

## ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: NO COUNTRY FOR OLD WOMEN: BURIAL PRACTICES AND PATTERNS OF HUNGARIAN QUEENS OF THE ÁRPÁD DYNASTY (975-1301)

Christopher Mielke, Master of Arts, 2010

Thesis directed by: Janna Wasilewski  
Department of History

Recent studies of Árpáadian queens of Hungary have shown promise. Unlike previous research however, the goal of this thesis is not to examine the lives of the Hungarian queens, but rather their deaths and their burials. Utilizing what little information is known, the queens will be divided into four groups of individual case study. Considering that the vast majority of Hungarian queens were buried outside Hungary, the central issue to this thesis will be researching the causality for this. Ultimately, all twenty-four women in this study have two main factors in relation to their burial. First, their close familial link with particular branches of the Árpád dynasty could prove problematic upon the death of their husband. Second, the perceived danger of the widowed queen is a testament not only to fears of her as a foreigner and a woman, but also fears of power she exercised in her own right.

NO COUNTRY FOR OLD WOMEN: BURIAL PRACTICES AND PATTERNS OF  
HUNGARIAN QUEENS OF THE ÁRPÁD DYNASTY (975-1301)

by

Christopher Mielke

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
2010

Advisory Committee:

Professor Janna Wasilewski, Chair  
Professor Kenneth Holum  
Professor Philip Soergel

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Master's thesis almost inevitably rests upon the shoulders of giants, and here I would like to take a moment to thank the many giants who have aided me in my research. I would first of all like to thank János Bak, Estella Weiss-Krejci, Martin Dimnik, and everyone else along the way whose communication and guidance helped shaped this work. I would also like to thank Elisabeth Herschbach, who translated the Greek sources for me.

I could not have done this without the help and support of my thesis committee. Their guidance and instruction was instrumental in getting this document into a polished and publishable state. Dr. Wasilewski in particular has been a pillar of strength for me from the beginning here at the University of Maryland, and I can not thank her enough.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family, in particular my mother who has proofread more drafts of my work than anyone will ever know.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Contents**

Introduction .....	1
Chapter 1: Predeceased Queens buried in Hungary.....	5
Chapter 2: Dowager Queens buried in Hungary.....	36
Chapter 3: Queens who outlived their husbands and were buried outside of Hungary.....	55
Chapter 4: Queens of Hungary who remarried .....	106
Conclusion.....	122
Appendix I: Unknown Burials of Hungarian Consorts.....	127
Appendix II: Hungarian Queens of the Árpád dynasty .....	129
Bibliography .....	131

## Introduction

The various historical and biographical works in which the Hungarians of the Middle Ages recorded their own origins and early doings are less numerous and less important than their counterparts from France, Italy or Germany. Nevertheless, they constitute a not inconsiderable body of literature which is of great value for the history, not only of Hungary and that Magyar people, but of the whole of South-Eastern Europe.<sup>1</sup>

This rather backhanded compliment comes from C. A. Macartney in his study of medieval Hungarian historical authors. Although his claim that these works are inferior compared to their continental counterpart is debatable, the unfortunate fact remains that most of the histories of the Árpád Dynasty (r. 975-1301) are written centuries after the fact. This problem of sources is exacerbated when undertaking any study of marginal groups.

Although queens in the Middle Ages were prominent public figures and the women of highest rank in the realm, their presence as foreigners and women sets up a problematic polemic against them. Some queens were lambasted as greedy self-serving powerbrokers, while others were praised in the same cookie-cutter language – and many more were simply ignored in the historical record.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, although feminist studies in history blossomed in the 1960s, the focus on socioeconomic history and a general disinterest in the history of administration did not generate much interest in the studies of queens.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), v.

<sup>2</sup> Anne J. Duggan, “Introduction” in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), xv.

<sup>3</sup> John Carmi Parsons, “Family, Sex, and Power: The Rhythms of Medieval Queenship” in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John C. Parsons (New York: St. Martins Press, 1993), 1.

It is hardly any surprise that studies of collective Hungarian queens have been few and far between. One of the earliest attempts to do so is the extensive work by Wertner Mór published in 1892, wherein he catalogs nearly 150 people related to the Árpád dynasty, including the queens of Hungary.<sup>4</sup> Although this work is a tour de force in its scope of studying the Árpád dynasty, it nevertheless has many problems, especially in the assumptions it makes about the queens. Raimund Kerbl explored some queens via his dissertation at the University of Vienna on Byzantine princesses in Hungary – unfortunately, it contained many errors which led to Hungarian historian Szabolcs de Vajay publishing an article clarifying some of the misconceptions.<sup>5</sup> More recently, János Bak at the Central European University in Budapest has published two chapters on the subject of Hungarian queens, exploring not only their roles and functions, but also their treatment in historical chronicles as scapegoats.<sup>6</sup> The few studies out there have thus tended to focus more on the lives of these queens, rather than their deaths. This present study seeks to uncover patterns and practices related to the burials of 24 women who were Queens of the Árpád Dynasty.

Considering the dearth of information in relation to these women in written sources, the main virtue of this study is the fact that in certain cases archaeological data is available to supplement what is known of some burials. While archaeological and epigraphical evidence only applies to a handful of these queens (Gisela of Bavaria, Tuta of Formbach, Felicia of Sicily, Agnes of Antioch, and Gertrude of Andechs-Meran) it is

---

<sup>4</sup> Mór, Wertner, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, (Nagy-Becskerekén: Pleitz, 1892).

<sup>5</sup> Raimund Kerbl, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádkönigreich” (Ph.D. diss., University of Vienna, 1979); Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn,” *Ungarn Jahrbuch*, 10 (1979), 15-28.

<sup>6</sup> János M. Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary (100-1386 A.D.)” in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John C. Parsons, 13-24; János M. Bak “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary” in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan, 223-234.

nonetheless valuable when the historical sources so often fail. However, some of the earlier excavations (in particular the excavations at Székesfehérvár in 1864) have some problems associated with them, and the text of the reports must be read very carefully. The sarcophagi of Constance of Aragon and Agnes Habsburg of Austria had been opened up in the eighteenth century, and while some information can be gleaned from the reports of those who examined the bodies, the lack of systematized study means that a lot of information is missing. When available, the archaeological evidence provides a useful insight into the burials themselves, but only when studied critically.

If the goal of this thesis is to study the circumstances of death and burial in these 24 queens, what purpose would this exercise serve? First and foremost, it aims to clarify a tangled historiographical tradition wherein the historical sources mentioning the burials of queens sometimes can not be trusted. More than that, this thesis seeks to address one of the serious peculiarities of Hungarian queens in relation to their European counterparts: of the twenty-four women in the main body of this survey, only ten were actually buried in Hungary. Of the other fourteen, only three seem to have remarried. That leaves eleven queens living out their widowhood in limbo, despite the fact that they had been the highest ranking woman in the country during the lifetime of their husbands.

This thesis proposes to study this oddity with two particular topics in mind. First, the queen in relation to the succession following the death of her husband needs to be established. Although several Árpáadian kings wished to follow the practice of primogeniture, there were always younger brothers or avaricious uncles claiming their own seniority instead. The queen's vulnerable position and close link to a challenged branch of the family in some cases saw her victoriously fighting for her sons, and in

many cases saw her exiled from a country where her presence was a nuisance to the newly-minted rival king. The other avenue of exploration is the queen herself, her actions and struggles in widowhood. Far from being colorless consorts, these were women who owned considerable property, who sometimes became quite wealthy in their own right, and who sometimes aided their own family when disputes in the succession broke out. In many cases, the need to remove a widowed queen was not that she was a redundant political nobody with nothing left to do, but rather that she was a powerful member of a displaced branch of the family whose presence could prove troublesome.

Thus, it is necessary to examine each of these women through these lenses, on both an individual and collective scale, using both historical and archaeological evidence where available. These queens of the Árpád dynasty are divided up into four groups: those who predeceased their husbands and were buried in Hungary, those who outlived their husbands and were buried in Hungary, those who survived their husbands and were buried outside of Hungary, and those who remarried and were buried outside Hungary. By drawing patterns of behavior related to death and burial in these four groups, this thesis will thus explore what role succession disputes (and the problematic implementation of primogeniture) and the queen herself had in determining place of death and burial.



## Chapter 1: Predeceased Queens buried in Hungary

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze what is known of the burials of six Hungarian queens who predeceased their husbands and were subsequently buried in Hungary. The six women in question are Adelaide of Rheinfelden (d. 1090), wife of Laszló I (r. 1077-1095); Felicia of Sicily (d. 1102-1112), wife of Kálmán (r. 1095-1116); Agnes of Antioch (d. 1184) wife of Béla III (r. 1172-1196); Gertrude of Meran (d. 1213), first wife of Andrew II (r. 1205-1235); Yolande de Courtenay (d. 1233), second wife of Andrew II; and Fenenna of Kujava (d. 1295), first wife of Andrew III (r. 1290-1301). Each burial is influenced by all sorts of factors, from developments in the regional church to veneration of particular saints, and in this set, possibly a burial that reflects the queen's choice. In addition to evidence provided by written sources such as chronicles and charters, each queen has a distinct body of evidence connected with her burial, such as Adelaide of Rheinfelden's epitaph, Agnes of Antioch's tomb and grave goods, and fragments of Gertrude of Meran's sarcophagus.

There are several goals in analyzing these women who fall into this pattern of burial. Due to the fact that they did not live long enough to encounter issues such as problematic succession, examining these women through the lens of their relationship to the next king who came to the Hungarian throne, or the problematic implementation of primogeniture in Árpáadian Hungary would be unnecessary. It is, however, useful for comparative purposes in relation to the other three chapters wherein the succession plays a large role in the queen's widowhood. For this chapter however, after first detailing the specifics of each burial circumstance and location, it will be necessary to determine what,

if anything about the burial is unique. Second, the burial of the queen's husband will be taken into account: some queens who predeceased their husbands were buried next to their husbands, while others were not. Third, based on all the prior determinations, the question of whether or not these women played any part in their burial will be addressed. Finally, this chapter will address how the nature of these burials in Hungary changed from the end of the eleventh century to the end of the thirteenth. In short, this chapter is meant to uncover any patterns relating to the burials of women who died as queens of Hungary.

The historical record has not been kind to Hungarian queens: some have been used as scapegoats for real or imaged wrongs,<sup>7</sup> while others have been completely ignored. **Adelaide of Rheinfelden**, wife of Laszló I (r. 1077-1095) definitely belongs in the latter category. Laszló I, the warrior saint and paragon of justice, was one of Hungary's most legendary kings, seen as a true successor to Saint István I in his manner of ruling and virtue. By contrast, Adelaide is a complete nonentity in the Hungarian chronicles. Half a century ago, she appears as a footnote in one of the most extensive works on medieval Hungarian chronicles, which states that all that is known about her is possibly her name from an inscription.<sup>8</sup> The little that is known about her comes mostly from references to her in thirteenth century charters that speak of her donation of the village of Merenye to the bishop of Veszprém (she is not named),<sup>9</sup> and a letter written

---

<sup>7</sup> See János M. Bak "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 223-234.

<sup>8</sup> C.A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, 182, n. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 194.

explicitly to her by Pope Gregory VII.<sup>10</sup> While there was some confusion over her parentage (she is sometimes referred to as the daughter of Berthold I of Zähringen)<sup>11</sup> her father is believed to be Rudolf of Rheinfelden, who the Empress-regent Agnes appointed as Duke of Swabia in 1057, and who would later become the German anti-king against her son, Henry IV.<sup>12</sup> The bonds between Rudolf and the Imperial family were strengthened when in 1059, he married Agnes' daughter Matilda who died the next year. He subsequently married Adelaide of Savoy, sister of Henry IV's first wife, Bertha, and it is from this second marriage that Adelaide of Rheinfelden was born. She would have still been a teenager when she married Laszló I of Hungary in 1078 – Wertner Mór suggests that she was Rudolf's eldest and would have been born in around 1061, making her roughly seventeen when she was married.<sup>13</sup> Little is known of their married life together. Laszló and Adelaide were known to have had two daughters together: one married a Russian prince, while the other, Piroska (Pyrisk, Prisca) became the Empress Eirene, wife of Byzantine emperor John II Komnenos.

There is some debate over the year of Adelaide's death. Due to the fact that so little is known of her life, some genealogists have placed her death at 1079, the year after her marriage.<sup>14</sup> However, considering Pope Gregory VII's letter to her in 1081, the records of her property donation from the thirteenth century and the fact that she gave

---

<sup>10</sup> Pope Gregory VII, Herbert E J Cowdrey, *The register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073 - 1085 : an English translation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 396. He had earlier written to Queen Judith of Hungary, wife of Salamon (see chapter 4) in 1075 with similar advice on good queenship, hinting that a good queen follows a policy friendly to the popes. Adelaide's husband Laszló was friendlier to Papal authority than Salamon, so the letter is slightly different. *Ibid.*, 133-134.

<sup>11</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 195.

<sup>12</sup> Ian Robertson, *Henry IV 1056-1106*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 33-34.

<sup>13</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 196.

<sup>14</sup> In listing the various Árpáadian queens, János Bak draws from Schwennicke when mentioning Adelaide, saying she died in 1079. János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons ed., 23-24. His original source is D. Schwennicke, *Europäische Stammtafeln. Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, (Marburg: Stargardt, 1980-1984).

birth to two girls, this seems unlikely. It seems more likely that Adelaide died in May 1090 and was buried at the cathedral in Veszprém.<sup>15</sup> His source for the date of her death is the Bernoldi Chronicon, which states that Adelaide died the same month as her brother duke Berthold, both of which are listed under the month of May for the year 1090.<sup>16</sup> In either case, Adelaide is known to have predeceased her husband, St. Laszló. Despite the fact that the two only had daughters from their marriage and Adelaide's death would have permitted him to remarry, St. Laszló never did so. Tempting as it is to read this as the symptom of a grieving widower, St. Laszló oversaw the canonization of not only St. István I, but also his son St. Imre. His legend was not written until the mid-twelfth century, but with St. Imre there is a clear emphasis on his holy chastity in sources written about him shortly after St. Laszló's death.<sup>17</sup> While Laszló's sainthood was not a foregone conclusion during his lifetime and the emphasis on chastity seems more prevalent after his death, Laszló's decision to remarry could have been influenced by a number of factors whether they are diplomatic issues, personal struggles with faith, or even true grief at his wife's death.

Adelaide's burial at St. Michael's Cathedral in Veszprém is unique for several reasons. First, it is believed that the inscription of her epitaph is known from a source four centuries after her death. In addition, one can not ignore a marble slab in Makranc dated to 1510-1520 that reads:

---

<sup>15</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 197.

<sup>16</sup> "Heremannus piae memoriae Metensis episcopus, et Barthaldus dux Alemanniae, filius Roudolfi regis, in fidelitate sancti Petri Maio mense diem extremum clausere, magnumque merorem catholicis, et exultationem scismaticis reliquere. Soror quoque praefati ducis, regina Ungarorum, eodem mense obit." Bertholdi Chronicon, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, ed. G. H. Pertz, (Hanover: 1854, etc.) Vol. 5, 450, lines 19-22.

<sup>17</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 129-130, 158-160.

D(eo) OP(timo) MAX(imo) S(anctificatus est)  
 HVIVS SACRI TEMPLI CONDIT  
 RICIGESLAE STEFANI ET OLAY  
 THI LADISLAI SANCTOR(um) PANNONIAE  
 REGVM DIVIS CONIVGIBVS  
 AMPLISS(imus) PATER D(omi)N(u)S PETRVS T(i) T(ularis)  
 SAN(c)TI CYRIACI S(anctae) R(omanae) E(cclesiae) P(res)B(ite)R  
 CAR(dinalis) (R)IEGYNVS EP(iscopu)S VESPRIMIEN(sis)  
 AP  
 MEMORIAE VENER(ationi)<sup>18</sup>

Though this monument refers to no place of burial, it is significant in that it puts Adelaide on par with Gisela of Bavaria (wife of István I, see chapter 3), the founder of the cathedral at Veszprém. Second, it appears to be the only burial of a Hungarian queen at the city of Veszprém – this is significant because the city is usually associated with the queen. Gisela founded the Cathedral there, the bishop of Veszprém had the right to crown the queens, and there is a seat in the cathedral identified as the queen’s seat.<sup>19</sup> Third, the only reference to her in Hungary’s legal history (the charters from the thirteenth century) shows that Adelaide had some connection with Veszprém in her gift of the village of Merenye to the bishop of Veszprém. Fourth, and finally, is the nature of Adelaide’s burial as it compares to that of her husband, St. Laszló I.

Her burial at the cathedral of Veszprém is noted in the fifteenth century account of Antonius de Bonfinius, who stated that there was a tombstone referring to Adelaide (and he mistakenly believes Gisela of Bavaria as well) which reads “*Ladislai regis consortum hic ossa quiescunt.*”<sup>20</sup> Considering the plural of consortium in the translation, it comes as no surprise that it is sometimes claimed that Laszló had a wife before

<sup>18</sup> András Uzsocki, “Die Echtheit des Grabes der ungarischen Königin Gisela in Passau.” in *Bayern und Ungarn: Tausend Jahre enge Beziehungen*, ed. Ekkehard Völkl, (Regensburg: Lassleben, 1988) 14-15.

<sup>19</sup> A. Kralovány, “The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages”, in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, ed. Laszló Gerevich, (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1990), 59; János M. Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary (100-1386 A.D.)” in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John C. Parsons, 17-18.

<sup>20</sup> Antonius de Bonfinius, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1936), Decas II, Liber IV, 91.

Adelaide.<sup>21</sup> In studying the city of Veszprém and its relationship with the Hungarian queens, Kraloványky points to the epitaph which he says reads “*Ladislai sanctissimorum Pannoniae regum consortium hic ossa quiescent,*”<sup>22</sup> which is quite a different transcription than the one actually in Bonfinius. According to Uzsoki, the former translation (“*Ladislai regis consortum...*”) is how the text appears in the sixteenth century copies of Bonfinius, while the text Kraloványky uses is from the version published in 1936.<sup>23</sup> Kraloványky is skeptical of any queen being buried there, not only because of Bonfinius’ confusion over Gisela being buried there, but also the fact that the charters in the thirteenth century which mention Adelaide’s donation of Merenye do not mention her burial at Veszprém, nor is there any mention of pilgrims to the queen’s tomb.<sup>24</sup> Interestingly enough, the biggest patron of pilgrimages to the shrines of Hungarian royals seems to be Elizabeth of Poland (d. 1380), the Queen of Lajos I (r. 1342-1382) who particularly supported the cults of St. István I, his son St. Imre, and Adelaide’s husband, St. Laszló I.<sup>25</sup> Regardless, it is entirely possible Adelaide was buried at Veszprém, but the lack of evidence corroborating Bonfinius’ account makes Kraloványky skeptical. While the archaeological evidence overwhelmingly supports his statement that Gisela of Bavaria was not buried at Veszprém, the evidence Kraloványky provides does not necessarily mean that Adelaide was not buried there and that Bonfinius’ account is entirely wrong. The nature of the original epitaph in Bonfinius addresses Laszló merely

---

<sup>21</sup> János M. Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary”, in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23.

<sup>22</sup> He uses Bonfinius as a source. A. Kraloványky, “The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages”, in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, Laszló Gerevich ed., 57.

<sup>23</sup> András Uzsoki, “Die Echtheit des Grabes der ungarischen Königin Gisela in Passau.” in *Bayern und Ungarn: Tausend Jahre enge Beziehungen*, ed. Ekkehard Völkl, 14.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 58.

<sup>25</sup> Since Adelaide herself is not a saint, it is worth questioning why a pilgrimage would have been made to her tomb. Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 341-342.

as king, which would fit entirely with a monument erected in the lifetime of St. Laszló and before his canonization. The fact that this epitaph seems to have remained unchanged since the late eleventh century and was in a state of disrepair by the fifteenth shows that little attention had been paid to the tombstone after her death. This seems to corroborate the fact that there were no pilgrims to the site of her burial and that others made no mention of its presence.

While Kralovansky appears to have mistranscribed the section of Bonfinius concerning Adelaide's burial, he makes several very good points about the nature of the relationship of the city of Veszprém to the Hungarian queens. While there are many claims from later centuries that the city of Veszprém enjoyed special rights via its relationship with the queen, Kralovansky identifies three features that are verifiable with historic evidence: first, the fact that the cathedral in Veszprém was founded by Queen Gisela, the first Queen of Hungary and the wife of St. István I; second, the fact that the bishop of Veszprém enjoyed the special right and privilege to crown the queen; and finally, that there is a seat in the cathedral of Veszprém specifically identified as being the seat of the Queen.<sup>26</sup> He is more skeptical of the claims that queens were crowned at Veszprém (as most of the coronations seem to have taken place at Székesfehérvár)<sup>27</sup> and the tradition of queens being buried there – it seems that Adelaide is the only known queen to have been buried there.

Adelaide's relationship with Veszprém itself is worth exploring when trying to evaluate how her body ended up being buried there. Queens of Hungary were known to hold and administer land of their own in the country, although little is known of the

---

<sup>26</sup> A. Kralovansky, "The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages", in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, Laszló Gerevich ed., 59.

<sup>27</sup> Pál Engel, "Temetkezések a középkori Székesfehérvári Bazilikában" in *Szazadok* 121 (1987), 633-635.

nature of this landholding due to the paltry, fragmentary evidence.<sup>28</sup> In the early years of the Árpád dynasty, St. István's mother Sarolta was known to have lived in Veszprém and after the death of St. István, his widow Gisela was exiled to the palace there by his successor, Peter Orseleo.<sup>29</sup> As mentioned above, there is also the fact that the bishop of Veszprém had the right to crown the Queens of Hungary, even if the place of the coronation took place at Székesfehérvár. The only references to Adelaide's legal activity in the written record are charters centuries later that mention her donation of the village of Merenye to the bishop of Veszprém. While it is only a single piece of evidence, it is representative of a pattern of queen's involvement in Veszprém. The epitaph from Bonfinius and the marble slab at Makranc do show evidence of Adelaide's activity in Veszprém, but this epigraphic evidence should be taken with a grain of salt. Both sources appear nearly 4 centuries after the death of Queen Adelaide, and one can not wonder whether or not their presence demonstrates a real commemoration of her activity or whether or not her activity there has been linked to Queen Gisela as St. Laszló I was linked to St. István I. Their presence is important, but at the same time, it is worth asking whether seeing her presence played out in these monuments is circular logic.

How does her husband's final resting place compare to her own? Admittedly there is some confusion over the burial of St. Laszló. A letter dating to 1106 from Pope Paschal II refers to St. Laszló buried at Somogyvár, at an abbey he founded there in 1091, but this seems to be the only reference to his burial at the abbey.<sup>30</sup> Hungarian sources such as the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle and Simon of Kéza instead point to

---

<sup>28</sup> János Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary" in *Medieval Queenship*, John Carmi Parsons, ed., 14.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>30</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 175.



Nagyvarad as the place of Laszló's burial.<sup>31</sup> There is even mention of this confusion in one of St. Laszló's legends from the twelfth century that has the king's body lying in a cart originally destined for burial at Székesfehérvár (the final resting place of Hungary's other saint king, St. István I), but instead setting out on its own without any animals hitched and ending at Varad, where his body was subsequently laid to rest.<sup>32</sup> Klaniczay doubts that Laszló's body would have ever been buried at Somogyvár, especially considering that it probably would not have been finished in the four years between the abbey's founding and St. Laszló's death.<sup>33</sup> The first and most obvious difference between the two locations is the fact that Adelaide was buried at a cathedral, whereas St. Laszló was buried at a monastery. Second is the issue of patronage. Laszló was buried at a monastery he founded in Nagyvarad. Though Adelaide did not found Veszprém, the evidence available of her activities as queen nonetheless suggest a connection she had with the city. Quite possibly, her burial at Veszprém could reflect her patronage of the city, as her husband's burial reflects his monastic foundation.

While there are unique aspects of Adelaide's burial, there are nevertheless certain aspects of it that are suggestive. Her burial at Veszprém, seemingly the only burial of an Árpáadian queen there, shows a connection made to the city traditionally associated with queens, especially since the burial took place in the only cathedral founded by a queen. Since she is the first queen chronologically speaking to be buried in Hungary (with the exception of Sarolta of Transylvania who technically wasn't queen – see chapter 2) her

---

<sup>31</sup> "In Warod requiescit", Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum: The Deeds of the Hungarians*, (New York: Central European University Press, 1999) ch. 63, 139; "Full of holiness and grace, he joined the company of the angels in the nineteenth year of his reign, and was buried in his monastery at Warad in the year of our Lord 1095 on Sunday, July 29" Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle: Chronica de Gestis Hungarorum*, ed. Dezső Dercsényi, (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970), ch. 141, 130-131.

<sup>32</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 175.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

burial at Veszprém could also show evidence of the Queen trying to connect with Hungary's first Queen, Gisela of Bavaria. The fact that Laszló was buried elsewhere and that Adelaide had a prior connection to the bishop of Veszprém through her donation allows the possibility that she may have expressed a desire to be buried there, though this is by no means proven beyond a shadow of all doubt. The epitaph does not refer to her by name, but as the consort of Laszló, a gesture which seems to subordinate her to him. Until more evidence comes to light, this unique burial remains something of a mystery, though examining it within the context of the burials of other queens should shed some light.

The next queen to be buried in Hungary is Adelaide's successor, the wife of Könyves Kálmán, or Koloman the Book-Lover/Learned. She was the daughter of King Roger I of Sicily and, according to Wertner Mór, his second wife Eremburg of Mortain (though he does admit that some historians favor Roger's first wife Judith of Evreux as her mother.)<sup>34</sup> Historians have disagreed on her name and the date of her death, so there is already a tradition of problematic historiography surrounding her. The trouble with her name begins when Goffredo Malaterra speaks of "Busila" being accompanied on her journey over to Hungary to marry the king in 1097.<sup>35</sup> However, upon closer reading it seems that the name was a mistranslation of the word "pucelle" (Latin, puella) meaning girl or virgin.<sup>36</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay points out a Greek manuscript naming the daughters

---

<sup>34</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 229.

<sup>35</sup> Walther Holtzmann, "Maximilla regina, soro Rogerii regis" in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 19 (1963) 158; Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1987), 30.

<sup>36</sup> John Tuzson, *István II (1116-1131) A chapter in medieval Hungarian history*, (Boulder, East European Monographs, 2002), 22-23.

of Roger I of Sicily, including a girl named Eleutheria who doesn't appear elsewhere in the records.<sup>37</sup> The Latinized form of Eleutheria is **Felicia**, and some scholars refer to her as Felicia instead of Busila. According to Vajay, the name Felicia would have come to Norman Sicily via a contemporary Queen of Aragon named Felicia of Roucy.<sup>38</sup>

The date of her death is not certain either. The general bookends for the date of her death are between 1101 and 1112. According to the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, Kálmán's sons Laszló and István were born in the year 1101.<sup>39</sup> In 1112, one of Kálmán's sons died and the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle suggests that this death sparked the king's remarriage to Eufemia of Kiev.<sup>40</sup> John Tuzson is of the opinion that Felicia died in 1112, but the source for this date of death is not cited.<sup>41</sup> Wertner Mór is of the opinion that she died between 1102 and 1104.<sup>42</sup> Márta Font says that Felicia died around 1110, though her exact source is not specified in the text.<sup>43</sup> In 1987, Z. J. Kosztoľnyik was of the opinion that Felicia died in 1108, based off, though none of the footnotes he cites seem to match up.<sup>44</sup> Twenty years later, his opinion is revised based on a passage from the *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* which states "Rex autem de prima uxore sua genuit Ladizlaum et Stephanum anno Domini MoClo", in which Kosztoľnyik interprets as her dying around or shortly after 1101.<sup>45</sup> While the exact date of her death is disputed, what is certain is that she died possibly after 1102 or possibly before her husband's remarriage in 1112 and her death precedes that of her husband in 1116.

---

<sup>37</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn", 21.

<sup>38</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn", 21.

<sup>39</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 146, 132.

<sup>40</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 149, 132.

<sup>41</sup> John Tuzson, *István II*, 79.

<sup>42</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 222.

<sup>43</sup> Márta Font, *Koloman the Learned, King of Hungary*, (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2001), 79.

<sup>44</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 33.

<sup>45</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2006), 66, 86 n. 59.

