

A. V. Maiorov

RUS', BYZANTIUM AND WESTERN EUROPE IN THE LATE TWELFTH — EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURIES*

The paper discusses the little known facts of the history of political relations between Old Rus', the Byzantine Empire and Western Europe in the time between 1163 and 1253. It analyzes the evidence that the Russian and foreign sources provide concerning the long stay of the Russian prince Mstislav Yurevich in the Holy Land as the governor for the Byzantine emperor Manuel I in Ascalon, the military-political and dynastic union between the Galician-Volhynian prince Roman Mstislavich and the Byzantine emperor Alexios III, Daniel of Galicia's foreign policy, and, in particular, his relationship with the German emperor Frederick II, the Austrian duke Frederick the Quarrelsome. The paper reveals the influence that the Nicaean Empire had on the relations between the Russian princes and the Apostolic See. Refs 62.

Keywords: Old Rus', Holy Land, Byzantine Empire, Nicaean Empire, Austrian duchy, Apostolic See.

A. B. Майоров

РУСЬ, ВИЗАНТИЯ И ЗАПАДНАЯ ЕВРОПА В КОНЦЕ XII — НАЧАЛЕ XIII ВЕКА

В статье рассматриваются малоизвестные факты истории политических отношений Древней Руси, Византии и Западной Европы в период между 1163 и 1253 гг. Анализируются свидетельства русских и иностранных источников о длительном пребывании русского князя Мстислава Юрьевича в Святой земле в качестве наместника византийского императора Мануила I в Аскалоне, о военно-политическом и династическом союзе галицко-волынского князя Романа Мстиславича и византийского императора Алексея III, о внешней политике Даниила Галицкого и, в частности, его отношениях с германским императором Фридрихом II, австрийским герцогом Фридрихом Воинственным, раскрывается влияние Никейской империи во взаимоотношениях русских князей с Апостольским Престолом. Автор приходит к выводу, что отказ нового никейского императора Феодора II Ласкаря от уступок папе и взявшего курс на возвращение Константинополя с помощью военной силы незамедлительно привел к разрыву отношений с Римом галицко-волынских князей. Библиогр. 62 назв.

Ключевые слова: Древняя Русь, Святая Земля, Византия, Никейская империя, Австрийское герцогство, Апостольский престол.

The Ipatiev Chronicle of the year 1163 reported that the prince of Vladimir-Suzdal Andrey Bogolyubsky exiled his Greek stepmother, the second wife of Yuri Dolgoruky, and probably the relative of Manuel I Komnenos, to the Byzantine Empire. Her three sons were exiled with her. The emperor granted lands to two of them: Prince Mstislav Yurievich received control over the Palestinian city of Ascalon ('О(т)скалана') [Ipat'evskaia letopis', col. 521].

Since at the time in question the Byzantine emperor was not the ruler of Palestine, the news given in the Russian chronicle has raised doubt among researchers. In the late twelfth

Maiorov Alexander Vyacheslavovich — Doctor of History, Professor, St. Petersburg State University, Institute of History, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; a.majorov@spbu.ru

Майоров Александр Вячеславович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Институт истории, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; a.majorov@spbu.ru

* The work was financially supported by St. Petersburg State University, Project number 5.38.265.2015.
© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2016

century, Ascalon was under the reign of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which in 1153 was conquered by King Baldwin III. In order to hold Ascalon and to continue the conquest, Baldwin III and his successor Amalric I repeatedly asked for military assistance in the West, but did not obtain a proper support. Then the rulers of Jerusalem put a stake on the union with the Byzantine Empire. Hoping to receive the empire's help, in 1158 Baldwin III secured his marriage with Theodora Komnenos, Manuel I's niece. Baldwin acknowledged his political dependence on Manuel and entered into *foedus iniquum* relationship with him in consideration of the Byzantine support [Magdalino 2002, pp. 73–74].

The main goal of the foreign policy of the King of Jerusalem, Amalric I, was to conquer Egypt. Between 1163 and 1169, Amalric made at least five campaigns to Egypt, exhausting his forces. Still he could not attain conclusive victory. Muslims' threat to Christian settlers in the Holy Land grew stronger. [Mayer 1978, pp. 175–192; Tyerman 2006, pp. 347–350]. Having given up hopes for assistance from the West, Amalric, like his predecessor, had to turn to the Byzantine Empire for help. In 1167 he married Maria Komnenos, the grand-niece of Manuel I, and, like Baldwin, had to declare himself a junior partner of the basileus in international affairs [Magdalino 2002, pp. 74–75].

It is very likely that Ascalon with its adjacent territories was the part of the Palestinian lands that the crusaders had conquered. The Byzantine emperor required to cede it to him in return for his military assistance. This is indicated by several factors, primarily by the terms of the agreement with Amalric concerning the division of Egypt. According to William of Tyre and John Kinnamos, Manuel was to obtain the coastland of the Mediterranean, while the king of Jerusalem would receive the country's inner regions. Ascalon became the base of the Byzantine navy and army sent by the emperor to conquer Egypt. In the fall of 1169 two hundred ships of war arrived there from the Byzantine Empire to begin the attack [Willem Tyrensis, pp. 891–892, 899–905; Ioannes Cinnamos, p. 279–280; Nicetas Choniates, pp. 159–168].

Negotiations between the Byzantine emperor and the king of Jerusalem concerning the conclusion of the dynastic marriage and the military alliance aimed at the conquest of Egypt began in 1165, when King Amalric's first embassy arrived in Constantinople. Possibly at that time or soon afterwards it was conceived to transfer the part of the crusaders' Palestinian possessions that the basileus laid claims to, namely the area of Ascalon ('волости О(т)скалана'), to the Russian prince Mstislav Yurievich who had taken service with the emperor and was related to the Komnenoi [see; Maiorov 2016a, pp. 124–142].

