

THE DYNASTIC HORIZONS OF THE ÁRPÁDS AND PIASTS, ca. 1150-1250

Wojciech Kozłowski

This comparative study aims to present, in brief, an interesting parallel development of marriage “policy” in Hungary and Poland in the High Middle Ages. Both states emerged on the European political map in the second half of the tenth century, linking the Ruthenian East and the Balkans with Western Europe. After nearly two centuries of mutual political and military cooperation that rested on a number of dynastic marriages, these states drifted apart during the second half of the twelfth century. Whereas Hungary was rising in power, Poland pulled back to more local politics.¹ This did not happen either automatically or rapidly, however, but was a gradual process which I will illustrate below from the marital point of view. Although the period selected, 1150-1250, seems somewhat artificial, it is meant to be so. The last interdynastic marriage took place around 1140 and in the meantime the last “universal” duke of Poland, Bolesław the Wrymouth, died in 1138. No more Árpád-Piast marriages were concluded until that of Salomea and Coloman in 1214.² I would call these several decades, nevertheless, a “new opening.” They completely reshaped Hungarian-Polish relations to such an extent that their further development in the middle of the thirteenth century linked the history of Hungary and Poland for the next couple of centuries.³ The marriage of 1214 was a precedent for those of 1239 and 1256;⁴ therefore, I decided to establish a final date for my discussion around 1250, examining this almost-hundred-year-long period of marital links.

¹ This study was written thanks to a scholarship from the International Visegrad Fund that allowed me to undertake studies at Central European University in Budapest, Hungary, in the academic year 2007/2008. This article is based on my MA thesis, “Prelude to the Angevins: Marriages of the Árpáds and Piasts Reconsidered (986 - ca. 1250)” (Central European University, Budapest, 2008) (hereafter: Kozłowski, “Prelude”).

² Partially due to Byzantine domination of Hungary between 1140-1170, see Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni; Political Relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989).

³ For a more extensive justification for this claim see Kozłowski, “Prelude.”

⁴ In 1239 the Polish Duke Bolesław the Shy married Kinga, a daughter of Béla IV, mainly due to the impending Mongol threat. The marriage of 1256 between another Polish duke, Bolesław the Pious, and Jolanta, a younger daughter of Béla IV, fitted into a new foreign policy run by the Hungarian king after the Mongol onslaught. See also László Szende, “Magyarország külpolitikája 1242-1246 között” [The Foreign Politics of Hungary between 1242 and 1246], *Első Század 2* (2000), 299-349.

Wojciech Kozłowski

Some general features of a dynastic marriage must necessarily be discussed; marriage in medieval society should be seen as a serious issue for several reasons.⁵ Firstly, according to Christian teachings a couple, once married, was supposed to live life together. Putting aside exceptions which could happen in practice and not from denying this basic idea, parties had to take into consideration in advance that a marriage could last for decades. Separating from a wife could happen, of course, but in the case of dynastic marriages it immediately had political repercussions. Therefore, I would claim that concluding a marriage was understood as more than gaining immediate profit; it was also seen to include the construction of a solid basis for long-lasting cooperation. In a sense, it was a clear signal of political options that were chosen by those who made the marriage contract. Furthermore, a marriage was an *expressis verbis* declaration of the will to cooperate and, hence, it created extraordinary space for diplomatic and political undertakings. At the same time, all the by-standers received clear information that from now on the contracted pair should be seen somewhat as a team. A dynastic marriage was closely linked to prestige, however; wide-ranging and honorable marital connections were greatly appreciated because they inevitably enhanced the status of a dynasty among other European houses. Subsequently, this usually broadened the sphere of political influence and resulted in both diplomatic and economic profit. On the other hand, a dynastic marriage had its own serious consequences, and its long-term perspective was not necessarily the most solemn. Namely, a marriage, once concluded, acted as a “give-me-a-reason” device. Depending on the political situation, it could equip one party with many claims against the other involving particular territories, land estates, regions or even thrones. Moreover, a marriage normally meant offspring, who in one circumstance would be very desirable but could be problematic under another conditions. Hungarian-Polish relations seen through their marriages were never free from any of these considerations.

It should be mentioned here that dynastic marriages, generally speaking, also aroused other than political consequences. A bride arriving at the court of her

⁵ Some readings concerning the problems of a medieval marriage: D. L. D’Avray, *Medieval Marriage: Symbolism and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Georges Duby, *Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-Century France* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Neil Cartlidge, *Medieval Marriage: Literary Approaches, 1100-1300* (Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 1997); Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993). For an anthropological approach see Jack Goody, *The Oriental, the Ancient, and the Primitive: Systems of Marriage and the Family in the Pre-industrial Societies of Eurasia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), and idem, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

prospective husband was accompanied by her own entourage, which often represented its own unique culture and social behavior. Therefore, such a marriage could become a great opportunity for cultural intersection, for broadening the social horizons of both sides and, as a result, a starting point for an exchange of more than political “goods.” These aspects of marital agreements, however, are not part of my study here.

