



*Gábor Barabás*<sup>\*</sup>

## The Kings of Hungary and the Princes of Poland in Late Thirteenth Century: Relatives, Alliances and Conflicts<sup>\*\*</sup>

The relations of Poland and Hungary have been the subject of historical research for a long time, the proverbial “friendship” has attracted the interest of many scholars. Nevertheless, it cannot be stated that every aspect of the contacts has been thoroughly dealt with. The focus of this study is on an important aspect of the relationship between the Kingdom of Hungary and the Polish Principality(ies), namely the relations between the ruling dynasties, the Árpáds of Hungary and the Piasts of Poland in the late thirteenth century. In the period following the death of King Béla IV of Hungary in 1270, one can encounter processes similar to those in the preceding era, during the first wave of the Přemyslid–Árpáadian conflict between King Ottokar II of Bohemia and his counterpart, Béla IV over the so-called Babenberg legacy, the duchies of Austria and Styria. Regarding the whole of the second half of the thirteenth century, it can be stated, that one can observe the shifting paradigm of the relations of the more or less independent dukes of Poland. At first sight it certainly looks as if the rulers built two ‘coalitions’, with one group supporting King Ottokar II, the other at first King Béla IV. Nevertheless, the relevance of the individual interests after the dukes’ decision and the importance of family-ties cannot be forgotten either while analysing the historical processes.

**Keywords:** Kingdom of Hungary, Kingdom of Bohemia, Polish principalities, thirteenth century, dynastic relations

<sup>\*</sup> Gábor Barabás, Department of Medieval and Early Modern History, Institute of History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Pécs H-7624, Rókus utca 2., Hungary, E-mail: barab.gabor@gmail.com

<sup>\*\*</sup> Research for this study was supported by the János Bolyai Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (BO/00173/24) and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Pécs. I am grateful to Radosław Kotecki and Adam Zapala for helping me to gain the necessary Polish source-editions and literature.

Polish–Hungarian relations have been the subject of historical research for a long time, the proverbial “friendship” has attracted the interest of many. If we limit our focus to the history of the Middle Ages, one can find a series of relevant scientific works.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it cannot be stated that every aspect of the contacts has been thoroughly dealt with. The focus of my study is on an important aspect of the relationship between the Kingdom of Hungary and the Polish Principality(ies),<sup>2</sup> namely the relations between the ruling dynasties, the Árpáds and the Piast, in the late thirteenth century.

The second half of the thirteenth century is definitely one of the most active, even turbulent periods of the Polish–Hungarian contacts. King Béla IV of Hungary (1235–1270) played a key role in the intensification of the relations, especially after the Mongol invasion of 1241–1242. The Hungarian monarch was aware of the continuous Mongol threat, so he made great efforts to establish a system of alliances, especially through the marriages of his children. Among his sons-in-law, besides Duke Henry XIII of Bavaria or Lev Danilovich of Halych, two Piast princes, Bolesław V the Chaste of Cracow and Bolesław the Pious of Greater Poland could be found as well. The former married Princess Kinga in 1239, or, perhaps in 1243, while the latter married Princess Yolanda (Jolanta) in 1256/1258.<sup>3</sup>

Actually, the eastern threat of the Mongols did not materialize during the lifetime of Béla IV. Nevertheless, in the 1250s, the Hungarian monarch had to face a series of wars, as he became embroiled in a serious conflict with King Ottokar II of Bohemia (1253–1278) over the duchies of Austria and Styria, a conflict also known as the Babenberg legacy. The conflict naturally affected the Piast princes of Poland as well, many of whom sided with Ottokar II, while others supported Béla IV. Some of them even took an active part in the fighting. This Bohemian–Hun-

<sup>1</sup> Only a handful of examples: Gyula Lovcsányi, “Adalékok a magyar–lengyel érintkezés történetéhez a mohácsi vész előtt” [Notes on the History of Hungarian–Polish Relations Before the Battle of Mohács], *Századok* 20 (1886): 330–344, 425–440, 501–522, 590–610, 692–715, 788–800; Adorján Divéky, *A magyar-lengyel érintkezések történelmi tanulságai* [Historical Lessons of Hungarian–Polish Interactions] (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Szövetség, 1937); Endre Kovács, *Magyarok és lengyelek a történelem sodrában* [Hungarians and Poles in the Course of History] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1973); Jerzy Wyrozumski, “Phasen der polnisch-ungarischen Beziehungen (bis 1526),” *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis* 1 (2001): 9–12; Ryszard Grzesik, “Obraz stosunków polsko-węgierskich w czasach piastowskich w rocznikach polskich” [Picture of the Polish–Hungarian Relations in the Piast-era in Polish Annals], *Studia Źródłoznawcze = Commentationes* 41 (2003): 1–18; Stanisław A. Sroka, *A középkori Bártfa és kapcsolatai Kis-Lengyelországgal* [Relations of Medieval Bardejov with Lesser Poland] (Budapest: MTA BTK Történettudományi Intézet, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> Primarily the duchies of Lesser Poland, Greater Poland and Silesia.

<sup>3</sup> With further literature see Gábor Barabás, “A fehér sasok és a turul: Lengyel–magyar dinasztikus kapcsolatok az érett középkor alkonyán” [White Eagles and the Turul: Polish–Hungarian Dynastic Contacts at the End of High Middle Ages], *Studia Quinqueecclesiensia* 1 (2025): 33–67, here 44–46; Gábor Barabás, “Friends, Foes, and Families: Polish–Hungarian Relations in the Mid-Thirteenth Century,” *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razred za društvene znanosti* 59 (2025): 31–65.

garian conflict came to an end in 1260 after the Battle of Kressenbrunn, as Béla IV and Ottokar II made a permanent peace, which lasted as long as both parties were alive.

The Hungarian king's final years were not free of conflicts, as in 1262 and 1264–1265 anew he had an internal war with his firstborn son, the future King Stephen V (1270–1272), who ruled over the Eastern part of Hungary in this period. Almost every family member living within the borders of the realm took part in this conflict, such as Prince Anne, daughter of King Béla IV<sup>4</sup>, and her son, Prince Béla.<sup>5</sup> In the end, father and son made peace and they went back to the status quo prior to the war.

## The New Přemyslid–Árpáadian Conflict and the Polish Dukes

In 1270 the Hungarian monarch, Béla IV and shortly afterwards his wife Queen Mary also passed away, and their daughter Princess Anne – with a significant part of the royal treasury – and several other nobles who had previously been on the side of the elder king saw the best solution in the light of the new ruler's, Stephen V's possible anger towards them, to lie in fleeing to Prague, to the court of Ottokar II. Shortly before his passing away, the Hungarian king had written to his ally, Ottokar II asking him to extend a “fatherly embrace [to] his wife, daughter and followers.”<sup>6</sup>

As due to the death of one party the former peace came to an end, a renewal of the Přemyslid–Árpáadian conflict seemed inevitable, not merely because of Princess Anna's actions, since the former alliance of his late father, Béla IV was not obligatory for Stephen V, earlier grievances foreshadowed the new clash. Both Ottokar II and the new Hungarian ruler began preparations. Stephen V's first step would follow soon afterwards, as he visited the tomb of St. Stanisław in Cracow in late August 1270, where he reconciled and made an alliance with his brother-in-law,

---

<sup>4</sup> For Princess Anne see Márta Font, *The Kings of the House of Árpád and the Rurikid Princes: Cooperation and conflict in medieval Hungary and Kievan Rus'* (Budapest: Research Centre for the Humanities, 2021), 210–211, 219.

<sup>5</sup> For the conflict see Attila Zsoldos, *Családi ügy. IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években* [Family Affair. The Struggle of King Béla IV and Younger King Stephen in the 1260s] (Budapest: MTA TTI, 2007).

<sup>6</sup> [...] *amplexu paterno recipiatis* [...] – *Árpádkori új okmánytár – Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus* (hereafter: *ÁÚO*), III: 1261–1272, ed. Gusztáv Wenzel (Pest, 1862), 204, no. 134. See Zsoldos, *Családi*, 124; Veronika Rudolf, *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században: Magyarország, Csehország és Ausztria hatalmi és dinasztikus kapcsolatai 1196 és 1310 között* [Central Europe in the Long Thirteenth Century. Power Relations and Dynastic Contacts of Hungary, Bohemia and Austria Between 1196 and 1310] (Budapest: HUN-REN Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023), 248–250; Angelika Herucová, “Vojna o Babenberské dedičstvo a Štefan V” [War for the Babenberg Legacy and Stephen V], *Historický Časopis* 65 (2017): 3–24, here 11.

Bolesław V the Chaste – a key step on his part in order to secure the support of his relative, who previously was on Béla IV's side against Stephen.<sup>7</sup>

All narrative sources recording the meeting emphasize that the peace and alliance were concluded at a symbolic location, at the tomb of Saint Stanisław, a martyred bishop from the eleventh century who was canonized in 1253 by Pope Innocent IV. There is no reason to doubt this report, as a few years earlier the competing Piast princes met at the very same tomb in 1254 in connection with the recent canonization, which occasion provided opportunity for them to negotiate with each other.<sup>8</sup> It is also worth noting that similar meetings at times happened at pilgrimage sites.<sup>9</sup> At the same time, it was also of symbolic relevance, that the meeting took place in Cracow, the seat of Bolesław V the Chaste, which shows that, although he was receiving a royal relative, with respect to the precarious position of the latter, reconciliation was more urgent for Stephen V.<sup>10</sup>

The annals of the Franciscans of Cracow, in addition to emphasizing the sanctity of the tomb, also mentions that the parties confirmed their reconciliation with an oath sworn over a piece of the Lord's cross.<sup>11</sup> This latter detail is also plausible, since it was a common practice in the Middle Ages. In the case of the new Hungarian ruler a close parallel can be found as well, as a few years earlier, in 1262, after their first clash,<sup>12</sup> and again in 1266, after their civil war, Béla IV and his son, Stephen, as Junior King by that time, confirmed the peace that had been established between them by swearing an oath on the Gospel and the cross of the

<sup>7</sup> *eodem anno venit Stephanus rex Ungarie visitare sepulchrum sancti Stanislay, et dum vidit ducem Boleslaum, qui habebat dominam Kingam sororem germanam, feceruntque pacem et concordiam inter se.* "Rocznik traski – Rocznik krakowski," in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. II, ed. August Bielowski (Lwów: Nakładem Własnym, 1872), 826–861, here 841. See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 253; Zsoldos, *Családi*, 78; Herucová, "Vojna," 14–18.

<sup>8</sup> Jerzy Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung polnischer Fürsten am Kampf um das Erbe der Babenberger," *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Historyczne* 121 (1997): 7–21, here 10; Wojciech Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century Inter-Lordly System. Lordly Identity and the Origins of the Angevin-Piast Dynastic Alliance* (Kiel: Solivagus, 2020), 278–279; Tomasz Jurek, "Der Einfluß Böhmens auf das geteilte Polen im 13. Jahrhundert," in *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn in der Přemyslidenzeit*, eds. Ivan Hlaváček and Alexander Patschovsky (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2011), 161–201, here 182–184.

<sup>9</sup> Dušan Zupka, *Ritual and Symbolic Communication in Medieval Hungary under the Árpád Dynasty (1000–1301)* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2016), 143.

<sup>10</sup> Zsoldos, *Családi*, 81–82; Zupka, *Ritual*, 143–144.

<sup>11</sup> *eodem anno 7 Calendas Septembris Stephanus rex Ungarie venit visitare limina sancti Stanislai, et ut videret ducem Boleslaum sorroium suum, utpote qui habebat dominam Kyngam germanam suam. Fecit quoque predictus rex pacem et concordiam cum Boleslao perpatuam prestito super crucem de ligno Domini iuramento, hoc eciam fecit idem dux et omnes barones utriusque partis.* – "Rocznik franciszkański krakowski," ed. August Bielowski, in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. III (Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności, 1878), 46–52, here 49.

<sup>12</sup> *Promittimus eciam tactis euuangelijis et sanctorum Reliquijs [...] et corpolariter per nos tactum uiuificum ominice Crucis lignum.* – *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis* 1, ed. Ferdinandus Knauz (Strigonii: Typis Descripsit Aegydius Horák, 1874), 479, 480, no. 619.

Lord.<sup>13</sup> The most detailed account, unsurprisingly, can be found in Jan Długosz's fifteenth-century work, according to which Bolesław V the Chaste and Princess Kinga went before Stephen, and received him with several festivities, before the oath and alliance were concluded.<sup>14</sup> The scope of this study does not allow for a detailed analysis of this account, but it is beyond dispute that the meeting and the alliance in fact was realized, and that it was indeed of outstanding importance for the Hungarian king in terms of military alliance.

It can be assumed that the other brother-in-law of Stephen V, Bolesław the Pious was also present at the meeting, at least according to the annals of the chapter of Poznań and the Chronicle of Greater Poland, as he was in Cracow at the time.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Nos et predictus pater noster, venerabili patre ... Strigoniensi Archiepiscopo presente et codicem Evangeliorum tenente iuravimus corporaliter tactis Sacrasanctis Evangeliiis et vivifice Dominice Crucis ligno* – ÁÚO III, 139, no. 92. For the peace and its circumstances see Zsoldos, Családi, 75–94.

