the attacks of Vladimir Monomakh in 1122/1123. Pashuto suggests that such help was only possible after a peace treaty between

---


293 Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 183.


the Czech lands and Rus’ had been agreed upon, and that the Czechs were hostile towards Vladimir Monomakh after his raid of 1076 in their lands.296

296 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 183. For Vladimir Monomakh’s raid against the Czechs, mentioned in the Primary Chronicle and in Vladimir’s own Testament, see PVL, ed. Ostrowski, vol. sub anno 6584 (1076), 1602; PSRL, vol. 1, sub anno 6584 (1076), 199 and 247 (Testament); PC, 211 and n. 239, 270.
26. Ryksa a daughter of Bolesław Wrymouth III, and Vladimir Vsevolodvich of Novgorod or Volodar Glebovich, c.1136

**Father of bride:** Bolesław Wrymouth III (d. 1138)

**Mother of bride:** Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

**Father of groom (debated):** Vsevolod-Gabriel Mstislavich (d. 1137 or 1138)

**Mother of groom (debated):** unknown

**Children:** Knud, Vladimir, Vasil’ko, Sophia (d. 1198), Ryksa

**Comments:**

Ryksa (Germanized variant: Richeza) was the daughter of Bolesław III Wrymouth of Poland by his second wife Salomea of Berg. Around 1129-1130 she was first married to Magnus Nielson, the son of the ruling king of Denmark, Niels Svendsen (1104-1134), but, became a widow in 1134 when she was around sixteen years old. Left with a little son, Knud, she returned to her father in Poland, but was soon married off to a Rus’ prince. From this marriage was born a daughter, Sophia, who later became the wife of King Valdemar I of Denmark (r. 1157-1182, see also below, no. 33). Finally, following either his death or her repudiation,

---

297 In secondary literature, Vsevolod Mstislavich’s wife is usually considered to be the daughter, of unknown name, of Sviatoslav “Sviatosha” Davidovich of Chernihiv (Chernigov, d. 1143). As Raffensperger demonstrates, however, this identification is purely speculative, *Ties of Kinship*, 122-123. For a different opinion, however, see Dąbrowski, *Genealogia Mićisławiczów*, 113.


Ryksa remarried for the third and final time with King Sverker of Sweden by around 1150. Her place of burial and death-date is unknown.

The identity of Ryksa’s Rus’ husband has been greatly debated and hinges on how to interpret the name “Valadar” mentioned in Scandinavian sources. Some scholars identify him as prince Vladimir Vsevolodovich of Novgorod (d. after 1140), others as Volodor Glebovich of Minsk (d. after 1167). Raffensperger concisely sums up both sides of the debate, noting that the main problem is lack of primary sources on which to base this identification. He makes the convincing argument that it is more plausible that Bolesław III concluded a marriage alliance with Vladimir Vsevolodovich, who belonged to the powerful Monomachichi branch of the Riurikid dynasty, which obtained the rule of Kyiv and Novgorod several times, rather than with an obscure prince of Minsk, belonging to a much less important branch of the Riurikids.

---


304 Ibid., 136. Dąbrowski considers that the identity of the Rus’ husband of Ryksa remains open, *Genealogia Mścisławiczów*, 211.

305 Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 137. Dąbrowski raises important doubts on the identification of Ryksa’s Rus’ husband with Vladimir Vsevolodovich, however, including the fact that if Ryksa was born around 1116, since she was already married to her first husband by 1129-1130, then she would have been about ten years older than Vladimir Vsevolodovich, which he considers to be an unlikely situation, *Genealogia Mścisławiczów*, 210. In his opinion, Ryksa’s Rus’ husband remains unidentified, Ibid, 210-211.
27. Verchoslava Vsevolodna and Bolesław the Curly before 1140

**Father of bride:** Vsevolod-Gabriel Mstislavich (d. 1137 or 1138)

**Mother of bride:** unknown

**Father of groom:** Bolesław III Wrymouth (d. 1138)

**Mother of groom:** Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

**Children:** Bolesław (d. 1172), Leszek (debated), a daughter of unknown name, and Verchoslava (Polish: Wierszchosława, d. after 1212).

**Comments:**

The marriage of Verchoslava Vsevolodna to a Polish ruler is recorded in the *Kyivan Chronicle*:

“Vsevolod Mstislavich gave his daughter Verchoslava [in marriage] to the Poles.” An indirect reference to the marriage is also found in twelfth-century *Translation of the Hand of Saint Stephen*, which records the Congress of the so-called “junior princes” of Poland (the younger sons of Duke Bolesław III Wry-mouth) and the dowager duchess Salomea of Berg in Łęczyca in 1140/1141. The account mentions that, present among the participants of this Congress, were Salomea’s “most famous two sons, Bolesław and Mieszko with their wives, namely the daughters of the kings of Hungary and Rus’.” While this source therefore states that Bolesław IV the Curly was married to an unnamed Hungarian princess, Polish genealogists consider that the *Translation* mistakenly mixed up the wives of Bolesław IV and of his brother Mieszko III the

---

306 “V to zhe vremę […] Vsevolod M’stislavich otda dchër’ svoiu v Lękhy Verkhuslavu,” PSRL, vol. 2 sub anno 6645 (1137), 300.

Old, who was indeed first married to a Hungarian princess (Elizabeth). On the basis of this source, Verchoslava’s Polish husband is identified as Boleslaw IV the Curly.

There are three genealogical debates concerning Verchoslava. One concerns the dating of her marriage; the second concerns her name, and the third concerns the number of children that she had. These three issues will be discussed in turn.

Although the *Kyivan Chronicle* places Verchoslava’s marriage to a Polish ruler in the year 1137, some historians move the date by a year or two, considering its chronology to be unreliable. The *Kyivan Chronicle* also claims that Verchoslava’s father, Vsevolod, was expelled from Novgorod in 1138, i.e. after his daughter’s marriage, but the better-informed local *Novgorod Chronicle* places this event in 1136. Shortly after his expulsion from the city, Vsevolod died. Thus the question remains: does the incorrect dating by the *Kyivan Chronicle* of the revolution in Novgorod mean that the Chronicle also incorrectly dates Verchoslava’s wedding? Magdalena Biniaś-Szkopek prefers to date Verchoslava’s marriage to Boleslaw the Curly to the year 1136, since she argues it would have been more prestigious for Boleslaw to conclude a marriage alliance with Vsevolod while the latter was still the prince of Novgorod. Even after Vsevolod’s exile, however, a marriage alliance with his family still could have brought its advantages since Vsevolod and his daughter Verchoslava came from the powerful

---

310 The expulsion of prince Vsevolod Mstislavich from Novgorod on May 29th 1136 was the seminal event in the establishment of the political life of the fledgling republic, PSRL, vol. 3, *sub anno* 6644 (1136), 209; Balzer, *Genealogia Piastów*, 282; Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 228; Wlodarski, “Ruś w planach,” n. 119, 57.
311 Chronicle sources give the years 1137 or 1138 for Vsevolod Mstislavich’s death, see Dąbrowski, *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów*, 111 and 194.
313 Wlodarski, “Ruś w planach”, n. 119, 57; Biniaś-Szkopek, *Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy*, 90.
Monomachichi line of the Riurikids, which remained an influential force in Rus’, and also because Vsevolod himself was the nephew of the ruling prince of Kyiv, Yaropolk Vladimirovich (d. 1139). While the date 1136 is well established for the marriage, the date 1137 cannot be excluded, and 1135 would be too early because the couple would then be too young to wed. Certainly, Verchoslava became Bolesław IV’s wife by the time that the Congress of Łęczyca met in 1140/1141. The fifteenth-century chronicler Jan Długosz places the marriage in 1151, but this date seems to be wholly incorrect.

The second debate concerns Verchoslava’s name. In contrast to the Kyivan Chronicle, Jan Długosz states that the name of Bolesław IV the Curly’s spouse was Anastasia, not Verchoslava. Some scholars are inclined to disregard the evidence from Długosz’s chronicle entry entirely, since the Rus’ genealogy Długosz constructs for “Anastasia” is wholly erroneous. Two surviving physical objects suggest, however, that Bolesław the Curly’s first wife might indeed have been called Anastasia, at least in Poland. The first is the silver repoussé cover of a twelfth-century Gospel Book (c. 1160) now in the National Library in Warsaw (Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa MS 3307 II). It is known as “Anastasia’s Gospel Book”

315 Ibid., 90.
316 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 283; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 229.
317 Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 200.
320 Długosz makes her the daughter of a Vsevolod, prince of Halich,” but both “Wszevoldimiro” and “Halicziensi” are written over an erasure in his manuscript, reflecting perhaps some uncertainty on the part of the author as to these place names. See Ioannis Dlugosii Annales, ed. Budkowa et al., sub anno 1151, 49, notes “a” and “b”.
(Polish: “Ewangeliarz księżnej Anastazjii”) because of the kneeling female figure on the front cover, depicted at the feet of Christ crucified. The kneeling woman is identified by the rubric ANA/STAS/IA. The second is a bracteate (a type of coin) recently attributed by Borys Paszkiewicz to Bolesław the Curly’s son, Leszek, depicts the latter’s parents under the inscription “BOL. ANA”, i.e. Bolesław and Anastasia. “Anastasia” may have been a Greek or Latin equivalent of the Slavic Verchoslava. Alternatively, “Anastasia” could also have been Verchoslava’s baptismal name, as the Rurikid dynasty gave double-names to its members.

According to Jan Długosz, Verchoslava (whom he names “Anastasia”) died in 1158 while giving birth to her second child, Leszek. This assertion has sparked a great debate among historians and genealogists as to whether Bolesław’s children were born from Verkhoslava or from his second wife, Maria.

Bolesław IV had two sons, an older son also called Bolesław (d. 1172) and a younger son called Leszek, (d. 1186) and possibly a daughter (d. after 1178) whose name is not known. The only information about the existence of a daughter of Bolesław IV is deduced from the seventeenth-century Russian History of Vasilii Nikitich Tatischev, which claims that the brother of the wife of prince Vasil’ko Yaropolkovich (d. after 1178) was the prince of Mazovia. Although Tatischev is notorious for adding to the sources that he used, Polish genealogists Oswald Balzer

324 Askanas, “Srebną okładkę”: 10; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mściśławowiczów, 203-204. Voitovich combines the names of Bolesław IV’s two wives and proposes that “Maria-Anastasia” was a daughter of Vladimirko Volodarich (d. 1152), but this view is not generally accepted, Kniażka doba, 346.
326 Biniaś-Szkopec, Boleslaw IV Kędzierzawy, 91-92.
327 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 329-337; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 229 and 270-279.
and Kazimierz Jasiński as well as historian Bolesław Włodarski accept his information about a daughter of Boleslaw the Curly.\footnote{Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 272.}

Scholars debate whether these children came from his first wife, Verchoslava, or his second wife, Maria.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 229 and 270.} Balzer hypothetically suggested that Boleslaw, who according to fourteenth-century sources was Boleslaw IV the Curly’s first born, and the daughter were Verchoslava’s children while Leszek could have been born to Boleslaw the Curly either from Verchoslava or from Boleslaw IV’s second wife Maria since the date of this second marriage is uncertain.\footnote{Balzer, \textit{Genealogia Piastów}, 329, 334-335, followed by Voitovich, \textit{Kniazha doba}, 346, discussed in Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 229} By contrast, other scholars have hypothetically accepted that all three children had Verchoslava as their mother.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 229}

Kazimierz Jasiński prefers to see all three children as Verchoslava’s, though he notes that because of the silence of the sources, any resolution of the problem remains only hypothetical.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 229} He notes that if it is true that Verchoslava had the second name Anastasia (and therefore can be identified with this person), then her marriage would have been of longer duration than that of her husband with his second wife and consequently it would be more likely that she was the mother of at least his eldest son, Boleslaw and daughter, if not all his children.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 230-230.} However if one accepts the hypothesis that Leszek (the youngest child of Boleslaw the Curly) was born in the 1160s, then it is possible that he could be Maria’s child.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 230.} On the other hand, if Boleslaw the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\footnotesize
\bibitem{329} Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 272.
\bibitem{330} \textit{Ibid.}, 229 and 270.
\bibitem{332} The debate over the number of children that Vierchoslva had is summarized and discussed in Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 229.
\bibitem{333} \textit{Ibid.}, 229
\bibitem{334} \textit{Ibid.}, 223-230.
\bibitem{335} \textit{Ibid.}, 230.
\end{thebibliography}
Curly and Verkhoslava had no children in the first years of their marriage because of her young age, then it still remains possible that all three had her as their mother.\textsuperscript{336}

The day of Verchoslava’s death is inscribed in the \textit{Necrology of the Abbey of Saint Mary in Lubiń} as March 15\textsuperscript{th}.\textsuperscript{337} Most scholars consider that Verchoslava died in the 1160s, though Dąbrowski is inclined to give a date range of 1150-1167.\textsuperscript{338} She was certainly deceased by December 31st 1167 when a charter mentioning Bolesław’s second wife, Maria, was issued.\textsuperscript{339} Verchoslava’s place of burial is unknown.\textsuperscript{340}

\textsuperscript{336} Ibid., 230.

\textsuperscript{337} “[Martius.] 15 d idus. Comemoratio Cosme monachi et conversi. Wirchoslaue ducisse,” \textit{Księga bracka i nekrolog opactwa Panny Marii w Lubiniu/Liber fraternitatis et Liber mortuorum Abbatiae Sanctae Mariae Lubinensis}, ed. Zbigniew Perzanowski in MPH. S. N., vol. 9, part 2 (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976), 43; Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 229; Biniaś-Szkopek, \textit{Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy}, 92, Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mściśławowiczów}, 207. The manuscript of the \textit{Necrology of Lubiń} (dating to the seventeenth century but containing entries going back to the second half of the eleventh century) was destroyed in 1944 and is known only from photoreproductions.

\textsuperscript{338} Balzer, \textit{Genealogia Piastów}, 283; Biniaś-Szkopek, \textit{Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy}, 91; Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mściśławowiczów}, 207.

\textsuperscript{339} Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 229.

\textsuperscript{340} Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 230; Dąbrowski, \textit{Genealogia Mściśławowiczów}, 207.
28. Zvenislava and Bolesław the Tall in 1141/1142.

**Father of bride:** Vsevolod Olgovich (d. 1146)

**Mother of bride:** Maria (d. 1178), the daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich

**Father of groom:** Władysław II the Exile of Poland (d. 1159)

**Mother of groom:** Agnes of Babenberg (d. 1157), daughter of Leopold III of Austria

**Children:** Yaroslav (Jarosław of Opole, d. 1201), Olga (d. 1175-1180), and possibly a daughter Zvenislava (d. circa 1230).