Methodological Remarks

The following discussion relies on a database which I created using published genealogical material. For the Polish figures I used mainly *Piastowie. Leksykon biograficzny*, which summarizes the up-to-date status of scholarly research, in some cases amending data in the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*.⁶ For some problematic Polish data I consulted the works of Kazimierz Jasiński, well-known Polish genealogist.⁷ I collected the data concerning the Árpáds from the genealogical tables published in *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9-14 század)*.⁸ For any other figures, chiefly regarding other dynasties, I also referred to the genealogical tables available in the last volume of the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*.⁹ My main goal was to gather all the marriages that were concluded (thus, engagement alone was not enough) within both dynasties in roughly the period 1150 to 1250.¹⁰ I believe that the data collected reveal some interesting trends in the marital policy of both houses.

Nevertheless, before getting to results of my survey,¹¹ I describe the methodology I have applied. Firstly, the term “marriage” should be elaborated here by a small

⁶ *Piastowie. Leksykon biograficzny* [Piasts. Biographical Lexicon], ed. Stanisław Szczur and Krzysztof Ożóg (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999) (hereafter: *Piastowie*).

⁷ Kazimierz Jasiński, *Rodowód Piastów śląskich. Piastowie wrocławscy i legnicko-brzeźscy* [Genealogy of the Silesian Piasts. The Piasts of Wrocław, Legnica and Brześć], Vol. 1, (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1973).

⁸ *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9-14 század)* [Lexicon of the Early History of Medieval Hungary (from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Century)], ed. Gyula Kristó, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994), 61-65.

⁹ *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ed. Robert Auty, et al. (Munich: Artemis-Verlag, 1991-1999), vol. 9.

¹⁰ I have, however, ignored the second marriage of Elisabeth (1152-1209) (see Table 2) into the Wettins, concluded no later than 1190, because after her first marriage to Sobieslaw II of Premislids she was already in Bohemian political circles and, therefore, the marriage into the Wettins cannot be counted as Piast politics. Moreover, the second marriage of Henry the White (1227/30-1266) (see Table 5) to Helena of Saxony also has been omitted because it was concluded c. 1260, which is chronologically beyond the dates of this study.

¹¹ Tables summarizing this data can be found at the end of this study. I have not included standard genealogical family trees because they do not add to the utility of the tables.

Wojciech Kozłowski

addition to its natural understanding. In case of the Piasts who married other members of the dynasty, for the sake of statistical convenience and in order to keep the same standards for all figures in the database, a Piast-Piast marriage meant statistically two separate marriages, because it expressed a dynastic horizon for two parties, no matter that both of them originated from the same dynasty. Similarly, all Hungarian-Polish marriages were counted twice in order to support two different perspectives, the Piasts' and the Árpáds'. Secondly, I introduced several other terms to describe concepts in the database. The term "direction" is crucial for the whole piece of research. This term gives a general impression of the marital objectives, i.e., what sort of political units were addressees of the dynastic efforts of the Piasts and the Árpáds. The "direction" was treated here somewhat superficially, but I found it necessary to obtain useful statistical data. "Empire" embraces all relations with the German-speaking and formal subjects of the Holy Roman Empire. "Byzantium" refers to all relations that concerned Hungarian Balkan-Byzantium politics, except for those which referred to the post-crusade political order and were characterized as "Crusade." "Ruthenia" took a broad meaning likewise. I distinguished the "Empire," however, from the term "Bohemia," because this was a neighboring state and therefore it played a special role in the politics of Hungary and Poland. For the same reason, during the more detailed interpretation of the data, I decided to disaggregate the "Empire" into smaller entities to make it possible to recognize the leading trends.

The whole database comprises eighty-five marriages that took place in the period from approximately 1150 to 1250. The choice criteria were based on the following factors: First, I set up a universal chronology. The starting point was the death of Bolesław III the Wrymouth in 1138, and the end point was 1256, i.e., the marriage of Bolesław the Pious to a Hungarian princess, Jolanta. This was, however, not enough for approaching the data accurately; therefore, I also created a relative chronology based on a system of *quasi-generations*. I defined five parallel *generations* of the Piasts and Árpáds which formed the core of my interpretation. A *generation* used as an analytical concept may vary in length; all references to *generation* here refer to my definition.