<sup>14</sup> *Stephanus Hungarie rex limina beatissimi Stanislai Cracoviensis episcopi adoraturus affinemque suum ducem Boleslaum Pudicum et ducissam eius Kingam sororem suam germanam visurus, in celebri et numeroso comitatu Cracoviam septimo Kalendas Septembris advenit et processionum honore ab ecclesiis, a duce vero Boleslao Pudico singulis necessariis, ex quo Regnum Polonie et terras suas introiit, tractatus et provisus, digna congratulatione obviam illi cum consorte sua Kinga ad septimum lapidem eunte exceptus est. Adventum autem novi et grati hospitis Stephani regis Boleslaus Pudicus dux ampliori gratulatione honorificaturus, curiam indixit et hastarum ludos assidue et varii generis ac multifariam fecit, quibus expletis victoribus postposita dedit premia. Multisque diebus Stephanum regem et omnes milites suos splendidis conviviis et mensis et omnium necessariorum abundancia, munifice et liberaliter singula administrans, festivavit. Innovatum est extunc fedus inter Hungarie et Polonie Regna vetus, utriusque regni consiliariis id optimum et salutare pro quiete regnorum consentibus et in verba sacra super lignum Crucis Dominice et a Stephano Hungarie rege et a Boleslao Cracoviensi et Sandomiriensi prelatis quoque et baronibus Hungarie et Polonie iuratum, ut omnes casus felices et adversos ex equo participarent, impeditentes et eventuras necessitates communibus propulsarent viribus, eosdem amicos, eosdemque hostes manente uno et eodem tenore quietis et amicitie inter eos et regna habituri. Donatum deinde Stephanum Hungarie regem et suos primores muneribus magnificis, Boleslaus Pudicus Cracoviensis dux in Pannonias revertentem usque in Sandecz cum Kinga ducissa sua prosecutus.* – *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, liber septimus, liber octavus (Varsaviae: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975), 169–170.

<sup>15</sup> *Absente domino Boleslao duce Polonie; iverat enim illa hora in terram Cracouiensem.* – “Rocznik kapituły poznańskiej,” in *Annales Poloniae Maioris*, ed. Brygida Kürbis, in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, vol. VI (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962), 21–78, here 48. [...] *absente Boleslao duce Polonie, qui tunc temporis iverat ad partes Cracouie pro quibusdam negociis peragendis.* – *Chronica Poloniae maioris*, ed. Brygida Kürbis, in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, vol. VIII (Warszawa: Instytut Historii PAN, 1970), 124–125, cap. 159. See Karolina Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy. Książę krakowski i sandomierski 1226–1279. Długie panowanie w trudnych czasach* [Bolesław V the Chaste, Prince of Cracow and Sandomierz 1226–1279. Long Reign in Difficult Times] (Kraków: Avalon, 2021), 249–250. See furthermore “Rocznik wielkopolski,” in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. III, ed. August Bielowski (Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności, 1878), 1–42, here 36; *Dominus Stephanus rex Hungarie intrat Cracoviam VI kalendas Septembris et mansit duobus diebus, tercio autem die ad propria revertitur.* – “Rocznik kapituły krakowskiej,” in *Annales Cracovienses priores cum kalendario*, ed. Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa, in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, vol. V (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978), 19–105, here 100, cap. 250. See *Annales Cracovienses Compilati*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, vol. XIX, ed. Georg Heinrich

In the next year, the ruler of Greater Poland attacked the Margraviate of Brandenburg for its earlier seizure of the castle of Santok.<sup>16</sup> Whether the military action can be linked to the Hungarian alliance is doubtful, given the relatively longer history of the conflict.<sup>17</sup>

Not long after, in the autumn of 1270, Stephen V had another personal meeting, where the Hungarian king, through the mediation of his sister Princess Kinga, signed a truce with Ottokar II for two years, whom he met on the border of their realms, on an island of the Danube near Pozsony (Bratislava, Slovakia). However, fighting broke out a few months later, when Stephen, probably in response to earlier invasions from Austrian territories and the defection of the mighty Hungarian oligarch Henry Kőszegi, attacked Styria and Austria, and the Bohemian monarch launched an offensive in 1271.<sup>18</sup>

Without going into the details of the outbreak of the war or the reasons for the collapse of the peace, it should be pointed out that a former ally of King Béla IV, who sided with Ottokar II afterwards, Władysław of Opole did not take part in the military events of 1271, although according to the Annals of Klosterneuburg the King of Bohemia had Polish troops at his disposal.<sup>20</sup> We can only speculate on the reasons for this, but it does not seem to be beyond credibility that the Silesian princes did not take part in the Ottokar II's campaign in Hungary because of two attacks on them by the "Hungarian coalition," Bolesław V the Chaste and his allies in late April and early June. According to the letters of complaint from Bishop Thomas

---

Pertz (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1866), 584–607, here 605; Herucová, "Vojna," 21; *Pia-stowie. Leksykon Biograficzny* [Piasts. Biographical Lexicon], ed. Stanisław Szczur and Krzysztof Ożóg (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999), 146.

<sup>16</sup> *Item anno Domini Millesimo CC LXXI dux Boleslaus collecto maximo exercitu tantummodo de sua terra et de una parte Cuyauie, quam tunc regebat, intravit terram de castellania de Santok, quam tenebat Otto, marchio Ottonis filius, locatam iure Theutonico, ipsam horribiliter destruxit spoliando, comburendo, anichilando, civitates expugnando. In qua terra secure tribus pernoctavit noctibus et cum magna preda sanus et illesus ad propria remeavit.* – "Rocznik kapituły poznańskiej," 49. ("Annales capituli Posnaniensis," ed. Max Perlach, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, vol. XXIX, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1892), 431–469, here 466). See *Pia-stowie*, 145.

<sup>17</sup> See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 281; Jakub Palko, "Uhorsko–české vzťahy v rokoch 1270–1272" [Hungarian–Bohemian Relations in 1270–1272], *Opus tessellatum – Historia Nova* 14 (2017), 7–33, here 21–23; Herucová, "Vojna," 21–22; Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 213–214.

<sup>18</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 254–273; Herucová, "Vojna," 18–20.

<sup>19</sup> See Gábor Barabás, "Barátból ellenség: Władysław opolei herceg és a Přemysl–Árpád-konfliktus a 13. század második felében" [From Friend to Foe. Duke Władysław of Opole and the Přemysl–Árpád Conflict in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century], *Történelmi Szemle* 67 (2025), no. 1: 1–30.

<sup>20</sup> [...] *collecta armatorum ex Austria, Styria, Bohemia et Karinthia, Saxonia, Polonia et ex aliis terris, [...]* – "Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis," vol. I–VII. ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, vol. IX, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1851), 607–624, 628–637, 647–648, 735–746, 755–757, here vol. VI, 743. See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 264.

of Wrocław sent to Archbishop John of Gniezno, the attack was linked not only to Bolesław but also to his relatives, Leszek II the Black and Conrad II of Mazovia (1264–1294),<sup>21</sup> although the former's participation is questionable, and the latter may merely have sent troops and not personally taken part in the campaign.<sup>22</sup> Based on the settlements listed in the bishop's letter, the Polish historian, Jerzy Wyrozumski states that one of the targets of the attack was the Duchy of Opole-Racibórz, Władysław's land.<sup>23</sup> On the one hand, this could be linked to the Hungarian–Bohemian conflict, as it was directed against one of the main supporters of Ottokar II but, as can be stated based on later events, it could also have been a personal conflict between the two Piast rulers,<sup>24</sup> Bolesław V and Władysław. According to the Galician–Volhynian Chronicle, Bolesław V the Chaste targeted Wrocław, the territory of Henry IV Probus (Prawy) (1266–1290),<sup>25</sup> but the Duke of Cracow's attack was probably directed against all of Ottokar II's Silesian supporters.<sup>26</sup>

The text of the peace concluded in the summer of 1271 between Ottokar II and Stephen V is known thanks to the charters issued in May of the following year by Pope Gregory X (1272–1276), which contain the relevant documents of both kings.<sup>27</sup> The charters list the supporters of the Bohemian monarch: Prince Henry IV of Wrocław, Bolesław II the Horned (Rogatka) of Legnica (1248–1278) and Conrad I of Glogów (1251–1273)<sup>28</sup> and their sons, i.e. a significant part of the

<sup>21</sup> *Piastowie*, 274–276.

<sup>22</sup> [...] *dom. Boleslaus, dux Cracouie, dei timore postposito, iniquo ductus consilio, cum innumeris Ruthenorum, Comanorum et Lituanorum milibus Slesiam invadens hostiliter [...] in nostra dyocesi multi sunt occisi, plures vulnerati et [...] in captivitatem miserabiliter sunt abducti [...] prefatum ducem et suos barones necnon dom. Conradum ducem Masovie [...] – Urkunden zur Geschichte des Bisthums Breslau im Mittelalter* (hereafter: UGBB), ed. Gustav Adolph Stenzel (Breslau: im Verlage bei Josef Max & Komp., 1845), 37–38, no. 31 and [...] *dampna non expressimus, per exercitum ducis Cracouiensis et alios nobis multipliciter facta in villis nostris et ecclesia nostra [...] per Cracouiensem dampna habuimus [...] – UGBB*, 40, 43, no. 36. See Wyrozumski, “Beteiligung,” 14–15; Herucová, “Vojna” 20–21; *Piastowie*, 194–195.

<sup>23</sup> Wyrozumski, “Beteiligung,” 14.

<sup>24</sup> See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 280; Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 213–214; Karolina Supernak, “Kilka uwag o powołaniu księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 roku” [A Few Remarks about the Attempts of Władysław of Opole to Obtain the Throne of Cracow in 1273], *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne* 12 (2016): 132–166, here 135–137.

<sup>25</sup> *The Galician–Volynian Chronicle*. An annotated translation by Georg A. Perfecky (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1973), 87. See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 280; Herucová, “Vojna,” 21; *Piastowie*, 427–431.

<sup>26</sup> *Książęta i księżne Górnego Śląska: praca zbiorowa* [Dukes and Duchesses of Upper Silesia. Collective Work], ed. Antoni Barciak (Katowice: Societas Scientiis Favendis Silesiae Superioris, Instytut Górnośląski, 1995), 122.

<sup>27</sup> *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum Natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCC-CIV* (hereafter: RPR), ed. August Potthast (Berolini: De Decker, 1874), no. 20540; *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia* (hereafter: VMHH), vol. I, ed. Augustinus Theiner (Romae: Typ.Vaticanis, 1859), 295–299, no. DXXIX; 299–304, no. DXXX.

<sup>28</sup> *Piastowie*, 613–615.

Silesian Piasts.<sup>29</sup> However, their neighbour Władysław of Opole, was left without a mention, a decision that, according to Wyrozumski, was of his own making,<sup>30</sup> which does not seem impossible, especially as his dukedom suffered damage during the fights, for which he may have felt he was not adequately compensated.

It is most probably due to an error on the part of the papal chancellery that Ottokar's allies included Prince Leszek II the Black and his unnamed brother,<sup>31</sup> although he remained on the side of his relative Bolesław V the Chaste, as his recognition as the latter's heir to Cracow clearly shows.<sup>32</sup> The marriage of Leszek II the Black may also have strengthened relations with Lesser Poland – and thus with the Hungarian monarch – as in 1265 he married Gryfina, the daughter of Rostislav Mikhailovich and Prince Anna of Hungary, thus the niece of Princess Kinga and the future Stephen V.<sup>33</sup> At the time of the alliance between Béla IV and Ottokar II, whose wife, Kunigunda was the sister of Gryfina,<sup>34</sup> this resulted in kinship with both kings, but after the reconciliation between Bolesław V the Chaste and the newly crowned Hungarian king in 1270, it is unlikely that the prince, who was in possession of Łęczyca and Sieradz, would have sided with Ottokar II, despite their kinship.<sup>35</sup> According to certain scholars, this decision was the reason why in 1271 Leszek's wife, Gryfina, accused her husband of impotence, and they were separated for several years until the prince became a supporter of Ottokar II.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, Stephen V's charter does not mention Leszek among his Polish allies, only his brothers-in-law, the two Bolesławs.<sup>37</sup> In any case, the peace also reveals the two camps of the Piasts, the Silesian branch supporting Ottokar II, and the power centres in Greater and Lesser Poland on the other side.

<sup>29</sup> [...] *d[omi]num Wolezlaum Ducem Slesie et suum Ducem Henricum ac alios filios suos, d[omi]num Chunradum ducem Slesie, cum pueris suis, d[omi]num Henricum filium Ducis Henrici de Wratislawia, d[omi]num Lezkonem et fratrem eius duces Cuiavie.* – VMHH, I, 299, no. DXXIX. See Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 14–15; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 279; Palko, "Uhorsko–česke," 23–30.

<sup>30</sup> Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 14.

<sup>31</sup> [...] *d[omi]num Lezkonem et fratrem eius duces Cuiavie* [...] – VMHH, I, 299, no. DXXIX.

