



The daughter of a Byzantine Emperor – the wife of a Galician-Volhynian Prince

«The daughter of a Byzantine Emperor – the wife of a Galician-Volhynian Prince»

by Alexander V. Maiorov

Source:

Byzantinoslavica - Revue internationale des Etudes Byzantines (Byzantinoslavica - Revue internationale des Etudes Byzantines), issue: 1-2 / 2014, pages: 188-233, on www.ceeol.com.

The daughter of a Byzantine Emperor – the wife of a Galician-Volhynian Prince

Alexander V. MAIOROV (Saint Petersburg)

The Byzantine origin of Prince Roman's second wife

There is much literature on the subject of the second marriage of Roman Mstislavich owing to the disagreements between historians concerning the origin of the Prince's new wife. According to some she bore the name Anna or, according to others, that of Maria.¹ The Russian chronicles give no clues in this respect. Indeed, a Galician chronicler takes pains to avoid calling the Princess by name, preferring to call her by her husband's name – “великая княгиня Романова” (Roman's Grand Princess).²

Although supported by the research of a number of recent investigators, the hypothesis that she belonged to a Volhynian boyar family is not convincing. Their arguments generally conclude with the observation that by the early thirteenth century there were no more princes in Rus' to whom it would have been politically beneficial for Roman to be related.³ Even less convincing, in our opinion, is a recently expressed supposition that Roman's second wife was a woman of low birth and was not the prince's lawful wife at all.⁴ Alongside this, the theory of the Byzantine origin of Roman's second wife has been significantly developed in the literature on the subject. This theory was first proposed as early as the nineteenth century and has so far been most fully argued by H. GRALA, L. V. VOITOVICH and D. DĄBROWSKI.⁵

¹ For the most comprehensive review of the various opinions, see D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, Poznań – Wrocław 2002, 34-40.

² *Полное собрание русских летописей* (further ПСРЛ), Москва 1998, т. II, стб. 726, 727, 733-734, 735.

³ Н. Ф. КОТЛЯР, *Галицко-Волынская Русь и Византия в XII-XIII вв. (связи реальные и вымышленные)*, in: Южная Русь и Византия (К XVIII конгрессу византинистов), отв. ред. П. П. Толочко, Киев 1991, 95-97; idem, *Дипломатия Южной Руси*, Санкт Петербург 2003, 97-102; О. Б. ГОЛОВКО, *Князь Роман Мстиславич та його доба*, Київ 2001, 141-142. Возражения см.: D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów...*, 37; Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила (зауваження на полях монографії Д. Домбровського)*, in: Княжа доба. Історія і культура, відп. ред. Я. Ісаєвич, Львів 2007, вип. 1, 48-50.

⁴ О. ТОЛОЧКО, *Як звали другу дружину Романа Мстиславича?*, in: *Confraternitas*. Ювілейний збірник на пошану Ярослава Ісаєвича, Львів 2006-2007, 99.

⁵ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mściślawicza*, *Slavia Orientalis* XXXI/3-4 (1982) 115-127; Л. В. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Князівські династії Східної Європи (кінець IX-*

The following are among the most important arguments in favor of this theory. No members of the Rurikid dynasty were considered to be near of kin to the descendants of Roman Mstislavich from his second marriage; nor did any of them extend their patronage over his young sons when they became orphans after their father's death. One cannot interpret this reality in support of the argument that Roman's widow came from Volhynian boyars, and even less to support the theory of her low birth and unlawful status. After all, it is known that Leszek the White, Prince of Poland, and Andrew II, King of Hungary, acknowledged their kinship with Roman's widow: both Leszek and Andrew called her their *yatrov'*.⁶

Yatrov' or *yatry* in Old Russian meant (in its direct meaning) "sister-in-law".⁷ Since Roman Mstislavich and Leszek the White were cousins and grandchildren of Bolesław III Wrymouth (1102-1138), Roman's widow did qualify as Leszek's *yatrov*. Roman's relationship to Andrew II was more distant: being the great-grandchildren of Mstislav Vladimirovich (1125-1132), they were only second cousins. Given such a distant relationship, in L. V. VOITOVICH's opinion, the Hungarian king could recognize Roman's widow as his *yatrov'* only in view of their close kinship with Byzantine emperors.⁸

The Byzantine origin of Roman's second wife is also supported by the unusually large number of Greek names given to the sons and grandchildren of this couple. Names such as Daniel, Salome, Sofia, Heraclius, and Leo had been utterly untypical for the Rurikid dynasty and had never before been used for princes and princesses of Rus'.⁹

The kinship of the new Galician princess with the Angelos dynasty is testified to by the accounts of West European and Rus' sources reporting the visit to Halych of the overthrown emperor Alexios III after Constantinople had been captured by the crusaders.¹⁰ A reference to the

початок XVI ст.). *Склад, суспільна і політична роль*, Львів 2000, 67, 71-72, 224, 376, 380-381, 402; idem, *Роман Мстиславич і утворення Галицько-Волинського князівства*, in: *Галичина і Волинь в добу середньовіччя. До 800-річчя з дня народження Данила Галицького* (= *Історичні та культурологічні студії*, вип. 3), Львів 2001, 22-23; idem, *Княжа доба на Русі: портрети еліти*, Біла Церква 2006, 484; D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów...*, 34-40; idem, *Genealogia Mścistawowiczów. Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*, Kraków 2008, 265-266.

⁶ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб.719. Ibidem, стб. 717, 727-728.

⁷ This interpretation is given by I. I. Sreznevskii. – И. И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка: в 3-х томах*, Москва 2003, т. III, стб. 1673-1674.

⁸ Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 46-47.

⁹ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścistawicza*, 123; D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów...*, 38-40; Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 55.

¹⁰ For details see: А. В. МАЙОРОВ, *Русь, Византия и Западная Европа. Из истории внешнеполитических и культурных связей XII-XIII вв.*, Санкт Петербург 2011, сар. 12 and 13.

direct contacts between the Galician-Volhynian Prince and Emperor Alexios is found in the report of the Novgorodian pilgrim Dobrynya Yadreikovich, who saw Roman Mstislavich's ambassadors in Constantinople (May 1200).¹¹

Roman's marriage with a well-born Byzantine woman, possibly a relative of the Byzantine emperor, could have been contracted late in the twelfth century as a result – or even as a pre-condition – of a military and political alliance between the Galician-Volhynian Prince and Alexios III. This alliance manifested itself in the successful attacks by the Galician-Volhynian Prince against the Cumans, which stopped their raids – that had attained an unprecedented scope – against the Byzantine Empire.¹²

Dynastic marriages as an instrument of the external policy of the Empire

By means of dynastic marriages the Byzantine rulers sought to solve the most critical foreign policy issues of the Empire, namely, appeasing their enemies and gaining allies. This was how Isaac II, for example, was able to normalize relations with Serbia and Hungary. Isaac gave his niece Eudokia Angelina (the youngest daughter of the future Emperor Alexios III, who was then in exile in Palestine) in marriage to the son of the Grand Župan (Prince) Stefan Nemanja – the future Tsar of Serbia, known as Stefan the First-Crowned.¹³ The basileus himself married the young daughter of King Bela III. This marriage became the basis not only for the cessation of hostilities on the part of the ruler of Hungary, but also for the return to the Empire of the territories in the Balkans that had been taken away from it earlier.¹⁴ In 1193, to strengthen the alliance with Tancred (1190-1194) the new king of Sicily, Isaac gave his daughter Irene in marriage to Tancred's son and co-ruler Roger III (1190-1193).¹⁵

This policy was continued by Alexios III, the successor of Isaac II. According to Niketas Choniates, he resolved to give his daughters Anna and Irene in marriage to foreign Christian sovereigns to persuade them

¹¹ Путешествие новгородского архиепископа Антония в Царьград в конце 12-го столетия, с предисловием и примечаниями П. Савваитова, Санкт Петербург 1872, 78-79.

¹² Concerning this alliance see: А. В. МАЙОРОВ, *Русь, Византия и Западная Европа*, сар. 19.

¹³ М. ЛАСКАРИС, *Византиске принцезе у средњовековној Србији. Пролог историји и византиско-српски односи од краја XII до средина XV века*, Београд 1926, 24-31; А. П. КАЖДАН, *Когда Евдокия вышла замуж за Стефана Неманича?*, in: *Источники и историография славянского средневековья*, Москва 1967, 216-217.

¹⁴ Gy. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Budapest 1970, 92-94; F. МАКК, *The Arpads and the Comneni. Political relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th century*, Budapest 1989, 112-113, 120-121.

into forming alliances with the Byzantine Empire.¹⁶ As for his granddaughter Theodora, Anna's daughter from her first marriage with Sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos, the Emperor gave her in marriage to the Bulgarian Tsar Ivan Kaloyan's cousin Ivanko, who defected to the Byzantine Empire and assumed the new name Alexios.¹⁷ Failing to suppress the rebellion of the former Byzantine governor of Macedonia Dobromir Chrysos, who had declared himself an independent ruler, Alexios III concluded peace with Dobromir and gave one of his kinswomen to him in marriage.¹⁸

There is no doubt that the most influential and militarily strong princes of Rus' in the late twelfth century also fell within the orbit of matrimonial considerations for Byzantine emperors. This is evident from the episode entered under 1194 in the Ipatiev Chronicle. It refers to the marriage proposal made by a certain Byzantine *tsarevich* (prince) to Euphemia Glebovna, the granddaughter of the Grand Prince of Kiev Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich. Matchmakers arrived in Kiev when Svyatoslav was near death: „... news came to him from matchmakers who had come to take Svyatoslav's granddaughter, Euphemia Glebovna, [to wife] for the prince.“¹⁹

Researchers generally treat this reference to the marriage proposal recorded in the ancient Kievan Rus' source as reliable. It appears that the *tsarevich* mentioned in chronicle may have been Alexios, the son of the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II, the future Emperor Alexios IV.²⁰ Investigators usually look upon the potential marriage between the *tsarevich* and Euphemia Glebovna as a *fait accompli*.²¹ However, it is perfectly clear that the marriage was not concluded at that time.

¹⁶ *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, rec. I. A. van Dieten, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1975, 508. See also: *Никита Хониат, История, начинающаяся с царствования Иоанна Комнина*, т. II, пер. под ред. проф. Н. В. Чельцова, Санкт Петербург 1862, 224.

¹⁷ Κ. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984, т. 2, 507-511.

¹⁸ *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, 507. See also in Russian: *Никита Хониат, История...* т. II, 223.

¹⁹ «...приде емоу вестъ от сватовъ, иже идяхоуть поимати вноуки Святославле Глебовны Офимьи за царевича». – ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 680.

²⁰ М. С. ГРУШЕВСКИЙ, *Исторія України – Руси*, Київ 1992, т. II, 215; Х. М. ЛОПАРЕВ, *Брак Мстиславны (1122 г.)*, Византийский временник. IX (1902) 419; А. Е. ПРЕСНЯКОВ, *Княжое право в древней Руси. Лекции по русской истории. Киевская Русь*, Москва 1993, 382; N. DE BAUMGARTEN, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes, du X^e au XIII^e siècle* (= *Orientalia Christiana* IX, ser. I, nr. 35), Roma 1927 Tabl. IV; М. В. ЛЕВЧЕНКО, *Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношений*, Москва 1956, 496-497; В. Т. ПАШУТО, *Внешняя политика Древней Руси*, Москва 1968, 201; П. П. ТОЛОЧКО, *Древний Киев*, Киев 1983, 271; H. GRALA, *Rola Rusi w wojnach bizantyńsko-bułgarskich przelomu XII i XIII w.*, in: *Balkanica Posnaniensia. Acta et Studia*, Poznań 1985, т. II, 127; Л. В. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Княжа доба на Русі...*, 409; D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia Mściławowiczów*, 459.

It was prevented by the death of Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich, which followed soon after the marriage proposal by the *tsarevich*.²² Euphemia's father – Gleb Svyatoslavich, the then Prince of Pereyaslavl²³ – was unlikely to be of any interest to the Byzantine emperor as an important ally. Nevertheless, Gleb was married to the daughter of Rurik Rostislavich,²⁴ who succeeded Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich on the Kievan throne. Thus, Euphemia Glebovna became the granddaughter of the new Kievan Prince. However, the sources fail to give any information on the wedding mission of the Byzantine emperor's son to Rurik to confirm his matrimonial intentions. Moreover, the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II was soon ousted from the throne, and his son Alexios had to look for influential patrons among the leaders of the Fourth Crusade.

Nevertheless, in Constantinople they continued to observe closely the princes who ruled Rus', especially the new Kievan Prince, Rurik Rostislavich. This is evident from the data of the Byzantine authors of that time.

The eminent historian and statesman Niketas Choniates (ca.1155-ca.1217) – who served as the emperor's secretary under Isaac II, and then as the governor of Philippopolis (today Plovdiv), and reached the summit of his career under Alexios III, when he served a number of high offices in the Empire and rose to the rank of Logothete of the Secrets, being identical to the rank of the Grand Logothete (the head of the government) – records in his History the key events of political life in Southern Rus' in the late twelfth – early thirteenth centuries, that were significant for the foreign policy of the Empire.²⁵

Byzantine authorities most likely would have continued to favor the Prince of Kiev, traditionally the strongest prince in Rus', had not the star of another southern Rus' ruler risen in the late twelfth century: the one who united Volhynia and Galicia under his rule and began his rivalry for Kiev. According to Niketas Choniates, the Kievan Prince Rurik was inferior to the Galician Prince Roman, who was more powerful and more skilful in warfare. Moreover, Byzantium was dissatisfied with Rurik's use of the Cumans who comprised the main part of his army that Roman defeated.²⁶

²¹ See for example: М. С. ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, *Історія України – Русь*, т. II, 215. DE BAUMGARTEN, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes*, Tabl. IV; Л. В. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Княжа доба на Русі...*, 409.

²² ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 680-681.

²³ See Д. В. ДОНСКОЙ, *Рюриковичи. Исторический словарь*, Москва 2008, 233.

²⁴ The marriage took place in 1182. – ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 625.

²⁵ For the biography and works of Nikita Choniates see: Ф. И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Византийский писатель Никита Акоминат из Хон*, Санкт Петербург 1874; J. L. VAN DIETEN, *Niketas Choniates. Erläuterungen zu den Reden und Briefen nebst einer Biographie*, Berlin 1971; H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, München 1978, Bd. I, 429-441; А. П. КАЖДАН, *Никита Хониат и его*

The assumption concerning Roman's marriage to one of the Kamateros kin

I. GRALYA assumes that the union between Alexios III Angelos and Roman Mstislavich against the Bulgarians and the Cumans was sealed with the marriage alliance between the Galician-Volhynian Prince and Maria Kamatera, the relative of Empress Euphrosyne, the wife of Alexios III. The Kamateros family was at the top of the Byzantine nobility: two patriarchs of Constantinople and many courtiers came from it in the late twelfth – early thirteenth centuries. According to GRALA, John X Kamateros, Patriarch of Constantinople (1198-1206), must have facilitated the dissolution of the first marriage of Roman Mstislavich with Predslava, the daughter of the Kievan Prince Rurik Rostislavich, who was married to a Cuman Princess and fostered friendly relations with the Cumans. It was no coincidence that by the end of her life, Roman's widow supported her son Daniel in his pursuit of a union with Rome, because several prominent members of the Kamateros family backed the union.²⁷

E. DĄBROWSKA agrees with H. GRALA's hypothesis and gives additional arguments in its favor. In particular, she asserts that Maria was a close relative – a daughter, a niece or a granddaughter – of the Logothete of the Drome John Kamateros, one of the closest associates of Emperor Manuel I. It was through him that the Kamateros may have acquired a relic owned by the basileus, namely, a precious cross with a piece of the Tree of the Holy Cross. This was later inherited by Roman Mstislavich and his descendants and is now kept in the sacristy of Notre Dame Cathedral.²⁸

This hypothesis, however, has yet to be verified. Among the kinswomen of Empress Euphrosyne, the daughter of Pansebastos Sebastos and Eparch of Constantinople Andronikos Doukas Kamateros, one cannot find one that would fit the role of the Galician-Volhynian Prince's wife or would have any connection with Rus' at all.²⁹ H. GRALA introduced new arguments to back the hypothesis that Roman Mstislavich's second wife was of Byzantine origin. Nevertheless, his assumption about Maria Kamateros is not convincing.³⁰ In our opinion, one of the drawbacks of this assumption is that it is impossible to explain the reason for the close

время, Санкт Петербург 2005; М. В. БИБИКОВ, *Byzantinorossica. Свод византийских свидетельств о Руси*, Москва 2004, 368-374.