**Comments:**

The *Kyivan Chronicle* gives the date of Zvenislava’s arrival in Poland as at the turn of the year 1140/1141 (6649) and the marriage itself to the turn of 1141/1142 (6650).³⁴¹

Zvenislava Vsevolodna was the first wife of Bolesław the Tall (d. 1201), the eldest son of Władysław II and his second wife Agnes, the sister of Emperor Konrad III.³⁴² Zvenislava gave birth to two children: a son called Yaroslav (Polish: Jarosław) and a daughter called Olga.³⁴³ Some scholars have suggested that she might also have had a third daughter called Zvenislava (d. circa 1230), who became the wife of the Pomeranian prince Mściwoj I of Gdańsk in around 1190. No source records the parentage of this younger Zvenislava, but the fact that she was given the same name as Zvenislava Vsevolodna suggests that the latter might have been her mother.³⁴⁴

---


The current scholarly consensus, however, is that the younger Zvenislava was the daughter of an unknown local Pomeranian prince (unrelated to the Zvenislava under consideration here).\textsuperscript{345}

Zvenislava Vsevolodna died around 1155-1163 and, according to a fourteenth-century source, was buried in the Saxon monastery of Pforta together with her mother-in-law Adelheid.\textsuperscript{346} After Zvenislava’s death Bolesław the Tall remarried with a Bavarian lady, Adelaide of Sulzbach, who was the sister of Emperor Konrad III’s wife Gertrude and daughter of Count Berengar II (1085-1125).\textsuperscript{347}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{345} Ibid., 236.
\item \textsuperscript{346} The mention of Zvenislava’s grave occurs in a poem praising her husband’s foundation of the Cistercian monastery of Lubiąż which was settled by monks from Pforta: “[Bolezlaus...] qui mutavit monachos grizeosque vocavit […]/De Porta, caris hoc claustro pro tumulatis, / Coniuge cum matre, nato pariterque Johanne, / Hic laudara deum dignos stabilivit in evum”, Wiersz o pierszych zakonnikach Lubiąża, ed. August Bielowski in MPH, vol. 3, 709; Zientara, “Bolesław Wysoki”, 371.
\end{itemize}

**Father of bride (debated):** Otto II Olomouc (d. 1126)

**Mother of bride:** ?

**Father of groom:** Mstislav Vladimiriovich the Great (d. 1132)

**Mother of groom:** Kristin of Sweden (d. 1122).

**Children:** ?

**Comments:**

The marriage between Sviatopolk Mstislavich (d. 1154), and a Moravian princess in the year 1143 is reported only by one line of the *Chronicle of Novgorod.*\(^{348}\) It took place when Sviatopolk Mstislavich was prince of Novgorod and probably for this reason is recorded in this chronicle.\(^{349}\) Some scholars have identified her as Euphemia, the daughter of the prince of Otto II of Olomouc and the sister of the Olomouc prince Otto III, who fled to Rus’ after his father died in the struggle against Soběslav I (r. 1125-1140).\(^{350}\) He remained in Rus’, most likely in Volhynia, until 1141 when Vladislav II “recalled him from Rus’.”\(^{351}\) After the marriage, Vladislav II is called Iziaslav’s “matchmaker” (svat’).\(^{352}\)

---


\(^{349}\) Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 183 and genealogical table 2, no. 12, 421.

\(^{350}\) *Ibid*, 183. See also the discussion of the Moravian princess’ ancestry in Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 131 with a summary of scholarship on the subject.


\(^{352}\) Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 183, no citations given.
30. King Géza II of Hungary and Euphrosyne of Kyiv in 1146

**Father of bride:** Mstislav Vladimirovich the Great (d. 1132)

**Mother of bride:** unknown daughter (d. after 1169) of Dmitrii Zavidich of Novgorod

**Father of groom:** Béla II the Blind (d. 1141).

**Mother of groom:** Ilona of Serbia (d. before 1157).

**Children:** István III (1147-1172), Béla III (1148-1196), Elizabeth (1149/1150-1189), Géza (1151/1152-1210), Árpád (?-?), Odola (?-?), Margaret (?), and Ilonka (d.1199).

**Comments:**

No primary source mentions Euphrosyne’s marriage to King Géza II of Hungary. The dating of the marriage in secondary literature to 1146 is based on the basis of the baptism of Géza and Euphrosyne’s first son, István III, in July or August of 1147.\(^{353}\) Her name, “Euphrosyne,” is known from Latin charters mentioning her donations to the Hospitallers in Hungary.\(^{354}\) Her Rus’ origins and genealogy can be deduced from the twelfth-century *Kyivan Chronicle* which states that the Queen of Hungary was the sister of prince Iziaslav Mstislavich: consequently, Euphrosyne was also a daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich and of (on chronological grounds) Mstislav’s second wife.\(^{355}\) She had several children together with her husband.\(^{356}\)


\(^{356}\) Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 188 and see list above.
The *Annales Posonienses* records that Euphrosyne’s son, Béla III, exiled his mother to Byzantium. ³⁵⁷ Subsequently, according to a charter issued by Euphrosyne’s daughter Elizabeth, Euphrosyne became a Hospitaller nun. ³⁵⁸ According to current consensus, Euphrosyne probably died in circa 1193 in the Orthodox monastery of Mar Saba in the Kidron Valley, and then was buried in the nearby Orthodox monastery of St. Theodosios the Koinobiarches. ³⁵⁹ Her body was exhumed and reburied in Hungary sometime before 1272 when Hungarian royal charters begin to refer to her body lying at the church of the Crusaders in Székesfehérvár. ³⁶⁰


³⁵⁹ Weigand, “Das Theodosioskloster”: 167-170. Pashuto tentatively accepted this information about Euphrosyne’s burial with a question mark, *Vneshniaia politika*, 179-180. See also Chapter Five under “Euphrosyne Mstislavna” for a fuller discussion of the question of her burial-place.

31. Unnamed daughter of Ban Belush of Hungary and Vladimir Mstislavich in 1150

Father of bride: Belush (d. c. 1163), brother of Urosh of Serbia

Mother of bride: unknown

Father of groom: Mstislav Harald Vladimirich (d. 1132)

Mother of groom: Kristin of Sweden (d. 1122)

Children: Mstislav (d. after 1203), Yaroslav (d. 1205-1209), Sviatoslav (d. c. 1202-1205), Rostislav (d. c. 1202-1205)

Comments:

The marriage between an unnamed daughter of Ban Belush (Hungarian: Béla) of Hungary and Vladimir Mstislavich (d. 1171) in 1150/1151 is listed in the twelfth-century Kyivan Chronicle, which adds that the Rus’-born Queen Euphrosyne of Hungary was involved in arranging this marriage for her brother.361 “Ban” (Latin: banus) refers to a military and judicial title in medieval Hungary, held since the early twelfth century by the king’s governor in Croatia.362 Although the Kyivan Chronicle does not explicitly identify who the ban was, his identification with Belush can be confirmed from Hungarian sources.363 Vladimir’s wife died sometime after 1169 when she is last recorded as a living person.364 Her place of burial is unknown.365

362 Engel, Realm of St Stephen, 36; Font, “Hongrois et slaves,” 189-190.
363 Fine, Early Medieval Balkans, 236; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 178.
364 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 305. Dąbrowski gives the date of 1167 for the last known time that Vladimir’s wife was still alive, Genealogia Mścisławowiczów, 178.
365 Ibid, 183.
32. Agnieszka of Poland and Mstislav Iziaslavich, 1151-1152.

**Father of bride:** Bolesław III Wrymouth (d. 1138)

**Mother of bride:** Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

**Father of groom:** Mstislav Iziaslavich (d. 1170)

**Mother of groom:** an unknown woman or a German princess

**Children:** Roman (d. 1205), Vladimir (d. 1170) and Vsevolod (d. 1195)

**Comments:**

The twelfth-century *Translation of the Hand of Saint Stephen* describes the decision of the junior princes of Poland, their wives, and the dowager duchess Salomea of Berg during the Congress of Łęczyca in 1140 or early 1141 to marry off the Polish princess Agnieszka to a Riurikid ruler. 366 The participants of the Congress debated whether to give Agnieszka as a nun to the monastery of Zwiefalten or to marry her to an unspecified “son of the king of Rus’” in order to form a marriage alliance against the senior prince of Poland, Władysław II (Salomea’s step-son and the junior princes’ elder half-brother). 367 As the chronicle specifies that Agnieszka was barely three years old at the time, she must have been born in 1137 (1138 is ruled out as her birth year because her brother Kazimierz the Just was born in this year). 368

The identity of this “son of the king of Rus’” (“filio regis Ruzziae”) has been the subject of ongoing scholarly debate. Polish genealogist Oswald Balzer, believing that a “king” of Rus’ could only be interpreted as a reference to the prince of Kyiv, identified her fiancé as an

366 *Translatio*, ed. Wallach et al., 128.


unknown son of prince Vsevolod Ol’govich, who was ruling Kyiv at the time of Agnieszka’s engagement.\footnote{Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 318 and 323, Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mściślawniczów, 220.} This son could have Yaroslav Vsevolodovich (born in 1139).\footnote{Biniaś-Szkopek, Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy, 295.} According to this theory, Agnieszka would have first been engaged to a son of Vsevolod Ol’govich of the Ol’govich line. Then, a decade later, as political circumstances changed, and the rival Monomachichi line of the Riurikid dynasty gained the throne, the engagement would have been broken, since Agnieszka was likely married off instead to a member of the Monomachichi line (see below).\footnote{Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 318-323; Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny”, 57.} The identification of the “filio regis Ruzziae” with a son of Vsevolod Olgovich, however, has been disputed by a number of scholars who pointed out that Latin sources use the term “rex” to refer to all the princes of Rus’ (i.e. all male members of the Riurikid dynasty) not only to the princes of Kyiv.\footnote{Soloviev, “‘Reges’ et ‘Regnum Russiae’”: 144-173; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 262; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mściślawniczów, 220.} Consequently, the necessity of identifying the “rex Ruzziae” with Vsevolod Olgovich has come under criticism.

On the basis of the friendly relations between the Monomachichi and the junior princes of Poland, Miron Korduba suggested that Agnieszka’s original fiancé was Mstislav Iziaslavich (d. 1172), the son of Iziaslav Mstislavich of the Monomachichi line, who was, furthermore, was the man she did indeed marry a decade later.\footnote{Miron Korduba, “Agniezka” in PSB, vol. 1., 30-31; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 262; Biniaś-Szkopek, Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy, 295; Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mściślawniczów, 220.} His view has been adopted by a number of other scholars.\footnote{Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 4, no. 2, 423; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 262; Biniaś-Szkopek, Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy, 295-296; Voitovich, Kniazha Doba, 469.} Information on Agnieszka’s marriage to Mstislav is based on indirect references in written sources to family connections between Kazimierz the Just’s and Mstislav Iziaslavich’s children. The thirteenth-century Polish chronicler Wincenty Kadłubek (d. 1223) states that Mstislav’s oldest son was Kazimierz the Just’s nephew.\footnote{“[Casimirus] Russian ingressus [...] Quam sororis sororis suae primogenito, a fratribus per errorem eiecto, restituere instituit,” Mistrza Wincentego kronika polska, ed. Bielowski, 407-408; Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 320; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 262.} Kadłubek also states that Roman...
Mstislavich, another son of Mstislav Iziaslavich, and Kazimierz the Just’s son, Leszek the White, were related to each other in the second degree of consanguinity.\textsuperscript{376} The Kyivan Chronicle states that Mieszko the Old was the uncle of Roman Mstislavich, a relation which also accords with Kadłubek’s information.\textsuperscript{377} Therefore, the wife of Mstislav Iziaslavich was the sister of Kazimierz the Just and of Mieszko the Old: and, since another otherwise unknown daughter who has this same relationship to both the Piast dynasty and the Riurikid dynasty is unlikely; this lady must have been Agnieszka.\textsuperscript{378}

The marriage between Agniezka and Mstislav Iziaslavich likely took place between 1149-1152 (probably in 1151 and 1152) when Agniezka had reached puberty and when Mstislav’s father, Iziaslav, had gained the throne of Kyiv.\textsuperscript{379} It is possible that the marriage was agreed upon in 1152 when Mstislav was sent by his father prince Iziaslav to Poland and Hungary to find allies against Vladimir of Galicia.\textsuperscript{380} Likewise in favour of the year 1151 or 1152 is that Mstislav had gained rulership over the town of Pereiaslav.\textsuperscript{381}

Agnieszka and Mstislav had three sons: Roman, prince of Galicia-Volhynia, Vsevolod, prince of Belz, and Vladimir, prince of Brest.\textsuperscript{382} Mstislav’s son Sviatoslav is generally considered illegitimate in secondary literature.\textsuperscript{383}

\textsuperscript{376} In Kadłubek’s chronicle, Polish nobles are portrayed as debating whether or not Leszek the White was under any obligation to help Roman Mstislavich militarily. Those who argued in favour of military intervention noted that Leszek had an obligation of kinship toward Roman: “[…] alii […] inquiunt, ‘nec nostro principi nec nobis esse Romanum extraneum. Nam quo pacto extraneus dici potest, cum quo secundo consanguinitatis gradu reperitur,'” Mi\textit{strza Wincentego kronika}, ed. Bielowski, 438; Balzer, \textit{Genealogia Piastów}, 319; Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 262.


\textsuperscript{378} \textit{Ibid.}, 262.


\textsuperscript{380} PSRL, vol. 1, \textit{sub anno} 6660 (1152), 336; PSRL, vol. 2, \textit{sub anno} 6660 (1152), 446-454; Shchaveleva, “Polki-zheny,” 57.


Agnieszka is last mentioned as a living person during the expedition of her brother, Kazimierz the Just, against Brest in 1182, in which he restored his nephew to power.\footnote{Shchaveleva, however, counts Sviatoslav as one of Agnieszka’s sons, “Polki- zheny,” 57.}
33. Valdemar the Great, King of Denmark and Sophia of Rus’, 1154; 34. second marriage with Ludwig V, Landgrave of Thuringia, after 1182

**Father of bride (debated):** Vladimir Vsevolodovich of Novgorod (d. after 1140) or Volodar Glebovich of Minsk (d. after 1167)

**Mother of bride:** Ryksa of Poland (d. circa after 1150)

**Father of groom (Valdemar):** Knud Lavard (d. 1131)

**Mother of groom (Valdemar):** Ingeborg Mstislavna (d. after 1137)

**Children (with Valdemar):** King Knud VI of Denmark (d. 1202), King Valdemar II of Denmark (d. 1241), Ingeborg of France (d. 1223), Helena of Denmark (d. after 1233), Queen Ryksa of Sweden (d. 1216). Sophia had no children with her second husband.

**Comments:**

Several Old Norse and Latin sources report that in 1154 the Rus’ princess Sophia married Valdemar, son of the Danish prince Knud Lavard and the Rus’ princess Ingeborg Mstislavna.  

Sophia’s genealogy is much debated, however. Although scholars agree on the basis of the above-listed sources that her mother was the Polish princess Ryksa, her father may have been Volodar Glebovich of Minsk or Vladimir Vsevolodich, son of Prince Vsevlod Mstislavich of Novgorod. The Scandinavian sagas identify her father as “Valada, Valadar…or the like.” Oswald Balzer and Nicholas de Baumgarten considers that this Old Norse name is a version of the Slavic name “Vladimir” and, partly on this basis and partly on chronological grounds, considers that the only prince who could have this name and who could have been

---


386 For the debate about Sophia’s genealogy see also the entry on her mother Ryksa above, No. 26.

Sophia’s father was Vladimir Vsevolodich. John Lind, however, believes that the Scandinavian “Valadar, Valadar” refer rather to the Slavic name “Volodar” and suggests Volodar of Minsk was Sophia’s father. As stated above, it seems more plausible that Bolesław III would marry his daughter Ryksa to Vladimir Vsevolodovich, because he was a member of the powerful Monomachichi branch of the Riurikid dynasty, while Volodar of Minsk was an obscure prince.