<sup>32</sup> Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 14; *Książęta i księżne*, 120–121; Norbert Mika, *Walka o spadek po Babenbergach 1246–1278* [War for the Babenberg Legacy 1246–1278] (Racibórz: WAW, 2008), 77; *Piastowie*, 204.

<sup>33</sup> Mór Wertner, *Az Árpádok családi története* [Family-History of the Árpáds] (Nagy-Becskerek: Pleitz, 1892), 474.

<sup>34</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 218–219, 279; Barabás, "A fehér sasok," 51.

<sup>35</sup> In making the statement, following Wyrozumski, I have to disagree with Veronika Rudolf. See Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 14; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 279. See furthermore Palko, "Uhorsko–česke," 28.

<sup>36</sup> *Piastowie*, 204.

<sup>37</sup> [...] *Bouzlaum Cracovie et Sandomerie, Boizlaum Maioris Polonie* [...] *Inclitos Duces, generos nostros.* – VMHH, I, 303, no. DXXX; RPR no. 20540. See Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 278. Cf. Herucová, "Vojna," 21; Palko, "Uhorsko–česke," 28.

## The Consequences of the Conflict of Rudolf of Habsburg and Ottokar II

The Přemyslid–Árpáadian conflict took a slightly different direction in 1272, after Stephen V's unexpected death and the murder of Princess Anne's son, Prince Béla of Macho,<sup>38</sup> because the new Hungarian ruler, Ladislaus IV (1272–1290) was still a minor. War broke out again in 1273, and after clashes around the Bohemian–Hungarian border and a Hungarian attack in February, Ottokar II led a campaign to the Kingdom of Hungary in July, which lasted until October. However, the Polish allies of the Bohemian monarch did not take part in this campaign, nor did the former “Hungarian party” launch a fresh action against Silesia.<sup>39</sup> Regarding Hungary, it has to be underlined that the kingdom went through a difficult period after 1272 due to the minor age of the new king, Ladislaus IV. The weakening of royal power was accompanied by the strengthening of the might of the oligarchs of the realm. A situation that determined the internal state of the country until 1277, when the monarch was declared of age at the general assembly of Rákoss with the help of the Church, the lower nobility and the Cumans.<sup>40</sup>

If we take a look at the situation in Poland, it is to be pointed out that based on the remaining Polish narrative sources, although their data is somewhat difficult to interpret, in the early 1270s Bolesław V the Chaste had difficulties in retaining control of Cracow due to internal opposition and the local bishop, Paul, but eventually he was able to overcome it. Later, however, the rebels turned for support to Władysław of Opole, who attacked Cracow in 1273, but was defeated at the Battle of Bogucin. In response, Bolesław V the Chaste and his allies, Bolesław the Pious, Leszek the Black and Conrad II of Mazovia attacked Opole and plundered the territory, but ultimately failed to achieve victory.<sup>41</sup> Hostilities ended in 1274 with a peace, which according to Długosz was mediated by Bolesław the Pious.<sup>42</sup> It is

<sup>38</sup> Tamás Kádár, “Egy rejtélyes politikai gyilkosság és háttere a XIII. század végi Magyarországon: Béla macsóí és boszniai herceg pályája” [A Mysterious Political Assassination and its Background in Thirteenth-Century Hungary: The Life of Duke Béla of Macsó and Bosnia], *Fons* 16 (2009): 411–429.

<sup>39</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 288–301; Palko, “Uhorsko–česke,” 23.

<sup>40</sup> Jenő Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok* [The Last Árpáds] (Budapest: MTA TTI, 1993), 293–295.

<sup>41</sup> [...] *Boleslaus dux Cracovie et Sandomirie, Boleslaus dux Polonie, Conradus dux Mazovie et Lestko dux Szyradie intrantes terram Wladislai ducis Opoliensis devastaverunt eam totaliter, spoliantes et incendio subiicientes usque in Opol et in Coszle et usque in Oderam, et multos homines amiserunt ibidem. Eodem anno quidam milites Cracovienses processerant ad ducem Wladislaum Opoliensem cum tota potencia sua de consilio Pauli episcopi Cracoviensis, sed Boleslaus misso exercitu comprehendit eos in campo Boguczyn, et commisso prelio ex utraque parte ceciderunt plurimi* – “*Annales Polonorum*,” in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum* vol. XIX, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1866), 612–663, here 639. See *Książęta i księżne*, 122; *Piastowie*, 204, 722; Supernak, “Kilka uwag,” 140–163; Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy*, 228–260, 266. According to Kozłowski, Przemysł II was also involved in the attack. Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 182–183.

<sup>42</sup> *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae*, VII–VIII, 186. See *Piastowie*, 722.

also worth pointing out that Bolesław V the Chaste probably concluded a peace and alliance with Ottokar II in Opava as early as the end of 1273. The king must have been particularly interested in the reconciliation of the two Piast princes, since he was trying to gain all possible support against Rudolf of Habsburg, who had been elected German king on 1 October 1273. The abandonment of the campaign in Hungary may also be linked to this situation.<sup>43</sup>

After 1273, the Bohemian monarch was faced with a new challenge, as the new German king, Rudolf of Habsburg had brought a fief suit against him as part of his so-called revindication programme. The appointed arbitrator, Duke Louis II the Strict of Upper Bavaria (1253–1294) ordered him to return Austria, Styria and Carinthia as imperial fiefs, which he had obtained improperly. And in 1275, at the imperial assembly in Augsburg, Rudolf and those present deprived Ottokar II of his imperial fiefs and then imposed imperial curses on him.<sup>44</sup>

This situation also left its mark on the relationship between Ottokar II and his Polish allies. Rudolf recognised the importance of the Silesian princes and tried to win them over. Henry IV Probus of Wrocław, who had been offered the title of imperial prince by Rudolf,<sup>45</sup> remained loyal to Ottokar, but his uncle Bolesław II the Horned, who held Legnica, decided otherwise, to the extent that in 1277 he attacked his nephew and even captured him.<sup>46</sup> So, along the new conflict, the Piast princes once again confronted each other. Henry IV Probus was supported by his cousin Henry III of Glogów (1273/74–1309),<sup>47</sup> and, presumably, by Prince Przemysł II of Poznań, the nephew of Bolesław V the Pious. The latter had no part in the armed conflict, yet he raised territorial claims over parts of Silesia. The supporters of Henry IV Probus were eventually defeated in the battle of Stolec by Bolesław II's son, Henry V the Fat (Brzuchaty).<sup>48</sup> Henry IV was finally freed from his captivity thanks to the mediation of Ottokar II, but he had to give up part of his dukedom in favour of Bolesław II the Horned. It is also worth mentioning that Henry IV made peace with Bolesław the Pious through the mediation of the former opponents, Bolesław V the Chaste and Władysław of Opole.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> 1273. *dux Boleslaus Cracoviensis convenit cum Primizlio rege Bohemie in Opava, et firman amicitiam perpetuam.* – “Rocznik traski,” 841–842. See Wyrozumski, “Beteiligung,” 15–17; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 294, 300–304; Supernak, “Kilka uwag,” 132–140.

<sup>44</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 310–317.

<sup>45</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 321; *Piastowie*, 427.

<sup>46</sup> Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 196, 215.

<sup>47</sup> *Piastowie*, 617–622.

<sup>48</sup> *Piastowie*, 421–423.

<sup>49</sup> Tomasz Jurek, “Henryk Probus i Henryk głogowski: stosunki wzajemne w latach 1273–1290” [Henry Probus and Henry of Glogów: Mutual Relations in the Years 1273–1290], *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka* 42 (1987), no. 4: 555–570, here 558–560; *Piastowie*, 422, 427–428.

As the peace of Vienna of 1276, which put an end to the first war, was not respected by either side, Ottokar II and Rudolf Habsburg concluded a new peace treaty on 6 May 1277, and then amended it on 12 September. Their texts included among the Bohemian monarch's allies Prince Henry IV of Wrocław and other Piast princes as well.<sup>50</sup> It is certain that the king attached great importance to keeping his Polish supporters. According to a text of questionable authenticity, preserved in the work of Henricus Italicus, the king addressed a manifesto to the Piast princes, emphasising the neighborhood, kinship and common destiny of the Czechs and the Poles,<sup>51</sup> thus calling on the Piasts to provide aid to him. Even if this call may be a literary fiction, it is undoubted that the Polish rulers, with the exception of Bolesław II the Horned of Legnica and his sons, supported Ottokar II. At the end of August and beginning of September 1277, Henry IV Probus renewed his oath of allegiance to the Bohemian monarch. Their relationship was also confirmed by a succession treaty.<sup>52</sup> During this period, Ottokar II's supporters included also the former opponents, Władysław of Opole and Bolesław V the Chaste, who – as mentioned above – now even mediated together in the conflict between Henry IV Probus and Bolesław the Pious.<sup>53</sup>

Nevertheless, Rudolf of Habsburg also sought to find supporters, and the Hungarian ruler, Ladislaus IV, who was in the process of consolidating his power in his realm, presented himself as a natural ally in this situation. Negotiations between the two rulers, or rather between Rudolf and the oligarch Kőszegi family by that time, began as early as 1274, and although Ottokar II also sought to win over the Kingdom of Hungary to his side, Ladislaus IV clearly committed himself to Rudolf in 1277. The Hungarian monarch and his younger brother, Prince

---

<sup>50</sup> [...] *ac ceteros principes Polonorum, qui nostri sunt consanguinei et amici* [...] – *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, volume V/2: 1267 – 1278, eds Gustav Friedrich et al. (Praha: Academia, 1981), 560, no. 846; *Regesta Imperii VI. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Rudolf, Adolf, Albrecht, Heinrich VII. 1273–1313. Erste Abtheilung*, ed. Oswald Redlich (Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchandlung, 1898), 212–213, no. 860. See Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 18; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 341–346.

<sup>51</sup> [...] *in lingue consonancia nobis conuenit, ipsa proxima loci contiguitate nullius intersecta distancie spacio, terris nostris coniungitur, ipsa et unione glutinatur sanguinis et affinitatis nobis connectitur vinculo* [...] – Bolesław Ulanowski, "Przyczynki źródłowe do ostatnich lat panowania Ottokara II" [Source Contributions to the Final Years of the Reign of Ottokar II], in *Archiwum Komisji Historycznej*, vol. 4, *Scriptores rerum Polonicarum* 12 (Kraków: Typis Lad. Anczyc et Sociorum, 1888), 1–41, here 12, no. 9. See Jurek, "Der Einfluß," 186–187.

<sup>52</sup> *Codex diplomaticus Silesiae*, vol. 7: *Regesten zur schlesischen Geschichte*, part 2: *Bis zum Jahre 1280*, ed. Colmar Grünhagen (Breslau: Josef Max & Comp., 1875), 231, no. 1540. See Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 18; Jurek, "Der Einfluß," 186–187; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 349–350. According to some scholars, the Piast supporters of the Bohemian king met the Přemyslid ruler in person at a meeting in Opaava in September 1277 or at the turn of 1277–1278. Bronisław Nowacki, *Przemysław II: Odnawiciel Korony Polskiej (1257–1296)* [Przemysław II: Restorer of the Polish Crown (1257–1296)] (Kraków: Avalon, 2007) (e-pub); Jurek, "Der Einfluß," 186.

<sup>53</sup> Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 18.

Andrew, also appeared in the text of the aforementioned peace in May, which obliged Ottokar II to return the previously conquered Hungarian territories.<sup>54</sup>

Although there is only limited information available regarding the Polish connections of King Ladislaus IV of Hungary, it is clear from this evidence that the strong ties to the Piasts of Lesser Poland had not disappeared overnight. Several royal charters from 1278 report that those who received donations had earned the king's favour by serving as his envoys in Poland.<sup>55</sup> However, it is impossible to determine exactly when these diplomatic missions took place. Similarly, one can only speculate that Ladislaus IV held negotiations with the husband of his aunt, Kinga: Bolesław V the Chaste.

The conflict between Ottokar and Rudolf of Habsburg culminated in the Battle of Marchfeld in 1278, which also marked the end of the struggle for the Babenberg legacy. The battle, in which King Ladislaus IV also participated, took place on 26 August, and it is commemorated either at length or in brief in almost all sources of the period.<sup>56</sup> From our point of view, the contemporary Styrian chronicler Ottokar aus der Gaal's report is of outstanding importance, since according to him the Polish princes of Wrocław (Henry IV Probus), Glogów (Henry III) and Opole-Racibórz, as well as several other, mostly difficult to identify Polish princes, among them probably Leszek the Black and Przemysł II fought on the side of Ottokar II.<sup>57</sup> It seems certain that Ottokar had called his Piast's allies to Opava by the beginning of June.<sup>58</sup> Yet, in Polish medieval studies the view has become accepted that neither Władysław of Opole nor Henry III and Henry IV were actually personally present in the camp of the Bohemian king, but merely assisted him with their troops.<sup>59</sup> Ottokar II placed them in a separate unit, presumably to play an auxiliary role.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 323–343; Szűcs, *Az utolsó*, 292.

