



Dariusz Dąbrowski (Bydgoszcz)

ON THE POSSIBILITIES OF RESEARCHING THE MARRIAGE POLICIES OF THE RURIKIDS: THE CASE OF MSTISLAV FYODOR VLADIMIROVICH MONOMAKHOVICH

Some time ago already, we indicated¹ the necessity of a scholarly synthesis of the marriage-of-state politics employed by the Mstislavichi, i.e. the descendants of Mstislav, the eldest son of Vladimir Monomakh. This branch of the Rurikid dynasty rose to prominence in the Rus' in the early 12th century and remained influential virtually until the late 14th century².

The issue requires a number of introductory remarks concerning the methodology involved.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that a *sine qua non* of this kind of research is the availability of reliable, verified biographical information concerning the historical figures in question. In our case, this condition happens to be fulfilled: an in-depth study on the genealogy of the Mstislavichi has been published recently³.

The enterprise of tracing the dynastic policies exercised by individual rulers may bring manifold benefits. Not infrequently, a marriage is the only indication of the formation of an alliance to get mentioned in the sources (it goes without saying that matrimonial deals were part and parcel of political life; this fact has

¹ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów. Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*, Kraków 2008, p. 732.

² Let us restate the basic facts: the descendants of Mstislav I Vladimirovich ruled Kiev (intermittently until 1240), Novgorod the Great (intermittently until 1221), Volhynia (until 1340), Halych (ultimately, from 1198/1199, intermittently until 1340) and Smolensk (as essentially independent rulers until the death of Ivan Aleksandrovich, 1358, or Svyatoslav Ivanovich, 1386). We may add that the history of the Principality of Smolensk deserves a modern synthesis: although the monograph by Petr GOLUBOVSKIJ (*История Смоленской земли до начала х ст.*, Киев 1895) is not without merit, it is often necessary to verify the interpretations it offers.

³ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...* Cf. also the revised and considerably enlarged Russian edition of this book: Д. ДОМБРОВСКИЙ, *Генеалогия Мстиславичей. Первые поколения (до начала XIV в.)*, trans. et ed. К. ЕРУСАЛИМСКИЙ, О. ОСТАПЧУК, Санкт-Петербург 2015 [= SSO, 10]. If we did not have at our disposal an appropriate basis – preferably one conforming to the principles of the so-called Polish genealogical school (Oswald Balzer, Kazimierz Jasiński) – we would soon get 'buried' in examining the primary data, which would substantially hinder (if not entirely thwart) our main project in this study.

been confirmed by numerous studies). Elsewhere⁴, we presented two arguments concerning this topic, corroborated by a number of concrete examples: firstly, that matrimonial ‘clashes’ of sorts were not uncommon, and secondly, that alliances based on marriages of state were usually of an *ad hoc* nature – aimed at achieving current political objectives – and therefore tended to lose actual political importance quite rapidly. On the other hand, they would sometimes bring about long-term effects in many fields, such as e.g. the migration of names from one family to another, cultural influences of various kinds, impact on the development of family memory, etc.; these aspects were sometimes utilized pragmatically a long time after the marriage itself.

Finally, we owe the reader one more remark. It stands to reason that there are many parallel ways in which the marriage policies of any dynasty (including, of course, the Rurikids) can be analyzed. The broadest approach would be tantamount to a synthetic study of the topic in its entirety (“The Marriage Policies of the Rurikids”). It could be divided into chronological units (e.g. “The Marriage Policies of the Rurikids in the 13th Century”). Furthermore, it is by all means legitimate to narrow down the focus of the study to a single branch only (“The Marriage Policies of the Mstislavichi”), possibly with a concomitant chronological delimitation “The Marriage Policies of the Mstislavichi in the Second Half of the 12th Century”). Each of the above-mentioned approaches would undoubtedly yield fruitful results, albeit somewhat different in each case. In our opinion, however, it is optimal for research of this kind to be conducted ‘bottom-up’, taking individual rulers or smaller family groups as the point of departure. The key advantage of this method of inquiry – which we have termed “dynastic micro-genealogy”⁵ – is the high level of precision of the results it yields. This translates into a deeper insight into the circumstances surrounding each marriage, which in turn enables us to interpret the political context of the relationships (at least as long as the state of preservation of the sources permits this⁶). Only subsequently – after the above-defined modules (i.e. single matrimonial arrangements) have been analyzed – do we go further, formulating synthetic conclusions and seeking a broader view of the phenomenon (in terms of time, space and family background). This, finally, opens up the possibilities of studying further aspects of the topic: processes and changes

⁴ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Piasten und Rurikiden im 11. bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, [in:] *Fernhändler, Dynasten, Kleriker. Die piastische Herrschaft in kontinentalen Beziehungsgeflechten vom 10. bis zum frühen 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. D. ADAMCZYK, N. KERSKEN, Wiesbaden 2015, p. 187–189.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 160.

⁶ Regrettably, the poor condition of the extant source material often renders this approach impossible. Regarding many Rurikids, the information at our disposal is extraordinarily scanty; cases where a given representative of the dynasty is only mentioned in the sources a single time are not uncommon. The situation is even worse as far as the princely wives and princesses are concerned: the sources clearly discriminate against women in their narratives, as we remarked elsewhere (cf. D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 733–734).

occurring in time, similarities and differences in the mechanisms of marriage alliance policies, their causes and effects, etc.

This is, we claim, the method of choice: it enables the most effective research into the marriage alliance strategies of particular dynasts and dynasties⁷.

Thus, let us have a look at the marriage policies of a particular Rurikid – Mstislav Fyodor Vladimirovich Monomakhovich. We should note right away that the above wording is still somewhat imprecise: as a matter of fact, we should declare that the article will deal both with the marriage policies of Mstislav himself and with the strategies that he and his children were subject to. Furthermore, we should remark that the core issue of our study is not so much the reconstruction of the marriage-related activities of prince Mstislav and the other historical figures involved (i.e. tracing the mechanisms employed by particular persons as well as the objectives and effects achieved in the relevant spheres) as another rudimentary issue, already alluded to above: namely, the possibilities offered in this respect by the source material. Accordingly, we shall appraise the character and value of the information found in the sources, reflecting on its relevance for studying the marriage policies of this key figure in the history of Rus'. This will provide the basis for further deliberations on the prospects, purposefulness and viability of studying the marriage alliance policies of the Rurikids in general – or at least the greater part of the dynasty. The reason for which we are undertaking this venture is that numerous scholars – even when making use of the highly specialized, well-thought-out methodology described above – fail to disclose the basis of their findings to their readers, which puts the accuracy of their conclusions in doubt and blurs the overall picture. We decided to follow the approach outlined above when the work on the article was already under way: we were impressed by picture of the sheer source material (which was, of course, well-known to us in advance) as it appeared when assembled for this particular purpose. The line adopted here will, we believe, be instrumental in demonstrating the character of scholarly findings in the field under discussion, revealing the proportions between results based on information directly stated in the sources and those that derive from intermediate analytical reasoning – and are therefore inevitably hypothetical to some extent. We shall adduce a number of examples that will serve to illustrate the factors and mechanisms by which research hypotheses – the groundwork of scholarly reasoning – are constructed in our field. In other words, we will attempt to expose the ins and outs of the working methods of a historian who studies the marriage policies of a medieval dynasty.

