

## Dynastic Intrigues and Domestic Realities during the Reigns of Andrew I and Béla I

Z. J. Kosztolnyik

Porro dux Andreas a perturbationibus hostium securus effectus in regia civitate Alba regalem coronam est adeptus.

*Chronicon pictum*, c. 86.

**In the mid-1030s**, the cousin of King Stephen I of Hungary, Prince Vazul (the son of Michael, the younger brother of Géza, Stephen's father) conspired to assassinate the elderly and ailing king. The conspiracy was discovered and the king's court had Vazul blinded and his three sons: Levente, Andrew and Béla, banished from the kingdom.<sup>1</sup> Next, a new article was added to the recently promulgated Laws of King Stephen (art. ii: 17) regarding conspiracy against king and country. The article proclaimed that the organizer of such conspiracy may find no refuge in a church. Although this decree shows similarity in concept and wording to the brief entry 5 of the Synod of Mainz (847 a.d.), the phrasing of the Hungarian article is firmer: it outlaws the traitor not only from the community of believers, but from the Church itself.

Upon the death of King Stephen in 1038, his nephew, Peter the Orseolo — the son of one of Stephen's sisters, and the favourite of Queen Gisela, Stephen's widow (and the sister of the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry II) — ascended the Hungarian throne. His tyrannical rule (from 1038 to 1041 and from 1044 to 1046) encountered strong opposition. In 1041 Peter fled the realm after which his opponents elected Sámuel Aba, the Palatine of the country and husband of Stephen's other sister, as their king. Unfortunately for Aba, the German imperial court refused to recog-

nize his election to the Hungarian throne and Emperor Henry III invaded Hungary.<sup>2</sup>

Henry's armies first seized the frontier fortress of Pozsony (Pressburg, today's Bratislava), then advanced along the left bank of the Danube to the Garam (Hron) River taking possession of nine other Hungarian fortifications. Aba reacted to this invasion by offering peace to the Emperor. Henry refused this offer and embarked on a new invasion this time along the right bank of the Danube. His forces, however, bogged down in the marshes of the Rábca River. In the fall of 1043 Henry concluded peace with Aba, thereby recognizing his royal status.

On the domestic front, however, King Aba's opponents, consisting of Orseolo sympathizers and Church leaders, were gaining strength. The King, fearing another conspiracy, early in 1043 ordered the slaughter of the dignitaries who had conspired against him. The following year the nobles who survived the massacre asked for the Emperor's intervention. Henry III once again entered Hungary with his armies and on July 5 defeated Aba's forces in the Battle of Ménfő (Győr county, in western Hungary). The King fled to the east but was captured and killed by his Hungarian opponents. Soon thereafter Henry entered Székesfehérvár (Alba Civitas or Alba Regia — Árpáadian Hungary's second most important city), where he restored Péter the Orseolo to the Hungarian throne.

Péter's throne rested on shaky foundations. In order to secure his reign and the unqualified support of the Emperor, in the spring of 1045 he offered Hungary as a fiefdom to Henry III.<sup>3</sup> And yet, the Orseolo did not feel secure in his kingdom, in spite — or, perhaps, because — of his feudal relationship with the imperial court. Accordingly, he had the district forts garrisoned by German and Italian troops — to the consternation of the Hungarian nobles who, led by Boja and Bonya, formed a conspiracy against him. The Orseolo had the conspirators executed. Thereupon in the spring of 1046, the nobles gathered at Csanád and sent envoys to Kiev to recall from their exile the Árpáadian princes Andrew and Levente (Vazul's oldest sons), to rule over the country.

In the early fall of 1046, the two princes — along with their Kievan auxiliaries — entered the realm, where they were joined by a multitude of King Péter's opponents, led by Vata from the region of Békés who wanted to restore paganism in the land. In order to gain time, the two princes seemingly consented to Vata's demand, thereby opening the floodgates of an anti-Christian uprising all over the land.<sup>4</sup> Simultaneously, an abortive uprising also broke out in the camp of the Orseolo

at Zsitvatorok (the estuary of the Zsitva stream). The king next tried to enter the city of Székesfehérvár, but the city gates remained shut before him. He was captured at Zámoly and was blinded.

It was Peter the Orseolo's tragedy that he, a ruler of non-Árpád blood, had been unable to comprehend that it was his sole responsibility to maintain the country's public institutions his predecessors had established. It was his personal tragedy that, in spite of the many years he had spent in the country, he was unable to understand the spiritual inner world of the Magyar people.

At the end of September, three bishops who had escaped the bloodbath of the pagan uprising, crowned Andrew I king in the royal cathedral (coronation church) of Székesfehérvár.