A *generation* was constructed on the following basis: I distinguished a "zero" generation that included two main figures – Bolesław III, duke of Poland, and Béla II, king of Hungary. Although there was a twenty-year-long break between them,¹² the marriages of their children took place in the 1130s at the earliest. This

¹² Bolesław III was born in 1086, and Béla II was born in 1108.

was the case with the children of Béla II and the children of Bolesław III, which were born, however, from his second marriage to Salomea. His descendants from the first marriage – Władislas II and Ryksa – I have included in the zero generation because the former was three years older than Béla II (b. 1108), and the latter (b. 1116) was between Béla II and Bolesław the Curled Hair (b. 1121/22), the oldest son of Bolesław III by his wife Salomea. Thus, I considered here two main factors supporting this particular order: 1) the level of descent in reference to the zero generation; and 2) the relative closeness of the dates of birth. Other factors, like the dates of marriages, cannot be used here because some people married several times over decades or some of them were engaged in their early years and married later. It would be problematic, therefore, to consider all the exceptions and specific cases that appeared over a century of dynastic marriages. I am completely aware that my statistical approach to human behavior has several drawbacks. Statistical data, nevertheless, are useful to track trends and reveal the big picture of a given process. The first marriages included in the database were contracted in 1136-1138, whereas the last ones took place in 1259 (in the Piasts' case) and in 1264 (in the Árpáds' case). I violated universal chronology a little by ignoring the marriage of Kinga and Přemysl Otokar II in 1261. The reason is that Kinga was a daughter of Anna and a granddaughter of Béla IV, i.e., according to my relative chronology she would have belonged to the sixth generation, which was not part of the research reported here.

Analysis of the Data

My basic aim in this discussion is to reconstruct the dynastic horizons of the Árpáds and the Piasts. Secondly, I will compare both houses within generations in a search for both common and distinctive features. Finally, I will summarize the data in total to show a big picture of the whole period.

The first generation¹³ comprised twelve people, eight Piasts and four Árpáds. All the Piasts, except for Bolesław the Tall and Ryksa (Richeza),¹⁴ were the descendants of Bolesław III from his second marriage, to Salomea, a daughter of Henry of Berg.

¹³ See Table 1, below.

¹⁴ One important note here. Ryksa (called also Richeza) should not be confused with her aunt of the same name, who lived 1116-1156, and, as I mentioned earlier, was included in the “zero” generation. To avoid misunderstandings I always use “Richeza” in brackets when referring to Ryksa, the daughter of Władislas II.

Wojciech Kozłowski

Bolesław the Tall was the oldest son of Władisław II, i.e., of the first-born son of Bolesław III. Ryksa (Richeza) was Bolesław the Tall's sister. On the Árpád side, only the children of Béla II who married are part of this study. There were three times as many marriages among the Piasts as among the Árpáds. Table 1 (at the end of this article) shows that their marital policy at that time presented an interesting variety of choices. Two-thirds of the Piasts' marriages linked them to their closest neighbors. This reveals their regionally centered spectrum. Nevertheless, these numbers change significantly if I remove the very prestigious marriages of Ryksa (Richeza). She was a distant relative of the emperor and, therefore, an inviting potential partner. She probably left Poland in 1146 with her father, who was forced to seek refuge at the imperial court. There the emperor engaged her to the king of Castile. Hence, omitting Ryksa's (Richeza) spouses, the Piasts' dynastic horizon is confined to only neighboring countries, mainly Ruthenia (40%) and the Holy Roman Empire (30%). Two of the marriages arranged by the emperor were concluded with possible political partners whose domains were located near the Piast territories. This fact underlines the importance of east-west relations. At the same time, the Árpáds evidently married their neighbors to the north and south. Taking into consideration that in Hungary the period from 1140 to 1170 was a time of Byzantine domination,¹⁵ apparently only a Polish marriage was free of Byzantine influence. I would imagine, however, that the Ruthenian direction was meant to counterbalance a growing pressure from the south. There is no doubt that marriage to a Byzantine princess was part of the imperial policy towards Hungary. Not going into details, the available data strongly suggest that in the first generation both dynasties were content to enter into marital contracts with their immediate neighbors. Thus, I would argue that there was not much difference between the dynastic horizons of the Árpáds and the Piasts.

