

УДК 94(477.83/86):327(439):930.22

THE ROLE OF GALICIA IN THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY IN THE LATE ÁRPÁD ERA AND EARLY ANJOU ERA

Veronika RUDOLF

Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Historical Studies,

Department of Auxiliary Studies of History

6–8, Múzeum Blvd., 1088, Budapest, Hungary

e-mail: rudolf.veronika@tk.elte.hu

DOI: 10.15330/gal.39.60-77,

ORCID: 0000-0001-5331-7237,

ISSN 2312-1165 (друкована версія), ISSN 3083-6670 (онлайн версія)

The study deals with the role of Galicia and its rulers from the Rurikid dynasty in the foreign policy of the Kingdom of Hungary in the Late Árpád Era and in the first decade of the Anjou Era. The previous times stayed relatively often in focus of historical research, because of the over and over again repeated attempts of the Hungarian kings to conquer Galicia. After King Béla IV of Hungary gave up on this – thanks to his defeat at Yaroslav in 1245 – a friendly connection and a political alliance was reached between the two countries. This enabled the involvement of the Rurikid rulers in Béla IV's fight for the so-called Babenberg heritage. The marriage of Roman Danilovich with Gertrud of Babenberg and the Opava campaign of Daniel Romanovych in 1253 are well known in Hungarian and international research, although some details still need to be clarified, which the study also attempts to do. After that it follows the history of the Galician–Hungarian relations in the 1260s, and 1270s, touching on Prince Lev of Galicia's conduct in the conflict between the Hungarian, and the Bohemian king. It argues for a close relationship between the last Árpáadian king, Andrew III and Lev, which manifested in common politics both on the battlefield and at the negotiating table. The common interest was later revived by the first Anjou king and Prince Lev II through a dynastic marriage in 1304.

Key words: *Galician-Hungarian relations, diplomatic history, Babenberg inheritance, Opava campaign, dynastic relations.*

It is well known in international medieval studies that the Kingdom of Hungary, and lands of the Rurikids and later several Ruthenian principalities, especially Galicia (Halych), had frequent contact with each other between the 11th and 14th centuries, whether in the form of dynastic marriages, military actions against each other, or alliances against a third party. These relations were most intense when the Kingdom of Hungary repeatedly attempted to conquer the Principality of Galicia, so it is not surprising that Hungarian academic research was at first most interested in this period¹. Initially, much less attention was paid to the history of Galician-Hungarian relations in the second half of the 13th century, but more recently, growing interest in the Mongol invasion just as in research on the Mongols' settlement, and politics in Eastern Europe have also led to a revival of interest in this period². In this study, I would like to contribute to the analysis of the history of the Galician-

¹ This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Without claiming to be exhaustive: Wertner M. *Boris und Rostislav: Beitrag zur Geschichte der russisch-polnisch-ungarischen Beziehungen*. Berlin : Verlag des Vereins Herold, 1889; Kállay U. Mikor koronázták meg Kálmánt, Halics felkent királyát a pápa által küldött koronával? *Századok*. 1903. Évf. 37. Sz. 7. Old. 672–673; Senga T. Béla királyfi bolgár, halicsi és osztrák hadjárataihoz. *Századok*. 1988. Évf. 122. Sz. 1. Old. 36–51; Makk F. *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996. passim; Font M. *Az Árpád-házi királyok és a Rurikida fejedelmek*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2005; Senga T. “Benedikt Bor”, Benedek és Bankó Halicsban 1210 körül. I–II. *Magyar Nyelv*. 2016. Évf. 112. Sz. 1. Old. 32–49, and Sz. 2. Old. 183–206; Font M. A halicsi magyar uralmat támogató elit. *Világtörténet*. 2017. Évf. 7. Sz. 1. Old. 33–52; Font M., Barabás G. *Kálmán (1208–1241): Halics királya – Szlavónia hercege*. Pécs : Kronosz Kiadó, 2017; Senga T. Achilles alkancellár Halicsban 1246-ban. Adalék a magyar vice szó történetéhez. *Magyar Nyelv*. 2018. Évf. 114. Sz. 1. Old. 44–58; Font M. *The Kings of the House of Árpád and the Rurikid Princes. Cooperation and Conflict in Medieval Hungary and Kievan Rus'*. Budapest : Eötvös Loránd Research Network Research Center for the Humanities, 2021. P. 91–199.

² Font M. Rosztyiszlav herceg IV. Béla udvarában. *Közlemények Székesfehérvár történetéből / szerk. Zsoldos A.* Székesfehérvár : Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet, 2016: *Hercegek és hercegségek a középkori Magyar-*



Hungarian relations from the mid-13th century to the first decade of the 14th century, primarily seeking to answer the question of what role Galicia and the Rurikid rulers played in the foreign policy of the Kingdom of Hungary toward the west during this period. Based on my previous research and on the findings of other historians regarding the history of medieval Galicia, I examine the participation of Daniel Romanovych, Prince (1218–1253) and later King of Rus' (1253–1264), and his sons in the struggle for the Babenberg inheritance, and later the relations between Prince Lev I of Galicia (1264–1301) and King Andrew III of Hungary (1290–1301), and finally the relationship between Charles I of Hungary (1301–1342) and Galicia in the early 1300s.

The struggle for the Babenberg inheritance (1252–1278)

King Béla IV of Hungary (1235–1270) decided, following his defeat at Yaroslav on 17 August 1245, to abandon his plans to conquer Galicia, and to withdraw his support for his son-in-law, Prince Rostyslav of Chernigiv (1241–1242). The following year he also initiated peace negotiations with his former enemies: in May, the Hungarian king sent Nikolaus, son of Obichk, and Achilles, son of Pázmány of the Hontpázmány kindred, to Galicia³. Due to the geographical distance, the presence of the Mongols in the Rus', and mutual distrust, the negotiations progressed slowly, but between the 11 and 27 September 1247, an alliance was concluded between the parties in Zvolen. This was confirmed shortly afterwards by a dynastic connection: the Hungarian king's daughter, Constance, married Lev, the son of the Galician ruler⁴. All this happened at an ideal time for the Hungarian king, as a favorable opportunity seemed to be dawning in the west.

On 15 June 1246, Frederick II, named the Quarrelsome, Duke of Austria and Styria (1230–1246) died in a victorious battle against the Hungarians on the banks of the Leitha River, which caused the extinction of the Babenberg dynasty, which had ruled the Duchy of Austria since 976 and the Duchy of Styria since 1192, in the male line⁵. Although it initially seemed that the crisis could be averted through the marriages of the duke's niece, Gertrude – first to the eldest son of King Wenceslaus I of Bohemia (1230–1253), Margrave Vladislaus of Moravia, later (under papal pressure) to Margrave Hermann VI of Baden (1243–1250, Duke of Austria 1248–1250) and, but the successive deaths of her husbands kept the issue on the agenda. The complexity of the situation is well illustrated by the fact that, in addition to the emperor, who was legally interested in the matter, because the duchies were imperial fiefs, the pope and the neighboring powers (Hungary, Bohemia, Bavaria) also made claims to the territories. By the early 1250s, only two parties remained in race: King Wenceslaus I of Bohemia, who now wanted to secure the duchies for his second son, the future Ottokar II (1253–1278), and King Béla IV of Hungary. Both parties sought to legitimize their claims with the help of the remaining female members of the Babenberg dynasty. Wenceslaus married his son to Margaret of

ország. *Konferencia Székesfehérváron 2014. szeptember 20.* Old. 25–58; idem. A «Halicsi» Danyiil és a Magyar Királyság. *Acta Academiae Agriensis, Sectio Historiae.* 2017. Évf. 44. Old. 267–283; Csiky G. Winter War in Rus'. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, 2025. Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242).* P. 175–184; Csiky G. The Conquest of South Rus' (1239–1240). *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, 2025. Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242).* P. 185–192; Font M. The Causes of the Rus' Defeat. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, 2025. Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242).* P. 193–196; idem. The Absorption of Rus' into the Golden Horde: Regional Relations with the Mongol Presence. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, 2025. Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242).* P. 283–186; Pow S. Fortification Reforms in Galicia-Volhynia and Poland after the Mongol Invasion of 1240–1242. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, 2025. Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242).* P. 319–326.

³ Font M. *Az Árpád-házi királyok.* Old. 246–249; Senga T. Achilles alkancellár Halicsban. Old. 50–51.

⁴ Font M. A «Halicsi» Danyiil. Old. 267–283; idem. *The Kings of the House of Árpád.* P. 212–214.

⁵ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században. Magyarország, Csehország és Ausztria hatalmi és dinasztikus kapcsolatai 1196 és 1310 között.* Budapest : Hun-REN Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023. Old. 130–135.

Babenberg, the good 20 years older widowed sister of the late Duke Frederick II, while the Hungarian king formed an alliance with Gertrude of Babenberg, who was already widowed twice at that time, but very keen to acquire the duchies⁶.

The latter alliance was consolidated through a dynastic marriage, as it was customary in the Middle Ages, but since there were no suitable candidates among Béla IV's relatives, he turned to his allies, where he found a man, who seemed suitable: Roman, the younger son of Prince Daniel Romanovych. Daniel had no serious interest in the conflict or claims for the duchies. Newly, Alexander Maiorov suggested that the intervention of the Prince of Galicia was due to dynastic reasons, since Daniel's mother, Eufrosina-Anna, and Duke Frederick's mother, Theodora, were both descended from the Byzantine Angelos dynasty, making their children second or third cousins, which gave Daniel a claim to the Austrian throne. However, even if this – even by medieval standards – extremely distant relationship was taken into account, it did not entitle the Prince of Galicia to the Babenberg inheritance⁷. Therefore, the most probable explanation is Aleksey Martynyuk's suggestion: Daniel simply wanted to increase his own and his family's prestige. If the venture was to be successful, his son would have been the first Rurikid to sit on the throne of a Western Christian country⁸.

Our main source for the events related to this is the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle⁹, which gives a relatively detailed account of Daniel's arrival in Bratislava, and the negotiations that took place there: "The Hungarian king sent [an envoy] to Daniel requesting him to come to his aid, for he was waging war with the Germans. Daniel set out to help him and came to Bratislava. [In the meantime] German envoys had come to the Hungarian king, for the [German] emperor was already in possession of Vienna, and the Rakusian and Styrian lands, and the [Austrian] Archduke had already been killed. The names of the envoys were: the emperor's voyevoda and bishop Salo Purs'kij known as Sol'skij; Garix Poruns'kij; and Otto Garetnnik Petovskij. The king rode forth with them to meet Prince Daniel, and Daniel approached him with all his troops in battle formation. [...] The Germans could not cease staring and admiring [all of this] and the king told [Daniel] that his coming [to him dressed] in accordance with the traditions of Rus' and of his forefathers was more important to him than a thousand pieces of silver. Daniel asked for permission to enter the king's camp, because it was extremely hot that day. [The king] took his arm and led him into his tent, undressed him, and put his own clothes on him. Such was the [great] honor that the king bestowed upon [Daniel], and he returned home"¹⁰.