According to the sagas, Valdemar and Sophia had several children together, two of whom—Knud VI and Valdemar II—became kings of Denmark. Her daughter Ingeborg (d. 1236) was the famous repudiated wife of Philippe II Augustus of France, who had married her in 1193. In 1187, a few years after Valdemar’s death in 1182, Sophia re-married with Landgrave Ludwig V of Thuringia (d. 1190), who had repudiated his previous wife (Margaret of Cleves) in that year in order to marry her. The marriage did not last long, however, as shortly afterwards, Ludwig also repudiated Sophia, and she returned to Denmark. She died in 1198 and was buried in Ringsted Abbey in Denmark.

389 Lind, “ Martyria,” 16
390 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 137. See also the discussion above in Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 26.
392 Ibid., genealogical table 2, 103.
35. Odon Mieszkowic and a daughter of Yaroslav Vladimirovich between 1153 and 1157.

**Father of bride:** Yaroslav Vladimirovich the “Eight-Minded” (“Osmomysl”, d. 1187)

**Mother of bride:** Olga Yurievna (d. 1181)

**Father of groom:** Mieszko III the Old (d. 1202)

**Mother of groom:** Elizabeth of Hungary (d. 1155) or Eudoxia Iziaslavna (d. after 1187)

**Children:** Władysław Odonic (d. 1239), Ryksa (d. after 1238), Otto (d. 1225).

**Comments:**

The contemporary thirteenth-century chronicle of Wincenty Kadłubek, bishop of Kraków, records that one of Mieszko III’s sons had a Galician prince as his father-in-law. This information is repeated in later chronicles. Oswald Balzer suggests that the prince of Galicia could have been Vladimirko Volodarevich (d. 1152) or his more famous son, Yaroslav “the Eight-Minded” (“Osmomysl”, d. 1187). Vladimir Pashuto identifies the couple as Mieszko III’s son, Odon Mieszkowic (d. 1194) and daughter of prince Yaroslav the Eight-Minded of Galicia, dating their marriage sometime between 1153 and 1157. Leontii Voitovykh dates the marriage significantly later to after the year 1187, perhaps considering Odon’s mother to be the Rus’ princess Eudoxia, who married Mieszko the Old in the early 1150s.

---


397 *Kronika Wielkopolska*, ed. Kürbis, 56; *Kronika polska*, ed. Ćwikliński, 634-635.


36. King István III of Hungary and a princess of Galicia in c. 1166

**Father of bride:** Yaroslav Vladimirovich the “Eight-Minded” (“Osmomysl”, d. 1187)

**Mother of bride:** Olga Yurievna (d. 1181)

**Father of groom:** King Géza II of Hungary (d. 1162).

**Mother of groom:** Euphrosyne Mstislavna (d. circa 1193).

**Children:** none

**Comments:**

Only the near-contemporary Byzantine chronicle of Ioannos Kinnamos records the marriage of King István III of Hungary (d. 1172) with the daughter of prince Yaroslav Osmomysl of Galicia. Kinnamos also relates how, in 1166, King István III repudiated this unnamed Rus’ princess and married instead a daughter of Duke Heinrich Jasormittgott of Austria. Latin chronicles state that the name of István III’s second wife was Agnes and that the marriage took place in 1166, but they do not mention that István III had repudiated his previous wife.

For political reasons, Ferenc Makk estimates that the engagement between the daughter of Yaroslav Osmomysl of Galicia and István III took place in early 1164, but that she only came to Hungary as a bride in 1166 and remained there less than a year before her repudiation. Her further fate is unknown.

---

404 Makk, Árpáds and the Comneni, 89 and 99.
37. A daughter of Bolesław IV the Curly and Vasil’ko Yaropolkovich around 1173

**Father of bride:** Bolesław IV the Curly (d. 1173)

**Mother of bride:** Verkhoslava Vsevolodna (d. early 1160s)

**Father of groom:** Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1168)

**Mother of groom:** Maria (d. 1189), daughter of Sviatoslav Olgovich.

**Children:** none known.

**Comments:**

The only information about the existence of a daughter of Bolesław IV the Curly (Kędzierzawy) comes from a controversial source, the *Russian History (Istoriia rossiskaia)* of Vasilii Tatishchev (d. 1750), compiled in the eighteenth century. Although Tatishchev can be notoriously unreliable, Polish genealogists Oswald Balzer and Kazimierz Jasiński as well as historian Bolesław Włodarski accept his information about a daughter of Bolesław the Curly. According to Tatishchev, using a lost source, a military conflict arose between Vasil’ko Yaropolkovich (d. after 1178), prince of Drohiczyn, and a certain Vladimir of Minsk, who is not further known. Vasil’ko was allied with the Poles and Mazovians against Vladimir and Vasil’ko’s wife is described as the daughter of the prince of Mazovia. “Leszek” is described


407 Tatishchev dates the conflict to 1182, but this date is not accepted by Balzer, who prefers to date it to 1177. See Tatishchev *Istoriia rossiskaia*, vol. 3, 127, Balzer, *Genealogia Piastów*, 333. Vasil’ko Yaropolkovich was the son of Yaropolk Iziaslavich and the grandson of Iziaslav Mstislavich, Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 272 and n. 4, 274.

408 “Vasil’ko drogichinskii, syn Yaropolkov, possoriasia so Vladimirom minkim, prizvav poliakov i mazovshan na pomoch’, poshel k Brestiu. […] Vasil’ko prished s poliaki, Brest vzial. Obache boiasia sam tut byt’, ostavil v nem brata zheny svoei, kniazia mazovetskogo, s poliaki,” [“Vasil’ko of Drohiczyn, the son of Yaropolk, having argued with Vladimir of Minsk, sent for Poles and Mazovians for help and marched on Brest. […] Vasil’ko having come with the Poles, took Brest. Afraid to be there alone, however, he appointed there the brother of his wife, the prince of Mazovia, with the Poles”], Tatishchev, *Istoriia rossiskaia*, vol. 3, 127, Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 272 and n. 5, 274, Balzer, *Genealogia Piastów*, 330.
as Vasil’ko’s “father-in-law” (test’) who helped him defeat Vladimir and gain Brest. According to this narrative, since Vasil’ko was unable to pay his Polish allies and since his marriage was childless, he left his entire princedom to Leszek as a recompense.

Balzer considered that the only prince of Mazovia active in the second half of the twelfth century could be Leszek, the son of Bolesław the Curly. Therefore he dated the events to around 1178-1183, when Leszek was over eighteen years old (assuming he was born around 116-1165) and thus able to act independently as described in the narrative. Jasiński, on the other hand, considers that Leszek could have already acted independently from age 16.

Leszek had no known children and according to Balzer, Tatishchev here incorrectly labeled Leszek as Vasil’ko’s father-in-law (test’) when he should have been Vasil’ko’s brother-in-law. Balzer hypothetically placed the marriage around 1173, which Jasiński accepts as a possibility. This date is based on the hypothesis that the marriage alliance would have only taken place after Vasil’ko took the princedom of Drohiczyn, which occurred at the earliest in 1173 when the preceding ruler died in that year.

---

409 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 331; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 272.
410 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 331; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 272.
411 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 331; discussed in Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 272 and n. 8, 274.
412 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 272 and n. 8, 274.
413 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 272.
415 Ibid., 273.
416 Ibid., 273 citing in n. 12, 274: PSRL, vol. 2, sub anno 6681 (1173). 562: “V to zhe vremę prestavil”sę bęshet brat emu [Romanovi] mën’šhií” (“At that time his younger brother died”). The preceding ruler was Vladimir Mstislavich, son of the Polish princess Agnieszka and Mstislav Iziaslavich and younger brother of Roman Mstislavich.
The daughter of Bolesław the Curly who married Vasil’ko would be born approximately in 1159/1160, either from Verkhoslova or Maria. Neither her date of death nor her place of burial is known.

Vasil’ko was the son of Yaropolk Iziaslavich (d. 1168) and grandson of Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1154) from the Monomachichi line with which the children of Bolesław Wry-mouth concluded many marriage alliances in the twelfth century. Vasil’ko was born before 1151 and died sometime before 1182 according to Jasiński and after 1178 according to Balzer; it seems that his marriage was indeed childless.

---

417 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 334 (in favour of Verkhoslova as the mother); Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 273.

418 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 273-274.

419 Ibid., 274.

420 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 334; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 274.
38. Mieszko III the Old of Poland and Eudoxia Iziaslavna before 1177

**Father of bride:** Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1154)

**Mother of bride:** unknown; a German princess?

**Father of groom:** Bolesław III Wrymouth (d. 1138)

**Mother of groom:** Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

**Children:** Bolesław (d. 1195), Mieszko (d. 1193), Władysław “Spindleshanks” (*Laskonogi*, d. after 1208), Anastasia (d. 1240), and Salomea (d. c. after 1176), Zvenisilava (d. 1240).

**Comments:**

Eudoxia Iziaslavna was Mieszko III’s second wife, though when Mieszko III married her and when his first wife died is matter of some controversy. The earliest information on Mieszko III’s first marriage is the twelfth-century *Translation of the Hand of Saint Stephen*, although this source confuses Mieszko III with his brother Bolesław the Curly (and consequently also mixes up the wives to each ruler). Wincent Kadłubek, Mieszko III’s contemporary, states that Mieszko III was married to a Hungarian lady (known from other sources as Elizabeth) but her genealogy is debated. Rejecting the death-date supplied for Elizabeth in Jan Długosz’s

---


422 “[...Salomea...] duces Bolezlaum ac Misionem, cum uxoribus eorum, filiabus scilicet regum Ungariae et Ruszaiæ, de regionibus suis fecit ad generale colloquium convenire,” *Translatio*, ed. Wallach et al., 128; Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 228 and 236.

423 *Mistrza Wincentego kronika polska*, ed. Bielowski, 379. Elizabeth’s genealogy is debated. Although the fifteenth-century chronicle of Jan Długosz states that she was the daughter of King Béla II of Hungary, this information must be rejected on chronological grounds, since in that case Mieszko III’s first wife would have been around eight to nine years old. For this reason, Oswald Balzer proposes that she would been the sister, rather than daughter of Béla II, making her the daughter of prince Álmos. Jasiński notes that Álmos was never king of Hungary and therefore instead suggests that Elizabeth was more likely the daughter of the Hungarian king István II, even though this means rejecting the testimony of sources which state that István II died childless. See the detailed discussion in Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 237-238.
chronicle, Jasiński estimates that Elizabeth died around 1150-1154 after which Mieszko III took a Rus’ princess for his wife.  

The chronicle of Wincenty Kadłubek names Mieszko III’s second wife as ‘the daughter of the king of the Rus’.’ This information is also repeated in later sources. Eudoxia’s name is known from the cartulary of the Canons of the Holy Sepulcher of Miechów and the necrology of the Premonstratensian abbey of Strzelno. Oswald Balzer put forward the theory that became widely accepted in secondary literature: that Eudoxia’s father was Iziaslav Mstislavich, who ruled Kyiv in 1146-1149, 1150 and 1151-1154. Balzer based this view on the account of the Kyivan Chronicle, which does not mention Eudoxia explicitly but which generally speaks of an alliance between Iziaslav Mstislavich and Mieszko III.

424 Ibid., 240.
426 Kronika kijżat polskich, ed. Węclewski, 479; Kronika polska, ed. Ćwikliński, 635; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 240.
428 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 240.
429 “[...] Iziaslav zhe prished vo Volodimir. Pocha sę slati v Ugry k zętiu svoemu koroleve i v Lękhy k svatu svoemu Boleslavu i Mezhstë i Ingdrikhovë i k Cheskomu kn[ë]ziu svatu svoemu Volodislawu prosë u nikh pomocbi a bysha vsëli na koni sami polkyi svoimi poiti k Kiyevu paky li samëm ne mochno poiti budet a polky svoia pustët’ liubo s mensheiu brateiu svoeu ili a i s voevodami svoimi,” PSRL, vol. 2, sub anno 6657 (1148/1149), 384 [“Iziaslav came to Vladimir [-in-Volhynia]. He sent messages to the Hungarians, to his relative by marriage, the King, and to the Poles, to his relative by marriage Boleslaw [the Curly] and to Mieszko [III the Old] and to Indrikov [his brother] and to the Czech duke, Vratislav, also his relative by marriage, asking for their help, that they would mount their horses with their armies to go on campaign against Kyiv. If they were not able to come in person [he asked that] they send their younger brothers or their voevodas.”]. See also Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 240-241.
If Balzer’s thesis is correct, then Eudoxia must have been the daughter of Iziaslav from his first marriage since his first wife (whose identity is not known) died in 1151. Eudoxia was clearly past the age of puberty at the time of her own marriage, since she gave birth already by 1159.

With Mieszko III, Eudoxia had three sons: Bolesław, Mieszko and Władysław Spindleshanks (Laskonogi) as well as two daughters, Anastasia and Salomea (Jasiński considers her name uncertain) who married Pomeranian princes.

Eudoxia’s death-date is recorded in the seventeenth-century necrology of the Premonstratensian abbey of Strzelno under March 13 together with her husband. She was still alive in 1173 when Mieszko became senior prince of Poland as is apparent from a later document issued by prince Przemysł I of Greater Poland from 1252 which refers to her Mieszko III’s wife as ducissa magna. In 1187 together with her husband, she granted the hospital of St. Michael in Poznań to the Order of St. John (Knights Hospitaller). Therefore she died sometime after 1187. It is possible that Eudoxia was buried in the collegiate church of St. Paul in Kalisz, since this was where her son Mieszko and her husband were buried and since this church was founded by her husband.

-------------------------------------------

430 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 241.
431 Ibid., 241.
432 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 350-380; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 242-245; Rymar, Rodowód książąt pomorskich, 115-116 (on Anastasia, second wife of Bogusław I of Pomerania, d. 1187) and 123-124 (for Salomea, wife of Racibor Bogusławowic, d. 1183).
434 Antoni Gąsiorowski and Henryk Kowalewicz, eds, Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski, vol. 6: 1174-1400, notes by Antoni Gąsiorowski (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1982), n. 4, and n. 8, 15; Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 242
435 Eudoxia’s donation of a hospital to the Knights Hospitallers together with her husband is known from the confirmation by Bishop Benedict of Poznań around 1191, Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski obejmujący dokumenta tak już drukowane, jak dotąd nie ogłoszone sięgające do roku 1400, vol. 1: Zawiera numera 1-616, ed. Ignacy Zakrzewski (Poznań: Nakładem Biblioteki Kórnickiej, 1877), no. 29, 34.
436 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 242

**Father of bride:** Kazimierz the Just (d. 1194)

**Mother of bride:** Helena of Znojmo (d. 1202-1206)

**Father of groom:** Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich (d. 1194)

**Mother of groom:** daughter (?) of Vasil’ko Sviatoslavich (d. after 1143)

**Children:** (Saint) Mikhail Vsevolodovich of Chernihiv (d. 1246), Andrei Vsevolodovich (d. 1262), Agafia Vsevolodivna (d. 1238), Vera-Helena Vsevolodivna (d. after 1208).