<sup>55</sup> *in nostris negociis ad Poloniam fideliter exhibitis. Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (hereafter: CDH), vol. V/2, ed. Georgius Fejér (Buda: typis typogr. Regiae Universitatis Vngaricae, 1829), 444, *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica – Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke*, vol. 1–2/1, ed. Emericus Szentpétery. Budapest, 1923–1943; vol. 2/2–4, ed. Iván Borsa. Budapest, 1961–1987. (=RA) no. 2908. See also: RA no. 2904; Dániel Bácsatyai, “Követek és követjárások az Árpád-korban” [Envoys and Diplomatic Missions in the Árpád Era], *Századok* 159 (2025), no. 1: 5–62, here 58.

<sup>56</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 362–363.

<sup>57</sup> *Ottokar aus der Gaal: Stájer Rímes Krónika (Részletek)* [Ottokar aus der Gaal: Styrian Rhyme-Chronicle (Excerpts)] (hereafter: SRK), edited and translated by Dániel Bagi (Budapest: ELKH Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023), 147, note 418.

<sup>58</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 359.

<sup>59</sup> Wyrozumski, “Beteiligung,” 19–21; *Piastowie*, 722–723.

<sup>60</sup> Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 365.

At this point we must return to Ottokar aus der Gaal's report that the son of a certain Prince Wenceslas, nephew of Ottokar II, Bolko, had sent a large troop to help the Bohemian monarch.<sup>61</sup> Jerzy Wyrozumski, based on the results of earlier Polish research, concludes that there is no known prince named Wenceslas from the period.<sup>62</sup> The translator and editor of the latest Hungarian edition of the chronicle, Dániel Bagi, resolved this information by claiming that actually Władysław of Opole's son Bolko (Bolesław, 1281/1282–1313)<sup>63</sup> was present at the battle.<sup>64</sup> As the third son of the Duke of Opole was co-regent alongside his father from 1277,<sup>65</sup> this scenario seems to be highly probable. Especially since, in the next sentence, Ottokar aus der Gaal also mentions the soldiers of the Duke of Opole, albeit without naming the ruler. Furthermore, Władysław was certainly over 50 years old in 1278,<sup>66</sup> therefore, according to the standards of his era he was not considered young, so the idea that his son led his troops instead cannot be dismissed.

The battle was won, as is well known, by Rudolf of Habsburg and his ally, Ladislaus IV. Ottokar II himself remained dead on the battlefield, thus beginning a new era in the life of the Piasts, both in Silesia and in Poland. Władysław of Opole, tried to take advantage of the new situation, attempting to acquire Opava, but without success. In 1280, Władysław and his son Bolko were present alongside Henry IV of Wrocław<sup>67</sup> in Vienna, where they swore an oath of allegiance to Rudolf Habsburg.<sup>68</sup> Władysław also strengthened his alliance with his Silesian neighbour, and their close kinship was enhanced by a marriage, Henry IV wed his daughter Constance.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>61</sup> [...] *michel helfe tet im dâ sîn ôheim herzog Wenzlâ wand des sun, herzog Pole, brâhte im ein michel vole, die sach man sînen willen erfüllen, und der herzog von Opullen durch sîn furdrung und sîn guot brâht im manigen helt fruot, daz in sît vil sêr gerou.* – Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik, vol. 1, ed. Joseph Seemüller, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Deutsche Chroniken*, vol. V/1 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1890), 201, cap. CXL, lines 15211–15219. See also: SRK, 147.

<sup>62</sup> Wyrozumski, "Beteiligung," 20. See furthermore Mika, *Walka*, 90–91.

<sup>63</sup> *Piastowie*, 726–728.

<sup>64</sup> SRK, 147, note 417.

<sup>65</sup> *Książęta i księżne*, 26–27; *Piastowie*, 726.

<sup>66</sup> Kazimierz Jasiński, *Rodowód Piastów śląskich. Piastowie wrocławscy, legnicko-brzescy, świdniccy, ziebiccy, głogowscy, żagańscy, oleśnicy, opolscy, cieszyńscy i oświęcimscy* [The Genealogy of the Silesian Piasts. The Piasts of Wrocław, Legnica-Brzeg, Świdnica, Ziębice, Głogów, Żagań, Oleśnica, Opole, Cieszyn and Oświęcim] (Kraków: Avalon, 2007), 510.

<sup>67</sup> After the death of II Ottokar, Henry IV Probus tried to act as guardian of the minor Bohemian heir, Wenceslas II, but without success. *Piastowie*, 428.

<sup>68</sup> *Książęta i księżne*, 27, 122; *Piastowie*, 723; Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 184.

<sup>69</sup> *Książęta i księżne*, 123; *Piastowie*, 428, 728. Władysław of Opole passed away at the end of August or in September of 1281 or 1282, afterwards his sons Bolko, Kazimierz, Mieszko and Przemysław divided the Duchy of Opole-Racibórz among themselves. *Książęta i księżne*, 122; *Piastowie*, 723; Jerzy Horwat, *Książęta górnośląscy z dynastii Piastów: Uwagi i uzupe na genealogiczne* [Upper Silesian

## Piast-Árpadian Relations after 1279

In 1279 both sons-in-law of the late Béla IV passed away, Bolesław V the Chaste and Bolesław the Pious.<sup>70</sup> Therefore, both Hungarian princesses, Kinga and Yolanda became widows. The latter at first went to her sister Kinga, who remained in Cracow and started doing charity. Soon afterwards Yolanda entered the nunnery of the Poor Clares in Gniezno, where she remained until her death in 1304.<sup>71</sup>

Regarding Kinga's later life at first it has to be emphasized, that the several-times mentioned Leszek the Black, a relative of the Hungarian royal family himself, in accordance with the will of the late Bolesław V the Chaste, gained power over Cracow without any major problems, and held it until his death in 1288, although not without some difficulties. In the early 1280s, after the widow of Bolesław, Kinga had entered the nunnery of the Poor Clares in Sary Sącz founded by herself and donated to the cloister some of the land inherited from her husband, Leszek, supported by members of the lay elite, wanted to take possession of the estates. The new duke's actions may have been motivated by the fact that Kinga entitled herself as lady of Sandomierz (*domina et princeps de Sandech*) and wanted to preserve the incomes of certain estates for herself. It is even assumable that the widowed duchess took possession of several estates unlawfully.<sup>72</sup> He also negotiated with Princess Kinga, through the mediation of the papal legate Philip of Fermo, who had previously visited the Kingdom of Hungary as well,<sup>73</sup> but to no avail.<sup>74</sup> The conflict escalated to such an extent that the prince took Kinga's supporter, Bishop Paul of Cracow prisoner, with whom and with Kinga he only reached an agreement

---

Princes from the Piast Dynasty. Notes and Additions to the Genealogy] (Ruda Śląska: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna w Katowicach, 2005), 29; Jasiński, *Rodowód*, 510–511; Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century*, 172.

<sup>70</sup> *Piastowie*, 147, 197.

<sup>71</sup> Gyula Pauler, *A magyar nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt* [History of the Hungarian Nation under the Árpadian Dynasty], vol. II (Budapest: Atheneum, 1899), 388; *Piastowie*, 147; Kazimierz Jasiński, "Genealogia Piastów wielkopolskich. Potomstwo Władysława Odonica" [Genealogy of the Piasts of Greater Poland. The Offspring of Władysław Odonic], *Nasi Piastowie, Kronika Miasta Poznania* 63 (1995), no. 2: 34–66, here 43.

<sup>72</sup> *Piastowie*, 205–206; Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy*, 586–587.

<sup>73</sup> For Philip of Fermo see Viktória Kovács, "Alter ego domini papae Nicolai III. Fülöp fermói püspök, szentszéki legátus magyarországi tevékenysége (1279–1281)" [Alter ego domini papae Nicolai III. The Activity of Bishop Philip of Fermo, Legate of the Holy See in Hungary (1279–1281)], in *Varietas delectat. A pápai-magyar kapcsolatok sokszínűsége a 11–14. században*, ed. Gergely Kiss (Pécs: PTE BTK TTI Középkori és Koraújkori Történeti Tanszék, 2019), 117–166. (DeLegatOnline Könyvek 1). The controversy between Kinga and Leszek the Black appears in the legend of the former too. See *Vita et miracula sanctae Kyngae ducissae Cracoviensis*, ed. Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. IV (Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności w Krakowie, 1884), 662–744, here 717. Interestingly, Jan Długosz does not mention the conflict, although he himself compiled a vita of Kinga.

<sup>74</sup> Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy*, 587–589.

as early as December 1284 and finally in 1286 again.<sup>75</sup> In 1285 (or possibly as early as 1282), the lay elite of Cracow and Sandomierz rebelled against him and invited Prince Conrad II of Mazovia to replace him on the throne. The rebels had already laid siege to the castle of Cracow, where Leszek's wife Gryfina was staying, but the duke, assisted by George, son of Simon of the Baksa kindred, who was leading the auxiliary troops of Hungarians and Cumans sent by King Ladislaus IV, won a decisive victory at the Battle of Bogucice.<sup>76</sup> At the turn of 1287–1288, the prince of Cracow again needed Hungarian military assistance, when he was unable to effectively resist another Mongol attack,<sup>77</sup> from which,

<sup>75</sup> Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy*, 590–592.

<sup>76</sup> [...] *dux Lestco videns maliciam suorum baronum, confugit ad auxilium Ungarorum, qui statim ei affuerunt in presidium. Non tantum Ungari christiani causam ducis pii et incliti condolentes sed et pagani Comani eius vicem fortissime condolerunt [...] cum auxilio regis Ungarie vincuntur.* – “Rocznik traski,” 851. A charter of Ladislaus IV of 1288 issued for *magister* Thomas, who took part in the fight against Conrad, also confirms the aid provided to Leszek the Black. RA no. 3499. *tunc, cum dux Conraldus terras domini Leznek, ducis Cracouiae, et Sandomirie; affinis nostri karissimi vastibus diris multiplicibus hostiliter adiisset, et idem dux Liznek contra eundem ducem Conraldus propulsandis iniuriis regni sui exercitum movisset; ad quem quidem exercitum predictus magister Thomas cum eodem in subsidium eiusdem domini Lyznek per nos transmissi exstitissent; memoratus magister Thomas contra aciem ipsius Conraldi ducis se viriliter opposuit.* CDH, V/3. 410–411. In 1285 King Ladislaus IV sent Amade of the Aba kindred to Leszek the Black as his emissary, Ladislaus, the son of Aladár of the Gutkeled kindred was also member of the mission. See Bácsatyai, “Követek,” 59.

<sup>77</sup> *Et sic idem magister Georgius ipsum regnum Polonie, quod sicut regnum nostrum proprium reputamus, de manu hostile ereptum, cum effusione sui sanguinis et suorum, potestati et dominio ducis Leznek restituit supradicti. Insuper eciam, quum novissime dicta gens Tartarica ipsum regnum Polonie iniisset vastaturus.* – CDH, V/3. 395, Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár (hereafter: MNL) – Országos Levéltára (hereafter: OL) – Diplomatai Levéltár (hereafter: DL), no. 57222; RA no. 3502. See Divéky, *A magyar-lengyel*, 9; *Piastowie*, 204–207; Szócs, Tibor, “Egy második „tatárjárás”? A tatár–magyar kapcsolatok a XIII. század második felében” [A Second “Mongol Invasion”? Mongol-Hungarian Contacts in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century], *Belvedere Meridionale* 22 (2010): 3–4, 16–49, here: 22; Liwoch, Radosław, “The Mongols in Poland in the 13th century. Traces of the Invasions,” in *Archaeology of Conflicts*, eds. Paweł Drnovský and Petr Hejhal (Hradec Králové: Pavel Mervart, 2020), 55–68, here 58; Witold Świątosławski, “The Mongol invasions of Poland in the thirteenth century. The current state of knowledge and perspectives for future research,” in *The Routledge Handbook of the Mongols and Central-Eastern Europe*, eds. Alexander V. Maiorov and Roman Hautala (London; New York: Routledge, 2021), 82–97, here 90; Tibor Szócs, “Fifty Years: Mongol-Hungarian Conflicts between 1242 and 1292, and the ‘Second Mongol Invasion’ in 1285,” in *The Mongols in Central Europe: The Profile and Impact of their Thirteenth-Century Invasions*, ed. Balázs Nagy (Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2024), 325–362, here 352–353. Attila Bárány linked the Hungarian aid of 1287/88 with the attack of the Mongols, referring to the work of Gyula Pauler, but in that work, we read about the war of Leszek II the Black against Conrad, the fight against the Mongols is mentioned by 1287. See Pauler, *A magyar nemzet*, II. 388–389, 398–399; Attila Bárány, “Magyarország, Anglia és a tatár veszély a XIII. század második felében” [Hungary, England and the Tatar Menace in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 122 (2009), no. 2: 251–277, here 274, 276.

at least according to Jan Długosz, he sought refuge in Hungary,<sup>78</sup> just like previously in 1285.<sup>79</sup>

George, son of Simon, who assisted Leszek on several occasions, both against Conrad II of Mazovia and in the time of the Mongol attack, was rewarded for his services not only by the king of Hungary, but also by the duke of Cracow.<sup>80</sup> The text of the Hungarian king's donation is quite important, as it confirms Długosz's mentioned report that the Polish prince sought refuge in Hungary.<sup>81</sup> Leszek the Black's charter issued on 19 February 1287 refers to king Ladislaus IV as a friend, i.e. as an ally.<sup>82</sup> This alliance also appears several times in the Hungarian king's charter issued a year later, but Leszek is not mentioned there as a friend, but as a relative.<sup>83</sup> However, we should not attach too much importance to this distinction, as both terms can be interpreted as emphasising a close alliance.