### **The Reign of Andrew I**

The invitation of Andrew and his accession to the Hungarian throne proved a mixed blessing to both the nobles who had invited him, and to Andrew himself. During his prolonged stay in Kiev, Andrew had gained the hand in marriage of Anastasia, daughter of Jaroslav the Wise, grand-prince of Kiev, and through this marriage he assured himself of the political — and, possibly, the military — support of the Kievan Empire for the realization of his own dynastic ambitions. The other daughter of Jaroslav, Anna, was the queen of Henry I, king of the Franks, whereby the recently anointed and crowned Hungarian monarch could hope to obtain diplomatic and cultural aid from his Frankish royal brother-in-law. The founding by Andrew of the abbey of Tihany in 1055 in the honour of the Frankish saint, Anian, may serve as proof that the establishment of Franco-Hungarian cultural ties had been realized.<sup>5</sup>

King Andrew's first concern was to restore peace in the land, to put Vata's pagan insurgents into their place, and to fill unoccupied ecclesiastical positions in the country with the twenty-four canons who came to Hungary after their canonry at Verdun had burned down. In the late 1040s, he provided military aid for the Croats against Venice and the Dalmatian cities, and in the early spring of 1050, he staged a counter offensive against Bishop Gebhard of Regensburg who had invaded Hungary's frontier region. When the Hungarian scouts noted that on the German side of the border the Germans were rebuilding the fort of Hainburg, Andrew's border guards harassed the builders and brought construc-

tion to a near standstill. To reach a peace agreement with the Holy Roman Empire, Andrew sent envoys to Emperor Henry III, and dispatched Archbishop George of Kalocsa to Pope Leo IX, who was at that time visiting in Lorraine, with the request that his Holiness intervene at the imperial court on behalf of the peace offer made by the Hungarian monarch.

In 1050, Prince Béla also returned to Hungarian soil with his Polish wife. Andrew rewarded him with a princely share of Hungary's territory that meant, among other things, that Béla had the right to mint money. In his exile Béla had made a reputation for himself as a military strategist and a brave soldier.<sup>6</sup> In the summer of 1051, King Andrew needed all of Béla's military know-how when German imperial forces gathered at Passau and, led by the Emperor Henry III in person, invaded Hungary and marched against Székesfehérvár. Bishop Gebhard was in charge of the imperial supply ships on the Danube carrying food for the Emperor's troops. The imperial high command had learned a lesson from past mistakes; it organized supplies of food provisions for the troops before actually starting the campaign. But Andrew's men — or Béla's scouts — in a cleverly written mischievous letter had caused the ships to return home prematurely, thereby leaving the German troops heading toward Szekesfehérvár without food supplies. Consequently, Andrew's and Béla's forces easily out-manoeuvred and then defeated the imperial forces at Bodajk near Mount Vértes (Hill of [the lost] Shields).

The imperial court next planned a new offensive. In the following year its forces besieged the fortress of Pozsony for eight weeks — to no avail. The imperial naval vessels on the Danube — it is not clear from the text whether the boats were armed ships, or food supply vessels — were sunk by a clever Hungarian frogman named Zotmund, whereupon the Emperor withdrew his troops. Since Pozsony was located near the German border, and the imperial high command could easily have provided for the needs of its forces by means of land transportation. Actually, Henry III was forced to withdraw his armed forces not so much because of Zotmund's brave deed, but because he had to face domestic troubles: Duke Conrad of Bavaria had revolted against him.<sup>7</sup>

Unfortunately for Hungary, this was the last occasion when Andrew and Béla cooperated with each other. In 1053, a son and heir: Salomon, was born to Andrew, and the king had a Basilian monastery erected at Visegrád to please his Kievan-born Queen Anastasia who had been brought up in Byzantine Christian traditions. In 1054 the schism

between Byzantium and Rome became open. In order to make sure that he did not appear to favour either side in this religious quarrel and that he did not offend the sensitivities of his Queen's sister Anna, the wife of the west-Frankish monarch, in 1055 King Andrew established a Latin-rite monastery in Tihany. Through these acts Andrew sought to have peace and balance between the religious and political interests of the two churches and wanted the Frankish court to know that his realm formed a part of western, Latin Christendom.

Peace had prevailed in the land. Archbishop Benedict of Esztergom and Zach[eus] the Palatine (*comes palatini*) were the country's head officials. In the 1050s, Sarchas, Judge of the King's Court, prepared a census of the personnel serving on the royal estates. It may have been at this time that Edward Aetheling (also known as Edward the Exile) — the son of King Edward's brother, Edmund (known as "Ironside") — who had been banished to Hungary by King Cnut the Great, allegedly married Agatha, a daughter of Stephen I. To quote from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Edward "won a kinswoman of the Emperor for his wife," that is, a daughter of Queen Gisela, the sister of Emperor Henry II, but returned to England where he died shortly thereafter. "[H]e so speedily ended his life after he came to England." An explanation for Edward's sudden death may be provided by a remark in the less-known *Florence* manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: "for the king — that is, Edward the Confessor — had determined to make Edward heir to the kingdom after him." Perhaps certain individuals at the English court disliked the idea of a prince who had been living abroad for years and had married into a "foreign" royal family, thereby establishing a dynastic blood tie with the Holy Roman imperial court, being allowed to ascend the English throne.<sup>8</sup>

