

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/mzu2021.30.010>

UDC [930.2:929.73(477.82/.86):061(437.32-21)]"1289"

Solomiya Kozak

Postgraduate Student

Ivan Krypyakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies

the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

4, Kozelnytska Street, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine

Email: rapko.sol@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0900-4852>

«И ДОКОНЦАВЪ С НИМЪ МИРЪ ДО СВОЕГО ЖИВОТА»: ON THE QUESTION OF THE CONTEXT OF THE OPAVA MEETING IN 1289, ITS PARTICIPANTS AND THE "ETERNAL" CZECH-GALICIAN UNION

The article covers the circumstances of the meeting that took place in Opava in 1289 with the participation of the Czech king Wenceslaus II Přemyslid, Galician-Volynian suzerain Lev Danylovych and some Polish princes. As the Polish participants in the meeting are not named in the sources, there are still doubts in historiography as to who they were. An attempt was made to substantiate the version that one of the unnamed Polish participants in the meeting was Prince Władysław I Łokietek of Piast dynasty. This assumption is based on an analysis of the eventful context of the Opava meeting, which was part of the struggle for the Cracow heritage, as well as the matrimonial and dynastic ties that played a very important role in medieval international communication. It is noted that the union of Wenceslaus II, Lev Danylovych and Władysław I Łokietek repeatedly manifested itself shortly after the meeting in Opava and was based on existing dynastic ties and the conclusion of new marriage agreements. At the same time, the assumption that Prince Henryk IV Probus of Silesia may also have been present at the talks cannot be completely ruled out, although this hypothesis is currently less plausible. Lack of sources does not allow to definitively refute any of the versions. It is concluded that the Opava meeting was one of the key episodes of the Galician-Czech political union of the late XIIIth century and clearly

demonstrated how relevant international communication was in the struggle for the Kraków throne. Lev Danilovych's participation in the vicissitudes of the struggle for the Kraków throne is considered to be inextricably linked with the orientation towards an alliance with the Czech king and is connected with the importance of an ally of the Galician-Volynian ruler ruling in Kraków.

Keywords: *Opava meeting, Lev Danylovych, Wenceslaus II, Henryk IV Probus, Władysław I Lokietek, struggle for Kraków heritage.*

Соломія Козак

аспірант

Інститут українознавства імені

Івана Крип'якевича НАН України

79000, Україна, Львів, вул. Козельницька, 4

E-mail: rapko.sol@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0900-4852>

«И ДОКОНЦАВЪ С НИМЪ МИРЪ ДО СВОЕГО ЖИВОТА»: ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО КОНТЕКСТ ОПАВСЬКОЇ ЗУСТРІЧІ 1289 РОКУ, ЇЇ УЧАСНИКІВ ТА «ВІЧНИЙ» ЧЕСЬКО-ГАЛИЦЬКИЙ СОЮЗ

У статті висвітлюються обставини зустрічі, яка відбулась в Опаві у 1289 р. за участі чеського короля Вацлава II Пршемисловича, галицько-волинського сюзерена Лева Даниловича та деяких польських князів. З огляду на те, що у джерелах польські учасники зустрічі не названі, в історіографії досі існують сумніви щодо того, хто ними був. На підставі аналізу подієвого контексту опавської зустрічі, яка була складовою боротьби за краківську спадщину, а також матримоніальних та династичних зв'язків, які відігравали дуже важливу роль у середньовічній міжнародній комунікації, було здійснено чергову спробу обґрунтувати версію, що одним із неназваних польських учасників зустрічі був саме ленченський і сєрадський князь Владислав I Локєток із династії П'ястів. Це вважаємо ймовірним з огляду на те, що союз Вацлава II, Лева Даниловича та Владислава I Локєтка неодноразово виявляв себе невдовзі після зустрічі в Опаві та ґрунтувався на підставі існуючих династичних зв'язків та укладенні нових шлюбних угод. Водночас, нами не відкидається повністю припущення, що на переговорах міг також бути присутнім вроцлавський князь Генріх IV Пробус, хоч ця гіпотеза наразі менш вірогідна. Брак джерел не дає змоги остаточно спростувати жодну з версій. Зроблено висновок, що опавська зустріч була одним із ключових епізодів галицько-чеського політичного союзу кінця XIII ст.

і яскраво продемонструвала, наскільки актуальною в умовах боротьби за краківський трон була міжнародна комунікація. Участь Лева Даниловича в перипетіях боротьби за краківський трон розглянуто у невід'ємному зв'язку із орієнтацією на союз із чеським королем та пов'язувано із важливістю того, аби у Кракові правив союзник галицько-волинського володаря.

Ключові слова: *Опавська зустріч, Лев Данилович, Вацлав II, Генріх IV Пробус, Владислав I Локеток, боротьба за краківську спадщину.*

In the last quarter of the XIII century the suzerain of the kingdom of Rus' the Galician-Volynian prince Lev Danylovych (1225/29–1301) was one of the active participants in the struggle for the Krakow throne. First he competes personally, and later supports his lucrative contenders. The participation of the Galician prince in the political life of the Polish principalities is mentioned in the local Galician-Volynian chronicle (XIII century)¹ and in Latin chronicles, in particular by the chroniclers Jan Dlugosz (1415–1480)² and Ottokar von Steiermark (1260/65–1319/21)³. At the same time, the Galician-Volynian prince maintained friendly relations with the Czech king Wenceslaus II (1271–1305) of the Přemyslid dynasty. Having established himself on the Czech throne, he began to actively prepare for the coronation with the Polish crown. That is why we are talking about Czech-Rus' relations, the apogee of which fell on the last decade of the life and reign of Prince Lev Danylovych.

