

Opažanja o prvoj supruzi ugarskog kralja Karla I.*

Some Remarks on the First Wife of Charles I of Hungary*

Veronika Rudolf

rudolf.veronika@btk.elte.hu

Institut za povijest, Odjel pomoćnih povijesnih studija / *Institute of
History, Department of Auxiliary Studies of History*
ELTE Filozofski fakultet / *ELTE Faculty of Humanities*
Múzeum körút 6–8, HU - 1088 Budapest

UDK/UDC: 94(439)⁶13⁶
10.15291/misc.4737

Izvorni znanstveni rad / *Original scientific paper*
Primljeno / *Received*: 30. IV. 2024.



Ključne riječi: Karlo I.; ugarsko-
galicijski savez; Lav II. od Galicije;
dinastički odnos; Wladislaw
Łokietek

Keywords: Charles I of Hungary;
Hungarian–Galician alliance; Leo
II of Galicia; dynastic relationship;
Wladislaw Łokietek

Dugo je među svim povjesničarima bilo općeprihvaćeno da je ugarski kralj Karlo I. imao tri žene: Mariju od Bytoma, Beatricu Luksemburšku i Elizabetu Poljsku, što je potkrijepljeno najvažnijim narativnim izvorom o njegovoj vladavini, takozvanom *Bečkom ilustriranom kronikom*. Međutim, 1988. godine mađarski medievalist Gyula Kristó – na temelju novih izvora, *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* i povelje koju je izdao sam kralj – iznio je novu teoriju koja je tvrdila da je Karlo I. imao četiri žene. Prema njemu, prva je supruga nedostajala u starijim istraživanjima, a trebala bi biti identificirana kao kći kneza Lava II. od Galicije (Halych). Iako su Kristóovo mišljenje kritizirali uglavnom poljski povjesničari, ono je općeprihvaćeno među mađarskim povjesničarima srednjeg vijeka. Unatoč raspravama i istraživanjima o Karlovoj vladavini koja su u tijeku, točan datum vjenčanja i motiv ugarsko-galicijskog saveza još uvijek su nejasni. U radu se, u potrazi za dokazima o dataciji, najprije ispituju izvori koji spominju suprugu iz Galicije, zatim se detaljno iznosi Kristóovo mišljenje i njegov spor sa Stanisławom Srokom te doprinosi drugih povjesničara koji su pridodali nove argumente i poglede na temu prve supruge nakon spomenute svade, a na kraju se ocrtavaju neki novi pogledi vezani za savezništvo te datum sklapanja braka.

For a long time, it was generally accepted by all historians that Charles I of Hungary had three wives: Mary of Bytom, Beatrice of Luxembourg, and Elizabeth of Poland, which was supported by the most important narrative source of his reign, the so-called Illuminated Chronicle. In 1988, however, the Hungarian medievalist, Gyula Kristó – based on new sources, the Descriptio Europae Orientalis, and a charter issued by the king himself – came up with a new theory which claimed that Charles I had four wives. According to him, the first wife was missing from the older research, and she should be identified as the daughter of Prince Leo II of Galicia (Halych). Although Kristó's opinion was criticised mainly by Polish historians, it has been widely accepted among Hungarian medievalists. Despite the disputes and the ongoing researches on the reign of Charles, the exact date of the marriage, as well as the motive of the Hungarian–Galician alliance are still unclear. The paper firstly examines the sources mentioning the Galician wife, in search for evidence regarding its dating, then it presents Kristó's opinion and his dispute with Stanisław Sroka in detail, as well as the contributions by other historians, who added new arguments and aspects to the topic of the first wife after the mentioned dispute, and finally, outlines some new aspects regarding the alliance, and the date of the marriage.

* Željela bih zahvaliti dvojici anonimnih recenzenata mog članka na savjetima i korisnim prijedlozima. Ovaj je rad kraća i revidirana verzija mojeg mađarskog članka o istoj temi (Rudolf 2024).

* I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers of my article for their advices and useful suggestions. This paper is a shorter and revised version of my Hungarian article regarding the same topic (Rudolf 2024).

Jedan od najvažnijih izvora o povijesti mađarskih Anžuvina, takozvana *Bečka ilustrirana kronika* (dovršena sredinom 14. stoljeća) navodi da je Karlo I. imao tri supruge: prva supruga bila je Marija, kći Kasimira, vojvode od Bytoma; druga supruga bila je Beatrica, kći cara Svetog Rimskog Carstva Henrika VII. od Luksemburga i sestra kralja Češke, Ivana od Luksemburga, dok je njegova treća supruga bila Elizabeta, kći Wladislawa Łokieteka, poljskog kralja.¹ Taj prikaz dugo su prihvaćali svi mađarski i inozemni povjesničari, no 1988. godine mađarski medievalist Gyula Kristó iznio je novi pristup ustvrdivši da je spomenuti dio kronike nepotpun te da je Karlo I. zapravo imao četiri žene. Prema Kristóu karika koja je nedostajala bila je prva žena, koja je bila – na temelju dvaju međusobno neovisnih izvora – kći princa Lava II. od Galicije (Halych).² Premda je Kristóovo mišljenje izazvalo određene kritike, uglavnom poljskih povjesničara – prije svega Stanisława Sroka, s kojim je također bio u ozbiljnom i dugotrajnom sporu³ – postojanje prve supruge iz Galicije bilo je općeprihvaćeno među mađarskim povjesničarima srednjeg vijeka.⁴ Unatoč pažljivom i temeljitom istraživanju tog pitanja tijekom njihova spora te tekućim istraživanjima u vezi s poviješću Anžuvina, a posebno Karlove vladavine, točan datum vjenčanja i motiv ugarsko-galicijjskog saveza još uvijek su nejasni ili upitni.

Najprije se u radu opisuju izvori koji spominju suprugu iz Galicije ne bi li se dokazala njihova vjerodostojnost, a zatim potraga za dokazima koji ukazuju na razlog i datum dinastičke poveznice. Detaljno se iznosi Kristóovo mišljenje, zatim najvažniji protuargumenti Stanisława Sroka i njihova pobijanja te

One of the most important sources on the history of the Hungarian Angevins, the so-called *Illuminated Chronicle* (finished in the middle of the 14th century) states that Charles I of Hungary had three wives: Mary, the daughter of Kasimir, Duke of Bytom was the first wife; Beatrice, the daughter of the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VII of Luxembourg, and the sister of the King of Bohemia, John of Luxemburg was the second wife while his third consort was Elizabeth, who was the daughter of Wladislaw Łokietek, King of Poland.¹ This report had been accepted by all Hungarian and foreign historians for a long time, but in 1988, the Hungarian medievalist, Gyula Kristó came up with a new approach, and stated that the aforementioned part of the chronicle was incomplete, and that Charles I in fact had four wives. According to Kristó the missing link was the first wife, who had been – based on two sources independent from each other – the daughter of Prince Leo II of Galicia (Halych).² Although Kristó's opinion caused some criticism, mainly by Polish historians – first of all by Stanisław Sroka, with whom he also got into a serious and protracted dispute³ – the existence of the first Galician wife was widely accepted among the Hungarian medievalists.⁴ Despite careful and thorough examination of the issue during their dispute, and the ongoing researches regarding the history of the Angevins, and specially the reign of Charles, the exact date of the marriage, as well as the motive of the Hungarian–Galician alliance, is still unclear or questionable.

Firstly, the paper describes the sources which mention the Galician wife to prove their credibility, and to search for evidence regarding the motive, and the date of the dynastic connection. Subsequently, Kristó's opinion

¹ „Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XV-o domina Maria prima consors domini regis, natione Polona, filia ducis Kasmerii tertio die post festum Beate Lucie virginis et martiris in Themeswar vite cursum feliciter terminavit et in Alba Regali in ecclesia Beate Virginis terre gremio commendatur. Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XVIII-o accepit rex dominam Beatricem filiam regis Romanorum, sororem regis Bohemorum de terra Luchumburgensi, que in revolutione eiusdem anni obdormivit in Domino et Waradini in cathedrali ecclesia tumulatur. [...] Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XX-o accepit rex Karolus filiam Ladizlai regis Polonorum, Elyzabeth nomine [...]” – *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. 489–490.

² Kristó 1988: 27–30.

³ Sroka 1994a: 187–193; Sroka 1994b: 261–268; Sroka 1998: 13–23. Spor je nedavno sažeo Tamás Kádár. Kádár 2009: 13–14.

⁴ Jedina je iznimka bila Renáta Skorka, koja je bez ikakva objašnjenja tvrdila da je Beatrica Luksemburška bila druga supruga Karla I. Skorka 2016: 177.

¹ „Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XV-o domina Maria prima consors domini regis, natione Polona, filia ducis Kasmerii tertio die post festum Beate Lucie virginis et martiris in Themeswar vite cursum feliciter terminavit et in Alba Regali in ecclesia Beate Virginis terre gremio commendatur. Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XVIII-o accepit rex dominam Beatricem filiam regis Romanorum, sororem regis Bohemorum de terra Luchumburgensi, que in revolutione eiusdem anni obdormivit in Domino et Waradini in cathedrali ecclesia tumulatur. [...] Anno Domini M-o CCC-o XX-o accepit rex Karolus filiam Ladizlai regis Polonorum, Elyzabeth nomine [...]” – *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. 489–490.

² Kristó 1988: 27–30.

³ Sroka 1994a: 187–193; Sroka 1994b: 261–268; Sroka 1998: 13–23. The dispute was summarized most recently by Tamás Kádár. Kádár 2009: 13–14.

⁴ The only exception was Renáta Skorka, who claimed that Beatrix of Luxembourg was the second wife of Charles I without any explanation. Skorka 2016: 177.

mišljenja i primjedbe drugih povjesničara čija su se istraživanja bavila tim pitanjima. To se čini nužnim jer se problem prve supruge pojavio više puta od spora između Kristóa i Sroke – uglavnom u mađarskim istraživanjima – te su unesene mnoge vrijedne nadopune koje se u takvom pothvatu ne mogu zanemariti. Na kraju, u radu se ocrta novi pristup u vezi s razlogom sklapanja saveza i datumom vjenčanja.

Izvori

Postoje dva izvora koja sadrže izričite podatke o prvom braku Karla I. Ugarskog. Odmah na početku valja napomenuti da oba sadrže onodobne zapise te da su potpuno neovisni jedan o drugome.

Prvi je izvor *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, traktat o istočnoj Europi s početka 14. stoljeća. Njegov je autor nepoznat, no prema novijim istraživanjima moguće je da je riječ o francuskom dominikancu, ili o glasovitom Andreasu Hungarusu iz istog reda, ili o kleriku iz kruga pape Klementa V. On opisuje niz zemalja kao što su Bizant, Albanija, Srbija, Bugarska, Rutenija, Ugarska, Poljska i Češka usredotočujući se na njihove prirodne, ekonomske, društvene i političke uvjete. Tekst ima jasan propagandni karakter: poziva na vojni pohod protiv pravoslavnih vjernika u jugoistočnoj Europi. Autor izvora zasigurno nije proputovao sve zemlje koje opisuje, izuzev Ugarske i Srbije, u geografskim opisima ima dosta pogrešaka, ali su njegovi podatci o političkom životu i događajima uglavnom točni.⁵ Informacije u poglavlju o Ugarskoj i druge spomene tog kraljevstva kritička literatura općenito smatra vjerodostojnima.⁶ Nadalje, treba istaknuti da autor posvećuje mnogo više pozornosti Ugarskoj nego ostalim predstavljenim zemljama.⁷ Također možemo pretpostaviti da se uz onodobne podatke služio i pisanim izvorima.⁸ I mađarska i međunarodna sekundarna literatura – i Kristóova (i njegova partnera u raspravi Sroka) – opis su dugo datirale u 1308. godinu na temelju kritičkog

is presented in detail, followed by the most important counterarguments of Stanisław Sroka as well as their refutations, and opinions and remarks of other historians whose research dealt with these questions. This seems necessary, because the problem of the first wife came up several times since the dispute between Kristó and Sroka – mainly in Hungarian research – and many valuable additions were made, which cannot be neglected by such an undertaking. Finally, the paper outlines a new approach regarding the reason for the alliance, and the date of the marriage.

The Sources

There are two sources, which contain explicit information about the first marriage of Charles I of Hungary. It is worth mentioning at the outset that both of them contain contemporary records, and that they are completely independent from each other.

