

Medieval Slovakia and Croatia as the Second Homeland of Nobility and Peoples from the Rus' in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries

Stredoveké Slovensko a Chorvátsko ako druhý domov šľachty a obyvateľstva z Rusi v 13. a 14. storočí / Srednjovjekovna Slovačka i Hrvatska kao druga domovina plemstva i stanovništva iz Rusije u 13. i 14. stoljeću

Active processes of migration (on the individual and the group level) were characteristic of Russian-Hungarian relations during the entire Middle Ages. Some communities from Rus' left for the Hungarian Kingdom, including the Balkans and north-eastern counties (in modern Slovakia). There were many such people. Most of them were free settlers, they were often representatives of the nobility and were close to the king and the royal family. For example, the sources mention the following people: Posillo Rusinich (near Zadar), Ladislas Ruthenus (comitatus Nitriensis), Maladik Ruthenus (comitatus Thurociensis), Myculay filius Rutheni (comitatus Scepusiensis), Orosz (Ruthenus) Jakab (comitatu Sarusiensis), magister Petrus dictus Orrus (comitatu Posoniensis) and others. Among these immigrants there were also princes: the sons of Galician prince Vladimir Yaroslavovich (in the late 1180s), Rostislav Mikhailovich – the prince of Galicia (after 1243) and others.

Keywords: Middle Ages, migrations, population from Rus', nobility, regions of Slovakia and Croatia

Social and political consequences of migration processes of the people from the East Slavic world into the medieval Kingdom of Hungary proved to be very profound. These circumstances were related to many factors. The question of the appearance of the Rus' people in the Carpathian basin before the migration of the Hungarians (at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century) has still been a politicized topic into a great extent, artificially and thoroughly emphasized by various political and non-political circles in many European countries. This concept is devoid of any serious historical argument and has no relevant support in historical sources. On the contrary, it is based mainly on fictional stories, legends, and other folk materials.

The majority of existing narrative and diplomatic documents, including those that are still stored unpublished in various archives, witnesses the appearance of first compact groups of migrants from Rus' in the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom no earlier than the mid-eleventh century. It has been traced that these dynamics continued in the subsequent generations, mainly in connection with the Rus'-Hungarian matrimonial relationships, developing rapidly from the

second half of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. At the same time, identification of the land and places where the mentioned migrants came from has still been a mystery, since most of them are known only from the realm of the Arpadians, especially as *Rutheni*. Significant historical sources do not report about the location of the former dwellings of the majority of the researched people. Specifically, contemporary Hungarian official documents tended to "generalize" with respect to the identification of people from the East Slavic world as much as possible with the purpose to avoid possible confusion with the later documentation. However, the majority of educated Hungarians, naturally, clearly understood the religious (and likely the ethnic as well) differences among the people from different countries controlled by the Rurik dynasty.

Leaving aside many doubts concerning these people, we can surely assert only the fact that a significant portion of the migrants came from the group of the "Rus'" nobility in the past, or were treated as privileged after their arrival in the Hungarian Kingdom. In this regard, the kings, or their local dignitaries were distributing fairly large land grants in the form of feuds (with the

* Myroslav Vološčuk, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University in Ivano-Frankivs'k, Department of History, Political science and International relations.

right of inheritance for all direct descendants), which led, as clearly proved, to the transformation of the concerned noblemen on a permanent service. They performed military functions, simultaneously were engaged in the protection of the borders of the kingdom and kept middle-ranked posts and small positions at the courts of the king or the queen, among the circles of the representatives of wealthy secular nobility and clergy. Often, they became the *comites*, *jobagiones* (sometimes sons of *jobagiones*) of the royal castles, *magistri* (masters), officers, and others. Those of them who were periodically mentioned in the documents with no posts at all were obviously noble-born and rich as far as their movable and immovable property is concerned.