²⁶ *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, 523.

²⁷ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścislawicza*.

²⁸ E. DĄBROWSKA, *Jeszcze o relikwii Krzyża Świętego i relikwiarzu koronacyjnym królów polskich*, *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 100/2 (1993) 7.

²⁹ Concerning the relatives of Empress Euphrosyne's father see: D. I. POLEMIS, *The Doukai. A contribution to byzantine prosopography*, London 1968.

³⁰ For opposing views see: D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów...*, 38-40; Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 53-56.

contacts with and the support rendered by the Hungarian King Andrew II to Roman's widow and her sons.

In the late twelfth – the first third of the thirteenth century, the Hungarian rulers constantly laid claim to Halych. They believed themselves to be the legitimate kings of Galicia because their rights had been sanctioned by Rome. King Andrew as well as his sons Koloman and Andrew Junior all served as rulers of Halych.³¹

Nevertheless, during the reign of Roman Mstislavich and for several years after his death, the Hungarian king renounced all claim to Halych and lent full support to Daniel and his mother. M. S. GRUSHEVSKY believed that during this period Andrew recognized Daniel as the legitimate ruler of Galicia.³² It is possible, however, that the Hungarian king may have had some far-reaching plans to turn the young Romanovich into his vassal.³³

Nonetheless, Andrew II began supporting Roman's widow (including militarily) right after the death of her husband. It is to the King of Hungary that the Dowager Galician Princess turned in the first place, when she met him in the town of Sanok: „... after the death of Roman the king met his *yatrov*' in [the town of] Sanok. Because he looked upon Daniel as his own beloved son, [he] left with him (in Halych – A. M.) the great blind Mokyi and Korochun, Volpt and his son Vitomir, and Blaginya, and many other Hungarians in ambush“.³⁴ It was only owing to this „ambush“ that the Hungarians succeeded in repelling the attack on Halych conducted by the Kievan Prince Rurik Rostislavich and to force the people of Halych to accept the authority of Roman's Grand Princess, who was unpopular with them: „and the people of Halych did not dare to do anything, because there were many Hungarians among them“.³⁵

When Daniel and his mother were forced to leave Halych, not only did Andrew II give refuge to the prince at his court,³⁶ but he even promised to make Daniel his heir by marrying the prince to his own daughter.³⁷ When this marriage did not take place, the king gave Daniel

³¹ For details see: А. В. МАЙОРОВ, *Галицко-Волынская Русь. Очерки социально-политических отношений в домонгольский период. Князь, бояре и городская община*, Санкт Петербург 2001.

³² М. С. ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, *Історія України – Руси*, Київ 1993, т. III, 26.

³³ See: М. ВОЛОЩУК, «Угорське дитинство» князя Данила Романовича (1206-1210 рр.), in: *На вівтар історії України. Ювілейний збірник на пошану В. В. Грабовецького, Івано-Франківськ* 2008.

³⁴ «...по смерти Романове снимался король со ятровью своею во Саноце. Прияль бо бе Данила, како милога сына своего, оставиль бо бе оу него (в Галиче – А. М.) засадоу – Мокъя великаго слепоокого, и Корочюна, Вълпта, и сына его Витомира, и Благиню, иньи Оугры многи». – ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 717.

³⁵ Ibidem.

³⁶ Ibidem, стб. 719.

³⁷ Ibidem, стб. 723.

a large army for a campaign against Halych in order to win it back from the Igorevich brothers, who at that time were the main rivals for the heritage of the Galician princes. It was only with the help of the Hungarians that the young Daniel succeeded to drive the Chernigov princes from Zvenigorod and Halych and crush their allies – the Cumans.³⁸ The chronicler summarizes his account concerning those events with a characteristic sentence: „King Andrew did not forget his first love that he had for his brother, Grand Prince Roman, and sent his soldiers, and put his son [Daniel] on the throne in Halych.“³⁹

The fact that the chronicler mentions „love“ between Andrew II and Roman Mstislavich may be indicative (though indirectly) of a family relationship between them. It appears to be no coincidence that during the entire period of Roman’s reign in Halych, the Hungarian kings Emeric I and Andrew II did not dispute his princely rights.⁴⁰

It is notable that when the people of Halych, dissatisfied with Roman’s widow who ruled on behalf of the minor Daniel compelled her to leave Halych, the Hungarian King backed his *yatrov*’ and by force of arms made the people of Halych accept her again.⁴¹ After another expulsion of Daniel and his mother from Halych, Andrew gathered his troops and went to their aid. Only a revolt of the Hungarian barons that resulted in the murder of Queen Gertrude forced Andrew to abandon the campaign.⁴²

As it has already been noted, under the circumstances, the support rendered by the Hungarian king to Roman’s Grand Princess and her young son may have been due to their close kinship that did not come from the side of the Princess’s deceased husband, but rather from the side of her parents.⁴³ This support must have been encouraged by the high birth of Roman’s second wife, which made the rulers of Hungary and Poland treat her with great esteem. Hence, her high birth may also account for her ambitions to seize power that were so much disliked by the people of Halych, who reproached her for „wishing to rule herself.“⁴⁴

³⁸ Ibidem, стб. 724-727.

³⁹ «Король же Андреи не забы любви своєю первыя, иже имяше ко братоу си великому князю Романови, но посла воя своя и посади сына своего [Даниила] в Галичи». – Ibidem, стб. 726-727.

⁴⁰ This fact is acknowledged by H. Grail (H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścistawicza*, 122-123).

⁴¹ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 727-728.

⁴² Ibidem

⁴³ Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 47.

⁴⁴ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 727.

Could «великая княгиня Романова» (Roman's Grand Princess) be the daughter of Isaac II from the marriage with Margaret of Hungary?

Neither Alexios III nor his wife Euphrosyne had any direct family ties with the Hungarian royal family. Nor is it known if a close relationship existed between the Arpads and any of the Kamateros kin living at the turn of the twelfth-thirteenth centuries. Nevertheless, Isaac II, Alexios III's predecessor who was deprived of power and blinded by the latter, did have such connections. Isaac's second marriage was with the daughter of the Hungarian King Bela III, Margaret, who took the name of Maria upon her arrival in Byzantium.⁴⁵ Thus, Empress Maria-Margaret was King Andrew II's sister, and her children were his nephews.

Based on these considerations, L. E. МАХНОВЕЦЬ and L. V. ВОЙТОВИЧ advanced the theory that Roman Mstislavich's second wife was the daughter of Isaac II from his marriage with Maria-Margaret.⁴⁶ L. V. ВОЙТОВИЧ supports this assumption with the following observations: „Maria-Margaret was married to Isaac II in the fall of 1185. Anna (as the researcher calls Roman's second wife – A. M.) might have been born as early as 1187, in 1200 she might have been married to Roman, and in 1201 she might have given birth to her son Daniel.“⁴⁷

D. DĄBROWSKI also considers this assumption to be probable. According to his calculations, the eldest child of Roman and his second wife might have been born between 1199 and 1201 (the historian finds it possible that the marriage between them was concluded as early as in 1199). Daniel was born around 1201, and Vasilko roughly two years later. In any case, by the time of her marriage, Maria (DĄBROWSKI hesitantly tends toward such a name of Roman's second wife) must have already reached childbearing age, which, according to the researcher, at that time was about 14 years.⁴⁸ If so, Roman's second wife must have been born no later than 1185, and her assumed mother – Empress Maria-Margaret – no later than 1171. However, the above calculations do not comply with the extant sources.

According to Niketas Choniates, the widowed Isaac married the Hungarian princess, when she had not even reached the age of ten: „Then the tsar wished to ask in marriage a wife from a foreign family, because the one to whom he had previously been married had died. Thus,

⁴⁵ К. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984, т. 2, 814-815.

⁴⁶ Л. Є. МАХНОВЕЦЬ, [Коментар], in: Літопис Руський. За Іпатським списком переклав Л. Махновець, Київ 1989, 369, прим. 2 (к 6710 г.); Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 51.

⁴⁷ Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 51.

⁴⁸ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia Mściławowiczów*, 265. – Other experts on historical genealogy also estimate fourteen years to have been the minimum age of child-bearing medieval women (see K. JASIŃSKI, *Rodowód Piastów śląskich*, Wrocław 1973, т. I, 25).

having reached an agreement through his ambassadors with Bela, the king of Hungary, he took to wife his daughter, who had not quite reached the age of ten.⁴⁹

The marriage took place shortly after Bela III – widowed after the death of Anna-Agnes of Antioch, the mother of Maria-Margaret and the half-sister of Maria, the wife of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I – turned to Constantinople with a request to give him in marriage Theodora, the niece of Manuel I and the widow of the prominent military leader of the empire Sebastos Andronikos Lapardos. Isaac II did not want to send abroad the kinswoman of the previous emperor and therefore rejected Bela's proposal. As compensation, he asked for the hand of the young daughter of the Hungarian king.⁵⁰

One can postulate the date of this marriage only on indirect evidence. In anticipation of the magnificent wedding of the basileus that was to take place in Constantinople, an extraordinary tax was levied. The main burden of the tax fell on the Balkan provinces of the Empire. This gave rise to the liberation rebellion in Bulgaria, which erupted in 1186 and led to the creation of the Second Bulgarian Empire. The tax (which must have preceded the wedding) was collected in the late autumn and early winter of 1185. Therefore, the marriage ceremony must have taken place either at the very end of 1185, or, what is more likely, early in 1186.⁵¹

Consequently, Empress Maria-Margaret must have been born ca. 1177 or, at the earliest, in 1176. She most likely did not reach childbearing age before 1190.⁵²

These calculations are in accord with the available data concerning the offspring of Isaac II and Maria-Margaret. We know the following details about their two sons born in the mid-1190s:

1. John (1193-1259), who, having come of age, went to Hungary, where in 1227-1242 he ruled in Syrmia and Bač as a vassal of King Bela IV.

2. Manuel (after 1195-1212), was adopted and made heir by Boniface of Montferrat. In May 1204, Boniface married Maria-Margaret. However later William the son of Boniface, imprisoned his half-brother in the cas-

⁴⁹ Никита Хониат, *История...*, т. II, 18.

⁵⁰ Κ. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Ἡ γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, т. 2, 815.

⁵¹ Г. Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Болгария и Византия в XI-XII вв.*, Москва 1960, 441; J. L., VAN DIETEN, *Niketas Choniates. Erläuterungen zu den Reden und Briefen...*, 88-90; Ph. MALINGOUDIS, *Die Nachrichten des Niketas Choniates über die Entstehung des Zweiten Bulgarischen Staates*, *Byzantina X* (1980) 113f.; G PRINZING, *Demetrios-Kirche und Aseniden-Aufstand. Zur chronologischen Präzisierung der Frühphase des Aseniden-Aufstandes*, *Зборник радова Византолошког института* 38 (1999-2000) 264-265.

⁵² The alleged daughter of Marie-Marguerite and Isaac II, therefore, was to marry a Roman Mstislavich who was 9 to 10 years of age; consequently, their first child would have been born around or after 1203-1204. However, the chronology of the births of the sons of Roman is rather conventional and sets the stage for all kinds of assumptions (see, eg.: А. П. ТОЛОЧКО, *Известен ли год рождения Даниила Романовича Галицкого?*, in: *Средневековая Русь*, т. 7, Москва 2007).

tle of Montferrat, where he stayed for a period of time along with the emperor Alexios III.⁵³

There is no information concerning the children born to Maria-Margaret in her marriage with Isaac II before 1193. There is also no evidence that the couple might have had female issue. This fact also eliminates the possibility of Roman Mstislavich's marriage to the daughter of Isaac II from his second wife. After all, even if we assume that Niketas Choniates and other Byzantine historians, for some reason, might have ignored recording the marriage of a Byzantine princess to a prince of Rus',⁵⁴ it is most unlikely that no historical document of the Empire recorded the birth of children in the royal family, especially at the time when Isaac II was in power.

The possibility of Roman marrying the daughter of Isaac II from Margaret of Hungary is doubtful also in view of the plans of the Hungarian King Andrew II – the brother of Margaret and the uncle of her supposed daughter, Roman's widow – to give his daughter Maria in marriage to Roman's son Daniel, as reported by the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle.⁵⁵

Niketas Choniates' records of the eldest daughter of Isaac II

We believe that the future princess of Halych-Volhynia, the wife of Roman Mstislavich and the mother of his sons Daniel and Vasilko, is to be found among the daughters of Isaac II who were born before he became emperor.

N. A. BAUMGARTEN concluded that Roman's most probable Byzantine wife might have been one of Isaac's unascertained daughters from his first marriage.⁵⁶ However, at a later date he renounced that idea, apparently, because he could not find any suitable candidate among the Byzantine princesses known to him. Eventually, BAUMGARTEN confined himself to a vague designation of Roman's second wife (whom he calls Anna) referring to her as some kinswoman of Isaac II.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, he is not confident with that identification either. Finally, in his main work on the genealogy of the Old Rus' Rurikid dynasty, he identified Anna as a kinswoman of Alexios III.⁵⁸

⁵³ К. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, т. 2, 797-798, 815-816.

⁵⁴ See for example, H. Grahl and L. V. Wojtowicz (H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mściławicza*, 126; Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Мати короля Данила...*, 55-56).

⁵⁵ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 723.

⁵⁶ Н. БАУМГАРТЕН, *Вторая ветвь князей Галицких. Потомство Романа Мстиславича*, in: *Летопись Историко-родословного общества в Москве, Москва 1909*, вып. 1 (17), 9-11.

⁵⁷ N. DE BAUMGARTEN, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes*, 23, Tabl. V, Nr. 47.

⁵⁸ Ibidem, 47, Tabl. XI, Nr. 1.

Following N. A. BAUMGARTEN's example, most researchers who accepted his arguments about the Byzantine origin of „Roman's Grand Princess“ also answered the question of her possible origin evasively. They suggested looking for her among the kinswomen of Emperor Isaac II generally⁵⁹ or limited themselves to an even more general reference to her possible Byzantine roots.⁶⁰ Disappointed by the outcome of this search, A. P. KAZHDAN rightfully assumed that the origin of Roman's second wife remained uncertain. He was dissatisfied with BAUMGARTEN's arguments and on the whole doubted the Greek origins of Anna and her kinship with the Angelos dynasty.⁶¹

This question, of course, requires more thorough investigation. The main difficulty is that one knows very little of Isaac's first wife, with whom he lived before his accession to the throne. In particular, her name and origin remain unclear. Nor is the fate of a number of the children born to her entirely clear. This might be due to the fact that Isaac's first wife apparently died before he became the emperor. Moreover, children from his first marriage were also born before Isaac's accession, and therefore their birth did not attract the attention of official historiographers. Finally, since not one of the three emperors of the Angelos dynasty died on the throne, no formal funerals, and no funeral speeches or obituaries befitting the occasion, in which family members and other relatives of the deceased could have been mentioned, were made.⁶²

As for the essential information on Isaac's progeny by his first wife, one can again find it with Niketas Choniates: “King Isaac had three children by his first marriage – two daughters and one son. He made his eldest daughter a nun...; and gave the other one in marriage to the son of Tancred, King of Sicily... And he prepared his son Alexios to be the heir to the throne...”⁶³

There is no difficulty in identifying two of the three Isaac's children mentioned in this passage. Those are his son Alexios, the future Emperor Alexios IV (1203-1204), and his daughter Irene, who was first married to King Roger III of Sicily (1190-1194) and then to the German king Philip IV of Swabia (1198-1208).⁶⁴

⁵⁹ W. DWORZACZEK, *Genealogia. Tablice*, Warszawa 1959, Tabl. 27; D. SCHWENNICKÉ, *Europäische Stammtafeln. Stammtafeln zur Geschichte europäischer Staaten*, Marburg 1984, Bd. II, Tabl. 136.