Polish historian Norbert Mika, who was later followed by many Polish and Slovak researchers, recently argued that the above passage refers to Emperor Frederick II's (1212–1250) envoy ("the emperor's voivode") and the Archbishop of Salzburg. In his view, the passage can be dated to the summer of 1247, and can be linked to Béla IV's initial aspirations to the duchies. The Hungarian king and Daniel discussed the Galician-Hungarian alliance in Bratislava, and after the departure of the Prince of Galicia, Béla IV, yielding to the emperor's request, withdrew from the fight for the Duchy of Austria¹¹. In his latest study, Alexander Maiorov dates the meeting to the summer of

⁶ More about the events: Ibidem. Old. 136–141; Szende L. *Harc a Babenberg-örökségért (1246–1261)*. *Sic Itur ad Astra*. 1999. Évf. 11. Old. 263–271; Zehetmayer R. Das sogenannte «österreichische Interregnum»: von den Babenbergern zu den Habsburgern. *Tagungen zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung* / hrsg. Kersken N., Tebruck S. Marburg : Verlag Herder-Institut, 2020. Vol. 38 : *Interregna im mittelalterlichen Europa. Konkurrierende Kräfte in politischen Zwischenräumen*. S. 45–73.

⁷ Maiorov A. V. The Dragon Turns its Gaze to the West: The Mongol Empire's Global Diplomacy in the Mirror of Outsider Chronicles. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 2025. Vol. 78. № 3. P. 519.

⁸ Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна. Австрия и Восточная Европа в системе персональных связей (XIII – начало XVI века)*. Москва : Квадрига, 2019. С. 93.

⁹ More about the source: Tolochko O. Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*. Vol. 1 / ed. G. Dunphy. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2010. P. 658.

¹⁰ *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle* / trans. G. A. Perfecky. Munich : Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973. P. 61–63.

¹¹ Mika N. *Walka o spadek po Babenbergach 1246–1278*. Racibórz : Wyd-wo Waw, 2008. S. 25–27; Dąbrowski D. *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264)*. *Biografia polityczna*. Kraków : Avalon, 2012. S. 288–291; Roháč P. *Boj o Babenberské dedičstvo a I. Česko-uhorská vojna 1252–1254*. *Vojenská história*.



1248, the purpose of which was, on the one hand, to dissuade Béla IV from intervening in the conflict over the Austrian throne and, on the other hand, to gather information about the Mongols' plans through Daniel. In his opinion, by 1248, after the death of the Moravian Margrave, Vladislaus and the recall of the first imperial governor, Count Otto of Eberstein, anarchic conditions prevailed in the duchies, in which the Hungarian king saw another opportunity to acquire Austria, but the emperor made him an in details unknown, but certainly irresistible offer in Bratislava, which ultimately led Béla IV and Daniel to call off the planned campaign¹².

It is certain that Daniel and Béla IV met in person in 1247, but, as we have seen above, not in Bratislava, but in Zvolen, and not in the summer of that year, but probably in the second half of September. We have no source which would confirm that either Béla IV or the Archbishop of Salzburg was in Bratislava or in its vicinity in 1247, which also argues against this dating. Furthermore, the Rus'ian source unambiguously states that the Hungarian king was preparing for war with the «Germans», which, in my opinion, was no longer a realistic possibility in the summer of 1247. The counter-king, Henry Raspe (1246–1247), who supported the Hungarian king, died in February of that year, and Béla IV had no other foreign supporters, as even the pope, who had initially welcomed the Hungarian venture, began to lean rather on Gertrude of Babenberg. In 1248, he married her to Hermann VI, Margrave of Baden, who appeared to be politically reliable and sufficiently insignificant, and whose reign was accepted by all the neighboring powers. Taking all this into consideration, Márta Font's opinion seems more well-founded: the Hungarian king and Daniel agreed at this meeting in Bratislava on the marriage between Gertrude of Babenberg and Roman, and concluded a contract about it, which the chronicler unfortunately refrained from mentioning, because of its length¹³. Based on the itinerary of Béla IV and Philip of Spanheim, elected Archbishop of Salzburg (1247–1257), the meeting may have taken place sometime in late May or early June of 1252¹⁴.

Accepting that the purpose of the meeting was to finalize the marriage between Gertrude and Roman, it could be assumed that the German envoys mentioned in the source represented the bride, and that they wished to discuss the details of the marriage and the strategy to be followed in acquiring the Austrian Duchy, but the names preserved in a distorted form in the chronicle suggest otherwise. All researchers agree that one of the envoys was definitely Philip of Spanheim, elected Archbishop of Salzburg, who attended the wedding of the future Ottokar II and Margaret of Babenberg in February 1252, and remained at the court of his cousin, the new Austrian duke afterwards. The «emperor's voivode», on the other hand, cannot be clearly identified, if only because there was no crowned emperor of the Holy Roman Empire at that time. Furthermore, in addition to Conrad IV (1250–1254), who held the title of the Roman king from 1250, we must also take into account William of Holland, who had been counter-king since 1248. Based on Philip of Spanheim's political orientation, only William of Holland's representative can be considered, but based on the wording, it is also possible, that the voivode is identical with the Archbishop of Salzburg himself¹⁵.

In addition to him (or them), at least two other ministerials can be identified among the envoys. According to Norbert Mika, Wolfker of Porrau (Wolfker von Porrau), Hartnid of Ptuj (Hartnid von Pettau) and Otto of Maissau (Otto von Maissau) participated in the delegation¹⁶. According to

2016. Roč. 20. Č. 1. S. 20–21. Older Russian research placed the story even earlier, to the conflict between Emperor Frederick II and Duke Frederick of Austria in 1236–1237. The inaccuracy of that was already convincingly proved by Márta Font (Font M. *The Kings of the House of Árpád*. P. 222–223).

¹² Maiorov A. V. *The Dragon Turns its Gaze to the West*. P. 519.

¹³ Font M. *Az Árpád-házi királyok*. Old. 255–256; idem. *The Kings of the House of Árpád*. P. 223. As a result, we do not know the text of the treaty, but it is possible that a copy was kept in the Cistercian monastery of Klosterneuburg (Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна*. С. 106–110).

¹⁴ Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна*. С. 83–87; Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 155.

¹⁵ Марынюк А. «Немци же дивящиеся оружию татарскому»: с кем и когда встречался Даниил Романович в Пожони. *Colloquia Russica* / eds. V. Nagirnyu, A. Mesiarkin. Krakow ; Bratislava : Jagiellonian University, 2015. Series I. Vol. 5 : *Rus' and Central Europe from the 11th to the 14th Century. Publication after the 5th International Conference, Spišská kapitula, 16th–18th October, 2014*. P. 156–157. Compare: Font M. *The Kings of the House of Árpád*. P. 223.

¹⁶ Mika N. *Walka o spadek po Babenbergach*. S. 25.

another view, Henry of Brunn (Heinrich von Brunn), Hartnid of Ptuj and his son Otto were present¹⁷. Contrary to these solutions, which consequently count with three ministerials, Alexej Martinyuk pledged only for two. He identified one of them as Henry of Brunn, who belonged to the Austrian Duchy, and the other as Frederick of Ptuj, the Younger (Friedrich von Pettau)¹⁸.

The text, or more precisely the names preserved in it, are badly damaged, so it is no wonder that several ideas have been put forward regarding their identification. Looking at these, Martinyuk's solution seems the most likely. Although Wolfker of Porrau was a prominent member of the Austrian ministerial class, owned estates in the vicinity of Vienna, and appeared as a supporter of Ottokar as early as the beginning of the 1250s, in my opinion, the name preserved in the source shows too much difference. The situation is similar with the also well-known Otto of Maissau, whose first name at most appears in the source¹⁹. Hartnid of Ptuj and his son, Otto cannot be considered for genealogical and chronological reasons, as Hartnid I of Ptuj did not have a son named Otto, only an uncle, Otto of Kunšperk (Otto von Königsberg), who was certainly no longer alive in 1252, just as Hartnid I himself. His son of the same name, Hartnid II, only appears in the diplomatic sources from 1253, so it is unlikely that he is the person in question²⁰. The envoys mentioned in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle were most likely on the one hand, Henry of Brunn, whose family had served the Babenbergs for many decades, and who can be considered as a representative of the Austrian Duchy²¹, and on the other hand, the Archbishop's own ministerial, Frederick of Ptuj, who served, and owned land in Styria. It is unclear how the name Otto came to be included in the passage. It is quite possible that this is simply a mistake, probably the author was misled by the name Otto, which was popular in the side branch of the Ptuj family. Of course, it cannot be ruled out that it refers to a third ministerial named Otto, whose «surname» is missing from the text. However, there is another possible explanation. In Perfecki's English translation the name of Otto Garetnnik Petovskij differs from the name *Гѹтагапетеньникъ Пѣтовъскый* in the Ipatyev (Нупиатов) Codex²². Since there is no person named Ottokar in the Ptuj family throughout their entire history, the most obvious solution would be Ottokar's *теньникъ* (castellan?) in Pettau, who can also be identified with Frederick of Ptuj. Of course, this theory is weakened by the fact that Ottokar did not actually hold the Duchy of Styria at that time, but may have had claims to it, and that Ptuj was owned by the Archbishop of Salzburg – however, these details may well have escaped the chronicler's attention.

Martyniuk suspected – as we have seen – the younger Frederick (i. e. V) of Ptuj²³, but I consider the role of the elder Frederick (i. e. IV) of Ptuj to be more likely. This is because the younger Frederick only appears independently in charters from the August of 1252²⁴. Based on this document, issued by Archbishop Philip in Maribor, presumably on his way home from the meeting, Martyniuk considers the role of the younger Frederick to be beyond doubt, but in fact this only proves that he

¹⁷ *Króńika Halicko-Wolynska (Króńika Romanowiczów)* / ed. D. Dąbrowski, A. Jusupović. *Monumenta Poloniae historica*. Kraków ; Warszawa : PWN ; PAU, 2017. Seria II. T. XVI. S. 311. Not. 821, 312. Not. 327.

¹⁸ Марынюк А. «Немци же дивящся оружию татарскому». С. 156–157.

¹⁹ More about the two ministerials: Weltin M. Landesherr und Landherren. Zur Herrschaft Ottokars II. Přemysl in Österreich. *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich. Neue Folge* / hrsg. A. Kusternig, M. Weltin. Wien : Verein für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich, 1979. Bd. 44–45: *Ottokar-Forschungen*. S. 162, 168. Anm. 41, S. 178–180, 200–204.