One of the important episodes of Rus'-Czech relations at that time was the meeting in Opava in 1289. It was aptly described by the Czech medievalist Vratislav Vaniček as a “congress of Slavic princes” of the “Czech, Lech and Rus”⁴ family. At this meeting, among other issues, the Galician-Czech union was farmed “until the end of its life”. The Galician-Volyn chronicle eloquently testifies to this: *«тогда же Левъ . гъха в Чехы . на снемь къ королеви . [Вацлава – S.K.] зане любовь держаше с нимъ великою . и dokonцавъ с нимъ миръ . до [скону – S.K.] своего живота . король же wdаривъ . Лва . дарми всакъыми дорогыми . и тако ѿпусти с великою чстью»*⁵.

The Opava meeting of 1289 remains in the field of view of researchers in view of the still open question about its participants, especially the unknown Polish ruler, who then met with Lev Danylovych and Wenceslaus II and promised them support against any enemy, as evidenced by the then source - records of the Prague bishop Tobiáš z Bechyně, or the so-called “formulář”⁶. In recent decades, this question has been raised by medievalists Norbert Mika⁷, Dariusz Dąbrowski⁸, Igor Lichtei⁹ and Leontii Voitovych¹⁰. We will mostly rely on the work of these researchers in the article. At the same time, often among researchers studying Czech-Polish relations in the second half of the 13th century¹¹, Lev Danylovych's participation in the events surrounding the meeting in Opava is not taken into account. Therefore, to pay attention to this aspect of Rus'-Czech-Polish relations

is one of the important tasks. Although the views of researchers on this issue differ somewhat, in general, there are two versions of possible participants in the meeting in Opava, to analyze which are the purpose of our intelligence. At the same time, we will try to outline the general event context of the Opava meeting of 1289 as one of the key episodes of Czech-Rus' communication.

First of all, we must turn to the events that prepared the ground for the allied Czech-Rus' relations of the last third of the XIII century. The conditions for this originated with the predecessor of Wenceslaus II - his father Ottokar II (1233–1278), and were associated with his search for allies against the German Emperor Rudolf I of Habsburg (1218–1291) in the war for the Austrian heritage (1246–1278).

Against the background of the formation of the Hungarian-German alliance during the 1270s, the King of Bohemia Ottokar II became increasingly close to his relatives – the Polish and Rus' princes. Between 1275 and 1277, the Galician-Czech alliance was confirmed¹² by a dynastic marriage between Casimir, the eldest son of Prince Vladislaus of Opole, and Olena of the Romanovychi family¹³. Evidence of the then union agreements was the fact that on the eve of January 21, 1278, a Czech diplomat (*venit de Russia*) Pardus, son of Neplach, came to Lev Danylovych¹⁴.

This was followed by the decisive events of the struggle for the heritage of the Austrian Babenbergs, because in the war that broke out in 1278 and ended on August 26 of that year with the bloody battle of Dürnkrut (*Suché Kruty*) on the Marchfeld near Vienna, the Czech suzerain was killed. As is known from several Czech, Austrian and Bavarian chronicles at the time, warriors from Rus' fought on the side of Přemysl Otakar II in this battle¹⁵. Lviv researcher Illia Parshyn analyzed the participation of Lev Danylovych's knights in this military campaign¹⁶.

The death of Ottokar II led to the extinction of the influence of the Czech Přemyslid dynasty and the entry of the Habsburg dynasty into the European political arena. At the same time, the Galician-Czech union faded away for a while, only to soon gain new relevance.

What was the political situation in Central and Eastern Europe under the successor of Ottokar II, King of Bohemia Wenceslaus II, and what was the place of the Kingdom of Rus'? Relations with the Czech king for Rus' were then determined primarily by relations with Polish rulers, and struggle for the Polish throne, which lasted from 1280 during the 80–90's of the XIII century. Lev Danylovych, who at first competed personally, having reason to do so as the husband of Constance, the sister of the wife of the deceased Kraków prince Bolesław V the Chaste (1226–1279) – Kunigunde (*Kinga*). A successful struggle for a free throne could restore political balance in Central and Eastern Europe, as the balance was ruined by the death of Ottokar II, a former ally of Lev Danylovych and

Bolesław V¹⁷. Actual in the 70's of the XIII century Czech-Polish-Rus' union had longevity in the next decade, when at a meeting in Opava in 1289 the rulers of Bohemia, Poland and Kingdom of Rus' had the opportunity to discuss controversial issues, which will be discussed later in the article.

Lev Danylovych, despite active hostilities aimed at seizing the throne of Kraków in the 80's of the XIII century, failed to achieve the desired. The ruler of Rus', realizing the mistakes of past campaigns, sought rather to normalize relations with neighbors, relying on the diplomatic method and not giving up their own interests. Therefore, in the future the situation was not in favor of Lev Danylovych's direct participation in these events, which created the basis for Rus'-Czech rapprochement¹⁸.

After the death of prince Leszek II the Black in 1288, a new round of struggle came, and the Czech King Wenceslaus II, duke Henryk IV Probus (~1258–1290) of Wrocław and prince Bolesław II of Mazovia-Płock, a cousin of the deceased Leszek, actively competed for the vacant throne. By then, Lev Danylovych was interested rather in having Kraków seized by his ally. He could't stand aside, but he had no reason to claim himself frankly, it remained to support the Płock prince Boleslaw II¹⁹. The latter was married (1290–1302) to the daughter of Ottokar II, the sister of Wenceslaus II Kunigunde (Kunguta)²⁰. This may have been one of the factors that further contributed to the rapprochement of the Galician prince Lev Danylovych with the Czech king, but also linked his policy to the open Polish question.

At the time of Leszek II the Black death, Wenceslaus II was occupied with his internal position in the lands of the Bohemian Crown, because in the autumn of 1288 or early 1289 he finally managed to take power into his own hands, imprisoning the then usurper, the leader of the Vítkovci noble clan, Zavis of Falkenstein. From that moment on, Wenceslaus's active assertion of his own position was inextricably linked to the struggle for the Kraków throne, which was then claimed by his relative and rival, prince Henryk IV Probus from Wrocław²¹. The fact is that shortly after the imprisonment of the Zavis, in the south of Bohemia the Vítkovci revolted, acting in alliance with the Hungarian king and Henryk Probus, offering the latter even the Czech throne²². In order to prevent another loss of power, as well as to avoid the unification of Wrocław land with Kraków land, the Czech king inevitably had to actively intervene in the struggle for the Kraków throne, trying to attract allies to his side. As the Czech medievalist Lukáš Reitinger aptly pointed out, the very idea of Polish subordination was decisive in monarchical representation of the last rulers of Přemyslid dynasty²³.