The first source is the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, which is a travel treatise regarding Eastern Europe from the beginning of the 14th century. Its author is unknown, but according to recent researches it is possible that he was a French Dominican friar, or that he was the famous Andreas Hungarus from the same order, or that he was a cleric from the circle of Pope Clement V. It describes a number of countries such as Byzantium, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia focusing on their natural, economic, social, and political conditions. The text has a clear propaganda character: it calls for a military campaign against the Orthodox Christians in Southeast Europe. The author of the source surely did not travel to all the countries he describes, with the exception of Hungary and Serbia, and there are a lot of errors in the geographical descriptions, but his information about the political life and events is mostly accurate.⁵ The information in the chapter about Hungary, and other mentions of the kingdom are generally seen as trustworthy by the critical literature.⁶ Furthermore, it has to be pointed out that the author seems to have taken a particular interest in Hungary, paying much more attention to it than to the other countries presented.⁷ We can also presume that he also used written sources in addition to

⁵ Borzákné Nacsa 1985: 33–34; Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 185–187.

⁶ Csukovits 2015: 133–135.

⁷ Csukovits 2013: 75–77; Borzákné Nacsa 1985: 71.

⁸ Daljnja literatura s podacima izvora o Ugarskoj: Csukovits 2013: 71–82; Csákó 2020: 119–144.

⁵ Borzákné Nacsa 1985: 33–34; Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 185–187.

⁶ Csukovits 2015: 133–135.

⁷ Csukovits 2013: 75–77; Borzákné Nacsa 1985: 71.

izdanja izvora koji je 1916. objavio Olgierd Górka.⁹ Međutim, srpski istraživači, s uvjerljivog filološkog i sadržajnog aspekta, odnedavno se zalažu za datiranje na prijelaz iz 1310. u 1311. godinu.¹⁰

U vezi s *Rutenijom* izvor navodi da ta zemlja „ima zaista junačkog vojvodu koji se zove Lav; ovih dana kći Lava postala je žena Karla, kralja Ugarske.”¹¹ Drugi je izvor kraljevska povelja koju je izdao sam Karlo I. 7. veljače 1326., u kojoj kralj nadoknađuje Stjepanu Apródu, sinu Laurentovu, posjed za njegove lojalne usluge.¹² Stjepan je zaslužio poštovanje vladara svojom odanošću „[...] a naši *hospites* iz Košica, i ljudi iz Spiša, napuštajući put odanosti, predali su kraljevski dvorac Spiš i grad Košice kralju Češke, a dok su podizali zastavu spomenutog kralja Češke protiv naše milosti i napali naš dvorac Gönc, gore spomenuti Stjepan im se, pripasan odanošću, muževno suprotstavio, izvojevao pobjedu i porazio ih. Mnoge je zarobio, a spomenutom kralju Češke oduzeo je zastavu koja je bila podignuta na štetu naše vladavine, i poslao je s nama u Galiciju, kamo smo putovali s odanim barunima da otpratimo našu prvu ženu kući. Sam Stjepan zadobio je rane opasne po život; pobjeda koju je postigao Stjepan povećala je našu moć u nemaloj mjeri, te su nam i Spišani i *hospites* gore spomenutog grada – čak i protiv svoje volje – postali lojalni; i stoga su ih mnogi drugi koji su bili uplašeni slijedili na putu odanosti.”¹³ Iako je povelja izdana dvadesetak godina nakon događaja, nema sumnje u njezinu autentičnost, pa se može pretpostaviti da sadrži vjerodostojne i pouzdane podatke.

Spor između Gyule Kristóa i Stanisława Sroke

Na temelju tih dvaju izvora, spomenuti Gyula Kristó izjavio je da prvu Karlovu ženu treba identificirati kao kćer kneza Lava II. od Galicije. Njezino ime nije spomenuto ni u tim dvama ni u drugim ruskim izvorima, ali na temelju šutnje gornjih izvora Kristó

contemporary information.⁸ The description had been dated for a long time to 1308 by both the Hungarian, and the international secondary literature – both by Kristó (and his discussion partner Sroka) – which was based on the critical edition of the source published in 1916 by Olgierd Górka.⁹ However, Serbian researchers recently argued, from convincing philological and substantive aspects, for a dating to the turn of 1310 to 1311.¹⁰

The source states in connection with *Ruthenia* that this country “has a quite heroic duke and he is called Leo; the daughter of Leo became the wife of Charles, King of Hungary these days.”¹¹ The second source is a royal charter issued by Charles I himself on 7th of February 1326, in which the king compensates Stephan Apród, the son of Laurent, for his loyal services with an estate.¹² Stephan earned the appreciation of the ruler with his loyalty “[...] as our *hospites* from Košice, and the people of Spiš, leaving the path of loyalty, handed over the royal castle of Spiš, and the town of Košice to the King of Bohemia, and as they raised the flag of the mentioned King of Bohemia against our grace and attacked our castle Gönc, the aforementioned Stephan, girded in loyalty, manfully confronted them, gained the victory and defeated them. He captured many, and took the flag from the mentioned King of Bohemia which was raised in detriment of our rule, and sent it after us to Galicia, where we travelled with certain loyal barons to escort our first wife home. Stephan himself suffered life-threatening wounds; the victory gained by Stephan increased our power in no small measure, and both the people of Spiš and the *hospites* of the aforementioned town – even against their will – have become loyal to us; and therefore, a lot of others who were frightened, followed them on the path of loyalty.”¹³ Although the charter was issued around twenty years after the events, there is no doubt about its authenticity, so it can be assumed that it contains credible and trustworthy information.

⁹ Borzákné Nacsá 1994: 166–167; Grzesik 2010: 518–519.

¹⁰ Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 51–64.

¹¹ „[...] habet unum ducem permaximum virorum qui vocatur dux Leo. Filiam huius Leonis duxit nunc in uxorem rex Hungarie Carolus.” – *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* 1916: 40; *Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis* 2013: 131.

¹² AO X. Nr. 50.

¹³ MNL OL DF 265464.

⁸ Further literature on the information of the source regarding Hungary: Csukovits 2013: 71–82; Csákó 2020: 119–144.

⁹ Borzákné Nacsá 1994: 166–167; Grzesik 2010: 518–519.

¹⁰ Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 51–64.

¹¹ „[...] habet unum ducem permaximum virorum qui vocatur dux Leo. Filiam huius Leonis duxit nunc in uxorem rex Hungarie Carolus.” – *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* 1916: 40; *Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis* 2013: 131.

¹² AO X. Nr. 50.

¹³ MNL OL DF 265464.

je zaključio da se ona također zvala Marija, baš kao i druga žena, što bi moglo objasniti nedostatak u *Beč-koj ilustriranoj kronici*: autor je jednostavno spojio likove dviju supruga. Kristó je kasnije svoju teoriju potkrijepio kraljevskom poveljom od 12. prosinca 1323., u kojoj Karlo svoju prvu ženu naziva Marijom.¹⁴ Taj povjesničar izračunao je da je brak morao biti sklopljen između 1304. i 1308. godine. Godina 1304. temelji se na opsadi Gönca te predaji Spiša i Košica kralju Češke, koje se spominju u povelji iz 1326., a koje su se mogle dogoditi jedino 1304. godine, kada je Václav II. vodio vojni pohod na Ugarsku. Godina 1308. temelji se na zaključku da je, prema Górkí, te godine dovršen *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*. Unutar tog razdoblja Kristó je uspio suziti vremenski okvir na datum prije 23. lipnja 1306. jer je tog dana Marija, ugarska kraljica, izdala povelju¹⁵ koja nije mogla biti zapečaćena autentičnim pečatom jer, prema Kristóovoj interpretaciji, nije bilo dovoljno vremena da se on napravi. To ga je dovelo do zaključka da se vjenčanje dogodilo netom prije 23. lipnja 1306. godine.¹⁶

Stanisław Sroka iznio je nekoliko kritika na Kristóovu izjavu, prije svega u pogledu pouzdanosti i točnosti izvora kojima se koristio. Poljski medievalist pretpostavio je da je u povelji iz 1326. napravljena pogreška te da je riječ *Ruthenia* izvorno trebala biti *Polonia*.¹⁷ Opće je poznato da mnoge povelje sadrže poneku pogrešku, ali većina je gramatičkih ili barem jezičnih. Tako krupna pogreška u sadržaju sigurno bi se otkrila tijekom verifikacije (ili barem proglašenja) povelje, kako je Kristó tvrdio.¹⁸ Što se tiče *Descriptio Europa Orientalis*, Sroka je smatrao, slijedeći Górkín ispravak, da se dotična gospođa u tekstu ne bi trebala spominjati kao Lavova kći (*filia*), nego kao njegova unuka (*neptis*), što bi prije upućivalo na Mariju od Bytoma, nekadašnju prvu ženu.¹⁹ Problem s tim je

The Dispute between Gyula Kristó and Stanisław Sroka

Based on these two sources, the aforementioned Gyula Kristó stated that the first wife of Charles should be identified as the daughter of Prince Leo II of Galicia. Her name was not mentioned either in these two or in other Russian sources, but based on the silence of the former, Kristó reasoned that she was also named Mary, just as the second wife, which could explain the lack in the *Illuminated Chronicle*: the author had simply merged the figures of the two consorts. Kristó supported his theory later with a royal charter from 12th December 1323, where Charles called his first wife Mary.¹⁴ The historian calculated that the marriage must have taken place between 1304 and 1308. 1304 is based on the siege of Gönc, and the handover of Spiš and Košice to the King of Bohemia which were mentioned in the charter of 1326, and which could have only happened in 1304, when Václav II led a military campaign to Hungary. And 1308, because the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* was completed in that year according to Górká. Within this period, Kristó managed to narrow down the date to before 23rd June 1306, as on that day Mary Queen of Hungary issued a charter,¹⁵ which could not be sealed with an authentic seal, because, in Kristó's interpretation, there was not enough time to make one. This led him to the conclusion that the marriage took place not much before 23rd June 1306.¹⁶

Stanisław Sroka made several criticisms of Kristó's statement, first of all concerning the reliability and the accuracy of the sources he used. The Polish medievalist hypothesized that an error has been made in the charter of 1326, and that the word *Ruthenia* should have been originally *Polonia*.¹⁷ It is widely known that a lot of charters contain some errors, but most of them are grammatically or at least linguistic. Such a major error in the content would surely have been detected during the verification (or at least the proclamation) of the charter, just as Kristó argued.¹⁸ As for the *Descriptio Europa Orientalis*, Sroka believed, following the emendation by Górká, that the

¹⁴ MNL OL DF 258544; AO VII. Nr. 652.

¹⁵ MNL OL DL 76198; AO II. Nr. 42. U svom prvom članku objavljenom 1988. Kristó je kraljicu identificirao kao Karlovu baku, kraljicu Mariju od Napulja, međutim 1992. povelju je već povezo s prvom ženom. Kristó 1988: 27–30; Kristó 1992: 27–28.

¹⁶ Kristó 1992: 18; Kristó 2005: 15–17.

¹⁷ Sroka 1994a: 190.

¹⁸ Kristó 1994: 194–195.

¹⁹ Poljski povjesničar također je s genealoškog aspekta pobijao Kristóovu teoriju, ali je mađarski povjesničar srednjeg vijeka uspješno pobio sve njegove argumente. Za više detalja: Sroka 1994: 188–189; Kristó 1994a: 197.

¹⁴ MNL OL DF 258544.; AO VII. Nr. 652.

¹⁵ MNL OL DL 76198; AO II. Nr. 42. In his first article published in 1988, Kristó identified the queen as the grandmother of Charles, Queen Mary of Naples, 1992, however, he already connected the charter with the first wife. Kristó 1988: 27–30; Kristó 1992: 27–28.

¹⁶ Kristó 1992: 18; Kristó 2005: 15–17.

¹⁷ Sroka 1994a: 190.