⁶⁰ A. ŚWIEŻAWSKI, *Ziemia Bełska. Zarys dziejów politycznych do roku 1462*, Częstochowa 1990, 31; M. FONT, *Oroszország, Ukrajna, Rusz*, Pécs 1995, 73.

⁶¹ A. KAZHDAN, *Rus' – Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 12-13 (1988-1989) 424.

⁶² R. HIESTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos und seine Kinder*, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 57 (1997) 201.

⁶³ *Никита Хониат, История, начинающаяся с царствования Иоанна Комнина*, т. II, пер. под ред. проф. Н. В. Чельцова, Санкт-Петербург 1862, 85.

⁶⁴ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, т. 2, 814.

The least is known concerning Isaac's eldest daughter from the first marriage, who was sent to a nunnery by her father. It appears that she must have been born soon after Isaac entered into his first marriage, i.e. shortly after 1175. She was apparently put into a nunnery when she was still a child. In 1182 or 1183 Isaac became a widower. The placement of his eldest daughter into a nunnery might have had something to do with the basileus's new marriage that took place in late 1185 or early 1186.

It was an extremely rare occasion in the history of Byzantium for an unmarried daughter of an emperor to take the veil. As noted by L. GARLAND, marriage and social life were the norm for Byzantine princesses and girls of the upper classes in general. By marrying their daughters, basileuses implemented the policy of dynastic alliances of the Empire, which became especially widespread during the reign of the Komnenos and the Angelos. There are only a few cases known when Byzantine princesses became nuns before marriage: this happened with the daughters of emperors Constantine VIII, Constantine X and the mentioned eldest daughter of Isaac II.⁶⁵

Ioannitsa's house – the residence of the Byzantine nun-princess

Niketas Choniates specified that Isaac did not choose for his eldest daughter a regular or existing nunnery, but created a new and special institution for her. The nunnery was created in a private residence known as „Ioannitsa's house“ or „the house of Ioannitsa“ (καί τὸν τοῦ Ἰωαννίτζη λεγόμενον οἶκον).⁶⁶ It had been specially modified for the princess and the Emperor incurred substantial costs in rebuilding and decorating it. According to Choniates, Isaac, „having turned Ioannitsa's house into a convent at large expense (as Empress Xene had intended to do after the death of her husband Emperor Manuel Komnenos), settled her [his eldest daughter – A. M.] therein, devoting her to God as a ewe lamb...“⁶⁷

It appears that Ioannitsa's house did not remain a nunnery for long. Nothing is known either about the house or the nunnery that it hosted. This would have been most unlikely if it had been a real nunnery. Byzantine sources mention Ioannitsa's house only once, namely, in connection with placing Isaac's young daughter therein. One can only guess that this house may have been somewhere in Constantinople or near the capital.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ L. GARLAND, *The life and ideology of Byzantine women: A further note on conventions of behaviour and social reality as reflected in eleventh and twelfth century historical sources*, Byzantion 58 (1988) 366. – See also L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses: women and power in Byzantium, 527-1204*, London – New York 1999.

⁶⁶ For the original text of the message, see: *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, 419.

⁶⁷ *Никита Хониат, История...*, т. II, 85.

⁶⁸ See: R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*. Première partie:

This choice of a cloister for the emperor's daughter has a number of parallels in the history of Byzantium that help us to understand its nature. According to researchers, the saints' lives of the ninth – tenth centuries contain several references to convents that are not mentioned in any other documents.⁶⁹ Such cloisters were created in private homes for individual families or individual persons. For example, it is known that during the reign of Leo V the Armenian (813-820) there was a wealthy woman who turned her house in Constantinople into a cloister and lived there with her three daughters and servants.⁷⁰

The purpose of these institutions was to provide an appropriate refuge for particular members of aristocratic families for the period of any distress that befell them or in the event of potential threats. Accordingly, the importance of these cloisters increased during periods of unrest and turmoil experienced by the Empire. Aristocratic women, for example, could find shelter there after the defeat of their kinsmen. According to J. HERRIN, who made a special study of the phenomenon of those cloisters in Byzantine history, one cannot say with certainty whether they functioned as religious institutions or just as temporary refuges for the owners.⁷¹

Returning to Ioannitsa's house, we should note that some light on its subsequent history can be shed by examining its distinctive name. Ioannitsa, Ioannica, Ioannitza, Ivanitsa or Ivanica was the diminutive form for the name John used by Byzantine and West-European sources to refer to Kaloyan, the Tsar of Bulgaria (1197-1207), who had become one of the Empire's main enemies.⁷²

Kaloyan – the youngest of the three Asen brothers – was born ca. 1170.⁷³ According to the terms of the 1188 peace treaty with Byzantium, his elder brother, the Bulgarian Tsar Peter IV, sent him to Constantinople as a hostage. Kaloyan spent about two years in the Byzantine capital, and in

Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique, t. III: *Les églises et les monastères*, Paris 1969, 263.

⁶⁹ J. HERRIN, *Changing Functions of Monasteries for Women during Byzantine Iconoclasm*, in: *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience 800-1200*, ed. by L. Garland, Aldershot – Burlington 2006, 3-4.

⁷⁰ G. HUXLEY, *Women in Byzantine Iconoclasm*, in: *Les femmes et le monachisme byzantin. Women and Byzantine Monasticism. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium*, 28-29 March 1988, Athens 1988, 12.

⁷¹ J. HERRIN, *Changing Functions of Monasteries for Women during Byzantine Iconoclasm*, 11.

⁷² CH. M. BRAND, *Byzantium confronts the West, 1180-1204*, Cambridge 1968, 127, 130, 133; A. J. ANDREA, *Contemporary sources for the fourth crusade*, Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000, 160, 255.

⁷³ See: И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Фамилията на Асеневици (1186-1460). Геналогия и просопография*, София 1985, 43sq.; И. АНДРЕЕВ, *Българските ханове и царе VII-XIV век: историко-хронологичен справочник*, София 1988, 112sq.

1190, it would appear, managed to escape.⁷⁴ Choniates also reports these facts from the career of the future Bulgarian Tsar, saying that „he had been a hostage of the Romans for quite a long time.“⁷⁵

Choniates, who in his History gave the most complete and accurate information on the relationship of the Byzantine emperors with Kaloyan, consistently used his full official name John (Ἰωάννης).⁷⁶ Nevertheless, the disparaging form of the Bulgarian Tsar’s name – Ioannitsa (Ἰωαννίτζα) – was also in Choniates’ arsenal: that name is given to Kaloyan by the Byzantine courtier in one of his panegyrics.⁷⁷ According to J. L. VAN DIETEN, this speech was delivered by Choniates in the presence of Alexios III in March – April 1202 on the occasion of the triple victory over the rebels Manuel Kamitsa, Dobromir Chrysos and John Spiridonaki and the conclusion of the peace treaty with Ioannitsa.⁷⁸

Kaloyan’s whereabouts in Constantinople, when he lived there as a hostage, is unknown. If, however, it could have been the Ioannitsa’s house mentioned by Choniates, then, of course, by the time when Kaloyan occupied it, it could hardly have been a nunnery or the residence of Isaac’s daughter.

We have other reasons for believing that the eldest daughter of Isaac II was not a nun for life. In the commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral, which for centuries used to be the burial place of German kings and where Philip of Swabia and his wife Irene (the youngest daughter of Isaac II’s first marriage) found their final resting place, the father, the mother, the sister and the brother are recorded among her Greek relatives.⁷⁹ Queen Irene’s sister referred to in the commemoration book (under the name of Maria) can only be the sister, the eldest daughter of Isaac, whom he sent to a nunnery in her childhood.⁸⁰ However, contrary to expectations, in the church book she is commemorated as a secular person without a religious status.⁸¹

⁷⁴ R. GUILLAND, *Byzance et les Balkans, sous le règne d’Isaac II Ange (1185-1195)*, in: Actes du XII^e Congrès International d’études byzantines, Beograd 1964, t. II, 131; Ch. M. BRAND, *Byzantium confronts the West*, 92, 338; J. L. VAN DIETEN, *Niketas Choniates*, 140.

⁷⁵ *Никита Хониат, История...*, т. II, 58, 165-166.

⁷⁶ J. L. VAN DIETEN, *Niketas Choniates*, 131f.

⁷⁷ *Nicetae Choniatae Orationes et Epistulae*, rec. I. A. van Dieten, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1972, 229.

⁷⁸ J. L. VAN DIETEN, *Niketas Choniates*, 59, 131-133. – These events are also mentioned in one of the speeches of the Sardinian Metropolitan Nicephoros Chrysoberges: *Nikephoros Chrysoberges, Ad Angelas orationes tres*, ed. M. Treu, Breslau 1892, 16-19, 21, 27.

⁷⁹ *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, Fontes rerum Germanicarum, Stuttgart 1868, t. IV, 323-325.

⁸⁰ R. HIESTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos...*, 204.

⁸¹ It is unlikely that the compilers of the commemoration book would have ignored Maria’s monastic status if she had died as a nun. Significantly, the monas-

The taking of monastic vows in the political practice of Byzantium

There were many cases in the history of the Byzantine Empire in which members of the aristocracy, including members of the royal family, for various reasons, mostly political ones, took monastic vows, but at a later date gave them up, returned to social life, and even got married. Such lenience was often allowed particularly for women.

For example, Empress Zoe Karbonopsina, the fourth wife of Leo VI the Wise (886-912) and the mother of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913-920 and 945-959), took monastic vows in 914. This was subsequently reversed on the grounds that before taking the vows (which she did during the fast) Zoe had eaten meat, after obtaining special permission to do so from the Patriarch of Constantinople owing to her illness. For few years after that she returned to her regular life.⁸²

Something similar happened to the daughters of Emperor Constantine VIII (1025-1028) – Zoe and Theodora. Constantine's successor Romanos III Argyros (1028-1034), for fear of conspiracy and at the insistence of Zoe, sent Theodora to a convent to become a nun.⁸³ Nevertheless, in 1042, during a rebellion against Michael V Kalaphates (1041-1042), Theodora was taken to Constantinople and crowned.⁸⁴ As for her sister Zoe, Michael V ordered her to be sent to the Princes' Islands and also become a nun.⁸⁵ This, however, did not prevent Zoe not only from returning to the throne, but also from getting married for the third time (at the age of 64) to Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055).⁸⁶

This practice continued through the second half of the twelfth century, including during the reign of Isaac II, when, according to the available data, it became widespread. According to Niketas Choniates, the Patriarch of Constantinople „gave permission to take off the black dress and return to the previous way of life and previous clothes to the women of the upper class whom Andronikos (Emperor Andronikos I Komnenos – A. M.) had made nuns against their will.“⁸⁷

The patriarch referred to in this report is Basil II Kamateros (1183-1186), who contributed significantly to the accession of Isaac II, but then

tic ranks of others buried in Speyer Cathedral are specifically mentioned in the commemoration book. – See *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, 317-327.

⁸² See L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses...*, 119.

⁸³ *Ioannis Skylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, rec. I. Thurn, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1973, 385.

⁸⁴ *Михаил Пселл, Хронография*, пер., ст., комм. Я. Н. Любарского, Москва 1978, 63-69.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, 60.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, 73-75. – For details see L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses...*, 136-157.

⁸⁷ *Никита Хониат, История...*, т. II, 66-67.

fell out of favor and was deposed.⁸⁸ His Holiness was blamed for the decision to abolish the monastic vows of the kinswomen of the Byzantine nobles who had suffered from the repressions of Andronikos I. However, as Choniates explains, his deposition was used as a convenient excuse to cover up the outrage of the emperor.⁸⁹

Records of the origin of the first wife of Emperor Isaac II

We also have evidence that sheds light on the origin of the first wife of Isaac II and, therefore, the children from his first marriage. This evidence may be useful in determining the fate of the eldest of the basileus's daughters.

As already noted, historians generally agree that little is known about the origin of Isaac's first wife. Nevertheless, there are reasons to believe that she might have belonged to the Palaiologos kin and might have been the daughter of the great heteriarch George Palaiologos Komnenos Doukas. The collection of historical documents from the library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate published by A. I. PΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ contains a document, supposedly dating back to 1191, in which George's son – Andronikos Palaiologos Komnenos Doukas – was called a „beloved gambros“ of Emperor Isaac. Owing to his close relationship to the basileus, Andronikos received the rank of protopansebastohypertat and reached the heights of power.⁹⁰

The Greek word “gambros” (γαμβρός) was used to refer to a relative from the female side – a brother-in-law or a son-in-law. As noted by K. VARZOS, Andronikos clearly cannot have been the husband of Isaac's sister or daughter. Therefore, he was most likely the brother of his first wife, who thus must have come from the kin of Palaiologos Komnenos Doukas.⁹¹

The elevation of the new Palaiologos occurred in the reign of Alexios III. Another son of the aforementioned great heteriarch George Palaiologos Komnenos Doukas named Alexios became his favorite. In the winter 1199, at the insistence of Alexios III, he divorced his first wife and married the daughter of the Emperor, Irene. From this marriage their daughter Theodora was born. She became the mother of the first Byzantine emperor from the Palaiologos dynasty – Michael VIII (1259-

⁸⁸ M. ANGOLD, *Church and society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081-1261*, Cambridge 1995, 119-121.

⁸⁹ *Никита Хониат, История...*, т. II, 66.

⁹⁰ A. I. PΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, Petroupolei 1894, т. II, 362.

⁹¹ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Ἡ γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών* т. 2, 814. – See also J.-F. VANNIER, *Les premiers Paléologues. Étude généalogique et prosopographique*, in: J. C. Cheynet – J. Vannier, *Études prosopographiques*, Paris 1986, 164 n.; R. HIESTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos...*, 201, 205.

1282). As Alexios III did not have a male heir, he granted Alexios Palaiologos the title of despot and designated him to become the future emperor.⁹²

Thus, during the reign of Alexios III, very favorable conditions arose for the eldest daughter of Isaac II. Since she had been sent to the monastery as a child against her free will, her monastic vows could now be canceled.

Both her uncle, the despot and the heir to the throne Alexios Palaiologos, and, possibly, the new Patriarch of Constantinople John X Kamateros (1198-1206), whose predecessor and relative Basil II had suffered unfairly under the deposed Emperor Isaac, may have contributed to her release from the monastery.

The abolition of monastic vows for the young girl, who by the end of the twelfth century was about to turn a little more than twenty years of age, of course, opened up the prospect of marriage. The political interest that Alexios III had in strengthening his alliance with the Galician-Volhynian Prince Roman Mstislavich would therefore influence the fate of the young Byzantine princess. Accordingly, her subsequent career can be traced, we think, in Galician-Volhynian Rus'.

The Tower in Stolpie: the results of the latest research

Nine kilometers from the modern Polish town of Chelm (Old Rus' Kholm), by the village Stolpie, near the Lublin – Chelm motorway, there is an old stone tower, almost 20 meters high, that is relatively well preserved to the present day. The tower has a rectangular outside shape and is round on the inside: its external dimensions are 5.8 × 6.3 m, while the inner diameter is about 3 m.⁹³

Opinions vary concerning the foundation of this structure and its purpose. According to P. A. RAPPOPORT, whose view has become widely accepted, the tower was a military-defensive facility, possibly a part of a lost castle. As such, it was built by Galician-Volhynian princes in the second half of the thirteenth – the first third of the fourteenth century.⁹⁴

⁹² V. LAURENT, *La généalogie des premiers Paléologues*, Byzantion 8 (1933) 126; J.-F. VANNIER, *Les premiers Paléologues*, 170-172, Nr. 29.

⁹³ For the description see И. В. АНТИПОВ, *Древнерусская архитектура второй половины XIII – первой трети XIV в. Каталог памятников*, Санкт Петербург 2000, 135-138, № IV.17.

⁹⁴ П. А. РАППОПОРТ, *Волыньские башни*, Москва 1952 (= МИА СССР, № 31), 215-219; idem, *Очерки по истории русского военного зодчества X-XIII вв.*, Москва – Ленинград 1956 (= МИА СССР, № 52), 163-166; idem, *Оборонительные сооружения Западной Волыни XIII-XIV вв.*, Światowit XXIV (1962) 621-627; idem, *Военное зодчество западнорусских земель X-XIV вв.*, Ленинград 1967 (= МИА СССР, № 140), 104, 204-205.