The second generation¹⁶ embraced six Piasts (five of them were children of Mieszko the Old of Great Poland, and one, Mieszko I Płatonogi, originated from Silesia) and seven Árpáds (all children of Géza II, except for Mary, who was a daughter of Władisław II). The marital politics of Mieszko the Old continued the patterns of the previous generation. He married his children to the closest neighbors to his Great Poland domain – Brandenburg and Pomerania. His relations with Bohemia and Halich could also be understood as a part of his Little Poland politics,

¹⁵ I would like to express my gratitude here to Professor József Laszlovszky, who drew my attention to this period and called it the era of Byzantine domination.

¹⁶ See Table 2.

where he was partly successful in attempting to secure his power. This regionally centered spectrum was interrupted only once, by a marriage with the family of the Lotharingian dukes. Mieszko the Old secured his domain by marriages to the north, west, southwest, and southeast. No data about the marriage of Mieszko I Piłtonogi suggest that this was not a prestigious relationship. The general pattern of the Piasts' nuptial horizon, therefore, emulated the first generation, unlike the Árpáds, who effectively attempted to step into broader European politics. Statistically, the only direction that repeated after the first generation was Byzantium; however, in political matters these marriages are hardly comparable. Dynastic interests shifted from the northern and northeastern borders to the northwest: the Babenbergs and Přemyslids. These two directions also reflected a regionally centred spectrum like the Piasts, but with marriage-contracting partners who were more esteemed. Furthermore, whereas Mieszko the Old's dynastic range reached as far as the court of the Lotharinian dukes, Béla III first attempted to ally with the English court, but finally received a daughter of the king of France. This significantly expanded the dynastic horizon of the Hungarian house. A marriage to a Venetian doge revealed growing Hungarian interests in the Dalmatian coast. Thus, the Árpáds' marriage policy in the second generation crossed the Adriatic Sea and leaped over the empire. The second generations of both dynasties differed; whereas the Piasts were slowly focusing on the regional context, the Árpáds successfully attempted a more ambitious nuptial policy. The Dalmatian issue compelled them to get closer to Venice, but penetration of the Italian peninsula had started earlier with anti-Byzantine politics associated with the Normans.

The third generation¹⁷ comprised nine Piasts and four Árpáds. The Piasts originated from various Polish principalities, which was a result of the increasing disintegration of the larger entities of their ancestors. Four Piasts came from Great Poland, three from Silesia, one from Little Poland, and one from Mazovia. All the Árpáds in this generation were children of King Béla III. Analysis of the marriages of the Piasts gives the impression that nothing had changed compared with the previous generations. Constant marriage affiliations continued with Ruthenia and Bohemia (both have equal percentages here as in the second generation) and Pomerania. Depending on the interpretation, however, the number of Pomeranian marriages could have risen to four and, if that were so, the number of Bohemian couples would fall to one. Whatever was done, it does not change the general notion

¹⁷ See Table 3.

Wojciech Kozłowski

that the Piasts were unwilling to cross their regional horizon and look for marriage partners somewhere more distant in Europe. This is, I think, a clear reflection of their politics. The growing dismemberment of Poland and repeated internal clashes among the Piasts shaped their politics to a great extent. None of them yet represented a power attractive to prominent European houses. Moreover, the permanent desire of individuals to check their Piast opponents forced them to enter less prestigious but more practical local alliances, which proved helpful in dynastic quarrels. To a certain degree, such contests were increasingly focused on single strongholds and plots of land rather than whole principalities; nonetheless, more serious fights did not cease. The marriage of Henry the Bearded to Hedwig of Andechs should be considered here as a specific feature of the duchy of Silesia. Henry was a grandson of Władisław I of Silesia, who was forced to take refuge in the empire after his younger brothers rebelled in 1146. Sons of Władisław I, Bolesław I the Tall (the father of Henry the Bearded), and Mieszko I Płatonogi, regained Silesia in 1163, but they never gave up their close relations with the imperial court. Henry the Bearded successfully continued this tradition.¹⁸ The only “exotic” marriage in the third Piast generation was, seemingly, that with a Bulgarian princess, which is, however, a much disputed issue.¹⁹ Thus, I will not draw too many conclusions from it.

Four Árpáds in the third generation married almost as many times as did nine Piasts. About 60% of their marriages could still be considered as regional, but their variety, especially towards Byzantium and post-Crusade rulers, shows that Hungary was carrying out active and flexible politics, which were adjusting immediately to historical development. The Byzantium region was particularly important for Hungary because it was the most powerful opponent in the Balkans and apparently the marital policy of Hungary was used to appease it. The nuptial horizon broadened even further, in comparison with the second generation, since it reached the Iberian Peninsula, put a foothold in northern Italy, and even touched northeastern France. Simultaneously, Ruthenia and Poland completely disappeared

¹⁸ It would be interesting to make a further study of the dynastic horizons of particular Piast families. At first sight some features stand out which might be elaborated. For instance, the Great Poland branch paid close attention to Pomerania, the Little Poland and Masovian branches tended to turn to Ruthenia, and Silesian dukes concentrated more on the West.