²⁰ Rudolf V. Az Árpádok és a Pettaiak. *ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, Tanulmányok – Konferenciák* / szerk. E. Kovács, V. Rudolf., L. Szokola, O. Varró, M. Veszprémy. Budapest : ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, 2022. Köt. 16: *Micae Mediaevales X. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról*. Old. 88–91; Rudolf V. *Az Árpádok és a Pettaiak 1254 után*. Manuscript.

²¹ More about Henry of Brunn: Rudolf V. *Osztrák, stájer, karintiai miniszteriálisok és a Magyar Királyság az Árpád-korban*. Manuscript.

²² Quoting the original text: Марынюк А. «Немци же дивящся оружию татарскому». С. 150.

²³ Марынюк А. «Немци же дивящся оружию татарскому». С. 156–157; idem. *До Герберштейна*. С. 87–89.

²⁴ *Urkundenbuch des Herzogtums Steiermark*. Bd. III / bearb. J. von Zahn. *Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Landeskommision für Steiermark*. Graz : Verlag des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark, 1903. Bd. 33. S. 181. Nr. 114.



appeared before his suzerain, when he arrived in Styria²⁵. In light of the fact that this document contains the first independent mention of Frederick, it is unlikely that he had sufficient influence to take part in such a diplomatic mission, especially since Frederick the Elder had already been to Hungary in 1236, where he met with Béla IV, and may even have received a land grant from him²⁶.

The purpose of the delegation led by Philip of Spanheim is quite mysterious. Given the presence of the Archbishop of Salzburg, it is certain that they did not intercede with Béla IV on Gertrude's behalf, so we must look for the solution in the interests of the elected archbishop himself, or Ottokar. Martyniuk considers it likely, that Philip was trying to persuade the Hungarian king, who was preparing for a military campaign against the duchies, to protect his estates in Styria, and/or ensure the prosperity of the archbishopric, but he does not rule out the possibility that Ottokar entrusted his cousin with some kind of diplomatic mission²⁷. Considering the close family ties and the alliance between Philip and Ottokar, it seems unlikely that Philip would have negotiated with the enemy behind his cousin's back. Moreover, the including of Henry of Brunn in the delegation suggests that the Austrian Duchy, or at least the Austrian elite, was also interested in the negotiations, but as Ottokar's subjects, they were even less likely to have been able to contact the neighboring ruler without the duke's knowledge and permission. For all these reasons, the most realistic scenario is that the archbishop visited Béla IV on behalf of his cousin, as Ottokar was staying in Bohemia and then Moravia at that time – he issued a charter on 12 April in Prague, and on 6 June in Znojmo²⁸, before, which meant that his newly acquired territories were unprotected. Philip may have had to prevent, or at least delay the Hungarian attack until Ottokar was ready. The news of the Austrian duke's absence and the duchies' lack of preparedness, which became known at the meeting in Bratislava, may have been the reason why Daniel – according to the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle – returned home with his extremely ornate army that amazed the German envoys. He saw his son's advance into Austrian territory secure enough with the Hungarian king's army.

That is why, only Roman, and a small Rus'ian auxiliary troop set out with the royal army, which had raised its flag in June 1252, to conquer the neighboring duchies²⁹. The main army, marching along the southern bank of the Danube, captured several castles: Gerhaus, Rohrau, Fischamend, Himberg, Mödling, Sparbach, Tulln and Klosterneuburg fell into their hands, which shows that they had surrounded Vienna, and were preparing for the siege. At the same time, smaller Hungarian armies invaded Styria and Ottokar's hereditary territory, Moravia. Parallel to the advance, they also sealed the Galician-Hungarian alliance: Roman and Gertrude of Babenberg were married in the newly acquired castle of Himberg, as reported by the Styrian Rhymed Chronicle³⁰. However, as the siege of Vienna took longer than expected, Béla IV decided to retreat at the beginning of July, leaving the conquered territories in the hands of Roman and Gertrude³¹. The newlyweds set up their residence in the castle on Kahlenberg (today Leopoldsberg), barely 10 kms from Vienna, which was an obvious choice due to its strategic location and also, because Gertrude's former residence was there. The immediate surroundings of the castle, including Kahlenbergdorf at the foot of the mountain, and the monastery in Klosterneuburg, were firmly under their control³².

After the Hungarian troops withdrew, Ottokar returned to the Austrian Duchy, and recaptured almost everything: Roman and Gertrude, lacking sufficient support, were forced to retreat to Kahlenberg Castle. Although Béla IV launched another attack against Ottokar the following year,

²⁵ Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна*. С. 87–88.

²⁶ Rudolf V. *Az Árpádok és a Pettauiak*. Old. 92–93.

²⁷ Мартынюк А. «Немци же дивящиеся оружию татарскому». С. 158–159.

²⁸ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. IV. T. 2 / ed. J. Šebánek. Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе, 1965. P. 415. No. 242, P. 418–421. No 244.

²⁹ Compare: Varga G. *Ungarn und das Reich vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert. Das Herrscherhaus der Árpáden zwischen Anlehnung und Emanzipation*. München : Ungarisches Institut, 2003. S. 272.

³⁰ *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik* / hrsg. J. Seemüller. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Deutsche Chroniken*. Bd. V/1. Hannover : Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1890. S. 33.

³¹ For more about the campaign of 1252: Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 156–159.

³² Мартынюк А. «Австрийский стол» князя Романа Даниловича. *Colloquia Russica* / за ред. В. Нагірного, М. Волощука. Івано-Франківськ ; Краків, 2017. Series II. Vol. 3 : *Данило Романович і його часи*. С. 135–136.

this time the main army marched not against the Austrian but against the Moravian territories³³. The plan was a two-front attack against Ottokar's domain, so Béla IV's eastern allies, Prince Daniel Romanovich, his son Lev, and his brother, Prince Vasilko of Volhynia (1231–1269) joined forces with Béla IV's Polish son-in-law, Duke Bolesław V (the Chaste) of Krakow (1243–1279), and Duke Władysław I of Opole (1246–1281) and invaded the region of Opava. The Polish troops were initially defeated by Beneš, and his brother Andrej, who marched against them from Opava, whereupon also Daniel attempted to capture it, but failed. Later he changed course, captured Násile, and several fortified villages in the vicinity, just as Głubczyce. His attempt to capture Opava was unsuccessful because, according to the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, his men could not find enough wood for the siege and because of the mistakes of the Duke of Opole³⁴. Based on other considerations, the Prince of Galicia refrained from the siege, because of the arrival of the Moravian Beneš, who came to defend the castle and who had previously achieved success against the Poles³⁵. In any case, it is certain that Daniel did not take advantage of his (initial) military superiority, did not attempt to capture Opava, and did not march through the Moravian Gate to Olomouc to join forces with Béla IV. This was despite the fact that there were no castles in the immediate vicinity of Opava at that time, only fortified villages, and, according to our sources, there were no troops capable of serious resistance in the area³⁶. Apart from the inhabitants of the Opava region and the men of the Bishop of Olomouc, our narrative and documentary sources do not report any serious resistance. Wenceslaus I did not get involved in the conflict, nor did the Silesian dukes related to the Přemysl dynasty. In light of this, it is quite surprising that Daniel abandoned his military operations without achieving any real results, thus ending the entire campaign and the coalition against Ottokar³⁷. Even the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, which provides the most detailed account of his activities and depicts the Galician ruler as almost a victor, offers no explanation for this³⁸. The later charters of the Bishop of Olomouc, which describe the destruction caused by the campaign, interestingly mention only the Duke of Opole, and his soldiers, which – according to Jitka Komendová – may indicate that Bohemian-Moravian contemporaries did not attach as much importance to Daniel, and his Rus'ian troops, and perhaps they did not stand out as much in terms of numbers as the Rus'ian source suggests³⁹. In addition, we can perhaps assume that Daniel's retreat may have been related to events on the Austrian front.

Although the Hungarian king sent a small army to the Austrian Duchy, the latter was unable to reverse the balance of power, and Roman, finding himself in a hopeless situation, decided to leave

³³ About the events: Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 160–164.

³⁴ *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*. P. 64–67. The campaign is also mentioned by: Matthias Miechovius. *Chronica Polonorum. Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae aevo ducum et regum ex stirpe Arpad descendendum ab anno Christi DCCC usque ad annum MCCC*. Vol. 2. / coll. F. A. Gombos. Budapest : Szent István Akadémia, 1937. P. 1605; *Annales Sanctae Crucis Polonici* / ed. G. H. Pertz. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*. 19. Hannover : Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1866. P. 681; *Annales Cracovienses compilati* / ed. R. Röpell, W. Arndt. Ibidem. P. 600. More about the campaign: Font M. *Az Árpád-házi királyok*. Old. 258; Wihoda M. Přemyslova Moravská léta mezi královskou korunou a babenberským dědictvím. *Pocta králi. K 730. výročí smrti českého krále, rakouského vévody a moravského markraběte Přemysla Otakara II* / ed. L. Jan, J. Kacetl. Brno ; Znojmo : Matice moravská, 2010. S. 52; Dąbrowski D. *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi*. S. 334–346. More about the role of Władysław of Opole recently: Barabás G. Barátból ellenség. Władysław opolei herceg és a Přemysl-Árpád-konfliktus a 13. század második felében. *Történelmi Szemle*. 2025. Évf. 67. Sz. 1. Old. 9–13.

³⁵ Dykastová G. Vzestup a pád Beneše ze Cvilína. *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*. 2020. R. 23. Č. 2. S. 39–40.

³⁶ Мартынюк А. «Австрийский стол». С. 126–127.

³⁷ Ibidem. С. 122–124.

³⁸ About the idealised picture of Daniel in the source: Komendová J. Vladařská propaganda a antipropaganda na Rusi a v Čechách ve 13. století. *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Historica*. 2000. R. 29. S. 42–43.