A wide range of powers, positions, and titles, their influence at the courts of monarchs like the Arpadians and the Angevins, as well as their participation in various military campaigns helped Ruthenians to turn into a fairly prominent and active community of foreign origin in the kingdom during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

A part of the newcomers, after being settled in a new place, maintained, at least at a certain level, a clannish identity, which is sometimes visible in the toponymic bindings, demonstrated by the term *Rus*, *Ruska*, *Ruthenus* used for many decades onwards (e.g. the family of Dobeš-Ruska (Dobó-Ruska),¹ well-known in the eastern districts of the Kingdom of Hungary from the fourteenth to the seventeenth/eighteenth centuries²). It seems almost futile to try to precisely and accurately identify the majority of the participants of the migration movement either with the noble boyars well-known from the annals, or with the representatives of the lower classes of society. The only exceptions might possibly be seen in the case of Volodislav Kormilichich – *Ladislaus Ruthenus*,³ with some probability also Sudislav / Sebeslav

– *Subislaus* [etc.] *de genere Ludan* (?),⁴ Gleb Potkovich (*filius Potkoni*), Zhyroslav (*Gyroslaus*), or Artemy episcopus Galitskiy*.

The absence of chronicle evidence on the majority of our researched people identified in the medieval Hungarian materials may be associated not only with their mediocre influence within the boundaries of some lands from Rus'. As a rule, the chronicle tradition relates the most important events that took place primarily in the centres, less on the peripheries. Therefore, it seems quite possible that some of the noblemen mentioned in the later diplomatic documents lived on the periphery of one or the other country previously and had very limited tools to take a more active part in politics, military affairs, etc. This is the reason why, the percentage of their hypothetical appearance in the annals was rather small as well.

In addition, the representatives of the boyar families, ethnically different from the local population, some time being of nomadic origin, lived particularly within the boundaries of Galicia in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries; for example, Chagrovichi, Haldeevichi, etc. The analysis of the chronicle evidence does not help to determine their ethnic identity after they obtained relevant positions in Galicia, because there is no mention of it. It is likely that many a boyar family in Galicia was of foreign origin. The experience of the Kingdom of Hungary shows that the seizure of Pannonia by the Hungarians in the ninth and the tenth centuries as well as further active processes of internal colonization in the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries strengthened the formation not only of the local noble families of Hungarian or Slavic origin, but also those of Kabarlian, Germanic (Saxon, Swabian), Flemish, Walloon, Italian, Czech origin, etc. After moving to the new lands, many a noble family of foreign origin maintained its fairly high social status in the domain of the

¹ Etymology of the family name of *Dobó*, *Dobos* may indirectly indicate the participation of one of its first representatives in the military campaigns of kings in the position of a drummer. We haven't any facts, that Dobeš-Ruska family was from Rus', but the using of Ruthenian etymology is very interesting in the common Hungarian-Slovakian-Ruthenian noble-families research.

² *Anjou-kori oklevéltár*, tom. 23 (1339). Ed.: Ferenc PÉTI. Budapest – Szeged: Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap, 1999, pp. 130–131; *Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis (Anjoukori Okmánytár)*, vol. 3 (1333–1339). Ed.: Imre NAGY. Budapest: A.M. Tud. Akadémia Könyvtár-és Kiadó-Hivatala, 1883, pp. 550–552; Deržavnij archiv Zakarpatskoi oblasti (deinde DAZO), f. 10 (Nadžupan berezkoi župi Beregovo), p. 37. etc.

³ VOLOŠČUK, Myroslav: Voknjaženje galicke Volodislava Kormilčiča (1210–1214 rr., z perervami). In: *Visnyk Prykarpats'kogo universytetu, Istorija*, a. 15, 2009, pp. 38–48; IDEM: Nevidomi stopinky biografii Volodyslava Kormilčiča (1214–1232 rr.). In: *Visnyk Prykarpatskogo universytetu, Istorija*, a. 16, 2009, pp. 29–39.