¹⁸ Kristó 1994: 194–195.

sam izvor, iz kojeg je jasno da je Karlo I. oženio kćer kneza Lava koji je vladao u vrijeme kada je tekst napisan. To isključuje Lava I. kao oca ili čak kao djeda kneginjice s obzirom na to da je umro 1300. ili 1301. i ukazuje na Lava II.²⁰ Budući da je izvor napisan nekoliko godina kasnije nego što su Sroka i Kristó isprva mislili, podatak o ocu nevjeste čini se još sigurnijim jer se promjena na galicijskom prijestolju između Jurija I. i njegova sina Lava II. dogodila 1308. godine.²¹ Sroka je kasnije Mariju iz Bytoma pokušao povezati s podacima iz *Descriptio* na drugi način; na temelju kneginjine majke koja je bila Ruskinja, naveo je da ju je na galicijskom dvoru mogao odgojiti njezin ujak.²² Nažalost, ne postoje apsolutno nikakvi izvori koji bi poduprli tu teoriju. Budući da je Kristó opovrgnuo jedan dio Srokinih protuargumenata, a budući da drugi dio nema temelja u trenutačno poznatim izvorima, dalje ću govoriti o prvom braku na temelju Kristóove teorije.²³

Kristó se tijekom svog života nekoliko puta vraćao na to pitanje i naglašavao da će biti potrebno više podataka o Lavu II. i njegovoj kćeri da bi se stvorila potpuna slika, ali nedostatak izvora predstavljao je prepreku na njegovu putu. Također, smatrao je pronalaženje razloga vjenčanja zadatkom za budućnost.²⁴ Osobno je povezivao dinastičku vezu s županijom Bereg: prema njegovu mišljenju, 1299. godine županija je potpala pod vlast galicijskog kneza Lava I. (djeda Lava II.), što je vidljivo iz povelje u kojoj stoji da je pouzdanik Lava I. (*officialis Leu ducis Ruthenorum*), izvjesni Gregor, bio župan.²⁵ Godine 1307. županijom je još uvijek vladao Gregor, ali sljedeće godine Job Csicseri obnaša dužnost kneza²⁶ što znači, prema Kristóu, da je Karlo, koji je želio osvojiti cijelu zemlju, pokušao povratiti županiju Bereg i uspio je u tome jer ju je Marija donijela u brak kao miraz.²⁷

lady in question should not be mentioned in the text as Leo's daughter (*filia*), but as his granddaughter (*neptis*), which would point rather on Mary of Bytom, the former first wife.¹⁹ The problem with this is the source itself, which makes it clear that Charles I married the daughter of a Prince Leo, who was reigning at the time the text was written. This excludes Leo I as the father or even as the grandfather of the princess since he died in 1300 or 1301, and points on Leo II.²⁰ Considering that the source was written a few years later than Sroka (and Kristó) initially thought, the information about the father of the bride seems even more certain, because the change on the Galician throne between Jurij I and his son, Leo II occurred in 1308.²¹ Sroka later tried to connect Mary of Bytom to the data of the *Descriptio* in another way as he stated, based on the Russian mother of the princess, that she could have been raised at the Galician court by her uncle.²² Unfortunately, there are absolutely no sources, which would support this theory. Because Kristó could refute one part of the counterarguments of Sroka, and because the other part of them has no basis in the currently known sources, I will further discuss the first marriage on the basis of Kristó's theory.²³

Kristó returned to this question several times during his life and underlined that more information would be required about Leo II and his daughter to complete the picture, but the lack of sources presented an obstacle in his path. He also considered the finding of the motive of the marriage as a future task.²⁴ He personally linked the dynastic relationship to the county of Bereg: in his opinion in 1299, the county fell under the rule of Prince Leo I of Galicia (the grandfather of Leo II), which is evident from the charter, which states that a familiar of Leo I (*officialis Leu ducis Ruthenorum*), a certain Gregory, was the comes of the county.²⁵ In 1307, the county was still led by Gregory, but the following year, Job Csicseri held the

²⁰ Kristó 1994: 195–196.

²¹ Font 2011: 95.

²² Sroka 1994: 190.

²³ Treba napomenuti da su urednici novog srpskog izdanja *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* prihvatili Srokinu mišljenje, ali je također važno napomenuti da nisu bili upoznati s novim rezultatima i dopunama mađarskih znanstvenika. Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 173, bilješka CLXV.

²⁴ Kristó 1988: 30; Kristó 1994: 194–199.

²⁵ MNL OL DL 57225; CD VI/2. 216.

²⁶ Zichy Okl. I. 114 (1307), 118 (1308)

²⁷ Kristó 1988: 30.

¹⁹ The Polish historian also argued from the genealogical aspect against the theory of Kristó, but the Hungarian medievalist successfully refuted all of his arguments. For more details: Sroka 1994: 188–189; Kristó 1994a: 197.

²⁰ Kristó 1994: 195–196.

²¹ Font 2011: 95.

²² Sroka 1994: 190.

²³ It has to be noted that the editors of the new Serbian edition of the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* accepted Sroka's opinion, but it is also important to mention that they were unfamiliar with new results and additions by Hungarian scholars. Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 173, note CLXV.

²⁴ Kristó 1988: 30; Kristó 1994: 194–199.

²⁵ MNL OL DL 57225.; CD VI/2. 216.

Doprinosi nakon spora

Kao što je ranije spomenuto, većina mađarskih medievalista prihvatila je Kristóovu teoriju o prvoj ženi, ali bilo je učenjaka koji su dodali neke relevantne napomene koje vrijedi pregledati prije nego što pokušamo pronaći datum i razlog koji stoji iza toga.

Márta Font prihvatila je najvećim dijelom Kristóovu teoriju, a proučavajući anžuvinsko-galicijske odnose u jednoj studiji, ustvrdila je da je Karlu I. sigurno bio poznat broj i redosljed njegovih supruga, pa je povelja iz 1326. vrlo pouzdan izvor. Međutim, skrenula je pozornost na činjenicu da je ime galicijske supruge Marije samo Kristóova hipoteza koja se temeljila na (identičnom) imenu druge žene što je kroničaru dalo priliku da spoji dvije dame i što zauzvrat objašnjava zašto su mnogi izvori zaboravili na prvu suprugu.²⁸ Osim što se Kristóovo objašnjenje čini logičnim samo po sebi, vrijedno je napomenuti da je ime *Marija* imalo određenu tradiciju u galicijskoj vladajućoj dinastiji. Baka Lava II. bila je Konstanca od Ugarske, kći ugarskog kralja Béle IV. i njegove žene Marije Laskaris. Marija se zvala i sestra Lava II., koja se udala za vojvodu Trojdena od Sandomierza, a čiji je sin Jurij II. naslijedio galicijsko prijestolje 1327. godine.²⁹

Godine 2012. Enikő Csukovits posvetila je monografiju vladavini Karla I., u kojoj je istaknula da je poljski historiograf Jan Długosz datirao brak Karla Ugarskog i Marije od Bytoma u 1306. godinu.³⁰ Već spomenuta povelja, koju je izdala Marija, ugarska kraljica, koja je zapečaćena pečatnjakom (prstenom) zbog nepostojanja autentičnog pečata, iz iste je godine.³¹ Profesorica stoga smatra mogućim – i tu proturječi Kristóu – da je povelju već izdala vojvotkinja od Bytoma i da je zajednica Charlesa i galicijske kneginjice dosegla tek fazu zaruka.³² Kasnije ću se vratiti na – po mom mišljenju točnu – tvrdnju o povelji, no možda će biti sumnje u ispravnost

office of the *comes*,²⁶ which means, according to Kristó, that Charles, who wanted to conquer the whole country, tried to gain back the county of Bereg and he succeeded, because Mary brought it as her dowry into the marriage.²⁷

Contributions after the Dispute

As mentioned above, most Hungarian medievalists accepted Kristó's theory on the first wife, but there were some scholars who added some relevant remarks to it, which are worthy to review before trying to find the date and the motive behind it.

Márta Font accepted for the most part Kristó's theory, and while examining the Angevin–Galician relations in a study, she stated that Charles I was certainly aware of the number, as well as the order of his consorts, so the charter of 1326 is a highly reliable source. However, she drew attention to the fact, that the name of the Galician wife, Mary, is only a hypothesis of Kristó, which was based on the (identical) name of the second wife, which could have given an opportunity for the chronicler to merge the two ladies, which in turn explains why a lot of sources forgot the first consort.²⁸ Besides that Kristó's explanation seems logical on its own, it is worthy to note, that the name 'Mary' had a certain tradition in the Galician ruling dynasty. The grandmother of Leo II was Constance of Hungary, the daughter of King Béla IV of Hungary and his wife, Mary Laskaris. The sister of Leo II, who married Duke Trojden of Sandomierz, and whose son, Jurij II inherited the Galician throne in 1327, was also named Mary.²⁹

In 2012, Enikő Csukovits devoted a monography to the reign of Charles I, in which she pointed out that the Polish historiographer, Jan Długosz dated the marriage of Charles of Hungary and Mary of Bytom to 1306.³⁰ The already mentioned charter, which was issued by Mary Queen of Hungary, and sealed with a signet (ring seal) due to the absence of an authentic one, is from the same year.³¹ The professor considers it therefore possible – and contradicts Kristó at this point – that the charter was already issued by the Duchess of Bytom and that the union of Charles and the Galician princess only reached

²⁸ Font 2012: 66.

²⁹ Font 2011: 96.

³⁰ *Johannes Dlugossi Annales IX.* 42.

³¹ AO II. Nr. 42.

³² Csukovits 2012: 126–127. Isto mišljenje o izdavatelju povelje zastupao je i Antal Pór u svojoj studiji objavljenoj 1903. godine, ali je, naravno, Mariju od Bytoma smatrao prvom ženom mladog anžuvinskog vladara. Pór 1903: 309. Christopher Mielke također povezuje povelju s Marijom od Bytoma, ali je on, nakon Sroke, smatra prvom Karlovom ženom. Mielke 2021: 190.

²⁶ Zichy Okl. I. 114. (1307), 118. (1308)

²⁷ Kristó 1988: 30.

²⁸ Font 2012: 66.

²⁹ Font 2011: 96.

³⁰ *Johannes Dlugossi Annales IX.* 42.

³¹ AO II. Nr. 42.

drugog dijela Csukovitsine pretpostavke. Obje povelje – i ona Marijina (1306.) i ona Karlova (1323.) – uvijek nazivaju prvu suprugu kraljevom suprugom (*consort*), što je bio pravilan naziv za ženu kralja u ugarskim poveljama,³³ što znači da je do vjenčanja sigurno došlo.

Ukrajinski povjesničar Myroslav Voloshchuk privatio je Kristóove argumente u svojoj monografiji objavljenj 2014., kao i u svojoj studiji četiri godine kasnije, te je dao značajne primjedbe. Uočio je da je u prvoj polovini 14. stoljeća bio značajan broj ljudi koji se u izvorima nazivaju Rusima, a koji su ostali u vezi s kraljevskim dvorom. Voloshchuk je zaključio da je većina njih sigurno pratila galicijsku kneginjicu u njezin novi dom te su nakon njezine smrti ostali u Ugarskoj, a u većini slučajeva čak su ostali u službi nove kraljice.³⁴ Naravno, mogla bi postojati i druga moguća objašnjenja za njihovu pojavu na kraljevskom dvoru, ali s obzirom na to da je Karlo nastojao stvoriti vlastitu, samo njemu lojalnu elitu sačinjenu od aristokracije iz doba Árpáda i manjim dijelom stranaca koje je doveo sa sobom – uglavnom iz Italije³⁵ – čini se logičnim povezati dolazak Rusa, dosad nikad spomenutih u izvorima, s kraljicom dovedenom iz Galicije. To se također može potvrditi činjenicom da u kasnijim fazama Karlove vladavine ne znamo ni za jedan događaj koji bi potaknuo priljev velikog broja Rusa.

Tamás Kádár dva se puta bavio obiteljskim odnosima Karla I. Ugarskog. Najprije je u detaljnoj studiji objavljenj 2009. opisao raspravu između Gyule Kristóa i Stanisława Sroke, ali mišljenje je dijelio s Kristóom.³⁶ Zatim je, šest godina kasnije, istraživao prve godine Karlove vladavine, te se morao baviti kraljevima suprugama. Vjerovao je u motiv koji je Kristó ocrtao u vezi sa županijom Bereg te je naglasio da između 1304. i 1306. godine, kada se može datirati put u Galiciju i vjenčanje, Karlo nije bio privlačan kandidat na bračnom tržištu te zbog tih okolnosti nije imao mnogo izbora ako se htio oženiti. Shodno tome, izbor je pao na galicijsku kneginjicu jer bolje od nje nije bilo. Osim toga, Kádár je spomenuo i potencijalnu legitimacijsku moć supruge iz Galicije jer se preko nje, unuke Konstance od

the engagement phase.³² I will come back to the – in my opinion, correct – statement about the charter later, but there may be doubts about the correctness of the second part of Csukovits' assumption. Both charters – that of Mary (1306) and that of Charles (1323) – always call the first wife *consort*, which was the proper denomination for the wife of the king in Hungarian charters,³³ which means that the wedding certainly took place.