¹⁹ Jerzy Rajman has stated that all we know for sure about the wife of Casimir of Silesia is her name – Wiola. Information about her Bulgarian roots comes from Jan Długosz, but in Rajman’s opinion this does not make much sense. There was no reason for this marriage, he argues, see, *Piastowie*, 715-716. On the contrary, Stanisław Sroka repeats without hesitation from Długosz that Wiola was a daughter of Tsar Kołojan, see *Piastowie*, 721.

as Hungarian connubial targets. Furthermore, Bohemia, which was a double marriage contractor in the second generation, this time was chosen only once, but from the very top – Přemysl I Otokar, the king of Bohemia, married Konstanze. The turn of the thirteenth century found Hungary conducting active marital politics that had already resulted in close relations with the influential European dynasties. This was also the time when Hungarian foreign policy “remembered” the North; the next generation re-entered the Polish and Ruthenian region. There is no doubt, however, that between the first and the fourth generations the Árpáds developed their dynastic horizon on an unprecedented scale, whereas the Piasts did not.

The fourth generation²⁰ embraced six Piasts and six Árpáds. Geographically the Piasts originated from Mazovia (three), Silesia (two), and Little Poland (one), and all of them were born at the beginning of the thirteenth century. They were grand- or great-grandchildren of Bolesław III the Wrymouth and lived in a Poland that was very different from that of Bolesław III. This generation also introduced Piast-Piast marriages, which reappeared on an even greater scale in the fifth generation. Such marriages were the effect of the further dismemberment of Poland and are plain evidence of the growing decline of the Piasts’ political horizons. 45% of the marriages in this generation occurred within the Polish dynasty. Consequently, this meant that nearly half of the dynastic “manpower” was not used to expand the house’s influence outside, but played on a very local political scene. Thus, the Piasts’ domestic politics gained the upper hand in juxtaposition with their foreign policy. Moreover, such internal alliances were, I think, more efficient for them in securing their own domains against other claimants than any outside relations. Following the tradition which had arisen in at least the first generation, some marriages were concluded with Ruthenian dukes of regional importance and with Bohemia. Nevertheless, the latter relation was extraordinary for the Piasts because the father of the bride was Přemysl Otokar I, king of Bohemia. Such a prominent marriage occurred, however, within the Silesian branch, which had distinguished itself before for its wider and more prestigious marital horizon. Another high-status marriage took place in 1214, when Coloman, a son of Andrew II, king of Hungary, received Salomea, a daughter of Leszek the White, duke of Cracow. This relation was, in my view, merely due to the Ruthenian politics of Andrew II, i.e., a reawakened Hungarian interest in northern politics pushed the Árpáds into the Piasts’ arms. In this case, the Hungarian dynasty emulated its Byzantine politics of soothing

²⁰ See Table 4.

Wojciech Kozłowski

and weakening rivals by marrying them. Moreover, behind this marriage stood the powerful idea of creating a new kingdom east of Poland for members of the Árpád dynasty. Therefore, it seemed worth fighting for.

Six Árpáds in the fourth generation were children of Andrew II, with the exception of Stephen, who was born much later than his siblings, actually after the death of his father. Therefore, he was taken from the Hungarian court to Italy by his mother and did not play a political role in the country. Moreover, he probably married after 1250, which puts him outside the scope of my study. Stephen was, nevertheless, the father of Andrew III, a future king of Hungary, but this issue concerns events in the second half of the thirteenth century. Returning to Stephen's older siblings, I want to stress that continuity (compared with the third generation) was sustained in only two directions – Crusader states (within the Byzantium region) and the Kingdom of Aragon. These are, I think, expressions of permanent dynastic and political interest that seemed profitable for all the actors involved. In the second and third generations the Árpáds were anxious to marry Babenbergs, who ruled Austria. The fourth, and later the fifth, generations experienced a “connubial shift” to the North and to the West, in search of powerful political partners behind the Babenberg domains. This was surely the case in the fifth generation, when the Austrian house died out and the question of inheritance subsequently emerged. Bulgaria became a completely new nuptial region of Árpáodian attention. Entering these relations was, however, in accordance with the Balkan politics of the previous century, and with the fall of Byzantium after the Fourth Crusade Hungary expressed even more eagerness to dominate its southern neighbors. I mentioned the Árpáodian flexibility towards Byzantium in the third generation and I want to recall this issue again here. After the reign of Béla III, the Kingdom of Hungary attained an authoritative position in the region and could run its politics by means of power. The idea of expansion was there, and marriages clearly depict the directions where the vital concerns of Hungary lay. Rediscovery of the North is evidence of that. I think that the Polish and the Ruthenian marriages concluded after eighty years of total indifference played a crucial role in the Árpáds' northern expansion. This expansion, launched under Béla III, lasted for the next two hundred years and was automatically inherited by the Angevins in the fourteenth century. The Árpáds' longing to subordinate Serbia and Bulgaria led them to marry Byzantine and post-Crusade princesses continuously. According to this statistical study, I would strongly argue that an analogical desire to dominate/incorporate southwestern Ruthenia (Halich Land)