⁴ VOLOŠČUK, Myroslav: Sudyslav de genere ludan. Sproba genealogično-biografičnoji rekonstrukciji In: *Zapysky NTŠ*, 2010, tom. 260, nr. 1, pp. 257–273; IDEM: Also Dobroslav Suddič: sproba biografičnogo narysu. In: *Karpaty: ljudyňa, etnos, cyvilizacija*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Plaj, 2010, vol. 2, pp. 20–31.

* Artemy, the bishop of Galicia, together with Prince Rostislav Mikhailovich set out on a journey from Galicia into the Kingdom of Hungary. This could be related with the fact that Daniel Romanovich took over the city of Galicia several times at the end of the 1230s and the beginning of the 1240s. Cfr. Ipatjevskaja letopis, *PSRL*. In: *Jazyki Slavjanskoj kultury*, vol. 2, 2001, pp. 777, 793.

Arpadians. The source evidence shows that similar processes took place in Galicia as well. In particular, Yarun, the head of the guards of Przemyśl (Peremyshl), apparently moved to Galicia from Novgorod, Gleb Zeremeevich – from Peresopnitsa. The name of the boyar Derzhikray was possibly of Polish origin. There is abundance of such examples and majority of them is presented in various scientific studies.⁵

Hence, there is a problem with identification of that part of the Galician nobility who did not call themselves “Ruthenians”, as far as they hypothetically could be of foreign origin and preserved the knowledge of their ancestral roots. As a result, although the migration of such representatives of the East Slavic world into the Hungarian kingdom could be recorded in historical documents, it was deprived of the element of their ethnic identity. This circumstance, in turn, complicates the research and establishment of their former places of residence. Given that the language of the Slavic peoples of Central Europe was almost identical,⁶ a large part of the nobility in Galicia could come from the Slavic territories neighbouring with Poland and Hungary, maintaining their generic relationship together with private possessions there.

The comprehensive studies show that the localization of the new dwellings of the migrants who can very likely be identified as the “East Slavs” was not based on the principles of another *hospites*. For example, within the boundaries of present Slovakia, we can identify several people of “East Slavic” origin, but it is hardly possible to group them on the basis of the community principle. They were individual representatives of the middle-ranking and petty nobility: *Ladislaus Ruthenus* (Nitra – *comitatus Nitriensis*, 1218, 1232),⁷ *Hosch filius Ruse* (Spiš – *comitatus Scepusiensis*, 1255–1256),⁸ *Maladik Rutenus* (Turiec – *comitatus Thurociensis*, 1262),⁹ *Myculay filius Rutheni* (Spiš, 1273),¹⁰ *Ruthen* (Turiec, 1280),¹¹ *Myculay filius Myculai filii Rutheni* (Spiš, 1298),¹² *Orosz* (*Ruthenus*) *Jakab* (Šariš – *comitatus Sarusiensis*, 1325),¹³ *magister Petrus dictus Orrus* (Bratislava *comitatus Posoniensis*, 1331),¹⁴ and many others.

The processes of settlement by the newcomers from Rus’ in the Croatian lands were similar, although not that active. Among the population hypothetically of the origin from Rus’ in these areas, the following might be listed: *Posillo Rusinich* (Zadar, 1182),¹⁵ *filiis Rusinne* (Split / *Spalatio*, 1208),¹⁶ possibly also *Daniel Galisic* (? / *Fare*, 1 May 1320)

⁵ See, for instance, the works of Andrij Petrik. PETRYK, Andrij: Do istorji bojarstva ta bojarskykh rodiv Peremišlskoj zemli. In: *Drogobyc'kyj krajeznavčyj zbirnyk*, a. 6, 2002, pp. 105–117; IDEM: Do pytan'nja stanovlennja bojarskykh rodiv u period knjažinnja dynastiji Romanovyčiv. In: *Korolj Danylo Romanovič i jogo misce v ukrainskij istoriji*. Lviv: VTS, 2003, pp. 137–142; IDEM: Pro formuvannja bojarskykh rodiv u period knjažinnja dynastiji Romanovyčiv. In: *Knjaža doba: istorija i kultura*, vol. 1, 2007, pp. 115–122. Cfr. JUSUPOVIĆ Adrian: *Elity ziemi halickiej i włodziemierskiej w czasach Romanowiczów (1205–1269)*. *Studium prozopograficzne*. PhD thesis. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2011, 294 p.