³⁹ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. V. T. 1 / ed. J. Šebánek. Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovaecae, 1974. P. 112–114. Nr. 56, P. 146–148. Nr. 80; Комендова Ї. Опавский поход Даниила Романовича: чешский взгляд. *Colloquia Russica* / ed. V. Nagirnyu. Kraków : Jagiellonian University, 2014. Series I. Vol. 4 : *Rurikids in Dynastic Relations: Politics, Customs, Culture, Religion (10th–16th c.)*. Publication after 4th International Conference, Mogilno, 14–16th November 2013. С. 160–162.



sometime in June or July⁴⁰. With the help of Wernhard Preußel, the captain of the castle of Himberg, he left Kahlenberg, which was under siege, leaving the pregnant Gertrude behind⁴¹. Wernhard and his brother, Henry had been loyal to Gertrude since the death of Duke Frederick, and also had very close ties to Roman, so his help is not surprising⁴². Although the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle believes that Béla IV did not help Roman, because he wanted to acquire the duchy for himself, leaving Roman with no choice but to flee⁴³, it is more likely that the developments in Moravia simply did not allow to launch another military campaign, and the chronicler tried to portray the son of his protagonist in a better light. This is supported by the fact that while the Hungarian troops were besieging Olomouc, a Moravian army invaded the counties of Trenčín and Turiec, an attack that was repelled by Béla IV's son-in-law, Rostislav, who had remained at home⁴⁴. In July, Ottokar easily recaptured Kahlenberg from Gertrude, who was left alone, whereupon Béla IV was forced to recognize the lack of prospects of the venture and agreed to the truce urged by the Pope⁴⁵. Under the terms of the Peace of Buda, finally concluded in April 1254, the parties divided the Babenberg inheritance between themselves: Ottokar II received the Duchy of Austria, including the territories above the Enns (Land ob der Enns), and the former County of Pitten, while Béla IV had to catch up with the rest of the Duchy of Styria and even had to compensate Gertrude of Babenberg, who had emerged from the conflict as the clear loser⁴⁶. Our sources remain silent on whether Roman still had a relationship with Gertrude, or even with his daughter Mary, who was born after his departure⁴⁷.

Although Roman's departure did not sour Galician-Hungarian relations, the Hungarian king could no longer count on him in the future conflicts related to the Babenberg inheritance. Nevertheless, it is certain that Roman's father, Daniel, despite his failed venture, remained an ally of Béla IV on a diplomatic level and rejected Ottokar II's attempts of rapprochement in the 1250s⁴⁸. In addition to Roman's adventure, Mongol pressure on the Rus' principalities played a major role in the Rurikids crowding out from the Western politics of the Hungarian king, which greatly complicated an effective Galician-Hungarian cooperation. In 1259, Khan Berke launched a major attack on Rus'ian and Polish territories: Daniel, and later Bolesław the Chaste fled to the Hungarian court, while the eldest son of the Galician prince, Lev remained at home and was forced to join the Mongol taxpayers⁴⁹. In light of the human and material losses suffered at that time, neither Bolesław nor

⁴⁰ According to another opinion, he left the duchy only in mid-September, but since he – according to the chronicle – did so before the Bohemian army occupied his seat, this thesis cannot be upheld, as Ottokar was already in July in possession of Kahlenberg. Dąbrowski D. *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi*. S. 369.

⁴¹ *Continuatio Garstensis* / ed. W. Wattenbach. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores* 9. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung, 1851. P. 598; *Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis secunda* / ed. W. Wattenbach. Ibidem. P. 612; *Continuatio Praedicatorum Vindobonensium* / ed. W. Wattenbach. Ibidem. P. 643; Meier H. Gertrud. Herzogin von Österreich und Steiermark. *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark*. 1927. Jg. 23. S. 11. Compare: Žemlička J. *Přemysl Otakar II. Král na rozhraní věků*. Praha : NLN, 2011. S. 95; Varga G. *Ungarn und das Reich*. S. 272.

⁴² Martyniuk A. Rus in the Christian Community: a View from Thirteenth-century Europe. *Christian Rus in the Making. 1. Politics and Culture* / eds. A. Jusupović, A. Paroń, A. Vukovich. Paderborn : Brill, 2025. P. 96–97; idem. *До Герберштейна*. С. 103–104.

⁴³ *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*. P. 72.

⁴⁴ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 160–163.

⁴⁵ Ibidem. Old. 163–164.

⁴⁶ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. V. T. 1. P. 59–60. Nr 21; Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 167–169.

⁴⁷ From 1254, Roman ruled over Novogrudok in «Black Rus» as a vassal of the Lithuanian ruler. He is last mentioned as alive in 1256 in connection with an unsuccessful campaign by Daniel, as a result of which Roman was taken prisoner by the Lithuanians. By 1259, he was definitely dead. Mary grew up at her mother's court in Styria and later married a Hungarian noble Joachim from the Gutkeled kindred, who would later have a distinguished career, in the 1270s. Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна*. С. 161–166.

⁴⁸ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 202.

⁴⁹ Font M. *The Kings of the House of Árpád*. P. 226; Szócs T. Fifty Years: Mongol–Hungarian Conflicts between 1242 and 1292, and the 'Second Mongol Invasion' in 1285. *The Mongols in Central Europe: The Profile and Impact of their Thirteenth-Century Invasions* / ed. B. Nagy. Budapest : Eötvös Kiadó, 2023. P. 328–329;

Daniel were in a position to support Béla IV with significant auxiliary troops in the decisive battle against Ottokar II. at Kroissenbrunn in July 1260, and we must completely rule out the possibility of his, and his sons' personal participation⁵⁰. As it is well known, the battle ended in defeat for the Hungarian king, as a result of which Béla IV was forced to renounce his claims to Styria for good, and shortly afterwards he even entered into an alliance and a dynastic relationship with the Bohemian king⁵¹.

The latter included the marriage of his granddaughter (the daughter of Princess Anna, and Rostyslav), Kunigund with the Bohemian king in 1261, just as the marriage of the Hungarian king's second son, Prince Béla, to Ottokar's niece, Kunigund of Brandenburg, in 1264. According to the Styrian Rhymed Chronicle, Lev may have attended the wedding held near Vienna in 1264. According to the author, Béla IV arrived with his sons, «Stephan and Béla, the king of the Rascians, the king of Mačva, whose wife was the daughter of King Béla, and even the Serbian king. You should know that these three kings were not ashamed to accept the crown from the hands of the Hungarian king»⁵². András Vizkelety, who studied the part of the chronicle, which describes the wedding in depth, interpreted the chronicle's term *kunic von Râzen* as «king of the Rascians»⁵³. However, Josef Seemüller, who edited the critical edition of the Styrian Rhymed Chronicle, and Dániel Bagi, who recently published a Hungarian translation of the parts, which deal with Hungarian matters, identified him as the king of the Rus'. The former specifically suspected Daniel Romanovich to be behind it⁵⁴. Although the use of *kunic von Ruizen* is more common in other parts of the chronicle to refer to the Rurikid princes, we cannot reject Seemüller's identification, as the Serbian king is also mentioned separately in the passage. However, if we assume that the Galician ruler was present at the wedding, then it may be more appropriate to identify the ruler of Galicia not as Daniel Romanovich, who died in 1264, but as his son, Lev, who was married to Constance of Hungary and, as Béla's brother-in-law, had more reason to participate in the event⁵⁵.

According to documentary evidence, in the dispute between Béla IV and his son, Stephen, Lev supported the old king, even if only on a diplomatic level⁵⁶. Béla IV's daughters were in Hungary in the spring of 1268, as revealed in the *narratio* of a royal charter for Master Nikolas, son of Mark of Spiš: Nikolas had just brought news to the Hungarian king about Stephan's victory over the Serbian ruler, Stephan Uroš I. (1243–1276) and the latter's capture, when the wife of the Prince of Galicia, Constance, the wife of Bolesław the Chaste, Kinga, and Princess Jolan of Kalisz were also present at court. The diploma also mentions the presence of Byzantine, Bulgarian, Tatar, French, and Bohemian

Font M. To the Question of Exile in the Middle Age. Refugees from Eastern Europe in Medieval Hungary in the Eleventh-Thirteenth Centuries. *Memoria Hungariae* / eds. A. Bárány, R. Czaja, H. Flachenecker, L. Pósán. Debrecen : Universität Debrecen Forschungsgruppe «Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa», 2024. Vol. 6: *Zwischen Ostsee und Adria II. Ostmitteleuropa im Mitteleuropa und in der Frühen Neuzeit. Die Mobilität von Menschen, Gütern, Geld, Diplomaten, Reliquien*. P. 26.

⁵⁰ *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. S. 106; Szende L. *Harc a Babenberg-örökségért*. Old. 288–289. Compare : Dąbrowski D. *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi*. S. 422–426.

⁵¹ More about the events: Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 203–219.

⁵² *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. S. 106–107.

⁵³ Vizkelety A. Béla hercegnek, IV. Béla király fiának menyegzője. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*. 1993. Évf. 97. Sz. 5. Old. 579. This interpretation is followed by: Palko J. *Král'ovič Bélo (1249–1269). Dux totius Sclavoniae, Dalmaciae et Croaciae*. Bratislava : Univerzity Komenského, 2022. S. 80–81.

⁵⁴ *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. S. 106–107; *Ottokar aus der Gaal: Stájer rimes krónika (Részletek)* / Ford., kommentárok és bev. tanulmány Bagi D. *Arpadiana*. Köt. XII. Budapest : Eötvös Loránd Kutatási Hálózat Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023. Old. 126.

⁵⁵ Войтович Л. В. Лев Данилович и загадки «австрийского узла» (1272–1278). *Rossica Antiqua*. 2011. Vol. 7. No. 2. C. 127. Compare: Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна*. С. 188.

⁵⁶ More recently, Dariusz Dąbrowski, based on a passage from the Peace of Poroszló signed in 1262, suggested that Prince Daniel, who visited Hungary in the same year, would have supported Stephan in the civil war, but we have no real source data on this, as Márta Font already pointed out. Dąbrowski D. Danylo Romanovich Versus the Civil War in Hungary in the Years 1261–1264 and the Specificity of Information Contained in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle (The Romanovichi Chronicle) on Hungarian Matters. *Hungary and the Hungarians in Central and East European Narrative Sources (10th–17th Centuries)* / eds. D. Bagi, G. Barabás, M. Font, E. Sashalmi. Pécs : University of Pécs, 2019. P. 83–88; Font M. *The Kings of the House of Árpád*. P. 227–228.



envoys⁵⁷, which was certainly not, or not only, related to the Serbian war, but also to the family affairs of the Árpáds and the conflict between the old, and the younger king, which had become more acute again.

The alliance between Galicia, and the Kingdom of Hungary did not end after the death of Béla IV. However, based on the sources available to us, Lev did not intervene directly in the conflict that arose between Stephen V (1270–1272), and Ottokar II. He did not send reinforcements to the Bohemian-Hungarian war of 1271. However, it can be suggested that Lev and Bolesław the Chaste, Duke of Krakow, launched an attack on Silesia in 1271 in connection with the parallel Bohemian-Hungarian conflict. The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle reports that after Bolesław the Chaste made peace with the Rurikids, «he waged war against the Duke of Wrocław, and Lev, and Mstislav rushed to his aid. Vladimir, although he did not go in person, sent an army under the command of Želislav»⁵⁸. Although the chronicle dates the event to 1273, and the latest English edition dates it to 1272–1273, it is more likely that it took place in the first half of 1271, as Bishop Thomas II of Wrocław (1270–1292) mentions the attack of Bolesław the Chaste on Silesia in the company of Ruthenians, Cumans, and Lithuanians, and the serious destruction of churches in his diocese in a letter dated on 28 June 1271, and then calls on the duke to pay compensation⁵⁹. The latter date is accepted by recent Polish, and Ukrainian research⁶⁰. Considering the reconciliation between Stephen V, and Bolesław the Chaste in August 1270⁶¹, it seems logical to assume that the Duke of Krakow wanted to relieve the Hungarian battlefield, and/or deter the Silesian troops from helping Ottokar by attacking Silesia⁶². However, due to a lack of sources, this direct connection cannot be confirmed with complete certainty. What is sure, however, is that Stephen V considered Lev, and his relatives to be his allies, as in the Peace of Bratislava, which ended the war with Ottokar, he included Lev, Mstislav, the latter's brother, and their cousin, Volodymyr of Volhynia (1269–1289), among his allies⁶³.