Mstislav Yurevich apparently stayed in the east for more than a decade. Most likely, Mstislav returned to Rus' on the eve of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, i. e., in about 1187. Together with the prince, his wife's brother Olisei Grechin returned to Rus'. He had spent his younger years in the Holy Land and learnt there the skill of a painter. Soon Grechin turned up in his home town Novgorod and quickly became famous as an outstanding icon painter there. His name is often mentioned in the Novgorod birch bark writings of the late 12th — early 13th centuries. In 1193 he probably aspired to the position of the Archbishop of Novgorod [Gippius 2004, pp. 164–182]. Many contemporary scholars consider Olisei Grechin to have been one of the main artists who executed the fresco paintings in the Church of the Savior on the Nereditza, near Novgorod [Ianin 1988, ss. 178–183; Etinhof 2005. pp. 115–143].

Relations with the Byzantine Empire played a very important role in the foreign policy of the Galician-Volhynian prince Roman Mstislavich. As reported in Jan Długosz's

History and in the *Gustynya Chronicle*, the Byzantine Emperor deposed by the crusaders, Alexios III Angelos, stayed for a while in Galicia after his escape from the besieged Constantinople in July 1203, where he met Prince Roman.

According to Długosz (the late 15th century), 'Ascarus, the emperor of Constantinople, after the city was seized (by crusaders — *A. M.*), moved to Tersona near the Pontic Sea, from where he proceeded to Galatia or the Galician Land, which is a part of Rus' still under the Polish Kingdom, and having been kindly and favorably received and accommodated by the prince of Rus', Roman, he stayed there for a while' [Ioannis Dlugos 1973, p. 177]. In the *Gustynya Chronicle* (early 17th century) we read, 'They (crusaders — *A. M.*) came to Tsarigrad by sea and were unprepared to capture Alexios Angelos, the Greek Tsar. Nevertheless, Alexios was afraid of them. Besides, there was nobody among the Greeks who was benevolent to him. Therefore he left the tsardom to Isaac, his blinded brother, and with his boyars and plenty of riches and treasures fled to Rus', to Roman Mstislavich in Halych' [Hustynskaia letopis', p. 108].

Some researchers have questioned the above reports and rejected the possibility that Emperor Alexios stayed in Rus' [Grala 1986, pp. 639–661]. However, the evidence of the Italian chronicler of the late 13th — early 14th century Bartolomeo del Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca) also confirms this fact. 'In the occupied city (Constantinople — *A. M.*) by the general consent of the Franks rather than the Venetians, the count of Flanders [Baldwin] became emperor, as narrated by Martin and Vincent, which occurred by the consent of the said pontiff (Pope Innocent III — *A. M.*) The said empire (the Byzantine Empire — *A. M.*) was owned by the Latins continuously up to the times of Alexander (Pope Alexander IV — *A. M.*), i.e. for 57 years, as it is said there. At the time of its fall, according to Cusentinus, Ascarus ruled, who immediately headed across the Black Sea for Chersonesus and from there for Galatia, which is now a part of Rus'' [Tholomeus Lucensis 2009, pp. 509–510].

According to B. Schmeidler, Fiadoni uses the name Cusentinus to denote a certain chronicler from Cosenza, Calabria. This name may refer to several persons who lived there at the time. Cusentinus' chronicle, to which Fiadoni often referred, should be understood as the continuation of the *Annals of Archbishop Romuald from Salerno* (d. in 1181), which was drawn up at the archbishop's *cathedra* in Cosenza and covers the period from 1177 to 1264. The final form to this work was given by Tommaso of Leontine, Archbishop of Cosenza in 1267–1272, who, as well as Fiadoni, belonged to the Dominican Order [Schmeidler 1906–1907, ss. 252–261].

Thus, Fiadoni found the report about the flight of Askarus from Constantinople to Galicia in an earlier written source. Besides, Fiadoni, who was born in approximately 1227, could speak directly to the eye-witnesses of the described events. Librarian to Pope John XXII, he showed considerable awareness in the matters of the Curia's foreign policy and paid particular attention to the details of the Fourth Crusade, especially to the circumstances of the conquest of Constantinople. In addition, Fiadoni for many years was the bishop of Torcello (the city and the island in the Venetian lagoon), the residents of which, together with the Venetians, took an active part in the Fourth Crusade. Clearly, Fiadoni, as the bishop of Torcello, could learn from his parishioners more information about the particulars of the conquest of Constantinople.

There is no reason to believe that Bartolomeo del Fiadoni, and other medieval authors following him, would confuse Galician-Volhynian Rus with Galatia — the historical region located in Asia Minor, or to mistake Thracian Chersonese for Tauric Chersonese.

The now known story of how Alexios III stayed in exile, visited Bulgaria and negotiated with Tsar Kaloyan also indicates the possibility of ex-emperor's contacts with the Galician-Volhynian prince. This is also supported by the information about the military-political alliance between Roman and Alexios, as well as the traditionally active role of Halych in supporting the contenders for the Byzantine and Bulgarian thrones [see: Maiorov 2016b, pp. 364–388].

It was Roman Mstislavich who became the principal military ally of the Byzantine Empire in the early 13th century. The Eastern Roman Empire was experiencing a severe political crisis at that time caused by the rebellion of the Serbs and Bulgarians and aggravated by the devastating raids of the Cumans (Polovtsy). According to Niketas Choniates, only the military aid of the Galician prince Roman could help to stop the nomads' aggression. 'It was Roman, the Prince of Halych, who quickly assembled a brave and numerous armed force, attacking the Cumans and, having passed through their land without stopping, plundering and devastating it. After repeating such attacks several times to the glory and the magnificence of the holy Christian faith, the smallest part of which like, for example, a mustard seed, can shift mountains and move rocks, he stopped the raids of the Cumans and put an end to those terrible miseries that the Romans suffered from them. In this way he rendered to the people of the same faith an unexpected assistance, an unforeseen defense and, so to say, protection sent down by God' [Niketas Choniates, pp. 522–523].

The circumstances and the time of Roman's campaign against the Cumans in Choniates' story coincide with the reports in the Russian chronicles about the campaigns in the Steppe of the Galician-Volhynian prince [Lavrent'evskaia letopis', col. 417–420; Novgorodskaja Pervaia letopis', pp. 45, 240].