M. N. ТИХОМИРОВ believed the tower to be part of Kholm's fortifications.⁹⁵ However, the historian considered Stolpie to be a separate city that was first mentioned in the Galician-Volhynian chronicle earlier than Chelm.⁹⁶

It is customary to compare the tower of Stolpie with other similar facilities that once existed in the vicinity of Chelm. These have survived as ruins or foundations, in particular, in the villages of Belavino and Spas. The study of these has been resumed in the last decades after a long break.⁹⁷

The latest research of the tower of Stolpie has revealed a number of previously unknown details. In particular, during the investigation carried out in 1976-1978 by I. KUTYLOVSKAYA, the suggestion expressed earlier was confirmed that in its top (fifth) floor, there was an octagonal chapel with several niches. The eastern niche – the largest in size – resembled a semi-circular apse with a window at the back. In its interior the chapel was covered with rectangular bricks. Archeological excavations also revealed numerous fragments of the rich interior decorations that included ceramic tiles of various shapes covered with gold and red glaze, as well as a large number of carved white stone architectural fragments.⁹⁸

The new study of the system of structures in Stolpie including the tower itself, the adjacent earth bank, and other engineering aspects, carried out in 2003-2004 by the expedition led by A. BUKO, confirmed the findings of I. KUTYLOVSKAYA. It also revealed a number of heretofore undiscovered building features at the site, namely, the diversion of ground water and the underpinning of the foundations.⁹⁹

According to I. KUTYLOVSKAYA, the tower of Stolpie, and especially the chapel discovered in its top tier, display a genetic relation to architectural monuments of early Christianity built in the Byzantine Empire and in a number of European countries.¹⁰⁰ The chapel at Stolpie has direct analo-

⁹⁵ М. Н. ТИХОМИРОВ, *Древнерусские города*, Санкт Петербург 2008, 180.

⁹⁶ Ibidem, 51.

⁹⁷ See S. GOŁUB, *Chełm-Bielawin*, stan 1 (2). *Badania konserwatorskie pozostałości wieży z okresu średniowiecza*, Informator o badaniach archeologicznych w województwie Chełmskim w 1992-1993 roku, Chełm 1996, Nr. VII; В. АЛЕКСАНДРОВИЧ, *Архитектурний ансамбль середини XIII ст. у Спасі-Стопні в околицях Холма*, in: *Confraternitas. Ювілейний збірник на пошану Я. Ісаєвича*.

⁹⁸ I. KUTYŁOWSKA, *Badania archeologiczno-architektoniczne zespołu średniowiecznego w Stołpiu-Nowosiołkach, woj. Chełmskie*, Archeologiczne listy Nr. 2 (1981); eadem, *Zabytkowy zespół warowno-kultowy w Stołpiu woj. Chełmskie*, Zeszyt Biura badań dokumentacji zabytków w Chełmie Nr. 2/81 (Chełm 1981).

⁹⁹ See *Zespół wieżowy w Stołpiu. Badania 2003-2004*. Praca zbiorowa pod redakcją A. Buko, Warszawa 2009.

¹⁰⁰ I. KUTYŁOWSKA, *Związki architektury warowni kultowej w Stołpiu z bizantijskim i romańskim kręgiem kulturowym*, in: *Труды V Международного конгресса славянской археологии*, т. 3, вып. 2а, Москва 1987.

gies with the octahedral baptisteries and martyria surviving in Syria, Byzantium, as well as in Italy, southern France and Switzerland.¹⁰¹

According to A. BUKO, the tower of Stolpie could have been a major architectural feature of a suburban monastery, specially built for some noble person near Chelm, the new capital of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia.¹⁰²

The phenomenon of tower-monasteries was widespread in the Mediterranean basin, especially in its eastern part. There such structures had a long tradition, existing from the time of early Christianity until the late Middle Ages.¹⁰³ From the Mediterranean the phenomenon spread to other regions, in particular to Italy, Bulgaria and Rus'.¹⁰⁴

According to A. BUKO, structures such as the tower at Stolpie can be traced back to the private chapels built for top aristocratic families in medieval Greece.¹⁰⁵ In addition, the appearance and structural features of the tower at Stolpie are strongly reminiscent of stone tower monastic buildings that have survived in large numbers in Northern and partly in Central Greece. These are being actively studied at the present time.¹⁰⁶

An examination of the remains of tiles and other ceramic products from Stolpie and Chelm (Belavin tower, Vysokaya Gorka), carried out by A. BUKO's expedition, also showed that these articles, to judge from many particular features, were made in the same style and technique that went back to the Rus'-Byzantine cultural tradition of the twelfth – thirteenth centuries. The same can be said concerning the discovered samples of pottery that, according to a number of features, are direct replicas of similar Byzantine articles.¹⁰⁷ The use of rectangular bricks in Poland during the first half of the thirteenth century, was also influenced by Byzantine construction practices.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰¹ See A. KHATCHATRIAN, *Les baptistères paléochrétiens: plans, notices et bibliographie*, Paris 1962, Nr. 56, 59, 162, 180, 181, 342, 345, 358b.

¹⁰² A. BUKO, *Zagadki pogranicza: zespół wieżowy w Stolpiu*, *Archeologia Żywa* Nr. 3 (33) (2005) 48.

¹⁰³ A. BUKO, *Na pograniczu kultur i ideologii: zespół wieżowy w Stolpiu na ziemi chełmskiej*, *Ruthenica* VI (2007) 201.

¹⁰⁴³ See Ю. ДИБА, *Українські храми-ротонди X – першої половини XIV століть*, Львів 2005.

¹⁰⁵ A. BUKO, *Na pograniczu kultur i ideologii...*, 201.

¹⁰⁶ See *An essay on Byzantine fortification: northern Greece 4th-15th c.*, Thessaloniki, October 2001-January 2002. Exhibition catalogue. Ministry of culture (9th Ephorate of Byzantine antiquities of Thessalonike), ed. by Nh. Bakirtzis – Ph. Oreopulos, Athens 2001.

¹⁰⁷ A. BUKO, *Na pograniczu kultur i ideologii...*, 200. – See also K. DARK, *Byzantine pottery*, Gloucestershire 2001.

¹⁰⁸ М. В. МАЛЕВСКАЯ, *Применение брускового кирпича в архитектуре Западной Руси второй половины XIII-XIV вв.*, *Советская археология* № 4 (1989) 214.

It is important to note some of the architectural features of the structure of the tower at Stolpie observed by Yu. ДУБА. He established that all its external and internal spaces were calculated on measurements used in Byzantium – the so-called Byzantine cubit and foot. These were respectively 48 and 32 cm. Overall planning was based on the square measuring 12×12 cubits, to which 2 cubits were added on the east. The internal diameter of the rotunda-chapel was 10 cubits.¹⁰⁹

This feature significantly distinguishes the tower and the chapel in its upper tier from other typologically similar Volhynian landmarks. In particular, St Basil's Church in Volodymyr-Volynskiy,¹¹⁰ that is very similar in its architectural concept to the tower at Stolpie, was designed on another measure of length – a span (27 cm) that is a half of a great cubit (54 cm).¹¹¹

According to an analysis of the evidence of the written sources relating to the history of Stolpie carried out by D. DĄBROWSKI, the tower was most likely built between the years 1220 and 1246-1247. Moreover, Prince Daniel Romanovich probably initiated its construction, and the building may have been intended for his mother, „Roman's Grand Princess.“¹¹²

According to the Galician-Volhynian chronicle, ca. 1219 the princess became a nun.¹¹³ For a few decades afterwards she lived in a nunnery but without terminating her participation in political life. The chronicle reports that ca. 1220 Lithuanian princes sent their ambassadors to „Roman's Grand Princess“, as well as to Daniel and Vasilko, with a peace proposal.¹¹⁴ In 1253 the nun-princess together with Polish princes and

¹⁰⁹ Ю. ДИБА, *Українські храми-ротонди...*, 54.

¹¹⁰ On the typological similarity of monuments see: І. МОГИТИЧ – Р. МОГИТИЧ, *Центричні храми княжої Волині: нові риси будівельної технології кінця XII століття*, in: Галицько-Волинська держава: передумови виникнення, історія, культура, традиції. Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції, Галич, 19-21 серпня 1993 р., Львів 1993. – See also І. В. АНТИПОВ, *Древнерусская архитектура второй половины XIII-первой трети XIV в.*, № IV.15, 128-132.

¹¹¹ Ю. ДИБА, *Українські храми-ротонди...*, 53. – On architectural measuring units of ancient Rus', see Б. А. РЫБАКОВ, *Архитектурная математика древнерусских зодчих*, Советская археология № 1 (1957); Л. Н. БОЛЬШАКОВА, *Метрический анализ древнерусских храмов XI-XII вв.*, in: Древнерусское искусство. Художественная культура X – первой половины XIII в., отв. ред. А. И. Комеч – О. И. Подобедова, Москва 1988.

¹¹² D. DĄBROWSKI, *Źródła pisane do dziejów zespołu wieżowego w stolpiu*, Zespół wieżowy w Stolpiu.

¹¹³ ПСРЛ, Москва 1998, т. II, стб. 733-734. – A Galician princess who became a nun is usually referred to under the year 1219 or early 1220 (М. ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, *Хронологія подій Галицько-Волинської літописи*, ЗНТШ ХLI (Львів 1901) 16, 63; Л. Є. МАХНОВЕЦЬ [Коментар], *Літопис Руський*. За Іпатським списком переклав Л. Махновець, Київ 1989, 377.

¹¹⁴ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 735. – On the dating of this embassy, see: E. GUDAVIČIUS, *Mindaugas*, Vilnius 1998, 118, 137 (1219 r.).

boyars persuaded the vacillating Daniel to accept the king's crown from Pope Innocent IV.¹¹⁵

Thus, the results of the architectural and archaeological investigations made of the structures at Stolpie are strongly indicative of the close ties that existed between its dwellers and the cultural traditions of Byzantium, in particular, the traditions of monastic life among the Byzantine aristocracy. The evidence of the written sources suggests that the most likely proprietor of the monastery might have been Daniel Romanovich's mother. Since she was evidently of Byzantine origin, A. BUKO suggested that the princess would have been accompanied by courtiers who were familiar with the tradition of building structures that were characteristic for the medieval monastic architecture in Northern Greece.¹¹⁶

In our opinion, an alternative explanation is more probable. After living in Rus' for almost twenty years after her marriage and before becoming a nun, hardly anyone could be found in the environment of the Galician-Volhynian princess who had been connected with that specific practice of monastic life of the Byzantine aristocracy. At least we know nothing about such people. Indeed, it is unknown whether there were any Greeks or Byzantines in her environment at all. Therefore, "Roman's Grand Princess" herself must have shown such a preference by choosing the form of a cloister with which she was familiar. Her choice testifies to the fact that she could have had a personal experience of living in a traditional Greek nunnery during her early life at home.

The commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral on the Greek relatives of the German Queen Maria and her sister Euphrosyne

In the commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral – the ancient (since the Salian dynasty) burial place of German kings, where Philip of Swabia and his wife Irene were buried – Irene's Greek relatives are mentioned more than once. She is referred to under August 27 under the name of Maria that she was given in Germany. The testimony in the book that Maria was the wife of King Philip and came from Greece eliminates any doubts about her identity: „Aug[ust] 27. VI cal[end] of Sept[ember]. Queen Maria, the wife of King Philip, born a Greek, died“.¹¹⁷

Queen Irene-Maria indeed died on 27 August 1208 due to preterm labor, outliving by only two months her husband Philip, who had been

¹¹⁵ ПСРЛ, т. II, стрб. 827.

¹¹⁶ A. BUKO, *Na pogramiczu kultur i ideologii...*, 202.

¹¹⁷ «Aug. 27. VI. kal. sept. Maria regina, Philippi regis contextalis, obiit, nata de Grecia». – *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, Fontes rerum Germanicarum, hrsq. von J. F. Boehmer, Stuttgart 1868, t. IV, 323.

assassinated on June 21.¹¹⁸ At first she was buried at Lorsch (near Darmstadt). A few years later, however, her remains were reburied in the Speyer Cathedral. In 1214 the coffin with the remains of Philip, who originally had been buried in Bamberg, was also brought to Speyer and laid in the place that had been specially prepared for him and his spouse.¹¹⁹

Immediately following the commemoration of Queen Maria, in the same record of the Speyer commemoration book under August 27, there is a long list of valuables that she donated to the cathedral. After that her parents, as well as brother and sister are mentioned (later they are mentioned again separately under different dates): „... then she (Queen Maria – A. M.) established that [on] Martin’s octave the anniversary of her father and mother should be observed, and her father was Isaac and her mother was Irene, and the anniversary of her brother and sister should be observed on the third day after the feast of St Michael, and her brother was Manuel and her sister was Euphrosyne.“¹²⁰

From the above record we learn that the name of Irene-Maria’s sister was Euphrosyne. Since the German Queen had only one sister – Isaac II’s eldest daughter from the first marriage, this name could belong only to her.

The name of Isaac II’s eldest daughter, which Niketas Choniates for some reason did not give (although the historian did give the name of his second daughter Irene¹²¹), is also not found in other Byzantine sources. Evidently, that is also the reason why most current studies and reference books on the history of Byzantium do not name Isaac’s eldest daughter.¹²² The records of the Speyer commemoration book fill this gap.

E. WINKELMANN, who was one of the first German historians to study the evidence of Queen Irene-Maria’s relatives in the commemoration book, noted that, after becoming a widow for the second time after Philip was killed, at the end of her life she lost all her relatives, i.e. mother,

¹¹⁸ For details, see A. BIHRER, *König Philipp von Schwaben – Bamberg, 21. Juni 1208*, in: *Politische Morde. Vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*, hrsg. von M. Sommer, Darmstadt 2005, 117-126.

¹¹⁹ C. EHLERS, *Metropolis Germaniae: Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum (751-1250)*, Göttingen 1996, 180; R. HIESTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos und seine Kinder*, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 57 (1997) 203.

¹²⁰ «...statuit preterea, ut in octava Martini anniversarium patris eius et matris eius celebretur, patre scilicet Ysaac et matre Herina, fratris vero eius et sororis eius tertia die post festum Michaelis celebretur, Manuel fratre et Effrosina». – *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, 323.

¹²¹ *Никита Хониат, История, начинающаяся с царствования Иоанна Комнина*, т. II, пер. под ред. проф. Н. В. Чельцова, Санкт Петербург 1862, 180.

¹²² *The Byzantine Empire*, ed. by J. M. Hussey (= Cambridge medieval history, t. 4), Cambridge 1967, 795; M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire. A Political History, 1025-1204*, London 1984, 267-283; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, New York – Oxford 1991, vol I, 65, vol. II, 1012.

father, sisters and brothers.¹²³ A number of modern authors share WINKELMANN's view.¹²⁴

These statements are probably based on the assumption that Irene-Maria herself entered the names of her relatives in the commemoration book. Moreover, it was most likely assumed that one can pray in church for the repose of souls of only those who were deceased. Therefore, Irene-Maria's relatives mentioned in the Speyer commemoration book (including her sister Euphrosyne) must have died during her lifetime.

However, it was not so. Euphrosyne's brother Manuel is mentioned together with his sister in the commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral. According to this record, they were both commemorated on the same day – „on the third day after the feast of St Michael“ or on October 1: „Oct[ober] 1. Manuel, Queen Maria's brother, and her sister Euphrosyne died, whose anniversary she (Queen Maria – A. M.) ordered to celebrate”.¹²⁵

The coincidence in the dates raises doubts concerning their trustworthiness. After all, it is known that Irene-Maria's brother Manuel (Isaac II's son from his second marriage with Margaret of Hungary) was still alive at the time of his sister's death – he died only in 1212.¹²⁶ Therefore, two explanations are possible: either the record of his death must have been entered in the commemoration book a few years after the death of Irene-Maria, or the queen herself entered it, unaware of his fate and assuming that he had died.