⁷ Thus, we are following the established methodology proposed some time ago by German scholars, especially Dieter VELDTRUP (*Zwischen Eherecht und Familienpolitik. Studien zu den dynastischen Heiratsprojekten Karls IV*, Warendorf 1988) and Tobias WELER (*Die Heiratspolitik des deutschen Hochadels im 12. Jahrhundert*, Köln 2004).

At the same time, we shall ponder the question what determines the extent to which information on the princely marriages is included in various sources. These considerations – which ultimately pertain to the historical culture of the period – may turn out useful for the purposes of further research on the mechanisms in which medieval authors registered various kinds of information.

Let us now turn to the facts.

Mstislav Fyodor Vladimirovich was born in mid-February 1076 and died on April 15, 1132. He was the son of Vladimir Vasily Vsevolodovich Monomakh and Gytha of Wessex, daughter of King Harold Godwinson of England (d. 1066). He was married twice. His first consort was Christina, daughter of King Inge Stenkilsson of Sweden; she died on January 18, 1122. His second wife was N., daughter of Novgorod *posadnik* Dmitry; she outlived her husband considerably, dying after May 15 or on May 19, 1167⁸.

The former marriage probably yielded eleven children (known to the sources)⁹:

- 1) N., daughter (b. 1095–1099, d. after August 15, 1118);
- 2) Malmfred (b. 1095–1102, d. after January 1, 1135);
- 3) Ingeborg (b. 1097–1102, d. after January 1131);
- 4) Vsevolod Gabriel (b. abt. 1103, d. February 11, 1137 or February 10, 1138);
- 5) Izyaslav Panteleimon (b. 1106–1108, d. on the night of November 13/14, 1154);
- 6) Rostislav Michael (b. 1107–1109, d. March 14, 1167);
- 7) N., known as Irene in the Byzantine Empire (b. 1108/1109–1110/1111, d. 1125 – 1st half of 1136);
- 8) N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Xenia (b. abt. 1105–1112, d. after August 1127, before 1200);
- 9) N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Maria (b. abt. 1110–1113, d. March 1, 1179 – February 28, 1180);
- 10) Rogneda (b. before January 18, 1122, d. after March 14, 1167);
- 11) Svyatopolk (b. 1114–1118, d. between March 26 and November 13, 1154).

From the second marriage, Mstislav had – according to our own research – three children:

- 12) Euphrosyne (b. 1123–1130, d. in or shortly after 1193);
- 13) Vladimir, called Macheshich (b. 1131, d. May 10, 1171);
- 14) Yaropolk (b. 1132, d. shortly after September 2, 1149)¹⁰.

⁸ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 80–82; IDEM, *Генеалогия...*, p. 75–77.

⁹ This uncertainty concerning the number of Mstislav's children from his first marriage is due to doubts regarding the biography of Rogneda: namely, it cannot be ruled out that one of Mstislav's nameless daughters should be identified with her.

¹⁰ All biographical information follows D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 82–187; IDEM, *Генеалогия...*, p. 77–187.

This picture results largely from the analysis of certain indirect indications, given that the sources do not state the relevant facts in a direct manner. Still, we would like to emphasize that the above presentation is more accurate than any other one currently found in the literature.

Marriages that occurred after Mstislav's death (April 15, 1132)¹¹, we should note, essentially fall outside of the scope of our study. Nevertheless, certain conclusions regarding them will be presented in the final part of the article.

Accordingly, the basis of our analysis will be narrowed down to a total of 12 marriages – 2 by Mstislav Vladimirovich himself and 10 by his children. We may note that Mstislav did not live to see any of his grandchildren enter wedlock, in stark contrast to the case of Vladimir Monomakh – an observation which will turn out relevant for our considerations to some extent.

In what follows, the marriages are presented in chronological order.

The entries consist primarily of the presentation of the source material relevant for each marriage. Besides, further information important for the present study is added: the names of the spouses, the basic data concerning their filiation, the thrones they occupied, the date of the marriage, and other pertinent facts as needed:

- 1) Mstislav Fyodor Vladimirovich (at the time, Prince of Novgorod the Great) x Christina, daughter of King Inge Stenkilsson of Sweden and Helena (1091–1096)

A direct remark on this marriage – though extremely brief, vague and lacking chronological context – is found in *Fagrskinna*, a saga written down around 1225¹². The passage in question reads as follows: [...] *er* [Harald Valdemarsson, i.e. the name under which Mstislav Vladimirovich is known in the Scandinavian tradition] *fekk Kristinar, dóttur Inga konungs Steinkelssonar*¹³. A non-nuanced reading might indicate that Mstislav himself must have been the principal agent behind the relationship. However, in view of the brevity of the passage and its other characteristics (after all, it stems from a chapter portraying the consanguinity and affinity relations among a group of dynasts, primarily Scandinavian), is

¹¹ This applies to the following marriages: 1) Svyatopolk to N., Moravian princess, between December 25, 1143 and January 6, 1144; 2) Euphrosyne to King Géza II of Hungary, probably in 1144; 3) Vladimir (called Macheshich) to N., daughter of ban Beloš, between December 1150 and February 1151; 4) Izjaslav Panteleimon to Rusudan, daughter of King Demetrius I of Georgia, winter 1151/1152; 5) Vladimir (called Macheshich) to N., presumably daughter of Prince Rostislav Yaroslavich of Ryazan, probably winter 1155/1156.

¹² Recently on the dating of this source cf. H. JANSON, *The Dukedom of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and the Dating of Fagrskinna*, [in:] *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. Материалы и исследования 2016 год*, Москва 2018, p. 97–110.

¹³ *Fagrskinna*, [in:] *Ágrip af Nóregskonunga sögum; Fagrskinna – Nóregs konunga tal*, ed. B. EINARSSON, Reykjavík 1985 [= Ifo, 29] (cetera: *Fagrskinna*), p. 295 (LXXVII. Kapítúli). The English translation (*Fagrskinna, a Catalogue of the Kings of Norway*, trans. et ed. A. FINLAY, Leiden–Boston 2004, p. 236) reads: *King Haraldr [...] married Kristin, daughter of King Ingi Steinkelsson*.

this conclusion really warranted? By no means. The wording in the text contains a fixed phrase; what is more, no historical context is provided. We may add that other sagas only mention the relationship under discussion indirectly, in passages similar to the one quoted above¹⁴.

As we can see, the source material does not permit us to formulate any conclusions on the political background of this marriage, the more so because its very date remains unknown¹⁵.