Another entry in this *Florence* manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* may, however, reveal a further dynastic aspect of this story, that is that Andrew I of Hungary might have made plans with Edward the Exile, heir presumptive to the English throne, to expand the Hungarian Kingdom's diplomatic influence beyond the confines of the Germanic world. In such a manner, through family connections with the Frankish and English royal houses, to which he could add his family ties with the ruling house in Kiev (and the religious-political ties with Byzantium), King Andrew I wanted to bring about a far-reaching dynastic network by arranging for a well placed marriage alliance between his son Salomon and Judith, the sister of the new German ruler, the future Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV.<sup>9</sup>

The dynastic marriage relationship in the making between the House of Árpád and the Franconian dynasty of German rulers — against the background of Árpáadian blood ties with the west-Frankish and English kingdoms, and family and religious ties with the eastern, Kievan and Byzantine, courts — provided a seemingly firm foundation for the position of Andrew I, as well as his son Salomon, in a central Europe.

A well-informed Hungarian chronicler of the times who probably had a clear picture of Andrew's dynastic goals,<sup>10</sup> commented on the case from an entirely different perspective. Blood ties often hinder the truth, he complained. Also, fatherly concern in the heart of Andrew, he wrote, defeated justice, in that Andrew, by now old and invalid — and yet, in a manner unworthy of a king — broke the promise he had made to his younger brother Béla that, upon his death, it will be Béla who shall inherit the Hungarian throne. Instead, Andrew had Salomon, his five-year-old son, anointed and crowned king, “in regem fecit iniungi et coronari.” The chronicler excused the King's behaviour by saying that he had acted out of national interest: the German court would not have consented to the arranged marriage without Salomon's coronation; and yet, the chronicler also pointed out, the king had made a mistake. When Béla found out what really had happened, he justly grew indignant and, what was worse, became suspicious.

Later Andrew once again met his younger brother at the royal hunting lodge at Várkony. There he, without the knowledge of Béla, put his brother to a test. Would the prince accept political reality? Would he be satisfied with his princely title and landholdings, and continue as the realm's military defender during the minority of the child king, Salomon; or, would he reach out for the crown, thereby voiding Andrew's dynastic ambitions? Accordingly, at Várkony, Andrew placed before Béla the crown and a sword and asked him to chose. Béla, following the advice of Nicholas, reeve of the royal court: “Si vitam optas, accipe gladium,” chose, out of fear, the sword, that is, the princely title. After he had made his choice, Béla with his family immediately left the kingdom. Regardless of the fact that he had acted out of fear, the prince, in deciding to flee to Poland, simply refused to identify himself with — and may have decided to undermine — his brother's pro-German game of dynastic chess.

In the fall of 1060, Prince Béla returned from Poland with three divisions of Polish auxiliaries and took up position east of the Tisza river. King Andrew grew concerned, sent his family to safety in Austria, and

asked for German military aid. Through this twofold act the already very ill monarch committed a fatal mistake. He had fully weakened his position on the home front and demolished any prospect of success he could have claimed for his foreign diplomacy. The king was no match for Béla's military know-how, not to mention the fact that the majority of his subjects sided with the prince. Béla deployed his forces in the Tisza region — a region that formed part of his princely territory, whose terrain he knew well, where he could easily provide logistics for his men — and encircled the German troops that had arrived to help Andrew. The King fled to Moson on the western border, was severely wounded in an accident, was captured by Béla's men and, because of incompetent medical treatment, soon died in the royal hunting lodge at Zirc.

A word of explanation will be in order here. In this writer's opinion, King Andrew I must have become overconfident by the prospects of his marriage-bound diplomacy: his links to Kievan Rus, to the Frankish Kingdom, to the Germanic world of the Holy Roman Emperors, and his expected ties to England, blinded him to realities.

In connection with the latter it might be mentioned that there is no record of Edward Aetheling's stay — that lasted well into King Andrew's reign — in Hungary by the Hungarian chroniclers. If, however, Edward did *not* marry one of King Stephen's daughters but only a Hungarian noble woman (an unlikely scenario knowing King Stephen's warm hospitality extended to all "foreigners") the Anglo-Saxon prince, who had lived and raised a family in Hungary, still had to have active contacts with the Hungarian royal court.