The same can be said concerning the record of Euphrosyne's death. The manner of recording the commemoration date of Irene-Maria's brother and sister convincingly shows that this date has nothing to do with the actual dates of the deaths of the one or the other. The fact that the commemoration dates of two different people were set for the same day coinciding with the feast of the Archangel Michael¹²⁷ probably indicates that the compiler of the commemoration book did not know the actual dates of the deaths of Manuel and Euphrosyne.

Timing the commemoration of the brother and sister of the queen to coincide with the feast of the Archangel Michael is clearly associated with

¹²³ E. WINKELMANN, *Philipp von Schwaben und Otto IV von Braunschweig*, Leipzig 1873, Bd. I, 474.

¹²⁴ O. ENGELS, *Die keiserliche Grablege im Speyer Dom und die Staufer*, in: *Papstgeschichte und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift für H. Jakobs*, Köln 1995, 249f.

¹²⁵ «Oct. 1. Manuel frater Mariae reginae et Effrosina soror eiusdem obierunt, quorum anniversarium ipsa constituit celebrari». – *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, 324.

¹²⁶ C. EHLERS, *Metropolis Germaniae...*, 180, Anm. 469.

¹²⁷ The feast was created in 493 by Pope Gelasius I (493-496). – *The Catholic encyclopedia: an international work of reference on the constitution, doctrine, and history of the Catholic church*, ed. by Ch. G. Herbermann, New York 1913, vol. 10, 275sq.

the widespread belief in the Western Church in the Middle Ages about this saint. He was looked upon as the patron and protector of the souls of all the dead, who helped the righteous souls go to heaven. The Gospel of Nicodemus (IV c.), the Revelation of Paul (late IV c.) and other Christian apocrypha attributed to Michael the ritual ablution of repentant souls of the dead before they enter the Heavenly Jerusalem, and even the return of the souls of the righteous from hell. The theme of Archangel Michael weighing the souls of sinners on the Day of Judgment became a traditional motif in medieval iconography of the Last Judgment.¹²⁸

The choice of the third day after the feast of St Michael for the commemoration day of the queen's brother and sister was determined by the consideration that on feast days (with few exceptions) no services were held for the dead. On those days no public praying for the dead was allowed in church even in the form of private worship.¹²⁹ Therefore, the commemoration of the dead in the church could be held only following all the festive services.

In the Middle Ages Archangel Michael was shown special honor in Germany. This personage of the New Testament, the victor over Satan, was named the patron of the German state (Schutzpatron Deutschlands).¹³⁰ Beginning with the tenth century, the image of the Archangel is always depicted on German military banners. According to legend, the victory at Lechfeld (at Augsburg) in 955 was won by the troops of the King of East Francia Otto I (936-973) thanks to the intervention of St Michael. In the battle the German forces defeated the Hungarians therewith stopping their further expansion into Europe and contributing to the coronation of Otto in Rome and the creation of the Holy Roman Empire (962).¹³¹ Apparently, the feast of St Michael in the German Church in the Middle Ages could last several days.

¹²⁸ See J. P. ROHLAND, *Der Erzengel Michael. Arzt und Feldherr: zwei Aspekte des vor- und frühbyzantinischen Michaelskultes*, Leiden 1977; Ф. АРЬЕС, *Час смерти. Память о жизни*, in: Ф. АРЬЕС, *Человек перед лицом смерти*, Москва 1992. – См. также: *Culto e santuari di san Michele nell'Europa medievale*, in: *Culte et sanctuaires de saint Michel dans l'Europe médiévale. Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi, Bari, Monte Sant'Angelo, 5-8 aprile 2006*, ed. P. Bouet – G. Otranto – A. Vauchez, Bari 2007.

¹²⁹ See Афанасий (Сахаров), *архиепископ. Поминование усопших по Уставу Православной церкви*, Санкт Петербург 1999.

¹³⁰ See FR. SCHELLENS, *Erzengel Michael 'Schutzpatron' der Deutschen?* Düsseldorf 1936; M. MÜLLER, «St. Michael – der Deutschen Schutzpatron?» *Zur Verehrung des Erzengels*, in: *Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Langwaden 2005.

¹³¹ Details see K. VON WALLEMICH, *Die Ungarnschlacht auf dem Lechfelde*, München 1907; Th. VON BOGYAY, *Lechfeld – Ende und Anfang. Geschichtliche Hintergründe, ideeller Inhalt und Folgen der Ungarnzüge. Ein Beitrag zur Tausendjahrfeier des Sieges am Lechfeld*, München 1955; CH. R. BOWLUS, *The Battle of Lechfeld and its Aftermath, August 955. The End of the Age of Migrations in the Latin West*, Aldershot – Burlington 2006.

Nonetheless, October 1 cannot be identified as the actual date of death of the Byzantine Princess Euphrosyne. Even if we assume that the day of her death did fall on the third day of the feast of St Michael, it would correspond to October 1 only in the Latin church calendar. Euphrosyne, however, belonged to the Orthodox faith that used a different calendar. It celebrated the main feast of St Michael – the Synaxis of St Michael the Archangel and the Angelic Hosts – on November 8. This feast was established in the fourth century by the Local Council of Laodicea and entered into the menologion of the Eastern Church.¹³²

The only satisfactory explanation for such an arbitrary dating may be the reality that Irene-Maria, living in Germany, was ignorant of the fates of her brother and sister, who had also left their homeland and had lost touch with each other. Consequently, she recorded the commemoration of her brother and sister in the church book without knowing if they were dead or alive.

The date October 1 was apparently recorded in the commemoration book as the date of the deaths of Manuel and Euphrosyne in 1214, in relation to the reburial of the remains of King Philip and his wife Irene in the Speyer Cathedral. It was at that time that the commemoration dates of the queen's Greek relatives were finally determined. The annual prayers for her relatives were also entered into the book and rich donations were given for the building's upkeep.

The Speyer canons adopted the same procedure in establishing the commemoration day of Irene-Maria's father, Basileus Isaac. Apparently, they did not know the exact date of his death (which, incidentally, is also unknown to modern scholars¹³³). Therefore, Isaac was mentioned under the same day as his spouse, Queen Irene-Maria's mother, who was also called Irene in the commemoration book: „Nov[ember] 18. XIII cal[end] of Dec[ember]. Isaac, Queen Maria's father, and her mother Irene died, whose anniversary she (Queen Irene – A. M.) determined to celebrate”.¹³⁴ In the Catholic calendar November 18 is the eighth day or the „octave“ of St Martin of Tours (he died in 397). He is one of the most revered saints of the Western Church (his feast day is commemorated on November 11).¹³⁵

Irene-Maria would have remembered the day of her mother's death since she died when the young Byzantine princess was still living in her

¹³² Сергей (Спасский), архиепископ. Полный месяцеслов Востока в 3-х тт., Москва 1997, т. II, 348.

¹³³ Isaac II died on an undetermined date between about 28/29 January and 8 February 1204. His son Alex IV had him killed before 8 February (R. HIESTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos...*, 207).

¹³⁴ «Nov. 18. XIII. kal. dec. Ysaac pater Mariae reginae et Herina mater eiusdem obierunt, quorum anniversarium ipsa constituit celebrari». – *Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius*, 325.

¹³⁵ *The Catholic encyclopedia*, vol. 9, 731sq. (St Martin of Tours).

parental home.¹³⁶ The date of her mother's death, therefore, may have been the only trustworthy date of death concerning Irene-Maria's Greek relatives mentioned in the Speyer commemoration book.

Nevertheless, the combination of the dates of death of the queen's father and mother and associating them with the feast of St Martin suggests that in this case the date is also conditional. The most important religious festivals are celebrated for seven days, with the octave falling on the eighth day. This custom dates back to the Old Testament and is typical for both the Latin and the Byzantine churches celebrating post-feast days and the leave-taking of the feast.¹³⁷ The choice of the octave of St Martin of Tours as the commemoration day of the queen's father and mother undoubtedly reflected some particular association that her family had to this saint.

The Speyer list of Irene-Maria's Greek relatives is incomplete. It fails to mention her stepmother Margaret of Hungary, as well as two of her younger brothers – the full brother Alexios (who became Emperor Alexios IV) and the stepbrother John. Irene must have known about the death of the first in February of 1204 because this fact was widely publicized. One can agree with the assumption of R. HINSTAND that the list of Irene's Greek relatives reconstructed in the Speyer commemoration book reflects her personal relations with each one of them.¹³⁸

The Report of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle on the circumstances of the murder of the “Roman Tsar” Philip

It seems that “Roman's Grand Princess” maintained some form of contact with her sister, the German Queen Irene-Maria, up until the death of the latter in 1208. The Galician-Volhynian chronicle reports on the murder of King Philip of Swabia and the related circumstances. Only a person who was well acquainted with German affairs and knew the secret details of the tragic events in Bamberg on 21 June 1208 could have provided such information: „Great King Philip of Rome was killed at the instigation of the Queen's brother, who persuaded his sister to find him an ally. She, however, could do nothing to help her brother except to give her daughter [in marriage] to Louis, the son of the Landgrave, as [he] was a powerful man and her brother's ally.“¹³⁹

¹³⁶ Irene was married in 1193, but her mother died about ten years earlier (Κ. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, т. 2, 814).

¹³⁷ *The Catholic encyclopedia*, vol. 11, 204 sq. (Octave).

¹³⁸ R. HINSTAND, *Die erste Ehe Isaaks II. Angelos...*, 207.

¹³⁹ «Оубьен бысть царь великий Филипп Римский советомъ брата королевое, молящеся сестре, да бы ему нашла помощника. Она же, никако могоущи помощи братоу своему си, и да дщерь свою за Лонокрабовича за Лоудовика, бе бо моужь силенъ и помощникъ братоу ее». – ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 723.

This report refers to the involvement of Duke Ekbert of Andechs, Bishop of Bamberg, the brother of the Hungarian Queen Gertrude (the wife of Andrew II), in the murder of King Philip.¹⁴⁰ Being afraid of suffering retribution he fled to Hungary. To help her brother, Gertrude gave her daughter Kunigunde (Kineka) in marriage to Louis IV, Landgrave of Thuringia, in the hope that he would become Ekbert's ally.¹⁴¹

This news relating events that happened so far from Halych, events that were not mentioned in any other chronicle of Rus', requires an explanation. A number of researchers have linked it to the young Daniel Romanovich's stay at the court of the Hungarian King in 1211. It also coincided with the departure to Thuringia of Princess Kunigunde, who had been expected to become Daniel's bride.¹⁴²

We cannot accept this explanation. It is true that the Hungarian King Andrew II was for a time considering marrying one of his daughters to Daniel Romanovich. He even intended to make Daniel his heir. This though had been the King's plan only until his own son and heir was born: „[When] Daniel was in Hungary, King Andrew and the Hungarian nobles, and all the people wanted to give his daughter [in marriage] to Prince Daniel – both of them were children – because he (the King – A. M.) did not have a son.“¹⁴³

In 1206, however, an heir was born to Andrew II – his eldest son and the future king of Hungary, Bela IV (1235-1270). Accordingly, Andrew could have expressed his intention to become related by marriage to Daniel Romanovich no later than that year, and the Hungarian Princess, the bride to be, also could not have been born later than that year. Since Princess Kunigunde (Kineka), who married the Landgrave of Thuringia

¹⁴⁰ Concerning this murder and Duke Ekbert's possible motives, see B. U. HUCKER, *Der Königsmord von 1208 – Privatrathe oder Staatsstreich?*, in: *Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken. Europäisches Fürstentum im Mittelalter*, Mainz 1998; A. BIHRER, *König Philipp von Schwaben – Bamberg, 21. Juni 1208*, in: *Politische Morde. Vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*, hrsg. M. Sommer, Darmstadt 2005.

¹⁴¹ See G. ZIMMERMANN, *Ekbert von Andechs, Bischof von Bamberg (1203-1237)*, in: *Dieses große Fest aus Stein. Lesebuch zum 750. Weihejubiläum*, hrsg. von H.-G. Röhrig, Bamberg 1987; S. BEULERTZ, *Ekbert von Andechs. Bischof von Bamberg (1203-1237)*, *Fränkische Lebensbilder 17* (Würzburg 1998) (= *Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Fränkische Geschichte, Reihe VII A*); H. FLACHENECKER, *Ekbert von Andechs (um 1175-1237)*, in: *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen römischen Reiches 1198-1448. Ein biographisches Lexikon*, hrsg. von E. Gatz, Berlin 2001.

¹⁴² М. ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, *Хронологія подій Галицько-Волинської літописи*, 11. – For commentators who accepted Grushevski's assumption refer to the latest edition of the Galicia-Volyn chronicle: *Галицько-Волинська літопись. Текст. Коментарій. Исследование*, под ред. Н. Ф. Котляра, Санкт Петербург 2005, 195.

¹⁴³ «Данилови соущо во Оугрехъ, король же Андреи, и бояре Оугорьстеи, и вся земля хотяше дати дщерь свою за князя Данила, – обеима детьскома бывшима, – зане сына оу него не бе». – ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 723.

Louis IV in 1211, was born in 1207, she cannot be identified as the Hungarian princess that was slated to become Daniel's bride.¹⁴⁴

Andrew's only daughter whom he could have intended to become Daniel's wife before Bela's birth was his eldest daughter Maria. She was born in 1204, and in 1221, she married the Bulgarian Tsar Ivan II Asen (1218-1241). She became the mother of Kaliman I, the Tsar of Bulgaria (1241-1246) (in Bulgarian sources she appears as Anna).¹⁴⁵ Therefore, the assumption that the report on the murder of Philip of Swabia was included in the Galician-Volhynian chronicle in connection with the matrimonial affairs of Daniel Romanovich should be rejected.

In our opinion, the Galician chronicler may have been interested in this event only because of the importance given to it by the Galician princely family and, above all, by "Roman's Grand Princess". At that time in Halych only the relatives of the victims would have had a personal interest in the tragic death of the German King followed by that of his wife, as well as in finding out who perpetrated the crime. Those relatives were Princess Euphrosyne and her children. Perhaps, the deceased German Queen Irene was revered in Halych, just as the repose of her elder sister Euphrosyne's soul was prayed for in the Speyer Cathedral.

The Name Euphrosyne of the daughters and granddaughters of Roman Mstislavich

The name of the eldest daughter of Isaac II – Euphrosyne – mentioned in the commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral is additional important evidence that helps to identify her.

For a long time scholars have observed that the personal names of medieval rulers are an important tool in studying their genealogy and dynastic ties. Often certain names were passed on from one generation to the next, thus assuming a dynastic character: through them one can at times trace the family relationships of their owners. Such dynastic names can be found among the four generations of Roman Mstislavich's descendants – children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and great-great-grandchildren. As observed by H. GRALA and L. V. VOITOVICH, the most popular male names for Roman's descendants were Daniel, Roman, Vasilko and Lev.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ For detailed biographical information about Andrew II and his family, see *Korai magyar történeti Lexikon (9-14. század)*. Töszerkesztő Gy. Kristó; szerkesztők P. Engel – F. Makk, Budapest 1994.

¹⁴⁵ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Фамилията на Асеневици (1186-1460)*. *Генеалогия и просопография*, София 1985, 87; Г. Н. НИКОЛОВ, *Венгры в Болгарском царстве в XIII-XIV веках*, in: *Byzance et ses voisins. Mélanges à la mémoire de Gy. Moravcsik*, Szeged 1994, 78-79.