2) N. daughter of Mstislav x Prince Yaroslav Sviatopolchich of Vladimir-in-Volhynia (late spring 1112)

In the Hypatian text of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (probably completed around 1119 in Kiev and, according to Mark Aleshkovsky, constituting a *family chronicle of the house of Monomakh*¹⁶, we find the following entry under the year 6620: Ярославъ [...] сынъ Святѡполчъ [...] посла Новѡгороду. и поя Мѡстиславю дщерь совѣ женѣ. Володимірю внуку¹⁷. A similar account concerning this or the following year (6621) is furnished by other Rus' sources¹⁸.

As can be seen, the sources offer no detailed evidence that could be used for analyzing the politics behind the relationship, although the phrasing Ярославъ [...] посла Новѡгороду. и поя Мѡстиславю дщерь совѣ женѣ could at least be taken as an indication concerning Yaroslav's agency.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. SNORRI STURLUSON, *Heimskringla*, vol. III, ed. V. АДАЛBJАРНАРСОН, Reykjavík 1979 [= Ifo, 28] (cetera: SNORRI STURLUSON), p. 258 (Magnússona saga, XX. Kapítúli).

¹⁵ Based on indirect premises, Mstislav's first marriage is usually dated to 1091–1096; recently on this D. ДОМБРОВСКИЙ, *Генеалогія...*, p. 71–73.

¹⁶ М.Х. АЛЕШКОВСКИЙ, *Повесть временных лет. Из истории создания и редакционной переработки*, ed. Ф.Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, Москва 2015, p. 294. The origin and history of the *Tale of Bygone Years* as well as its redactions is a complex subject with a vast, ever-growing scholarly literature. Without going into too much detail, we may note that the intricacies involved (including, for instance, the contested time of origin of the particular redactions) do not affect our present considerations. An English translation of the source (as found in the Laurentian text) is available in: *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text*, trans. et ed. S. HAZZARD CROSS, O.P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR, Cambridge Massachusetts 1953. For the record, we may mention that there also exist several Polish translations of the *Tale of Bygone Years*: cf. *Latopis Nestora*, trans. et ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, J. WAGILEWICZ, [in:] МРН, vol. I, Lwów 1864 [repr. Warszawa 1960], p. 521–862; *Powieść minionych lat. Charakterystyka historycznoliteracka*, trans. F. SIELICKI, ed. M. JAKÓBIEC, W. JAKUBOWSKI, Wrocław 1968 (2nd ed.: Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1999).

¹⁷ *Ипатьевская летопись*, [in:] ПСРЛ, vol. II, Москва 1998 (cetera: *Ипатьевская летопись*), col. 273.

¹⁸ Under the year 6620: *Московский летописный свод конца XV века*, [in:] ПСРЛ, vol. XXV, Москва 2004 (cetera: *Московский летописный*), p. 27; *Летопись по Воскресенскому списку*, [in:] ПСРЛ, vol. VII, Москва 2001 (cetera: *Летопись по Воскресенскому списку*), p. 22. Under 6621: *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов*, [in:] ПСРЛ, vol. III, Москва 2000 (cetera: *Новгородская первая летопись*), p. 20, 203.

3) Malmfred x King Sigurd Jorsalafari of Norway (1111–1115)

The only source to provide any details concerning the marriage in question comes from contemporary Norman chronicler Orderic Vitalis, who lived in the years 1075–1142¹⁹. Among other things, he provides some hints regarding the chronology, albeit not overly precise. Thus, Orderic writes that Sigurd Jorsalafari *Malfridam, regis filiam, uxorem duxit* while returning from the crusade; subsequently, *domumque reversus, paulo post, regnum, dante Deo, suscepit*²⁰. Other than that, the existence of this marriage is only confirmed anachronistically by Scandinavian sources, in passages dealing with the consanguinity and affinity relations of certain (primarily Scandinavian) royals²¹.

Therefore, the extant sources do not yield any direct information that could help us gain insight into the marriage policies involved: in fact, we are not even told who initiated the marriage.

4) Ingeborg x Canute Lavard (1115–1117)

The case of this marriage is quite exceptional. Firstly, *Knýtlinga saga*²² recounts the story of Canute Lavard's advances aimed at winning the hand of Mstislav's daughter Ingeborg. We learn that the Danish prince dispatched a wealthy merchant known as Vidgaut of Sambia to Novgorod the Great – at the time ruled by Harald, son of Valdemar, son of Jarizleif, son of Valdemar²³, foster father of Olaf Tryggvason. The envoy's task was to conduct talks with the prince. After an exchange of gifts, Vidgaut praised Canute and stated his message to Mstislav. The ruler of Novgorod consented to the marriage and subsequently made his decision known to his counsellors and to Ingeborg. With the plan endorsed by all parties, Vidgaut returned to Denmark to inform Canute of the mission's success. Later, at a pre-arranged time, Mstislav sent his daughter to her prospective husband²⁴. In short, we are evidently dealing with an exceptionally detailed and presumably quite reliable account of Canute's efforts to earn Ingeborg's hand. Ironically, however, the content that would be the most interesting from our point of view is

¹⁹ Concerning Orderic, cf. U. SCHMIDT, *Ordericus Vitalis*, [in:] *BBKL*, vol. VI, col. 1230–1231.

²⁰ *Orderici Vitalis Angligenae coenobii uticensis monachi Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 10, 4, [in:] *PL*, vol. CLXXXVIII, col. 727. Orderic's account is generally accepted as reliable in the modern literature, cf. e.g. А.Ф. ЛИТВИНА, Ф.Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Выбор имени у русских князей в X–XVI вв. Династическая история сквозь призму антропониимики*, Москва 2006, p. 246, an. 26.

²¹ Cf. e.g.: *Fagrskinna*, p. 295 (LXXVII. Kapitúli); SNORRI STURLUSON, p. 258 (*Magnússona saga*. XX. Kapitúli).

²² The source is dated to the mid-13th century.

²³ As we can see, the presentation of Mstislav's genealogy here is not free from error: it omits the prince's grandfather, Vsevolod Yaroslavich.

²⁴ *Knýtlinga saga*, [in:] *Danakonunga sögur. Skjöldunga saga; Knýtlinga saga; Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, ed. B. GUÐNASON, Reykjavík 1982 [= Ifo, 35] (cetera: *Knýtlinga saga*), p. 246–247 (LXXXVIII. Kapitúli).

missing – perhaps save for the clear suggestion that the Danish prince was the active side in arranging the marriage. On the other hand, we also have at our disposal the testimony of Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus, who lived from about 1160 until after 1208. He has the following to say about Canute's marriage to Mstislav's daughter:

Cui mater [of Magnus, the son of King Niels of Denmark; the woman in question is Margaret Fredkulla] ampliorem propinquorum favorem affinitatum beneficio creare cupiens, Henrico Regnaldi fratris, Kanuto Ingiburgam sororis filiam coniugo copulavit²⁵.

The passage is important for two reasons: firstly, because it directly names (in an exceptional manner) the woman who was the principal agent behind seeking the marriage deal, and secondly, because it reveals the exact motives that led the queen of Denmark to pursue this plan. To wit, the aim was to bolster family ties through arranging a marriage. Although still relatively vague, this statement is nonetheless remarkable when compared with the information we have concerning the other marriages under analysis. Finally, we may add that the two accounts by no means contradict one another; on the contrary, they can be read as complementary.