King Andrew wanted to crown this complicated and perhaps unrealistic policy with the marriage of *his* son to the sister of the ruling German monarch, the future Holy Roman Emperor, Henry IV — who at the time was still a minor. It was the Andrew's personal tragedy that his overbearing dynastic ambitions lacked political reality. On the one hand, the imperial court's advisors and dowager empress Agnes (Henry II's widow), viewed the proposed marriage between Salomon and Judith as a means to draw the Magyar kingdom back into the sphere of imperial influence, from which it had only recently pulled away. This German-Hungarian marriage alliance sooner or later would have restored the Magyar court's dependency on the Holy Roman Empire. On the other hand, Andrew's diplomacy lacked domestic reality: it ignored his subjects' deep-seated distrust of foreign influences and their attachment to ancient Magyar habits and manner of life. Many in Hungary of the times were

searching for an excuse to revolt — with armed force, if needed — against the “foreign” politics of their monarch.

### The Reign of Béla I

In early December 1060, Béla I became king. The Hungarian chronicler called Béla *Benin* (the warrior). Béla entered Székesfehérvár in triumph, where the bishops anointed and crowned him — “regali dyademata... est coronatus,” the chronicler reported. This writer, however, believes that the circlet used at the coronation was not the crown that touched King Stephen’s forehead, but “[the] *ruler’s diadem* with which the bishops, after anointing him, had crowned him.” If this ruler’s diadem happened to be the circlet sent by the *Byzantine* Emperor Monomachos, a diadem that the *Latin-rite* bishops had placed on Béla’s head, the new king through his coronation wanted to signal his determination that during his reign he shall maintain good relations with the *eastern* Greek court, and at the same time also continue the Árpáds’ *western* orientation. The new king’s first task was to deflate once and for all the still vigorous “pagan” revolution in the land. Béla first tried persuasion but made only slow progress; in the end he had to rely upon military force to restore law and order. The chronicler’s statement that the king summoned, countrywide, two *well-spoken men* from every village to his Royal Council to aid him in decision making — “misit etiam rex... per totam Hungariam precones, ut de singulis villis vocarentur duo seniores *facundiam habentes* [italics mine] ad regis concilium” — may refer to this resolution of the monarch. The chronicler’s choice of Latin terms meant that two well-spoken elders invited from every village were, “*facundiam habentes*,” actually *representatives* of the villages in, or before, the King’s Council, whose framework King Béla now expanded from the size the council had earlier been established by King Stephen.

In other words, King Béla I in the early 1060s had — together with members of the high clergy, nobility, and elected representatives of the people — enacted effective legislation, placed the dismal financial problems of the country in order, and realized his clearly set domestic and foreign political aims. It might be pointed out that Béla’s example would be emulated by other European rulers. In Aragon of the 1080s, it would be *rex et regina* who would call upon the representatives of the towns to participate in the discussion of public matters — and enact legislation. In



England, it will be Henry II who, according to the resolutions of his Assize of Clarendon of 1166, through statements taken from the local *legaliores* (who knew of a certain crime, at the certain time, at a certain place) before courts of law, would conduct legal proceedings by the “Justices in the eyre.”

It was through his expanded Council that Béla had successfully handled financial matters, minted money, determined prices and wages, punished black marketeering, supported *laissez faire*, introduced Byzantine gold coins into circulation — his forty silver denars were worth one Byzantine gold coin. This writer agrees with historian Bálint Hóman who, in his assessment of late eleventh century reforms in Hungary, said that the economic-financial improvements in the realm reached back to the days of King Béla I. The fiscal improvements “introduced” by King Salomon, for instance, would not have been possible without the fiscal initiatives under King Béla.<sup>11</sup>

One cannot leave out of consideration the fact that Béla had grown up in the Polish court, where fiscal reforms had been carried out already in the first half of the eleventh century. Béla had been aware that no matter how important his domestic and diplomatic efforts would be, he could not realize them without at first placing his country’s economic and monetary state on solid foundations. In the spirit of King Stephen, he did this at the beginning of his reign, acting with the full cooperation of the high clergy, the nobility, and the peoples’s *representative* spokesmen in the Council.

It was also with the consent of his spiritual and temporal lords that Béla had, at the beginning of his reign, suppressed the *pagan* upheaval countrywide. This is evident from the remark of the *Chronicle* that it took Béla three days to take action; as soon as he had obtained the consent of his lords, and re-grouped his available army units, he mastered the situation. (The monarch had been aware that it was dangerous to use troops to quell domestic unrest; the experience could have backfired: “Hungaria ad Christum convertita bis ad paganismum versa est.”)

During the summer of 1063, the imperial diet meeting at Mainz decided on a military campaign against Béla in order to restore King Salomon to the Hungarian throne. The king, because he wanted to delay the invasion, or to avoid it by diplomatic means, sent envoys to the German court, but Empress Agnes was (rather, her advisors were) unwilling to negotiate. Béla spent the early fall of 1063 at his hunting lodge at Dömös to prepare for the Germans attack, when his throne literally

collapsed under him — it depends how one reads the sentence in the *Chronicle* as the text also reads "when the roof of the building fell upon him." Was the event a coincidence or sabotage organized from abroad — an attempt upon the king's life? Historians do not know the answer to this question.