Though Simon of Kéza completely forgets about the reign of Kálmán's son István II (r. 1116-1131), he nonetheless states that Kálmán was buried at the cathedral at Székesfehérvár.<sup>46</sup> This is echoed in later chronicles such as the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle<sup>47</sup> and there seems to be little indicating Kálmán was buried anywhere other than Székesfehérvár. The evidence for Felicia's burial at Székesfehérvár comes from Henszlmann's excavation in the 1860s, which points to a double sarcophagus with a sandstone base and a red marble top near the southeastern corner.<sup>48</sup> The reason it is said to be the bodies of Kálmán and Felicia is the fact that the burial just outside the church would be consistent with Kálmán's restrictions on burial within churches in Hungary.<sup>49</sup> The tombs seem to have suffered a good deal from outside sources, but their location right outside the church, the historical record recording Kálmán's burial there, the association of this part of the church with the early twelfth century indicates that this is the burial of Kálmán and possibly his wife Felicia, though it does not empirically prove it.<sup>50</sup> Felicia is the first Hungarian queen whose burial at Székesfehérvár is believed to be in the archaeological record, and if so one of a handful of examples to be buried in the same location as her husband. In order to understand the phenomenon of her burial at Székesfehérvár, it is necessary to look at the pattern of burial for Hungarian kings to determine what, if anything is unusual about their burial together.

The general trend of the first half of the eleventh century had been for monarchs to build their own cathedrals which ended up housing their mortal remains (such as St.

---

<sup>46</sup> "Post Kalomannum vero regnavit Bela annis IX, duobus mensibus. Albae tumulatur." Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, chapter 65, 142-143.

<sup>47</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 152, 133.

<sup>48</sup> Imre Henszlmann, *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye* (Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv Bizománya, 1864) 204-205.

<sup>49</sup> Dezső Dercsényi, *A székesfehérvári királyi bazilika*, (Budapest: Műemlékek Országos Bizottsága, 1943) 5.

<sup>50</sup> Imre Henszlmann, *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye*, 204.

István and Peter Orseleo) while Samuel Aba, Andrew I, Béla I, and Géza I chose to be buried in abbeys they had founded themselves.<sup>51</sup> With Kálmán and Felicia, the means and method of burial shifts, and rather than individual monasteries, there is a preference (starting with Kálmán) in the twelfth century for monarchs to be buried at the main cathedral of Székesfehérvár. The last king to have been buried at Székesfehérvár at the time of Kálmán's death seems to have been Hungary's first king, St. István. Even though Kálmán's successor St. Laszló had been responsible for St. István's canonization in 1083, Kálmán still supported the legend of the saint king, and ordered that Hartvik, bishop of Győr complete a new legend of St. István, finding the *legenda minor* and the *legenda maior* about him insufficient.<sup>52</sup> Kálmán also named his sons by Felicia after Árpadian kings István and Laszló – the former was canonized in 1083.<sup>53</sup> He seems to have been the first member of the Árpád dynasty after the death of St. István to name one of his sons after him though, and the dynastic connections he was trying to make should not be underestimated. He is also known to have renewed the rights given by St. István I of the monastery at Veszprémvölgy, a nunnery following Byzantine rite. Though the exact connection with St. István I is unclear (possible foundresses include Sarolta, István's mother, his unnamed Byzantine daughter in law, and even his wife, Gisela of Bavaria<sup>54</sup>) it nonetheless shows in the scant record a vested interest in keeping the religious houses of St. István I alive.<sup>55</sup> Kálmán's interest in revising the legal codes enacted by his uncle St. Laszló I and by St. István I can also be seen as another aspect of his connection to

---

<sup>51</sup> The burial of St. Laszló is problematic. See Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 175.

<sup>52</sup> Márta Font, *Koloman the Learned, King of Hungary*, 25.

<sup>53</sup> The latter would not be canonized until 1192, but he was Kálmán's uncle and still a very popular figure even after his death. Gábor Kosztolnyik, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 176.

<sup>54</sup> A. Kralovány, "The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages", in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, Laszló Gerevich ed., 57; See János Bak, "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 224, n 6.

<sup>55</sup> Márta Font, *Koloman the Learned, King of Hungary*, 29-30.

Hungary's first king. In short, while many explanations can be offered for Kálmán's burial at Székesfehérvár, the simplest explanation seems to have been an interest on the part of Kálmán in emphasizing his connection with not only Hungary's first king, but also Hungary's newly minted saint. This pattern is evident elsewhere on the continent. In France, the abbey of St. Denis was favored by Capetian monarchs who joined their Merovingian, Carolingian, and Robertian predecessors as a site for burial.<sup>56</sup> In Germany, Empress Matilda, wife of Henry I (d. 936) created a female convent at Quedlinburg which would serve as not only the burial site of her and her husband, but also the main place where her cult developed.<sup>57</sup> In thirteenth and fourteenth century England, the Plantagenet dynasty would bury several members of their family at Westminster Abbey, the burial site of Edward the Confessor.<sup>58</sup>

If Kálmán's burial at Székesfehérvár was representative of a conscious decision on his part to emphasize his connection with St. István, what does this say about Felicia's burial there? First of all, the evidence available points to more interest in burial at Székesfehérvár on the part of Felicia's husband Kálmán. If she died as early as 1102 (only five years after her marriage in 1097), it is doubtful she would have grown attached to any particular religious institution or expressed a desire to be buried there. The only written evidence for Felicia mentions her marriage and the birth of her twin sons. What is interesting is the fact that, as early as Felicia's death, Kálmán seems to have been planning for his own death accordingly, and upon the death of his first wife, had her

---

<sup>56</sup> Kathleen Nolan, *Queens in Stone and Silver: the Creation of a Visual Imagery of Queenship in Capetian France*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 6-7.

<sup>57</sup> Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke, "From Famous Empresses to Unspectacular Queens" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 82-83.

<sup>58</sup> This tradition starts with Henry III. John Steane, *The Archaeology of the Medieval English Monarchy*, (London & New York: Routledge, 1999), 46 ff.

buried at the cathedral of St. István I, the last Árpáadian monarch to be buried there before Felicia. The paltry evidence available does not suggest much agency on the part of the Queen in her own burial, and the limited evidence provided by the excavation at Székesfehérvár does not divulge any more information to be helpful at this point.

The dynastic plan of Manuel I Komnenos was originally to marry Maria, his daughter and heiress, to the Hungarian prince Béla (who had taken on the name Alexios at the Byzantine court) and have his daughter and son-in-law succeed him on the Byzantine throne. However, when Manuel's second wife Maria of Antioch gave birth to a boy in 1169, his plans for the dynastic succession changed. Béla-Alexios was disinherited and rather than being married to Manuel's eldest daughter, Béla-Alexios was married to **Agnes (Anna) de Châtillon of Antioch** the half sister of Manuel's second wife.<sup>59</sup> Agnes had been born to Constance, princess of Antioch in her own right by her third husband, Reynald of Châtillon probably in 1154.<sup>60</sup> As Queen of Hungary she is known as Anna, and the switch from Agnes to Anna is believed to have taken place while the newlyweds were still living in Byzantium.<sup>61</sup> Upon the death of his older brother István III in 1173, the disinherited Béla returned to his homeland in Hungary and after a brief struggle with his younger brother Géza, succeeded his older brother on the throne. Anna was the mother to four of Béla's children, but beyond that little is known of her actions or activities as Hungarian queen. Though the date of Anna's death is not

---

<sup>59</sup> Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Harry Magoulias, trans. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), Book Five, 96.

<sup>60</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 359.

<sup>61</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989), 106, 170.

recorded, 1184 is usually given as the most probably year.<sup>62</sup> Béla's unwillingness to attack Byzantium in 1184 is thought to have been caused by the recent death of Anna, though there is no definitive written evidence for this.<sup>63</sup>

While little is known of Agnes/Anna's life, there is a wealth of information known about her death due to the fact that her tomb in the cathedral of Székesfehérvár was uncovered alongside that of her husband in 1848 in a state of excellent preservation.<sup>64</sup> This seems to be the only case of an Árpáadian queen whose tomb survived the many destructions of the period, and it offers a vast array of information that is otherwise lost in the historical and archaeological record. For instance, her skeleton was recovered mostly intact, and measured roughly 159 centimeters tall, or 5 feet, 2.5 inches – she is nearly a foot shorter than her husband Béla III.<sup>65</sup> She was buried with a silver gilt funerary crown, slightly smaller than a matching one Béla III was buried with, which was adorned with four crosses. Anna was also buried with a golden finger ring with a beveled image of a winged siren playing the harp, and fabric fragments of a blue veil and gold lacework were recovered from her tomb as well.<sup>66</sup>

The excavation of Queen Anna's burial is very informative in terms of placement in space and grave goods, but comparison with the burial of her husband is necessary due to the close proximity. Anna's tomb is not only behind Béla's, but his tomb is bigger than hers, though that could be because of the size of Béla's body. The pattern on the lid of Béla's sarcophagus shows not only his name, but also the Hungarian cross with two

---

<sup>62</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 361; János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23

<sup>63</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 118.

<sup>64</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 218.

<sup>65</sup> Gyula Forster, *III. Béla magyar király emlékezete*, (Budapest: Hornyánszky, V., 1900), 206.

<sup>66</sup> Gyula Forster, *III. Béla magyar király emlékezete*, 216-218.



bars, and the letter R at the bottom perhaps meaning “rex”.<sup>67</sup> The lid to Anna’s tomb on the other hand has only her name and several crosses, but little else indicative of her rank or personality, other than being directly behind the resting place of her husband.

Interestingly enough the symbols on Anna’s tomb are explicitly Christian. Stylistically, the lids of both Anna and Béla differ from the lids of the eleventh century burials of Gisela of Bavaria (see chapter 3) and King András I (r. 1046-1060). Whereas the earlier burials had a tomb slab with one very large cross over it, Béla’s tomb shows the double-barred Hungarian cross, and both Béla and Anna have a subsection on the top and bottom of the lid of their sarcophagus. The detail in their sarcophagi is also done in metalwork, rather than in stone carving like for the tomb slabs of Gisela and András.

In addition, a comparison of the grave goods shows a disparity with the couple as well: Béla was buried with a slightly larger, matching silver crown, a silver ring with an Arabic inscription (“Muhammad, son of Abdullah”), part of a pilgrim’s staff, a sword, pieces of Byzantine enamel work, spurs, a bracelet, and a scepter.<sup>68</sup> Anna in comparison has a crown, a gold ring, and textile scraps of a blue veil and gold lace work.<sup>69</sup> Béla has many more items in his tomb and a lot of these reflect not only kingly activity (i.e. scepter, crown) but also military activity (spurs, sword) and a good amount of cultural exchange and interaction (the ring, the Byzantine enamel work.) The design on Anna’s ring depicts a winged siren with a harp. Considering her upbringing first in Antioch then at the Byzantine court, this ring very well could reflect a cultural interest outside of Hungary. Other queens were buried with personal items such as the English Queen

---

<sup>67</sup> Gyula Forster, *III. Béla magyar király emlékezete*, 241.

<sup>68</sup> Gyula Forster, *III. Béla magyar király emlékezete*, 209-214.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 217-218.

Matilda of Flanders (d. 1083) who was buried at Caen with her coronation ring.<sup>70</sup> Other queens were known to be buried with crowns as well: the skeleton of Berengaria of Navarre (wife of English king Richard I) at Le Mans displayed traces of metal on the skull, indicating the presence of a crown at the time of burial.<sup>71</sup> Anna's crown is slightly smaller than her husbands in term of band width and circumference, but part of this could be due to the fact that Béla is at least a foot taller than Anna. The crowns are nonetheless very similar, silver gilt with four crosses attached to the band. Though Béla has many more grave goods than Anna, his grave goods make statements about him as a king and warrior of international renown. The richness of the fabric scraps, the gold ring and matching silver crown on Anna's head makes a similar statement about her as a queen, though to a lesser extent. This seems to be the case as well with the placement of her sarcophagus directly behind Béla's. By contrast, the burial of Felicia of Sicily (if it is her) appears right next to that of her husband. All in all, the state of preservation for these two tombs is unparalleled and Anna's burial follows many conventions in what is known of burials of other queens. Even with this plentiful amount of evidence it is still difficult to make an argument one way or another in terms of her personal agency in the manner in which she was buried. Definite planning was involved – despite the twelve years of difference between the time Anna died and the time Béla died, the two are buried with nearly identical silver crowns. Yet ascribing identity to who was behind the planning is something that for now must remain elusive.

---

<sup>70</sup> Kathleen Nolan, *Queens in Stone and Silver*, 28.

<sup>71</sup> The crown it seems was subsequently the object of vandalism. Ann Trindade, *Berengaria: In search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen*, (Portland: Four Courts Press, 1999), 189.

The murder of **Gertrude of Andechs-Meran**, first wife of Andrew II (r. 1205-1235) is unusual for many reasons, though it is not the only episode of violence against a Hungarian queen. Elizabeth of Poland, wife of Lajos I the Great had four fingers on her hand hacked off in an attack, and her daughter in law Elizabeth of Bosnia was strangled.<sup>72</sup> The murder of Queen Gertrude is a story in and of itself (it has even been made into an opera) and in order to understand the circumstances of her death, it is first necessary to discuss her life and what exactly led to her death in order to determine if this violent act in any way impacted the treatment of her body post mortem. In János Bak's chapter on Hungarian queens as scapegoats, Gertrude is one of the prime examples of a foreign women holding significant unofficial power in Hungary who meets a most untimely demise at disgruntled hands, and whose reputation in the historical chronicles has suffered considerably.<sup>73</sup> Her burial at a Cistercian abbey near the scene of her death and her elaborate sarcophagus raise the question what sort of plans had been made for her burial prior to her brutal murder. First, it is necessary to establish the events leading up to her murder, the murder itself, what the excavations at Pilis recovered of her sarcophagus, and finally what these facts can tell us about the role Gertrude had insofar as her burial is concerned.

While his brother Emery was still king, Andrew took as his wife Gertrude, the daughter of Berthold IV, duke of Merania from the family of Andechs.<sup>74</sup> Considering the weak and vacillating character of Andrew, the general assessment of their relationship is that she was responsible for much of his rash ambition. During the reign of his brother

---

<sup>72</sup> See János Bak, "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 229-230.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 227.

<sup>74</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 416-417.

Emery, Andrew instigated a rebellion against his brother which was solved by the sick king going straight to Andrew's camp armed only with a staff and taking the rebellious prince by the hand straight into his custody. After imprisoning Andrew in Esztergom, the king then sent Gertrude back to her family – an action which Kosztoľnyik interprets as evidence of her ambition behind the whole affair.<sup>75</sup> It was not until Emery died and Andrew was made guardian for his nephew Laszló III (whose throne he overtook shortly before the young king's death) that Gertrude was allowed to return to Hungary.<sup>76</sup> As Queen of Hungary, Gertrude's nepotism won the resentment of many nobles. Her daughter Elizabeth (who would become St. Elizabeth of Hungary) was sent to the court of Thuringia with one of the most lavish trousseaus imaginable, quite possibly to show off the personal wealth of Andrew and Gertrude.<sup>77</sup> Upon the death of the archbishop of Kalocsa, Gertrude proposed the candidacy of her brother Berthold who took the position in spite of many protests over his unsuitability – in particular the fact that he was much too young to be appointed to the position.<sup>78</sup> Things came to a head on September 28, 1213.

That day, while Andrew II was on his way to Halich, Queen Gertrude was on a hunting trip in Pilis with her brother, Archbishop Berthold of Kalocsa and Leopold VI of Austria. The three were resting in a tent when suddenly, two reeves named Peter and Simon, a noble also named Simon, and Palatine Bánk, a high-ranking official, attacked

---

<sup>75</sup> This would have been around the year 1203. Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1996), 30.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>77</sup> Among the items sent to Thuringia are a silver crib and bathtub, along with jewelry, silk clothing and 8,000 silver marks. Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 40.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

them.<sup>79</sup> The immediate motives behind the attack are somewhat inscrutable – the story some chroniclers tell of Gertrude personally letting her brother rape the wife of Bánk has been largely discredited due in part to a similar story behind Zah’s attack on Queen Elizabeth of Poland, wife of Louis I nearly 150 years later.<sup>80</sup> It is possible the intended target was originally Berthold the Queen’s brother, but both he and Duke Leopold VI of Austria were able to escape. Instead, the reeves Peter and Simon attacked Gertrude, cutting off her arms with a knife. Her body was taken in by the Cistercian monks at Pilis and buried there.<sup>81</sup> While on his way to Halich, Andrew had been handed a piece of her bloodstained clothing and immediately went back to Hungary. While action was immediately taken against the reeve Peter, Bánk merely lost the position of palatine, and it was not until 1240 five years into the reign of Gertrude’s son Béla IV that subsequent action was taken against Bánk and his land confiscated.<sup>82</sup> Bak’s assessment of her murder is that Gertrude herself confirmed a lot of fears the Hungarian nobles had against queens as women, foreigners, and bringers of foreigners to the Hungarian court. Not only that, but also the court of Andrew and Gertrude would have culturally alien compared to the Hungarian nobles – patterns which are evident in hostility towards other, later queens for the same reason.<sup>83</sup>

The excavations of the Cistercian abbey at Pilis (now Piliszentkerest) have revealed several interesting details about this forceful Hungarian queen. The abbey had

---

<sup>79</sup> Kosztolnyik says Leopold IV of Austria, but that Leopold died in 1141, so Leopold VI is a more likely candidate. Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 46.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, p. 49; János Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary”, in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 227-228.

<sup>81</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 46.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 47-48.

<sup>83</sup> János Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary”, in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 227-228.

been founded by Béla III in 1184, one of five Cistercian monasteries he founded.<sup>84</sup> The excavations at the abbey in Pilis by Laszló Gerevich turned up 18-20 fragments of a sarcophagus which Gerevich was able to ascribe to Queen Gertrude.<sup>85</sup> Gerevich goes a step further in his analysis ascribing the sarcophagus and even the floor plan at Pilis to be done by Villard de Honnecourt.<sup>86</sup> The actual text of Honnecourt's notebook states that he saw a church pavement when he was in Hungary and he drew the design of it in Folio 15 – it says nothing about him being behind the design of the pattern. Furthermore, the pattern in Villard's notebook is similar to the pattern at Pilis, but it is not a perfect match.<sup>87</sup> Honnecourt was known to have travelled in Hungary, but in spite of Gerevich's excavation, his connection to Pilis and in particular to Queen Gertrude's sarcophagus is still a tenuous one at best.

A reconstruction of the sarcophagus shows fragments of Gertrude's effigy resting on a pillow attended by an angel, while the box itself has carved arcades on the side with seated monarchs.<sup>88</sup> In terms of influence, Gerevich has shown that many of the carvings on the tomb such as the leaves, heads, drapery, and foliage directly correspond to the south transept portal at Chartres, and the tomb's architectural detail show an acquaintance with the choir in the cathedral at Reims.<sup>89</sup> It also seems to be the one of the earliest, if not the first example of funerary effigies used in Hungary. Royal effigies had been used

---

<sup>84</sup> Dora Wiebenson & Jozsef Sisa, *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998), 18.

<sup>85</sup> Laszló Gerevich, "Ausgrabungen in der Ungarischen Zisterzienserabtei Pilis," *Analecta Cisterciana* XXXIX, 39 (1983), 291-293.

<sup>86</sup> Laszló Gerevich, "Ausgrabungen in der Ungarischen Zisterzienserabtei Pilis," 292.

<sup>87</sup> Carl F. Barnes, *The Portfolio of Villard de Honnecourt*, (Surrey: Ashgate, 2009), 98.

<sup>88</sup> Paul Crossley, "The Architecture of Queenship", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 270.

<sup>89</sup> Laszló Gerevich, "Ausgrabungen in der Ungarischen Zisterzienserabtei Pilis," 292; Paul Crossley, "The Architecture of Queenship", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 270.

elsewhere on the continent, in France starting with the mosaic effigy of Queen Adelaide of Maurienne (d. 1154) wife of Louis VI who seems to have modeled her tomb slab after the Merovingian queen Fredegonde.<sup>90</sup>

Tempting as it is to interpret this bold, innovative sarcophagus as reflecting the queen's bold personality, the chronology of events seems to indicate that the sarcophagus was constructed after her death. The transept at Chartres dates to the decade of her death (1210-1220) and the sarcophagus seems to have been sculpted in the 1220s.<sup>91</sup> Rather than being commissioned by the Queen before her death, this sarcophagus seems to have been made for her body after it had already been deposited at Pilis following her murder. That being said, the construction of this sarcophagus took place while Andrew was still alive, and even though he did not prosecute the murderers of his wife, he was still around when this magnificent sarcophagus was constructed. Given the fact that her murder took place in the Pilis Hills and her body was buried in the nearest abbey, it seems doubtful that her original plan, if she had one, would have entailed her burial at Pilis (or her murder for that matter). That being said, it is interesting that even though Andrew might have ordered the construction of her sarcophagus, her body was not moved during his lifetime.

The final level of analysis of Gertrude's burial concerns her relationship to her husband's place of burial. According to the Cistercian monk Albericus of Trois-Fontaines, the original plan had been for the body of András II to be buried in Nagyvárád, at the feet of St. Laszló I, but complications arose when the Cistercians at the abbey of

---

<sup>90</sup> Kathleen Nolan, *Queens in Stone and Silver*, 54-64.

<sup>91</sup> Paul Crossley, "The Architecture of Queenship", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 270.

Pilis demanded that his body be buried next to Gertrude.<sup>92</sup> Even though he ended up being buried at Egres, the monks at Pilis wanted András to be buried next to his first wife. Egres was also a Cistercian establishment, both of them founded by Béla III, the father of András. The monks of Pilis however, seem to have held on to the body of Gertrude in the expectation that András would then be buried there. Considering the lavish sarcophagus present at their abbey, it could very well have been taken as a sign of the permanent aspect of Gertrude's body resting there. Queen Gertrude's sarcophagus shows a keen interest at the Hungarian court of architectural and artistic feats that were going on elsewhere on the Continent, and even if she was not responsible for its construction, its presence nonetheless is suggestive of a more cosmopolitan aspect of the Árpáadian court. External factors shaped many of the details regarding Gertrude's death and burial, yet her burial is unique in so many aspects. Unlike Anna and Felicia, Gertrude is given her own separate place for burial with a grand monument that hardly seems subordinate to her husband. Though her initial burial at Pilis may have been dictated by necessity rather than her own agency, it seems to have grown into a fitting monument for her while her husband was still alive.

Andrew's second wife **Yolande de Courtenay** was also buried in Hungary as well – the only one of his three wives to be buried beside him.<sup>93</sup> After the murder of his wife Gertrude, Andrew sought to marry again, and in 1215 married Yolande, the daughter of Peter of Courtenay, grandson of Louis VI of France, and Yolanda of Flanders. Andrew had hoped that his marriage to Yolande would entail greater influence in the

---

<sup>92</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 116.

<sup>93</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 116.



former Byzantine lands, but was very disappointed when in 1216 her father was chosen as Latin Emperor of Constantinople instead of himself.<sup>94</sup> When her brother Robert became Emperor of Constantinople in 1220, he visited his sister and was received warmly by the Hungarian court, in spite of Andrew's ambitions in the east having been dashed. Wertner Mór's assessment of her is that considering the murder of her predecessor, Yolande's activity at court was more subdued.<sup>95</sup> While Yolande certainly does not seem to have shown such high-handedness and blatant nepotism, there is some evidence for her queenly activity – Yolande is the first queen of Hungary with an extant charter that has survived in its original format.<sup>96</sup> Upon Yolande's death in 1233, she was buried at the Cistercian monastery of Egres, which had been founded in 1179 by Béla III.<sup>97</sup>

While little is known of Yolande's burial at Egres (Igris), the story of her husband's interment there is typical of the turbulence of Andrew II. According to Albericus of Trois-Fontaines, a Cistercian monk, the original plan had been for the body of Andrew II to be buried in Nagyvárád, at the feet of St. Laszló I, but complications arose when the Cistercians at the abbey of Pilis demanded that his body be buried next to his first wife, the murdered Gertrude. Eventually, the body of Andrew was laid to rest at Egres, next to Yolande, his second wife.<sup>98</sup> It should be noted here that in spite of his

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.; Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 423.

<sup>95</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 423.

<sup>96</sup> This particular one dates to 1224. Attila Zsoldos, "The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpáadian Age (Eleventh-Thirteenth Century)" in *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 151.

<sup>97</sup> "Regina Hoilenz de Hungaria in presentia Iacobi cardinalis et episcoporum moritur et in abbatia de Egris sepelitur. Qui cardinalis per Hungariam hoc anno concilia sua tenuit." Alberichi Chronicon, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores*, XXIII, 933, lines 7-9; Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, 171, n. 506.

<sup>98</sup> For the burial of his third wife, see Beatrice d'Este, chapter 3. Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, 171, n. 506; Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 116.

father being buried at the cathedral in Székesfehérvár, after 1205 none of the Árpáadian monarchs are buried at Székesfehérvár, or even in any cathedral for that matter.<sup>99</sup> Of the abbey at Egres itself, archaeological excavations have uncovered a brick basilica with three aisles and three apses, done in Romanesque style. Andrew II had the abbey enlarged, supposedly with the purpose of having it serve as a royal burial ground.<sup>100</sup> If this had really been the case, it seems to conflict with Albericus' account of his original burial at Nagyvárad. Furthermore, if Andrew's plan was to turn Egres into a royal mausoleum, it seems to have mostly failed as Andrew and Yolande seem to be the only Árpáds buried there.

András II's grandiose plans for a family mausoleum are extremely important when evaluating what why Yolande was buried there. If, according to Albericus, András intended to be buried at Nagyvárad and after a dispute with Pilis ended up being buried at Egres next to Yolande, it would indicate that Yolande's burial took place independent of Andrew's, despite the fact that the two of them were buried there together. On the other hand, if Andrew intended Egres to be his own burial vault, Yolande merely seems to have been the only other member of his family who joined him in that regard. If Albericus is to be believed, his choice of burial at Nagyvárad would not have been unusual: István II chose to be buried at the monastery of St. Laszló I as well,<sup>101</sup> so there is precedent for this kind of action. Other actions of Andrew such as his "leading" of the Fifth Crusade in 1217-1219 and the naming of his sons after earlier Árpáds indicate his own awareness of his family's history – Kálmán had done the same thing. With András II and the start of

---

<sup>99</sup> The last king to be buried there was the infant king Laszló III, András' nephew. Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 32.

<sup>100</sup> Florin Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500-1250*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 354.

<sup>101</sup> Gábor Kosztoľnyik, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 176.

the thirteenth century, it seems that he in particular wanted to build upon the success of his ancestors in creating his own image. Not only did he continue the Cistercian orders founded by his father, but his reign also saw the first foundation of the Dominican and Franciscan houses in Hungary. What seems to be the case with András is that he had many extravagant ideas for his own self-promotion that did not always work in his favor. His journey to the Holy Land in the Fifth Crusade meant that he took the crown of the queen (formerly Gisela of Bavaria's) from the cathedral of Veszprém and sold it in 1217 to finance his mission.<sup>102</sup> The Fifth Crusade itself accomplished little, except for András bringing back a relic from the head of St. Margaret of Antioch.<sup>103</sup> His lavish tomb for his first wife at Pilis and his expansion of Egres meant that Andrew understood the importance of manipulating symbolic imagery in power, even as the Hungarian nobles were eroding his regalian rights. Though the evidence does not support much agency on the part of Yolande in the place of her burial, her husband nonetheless understood the importance of being buried in style.

The last Hungarian who predeceased her husband and is known to be buried in Hungary is one of the last queens of the Árpáadian dynasty. **Fenenna of Kujava** was a Polish princess, the daughter of Siemomysł, the duke of Kujava (Kujawy) and Łęczyca and Salome of Pomerania, who Długosz mistakenly states Fenenna married Stephen V of Hungary.<sup>104</sup> In reality, she was the first wife of the last Árpáadian king of Hungary, Andrew III (r. 1290-1301). In her few years as Queen of Hungary, Fenenna is known to

---

<sup>102</sup> András Uzsocki, "Die Echtheit des Grabes der ungarischen Königin Gisela in Passau," 14.

<sup>103</sup> Gábor Kosztoľnyik, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 261.

<sup>104</sup> Jan Długosz & Maurice Michael, ed. *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, (Chichester: I.M. Publications, 1997), 212.

have given birth to Andrew's only child, a daughter named Elizabeth. Due to the better preservation of later material, there are also a few of her charters still extant, including a gift of an estate near Pápa to one of the legal officers of the royal court.<sup>105</sup> The date of her death is unknown, but there are several factors that pinpoint it further. Based off the date of the latest charter attributed to her, it seems she died sometime after September 8 in the year 1295.<sup>106</sup> Other sources speak of the fact that she died in Advent, putting her death in the month of December, even if there is some confusion in the primary sources over the year of her death.<sup>107</sup> The main problem is the sources stating that she died in Advent of 1296, when that was the year Andrew began negotiations for his second wife, Agnes of Austria, daughter of Albrecht I of Habsburg. It seems most likely that Fenenna died in December of 1295, before Andrew III's second marriage.