5) N., known as Irene in the Byzantine Empire x Alexios Komnenos, son of Emperor John II (1122)

In the *Kievan Chronicle* – whose currently extant form arose at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries in Kiev (hence the name)²⁶ – we find the following sentence under the entry for 6630: **ВЕДЕНА МЪСТИСЛАВНА ВЪ ГРЪКЪ ЗА ЦЪРЬ**²⁷. Similar passages are found in other Rus' sources, presumably relying to a certain degree on the above-mentioned statement in the *Kievan Chronicle*²⁸.

²⁵ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, XIII, 1, vol. I, rec. J. OLRIK, H. RÆDER, Hauniae 1931 (cetera: *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*), p. 342.

²⁶ The source has been the subject of a great deal of reliable scholarly work. Neither the date of its origin nor the fact that it displays an intricate internal structure, reflecting a whole array of *svods*, have given rise to significant controversy (cf. e.g. В.Ю. ФРАНЧУК, *Киевская летопись. Состав и источники в лингвистическом освещении*, Киев 1986). It is worth noting that a new edition of this text has been published recently, valuable especially from the philological point of view, *Киевская летопись*, ed. И.С. ЮРЬЕВА, Москва 2017. The text has been translated into Polish: *Latopis kijowski 1118–1158*, trans. et ed. E. GORANIN, Wrocław 1995 [= AUW.SW, 86]; *Latopis kijowski 1159–1198*, trans. et ed. E. GORANIN, Wrocław 1988 [= AUW.SW, 40]. The only English translation is available in: *The Kievan Chronicle*, trans. L. HEINRICH (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1977).

²⁷ *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 286.

²⁸ Cf. e.g. *Летопись по Воскресенскому списку*, p. 25: **ДЦН МСТИСЛАВА ВЕДЕНА ВЪСТЬ ВО ГРЪКЪ ЗА ЦАРЬВИЧА**. As we see, the text provides some additional information here inasmuch as it identifies the groom's background. The 17th-century *Hustynja Chronicle* (*Густынская летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. XL, Санкт-Петербург 2003, p. 76) goes even further in this respect: **В ЛѢТО 6630. МСТИСЛАВЪ**

Clearly, the adduced passage cannot be the basis for any conclusions regarding the circumstances and motivation behind the marriage in question.

It is interesting and quite noteworthy, however, that certain information complementing the above text is offered by 18th-century Russian historian Vasily Tatishchev (1686–1750). In the first redaction of his *Russian History*, the 6627 entry contains the fragment: **Послы же** [of emperor Alexios Komnenos] **рекоша**; under 6630, we read: **Введена дочь Мстислава, Владимирово внука, во Царьград за царя Иоанна, и проводиша ю с честью. С нею же иде епископ Никита**²⁹. In the second redaction of the work, the events are described as follows:

Потом просили послы [of emperor Alexios Komnenos], чтоб Владимир дал внуку свою, дочь Мстиславу, за сына императорского Иоанна [...] а о браке младости ради сочетающихся отложили на два года (6627) and Владимир отпустил внуку свою Довродею, дочь Мстиславу, в Царьград за императора Иоанна. С нею же послал Никиту епископа и других знатных вельмож. И принята была с великою честью (6630)³⁰.

Were we to take the above narrative at face value, we would at least obtain a partial explanation for the *raison d'être* of the marriage: the Byzantine emperor's initiative and the decision of the princess's grandfather (ruling in Kiev) to marry her off once she reaches adulthood. It must be emphasized, however, that – as we have already remarked elsewhere – almost none of the facts described here find confirmation in any other known sources (to the exception of the princess's filiation and the date of the marriage). In fact, some of them – as e.g. the identification of the princess's imperial husband – are patently false. Thus, bearing in mind Tatishchev's confabulatory tendencies as well as his habit of filling in missing information, we are forced to reject the account under discussion³¹.

- 6) Mstislav Fyodor Vladimirovich (at the time, Prince of Belgorod Kievsky) x N., daughter of Novgorod *posadnik* Dmitry Zavidich (October 15, 1122 – February 17, 1123)

Certain Rus' sources inform us about this marriage in a direct manner. For instance, the *Kievan Chronicle* includes the following passage under the 6630 entry: **се же лѣто привезоша из Новгорода. Мъстиславу жену другую Дмитровну.**

Володымирч отда дщер свою за царевича Греческого, сына Иоанна Комнина. See also the edition: *The Hustyynja Chronicle*, coll. O. ТОЛОЧКО, Cambridge Massachusetts 2013 [= HLEUL.T, 11], cf. p. 192. For the record, we may add that a Polish translation can be found in: *Latopis hustyński*, trans. et ed. H. SUSZKO, Wrocław 2003 [= AUW.SW, 124].

²⁹ В.Н. ТАТИШЧЕВ, *История российская*, pars 2, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Собрание сочинений*, vol. IV, Москва 1995, p. 182–183.

³⁰ ИДЕМ, *История российская*, pars 2, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Собрание сочинений*, vol. II–III, Москва 1995, p. 133, 135.

³¹ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 136–137; ИДЕМ, *Генеалогия...*, p. 136–137.

Завидову внуку³², while the Novgorod First Chronicle entry for the same year features the statement: **Томъ же лѣтъ оженися Мъстиславъ Кыевъ, поя Дмитровъну Новѣгородѣ Завидиця**³³. Thus, the latter source complements the former one by revealing that the marriage took place in Kiev³⁴. No further information is offered by any other chronicles³⁵. Indidentally, the phrasing **оженися Мъстиславъ Кыевъ** may at first glance appear to suggest that the marriage was initiated by the prince himself. Whether that was indeed the case remains unverifiable, however; note that Vladimir Monomakh, Mstislav's father, was still alive at the time, remaining fully in control of the state and the family³⁶.

It is clear that the extant data offer no possibility of any direct inference concerning the circumstances of the marriage; thus we can hardly draw any conclusions that would be satisfactory from the viewpoint of research on marriage politics.

7) Vsevolod Gabriel (at the time, Prince of Novgorod the Great) x N., daughter of Svyatoslav (Svyatosha) Davidovich (March 1, 1123 – February 29, 1124)

The 6631 entry of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* informs us: **Оженися Всеволод, сын Мъстиславль, Новѣгородѣ**³⁷; similar notes are found in other Rus' sources, probably based on the above statement³⁸. Needless to say, this information merely enables us to confirm the existence of the marriage and to determine the approximate date³⁹.

³² *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 286.

³³ *Новгородская первая летопись*, p. 21, 205.

³⁴ The *Kievan chronicles* did not consider it necessary to note from where привезоша из Новгорода. **Мъстиславу жену**, since the destination was the very place where he wrote his work.