Béla never recovered from his wounds. From Dömös he was taken on a stretcher to fort Moson so that he could direct military operations against the approaching imperial forces, but his health did not hold out. He had to be carried semi-conscious to the Kanizsa [Kynisua] Creek, where he died, "et ibi migravit e seculo."

His sons fled to Poland to return with Polish troops by the end of the year. In early 1064, at Győr in western Hungary, the headmen of the realm negotiated a peace between Salomon's supporters and Béla's sons: Géza, László [Ladislav], and Levente. On Easter Sunday, Prince Géza crowned Salomon anew in the cathedral at Pécs. Thereafter, the court of Salomon and his wife Judith revived — one ought to say: implemented — the financial reforms of Béla by establishing a system of monetary exchange of new coins (only) every two years.

## Conclusions

King Béla had followed a very successful domestic and foreign policy based on common sense; unexpectedly, and, perhaps, too rapidly, did he achieve success with his military, administrative, fiscal and judicial policies. He had reached his triumphs far too soon for some of his — mostly non-Magyar — adversaries who wished nothing more than Béla's failure while his nephew, Salomon was still alive. Although collapsing buildings, or royal thrones, had buried ruling monarchs before, judged by the overly brief report by the *Hungarian Chronicle* on the reign of Béla I, the dying monarch had been aware that the Franconian [i.e. Holy Roman] court just would not refrain from using any Byzantine political method — including assassination — in removing him from the throne of the Árpáds.

The politics of both Andrew I and Béla I can only be characterized as cautious. Both monarchs passed resolutions, issued directives, undertook no action without the consent of the Council made up of the spiritual and temporal lords, as well as the well-spoken elders *representing* the people's interests. Their diplomacy relied upon marriages, form-

ing blood ties with various ruling families, in order to counterbalance any threat from the imperial Franconian court. Domestically, both had achieved great accomplishments. Because of the tragedies — accidental or premeditated — that cut their lives short, their dynastic policies remained unfinished, unsuccessful attempts.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Stephen I (the Saint, ruled 997-1038) is known to Hungarians as Szent István, Vazul is also known as Vászoly, Michael as Mihály, and Andrew as András or Endre.

Vazul's three sons fled first to Bohemia. Later, Levente and Andrew found refuge in the court of Jaroslav the Wise (ruled 1015-53) in Kiev, while Béla, at that of Casimir I (the Restorer, ruled 1038-58), the King of Poland.

For information on primary and secondary sources relevant to this paper see the bibliographical essay at the end of these notes.

<sup>2</sup> Henry III (b. 1017, d. 1056), duke of Bavaria and of Swabia, German king (1039-56) and Holy Roman Emperor (1046-56), was a member of the Salian or Franconian dynasty of Holy Roman Emperors. Henry was a highly educated and a very religious ruler who devoted much of his energies to serving the interests — as he saw them — of Christianity and the Germanic realm he ruled. He was the last of the emperors who was able to dominate the papacy.

For an overview of the international context of this age see my article "Német politikai fejlemények a magyar történet háttérében..." [German political developments in the background of Hungarian history...], *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis* 109 (1999): 3–11.

<sup>3</sup> The odd nature of the situation was depicted by the mid-XIVth century illuminator of the *Chronicon pictum*, which showed the Orseolo receiving the crown while *standing* from the hands of the Emperor who was *sitting* on the throne, as he, presumably, received *the* crown that had touched the forehead of King Stephen so that the Emperor could, upon performing this act, send the crown back to Rome. The return of the crown to the Roman See is witnessed by the testimony of the letter, dated October 28, 1074, of Pope Gregory VII, in the sense that, in that letter, the pontiff laid claim as a papal fief to the Magyar realm of King Salomon (1063–74, son of Andrew I).

One has to assume that the crown used at Peter's coronation (if there ever was a coronation) was the diadem [circlet] sent by Pope Sylvester II to Stephen, if one is to believe the assertion made by Pope Gregory VII in his writ to King Salomon. However, one should remember that the *Chronicon pictum*, c. 71, mentioned no coronation! "Postquam autem Petrus factus est rex" (after they had made him king), the statement does not necessarily imply coronation. In

order to be "crowned" king, one needed the presence of bishops, and the anointment by bishops (like, in the Old Testament, Samuel anointing Saul king of Israel, ca 1025 BC). The "P" initial on fol. 24a of the *Chronicle* manuscript, depicted King Peter dressed in a shirt of mail, holding a sword in his right hand, and in his left a [the] crown. The crown could have been any circlet, perhaps Peter's house-crown. On the other hand, in c. 77, the *Chronicle* recorded that the Emperor, Henry III, upon the defeat of Aba, restored Peter to kingship with the royal insignia of King Stephen; "Petrum regem regali corona plenarie restitutum, et sacris insignibus sancti regis Stephani more regio decoratum." The Emperor could do that to a vassal, as, indeed, in the following year, Peter submitted himself as *vassal*, and his realm as *benefice*, to the Emperor (*Chronicle*, c. 78; and, the drawing in the "S" initial on fol. 27b of the *Chronicle* manuscript, where Peter, *standing* in front of, handed a [the] golden lance to, the Emperor *sitting* on a [the] throne).