After all this, it comes as quite a surprise to learn from the Styrian Rhymed Chronicle that Prince Lev of Galicia joined the ranks of the Bohemian king's supporters in 1278, in the Battle of Dürnkrut, which marked the final conclusion of the struggle for the Babenberg inheritance: «sent him some quick-footed soldiers, Lev, Prince of Rus, too, on account of their kinship»⁶⁴. The intervention of the Prince of Galicia on the Bohemian side is more than surprising in light of the existing alliance between Galicia and Hungary, as well as of the marriage between Lev and Constance of Hungary, who was still alive at the time⁶⁵. Although the latter did, of course, mean that there was also a distant kinship between the Bohemian and Galician rulers through Ottokar's wife, Kunigunda.

⁵⁷ *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico diplomatica. Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke.* Vol. II. T. 1 / szerk. I. Szentpétery. Budapest : Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1943. Nr. 1604. More about the conflict between Béla IV and Stephan: Zsoldos A. *Családi ügy: IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években.* Budapest : MTA TTI, 2007.

⁵⁸ *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle.* P. 87.

⁵⁹ *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch.* Bd. IV / hrsg. H. Appelt, J. J. Menzel. Köln : Böhlau Verlag, 1988. S. 91. Nr. 124.

⁶⁰ Wyrozumski J. *Beteiligung polnischer Fürsten am Kampf um das Erbe der Babenberger.* *Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Historyczne* 1997. Vol. 121 S. 14; Войтович Л. В. *Лев Данилович.* С. 129.

⁶¹ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században.* Old. 253–254.

⁶² Randt E. *Politische Geschichte bis zum Jahre 1327. Geschichte Schlesiens.* I / hrsg. L. Petry, J. J. Menzel, W. Irgang. Sigmaringen : Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1988. S. 154; Roháč P. III. *česko-uhorská vojna o Babenberské dedičstvo 1270–1271. Vojenská história.* 2016. R. 20. Č. 4. S. 17–18. and independently from them Herucová A. *Vojná o Babenberské dedičstvo a Štefan V. Historický časopis.* 2017. R. 65. Č. 1. S. 20–21. For other reasons behind the campaign see: Barabás G. *Barátból ellenség.* Old. 20.

⁶³ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae.* Vol. V. T. 2 / ed. J. Šebánek. Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе, 1981. P. 258. Nr. 636.

⁶⁴ *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik.* S. 201. The information is taken over by: Johannes Victoriensis: *Chronica Romanorum. Johannes Victoriensis und andere Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands im vierzehnten Jahrhundert* / hrsg. J. F. Boehmer. Stuttgart : Cotta, 1843. S. 309; Thomas Ebendorfer. *Chronicon Austriae* / ed. A. Lhotsky. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicum Nova Series.* 13. Berlin ; Zürich : Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967. P. 737. Compare: Мартынюк А. *До Герберштейна.* С. 196–197.

⁶⁵ Constance died in 1296. Kádár T. *Az Árpád-házi uralkodók és az országlásuk idején hercegi címmel tartományi különhatalmat gyakorolt külhoni, fejedelmi származású előkelők, valamint azok családtagjainak elhalálozási és temetkezési adatai 997–1301 között.* *Fons.* 2012. Évf. 19. Sz. 1. Old. 108.

Recent Ukrainian research has attributed this surprising turn of events – beyond the murder of the Bohemian king's brother-in-law, Béla, Prince of Macsó and Bosnia – to two convincing reasons. On the one hand, Lev and Ottokar II had already become close before 1278, as Lev had apparently helped the Bohemian king to establish contact with the Mongols⁶⁶. Shortly after 1259, Khan Berke sent envoys to Ottokar, who was not against an alliance against Hungary. We have no sources indicating whether this ultimately came to pass, but in light of the events of 1260 and 1261, it was probably taken off the agenda, at least for a time. However, as relations between the Hungarian and Bohemian Kingdoms deteriorated, Ottokar once again sought allies in the east, as evidenced by the Council of Lyon in 1274: here, the Bohemian king was accused of maintaining friendly relations with the Mongol court, and the Mamluk sultan against the King of the Romans, Rudolf of Habsburg (1273–1291) and, naturally, against King Ladislaus IV of Hungary (1272–1290)⁶⁷. According to a letter found in the formulary of Bishop Tobias of Prague (1278–1296), the Bohemian king asked Duke Bolesław the Chaste of Krakow to ensure the safe passage of his own envoy and the Tatar envoys returning home from the Bohemian court to Lev⁶⁸. Jan Bedřich Novák dated the letter between 1269 and 1276 when preparing the edition of the formulary, mainly on the basis of Ottokar's *intitulatio*, but if we take into account that Bolesław the Chaste was an ally of the Kingdom of Hungary until 1273, while the Bohemian king was rather his enemy, the date can be narrowed down to between 1273 and 1276.

On the other hand, Ukrainian research also drew attention to the fact that in the second half of the 1270s, the Prince of Galicia came into conflict with the Vlachs living in the eastern parts of the Kingdom of Hungary. In his work entitled *The Deeds of Emperors and Popes (Gesta imperatorum et pontificum)*, Thomas Tuscanus mentions that, despite the peace treaty of November 1276, Ottokar II began to organize a rebellion against Rudolf of Habsburg, calling on the Ruthenians (*Brutenni*) for help, among others, but they were unable to respond to the call due to their ongoing conflict with the Vlachs⁶⁹. According to the rest of the source, Ottokar, realizing his hopeless situation, entered into a new agreement with Rudolf, which may refer to the events of 6 May 1277, as Manfred Stoy has already pointed out⁷⁰. However, we have no other information about the extent and timing of the problem posed by the Vlachs, so it is quite possible that it continued to hamper the Prince of Halych in 1278. According to the newest research, it cannot be ruled out that Ladislaus IV. himself and his entourage provoked the conflict in order to prevent Lev from personally intervening in the war against the Bohemian king. Accordingly, if Lev did take part in the battle, he could only have done so by sending auxiliary troops, as Ottokar aus der Geul claimed⁷¹.

As it is well known, the battle of Dürnkrut ended with the victory of Rudolf of Habsburg, and Ladislaus IV, as well as the death of Ottokar II, so it is not surprising, that the Galician-Hungarian relations broke for a time⁷². This may have been influenced by the fact that in 1285, during the so-called second Tatar invasion against Hungary, Lev was supposed to join Nogai's and Telebuga's attack, but when he reached the Hungarian border, he was ultimately dismissed⁷³.

⁶⁶ Войтович Л. В. *Лев Данилович*. С. 131–136.

⁶⁷ Vatai G. Az Arany Horda külpolitikája a XIII. század második felében. *Belvedere Meridionale*. 2011. Évf. 23. Sz. 4. Old. 65.

⁶⁸ *Formulář biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně (1279–1296)* / ed. J. B. Novák. *Historický Archív*. 22. Praha : Nákl. České Akademie Čisare Františka Josefa, 1903. S. 43. Nr. 47.

⁶⁹ «Temptat [Ottokar II. – V. R.] cum multis nobilibus Alamanie machinari rebellionem, Brutenis et infideles sibi in adiutorium vocat, sed Deo disponente Bruteni et Blacis inter se discordantibus suo rex Boemie proposito defraudatur», *Thomae Tusci: Gesta imperatorum et pontificum* / ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. 22. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung, 1872. P. 525.

⁷⁰ Stoy M. Die Schlacht auf dem Marchfeld (1278) und der “rex Ruthenorum” Lev/Leo. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*. 2011. Jg. 55. Nr. 2. S. 727–728.

⁷¹ Паршин И. Л. Битва при Дюрнкроте 26. августа 1278 г.: альянс Льва Даниловича и Пшемысла II. Оттокара. *Rossica Antiqua*. 2012. Vol. 5. No. 1. С. 105.

⁷² More about the battle: Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 349–373.

⁷³ Szöcs T. Egy második «tatárjárás» A tatár–magyar kapcsolatok a 13. század második felében. *Belvedere Meridionale*. 2010. Évf. 22. Sz. 3–4. Old. 21.



Andrew III (1290–1301) and Galicia

The alliance between the two countries was renewed by the last ruler of the Árpád dynasty, Andrew III. In connection with the campaign launched against the Austrian Duke, Albert of Habsburg in 1291, one of Seifried Helbling's poems mentions *Riuzischen* in the Hungarian king's army⁷⁴. The main goal of the well-prepared campaign was to recapture the Hungarian castles, and territories that had previously fallen into Austrian hands, but after this was accomplished, Andrew invaded the Austrian Duchy and laid siege to the duke's capital, Vienna. Although no other source explicitly mentions Rus'ian participation in the conflict, there is no reason to doubt the report, as other sources indicate that Tatars, Ruthenians, Vlachs, Cumans, and other barbarian peoples were also present in Andrew III's army⁷⁵. It is very likely that the Ruthenians mentioned in the annals were in fact Rus'ians, and that the Tatars were also linked to the Rurikid princes who had become taxpayers of the Mongols, on the basis of which Polish research considers it possible that Lev provided assistance to Andrew III as an ally, because he had a strategic interest in maintaining peaceful relations with the Kingdom of Hungary⁷⁶.

In addition to all this, it cannot be ignored that at this time a new, albeit distant family connection linked the Hungarian and Galician ruling houses. At the end of 1290, Andrew III married the niece of Duke Władysław Łokietek of Kuyavia named Fenenna, whose sister, Euphemia, had been married to Yuri, the eldest son of the Prince of Galicia. The marriage was intended to counterbalance the influence of King Wenceslaus II of Bohemia, who also made claims to the Polish throne, and was hostile towards the Kingdom of Hungary. His main rival in the Polish territories was actually Władysław Łokietek. The latter was later provided with military assistance by Andrew III on several occasions. Based on all this, it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that a small but easily recognizable Galician contingent also took part in the Hungarian campaign against Albert⁷⁷.