The Ukrainian historian, Myroslav Voloshchuk accepted Kristó's arguments in his monograph published in 2014, as well as in his study four years later, and he made a noteworthy remark thereon. He noticed that there were a remarkable number of people in the first half of the 14th century, who are called Russians in the sources, and who stayed in contact with the royal court. Voloshchuk reasoned that most of them must have accompanied the Galician princess to her new home, who stayed after the death of the latter in Hungary, and in most cases even remained in the service of the new queen.³⁴ Of course, there could be other possible explanations for their appearance at the royal court, but considering that Charles sought to create his own elite, which was loyal only to him, consisting of the Árpád-era aristocracy and in smaller part of the foreigners he brought with him – mainly from Italy³⁵ – it seems logical to link the arrival of the Russians, previously never mentioned in the sources, with the queen brought from Galicia. This may also be confirmed by the fact that in the later stages of Charles's reign we know of no event that would have induced an influx of large numbers of Russians.

Tamás Kádár dealt two times with the familial relations of Charles I of Hungary. Firstly, in a detailed study published in 2009, on the one hand, he described the discussion between Gyula Kristó and Stanisław Sroka, and on the other hand, he shared the opinion of the former.³⁶ Secondly, six years later, he examined the first years of Charles' reign, and dealt with the king's consorts. He believed in the motive outlined by Kristó regarding the county of Bereg, and emphasised that between 1304

³³ *Lexicon Latinitatis* 337; *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* 256.

³⁴ Voloshchuk 2014: 195–198; Voloshchuk 2018: 21–22.

³⁵ Zsoldos 2020: 93–108.

³⁶ Kádár 2009: 17–18.

³² Csukovits 2012: 126–127. The same opinion regarding the issuer of the charter was maintained by Antal Pór in his study published in 1903, but he naturally regarded Mary of Bytom as the first wife of the young Angevin ruler. Pór 1903: 309. Christopher Mielke also connected the charter with Mary of Bytom, but he considers her, following Sroka, as the first wife of Charles. Mielke 2021: 190.

³³ *Lexicon Latinitatis* 337; *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* 256.

³⁴ Voloshchuk 2014: 195–198; Voloshchuk 2018: 21–22.

³⁵ Zsoldos 2020: 93–108.

³⁶ Kádár 2009: 17–18.

Ugarske i praunuke ugarskog kralja Béle IV., Karlo mogao blisko vezati za dinastiju Árpád. Drugih prilika nije bilo s obzirom na to da je Elizabeta, kći posljednjeg kralja iz dinastije Árpád, Andrije III., bila zaručnica Karlova najvećeg rivala, Václava od Češke.³⁷ Iako je Kádár datirao vjenčanje prije 23. lipnja 1306. i povezo povelju kraljice s prvom ženom, datirao je vjenčanje u lipanj ili srpanj 1304. godine.³⁸

Osvrćući se na evoluciju problema prve supruge, postaje očito da su se mnogi mađarski i ukrajinski medievalisti bavili tim pitanjem i nakon spora između Gyule Kristóa i Stanisława Sroke te da su mu dodali neke relevantne napomene. Prije svega, mora se primijetiti da su neki znanstvenici iznijeli nove argumente koji jasno jačaju mišljenje Kristóa o postojanju Karlove supruge iz Galicije, ali bilo je i priloga koji su bili u suprotnosti s duljinom i datiranjem braka koje pretpostavlja Kristó. Međutim, njegov točan datum i razlog koji pretpostavljaju ti znanstvenici još su uvijek upitni i/ili nerazjašnjeni.

Opaske o prvoj supruzi

Dok je očito da je brak s potomkom dinastije Árpád mogao donijeti prednosti mladom kralju, upitno je je li tako daleko srodstvo moglo biti dovoljno korisno da se Karlo odluči na brak, jer je njegova supruga bila praunuka Konstancie od Ugarske i prapraunuka Béle IV. po ženskoj liniji, baš kao i njegov suparnik Václav od Bohemije, dok je sam Karlo bio praunuk ugarskog kralja Stjepana V. On je također bio potomak po ženskoj liniji, ali je imao bliže veze s muškom linijom. Dakle, s genealoškog aspekta Karlo je već bio u povoljnijem položaju. On svakako nije bio najatraktivniji neženja svog vremena, jer je veći dio Ugarske bio pod kontrolom Václava i njegovih pristaša, međutim ne može se govoriti o ograničenju jer je uživao podršku svog djeda, kralja Karla II. Napuljskog, papinstva i Habsburgovaca. Potonji, Albert, njemački kralj i njegovi sinovi smatrani su značajnim čimbenicima moći i

and 1306, when the journey to Galicia, and the marriage could be dated, Charles was not an attractive candidate on the marriage market, and due to this circumstance, he did not have much choice if he wanted to marry. Accordingly, the choice fell on the Galician princess, because there was no one better than her. Besides that, Kádár also mentioned the potential legitimising power of the Galician wife, because through her, a granddaughter of Constance of Hungary, and a great-granddaughter of King Béla IV of Hungary, Charles could become closely attached to the Árpád dynasty. There were no other opportunities, since the daughter of the last King from the Árpád dynasty, Andrew III, named Elisabeth, was the fiancée of Charles' biggest rival, namely Václav of Bohemia.³⁷ Although, Kádár dated the marriage before 23rd June 1306, and linked the charter of the queen to the first wife, he dated the wedding to June or July 1304.³⁸

Looking back on the evolution of the problem of the first wife, it becomes obvious that many Hungarian and Ukrainian medievalists dealt with the question even after the dispute between Gyula Kristó and Stanisław Sroka, and that they added some relevant remarks to it. First of all, it has to be noted that some scholars brought up new arguments which clearly strengthen the opinion of Kristó regarding the existence of Charles' Galician wife, but there were also contributions which contradicted the length, and the dating of the marriage assumed by Kristó. However, its exact date and motive hypothesized by these scholars, are still questionable and/or unclarified.

Remarks on the First Wife

While it is evident that a marriage with a descendant of the Árpád dynasty could have brought advantages to the young king, it is questionable if such a distant kinship could have been beneficial enough for Charles to decide on a marriage, as his wife was the great-granddaughter of Constance of Hungary, and the great-great-granddaughter of Béla IV on the female line, just like his rival, Václav of Bohemia, while Charles himself was the great-grandson of King Stephan V of

³⁷ Kao što je poznato, brak između njih nikad nije zaživio – Václav Češki raskinuo je zaruke jer je bio istisnut iz Mađarske. Elizabeta je nakon očeve smrti (1301.) neko vrijeme živjela u Beču sa svojom maćehom Agnesom Habsburškom, a kasnije je otišla u dominikanski samostan Töss. Pór 1888: 478–483; Lhotsky 1967: 121.

³⁸ Kádár 2009: 17–18; Kádár 2015: 91–92.

³⁷ As it is widely known, the marriage between the two never came to fruition, because Václav of Bohemia broke up the engagement, as he was squeezed out from Hungary. Elisabeth lived after the death of her father (1301) for a while in Vienna with her stepmother, Agnes of Habsburg, and later she entered the Dominican monastery of Töss. Pór 1888: 478–483; Lhotsky 1967: 121.

³⁸ Kádár 2009: 17–18; Kádár 2015: 91–92.

u srednjoeuropskoj regiji i u Svetom Rimskom Carstvu, pa možemo pouzdano pretpostaviti da su Karlu mogli dati vodstvo u pronalaženju odgovarajuće žene ako bi to bilo potrebno. Vrijedno je uzeti u obzir i to da je papa Bonifacije VIII. priznao Karla 1303. kao pravog nasljednika ugarske krune,³⁹ a čija je odluka bila poznata među europskim vladarima, što je također moglo poboljšati njegove šanse na bračnom tržištu. Na temelju navedenog, izbor kćeri Lava II. prije se može smatrati proračunatom, a ne iznuđenom političkom odlukom.

Mora se, međutim, svakako odbaciti motiv vjenčanja koji je Kristó ocrtao, a Kádár prihvatio u pogledu ponovnog stjecanja županije Bereg. Márta Font nedavno je skrenula pozornost na problematičan trend, koji se širi (i) u ukrajinskoj historiografiji, a to je da je današnje Potkarpatje, točnije županija Bereg, pripadalo princu Lavu I. od Galicije na prijelazu iz 13. u 14. stoljeće. Prema tom gledištu, miraz Konstance Ugarske može se poistovjetiti s tim područjem. Međutim, profesorica Font dokazala je da je to mišljenje netočno: Lav I. mogao je imati posjede u Ugarskom Kraljevstvu, baš kao i Rostislav od Černigova, još jedan zet Béle IV., i kao posljedica toga mogao je imati podanike, a kojoj kategoriji pripada Gregor *officialis* iz Berega. Iako su nam posjedi Lava I. u Ugarskoj nepoznati, ne može se isključiti da ih je imao, možda u Beregu, ali oni nikako nisu značili samostalnu teritorijalnu vlast,⁴⁰ a svakako nikada nisu bili vezani za Galiciju.

Osim toga, mislim da je upitno i trajanje razdoblja; iako je „vladanje“ Beregom pripadalo Lavu I., Gregor se jasno javlja kao *officialis* galicijskog kneza 1299., ali 1307. imenovan je samo kao *comes Gregorius de Bereg*, baš kao što se Job spominje sljedeće godine (*magister Joub comes de Bereg*).⁴¹ S obzirom na to da je popis beregskih knezova, bez pretjerivanja, nepotpun (1299. g.: Gregor, 1307. g.: Gregor, 1308. g.: Job Csicseri⁴²), nije sigurno ni da su dva Gregora jedna te ista osoba. Ali čak i ako jesu, mogli su postojati drugi razlozi za Jobovo stupanje na dužnost, kao što

Hungary. He was naturally also a descendant on the female line, but had closer ties to the male line. Therefore, from a genealogic aspect Charles already had the more favourable position. He was certainly not the most attractive bachelor of his time, because the larger part of Hungary was under the control of Václav and his supporters, however, we cannot speak about a constraint, since he enjoyed the support of his grandfather, King Charles II of Naples, the Papacy, and the Habsburgs. The latter, Albert, the German King and his sons were considered as significant power factors both in the Central-European region, and in the Holy Roman Empire, so we can confidently assume that they could have given Charles a lead on finding an appropriate wife, if needed. It is worth considering too that Pope Boniface VIII recognised 1303 Charles as the true heir of the Hungarian crown,³⁹ which decision became naturally known among the European rulers, which also could improve his chances at the marriage market. Based on the above, the choice of the daughter of Leo II can rather be seen as a calculated political decision rather than a forced one.

The motive of the marriage outlined by Kristó, and accepted by Kádár regarding the regaining of the county of Bereg must be, however, certainly rejected. Márta Font has recently drawn attention to a problematic trend, which spreads in Ukrainian historiography (too), namely that today's Subcarpathia, or more specifically the county of Bereg had belonged to Prince Leo I of Galicia on the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries. According to this view, the dowry of Constance of Hungary can be identified with this territory. Professor Font, however, proved that this opinion was incorrect: Leo I might have had estates in the Kingdom of Hungary, just like Rostislav of Chernigov, another son-in-law of Béla IV, and as a consequence, he also could have had familiars, to which category Gregory the *officialis* of Bereg belongs. Although the estates of Leo I in Hungary are unknown to us, it cannot be excluded that he had some, maybe in Bereg, but these in no way meant independent territorial power,⁴⁰ and of course they were never attached to Galicia.

Besides that, I think that the duration of the period, even though the 'rule' over Bereg belonged to Leo I, is also questionable. Gregory occurs clearly as an *officialis* of the Galician Prince in 1299, but in 1307 he is named only as *comes Gregorius de Bereg*, just as Job is mentioned in the

³⁹ VMHH I. 397–399; AO I. Nr. 392. Više o odluci: Kiss 2018: 1359–1360, 1370–1372; Maléth 2020: 150.

⁴⁰ Font 2021: 87–88.

⁴¹ Zichy Okl. I. 114, 118.

⁴² Treba napomenuti da arhontologija, koja se bavi tim razdobljem, počinje Jobovim stupanjem na dužnost 1308. godine. Engel 1996: Bereg megye.

³⁹ VMHH I. 397–399; AO I. Nr. 392. More about the decision: Kiss 2018: 1359–1360, 1370–1372; Maléth 2020: 150.

⁴⁰ Font 2021: 87–88.

je Gregorova smrt, koji je služio najmanje osam (ili više) godina kao knez Berega.⁴³ Osim toga, pitanje je i zašto je Karlo toliko dugo čekao sa zamjenom kneza. Istina je da se Lav II. uspeo na galicijsko prijestolje tek 1308., ali može se pretpostaviti da bi i njegov otac pristao na predaju županije radi uređenja dinastičkog odnosa. Stoga bi bilo logičnije da je Karlo smijenio dužnosnika odmah nakon vjenčanja.