⁶ There are many references to this issue in the documents, in particular, from the Franciscan friars, missionaries. See, for example: *Hrystjanskij mir i Velikaja Mongolskaja imperija*. Materialy franciskanskoj missii 1245 goda. Trans. et ed.: Aleksandr Grigorjevič JURČENKO. S. Peterburg: Evrazja, 2002, pp. 78, 101 (dannije monaha C. de Brydya); MATUZOVA, Vera Ivanovna: *Anglijskije srednevekovyje istočniki 9–13 vv. Teksty, perevod, kommentarii*. Moskva: Nauka, 1979, pp. 78, 85–86 (svedenija Bartolomeja Anglijskogo), p. 199, 213 (svedenija Frensisa Bekona); BACON, Roger: *The Opus Majus*. Ed.: John Henry BRIDGES. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1897, vol. 1, p. 360. KARPINI, Joan de Plano: *Istorija Mongalov*. RUBRUK, Vil'gel'm de: *Puteshestvoje v vostochnyja strany*. Trans. et ed.: Aleksandr Yustynovych MALEYN, S. Peterburg: Yzdanie A. S. Suvoryna, 1911, p. 101 (svedenija Vil'gel'ma Rubruka). Thank to Mgr. Andrij Stasjuk from Ivano-Frankivsk (Ukraine) for this necessary information.

⁷ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae* (deinde *CDSI*), vol. 1. Ed.: Richard MARSINA. Bratislava: Sumptibus Academiae Scientiarum Slovaciae, 1971, pp. 180, 281.

⁸ *Az Arpádházi királyok okleveleinek kritikái jegyzéke*, vol. 2 (1270–1292). Ed.: Imre SZENTPÉTERY – Iván BORSA. Budapest: Akademiai kiadó, 1961, p. 195.

⁹ *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (deinde *CDH*), tom. 4, vol. 3. Ed.: György FEJÉR. Budae: Typis Typogr. Regiae Universitatis Ungaricae, 1829, p. 59.

¹⁰ *Codex diplomaticus patrius. Hazai okmánytár* (deinde *CDP*), vol. 8. Ed.: Imre NAGY. Budapestini: Typis Alexandri Kocsi, 1880, pp. 156–157, 378.

¹¹ *CDH* 5/3. Ed.: György FEJÉR. Budae: Typis Typogr. Regiae Universitatis Ungaricae, 1830, p. 73; *Regesta rerum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica*, vol. 2 (1270–1292). Ed.: Imre SZENTPÉTERY – Iván BORSA. Budapest: Akademiai kiadó, 1961, p. 276.

¹² *CDP* 8, pp. 156–157, 378.

¹³ *Anjou-kori oklevéltár*, vol. 9 (1325). Ed.: László BLAZOVICH. Budapest – Szeged: Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap – Nemzeti Kulturális Alap Levéltári Kollégiuma, 1997, p. 202.

¹⁴ *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, vol. 1 (1199–1345). Ed.: Eudoxiu de HURMUZAKI. Bucuresci: Publicate sub auspiciile Academiei Române și ale Ministeriului Cultelor și Instrucțiunii publice, 1887, p. 618.

¹⁵ *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (deinde *CDCr*), vol. 2 (1101–1200). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1904, p. 180.