The Galician alliance played once again a role in Andrew III's western policy. Henry of Hainburg's chronicle mentions a personal meeting between King Wenceslaus II of Bohemia, and Prince Lev of Galicia in Brno in 1299⁷⁸. This may seem surprising taking his son's Kuyavian marriage into account. Although Lev had consistently supported Władysław Łokietek in his fight for the Polish throne since the turn of the last decade of the 13th century, he began to move closer to the Bohemian king in the second half of the 1290s⁷⁹. The meeting was probably initiated by Wenceslaus II, as he – before finally taking the throne in Krakow and being crowned King of Poland – wanted to gain as many allies as possible and resolve as many issues as possible through diplomacy, so the main topic of the discussion was likely a future agreement with Władysław. If this assumption is correct, then the effort seemed to pay off, as Władysław promised to submit to the Bohemian king on 23 August 1299⁸⁰. Previous literature has placed the meeting between early March and mid-May 1299, based

⁷⁴ Seifried Helbling / hrsg. J. Seemüller. Halle : Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1886. S. 178.

⁷⁵ Andrew III «exercitum ducens in Austriam, in quo habuit Tartaros et Ruthenos et alias barbaras nationes [...]», *Annales Florianenses* / ed. W. Wattenbach. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. Vol. 9. P. 749; «Andreas rex Ungarie [...] collecto exercitu maximo et forti pugnatorum et sagitariorum ad estimationem 80 milium, Cozlonum, Walachorum, Ruthenorum, Chomanorum, Ungarorum, Septem castrorum, Austriam nemine sibi resistente potenter intravit [...]», *Annales Vindobonenses* / ed. W. Wattenbach. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. Vol. 9. P. 716.

⁷⁶ Woytowycz L. Lew Daniłowicz i walka o tron krakowski w ostat niej ćwierci XIII. wieku. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie*. 2016. Vol. 12. S. 128.

⁷⁷ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században*. Old. 486–487.

⁷⁸ *Henricus de Heimburg: Annales* / ed. G. H. Pertz. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. 17. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung, 1861. P. 718.

⁷⁹ Lübke Ch. Außenpolitik im östlichen Mitteleuropa: Expansion und Hegemonie am Beispiel Polens und des Landes Halic–Volyn' (bis 1387). *Das Reich und Polen: Parallelen, Interaktionen und Formen der Akkulturation im Hohen und Späten Mittelalter* / hrsg. A. Patschovsky. Stuttgart : Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2003. S. 51; Woytowycz L. Lew Daniłowicz i walka. S. 126–130.

⁸⁰ Woytowycz L. Lew Daniłowicz i walka. S. 130. According to another opinion, the meeting can be related to the Mongols. Adamovyc V. Rus v českých kronikách 13–14. storočia. *Княжа доба*. 2013. Roč. 7. S. 98–99.

mainly on the itinerary of Wenceslas II⁸¹. However, this can be specified by using a previously overlooked documentary source. Bishop Antal of Cenad issued a charter in Brno on 7 May 1299⁸², just when the Bohemian king was also in the city⁸³. It is reasonable to assume that the bishop did not visit Moravia solely for the purpose of issuing the document, but was also performing some kind of diplomatic task⁸⁴, and that he himself participated in the meeting between Wenceslaus and Lev, which can therefore be dated to the first half of May⁸⁵.

The role of Galicia in the early years of Charles I (1301–1342) reign

In my opinion, the Hungarian-Galician alliance did not fall into oblivion even after the extinction of the Árpád dynasty: Prince Lev II of Galicia and the first king of the new dynasty, Charles I, renewed the lucrative cooperation of their predecessors. Gyula Kristó already drew attention to this in his 1988 published study, in which he – based on a Hungarian royal charter from 1326⁸⁶ and the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*⁸⁷ – stated that Charles I had been married four times, contrary to the previously assumed three. The unknown wife was the first in line, whom Kristó identified as the daughter of Prince Lev II of Galicia, presumably named Mary⁸⁸. Although the suggestion was criticized – mainly by a Polish researchers⁸⁹, and the circumstances of the marriage have since been supplemented as well as clarified in several aspects, the Hungarian and, in part, the international research accepted the existence of a new first wife⁹⁰. However, uncertainty remained regarding the exact date and motivations of the marriage. I have already discussed these issues in detail in a previous study, so I will limit myself here to the results.

Based on the available direct and indirect sources, it is most likely that the alliance was formed in Hungary in the summer of 1304, even before the campaign launched by Charles and the Habsburg dukes in the autumn of that year against Bohemia. The main motivation was to form an alliance against King Wenceslas II of Bohemia, and to help Władysław Łokietek, who was not only connected to Lev, but thanks to the marriage, also distantly related to Charles. Władysław continued to fight Wenceslas II for the Polish throne, while Charles's main rival in the struggle for the Hungarian crown was the son of the Bohemian king, the future Wenceslas III (1305–1306). As there were no

⁸¹ Woytowycz L. Lew Daniłowicz i walka. S. 130.

⁸² *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae. Urkundensammlung zur Geschichte Mährens* / hrsg. A. Boczek, J. Chytil. Brno: Typographia Caroli Winikeril, 1850. Vol. V. P. 109. Nr. 106.

⁸³ Ibidem. P. 110. Nr. 107, P. 111. Nr. 108, P. 112–113. Nr. 109, P. 113. Nr. 110.

⁸⁴ Szabó A. Venczel és Ottó királyok oklevelei. *Turul.* 1916. Évf. 34. Sz. 1. Old. 16.

⁸⁵ Rudolf V. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században.* Old. 518–519.

⁸⁶ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény 265464.

⁸⁷ *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis, «Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Ungaria, Polonia, Bohemia» anno MCCCVIII exarata* / ed., praef. et adnot. O. Górká. Cracoviae: Sumptibus Academiae Litterarum, 1916. P. 40. About the source: Grzesik R. *Descriptio Europae Orientalis. The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle.* Vol. I. P. 518–519; Живковий Т., Петровий В., Узелац А. *Време настанка DEO. Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis – Анонимов опис источне Европе* / крит. изд., превод Д. Кунчер. *Извори за српску историју 13. Латински извори* Vol. 2. Београд: Историјског института. 2013. S. 51–64.

⁸⁸ Kristó Gy. Károly Róbert első felesége. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica.* 1988. Évf. 86. Old. 27–30.

⁸⁹ Sroka St. Hungarian-Galician Marriage at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century? *Harvard Ukrainian Studies.* 1992. Vol. 16. No. 1. P. 261–268; idem. Ki volt Károly Róbert első felesége? *Aetas.* 1994. Évf. 9. Sz. 1. Old. 187–193.

⁹⁰ Font M. «Halics» a magyarországi Anjouk politikájában. *Hungaro Ruthenica.* 2012. Évf. 6. Old. 66; Csukovits E. *Az Anjouk Magyarországon I. rész. I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342).* Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2012. Old. 126–127; Kádár T. Megjegyzések, észrevételek I. Károly (Róbert) magyar király házassági és egyéb családi kapcsolatai kérdéséhez. *Turul.* 2009. Évf. 82. Sz. 1. Old. 17–18; idem. Harcba a koronáért. I. Károly (Róbert) király uralkodásának első éveitől 1305 végéig. *Történeti Tanulmányok.* 2015. Évf. 23. Old. 91–92; Voloshchuk M. Ruthenian-Hungarian Matrimonial Connections in the Context of the Rurik Dynasty Inter-dynasty Policy of the 10th–14th Centuries: Selected Statistical Data. *Codrul Cosminului.* 2018. Vol. 24. No. 1. P. 21–22.



suitable marriage candidates among Władysław's immediate family, he established a dynastic connection with the new Hungarian king through his nephew's daughter, reviving the alliance that had existed during the reign of Andrew III. However, the dynastic connection, which promised to be beneficial for both parties, failed to meet all expectations, as it did not produce any children, most likely due to the early death of the Galician princess. In 1306, Charles was forced to marry for the second time, but the common interests with Łokietek, and Lev II persisted for almost a decade⁹¹.

Summary

Looking back at the Galician–Hungarian relations from the mid-13th century to the first decade of the 14th century, it can be concluded that, unlike in earlier periods, these relations were fundamentally balanced, and largely friendly, and cooperative. After Béla IV finally gave up on acquiring Galicia, the marriage between Lev and Constance cemented the friendship between the two parties for a long time, which also led to the Rurikid participation in the western wars of the Hungarian king. It is true that Roman's involvement in the struggle for the Babenberg inheritance did not turn out that way, as Béla IV planned, but even this did not spoil the relationship, as indicated by Lev's possible participation in Prince Béla's wedding in 1264, and the Galician prince's support for the old king in his dispute with his son. There was no direct intervention in the western policy of the Hungarian kings in the 1260s, but in 1271 it is possible that Lev and Bolesław the Chaste destroyed the Silesian territories on behalf of their brother-in-law, Stephen V.

Relations temporarily deteriorated during the reign of Ladislaus IV. Although, Lev sent auxiliary troops to the Battle of Dürnkrut, not for the Hungarian king, but to the Bohemian king. Relations were restored during the reign of the last Árpadian ruler, thanks to a common relative, Władysław Łokietek, and a common enemy, King Wenceslaus II of Bohemia. Lev sent troops to Andrew III for his Austrian campaign in 1291, and then, with the change in the political situation, in 1299, the Prince of Galicia personally and the Hungarian king through his envoy took part in a meeting with the Bohemian king in Brno. In my opinion, the common interests between the Kingdom of Hungary and the Principality of Galicia did not cease with the extinction of the Árpád dynasty: the intention to revive the alliance can be traced back to the first marriage of Charles I with the daughter of Lev II of Galicia, presumably named Mary.

РОЛЬ ГАЛИЧНИНИ В ЗОВНІШНІЙ ПОЛІТИЦІ УГОРСЬКОГО КОРОЛІВСТВА ЗА ОСТАННІХ АРПАДІВ ТА ПЕРШИХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ ДИНАСТІЇ АНЖУ

Вероніка РУДОЛЬФ

Університет Лоранда Етвеша, Інститут історичних досліджень,

Кафедра допоміжних історичних дисциплін

6–8, Múzeum Blvd., 1088, Budapest, Hungary

e-mail: rudolf.veronika@btk.elte.hu

ORCID: 0000-0001-5331-7237

Дослідження присвячене ролі Галичини та її правителів з династії Рюриковичів у зовнішній політиці Угорського королівства за останніх Арпадів та в перше десятиліття Анжуйської епохи. Попередні часи досить часто були в центрі уваги історичних студій через неодноразові спроби угорських королів завоювати Галичину. Після того, як король Угорщини Бела IV відмовився від цього – через поразку під Ярославом 1245 р. – між двома країнами було досягнуто дружніх зв'язків та політичного союзу. Це дозволило залучити правителів з династії Рюриковичів до боротьби Бели IV за так звану Бабенберзьку спадщину. Шлюб Романа Даниловича з Гертрудою Бабенберзькою та Опавський похід Данила Романовича 1253 р. добре відомі в угорських та назагал європейських дослідженнях, хоча деякі деталі все ще потребують уточнення, що також намагається зробити авторка цієї публікації. Наступний етап галицько-угорських відносин у 1260–1270-х рр. відтворює участь князя Лева Даниловича у конфлікті між угорським та богемським королями. У статті обґрунтовуються тісні

⁹¹ Rudolf V. Some Remarks on the First Wife of Charles I of Hungary. *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea*. 2024. Vol. 11. P. 9–38.