In addition to Niketas Choniates, other Byzantine sources report the outstanding role of Roman Mstislavich in the fight against the enemies of the Empire. Those sources are essentially unknown to modern historians of Russia. They include the story in *The Chronicle* of Theodore Skoutariotes [Anonymou Synopsis Chronike 1972, p. 428] and the poetic testimony of Ephraem the Enian [Ephraem Aenius 1990, p. 234]. Both authors on the whole echo Niketas Choniates' reports, but supplement them with some new details.

All the Byzantine sources called Roman the 'hegemon of Galicia' (*Γαλιτζης ἡγεμών*). The term *hegemon*, unlike other Byzantine definitions of Russian princes, meant the emperor's military ally and relative (or the brother). Roman's union with Alexios III showed also in the stabilization of relations with the Russian population of the lower reaches of the Dniester and the Danube (the 'branch of Tauro-Scythians' from 'Vordona', as the Byzantine sources call it) [see: Maiorov 2015a, pp. 272–303].

Old Rus' chronicles have preserved the record of at least two big campaigns of the Russian princes against the Cumans led by Roman Mstislavich. The first one was to take place in early 1201. The second campaign's chronology is difficult to establish because of the condition of the chronicle's records. During editing the initial composition of the chronicle, the entry containing the information about the second campaign in the steppe had undergone a significant rearrangement [Lavrent'evskaia letopis', col. 418, 421; Novgorodskaja Pervaia letopis', pp. 45, 240. See also: Berezhevskii 1963, p. 315, n. 84]. The chronology and the sequence of the events set forth therein can be established thanks to the mention of the Leonides on 18 October 1202, which preceded the campaign [Radzivilovskaia letopis', p. 161; Letopisets Pereiaslavlia Suzdal'skogo, p. 125. See also: Sviatsky, 2007, pp. 237, 263, 279]. The campaign can be dated to the early spring of 1203.

The belittling of the role of the Galician-Volhynian prince Roman Mstislavich in the political life of South Rus' and in the organization of the joint campaigns of the Russian princes against the Cumans, characteristic for the chronicles of North-Eastern Rus', can be primarily explained by the political views of the chronicler Simon, who at the beginning of the 13th century came from Kiev to Vladimir-Suzdal, where he later became a bishop [Nasonov 1969, pp. 199–201]. Simon had close ties with the family of the Kievan prince Rurik Rostislavich, the main enemy of Roman in the struggle for Kiev. When Simon arrived in Vladimir, he began to serve the interests of Grand Prince Vsevolod the Big Nest, who also saw Roman as a dangerous rival in the struggle for the influence in South Rus'.

Prince Vsevolod did not share Roman's foreign policy orientation to the support of the Byzantine authorities in the fight against the rebellious Bulgarians and their allies — the Danube Cumans. The prince of Vladimir-Suzdal had direct contacts with the leaders of the Bulgarian revolt and deliberately evaded military support of Byzantine Empire [Etinhof 2005b, p. 198].

The key to military aid that Roman provided to Alexios III was the Galician-Volhynian prince's marriage with a certain Byzantine princess. That marriage has given rise to a considerable literature, which has suggested a great number of different hypotheses [see: Dąbrowski 2002, p. 34–40]. Most authors tend to conclude that "Roman's Grand Princess" was of a high Byzantine origin; however, her identification causes considerable difficulties. There are no sufficient grounds to believe that Roman's second wife was the representative of the Kamateros kin. It is also incorrect to suggest that she was the daughter of Emperor Isaac II from his marriage to Margaret of Hungary [see: Maiorov 2014a, pp. 188–233].

The starting point for our search was Niketas Choniates' information about Isaac II's eldest daughter who was born before his accession to the throne and by the order of the father sent to the monastery as a child [Niketas Choniates, p. 419]. In the practice of the Byzantine Empire, taking the vows by the members of the royal family or aristocracy did not necessarily have to be for life. On the contrary, there are many examples when monastic vows were completely canceled due to a change in political circumstances. Very often that happened with noble Byzantine women, including empresses [see: Herrin 2006, pp. 3–11].

After the *coup d'état* of 1195, when Alexios III overtook the imperial power from his deposed brother Isaac II, the conditions were favorable for the abolition of monastic vows for the ex-emperor's eldest daughter. The new ruler decided to marry her to the Galician-Volhynian prince Roman, whose military aid was urgently needed for the Balkan provinces of the empire, exhausted by the Cuman raids.

Near the Polish town of Chelm (Old Russian Kholm), an ancient five-tier (storey) stone tower has survived to this day with the remains of a chapel in the top tier. The tower stands on the place where the Old Russian town of Stolpie once existed. According to the latest research, the Stolpie tower replicates architectural structures that were wide-spread in Northern Greece in the later Byzantine times. These were religious buildings belonging to the local monasteries and representatives of the secular elite. According to written sources, the Stolpie tower was most likely built between the 1220 and the 1240s and was intended for "Roman's Grand Princess", who again took monastic vows [see: Zespól wieżowy 2009].

Emperor Isaac II had another daughter, named Irene, who later married the German king Philip of Swabia. The commemoration book of the Speyer Cathedral, where

the royal couple of Philip and Irene was buried, listed among Irene's Greek relatives her sister named Euphrosyne (Effrosina) [Kalendarium necrologicum, p. 323]. That German queen's sister could only be Isaac's eldest daughter, sent to the nunnery as a child by her father. However, contrary to expectations, the church book commemorated Euphrosyne as a secular person without her religious status. The book provides conventional commemoration dates of the German queen's Greek relatives in connection with major religious feasts. This shows that the Speyer canons did not have any precise information about the death dates of the named persons when compiling the list.

However, the precise data concerning the death of the German king Philip of Swabia in the summer of 1208, shortly after which his wife Irina died, were well known in Halych. The Galician-Volhynian chronicle is the only one among all Old Rus' sources to provide a detailed description of the circumstances of Philip's murder and to name the people involved in this crime [Ipat'evskaia letopis', col. 723]. Only the bereaved relatives could be interested in those details of the events that were so distant from Rus'. And those relatives were Princess Euphrosyne and her children.

The name *Евфросиния* (Euphrosyne) is repeated in several generations of Roman Mstislavich and his second wife's descendants. This name, part of the Russian princes' name list in the 11th-12th centuries, is undoubtedly related to the cult of St Euphrosyne of Alexandria. The cult of the saint was venerated also in the Byzantine Empire, where the name Euphrosyne became the part of the Byzantine empresses' name list [see: Maiorov 2014a, pp. 188–233].