¹⁶ *CDCr* 3 (1201–1235). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1905, p. 80.

and many others, especially called *dictus Orrus*.¹⁷ In fact, a large number of the names carrying the root of *Rus* – and *Ruth* – occurring in diplomatic materials of Croatia is not necessarily related to the migrants from “Rus” in this land. In neighbouring Italy in the period of the twelfth–fourteenth centuries, there lived many families with similar names, though we cannot say in all probability that we are talking about Italians.¹⁸

The most well-known settler of the Arpadian territories in the Balkans was Rostislav Mikhailovich, Prince of Galicia, who owned the land of Machva in the period of 1247–1264.¹⁹

Undoubtedly, the majority of the researched people could have previously lived in the foothills of the Galician Carpathians, and thus belonged to the subordinates of the Galician princes. This thesis finds support in the medieval Hungarian historical sources bringing information about the later land donations, which from the viewpoint of ownership and geographical location were very much similar to those in the East Carpathian border territory (modern Vizhnitskiy district of Chernivtsi region, Bohorodchany, Verkhovyna, Dolinsky, Kolomyia, Kosiv, Nadvirna, Rozhnyativ districts of Ivano-Frankivsk region, Samborski, Skolivsky, Stryj, Turka district of Lviv region, Subcarpathian Voivodship of Poland, Bukovina region in Romania – and especially the territories that were included in the sphere of influence of the Galician rulers from the twelfth until the first half of the fourteenth century). Obviously, similar practice was not innovative, as it allowed them to settle the lands of the kingdom more intensively. Simultaneously, it enabled them to make use of natural resources more efficiently, and so on. Accordingly,

the possessions of the new settlers in the counties of Liptov, Turiec, Spiš, Šariš, Zemplín, Maramureş (*Marmatia*), Cluj in Transylvania, and others. In our opinion, this situation can be regarded as a completely natural phenomenon in terms of economic feasibility of a single family and the economic policies of the ruling dynasty as a whole.

As a matter of fact, a part of the migrants remained permanently in the coastal lands of the kingdom (Croatia and Dalmatia), as reflected in the local diplomatic material. We have repeatedly carried out research tours over the mentioned territories in 2007, 2009, 2011–2012, which together with a micro-toponymic analysis, photo-documentation, mapping, etc. only confirmed the previously expressed opinions and hypotheses.

Compact communities which gradually began to be called *Rusyn*²⁰ lived in particular in the territories of modern Slovakia, Romania, partly eastern Hungary, *in terra maritima*; however, as we believe, they lost the knowledge of how their ancestors found themselves in the Hungarian Kingdom.

However, an attempt to re-establish at the level of the micro-toponymic research the particular details of the economic activities of Ruthenians new settlers in the territory of Hungary, their social status and property relations is in fact a more than difficult task. Despite the presence of the micro-toponyms of Slavic origin, their phonetic and lexical context is no different from the analogical examples from the rest of the Slavic world. Accordingly, coming across one or another Slavic toponym or micro-toponym in the pages of documents, or in the course of the field research without its clearly visible “Russian / Ruthenian” content, we have no basis to accurately determine

¹⁷ CDCr 8 (1301–1320). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1910, p. 559.

¹⁸ See for instance: CDCr 2, pp. 39, 127, 143, 157, 246; Ibidem 3, p. 75; Ibidem 6 (1272–1290). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1908, p. 371; Ibidem 8, p. 274; Ibidem 9. Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1911, pp. 54, 503, 526; Ibidem 10 (1332–1342). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1912, pp. 87, 472, 545, 563; Ibidem 11 (1342–1350). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1913, pp. 67–68, 83, 157, 159; Ibidem 12 (1351–1359). Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1914, pp. 167, 537.

¹⁹ The most comprehensive research concerning this topic has been recently carried out by a Serbian scholar, Djura Hardy. For instance, see – HARDY Djura: O veri prvgo gospodara Mačve. In: *Srpsko-madarski odnosi kroz istoriji*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2007, pp. 43–49; IDEM: O poreklu mačvanskog „bana“ Rostislava Michajloviča. In: *Spomenica Istorijskog Arhiva „Srem“*, a. 2, 2003, pp. 15–32; IDEM: Rostislav Michajlovič «Dominus de Machou» In: *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca*, a. 6, 2006, nr. 1, pp. 59–70; IDEM: Čy Rostyslav Mychajlovyč buv banom Mačvy. In: *Actes testantibus*. Lviv: Nacional’na akademija nauk Ukrajinjy. Instytut ukrajinoznavstva imeni Ivana Krypjakovyča, a. 20, 2011, pp. 197–204; IDEM: Ostannja zustrič Danyla Romanovyča i Rostyslava Mychajlovyča. In: *Knjaža doba: istorija i kultura*, a. 4, 2011, pp. 193–207.