In this vein, the meeting of Central European rulers in Opava in August 1289 was very important for the Czech king. Meeting was designed to outline a further political alliance capable of resisting a possible coalition of the Vítkovci, Hungarian king Ladislaus IV Kun and Henryk IV Probus.

We find out about the Opava meeting from the already mentioned formulář of the Prague bishop Tobiáš z Bechyně, in which he congratulates Wenceslaus II on the successful negotiations²⁴. There is no discussion about the date of the meeting, and it is believed that it took place on August 15, 1289²⁵, but there is no final agreement among historians about the participants of the meeting. It is more or less clear about some of the participants, as about the Bytom duke Casimir II and Mieszko Władysławych of Cieszyn, Bolko I, duke of Świdnica and Lev Danylovych²⁶. But the figure of the Polish prince, unnamed in any source, is unexplained. Henryk IV Probus, as well as prince Władysław I Łokietek of Łęczyca and Sieradz, the brother of the late Leszek II the Black, could be this prince with a high probability. Next, we consider the researchers' arguments for these two likely candidates.

The version that Henryk IV Probus was an unnamed participant in the meeting in Opava was suggested by the Polish medievalist Bronisław Włodarski. His arguments boiled down to the fact that the “formulář” (however, only there) recorded the Czech king's promise to provide military support to the Wrocław duke²⁷. According to the researcher, it was important for Wenceslaus II to agree with Henryk IV his non-interference in the internal affairs of the Czech crown, so that he would't enter into agreements with opponents of the Czech king²⁸. However, the problem is that there is no source of evidence that such an agreement really existed. On the one hand, Henryk did claim the precedence among the Polish elite for a long time, so the assumption of his participation in the negotiations is partially justified.

What could have been another scenario of the Opava meeting, if among its participants was not Henryk IV Probus, but Władysław I Łokietek? It is this version that is gaining increasing support in research circles. As Dariusz Dąbrowski²⁹, Jan Tęgowski³⁰ and Leontiy Voytovych³¹ argued, the meeting in Opava was attended not only by Wenceslaus II and Lev Danylovych, but also by Casimir II and Mieszko III Władysławych's, possibly Bolko I of Świdnica, and Władysław I Łokietek. It was they who could sign the agreement on against Henryk IV Probus and his allies, and also decided to support Władysław I Łokietek's claim to the Kraków throne³².

The union that took place in Opava was based on dynastic-matrimonial prospects, as the agreement between Lev Danylovych and Władysław I Łokietek provided for the marriage of Lev's son Yuri with Łokietek's sister Euphemia (†1308)³³. At the same time, this would fit the Polish-Galician union into the already existing marriage and political alliance of other participants in the Opava meeting: Casimir II was son-in-law of Lev, vassal of Wenceslaus and cousin of Władysław³⁴. Therefore, the version that Władysław I Łokietek was the unnamed Polish prince-participant of the Opava meeting seems plausible.

Wenceslaus II really had reason to form a coalition of princes, directed against Henryk IV Probus. An additional argument in this direction is made by the Czech researcher Kateřina Charvátová and the Ukrainian medievalist Myroslav Voloshchuk, noting that Wenceslaus II could have been assisted in anti-Probus policy by his mother Kunigunde's sister (~1245–1285) – widow of Leszek II the Black, Princess Agrippina (Gryfina), aunt of the Czech king³⁵.

Another interesting fact follows from this dynastic connection, which is an additional explanation of the allied nature of relationship of Wenceslaus II with Lev Danylovych. The fact is that the mother of the Czech king Kunigunde was of Rus' origin, namely she was the daughter of Rus' prince Rostyslav Mykhailovych (1219 – after 1264), who for a long time fought for the Galician heritage with Danylo Romanovych (1201–1264), being his nephew³⁶. So Wenceslaus II was a relative for Lev Danylovych – a grand-nephew. And the mother of the Czech king and Princess Gryfina the widow of Leszek II the Black, were the daughters of the Rus' prince Rostyslav Mykhailovych. This, of course, created a favorable ground for the establishment of Rus'-Czech relations, as well as led to quite fair claims of Wenceslaus II to the throne of Kraków.

Returning to the course of events shortly after the death of Leszek Chorny, we will try to find out what can help us reveal the mystery of an unknown participant in the Opava meeting. At first, the brothers of the deceased Leszek II the Black, Prince Casimir of Kuyavia and Prince Władysław I Łokietek of Sieradz, forming a coalition, unequivocally sided with the contender close to them – Bolesław II of Mazovia and Płock. In late 1288 and early 1289, Lev Danylovych supported the Mazovian-Kuyavian coalition in the struggle for the Kraków throne against Henryk IV Probus, and in July 1289 already stood with his army under the walls of the Wawel, captured by the Prince of Wrocław and tried to storm it³⁷. At the end of July 1289, just before Opava, Galician troops devastated the Wrocław principality, the domain of the new prince of Kraków³⁸. On this basis, as L. Voitovych convincingly argues, there is no doubt that these allies, united against Henryk IV Probus, were present at the Opava meeting, and among them, most likely, was Władysław I Łokietek, recorded in the sources as “unnamed”³⁹.

If at the meeting in Opava Lev Danylovych did support Władysław I Łokietek in his plans to ascend the Kraków throne, then the further course of events may also confirm this. Shortly after the meeting, Yuri, son of Lev Danylovych, married Władysław's sister Euphemia, which has already been mentioned. This happened between September 1289 and June 23, 1291, which directly suggests that this marriage was preceded by a certain union agreement, and it is logical to connect it with the Opava meeting⁴⁰. Such a decision could help the Rus' prince to strengthen his position in the region and ensure a reliable alliance between the Rus' and Polish kingdoms.