The deeds of the Galician princess Euphrosyne were reflected in the artifacts of Old Rus' sfragistics. Several seals from Old Novgorod depict the image of St Euphrosyne with the scene of the Transfiguration on Mount Tabor on the reverse. There are no sufficient grounds to identify the owner of these seals as Euphrosyne of Polotsk, the hegumeness of the Holy Savior Convent. She cannot be associated with any special reverence for the Transfiguration feast. Contrary to the prevailing opinion, she had nothing to do with the foundation of the Transfiguration church or monastery in Polotsk. The Holy Savior Convent with the church, founded during her lifetime, were dedicated to the old feast of the Most Merciful Savior, the iconography of which is in no way connected with the Transfiguration [see: Maiorov 2011a, pp. 5–25].

The above was confirmed by a finding made in May 2015 during the excavation on the territory of the Holy Savior Convent of St Euphrosyne in Polotsk. It was the seal with the half-length depiction of Christ Pantocrator and the inscription on the back «+ ГИ ПОМОЗИ РАБѢ СВОЕИ ОФРОСИНИ» (God, help your servant Euphrosyne). The identical seal was found in the same place in 1998, but the inscription on it was hardly legible. Both seals can be reasonably attributed to the princess-nun Euphrosyne [see: Duk, Kalechyts, Kots 2015, pp. 13–18].

Historians possess no evidence to prove that the hegumeness of Polotsk had personal relationship with any of the Novgorod princes. On the other hand, the Galician princess Euphrosyne had close ties with Novgorod. She undoubtedly corresponded with the Novgorod prince Mstislav the Bold, whose daughter Anna became the wife of Daniel — the eldest son of the dowager Galician princess [Ipat'evskaia letopis', col. 732]. According to D. Dąbrowski, the marriage was concluded in 1217 [Dąbrowski 2002, pp. 67–71]. Influenced by the information received from South-Western Rus', Mstislav abdicated the Novgorod throne, interfered decisively into the struggle for Halych with the Hungarian

king's son Koloman, and soon became the Galician prince [see: Maiorov 2001, pp. 437–479].

Moreover, there is good reason to associate Euphrosyne of Galicia with the spread of the Transfiguration cult in the Galician-Volhynian Rus'. Many Transfiguration monasteries and churches there date to the 13th century. Various sources have preserved information about them [Rozhko 1999, pp. 42–49]. Numerous Transfiguration icons have survived from the late 13th to 15th centuries. They come from the western Ukrainian areas and used to be patronal icons in churches [Dimitrii 2005, pp. 42, 46–48, 213, 397–398].

Another name by which the Galician princess Euphrosyne is better known in historical literature was the name Anna. Apparently it became her monastic name. The connection of the 'Roman's Grand Princess' with the cult of St Righteous Anna, the Virgin's mother, is evidenced by the construction of the chapel in honor of the Holy Godparents Joachim and Anna over her tomb, as reported by the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle [Ipat'evskaia letopis', col. 937–938]. The unique Galician icon *The Cathedral of Joachim and Anna* has also survived. Created at the turn of the 14th-15th centuries, it is a copy of an older patronal icon [see: Maiorov 2010a, pp. 70–75].

Several famous Christian relics of Galician-Volhynian Rus' are associated with Roman Mstislavich's second wife. Along with liturgical, they also had a great political significance as the insignia of supreme power. The most important is a precious reliquary cross with a piece of the wood of the True Cross, which is now kept in the Notre-Dame Cathedral [Durand 1992, pp. 139–146]. Manuel Komnenos the Crown-Bearer mentioned in the Greek inscription on the reliquary should be identified as the Byzantine emperor Manuel I [Dąbrowska 1991, pp. 67–89].

Such a noteworthy relic could have come to Rus' only as a dowry of the Byzantine princess Euphrosyne, who became Roman Mstislavich's new wife. According to Niketas Choniates, when Isaac II sent his elder daughter to the convent, he did what once 'Empress Xene intended to do after the death of her husband, Emperor Manuel Komnenos' [Niketas Choniates, p. 419]. In other words, princess Euphrosyne in her early childhood was elected as a 'sacrifice to God', which was made by her father in memory of another great Byzantine ruler, Emperor Manuel I.

After Polish troops captured Lviv in 1340, King Casimir III received the relic as part of the loot. Together with other valuables of the Galician-Volhynian treasury, the cross was brought to Kraków. *Rocznik Traski*, a Lesser Polish chronicle compiled in the mid-14th century, reported, "There (in Lviv — A. M.) numerous spoils of war [were taken consisting of] of silver, gold, precious stones, great treasures of ancient monarchs, including a number of golden crosses, especially the one in which a big piece of the wood of the Holy Cross was found [...]" [Rocznik Traski, p. In 1669, the Polish king John Casimir abdicated the throne and went to France, stealing some of the most valuable relics of the Polish treasury, including Emperor Manuel's cross [Raffin 1935, pp. 286–287].

The creation of the Galician-Volhynian Aprakos Gospel of the early 13th century should be also associated with Euphrosyne of Galicia. That Gospel is now kept in the State Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow. Today the highly artistic illustrations and ornaments decorating the manuscript are considered to be the most significant examples of Old Rus' miniatures.

The general stylistic analysis of the manuscript artistic decoration reveals its resemblance to the works of Byzantine art of the later Komnenos time, as well as to the book

miniatures of the later Romanesque period that came from Southern Germany and, in particular, Swabia [see: Popova 1972, pp. 283–315]. The menologion of the Galician-Volhynian Gospel contains the dates of religious feasts and the memory days of the saints, whom Euphrosyne of Galicia personally worshiped [see: Maiorov 2010b, pp. 160–166].