¹⁴⁶ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścislawicza*, 124-125; Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Князівські династії Східної Європи (кінець IX-початок XVI ст.)*. *Склад*,

A number of characteristics of female names in the Rurikid dynasty are especially noteworthy. As established by A. F. LITVINA and F. B. USPENSKII, these names “turn out to be a most essential element of dynastic strategy related to both the kin’s domestic policy and its outward aspirations”. The reality is that the «history of female names as such is closely connected with the history of the exchange of names between the two branches of kin, and often between two different dynasties entering into an alliance through marriage”.¹⁴⁷

Female names could be inherited from the mother’s kin, thus consolidating the inter-kin relations that had recently come into being. Using the names of relatives from the female side in the naming practice underscored the high rank of the woman who had entered the marriage.¹⁴⁸ We should also note that not only personal names given at birth were significantly influenced by family traditions, but also the new Christian names taken by princes’ daughters and wives at a more mature age (e.g. baptismal or monastic names). Most of those names, as modern experts put it, can be considered “quite traditional for a dynasty” and sometimes even “hypertraditional”.¹⁴⁹

Acquiring a monastic name in the princely environment did not mean the loss of the former personal name, thus creating the phenomenon of Christian double names. If a prince or a princess acquired a new name when taking monastic vows, it came into family use just as the former baptismal name had done. In other words, monastic names of ancestors could be used for descendants along with their baptismal names. On taking the vows, Rurikid dynasts could take the names that used to be the monastic names of their ancestors; at the same time the monastic names of ancestors were just as often given to descendants as secular Christian names. Moreover, while the repetition of a secular name of an ancestor for princes could mean the succession of family privileges, the repetition of monastic names was a way of honoring the ancestors who had renounced the worldly life.¹⁵⁰

Thus we see that in the family of Emperor Isaac II there was also a tradition of choosing for new born daughters the names of their closest kinswomen from the previous generations – e.g. the mother and the grandmother. Thanks to the data of the Speyer commemoration book, we know that Isaac’s eldest daughter was given the name of his mother

суспільна і політична роль. Історико-генеалогічне дослідження, Львів 2000, 370.

¹⁴⁷ А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей в X-XVI вв. Династическая история сквозь призму антропониимики*, Москва 2006, 238.

¹⁴⁸ Ibidem, 256.

¹⁴⁹ Ibidem, 240-241.

¹⁵⁰ For details see ibidem, 175-178 sq.

Euphrosyne Kastamonitissa.¹⁵¹ The name of his first wife Irene was given to his next eldest daughter from the first marriage; she later became the German Queen Irene-Maria.

One would expect the said names to be repeated in the following generation of the female descendants of Emperor Isaac. It seems that in the case of the name Euphrosyne such expectations proved to be justified.

Among the large number of Greek names given to the descendants of the Galician-Volhynian Prince Roman Mstislavich and his second wife (in the first and in the second generation) one comes across the name Euphrosyne that was seldom used in Old Rus'.

In the academic and reference literature on the genealogy of the Rurikid dynasty, only some ten instances of Rus' princesses with the name Euphrosyne are cited for the entire period of the dynasty's history (up to the late sixteenth century). In the pre-Mongol period only five such cases are noted (with part of them being monastic names).¹⁵² Consequently, it is more remarkable that, among the nearest descendants of Roman Mstislavich and his second wife, the name Euphrosyne is found more than once. One can mention at least two such cases.

As far as one can judge, that was the name of one of Roman Mstislavich's daughters, about whom, unfortunately, not much information is available. She is referred to only in foreign sources that have contradictory information.

The German eighteenth-century historian Elias Roisner reports that the Polish Prince Świętopełk II of Pomerania (1215-1266) was married to the daughter of a certain Russian Roman (Romar) named Salome ("Salome fil. Romari Russi").¹⁵³ Similar data is found in the works of a number of other authors from the sixteenth – eighteenth centuries (Thomas KANTZOW, Wolfgang JOBST, Friedrich Wilhelm von SOMMERSBERG, etc.).¹⁵⁴

At the same time, according to a number of medieval sources, the first wife of Świętopełk II was named Euphrosyne. The commemoration book

¹⁵¹ Isaac II was born probably in September 1156 and was the sixth son of Andronicos Ducos Angelos (ca. 1115-1185) and Euphrosyne Kastamonitos (ca. 1125-between 1185 and 1195) (Κ. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, t. 2, 807sq.).

¹⁵² Л. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Князівські династії Східної Європи...*, 609; Д. В. ДОНСКОЙ, *Рюриковичи. Исторический словарь*, Москва 2008, 766; D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia Mściławowiczów...*, 780. – The complete list includes nine instances in XII-XIV centuries. – А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей...*, 544-545.

¹⁵³ *Elias Reusner, Basilikon opus genealogicum catholicum de praecipuis familiis imperatorum, regum, principum, aliorumque procerum orbis Christiani*, Francofurti 1592, t. I, 468.

¹⁵⁴ See E. RYMAR, *Rodowód książąt pomorskich*, Szczecin 1995, t. I, 270; D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, Poznań – Wrocław 2002, 265-266.

of the Cistercian monastery of Santa Maria de Oliva located in the Prussian town of Oliva near Danzig (Gdansk) gives the exact date of her death – 23 September 1235.¹⁵⁵ Euphrosyne is mentioned for the first time in a Pomeranian document dated about 1220.¹⁵⁶

Historians have expressed different views concerning the origin and the name of the first wife of Świętopełk of Pomerania.¹⁵⁷ In agreement with N. A. BAUMGARTEN, most scholars believe her to be the daughter of the Galician-Volhynian Prince Roman Mstislavich whose name was Salome.¹⁵⁸ A number of historians consider it more correct to name her Euphrosyne or Salome- Euphrosyne, with one of the names being the monastic one.¹⁵⁹

In our view, the name of the first wife of Świętopełk II – Euphrosyne – that is confirmed by reliable medieval sources is more trustworthy. It is possible that the discrepancies between the sources may have arisen owing to the name change of Świętopełk's wife from Rus' due to her marriage and to the influence of her new cultural environment: the Rus' dynastic name *Euphrosyne* could have been replaced (or supplemented) by the Polish dynastic name *Salome*. At the same time, the question of the origin of this princess, namely, whether she was the daughter of Roman Mstislavich or of his son Daniel, remains open.

One is on surer ground concerning another use of the name Euphrosyne by the descendants of Roman Mstislavich and his second wife. One of their daughters, as established by H. GRALA and D. DĄBROWSKI, named Elena, was given in marriage to Michael Vsevolodovich, Prince of Chernigov, ca. 1212. In this marriage three daughters were born, one of whom was named Euphrosyne.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁵ *Liber mortuorum monasterii beatae Mariae de Oliva ordinis Cisterciensis*, ed. W. Kętrzyński, Monumenta Poloniae historica, Lwów 1888, t. V, 525.

¹⁵⁶ *Pommerellisches Urkundenbuch*, bearb. von M. Perlbach, Danzig 1882, Nr. 18.

¹⁵⁷ For an overview of these opinions, see D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, 267.

¹⁵⁸ N. DE BAUMGARTEN, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes*, Tabl. XI, 48; В. Т. ПАШУТО, *Очерки по истории Галицко-Волынской Руси*, Москва 1950, 208; idem, *Внешняя политика Древней Руси*, Москва 1968, 251, 296, 357, прим. 15; J. FORSSMANN, *Die Beziehungen altrussischer Fürstentugeschlechter zu Westeuropa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Ost- und Nordeuropas im Mittelalter*, Bern 1970, Taf. VII; D. SCHWENNICKÉ, *Europäische Stammtafeln. Stammtafeln zur Geschichte europäischen Staaten*, Marburg 1984, Bd. II, Taf. 136; Л. Є. МАХНОВЕЦЬ [Примітки], *Літопис Руський...*, 385, прим. до 6737 р.; М. Ф. КОТЛЯР, *Галицько-Волинська Русь*, Київ 1998, 276.

¹⁵⁹ L. QUANDT, *Ostpommern, seine Fürsten, fürstlichen Landestheilungen und Distrikte*, Baltische Studien [Alte Folge] 16/1 (Stettin 1856) 101; A. HOFMAISTER, *Genealogische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des pommerschen Herzogshauses*, Greifswalder Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Greifswald 11 (1938) 44; Л. В. ВОЙТОВИЧ, *Княжа доба на Русі: портрети еліти*, Біла Церква 2006, 495.

¹⁶⁰ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścistawicza*, 125-126; D. DĄBROWSKI,

More exactly, the name Euphrosyne of the said granddaughter of Roman Mstislavich and his second wife was a monastic one. Betrothed to Fedor Yaroslavich, the elder brother of Alexander Nevsky, the princess took the veil after his sudden death (1227) and became well-known for her Christian deeds. In the sixteenth century she was canonized under the name of Euphrosyne of Suzdal.¹⁶¹

The reflection of the cult of St Euphrosyne in the naming traditions of Rus' princes

The name Euphrosyne was popular not only in the family of the Galician-Volhynian prince. It is also found several times among the closest descendants of Yuri Dolgoruky of Suzdalia. His daughter, Olga, took vows before her death under the name Euphrosyne.¹⁶² Two of Yuri's granddaughters were named Euphrosyne: one was the daughter of Boris Yurievich, Prince of Belgorod and Turov, and is known to us only from the chronicle report of her death.¹⁶³ The other was the daughter of the Galician Prince Yaroslav Osmomysl and the said Olga-Euphrosyne Yurievna and became the main female character of the Tale of Igor's Campaign.¹⁶⁴ Euphrosyne Rostislavna – the great-niece of Olga-Euphrosyne, the granddaughter of Vsevolod Big Nest and the Kievan Prince Rurik Rostislavich – was also baptized with that name.¹⁶⁵

A. F. LITVINA and F. B. USPENSKII suggest that a family cult of St Euphrosyne may have been initiated among the descendants of Yuri Dolgoruky owing to the influence of Euphrosyne of Polotsk.¹⁶⁶ Having distinguished herself for her monastic life, which she had voluntarily chosen at an early age, Euphrosyne (born Predslava, the daughter of Georgy Vseslavich, Prince of Polotsk) in her later years made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where she died.¹⁶⁷ She was not canonized until the Council of 1547. Nevertheless, her veneration began in the pre-Mongol period, when the first version of her hagiography was composed and Church worship of the nun-princess began.¹⁶⁸

Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich, 51-59; idem, *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów*, 296-300.

¹⁶¹ А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей...*, 619-620.

¹⁶² ПСРЛ, Москва 1997, т. I, стб. 389; т. II, стб. 624.

¹⁶³ Ibidem, т. I, стб. 417.

¹⁶⁴ А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей...*, 544-545, 592-593.

¹⁶⁵ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 708.

¹⁶⁶ А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей...*, 178.

¹⁶⁷ For details see: А. В. НАЗАРЕНКО, *Древняя Русь на международных путях. Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX-XII веков*, Москва 2001, 632-633.

¹⁶⁸ Е. М. ВОРОНОВА, *Житие Евфросинии Полоцкой*, in: *Словарь книжности и*

It should be noted, however, that the dynasty of Polotsk alienated itself from the rest of the Rurikides as early as the eleventh century. It engaged in a persistent political struggle, in particular, with the descendants of Vladimir Monomakh. One of the most striking moments in this conflict was the exile of the princes of Polotsk to Byzantium by Monomakh's son, the Kievan Prince Mstislav Vladimirovich.¹⁶⁹ No close contacts existed between the princes of Polotsk and the family of Yuri Dolgoruky in the mid – late twelfth century.

In our opinion, it would be more correct to connect the appearance of the name Euphrosyne among Yuri's descendants with his second marriage. This was concluded with an unidentified noble Byzantine woman, who gave birth to his younger sons – Mstislav, Vasilko, Mikhailko and Vsevolod, and two daughters, including Olga-Euphrosyne.¹⁷⁰ In 1162, after the death of Dolgoruky, his second wife together with his sons was exiled to Byzantium by Andrei Bogolyubsky (Yuri's son from the first marriage). There, according to the chronicle report, Emperor Manuel gave them a warm welcome and granted them four cities on the Danube and the "Otskalana" region.¹⁷¹ The Byzantine historian John Kinnamos confirms this information. He states that „the basileus gave to Vasilko, the son of Georgy, who had come and who had seniority among the phylarches of the Tauro-Scythian country“, „the lands at the Istros (Danube – A. M.)“.¹⁷²

A. P. KAZHDAN questions the hypothesis of the Byzantine origin of Dolgoruky's second wife pointing out that the sources do not confirm this.¹⁷³ Yet, there is such evidence available to researchers.

The information in which we are interested was found on the remains of the frescos in the Church of Sts Boris and Gleb in the village of Kideksha near Suzdal, where in the middle of the twelfth century Yuri Dolgoruky built a country residence. Constructed in 1152, the church was

книжников Древней Руси, Ленинград 1987, вып. 1; Н. С. СЕРЕГИНА, *Песнопения русским святым. По материалам рукописной певческой книги XI-XIX вв.*, «Стихирарь месячный», Санкт Петербург 1994, 346; Б. Н. ФЛОРЯ, *Историческая традиция об общественном строе средневекового Полоцка*, Отечественная история № 5 (1995) 112.

¹⁶⁹ Л. В. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, *Полоцкая земля в IX-XIII вв.*, Москва 1966, 257-262; idem, *Западные земли домонгольской Руси. Очерки истории, археологии, культуры*, Москва 2006, кн. 2, 14-15; Г. В. ШТЫХОВ, *Древний Полоцк*, Минск 1975, 16 и др.

¹⁷⁰ See E. В. ПЧЕЛОВ, *Генеалогия семьи Юрия Долгорукого*, Ruthenica III (2004).

¹⁷¹ ПСРЛ, т. II, стб. 521. – See also М. В. ЛЕВЧЕНКО, *Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношений*, 469, 485.

¹⁷²¹ М. В. БИБИКОВ, *Византийский историк Иоанн Киннам о Руси и народах Восточной Европы*, Москва 1997, 67.

¹⁷³ А. KAZHDAN, *Rus' – Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 423-424.

painted a few decades later, when it became a princely burial vault. The already mentioned Prince Boris Yurievich, his wife Maria and daughter Euphrosyne were buried in this church.¹⁷⁴

In 1946-1947, in the arcosolium (burial niche) of the northern wall of the church, to the right of the large painting of *Our Lady of the Sign* made in the second half of the nineteenth century, an old image of a female saint was discovered. After the nineteenth-century painting was removed, a twin image was exposed on the left.¹⁷⁵ An examination of the images performed in the course of their restoration revealed that in the right part of the niche there is the image of St Mary. This was confirmed by the remains of the inscription that can be read on the both sides of her nimbus: "...а Ма...на" – "Agia Maria" (Saint Mary). This image is undoubtedly situated near the sarcophagus of Princess Maria († 1161), located in the northern arcosolium of the church.¹⁷⁶ The other sarcophagus is in the opposite southern arcosolium, and in it, one may presume, lie the remains of Prince Boris († 1159). Both sarcophagi, made in the form of simple rectangular stone trapezium-shaped cases, have survived to our time. Each is still located in its original place in the arcosolia of the church of Sts Boris and Gleb.¹⁷⁷

One would assume that the female figure depicted in the left part of the northern arcosolium is the namesake saint of the daughter of Boris and Maria, Euphrosyne, who died in 1202 and was buried in this church. However, the portrayal of the supposed saint is unusual for St Euphrosyne. She is dressed in splendid imperial garments made of gold- and pearl-embroidered purple cloth with a gold stemma (crown) on her head and a halo.¹⁷⁸

Researchers are unanimous in identifying her as a Greek princess, the wife of Yuri Dolgoruky, who is depicted next to St Mary.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ Н. Н. ВОРОНИН, *Зодчество Северо-Восточной Руси XII-XV вв.*, Москва 1961, т. I, 67-76; П. А. РАПОПОРТ, *Русская архитектура X-XIII вв. Каталог памятников*, Ленинград 1982 (= *Археология СССР. Свод археологических источников*, вып. Е 1-47), 60-61; *Свод памятников архитектуры и монументального искусства России. Владимирская область: В 6-ти частях*. Отв. ред. В. В. Седов, Москва 2004, ч. 1., 37; С. В. ЗАГРАЕВСКИЙ, *Новые исследования памятников архитектуры Владимиро-Суздальского музея-заповедника*, Москва 2008, Гл. 4.

¹⁷⁵ Н. СЫЧЕВ, *Предполагаемое изображение жены Юрия Долгорукого*, in: *Сообщения Института истории искусств Академии Наук СССР*, Москва – Ленинград 1951, Вып. 1.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, 55-56.

¹⁷⁷ Т. Д. ПАНОВА, *Каменные гробы в погребальном обряде русского средневековья (XI- XVII вв.)*, *Russia mediaevalis X/1* (München 2001) 159.

¹⁷⁸ Н. СЫЧЕВ, *Предполагаемое изображение жены Юрия Долгорукого*, 56.