Unfortunately, the place of her burial at this point is also speculative. István Soltész suggests that she was possibly buried next to her husband in the Franciscan monastery at Buda<sup>108</sup>, though there does not seem to be any evidence behind this claim. If Fenenna was indeed buried at the Franciscan monastery at Buda, it would follow the pattern of burials for queens predeceasing their husbands in the thirteenth century, as in the case of the burial of Andrew II and his second wife Yolande. Rather than being buried at a cathedral, these burials are meant to seem more humble, connected to particular orders of the monarchs' choice. Budapest in particular is known to have had a few Franciscan houses – one was the convent of St. John, installed in 1248 and

---

<sup>105</sup> Attila Zsoldos, "The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpáadian Age (Eleventh-Thirteenth Century)" in *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., 153.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> "Nam in primo anno regni sui duxit uxorem de Polonia, que obit in Adventu Domini anno Domini M-o CC-o L-o XXXXVI-o. In eodem autem anno ante Ascensionem Domini duxit in uxorem filiam ducis Austriae." Imre Szentpetery, *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, (Budapest: Academia litter. hungarica atque Societate history, 1937-1938) Vol. I, 477, lines 22-25.

<sup>108</sup> István Soltész, *Árpád-hazi kiralynek*, (Budapest: Maecenas, 1999), 209.

refurbished in 1265.<sup>109</sup> The other famous Franciscan establishment near Buda would have been the convent founded on Margaret Island (see Maria Laskarina, chapter 3). The latter monastery had a direct connection to the royal family in that it was the house where St. Margaret of Hungary, daughter of Béla IV made her residence. Considering that András III had several powerful contenders in relation to the Hungarian throne, stressing continuity with the most recent reputable Hungarian king would have been a wise move. There were still several people familiar with the previous dynasty in Hungary at this point, including Isabella of Naples, the widow of Laszló IV (r. 1272-1290).

The other point in Fenenna's presumed burial at the Franciscan monastery in Buda is the complete move away from cathedral burials. The last Hungarian king of the Árpád dynasty to be buried in a cathedral was Imre (r. 1196-1204) who was buried at the cathedral in Eger.<sup>110</sup> The last queen to be buried in a cathedral is Imre's mother, Anna.<sup>111</sup> In Hungary, this seems to suggest that both kings and queens of the thirteenth century preferred to be buried in specific monastic settlements rather than in cathedrals. Elsewhere in Europe other monarchs had moved away from burials in cathedrals. Eleanor of Aquitaine is believed to be the engineer behind the Angevin burials at the abbey of Fontevrault.<sup>112</sup> Henry III and Edward I of England were buried in Westminster Abbey with the explicit purpose of connecting themselves to the cult of the English king Edward the Confessor.<sup>113</sup> In Poland, the pattern is similar as it is in Hungary. Polish kings of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries seem to have favored burial at the

---

<sup>109</sup> John R. H. Moorman, *Medieval Franciscan Houses*, (St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute St. Bonaventure University, 1983), 94-95.

<sup>110</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 272.

<sup>111</sup> Constance of Aragon was also buried in a Cathedral at Palermo, but this hardly counts as she died as Queen of Sicily and Holy Roman Empress – see chapter 4.

<sup>112</sup> Kathleen Nolan, *Queens in Stone and Silver*, 28

<sup>113</sup> John Steane, *The Archaeology of the Medieval English Monarchy*, 45.

cathedral in Poznań, yet in the twelfth century, there starts to be more monastic burials, starting with the displaced Wladyslaw II being buried at a Cistercian cloister in Pforta.<sup>114</sup> Though little specific information can be derived from Fenenna's burial, it nonetheless is reflective not only of events going on in Europe, but also immediate dynastic concerns of her family.

The individual cases have already been covered, and some conclusions can be made from them. These six queens who predeceased their husbands for the most part did not reign very long: Fenenna for 5 years, Felicia anywhere from 5 to 15 years, Adelaide and Agnes for 12, Gertrude for 13, Yolande for 18. Of the six women concerned, three – possibly four – were interred next to their husbands. In most of these cases, what is known of their burials is that the queen's tomb in terms of placement, size, or epitaph seems to have been deliberately subordinate to that of her husband's. Only Adelaide of Rheinfelden and Yolande de Courtenay have evidence, however minimal, suggesting the possibility that their location of burial reflects their own choice. The main change that took place in queenly burials in this set is the transition from Cathedral to abbey or monastery: Adelaide, Felicia and Agnes were buried in cathedrals while Gertrude, Yolande, and Fenenna seem to have been buried in monasteries. Unfortunately, the overall evidence is too sparse to argue for most of these queens' deciding any aspect of their burial. Yet their burial nonetheless is reflective of realities and concerns of their husbands. An opportunist like András II could not afford to give up an opportunity to display symbolic power and wealth in spite of his dwindling regal power. A monument to his deceased wife is certainly a reflection of this. The possible burial of Fenenna in

---

<sup>114</sup> Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 280-281.

Buda very well could have been an attempt by András III to cement his relationship with the previous Árpáadian kings. The epitaph of Adelaide, unchanged despite the elevation of her husband to sainthood, seems to reflect a subordinate role to her husband, perhaps the way he wished the world to remember his mostly forgotten wife. The grave goods and skeleton of Agnes/Anna of Antioch represent a treasure trove that is not normally available in the archaeological record, but one that pales in comparison to the goods uncovered in the more prominent tomb of her husband. The beautiful sarcophagus of the slain queen Gertrude reflects many influences that would have been familiar to the Meranian queen, and display several innovations in style, but the chronology seems to indicate that the fine piece of workmanship was constructed after her death. What this analysis does show is that the burials reflected the changing attitudes of personal faith from the switch of cathedrals to monasteries. The queens, as well as the kings, were aware of changing aspects and attitudes of the church, and their burials in the thirteenth century reflect this. Not only were queens (and their husbands) buried in monasteries, but in the foundations of certain orders that they chose to patronize, such as the Cistercians and Franciscans. In many ways, the burials of Hungarian queens who predeceased their husbands are similar to what was happening elsewhere on the continent. The evidence base may differ from case to case, but all the same these burials were understood in a larger dynastic context.

## Chapter 2: Dowager Queens buried in Hungary

The majority of known Hungarian queens of the Árpáadian dynasty outlived their husbands. Of these widowed queen dowagers, the overwhelming majority of them left Hungary at some point and were thus buried abroad, as shall be seen in chapters three and four. This chapter however, will discuss four Hungarian queens who outlived their husbands and were still buried in the crown of St. István. The four women in question are: Sarolta of Transylvania (d. 1008?) wife of prince Géza (r. 975-997); Jelena (Helen/Ilona) of Serbia (d. 1146?) wife of Béla II “the Blind” (r. 1131-1141); Maria Laskarina (d. 1270), wife of Béla IV (r. 1235-1270) and Elizabeth of the Cumans, wife of István V (r. 1270-1272). There are several issues that need to be explored with these four women.

- 1) Where in Hungary were they buried?
- 2) Where in comparison were their husbands buried?
- 3) Would there have been any other options for their place of burial?
- 4) Did these women have any remaining natal kin upon their death?
- 5) What were the favorable circumstances that enabled a burial within Hungary?

In comparison with other queens of the Árpáadian dynasty, each of these women had unique experiences as dowagers. The goal of this chapter is thus to reconcile circumstances in widowhood as they relate to burial within the lands of the Crown of St. István.



**Sarolta of Transylvania**, wife of the Magyar prince Géza is not a Hungarian queen in the strictest sense of the word – her husband was never crowned king and Hungary was only made into a kingdom with her son, St. István I. However, she is the mother of a king and she is the earliest known consort of a leader of the Magyars and for the purposes of this research, her treatment in widowhood is certainly noteworthy for several reasons. While the precise location of her burial is unknown, it is nonetheless worth investigating her treatment as a widow and comparing it to the experiences of her successors.

First, it is necessary to discuss the tangled historiographical tradition surrounding the mother of St. István. Contemporary sources speak of Géza's wife as the daughter of prince Gyula of Transylvania, who Thietmar of Merseburg calls *Beleknegini*, which is derived from the Bulgarian-Turkish *Sar-aldy*, or Sarolta as she is more commonly called.<sup>115</sup> Thietmar is particularly critical of Géza's wife, stating that she rode her horse like a man, was an inebriate, and killed a man in a fit of rage. Bruno of Querfurt writes that she “governed her husband and everything that belonged to him.”<sup>116</sup> On the other hand, Polish chroniclers writing centuries after the death of prince Géza and St. István began the tradition that Géza was converted to Christianity by his wife, a Polish princess named Adelaide, the daughter or sister of Mieszko I who then gave birth to his son St. István. The legends surrounding Adelaide bear a marked similarity to what is known of Mieszko's conversion to Christianity by his own wife, Dubravka of Bohemia. The primary culprits in establishing this questionable chain of events are the Polish-

---

<sup>115</sup> Beleknegini means “White dame” while Sar-aldy means “weasel”, though in this context it means “white lady”. György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1994), 45.

<sup>116</sup> Bruno's statements were made towards the end of Geza's reign, when he had been ill for a while. *Ibid.*

Hungarian Chronicle from the second half of the fourteenth century,<sup>117</sup> and later Polish sources that used it such as Długosz.<sup>118</sup> Later historians had difficulty reconciling these two disparate traditions – some stated that Thietmar’s violent wife was actually meant to be Adelaide, while others treated Sarolta as the first wife and Adelaide as the second wife.<sup>119</sup> The lack of any contemporary evidence for Adelaide of Poland means that most modern historians fail to see any evidence for her existence, for Géza divorcing Sarolta to marry her, or for Sarolta’s early death and Géza’s remarriage.<sup>120</sup> In addition, the confusion over Adelaide’s name (which would not enter the Piast dynasty until 100 years later, after the canonization of St. Adelaide of Burgundy) can be interpreted as confusion between St. István and St. Laszló – the latter’s wife was named Adelaide.<sup>121</sup> The consensus nowadays is that the colorful princess in Thietmar’s account outlived her husband, bore St. István to prince Géza, and never had to compete with a Polish princess.

Next, it is vital to trace Sarolta’s actions after the death of her husband. In 997, prince Géza died and was then buried at the chapel of St. Peter & St. Paul in Székesfehérvár.<sup>122</sup> The rule of her son István was immediately challenged by Koppány, duke of Somogy, whose first action was to besiege the castle at Veszprém, where Sarolta was living. The reason for doing this is that Koppány wanted to assert his own candidacy for leading the Magyars and invoking the tradition of levirate marriage by marrying the widow of the former chief would have been instrumental in securing his own power.<sup>123</sup> In 1003, Sarolta’s brother Gyula of Transylvania surrendered to István and Gyula and his

---

<sup>117</sup> C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, 173, 179.

<sup>118</sup> Jan Długosz, *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, 1-6.

<sup>119</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 25-31.

<sup>120</sup> In fact, Sarolta outlived Geza. György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, 45-47.

<sup>121</sup> C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, 179.

<sup>122</sup> György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, 163.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

family were given a residence in the county of Heves, where Sarolta lived.<sup>124</sup> It seems that Sarolta lived until the year 1008.<sup>125</sup> Since her son was still in power by the time of her death, it thus seems most likely that her place of burial would have been within the borders of Hungary. Unfortunately, the exact place of her burial in the country is unknown. During her lifetime she is known to have established a Greek monastery at Veszprém which followed the Basilian rite.<sup>126</sup> She is known to have owned property in Heves, but she founded a religious house in Veszprém and was living there when Koppány tried to marry her. The chronology for the construction of the cathedral at Veszprém (founded by her daughter-in-law, Gisela of Bavaria) is problematic – dated roughly to the first decade of the eleventh century, it is a shaky hypothesis for burial location at best.<sup>127</sup> The place of Sarolta's burial is unknown, but considering the submission of her brother to her son, it is doubtful that she would have returned to Transylvania for burial.

Though current information can not answer the first three questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, it is worth exploring the last two: Sarolta's relationship with her natal kin, and why she would have been buried in Hungary. As mentioned above, Sarolta still had members of her family around in the person of her brother Gyula. However, they were living under the watchful eye of her son at the time of her death, and unlike the queens in chapters three and four, there would not have been any incentive for her to return to a Transylvania where her natal kin no longer ruled. Why Sarolta was

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 99.

<sup>125</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 435.

<sup>126</sup> Z. J. Kosztonyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds, 890s to 1063*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2002), 59.

<sup>127</sup> Kralovansky states the bishopric at Veszprém was founded in 1009, while Györffy states that the first Latin Episcopal church would have been founded between 997 and 1001. A. Kralovánsky, "The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages", in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, Laszló Gerevich ed., 54; György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, 104.

buried in Hungary is a trickier question to answer, especially as the location of her tomb is unknown. However, it should be pointed out that her son was still king at the time of her death, and he had been able to successfully combat opponents to his rule. Most of Sarolta's life had been spent in Hungary, she had endowed a Greek monastery, and according to Bruno of Querfurt even controlled her husband in her final days. The chain of reasoning best supported by what is known of Sarolta's final days indicates her burial in Hungary. It should be made clear however, that other widowed queens who spent their retirement in Hungary ended up being buried elsewhere. Gisela of Bavaria, Eufrozina of Kiev and Isabella of Naples (chapter 3) all spent many years in retirement in Hungary and yet were buried in monasteries outside the country. Compared to them, what is different about Sarolta's experience is the fact that their departure from Hungary was facilitated by a sudden change in power related to the succession. Assuming she lived until 1008, Sarolta had experienced no such violent political shift, and as such appears to have died in Hungary while her son was still securely on the throne.

The next widowed queen to be buried in Hungary was **Helen (Ilona/Jelena) of Serbia**. The wife of Béla II "the Blind" (r. 1131-1141), Helen is best remembered for her calling the council of Arad, wherein she ordered the death of 68 nobles who were responsible for the blinding of her husband as an infant. She and her brother, the *ban* Belos, were mostly responsible for running affairs during the reign of Béla II, and she appears in the record as a forceful personality who avoided being turned into a scapegoat like many other Hungarian queens.<sup>128</sup> Regrettably, little is known about the

---

<sup>128</sup> "Contemporaries and national memory alike seem to have accepted the execution of some sixty-eight magnates at the meeting of 1131 (or 1132) in Arad, engineered by Queen Ilona. Or, to be more

circumstances of her death, but all the same what is known is nonetheless suggestive.

With Helen, it is worth exploring what links her burial had with her husband, what it says about her status in widowhood, and most importantly, what evidence is used as information regarding her death and burial.

The Hungarian king Béla II was blinded as an infant with his father by his uncle, King Kálmán who thought that Béla's father Almos was plotting against him. Kálmán wanted to secure the throne for his son István II, and eliminate all other rivals. There is even a legend that Kálmán wanted Béla castrated but the person responsible castrated a dog instead and left the blinded Béla intact.<sup>129</sup> The reign of István II proved to be very unstable however, and the issue of succession was a particularly contentious one. In about 1129, towards the end of his reign when István II was ill, Béla was discovered alive, and István married him to Helen, the daughter of Uroš I of Raška and his wife Anna, possibly a niece of Alexius I Komnenos.<sup>130</sup> Her dowry would have comprised part of northern Serbia, probably northeastern Bosnia and Mačva.<sup>131</sup> Shortly after their marriage, she gave birth to their son Géza and István II gave Béla and his young family a residence at Tolna.<sup>132</sup> The next one hears of Helen, she is presiding at the council of Arad. She is seated there next to her husband, and her four sons (Géza, Laszló, István and Almos) are seated on either side of the king.<sup>133</sup> The presence of her four sons indicates that the council would have taken place at least four years after her marriage in

---

cynical, no one was left alive to spread her bad fame.” János M. Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary”, in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 226.

<sup>129</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 150, 133.

<sup>130</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 134 n. 94; Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn”, 22.

<sup>131</sup> John V. A. Fine, *The early medieval Balkans*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983) 236.

<sup>132</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 157, 135.

<sup>133</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 160, 136.

1129.<sup>134</sup> Tuzson points out that she came to Arad with her sons to show that her husband had not in fact been castrated.<sup>135</sup> As mentioned above, sixty-eight nobles were duly killed after their involvement in blinding Béla was established and their property divided among the cathedral churches.<sup>136</sup> Helen and her brother the *ban* Belos seem to have done most of the de facto ruling for the blinded king Béla. Using the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle as a source, Kosztolnyik states that the Queen died by 1139, which caused the king to drink heavily.<sup>137</sup> The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle does in fact mention Béla's indulgence with wine and the fact that courtiers took advantage of his inebriation, but it does not make mention of Helen's death.<sup>138</sup> Mór also suggests the possibility that Helen died around 1138, near the time of her daughter Sophia's engagement to Frederick, son of Holy Roman Emperor Conrad III. However, Mór points to a letter from Sophia dated to 1146-1147 which is addressed to her mother indicating that she outlived Béla by several years.<sup>139</sup> He also points to a document from Géza II written in 1157 which refers to both of his parents as being dead.<sup>140</sup> Thus based on the letter of Sophia, Helen is believed to have died some time after 1146.

Determining the place of Helen's burial poses other problems as well. Béla is known to have been buried at Székesfehérvár following his death in 1141.<sup>141</sup> Mór does

---

<sup>134</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 101.

<sup>135</sup> John Tuzson, *István II*, 144.

<sup>136</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 160, 136.

<sup>137</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 106-107, 111 n 96.

<sup>138</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 162, 137.

<sup>139</sup> "Excellentissime matri sue N. regine Nobilissime N. Christi et ipsius ancilla videre d(ominu)m d(eum) in Syon vel regem r(egum) cum decore s(alutem)." Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 299-300.

<sup>140</sup> "pro salute animarum matris et patris mei" Ibid., 301.

<sup>141</sup> "on the Ides of February, a Thursday" Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 163, 137.

not state the place of Queen Helen's burial.<sup>142</sup> It is assumed that following her death after 1146, Helen would also have been buried at Székesfehérvár herself.<sup>143</sup> All four of her sons were interred at Székesfehérvár as well.<sup>144</sup> Henszlmann attributes a skeleton uncovered in the 1864 excavations to Helen not only because he said it was similar to the skeleton identified as that of her husband, but also he says the age matches – according to him Helen died in 1139, and would have been roughly 30 years at the time of her death.<sup>145</sup> There are several problems with this assumption that need to be pointed out. First is the problem of associating Helen's skeleton with that of her husband's due to their proximity and similar appearance. Second is the fact that Helen may have died several years after 1139, and this young skeleton may be a misidentification, since its age at death is a main argument that it belongs to Helen.

If Helen was indeed buried at Székesfehérvár, it would be one of the few instances where a Hungarian queen was buried in the same establishment as her husband. Unfortunately, the evidence from the archaeological reports is unable to place them, so not much can be said about their interment other than that it was at the cathedral at Székesfehérvár. Helen's experience as Hungarian queen is admittedly unusual, and there are certainly other factors to consider when analyzing her place of burial. At the time of her death, her brother Belos was still alive. He had become the ban of Croatia and Dalmatia in 1142 and in 1145 would become the count palatine – one of the court's highest positions.<sup>146</sup> Belos is known to have remained in Hungary until 1157, when he

---

<sup>142</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 302.

<sup>143</sup> The archaeologist Henszlmann mentions that she would have been roughly 30 years old at the time of her death and died in 1139. Imre Henszlmann, *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye*, (Pesten: Heckenast Gusztáv Bizománya, 1864 ), 211.

<sup>144</sup> Pál Engel, "Temetkezések a középkori Székesfehérvári Bazilikában" in *Szazadok* 121 (1987), 620-621.

<sup>145</sup> Imre Henszlmann, *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye*, 211.

<sup>146</sup> John V. A. Fine, *The early medieval Balkans*, 236.

got caught in an unsavory plot with Géza's brother István.<sup>147</sup> Furthermore Helen's son was ruling at the time of her death and her most immediate connections not only to her husband's family but also to her natal family were in Hungary. In short, the burial of Helen in Hungary is plausible due to favorable circumstances in Hungary upon her death. The archaeological evidence regrettably remains inconclusive in this instance.

It is not until more than a century later that another widowed Hungarian queen was buried in the land she ruled. **Maria Laskarina**, wife of Béla IV (r. 1235-1270) had been queen for nearly 35 years, and she only outlived Béla IV by a couple of months. Maria is known to have been active as a queen in her own right, involving herself with severable foundations and charters. Upon her death she was buried with her husband and younger son Béla at the Franciscan monastery at Esztergom.<sup>148</sup> The question with Maria Laskarina is thus determining what her own relationship to the monastery would have been (independent of her husband) and how her burial at Esztergom reflects her own activities as queen.

This solid marriage between Béla and Maria had a very rocky start. In 1218, after Béla's father Andrew II had returned from his pilgrimage, Andrew married Béla to Maria, the daughter of Theodore Laskaris, the emperor of Nicaea and his second wife Anna Angelina.<sup>149</sup> However, several years later, Andrew II persuaded Béla to break off the engagement for it seems he felt the marriage beneath Béla. An investigation was conducted, and the bishops felt Béla had no legal grounds to divorce Maria and so they

---

<sup>147</sup> Who would later be the grasping anti-king István IV. Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 68.

<sup>148</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 179, 140; Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 247-248.

<sup>149</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 460.



advised him to keep her. Béla followed the advice of the bishops, angering his father which led to him and his reconciled wife Maria fleeing to Austria under the protection of Leopold VI of Austria.<sup>150</sup> Other than this brief episode and the chronology of her children being born, little is known of Maria's life until her coronation at Székesfehérvár in 1235.<sup>151</sup> In 1241, Maria and Béla fled Hungary under the severe onslaught of the Mongol army, and the subsequent decades of Béla's reign were spent rebuilding Hungary. Construction began in 1246 on a monastery for Béla and Maria's daughter Margaret (later St. Margaret of Hungary) on Rabbit Island near Budapest – now known as Margaret Island. The land used for this project had formerly been the site of the Queen's manor house – Maria is known to have had her own house in the monastery once it was completed and stayed there frequently.<sup>152</sup> Kosztolnyik attributes an alliance in the 1260s with Bohemia-Austria to Maria's influence. In 1259, Béla donated the strategic fort of Visegrád on the Danube to his wife, who used her own money to restore it.<sup>153</sup> In 1269, her chancellor the bishop of Veszprém ensured that the office of queen's chancellor would always be connected to the bishop of Veszprém.<sup>154</sup> Thus Maria Laskarina appears in the historical record as a staunch supporter of her husband, and a contributor in her own right to the rebuilding of Hungary.

Béla IV died on May 3, 1270 on Margaret Island.<sup>155</sup> It was his wish that Ottokar II of Bohemia & Austria (his son-in-law) protect Maria and her retinue – specifically

---

<sup>150</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 86-87.

<sup>151</sup> Pál Engel, "Temetkezések a középkori Székesfehérvári Bazilikában", 634.

<sup>152</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 260-261.

<sup>153</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 209; Dora Wiebenson and József Sisa, eds., *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, 23.

<sup>154</sup> The earliest known royal curia seems to be attributed to Margaret of France, in chapter 3. János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 19.

<sup>155</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 170, 140.

from their son István, who took the throne as István V.<sup>156</sup> There had been a great deal of hostility between Béla and István over the years, so Béla was concerned about the fate of his wife, even though her son was on the throne. Maria lived long enough to see the coronation of her son at Székesfehérvár before her own death.<sup>157</sup> The *Necrologium Saeldentalense* states that “*Maria regina Ungarie*” would have died on July 16 1270,<sup>158</sup> while the *Necrologium Althae Superioris* gives July 24 1270 as the date of her death.<sup>159</sup> Maria, Béla, her husband for 52 years, and their younger son Béla were all laid to rest in the crypt of the Franciscan Minorites in Esztergom.<sup>160</sup> The place of their burial is now the site of the Esztergom City Parish Church, built on the ruins of the monastery.<sup>161</sup> The unfortunate reality of the situation is that little archaeological data can be extracted from the site of their burial.

However, in this case the historical sources can provide some information about Maria’s burial. Maria was interred in the same establishment as her husband, perhaps even in close proximity. Insofar as other potential sites of burial are concerned, it is known that Béla and Maria founded several religious establishments of their own, especially following the wake of the Mongol destruction. Land that Maria owned was used for the Dominican monastery the couple built for their daughter St. Margaret. In addition to being buried in a Franciscan monastery, Béla IV was known to be a great benefactor to the order, even becoming a Franciscan tertiary.<sup>162</sup> The earliest foundation of Dominican and Franciscan monasteries occurred in 1221 and 1229, during the reign of

---

<sup>156</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 247.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 248.

<sup>158</sup> “XVII. kal.” *Necrologium Saeldentalense*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Antiquitates*, Vol. 3, 365.

<sup>159</sup> “IX. kal.” *Necrologium Althae Superioris*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Antiquitates*, Vol. 3, 231.

<sup>160</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 248.

<sup>161</sup> Charles Hebbert, Norm Longley, and Dan Richardson, *Rough guide to Hungary*, (London: Rough Guides, 2002), 173.

<sup>162</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 231.

Béla's father Andrew II.<sup>163</sup> The Franciscan monastery that Béla and Maria would have been buried at would have been founded in the time of Andrew II.<sup>164</sup> By 1277, there would be thirty Dominican monasteries, and by the death of Béla IV in 1270, there would be twenty-five Franciscan monasteries.<sup>165</sup> In addition, Béla and Maria were not the only contemporary monarchs to be buried at Franciscan settlements: Peter III of Aragon was buried at Villanuova in 1285, and even Pope Adrian V was buried at Viterbo in 1276, the first pope to be buried in a Franciscan monastery.<sup>166</sup> While holy princes and princesses may have chosen to live their lives at Franciscan or Dominican establishments and end up buried there, the second half of the thirteenth century clearly shows an interest in secular rulers choosing these religious houses for their own place of burial. Maria Laskarina seems to have shown a preference of her own to the Dominican order her daughter St. Margaret took part in, and there does not seem to be any established tradition of her supporting the Franciscans with the same enthusiasm her husband had. That is not to say, however, that her burial at the Franciscan Minorite's crypt in Esztergom was entirely the choice of her husband – it was the order he favored, and her burial next to him has many potential explanations.

In terms of Maria's natal kin, the Empire of Nicaea ceased to exist in 1261, and by the time of her death in 1270 she had spent the past 52 years of her life in Hungary. Even though Béla IV seems to have worried about her treatment by their son István V, Maria would not have had existing, powerful natal kin to fall back on should her son fail to protect. Finally, there were several factors that contributed in some way to Maria's

---

<sup>163</sup> Dora Wiebenson and József Sisa, eds., *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, 27.

<sup>164</sup> Before 1235. John R. H. Moorman, *Medieval Franciscan Houses*, 174.

<sup>165</sup> Dora Wiebenson and József Sisa, eds., *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, 27.

<sup>166</sup> Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 96.

burial in Esztergom. Maria died within months of her husband, so unlike other queens whose existence as a dowager proved problematic, Maria would have only been a widow a very short while. Maria also died while her son was on the throne. Though Béla had reservations about the rebellious István V, his succession to the throne appears to have been a smooth one. Maria had also been Queen of Hungary for 35 years – a record beaten in the Árpáadian age only by Gisela of Bavaria, wife of István I. Considering her involvement in the monastery on Margaret Island and her fortification of Visegrád, not only was Maria a well-established queen, but also one who pursued independent projects herself.

That being said, her support of Dominican establishments and subsequent burial at a Franciscan house is not at odds with the idea of her having agency in her own burial. The majority of thirteenth century Hungarian kings were buried with their wives, including Béla's father and Béla's son.<sup>167</sup> Maria Laskarina would have died while her son was on the throne, and she would have had her own chancellor to help carry out her wishes. Since she would have been over 60 when she died, it is plausible that she would have been involved in arranging the details of her own burial. Though there are certain unique circumstances related to Maria Laskarina's final days, in a lot of ways it conforms to changing dynastic burial patterns in the late thirteenth century.

Nearly all Árpáadian queens were foreign princesses of one kind or another: roughly half came from Western Europe, half from neighboring countries to the north, east, and south (i.e. Poland, Kiev or Serbia) and the remainders were of Byzantine extraction. There seem to have been only two exceptions. One was the wife of Samuel

---

<sup>167</sup> And possibly András III (see chapter 1).