led the Árpáds to similar connubial contracts not only with Ruthenian dukes but also with the Piasts, especially those ruling in Cracow. I think, however, that for some time the Árpáds were not aware of the significant role of the Piasts in Lodomeria and Halich, but this is another issue.

The fifth generation included fourteen Piasts (four from Great Poland, one from Little Poland, two from Mazovia, and seven from Silesia) and seven Árpáds (all children of Béla IV). For the Piasts, the Piast-Piast type of marriage became more important; two-thirds of all marriages in this generation occurred among Piast relatives. The reason for the increase in such relations is similar to that in the fourth generation, but on a larger scale. The majority of the Piasts were fully engaged in local and domestic Polish politics, constructing intra-dynastic alliances. Other nuptial partners remained traditional – bordering imperial lords and the Pomeranian dukes. In this milieu, the two Hungarian marriages to royal daughters were extraordinary. To demonstrate this, it is enough to show the following numbers. For all thirty-nine marriages that took place before 1239 only two (5%) were with royal daughters – the marriages of Mieszko the Old (the first generation) and Henry II the Pious (the fourth generation). Even counting a marriage of 1214 with a royal son would give less than 8%. I argue, therefore, that for the Piasts of the thirteenth century, entering such relations was politically beneficial and prestigious. Furthermore, it was totally unlike the period before 1140, which had been dominated by partnerships giving a slight advantage to the Piasts.

At the same time, the Árpáds continued their northern politics. I have already mentioned a shift in their politics toward the empire. In the fifth generation another thing is striking, however; for the first time there was no marriage with the Byzantine region. Béla IV was preoccupied with Northern politics and the numbers show that 60% of all marriages were related to Halich and Poland. Moreover, there was a single marriage to a Cuman, which was mainly connected to internal Hungarian politics. All of these give an impression that Hungary in the fifth generation dropped its European-wide contacts and replaced them with less prestigious ones. This would partially be an accurate conclusion; however, it had plain political reasons, which cannot be discussed here. For the sake of honesty I need to add here that under Béla IV marriages also took place with the Bohemian king and, later at Béla IV's deathbed, with the Kingdom of Naples. Thus, it would be improper to claim that the Árpáds withdrew completely from a European dynastic policy. This somewhat deceptive picture of the mid-thirteenth century in my statistics arises from the chronology which I described previously and applied here.

Wojciech Kozłowski

Conclusion

Summarizing this discussion of five generations, I emphasize a simultaneous process of an Árpád rise in power and a gradual Piast decline. This process was noticeably reflected in the dynastic horizons of both houses. The Piasts had the widest horizon in the first generation, which at that time exceeded that of the Hungarians. This was, however, no longer the case in later generations. Whereas the Piasts confined themselves to regional politics, the Árpáds reached the Western borders of Europe and managed to prolong connections with it for two generations. A number of marriages with the post-Fourth-Crusade Byzantine emperors reflected the vigorous Hungarian politics in the Balkans, while connections with the northern Italian cities betrayed their ambitions along the Adriatic Sea. In the fourth generation the first Piast-Piast marriages occurred – a clear mark of a shrinking political and dynastic horizon. Thus, when Bolesław I received the hand of Gertrud in the first Piast-Piast marriage c. 1234, Jolanta of Hungary was just about to marry Jacob I, king of Aragon. The Piasts throughout nearly all five generations married bordering dukes and territorial lords. On the contrary, the Árpáds were marrying not only their immediate neighbors but also into powerful allies which were crucial for their expansionist politics. All these results, I think, reveal another important feature. Namely, the Piasts were actually unable to conduct an expansionist political program which would have put them in confrontation with rival powers that were controlled by the high-status royal European dynasties. Thus, their dynastic horizon was adjusted to the sort of politics which they were in fact doing. On the contrary, step-by-step the Árpáds were entering a serious contest with Byzantium for the Balkans and a struggle with Venice for Dalmatia, not to mention attempts to control Austria. Such ambitious politics encroached on the vital interests of “big” European houses and, consequently, they opened their courts to the Árpáds. The more successful the Hungarians were the easier it became to broaden their dynastic horizon.