¹⁷⁹ Н. СЫЧЕВ, *Предполагаемое изображение жены Юрия Долгорукого*, 56; Н. Н. ВОРОНИН, *Владимир, Боголюбово, Суздаль, Юрьев-Польской*, Москва 1967, 248; Г. К. ВАГНЕР, *Суздаль. Очерк*, Москва 1969, 9; С. И. МАСЛЕНИЦЫН, *Живопись*

The representation of a Byzantine princess with the halo of a saint is not contrary to this attribution. In the Byzantine tradition such images of emperors and empresses were widespread and are well known both in Byzantium and beyond.¹⁸⁰ We are also aware of the attempts to implant such a tradition in Muscovy. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible, the Muscovites began portraying his father Vasily III as a saint, in this way probably preparing the ground for his possible canonization.¹⁸¹

Painting a secular portrait over a burial place along with the images of saints seems to have been common practice in Old Rus': such portraits can be found in burial niche paintings in other churches of the pre-Mongol period. For example, in the southern wall arcosolium of the St Savior Church on Nereditsa near Novgorod there is a portrait of an Old Rus' prince – probably the founder of the church – holding the model of the church in his hands. In the second arcosolium of the southern wall (in the apse) the Prophet Elijah was painted; in the apse of the northern wall we find Peter of Alexandria; and in the western part of the northern wall we find St Thecla.¹⁸²

Investigators believe that the Church of Sts Boris and Gleb in Kideksha was not painted until the 1180s. "It is quite likely," N. N. VORONIN writes, "that the painting was made by order of Vsevolod III, who wanted to honor his father's estate church and the memory of his Greek mother, the princess from the Komnenos kin."¹⁸³ She was the grandmother of Euphrosyne Borisovna, Vsevolod's niece, who chose the church in Kideksha as her own burial place. It is most likely that Euphrosyne was given her Greek name in honor of her Greek grandmother.¹⁸⁴

Владими́ро-Суздальской Руси. 1157-1238 годы, Москва 1998, 55; Т. Д. ПАНОВА, *Царство смерти. Погребальный обряд средневековой Руси XI-XVI веков*, Москва 2004, 104.

¹⁸⁰ Ш. Диль, *Основные проблемы византийской истории*, Москва 1947, 61; Д. ОБОЛЕНСКИЙ, *Византийское содружество наций*, 171. – Подр. см.: А. ГРАБАР, *Император в византийском искусстве*, Москва 2000.

¹⁸¹ Т. Е. САМОЙЛОВА, 1) «Новооткрытый» портрет Василия III и идеи святости государева рода, *Искусствознание*, Москва 1999, Вып. 1; 2) *К истории возникновения традиции написания мерных икон*, in: *Древнерусское искусство. Русское искусство позднего средневековья: XVI век*. Отв. ред. А. Л. Баталов, Санкт Петербург 2003, 362.

¹⁸² А. И. НЕКРАСОВ, *Древнерусское изобразительное искусство*, Москва 1937, 86; Ю. Н. ДМИТРИЕВ, *Стенные росписи Новгорода, их реставрация и исследование*, in: *Практика реставрационных работ*. Науч. ред. Ш. Е. Ратия, Москва 1950, сб. 1, 155-157; А. И. СЕМЕНОВ, *Нередица*, Новгород 1962, 20-21; Н. В. ПИВОВАРОВА, *Ктиторская тема в иконографической программе церкви Спаса на Нередице*, in: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины*, Ленинград 1991, вып. 23; Т. Д. ПАНОВА, *Царство смерти. Погребальный обряд средневековой Руси...*, 104.

¹⁸³ Н. Н. ВОРОНИН, *Владимир, Боголюбово, Суздаль, Юрьев-Польской*, 248.

¹⁸⁴ Н. СЫЧЕВ, *Предполагаемое изображение жены Юрия Долгорукого*, 59. – См.

In the 1770s an inquisitive Suzdal governor named Timofey Savelov, having looked into a crack of the split lid of one of the princely sarcophagi in the Church of Sts Boris and Gleb, saw the very well-preserved remains of precious garments on the skeleton: “no one knows what kind of clothing embroidered with gold lies on top ... there is a gold-embroidered single-headed eagle with open wings on it, and from this eagle two ornaments begin, embroidered with gold and silver ...” (“поверх лежит неведомо какая одежда шитая золотом..., на ней же вышит золотом орел пластаной (т. е. раскрывший крылья. – А. М.) одноглавной, а от того орла пошло на двое шито золотом же и серебром узорами...”)¹⁸⁵ One could see garments from fabrics with embroidered or woven eagles with outstretched wings on gala portraits of princes depicted on the walls of Old Rus’ churches (St Sophia Cathedral in Kiev, Assumption Cathedral in Vladimir, St Savior Church on Nereditsa near Novgorod).¹⁸⁶ The Byzantine origin of such attire is certain. As established by N. P. KONDAKOV, “cloaks and robes with this pattern, which in Byzantium had the special name of ‘eagles’, were among the garments of the highest-ranking officials of the Byzantine court.”¹⁸⁷

It should be noted that the name of St Euphrosyne of Polotsk might have also been adopted by the princes of Polotsk owing to their family ties with the Byzantine imperial house of the Komnenos. There are grounds for believing that Euphrosyne’s aunt, the daughter of Prince Vseslav of Polotsk, in 1106 married one of the sons of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118).¹⁸⁸ This kinship probably explains the reason why Emperor Manuel I Komnenos received Euphrosyne during her pilgrimage to Jerusalem. She was also shown special favor by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Luke Chrysoberges (1156-1169), who sent her the valuable icon of Our Lady of Ephesus painted, according to legend, by St Luke, Apostle and Evangelist.¹⁸⁹

также: *История русского искусства*. Под ред. И. Э. Грабаря, Москва – Ленинград 1953, т. I., 458.

¹⁸⁵ Cited by: Н. Н. Воронин, *Владимир, Боголюбово, Суздаль, Юрьев-Польской*, 247.

¹⁸⁶ See: С. А. Выходский, *Светские фрески Софийского собора в Киеве*, Киев 1989, 63, 84; Н. П. Кондаков, *Русская икона: В 4-х тт*, Прага 1928, т. I., 119; Н. П. Сычев – В. К. Мясоедов, *Фрески Спаса-Нередицы*, Ленинград 1925, табл. 56, л. 1.

¹⁸⁷ Н. П. Кондаков, *Изображения русской княжеской семьи в миниатюрах XI века*, Санкт Петербург 1906, 38.

¹⁸⁸ Х. М. Лопарев, *Брак Мстиславны (1122 г.)*, Византийский временник IX (1902) 419; В. А. Мошин, *Русские на Афоне и русско-византийские отношения в XI-XII вв.*, in: Из истории русской культуры. Статьи по истории и типологии русской культуры. Сост. А. Ф. Литвина – Ф. Б. Успенский, Москва 2002, т. II., кн. 1., 332; Л. В. Алексеев, *Западные земли домонгольской Руси*, кн. 2., 11.

¹⁸⁹ See: *Повесть о Евфросинии Полоцкой*, in: Памятники старинной русской литературы. Изд. гр. Г. Кушелевым-Безбородко, Санкт Петербург 1862, вып. 4.

The cult of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria and the Byzantine empress and nun Euphrosyne

The proliferation of the name Euphrosyne both in Byzantium and in Rus' was linked to the cult of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria (d.470), whose memory is celebrated twice – on September 25 and February 15.¹⁹⁰ This is confirmed in particular by the report in the Ipatiev Chronicle (under 1199) on the birth of a daughter to Rostislav Rurikovich: “The same year, in the winter, a daughter was born to Rostislav Rurikovich and given the name Euphrosyne and the nickname Smaragd, the name of a precious stone.”¹⁹¹

The second name of the princess – Smaragd (Izmoragd) – defined in the chronicle as a nickname, points exactly to St Euphrosyne of Alexandria. According to her hagiography, the saint took the veil against her father's wishes at the age of eighteen. So that her father would not be able to find her and take her home, she fled to a monastery, pretending to be a eunuch named Izmaragd.¹⁹²

It was after St Euphrosyne of Alexandria that the daughter of Michael Vsevolodovich of Chernigov, Theodulia, who became St Euphrosyne of Suzdal, took her monastic name. Her hagiography states that the princess took vows on September 25, when the „memory is celebrated of Zmaragd, St Euphrosyne of Alexandria.“¹⁹³ The image of this patron saint was on the well-known reliquary cross of St Euphrosyne of Polotsk.¹⁹⁴ This piece of evidence suggests that she also took her monastic name in honor of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria.

The cult of this saint, widespread among the princes of Rus' during the twelfth century, clearly came from Byzantium. It was propagated, as we have seen, by the dynastic marriages of princesses and princes of Polotsk, Suzdal, and Galicia-Volhynia with the relatives of the Byzantine emperors.

Special veneration of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria at the imperial court and among the Byzantine aristocracy was probably connected with the history of the Empress Euphrosyne (d. after 836), the daughter of the

¹⁹⁰ *Сергий (Спасский), архиепископ, Полный месяцеслов Востока*, Москва 1997, т. II., 154, 204, 298.

¹⁹¹ «Того же лета на зимоу родися дщи оу Ростислава оу Рюриковича, и нарекоша имя еи Ефросеня и прозваниемъ Изморагдъ, еже наречеться дорогии камень». – ПСРЛ, т. II., стб. 708.

¹⁹² *Vita sanctae Euphrosynae*, PG LXXIII, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1851, col. 643-652.

¹⁹³ Б. М. КЛОСС, *Избранные труды*. Т. II. *Очерки по истории русской агиографии XIV-XVI веков*, Москва 2001, 383.

¹⁹⁴ Л. В. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, *Лазарь Богша – мастер-ювелир XII в.*, Советская археология (1957) № 3; Г. В. ШТЫХОВ, *Печать XII века из Полоцка*, Советская археология (1965) № 3, 244. – Cf.: В. Л. ЯНИН, *Актовые печати Древней Руси X-XV вв.*, Москва 1970, т. I., 102.

last emperor of the Isaurian dynasty, Constantine VI the Blind (780-797). She became the wife of the progenitor of the Amorian dynasty, Michael II the Stammerer (820-829), and the step-mother of Emperor Theophilus (829-842).

She was born ca.790. In January of 795 Euphrosyne together with her mother and sister was sent by her father to a convent on the Princes' Islands, where they took vows. In this way Emperor Constantine got rid of his first family after his divorce from Empress Maria, whom he had married against his will at the insistence of his mother Empress Irene. After that, Constantine married his longtime mistress, one of the ladies-in-waiting named Theodote. Soon, however, he became the victim of a plot organized by his mother, who for many years had been his co-ruler and rival in the struggle for power. After Constantine was blinded and died, Empress Irene began to rule alone (797-802).¹⁹⁵

After Euphrosyne spent a few decades as a nun, there was a sudden change in her fortune. In 823, the new emperor Michael II who had recently become a widower proposed to strengthen his position on the throne by becoming related to a representative of the former imperial dynasty and in this way compensate for his own low birth. After securing the support of the senate, he released Euphrosyne from the convent and married her. The report of this marriage can be found in *The History of the Successor to Theophanes*: "And the ruler of the entire land obeyed the order of the senate and, having rejected a chaste life, as if against his will, got married, taking not just any other woman as his wife, but one who had long rejected the world and its pleasures, who was betrothed to Christ, and who since her childhood had led an ascetic life of devotion to God in a convent on the island of Prinkipo (Princes' Islands – A. M.). Her name was Euphrosyne, and she was the daughter of the Constantine who by his mother's fair judgment was condemned to blindness."¹⁹⁶

Euphrosyne's stay at the Imperial Palace lasted several years until shortly after the death of her husband. After assuming power the new emperor Theophilus was quick to send his stepmother back to her former life of a nun. The Successor to Theophanes reports: "He (Emperor Theophilus – A. M.) exiled his stepmother Euphrosyne and forced her to return to the convent where she had formerly taken the veil".¹⁹⁷ According to another version, Euphrosyne withdrew to a convent of her own free will.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁵ See: D. BARBE, *Irène de Byzance: La femme empereur*, Paris 1990; R.-J. LILIE – I. ROCHOW, *Byzanz unter Eirene und Konstantin VI. (780-802)*, Frankfurt am Main 1996.

¹⁹⁶ *Продолжатель Феофана, Жизнеописания византийских царей*. Пер., ст., комм. Я. Н. Любарского, Санкт Петербург 2009, 55 (II. 24).

¹⁹⁷ Ibidem, 61 (III.1).

¹⁹⁸ *Georgii Monachi vitae imperatorum recentiorum*, in: Theophanes Continuatus.

There can be no doubt that the creation of the Convent of St Euphrosyne in Constantinople in the first quarter of the ninth century was associated with Euphrosyne, the empress and nun. In the *Patria of Constantinople* (Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως) – the artifact of the tenth century (with numerous later additions) dedicated to the origin and history of the city and the description of its attractions¹⁹⁹ – this small convent is referred to as the Convent of Livadia (τά Λιβιάδια) and Empress Irene is identified as its founder.²⁰⁰ Investigators hold different views concerning the time and specific circumstances of its foundation; they also offer different answers to the question as to which of the Byzantine empresses was its founder.²⁰¹ Nonetheless, it seems that one can consider the foundation of the Convent of Livadia in Constantinople as the first evidence for the veneration of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria in the family of the Byzantine emperors.

It seems that the fate of the Byzantine empress and nun Euphrosyne, the daughter of Constantine VI and the wife of Michael II, was closely repeated four centuries later by Emperor Isaac II's daughter, who was also named Euphrosyne. After her father sent her to a nunnery as a child, she returned to secular life a few years later to become the wife of the Galician-Volhynian Prince Roman Mstislavich, the most important military ally of the new Emperor Alexios III. A few years after becoming a widow following Roman's unexpected death, Euphrosyne returned to monastic life to a convent built for her near Kholm – the new capital of Galician-Volhynian Rus'. Its outer and interior decorations were very similar to those of the small private monasteries built at that time for representatives of the high aristocracy in Northern Greece.

In giving Princess Euphrosyne, a former nun, as a wife for a prince of Rus', Alexios III's advisers would have known about her predecessor, the Empress Euphrosyne who had lived in the first half of the ninth century, and whose example was to become a kind of precedent for her namesake. The name Euphrosyne given to the eldest daughter of Isaac II reflects the life journey of her predecessor Princess Euphrosyne. We do not know

Ioannes Cameniata. Symeon Magister. Georgius Monachus, rec. I. Bekkerus, *Vonnae* 1838, 790 (21). – See also: Б. МЕЛИОРАНСКИЙ, *Из семейной истории Аморийской династии*, *Византийский временник* VIII (1901) 32 sq.; L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses: women and power in Byzantium. 527-1204*, London – New York 1999, 84 sqq.; J. HERRIN, *Women in Purple: Rulers of Medieval Byzantium*, Princeton 2001, 176 sqq.

¹⁹⁹ See: A. BERGER, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, Bonn 1988.

²⁰⁰ *Patria Constantinopoleos*, ed. Th. Preger, in: *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, t. II, Leipzig 1907, Bd. II, 243, 265.

²⁰¹ R.-J. LILIE – I. ROCHOW, *Byzanz unter Eirene und Konstantin VI.*, 77, 145; L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses...*, 93; P. HATLIE, *The monks and monasteries of Constantinople. 350-850*, Cambridge – New York 2007, 332. – For the location of

whether the name was given to her at birth or when she took monastic vows, but a certain stereotype of its owner's feminine fate was obviously "encoded" in it.

One should keep in mind that in the European tradition, since antiquity it has been believed that there is a certain (sometimes direct) connection between the choice of a name and the subsequent fate of its bearer as if predetermined by that name – whether in a mundane and worldly sense or in a religious and mystical one.²⁰² This belief was also shared by the princes of Old Rus', who were most careful in choosing a name, while observing various conditions and limitations.²⁰³ Nonetheless, one can assume that Princess Euphrosyne's name, in which the example of her famous namesakes – St Euphrosyne of Alexandria and the empress and nun Euphrosyne – was imprinted, could serve as a kind of a guideline in choosing her own life strategy.