To the influence of Grand Princess Euphrosyne should be attributed the appearance among the Galician-Volhynian princes of baptismal names that were unusual or even unique for the Ruriks. This is primarily the name of Prince Daniel, which was subsequently repeated in the name list of the Moscow princes. The use of this name in the princely family is explained by the spread of the cult of St Daniel the Stylite and the rise of interest in the outward features of stylitism, which is evident in sphragistics and in numerous architectural monuments of Galician-Volhynian Rus' of the 13th and early 14th century. Due to the family ties of the Galician-Volhynian princes with the princes of Vladimir-Suzdal, this cult spread in North-Eastern Rus', and later in Moscow [see: Maiorov 2011b, pp. 32–50].

The origin of Euphrosyne of Galicia, who was the daughter of *Vasileos* Isaac II, explains a surprising for Rus' rise of interest in stylitism among the princes of Rus' and their milieu. According to Niketas Choniates, Emperor Isaac II especially patronized and sympathized with the stylites and the ascetics, thus astonishing his contemporaries, since the stylites had lost the influence over the emperors that they once exerted in the times of iconoclasm, and their movement had been gradually declining.

The Byzantine hagiography concerning Sts Daniel the Stylite and Leo the Great Tsar explains the connection between the names of Daniel and Leo among the descendants of Roman Mstislavich. Daniel the Stylite was the spiritual father and the main adviser of Emperor Leo I. Apparently this connection was reflected in the names of the father and the son — the Galician-Volhynian princes — Daniel Romanovich and Lev (Leo) Danilovich [see: Maiorov 2015b, pp. 345–366].

The appearance of the name of Irakli Danilovich is related to the cult of the True Holy Cross. Although the Byzantine emperor Heraclius I, who returned the main relic of all Christians — the Cross of Calvary — from Persian captivity was never canonized by the Church, his memory was widely venerated in both the Christian East and West. Heraclius became especially popular in the countries of Europe during the Age of Crusades, when his name became the symbol of the liberation and the defense of the Holy Land. This was reflected in the medieval literature and art, as well as in the name list of the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem.

Perhaps in the name of Irakli Danilovich, the influence of his father's personal relationship with the Hungarian king Andrew II can be traced. Andrew II patronized Daniel Romanovich from an early age and at one time even considered making him heir. The Hungarian king is known to have been one of the leaders of the Fifth Crusade. He participated personally in the war in Palestine, claimed the throne of the Latin Empire, and all his life remained a true knight of Christ like the celebrated Byzantine emperor Heraclius [see: Maiorov 2011c, pp. 110–121].

In the chronicle's description of the outward appearance of the Galician-Volhynian princes, in particular that of Daniel of Galicia, we cannot notice the characteristic attributes of the imperial dignity that no other Russian princes had. Prince Daniel wore the ceremonial attire made of the "*Greek oloviron*", which was unprecedented [see: Maiorov 2014b, pp. 225–235]. This was a special Byzantine term for the "genuine" or "royal" purple. According to the laws of the empire, only emperors and their next of kin had the right to

wear clothes made of precious fabrics like *oloviron*. Such fabrics, which were considered to be the main attribute of royal blood, could not be freely sold or exported to other countries. Daniel could have obtained the ceremonial dress made of Greek *oloviron* only thanks to his mother, the Byzantine princess Euphrosyne [see: Maiorov 2014c, pp. 147–161].

The outward signs of the royal dignity match the royal title of the Galician-Volhynian princes. Numerous written sources use the titles *царь* (tsar) and *самодержец* (autocrat), as well as the epithets derived from them, with respect to the princes of Galician-Volhynian Rus' throughout the 13th century. The interest in the royal title on the part of the rulers of other Russian lands, on the contrary, had become a thing of the past. The Russian sources of the 13th and early 14th centuries use the royal title mainly referring to the Great Mongol Khans and the Khans of the Golden Horde [see: Maiorov 2009, pp. 250–262].

Starting with Roman Mstislavich, the Galician-Volhynian princes constantly thought about the sacralisation of their power. To that end they collected the most honored Christian relics. Similarly, the Byzantine emperors for centuries had been gathering in Constantinople almost all the known relics of the Christian East. After the Crusaders plundered the Byzantine capital in 1204, many European monarchs had the idea of the “transfer of rule” (*translatio imperii*) through the acquisition and transfer of Constantinople relics into their capitals. Subsequently, Moscow grand princes and tsars continued this practice over the centuries [see: Maiorov 2011d, pp. 17–24]. Maiorov 2011d, pp. 17–24].

Old Rus' literature and art reflected the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders, in particular, in *The Tale on the Taking of Tsargrad by Fryagi*.

The most likely author of this work, the oldest version of which has survived as part of the Older Version of the First Novgorod Chronicle, is the Novgorod Boyar Dobrynya Yadreykovich (later Archbishop Anthony).

A close associate of the Galician-Volhynian prince Roman Mstislavich, Dobrynya spent several years in Constantinople on his behalf and witnessed the devastation of the Byzantine capital by the Latins in April 1204.

The close relationship with the Galician-Volhynian prince explains why Dobrynya paid attention to the prince's brother-in-law — the German king Philip of Swabia — and his role in the organization of the Fourth Crusade. The author of *The Tale on the Taking of Tsargrad by Fryagi* expressed the “Ibellin” point of view, i.e. he attempted to take off the German king the responsibility for the devastation of Constantinople. He was familiar with the details of the escape of Prince Alexios (the future emperor Alexios IV) from the Byzantine capital to King Philip and used characteristic German vocabulary (place names and personal names). All that suggests that the Russian scribe used the information received from a well-informed German source. Dobrynya's informer could be one of King Philip's supporters, Bishop of Halberstadt Konrad von Krosigk, who participated in the siege of Constantinople in 1203–1204 [see: Maiorov, Metelkin 2016, pp. 292–308].

The Byzantine heritage of Roman Mstislavich and “Grand Princess” Euphrosyne-Anna was evident in the foreign policy of their sons and grandsons, first of all in the struggle of Daniel of Galicia for Austria and his son Roman Danilovich's attempt to seize the throne of the Austrian dukes in 1252–1253. The Galician-Volhynian princes were among the main claimants to the “Austrian succession” due to their relation with the Babenberg dynasty from the female side: Euphrosyne of Galicia was a cousin of the Austrian duchess Theodora, while the childless duke Frederick II the Quarrelsome was Daniel's second cousin [see: Maiorov 2011e, pp. 32–52].