**Comments:**

The marriage is recorded under the year 6686 (1177/1178) by the *Kyivan Chronicle*: “In that year, on the feast of St. Philip, Sviatoslav brought for Vsevolod, for his middle son, a wife from Poland, the daughter/relative of Kazimierz.” According to the seventeenth-century necrology of Liubech, her name was Anastasia. The *Kyivan Chronicle* claims that she was founder of the church of Saint Cyril of Alexandria in Kyiv, whose proper patron should be rather, according to the convincing arguments of Olenka Pevny, Maria, the daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich (d. 1132). Anastasia and Vsevolod had several children together.

---


Appendix 4: Genealogical Information on Additional Debated or Doubtful Inter-Rite Marriages.

1. Hypothesized marriage of Vladimir I the Great and the daughter of Kuno von Öhningen, c. 1010-1015

Father of bride: “Kuno of Öhningen” (probably identical with Konrad of Swabia, d. 997) ¹

Mother of bride: Richlint (? , fl. late tenth century).²

Father of groom: prince Sviatoslav Igorevich (d. 972)

Mother of groom: the serving woman Malusha/Malmfrid (d. 1000)

Children: possibly Maria Dobroniega (d. 1087) and Sviatoslav Vladimirovich (d. circa 1015?).

Comments:

Thietmar of Merseburg’s chronicle, contemporary with the events it describes, mentions that when the Polish king Bolesław I the Brave occupied Kyiv in 1015, present among the Riurikid princely family was Yaroslav the Wise’s stepmother, that is to say a widow of Yaroslav’s father, Vladimir Sviatoslavich.³ Consequently Nicholas de Baumgarten deduced that Vladimir (d. 1015)

¹ The identity of this nobleman is uncertain. He may, perhaps, be a legendary figure or, as is generally accepted, he could be tentatively identified with Duke Konrad of Swabia (d. 997). See the review of critical literature in Hlawitschka, “Königin Richenza,” 222; Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 242-243; Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, n. 8, 362.

² The name “Richlint” is given as Kuno’s wife in the twelfth-century Genealogia Welforum and the twelfth-century Historia Welforum Weingartensis. The anonymous author of the former claims that she was the daughter of Emperor Otto I and the wife of “Kuno” (“Rudolfus uxorem accepit de Onigen Itam nomine, cuius pater fuit Chuno nobilissimus comes, mater vero filia Ottonis Magni inperatoris fuit”, Genealogia Welforum, MGH, ed. Georgius Waitz, vol. 13, 734). “Kuno’s” identity is uncertain. The author perhaps is thinking of Duke Konrad of Lotharingia, who married Liutgarda, daughter of Otto I, Ibid, n. 6, 734. See also Historia Welforum Weingartensis, ed. Ludewicus Weiland, MGH, vol. 21, 460. An alternative genealogical reconstruction makes “Kuno/Konrad’s” wife a hypothetical daughter of Duke Liudolf (d. 957), who was the son of Otto I, Nazarenko, Drevniaia Rus’, n. 8, 362.

married once more after the death of Anna of Byzantium (1011).  

As a result, Baumgarten, followed by later scholars, proposed that after Anna died, Vladimir remarried with a daughter of Kuno of Öhningen. Those who support this view hypothesize that Vladimir changed allies around 1011/1012: he had previously been allied with Boleslaw I of Poland against Emperor Henry II of Germany (r. 1002-1024), but after the death of Anna in around 1011, he formed a new German marriage alliance against the Poles. According to Baumgarten’s hypothesis, adopted by others, the children born of this marriage alliance were Dobroniega-Maria who married Kazimierz I of Poland around 1038 and Sviatoslav, a son of Vladimir who was murdered in the succession struggle of 1015.

This thesis has a number of problematic aspects, however. Firstly, the death-date of Anna of Byzantium of 1011 as reported by the Rus’ chronicles is contradicted by other equally reliable Byzantine and German sources and hence is uncertain. Second, the historic identity of “Kuno

---


7 Pashuto, Vneshtniaia politika, 35, 121-122, n. 17, 326, and genealogical table 1, no. 1.III, 419; Voitovich, Kniažha doba, 242.

8 Baumgarten, “Le dernier mariæ,” 165-166; Pashuto, Vneshtniaia politika, n. 17, 326, discussed in Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 18.

9 The only Rus’ source which explicitly gives Anna’s name in reporting her death is the mid sixteenth-century Kholmorgorski Chronicle: “V leto 6519 [1011]. Predstavisia Anna tsaritsa,” Kholmogorskái letopis’ in PSRL, vol. 33, ed. B. A. Rybakov (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977), 30. Anna of Byzantium’s death date of 1011 is given in Rus’ chronicles, but is contradicted by the testimony of the Byzantine historian Ioannes Skylitzes and by the German chronicler Thietmar of Merseburg, who refers to her as still alive in the first quarter of the eleventh century (though he refers to her by the wrong name as “Helena”). See: Kazhdan, “Rus’-Byzantine Marriages,” 415-416.
von Öhningen” is rather mysterious. Several scholars have suggested that “Kuno” can, in fact, be equated with Count Konrad of Swabia (r. 982/983-997). Finally, the “king of the Rus’” is a very vague appellation and may not necessarily apply to Vladimir. Aleksandr Nazarenko argued on chronological grounds that the anonymous “king of the Rus’” was Vladimir’s brother, Yaropolk Sviatoslavich (d. 980), for instance, but his view has not been widely accepted.

Kazimierz Jasiński and Christian Raffensperger provide the most reasonable assessment of these genealogical possibilities. They consider Vladimir’s remarriage after Anna’s death an undisputed fact, but they question Baumgarten’s identification of this last wife as a daughter of Kuno of Öhningen.

10 Hlawitschka, “Königin Richeza,” 222.
11 Ibid., n. 4, 222; discussed in Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 242-243; Nazarenko, “Die Rus’ und Deutschland vor 988,” in Le origini, ed. Swierkosz-Lenart, 40, and item, Drevniaia Rus’, n. 8, 362.
13 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 132; Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 19.
2. A daughter of Vladimir the Great and the Margrave of the Northmark Bernard II?

**Father of bride:** Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)

**Mother of bride:** Anna of Byzantium (d. 1011?) or a concubine

**Father of groom:** Bernard I

**Mother of groom:** ?

**Children:** Count Otto

**Comments:**

Nicolas de Baumgarten, citing an early eighteenth-century genealogy, asserts that before Vladimir Sviatoslavich died in 1015 he married off an unnamed daughter to Margrave Bernhard II of the Northmark (d. 1059).\(^{14}\) This idea finds some support in the late thirteenth-century Middle Low German *Saxon World Chronicle* which states that Bernand’s son Otto had a Rus’ mother.\(^ {15}\) The idea that a daughter of Vladimir married Margrave Bernard is accepted by, for example, Leontii Voitovich, but he dates the marriage to 1025 after Vladimir’s death.\(^ {16}\) Alexander Nazarenko accepts this theory, but modifies it slightly, believing that Vladimir’s daughter married Margrave Bernard II’s father, Bernard I. This idea is accepted as a possibility by Christian Raffensperger, though he notes that the evidence for this marriage is based on late sources which may be unreliable in reconstructing this genealogy.\(^ {17}\)

\(^{14}\) de Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux,” genealogical table 1, no. 16, 7 and n. 16, 8 presumably citing Eccardus Jo. Georgius, *Historia Genealogica Principvm Saxoniae Superioris, qua recensentvr stemma W itchindeum, origines familiae Saxonicae regnantis, veteresque marchiones orientales sive Lusatici ; vt et misnenses ex stripe Eccardinga, Comitvm Wimariensisvm, ac V etervm principvm B rvnsvicensivm ; veteres item Thvringiae Landgravii nec non Origines Familiae Anhaltinam…etc* (Leipzig : Apvd Jo. Friderici Gleditschii B. Filivm, 1722), 496. Baumgarten does not give complete publication information.

\(^{15}\) “[…] maregreven Bernarde; dese gewan […]enen Otten, des múder was van Ruzen,” *Sächsische Weltchronik*, ed. Ludwig Weiland, in MGH, *Scriptores qui vernaculo lingus usi sunt./Deutsche Chroniken und andere Geschichtbücher des Mittelalters*, vol. 2 (Hannover: Hansche Hofbuchhandlung, 1876), 199.

\(^{16}\) Voitovich, *Kniazha doba*, 276.

Raissa Bloch, however, convincingly disputes the existence of this marriage. The eleventh-century chronicler Lampert of Hersefeld (d. before 1085) reports under the year 1057 that Count Otto, the son of the Margrave of the Saxon Northmark Burchard II, was born from an “unequal marriage” with a Slavic woman.18 The report is repeated in the Annalista Saxo.19 In the end the theory of marriage finds support only in the thirteenth-century Saxon World Chronicle. Bloch convincingly argues that in light of the fact that Lampert says the marriage was an unequal one “it is difficult in this case to think of a Rus’ princess daughter from the generation of the children of Saint Vladimir.”20 Moreover, Otto spent time in exile in Bohemia and it is therefore more probable, Raissa Bloch states, that Otto’s mother would be a Slavic woman from Bohemia of lower social status rather than a Rus’ princess.21

---


20 Ibid., 188.

3. A daughter of Vladimir (“Premislava”) and László of Hungary, circa before 1015

**Father of bride (uncertain):** Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015)?

**Mother of bride:** unknown

**Father of groom:** Prince Michael of Hungary (fl. tenth century).

**Mother of groom:** unknown

**Children (debated):** disputed, possibly András I (d. 1060), Béla (d. 1063), and Levente (d. 1047).

**Comments:**

According to the *Buda Chronicle*, printed in 1473, László the “Bald” (Latin: “Calvus,” d. 1031) “is said to have married” a Rus’ woman, probably one of Vladimir Sviatoslavich’s daughters, Yaroslav the Wise’s sister.22 László was the son of King István I’s paternal uncle, Michael (the brother of Géza, István I’s father).23 The fourteenth-century *Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle* reports that the princes András and Béla were the sons of László the Bald “who is said to have taken a wife from Ruthenia to whom these two brothers were born.”24 Nothing further is known of the marriage. Baumgarten considers László’s wife to have been a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015); V. T. Pashuto accepts this hypothesis tentatively and calls the princess “Premislava.”25 Raffensperger notes that the name “Premislava” given to this Rus’ princess

---


25 Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politika*, 50 and genealogical table 1, no. 4, 419 with a question mark.
appears only in secondary literature and is not found in medieval sources, but accepts the marriage as authentic.\(^{26}\)

The purported marriage between László and a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich creates a potential genealogical problem, however. In the following generation, around 1048-1050, András I of Hungary married Anastasia Yaroslavna (see above, Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 8). András’ paternity is disputed, since András could have been the son either of László or of László’s brother Vazul.\(^{27}\) It should be noted that if László the Bald really was András I’s father, this would introduce a scandalously close consanguinity tie for András and Anastasia (two degrees of consanguinity according to the western calculation and four by the Byzantine), about which we have no report in the sources. In other words, if a marriage between László and a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich did take place, then the marriage between András I of Hungary married Anastasia Yaroslavna would be the only example of a marriage between first cousins in all of the inter-rite marriage alliances of the Riurikids. Such a marriage would have been subject to ecclesiastical censure in both Latin and Byzantine canon law, but we have no record of any cleric protesting their marriage.\(^{28}\) These circumstances lead one to doubt the historical validity of the marriage between László the Bald and a daughter of Vladimir Sviatoslavich.

\(^{26}\) Raffensperger, *Ties of Kinship*, 23.

\(^{27}\) *Anonymi Bele Regis notarii, Gesta Hungarorum*, ed., trans. and annotated by Rady and Veszprémy, n. 4, 4. For András’ genealogy, see also the genealogical entry above on “Anastasia Yaroslavna.”

\(^{28}\) Zajac, “Marriage Impediments,” 724.
4. Edward the Exile and Agafia Yaroslavna (?) before 1054

**Father of bride (highly debated):** Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054) or Margrave Liudolf of Westfriesland (d. 1038) or unknown

**Mother of bride (highly debated)** Ingigerd of Sweden (d. 1050) or Gertrude of Germany

**Father of groom:** Edmund Ironside (d. 1016).

**Mother of groom:** Ealgyth (Edith) (d. ?)²⁹

**Children:** Edgar Ætheling (d. in or after 1125), Saint Margaret of Scotland (d. 1093), Christina (d. after 1086).

**Comments:**

The origins of Agatha/Agafia, the mother of Saint Margaret of Scotland and wife of Edward the Exile of England, are highly debated as the sources are seemingly contradictory and do not clearly indicate her paternity. Since the nineteenth century there are three main theories as to Agafia’s origins: she was either Hungarian, German, or from Rus’.³⁰ The Anglo-Norman monk Orderic Vitalis (d. circa 1142) claimed that Agatha was the daughter of the king of Hungary, but the identification of this king either as King István I or as King Solomon in nineteenth and early twentieth century has been rejected on chronological grounds by the more recent genealogical studies since neither of these kings had daughters of marriageable age for Edward the Exile.³¹ Consequently, the two main theories for Agafia’s origins are that she was either of Rus’ or of German origin. The Rus’ theory was first proposed by René Jetté and has since been developed by Norman Ingham and Christian Raffensperger.³²

---

²⁹ There is no information in the sources about the origins of Ealgyth, the bride of King Edmund Ironside, except that she was English and the widow of one Sigeferth, Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 11.

³⁰ The evidence and debates on Agatha/Agafia’s origins are most recently discussed in great detail in *Ibid.*, 9-17 and genealogical charts 1 and 2.