Aba, the Magyar nobleman who asserted his claim to the Hungarian throne through his wife, the sister of St. István I. The other is **Elizabeth of the Cumans**, the daughter of a chieftain of the pagan, nomadic Cumans and wife of István V (r. 1270-1272).<sup>168</sup> In spite of the fact that Helen of Serbia and Eufrozina of Kiev would exercise de facto power for their young sons, Elizabeth was the first queen to be officially made regent in Árpáadian Hungary after the short reign of her husband. In spite of the fact that Elizabeth is queen in the late thirteenth century and sources are much more plentiful, very little is known of Elizabeth's death or burial. However, based on the patterns of preceding queens, the little that is known indicates similar conditions at her death with the other women in this chapter.

The Cumans had been moved west by the Mongol attacks and were eventually given privileges in Hungary after they settled there. Wishing to keep their loyalty, Béla IV married his son István to the daughter of their leader in 1254.<sup>169</sup> It had been thought that Elizabeth's father was the Cuman chieftain Kuthen (Kotony), but based on the fact that he died in 1241 and Elizabeth's family was converted after that, it seems more likely that her father was the chieftain Zeyhan. Upon her christening and marriage, the Cuman princess was given the name Elizabeth.<sup>170</sup> Relations between Béla and his son István were very strained, with the young son often rebelling against his father. After István occupied his mother's lands in eastern Hungary (his mother was Maria Laskarina), Béla counterattacked and took István's wife Elizabeth and their children captive at Patak.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons ed., 13-14.

<sup>169</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 190; 1247 is also given as a date. Nora Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 261 n. 197.

<sup>170</sup> Nora Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, 88 n 56.

<sup>171</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 209.

After the death of István V in 1272, Elizabeth took the title of regent for her young son, Laszló IV (r. 1272-1290) until 1277. The regency in general is seen as an unstable period with many local nobles vying for power, and Elizabeth is usually blamed for failing to keep order and for favoring her fellow Cumans in appointments.<sup>172</sup> Others have questioned the sincerity of her conversion to Christianity in spite of the many donations she made for her own salvation and that of her family. Nora Berend has challenged these notions of Elizabeth, stating that many of her actions seen as excessive or uninformed were actually typical actions associated with queenly behavior.<sup>173</sup> Though she does not appear in Bak's treatment of queens as scapegoats, blaming the troubles of the regency on the queen rather than the opportunistic nobles who wreaked so much havoc does fit well in that paradigm.

Unfortunately, virtually nothing is known of her death. There is a seal of hers from 1280,<sup>174</sup> and a charter of hers has been dated to 1282.<sup>175</sup> She is not mentioned after the death of her son in 1290 or in the reign of his successor, Andrew III. Mór points to a charter from Andrew's second wife Agnes of Habsburg that speaks of Béla, István, and both of their wives as being deceased.<sup>176</sup> In most cases, the general bookend for Elizabeth's life is usually given as the year 1290, though it is not universal.<sup>177</sup> The place

---

<sup>172</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 255. For other studies of the problems related to queen-regents elsewhere on the continent, see Roger Collins, "Queens-Dowager and Queens-Regent in Tenth Century León and Navarre" ed. Anne J. Duggan, *Medieval Queenship*, 79-92 and André Poulet "Capetian Women and the Regency: The Genesis of a Vocation" ed. Anne J. Duggan, *Medieval Queenship*, 93-116.

<sup>173</sup> Nora Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, 262-263.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 263.

<sup>175</sup> Attila Zsoldos, "The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpáadian Age" in *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., 153.

<sup>176</sup> Though the problem with this charter is that Mór says it dates to 1295, which is impossible as Agnes was not married to Andrew until the following year. Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 505.

<sup>177</sup> János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons ed., 24.

of her burial is even more elusive. The only clue alluded to in the secondary literature is a tradition Mór mentions wherein it is generally assumed that Elizabeth would have been buried at the Dominican monastery on Margaret Island.<sup>178</sup> The monastery had particularly significant dynastic ties to the Árpáds, and in particular to Elizabeth – this was the location where her husband István V's burial.<sup>179</sup>

It is worth investigating the claim that Elizabeth was buried at Margaret Island with her husband. Looking at other examples of Hungarian queens, there are several cases where the husband and wife were not buried together even if they were buried in Hungary (possibly Sarolta of Transylvania and Prince Géza, Adelaide of Rheinfelden and St. Laszló I, Andrew II and Gertrude of Meran). However, there are also several other cases where the pair were buried together (Andrew II and Yolande de Courtenay of Constantinople, Béla IV and Maria Laskarina, possibly Béla II and Helen of Serbia, possibly Andrew III and Fenenna of Kujava). The thirteenth century in particular seems to be where many of the couples were buried together when possible. Even though Elizabeth's burial at Margaret Island is not proven, the suggestion nonetheless seems consistent with dynastic burial patterns in the Árpád dynasty at that particular moment. It is very difficult to gauge whether or not there would have been other options for Elizabeth's burial, and it is generally not known which particular religious institutions she would have favored. Thus while there is nothing in the way of proof supporting the theory that Elizabeth of the Cumans was buried at Margaret Island, the theory is itself a plausible one.

---

<sup>178</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 505.

<sup>179</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 180, 141.

It is also unknown what precise relationship Elizabeth had with her natal kin at the time of her death. Berend points out that a seal of hers from 1273 refers to her as daughter of the emperor of the Cumans, but that a later one from 1280 has excised that particular phrase.<sup>180</sup> It seems most likely that she was closer to the Árpáadian dynasty at the time of her death than to her remaining natal kin. As mentioned above, even though it seems Zeyhan was her father, there seems to be no record of them alive by the time she became regent. Lastly, there seem to be several aspects of her widowhood that would prove favorable to burial within Hungary. First is the fact that she is the only Árpáadian queen to have the official title of regent. Though it was a regency with many problems on many fronts, at this point Hungary was her adopted homeland, and there probably would have been no place outside the country for her to go to after the death of her husband. Second is that she seems to have died during the reign of her son Laszló IV. While this can not be empirically proved with the paltry evidence available, there is virtually no indication that she survived into the reign of András III. Third is that her family at the time of her death would have solely consisted of her husband's family and her children. Beyond that, it is next to impossible to determine anything more about the death of Elizabeth without launching headfirst into the realm of conjecture.

The four women covered in this chapter are all similar in that they were buried within Hungary following the deaths of their husbands. That being the case, there are many similarities these four women share as well. All four of them are believed to have died not only while their sons were still alive but also while their sons were on the Hungarian throne. Unlike other Hungarian queens, these women were not caught up in a

---

<sup>180</sup> Nora Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, 262-263.



no-holds-barred struggle for the throne after the death of their husband. There is no evidence to indicate that any of these women remarried after the death of their husbands either (though Koppány of Somogy did try to wed Sarolta of Transylvania.) The overall evidence for information surrounding their burials is uniformly in a poor state – the only burial location agreed upon across the board is that of Maria Laskarina, and it is assumed that the other three were interred in close proximity to their husbands. On one hand, it could show a concerted effort on the part of these widows to be buried with their deceased husbands, but the evidence is too paltry to draw too many conclusions on their own choice in place of burial. The four women all seem to be heavily involved with various aspects of ruling as well – Elizabeth of the Cumans became regent for her son Laszló IV, and Helen of Serbia served along with her brother as de facto regent for her young son as well.

There are some minor differences that should be pointed out as well. The periods of widowhood varied considerably: Maria Laskarina was only a widow for two months, Sarolta 11 years at the most, Elizabeth at no more than 12 years, and Helen perhaps 15 years. Chronologically speaking, the burial patterns seem to follow the trend apparent in the queens who predeceased their husbands: the twelfth century queen (Helen of Serbia) seems to have been buried in the cathedral at Székesfehérvár, while the two thirteenth century queens (Maria Laskarina and Elizabeth of the Cumans) were buried in royally founded monastic settlements, a Franciscan and Dominican establishment respectively. The nature of evidence concerning what is known about their deaths varies considerably, and thus makes extracting patterns and conclusions from these few cases difficult and cumbersome.

These burials of widowed queens in Hungary serve as a testament to broader socio-political issues in the Árpáadian age. The fact that so few of these women were buried in Hungary, and only when their son's rule was stable is consistent with the fact that primogeniture was very difficult to enforce successfully. Furthermore, Helen of Serbia and Elizabeth of the Cumans had the added responsibility of ruling for their young sons and were thus honored with a place of burial in Hungary. Eufrozina of Kiev (chapter 3) had the same responsibility of exercising power for her son István III, and had she predeceased him she very well might have been originally buried in Hungary as well. Maria Laskarina had been queen for three and a half decades, and stood by her husband as he had to rebuild Hungary after the Mongol attacks. Too little is known of Sarolta's activities, but the picture Thietmar of Merseburg gives of her is certainly a strong woman who could fend for herself. The queens of Hungary for the most part were distrusted and easy targets for being foreign women, and their close ties to their immediate family could prove costly. However, in the case of Sarolta, Helen, Maria, and Elizabeth they were able to survive the death of their husband and remain in Hungary under a stable succession. In Helen and Elizabeth's case, they were directly responsible for the transition of power and it is a testament to their mettle that they were able to successfully weather the storm and thus be buried in Hungary when many others had fled.

### **Chapter 3: Queens who outlived their husbands and were buried outside of Hungary**

The majority women who became Hungarian Queens under the Árpád dynasty simply were not buried in Hungarian lands. Unlike the dynasties in England, France, Byzantium, the Holy Roman Empire, and Kievan Rus, the women who were crowned queen of Hungary only seem to have been buried in Hungary under very specific circumstances. Circumstances also dictated the location of burial for women buried outside the lands comprising the crown of St. István, but the circumstances were certainly not uniform for each woman. The purpose of this chapter is thus to ask several questions related to the burial practices of queens who outlived their husbands and were subsequently buried outside of Hungary:

- 1) What were the immediate causes (if known) that led to the dowager Queen leaving Hungary?
- 2) Was the Queen's departure imposed on her, or of her own volition?
- 3) How soon after the death of their husband did the widowed Queen leave Hungary?
- 4) Where did the queens end up going after they left Hungary?
- 5) Is there any connection between the queens' final destination and their natal kin?
- 6) What agency on the part of the Queen can be determined in her place of burial?

Due to the fact that knowledge of the queens varies so much on an individual basis, the level of analysis shall be that of the individual for all eleven queens, as with the other chapters. Since the queens had to leave Hungary for various reasons, it is necessary to essentially identify what is similar about the reasons for leaving, and what about the circumstances in Hungary facilitated departure. Lastly, even though these queens had to flee Hungary, the fundamental question this chapter seeks to answer is what these burials outside Hungary tell us about Hungarian queens themselves.

The experience of **Gisela of Bavaria** following the death of her husband, King István I (r. 997-1038, canonized 1083) was the first, but not the last, situation wherein the widowed queen was caught up in a dynastic free-for-all following the death of her husband. She was an active force as Hungarian queen, but her position in Hungary was put in jeopardy by the succession crisis that followed the death of her husband – István and Gisela's only son predeceased his father. Gisela of Bavaria is the first true Queen of Hungary, the first queen chronologically to be buried outside Hungary, a queen with her burial still intact well into the twentieth century, and one of the earliest queens to be made into a scapegoat in the historical record.<sup>181</sup> The discussion of Gisela will thus focus on the reasons for leaving Hungary, the significance of the place of her retirement, and finally if and how her burial itself reflects her time as Queen of Hungary.

The marriage between István and Gisela shortly before his father's death in 997 was seen as the hallmark of his father's pro-western policy towards the end of his reign. Gisela was the daughter of Duke Henry II of Bavaria and Gisela of Burgundy and was

---

<sup>181</sup> For more on the lattermost point, see János M. Bak, "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 223-234.

brought up in a very religious atmosphere – her brother as Holy Roman Emperor Henry II became a saint, her brother Bruno became a priest, and her sister Brigitta became a nun.<sup>182</sup>

There is a lot of evidence for Gisela's activities as queen. Despite the poor quality of preservation of queen's charters, there still exists a fifteenth century register recording her donations to the monastery at Bakonybél, which is particularly significant considering no original queens' charters survive until the thirteenth century.<sup>183</sup> She is known to have embroidered the Hungarian coronation robe, which still exists to this day.<sup>184</sup> Györffy attributes the abbey of St. Hippolytus in Zobor to Gisela due to its Bavarian patrocinium.<sup>185</sup> She is also the only person who was neither a king nor a bishop to found an episcopal cathedral, in this case the cathedral at Veszprém – it is this founding that is the base for associating the city of Veszprém with Hungarian queens.<sup>186</sup> It is this connection with the Hungarian city of Veszprém that caused some confusion over the place of her burial, some saying that she was buried in Hungary, at Veszprém, the Cathedral she founded. The truth however, is much more complicated.

In 1038, St. István I was succeeded on the throne by Peter Orseleo, the son of István's sister and the Venetian doge. Here enters a very tricky historiographical situation, wherein some of the later chroniclers have demonized queen Gisela, stating that she blinded István's other kin and put "her relative" Peter (which he was not) on the

---

<sup>182</sup> György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, 80.

<sup>183</sup> Attila Zsoldos, "The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpadian Age (Eleventh-Thirteenth Century)", in *Dating Undated Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., 151.

<sup>184</sup> György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, 88.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>186</sup> A. Kralovanszky, "The Settlement History of Veszprém and Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages", in *Towns in Medieval Hungary*, László Gerevich, ed., 56.

throne.<sup>187</sup> This view has been mostly discredited among modern historians, as contemporary reports indicate that István himself was behind blinding his cousin Vazul. In exploring Hungarian queens as scapegoats, János Bak points out that this anti-Gisela rhetoric in the chronicler's record stems from her as a German and as a woman, and that it is much easier to blame her for blinding Vazul (whose heirs ended up taking over the Hungarian crown) than it is to blame the canonized king István.<sup>188</sup> Some sources even state falsely that she was murdered for her wicked actions.<sup>189</sup> What is clear is the fact that Peter Orseleo mistreated the dowager Queen Gisela in her widowhood. Peter, feeling that Gisela was too free with her almsgiving limited her household, and after a few comfortable years in retirement, Gisela was placed under house arrest, her possessions taken away, and she was made to swear an oath that she would not donate anything without his prior consent.<sup>190</sup> Promising to restore the queen's goods (among other things) Samuel Aba, a noble married to István's sister took power in 1041 though her situation did not improve.<sup>191</sup> After Peter was restored in 1044, Gisela left Hungary for good in 1045, and went back to Germany. Holy Roman Emperor Heinrich III found a place for her at the abbey of Niedernburg, in Passau: it was here where Gisela retired, became abbess, and eventually was buried.<sup>192</sup>

In Gisela's case, her bad treatment by her husband's successor led to her leaving Hungary for Germany, but her decision to leave seems to have been her own, even if

---

<sup>187</sup> Chronicles that make this claim are Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 105-107, and Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 69, 107.

<sup>188</sup> János M. Bak, "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne Duggan, ed., 225-226.

<sup>189</sup> Such as Alberic of Troisfontaines. Most of these sources come centuries after her death, however. *Ibid.*, 226.

<sup>190</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 332-333.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 336.

<sup>192</sup> András Uzsocki, "Die Echtheit des Grabes der ungarischen Königin Gisela in Passau," 17.

Peter is partly to blame. Gisela endured having her property confiscated, behavior restricted, and general mistreatment at the hands of Peter for nearly seven years before leaving Hungary and going to the German Emperor. Gisela's brother had been Holy Roman Emperor Henry II (r. 1002-1024), and the current emperor was a distant relation. Most of the Queen's immediate natal family died off, but Henry III was a distant relation who clearly was able to procure a place for her in retirement.

Uncovered in 1912, the tomb of Gisela is fascinating in its own right. The tomb slab is very large with two eagles flanking a large cross and the following inscription on it: "Anno Domini millesimo nonagesimo quinto, Nonis Maii obit Venerabilis Domina Gisula, soror sancti Hainrici Imperatoris uxor Stephani Regis Ungariae, abbatissa huius monasterii. Hic sepulta."<sup>193</sup> The skeleton itself was over 170 cm tall (nearly 5'7") and the anthropologist examining it believed the skeleton to be that of a woman in her sixties or seventies. Though the epitaph says Gisela lived until 1095, Uzsocki thinks that it is more likely she would have lived until 1055 or 1065, based on the report of the anthropologist.<sup>194</sup> What is most striking about this tomb slab is the similarity it has with the tomb slab of András I, king of Hungary. Though slight details vary, both grave-markers are a stone slab with a giant elongated cross as the centerpiece.

Gisela's experience as a mistreated queen dowager is certainly not unique. In England, Berengaria of Navarre found better treatment under Philip II Augustus of France than under her husband's brother, John Lackland.<sup>195</sup> Clearly there were several Hungarian examples who shared the same experiences with Gisela in this respect. Yet Gisela is such a pivotal figure and one of the most influential Hungarian queens. She is

---

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., 18-20.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>195</sup> Ann Trindade, *Berengaria: In search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen*, 151-156.

the only person besides a bishop or king to found a cathedral in the Árpáadian age, and it seems only one Hungarian queen considered the option to be buried at this particular cathedral (see Adelaide of Rheinfelden, chapter 1). Her actions as queen are extensive, and in her retirement she appears to have been living comfortably enough to give massive sums to charity. It was only after seven years of civil war and strife that Gisela saw fit to go back on German soil after nearly fifty years of living in Hungary. Considering that Peter died the year after she settled down in Niedernburg, it is also curious to note that there is no record of her trying to return to Hungary following the ascension of the son of her husband's former rival Vazul. Part of it could be that she felt uncomfortable with the connection András I had to Vazul. Another part of it could be that after years of activity and struggling she chose to remain in retirement at Niedernburg. Her burial there is more befitting a queen than a humble abbess, as the comparison to András' tomb clearly shows. Gisela's death and burial thus reflects a long, storied career, even in her final days.

The status of **Tuta of Formbach** as a Hungarian queen has been both debatable and intrinsically linked with her tomb at the abbey of Suben, in modern-day Austria. It is known that King Peter Orseleo (r. 1038-1041, 1044-1046), the successor to St. István I had been married, but the name of his wife is not recorded. The *Annales Altahenses* state that Peter and his queen barricaded themselves for three days in a country manor house before the envoy of his rival for the throne massacred their bodyguard, blinded Peter and



physically abused the queen.<sup>196</sup> Jan Długosz states that after the blinding and death of Peter (which he states happened in 1047, rather than 1046), “The widowed queen is turned out of her home.”<sup>197</sup> According to Cosmas of Prague, Judith of Schweinfurt, widow of Břetislav of Bohemia (r. 1037-1055) would have married Peter Orseleo “as an insult to him [her son Spithnev] and all the Czechs”, but this can not possibly be true as Peter had died in 1046, and Judith could not have married him until 1055.<sup>198</sup> The problems with the identification of Tuta as a Hungarian Queen based off of her epitaph will be discussed below, and after this, the nature of her burial at Suben will be analyzed in terms of what it tells us about Tuta’s relationship to the Hungarian crown.

In the nineteenth Century, Wertner Mór knew that Tuta and her sister Himiltrud had some connection to the Árpáadian royal family, but the precise nature of their relationship was unclear. He points to an epitaph found at the abbey of Suben that states that an abbess of “high-born, queenly sex” from Hungary, named Tuta, was died there at Suben on the first of May in 1136.<sup>199</sup> There is a date and inscription stating that she is queen of Hungary, but fitting her in chronologically is more of a problem. Tuta would have lived in the middle of the eleventh century, not the twelfth. The general impression of the gravestone is that it depicts the date of its commission, not the date of Tuta’s death.<sup>200</sup> One of the reasons Mór had such a difficulty placing Tuta and Himiltrud within the Árpáadian dynasty is that he was trying to find where she would fit in the early twelfth

---

<sup>196</sup> The rival in question would have been András, son of the blinded prince Vazul and cousin to St. István I who took the throne as András I (r. 1046-1060). Z. J. Kosztonyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 343.

<sup>197</sup> Jan Długosz, Maurice Michael, trans. *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, 38.

<sup>198</sup> Cosmas of Prague, *The Chronicle of the Czechs*, (Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009), Book Two, 135.

<sup>199</sup> “Hier lei di Hochgeborne Chünigliches Geschlechts zu Vngern, genant Tuta, Stiffterin diss gegenwärtigen Rottschauss hir zu Suben gestorben 1136 Calendis May” Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 586-588.

<sup>200</sup> Bernhard Schütz, *Stift Suben am Inn*, (Munich: Schnell & Steiner, 1970), 3.

century and thus claims that she was the daughter of Henry II of Neuburg.<sup>201</sup> It is thus generally believed that both Tuta and her sister Himiltrud were the daughters of Henry (Hesso) count of Formbach and that they lived in the mid-eleventh century.<sup>202</sup>

Raimund Kerbl states that she would have been the wife of Béla I (r. 1060-1063), and that the two would have had a daughter, Sophia.<sup>203</sup> While there are many problems with the identity of Béla's wife (see Appendix) all of the contemporary evidence seems to indicate that Béla's only known wife was the daughter of Mieszko II of Poland. Szabolcs de Vajay agrees that Tuta would have been a Hungarian Queen, but his opinion is that she would have been the wife of Peter Orseleo, the successor to St. István I.<sup>204</sup> The abbey of Suben was founded circa 1050, so that would have been well within the range of her lifetime (the false date of 1136 from her epitaph notwithstanding) and it would give some indication of how her final years were spent after the death of her husband.<sup>205</sup> As mentioned above, the *Annales Altahenses* indicate that Peter's wife would have been alive (and mistreated) at the time of his blinding and death in 1046, but beyond that her fate is largely unknown. The latest possible date of her death seems to be 1055.<sup>206</sup> If her presence at the abbey of Suben is any indication, it suggests that after her husband's brutal death and her mistreatment, she would have returned to her home near the modern Austrian/German border. Tuta's presence in Hungary would not have been desirable considering the ascension of Andrew I, from a collateral branch of the Árpáds, and since

---

<sup>201</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 589.

<sup>202</sup> Bernhard Schütz, *Stift Suben am Inn*, 3.

<sup>203</sup> Raimund Kerbl, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich", 12-13.

<sup>204</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn", 16.

<sup>205</sup> Franz N. Mehling & Marianne Mehling, *Austria: A Phaidon Cultural Guide*, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1985), 427.

<sup>206</sup> 1046 has also been suggested as a possible date of death. János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpádan and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23.

Peter does not seem to have had any children of his own, there seems to be little that would have kept Tuta in Hungary, following the death of her husband. Going back to Bak's studies on Hungarian queens as scapegoats, there seems to be quite a parallel between the fate of Peter's wife and the fate of her predecessor, Gisela of Bavaria. Both became targets of anti-German sentiment – especially considering that Peter's patronage of westerners brought considerable resentment from the Hungarian nobles – both had no living sons at the time of their husbands' death, and both seemed to have retired to monasteries on the Austrian/German border.

Comparing the two queens is particularly useful, considering their proximity geographically and chronologically. However, there are certain differences between the two women's burials that is worthy of mention. First is the fact that Tuta retired to a monastery she founded herself, whereas Gisela had not founded Niedernburg. Visually speaking, the gravestones look quite different. Whereas Gisela's is fairly simple, Tuta's depicts her with a crown and a scepter in her left hand, holding the abbey in her right and resting on a tasseled pillow with her eyes open. However, too much should not be made of the difference between gravestones – the elaborate stone of Tuta seems to date from 1430, centuries after her death, meaning ultimately little when comparing the two.<sup>207</sup>

In short, though there is sparse evidence for Tuta of Formbach as Hungarian queen, her fate and burial is eerily similar to that of her predecessor Gisela of Bavaria. The length of Tuta's stay in Hungary following the death of Peter is not known, but considering the foundation of Formbach in 1050, it is doubtful that she stayed longer than four years. Unlike Gisela, Tuta seems to have had someone in her natal family to share her retirement with, namely the person of her sister Himiltrude. Though Suben is quite a

---

<sup>207</sup> Bernhard Schütz, *Stift Suben am Inn*, 3.

ways away from their patrimony of Formbach, Tuta had a sister to share her retirement with. In comparison, Gisela of Bavaria had no remaining immediate natal kin to return to in 1045, she nonetheless found refuge with Henry III. Though Tuta's departure from Hungary was probably not done of her own choice, her burial at a monastic community which she founded almost certainly reflects her choice in burial site.

While Andrew the son of the blinded prince Vazul was in exile, he would have married **Anastasia**, the daughter of Grand Prince Yaroslav of Kiev in 1038. In 1060, After living as Queen of Hungary for sixteen years, upon the death of her husband there emerged a succession conflict despite the fact that she gave birth to two sons. Her final years would be spent in exile, and according to the chroniclers, she would retire to the abbey of Admont in Styria and be buried there after her death. She is the first Hungarian queen whose place of death has no connection to either her natal or conjugal kin. Further complicating the matter is the fact that though the chroniclers state that she and her daughter-in-law Judith of Swabia were buried at Admont, the evidence suggests quite firmly that Judith was not, in fact buried at Admont. Therefore, the study of Anastasia's death and burial will need to cover several key points. First – what Anastasia's role in the succession dispute following the death of her husband was, and what is known of her final years. Second – what connection can be drawn between her actions in her later life and the abbey of Admont. Third – did Anastasia really remarry following the death of Andrew I, and does that have any bearing on her burial at Admont.

The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle reports that Andrew “took to wife a daughter of the Duke of the Ruthenians” and that she gave him two sons, Salamon and

David.<sup>208</sup> Wertner Mór is of the opinion that Anastasia would have been Yaroslav's oldest daughter and places her date of birth at around 1021/1022, and the date of the marriage at around 1037/1038.<sup>209</sup> Długosz on the other hand is of the mind that Andrew would have married after he became king.<sup>210</sup> The marriage itself seems to have happened shortly after the exile of Andrew and his brothers following the blinding of their father Vazul, and Kiev was the first places he and his brothers sought refuge. Her sisters would marry monarchs as well: Elisabeth would marry Harald III Hardrada of Norway, and Anna would marry Henri I, King of France.<sup>211</sup> According to Kosztolnyik, the marriage between Andrew and Anastasia was a true love match, though her father Yaroslav certainly saw the benefit in allying himself with the Hungarian royal court. The marriage would have been celebrated at the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev according to Byzantine rite.<sup>212</sup> Shortly after this marriage, Anastasia would have given birth to a daughter named Adelaide in 1040, who would shortly be married to Vratislav II, Duke of Bohemia.<sup>213</sup> In 1046, Andrew defeated the unwanted King Peter Orseleo. The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle states that Andrew had no sons of his own at this point, and nominated his younger brother Béla as his heir, naming him duke and giving him a third of the kingdom.<sup>214</sup> For a while, all was well and the country started rebuilding itself. In 1053, the Queen gave birth to a son, Salamon – shortly afterwards, Andrew erected a Basilian monastery at Visegrad for his Greek-Orthodox wife. Anastasia's influence is also in seen the erection of a monastery dedicated to the French St. Anian in Tihany, due to the fact

---

<sup>208</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 88, 113.

<sup>209</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 118, 120.

<sup>210</sup> Incorrectly given as the year 1049. Jan Długosz & Maurice Michael, *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, 39.

<sup>211</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 117.

<sup>212</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 344-345.

<sup>213</sup> Cosmas of Prague, *The Chronicle of the Czechs*, Book Two, 177, n. 272.

<sup>214</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 88, 113.

that her sister Anna was Queen of France.<sup>215</sup> The birth of Salamon, however, created unrest between Andrew and his brother Béla, who had originally been designated Andrew's heir. Particularly worrying to Béla was Salamon's coronation as king in 1058 while Andrew was still alive, and Andrew's engagement of his son to Judith, the sister of Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV while the two were still children.<sup>216</sup> Béla, "fearing his life" fled to his wife's family in Poland in 1059 and soon returned with an army. Anastasia and her children fled to margrave Ernst of Austria seeking his protection while Andrew received aid from his German allies.<sup>217</sup> Two Germans, Margrave William of Thuringia and count Poto (Potho) actually received accolades from the Hungarian chroniclers detailing their bravery, but Andrew's forces were soon beaten. He died soon after an encounter with Béla in 1060, and the younger brother took the Hungarian throne in 1060.<sup>218</sup>

Here the first issue shall be addressed – the nature of Anastasia's activity as a widow. The Empress-regent had a location in Austria provided for Anastasia, but kept Salamon and Judith with her at the imperial court.<sup>219</sup> Political problems kept Anastasia and her young family in the Holy Roman Empire for several years, but in 1063 Salamon and the German forces began making their move after hearing that Béla I had died (after his throne collapsed.)<sup>220</sup> Anastasia appears as a fierce advocate of her son, particularly in securing German allies – she is known to have conferred upon Otto of Norheim, duke of Bavaria, a richly-adorned item from the Hungarian treasury known as the 'sword of

---

<sup>215</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 398, 400.