Drugo problematično pitanje jest kako je Lav I. dobio posjede u Beregu. Da su pripadali mirazu Konstance, kao što to ukrajinsko istraživanje navodi, tada bi se svi komiti koji su stupili na dužnost nakon vjenčanja morali imenovati kao *officialis* Lava I., ali nijedan od šest (ili sedam) komita nije to učinio u tom razdoblju.⁴⁴ Naravno, treba priznati da ih većinu poznajemo uglavnom iz kraljevskih povelja što bi moglo biti problematično jer ti spomeni nisu samooznake. Međutim, ne možemo sasvim sigurno isključiti da bi kraljevska kancelarija naznačila i njihov odnos prema galicijskom knezu uz njihove počasti s obzirom na to da nam nisu poznati primjeri da su strani vladari imali posjede u Ugarskoj u ranijem razdoblju. Još relevantnije za temu o kojoj se radi je to što nema primjera da je ugarska princeza koja se udala u inozemstvo dobila u miraz manji ili veći dio državnog teritorija. U svim poznatim slučajevima miraz je uključivao nakit, blago, velike svote novca ili prihode pojedinog teritorija, ali nikada koherentnu teritorijalnu cjelinu – to je bio slučaj i sa suprugama ugarskih kraljeva koje su dolazile iz inozemstva, a koje nisu donijele strane teritorije u svoj brak.

Mogli bismo reći da je Lav I. silom zadobio Bereg za sebe s obzirom na to da su postojali neki nespo razumi između galicijskog kneza i Vlaha koji su živjeli na istočnim granicama Ugarskog Kraljevstva, što je bilo pogoršano činjenicom da je Lav I. podržavao 1278. kralja Otokara II. Češkog protiv njemačkog kralja Rudolfa Habsburškog, koji je bio saveznik ugarskog kralja Ladislava IV. Ukrajinska historiografija smatra čak mogućim da je Ladislav huškao Vlahe protiv Lava ne bi li ga spriječio da pruži značajnu pomoć češkom kralju u nadolazećoj bitci.⁴⁵ Nažalost,

following year (*magister Joub comes de Bereg*).⁴¹ Considering that the list of the *comites* of Bereg is, without exaggeration, incomplete (1299: Gregory, 1307: Gregory, 1308: Job Csicseri⁴²), it is not even certain that the two Gregorys are one and the same person. But even if they are, there could have been other reasons for Job's accession to the office, such as the death of Gregory, who served at least eight (or more) years as the *comes* of Bereg.⁴³ Besides that, it is also a question why Charles had waited so long with the replacement of the *comes*. It is true that Leo II ascended the Galician throne only in 1308, but it can be assumed that his father would also have agreed in the handover of the county to arrange the dynastic relationship. Therefore, it would have been more logical if Charles had replaced the official right after his wedding.

Another problematic question is how Leo I got the estates in Bereg. If they had belonged to the dowry of Constance, just as the Ukrainian research states, then all *comites* who came into office after the marriage would have had to name themselves as an *officialis* of Leo I, but none of the six (or seven) *comites* did so in this period.⁴⁴ Of course it has to be admitted that we know the majority of them mostly from royal charters, which could be problematic, because these mentions are not self-designations. However, we cannot rule out with absolute certainty that the royal chancellery would have indicated their relationship to the prince of Galicia in addition to their dignity, since we do not know of any examples of foreign rulers having estates in Hungary in the earlier period. Even more relevant to the topic at hand is, that there are no examples of Hungarian princess who married abroad receiving a dowry of a small or large part of the country's territory. In all known cases, the dowry included jewellery, treasures, large sums of money, or the income of a particular territory, but never a coherent territorial unit – this was also the case with the wives of Hungarian kings who came from abroad, and who did not bring foreign territories into their marriage.

We could say that Leo I gained Bereg with force for himself, since there were some misunderstandings between the Galician prince and the Wallachians

⁴¹ Zichy Okl. I. 114, 118.

⁴² It should be noted, that the archontology, which deals with the period in question, begins with Job assuming office in 1308. Engel 1996: Bereg megye.

⁴³ The previous *comes* of Bereg, Nikolas from the Pok kindred is known from 1274, which makes it possible, that Gregory started his career as a *comes* earlier than 1299. Zsoldos 2011: 136.

⁴⁴ Zsoldos 2011: 136.

⁴³ Prethodni knez Berega, Nikolas iz roda Pok, poznat je iz 1274., što omogućuje da je Gregor započeo svoju karijeru kao knez ranije od 1299. godine. Zsoldos 2011: 136.

⁴⁴ Zsoldos 2011: 136.

⁴⁵ Parshin 2012: 105.

ne postoje apsolutno nikakvi izvori o pojedinostima galicijsko-vlaškog sukoba, ali teoretski se ne može isključiti da je Lav I. stupio na ugarsko tlo i počeo zauzimati teritorije. Međutim, te otete teritorije (ako su ikada postojali) sigurno je ponovno preuzeo Ladislav IV. te oni nisu mogli ostati u rukama galicijskog kneza sve do 1299. godine.⁴⁶

Po mom mišljenju, Lavovo pojavljivanje u Beregu najvjerojatnije se može datirati u vrijeme vladavine ugarskog kralja Andrije III. S jedne strane, spomenuti Lavov *officialis* odgovara tom razdoblju. S druge strane, poznato je da su ugarski kralj i galicijski knez imali prijateljski odnos 90-ih godina 13. stoljeća. Nekoliko izvora pokazuje da je Lav I. podržao Andriju III. s trupama protiv austrijskog vojvode Albrechta Habsburškog 1291. Osim toga, u borbi za poljsko prijestolje između vojvode Wladislawa Łokieteka od Kujavije i kralja Václava II. od Češke 90-ih godina 13. stoljeća obojica su, Lav I. i Andrija III., stajali ponajviše na stranu vojvode Wladislawa.⁴⁷ Uzimajući sve to u obzir, može se pretpostaviti da je Andrija III. darovao Lavu posjede u Beregu. Ako želimo odgovoriti na pitanje zašto je područje Berega moglo poslužiti kao dar, možemo pronaći dva moguća razloga. Prvo, ta se županija nalazi na samom putu za Galiciju, pa su posjedi bili lako dostupni Lavu I. ili njegovim službenicima. Drugo, Bereg se u drugoj polovini 13. stoljeća razvio iz kraljevskog šumskog posjeda u županiju što znači da je u vrijeme Andrije III. još bilo praznih i nenaseljenih područja. Osim toga, čini se da je u drugoj polovini 13. stoljeća zaradu s tog područja uživao član kraljevske obitelji; posljednja je bila Elizabeta Kumanka koja se posljednji put spominje u svibnju 1290. godine.⁴⁸

To bi moglo značiti da je umrla iste godine, ali i da je živjela još koju godinu nakon toga. Po mom mišljenju prva je verzija izglednija. Njezin posljednji živi spomen nalazi se u njezinoj vlastitoj povelji, u kojoj daje donaciju dominikancima koji su bili u procesu izgradnje nove crkve. Pobožna gesta bila je – prema riječima same Elizabete – potaknuta s jedne strane njezinom zahvalnošću Crkvi što ju je dovela na put

who lived at the eastern borders of the Hungarian Kingdom, which was aggravated by the fact that Leo I supported 1278 King Ottokar II of Bohemia against the German King, Rudolf of Habsburg, who was an ally of King Ladislaus IV of Hungary. The Ukrainian historiography considers it even possible that Ladislaus incited the Wallachians against Leo to prevent him from providing significant help to the King of Bohemia in the upcoming battle.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, there are absolutely no sources about the details of the Galician–Wallachian conflict, but theoretically, it cannot be excluded that Leo I entered Hungarian soil and started occupying territories. However, these seized territories (if they ever existed) were certainly retaken by Ladislaus IV, and they could not have stayed in the hands of the Galician prince until 1299.⁴⁶

In my opinion, the time of Leo's appearance in Bereg can most likely be dated to the reign of King Andrew III of Hungary. On the one hand, the reference to Leo's *officialis* corresponds to this period, and on the other hand it is known that the Hungarian king and the Galician prince had a friendly relationship in the 1290's. Several sources show that Leo I supported Andrew III with troops against the Austrian Duke, Albrecht of Habsburg in 1291. Besides that, in the battle for the Polish throne between Duke Wladislaw Łokietek of Cuyavia and King Václav II of Bohemia in the 1290's, both Leo I and Andrew III stood mostly on Duke Wladislaw's side.⁴⁷ Taking all of these into consideration, it can be assumed that Andrew III donated the estates in Bereg to Leo. If we would like to answer the question why the territories of Bereg could have served as a gift, we can find two possible reasons. First, this county is situated right on the way to Galicia, so they were easily reachable to Leo I or his officials. Second, Bereg was developed from a royal forest estate to a county in the second half of the 13th century, which means that there were still empty and uninhabited territories at the time of Andrew III. Besides that, it seems that in the second half of the 13th century, a member of the royal family enjoyed the earnings from this territory, lastly by Elisabeth the Cuman, who is lastly mentioned in May of 1290.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Parshin 2012: 105.

⁴⁶ It is also well-known, that at the time of the so-called second Mongol invasion against Hungary, in 1285 Nogai and Telebuga called their Russian vassals to join the Mongol campaign, but as the Mongols arrived in Hungary, they dismissed Leo I, so he had no chance for occupying territories at that time. Szócs 2010: 21.

⁴⁷ Woytowycz 2016: 126–130; Rudolf 2023: 518–519.

⁴⁸ RD Nr. 152; *ÁMTF* I. 522–524; Zsoldos 2005: 191.

⁴⁶ Također je poznato da su u vrijeme takozvane druge mongolske invazije na Ugarsku 1285. Nogaj i Telebuga pozvali svoje ruske vazale da se pridruže mongolskom pohodu, ali budući da su Mongoli stigli u Ugarsku, otpustili su Lava I. pa u to vrijeme nije imao šanse za okupaciju teritorija. Szócs 2010: 21.

⁴⁷ Woytowycz 2016: 126–130; Rudolf 2023: 518–519.

⁴⁸ RD Nr. 152; *ÁMTF* I. 522–524; Zsoldos 2005: 191.

prave vjere te željom za radosno i uspješno razvijanje sudbine njezine djece. S druge strane, Elizabeta je željela osigurati i spasenje svojih već preminulih članova obitelji (sina, muža, šogora, svestra i svestrve) te svoje vlastite duše.⁴⁹ Naravno, takve donacije mogle su se dati u bilo kojem trenutku života, ali u većini slučajeva to se događalo kada je postojao osjećaj da se bliži kraj. Primjetno je i da je Elizabeta bila vrlo aktivna kraljica, a kasnije i kraljica udovica, koja se uvijek pokušavala miješati u politiku, ali je nakon smrti svog sina 10. srpnja 1290. izgubila pravni temelj za svoje djelovanje. Čini mi se logičnim da bi joj novi kralj Andrija III. ostavio u rukama dobra koja bi joj osigurala život i eventualno skroman dvor, ali ne i tako velike teritorije s kojima bi mogla uspostaviti bilo kakvu teritorijalnu autonomiju. Stoga se može pretpostaviti da postoji ozbiljna mogućnost da je područje Berega 90-ih godina 13. stoljeća bilo uglavnom u kraljevskim rukama – bilo zato što je Elizabeta Kumanka već bila mrtva, bilo zato što je Andrija III. vratio posjed od bivše kraljice udovice.

Nema izvora o prirodi navodne donacije: teoretski je mogla biti doživotna ili nasljedna. Uzimajući u obzir da je jedan od uvjeta za Andriju pri izboru za kralja bio ponovno ujedinjenje i poboljšanje prava zemlje, ne čini se vjerojatnim da bi dao nasljedne donacije strancu bez dobrog razloga.⁵⁰ Uzimajući u obzir sve navedeno, vlasništvo galicijskih knezova nad teritorijem u Beregu ne može se smatrati kontinuiranim nakon izumiranja dinastije Árpád i smrti Lava I. koja se dogodila oko 1300. godine.⁵¹ Stoga se razlog ugarsko-galicijskom braku mora tražiti negdje drugdje.