Only one source, of doubtful historical value, directly supports the theory that Agafia was a member of the Riurikid dynasty, while other evidence used to prove her Rus’ origins is circumstantial. This direct piece of evidence is found in the so-called “Laws of Edward the Confessor” (*Leges Edwardi Confessoris*), which though attributed to the reign of this sainted English king (1042-1066), were, in fact, written in the early twelfth century:

This above said Edmund [Ironside] had a certain son called Edward. And he, after his father died, in fear of King Cnut fled to the land of the Rugi, which we call Rus’. The king of that land, Malesclodus by name, when he heard and understood who he was and where he came from, honourably retained him. And this Edward accepted there a wife of noble family, from whom was born to him Edgar the Atheling and Queen Margaret of Scotland and Christina his sister.33

The London version of the “Laws of Edward the Confessor”, written in circa 1200, and titled the “Laws of the English” further includes the interpolation that Queen Margaret descended “on her father’s side…from the noble race and blood of the kings of the English and Britons, on her mother’s from the race and blood of the king of the Rugi [Rus’]].”34

Further corroboration of the theory of Agafia’s Rus’ origins and more specifically the argument that she was a daughter of Yaroslav the Wise relies on the fact that Adam of Bremen reports in this late eleventh century chronicle that after Knud of Denmark’s invasion of England, the sons

---


of Edmund Ironside, Edwin and Agatha/Agafia’s future husband Edward the Exile, were “condemned to exile in Russia” around 1028.\textsuperscript{35} Adam’s chronicle is considered a well informed source, since the bishopric of Bremen was involved in missionary work in Scandinavia and, as mentioned above, one of his sources was King Sven Estridsson of Denmark, the nephew of Knud the Great.\textsuperscript{36} Moreover, the presence of Edwin and Edward in Rus’ is also suggested by the Old French rhymed chronicle \textit{L’Estoire des Engleis}, written around 1140 by one Geoffrei Gaimar, which states that the princes fled from Scandinavia to Rus’ to Hungary, to the city of “Gardimbre.”\textsuperscript{37} Ingham points out that “Gardimbre” and its variant “Gardhumbre” cannot be Hungarian place-names and, more likely, are a garbled renditions of the Scandinavian toponym for Rus’, \textit{Gárdaríki} (“Garðr/Garðar, ‘towns/enclosures’”; medieval Icelandic writings refer to it as ‘Garðaríki,’ ‘the kingdom of the towns’”).\textsuperscript{38}

Those who support the theory that Agatha/Agafia was a daughter of Yaroslav the Wise also point to the onomastic evidence for Agafia’s Orthodox origins. The name Agatha/Agafia, of Greek origin, is rare in eleventh-century Hungary and Germany.\textsuperscript{39} The name given to Agafia’s most famous daughter, Margaret, was previously almost unheard of in the British Isles; appearing neither in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle nor the \textit{Domesday Book}.\textsuperscript{40} The name could have been given in honour of Saint Margaret of Antioch, a fourth-century eastern saint.\textsuperscript{41} Norman Ingham

\textsuperscript{35} “[…] Emund, vir bellicosus, in gratiam victoris veneno sublatus est; filii eius in Ruzziam exilio damnati,” \textit{Adami Bremensis Gesta Pontificum}, ed. Trillmich, 202.

\textsuperscript{36} Keene, \textit{Saint Margaret}, 12.

\textsuperscript{37} According to Geoffrei Gaimar, the English princes were travelled with a loyal nobleman by the name of Walgar who “…sul treis nefs se mist en mer./Si espleitat tant de l’errer/Qu’en sul cinc jurz passat Russie/E vit la…terra de Hungerie./Le sist[e] jur est arrived/Desuz [Gardimbre] la cited,” Geoffrei Gaimar, \textit{L’Estoire des Engleis}, ed. Bell, verses 4576-4580; English trans. in Ingham, “Missing Daughter?” 238-239. See also the discussion of these sources in Keene, \textit{Saint Margaret}, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{38} The definitions of Garðr/Gardðar and Garðaríki are given in Omeljan Pritsak, “‘Rus’” in \textit{Medieval Scandinavia: an Encyclopedia}, ed. Phillip Pulsiano (New York: Garland, 1993), 555. The argument that Gaimar preserves a garbled reference to this toponym is made in Jetté, “Is the Mystery?”, 419 and Ingham, “Missing Daughter?”, 238-239. See also Keene, \textit{Saint Margaret}, 12.

\textsuperscript{39} Jetté, “Is the Mystery?”, 424.

\textsuperscript{40} Keene, \textit{Saint Margaret}, 15.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, 15.
notes that an Old Church Slavonic Litany of All Saints of debated dating, but which he places in the eleventh century, “includes Sts. Agatha (Agafiiia), Marina (the Orthodox name for Margaret), and Christina (Krestina), which indicates these were available for christening names in Rus’.”

As Catherine Keene demonstrates, however, the cults of saint Margaret and Saint Christina were known throughout Latin Christendom by the eleventh century (Margaret’s relics were transferred to Montefiascone in Umbria in 908) and consequently cannot be used as evidence for the children’s descent from the Riurikid dynasty.

Finally, Norman Ingham points to the fact that the donors’ fresco in Saint Sophia in Kyiv, painted in the around 1045/1046, depicts four or five women as members of Yaroslav the Wise’s family. He identifies that the smallest woman in the fresco as Agafia, believing her to be Yaroslav the Wise’s youngest daughter. Unfortunately, however, the donors’ fresco in Saint Sophia is heavily damaged and does not survive in its original state. It was badly “restored” in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries so that the original state of its composition as it appeared in the 1040s is open to debate.

Three different reconstructions have been offered of the original composition of the fresco and no inscriptions identifying the figures survive. While it is clear that the donation fresco represents Yaroslav the Wife’s family, it is not clear which woman corresponds to which of his daughters.

Sources agree that after their stay in Rus’, Edward and Edwin then returned with András I to Hungary when the latter assumed the throne in 1046. According to William of Malmesbury’s

---

43 Keene, Saint Margaret, 16.
45 Grabar, L’art du Moyen Age 144; Lazarev, “ Le système de décoration,” fig. h, 236, and idem, Old Russian Murals and Mosaics, 48; Boeck, “Hippodrome,” 283-284.
47 Klaniczay, Holy Rulers, 132; Keene, Saint Margaret, 13.
early twelfth century chronicle, it was in Hungary that Edward married Agatha/Agafia. His is well informed source as his chronicle was dedicated to Agatha/Agafia’s grandson, King David of Scotland (r. 1124-1153). William of Malmesbury and Roger of Wendover both state that Agatha/Agafia was “the younger sister of the queen of Hungary.” Since Yaroslav’s daughter Anastasia married András I of Hungary, however, later chroniclers, knowing that Edward the Exile married a sister of the queen of Hungary, could easily assume that her sister was Hungarian herself.

In favour of the testimony that Agafia was related to the German imperial house, however, is the testimony of several important twelfth-century sources as well as the early twelfth-century interpolations in the D Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv). The D Manuscript calls Agatha/Agafia “the kinswoman of the emperor” (caseres maga) and descended from the Emperor Heinrich “who ruled over Rome” (modorcynn gað to Heinrice casere). Aelred of Rievaulx (d. 1167), who was raised at the court of Agatha’s grandson King David of Scotland, also states that Agatha/Agafia was related to the German Emperor, but in another work claims in seeming contradiction, that her daughter Margaret was of English and Hungarian descent. The twelfth-century chronicle of John of Worcester (d. after


49 Ibid., 9.


1140) identifies her as the daughter of the *germanus* of Emperor Heinrich III (1039-1056). The meaning of the word *germanus* here has been vigorously debated in scholarship, since it can mean brother, brother-in-law, or generally a male relative. Recently, scholars have argued that *germanus* cannot refer to a relative by marriage and only refers to a blood relative.

The first proponent of the “Salian” theory of Agafia’s origins, Hungarian historian and genealogist Szabolcz de Vajay, suggested that this noblewoman may have been the daughter of Gertrude and Margrave Liudolf of Westfriesland (d. 1038), who was, in turn, the son of Gisela of Swabia and her first husband Bruno of Brunswick (d. 1029). Gisela subsequently married Emperor Heinrich III which could make Agafia/Agatha the “daughter of the relative of the emperor” since her father would be the emperor’s half-brother, which accords with one possible meaning of *germanus*. Moreover, since, as Catherine Keene points out, Heinrich III’s daughter Judith married King Solomon of Hungary in 1058, the theory that she was a daughter of Margrave Liudolf could explain how she could have been related to the Hungarian royal house as well. Solomon of Hungary, in turn, was the son of Anastasia Yaroslavna, so that the chronicles’ seemingly contradictory reports of Agafia/Agatha’s German, Hungarian, and Rus’ origins may be resolved in this manner.

Ultimately, the basis for Agafia’s Rus’ origins lies in the testimony of Adam of Bremen’s chronicle, which, however, only directly states that her husband Edward was in exile in Rus’, but does not mention the fact that he married a Rus’ princess. Moreover, surprisingly not discussed

---


55 Ingham, “Missing Daughter?”, 249; Wilson, *St. Margaret Queen of Scotland*, 34-35.

56 Ibid., 35.

57 Keene, *Saint Margaret*, 14 and genealogical chart 2.


59 Ibid., 14.

60 Ibid., 14-15.
in the context of building a case for Agafia’s Rus’ origins on the basis of Adam of Bremen’s chronicle, is the fact that Adam himself only mentions that Yaroslav the Wise had three daughters. He lists their marriages and the name of their eldest sons, but says nothing about a fourth daughter. In light of Adam’s relatively well-informed knowledge of the marriage alliances of the Riurikids at this time, this omission is striking.

In 1056-1057 Edward and Agafia journeyed back to England via Germany on the invitation of his uncle Edward the Confessor, following Knud’s death in 1035 and the certainty that Edward the Confessor was to have a childless marriage.61 Edward died in London shortly after his arrival in 1057 and was buried in Saint Paul’s.62 Following the Norman invasion of England in 1066, Agatha/Agafia fled with her children to Scotland in 1067 or 1068 where they were received by King Malcom Macduncan III Canmore of Scotland (r. 1058-1093).63 Presumably Agatha/Agafia died after 1068 and was buried in Scotland after this date.64 Her place of burial is unknown.

Her son Edgar (uncrowned king of England from October to December 1066) died unmarried and without legitimate children, her daughter Christina became a nun at Romsey Abbey, while her daughter Margaret married Malcolm III of Scotland: their daughter, Edgyth (renamed Matilda on her marriage), in turn married King Henry I of England (d. 1135).65


64 Ingham, “Missing Daughter?,” 240.

5. A Rus’ princess, Vysheslava, of unknown parents, and Boleslaw II, c. 1067 (uncertain)

Father of bride: debated—Sviatoslav Yaroslavich (d. 1076)

Mother of bride: Oda of Stade (d. after 1076)

Father of groom: Kazimierz I the Restorer (d. 1058)

Mother of groom: Maria Dobroniega (d. 1087)

Children: Mieszko (d. 1089).

Comments:

Jan Długosz places the marriage between Bolesław II and Vycheslava in the year 1067 and states that Vycheslava was the only daughter of a Rus’ prince. In 1069 he adds that Vycheslava gave birth to a son, Mieszko.

As Kazimierz Jasiński states, however, little is known about the wife of Bolesław and even considers her origins to be unknown. Her existence is confirmed only by the fact that sources consider Bolesław II’s son, Mieszko Bolesławowic, to be legitimate. Following Balzer, he considers that the late sources on her origin, including Długosz, are confused. Since the Piasts in the eleventh century usually married into German or Rus’ dynasties, Jasiński considers German or Rus’ origin most likely for Bolesław II’s wife. He dates the marriage to 1068 at the

---


67 Ioannis Dlugossii Annales, ed. Budkowa sub anno 1069, 99. The marriage between Vysheslava and Boleslaw II is accepted in Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 60, even though he acknowledges that it is based solely on late sources.

68 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 155.

69 Ibid., 155.

70 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 179-180; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 155.

71 Ibid., 155.
latest since Bolesław II’s son Mieszko Bolesławowic was born the following year. Balzer also dates the marriage to before 1069 for this reason. Moreover, if it existed, then the marriage of Vysheslava and Bolesław II would also be consanguineous since both spouses were descended from Vladimir Sviatoslavich (d. 1015): Vladimir would be Bolesław II’s maternal grandfather and Vysheslava’s paternal great-grandfather.

Vysheslava’s death date and place of burial are unknown. If one accepts the description of her mourning at her son’s funeral in 1089 by the twelfth-century Gallus Anonymous as not wholly fictitious, then she was still alive in 1089 and died sometime after this date.

---

72 Ibid., 155.
73 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 179.
74 “Mortuo autem puero Meschone tota Polonia sic lugebat, sicut mater unici mortem filii. […] Ad extremum misera mater, cum in urna puer plorandus condetur, una hora quasi mortua sine vitali spiritu tenebatur, vixque post exequias ab episcopis ventilabris et aqua frigida suscitatur,” GPP, 102, discussed in Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 156.
6. A Daughter of the Czech prince Spytihněv and Sviatopolk Iziaslavich in 1072?

**Father of bride:** Spytihněv I (r. 1055-1061)

**Mother of bride:** Ida of Mainz

**Father of groom:** Iziaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078)

**Mother of groom:** Gertruda of Poland or unknown?

**Children:** Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna (d. before 1115), Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123)

**Comments:**

The marriage is not found in primary sources and is only hypothesized by A. V. Nazarenko.75

Nazarenko suggested that the first wife of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (who subsequently married the daughter of Tugorkhan in 1094) may have been a daughter of the Czech prince Spytihněv (r. 1055-1061) and Ida, the sister of margrave Dedi of Meissen.76 The hypothesis arises in order to explain in what sense Sbyslava and Bolesław III Wry-mouth (1102-1138) who married in 1113 could be related in the third degree of consanguinity as Gallus Anonymous states, if the Polish princess Gertruda was not Sviatopolk’s mother. Nazarenko’s hypothetical solution is reached on the basis of evidence from the Codex Gertrudianus, Gertruda’s personal prayer-book, in which she mentions only one son, Yaropolk. Nazarenko concludes that in order for Sbyslava and Bolesław to be related in the third degree of consanguinity as the Polish chronicler asserts, Sviatopolk’s wife must have been a daughter or granddaughter of one of the following three eleventh-century royal couples: of King Mieszko II (d. 1034) and Richeza of Poland, of King Břetilav I (d. 1055) and Judith of Bohemia, or of King András (d. 1060) and Anastasia of Hungary. Working by process of elimination of potential candidates, he suggests a daughter of Spytihněv I, himself the son of Břetislav. Spytihněv’s wife Ida was a daughter of Margrave Dedi of Meissen, whose stepdaughter, Kunegunda, married Yaropolk Iziaslavich, Sviatopolk’s brother

---

75 Nazarenko, *Drevniaia Rus’*, summary of hypothesis on 528, lengthy discussion in *Ibid.*, 559-584.

or half-brother: “Thus, the spouses of Sviatopolk and Yaropolk Iziaslavich turn out to be step first cousins, related through margrave Dedi, the son of the Lower Lusatian margrave Dietrich II from the Wettin family.”77 In light of the lack of primary sources to support this marriage, however, it remains only a hypothetical possibility.

7. Prince Mieszko of Poland and Eudoxia Sviatopolkova (?) in 1088

Father of bride: Debated. Perhaps Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113)

Mother of bride: Debated. Perhaps a Byzantine, Bohemian, or Qipchaq princess.

Father of groom: Bolesław II the Bold (or “the Bountiful”, d. 1079)

Mother of groom: possibly Rus’ princess Vycheslava (d. after 1089).

Children: no children.

Comments:

Mieszko, the only son of Bolesław II, was born in 1069. He was exiled together with his father to Hungary in 1079, following his father’s murder of Bishop Stanisław of Kraków, and returned to Poland in 1086. The twelfth-century chronicle of the so-called Gallus Anonymous reports that Boleslaw II had a son called Mieszko who married a Rus’ girl. The chronicler goes on to say that Mieszko soon died by poison. Later Polish annals of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries date Mieszko’s marriage to 1088, but they do not record the origins of his bride. They also record that Mieszko died a year later, in 1089, though they do not specify that poison was the cause.