²⁰ In particular, we carried out calculations on the basis of the *Geographical Dictionary of Hungary*, written in the mid-nineteenth century by a founder of the Hungarian statistical sciences, a corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Elek Fényes. These have shown that in today’s Transcarpathia there were no more than 10 communities that were directly related to Ruthenian/Russian toponymy FIJNEŠ, Elek: *Geografičnij slovník Ugorštini. Opis naselenich punktiv Zakarpattja seredyny XIX. st.*. Užgorod: TOV, 2011, pp. 12–13, 15–16, 56, 64, 67, 71, 78–79. Other towns and villages arose on the basis of Slavic, Hungarian, and German names.

who the place names were related to – one of the migrants from Rus' or a local Slav? As far as the toponymic issue is concerned, the Kingdom of Hungary was, for objective reasons, a territory formed mainly by the Slavic toponyms. As a result, to display the difference in social or property status of "Rus' / Ruthenian people" in various parts of the kingdom, and in particular in present-day Slovakia and Croatia, seems to be an almost impossible mission.

In general, up to today all known persons of our interest can be divided into the following four groups:

1. The persons of undoubtedly Ruthenian origin, which is clearly visible from their names (*Rutenus, Ruthen, Oros, Wrucz, Urus, Vrwz*, etc.), or from their generic or patronymic predicate (*genere Ruthenus*, etc.). In this case, the problem for the scholars is to define the particular land belonging to those persons. In most of the cases we simply have no clue of which land or principality they came from; consequently, there is an absolute information vacuum on the extent of linkage of the population from that or another part of Rus'. However, in any case, they can all be with absolute certainty considered the *hospites* of the kingdom, i.e. the free settlers, granted a wide range of various property, economic, and social benefits by the king.

2. Those persons whose ethnic roots could be considered Ruthenians with a high probability (*sic!*), as they appear in the documents as *dictus Ruthenus / Orrus*. The custom to be named or nicknamed "Russian / Ruthenian" could, of course, belong to those who indeed came from the territories east of the Carpathians, but also to those who might have been related with Rus' on the basis of trade or religion, while they themselves were the representatives of the Western world. Similar examples can be observed within the German merchant nobility, who were connected with the Rurikids by their permanent trading operations (e.g. *Henricus von Plawen dictus Ruthenus*, living in the town of Torun and many others, for example, from Poland, Bohemian lands etc.). There were more, than 25 persons, which called *dictus Orrus* in all Hungarian Kingdom during fourteenth century. We know about 18 properties of them in modern Slovakia and 3 lands in Croatia. They were very different social status of them: *comes, vicevoievoda Transilvaniae, miles aulae regiae, homo regis, iobagio, clericus* etc.²¹.

3. The residents of the settlements (*Oroshaza, Kisorosi, Rutheni, Orosi, Oroskap*, etc.) which were founded by the migrants from Rus', as it is clearly understandable from the root parts of these place names and from their phonetic sound, too. However, in this case we cannot be definitely sure that the representatives of the third, fourth, and subsequent generations were able to maintain their own ethnic identity, as there is, firstly, total absence of direct historical source evidence on the general trends, and, secondly, the presence of Hungarian names or names written in a Hungarian style (*Ethened, Educh, Othmar, Denklinus, Imre, Kristóf, Máté, Mátyás, Egyed, Batur, Balázs, Baxa*, etc.) in the diplomatic material. Those who appear in the documents, such as *Miklos filius Bydke filius Ethened nobiles de Ruska*, or *Janos Orozthoni filius Petri*, or *Ruzka-i Jakab* could be the residents of a village which was associated with the "Ruthenians" founders in an unidentified period, or they could be the civil servants placed there and having no ethnic relationship to the local families. The discussed group of people requires a more comprehensive and detailed interdisciplinary study, which is not the purpose of this work.