<sup>4</sup> In the meanwhile at the Pest shore ferry on the Danube the pagan insurgents murdered Gerard (known to Hungarians today as Szent Gellért), the bishop of Csanád and Szolnok, a royal reeve.

<sup>5</sup> During his exile in Kiev, Andrew came under Byzantine religious influence which would accompany him long after he returned to Hungary.

<sup>6</sup> During his exile in Poland, in a duel Béla had defeated a Prussian duke, an opponent of Casimir I, who had refused to pay feudal dues to the Polish court. As a reward for his deed, Béla was given the whole amount the Prussian duke owed to the King of Poland.

<sup>7</sup> The insurgent duke later fled to the court of Andrew, and, probably encouraged by Andrew and Béla, the duke's armed men harassed the Bavarian border lands from a base in Hungary.

<sup>8</sup> This is reported in the D and E manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

<sup>9</sup> Henry IV (b. 1050, d. 1106), duke of Bavaria (1055-61), German king (from 1054) and, later, Holy Roman Emperor. Henry IV was second member of the Salian or Franconian dynasty Holy Roman emperors. The most notable development of Henry's long reign was his conflict with Pope Gregory VII.

<sup>10</sup> According to historian János Horváth this chronicler was non other than Bishop Nicholas, the chancellor of King Andrew I, "qui tunc temporis vicem procurabat notarii," whose name appeared twice on the Tihany founding charter (he had witnessed and signed the document).

<sup>11</sup> I am aware that some historians argue that the segment of the *Chronicle* which describes King Béla's reforms could be a later addition to the text that summarized fiscal reforms in the realm in the second half of the eleventh century.

### A note on sources for the study of the age of Andrew I and Béla I

Related data in the mid-fourteenth century *Chronicon pictum* [Illuminated Chronicle], based on contemporary informative evidence of the 1040s through the 1060s, provide information on the reigns of Andrew I and Béla I, 1046 through 1063; for text, cf. "Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV," cc. 70 to 99, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, ed. Emericus Szentpétery, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1937-38; rev. ed. edited by Kornél Szovák and László Veszprémy, Budapest, 1999) [cited hereafter as *SSH*] I, 321ff.; for added comments, cf. *ibid.*, II, 750ff.; also, Dezső Dercsényi, ed., *Chronicon pictum: Képes Krónika*, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1963), vol. I: facsimile, f. 23v to fol. 35r. For an analysis of contemporary evidence, see János Horváth, *Árpád-kori latinnyelvű irodalmunk stílusproblémái* [Stylistic questions in the Latin-language literature of the Árpád age] (Budapest, 1954), 305ff.

The late-thirteenth century chronicler, Simon de Keza, provided some observations in his "Gesta Hungarorum," cc. 45 to 60; cf. *SSH*, I, 173ff.; annalistic entries in the "Annales Posenienses," as, for example, under a. 1041: "Petrus rex elicitur et Aba in regem elevatur;" or, anno 1044: "Aba rex interficitur et Petrus rex in pristinum restituitur;" anno 1047: "... et Andreas rex elevatur;" also, anno 1052: "Henricus imperator Pannoniam ingreditur;" and, anno 1057: "Andreas rex infirmatur et Salamonem filium suum coronavit;" further, under anno 1060: "inter Andream et fratrem suum Bela gravie discordia oritur et rex Andreas moritur," etc., provide brief but valuable historical data — see *SSH*, I, 125, while additional remarks were made in the "Chronicon Zagrabense," cc. 3 - 7, *ibid.*, I, 207ff. For a critical analytical summary of the material, see C. A. Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians* (Cambridge, 1953), 111ff., 133ff., 89ff., and 109f., respectively.

The Hungarian royal writs, documents — as, for example, the founding charter of Tihany abbey, 1055 — were carefully logged in Emericus Szentpétery *et al.*, eds., *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica*, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1923-87), cited hereafter as RA, n. 12; for text, cf. Henrik Marczali, ed., *Enchiridion fontium historiae Hungarorum* (Budapest, 1901), 81ff.; or, Emil Jakubovich and Dezső Pais, eds., *Ó-magyar Olvasókönyv* [Old Hungarian reader] (Pécs, 1929), 19ff.; also, *SSH*, I, 354, 17-19. For papal documents — as, for instance, the writ, dated Oct. 28, 1074, of Pope Gregory VII addressed to King Salomon, logged under ii:13 in the papal Register — see Erich Caspar, ed., *Das Register Gregors VII*, MGH Epp., sel. II, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1920-23), I, 145.