As a result, by the middle of the thirteenth century the Piasts’ and the Árpáds were no longer comparable. In addition, a change in Hungarian politics in the fifth generation automatically reshaped the dynastic horizon. My analysis, buttressed with the historical context, shows that the Hungarian dynasty was eager to marry parties who contemporarily played an essential role in their politics. Therefore, I can state that not only was there a striking gap between the Piasts’ and the Árpáds’ dynastic perspectives in the middle of the thirteenth century, but also Hungarian

The Dynastic Horizons of the Árpáds and Piasts, ca. 1150-1250

northern politics at the turn of the thirteenth century took shape as a result of the Árpáds' choice and a changed direction for their further expansion. Hence, the marriages with Ruthenia and the one with Poland in 1214 were effects of this renewed northern policy. According to the data, the two following marriages of 1239 and 1256 were extraordinary for the Piasts, who had scarcely managed to marry into any nuclear royal family for a whole century, and suddenly they received two royal daughters as spouses. The partnership of the early Middle Ages, interrupted for eight decades, seemed to reemerge, but undoubtedly in very different circumstances. The Piasts and the Árpáds were no longer of equal status.

Table 1. Dynastic marriages in the first “generation.”

Piasts						
Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction	
Bolesław I the Tall	1127-1201	Zwienisława	Wszewołod, duke of Kiev	c. 1142	Ruthenia	
		Krystyna	Unknown imperial house of lower wealth	c. 1160	Empire	
Ryksa (Richeza)	1130/40-1185	Alfons VII, king of Castile		1152	Castile	
		Raimund II Berenger, duke of Provence		1161	Provence	
Bolesław the Curled Hair	1121/22-1173	Wierzchosława	Wszewołod, duke of Novogrod	1136	Ruthenia	
		Mary	?	c. 1160	?	
Mieszko the Old	1122/25-1202	Elisabeth	Béla II Árpád	1136-38	Hungary	
		Eudoksja	Izasaław Monomach, grand duke of Kiev	1150-54	Ruthenia	
Dobroniega Ludgarda	1128/35-1160	Dytryk	son of margrave of Meissen	1146-1150	Empire	Meissen
Judith	1130/35-1171/75	Otto	Albrecht the Bear, mrg. of Brandenburg	1148	Empire	Brandenburg
Agnes	1137-1182<	Mściśław	Izasaław Monomach, grand duke of Kiev	<1151	Ruthenia	
Casimir the Just	1138-1194	Helen	Conrad II Premislid, duke of Znojmo	1161<	Bohemia	

Árpáds						
Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction	
Géza II	1130-1162	Eufrosina	Mściśław Monomach, grand duke of Kiev	c. 1146	Ruthenia	
Władisław II	1131-1163	?				
Stephen IV	1132/3-1165	Mary	princess from Byzantium	?	Byzantium	
Elisabeth	?	Mieszko the Old	Bolesław III the Wrymouth of Poland	1136-1138	Poland	

Legend						
c.	?	<1200	>1200	1208?	1122/25	1271 ↓
circa	no data	before	after	dubious	between	death

Table 2. *Dynastic marriages in the second “generation.”*

Piasts

Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction	
Odon	1145-1194	Wyszczława	Jarosław Ośmiomysł, duke of Halich	c. 1180	Ruthenia	
Wierzchosława-Ludmiła	<1152-1223	Frideric I of Bitsch	Mathew I, duke of Lotharingia	c. 1166	Empire	Lotharingia
Judith	<1154- <1201	Bernard III of Anhalt	Albrecht the Bear, mrg. Of Brandenburg	c. 1173-1177	Empire	Brandenburg
Elisabeth	c. 1152-1209	Sobiesław II, duke of Olomunc	Premislids	c. 1173/4	Bohemia	
Bolesław	1159-1195	Dobrosława	Pomerania: Dymin or West Pomerania	1180/1 or 1187/9	Pomerania	
Mieszko I Płatonogi	<1146-1211	Ludmiła	?		?	