4. A separate group are the representatives of the Galician (and possibly the Volynian) nobility, who were of foreign, not local ethnic origin. They set up their homes here thanks to their commercial, military, or craft activities. They cannot be identified as "Russian / Ruthenians" in the chronicles at all, because they did not considered themselves in this way. Accordingly, their hypothetical moving into Hungary in the twelfth–fourteenth centuries is not reflected in the diplomatic materials of the kingdom in terms of ethnic identification, and thus it does not allow us to determine, even approximately, the number of such persons, their place of future residence, social and financial liabilities, etc. This, roughly speaking, could be anyone appearing in the diplomatic material, but not being mentioned in the chronicles, or *vice versa*. Because they have no ethnic predicate, we cannot know the origin of this group of people.

It seems necessary for any study of the dynamics of the increasing number of the "Russians / Ruthenians" in the fifteenth–eighteenth centuries to establish the degree of preservation of the ethnic self-consciousness and self-identification among the migrants on the local toponymic and geographically wider – county (*comitatus*), regional (group

²¹ This is a short result of the author's report in the Institute of history of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine (21st June 2013, Kyiv, the Head of the Section of Ukrainian Middle Age history – Prof. Olexij Tolochko).

of counties) – levels. It also helps to determine and construct the specific forms of their subculture, linguistic characteristics, mentality, etc.

The dwellings of the families moving into the medieval Kingdom of Hungary from Rus', their foundation of a number of notable and middle-stock families, all these were reflected neither in the heraldic or in the sphragistic symbols of the kingdom almost at all. In the armorials and on the images of the seals, we do not find a "Russian / Ruthenian" influence, as compared to the one which was left, for example, by the German colonists. The long-lasting research of Slovak scholars confirms this thesis,²² thus, leaving many an unresolved question for the future generations of researchers.

The solution of these problems might possibly be hidden in a detailed, meticulous study of the matrimonial binds among the "Russian / Ruthenian" migrants as well as among the representatives of other nationalities living nearby. In this respect, the study of social policy of the rulers appears significant – not only of the monarchs of the Arpadian and Anjou / Angevin dynasty, but also of the Luxembourgs, the Jagiellonians, and the Habsburgs who held the throne of the Hungarian kingdom in the period from the end of the fourteenth to the first quarter of the sixteenth century and had their own visions concerning the place and the role of the non-Hungarian ethnics within the kingdom.

Certainly, there is a strong demand for a "fresh" research of the ecclesiastical policy of

the papal curia (the Avignon and the post-Avignon periods, the epoch of the Great Schism) and the Hungarian archbishoprics in their relation towards the non-Catholic communities in the country – especially on the background of the growing influence of the teachings of John Wycliffe, Jan Hus, and of the Protestant ideas of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (in particular those of Martin Luther and John Calvin). The religion and the confessional issues have always been an important attribute, a motivator of the inner world and psychology of some personal settings of the "national" communities caught up themselves, from the variety of reasons, out of their previous native place of residence.

Thus, the spectrum of the researched issues concerning the "Russian / Ruthenian" settlers in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary (especially in the today Slovakia and Croatian lands) is fairly large, but, still, this subject leaves a lot of problems to be resolved in the future. This study is an introduction to the problem which is to be resolved through direct historical research. The further task is to determine not only the obstacles and the trends of the so-called first relocation of the national "diaspora," but also, in particular on the background of current critical scholarly and political debates, to answer the question about the ethnic origin of the communities and some individuals who clearly and categorically identify themselves as the Ruthenians today.*

²² NOVÁK, Jozef: *Pečate miest a obcí na Slovensku*. Second volume. Bratislava: FiF UK, 2008, passim.

* Translated by Nora MALINOVSKÁ (VEREŠOVÁ).