The "last of the Árpáds," Andrew III (1290–1301) ascended to the Hungarian throne in 1290, after the death of Ladislaus IV, with the support of the leader of the Hungarian Church, Archbishop Lodomér of Esztergom and members of the

<sup>78</sup> *Metu itaque nimio correptus et de viribus suis et militum suorum diffidens in Hungariam secessionem cum coniuge Griffina et nonnullis baronibus fecit, propter quod Thartari ex captivis ducem Lestkhonem in Hungariam secessisse docti, omnem Cracoviensis terre oram versus Sandecz sitam et usque ad Alpes Pannonicos licensius vastabant – Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae, VII–VIII, 247. See Piastowie, 207.*

<sup>79</sup> *Ipse cum paucis arce civibus Cracoviensibus tradita <sue deieccionis iniuriam amplexatus> in Hungariam ad Wladislaum regem solacia quesiturus, quanto celeriori potest cursu, quarta decime die Iulii ex Cracovia egressus, contendit – Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae, VII–VIII, 235.*

<sup>80</sup> *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Małopolski* (hereafter: KDM), vol. I, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków: Academia Literarum Cracoviensis, 1876), 133–134, no. CXIII. See Marcin R. Pauk, "Language of Power and Communication in the Piast Dynasty: Toward a Reappraisal of Polish Political Culture of the 12th–13th Century," in *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe Power, Rituals and Legitimacy in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland*, eds. Grischa Vercamer and Dušan Zupka (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2022), 178–197, here 188.

<sup>81</sup> *Preterea, quum dux Conardus, presumta audacia, et spiritu superbie inflammatum, magnificum virum, Dominum Leznec ducem Cracovie, ac Sandomeriae, cognatum nostrum carissimum, de regno suo potencialiter exclusisset, et nos in auxilium ipsius ducis, ad petitionem eiusdem, memoratum magistrum Georgium cum aulicis et iuvenibus nostris destinassemus; idem magister Georgius inibi primam tenens aciem, aliis ab eo longe adstantibus et sequentibus aciebus, solus cum sibi adherentibus in prelio predictum Conardum ducem potenter et viriliter debellavit; multis ibidem ex parte adversa in area certaminis interfectis et pluribus captivatis; paucis ex eisdem, sicut certo certius intelleximus, vix fuge presidio euadentibus. In quo quidem conflictu ipse magister Georgius quinque letalia vulnera in suo corpore recipiens, unus cognatus suus exstitit interfectus; et undecim servientes ipsius exstiterunt letaliter vulnerati. [...] idemque dux Leznec non credens, se posse resistere potencie ipsorum Tartarorum, ante eos terga vertens, se in terram nostram defensionis presidio recepisset – CDH, V/3. 394–395, RA no. 3502.*

<sup>82</sup> *Rex illustris Hungarie, dominus Ladislaus amicus noster – KDM, I. 134, no. CXIII.*

<sup>83</sup> *magnificum virum, dominum Leznec ducem Cracovie, ac Sandomeria, cognatum nostrum carissimum – CDH, V/3, 394.*

aforementioned Kőszegi family.<sup>84</sup> He was not the sole candidate, but his rivals, the Angevins of Naples and Wenceslas II of Bohemia (1278–1305) – unlike Albert of Habsburg – were not active in Hungary at the time.<sup>85</sup> Andrew's situation was not ideal, which may have influenced his plans to marry, as well. In Attila Zsoldos's words, "there was no prospect of an illustrious spouse."<sup>86</sup> The new Hungarian king in the end married Fenenna, "a relatively insignificant"<sup>87</sup> princess of the Kuyavian branch of the Piasts.

Fenenna was the daughter of Prince Siemomysł (Ziemomysł), who, indeed, cannot be mentioned among the prominent political figures of late thirteenth-century Poland. He was the second son of the Kuyavian prince Casimir I, hence the younger brother of Leszek II the Black, and after his father's death he became head of the Inowrocław part of Kuyavia, but the following year he lost first Bydgoszcz, which fell under the rule of Bolesław the Pious, and then, between 1271 and 1278, his entire duchy was lost and he and his wife were forced into exile. Siemomysł then regained part of the territory from his brother, who had acquired it in the meantime, and held it until his death in 1287.<sup>88</sup>

Therefore, Fenenna's father was certainly not a prominent figure among the Piasts, but the political background to Andrew III's marriage is not to be sought for solely on his side. In 1290, not only Siemomysł but also his older brother Leszek the Black was already deceased,<sup>89</sup> so their half-brother Władysław Łokietek (the

<sup>84</sup> Andrew's belonging to the Árpadian dynasty was questioned already by his contemporaries as his father Stephen was born after the death of King Andrew II. He grew up in Italy and arrived in the Kingdom of Hungary in 1290 during the lifetime of Ladislaus IV but was taken prisoner and enjoyed the 'hospitality' of the Habsburgs in Vienna until his escape organised by Archbishop Lodomer of Esztergom. See Zoltán Lenkey, Attila Zsoldos, *Szent István és III. András* [Saint Stephen and Andrew III] (Budapest: Kossuth, 2003), 123–125, 131–136; Attila Zsoldos, "Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," *Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2013), no. 2: 211–242, here 212, 216; Renáta Skorka, "Előjáték egy házasságkötéshez. A Habsburgok útja az első magyar házassághoz" [Foreplay to a Wedding. The Habsburgs' Road to the First Hungarian Marriage], in *Királynék a középkori Magyarországon és Európában*, ed. Kornél Szovák and Attila Zsoldos (Székesfehérvár: Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet Székesfehérvár, 2019), 59–77, 60–65.

<sup>85</sup> Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 133–135; Szűcs, *Az utolsó*, 322–323, 327; Skorka, "Előjáték," 65–75; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 445–460.

<sup>86</sup> Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163. All Hungarian citations were translated by the author of this article.

<sup>87</sup> Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163. As Gyula Kristó and Ferenc Makk put it: "Andrew III, struggling for recognition, could hardly have expected a more 'prestigious' wife." – Gyula Kristó, Ferenc Makk, *Az Árpád-házi uralkodók* [Rulers of the Árpadian Dynasty] (Budapest: Interpress, 1988), 303.

<sup>88</sup> *Piastowie*, 208–209. According to Kristó and Makk "Fenenna's [...] father lived in exile, the king could not expect significant help from him." – Kristó; Makk, *Az Árpád-házi*, 302–303.

<sup>89</sup> *Piastowie*, 208, 209.

Elbow-high)<sup>90</sup> was the senior Piast in Kuyavia. In addition to his paternal inheritance, Łokietek became one of the most important rulers among the Piasts in 1290, when, following his victory over Henry IV Probus of Wrocław, and after his cousin Bolesław II of Mazovia had renounced his claim to seniority, he briefly took Cracow, while he was able to take permanent possession of Sandomierz.<sup>91</sup> Łokietek's main opponent, Henry IV Probus, died in June 1290,<sup>92</sup> when – partly by Henry's will – Cracow passed into the hands of Przemysł II of Greater Poland, although only for a few months.<sup>93</sup> In 1291 Przemysł II even had pledged his support to Wenceslas II, the Bohemian king who claimed Cracow, but this relation changed soon afterwards. In 1293, the duke of Greater Poland, Władysław Łokietek and his brother Conrad II formed an alliance. As usual, this was sealed with a marriage, the duke of Sandomierz, Władysław married Hedvig, the daughter of Bolesław the Pious and Yolanda, i.e. the granddaughter of King Béla IV of Hungary.<sup>94</sup>

Of course, at the time of the preparation and conclusion of the marriage between Andrew III and Fenenna, the new Hungarian king could not have been aware of the subsequent course of events. The situation of Łokietek, as we have seen, changed in the summer of 1290 with the death of Henry IV Probus and the pursuit of Przemysł II. The coronation of Andrew III took place on 23 or 29 July, possibly on 1 August,<sup>95</sup> after which negotiations could begin on an alliance to be confirmed by a marriage. The monarch of Hungary sent Provost Theodor of Fehérvár to Poland, who previously had already distinguished himself in the preparation of the coronation, and he succeeded in this endeavour. In October–November, Andrew was staying in the northern parts of his kingdom, in the counties of Zólyom (Zvolen, Slovakia), Szepes (Spiš, Slovakia) and Sáros (Šariš, Slovakia), probably to receive his future spouse there. The wedding and coronation of the new queen presumably took place in December.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>90</sup> The sister of Władysław of Opole, Euphrosyne got married to Casimir I of Kuyavia in 1257, her son was Władysław Łokietek. Jasiński, *Rodowód*, 513–514; *Piastowie*, 722–723.

<sup>91</sup> *Piastowie*, 211.

<sup>92</sup> Jasiński, *Rodowód*, 160.

<sup>93</sup> Nowacki, *Przemysł II*; *Piastowie*, 157–158.

<sup>94</sup> Nowacki, *Przemysł II*; *Piastowie*, 158. According to others, the marriage took place in 1289. *Piastowie*, 211.

<sup>95</sup> Kádár, Tamás, “Az utolsó Árpád-házi uralkodó, III. András király megkoronázásának időpont-jához” [Remarks on the Date of the Coronation of the Last Árpadian King Andrew III], *Levéltári Közlemények* 84 (2013): 3–25; SRK, 234. note 776; Dániel Bácsatyai, *A Somogyvári formuláskönyv évkönyvei* [Annals of the Formula Book of Somogyvár] (Székesfehérvár: Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet, 2019), 21–22.

<sup>96</sup> Kádár, Tamás, “III. András király itineráriuma (1278–[1290]–1301)” [Itinerary of King Andrew III (1278–[1290]–1301)], *Fons* 25 (2018): 87–124, here 114; Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163; Dániel Bácsatyai, *Az Árpád-kor történeti kronológiája (997–1301)* [Chronology of the Árpadian-Era (997–1301)] (Budapest: ELKH BTK, 2022), 265; Bácsatyai, “Követek,” 60.

In connection with this latter statement, the report of a contemporary source also has to be taken into consideration, since Ottokar aus der Gaal's rhymed chronicle contradicts the events outlined in several points. Firstly, the origin of the unnamed bride, according to the Styrian chronicler, Andrew III married the daughter of an unnamed duke of Glogów.<sup>97</sup> In 1290, two living sons of Prince Conrad I of Glogów (1249/50–1273/74), Henry III and Conrad II the Hunchback (Garbaty), could be considered, but in both cases the claim of the Styrian chronicler can be easily refuted. Henry III did have three daughters, but all of them were born after 1290, while his younger brother was a prince who entered the church, so he did not get married at all.<sup>98</sup>

The descent of Fenenna is beyond dispute: as we have seen above, she was the daughter of Siemomysł, a member of the Kuyavian branch of the Piast dynasty. At the same time, another idea has been put forward, as so often is the case, based on the fifteenth century narrative work of Jan Długosz. Concerning the marriage of Fenenna, in connection with his father by the year of 1268 we can read that the princess's husband was the Hungarian king Stephen.<sup>99</sup> The father of Andrew III was indeed called Stephen, but here we are dealing with a mistake that can be traced back to the time of the data, since Długosz mentions the marriage by 1268. Siemomysł also appears by the year of 1287, when the chronicler speaks of his death after twelve years in exile and, contrary to his earlier statement and to reality, states that the prince died childless.<sup>100</sup> According to the nineteenth-century Hungarian historian, Mór Wertner, Fenenna spent time in the Kingdom of Hungary either during or after her father's lifetime, and the marriage could be traced back to this period. Wertner also mentions the theory that it was one of the mighty oligarchs, Ivan Kőszegi's<sup>101</sup> conditions to Andrew for the acceptance of his rule to marry Fenenna, thus preventing the future Hungarian king from marrying an Austrian princess.<sup>102</sup>

Without going into the depths of late medieval sources and modern historical literature, we can conclude that the unanimous opinion of authoritative Hungarian and Polish medieval studies is that the marriage took place in the second

<sup>97</sup> *ze jungist dô vant man einen fursten ze Pôlân, des lant heist Glogouwe, dem was ein juncfrouwe ze kinde erkorn, wand si von im was geborn. diu was sô tugenthaft und sô klâr, daz die Unger riten dar, dem der ze kunig erwelt was – Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*, 533. cap. CCCLXXXVI, lines 41089–41097. See furthermore SRK, 234–236; Skorka, "Előjáték," 72–73.

<sup>98</sup> *Piastowie*, 613–615, 616–624. Cf. Wertner, *Az Árpádok*, 573–574.

<sup>99</sup> [...] *Fennenam, que regi Hungarie <Stephano> nupserat [...]* – *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae*, VII–VIII. 161.

<sup>100</sup> *nullos liberos reliquens* – *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae*, VII–VIII. 248.