The Austrian knot was tied in the Galician-Volhynian princes' foreign policy apparently in the late 1230s, when the German emperor Frederick II removed Duke Frederick the Quarrelsome from power. Daniel of Galicia initially intended to take the side of his Austrian relative. However, after meeting Emperor Frederick II in the spring of 1237 in Vienna, he went over to his side. In return the Galician-Volhynian prince received from the emperor a monetary reward in the amount of five hundred silver marks and the title of the "king of Rus" (rex Rusciae) [see: Maiorov 2010c, pp. 140–148; Maiorov 2015c, pp. 53–61].

The alliance with the Hungarian king Béla IV in 1246 brought Daniel of Galicia to the side of Frederick Babenberg's enemies. There are all grounds to believe that Daniel could have taken part in the battle at the Leitha River on the side of the Hungarian king. That battle resulted in the death of Duke Frederick. Moreover, the Galician-Volhynian prince could have had his hand in the death of the duke, who fell in a fight with a certain "king of Rus". The breakup between the Romanovichi and Frederick Babenberg was obviously contributed to by a bitter conflict of the latter with his own mother Theodora Angelina, who sought protection with her relatives abroad [see: Maiorov 2012a, pp. 54–77].

The struggle for the 'Austrian succession' is directly connected with the history of the coronation of Daniel of Galicia. Before the crown was received from the ambassadors of Pope Innocent IV, the campaign of Russian-Polish troops in Moravia took place in the summer of 1253, described in detail in the Galician-Volhynian chronicle. Daniel and his allies' attempt to provide military support to his son Roman in the castle Grimberg near Vienna besieged by the troops of Přemysl Ottokar (who also claimed the Austrian throne) failed. The reason for this was the position of Innocent IV, who did not want a Russian prince to appear on the Babenberg throne and contrary to his initial promises gave preference to other candidates [see: Maiorov 2012b, pp. 49–54].

The position of the Pope in the Austrian question led to Daniel's reluctance to take the royal crown that had been sent to him and to his demonstrative refusal to meet the papal legate in Kraków. Only six months later, after much hesitation, Daniel agreed to be crowned, yielding to the persuasion of his Polish allies (December 1253) [see: Maiorov 2011f, pp. 143–156].

Daniel's rapprochement with the Apostolic See began in 1246–1248, as a result of the Pope's promises to support the Romanovichi's claims to Austria expressed in his personal letters and via the Archbishop of Salzburg Philipp von Spanheim during the talks in Pressburg (summer 1249). This rapprochement continued in 1252–1253 with the mediation of the Hungarian king Béla IV, who also had his eyes on the 'Austrian succession' [see: Maiorov 2012c, pp. 33–52].

At the same time, the Byzantine factor continued to play a significant role in the Romanovichi's foreign policy. Daniel's coronation and the talks concerning the church union with Rome took place against the background of broader political processes initiated by Pope Innocent IV and the Nicaean emperor John III Vatatzes. In exchange for the return of Constantinople to the Greeks, Nicaea's authorities agreed to recognize the supremacy of the Pope in church affairs and the Orthodox clergy's subordination to him. At the same time when Daniel held negotiations with the papal legate Opizo in Kraków and Chelm, the embassy was dispatched from Nicaea to Rome in order to conclude the agreement on the union of the Western and the Eastern churches (late 1253) [see: Maiorov 2015d, pp. 11–34].

Daniel Romanovich's mother, Euphrosyne-Anna, remained the conveyor of the Nicaean interests in Galician-Volhynian Rus'. After spending many years in the convent, she

appeared for the last time on the pages of the chronicle as one of the protagonists in coronation history. According to the court chronicler, “his mother persuaded” Daniel to give consent to the coronation and the union with Rome. The union of the strongest prince of Rus’ with Rome was advantageous at the time for the rulers of Nicaea, as it contributed to the realization of their own political purposes. When the new Nicaean emperor Theodore II Lascaris refused to yield to the Pope and decided to return Constantinople by military force, it immediately led to the rupture of relations of Galician-Volhynian princes with Rome [see: Maiorov 2011g, pp. 60–99].