Among the non-Hungarian western Latin sources, one may refer to the *Annales Altahenses*, rev. ed., ed. E. ab Oefele, SSrG (Hannover, 1891), aa. 1041 through 1046, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1056, 1058, 1060, 1063, etc.; the *Annales Hildesheimenses*, ed. G. Waitz, SSrG (Hannover, 1878; reprint 1947), aa. 1041-

1046; Herriman Contractus, "Chronicon," aa. 1038–46, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, ed. G. H. Pertz, 30 vols. (Hannover, 1854etc.), cited hereafter as MGHSS, V, 126, 127. Under 1047, the entry records that Henry III would not enter Hungary because of the revolt in Flanders; under 1050; another entry mentions the attempt made by armed Magyar troops to prevent, or to delay, the re-fortification of Hainburg. In 1051, Gebhardt and Bohemian king Bretislav invaded Magyar land north of the Danube, while the Emperor entered Hungarian territory from Carinthia. In 1053, the Germans concluded peace with Andrew at Tribur; in 1060, Andrew, a sick man, sought safety for his family at Melk. Cf. MGHSS, V, 127.

*Lamperti Hersfeldensis Opera*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, with the Weissenburg Annals, SSrG (Hannover, 1894), records the same event under *anno 1061*, and makes mention of William of Thuringia and Bishop Eppo; William was engaged to the daughter of Béla, but died, and it was Udalrich of Carinthia who had married her. The remark by Cosmas of Prague, "Chronicon Boemorum," that Peter Orseolo — some ten years after he had been captured, blinded and was buried at the cathedral in Pécs (see "Chronicon pictum," c. 85, *SSH I*, 342f) had married the widow of the Czech Brestislav, cf. MGHSS, IX, 78, rests upon shaky ground — cf. J. Loserth, "Kritische Studien zur ältere Geschichte Böhmens," *Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 5 (1884), 366ff.; or, St. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungariae stirpis Arpadianae*, 7 vols. (Pest–Buda, 1779–81), I, 991–92.

On the diplomacy of Pope Leo IX, cf. *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana*, 60 vols. (Paris–Rome, 1864–76), April, II, 661; or, Wibert's "Vita s. Leonis IX papae," in J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–55), cited hereafter as MPL, 143, 496bc; also Hildebert, "Vita Hugonis," ii: 7, MPL, 159, 864cd; Andrew did not comply with the agreement — see Contractus, a. 1052, MGHSS, Vol. 131, 36–43. Johannes Haller, *Das Papsttum: Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 5 vols. (Esslingen am Neckar, 1962), II, 278ff., spoke of a *deutsches Papsttum*. On relations between Leo IX and Archbishop Gregory — see Ph. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885), n. 3222. Karl Hampe recognized that Andrew did not regard himself as vassal of the German court; "in Ungarn war die Lehenshoheit des Reiches nichts lange behauptet werden." Cf. his *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer*, 12<sup>th</sup> ed., ed. Friedrich Baethgen (Heidelberg, 1968), 33.

For the Polish source collection, see the *Monumenta Poloniae historica*, ed. A. Bielowski, 6 vols. (Lvov–Cracow, 1864–93; repr. Warsaw, 1960–61), cited hereafter as MPH, I, 495ff.; of the Russian-Kievan sources, see the *Russian Primary Chronicle*, ed. Samuel Hazzard–Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz–Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), 136ff.; Antal Hodinka, ed., *Az orosz évkönyvek magyar vonatkozásai* [Hungarian-related entries in the Russian annals] (Budapest, 1916), 52ABff., provide sparse information; also, Gy. Kristó and I. H. Tóth, "Az

orosz évkönyvek néhány magyar vonatkozásáról” [Some remarks on the Hungarian-related references in the Russian annals], *Acta historica Szegediensis*, 103 (1996): 21ff.