<sup>101</sup> For Ivan see recently Zsoldos, "Kings and Oligarchs," 217–218.

<sup>102</sup> Wertner, *Az Árpádok*, 571–572.

half of 1290.<sup>103</sup> It is all the more interesting that – although Władysław Łokietek is clearly mentioned in Polish literature as an active participant in the preparation of the marriage – the significance of the later Polish king has mostly escaped the attention of Hungarian researchers.<sup>104</sup> As we saw above, in the second half of 1290 Łokietek was both in a hopeful situation and in need of an external ally. When, as duke of Sandomierz, he approached the new Hungarian king, he continued a pattern that by then was an almost a century-old practice, and he could also recognise the common interests.

Furthermore, it should be emphasized, that the last time the wife of a Hungarian king was from the House of Piast was in the case of Béla I (1060–1063), yet the marriage was concluded before his reign.<sup>105</sup> In the twelfth century, an engagement took place between the two dynasties, presumably in the case of the later king Géza II (1141–1162) and Judith, the daughter of Prince Bolesław III Wrymouth (1102/1107–1138), but in the end it was not realized.<sup>106</sup> Therefore, the relation of an Árpadian husband and a Piast wife cannot be considered quite common.<sup>107</sup> Nevertheless, I think that in the case of the Piasts of Lesser Poland and Kuyavia,

<sup>103</sup> *Piastowie*, 222; Kádár, “III. András,” 114; Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163; Bácsatyai, *Az Árpád-kor*, 265.

<sup>104</sup> Wertner, *Az Árpádok*, 570–571; Pauler, *A magyar nemzet*, II, 419–420; Divéky, *A magyar-lengyel*, 9; Bálint Hóman, Gyula Szekfű, *Magyar történet* [Hungarian History] (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1928) (accessed version: <https://mek.oszk.hu/00900/00940/html/>); Kristó; Makk, *Az Árpád-házi*, 302–303; Szűcs, *Az utolsó*, 326–327, 331; Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163; Kádár, “III. András,” 114; Skorka, “Előjáték,” 72–73. Károly Kapronczay mentions Łokietek’s involvement, but refers to him not as Fenenna’s uncle, but as her cousin. Károly Kapronczay, *A magyar-lengyel történelmi kapcsolatok évszázadai* [Centuries of Hungarian–Polish Historical Relations] (Budapest: Mundus, 2000), 17. Dániel Bácsatyai mentions the kinship of Łokietek and Fenenna in his study on the envoys of the Árpáds. Bácsatyai, “Követek,” 60. Attila Zsoldos refers to the kinship in connection with Andrew III’s aid to Łokietek in 1291. Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 169–170; Attila Zsoldos, “Tamás fia Sinka érdemei (Elhallgatás és manipuláció oklevelek narratioiban)” [The Merits of Sinka, Son of Thomas (Reticence and Manipulation in the Narrationes of the Charters)], in *Tanulmányok Borsa Iván tiszteletére*, ed. Enikő Csukovits (Budapest: Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1998) 327–337, here: 329. See furthermore: Veronika Rudolf, “Some Remarks on the First Wife of Charles I of Hungary”, *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea* 11 (2024): 39–58, here: 52.

<sup>105</sup> Péter Báling, *Az Árpád-ház hatalmi kapcsolatrendszerei. Rokonok, barátok és dinasztikus konfliktus Kelet-Közép-Európában a 11. században és a 12. század elején* [Networks of Power of the Árpád Dynasty: Relatives, Friends, and Dynastic Conflicts in East-Central Europe in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries] (Budapest: ELKH BTK, 2021), 390–394.

<sup>106</sup> Kazimierz Jasiński, *Rodowód pierwszych Piastów* [Genealogy of the First Piasts] (Warszawa; Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski, 1993), 255–258; Gábor Barabás, “From Conflict to Marriages. The Relations of the Piasts of Poland and the Árpáds of Hungary in the 1130s. Part 1,” *Konstantinove listy* 18 (2025), no. 1: 30–38.

<sup>107</sup> Although Prince Coloman, the second son of Andrew II, had a Polish wife, Salomea, and a royal title, yet, he was not the ruler of the Kingdom of Hungary, but his title was bound to the Principality of Galicia. See Márta Font, Gábor Barabás, *Coloman, King of Galicia and Duke of Slavonia (1208–1241)* *Medieval Central Europe and Hungarian Power* (Leeds: Amsterdam University Press, 2019), 79–86.

the Hungarian orientation can safely be considered traditional. In addition, there was a common interest between the two rulers, namely against the Bohemian king, Wenceslas II. The Přemyslid monarch meant a threat primarily for Łokietek, although in 1290 this was not yet direct, and he became active in the struggle for Cracow in the following year, which he achieved, although only temporarily.<sup>108</sup> In the case of Andrew III, the threat was even more indirect; after the death of Ladislaus IV, Wenceslas II, descended from Béla IV through his mother Kunigunda, although announced his claim, but probably he did not actively pursue to gain the Hungarian throne.<sup>109</sup> Nevertheless, the new monarch of Hungary must have been aware of the threat.<sup>110</sup>

At the same time, an unexpected incident may have had a greater impact on the Polish orientation, namely, the action of “Pseudo Andrew,” who claimed to be the brother of Ladislaus IV, who, in fact, died in 1278. According to the legend of St. Kinga, Bolesław V’s widow, the Hungarian princess recognised her nephew from a birthmark,<sup>111</sup> which means that, if the story is to be believed, then “Pseudo Andrew” found support and credibility in a surprising place. However, we must bear in mind that according to the legend “Andrew” did arrive in Poland after fleeing his brother in the Kingdom of Hungary. Jan Długosz added to the story in his chronicle that after Kinga’s validation, “Prince Andrew” was given the estate of Chroberz

<sup>108</sup> Jerzy Lukowski, Hubert Zawadzki, *A Concise History of Poland*, Third Edition (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 24–26.

<sup>109</sup> Against Andrew III, King Stephen V’s daughter, Queen Mary of Naples and also King Rudolf Habsburg of Germany, announced their claim to the Hungarian throne, meanwhile Pope Nicholas IV claimed the right of decision regarding the succession for himself. Szűcs, *Az utolsó*, 327; Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 134–135; Gergely Kiss, “VIII. Bonifác és Magyarország (1290–1303). A pápai hatalmi legitimációs elképzelések és kormányzat összefüggései” [Boniface VIII and Hungary: Papal Ideas of Power and Legitimation and its Correlation to Government], *Századok* 152 (2018), no. 6: 1353–1373, here: 1353–1357; Skorka, “Előjáték,” 68–68; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 445–454. Renáta Skorka stated, that Albert Habsburg, who was active against Andrew III, temporarily succeeded in securing King Wenceslas II of Bohemia’s support for his claim to Hungary. According to Veronika Rudolf, however, his efforts were not crowned with lasting success. See Skorka, “Előjáték,” 65–71; Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 455–460.

<sup>110</sup> The so-called Chronicle of Königsaal (Chronicon Aulae Regiae), written in the first half of the fourteenth century in the Cistercian monastery of Zbrslav, near Prague, states that after his coronation Andrew III met Wenceslas II and made an alliance with him. Nevertheless, there is no other source which could confirm this information. *Quomodo rex Wenceslaus cum Andrea noviter electo in Ungaria in regem convenit et quomodo cum ipso fedus amicitie pepigerit.* – “Petra Žitavského kronika zbraslavská,” in *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. IV, ed. Josef Emler (Praha: Nadání Františka Palackého, 1884), 1–337, here: Cap. XXVIII, 34–35. Regarding the source see Szilárd Kováč, “A magyar uralkodók a Königsali Krónika tükrében” [The sovereigns of Hungary in the light of the chronicle of Zbraslav (Chronica aule regie)], *Belvedere Meridionale* 38 (2026), no. 2: 85–113, here: 101. For the itinerary of Andrew III see Kádár, “III. András.” Veronika Rudolf accepts the fact of the meeting, but she dates it to 1291. Rudolf, *Közép-Európa*, 452–453.

<sup>111</sup> *Vita et miracula sanctae Kyngae*, 704–705. The data also appears in Jan Długosz’s work. *Ioannis Długossii Annales seu Cronicae*, VII–VIII, 260.

by Duke Przemysław II of Greater Poland as his residence.<sup>112</sup> Although Przemysław indeed did briefly occupy Cracow in 1291, the story is quite suspicious, especially as the narrative says that “Andrew” was eventually killed by men sent by Ladislaus IV. All in all, the legend and Długosz’s report should be treated with necessary skepticism.

In any case, it seems to be certain that the fortune hunter existed, and he tried his luck in Hungary, but as he was unsuccessful, then went to Poland, where he was most probably murdered.<sup>113</sup> Polish research has also raised the possibility that the impostor was taken down by Władysław Łokietek’s men.<sup>114</sup> This version, in my opinion, would not be surprising at all, and could also provide an additional argument in support of the view that the choice of the “relatively insignificant princess” after the coronation of Andrew III was not accidental.<sup>115</sup> There were probably well-conceived political interests at work behind the marriage, in addition to the overwhelming compulsion to marry and thus secure an heir.

There was certainly a close alliance between Andrew III and Łokietek. According to several charters and certain narrative sources written in Poland, they supported each other with troops on several occasions. When Wenceslas II went to Cracow in 1291 at the invitation of his aunt, Gryfina, the widow of Leszek II the Black, Łokietek stood his ground in Sandomierz, and was assisted by Hungarian troops.<sup>116</sup> In several of his charters, Andrew III mentions the assistance he sent to his ‘dearest relative’. These texts narrate the heroic deeds of the recipients,

<sup>112</sup> *qua etiam intercedente mansio illi per Przemislaum Cracowiensem et Maioris Polonie ducem apud curiam ducalem Chroberz consignatis introitibus aliis, que sue condicissuppeterent concessa estioni – Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae, VII–VIII, 260.*

<sup>113</sup> The impostor’s activity in Hungary is also referred to in a charter of Andrew III issued in 1291. The Hungarian king donated the above-mentioned George, son of Simon among other things because in the name of the king he had opposed Pseudo-Andrew. *Et quidam, qui se ducem Andream nominabat, adiunctis sibi perversitatis sue sociis, in totius regni nostri preiudicium et gravamen, contra nostram regiam procedere niteretur maiestatem, habito cum baronibus nostris communi consilio, et tractatu, magistrum Georgium, filium Symonis, deputatis sibi in socios quibusdam cognatis et amicis eiusdem, ad insequendum dictum ducem duximus destinandum, qui se eidem pro fidelitate nobis et coronae regiae, ac toti regno nostro debita, viriliter opponere non expavit* – CDH, VI/1. 123, MNL-OL-DL no. 50543, RA no. 3804. The vita of Blessed Kinga commemorated the suffocation of Pseudo-Andrew. *Vita et miracula sanctae Kyngae*, 704. Another Pseudo-Andrew appeared a few decades later. According to a letter of King Robert of Naples sent to King Sancho of Majorca in 1317, there was a man in the letter’s court who claimed to be Prince Andrew. Nevertheless, it seems highly unlikely that the two Pseudo-Andrews were one and the same. *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból*, vol. I, ed. Gusztáv Wenzel (Budapest: A M. T. Akadémia Könyvkiadó-Hivatalában, 1874), 208–210, no. 269. See Wertner, *Az Árpádok*, 544–545.

<sup>114</sup> *Piastowie*, 222.

<sup>115</sup> Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 163.

<sup>116</sup> *Piastowie*, 211; Lenkey, Zsoldos, *Szent István*, 169–170; Zsoldos, “Tamás fia Sinka,” 327–329; Rudolf, “Some Remarks,” 52.

which were even confirmed by Łokietek's letter, and also speak to the difficult situation faced by the Piast prince.<sup>117</sup> In addition to all this, we also have evidence that the aforementioned George, son of Simon, served as an envoy to Władysław Łokietek which confirms the active relationship between the two rulers. This is also confirmed by another charter of Andrew III from 1291, in which he grants a donation for the role played in the Hungarian contingent which was sent to Poland and which contains another reference to Łokietek's letters.<sup>118</sup> In addition, it is clear that a personal meeting took place between the Hungarian ruler and Władysław Łokietek in October–November 1291. This is implied by Andrew III's charter dated 8 December. According to the text the Piast prince reported in person to the Hungarian king on the heroic deeds certain Hungarian warriors performed on Łokietek's behalf.<sup>119</sup> Nevertheless, the circumstances of this meeting are not known. It should be noted, however, that in all relevant documents, Andrew III refers to Władysław Łokietek as his relative.<sup>120</sup>

Although Fenenna died in 1295, but there are further indications of the close relationship between the Hungarian king and the Polish prince, in 1297 Hungarian forces again assisted Łokietek in his attack against Henry III of Glogów.<sup>121</sup> The Hungarian king continued his former practice even after Fenenna's death and still referred to the Polish prince as his relative.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>117</sup> *Demum cum regnum Lactus [Ladislaus], ducis Cracoviensis, Sandomeriensis et Syradiensis, et Kuyaviensis, cognati nostri karissimi, quidam inimici ipsius capitales hostiliter invadere voluissent, et nos ad refroenandas, seu conterendas ferocitates polonicae gentis, ab adversa parte insurgentis [...] que omnia per litteras eiusdem L. ducis, cognati nostri predilecti, et per consequens per veridicam relationem eiusdem et aliorum quam plurimorum nobis relata exstiterunt.* – CDH, VI/1. 135., MNL-OL-DL no. 1321; RA no. 3782. (Bolded by G. B.)