78 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 180.
79 Ibid., 180.
80 “Habuit autem unum filium rex Bolezlaus nomine Meschonem […] placuit patruo suo Wladislauo duci […] eumque Ruthena puella […] uxorare,” GPP, 100.
81 Ibid, 102-103.
It is the fifteenth-century chronicle of Jan Długosz that claims to provide more information, giving Mieszko’s wife a name (Eudoxia) and making her a Rus’ princess. He adds that Mieszko, however, died the following year without having any children by his wife.

The wide-spread statement that Mieszko married Eudoxia, a daughter of Iziaslav Yaroslavich is found, inter alia, in Pashuto. While Jasiński accepts Gallus’ information that Mieszko’s wife was a Rus’ woman and concludes that she likely came from the Riurikid family, he follows Balzer in considering Długosz’s record of her name as Eudoxia to be unreliable. It is not known when she died or where she was buried and there do not appear to be any children from this marriage since none are mentioned in the sources.


86 Pashuto puts a question mark next to Eudoxia’s name, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 6, no. 3, 425.

87 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 204-206, Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 181.

88 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 181. Raffensperger suggests that Eudoxia may have returned to Rus’ and entered into a monastery, Ties of Kinship, 75.
8. An unknown daughter of Władysław Herman and a Rus’ prince, perhaps Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, 1101-1110

Father of bride: Władysław I Herman (d. 1102)

Mother of bride: Judith (d. after 1088)

Father of groom: Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113)

Mother of groom: Byzantine, Bohemian, or Qipchaq princess.

Children: none known

Comments:

Our only source on this marriage is the early twelfth century chronicle of Gallus Anonymous which asserts that Duke Władysław I Herman of Poland and Judith, widow of Solomon of Hungary, married one of their daughters “to a man in Rus”.

89 Scholars have long speculated on the identity of this man. The most popular thesis is that this man was Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123), the son of Sviatopolk Iziaslavich and perhaps the grandson of Gertruda Piast.

Yaroslav Iziaslavich’s sister, Sbyslava, was given in marriage to Bolesław Wrymouth, another child of Władysław Herman. N. I. Shchaveleva treats these two marriages as another example of “sister exchanges” between Polish and Rus’ rulers to cement alliances.

If this marriage did indeed take place, it would be the second marriage of Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich with a Catholic woman: his first was with the daughter of King László I of Hungary, who died around 1106.


90 Bazler, Genealogia Piastów, 224-225; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, n. 2, 331 and genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425; Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55.

91 Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55.

92 Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 6, no. 5, 425; Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55. For Yaroslav’s marriage with a daughter of King László I of Hungary see above, Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 17.
In favour of the authenticity of this marriage, according to N. I. Shchaveleva and Kazimierz Jasiński, is the help that Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich gave in 1107 to his brother-in-law Bolesław III Wrymouth against the latter’s step-brother and rival for the Polish throne, Zbigniew. She explains the lack of information on this marriage in Rus’ sources by the fact that this marriage was very brief: by 1112 Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich was a widower for the third time and married to a granddaughter of Vladimir Monomakh. Instead of Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, however, Pierre David suggested David Igorevich (d. 1112) may have been the husband in question in order to explain the presence of a “dux David” in the twelfth-century obituary of Saint-Gilles in Provence, which was patronized by the Polish ducal house.

Gallus Anonymous, however, mentions Yaroslav by name elsewhere in his twelfth-century chronicle without explicitly connecting him to the Polish ducal family. While Jasiński agrees that the omission of the name and rank of the husband of Władysław Herman’s daughter is surprising, he does not think this fact should be weighted too heavily. He notes that Gallus Anonymous was not concerned with recording the names of Władysław Herman’s daughters; he was only concerned that Władysław Herman had no sons. Gallus Anonymous likewise does not record the names of the wives of Bolesław the Brave, Mieszko II, Kazimierz the Restorer and Bolesław the Bountiful: in short, it was not important for him to record the maternal line of the Piasts. Nonetheless it may be significant that the Rus’ Primary Chronicle also does not mention that Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich married a Polish woman, even though it records the marriage of his sisters (Sbyslava, wife of Bolesław III Wrymouth, and Predslava, wife of the Hungarian prince Álmos), as well as Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich’s marriage in 1112 with a daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich.

---

93 Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 195.
94 Shchaveleva, “Polki- zheny,” 55.
95 David, “La Pologne dans l’obituaire,” 221-222; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 195. Balzer rejects this possibility that a daughter of Władysław Herman married David Igorevich on the chronological grounds that she would have been too young when he married in 1097, Genealogia Piastów, 224.
96 “Yaroslao duce Rutheno simulque Balduino Cracouiensi episcopo mediantibus,” GPP, 188; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 19.
97 Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 195.
98 Ibid, 196.
Jasiński concludes that Balzer’s hypothesis concerning Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, although widespread in secondary literature, remains simply a hypothesis. It can only be said with certainty that the woman’s marriage was arranged during Władysław Herman’s lifetime (i.e. before his death in 1102). 99 We know that she was still alive at the time that Gallus Anonymous was writing his chronicle, i.e. around 1112. 100

99 Ibid, 196.
100 Ibid, 196.

**Father of bride:** Kálmán of Hungary (d. 1114)

**Mother of bride:** Norman princess of Sicily (d. before 1112), daughter of Count Roger of Sicily (d. 1101)

**Father of groom:** Volodar Rostislavich (d. 1124)

**Mother of groom:** unknown\(^\text{101}\)

**Children:** Yaroslav “the Eight-Minded” Osmomysl (d. 1187)

**Comments:**

The marriage between prince Vladimiro Volodarevich and a daughter of King Kálmán of Hungary is hypothesized on the basis of the eighteenth-century history of Vasilii Tatishchev, who states that in 1126 Vladimiro Volodarevich fled from prince Mstislav Vladimirovich to Hungary with his wife and children “to his father-in-law.”\(^\text{102}\) No other source mentions this event.\(^\text{103}\) Nonetheless, some historians, such as Christian Raffensperger, accept the factuality of the marriage since in 1144 Vladimiro Volodarevich received military help from the Hungarians and the reason for this military support could be explained by a pre-existing marriage alliance.\(^\text{104}\)

---

\(^{101}\) Volodar may have been married to a Pomeranian princess, since he was allied with the Pomeranians, Voitovich, *Kniažha doba*, 330.

\(^{102}\) “No Vladimiro, uboias’ Mstislava, vziav zhenu i detei, uekhal v Vengry k testiu prosit’ voiska” (“But Vladimiro, having become afraid of Mstislav, took his wife and children, and went to Hungary to his father-in-law to request an army”), Tatishchev, *Istoriia rossiiskaia*, vol. 2, *sub anno* 6634 (1126), 138.

\(^{103}\) The marriage is discussed in Gyöffy, “Das Güterverzeichnis,” 58.

10. Piotr Włostowic and Maria, circa 1117-1123.

**Father of bride:** ? (highly debated)

**Mother of bride:** ? (highly debated)

**Father of groom:** Włost (fl. late eleventh/early twelfth century)

**Mother of groom:** ?

**Children:** Świętosław (Sviatoslav), Konstantyn, Idzi [Giles / Latin. Aegidius], Agafia. Possibly also Beatrycze (Beatrice) and Wszebór.

**Comments:**

The genealogy both of Maria and her husband are obscure and consequently highly debated. Three key sources describe Maria’s Rus’ origins and her marriage to Piotr. An interpolation in the late thirteenth-century *Chronicle of the Poles*, states that Maria was the daughter of the “king of the Rus.” The late thirteenth century/early fourteenth century *Chronicle of Greater Poland* states that “Peter, later called Piotrko the Great, married the daughter of a certain prince of the Rus’, who was a blood-relative of the wife of Bolesław [Wry-mouth], after King Boleslaw had arranged it.” It also specifies that this woman was the aunt of Bolesław’s successor, Władysław II. Finally, a twelfth-century source, the *Translation of the Hand of Saint Stephen* claims that a certain “Patricius”—identified by the majority of scholars as Piotr—was sent to Rus’ on behalf of his lord Bolesław III to negotiate a marriage alliance with the daughter of the

---


108 “Verum vir ille Pyotrko Magnus, qui Wladislaï amitam habebat uxorom…,” *Ibid.*, 49.
Rus’ king and a Greek noblewoman.\textsuperscript{109} On the basis of this source Maria’s father has been identified as Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (d. 1113) who took as his second wife a Byzantine noblewoman.\textsuperscript{110} A second candidate for Maria’s father frequently cited in scholarly literature is prince Oleg Sviatoslavich of Chernihiv (d. 1115), who was possibly married to the Byzantine princess Theophano Mouzalonissa.\textsuperscript{111}

Only the early sixteenth-century\textit{ Chronicle of Piotr}, a prose version of a now-lost verse\textit{ chanson de geste} concerning Piotr called the\textit{ Carmen Mauri}, makes the claim that Maria was the daughter of prince Volodar Rostislavich of Przemyśl (d. 1124), whom Piotr had abducted.\textsuperscript{112} Piotr’s abduction of Volodar is corroborated by various Polish, German, and Rus’ sources, but only this sixteenth-century text mentions that Piotr married Volodar’s daughter.\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Translatio}, ed. Wallach, 124.

\textsuperscript{110} August Bielowski, followed by Nicolas de Baumgarten and V. T. Pashuto, identifies this Byzantine lady as Barbara Komnena, daughter of the Emperor Alexis Komnenos (r. 1081-1118). However, Alexander Kazhdan, followed by Christian Raffensperger and David Birnbaum, has shown that Alexius had no daughter by that name nor do Byzantine sources report such a marriage. In the absence of corroborating sources, one can only take Ortlieb’s account at face value and accept that Sviatopolk’s wife was a noble Byzantine woman, de Baumgarten, “Généalogies et mariages occidentaux,” no. 3 in table 2: “Maison de Tourov”, 10 and no. 3, 11, Kazhdan, “Rus’-Byzantine Marriages,” 419. Raffensperger, while admitting that Maria’s parentage is controversial, considers that Sviatopolk Iziaslavich could have been her father, but believes that her mother was an unknown woman, the daughter of the steppe nomad Tugorkhan (d. 1125) whom Sviatopolk married in 1125,\textit{Ties of Kinship}, genealogical table on 101.

\textsuperscript{111} Włodarski, “Ruś w planach,” 48; Janusz Bieniak, “Polska elita polityczna XII wieku. Częć II. Wróżda i zgoda,” in \textit{Społeczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej. Zbiór studiów}, vol 3, ed. Stefan Kuczyński (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985), 54-55; Voitovich, \textit{Kniazha doba}, 358; Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria,” 739. The marriage between Oleg and Theophano is maintained by Dimnik, but rejected by Kazhdan. See the summary of the debate in Raffensperger, \textit{Ties of Kinship}, 67. Benyskiewicz’s objection to Maria being counted as a daughter of Oleg Sviatoslavich on the grounds that only male children are recorded in Rus’ sources as belonging to this prince does not convince, since Rus’ chronicle frequently omit mention of daughters. More convincing are his objections on chronological grounds that the marriage would, in that case, have to be concluded before Oleg’s death in 1115 when Sviatopolk Iziaslavich, of a rival Riurikid branch, was still in control of Kyiv, “Księżna Maria,” 739-740.


\end{footnotesize}
Maria was the daughter of an unspecified duke of France, but this fact not corroborated by any another source.114

The origins of Maria’s husband count palatine Piotr are equally debated among historians and genealogists. The fact that his father was a man called Włost is known only from Piotr’s patronymic (Włostowic, “son of Włost”).115 The earliest source to speak of Piotr’s origins is the late thirteenth century/early fourteenth-century *Chronicle of Greater Poland* which claims that he was from Denmark (“Dacia”).116 The *Chronicle of Greater Poland* considers, however, that the Piotr who was of Danish origin and married a Rus’ princess was different from the Piotr Włostowic (“comes Petrus Wlostides de Kszansz”) who captured the Rus’ prince Volodar.117 All other sources identify Volodar’s abductor with count palatine Piotr and with the same Piotr who had a Rus’ princess as his wife and the “Danish” origins story is not considered to be historically reliable.118 At the turn of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century, however, the Silesian branch of the Polish Łabędź (“Swan”) family of magnates, which traced its descent from Piotr Włostowic, considered the two Piotrs to be one and the same and consequently claimed a noble Danish ancestry for itself.119

---

114 “Id quadam autem cronica Polonorum et ducum Slesie legitur, quod ipse Petrus comes Slesie ipsam dominam Mariam de regno Francie, filiam cujusdam ducis, duxit in uxorem,” *Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena*, ed. Stenzel, 63, discussed in Benyskiewicz, “Księżna Maria”, n. 25, 736. See also below.


Another theory of Piotr’s origins is that he came from Rus’, like his wife, since the geographic place-name “Dacia” could be applied to both Rus’ as well as Denmark in the twelfth century, as indicated by the Sawley Map, which includes the label “Dacia sive Russia.” In 1974, Marek Cetwiński further developed the theory that Piotr was, in fact, of Rus’ origin, namely that he was a son of prince Sviatoslav (“Sviatosha”) Davidovich of the Chernihiv line, and that he came to Poland when the Rus’ princess Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna married Bolesław III in 1106. He came to this conclusion on the basis of the fourteenth-century Kraków Annals which name Piotr’s father as Sviatoslav and which, for chronological reasons, Cetwiński narrows down to the prince of Chernihiv. Accepting this theory entails, as a consequence, rejecting the thirteenth-century chronicle of Master Wincenty Kadłubek of Kraków which ascribes to Piotr the patronymic “Vlostides” (Włostowic). Based on this patronym, however, the location of Piotr’s estates in Silesia and the fact that all of the monastic foundations of his family were in Silesia, the most plausible genealogical hypothesis is that Piotr was a nobleman of local Silesian origin.

Late medieval sources give the names of several of Piotr and Maria’s children: Świętosław (Sviatoslav), Konstantin (Constantine), Idzi (or Giles / Latin. Egidius), Agafia (Agatha) and Beatrycze (Beatrice). Some scholars, trying to reconcile the different chronicle sources have

---

120 Marek Cetwiński, “Piotr Włostowic czy Piotr Rusin?” in Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka 29.4 (1974), 432 and Bieniek, Piotr Włostowic, fig. 2, 16 (for an image of the map).

121 Cetwiński, “Piotr Włostowic czy Rusin?”, 429-443.


123 Cetwiński argues that the patronymic “Vlostides” must have been inserted into the copies of Kadłubek’s chronicle and could not have been found in the original (lost) autograph manuscript, “Piotr Włostowic czy Rusin?”, 435-439.