стосунки між останнім королем з родини Арпадів – Андрієм III, та Левом, що проявлялися у спільній політиці, як на полі бою, так і за столом переговорів. Спільний інтерес пізніше був відроджений першим королем з династії Анжу Карлом Робертом і князем Левом II через династичний шлюб 1304 р.

Ключові слова: галицько-угорські відносини, дипломатична історія, Бабенберзька спадщина, Опавська кампанія, династичні стосунки.

REFERENCES

- Adamovč, V. (2013). Rus v českých kronikách 13–14. storočia. *Knjaža doba*. Vol. 7. S. 95–107 (in Slovak).
- Appelt, H., Menzel, J. J. (Hrsg.). (1988). *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*. Bd. IV. Köln : Böhlau Verlag. 439 p. (in Latin).
- Barabás G. (2025). Barátból ellenség. Władysław opolei herceg és a Přemysl–Árpád-konfliktus a 13. század második felében. *Történelmi Szemle*. Évf. 67. Sz. 1. Old. 1–30 (in Hungarian).
- Bocek, A., Chytil, J. (Hrsg.). (1850). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae. Urkundensammlung zur Geschichte Mährens*. Bd. V. Brunae : Typographia Caroli Winikeril, 1850. 300 p. (in Latin).
- Boehmer, J. F. (Hrsg.). (1843). *Iohannes Victoriensis: Chronica Romanorum. Johannes Victoriensis und andere Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands im vierzehnten Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart : Cotta, 1843. S. 271–450 (in Latin).
- Csiky, G. (2025). Winter War in Rus'. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation. Vol. 1 : *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242)*. P. 175–184 (in English).
- Csiky, G. (2025). The Conquest of South Rus' (1239–1240). *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D.. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, Vol. 1 : *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242)*. P. 185–192 (in English).
- Csukovits, E. (2012). *Az Anjouk Magyarországon I. rész. I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342)*. Budapest : MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet. 154 s. (in Hungarian).
- Dąbrowski, D. (2012). *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264). Biografia polityczna*. Kraków : Avalon. 538 s. (in Polish).
- Dąbrowski, D. (2019). Danylo Romanovich Versus the Civil War in Hungary in the Years 1261–1264 and the Specificity of Information Contained in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle (The Romanovichi Chronicle) on Hungarian Matters. *Hungary and the Hungarians in Central and East European Narrative Sources (10th–17th Centuries)* / eds. D. Bagi, G. Barabás, M. Font, E. Sashalmi. Pécs : University of Pécs, 2019. P. 77–90 (in English).
- Dąbrowski, D., Jusupović, A. (eds). (2017). *Krónika Halicko–Wolynska (Krónika Romanowiczów). Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. Kraków ; Warszawa : PWN ; PAU, Seria II. T. XVI. 709 s. (in Old-Ukrainian).
- Dunphy, G. (ed.). (2010). *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* 1. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 1748 p. (in English).
- Dykastová, G. (2020). Vzestup a pád Beneše ze Cvilína. *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*. Roč. 23. Č. 2. S. 37–63 (in Czech).
- Ehrenfeuchter, E. (ed.). (1872). *Thomae Tusci: Gesta imperatorum et pontificum. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. 22. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 483–528 (in Latin).
- Font, M. (2005). *Az Árpád-házi királyok és a Rurikida fejedelmek*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely. 330 old. (in Hungarian).
- Font, M. (2012). «Halics» a magyarországi Anjouk politikájában. *Hungaro Ruthenica*. Évf. 6. Old. 65–76 (in Hungarian).
- Font, M. (2014) Rosztiziszlav herceg IV. Béla udvarában. *Közlemények Székesfehérvár történetéből* / szerk. Zsoldos A. Székesfehérvár : Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet, 2016: *Hercegek és hercegségek a középkori Magyarországon. Konferencia Székesfehérváron 2014. szeptember 20.* Old. 25–58 (in Hungarian).
- Font, M. (2017). A «Halicsi» Danyiil és a Magyar Királyság. *Acta Academiae Agriensis, Sectio Historiae*. Évf. 44. Old. 267–283 (in Hungarian).
- Font, M. (2021). *The Kings of the House of Árpád and the Rurikid Princes. Cooperation and Conflict in Medieval Hungary and Kievan Rus'*. Budapest : Eötvös Loránd Research Network, Research Centre for the Humanities, 354 p. (in English).
- Font, M. (2024). To the Question of Exile in the Middle Age. Refugees from Eastern Europe in Medieval Hungary in the Eleventh-Thirteenth Centuries. *Memoria Hungariae* / eds. A. Bárány, R. Czaja, H. Flachenecker, L. Pósan. Debrecen : Universität Debrecen Forschungsgruppe «Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa», T. 6 : *Zwischen Ostsee und Adria II. Ostmitteleuropa im Mittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit. Die Mobilität von Menschen, Gütern, Geld, Diplomaten, Reliquien*. P. 3–38 (in English).



Font, M. (2025). The Causes of the Rus' Defeat. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, Vol. 1: *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242)*. P. 193–196 (in English).

Font, M. (2025). The Absorption of Rus' into the Golden Horde: Regional Relations with the Mongol Presence. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation. Vol. 1 : *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242)*. P. 283–186 (in English).

Font, M., Barabás, G. (2017). *Kálmán (1208–1241): Halics királya – Szlavónia hercege*. Pécs : Kronosz Kiadó, 202 old. (in Hungarian).

Gombos, F. A. (coll.). (1937). *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae aevo ducum et regum ex stirpe Arpad descendantium ab anno Christi DCCC usque ad annum MCCCII*. 2. Budapest : Szent István Akadémia. 901 p. (in Latin).

Górka, O. (ed., praef. et adnot.). (1916). *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis, «Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Ungaria, Polonia, Bohemia» anno MCCCVIII exarate*. Cracoviae : Sumptibus Academiae Litterarum, 70 p. (in Latin).

Herucová, A. (2017). Vojná o Babenberské dedičstvo a Štefan V. *Historický Časopis*. Roč. 65. Č. 1. S. 3–24 (in Czech).

Kádár, T. (2009). Megjegyzések, észrevételek I. Károly (Róbert) magyar király házassági és egyéb családi kapcsolatai kérdéséhez. *Turul*. Évf. 82. Sz. 1. Old. 13–23 (in Hungarian).

Kádár, T. (2012). Az Árpád-házi uralkodók és az országlásuk idején hercegi címmel tartományi különhatalmat gyakorolt külhoni, fejedelmi származású előkelők, valamint azok családtagjainak elhalálzási és temetkezési adatai 997–1301 között. *Fons*. 2012. Évf. 19. Sz. 1. Old. 57–108 (in Hungarian).

Kádár, T. (2015). Harcban a koronáért. I. Károly (Róbert) király uralkodásának első éve 1305 végéig. *Történeti Tanulmányok*. Évf. 23. Old. 42–111 (in Hungarian).

Kállay, U. (1903). Mikor koronázták meg Kálmánt, Halics felkent királyát a pápa által küldött koronával? *Századok*. Vol. 37. No. 7. S. 672–673 (in Hungarian).

Komendová, J. (2000). Vladařská propaganda a antipropaganda na Rusi a v Čechách ve 13. století. *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Historica*. Roč. 29. S. 39–50 (in Czech).

Komendová, J. (2014). Opavskij pohod Daniila Romanoviča: češkij vegljad. *Colloquia Russica* / ed. V. Nagirnyy. Kraków : Jagiellonian University, Series I. Vol. 4 : *Rurikids in Dynastic Relations: Politics, Customs, Culture, Religion (10th–16th c.)*. Publication after 4th International Conference, Mogilno, 14–16th November 2013. P. 156–167 (in Russian).

Kristó, Gy. (1988). Károly Róbert első felesége. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica*. Évf. 86. Old. 27–30 (in Hungarian).

Kynger, D. (Krit. izd., prevod) (2013). *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis – Izvoru za srnky usmoruji 13. lamunsku uzvoru*. Vol. 2. Beograd : Istorijskog instituta, 221 s. (in Latin and Serbian).

Lhotsky, A. (ed.). (1967). Thomas Ebendorfer. *Chronica Austriae. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicum Nova Series*. 13. Berlin ; Zürich : Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 602 p. (in Latin).

Lübke, Ch. (2003). Außenpolitik im östlichen Mitteleuropa: Expansion und Hegemonie am Beispiel Polens und des Landes Halic-Volyn' (bis 1387). *Das Reich und Polen: Parallelen, Interaktionen und Formen der Akkulturation im Hohen und Späten Mittelalter* / hrsg. A. Patschovsky. Stuttgart : Jan Thorbecke Verlag. S. 21–58 (in German).

Maierov, A. V. (2025). The Dragon Turns its Gaze to the West: The Mongol Empire's Global Diplomacy in the Mirror of Outsider Chronicles. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. Vol. 78. No. 3. P. 509–538 (in English).

Makk, F. (1996). *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)*. Szeged : Szegedi Középkorász Műhely. 243 old. (in Hungarian).

Martynyuk, A. (2015). «Nemci že divjašesja oružiju tatarskomu»: s kem i kogda vstrečalsja Daniil Romanovič v Požoni. *Colloquia Russica* / eds. V. Nagirnyy, A. Mesiarkin. Krakow ; Bratislava: Jagiellonian University, Series I. Vol. 5 : *Rus' and Central Europe from the 11th to the 14th Century*. Publication after the 5th International Conference, Spišská kapitula, 16th–18th October, 2014. S. 149–160 (in Russian).

Martynyuk, A. (2017). «Avstrijskij stol» knjazja Romana Daniloviča. *Colloquia Russica* / za red. V. Nagirnogo, M. Voloččuka. Ivano-Frankivs'k ; Krakiv : Centr medievističnih studij Deržavnogo višogo navčal'nogo zakladu ; Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Series II. Vol. 3 : *Daniilo Romanovič i jogo časi*, C. 133–143 (in Ukrainian).