<sup>118</sup> *Ad haec cum ddominum Ladislaum, inclitum ducem Sandomiriae, et Cracovie, cognatum nostrum karissimum, urgeret in ducatu suo nimia necessitatis, et adversitas praeliorum satagentes eidem, prout postulanti subsidium opportunitas et commoditas exigebat, necessariis auxiliis, nostre armate militie subvenire [...] eodem domino duce La. in suis litteris de prosperitate gestorum ipsum multipliciter attollendo* – CDH, VI/1. 139; MNL-OL-DL no. 1244; RA no. 3820.

<sup>119</sup> *sicut hec omnia dictus Ladislaus dux oraculo vive vocis nobis recitavit* – RA no. 3841; MNL-OL-DL no. 50544. Several later charters of Andrew III also refer to Łokietek's account. RA no. 3908 and 3910.

<sup>120</sup> E.g. *dux Lad[islaus] cognatus noster karissimus* – RA no. 3910; MNL-OL-DL no. 65255.

<sup>121</sup> *Piastowie*, 212. A Hungarian Participant, Sinka son of Thomas, the nephew of George, son of Simon, who took part in the campaign of 1297 can be identified. He suffered serious injuries in the fighting but was able to bring a considerable number of spoils of war back to Hungary. CDH, VI/2. 214; RA no. 4317, CDH, VI/2. 258–260. See Zsoldos, "Tamás fia Sinka," 327–329.

<sup>122</sup> *in subsidium domini Ladislai, ducis maioris Polonie, cognati nostri carissimi, ad petitionem eiusdem contra rabiem et feritatem ducis de Golgou.* CDH, VI/1. 259, RA no. 4317. See also: *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Slovaciae*, vol. I, ed. Vincent Sedlák (Bratislava: VEDA, 1980), 521–522, no. 1231.

## Concluding Remarks

At the end of this study, it can be underlined with regard to the relationship between the Hungarian kings and the Piast princes, that in the period following the death of King Béla IV in 1270, one can encounter processes similar to those in the preceding era, during the first wave of the Přemyslid–Árpáadian conflict between King Ottokar II of Bohemia and his counterpart, Béla IV of Hungary for the so-called Babenberg-legacy. Regarding the whole of the second half of the thirteenth century it can be stated, that one can observe the shifting paradigm of the relations of the more or less independent dukes of Poland. At first sight it certainly looks as if the rulers built two “coalitions,” with one group supporting King Ottokar II, the other at first King Béla IV. Nevertheless, the relevance of the individual interests after the dukes’ decision and the importance of family-ties cannot be forgotten either while analysing the historical processes.

The new Hungarian ruler, Stephen V, paid particular attention to restoring his relationship with his brothers-in-law, Bolesław V the Chaste and Bolesław the Pious, which had become hostile due to the previous civil war in Hungary in the 1260s, when Béla IV was supported by his daughters and sons-in-law. Stephen V’s endeavour was primarily motivated by the resurgent Bohemian–Hungarian conflict and the threat posed by Ottokar II. With regard to the settlement of relations between Hungary and Lesser Poland, the meeting between Stephen V, Bolesław V the Chaste and his wife, Princess Kinga in Cracow is especially noteworthy, during which the parties reconciled and entered into an alliance.

Without going into detail about the events that followed, it can be stated that the alliance with the respective ruler of Cracow continued to be an important factor for Hungarian monarchs in later years as well. Although this particular relationship faded into the background during the minority of Ladislaus IV, Bolesław V the Chaste even settled his relations to Ottokar II. However, after the Battle of Marchfeld in 1278, and the downfall of Ottokar, the close relationship between the new ruler of Cracow, Leszek the Black, and his Hungarian relative, Ladislaus IV, became apparent once again. Around 1290, changes took place in both territories, but the new Hungarian king, Andrew III, and the late Leszek’s younger brother, Władysław the Elbow-high (Łokietek), who was fighting for the throne of Cracow, formed an alliance, which was sealed by the marriage of Andrew and Łokietek’s niece, Fennen-na, and which also manifested itself in mutual military assistances.

In the end, one may safely say that the constantly shifting combination of military factors and family ties defined the chain of events regarding the relations between members of the Piast- and Árpád-dynasties. This study ends with the death of the Hungarian King, Andrew III, but the struggle of the Piast princes continued in the decades to come, until Władysław the Elbow-high managed to gain the royal title in 1320.

## Unpublished Sources

Hungary – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára – Diplomatikai Levéltár (MNL-OL-DL).

## Published Sources and Literature

“Annales capituli Posnaniensis.” In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, volume XXIX, edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz, 431–469. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1892.

“Annales Cracovienses Compilati.” In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, volume XIX, edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz, 584–607. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung 1866.

“Annales Polonorum.” In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, volume XIX, edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz, 612–663. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1866.

*Árpádkori új okmánytár – Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus*, volume III: 1261–1272, edited by Gusztáv Wenzel. Pest, 1862.

**Bácsatyai**, Dániel. “Követek és követjárások az Árpád-korban” [Envoys and Diplomatic Missions in the Árpád Era]. *Századok* 159 (2025), no. 1: 5–62.

**Bácsatyai**, Dániel. *A Somogyvári formuláskönyv évkönyvei* [Annals of the Formula Book of Somogyvár]. Székesfehérvár: Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet, 2019.

**Bácsatyai**, Dániel. *Az Árpád-kor történeti kronológiája (997–1301)* [Chronology of the Árpadian-Era (997–1301)]. Budapest: ELKH BTK, 2022.

**Báling**, Péter. *Az Árpád-ház hatalmi kapcsolatrendszerei. Rokonok, barátok és dinasztikus konfliktus Kelet-Közép-Európában a 11. században és a 12. század elején* [Networks of Power of the Árpád Dynasty: Relatives, Friends, and Dynastic Conflicts in East-Central Europe in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries]. Budapest: ELKH BTK, 2021.

**Barabás**, Gábor. “A fehér sasok és a turul: Lengyel–magyar dinasztikus kapcsolatok az érett középkor alkonyán” [White Eagles and the Turul: Polish–Hungarian Dynastic Contacts at the End of High Middle Ages]. *Studia Quinqueecclesiensia* 1 (2025): 33–67.

**Barabás**, Gábor. “Barátból ellenség: Władysław opolei herceg és a Přemysl–Árpád-konfliktus a 13. század második felében” [From Friend to Foe. Duke Władysław of Opole and the Přemysl–Árpád Conflict in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century]. *Történelmi Szemle* 67 (2025): no. 1: 1–30.

**Barabás, Gábor.** “Friends, Foes, and Families: Polish-Hungarian Relations in the Mid-Thirteenth Century.” *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razred za društvene znanosti* 59 (2025): 31–65.

**Barabás, Gábor.** “From Conflict to Marriages. The Relations of the Piasts of Poland and the Árpáds of Hungary in the 1130s. Part 1.” *Konstantínove listy* 18 (2025), no. 1: 30–38.

**Bárány, Attila.** “Magyarország, Anglia és a tatár veszély a XIII. század második felében” [Hungary, England and the Tatar Menace in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century]. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 122 (2009), no. 2: 251–277.

“Chronica Poloniae maioris.” In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, edited by Brygida Kürbis, volume VIII. Warszawa: Instytut Historii PAN, 1970.

*Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, volume V/2: 1267 – 1278, edited by Gustav Friedrich, Jindřich Šebánek and Sáša Dušková. Praha: Academia, 1981.

*Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, volume V/2, edited by Georgius Fejér. Budae: typis typogr. Regiae Vniversitatis Vngaricae, 1829.

*Codex diplomaticus Silesiae*, volume 7: Regesten zur schlesischen Geschichte, part 2: *Bis zum Jahre 1280*, edited by Colmar Grünhagen. Breslau: Josef Max & Comp, 1875.

“Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis,” volume I–VII, edited by Wilhelm Wattenbach. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*, volume IX. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1851.

**Divéky, Adorján.** *A magyar-lengyel érintkezések történelmi tanulságai* [Historical Lessons of Hungarian-Polish Interactions]. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Szövetség, 1937.

**Font, Márta; Barabás, Gábor.** *Coloman, King of Galicia and Duke of Slavonia (1208–1241) Medieval Central Europe and Hungarian Power*. Leeds: Amsterdam University Press, 2019.

**Font, Márta.** *The Kings of the House of Árpád and the Rurikid Princes: Cooperation and conflict in medieval Hungary and Kievan Rus’*. Budapest: Research Centre for Humanities, 2021.

**Grzesik, Ryszard.** “Obraz stosunków polsko-węgierskich w czasach piastowskich w rocznikach polskich” [Picture of the Polish–Hungarian Relations in the Piast-era in Polish Annals]. *Studia Źródłoznawcze = Commentationes* 41 (2003): 1–18.

**Herucová, Angelika.** “Vojna o Babenberské dedičstvo a Štefan V.” *Historický Časopis* 65 (2017): 3–24.

**Hóman, Bálint; Szekfű, Gyula.** *Magyar történet* [Hungarian History]. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1928 (accessed version: <https://mek.oszk.hu/00900/00940/html/>).

**Horwat**, Jerzy. *Książęta górnośląscy z dynastii Piastów: Uwagi i uzupe na genealogiczne* [Upper Silesian Princes from the Piast Dynasty. Notes and Additions to the Genealogy]. Ruda Śląska: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna w Katowicach, 2005.

*Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, liber septimus, liber octavus, Varsaviae: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975.

**Jasiński**, Kazimierz. "Genealogia Piastów wielkopolskich. Potomstwo Władysław Odonica" [Genealogy of the Piasts of Greater Poland. The Offspring of Władysław Odonic]. *Nasi Piastowie, Kronika Miasta Poznania* 63 (1995), no. 2: 34–66.

**Jasiński**, Kazimierz. *Rodowód Piastów śląskich. Piastowie wrocławscy, legnicko-brzescy, świdniccy, ziębiccy, głogowscy, żagańscy, oleśniccy, opolscy, cieszyńscy i oświęcimscy* [The Genealogy of the Silesian Piasts. The Piasts of Wrocław, Legnica-Brzeg, Świdnica, Ziębice, Głogów, Żagań, Oleśnica, Opole, Cieszyn and Oświęcim]. Kraków: Avalon, 2007.

**Jasiński**, Kazimierz. *Rodowód pierwszych Piastów* [Genealogy of the First Piasts]. Warszawa; Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski, 1993.

**Jurek**, Tomasz. "Der Einfluß Böhmens auf das geteilte Polen im 13. Jahrhundert." In *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn in der Přemyslidenzeit*, edited by Ivan Hlaváček and Alexander Patschovsky, 161–201. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2011.

**Jurek**, Tomasz. "Henryk Probus i Henryk głogowski: stosunki wzajemne w latach 1273–1290" [Henry Probus and Henry of Głogów: Mutual Relations in the Years 1273–1290]. *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka* 42 (1987), no. 4: 555–570.

**Kádár**, Tamás. "Az utolsó Árpád-házi uralkodó, III. András király megkoronázásának időpontjához [Remarks on the Date of the Coronation of the Last Árpadian King Andrew III]." *Levéltári Közlemények* 84 (2013): 3–25.

**Kádár**, Tamás. "III. András király itineráriuma (1278–[1290]–1301)" [Itinerary of King Andrew III (1278–[1290]–1301)]. *Fons* 25 (2018): 87–124.

**Kádár**, Tamás. "Egy rejtélyes politikai gyilkosság és háttere a XIII. század végi Magyarországon: Béla macsóí és boszniai herceg pályája" [A Mysterious Political Assassination and its Background in Thirteenth-Century Hungary: The Life of Duke Béla of Macsó and Bosnia]. *Fons* 16 (2009): 411–429.

**Kapronczay**, Károly. *A magyar–lengyel történelmi kapcsolatok évszázadai* [Centuries of Hungarian–Polish Historical Relations]. Budapest: Mundus, 2000.

**Kiss**, Gergely. "VIII. Bonifác és Magyarország (1290–1303). A pápai hatalmi legitimációs elképzelések és kormányzat összefüggései" [Boniface VIII and Hungary: Papal Ideas of Power and Legitimation and its Correlation to Government]. *Századok* 152 (2018), no. 6: 1353–1373.

*Kodeks dyplomatyczny Małopolski*, volume I, edited by Franciszek Piekosiński. Kraków: Academia Literarum Cracoviensis, 1876.

**Kováč**, Szilárd. “A magyar uralkodók a Königsali Krónika tükrében” [The sovereigns of Hungary in the light of the chronicle of Zbraslav (Cronica aule regie)]. *Belvedere Meridionale* 38 (2026), no. 2: 85–113.

**Kovács**, Endre. *Magyarok és lengyelek a történelem sodrában* [Hungarians and Poles in the Course of History]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1973.