<sup>216</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 91, 115.

<sup>217</sup> A. W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941), 183.

<sup>218</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 366-367.

<sup>219</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 376.

<sup>220</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 97, 117.

Attila', for his support in aiding her son.<sup>221</sup> She seems to have resided in Hungary while her son was king (1063 to 1074) and in this period of her life is only mentioned in one incident towards the end of Salamon's reign. As an irresponsible ruler, Salamon faced the opposition (and eventual takeover) of his cousins Géza and Laszló. When it appeared that they had the upper hand, Salamon fled to his mother who was at the city of Musun, near the Austrian border where she reproached him for never seeking her counsel. This berating so enraged Salamon that he moved to strike her and was only held back by the intervention of his wife, Judith.<sup>222</sup> After the coronation of Géza in 1074, he seems to have left his wife and mother at the newly formed cloister at Admont, in Styria.<sup>223</sup> The Chronicles of Simon of Kéza only mention his household and wife residing at Admont at this time.<sup>224</sup> Salamon then made several aborted attempts to regain the Hungarian throne before passing away in obscurity, possibly in the Istrian city of Pola (Pula).<sup>225</sup> The date of Anastasia's death is disputed, but Mór thinks she had died by 1094.<sup>226</sup> Elsewhere, it is listed as 1096.<sup>227</sup> Anastasia and her daughter-in-law Judith were said to have been buried at the abbey in Admont.<sup>228</sup>

Considering that the burial of Judith at Admont is highly unlikely (see ch. 4) it is necessary to evaluate the veracity of the sources that mention Anastasia's burial at Admont before drawing conclusions.

---

<sup>221</sup> Cited from the Annales of Lampert. Ian Robinson, *Henry IV*, 53.

<sup>222</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 123, 124-125.

<sup>223</sup> Admont was founded in 1074. Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 126, 125.

<sup>224</sup> Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, ch. 61, 135-137.

<sup>225</sup> Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, ch. 61, 137; Macartney has doubts about this. C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, 107-108.

<sup>226</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 121.

<sup>227</sup> János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary" in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23.

<sup>228</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 136, 129. Simon of Kéza only speaks of Judith (who he calls Sophie) being buried at Admont. Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, ch. 61, 137.

One further complication is Kosztolnyik suggesting that Anastasia remarried upon the death of Andrew. His text reads:

This writer wishes to note at this point that Duke Conrad [of Bavaria] sent Count Potho as his personal envoy to King Andrew; Potho was one of those nobles whose goods had been confiscated by the emperor because the count was a friend of the Bavarian duke. Thus, Potho, too, remained at the court of Andrew, and when Andrew died in 1060, he married the widowed queen Anastasia (though it may have been true that, during the prolonged illness of her husband, the queen and Potho already maintained an intimate relationship). Eventually, Potho was able to return home, and offer his ambassadorial services to the court of Henry IV.<sup>229</sup>

This Count Potho is mentioned by the *Chronicon* as accompanying William of Thuringia to fight on Andrew's side against Béla in 1060.<sup>230</sup> The *Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle* is somewhat inconclusive on the eventual fate of William and Potho: it states in one place that William and Potho fought but in chapter 125, it says that both of them had perished at the hands of the Hungarians.<sup>231</sup> The biggest problem with Kosztolnyik's line of argumentation at this point is the fact that his sources do not hold up. Neither of the sources he cites indicates any remarriage on Anastasia's part nor any prior relationship between Anastasia and Count Potho. Therefore, her move to Admont does not seem to be influenced by any such marital factors.

At first glance, Anastasia's presumed death and burial at Admont is similar to the experiences of Gisela and Tuta before her: in all three cases, the displaced wife of a monarch fled west after the crown changed hands. However, Anastasia of Kiev had no relations in Styria nor is there evidence for any kind of prior relationship with the abbey before she fled there as a refugee. Furthermore, Anastasia had a surviving son and her movements after the death of her husband are suggestive: upon his death she flees to Austria but after the restoration of her son, she is known to have returned at some point

<sup>229</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 361-362.

<sup>230</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 93, 116.

<sup>231</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 93, 116; ch. 125, 125.



for the confrontation at Musun before finally fleeing once again finally to Styria and taking refuge at Admont. This turn of events indicates that at this point, the position of queen was highly dependent on familial relationships and the queen's safest position for the most part seems to have been while her husband or son was still alive. In Hungary, where primogeniture would continue to be a hotly contested issue even until the thirteenth century, a queen's immediate familial ties could make her position temporarily comfortable, but quite insecure following a political changing of the guard. Anastasia herself seems to have had an authority of her own as evidenced by the monastic foundations and rewarding those who fought for her son and even while a dowager and she does not seem to have retired to a monastery until after her son's dethroning and exile. Anastasia of Kiev and Gisela of Bavaria, both active and persistent queens in their own right, seem to have originally opted to retire in Hungary. It is only after unfavorable circumstances such as civil war and rivals on the throne that these women felt it necessary to leave. Gisela had the protection of her distant relation Henry III. Anastasia likewise had been protected by the court of Henry's widow, the Empress-Regent Agnes. By 1074, her father and mother were dead, and considering she found shelter in these German frontiers once before, she found it again after her son was deposed a second time.

Though Géza I (r. 1074-1077) had been married before (see Sophia of Looz in the Appendix) for a second wife he looked east, rather than west. To that end he married the daughter of Theodolus Synadenos (often called **Synadene**), niece of Nikephoros Botainetes who in 1078 would become Byzantine emperor Nikephoros III (r. 1078-1081).

There had been some confusion about the chronology of events related to the marriage between Géza and Synadene – in his dissertation at the University of Vienna, Kerbl suggests that Géza’s son Kálmán would have been born between 1064 and 1067.<sup>232</sup> The evidence supports an earlier marriage of Géza mentioned in western sources that state he would have married Sophia of Looz in 1062.<sup>233</sup> Marta Font, thinking the boys being of age in the succession dispute following the death of St. Laszló in 1095 suggests not only that the pair was born around 1070, but they also had the same mother, Sophia of Looz.<sup>234</sup> However, this does not take into account the short-lived marriage of Géza and Sophia, for it seems that she died roughly in 1065.<sup>235</sup> A more likely historical argument stemming from this new look at the age differences between the two brothers suggests that Kálmán would have been a son of Géza’s first wife, Sophia of Looz while Géza’s much younger son Almos would have been a son of his second wife, the Greek Synadene.<sup>236</sup> In this revised set of events, it also seems that the date for the marriage between Synadene and Géza would have been sometime after he came to the Hungarian throne, rather than before.<sup>237</sup> Assuming the marriage took place in 1074, as is now commonly believed,<sup>238</sup> her uncle would not have been emperor until 1078, well after the death of Géza I. It is worth noting however, that as Nikephoros III had no children of his own, he seems to have had in mind to make Synadene’s brother, Nikephoros Synadenos,

---

<sup>232</sup> Raimund Kerbl, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich”, 20-21.

<sup>233</sup> Source such as Alberic of Trium Fontium. Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn”, 16-17.

<sup>234</sup> Marta Font, *Koloman the Learned, King of Hungary*, 13.

<sup>235</sup> János M. Bak “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary” in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23.

<sup>236</sup> John Tuzson, *István II*, 44.

<sup>237</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 21.

<sup>238</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn”, 17-19.

his heir. This unfortunately did not end up happening, for the young Nikephoros died fighting the Sicilian Normans in 1081.<sup>239</sup>

Considering that Synadene would only have been queen for less than three years, it is not surprising that what little is known of her activity at court is mostly conjectural. What is most interesting however is Synadene's possible connection to the Hungarian royal crown. As Géza came to the Hungarian throne through dispossessing his predecessor, King Salamon (r. 1063-1074), the former king had taken the Hungarian crown with him, and the details of Géza I's coronation are thus very sketchy. Kosztolnyik notes that unlike other Hungarian kings, there is no illumination of Géza's coronation in the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, leading to confusion over the issue among later generations.<sup>240</sup> What is known is that the Byzantine emperor Michael VII Dukas sent a diadem to the Hungarian court, though it seems unlikely that this was the circlet used in Géza's coronation.<sup>241</sup> This circlet, with its enameled Greek inscriptions (referring to Géza as *dux*, rather than as king!) forms the lower part of the Hungarian crown that still exists today.<sup>242</sup> The lower part of the crown resembles other contemporary empresses' crowns and seems sized to fit over a head with a woman's hair styled up and veil.<sup>243</sup>

What is certain about her time at the Hungarian court is that it was very brief. Géza died in 1077, and Synadene is believed to have been left with her son Almos, only an infant. Shortly after her husband's death, his brother Laszló I came to the throne,

---

<sup>239</sup> Raimund Kerbl, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich", 25.

<sup>240</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 23.

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>242</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 23.

<sup>243</sup> János M. Bak "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpádan and Angevin Hungary" in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 21.

rather than Géza's son Kálmán, who Laszló put in the church. Synadene soon left her son at the Hungarian court and returned to Constantinople sometime between October of 1079 and October of 1080.<sup>244</sup> This move has puzzled historians, especially ones trying to elucidate what happened on faulty knowledge: Makk says she has no children and therefore has no reason to stay in Hungary, while Kerbl tries to state that she contested the treatment of "her" son Kálmán until giving up and returning to Byzantium.<sup>245</sup> What seems to have been the case is that Laszló I succeeded to the Hungarian throne in 1077, while Almos was an infant, and while Kálmán was still fairly young. While Kálmán was tonsured, Almos was given a secure position at court, even after Laszló's own marriage to Adelaide of Rheinfelden in 1078. What seems to be possible is that Synadene returned to Byzantium between 1079-1080 once her own son's position at court was secure, and she returned to her homeland where her uncle had made her brother heir to the throne, seemingly ensuring her a much more comfortable situation than remaining in Hungary as dowager.

Of course, upon Synadene's return to Constantinople historical sources are silent on her eventual fate and again, one must turn to the realm of conjecture for explanation. If Synadene had expected a leisurely retirement, her comfortable situation would have been drastically altered in a very short span of time. Her uncle, Nikephoros III abdicated the throne in favor of the young general Alexios I Komnenos, who came to the throne on Easter Sunday in 1081.<sup>246</sup> Her brother Nikephoros Synadenos, formerly heir of his uncle

---

<sup>244</sup> Raimund Kerbl, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich", 55.

<sup>245</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 125, n. 1; Raimund Kerbl, "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich", 55-57.

<sup>246</sup> The particular date seems to have been April 4, 1081. John Julius Norwich, *A Short History of Byzantium*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), 244-248.

and namesake died in October of 1081, fighting against Roger of Sicily.<sup>247</sup> The only knowledge concerning burials of Synadene's immediate family seems to be the final resting place of her uncle Nikephoros III: the church of St. Mary Peribleptos, in Constantinople.<sup>248</sup> In eleventh century Byzantium, there certainly was a precedent for shipping off unwanted royal women (usually dowager empresses) when it was deemed a political necessity. Eudokia Makrembolitissa was deposed and sent off to her convent of Piperoudion on the Bosphoros and the mother of Alexios I Komnenos spent her final days at her convent, the Pantepoptes in Constantinople.<sup>249</sup> Maria of Alania, Synadene's aunt (wife to Nikephoros III) was also removed to a convent, perhaps on the Prince's Islands.<sup>250</sup> In these contemporaneous cases, there seems to be some prior relationship with the convent these women were exiled to. Even though removing them to a convent was meant to remove them from political power, at the same time the pattern of removal shows that these politically negated women were transferred to establishments they were familiar with on some level. In short, the case of Synadene seems to be similar to both the experiences of Hungarian queens and Byzantine women: she left Hungary by her own choice, and the most likely plan of action in her retirement would have been to settle at a convent where she was familiar.

The case of **Eufemia of Kiev** is unique among Hungarian queens – she is the only queen of the Árpád dynasty to be divorced, and as such her burial in her homeland would

---

<sup>247</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad*, Book IV, (London: Penguin Books, 2009), 120-122.

<sup>248</sup> Ken Dark, "The Byzantine church and monastery of St Mary Peribleptos in Istanbul", in *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 141, No. 1160 (Nov., 1999), 656.

<sup>249</sup> Lynda Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*, (London & New York: Routledge, 1999), 177, 192.

<sup>250</sup> Lynda Garland, *Byzantine Empresses*, 186.

seem a foregone conclusion. Though she is disgraced in the Hungarian historical record, she appears to have been buried with all the due honor of a Kievan princess, and her death is recorded in Russian sources. Therefore, the central question in analyzing the burial of Eufemia of Kiev is connecting the nature of her burial as a Russian princess to her brief time as a Hungarian queen.

Upon the death of his son Laszló in 1112, the aging king Kálmán, widower of Felicia of Sicily (see previous chapter) decided to marry again. To this end, he married Eufemia, the daughter of Vladimir II Monomakh and his second, unnamed wife.<sup>251</sup> His reasons for choosing a Russian princess are worth mentioning here in light of the fact that the Aprads were already related to the Kievan dynasty through the king's younger brother marrying Predeslava of Kiev in 1104.<sup>252</sup> Relations between Kálmán and his younger brother were strained at best, and the two had quarreled many times before. The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle records an event wherein Almos revealed his intents to usurp power from Kálmán to the king's spies and upon realizing this, Almos fled to the German Emperor seeking protection.<sup>253</sup> One source says the impetus for seeking German aid came from Predeslava, wife of Almos.<sup>254</sup> If this is the case, then Kálmán's move to counterbalance the alliance between Almos and the Russians was calculated to perfection – in 1112, Vladimir Monomakh was only a minor prince of Pereyaslavl and Suzdal, but in 1113 he would become prince of all Kiev.<sup>255</sup> Furthermore, Predeslava was a daughter of Svyatopolk II of Kiev while Eufemia was a daughter of Vladimir II Monomakh of

---

<sup>251</sup> “In the year of our Lord 1112, N., King Coloman's son died, and the King married a second wife from Russia”, Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 149, 132.

<sup>252</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 14.

<sup>253</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 148, 132.

<sup>254</sup> The “Chronicle of the Fourteenth Century”, Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds from Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 101.

<sup>255</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 16.

Kiev. Svyatopolk and Vladimir had been at loggerheads and their relationship had been marked by constant feuding, so Kálmán's marriage to Vladimir's daughter not only strengthened his own Russian connection, but also reduced the threat of Predeslava's family ties against himself. Marta Font says Eufemia would have been around 15 or 16 years old in 1112, and considering one of his sons had just died, the thought of other heirs would have been important as well.<sup>256</sup> It has also been suggested that this marriage was intended as an insurance policy against the Cumans south of Russia, who Kálmán successfully engaged in 1110-1111.<sup>257</sup>

Unfortunately for everyone involved, there was an incident that led to Eufemia being accused of adultery. The divorce is not mentioned in Simon of Kéza, but the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle mentions it in a somewhat ham-handed way:

When she was taken in the sin of adultery, he put her away, but not in headstrong anger. For he know that it is written: What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. That is, without law and reason. He did not separate himself from her, but the law separated him from her, whom he, having suffered wrong, accused; it condemned her for her fault and judged her for her evil act. The law sent her away into her own country. As the fruit of her adultery she bore a son, named Borich. Borich begot Calaman.<sup>258</sup>

Marta Font sees the hands of three authors in this text: one who wants to excuse Kálmán for repudiating his lawful wife by emphasizing the unlawful act, another who wants to emphasize the illegitimacy of Eufemia's son Boris and his unsuitability for the throne, and a third and later author who tries to reconcile the two.<sup>259</sup> This passage and the divorce of Eufemia in general have come under strict scrutiny from historians trying to make sense of it. John Tuzson, who sees the Norman lords at the Hungarian court perpetuating many of the "evil deeds" in the later reign of Kálmán, and in the reign of his

---

<sup>256</sup> Marta Font, *Koloman the Learned: King of Hungary*, 79.

<sup>257</sup> Marta Font, *Koloman the Learned: King of Hungary*, 80.

<sup>258</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 149, 132.

<sup>259</sup> Marta Font, *Koloman the Learned: King of Hungary*, 80.

son István II also blames their intriguing for the divorce of Eufemia.<sup>260</sup> It is certainly unquestionable that displacing Eufemia and her son and ensuring the succession of a prince who is their kin through his mother benefitted these Norman nobles. János Bak also sees the fate of Eufemia as fitting in with a pattern of behavior in the historical literature that treats Hungarian queens as scapegoats, though he admits that there is not enough information available to determine the exact nature of her as a scapegoat.<sup>261</sup>

The next time Eufemia pops up in the historic records is with her death on April 4, 1138. She was buried at the Church of St. Spas at Berestovo, right outside the boundaries of Kiev, and is the first member of the Kievan dynasty whose burial at St. Spas was mentioned in the historical record.<sup>262</sup> There is the possibility that her stepmother, Vladimir Monomakh's third Polovtsian wife, was buried there upon her death in 1127, but there is little evidence beyond the circumstantial to reinforce that notion.<sup>263</sup> It is generally believed to have been built by Eufemia's father between the years 1113 and 1125, and that the number of his family who ended up being buried there (i.e. his daughter Eufemia, possibly his third wife, possibly his daughter Maritsa, his son Yuri Dolgorukiy, and his grandson Gleb Yurivich) is indicative of his patronage.<sup>264</sup> Thanks to Martin Dimnik's study on burials of Kievan dynasts and their kin, there is a wealth of information that can be gathered in regards to Eufemia's location of burial. First, considering the window of time in which the Church of St. Spas was constructed, it is possible that Eufemia could have spent the years where she is absent from the

---

<sup>260</sup> "It would have been easy to lure the young, inexperienced queen into a compromising situation and then accuse her" John Tuzson, *István II*, 79.

<sup>261</sup> János M. Bak, "Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 226.

<sup>262</sup> Martin Dimnik, "Dynastic Burials in Kiev before 1240" in *Ruthenica VII* (2008), 83.

<sup>263</sup> Martin Dimnik, "Dynastic Burials in Kiev before 1240" in *Ruthenica VII* (2008), 83.

<sup>264</sup> *Ibid.*, 83, n 69.



historical chronicles (roughly 1113-1138) living as a nun in the monastery her father built. It is also worth noting that her death and burial were deemed significant enough to be recorded in the Russian historical chronicle, but one must be careful in how much importance is attached to this fact: in general, the deaths of female members of the Kievan dynasty, be they daughters or wives, seems to be much better recorded for princesses of the twelfth and early thirteenth century, rather than those who died in the eleventh century.<sup>265</sup> Finally, there is the nature of family relations at the burial vault of St. Spas. The only members of the Rurikid dynasty buried alongside Eufemia were her immediate nuclear family, and there is much evidence that suggests that burials in twelfth century Kiev were closely related to what immediate branch of the dynasty the individual belonged to. With Eufemia, after her time as queen of Hungary was over, she returned to her homeland, was received by them, lived in a monastery founded by her father and was buried among them. She still had family to go back to and was still young at the time of her divorce, and the Russian evidence indicates that she was re-integrated into her family upon her return – her father had even been elevated to the Grand duchy of Kiev in 1113. Lastly, it is fortunate for historians that at the time of her death, there was an established tradition of sorts in recording the death of Kievan princesses, meaning that though Eufemia had been divorced and disgraced, she had not been forgotten.

Activity and agency are difficult enough to measure in even the most well documented studies of medieval queens, and the lack of evidence in the Hungarian case makes gauging political participation for queens challenging. However, the case of

---

<sup>265</sup> Of the dynasts Martin Dimnik discusses, the burials of ten women are not mentioned in the chronicles, compared to six (including Eufemia) whose place of burial is mentioned. *Ibid.*, 91-92.

**Eufrozina of Kiev**, wife of Géza II (r. 1141-1161) is remarkable for there remains a surprising amount of evidence that showcases her bold, powerful character. She was a staunch supporter of her son István III (r. 1161-1173) during his young, unstable reign and secured an alliance with the Czechs by marrying her daughter to Svatopluk, son of Vladislav II of Bohemia.<sup>266</sup> Eufrozina, along with Archbishop Martyrius of Esztergom was the first to patronize the Hospitaller order in Hungary, founding a house at Székesfehérvár.<sup>267</sup> However, after supporting the wrong son in a succession war, Eufrozina was exiled by her other, successful son Béla III (r. 1173-1196) and she spent her last days in the Holy Land, where it seems she was buried. Therefore, when analyzing the burial of Eufrozina, one of the few “official” exiles of dowager queens in Árpáadian Hungary, it is necessary to determine 1) what led to her exile, 2) her relationship to the place of her death and burial, and 3) how this relationship is determined by her actual burial itself.

Based on the birth of her first son in 1147 (Louis VII of France, passing through with the Second Crusade was the godfather) it seems that Géza and Eufrozina were married sometime in the summer of 1146.<sup>268</sup> Following the death of her husband Géza II, Eufrozina appears as a fervent supporter of her son against his avaricious uncles, the anti-kings Laszlo II and István IV. After the death of her son István III, Eufrozina once again seems to have made her own play for power. The sparse evidence available seems to indicate that Eufrozina supported her younger son Géza as being more fit for the throne,

---

<sup>266</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 89.

<sup>267</sup> Zsolt Hunyadi, “The Hospitallers in the Kingdom of Hungary: Commanders, Personnel, and a Particular Activity up to c. 1400” in *The Crusades and the military orders*, Zsolt Hunyadi and József Laszlóvsky, eds., (Budapest: Central European University, 2001), 253.

<sup>268</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 89, 139 n 105.

and supported him against her older remaining son, Béla.<sup>269</sup> There are several reasons this may have been the case. There is the fact that Eufrozina would have been more familiar with Géza than Béla – the latter had been raised at the Byzantine court and was originally intended to be the heir to the Byzantine emperor. Géza was also married to a Byzantine princess, and Kosztolnyik posits that Béla and his mother were opposed on the grounds that Eufrozina would have pursued a more Byzantine-friendly policy while Béla would have favored a more western one.<sup>270</sup> Whatever the reasons for supporting her younger son, it was ten months after the death of István III that Béla was crowned as Béla III, indicating a dynastic struggle wherein Géza and their mother Eufrozina were the primary losers.

Sometime after Béla III took the crown, Eufrozina was exiled. It could have been as early as 1177, but what is certain is that in 1186, the queen-mother was exiled to the Byzantine city of Braničevo (Barancs).<sup>271</sup> The same year, she also seems to have taken the veil in Jerusalem with the Knights of St. John (i.e. the Hospitallers).<sup>272</sup> Moravcsik states that she was buried in the Theotocus church of the St. Theodosius havra, in Jerusalem, but “according to tradition”, her remains were taken back to Russia.<sup>273</sup> Mór points to another tradition that upon her death, her bones were repatriated and buried by her son at the church of Székesfehérvár, from a document written by her son, Béla III.<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>269</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 223.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, 225.

<sup>271</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 177, n 149.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>273</sup> Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1970), 91.

<sup>274</sup> “Tandem domina meter nostra, instinctu divinae inspirationis accensa, pro remedio animae suae, et pro anima mariti sui, patris nostril, piae memoriae, Regis Geysae, et pro salute nostra, praefatum monasterium opera desiderato complevit, et variis possessionibus copiosius dotatum ac dilatatum, ob religionem et honestatem ipsius domus hospitalis, perpetuis temporibus ei contulit possidendum. Haec igitur sunt nomina praediorum, que a domina matre nostra praefato monasterio sunt collata.” Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 314.

Though Imre Henszlmann was aware of Eufrozina's presence at Szkesfehérvár, he does not seem to have found anything suggesting she was buried there.<sup>275</sup>

What this tangles series of events shows is remarkably similar to the experience of unwanted Byzantine royal women. Béla would have been educated at the Byzantine court, and in the tradition highlighted in Synadene's case, Eufrozina at some point seems to have been sent to Jerusalem wherein she took vows with the Hospitallers, an order she had patronized as Queen, and one which she would have been familiar with. She had backed the wrong son, and in doing so made Béla III wary of his mother. Upon her death in the city, it is possible she was buried in Jerusalem. The identification of her burial in the church of St. Theodosius is questionable, as Denys Pringle thinks the existence of a church by the name of St. Theodosius in the city of Jerusalem is spurious.<sup>276</sup> Though Henszlmann was unable to find a trace of Eufrozina during his excavation that does not immediately discredit the thought that Béla might have repatriated her remains upon her death.

Eufrozina in many ways exemplifies the extremes of queenship. After the death of her husband, she was embroiled in a bitter dynastic struggle on behalf of her eldest son, which saw great success. She was able to found her own orders, supporting the monk-knights facilitating the defense of the Holy Land, and seems to have enjoyed a good deal of power as the mother of the king. Upon the death of her young son however, all of that turned on its head, and after backing the losing candidate for the throne, she was stripped of her power, though exiled to a religious order she patronized in the Holy Land. What is unusual is the notion that Béla had the bones of his mother brought back

---

<sup>275</sup> Imre Henszlmann, *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye*, 141.

<sup>276</sup> Denys Pringle, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a Corpus*, Vol. III The City of Jerusalem, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 386.

to be buried in Hungary after her death and burial abroad – this is the only instance of this kind of repatriation in this study, if it indeed happened. In short, Eufrozina’s death and burial seems to have been just as adventurous as her life.

Most of what is known about **Maria Komnena** derives from Greek sources. The most obvious explanation for this is the fact that her husband István IV (r. 1163-1165) was technically speaking an anti-king who was illegally crowned, and the Hungarian sources available thus tend to treat him with disdain. There is very little information to go on in regards to her life after her marriage, but her treatment by the chroniclers is nonetheless suggestive. Starting with what is known of her, the task at hand will be to read from the silences in the chroniclers notes, determine possibilities for her eventual fate, and analyze those possibilities with the experience of prior queens in mind.

Maria Komnena was the daughter of the sebastocrator Isaac (third son of Emperor John II & Eirene (Pyroska) of Hungary) and his first wife Theodora. The year of her birth is unknown, with Varzos saying 1140,<sup>277</sup> Mór saying 1144,<sup>278</sup> and Kerbl citing sources that give it from 1143 to 1145.<sup>279</sup> As she seems to be one of the older of the sebastocrator Isaac’s children, Vajay places the date of her birth even earlier, in 1138.<sup>280</sup> According to Kinnamos, in 1153 Maria Komnena received international attention when she was very young, with Frederick Barbarossa who “heard that Maria ... was outstanding in birth and superiority of beauty, and growing up in Byzantion [sic], he was

---

<sup>277</sup> Konstantinos Varzos, *E genealogia ton Komnenon*, (Thessaloniki: Kentron Vyzantinōn Ereunōn, 1984), Vol. 2, 314.

<sup>278</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 337.

<sup>279</sup> Raimund Kerbl, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich”, 110.

<sup>280</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn”, 22.

immediately captivated by the girl,” and sent envoys asking for their mutual betrothal.<sup>281</sup> However, Frederick Barbarossa and Manuel Komnenos were each vying for Italy and by 1155, negotiations were off and Frederick instead married the heiress of Upper Burgundy, Beatrice.<sup>282</sup> Maria did not have to wait long for a new husband, however. István, the brother of Géza II had plotted against his life and fled to Byzantium in 1154, and István and Maria were married after negotiations with Frederick failed. Kerbl places the date of the marriage some time between 1153 and 1156,<sup>283</sup> Mór 1156 or 1157,<sup>284</sup> Vajay thinks 1158 is more plausible<sup>285</sup> while Varzos gives 1161 as the marriage date.<sup>286</sup> In a short while, István was joined by his older brother Laszló, though unlike István, Laszló chose not to marry “so that he should not forget to return to his country and thus bring ruin to his domestic affairs, enchanted by the spell of a wife.”<sup>287</sup>

Upon the death of Géza II in 1161, his brothers István and Laszló pounced at the opportunity to proclaim their own candidacy over that of Géza’s young son, István III. Due to the fact that Laszló was older and not tied to Byzantium like István, he was crowned (illegally) by Miko, archbishop of Kalocsa rather than the archbishop of Esztergom who reserved the right to crown kings. Within months however, Laszló was dead.<sup>288</sup> Following Laszló’s death, his younger brother István asserted his right to the throne and was crowned by the same archbishop, Miko of Kalocsa. Though the date of the illegal coronation is disputed, it is nonetheless assumed that Maria was crowned

---

<sup>281</sup> John Kinnamos, trans Charles M. Brand, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), Book IV, 106.

<sup>282</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 64.