Árpáds

Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction	
Stephen III	1147-1172	Agnes	Henry II Babenberg of Austria	1166	Empire	Austria
Béla III	1148-1196	Anna Chatillon	Konstanz, duchess of Antioch	1170	Byzantium	Antioch
		Margaret Capet	Louis VII, king of France	1186	France	
Géza	c. 1150- <1210	?	princess from Byzantium	?	Byzantium	
Elisabeth	>1189]	Frideric, duke of Bohemia	Premislids	c. 1157	Bohemia	
Odola	>1169]	Świętopełk	Wladislas II, king of Bohemia	1164	Bohemia	
Ilona (Helena)	1199]	Leopold V, duke of Austria	Babenberg	1174	Empire	Austria
Mary	?	Nicolaus	Michiele Vitale II, Venerian doge	1167	Venice	

Legend						
c.	?	<1200	>1200	1208?	1122/25	1271↓
circa	no data	before	after	dubious	between	death

Table 3. Dynastic marriages in the third “generation.”

Piasts					
Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction
Adefajda Zbysława	1157/66- >1213	Dypold II	Premislids	1175-80	Bohemia
Casimir	1178/79-1230	Wiola	tsar Kolojan of Bulgaria (dubious!!)	1217-1220	Bulgaria ??
Henry the Bearded	1165/70-1238	Hedwig	Bertold VI of Andechs	1186-1190	Empire Bavaria
Wladislas Laskonogi	1161/66-1231	Łucja	Jaromir, duke of Rugia	1186	Pomerania
Salomea	1162/64-?	Racibor	Bogusław I, duke of West Pomerania	1173-76	Pomerania
Anastazja	<1164- >1240	Bogusław I, duke of West Pomerania		1181	Pomerania
Wladislas Odonic	c. 1190-1239	Jadwiga	Mściwoj I, procurator of Gdańsk Pomerania or Świętopełk, duke of Moravia of Premislids	1218-20	Pomerania Bohemia
Leszek the White	c. 1186-1227	Grzymisława	Ingwar, duke of Łuck	1208?	Ruthenia
Conrad	c. 1187/8-1247	Agafia	Światosław, duke of Premisl	1208?	Ruthenia

Árpáds

Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction
Emeric	1174-1204	Konstanz	Alfons II, king of Aragon	1198-1200	Aragon
Margaret	1175- >1229	Issakios Angelos	emperor of Byzantium	1185	Byzantium Byzantium
		Boniface of Montferrato	king of Thessaloniki	1204	Crusade Thessaloniki
		Nicolaus	a knight of the Saint Omer Order	1210	Crusade Flandres
Andrew II	c. 1177-1235	Gertrud	Bertold IV, duke of Istria and Kraina	c. 1200	Empire Austria
		Jolanta	Pierre Courtenay, the Latin Emperor	1215	Crusade Byzantium
		Beatrix Este	Azzo IV of Este	1235	Ferrara
Constanz	1240]	Premisl I Ottokar	king of Bohemia	1198	Bohemia

Table 4. Dynastic marriages in the fourth “generation.”

Piasts

Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction
Salomea	1211-1268	Koloman	Andrew II Árpád, king of Hungary	1214	Hungary
Bolesław I	c. 1208-1248	Gertrud	Henry II the Pious of Silesia	c. 1234	Piast-Piast
		Anastasia	Alexander, duke of Belz	1247	Ruthenia
Siemowit I	c. 1215-1262	Perejaślawa	Danil, duke of Halich	c. 1248	Ruthenia
Casimir I	c. 1211-1267	Hedwig	?		?
		Konstanz	Henry II the Pious of Silesia	c. 1234	Piast-Piast
		Eufrosina	Casimir I of Opole & Racibórz	c. 1257	Piast-Piast
Mieszko II the Obese	c. 1220-1246	Judith	Conrad, duke of Mazovia	<1239	Piast-Piast
Henry II the Pious	1196/1207-1241	Anna	Premisl Otokar I, king of Bohemia	1214-18	Bohemia

Árpáds

Name	Life dates	Marriage partner	Father/Dynasty	Date of marriage	Direction
Mary	1203/4-1237/8	Ivan II Asen, tsar of Bulgaria		1221	Bulgaria
Béla IV	1206-1270	Mary	Theodoros Laskaris, emperor of Nicea	1220	Crusade Nicea
Elisabeth	1207-1231	Louis IV, duke of Thuringien		1221	Empire
Koloman	1208-1241	Salomea	Leszek the White, duke of Cracow	1214	Poland Cracow
Andrew	c. 1210-1234	Mary	Mścisław, duke of Novogrod and Halich	1226/7	Ruthenia
Jolanta	c. 1219-1251	Jacob I, king of Aragon		1235	Aragon