One can also assume that at some point Alexios III's wife, who was also named Euphrosyne (a very rare name among Byzantine empresses), and who, as it is known, played a prominent role in the political life of the empire, also played an active role in the fate of her poor relation to facilitate her release from the nunnery for the subsequent marriage.²⁰⁴

The secular and monastic names of the Galician-Volhynian Princess Романова (Roman's Princess)

Finally, we must attempt to establish what name the daughter of Isaac II was known by in Rus'. This problem is complicated by the consideration that Roman's Grand Princess was never referred to by name in the Galician-Volhynian chronicle or in any other source. Nevertheless, researchers have repeatedly attempted to ascertain her name.

Their search has been based mainly on the chronicle account that reports that her grandson Prince Mstislav Danilovich erected a chapel dedicated to Sts Joachim and Anna over the grave of his grandmother. The Galician-Volhynian chronicle reports on this under year 6799 (1291): "The same year God put the happy thought into the heart of Prince Mstislav to build a stone burial vault over the grave of his grandmother Романова (Roman's Princess) in the monastery of the saint. And

the convent, see: A. BERGER, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, 632.

²⁰² See, for example: С. Н. БУЛГАКОВ, *Философия имени*, Париж 1953, 166; В. П. ГОРАН – В. Н. КАРПОВИЧ, *Древнегреческая мифологема судьбы*, Новосибирск 1990, 163.

²⁰³ А. Ф. ЛИТВИНА – Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей...*, 13 и след.

²⁰⁴ For the Empress Euphrosyne, wife of Alexios III, see: D. I. POLEMIS, *The Doukai. A contribution to Byzantine prosopography*, London 1968, 131, Nr. 101; L. GARLAND, *Byzantine empresses...*, 210 sqq.

he consecrated it in the name of Sts Joachim and Anna and held a service in it.”²⁰⁵

The above account, unfortunately, fails to identify the monastery where the princess's grave was situated or at least give the name of the town where the monastery was located. One can only guess that the monastery was in Volodymyr-Volynskiy where Mstislav Danilovich reigned at that time.

Indeed, a church dedicated to Sts Joachim and Anna did exist in Volodymyr-Volynskiy: it is mentioned in sixteenth century sources.²⁰⁶ The church was evidently demolished in 1370, when Lithuanian princes destroyed the castle built by the Polish King Casimir III in Volodymyr-Volynskiy. Unfortunately for the historian, repeated attempts to find archaeological traces of the church have failed to yield any reliable results.²⁰⁷

The name of the chapel built over the grave of Roman's Grand Princess, as mentioned in the chronicle, became for most researchers the key to solving the problem of the princess's name. It was believed that she had to be called Anna in imitation of the saint of the same name in whose honor the church was built. This opinion, first expressed as an assumption by M. S. GRUSHEVSKY, supported by N. A. BAUMGARTEN, and reiterated by V. T. PASHUTO,²⁰⁸ has now become generally accepted.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵ «Того ж лета Мьстиславоу князю вложи емоу Богъ во сердце мысль благоу: созда гробницу каменую надъ гробомъ бабы своеи Романовой в монастыре въ святого. И свяща ю во имя праведникоу Акима и Аньны, и слоужбоу в ней створи». – ПСРЛ, т. II., стб. 937-938.

²⁰⁶ Н. И. ТЕОДОРОВИЧ, *Город Владимир Волынской губернии в связи с историей волынской иерархии* (Исторический очерк), Почаев 1893, 142.

²⁰⁷ М. В. МАЛЕВСКАЯ – Е. В. ШОЛОХОВА, 1) *Раскопки архитектурных памятников в Любомле и Владимире-Волынском*, in: Археологические открытия 1975, Москва 1976, 355; 2) *Архитектурно-археологические исследования во Владимире-Волынском*, in: Археологические открытия 1976, Москва 1977, 328; М. В. МАЛЕВСКАЯ, *Архитектурно-археологические исследования на Вольни*, Археологические открытия 1982, Москва 1984, 291.

²⁰⁸ М. С. ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, *Історія України – Русь*, Київ 1993, т. III., 569; N. DE BAUMGARTEN, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes*, tabl. XI; V. T. ПАШУТО, *Очерки по истории Галицко-Волынской Русь*, Москва 1950, 132.

²⁰⁹ В. WŁODARSKI, *Polska i Rusь. 1194-1340*, Warszawa 1966, 32; W. K. VON ISENBURG, *Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, Marburg 1956, Bd. II., Tabl. 93; W. DWORZACZEK, *Genealogia* (Tablice), Warszawa 1959, Tabl. 27; П. ГРИЦАК, *Галицько-Волинська держава*, Нью-Йорк 1958, 61-68, 106; Л. Є. МАХНОВЕЦЬ [Примітки], *Літопис Руський...*, 369, прим. 2 до 6710 р; М. Ф. КОТЛЯР, 1) *Галицько-Волинська Русь*, Київ 1998, 161; 2) *Дипломатія Южної Русь*, Санкт Петербург 2003, 97-110; 3) *Даниил, князь Галицкий. Документальное повествование*, Санкт Петербург 2008, 51-68; М. Ф. КОТЛЯР – В. М. РИЧКА, *Княжий двір Південної Русь X-XIII ст.*, Київ 2008, 241 та ін.; О. Б. ГОЛОВКО, 1) *Князь Роман Мстиславич та його доба. Нариси з історії політичного життя Південної Русь XII-початку XIII століття*, Київ 2001, 141-142; 2) *Корона Данила Галицького. Волинь і Галичина в державно-*

Just the same, it seems that the question of the princess's personal name should not be resolved in such a straightforward manner. The chapel built over her grave was devoted not to one saint but to two, and first of all to Joachim, rather than to Anna. Therefore, the direct correlation of the name of the princess buried there with the name of St Anne is impossible. This circumstance, which has been insufficiently examined, can apparently be the reason for the revision of the stereotype existing in historiography.

The first investigator to study the name of the chapel and its inconsistency with the name Anna attributed to the princess was H. GRALA.²¹⁰ Unfortunately, his observations go unnoticed by most modern historians.²¹¹ In light of the above observations, the problem of attributing the name Anna to Roman Mstislavich's second wife requires new examination.

As a pair, in the list of names of Christian saints the names of Joachim and Anna correspond to the names of the righteous parents of St Mary, the mother of Jesus. One may assume that the veneration of the Virgin Mary was the most widespread and lasting in Rus'. Adopted with the introduction of Christianity, it manifested itself in the construction of a large number of churches and monasteries in the honor of the Mother of God and the creation of countless works of art and literature.²¹²

We agree with the assumption shared by many researchers that the name of the Galician-Volhynian princess somehow had to be associated with the names of the saints to whom the burial chapel built over her grave was dedicated. That is, the chapel could be dedicated to two saints if the name of the deceased was equally correlated with the names of both Joachim and Anne. This was possible if the name of the princess coincided with the name of the daughter of the righteous Joachim and Anne, Mary.

Churches in honor of princesses of Rus' bearing the name Maria dedicated, however, not to the Virgin Mary but to her parents, were also con-

політичному розвитку Центрально-Східної Європи раннього та класичного середньовіччя, Київ 2006, 238, 242, 260-262; Л. В. ВОЙТОВИЧ, 1) *Князівські династії Східної Європи*, 71-72, 380-381 та ін.; 2) *Княжа доба на Русі...*, 482-484; 3) *Мати короля Данила (зауваження на полях монографії Д. Домбровського)*, in: *Княжа доба. Історія і культура*. Відп. ред. Я. Ісаєвич, Львів 2007, вип. 1; M. BARTNICKI, *Polityka zagraniczna księcia Daniela Halickiego w latach 1217-1264*, Lublin 2005, 24.

²¹⁰ H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mścislawicza*, 124.

²¹¹ See: D. DĄBROWSKI, 1) *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, 42; 2) *Genealogia Mścislawowiczów*, 264.

²¹² See: М. В. ПЛЮХАНОВА, *Сюжеты и символы Московского царства*, Санкт Петербург 1995; О. Е. ЭТИНГОФ, *Образ Богоматери. Очерки византийской иконографии XI-XIII вв.*, Москва 2000; Е. А. ПРУДНИКОВА, *Земля Богородицы*, Москва 2007.

structed in other cities of Rus'. An example is the Church of Sts Joachim and Anne built by Vsevolod Big Nest in 1196 in Vladimir-on-Klyazma.²¹³ The church, apparently, was dedicated to his wife, Princess Maria, who is one of the best-known princesses of Rus' from the turn of the twelfth–thirteenth centuries.²¹⁴ The consecration of another church in Vladimir is associated with the veneration of the Virgin Mary's parents by Maria Всеволожая (Vsevolod's Maria): the Assumption Church (built in the monastery founded by her) was consecrated on the day when the memory of Sts Joachim and Anne was celebrated, i.e. on September 9.²¹⁵

The choice of the righteous Anne as a patron saint for the princess who bore the name of Maria, in our opinion, can be explained as follows. In the Middle Ages people often avoided giving the name directly in honor of the Virgin Mary.²¹⁶ Nevertheless, the name Maria (Mary) remained one of the most popular Christian names – both baptismal and monastic. The Mother of Mary – Anne – in some cases, apparently, could act as a, so to say, substitute patron saint for the holders of the name Mary.

At the same time, we cannot exclude the possibility that the churches dedicated in honor of Sts Joachim and Anne did relate to a person having the same name as only one of the two saints. Such cases are also known in the history of Old Rus'.

According to available data, one of the oldest Christian churches in Veliky Novgorod was the Church of Sts Joachim and Anne, built by the first bishop of Novgorod Joachim the Korsunian. The church was demolished during the construction of St Sophia Cathedral, where since the beginning of the twelfth century there has been a side altar dedicated to Sts Joachim and Anne. It was richly decorated in the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries and has its own exquisite iconostasis called Joachim's iconostasis.²¹⁷

Under the year 1549 the Short Novgorod chronicle copied by Nikol'sky (second half of the sixteenth century) reports that under the demolished

²¹³ ПСРЛ, т. I., стб. 412.

²¹⁴ See: Л. С. Кишкин, *Мария Всеволожая – ясыня или чехиня?*, in: Исследования по истории славянских и балканских народов. Эпоха средневековья. Киевская Русь и ее славянские соседи. Отв. ред. В. Д. Королук, Москва 1972; А. Ф. Литвина – Ф. Б. Успенский, *Кем была «Мария Всеволожая». Отчество и происхождение трех русских княгинь XII в.*, ДГ 2004 год, Москва 2006.

²¹⁵ ПСРЛ, т. I., стб. 417.

²¹⁶ А. Ф. Литвина – Ф. Б. Успенский, *Выбор имени у русских князей в X–XVI вв.*, 368.

²¹⁷ See: В. Г. Брюсова, *Страница из истории Софийского собора в Новгороде*, in: Культура Древней Руси. Посвящается 40-летию научной деятельности Н. Н. Воронина, Москва 1966; В. М. Сорокатый, *Храмовое строительство и иконостасы Великого Новгорода в середине – второй половине XVI в.*, in: Древнерусское искусство. Русское искусство позднего средневековья: XVI век.

wooden dyak's (clerk's) office, which had been located behind the altar of St Sophia Cathedral, an ancient cemetery was discovered. It was on this site that the church of Sts Joachim and Anne was built by the order of Ivan the Terrible in honor of his new-born daughter Anna.²¹⁸

The burial chapel in honor of Sts Joachim and Anne built over the grave of Roman Mstislavich's wife thus suggests that the deceased could have had one of two names – Maria or Anna. To choose between them, one should consider a number of other circumstances.

Among the direct descendants of Roman Mstislavich and his second wife one repeatedly comes across the names of both Maria and Anna. Maria's name is regularly repeated in all subsequent generations of the Romanovich family up to the end of the dynasty, whereas the name Anna is much rarer.²¹⁹ As established by D. DĄBROWSKI, the name Maria was given to the following women at birth: the daughter of Elena (?) Romanovna and Michael Vsevolodovich of Chernigov, the daughter of Roman Danilovich and Gertrude Babenberg, the daughter of Helena and Casimir II of Bytom, the daughter of Yuri L'vovich and Euphemia Casimirovna, the daughter of Anastasia Yurievna and Alexander Mikhailovich of Tver.²²⁰

There is additional evidence available to us suggesting that the name Maria was the most probable personal name of "Roman's Grand Princess".

This evidence comes from the tower of Stolpie and the chapel located in its upper tier. As we have seen, the chapel was most likely associated with the convent that served as the residence of Roman Mstislavich's widow after she became a nun. Two centuries after her death, the tower still had a chapel, and in the mid-fifteenth century an Orthodox priest was assigned to it.

This information can be culled from the message that Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kiev and a papal legate, sent to the elders of Kholm on 27 July 1440. Referring to the unification of the churches decreed by the Council of Florence, the metropolitan took a certain Vavila, a priest of the Savior Church in Stolpie, under his patronage. He demanded that the priest should be guarded from unlawful infringement on the church property that he was using: "... asked us priest Vavila of St Savior [Church] in Stolpie, and said that a lot of wrong had been done to him, and his church garden had been robbed, while he lived off it at this church and prayed to God for all Christianity".²²¹ Based on this evidence, researchers

²¹⁸ ПСРЛ, Ленинград 1929, т. IV., вып. 3., 620-621. – См.: В. Л. янин, *Некрополь Новгородского Софийского собора*, Москва 1988, 177-178.

²¹⁹ См.: D. DĄBROWSKI, *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, Tabl. II-III., 345-347.

²²⁰ *Ibidem*, 42.

²²¹ «...билъ намъ чоломъ попъ Вавила отъ светого Спаса отъ Стольпа, а сказываесть что же дей обидъ чинитья ему вельми много, да и садъ дей

identify the rotunda on the fifth tier of the tower at Stolpie as the Chapel of Our Savior (The Transfiguration).²²²

According to the Orthodox calendar, three feasts of the Savior fall within the Dormition Fast (the second in importance after Lent), which lasts for two weeks – from August 1 (14) to 14 (28). They were established to coincide with the celebration of the feast of the Dormition of the Most Holy Mother of God on August 14 (28).²²³ The feasts of the Savior, that were considered also to be feasts of the Mother of God, are dedicated to the Most Merciful Savior and the Most Pure Mother of God. Consequently, the dedication of the convent chapel in Stolpie to one of the major feasts of the Mother of God is strong testimony in support of the suggestion that the chapel was dedicated by the princess and nun who herself bore the name of the Mother of God.

Whether the personal name of “Roman’s Grand Princess” was either Maria or Anna, it is most unlikely that it was her secular name, as the princess died and was buried in the convent, apparently, as a nun. The numerous instances in which the name Maria was given to representatives of the Romanovich kin suggests the existence of a family cult honoring Maria associated with the famous Princess Романова (Roman’s Princess), the progenitress of the dynasty.

In conclusion, we have ascertained a number of personal names belonging to Roman Mstislavich’s second wife. This was consistent with the tradition of Christian double names and characteristic of the Rurikid dynasty. Her baptismal name, by which she was known in Byzantium and in Germany, was Euphrosyne, while her monastic name, given to her in Rus’, was one of the names associated with the Mother of God – Maria or Anna.²²⁴ It is noteworthy that the princess’s secular name as well as the monastic one became dynastic names and were repeatedly given to many of her descendants. This confirms our hypothesis about the existence of the family cult of Euphrosyne Angelina as the progenitress of the Romanovich family.

церковный у него обирають, а нимъ то он у тоє церквѣ живеть и Бога молитъ о всемъ христіянствѣ». – *Архив Юго-Западной России*, Киев 1883, ч. I, т. VI, № II, 5.

²²² For an overview of the historiography of the question, see: Ю. ДИБА, *Українські храми-ротонди Х-першої половини XIV століть*, Львів 2005, 6-7.

²²³ The Church’s celebration of the Feast of the Savior (The Transfiguration) was observed in the Christian East, and in the Byzantine Empire from the IV-V centuries. In Rus’ the feast of the Merciful Saviour was established by Andrew Bogolyubsky. – See: Е. Е. ГОЛУБИНСКИЙ, *История Русской церкви*, Москва 1997, т. I. 2-я половина тома, 409-410; О. В. ЛОСЕВА, *Русские месяцесловы XI-XIV вв.*, Москва 2001, 108-109.

²²⁴ Her sister Irene was given the same name on becoming the German queen and wife of Philip of Swabia.