Možda iza braka stoje prilično politički razlozi u vezi sa situacijom u Poljskoj i poljsko-češkim odnosima. Kao što je poznato, češki kralj Václav II. postupno je širio svoju kontrolu nad šleskim i poljskim vojvodstvima, a u kolovozu 1300. okrunjen je i za kralja Poljske u Gnieznu. Njegov najveći suparnik bio je već spomenuti vojvoda Wladislaw Łokietek od Kujavije, koji je također pretendirao na prijestolje.⁵² Potonjeg

This could mean that she died in the same year, but also that she lived some more years thereafter. In my opinion the first version seems more plausible. Her last living mention occurs in her own charter, in which she makes a donation to the Dominican friars, who were in the process of building a new church. The pious gesture was – according to Elisabeth herself – motivated on the one hand by her gratitude to the Church for leading her to the path of the true faith, and for the joyful and successful development of the destiny of her children. On the other hand, Elisabeth also wanted to secure the salvation of her already deceased family members (her son, husband, brother-in-law, father-in-law, and mother-in-law) just as the salvation of her own soul.⁴⁹ Of course, donations just like that could be made at any moment in life, but in most cases, it happened when there was a feeling that the end is near. It is also noticeable that Elisabeth was a very active queen, and later queen dowager, who always tried to interfere in politics, but after the death of her son on 10th of July in 1290 she lost the legal basis for her activities. It seems logical to me, that the new king, Andrew III would have left in her hands the goods, which would ensure her subsistence, and possibly a modest court, but not such big territories, with which she could establish any territorial autonomy. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a serious possibility that the territory of Bereg was mostly in royal hands in the 1290s – either because Elisabeth the Cuman was already dead, or because Andrew III took the county back from the former queen dowager.

There are no sources about the nature of the supposed donation: theoretically, it could have been lifelong or inheritable. Taking into consideration that one of the conditions for Andrew at his election as a king was to restore the integrity, and to improve the rights of the country, it does not appear likely that he would make inheritable donations for a foreign person without a good reason.⁵⁰ Considering all of the above, the ownership of the territories in Bereg by Galican princes cannot be considered as continuous after the extinction of the Árpád dynasty, and the death of Leo I, which occurred around 1300.⁵¹ Therefore, the reason of the Hungarian–Galician marriage has to be searched elsewhere.

⁴⁹ MNL OL DL 39255.

⁵⁰ Prisega na početku vladavine ne znači da je se Andrija III. držao tijekom cijele svoje vladavine. Međutim, zakon iz 1298. učinio je pristanak vijeća nužnim za veće odluke, poput donacija. *DRMH* 49; Zsoldos 2003: 170, 208–209.

⁵¹ Fedinec *et al.* 2021: 81; *ÁMTF* I. 526.

⁵² Antonín 2009: 103–121, 188–209; Antonín 2011: 253–272; Jasienica 1985: 169–177.

⁴⁹ MNL OL DL 39255.

⁵⁰ The oath at the beginning of his rule does not mean that Andrew III stuck to it during his whole reign. The law of 1298 however made the consent of the council necessary for bigger decisions, like donations. *DRMH* 49; Zsoldos 2003: 170, 208–209.

⁵¹ Fedinec *et al.* 2021: 81; *ÁMTF* I. 526.

je podržavao princ Lav I. tijekom gotovo cijele njegove vladavine. Povukao je svoju potporu tek između 1297. i 1299., kada je prihvatio prevlast češkog kralja i potražio diplomatsko rješenje. Nakon krunidbe Václava II., međutim, vratio se na Wladislawovu stranu, gdje je činjenica da je njegov sin Jurij oženio Eufemiju, sestru kujavskog vojvode, možda odigrala važnu ulogu. Među istraživačima postoji suglasje da je i Jurij podržavao svog tasta tijekom njegove vladavine (1301. – 1308.), a nema razloga za pretpostavku da isto nisu činili i njegovi sinovi Lav II. i Andrej.⁵³ Orijentiranost galicijske politike na sreću je odgovarala ciljevima Karla I. Ugarskog, koji je rado podupirao neprijatelje Přemyslida.

Wladislaw Łokietek već je primio vojnu pomoć od mađarskog kralja Andrije III., koji je bio u srodstvu s kujavskim vojvodom preko svoje prve žene. Ugarski pohod vodio je u to vrijeme, krajem 1290. ili početkom 1291., kasnije poznati oligarh Amádé iz roda Aba, a rezultirao je zauzimanjem grada Prodatina.⁵⁴ Amádé je bio taj koji je vojvodi ponudio azil nakon njegova neuspješnog pohoda protiv Václava i Sandomierskog vojvodstva 1302. godine. Zauzvrat, Wladislaw je 1304., uz podršku Ugarske, započeo novi vojni pohod na Krakov, istodobno s pohodom Karla i habsburških vojvoda protiv češkog kraljevstva.⁵⁵ Wladislaw se oslonio na trupe Amádéa iz roda Aba te je zauzeo čak i grad Wišlicu.⁵⁶ Cilj kampanje očito nije bio samo pomoći kujavskom vojvodi da dobije poljsko prijestolje, već i spriječiti poljske vojvode da pruže pomoć češkom kralju.⁵⁷

Na temelju navedenog izvjesno je da je već prije 1304. postojao savez između Karla I. i Wladislawa Łokieteka, koji je zahtijevao jačanje, za što se u srednjem vijeku dinastički odnos mogao smatrati najprikladnijim rješenjem. Ulogu Wladislawa Łokieteka u ugarsko-galicijskom braku podupire i činjenica da je Amádé iz roda Aba pratio Karla u Galiciju. Inače se pristaše češkog kralja ne bi usudile napasti njegov

There could be rather political considerations behind the marriage in regards with the situation in Poland, and the Polish–Bohemian relations. As it is well-known, King Václav II of Bohemia gradually extended his control over the Silesian and Polish duchies, and in August of 1300, he was also crowned as the King of Poland in Gniezno. His biggest rival was the aforementioned Duke Wladislaw Łokietek of Cuyavia, who also had a claim to the throne.⁵² Prince Leo I supported the latter during almost the whole of his reign. He withdrew his support only between 1297 – 1299, because he realised the dominance of the Bohemian King, and sought for a more diplomatic solution. After the coronation of Václav II, however, he returned to Wladislaw's side, where the fact that his son, Jurij married Eufemia, the sister of the Cuyavian duke, might have played an important role. There is a consensus among researchers that Jurij also supported his father-in-law during his reign (1301 – 1308), and there is no reason to assume that his sons, Leo II and Andrej had not done the same.⁵³ The orientations of the Galician policy luckily corresponded with the aims of Charles I of Hungary, who gladly supported the enemies of the Přemyslids.

Wladislaw Łokietek had already received military aid from King Andrew III of Hungary, who was related to the Cuyavian duke through his first wife. The Hungarian campaign was led at that time, at the end of 1290 or at the beginning of 1291 by the later famous oligarch, Amádé of the Aba kindred, and it resulted in the occupation of the city of *Prodatin*.⁵⁴ Amádé was the one who offered the Duke an asylum after his unsuccessful campaign against Václav and the Duchy of Sandomierz in 1302. In return, Wladislaw started a new military campaign against Krakow in 1304 with Hungarian support, concurrently with the campaign of Charles and the Habsburg dukes against the Kingdom of Bohemia.⁵⁵ Wladislaw relied on the troops of Amádé from the Aba kindred, and captured even the town of Wišlica.⁵⁶ The aim of the campaign was clearly not only to help the Cuyavian duke obtaining the Polish throne, but also to prevent the Polish dukes from providing assistance to the King of Bohemia.⁵⁷

⁵³ Woytowycz 2016: 125–130; Fedinec *et al.* 2021: 81.

⁵⁴ RA Nr. 1987. 3820., 3841., 3908., 4317.; Zsoldos 1988: 329.

⁵⁵ Kozłowski 2011: 244; Graebner 1903: 161; Charvátová 2007: 200, 208.

⁵⁶ AO I. Nr. 676, 702, II. Nr. 95.

⁵⁷ Kádár 2015: 97. Neki istraživači smatraju mogućim da su se Václav II., a kasnije i njegov sin, odrekli stjecanja ugarske krunice zbog uspjeha Wladislawa Łokieteka. Kozłowski 2013: 164.

⁵² Antonín 2009: 103–121, 188–209; Antonín 2011: 253–272; Jasienica 1985: 169–177.

⁵³ Woytowycz 2016: 125–130; Fedinec *et al.* 2021: 81.

⁵⁴ RA Nr. 1987. 3820., 3841., 3908., 4317.; Zsoldos 1988: 329.

⁵⁵ Kozłowski 2011: 244; Graebner 1903: 161; Charvátová 2007: 200, 208.

⁵⁶ AO I. Nr. 676, 702, II. Nr. 95.

⁵⁷ Kádár 2015: 97. Some researchers consider it possible that Václav II and later his son renounced the acquisition of the

dvorac u Göncu.⁵⁸ Budući da Wladislaw u to vrijeme nije imao kćeri ili sestre koje su već stasale za udaju, nećakinja bi se činila kao idealan izbor. Vrijedno je spomenuti da je kneginja Marija od Bytoma – prema Sroki prva supruga ugarskog kralja, a prema Kristóu druga žena ugarskog kralja – također bila u rodu s kujavskim vojvodom s obzirom na to da su njezin otac, vojvoda Kazimir od Bytoma, i Wladislaw Łokietek bili prvi rođaci. Dakle, u načelu se i s njom mogao postići željeni učinak. Istodobno, ne možemo zanemariti činjenicu da je u to vrijeme Kazimir očito bio vazal češkog kralja Václava II., kojeg je aktivno podržavao u ratu protiv Vladislava, pa je nemoguće da bi stupio u dinastičku vezu s neprijateljem vlastitog kralja.⁵⁹

Povezanost s galicijskom vladarskom dinastijom uključivala je i koristi za Karla, što je vidljivo iz geopolitičkog stanja regije. Prednost je bila, primjerice, sigurnost ugarskih granica na istoku tijekom rata protiv Češke. Lav II. također je imao koristi od braka jer je dobio saveznika protiv kralja Češke, a i prijateljski nastrojenog susjeda ako sve bude išlo po planu. Da ne spominjemo da je za galicijskog kneza bilo međunarodno poticajno postati rođak budućeg mađarskog kralja, koji je također bio potomak zapadnjačke kraljevske dinastije.

Iz povelje iz 1326. vidljivo je da je Stjepan obavljao svoje vjerne usluge tijekom pohoda Václava II. u ljeto 1304., stoga se Karlovo putovanje u Galiciju također može datirati u tu godinu, točnije između 22. svibnja i 24. kolovoza, za koje razdoblje nemamo podataka o tome gdje se nalazio ugarski kralj.⁶⁰ Izvještaj *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, koji se treba datirati na prijelaz iz 1310. u 1311. i koji kaže da je Karlo oženio kćer Lava II. „u ove dane“ (*nunc*), nije u suprotnosti s tim jer putopis govori o brojnim događajima u sadašnjosti koji se nisu dogodili usporedno jedan s drugim. Dobar je primjer predstavljanje zemalja srednje Europe: dok raspravlja o Poljskoj, anonimni pisac spominje da Albrecht Habsburški, njemački kralj, trenutačno pokušava dobiti češko prijestolje za svog sina (i također poljsku krunu preko svoje snahe), što odgovara događajima iz 1307. godine. Istodobno, izvor u opisu Češke navodi da kralj Henrik VII. Luksemburški pokušava postaviti svog sina na prijestolje što se,

Based on the above, it is certain that there had been an alliance between Charles I and Wladislaw Łokietek already before 1304, which required a strengthening, for which in the Middle Ages, a dynastic relationship could be considered as the most suitable solution. The role of Wladislaw Łokietek in the Hungarian–Galician marriage is also supported by the fact that Amádé of the Aba kindred accompanied Charles to Galicia. Otherwise the supporters of the King of Bohemia would not have dared to attack his castle in Gönc.⁵⁸ Since Wladislaw had no daughters or sisters at that time who already reached the age of marriageability, a niece would seem like an ideal choice. It is worth mentioning that Princess Mary of Bytom – according to Sroka the first wife of the Hungarian king, and according to Kristó the second wife of the Hungarian king – was also related to the Cuyavian duke, since her father, Duke Casimir of Bytom and Wladislaw Łokietek were first cousins. So, in principle the desired effect could have been achieved with her, too. At the same time, we cannot ignore the fact that at this time, Casimir was clearly a vassal of King Wenceslas II of Bohemia, whom he actively supported in the war against Wladislaw, so it is impossible that he would have entered a dynastic relationship with his king's enemy.⁵⁹

A connection with the Galician ruler dynasty included benefits for Charles, which are evident by looking at the geopolitical character of the region. An advantage was, for example, the safety of the Hungarian borders from the east during the war against Bohemia. Leo II also benefited from the marriage, since he gained an ally against the King of Bohemia, too, and a friendly neighbour, if everything went according to plan. Not to mention that for the Galician Prince, becoming a relative of the future Hungarian King, who was also a descendant of a western royal dynasty, would have been an international boost.