³⁵ *Софийская первая летопись старшего извода*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. VI.1, Москва 2000 (cetera: *Софийская первая летопись*), col. 220: [6630 г.] **Женися князь Мъстиславъ Бълодимеричъ в Кыевъ, поя Дмитриевну в Новѣгородѣ Завидовичъ**. Similarly e.g. *Тверская летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. XV, Москва 2000 (cetera: *Тверская летопись*), col. 193; *Типографская летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. XXIV, Москва 2000, p. 74.

³⁶ A telling sign of Monomakh's remaining in charge of state and family matters alike is, for example, Mstislav's being transferred from Novgorod the Great to Belgorod Kievsky in 1117 (*Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 284; *Лаврентьевская летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. I, Москва 2001 (cetera: *Лаврентьевская летопись*), col. 291). Furthermore, at the time, the old prince would frequently manipulate his sons as executors of his political will. One instance of such behavior – particularly informative as regards the topic of our study – occurred when Yaroslav Svyatopolchich (according to a group of chronicles) sent away his wife, Mstislav's daughter and Vladimir's granddaughter. Monomakh organized an expedition against Yaroslav and installed his son Roman in the conquered city of Vladimir-in-Volhynia; when Roman died, he was replaced by his brother Andrew (*Московский летописный*, p. 28).

³⁷ *Новгородская первая летопись*, p. 21, 205.

³⁸ *Новгородская четвертая летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. IV, Москва 2000, p. 143 (entry for 6631); *Софийская первая летопись*, col. 220 (entry for 6631); *Тверская летопись*, col. 193 (entry for 6631).

³⁹ Concerning the chronological details, cf. Д. ДОМБРОВСКИЙ, *Генеалогия...*, p. 110.

We may add that the bride's filiation can be established based on the following passage from the *Novgorod First Chronicle*: **В лето 6641 [...] пострижесе Святоша князь, сын Давыдов, Чьрнигове, тьсть Всеволожь**⁴⁰.

Again, it is evident that the circumstances and motivation behind the marriage remain unrecoverable in view of the quite limited information in the sources.

8) Izyaslav Panteleimon x NN (before 1130 (in the 1220s))

The sources do not mention the fact of Izyaslav's marriage – his relationship with NN is only attested indirectly. For example, the princess's death is noted in the *Kievan Chronicle* entry for the year 6659⁴¹; moreover, the couple's children have a clear presence in the sources⁴².

Thus, this case exemplifies the situation where absolutely no conclusions regarding the circumstances and political significance of a given marriage are possible.

9) N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Xenia x Prince Bryachislav of Logoyisk and Izyaslavl (1119 – before August 1127)

Not unlike in the preceding case, no source mentions the event of the marriage directly; we can only infer the latter's existence from the *Kievan Chronicle* account of Mstislav Vladimirovich's expedition against Polotsk (year 6636), where we read:

Изыславъ [Мстиславич] же. перестрапъ два дни у Логожьска. и иде къ Изаславию. къ строеви своему. вода съ собою Брачислава зата своего. иже еаше пошель. к штцью своему и быеть посредеѣ пути и острашиса не мога поити ни сѣлю ни онамо. и иде шюрину своему в рущѣ и Логожаны приведе. иже еѣ вывелъ из Логожьства и виднеше Изаслави княза своего. и Логожаны. иже ес пакости сѣть [...] Воротиславъ Яндрѣевъ тысячькыи. и Иванко Вячславъ въсласта отроки своя в городъ [Изыславль = Заславль = Заслауѣ]. и свитающе. оубиднеше вси вон тако възаша. и в ночи и одева Мьстиславыи товаръ ублюдоша. и то з нужею бьучиса.⁴³

In effect, we are dealing with yet another marriage whose circumstances and political motivation remain entirely obscure due to the lack of source information.

10) N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Maria x Vsevolod Olegovich, son of Oleg Svyatoslavich (summer 1126 – spring 1127)

⁴⁰ *Новгородская первая летопись*, p. 19, 203.

⁴¹ *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 446: то же верей престависа княгини Изаславляя. A similar note concerning the death of Izyaslav's first wife is found in the *Laurentian Chronicle* (*Лаврентьевская летопись*, col. 336: **В то же время престависа княгини Изаславляя**).

⁴² On the children from Izyaslav's first marriage cf. e.g. D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 212–248.

⁴³ *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 292, 292–293. Similar information is also found in other chronicles (*Лаврентьевская летопись*, col. 298; *Радзивилловская летопись*, [in:] *ПСРЛ*, vol. XXXVIII, Ленинград 1989, p. 106).

This is the third consecutive case in which the event of the marriage is not reflected in the sources at all. That the unnamed daughter of Mstislav was the wife of Vsevolod Olegovich can only be deduced from the (rather numerous) indirect indications showing the relationship of affinity between Vsevolod and Mstislav's sons and the relationship of consanguinity between the latter and Vsevolod's princess, as well as between Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich and Izyaslav Mstislavich⁴⁴.

It follows that, as far as information useful for researching marriage politics is concerned, the sources provide us with no data whatsoever – just as in the two preceding cases.

11) Malmfred x King Eric Emune of Denmark (after 7 January 1131 – winter 1131/1132)

Malmfred's second marriage is only reflected in Scandinavian sources. Interestingly, however, Saxo Grammaticus provides information that may give us some understanding of the politics behind it. The relevant passage reads:

Superveniunt legati, a Magno rege Norvagiensium missi, maiorem Kanuti filiam, sed non-dum nuptiis tempestivam, eius coniugio petituri. Quorum legationem Ericus contrahendarum virium spe favorabiliter habuit, excepit alacriter, cupiens finitimorum auxilia affinitatis beneficio comparare. Ipse quoque, bellis otium interpellantibus, adhuc coniugio vacuus, novercam Magni, Norvagiensium quondam reginam, utpote dignus hac nuptiarum vicissitudine favente eiusdem privigno, suscepit uxorem.⁴⁵

Evidently, Norwegian ruler Magnus Blinde – himself striving to marry Christina, daughter of Canute Lavard and Ingeborg – resolved to augment his alliance with Eric Emune (who was fighting for control over Denmark) with as many as two marriages. This also provided him with the opportunity to have his stepmother leave the country. Eric, counting on Norwegian support, accepted the deal. Incidentally, after losing the war for the crown, he fled to Norway and took Malmfred with him. Although initially received cordially, he was later imprisoned. He managed to break free; soon afterwards, Mangus Blinde sent Christina to him⁴⁶. The fact that this alliance – based on two marriages – turned out to be so volatile is a prime example of how erratic the dynamics of marriage-related politics could be: they were clearly determined by a number of extemporaneous factors.

⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 308, 309, 327, 377; *Лаврентьевская летопись*, col. 309.

⁴⁵ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, XIII, 8, vol. I, p. 360. Similar accounts are found in: *Historia Sancti Canuti Ducis et Martyris, auctore Anonymo*, [in:] *Scriptores Rerum Danicarum Medii Aevii*, vol. IV, ed. J. LANGEBEK, Hafniae 1776, p. 250; *Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, [in:] *Danakonunga sögur. Skjöldunga saga; Knýtlinga saga; Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, ed. B. GUÐNÁSON, Reykjavík 1982 [= Ifö, 35], p. 332–333.