The Czech researcher R. Antonín expressed a somewhat different view of the events in Opava. In his opinion, Henryk IV Probus could be one of the participants in the «meeting»: both the negotiations and the gifts received by Lev Danylovych from the Czech king aimed at could that the Galician prince would side with the prince of Wrocław, with whom then Wenceslaus II was in confrontation. Therefore Henryk himself, could be present at the meeting⁴¹.

Also leads to such conclusions the course of events shortly after Opava, which was unfavorable for Władysław I Łokietek. On August 24, 1289, Henryk Probus and Henry V the Fat, duke of Legnica, managed to defeat the enemys under the walls of Wawel⁴². As I. Lichtei noted, relying on the testimony of chroniclers Jan Długosz and Alexander Guagnini, Władysław I Łokietek barely managed to escape from Kraków, disguised as a Franciscan⁴³. Instead, his knights was much less fortunate: some were killed, others were taken prisoner⁴⁴. Thus, version to R. Antonín, such consequences for Władysław I Łokietek shortly after the Opava meeting suggest that it was Henryk IV Probus was the unnamed participant in the congress who promised to help Wenceslaus II and Lev Danylovych.

Can information about position of Lev Danylovych during the Kraków campaign of Henryk IV Probus at the end of August 1289 help answer this question? Unfortunately, it is not known for sure in favor of which prince the actions of the Lev Danylovych were. We have only information from the Galician-Volynian chronicle that warriors of Lev Danylovych near Kraków *«не оуспѣша ничтоже . и поиде Левъ . во своаеси . с чстъю великою вземь бесчисленое множество . полона . челдди и скота и конии . и товара . славице Бѣи прчстѣую его Мтѣрь . помозишоу емоу»*⁴⁵. Could this indicate that there was no agreement with Władysław I Łokietek, and the Galician prince with gifts from Wenceslaus II had just returned to the Rus' lands? Perhaps, this message reveals the failure of the Lev's army in alliance with Łokietek, so after this failure near Krakow, the Galician prince had more sense to return home.

However, it is known that the Galician prince did not stop there, and from the beginning of 1290 he together with the allied from the Golden Horde made a campaign in the Silesian lands⁴⁶ up to Racibórz⁴⁷, which was carefully studied by N. Mika. After the unsuccessful assault on Racibórz on January 16, Rus' troops abandoned the attempt to subdue the Racibórz prince to Wenceslaus II and moved on to the possession of their main adversary in Silesia, Henryk Probus⁴⁸. It turns out that there were hardly any allied agreements between Lev Danylovych and Henryk Probus in Opava, if the Galician prince fought against the prince of Wrocław shortly after their hypothetical meeting. However, a compromise peace between the rulers could have taken place as a result of the Silesian campaigns of the Galician prince. According to Austrian chroniclers, before his death, Henryk Probus gave the “king of Rus' ” lands and

city⁴⁹. It was, obviously, about the recognition of the Lublin land captured by Lev during the war of 1289–1290⁵⁰. In response, the Galician prince could recognize Henryk as the prince of Kraków – such an alliance would be beneficial to both.

Henryk IV Probus, inspired by the success in Kraków in 1289, do the following step: he tried to restore the Polish royal title with the help of the Roman Curia⁵¹. But fortune was not in favor of the Prince of Wrocław, and on June 23, 1290 he died suddenly, apparently poisoned⁵². Perhaps this turn of events is evidence that a coalition was formed against Henryk Probus, and that at the Opava meeting the unnamed Polish prince was not Henryk, but Władysław I Łokietek, who from that moment acted in alliance with Wenceslaus II and Lev Danylovych. The above-mentioned matrimonial grounds, which became apparent shortly after Opava, may serve as an argument here.

What was the content of Polish-Rus'-Czech relations shortly after the Opava meeting, and especially after the death of Henryk IV Probus? Lev Danylovych supported Władysław I Łokietek, who immediately after the death of the Silesian prince established himself in the Sandomierz principality⁵³. At the same time, the Galician suzerain could't actively interfere in Polish events, because the events surrounding the struggle for the Hungarian throne became more relevant for him at that time, when on the Hungarian throne with the establishment of Andrew III (1265–1301) and the Hungarian-Galician alliance appeared. In the conditions when in 1292 Wenceslaus II attacked the Sandomierz principality of Władysław I Łokietek, and in August of the same year the latter was forced to take a vassal oath of allegiance to the Czech king, Lev Danylovych openly did not interfere in the struggle, but later began to lean more and more. to the alliance with Wenceslaus II⁵⁴.

As we can see, the congress in Opava in 1289 demonstrated how important and ambiguous the communication of the Central European rulers was in the struggle for the Kraków throne. Its key participants were the Czech and Galician-Volynian suzerains, as well as some Polish princes. At the same time, the question of who the Polish prince was not named in the sources remains open, as there are arguments both in favor of the fact that Henryk IV Probus could be this prince and that it was Władysław I Łokietek, and the sources are not enough to finally accept one version. This requires a careful study of the events that preceded the Opava meetings and took place soon. The matrimonial connections of the explicit and hypothetical participants of the meeting – Wenceslaus II, Lev Danylovych and Władysław I Łokietek – are quite informative in this context, which may indicate that Prince Władysław was unnamed participants in Opava.

The events of the next decade will only confirm what was said when the union of three rulers – Wenceslaus II, Lev Danylovych and Władysław I Łokietek

– bound by agreements and matrimonial ties, more than once found its expression in the vicissitudes of power struggle in Central and Eastern Europe. And this for some time determined the close Czech-Polish-Rus' communication of the late XIII century.

¹ Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Ипатьевская летопись. СПб, 1908. стлб. 881, 933.

² Joannis Długossii seu Longini Canonici Cracoviensis Historiae Polonicae: Libri XII. *Ad Veterrimorum Librorum Manuscriptorum Fidem Recensuit, Variis Lectionibus Annotationibusque*. Ed. A. Przezdziecki. Tomus II. Libri V, VI, VII, VIII. Cracoviae: 1873. P. 455–456.

³ Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik . Hrsg. J. Seemüller. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Deutsche Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters*. Т. 5. Bd. 1. Hannoverae, 1890. P. 281, W. 21307–21311.

⁴ Vaníček V. Velké dějiny zemi Koruny české. Praha–Litomyšl: Paseka, 2002. Svazek III. 1250–1310. S. 410.

⁵ Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Ипатьевская летопись... стлб. 936.

⁶ Hlaváček I. Nový zlomek formuláře biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně. *Československý časopis historický*. 1958. Ročník VI (56). Číslo 1. S. 545–561.

⁷ Mika N. Polityka czeska kniazia Lwa Daniłowicza. Z dziejów stosunków rusko–czeskich w drugiej połowie XIII w. *Przemyśl i ziemia przemyska w strefie wpływów ruskich X–połowa XIV w.* Red. V. Nagirnyu, T. Pudłocki. (Colloquia Russica, ser. II, vol. 1). Kraków, 2013. S. 163–181. Його ж. Русь у сілезьких середньовічних джерелах (до кінця XIII ст.). *Середньовічна Русь: Проблеми термінології*. Ред. В. Нагірний, М. Волощук. (Colloquia Russica, ser. II, vol. 4). Івано-Франківськ–Краків, 2018. S. 227–249. Idem. Traktat w Opawie z 15 sierpnia 1289 roku. Przyczynek do pierwszego planu rozbiorowego Polski. *Pro pana profesora Libora Jana k životnímu jubileu*. Ed. V. Chocholáč, J. Malíř, L. Reitinge, M. Wihoda. Brno, 2020. S. 287–302.

⁸ Dąbrowski D. Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza z sąsiadami zachodnimi. *Галичина та Волинь у добу середньовіччя. До 800-річчя з дня народження Данила Галицького. Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України. Історичні та культурологічні студії*. Т. 3. Львів, 2001. С. 42–69.

⁹ Ліхтей І. Суперництво польських князів за володіння Краковом у 80-х роках XIII ст. й позиція галицького правителя Лева Даниловича та чеського короля Вацлава II. *Ужгородські польські наукові читання: історія, культура, політика, право*. Ужгород, 2014. С. 7–27.

¹⁰ Войтович Л.В. Князь Лев Данилович. Львів: НАН України. Інститут українознавства ім.І.Крип'якевича, 2012. Його ж. Лев Данилович: «князь думен и хоробор на рати» чи «безчесний князь»? *Україна в Центральній-Східній Європі*. Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2013. Вип. 12–13. С. 148–189. Його ж. Лев Данилович і боротьба за краківський престол в останній чверті XIII ст. *Проблеми слов'янознавства*. 2014. Вип. 63. С. 9–21. Його ж. Лев Данилович. Князь галицько-волинський (бл. 1225 – бл. 1301). Львів, 2014. Його ж. Галич у політичному житті Європи XI–XIV ст. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича, 2015.

¹¹ Для прикладу, можна згадати праці авторитетних дослідників, у яких руський аспект чесько-польських відносин, зокрема участь Лева Даниловича в міжнародній комунікації, майже не береться до уваги: V. Vaníček, *Velké dějiny země Koruny české*. Praha-Litomyšl: Paseka. (Svazek III. 1250–1310). S. 410–411; R. Antonín, *Zahraníční politika krále Václava II. v letech 1283–1300*. Svazek 26. Brno: Matice Moravská, 2009, S. 114–121. Idem. *Malopolsko jako objekt zahraniční politiky Václava II. v letech 1289–1300*. *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2007. Číslo 11. S. 95–116.

¹² Dąbrowski D. *Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza...* S. 49.

¹³ Jasiński K. *Rodowód Piastów śląskich*. T. 3. Wrocław, 1977. S. 35–38; Sroka S. *Z dziejów stosunków polsko-węgierskich w późnym średniowieczu*. Kraków, 1995. S. 34–36.

¹⁴ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae*. Ed. J. Šebánek, S. Dušková. T. 5/1. Pragae, 1974. №50.

¹⁵ *Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik*. Ed. J. Seemüller. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Deutsche Chroniken*. T. 5/1. Hannoverae, 1893. W. 15233–15234; *Johannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber centanum historianum*. Ed. F. Schneider. *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum*. T. 43. Hannoverae–Lipsiae, 1909. P. 231, 277; Heiling K.J. *Leopold Stainreuter von Wien der Verfasser der sogenannten Österreichische Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften*. *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. T. 47. Innsbruck, 1933. S. 257; *Anonimi Leobensis chronicon*. Ed. H. Pez. *Scriptores rerum Austriacarum veteres ac genuini*. T. 1. Lipsiae, 1721. P. 848; Eberhardi Thomas. *Chronica Austriae*. Ed. A. Lhotski. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*. Seriae Nova. T. 13. Berlin–Zürich, 1967. P. 146; *Die Weltchronik des Mönchs Albert 1273/1277–1454/56*. Ed. R. Sprandel. Id. T. 17. München, 1994. P. 179; *Eberhardi archidiaconi Ratisbonensis annals*. Ed. Ph. Jaffé. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*. T. 17. Hannoverae, 1861. P. 593; *Hermani Altahensis annals*. Ed. Ph. Jaffé. *Ibid.* P. 410.

¹⁶ Див.: Паршин І. Участь Лева Даниловича у битві при Дюрнкрюті 1278 року. *Княжа доба: історія і культура*. Львів, 2012. Вип. 6. С. 187–192; Його ж. Галицькі війська у битві при Дюрнкрюті 1278 року: факти і здогади. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*. Львів, 2013. Вип. 48. С. 45–60. Його ж. Битва при Дюрнкроте 26 августа 1278 г.: альянс Льва Даниловича и Пшемисла Оттокара. *Rossica Antiqua*. Санкт-Петербург, 2012. №1 (5). С. 95–106. Його ж. *Leon rex ruthenorum на сторінках «Anonimi Leobensis Chronicon»*. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie*. 2013. Zeszyt 5 (9). S. 86–93.