References

- Anōnymu synopsis chronikē, ed. K.N. Sathas. Athens: Grēgoriadēs, 1972 (= *Mesaiōnikē bibliothēkē / Bibliotheca Graeca medii aevi*, vol. 7). 680 pp. (in Greek).
- Berezhkov N. G. *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia [Chronology of Russian chronicles]*. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963. 346 pp. (in Russian).
- Dąbrowska E. ‘Królów polskich relikwiarz koronacyjny Krzyża Świętego’, *Kultura średniowieczna i staropolska. Studia ofiarowane A. Gieysztorowi w pięćdziesięciolecie pracy naukowej*. Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1991, pp. 67–89. (in Polish).
- Dąbrowski D. *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*. Poznań, Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Historyczne, 2002. 347 pp. (in Polish).
- Dimitrii (Iarema), patriarch, *Ikony Zakhidnoi Ukrainy XII–XV st. [Painting of icons of the Western Ukraine 12th–15th centuries]*. Lviv, Drukars'ki kunshty, 2005. 508 pp. (in Ukrainian).
- Duk D., Kalechyts I., Kots A. ‘Piachatka Eufrosinni Polatskai’ [Seal of Euprosinia Polotzkaya], *Belaruskii gistorychny chasopis*, 2015, no. 7, pp. 13–18. (in Belarusian).
- Durand J. ‘La Vraie Croix de la princesse palatine au trésor de Notre-Dame de Paris: Observations techniques’, *Cahiers Archéologique*, 1992, vol. 40, pp. 139–146.
- Ephraem Aenius, *Historia Chronica*, ed. by O. Lampsides. Athens: Athenis Institutum Graecoromanae Antiquitatis, Academiae Atheniensis, 1990 (= *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, ser. Atheniensis*, vol. 27). XL+464 pp. (in Greek).
- Etinhof O. E. *Vizantiiskaia ikona VI — pervoi poloviny XIII veka v Rossii [Byzantine icon 6th — the first half 13th century in Russia]*. Moscow, Indrik Publ., 2005. 766 pp. (in Russian).
- Etinhof O. E. ‘Zametki o greko-russkoi ikonopisnoi masterskoi v Novgorode i rospisiakh Spaso-Preobrazhenskoï tserkvi na Nereditse’ [Notes on the Greek-Russian icon painting workshop in Novgorod and the paintings of the Holy Transfiguration Church on the Nereditsa], in: *Tserkov' Spasa na Nereditse: ot Vizantii k Rusi. K 800-letiju pamiatnika [Church of the Saviour on Nereditsa: from Byzantium to Rus'. By the 800th anniversary of the monument]*, ed. by O. E. Etinof. Moscow, Indrik Publ., 2005. pp. 115–143. (in Russian).
- Gippius A. A. ‘O neskol'kikh personazhakh novgorodskikh berestianykh gramot XII v’ [On several personages of the Novgorod birchbark documents of the 12th century], Ianin V. L., Zalizniak A. A., Gippius A. A., *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste: Iz raskopok 1997–2000 gg. [Novgorodian birch bark manuscripts. From the excavations of 1997–2000]*. Moscow, Russkie slovari, 2004, pp. 164–182. (in Russian).
- Grala H. ‘Tradycja dziejopisarska o pobytcie władcy Bizancjum w Haliczu (Jan Długosz i kronikarz Hustyński)’, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 1986, vol. 93, no. 3, pp. 639–661. (in Polish).
- Herrin J. ‘Changing Functions of Monasteries for Women during Byzantine Iconoclasm’, *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience 800–1200*, ed. by L. Garland. Aldershot, Burlington, Ashgate, 2006, pp. 3–11.
- Hustynskaia letopis'*, ed. by V. A. Kuchkin. St. Petersburg, Dmitrii Bulanin Publ., 2003 (= *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, vol. 40). 202 pp. (in Russian).
- Ianin V. L. ‘K probleme avtorstva nereditskikh fresok’ [On the problem of the authorship of the Nereditsa frescoes], *Pamiatniki kul'tury: novye otkrytiia, 1987 god*. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1988, pp. 178–183. (in Russian).
- Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. by A. Meineke. Bonnae, Weber, 1836 (= *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. 13). 412 pp. (in Greek).
- Ioannis Dlugosii Annales, seu Cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*, ed. by J. Dąbrowski. Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawn, Naukowe, 1973, vol. 5–6. 432 pp. (in Latin).
- Ipat'evskaia letopis'*, ed. by A. A. Shakhmatov. Moscow, Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998 (= *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, vol. 2). XVI p.+938 col.+92 p. (in Russian).

- Kalendarium necrologicum canonicorum spirensium recentius, J.F.Boehmer (hrsg.), *Fontes rerum Germanicarum*. Stuttgart: Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1868, vol. 4, pp. 315–327. (in Latin).
- Lavren'evskaia letopis'*, ed. by E. F. Karsky. Moscow, lazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1997 (= *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. I). VIII+580 pp. (in Russian).
- Letopisets Pereiaslavlia Suzdal'skogo*, ed. by V. I. Buganov. Moscow, Arkheograficheskii tsentr, 1995 (= *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, vol. 41). 184 pp. (in Russian).
- Magdalino P. *The empire of Manuel I Komnenos. 1143–1180*. Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2002. 558 pp.
- Maiorov A. V. *Galitsko-Volynskaia Rus'. Ocherki sotsial'no-politicheskikh otnoshenii v domongol'skii period. Kniaz', boiare i gorodskaia obshchina* [Galician-Volhynian Rus'. Essays on the socio-political relations in the pre-Mongol period. Prince, nobles and urban communities]. St. Petersburg, 2001. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Tsarskii titul galitsko-volynskogo kniazia Romana Mstislavicha i ego potomkov' [The title of Tsar of Halych and Volyn' Prince Roman Mstislavich and his descendants], *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 2009, no. 1–2, pp. 250–262. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Drevnerusskoe rukopisnoe Evangelie Aprokos iz sobraniia Gosudarstvennoi Tre'tiakovskoi galerei: k voprosu o datirovke i atributsii' [The Old Russian handwritten Gospel Aprokos from the collection of the State Tretyakov gallery. The question of its dating and attribution], *Voprosy muzeologii*, 2010, no. 1, pp. 160–166. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Neizvestnyi fakt biografii Daniila Galitskogo' [The unknown fact of biography of Daniel of Galicia], *Rossica antiqua*, 2010, no. 2, pp. 140–148. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Unikal'naia drevnerusskaia ikona iz sobraniia Lvovskogo natsional'nogo muzeia' [A unique Old Russian icon from the collection of the Lviv National museum], *Voprosy muzeologii*, 2010, no. 2, pp. 70–75. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Apostof'skii presto i Nikeiskaia imperiia vo vneshnei politice Daniila Galitskogo' [The Apostolic See and the Empire of Nicaea in foreign policy of Daniel Galitsky], *Rossica antiqua*, 2011, no. 1, pp. 60–99. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Daniil Galitskii i Fridrikh Voinsvennyi: russko-avstriiskie otnosheniia v seredine XIII v.' [Daniel Galitsky and Friedrich the Quarrelsome: Russian-Austrian relations in the middle of the 13th century], *Voprosy istorii*, 2011, no. 7, pp. 32–52. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Daniil Galitskii i nachalo formirovaniia kul'ta Sv. Daniila Stolpnika u Riurikovichei' [Daniel of Galicia and the Beginning of the Cult of Saint Daniel the Stylite in the Rurik Dynasty], *Drevniaia Rus': voprosy medievistiki*, 2011, no. 4, pp. 32–50. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'O proiskhozhdenii i simvolike imeni kniazia Irakliia Danilovicha' [On the provenance and symbolism of the name of Prince Iraklii Danilovich], *Voprosy istorii*, 2011, no. 3, pp. 110–121. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Pechat' Evfrosinii Galitskoi iz Novgoroda' [The Seal of Euphrosyne of Galicia from Novgorod], *Drevniaia Rus': voprosy medievistiki*, 2011, no. 2, pp. 5–25. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Koronatsiia Daniila Galitskogo: Nikeia i Rim vo vneshnei politice galitsko-volynskikh kniazeei' [The Coronation of Daniel of Galicia: Nicaea and Rome in the foreign policy of Galicia-Volhynian Princes], *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 2011, no. 1, pp. 143–156. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Vostochnokhristianskie relikvii i ideia "perenosa imperii": Vizantiia, Balkany, Drevniaia Rus'' [Eastern Christian Reliquiae and an Idea of "Transfer of Empire": Byzantium, the Balkans, Ancient Rus], *Religiovedenie*, 2011, no. 1, pp. 17–24. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. "'Korol' Rusi" v bitve na Leite' [The "king of Russia" in the battle of Leitha]. *Rusin*, 2012, no. 3, pp. 54–77. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Pervaia unii Rusi s Rimom' [The First Rus'-Rome Union], *Voprosy istorii*, 2012, no. 4, pp. 33–52. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Pokhod russkikh voisk v Moraviiu i bor'ba za "avstriiskoe nasledstvo" v 1252–1253 gg.' [Campaign of the Russian troops in Moravia and the struggle for "Austrian Succession" in 1252–1253], *Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal*, 2012, no. 3, pp. 49–54. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'The daughter of a Byzantine Emperor — the wife of a Galicia-Volhynian Prince', *Byzantino-slavica*, 2014, vol. 72, no. 1–2, pp. 188–233.
- Maiorov A. V. 'Grecheskii olovir Daniila Galitskogo: iz kommentariia k Galitsko-Volynskoi letopisi' [Greek olovir of Daniel Galitsky: from the commentary to the Galician-Volhynian chronicle], *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury Instituta russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom) RAN*, 2014, vol. 62, pp. 225–235. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'The imperial Purple of the Galician-Volhynian Princes', *Rusin*, 2014, no. 2, pp. 147–161.