⁴⁶ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, XIII, 8, vol. I, p. 360.

- 12) Rostislav Michael x NN, a representative of the Halych branch of the Rurikids, daughter of Volodar Rostislavich or Vasil'ko Rostislavich (before 1133/1134 r.)

We can only include this relationship in our survey hypothetically, since we do not know when the marriage took place. Certain indirect indications permit us to surmise that it happened before 1133/1134 at the latest⁴⁷, i.e. possibly during Mstislav's final years.

As the reader may have inferred from the above statement, Rostislav Mstislavich's marriage is not mentioned in the sources directly. Our knowledge about it is based on a number of random, enigmatic remarks concerning his wife scattered across various sources⁴⁸, as well as on the fact of his having children (well-documented in the source material⁴⁹).

Hence, in the light of the extant evidence, we are scarcely able to formulate any hypothesis regarding the circumstances and political context of Rostislav's marriage.

* * *

The analysis of the source material reveals certain most unfavorable tendencies as far as research on marriage policies is concerned. Firstly, from among the marriages selected for our sample, four are not mentioned directly in any source at all (Izyaslav to NN; N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Xenia to Bryachislav; N., possibly baptismal or monastic name Maria to Vsevolod Olegovich; Rostislav to N., possibly a representative of the Halych branch of the Rurikids). This amounts to as much as one third of the selection. Secondly, if we limit ourselves to sources native to Rus', a number of further relationships elude us completely, namely those of Mstislav Vladimirovich (first marriage), Ingeborg, and Malmfred (both marriages). It turns out, then, that Rus' authors failed to mention 8 out of the 12 marriages ($\frac{2}{3}$ of the sample⁵⁰).

Accordingly, both the marriage of Mstislav himself to the Swedish royal and the relationships of Mstislav's daughters with one Norwegian and two Danish dynasts are only reflected – with various levels of attention to detail – in foreign sources (predominantly Scandinavian; in a single case, Norman⁵¹).

⁴⁷ Concerning the chronology cf. D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 129, 132.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. *Новгородская первая летопись*, p. 30, 217; *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 516.

⁴⁹ Most extensively on Rostislav's children cf. D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 400–444.

⁵⁰ Needless to say, we mean information stated explicitly, not indirect allusions of various sorts.

⁵¹ As correctly pointed out by Tatjana Jackson, Rus' sources fail to note a single marriage of a member of the native ruling family to a Scandinavian dynast (Т.Н. ДЖАКСОН, *Исландские королевские саги о Восточной Европе (середина XI – середина XIII в.)*. *Тексты, перевод, комментарий*, Москва 2000, p. 11).

To be sure, we should concede that in the case of Malmfred's second marriage this fact is fully understandable, given that it was an affair of intra-Scandinavian scope. This, however, leads to a conclusion that is interesting in its own right. Namely, the example of Malmfred might permit us to assume that a princess married off in a foreign land was no longer in the sphere of interest of a Rus' ruler as far as marriage politics was concerned. Nonetheless, although the case under discussion could be explained in this way, we also know of instances (likewise stemming from Rurikid practices) where the converse was true. We may exemplify this with the marriages of Anastasia, daughter of Prince Alexander Vsevolodovich of Belz⁵². In what is incidentally the only appearance of the princess in the text, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* states:

Потом[ь] же с[ы]нъ его оумре Болеславъ, Мазовец[ь]кый княз[ь], | и вѣдатель Мазовешъ
врату своему Сомовитови, послѣшавъ князя Данила, вѣ бо братоучада его за нимъ | дѣщи
Ялеѣандрова именован[ь] Настасіа, яже посаже потом[ь] | за водрина оугор[ь]скаго именован[ь]
Дмитра⁵³.

Clearly, Anastasia's future was decided not by the kinsmen of her Masovian husband, but by her Rus' relative: the latter was not only the hegemon on the territories that the princess's father (presumably no longer alive at the time) had ruled before, but also probably the architect behind Anastasia's first marriage as well. The veracity of the account found in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is corroborated by the very choice of the second husband for Bolesław I's widow: a Hungarian nobleman by the name of Dmitry. The princes of Masovia had no interests in Hungary, while Daniel by all means did.

In consequence, it is difficult to point out any definite principles concerning the Rurikid princesses' marriages outside of Rus'. It seems that, in the case of the husband's death, their further fate depended on a combination of diverse factors. This conclusion also applies to the story of Mstislav's daughter Ingeborg, where a yet different approach was chosen: namely, we know that after her husband's murder the princess relocated to Rus'. There, she gave birth to his posthumous son Valdemar, who later became an eminent ruler of Denmark⁵⁴.

Digressions aside, let us return to the main issue at hand.

⁵² It can be inferred from a number of indirect premises that Anastasia married Prince Bolesław I Konradowic of Masovia between late spring 1244 and August 17 or 18, 1245 (D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 391–394). This view was recently accepted e.g. by Janusz GRABOWSKI, one of the leading experts on the Masovia Piasts (*Dynastia Piastów mazowieckich*, ²Warszawa–Kraków 2016, p. 434).

⁵³ *Kronika halicko-wołyńska. (Kronika Romanowiczów)*, rec. D. DĄBROWSKI, A. JUSUPOVIĆ et al., [in:] *MPH.SN*, vol. XVI, p. 299–300. (For the English translation of the source, see: *The Hypatian Codex*, pars 2, *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*, trans. G.A. PERFECKY, München 1973 [= HSUS, 16.2]). Cf. also *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 810.

⁵⁴ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, XIII, 7, vol. I, p. 356. Cf. also *Knyttlinga saga*, XLIII. Kapitúli.

It should be emphasized particularly strongly that – save for two exceptions of Scandinavian provenance – the sources convey no information whatsoever as regards the political aims behind this or that marriage agreement.

It appears, then, that the chroniclers of the period and cultural sphere in question did not regard details concerning marriages (such as their circumstances or the reasons behind them) as information notable enough to be worth preserving. Truth be told, even the very fact of the marriage did not always belong to this category. And to the extent that such information is given after all, the pattern of omitting the woman's name predominates in the sample under analysis (we mean the native Rus's sources here): Mstislav's daughters figure in the relevant passages anonymously, and so do his sons' wives. This principle, we may note, also applied to other women who belonged to (or entered) the dynasty. Sometimes, of course, a Rus' chronicler would decide to include the name of a given princess in his narrative. However, pursuing this issue further would be outside of the scope of the present study; we will limit ourselves to noting that the Scandinavian sources follow a wholly different practice when speaking about Mstislav's wife and daughters.