**Kovács**, Viktória. “Alter ego domini papae Nicolai III. Fülöp fermói püspök, szentszéki legátus magyarországi tevékenysége (1279–1281)” [Alter ego domini papae Nicolai III. The Activity of Bishop Philip of Fermo, Legate of the Holy See in Hungary (1279–1281)]. In *Varietas delectat. A pápai-magyar kapcsolatok sokszínűsége a 11–14. században*, edited by Gergely Kiss, 117–166. Pécs: PTE BTK TTI Középkori és Koraújkori Történeti Tanszék, 2019. (DeLegatOnline Könyvek 1).

**Kozłowski**, Wojciech. *The Thirteenth-Century Inter-Lordly System. Lordly Identity and the Origins of the Angevin-Piast Dynastic Alliance*. Kiel: Solivagus, 2020.

**Kristó**, Gyula; **Makk**, Ferenc. *Az Árpád-házi uralkodók* [Rulers of the Árpadian Dynasty]. Budapest: Interpress, 1988.

*Książęta i księżne Górnego Śląska: praca zbiorowa*, edited by Antoni Barciak. Katowice: Societas Scientiarum Favendis Silesiae Superioris, Instytut Górnośląski, 1995.

**Lenkey**, Zoltán; **Zsoldos**, Attila. *Szent István és III. András* [Saint Stephen and Andrew III]. Budapest: Kossuth, 2003.

**Liwoch**, Radosław. “The Mongols in Poland in the 13th century. Traces of the Invasions.” In *Archaeology of Conflicts*, edited by Paweł Drnovský and Petr Hejhal, 55–68. Hradec Králové: Pavel Mervart, 2020.

**Lovcsányi**, Gyula. “Adalékok a magyar–lengyel érintkezés történetéhez a mohácsi vész előtt” [Notes on the History of Hungarian–Polish Relations Before the Battle of Mohács]. *Századok* 20 (1886): 330–344, 425–440, 501–522, 590–610, 692–715, 788–800.

**Lukowski**, Jerzy; **Zawadzki**, Hubert. *A Concise History of Poland*. Third Edition. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

**Maciaszek**, Karolina. *Bolesław V Wstydlivy. Książę krakowski i sandomierski 1226–1279. Długie panowanie w trudnych czasach* [Bolesław V the Chaste, Prince of Cracow and Sandomierz 1226–1279. Long Reign in Difficult Times]. Kraków: Avalon, 2021.

*Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból*, volume I, edited by Gusztáv Wenzel. Budapest: A M. T. Akadémia Könyvkiadó-Hivatalában, 1874.

**Mika**, Norbert. *Walka o spadek po Babenbergach 1246–1278*. Racibórz: WAW, 2008.

*Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis* 1, edited by Ferdinandus Knauz. Strigonii: Typis Descriptis Aegydius Horák, 1874.

**Nowacki**, Bronisław. *Przemysł II: Odnowiciel Korony Polskiej (1257–1296)*. Kraków: Avalon, 2007. (e-pub).

*Ottokar aus der Gaal: Stájer Rímes Krónika (Részletek)*, edited and translated by Dániel Bagi. Budapest: ELKH Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont: 2023.

*Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*, volume 1, edited by Joseph Seemüller. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Deutsche Chroniken*, volume V/1. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1890.

**Palko**, Jakub. “Uhorsko–české vzťahy v rokoch 1270–1272” [Hungarian–Bohemian Relations in 1270–1272]. *Opus tessellatum – Historia Nova* 14 (2017): 7–33.

**Pauk**, Marcin R. “Language of Power and Communication in the Piast Dynasty: Toward a Reappraisal of Polish Political Culture of the 12th–13th Century.” In *Rulership in Medieval East Central Europe Power, Rituals and Legitimacy in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland*, edited by Grischa Vercamer and Dušan Zupka, 178–197. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2022.

**Pauler**, Gyula. *A magyar nemzet története az Árpádházi királyok alatt* [History of the Hungarian Nation under the Árpadian Dynasty], volume II. Budapest: Atheneum, 1899.

*Piastowie. Leksykon Biograficzny*, edited by Stanisław Szczur and Krzysztof Ożóg. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999.

“Petra Žitavského kronika zbraslavská.” In *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, volume IV, edited by Josef Emler, 1–337. Praha: Nadání Františka Palackého, 1884.

*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum Natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV*, volume II, edited by August Potthast. Berolini: De Decker, 1874.

*Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Slovaciae*, volume I, edited by Vincent Sedlák. Bratislava: VEDA, 1980.

*Regesta Imperii VI. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Rudolf, Adolf, Albrecht, Heinrich VII. 1273–1313. Erste Abtheilung*, edited by Oswald Bedlich. Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner’schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1898.

*Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica – Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikái jegyzéke*, vol. 1–2/1, edited Emericus Szentpétery. Budapest, 1923–1943; vol. 2/2–4, edited Iván Borsa. Budapest, 1961–1987.

“Rocznik franciszkański krakowski.” In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, volume III, edited by August Bielowski, 46–52. Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności, 1878.

“Rocznik kapituły krakowskiej.” In *Annales Cracovienses priores cum kalendario*, edited by Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa, 19–105. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, volume V. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978.

“Rocznik kapituły poznańskiej.” In *Annales Poloniae Maioris*, edited by Brygida Kürbis, 21–78. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series*, volume VI, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962.

“Rocznik traski – Rocznik krakowski.” In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, volume II, edited by August Bielowski, 826–861. Lwów: Nakładem Własnym, 1872.

“Rocznik wielkopolski.” In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, volume III, edited by August Bielowski, 1–42. Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności, 1878.

**Rudolf**, Veronika. “Some Remarks on the First Wife of Charles I of Hungary”. *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea* 11 (2024): 39–58.

**Rudolf**, Veronika. *Közép-Európa a hosszú 13. században: Magyarország, Csehszlovákia és Ausztria hatalmi és dinasztikus kapcsolatai 1196 és 1310 között*. Budapest: HUN-REN Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2023.

**Skorka**, Renáta. “Előjáték egy házasságkötéshez. A Habsburgok útja az első magyar házassághoz” [Foreplay to a Wedding. The Habsburgs’ Road to the First Hungarian Marriage]. In *Királynék a középkori Magyarországon és Európában*, edited by Kornél Szovák and Attila Zsoldos, 59–77. Székesfehérvár: Városi Levéltár és Kutatóintézet Székesfehérvár, 2019.

**Sroka**, Stanisław A. *A középkori Bártfa és kapcsolatai Kis-Lengyelországgal* [Relations of Medieval Bardejov with Lesser Poland]. Budapest: MTA BTK Történettudományi Intézet, 2016.

**Supernak**, Karolina. “Kilka uwag o powołaniu księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 roku” [A Few Remarks about the Attempts of Władysław of Opole to Obtain the Throne of Cracow in 1273]. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne* 12 (2016): 132–166.

**Świętosławski**, Witold. “The Mongol invasions of Poland in the thirteenth century. The current state of knowledge and perspectives for future research.” In *The Routledge Handbook of the Mongols and Central-Eastern Europe*, edited by Alexander V. Maiorov and Roman Hautala, 82–97. London; New York: Routledge, 2021.

**Szöcs**, Tibor. “Egy második „tatárjárás”? A tatár–magyar kapcsolatok a XIII. század második felében” [A Second “Mongol Invasion”? Mongol–Hungarian Contacts in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century]. *Belvedere Meridionale* 22 (2010), no. 3–4: 16–49.

**Szöcs**, Tibor. “Fifty Years: Mongol–Hungarian Conflicts between 1242 and 1292, and the ‘Second Mongol Invasion’ in 1285.” In *The Mongols in Central Europe: The Profile and Impact of their Thirteenth-Century Invasions*, edited by Balázs Nagy, 325–362. Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2024.

**Szűcs**, Jenő. *Az utolsó Árpádok*. Budapest: MTA TTI, 1993.

*The Galician–Volynian Chronicle*. An annotated translation by Georg A. Perfecky. München: Fink, 1973.

**Ulanowski**, Bolesław. “Przyczynki źródłowe do ostatnich lat panowania Ottokara II” [Source Contributions to the Final Years of the Reign of Ottokar II]. In *Archivum Komisji Historycznej*, volume 4. *Scriptores rerum Polonicarum* 12. Kraków: Typis Lad. Anczyc et Sociorum, 1888, 1–41.

*Urkunden zur Geschichte des Bisthums Breslau im Mittelalter*, edited by Gustav Adolph Stenzel. Breslau: im Verlage bei Josef Max & Komp., 1845.

*Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, volume I, edited by Augustinus Theiner. Romae: Typ. Vaticanis, 1859.

*Vita et miracula sanctae Kyngae ducissae Cracoviensis*, edited by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, volume IV, 662–744. Lwów: Akademia Umiejętności w Krakowie, 1884.

**Wertner**, Mór. *Az Árpádok családi története* [Family-History of the Árpáds]. Nagy-Becskerek: Pleitz, 1892.

**Wyrozumski**, Jerzy. “Beteiligung polnischer Fürsten am Kampf um das Erbe der Babenberger.” *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Prace Historyczne* 121 (1997): 7–21.

**Wyrozumski**, Jerzy. “Phasen der polnisch-ungarischen Beziehungen (bis 1526).” *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis* 1 (2001): 9–12.

**Zsoldos**, Attila. *Családi ügy. IV. Béla és István ifjabb király viszálya az 1260-as években* [Family Affairs. The Conflict of Béla IV and King Junior Stephen in the 1260s]. Budapest: MTA TTI, 2007.

**Zsoldos**, Attila. “Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.” *Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2013), no. 2: 211–242.

**Zsoldos**, Attila. “Tamás fia Sinka érdemei (Elhallgatás és manipuláció oklevelek narratioiban)” [The Merits of Sinka, Son of Thomas (Reticence and Manipulation in the Narrationes of the Charters)]. In *Tanulmányok Borsa Iván tiszteletére*, edited by Enikő Csukovits, 327–337. Budapest: Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1998.

**Zupka**, Dušan. *Ritual and Symbolic Communication in Medieval Hungary under the Árpád Dynasty (1000–1301)*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2016.

Gábor Barabás \*

## Kraljevi Ugarske i knezovi Poljske krajem 13. stoljeća: rodbinske veze, savezi i sukobi

### Sažetak

Odnosi Poljske i Ugarske već su dugo predmet povijesnih istraživanja, a poslovično „prijateljstvo” privuklo je pozornost mnogih znanstvenika. Ipak, ne može se reći da su svi aspekti temeljito obrađeni. Stoga se ovaj rad usredotočuje na važan aspekt odnosa Ugarskoga Kraljevstva i Kneževine Poljske (ili kneževina), odnosno odnosa njihovih vladajućih dinastija, ugarskih Arpadovića i poljskih Pjastovića, krajem 13. stoljeća. U razdoblju nakon smrti ugarskoga kralja Bele IV. 1270. godine mogu se uočiti procesi slični onima iz prethodnoga razdoblja, tijekom prvoga vala sukoba između Přemyslovića i Arpadovića, odnosno između češkoga kralja Otokara II. i njegova suparnika Bele IV., oko tzv. babenberške baštine, vojvodstava Austrije i Štajerske. Tijekom čitave druge polovice 13. stoljeća može se pratiti promjena paradigme odnosa među više ili manje neovisnim poljskim knezovima. Na prvi pogled doista se čini da su vladari izgradili dvije „koalicije”: dok je jedna skupina podržavala kralja Otokara II., druga je isprva bila sklonija kralju Beli IV. Međutim, pri analizi povijesnih procesa ne smije se zanemariti važnost pojedinačnih interesa koji su stajali iza odluka knezova, kao ni značaj obiteljskih veza.

Ovaj rad ispituje nastojanja ugarskoga kralja Stjepana V. da osigura potporu svojih šurjaka, knezova Male Poljske, Boleslava Čednog, i Velike Poljske, Boleslava Pobožnog, protiv češkoga vladara Otokara II., koji je nakon smrti Bele IV. obnovio ranija neprijateljstva. Nadalje se razmatraju događaji nakon smrti Stjepana V. 1272. godine koji su doveli do Bitke na Moravskom polju 1278. te posljedice sukoba Rudolfa Habsburškog i Otokara II. Analiziraju se odnosi ugarskoga kralja Ladislava IV. i krakovskoga kneza Leszeka II. Crnog, ugarska kraljevska potpora potonjemu te odnosi budućega poljskog kralja Vladislava Kratkog s ugarskim vladarima. U vezi s potonjim aspektom posebna se pozornost posvećuje Feneni iz dinastije Pjastovića, prvoj supruzi Andrije III., posljednjeg kralja Arpadovića, kao i političkoj pozadini toga braka te bliskoj suradnji između Vladislava Kratkog i ugarskog vladara.

**Ključne riječi:** Ugarsko Kraljevstvo, Češko Kraljevstvo, poljske kneževine, 13. stoljeće, dinastički odnosi

---

\* Gábor Barabás, Odsjek za srednjovjekovnu i ranonovovjekovnu povijest, Institut za povijest, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Pečuhu, H-7624, Rókus utca 2, Mađarska. E-mail: barab.gabor@gmail.com