¹⁷ Войтович Л. Лев Данилович і боротьба за краківський престол в останній чверті XIII ст. *Проблеми слов'янознавства*. 2014. Вип. 63. С. 10.

¹⁸ Паршин І. Дипломатія Галицько-Волинської держави: європейські наративні джерела XIII–XV століть. Львів: 2018. С. 185.

¹⁹ Dąbrowski D. *Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza...* S. 54.

²⁰ Флоровский А. Чехи и восточные славяне. Очерки по истории чешско-русских отношений (X–XVIII вв.). В 2-х томах. Прага: Slovansky ustav, 1935. T. 1. С. 255. J.Szymczak. *Genealogia Przemyślidów z przełomu XIII i XIV wieku spokrewnionych z Piastami*. *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Historia*. T. 8 (54). Toruń: 1973. S. 40–42.

²¹ Bar P. *Vratislavský vévoda Jindřich IV. Probus a poslední Přemyslovci*. *Český časopis historický*. 2008. Ročník 106. Číslo 4. S. 774.

²² Zbraslavská kronika. *Chronicon aulae regiae*. Překl. F. Heřmanský, verše přelož. R. Mertlík, historická revize Z. Fiala, spolupráce M. Bláhová. 2 oprav. vyd. Praha: Svoboda, 1976. S. 66; Ліхтей І. Суперництво польських князів... С. 19.

²³ Reitinger L. Polské země a originálnost piastovské monarchie jako inspirace a nástroj panovnické sebezprezentace Přemyslovců. [in:] Michałowski R., Pac, G. *Oryginalność czy wtórność? Studia poświęcone polskiej kulturze politycznej i religijnej (X–XIII wiek)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2020. P. 233–290.

²⁴ Formulář biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně (1279–1296). Vyd. J. B. Novák. *Historický archiv*. Č. 22. N. 192. Praha: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1903. P. 152.

²⁵ Dąbrowski D. Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza... S. 55; Jurek T. Plany koronacyjne Henryka Probusa. *Śląsk w czasach Henryka IV Prawego*. Wratislavia Antiqua 8. Studia z dziejów Wrocławia. Ed. K. Wachowski. Wrocław, 2005. S. 24; Vaníček V. Velké dějiny zemi Koruny české. Svazek III. 1250–1310. Praha–Litomyšl: Paseka, 2002. S. 410; Włodarski B. Polska i Czechy w drugiej połowie XIII i początkach XIV wieku (1250–1306). *Archiwum towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie*. Dz. 2. T. 7. Z. 3. Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1931. S. 112.

²⁶ Ліхтей І. Суперництво польських князів... С. 20.

²⁷ Там само.

²⁸ Włodarski B. Polska i Czechy w drugiej połowie XIII i początkach XIV wieku... S. 112–113.

²⁹ Dąbrowski D. Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza... S. 55; Idem. Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich. *Biblioteka Genealogiczna*. T. 6. Poznań; Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Historyczne, 2002. S. 211–212.

³⁰ Tęgowski J. Zabiegi księcia kujawskiego Władysława Łokietka o tron krakowski w latach 1288–1293. *Zapiski Kujawsko-Dobrzyńskie*. T. 6. Historia. Włocławek: Włocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1988. S. 48–49, 53–54.

³¹ Войтович Л.В. Князь Лев Данилович. Львів: НАН України. Інститут українознавства ім.І.Крип'якевича, 2012. С. 151.

³² Ліхтей І. Суперництво польських князів... С. 21.

³³ Dąbrowski D. Rodowód... S. 197–217. Войтович Л. Лев Данилович... С. 212.

³⁴ Dąbrowski D. Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza... S. 55.

³⁵ Charvátová K. Václav II. Král český a polský. *Velké postavy českých dějin*. Svazek 7. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2007. S. 126. Волощук М. Княгиня Грифіна Ростиславівна, її польський шлюб та ймовірне руське оточення двору. *Галичина: науковий і культурно-просвітний краєзнавчий часопис*. Івано-Франківськ: 2017. Вип. 28. С. 12–19.

³⁶ Козак С. Постать Кунегунди Ростиславни на тлі русько-чеських відносин другої половини XIII ст. *Актуальні проблеми вітчизняної та всесвітньої історії*. 2018. Вип. 21. С. 7–12.

³⁷ ПСРЛ... Стлб. 935–936.

³⁸ Там же. Стлб. 936; Rocznik Cystersów Henrykowskich. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica: Pomniki dziejowe Polski*. T.3. Lwów, nakł. Akademii Umiejętności, 1878. S. 702.

³⁹ Войтович Л. Князь Лев Данилович... С. 150.