Are we in a position to answer the question why Rus' chroniclers, quite unlike their Scandinavian counterparts, displayed so little interest in the local dynasty's marriages? Although the problem remains rather enigmatic, we may at least venture a tentative explanation. Firstly, let us note how the genre of a given source, as well as the environment in which it arose, could influence its content. Thus, the *Novgorod First Chronicle* – closely associated with the ruler's court during the time under discussion, and resembling the western annals in form and substance – tended to note down the relevant content in a succinct manner, not necessarily delving into the political intricacies behind the princely marriages. On the other hand, the final part of the *Tale of Bygone Years* and the beginning of the *Kievan Chronicle* – which, as we noted above, may be regarded as a 'personal' court journal of Monomakh and his house – hardly pay any more attention to the royals' matrimonial life. Is it due to the individual interests of the author or authors? Who knows. Be that as it may, it is a fact that the various authors associated with the Rus' princely courts did display some variation as regards their interest in particular topics; this issue is in need of substantial further research. Although we cannot deal with the question here, we may make certain preliminary observations. Thus, while the chronicler of Vsevolod the Big Nest consistently – and quite atypically – included precise information concerning the births of the princely couple's children, the author writing for Vladimir Vasil'kovich paid particular attention to his master's daily life and deeds. We have no choice but to abandon this topic here, however – hoping to develop it further on a different occasion – and we shall return to issues of direct relevance for our central question.

We must turn to another fundamental issue. Does the glaring scarcity of data – as described above on the basis of several examples – preclude any research on

the Rurikid marriage policies whatsoever? Before we proceed to answering this more general question, let us first return to the narrower issue to which the present study is devoted. Thus, in spite of the extremely sparse source material (first and foremost, the virtual lack of information stated directly), we should still answer the question in the positive: such research is possible. Let us first recall the obvious truth that even an indirect remark concerning the existence of a given marriage is tantamount to confirming the relationship between the parties involved. Consequently, a meticulous analysis of other data concerning the relations between the relevant states (or principalities, in the case of inter-Rus' affairs) may bring considerable results, especially when concentrated on a highly specific period (based on the available chronological indications). Regrettably, in those cases where no chronological clues concerning the event of the marriage are available, the situation is markedly less optimistic: in fact, we usually remain utterly helpless, unable to locate the potentially traceable political background. Even in such instances, however, there is sometimes hope. To exemplify this, we shall inspect the marriage of N. (Mstislav's daughter) to Vsevolod Olegovich. Let us first note that – although we would be searching the sources in vain for a direct mention of the event – we are in the position to ascertain the *terminus ad quem* quite precisely. This is so because we know that: 1) Svyatoslav Vsevolodovich, who was in all likelihood the couple's eldest child, married already in 6651 (i.e. 1143); 2) Zvenislava, daughter of Vsevolod, was married off to Bolesław the Tall; 3) Yaroslav Vsevolodovich was born in 6648 (i.e. 1139). It is plain to see that Vsevolod Olegovich must have married Mstislav's anonymous daughter no later than in 1126–1127⁵⁵. Having established the *terminus ad quem* – which, although based exclusively on indirect evidence, can be considered fairly reliable – we may direct our attention to the likely political setting of this marriage. It is known that in 6635 or 6636 – according to Rus' sources – Vsevolod Olegovich rebelled against his paternal uncle Yaroslav Svyatoslavich, who ruled Chernigov at the time. The revolt was successful; the defeated prince was later relocated to Murom, while Vsevolod ascended the Chernigov throne⁵⁶. Despite an earlier agreement with Yaroslav, Mstislav Vladimirovich – the Kievan prince at the time – did not support him, taking Vsevolod's side instead⁵⁷. As we already argued above, we believe that this evident shift of alliances was related to nothing other than a newly-reached agreement between the ruler in Kiev and Vsevolod Olegovich – an agreement augmented by marriage⁵⁸. This case exemplifies what we consider successful use of indirect argumentation in research on marriage politics (in a situation in which direct information is wanting).

⁵⁵ The essence of this reasoning is presented in D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 148–149.

⁵⁶ *Лаврентьевская летопись*, col. 296–297 (entry for 6635); *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 290–292 (entry for 6636).

⁵⁷ *Ипатьевская летопись*, col. 291–292.

⁵⁸ D. DĄBROWSKI, *Genealogia...*, p. 148–152.

Naturally, as far as certain other members of the Rurikid dynasty are concerned, the source material is not as meager as in the case of Mstislav Vladimirovich and his children: we may mention e.g. Daniel Romanovich, where much more information of the relevant kind has been preserved⁵⁹. Again, however, developing this point further would be outside the scope of the present article.

We shall close our analysis with a judgement more optimistic than could be expected based on the fairly gloomy opening: in spite of the mercilessly sparse source material, it is by all means possible to conduct feasible research on the Rurikids' marriage policies. One must know how to do it right, however. Thus, such studies must on the one hand be rooted in a deep knowledge of the relevant sources (not only of Rus' provenance) as well as the ability to subject them to astute analysis; on the other hand, they must adhere to the methodology established by our predecessors in the field, as outlined in the introductory sections of the present work.

Translated by Marek Majer

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, [in:] *Danakonunga sögur. Skjöldunga saga; Knýtlinga saga; Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, ed. B. GUÐNASON, Reykjavík 1982 [= Íslenzk fornrit, 35].
- DŽAKSON T.N., *Islandskie korolevskie sagi o Vostočnoj Evrope (seredina XI – seredina XIII v.). Teksty, perevod, kommentarij*, Moskva 2000.
- Fagrskinna*, [in:] *Ágrip af Nóregskonunga sogum; Fagrskinna – Nóregs konunga tal*, ed. B. EINARSSON, Reykjavík 1985 [= Íslenzk fornrit, 29].
- Fagrskinna, a Catalogue of the Kings of Norway*, trans. et ed. A. FINLAY, Leiden–Boston 2004.
- Gustynskajja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. XL, Sankt-Peterburg 2003.
- Historia Sancti Canuti Ducis et Martyris, auctore Anonymo*, [in:] *Scriptores Rerum Danicarum Medii Aevii*, vol. IV, ed. J. LANGEBEK, Hafniae 1776, p. 230–256.
- The Hustynja Chronicle*, coll. O. TOLOCHKO, Cambridge Massachusetts 2013 [= Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts, 11].
- The Hypatian Codex*, pars 2, *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*, trans. G.A. PERFECKY, München 1973 [= Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, 16.2].
- Ipat'evskaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. II, Moskva 1998.
- The Kievan Chronicle*, trans. L. HEINRICH (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1977).

⁵⁹ Concerning this representative of the dynasty, cf. the two recently published volumes on his biography (D. DAŃBROWSKI, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264). Biografia polityczna*, Kraków 2012 [= M.UKW.PBDR, 1]; IDEM, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz. O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.*, Kraków 2016 [= M.UKW.PBDR, 4]).