<sup>283</sup> Raimund Kerbl, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádenkönigreich”, 112.

<sup>284</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 338.

<sup>285</sup> Szabolcs de Vajay, “Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn”, 22.

<sup>286</sup> Konstantinos Varzos, *E genealogia ton Komnenon*, Vol. 2, 317.

<sup>287</sup> Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Book Four, ch. 126, 72.

<sup>288</sup> Z. J. Kosztonyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, pp. 182-183.

alongside her husband – this would be the only known activity of Maria in Hungary.<sup>289</sup>

After many attempts to gain the upper hand, István IV finally died, with Byzantine sources stating that his nephew had him poisoned.<sup>290</sup>

Due to the fact that the death of Maria is not recorded during the lifetime of István IV, it is generally assumed that she outlived her husband. His Hungarian supporters looked upon the marriage suspiciously as they felt it made István a Byzantine pawn, and since her marriage was so critical to István's Byzantine ties, it seems likely that had she died, it would have been recorded. Neither the Hungarian nor the Greek sources make any mention of children, and it is assumed that the pair had none.<sup>291</sup> Though her eventual fate is mostly unknown, a parallel can be drawn with the last Byzantine Queen of Hungary, Synadene. In Synadene's case, she returned to Constantinople with her uncle in power as emperor. It is likewise assumed that Maria Komnena would have returned to Byzantium, where her uncle Manuel Komnenos still ruled. Synadene appears to have returned to Byzantium after her son's position was secure – Maria Komnena on the other hand appears to have had no children of her own and therefore no reason to remain in Hungary where her husband's nephew now ruled undisputed. The most likely fate of Maria is that she retired to one of Byzantium's many monasteries, having served her political duty.<sup>292</sup>

---

<sup>289</sup> Varzos says 1162, while Engel says 1163. Konstantinos Varzos, *E genealogia ton Komnenon*, Vol. 2, 320; Pal Engel, "Temetkezések a középkori Székesfehérvári Bazilikában", *Akademiai Kiado* **121**, 1987, 633.

<sup>290</sup> Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Book Four, ch. 128, 73.

<sup>291</sup> Konstantinos Varzos, *E genealogia ton Komnenon*, Vol. 2, 326.

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*

After the death of his first wife Agnes/Anna of Antioch, Béla III (r. 1173-1196) felt the need to remarry. Initially he had his eyes on a Byzantine princess, Theodora Komnena, the granddaughter of Manuel Komnenos, but as she was already an ordained nun, the Council of Constantinople would not approve of the marriage.<sup>293</sup> Turning west, in 1185 Béla then asked for the hand of Matilda, the eight year old daughter of Henry the Lion Duke of Saxony, a request apparently not received well by the girl's grandfather, Henry II of England.<sup>294</sup> Finally, the Hungarian king asked for the hand of **Margaret of France**, the sister of Philip II Augustus of France and the widow of Henry II of England's oldest son, Henry. Considering that her dowry would be forfeit upon marriage to Béla, the French court asked Béla III for a written statement of his own revenues, which still exists in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris. Apparently it was satisfactory enough for the French, and the pair were wed in the summer of 1186.<sup>295</sup>

Margaret had been the first child born to Louis VII of France and his second wife Constance of Castile, and it was her birth that caused the king to exclaim about the superfluity of his daughters.<sup>296</sup> As a child, she had been betrothed to and eventually married to Henry, the oldest son of Henry II of England by Eleanor of Aquitaine, her father's first wife. After the death of William in 1183, Margaret seems to have retired to her dowry in the Vexin, though her land in the Vexin had always been a point of contention between the Angevins and the Capetians. As Queen of Hungary, there seems to be slightly more information regarding her actions at court. For instance, though the

---

<sup>293</sup> There is some confusion in the record that Bela III wanted to marry Manuel's sister and gain the throne of Byzantium for himself in a personal union, but Makk does not think this was the case. Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 119-120.

<sup>294</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 120; Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 212.

<sup>295</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 120.

<sup>296</sup> Louis had two daughters from his earlier marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine. Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 362-363.



queen's royal curia is not mentioned until 1205, the tradition of a reginal household along the lines of a curia seems to have started with Margaret.<sup>297</sup> Kosztolnyik suggests that the marriage of Béla III's son Imre to the Aragonese princess Constance might have some connection with Margaret, the maternal granddaughter to Alfonso VII of León-Castile.<sup>298</sup> When the army of the Third Crusaders was passing through in 1189, Béla and Margaret greeted them at Esztergom, and Margaret is known to have given Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa a lavishly decorated tent. While in Hungary, Frederick asked for the release of Géza, Béla's traitorous brother who had been in captivity for eleven years – the request, however, had originally come from the Queen.<sup>299</sup> Béla III is known to have shown a greater interest in the foundation of Cistercian settlements (he would sponsor a total of four: Egres in 1179, Zirc in 1182, Szentgotthárd in 1183, Pilis in 1184)<sup>300</sup> and it is tempting to see the hand of the French-born Queen in this as well.<sup>301</sup> In short, Margaret's ten years as Queen of Hungary indicate a good deal of activity on her part.

After the death of Béla III in 1196, Margaret's next action was to make her own pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The main source of information regarding the final years of her life is derived from the Continuation of William of Tyre, which makes several points about her death. In the first place, the Continuation does make the error of stating that Béla III died without an heir and that his brother-in-law inherited the throne – in fact, Béla had four sons by his first wife Agnes/Anna of Antioch, and the crown went to his eldest, Imre. The second point of interest is that the Continuation states that not only had

---

<sup>297</sup> János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary" in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 19.

<sup>298</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III (1095-1196)*, 213.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

<sup>300</sup> Pilis and Egres would be the resting place of Gertrude of Meran and Yolande de Courtenay respectively. Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 170.

<sup>301</sup> János M. Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", 17.

she “conceived a longing to visit the Holy Sepulchre”, but that she expected the emperor to recover the whole kingdom of Jerusalem based on the size of the army that accompanied him. This is worth pointing out as Margaret had made her presence known when the Hungarian court was entertaining the Crusaders passing through in 1189 and shows that in 1197 she was still interested in affairs in the Holy Land, if the Continuation is to be believed. Next, the Continuation states that Margaret sold her dower to “her brother-in-law” (or more possibly her step-son, the current Hungarian king) for a large amount of cash and then with a “fine company of knights” she travelled to Syria and arrived in the city of Tyre. The chronicler also suggests that she thought this new wave of Crusaders would help win back the city of Jerusalem. Considering that the queen’s dower lands were meant to support her in her widowhood, this is a very bold move on her part, especially considering the wealth of most queens (and most medieval people for that matter) was measured in land. In Tyre, she was visited by Count Henry II of Champagne, who ruled Jerusalem after becoming the third husband to Queen Isabella of Jerusalem. Henry was also Margaret’s nephew, the son of her step-sister Marie.<sup>302</sup> Henry arrived in Tyre and she was received “with the greatest honour”, but unfortunately their visit did not last long. Within eight days of her arrival, Margaret was dead. The Continuation states that she was buried in the choir at the Cathedral of Tyre, and that all her wealth went to Henry, because he was her nephew.<sup>303</sup>

Though her death and subsequent burial only seem to be recorded in this Continuation of William of Tyre, it nonetheless depicts a series of circumstances that might otherwise have been lost to the historian. What the chronicle makes clear is that

---

<sup>302</sup> Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998), ch. 183, 142-143.

<sup>303</sup> Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, ch. 183, 142-143.

Margaret's journey to the Holy Land was one that was taken entirely at her own volition. Unlike the case of her mother-in-law Eufrozina of Kiev, Margaret's journey east does not seem to have been coupled with exile or banishment of any kind. To finance her journey, she sold her own dower estate and would later give the leftover proceeds to her nephew Henry of Champagne, who would die shortly after her. What is of most interest is that after her death in the city of Tyre, her body was then buried there. Among this group of queens studied, Margaret is the only one buried at a cathedral, rather than at a monastery. The only other queens buried at cathedrals are those buried in Hungary and one who remarried. In addition, of prime importance is the fact that by this point in European history there were several ways to transport bodies of the deceased to their resting place. Estella Weiss-Krejci points out that in the tenth and eleventh centuries, there was a greater interest in burying bodies of the Ottonian and Salian emperors in the burial place of their choice, even though this required travel over a great distance.<sup>304</sup> She also points out that since Charlemagne had banned cremation, there developed a technique known as the *mos teutonicus* (the German custom) wherein the bodies of the deceased were dismembered and the flesh removed through boiling, allowing the cleaned bones to be transported – in the Austrian dynasty around the year 1200, this kind of excarnation is favored when the body has to be transported great distances over several hundreds (or thousands) of kilometers.<sup>305</sup> In short, technology was in place – and employed – in order to eliminate the difficulties of transporting bodies over great distances of land and thus ensure a proper burial in their homeland.

---

<sup>304</sup> Estella Weiss-Krejci, "Restless corpses: 'secondary burial' in the Babenberg and Habsburg dynasties" in *Antiquity*, 75 (2001), 770.

<sup>305</sup> Estella Weiss-Krejci, "Restless corpses: 'secondary burial' in the Babenberg and Habsburg dynasties", 770-771, fig. 2.

Turning towards one of the original questions posited at the beginning of this chapter, one then asks what the nature of Margaret's burial was to her natal kin. As mentioned before, Margaret was greeted very warmly by her nephew who happened to be ruling the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Presumably, Henry would have met Margaret in Hungary when travelling in the Third Crusade, so it is possible that there had been some prior contact between aunt and step-nephew before her visit in 1197. The Cathedral of Tyre itself was a prestigious building that would figure prominently for the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Before Margaret's death, the Cathedral is mentioned at the marriage of King Amalric to the Byzantine princess Maria Komnena (not the widowed Hungarian Queen) in 1167. After Tyre had successfully resisted Saladin's attempts to take it over, Tyre is believed to have been the final resting place of Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa after he drowned in 1190 – though it is debatable whether he was laid to rest in the Latin Cathedral at Tyre, or another church in the city.<sup>306</sup> In the thirteenth century, the Cathedral at Tyre became the place of coronation for the Latin Kings of Jerusalem as well as some of the kings of Cyprus, as the city of Jerusalem was in Muslim hands while Tyre remained Christian.<sup>307</sup> After the city was captured by the Muslims in 1291, the cathedral fell into a general state of disrepair and one of the first archaeological excavations of the Cathedral in 1874 had in mind to recover the body of Frederick I Barbarossa.<sup>308</sup>

In short, Margaret's death and subsequent burial at Tyre reflects more than just immediate convenience. There were means of transporting bodies of the deceased to intended destinations, and this option was not taken. Margaret died visiting a nephew

---

<sup>306</sup> Denys Pringle, "The Crusader Cathedral of Tyre" in *Levant* 33 (2001), 167.

<sup>307</sup> Denys Pringle, "The Crusader Cathedral of Tyre", 168.

<sup>308</sup> His body was not found. *Ibid.*, 171.

who was fighting a holy war in the Holy Land, and the journey she made was one she had every intention of making if Ernoul is to be believed. The sale of her dower might indicate that her original plan was to stay in the Holy Land for much longer, and possibly even retire there. Finally, her burial in the choir, at such a prominent place in the church indicates that her final resting place was meant to be one of honor. While evidence for her choice in place of burial will be elusive, Margaret nonetheless demonstrated a will of her own during her life, and her journey out to the Holy Land was certainly one made at her own volition.

Andrew II's third marriage to a young Italian princess was a surprise to his family – an unwelcome one, that is. **Beatrice d'Este** was the daughter of margrave Adalbrandino I of Ancona, and Andrew married her on May 14, 1234, after the death of his second wife Yolande of Courtenay. She would only have been queen for a year or so before her husband died, which prompted her immediate departure from Hungary while still pregnant. After returning to her Italian homeland, there is a tradition that she retired to and been buried at the abbey of Gemmola (Gemula) which had ties to the female members of her family.<sup>309</sup> Though the evidence behind this claim seems to come centuries after her death, Beatrice's burial at this particular monastery is nonetheless plausible. Thus with Beatrice it is necessary first to establish which sources say she was buried at Gemmola, the nature of the monastery's relationship with the Este women, and what Beatrice's burial there says about this specific case.

---

<sup>309</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 435; Luciano Chiappini, *Gli Estensi*, (Milan: Dall'Oglio, 1967), 37.

Beatrice would have been a very small child upon the death of her father Adalbrandino d'Este in 1215.<sup>310</sup> His brother Azzo VII adopted her and supervised her upbringing until her marriage in 1234. Upon marrying the nearly sixty year old king, Beatrice was secured five thousand silver marks and her rights as Hungarian Queen were assured.<sup>311</sup> The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle and the Chronicon Budense both operate under the impression that Andrew married Beatrice on his way back from the Crusade, around 1218 but this is very unlikely as his second wife Yolande would have still been alive.<sup>312</sup> In typical fashion, Andrew's wedding gifts and lavish celebrations put quite a dent in the treasury, though the financial difficulties of the king would not last long. Sixteen months after their marriage, Andrew died in September 1235.<sup>313</sup> The new king Béla IV had inherited a messy state of affairs from his father, and went about asserting his authority. One of his first actions was to blind a noble named Dénes (Gyínes) the Palatine appointed by his father on the ground that Dénes had cuckolded Andrew II with Beatrice.<sup>314</sup> Beatrice in turn escaped Hungary with Dénes dressed as a stable boy, but she was discovered by envoys of Frederick II.<sup>315</sup> The widowed Queen made her way to Thuringia where she gave birth to a son she named István. Before long, she made her way back to her homeland in Italy completely destitute, as her Hungarian lands had been confiscated and she had none of her own back in Italy.<sup>316</sup> Pope Innocent felt so sorry for her that he gave her alms from 35 monasteries (which Mór calculated to

---

<sup>310</sup> About three years old. Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 426.

<sup>311</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 113-114.

<sup>312</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 186, p. 142; C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Histories*, 132.

<sup>313</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 431-432.

<sup>314</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 122.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid.

<sup>316</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 434.

be the equivalent of 20,000 francs in 1294.)<sup>317</sup> Beatrice continued to vouch for her son István's legitimacy, but Béla IV refused to acknowledge her child, thinking that the Palatine was the true father, not the king. In the end, the young boy was raised at the Este court while Beatrice retired to the monastery of St. John the Baptist at Gemmola where she died in 1245.<sup>318</sup>

Her retirement, death, and presumed burial at this particular monastery opens up a tangled web of historiography around the holy women of the Este family. In all, there would be three women named Beatrice d'Este in the thirteenth century who would be beautified: Beatrice I d'Este was the daughter of Azzo VI, Beatrice II d'Este was the daughter of Azzo VII, and Beatrice III d'Este, Queen of Hungary, was the daughter of Adalbrandino I. Beatrice I was the aunt of Beatrice III, while Beatrice II was the cousin of Beatrice III. Beatrice I (1206-1246) is credited with the revival of the monastery at Gemmola – the monks had deserted it and it lay in ruins until she refurbished it with the help of her brother. Her body rested there until 1252, when it was taken along with her epitaph to the Church of St. Sophia in Padua.<sup>319</sup> Beatrice II (d. 1262/1270) was chronologically later than her counterparts and of the three she does not seem to have any connection with Gemmola. Rather, Beatrice II lived for fifteen years in a new Benedictine monastery named after St. Anthony.<sup>320</sup> Beatrice III, the focus of this particular study is the only one of the three to have been married, and her retirement at Gemmola happened after her return to Italy. The nature of her being called “the Blessed” is furthermore questionable – Wion and some other hagiographers refer to her as

---

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., 435.

<sup>318</sup> Ibid; Chiappini says 1239, but 1245 is the favored date of her death. Luciano Chiappini, *Gli Estensi*, 37.

<sup>319</sup> Agnes B. C. Dunbar, *A dictionary of saintly women*, (London: G Bell, 1904), Volume I, 107.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., 108.

“blessed”, but the Bollandists say there is no authority for her cult.<sup>321</sup> What little is known of her life makes her a somewhat unlikely candidate for beatification, and considering the fact that her aunt and cousin were also beatified Beatrices, the inclusion of this Queen of Hungary in her family’s pantheon of saints is worth questioning.

Beatrice’s exile from court after the death of her husband is not unusual in the experiences of dowager Hungarian queens. What is unusual is she fled while she was pregnant and gave birth abroad. Synadene in the eleventh century had an infant son of her own, but she left him in Hungary while she retired to Constantinople. The experience of Beatrice in this case best fits the example of Eufemia of Kiev, which was divorced and gave birth to a son who the Hungarian court treated as illegitimate. Both women, rightly or wrongly, were accused of adultery and treated accordingly. Beatrice’s son pressed his legitimacy, and her grandson actually became Hungarian king as Andrew III – but only after the other Árpáds before him had all died off. Both Eufemia and Beatrice had relatives to go back to, though even in Beatrice’s case, it was the assistance of Innocent IV that kept her fed. Both ladies retired to recently-minted monastic settlements and lived out their final days after pleading the case of their sons. Beatrice’s retirement at Gemmola (where the confusion over her status as being “blessed” undoubtedly arises) shows on one hand a continuation of the Estes supporting a newly formed monastic settlement founded by one of their own. On the other hand, it seems that since Beatrice was destitute by the time of her return to Italy, retirement at a monastery may have been the only way Beatrice would be able to support herself. Thus the example of Beatrice shows that beyond disputes related to the succession and implementation of primogeniture, many other factors could potentially erode the Queen’s position at court.

---

<sup>321</sup> Ibid.



The marriage of **Isabella of Naples**<sup>322</sup> to the Hungarian prince who would become Laszló IV (r. 1272-1290) was a double alliance, for his sister Maria married Isabella's brother. Traditionally, the study of Isabella has mostly been confined to what historians have interpreted as her rocky relationship with her husband Laszló. Laszló is known to have kept mistresses, and the chroniclers take particular umbrage with the fact that most of them were Cuman. However, recent scholars like Kosztołnyik have chosen to re-examine the source material and challenge these older notions of personal conflict between Laszló and Isabella. Likewise, the aim of this study is to determine Isabella's activity as queen, give reason to her movements following the death of her husband, and analyze her actions in comparison with the experience of other women in similar situations in mind.

In order to understand Isabella's life, it is first necessary to understand the circumstances of her marriage. In Angevin Sicily, after the death of the Queen Beatrice of Provence in 1268, Charles I of Naples initially asked for the hand of Margaret, daughter of Béla IV (later St. Margaret of Hungary). After Margaret's refusal, Charles then proposed a double marriage – between his son Charles the Lamé and Béla's granddaughter Maria and also between his daughter Isabella and Béla's grandson, Laszló. The marriage alliance was eventually concluded in 1270, after the death of Béla IV.<sup>323</sup> According to Mór, Isabella would have been born roughly in 1264/5 while Laszló would

---

<sup>322</sup> In some charters she is referred to as Elisabeth, but since that is the name of her mother-in-law, there is a tradition of differentiating the two by referring to Laszló's mother as Elisabeth and his wife as Isabella.

<sup>323</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 246-247.

have been born in 1262.<sup>324</sup> Though Isabella would have lived at the Hungarian court since 1270, the two were not married until 1277, when the pair was old enough.<sup>325</sup>

Concerning his personal behavior, the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle is one of Laszló's harshest critics. It says that he

“Spurned the marriage-bed and went with daughters of the Comans, whose names were Eydua, Cupchech and Mandula, and he took many other concubines; and through love of them his heart became depraved, and he was hated by his barons and the nobles of the kingdom.”<sup>326</sup>

Even the papal legate who threatened him with excommunication was not able to persuade Laszló to abandon these ways.<sup>327</sup> Thus, according to the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle, Laszló lets the kingdom run into the ground and his death at the hands of Cuman assassins is entirely justified. In actuality, the picture seems more complex than this. The chronicle of Simon of Kéza – written during the reign of Laszló IV – eulogizes Laszló's military victories against Ottokar II of Bohemia and the Cumans.<sup>328</sup> Based on the reading of papal letters compared to charters and other documents, Kosztolnyik is of the mindset that many of the misdeeds that occurred during the reign of Laszló IV happened due to his advisors and counselors.<sup>329</sup> Likewise, Isabella's life as Hungarian queen has been re-evaluated, in spite of the fact that it certainly was no picnic. In 1285, she had to barricade herself in Buda while the Mongol army attacked.<sup>330</sup> After the death of her father, Laszló had his wife imprisoned in a monastery on St. Margaret's Island.<sup>331</sup> Eventually the Archbishop of Esztergom secured Isabella's freedom, and Laszló begged

---

<sup>324</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 537.

<sup>325</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 278.

<sup>326</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 182, 141.

<sup>327</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 183, 141.

<sup>328</sup> Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, chapters 74-75, 148-157.

<sup>329</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 284-296.

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

<sup>331</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 538.

her forgiveness.<sup>332</sup> Kosztolnyik also points out that donations made by Isabella in her husband's honor following a military defeat of the Cumans points to a loving relationship between the two.<sup>333</sup> While this very well may be the case, it is nonetheless important to point out the difference between the person of the monarch and the office of the monarch – the fact that affectionate language is used in legal documents does not completely imply that the relationship itself was affectionate.

Isabella's actions after the assassination of her husband in 1290 are also worthy of mention. She is known to have remained in Hungary for several years after her husband's death – nine according to Kosztolnyik,<sup>334</sup> ten according to Mór.<sup>335</sup> Mór points to a document written by her successor Queen Fenenna that refers to Isabella with the phrase “socrus nostra carissima”, which he interprets as evidence of affection between the two ladies.<sup>336</sup> Indeed, the fact that Isabella remained in Hungary for so long after the death of her husband is worth pointing out as well. The length of her stay in Hungary following her husband's death only seems equaled by the experiences of Gisela of Bavaria and Eufrozina of Kiev, the former endured seven years of abuse by her husband's successor while the latter seems to have lived comfortably supervising the reign of her eldest son István III. Though Andrew, an Italian himself, was only a distant relation to her former husband, the sparse evidence seems to suggest that her stay in Hungary was more comfortable than her time as queen during the lifetime of her own husband.

---

<sup>332</sup> Kosztolnyik cites papal letters as his source. Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 291-292.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, 284.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, 296.

<sup>335</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 539.

<sup>336</sup> Though the same problems with determining affection from medieval documents applies here as well as to the situation with her husband. *Ibid.*, 540.

This begs the question – what made Isabella leave? One possible (if rather facile) reason could be the fact that Queen Fenenna died in 1295. There were other more complex factors at play, however. Though Andrew III came to the throne and ruled in Hungary, Isabella's natal family made their own claims for the Hungarian throne following the death of her husband. In the double marriage alliance of 1270, the Angevins became kin of the Árpáds through Maria of Hungary, Isabella's sister-in-law. Even if Isabella was friendly with the court of Andrew III, the tensions between her Neapolitan kin asserting their own claim to the Hungarian throne could have made Isabella's position in Hungary politically awkward. It is also worth noting that Isabella left only a year or two before the death of Andrew III in 1301. The years after his death are seen as something of an interregnum, due to the many factions and claimants to the throne, as well as several short-lived kings before Isabella's great-nephew became the uncontested king as Charles I Robert.<sup>337</sup>

What is known is that following Isabella's return to Naples, she died as a Dominican nun in the monastery of St. Peter (San Pietro a Castello).<sup>338</sup> The date of her death is given as October 1303<sup>339</sup> or 1304.<sup>340</sup> It seems that in 1301, the ancient monastery of Castel dell'Ovo was turned into Naples' third Dominican community attributed to the Angevins. The purpose for this new structure seems to have been either for Isabella's retirement,<sup>341</sup> or that of her husband's sister, Elizabeth. This Elizabeth had come to Naples in 1300 as well, and would eventually become prioress of San Pietro a

---

<sup>337</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chs. 194-196, 144-145.

<sup>338</sup> Not to be confused with the San Pietro Martire Dominican monastery, also built at this time. Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 296; Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 540.

<sup>339</sup> Caroline Astrid Bruzelius, *The stones of Naples: church building in Angevin Italy, 1266-1343*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 99.

<sup>340</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 296.

<sup>341</sup> Caroline Astrid Bruzelius, *The stones of Naples: church building in Angevin Italy, 1266-1343*, 99.

Casello.<sup>342</sup> Unfortunately, nothing remains of the structure, which was destroyed in 1427.<sup>343</sup> Isabella's retirement and burial at a new monastic foundation took place within the context of her father and brother sponsoring multiple new religious settlements – at least seven new projects were begun at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries in Naples, not including the continuing work on the city's cathedral.<sup>344</sup> The presence of her sister-in-law Elisabeth of Hungary indicates this monastery as a place of retirement for royal and noble ladies. Isabella and Elisabeth both retiring to a Dominican monastery is also worthy of note. Dominican houses had been growing in popularity and by the reign of Laszló IV, there were thirty Dominican establishments in Hungary.<sup>345</sup> The most famous of the Dominican establishments in Hungary would have been the one for Isabella's sister in law, St. Margaret of Hungary. In Central Europe, the popularity of cults like Margaret and St. Elizabeth of Hungary (daughter of Andrew II) encouraged patronage of these mendicant orders, as well as inspiring many royals to achieve the lofty ideals of these orders.<sup>346</sup>

Though nothing remains of the monastery where Isabella was buried, her experience is worth noting, especially considering the critical juncture in Hungarian history at which she was queen. Though she died and was buried in her homeland of Naples, it is worth noting that thirty years of her life were spent in Hungary (1270-1299/1300) whereas her time in Naples merely served as bookends. Her return to Naples coincides not only with the end of the Árpád dynasty, but also the foundation of the Dominican monastery where she was buried. Though it is difficult to determine what

---

<sup>342</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 304.

<sup>343</sup> Caroline Astrid Bruzelius, *The stones of Naples: church building in Angevin Italy, 1266-1343*, 99.

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>345</sup> Dora Wiebenson and József Sisa, eds., *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, 27.

<sup>346</sup> See Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*.

role Isabella had in the new foundation of San Pietro a Castello, the connection she had with it as a new foundation seems to have been a personal, if brief one. She seems to have left Hungary of her own volition, as there is no particular reason to indicate otherwise.

The last Árpáadian queen of Hungary was **Agnes of Habsburg**, only queen for a couple of years, and yet she too was not buried in Hungary. Her husband Andrew III (r. 1290-1301) was the last Árpáadian king of Hungary, and following his death there emerged a brutal struggle for the throne that would last roughly seven years. It is no surprise then that Agnes quickly left Hungary for her homeland – with her stepdaughter Elizabeth, the last scion of the Árpáds no less. Agnes would continue to live for many decades after the death of her husband at the monastery she founded in the Habsburg's Swiss territories. Much of Agnes' actions are clear, so therefore it remains to determine what patterns of behavior in her death and burial are established, and what about them is exceptional.

Born in 1280 or 1281, to Albert of Habsburg and Elizabeth of Görz-Tyrol, Agnes grew up in an environment where her father was trying to consolidate the power of the fledgling dynasty, particularly after the death of her grandfather Emperor Rudolf I. After several marriage attempts failed for Agnes, an opportunity presented itself with the death of Fenenna, the Queen of Hungary. Soon after, Andrew III and Agnes were engaged in 1296 and married in 1297.<sup>347</sup> Agnes was regarded as one of the richest brides in Europe, and her lavish dowry included 40,000 silver marks, a castle in Weitenegg, and the city of

---

<sup>347</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története, 576-577*; Attila Zsoldos, "The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpáadian Age" in *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., 154.

Poszony.<sup>348</sup> Agnes was only queen for a couple of years, though there are a certain number of charters that survive from her period as queen – one of them even a proven forgery.<sup>349</sup> The short-lived marriage ended on January 14, 1301 with the death of Andrew III. Her brother Rudolf III of Austria and Herman of Landenberg accompanied by an army of Austrians made their way to Buda wherein they negotiated with the magnates over Agnes' return to the Habsburg lands. In the end, not only was Agnes able to take with her quite a considerable amount of treasure, but she was also allowed to take with her Elizabeth, the daughter of Andrew III by his first wife, Fenenna of Kujava.<sup>350</sup> This would have serious political implications for years to come, as Elizabeth the heir to Hungary was betrothed to the young king of Bohemia, a move meant to unite the two kingdoms. However, with Elizabeth outside of Hungary and living with the Habsburgs, the young king of Bohemia lost interest and married Viola of Teschen instead in 1305. Volker Honemann discusses the finer points related to Agnes taking Elizabeth back with her, and they need not be discussed here in any greater detail.<sup>351</sup> Agnes seems to have lived on in Vienna until disaster struck the Habsburgs with the murder of Holy Roman Emperor Albert I at the hands of his nephew, John “the Parricide”. Later tradition has Agnes and her relatives committing all sorts of butchering against the household of her father's murderers, but most of these seem to be legends that sprung up centuries after Albert's murder.<sup>352</sup> An event of more immediate importance occurs in 1308, with the foundation by Agnes and her mother Elizabeth of Tyrol of a Franciscan monastery for

---

<sup>348</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 577.