- ⁴⁰ Войтович Л. Лев Данилович... С. 212-213.
- ⁴¹ Antonín R. *Zahraniční politika krále Vaclava II...* S. 121.
- ⁴² Tęgowski J. *Zabiegi księcia kujawskiego Władysława Łokietka...* S. 54–55.
- ⁴³ Гваньїні Олександр. *Хроніка європейської Сарматії. Упорядкув. та пер. з пол. о. Ю. Мицика. Київ: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2007. С. 115–116.;* *Joannis Długossii seu longini Canonici Cracoviensis Historiae Polonicae...* P. 500. I. Ліхтей. *Суперництво польських князів...* С. 22–23.
- ⁴⁴ Ліхтей І. Там само. С. 23.
- ⁴⁵ ПСРЛ... Стлб. 937.
- ⁴⁶ *Rocznik Cystersow Henrykowskich...* P. 702.
- ⁴⁷ Mika N. *Racibyrz w obliczu najazdyw tatarskich i zagrożenia wałaskiego. Racibyrz, 2002. S. 50–62. Idem. Polityka czeska kniazia Lwa Daniłowicza...* S. 176–177. Idem. *Dzieje ziemi raciborskiej. 2. wyd. Kraków: Avalon, 2012. S. 45–46.*
- ⁴⁸ Міка Н. Русь у сілезьких... С. 247.
- ⁴⁹ Ottokars *Österreichische Reimchronik...* P. 284; *Österreichische Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften. Hrsg. J.Seemüller. Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Deutsche Chroniken. T. 6. Hannoverae et Lipsae, 1909. P. 138; Ebendorfer Thomas. Chronica Austriae...* P. 210–211.
- ⁵⁰ *Rocznik krakowski. Ed. A. Bielowski. Monumenta Poloniae Historica: Pomniki dziejowe Polski. T. 2. Lwów: Druk. Zakł. Nar. im. Ossolińskich, 1872. P. 852.;* Войтович Л. Лев Данилович... С. 214.
- ⁵¹ Ottokars *Österreichische Reimchronik...* P 287, v.21710–21714.
- ⁵² Bar P. *Vratislavský vévoda Jindřich IV. Probus....* S. 777. I. Ліхтей. *Суперництво...* С. 23.
- ⁵³ Войтович Л. Лев Данилович... С. 215.
- ⁵⁴ Там само. С. 216–217.

REFERENCES

1. Anonimi *Leobensis chronicon. (1721). H. Pez (Ed.). Scriptores rerum Austriacarum veteres ac genuini. (Vol. 1). Lipsiae [in Latin].*
2. Antonín, R. (2007). *Malopolsko jako objekt zahraniční politiky Václava II. v letech 1289–1300. Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica, 11, 95–116 [in Czech].*
3. Antonín, R. (2009). *Zahraniční politika krále Vaclava II. v letech 1283–1300. (Svazek 26). Brno: Matices Moravská [in Czech].*
4. Bar, P. (2008). *Vratislavský vévoda Jindřich IV. Probus a poslední Přemyslovci. Český časopis historický, 4, 753–787 [in Czech].*
5. Charvátová, K. (2007). *Václav II. Král český a polský. Velké postavy českých dějin. (Svazek 7). Praha: Vyšehrad [in Czech].*
6. *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. (1974). J. Šebánek, S. Dušková (Ed.). (Vol. 5/1). Pragae [in Latin].*
7. Dąbrowski, D. (2002). *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich. Biblioteka Genealogiczna. (Vol. 6.) Poznań; Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Historyczne [in Polish].*

8. Dąbrowski, D. (2001). Stosunki polityczne Lwa Daniłowicza z sąsiadami zachodnimi. *Halychyna ta Volyn' u dobu seredn'ovichchia. Do 800-richchia z dnia narodzhennia Danyla Halyts'koho. Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha NAN Ukrainy. Istorychni ta kul'turolohichni studii*, 3, 42–69 [in Ukrainian].
9. *Die Weltchronik des Mönchs Albert 1273/1277–1454/56* (1994). R. Sprandel (Ed.). (Vol. 17). München [in German].
10. Ebendorfer, Th. (1967). *Chronica Austriae*. A. Lhotski (Ed.). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum*. Seraes Nova. (Vol.13). Berlin–Zürich [in Latin].
11. Eberhardi archidiaconi Ratisbonensis annals. (1861). Ph. Jaffé (Ed.). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*. (Vol. 17). Hannoverae [in Latin].
12. Florovskiy, A. (1935). *Chekhi i vostochnye slavyane. Ocherki po istorii cheshskorusskikh otnosheniy (X–XVIII vv.)*. (Vol.1). Praga: Slovansky ustav [in Russian].
13. Formulář biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně (1279–1296). (1903). Vyd. J. B. Novák. *Historický archiv*. (Č. 22. N. 192). Praha: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění [in Czech].
14. Heiling, K. J. (1933). Leopold Stainreuter von Wien der Verfasser der sogenannten Österreichische Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. (Vol. 47). Innsbruck [in German].
15. Hermani Altahensis annals. (1861). Ph. Jaffé (Ed.). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*. (Vol. 17). Hannoverae [in Latin].
16. Hlaváček, I. (1958). Nový zlomek formuláře biskupa Tobiáše z Bechyně. *Československý časopis historický*, 1, 545–561 [in Czech].
17. Hvan'ini, O. (2007). *Khronika ievropejs'koi Sarmatii*. Kyiv: Vyd. dim Kyievo-Mohylians'ka akademiia [in Ukrainian].
18. Jasiński, K. (1997) *Rodowyd Piastyw śląskich*. (Vol. 3). Wrocław [in Polish].
19. Joannis Długossii seu Longini Canonici Cracoviensis Historiae Polonicae: Libri XII. (1873). *Ad Veterrimorum Librorum Manuscriptorum Fidem Recensuit, Variis Lectionibus Annotationibusque*. A. Przewdziecki (Ed.). Tomus II. Libri V, VI, VII, VIII. Cracoviae [in Latin].
20. Joannis abbatis Victoriensis Liber centanum historianum. (1909). F. Schneider (Ed.). *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum*. (Vol. 43). Hannoverae–Lipsiae [in Latin].
21. Jurek, T. (2005). Plany koronacyjne Henryka Probusa. Śląsk w czasach Henryka IV Prawego. *Wratislavia Antiqua 8. Studia z dziejów Wrocławia*. K. Wachowski (Ed.). Wrocław [in Polish].
22. Kozak, S. (2018). Postat' Kunehundy Rostyslavny na tli rus'ko-ches'kykh vidnosyn druhoi polovyny XIII st. *Aktual'ni problemy vitchyznianoï ta vsesvitn'oi istorii*, 21, 7–12 [in Ukrainian].
23. Likhtej, I. (2014). Supernytstvo pol's'kykh kniaziv za volodinnia Krakovom u 80-kh rokakh XIII st. j pozytsiia halyts'koho pravytelia Leva Danylovycha ta ches'koho korolia Vatslava II. *Uzhhorods'ki pol's'ki naukovi chytannia: istoriia, kul'tura, polityka, pravo*. Uzhhorod, 7–27 [in Ukrainian].
24. Mika, N. (2002). *Racibyrz w obliczu najazdów tatarskich i zagrożenia wałaskiego*. Racibyrz [in Polish].