124 Bieniak, “Ród Łabędziów,” 228, likewise Bieniek, Piotr, 31-38.

125 Giles (Aegidius) is mentioned in Piotr’s son in Kronika szląska skrórona, ed. Semkowicz, 723 and Cronica Petri, ed. Plezia, 15, 18, 21, 33. Świętosław (Sviatoslav) is mentioned as Piotr’s son in Monumenta Wroclaviensi, ed. Semkowicz, 732 and Cronica Petri, ed. Plezia, 8. His name is also mentioned on the twelfth-century Latin inscription on the Church of Our-Lady-on-the-Sand in Wrocław. Beatrice is mentioned as Piotr and Maria’s daughter in Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena, ed. Stenzel, 161. Agafia was the wife of the Sorbian Duke Jaksa, as is known from a twelfth-century inscription on the monastery of Saint Michael’s in
suggested that Agafia and Beatrice may have been one and the same person, i.e. that this daughter had a double-name as was still common among the nobility of Rus’ and Poland in the twelfth century. Others have likewise suggested that Konstantin or Giles might have been Świętosław’s second name. As noted in Chapter Five, the question remains open. The identity of Agafia’s husband Jaksa is also debated.

Janusz Bieniak attempted to authenticate the tradition of the Łabędź family that claimed descent from Piotr Włostowic by arguing that Piotr and Maria had another son called Wszebór, whose descendents founded the Łabędź clan. He based his argument primarily on the appearance of a knight called Piotr in a charter of 1193, issued when Piotr Włostowic’s monastic foundation of Saint Vincent in Olbin was transformed from a Benedictine to a Premonstratensian house. The younger Piotr’s donations precede those of Piotr Włostowic’s grandsons Włodzimierz and Wrocław. The Chronicle of Greater Poland states that she was the daughter of Piotr Wlast, Kronika Wielkopolska, ed. Kürbis, 50. The same source also states that Piotr’s son was called Konstantin (“Constantinus”), Ibid, 50. The Chronicle of Piotr mentions that Piotr’s daughter married Duke Jaksa, but does not provide her name, Cronica Petri, ed. Plezia, 19 and 30.

Wroclaw. The Chronicle of Greater Poland states that she was the daughter of Piotr Wlast, Kronika Wielkopolska, ed. Kürbis, 50. The same source also states that Piotr’s son was called Konstantin (“Constantinus”), Ibid, 50. The Chronicle of Piotr mentions that Piotr’s daughter married Duke Jaksa, but does not provide her name, Cronica Petri, ed. Plezia, 19 and 30.

126 On double names among the nobility see Chapter Two, “Regina Binomina.”

127 According to Stanislaw Kętrzyński, Świętosław had the second name Konstantin, “O imionach piastowskich,” 599. Trawkowski suggests that Giles and Świętosław could have been the same person, “Piotr Włostowic,” 357-358.

128 Cetwiński accepts only Agafia as a child of Piotr’s and Maria’s and rejects all other information about his Piotr’s children as based on uncertain sources, “Piotr Włostowic czy Rusin?”, 439.

129 Two noblemen called Jaksa appear in Polish and German sources in the mid twelfth century. One, the Sorbian Jaksa of Köpenick (now a district of Berlin), was a relative of the West Slavic prince Pribislav-Henryk of Wagria. At Pribislav’s death without a son, Jaksa contested the claim of the Saxon lord, Margrave Albrecht the Bear for the territory of Brandenburg (Slavic: Brenna). This Jaksa, who had lands in Poland, managed to capture Albrecht and hold on to Brandenburg from 1154 to 1157. A number of coins minted by him from this period survive. After his defeat by Albrecht in 1157 he took up residence in Wrocław. The other nobleman active at the same time was Jaksa of Miechów of Lesser Poland, who is known primarily for his pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1162 and his subsequent foundation of the canons of the Holy Sepulchre in Miechów in Poland. According to some scholars, Jaksa of Kopanicy of Silesia and Jaksa of Miechów in Lesser Poland were the same person. See Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic,” 358; Gerard Labuda, “Jaksa z Kopanicy” and idem, “Jaksa z Miechowa,” in PSB, 339-341 (rejecting evidence that these two noblemen were the same person); Gladysz, Forgotten crusaders, 61-65, esp. 63 (arguing that these two men were one and the same). Jerzy Rajman discusses the issue of whether the two Jakasas are one and the same person and is inclined to consider that this is the case, even if the sources are not entirely clear, “Pilger und Stifter,” 317-318, 338-345.

Leonard (Świętosław’s sons) in the list.  

Bieniak argued that the knight Piotr was Piotr Włostowic’s grandson by a previously unknown son, Wszebór. Stanisław Trawkowski is more doubtful of the Łabędź tradition, suggesting rather that this family probably conflated the figure of Piotr, celebrated in a song of deeds already in the mid twelfth or early thirteenth century, with other twelfth-century noblemen with the same name.

Piotr died around 1151/1153 and was buried in his foundation of Saint Vincent’s. Based on the dating of the relief sculpture on the foundation tympanum of Our Lady-on-the-Sands in Wrocław to 1160-1170 in which Maria appears as a donor with her son Świętosław but without her husband Piotr, it seems that Maria survived her husband by some ten years. She was buried at her husband’s side.

---


132 Bieniak extracts the name “Wszebór” from an inscription in the Praemonstratensian convent of Holy Cross in Strzelno, subordinated to Piotr’s foundation of Saint Vincent, as well as “the inheritance by Wszebór’s family of Skrzyńsko, which according to historiographic tradition [sic] was given to Piotr Włostowic,” “Ród Łabędziów,” reprint. 227 (“[…] dziedziczenie przez rodzinę Wszeborzców Skrzyńskiego, według tradycji historiograficznej nadanego Piotrowi Włostowicowi.”). Which member of Piotr Włostowic’s family founded Strzelno remains controversial in historiography, however, Jamroziak, “Foundations,” 186.

133 Trawkowski, “Piotr Włostowic”, 358.


11. Vsevolod Davidovich and a daughter of Bolesław Wrymouth III of Poland or of count palatine Skarbimir in 1124.

**Father of bride:** Bolesław Wrymouth III of Poland (d. 1138) or of count palatine Skarbimir (d. circa 1138)

**Mother of bride:** Sbyslava Sviatopolkvna (d. before 1115) or Salomea of Berg (d. 1144) or unknown.

**Father of groom:** David Sviatoslavich (d. 1123) or unknown

**Mother of groom:** Feodosiia or unknown

**Children:** ?

**Comments:**

The marriage between a “Polish woman” and Vsevolod Davidovich (d. after 1124), prince of Murom, took place in 1123/1124 according to the Kyivan Chronicle, which is the only extant source on the subject: “In that year a Polish woman was brought to Murom as [a wife for] Vsevolod Davidovich.”

Oswald Balzer’s thesis that the unnamed Polish woman who married Vsevolod Davidovich was a daughter of Bolesław Wry-mouth III and the Rus’ princess Sbyslava has been widely accepted in scholarship. No source records that Bolesław III and Sbyslava had a daughter who married a Rus’ prince, however. Consequently, Janusz Bieniak first hypothesized that the wife of

---

137 Feodosiia’s name is known only from the seventeenth-century necrology of Liubech: O Chernigovskikh kniaziakh po Liubetskomu sinodiku, ed. and commentary, Zotov, 24. Her origins are unknown, Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 372.

138 “..Tom zhe lĕtĕ vedosha Lĕkhovitsiu Miuromu za Davydovicha Vsevoloda”; PSRL, vol 2, sub anno 6632 (1123/1124), 288.

139 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 246-249; Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, genealogical table 5, no. 2, 424; Włodarski, “Ruś w planach,” 53; Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 358; discussed in Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 207, and Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 104.

140 Ibid., 104.
Vsevolod Davidovich could have been the daughter of the Polish count palatine at the time, Skarbimir (d. circa 1138). Kazimierz Jasiński is inclined to accept Bieniak’s thesis, since the German twelfth-century chronicler Herbold speaks of Bolseław Wry-mouth and Sbyslava as only having one child (Władysław II the Exile) and Gallus Anonymous also makes no mention of their having any daughters. Since, however, the sources do not preserve any genealogical information about Vsevolod Davidovich’s wife, he does not exclude Balzer’s thesis entirely and notes that because of the silence of the sources, any solution to the problem can remain only hypothetical.

Polish historians have long commented on how Bolesław Wry-mouth III of Poland (whose first wife was the Rus’ princess Sbyslava Sviatopolkovna) used marriage alliances widely in his dealings with Kyivan Rus’. N. I. Shchaveleva, following Bronisław Włodarski, argues that Bolesław Wrymouth wanted to ally with Rus’ princely families other than the Monomachichi, since she believed that the Monomachichi were full of enmity toward Poland (her evidence for this claim is Vladimir Monomakh’s capture of Gertruda). Bronisław Włodarski presents this marriage as act of reconciliation between Bolesław III and the Monomashichi, following the death of his Rus’ wife’s brother, Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich, in 1123. Christian Raffensperger is more doubtful, noting that there is no compelling reason for a marriage between a Polish princess and an obscure prince of Murom. He considers that her identity remains unknown.

---

141 Janusz Bieniak, “Polska elita,” 71-72; discussed in Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 207.
142 Ibid., 207.
143 Janusz Bieniak, “Polska elita,” 71-72; Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów, 207.
145 Ibid., 55.
146 Włodarski, “Ruś w planach,” 53.
147 Raffensperger, Ties of Kinship, 105.
148 Ibid, 105.
12. Maria and Vsevolod Olgovich in c. 1127

**Alleged father of bride:** Kazimierz the Restorer (d. 1058)

**Alleged Mother of bride:** Maria Dobroniega (d. 1087)

**Father of groom:** Oleg Sviatoslavich (d. 1115)

**Mother of groom:** Theophano Mouzalonissa (d. before 1090)

**Children:** Sviatoslav (d. 1194), Zvenislava (d. 1155-1163), Yaroslav (d. 1198)

According to the seventeenth-century *Hustynia Chronicle* Kazimierz I the Restorer and Maria Dobroniega had a daughter called Maria, who became the wife of the Rus’ prince Vsevolod Olgovich (d. 1146). This marriage is not supported by any other source, however. From the Rus’ chronicles, it appears that Maria was rather the daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich (d. 1132) and Kristin of Sweden (d. 1122): that is to say, that hers was an internal marriage alliance between members of the Riuriki family, not an inter-rite one.
13. Prebyslava Yaroslavna and Ratibor I of Pomerania, circa 1140s

Father of bride (debated): Yaroslav Sviatopolkovich (d. 1123)

Mother of bride (debated): a daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich the Great (d. 1132)

Father of groom: Świętołobor (d. ca. 1107)?\(^{151}\)

Mother of groom: unknown

Children: Margaret of Pomerania (d. before 1197/1198), Świętopełk (fl. 1175).

Comments:

The Rus’ origins of Prebyslava are hypothesized by Nicolas de Baumgarten based on onomastics.\(^{152}\) After his conversion to Christianity in 1148, prince Ratibor I of Pomerania (d. 1155 or 1156), co-issued charters for his foundation of the Premonstratensian monastery of Grobe (also known as Pudagla Abbey) on the Baltic island of Usedom/Uznam along with a wife who had a Slavic name: Prebyslava or Predisyława.\(^{153}\) Saxo Grammaticus states that their daughter Margaret (Polish: Małgorzata) married Count Bernhard of Ratzeburg, and also that Margaret was the “niece” of King Valdemar I of Denmark.\(^{154}\) Baumgarten argues that Margaret must have been related to Valdemar through her mother and hypothesizes that her Margaret’s

---

\(^{151}\) Prince Ratibor (Polish: Racibor) of Pomerania’s descent from prince Świętołobor is reported in a late source, the *Chronik von Pommern* by Thomas Kantzow (circa 1505-1542), Rymar, *Rodowód książąt pomorskich*, 16 and 106. 


\(^{153}\) Prebyslava’s name appears in a charter issued by Bishop Adalbert of Pomerania on June 8th 1159 for Grobe Abbey in which the bishop confirms the possessions granted to the abbey by her and her husband Ratibor I: “quoscunque usus seu quecunque bona domnus Ratiboro cum pia coniuga sua Pribizlawa ecclesie sancte Marie santique Godeardi in Grobe De intuiui pietatisque affectu tradiderunt [… ] confirmamus,” *Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1: 786-1253, rev. ed. Klaus Conrad (Vienna: Böhlau, 1970), no. 48, 52. Her name appears as “Pribizlaua” in the confirmation charter issued by Adalbert’s successor, Bishop Konrad I of Pomerania, in 1168: “cum pia consortae sua Pribizlaua”, *Ibid*, no. 51a, 57. The charters are discussed in Baumgarten, “Prbyslava,”156.

mother was a daughter (of unknown name) of Mstislav the Great Vladimirovich (d. 1132).\textsuperscript{155} Another of Mstislav’s daughters, Ingeborg, was the mother of King Valdemar I, which would make Margaret Valdemar’s first cousin.\textsuperscript{156} While Baumgarten’s thesis has provoked some debate, his argument still remains accepted, partly because the name “Prebyslava” was indeed used in the Riurikid dynasty.\textsuperscript{157}

The marriage between Prebyslava and Ratibor took place around 1131-1136, perhaps through the mediation of the Rus’ princess Malmfrid Mstislavna, wife of King Erik Emune of Denmark, who was campaigning against the pagan Pomeranians at this time.\textsuperscript{158} From Saxo Grammaticus we learn of Margaret’s existence, while the existence of a son called Świętopełk is known only from his appearance in a charter of 1175 in favour of Grobe Abbey.\textsuperscript{159}

Prebyslava died sometime after 1155/1156 and was buried together with her husband in their foundation of Grobe.\textsuperscript{160} Their remains were moved to the monastery’s new location in Usedom (Polish: Uznam) in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{161} Until the nineteenth century, an early modern tombstone contained the image of Prebyslava with her hands clasped in prayer at the side of her husband, depicted in armour holding a shield depicting a griffin, emblem of the Gryfici dynasty of Pomeranian dukes to which he belonged.\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 158-161.
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., 158.
\textsuperscript{157} Voitovich, Kniazza doba, 359, Rymar, Rodowód książąt pomorskich, 107-109.
\textsuperscript{158} Rymar, Rodowód książąt pomorskich, 109.
\textsuperscript{159} “Szpenthepolc filius ducis Ratheberni,” as cited in Rymar, Rodowód książąt pomorskich, 121.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 106-107.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., n. 62, 106.
\textsuperscript{162} For a reproduction of a line-drawing of Ratibor and Prebyslava’s tombstone, see Rymar, Ibid., 106. The tomb had the following inscription: “Centum cum mille quinquaginta quoque quinque Ratiborus dux egregius fuit hic tumulatus / Cum consorte simul vitae voti Primislava/Qui dux Slavorum fuerat et Leuticiorum/ Et fidei primus auctor, non actibus imus,” as cited in Ibid, n. 62, 106.
14. A princess of Germany, “consanguinea Frederici imperatoris” and Iziaslav Mstislavich (d. 1151), before 1151.

Father of bride: Emperor Konrad III (d. 1152, hypothesized)

Mother of bride: Gertrude of Comburg (d. 1130/1131, hypothesized)

Father of groom: Mstislav Vladimirovich the Great (d. 1132)

Mother of groom: Kristin of Sweden (d. 1122)

Children: Eudoxia (d. after 1187), daughter of unknown name (d. after 1151/1152), Mstislav (d. 1170), Yaroslav (d. 1176), Yaropolk (d. 1168).