<sup>349</sup> Attila Zsoldos, “The Problems of Dating the Queens' Charters of the Árpáadian Age” in *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*, Michael Gervers, ed., 155-156.

<sup>350</sup> Volker Honemann, “Agnes and Elizabeth of Hungary” in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 110.

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*, 111-113.

nuns and friars erected on the site of Albert's murder called, appropriately enough, Königsfelden.<sup>353</sup> Agnes had small residence built at Königsfelden for her own use, and lived there until her death in on June 11 1364. Her burial at this monastery where she lived more than fifty years took place five days later.<sup>354</sup>

With Agnes, the ties between her burial place, its relationship to her natal kin, and her own monastic foundations are abundantly clear. She left Hungary with considerable treasure, and was able to leave even with Elizabeth, scion of the Árpáds. Her many years in widowhood were spent aiding her natal family: Agnes definitely had a much stronger connection to the Habsburg dynasty than to the Árpád dynasty.

This chapter has thus far dealt with eleven queens – nearly half covered in this thesis – and their widowhood, death, and burial abroad. In answer to the first question posed in this chapter, there are many factors that contributed on an individual basis to the queens' treatment in widowhood. In the cases of Gisela of Bavaria, Tuta of Formbach and Beatrice d'Este of Ancona, these women were treated poorly by their husbands' successors, even if for completely different reasons. Anastasia of Kiev, after a brief period in Austria returned to Hungary with her son in his brief rule, and left once again when he was ousted as king for a second time. Synadene seems to have left her young son at the Hungarian court for his upbringing while she returned to what would have been a more comfortable and familiar retirement in Constantinople. Eufemia of Kiev was divorced

---

<sup>353</sup> Volker Honemann, "Agnes and Elizabeth of Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Anne J. Duggan, ed., 110.

<sup>354</sup> Werter Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 579.



The answer to the second question – choice in leaving Hungary – is a mixed bag. Gisela was treated badly for many years after the death of István, but her departure from Hungary does not seem to be imposed on her. Tuta was mishandled when her husband was captured by Andrew's forces, but the chroniclers are silent on the nature of her actually leaving her husband's land. After the death of her husband, Anastasia came and went with her son – she appears in Hungary when he is in power, and appears first in Austria, then in Styria when he is ousted from power. Synadene's return to Constantinople has all the appearances of a journey made of her own volition considering the infant son she left behind in Hungary. Eufemia of Kiev and Beatrice d'Este were both accused of adultery, but the difference in their leaving Hungary should be pointed out – Eufemia was accused while her husband was still alive, summarily divorced, and sent back to her home in Kiev. Beatrice was accused after the death of her husband, and after being kept under close watch by her step-son Béla IV, she escaped dressed as a stable boy. Eufrozina of Kiev was deliberately exiled for her political support of her younger son. The movements of Maria Komnena are inscrutable, but it is doubtful having the Byzantine wife of an anti-king would have been welcomed by her husband's nephew. Margaret of France, according to Ernoul, sold all her property and left for the Holy Land – a journey entirely of her own decision, and one which would be her last. Isabella of Naples did leave Hungary for her homeland, but only after nine years had passed. Finally, Agnes of Austria left immediately after the death of her husband, but this could have been common sense on her part – his death sparked the interregnum crisis from 1301 to 1308. A good many of these queens experienced unfavorable circumstances largely beyond their control in widowhood and left Hungary either

voluntarily or in exile. Factors such as ill treatment, political adversity, finances, or a need for the king to exile the widowed queen are all seen in the study of these women.

The exact time period between husband's death and queen's departure is not known for some of these women (Tuta of Formbach, Maria Komnena) but again the length of time varied. In the cases of Anastasia of Kiev, Eufrozina of Kiev, Beatrice d'Este and Agnes of Austria, political considerations and a changing of the guard necessitated a hasty departure. Gisela of Bavaria endured nearly seven years of mistreatment before returning to Germany. Synadene remained nearly two or three years after the death of her husband before returning to her uncle, the Byzantine emperor. Eufemia of Kiev's divorce meant an immediate return home. Margaret of France journeyed to the Holy Land very shortly after the death of her husband, and died within a year of him. Isabella of Naples remained in Hungary for nine years before she returned to Italy. With the possible exception of Margaret of France, there seems to be a direct correlation between leaving Hungary by choice and time spent there after widowhood – Gisela, Isabella and Synadene seem to have spent several years after the death of their husbands in Hungary, whether their position there was comfortable or not. The cases of the queens who left shortly after the death of their husbands on the other hand, indicates an urgency and necessity linked to other circumstances dictating their movement.

The fourth point of concern – location after leaving Hungary – indicates for the most part a return to the queen's homeland and natal kin, though this is not always the case. The exceptions include Anastasia of Kiev, whose retirement in modern-day Austria seems to be more related to her daughter-in-law's family providing for her. Added to that list is Eufrozina of Kiev, whose move first to Byzantine territory, then to Jerusalem

indicates the severe nature of her exile. Finally, there is Margaret of France, who died in the Holy Land. However, Margaret's case is quite unique as her nephew was the Latin King of Jerusalem, and he buried his dead aunt in a place of honor at the cathedral in Tyre. For the other queens in this study (in answering the fifth point), a sojourn home meant returning to one's remaining family and spending one's retirement in a convent with some connection to her natal family.

Of final concern is the issue of agency in place of burial. This is perhaps the most difficult question to answer of all, because it requires the most information about the personality of the queen and knowledge of her life's actions. A good starting point would be the queens who were buried in monasteries that they founded themselves – this is the case for Tuta of Formbach and Agnes of Austria. While less is known of Tuta, Agnes' influence is seen all throughout Königsfelden as a testament to her father and the greatness of the Habsburgs. She was absolutely active as a widow, Emperor Charles IV even calling her a second Esther, and her burial there is a testament to her active life. Next of concern are the queens whose burials take place within monasteries related to their families – Synadene, Eufemia of Kiev, Maria Komnena, Beatrice d'Este, and Isabella of Naples. In most cases, the family founded monastery seemed to be a convenient dumping ground for leftover queens with no land, power, or influence of their own. Yet there are certain aspects of their burial there that are suggestive. Eufemia of Kiev is the first recorded dynast to be buried at St. Spas in Berestovo, even if her father had been the one who founded it. Russian princesses tend to associate with monasteries related to their nuclear family and this could be a pattern of behavior, but it could also reflect a personal choice. Beatrice d'Este retired in a monastery founded by an aunt who

became a saint, which could have made staying at Gemmola more attractive. Isabella of Naples took nine years to return to Italy, and she arrived around the same time that San Pietro Castello was erected for her and her sister-in-law. However, still much remains to the realm of conjecture in determining agency. Finally, there are the three queens who were buried in a place not immediately related to their natal kin. Gisela of Bavaria's burial at Niedernburg happened after she was abbess for many years, and by the time she returned to Germany most of her family was dead. With Eufrozina of Kiev, despite the fact that she had an incredibly active queenship, her exile was the biggest determining factor in her burial abroad. Lastly with Margaret of France though she died visiting her nephew, the evidence just does not seem to exist to prove that her burial at Tyre was her own decision.

What then does all this tell about Hungarian queens? In a lot of cases, circumstances beyond their control led to some kind of need to escape the country upon the death of their husbands. Some of these women had children they fought for, others had children who lost the dynastic struggles, while others had no children at all. Though external factors shaping the destiny of these women, the conclusion one reaches when analyzing their deaths and burials should not be that they were helpless and weak and unable to defend themselves. In most cases, the evidence suggests the contrary. Gisela of Bavaria remained in Hungary for several years, despite her treatment from Peter Orseleo. Anastasia of Kiev fought tooth and nail for her son Salamon. Eufrozina of Kiev did as well, for two sons – though in the end, she lost the struggle because she supported the losing son. Margaret of France's decision to leave was entirely hers, and a reflection perhaps of a queen with many accomplishments under her belt. János Bak's study of

Hungarian queens shows that in many cases they were used as scapegoats by the Hungarian nobles or by the historians themselves. While it did lead to a lot of unjust action, it also speaks to the fear that these men had towards the queen as a foreigner, as a woman, and as one who brought foreigners with her into Hungary. In many cases, the queens could be an upset to the established order – Eufemia of Kiev serves as a particularly obvious example – and it is apparent that certain queens – Gisela, Anastasia, Eufrozina, Margaret – were able to exert considerable personal influence themselves, even if the office of the queen was still amorphously defined. In short, though the evidence is sparse, it does suggest that in many cases, the queen's presence was a threatening one for the status quo – and that can be seen reflected in the treatment of the queens upon the death of their husbands.

## Chapter 4: Queens of Hungary who remarried

While many Hungarian queens outlived their husbands, only three seem to have remarried: **Judith of Swabia** (1047-1090s) wife of King Salamon (r. 1063-1074) who married Wladyslaw I Herman of Poland; **Agnes von Babenberg of Austria** (1154-1182) wife of Stephen III (r. 1161-1172) who married Herman II of Carinthia; and lastly, **Constance of Aragon** (d. 1222) wife of Imre (r. 1196-1204) who later became the first wife of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II. Marriage of queen dowagers was not unheard of, but rare nonetheless. Judith, Agnes, and Constance married outside of their first husband's realm. In addition, their second husbands in the first two cases were dukes, and in Constance's case a king and later emperor – in other words, still of considerable rank.

In the scope of this study, these women are in many ways outliers. At the time of their death, none of these women seems to have been buried as a Queen of Hungary. That being said, many of the women in the third chapter were not buried as Hungarian queens either. Though the epitaphs of Gisela and Tuta refer to them as Hungarian queens, many others buried outside the country were buried as members of simple mendicant orders, even though at one time they had been the highest ranking woman in Hungary. Therefore, in studying Judith, Agnes and Constance the conceptual framework needs to be adjusted in order to study the burials of these women. The first question is whether or not the second marriage in any way affected the place of burial. Second is the question of whether or not either the location of burial in any way reflects personal decisions made by the queen. It will also be necessary to draw out any connection with

the natal kin in their movements as widows, especially if one is to compare them to women covered in previous chapters. Lastly, this chapter seeks to identify burial patterns of immediate relation to these three women, and to evaluate them in comparison with burial patterns of other Hungarian queens. Identifying what makes these three burials different or similar will thus aid in understanding more common situations for burials of Árpáadian royal women.

Primogeniture had not taken a serious stronghold in Árpáadian diplomatic politics and this represented a serious problem when it came to the issue of succession. This was especially true of the eleventh century where every king after St. Stephen had to deal with some sort of competition from a competing branch of the family. András I (r. 1046-1060) had taken the throne from St. Stephen's nephew with the help of his two brothers, Béla and Levente (who seems to have died in the conflict). Andrew and Béla had lived in peace for several years and as András had no sons, it was understood that Béla would succeed him on the throne. However, the situation changed once András' wife gave birth to a boy, Salamon (r. 1063-1074), in 1053. By 1057, Andrew took steps to ensure Salamon's succession – he had the young boy crowned.<sup>355</sup> The following year, András and Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV concluded peace with a stipulation that Salamon should marry Henry's sister, **Judith**, and the excuse given was that an Imperial princess could not marry an uncrowned king.<sup>356</sup> According to Simon de Kéza's *Gesta Hungarorum*, Judith (whom he calls Sophie) was previously betrothed to Philip, the son of King Henri I of France, but there is no documentation of this engagement other than

---

<sup>355</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary under the Early Árpáds*, 363.

<sup>356</sup> *Ibid.*; Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chs. 91-92, 115.

his claim.<sup>357</sup> Regardless, the crowning of Salamon and András marrying his son to the Imperial princess Judith in 1058 was significant enough to alarm Béla, and Béla and his family sought help from Poland while András sent his family to Austria to fight his brother. In 1060, Andrew died while his son was still in Imperial custody, and Béla I was crowned king. In 1063, Béla I died and Salamon and the German forces took that moment to make their move. Salamon was thus crowned king of Hungary in 1063.

Like other Hungarian queens of the eleventh century, there is a problem with Judith's name in the chronicles. There is a disconcerting confusion that starts when she becomes Queen of Hungary, mostly stemming from Simon of Kéza calling her Sophia, while others address her as Judith.<sup>358</sup> In some cases, this name-switching even happens within the span of a single text.<sup>359</sup> The earliest instance of this confusion seems to take place in the thirteenth century chronicle by Simon of Kéza (double-check chronology) wherein he confuses Judith with Sophia, the daughter of Béla I (Salamon's uncle) who was betrothed to William of Thuringia.<sup>360</sup> The situation is exacerbated even more in Kéza wherein the life of this "Sophia" is further confused with the life of Sophia, the daughter of Béla II who became a nun at the convent of Admont, in Styria.<sup>361</sup>

---

<sup>357</sup> Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 127-129.

<sup>358</sup> A letter from Pope Gregory VII refers to her as Judith, but Simon of Kéza and chroniclers that used him as a source refer to her as Sophia. Pope Gregory VII, Herbert E J Cowdrey, *The register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073 – 1085, 133-134*; Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 127; Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chapter 90, 114.

<sup>359</sup> In Długosz, she is referred to as Judith Maria in 1060 in reference to her engagement to Salamon of Hungary, but when she marries Wladyslaw of Poland in 1088, she is called the "Hungarian Queen Sophia" all the while still mentioning her as the widow of Salamon. Jan Długosz, *Annals of Jan Długosz*, 42, 62.

<sup>360</sup> C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, 107.

<sup>361</sup> Of this fictitious Sophia, he says she "Regina vero Sophia uxor eius in maxima castitate perseverans, nuncios frequentibus maritum visitabat mittens ei expensam, ut habere poterat, invitando nihilominus, quod eam videre dignaretur usque mortem. Qui quamvis in corde habuisset, ob nimiam egestatem tactus verecundia ire recusavit. Quem cum de medio sublatum cognovisset, licet multi principes de Germania sibi copulari matrimonialiter coluissent, spretis omnibus, quae habebat saecularia faciens venundari, egenis est largita. Ipsa vero monialis effecta arctissimam



The confusion may have originated in the notion that Judith and her mother in law Anastasia fled to Styria and took refuge in Admont in 1074, when Salamon was overthrown.<sup>362</sup> John Tuzson also points out that there would have been another contemporaneous Sophia, the wife of Géza, Salamon's cousin and successor to the Hungarian throne whose presence could have complicated the sloppy nomenclature.<sup>363</sup> The conclusion from this mismatch of identities is that this Judith/Sophia was buried at the Abbey of Admont – this is echoed by later chroniclers such as in the *Chronicon Monacense*<sup>364</sup> and the *Chronicon Knauzianum*.<sup>365</sup>

The main problem stemming from this confusion is that it completely overlooks another, more solid historic tradition that holds that she married Wladyslaw I Herman, duke of Poland. This is attested to in mainly the Polish chronicles.<sup>366</sup> The marriage between Judith and Wladyslaw I of Poland took place in 1088.<sup>367</sup> The two are believed to have had three daughters together, and that the marriage occurred is well attested to. Otto of Bamberg was her escort to Poland, and she is known to have brought German liturgical books with her that remained in Poland.<sup>368</sup> The issue with this marriage is reconciling the two historical traditions with each other. Several questions arise from this tangled series of events. First, what evidence is there that ties Judith with the Abbey of

vitam deducendo migravit ad Dominum et in praefato monasterio tumulata, sicut sancta veneratur..” Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 137.

<sup>362</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chapter 126, 125.

<sup>363</sup> John Tuzson, *István II*, 11-12. Wertner Mór was unsure of her relationship to the Árpáds. Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 592.

<sup>364</sup> “Postea rex Salamon, timens Geysam et fratres suos, cum rebus et familia intravit Styriam, et in claustro Agmund matre et uxore relictis in musun et deinde ad cesarem ivit ut ei auxilium daret in Hungariam revertendi.” Imre Szentpetery, *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, (Budapest: Academia litter, 1937), 77, lines 7-10; “uxor cum matre in Agmund quiescent” 78, line 26.

<sup>365</sup> “uxor autem et mater eius in Agmund requiescunt”, *ibid.*, 332, lines 26-28.

<sup>366</sup> Jan Długosz, *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, 62.; Anonymous Gallus, *Gesta Principum Polonorum*, 117.

<sup>367</sup> Jan Długosz, *Annals of Jan Długosz*, 62.

<sup>368</sup> Ian Robinson, *Henry IV*, 276; W. F. Reddaway, *Cambridge History of Poland*, (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), Vol. I, 71.

Admont? Second, based on what is known of her final years in Poland, would burial at Admont be a feasible choice for her? Third, would it fit into the general pattern of burials for Polish queens? Finally, if Judith was not buried in Admont, where then might she have been buried?

Admittedly, many of the sources that confuse her with Béla II's daughter Sophia are the sources that connect her with Admont. However, the confusion with Sophia is not the only instance where Judith seems to have been placed in Austria. The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle says that in the last years of András I's life, he sent Salamon to his "father-in-law" the German emperor, but there isn't any mention of Judith at this point.<sup>369</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik says that in the fall of 1060, Andrew would have sent Anastasia, Salamon, his other son David, and Judith to Melk in Austria accompanied by the royal reeve Tibold.<sup>370</sup> After the death of András I, Judith and Salamon seem to have stayed with her mother at the Imperial court while Anastasia stayed in Austria until Salamon came to the Hungarian throne in 1063.<sup>371</sup> Judith was present for the incident in Musun (Moson), near the Austrian border, when she held back Salamon's hand as he was about to slap his mother.<sup>372</sup> Simon of Kéza says that "In fear of his brothers, Solomon moved his household to Styria and left them in the monastery at Admont."<sup>373</sup> Perhaps deriving from Kéza, the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle also states that he left his wife and mother at the cloister at Admont, but it says nothing about either of them dying there.<sup>374</sup> Kosztołnyik points out an incident that occurred in 1083 (after Salamon was deposed)

---

<sup>369</sup> The German Emperor at this time was actually Henry IV, Judith's brother – their father died in 1156. Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chapter 93, 116.

<sup>370</sup> Mostly from the *Annales Altahenses maiores*. Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary under the Early Árpáds*, 365.

<sup>371</sup> Z. J. Kosztołnyik, *Hungary under the Early Árpáds*, 376.

<sup>372</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, chapter 123, 124-125.

<sup>373</sup> This would have taken place in 1074. Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, chapter 61, 135.

<sup>374</sup> "Agmund" Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 126, 125.

wherein he tried to visit Judith while she was staying at Regensburg, but she refused to see him.<sup>375</sup> From examining the various interactions with place Judith has in these contemporary chronicles, it seems the only places that explicitly link her with Admont are the very places that confuse her with Sophia, the daughter of Béla II. Considering how this account completely ignores her life in Poland as well, it is not a very reliable assumption based on this imperfect evidence.

What then is known of Judith's final years in Poland? She is not mentioned in Długosz after her wedding which he dates to 1088. The *Gesta Principum Polonorum* is a little more informative, saying that while Judith and Wladyslaw had no sons, the two had three daughters.<sup>376</sup> Jasiński places the dates of their births as 1089, 1090, and 1091.<sup>377</sup> He also states that she would have died on March 14, somewhere between the years 1092 and 1100.<sup>378</sup> Kosztolnyik narrows the date down to 1094,<sup>379</sup> but this is certainly not canon. Bak's study of Hungarian queens says that she would have died in either 1093 or 1095.<sup>380</sup> In the 1090s, the chronicles whisper of her involvement with Sieciech, Wladyslaw's count palatine, against Zbiegniew but even this is unclear, and it is questionable whether or not she played any part in court intrigue or the recording of it reflected misogynist, anti-German sentiment.<sup>381</sup> With most contemporary chronicles

---

<sup>375</sup> From the Bernoldi Chronicon, *Monumenta Germaniae historiae*, V, 439; Kosztolnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 385.

<sup>376</sup> One seems to have married a Russian prince, one became a nun at Gandersheim, and one married a Polish noble. Gallus Anonymus, *Gesta Principum Polonorum*, Liber Secundus, 117.

<sup>377</sup> Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 280-281.

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>379</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary under the Early Árpáds*, 364.

<sup>380</sup> Though this information mostly comes from Schwennicke's *Europäische Stammtafeln* published 1980-1984. János Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary", in *Medieval Queenship*, John Carmi Parsons, ed., 23.

<sup>381</sup> The Czechs seem to have encouraged hostility both towards Judith and Sieciech. *Cambridge History of Poland*, Vol. I, 43; *The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*, 125.

focused on the problems of succession towards the end of Wladyslaw's life, Judith simply falls off the radar sometime in the 1090s.

If Judith was buried as queen of Poland, and not as a Hungarian queen, a word should be said on the patterns of burials for Polish queens. Unlike Hungary in the late tenth through early twelfth centuries, the overwhelming tendency seems to be that Polish queens as well as kings were buried in Polish cathedrals. The only exception appears to be those who died in exile, such as Oda of Miessen, second wife of Mieszko I (r. 965-992) who was buried in Quedlinburg and the deposed Boleslav II who was buried at the Benedictine monastery at Tyniec.<sup>382</sup> The first four generations of kings of the Piast dynasty appear to have been buried at Poznań, but after 1058 with the death of Wladyslaw's father Kazimierz the Restorer, Piast burials shifted away from Poznań.<sup>383</sup> Wladyslaw Herman and his son Boleslav III were both buried at the cathedral in the city of Płock. In addition, it would seem that Wladyslaw's first wife, Judith of Bohemia, and Boleslav's second wife, Salome of Berg, were also buried at Płock with their husbands.<sup>384</sup>

Unfortunately, with the information available at the moment, the final resting place of Judith may never be known. Yet even this scarce information can divulge some information about the activity of Hungarian queens as widows and exiles. Rather than share in the many failed attempts of Salamon to regain the Hungarian throne, Judith opted for a life back in the Imperial court. Marriage to duke Wladyslaw I of Poland not only strengthened Imperial ties (and benefitting her natal family in the process) but also would have been an alternative instead of retiring to a convent. Though Judith would have been in her forties at the time of her second marriage, she was still able to give birth

---

<sup>382</sup> Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 280-281.

<sup>383</sup> Ibid.; Jan Długosz, *The Annals of Jan Długosz*, 41-42.

<sup>384</sup> Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 280-281.

to three daughters, and contribute to religious developments in Poland. It is unfortunate that there is no record either of her death or burial, but at the same time her life presents an alternative to what happened to many of the queens in chapter 3. Unlike many of them, she still had a very close and powerful member of her natal kin still alive in the form of her brother, Henry IV. While his presence seems to have kept her away from spending her retirement in a convent, it nonetheless seems to have come with a price, especially as a marriage alliance with Poland benefitted Henry a good deal.

Most of what is known of **Agnes of Babenberg**, the Austrian wife of István III (r. 1161-1172) comes from German sources<sup>385</sup> – and even they are not very informative.

Kosztolnyik in 1987 states that:

It is unfortunate that so little is known about the queen of King Stephen III, the daughter of Margrave Henry II of the *Ostmark*. It is to be feared that she was not the mature and self-assured person who might have influenced the behavior of her royal husband.<sup>386</sup>

He is a little more forgiving two decades later, writing that “having taken this step [i.e. marriage to Agnes], István III was able to bring together a serious Hungarian-German dynastic alliance,<sup>387</sup> though the remark says virtually nothing of Agnes herself. Ferenc Makk’s opinion of the marriage is that Austro-German and Hungarian connections were strengthened, though he warns that it should by no means indicate any kind of Imperial hegemony.<sup>388</sup> This opinion however fails to give any real information on Agnes herself. Unlike Judith, the location of Agnes’ final resting place is known: she was buried at the

---

<sup>385</sup> She is absent from both the Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle and Simon of Kéza, though neither mention much of her husband. Her marriage is mentioned in the Appendix of Otto of Freising’s *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, though by Rahewin, his continuer rather than Otto, her uncle. Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 336.

<sup>386</sup> Italics in text. Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Bela III*, 181.

<sup>387</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds from Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 205.

<sup>388</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 99.

Schottenstift in Vienna, with her mother and father. Due to the close proximity of her burial with her natal family, the temptation has been to interpret this as yet another reinforcing example of her colorlessness and lack of individual agency. Therefore, the challenge with Agnes von Babenberg is to determine how her burial at the Schottenstift fits into what is known of her life and what considerations led to her burial there.

Born in 1154, she was the oldest daughter of Heinrich II “Jasomirsgott”, the Babenberg duke of Austria by his second wife, Theodora Komnena, niece of Emperor Manuel Komnenos.<sup>389</sup> Her father had been chosen to act as arbitrator between the Hungarian court and the Byzantine court (his wife was Manuel Komnenos’ niece). The early years of the reign of István III had been marred by his greedy uncles who proclaimed themselves anti-kings Laszló II (r. 1161-1162) and István IV (r. 1163-1165). The latter was married to a niece of Manuel’s, and István III had to contend with these two pretenders as well as their foreign support. He had originally been betrothed to a daughter of Yaroslav of Halich in an attempt to gain a foreign ally of his own. When Heinrich II of Austria negotiated the peace between Hungary and Byzantium, however, part of the negotiations included István III marrying Heinrich’s daughter, Agnes, and the Russian princess was sent back to her home.<sup>390</sup> István and Agnes were married near the end of 1166, the following year Agnes gave birth to a boy, Béla, who died shortly thereafter.<sup>391</sup> She does not appear in the historical record again until 1172. Her father and Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony were en route to the Holy Land when they stopped by Esztergom to visit Agnes and István. Word soon reached the two Henrys that István

---

<sup>389</sup> Karl Lechner, *Die Babenberger: Markgrafen und Herzoge von Österreich 976-1246*, (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1996), 480.

<sup>390</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds from Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 205; Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 99.

<sup>391</sup> Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 99, 167 n. 31.

had died very suddenly on March 4, 1172.<sup>392</sup> Among the Germans, rumors swiftly circulated that the dead king's brother Béla-Alexios (former heir of Manuel Komnenos) had István III poisoned so he could take the Hungarian throne.<sup>393</sup> István III had no heir, though Agnes was pregnant at the time. Unfortunately, nothing more is known of the baby from this pregnancy and the assumption is that the child died either during birth or shortly thereafter. After returning to Austria with her father, she was married to Herman I of Carinthia on May 3 1173.<sup>394</sup> After having two sons together, Duke Herman died in 1181. Agnes died the following year and was buried that the Schottenstift in Austria, with her mother and father. Irish monks from Ratisbon had been invited by Heinrich II to form a Benedictine monastery outside the west city walls of Vienna in 1150. The foundation seems to have been laid on October 4 1161,<sup>395</sup> but the building itself took half a century to be constructed and it was not until 1200 that the original building, a square pillared basilica with three naves, was consecrated.<sup>396</sup> The neo-Roman marble sarcophagus that houses the remains of Heinrich, Theodora and Agnes is from the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>397</sup>

The role of Agnes in this narrative construction of her life appears to be mainly that of a uterine pawn and the fact that she was buried with her mother and father has been interpreted as confirming this. However, her burial at the Schottenstift is worthy of mention for several reasons. While her father may have been the driving force behind her

---

<sup>392</sup> Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds from Geza I to Emery (1074-1204)*, 208, 210.

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, 208-209.

<sup>394</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 331; Franz Gall, "The 'Schottenkloster' in Vienna", in *Die Babenberger, und was von ihnen bleib (The Babenbergs, and what they left to us)*, ed. Christine Wessely, (Vienna: Verb. d. Wissenschaftl. Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1975), 85-88.

<sup>395</sup> A. W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, 262; Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 331.

<sup>396</sup> Franz Gall, "The Schottenkloster in Vienna", 87.

<sup>397</sup> Heinrich Ferenczy & Christoph Merth, *Das Schottenstift und seine kunstwerke*, (Vienna: Orac, 1980), 26.

marriages, he died after falling off his horse in 1177 and Agnes did not die until 5 years later.<sup>398</sup> Franz Gall believed that Theodora was the next to die and Agnes was the last of the three to die,<sup>399</sup> but the chronology seems to be that Heinrich II died in 1177, Agnes in 1182, and Theodora was the last to die in 1183.<sup>400</sup> Concerning her father, this was the only monastery he seems to have founded<sup>401</sup> and it appears that no other Babenbergs were buried there. Her mother was buried with her father as well, but this was by no means a hard and fast rule. Therefore the best way to approach this is to clarify the relationship Agnes had with her mother and father, and determine what the most significant factors were in Agnes' burial at the Schottenstift.