From the charter of 1326 it is evident that Stephan had performed his loyal services during the campaign of Václav II in the summer of 1304, therefore, Charles' journey to Galicia can also be dated in this year, specifically between 22nd May and 24th August, in which period we have no information about the whereabouts of the Hungarian King.⁶⁰ The report of the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, which is to be dated at the turn of

Hungarian crown because of the successes of Wladislaw Łokietek. Kozłowski 2013: 164.

⁵⁸ Kádár 2015: 18.

⁵⁹ Rudolf 2023: 444, 487–488.

⁶⁰ Kádár 2015: 111.

⁵⁸ Kádár 2015: 18.

⁵⁹ Rudolf 2023: 444, 487–488.

⁶⁰ Kádár 2015: 111.

međutim, može datirati samo u 1310.⁶¹ Te kronološke nedosljednosti relativiziraju odrednicu vremena u citatu u vezi s brakom. Međutim, činjenice koje izvor spominje i o Poljskoj i o Češkoj, iako nisu vremenski točne, sadržajno odgovaraju našim današnjim spoznajama o događajima u prvim desetljećima 14. stoljeća, pa nema razloga misliti da su dijelovi o Galiciji i braku bili pogrešni ili nevjerojatni.

Unutar navedenog razdoblja, u kojem je Karlova lokacija upitna, čini se da je nemoguće pobliže odrediti vrijeme vjenčanja jer je jedino sigurno da je pohod Václava II. od Češke započeo nakon 24. svibnja 1304. i da je završio već 24. kolovoza 1304. godine, pošto je Karlo sklopio formalni savez s habsburškim vojvodama.⁶² *Štajerska rimovana kronika (Steirische Reimchronik)* iz prvih desetljeća 14. stoljeća spominje crkveni blagdan (*heilic tac*) tijekom boravka Václava II. u Mađarskoj, na kojem je njegov sin nosio krunske dragulje, ali ne pojašnjava na koji se blagdan zapravo odnosi.⁶³ János M. Bak pretpostavio je (uvjerljivo) da bi se blagdan mogao povezati s imenom koje je mladi Václav nosio kao ugarski kralj, stoga ga treba tražiti među blagdanima Ladislava I. Svetog koji su padali u ljeto. To bi mogao biti dan kanonizacije Ladislava I. Svetog (*elevatio S. Ladislai*), 27. lipnja, ili datum njegova ukopa (*Ladislai Regis Depositio*), 29. srpnja.⁶⁴ To znači da je kampanja Václava II. započela najvjerojatnije početkom lipnja ili srpnja, a završila povlačenjem kralja i njegova sina u Češku vjerojatno početkom sljedećih mjeseci, što datira Karlovo putovanje ili u lipanj ili srpanj. Budući da se u srednjem vijeku prvenstveno slavio dan kanonizacije sv. Ladislava,⁶⁵ smatram da je vjerojatnije da je blagdan bio 27. lipnja, što je slučajno palo u nedjelju 1304., što znači da su se Karlovo putovanje i pohod Václava II. dogodili u lipnju iste godine.

Zaključak

Na temelju svega navedenog može se ustvrditi da je Karlo I. putovao u ljeto, možda u lipnju 1304. u Galiciju u društvu Amádéa iz roda Aba i drugih baruna da

1310 to 1311, and which states that Charles married the daughter of Leo II ‘in these days’ (*nunc*), does not contradict this, because the treatise discusses numerous events in the present, which did not happen concurrently with each other. A good example is the presentation of the countries of Central-Europe: while discussing Poland, the anonymous writer mentions that Albrecht of Habsburg, the German King is currently trying to gain the Bohemian throne for his son (and also the Polish crown through his daughter-in-law), which corresponds to the events of 1307. At the same time, the source states in the description of Bohemia that King Henry VII of Luxemburg tries to put his son on the throne, which, however, can only be dated to 1310.⁶¹ These chronological inconsistencies relativize the time determiner in the quote regarding the marriage. However, the facts mentioned by the source on both Poland and Bohemia, even if not accurate in time, correspond in content to our current knowledge of the events in the first decades of the 14th century, so there is no reason to think that the parts about Galicia, and the marriage were wrong or implausible.

Within the aforementioned period, in which Charles whereabouts are questionable, it seems impossible to determine closely the time of marriage, because it is only certain that the campaign of Václav II of Bohemia began after 24th May 1304 and that on 24th August 1304 it had already ended, as Charles made a formal alliance with the Habsburg dukes.⁶² The *Steirische Reimchronik* from the first decades of the 14th century mentions an ecclesiastical feast (*heilic tac*) during the stay of Václav II in Hungary, at which his son wore the crown jewels, but it does not clarify to which feast it actually refers.⁶³ János M. Bak assumed (convincingly) that the feast could be linked to the name that the young Václav used as a Hungarian King, therefore, it should be searched among the feasts of Saint Ladislaus, which fell in the summer. It could be the case of the elevation of the Holy King (*elevatio S. Ladislai*) on 27th June, or the case of his burial (*Ladislai Regis Depositio*) on 29th July.⁶⁴ These mean that the campaign of Václav II started most likely in the beginning of June or July, and ended with the withdrawal of the king and his son to Bohemia probably in the beginning of the next

⁶¹ *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* 1916: 40; Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 52–55, 58–64.

⁶² *RBM* II. Nr. 2006.

⁶³ Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik 1090–1091.

⁶⁴ Bak 1964: 179.

⁶⁵ Magyar 2016: 30–37; Solymosi 2021: 49.

⁶¹ *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* 1916: 40; Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013: 52–55, 58–64.

⁶² *RBM* II. Nr. 2006.

⁶³ Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik 1090–1091.

⁶⁴ Bak 1964: 179.

bi ispratio svoju prvu suprugu, kćer kneza Lava II. od Galicije (vjerojatno imenom Marija) u Ugarsku. Cilj tog dinastičkog odnosa nije bio povrat županije Bereg ni nekih njezinih teritorija, koji su trebali pripasti knezu Galicije, već stvaranje širokog saveza između Galicije, Ugarske i Kujavije protiv Přemyslida. Lav II. bio je u obiteljskoj vezi s Wladislawom Łokietekom, dok je Karlov suparnik u utrci za ugarsko prijestolje bio sin najvećeg neprijatelja kujavskog vojvode. Također je vrijedno napomenuti da je ugarsko-kujavski savez imao neku vrstu tradicije u Ugarskoj, barem u vidu Amádeá iz roda Aba. Vjenčanje se dogodilo vjerojatno ubrzo nakon njihova dolaska u Ugarsku (u srpnju ili vjerojatno u kolovozu) zbog nadolazećeg vojnog pohoda na Češku. Nije bilo apsolutno nikakvog razloga za odgađanje braka jer se Karlo očito nadao nasljedniku, što bi ga učinilo boljim kandidatom u odnosu na Václava Češkog koji je bio bez djece. Osim toga, odlaskom Přemyslida iz Ugarske stvorila se povoljna prilika za takav pothvat. Međutim, brak nije mogao ispuniti Karlove nade i nije dugo trajao vjerojatno zbog iznenadne kraljičine smrti, možda 1305. godine. Nakon toga se Karlo, prema Janu Długoszu – koji se slaže s Enikő Csukovits – i povelji iz 1306., koju je izdala ugarska kraljica, ponovno oženio u prvoj polovini 1306. te je pred oltar odveo Mariju, kćer vojvode Kasimira od Bytoma.

months, which dates the journey of Charles to either June or July. Because in the Middle Ages the day of St. Ladislaus' canonisation was primarily celebrated,⁶⁵ I consider that it is more plausible that the feast took place on 27th June, which happened to fall on a Sunday in 1304, meaning that Charles' journey and the campaign of Václav II took place in June of the same year.

Conclusion

Based on all the above, it can be stated that Charles I of Hungary travelled in summer, perhaps in June 1304 to Galicia in the company of Amáde of the Aba kindred, and other barons to escort his first wife, the daughter of Prince Leo II of Galicia (probably named Mary) to Hungary. The aim of this dynastic relationship was not to regain the county of Bereg nor some of its territories, which were supposed to belong to the Galician Prince, but the creation of a broad alliance between Galicia, Hungary, and Cuyavia against the Přemyslids. Leo II had a familial relationship with Wladislaw Łokietek, while Charles' rival in the race for the Hungarian throne was the son of the archenemy of the Cuyavian Duke. It is also worthy to note that the Hungarian–Cuyavian alliance had some kind of tradition in Hungary, at least in the person of Amáde of the Aba kindred. The wedding took place probably shortly after their arrival in Hungary (in July or probably in August) due to the upcoming military campaign against Bohemia. There was absolutely no reason to postpone the marriage, as Charles obviously hoped for an heir, which would make him the better candidate compared to the childless Václav of Bohemia. Besides that, the leaving of the Přemyslids from Hungary created a favourable opportunity for such an undertaking. However, the marriage could not fulfil the hopes of Charles and it did not last long probably due to the sudden death of the queen, maybe in 1305. Afterwards according to Jan Długosz – agreeing with Enikő Csukovits – and to the charter of 1306 issued by the Queen of Hungary, Charles remarried in the first half of 1306, and led the daughter of Duke Kasimir of Bytom, named Mary the altar.

⁶⁵ Magyar 2016: 30–37; Solymosi 2021: 49.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

Izvori / Sources

- MNL OL DF – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény
- MNL OL DL – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Levéltár
- Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* 1916 – *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, „Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Ungaria, Polonia, Bohemia” anno MCCCVIII exarate, ed. O. Górka, Cracoviae: Academia Litterarum Cracoviensis, 1916.
- Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis* 2013 – Tibor Živković, Vladeta Petrović & Aleksandar Uzelac, *Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis – Anonimov opis istočne Evrope*, krit. izd., prevod Dragana Kunčer, Izvori za srpsku istoriju 13. Latinski izvori 2, Beograd: Istorijski institut Beograd, 2013. [Тибор Живковић, Владета Петровић & Александар Узелац, *Анонимов опис источне Европе*, крит. изд., превод Драгана Кунчер, Извори за српску историју 13. Латински извори 2, Београд: Историјски институт Београд, 2013.]
- AO – *Anjou-kori Oklevéltár*, I–XV, XVII–XXXVIII, XL, XLII–XLIV, XLVI–LII, eds. Gy. Kristó et al., Szeged–Budapest, 1990–2023.
- Bereg megye – Tibor Neumann, *Bereg megye hatóságának oklevelei (1299–1526)*, Szabolcs–szatmár–bereg-i Szemle Füzetek 3., Nyíregyháza: Móricz Zsigmond Könyvtár, 2006.
- CD – *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, Studio et opera G. Fejér, I–XII, Budae: Typis Typogr. Regiae Universitatis Hungaricae, 1829–1844.
- Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV* – *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*, ed. Alexander Dománovszky, u / in: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, I, ed. E. Szentpétery, Budapest: Nap Kiadó, 1937, 217–506.
- DRMH – *Decreta regni mediaevalis Hungariae – The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, I, Transl., ed. J. M. Bak, Gy. Bónis & J. R. Sweeney, Idyllwild: C. Scilacks, Jr. Publisher, 1999.2
- Iohannes Dlugossi Annales – Ioannis Dlugossi Annales seu Chronicae incliti regni Poloniae*, Varsaviae: Pánstw. Wydawn. Nauk, 1978.
- Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik – Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik, ed. J. Seemüller, u / in: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Deutsche Chroniken*, V/1–2, Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1890–1893.
- RA – *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico diplomatica – Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke*, eds. I. Szentpétery & I. Borsa, I–II, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1923–1987.
- RBM – *Regesta diplomatica necnon epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*, I–VII, eds. K. J. Erben, J. Emler & B. Mend, Prag, 1855–1963.
- RD – *Az Árpád-házi hercegek, hercegnők és a királynék okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke*. Szentpétery Imre kéziratának felhasználásával ed. A. Zsoldos, A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai II. Forráskiadványok 45, Budapest: Magyar Országos Levéltár & MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2008.
- VMHH – *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*. I–II, ed. A. Theiner, Rom: Typis Vaticanis, 1859–1860.
- Zichy Okl. – *A zichi és vásonkeői Zichy család idősb ágának okmánytára*, I–XII, eds. I. Nagy et al. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1871–1931.