25. Mika, N. (2012). *Dzieje ziemi raciborskiej*. Kraków: Avalon [in Polish].
26. Mika, N. (2013). Polityka czeska kniazia Lwa Daniłowicza. Z dziejów stosunków rusko–czeskich w drugiej połowie XIII w. *Przemyśl i ziemia przemyska w strefie wpływów ruskich, X – połowa XIV w.* (Colloquia Russica, ser. II, vol. 1). Kraków, 163–181 [in Polish].
27. Mika, N. (2018). Rus' u silez'kykh seredn'ovichnykh dzhherelakh (do kintsia XIII st.). *Seredn'ovichna Rus': Problemy terminolohii*. (Colloquia Russica, ser. II, vol. 4). Ivano-Frankivs'k–Krakiv, 227–249 [in Ukrainian].
28. Mika, N. (2020). Traktat w Opawie z 15 sierpnia 1289 roku. Przyczynek do pierwszego planu rozbiorowego Polski. *Pro pana profesora Libora Jana k životnímu jubileu*. Brno, 287–302 [in Polish].
29. Ottokars Österreichische Reimchronik. (1890). Hrsg. J. Seemüller. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Deutsche Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters*. (T. 5. Bd. 1.). Hannoverae. W. 21307–21311 [in German].
30. Parshyn, I. (2012). Bytva pry Diurnkrute 26 avhusta 1278 h.: al'ians L'va Danylovycha y Pshemysla Ottokara. *Rossica Antiqua*, 1/5, 95–106 [in Ukrainian].
31. Parshyn, I. (2012). Uchast' Leva Danylovycha u bytvi pry Diurnkruti 1278 roku. *Kniazha doba: istoriia i kul'tura*, 6, 187–192 [in Ukrainian].
32. Parshyn, I. (2013). Halyts'ki vijs'ka u bytvi pry Diurnkruti 1278 roku: fakty i zdohady. *Visnyk L'vivs'koho universytetu. Serii istorychna*, 48, 45–60 [in Ukrainian].
33. Parshyn, I. (2013). Leon rex ruthenorum na storinkakh Anonymi Leobensis Chronicon. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie*, 5/9, 86–93 [in Ukrainian].
34. Parshyn, I. (2018). *Dyplomatiia Halyts'ko-Volyns'koi derzhavy: ievropejs'ki naratyvni dzhherela XIII–XV stolit'*. L'viv [in Ukrainian].
35. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*. (1908). (Vol. 2). Sankt-Peterburg [in Russian].
36. Reitinger, L. (2020). Polské země a originalnost piastovské monarchie jako inspirace a nástroj panovnické sebezprezentace Přemyslovců. In: Michałowski R., Pac, G. *Oryginalność czy wtórność? Studia poświęcone polskiej kulturze politycznej i religijnej (X–XIII wiek)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 233–290 [in Czech].
37. Rocznik Cystersow Henrykowskich. (1878). *Monumenta Poloniae Historica: Pomniki dziejowe Polski*. (Vol. 3). Lwów: nakł. Akademii Umiejętności, 699–704 [in Latin].
38. Rocznik krakowski. (1872). A. Bielowski (Ed). *Monumenta Poloniae Historica: Pomniki dziejowe Polski*. (Vol. 2). Lwów: Druk. Zakł. Nar. im. Ossolińskich [in Latin].
39. Szymczak, J. (1973). Genealogia Przemyślidów z przełomu XIII i XIV wieku spokrewnionych z Piastami. *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Historia*, 8 (54), 39–54 [in Polish].
40. Sroka, S. (1995). *Z dziejow stosunkow polsko-węgierskich w pyżnym srednowieczu*. Krazyw [in Polish].
41. Tęgowski, J. (1988). Zabiegi księcia kujawskiego Władysława Łokietka o tron krakowski w latach 1288–1293. *Zapiski Kujawsko-Dobrzyńskie*. (Vol. 6). Włocławek: Włocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe [in Polish].
42. Vaníček, V. (2002). *Velké dějiny zemi Koruny české*. Praha–Litomyšl: Paseka. (Svazek III. 1250–1310) [in Czech].

43. Vojtovych, L.V. (2012). *Kniaz' Lev Danylovych*. L'viv: NAN Ukrainy. Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I.Kryp'iakevycha [in Ukrainian]
44. Vojtovych, L. (2013). Lev Danylovych: kniaz' dumen y khorobor na raty chy bezchesnyj kniaz'? *Ukraina v Tsentral'no-Skhidnij Yevropi*, 12–13, 148–189 [in Ukrainian].
45. Vojtovych, L. (2014). Lev Danylovych i borot'ba za krakivs'kyj prestol v ostannij chverti XIII st. *Problemy slov'ianoznavstva*, 63, 9–21 [in Ukrainian].
46. Vojtovych, L. (2014). *Lev Danylovych. Kniaz' halyts'ko-volyns'kyj (bl. 1225 – bl. 1301)*. L'viv [in Ukrainian].
47. Vojtovych, L. (2015). *Halych u politychnomu zhytti Yevropy XI–XIV st.* L'viv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha [in Ukrainian].
48. Voloschuk, M. (2017). Kniahynia Gryfina Rostyslavivna, ii pol's'kyj shliub ta jmovirne rus'ke otochennia dvoru. *Halychyna: naukovyj i kul'turno-prosvitnij kraieznavchij chasopys*, 28, 12–19 [in Ukrainian].
49. Włodarski, B. (1931). Polska i Czechy w drugiej połowie XIII i początkach XIV wieku (1250–1306). *Archiwum towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie*. (Dz. 2. T. 7. Z. 3). Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe [in Polish].
50. *Zbraslavská kronika. Chronicon aulae regiae*. (1976). Praha: Svoboda [in Czech].