- Maiorov A. V. 'Illustri regi Russiae: korolevskii titul russkikh kniazei v pervoi polovine XIII v.' [Illustri regi Russiae: the Royal Title of Russian Princes in the First Half of the 13th Century], *Stratum plus: Archaeology and Cultural Anthropology*, 2015, no. 6, pp. 53–61. (in Russian).
- Maiorov A. V. 'Ecumenical Processes in the mid — 13th century and the Union between Russia and Rome', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 2015, vol. 126, no. 1, pp. 11–34.
- Maiorov A. V. 'The Alliance between Byzantium and Rus' before the Conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204', *Russian History*, 2015, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 272–303.
- Maiorov A. V. 'The Cult of St. Daniel the Stylite among the Russian Princes of the Rurik dynasty', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 2015, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 345–366.
- Maiorov A. V. 'Angelos in Halych: Did Alexios III Visit Roman Mstislavich?', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 2016, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 343–376.
- Maiorov A. V. '...and Mstislav was given the city of Ascalon. Could the Russian Prince be the Viceroy of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I in the Holy Land?', *Byzantion*, 2016, vol. 86, pp. 124–142.
- Maiorov A. V., Metelkin E. N. "Die deutsche Spur" in der altrussischen Erzählung über die Einnahme Konstantinopels durch die Kreuzritter', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 2016, vol. 109, no. 2, pp. 392–408.
- Mayer H. E. 'Latins, Muslims and Greeks in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', *History*, 1978, vol. 63, pp. 175–192.
- Nasonov A. N. *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI — nachala XVIII veka. Ocherki i issledovaniia* [History of Russian chronicles 11th — the beginning of the 18th century. Essays and research]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1969. 556 pp. (in Russian).
- Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. by I. A. van Diäten. Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1975 (=Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, ser. Berolinensis, vol. 11/1). CXV+656 pp. (in Greek).
- Novgorodskaiia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov*, ed. by A. N. Nasonov. Moscow, Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000 (=Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 3). XVI+592 pp. (in Russian).
- Popova O. S. 'Galitsko-volynskie miniatiury rannego XIII v. (k voprosu o vzaimootnosheniakh russkogo i vizantiiskogo iskusstva)' [The Galician-Volhynian miniatures of early 13th century (to the question of relationship between Russian and Byzantine art)], *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo. Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura domongol'skoi Rusi*, ed. by V. N. Lazarev. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1972, pp. 283–315. (in Russian).
- Radzivilovskaia letopis'*, eds M. D. Priselkov et al. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1989 (=Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei, vol. 38). 178 pp. (in Russian).
- Raffin L., *Anne Gonzague, princesse palatine. 1616–1684*. Paris, Desclée, de Bruwer & cie, 1935. 386 pp.
- Rocznik Traski, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, ed. by A. Bielowski. Lwów, Nakładem Własnym, 1872, pp. 826–861. (in Latin).
- Rozhko M. 'Pro deiaki oboronni Preobrazhens'ki monastiri XIII st. v Galichini' [About the defense of the Transfigurations Monasteries of 13th century in Galicia], *Lavra. Chasopis monahiv Studits'kogo ustavu*, 1999, no. 1, pp. 42–49. (in Ukrainian).
- Schmeidler B. 'Der sogenannte Cusentinus bei Tolomeus von Lucca', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 1906–1907, Bd. 32, Hft. 1, SS. 252–261.
- Sviatsky D. O., *Astronomiia Drevnei Rusi [Astronomy of Ancient Rus']*. Moscow, Russkaia panorama, 2007. 664 pp. (in Russian).
- Tholomeus Lucensis Historia ecclesiastica nova*, eds O. Clavuot, L. Schmutge. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2009 (=Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum, vol. 39). LXXVIII+786 pp. (in Latin).
- Tyerman Ch. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. London, Penguin, 2007. 1040 pp.
- Willemi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. by R. B. C. Huygens. Turnholt, Brepols, 1986, vol. 1 (=Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis, vol. 63). XLII+1024 pp. (in Latin).
- Zespól wieżowy w Stołpiu. Badania 2003–2004*, ed. by A. Buko. Warszawa, IAE PAN, IA UW, 2009. 376 pp. (in Polish).

For citation: Maiorov A. V. Rus', Byzantium and Western Europe in the late twelfth — early thirteenth centuries. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2016, issue 4, pp. 31–43. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2016.403

Received: 27 February 2016
Accepted: 2 September 2016