From the little known of her time as queen, Hungary does not seem to have been considered as a burial option for Agnes. She was married at twelve, her first son died when she was thirteen, she was widowed by eighteen and appears to have lost her second child shortly thereafter. After returning to Austria, she thus had no further ties with Hungary. Her attachment to Carinthia is a different story. With Duke Herman I, she had two children, Ulrich and Bernard and both would have been very young when their father died in 1181 – Ulrich, who succeeded his father, would have been around six years old and Bernard even younger.<sup>402</sup> Herman was the first duke of Carinthia to be buried in the abbey founded by his great-great-grandfather at St. Paul in Lavant.<sup>403</sup> Since Ulrich was so young upon the death of his father, his uncle and Agnes' brother Leopold V of Austria

---

<sup>398</sup> A. W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, 266.

<sup>399</sup> Franz Gall, "The Schottenkloster in Vienna", 87-88.

<sup>400</sup> Karl Lechner, *Die Babenberger*, 480.

<sup>401</sup> A. W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, 263.

<sup>402</sup> Leeper believes the date of his birth to be 1175, Mór 1176. A.W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, 356; Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 332.

<sup>403</sup> A. W. Leeper, *History of Medieval Austria*, p56.



stepped in as the young Duke's guardian.<sup>404</sup> Unlike her experience in Hungary, Agnes had small children in Carinthia when she died, but rather than being buried near her second husband's family, she was buried with her natal family. While burial in Hungary may not have been an option, it is plausible that burial in Carinthia might have been an option for Agnes, especially since she died so shortly after her husband's death. And yet, if it was an option it was not one that was taken.

What information does this impart about Hungarian queens then? In Agnes' case her father was right there to escort her to Austria following the death of her young husband. Considering the struggle for the throne that took place between Béla (III) and his brother Géza, removing the young widow probably reflects a real concern for her safety. Since she was still young, marriage to the duke of Carinthia was the next move in Agnes' life. Following the death of her second husband, Agnes would have then made her way back to Vienna, where she was buried with her father and mother. Considering that her father was able to intervene when she was widowed a first time, and her mother was still alive when Agnes herself died, like Judith there is an immediate family connection that acts as a safety net for this young widow. Not all of the women who did not get remarried had this same kind of network to fall back on, and many of them thus retire to a convent usually in their homeland. Thus, if much of Agnes' adult life seems dictated by her parents in comparison to other women in this study, part of that could be the fact that they were still alive and taking an active part in her life.

The last of the Árpáadian queens to remarry after the death of her husband was **Constance of Aragon**, widow of Emeric/Imre (r. 1196-1204). The two were married

---

<sup>404</sup> Ibid., 356-357.

shortly after his ascension to the Hungarian throne and little is known of Constance's activities as queen. Simon de Kéza attributes the noble family of Nagymarton as originating from Constance's retinue.<sup>405</sup> In 1201, she gave birth to a boy, Laszló. Upon the death of his father in 1204, Laszló succeeded for a brief while as king of Hungary as Laszló III, but seeing that Emeric's brother Andrew was making a claim to disinherit his nephew, Constance fled to Austria with her son and the Hungarian crown, seeking protection from Leopold VI.<sup>406</sup> Despite Emeric having the archbishop of Kalocsa crown Laszló before his death, Andrew refused to give Constance money Emeric had left for her at the Cistercian Abbey of Pilis and pressed his claims to the throne.<sup>407</sup> The conflict between Andrew and his four year old nephew did not last long, for Laszló III died in Austria on May 5, 1205, paving the way for Andrew's unimpeded coronation. Peter, the bishop of Győr, had Laszló's body taken back to Hungary to be buried at Székesfehérvár,<sup>408</sup> but Constance felt no need to return to a brother-in-law who mistreated her and returned to Aragon, residing at Sigena.<sup>409</sup>

However, she did not stay in Spain, and soon Pope Innocent III was arranging her to be married to Frederick, the young king of Sicily who would become Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II. The two had a son, Henry, together and the relationship between Constance and Frederick seems to have been a close one. However, in 1222 while in the city of Catania Constance died and was subsequently buried at the Cathedral of Palermo, in Sicily.

---

<sup>405</sup> Counts Simon, Michael, and Bertram were originally surnamed Martinsdorf, and their kinswoman, Tota, would enjoy a prominent role in Hungary in the rule of Andrew II, Emeric's successor. Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*, 169, 171, 173.

<sup>406</sup> Z. J. Kosztoľnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, 32.

<sup>407</sup> Andrew's murdered first wife would be buried at Pilis in 1213. *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>408</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>409</sup> Damian J. Smith, *Innocent III and the crown of Aragon: the limits of papal authority*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 68.

Constance was interred in the first chapel, along the west wall and in a Roman era sarcophagus with the relief of a lion hunt.<sup>410</sup> According to Deer, the sarcophagus is only of “mediocre” quality, and despite a tradition of Sicilian kings being buried in porphyry sarcophagi, Constance was the first member of the dynasty to be buried without it. However, this became a trend and burial in porphyry sarcophagi seems to have stopped by the time Constance died.<sup>411</sup> The tomb was opened up twice, first in 1491 and then again in 1781 and the grave goods have been documented: her remains were wrapped in red fabric and a wooden box at her feet contained the imperial crown Frederick II is thought to have placed in her tomb. Her fair hair was still preserved, along with a headdress and many personal ornaments, thought to be Byzantine in style.<sup>412</sup>

Part of her epitaph reads as follows:

“Hoc est corpus Dominae Constantiae, III Romanorum Imperatricis semper Augustae, et Reginae Siciliae, uxoris Domini Imperatoris Friderici et Siciliae Regis et filiae Regis Aragonum. Obiit autem anno Incarnationis 1222 23. Junii 10 ind. in civitate Catanae.”<sup>413</sup>

Though her status as German empress was considerably higher than that of Hungarian queen, her first marriage and time spent in Hungary are nonetheless absent. Part of this could be reflective of the miserable experience she had with her brother in law András II. Part of it could be that the epitaph was commissioned after her death, and saw no reason to include her time or experience in Hungary.

While the date of her death, location of burial, and some grave goods are known, the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter need to be addressed. In this case, Constance’s burial at Palermo was very much affected by her second marriage. She was

<sup>410</sup> Sir R. Lambert Playfair, *Handbook to the Mediterranean: its cities, coasts and islands*, (London: J. Murray, 1890), 401.

<sup>411</sup> József Deér, *Dynastic Porphyry Tombs*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 19, 79.

<sup>412</sup> John Murray, *Handbook to the Mediterranean*, 401.

<sup>413</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 373.

buried in the same cathedral as Frederick II, joining his mother's forbears. It is very difficult to say what type of agency Constance exercised in her burial at Sicily, but the recycled sarcophagus and overwhelming presence of her husband's Sicilian ancestors suggests against it. Constance had returned to Aragon following the death of Imre in 1204, but her second marriage seems largely to have been determined by Innocent III rather than her birth family. Of the 24 women covered in this thesis, Constance is the latest chronological burial at a cathedral, but this is more reflective of Sicilian dynastic burial practices, which were also undergoing a transition in the early thirteenth century as well. By the end of the thirteenth century, Sicily would have its own mausoleum pantheon to sainted members of the dynastic family, thanks in large part to its Queen, Maria of Hungary.<sup>414</sup>

While the circumstances of each burial are too disparate to be able to create some grand scheme or generalization, several observations can be noted. First, these three women who remarried do not seem to have expressed their status as Queen of Hungary through either their place of burial or through what is known of their funerary interment. This is interesting in the case of Judith and Agnes, as both of their husbands were of considerably lower rank. Both Agnes and Constance spent more time with their second husbands than as Queen of Hungary. Regrettably, too little is known of Judith's final days to be able to say one way or another where her final resting place is, but it can be ascertained that it most certainly was not at the abbey of Admont in Styria. Agnes' burial is worthy of mention, for she is the only one of the three to outlive both of her husbands, and she is the only one to be buried with her natal family. With regards to Constance,

---

<sup>414</sup> Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 312-313.

much is known of her grave goods, yet the details of her burial indicate a similar pattern with those queens in chapter 1 who predeceased their husbands.

After these three women were widowed, they had remaining members of their native family to return to, and all three did so before their second remarriage. Departure from Hungary in all cases was necessitated by a dangerous, immediate political conflict following the death (or in Judith's case, overthrow) of their husbands. Judith returned to the Imperial court in Germany before her remarriage to the Polish duke. Agnes of Babenberg was escorted back to Austria by her father following the death of István III. She even returned to Austria following the death of her second husband. Constance of Aragon first fled to Austria following the hostile takeover of András II, yet it seemed she had every indication of fighting for her son's right to the throne. Once he died, Constance returned to Aragon with no practical reason to go back to Hungary. Personal agency in the case of all three women is virtually inscrutable, unlike other situations where it is more plausible. Unlike other widowed Hungarian queens who fled (chapter 3), these women had a family network to fall back on, and it was very beneficial to these families to have their widowed daughters/sisters remarry and forge new alliances. This gives a window into the past to see what might have happened if some of the other queens had relatives who still saw their political use.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis has been to elucidate matters related to death and inhumation of Árpáadian queens. As indicated in the previous chapters, the end results vary considerably, the evidence base varies considerably, and there are many things that will likely never be discovered. And yet, there are several aspects related to the lives of these women that are suggestive.

The first point of interest is the queen's relation to her natal kin upon the death of her husband. This was not a concern for the queens who predeceased their husbands, of course. The queens in chapter 2 buried in Hungary largely have no natal kin, but the favorable circumstances at court aid in keeping their retirement secure. For the most part, the queens who outlived their husbands and were buried outside of Hungary had little outside support to rely on. There are exceptions to this, of course: Tuta of Formbach retired with her sister, Eufemia of Kiev retired in a monastery founded by her father, Margaret of France died visiting her nephew, Isabella of Naples retired to a Dominican convent with her sister-in-law, and Agnes Habsburg of Austria guided an entire generation of Habsburgs from Königsfelden. For the most part however, the members of the families in the third group rarely imposed themselves on the lives of these retired women, regardless of how young or suitable for remarriage they might have been. In chapter 4, the remarried widows all had close relatives to return to, and after a brief period found themselves married again. Overall, the general pattern seems to be that when networks of natal kin were in place for these widowed queens, it facilitated remarriage, especially if it proved to be convenient for the bride's birth family.

There are other trends that become apparent in studying these women. The location of burial shifts varying degrees for these women, sometimes in response to larger religious movements going on. Most of the burials in the eleventh century take place in a Benedictine monastery (the possible exception being Synadene, who would have retired to a Basilian foundation). Towards the end of the eleventh century and into the twelfth, queens start to be buried at cathedrals, starting with Adelaide of Rheinfelden's burial at Veszprém. This burial is unique not only because it occurs in a cathedral founded by Hungary's first queen, but also because no subsequent Hungarian queen took it upon herself to be buried there. The other cathedral burials in Hungary all take place at Székesfehérvár, the site of the coronation and mausoleum to Hungary's first saints, St. István I and St. Imre. Monarchs in the twelfth century starting with king Kálmán took an active interest in burying themselves among their sainted ancestor rather than in their own monastic foundations. This tradition too stops in the thirteenth century, wherein monarchs are buried in new foundations of recently minted religious orders, particularly the Cistercians, Dominicans, and Franciscans. Considering the popularity of these orders, it is hardly a surprise that worldly monarchs would wish that their eternal resting place be in an active religious order they (or someone close to them) founded.

In some very special cases, the archaeological evidence is able to divulge information on aspects of royal burial. Though Gisela died as an abbess at Niedernburg in Passau, the slab on her tomb nonetheless makes it very clear that she is still a queen. The lid to the sarcophagi believed to be attributed to Kálmán and Felicia is made with red marble. The grave goods of Agnes of Antioch, though not as plentiful as those of her husband, nonetheless display great wealth and cosmopolitanism. Though Constance of

Aragon is placed in a beat-up, recycled sarcophagus, the crown she is buried with nonetheless evokes majesty and awe. The sarcophagus of Gertrude of Meran also tells of great wealth and care and interest in following recent Gothic trends from Western Europe. However, in some cases the archaeological information and the historical narratives do not always match up. This is always a serious concern when combining the two bodies of evidence, and rather than favoring one over the other this thesis has sought to judge the information on its own terms. For instance, the age of the body in the sarcophagus at Passau combined with the inscription and similarity in style to a slab found elsewhere in Hungary is a pretty convincing case for that particular tomb belonging to Gisela of Bavaria. For that matter, the inability to locate the body of Eufrozina of Kiev does not necessarily mean it was never brought back there. The latter is especially problematic, as the excavations at Székesfehérvár conducted in 1864 had numerous problems associated with the way excavations were conducted in the nineteenth century.

What then do the experiences of these women tell about life as a Hungarian queen? For one, most of the queens would outlive their husbands. This could lead to potential problems, especially if there was a disputed succession (which many of them were). Some queens chose to fight, while others chose flight. Some who fought ended up losing (Eufrozina of Kiev), while others stayed for many years before finally leaving (Gisela of Bavaria, Isabella of Naples). Being the wife of the king could be very lucrative, and during the lifetime of their husbands, some queens were able to attract a great deal of wealth and property (Gisela of Bavaria, Margaret of France). However,



once the king died, the wheel of fortune would start turning the other way, and a queen could easily be left destitute and alone (Beatrice d'Este).

The most perplexing issue of all continues to be addressing what kind of control any of these women had over anything related to their burial. Women buried at institutions they founded (Tuta of Formbach, Agnes of Austria) make the strongest cases for this aspect of choosing the site of one's burial. With other queens, one has to look at their life in order to determine if there was any prior relationship to their place of burial. In the case of Adelaide of Rheinfelden, there are many scraps of evidence indicating some kind of relationship she had with Veszprém. With some queens you can point to actions and circumstances of their life that played a large role in determining the queen's movements. Gisela of Bavaria it seems only left Hungary when her hand was forced, but if her tomb is any indication she certainly saw to it that she was buried like a queen. Margaret of France set out for the Holy Land of her own volition, and there is the possibility that she chose to be buried out there, though the evidence for that is admittedly slim. Many queens seem to have chosen a place of retirement that was comfortable or familiar to them, though in some cases (particularly the Byzantine ones) it seems that someone else made the decision over what was suitably comfortable.

The power the Queen of Hungary could wield seems to have varied considerably based on the personality of the woman involved. Yet reading between the lines, and across all bodies of evidence, one gets the sense that these women could acquire significant, if mostly unofficial power, for themselves. Natural distrust of queens as foreigners and women in some cases worked against the women who were seen as wielding too much power (Gertrude of Meran). In short, the burial practices of the

Árpáadian dynasty towards its queens are a mixed bag. Some women did not live to see widowhood, yet were given a comfortable place of honor in Hungary. In some cases, powerful women operating due to special circumstances could enjoy a somewhat comfortable retirement and suitable burial in Hungary. In other cases, a sudden political shift made the queen's position precarious and fight or flight was the primary reaction. Some who fled had family to turn to for aid, which brought about remarriage in some cases. Others had to rely on living in poverty and retiring as an exile. Though the office of queen in many cases seems to be a hardly enviable one, many of the women who held it were able to demonstrate some sort of power in their own right, in spite of the potential danger and pitfalls. It is a testament to their bravery and gumption that so many women chose to fight, and only resorted to fleeing as a last resort.

## Appendix I: Unknown Burials of Hungarian Consorts

There are several women who fall under the umbrella of Hungarian queen whose burials are not included in the main body of this text. In particular, missing from the main study are **NN of Hungary**, wife of Samuel Aba (r. 1041-1044), **Ryksa/Adelaide of Poland** (d. 1059?) wife of Béla I (r. 1060-1063), **Sophia of Looz** (d. 1065?), first wife of Géza I (r. 1074-1077), and **NN of Capua**, wife of István II (r. 1116-1131). In the case of all four of these women, the circumstances of their death and burial are so nebulous as to preclude any serious study. The first woman would have been a Hungarian princess, a sister of St. István I, who was married to a noble by the name of Samuel Aba.<sup>415</sup> The date of her death is unknown, and it is not even clear whether she was alive or not at the time her husband usurped the Hungarian throne. The second woman is Ryksa (Rikissa, Richenza, Rixa)/Adelaide, daughter of Mieszko II of Poland and Richenza of Lorraine. Her real name is unknown, though some historians say she was named after her mother, while others claim she would have been named Adelaide after her mother's relatives.<sup>416</sup> After marrying Béla following his victory of the Pommeranians, Ryksa/Adelaide would have moved to Hungary in 1048, given birth to his large brood of children, and if she was still alive in 1059, she would have followed him back to Poland briefly.<sup>417</sup> Beyond that, there is no more information of her life – it is not known whether she even became Queen of Hungary, or whether or not she was buried in Hungary or in Poland. Sophia of Looz likewise died before her husband became King of Hungary in 1074. The exact date is not

---

<sup>415</sup> In Kosztolnyik's study of the early Árpáds, he notes in one section that she would have been István's younger sister, though four pages later he refers to her as István's older sister. Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary Under the Early Árpáds*, 330, 334.

<sup>416</sup> Mór mentions Narusczevicz, an eighteenth century historian who refers to her as Rixa: Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 144; Jasiński is more of the mindset that her name was Adelaide: Jasiński, *Rodowód Pierwszych Piastów*, 149-150.

<sup>417</sup> Wertner Mór, *Az Árpádok családi Története*, 143.

known, but the general consensus is that she would have died in 1065.<sup>418</sup> Of the four women listed here, only the last is a plausibly legitimate queen. The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle makes note that István II married a daughter of Robert, the Duke of Apulia.<sup>419</sup> She would have been married to István while he was king, but there is a complete dearth of information where she is concerned. Assuming that she died before her husband, it seems more likely that she would have been buried in Hungary but there is no definite proof of this.

With all of these women, the sources are too vague to place their death chronologically or geographically with any kind of certainty, and they are thus left out of the main body of study.

---

<sup>418</sup> János M. Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpáadian and Angevin Hungary”, in *Medieval Queenship*, John C. Parsons, ed., 23.

<sup>419</sup> Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 154, 134. She is not named, but sometimes she is referred to as Christiana – this seems to be another reference from the illustrated chronicle wherein it states that “He [István II] burned to death the lady Christiana” Markus Kalti, *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle*, ch. 157, 135.

## Appendix II: Hungarian Queens of the Árpád dynasty

Queen	Husband	Burial place
Sarolta of Transylvania (d. 1008)	Prince Géza (r. 975-997)	Hungary
Gisela of Bavaria (985-c.1065)	St. István I (r. 997-1038)	Niedernburg
Tuta of Formbach (d. 1055?)	Peter Orseleo (r. 1038-1046)	Suben
Anastasia of Kiev (d. c. 1096)	András I (r. 1046-1060)	Admont
Judith of Swabia (1047-1094?)	Salamon (r. 1063-1074)	Poland
Synadene Synadenos (d. after 1079)	Géza I (r. 1074-1077)	Constantinople
Adelaide of Rheinfelden (d. 1090)	St. Laszló I (r. 1077-1095)	Veszprém
Felicia of Sicily (d. 1102-1112)	Kálmán (r. 1095-1116)	Székesfehérvár
Eufemia of Kiev (d. 1138)	Kálmán (r. 1095-1116)	Kiev
Helen of Serbia (d. 1146?)	Béla II (r. 1131-1141)	Székesfehérvár
Eufrozina of Kiev (1130?-1193)	Géza II (r. 1141-1161)	Jerusalem
Agnes Babenberg (1154-1182)	István III (r. 1161-1172)	Vienna
Maria Komnene (d. after 1165)	István IV (r. 1163-1165)	Constantinople
Agnes/Anna of Antioch (d. 1184)	Béla III (r. 1173-1196)	Székesfehérvár
Margaret of France (1158-1197)	Béla III (r. 1173-1196)	Tyre
Constance of Aragon (1179-1222)	Imre (r. 1196-1204)	Palermo
Gertrude of Meran (d. 1213)	András II (r. 1205-1235)	Pilis
Yolande de Courtenay (d. 1233)	András II (r. 1205-1235)	Egres
Beatrice d'Este (d. 1245)	András II (r. 1205-1235)	Gemmola
Maria Laskarina (d. 1270)	Béla IV (r. 1235-1270)	Esztergom
Elizabeth of the Cumans (d. 1290?)	István V (r. 1270-1272)	Budapest

Isabella of Naples (d. 1304)	Laszló IV (r. 1272-1290)	Naples
Fenenna of Kujava (1276-1295)	András III (r. 1290-1301)	Budapest
Agnes Habsburg (1281-1364)	András III (r. 1290-1301)	Königsfelden

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources:

- Bonfinius, Antonius. *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1936.
- Choniates, Niketas. *O city of Byzantium: the annals of Niketas Choniates*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984.
- Cosmas of Prague, Lisa Wolverton, trans. *The Chronicle of the Czechs*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009.
- Długosz, Jan & Maurice Michael, ed. *The Annals of Jan Długosz*. Chichester: I.M. Publications, 1997.
- Edbury, Peter W. *The conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: sources in translation*. Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998.
- Gallus, Anonymous. *Gesta principum Polonorum*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2003.
- Pope Gregory VII, Herbert E J Cowdrey. *The register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073 - 1085: an English translation*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002),
- Kalti, Markus. *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle: Chronica de Gestis Hungarorum*. Edited by Dezső Dercsényi. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970.
- Kéza, Simon. *Gesta Hungarorum*. New York: Central European University Press, 1999.
- Kinnamos, John, and trans. Charles M. Brand. *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
- Komnene, Anna and E. R. A. Sewter, trans. *The Alexiad*. London: Penguin Books, 2009.
- Otto of Freising, Rahewin, Charles Christopher Mierow, trans. *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

Szentpetery, Imre. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Budapest: Academia litter. hungarica atque Societate histor, 1999.

Wolfherius, Wilhelm von Giselbrechy, Edmund von Oefe. *Annales Altahenses Miores*. Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1891.

#### Secondary Sources:

Barnes, Carl F. *The Portfolio of Villard de Honnecourt*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2009.

Berend, Nora. *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000-c.1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Berend, Nora, ed. *Christianization and the Rise of the Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c. 900-1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Bruzelius, Caroline Astrid. *The stones of Naples: church building in Angevin Italy, 1266-1343*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Chiappini, Luciano. *Gli Estensi*. Milan: Dall'Oglio, 1967.

Curta, Florin. *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Age, 500-1250*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Dark, Ken. "The Byzantine church and monastery of St. Mary Peribleptos in Istanbul." *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 141, No. 1160 (Nov. 1999), pp. 656-664.

Deér, József. *The dynastic porphyry tombs of the Norman period in Sicily*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Dercsényi, Dezső. *Historical Monuments in Hungary: Restoration and Preservation*. Budapest: Corvina Press, 1969.



- Dercsényi, Dezső. *A székesfehérvári királyi bazilika*. Budapest: Műemlékek Országos Bizottsága, 1943.
- Dimnik, Martin. "Dynastic Burials in Kiev before 1240." *Ruthenica* VII (2008) 71-104.
- Duggan, Anne J. *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997.
- Dunbar, Agnes B. C. *A dictionary of saintly women*. 2 Vols. London: G Bell, 1904.
- Engel, Pál. "Temetkezések a középkori Székesfehérvári Bazilikában." *Századok* 121 (1987), 613-637.
- Ferenczy, Heinrich & Christoph Merth. *Das Schottenschtift und seine Kunstwerke*. Vienna: Orac, 1908.
- Fine, John V. A. *The early medieval Balkans: a critical survey from the sixth to the late twelfth century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983.
- Font, Márta. *Koloman the Learned: King of Hungary*. Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2001.
- Forster, Gyula. *III. Béla magyar király emlékezete*. Budapest: Hornyánszky, V., 1900.
- Garland, Lynda. *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Gerevich, Laszló. "Ausgrabungen in der Ungarischen Zisterzienserabtei Pilis." *Analecta Cisterciana* XXXIX, 39 (1983), pp. 281-310.
- Gerevich, Laszló, ed. *Towns in Medieval Hungary*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Gervers, Michael ed. *Dating Undated Medieval Charters*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000.

- Györffy, György. *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Henszlmann, Imre. *A székes-fehérvári ásatások eredménye*. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv Bizománya, 1864.
- Hebbert, Charles, Norm Longley, and Dan Richardson. *Rough guide to Hungary*. (London: Rough Guides, 2002).
- Holtzmann, Walther. "Maximilla regina, soro Rogerii regis" in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 19 (1963) 149-167.
- Hunyadi, Zsolt & József Laszlóvsky, eds. *The Crusades and the military orders*. Budapest: Central European University, 2001.
- Jasiński, Kazimierz. *Rodowód pierwszych Piastów*. Poznan: Wydawn, 2004.
- Kerbl, Raimund. "Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluß auf das Árpádkönigreich." Ph. D. diss., University of Vienna, 1979.
- Klanciczay, Gábor. *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: dynastic cults in medieval Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kosztolnyik, Z. J. *From Coloman the Learned to Béla III*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1987.
- Kosztolnyik, Z. J. *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1996.
- Kosztolnyik, Z. J. *Hungary under the Early Árpáds, 890s to 1063*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 2002.
- Kosztolnyik, Z. J. *The Dynastic Policy of the Árpáds, Géza I to Emery (1074-1204)*. Boulder: East European Monographs, No. DCLXXXVII, 2006.

- Lechner, Karl. *Die Babenberger: Markgrafen und Herzoge von Österreich 976-1246*. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1996.
- Leeper, A. W. A. *A History of Medieval Austria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Lendvai, Paul. *The Hungarians: a thousand years of victory in defeat*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Macartney, C. A. *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Makk, Ferenc. *The Árpáds and the Comneni: Political Relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12<sup>th</sup> Century*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989.
- Mehling, Franz & Marianne Mehling. *Austria, a Phaidon Cultural Guide*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1985.
- Moorman, John R. H. *Medieval Franciscan Houses*. St. Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute St. Bonaventure University, 1983.
- Mór, Wertner. *Az Árpádok családi Története*. Nagy-Becskereken: Pleitz, 1892.
- Moravcsik, Gyula. *Byzantium and the Magyars*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1970.
- Nolan, Kathleen. *Queens in Stone and Silver: the Creation of a Visual Imagery of Queenship in Capetian France*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Norwich, John Julius. *A Short History of Byzantium*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.
- Parsons, John Carmi, ed. *Medieval Queenship*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Playfair, Sir R. Lambert. *Handbook to the Mediterranean: its cities, coasts and islands*. London: J. Murray, 1890.
- Pringle, Denys. "The Crusader Cathedral of Tyre" in *Levant* 33 (2001), pp. 165-188.

- Pringle, Denys. *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a Corpus*. Vol. III The City of Jerusalem. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Reddaway, W. F. *The Cambridge History of Poland*. 2 Vols. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.
- Robinson, I.S. *Henry IV of Germany 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Robson, Michael. *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Schültz, Bernhard. *Stift Suben am Inn*. Munich: Schnell & Steiner, 1970.
- Smith, Damian J. *Innocent III and the crown of Aragon: the limits of papal authority*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Soltész, István. *Árpád-hazi kiralynek*. Budapest: Maecenas, 1999.
- Steane, John. *The Archaeology of the Medieval English Monarchy*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Szentpétery, Imre. *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*. Budapest: Academia litter, 1937.
- Trindade, Ann. *Berengaria: In search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen*. Portland: Four Courts Press, 1999.
- Tuzson, John. *István II (1116-1131): A chapter in medieval Hungarian history*. Boulder: Eastern European Monographs, 2002.
- Uzsoki, András. "Die Echtheit des Grabes der ungarischen Königin Gisela in Passau." In *Bayern und Ungarn: Tausend Jahre enge Beziehungen*, ed. Ekkehard Völkl, 13-22. Regensburg: Lassleben, 1988.

- Varzos, Konstantinos. *He genealogia ton Komnenon*. Thessaloniki: Kentron Vyzantinōn Ereunōn, 1984.
- Weiss-Krejci, Estella. "Restless corpses: 'secondary burial' in the Babenberg and Habsburg dynasties." *Antiquity* 75 (2001), pp. 769-780.
- Weiss-Krejci, Estella. "Unusual Life, Unusual Death and the Fate of the Corpse: A Case Study from Dynastic Europe." *In Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*, ed. Eileen M. Murphy, 169-190. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2008.
- Wessely, Christine. *Die Babenberger und das was von ihnen blieb (The Babenbergs and what they left to us)*. Vienna: Verb. d. Wissenschaftl. Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1975.
- Wiebenson, Dora and József Sisa. *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998.