Comments:

The late thirteenth century/early fourteenth century Chronicle of Greater Poland identified the second wife of Mieszko III the Old, the Rus’ princess Eudoxia, as the blood-relative (consanguinea) of Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (r. 1152-d. 1190). This information was accepted by, among others, Nicholas Baumgarten and V. T. Pashuto, who hypothesized on this basis that Eudoxia’s father, Iziaslav Mstislavich, must have been married to a German princess. Pashuto argued that the support of Czech troops for Iziaslav’s sister Queen Euphrosyne in her battle against Byzantium in 1164 corroborated his thesis: in his opinion, the Czech forces were allied with the Germans forces of Frederick I.

The German historian Hansmartin Decker-Hauff slightly modified this hypothesis, by attempting to identify Iziaslav Mstislavich’s first wife as a daughter of Emperor Konrad III Hohenstaufen

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{163}}\] Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 241 citing in n. 53, 244: Kronika wielkopolska, ed. Kürbis, 55: “reliquis tres [filiis] de consanguinea Frederici imperatoris regis Romanorum suscepit."

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{164}}\] Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika 219 and genealogical table 4, no. 1. 423, Voitovich, Kniazha doba, 461, discussed in Dąbrowski, Genealogia Mścisławiczów, 121.

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{165}}\] Pashuto, Vneshniaia politika, 219.
and Konrad III’s first wife Getrude of Comburg.\(^\text{166}\) These claims have been rejected by Polish genealogist Kazimierz Jasiński, however. The *Chronicle of Greater Poland*, Jasiński argues, likely relied on the *Chronicle* of Master Wincenty Kadłubek for its information about Mieszko III, which in a few places is confused.\(^\text{167}\) It is unlikely, argues Jasiński, that Kadłubek would have neglected to mention a Hohenstaufen marriage in his chronicle, especially because he was familiar with Mieszko III’s affinity with Frederick and correctly identified Mieszko III’s son-in-law (the husband of Mieszko III’s daughter Wierzchosława Ludmiła) as duke Frederick of Lorraine, the nephew of Frederick Barbarossa.\(^\text{168}\) This family connection described by Vincent Kadłubek was mistakenly ascribed to Mieszko III’s wife by the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*.\(^\text{169}\) Jasiński concludes that therefore Decker-Hauff’s theory about the marriage of Iziaslav and a daughter of Frederick Barbarossa should be rejected.\(^\text{170}\)

If this hypothesis is indeed to be rejected, then the origins of Iziaslav’s first wife are unknown.\(^\text{171}\) She died in 1151.\(^\text{172}\) After her death, Iziaslav married Rusudan, daughter of King Demetrius I of Georgia, who outlived him and returned to Georgia after his death in 1154.\(^\text{173}\)


\(^\text{167}\) Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 241


\(^\text{170}\) *Ibid.*, 241

\(^\text{171}\) Dąbrowski suggests that perhaps Iziaslav’s first wife was a Rus’ princess, *Genealogia Mścisławiczów*, 122-123.

\(^\text{172}\) PRSL, vol. 1 *sub anno* 6659 (1151), 336; PSRL, vol. 2, *sub anno* 6659 (1151) 446.

15. Bolesław IV the Curly of Poland and Maria, possibly a Rus’ princess, his second wife in circa 1160

Father of bride: unknown

Mother of bride: unknown

Father of groom: Bolesław III Wrymouth of Poland (d. 1138)

Mother of groom: Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

Children: (debated) perhaps Leszek (d. 1186)

Comments:

The only reference to the fact that Bolesław IV the Curly’s second wife was a Rus’ princess is in the fifteenth-century chronicle of Jan Długosz, who, however, calls her “Helena” and states that she was the daughter of the prince of Przemyśl. Later, however, under the year 1173, however, Długosz refers to her as Maria. The chronicle is not reliable in this regard, and the information Długosz provides on Maria’s origins is considered untrustworthy by genealogists. Jasiński considers Długosz’ report that the marriage of Bolesław IV the Curly with Maria took place in 1160 to be a guess (though probably a correct one) on the part of the fifteenth-century chronicler, not a fact established on any source.

Maria’s name and historical existence is confirmed by a charter dating to December 31st 1167, in which she gives the villages of Złota and Łojowice to Bishop Gedko of Kraków (r. 1166-


176 Ibid., 230.

177 Ibid., 230.
1185) in exchange for the villages Skotniki and Świężyca.\(^{178}\) The authenticity of this charter, however, is uncertain. Its editor, Franciszek Piekiłoński, considers that this charter may be a forgery or at least a general record of the agreement, rather than an exact copy of the charter itself, because the charter is written in a narrative style unlike the typical donation formulas of other twelfth-century charters (for instance, instead of the two main parties of the contact issuing the act in the first person, they are instead described in the third person).\(^ {179}\)

According to Jan Długosz, Bolesław IV’s first wife Verchslava died in 1158 while giving birth to her second child, Leszko.\(^ {180}\) This assertion has sparked a great debate among historians and genealogists as to whether Bolesław’s children were born from Verkhoslava or from Bolesław’s second wife, Maria.\(^ {181}\) If one accepts the hypothesis that Leszek (the youngest child of Bolesław IV the Curly) was born in the 1160s, then it is possible that he could be Maria’s child.\(^ {182}\)

Although Jan Długosz claims that Bolesław IV died before his second wife, Magdalena Biniaś-Szkopek argues that the opposite was the case based on the figures that appear on the foundation tympanum in Olbin in which Bolesław appears with his son, but not his wife.\(^ {183}\) On the basis of the dating of this tympanum, she suggests that Maria died before 1172.\(^ {184}\) The fact that the marriage was brief in duration and probably produced no children can explain why so little information about Maria has survived in written sources.\(^ {185}\)


\(^{179}\) Ibid., n. 2, 2.

\(^{180}\) *Ioannis Dlugosii Annales, Liber Quintus*, ed. Budkowa, *sub anno* 1158, 65. For the debate on Verchslava’s death date, see also Appendix 3, “Genealogical Information,” no. 27.


\(^{182}\) Ibid., 230.

\(^{183}\) Biniaś-Szkopek, *Bolesław IV Kędzierzawy*, 95.

\(^{184}\) Ibid., 95.

\(^{185}\) Ibid., 95.
Maria’s death date and place of burial is unknown.\textsuperscript{186} We only know that she died after 1167 since in the charter of 1167 she appears as a living person.\textsuperscript{187} In secondary literature, however, she is usually identified as a Rus’ princess.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{186}\textit{Ibid.}, 95.

\textsuperscript{187} Jasiński, \textit{Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów}, 230.

\textsuperscript{188} \textit{Ibid.}, 230.
16. Helena and Kazimierz II the Just in circa 1165

**Father of bride:** Konrad II of Znojmo

**Mother of bride:** Maria of Serbia.

**Father of groom:** Bolesław III Wrymouth (d. 1138)

**Mother of groom:** Salomea of Berg (d. 1144)

**Children:** Leszek the White (d. 1227) and Konrad I of Mazovia (d. 1247). Probably also Kazimierz (d. 1167), and Bolesław (d. 1182).

**Comments:**

The fifteenth-century chronicle of Jan Długosz claims that in the year 1168 the youngest son of Duke Bolesław III of Poland, Kazimierz the Just, married Helena, the daughter of prince Vsevolod of Belz. 189 Helena’s filiation and the date of her marriage to Kazimierz the Just is also repeated in early modern Russian sources, which use Długosz as a source, including the history of Tatishchev. 190

Oswald Balzer, however, rejected both the date of the marriage given in Długosz and the filiation given for this princess by the fifteenth-century chronicler. Instead, he proposed the widely-accepted thesis that Kazimierz the Just’s wife, Helena or Elena, was a Rus’ princess, the daughter of prince Rostislav Mstislavich of Smolensk (d. 1167), and that her marriage to Kazimierz the Just took place probably around 1163. 191 He based his hypothesis both on the fact that Rostislav was ruling Kyiv at this time (from 1159 to 1167), and thus was an enviable partner

---


191 Balzer, *Genealogia Piastów*, 323-327. This view is followed by Pashuto, *Vneshniaia politka*, 160 and genealogical table 7, no. 1, 426.
for a marriage alliance, and also on the basis that the *Kyivan Chronicle*, which calls Kazimierz the Just’s son, Leszek the White, the “brother” of Rostislav Mstislavich’s grandson, Mstislav Mstislavich “the Capable” (*Udaloy*, d. 1228). The two rulers were not literally brothers, but he considers that the term was used by the Rus’ chronicle to indicate kinship between their families through marriage.

In 1978, however, Tadeusz Wasilewski, proposed a completely different genealogy for Helena, which has since been accepted by subsequent scholars. In contrast to Balzer, he interpreted the *Kyivan Chronicle’s* reference to Leszek the White as Mstislav Mstislavich’s “brother” as a synonym for “political ally.” Wasilewski proposed instead that Helena was the daughter of Konrad II of Znojmo, a member of the Czech Přemyslid dynasty, and Maria, the daughter of the Serbian zhupan Urosh. Wasilewski based this thesis on the chronicle of Wincenty Kadłubek, which, in the course of describing the rivalry for the throne of Kraków between Mieszko III the Old and Kazimierz the Just, described the Czech duke Konrad III Otto as Kazimierz’s brother-in-law (*frater iugalis*). Wasilewski further corroborated his argument through onomastic evidence, arguing that for this reason Helena gave the name Konrad to her son and noting that “Helena” was also the name of her aunt, the wife of King Béla II of Hungary (in its Hungarian form, Ilona).

---


197 Helena’s mother, Maria, was the sister of Ilona, the wife of King Béla II the Blind of Hungary; both were daughters of Uroš I of Serbia, Wasilewski, “Helena księżniczka,” 117-118, Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 266.
Jasiński dates the marriage of Kazimierz and Helena sometime to 1160-1165 or 1166; Wasilewski to 1166/1167. Balzer had dated the marriage to 1163 based on the birth-date of a daughter (of unknown name) of Kazimierz and Helena and on his dating of Kazimierz’s return from Germany, where he had been given to Frederick Barbarossa as a hostage by his brothers fighting over the throne of Kraków. Based on Kazimierz the Just’s appearance in the witness-list of a document from May 21st 1161, however, Jasiński demonstrates that Kazimierz had already returned to Poland by 1161.

In 1931 Stanisław Kętrzyński put forward the theory that Kazimierz the Just was married twice, and considered Helena to be Kazimierz’s second wife. He based this theory on the birth-dates of Kazimierz’s sons Leszek the White and Konrad of Mazovia, 1186/1187 and 1187/1188, respectively. He argues that they were born to Helena after Kazimierz’s first wife died. According to this theory, Kazimierz’s marriage with Helena took place around 1185-1186, that is twenty years later than the date first proposed by Balzer. Both Wasilewski and Jasiński reject this theory. Jasiński notes that the theory that Kazimierz was twice married has no direct support in the sources. If this unlikely scenario was the case, then Helena would have been Kazimierz’s second wife, since she was certainly the mother of his youngest sons, Leszek the White and Konrad I of Mazovia.

---

199 Balzer, Genealogia Piastów, 326-327, discussed in Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 266.
200 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 267.
203 According to this theory, the unknown first wife of Kazimierz the Just would have been the mother of a daughter, who married Vsevolod of Kyiv in 1178, and Kazimierz, who died as a child, Kętrzyński, “Na marginesie,” 202.
205 Jasiński, Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów, 267.
206 Ibid., 267.
Helena survived her husband and acted as regent for her sons Leszek and Konrad. She died sometime between 1202-1206: she was still alive in 1202, when she negotiated with Mieszko the Old for control of Kraków, but is mentioned as deceased in a charter of her son Leszek the White from 1206. She is commemorated in the *Necrology of St. Vincent in Wroclaw* under April 2nd.

---


208 Ibid., 267-268.

209 Ibid., 267-268 and n. 43, 270 citing *Nekrolog opactwa św. Wincentego we Wroclawiu*, ed. Maleczyński, 32: “Helena ductrissa,” The unpublished necrology of the Norbertine abbey in Zwierzyniec (*Nekrolog zwierzyniecki*), preserved in an eighteenth-century copy, notes Helena’s death under September 28th. Jasiński considers this notice to be either an error or simply a record of commemoration, rather than a record of her death-day; *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, n. 43, 270.
17. Miroslava and the Pomerian duke Bogusław II in circa 1209-1210

Father of bride (debated): Mściwoj I (d. ca. 1220)/according to older historiography, Yaropolk Romanovich, (d. after 1177).

Mother of bride (debated): Swinisława/Zvenyslava, of debated origin (d. circa 1230).

Father of groom: Bogusław I (d. 1187)

Mother of groom: Anastasia (d. after 1240), daughter of Mieszko III and Eudoxia of Rus’.

Children: Barnim I the Good (d. 1278), Wojsława (d. 1229).

Comments:

Vladimir Pashuto gives the bride’s name with a question mark and lists her Rus’ filiation and name in a genealogical table.\(^{210}\) Pashuto’s view is based on the sixteenth-century Pomeranian chronicle of Thomas Kantzow, but more recently, however, genealogists consider that Miroslava (Polish: Mirosława) was the daughter of another Pomeranian duke, Mściwoj I of Gdańsk (d. ca. 1220), based on charter evidence suggesting kinship between her son and his cousins.\(^{211}\) Following her husband Bogusław II’s death in 1221, Miroslava ruled western Pomerania as regent for her son Barnim until 1233 and died on February 2\(^{\text{nd}}\), 1236-1237.\(^{212}\) She was buried in the church of Saint Jacob in Szczecin (German: Stettin).\(^{213}\)

\(^{210}\) Pashuto bases Miroslava’s name and Rus’ origins on two sixteenth-century German sources: Thomas Kantzow’s sixteenth-century Chronik von Pommern which calls Mirosvlava “Jaroslavs Tochter” and the Basilikon, Opus genealogicum Catholicum (Frankfurt, 1592) by Elias Reusner (1555-1619) which calls her “Wislawa doch Jarolphi,” as cited in Vneshniaia politika, table 7, no. 5, 426.

\(^{211}\) Rymar, Rodowód książąt pomorskich, 247 and n. 141, 247.

\(^{212}\) Ibid., 247-248. See also Ibid., 247 for a reproduction of Miroslava’s seal as regent, depicting her seated on a throne, facing her standing son.

\(^{213}\) Ibid., 248.
Illustrative Plates

Plate 1. Donation miniature: Gertruda, her son Yaropolk-Peter, and a noblewoman (Kunegunda or the virtue of righteousness?) before Saint Peter. Codex Gertrudianus (Cividale, Museo Nazionale Archeologico, codex 136), folio 5v. Circa 1078-1086/1087.
Plate 3. Christ in Majesty Crowning a Princely Couple, Codex Gertrudianus, folio 10v. Circa 1078-1086/1087.
Plate 4. The Mother of God, Codex Gertrudianus, folio 41r. Circa 1078-1086/1087.