On the political background, see George Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven - London, 1948; 7<sup>th</sup> printing, 1973), 79ff.; Martha Font, *Oroszország, Ukrajna, Rusz* [Russia, the Ukraine, and the Rus] (Pécs, 1998), 41ff., and 70ff. Among the Byzantine sources, Anna Comnena made some pertinent remarks on the Hungarian scene in the 1040s — see her *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib, 3 vols. (Paris, 1937-45), I, 127-28, partly based on a remark made in Johannes Scylitzes Continuatus, *Historiarum compendium*, ed. I. Bekker, CB, vol. II (Bonn, 1839), 645, 17-22, and on Psellus, *Chronographia*, ed. E. Renauld, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926, 1928), II, 125. For background, cf. Georg Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Munich, 1952), 260ff.; Romilly Jenkins, *Byzantium: the imperial centuries AD 610-1071* (1966; repr. Toronto-London, 1987), 333ff.; J. M. Hussey, “The Byzantine Empire in the eleventh century: some different interpretations,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 32 (1950), 71ff.; A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, WI, 1952), 351ff.; Z. J. Kosztolnyik, “Similarities between King St. Stephen of Hungary’s Law Code and the Laws of Jaroslav the Wise of Kiev,” *Hungary’s historical legacies: Studies in honor of S. B. Várdy*, ed. D.P. Hupchick and R.W. Weisberger (New York, 2000), 45ff.; Robert Browning’s penetrating, and yet, almost forgotten study, *The Byzantine Empire* (New York, 1980), 92ff., is worth reading. It also carries a picture of the crown of Constantine IX, believed to have been a gift to the Hungarian court (p. 93). On German conditions in the late 1050s, cf. Bertholdi “Chronicon,” MGHSS, V, 271. Lampert of Hersfeld, *anno 1060*, mentioned the confrontation between Andrew and Béla.

On the return to England of *aetheling* Edward — whom King Cnut had banished to Hungary and who supposedly married Agatha, King Stephen’s daughter — see *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, rev. transl., ed. Dorothy Whitelock *et al* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1961), anno 1057, MS “D”; the *Florence MS* added a note to this story providing the reason for Edward’s return: “for the king — that is, Edward the Confessor — had determined to make him heir the kingdom after him” (see *ibid.*, 133, n. 6). Margaret, Edward Aetheling’s daughter — born to King Stephen’s daughter; or, if not (which is unlikely), to a Hungarian noble woman — married a widower, King Malcolm III of Scotland. Cf. her “Vita,” in *Acta sanctorum*, Iunii II, 328; and, W. Forbes--Leith, *Life of St. Margaret of Scotland by Turgot of St. Andrews*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Edinburgh, 1896), 19ff.

On King Béla I’s calling upon two *well spoken* elders of every community, see the *Chronicle*, c. 93, *SSH*, I, 393,1-2; on *representation* in the Spanish *cortez*, see H. Mitteis, *Der Staat des hohen Mittelalters*, 8<sup>th</sup> rev. ed. (Weimar, 1968), 416f.; for the text of the “Assize of Clarendon” (1166), issued by Henry II of England, see William Stubbs, ed., *Select charters of English constitutional*

history, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (Oxford, 1900), 143ff. Béla I had died because of the collapsing throne (or, building), the chronicler recorded; a similar accident befell the east-Frankish king Arnulf in 897 — cf. Ernst Dümmler, *Geschichte des oströmischen Reiches*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1887-88), III, 437. See further Gerold Meyer v. Knonau, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV und Heinrich V*, 2 vols. (1890; rep. Berlin, 1964), I, 189; for his views on the battle at Ménfő, “Pforte des Reiches,” see *ibid.*, I, 198ff.; and, for Knonau’s comments on the death of Béla, *ibid.*, I, 344ff.

German background in Karl Hampe, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer*, 12<sup>th</sup> rev. ed., ed. Friedrich Baethgen (Hiedelberg, 1968), 33: “in Ungarn war die Lehenshoheit des Reiches nicht lange behauptet worden;” also, Bruno Gebhardt, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte*, 8<sup>th</sup> rev. ed., 4 vols. (Stuttgart, 1954; 6<sup>th</sup> rev. repr. 1962), I, 224ff., and 235ff., who provides a solid survey; so does Elizabeth M. Hallam, *Capetian France, 987–1328* (London and New York, 1980), 71ff., on Frankish politics and diplomacy. See further, Robert Fawtier’s analytical narrative, *The Capetian kings of France* (New York, 1966), 15ff.

The Hungarian background has been covered in depth — and based on original research! — by Bálint Hóman, *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1940–43), I, 254ff.; György Székely and Antal Bartha, eds., *Magyarország története: előzmények és magyar történet 1242-ig* [Early history, and Hungarian history to 1242] (Budapest, 1984), 835ff., did a clever job; Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Five eleventh century Hungarian kings: their policies and their relations with Rome* (New York, 1981), 72ff., and 175ff.

On medieval central European, and Hungarian, financial conditions, see Peter Spufford’s excellent work, *Money and its use in medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1988), 80f., and 95. Ferenc Makk, “Megjegyzések I. András történetéhez” [Some remarks on the reign of Andrew I], *Acta Historica Szegediensis*, 90 (1990): 23ff.; Zoltán Kordé, “A magyarországi besenyők az Árpád-korban” [The Pechenegs in Hungary during the Árpád age], *ibid.*, 90 (1999), 3ff. Gyula Kristó, *Megjegyzések az ún. “pogánylázadások” kora történetéhez* [Background of the age of the so-called “pagan” uprisings in Hungary] (Szeged, 1965), 36ff., and 49ff.