Popis literature / Literature

- ÁMTF – György Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza*, I–IV, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987–1998.
- Antonín 2009 – Robert Antonín, *Zahraniciční politika krále Václava II. v letech 1283–1300*, Knihnice Matice Moravské 26, Brno: Matice moravská, 2009.
- Antonín 2011 – Robert Antonín, Hnězdenská korunovace krále Václava II. v kontextu jeho zahraniční politiky na počátku 14. století, u / in: *Gnieźnieńskie koronacje królewskie i ich środkowoeuropejske kontexty*, ed. J. Dobosz, N. Matli & L. Wetesko, Gniezno: Institut Historii UAM, 2011, 253–271.
- Bak 1964 – János M. Bak, Sankt Stefans Armreliquie im Ornat König Wenzels von Ungarn, u / in: *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm zu seinem Siebzigsten Geburtstag von Schülern und Freunden zugeeignet*, I, eds. P. Classen & P. Scheibert, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1964, 175–188.
- Borzákné Nacsá 1985 – Mária Borzákné Nacsá, *A Descriptio Europae Orientalis eszmei háttere és politikai célzatossága*, Doktori értekezés, Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem, 1985.
- Borzákné Nacsá 1994 – Mária Borzákné Nacsá, *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, u / in: *Korai Magyar Történeti Lexikon (9–14. század)*, eds. Gy. Kristó et al. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994, 166–167.
- Charvátová 2007 – Kateřina Charvátová, *Václav II. Král český a polský*, Velké postavy českých dějin 5, Vyšehrad: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy v Praze, 2007.

- Csákó 2020 – Judit Csákó, A rómaiak pannóniai legelője. Megjegyzések egy hagyomány keletkezéséhez, II, *Fons*, 27/1, Budapest, 2020, 119–144.
- Csukovits 2012 – Enikő Csukovits, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon I. rész. I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1342)*, Magyar Történelmi Emlékek – Értekezések, Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2012.
- Csukovits 2013 – Enikő Csukovits, Magyarország helye Kelet-Európában. A Descriptio Europae Orientalis országleírásai, u / in: *Archivarium historicorumque magistra. Történeti tanulmányok Bak Borbála tanárnő 70. születésnapjára*, eds. Zs. Kádár, B. Lakatos & Á. Zarnóczki, A Magyar Levéltárosok Egyesületének Kiadványai 13, Budapest: Magyar Levéltárosok Egyesülete, 2013, 71–82.
- Csukovits 2015 – Enikő Csukovits, *Magyarországról és a magyarokról. Nyugat-Európa magyar képe a középkorban*, Magyar Történelmi Emlékek – Értekezések, Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2015.
- Engel 1996 – Pál Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457*, I–II, História Könyvtár – Kronológiák, adattárak 5, CD-ROM, Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet & História Kiadó, 1996.
- Fedinec et al. 2021 – Csilla Fedinec, Márta Font, Imre Szakál & Beáta Varga, *Ukrajna története: régiók, identitás, államiság*, Budapest: Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont & Gondolat Kiadó, 2021.
- Font 2011 – Márta Font, A 14. század eleji „Halics” és a lengyel-magyar érdekek, *Hungaro–Ruthenica*, 5, Szeged, 2011, 93–101.
- Font 2012 – Márta Font, „Halics” a magyarországi Anjouk politikájában, *Hungaro–Ruthenica*, 6, Szeged, 2012, 65–76.
- Font 2021 – Márta Font, Egy mai elnevezés és a középkor valósága. Kárpátalja a 13–15. században, *Pontes*, 4, Pécs, 2021, 77–94.
- Graebner 1903 – Erik Graebner, *Böhmische Politik vom Tode Ottokars II. bis zum Aussterben der Přemysliden*, *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, 42/2, Prag, 1903, 117–184.
- Grzesik 2010 – Ryszard Grzesik, *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, u / in: *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, I–II, ed. G. Dunphy, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2010, I, 518–519.
- Kádár 2009 – Tamás Kádár, Megjegyzések, észrevételek I. Károly (Róbert) magyar király házassági és egyéb családi kapcsolatai kérdéséhez, *Turul*, 82/1, Budapest, 2009, 13–23.
- Kádár 2015 – Tamás Kádár, Harcban a koronáért. I. Károly (Róbert) király uralkodásának első éve 1305 végéig, u / in: *Történeti Tanulmányok XXIII*, eds. A. Bárány & B. A. Bacsa, Acta Universitatis Debreceniensis, Series Historica 67, Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem, 2015, 42–111.
- Kiss 2018 – Gergely Kiss, VIII. Bonifác és Magyarország (1290–1303). A pápai hatalmi legitimációs elképzelések és kormányzat összefüggései, *Századok*, 152/6, Budapest, 2018, 1353–1376.
- Kozłowski 2011 – Wojciech Kozłowski, Developing the Concept of „Succession Crisis”: New Questions to Social and Political Circumstances of Lokietek’s Rise to Power, 1304–1306, *Studia Mediaevalia Bohemica*, 2, Praha, 2011, 231–248.
- Kozłowski 2013 – Wojciech Kozłowski, Power-Winning Contexts and Strategies of Charles I and Wenceslas III. A Comparison of their Quest for the Hungarian Throne, *New Europe College Yearbook 2012–2013*, 13, Bucharest, 2013, 131–174.
- Kristó 1988 – Gyula Kristó, Károly Róbert első felesége, *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica*, 86, Szeged, 1988, 27–30.
- Kristó 1992 – Gyula Kristó, Aba Sámuel és Károly Róbert családi kapcsolatairól, *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica*, 96, Szeged, 1992, 25–30.
- Kristó 1994 – Gyula Kristó, Orosz hercegnő volt-e Károly Róbert első felesége? *Aetas*, 9/1, Szeged, 1994, 194–199.
- Kristó 2005 – Gyula Kristó, Károly Róbert családja, *Aetas*, 20/1, Szeged, 2005, 14–28.
- Lexicon Latinitatis – Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi Hungariae – A magyarországi középkori latinság szótára*, II/3, eds. J. Harmatta et al. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 1991.
- Lhotsky 1967 – Alphons Lhotsky, *Geschichte Österreichs seit der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts (1281–1358)*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte Österreichs 1, Wien: H. Böhlau, 1967.
- Magyar 2016 – Zoltán Magyar, Szent László a magyar művelődéstörténetben, *Korunk*, /8, Kolozsvár, 2016, 30–37.
- Maléth 2020 – Ágnes Maléth, *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék kapcsolata I. Károly korában (1301–1342)*, DeLegatOnline Könyvek 2, Pécs: PTE BTK TTI Középkori és Korajújkori Történeti Tanszék, 2020.
- Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus – Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, comp. J. F. Niermeyer. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Mielke 2021 – Christopher Mielke, *The Archaeology and Material Culture of Queenship in Medieval Hungary, 1000–1395*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.
- Parshin 2012 – Il’ia Leont’evich Parshin, Bitva pri Diurnkrute 26 avgusta 1278 g.: al’ians L’va Danilovicha i Pshemyla II. Ottokara [Илья Леонтьевич Паршин, Битва при Дюрнкруте 26. августа 1278 г.: альянс Льва Даниловича и Пшемьла II. Оттокара], *Rossica Antiqua*, 5/1, Russian Federation, 2012, 95–106.

- Pór 1888 – Antal Pór, Habsburgi Ágnes magyar királyné és Erzsébet hercegasszony, az Árpád-ház utolsó sarja, II, *Katolikus Szemle*, 2, Budapest, 1888, 463–499.
- Pór 1903 – Antal Pór, Magyar–lengyel érintkezés a XIV-ik században, II, *Századok*, 37, Budapest, 1903, 308–326.
- Rudolf 2023 – Veronika Rudolf, *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században. Magyarország, Csehország és Ausztria hatalmi és dinasztikus kapcsolatai 1196 és 1310 között*, Arpadiana XIV, Budapest: HUN-REN Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023.
- Rudolf 2024 – Veronika Rudolf, Megjegyzések I. Károly első és második házasságához, *Turul* 96, Budapest, 2024, 64–72.
- Skorka 2016 – Renáta Skorka, Luxemburgtól Váradig. Beatrix magyar királyné története, u / in: *Nagyvárad és Bihar az Árpád-kor végén*, ed. A. Zsoldos, Tanulmányok Biharország történetéből 3, Nagyvárad: Varadinum Kulturális Alapítvány, 2016, 175–195.
- Solymosi 2021 – László Solymosi, *Szent László király sírja, kultusza és szentté avatása*, Székfoglaló előadások a Magyar Tudományos Akadémián, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 2021.
- Sroka 1994a – Stanisław Sroka, Ki volt Károly Róbert első felesége? *Aetas*, 9/1, Szeged, 1994, 187–193.
- Sroka 1994b – Stanisław Sroka, A Hungarian–Galician Marriage at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century? *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 16, Cambridge, 1994, 261–268.
- Sroka 1998 – Stanisław Sroka, *A magyar Anjouk családi története*, Krakko: Wydawnictwo PIT, 1998.
- Szőcs 2010 – Tibor Szőcs, Egy második „tatárjárás”? A tatár–magyar kapcsolatok a 13. század második felében, *Belvedere Meridionale*, 22/4, Szeged, 2010, 16–50.
- Voloshchuk 2014 – Myroslav Voloshchuk, «Rus» v Uhorskomu korolivstvi (XI – druha polovyna XIV st.): suspilno-politychna rol, maynovi stosunky, mihratsiyi, Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileya-NB, 2014 [Мирослав Волощук, «Русь» в Угорському королівстві (XI – друга половина XIV ст.): суспільно-політична роль, майнові стосунки, міграції, Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2014.]
- Voloshchuk 2018 – Myroslav Voloshchuk, Ruthenian–Hungarian Matrimonial Connections in the Context of the Rurik Dynasty Inter-dynasty Policy of the 10th–14th Centuries: Selected Statistical Data, *Codrul Cosminului*, 24/3, Suceava, 2018, 7–30.
- Voloshchuk 2021 – Myroslav Voloshchuk, *Ruthenians (the Rus’) in the Kingdom of Hungary, 11th to Mid-14th Centuries: Settlement, Property, and Socio-Political Role*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, 76, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2021.
- Woytowycz 2016 – Leontij Woytowycz, Lew Daniłowicz i walka o tron krakowski w ostatniej ćwierci XIII. wieku, *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie*, 12, Katowice, 2016, 117–131.
- Zsoldos 1988 – Attila Zsoldos, Tamás fia Sinka érdemei. Elhallgatás és manipuláció az oklevelek narratíváiban, u / in: *Tanulmányok Borsa Iván tiszteletére*, ed. E. Csukovits, Budapest: Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1988, 327–337.
- Zsoldos 2003 – Attila Zsoldos, III. András, u / in: Zoltán Lenkey & Attila Zsoldos, *Szent István és III. András*, Párhuzamos életrajzok a magyar történelem évszázadaiból, Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 2003, 119–227.
- Zsoldos 2005 – Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik. A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában*, Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok 36, Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2005.
- Zsoldos 2011 – Attila Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája. 1000–1301*, História Könyvtár – Kronológiák, adattárak 11, Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet & História Kiadó, 2011.
- Zsoldos 2020 – Attila Zsoldos, A hatalmi elit újjászervezése I. Károly uralkodása alatt, u / in: *Az Anjou-kor hatalmi elitje*, ed. E. Csukovits, Magyar Történelmi Emlékek – Értekezések, Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat & Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2020, 93–108.
- Živković, Petrović & Uzelac 2013 – Tibor Živković, Vladeta Petrović & Aleksandar Uzelac, Vreme nastanka DEO, u / in: Tibor Živković, Vladeta Petrović & Aleksandar Uzelac, *Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis – Anonimov opis istočne Evrope*, krit. izd., prevod Dragana Kunčer, Izvori za srpsku istoriju 13. Latinski izvori 2, Beograd: Istorijski institut Beograd, 2013, 51–64. [Тибор Живковић, Владета Петровић & Александар Узелац, Време настанка ДЕО, u / in: Тибор Живковић, Владета Петровић & Александар Узелац, *Аноними Дескрипцио Еуропае ориенталис – Анонимов опис источне Европе*, Крит. изд., превод Драгана Кунчер, Извори за српску историју 13. Латински извори 2, Београд: Историјски институт Београд, 2013, 51–64.]