Martyniuk, A. (2019). *Do Gerberštejna. Avstrija i Vostočnaja Evropa v sisteme personal'nyh svjazej (XIII – načalo XVI veka)*. Moskva : Kvadriga. 576 s. (in Russian).

- Martyniuk, A. (2025). Rus in the Christian Community: a View from Thirteenth-Century Europe. *Christian Rus in the Making. 1. Politics and Culture* / eds. A. Jusupović, A. Paroń, A. Vukovich. Paderborn : Brill. P. 91–99 (in English).
- Meier, H. (1927). Gertrud. Herzogin von Österreich und Steiermark. *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark*. Jg. 23. S. 5–38 (in German).
- Mika, N. (2008). *Walka o spadek po Babenbergach 1246–1278*. Racibórz : Wyd-wo Waw, 136 s. (in Polish).
- Novák, J. B. (ed.). (1903). *Formulář biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně (1279–1296)*. Praha : Nákl. České Akademie Čisare Františka Josefa, (*Historický Archiv* 22.) 248 s. (in Czech and Latin).
- Palko J. (2022). *Kráľovič Bélo (1249–1269). Dux tocius Sclavoniae, Dalmaciae et Croaciae*. Bratislava : Univerzity Komenského, 216 s. (in Slovak).
- Paršin, I. L. (2012). Bitva pri Djurnkrute 26. avgusta 1278 g.: al'jans Leva Daniloviča i Pšemysla II. Ottokara. *Rossica Antiqua*. Vol. 5. № 1. S. 95–106 (in Russian).
- Perfecky, G. A. (trans.) (1973). *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*. Munich : Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 159 p. (in English).
- Pertz, G. H. (ed.). (1861). Henricus de Heimburg: Annales. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. 17. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 711–718 (in Latin).
- Pertz, G. H. (ed.). (1866). Annales Sanctae Crucis Polonici. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. 19. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 678–687 (in Latin).
- Pow, S. (2025). Fortification Reforms in Galicia-Volhynia and Poland after the Mongol Invasion of 1240–1242. *Europe and Inner Asia: Historical and Archeological Interactions* / eds. B. Szabó J., Uhrin D. Budapest : Archaeolingua Foundation, Vol. 1 : *Mongol Invasion against Europe (1236–1242)*. P. 319–326 (in English).
- Randt, E. (1988). Politische Geschichte bis zum Jahre 1327. *Geschichte Schlesiens*. Bd. I / hrsg. L. Petry, J. J. Menzel, W. Irgang. Sigmaringen : Jan Thorbecke Verlag. S. 73–200 (in German).
- Roháč, P. (2016). Boj o Babenberské dedičstvo a I. česko–uhorská vojna 1252–1254. *Vojenská historia*. Roč. 20. Č. 1. S. 18–42 (in Slovak).
- Roháč, P. (2016). III. Česko-uhorská vojna o Babenberské dedičstvo 1270–1271. *Vojenská historia*. Roč. 20. Č. 4. S. 6–33 (in Slovak).
- Röpell, R., Arndt, W. (ed.). (1866). Annales Cracovienses compilati. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*. T. 19. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 582–607. (in Latin).
- Rudolf, V. (2022). Az Árpádok és a Pettaiak. *ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, Tanulmányok – Konferenciák* / szerk. E. Kovács, V. Rudolf, L. Szokola., O. Varró, M. Veszprémy. Budapest : ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, Köt. 16: *Micae Mediaevales X. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról*. S. 77–96 (in Hungarian).
- Rudolf, V. (2023). Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században. Magyarország, Csehország és Ausztria hatalmi és dinasztikus kapcsolatai 1196 és 1310 között. Budapest : Hun-Ren Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 904 old. (in Hungarian).
- Rudolf, V. (2024). Some Remarks on the First Wife of Charles I of Hungary. *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea*. Vol. 11. P. 9–38 (in English).
- Rudolf, V. (2025). *Az Árpádok és a Pettaiak 1254 után*. Fons. Manuscript. (in Hungarian).
- Rudolf, V. *Osztrák, stájer, karintiai miniszteriálisok és a Magyar Királyság az Árpád-korban*. Manuscript (in Hungarian).
- Šebánek, J. (ed.). (1965). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. IV. T. 2 / Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе (in Latin).
- Šebánek, J. (1974). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. V. T. 1. Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе. (in Latin).
- Šebánek, J. (1981). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. V. T. 2. Prag : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе (in Latin).
- Seemüller, J. (Hrsg.). (1886). *Seifried Helbling*. Halle : Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 393 s. (in Old-German).
- Seemüller, J. (ed.). (1890). Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Deutsche Chroniken* V/1. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. 720 s. (in Old-German).
- Senga, T. (1988). Béla királyfi bolgár, halicsi és osztrák hadjárataihoz. *Századok*. Évf. 122. Sz. 1. Old. 36–51. (in Hungarian).
- Senga, T. (2016). «Benedikt Bor», Benedek és Bankó Halicsban 1210 körül. *Magyar Nyelv*. Évf. 112. Sz. 1. Old. 32–49 and Sz. 2. Old. 183–206 (in Hungarian).
- Senga, T. (2018). Achilles alkancellár Halicsban 1246-ban. Adalék a magyar vice szó történetéhez. *Magyar Nyelv*. Évf. 114. Sz. 1. Old. 44–58. (in Hungarian).



- Sroka, S. (1992.) Hungarian–Galician Marriage at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century? *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. Vol. 16. № 1. P. 261–268. (in English).
- Sroka, S. (1994) Ki volt Károly Róbert első felesége? *Aetas*. Évf. 9. Sz. 1. Old. 187–193 (in Hungarian).
- Stoy, M. (2011). Die Schlacht auf dem Marchfeld (1278) und der «rex Ruthenorum» Lev/Leo. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*. Jg. 55. № 2. S. 727–742 (in German).
- Szabó, A. (1916). Venczel és Ottó királyok oklevelei. *Turul*. Évf. 34. Sz. 1. Old. 13–46. (in Hungarian).
- Szende, L. (1999). Harc a Babenberg-örökségért (1246–1261). *Sic Itur ad Astra*. Évf. 11. Old. 263–306 (in Hungarian).
- Szentpétery, I. (szerk.) (1943). *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico diplomatica*. Vol. II. T. 1. Budapest : Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. 194 old. (in Hungarian and Latin).
- Szőcs, T. (2010). Egy második «tatárjárás»? A tatár-magyar kapcsolatok a 13. század második felében. *Belvedere Meridionale*. Évf. 22. Sz. 3–4. Old. 16–50 (in Hungarian).
- Szőcs, T. (2023). Fifty Years: Mongol-Hungarian Conflicts between 1242 and 1292, and the ‘Second Mongol Invasion’ in 1285. *The Mongols in Central Europe: The Profile and Impact of their Thirteenth-Century Invasions* / ed. B. Nagy. Budapest : Eötvös Kiadó. 325–362 p. (in English).
- Zahn, J. von. (bearb.). (1903). *Urkundenbuch des Herzogtums Steiermark*. Bd. III. Graz : Verlag des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark (*Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Landeskommission für Steiermark* 33). 466 p. (in Latin).
- Vatai, G. (2011). Az Arany Horda külpolitikája a XIII. század második felében. *Belvedere Meridionale*. Évf. 23. Sz. 4. Old. 58–69 (in Hungarian).
- Vizkelety, A. (1993). Béla hercegnek, IV. Béla király fiának menyegzője. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*. Évf. 97. Sz. 5. Old. 571–584 (in Hungarian).
- Voytovič, L. V. (2011). Lev Danilovič i zagadki «avstrijskogo uzla» (1272–1278). *Rossica Antiqua*. Vol. 7. № 2. S. 120–139 (in Russian).
- Voloshchuk, M. (2018). Ruthenian–Hungarian Matrimonial Connections in the Context of the Rurik Dynasty Inter-dynasty Policy of the 10th–14th Centuries: Selected Statistical Sata. *Codrul Cosminului*. Vol. 24. № 1. P. 7–30 (in English).
- Wattenbach, W. (ed.). (1851). *Continuatio Garstensis. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 9*. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 593–600 (in Latin).
- Wattenbach, W. (ed.). (1851). *Continuatio Claustroneoburgenses secunda. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 9*. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 614–624 (in Latin).
- Wattenbach, W. (ed.). (1851). *Annales Vindobonenses. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 9*. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 699–722 (in Latin).
- Wattenbach, W. (ed.) (1851). *Continuatio Praedicatorum Vindobonensium* / ed. W. Wattenbach. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 9*. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 724–732 (in Latin).
- Wattenbach, W. (ed.). (1851). *Annales Florianenses. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 9*. Hannover : Hahnische Buchhandlung. P. 747–753 (in Latin).
- Weltin, M. (1979). Landesherr und Landherren. Zur Herrschaft Ottokars II. Přemysl in Österreich. *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich. Neue Folge* / Hrsg. A. Kusternig, M. Weltin. Wien : Verein für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich, Vol. 44–45: *Ottokar-Forschungen*. S. 159–225 (in German).
- Wertner, M. (1889). *Boris und Rostislav: Beitrag zur Geschichte der russisch–polnisch–ungarischen Beziehungen*. Berlin : Verlag des Vereins Herold, 154 s. (in German).
- Wihoda, M. (2010). Přemyslova Moravská léta mezi královskou korunou a babenberským dědictvím. *Pocta králi. K 730. výročí smrti českého krále, rakouského vévody a moravského markraběte Přemysla Otakara II* / eds. L. Jan, J. Kacetl. Brno ; Znojmo : Matice moravská. S. 47–53 (in Czech).
- Woytowycz, L. (2016). Lew Daniłowicz i walka o tron krakowski w ostatniej ćwierci XIII. wieku. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne*. Vol. 12. S. 117–131 (in Polish).
- Wyrozumski, J. (1997). Beteiligung polnischer Fürsten am Kampf um das Erbe der Babenberger. *Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Historyczne*. Vol. 121. S. 7–21 (in German).
- Zehetmayer R. (2020). Das sogenannte «österreichische Interregnum»: von den Babenbergern zu den Habsburgern. *Tagungen zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung* / hrsg. N. Kersken, S. Tebruck. Marburg : Verlag Herder-Institut, 2020. Vol. 38 : *Interregna im mittelalterlichen Europa. Konkurrierende Kräfte in politischen Zwischenräumen*. S. 45–73 (in German).
- Žemlička, J. (2011). *Přemysl Otakar II. Král na rozhraní věků*. Praha : NLN, 760 s. (in Czech).
- Zsoldos, A. (2007). *Családi ügy: IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években*. Budapest : MTA TTI, 172 s. (in Hungarian).

Надійшла до видавництва 23 грудня 2025 р.

Прийнята до друку 21 лютого 2026 р.

Опублікована 6 травня 2026 р.