- Kievskaja letopis'*, ed. I.S. JUR'EVA, Moskva 2017.
- Knyttlinga saga*, [in:] *Danakonunga sögur. Skjöldunga saga; Knyttlinga saga; Ágrip af sögu Danakonunga*, ed. B. GUÐNASON, Reykjavík 1982 [= Íslenzk fornrit, 35].
- Kronika halicko-wołyńska. (Kronika Romanowiczów)*, rec. D. DĄBROWSKI, A. JUSUPOVIĆ et al., [in:] *Monumenta Poloniae Historica. Series Nova*, vol. XVI, Kraków–Warszawa 2017.
- Latopis hustyński*, trans. et ed. H. SUSZKO, Wrocław 2003 [= Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Slavica Wratislaviensis, 124].
- Latopis kijowski 1118–1158*, trans. et ed. E. GORANIN, Wrocław 1995 [= Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Slavica Wratislaviensis, 86].
- Latopis kijowski 1159–1198*, trans. et ed. E. GORANIN, Wrocław 1988 [= Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Slavica Wratislaviensis, 40].
- Latopis Nestora*, trans. et ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, J. WAGILEWICZ, [in:] *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. I, Lwów 1864 [repr. Warszawa 1960], p. 521–862.
- Lavrent' evskaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. I, Moskva 2001.
- Letopis' po Voskresenskomu spisku*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. VII, Moskva 2001.
- Moskovskij letopisnyj svod konca XV veka*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. XXV, Moskva 2004.
- Novgorodskaja četvertaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. IV, Moskva 2000.
- Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. III, Moskva 2000.
- Orderici Vitalis Angligenae coenobii uticensis monachi Historia Ecclesiastica*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CLXXXVIII, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Paris 1855, col. 17–984.
- Powieść minionych lat. Charakterystyka historycznoliteracka*, trans. F. SIELICKI, ed. M. JAKÓBIEC, W. JAKUBOWSKI, Wrocław 1968 (2nd ed.: Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1999).
- Radzivilovskaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. XXXVIII, Leningrad 1989.
- The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text*, trans. et ed. S. HAZZARD CROSS, O.P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR, Cambridge Massachusetts 1953.
- Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, vol. I, rec. J. OLRİK, H. RÆDER, Hauniae 1931.
- SNORRI STURLUSON, *Heimskringla*, vol. III, ed. B. AÐALBJARNARSON, Reykjavík 1979 [= Íslenzk fornrit, 28].
- Sofijskaja pervaja letopis' staršego izvoda*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. VI.1, Moskva 2000.
- Tipografskaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. XXIV, Moskva 2000.
- Tverskaja letopis'*, [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, vol. XV, Moskva 2000.

Secondary Literature

- ALEŠKOVSKIJ M.Ch., *Povesť vremennykh let. Iz istorii sozdanija i redakcionnoj pererabotki*, ed. F.B. USPENSKIJ, Moskva 2015.
- DĄBROWSKI D., *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264). Biografia polityczna*, Kraków 2012 [= Monografie. Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego. Pracownia Badań nad Dziejami Rusi, 1].

- DĄBROWSKI D., *Genealogia Mściławowiczów. Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*, Kraków 2008.
- DĄBROWSKI D., *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz. O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.*, Kraków 2016 [= Monografie. Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego. Pracownia Badań nad Dziejami Rusi, 4].
- DĄBROWSKI D., *Piasten und Rurikiden im 11. bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, [in:] *Fernhändler, Dynasten, Kleriker. Die piastische Herrschaft in kontinentalen Beziehungsgeflechten vom 10. bis zum frühen 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. D. ADAMCZYK, N. KERSKEN, Wiesbaden 2015, p. 155–189.
- DOMBROVSKIJ D., *Genealogija Mstislavičej. Pervye pokolenija (do načala XIV v.)*, trans. et ed. K. ERUSALIMSKIJ, O. OSTALČUK, Sankt-Peterburg 2015 [= Studiorum Slavicorum Orbis, 10].
- FRANČUK V.Ju., *Kievskaja letopis'. Sostav i istočniki v lingvističeskom osveščennii*, Kiev 1986.
- GOLUBOVSKIJ P.V., *Istorija Smolenskoj zemli do načala XV st.*, Kiev 1895.
- GRABOWSKI J., *Dynastia Piastów mazowieckiech*, ²Warszawa–Kraków 2016.
- JANSON H., *The Dukedom of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and the Dating of Fagrskinna*, [in:] *Drevnejšie gosudarstva Vostočnoj Evropy. Materialy i issledovanija 2016 god*, Moskva 2018, p. 97–110.
- LITVINA A.F., USPENSKIJ F.B., *Vybor imeni u russkich knjazej v X–XVI vv. Dinastičeskaja istorija skvoz' prizmu antroponomiki*, Moskva 2006.
- SCHMIDT U., *Ordericus Vitalis*, [in:] *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. VI, ed. F.W. BAUTZ, Hamm 1993, col. 1230–1231.
- TATIŠČEV V.N., *Istorija rossijskaja*, pars 2, [in:] IDEM, *Sobranie sočinenij*, vol. II–III, Moskva 1995.
- TATIŠČEV V.N., *Istorija rossijskaja*, pars 2, [in:] IDEM, *Sobranie sočinenij*, vol. IV, Moskva 1995.
- VELDTRUP D., *Zwischen Eherecht und Familienpolitik. Studien zu den dynastischen Heiratsprojekten Karls IV*, Warendorf 1988.
- WELLER T., *Die Heiratspolitik des deutschen Hochadels im 12. Jahrhundert*, Köln 2004.

Abstract. The main goal of the article is to present the possibilities and methods of research on the Rurikid's matrimonial policy in the Middle Ages on the example of a selected group of princes. As the subject of studies were chosen Mstislav Vladimirovich and his children. In total, 12 matrimonial relationships were included.

The analysis of the source material revealed very unfavorable phenomena from the perspective of the topic under study. The Rus' primary sources gave information on the conclusion of just four marriages out of twelve. The next four matrimonial arrangement inform foreign sources (Scandinavian and Norman). It should be emphasized particularly strongly that – save for two exceptions of Scandinavian provenance – the sources convey no information whatsoever as regards the political aims behind this or that marriage agreement.

It appears, then, that the chroniclers of the period and cultural sphere in question did not regard details concerning marriages (such as their circumstances or the reasons behind them) as “information notable enough to be worth preserving”. Truth be told, even the very fact of the marriage did not always belong to this category.

Due to the state of preservation of primary sources the basic question arises as to whether it is possible to study the Rurikids' matrimonial policy?

In spite of the mercilessly sparse source material, it is by all means possible to conduct feasible research on the Rurikids' marriage policy. One must know how to do it right, however. Thus, such studies must on the one hand be rooted in a deep knowledge of the relevant sources (not only of Rus' provenance) as well as the ability to subject them to astute analysis; on the other hand, they must adhere to the specially developed methodology, presented in the first part of the article.

Keywords: genealogy, matrimonial policy, Rurikids, medieval Rus', Mstislav Fedor Vladimirovich and his family

Dariusz Dąbrowski

Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszczy
Wydział Humanistyczny
Instytut Historii i Stosunków Międzynarodowych
ul. Księcia Józefa Poniatowskiego 12
85-671 Bydgoszcz, Polska/Poland
dabr.ih@ukw.edu.pl